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Introduction

The *Ars edendi* Research Programme, funded by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond and based at Stockholm University, explores both theoretical and practical issues of the editing of medieval Greek and Latin texts, especially in genres presenting quandaries to standard error-based, Lachmannian approaches. In our series of *Ars edendi* lectures, ever since the start of the eight-year programme in 2008, we have been inviting experienced scholars to share with us their perspectives on current developments in textual criticism or to address specific editorial challenges.

This volume, the third and penultimate, offers its readers the personal reflections and experiences of two Latin and two Greek scholars in regard to their own editorial work as well as the perspectives of a researcher in library and information science concerning critical digitization. Thanks to their admirably didactic presentations, each of the lectures, we believe, can be useful not only for scholarly research but also in teaching settings to convey the finer points of textual criticism and to indicate both the differences and similarities between editing classical works and editing medieval ones.

While we were preparing this introduction and summarizing the main points of each lecture, we realized that, though at first glance they deal with rather disparate subjects, there were some common issues which could bridge the passage from one to another. Hence we will not be presenting the lectures in their chronological order of appearance according to the arrangement of the volume but will make the transition hinge on some common editorial aspect.

One of the genres of particular interest to the *Ars edendi* programme is that of medieval commentaries on various kinds of ‘canonical’ texts (classical or biblical or even other medieval texts, prose as well as poetry). As stated on the *Ars edendi* homepage (www.arsedendi.org):

The commentary genre represents a hallmark of medieval hermeneutic tradition. A commentary is by nature a multilevel composition in which different textual, and at times also visual, layers are interwoven and interact with each other: the text to be
commented upon; excerpts from authoritative authors; the explanations of the commentator(s). Both this circumstance and the often quite variable manuscript copies of the same commentary present specific challenges to the editor.

With his wide-ranging knowledge of medieval commentaries on Ovid, Frank Coulson was a natural choice to give an *Ars edendi* lecture. In the published version of his lecture Coulson discusses the editorial problems peculiar to medieval commentaries and glosses on classical authors. One very ordinary but real such problem is simply locating the manuscripts transmitting glosses: many manuscript catalogues omit descriptions of such material or give only very cursory information. Scholars working on classical Latin texts deal, generally speaking, with relatively stable texts which, moreover, have almost always already been edited a number of times. In contrast, medieval commentaries on classical texts are often subject to variation and change due to classroom use, and very few of them have been edited. The core of the lecture deals with the question of how physically to represent the commentary tradition in a printed edition. Coulson offers examples from his own work on two important commentators on the *Metamorphoses*: Arnulf of Orléans (ca. 1180) and the anonymous author of the Vulgate Commentary (ca. 1250). In the earliest exemplars Arnulf is transmitted in a catena format, which usually led to a fairly stable text. Later, however, his commentary was transmitted in the form of scholia (interlinear or marginal glosses). The Vulgate Commentary, on the other hand, was regularly transmitted as scholia. Thus one problem for the editor of Arnulf is whether to attempt to recreate the author's original layout or to make separate editions of the philological and allegorical glosses that were transmitted independently in later manuscripts. As for the Vulgate, the glosses are sometimes copied into a manuscript of the *Metamorphoses* that has alternative readings not in accordance with the commentary. Coulson concludes by discussing different ways of approximating the medieval *mise-en-page* as well as different types of edition.

One point raised by Coulson is the degree to which corrections should be admitted. He states as a principle the need to resist 'hypercorrecting' the language of the medieval commentator. This is also one of the salient points in the lecture by Tiziano Dorandi, the
most recent editor of Diogenes Laertius. A well known textual scholar in the field of Hellenistic and Imperial Age Greek philosophy, Dorandi gave his lecture within the framework of the *Ars edendi* conference 'Apophthegmata', held at the Newman Institute in Uppsala (7-8 June 2012). Diogenes Laertius is, of course, an ancient and not a medieval author and thus falls outside the period of primary interest to *Ars edendi*, but his editors, too, must deal with a secondary tradition that was very much part of the Byzantine Middle Ages: the collections of sayings and anecdotes of philosophers and other luminaries which may be generically described as the 'gnomological tradition'. Like the commentary traditions on classical and biblical authors, the gnomological tradition started in antiquity and continued down to and throughout the Middle Ages. Since sayings and anecdotes form a prominent part of the *Lives of the Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius, and because the Byzantine tradition may preserve independent witnesses to earlier sources, the editor of Diogenes is also compelled to evaluate the parallel medieval traditions. Yet Diogenes himself made great use of the ancient gnomological tradition and other 'secondary' sources in addition to the works of the philosophers themselves. Also in this case the editor must resist the urge to hypercorrect, i.e. to adjust the language of Diogenes to the supposed usage of the original sources. Dorandi illustrates this with several examples, especially a saying of Epicurus quoted by Diogenes which survives both in the later medieval tradition and in the earlier, direct tradition of Epicurus. As stated in the conclusion of Dorandi’s lecture:

... in dealing with a work like the *Lives of the Philosophers*, which makes heavy use of quotations from source materials that are mostly extant (if at all) in a fragmentary state or merely paralleled in such fluctuating traditions as that of the Greek gnomologia, the editor should aim at restoring the quoted texts as they were 'received' by the author of the work being edited and not the original state of the sources quoted. The editor must avoid falling into the trap of mixing traditions and forgetting which text he or she is actually editing.

Like Dorandi, Michael Winterbottom is well known for his work on ancient authors (especially Quintilian, Tacitus, Cicero and the elder Seneca), but he has also made important contributions to medieval Latin, not least through his work on William of Malmesbury. His
lecture displays a nice ring-composition, beginning with an example of ‘moving the goal posts’ in classical Latin literature (the elder Seneca), proceeding to an illuminating discussion of the same phenomenon in medieval Latin, and concluding with an application of the lesson learned from the medieval authors to editing classical literature. Now what does he mean by the metaphor of ‘moving the goal posts’? It refers to the messy situation of manuscripts that give evidence of re-writing:

Editors like a quiet life. They hope for a nice simple stemma. They have a fantasy, that their author has erected a pair of goal posts, between which the skillfully established text can be kicked with no difficulty. Unfortunately, things are often not so easy ... One familiar source of trouble is that one manuscript, or a group of manuscripts, gives what looks in general like a sincere text, while others present what looks like a widely corrected and interpolated text. Someone, alongside the original goal posts, has erected a new pair, and the editor is not sure where he should be aiming his shots.

The classical scholar can only rarely determine when or where the rewriting has taken place, whereas the ‘fascination of medieval texts is that one can sometimes get right back to the top of a tradition, see the goal posts moving, and know or guess who was moving them.’ Winterbottom gives examples of re-writing with a special focus on William of Malmesbury (twelfth century), discussing William’s own corrections in the autograph of Gesta pontificum and also in Gesta regum (no autograph). He reaches the conclusion that revised versions of texts – even by the authors themselves – often follow soon after the originals, more often than people usually think. In textual traditions involving authorial revisions, the apparatus criticus assumes a particular importance, and, with regard to Winterbottom’s own edition of the Gesta Regum, ‘readers have to keep an open mind, and in a sense to choose and establish the text that suits them.’ In regard to classical texts, Winterbottom thinks it entirely possible that ‘by analogy with the revisions I have been pointing to in the high Middle Ages, revision was being carried out at a much earlier stage, even contemporary with the author, and even by him,’ although ‘the details of this process will rarely be available to us.’
Winterbottom had the privilege of editing the *Gesta pontificum* from an autograph of William of Malmesbury, which allowed him to observe, among other things, stable features of William's style and manner of writing Latin, not least his remarkably consistent orthography which Winterbottom followed in his own edition.

Our next lecturer, John M. Duffy, also found certain authorial idiosyncrasies to be of even greater importance in his editorial work on Sophronius of Jerusalem. This prolific author was born around the middle of the sixth century and elected patriarch of Jerusalem when he was over 80 years of age. He died around 639 after being compelled to hand over the city to the conquering Arabs. His most notable stylistic idiosyncracy was the striking prose rhythm that can be observed in his works, especially his use of the double dactyl, 'such a firm and almost unique trademark that it can serve as a fail-safe method of identifying any piece of prose from the pen of this author.' In this lecture we are treated to a careful selection of instructive examples of textual emendation based not only on rhythmic but also grammatical and paleographical observations. Duffy concludes as follows:

In the matter of *ars edendi* the present short contribution will have offered illustrations of the usual, commonsensical, ways of retrieving and restoring (where necessary) texts that have been transmitted in hand-written copies. Among those essential elements are close attention to all the manuscript evidence, a sound knowledge of paleography, and sensitivity to the author's modes of composition ... In the case of Sophronius of Jerusalem there is the added dimension of his deep attachment to rhythmical prose ... For the editor of the prose works of Sophronius this stylistic hallmark is a welcome boon providing an instrument to detect problem areas in the text and often (though clearly not always) helping to point the way to satisfactory solutions.

Professor Duffy has made textual philology one of his specialities because he believes it to be of fundamental importance for medieval Greek which, in the matter of reliable editions, lags behind not only classics but medieval Latin as well. With his own numerous critical editions of Byzantine texts, he has made significant contributions to closing the gap.
But what do we mean by critical edition? The age of digital technology has made even the ‘new philology’ of twenty years seem stale and old-fashioned when placed next to the digital philology of today. With his background in classics and library science, Mats Dahlström has reflected and published a great deal about the effects of digitization on scholarship. He begins his lecture by broadly contrasting ‘mass digitization’ of the Google Books variety with ‘critical digitization’ that focuses on quality over quantity. Successful examples of the latter are the digitization of the Codex Sinaiticus or, in our own country of Sweden, that of the Codex Gigas. Are these latter primarily digital editions of source documents or primarily digitization projects within a memory institutional context?

In fact, as would be evident, much of what goes on in critical digitization reminds us of what scholarly editors have been doing for centuries – and that includes both problems and solutions. This is of course no coincidence: they are both instances of what I would call critical transmission.

We are living through an important transitional period in terms of textual criticism which shows similarities with the ancient foundational period in Alexandria or with the Gutenberg era. In his lecture Dahlström mentions several fundamental issues, such as new forms of canonization through digitization, similarities and differences between library digitization and scholarly editing. Digitization focuses on the transmission of graphical and material documents, while scholarly editing focuses on the transmission of text. Scholarly editing and digitization carried out by libraries ‘seem to share an increasing amount of features and concerns, and might occasionally even merge on the project level.’ While automated mass digitization is not suitable for all kinds of resources or documents and ‘critical digitization’ is sometimes needed, even modest library digitization can have significant benefits for textual scholarship. Mass digitization such as Google Books can also benefit scholars sometimes in unexpected ways: ‘there have already been several fruitful examples of text mining and other technologies to detect patterns over very large collections of texts and images.’ Dahlström concludes with an upbeat discussion of rewarding collaboration between textual scholars and cultural memory institutions, and he sees many ‘reasons for being
optimistic about cooperative opportunities in critical transmission endeavours.’

We would like to mention one Ars edendi lecture that was held during the period covered by volume 3 but has not been included here. This was William Flynn’s lecture, ‘Liturgical Ductus and Editorial Practice’ (7 June 2011), which he decided to rework and publish as ‘Reading Hildegard of Bingen’s Antiphons for the 11,000 Virgin Martyrs of Cologne: Rhetorical ductus and Liturgical Rubrics’, in Nottingham Medieval Studies 56 (2012), 171–89.

To conclude, we would like to thank our colleagues in the Core Group of Ars edendi (Gunilla Iversen, Erika Kihlman, Brian Møller Jensen, Barbara Crostini, Elisabet Göransson); Professor Katerina Ierodiakonou who helped to arrange Professor Duffy’s lecture; Professor Gerd Haverling in Uppsala who joined forces to invite Professor Winterbottom; our research assistant Klara Borgström, who took care of the practical arrangements for the lectures; Maria Plaza, lecturer in Latin and chief editor of the Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, who took the time to read and approve this volume for publication in the series, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond for their continuing support; and, of course, our Ars edendi lecturers themselves who have shared their insights and experiences with us in their lectures and taken the time to prepare them for publication. We look forward to the fourth and final volume in the series which is planned to include lectures by Mariken Teeuwen, Paolo Maggioni, Charalambos Dendrinos, Richard Janko, Marjorie Woods, Glenn Most and Peter Robinson.

Eva Odelman and Denis Searby
Contributors
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focus of his research has been on Byzantine literature in the areas of theology, philosophy, medicine, and religious tales. His recent textual editions include: John of Alexandria, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics VI* (*Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, Berlin 1997); Michael Psellos, *Theologica II*, edited with L. G. Westerink (*Bibliotheca Teubneriana*, Munich / Leipzig, 2002); Nicetas David, *The Life of Patriarch Ignatius*, text and translation by A. Smithies, with notes by J. M. Duffy (Washington DC, 2013).

*Michael Winterbottom* is a former Corpus Christi Professor of Latin at the University of Oxford, and a fellow of the British Academy. He has edited a number of classical and medieval Latin texts, including works by Quintilian, Tacitus, Cicero, the elder Seneca and William of Malmesbury. His most recent work is on William of Malmesbury, an edition (with Rod Thomson) of his *Commentary on Lamentations* (*Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 244: 2011), and a separate translation (*Corpus Christianorum* in Translation, 13: 2013).
Critical Transmission

Mats Dahlström

My home department has for some years been running a course on cultural heritage digitization, directed primarily at employees within the memory institution sector.¹ As their major assignment, students perform a small-scale digitization project, all the way from selecting and handling the physical source documents, to creating a web site where the digitized material is presented and commented. The students usually choose to digitize, edit and publish 19th century manuscripts such as letters or diaries, or late 19th or early 20th century children's books. The reason is that those kinds of material rarely pose any copyright constraints, and they often provide a challenging mix of alphanumeric texts and illustrations in a document whose size makes it feasible to be digitized in its entirety.

In the typical case, the students produce high-resolution TIFF digital facsimiles of the source documents for archival and preservation purposes and then convert these archival files into JPG compressed file formats suitable for web browsing.² The students

This lecture was given 8 March 2012 at Stockholm University.

¹ This essay is a modified version of my 2012 Ars edendi lecture. The lecture was in turn based on two previously published articles: Mats Dahlström, 'Critical Editing and Critical Digitization', in Text Comparison and Digital Creativity: the Production of Presence and Meaning in Digital Text Scholarship, ed. by Wido Th. van Peursen, Ernst D. Thoutenhoofd & Adriaan van der Weel (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 79–97; and Mats Dahlström, 'Editing Libraries', Bibliothek und Wissenschaft, 44 (2011), 91–106. The present essay therefore has a high degree of similarity to those articles, particularly the latter.

² Acronyms in this paragraph: TIFF = Tagged Image File Format; JPG = Joint Photographic Experts Group; OCR = Optical Character Recognition; TEI = Text Encoding Initiative; XSL = eXtensible Stylesheet Language; XHTML = eXtensible HyperText Markup Language.
proceed to transcribe the textual contents, either manually or through OCR software. This is followed by writing XSL style sheets to have the TEI file transformed into various XHTML outputs for the web to serve different user groups, while also making both the TEI file and the style sheet files available open source. Both the high-resolution and the compressed image files are also made available online. In addition, the students are required to present both descriptive documentation and a critical report with scholarly reflections of the work they have done, and publish this material as well on the web. Some students display considerable critical skills during the project, for instance by detecting slight bibliographical differences between various copies and editions of the work they are to digitize, and using that as a critical platform to decide upon the ‘best’ copy given their specific task, resources and imagined audience.

The student projects are obviously small-scale. Their relative degree of technical sophistication must be assessed in proportion to whatever limited resources the students possessed with respect to time, equipment, and technical skills. My point in mentioning them, however, is that in all their modesty, they display a kind of modus operandi which is rational to libraries and archives when embarking on projects to digitize older printed or hand-written materials.

In many respects, the previous description points to a digitization strategy, which is as far as you can possibly come from the currently most talked-of mode, mass digitization, with Google Book Search (GBS) as the paradigmatic example. In mass digitization, huge amounts of documents are digitized by automated means during a short period of time (i.e. the amount of time devoted to digitizing each object is minimized). It operates on an industrial scale and with as many steps in the process as possible fully automated. The mass mode systematically digitizes whole collections with little or no particular means of discrimination. To be at all feasible, it needs to track down and delete any time-consuming steps in the process. Therefore, it minimizes manual and labour-intensive work and cannot include

---

3 For a critical discussion on GBS and the mass digitization mode, see e.g. Marilyn Deegan and Kathryn Sutherland, *Transferred Illusions: Digital Technology and the Forms of Print* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), ch. 5.
intellectual aspects such as careful selection, interpretation, contextual descriptions, descriptive text encoding, or manual proofreading. It cannot afford to produce new metadata and other bibliographic information about the source document. Here, digitization flattens out into a linear streamlined affair. And deliberately so: the primary aim for mass digitization simply is not depth and perfection. Its quality resides in its quantity: a gigantic, growing bank of digital texts that can be free-text searched, used as a tool to locate specific copies, and to form the technical base for many kinds of future software applications. The rationale that is fuelling mass digitization states: let us not spend costly manual labour on correcting transcriptions, carefully checking scanner outputs, assigning metadata, producing historical and bibliographical information, registering, or indexing. We had better go on digitizing as much and as fast as the machines will allow us, then make the scanning files and automatically produced transcriptions available as much as possible, however incorrect some of them currently may be. Users will anyway gladly come to help, and as a document gets accessed and used, chance is it will be corrected. More importantly perhaps, machines will soon enough come to help: forceful algorithms, recognition software (for patterns, genres, texts, or images), intelligent search, fuzzy search, text mining, and other technologies will aid machines in such a way that manual hands-on can be minimized or even completely avoided. At least, so goes the rationale behind the projects.

Be that as it may, mass digitization does not fit all kinds of libraries, all kinds of resources, or all kinds of documents. A large number of digitization projects exist that cannot be designed along these streamlined principles, that are anything but ‘mass’, where most of the work is and has to be manual and the technology tailored – what do we label such projects? For a while now I have been toying with the term ‘critical digitization’ to designate such strategies. Let us keep in mind that at every step in the long digitization process, the persons and institutions involved can make choices, deselect and interpret.

Usually by necessity, mass digitization ignores most of these choices by designing a uniform straitjacket to impose on every document in the collection to be digitized. Critical digitization however acknowledges the choices and alternatives, and makes active use of them.

A digitizing agent may e.g. need to perform a deliberate and strategic – i.e. critical – selection from a number of possible source documents. Perhaps the contents of the document are difficult to decipher. The text or, more often, the image may need to be edited and manipulated to make sense or context. Intellectual editing, preparation and emendation of the contents of the digitized documents thus often occur during the process. Perhaps the project needs to take great care not to place the source documents in peril during the digitization process (as is often the case within mass digitization), but on the contrary to make sure that they are subjected to careful preservational or conservational measures. The digitizing agent may aim for a manually and critically produced representation that is as exhaustive and as faithful as possible to the source document – not only with respect to its text, but to its visual and graphical qualities, perhaps even to its artefactual materiality. The digital object may need to be provided with large amounts of metadata, indexing, descriptive encoding, paratexts and bibliographical information. If so, bibliographical and other scholarly research is embedded in the objects. Finally, perhaps fragments from different sources are critically selected to form an eclectic virtual representation in the process.

Therefore, critical digitization is qualitative in the sense that it concentrates on what is unique and contingent in the documents, whereas mass digitization is quantitative in its design to capture common, regular, foreseeable traits in large amounts of documents. In consequence then, critical digitization normally has to develop project contingent procedures and tools and tailor them to the nature of the documents in the particular collection. In mass digitization, the individual documents in the digitized collection are on the contrary subordinated (tailored, if you will) to more general, perhaps even universal procedures and tools.

The student projects in the course mentioned at the outset of this essay can be designated, to some extent, as critical digitization. More to the point, most of us have come across several professional and
impressive examples of such digitization endeavours. A prime example would of course be the digitization of the Codex Sinaiticus.\textsuperscript{5} The project’s careful and thorough bibliographic investigation of the codex object and its textual and material history is as impressive as its application of cutting-edge technology to dig as deeply as possible into the heretofore invisible layers of the object, or its commendable success at displaying the virtual object and helping the user navigate both horizontally and vertically in it.

And there are many other magnificent examples of high quality critical digitization endeavours. Projects working with e.g. palimpsests, \textit{bullae} or wax tablets, where original text is difficult or impossible to read without machine aid, have demonstrated the benefits of applying new technology to old documents.\textsuperscript{6} Their methods include artefact scanning in 3D, X-Ray, and multi-spectral imaging technology (taking several shots of a document carrying illegible text and capturing different wavelengths of light, whereby one is able to distinguish ink from paper in a manner prohibited to the naked eye). By stretching the muscles of current digital humanities, projects such as these display how high-quality digitization promises to enhance new scholarship and research, and to enable us to see familiar objects through new lenses.

Prominent Swedish examples would be the digitization of the Codex Gigas (the Devil’s Bible) at the National Library in Stockholm, and the Codex Argenteus (the Silver Bible) at the university library in


Uppsala. These manuscript books were digitized in minute detail. Digitizing the Codex Gigas, the largest manuscript book in the world, proved a considerable task, involving creative adjustment of equipment and innovative methodological development.

I confess to not being perfectly content with the distinction between the mass and the critical mode of digitization. It might suggest that a digitization project is either a mass or a critical mode project. Instead, I would like to think of the two modes as poles at each end of a scale – most digitization activities contain features from both strategies and place themselves somewhere along the scale. A more problematic aspect, one that suggests that the scale of critical inquiry and method should be supplemented with a scale along parameters of e.g. collection size and project scale, is that the two labels might suggest that a digitization project cannot comprise huge quantities of objects while still being performed with critical inquiry and a high level of standards and quality. Current development within technology points to increased automation, but also to maintaining high standards and requirements for preparation and management of source documents, or high quality digital facsimile production. Many memory institutions obviously are interested in finding ways to satisfy both these demands. A final potential problem with the distinction, or rather the description of it that I provided, is that it might suggest that the one is objectively superior to the other.

