

As a general rule, those manuscripts which are missing one or more expansions probably contain mixed recensions. Unsurprisingly, basically all of the manuscripts identified by Winroth – including Me – are missing several: Br (6/7); Cg (3/8); Gg (5/5); In (5/8); Me (4/8); Mz (7/8); Pa (5/8); Pf (2/8); Pl (7/8); Sa (5/8); Vd (6/8). Manuscripts at the top of the table, which omit most or all of the expansions, tend to be very messy. In these manuscripts, it is easy to find other examples of second-recension omission and dislocation. For example, both Gt (0/8) and Py (1/8) – as well as Iv (6/8), Ka (4/8), Pa (5/8), Pt (3/8), Pu (5/8), and Sq (6/8) – are missing all of the second-recension additions from De pen. D.1 c.6 to c.29<sup>77</sup>. Similarly, Bi (4/8) contains a striking example of second-recension dislocation at C.2 q.1 c.7.<sup>78</sup> Many more examples could be provided here<sup>79</sup>.

Somewhat more complicated are those manuscripts at the bottom of the table which contain all eight expansions. At first glance, these manuscripts might seem to preserve the pure second recension, and indeed some may. There are good reasons to suspect, however, that most do not. First, a good scribe working from a quality supplemented first-recension manuscript may well have been able to integrate all eight expansions in their proper places. Second, missing expansions could enter the manuscript tradition through comparison, correction, and recopying. As the tables above show, missing expansions were very often added into the margins, between the lines, or over erasure. When

---

77) Folio numbers: Gt(289rb); Iv(260rb); Ka(262vb); Pa(245vb); Pt(283rb); Py(314vb); Sq(229ra). Jacqueline Rambaud-Buhot also noticed this gap in Gt, Pa, and several other French manuscripts; RAMBAUD-BUHOT, *Le legs* (as n. 20) p. 84–85.

78) In the first recension, C.2 q.1 c.7 is a medium-sized canon. The redactor(s) of the second recension added substantial material to the beginning and the end, tripling its size. The scribe of Bi, when confronted by the first-recension canon and separate second-recension additions, became confused as to how they fit together. On fol. 98vb, he placed the second-recension additions (in their proper place) after c.6, but without the first-recension core paragraph. The missing first-recension paragraph can be found two pages later on fol. 99va (misplaced) between the second-recension c.10 and the first-recension c.11. Tie marks were later included to alert readers that the two texts belong together. Rudolf Weigand also noticed several similar dislocations and omissions in Bi; Rudolf WEIGAND, *Die Dekrethandschrift B 3515 des Spitalarchivs Biberach an der Riss*, in: *BMCL 2* (1972), p. 76–81, at p. 77.

79) Py(53vb) is missing both the second-recension expansion to D.45 d.p.c.17 („Percussor quoque dicitur [...] conscientiam vulnerat“) and the entire second-recension c.18. These two texts are present in all other manuscripts which I have investigated.