

# From Book to Text: Towards a Comparative History of Philologies

*Christian Jacob*

Our methods of research, duly elaborated hereafter, would benefit from being applied to the realm of the East. For that matter, the examination of Syriac, Armenian, Coptic or Arabic manuscripts does not differ in the least from that of a Greek or Latin manuscript. The rules developed by classical philologists are just as valid for the study of the Maxims of Phtahhotep and the Precepts of Kagemeni . . .

Alphonse Dain (1975), *Les Manuscrits* (Paris, Les Belles Lettres)

One of the objects of a comparative history of the scholarly practices in the West, the Far East, the Arab world and classical antiquity is the role of libraries in the constitution, transmission and transformations of the great textual corpora. To the institutional and social aspects of the politics of social memory should be added the range of intellectual and technical practices which have as their aim the conservation of this inheritance: material conservation and transmission – copying texts, restoring them, transferring them from one medium, one script and one language to another – but also work on the literal level and the meaning, the content and the form.

A comparative history of philologies would have as its aim the study of local, dated configurations where specific agents, to order, by delegation or at their own initiative, transformed the transmitted texts to preserve, correct or improve their literal form and their contents.

Such a project would lead to an archaeology (as defined by Michel Foucault) of the philological gaze, conceived as a scholarly and expert modality of reading. This gaze aimed at different objectives, depending on cultural milieux, texts and periods. It might seek – by means of one or several exemplars – to reconstruct an improved text, corresponding to a primordial and indeed original status of a writing purged of the interpolations and errors which corrupt it; or it might make its concern the conservation of a text in a state judged to be original, by forestalling all risk of alteration and maintaining effective control over the diffusion and uses of the work; or finally, it might intervene actively in the form and meaning of this text, modifying, refining and completing it, and imposing on it structural alterations or ideological and stylistic adjustments. These different stances could, moreover, be combined. In all instances, the historian observes technical movements, critical operations, scribal practices.

Alexandria offers an exemplary point of departure for such an enquiry, combining a library, a political project and a literate milieu.<sup>1</sup> From the foundation of the library, at the beginning of the third century BC, a methodical and skilled correction of the great texts inherited from classical hellenism can be seen developing on an unprecedented scale.

Admittedly, at the period of the manuscript book, checking one's exemplar, correcting it by comparing it with another copy of the same text, were current procedures which every reader probably had to practise. Before Alexandria, the owners of books carried out these checks for their own private use. It might be a question, depending on circumstance, of the local correction of obvious faults or the systematic comparison of two exemplars, for instance when one had been copied from the other. The result was an exemplar of the text with 'added value', showing traces of careful rereading and more or less detailed editorial work. Aristotle carried out this work on a copy of the *Iliad* which had been given to Alexander the Great and accompanied him on his expedition to Asia.<sup>2</sup>

The Alexandrian Library gave a new dimension to this technical preparation of reading. The profusion of different versions of certain works, the result of a voluntarist policy of manuscript acquisition, necessitated the choices and critical operations which would, from the multiplicity of books, effect the emergence of the category of the text as an intellectual and problematic object.

Philology appeared from the moment when the autonomy of the text in relation to the book was recognized. Not only could a text be copied from one medium to another, but it could also be studied independently of the media which served as a vehicle for it, as an object composed of letters, words, phrases and developments which made sense and were governed by the criteria of logical coherence, grammatical correction and stylistic elegance. The emergence of the text as an intellectual object appears to be a consequence of the relativization of the authority of the book, as a material object, ever since there had been competing versions of the same work. This discrepancy had in addition to be perceptible and perceived as problematic. This presupposes first of all a cultural conception of the text as a fixed and unambiguous apparatus, resulting from an authorial intention and excluding the coexistence of variants.<sup>3</sup> Conditions had also to combine to make it possible to compare different exemplars and the decision to intervene in a given exemplar had to be imperative, whether comparing it with its variants or correcting it authoritatively. This is a cultural decision and it results from intellectual, religious, political and axiological assumptions. Likewise the criteria implemented to apply this decision reflected conceptions of the linguistic and stylistic norm, as well as an orthodoxy (religious, political, ethical or aesthetic).

