The Santa Cruz Transcription of Benedict of Peterborough's *Liber miraculorum beati Thome*: Porto, BPM, cod. Santa Cruz 60

Following the publication of my study on the very early copy of Benedict of Peterborough's *Liber miraculorum beati Thome* in Lisbon, cod. Alcobaça CCXC/143, Dr José Meirinhos drew my attention to Porto, BPM, Santa Cruz 60, which is revealed to be another early Portuguese transcription of the same text. This discovery means that of the thirteen complete copies of Benedict's *Miracula* now known, three were transcribed in Portugal in the late twelfth or very early thirteenth century; moreover, they belong to an élite group of five manuscripts (and one fragment), which transmit the earliest surviving version of the text. Furthermore, they were written in religious houses which occupied the first rank in the emerging kingdom of Portugal—S. Mamede de Lorvão, Santa Cruz in Coimbra, and perhaps Alcobaça—and, even more significantly, they represented three distinct orders, Benedictine, Augustinian canons regular, and Cistercian. The context for this remarkable precocity, and its relevance for the high level of Anglo-Portuguese relations in the twelfth century, were reviewed in 1998 and need not be repeated here. The purpose of this study is to establish the place of the Santa Cruz

manuscript in the textual history of Benedict of Peterborough’s collection of Becket miracles.

Thomas Becket was murdered in Canterbury Cathedral in the early evening of 29 December 1170; and, almost immediately, evidence of popular veneration of the dead archbishop began to manifest itself, while, simultaneously, his familia, led by John of Salisbury, set out to canvas the support of powerful friends to advance the cause of his canonization at the papal curia. Part of that programme included the compilation of a dossier of miracles; and it is very likely that the task of recording the evidence of Becket’s posthumous sanctity fell to the monk Benedict, who became, in rapid succession, first prior of the cathedral priory (1175–77), in succession to Odo, who was transferred to Battle Abbey, then abbot of the great monastery of Peterborough (1177–93). Although when they referred to his authorship contemporaries tended to call him either prior or abbot, there is no doubt that his work was accomplished before he achieved either dignity, as one anonymous compiler seemed to recognize. The *incipit* of the extensive selection from Benedict’s miracles appended to the Lyell Quadrilogus in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lyell 5 (early thirteenth century), f. 94ra, records his dual status as monk and abbot in a manner which implies that the work was completed by the monk: «Incipit prologus in libro miraculorum beati Thome edito a uenerabili Benedicto pridem monacho Cantuariensi, sed postmodum abbate Sancti Petri de Burgo, de quo supra mentionem fecimus.» The *Explicit* of the same source provides confirmation of Benedict’s composition of the rhymed office, which formed the musical core of Matins for Becket’s feast, as it was celebrated at Canterbury (and in many other churches and monasteries across Europe): «Explicit liber miraculorum aliquorum de sancto Thoma, quem ut prediximus edidit uenerabilis Benedictus, tune quidem monachus Cantuariensis, sed postea abbas de Burgo, qui et hystoriam satis eximie fecit que de martyre sancto in ecclesia citatur.»


5. Edward Grim’s supplement to his *Vita et Passio*, added c. 1175, seems to imply the same thing: *MTB*, ii, 448.

miracles began in early 1171; some kind of dossier was submitted to the Cardinal legate who supervised Henry II's reconciliation with the Church in May 1172, for they were able to make a formal report to the pope on their return to the curia in late 1172, well in time for Becket's canonization by Alexander III at Segni, on 21 February 1173. It is very probable, but not provable, that something like Benedict's Book I (with or without the Prologue), which concentrates on the beginning of the popular cultus at Canterbury, was used to support the monks' supplication to the papal legates in early 1172. No event in the first recorded version of the work (Version 1, below) can be securely dated later than April 1177, and, in any case, he departed for Peterborough at the end of May, 1177. By 1185, however, a copy, or copies, of Version 1 of his Liber miraculorum had already been transmitted to Portugal, where it was copied at Lorvão (Lor, below); exemplars of the same version were available in France, at Clairvaux and Pontigny (Cl, Pont, below), soon afterwards; and during the same period, Abbot Odo of Battle, who had been prior

---


8 The great fire which devastated Rochester is mentioned in iv. 6 (MTB, ii, 186). R. C. VAN CAENEGEM, Selden Society, 107, 509, dates the completion of the work «shortly after 1182»; Madeleine Harrison CAVINESS, The Early Stained Glass of Canterbury Cathedral circa 1175–1220 (Princeton, 1977), 143, places it slightly earlier, «in and after 1179». The first chapter of Book IV (MTB, ii, 173, «Si Dominus exulis ingenii mei...cum sim pulvis et cinis»), can be read as the prologue to a new section, but in Version 3, it forms the last chapter of its Book IV!
of Canterbury when Benedict was making his collection, sent a slightly expanded copy (Version 2) to relations of his in the Cistercian monastery of Igy (below, Au and Sig). The textual history of the work supports the conclusion that Benedict’s own composition stopped at the end of Version 1 or 2, and that the accretions in Versions 3–6, the latest of which can be dated to 1202 (see Version 6), were added by other compilers at Canterbury.

i. The Manuscripts of Benedict of Peterborough’s Miracula.

The thirteen complete manuscripts contain six slightly different versions of the text.

Version 1 arranges the text in four books, comprising 24, 77, 78, and 94 chapters respectively, and ends testificati sunt. It is thus twenty-five pages shorter than the text published by Canon Robertson in the Rolls Series edition of 1876, which exploited one French and three English manuscripts,9 and it has good claim to be the earliest surviving representative of Benedict’s composition. The five complete manuscripts now known are:

Lor

Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional, cod. Alcobaça CCXC/143, ff. 1v–137r, from the (then) Benedictine monastery of S. Mamede of Lorvão. 1185. Arranged in four books, it ends iv. 94, testificati sunt. Explicit liber.10 The Miracula are followed (f. 137r) by a very full colophon, describing the place and date of transcription;11 the «Passio Anon. IV» (ff. 137v–142v), arranged in eight sections, with the heading «Passio sancti Thome Cantuariensis archiepiscopi, qui passus est in urbe sua Cantuaria, sub Henrico rege Anglorum, in era

---

9 MTB, ii, p. Ivii, lists the MSS used: Paris, Bibl. Nationale; MS lat. 5320, ff. 69ra–142ra (MS P); London, Lambeth Palace, MS 135, ff. 26ra–117vb (MS L); Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.14.37, ff. 1r–131r, from St Augustine’s, Canterbury (MS T); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 509 (mistakenly numbered «309»), ff. 111r–130r, an unfinished transcription which breaks off with the words “siccum invenit” (ROBERTSON, 72), at the end of ii. 21: the miracles to that point are in a single sequence: cf. MS P.

10 Fully described in DUGGAN, «The Lorvão Transcription». It should be noted that the description of this MS in L. AMOS, The Fundo Alcobaça of the Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon, Descriptive Inventories of Manuscripts Microfilmed for the Hill Monastic Library: Portuguese Libraries, 3 vols (Collegeville, Minnesota, 1988–90), i, 182–4, is seriously misleading. It seems to be based not on the MS but on the old edition by J. A. GILES (Benedicti abbatis Petriburgensis de Vita et Miracula S. Thome Cantuariensis, Caxton Society [London, 1850; repr. New York, 1967]), which reproduced the book and chapter arrangement of MS P.

