

pitulary forgeries, are therefore confined to the five years between 847 and the first glimmerings of the indirect tradition in 852⁷.

The dominant hypothesis removed the forgeries from the political world of the 830s. All of Pseudo-Isidore's idiosyncrasies, from his procedural desiderata to his ire over the chorepiscopate, had therefore to be transposed to a much different era. The western kingdom under Charles the Bald, and more specifically Reims during the pontificate of Hincmar, its most domineering archbishop, became the new historical backdrop. Pseudo-Isidore went from a Lothar partisan to a player in the provincial politics of Reims, Hincmar's enemy rather than Louis's, but perhaps also a friend or associate of Hincmar's predecessor, Ebo, in his later years of obscurity and exile at Hildesheim. In this way the dominant hypothesis cut Pseudo-Isidore down to size. If scholars like Hinschius were already inclined to look beyond the Pseudo-Isidorian corpus to establish date and origins, this was a further reason to study the forgeries not from within but from without, as Pseudo-Isidore's historical importance seemed increasingly to lie not in his person or his political position, but purely in the influence his ideas found. Pseudo-Isidore's identity ceased to be a pressing question.

As the study of medieval Latin scripts matured in the twentieth century, the dominant hypothesis of Pseudo-Isidore's origins received unexpected confirmation. Hinschius, in his edition, had wildly misdated important codices, placing them long after the era of forgery. When the palaeographical evidence finally accumulated in the 1970s, it emerged that the earliest stratum of Pseudo-Isidorian codices, like the earliest reception, dates to the middle of the ninth century, precisely the

7) Emil SECKEL, *Pseudoisidor*, in: *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 16 (31905) p. 265–307, *passim* but esp. p. 294. Beyond this article, Seckel is best known for his *Studien zu Benedictus Levita*, analyses of the sources of the False Capitularies preparatory to a critical edition that never appeared. SECKEL, *Studie I*, in: *NA* 26 (1901) p. 39–72 and *Studien II–V*, in: *NA* 29 (1904) p. 275–331, both on preliminary matters. Then, on the sources for *Benedictus Levita*, *Book 1: Studie VI*, in: *NA* 31 (1906) p. 59–139 and 238–239. On *Book 2: Studie VII Teil I*, in: *NA* 34 p. 319–381 (BL 2.1–161); *Studie VII Teil II*, in: *NA* 35 (1910) p. 433–539 (BL 2.162–255); *Studie VII Schlussteil III*, in: *NA* 35 (1910) p. 533–539 (BL 2.256–436). On *Book 3: Studie VIII Teil I*, in: *NA* 39 (1914) p. 327–431 (BL 3.1–254); *Studie VIII Teil II*, in: *NA* 40 (1915) p. 15–130 (BL 3.255–374); *Studie VIII Teil III*, in: *NA* 41 (1919) p. 157–263 (BL 3.375–429). Seckel died in 1924 and the final instalments appeared posthumously, ed. Josef JUNCKER: *Studie VIII Teil IV*, in: *ZRG Kan.* 23 (1934) p. 369–377 (BL 3.430–446) and ed. by IDEM, *Studie VIII Schlussteil V*, in: *ZRG Kan.* 24 (1935) p. 1–112. All of these studies have been digitized at <http://www.benedictus.mgh.de/studien/seckel.htm>.