

some reason, however, they did not. As Paul Krüger worked to edit the *Code* in the 1860s and 1870s, he observed that nearly all manuscripts seemed to contain errors of omission and dislocation on the seams between the *Epitome Codicis* and the original *Code*⁶¹. Based on these errors, Krüger determined that the vulgate version of the *Code* used in Bologna must have descended from a manuscript of the *Epitome aucta* which was supplemented and then reintegrated into a form which approximated the full *Code*. Krüger then advanced an even more startling conclusion: the entire surviving Latin manuscript tradition – apart from a few fragments and palimpsests – descends from the Bolognese vulgate text and no complete, direct copies of the ancient *Code* survive today. Scholars since Krüger have challenged his overly neat version of events. Carmen Tort-Martorell has argued for extensive correction and contamination on the way back to the reintegrated *Code* while Charles Radding and Antonio Ciaralli have argued that the jump from the supplemented *Epitome aucta* to the reintegrated *Code* occurred several times and in different places⁶². Nevertheless, Krüger's basic idea that nearly all surviving Latin manuscripts of the *Code* descend from supplemented *Epitome aucta* remains standard. With these conclusions in mind, let us return to the *Decretum*.

Mixed-Recension Manuscripts of the *Decretum*

During the 1150s and 1160s, supplemented copies of the first recension such as Aa, Bc, Fd, and Vx would have been useful because they cheaply approximated the second recension. Sooner or later, however, most were recopied. In the process, scribes usually chose to integrate the second-recension additions and modifications into the main text since it made them easier to read. The resulting copies, because they derive from separate manuscripts of the first and second recensions, can be said to „mix“ recensions. Occasionally, as in Aa, only some of the additions made their way into the main text as interpolations. Most of the time, however, scribes included as many texts as possible and approached the complete contents of the second recension. During the 1170s and 1180s, as the second recension decisively supplanted the

61) KRÜGER, *Codex* (as n. 11) p. i–xlili; KRÜGER, *Kritik* (as n. 53) p. 12–36; RADDING / CIARALLI, *Corpus* (as n. 11) p. 15–16, 135–38, 155–68.

62) TORT-MARTORELL, *Tradición textual* (as n. 51) p. 1–3, 16–18; RADDING / CIARALLI, *Corpus* (as n. 11) p. 157–58.