But relative to the number of digitized objects and in comparison to mass digitization projects, the critical mode of digitization is expensive, slow, and often attracts few and small user communities. To perform a thorough critical digitization project also requires considerable skills, e.g. in textual or image scholarship. As for the scholarly value of critical digitization, it often emphasizes the digital facsimile work to the extent that the production of machine-readable transcriptions is neglected – so the text cannot even be searched. In some similarity to many high quality research projects within the humanities, critical digitization projects tend not to really meet

throughout requirements of documentation, transparency, and repeatability. And as for the scholarly value, some users might find it problematic that the digitized material has already been deliberately and explicitly interpreted and narrowly formed for a particular purpose. On the one hand, critical digitization enriches its objects with an intellectual added value and applies some kind of quality seal with respect to selection, textual quality, resolution, proofreading, comments, and bibliographical information. On the other hand, not all scholars may be interested in that particular metainformation and added value, but are in need of quite different aspects than those that happened to catch the interest of the digitizing institution. Further, much of the discourse framing mass digitization can be criticized for trivializing the image and text capture phases into a simple 'conduit' view of transmission, where the objects and their contents run through the operation unaffected, and where the digital collection thus is a complete surrogate for the source collection. One might equally well claim that critical digitization risks falling for another kind of cloning ideal: as long as the most powerful reproduction technologies available are implemented in the project with enough rich metainformation provided for each object, there will be no need for any future digitization of the object – we would be facing the definitive digital representation. To this line of reasoning, mass digitization has an advantage because it does not select nor provide interpretative metadata and explicit text encoding, but rather provides supposedly neutral banks that scholars ideally can use, reuse and enrich the way it suits them best. Some readers might be prone to recognize a pattern here from the classical tension in scholarly editing between Alexandrian and Pergamanian ideals, that is, between intervening and non-intervening ideals. Might this suggest that there are further traits common to both critical digitization and scholarly editing, based on textual criticism? I will make such a case in the subsequent sections.

Let us keep in mind that scholarly editing based on textual criticism is largely a bibliographical, referential activity. It examines historical documents and witnesses, compares their texts, in most cases clusters

---

these around the abstract notion of a work, arranges them in a web of relations, and attempts to embody this web in the bibliographical, complex document genre known as the scholarly edition.\(^9\) The edition, then, becomes a surrogate purporting to register, represent, tag and comment on the edited work. In a sense, the editor reproduces existing documents by making a new document that also embodies a documentation of the textual history and the editorial process.

At the same time, scholarly editions are hermeneutical documents and subjective interpretations, in two senses: they carry with them an ideological and hermeneutical heritage, and they also exert an interpretative influence over the objects they are designed to embody and represent. Nevertheless editions by tradition pretend to convey a sense of value-free objectivity, a mere recording of facts, somewhat in the manner in which library transmission processes (such as digitization or microfiche copying) tend to be regarded as trivial tasks performed by unbiased and non-interpreting machines.

In fact, as would be evident, much of what goes on in critical digitization reminds us of what scholarly editors have been doing for centuries – and that includes both problems and solutions. This is of course no coincidence: they are both instances of what I would call critical transmission. In that sense, library digitization belongs to the same transmission tradition as 20th century microfilming or the transcribing of manuscripts in ancient libraries and medieval monasteries. The bibliographers of antiquity were engaged in critical full-text transmission. Their practice of transmitting, commenting and correcting texts gradually evolved into textual criticism and scholarly editing, while libraries increasingly devoted their time to producing bibliographical labels for documents rather than reproducing the full documents. The Gutenberg era significantly changed the extent and nature of this full-text transmission in libraries. With digital reproduction technologies and current digitization projects however, libraries are drawing a historical circle and are yet again dedicating much energy and attention to such transmission. In so doing, they

\(^9\) If we consider the scholarly edition as a bibliographical, referential genre, we should recognize that as such it is a member of a family that includes e.g. the catalogue, the reference database, the library collection, the archive, or the enumerative bibliography.
face tasks that go beyond the mere trivial and that enter a critical transmission mode.

When performing such transmission, cultural memory institutions as well as scholarly editors need to select and discriminate materials. They both face the task of having to interpret and sometimes compare and collate variant source documents, perhaps even to identify common – sometimes even ideal – contents within such a range of variant documents. They share a concern for authenticity and faithfulness between the sources and the representations. They edit, comment and produce metatexts. They both make the same kind of distinction between two different perspectives of the empirical object of editing or digitizing: either the text as reduced to linguistic sign sequences or as a meaning conveyed by those linguistic sequences in conjunction with layout, typeface, colour and the rest of the graphical and material appearance that the document provides. This is in other words a difference between text and document, manifested in the distinction between, on the one hand, text based versus image based editing, and on the other hand, text oriented versus image oriented digitization.

Scholarly editing and library digitization are both practices legitimized by prestige institutions, and based on fairly stabilized principles. As such, critical digitization is, similar to scholarly editing, an exclusive affair – in more senses than one. Efforts such as the Codex Gigas, Argenteus and Sinaiticus digitization projects increase the symbolic significance of the digitized documents. Critical digitization and editing share a canonizing function; by putting a quality seal on a digitized object they honour particular works and documents by raising ‘cathedrals’ in their honour, turning documents into monuments. In general, library digitization and scholarly editing display a similar internal pattern of conflicting scholarly ideals. I would even say that in the case of critical digitization, libraries are in effect engaged in what comes close to textual criticism. Librarians and other employees involved in current digitization projects might feel awkward with having the label of textual criticism or even

---

10 See the special journal issue of *Computers and the Humanities* 36:1 (2002) on image-based humanities computing.
bibliography put on their work, but the historical connection cannot be denied.

Might we go so far as to say that scholarly editing and critical digitization are one and the same activity? No. The institutional context aside, there are some important differences. John Lavagnino has addressed this issue, formulated as the differences between digital (scholarly) editions and digital libraries (in the sense of collections of objects digitized by memory institutions such as libraries).\(^{11}\) The former, Lavagnino argues, displays a more profound analytical understanding of the extant source, its problems and challenges, for instance by emending textual errors or making arguments about authorship:

It is a perfectly respectable thing to provide an accurate transcription or photographic reproduction of one copy of a book, and in many cases those tasks require a considerable amount of expertise and judgment, but the potential achievements of these tasks are different from those that are possible in a scholarly edition.\(^{12}\)

A library digitizing a collection, on the other hand, ‘does not involve any analysis; it is devoted to reproducing existing books, but not to any critical or bibliographical analysis.’ Producing it is largely a clerical task, and it ‘can be created by workers who have no special knowledge of the material.’\(^{13}\)

This is an accurate description of most mass digitization projects performed by libraries, archives, and partner agents such as Google. But if we broaden our view of digitization in libraries, we see a more complex spectrum of analytical, critical levels in the work performed. In high-quality digital imaging projects for instance, teams of conservators, technicians and photographic experts base a row of decisions on thorough critical and bibliographical analysis and on a highly specialized knowledge of the bibliographical, graphical, bibliological, historical, and other research aspects of the material to


\(^{12}\) Lavagnino, p. 63.

\(^{13}\) Lavagnino, p. 64.
be digitized. Libraries further produce, with or without the aid of subject specialist scholars, electronic thematic research collections, a task that requires a considerable degree of scholarly, critical skill and deliberation.

I agree that the major distinction one might make between scholarly editing and library digitization concerns the textual level: library digitization does not seek, as scholarly editing does, to establish a text that perhaps never existed previously and which cannot be literally transmitted from a single source document. But this distinction is not as sharp as one might at first expect.

On the one hand, movements such as full-text versioning, digital facsimile editions and documentary editing push scholarly editions towards becoming documentary, flat archives. There, the products of scholarly editing are broken down into small, modular fragments in the manner of a database, or 'library'. Some within the scholarly editing discourse also advocate minimizing editorial interventions and instead providing fulltext and ‘raw’ versions, refraining from highlighting or constructing a single uniform established base text. Scholarly editions are also increasingly based on image-oriented editing, and devote more of their space to harbouring digital facsimiles of the source documents. On the other hand, critical digitization approaches the domain of scholarly editing and textual criticism, for example in image-oriented digitization of documents where we have more than one source copy to choose from. There, the critical comparison of several source candidates based on e.g. their condition, completeness and state results either in the deliberate selection of one candidate or perhaps even in an eclectic amalgam of fragments from several candidates (such as eclectic facsimiles à la Charlton Hinman's famous 1968 edition of Shakespeare's First Folio). In the latter case we are facing, if not the ambition of textual criticism to establish an ideal text, then at least a kind of document criticism that seeks to establish an ideal document. This is in fact the primary aspect where critical digitization and scholarly editing are both different and similar. The former devotes its analytical faculties to the critical transmission of graphical and material documents, and has been criticized for not paying enough critical attention to their texts. Conversely, scholarly editing devotes its analytical faculties to the critical transmission of text, and has been criticized for not paying enough critical attention to
the graphical and material documents carrying those texts. Understood this way the two activities not only differ but support and complement each other.

And frankly, how do we label projects such as the ones digitizing the Codex Sinaiticus or the Codex Gigas—are they primarily digital editions of source documents or primarily digitization projects within a memory institutional context? That kind of undecidedness is perhaps a symptom that the two fields of scholarly editing and library digitization are brought much closer together in the digital realm. On a practical level, there is of course much tangible cooperation between the two fields. Libraries normally house the source documents of interest to scholarly editors to begin with, and often perform the technical digitization of them to serve large editing projects. Libraries are also arguably best suited to be responsible for the long-term technical and bibliographical maintenance and preservation of the digital files. They are, further, in a good position to coordinate and manage the intricate web of intellectual property rights (IPR) within large editing projects in a way that other agents, including scholarly editors, simply cannot do. This is particularly the case with image-oriented projects, where libraries and archives often are the very IPR holders themselves.

Notwithstanding high-quality, critical digitization, even quite modest library digitization has significant benefits for textual scholarship. Large amounts of materials are made available for both people and search software, at least as facsimiles, and can thus become the object of text capture and turned into machine-readable text, to be used and re-used in research and editing projects. Unpublished and sometimes unknown manuscript material is identified, registered and made available. Even quick-and-dirty produced image scans of selected parts of manuscripts in a collection can help a researcher decide whether or not he or she should make the effort of actually travelling to the physical library to consult its collections.

And even the gigantic banks of transcription files produced from scanned books by Google Book Search are beginning to be interesting as research data to textual scholars around the world. There have already been several fruitful examples of text mining and other technologies to detect patterns over very large collections of texts and
images. Many scholarly editors, textual scholars and digitizing agents alike, begin to think about how to coordinate their projects with what agents such as Google are already doing anyway, e.g. by superimposing new collections or patterns or data on top of Google’s bank (to the extent that is allowed and technically feasible).

Scholarly editing and library digitization thus seem to share an increasing amount of features and concerns, and might occasionally even merge on the project level. A *sine qua non* for such a development to take place however, is that the researchers as well as the memory institutions involved both embrace principles such as mutually shared data (or even linked open data) and open access (or even open source) availability. For instance, many digital text editing projects depend on high-resolution digital facsimiles, carefully prepared and proofread transcriptions, and XML encodings of the highest quality. The libraries and archives with which the editing projects have partnered are often in a position to make such material available to the researchers. Not only do the editing teams need to have access to the underlying data, the text encodings, the rich metadata, the high resolution images, the scripts, style sheets etc, but they also need to be able to exchange, use, reuse, integrate and remodule them. Such needs are obviously better met by critical digitization than by mass digitization, which produces information-poor files.

Due to legal, economical, or administrative reasons however, libraries, archives and other digitizing agents are occasionally prone to restrict access to and usage of the information-rich files. Not a few scholarly editing projects have in fact failed to come to fruition because the institution holding the source documents either claimed copyright to its particular copy of the public domain work or posed a forbidding charge for access to the high quality master file.14

There are nevertheless many encouraging examples of intimate cooperation between libraries and scholarly editors. Many joint

projects would not have been feasible if both partners had not embraced an open source ideal, at least to some extent. They provide good reasons for being optimistic about cooperative opportunities in critical transmission endeavours.
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Moving the Goal Posts: The Re-writing of Medieval Latin Prose Texts

Michael Winterbottom

I should like first to say how honoured I am to have been asked to take part in this series of lectures, and to be speaking in Sweden, a country from which so many distinguished Latinists have sprung.

Editors like a quiet life. They hope for a nice simple stemma. They have a fantasy, that their author has erected a pair of goal posts, between which the skilfully established text can be kicked with no difficulty.

Unfortunately, things are often not so easy. A stemma cannot always be drawn, or, if drawn, cannot be made to produce consistently satisfactory results. Or a picture that looked convincing when only two manuscripts were available starts to look less clear when a third or fourth arrives on the scene.

One familiar source of trouble is that one manuscript, or a group of manuscripts, gives what looks in general like a sincere text, while others present what looks like a widely corrected and interpolated text. Someone, alongside the original goal posts, has erected a new pair, and the editor is not sure where he should be aiming his shots.

This lecture was given 26 April 2012 at Stockholm University.

1 I have so far as possible kept to the wording of my original lecture. But what I shall say, towards the end, of William of Malmesbury's book of Miracles has been revised to take account of my subsequent researches. I make no apology for concentrating on texts on which I have myself worked as editor and/or translator.

2 With a bow to the other meaning of *edendi*, I should like to record how much my wife and I appreciated the sumptuous dinner that followed the lecture, on a rainy evening by the sea. Everyone made us welcome to Stockholm; Elisabet Göransson made scrupulous arrangements, and a quarter of an hour's talk with Monica Hedlund was the perfect preface to my lecture.
I shall start by saying a little about such re-writing in one classical Latin prose text. Then I shall go on to a couple of medieval prose texts where the re-writing has (it seems) again been done by someone other than the author. Finally, I shall talk about various works of the twelfth-century English historian and hagiographer, William of Malmesbury, whom we can more than once catch out in the process of re-working his own books: erecting, even, a whole series of goal posts.

In a discussion of the manuscript tradition of Juvenal, Richard Tarrant has written:

The revived attention of readers and expositors [in the fourth century] made its own mark on the text, difficult or obscure language often being replaced by more straightforward equivalents. The vast majority of the medieval manuscripts derive from ancient copies much affected by this process of interpolation; fortunately, however, a few manuscripts and fragments bear witness to another ancient form of the tradition, often more corrupt but less subject to interpolation than the common class.3

So Tarrant on Juvenal. But the same sort of thing is true also of the traditions of quite a few classical texts. I have just come from Uppsala, where we were honouring the great (and much lamented) Swedish textual critic Lennart Håkanson. I spoke on that occasion about his edition of the Elder Seneca (Leipzig: Teubner 1989). In that tradition, two ninth-century manuscripts confront each other, one (a Brussels book, B) sincere, though often corrupt, the other (a Vatican MS, V) wildly interpolated.4 What makes V so difficult to deal with is that an editor has to decide, in each particular case, whether a reading of V that looks superior to that of B is the result of conjecture, collation with another manuscript, or a mixture of the two. But in practice the editor of the Elder Seneca, when confronted with a contested passage,

4 The manuscripts are Brussels 9594 and Vatican lat. 3872. I disregard here Antwerp 411, which adds little if anything to B. For a recent and highly sophisticated discussion of this tradition, see Bart Huelsenbeck, ‘The rhetorical collection of the Elder Seneca’, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 106 (2012), 229–99.
customarily starts not from the beautified text of V but from the uglier but more authentic text of B, if the two differ.5

In V, then, we have one extreme classical case of the moving of goal posts. It is unknown when, or over how long a period, the interpolation seen in the first hand of V took place: perhaps at one fell swoop in the fourth century, perhaps over several centuries; perhaps one person was responsible, perhaps many. We just do not know. The fascination of medieval texts is that one can sometimes get right back to the top of a tradition, see the goal posts moving, and know or guess who was moving them.

I shall discuss two medieval texts where the author’s book was re-written by another hand; and then come on to various works where William of Malmesbury can be seen re-writing himself. These are all texts I have myself edited, and I hope to give you some flavour of the problems an editor encounters in traditions of this kind.

I start with an abbreviation.6 For a long time the Life of St Aldhelm by the Italian monk of Malmesbury, Faricius (who died in 1117), was known only in a version found in a single late twelfth-century Cotton manuscript in the British Library (C). From this was printed the text found in the Patrologia Latina. Only recently has a new witness emerged, a somewhat later manuscript in the library of Gloucester Cathedral (G). This longer version of the text certifies itself as more authentic, for it contains a dedication addressed to Osmund, who was bishop of Salisbury from 1078 to 1099. Preceding this is a pair of hexameters, stating that this same Osmund had given his blessing to the book (hoc opus ... sanctiuit). The new text contains at the end a number of miracles unknown to C, almost all of which were reworked by William of Malmesbury in the fifth book of his Gesta Pontificum; his source for them had not hitherto been known.

The Cotton manuscript carries an abbreviation of this apparently original version of the *Life*. In the process, it suppresses almost all reference to Malmesbury as the author's house, apparently with the intention of appealing to a wider audience than the local one addressed by Faricius (there are medieval parallels for this\(^7\)). But the revision also does something to correct Faricius's Latin. At 8. 7 G has *loca supradicti patris ... libera ab omni stabiliiuerunt fore seruitio*, 'decree that the places belonging to Aldhelm should be free from all service'. In C the main verb has become *statuerunt*; what seems to be an Italianism has been eliminated. Or again at 21. 3 C had: *apud quem sanctorum sperarent eum misericordiam inuenturum*, 'from whom among the saints they expected he would find mercy'. The future participle replaces the less 'correct' *inuenire* found in G.

It was not an entirely simple matter to decide how to edit this text. Any variant in C may be a) the truth where G is in error; b) a scribal error peculiar to C; or c) an intentional re-writing. A particular difficulty arises when the witnesses vary in their ordering of words. These are typical problems when one is dealing with texts that have been systematically revised. In the *Life* of Faricius I kept as close to G as I could, correcting only where absolutely necessary from C (or by conjecture).

This kind of grammatical and stylistic revision is seen taking place on a much bigger scale in a second, rather earlier text, the *Life of St Dunstan* written by someone whose name we know only as B.\(^8\) The *Life* followed close on the saint's death in 988, for the date of composition is limited by the dedication to Ælfric, archbishop of Canterbury, who was in office from 995 to 1005. There are three manuscripts, all apparently written at St Augustine's, Canterbury: an

---

\(^7\) E.g. Hugh of Miramar's *De hominis miseria, mundi et inferni contemptu*, revised by the author in a most eccentric manner (ed. by Fabrice Wendling as *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 234; see p. xxxiii for the changing audience, and a parallel with Hugh of St Victor's *Libellus de formatione arche*).

Arras MS (A), another from St Gall (C), and a Cotton MS (D). All were known to the great English editor William Stubbs. He was right to dismiss the claims of D, which is no more than a revision and abbreviation not of A itself but of an ancestor of A. But he based his text on A, and indeed only gave the variants of C in an appendix. He convinced himself that C was a re-writing of A. It seems, however, that the reverse is the case: that is, C is much closer to the original, which is seen in a revised form in A.

The temptation to revise B’s text was great. His style is obscure and pompous, his language is marked by many neologisms, and his grammar is loose in the extreme. The reviser set himself to re-write whole phrases or sentences, but he wearied of the task when he was about a third of the way through the work. We are able therefore to see many of B’s characteristic usages corrected in those early chapters of A, but left untouched in the later ones. To give one of very many examples, the reviser (rightly) objected to the use of the word *paulatim* in 9.4, replacing it (wrongly) with *post paucum:* *paulatim* in the sense ‘for a short time’ is left uncorrected in three later passages. No doubt this work of revision took place at Canterbury itself, and not long after the date of composition.

Here the basis for the text could only be C. The apparatus criticus gives the variants of A and D, and is in its way as interesting as the text. We can see in detail a reviser (or revisers) taking issue with a contemporary, perhaps even a colleague, with whose Latin they found serious fault. The content they hardly tampered with, even though Dunstan had died quite recently and B’s Life had left gaping holes in the story of his (possibly controversial) archbishopric. Those holes could have been filled, but the reviser chose not to fill them.

I come now to William of Malmesbury, my prime exhibit. The most vivid example of his re-writing of his own work is provided by his surviving autograph of the *Gesta Pontificum* (A): a small book, closely written, and corrected in an even tinier script.\(^9\) It is not merely that the book has been corrected; folios have, as collation shows, been ripped out, while elsewhere whole passages have been erased and (at times) written over. Sometimes the motive for change is adjustment or addition of information, sometimes a matter of stylistic nuance. But

\(^9\) This is Oxford, Magdalen College lat. 172.
normally William was concerned to tone down provocative remarks about persons of authority, especially kings and bishops, past and present. Age had brought discretion.

If this remarkable book were the only witness to this long text, an editor would naturally print the text as corrected, recording the original text where that is legible. Lost passages would be noted, and lamented. But by a stroke of fortune we can get back behind at least some of William’s changes. Before William made these, a copy was taken (β), now lost; and of this in turn two copies survive, B and C. From these two witnesses β can be reconstructed, with the usual judgement necessary in choosing between the two. In this way, passages removed or deleted can be brought back to light.

My Oxford Medieval Texts edition of 2007 therefore has as its basis the corrected text of A. The apparatus records places where William changed what he first wrote, and, if possible, his original wording. My apparatus gives some material enabling the reader to plot the sequence of William’s various layers of correction. Thus (to take a simple case) an omission marked merely ‘om. a.c.’ (‘omitted before correction’) was corrected very early, before the copy β was taken. ‘om. a.c. + β’ implies that the correction had still not been made when β was copied. And as other copies of the autograph were made later, these can play their part here too: hence an entry like ‘om. a.c. + βEG’.

