

as a reference to Christ as key-bearer. Also annotated is Ennodius's suggestion that Symmachus should not be subject to the sentence of those beneath him in rank, and a further passage in which Ennodius writes that Symmachus has been *de incorrupta iudicum inquisitione pulsatus*. Further on we find notae near references to Peter the Apostle and the pope⁵⁸.

A final annotation worthy of mention occurs in one of Ennodius's letters to Pope Symmachus. Near the end of this brief missive, Ennodius writes of a legation that has been assigned *ad Marcellianum episcopum*, and adds that this Marcellianus is writing separately with the results of his venture. The statement has been set off with *trigonii* before and afterwards. While such remarks might be expected to interest a forger of papal correspondence, the relationship of these annotations to Pseudo-Isidore's project seems more specific. The False Decretals appropriate, in its entirety, Ennodius's letter to the patrician Liberius, which discusses the election of Marcellinus to the diocese of Aquileia. That the forgers might have taken a deeper interest in a bishop named Marcellianus receiving instructions from the pope therefore aligns neatly with the contents of Pseudo-Isidore's Symmachus dossier as constructed from V⁵⁹.

Implications

By the later twentieth century, most scholars had come to agree that Pseudo-Isidore worked between 847 and 852 in the Reims province, and that his purpose was to oppose secular interference in diocesan affairs and resist the authority of Hincmar, who became archbishop of Reims in 845. With his discovery, Zechiel-Eckes confirmed the venerable theory of Pseudo-Isidore's Reims origins, and yet in other respects he opposed the approach of his predecessors. He believed that the forgeries required wholesale reassessment in light of their Corbie association, which in his eyes revealed Pseudo-Isidore to be a monastic rather than an episcopal agitator. The False Decretals were not a self-

58) Appendix 3 (respectively: fols. 24va, l. 16; 25va, l. 27, 26va, l. 10; 27ra, l. 12; 31ra, l. 26; 42ra, l. 20).

59) Appendix 3 (fol. 68va, l. 15–17). In all likelihood the Marcellianus at issue was also bishop of Aquileia, and Marcellinus's direct predecessor. Not only Pseudo-Isidore, but also modern scholars, have confused the two bishops: VOGEL, *Enodii Opera* (as n. 7) p. xv.