30
m₄,cc₄,x₄,i₄, quarto kal. Januarii»; and, finally (ff. 142v–146v), a unique copy of *Sepe quidem cogimur*, sent by Archbishop Thomas to Cardinal Hyacinth of S. Maria in Cosmedin in early August 1169.¹² The manuscript was re-bound in the eighteenth century, at which time one quire (between present ff. 8 and 9) and two separate folios (between ff. 114 and 115 and ff. 121 and 123) were lost, and with them three substantial passages.¹³

### Alc.

Lisbon, Bibl. Nacional, cod. Alcobaca CCLXXXIX/172, ff. 7r–143r, medieval provenance unknown, but probably Cistercian and certainly Portuguese. Sae. xii–xiii (probably xii). Arranged in four books (with 24, 77, 78, 94 capitula respectively, ending testificati sunt)¹⁴ and preceded, ff. 1v–6v, by «Passio Anon. IV», with the same heading and dating clause as in *Lor*. Although set out in eight paragraphs corresponding with the numbered Lections in *Lor*, the sections are not numbered and there is no indication that the text was used for liturgical reading. This feature would be readily explicable if, as I think, this is a Cistercian manuscript,¹⁵ for the Cistercians had their own Becket liturgy from 1185 onwards.¹⁶

### SC

Porto, BPM, cod. Santa Cruz, 60, ff. 8v–169r, from Coimbra: discussed below.

---

¹¹ «Ad honorem Dei et sancti Mametis Laurhanensi monasterii...In era M₃,CC₃,XX₃,III₃; for the full text, see DUGGAN, «The Lorvão Transcription», 52.


¹³ The passages lost are «pondus firmitatis ... Ecce», «sociis suis ... uisus est ei», «incommodo ... audiumus»: *MTB*, ii, 32–46, 215–17, 229–30.


¹⁵ Despite its single column format, the decoration of this MS reflects contemporary (late twelfth/ early thirteenth-century) Cistercian taste, especially in its use of large, finely-executed capitals at the beginning of major sections. The initial P of *Passio* on f. 1v has a drop of 19 lines; and the equally elaborate P of *Postquam*, which opens the *miracula* on f. 7v, has a drop of 21 lines.

Cl

Montpellier, Bibliothèque inter-universitaire, section médecine (formerly École de Médecine), cod. 2, ff. 6rb–59ra, from Clairvaux.17 Saec. xii. Although the transcription of the Liber miraculorum ends without explicit, there is no evidence that the text has been curtailed; indeed the 94 chapters of Book IV correspond with the 94 capitula listed in the tabula capitulorum which precede the collection of miracles. The presentation of the Miracula, however, is different from that of the other four related texts. It is preceded, ff. 1ra–6rb, by a unique combination of contemporary materials, designed to form a detailed introduction to the Miracula. This preface comprises: part of Alexander III’s canonization letter, Redolato Anglia,18 John of Salisbury’s VST, a version of the Pontigny vision, «Dum beatus Thomas moratus est apud Pontiniacum ... tu glorificaberis»,19 and a summary of William of Canterbury’s Miracula, vi. 91–5, arranged to form a sixteen-chapter passio, supplemented by an abbreviation of William of Canterbury’s vi. 97, with the title Quod vatum resis ad reedificationem ecclesie dilatum sit. This manuscript formed the supplement (ton. viii) to the Great Lectionary of Clairvaux, and can be traced in the monastery’s library catalogues from 1472.20


18 «Quamuis de sanctitate illius ... intercedat. Dat. Sig. iii. idus Martii»: cf. MTB, vii, no. 785

19 This version of Becket’s prophetic vision about his martyrdom circulated from the twelfth century onwards. It was inserted into the earliest copy of Alan of Tewkesbury’s collection of the Becket correspondence (London, Brit. Libr. MS Cotton Claudius B.ii, f. 140ra) and is found in association with John of Salisbury’s VST in at least four other manuscripts: Oxford, Bodleian Library: MS 509, f. 14v; MS 937, f. 18v; MS Laud Misc. 666, f. xlvi; and Paris, Bibl. Sainte-Geneviève, MS cc.1 in 4° 19, f. 70r (Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, ed. C. KOHLER, i [Paris, 1893], no. 1370, at p. 642).

20 VERNET, La bibliothèque de l’abbaye de Clairvaux, 247 no. 1451 (Q 76).
Br

Brussels, Bibl. royale, MS 3190 (7959-61), ff. 10v–125v, preceded, ff. 3r–10v by the *Vita et Passio* of «Master Eufrardus». Medieval provenance unknown. Sec. xiii.21

To these five can now be added the splendid, but unfortunately mutilated copy in London, British Library, Egerton MS 2818 (formerly Phillipps 10227), ff. 2r–70vb. Although incomplete, the venerable age and provenance of the manuscript command attention, for it was written at Pontigny in the twelfth century, and is almost certainly the «lost» Pontigny *miracula*,22 listed in two catalogues compiled at Pontigny in the seventeenth century. In the earliest listing, Abbé Jean Le Boeuf’s catalogue of books considered suitable for the Royal Library, dated 1734 (Paris, BNF, MS lat. 17173, f. 136v), the volume is described as «Epistola Suffraganeorum episcoporum provinciae Cantuariensis ad Thomam eorum metropolitanum./ Thomae responsio ex Pontiniaco,24 / Vita ejusdem de S. Thomae per Johannem Saresber./ Item libri de miraculis ejus quatuor, in-fol...».25 The fact that the Egerton manuscript does not conform either with this description or with that recorded later (1778/95) by Jean Depaquit, last abbot of Pontigny (Auxerre, bibl mun. MS 226),26 is readily explained by the disturbed and incomplete state of the surviving codex. The volume is not in its original binding; some of its folios are missing; and others have been mis-bound.27 The placement of John of Salisbury’s *Passio*, which occupies a separate un-numbered quire, after the *miracula*, instead of before it,

21 *PL*, cxc, 335–44.
22 *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum bibliothecae regiae Bruxellensis*, ii (Brussels, 1886), 177–8; cf. *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque royale de Belgique*, v (1905), 165–6 no. 3190.
24 *Que uestro, pater and Fraternalitis uestre*: CTB, i, nos. 93 and 95
27 See the MS description below.
could be the result of faulty reassembly of the manuscript; and the exchange of letters between the English bishops and Archbishop Thomas, which would have occupied another whole quire, may have been lost at the same time.\textsuperscript{28}

PONT

London, British Library, MS Egerton 2818 (formerly Phillipps 10227), ff. 2r–70vb, from Pontigny, Sec. xii. Arranged in four books,\textsuperscript{29} ending (incomplete), \textit{aliis qui astabant ut presbyter} (\textit{MTB}, ii, 238 ln. 30). The manuscript has suffered serious losses, however. The greater part of the table of \textit{capitula} for Book III and most of the first chapter of the fourth book are missing through the loss of one folio between present ff. 32 and 33; and the last twenty-four chapters of Book IV are similarly missing, through the loss of one gathering, between ff. 70 and 71.\textsuperscript{30} In addition, the middle bi-foldium of quire vi (between ff. 43 and 44), has been mis-bound between present ff. 62 and 63, thus transferring a sequence of miracles from Book III into Book IV.\textsuperscript{31} The \textit{miracula} are followed, on a new gathering (ff. 71ra–78vb) by John of Salisbury's \textit{Vita}, of which the first ten and a half chapters of the published edition are arranged in twelve numbered lections.\textsuperscript{32} The manuscript is listed among Pontigny MSS in «Cistercian Manuscripts in England», \textit{Collectanea ordinis Cisterciensis reformatorum (Collectanea Cisterciensia)}, 14 (1952), 265–77, at 272.

Version 2, arranged in four books (with 24, 77, 78, and 96 capp. respectively), adds two miracles, taking the work to iv. 96, ending \textit{talem se suscipere}. It is found in two manuscripts:

Ca

Cambrai, Bibl. de la Ville, MS 488, formerly Cathédrale, MS 317, but medieval provenance uncertain. The manuscript belonged at one time to Pierre Preudhomme, canon of

\textsuperscript{28} In the earliest surviving manuscript of Alan of Tewkesbury's collection of Becket materials, for example, the two letters occupy almost exactly one quire of a double-columned folio volume: see London, BL, MS Cotton Claudius B. ii, ff. 84ra–85ra + 87va–93rb.

