

## SURVEY ARTICLE

### CUIUS IN USUM? RECENT AND FUTURE EDITING

By MICHAEL REEVE

In 1993 Michael Winterbottom remarked that we have reached 'what may be the last decades of the systematic editing of classical texts'.<sup>1</sup> If he was right, what has been dwindling: capacity, interest, scope, or confidence?

When editors' prefaces include such Latin as 'ad huius operis finem . . . longdudum exspectatum' (1983), 'non solum hominibus, sed ne libris quidem non pepercit' (1991, of the War), 'ex Italia, ut Munk Olsen videtur, ortus' (1997), or 'latet uel peritus' (1997, of an untraced manuscript),<sup>2</sup> it is tempting to blame incapacity, and to blame that in turn on a decline of interest in Latin and more narrowly in textual criticism. Not just a *laudator temporis acti se puero* could document the decline by looking at statistics and syllabuses; but there would be widespread agreement that in so far as textual criticism has given way to greater concern with content its proportional decline is no bad thing. Relevant too, some would say, is the decline of composition; but I am not convinced by either the obvious or the deeper reason that they give. Obviously, a preface should not be the first thing, or the first thing for thirty years, that the editor composes in Latin. Need it be, though? Lloyd-Jones and Wilson chose English in their O.C.T. of Sophocles (1990), and Green has now followed their example in a Latin O.C.T., his very handy *editio minor* of Ausonius (1999). Anyone who takes the view expressed to me by a distinguished German Latinist, that by abandoning Latin in prefaces one cuts off the branch that one is sitting on, should answer Merkelbach's charge that the policy of writing the notes in Latin has held up *Inscriptiones Graecae*.<sup>3</sup> At a deeper level, composing in a language is said to be the best way of learning it; but surely reading large amounts of it observantly is just as good or better, unless the distinction between active and passive knowledge of a language holds only for the modern languages that one reads comfortably and sometimes makes a pitiful attempt to speak. Even without mystical claims for the value of composition, declining knowledge of Latin is quite enough of a threat to editing.

In some ways, though, interest in editing has never been keener. *Scribes & Scholars*, a guide to transmission that includes a chapter on textual criticism, has gone into a third edition and been translated into Italian, French, Spanish, Greek, and Japanese;<sup>4</sup> after twenty-one years, E. J. Kenney's book *The Classical Text* has been translated into Italian;<sup>5</sup> brief guides to editing have been commissioned from Richard Tarrant and Josef Delz;<sup>6</sup> aims, methods, and questions of authority are vigorously debated at conferences, for instance those that led to recent volumes edited by Glenn Most and Anna Ferrari;<sup>7</sup> and computers have fuelled the debate by not only carrying out some traditional tasks more quickly and more reliably but also suggesting new tasks and new modes of presentation.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, Munk Olsen's descriptive inventory of classical

<sup>1</sup> CR 107 (1993), 431.

<sup>2</sup> These examples come from editions published since L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), which I take as my starting point. I shall dispense with details of works mentioned there, and I have not aimed at completeness. Works that I cite without title are all reviews.

<sup>3</sup> 'Quinquennialia der neuen Inscriptiones Graecae', *ZPE* 114 (1996), 299–300; 'Überlegungen zur Fortführung der Inscriptiones Graecae', *ZPE* 117 (1997), 297–303, at 297.

<sup>4</sup> L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes & Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek & Latin Literature* (Oxford, 1st edn, 1968; 2nd edn, 1974; 3rd edn, 1991).

<sup>5</sup> A. Lunelli (trans.), *Testo e metodo* (Rome, 1995).

<sup>6</sup> 'L'édition de la littérature latine classique', in J. Hamesse (ed.), *Les problèmes posés par l'édition critique des textes anciens et médiévaux* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1992), 1–56 = 'Classical Latin literature', in D. C. Greetham (ed.), *Scholarly Editing: A Guide to Research* (New York, 1995), 95–148; 'Textkritik und Editionstechnik', in F. Graf (ed.), *Einleitung in die*

*lateinische Philologie* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997), 51–73. M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts* (Stuttgart, 1973), remains the latest manual in English; S. Timpanaro, 'Recentiores e deteriores, codices descripti e codices inutilis', *Filologia e Critica* 10 (1985), 164–92, at 171 n. 6, says that it 'alterna idee originali e formulazioni didatticamente molto efficaci a parti deboli e molto discutibili', but so far as I know he has not elaborated.

<sup>7</sup> *Editing Texts / Texte edieren* (Göttingen, 1998); *Filologia classica e filologia romanza: esperienze ecdotiche a confronto* (Spoleto, 1998).

<sup>8</sup> P. M. W. Robinson, 'Collate: a program for interactive collation of large textual traditions', *Research in Humanities Computing* 3 (1995), 32–45, and 'Redefining critical editions', in G. P. Landow and P. Delany (eds), *The Digital Word: Text-based Computing in the Humanities* (Cambridge Mass., 1993), 271–91; D. C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (New York & London, 1994), 357–61. Besides *Research in Humanities Computing* (1991–), articles on editing can be found in *Literary and Linguistic Computing* (1986–).

Latin manuscripts earlier than 1200, even though it does not cover every work, can save editors much time and anxiety.<sup>9</sup>

For editing unpublished Latin texts from pagan Antiquity there is almost no scope. Only seldom does Alcestis come back from the dead (accompanied recently by nothing more than nine lines of Gallus and a scrap of Livy 11<sup>10</sup>), or someone recognize in a late antique or medieval manuscript a new work or a missing section of a known work, as Augusto Campana did with the *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, Mirella Ferrari with Rutilius Namatianus, Bernhard Bischoff with Sallust's *Historiae* and Fronto's correspondence, Rita Cappelletto with Ammianus Marcellinus, D. Ollero and U. Capitani simultaneously with Celsus' *De medicina*, Carlotta Dionisotti with the *Hermeneumata Celtis*,<sup>11</sup> Mario De Nonno with a metrical treatise by Martianus Capella,<sup>12</sup> and Peter Marshall with the commentary of Tiberius Donatus on the *Aeneid*.<sup>13</sup>

The scope for improving texts, whether by collation, discrimination, or conjecture, may seem not much greater, because the extant manuscripts show that people have been trying to improve most texts in these ways for anything from 500 to 1,200 years and a few for still longer. Thousands of manuscripts, however, remain uncollated or even uninspected, and the very accumulation of conjecture requires editors who can distinguish what is helpful or plausible from what is not. Furthermore, the main principle of genealogical classification, whether of manuscripts or of anything else, was first stated not much over a century ago,<sup>14</sup> and the historical investigation of traditions, a legacy of Mommsen and Traube, is no older; neither has yet been applied more than patchily, and in combination they have been applied even less, because few classicists know enough medieval history and the last thing that many historians or codicologists study about a manuscript is its text. Concordances, too, have mostly been compiled in the present century, and the indispensable *Thesaurus* has a third of the alphabet still to cover; even Housman made conjectures that he would not make today with works like these on his shelves. Equally recent is such understanding as we possess of clausulae in prose.<sup>15</sup>

For the Latin output of the Middle Ages and Renaissance far less has been done. Works of such stature as Petrarch's *Seniles* are still being read in sixteenth-century editions, and so much remains unpublished that prospective editors must face a question more fundamental than any that has troubled classicists: is this work actually worth publishing?

