

Deutsches Archiv

für

Erforschung des Mittelalters

namens der Monumenta Germaniae Historica

herausgegeben von

FRIEDRICH BAETHGEN WALTHER HOLTZMANN

HERBERT GRUNDMANN

18. Jahrgang

1962

BÖHLAU VERLAG KÖLN GRAZ

Die Arbeit des Verfassers, die 1959 erschienen ist, hat jetzt zum ersten Mal eine — wenn auch nur sehr summarische — Würdigung in einer wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift gefunden⁴⁵). 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 Sens¹)

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 survives²). 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)³). 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

⁴⁵) (G. W a c h a), *MIÖG.* 69 (1961) 213.

¹) 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.

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

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

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. Garcia 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.

in the Pope's letter strongly suggests that it is Elipand's letter to Bishop Felix of Urgel, in which he speaks of the help he is receiving from Ascaricus¹¹), that is the ultimate source of the Pope's knowledge of the new heresy: although it is fairly clear from the words *de partibus vestris pervenit ad nos lugubre capitulum*¹²) that he has merely been told about the contents of a letter that he has not seen. The letter itself, however, was only written in October and it did not become available to Etherius and Beatus, who wrote a reply to it, until the last week of November 785, as we learn from the opening words of their Apologeticum¹³). It is hardly likely, therefore, that its contents were known in Rome before the beginning of 786 and perhaps not until well on in that year. A still later date is, of course, possible but not in my view very probable; and it becomes even less likely if, as I believe, nos. 96 and 97 were written before and not after no. 95.

The doctrines of Elipand and Ascaricus are one of several heterodoxies currently rife in Spain against which Hadrian is inveighing in the letter of ?786. In its opening section the Pope tells how he had allowed Wilchar to consecrate a certain Egila, not to a particular see but as a wandering or missionary bishop¹⁴): and now he has perhaps usurped a see — the text is not very clear on this point¹⁵) — and is certainly preaching false doctrine, apparently on the lines of Migetius, and committing other unspecified offences. In the final section Hadrian gives a long list of heresies which he has been told are taught in Spain. In the other two letters (the first of which, no. 96, alludes again to Egila's consecration by Wilchar) the Pope praises the missionary-bishop's orthodoxy: the greater part of the first letter is, however, devoted to an account of the various heretical doctrines then current in Spain in words that are almost identical with those used in the final section of no. 95. The reasons given by Hauck, and accepted by Gundlach, for making this the earliest letter in the group (and not the latest as Jaffé had believed) are: firstly, that the use of the words *ut fertur*, etc., in no. 95 shows that he was relying on — and discounting — a rumour about Egila's (and his priest-assistant John's) un-

¹¹) Migne PL. 96, 918.

¹²) Epp. 3, 637 l. 33. *Capitulum* here and elsewhere in the same letter (637 l. 27, 643 l. 1) and in a corresponding passage of no. 96 (646 l. 53) means "charge, point of indictment", as in the letters of Gregory I, Epp. 1, 147, 166 etc., and of Pope Theodore I, JL. 2052 of 642/3 (Migne PL. 87, 81). In Liber Pontificalis, 1, 383 (ed. Duchesne; 1886) *capitulare* is used (? uniquely) in the same sense.

¹³) Migne PL. 96, 894 f.; partial re-edition, Rivera, p. 51.

¹⁴) Ed. cit. p. 633 l. 22 f.; also in no. 96, ed. cit. p. 644 l. 13 f.

¹⁵) The crucial passage reads (with Gundlach's punctuation) [*Wilcharii licentiam tribuimus ut Egilam] episcopum ordinaret: et nullam quamlibet alienam sedem ambiret vel usurparet, sed solummodo animarum lucra Deo offerri — quia una cum Iohanne presbitero partibus vestris venientes — quod peius est, ut eius fama in auribus nostris sonuit — non recte illa Egila predicat.* The language of the dictator of the Papal letters of this period (on which see especially Grundlach, NA. 17, 539 ff.) is not always easy to follow but ungrammatical construction is rare; and it must be assumed that something has dropped out after *offerri* and before *quod peius est*. The necessary contrast with the offence introduced by the latter phrase seems best provided by an accusation of usurping a see, which had previously been expressly forbidden; and this supposition is borne out by the occurrence of Egila's name in the catalogue of the bishops of Elvira preserved in the Codex Emilianensis: H. Flores, España Sagrada, 12 (1754; repr. 1904), 104, cf. 162—3

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 arguments¹⁶): 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'¹⁷); 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 orthodoxy¹⁸) 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).