\textsuperscript{29} Although on f. 5va the scribe erroneously merged Book I, capp. III and IV, by omitting the passage «Et jam quidem...et ecclesia affectus est major. Unde et» (\textit{MTB}, ii, 31 line 15–33 line 22). Since there is a change to slightly paler ink following the omission (f. 5va), it is likely that the scribe interrupted his work at this point and left out the section by mistake.

\textsuperscript{30} The text breaks off with the words «aliis qui astabant ut presbyter», in the middle of cap. 66 (\textit{MTB}, ii, 238 lire 30), thus lacking nineteen pages of the printed text.

\textsuperscript{31} Thus misplaced, the long section «coagulari et confici solebat (\textit{MTB}, ii, 154, ln. 22)...monochos aque» (\textit{ibid.}, 161, ln 4) follows «plenus dierum et usque ad» (\textit{ibid.}, 217 ln. 30).

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{MTB}, ii, 301–22. The lections end «per omnia rectissimus executor» (\textit{ibid.}, 307 line 7), marked «finis» (f. 73ra).
Cambrai, who died in 1628. His library contained manuscripts from the Cistercian monastery of Ourscamp and also from Mont-Saint-Martin. Saec. xii/xiii.\textsuperscript{33}

D

Douai, Bibl. de la Ville, MS 860, ff. 10r–93v, formerly English College, MSS D 606 and 809; earlier still it belonged to William Reed, bishop of Chichester (d. 1383), who had bought it from John Tryllek, bishop of Rochester (d. 1372), and later donated it to Exeter College Oxford (cf. f. A), whence it was rescued from «amonge a caos of caste bookes and waste papers».\textsuperscript{34} Saec. xii. Preceded by John of Salisbury’s VST:\textsuperscript{35} There is an English translation of this MS in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. Misc. c. 322.

Version 3, containing the same material, is arranged in three books (with 87, 78, and 95 capp. respectively), ending talem se suscipere (= iv. 96). It is found in one manuscript:

P

Paris, Bibl. Nationale, MS lat. 5320, ff. 69ra–142ra, provenance uncertain. Saec. xii/xiii. One leaf is missing between ff. 95 and 96, with the consequent loss of the section «et expulit ... Annis ferme» (\textit{MTB}, ii, 103–6), containing six miracles (ii. 56–60, 62) and part of two others (ii. 55 and 61), the order of capp. 61 and 62 having been reversed.\textsuperscript{36} The Miracula are preceded by John of Salisbury’s VST. This manuscript was collated in part by Robertson (MS P) for the \textit{MTB} edition, but he judged it textually unreliable.\textsuperscript{37} That this was not just an idiosyncratic version of the miracles is shown by the survival of two fragmentary copies which are similarly arranged, though neither has capitula or chapter numbers. The twelfth-century Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 509, ff. 111r–130r (Robertson’s MS B), terminates abruptly, without explicit, at siccam inuenit; the end of ii. 21.\textsuperscript{38} The fine early thirteenth-century transcription in Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana,


\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Catalogue générale}, vi, 611–13; see Analecta Bollandiana, 20 (1901), 414.

\textsuperscript{36} DUGGAN, \textit{Textual History}, 140, esp. nn. 2 and 4; cf. HARDY, \textit{Descriptive Catalogue}, ii, 341 and n. *; \textit{MTB}, ii, 103 n. 2, 109, 173 n. 3; see \textit{Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum bibliothecae nationalis Parisiis}, ii (1890), 197: formerly in the possession of the counts of Béthune.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{MTB}, ii, xxv.

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{MTB}, ii, 72.
Version 4, arranged in four books (with 24, 77, 78 [numbered 77], and 103 capp. respectively), adds a further seven miracles, taking the collection to iv. 103 (= MTB, vi. 3), ending gratia rependit. This version is preceded by an abbreviation of Herbert of Bosham’s Thomus, which had been written in 1185/6, and a letter of dedication from Abbot Odo of Battle, from the mid-1180s; and followed by a Sequence by «Philip of Liège». The attachment of Odo’s letter establishes that this tradition is descended from the copy which the abbot, formerly Prior of Christ Church Canterbury (1168–1175) sent in the mid-1180s to relatives in the Cistercian monastery of Igny (Marne). Four derivatives from that presentation copy were known at the end of the seventeenth century, when they were described, not entirely accurately, by Casimir Oudin. They were distributed through a group of Cistercian monasteries in relatively close geographical proximity in northern France and Flanders: at Igny itself, Foigny (Aisne), Signy (Ardennes), and Aulne-sur-Sambre (Hainaut). The Igny and Foigny copies have

---

39 MTB, ii, 116. For this important English MS, see CTB, i, pp. cvii–cviii.
40 HARDY, Descriptive Catalogue, ii, 341.
41 «Sequentia quam de eodem martire domus Philippus, Leodiensis quondam archidiaconus, postea prior Clarevallis, deinde abbas Elemosinaris composituit»: cf. «Carmen breve rhythmicum de S. Thomæ», ed. J. A. GILES (from Au, below), Anecdota Bedae, Lanfranci et aliorum, Caxton Society, 7 (1851), 167–9. This heading provides evidence that Philip of Liège (= Lüttich) was from an early stage confused with his famous name-sake, the fourth abbot of l’Aumône. The author is either Philip of Fontaine-l’Évêque, archdeacon of Liège or Philip of l’Aumône, successively canon of Tours, archbishop-elect of Tours (1133), archbishop of Taranto (1138–39, deposed at the Second Lateran Council, 1139), monk (1139–c. 1152/3), then prior (1152/3–1156) of Clairvaux and abbot of l’Aumône (1156–c. 1170), d. c. 1179 at Clairvaux: see DUGGAN, «The Lorvão Transcription», 58–9, n. 48.
42 MTB, ii, xlii n. A. «Librum miraculorum beati martyris Thomae dlectioni vestrae transmittit, quae quidem miracula probata nosteritis esse et examinata, nihilque eis admixtum quod pateat falsitati. Miseram quidem jam vobis ante de ipsis miraculis librum, isto multo meliorem, sed numcle fraudi minime pervenit ad vos».
not been traced; but those from Aulne and Signy are now respectively in Brussels and Charleville.

Au

Brussels, Bibl. royale, MS IV.600, ff. 100vb–161va (formerly Phillipps MS 4622), from Aulne-sur-Sambre (f. 1r: Liber beate Marie de Aulna). Saec. xii. Preceded (ff. 1ra–100vb) by the Herbert of Bosham abbreviation; followed by the Sequence by «Philip of Liège».

Sig

Charleville, Bibl. de la Ville, MS 222, ff. 104v–172, from Signy (f. 1: Liber Signiaci). Saec. xiii. Preceded (ff. 1r–104v) by the abbreviation of Herbert of Bosham’s Thonus; followed by the Sequence by «Philip of Liège».

Version 5 contains the same miracles as Version 4, but arranges them in five books instead of four (with 24, 77, 78, 100, and 3 (arranged as two) capp. respectively); ends «gratia rependi» ( = MTB, vi. 3).

E

Évreux, Bibl. de la Ville, MS lat. 10, ff. 7r–82v, from Lyre (Benedictine). Saec. xiii. Arranged in five books, as above, but with an additional chapter «De clerico cui sanctus reddidit genitalia» (ff. 81r–82v) inserted at the end of Book V; preceded (ff. 1–7r) by John of Salisbury’s VST.

H

Heidelberg, Universitäts-Bibliothek, cod. Salem ix.30, ff. 43vb–108va, from Salem (Cistercian). Saec. xiii. Arranged in five books, as above, but lacking capitula and numeration; preceded by William FitzStephen’s VST.