When the decision to publish has been taken, medievalists often find themselves in a different position from classicists. An autograph may have survived, so that no reconstruction is necessary (unless it was one of many); or the witnesses may variously reflect an original that the author worked on over a long period, so that no single state of the text can be reconstructed; or a presentation copy may reveal so much about the context of composition, or have done so much to shape the later tradition, that its text acquires a historical importance independent of any editorial importance; or the reception of the work in medieval witnesses may be thought as interesting as the work itself. To these anti-reconstructionist arguments others have been added: that the difference between authors and scribes has been exaggerated (a milder form of this argument is that scribes took liberties if they spoke the language), or that even if there was a single original it cannot be reconstructed either stemmatically, because there was too much contamination (mixing of textual strains), or conjecturally, because the human intellect is fallible. Reproduction of witnesses therefore suits many medievalists better than reconstruction of originals. In rabbinic studies, whether or not for the same reasons, editors have so often published bulky synoptic editions of slim texts that Milikowsky wonders if by 'editing' they have simply understood 'transcribing'.<sup>16</sup> Scholars of such schools welcome, or so computer-programmers say, programmes that make it possible, once a witness has been fully collated, to call up its text in a trice and hang the variants of the other witnesses on it. If they are as much interested in the layout, say, as in the text, then technical progress on another front will soon enable them to call up a digital image of any witness page by page.

How much of this ought to shake the confidence of classicists or arouse their interest? I will go through the main areas of debate in turn.

<sup>9</sup> *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris, 1982–89), supplemented in *RHT* 21 (1991), 37–76; 24 (1994), 199–249; 27 (1997), 29–85.

<sup>10</sup> B. Bravo and M. T. Griffin, 'Un frammento del libro XI di Tito Livio?', *Athenaeum* 66 (1988), 447–521.

<sup>11</sup> 'From Ausonius' schooldays? A schoolbook and its relatives', *JRS* 72 (1982), 83–125.

<sup>12</sup> 'Un nuovo testo di Marziano Capella: la metrica', *RFIC* 118 (1990), 129–44.

<sup>13</sup> Tiberius Claudius Donatus on Virgil *Aen.* 6.1–157', *Manuscripta* 37 (1993), 3–20.

<sup>14</sup> M. D. Reeve, 'Shared innovations, dichotomies, and evolution', in *Esperienze ecdotiche*, op. cit. (n. 7), 445–505, at 450–69.

<sup>15</sup> Two complementary studies: G. O. Hutchinson, 'Rhythm, style, and meaning in Cicero's prose', *CQ* 89 (1995), 485–99; G. Orlandi, 'Le statistiche sulle clausole della prosa. Problemi e proposte', *Filologia Mediolatina* 5 (1998), 1–35.

<sup>16</sup> 'Further on editing Rabbinic texts', forthcoming in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* 90.

Any evidence that may once have existed of unstable originals or multiple versions was effaced before most traditions of classical texts assumed their present shape, except that instability is inherent in the tradition of such things as scholia and grammatical texts and sometimes overtakes literary works, for instance the *Historia Apollonii*, which Schmeling has published in three versions (Teubner, 1988).<sup>17</sup>

As contamination seems to thwart any systematic attempt at reconstructing less corrupt stages of a tradition, it was largely responsible for what Timpanaro has called the 'crisis' of textual criticism in the late nineteenth and twentieth century.<sup>18</sup> The classic exploration of this and other obstacles to stemmatic reconstruction, and therefore the bible of those who believe that stemmata never take sufficient account of real life, is Pasquali's *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, which appeared in 1934. Nevertheless, contamination has not paralysed editors, if only because they can always take refuge in eclecticism (choosing attractive readings wherever they occur in the tradition). Warnings about contamination therefore tend to be directed less at editors in general than at stemmatists, as when Victor's findings in the medieval tradition of Terence lead him to wave the banner of Pasquali;<sup>19</sup> I agree with some of his points,<sup>20</sup> but Timpanaro has never given many examples of flawed stemmata, and from Victor too I should like to see more. I doubt whether even Timpanaro would say that most traditions defy classification in outline or that some defy it at all levels, and establishing which manuscripts have authority is a useful achievement even if their relationships shift too much for an archetype to be reconstructed. If the good that Pasquali and Timpanaro have done has brought with it any damage, it is a reluctance to believe that any extant witness ever owes all its inherited readings to another.<sup>21</sup>

Mistrust of conjecture, not peculiar to medievalists, often afflicts people who happily employ the human intellect for such purposes as writing interpretative essays; or perhaps they feel so fallible that they want the textual ground, if nothing else, to stay firm under their feet. Here too, however, they have a refuge, or think they have: accepting as few conjectures as possible (equally, alas, a policy of the human intellect).

The only evidence I can cite that either contamination or mistrust of conjecture has deprived the world of editions is something that Hugh Trevor-Roper wrote years ago (I have forgotten where): he decided against an academic career in classics, he said, because classicists spent most of their time trying to restore ancient texts, and his own experience as an author led him to believe that the kind of error most often committed by scribes was omission by *saut du même au même*, hardest to detect and impossible to remedy.

The confidence of classical editors need not be shaken, then, in any of these three areas. Should computers arouse their interest? As reconstruction by one method or another is bound to be their chief aim, they are unlikely to see any use for programmes that amass collations with a view to shuffling them between the text and the apparatus.

Altogether, though, classical and medieval editing do not differ so much that classicists have nothing to learn from medievalists;<sup>22</sup> and though computer programmes tailored to medievalists will have no appeal, programmes that reduced collations to genealogical order would be another matter, because they might ease the work of stemmatists and perhaps weaken the resistance of antistemmatists. Do they or could they exist?

The editor of a Latin text who has done most with a computer and explained most fully what she did is the Teubner editor of Hyginus' *Astronomica*, Ghislaine Viré, whose work on the text seems to have begun in 1971.<sup>23</sup> After collating thirty-seven manuscripts in full on punched cards, she transferred the variants to magnetic tapes and sorted them in different ways with a programme put at her disposal by a colleague. In a monograph of 1986 she made it clear what decisions she had to take at each stage, for instance about spelling and such fundamental things as the significance of variants, in order to arrive at a grouping of her manuscripts; and she came out very candidly recommending her method as a labour-saving rather than a problem-solving

<sup>17</sup> See M. De Nonno, 'Testi greci e latini in movimento: riflessi nella tradizione manoscritta e nella prassi editoriale', in *Esperienze ecdotiche*, op. cit. (n. 7), 221–39.

