

mus of Pavia; via another false rubric and address, he portrays this item as a letter from Symmachus to Bishop Laurentius of Milan. He further incorporates a letter that Ennodius wrote on the occasion of the election of Marcellinus to the diocese of Aquileia. Once again, fictitious rubric and address transform this into an item of Symmachian correspondence¹⁸. Finally and most anomalously, a further letter of Ennodius has become embedded in an otherwise unrelated Pseudo-Isidorian decretal forgery in the name of Pope Liberius I, apparently through some editorial accident.¹⁹ All four of these appropriations are in addition to Pseudo-Isidore's finer-grained use of the Ennodian corpus. Twenty-one items among the decretal forgeries, together with three capitula in Benedictus Levita and two alterations to the Fifth Council of Carthage from the interpolated Hispana, draw on Ennodius's work in some way. The most widely cited item is the Libellus, but Pseudo-Isidore also leans heavily on Ennodius's other products, particularly his letters²⁰.

For all of these appropriations, Pseudo-Isidore had one source, namely a collection of Ennodius's literary production that, in the traditional view, was assembled sometime shortly after his death by a secretary or associate. The anthology juxtaposes 470 distinct compositions, and

18) Ed. HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* (as n. 1) p. 684–6 (JK †760 and 752); Ennodius n. 214/Dict. 3 and n. 174/Ep. 5.1 are ed. Vogel, *Enodii Opera* (as n. 7) p. 171–2 and 153–4.

19) Pseudo-Liberius, JK †224, ed. HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* (as n. 1) p. 494–8; insert from Ennodius n. 48/Ep. 2.13 (ed. Vogel, *Enodii Opera* [as n. 7] p. 47–8) at 497–8. On this error, which is not present in the A/B recension and which introduces serious incoherence into the Liberius forgery, such that it cannot have been intended, see HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* (as n. 1) p. xcvi.

20) See the overview in HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* (as n. 1) p. cxxix–cxxx. The following items in the False Decretals draw on Ennodius: Pseudo-Anacletus (JK †2, at HINSCHIUS, *Decretales* [as n. 1] p. 69–70), Pseudo-Alexander (JK †24, at p. 98), Pseudo-Sixtus I (JK †31 and †32, at p. 107 and 109), Pseudo-Vigilius (JK †35, at p. 114), Pseudo-Anterus (JK †90, at p. 152–3), Pseudo-Stephen (JK †131, at p. 186), Pseudo-Sixtus II (JK †134, at p. 192), Pseudo-Dionysius I (JK †139, at p. 196), Pseudo-Felix I (JK †142, at p. 198), Pseudo-Euticianus (JK †146, at p. 212), Pseudo-Marcellus (JK †161, at p. 228), Pseudo-Eusebius (JK †163 and †164, at p. 231–2 and 237), Pseudo-Julius (JK †196, at p. 468–9 and 471), Pseudo-Liberius (JK †224, at p. 497–8), Pseudo-John I (JK †872, at p. 694–5), the false letter from Amator to Pope Silverius (at p. 708), Pseudo-Pelagius II (JK †1049 and †1050, at p. 727–8 and 731–2). The false fifth Symmachian Synod also draws on Ennodius (at p. 676). Benedictus Levita uses Ennodius at 3.108, Add. 3.8 and Add. 3.15 (Benedicti diaconi capitularia, ed. Georg Heinrich PERTZ [MGH LL 2.2, 1837] p. 109, 139 and 140). On the interpolations to the Fifth Council of Carthage, see Horst FUHRMANN, *Einfluß und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen* (Schriften der MGH 24/I, 1972) p. 149–50; and below, p. 29 with n. 72.