



BRITISH
ACADEMY

Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi

SERIES GUIDELINES

About the series

Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi (ABMA) is a British Academy series, managed by a committee (the Medieval Texts Editorial Committee) which reports to the British Academy's Publications Committee. MTEC is chaired by Dr Cecilia Trifogli, and the Project Director for ABMA is John Marenbon, who is the person to be contacted initially with proposals or enquiries (jm258@cam.ac.uk; Trinity College, Cambridge, CB2 1TQ).

There are three stages for submitting a proposal, but we hope that the first and the third are very simple.

Submitting a Proposal

1. Initial Proposal

Editors who are planning, beginning or in the middle of work on an edition which they would like to be published in ABMA are invited to contact the Project Director informally, and to tell him about the nature of the edition and the timetable. If the planned edition seems suitable for ABMA, then the details of it will be reported to the next MTEC meeting and, if approved, it will be added to the list of projected publications. The editor(s) will be encouraged to proceed to a Full Proposal as soon as the edition is sufficiently advanced – in some cases, the Project Director will advise them to do so immediately.

2. Full Proposal

Editors should submit the following information:

Work(s) being edited – name(s) and position(s) of (and, optionally, further information on) editor(s) – manuscripts used for edition – will there be a translation? – estimated length of the whole book and what proportion of that will be the introduction – timetable for the project (this should be reasonably precise and reliable).

We also require at this stage a minimum of ten pages of the edition, with apparatus and, where applicable, with translation, and a discussion of the principles that have been using in making the edition. We welcome, however, the submission at this stage of longer samples or of whole editions.

The materials submitted will be carefully examined by members of the Medieval Texts Committee, and on the basis of their advice, the Committee will decide whether to accept the proposed edition for the series, subject to approval of the complete edition when it is received and the incorporation of any changes and corrections which may be required by MTEC. (It is MTEC's practice for one or more members to go over carefully the complete editions that are submitted.)

3. Official Acceptance

Only the British Academy Publications Committee (on the recommendation of MTEC) has the authority to accept an edition for publication in *ABMA*, and it requires that proposals are for editions that are finished, or nearly so. Once, it has accepted a Full Proposal, MTEC will, at the appropriate stage, so long as the edition has been satisfactorily completed, make the formal proposal to the Publications Committee. We are confident that in all normal circumstances, once a Full Proposal has been accepted by us, and if the editor(s) carry out what they have promised, we shall be able to publish the edition in *ABMA*.

Preparation of your Edition for Publication

You are strongly advised to consult the MTEC's Project Director before committing much time to preparing the final text of your edition. The Academy's Publications Office may also be called upon for advice.

Your final text should be complete and should include a title page and a table of contents.

You should supply your edition electronically and in hard copy.

Word files

Microsoft Word is the preferred program for your document files. Please ensure that all annotation is linked electronically, using the footnote and/or endnote functions. Differentiate between each series of annotations by using medium, bold or italic type, because these can each be searched for automatically by the typesetter. Unfortunately, roman and arabic numbers cannot be searched for separately in this way, which may create extra work for the typesetter (and, therefore, expense).

Using Classical Text Editor (CTE)

The CTE program is not compatible with the typesetting programs used by the Academy's typesetters. If you would like to use CTE in the preparation of your edition you will have to submit PDF files containing the complete edition in a format ready for print (i.e., what used to be known as 'camera-ready copy'). If this is your choice then please consult the Academy's Publications Office (pubs@britac.ac.uk) for detailed specifications for page layout, etc.

Your final text will be scrutinised by the MTEC and passed by them to the Academy's Publications Office for final approval by the Publications Committee, after which it can be put into production.

The Publications Office of the British Academy deals with all matters relating to typesetting, proofreading and printing. Oxford University Press will distribute and market the book.