<sup>18</sup> *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann* (1st edn, Florence, 1963; 2nd edn, Padua 1981, 'corretta con alcune aggiunte', 1985), ch. VIII.

<sup>19</sup> 'A problem of method in the history of texts and its implications for the manuscript tradition of Terence', *RHT* 26 (1996), 269–87.

<sup>20</sup> I have long been saying, for instance, that my worst contribution to *Texts and Transmission*, op. cit. (n. 2), was my talk of an archetype for Terence (p. 413).

<sup>21</sup> M. D. Reeve, 'Eliminatio codicum descriptorum: a methodological problem', in J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York, 1989), 1–35.

<sup>22</sup> Besides many of the contributions to *Esperienze ecdotiche*, op. cit. (n. 7), see three acute and well documented articles by G. Orlandi: 'Problemi di ecdotica alto-medioevale', in M. Simonetti (ed.), *La cultura in Italia fra tardo antico e alto medioevo* (Rome, 1981), I, 333–56; 'Perché non possiamo non dirci lachmanniani', *Filologia Mediolatina* 2 (1995), 1–42; 'Recensio e apparato critico', *ibid.* 4 (1997), 1–41.

<sup>23</sup> See the footnotes on her list of manuscripts in 'La transmission du *De astronomia* d'Hygin jusqu'au XIIIe siècle', *RHT* 11 (1981), 159–276, at 163–77.

device.<sup>24</sup> She leaves me with the impression, however, that for editing just Hyginus it created rather than saved labour. Whatever the reason why her edition did not appear until 1992, it still left over fifty manuscripts unclassified. A reviewer also feared that she had sacrificed knowledge of Latin for skill with the computer.<sup>25</sup>

Until recently, Peter Robinson contented himself with refining *Collate*, a programme for recording and shuffling variants, and said explicitly that external evidence or decisions about errors were needed for producing a stemma; but since 1993 he has been arguing that cladistic programmes can produce stemmata much faster than traditional methods.<sup>26</sup> These are programmes devised by biologists for placing species in a 'phylogenetic tree' (a stemma), and 'cladistic' is what they call the principle that only shared innovations, not just resemblances of any kind, indicate a closer relationship within a family. In 1998 Robinson made news by supplying two biochemists with an undigested mass of variants from fifty-eight manuscripts of the *Prologue to the Wife of Bath's Tale*; they put it all through a cladistic programme and told him how the manuscripts were related to one another. 'Science to the aid of Eng. lit.' was the drift of the headlines, except that above its photograph of Robinson *Der Spiegel* had a rather more opaque headline, 'Cooler Code'. The accounts of the procedure that had been applied differed so widely that I went back to the original article in *Nature*, shorter than the one in *Der Spiegel*; and there I found four things that punctured the headlines.<sup>27</sup> First, nothing was said about how the phylogenetic tree had been rooted; second, forty-four manuscripts were included in it, but fourteen others were excluded as contaminated; third, not a single extant manuscript had an extant ancestor; fourth, the conclusion had been drawn from the phylogenetic tree 'and other evidence' that the manuscripts go back to a working draft of Chaucer's covered with cancellations and additions. One of the biochemists has been kind enough to tell me that the computer produced an unrooted tree and they rooted it by accepting the view of Chaucer scholars that the Hengwrt manuscript is close to the original; so that when the *Times* reported that the Hengwrt manuscript emerged as particularly close to the original, 'emerged' was the reverse of the truth. I have not yet discovered why no extant manuscript emerged with an extant ancestor, but I wonder if it is a coincidence that in cladistic classification a highly questionable principle is adopted: when species B arises from species A, species A is not allowed to survive the event but becomes species C (usually called species A'). The headlines cut an even sorer figure if one recalls that historical linguists, and in their footsteps editors of texts, saw the significance of shared innovations almost a century before biologists.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, Robinson's previous triumphs were celebrated in an Icelandic text of 1,500 words preserved in forty-six manuscripts, and even with Chaucer he has still reached only fifty-eight manuscripts and 850 lines.<sup>29</sup> The first volume of Stephen Oakley's commentary on Livy 6–10 (1997) includes a detailed classification of some 195 witnesses, carried out in three years without the aid of a computer; admittedly he collated few of them in full, but did he need to?

Of course, computers and programmes improve every month (except for their hostility to previous versions), and editors who collate into a computer can perhaps save themselves time when they move on to analysing their collations; but there is more to a manuscript than its text. Computers can compare texts, but they cannot make genealogical use of the information that three manuscripts were all written at Ferrara or by the same scribe, and to judge from Viré's method they choke on corrections. It will be a pity if wider use of computers in the study of textual traditions reopens the old rift between textual and historical evidence.

To my mind, the hardest decision that editors of classical texts face is whether they are editing just for classicists. Danuta Shanzer put the point very clearly in a review of Willis's *Martianus Capella* (Teubner, 1983): though 'the printed text is excellent', 'the edition lacks a solid basis in a thorough *recensio* . . . All these defects are more likely to affect the medievalist using this edition to study, for example, Carolingian scholarship, than the classicist purely

<sup>24</sup> *Informatique et classement des manuscrits: essai méthodologique sur le de astronomia d'Hygin* (Brussels, 1986), for instance pp. 18, 53, 93.

<sup>25</sup> W. Hübner, *Gnomon* 67 (1995), 322 ('Es sollte nicht zur Regel werden, daß Kenntnisse in Informatik auf Kosten der Beherrschung der lateinischen Sprache erworben werden'). Though directed at her preface, the comment might equally well have been directed at her text, as I intend to show elsewhere.

<sup>26</sup> 'Redefining critical editions', op. cit. (n. 8), 283; with R. J. O'Hara, 'Cladistic analysis of an Old Norse manuscript tradition', *Research in Humanities Computing* 4 (1996), 115–37.

<sup>27</sup> A. C. Barbrook, C. J. Howe, N. Blake, and

P. Robinson, 'The phylogeny of *The Canterbury Tales*', *Nature* 394 (1998), 839; 'Evolutionary biology unlocks the secrets of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*', *University of Cambridge press releases* 26 August 1998; *Der Spiegel* 53 (1998), 151; *The Times* 27 August 1998, p. 6.

<sup>28</sup> Reeve, op. cit. (n. 14), at 450–73. On the previous point see 474–83.