The privilege of editing from an autograph survives such complications. Having a copy written by the author himself enables us to draw invaluable deductions about the orthographical system that he

10 I note, per contra, that the new Cambridge edition of Ben Jonson ‘aims to present Jonson’s texts in a form as close as possible to that in which they were first staged or published’, not in the author’s own eventual version of them published in 1616; see Blair Worden in London Review of Books, 11 October 2012, p. 18.

11 These are London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A. v and Harley 3641 (both s. xii).

favoured.\textsuperscript{13} William is remarkably consistent in his practice, and I have imposed his principles on other texts of his that I have edited despite the varying orthography found in non-autograph manuscripts of those various works. William cared how Latin was spelt, and it seemed courteous to follow his lead. No less helpful is the insight that William’s corrections give us into his sense of style. We see him replacing one word by one he felt was better, or (especially interesting) altering the order of words.

Where only a word or two are corrected, I record the change in the apparatus criticus. But where wholesale correction has been carried out, sometimes involving hundreds of words, I use two columns, with the uncorrected text (available from \(\beta\)) on the left hand side and the corrected version, often much shorter, on the right. The really excellent Victorian editor of the \textit{Gesta Pontificum}, N.E.S.A. Hamilton,\textsuperscript{14} put these longer original passages in footnotes. In either case, the reader in search of the more sensational parts of the text can easily track them down. The only respect in which I might hope to have made an appreciable advance on Hamilton is in my more systematic assessment and treatment of the evidence of \(\beta\). And to judge from the fragments of translation of the Latin which Hamilton vouchsafed us, he would have done that job better than I did.

Astonishingly enough, William was writing another book, equally long, at the same time as the \textit{Gesta Pontificum}. This, the \textit{Gesta Regum}, covered the same vast period of English history, but with emphasis on the kings rather than the progress of the church. It was a book that meant even more to William. It had in some sense been royally commissioned, for it arose from a conversation with Queen Matilda (mother of King Henry I), who expressed interest in an account of the family of her long dead relative, St Aldhelm; this led by degrees to a much greater project, a full account of her royal predecessors. And the completed book was dedicated to her daughter, the empress, another


Matilda. From this presentation copy descend two surviving though incomplete manuscripts, as well as an abbreviation found in a whole series of continental books. But this version, which we call T, was only the beginning. The phenomena are complex, and what seemed to me when I wrote it many years ago a masterpiece of clear exposition now provides hard reading even to me. My view (and I shall not go into any detail now) was that William’s original draft, W₁, the one that gave rise to T, was copied later as W², which then generated what is known as the A group of manuscripts. W² was subjected, in the years up to 1125, to a major revision, of exactly the same type as we have seen in the Gesta Pontificum. William was, here as there, concerned to tone down passages that might seem to reflect on the great. From this revised version was copied W³. And from W³ descend a group of C manuscripts, and, after yet more revision, the B group.

I cannot do better than to quote from my own (here more intelligible) summary of the principles on which my edition was based (‘we’ is however used in the quotation that follows).

In these circumstances, it has seemed best to print an eclectic text, as close as possible to the text agreed between C and B, but purged of mistakes which crept in between W₁ and W² (i.e. between T and A) and between W² and W³ (i.e. between A and C) and which William himself never corrected. The diagnosis of such mistakes is a delicate matter. Where we feel that a T or a TA reading has a good but not quite compelling claim to be considered superior, we distinguish it with an asterisk in the apparatus. We do not try to conceal that we are presuming to print a text that never existed in its entirety at any stage of William’s work, though it is one that we hope he would have regarded as by and large close to his wishes. We are particularly conscious that we have usually relegated to the apparatus readings found only in B even where there is good reason to suppose them to be William’s considered work. It is for this reason that we have marked such readings with a dagger. It is essential therefore that the reader keep a constant eye on the apparatus, paying particular attention to T variants, which may represent William’s first thoughts, and to B variants, which may represent his last thoughts.

I stress these last words in particular. It is quite impossible to print a text of the *Gesta Regum* that properly represents William's intentions. Those intentions varied over time, might be vitiated by scribal error, and were always subject to revision. The text I produced was one that (to repeat myself) needs to be read with half an eye on the apparatus criticus. To put it another way, readers have to keep an open mind, and in a sense to choose and establish the text that suits them (I hope that is good post-modern advice).

I come finally to the text on which I have been working for some time, again with Rod Thomson: William's collection of miracles of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Editing the two *Gesta* texts had accustomed me to William's practice of systematically revising his texts over a considerable period. In the *Gesta Pontificum* the process was vividly seen in the preserved autograph of his working draft. A copy taken before the major revision mercifully allowed us to see what lay behind erasures in the autograph. In the *Gesta Regum* no autograph was available, but the progress of William's revision could be traced by collation of a number of manuscripts descending from copies taken at different stages of William's work, work which did not confine itself (as in the *Gesta Pontificum*) to alteration of a single working draft. In the *Miracles*, a process of revision is again detectable, but new and complicated problems face the editor.

When Adolf Mussafia produced his remarkable articles on the Mary collections at the end of the nineteenth century, he knew of one manuscript containing William's book, Salisbury, Cathedral Library 97 (S), written well after William's time, in the first half of the thirteenth century. This contains over fifty miracles, with a prolonged prologue and various transitional remarks between stories. The order in which the miracles appear here cannot be authentic. The story of Theophilus is placed first, and proclaims itself to be first (*quod primum de Theophilo suggerit mens ponere*). The story of Julian no less clearly proclaims itself to be second (*quia iam dicendi primitias libavi*, followed by a programmatic statement of William's methods of ordering). Despite that, this story comes much later in the Salisbury

---

It was not until the middle of the twentieth century that a new and vital witness emerged, in the shape of a lacunose Paris manuscript (P, lat. 2769), earlier and more handsome than the Salisbury book, but lacking a good deal of the text. From what does survive it is clear that the order of the stories here differs from that in S. And there has been a good deal of revision of the wording.

Editing the text naturally brings with it the need to decide in what order the miracles should be printed. Peter Carter and J. M. Canal agreed that P’s order was what William eventually intended, though only Carter argued for this (I think correct) conclusion. But P is badly mutilated. And it is a delicate matter properly to order the stories which are found only in S. Neither Carter nor Canal explained precisely how he arrived at the order on which they independently agreed, though Carter meticulously listed the indications on which the ordering has to be based. These indications include a number of variants in P patently made necessary by the change in order. But no less important is to take account of the way in which the stories are grouped by subject matter. S had gone some way towards a hierarchical order. P’s order, as Carter showed, refined on that in S. We now move from miracles featuring bishops to ones concerning, successively, abbots, sacristans, and then mere monks. In a second book, there follow clerks, priests, laymen, and women. Next come some assorted minor stories (William himself calls them *leuia*). Then, as a climax, a series of stories concerning images of our Lady. An epilogue completes the whole work. In order to test the conclusion reached by Carter and Canal, I worked out the order myself by a different method, and was glad to find that I agreed with my predecessors. When the Thomson/Winterbottom edition is published I shall explain my own procedure in detail.

If these two manuscripts were the only ones in question, editing the text would still present problems. But they would be problems familiar enough to anyone who has tried to establish a text from a couple of
independent witnesses. An editor chooses, where they vary, the reading that seems preferable. The position seems the more familiar in that S and P both at times present individual readings that cannot be correct. In the Miracles tradition, however, there is a complication. If P’s reading differs from that of S, and is clearly untenable, it will be rejected as due to corruption. But if both readings are tenable, one must bear in mind that P is a revised version of what stood behind S, and be tempted to give the preference to P. We should not, however, delude ourselves that this is a procedure without risk. P’s reading, though intelligible, may still not be what William intended: it could have resulted from accidental corruption, or from a scribe’s deliberate intervention, without William himself having made the change.

S and P are not the only witnesses to this book, though they are the only ones that (at least originally) contained the complete work. Canal listed ten or so others in which a number of William’s stories occur, in some form or other; Carter knew of many more such manuscripts, and examined a fair number of them (see the list in his Appendix I). Carter, furthermore, made much better use of what he found than did Canal. His apparatus sets out clearly what witnesses he used for each story and gives the result of his collations of them. Canal was, to put it mildly, very much less systematic.

What Carter and Canal did have in common, however, is that neither made any attempt to relate the texts of the subsidiary witnesses to those of S and P. The matter is important. In particular, we badly need evidence to back up S where P is not available. And that is a frequent occurrence: P in its present mutilated state contains no more than 29 of the fifty plus transmitted by S. Canal ignores the question altogether. Carter does not address it head on. He merely registers the behaviour of his subsidiary witnesses. It is left for the reader to observe where one of them, for example, agrees with another against SP, or agrees with S against P, or with P against S. The material is there awaiting an analysis Carter never gave it.

Carter did not even ask himself systematically how the various subsidiary witnesses relate to each other. If we do ask that question, we achieve interesting results. If we look at three of these witnesses (all

---

17 Canal knew of Carter’s thesis (see his n. 59 on pp. 43–4), but it resided beyond the Channel, and he did not consult it.
English),\textsuperscript{18} Balliol College, Oxford 240 (s. xii ex.: B; 24 stories), another in the Cambridge University Library, Mm. 6. 15 (s. xiii\textsuperscript{2}: C; 26 stories) and a third in the library of Lambeth Palace, MS 51 (s. xiii, L; 16 stories), we find that they are different in character. C, though extremely corrupt, does on the whole try to copy out a number of stories from William's collection as it found them. So does the less corrupt L. The person ultimately responsible for B, on the other hand, adapts and abbreviates what he found, to a degree that varies from story to story. But two important observations can be made.

a) The stories in B come in virtually the order established by Carter and Canal as that finally intended by William.\textsuperscript{19} This is very welcome proof of the soundness of their conclusion. As for C and L, they show some traces of the revised order; this is especially true of L.

b) There is considerable overlap between the stories contained in B, C and L. 13 appear in all of BCL. 19 of C's stories are also found in B. L is only available where C or B or both are available.

It is tempting to suppose that behind these three witnesses lay a lost \textit{selection} from the whole work, perhaps containing all the 31 stories found in B or in C or in both. These 31 (henceforth 'the Selection') come from all the groups I distinguished earlier: 8 bishops, 2 abbots, 1 sacristan, 4 monks, 1 clerk, 1 priest, 5 laymen, 3 women, 2 minor stories, 4 images. William, or someone after his death, might have been thinking in terms of a 'paperback' selection from the complete book, faithful to its varied content, but biased towards novelties. In any case, the selection was made after the author changed the order of the stories. We can tell that from the ordering of B, and less clearly from that of C and L (see above).

What can be said about the interrelationships of B, C and L?

Collation shows that C and L share frequent errors and innovations against BS (or BSP), as well as displaying errors that separate them from each other; they thus go back to a common ancestor (call it \(\beta\)), copied or descended from William's working text. What of B? There

\textsuperscript{18} For these dates and provenances I rely on information kindly supplied by Rod Thomson.

\textsuperscript{19} Mussafia had used B as an aid to his ordering. Carter made less of it. My own ordering was carried out quite independently of it.
are only two innovations conjoining B, C and L against SP. These are: 21 6. 2 (77, 410) excibat SP; excitabat BCL; 28. 5 (121, 274) Mariae SP; sanctae Mariae BCL. This is not a very impressive haul, compared with the abundance of good readings in BCL that support S or P or both. 22

It seems then that B and β do not go back to a common source copied from William’s master version. I have suggested that William, or another, marked the Selection to be copied for wider circulation. One such copy was β. 23 Of β we can get a good idea from its descendants C and L, though C is (as we have seen) very corrupt. 24 B, on the other hand, derives from a much adapted and abbreviated

20 Errors common to BCL can, of course, only be looked for in the 13 stories where they are all available to us. And even here the adaptation and abbreviation to which B has been subject reduces the scope for comparison. Errors shared by BCL with S in the absence of P have to be discounted, for if we had P at these points it might prove to agree with them.

21 I shall cite readings by the story number and sub-section to be used in our eventual edition. In brackets I shall cite Canal’s second edition, by page and line.

22 It will be seen from my forthcoming apparatus that one or two of BCL quite often accompany either S or P in error. No single explanation will account for these phenomena.

23 CL are correct against SP at 38. 4 (143, 949) sciat (for scias), where B lacks. As for BCL, they are correct against SP at 10. 3 (84, 589) curabilem (curabile S, incurabilem P); in this passage, there may have been some ambiguity in William’s master copy.

24 It was no doubt by conjecture that L alone gives profecturi (for profecti) at 13. 2 (95, 849), surely rightly; at 19. 2 (105, 1162) its carent shows an alert reader at work. Much more striking is the extra clause (de presentibus tutelam) present only in C at 6. 2 (77, 409: after ueniam). The words must be William’s, not the contribution of the hopeless scribe of C, and I shall have to print them. But it seems an extravagant coincidence that they should have been lost independently in SPBL. As for constitutus (substitutus SP) at 32. 10 (135, 703), I conjectured it myself before I found it in B, C and other manuscripts.

25 In the process the adaptor showed good judgement in correcting the text he found before him. Hence (it would seem) 14. 1 (96, 881) salis (sali SC), 14. 2 (96, 891) est (before facta: om. SC; perhaps not supplied by B in the right place), 15. 3 (97, 915) pretendit (pretendit SC), 15. 3 (97, 918) molitus (mollitus SC), 39. 2 (144, 994) statim (etiam SC). L is in each case not available. B tries intelligently to make sense of a lacunose text at 7. 5 (81, 511).
version of (some of) the Selection.\textsuperscript{26} There are cross-currents, however. In four of the Selection (9, 30, 32 and 53) there is a breakdown of the normal pattern, by which, as we have seen, CL agree in occasional error against B. In the first two (9 and 30) CB tend to agree in error against L; further, in both, C and B (but not L) begin and end with identical newly crafted sentences of a type often found in B alone. In the other two (32 and 53) L is not available, but C and B again share new beginnings and ends, as well as other innovations and ‘errors’. It will be significant\textsuperscript{27} that these four stories appear together in C, separately from the other stories derived from William, and that they appear alongside each other in British Library, Royal 6. B. xiv (Rb), in a text closely related to that of C. These stories, then, derive from a B-type source, and found their way into C and Rb as a group.

I at one time had high hopes of making further progress by exploiting two big collections of Mary stories that survive in two manuscripts, one known to both Carter and Canal, the other to Canal alone, but not used by either of them. One is in the library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge (MS 95; Z), and dates as late as the early fifteenth century; the other, rather older one is held by Trinity College, Dublin (MS 167, s. xiv–xv: D). Both books contain a number of stories that are based on William, though they are often abbreviations of his text. And both have been described in detail. M.R. James\textsuperscript{28} gave the tituli of all the stories in the Cambridge book. M.L. Colker\textsuperscript{29} gave the incipits of all the stories in the Dublin book for which there were no Poncelet numbers (the standard reference system for Marian stories: a system which causes problems of its own, on which I will not dwell).

\textsuperscript{26} It has close relations: Toulouse 482, Aberdeen U.L. 137, and a book once owned by Francis Wormald, now British Library, Add. 57533. Neither appears to be a copy of the Balliol MS, but nothing hangs on the interrelations of this group. It is likely that they share an ancestor that was copied from William’s working text and then transformed by a reviser.

\textsuperscript{27} What follows in this sentence was already known to Carter (p. 77).

\textsuperscript{28} Montague R. James, \textit{A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895), pp. 76–109.

This difference in cataloguing method makes it ridiculously hard to correlate the stories in the two sources. I have done something to bring them to order, but these complications are typical of those that have attended this whole project.

The results of my investigations are disappointing. The relationship between the two collections is not at all straightforward, and the siglum $\zeta$ that appeared on the handout for my lecture glossed over many a difference between the treatment of the same story in the two manuscripts. A number of stories in Z or D or both are taken not from William but from the sources on which William drew, familiar Marian collections. In many others Z (and the same is often true of D too) is in effect just another witness (and not a very helpful one) to the group that includes B. It is unusual$^{30}$ when Z gives us the story of Guy of Lescar (no. 12) in a full and sincere form; this is of real use, for at this point P is not available and D gives only an abbreviation. But on the whole we have to look for traces of gold amid much dross.

The value of the subsidiary manuscripts lies in their frequent ability to improve on faulty readings in S.$^{31}$ They can do this either because they reflect a state of William’s working copy in which he had corrected errors of his own, or (as I should judge more likely) because those faults in S are not authorial but the result of the copying process that led to S. By the time the Selection had broken away from the main stem, William had already made the crucial move, the radical change in the ordering of the stories, together with the re-jigging of cross-references that this entailed. To that extent the goal posts had been moved. But it is difficult on the restricted evidence to be sure what else had been altered. How far had William tinkered with the wording in the way that (as we have seen) he did in the Gesta Pontificum and the Gesta Regum?

$^{30}$ Anyone delving further into the countless Marian collections must hope to find a similar treasure rather than new witnesses to the Selection. But the search will not be easy (one feels the highest admiration for the past labours of Peter Carter). One particular problem is that a title like ‘Theophilus’ found in a printed catalogue may, or may not, point to a story as it is told by William as opposed to a source. William’s book is part of an ever-evolving nexus of texts copied or adapted from each other.

$^{31}$ The same is true of the subsidiary manuscripts for the Prologue: a separate matter into which I do not go here.
This is a crucial question for the editor, because the answer to it must govern his (or indeed her) treatment of the evidence of P. This is work in progress, but at present I incline to the view that P was overvalued by Carter and Canal. It does of course throw invaluable light on the re-ordering that William brought to his book in (as it were) its second edition. But where we have the witness of the subsidiary manuscripts we can see that P is far from being a trustworthy witness to the wording of a final stage of William's work. My strong impression is that, where S, P and B (and/or β) are all available, a reading agreed by SB (and/or β) against P or by PB (and/or β) against S almost invariably is, or may plausibly be reckoned, superior.32 Thus, where the subsidiary manuscripts are not available, we should be very cautious to assume that P is at any given point superior to S. It may be, but it must make its own case each time.

In the medieval traditions I have discussed, the revised versions follow soon on the originals. In the case of the B. Life of Dunstan and of Faricius's Life of Aldhelm, the revision was the work of another person. In the former, the reviser tried to simplify and correct the Latin; in the latter, he abbreviated, while improving the language and trying to appeal to a wider audience by removing most local references. In the case of William of Malmesbury, the revisions come from the author's hand. In two major historical works, extensive revision aimed to tone down the original versions; but at all stages the author was concerned to add information and occasionally to improve the wording. In the case of the Mary collection there is evidence at least of William making a radical change in the ordering of the stories. In all of these cases, we should not be able to imagine what had been going on earlier if we had only the evidence of the revised texts. It is because we can come so near the authors, and providentially have access to different versions of the texts, that we can map out stages of revision.

32 Pβ seem to agree in error at 10. 3 (84, 592), where S is probably right to omit etiam. When there is a subsidiary manuscript available, I only note 2 cases where P solus improves on a reading of S: 2. 3 (70, 214) <in> (om. SC) throno, 38. 4 (143, 947) sua omitted after familia (SCL have the word; but the wording of the passage is not secure).
If we turn back to the classical text from which I started, and to others like it, we are confronted only with branches of a tradition in which one group of witnesses presents what looks more like an authentic text than the other. We can only guess what process has led to this contrast between such groups of manuscripts. It is normally assumed, and perhaps rightly, that the process of banalisation and correction goes back to the fourth and fifth centuries, when texts were being revised and copied into new formats. But we can never do more than guess. It seems entirely possible that, by analogy with the revisions I have been pointing to in the high Middle Ages, revision was being carried out at a much earlier stage, even contemporary with the author, and even by him. What will certainly be true is that scribes, of set purpose or casually, were in every century of the long tradition chipping away at classical texts, corrupting and correcting. The details of this process will rarely be available to us.

In any case, if the editor of a classical text is disposed to think he has any hope of knowing what processes it went through before it left the author’s hand, he should consider the case of William of Malmesbury, and think again.
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The Homilies of Sophronius of Jerusalem: Issues of Prose Rhythm, Manuscript Evidence and Emendation

John M. Duffy

Sophronius,¹ Patriarch of Jerusalem from 634 to early in 639, was a native of Damascus, as he himself tells us in two of his writings.² That concrete detail of autobiography, along with the names of his Syrian father and mother (Plynthas and Myrho), are among the very few direct pieces of information we have about his early life, before he left the country of his birth.

Half a millennium later, when the Byzantine historian-monk and intellectual, John Zonaras, wrote a biographical encomium on Sophronius, he clearly did not have any more facts than we have today about his hero’s schooldays in Damascus. But he was not at a loss for words to describe this period of Sophronius’ life. He simply fell back

This lecture was given 25 May 2012 at Stockholm University.

¹ This paper is a slightly revised version of my Ars edendi lecture. I wish to acknowledge in particular the hospitality of Denis Searby, Barbara Crostini, Erika Kihlman, and not least Katerina Ierodiakonou (who was a Visiting Professor then at the university). The paper also benefitted from passing under the eagle eye of Peter O’Connell.