45 HARDY, Descriptive Catalogue, ii, 341.
47 Cf. William of Centerbury, Liber miraculorum, vi. 13–16, on the cure of the deacon Thomas who had been brutally mutilated by a neighbouring knight (MTB, i, 424–8).
48 Catalogue générale, ii, 407, 408.
L

London, Lambeth Palace, MS 135, ff. 26ra–117vb, English, once belonged to Lord John Lumley (cf. f. 1). Saec. xiii. Arranged in five books (as above, except that Book IV is mis-numbered to 101 capp. and Book V is set out with an introduction and 2 capp.); preceded by the «Lambeth Anonymous» VST.50

Version 6 is represented by one manuscript only,

T

Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.14.37, ff. 1r–181r, from St Augustine’s, Canterbury (Benedictine). Saec. xiii. Arranged in four books (with 24, 77, 79, and 107 capp. respectively); ends iv. 107 (= MTB, vi. 6), non inmemor est reuersus.51 It is clear that the last four miracles (T, iv. 104–107 = MTB, vi. 4–7) constitute late additions to the work by another hand, for they concern events which occurred between 1194 and 1202, after Benedict’s death in September 1193/4.

ii. The Santa Cruz Miracula: Porto, Bibl. Pública Municipal, cod. Santa Cruz, 60, ff. 1r–169r.52

This important manuscript belonged to the Augustinian monastery of Santa

---

50 MTB, ii, 80–144; HARDY, Descriptive Catalogue, ii, 359 (where the Miracula are wrongly ascribed to William FitzStephen); M. R. JAMES and C. JENKINS, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace, 5 fascicles in 1 vol. (Cambridge, 1930–32), 214–16. The manuscript formerly belonged to Lord John Lumley (d. 1609), though it had left his library by the time the catalogue was compiled in 1609: cf. S. JAYNE and F. R. JOHNSON, The Lumley Library, British Museum Publications (London, 1956), 302. Collated by Robertson for the MTB edition, but his statement (MTB, ii, 261 n. 1) that the text is divided into six books by the insertion of the heading LIBER SEXTUS before his vi.1, is mistaken: the text is clearly arranged in five books, not six. MSS L and T share the homoioteleuton omission, «in uocem ... martyr” (289).

51 Canon ROBERTSON (MTB, ii, 273, n. 3), reversed the last two chapters, which he numbered vi. 6 (ending non inmemor est reuersus,) and vi. 7 (ending ad mare processit). For the MS, see HARDY, Descriptive Catalogue, ii, 359–60 (where the Miracula are wrongly ascribed to William FitzStephen); M. R. JAMES, The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: A Descriptive Catalogue, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1900–01), i (1900), 436; Ker, Medieval Libraries, 41. MS T shares with L the homoioteleuton omission, «in uocem ... martyr” (289).

52 The following study is based on a microfilm of the Santa Cruz manuscript, kindly lent by Dr MEIRINHOS. I have also benefited from the excellent description of the manuscript by Dr Bernardino MARQUES in Aires Augustino NASCIMENTO and José Francisco MEIRINHOS,
Cruz in Coimbra, and may have been transcribed there, at least in part. Its 169 parchment leaves are numbered consecutively in a modern hand; the text is in single columns, with 22, 23, or 24 lines to the column, and the pages are pricked and ruled. The manuscript was re-bound in the eighteenth century, when it received paper endleaves, of which the verso of the second bears the contemporary inscription:

Este livro da morte e milagres de S. Thomas Arcebispo de Cantuare e Conego Regular foi composto por Benedito Abbate de S. Pedro de Brugo, aquem o santo apareceu a noite sequinte ao seu martírio, como consta deste mesmo livro. N° 349.

The volume comprises two segments: the first, a gathering of seven parchment leaves (ff. 1–7), with twenty-three lines to the page; the second, with twenty-two lines, comprises twenty eight-leaved gatherings and a bi-folium, all, except the final binion, linked by catchwords. Dr Bernardino Marques distinguishes three hands, responsible respectively for ff. 1–7r (Part I), 8v–15 (first quire of Part II), and 16r–169r, and he dates the script to the thirteenth century. A slightly earlier dating (to the late twelfth century) can be argued, however. Its punctuation consists of the four-part scheme of punctus, point (.), punctus flexus (?), punctus elevatus (‘’), and punctus interrogativus, question mark, used with consistency and care. In this feature it conforms very closely with its two Portuguese relations, Lor and AIC.


53 Founded by Tello, archdeacon of Coimbra, in 1132, on land given by Afonso Henriques, the later King Afonso I of Portugal (1139/40–85); see Catálogo dos códices, xxv–lii; Dictionnaire d’histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques [= DHGE], 13 (1956), 207.

54 Part I was transcribed separately.

55 On this scheme, see M. B. PARKES, Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West (Berkeley, 1993), 35–40, and 306. For punctus flexus, which became a characteristic feature of Cistercian and Carthusian books, see N. R. KER, English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest (Oxford, 1960), 47–9. For examples of its use in twelfth- and early thirteenth-century Portugal, see A iluminura em Portugal. Identidade e Influências. Catálogo da Exposição. 26 de Abril a 30 de Junho '99 (Biblioteca Nacional: Lisbon, 1999), 157 (Alcobaça), 179 (Alcobaça), 181 (Coimbra), 201 (Alcobaça). The flexus is usually employed in texts intended for public reading in the chapel or refectory.
(I) ff. 1r–6v: Passio sancti Thome Cantuariensis archiepiscopi, qui passus est in urbe sua Cantuaria, sub Henrico rege Anglorum, in era m\(a\)e. cc\(a\)e.xi\(v\)o, quarto kal. Ianuarii. Digne fratres ... ut peruiamus cum eo ad regnum lucis et glorie, in qua regnat Deus per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.56

This is a version of the anonymous «Passio Anon. IV»,57 here arranged in eight lectiones. Each of Lections 1–7 is followed by the abbreviation «T.»,58 and the incipit of the Gospel reading, «Evangeliwm. Si quis uenit ad me» is inserted in smaller script at the end of Lection 6 (f. 4v). Neither authorship nor provenance have been established, although an early appearance in an English Cistercian manuscript has been cited in support of an English and Cistercian origin.59 Close reading of the text certainly confirms its English provenance (St Thomas is pater noster and patriae protector), but although it was evidently composed for public reading in a religious community (the audience consists of fratres), one cannot define its place of composition more narrowly. Nor can one say whether it was originally intended for liturgical reading, although its brevity made such adaptation easy.

The passio ends on f. 6v without explicit, and the remainder of the quire (to f. 7v) is ruled but without text. The decoration of this section is more elaborate than that found in Part II. The first initial (\(P\), of Passio), in blue, decorated with reddish brown and green, has a striking seven-line drop; and the subsequent paragraphs are marked by smaller initials, with a two- or three-line drop, finely executed, and multi-coloured (reddish brown embelished with blue, green with reddish brown, red with green, blue with red). These features (lack of physical continuity with the remainder of the volume, combined with the distinctness of its script, decoration and ruling pattern, and the fact that Part II begins with an unruled recto, f. 8r) suggest that the two parts were transcribed separately.

(II) ff. 8v–169r: [Liber miraculorum beat\(i\) Thome by Benedict of Peterborough. Arranged in four books (24, 77, 78, 94), ending iv. 94 ... testificati sunt. Explicit.]

The work begins sine titulo, but the space of three lines, which precedes the first line of the tabula capituum, could have accommodated a full heading. The scribe inserted the

56 A later hand has written «Notum sit» on the same line as the «Amen».
58 For the response: «Tu autem, Domine, miserere nostri».
pious invocation, Sancti Spiritus adsit nobis gratia, along the top edge of the first page of the text (f. 8v).\textsuperscript{60}

ff. 8v–9r: Chapter headings 1–24 for Book I, unnumbered (MTB, ii, pp. iii–iv).

ff. 9v–13r: Prologue: Postquam igitur ... sumatur exordium. (MTB, ii, 21–27).

ff. 13v–34r: [Book I]: Aspiciebam in usum ... uicinac despectui (MTB, ii, 27–56). The 24 chapters are transcribed without headings or numbers.

ff. 34v–37r: Chapter headings 1–77 for Book II (MTB, ii, pp. iv–vii).