<sup>29</sup> I learn from the *University of Cambridge Newsletter* for February–March 2000, p. 13, that the same team has received a grant of £ 102,000 from the Leverhulme Trust for extending its work to the *Divina commedia* and the Greek *New Testament*.

interested in what Martianus wrote'.<sup>30</sup> As any reading of any medieval manuscript may interest some medievalist, there is a case after all for amassing collations even of eliminable manuscripts, and only time and expense need impose a limit. Perhaps, therefore, editors who choose to cite in the apparatus only a fraction of the variants that they have collected should consider making the rest available electronically, at least if they recorded them electronically. When I have written articles on traditions, I have hoped that they might help medievalists as well as editors; but as I have seldom collated more than a few stretches of a work, I might well have no information to offer if I were asked to affiliate a quotation, a set of excerpts, or a newly discovered fragment. One recent editor who expressly declares that he had medievalists in mind as well as classicists is Havas in *Florus* (Debrecen, 1997). Certainly his dense and muddy apparatus includes numerous readings that anyone interested in what *Florus* wrote can safely ignore. Classicists too, however, can benefit from occasionally being shown the extent and the nature of medieval corruption and conjecture, not least because transmission in Antiquity was probably not much different.

A similar question arises over spelling. Few editors these days believe that medieval manuscripts are a safe guide to the spelling of the Republic or early Empire, and I agree with those who say that the space and labour needed for recording such evidence is better devoted to other things; but variations in spelling may shed light on the development of Latin and other languages, especially the Romance languages.<sup>31</sup>

For every medievalist or historical linguist who wants an exhaustive apparatus there are many readers who want not even a text but rather a translation. Between the two extremes the most successful compromise has been the Loeb Classical Library, which since the 1970s, under the general editorship of George Goold, has offered high quality both in its new and in its revised editions. To Goold himself goes much of the credit, for his revisions of Ovid and Catullus-Tibullus-*Pervigilium* as well as for his new Manilius, Propertius, and Virgil (vol. 1, 1999); and Shackleton Bailey's *Martial* (1993) and *Ad Atticum* (1998), welcome adaptations of his Teubner editions, will soon be joined, I hear, by Valerius Maximus.

Readers who can dispense with a translation now have at their disposal a compromise that some believe will overtake printed texts even more rapidly than printed texts overtook manuscripts: electronic texts. I call them a compromise because none, so far as I know, have yet appeared with an apparatus. Certainly the discs issued by Teubner and the Packard Humanities Institute do not include an apparatus, nor do collections available on the Net. Until the apparatus can be restored, there is a danger that electronic texts will be trusted further than any text merits even if accurately reproduced. The invention of printing caused similar disquiet. Already in 1471, Niccolò Perotti feared that 'men of slight learning were now in a position to publish whatever they liked in hundreds of copies, without any sort of editorial responsibility or control'.<sup>32</sup> As for accuracy, scanners are no better yet than scribes. On the Net I have found three texts of Vegetius, one declared to be Lang's of 1885 but disfigured by a misprint in the first word of Book 1, the others copied from it (perfectly, one hopes). At Sen., *Tro.* 50 the Budé edition (1996–99), which follows Zwierlein's O.C.T., misprints as *timetus* the reading of A, *tinctus*, and I have a suspicious mind.

A series that provides commentary plainly cannot cover so much text in one volume, and the actual edition tends to be a reprint adjusted here and there in the light not of collation but of reflection. British exceptions are Eden's *Apocolocyntosis* for Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (1984); Powell's *De amicitia* for Aris & Phillips (1990), though it has no apparatus; and Walsh's volumes on Livy 36–40 for Aris & Phillips (1990–96). As the present editor of the 'orange series', Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, I refrain from discussing it; but volumes on the same scale are Winterbottom's *Minor Declamations* of Quintilian (Berlin, 1984), Green's *Ausonius* (Oxford, 1991), and Kaster's *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* of Suetonius (Oxford, 1995). Italian commentators who publish short works with Pàtron (Bologna) do their own collating: Formicola in Grattius' *Cynegetica* (1988), Lucia Di Salvo in Calpurnius 7 (1990), Di Giovine in *Ausonius Technopaegnon* (1996). Perutelli in *Moretum* (Pisa, 1983) uses fifteen manuscripts and lists over one hundred others.

<sup>30</sup> *C. Phil.* 81 (1986), 62–81, at 76, 78.

<sup>31</sup> In late Antiquity the editorial problems become more serious. See for instance G. Orlandi, 'Un dilemma editoriale: ortografia e morfologia nelle *Historiae* di Gregorio di Tours', *Filologia Mediolatina* 3 (1996), 35–71; R. Coleman, 'Vulgarism and normalization in the text of *Regula Sancti Benedicti*', in

H. Petersmann and R. Kettemann (eds), *Latin vulgare — latin tardif V* (Heidelberg, 1999), 345–56.

<sup>32</sup> M. C. Davies, 'Humanism in script and print in the fifteenth century', in Jill Krayer (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (Cambridge, 1996), 47–62, at 57.

Editions of authors who survive only in quotation may serve little purpose without commentary, and the editor can hardly be expected to investigate afresh the tradition of every work in which quotations occur.<sup>33</sup>

'The editor's principal function' it has recently been said, and I agree, 'is . . . to recover, by sifting manuscript evidence, what the author wrote, and to represent the author's words for the modern reader. Any other consideration is secondary to this one. Desirable though they might be, indices, introductions, commentaries — and even translations — are not indispensable features of editorial activity. What *is* indispensable, is that the editor represent the words of the author as accurately as possible'.<sup>34</sup> From an edition so conceived I have come to expect five things: a survey of the available witnesses, reasons for using some rather than others, accurate collation, guidance on the difference between the best text that can be extracted from the witnesses and what the author seems likely to have written, and substantial progress in at least one of these four. Ideally, the first two should be combined in a historical account, because the value of a witness depends on the aims, resources, and abilities of whoever produced it; but it would be a luxury to dwell on the ideal when many editions still fall at one or more of the five hurdles.

If the available witnesses have been surveyed or analysed elsewhere, a reference is enough, provided that it was done in an accessible place. Havas in Florus gives no reason for collating only about seventy of the 180-odd witnesses that I discussed in 1991<sup>35</sup> and indeed nowhere mentions the existence of the rest; a Hungarian editor must have surmounted great difficulties in order to achieve so much, but openness costs nothing. The Budé editor of *Querolus* (1994) refers to her unpublished dissertation for the arguments that underlie her stemma. False or outdated shelfmarks make work for readers and often betray failure to consult even the latest catalogue, let alone the manuscript; but would librarians please not set traps by altering shelfmarks for poor reasons, as has happened at Antwerp and Vicenza? Eisenhut in Catullus (Teubner, 1983), besides mentioning two manuscripts for the first time in his *sigla*, miswrites the shelfmark of the Datanus, which he reports throughout even though 'iis viris doctis assentior, qui censent hunc codicem esse nullius fere momenti ad Catulli textum recensendum'; Ireland in Frontinus' *Strategemata* (Teubner, 1990) puts one member of his family ζ in Vienna when it is in Vaduz and calls the other Uppsala Univ. C 193 (a borrowed mistake) when it is 913; Schilling in *Fasti* (Budé, 1992-93) describes the fragmentary Ilfeldensis as 'aujourd'hui perdu' when it appears as Bodmer 123 in *Texts and Transmission* and Goold's Loeb (1989); and good luck to any user of Fontaine's Ammianus 20-22 (Budé, 1996) who sets off to check anything in 'Neapolitanus Parisinus latinus 6120' or 'Tolosanus Parisinus latinus 5820'.

