English 7/825: Scholarly Editing and Textual Scholarship
Dr. Edward Jacobs
4030 BAL (Ph: 683-4028); ejacobs@odu.edu; office hours: MW 2-3
REQUIRED TEXTS

Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oak Knoll: 1995)
Gaskell, *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method* (Oak Knoll: 1978)
McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (University of Virginia: 1992)
Williams and Abbott, *Introduction to Bibliographical and Textual Studies*, 4th ed. (MLA: 2009)
All other readings cited on the syllabus are available on Blackboard or (if a web address is given) online

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course teaches students the theory and practice of scholarly editing. The course surveys the major theoretical approaches to scholarly editing (such as copy-text theory, versions theory, and sociological theory) and investigates how different theoretical approaches ramify in such practical choices as collation (the character-by-character comparison of different versions of a work), emendation (the choice to alter details of a textual version), annotation (the decision about what in the editing process and in the substance of the edition needs to be explained to readers), and copy-editing (the procedures used to minimize the errors inevitably produced by any mechanical reproduction of texts, such as keyboarding, typesetting, or OCR scans). In support of this central focus on the craft of scholarly editing, the course will also survey the history of textual production (from the manuscript through print into digital technologies) and the procedures of "textual criticism," which is the process of identifying, organizing, and evaluating the "authority" of all extant versions of a work. Working in small teams, students will get hands-on experience by producing an edited and annotation scholarly edition of a work that exists in multiple versions and has never been edited: *Hell upon Earth* (1703) / *Memoirs of John Hall* (1708/1714). The resulting edition will be published on the web. For M.A. students in the Literature emphasis, this course fulfils the requirement for a course in Methodology/Theory. For PhD students, it counts toward the Literary and Cultural Studies emphasis.

REQUIRED WORK

MA Students
Argument for Editorial Approach [Individually-graded] (1000 words)................... 20%
Transcribed and Proofread UTF-8 Plain-Text & MSWord Rich-Text of Textual
Witness(es) [Team-graded] 20%
Emended, Annotated, and Proofread Text Section of Critical Edition, including List of
Emendations and Works Cited [Team-graded]... 40%
Final Exam [Individually-graded]... 20%
PhD Students
Argument for Editorial Approach [Individually-graded] (1000 words)................... 15%
Transcribed and Proofread UTF-8 Plain-Text & MSWord Rich-Text of Textual
Witness(es) [Team-graded] 15%
Emended, Annotated, and Proofread Text Section of Critical Edition, including List of
Emendations and Works Cited [Team-graded]... 40%
Draft of Note on Text [Team-graded]... 15%

Final Exam [Individually-graded]... 15%

<p style="text-align:center">COURSE POLICIES</p>

1. All team members will get same grade on team-graded work unless compelling reasons for differential grading occur.
2. All team members must by consensus of the group have contributed equitably to the team work. Complaints of inadequate work by team members must be emailed to me at ejacobs@odu.edu no later than one week after the due date for that work. I will penalize the grade of individual team members according to my judgement of the gravity of the situation, based upon emailed complaints and team/individual conferences (if needed) about those complaints. I (and your fellow students) certainly recognize that unforeseen events can complicate life, but this course *necessarily* entails on-going team work. So please accord me, your classmates, and the course material the respect of doing your share of the work responsibly.
3. Team-proofread witness texts will be graded according to how accurately they transcribe and format the witness text. Each error in transcription, proofreading or formatting will reduce the grade by one grade-step, i.e., from A to A-. Accuracy is VITAL in transcriptions, so proofread scrupulously.
4. Arguments for Editorial Approach must include: A] an argument and diagram for the "stemmatic" historical/textual relations among witness texts, based upon the Juxta files that register their collation and upon contextual information about those witness texts. (See Williams & Abbott 57-70 for examples of prose descriptions and diagrams of relations among witness texts). B] an argument for the best editorial theory/standard of authority for these witness texts, based upon our theoretical readings in Textual Criticism and the textual/contextual facts about Hell upon Earth/Memoirs of John Hall that we have identified and discussed before the due date. C] an argument for the best way to present the text, based upon the Juxta collation files and upon the alternatives for presenting texts summarized in Williams & Abbott 103-5 and illustrated by the examples in Williams & Abbott 108-28 and Gaskell, *From Writer to Reader*. Arguments for Editorial Approach will be graded on how persuasively and accurately they make these arguments, given our readings in Textual Criticism and the textual/contextual facts about Hell upon Earth/Memoirs of John Hall that we have identified and discussed before the due date.
5. Team-graded text sections will be graded on how accurately their lists of emendations conform to the protocols stipulated in Williams & Abbott 127-9), how well those emendations execute the editorial approach we decide upon, and how well explanatory notes execute the principles we decide upon for the substance and presentation of explanatory notes.
6. The "Note on the Text" that PhD students will draft and revise after input from the entire class will be graded in terms of how accurately and comprehensively it summarizes our conclusions about: A] the "stemmatic" historical/textual relations among our witness texts B] the editorial theory/standard of authority we have adopted for our edition, among the options outlined by our readings in Textual Criticism C] the principles and protocols for emendation, textual and explanatory notes, and presentation that we have adopted for our edition. For an example of