Capp. 1–69 are numbered in Roman numerals; capp. 61 and 62 are in reverse order. The last 8 headings are not numbered.

ff. 37v–80v: [Book II]: Aderat resurrectionis ... solide fixit (MTB, ii, 57–117, but capp. 61 and 62 are in reverse order). The chapters have no headings, and only the first is numbered.

ff. 80v–82v: Chapter headings 1–78 for Book III (MTB, ii, pp. viii–x), ending «Explicitunt capitula libri tercii». Capp. 1–65 (= Robertson, 66) are numbered in Roman numerals, but the numeration goes astray from no. 53, where the headings of capp. 53–4 are merged (through homoeoteleuton) to form a single heading (iii).\textsuperscript{61} The remaining numeration is consequently one digit wrong (iii–lv, recte 55–66). The final 12 headings (67–78) are not numbered.

ff. 82v–113v: [Book III]: Instabat iam ... copia fecit (MTB, ii, 118–72). Again, there are no chapter headings, but capp. 1–4 are numbered.

ff. 113v–116r: Chapter headings 1–78 and 80–94 for Book IV, omitting cap. 79, «De aliis eadem de causa accusatis» (MTB, pp. x–xiv). Roman numbers are supplied only for i.–xxvi. and xxvii.–xxxiii., but the numeration is incorrect from no. 15 onwards, because the capitula for capp. 14 and 15 are merged to form a single confused heading, numbered xiii., «De euerardo de wintonia paralisi repente eiusdem fratre radulfo presbitero» (f. 113v).

ff. 116r–169r: [Book IV]: Si Dominus ... testificati sunt (MTB, ii, 173–257).

The chapters lack headings and only nos. 1–4 and 13–18 (= Robertson, 19) are numbered; capp. 17 and 18 are both numbered xvii. (13r–v).

f. 169r: Explicit.

---

\textsuperscript{60} The same invocation is found at the beginning of the transcription of the Customary of Becket’s shrine, London, BL, Addit. MS 59616, f. 1; and also on the first page of the Florilegium Gallicum in Paris, Bibl. nat., Int. MS 7647, f. 34r.

\textsuperscript{61} The two headings «De aureo quem sanctus cuidam dedit» (c. 53) and «De argenteo quem sanctus cuidam facete abstulit» (c. 54) are fused, producing the single heading, «De aureo quem sanctus cuidam facete abstulit» (iii).
There is no doubt that the Santa Cruz copy of Benedict’s *miracula* is closely related to those in the Lorvão and Alcobaça manuscripts, with which it shares a similar format and errors in the caputal table. In the list of headings for Book III, for example, it follows *Lor* and *Alc* in reading *fluexurit* for *fluebunt* in cap. 39, in omitting the phrase *et non est effusa* in cap. 43, and in committing the same *homoioiteleuton* which fused the headings of capp. 53 and 54 to form a single erroneous heading, liii. In the list for Book IV, it follows *Lor* and *Alc* in running the headings for capp. 14 and 15 together to create a single meaningless title; and it agrees with them in omitting the heading of cap. 79, *De allis eadem de causa accusatis*. Agreement in errors of this kind suggests a very close relationship; and this is confirmed by more detailed textual collation.

Using a slightly extended version of the select collation of the Lorvão manuscript published in 1997, the Appendix collates three hundred and fifteen readings, where *Lor* differs from Robertson’s standard edition, with *SC* and *Alc*; and the results are dramatic. Two hundred and forty-nine variants are shared by all three Portuguese manuscripts. Most, indeed, are fairly minor—*possit* for *posset* (24), for example, or *poterat* for *potuerat* (87), and many are orthographical variants of place and personal names. But some are more significant, involving more than differences of spelling or slips of the pen: *clericis* for *ecclesiis* (65), *igitur* for *pater* (74), *salutem* for *misericordiam* (83), *martirio* for *misericordia* (84), *ab hoc* for *a mundi huius* (103), *miracula* for *miranda* (124), *coronauit* for *donauit* (140), *sub altare* for *retro altare beate Marie* (146), *ornamento* for *orario* (179), *inpetrauit*

---

62 See above, n. 27.
63 «De Euerardo de Wontonia, paralisi repente eiusdem fratre Radulfo presbitero.»
66 *Lor* mistakenly reads *oculis.*
for mane exaudiat uocem eius (181), the reversal of capp. 61 and 62 (183), tumorisque for timorisque (223), norforkia for sudfolkia (240), utique for utrique (286); some are better readings: intutis for intimis (11), linierat for liuerat (78), astitit for institit (118), aqua in latus contrarium for aquam in alium pyxidis latus (125), Dolentes for Volentes (176), martiri for martiris (185), et quia non est firmamentum for quia est firmamentum (193), Audit for Addit (205), iterum for item (248), loca for merita (254); mortuo quam uiuenti similior for morienti simillimus (260), iuliane for uillane (294), omnibus for omnis (303); Descendunt for Descendunt (306), prorsus for prius (309). More significant, however, are the agreements in fifty-two omissions,\(^{67}\) of which the shared omission of misisset...quantum (27), pauper quidem (77), qualiter...doluerit (178), Nonulli...comparaut (207), and Reversus autem...deterioratus est (299) are particularly significant. Among the seven additions,\(^{68}\) the insertion of ecclesie after universalis (6) and of the phrases turbatus post paululum quietem cum uisu receptit (107), in modum (before serpentum: 154), and in uocem ... beatissimi martyris (289),\(^{69}\) are telling. Most telling of all, however, are their agreements (or near agreements) in evidently erroneous readings: ordomisse et/obdormisse et for obdormimentm (59), Voluit for Doluit (127), martiris for matriis (150), Fundoniensis for Lundoniensis (156), Giro for Viro (222), Durandus osberni augensis ciusdam filius amatus forte uocatus. lapillos ludebat cum lapillos in aera sparsit for Ludebat cum lapilliis Durandus Osbernii Augensis cuiusdam filius. A matre forte uocatus lapillos in aera sparsit (264),\(^{70}\) \[—\] Moroides/Moroides for Hemorrhoides (291), mane for mare


\(^{68}\) Appendix, nos. 3, 6, 18, 107, 154, 168, and 289.


\(^{70}\) SC's scribe was confused at this point( f. 133r). He seems to have begun the chapter with the words \[—\] Ludebat cum lapillos in aera sparsit, leaving space for the insertion of a coloured capital \(L\); then he inserted some text into the space which had been left between the chapters, erased it, and wrote Durandus osbernii augensis ciusdam filius amatus forte uocatus. lapillos L....

\(^{71}\) Initial, probably M, not inserted.
(297), Virum for Mirum (308). In addition, SC agrees with Lor in a further twenty-eight readings (not shared by Alc).\footnote{Appendix, nos. 55, 61, 68 (Alc ante corr.), 75, 80, 102, 120 (Alc ante corr.), 136, 158, 159, 173, 175, 188, 212, 216, 224 (post corr.), 230 (post corr.), 246, 256 (post corr.), 258, 266, 270 (post corr.), 285, 298, 304 (but marked for corr.), 305, 312.} In four of these cases, SC agreed with Alc before correction, by the erasure of words or syllables, to agree with Lor (224, 230, 256, 270); in two, Alc originally agreed with Lor and SC (68, 120), but was corrected; and in one (304), SC was marked for correction.

