

NORMS FOR PUBLISHING IN THE SCRIPTORES CELTIGENAE SERIES

Originally written in August 1987; revised in April 2007.

Because material submitted must be compatible with the computing requirements of the Royal Irish Academy's *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources*, the following stipulations apply. **They take precedence over the standard Brepols / Corpus Christianorum norms** (that is, over *Instructions and Style-Book for the Publication of Texts in Corpus Christianorum*, version 1, August 2003). In what follows, numbers in brackets refer in each case to the entry in the standard norms which is being overruled [as shown in square brackets in those norms]. (N.B. these stipulations apply only to text, not apparatuses.) Note that references in the standard norms to "the editorial board" should, in the case of our sub-series, be taken as referring to the Scriptorum Celtigenae Committee (secretary Dr Anthony Harvey, e-mail DMLCS@ria.ie).

Capital *u* should be rendered *U*; the character *V* should be used only for numerals [40].

After a *full stop*, an *interrogation mark* or an *exclamation mark* a double space should be left wherever these indicate the end of a sentence. But the transition from lemma to commentary does not count as the end of a sentence.

The text itself is to be in normal roman (upright) upper- and lower-case characters. Biblical lemmata, however, are to be in small (two-line) capitals. Other Biblical quotations should be enclosed within smart, double quotation marks (e.g. "xxxx") [44, 45].

Citations of other authorities, such as the Fathers, are to be enclosed within smart, single quotation marks (e.g. 'xxxx') [46, 47, 48].

Rhetorical quotations (i.e. conversations within the text) should be enclosed within single quotation marks repeated (e.g. "xxxx") [49, 50, 51].

N.B. We are not using italics within the body of the text at all [42, 43].

(Please note that Brepols may automatically cancel the above stipulations at a later stage in the process, so that your text as finally printed may appear according to the *unmodified* Brepols norms after all. But such cancellation will be carried out electronically within the Brepols machinery and will not require intervention on your part. In order that your edition be usable by both the RIA Dictionary computer **and** the Brepols machine, it is important that you do adhere to these stipulations in your preparation of your main text.)

The following **General Guideline** applies to the whole venture:

"Editors should aim to edit their texts, in words and orthography, as they believe these proceeded from the pens of the original compilers. They should introduce emendations of which they are confident to the body of the text, doubtful ones being relegated to the apparatus. It should thus be possible to read the text, as the Editor believes it should be, without referring to the notes; while the foot of the page preserves a record of MS readings properly rejected. The purpose of the critical apparatus is to show the relation of the critical text, as edited, to the manuscript(s). Editorial insertions must be enclosed in angle-brackets (i.e. < xxxx >). On the other hand, material deleted editorially should (by definition) not appear at all in the text (although the deletion should be clearly indicated in the critical apparatus)."

(Note that the final sentence in this statement means that the use of square brackets — [xxx] — in the main text will not arise. Thus we have here a further slight derogation from Brepols norms - see norm [41]).

Supplementary Guidelines for Editors

Originally written 2 December 1991.

1) *Keying apparatuses to text*

Line-numbers are likely to keep changing until the last minute (see Brepols norms, p. 18). As an interim measure it is therefore advisable to use a less volatile method of keying apparatuses to text; this can then be ‘translated’ when page- and line-divisions have been finalized by Brepols. The use of suprascript letters for one apparatus, and (consecutive) suprascript numbers for the other, has been found to be a highly workable system by at least one editor, and is to be recommended. (Certain modern word-processing packages avoid this problem by having the inputter enter the apparatus-items, suitably flagged, at the appropriate points in the main body of the text; when printed out, these items appear grouped together, and apart from the main body of the text, in the normal way. However, what one sees on the screen is then very different from what gets printed out; and in any case, editors are asked — both by ourselves and by the Brepols norms — to prepare their critical texts, on the one hand, and their various apparatuses, on the other, each in a separate computer file, these files not being linked electronically in any way.)

2) *What constitutes a quotation? (These observations take precedence over norms [43] to [51])*

The aim here is the deployment of quotation-marks in a way that satisfies modern standards for the edition of texts and that is also helpful for DMLCS dictionary purposes. In the case of the latter, the point is this: when the DMLCS computer produces its listings, the absence or presence respectively of (non-rhetorical) quotation-marks around a word or passage serve to distinguish that which is original to the particular Celtic-Latin author in question from that which may have been imported undigested by him from outside the domain of Celtic Latinity and which may therefore not be representative of its natural usage. It would be a pity if the Dictionary were to quote, as illustrative of Celtic-Latin practice, something that was in fact lifted directly from the pages of Gregory the Great! And by making sure that “xxx” and ‘xxx’ quotation marks are appropriately used at the inputting stage, *Scriptores Celtigenae* editors can help to ensure that such gaffes do not get made later on. (For this reason, even where the real source of a borrowing is not the source the author alleges it to be, it should be marked as a quotation unless the author seems likely to have made it up himself.)

