Summary

The editor's text: bibliographic functions in scholarly editing (Under utgivning: den vetenskapliga utgivningens bibliografiska funktion)

This thesis has investigated in what way bibliographic documents, in particular scholarly editions, manage and position other documents. This is the study's primary area of demarcation and contribution in relation to previous research on scholarly editing, editions and bibliography.

Study framework

Knowledge organization has by tradition treated its bibliographic tools as more or less value free and neutral instruments beyond the limitations of medial, historical, social, and ideological constraints, and free from the biases and tastes of any author. Several library and information science (LIS) studies have however lately performed close readings of bibliographic tools as situated *texts*, revealing the dependency of the tools on particular historical media settings, their socio-cultural roles and functions, or their argumentative and rhetorical dimension. This study hopes to further such research by investigating *scholarly editing*, based on textual criticism, and in particular studying its bibliographic functions. Bibliographic tools are always, it is argued, to some extent hermeneutical documents and subjective interpretations, in two senses: they carry with them a history of ideology and a hermeneutical heritage, and they also exert an interpretative influence over the objects they are designed to manage.

Scholarly editing means examining a bulk of documents and their texts, clustering these around the abstract notion of a work, arranging them in a web of relations and trying to represent this web in the particular document genre called the scholarly edition, a surrogate purporting to represent the work. The way the edition positions the documents to the work, and itself as mediator between them, is affected by such factors as ideology, epistemology, aim and function, tradition and supporting and distributing media.

Problem areas and research questions

One research problem that called for the study concerned the different editorial approaches to selecting (elements from) source documents, the various assumptions and arguments with which the selections are being legitimated, and the possible conflicts between such arguments. Editors strive to propose "correct" texts of the edited works, but their definitions of correctness vary considerably. As a result, the texts manifested in the resulting editions vary, and there is in fact a large scale of various edition types, ranging from facsimile editions to full-blown archival editions. Nevertheless, a prominent idea has been that the editor merely

mediates the work without affecting it, that she is a more or less neutral filter correcting the hitherto corrupt edited work and passing it along to future generations. This is of course true in a trivial sense. But it also has brought about a tendency to suppress the bias of the editor.

It has also been claimed that digital scholarly editing, with its large-scale digital archives on compact discs or mounted on the web, makes the typology even more heterogeneous, if not even obsolete. Are we e.g. witnessing an increase in labour division between various edition types in order to cope with new media parameters? To investigate whether there is any reasonable ground for such claims, the thesis has studied, firstly, how editors make use of material and technical media in order to "faithfully" relate, represent and reproduce parts of documents and, secondly, what kinds of efficiency claims the editors make for various media types.

Another research problem concerned the relation between scholarly editing and bibliography. Both fields manage sets of documents by *clustering* them to one another and *transposing* their contents by producing new documents: various kinds of reference works in the case of bibliography, and critical editions in the case of scholarly editing. Subjecting scholarly editing to close scrutiny in fact discloses striking similarities with bibliography, in both their activities, concepts, theories and products, to the degree that one might be tempted to regard scholarly editing as an instance of bibliographic activity, editorial theory as an application of bibliographic theory and an important rationale for editions being their bibliographic function. From this would follow that the concepts and problems of bibliography are relevant for editorial theory and vice versa. The bibliographer Atkinson even suggests that there is only a quantitative difference between bibliography and textual criticism and that the latter is in fact an extension of bibliography. If Atkinson is correct, this might mean that the scholarly edition is basically a reference work, a kind of bibliography. But is this a legitimate suggestion? Which are, more precisely, the connections and differences between the two areas?

In order to deal with these problems, four major research questions were formulated:
1. How do scholarly editors identify, define and reproduce their source material?
2. How do bibliographers identify, define and reproduce their source material?
3. Are there discernible conflicts between editors' varying expectations of the reproductive force in printed and digital editions, and how can such conflicts be explained?
4. What is the nature of the relation between scholarly editing and bibliography? What connections and demarcations can be drawn between them and between scholarly editions and bibliographies?

Empirical objects and demarcations

The study's primary empirical object is editorial theoretical literature, primarily monographs, articles, guidelines and essays. Secondarily, and serving rather as illustrations and examples, printed and digital scholarly editions are considered. This is not primarily a document analysis of a set of editions, but a qualitative content analysis of editorial literature. Statements, models, concepts and theories are identified in the literature and subjected to a critical and historical analysis. An extensive auxiliary literature is brought mainly from bibliographic and media theory, consisting of roughly the equivalent document types as the empirical literature. In addition to the analytical sections, the thesis includes primarily descriptive sections on bibliography, textual criticism, scholarly editing and digital media. The study object has been delimited to editorial theory connected to the editing of aesthetical literary works of art in the Western hemisphere, in particular Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, German and French scholarly editing, in that order.

