

cial exception is the eleventh-century papal history of Ps.-Liutprand, which draws heavily on some forerunner of the C version of the False Decretals to fill out its papal biographies. Ps.-Liutprand's chapter on Pelagius II cites the three canonical Ps.-Pelagius forgeries of the False Decretals, in the order that they occur there, before providing an excerpt from J³ †2067 at the end. Ps.-Liutprand knows the anathema that was erased in Pal. lat. 585, revealing that his source for this item is very unlikely to have been the Bishop of Worms⁹⁸.

Taken together, the evidence suggests that both Burchard and Ps.-Liutprand had J³ †2067 from a long-form manuscript of the False Decretals. This would explain why Decretum III, 69 repeats Pseudo-Isidore's Pelagius rubrication, and how this forgery found its way into the last position of Ps.-Liutprand's sequential rehearsal of Pseudo-Isidore's Pelagian forgeries. Despite its vast difference in subject matter, the possibility that J³ †2067 has some affiliation with the forgery enterprise of Pseudo-Isidore thus becomes very hard to exclude. Otherwise it is a strange coincidence, that a later accretion to the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries should take as its model, from abundant possibilities, precisely another forgery in Pseudo-Isidore's orbit. It is also worth considering whether the same rather formulaic forger was not responsible both for Ps.-Leo and Ps.-Pelagius II.

*

In conclusion: Ps.-Leo extravagans is a crude polemical item against chorbishops drawn up by somebody with access to some of the same sources known to Pseudo-Isidore, including otherwise uncirculated internal items, such as the capitulary forger's distinctive recension of the *Episcoporum relatio* of 829 and the decretal forger's *Hispana Gallica*. He worked in the wake of the 829 Council of Paris, probably to clarify the muted and unclear prohibitions on chorbishops that Jonas of Orléans had formulated in c. 27 of that council. Ps.-Leo circulated

Burchard de Worms (1910) p. 22. For Fournier, it was additionally important that Vat. lat. 3829 also carries the *Deusdedit* forgery (J³ †3203) at fol. 255r.

98) So also Detlev JASPER, *Die Papstgeschichte des Pseudo-Liutprand*, DA 31 (1975) p. 17–107 at p. 74. Ps.-Liutprand is ed. MIGNE, PL 129 col. 1149–1256; of interest here is c. 67 on Pelagius II, at col. 1228f., which draws respectively on the first three canonical Pelagius forgeries J³ †2056, J³ †2043 and J³ †2044 (col. 1228: *Scitote certam ... discernantur*: see HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* [as n. 2] p. 724; col. 1128f.: *Dona iniquorum ... decimas tuas*: HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* p. 729; and col. 1229: *Nullusque monachus ... est mortua*: HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* p. 731), before its appropriation from J³ †2067 (col. 1229: *Sacrum ordinem Romanum ... Si quis his supradictis demperit vel addiderit, anathema sit*).