Style sheet

We would normally expect an edition to have the following elements: (i) an introduction; (ii) the edited text, with (iii) an apparatus of variant readings and (iv) an apparatus of quotations and allusions; (v) a facing English translation; (vi) an index of quotations and allusions; (vii) an index of persons and subjects. Editions might also include an index of key Latin words, and an appendix or appendices.

i. *The Introduction* At the minimum, an Introduction should contain a brief account of the author and the setting of the work edited, along with a description of the manuscripts and the transmission of the text and an explanation of the editorial principles followed. *ABMA* welcomes, in principle, longer Introductions, which include contextual and analytical discussion of the texts edited.

ii. *The Text* Editors are encouraged to use their judgements in balancing consistency and clarity with a presentation of the peculiarities of particular manuscripts. There is no firm rule for the series about orthography, paragraphing or punctuation, but in their Introduction editors should explain and justify their decisions. The following practices should, however, be followed:

- tironian 7 and & should be read as *et*
- abbreviations should be silently extended
- cross-references should be clearly indicated
- editorial additions (e.g. for scribal omissions) should be in angled brackets < >; editorial deletions should be in square brackets []. This convention should be indicated in the list of abbreviations, and normally such additions and deletions should be recorded in the apparatus
- lacunae should be indicated unambiguously (e.g. by a series of dots) and recorded in the apparatus

Editors are encouraged to discuss any queries over such matters of presentation with the Project Director.

iii. *The Apparatus of Variants* Only significant variants should be recorded. Marginal notes, erasures, changes of hand or ink may also be recorded in this apparatus. See the extended 'Note' below.

iv. *The Apparatus of Quotations and Allusions* Any comments by the editor should be brief and in longer discussion can be included in the Introduction or in an appendix. Use English forms of Greek and Latin names (e.g. 'Aristotle', 'Jerome').

v. *The Facing English Translation* Usually, editions in the series will include a translation into English, which will be printed so as to face the original. In some cases, however, the committee responsible for *ABMA* may agree to publish without a translation, because it would be impracticable to produce one, or because the work is of a very specialized sort, where a translation would find few users. Prospective editors should speak to the Project Director if they do not wish to include a translation.

vi. *Indexes* Editors should be careful to indicate clearly whether entries refer to pages, lines or numbered sections in the editions.

Some pages from an *ABMA* volume (Harclay, *Ordinary Questions*, ed. M. Henninger) are attached, so as to give a general idea of the practices adopted in the series, though for different works different editorial decisions will be appropriate.

NOTE

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 automatically 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.

5. Huic videtur concordat Guilelmus Alvernus,⁶ Parisiensis episcopus, in libro *De fide et legibus*, capitulo 20, ubi tractat istam materiam. Assignare enim videtur eandem causam, nam^k dicit quod totus mundus resonat laudem Dei, quasi quodam cantico musicali et proportionato, ubi quidam cantant supra, quidam sub, et unus cantus efficitur ex utrisque. Ita iuges laudes et gratiarum actiones continue resonabunt Dei misericordiam in salvatis; sic planctus, eiulatus resonabunt Dei iustitiam in perditis. ¹Unde infernus^l in^m gloriicatorum auribus ineffabili suavitate succinetⁿ paradiso.⁷ Nec esset^o locunda omnique^o ex parte perfecta musicalis concentus suavitas, si discantus infernalis Dei iustitiam resonans cantui misericordiae deesset.

6. 2^o, probatur⁸ idem per auctoritatem Romanos 9: *An non habet figulus luti potestatem ex eadem massa facere aliud quidem vas in honorem, aliud in contumeliam?*⁹ *Quod si volens Deus ostendere iram suam et notam facere potentiam suam, sustinuit in multa patientia vasa irae apta ad interitum, ut ostenderet divitias gloriae suae in⁹ vasa misericordiae quae praeparavit in gloriam.* Et ipsemet¹⁰ Apostolus¹⁰ erat huiusmodi vas electionis, *Actuum* 9. Ergo videtur quod Apostolus innuat causam praedictam. Item,¹¹ 2^o *Timotheum* 2: *In magna domo sunt multa vasa quaedam aurea, argentea, lignea, fictilia, quaedam in honorem, quaedam in contumeliam.*

