

Capitula Angilramni	Benedictus Levita	Interpolated Hispana, (Vat. lat. 1341):
CA 42	BL 2.300	fol. 32r–v (Carthage III, c. 10)
	BL 2.301	fol. 29v (Carthage I, c. 10)
	BL 2.302	fol. 29v (Carthage I, c. 11)
	BL 2.303	fol. 29v–30r (Carthage I, c. 14)
CA 4bis	BL 2.304	fol. 31r (Carthage II, c. 13)
	BL 2.305	fol. 30v (Carthage II, c. 8)
	BL 2.306	fol. 31r (Carthage II c. 9)
	BL 2.307	fol. 31r (Carthage II c. 10)
	BL 2.308	fol. 32v (Carthage III c. 20)
	BL 2.309	fol. 44r (Mileve, c. 21)
	BL 2.310	fol. 45v (Arles I, c. 17)
	BL 2.311	fol. 45v (Arles I, c. 19)
	BL 2.312	fol. 45v (Arles I, c. 20)
	BL 2.314	fol. 46v (Arles II, c. 24)
	BL 2.315	fol. 47r–v (Valence, c. 4)
	CA 6bis	BL 2.316
BL 2.317		fol. 58r (Elvira, c. 73)
CA 7bis	BL 2.318	fol. 58v (Tarragona, c. 3)
CA 8bis	BL 2.319	fol. 62v (Toledo I, c. 11)
CA 9bis	BL 2.320	fol. 62v (Toledo I, c. 12)
	BL 2.321	fol. 75v (Toledo IV, c. 45)
	BL 2.322	fol. 84r (Toledo VII, c. 1)
CA 11bis	BL 2.323	fol. 88r (Toledo VIII, c. 2)

There is no denying that the Capitula Angilramni draw on Benedictus Levita, who excerpts directly from his own recension of the interpolated Hispana – a close relative of Vat. lat. 1341⁶⁴. Especially decisive, as Emil Seckel recognized, are CA 42 and BL 2.300, which are strictly speaking out of order. They come from Carthage III in the Hispana, specifically from a canon on fol. 32r–v in Vat. lat. 1341; but are then followed by sequentially earlier material, namely CA 4bis or BL 2.304,

64) On apparent differences between the interpolated Hispana available to Benedictus Levita and Vat. lat. 1341, cf. SECKEL, *Studie VII Schlussteil III* (as n. 7) p. 466–470.