

Canon 64 from Toledo IV enters the world of the forgeries at BL 1.335. Benedict truncates its text such that it no longer applies specifically to Jews, but to anyone whose faith is in doubt. From there, the item is split in two. The first part, which associates doubtful faith in Christ with doubtful testimony in human affairs, flows to BL 3.176; in familiar fashion, Benedictus Levita extends the discussion of testimony to include accusations raised against *sacerdotes*. He also provides a rubric that reformulates the clause about those *qui in fide catholica suspecti sunt* to speak of those *qui in recta fide suspecti sunt*. The second half of BL 1.335/c. 64, meanwhile, makes its way to CA 3. Here our forger enriches the statement about disbelieving those *qui veritatis fidem ignorant* with the familiar formula from BL 1.393/2.381h about the *fides et vita* of those raising accusations – the third item discussed just above. Distinct from all of this is Lex Visigothorum 12.2.10, which Benedict adopts at 3.427, with highly familiar falsifications. The original provisions on testimony are extended again to include accusation, and mention of Jews is replaced by a relative clause, parallel to the rubric of BL 3.176, about those *qui in recta fide suspecti sunt*.

The permutations yielded by this process echo through nine decretal forgeries. Five repeat the line about those who are suspect in the right faith, whether from BL 3.176 or 3.427 it is not always clear, while a sixth and a seventh know the composite statement at CA 3⁶⁰. An eighth lifts the entire concluding clause from BL 3.427, and a ninth appears to reach all the way back to BL 1.335, while extending the scope from testimony to accusation via the familiar line about those suspect in the right faith from the rubric to BL 3.176⁶¹. At the level of the False Decretals, none of these formulae demanding that the faith of the accusers be scrutinized has any independent contact with the Lex Visigothorum or Toledo IV. Some statements of this doctrine stand at such great remove from the original Visigothic legislation that, without this analysis, their source bases would prove nearly impossible to identify.

Clearly it was authentic material on witnesses that interested Pseudo-Isidore first of all. He did not wish to exclude the testimony of Jews, but he did hope that witnesses might be subjected to tests of

60) From BL 3.176/3.427: Ps.-Pius I, J³ †86; Ps.-Pontianus, J³ †180; Ps.-Fabianus, J³ †192; Ps.-Stephanus I, J³ †257; Ps.-Eusebius, J³ †337 (ed. HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* [as n. 1] p. 117, 149, 162, 182 and 230). From CA 3: Ps.-Sixtus I, J³ †60; Ps.-Julius I, J³ †443 (ed. ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Pseudoisidors Werkstatt* [as n. 9] p. 78 l. 156–157).

61) Respectively: Ps.-Fabianus, J³ †190; Ps.-Calixtus I, J³ †162 (ed. HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* [as n. 1] p. 158 and 140).