

distinctive variants that he shares with Ps.-Leo extravagans⁶². What is more, BL 1.320f. splits the capitulum precisely as Ps.-Leo does, making a separate item out of Antioch, c. 10. Because BL 1.320 occurs amid a much larger bloc of material taken from the *Episcoporum relatio*, it is impossible to imagine that Ps.-Leo was Benedict's source at this moment⁶³. On the other hand, BL 1.320f. – at least in the form we have it – is an unlikely source for Ps.-Leo. At BL 1.321, Benedictus provides Antioch c. 10 with his own rubric, while Ps.-Leo knows the original inscription of the *Episcoporum relatio*, which reads *Item in concilio Antiocheno c. X*⁶⁴. Once again, Ps.-Leo seems adjacent to Pseudo-Isidore, with early access to the same sources, and yet he does not appear to know the forgeries themselves and in important ways he stands apart.

IV. Ps.-Leo and Pseudo-Isidore

Pseudo-Isidore's opposition to the chorepiscopate has been used to support at least two different theories of his origins and motives, and in the course of these long-running debates, chorbishops have become an emblematic Pseudo-Isidorian theme⁶⁵. This has obscured the im-

62) This textual relationship was first noted by Bernhard SIMSON, *Die Entstehung der pseudo-isidorischen Fälschungen in Le Mans. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der pseudo-isidorischen Frage* (1886) p. 14–16. The variants with line numbers as in Appendix: p. 522 l. 6 *MENSURAE* Ps.-Leo extrav. and Ben.] *MENSURAE SUAE* Ep. rel.; p. 522 l. 11 *nullum* Ps.-Leo extrav. and Ben.] *nullus* Rel. ep.; p. 522 l. 12f. *donum sancti spiritus* Ps.-Leo extrav. and Ben. (following Paris 829, c. 27)] *sancti spiritus donum* Rel.; p. 522 l. 13 *manus* Ps.-Leo extrav. and Ben. (cf. Paris 829, c. 27)] *manuum* Rel.; p. 522 l. 18 *honorentur* Ps.-Leo extrav. and Ben.,] *honorantur* Rel. ep. See also the commentary by SCHMITZ, libI.pdf (as n. 61).

63) The bloc is BL 1.315–334: the greater part are ed. SCHMITZ, libI.pdf (as n. 61) p. 101–111 with abundant commentary; see also Georg Heinrich PERTZ, *Capitularia Spuria* (MGH LL 2, 2, 1837) p. 88b–89b, and the fundamental source analysis by Emil SECKEL, *Studien zu Benedictus Levita* Teil VI, NA 31 (1906) p. 59–139 at p. 107–112.

64) Ed. SCHMITZ, libI.pdf (as n. 61) p. 105 l. 7f.: *DE CHOREPISCOPIIS, QUI IN VICIS COMMORANTUR, IN CONCILIO ANTIOCENO HABETUR ITA*.

65) Most recently, Klaus ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Der „unbeugsame“ Exterminator? Isidorus Mercator und der Kampf gegen den Chorepiskopat*, in: *Scientia veritatis. Festschrift für Hubert Mordek zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. von Oliver MÜNSCH / Thomas ZOTZ (2004) p. 173–190, who saw in this aspect of the forgeries a means of supporting his dating scheme for the A2 version of the decretal forgeries. Compare now Eric KNIBBS, *Defence of the Hinschius Thesis* (as n. 4) p. 486f. Otherwise