

OXFORD MEDIEVAL TEXTS (OMT)

STYLE SHEET

1. *The Series*

Oxford Medieval Texts, published by the Oxford University Press, is a series of scholarly editions of important Latin texts pertinent to the cultural history of medieval Europe. It is the aim of the series to provide critical texts together with adequate apparatus, full historical commentary, and precise modern English translations.

The General Editors, and the Publishing Editor at Oxford University Press, are as listed on a separate sheet.

All these are ready to give advice to prospective and contracted editors or to anyone interested in OMT. General inquiries should be addressed in the first instance to the Oxford-based General Editor.

2. *Procedure for Making a Proposal*

If, after consultation with the Oxford-based General Editor, there is agreement that a particular text would make a desirable addition to OMT, the formal procedure is normally as follows. The prospective editor is asked in the first instance to submit a written proposal consisting of the following elements.

(a) A brief general statement concerning the historical importance of the text in question, and why it should be published in the OMT format, i.e. with parallel text and translation.

(b) A list of extant manuscripts, listing the principal manuscripts on which the edition will be based and explaining why these have been chosen.

(c) A statement of editorial policy on orthography.

(d) A detailed explanation, perhaps extending to ten or fifteen pages if necessary, of how the principal manuscripts are related, and how the critical edition will be constructed. The nature of the edition envisaged should be explained, e.g. whether it is aiming to be a reconstruction of hypothetical authorial intention, the reproduction of an autograph manuscript, or the reproduction of a 'principal' or sole surviving MS representative. Prospective editors are therefore requested to collate significant portions of text in relevant manuscript witnesses, in order to determine precisely the manuscripts' relationships, before submitting a proposal. Without such a statement of how and why the manuscripts are related, the specimen apparatus criticus mentioned in (e) below will be unintelligible. Further guidance on the apparatus is given in an Appendix at the end of this document.

(e) A specimen, consisting of not fewer than ten pages of text, together with accompanying apparatus criticus, historical notes, and English translation, all in conformity with the instructions of this style sheet.

(f) A rough estimate of length in words and a (very approximate) date of delivery.

The General Editors will then adjudicate the written proposal and, provided they are satisfied that such an edition is desirable, will submit a proposal on behalf of the editor to the Delegates of the Oxford University Press. If the proposal is accepted by the Delegates, the editor will in normal circumstances be offered a contract with the OUP. No expenses or royalties are payable, but the editor or editors of a volume will each receive six free copies on publication.

The editor of a text which has been accepted in this way is asked to maintain close contact with the Oxford-based General Editor so that problems of any sort can be identified and dealt with at an early stage. When the edition is complete, the typescript is to be submitted to him. Every care is taken of typescripts, but neither the General Editors nor the Publisher can offer an absolute guarantee against loss; editors should therefore retain in safe keeping a duplicate of the typescript submitted.

For the preparation of the typescript, see section 10 below.

3. *Format of OMT Editions*

The completed typescript should be laid out so as to include the following:

- title page
- preface and/or acknowledgements (if necessary)
- table of contents
- list of illustrations
- list of abbreviated titles or references, headed 'Abbreviated References'
- Introduction
- footnotes to the Introduction
- list of sigla of manuscripts
- Latin text
- English translation
- apparatus criticus to the Latin text
- general notes to text and translation
- appendices (if required)
- list of concordances with earlier editions (if required)
- bibliography, divided into primary and secondary sources
- indexes of manuscripts referred to, of biblical allusions, of classical and medieval allusions, and a general index.

4. *Introduction*

The essential ingredients of the Introduction are an account of the author, historical setting, date, nature, and value of the work; in addition, it must contain an account of the manuscripts on which the edition is based, together with a clear explanation of how the manuscripts are related and the principles on which the text has been constructed. Footnotes are to be numbered consecutively throughout the entire Introduction as indicated above, and submitted on separate sheets at the end of it.

5. *Latin Text and Apparatus Criticus*

In general the editorial conventions of OMT are those normally in use by editors of medieval Latin texts. A statement of editorial policy on orthography should, however, be made as noted above in 2(c). In any event, manuscript abbreviations are to be expanded silently. Note that abbreviations for the *nomina sacra* IHS and XPS are to be expanded as Iesus and Christus. Note, however, that we require lower-case *u* and upper-case *V*; *i* and not *j* (except in the case of roman numerals (see below)). Editorial practice in the face of scribal inconsistencies should be discussed at an early stage with the appropriate General Editor.

