

pleased Pseudo-Isidore least of all. This case of reception nevertheless raises disquieting problems. Beyond outright borrowings, the passage on chorbishops from the Le Mans forgeries presents stylistic peculiarities redolent of the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries⁹¹. We are reminded of Walter Goffart's suggestion that the Le Mans forger might have spent some earlier period of his career in the archdiocese of Reims⁹².

This leaves the second case, a forgery in the name of Ps.-Pelagius II (J³ †2067), which we find throughout the canonical tradition, and which bears striking similarities to the formulation of Ps. Leo's *De privilegio chorepiscoporum*. We first encounter Ps.-Pelagius in Burchard, Decretum III, 69⁹³. The rubric that heads this capitulum clearly draws on the rubric that Pseudo-Isidore supplies to his dossier of Ps.-Pelagius II forgeries in the False Decretals⁹⁴, although the decretal itself has been found nowhere in the extant Pseudo-Isidorian manuscript tradition. In the text beneath this rubric, Ps.-Pelagius names nine

91) These formed a good part of the original case for the Le Mans origins of Pseudo-Isidore; see in particular the parallels adduced by SIMSON, Entstehung (as n. 62) p. 8–11, and again at p. 68f, especially the shared fondness for the adverb *enucleatim*.

92) Walter GOFFART, The Le Mans Forgeries. A Chapter from the History of Church Property in the Ninth Century (Harvard Historical Studies 76, 1966) p. 188–190, esp. p. 189: „It remains quite remarkable that the Le Mans forger knew that St. Remigius had a brother called Principius. At present only one source supplies this information, namely the *Vita s. Remigii* published ca. 877–78 by Hincmar of Rheims [...] Now, there can be no question of moving the terminus of the *Actus* and *Gesta* to such a date as 878 ... The forger's source must have been different from Hincmar's *Vita* ... Could it then be that the forger, who arrived in Le Mans only after Aldric's death, originated from the diocese of Rheims or from its province?“ Compare *Actus* 8, c. 3 (ed. WEIDEMANN, Geschichte 1 [as n. 65] p. 47, with commentary at p. 48f.).

93) Ed. MIGNE, PL 140 col. 687f.; for commentary see Hartmut HOFFMANN / Rudolf POKORNY, Das Dekret des Bischofs Burchard von Worms. Textstufen – Frühe Verbreitung – Vorlagen (MGH Hilfsmittel 12, 1991) p. 97f. Along with Ps.-Deusdedit, J³ †3203 (which seems to enter the canonical tradition in Burchard, Decretum XVII, 44), J³ †2067 was tentatively ascribed to Pseudo-Isidore by David BLONDEL, Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes (1628) p. 645f., 675, and has remained among the Pseudo-Isidorian dubia (for want of a better term) for centuries. See also FUHRMANN, Einfluß und Verbreitung (as n. 3) Bd. 1 p. 138f. n. 6.

94) To the Burchard rubric as ed. MIGNE, PL 140 col. 687 (*Incipiunt decreta secundi Pelagii papae successoris Benedicti et antecessoris Gregorii papae*) compare HINSCHIUS, Decretales (as n. 2) p. 720 and the transcriptions of Karl-Georg SCHON, <http://www.pseudoisidor.mgh.de/html/300.htm>. The Pseudo-Isidorian rubric differs at ... *beati Benedicti* ..., and of the three codices that Schon collates (Ap, An and Vatican City, Bibl. Apost., lat. 630), only An has *papae*.