

## The Second Proof: Marginal Notae in V

Pseudo-Isidore's source for Ennodius was therefore twofold. Via the library at Corbie he had access to Ennodius's works in V, and via his own industry he had working drafts of the *Libellus* at least. These latter came to include his glosses, revised rubrication, and interpolations. This state of affairs is complex, but it is in keeping with what we know of Pseudo-Isidore's approach to other sources<sup>43</sup>. The forgery enterprise emphasized compilation alongside invention, and it commanded substantial scribal resources.

Above, we noted that Pseudo-Isidore's three wholesale appropriations from Ennodius's work have each received a large, distinctive marginal *s* that should probably be resolved "Symmachus"; and that two of his four interpolations to the *Libellus* also coincide with marginal signs in V. In fact, as Vogel first noted in 1885, the margins of V carry a great many marks<sup>44</sup>. An important subset of these interact with Pseudo-Isidore's Ennodius citations, and they constitute a second proof that Pseudo-Isidore knew Ennodius through V.

---

43) Zechiel-Eckes, for example, has shown that Pseudo-Isidore compiled from Rusticus's version of the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. lat. 11611, a series of procedural extracts that comes down to us as an appendix to the *False Decretals*. These so-called *Excerptiones de gestis concilii Chalcedonensis*, ed. Johannes Baptista PITRA (*Spicilegium Solesmense* 4, 1858) p. 166–85 went on to inform Pseudo-Isidore's use of Chalcedon in his forgeries. Thus ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Verecundus oder Pseudoisidor* (as n. 3) p. 427 with n. 50. Yet after compiling the *Excerptiones*, Pseudo-Isidore plainly continued to exploit the unexcerpted decrees of Chalcedon directly from Paris 11611. Compare the appendix in *Verecundus oder Pseudoisidor* p. 431–46 to the table in IDEM, *Pseudoisidors Werkstatt* (as n. 3) p. 50. The latter table lists ten passages from Paris 11611 that occur in the *False Decretals*, the *False Capitularies*, or the *Capitula Angilramni*. Of these passages, only five (the first, second, third, eighth and ninth) stand in Pseudo-Isidore's *Excerptiones*.

44) VOGEL, *Enodii Opera* (as n. 7) p. xxxvii: „... atque quondam in eo legendo studium consumptum esse testantur variae notae puncta unci litterulae, quae passim in marginibus reperiuntur. ...“ Bizarrely, recent scholarship has not only overlooked this feature of V, but actively denied it. See GIOANNI, *Lettres: Tome I* (as n. 7) p. cxlv, who writes that Pseudo-Isidore's source cannot have been V „... dans le mesure où le *codex vaticanus* ne porte aucune des annotations ... que l'on retrouve dans les autres manuscrits utilisés par le laboratoire pseudo-isidorien“. Also ROHR, *Theoderich-Panegyricus* (as n. 7) p. 73: „Der ... Schreiber korrigierte den Text an vielen Stellen selbst, hinzu kommen einige wenige Randnotizen aus dem Spätmittelalter und der frühen Neuzeit“.