

developed last of all. The False Capitularies place themselves among our forger's contemporaries, and yet Pseudo-Isidore began work on them very early. If Benedictus Levita and Isidorus Mercator worked in parallel, and the relationships studied here are all deceptive instances of the decretals forger looking over the shoulder of the capitulary forger or straying further from a master repository, then similar cases should exist in the other direction. However late he wrote, after all, Isidorus Mercator could never cite the False Capitularies directly without anachronism too great even for our forgers. His use of Benedictus Levita had to be silent. The False Capitularies, however, should have been free to cite Isidorus Mercator's inventions early and often. In fact it would accord with Pseudo-Isidore's legal preconceptions for Carolingian emperors to invoke apostolic authority wherever possible, especially when legislating on ecclesiastical matters. From Book 1 through Additio 3, however, Benedictus Levita, while he sometimes talks vaguely of apostolic decrees, can produce not a single specific citation to the False Decretals as a means of supporting his legal inventions⁸⁹.

The final appendix to the False Capitularies, Additio 4, is a different case. As Paul Hinschius first showed, and as everybody now accepts, these capitula suddenly know the pseudopopes. They cite both their sources and their pronouncements explicitly, though in an early form that has not come down to us. This final appendix to the False Capitularies is probably very late, for it appears to postdate the preface of Benedictus Levita with its 847 terminus ante quem non. It is the only stretch of capitulary material in Benedictus Levita that could be called parallel to or even later than the False Decretals. For the space of Additio 4, in other words, the relationship that scholars have posited for the entirety of the False Capitularies actually prevails. In the powerful contrast that these 170 capitula strike with the rest of Benedictus Levita's compilation stands a final refutation of the parallelist hypothesis⁹⁰.

89) Thus, just by way of example, Benedictus Levita is desperate to claim that his statements on the chorepiscopate accord with papal doctrine, and yet he very obviously has nothing specific to cite. This accounts for the strange tenor of BL 3.260, where the capitulary forger invents a long and awkward story of Arn of Salzburg's consultation with Pope Leo III (on which cf. also SCHMITZ, *Verfilzungen* [as n. 16] p. 138–139) as a device to shroud the capitulary condemnations in Roman authority. At this point Benedictus Levita plainly had no decretal forgeries against chorbishops to hand, and perhaps had not yet even developed the intention of inventing any.

90) On Additio 4 and its many distinctive features, cf. above all SCHMITZ, *Verfilzungen* (as n. 16) p. 146–149; and HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* (as n. 1) p. CLIX–CLXII on the Additiones in general, with special focus on Additio 4. This final