

Introduction

Barbara Crostini, Gunilla Iversen and Brian M. Jensen

The fourth volume of the by now established *Ars Edendi Lectures Series* is also the last to be published within the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond programme by the same name that ran at the University of Stockholm 2008-2015. As in the other volumes, the reader will find here gathered the lectures, printed in the same order in which they were chronologically delivered, which animated the main themes of that programme, but also echoed more closely the concerns of this or that researcher who contributed to the event. Fittingly, this volume is edited by Barbara Crostini, Gunilla Iversen, and Brian M. Jensen, who were responsible for organizing most of the events that see the light of publication in this volume.

The contributions to this volume are well balanced between Latin and Greek, the two languages at the centre of the programme, and reflect the range of approaches to editing and types of editions that well exemplify the activity of the group throughout these years. Both a reflection on the fundamentals (e.g. What is a critical edition?) and a closer look at the specifics (e.g. marginalia, errors, musical notation) of editing are explored by the topics addressed by our expert lecturers, whose participation in the *Ars edendi* programme we gratefully acknowledge here. Their contributions have broadened and enlivened our work on our own editions, and given us food for thought in the knowledge that we were confronted with state-of-the-art approaches in our respective fields. The oral tone of the presentations has not been entirely edited out from this book.

Mariken Teeuwen represented the distinguished Huygens Institute for Text-Critical Studies, and focused our attention on the margins of the manuscripts, and what the annotations there can offer us for a knowledge of their texts, history, and readership; in many ways, her research is at

How to cite this book chapter:

Crostini, B., Iversen, G. and Jensen, B. M. 2016. Introduction. In: Crostini, B., Iversen, G. and Jensen, B. M. (eds.) *Ars Edendi Lecture Series, vol. IV*. Pp. vii–xi. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.16993/baj.a>. License: CC-BY 4.0

the forefront of the new interest in ‘paratexts’, intended broadly, as an area so far neglected but which appears very fruitful for the textual and cultural scholar. Teeuwen suggests different editorial strategies to present the glosses and annotations to the reader: a digital edition, where it is possible to highlight with colours which parts came first, which later. She discusses questions of how to encode the interconnectedness of marginal texts to other texts. A marginal text is in fact a set of texts, and each individual annotation would need its own apparatus, but it would result in a rather confusing page when presented in the standard lay-out of a modern scholarly edition. Thus, she concludes, we need better means to visualize structure and movement, in order to gain a better understanding of these marginal texts.

The edition by Giovanni Maggioni of one of the major (if not the major) medieval collection of hagiographies, the *Legenda aurea*, puts him in a privileged position of the hands-on scholar with a vast experience of the world of borrowings, reworkings, and translations, the essential ingredients of such influential compilations. These formed the cultural (and cultural) perspective of generations of medieval and early modern Christians. The examples discussed are therefore taken mainly from Maggioni’s own editions of the *Legenda aurea* and are compared to the primary source for Jacobus’s work, Jean de Mailly’s *Abbreviatio in gestis sanctorum*.

Maggioni’s application of Lachmannian principles for the understanding of textual issues is a fascinating journey into the mechanics and dynamics of manuscript copying. ‘Error’ has been a significant term in philology from the very beginning of editorial practice and *the* central issue in the traditional editorial method named after Karl Lachmann. Maggioni defines error as “something (a term, a phrase, a chronological notation) that contradicts the culture of the author, as we know it, [...] and is incompatible with the author’s actual work of composition and edition”. How do we then recognize authorial errors in the textual complexity of sources, author, original, archetype, copies and readers? *Primum recensere!* was the lesson of Karl Lachmann, and Maggioni underlines the importance of *recensio*, the traditional distinction between original and archetype, an editor’s knowledge of the sources the author used for his work and acquaintance with an author’s method of composition as a means to recognize these errors.

The distinguished musicologist Charles Atkinson combines in a similar way the traditional principles of critical editing with a complex situation where texts are found together with music. The musicological knowledge and transmission of the texts sung in the medieval liturgy

need to be translated for a modern public, in order that not only scholars, but musicians themselves can benefit from the result in a practical way. Beginning from the fact that the musical notation in the earliest manuscripts cannot be transcribed and discussing ways of making an edition that provides performable music, Atkinson says:

since the texts were clearly sung in their role as parts of the liturgy, but lacking an oral tradition that extends back to the ninth or tenth centuries, we must present them in a type of musical notation that a modern singer can read, i.e., in ordinary staff notation [...].

He concludes that in order to answer to the needs of both performers and scholars the best way must be to present editions of texts with their melodies as they appear in specific manuscripts representing specific geographical areas and liturgical traditions. Thus he suggests an edition based on manuscript sources, not on genres of chant: even if such a musical edition cannot pretend to be a “complete critical edition,” in the sense that the editions of the texts in *Corpus Troporum* are, it can at least provide a representative sample.