the genre of a "Note on the Text," see Jacobs & Mourão, "Note on the Text." *Jack Sheppard*, by William Harrison Ainsworth. Ed., with an Introduction and Notes by Edward Jacobs and Manuela Mourão. (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2007). Unfortunately, the examples of critical edition apparatus in the Appendices to Williams & Abbott and in Gaskell, *From Writer to Reader* do not include examples of a "Note on the Text," but they remain useful as instances of styles for textual apparatus, per se.

7. **ALL** MSWord files produced and submitted during the course **MUST** follow the formatting protocols stipulated in Jacobs, "Protocols for Transcribing and Formatting Textual Witnesses for Scholarly Editing." Files not formatted according to these protocols will not be accepted.

8. The final exam will consist of definitions of key terms/protocols in scholarly editing and the history of textual production plus series of short answer questions about key theoretical/practical issues in scholarly editing.

9. This course will be taught via the meeting software WebEx. See the file "WebExDoc%5bstudents%5d" for information on WebEx. (Don't be confused by the fact that much of the file refers to Kevin Depew as the course instructor; as Graduate Program Director for the PhD in English, Kevin used one of his courses for this documentation file). I will invite you into our WebEx classroom approximately 15 minutes before each class meeting.

10. In order to ensure equal access to the course, ALL students, whether on-campus or distance, must participate in the course through WebEx.

11. All students must download the free Juxta Software (and user manual) at http://www.juxtasoftware.org. You should download the "legacy" Java version of Juxta, but you should also create a Juxta Commons account, which allows us to use Juxta and share Juxta files via the web. Note that Juxta prefers to be accessed via the Firefox browser, which you can download free at http://www.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/new/.

12. All students should create a free Skype account at http://www.skype.com, so that you can videoconference with each other during proofreading and other team work that requires real-time interaction.

13. All students must activate a free Google Drive account at https://drive.google.com/, so that we can share Google documents as needed, such as if WebEx or Blackboard goes down. I have created a Google documents called "Jacobs 725 825 scholarly editing class log" that will be our default on-going backup. The link is https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Jes9EZ8t66Pwgb9xWb8cX8RJJEgxfu-k4Cf-R0xDsEI/edit. You may find it useful to create Google documents of your own in the process of team-work, but be aware that Google documents do not allow some of the format options stipulated for ALL documents created during the course in my "Protocols for Transcribing and Formatting Textual Witnesses for Scholarly Editing."

14. Be aware that in creating Google document versions of Word files as stipulated on the syllabus, you must select and paste your Word file into a new Google document rather than uploading the Word file. Then use the File>Rename command to give the Google document the same name as your Word file. (If you

upload rather than paste your Word file, no one else will be able to edit the document or comment on specific places in it even if you share it with them).

<div align="center">SYLLABUS</div>

Jan 16: Course Introduction and Organization: Our Text(s) and Protocols and Teams for Transcription and Proofreading of Textual Witnesses/Versions

Tuus Inimicus, *Hell upon Earth* (London: 1703) [Siglum (short title code)=HUE]

Memoirs of the Right Villanous John Hall (London: Ben. Bragg, 1708) [Siglum (short title code)=MJH 1708b]

Memoirs of the Right Villanous John Hall (London: H. Hills, 1708) [Siglum (short title code) =MJH 1708h]

Memoirs of the Right Villainous John Hall (London: J. Baker, 1714) [Siglum (short title code)=MJH 1714]

[NOTE: The above are four different versions or "textual witnesses" of the work we will critically edit. Do not on this first reading worry about identifying differences among the versions, because we will be doing that systematically. Just read the texts to get a sense of what we are dealing with as a project.]

"ESTC hell upon earth memoirs of john hall.txt," a search saved from *English Short Title Catalogue*, a database available via the ODU Library database menu.

Juxta User's Manual.

Fenton and Duggan, "Effective Methods of Producing Machine-Readable Text from Manuscript and Print Sources," *Electronic Textual Editing*, ed. Burnard, O'Keeffe, and Unsworth (New York: MLA, 2006): 241-53.

Jacobs, "Protocols for Transcribing and Formatting Textual Witnesses for Scholarly Editing" (includes instructions for saving MSWord files in the UTF-8 plain-text format referred to below and formatting instructions that must be used for **ALL** MSWord files in this course).