Except in cases that will be obvious, e.g. sums of money or bags of wool, roman numerals should be spelt out if under 100, e.g. *quattuor*, not *iiii^{or}*. Numerals within the text should be preceded and followed by a point, e.g. .ccxxiv. (And note too that in roman numerals *v* and not *u* is used.)

Capitalization, punctuation, and paragraphing will normally be according to modern conventions except in special circumstances; for example, when (as in the case of Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*) the edition is based on an autograph manuscript and the manuscript punctuation is demonstrably that of the author himself. Note that forms of *Deus* and *Dominus* are capitalized where reference is to the Christian deity. Quotation marks rather than italics are used for quotations. Single quotation marks are normally used; double quotation marks are used only for a quotation within a

quotation. Verse texts should be numbered continuously in fives [i.e. every fifth line] throughout. The line numbers should then be inserted at the appropriate points in the corresponding English translation, sequestered with square brackets: [5], [10] etc. in order to facilitate comparison with the Latin. The numbering of paragraphs in prose texts is left to the discretion of the editor; in cases where such numbering differs substantially from that of previous editions it may be helpful to print a concordance. The paragraphing of the English translation must be made to correspond precisely to that of the Latin prose text. The following sigla are used to indicate editorial intervention in the text, supported as appropriate by notes in the apparatus criticus:

[] to indicate editorial addition;

< > to indicate damage in the manuscript (to be used only in cases where the edition is based on a single manuscript);

* * * to indicate a lacuna in the text;

†† to indicate a passage so desperately corrupt that the editor is unable to suggest a conjectural reconstruction.

Editorial deletion: when, in the editor's opinion, a transmitted word or passage derives, not from the author, but from later scribal interference, the word or passage in question should simply be removed from the text and its removal recorded in the apparatus criticus. Note that a word or passage to be deleted in this way is in no circumstances to be sequestered with square brackets [], as was the practice until quite recently with classical texts, or with braces { }.

The apparatus criticus is to be keyed to the Latin text by means of italic superscript letters (^{a b c}) following the lemma for which a variant is to be recorded. In cases where the textual lemma is more than one word, the extent of the lemma can be identified by a superscript letter at the beginning and the end of the passage (^{m-m}). These superscript letters run throughout a particular section of text in the sequence ^{a-z}, then begin again with ^a. (Double and treble exponents, ^{aa}, ^{bbb}, should not be used.) All superscript letters and numbers (indicating apparatus criticus and notes respectively) are to be placed *outside* punctuation, not within it, as in the following example:

et dixit Dominus:^a NOT et dixit Dominus^a:

Note that this method of keying the apparatus to the text is used even in cases of poetic texts for which there is separate line-numbering.

Within the apparatus criticus itself, all editorial comment, including reference to manuscript sigla, is to be printed in italics; only the variant readings are to be given in roman. Conventional abbreviations (such as *om.*, *add.*, or *del.*) should be employed where appropriate, but never in such a way as to compromise clarity for the sake of brevity. All editorial comment in the apparatus criticus is, without exception, to be in English.

6. *English Translation*

The translation is at once an aid to the modern student and an essential part of the editorial process, in that it properly permits the editor to reveal mastery of the text. The aim is a precise rendering in modern idiom and, where practicable, in a style appropriate to the text. Precision is the uppermost consideration, and editors should bear in mind that too 'literal' a rendering may often be the least precise; on the other hand, the translation should enable readers whose command of Latin is insecure to follow the Latin text closely. Place-names should as a rule be given in their modern forms, personal names Anglicized or given in an accepted modern convention (Peter of Blois but Piers Gaveston). Paragraphs should normally start at the same points in both text and translation. Capital letters should be used sparingly: e.g. with titles (kings, popes, bishops, etc.) only when attached to a name: thus King Henry II, *but* king of England *and* Henry II, king of England.

7. *General Notes to Text and Translation*

The function of these is to provide the source of quotations, explanations of obscure phrases or passages, and historical elucidation where relevant. OMT is not shy of quite elaborate notes; but

these are only appropriate when essential to the purpose of the edition, i.e. normally as fundamental commentary, of lasting use in the interpretation of the text.

