

The supposedly prior forms are therefore clearly legible in V, and the posterior forms originated only as corrections to this codex<sup>28</sup>.

In fact, it is V that has priority over Pseudo-Isidore. Hartel, Vogel and Gioanni have dated the Vatican Ennodius a half century too late. Paleographically, V is roughly contemporaneous with our earliest Pseudo-Isidorian codices, and, as it happens, Pseudo-Isidore's source for Ennodius's work.

### The First Proof: Pseudo-Isidore and the Libellus

The first proof that Pseudo-Isidore knew Ennodius from V emerges from the text of the Libellus. No other item in V has received such close correction and such dense marginal attention as this treatise. That this activity should surround the single item in the entire collection of greatest interest to Pseudo-Isidore is no coincidence; and of course the volume of glosses and corrections must increase the likelihood that a later copyist, perhaps even Pseudo-Isidore, would overlook a few changes, such as the substitution of *loquacitate* or the addition of *in*. For our purposes, the most important of these additions are a series of marginal glosses that several different hands have contributed to the initial folios of the Libellus in V. Each of these reflects an effort to clarify the sense or vocabulary of Ennodius's opaque prose. The Pseudo-Isidorian tradition misunderstands these glosses and takes them into the text, resulting in a series of characteristic errors.

---

28) VOGEL, *Enodii Opera* (as n. 7) p. xlv; text p. 56 l. 1–2 and 57 l. 2–4. In the former passage, V after correction and its issue have Ennodius asking his adversaries why they have attacked Symmachus *canina loquacitate*, likely a correctio ex ingenio of the solecism of the archetypal *canina colacitate* (in V before correction). In the latter case, Ennodius asks: *Nonne directa verba sunt canonum, quicumque clericorum ab episcopo suo ante sententiae tempus pro dubia suspitione discesserit, manifestam eum manere censuram?* The clear meaning is that a cleric who has fled can expect „manifest censure,“ but a scribe in V misunderstands *manere* (here used in the sense of „to expect“) and emends superfluously to ... *in eum manere* ... GIOANNI, *Lettres*: Tome I (as n. 7) p. clv with n. 731, cites an even less probative variant from n. 48/Ep. 2.13), ed. VOGEL, *Enodii Opera* p. 48 l. 22. As noted above, the A1 recension of Pseudo-Isidore erroneously appends this item to Pseudo-Liberius, JK †224. All A1 manuscripts (as ed. HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* [as n. 1] p. 498 – and also Rennes, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. 134, at p. 281) agree with B in reading ... *diligentiam pectoris* ... , while V (fol. 24rb, l. 5) reads *diligentiam peccatoris* before correction (the erroneous *-ca-* has been expunged). Once again, V provides both readings, and Pseudo-Isidore quite plainly has *pectoris* from V after correction.