

of ancient Latinity that was all the more valuable for being little known to his contemporaries and containing politically sympathetic views on judicial and ecclesiastical subjects. Ennodius's diocesan, Bishop Laurentius of Milan, was a leading member the faction that supported Symmachus, and it was through him that Ennodius became entangled in the later stages of the Symmachian schism. After the final vindication of Symmachus at the Synodus Palmaris of October 502, the anti-Symmachian faction circulated a tract *Adversus synodum incongruae absolutionis* to denounce the proceedings. Ennodius answered their objections with his *Libellus adversus eos qui contra synodum scribere praesumpserunt*¹⁶.

The False Decretals appropriate this *Libellus* in its entirety. Pseudo-Isidore supplies false rubrication that recasts its content as a conciliar decree, promulgated in Symmachus's defense. He also enhances its text with characteristic interpolations¹⁷. Also from the works of Ennodius, Pseudo-Isidore borrows a speech composed to commend Bishop Maxi-

der Nachwelt mit seinen Schriften nicht den Beifall gefunden, welchen er selbstbewußt vorausgesetzt hatte. Der komplizierte Stil und Mangel an Inhalt mögen die Lektüre verleidet und die Abschreiber abgehalten haben, die umfangreichen Werke des vielseitigen Bischofs zu verfielfältigen“. ROHR, *Theoderich-Panegyricus* (as n. 7) p. v: „In der Tat waren die Jahre der Beschäftigung mit dem [Ennodius] nicht immer ein Vergnügen, sondern vielmehr ein Ringen, ihn ... zu verstehen“. For recent remarks on Ennodius's style and particularly his difficulty, see SCHRÖDER, *Bildung und Briefe* (as n. 14) p. 53–63; and GIOANNI, *Lettres: Tome I* (as n. 7) p. xcvi–cxxxiii.

16) The decrees of the Synodus Palmaris, from 23 October 502, are ed. MOMMSEN (as n. 6) p. 419–37. For the political controversies and chronological problems surrounding this synod and the prior legal entanglements of Symmachus, see WIRBELAUER, *Zwei Päpste in Rom* (as n. 4) p. 17–34. The *Libellus* is ed. VOGEL, *Enodii Opera* (as n. 7) p. 48–67 (n. 40/Opusc. 2). On Ennodius's defense of Symmachus and the *Libellus*, see WIRBELAUER, *Zwei Päpste in Rom* (as n. 4) p. 147–9; KENNEL, *Magnus Felix Ennodius* (as n. 14) p. 186–201; and Bianca-Jeanette SCHRÖDER, *Petrus, Paulus, and Roma: Three Prosopopeias in Ennodius' Libellus adversus eos qui contra synodum praesumpserunt*, in: *Quarta Giornata Ennodiana*, ed. Silvia CONDORELLI / Daniele DI RIENZO (*Quaderni di 'Paideia'* 13, 2011) p. 11–33. For Ennodius's wider views of papal primacy in the context of the Laurentian schism, see Stéphane GIOANNI, *La contribution épistolaire d'Ennode de Pavie à la primauté pontificale sous le règne des papes Symmaque et Hormisdas*, *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome: Moyen Âge* 113 (2001) p. 245–68. The Laurentian attack upon the Synodus Palmaris does not survive and must be reconstructed from the *Libellus*; Ennodius gives its title at p. 49.

17) For the false rubrication: HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* (as n. 1) p. 664–5. Otherwise, because Hinschius reprints the *Libellus* of Ennodius from Sirmond's 1611 edition, he obscures Pseudo-Isidore's interpolations (for which see below, p. 19–24).