As far as the identification of sources is concerned, it is the responsibility of each individual editor to identify as much as possible the author's indebtedness to previous authors (not only direct quotations, but also verbal allusions). The task of identification has been greatly facilitated by the availability of electronic databases, and editors of OMT texts should have recourse to these as much as possible or necessary: for patristic authors, the Chadwyck-Healey *Patrologia Latina Database* and the CETEDOC *Library of Christian Latin Texts*; for Classical Latin authors the CETEDOC *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina*; and for poets of all periods, from the beginnings to the twelfth century, the SISMEL *Poetria Nova*.

Where it is necessary to treat a subject at greater length, for example in order to establish a debated piece of chronology, this should be done either in the Introduction or in an Appendix. Editors are advised to look at other OMT volumes which illustrate best practice here, e.g. Diana Greenway's edition of Henry of Huntingdon.

Where the text to be edited contains a large number of references to persons who will need to be identified with repeated references to a body of literature and source material, as for example with a letter collection or historical work or regional or local focus, it is often desirable to make these identifications in a separate prosopographical appendix; for an example of how this may be approached, see *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket* (OMT, 2000).

Do not abbreviate supposedly standard words in the commentary: 'elected', not el.; 'bishop' not 'bp'; 'century', not 'cent.', and so on. OMT texts are aimed at an international audience, not all of whom have English as their first language. County names should also be given in full: 'Gloucestershire', not 'Glos.'.

Notes are keyed to both text and translation by means of superscript numbers which run in sequence through each subdivision of text. In the typescript they should be numbered consecutively through the text/translation and appear at the end on separate sheets as endnotes (not footnotes). Since full versions of the titles cited will appear either in the Abbreviated References or in the Bibliography, citations in notes should use the author's name and short title only.

8. References to Primary and Secondary Sources

These will, of course, occur in the footnotes to the Introduction and the general notes to the text and translation, and it is important that practice should be consistent throughout. The following samples cover the main situations that are likely to arise.

For poetry: give book in lower-case roman numerals, then a point and space, then the line number in Arabic numerals: Vergil, *Aeneid*, vi. 344; Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, xiv. 16.

For prose: for a work which was not divided by its author into books, but for which there are agreed editorial subdivisions, use the sigil 'c.' as follows: Jerome, *De uiris illustribus*, c. 100

For a prose work existing in more than one book, use lower-case roman for the book, Arabic for the subsequent subdivisions: Augustine, *De uera religione*, xxxv. 65. Isidore, *Etymologiae*, vi. 2. 6.

In the case of patristic authors, the references to PL or CSEL or CCSL will follow the specification of book/subdivision and will be enclosed within parentheses. PL references are useful, but should always be accompanied by reference to a more modern edition where one exists: Jerome, *In Ezechielem*, ii (CCSL lxxv. 55–6 = PL xxv. 52); Gregory the Great, *Epistolae*, xi. 56A (MGH *Epistolae*, ii. 337 = PL lxxvii. 1192).

In the citation of saints' Lives, the standard form of citation is [e.g.] *Vita S. Dunstani* [NOT *Vita sancti Dunstani* or *Vita Dunstani*]. The point of inserting the 'S.' is to distinguish the *vita* of a saint from the *vita* of a lay person [e.g. *Vita Ælfredi*].

Note that abbreviations of words in titles are to be avoided.

A note on citing the *Corpus iuris canonici*

1. Use the abbreviation *Decretum*, which should be listed along with the other abbreviated references. Friedberg's edition should be used. Use capital D. for *Distinctio*, capital C. for *Causa*, lower case q. for *quaestio*, lower case c. for *capitulum*.

2. For references in *Prima pars*, do not cite the part, but cite as follows: for *Distinctio XII cap. vi*, use *Decretum*, D. 12 c. 6.

3. For references in *Secunda pars*, do not cite the part, but cite as follows: for *Causa X quaestio iii cap. vii*, use *Decretum*, C. 10 q. 3 c. 7. For the Section *De poenitentia* in *Secunda Pars*, cite as follows: *Decretum*, D. *de pen.* 1 c. 1 etc.