² The first source is the collection of seventy miracles of Cyrus and John, edited in modern times by Natalio Fernández Marcos, Los Thaumata de Sofronio: Contribución al estudio de la incubatio cristiana (diss. Madrid: Instituto Antonio de Nebrija, 1975). In the final miracle account, whose subject is Sophronius himself, he specifies: ἔστι μὲν ὄνομα τῷ γεγραφότι Σωφρόνιος, πόλις Δαμασκός ἤ μητρόπολις (p. 395, 1–2 = Migne PG 873 col. 3665A). This is corroborated by an autobiographical epitaph whose authenticity was put beyond reasonable doubt by Alan Cameron in his brief study, ‘The Epigrams of Sophronius’ in Classical Quarterly, 33(i) (1983), 284–92, esp. 285–8. The names of the parents are given in the epigram.

on the age-old topos, so familiar to us from the pages of hagiography, and provided a fulsome account of the young man’s prodigious progress in both sacred wisdom and Hellenic paideia. Naturally he was such a star pupil that he needed only a short time to master his lessons and quickly outpaced all his fellow students. And, needless to say, the young man’s accomplishments in literary studies and skill in the Greek language, however impressive, paled in comparison with his achievements in morals and good character.³

Modern attempts to conjure up a somewhat more realistic account of Sophronius’ time in Damascus have left us with a number of reasonable suggestions. The best living authority on the subject, Christoph von Schönborn, building on the work of others like Bouvy and Vailhé, paints the following miniature picture. The young man, born around the year 550, would most likely have been bilingual in Syriac and Greek. The title ‘sophist’, which he carried for many years, indicates that he was a teacher of Greek rhetoric and this qualification he achieved already in his native city. From the beginning he combined knowledge of eastern Christianity with professional training in Hellenic culture, and it is more than likely that he had a direct acquaintance with Syriac hymnography, which will have had an impact on his literary style. This is about as much as can be stated with reasonable confidence on the matter of his early formation.⁴

For much of the rest of his life, spent outside of Syria, we are on more solid ground, thanks to a combination of three Greek sources, namely his own writings, the Pratum Spirituale of John Moschus, and a life of John the Almsgiver by Leontios of Neapolis. Still in his twenties, Sophronius left home and migrated to Palestine where he ended up at the monastery of St. Theodosius, some six or seven miles

³ The encomium of Zonaras was published by Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus in Analekta Hierosolymitikes Stachyologias, vol. V (St. Petersburg: V. Kirsvaoum, 1898), pp. 137–70.
to the east of Bethlehem. What the precise status of Sophronius in that community at the beginning was, we do not know, but it was there that he and John Moschus were to form a special and inseparable friendship that lasted until the death of Moschus forty years later. After a study tour that both of them made to Egypt for about six years, they returned to Palestine and Sophronius was accepted into the monastic life at St. Theodosius.

As an aside, it may be worth noting that when Zonaras comes to speak of the Egyptian sojourn, he has Sophronius fall in with a certain John, who is described as one of the leading literary and learned men of Alexandria; he attaches himself to this distinguished individual, lodges at his house and becomes his student. This can hardly be anything other than a misunderstanding of the relationship between Sophronius and John Moschus, caused perhaps by a loose reading of the *Pratum Spirituale*. It does, however, serve to remind us that we should not underestimate the potential intellectual and literary powers of Moschus. It is true that the *Pratum* is, by comparison with the works of Sophronius, an unsophisticated document written in a wholly unpretentious style. On the other hand, this is a function of the *Pratum* itself, which is essentially a collection of monastic and religious folktales. It certainly does not preclude the possibility that Moschus could have been the intellectual equal of his somewhat younger protegé. In the several different scenes of the *Pratum* involving both men with books and learning they are full partners, and we know as well that they teamed up at a later period to write a biography of John the Almsgiver.

But let us return to Sophronius. Soon after his entry into the monastic life he and Moschus were on their travels again and spent a number of years visiting and residing at various monasteries around Palestine and at Mt. Sinai. Later, in the second decade of the seventh century, the learned duo had a second sojourn in Egypt where they became special theological advisors to the patriarch, John the Almsgiver, the leader of the minority Melchite, i.e. the pro-Chalcedonian, church in that part of the empire. According to Leontios of Neapolis, in his *Life* of the patriarch, the two staunch Orthodox monks were of great help to John the Almsgiver in winning
over numerous monophysites to the Melchite side. In 614, however, after the fall of Jerusalem to the Persians, John and Sophronius went to Rome where Moschus died some five years later.

Sophronius then headed back east, first to his old monastery of St. Theodosius, but later he migrated to Africa where he was joined by his younger protegé and friend Maximus the Confessor. By the time he made his way back to Palestine and was elected patriarch of Jerusalem, in 634, he was already over 80 years old, but still very active in preaching and writing in support of the Orthodox cause. Within four years the conquering Arabs were at the gates of Jerusalem, and less than a year after handing over the city to the calif, Omar, Sophronius passed away early in 639 when he was almost ninety years of age.

Despite all of the uprooting and movement throughout his life, Sophronius still managed to produce a sizeable and varied corpus of writings. For the main surviving works in Greek from his pen we have an encomium on the Egyptian saints Cyrus and John, as well as the account of the seventy miracles attributed to them; there is a collection of twenty-two hymns, composed in ancient meter; we have the extensive synodical letter written in 634 on his elevation to the patriarchate,7 and finally a set of homilies most, if not all, of which should be dated to his patriarchal period.8 It is fair to say that one of the leading characteristics of all his writings is the constant concern

5 In the edition issued by André-Jean Festugière, Vie de Syméon le Fou; Vie de Jean de Chypre (Paris: Geuthner, 1974) there are interesting additional details about Sophronius and John Moschus that do not appear in the version of the text published by Heinrich Gelzer, Leontios von Neapolis: Leben des heiligen Johannes des Barmherzigen Erzbischofs von Alexan
drien (Freiburg i. B./Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr, 1893).

6 For the miracles see note 2 above. The encomium has recently been edited and translated by Pauline Bringel, Panégyrique des saints Cyr et Jean/ Sophrone de Jérusalem : réédition et traduction d’après de nouveaux manuscrits (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008). The hymns were edited by Marcello Gigante, Sophronii Anacreontica (Rome: Gismondi, 1957).

7 Modern edition by Rudolf Riedinger in the Acta Conciliorum Oecumenico-

8 See p. 57 below.
with orthodoxy in doctrine and the struggle against heresies of different kinds. The other constant is in the matter of prose style, because everything that he wrote (with the exception of the hymns) has been composed according to a consistent and strict rhythmical pattern.

It was the French Assomptioniste, Edmond Bouvy, who in a Paris dissertation of 1886 first paid direct attention to the 'clausula' or prose rhythm in the works of Sophronius and other Greek authors. It soon turned out that he had underestimated the complexity of the phenomenon, but his pioneering research immediately stimulated others to pursue the issue more deeply and across a broader span of time. Already in 1891 the German scholar Wilhelm Meyer published in Göttingen his short but wide-ranging study of Greek prose rhythm called Der accentuirte Satzschluss in der griechischen Prosa vom IV. bis XVI. Jahrhundert. This monograph was the origin of what is still called 'Meyer’s Law’ of the clausula. There were refinements made subsequently by Meyer himself and others, and not least by Paul Maas, who to my mind, has left us the most satisfactory formulation of the law. He stated it in a book review of 1906: ‘zwischen den beiden letzten Hochtönen jedes Satzgliedes sollen 2 oder 4 oder 6 Silben stehen’ (‘between the last two primary accents of each sentence part there should be an interval of 2 or 4 or 6 <unaccented> syllables’). And to this he adds the comment: ‘Die Intervalle von 5, 7 und mehr Silben werden mit derselben Intensität gemieden wie die von 0, 1 und 3’ (‘The intervals of 5, 7 and more syllables are as strenuously avoided as those of 0, 1 and 3 syllables’). It is very important to point out another feature in the functioning of the clausula and it may be stated as follows: Certain ‘secondary’ or ‘helping’ words (most notably articles, conjunctions, negative particles, prepositions, and some pronouns) are ambiguous in the matter of accent; normally they are

9 As in note 4 above.
regarded, for rhythm purposes, as having no accent of their own, but
sometimes it happens otherwise.\footnote{This aspect of the topic is discussed in some detail by Wolfram Hörandner in what is the best and most complete study of Greek prose rhythm produced in the last century, \textit{Der Prosarhythmus in der rhetorischen Literatur der Byzantiner} (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981), esp. p. 34.}

In order to provide a general illustration of the "law" in action in the
work of a Byzantine author, we will look at a passage from one of the
panegyrics of Michael Psellos, the eleventh-century polymath who
regularly wrote with fairly strict attention to prose rhythm. The
sample text is the opening section from an address to the Emperor
Constantine Monomachos, exhibiting what we could call complete
rhythm, i.e. there is no part of it that does not conform to the "law".\footnote{Edited by George T. Dennis, \textit{Michael Psellus: Orationes Panegyricae} (Stuttgart / Leipzig: Teubner, 1994), pp. 1–2.}
The text has been marked for strong (||) and weak (|) pauses, and at
the end of each colon (i.e. sentence part) those syllables carrying the
two primary accents have an x above them, while "unaccented"
syllables in between are distinguished by a tilde sign.

\begin{verbatim}
Ω βασιλεῦ ἥλιε· | καὶ τίς ἄν ἐν καταιτιάσατο | ταύτην σοι προσφυῶς τὴν
κλῆσιν ἁρμόζοντα; || ἢ γὰρ οὐχὶ καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ κύκλῳ τῶν ἀρετῶν | καὶ τῇ
ἀγχιστρόφῳ κινήσει τοῦ νοῦ, | τῷ τε μεγαλείῳ τῆς φύσεως | καὶ τοῦ
κάλλους τῷ ἀπαστράπτοντι | πάσαν καταυγάζεις τὴν γῆν; || ἀλλὰ
συμμέτρους μοι τὰς ἀκτῖνας | ἐπάφες τὴν τήμερον, | καὶ γενοῦ μοι κατὰ
μεσημβρίαν ἱστάμενος | καὶ βραχυτέρῳ τῷ κύκλῳ φαινόμενος, | ἀλλὰ
μὴ ἑξιός καὶ ἀπρόσιτος ταῖς μαρμαρυγαῖς, | ἵνα μὴ ἐκπλήξῃς τῷ
ὑπερβάλλοντι τῆς αὐγῆς. || δύναμιν δὲ τινα μᾶλλον θείαν ἐνθήσεις | καὶ
\end{verbatim}
ἀνακινήσεις θαρραλεώτερον | ἀντωπῆσαι σου τῷ ἀρρήτῳ φωτί.

It will be observed that the great majority of intervals between the two primary accents consist of either two or four syllables; however, there is also one example of six una ccented syllables (ἀπρόσιτος ταῖς μαρμαρυγαῖς). It is important as well, in the context of Sophronius, to point out that of the 15 marked cola in the Psellos passage, 5 are of the so-called ‘double dactyl’ variety, that is, the penultimate accent and the final accent is each followed by two unaccented syllables (and we have underlined the places in question). This type of rhythm was very common in late antique and Byzantine prose.

The mention of the double dactyl will serve as the perfect introduction to the style of Sophronius. For while it is a remarkable fact that the man never wrote a piece of prose that was not fully rhythmical, it is even more unusual that he clings to his favorite form, the double dactyl, over 90% of the time. Hermann Usener, who was very familiar with the writings of Sophronius, crowned him the ‘unbestrittene meister im wirbeltanz didaktylicher cadenzen’, or as we might say, ‘he was the whirling dervish of the double dactyl’. It is such a firm and almost unique trademark that it can serve as a fail-safe method of identifying any piece of prose from the pen of this author. I have recently used the feature to help pin down the authenticity of

---

13 Noteworthy too is the opening phrase, Ω βασιλεῦ ἥλιε, which contains a zero interval. This indicates, pace Maas, that at least in later times such a clausula was permitted.

14 The percentage is based on a rough estimate that I reported almost thirty years ago in the article, John M. Duffy, ‘Observations on Sophronius’ Miracles of Cyrus and John’, Journal of Theological Studies 3:1 (1984), 71–90 (the estimate is discussed on p. 75).

some fragments of a homily on the Circumcision ascribed to Sophronius in a Sinai manuscript.\textsuperscript{16}

Here are a couple of passages from the hitherto unknown text, in the first of which I have marked off the sentence parts and indicated the rhythm:

\begin{verbatim}
a) νυνὶ δὲ πάλιν κυριακῆς τῆς μακαρίας ἡ λαμπρότης ἀνέτειλεν, ἄλλην ἡμῖν Χριστοῦ πρᾶξιν μυστικὴν ἑαυτῇ συνεξέλαμψεν, | καὶ κοινωνὸν αὐτὴν τῆς οἰκείας προόδου πεποίηκεν | (οὐκ ἀεὶ μὲν κυριακῆς τὴν προέλευσιν φέρουσα, | νυνὶ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἑβδοματικὴν τοῦ κύκλου περιφορὰν καταντήσασα), | καὶ φαιδροτέραν ἡμῖν τὴν αὐτῆς ἐνδεικνυμένη λαμπρότητα, | διπλῷ φωτὶ τῷ θεικῷ καταστράπτουσα, | καὶ τοὺς συνειλεγμένους ἡμᾶς πλουσίως αὐγάζουσα.
\end{verbatim}

b) Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Λουκᾶς ὁ θεσπέσιος | τοῦ Ἰάσωνος καὶ Παπίσκου Διάλογον συγγράφων ἐδίδαξεν, | ὡς κυριακή ἡμέρα < . . . > φεγγὴς καὶ διάσημος | καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡμερῶν πρώτη τῷ χρόνῳ καθέστηκεν, | καὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου τοῦ σωτῆρος γεννήσεως ἡμέρα γνωρίζεται | καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ οὐρανῶν δεύτερας ἀφίξεως, ἥτις καὶ ἀδιάδοχός ἐστι καὶ ἀπέραντος, οὔτε εἰς τέλος πώποτε λήγουσα, οὐδὲ ἑτέραν μετ᾽ αὐτὴν παραπέμπουσα πάροδον, | καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, | ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἁγίας ἁγίας τῆς ἐν τῷ ἁγιασμῷ τῆς ἁγίας τῆς τριάδος αὐτῆς τῆς εἰς τὸν θανάτον τὴν ἀναστάσειν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσειν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἁγιασμῷ τῆς ἁγίας τῆς τριάδος αὐτῆς τῆς εἰς τὸν θανάτον τὴν ἀναστάσειν. \end{verbatim}

In each of these pieces of text there is no colon, with the exception of the phrase ἀδιάδοχός ἐστιν καὶ ἀπέραντος in b 6, which does not end in a double dactyl rhythm. The normal clausula pattern for Sophronius is the double dactyl, but sometimes he admits variants of either two or four syllables.

One of my current projects is to produce the first critical edition of the seven fully extant sermons of Sophronius for the Corpus Christianorum series. They have never been put together before in a collected volume, and all we have for four of them are very old editions, based on extremely limited manuscript evidence and reprinted in the Patrologia graeca. The remaining three have been published as individual items and by scholars using better but by no means complete manuscript sources — two by Hermann Usener and one by Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus. The actual number of witnesses overall is more than seventy, though there is hardly any overlap with regard to the individual homilies; in other words, each of the seven has its own separate manuscript transmission, so that effectively the project involves preparing seven independent editions, each with its own manuscript stemma. The range is from as few as three copies in the case of the sermon on the Nativity, to twenty for the homily on John the Baptist. The reason for the extensive number of copies of some of these texts is that they were used for liturgical purposes and are, without exception, preserved in the class of book known as a *panegyrikon*, that is, a collection of reading material (mainly homiletic) used in the services for church feastdays. We have a good illustration of this in practice in the *Synaxarion* of the Theotokos Evergetis monastery in Constantinople, a book containing

---

17 Migne (PG 873) gives the Greek text of the sermons on the Annunciation, on the Elevation of the Cross, on John the Baptist, and on Sts. Peter and Paul.

detailed instructions for, literally, every step and sound of the liturgy. Among the prescribed music and readings for the morning service of Feast of the Elevation of the Cross (falling on September 14) we have the following: ‘And after the recitation of the first kathisma, reading: homily of Sophronius of Jerusalem in the Panegyrikon beginning Σταυροῦ πανήγυρις καὶ τίς οὐ σκιρτήσειε, and another homily, of Pantoleon the Deacon, Πάλιν ὑψοῦται σταυρὀς . . . and another homily, of Alexander the Monk, in the small Panegyrikon.’

Having thus far introduced Sophronius, his prose style, and the surviving homilies, I would like now to turn to specific parts of the homily on the Nativity in order to discuss some passages where improvements can be made in the transmitted text, making use of the author’s particular style, the manuscript evidence and paleography, or some other means.

The sermon in question was composed by Sophronius for Christmas Day of 634, his first year in office as the Patriarch of Jerusalem. It has the subtitle ‘On the disorder and destructive invasion of the Saracens’ because, at the very time it was delivered, the Arab forces were already surrounding Bethlehem and in fact had barred the Christian congregation in Jerusalem from walking to the birthplace of Jesus, as they would normally do on that day every year. The complaint of Sophronius about this situation is something of a leitmotiv running through the text.

The homily on the Nativity was edited in 1886 by Hermann Usener and appeared in the *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* for that year. He used two manuscripts, a tenth-century copy from Paris (p1) and a Munich codex dating to the fifteenth century (m1). I have also collated a sixteenth century copy of the homily from Mt. Athos; however, this one was made directly from the Paris copy and offers no practical help

---

19 The Greek text and an English translation are conveniently available in *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis* [Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.5 = September-February], ed. and tr. by Robert H. Jordan (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000).

20 P. 57, the translation of Jordan, with minute changes by me.

21 As we have seen (note 18 above), he reprinted the edition in his *Kleine Schriften*. In this study we will cite the first edition.
to the editor. In addition, we need to mention that in the 1930's the German scholar Theodor Nissen published two studies on the various texts of Sophronius, offering a series of, for the most part, very useful corrections and emendations, but not using any new manuscript evidence.

A.

Ἀλλὰ μάγοι μὲν καὶ ποιμένες οἱ ἐνθεόι | ἐπὶ τὴν θεηδόχον Βηθλεὲμ
πορεύεσθωσαν | καὶ σύνδρομον τὸν ἀστέρα καὶ σύνοδοιπόρον
ἐχέτωσαν | καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ θαύμα θεάσθωσαν θαύμα | καὶ θεωροῦντες τὸ
θαύμα θαμβεῖσθωσαν | καὶ τὴν ἀγγελικὴν χορείαν ἰδέτωσαν | καὶ
carpορφοῦν τὴν μαγικὴν δωροφορεῖτοσαν, | 'Δόξα ἐν ὑφίστοις θεῷ
καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία' φθεγγόμενοι, | μὴ
Φόβον κωλυτήν ἐνθυμούμενοι.

1.) The phrase involving θαύμα in line 3 has given rise to a surprising amount of variation and it will be best to set out in order the different versions, with comments on each:

Ms. p1 reads τὸ ὑπέρθαυμα θεάσασθαι θαύμα. This has three strikes against it. In the first place the form ὑπέρθαυμα as an independent word does not really exist; secondly, the end rhythm is not a double dactyl, which would be by far preferable here; and finally, to judge by the other five verbs in the immediate context, we would certainly expect a third plural imperative and not an infinitive.

Ms. m1 has τὸ ὑπὲρ θαύμα θαῦμα τεθεάσθωσαν. Here the clausula rule is violated by the extra syllable in the verb form, and why the perfect tense would be more appropriate in the context is not clear. Nonetheless, this was the solution favored by Usener when he reissued a slightly corrected edition of the text in his Kleine Schriften.24

In the first edition, as quoted above, Usener printed τὸ ὑπὲρ θαύμα θεάσθωσαν θαύμα. The two problems here are that the rhythm is not the normally expected double dactyl, and this would be the only imperative in the series not positioned at the end of the colon.

22 More precisely the three witnesses are: Par. gr. 1171, Monac. gr. 221, and Athos, Xeropot. 134.
23 His treatment of the present homily is in Theodor Nissen, ‘Sophronios-Studien II,’ Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 39 (1939), 89–93.
24 See note 18 above. The corrections are registered in the apparatus.
The easiest solution would be to choose the reading of $m^1$, with a slight adjustment in the verb form, giving us τὸ ὑπὲρ θαῦμα θαῦμα θεάσθωσαν. Unlike the choice of Nissen, who had to argue for an unattested adverbial formation, ὑπέρθαυμα, on the analogy of ὑπέρμορον and ὑπερέκεινα, the idea of a θαῦμα ὑπὲρ θαῦμα is found several times in Byzantine Greek. 25

2.) In lines 4–5 the phrase τὴν μαγικὴν δωροφορείτωσαν contains an anomaly that went unnoticed by Nissen (and by Usener as well who, judging by his silence, was not paying attention to prose rhythm at this date); there is a three syllable interval, which is not allowed. The problem is taken care of, however, if we transpose the noun καρποφορίαν and write τὴν μαγικὴν καρποφορίαν δωροφορείτωσαν. It is not a double dactyl, but it is a fully acceptable rhythm (cf. ἀκόντες, μὴ βουλόμενοι in line 3 of passage B, discussed below). A further argument in favor of this change would be the word order of the preceding parallel phrase τὴν ἀγγελικὴν χορείαν ἀδέτωσαν. 26

3.) In line 6, and missed by Usener, $m^1$ has the added phrase μηδὲν εὐλαβούμενοι after the participle φθεγγόμενοι. As such it suits well the style of Sophronius who likes to employ strings of quasi-synonymous phrases, and it fits the rhythmical pattern in parallel to μηδὲν δεδιττόμενοι. Homoeoteleuton (and indeed the identical

25 E.g. Theodoret, Gr. Affect. Cur. IV 64.1-2 Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὑπὲρ θαῦμα τὸ θαῦμα. Nicephorus Gregoras, Ep. 22, 104 ὑπὲρ θαῦμα τίθησι τὸ θαῦμα. Id. Ep. 23, 105 ὑπὲρ θαῦμα τὸ θαῦμα ποιεῖς. These parallels were detected with the help of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae.

26 ἰδέτωσαν was an attempted emendation by Usener; however, it was rightly rejected by Nissen who argued correctly for restoring the reading of the two manuscripts.

27 Perhaps the oversight was not entirely his fault. Usener informs us in his short introduction (p. 501) that he had a copy of $m^2$ made for his use by two younger scholars, and in fact he knew the Paris manuscript only through a collation made for him by an Austrian colleague.
beginning) may have played a role in its disappearance from one of the manuscripts. There is no good reason not to restore it to the text.28

B.

