

## V. Reception

Through Pseudo-Isidore, Ps.-Leo entered the canonical collections and ultimately even Gratian's *Decretum*<sup>86</sup>. His is a meagre reception, but still respectable, for the disappearance of chorbishops after the ninth century sharply limited the relevance of his pronouncements for later generations. Of course it is the A1 recension of Ps.-Leo, the most widely circulated form by far, that informed the canonical tradition. While nearly all of this reception is far removed from the earliest history of our forgery, two cases of early reception raise intriguing problems adjacent to the matter of Ps.-Leo's origins and his significance for the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries.

The first involves vague allusions to Ps.-Leo among the concoctions of Pseudo-Isidore's notorious contemporary, the Le Mans forger. The *Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium*, assembled to defend the property of that diocese between 855 and 862, provides an extended biography of the Bishop Gauziolen, who died probably in 771<sup>87</sup>. Gauziolen, we are told, was blind and required assistance in his ministry, and so he asked Charlemagne for permission to ordain a chorbishop. Charlemagne, however, had developed scruples about the propriety of the office; together with papal legates and the bishops of his kingdom, he declared

*ut nullus chorepiscopus crisma conficeret, virgines sacraret, spiritum paraclitum traderet, neque aecclesias dedicaret, vel altaria erigeret seu aut sacraret, etiam oleum ad infirmos unguendos benediceret, nisi a tribus etiam ordinatis episcopis, quae vero omnia summis sacerdotibus et non chorepiscopis debentur*<sup>88</sup>.

These remarks clearly depend upon Benedictus Levita 3.423, the very capitulum that mentions Pope Leo III and associates him with these prohibitions. The *Actus* then proceeds to explain why chorbishops are to be denied these faculties. This time, the Le Mans forger's source is very probably Ps.-Leo:

---

l. 67; *Quod autem ... docet* and *Presertim ... tradidisse: Episcoporum relatio*, c. 6 via Ps.-Leo extravagans, l. 50f. and 48–50.

86) For an overview of the major reception (from *Quamvis cum episcopis*, or – as it becomes in the canonical collections – *Quamvis chorepiscopis* [l. 25]) see FUHRMANN, *Einfluß und Verbreitung* (as n. 3) Bd. 3 p. 932, Lfd. Nr. 325.

87) On Gauziolen's dates, see WEIDEMANN, *Geschichte* 1 (as n. 65) p. 97.

88) *Actus* 15, part 3d., ed. *ibid.* p. 92, with commentary at p. 99.