Bibliography, clustering and transposition

The thesis investigated how bibliographers go about identifying and reproducing their study objects. It must firstly be stated that there are two main branches within bibliography: reference (a.k.a. enumerative) and material (a.k.a. physical, analytical or critical) bibliography. In knowledge organization as a LIS subfield, the latter is subordinate to the former to such a degree that it is legitimate to question whether the two in fact form a coherent LIS field at all. Material bibliography is, furthermore, pursued in other disciplines as well, e.g. book history, philology or literary sociology. Chapter 2 has however identified a number of both historical and intellectual bonds between the two branches. Most importantly, they are unified by the two activities of *clustering* and *transposition*.

Clustering takes the primary form of the conceptual hierarchies and models within reference and descriptive bibliography, in particular within cataloguing and its normative instruments such as IFLA's Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. Bibliographic clustering normally operates from the discrete document up to the level of the work. There have been some attempts to conceptualize a superordinate level, "superworks", but little work has been done to designate parts of documents. The thesis therefore imports the concept of *paratexts* from literary theory to be able to talk about document parts as well as to identify types of relations between documents and parts of them. Bibliographic clustering is also manifested as the establishing of genealogical relationships between documents and versions, and works by e.g. Tillett and Smiraglia are discussed in the thesis.

Transposition refers to the transmission of a conceived content between one or several departure documents and one or several target documents. The latter are always derivatives to the former, conditioned by the media qualities of the departure documents and by the distortion each transposition brings about.

Bibliographic transposition can be found, firstly, in the desire of (particularly descriptive) bibliography to produce document surrogates that are exhaustive to the degree they are able to call forth "an absent book before a reader's eyes." Secondly, transposition and distortion are the key focal points as material bibliography performs studies of transmissions between material carriers across time, space, context and media types. Material bibliography investigates what kind of content is added and lost in transposition processes, and is occupied with detecting historical traces of transposition in material documents. Chapter 2 also put the phenomenon of transposition in a wider historical and media theory perspective, while also demonstrating the power of the concept to elucidate problematic issues in e.g. current digitization projects of cultural heritage material in libraries.

Problem areas were detected within both the clustering and transposition of bibliography. A number of conflicting assumptions and conceptions were identified in relation to the practice of positioning documents at various conceptual levels, as well as in relation to the bibliographical concept of text, which floats rather loosely between the levels of the material document and the immaterial work. Finally, a number of assumptions regarding transposition were subjected to critical analysis with the help of explanatory concepts from media theory, such as the simple replacement model, the straight forward progress model, the mimetic fallacy, and conceptions of media as primarily

- vehicles that merely deliver content,
- filters that affect content, or
- ecosystems that circulate content.

Scholarly editing, clustering and transposition

An editor interrelates a set of documents and versions and then proceeds to transmit and reproduce selected elements from the document set by producing a new document, the scholarly edition. In doing so, editors make use of two main groups of techniques and tools, clustering and transposition, just as bibliographers do.

Editorial clustering takes on the form of stemmatics, version and variant identification, and paratext classification and production. Normally, a number of versions of the edited work are subjected to hierarchic order, and a so-called copy-text is selected (or constructed) to represent the work in full-text, while the differing versions and variants are deported to subsidiary locations in the final edition. Editorial transposition is probably most familiar to the general public in the form of facsimile or transcription editing. Chapter 3 attempted as well to make the conceptual distinction between the clustering and transposing tasks more complex by identifying clustering areas within transposition and vice versa. There is further a division of labour between the two tasks, and they correspond to different types of editions. To that end, chapter 4 presents a preliminary typology of editions while

critically reviewing the discriminatory category sometimes attributed to digital editions as being distinct from functional edition types.

Ideals, claims, and conflicts

The question of conflicts between editorial claims for reproductive force in various media and edition types demanded that the thesis presented an overview of the dominant editorial ideals and traditions and subjected them to critical and comparative analysis. Chapter 3 offered a descriptive panorama of editorial theory and practice as developed during two millennia, on the one hand emphasizing the intellectual and social contexts to which the editorial traditions correspond, and on the other focusing on the central problems and tasks each editorial ideal attempts to solve, notwithstanding the fact that fairly pragmatic factors (such as economical, technological or copyright concerns) also come into play when source material is being selected, clustered and transposed to a scholarly edition.