¹⁶) 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.

¹⁷) In Christian Latin of the third to fifth centuries *praevaricator* is used frequently in the general sense of "betrayed, 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).

¹⁸) 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.

their favour but obviously cannot be insisted on¹⁹). (No objection can be raised to this dating because of the reference in no. 97 to bishop Peter of Pavia: for although the latest account of the early medieval bishops of that city gives the dates of Peter's pontificate as '787—805' this is based on completely false arguments; and there is evidence to suggest that Peter was consecrated as early as 781.)²⁰)

Does the other evidence for Wilchar's life and career have any bearing on the dating-limits of the letters in the Codex Carolinus in which he is named? When Wilchar appears for the first time as 'archbishop of the Gauls' — at the Roman council of 769 — his full title is *archiepiscopo provintiae Galliarum civitate Senense*²¹). In the Sens episcopal catalogues the name of *Unil(i)arius* comes after that of Lupus who is recorded as bishop in texts of 757 and 762²²). If it were the case (as has been generally assumed) that Wilchar retained the diocese of Sens until his death (or until the end of his active life) although he is always referred to as *archiepiscopus (provinciae) Galliarum* or simply *archiepiscopus*²³), a fairly precise terminus ante quem could be established for Codex Carolinus no. 95 (and 96). In an Echternach document dated in the 15th year of King Charles, i.e. 785 October 9—786 October 8²⁴), the Anglo-Saxon Beornred, abbot since 775²⁵), is referred to for the first time as *episcopus (sc. Senonensis) et rector* also; in a document of Charles' 16th year he is *archiepiscopus*²⁶) and thereafter he regularly figures as *archiepiscopus* or *episcopus* until his death in 797²⁷). Unfortunately for this line of argument, the Sens episcopal catalogues, which seem entirely reliable for this period, give no less than three names between Wilchar and Beornred. The second of these, *Gun(t)bertus*, is also named in a diploma of 826, where it is recorded that, following the disappearance of the Sens cathedral charters *domnus et genitor noster Karolus augustus ad petitionem Gunberti episcopi eandem relevasset iacturam*²⁸). It is evident that Wilchar ceased to be bishop of Sens not very long after the one dated record of his association with that see²⁹).

¹⁹) Charles was in Saxony during the first half of 785, then at Attigny from the late summer. The latter is obviously the more likely context for the presence of the Bishop of Pavia at the Frankish Court and his being sent by the king to Rome, referred to in no. 97. If Gundlach's sequence (95, 96, 97) is still preferred it should be noted that Charles was in Italy in the first half of 787.

²⁰) Above, n. 8.

²¹) Liber Pontificalis 1, 473; cf. Concilia 2 (ed. Werminghoff), 80.

²²) L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*², 2 (1910) 396—7, 418; *Capitularia* 1 (ed. Boretius) 221.

²³) So Gundlach, *Epp.* 3, 636, 643, 744 (s. v. *Wilcharius archiep. Senonensis*); Lesne, *Hiérarchie*, p. 58 et seq., 70 n. 3; Amann in Fliche and Martin, *Histoire de l'Église* 6 (1947) 80—1. For Wilchar's title see, e. g., DK. I 118; *Epp.* 3, 571, 593, etc.

²⁴) C. Wampach, *Gesch. der Grundherrschaft Echternach* 1, 2 (1930) 159, no. 94; for the dating, cf. *ibid.*, 130—1.

²⁵) For this date (not 777) see Wampach p. 130.

