

passages that the decretal forger has used more than once⁴⁹. Either these isolated citations proceed from an intermediary compilation of Ennodius excerpts that was developed with the help of notae in V, or Pseudo-Isidore used his notae for guidance when occasionally opening V in a superficial search for helpful passages. Conversely, Appendix 2 reveals that those decretal forgeries drawing on Ennodius without corresponding notae in V tend to appropriate multiple passages, often in sequence. In these cases, the decretal forger appears to have perused V more closely, in search of adjacent items that he might stitch together. Here the clear parallel is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. lat. 12217, an eighth-century Corbie copy of the rare anti-Arian treatise *Contra Varimadum*. This manuscript has surely also been exploited by Pseudo-Isidore, and it has also yielded multiple, sequential passages to the False Decretals without notae⁵⁰.

In the St. Petersburg and Paris codices uncovered by Zechiel-Eckes, Pseudo-Isidorian appropriations correspond with marginal notae rather more closely. The marginalia present in Zechiel-Eckes's codices are also far more likely to occur in combinations of two, three or four characters. The most common sign by far is a dotted *n*, presumably for „nota“⁵¹. In the list above only no. 12 is directly comparable in combining a dotted *n* with other signs, a *q* and a *t*. Otherwise, the notae in the margins of the Vatican Ennodius occur only singly. At the same time, the graphical forms assumed by the notae themselves are an unmistakable point of similarity with the excerpted codices discovered by Zechiel-Eckes, such that despite the different secretarial practices suggested by V, there can be no doubt that all of the excerpted manuscripts were studied in the same atelier. In V as elsewhere, we find a preponderance of three- and two-dot clusters (*trigonii* and *colons*),

49) The exceptions are Pseudo-Felix I, JK †142 (an annotated borrowing that occurs nowhere else) and the editorial mistake underlying the unannotated, unique appropriation of Pseudo-Liberius, JK †224 (for which see above p. 18 with n. 19).

50) The *Liber contra Varimadum* has been edited by Benedictus SCHWANK (CC 90, 1961); passages received by Pseudo-Isidore are enumerated at p. xiv. See also Horst FUHRMANN, *The Pseudo-Isidorian Forgeries*, in: *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Wilfried HARTMANN / Kenneth PENNINGTON (History of Medieval Canon Law, 2001) p. 135–95, at 159 with n. 91.

51) Though Zechiel-Eckes never argued as much, the graphical arrangement of these notes strongly suggests that Pseudo-Isidore went over his source manuscripts twice, the first time providing nota marks at passages of interest, the second time adding additional signs that were perhaps intended as more explicit markers for his secretaries.