It is significant that the foundation and the first years of the Alexandrian Library were marked on the one hand by a great translation project (the Pentateuch, translated from Hebrew to Greek), on the other by the rise of philological activity around the first librarian, Zenodotus, and the scholars who assisted him. The translation presupposes in effect that it was agreed that the text was autonomous not only in relation to the book, but in relation to the original language and script in which it was written. Likewise, the work of Zenodotus and his companions presupposes a certain distancing from the materiality of the rolls of papyrus arranged on the shelves of the library. To constitute corpora, establish bibliographies, classify, attribute: such were the probable tasks of Alexander the Aetolian who took responsibility for the writings of the tragedians, of Lycophron, who was in charge of texts of the comedies, and Zenodotus, described by the *Suda* as the 'first corrector of Homer'. Although the library led to the incorporation of books classified according to literary genres, it also gave way to their deconstruction, by the extraction of words and their redistribution in lexical collections which displayed the extent of the written Greek language, its dialects and its literary forms.<sup>4</sup> The material accumulation of books made

possible the formation and exploration of three intellectual areas: the map of literary and discursive genres, which resulted in the biographical–bibliographical catalogue of Callimachus; the Greek language, by means of lexicography and grammar; the text as object of philological rectification and of interpretation.

Philology was born when primacy was accorded to the text over the book, when it was perceived that a text was not necessarily equivalent to its record in a particular medium. This proposition had still to be refined further. There are traditions in which the text precedes the book, exists independently of it and is essentially diffused through orality, whether in the flexibility of poetic performances which are themselves acts of composition (early phases of the homeric tradition), or in the fixity of a literal memorization reinforced by specific techniques (for example, the Vedas in ancient India). There are also traditions where the text is indissociable from the book, where the material object is invested with an intrinsic value which can have an effect on the ways the text is disseminated, by imposing for example the literal and completely identical reproduction of an authoritative model. These forms of valorizing the book are manifold. Sacred books, in the hands of the guardians of the tradition (the sacrality of the text is transmitted to its medium); autograph manuscripts, rough drafts or corrected proofs bearing witness to an authorial will, and to an intentionality affecting at once the foundation and the form of the text; copies invested with particular authority by a more ancient editorial work of which they are the result, by their origin and their antiquity<sup>5</sup> – there are so many cases where the book and the text are no longer dissociable but are invested with their own authority. Such exemplars may, in their turn, constitute the point of departure of a new tradition.

The tension between books and text, between the diffusion of material copies and the intellectual effort to intervene in the text for which they are the vehicle and to which none corresponds entirely, such could be the point of departure for a comparative study of the major philological traditions. Some show a suspicion, a disquiet in their scrutiny of the text. This misgiving can spring from the empirical discovery of errors, corruptions, lacunae and illogicalities. The dissatisfaction of the reader can also result from dogmatic stances – a concept of language, grammar, style, or even of the truth, the spiritual, ethical or political norm. These editorial positions are historical and cultural variables. They may be identical to those of the author of the text under consideration. They may also be foreign to him: such is the case when there is a temporal, spatial or cultural distance between the author and the readers studying his text. The latter then attempt to make the text conform to their own conception of language, grammar and the norm, and this was the case with the Alexandrian Library, where Zenodotus, Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus, faced with the Homeric epics, corrected the text on the basis of internal criticism and a diverse palette of criteria reflecting their own literary culture. As Bernard Cerquiglini has underlined, ‘every edition is based on a theory, often implicit, of the work’.<sup>6</sup>

A comparative history of philologies does not therefore limit itself to comparing techniques of textual correction and edition, within a technical field of knowledge. The implications of such a project are much wider and open an advantageous access route for the exploration of scholarly milieux and cognitive traditions, that is to say, to understand the social and cultural treatment of the corpora of texts invested with collective memory and identity. Our aim is to bring out some of these implications, as a prelude to an international conference for which they will constitute the agenda.<sup>7</sup>

## Places and agents

The first approach is a sociological one: to identify the agents in the transmission of texts, specify their institutional affiliation, the source of their authority and their legitimacy. Who grounded their authority? Who established their power over the material aspect, the form and the meaning of texts? What was the purpose of their work?