²⁶) Wampach p. 163, no. 97. In Wampach p. 162, no. 96, also of Charles' sixteenth year, he is still *episcopus et rector*.

²⁷) Wampach, nos. 98—111; *Epp.* 3, 632, etc.

²⁸) T. Sickel, *Beiträge zur Diplomatik* V (SB. Wien, P. 49, 1865) p. 408; BM.² 829 (770).

²⁹) In 769 Sens was part of Karloman's kingdom. In 771 the subjects of Karloman who transferred their allegiance to Charles (*Ann. reg. Franc.* 32) were headed by *Wilcharius archiepiscopus* — almost certainly the *archiepiscopus*

For most of his career as 'archbishop of the Gauls', therefore, Wilchar was without a diocesan see of his own. In this respect his position was identical with that of archbishop Boniface before October 745³⁰); and indeed, although Boniface is never called *archiepiscopus (provinciae) Galliarum* in any surviving text, it was over the *provincia Galliarum* that Pope Zacharias (following an earlier decision of Karloman) extended his archiepiscopal powers at the end of 744³¹). By the 780s the existence in Francia of an archbishop without a see must already have seemed a serious anomaly: the notion of metropolitan archbishop was at last becoming firmly established after the abortive attempt of 744 to give the title of *archiepiscopus* to the bishops of Rheims and Sens as well as of Rouen³²) and after the (as we now see) equally temporary revival of the archiepiscopal title for a bishop of Sens in or shortly before 769. The diocesans of Rheims, Trier and ?Tarentaise were recognised as metropolitans — and subsequently adopted the archiepiscopal title — shortly before 780; the diocesans of Mainz were metropolitan archbishops from c. 781³³). The final recognition of Sens as an archiepiscopal see belongs to the same decade and perhaps specifically to 786—7: the contrast between the *episcopus* Gunbert and the *archiepiscopi* Magnus (succeeded a. 802)³⁴) and Jeremy in the diploma of 826 seems deliberate; and the reference to Beornred in Echternach documents first as *episcopus* and only subsequently as *archiepiscopus* is not necessarily accidental³⁵). Indeed, it is tempting to suppose that it was only after Wilchar's death (which would then have happened 786—7) that it was felt possible to give the archiepiscopal title once more to the diocesan of Sens.

If this reading of the evidence is correct, new and unexpected light is thrown on Charles' policy towards the Church and its hierarchy in the 770s and 780s. Bishops and archbishops unattached to any see had been under attack for several decades: but simultaneously with the establishment of permanent metropolitan sees in the Frankish church, Charles was prepared to maintain exceptions where they were of advantage to his authority; and in the early 780s, apparently in order to extend Frankish influence, he did not hesitate to send a 'missionary bishop' into regions that had their own established hierarchy still in touch with Rome. The scheme failed as completely as his earlier military expedition across the Pyrenees — perhaps because Charles had chosen a wholly unsuitable man as his instrument. The Pope might have felt a rueful satisfaction that the choice of Egila had proved such an unfortunate one³⁶) but

Galliarum and not, as was later supposed, the bishop of Sion who as bishop of Vienne had earlier received a pallium: compare Lesne p. 60 and n. 2 with Duchesne, *Fastes* 1, 247. Was Wilchar's loss of Sens connected with these political changes?

³⁰) Lesne p. 40 et seq.; W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the eighth century* (1946) p. 72—4, 86—7; T. Schieffer, *Winfrid-Bonifatius* (1954) p. 156—9, 204—7.

³¹) Bonifatii et Lulli Epist. ed. Tangl (MG. Epp. sel. 1, 1916) p. 108.

³²) Bonifatii ... Epist. nos. 57—8; Lesne p. 41 et seq.; Schieffer, *Winfrid-Bonifatius* p. 222, 228.

³³) Levison p. 234—5; Schieffer, *Angelsachsen u. Franken* (Mainzer Abh., Geistes- u. Sozialwiss. Kl., 1950, no. 20, 1951) p. 45 et seq. and esp. p. 95 et seq.

