

texts which we would expect to find in the complete second recension. Vx omits the most second-recension texts, including entire series of canons and *dicta*, but many of these texts were probably once present in the margins of its now-lost first-recension partner. Fd is more complete, but it also omits many second-recension texts. Aa and Bc are even more complete than Fd, but even they occasionally omit entire canons and *dicta*. Another peculiarity common to our four examples is the presence of some first-recension texts among the second-recension additions. Vx contains the most first-recension texts, with particular concentrations in D.10–12, 22, and 37. Occasional first-recension texts also appear in the appendix of Fd and are spread evenly throughout. Very few first-recension texts appear in the appendix of Aa or on the added folios of Bc³⁹. When first-recension texts appear among the second-recension additions, they almost always duplicate texts which are already present in the first-recension portion of the manuscript.

Anders Winroth offered an explanation for these peculiarities in his initial study of the two recensions. When owners of first-recension manuscripts encountered second-recension manuscripts in the 1150s and 1160s, they often chose to add the missing texts into the margins or appendices of their manuscripts rather than make entirely new copies of the second recension⁴⁰. In doing so, they were able to quickly and cheaply bring their manuscripts up to date. The process of comparing and excerpting, however, was messy and prone to error. The *Decretum* is hugely complex, and in the middle of the twelfth century it lacked many of the organizational features familiar today. Scribes found it difficult to isolate the second-recension additions, especially the many minor modifications made to first-recension texts. As a result, they often overlooked the minor changes and accidentally duplicated texts of the first recension. Observing these same peculiarities, Melodie H. Eichbauer, Carlos Larrainzar, and others have come to a different conclusion as to how they came into being⁴¹. For these scholars, the omission of some second-recension texts indicates, above all, intermediate stages between the first and second recensions. According to them, the individual layers of additions in Aa, Bc, and Fd (appendices, margins etc.) reflect a gradual process of organic accumulation

39) A rare cluster of first-recension texts appears in Aa at D.21 d.p.c.3, c.4, and c.5.

40) WINROTH, *Making* (as n. 2) p. 134–36.

41) See the many works of Eichbauer, Larrainzar, Larson, and Viejo-Ximénez mentioned above (as n. 25, 32).