To begin with, textual criticism was characterized as a basic rationale for and historical criterion of scholarly editing. An Alexandrian and a Pergamanian ideal within textual criticism, identified by Greetham, were then discussed. The former, unlike the latter, accepts editorial intrusion in the departure document's text(s). Other crucial historical roots are the Renaissance humanists' desire to deliver the rediscovered classical heritage to their contemporaries, the development of the principles of Old and New Testament editing, and the Lachmannian foundation for modern scholarly editing steeped in 19th century positivist ideals. Major editorial ideals of the 20th century were depicted as intentionalism, the sociology of texts, material philology, and genetic criticism. Chapters 3 and 4 pinpointed relations and borders between these ideals, for instance suggesting they each have respective bibliographic foci. There is, further, a distinction to be made between editorial ideals oriented towards either sequences of abstract linguistic texts or the graphical aspect of material documents. Chapter 4 also included a section on scientific ideals in editing, while chapter 5 attempted to trace the prolongation of the ideals, claims, and conflicts within the theory and practice of digital scholarly editing. A pattern was detected: an idealistic strand treats departure and target documents (i.e. the final editions) as primarily unbiased, content delivery vehicles, whose texts and other content can be subjected to disambiguation. The idealistic strand nourishes the scientific ideals of representativity, testability and cumulativity. A more hermeneutically oriented strand emphasizes the interpretative element as unavoidable within all phases of editorial clustering and transposition. To that strand, the interpretative and rhetorical elements are dominant to the point where the scholarly edition is more aptly depicted as a rhetorical argument rather than as an objective report, and where the editor has the face of a biased author rather than of a mere textual porter. The very form and mediality of the edition then assumes the role of content constraining filters. A third option would be to view editions as content circulating ecosystems, where the division of labour between collaborating

and parallel media and edition types is emphasized, and where the varying technical and material qualities of different media and edition types are appropriated to accommodate different aims, functions, values, uses and target audiences.

As for the conception of editions as rhetorical arguments, the thesis points to some correspondences with observations made in genre studies and scholarly communication studies. For instance, Frohmann has, among others, suggested that the social and constitutive functions of the scientific article are more important than the potential information the article as document might be able to effect, as well as than the potentiality of that information to be reproduced into new research. Its qualities as scientific report, rhetorical argument, constitutive and canonizing instrument and even ideological monument create a tension within the scholarly edition. On the one hand, it is supposed to be a dynamic research tool, always ready to quickly respond to new findings and scholarly ideals. On the other, there are plenty of arenas where the edition is supposed to serve as a conservative force, static and confirmatory. The thesis argues that the perspectives of genre and scholarly communication studies help us deepen our understanding of the scholarly edition, and in consequence, the textual tools of bibliography.

A crucial issue in the thesis turned out to be the claims being made by editors on the *reproductive* force of printed and digital editions. The idea is that the target documents of editing can be turned into departure documents for new endeavours in critical editing, where the aims, audiences, ideals and bibliographical foci differ from that of the original editorial project. The final chapter problematizes those kinds of claim by identifying and critically analysing assumptions in the empirical literature about editorial clustering and transposition as unbiased processes, where editorial interpretations can be suppressed, and where departure and target documents are depicted as being context-free phenomena and therefore malleable to disambiguation. That discussion leads us to question to what degree, if at all, an edition has reproductive force, and to suggest that a critical, eclectic edition cannot alone form the platform for a new critical, eclectic edition.

There is, further, by tradition a claim for *totality* and complete exhaustiveness within scholarly editing which is being strengthened by digital editing. The potential of digital media to vastly enhance the inclusive force of editions and archives, to enable full-text representation of many or indeed all versions of the edited work, and to support the modularization of documents into movable fragments across varying contexts, seems to boost the idealistic strand in editorial theory. This trend is even further supported by text encoding, where form is separated from content, and where fact is often conceived of as separable from interpretation. As a consequence, the simple replacement model and the mimetic fallacy have consolidated their positions within digital editing.

Digital scholarly editing offers the chance to organize paratexts and transposed material in much more dynamic and complex manners than is possible within the

printed edition. The modular, database logic along with the potential qualities of digital media mentioned above push the edition towards becoming an archive. The thesis has critically discussed such transformations, which affect the relation between e.g. editorially and lectorially controlled manifestation forms, between both editorial and lectorial "presence" and "absence", and between primarily monoversional and primarily multiversional structuring. In a number of current digital editing projects, an "edition" can designate a temporary, editorially argumentative cut from a more unbiased storage archive. This suggests a possible distinction between edition and archive, where the former but not the latter explicitly takes a stand. The empirical literature on the other hand displays a parallel counter-reaction against the archival trend, pleading for a return to the editorial prerogative and to primarily monoversional manifestation forms.

