

first recension at the schools, purely first-recension manuscripts – like the original *Epitome Codicis* – ceased to be copied<sup>63</sup>. Without new first-recension manuscripts, the practice of supplementing them also ceased and existing copies were relegated to monastic libraries such as Camaldoli, Admont, and Ripoll. They were survived, however, by their mixed-recension descendants.

Because mixed-recension manuscripts generally approximate the second recension and are poorly understood, scholars so far have made no attempt to differentiate them systematically from true manuscripts of the second recension. Luckily, mixed-recension manuscripts are relatively easy to identify when one focuses on the „untidy seams“ between the two recensions<sup>64</sup>. When one checks for minor modifications and expansions introduced in the second recension, mixed-recension manuscripts tend to reveal themselves by omitting and dislocating them. To date, the jump from a supplemented first-recension manuscript to a mixed-recension manuscript has been observed most clearly in a group of manuscripts from the archdiocese of Salzburg including Aa<sup>65</sup>. Closely related to Aa is München, BSB, Clm 13004 (Me), which has been dated to the 1160s and has been variously associated with the Salzburg cathedral library, the Regensburg cathedral library, and Prüfening Abbey<sup>66</sup>. Because Aa and Me contain many first-recension readings, similar glosses, and shared non-*Decretum* texts, it has been suggested that Aa was used to create Me or that both descend from a common supplemented first-recension exemplar<sup>67</sup>. Beyond the Salz-

---

63) On the reception and study of the *Decretum* in the universities, see the relevant essays in HARTMANN / PENNINGTON, *The History* (as n. 2); on the *De penitentia* at the universities, see LARSON, *Master of Penance* (as n. 2).

64) Long before the discovery of the first recension, Stephan Kuttner argued that evidence of stages and revisions could be seen in the many „untidy seams“ present in the *Decretum*; Stephan KUTTNER, *Research on Gratian: Acta and Agenda*, in: *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Medieval Canon Law*, Cambridge 1984, ed. Peter LINEHAN (*Monumenta Iuris Canonici C/8*, 1988) p. 3–26, at p. 10 (Reprint in: *Studies in the History of Medieval Canon Law* [Variorum Collected Studies, 1990] no. V). Several of these seams are also discussed in: VIEJO-XIMÉNEZ, *Costuras* (as n. 8).

65) On this group of Austrian manuscripts, see most recently: BURDEN, *Gratian* (as n. 22) p. 96–104.

66) On Me, see: WEIGAND, *Die Glossen* (as n. 18) p. II,848–50.

67) Me, for example, is the only known manuscript besides Aa which contains the *Decretum* introduction *Hoc opus inscribitur*. Aa alone, however, is not enough to fully account for all the texts and readings present in Me. Gujer has convincingly argued that Me was created by comparing Aa to another second-recension manu-