Answering these questions leads to an exploration of the places where books are accumulated, and where material accumulation sometimes results in an intellectual intervention on the form of texts: libraries, with their diverse arrangements of architecture and furnishings, their specializations, their social and institutional roots. Philological activity may thus be considered on the very broadest background of archival practices. What use should be made of the written inheritance? What should be preserved and why? Who are the guarantors, the custodians of conservation? What is expected from the texts thus accumulated? The latter may constitute an intellectual, literary, philosophical, religious or juridical inheritance, playing a fundamental and legitimizing role for a political power, a national identity, a spiritual practice or even be an instrument of social integration and ideological affiliation.

Libraries today are dedicated to the conservation and communication of books, among other vehicles for the transmission of knowledge (image, sound). They were also for a long while places where books were produced, where craftsmen worked (copyists, calligraphers, binders . . . ) as well as the agents responsible for choices, contents and formal decisions. This editorial vocation is reappearing today, with the digitalization of texts undertaken by the great libraries: what texts should be digitized? what technical protocols should be followed? what ergonomic concepts and what norms for typographical make-up? for what uses? with what added value? Digitalized libraries, just like traditional libraries, have to face problems relating to the selection, the coherence of a corpus of texts, and the editing of texts.

Depending on the period and cultural milieu, libraries were open or closed on themselves, dedicated to conservation or designed for the use of more or less strictly defined communities of readers. Moreover, libraries played an essential role in the definition of these communities – monastic, academic, humanist, or communities linked to a court milieu.

The purpose of libraries depended on the agents who worked there (scribes, priests, officials, religious, scholars enjoying royal or imperial patronage) but also on the texts which they had in their archives: reports of oracular consultations, historical chronicles or sacred texts, literary and scientific heritage, administrative and judicial archives. These two variables, the agents and the corpora, were to define the intellectual practices within the library.

The Alexandrian Library, whose aim was to collect all the books in the world, Greek and 'barbarian', thus gave rise to the translation into Greek of foreign texts. The very size of the collection and the scheme to condense Greek culture in the palace of the new Graeco-Macedonian dynasty which reigned over Egypt, involved the inventorying, classifying and typology of literary genres, and systematic bibliography. The conservation of this literary heritage also led to an ordering of manuscript exemplars, and to an undertaking which, from one given exemplar, aimed to improve, refine and correct the text. This editorial work was the prelude to other forms of scholarly treatment (commentary,

monographs, literary imitations). To the symbolic benefits sought by the Ptolemies should thus be added the dynamic of scholarly work fostered by a great patrimonial library.<sup>8</sup> Alexandria is a lasting reference-point in the western and the eastern mental image of the library. It enabled the development of modern thought on what a public library should be, as Justus Lipsius, for example, testifies in his *De Bibliothecis Syntagma* (1602).<sup>9</sup>

The Alexandrian scholars could legitimately believe that they had available in the same place virtually the whole of ancient Greek literature, sometimes in several exemplars. The situation was much less favourable for humanist Europe. It was a question of discovering the traces of a shipwreck and making good the effects of their dispersion in a great variety of private and then public libraries, more or less accessible to scholars. Although fortune might by chance place a scholarly reader in the presence of the manuscript of a work known or sometimes unknown, it was more difficult to arrange access to several manuscripts of the same text, to compare and collate them.

During the Renaissance, with the rediscovery of Greek literature and the rise of the scholarly edition, taken up by the commercial interests of the printers, one of the principal tasks of the humanists was to search for manuscripts of classical texts, whether because it was a question of printing a text in its original condition, or because the consultation of different manuscripts would be useful in the correction of a text corrupted by tradition. The search for new manuscripts was aimed at either the discovery of unedited texts, as a preliminary to a first edition, or the discovery of less defective copies of texts already edited, which would allow the production of better editions.

