

# Critical editions and the complementary apparatuses to a critical apparatus\*

Antonia Giannouli, University of Cyprus

## Summary

The present paper aims to contribute to the discussion about a) the complementary information in an edited text, namely sources, parallel or similar passages, or the later use of texts and text elements, b) the classification of this information and c) its distribution in apparatuses. Using the guidelines of the *Association Guillaume Budé*, the *Union Académique Internationale* and the *Association Internationale des Études Byzantines*, it raises the question of conformity among editors and points up the need for consistency, at least as regards terminology and the treatment of clear cases.

The note aims to provide a brief glimpse of the methods and practices applied in editions of Byzantine texts with regard to supplementing information on sources, parallel or similar passages, or later use of texts and text elements.

*Fontes* and *parallela* (or *similia*) along with *imitationes* and *testimonia* constitute essential material for the *constitutio textus* as well as for the better appreciation of the text, in particular its composition technique and literary impact. Hence, the related indications are regarded as proper complements to the *apparatus criticus*. However, the difficulty in distinguishing between these categories of material is reflected in their distribution in the relevant apparatuses. What to include in what involves critical issues of the editorial technique.

There are two main sources at our disposal, namely (A) the official *guidelines*, and (B) the *introductions* to the editions.

## A. Definitions of complementary material and classifications

### 1. Guidelines of the Association Guillaume Budé

In the first guidelines for the critical editions of the Association Guillaume Budé published by Louis Havet in 1925<sup>1</sup> there is no mention of the material in question. It was not until 1972, when Jean Irigoien revised the guidelines in his *Règles et recommandations pour les éditions critiques*, that he considered tes-

\* This contribution is based on the paper 'Apparatus fontium, similium etc. (Byzantine Greek)' presented at the COMSt workshop 'Specific Issues in Oriental Philology' at the National Research Institute in Athens, 8–9 December 2011. It was submitted for the COMSt Handbook in July 2012; some parts of it have found their way into the published *Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies. An Introduction*, ed. A. Bausi et al. (Hamburg: Tredition, 2015).

1 Havet 1925.

*timonia* as one of the proper components of a critical edition. Under the term *testimonia* he includes citations, excerpts, etc. without further distinction.<sup>2</sup> His aim was the same as that of his predecessor, namely to avoid anarchy and enhance consistency and conformity in the Greek editions of the ‘Collection Budé’ or the ‘Collection des Universités de France’, without excluding possible adaptations in the details.<sup>3</sup> Irigoin suggested that *testimonia* should precede the *apparatus criticus* and be distinguished by the prefixed abbreviated designation ‘TEST’, since they constituted an indirect tradition of the edited text.<sup>4</sup> The form of the citation was also precisely defined. There is no explicit mention of the rest of the complementary material. But, from his remarks about the form of the references and citations in the introduction, the preface and the notes we may infer that he is suggesting that this material should be treated in one or more of these three.<sup>5</sup>

## 2. Guidelines of the Union Académique Internationale

More detailed definitions and specific directions are contained in the guidelines first elaborated by Joseph Bidez and Anders Bjørn Drachmann at the behest of the Union Académique Internationale (Académie royal de Belgique) and published in 1932. The guidelines were reworked by Armand Delatte and Albert Severyns in 1938.<sup>6</sup> The aim of the recommendations was to achieve a certain standardization in the critical editions of ancient Greek and Latin texts. The information presented below is based on the 1938 edition.

### 2.1. *Fontes – imitationes – testimonia*

In terms of definition, the complementary indications of the *apparatus criticus* are divided into the following three categories and subcategories.<sup>7</sup>

2.1.1. The first category, the *fontes*, includes:

- a) the sources of the edited text, i.e. the passages from earlier authors on which the author of the edited text drew and
- b) parallel passages, i.e. the passages from authors who had treated the same subject, using the same sources.<sup>8</sup>

2 Irigoin 1972, 1 and 23–24.

3 Irigoin 1972, vii.

4 Irigoin 1972, 24, where he also comments on the rest of the material contained in the *apparatus criticus*, namely *lectiones*, conjectures accepted or proposed, etc.

5 Irigoin 1972, 2 and 59–63.

6 Bidez and Drachmann 1938, 1.

7 Bidez and Drachmann 1938, § 30 (pp. 32–33).

8 For example, passages which go back to the same Byzantine collection of laws, as explained by Fögen 1990, 153–214, esp. 160: ‘Als *loci paralleli* werden solche Texte notiert, die entweder wörtlich mit einem Lexikoneintrag übereinstimmen

2.1.2. The second category, *imitationes*, includes passages by contemporary or later authors, who were inspired by the edited work.