It is at the level of the **lexical item** that this matters, because for Dictionary purposes that is the level at which distinctions will be drawn. In a passage that is a quotation from another author, therefore, quotation-marks should only be switched off where there has been a **lexical substitution**. **Syntactic** and **grammatical** substitutions matter less — that is, a verb can have its tense, mood, person, number or voice altered, or a noun its case or number, or a clause its word-order, and still be regarded as a quotation and be marked as such. The reason: the distribution of the items among the head-words in the Dictionary would not be affected. For precision, quotation marks should be switched on and off as many times as necessary within a sentence; and the use of *cf.* etc. in the apparatus can be used to explain ambiguities. Quotation-marks should **not**, however, be placed in the middle of words, as this would simply confuse the computer. Finally, where there is a recognizable echo of (say) a Biblical phrase, but with few of the same words being used, the echo can be indicated by enclosing (as “xxx”) just one or two of the catch-words, even if these are otherwise quite common in the text at large (e.g. “panes” and “piscis” if the echo is one of the Feeding of the Multitudes accounts). This ploy will draw the reader’s attention to the fact of the echo, and an appropriate *cf.* entry in the apparatus fontium will provide the details.

3) *Rhetorical quotations.*

The best approach is to think of these as anything that one would in normal usage put into quotation-marks **other than** Biblical quotations (“xxx”) and quotations from other written sources (‘xxx’). Thus, as well as for conversations within the text, rhetorical quotation-marks (“xxx”) can be used in passages such as:

“Salathiel” interpretatur “petitio mea”

though this should not be done if it would cause confusing phenomena such as three unspaced quotation marks in a row. Nothing of importance lexicographically would be affected if the use of rhetorical quotation-marks were abandoned altogether and the passages in question left unmarked: but

from the point of view of the publication of their texts, editors will wish to use them to make such passages easier to read and understand.

4) *Amplification of 'General Guideline' (see above)*

It is appropriate, in cases of doubt, to give the original compilers of *Scriptores Celtigenae* texts credit in the case of:

- a) Accuracy of quotation. If there is a missing or illegible passage in the MS record, but it is clear that it originally contained an identifiable quotation that is known to us, then the passage should be restored directly from that source (e.g. St. Augustine, or the Bible). It should, of course, be placed in angle-brackets; and the spelling should be made to conform with that of the rest of the text (i.e. almost certainly **not** Classical standard).
- b) Grammatical sense. If there are variant readings, the principle of following the *lectio difficilior* should be adopted, other things being equal. However, other things should **not** be considered equal if not all readings make sense. There is an onus on editors not to present nonsense in the body of the texts they are publishing (see reference in 'General Guideline' to the text 'as the Editor believes it should be'), and no scribe's faulty copying should be allowed to stand between the modern reader and the original compiler's intention (even if such faulty copying is common to all extant MSS). Hence:
 - i) it may well be necessary to present as the reading in the edited text what is to be found now in one, now in another of the extant MSS;
 - ii) if (i) fails to produce sense, conjecture must be resorted to;
 - iii) only if (i) and then (ii) both fail should defeat be admitted (and then this should be made explicit in the apparatus).

5) *Expansion of abbreviations*

The spelling-patterns of the text at large should be used, so that expansions sit as comfortably as possible with the rest of what is being offered.

6) *In source apparatuses,*

the onus is on showing that the compiler's library was any larger than the smallest possible. For example, if the compiler quotes a passage that in his time existed both in a well-known work and in what was then a little-known work, then the assumption must be that he is quoting directly from the well-known work, unless the contrary can be shown. (This applies whether his two possible sources are independent of one another or not, and whichever way the dependence lies if not.)

Amplification of a Point of Spelling Policy for Critical Texts

Originally written 27 July 1992.

In the case of any text of which there are two or more extant MSS, the point takes this form: having used the evidence of the available MSS to arrive as closely as possible at the original compiler's intentions (including his orthography), the editor may then use the vantage point of these intentions (as deduced) to overrule, on any particular matter, any one or more of the extant MSS (and even, on occasion, all of them). The orthography of the resulting critical text, as edited, should then be consistent (or uniformly inconsistent!) throughout, since it will avoid the trap of varying according to the random accident of which MSS are available for any particular passage.