



Hartel, Vogel and Gioanni have all agreed in dating V to the later ninth or early tenth century, at least fifty years after Pseudo-Isidore flourished²⁷. It has therefore seemed to these scholars that the earliest False Decretals manuscripts predate the entire manuscript tradition of Ennodius aside from B. This has forced their conclusion that Pseudo-Isidore knew Ennodius through some antecedent of V, and yet philological evidence for the priority of the False Decretals over the Vatican Ennodius is not forthcoming. Vogel could cite only two instances in which Pseudo-Isidore appears to provide earlier readings than V or its descendants, both of them the *Libellus*. In the first, the False Decretals and B share the corruption *colacitate*, as against the more readily comprehensible *loquacitate* in V and its descendants. Conversely, V and its progeny insert into a later passage an extraneous *in*, betraying a minor misunderstanding of the verb; Pseudo-Isidore and B exclude the superfluous preposition. As proof of Pseudo-Isidore's priority, both of these variants are meaningless: When it was first copied, V also read *colacitate*, which is still legible beneath the correction to *loquacitate*; and omitted *in*, which appears in this codex only as an interlinear addition.

27) On the date of V, see HARTEL, *Opera Omnia* (as n. 15) p. iiiii; and VOGEL, *Ennodii Opera* (as n. 7) p. xlv: V "exeunte demum nono saeculo scriptus est." Likewise GIOANNI, *Letteres: Tome I* (as n. 7) p. clxxix. Only ROHR, *Theoderich-Panegyricus* (as n. 7) p. 73, follows Bischoff in offering a mid-ninth-century date for V.