4. For references in *Tertia Pars, De consecratione*, cite as follows: *Decretum*, D. 1 *de cons.* c. 1 etc.

5. For other canon law references:

Decretales Gregorii IX (= Liber Extra): cite as X, thus X. 4. 9. 1

Liber Sextus: VI. 2. 10. 4

Extravagantes Johannis XXII: Extrav. Jo. 1. 3. 5

Extravagantes communes: Extrav. comm. 1. 3. 2

Further guidance on canon law citations can be found in James Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law* (Harlow, 1995), pp. 192–8.

Volume numbers in series or in periodicals are always given in lower-case roman numerals. Citation of part of a volume: iv (2).

For another OMT:

Magna Vita Sancti Hugonis, ed. D. L. Douie and H. Farmer (2 vols., NMT, 1961–2; OMT, 1985), ii. 100.

In titles of articles, all words in the title except names are in lower case:

C. T. Clay, 'The family of Amundeville', *Lincolnshire Architectural and Archaeological Society Reports and Papers*, iii (1948), 109–36, at p. 131.

For a modern monograph: R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 211 and n.

For an essay in a collection of essays by various authors:

M. Lapidge, 'Æthelwold as a scholar and teacher', in B. Yorke, ed., *Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence* (Woodbridge, 1988), pp. 89–117, at 106–7; in text: Lapidge, 'Æthelwold as a scholar', pp. 106–7.

For an essay in a collection by one author: the title of the essay need not be cited: E. John, *Orbis Britanniae and Other Studies* (Leicester, 1966), pp. 154–209. If, however, the essay is included in *Abbreviated References*, it should be cited in full there. For a major lexicon or encyclopedia: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, iii. 2051.

For an unpublished dissertation: L. A. Holford-Strevens, 'Select Commentary on Aulus Gellius, Book 2', D.Phil. thesis (Oxford, 1971).

For the citation of manuscripts: where possible, the origin and date of a manuscript should be specified when it is first mentioned as follows: London, British Library, Royal 15. C. vii (Winchester, s. x²). (Other examples of palaeographical datings might include: s. xi^{2/4}, s. x/xi, or s. x^{ex}.) In the Introduction, this dating system should be succinctly explained for the benefit of inexpert readers. Formulae such as mid-13th–14th centuries may also be applicable. OMT uses 'fo.' for 'folio' and 'folios' followed by 'r' and 'v' for recto and verso, and 'a' and 'b' for columns: thus, 'fo. 78^{ra}'. Note that the indication of recto, verso, and column is superscript.

Biblical references should be taken from the Vulgate. In the English translation, a Vulgate-based version such as the Douai–Reims version as revised by Richard Challoner should be used and

identified in the Introduction. References should take the form ‘Gen. 2: 2’. If numerous, they should be abbreviated as follows:

Gen. Exod. Lev. Num. Deut. Josh.
Judg. Ruth 1 Kgs. (1 Sam.) 2 Kgs. (2 Sam.) 3 Kgs. (1 Kgs.) 4 Kgs. (2 Kgs.)
1 Chr. 2 Chr. 1 Esd. (Ezra) 2 Esd. (Neh.) Tobias¹ Judith
Esther² Job Ps.³ Prov. Eccles. S. of S.
Wisd. Eccclus. Isa. Jer. Lam. Baruch
Ezek. Dan.⁴ Hos. Joel Amos Obad.
Jonah Mic. Nahum Hab. Zeph. Hag.
Zech. Mal. 1 Macc. 2 Macc. Matt. Mark
Luke John Acts Rom. 1 Cor. 2 Cor.
Gal. Eph. Phil. Col. 1 Thess. 2 Thess.
1 Tim. 2 Tim. Titus Philem. Heb. Jas.
1 Pet. 2 Pet. 1 John 2 John 3 John Jude
Rev. 3 Esd. (1 Esd.) 4 Esd. (2 Esd.) Pr. Of Man.

¹ Since Tobias and Tobit represent different recensions, there is seldom any point in adding a cross-reference to the latter.

² Add AV reference as appropriate: (Rest of) Esth. 11: 2.

³ Plural Pss. Add AV reference as appropriate: Ps. 44 (45): 2 (1).

⁴ Add AV references as appropriate: Dan. 3: 88 (S. of III Ch. 66); Dan. 3 (91) (24); Dan. 13: 17 (Sus. 17); Dan. 13: 65 (Bel & Dr. 1).

Note that in such cases as ‘1 Kgs. (1 Sam.)’ the parenthetic element is part of the abbreviation and must be included.