῾Ημεῖς δὲ δι’ ἁμαρτίας ἀπείρους καὶ παγχάλεπα πταίσματα | ἀνάξιοι τούτων τῆς θέας γενόμενοι | ἐκεῖσε παρέίναι τοῖς δρόμοις εἰργόμεθα | καὶ ἄκοντες, μὴ βουλόμενοι | οἴκοι μένειν ἄναγκαζόμεθα, | οὐ δεσμοῖς σωματικοῖς συσφιγγόμενοι, | ἀλλὰ φόβῳ Σαρακηνικῷ συνδεσμούμενοι | καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης οὐρανίου χαρμοσύνης κωλυόμενοι | καὶ λύπῃ λοιπῶν κυματούμενοι | ἀξίᾳ τῆς οὐ κ ἀξίας ἡμῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀθλιότητος. ||

Εἰ γὰρ, εἰ γὰρ τούτων ἐτυγχάνομεν ἄξιοι, | πάντως ἂν κατὰ τοὺς τόπους γενόμενοι | ἐγγύθεν οὖν ὑμᾶς, οὐκ ἄπωθεν, | σὺν ποιμέσιν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσκιρτήσαμεν | καὶ σὺν μάγοις τὰ δῶρα τῷ θεῷ προσηγάγομεν | ὑμνολογοῦντες σὺν ἀγγέλοις καὶ λέγοντες, | 'Δόξα ἐν ὑφίστοις θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία' .

In this passage there are a couple of issues connected with the rhythm that deserve attention:

1.) In line 3 one of the two main manuscripts, \( p^1 \), has added the conjunction καὶ after the word ἄκοντες. This was not noticed by the editor Usener and received no comment from Nissen (who did not inspect the manuscripts). However, the reading of \( m^1 \) is to be preferred, because ἄκοντες, μὴ βουλόμενοι preserves the clausula (here an interval of four syllables), and the asyndetic construction is bolstered by another instance in the same passage (l. 8), ἐγγύθεν ὄντας, οὐκ ἄπωθεν.

2.) In line 5 the phrase καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης οὐρανίου χαρμοσύνης κωλυόμενοι is a bit problematic. In the first place it does not show up

28 In the same line, we draw attention to a small point. Almost invariably Sophronius leaves original quotations intact and does not tailor them to his preferred rhythmic pattern. That is true also in this instance, but we notice how he still chooses an appropriate word-form (here φθεγγόμενοι) to achieve the closing cadence. Occasionally he does alter the original to make it conform. For example, in the homily on the Presentation (ed. Usener [Bonn, 1889], p. 11 a, 22–5) in close succession he changes Ioh. 3, 19 τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον to the rhythmical τὸ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθεν, and rearranges Luc. 1, 78 from ἐπισκέψεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολή ἐς ύψος το ἀνατολή ἐξ ύψους ἡμᾶς ἐπεσκέψατο.
in \( m^1 \) and, in addition, its ending violates the clausula rule. It would appear, however, that Usener has done the right thing in accepting it from \( p^1 \), and its absence from the other witness could easily be explained by homoeoteleuton. I too would include the phrase in the text, but so far have not been able to conjure up a solution for the clausula. Nissen, it would appear, did not notice the rhythmical anomaly.

C.

1.) It is worth pointing out that in this section, on line 5, there is another example of a 4-syllable interval in the clausula (Ἰάκωβον τὸν θεάδελφον).

2.) There is one quite complicated issue in lines 7 ff. The participial phrase οὐ στερεοῦντες is an emendation made by Usener for the reading of the manuscripts, both of which have οὔτε πτεροῦντες. The change makes very good sense, but is it really necessary? In the same sentence Usener himself makes the excellent correction of the transmitted ὦτα (ears) to νῶτα (backs), where the text is speaking of putting nimble wings of good works on the back. The passage is highly metaphorical, as frequently in Sophronius, and he is preaching about the indispensable connection, the special ‘partnership’, between faith and good works; the vocabulary even includes words from the language of marriage (συζυγία, l.3) and separation (χηρεύουσα, l. 6). If we were to extend the metaphorical idea of wings to the preceding
phrase, could we not see the author applying that image to faith as well? In other words, he would be suggesting to his congregation that they supply their faith with wings and let it soar. This double reference to wings (and enhanced movement) would also be appropriate for the notion of “running well” (ἐνδορμίσωμεν) in line 7. The only change to be made to the reading of the two witnesses, then, would be from οὔτε πτεροῦντες to οὐ πτεροῦντες. The whole passage in translation would read:

I am afraid and all atremble lest we, though orthodox in faith, should appear to fail her (the faith), abandoning her to flock on her own, separating her from her pairing with deeds, and bereaving her of good works. For if, according to James the brother of God and former shepherd of this Jerusalem flock, faith dies when it is separated from the performance of fragrant good deeds, how will we run the good course, if we do not by means of good actions supply our faith with wings and attach the very nimble wings of beneficence to our backs? And that is why, dearest brethren, I make the plea that we join good works to our faith and never divorce her from her mate beneficence, in order that, just as we have been strong in our faith and have never by God’s grace been harmed in her, in the same way we may be strengthened by good works, we may by our faith and deeds bring joy to Christ Himself who is ever gladdened by good works, and be rich in His most loving goodwill towards man.

3.) Both Usener and Nissen were unhappy with the verb ἀθετήσωμεν (line 10) and each of them opted for a different solution. The older scholar suggested a change to ἀποστήσωμεν, while Nissen, expressing the opinion that the use of the verb ἀθετεῖν is ‘impossible’ in the context, offered ἀφετήσωμεν as the way out, noting that Sophronius has a fondness for ἀφιέναι. All of this is a bit unexpected and

29 It is even conceivable that τὰ νῶτα refers to τῆς ἀγαθουργίας and that Sophronius means attaching nimble wings to ‘the backs of (our) good deeds.’
unnecessary.\textsuperscript{30} Nissen already spells out the need for a verb to express the idea of ‘separation’ and this is fully correct; we have seen how Sophronius here has an image of ‘marriage’ and ‘separation’ in mind. In later Greek (as attested by several examples in Lampe’s \textit{Patristic Greek Lexicon}) the verb ἀθετεῖν is in fact used in the sense of ‘put away, divorce a partner in marriage’. The reading of the manuscripts, therefore, should stand in this instance as being perfectly appropriate for the context.

D. At the climax of the sermon on the Nativity Sophronius launches into an extended glorification of God the Father, of the Son whom he sent into the world, and of the Mother of God who bore him. He says in part,

God the Father in his goodness and love of mankind ‘has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of David;’ and He has given us through human birth his only-begotten Son who carries eternal rule upon his shoulders and who as the Word and Son is called the messenger of the ‘mighty counsel’ of the Father, the ‘wonderful counselor’ of God who begat him, the strong and invincible God who holds the power over all things, the master of peace of every kind, the father and maker of the age to come, whom the all-holy and all-pure Virgin conceived in her womb and brought into the world without a thought for human seed and coition.\textsuperscript{31}

For the final part of this text in the Greek, the sole witness \textit{p}\textsuperscript{1} (manuscript \textit{m}\textsuperscript{1} has run out at this point) gives the following version:

ὅν ἡ παναγία παρθένος καὶ πάναγνος ἐν γαστρὶ συλλαβοῦσα γεγέννηκεν, ἀνθρωπίνης σπορᾶς οὐκ εἰδοῦσα καὶ μίξεως.

\textsuperscript{30} The full comment is worth quoting (pp. 90-1): ‘Das letzte Wort ist unmöglich; τὴν πίστιν ἀθετεῖν heisst “die Treue brechen”; hier aber wird der Begriff des Trennens, Losmachens gefordert. Usener schlägt ἀποστήσωμεν vor; näher liegt das von Sophronios viel gebrauchte ἀφετέω (z.B. 169, 28). Ich zweifle nicht, dass dieser Wortkünstler, von dem Photios cod. 231 mit Recht sagt ἔννεωτριξεί τοῖς ῥήμασι, nach dem Muster von συνετέω ein ἀφετέω zu bilden gewagt und ἀφετήσωμεν geschrieben hat.’

\textsuperscript{31} The corresponding Greek text is on p. 515, 19–29 (cf. n. 18 above).
I suppose if the manuscript had ἀνθρωπίνην σποράν οὐκ εἰδοῦσα καὶ μίξιν, we could translate this as ‘not having seen (i.e. experienced) human seed and coition,’ but it is much easier to think, along with Usener and Nissen, that there is a corruption in the participle, and what is required is a verb that takes the genitive case. Both of these scholars make reasonable suggestions: Usener picks up on an actual phrase used earlier in the homily in a similar context (509, 18 ἄσπορον ἔσχε τὴν σύλληψιν | οὐ δεηθείσαν ἀνδρὸς πρὸς συνέργειαν); ‘not needing’ would make perfect sense here as well, but (as Nissen already commented) the verb form is very far from the ms. reading. Nissen himself opted for a present participle of the verb κυρέω (οὐ κυροῦσα), which is a little more difficult to translate in this instance, but essentially means, ‘not hitting upon’ or ‘not encountering’. It would fit the bill, but I am reasonably sure that it is possible to find a superior candidate; by that I mean one that suits the meaning and syntax very well, reflects closely the transmitted text, and allows us to explain how the error might have crept into the manuscript tradition in the first place. The verb in question is ἀκηδεῖν, the required form is ἀκηδοῦσα, and the sense would be ‘paying no heed to/without a thought for’. On the level of handwriting, it is not difficult to imagine that a certain type of cursive alpha could be misread as the negative particle οὐ, with the omicron and upsilon seeming to be contiguous. Yet another possibility for this textual crux would be the participle ἀφειδοῦσα. It does meet the criteria very nicely, except that one would find it a bit difficult to explain how the letter phi might have ended up as a kappa.

**Conclusion**

In the matter of *ars edendi* the present short contribution will have offered illustrations of the usual, commonsensical, ways of retrieving and restoring (where necessary) texts that have been transmitted in hand-written copies. Among those essential elements are close attention to all the manuscript evidence, a sound knowledge of paleography, and sensitivity to the author’s modes of composition (such as special features of grammar, syntax and vocabulary, including

32 ἀ misread as ἄ.
the use of figurative language). In the case of Sophronius of Jerusalem there is the added dimension of his deep attachment to rhythmical prose; for all intents and purposes he never wrote an unrhythmical colon in his life and most of the time he opted for the 'double dactyl' clausula. For the editor of the prose works of Sophronius this stylistic hallmark is a welcome boon providing an instrument to detect problem areas in the text and often (though clearly not always) helping to point the way to satisfactory solutions.
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Diogenes Laertius and the Gnomological Tradition: Considerations from an Editor of the *Lives of the Philosophers*

Tiziano Dorandi

One of the characteristics of the *Lives and Doctrines of Eminent Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius (third century C.E.) is the preponderance of *chreiai* (apophthegms) within the narrative.\(^1\) One of the *Lives* in particular, that of the Cynic philosopher Diogenes of Sinope (6.20–83), consists almost entirely in a succession of *chreiai* occupying the central part of the narrative (§ 24–30, 32–69). In other books, and therefore in regard to other philosophers, there are specific groups of sayings or maxims of, first, the Seven Sages (book 1), including Anacharsis (1.103–5); Aristippus of Cyrene (2.65–83), Plato (3.38–40), Bion of Borysthenes (4.48–51), Aristotle (5.17–21), Antisthenes (6.3–10), Zeno of Citium (7.16–24) and Pyrrho of Elis (9.66–8). A separate case, but equally interesting, is that of Epicurus, whose life takes up all of book 10, ending with Diogenes’ presentation of forty principal doctrines or maxims (Κύριαι δόξαι) of the founder of the Garden.

This lecture was given 7 June 2012 at the Newman Institute, Uppsala. Translated from the French by Denis Searby.

Diogenes Laertius and the chreia tradition

Some years ago, Jan Fredrik Kindstrand wrote a groundbreaking article on ‘Diogenes Laertius and the Chreia Tradition’, the results of which are still valid and represent, in my opinion, still the best thing written on the subject.² Both after and before Kindstrand, other scholars have worked on the gnomological tradition in regard to particular philosophers, taking into account all the data relevant to the persons under study and not just the testimony of Diogenes Laertius (D.L.): Winfried Bühler and Maria Tziatzi-Papagianni investigated the rather complex and multifaceted tradition of the Seven Sages;³ Karl-Heinz Stanzel wrote his doctoral thesis on Dicta Platonica following on the research of Alice Swift Riginos on the anecdotes concerning the life of Plato;⁴ Denis Searby studied the gnomological tradition relative to Aristotle and devoted a number of pages of his book to the texts transmitted by Diogenes Laertius.⁵ The plethora of anecdotes and apophthegms related to Diogenes the Cynic was the subject of studies by Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé and Oliver Overwien in which both the Greek and the Arabic traditions were taken into account.⁶ Finally, I

myself have examined the tradition of Epicurus and the Epicureans. All these studies provide a sufficient and generally satisfactory idea of the relations of Diogenes Laertius with what is called 'χρεία-literature'.

Kindstrand discussed the subject with a measure of caution ('I must confine myself largely to what can be reasonably assumed rather than proved. Therefore no final solutions or even new hypotheses will be offered here'), starting with the question of terminology 'both in general and more specifically as far as Diogenes is concerned', then concluding with the testimony of Diogenes himself in regard to collections of these texts in order to present 'a brief historical survey of this kind of literature, its origin, forms and uses, as far as they are known to, or can be plausibly visualized by us'; he suggests an analogical study of certain passages in the Lives in comparison with the parallel tradition in gnomological collections 'in order to gain an idea of the sources he may have used, of his method of working with them, and of his general intentions.'

Kindstrand9 effectively demonstrated that Diogenes had access to a 'literature in the form of collections of pointed sayings and anecdotes, which was of a later date. It is not possible to make any general statements concerning his sources or to try to reconstruct them, and it is doubtful whether it ever will be.'10 One can get an idea of the character of the collections used by Diogenes by comparing his text with that of certain of the extant collections. In general, Kindstrand suggests that Diogenes made use of mostly anonymous, alphabetically arranged collections. He derives useful information about the biographer's sources and methods from an analysis of the lives of the Seven Sages in the first book.11 At a fairly early date, series of sayings, in the form of γνῶμαι in principle, though perhaps also anecdotes (χρειαί), were attributed to these sages. At the end of each of these

---

8 Kindstrand, 'Diogenes Laertius,' p. 220 (quotations are taken from the page).
10 Kindstrand, 'Diogenes Laertius,' p. 233.
11 See below, pp. 81–2.
Lives— whose narrative structure is broadly similar — Diogenes transcribes samples of the songs (τῶν ᾀδομένων) which these sages were supposed to have composed as well as a collection of dicta of a different kind (which Diogenes calls ἀποφθέγματα on the Life of Thales, 1.35) and, finally, the distinctive apophthegm of each sage (this he designates as ἀπόφθεγμα or uses the verb form ἀπεφθέγξατο). All these collections of sayings make up a uniform group, the origin of which must be supposed to derive from at least two distinct sources. For the first part, the source would be a collection of sayings, not only of philosophers but also of other important personalities, which goes back to the Hellenistic period, circulating anonymously for the most part but arranged in alphabetic order. We know of several such collections, the most complete of which is the one transmitted in Vaticanus graecus 743 (copied at the beginning of the 14th cent.), edited by Leo Sternbach under the title of Gnomologium Vaticanum (GV). Diogenes and this gnomologium derive from a common source, probably preserved in a more original form in Diogenes Laertius, while becoming more contaminated in the redaction of GV. The situation is the same for the sayings in the Life of Anacharsis. For the second part of the collections, which comes in the form of γνῶμαι, one must postulate recourse to a different parallel tradition (maybe source), that is, the collection of the sayings of the Seven Sages as transmitted in the Anthologion of Stobaeus where it is attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum. Diogenes did not make direct use of this work: 'Diogenes or his source did not have immediate access to the collection of Demetrius, but [...] he used him through an intermediate

12 Thales 1.35–37; Solon 1.58–61; Chilon 1.68–71; Pittacus 1.76–78; Bias 1.85–88; Cleoboulus 1.91–93; Periander 1.97–98.
15 See below, pp. 81–2.
source." For the other groups of sayings and maxims in the Lives, the situation is not as clear, and 'we may state that the original collection behind GV and its parallel versions even in its complete form was certainly not the only or even the main source used by Diogenes for the philosophers of the Socratic schools." However there is no reason to assume that Diogenes used a unique source for a genre so widespread and easily accessible; we should not discount the possibility that such collections were already present in whole or in part in the older biographies that Diogenes used as sources. 'We can see from many indications that the collections as found now in Diogenes are not uniform, but that they represent the product of a long process, which seeks to combine different collections [...] This combination of sources may have taken place already long before Diogenes.'

Traces of the Lives of Diogenes Laertius in the later gnomological tradition

While Kindstrand clarified the background of the so-called 'χρεία-literature' by analyzing the debated issue of Quellenforschung concerning Diogenes Laertius, as editor of the text of the Lives I have myself dedicated part of my research to pinpointing traces of the work in the later gnomological tradition. So I focused my attention on the relationship between the text of Diogenes and that of the gnomologia from Late Antiquity and the Byzantine period in order to establish possible direct or indirect use of the Lives in these collections that could be useful for the constitutio textus of some passages in Diogenes.

16 Kindstrand, 'Diogenes Laertius', p. 237. For Kindstrand it is 'probable that Diogenes received the material, which ultimately derives from Demetrius, through Apollodorus, although perhaps not directly.' This is Apollodorus the author of a book Περὶ φιλοσόφων αἱρέσεων which D.L. cites in 1.60 introducing the second part of the sayings of Solon. But according to Eduard Schwartz, 'Diogenes Laertios' (Realencyclopaedie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft V.1, 1903, 738–63 = Griechische Geschichtschreiber, Leipzig: Koehler und Amelang 1957, pp. 453-91), col. 745 (= 1957, p. 463), the citation of Apollodorus 'steht an falscher Stelle.'

17 Kindstrand, 'Diogenes Laertius', p. 238.

18 Kindstrand, 'Diogenes Laertius', p. 238.
as witnesses to a textual tradition independent of the ones on which I chiefly relied for my edition of the ten books of Laertius, i.e. the one represented by the complete Byzantine manuscripts (BPF) as well as the tradition of the *excerpta Vaticana* (Φ).

Searby developed the idea that the compiler of the *Corpus Parisinum* (around the middle of the seventh century) had access to a collection of *excerpta* originally taken from the *Lives* of Diogenes Laertius. An examination of all the passages for which Searby postulates a derivation from Diogenes would appear to confirm the hypothesis, but one must remain cautious, because I have not found any decisive evidence against the possibility that Diogenes and the source used by the compiler of *CP* went back to a common, no longer extant source preceding the composition of the *Lives* and which one might, for example, identify with Favorinus. I would, however, draw attention to *CP* 3.380 (in a section of *CP*, 3.361–80 that derives entirely from Favorinus) = D.L. 6.44. In this case, the reading ἄθλια in the manuscripts of *CP* (= Favorinus) contrasts with the reading ἀθλίας in the witnesses of Diogenes:

ἀθλίας παρ’ ἀθλίου δι’ ἀθλίου πρὸς ἄθλιον

---


Even if we allow that the *Lives* were one of the sources of *CP*, this latter witness adds nothing new to the establishment of the text of Diogenes. An analysis of the variants of *CP* in relation to the *Lives* shows that we have to do with mere trivializations, inversions of words and other minor changes that give the impression of a textual stage not much different from that transmitted by the other manuscripts of Diogenes.²³

There are two other gnomological collections that point to a likely use of the *Lives*. I refer to the two collections extant in *Patmensis* 263, and *Vaticanus gr.* 151.

The gnomological material in *Patmensis* 263 (tenth cent.) was published by Alessandra Bertini Malgarini.²⁴ The manuscript transmits two florilegia, the second of which, entitled Ἀρχαίων φιλοσόφων γνώμαι καὶ ἀποφθέγματα, is the one that interests us here. It consists of a first part (f. 236r–241v) with the gnomai and apophthegms of Thales, Solon, <Chilon>, <Pittacus>, Bias, Cleobulus, Periander, Anacharsis, Anaxagoras, Aristippus, Plato, Bion of Borysthenes, Demetrius of Phalerum, Antisthenes, Diogenes of Sinope and Democritus; a second part follows (f. 241v–246r), made up of seventy-nine apophthegms, almost all of them anonymous:

L’ordine con il quale si succedono gli ἀποφθέγματα e le γνώμαι nella prima parte, sembrerebbe essere fino a Demetrio cronologico, ma similmente a quello che si legge nelle Vite (1, 13–4).²⁵

Following the suggestion of Bertini Malgarini that the first section of the collection offers points of contact with Diogenes Laertius, or with one of his sources,²⁶ Kindstrand confirmed that there are indubitable traces of the *Lives*: ‘It would otherwise be difficult to

²⁶ Bertini Malgarini, ‘Ἀρχαίων φιλοσόφων’, 159 n. 19.
explain the fact that the philosophers are presented in the same order as in Diogenes, and not in alphabetical order, and that the first part of this collection contains only material known from him. An in-depth study of the two texts has convinced me of the plausibility of this hypothesis. The excerpta reproduce several passages from the Lives, often word for word, sometimes with changes in sentence structure or considerable rewording, and maintain the same sequence. Yet it should be noted that there are a number of passages in the section on Diogenes the Cynic which are not paralleled in the Lives (nos. 54–60 and 66–8) and that the maxim attributed to Democritus (no. 76) is also unknown to Diogenes Laertius. One might suppose that the anonymous compiler of this collection did not have direct access to the Lives, but used an intermediate source. Another indication supports this possibility. Under the name of Plato are found four sayings (nos. 31–4), the first of which (no. 31) is in fact taken from the Life of Bion (D.L. 4.48); the same can be said of the two texts immediately following the sayings attributed to Plato, although these are correctly transmitted under the name of the philosopher of Borysthenes (nos. 35–6). One might explain this 'confusion' by positing the existence of an intermediary manuscript of the Lives used by the compiler of the collection in Patmensis 263 in which the passage had already been displaced. One should not forget that saying 48 results from the union of two similar anecdotes transmitted in D.L. 6.39 and 6.50; it is not to be excluded that they go back to the exemplar one may posit for Patm. 263. However, one should keep in mind regarding the second case that the anecdote in D.L. 6.50 is repeated later on (no. 71) in a form recognizable from the manuscripts of Diogenes Laertius.