In proposing a classification, some editors still argue from agreement in true readings or follow predecessors too early to have argued from shared innovations. In Tacitus' *Histories* Heubner (Teubner, 1978), Le Bonniec (Budé, 1987-92), and Wellesley (Teubner, 1989), all accept Mendell's division of the manuscripts into three groups (though in reverse order) according as they end at 5.26.3, 5.23.2, or 5.13.1; but the first, which has what amounts to the true reading, need not be a genealogical group, and the third could belong genealogically to one of the others. According to Hall in his *Tristia* (Teubner, 1995), 'mediaevalem traditionem bifariam esse divisam ex eo concluditur quod 5.1.18 AGHPV . . . recte legunt *aptior ingenium come, Tibullus erit, ceteri codices una voce et plures quorum nomina magna vigen*'. Goold in the revised Loeb of Suetonius (1997-98) says that the manuscripts of *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* 'fall into two classes, distinguished from each other by the presence or absence of the index of names at the beginning of the treatise'. In his edition of Apuleius' philosophical works (Teubner, 1991), another uninformative about the extent of the tradition, Moreschini starts from Goldbacher's *potior* and *deterior* families of 1876 and continues in the same vein by adding a third family that 'mediam . . . viam inter duas illas . . . tenet'. Underneath her operations with a computer, Viré essentially divides the older manuscripts of Hyginus into *meliores* and *deteriores* and then does the same again to the *meliores*, with the result that her *optimi* have not been properly defined as a family; her preface is also full of unsound arguments, some of which rest on inaccurate collation, and she ignores Göttweig 146, an independent witness to the narrow line of indirect tradition found as scholia on Cicero's *Aratea*. Another danger is defining families by a small number of easily corrected errors, as Ireland does with his α in Frontinus' *Strategemata* and Hine with his ζ in Seneca's *Naturales quaestiones* (Teubner, 1996); unlike Hine, who classifies

<sup>33</sup> The contributors to G. W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments / Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen, 1997), largely discuss Greek topics.

<sup>34</sup> M. Lapidge, 'The edition of medieval Latin texts in the English-speaking world', *Sacris Erudiri* 38 (1998-99), 199-220, at 219.

<sup>35</sup> 'The transmission of Florus and the *Periochae* again', *CQ* 85 (1991), 453-83. I concluded that the four-book tradition, carried by all the direct witnesses except B, is adequately represented by N, P, and a choice of three others, which might even be reduced to one.

the whole tradition and altogether advances much further beyond his predecessors, Ireland also ignores medievalists and asks classicists to trust that the 'rudis indigestaque moles' of 150 other manuscripts belongs entirely to the lower reaches of his stemma.<sup>36</sup> Some editors who for good or bad reasons attempt no genealogical classification or very little, for instance Willis in Martianus Capella and Hall both in *Tristia* and in Claudian (Teubner, 1985),<sup>37</sup> have shirked no labour in collation; but if they report only a selection of variants, they too need trusting readers.

For borrowing collations strong reasons must be given. Can manuscripts be collated accurately from microfilm? Not always, especially if they have corrections; but I have sometimes detected on microfilm an erasure that escaped me on the spot, and microfilms, unlike most manuscripts, can be consulted at leisure. The Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, produces excellent microfilms, and I hope it will continue to do so, because the charge for admission is now exorbitant and the standard of its other services to readers has plummeted.

To the debate between conservatives and sceptics, essentially as old as the debate in ancient linguistics about anomaly and analogy, Madeleine Tyssens contributes the observation that 'les auteurs de conjectures sont . . . les conservateurs, au sens politique du terme, les gardiens de l'ordre, les gardiens de la norme'.<sup>38</sup> When some Italian scholars court approval by deriding 'the Anglo-Saxon school', it is a pleasure to hear Fedeli lamenting that Klingner in Horace reports Bentley's conjectures only sporadically.<sup>39</sup> Willis in his Juvenal opines that 'nimium confidere ingenio suo videtur, qui quid eruditi et illustres viri ante se censuerint silentio transire gaudeat' (Teubner, 1997, p. xl), and certainly conjectures made in Hyginus' *Astronomica* by Micyllus, Scheffer, Muncker, and Bursian, should have appeared much more often in the editions of Le Bœuffe (Budé, 1983) and Viré (Teubner, 1992), if not in the text, at least in the apparatus; but Willis's opinion could also be invoked in defence of a practice that wastes space, the listing of editors not always *eruditi* or *illustres*, though certainly for the most part *viri*, who have followed this or that reading. Among editions that offer little or nothing new on the tradition but instead a reappraisal of the text, Willis's Juvenal, incisive and excisive, puts what he perhaps regards as an untypical case. Shackleton Bailey, however, has attained unrivalled eminence by the quantity as well as the penetration of his work; in the last fifteen years alone he has edited Horace (1985), Cicero's *Philippics* (1986) and letters (1987–88, for the second time), Lucan (1988), the *Minor Declamations* of Quintilian (1989) (the declaimers have done well to attract such formidable critics as Håkanson, Winterbottom, and Shackleton Bailey), and Martial (1990). Only someone who has read and digested as much Latin can usefully edit texts in such a way.

Three matters of presentation deserve a word. First, in both the preface and the text of my Longus (Teubner, 1982) I followed the common practice (introduced by whom?) of not beginning sentences with a capital letter, but I soon came to agree with David Dumville, who described the practice to me as 'idiotic'. Why does it not entail leaving the dots off *i*'s, for instance, or reverting throughout to majuscule script? Second, it seems pointless to duplicate the function of the apparatus by turning the text itself into an obstacle course, as happens to an extreme degree in Mazzarino's Cato (Teubner, 2nd edn, 1982); Paschoud in vol. V.i of the Budé *Historia Augusta* (1996) rightly says that 'le texte de Hohl, surchargé de signes divers, est peu lisible' (p. xlv). Third, a new system of reference, such as the continuous numbering of lines that Teubner have introduced in books of prose since 1990, should not supplant the usual system outside the covers of the edition but at most supplement it. For many purposes, reference to a specific edition is unnecessary, and having to seek it out may be tiresome.<sup>40</sup> Conservatism of reference will seldom impede reconstitution of the text. Similarly, there need to be stronger reasons for giving witnesses new symbols than Axer and Marek had when they changed Vat. Lat. 11458 of Cicero's speeches from X to V (Teubner, 1976, 1983) or Viré in Hyginus when she kept some of Le Bœuffe's symbols but changed others.

If I offer a rapid survey of what has been achieved recently in each of the main series, I shall have to be pardoned for some bald judgements. Documenting them all would require too much space.<sup>41</sup>

Budé editions have often had a long introduction on all aspects of a work, but the recent expansion of the *Notes complémentaires*, officially with no reduction of the apparatus, makes the series the most ambitious currently in progress. It is also the most uneven, despite the *Règles et*

<sup>36</sup> I share the reactions of W.-W. Ehlers, *Gnomon* 68 (1996), 120–3.

<sup>37</sup> P. L. Schmidt, 'Die Überlieferungsgeschichte von Claudians Carmina maiora', *ICS* 14 (1989), 391–415, reinstates genealogy.

<sup>38</sup> 'L'infraction et la norme', in *Esperienze ecdotiche*, op. cit. (n. 7), 313–23, at 315.

<sup>39</sup> 'Congetturare si, ma con cautela', in *Esperienze ecdotiche*, op. cit. (n. 7), 267–80, at 275.

<sup>40</sup> See Anon., 'Zitierfähigkeit der Ausgabe eines antiken Autors', *Gnomon* 57 (1985), 495–6. W. Hübner, *Gnomon* 61 (1989), 591 n. 6, identifies the author as D. Krömer of the *Thesaurus*.

<sup>41</sup> Lapidge, op. cit. (n. 34), surveys the main series of medieval Latin texts published in the English-speaking world and goes on to discuss aims and audiences.

*recommandations* of 1972 and the 'commission technique', which for every edition 'a chargé X d'en faire la révision et d'en surveiller la correction en collaboration avec' the editor. For domestic consumption the translation may well matter most, but abroad it probably matters least, especially since the translators are adept at wresting sense from nonsense. In their choice of witnesses the editors often follow predecessors, sometimes collating afresh, sometimes checking reports, and sometimes merely borrowing. In Calpurnius (1991) Amat does not say whether she collated anything (presumably not), and her account of the tradition is an indiscriminating medley of previous work; after crediting Poggio with bringing to Italy the lost manuscript V, which produced a large family, I am sorry to see two of its descendants pushed back to the fourteenth century, one allegedly on my authority and the other in defiance of its script and decoration (to say nothing of my contention that it derives from the ed. Rom. 1471). The same editor's *Consolatio ad Liviam* (1997) is no better.<sup>42</sup> In Valerius Maximus (1995–) Combès collates six manuscripts that Kempf collated over a century ago, borrows Kempf's reports of two others, and adds one in Montpellier, where he taught; but only two of the nine have established their right to be used, and there are hundreds of others. In Livy 21 (1988) Jal announces without explanation that out of over 100 manuscripts 'nous en avons collationné 16'; fifteen are *descripti*, and they all reappear in the other volumes for the decade, augmented in Book 26 by Z, which 'permet de connaître un autre *Mediceus* du XV<sup>e</sup>'. Some of them have more reason for reappearing in Books 26–30, but only François in Book 29 (1994) has shown much understanding of what makes a witness worth citing. Opportunities for using or investigating more manuscripts were waiting to be seized in Varro's *De re rustica*, where Guiraud missed them (Book 2, 1985; Book 3, 1997); in Festus' *Breviarium*, where, as I argued in a review,<sup>43</sup> Marie-Pierre Arnaud-Lindet did the same (1994); in *Querolus*, where the editor does indeed use the important manuscript H for the first time (1994) but undermines my confidence by absurdly transcribing Gude's *caussâ* and *Lutiâ* as *caussam* and *Lutetiam* (p. lvii); and in the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, where Festy at first glance (all that I have yet had time for) seems to have given a salutary illustration of what can still be achieved in some traditions (1999). Other editions that have made a mark are those of Vitruvius (five more volumes since 1986) and the *Historia Augusta* (1992–); and Achard in *Ad Herennium* and *De inventione* (1989, 1994), Charlet in *De raptu Proserpinae* (1991), and Liberman in Valerius Flaccus (1997–)<sup>44</sup> are in command of the material. Some editors fail to exploit the resources of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, others to look beyond them; two of the manuscripts that even as capable an editor as Achard in Lyon decided not to collate because he could not obtain legible microfilms were no further away than Paris and London (*De inventione*, p. 38).

Teubner have recently been taken over twice, but their Bibliotheca, the oldest series of classical texts still current and since the War the most international, seems under no immediate threat. Teubner editions too have expanded. Sometimes the main apparatus becomes very discursive, as in Fedeli's Propertius (1984); sometimes the *Testimonienapparat* becomes a list of *loci similes*, as in Sallmann's Censorinus (1983); and sometimes the editor compiles an *appendix critica*, as Wellesley chose to do, 'ieiunis quod vorarent praebens', in *Annals* 11–16 and the *Histories* (1986, 1989), and Roncali in the *Apocolocyntosis* (1990). As the readings of the witnesses are never more than part of the evidence for what the author wrote, there is no reason in principle why an apparatus should not include as much argument as a commentary, and I agree with anyone who considers an apparatus dead if it presents only readings; but I dislike having to fight my way through arguments or bibliography to find the readings. When Timpanaro reviewed van den Hout's second edition of Fronto (1988), which he found unsatisfactory in many respects but nevertheless a great advance,<sup>45</sup> he remarked that 'un'edizione critica non è un commento . . . , ma deve pur far capire almeno approssimativamente al lettore in qual modo l'editore intenda passi che appaiono davvero inintelligibili'.<sup>46</sup> Some recent Teubner editions, for instance Sconocchia's Scribonius Largus (1983),<sup>47</sup> Ireland's *De rebus bellicis* (1984), Delz's exemplary Silius (1987), Maslowski's volumes of Cicero's speeches (1981–), Håkanson's Seneca Rhetor (1989), Rosellini's Julius Valerius (1993), or Hine's *Naturales quaestiones* (1996), are unlikely to have serious competitors for a long time, and the same might be said of Watt's Velleius (1988) or Marshall's *Fabulae* of Hyginus (1993) if the text rested on more witnesses; Tarrant suggests that on Velleius

<sup>42</sup> E. Courtney, *CR* 113 (1999), 399, speaks of 'colossal incompetence'. In the same issue, p. 411, P. K. Marshall calls Boriaud's *Fabulae* of Hyginus (1997) 'a disaster'.

<sup>43</sup> *Gnomon* 69 (1997), 508–13.

<sup>44</sup> 'Liberman's edition' say J. Delz and W. S. Watt, *Mus. Helv.* 55 (1998), 131 n. \*, 'marks an important advance both in the presentation of the manuscript evidence and in the establishment of the text; the

notes appended to it constitute a valuable critical commentary'.

<sup>45</sup> I ought to have checked it before repeating under 'subscriptions' in the *OCD* (3rd edn, 1996), 1450–1, that one Caecilius revised the text.

<sup>46</sup> *RFIC* 117 (1989), 365–82, at 375.

<sup>47</sup> Add, however, his article 'Nuovi testimoni scriboniani tra tardo antico e medioevo', *RFIC* 123 (1995), 278–319.



'a moratorium is probably in order — not because the problems of Velleius' text have been solved but because the means now available for solving them have been placed on record' (p. 123). Briscoe passed from Books 41–5 of Livy (1986), which rest on one manuscript, to Books 31–40 (1991), where he tackles a complex tradition with shrewdness and determination, and then to Valerius Maximus (1998), where he rigorously applies Carter's radical view of an even richer tradition. A disappointment, as I have argued elsewhere,<sup>48</sup> is Önnersfors's Vegetius (1995).

Oxford Classical Texts have always had a narrower range and usually a selective apparatus (in the past often an excuse for laziness), and old volumes long known to be poor, such as Owen's *Tristia* and the volumes of Cicero's rhetorical works done by Wilkins, still await replacement. A good edition of Seneca's tragedies would have been welcome in any series when Zwierlein's appeared after twenty years of unblinkered preparation (1986), and embarrassing gaps have now been filled by Reynolds's Sallust and *De finibus* (1991, 1998), Winterbottom's *De officiis* (1994), and Walsh's Livy 36–40 (1999). Reynolds and Winterbottom, masters of their craft, sifted manuscripts by the hundred but keep their apparatus in strict bounds. Walsh's edition, much indebted to Briscoe's where he goes beyond his own volumes for Aris & Phillips, cannot be fully understood without reference to it. He does not say, for instance, what policy he adopts about citing  $\alpha$ , so that a reader who wonders if it had *quarta Argitheam* at 38.1.7 with  $\phi$  (om. B $\psi$ ) must first establish that Briscoe does not cite it when it agrees with  $\phi$  (at any rate before B breaks off at 38.46.4) and then notice that the descendants of  $\alpha$  least likely to be contaminated omit 37.59.2–38.17.15; yet unlike Briscoe he gives  $\alpha$  a position in the stemma that should demand its citation throughout (p. xix). He also neglects to say whether B or A ever went further than it now does, a question that always arises in my mind when I read that a witness is incomplete.<sup>49</sup> Courtney's *Silvae* (1990) is so much better than others that it will seem churlish to complain of stinginess with conjectures, for instance in the first sentence Baehrens's *qua parte coluisti*.

In Italy, presses large and small publish a stream of editions, albeit mostly of short texts. Such pluralism brings about more duplication than is usual north of the Alps (to overlook a phase in the history of Teubner); *De optimo genere oratorum*, for instance, has appeared twice in three years, edited by Giomini (Rome, 1995) and better by Antonella Ippolito (Palermo, 1998). Giomini, whose mechanical and undistinguished editing goes back to 1953, has also added Julius Severianus (1992) and Cicero's *Partitiones* (1996). The Corpus Paravianum, which boasts the most informative edition of Virgil, M. Geymonat's (1973), seemed to have lost steam until Petronius appeared (1995), edited by Giardina and Rita Cuccioli Melloni, who puzzlingly say 'saepe nobis factum est, uti . . . codicum vel librorum lectiones ex Mülleriana prima depromere auderemus, quamquam . . . testes traditionis denuo contulimus'; in the same year Müller's own edition, which I still use in its first version (1961), went into a fourth for Teubner, and altogether a Tarrantian moratorium has attractions until fresh material turns up, because there is greater need for a commentary. Long delays in printing have plagued the Mondadori Cicero, launched in 1963, and one of the only two volumes completed since the appearance of *Texts and Transmission* (1983) is a feeble *Verrine* II.2 by G. Lopez (1993); but the other, Silvia Rizzo's splendid *Pro Cluentio* (1991), has not been matched, so far as I am aware, by any other edition published in Italy since Giusta's invigorating *Tusculans* (Paravia, 1984). Her combination of a historical approach to the transmission with a sure command of Latin and of stemmatic logic is something that one might have expected to see oftener in Italy now that much of the best historical work on manuscripts is done there.<sup>50</sup> Not that no progress has been made: Parroni has devoted a stout volume to Pomponius Mela (1984); Rapisarda (1991) has gone some way towards remedying the defects of Sallmann's *Censorinus*;<sup>51</sup> Di Maria has put the text of Cicero's *Topica* on a firmer footing (1994); and Ortoleva in a monograph (1996) has brought an impressive amount of new evidence to bear on Vegetius' *Mulomedicina*, which he proposes to edit. Badalì's promising work on Lucan fizzled out in an edition handsomely printed for the Accademia dei Lincei (1992) in a series so sporadic as hardly to be a series, at any rate on the Latin side; the preface is heavy with weariness and resignation. The strong tradition at Rome of work on grammatical texts has not only yielded editions by De Nonno (1982), Marina Passalacqua (1984,

<sup>48</sup> 'Editorial opportunities and obligations', *RFIC* 123 (1995), 479–99; 'Notes on Vegetius', *PCPS* n.s. 44 (1998), 182–218.

<sup>49</sup> I could say more about recent editions of Livy, not all of them mentioned here, but I have discussed the transmission of Books 21–40 in four articles, of which the latest and simplest is 'The *Vetus Carnotensis* unmasked', in J. Diggle, J. B. Hall, and H. D. Jocelyn (eds), *Studies in Latin Literature and its Tradition in Honour of C. O. Brink*, PCPS Suppl. 15 (1989), 97–112, and the transmission of Books 1–10 in four

others, best used now as footnotes on Oakley's discussion (mentioned above). See also *CR* 102 (1988), 42–9, where he reviewed Walsh's Teubner edition of Books 28–30.

<sup>50</sup> She prepared the ground with *La tradizione manoscritta della Pro Cluentio di Cicerone* (Genoa, 1979) and *Catalogo dei codici della Pro Cluentio ciceroniana* (Genoa, 1983).

<sup>51</sup> M. Winterbottom, *CR* 107 (1993), 177. His collected reviews would serve in themselves as a manual of editing.