2.1.3. Finally, the third category, *testimonia* or *testes*, includes copies, i.e. ‘the passages of later authors which copied, reproduced or literally quoted passages of the edited work’.

It is clear from the above mentioned definitions and recommendations that, on the one hand, *fontes* and *parallela* (or *similia*) refer to the content of the edited text, while, on the other, *testimonia* and *imitationes* refer to its impact on other writers. Therefore, it is arguable that these categories of information should be presented differently.

## 2.2. ‘Parallel’ and ‘indirect’ tradition

A further distinction between the ‘parallel’ and ‘indirect’ tradition of the edited text was suggested. The first two categories (*fontes* and *imitationes*) were classified in the ‘parallel’ tradition and the third category (*testimonia*) in the ‘indirect’ tradition, since this last category involves complementary information of varied quality and nature. This second distinction and especially the use of the term ‘parallel’ to include the (actual) sources (i.e. category 2.1.1a) raises questions and introduces an element of ambiguity.

## 2.3. Disposition of the complementary material

For the sake of clarity, it was recommended that the three categories of complementary material in question appear separately from the rest of the *apparatus criticus* but also from each other, i.e. by category, with each one being prefixed by the initial letter of the relevant Latin term, i.e. *F*(ontes), *I*(mitationes), *T*(estes).<sup>9</sup>

## 2.4. Placement

The *T*(estes) should be placed between the text and the rest of the *apparatus criticus* and next to the *sigla* of the manuscripts, to facilitate consultation of the apparatus. The *F*(ontes) and the *I*(mitationes), on the other hand, should be placed below the *apparatus criticus*.

## 2.5. Appearance

All three categories should consistently use certain abbreviations and symbols and follow a standard format.<sup>10</sup>

---

oder—trotz sprachlicher Varianten—eine gemeinsame Quelle mit dem Lexikoneintrag haben. Da diese gemeinsame Quelle regelmäßig das justinianische Corpus Iuris ist, wird dieses neben den Basiliken zitiert’.

9 Bidez and Drachmann 1938, § 30 (pp. 32–34). On the other hand, emendations and conjectures should be denoted all together in the *apparatus criticus*, *ibid.* §§ 26–28 (pp. 29–32).

10 See examples in Bidez and Drachmann 1938, § 30 (p. 33).

### 3. *Guidelines of the Association Internationale des Études Byzantines*

The concise guidelines for one of the most renowned international series of editions of Byzantine texts, the *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* (henceforth *CFHB*), published in 1968, mentions three categories, *fontes*, *testimonia* and *parallela*, and suggests they should be presented together but apart from the *variae lectiones*.<sup>11</sup> Despite the listing of the three categories, no special directions concerning the disposition of the material are offered. There is an explicit reference to the aforementioned 1938 revised guidelines for further consultation.

#### B.1. Editorial practice

In practice, despite theoretical guidelines, diversity continues to dominate both the presentation of the material and the use of terminology. To better illustrate this situation, I will focus on the last mentioned series, the *CFHB*, which since its inauguration in 1967, has seen almost fifty editions. Taking the guidelines as our starting point, we can deduce the following from an examination of the practices followed in the various editions in the series.

- 1) The optional character of the guidelines has led to this material being presented in a variety of ways within the same series. The arrangement of the apparatus with the complementary material may, of course, differ from case to case, according e.g. to the originality of the text being edited (namely if it is an original, a paraphrase, a compilation, a florilegium etc).
- 2) It is fortunate that in their introductions most editors of this series refer, in more or less detail,<sup>12</sup> to the policy followed in the construction of the apparatuses. Yet in almost 30% of the published volumes explicit mention of the arrangement of the complementary material is lacking. In these cases the editor's decisions can be deduced from the edition itself. However, sometimes such material is either absent from the apparatus, or treated in the commentary, or is collected without further designation in the apparatus. For example, Mango (1990) and Haldon (1990) preferred a commentary to an *apparatus fontium*. Dennis (1981) recorded extracts from the edited work preserved by later authors (i.e. *testimonia*) in an individual apparatus.<sup>13</sup>
- 3) Apart from variations in the arrangement of the material, a really problematic issue concerns the term *testimonia*, the liberal use of which causes some confusion (more especially when it is contrary to the conventional meaning

11 'Règles ...' 1968.