³⁴) *Capitularia* 1, 100: *Magnus archiepiscopus*.

³⁵) References above, nn. 24, 26, 27. But the occasional use of *episcopus* in the later texts means that this cannot be pressed.

³⁶) Assuming, that is, that no. 95 is the last letter in the group. If Hauck were right in treating it as the first, the other two letters show the Pope trying to make the best of a situation which clearly gave him no pleasure.

it is clear that he had to accept (however unwillingly) whatever Charles did in this direction. It is possibly significant for the changing relations of Pope and king in this period that, whereas in 781 Hadrian declared that 'full of good will we have carried out your orders as we are accustomed to' in consecrating a man put forward by Charles for the bishopric (as I believe) of Pavia³⁷), a decade or so later when Charles again put forward a candidate for that see, namely abbot Waldo, the Pope declined to consecrate him³⁸).

One last point may be made about the man who for more than a decade-and-a-half was the titular head of the church in Francia and who for at least part of that period was high in the counsels of the king. Since Duchesne's edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* it has been generally accepted that archbishop Wilchar is identical with the bishop of Mentana of that name who is recorded from 753 until some time in the 760s³⁹). The evidence of Codex Carolinus no. 25, in which the Pope asks Pippin to order Wilchar to consecrate as bishop, *nostra vice*, a Roman priest resident at the Frankish court⁴⁰), surely strengthens this identification, whether Wilchar is regarded as still bishop of Mentana at this time or already bishop of Sens⁴¹). The appearance among the bishops of

³⁷) Epp. 8, 600, with my comments in the article forthcoming in Riv. stor. della chiesa in Italia.

³⁸) D. A. Bullough, *Baiuli* in the Carolingian *regnum Langobardorum* and the career of Abbot Waldo († 813), EHR. 77 (1962) (in the press).

³⁹) Lib. Pont. 1, 446, 457 n. 25; Codex Carolinus (ed. Gundlach) nos. 7, 11, 14, 22, 25, 30.

⁴⁰) Fourth-century councils had laid down that at least three bishops were to perform the consecration of a new bishop; at an early date, however, the bishop of Rome was recognised as having the right of consecrating without the participation of other bishops: M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen age 3* (*Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, Ét. et docs.*, 24, 1951), p. 584—6 and, for the insistence on the participation of three or more bishops in episcopal consecrations in the sixth and seventh centuries, the so-called *Responsio ad Augustinum*, supposedly sent by Gregory I, c. 6 (*Bede, Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 26; Epp. 2, 336) and bishop Wini of Wessex's summoning of two British bishops to help him consecrate Ceadda c. 664, *Hist. Eccl.* III, 28. The wording of some of the Gallic councils of the same period suggests, however, that in some regions metropolitans were coming to have the same privilege in this respect as the bishops of Rome: see the passages collected in Lesne, *Hiérarchie épiscopale* p. 14—5. (For the powers of metropolitans later, see Lesne p. 117—20). It is hardly surprising that particularly in missionary regions Popes allowed or empowered other bishops to act alone: so in the *Responsio*, loc. cit., archbishop Wilchar's consecration of Egila, etc. Why Paul found it necessary to give this power to Wilchar in the case of the *presbyter* Marinus is not clear: was it because he had previously been ordained to one of the Roman *tituli* (C. C. no. 24)? or because for some reason Frankish bishops would have refused to consecrate him?

⁴¹) Lesne's reason (*Hiérarchie épiscopale* p. 58 n. 1) for denying that Wilchar was bishop of Sens at the time this letter was written is quite unconvincing and there is slight evidence in favour of the contrary view. In the (later) eighth century the papal writing office seems normally to have used the word *coepiscopus* only of bishops who collectively constituted the Roman metropolitan synod and who in later sources are distinguished by the title of *cardinalis*. Thus, in the letters in the Codex Carolinus it is applied to George of Ostia in nos. 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18 (in nos. 37 and 99 the same man is referred to as *episcopus*: but the first of these empowers Pippin to keep him in Francia and the second demands his return), to Wilchar of Mentana in nos. 7, 11, 14, 22, 30, and to Andrew of Palestrina in no. 51 (but he is *episcopus* in nos. 53,

