

glossed *tenuem*. This, too, would seem to have happened at the level of α , for *rimosam* has received no gloss in V.

Appendix 1 assembles evidence of twenty-six further glosses that can be ascribed to the hyparchetype β or later stages of the tradition. R134 is free of these glosses, while V630 and MH3 carry a substantial subset, and P9629 and N442 have the most. Towards the end of the Libellus, the scribes of P9629 and N442 cease treating these glosses as textual insertions, adding them instead to the margins or between the lines of their text, much as R134 handles the first few glosses surveyed above. The dense activity of glossators through successive stages of the Pseudo-Isidorian tradition suggests that the disappearance of glosses in V after fol. 26v marks the moment at which Pseudo-Isidore moved his study of the Libellus from V to his own working drafts.

Glosses and related corruption are far from Pseudo-Isidore's only contribution to the Libellus. Our forger also supplied the treatise with false rubrics and interpolated its text at two points. None of these enhancements occur in V, and yet they are present across the entire Pseudo-Isidorian tradition, including R134. These must therefore have originated with α , and so they merit comment here. In the first of them, Pseudo-Isidore presents the Libellus to his readers as a synodal decree: