



No sooner had Hartel's edition appeared than the stock of V began to rise<sup>24</sup>. When Friedrich Vogel published his edition three years later in 1885, he realized that all known medieval codices beyond B owe their text, ultimately, to V. As Vogel addressed himself to the nature of Pseudo-Isidore's Ennodius, however, he found reason to retain the hypothetical X from Hartel's stemma codicum, arguing that Pseudo-Isidore knew not V but its antecedent<sup>25</sup>. Ennodius's most recent editors, Christian Rohr and Stéphane Gioanni, have not questioned Vogel's basic vision, and his analysis describes the state of the question to this day<sup>26</sup>:

24) See KRUSCH, review (as n. 15) p. 100–104.

25) VOGEL, *Enodii Opera* (as n. 7) p. xxxi–xlvi.

26) AUSBÜTTEL, *Heiligenviten* (as n. 22), revises Vogel's text at points but does not critically re-edit Ennodius's hagiographical works. ROHR, *Theoderich-Panegyricus* (as n. 7), reconsiders the transmission of Ennodius's work in producing his critical edition of n. 263/Opusc. 1, the *Panegyricus Theoderico*. His conclusions (p. 179–87) represent a refinement of Vogel's analysis but the stemma retains its basic shape. GIOANNI, *Lettres: Tome I* (as n. 7) p. cliv–clxxvii, brings still further refinements, including the discovery of a new early medieval witness to Ennodius's work (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. lat. 2833A, from the tenth century). Yet he hardly deviates from Vogel's view of the early medieval manuscript tradition, merely supplying X from Hartel and Vogel with the new siglum α (p. cxliv–cxlv, clxxiv). The excerpts from Paris 2833A appear to derive, like the rest of the tradition besides B, from V; thus Gioanni's statements at *Lettres: Tome I* p. clvi, are in tension with his stemma on clxxiv (which portrays Paris 2833A as a sibling, rather than a derivative, of the Vatican Ennodius).