12 Usually in a sub-section entitled 'Comments on / Principles / Method of the present edition'.

13 Mango 1990, 13–18; Haldon 1990, 195–293. Dennis and Gammilscheg 1981, 45–47.

established in the 1938 Guidelines by Delatte and Severyns). A couple of illustrative examples attest to this:

a) In his introductory chapter, J.L. van Dieten (1972), refers explicitly to the composition of the apparatuses and to the terms *testimonia*, *fontes*, *loci paralleli*, *imitationes*. But in his preliminary comments he considers the term *testimonia* a superordinate, with *fontes*, *loci paralleli*, *imitationes* as its subordinates.<sup>14</sup> This is why he presents all this material without further distinction in one apparatus, which he designates ‘das sogenannte Testimonienapparat’.

b) Likewise in the introduction to another edition two years later, J.L. van Dieten<sup>15</sup> explains that, in ‘the so called *apparatus testimoniorum*’, he will take into account other works of the author he is editing (i.e. Nicetas Choniates), as well as three earlier works, which his author (Nicetas) certainly consulted. By this he means *fontes*.

c) Also Giuseppe Schirò (1975), editing the verse Chronicle of the Tocco, describes the complementary material he had collected for the apparatus, which he designates *testimonia* (T) and *parallela* (P).<sup>16</sup> He explains that the term *testimonia* is used for other evidence corroborating the facts mentioned in the chronicle he is editing, while the term *parallela* refers to the evidence which comes from works written in the demotic. It is clear that the editor was using these terms in a way that deviated from their conventional understanding in the Guidelines.

## B.2. Modern recommendations

This list can be further supplemented with editions from other series. Including quotations and parallels (*similia*) in one apparatus may have been a practical decision for editors, who were attempting to overcome the difficult and sometimes uncertain distinction between (actual) sources and parallels. But it is misleading for the modern reader, blurring the picture of the Byzantine author’s education and the range of his actual readings.<sup>17</sup> Above all, this practice can lead to terminological confusion.<sup>18</sup>

14 van Dieten 1972, xx.

15 van Dieten 1975, civ.

16 Schirò 1975, 205–206 the introductory subchapter *testimonia e parallela*.

17 Cf. Littlewood 1988, 139. On the difficulty in distinguishing the sources from the parallels, see Knoche 1940, 526, n. 1.

18 On the mistaken use of *testimonia* for *fontes* see Reinsch 2006, 301ff. Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 303: ‘die undifferenzierte Bezeichnung „Zitat“ für wirkliche Zitate und für Wendungen, welche Anna Komnene mit früheren und späteren Schriftstellern als an der allgemeinen Literatursprache Partizipierende teilt, führt auf methodische Irrwege dieser Art’.

The observations made above may suffice at this stage to support the recommendation made by Dieter R. Reinsch at the 21<sup>st</sup> International Congress of Byzantine Studies in London, 2006, in respect of the need to distinguish between the various types of complementary material in question.<sup>19</sup>

Given that both Byzantine authors and audiences appreciated quotations from, and references to literary models from classical antiquity but also from later periods, the editors of these texts should handle the relevant information more carefully for the sake of the modern reader.

Even if it is not desirable to follow a rigid system, it should be possible to pursue conformity as regards the terminology and the treatment of clear cases. For this reason, I will repeat three recommendations in relation to the material in question:

- an introductory presentation of the methodology followed;
- definition of the terminology used and consistency in its use (if possible throughout the editions of a series);
- the differentiated presentation of the material either in a single apparatus—introduced by the relevant qualifying verbs (such as *confer*, *alludit ad*, *more confer exempli gratia*)—or in separate ones (at least distinguishing *fontes* and *parallela*, from *testimonia* and *imitationes*, since they are not equal or equivalent). In this respect, the *index locorum* will be more useful, once the material is appropriately designated.

## References

- Bidez, J. and A.B. Drachmann <sup>2</sup>1938. *Emploi des signes critiques, disposition de l'apparat dans les éditions savantes des textes grecs et latins. Conseils et recommandations*. Édition nouvelle par A. Dellatte et A. Severyns (Bruxelles: Union Académique Internationale and Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1938).
- Dennis, G.T. and E. Gammilscheg 1981. *Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, ed. G.T. Dennis, tr. E. Gammilscheg, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, 17 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981).

