

avoid confronting the mediating role of the *Nonnullae sanctiones* in any detail²⁵.

While the *Nonnullae sanctiones* may have been particularly early, they had no more than a peripheral importance for later Pseudo-Isidorian products. As we have said, the *Nonnullae sanctiones* consist of 111 unique extracts from Paris lat. 11611. The False Capitularies of Benedictus Levita (BL), the Capitula Angilramni (CA) and the False Decretals, meanwhile, know only ten distinct passages from the Chalcedon actiones as edited by Rusticus. Of these, four have no presence in the *Nonnullae sanctiones* at all. Two of these apparently direct appropriations from Paris lat. 11611 happen in the same Ps.-Cornelius forgery; the other two occur as adjacent capitula in Benedictus Levita. In all four cases we find the expected notae in the margins of Paris lat. 11611²⁶.

At most, then, Pseudo-Isidore can have consulted his own intermediary compilation for six items, namely NS 2, 11, 16, 76, 77 and 107²⁷:

25) In his first article, Zechiel-Eckes studied Rusticus/Chalcedon reception in the *Nonnullae sanctiones* alone; the table in IDEM, Verecundus oder Pseudoisidor (as n. 9) p. 431–446 thus lists only those notae in Paris lat. 11611 demonstrably tied to the *Nonnullae sanctiones*. In his subsequent article (IDEM, Pseudoisidors Werkstatt [as n. 9] p. 48–54, with the table at p. 50), he tracked Rusticus/Chalcedon reception in all Pseudo-Isidorian products except the *Nonnullae sanctiones*. In this way the problem of the *Nonnullae sanctiones* as a formal source for other Pseudo-Isidorian items is almost entirely obscured, and neither article provides a full picture of Pseudo-Isidore's use of Paris lat. 11611.

26) ZECHIEL-ECKES, Pseudoisidors Werkstatt (as n. 9) p. 50: The fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh items in the table involve passages from Rusticus/Chalcedon that have no presence in the *Nonnullae sanctiones*. For the False Capitularies reception, see the discussion just below, p. 463–468. Ps.-Cornelius, J³ †226 (ed. HINSCHIUS, Decretales [as n. 1] p. 172–175, here 173–174) bypasses the *Nonnullae sanctiones* twice in the course of the same discussion, first appropriating a passage verbatim from Actio I of the Chalcedon acts that the compiler of the *Nonnullae sanctiones* had only summarized (the fourth instance in Zechiel-Eckes's table), before some lines later drawing on another passage from Actio X that the *Nonnullae sanctiones* do not have at all (the seventh instance in this table).

27) I reproduce here a reduced version of the table in ZECHIEL-ECKES, Pseudoisidors Werkstatt (as n. 9) p. 50. The *Nonnullae sanctiones* are cited according to pages in PITRA, Spicilegium (as n. 21) and folios in Paris lat. 11611. The central column does not quote the full items from the (often extensively excerpted) *Nonnullae sanctiones*, but only the precise loci of interest to Pseudo-Isidore as indicated by the placement of the notae in the source codex. These quotations are according to Pitra but controlled against Schon's transcription of Vat. lat. 630 online at <http://www.pseudoisidor.mgh.de/html/311.htm>. The False Decretals are cited according to HINSCHIUS, Decretales (as n. 1).