

occurs on a tipped-in folio, namely fol. 95. The placement is curious and must be deliberate, seeing as fol. 95 locates *De privilegio chorepiscoporum* directly after Leo's authentic J<sup>3</sup> 916. This is not only the last of Leo's letters in the Dionysio-Hadriana, but also the authentic source after which the exordium of Ps.-Leo has been modelled. What is more, E<sub>1</sub> provides the best text of the extravagans recension. Here, it seems, we are very near the origins of J<sup>3</sup> †1118<sup>35</sup>.

2. The Pseudo-Isidorian recensions. There are three of these, corresponding to the A1, A/B, and C versions of the False Decretals. The best-known today is the A1 recension of Ps.-Leo, because it was print-

---

809 (MGH Conc. 2, Suppl. 2, 1998) p. 48–62; the unredacted E<sub>1</sub> shows many similarities in contents and arrangement to Paris, Bibl. nat., Ms. lat. 3846. Both appear to descend from a common exemplar of the Dionysio-Hadriana / *Collectio Sancti Amandi* ensemble (on this latter, named for Paris, Bibl. nat., lat. 3846: KÉRY, Canonical Collections [as n. 30] p. 84f.). Abigail FIREY, Canon Law Studies at Corbie, in: *Fälschung als Mittel der Politik? Pseudoisidor im Licht der neuen Forschung. Gedenkschrift für Klaus Zechiel-Eckes*, hg. von Karl UBL / Daniel ZIEMANN (MGH Studien und Texte 57, 2015) p. 19–79, esp. p. 42–50, has written extensively on E<sub>1</sub>. Her discussion must be disregarded as almost entirely mistaken and unreliable; her thesis that the Caroline scribes of this codex are not redactors, but near-contemporary collaborators with a-b scribes in the production of E<sub>1</sub>, is impossible. Compare KNIBBS, *Firey Review*, Part II/1: The Production of Berlin, Hamilton 132, at <https://pseudo-isidore.com/2019/10/18/firey-review-part-ii-1-the-production-of-berlin-hamilton-132/>. For our purposes, the most important of Firey's contentions is that the copies of Ps.-Leo in E<sub>1</sub> and E<sub>3</sub> have been made by the same scribe (FIREY, *Canon Laws Studies* p. 50f.). The scripts are not without similarities, but differences are apparent as well, also in matters of orthography. Philological matters also undermine her judgment: E<sub>1</sub> shares an archetype with E<sub>4</sub>, while E<sub>3</sub> presents a slightly different text.

35) The bloc of original Dionysian Leo letters occurs in E<sub>1</sub> at fols. 85r–94v; in the unredacted codex, J<sup>3</sup> 916 occupied fols. 94v–96r (fol. 95 being a later addition), where it was followed by the capitulatio for the decretals of Pope Hilarius and then a Hilarius synod from 465 (J<sup>3</sup> 1138). The running title in the upper margin by a-b scribes corresponding to J<sup>3</sup> 916 is thus divided across fol. 94v and 96r (*Leonis papae / Cesariensis vel Mauritanie*: an error for the correct version that we find at the top margin of fol. 94v: *LEONIS PAPE AD EPISCOPOS CESARIENSES ET MAURITANIE*). When the redactors tipped in fol. 95r, they had to recopy the conclusion of J<sup>3</sup> 916 onto this new leaf, complete with an original explicit they must have found in the unredacted codex: *EXPLICIT DECRETA PAPAE LEONIS*. They then added Ps.-Leo extravagans after this explicit on the tipped-in folio, with its capitulatory appendix continuing onto the verso. On fol. 96r, they erased the old a-b conclusion to J<sup>3</sup> 916, stranded and redundant, as well as the Dionysio-Hadriana capitulatio to Hilarius, adding the Hispana version in its place. They then left the Hilarius synod (J<sup>3</sup> 1138) as the a-b scribes had copied it before them.