The small number of instances in which SC and Alc agree on differences from Lor's readings comprise very small orthographical variants of place or personal name, often involving differences in the transcription of uu (= w),\footnote{Appendix, nos. 15, 91, 198, 215, 221, 228, 235.} or better readings of words misread or simply mis-transcribed by Lor's scribe;\footnote{Appendix, nos. 5, 9 (SC post corr.), 19, 41, 44, 63, 65 (SC post corr.), 76, 79, 90 (SC post corr.), 97, 98, 108, 109, 130, 142 (SC post corr.), 184 (Alc post. corr.), 194, 262. In no. 52, SC corrects ad dulcedinem (which is found in Lor) to the correct reading a dulcedine, found in Alc and Cl; an example where SC made the same mistake as Lor, but corrected it?} although their shared reading of Eilovinus/Eiululinus for Eilwinus (201), may be significant. Some words evidently caused difficulties. In no. 93, the English name ᾖEdmundus confused the scribes, perhaps because of the unfamiliar initial diphthong Ē. Lor's scribe first wrote et nudus, then corrected it to et nudas; Alc's wrote et mundus, and the Santa Cruz scribe made a better effort with Edmundus. In no. 189, Lor mistakenly read Ite. Since the true reading is Vite, Lor's mistake could have arisen from the absence of the initial capital V; alternatively, the exemplar may have read item, which Lor transformed into Ite through a simple lapsus calami, by which its scribe omitted the suspension mark over the letter u. If this is so, then SC and Alc transmitted accurately the mistaken reading from their common ancestor.

This evidence demonstrates that the three Portuguese manuscripts are very closely related to one another. Indeed, a comparison of the punctuation of one sample folio in Alc (f. 70r) with the corresponding text in Lor (f. 61r–v) and SC (f. 88r–v) reveals that the three manuscripts agree exactly in the placement of all nine examples of the distinctive punctus flexus. Moreover, all three share mistakes in the tables, omissions, and the homoioteleuton in no. 27; and these errors distinguish the Portuguese transmission from Cl and Pont., which constitute the nucleus
of a French Cistercian family. These important manuscripts have yet to be studied in detail; but a cursory examination confirms both their derivation from a parallel version of the first known text of Benedict’s *miracula*, and their differences from the Portuguese descent. Briefly, although they contain the same text, to iv. 94, and agree with about half of the variant readings listed in the Appendix below, they do not share the mistakes in *the capitula*, the erroneous readings, or the *homoioiteleuton* at no. 27. They are, moreover, more carefully organized. Their *tabulae capitulorum* are fully numbered, as are their individual books and chapters. The overwhelming weight of textual evidence therefore suggests that all three Portuguese transcriptions of Benedict’s *miracula* derive from the same textual tradition, possibly from the same exemplar.

Despite the association in the Portuguese manuscripts of «Passio Anon. IV» with Benedict’s *miracula*, it is unlikely that both texts were originally transmitted together. In *Lor*, the *Passio* follows the *miracula*, being written after the colophon which recorded their place and date of transcription; in *SC*, it occupies a separate gathering inserted at the front of the book, which was written by a different scribe and decorated more elaborately than the remainder of the codex. *Alc*, in contrast with *Lor* and *SC*, was conceived as a single entity. The same scribe wrote both *passio* and *miracula*, and the *passio* functions as an introduction to the miracles.

The arrangement and text of the *Passio* is virtually identical in all three manuscripts, however. It has the same heading and date as well as readings which distinguish it from the generally received text published in the nineteenth century by Canon Robertson. Moreover, all three arrange the *passio* in the same eight sec-

---

75 And perhaps *Br*, which I have not yet been able to see.

76 *Pont.* is now incomplete; but its *tabula capitulorum* for Book IV confirms that it contained the same material as *Ci* and the Portuguese MSS.

77 Appendix, nos 127, 150, 156, 222, 264, 291, 297, 308.

78 Among the more significant readings which they share is *ugilis crebrior*, *prolixior in oratione*, *sollicitior in predicatone* for in *ugilis crebrior, in oratione prolitior, in predicatone sollicitior* (*MTB*, ii, 188 lmn. 8–9), *facinoris for facinus* (*ibid.,* 193, at n. 3), *eliderer for illideret* (*ibid.,* 194, n. 3); their insertion of the sentence *Quid (Lor Quis) enim...pro Christo?* (*ibid.,* 188, n. 7) and the phrase, *et eum gretiarum actione clamavitibus* (*ibid.,* 192, n. 4), and their omission of the paragraph *Cumque regis...sententiam minabatur* (*ibid.,* 189–90 and the phrase *noster beatissimus et invictus* (*ibid.,* 194 at n. 4).
tions. In Lor, the sections are numbered as lections, and five of them are followed by the abbreviation «tu autem», which suggests immediate derivation from a liturgical book designed for secular, that is, non-monastic use. With the addition of a Gospel reading, such an arrangement would have provided enough lections for the celebration of St Thomas's feast (29 December) in a cathedral church or in a community of canons regular. This adaptation seems to have been made at Santa Cruz. Although there are no numbers in SC, its text indicates that the passio was adapted for local liturgical use. Each of paragraphs [1]–[7] is followed by the abbreviation «T», and a contemporary hand has inserted, between Lections [6] and [7], the incipit of an appropriate reading from St Luke's gospel, «Si quis uenit ad me» (f. 4v). Santa Cruz, of course, was a monastery of Augustinian canons; and it is interesting that the librarian who entered a description of the work on the flyleaf (f. iiiv) in the eighteenth century thought that Becket was a «Conego Regular». No such adaptation seems to have been made at Lorvão, where monastic custom would have required a twelve-lection structure: Lor's scribe merely copied what he had in front of him. In the Alc transcription there is no numeration and no liturgical abbreviations, but the passio is arranged in the same eight sections, and the insertion of stress marks suggests that it was used for public reading, perhaps in the refectory.

Five years ago I suggested that the Lorvão manuscript was copied from the first exemplar which Abbot Odo of Battle sent to his relatives in the Cistercian monastery of Igny. Further work on the surviving manuscripts suggests a modification of that attractive theory. In the light of the survival of what appear to be two traditions of the earliest text, one can now propose that Odo's text was taken to France, where it became the ancestor of the transcriptions in Pontigny and Clairvaux, while a less carefully produced transcription, perhaps hurriedly copied from it, found its way to Portugal by 1185 at the latest, when it was copied at Lorvão, before transmission to Coimbra and (perhaps) Alcobaça.

79 «Tu autem», which follows Lections 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7, is an abbreviation for the response, «Tu autem Domine, miserere nostri».

80 The secular office of Matins was distinguished from the monastic office by having nine lections instead of twelve for major feasts.

APPENDIX

Select Collation of Lisbon, Bibl. Nacional, cod. Alcobaça CCXC/143 (from Lorvão), Porto, BPM, cod. Santa Cruz 60 (from Santa Cruz, Coimbra), and Lisbon, Bibl. Nacional, cod. Alcobaça ccxxxix/172 (? from Alcobaça).


+ agreement with the reading or omission noted for the Lorvão MS
[... ] erasure
[—] omission
underline on erasure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lorvão MS</th>
<th>Santa Cruz MS</th>
<th>Alcobaça MS</th>
<th>MTB p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  om. immo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  apostatam for apostata</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  ins. mundi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  om. ecclesie</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  de ecclesie for decedere</td>
<td>decedere</td>
<td>decedere</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  ins. ecclesie after universalis</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  super for sub</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  om. et penitentibus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  esset for esset</td>
<td>esset</td>
<td>esset expunct.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 uirgus for uirgulas</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 intius for intimis</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 lh. 23–46 lh. 18: om.usioni ...

