

Reflections on the Two Recensions

The findings of this article emphasize the need for new editions of the *Decretum*. As we have seen, the Roman edition (1582) attempts to present the Bolognese vulgate text of the thirteenth century while Emil Friedberg's edition (1879) relies upon mixed-recension and Sigma (Σ) group manuscripts. Neither edition accurately reflects the first recension, the second recension, or any text that was ever taught by Gratian or the early Bolognese masters. Hopefully this article will facilitate the task of editing the first and second recensions. For an edition of the first recension, mixed-recension manuscripts – with their many first-recension preservations – can be used to resolve discrepancies and faulty readings in Aa, Bc, Fd, and P¹⁰⁶. For an edition of the second recension, mixed-recension manuscripts can also be used for those canons and *dicta* which were introduced in the second recension. For those first-recension texts which were modified by the redactor(s) of the second recension, however, it will remain difficult to isolate true second-recension readings from the many diverse readings which scribes came up with as they sought to reconcile the conflicting versions they encountered in supplemented first-recension manuscripts.

For an edition of the second recension, it would be helpful to identify one or more manuscripts which descend entirely from the second recension and are not contaminated by first-recension preservations. A good place to start looking is among those early manuscripts which contain all eight expansions listed above. Such manuscripts should be tested for many other minor second-recension modifications, including cases where first-recension texts were deleted in the second recension¹⁰⁷. The presence of early glosses would also indicate an early text¹⁰⁸. This scenario assumes, however, that the redactor(s) of the second recension produced a single, finished „fair copy“ which con-

106) Winroth has adopted this approach in his edition of the first recension and is currently utilizing Bi (4/8), Bm (5/8), Gt (0/8), Py (1/8), and Mv (2/8); Anders WINROTH, *Critical Notes on the Text of Gratian's Decretum 1*, <https://sites.google.com/a/yale.edu/decretumgratiani/critical-notes-1>. See also Winroth's forthcoming essay in the *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, Paris 2016*.

107) The redactor(s) of the second recension deleted first-recension canons which duplicate texts found elsewhere in the *Decretum*; Rudolf WEIGAND, *Versuch einer neuen, differenzierten Liste der Paleae und Dubletten im Dekret Gratians*, in: *BMCL* 23 (1999) p. 114–35.

108) On glosses in the earliest *Decretum* manuscripts, see most recently Philipp