

Opinions on the second recension are more divided⁷. Unlike the first recension, the second recension has never been precisely defined using manuscripts. Many twelfth-century manuscripts approximate the size of the second recension but vary slightly in their contents and readings. This diversity has led some scholars to argue that a true second recension never actually existed and that it was just one of many stages of accumulation following the first recension⁸.

7) On the debates surrounding the existence and nature of the second recension, see Atria A. LARSON, Gratian's *De penitentia* in Twelfth-Century Manuscripts, in: *BMCL* 31 (2014) p. 57–110, at p. 57–64. Also helpful are Rudolf Weigand's final reflections on the two recensions in Rudolf WEIGAND, *Causa 25 des Dekrets und die Arbeitsweise Gratians*, in: *Grundlagen des Rechts. Festschrift für Peter Landau zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Richard H. HELMHOLZ / Paul MIKAT / Jörg MÜLLER / Michael STOLLEIS (2000) p. 277–90; IDEM, Chancen und Probleme einer baldigen kritischen Edition der ersten Redaktion des Dekrets Gratians, in: *BMCL* 22 (1998) p. 53–75; IDEM, Zur künftigen Edition des Dekrets Gratians, in: *ZRG Kan.* 83 (1997) p. 32–51.

8) In general, the diverse readings of early *Decretum* manuscripts have so far defied attempts to neatly group them into families. Atria A. Larson explains: „While some manuscripts have more readings in common with certain other manuscripts, the early Gratian manuscripts do not fall neatly into families, and evidence abounds for much cross contamination [...]“; LARSON, Gratian's *De penitentia* (as n. 7) p. 107. Larson has recently edited Gratian's *De penitentia* (C.33 q.3) using seven manuscripts; Atria A. LARSON, *Gratian's Tractatus de penitentia: A New Latin Edition with English Translation* (Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Canon Law, 2016). Regula Gujer has also drawn attention to early contamination in the manuscript tradition and argued that the *Decretum* must be treated as a living text. Regula GUJER, *Concordia Discordantium Codicum Manuscriptorum? Die Textentwicklung von 18 Handschriften anhand der D.16 des Decretum Gratiani* (2004) p. 193–202, 416–18. On proposed stages both pre- and post-second recension, see Carlos LARRAINZAR, Métodos para el análisis de la formación literaria del *Decretum Gratiani*: „Etapas“ y „esquemas“ de redacción, in: *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, Esztergom 2008*, ed. Péter ERDŐ / Sz. Anzelm SZUROMI (Monumenta Iuris Canonici C 14, 2010) p. 85–116; IDEM, La edición crítica del Decreto de Graciano, in: *BMCL* 27 (2007) p. 71–105; IDEM, La formación del Decreto de Graciano por etapas, in: *ZRG Kan.* 87 (2001) p. 5–83; José Miguel VIEJO-XIMÉNEZ, „Costuras“ y „Descosidos“ en la versión divulgada del Decreto de Graciano, in: *Ius Ecclesiae* 21 (2009) p. 133–54; IDEM, La composición de C. 28 del Decreto de Graciano, in: *Mélanges Anne Lefebvre-Teillard*, ed. Bernard D'ALTEROCHE / Florence DEMOULIN-AUZARY / Olivier DESCAMPS / Franck ROUMY (2009) p. 1007–30; IDEM, Variantes textuales y variantes doctrinales en C.2 q.8, in: *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, Washington D.C. 2004*, ed. Uta-Renate BLUMENTHAL / Kenneth PENNINGTON / Atria A. LARSON (Monumenta Iuris Canonici C 13, 2006) p. 161–90; IDEM, La composición del Decreto de Graciano, in: *Ius canonicum* 45 (2005) p. 431–45.