A review of the variants from the collection in Patm. 263 in relation to those from the tradition of the Lives, without taking into account a small number of lectiones singulares, suggests that the exemplar of Patm. 263 was a manuscript closer to the group BPF than to Φ. The contribution of Patm. 263 to the constitutio textus of the Lives nevertheless proves negligible.

---

27 Kindstrand, 'Diogenes Laertius', p. 235 n. 46. See also Searby, Aristotle, p. 54, and Overwien, Die Sprüche des Kynikers Diogenes, pp. 20–1.

28 See also Overwien, Die Sprüche des Kynikers Diogenes, p. 20 n. 21.
A copy of a collection of sayings, still largely unedited, in *Vaticanus gr. 151* shows evident traces of the *Life of Xenocrates* of Diogenes (D.L. 4.7). On f. 241r–245v of this manuscript, dated to between the 10th and 11th centuries, after the collective title ἄποφθεγματα φιλοσόφων one finds a group of 25 anecdotes of philosophers and sages that is mutilated at the end. Many of the anecdotes are recognizable from the parallel gnomological tradition.

The third of the capitai in this brief collection with the disjunctive title περὶ πορνείας ἢγουν σωφροσύνης (ff. 241v–243r) differs from the others in that it contains ‘una lunga rielaborazione (un autoschediasmò?) del celebre episodio di Frine e Senocrate’ only known in Greek through Diogenes Laertius (4.7 = test. 2 Isnardi.

---


32 As defined by Piccione, ‘Forme di trasmissione’, p. 414 n. 18.
ὁ Ἑνοκράτης ἐπὶ πολλὴ δικαιοσύνη παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἔφερε τὸ δόξαν· τῆς ἀφροδίτης ὑπεροψίαν, τοιούτοις καὶ ἄλλην τήν ἱκετείαν, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ στέγης φιλανθρωπίαν, οὐκ ἀντέχειν δύνασθαι πρὸς τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἱπποκράτην ἀναλγησίας μεστὸν τὴν ἱκετείαν τῆς ἀνθρώπου καὶ περὶ τοῖς ἐσχάτοις κινδυνεύσεως ὑπεριδεῖν, ἀνοῖξαί τε λέγεται τὸ οἰκήμα τὸ μηδὲν ὁτιοῦν ὑπεριδόμενον τὴν ἀπάτην· καὶ δὴ ἑνὸς μόνον σκίμποδος ὃς καὶ συναναπαύεσθαι δεομέν ἄντιγραφής πρὸς τῆς διαπεριστάσεως, ὡς ἀνθρώπων ἐπιστολὴν εἰληφέναι τὸν ἅρπαγον μηχανᾶσθαι πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἱπποκράτην κακοτεχνίας πλήρωσιν, οὐ μὴ ἀπεκτῆσαι, κἂν μέσαις ἄκρυσιν ὡς εἰλημμένον, καταγοητεύσαι πρὸς τῆς χαμαιτύπης, ἀλλ᾽ ἃ ὑπὸ τοῦ βοηθήσαντος· καὶ τὸν μὲν ὑπ᾽ εὐηθείας εὐθύς, ὥστε παντελῶς ἀπαλλαγεῖσαν τὴν Φρύνην, οὐχὶ μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἔμπνου καὶ μετόχου ζωῆς τινος, ἀλλὰ μετ᾽ ἀνδρίας λιθίνου συγκατακλιθῆναι προσομολογεῖν.
Verbal parallels confirm the hypothesis that the anonymous author of this book (or its exemplar) had before him the *Life of Xenocrates* by Diogenes:

ὅπόσας μὲν ύπέμεινε τομὰς ὁπόσας δὲ καύσεις περὶ τὸ ἦτρον (Vat.) = τὸν δὲ οὕτως εἶναι ἐγκρατῆ, ὥστε καὶ τομὰς καὶ καύσεις πολλάκις ύπομεῖναι περὶ τὸ αἰδοῖον (D.L. 4.7).

The presence in the collection of *Vaticanus gr. 151* of this text which resembles the genre of *dialexeis* or *progymnasmata* more than that of apophthegms or maxims is perplexing.

There are also several additions, interpolations or contaminations from the *Lives* of Diogenes (directly or indirectly) in the Byzantine collections of the sayings of the Seven Sages, especially in the two versions of the Paris redaction (Par. 1, Par. 2) and in the version of Munich. The original source of these anthologies can be discovered in the two collections of the sayings of the Seven Sages made by Demetrius of Phalerum and by a certain Sosiades. Two redactions of the collection by Demetrius are known: the first is the one in the *Anthologia* of Stobaeus (3.1.172: vol. III 111–125 ed. Hense, with the title Δημητρίου Φαληρέως τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν ἀποφθέγματα); the second in the first book of the *Lives* by Diogenes (1.37, 60, 69–70, 78, 87–8, 92–3 and 97–8). Diogenes groups the sayings under the names of the Seven Sages (Cleobulus, Solon, Chilon, Thales, Pittacus, Bias, Periander) who are assigned fifteen maxims each. Stobaeus also transmits a version of the collection by Sosiades (3.1.173: vol. III 125–8 Hense, with the title Σωσιάδ ου τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν ὑποθῆκαι). This collection is made up by a series of 147 two-word maxims (generally, but not necessarily, complement+imperative of the second person singular), without being assigned to any one sage in particular.

---

34 Bühler, *Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung*, pp. 3–6 (relations with Diogenes Laertius) and Tziatzi-Papagianni, *Die Sprüche*.

but presented as common to all. There is no lack of contamination between the two collections.\textsuperscript{36}

Concerning Diogenes Laertius, it must be supposed that he had access to the work of Demetrius through an intermediate source of higher quality than that used by Stobaeus. The latter source was reworded in several places and probably corrupt.\textsuperscript{37} Tziatzi-Papagianni, following Bühler,\textsuperscript{38} has shown that the anonymous redactors of the Byzantine collections of Paris and Munich (as well as the Greek redactions related to them) made systematic use of the \textit{Lives} in order to correct or complete the text of certain maxims in the version transmitted by Stobaeus.\textsuperscript{39}

The relationship between the tradition of Diogenes Laertius and that of the \textit{GV} (\textit{Vaticanus gr. 743}) must be explained in a different way.\textsuperscript{40} The redactor of the \textit{GV} which, in Sternbach's edition, comprises 577 maxims and apophthegms in alphabetical order, did not use the \textit{Lives} of Diogenes as a source.\textsuperscript{41} Diogenes and the \textit{GV} derive from a more ancient common origin and reflect various independent sources. We might think of a collection compiled in Late Antiquity or possibly in the period of so-called Byzantine ‘encyclopédisme’ through the union of various Hellenistic florilegia which had been reworked and rearranged at different points in time.

\textsuperscript{36} The latest edition of the remains of the collection of Demetrius, based on the tradition of Stobaeus (but taking also Diogenes Laertius and the two Byzantine redactions of Paris and Munich into account), was published by Peter Stork, Jan Max van Ophuijsen and Tiziano Dorandi, pp. 154–65 (fr. 87) in \textit{Demetrius of Phalerum: The Sources, Text and Translation}, ed. by William W. Fortenbaugh and Eckart Schütrumpf [Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities IX] (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1999).


These collections were not only used by Diogenes Laertius and by the compiler of GV and its related collections but also by Plutarch and Stobaeus.\footnote{Searby, Aristotle, pp. 48–52.}

To conclude this discussion, I would like to give a very brief overview of the Συναγωγὴ παροιμιῶν καὶ συνθῆκη compiled between 1454 and 1466 (but never completed) by Michael Apostolis (ca. 1422 to after 1474 or 1486). All the material passed through the hands of Michael’s son, Aristobulus Apostolis (1468/9–1535), who was bishop of Monemvasia from 1506 going by the name of Arsenius. Arsenius took the collection made by his father in the version preserved in manuscript Angelicanus gr. 27, and incorporated a variety of maxims, apophthegms, mythological stories and new proverbs. He divides all these texts into four distinct sections: παροιμίαι, γνῶμαι, ἀποφθέγματα, ἱστορίαι (each in turn arranged in alphabetical order in separate chapters). As the title of his work he chose Ἰωνιά or Violetum. Between 1516/1517 and 1519, Arsenius sent a copy to Pope Leo X (Giovanni de Medici: 1513–1521).\footnote{More details in Dorandi, Laertiana, pp. 185–94.}

The section of the Ἰωνιά relevant here is the group of ἀποφθέγματα. Arsenius has assembled here a very large number of texts taken, in particular, from Diodorus of Sicily, Plutarch, Clement of Alexandria, Diogenes Laertius, Stobaeus, pseudo-Maximus the Confessor and from the ‘Melissa’ attributed to a certain Antonius. A study of the textual variants transmitted by Apostolis / Arsenius proves that the Byzantine scholar made direct use of the Lives of Diogenes Laertius which he read in a manuscript belonging to the inferior ‘vulgate’ tradition, and that he also introduced contamination into the passages of Diogenes from other texts (e.g. the parallel traditions in Stobaeus and the Byzantine gnomologia). He has also often touched up and arbitrarily rewritten certain quotations. While the testimony of Apostolis / Arsenius is of very limited importance for the constitutio textus of the Lives, his contribution is fundamental for studying the textual and cultural interaction between the Lives of Diogenes and the gnomological tradition, and vice versa, from a diachronic point of view.
Taking all the above into account, I will now give a few examples to illustrate my editorial principles in establishing the text of Diogenes’ ‘gnomological’ passages. I would like to point out that those principles are the same I have followed in dealing with other passages in Diogenes for which we have a parallel tradition. I asked myself whether the constitutio textus of the ‘gnomological’ sections in the Lives could benefit from a comparison with the later χρεία-literature. This is obviously possible only in the cases where the later ‘gnomological’ collections used Diogenes as a source.

In contrast to Marcovich, the latest editor before me, I am convinced that liberally correcting mistakes (whether real or only apparent) in the text of the Lives, on the sole basis of the testimony of a parallel tradition, is a risky business. This is especially so in view of the fact that Diogenes’ work is a collection of multiple sources, often cited verbatim but sometimes abridged or summarized, to which the ancient biographer had indirect access by way of one or more intermediaries. In my edition of the Lives, therefore, I have reflected on each case with attention to the text(s) or source(s) which Diogenes may have used, at the same time posing the question of what kind of access he had. I have not, moreover, excluded the possibility that Diogenes’ manuscript of his source may have transmitted an ‘inferior’ reading in relation to the parallel tradition nor that this ‘inferior’ variant was passed on in Diogenes’ text. The editor of the fragments of Diogenes’ sources or of his cited ‘authors’ has the right to choose the ‘superior’ and, with regard to the text of the author he is editing, more authentic reading, when confronted with more than one variant transmitted by one or more distinct traditions. The editor of the Lives of Diogenes Laertius, on the other hand, must in principle aim at an edition of Diogenes’ work such as Diogenes could have written. Each time one encounters a reading transmitted by the best manuscripts that does not go against the rules of grammar, syntax and language, it would be inappropriate and contrary to every editorial method to correct it on the basis of a parallel tradition only because the latter
transmits a reading that is ‘superior’ from the point of view of someone working on Diogenes’ sources.\textsuperscript{44}

\textit{A selection of examples}

So as not to remain on an abstract level, here are some specific examples which will give an idea of my editorial principles.

In the biography of Aristippus of Cyrene, in the section of anecdotes where the protagonists are the philosopher and Dionysius the Young, tyrant of Syracuse (D.L. 2.69), the oldest manuscripts (BPF) transmit the following text:

\begin{quote}
ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ Διονυσίου διὰ τί οἱ μὲν φιλόσοφοι ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν πλουσίων θύρας ἔρχονται, οἱ δὲ πλούσιοι ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν φιλοσόφων οὐκέτι, ἐφη, ἵνα οἱ μὲν ἴσασιν ἄν δέονται, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἴσασιν. ἐρωτηθεὶς τίνι διαφέροσιν οἱ πεπαιδευμένοι τῶν ἀπαιδεύτων, ἐφη, ὅπερ οἱ δεδαμασμένοι ἵπποι τῶν ἀδαμάστων.
\end{quote}

Between the first and second anecdote, some of the recentiores as well as the \textit{editio princeps Frobeniana} (witnesses to the ‘vulgate’ tradition and thus less trustworthy) add another anecdote which in BPF is located a little farther on in 2.76 in a version differing slightly at the beginning (\textit{ὀνειδιζόμενος ποτ’ ἐπὶ τῷ πολυτελῶς ἦν ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος instead of πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὀνειδίσαντα <αὐτῷ> τὴν πολυτέλειαν):

\begin{quote}
πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὀνειδίσαντα <αὐτῷ> τὴν πολυτέλειαν, ἀρα, ἐφη, φαίνεται σοι Διονύσιος ἀγαθός; τοῦ δ’ ὀμολογήσαντος, καὶ μὴν; ἐφη, ἥ ἐμοῦ πολυτελέστερον ἔστ’ οὐδὲν κωλύει καὶ πολυτελῶς καὶ καλῶς ἦν.
\end{quote}

With respect to D.L. 2.76, Mannebach wisely noted: ‘verba ὀνειδιζόμενος [...] ἦν perperam ex antecedentibus (§ 69) iterata esse videntur.’\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{44} See Dorandi, \textit{Laertiana}, pp. 45–7.
\textsuperscript{45} Mannebach, p. 19 (ad fr. 75).
The editor of Diogenes should not take the addition of the *recentiores* into account and should only include the anecdote in 2.76, following the *vetustiores*. Long and Marcovich wrongly kept the text transmitted by the *recentiores* in 2.69, even while bracketing it. This makes no sense, since the *recentiores* do not go back to a tradition that is independent of the *vetustiores*.

In 4.48, in the *Life of Bion of Borysthenes*, the manuscripts transmit the text:

```greek
κατεγίνωσκε δὲ καὶ τῶν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κατακαόντων μὲν ὡς ἀναισθήτους, παρακαόντων δὲ ὡς αἰσθανομένους.
```

The word ἀνθρώπους in the sense of ‘corpses’ is difficult to retain, even though Kindstrand refers to Hom. *Il.* 3.279, 19.260 and *Od.* 4.565.\(^\text{46}\) Still I think that Marcovich was right to correct it to νεκροὺς on the basis of the parallel in *Gnom. Vat.* no. 20 where the apophthegm is attributed to Anacharsis (= A 49 Kindstrand) with some variants: ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος, τί ἐθέασατο ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι παράδοξον, εἶπε· 'τό τοὺς νεκροὺς καίεσθαι μὲν ὡς ἀναισθήτους, ἀποκαίεσθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς ὡς αἰσθανομένους.'

Let us now move on to an apophthegm attributed to Aristotle (5.19):

```greek
τῶν γονέων τοὺς παιδεύσαντας ἐντιμοτέρους εἶναι τῶν μόνον γεννησάντων· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ τὸ ζῆν, τοὺς δὲ τὸ καλῶς ζῆν παρασχέσθαι.
```

Searby\(^\text{47}\) notes that the saying introduced by τῶν γονέων τοὺς παιδεύσαντας ἐντιμότερους εἶναι τῶν μόνον γεννησάντων is the only one of the sayings attributed by Diogenes to Aristotle that lacks an introductory formula (e.g. a verb of saying). If this text is kept, Aristotle is distinguishing between two groups of parents, the ones...

---


who merely beget children and the ones who also educate them. In view of the parallel tradition, Sternbach\(^{48}\) proposed suppressing the words τῶν μόνον γεννησάντων as:

\[
\text{ineptissimum emblema [...], quod et insulse verbis τῶν γονέων τοὺς παδεύσαντας sensu scilicet 'parentes qui liberos erudiendos curent' sumptis opponitur et immanem tautologiam in sequenti membro: τοὺς μὲν γὰρ τὸ ζῆν παρασχέσαθαι efficit et denique logica vi cogit, ut verbis τοὺς μὲν γὰρ τὸ ζῆν, τοὺς δὲ τὸ καλῶς ζῆν παρασχέσαθαι consideratis e volgato textu ridiculam sententiam explicaremur, parentes qui liberos erudiendos curent iisdem nequaquam vitae esse auctores. Inscito additamento expulso lucramur dictum: praeceptores honorabiles esse parentibus: hos enim vivendi tantum, illos bene honesteque vivendi auctores esse.}
\]

This hypothesis, accepted by Gigon,\(^{49}\) was criticized by Searby\(^{50}\) who did not hesitate to maintain the ‘clumsy’ text of the manuscripts, suggesting that Diogenes (or his source) intended to give a version of the anecdote more favorable to the role of parents than in the other versions. However, one should note the suggestion of Nauck to place μόνον after ζῆν.\(^{51}\) For ζῆν with μόνον, one might cite Isocr. fr. 18 ed. Mathieu-Bremond (ap. Theon, Prog. 22.22–6 ed. Patillon) ἀποδεικτικὸς δὲ οἷον Ἰσοκράτης ὁ ῥήτωρ παρῄνει τοῖς γνωρίμοις προτιμᾶν τῶν γονέων τοὺς διδάσκαλους, ὅτι οἱ μὲν τοῦ ζῆν μόνον, οἱ δὲ διδάσκαλοι καὶ τοῦ καλῶς ζῆν αἴτιοι γεγόνασιν. Note, however, that ζῆν without μόνον is found in Plut., Alex. 8.4.

Among the very many anecdotes surrounding Diogenes the Cynic, I choose to concentrate on a single example, interesting for its editorial implications. It involves two anecdotes transmitted exclusively among the excerpta Vaticana (Φ) which find their place in 6.69 after the words οὐδ᾿ ἀρα ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἐστιν ἄτοπον. I transcribe here the text

\(^{48}\) Sternbach, Gnomologium Vaticanum, p. 41.  
\(^{50}\) Searby, Aristotle, p. 180.  
according to the edition of the *Magnum excerptum* as edited by Marcovich:52

ἀγγελλομένου Φιλίππου ώς μέλλοι τῇ Κορίνθῳ προσβάλλειν καὶ πάντων πρός ἐργοὺς ὄντων καὶ περισπωμένων, ὁς (sc. Διογένης) τὸν οἰκείον πίθον ἐκύλιεν· ἐρωμένων δὲ τινων ὑπὲρ Χάριν, Διόγενες· ὃτι, ἐφη, πάντων ταλαιπωρομένων ἐμὲ μηδὲν ποιεῖν ἄτοπον· γυνὶ γούν τὸν πίθον, οὐδὲν ἄλλο διαπράττεσθαι ἐξων. ὁράοιν ιδών μειράκιον ἀτάκτως ἰνω καὶ κάτω φερόμενον καὶ μεταπηδών συνεχῶς, ἐφη·

Μηριόνη, τάχα κέν σε καὶ ὀρχηστήν περ ἐόντα ἐγχος ἐμὸν κατέπαυσε διαμπερές, εἰ σ᾿ ἐβαλὼν περ.

The second anecdote, apart from the Homeric reference (II. 16.617–8), has no other parallel. For the first, we can recall a passage in the *Historia conscribenda* of Lucian:

ὁπότε γὰρ ὁ Φίλιππος ἐλέγετο ἢδη ἐπελαύνειν οἱ Κορίνθιοι πάντες ἐμετατόττοντο καὶ ἐν ἐργῷ ἦσαν, ὁ μὲν ὕπλα ἐπισκευάζων, ὁ δὲ ὑποικοδομῶν τοῦ τείχους, ὁ δὲ ἐπάλξιν ὑποστηρίξων, ὁ δὲ ἄλλος ἄλλο τῶν χρησίμων ὑπουργῶν. ὁ δὴ Διογένης ὅτι ταύτα, ἐπεὶ μηδὲν εἶχεν ὁ τι καὶ πράττοι—οὐδεὶς γάρ αὐτῷ ἐς οὐ δὲν ἐχρῆτο—διαζωσάμενος τὸ τριβώνιον σπουδῇ μάλα καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκύλιε τὸν πίθον, ἐν ὑπὲρ οἰκῶν, ἀνω καὶ κάτω τοῦ Κρανείου, καὶ τίνος τῶν συνήθων ἐρωμένον, τι ταύτα ποιεῖς, ὦ Διόγενες; κυλὼ, ἐφη, κάγι τὸν πίθον, ὡς μὴ μόνον ἄργειν δοκοῖν ἐν τοσοῦτοις ἐργαζομένοις.53


According to Luigi Tartaglia,\textsuperscript{54} the comparison between our first text and the passage in Lucian shows that the latter was not the source of the anecdote, because there are no clear parallels in the vocabulary of the two. Tartaglia also excluded the possibility that the two anecdotes may have been interpolated by the anonymous compiler of the \textit{excerpta Vaticana}, since he was not in the habit of making additions or enlarging \textit{suoi Marte} the text of the \textit{Lives} of Diogenes. Tartaglia offers, therefore, two hypotheses:\textsuperscript{55} (1) the two anecdotes were found in the manuscript used by the \textit{excerptor} and were already in the text composed by Diogenes Laertius; (2) the two anecdotes were only interpolated at a subsequent stage in a manuscript intermediate between the autograph of the \textit{excerpta} and \Phi.