Abbreviations are used for works cited frequently, but should normally give the author’s name and be readily identifiable. Initials should only be used for standard abbreviations: NMT, OMT for this series; HBS, HMC, MGH, PL, RS, etc.; in these cases, as in ‘MS’, capitals without full points are normally used. Series titles are roman.

Hagiographic sources and topoi should be identified. Useful works which facilitate this task include:

F. C. Tubach, *Index Exemplorum: A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales* (Helsinki, 1969).

Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (6 vols., Copenhagen, 1955–8).

T. P. Cross, *Motif-Index of Early Irish Literature* (Bloomington, Ind., 1952).

E. R. Henken, *The Welsh Saints: A Study in Patterned Lives* (Cambridge, 1991).

B. Merdrignac, *Recherches sur l’hagiographie armoricaine du VII^e au XV^e siècle* (2 vols., Saint-Malo, 1985–6).

9. Indexes

It is normal to have a separate index of biblical and other quotations; occasionally other indexes, e.g. of manuscripts or of recipients of letters, etc. are appropriate. A copy of *Indexing: A Guide for Authors* will be sent to you by the Press with your proofs. The following points should be noted.

The General Index consists of names of persons, places, and subjects, with references to both Latin and English pages. In order to avoid long lists of undifferentiated page references, large entries are broken by subheadings, which should be ordered alphabetically (ignore initial ‘and’, ‘at’, ‘in’, ‘of’, etc.). For general style and layout, editors are invited to look at indexes of previous volumes in

the series, particularly Diana Greenway's edition of Henry of Huntingdon. Please note that the OUP insists that the typescript of the Index be double-spaced, like the rest of the script, and that subentries be typed on separate lines, even if they are to be run on in the printed volume.

All the persons and places named in the book should be indexed, in the form given in the translation.

Persons. Where appropriate, especially for the period before c.1300, persons should be indexed by their Christian names, and given their titles, offices, etc., with suitable cross-references. Normally 'son of' is to be preferred to Fitz, which should be used only where it forms a genuine surname (e.g. in the case of Robert Fitz Ralph bishop of Worcester 1191–3, who was son of William son of Ralph). In alphabetizing names, ignore numbers, rank, sanctity, 'de', 'Fitz', 'of', 'the', and material in parentheses, and arrange in a strict alphabetical sequence. Thus:

Henry 416–17

Henry (of France), archbishop of Reims 32 n.

Henry, chaplain 89

Henry I, count of Champagne 554–5

Henry (the Lion), duke of Saxony 123

Henry, earl of Warwick 23 n.

Henry II, emperor and king of Germany 164–5

Henry IV, emperor and king of Germany 475–6

Henry VI, emperor and king of Germany xlii

Henry I, king of England 580–1

Henry II, king of England 203–4

Henry, king of England, the young king 4–5

Henry, scribe of Bury St Edmunds 345–7

Henry, son of John 44

Henry de Beaumont, bishop of Bayeux 16–21

Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester 142–4

Henry Blund 102–3

Henry of Essex 110–12

Henry the Little 87–8

Henry de Mowbray 64–5

Henry Fitz Robert 222

Although alphabet takes precedence over rank, persons in a single numbered sequence must be recorded in that sequence in spite of any surnames or other additions. Thus:

John I Tzimisce

John II Comnenus

John V Palaeologus

John VI Cantacuzene

An eye must also be kept open for omission of the number, especially of I; if others in the sequence appear duly numbered, it must be restored in the index. Hence Frederick Barbarossa becomes Frederick I Barbarossa and precedes Frederick II.

Places. Places should be given some form of identification, such as English county (before 1974), French *département*, etc. For English places, the ancient parish should be preferred as the index unit; smaller places within a parish, if they are indexed independently, should be given cross-references under the parish. Ordnance Survey grid references may be included at the discretion of editors.

Subjects. In selecting subjects to be included in the index, the editor should take care to consider what readers are likely to look for and provide entries that will assist them in finding passages relating to topics on which the text has information. If in doubt, the editor should err on the side of generosity: the General Editors will find it easier to prune superfluous entries than detect missing ones.

The completed index should be returned in the first instance to the General Editor who is responsible for your volume.

