

is working from the prior, mediating collection in this case as well. Yet the evidence of Paris lat. 11611 suggests otherwise. Two sequences of notae stand alongside the passage in question, in the right margin of fol. 32r l. 15–17, one directly above the other. The first, between the fifteenth and sixteenth lines, corresponds to the incipit of NS 11 (l. 15: *Directi religiosissimi ...*), while the second sits one line lower, precisely at the decretal forger's phrase on suspicion. The first notae have moreover been erased. The strong impression is that our forger has adjusted prior annotations made for the *Nonnullae sanctiones* in the course of later work on the Ps.-Fabianus forgery³⁵.

Later in his project, therefore, Pseudo-Isidore sometimes returned to Paris lat. 11611, with the result that the False Decretals at points know the Chalcedon acta more fully than the prior, mediating collection. The *Nonnullae sanctiones* nevertheless guided the decretal forgeries in important ways. The five items likely mediated by the *Nonnullae sanctiones* recur a full fifteen times in the False Decretals. This is in marked contrast to the material that the pseudopopes lift directly from the folios of Paris lat. 11611 in Ps.-Cornelius, J³ †226, and Ps.-Fabianus, J³ †192. In each of these cases, these later appropriations are confined to a single destination, even though the associated notae in Paris lat. 11611 are indistinguishable from all the others³⁶. Already, the False Decretals begin to look like the final stage of the textual processes at work here.

To this point we have considered only the False Decretals, respecting the bounds of *communis opinio*. As we extend our view to the False Capitularies, the prevailing hypothesis of parallel capitulary and decretal forgeries becomes harder to accommodate. Among four items in the collection of Benedictus Levita that flow from Paris lat. 11611 is

35) These notae are indexed at ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Verecundus oder Pseudoisidor* (as n. 9) p. 432 (third entry from the bottom); and IDEM, *Pseudoisidors Werkstatt* (as n. 9) p. 50 (second entry from top).

36) The themes involved are also central to Pseudo-Isidore's program. Ps.-Cornelius (ed. HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* [as n. 1] p. 173–174) draws on the Chalcedon acta to forbid the swearing of oaths by bishops (a means of shoring up their legal security: cf. Paris lat. 11611 fol. 52v l. 29 – 53r l. 2, corresponding to Actio I, ed. SCHWARTZ, ACO 2.3.1 [as n. 20] p. 136 l. 3) and to forbid condemnation in absentia (Paris lat. 11611 fol. 166r l. 11–166v l. 11, corresponding to Actio X, ed. SCHWARTZ, ACO 2.3.3 p. 21 l. 4 – p. 22 l. 10). And we saw just above how Ps.-Fabianus builds a mention of suspicion from Chalcedon Actio I into a disqualification for accusers. And again, in all three of these cases the marginal notae in Paris lat. 11611 are graphically indistinguishable from those that tie to the *Nonnullae sanctiones*.