

Sed hoc me oppido conturbat, quod diversae interpretationes varias sententias faciunt, et licet unus sit sensus, diversae tamen sunt sententiae, et aliae longiores, aliae breviores⁷⁷.

Horst Fuhrmann, who discovered this fleeting verbal resonance, suggests that the parallel represents Pseudo-Isidore's use of Radbert. In fact the relationship could go either way⁷⁸.

For Richard and Mary Rouse, Radbert's „isolated borrowing“ from Ennodius, „a turn of phrase taken from the first paragraph of the first work“, implies „only a superficial acquaintance“ with his work⁷⁹. It is tempting to read the faint verbal echo between the prefaces of Radbert and Isidorus Mercator in the same way. Perhaps, in both cases, we have before us the retired abbot of Corbie perusing the latest acquisitions of his library. Only according to the early dating of Zechiel-Eckes do the False Decretals align neatly with the caesura in Radbert's literary production that begins in the 830s, a time that Radbert lamented as a withdrawal from his scholarship and entanglement in worldly affairs. „Dazwischen blieb Zeit für anderes“, Zechiel-Eckes writes, that is to say the management of a forgery operation extending from Louis the Pious's final years until sometime after 847⁸⁰. The Vatican Ennodius shows that the years around 850 found the False Decretals still in production and Radbert hard at work on his Matthew commentary. Zechiel-Eckes has shown that Radbert and Pseudo-Isidore used the same library, and in doing so he changed study of the forgeries forever. He has not shown that Radbert and Pseudo-Isidore were the same person, and in fact nothing suggests that they were.

77) Radbert, *Expositio in Matheo*, ed. Beda PAULUS (CCCM 56A, 1984) p. 820–1 l. 770–73; Isidorus Mercator, ed. HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* (as n. 1) p. 17.

78) Horst FUHRMANN, *Pseudoisidor und die Bibel*, in: DA 55 (1999) p. 183–91.

79) ROUSE / ROUSE, *Ennodius in the Middle Ages* (as n. 7) p. 97–98.

80) ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Auf Pseudoisidors Spur* (as n. 3) p. 25.