10. *Preparation of the Typescript*

Typescripts should be produced on a word-processor in Times New Roman, double-spaced, with right margins unjustified, and with the hyphenation feature turned off. The word-processed files should be submitted with the typescript and must match it exactly. The files should be saved in Word or RTF, and be clearly numbered as to content. The nature of the program should be identified in a covering note, which should also state what part of the text is contained in each file.

- *Formatting.* Use a minimum amount of formatting, clearly distinguishing between different levels of heading. Use the tab key to indent paragraphs. For the Abbreviated References and the Bibliography please use hanging indents: first line full left, the rest indented (in Word you will find this feature under Paragraph–Special: Hanging). The apparatus criticus should be set out with each lemma on a separate line. If you include the folio numbers of the manuscript and/or the pages of a previous edition, please place these directly in the text within double square brackets, followed by a vertical, e.g. [[fo. 18^r]].
- *Footnotes.* Use the footnote feature for footnotes in the Introduction and Latin and English texts. The apparatus criticus may be typed separately, with the cues entered manually, or entered as endnotes numbered by letter. If the sections are short it is feasible to begin numbering of text at each new section; otherwise the apparatus criticus should be cued to the text in a way clear to the copy-editor.
- *Tabular matter.* Any tabular matter in the Introduction or parallel columns in the text should be set in table format (in Word under Insert– Table) rather than using tabs to space columns.
- *Special characters.* Please provide a list of any character that does not appear in the Times New Roman character set, and indicate the first place where it appears in the manuscript.

Once the typescript has been submitted, the General Editors are responsible for overseeing it in its entirety, and it is they who hand it over to OUP when all queries have been resolved. It is the individual editor's responsibility to correct proofs promptly, and to compile such indexes as are thought appropriate to the volume in question. At Proof Stage one of the General Editors will be designated to have particular responsibility for the volume, and proofs are to be returned to him or her, not to the OUP. The typescript of the Index should also be submitted to this editor.

Finally, please note that typescripts in which these conventions are not observed may be returned to the editor for resubmission.

APPENDIX

Which Variants to Include in the Apparatus Criticus

There are no iron rules about what to include in an apparatus criticus, but some general guidelines may be useful to editors.

Assumed in what follows is an edition with a base manuscript that is *not* treated as a best manuscript, so that the editor relegates its readings to the apparatus whenever other witnesses offer

better alternatives. Also assumed is a radical difference between the initial collation (where the rule is: 'if in doubt, include it'), and the final apparatus criticus, which should be highly selective. Note that the base manuscript for the final edition will often be different from the manuscript selected as the basis of the initial collation, since one will not know in advance whether the latter would make a good base manuscript.

The following types of variant should be distinguished:

1. Readings from the base manuscript that have been relegated to the apparatus. Editors may wish to give a full record of the base manuscript even when they discard its readings.

2. Trivial variants in other manuscript witness: such as inversions of words (in prose texts), or 'ergo' instead of 'igitur'. It will usually be best to omit these from the final version of the apparatus criticus.

3. Variants in which the scribe exercises initiative or independence by expanding, abbreviating, or paraphrasing. Such variants are not errors and they are evidence for the reception of the work. If the reception is of interest, as it normally will be, these variants should be included. There is much to be said for distinguishing such variants from other kinds by putting the sigla in heavy type.

4. Non-trivial variants which the editor cannot decisively reject as errors, while on balance preferring alternative readings. Such errors should be included in the apparatus criticus, so that readers can see the genuinely possible alternatives presented by the manuscript tradition.

5. Scribal errors: that is, variants that the editor would classify with some confidence as mistakes, say because they are obviously the result of eye-skip or because they cannot possibly make sense, yet can be explained by scribal psychology. (Textbooks on textual criticism give lists of types of typical scribal errors.)

It is not clear such error-variants should be included in the apparatus criticus even if they are non-trivial. It may be better to list major errors in the Introduction, and, in particular, to discuss common errors shared by several manuscripts there. If they are left in the apparatus they may be confused with possible alternative readings. Users of editions can expect guidance from the editor and should not be left to themselves to distinguish between variants that might be the true reading (even if the editor in the end opted for another) and variants that are definitely errors but which help reconstruct stemmatic relationships.

In sum, the user of an edition should not be left in the same position as the editor was after the initial collation of manuscript, and should be enabled to profit fully from the editor's critical analysis and decisions.

December 2013