

# Introduction

*Erika Kihlman and Denis Searby*

The *Ars edendi* Research Programme at Stockholm University, financed by the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation, ran from 2007 to 2015. With an emphasis on the editing of texts that had often been overlooked in the methodological and theoretic literature on editing, it focused on unusual editorial problems as well as on contrasting methodological solutions, particularly those related to medieval Greek and Latin literature. It dealt, not least, with commentary and compilatory traditions in various genres, model sermons, biblical glosses, anthologies and both prose and poetry for use in the liturgy. During these same years, the *Ars edendi* lecture series provided a dynamic forum for leading textual scholars to discuss their editorial decisions and share both their practical experience of methodological aspects of textual criticism, the mise-en-page of edited texts as well as wider perspectives on textual philology. These volumes preserve to a large extent the style of the original oral lectures. All of this is thematically and stylistically reflected in the present volume as well.

The final conference of the research programme, entitled *The Arts of Editing: Past, Present, and Future*, was held at Stockholm University in August 2016. Exactly one year earlier, a final workshop on editorial methods and theory took place, the theme of which dealt with fragments and writing commentaries. Selected papers from these two events fill the pages of this, the fifth and final volume of the *Ars edendi Lecture Series*, for, alas, there is an end to all things, and that principle applies not least to research funding.

The volume begins with two papers related to classical Greek comedy. Using as his frame-work attempts at reconstructing the *Taxiarchoi* of Eupolis, S. Douglas Olson launches into a lively and thought-provoking discussion of ‘how scholarly knowledge is created and maintained in

---

## How to cite this book chapter:

Kihlman, E. and Searby, D. 2020. Introduction. In: Kihlman, E. and Searby, D. (eds.). *Ars Edendi Lecture Series*, vol. V. Pp. vii–xii. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.16993/bbd.a>. License: CC-BY

regard to texts that are so emphatically ‘lost’ that one might better say that they simply do not exist any longer.’ In other words, what can we really know and how can we make claims to knowledge of the plots and structures of lost plays based on the scant fragments that have chanced to survive to our day? Yet, modern and even contemporary scholars do make knowledge claims about no longer existent works that prove to be more products of imagination than of science, and Olson takes one of them in particular to task in order to prove his deeper point about critical methodology and the creation of illusory academic consensus by means of accumulation and ingenuity rather than through an unprejudiced approach to the evidence. His deeper point, in other words, has to do with our responsibilities as scholars and teachers, and that this has wider social implications than his ostensible topic of the reconstruction of a lost play of an obscure Greek comic poet.

Benjamin Millis’s wide-ranging essay presents the edition and commentary as a form of scholarly engagement requiring much imagination and ‘the sort of detailed engagement with the text that is seemingly less and less stressed and valued.’ He argues that a shift in scholarly production occurred over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries away from editions and commentaries and toward the monograph as the prime means of scholarly discourse. As part of this process, commentaries took on a more subsidiary role in the production of advanced scholarship. He describes the effect that Eduard Fraenkel’s edition of Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* had in shaping subsequent scholarship which was ‘to establish a template for what a scholarly commentary on an ancient text could be and perhaps even should be’, and this was the idea of the ‘monumental, definitive commentary’. His aim in tracing the development of scholarly commentaries over the course of the twentieth century is to encourage reflection on the writing of commentaries as well as on their mediating role between texts and so-called higher criticism. He sees editions and commentaries as ‘themselves a dialogue with the material and a grappling with it much like any other type of criticism or analysis.’ Millis argues for a re-legitimization of editions and commentaries, and sees a role here precisely in the editions of literary fragments. In this regard, he discusses the difficulties faced by editors of fragments with regard to deference to previous authorities, the great names of scholarship, as well as the more immediately practical problems of the presentation and ordering of fragments and of the evaluation of the trustworthiness of the sources.

Both Olson’s and Millis’s reflections are recommended reading to any young scholars about to embark on work with fragments of Greek

and Latin authors. However, they also touch on the value, the difficulties, and the complex decisions involved in two pillars of philology, namely textual editing and commentary, as well as the transmission and reception of textual scholarship and how it can frame later scholarly discussions. They thus provide medievalists with food for thought. Olson and Millis presented their papers at the last workshop organized within *Ars edendi*. The remaining contributors to this volume presented theirs at the final conference in 2016.

Like Olson and Millis, Cynthia Damon is also primarily a classicist. Her paper begins with a reflection on the ways in which textual editing resemble pathways connecting not only the editor and the original text, but also different generations of readers and writers as well as different fields of scholarship. One such pathway, connecting classicists and medievalists alike, is the challenge to create critical editions in digital form in order to contribute to contemporary scholarly explorations of texts and literatures. With a conventional OCT edition of Caesar behind her, Damon moved on to studying the challenges of digitally editing Pliny's *Natural History*, a work with a rich reception history and itself an example of a text made up of material taken from other texts, most of which have not survived. Book 9, which deals with fish, serves as the case study here. Damon explores important parts of its reception history in *De piscibus*, Book 4 of *Hortus sanitatis*, printed in Mainz in 1491 and recently edited in both paper and digital form by Catherine Jacquemard and her colleagues. The most important source of this compendium was the *Speculum naturale* of Vincent of Beauvais, who in turn points back to Pliny. Damon asks how one can 'edit the reception' of Pliny's encyclopedia or 'edit the genesis' of Vincent's? Damon's paper is deliberately intended to stimulate imaginative solutions to providing durable infrastructure for the connections enabled by texts and editors, given our modern resources.

