

from Carthage II or fol. 31r in Vat. lat. 1341⁶⁵. It is hard enough to imagine that the *Capitula Angilramni* could have hit upon a subset of the sequence from Benedictus Levita by chance, and it is completely inconceivable that the *Capitula Angilramni* could have done so while also backtracking at precisely the same point.

Late in Book 3 this relationship changes, and suddenly it is Benedictus Levita who receives the *Capitula Angilramni*. BL 3.307–374 provide, with interspersed material, no less than thirty items from a wide variety of sources, many of them falsified or forged, that we also find in the same order in the *Capitula Angilramni*. Among these is BL 3.368 which is nothing more than CA 6bis from the table above, which in turn draws on BL 2.316, which Benedictus Levita excerpted from the Council of Elvira (Vat. lat. 1341, fol. 57v). Here is an item that the *Capitula Angilramni* take up from Benedictus Levita's second book and provide to his third book. For Emil Seckel, BL 3.307–374 thus represent Benedictus Levita's reception of the *Capitula Angilramni* in some form, and there is no reasonable alternative to his conclusion⁶⁶.

The *Capitula Angilramni* were thus compiled after BL 2.300–342, but alongside or even prior to BL 3.307–374. Because the False Decretals indisputably draw upon the *Capitula Angilramni*, they must also, on the strength of this evidence alone, postdate a great part of the capitulary forgeries. The best demonstration of this dependence lurks among a list of procedural mandates shared by the decretal forgeries

65) So Emil SECKEL, *Studie VIII Teil II* (as n. 7) p. 60–61. But compare SCHMITZ, *Book 2* (as n. 1) p. 61 n. 782, who holds that BL 2.300 could just as probably draw on the Dionysio-Hadriana, which provides precisely the same passage. Whatever its origins CA 42 = BL 2.300 represents an anomaly in the sequence that cannot have recurred by chance.

66) Positing a reverse relationship, namely that the *Capitula Angilramni* here receive Benedictus Levita, if anything worsens the case for the parallelist hypothesis, in light of the evidence for Isidorus Mercator's dependence upon the *Capitula Angilramni* outlined just below. It is also an untenable position in the face of Seckel's powerful and multidimensional proofs about the direction of the relationship; at most, there is room to argue that the capitulary forger knew a draft of the *Capitula Angilramni* with slightly better textual features than has come down to us – which could only be expected. Cf. the entire discussion in SECKEL, *Studie VIII Teil II* (as n. 7) esp. p. 55–66 with the table at p. 129–130. Confirming this basic interpretation is also SCHMITZ, *Verfälschungen* (as n. 16) p. 146: „Bei diesem kleinen ... Opuskel [i. e., the *Capitula Angilramni*] gibt es in der Tat kräftige Querbeziehungen und eine eindeutige Rezeption, hier kommen die Seckelschen ‚mehrschichtige(n) Hin- und Herbenutzungen‘ tatsächlich zur Geltung“ – citing SECKEL, *Pseudoisidor* (as n. 7) p. 296.