Forms of scholarly sociability, with the exchange of information and expertise, can be seen developing between scholars throughout Europe. Humanist correspondence, such as that of Isaac Casaubon, illustrate on a daily basis the functioning of these networks which circulated manuscripts, printed editions, annotations and collations. Aristocratic and princely libraries opened to circles of scholars and offered them the books necessary for their work: the library of Leonello d'Este at Ferrara, in the first half of the fifteenth century, is an example of this scholarly activity at court.<sup>10</sup>

But the scattering of sources and the difficulty of locating them remained major problems. Gathering manuscripts together in public libraries, and entrusting these manuscripts to scholars who could correct them by careful comparison, was the solution proposed as early as the fourteenth century by the chancellor of Florence, Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406).<sup>11</sup> Salutati had become aware of the need for ordering, comparing and gathering manuscripts together in a single place, and of reviving the alexandrian model of the librarian-corrector; for the passive transmission of texts he substituted correction by specialists, a collective work which required the greatest possible number of sources in the same place.

Recourse to manuscripts had practical and intellectual consequences. The libraries' collection had to be inventoried, 'collective' catalogues created which would signal their existence to potential editors. One had to ensure their conservation while allowing their use by scholars and, later, their photographic reproduction.<sup>12</sup> It was also necessary to experiment the intellectual methods and models which were to make it possible to give meaning to the comparison and interpret the differences between them.

The manuscript collections in the European libraries today are the record of the history of classical, middle- and far-eastern philology. They bear witness to the progressive awareness of the intrinsic value of manuscripts: no longer redundant exemplars, but irreplaceable

witnesses of one state of the transmitted text, and a significant link in the chain of its transmission. We are far from the optimism or the negligence of some Renaissance editors who were of the opinion that the printed text rendered obsolete the manuscript on which it was based.

Parallel to the development of locations for, and policies relating to, the conservation of texts, the history of philology is also that of the milieux of technical experts and specialists, belonging to institutions, united by the ties of master to pupil, collegial and/or competitive relationships, close to each other or opposed in their methods and cultural assumptions. These agents were assimilated within an economic milieu – that of printers, for example, with their working practices, profit imperatives and commercial strategies for dominating a market or responding to public expectation. They were also in social and professional milieux – teaching, learned societies or, once more, court circles.

These agents could be humanist figures of the first importance, whose critical work still marks the texts we read today. More often they are anonymous figures, or reduced to a simple name, who play a no less important role in the transmission of texts. Thus the scribes, who, from Greek papyri to medieval *codices*, copied the text from dictation or following a visual model, adding skipped lines at the base of the column of text, and sometimes scratching out or correcting between two lines. To this should be added their lapses of concentration, visual or auditive confusion, corrections that were ruthless to a greater or lesser degree and intuitive solutions brought to a difficulty in the original text. A different status and authority are to be found in those who decided to correct a text, or collate manuscripts as the preliminary to a new edition. They displayed critical rigour and an active role in the construction of the readability of the text. This type of project could be disseminated to a greater or lesser extent and subject to more or less control. It could encounter institutional, ideological or theological obstacles – as for instance New Testament studies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It could be reserved for a particular caste of specialists, little inclined to formulate and divulge their expertise. According to the definition given by A.E. Housman, 'Textual criticism, like most other sciences, is an aristocratic affair, not communicable to all men, nor to most men'.<sup>13</sup> The philologist thus exercises absolute power over texts and readers, and sometimes also over his colleagues. Great figures like Lachmann or Wilamowitz used and sometimes abused the argument of authority: their conjectures were the voice of an oracle.

Philological traditions should be relocated in the wider landscape of literate and intellectual, official, academic or 'fringe' milieux in Europe and China as well as the Arab world. Social interaction, the circulation of texts and books, the forms of power exercised by these specialists over the activities of their colleagues and the education of their pupils constitute important variables which influenced production as well as the reception of their philological work.

In the western tradition, we can contemplate the history of forms of validation of philological study: from when, by which criteria and in which forms did critical assessments of editions appear? From what point in time did critical reviews appear? What are the consensual criteria for a critical edition? What is an authoritative edition? And, conversely, what are the mechanisms of polemic and how are controversies resolved?

During the Renaissance, it was extremely difficult to check an edition of a classical text, because the editor did not indicate his manuscript sources, confining himself to mentions such as *vetus lectio* or *antiqua lectio* to justify a variant, whether because the manuscript

used was not available for checking or indeed was lost or destroyed as soon as the transcription had been made. What is more, the Renaissance editor only rarely indicated his own conjectures, that is the modifications and corrections which he had introduced into the text on the basis of his judgement alone. Verifying these conjectures, accepting or rejecting them presupposes instruments of control such as critical apparatuses or commentaries. The history of western philology is that of the slow emergence of the reflexive dimension and of critical analysis, of the dialectic between the authority of the corrector and the visibility of his procedures and his criteria.