those sees in the vicinity of Rome whose incumbents subsequently figure as *cardinales* of the Roman church⁴²) of a man with a Germanic name has never been commented on; yet it is, I think, unique in this period. Wilchar succeeded to the see of Mentana between November 751 and 753⁴³). If he were a Lombard (which is certainly possible, even though the name is not certainly recorded in north Italy before 774⁴⁴), this is especially noteworthy at this time, and not less so if (as I believe) the diocese of Mentana straddled the frontier between the duchy of Rome and the Lombard Spoletan Sabina (transferred later in the century to Papal authority) and that therefore areas of Lombard settlement were within its *plebs*⁴⁵). The fact, however, that another Wilchar was bishop successively of Vienne and Sion⁴⁶) makes a Transalpine origin of his more famous namesake at least equally plausible. In this case the bishop of Mentana who became archbishop of the Gauls is to be added to the not negligible number of Frankish clerics who in the first half of the eighth century journeyed to Italy and made a significant contribution to the life of the church there, particularly in the regions round Rome⁴⁷). Such men may have done more than is usually recognised to help create the links between the rulers of the Franks and the Papacy; and most of the records of Wilchar's activities before the 780s show him travelling between the two courts to maintain and strengthen these links.

55). Other bishops, including George after he had been translated from Ostia to Amiens (C. C. no. 73), are invariably referred to in the Codex and in other letters of the period as *episcopus* — with one exception. This is the *coepiscopus* Peter of C. C. no. 70: the editor's identification with a bishop of Verdun of that name is implausible and perhaps impossible and I have suggested elsewhere (art. cit. n. 8) that he is a bishop of Pavia, a see directly dependent on Rome since the end of the seventh century. C. C. no. 25 is the only pre-769 letter in which Wilchar is not *coepiscopus* — I suggest, because he was already bishop of Sens. If so, its date must be 762/3 (the terminus post quem being supplied by bishop Lupus of Sens' presence at the synod of Attigny) and C. C. nos. 30, in which Wilchar is *coepiscopus*, and 31 must precede no. 25; in fact, on quite other grounds, Kehr argued that these letters belong to 759 and not (as Gundlach thought) to 761/6: Göttinger Nachr., Ph.-hist. Kl., 1896, pt. 2, 113 ff., 120 ff.

⁴²) See especially H.-W. K l e w i t z, Reformpapsttum u. Kardinalkolleg (1957) p. 24—31.

⁴³) His predecessor Benedict was still alive in November 751: Bonifatii ... Epist., no. 90.

⁴⁴) It is not in W. B r u c k n e r, Der Sprache der Langobarden (1895); and although his list of "Personennamen" (p. 215 ff.) is far from complete, I have not noted it elsewhere unless *Uuiliari(s)* (the name of an archdeacon of Ravenna and abbot of S. Bartolomeo, Ravenna, in the 750s, Agnelli Lib. Pont. Rav., SS. rer. Lang. p. 380; cf. the rural archpriest *Uuiliari* in the Modenese, Regesto della chiesa cattedrale di Modena, ed. E. P. Vicini, 1931, no. 12 of 830) is the same name with loss of intervocalic *-ch-*. The root *willi(o)* is, however, common in Lombard personal names and the suffix *-c(h)ar* not infrequent.

⁴⁵) I hope to produce the evidence for this view elsewhere.

⁴⁶) D u c h e s n e, Fastes² 1, 209, 247.

⁴⁷) To the names given by E. H l a w i t s c h k a, Franken, Alemannen, Bayern u. Burgunder in Oberitalien (774—962) (Forsch. zur oberrhein. Landesgesch., 8, 1960) p. 19 must be added Adalhard (the later abbot of Corbie and an influential figure at the Frankish court) who was a monk at Monte Cassino before 774: Paschasii Vita Adalhardi c. 12, MG. SS. 2, 525.