

and the competing fifth Symmachian synods studied above, as well as the Ennodian epistolary fragment senselessly appended to the second decretal of Pseudo-Liberius in the A1 recension. Even the forger of the False Decretals, it seems, had to scramble to fold Ennodius into the world of the pseudopopes.

Radbert, whom Zechiel-Eckes sees behind the Pseudo-Isidorian facade, also knew Ennodius. He borrows four words from the first lines of Ennodius's work – presumably from V itself – in the preface to the ninth book of his *Expositio in Matheo*, written after he retired his abacy around 850⁷⁴. This unacknowledged quotation places Radbert in rare company, for the only other authors able to quote Ennodius in the ninth century are Paul the Deacon, Pseudo-Isidore and two popes, Nicholas I and John VIII⁷⁵. Zechiel-Eckes has suggested that this shared knowledge of a rare author strengthens the case for Radbert-as-Pseudo-Isidore⁷⁶. This is another argument we would do well to reconsider. Elsewhere among the later, retirement-era additions to his Matthew commentary, Radbert's prose echoes the opening passage of another text recently arrived at Corbie, namely the False Decretals themselves. His occasion is a discussion of parallel verses in the Gospels:

Quae nimirum varietas sententiarum, licet unus sit sensus, tamen amplius et perfectius apperitur intellectus, dum sententia ex alia predicatur et ornatior loquendi commendatur modus.

In the preface to the decretal forgeries, Isidorus Mercator, in a much different connection, claims to be bothered by differing translations of the Greek councils:

74) Radbert, *Expositio in Matheo Libri XII*, 9.praef., ed. Beda PAULUS (CC Cont. Med. 56B, 1984) p. 931 l. 28–29. From Ennodius, n. 1/Dict. 1 (ed. VOGEL [as n. 7] p. 1 l. 13–14) – on the very first folio of V. The citation corresponds to no visible annotations in the manuscript.

75) On the papal reception, ROUSE / ROUSE, *Ennodius in the Middle Ages* (as n. 7) p. 98–9. Their argument that both papal citations derive from Pseudo-Isidore is contentious and probably unjustified. See also SCHRÖDER, *Petrus, Paulus, and Roma* (as n. 16) p. 11–12. The citations themselves are in JE 2796, ed. Ernst PERELS (MGH Epp. 6, 1925) p. 469 l. 4–5 and JE 2954, ed. Erich CASPAR (MGH Epp. 7, 1928) p. 274 l. 16–17.

76) ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Fälschung als Mittel politischer Auseinandersetzung* (as n. 3) p. 18 and 22 with n. 53.