The second hypothesis seems more likely to me. I assume that it is a case of a late addition (later than the redaction of the \textit{Lives} of Diogenes) that originated and has its \textit{raison d'être} in the sentence one reads in the \textit{codices integri} immediately following the words οὐδὲ ἄρα ἐν ἁγορᾷ ἐστιν ἁτομον (6.69): χειρουργῶν τε ἐν τῷ μέσῳ συνεχές, εἰθὲ ἶν, ἔλεγε, καὶ τὴν κοιλίαν παρατριψάμενον τοῦ λιμοῦ παύσασθαι. This sentence is missing in \Phi, and the two new anecdotes are found in its place. One might well imagine that the episode involving Diogenes the Cynic masturbating in public was considered disrespectful and obscene, and so it was replaced by the two new anecdotes found in a branch of the large gnomological tradition surrounding Diogenes which has either left no extant traces or has not yet been studied.\textsuperscript{56} One might also observe the erasure in \Phi of the words καὶ τὰ Δήμητρος καὶ τὰ Ἀφροδίτης just a few lines earlier in the sentence εἰώθει δὲ


\textsuperscript{55} Tartaglia, p. 264.

\textsuperscript{56} Peter Von der Mühll (in his unpublished Nachlaß) noted in connection with these two anecdotes ex \textit{Gnomologia quodam haec hab} \Phi.
πάντα ποιεῖν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, καὶ τὰ Δήμητρος καὶ τὰ Ἀφροδίτης (6.69). Another example of prudishness!57

This is not the only case showing the interest of the anonymous compiler of Φ (or perhaps already in his source) in the gnomological literature. A small collection of 16 apophthegms of philosophers has been copied at the end of two series of extracts from Diogenes Laertius (f. 88rv) in Vat. gr. 96 (as well as in its direct apograph, Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 93, ante a. 1152, f. 42r = Ψ). Ten of these are attributed to Diogenes the Cynic, but none of them derive from Laertius' Life of Diogenes.58 The greater part of these texts are also found in the Gnomologium Parisinum ineditum (GPI), transmitted in Parisinus Suppl. gr. 134 (14th cent.), f. 232v–271r (Π), as well as partially in Athous Διονυσίου 90 (3624 Lampros), 14th cent., f. 238r–248v (Δ).59 Two manuscripts containing, among other items, an abridged version of the excerpta Vaticana (Φ), of which they represent late, indirect copies for this section.60

57 There are other examples of similar interventions. One of the most common is the note that Planudes writes at the start of the book of erotic epigrams in his autograph manuscript of the Anthologia Planudea (Marc. gr. 431, f. 68v): τὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα (scil. δοσα πρὸς τὸ ἀσεμνότερον καὶ αἰσχρότερον ἀποκλίνεται) πολλὰ ἐν τῷ ἀπογράφῳ δντα παρελίπομεν. But one should recall the purged version of the novel of Aesop prepared by the same Planudes: See Tomas Hägg, The Art of Biography in Antiquity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 101–2 and 108 n. 27 (with bibliography).


60 The agreements with GPI are not by chance. In Π and Δ the brief collection of Φ and Ψ is missing, and in its place one finds the GPI, which lends credence to the hypothesis that the anonymous compiler of GPI had reused part of at least the apophthegms of the collection that precedes it in the new compilation, the beginning of which it now forms (GPI 1–10, 12–14). A concordance is found in Searby, 'The Sources.'
These facts lead me to reject the idea that the two anecdotes were already found in the redaction of the *Lives* made by Diogenes Laertius himself. The question remains whether they were inserted by the scribe of Φ or were already in his source. Tartaglia\(^61\) denies that the scribe of Φ was the one responsible for the addition because, in that case, he would have added the two texts in the margin of the manuscript as he did in the case of an anecdote copied in red ink on the upper margin of f. 69v:\(^62\) ἰατρὸν ἱδὼν ἀϕυῆ ἱπποιατρῷ ὁμιλοῦντα καὶ αὐτῷ ἀϕεῖ ἔϕη· σὺ γ’ ἀνδρας ἔναιρε, μελήσουσι δὲ οἱ ἵπποι. Concerning this text, Artur Biedl writes:\(^63\) ‘Ubi inserenda sint nescio. […] Quod apophthegma deest in integris, neque in gnomologiis a Sternbachio editis neque alibi repperi […] quod autem in marg. adscriptum est, suspicionem movet non esse genuina Laertii verba.’ My remarks about the erasure of the words καὶ τὰ Δήμητρος καὶ τὰ Ἀϕροδίτης in 6.69 could point to an intervention by the scribe of Φ himself, but we cannot be sure.

Before giving one last example, this time from the Epicurean tradition, a brief presentation is necessary of the principles which I have adopted in editing the *Epicurea* transmitted by Diogenes Laertius.\(^64\)

The goal of the editor of the texts of Epicurus and that of the editor of the *Lives* of Diogenes are not one and the same. The editor of Epicurus, of course, aims at restoring the *ipsa verba* of Epicurus on the basis of the facts offered by the manuscripts of the *Lives* of Diogenes;

\(^61\) Tartaglia, p. 264 n. 31.


\(^63\) Biedl, p. 115 (*ad loc.*). The same anecdote is also transmitted with some variants in *GV* nr. 524 Sternbach. See also f. 231r of *Vat. gr. 1144*: ὁ αὐτὸς (sc. Stratonicus) θεασάμενος ἱατρὸν κακὸν καὶ ἱπποιατρῷ ὁμιλοῦντας εἶπεν· τούτων ὁ ἔτερος λέγει· ἀλλὰ σὺ γ’ ἀνδρας ἔναιρε· μελήσουσιν δ’ ἐμοὶ ἵπποι. The verse corresponds to Hom., *Il.* 10.481 (ἡ σὺ γ’ ἀνδρας ἔναιρε, μελήσουσιν δ’ ἐμοὶ ἵπποι) *paululum mutatum* as Biedl says (*facete Stratonicus versu Homerico […] utitur* Sternbach). There are no reasons to restore the original text of Homer as Marcovich does.

\(^64\) I summarize here concisely the conclusions I reached in Dorandi, ‘Diogene Laertio, Epicuro e gli editori.’
he can then take into account the testimony of the ‘indirect tradition’ and of the parallel Epicurean literature (Lucretius, Diogenes of Oenoanda, the Vatican Sayings). The editor of the Lives of Diogenes must take a different path in order to avoid mixing the traditions and editing a text that does not correspond to that of Diogenes.

It goes without saying that when Diogenes decided to include in his Life of Epicurus the three letters of Epicurus as well as the Principal Doctrines, he copied the text of a manuscript (now lost) found (we know not how or when) in some library. It was a scholarly edition (such as suggesting the presence of scholia), and one which was in itself a link in the chain of the already centuries old transmission of the writings of Epicurus, not exempt from more or less serious errors, corruptions, interpolations or rewordings of the style or content as well, perhaps, of the thought.

Once in possession of this manuscript, Diogenes copied the texts into his Life of Epicurus. While carrying out this process of excerpting, Diogenes did not act in the mechanical fashion of a simple or ignorant scribe. He had the opportunity of modifying the text of his source on two levels: the level of language and grammar and the level of philosophy. As to the former, which is quite likely to have been the case, he could have touched up the text of Epicurus here and there if he found it corrupt or incomprehensible; as to the latter possibility, which seems to be less likely given Diogenes’ usual working methods, he might have made editorial interventions to correct real or perceived philosophical flaws in the texts where he had a good understanding of the Epicurean doctrine.

The goal of the editor of the Lives is, thus, to restore the ‘received’ state of the manuscript of Epicurus that passed through the hands of Diogenes, freeing it of evident errors that crept in over the centuries between the composition of book 10 and the textual state of its Byzantine manuscript copies. To attempt to go beyond this ‘received’ textual state in order to restore theipsa verba of Epicurus within an edition of the Lives would be (and unfortunately has been) a very serious error in editorial method with deleterious effects on the reconstruction and understanding of the historical and literary personality of Diogenes Laertius.

What I have just said does not, of course, imply an exaggerated defense of the transmitted text. Almost nine centuries passed between
the composition of the Lives and the oldest extant byzantine manuscript, a lapse of time during which it would be pure illusion to suppose that the text was not subject to significant changes and corruptions. Where there are no conflicts of grammar or syntax or philosophical thought in the manuscript paradosis, I have retained the text in the conviction that this was what Diogenes read in his copy of the source (which, in some cases, can correspond to the ipsa verba of Epicurus). Elsewhere, when an obvious error is corrected in one way or another, I have chosen the conjectures and corrections that appear to be closest to the text transmitted by the manuscripts of Diogenes, even if they might give the impression of being philosophically inferior to others which the editor of Epicurus can or sometimes should choose. There are, finally, also cases where the text is hopelessly corrupt, and where none of the corrections are convincing, even for the editor who has no intention of going beyond the ‘received’ textual state of the Lives of Diogenes; such passages are put within cruces. We should not exclude the possibility that these errors were already found in the manuscript of the Epicurea used by Diogenes. When Diogenes made the decision to quote the texts of Epicurus in their entirety, he could not omit one or more phrases just because he found them obscure or were unsatisfactory grammatically or philosophically. The future editor of a modern collection of Epicurea will be at greater liberty to put forward new conjectures or defend old ones. It falls to him as well to distinguish the second-level errors, or the ‘received’ errors (the only ones that concern the editor of Diogenes), from the first-level errors (the ones already in the source of Diogenes).

In order to give a clear idea of what I have been saying, I have chosen to dwell on Principal Doctrines V of Epicurus (D.L. 10.140), the textual transmission of which is rather complicated.65

The text transmitted by the manuscripts of Diogenes (BPF) is untenable:

οὐκ ἔστιν ἡδέως ζῆν ἄνευ τοῦ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ἄνευ τοῦ ἡδέως. ὅτῳ δὲ τοῦτο μὴ ὑπάρχει, οὐ ζῇ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει· οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτον ἡδέως ζῆν.

Fortunately, this maxim was widespread among ancient authors, and their testimony shows itself to be very useful in reconstructing the *ipsa verba* of Epicurus.

Here are the collected *testimonia*:


Let me come at the question from two directions. First, I will offer the restitution of the text that I believe was that of the manuscript of the *Epicurea* used by Diogenes Laertius. Second, I will delve into the text as it may be presumed to have been written by Epicurus. Neither of the two approaches is easy, and I am still not entirely satisfied with my own results.

The editor of the *Lives* of Diogenes could content himself with the simple and effective suggestion of Jean Bollack which consists in suppressing the second ὑπάρχει. Bollack translates the entire maxim thus: ‘Il n’est pas possible de vivre dans le plaisir sans vivre de façon sensée, bonne et juste indépendamment du plaisir. Celui qui n’a pas cela ne vit pas de façon sensée, bonne et juste; impossible que cet homme vive dans le plaisir.’ But this solution is not very satisfying, and one should therefore look for other ones.

In my edition of Diogenes Laertius, I opted for the following text for want of a better solution:

οὐκ ἔστιν ἡδέως ζῆν ἄνευ τοῦ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως
<οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως> ἄνευ τοῦ ἡδέως. ὁτὲ δὲ τοῦτο µὴ ὑπάρχει, οὐ λά ὁ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως
†ὑπάρχει†· οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτον ἡδέως ζῆν.


Gnom. Vat.

It is impossible to live pleasantly without living with wisdom, honesty and justice <nor to live with wisdom, honesty and justice> without living pleasantly. He who does not have pleasure does not live with wisdom, honesty and justice †...†, it is not possible for him to live pleasantly.

Let us turn to a reconstruction of the *ipsa verba* of Epicurus. In the two problematic cases — the insertion of the words οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως and the crucifixion of the second ὑπάρχει— one might suppose the error to have already been present in the source manuscript of Diogenes, but the explanation that it was the result of an error in the subsequent transmission of the text appears to me as more probable.

---

Diogenes of Oenoanda\textsuperscript{69} (and, it seems, the mosaic of Autun) confirms Gassendi’s addition of the words ‘οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως’ after the first δικαίως (in this case, the words were omitted accidentally due to a saut du même au même in the archetype of the manuscripts of the tradition of Diogenes Laertius or possibly already in the source manuscript he used directly). The second part of the maxim is quite corrupt and no help is offered by the other witnesses. The words οὐ ζῇ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει are also missing in the manuscript of the Vatican Sayings (were they omitted due to a saut du même au même or because they made no sense?). There is no trace of them today in the inscription of Oenoanda, and they were omitted in the mosaic of Autun. Von der Mühll suppresses them (and with him Diano, Arrighetti and Marcovich). There is the radical intervention of Usener who introduced four corrections into the second part of the text: ὅτῳ δ᾿ ἐν τούτων μὴ ὑπάρχει οἷον ζῆν (following Gassendi) φρονίμως, καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει, οὐκ ἔστι κτλ.\textsuperscript{70} Ettore Bignone,\textsuperscript{71} basing himself on a parallel passage in Ep. Men. (132), had a less drastic proposal: ὅτῳ δὲ τοῦτο μὴ ὑπάρχει <ἐξ> οὐ ζῇ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει, οὐκ ἔστι κτλ. Bailey proposed: ὅτῳ δὲ τοῦτο μὴ ὑπάρχει, οὐ ζῇ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως <καὶ ὅτῳ ἐκεῖνο μὴ> ὑπάρχει οὐκ ἔστι κτλ.\textsuperscript{72} I must admit that I find none of the suggestions completely convincing. More attractive is the recent suggestion by Walter Lapini which the future editor of the Epicurea will have to take into consideration.\textsuperscript{73} Lapini noted that the phrase reinserted in the first part of the maxim (οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως) coincides strikingly with the phrase in the second part which, however, poses

\textsuperscript{69} Smith, ‘Quotations’, 191.

\textsuperscript{70} Hermann Usener, Epicurea (Leipzig: Teubner, 1887 repr. 1967).

\textsuperscript{71} Ettore Bignone, Epicuro. Opere, frammenti, testimonianze sulla vita, tradotti con introduzione e commento (Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1920), p. 57 n. 4 and ‘Studi critici sulle Κύριαι δόξαι e sulla vita di Epicuro’, Aegyptus 13 (1933), 419–42, esp. 419–28.


\textsuperscript{73} Walter Lapini, ‘Note laerziane (D.L. 1.12, 8.48, 10.2, 10.5, 10.7–9, 10.9, 10.11, 10.124, 10.140)’, Sileno, 37 (2011), 207–17, esp. 216–7.
greater difficulty, οὐ ζῇ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει. He asks, accordingly, whether or not we have a case of two phrases that are really the same phrase that has migrated from one place to another but became further corrupted in the new position, ‘io mi chiedo se non siano (due frasi) uguali, anzi se non si tratti della stessa frase, migrata da una parte all’altra e, nella nuova posizione, ulteriormente corrotta.’ In this light, Lapini suggests removing the words οὐ ζῇ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει (correcting οὐ ζῇ to οὐδὲ) from the second part to the position in the first part of the maxim where Gassendi made his addition <οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως>. This gives us:

οὔκ ἔστιν ἡδέως ζῆν ἄνευ τοῦ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως,
οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει ἄνευ τοῦ ἡδέως.
ὁτῷ δὲ τοῦτο μὴ ὑπάρχει, οὔκ ἔστι τοῦτον ἡδέως ζῆν.

It is not possible to live pleasantly if one does not live with wisdom, honesty and justice, and one can not live with wisdom, honesty and justice, if one does not live pleasantly. It is impossible for a person who does not have that to live pleasantly.74

Conclusion

To sum up, then, in dealing with a work like the Lives of the Philosophers, which makes heavy use of quotations from source materials that are mostly extant (if at all) in a fragmentary state or merely paralleled in such fluctuating traditions as that of the Greek gnomologia, the editor should aim at restoring the quoted texts as they were ‘received’ by the author of the work being edited and not the original state of the sources quoted. The editor must avoid falling into the trap of mixing traditions and forgetting which text he or she is actually editing.

74 The translation is inspired by that of Lapini, 217: ‘Non è possibile vivere beatamente senza il vivere con senno, onestà e giustizia, né si dà il vivere con senno, onestà e giustizia senza il vivere beatamente. Chi non ha questo, non è possibile che viva beatamente.’
In conclusion, I hope that my reflections on the interactions between the *Lives* of Diogenes Laertius and the vast gnomological literature, both in terms of *Quellenforschung* and of the use of the evidence of this tradition for the *constitutio textus* of the *Lives*, have given you a sufficient idea of the criteria I have adopted as the editor of the ten books of Diogenes Laertius, and perhaps convinced you of their suitability, as well as shown the profitable use to which I have put this parallel tradition.
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The Editing of Medieval Latin Commentary Texts: Problems and Perspectives

Frank Coulson

The editor of classical Latin texts, be they poetry or prose, must confront a number of difficulties. His text may be transmitted in manuscripts that range chronologically from the late antique period through to the Renaissance, and they may be written in such widely divergent hands as Rustic capitals, Beneventan, Gothic or humanistic minuscule. It may be relatively easy for the editor to classify his manuscripts into distinct families, thus demonstrating that the text flowed down to us in clear channels or streams, and he may choose to employ the stemmatic method developed by Karl Lachmann in drawing up his stemma codicum. Or it may be the case that the channels that transmitted the text from late antiquity are so interconnected and muddied, to carry on our metaphor, by the

This lecture was given 27 September 2012 at Stockholm University.

1 This article is a revised version of my Ars edendi lecture. I am most grateful to Erika Kihlman and the members of the group for their many kindnesses during my visit and for their stimulating comments. I have profited from the work of David T. Gura who is currently editing Arnulf of Orléans's glosses to the Metamorphoses. I am also most grateful to Marjorie Curry Woods, David T. Gura, and Anna Grotans for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article.


process of contamination that it is difficult to see how the manuscripts are divided into distinct families. But the editor of a classical Latin work usually can rely upon a relatively stable text; while there may be divergences in individual textual readings, word order, and omissions of paragraphs or sometimes longer sections, the text does not, in most instances, vary widely from copy to copy.

Medieval Latin commentary texts on classical authors such as Ovid, Virgil and Lucan, present the editor with complex and vexing problems peculiar to the genre. Commentary texts were by their nature rather amorphous and subject to variation and change. They were used in the classroom by multiple masters, sometimes over a span of years, and they suffered accretions, deletions, or wilful alterations depending on the needs of the master teaching a particular course. The present article seeks to explore some of the problems confronting the editor of such commentary texts and to offer readers concrete examples of how to produce a readable modern edition. My examples are culled primarily from the Latin commentary tradition on Ovid and stem from my editing work on the two major medieval commentators on the Metamorphoses, Arnulf of Orléans and the anonymous author of the Vulgate Commentary.


The Mise-en-page of the Commentary

In general, commentary texts were transmitted in two formats: first, the catena format (from the Latin noun *catena*, meaning a linking or a chain);\(^5\) and second, the gloss or scholion format, wherein the commentary is transmitted as a series of interlinear or marginal comments surrounding the text of the poem which is itself positioned in the center of the folio. Commentaries transmitted in the catena format usually place greater weight or emphasis on the commentary (in modern parlance, one might say it ‘privileges’ the commentary text), while commentaries that are transmitted as interlinear and marginal glosses tend to serve as ancillary or ‘meta-texts’; in the latter instance, the *mise-en-page* of the manuscript gives pride of place to the classical Latin text that is being explicated.

Let us turn to see what bearing these two formats, the catena and the scholion, have for the editor. The commentary of Arnulf of Orléans on the *Metamorphoses* (composed ca. 1180) in its earliest exemplars is always transmitted in the catena format: Figure 1 reproduces a folio from one of the earliest manuscripts (Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. Lat. XIV.222 (4007), fol. 36r), where one can clearly see that the text of the commentary is transmitted with lemma (the words from the text of the poem) followed by commentary. It is possible to draw some general conclusions about the use of the catena format, at least as it can be applied to the school tradition on the *Metamorphoses*. The earliest commentaries, so from 1100 to around 1220, are all transmitted in catena format, separate from a text of the poem. They all seem to come

out of monastic or cathedral schools. The other great period for the catena format can be found in later 14th- and 15th-century Italy where many 12th-century French commentaries are taken up again and copied under the name of an Italian humanist. Commentaries transmitted in the catena format have the great advantage of presenting a stable and relatively clear text. The one feature of the format which at times causes the editor certain consternation is that the individual lemma is written in highly abbreviated or truncated form, making it at times unclear which of two variant readings found in the textual tradition may be intended.

Commentaries may also be transmitted in scholion format as interlinear and marginal glosses surrounding the text of the poem. In many instances, the commentary exists in a single copy used by an individual teacher at a particular period. In other instances, the commentary may exist in multiple exemplars, as is the case with the so-called Vulgate Commentary. Figure 2 reproduces the opening folio from Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPL 95 and illustrates how the commentary is physically laid out in the manuscript when transmitted as scholia. The text of the *Metamorphoses* is placed in the center of each folio, with the commentary enveloping the text of the poem as interlinear and marginal gloss (usually in three columns). The interlinear gloss and the marginal gloss serve very marked and varied functions. The interlinear gloss tends to be short, often a single word,
placed immediately above the word it explicates. Usually, there is no lemma attached, since the position of the gloss above the word it explicates serves as a marker. The marginal gloss is most often positioned in the margin close to the line of text it explicates and is accompanied by the lemma, the words of the text of the poem that it explicates. In such a format, the reader’s eye and attention remain focused on the text of the poem; the commentary truly serves an ancillary function to facilitate the reader’s understanding. This particular layout, which dominated the exegetical landscape from 1230 to 1400, presents the editor with problems distinct from the catena format. First, the glosses can often be crammed into the margins of the manuscript making it very difficult to locate particular glosses. Secondly, sometimes the interlinear and marginal gloss is copied into a pre-existing text manuscript of the *Metamorphoses*, where the individual lemma of the commentary may not correspond to what is transmitted in the original text of the poem.