### **The constitution of corpora**

A comparative history of philologies should also lead to an investigation of the status of the texts which are the object of these scholarly practices. What do they represent in the culture of a particular society? What are the benefits of their transmission? What ideological or spiritual values inform them? What is their authorial status?

The constitution and transmission of the great textual corpora assumes individual or collective decisions on the definition and control of tradition, on the status of the texts, on the nature and latitude of the authorized scribal and intellectual procedures, on the room for manoeuvre by those with a part to play in the transmission – readers, scribes, correctors and exegetes. The textual corpora weapons of power, whether temporal or spiritual, political or intellectual – different facets which were, moreover, often combined.

The Bible, the Koran, the Confucian classics and Graeco-Latin literature are some examples amongst many. All played, and for some still play, a central socio-cultural role: at once a federating and an identifying principle, the foundation text defining a relationship with the divine, but also a juridical code, political charter, literary monuments and collective memory, knowledge of which was an indication of political, social and cultural integration.

The genesis of these corpora is an essential factor for the definition of their status as well as of the critical procedures of which they were the object. The text of the Koran, for example, is the written record of the revelations made by the Archangel Gabriel to the prophet Muhammad.<sup>14</sup> Muhammad was not the author of this fixed textual rendering. The transmission of the divine word was first entrusted to human orality and memory. Partial private transcriptions doubtless appeared fairly quickly. But the scheme to organize these revelations in a closed corpus, to determine their strict meaning was only imposed after the death of the Prophet (in 632). In the years that followed there were several definitive written versions resulting from individual initiatives. One was established by order of the caliph, Ab\_ Bekr. These transcriptions showed divergences one from the other, as much in the literal level as in the order of the surahs and the order of the verses. They lay at the origin of the parallel traditions which have criss-crossed the history of Islam. It was the third caliph, Othman (644–55) who was to proceed to the establishment of a Koranic canon. A commission of experts established the text, verse by verse, grounded upon the earlier transcriptions as well as the vivid memory of the faithful. Ab\_ Bekr's transcription was the basis for this official version, copies of which were sent to the great towns of the Empire – Mecca, Basrah, Kufa, Damascus. It was therefore a political decision which lay at the origin of the official version of the sacred book.

The history of the Koran demonstrates the complex process which led from an oral tradition to a fixed text, from a plurality of variants to a canonical version. Writing becomes the intermediary for the memory of the witnesses of the Revelation. It is also an instrument of power, imposing an official and authenticated version. Othman's version encountered resistance. The very form of the lectionaries and the specific characteristics of the writing employed still made the reading of the Koran a complex process, where the memory of the faithful had to supply the incomplete and sometimes ambiguous literal meaning.

The historical process which led to the canonization of one version of the Koran in fact spread out across several centuries. Although the heterodox exemplars could have been materially destroyed, it was more difficult to interrupt their oral transmission. To impose the Othmanian version, at the beginning of the eighth century reform of the script itself was undertaken (adoption of the *scripta plena*, which marks vowels in the form of dots and diacritical signs). The adjustment of the calligraphy of the Koran (and its regional variants) accompanied the normalization of spelling, a page layout which separated the surahs, specifying them by title and rendering visible the division of verses. The totality of these reforms and corrections made possible the emergence of a literal reading of the text in place of the reading 'according to meaning' characteristic of the first lectionaries, where individual memory played an active role.

The establishment of the Koran as a fixed text is indissociable from the history of Islam: the Sunni and Shiite traditions were to be defined primarily by the choice of different versions of the text. Oral transmission, in the form of 'readings' which, through the expedient of a chain of guarantors, asserted that it went back to the oral teaching of the Prophet himself, did not cease to interact with the written tradition to demarcate a space for interpretation and commentary on the sacred text.