Ecce (cod. mutil.)

| 12 circa for citra          | +             | circa post corr: | 47 |
| 13 om. coruscaret           | coruscaret ins. marg. | +     | 47 |
| 14 sclirosin for sclirosin  | +             | sclirosin post corr. | 48 |
| 15 uerthec for werde        | werde         | werde         | 49 |
| 16 dictum est for dixinnis  | +             | +             | 49 |
| 17 paruitate for paucitate  | +             | +             | 49 |
| 18 ins. reictare            | +             | +             | 50 |
| 19 Exultante for Exulante   | Exulante      | Exulante      | 50 |
| 20 om. est                  | +             | +             | 51 |
| 21 cloceostrensem for cloceostressem | + | + | 51 |
| 22 cloceostrensi for cloceostresni | + | + | 51 |
| 23 conscrubatur for conscrubatur | + | + | 51 |
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24 poscit for pesset  +  +  51  n. 8
25 Estimant for estimantes  Estimant post corr.  +  51  li. 24
26 clocestriam for colcestriam  +  +  52  li. 31
27 om. (per homoioteleuton)  misiset ... quantum  +  +  52  li. 3
28 suscepit for susceperit  suscepit post corr.  suscepit  52  n. 2
29 resumptum for resumpta  +  +  52  n. 4
30 om. illum  +  +  52  li. 9
31 fixa for fissa  fissa  +  52  n. 5
32 guillelmus for Gillemnum  +  +  52  n. 7
33 om. vir et  +  +  52  li. 16
34 om. et (2)  +  +  52  li. 17
35 om. enim  +  +  52  n. 9
36 deputatione for deputationem  +  +  52  n. 11
37 carius for impossibilus  impossibilus del.; carius interlin  +  53  li. 2
38 om. non  +  +  53  li. 2
39 speciosas for pretiosas  +  +  53  li. 4
40 om. martyris  +  +  53  li. 9
41 ampullam for ampulle fundo  ampulla  ampulla  53  li. 17
42 residuum in ampulla for in  residuum in ampulla  +  53  li. 19
43 Funditur for Finditur  Funditus corr. to Finditur  +  53  li. 25
44 sanguis for sanguinis  sanguinis  sanguinis  53  li. 30
45 om. ei  +  +  54  li. 13
46 Etheltridum for Etheltridam  Etheltridum post corr.  +  54  n. 4
47 om. quamdam  om. quamdam ?by erasure  +  54  li. 19
48 expertum for experimentum  +  +  55  li. 2
49 nec for non  +  +  55  n. 1
50 commixtiones for per commixtionem  +  +  55  li. 8
51 proccesit for procussit  +  +  55  n. 2
52 ad dulcedinem for a dulcedine  ad dulcedinem  a dulcedine  55  li. 25
corr. to a dulcedine
53 om. facc  +  +  55  li. 27
54 tamque for tantumque  +  +  56  li. 9
55 circa for citra  +  citra  56  n. 2
56 resurrectionis dominice dies, in qua tota leatur et exulat ecclesia; dies quam facit dominus for

dies resurrectionis ...eclesia;  +  +  57  li. 1-3
57 attraxerat for attaxt 1  +  +  57  li. 14
58 om. et  +  +  57  li. 1
59 obdomisse (1) et for obdormientem  obdomisse (1) et  obdomisse (1) et  57  li. 20
60 sansoneum for saronem  reading uncertain:  +  .  57  n. 4
61 exprimendum for exprimendis  +  exprimendis  58  li. 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>in. 2</td>
<td>om. paulatin + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>in. 5</td>
<td>hospiti hospiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>in. 10</td>
<td>a interlin; pueris et ebris +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
<td>clericis clericis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>n. 12</td>
<td>eamque for causaeque + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>n. 15</td>
<td>morientem post corr. +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
<td>om. rorca +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
<td>om. viro +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
<td>om. duo + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>n. 3</td>
<td>aut for vel + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>In. 10</td>
<td>convertat +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>In. 11</td>
<td>igitur +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>In. 12</td>
<td>intuentum for intuentium +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>In. 13</td>
<td>manwinus manwinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>In. 18</td>
<td>am. pauper quiem +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>In. 18</td>
<td>lincaret for lincrat +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>n. 5</td>
<td>promeruit promeruit +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>@n. 1</td>
<td>om. nolebat/noluit +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>In. 19</td>
<td>om. clausa + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>In. 7</td>
<td>non unum for unum tantum non unum [... ] +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>In. 11</td>
<td>saluten for miserocordiam saluten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>In. 13-4</td>
<td>martrio for miserocordia + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>n. 3</td>
<td>eliæa for elídaeliæa + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
<td>om. in + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>In. 4</td>
<td>poterat for potuerat + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>In. 5</td>
<td>om. pugno [... ] [... ] +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>In. 6</td>
<td>credebat for cederebat + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>In. 14</td>
<td>plantas post corr. plantas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>n. 6</td>
<td>uuluue for wlvive/wlvine wlvivæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>In. 19</td>
<td>remun cor to genu genu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>In. 23</td>
<td>et nudus (post corr. from et nudus) edmundus et mundus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>In. 23</td>
<td>om. sais + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>In. 4</td>
<td>om. et (1) + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>In. 6</td>
<td>om. sanguinis + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>In. 7</td>
<td>poitionis for poitionis poitionis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>In. 23</td>
<td>Prefectaque for perfectaque perfectaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>In. 31</td>
<td>om. per + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
<td>cessat for cessuit cessat +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>n. 2</td>
<td>tantos for thamatos/thamatos + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>n. 4</td>
<td>mirandi for miranda edmiranda +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word 1</th>
<th>Word 2</th>
<th>Line 2</th>
<th>Word 3</th>
<th>Line 3</th>
<th>Word 4</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>ab hoc for a mundi hiatus</td>
<td>ab hoc[...]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>imponatque for imponetque</td>
<td>impon[...]que;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>recordatus for recordatus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>n. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>oratione for orationem</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>n. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>insurbatus post paululum quietem cum usu recepit</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>n. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>fordwico for fordwico</td>
<td>fordwico</td>
<td>fordwico</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>insignians for insigniens</td>
<td>insigniens</td>
<td>insigniens</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>susceptius for receptusus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>orationi for et in oratione</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>eius for suo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>tenham for techam/thermam</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>cilwardus for cilward</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n. 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>suavis for suavitatis</td>
<td>suavis</td>
<td>suavis</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>cuidam for uni</td>
<td>cuidam add. marg.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>n. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>om. caus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>n. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>sttit for institi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>n. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>son for minime</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>n. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>corde for cordis</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>n. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>om. sanites</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>n. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>ferens for ferres</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>n. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>discræuit for decræuit</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>n. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>miracula for miranda</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>n. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>aqua in latus contrarium for aquam in aluid pyxidis latus</td>
<td>aqua in latus contrarium</td>
<td>aquam in latus contrarium</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>n. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>est for esse</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>n. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Voluit for Deulti</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>anne salubi for annue tamisie</td>
<td>anne salubrii[...]</td>
<td>anne salubi</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>n. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>uectura for uectori</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>n. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>proueet for proueete</td>
<td>proueete</td>
<td>proueete</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>n. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>hominis for hominum</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>n. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>reuocari for resouari</td>
<td>reuocari</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>n. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>om. que</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>n. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>durensi for deuressi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>n. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>paruit imperanti for paruit imperatis</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>n. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>norbantonia for norbantuna</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>norbantoria</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>n. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>rursus for rursus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>presentis for propopere</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>n. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>om. que</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>n. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>coronaut for donaut</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>n. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>om. catis</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>n. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>resuscitator for resuscitato</td>
<td>resuscitato post corr:</td>
<td>resuscitato</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>n. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>tumen for tantum</td>
<td>from resuscitator</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>n. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
quanto a for quantic
+ + 77 n. 5
extenta for extensa
+ + 77 n. 6
sub altare for retro altare beate Marie
+ sub altare + 77 ln 29
diuinus for diuinus
+ + 78 n. 3
celind for celindoi
+ acelindoi 79 n. 1
tractu uiolento for tractu uiolente
tractu uiolento + + 79 n. 4
mattiris for matris
+ + 79 n. 5
om. domini
+ + 80 @ n. 2
tangis for tangis
+ + 80 n. 3
radullus for randullus
+ + 80 n. 4
ins. in modum
in modum add. marg. + + 80 ln 23
sitini for cetini
+ citini post corr. 81 n. 2
Fandumiensis for Lundoniensis
+ + 83 ln. 4
circumstantium for stantium
+ + 84 n. 1
pium gloriosum spectaculum for
gloriosum et piam spectaculum
+ pium et gloriosum spectaculum 86 n. 2
tanintona for tanitora
tanintona 87 n. 1
parid for paridis
parid[...]
+ + 87 n. 2
gipesuit for gipeswiz/gipeswiz
+ + 87 n. 3
om. in
+ + 88 n. 2
freodonem for fredonem
+ + 88 n. 4
ailmerus for ilmeras
+ + 88 n. 6
dechecui for beche/deche
dechec with cui et
interlined + + 88 n. 7
aedilpa for edilda/aedilda
+ + 88 n. 8
successerat for successit
+ + 89 ln 13
ins. si fuerit
interlined + + 89 ln 23
om. pernox
+ + 93 ln. 22
malildi for malidi
malidi + + 94 ln. 10
gilleburtus for gileburtus
+ + 94 n. 2
om. cum
+ + 97 n. 1
om. abstracto
+ ins. 100 n. 1
erleia for erleya
+ + 101 n. 1
om. est
+ ins. 102 n. 3
Dolentes for volentes
+ + 102 n. 4
ydropsim for hydropsin
+ + 103 n. 3
om. qualiter... doluet
+ + 104 ln 8-9
ornamento for onorio
+ + 104 ln 9
lundaiensis for lundoniensis
+ + 104 ln 23
inspetrauit for mane aududiat uncem eius
canleuedone for canlewoodene
+ + 105 n. 1
capp. 61 and 62 reversed
+ + 106 n. 1
bokelcia for Bokelci
bokelcia post corr.
bokelcia 106 n. 2
mattiris for matriis
+ + 106 n. 4
186 hedelega for hethlega/helega  
187 om. ter  
188 sarepesberiensi for saleberiensi/sa  
lbernicensis  
189 Item for Vite  
190 hemberti for herberti  
191 coartato for coarcetato  
192 tisis for phthisis  
193 et quia non est firmamentum for  
quia est firmamentum (confirming  
Giles's reading)  
194 Lesseda for lefse/djebeseda  
195 tantos for tanatos/tanathos  
196 solide fixit for solito fixit  
197 elfwardi for Aylwardi  
198 elfsiestun for Elfestun  
199 mutuaut for mutauit  
200 reparato for reparta  
201 eilwinus de bercansted for eilwinus  
de beccumstede  
202 lefstoncetera for lefston/stestub/  
203 gesale for gescalde/gesahale  
204 om. sinus  
205 Audat for Addit  
206 abundantia for abundantiam  
207 om. Nonulli ... comparatu  
208 releis for roces/rozas  
209 norhantoniam/horantoniam  
210 vivini for vivini  
211 om. de wedestoe  
212 pech for pech  
213 om. eiam  
214 eggeardituna for eggerdintuna  
/eggerdintona  
215 chuidam for aluidam/neluidam  
aeluidam  
216 broth wella for breithwella/brithwelle  
breith wella  
217 epilicnsis for epilepsia/epylensia  
+  
218 lintana for luionila/lintona  
+  
219 gumalde for gumildec  
+  
220 infatigabilis for indefatigabilis  
+  
221 weldefordensi for wellesfordensis/  
veldefordness  
222 Giro for Viro  
223 tumonisique for timonisique  
+  
224 om. Itmaro id  
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225 in natam for innata
226 folhestania for folkestania/folliestania
227 Malticum for Matilcim
228 selewini for silewini/selewini
229 therbiria for thberria
230 om. uero aduesperacert
231 ben сента for benitона
232 cupiditas for cupiditatis
233 cillane for cillina
234 apposie for erecte
235 welwich for welewich/uwelwi
236 Ydropsis for Hydropsis
237 heysa for heisa/tesa
238 hadewic for hedewico
239 inclinavit for commowit
240 norfokla for sudofotic
241 aduluestre for aldulestre/alduestre
242 Videns for Videres
243 om. autem
244 elici for ethicici
245 cirothecas for chirrothecas/cirucleas
246 maxime ut for maxime uero
247 angerius for gaufridas
248 iterum for item (confirming Robertson's conjecture)
249 bedeforesem for bedefordensem
250 om. autem
251 populique for populi et
252 om. iam
253 delectatur for delectantur
254 loca for merit
255 Resedaret for Residbat
256 om. conflagrant
257 om. in spiritu
258 cifum for sceyphum/ciphum/cyphum
259 scielevis for scileve
260 mortuo quam uiaeini similior for moriens similinum
261 anfridis for anfridis/hamfridis
262 bertinim (hetinam) for beatinim/bietinam
263 pagano for pago
264 Durandus Osbernii augensis cuinistam filius amatus forte uocatus, lapillos ludebat cum lapillos in aera sparxis for Ludebat cum lapillis Durandus Osbernii Augensis