*Tracking down the Manuscripts*

As every editor knows, part of the difficulty involved in editing a text lies in tracking down the manuscript witnesses. This can be an arduous process, even in the age of the Internet and Google, for the manuscript collections of many, many smaller libraries, and indeed some major collections, lack a catalogue.10 Such is the case, for example, with the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan, an important repository of manuscripts whose riches can only be accessed by the Inventario Ceruti assembled by the then prefect of the library.11 In this

---

10 The principal finding guide for manuscript catalogues is Paul O. Kristeller and Sigrid Krämer, *Latin manuscript books before 1600: a list of the printed catalogues and unpublished inventories of extant collections* (Munich: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1993).

Figure 1 Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. Lat. XIV.222 (4007), fol. 36r.
Figure 2 Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPL 95, f. 2r.
inventory, many of the manuscripts are described in a very, very summary fashion, and so it is often near impossible to tell what is really in the manuscript from the truncated and inadequate descriptions. In the case of medieval commentaries, the potential problems involved in finding the manuscript copies of a text are multiplied. If a commentary is transmitted separately from the text of the poem, so in catena format, it may only be identified in the printed or handwritten catalogue as a commentary on Ovid, most often with no incipit of the commentary provided. In cases where the commentary is transmitted as a series of interlinear and marginal glosses to the poem, the cataloguer of the manuscript may not mention such ancillary and accretive materials. Or if the additional materials are alluded to, it is generally in a rather perfunctory manner.

An extremely instructive example of this tendency can be found in the catalogue to the manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses* (and its two supplements) published by Franco Munari. Entry number 105 of the catalogue, describing a manuscript now in the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel with the shelf mark Cod. Guelf. 5.4. Aug. 4° lists the contents as ‘Metamorphoses with marginal notes and four prologues.’ A closer examination reveals that this manuscript actually has the commentary of a known French commentator on Ovid, William of Thiegiis (extant in three manuscripts), the allegories of Arnulf of Orléans (extant in multiple copies), John of Garland’s allegorical poem on the *Metamorphoses* called the *In tegumenta Ovidii*

---


(also extant in multiple copies),\textsuperscript{15} an \textit{accessus} to the \textit{Metamorphoses}\textsuperscript{16} extant in numerous copies, and one final unedited \textit{accessus} to Ovid.\textsuperscript{17} None of this can be deduced from the laconic manuscript description.

One other problem I have had to come to terms with in tracking down the witnesses relates to the placement of ancillary materials within a manuscript, for scribes often copy these exegetical and explicative texts in various places. Introductory prologues can be written at the beginning of a text or at the end (sometimes it depends on where there was blank space left in the manuscript). In the case of allegories on the poem, as is the case with the works produced by Arnulf of Orléans, John of Garland, or Giovanni del Virgilio, the allegories are sometimes transmitted as a whole and continuously, or they are sometimes separated and placed beside the story of the \textit{Metamorphoses} that they allegorize. Further, sometimes the work of important commentators lies embedded within another commentary. Often, commentaries may be transmitted acephally, without a beginning, and so important copies can be missed. Lastly, many humanists take over earlier French commentaries on the \textit{Metamorphoses} (particularly those of the 12th century), attributing them to themselves.\textsuperscript{18}

\textit{Problems of Palaeography}

The editor of a classical Latin text will need good palaeographical skills, but he usually has the one advantage that his text has been

\textsuperscript{15} For a complete list of the manuscripts of the \textit{Integumenta Ovidii} (with bibliography) see Coulson and Roy, \textit{Incipitarium}, no. 333.

\textsuperscript{16} See Coulson and Roy, \textit{Incipitarium}, no. 271.

\textsuperscript{17} See Coulson and Roy, \textit{Incipitarium}, no. 450.

\textsuperscript{18} An extreme example of this tendency can be found in the commentary to the \textit{Metamorphoses} attributed to the 15th-century humanist Damiano da Paolo, extant in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5222, which is actually a verbatim copy of Arnulf of Orléans's glosses. Karsten Friis-Jensen noted this very problem in an edition of a commentary on Horace's \textit{Ars poetica} attributed to Paolo da Perugia in a late manuscript, though the commentary is in fact of 12th-century French origin. See his 'Horace and the Early Writers of Arts of Poetry', in \textit{Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter}, ed. by Sten Ebbesen (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1995), pp. 360–401.
edited before, and therefore collations of many of the manuscripts and a working text will be available. In the case of medieval commentaries on classical authors, this is rarely if ever the case. For the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, only the allegorical explications to the poem have received any attention, while the vast majority of commentaries remain in manuscript.\textsuperscript{19} Indeed the only two commentaries with editions are those of William of Orléans (ca. 1200) and my own edition of selections from the Vulgate Commentary.\textsuperscript{20} Editors tackling commentary texts are therefore in virtual virgin territory, and their Latin and paleographical skills should be up to the task. In the case of the Vulgate commentary, nearly all the manuscripts are written in a French or Italian Gothic textualis hand, but one that is very, very abbreviated and compact, so that it is very easy to transcribe incorrectly or misinterpret an abbreviation. Commentary texts themselves often contain abbreviations peculiar to the genres (\textit{m.} = \textit{mons}; \textit{c.} = \textit{civitas}; \textit{contio} = \textit{continuatio}) or are replete with unusual syntax that reflects their origins as classroom texts.

Are there ways of ensuring that the transcription of the text from the manuscripts will be as accurate as possible? There are a couple of things that the prospective editor can do to obviate potential errors. First, with texts that are hitherto unedited, I always try to make my initial transcription from the clearest manuscript copy, and from the one that is the easiest to read. In my initial transcription, I note all places where the expansion of the abbreviation may be unclear. When I move to collate the second copy of the text against the first transcription, I always double check when my second transcription yields a reading different from the first, for it is possible that I have

\textsuperscript{19} The allegories of Arnulf of Orléans are edited in Ghisalberti, ‘Arnolfo d'Orléans’, while the allegories of Giovanni del Virgilio have been edited in Fausto Ghisalberti, ‘Giovanni del Virgilio espositore delle Metamorfosi’ *Giornale dantesco*, 34 (1933), 3–110.

mistranscribed the abbreviation in my first manuscript. One other trick that was particularly helpful in editing Arnulf’s commentary was the following: one of the manuscripts of the commentary was written in a very clear Italian script of the 15th century with very few abbreviations (or certainly far fewer than is found in 13th-century Gothic), and in several instances I discovered that the transcription in the manuscripts in Gothic hand had been misunderstood due to an abbreviation.21

Two Case Studies: Arnulf of Orléans and The Vulgate Commentary

Let us now turn our attention to the two commentaries on the Metamorphoses that were the most influential during the medieval period (namely, the commentary of Arnulf of Orléans and the Vulgate Commentary) and explore some of the inherent difficulties confronting the scholar in editing their works. My observations are based primarily on editions of the commentaries I produced in 1993 and 1991 respectively.22

Arnulf of Orléans wrote his explanations of the Metamorphoses to serve as a sort of complete commentary on the poem. For each book of the poem, he wrote a Table of Transformations, then a philological explanation of that book, and finally an allegorical exposition of each story. Book One’s threefold explanation was followed by that for Book Two and so on. In the earliest manuscripts, this threefold outline is adhered to consistently, and the glosses are always written in catena format. In the later manuscripts of the late 13th and 14th centuries, this format is violated, and the allegories and the glosses circulate separately, with the glosses most often transmitted as marginal and

---

21 I refer to manuscript Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5222.
interlinear glosses surrounding a text of the poem. This rather unusual transmission history has implications for the editing of the text.

Let us look at a portion of the text of the commentary as it appears in a catena format. The section of the commentary reproduced treats *Met.* 1.76–81 and is transcribed from Munich, *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*, Clm 7205, fol. 30rb). For the sake of clarity, I have placed the lemma for each comment in caps:

SANCTIUS positis illis que propter hominem creata sunt subiungit creationem hominis ALTE MENTIS id est rationis IN CETERA creata SIVE ILLE duas ponit opiniones de creatione hominis quod aut a deo creatus sit aut a Promoteo plasmatus et per ignem a sole raptum uiuificatus ORIGO MUNDI MELIORIS id est efficiens causa mundi ab eo meliorati COGNATI quia de eadem massa fuerunt facti QUAM simplex est relatio ad quam mixtam ...

*More holy: having placed those things which were created for man, he adds the creation of man. Of a lofty mind: that is reason; over the rest: created; whether he: He places two opinions about the creation of man, that he was either created by God or formed by Prometheus and brought to life through the fire stolen from the sun; the origin of a better world, that is the efficient cause of the world improved by him; relation, since they had been formed from the same mass; which, a simple relation to which mixed material...*

In catena format, the commentary text is relatively clear and ordered, and the lemma for each gloss can be clearly deduced since it immediately precedes the commentary text.

This rather simple and easy-to-follow layout becomes more complex in later copies of the commentary where the glosses are copied as marginal and interlinear glosses around a text of the poem.

---

No longer is the commentary copied in a straightforward linear sequence; rather, each gloss is placed separately, interlinearly or in the margins of the manuscript, and the lemma for each gloss must at times be deduced by the editor from the text of the poem placed in the center of the manuscript page.

With the case of Arnulf’s glosses, then, the editor will have to take into account two quite distinct transmission formats. The manuscripts in catena format are of an earlier date and therefore closer to the production of the commentary (around 1180). They also have the distinct advantage of being written in a continuous and clear format. Later copies of the glosses are nearly always transmitted as marginal and interlinear glosses surrounding a text of the poem. This format causes the editor greater difficulty in extracting the actual text of Arnulf’s commentary, and often these glosses have been subject to minor variations in wording to accommodate the new context. However, it is my experience that sometimes these later manuscripts (of the 13th and 14th centuries) will contain readings that are correct and therefore they cannot be totally ignored in any projected edition.

The earliest manuscript copies of Arnulf’s commentary also remain true to authorial intention in that they transmit philological and allegorical glosses together for each book. Later 13th- and 14th-century manuscripts violate this structure in that philological gloss and allegorical gloss have become separated and are transmitted as two quite independent entities. The editor of Arnulf’s commentary, then, will have to decide how he wishes to reproduce the commentary for the modern reader: does he wish to recreate the author’s original layout, or will he produce separate editions for the allegories and philological glosses? Fausto Ghisalberti, for example, produced a separate edition for the *Allegorie* which, while violating the transmission history of the text, remains to date the standard edition of the text of the allegories.24

In the case of the Vulgate Commentary, we are in a slightly different situation. The Vulgate Commentary was produced in the Loire Valley area of Northern France about 1250. On the basis of the source material used in the commentary, I posit that the commentary was probably produced at Orléans, but there is nothing in the

24 See Ghisalberti, ‘Arnolfo’.
manuscripts which can prove this supposition. Unlike the commentary of Arnulf, where there is clear evidence for the author, the author of the Vulgate Commentary has eluded detection, and indeed it may be the case that the Vulgate Commentary represents a compilation of earlier commentaries on the poem that were brought together at a certain point and became canonical.

The original discoverer of the Vulgate Commentary knew of four manuscript copies. I have now increased this number to 22 manuscript copies, and I have collated the text of the commentary for all manuscript copies for Book One. From this initial collation, certain conclusions about the relationships of the manuscripts became immediately clear:

1. No catena copies of the Vulgate Commentary exist. The fact that all copies of the text of the commentary are transmitted as marginal and interlinear glosses does create some difficulties in determining the actual lemma for each gloss. This problem stems from the fact that in some instances the Vulgate Commentary is copied into a manuscript which transmits a text of the *Metamorphoses* that is different from the one used in the Vulgate Commentary, and therefore in some manuscript copies one will find a gloss of the Vulgate Commentary linked to a text of the poem which has an alternative reading, and one not appropriate to the commentary.

2. All manuscripts transmit a quite stable text of the Vulgate Commentary. There are, as one might expect, some copies in which individual glosses are left out, and there are some manuscripts in which the commentary has suffered truncation. The marginal commentary is nearly always stable in the manuscripts, but the interlinear gloss is slightly more prone to alteration, and this takes place particularly in two manuscripts, namely the Ambrosiana

---

25 Arnulf provides his name and place of execution of the commentary as a sort of sphragis to his gloss on *Met.* 15.879.
manuscript (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, P 43 sup.) and the Riccardiana manuscript (Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 624).

3. A close collation of the manuscript copies revealed, perhaps somewhat surprisingly, that one could divide the manuscripts into two distinct families, and it was clearly evident that at least one manuscript, that housed in Cambridge (Sidney Sussex College 5 [delta.1.5]), was a codex descriptus, a direct copy of the Ambrosiana manuscript (Ambros. P 43 sup.). I should hasten to add that these two distinct families of manuscripts could be determined both by variant readings in the manuscripts and on the basis of omissions and physical aspects of the transmission of the text.28

The stemma codicum reproduced below provides a schematic overview of the manuscript families and relationships:

\[\text{Diagram}\]

28 I have discussed these relationships in my dissertation. See Coulson, 'A Study of the Vulgate Commentary', pp. 48-66.
One further question, an important one, remains to be dealt with: in the case of two manuscripts, namely A, the Ambrosiana manuscript (Ambros. P 43 sup.), and V, the Vatican manuscript (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1598), the text of the commentary has been heavily altered and corrected by a second hand. In A, the alterations are nearly always variant readings imported into the manuscript from the alpha tradition, namely manuscripts VSW. In the case of the correcting hand in manuscript V, the Vatican manuscript, the corrections are more complex, and they usually reveal an attempt by a later 14th-century reader of the manuscript to correct and make sense of a faulty transmitted text of the commentary where the archetype of the text of the commentary seems to be wrong. These corrections are of two primary types: in some cases, the later reader is just exasperated by the nonsense transmitted by the Vulgate Commentary and deletes the problem text by erasure. This must have been an emotionally very satisfying action but not one that led to an improved text of the commentary. Secondly, in many instances, the later correcting hand in V wilfully alters the text of the commentary to give a reading that yields some sense. In my view these alterations have not been imported from a now lost manuscript of the Vulgate Commentary but rather represent the attempts of the corrector to bring some comprehension to the text of the commentary. So the editor must determine the degree to which such corrections should be admitted into the edited text. In general, I have favored a conservative approach, and where the alteration involves only a word or a minor
alteration, I have printed the correction of V, noting any reservations I may have in the *apparatus criticus*; but where the text of the commentary has been much more wilfully tampered with, I note V’s correction in the *apparatus criticus* but do not admit it into the text of the commentary.

Also, in editing the Vulgate Commentary I have strenuously attempted not to hypercorrect, that is to say, not to correct the errors of the commentator. Often medieval commentators are led astray or are just wrong, and I have alerted the reader to such infelicities in notes at the back of the edition.

It is all very well to speak of these topics in the abstract, but let us look at several concrete pages of text to see what such a stemmatic edition will look like on the printed page. One must recall that one of the real difficulties in editing medieval commentaries lies in the transmigration of a medieval *mise-en-page* to a modern one, in that the medieval layout of the text of the poem and glosses was devised to facilitate reference between the two, and often interlinear gloss is closely linked with marginal gloss, so that the reading will begin between the line and then carry over into the margin. Also it is evident that much thought was given by the scribe to the actual layout of the commentary on the page, since in general the comments are situated close to the text of the poem they explicate. Only in the case of very, very long glosses, usually such comments as allegories, is the gloss situated at the top or bottom of the page where there was more space for expansion.

Figure 3 reproduces a sample edited text slightly modified from my 1982 dissertation showing how we have transmuted the layout of the manuscript page to the modern text page. I draw your attention to the following:
20. MOLLIA aer et ignis; DVRIS cum terra et aqua;
SINE PONDERE cum haec quae erant, vellicet aeret
et ignis; HABENCIA PONDYS terrae et aqua

Mollia cum donis, mollia ignis et aer cum donis
cum aqua et terra, quae duras dicuntur quia duratur
aqua in grandinem et glacie et aqua transit in
terram, sicut ipsa dicit in ultimo per Octogenarium:

[ ] Tellus glomerata cogit tur unda [ ] Vel quia unda
causat lapidem.

21. HANC hec sic discordantia. ET pro id est;

NATVRA natura creans que melior est. DIREMIT
divinit.

-V per Melior natura id est efficacior et operosior. Vel
ras. X melior natura elementorum quae ad hoc laborabat at

<ae>pararentur. Vel melior natura id est magis
faciens quam anima. Vel melior id est meliorans.

Vel melior quae prius.

5-6 lat. 15.266-267

__________________________________________________________________________________

13 quae] quia X 13-14 duratur aqua \( \downarrow \); duratur alti \( \downarrow \) aqua (alt.) om. X 16-17 vel
quia ...lapidem om. V per ras. 22 quae] quia X adhibec X 23 pararentur RN; pararentur X;
quid B, non liquet

Figure 3 Page from Coulson diss. 1982
1. Interlinear gloss and marginal gloss from the manuscript page have been differentiated by the use of capital letters and italics. So the interlinear gloss for each line is provided first, with the lemma in caps, followed by the interlinear gloss. Below that line, I reproduce the marginal comment or comments for each line. Line numbering is keyed to Richard Tarrant’s recently published OCT text.\textsuperscript{29}

2. Each page contains text of the commentary, then an \textit{apparatus fontium} (when needed), followed by an \textit{apparatus criticus}. When a manuscript or group of manuscripts seems to be missing an entire gloss, I have indicated this in the margin. In the rare instance where one of the manuscripts truncates a gloss (as is the case with the Wolfenbüttel manuscript, Cod. Guelf. 123 Gud. Lat. 2° [X]), I usually append this at the bottom of the page in an \textit{apparatus} beneath the \textit{apparatus fontium}.

3. The orthography reproduced in the edited commentary text follows medieval and not classical conventions. In general I have followed the spelling conventions of V, the Vatican manuscript (Vat. lat. 1598).

4. Punctuation has been added to clarify the reading of the commentary text, and so I have probably punctuated the commentary text more than one would find in the manuscript copy. I have also capitalized proper nouns, etc. in order to facilitate the reader’s comprehension.

What can one say about such an edition, which reproduces readings of all witnesses? First and foremost, that it requires a great deal of time and effort to produce, since all copies of the text are collated, in itself an arduous task, one that it is very wearisome to the eye, and which only the young should venture upon (\textit{experto credel!}). Secondly, that the stemmatic method does produce a relatively good final result, since errors in any single manuscript or groups of manuscripts are corrected with help from the alternative manuscript family.

In editing the Vulgate Commentary for the Toronto Medieval Latin Text Series (TMLT), I employed a second approach that approximates the *codex optimus* method, advocated particularly by Bédier for the editing of French vernacular texts.\(^{30}\) The editorial principles on which texts are edited for the TMLT series are clearly put forward by the general editor George Rigg in the Preface to each edition:

Editions in this series are usually based on one MS only, with a minimum of textual *apparatus*; emendations are made only where the text fails to make sense, not in order to restore the author’s original version. The effect is to produce a ‘scribal version’ of a text—a version that was acceptable to its scribe and was read and understood by medieval readers.

Critics have responded to these editorial principles with less than overwhelming enthusiasm.\(^{31}\) Nevertheless, editing the commentary according to the principles developed by George Rigg seemed to me to have several distinct advantages for the editor:

1. The cost of the text was quite minimal, and so unlike current editions from Brill which often run in the neighborhood of 250 to 300 dollars, the Toronto series made accessible an important commentary on the *Metamorphoses* for 10 dollars Canadian.

2. Since I had examined all of the manuscripts of the commentary in my 1982 dissertation from Toronto, I had a relatively firm overview of the manuscript tradition and the merits of each family of manuscripts.

3. The text of the Vulgate Commentary as presented in the Toronto Medieval Latin Text edition does not adhere slavishly to the single manuscript chosen, and it does allow for choice of reading and emendation when absolutely necessary.


4. In adherence to the dictates of the general editor Rigg, the edition reproduced for the reader is a close approximation of a version of the commentary which circulated during the later 13th century, so at a date relatively close to its composition. The reality is that the text of the commentary as printed did not differ in many respects from that printed in my dissertation, where all known manuscripts were used. The major difference is, of course, that the dissertation allowed for a relatively full *apparatus criticus*, whereas the Toronto series, given its economies, did not provide one.

Let us turn therefore to look at a page from the Toronto Medieval Latin Text edition to see how the layout and presentation of the text of the commentary differed from that found in the 1982 dissertation. Figure 4 reproduces pages 78–9 from *The Vulgate Commentary on Ovid’s Metamorphoses: The Creation Myth and the Story of Orpheus*. The commentary text is set up as follows: the text of the *Metamorphoses* as transmitted in Sélestat, Bibliothèque humaniste, MS 92 is reproduced on the left side of the page following medieval orthography. The interlinear gloss is represented above the text of the *Metamorphoses* with a letter of the alphabet, due to the fact that when the edition was produced computers were not sufficiently advanced to allow us to reproduce the gloss immediately above the text. On the right-hand side of the page, the marginal comment is reproduced, keyed to the line number of the text. Rather than having an *apparatus fontium*, as was the case with my 1982 dissertation, there is a series of running comments at the bottom of the commentary text which serve both to identify sources and to clarify certain aspects of the commentary text for the reader.
Proceeding in the Vulgate Commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, pp. 78–9

**Figure 4 Coulson, The Vulgate Commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Pp. 78–9**

---
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Conclusion

In this article, therefore, I have attempted to outline some of the problems inherent in the editing of medieval commentaries. As we have seen, the problems reside in various and multiple areas: the actual format of the transmission of the commentary, namely is the text transmitted as a catena commentary or as interlinear and marginal gloss in a text manuscript of the poem? Is the text of the commentary relatively stable, as was the case with the Vulgate Commentary, or does it vary widely depending on the circumstances of copying, and so presents a relatively fluid text? How best to deal with questions of punctuation, orthography, and capitalization? (A point which there was not space to elaborate on in this article.) What is the best way of transmigrating the manuscript mise-en-page of the commentary to a modern edited page layout? Should one reproduce a text of the Metamorphoses to which the reader can refer, particularly for the interlinear gloss? Or is it better to reproduce lemma and gloss, separating interlinear gloss from longer marginal gloss on the layout of the page?
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