Scholarly editing and bibliography

The final research question concerned the relationship between scholarly editing and bibliography as well as between editions and bibliographies. Chapter 2 laid a particular ground by highlighting the structure and nature of bibliographies as reference works, while chapter 4 investigated the scholarly edition.

There is obviously an historical bond between, on the one hand reference and material bibliographic activity, and on the other scholarly editing based on textual criticism, from Alexandria and onwards. Particular branches of bibliography have collaborated closely with scholarly editing, such as textual and analytical bibliography. But there are also deeper epistemological bonds. Editing is an attempt to produce a document that bibliographically constitutes other documents. The declared principles and explicit concepts and ideals of editorial theory are, in a sense, statements of bibliographic ideals. Its concept levels and hierarchies overlap considerably with those of bibliography. The way reference bibliography structures works and documents by making bibliographies and catalogues is strikingly analogue to the way scholarly editing structures works, documents, versions and variants by making critical editions. Chapter 3 demonstrated that scholarly editing and textual criticism indeed were originally conceived within a bibliographical transposition activity in a library institutional context, an historical connection revived with the currently intense digitization activity in libraries.

Several bibliographical and editorial activities and functions correspond (both as clustering and transposition), such as the classification of what makes up a particular work, version management, and hierarchical ordering of documents. The typology of editions furthermore represents a division of bibliographical labour and interests: the eclectic and the historical-critical edition operate at the work level, the transcription edition at the text level, and the facsimile edition at the graphical and material document level. There are also adjacent areas where scholarly editing and bibliography differ. Bibliography and in particular reference bibliography displays much less interest in *texts* than does scholarly editing, and consequently has no

instrument that equals the variant categories of textual criticism to determine versions and works or to identify and delimit the significant text in a work or a document.

The two fields also share a set of problems in relation to clustering and transposition, such as difficulties in specifying the work level, the battle to define text, and the ambivalence to the materiality of documents. The ambivalence makes it awkward to for instance demarcate text and version, and to explain and manage distortion. The connections between the fields can be further identified in their respective theoretical frameworks, tenets and scientific ideals. In bibliography however, the idealistic, unbiased and objectifying tradition is clearly more prominent than in scholarly editing (although considerable current LIS research has aimed at dethroning such traditions by emphasizing the interpretative and rhetorical dimensions of knowledge organization tools and argue for their status as situated arguments).

As for whether the scholarly edition is to be regarded as a bibliographic reference work, as a bibliography, the thesis finds more arguments in favour of saying no than yes. The boundary between a critical edition and reference works such as bibliographies is not entirely sharp, and to a few genre typologies discussed in the thesis, the edition indeed seems to pose problems. Notwithstanding the many commonalities between editions and reference works, such as multisequentiality, referentiality, and the modularization into fragments that can be separately referenced, scholarly editions and reference works place themselves on different positions on a scale between reference and referent. The edition simultaneously refers to a work and manifests it, becoming a referent. Bibliographies and reference works can not claim the latter case. Editions step down to the level of its referents, becoming one of them.

The scholarly edition has been studied in this thesis as a kind of bibliographical tool, a valuable and privileged one. Such tools are governed by values, epistemologies and interests that need to be identified and formulated. The thesis analysis, including the thematic discussion about editing with the aid of digital media and distribution technologies, hopes to make the reader better equipped at identifying the nature, strengths, and weaknesses of bibliographic tools and transposition activities, even at the macro level of library digitization projects. It is vital to understand what forces but also what limitations they have and how these forces and limitations change with time, space, social context, and media. Recognizing what interests and views are at stake in, for instance, the making of digital archives might reduce the risk of us expecting the wrong things from them. It might assist in avoiding the traps of mimetic fallacies and replacement models, and make us cautious as to what we can reasonably expect from such projects. Whether we see scholarly editing and other bibliographical activities as primarily neutral prolongers of the life of works and documents, or as filtering media

affecting the works and documents and our way of perceiving them, or as content circulating ecosystems, we benefit from understanding what the tools can and cannot do, where they come from, what intellectual, cultural, symbolic heritage they bring with them, and where they might be going.

Mats Dahlström
Swedish School of Library and Information Science
University College of Borås / Gothenburg University
November 2006