Durandus Osbernii augensis cuinistam filius amatus forte uocatus, lapillos...
cuiusdam filius. A mater forte vocatus
lapillos in aere sparsit.

265 tuecmenis for tuecmenis
266 qualis
267 Imposito for Impositos
268 radulphus for radulphus
269 idemquito for idemquito

dimittens for dimittentes; om. cymbam
dimittens [...] 

discretum for absisptum
271 absispam
272 alueclus for aluclus/alueclus
273 alluucar for alluucar
274 om. omnes

215 ln. 16-217 ln. 30: om. sociis suis ... usus est quis (cod. mutil.)

275 neha for nean/nean
276 ferne for ferre
277 margaritum for margaretum
278 om. et
279 metanie for melanie
280 domnum for demum
281 robertulus for robortulus
282 rotrana for rhema
283 attentat for attendat
284 wiuuin for wuiuia
285 brichwuini for brithwhini

229 ln. 8-230 ln. 31: om. incommode...
audiausus (cod. mutil.)

286 utique for utique
287 mauult for maluit
288 ecneram for ecneram

289 ins. in vocem ... beatisini martyris
(confirming Robertson's emendation)

290 Extensus for Extenus
291 [---]rroides for Hennorhoides
292 cimiterium for cemeterium
293 ydriopis for hydriopis
294 Iuliana for uillane (confirming Robertson's conjecture)

295 uiuiucatum for uiuiufatum
296 redigensis for radigensis
297 mane for mare
298 effluenti
299 om. Reuerusus autem ... deterioratus est.
300 applicatus for appliatur

200 ln.17-19
201 ln. 5
202 n. 1
207 n. 2
211 n. 1
211 n. 4
212 ln. 26
213 n. 1
214 n. 3
215 n. 2
221 n. 1
222 n. 3
223 n. 2
226 n. 2
226 n. 3
226 n. 4
227 n. 1
228 n. 3
228 n. 4
232 n. 1
234 n. 2
236 n. 2
237 n. 2
238 n. 3
239 n. 1
239 n. 2
241 n. 1
241 n. 2
241 ln. 31
242 n. 1
243 n. 1
244 n. 1
244 ln. 31
245 n. 1
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Correction</th>
<th>Reason for Correction</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>ac magis for magique</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>n. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>convexit</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>In. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>omnibus for omnis (confirming Robertson's conjecture)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>in terram corruens superatus est tenebat</td>
<td>+ but marked for correction to tenebat...est</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>In. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>dehmitota for dehmitone</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>In. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Descendunt for Descendunt</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>In. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>a dextera for dextra</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Virum for Mirum</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>In. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>prorsus for prius (confirming Robertson's emendation)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>hathfel for hathfeld</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Ciusiam for Eiusdam</td>
<td>Ciusiam</td>
<td>Eiusdam</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>arripiens</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>n. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>ac for et</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>om. inquit</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>om. inquit</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>n. 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>