In China, the history of the Confucian classics followed a different scenario.<sup>15</sup> The corpus was progressively constituted: from five books under the Han, it contained thirteen under the Sung. This evolution reflected new cultural conceptions. At the start, Confucius played a founding role in the selection and determining of texts themselves inherited from a distant past.<sup>16</sup> Confucius gave shape to these traditions, by means of an action at once editorial and authorial: 'I transmit the teaching of the Ancients, without creating anything new, because it seems to me reliable and believable'.<sup>17</sup> Transmission was only possible by this original decision, which reorganized the temporality of Chinese history, by shaping its memory of the earliest times and by acknowledging the authority and educative value of the texts thus preserved.

These texts did not transmit a divine revelation; they were not sacred in origin. They marked an ethical, aesthetic and intellectual horizon which was to occupy a central place in the development of a state culture, reflecting the unifying will of imperial power, from the Han onwards. The Classics were books to read, to contemplate, to comment upon, tools of an education which went beyond erudition to inspire a way of life. Techniques of exegesis and teaching first led to the canonization of these texts, but the Han dynasty was to place them at the centre of a state orthodoxy, and make them an instrument of education, a tool of preferment for the administrative elites, by means of an educational *cursus* marked out with examinations.

Imperial power desired to control the transmission of the Classics by imposing an official version of the text. This latter was sometimes engraved on stone better to guarantee its immutability. From the first half of the tenth century onwards, wood-block printing



discharged the same role. Henceforth there was a reference text which private transcriptions had to respect. Printing was, initially, an instrument of canonization.<sup>18</sup> Its development, however, made this strict political control untenable.

From that time onwards there were official editions and interpretations, established by commissions of state scholars, under imperial control. The imperial libraries served as a framework for these enterprises. The Classics moreover constituted the first category in bibliographical classifications.<sup>19</sup> The revision of texts and commentaries was the main task of the high-ranking officials and scholars who worked in these libraries.

The history of Chinese classical culture is, to a great extent, that of variations and mutations in the scrutiny brought on these texts. Very soon there were two competing versions, one in 'ancient writing', the other in 'modern writing', that which was officially acknowledged by the imperial Academy of the Han. Periodically, the concern to preserve the authenticity of the Classics led to searching them for interpolations and errors. The critical process was a source of scepticism which, paradoxically, could undermine the authority of the corpus and challenge the orthodoxy of the state.

The Old and New Testaments, the Graeco-roman classics, the Vedas and the Buddhist canon display other scenarios of establishment and transmission. These texts are the magnetic poles around which a culture and a society spread themselves. Their power was not limited by temporal or geographical frontiers, as the great religions of the Book still demonstrate today. Invested with a specific authority, they also define positions of power: the guarantors of their literal form and of their meaning. Variations in the cultural gaze, norms and readings, developments of and breaks in the techniques and forms of transmission signal as many historical thresholds. How are orthodox interpretations constructed and imposed? What authorities and what interests do they serve? How can an orthodoxy be challenged, indeed supplemented, by new paradigms of interpretation? What is the status of rival schools of interpretation? How are crises and controversies between the competing traditions resolved? Can a text be decanonized, and following what procedure, with what consequences? In which conditions can an independent and secularized philology be born? The last question lies at the heart of European philology, where there are two great corpora of different status, the classics of Antiquity, and the New Testament and the Bible.

## Practices and artefacts

The study of corpora outlines cultural cartographies: each society defines itself in relation to the texts in which it has invested its identity, its memory and its values, which bind it simultaneously to its roots and sometimes to transcendency. To preserve their symbolic power, these texts, sacred or profane, are the object of literary practices. These practices dealt with artefacts and gave birth to new ones.

An intellectual field, philology in fact comprises a concrete and material aspect. What operations does it involve? What kind of textual devices does it produce? It is translated into a whole range of acts and artefacts. Foremost among them is the reproduction of texts, in manuscript or mechanically, involving agents, machines, media, distribution networks: the copying of an original from someone else's dictation or by personal reading (either silent or aloud reading), graphical techniques of page layout, calligraphy and

illumination, preparation of the exemplar for printing, composition of plates at the printers', correcting, binding, commercialization, archive storage of the books in libraries. Philology also acts on the transmitted texts, whether at the time of copying or at the time of reading. It produces a form of writing which is juxtaposed or superimposed, on a text already written whether it coexists with it or supplants it.