In his contribution, Odd Einar Haugen gets into the nitty-gritties of precisely that: how the digital mark-up or annotation of medieval texts is an editorial enterprise. He draws on his experience in working on medieval vernaculars in the Medieval Nordic Text Archive (MeNoTA) project and illustrates how annotation may usefully be seen as an integral part of the whole editorial process. Haugen discusses in particular three focal levels in the process: facsimile, diplomatic and normalised; thus he speaks of the multi-level rendering of manuscript texts, and exemplifies it with short extracts from the digital edition of the Old Norwegian Homily Book. Perhaps surprising for classicists or medievalists working in the classical languages is the amount of

morphological and syntactical mark-up involved; Haugen reminds us, however, of the importance of vernacular texts as sources for language history where these details become cumulatively significant. Yet other categories of annotation can be chosen, of course, depending on the scholarly objectives of the editorial project and the nature of the text, for instance annotation can be an aid for better understanding obscure or ambiguous passages in historical works, thus making annotation a close cousin of the scholarly commentary. Haugen concludes his chapter with a cost-benefit analysis, comparing relatively small textual traditions with those that have large numbers of manuscripts, and discussing how the level of canonicity will be decisive in the final cost-analysis.

Like Haugen, Dorothea Weber provides a close-up look at an ongoing editorial project, although, in this case, the project is the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* which started already in 1864. Weber provides an historical overview of CSEL, the foundation of which was directly connected to the planning of the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. She is thus also able to give us an interesting sidelight on the difference in the perceptions of both late antiquity itself and of the editing of late antique works that prevailed in the later nineteenth century and those of today. One result of the changing appreciation for late antiquity is the fact that CSEL has not limited itself to editing only Christian Latin texts from the period. Weber gives us short but detailed glimpses into the work currently being done at CSEL, beginning with the essential work of improved cataloguing, especially in the series devoted to works attributed to St. Augustine, which has yielded discoveries of new texts of Augustine such as the twenty-nine letters published in 1981 by Johannes Divjak, the recent discovery of the commentary on the Gospels by Fortunatianus, or Ars edendi's own Brian Jensen's discovery of a sermon. Weber offers some details of the kinds of editorial problems encountered and solutions proposed in recent editing projects. Of course, each and every edition has challenges and problems of its own, but a good edition must also make the structure of the text visible, which can be done in the *constitutio textus* as traditionally understood or by other means, which Weber illustrates with examples from the edition of Augustine's corpus of the *Enarrationes in psalmos*. In general, CSEL relies on tried and true stemmatic methods, and Weber notes that the kinds of texts edited within CSEL are generally not adequate to the methods of the so-called New Philology, because they 'in most instances are not texts that underwent systematic rescription, quite the contrary: they were held in esteem as authoritative and were thus not adapted freely.'

David Greetham, by contrast, examines three editions of works that did undergo rescription, although the rewriting in these cases was done by the authors themselves, namely John Scotus Eriugena, Samuel Coleridge and T. S. Eliot. Eriugena's *Periphyseon* was edited by É. Jeaneau between 1996–2003, the works of Coleridge by J.C.C. Mays in 2001, and those of Eliot by C. Ricks and J. McCue in 2015. Although the methods of the editors vary they are united in their 'aim to provide a comprehensive, indeed exhaustive, access to the extant documents of their authors' and one of the main editorial challenges lies in the treatment of the revisions, the versions thus created and the variants, the key word of 'New Philology'. In Jeaneau's edition, variance takes pride of place. The different versions of the texts are placed on par with the 'critical' text, all set in parallel columns on the page. Although this procedure, Greetham argues, places great demands not only on the editor but also on the reader, it also 'moves the readerly eye (or ear) away from the plainchant of a single utterance into a polyphony with multiple voices and variance as a normative condition – where a blank space is 'just as much a *presence* as is a positive textual variant'. Like Eriugena, Coleridge was also an avid revisioner of his writings but his editor Mays opted for a different solution than Jeaneau, creating a 'reading text' for each piece – not to be considered 'the' text or even a 'standard' text – against which a full documentary record of variants can be set, the 'variorum text'. Also, in the Eliot edition by Ricks and McCue, which they preferred to call an annotated rather than a critical text, a clear reading text is accompanied by the editors' commentary including a documentary history on the textual genesis. Despite Eliot's general reluctance to revise, variance still exists in the different impressions of Eliot's work, a fact lamented by Eliot himself. From his observations and remarks regarding the editorial principles and the realisations of the edited texts, Greetham opines that these new 'exhaustive' editions will not end but rather encourage further textual examination. The author, as Greetham points out, is not dead but very much alive and this is through 'the loyalties and devotions (and sheer hard work) of editors working in the long tradition extending from the Alexandrian librarians to the present day.' It was with great sadness we learned that David Greetham passed away just a few weeks before this volume was to be sent off to the Stockholm University Press.

The editors of this volume, who are the only remaining members of the *Ars edendi* project at Stockholm University, wish to extend our thanks to the contributors to the present volume and to previous volumes, as well as to our dear, now former colleagues in the *Ars edendi*,

both fellow researchers and student assistants, to all our colleagues who have lent their support over the years. We dedicate this volume to the memory of Benkt-Erik Hedin, husband of Gunilla Iversen on whose initiative the *Ars edendi* was formed and who was its leader throughout the duration of the project. Benkt-Erik was ever a splendid host when the whole team assembled, which we often did, at their home; he passed away as we were doing the final revisions of the papers. We end by expressing our hope that the art of editing medieval and classical texts will long continue at Stockholm University, so that the legacy may be both transmitted and developed.

Erika Kihlman and Denis Searby