1987, 1992), and De Paolis (1990), and new fragments or a better text of known fragments,<sup>52</sup> but also caused one of the sharpest controversies in the recent history of editing: De Nonno responded at length<sup>53</sup> when Carlotta Dionisotti pleaded for more attention to the content and historical context of the works and more thought about what exactly the editor should be trying to reconstruct.<sup>54</sup> I agree with her that a decision on what to reconstruct may sometimes depend on a wider study of the work, and there is force too in her further observation that 'grammars have small hope of finding other fans if even their editors show no interest'. A young scholar, C. Baschera, has bravely tackled the *Scholia Veronensia* on Virgil (1999), without, it must be admitted, making notable progress, even though, unlike van den Hout in Fronto, he went back to the palimpsest. Italian scholars have fewer excuses than most for not looking at manuscripts, because their libraries are full of them and the trains are still cheap.

In North America, before Thomson produced a Catullus that improves on the O.C.T. but much less than the O.C.T. improved on its predecessors (1st edn, 1978; 2nd edn with commentary, 1997), the publishing of editions had been confined to the Harvard Servius, 'whose difficult gestation and protracted lifespan' in the words of Tarrant (p. 124) 'would not encourage imitators'. On the other hand, editions by North Americans have been published elsewhere, most recently Kaster's of *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, mentioned above, and Sweeney's of 'Lactantius Placidus' on the *Thebaid* (Teubner, 1997).

Critical, stemmatic, and historical progress will continue to be made outside editions. There is hardly a text on which W. S. Watt has not published conjectures, at worst reasonable and at best very attractive. Editors of *De oratore* have long been using A and E, but in 1996 S. Renting proved that E derives from A,<sup>55</sup> editors and others had often borrowed collations of one or both. Nothing that Giuseppe Billanovich has written over the last fifty years can be ignored, even if it must all be approached with caution,<sup>56</sup> and Albinia de la Mare has transformed research on Italian manuscripts of the Renaissance by placing and identifying scribes and illuminators.<sup>57</sup> When the *Panegyrici* reached Italy from the Council of Basel, astute corrections were made by someone 'cuius nomen' said Mynors in the O.C.T. (p. x) 'pudet me nescire'; A. Manfredi has recently identified him as Tommaso Parentucelli, who became the humanist pope Nicholas V, founder of the Vatican Library.<sup>58</sup> An excellent monograph by Bianca Schröder holds lessons for editors of Columella, Hyginus, Cassiodorus, Ovid's *Heroides*, and other works.<sup>59</sup>

Such progress is hard to plan or predict, but many traditions still await direct investigation. Tarrant's *Metamorphoses* is imminent, and so is Heyworth's Propertius, which will apply the conclusions that he and Butrica have reached about the tradition; but where is a comparable Tibullus, or Caesar's *Civil War*, or Buchheit's *Priapea*, announced in 1962? The unprofitable debate about the stemma of Tacitus' *Germania* and *Dialogus* would surely benefit from an injection of history,<sup>60</sup> and Stephen Oakley kindly tells me that there is much more to be said about the traditions of Vitruvius, Curtius, Dictys, and Porphyrio on Horace. More reports, please, on Suetonius' emperors as well (over 200 manuscripts); and though Lindsay's stock has been rising of late,<sup>61</sup> I have the impression that his Martial has worn better than his Plautus, Terence, Festus, Nonius, or Isidore. The fourteen volumes of *Studi Noniani* from Genoa include editorial contributions in small doses, and there are welcome rumours from London of a multi-disciplinary assault on Festus.

In 1897, when the founding fathers of the *Thesaurus* wanted the *Mulomedicina Chironis* edited in a hurry so that they could cite its 'rustic' Latin, they twisted the arm of a schoolteacher, Eugen Oder, who was working on the Greek *hippiatrica*. If Winterbottom was right about the

<sup>52</sup> See, for instance, M. De Nonno, 'Nuovi apporti alla tradizione indiretta di Sallustio, Lucilio, Pacuvio e Ennio', *RFIC* 121 (1993), 5–23.

<sup>53</sup> 'L'*Anonymus Bobiensis* e la riforma dell'edizione dei grammatici', *RFIC* 113 (1985), 366–79.

<sup>54</sup> 'Latin grammar for Greeks and Goths', *JRS* 74 (1984), 202–8.

<sup>55</sup> 'The manuscripts of Cicero's *De oratore*: E is a descendant of A', *CQ* 90 (1996), 183–95.

<sup>56</sup> His publications up to 1984 are listed by Mirella Ferrari in R. Avesani *et al.* (eds), *Vestigia: studi in onore di Giuseppe Billanovich* (Rome, 1984), I, xxi–xxxv. Those more recent have mainly appeared in *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* and *Studi Petrarqueschi*.

<sup>57</sup> The most substantial of her many publications since *The Handwriting of Italian Humanists* I.1 (Oxford, 1973) is 'New research on humanistic scribes in Florence', in A. Garzelli, *Miniatura fiorentina del*

*Rinascimento 1440–1525: un primo censimento*, Indici e cataloghi toscani 18–19 (1985), I, 393–600.

<sup>58</sup> 'Un'editio umanistica dei *Panegyrici latini minores*: il codice Vaticano lat. 1775 (W) e il suo correttore (w)', in L. Belloni, G. Milanese, and A. Porro (eds), *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata* (Milan, 1995), 1313–25.

<sup>59</sup> *Titel und Text: zur Entwicklung lateinischer Gedichtüberschriften, mit Untersuchungen zu lateinischen Buchtiteln, Inhaltsverzeichnissen und anderen Gliederungsmitteln* (Berlin and New York, 1999).

<sup>60</sup> The latest contribution that I have seen is C. O. Brink, 'A bipartite stemma of Tacitus's *Dialogus de oratoribus* and some transmitted variants', *ZPE* 102 (1994), 131–52.

<sup>61</sup> See M. Lapidge's editorial 'Foreword' to the pieces assembled as W. M. Lindsay, *Studies in Early Mediaeval Latin Glossaries* (Aldershot, 1996).

impending demise of systematic editing, then arms need twisting on a more ambitious scale, both within and beyond what Tarrant calls 'a shrinking corps of trained editors' (p. 123). The fundamental issues are larger: contact with primary evidence, and the ability to evaluate it. The claims that advertisers can make in print for drugs are controlled by laws, but anyone can claim anything on the Web, which besides documented information already purveys huge quantities of disembodied 'information'. If the human race continues to respect its past, it will need more than a Netscape Navigator for its voyage through the third millennium.

## APPENDIX

I shall not want to look back at this piece, because while I was writing it Latin studies lost four outstanding scholars. Leighton Reynolds and Giuseppe Billanovich I have had occasion to mention. Don Fowler's reviews for *Greece & Rome* from 1986 to 1993 covered an astounding range with humour and lightly worn authority. Scevola Mariotti, who could not read a Latin work of any date without turning a problem of text or interpretation into a cameo of linguistic or literary history, contributed his last reflections on editing to *Esperienze ecdotiche*, op. cit. (n. 7), 95–102: 'Tradizione diretta e indiretta'.

*Pembroke College, Cambridge*