Philology aims at saving the readability of texts, indeed to reconstruct it by adapting to new norms (cultural, linguistic . . . ). It adapts texts to the demands of a particular time and place in relation to reading, interpretation and understanding. It reflects the norms of grammatical correctness, lexical adequacy and stylistic elegance. Work on the literal and formal level aims to optimize the meaning. This labour can result in a new exemplar of the text, improved in form and material character. It can also confine itself to graphical intervention on an existing exemplar: corrections, erasures, interpolations, the registering of variants, deleting the previous text or not. This phase may, or may not, be the prelude to the production of a new exemplar of the text.

The philology practised in the Alexandrian Library, in the second and third centuries BC, took the material form of a system of annotations in the margin of columns of text which followed one another on the papyrus roll.<sup>20</sup> It was a question of marks which pinpointed problematic places in the text (a line, word or passage) and would suggest actions such as correction, suppression, displacement over the text of a line or interpolated passage, or complementary clarification. This system preserved the transmitted text and constituted a level of autonomous writing. This non-destructive criticism could nevertheless lead to a new copy of the text, since it contained the instructions for establishing it. Side by side with the reading of the work was a technical reading of the text, indissociable from a form of writing. It was not the author of the text but an expert in reading and establishing it who remedied corruptions, deliberate or unintentional. It was a question of identifying the operations which had succeeded each other on a particular exemplar of the text, between its original state and the step of textual criticism. Nothing permits us to think that the Alexandrians thought of this process as a chain of transmission the steps of which could be reconstructed by systematic comparison of the manuscript evidence of the text.

This marginal fringe of critical marks was scarcely explicit in itself: it identified typical errors, generic problems in the *loci* of the text which it signposted. It demarcated a field of enquiry and a range of predictable errors. Critical treatment proper and the selected solutions to the discovered problems were perhaps the object of oral explications or of written commentaries on specific rolls.

Another case is the marginal or sometimes interlinear annotation which is found in particular on Byzantine and medieval *codices*. It was adapted to a new medium and a new form of book production, where the text could be bordered with scholia, often opposite the lines to which they referred. This form allowed the re-employment and reorganization of the tradition of commentaries inherited from Alexandrian scholarship, filtered by successive phases of compilation. A manuscript like Venetus A (tenth century) is thus one of our principle sources for knowledge of the homeric philology of the Alexandrian scholars: the original form of the commentaries has been deconstructed to adapt to the discontinuous and very cursory notes placing variants and critical judgements side by side.<sup>21</sup>

The margins of Greek and Latin texts printed in the Renaissance were also suited to manuscript notations. Their meaning and scope was different. The owner of a book could

contribute corrections to the printed text, by writing his own conjectures in the margin. He could add references to other texts, explanatory glosses. In some cases, the printed text could serve as a medium for the systematic collation of another manuscript, the variants of which were then transferred to the margin and sometimes substituted for those of the edition used. The libraries of the European humanists of the Renaissance have many examples of these working exemplars, used for the preparation of a new edition.<sup>22</sup> The printed volume served as a medium for the deconstruction of the text in a constellation of variants, which brought forth the critical decision.

In the course of its history, western philology has adopted different mechanisms to represent its critical operations. How should traces of the textual variants of a text be kept? Should an edition preserve the scaffolding which has made it possible, so that the future reader can check the edifice and if necessary recommence the building? The editor of the text has the power to conceal, indeed to destroy the material evidence of the state of the text transmitted by particular manuscripts. He also has that of substituting, suppressing and adding variants, and sometimes of rewriting the text. The editorial act then comes close to authorial function. But should textual criticism be a reversible process, placed beneath the gaze of an intellectual milieu which can at any time control its decisions and undo its workings? The presence in the edited text itself of mechanisms enabling this control defines a level where philology sees itself as a scholarly tradition, in a state of constant development, with its imperfect endeavours, but also with its cumulative dynamic and its perfectibility.