With Charalambos Dendrinis, author of a much appreciated electronic edition of a Greek manuscript from the British Library, we turn to a different approach towards modern concepts of editing. Dendrinis’s contribution comes across as a pioneering work exploring some of the dynamic displays possible when editing in the digital age. The full potential of alternative visualizations has been exploited for this short text: diplomatic and critical editions and translations overlap; links to grammatical explanations for each word are available, a feature that revolutionizes the approach to ancient languages and their teaching. A substantial portion of his paper, written by his collaborator Philip Taylor, is essentially technical, setting out in detail the questions and the solutions found at each stage of the process of digitizing and building the web-site. The further plan of adding a vocal performance of the text to the visual alternatives made available to the user will in the future complete this ambitious project. Surely the enterprise has benefitted from the contributions of a dedicated team of collaborators, whose services are, however, not always very easy to come by.

With Richard Janko’s detailed paper on how to study Herculaneum papyri we return to the ‘old’ techniques of pencil-and-paper *in situ* transcription, presenting their own problems, which reveal the patience and expertise with which Janko has produced much of his recent editions of the works by Philodemus. The editor is set in a tradition of recordings and evaluations of the primary evidence that forms layer

after layer of precious information, any details of which, if lost or badly handled, may impinge on the final outcome. Thus knowledge of the circumstances of the finds and their subsequent storage is part of a precious piling up of knowledge that makes the editor an expert in his field of research. There is a distinct sense of dedication and quiet triumph in the making out of words from charred, broken letters in the extant scraps of papyrus rolls, adding up to broaden our knowledge of ancient civilizations literally bit by bit.

The last two papers, by Glenn Most and Peter Robinson respectively, unexpectedly —perhaps— fit together in providing broader perspectives on attitudes to texts and editorial work.

Most takes the long-term historical approach to lead us by the hand in the significance of textual scrutiny from the time of Ancient Greece, where reading and comparing texts was already a known practice. Most closely reviews the approach of three early editors of Homer, Antimachus, Zenodotus and Aristarchus, asking quite what each had to contribute to the methodology of editing the texts of the epics. The rationale behind these early editors' choices and their peculiar working practices are lost between their own inchoate methods and the portion of aurality contained in the explanations that were delivered by them only in the classroom. On firmer grounds, the pre-critical editions of the nineteenth-century German scholars, notably beginning with the exposition in Friedrich August Wolf's *Prolegomena ad Homerum* of 1795, bring us closer to modern theories of editing, if not precisely to the term "critical edition".

Most also surprisingly takes us on a detour to China, where the work of scribes was demonstrably set within the intellectual structures of a complex society: by analysing two pieces of visual evidence, Most highlights similarities and differences in how texts can be handled and shared. It is a fascinating journey into how confrontation with and through a text can be a place for interpersonal relationship, a strategy for communication. As he states, "Collation is [...] the transmission of certain values —attention, obedience, precision, collegiality— that are important not only for their embodiment in canonical texts but also for their instantiation in the acts by which those texts are copied and checked".

Peter Robinson looks forward to a different type of sharing texts, *en masse*, on the world-wide web. His question concerning the digital revolution is really one about the status of the editor, and how s/he is being transformed into a facilitator for collaborative work by the means of mass outreach that digital material and open web-sites can allow.

In itself access to manuscript images changes nothing fundamental in textual scholarship, other than that thousands of manuscripts and books online are immediately available as ‘archives’ or ‘research collections’. Unless scholars combine this access with radically new digital tools and use them to make new editions, in a manner never seen before, we cannot yet talk about a digital revolution. For example, Stefan Hagel’s Classical Text Editor software and Wilhelm Ott’s TUSTEP system are only going part of the way as they are just tools to produce traditional editions. In Robinson’s own words, “If in the digital world, we do not change what we do, we do not change what we make, we do not change who we are: there is no revolution”.

Concluding the presentation of these three elements of change and their consequences in digital editing, Robinson states: “We all know the topos, that we are standing on the shoulders of the scholars who have preceded us. The digital age offers a variant on this. As well as stand on the shoulders of others, we should help others to stand on our shoulders. This will change who we are. Now, that would be revolutionary”. While Robinson certainly represents one of the foremost authorities in this field, both in the experimental and in the theoretical sense, his reflexions provide a measure of the relative novelty that these means are offering, and the need to deepen the understanding of both the potential and the challenges they will pose.

In conclusion, we would like to thank all the speakers who have contributed to this volume, as well as the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation for funding the publication of this volume. We thank our colleagues in *Ars edendi*, Elisabet Göransson, Erika Kihlman, Eva Odelman and Denis Searby for their active participation at these events. Special thanks to our research assistant, Agnes Vendel, who took care of the practical arrangements for the lectures and helped copy-editing this volume. Thanks are also due to colleagues in our department, especially Professor Maria Plaza, editor in chief of *Studia Latina Stockholmiensia*, for supporting our work. It is our hope that the *Ars Edendi* Lecture Series will continue function as an important forum for textual philology at Stockholm University in the future, although the first funding period of the *Ars edendi* programme has ended.

Barbara Crostini, Gunilla Iversen, Brian M. Jensen