7. Sic ergo patet de primo quod^l in generali potest esse causa praedestinationis 40 et reprobationis, sed in speciali non, sicut ipse probat⁵ persuasionem et auctoritate.⁵ Ratione tali^l in generali sit aliqua causa quare aliqua pars materiae est sub forma terrae et aliqua sub forma aquae,⁴ tamen quare haec pars est sub forma terrae et alia sub forma aquae, nulla est causa nisi a casu.¹² Ita in artificialibus bene est causa in generali quare aliqui lapides ponuntur inferius, quare aliqui superius, sed in speciali quare hic lapis inferius et alius eiusdem conditionis superius, nulla causa est nisi voluntas artificis ponentis. Eodem modo in proposito. Illud etiam probatur auctoritate Augustini,¹³ omilia 26, *Super Iohannem*, 'Nemo quaerat quare hunc trahat^l et illum non trahat,^m noli quaerere, si non vis errare.'

^k nam| ubi V ^l Unde infernus| unde infernis B, in inferno V ^m in| et WV ⁿ succinet scriptis| sustinet B, succinet W, succinet in V ^o locunda omnique| inundationum quia WV *p contumeliam*| contumelia BW ⁹ in ex textu Sacrae Scripturae| et BWV ^r quod om. WV ^s persuasionem et auctoritate| per persuasionem et auctoritatem WVV ^t talis| sed add. W, sed quod add. V ^u tamen . . . aquae om. hom. V ^v trahat| trahit WV ^w trahat ex textu Augustini| trahit BWV

⁶ William of Auvergne, *De fide et legibus*, 22, ed. Paris: i. 64b–65b.

⁷ William of Auvergne, *De fide et legibus*, 22, ed. Paris: i. 65b.

⁸ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theol.* 1, q. 23, a. 5 ad 3, iv. 277^b–278^b.

⁹ *Rm.* 9, 21–3.

¹⁰ *Act.* 9, 1–30.

¹¹ 2 *Tm.* 2, 20.

5. William of Auvergne,⁶ Bishop of Paris, seems to agree with this in chapter twenty of his book *On Faith and the Laws*, where he discusses this issue. He seems to put it down to the same cause, saying that the whole world resounds with praise of God, just as in an arranged choral work, some sing high, others low, and one music is made of both. 'Perpetual praise and thanksgiving constantly re-echo the mercy of God in the saved, while shrieks and laments echo his justice in the damned. In this way, hell produces an indescribably sweet sound in the ears of the blessed in heaven.'⁷ Nor would there be the joyful sweetness of this musical harmony, perfect in every part, if this merciful music lacked the hellish descent celebrating the justice of God.

6. In the second place, this can be proven⁸ from another text in Romans chapter nine:⁹ *Is not the potter free to do what he will with the clay, using the same lump to make two objects, one for noble and one for ignoble use? It may be that God has borne, long and patiently, with those who are the objects of his vengeance, fit only for destruction, meaning to give proof of that vengeance, and display his power at last; meaning also to display, in those who are the objects of his mercy, how rich he is in the glory he bestows, that glory for which he has destined them.* Paul himself¹⁰ was one of these chosen vessels (see Acts chapter nine); he appears to give the same reason¹¹ in chapter two of his second letter to Timothy: *A great house, besides its plate of gold and silver, contains other objects made of wood and earthenware, those for noble, these for ignoble uses.*

7. In the first place it is clear, then, that there can be general causes of predestination and reprobation, but not specific ones, as Thomas shows by persuasive reasoning and an authoritative text. There is a general reason why some matter has the form of earth and other matter that of water, but there is no reason except chance¹² why this bit of matter is earth and that water. So also with the products of art: there is a good general reason why some stones are placed below and others above, but there is no specific reason why this particular stone is placed underneath another of the same type, except the will of the workman who puts it there. Exactly the same is true in the issue at hand. Augustine¹³ also shows this in his twenty-sixth *Homily on John*: 'Let no one ask why God draws this one and not that one; ask not, if you would not be mistaken.'

¹² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theol.* 1, q. 23, a. 5 ad 3, iv. 277^b–278^b. Harchley reports the same argument, *In I Sent.*, d. 41, fol. 80^{ra}–b; see Scotus, *Rep.* 1 A, d. 41, q. un., MS Viennalat. 1453, fol. 118^{ra}.

¹³ Aug. *Tract. in Io.* 26, 2, CCL 36, 260 = PL 35, 1607.