

This table depicts the relationship between Pseudo-Isidore and V only partially. For a fuller view, Appendix 2 lists a further 32 instances in which Pseudo-Isidore uses Ennodius but leaves no visible mark in V; and Appendix 3 documents 46 instances of marginal annotation in V that are graphically similar to the annotations described in this table, but that surround items with no apparent reception in the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries.

Together, table and appendices show that Pseudo-Isidore's use of Ennodius corresponds only loosely to notae in the Vatican Ennodius. Some of the slippage must reflect Pseudo-Isidore's creation and use of his own working drafts of the *Libellus*, reconstructed above as α and β . At least one decretal forgery, at no. 8 in the table above, draws upon the *Libellus* in its interpolated form, which is to say its author would seem to have used α or a later draft rather than V itself. Thirteen of the 32 unannotated appropriations in Appendix 2 likewise involve the *Libellus*, and it is probable that working drafts served as Pseudo-Isidore's source for at least some of these borrowings as well.

Otherwise, the slippage between notae in V and Pseudo-Isidore's use of Ennodius is subject to distinct patterns that suggest the working methods of the forgers. The decretals were composed as units, such that the same secretarial practices apply throughout each document. Within a given decretal, therefore, every borrowing tends to tie to annotations in V, or no borrowing does. Of twenty forgeries that cite Ennodius's work, only three mix annotated and unannotated borrowings. In these cases, the very first appropriation corresponds to an annotation in V, and the ensuing, unmarked appropriations fall in the general vicinity. For the space of these decretals, it is clear that Pseudo-Isidore began with a notated passage and worked outwards⁴⁷.

Ten forgeries within the False Decretals are remarkable for citing Ennodius only once, in an isolated passage⁴⁸. All ten of these isolated citations correspond to marginal annotations in V. Such isolated citations are moreover almost never unique and tend to involve favorite

47) Pseudo-Anacletus, JK †2 (at no. 13 in the table above); Pseudo-Eusebius, JK †163 (no. 9 in the table above); Pseudo-John I, JK †872 (no. 7 in the above table). Note also the tendency of Ennodius borrowings in Pseudo-Anacletus to correspond to horizontal colons (.) in V.

48) Pseudo-Alexander, JK †24; Pseudo-Sixtus I, JK †31 and JK †32; Pseudo-Stephen, JK †131; Pseudo-Sixtus II, JK †134; Pseudo-Dionysius I, JK †139; Pseudo-Euticianus, JK †146; Pseudo-Marcellus, JK †161; Pseudo-Eusebius I, JK †164; and Amator to Silverius (at HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* [as n. 1] p. 708).