Jacobs, "Protocols for Scholarly Proofreading"

Jan 23: Conceptual Overview, Vocabulary, and Examples

Williams & Abbott

Gaskell, *From Writer to Reader*

Jan 30: Analytical Bibliography/Publishing History

Gaskell, *New Introduction to Bibliography*

Jacobs, "Select Sources for British Publishing History"

Feb 4 (Monday; No Class Meeting): Draft of General Introduction due by midnight from professor (in MSWord rich-text file entitled "DRAFT General Introduction") to Blackboard Discussion Board Forum "General Introduction" and as a Google document. All students should critically read the draft introduction and enter their suggestions for revisions as comments on the Google document version.

Feb 6: Discussion of Draft of General Introduction and Social/Bibliographical Contexts for Memoirs of John Hall/Hell upon Earth

Love, *Attributing Authorship* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), Introduction & Chapters 2, 4, 5 & 8

Feb 13: Textual Criticism 1: Copy-Text, Best-Text, and Radiating Text Theory

Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950-1): 19-36

Tanselle, "Editing without a Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography* 47 (1994): 1-22

Zeller, "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts," *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231-64.

Feb 20: Textual Criticism 2: Versions, Sociological, and Hypertext Theory

McGann, *Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*

Stillinger, "Practical Theory of Versions," *Coleridge and Textual Instability* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994): 118-40

McGann, "Rationale of the Hypertext," *Electronic Text*, ed. Sutherland (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997): 19-46

Sutherland, "Being Critical: Paper-based Editing and the Digital Environment," *Text Editing, Print and the Digital World*, ed. Deegan and Sutherland (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009): 13-26

Feb 27 (No Class Meeting): Team-proofread witness texts saved both in MSWord UTF-8 plain-text format and in MSWord rich-text format due to Bb Discussion Board on "Textual Witnesses." Files must be named as the siglum indicated under readings for our first meeting PLUS "utf8" or "richtext." For example, the witness texts for Hell upon Earth should be save as "HUE utf8" and "HUE richtext." Within 24 hours, I will upload all UTF-8 witness files to the Juxta Comparison Set "Memoirs of John Hall Hell upon Earth" and post that Comparison Set as a Juxta (.jxt) file to the "Textual Witnesses" Blackboard Discussion Board Forum, setting MJH 1714 as the base text. I will also generate a Juxta critical apparatus for that comparison set view and post the html file (named "Memoirs of John Hall Hell upon Earth Juxta Apparatus") to the "Textual Witnesses" Discussion Forum. All students should download that Comparison Set and critical apparatus link and use the week to explore (using Juxta's options) and critically reflect upon the significance of the collation that it registers, as a basis for the Arguments for Editorial Approach due before our next class.

Mar 4 (Monday; No Class Meeting): Arguments for Editorial Approach to Memoirs of John Hall/Hell upon Earth due by midnight to Blackboard Discussion Board Forum "Editorial Approach" and as Google documents shared in the default allow comments mode with other students. All students should critically read all arguments and enter critical comments on them into the Google document versions before our next meeting. (Note: I have taken Hypertext off the table as a potential approach to our project because there isn't enough time in the semester to do the basic editorial work and then code it. Plus, I don't write code).

Mar 6: Debate and Choice: Editorial Principles for Hell upon Earth/Memoirs of John Hall. During this meeting we will debate and come to a consensus on which of the editorial/textual criticism theories (i.e., best-text vs. copy-text vs. versions vs. sociological) and which mode for presenting the text (see Williams & Abbot 103-5) we will adopt for our edition.

Mar 8 (Friday; No Class Meeting): In response to the outcomes of previous meeting, by midnight I will also post to the Blackboard Discussion Board Forum "Text Sections" a version of the MSWord rich-text of our chosen base text (named "Base Text with Paragraph Numbers") that gives each paragraph of that text a sequential number [in brackets at the end of each paragraph]. I will use the paragraph numbers in this document to assign (in a file named "Text Section Assignments and Numbers" on the "Text Sections" Discussion Forum) equivalent text sections in that base text for emendation and annotation to the same teams that transcribed and proofread the witness texts. The

section/team numbers assigned in this file must also be used in subsequent filenames as indicated below. NOTE: The paragraph numbers given in "Base Text with Paragraph Numbers" on the "Text Sections" Discussion Forum must also be used to cite lemmata (i.e., the passages in our edition that have been emended or are being textually annotated) in list of emendations and textual notes. We will cite lemmata by paragraph and line number rather than by page and line number because those latter numbers may change depending on our later decision about how to present annotations. (See Williams & Abbott 127-9 on standard protocols for textual annotation. I will reiterate this mode for citing lemmata in the file "Principles for Emendation and Textual and Explanatory Notes" that I will post to the Blackboard Discussion Board Forum "Emendation and Annotation Principles" as indicated below.)