19 Reinsch 2006, 304. He recommends (I am summarizing): a) For actual quotations (with or without citation of the source used by the author) an exact demarcation of the quotation indicating the first and the last word; it should be followed by a colon and the reference to the quoted work. If the quotation is not too extensive, the quoted text could be written out in full for the sake of the reader. b) For modified quotations (with or without citation of the source used by the author), the same procedure is recommended, but with the stipulation that a tilde (~) or some other diacritic should be added after the colon. c) Where there are similarities that could be quotations, the abbreviation 'cf.' should be used in place of the colon. For further suggestions see also Reinsch 2010, 442

- Dieten, J.A. van 1972. *Nicetae Choniatae Orationes et epistulae*, ed. J.A. van Dieten, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, 3 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972).
- 1975. *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, I–II, ed. I.A. van Dieten, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, 11/1–2 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975).
- Featherstone, M. 2004. ‘Court Orthography: Spelling in the Leipzig Manuscript of *De Cerimoniis*’, in B. Janssens, B. Roosen, and P. van Deun (eds), *Philomathestatos: Studies in Greek and Byzantine Texts Presented to Jacques Noret for his Sixty-Fifth Birthday / Études de patristique grecque et textes byzantins offerts à Jacques Noret à l’occasion de ses soixante-cinq ans*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, 137 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 239–247.
- Fögen, M.T. 1990. ‘Das Lexikon zur Hexabiblos aucta’, *Fontes Minores*, 8 (1990), 153–214.
- Haldon, J.F. 1990. *Constantini Porphyrogeniti tres tractatus de expeditionibus militaribus imperatoris*, ed. J.F. Haldon, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, 28 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990).
- Havet, L. 1925. *Règles et recommandations générales pour l’établissement des éditions Guillaume Budé* (Paris: Durand, 1925).
- Irigoin, J. 1972. *Règles et recommandations pour les éditions critiques (Série grecque)* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1972; repr. 2002).
- Knoche, U. 1940. Review of Bidez and Drachmann 1938, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 202 (1940), 515–531.
- Littlewood, A.R. 1988. ‘A Statistical Survey of the Incidence of Repeated Quotations in Selected Byzantine Letter-Writers’, in J. Duffy and J. Peradotto (eds), *Gonimos. Neoplatonic and Byzantine Studies Presented to L.G. Westerink at 75* (Arethusa: Buffalo, NY, 1988), 137–154.
- Liverani, I.A. 1999. ‘L’accentuazione di τε in Eustazio di Tessalonica’, *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici*, 36 (1999), 117–120.
- Maltese, E.V. 1995/96. ‘Ortografia d’autore e regole dell’editore: gli autografi bizantini’, *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici*, NS 32 (1995/96), 91–121.
- Mango, C. 1990. *Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople: Short History*, ed., tr. C. Mango, *Dumbarton Oaks Texts*, 10 / *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, 13 (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990).
- Mazzucchi, C.M. 1979. ‘Sul sistema di accentuazione dei testi greci in età romana e bizantina’, *Aegyptus*, 59 (1979), 145–167.
- Noret, J. 1987. ‘Quand donc rendrons-nous à quantité d’indéfinis, prétendument enclitiques, l’accent qui leur revient’, *Byzantion*, 57 (1987), 191–195.
- 1989. ‘Faut-il écrire οὐκ εἰσιν ou οὐκ εἰσίν?’, *Byzantion*, 59 (1989), 277–280.



- 1995. ‘Notes de ponctuation et d’accentuation byzantines’, *Byzantion*, 65 (1995), 69–88.
- 1998. ‘L’accentuation de τε en grec byzantin’, *Byzantion*, 68 (1998), 516–518.
- 2008. ‘Καὶ τό τε (mieux que καὶ τότε) dans le sens de καὶ τοῦτο ou καὶ ταῦτα’, *Byzantion*, 78 (2008), 340–345.
- and C. De Vocht 1985. ‘Une orthographe insolite et nuancée, celle de Nicéphore Blemmyde, ou à propos du δέ enclitique’, *Byzantion*, 55 (1985), 493–505.
- Oikonomakos, K. 2005. ‘Ἀγαθὸν τὸ διτονεῖν?’, *Byzantion*, 75 (2005), 295–309.
- Randolph, C.B. 1910. ‘The Sign of Interrogation in Greek Minuscul Manuscripts’, *Classical Philology*, 5 (1910), 309–319.
- ‘Règles pour la publication des textes dans le Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae’, *Bulletin d’Information et de Coordination* (Association Internationale des Études Byzantines) 4 (1968), 24–31.
- Reil, M. 1910. ‘Zur Akzentuation griechischer Handschriften’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 19 (1910), 476–529.
- Reinsch, D.R. 2006. ‘Zum Edieren von Texten: Über Zitate’, in E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies, London 21–26 August 2006*, I: *Plenary Papers* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 299–309.
- 2010. ‘The History of Editing Byzantine Historiographical Texts’, in P. Stephenson (ed.), *The Byzantine World*, Routledge Worlds (London – New York: Routledge, 2010), 435–444.
- Schirò, J. 1975. *Ignoti auctoris Chronica Toccoorum Cephalleniensium*, ed. J. Schirò, Series italica / Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 10 (Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1975).