Mar 13: Spring Break

Mar 20: Emendation and Apparatus Theory and Debate: Editorial Principles for Emendation and Textual/ Explanatory Notes. During this class we will discuss the assigned readings and come to a consensus about what principles we will use for emending our base text, for textual and explanatory notes, and for the presentation of emendation, textual notes, and explanatory notes. (In order to get a physical sense of the issues raised by these readings, students should review the examples of apparatus in Williams & Abbott 108-28 and in Gaskell, *From Writer to Reader*).

Tanselle, "Some Principles for Editorial Apparatus," *Studies in Bibliography* 25 (1972): 41-88

Tanselle, "Editorial Apparatus for Radiating Texts," *Library*, 5th ser., 29 (1974): 330-7. (Appendix to "Some Principle for Editorial Apparatus")

Tinseled, "External Fact as an Editorial Problem," *Studies in Bibliography* 32 (1979): 1-47

Battestin, "Rational of Literary Annotation: the Example of Fielding's Novels'" *Studies in Bibliography* 34 (1981): 1-22

Jack, "Novels and those 'Necessary Evils': Annotating the Brontes," *Essays in Criticism* 32 (1982): 321-37

Small, "The Editor as Annotator as Ideal Reader," *Theory and Practice of Text-Editing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991): 186-209

Mar 22: (Friday; no class): I will post to the Blackboard Discussion Board Forum "Emendation and Annotation Principles" a file (entitled "Principles for Emendation and Textual and Explanatory Notes") that stipulates protocols for executing our consensus about principles for emending our base text and for the substance and presentation of textual and explanatory notes

Mar 27: No class; students working

Apr 1 (Monday; No Class Meeting): Student drafts (in MSWord rich-text format) of proofread text sections with emendations and textual notes due by midnight to the Blackboard Discussion Board Forum "Text Sections." These drafts must correspond to the principles and protocols (including file names) defined in "Principles for Emendation and Textual and Explanatory Notes" on the Discussion Forum "Emendation and Annotation Principles."

Apr 3: Workshop on issues in emendation and textual notes. Students must read all drafts posted on the previous syllabus entry and be prepared to critically discuss those drafts.

Apr 8 (Monday; No Class Meeting): Revised text sections (in MSWord rich-text format) with explanatory annotations and (in a separate file) Works Cited (in MLA style) in annotations due by midnight to the Blackboard Discussion Board Forums "Text Sections" and "Works Cited." Files should be saved as "DRAFT ANNOTATED Text Section X" and "DRAFT Works Cited Section X," substituting your respective section/team numbers (as assigned on Mar 8) for "X."

Apr 10: Workshop on issues in explanatory annotation. Students must read all drafts posted on the previous syllabus entry and be prepared to critically discuss those drafts.

Apr 15 (Monday; No Class Meeting): Draft of Note on Text due by midnight from PhD students (in MSWord rich-text file entitled "DRAFT Note on Text") to Blackboard Discussion Board Forum "Note on the Text" and as a Google document shared in the default allow comments mode with other students. All students should critically read the draft and enter critical comments on them into the Google document version before our next meeting.

Apr 17: Workshop on Draft Note on Text

Apr 22 (Monday; No Class Meeting): Revised Note on Text due by midnight from PhD students (in MSWord rich-text file entitled "Note on Text") to Blackboard Discussion Board Forum "Note on the Text" and as a Google document shared in the default allow comments mode with other students. All students should critically read the final draft and enter final critical comments on them into the Google document version before our next meeting. Revised "General Introduction" due by midnight from professor (in MSWord rich-text file entitled "General Introduction") to Blackboard Discussion Board Forum "General Introduction." All students should critically read the final draft and enter final critical comments on them into the Google document version before our next meeting.

Apr 24: General/final workshop and reflection on the edition. FINAL EXAM (TAKE-HOME) DISTRIBUTED

May 1 (Reading Day): Final versions (in MSWord rich-text format) of Emended and Annotated Text Sections (saved as FINAL Text Section X), Works Cited (saved as FINAL Works Cited Text Section X), Note on the Text (saved as FINAL Note on Text), and General Introduction (by Professor, saved as "FINAL General Introduction") due by midnight to (the Blackboard Discussion Forum "Final Files." Final Emended and Annotated Text Sections must correspond to the principles and protocols defined in "Principles for Emendation and Textual and Explanatory Notes" on the Discussion Forum "Emendation and Annotation Principles." All file names as stipulated above that include "X" must substitute for "X" the team/section numbers assigned on Mar 8.

May 8: Final exams due by email to ejacobs@odu.edu as MSWord files saved as "725s13finalYOURLASTNAME" by 6.45PM.

By May 15: Professor merges all "FINAL" files into a single document and publishes it (as a PDF file) and the Juxta collation file(s) at http://www.???? (site address TBA).