The graphical forms of the scholarly edition rely on manuscript evidence that is assembled and compared, and also on the meaning that is given to their divergences: is it a synchronic space for the juxtaposition and permutation of variants where a free choice may be made with respect to stylistic, aesthetic and intellectual criteria? Or is there a logically reconstitutable chain of the stages in the transmission of the text, the branchings of its tradition, visualized in the tree-like classification of manuscripts? Another condition is the emergence of a milieu of specialists fitted to turn this technical information to good account. Although a Greek or Latin text can be read as a work closed in on itself, the edition accompanied by a history of the text and a critical apparatus recording the variants is addressed to readers capable of making use of them, checking the critical choices of the editor and, if need be, proposing others. For the closed, fixed and inviolable text is substituted an evolving and perfectible text, constructed in the field of possible variations thanks to intellectual processes made explicit and supervised by an expert milieu, with its consensuses and controversies.

In the history of European philology, the Greek text of the New Testament naturally made use of, and benefited from, numerous manuscript sources. The debates and the new models which this factual datum gave rise to had a decisive role in the development of secular philology. The *editio princeps* of the New Testament was published by Erasmus in 1516. The editions derived from it, such as those published at Leiden (1624, 1633), were adopted by the Protestant churches: they presented the *textus receptus*. Some later editions then began to assemble variants at the foot of the page, thus providing evidence of reference to manuscripts as a documentary source to improve the traditional text and leading to some degree of destabilization of authority. On the other hand, it was impossible to modify the text itself without being exposed to violent theological reaction: reference back to the oldest manuscripts to modify the literal level of the text was unacceptable

in particular in countries with a Protestant tradition.<sup>23</sup> The conflict resulted from different representations of the text and of tradition. It was first expressed by means of a method of page layout: the text was accompanied by alternative readings which did not undermine its formal integrity.

The accumulation of variants raised the question of the criteria of the choice between them. This choice could be objectively based only in the chronological classification and the qualitative hierarchization of manuscripts. In the eighteenth century, the emphasis laid on the use of manuscripts at the expense of *ex ingenio* conjecture and local corrections, led to conceiving the tradition in terms of manuscript inter-relations. In the work of the German philologist, Johann Albrecht Bengel, the concept of a *tabula genealogica* of the manuscripts of the New Testament appears (1734), which made it possible to base the choice of variants on safer criteria than those of the concordance of the majority of manuscripts. The latter were henceforth organized in families. The genealogical table prefigured the *stemma codicum*. A century was to pass before the latter was outlined for the first time: we owe it to the Berlin philologist, Carl Gottlob Zumpt, a pupil of Wolf, as an accompaniment to his edition of Cicero's *Verrine Orations* (Berlin, 1831). Despite Lachmann's reticence, the device was adopted by other German philologists of the first half of the nineteenth century, such as Ritschl and Madvig, and accompanied the development of a genealogical approach to manuscript tradition.

The *stemma* was a tree-like apparatus which aimed less to divide manuscripts in classes defined by their quality (like the *tabula* of manuscripts of Goerenz in 1809 and 1813) than to restore their derivative relationships in all their complexity. It was a tool of synoptic visualization and ordering. Its effectiveness lay in the fact that it made it possible to go back as close as possible to the archetype, that is to the medieval foundation manuscript of the tradition, most frequently lost, but the text of which can be reconstructed by the careful examination of the readings of the tradition. The *stemma* thus enabled the identification and reconstruction of a lost text, by successive deductions.

The philologists' genealogical *stemma* should be located in relation to the derivation schemata of comparative linguistics or even the evolutionary tables of zoologists and botanists.<sup>24</sup> During the second half of the nineteenth century, interesting interdisciplinary exchanges were witnessed: exchanges of concepts and methodological models, often in both directions, and the adoption of graphical devices enabling complex typological arrangements to be visualized.

The study of philological artefacts should lead to the practices of electronic publishing and new modes of textual visualization, especially in the form of hypertext. We may ask whether the hypertext does not reintroduce a fundamental uncertainty and instability, indeed the reign of the variant, if not of variation.<sup>25</sup> The emphasis is on the choices, hypothetical readings and the plasticity of the text. Any reader can then assume the position of editor.

### **The normal and the pathological: fixity, corruption, contamination**

A final line of research would consist of shedding some light on the representations, implicit or explicit, of the textual tradition itself. How should the changes affecting text be interpreted? How should textual corruption be viewed?

The point of departure for such a study could be the tradition of western philology: since Antiquity, it has defined itself as *diorthôsis* or *emendatio*, that is, 'correction'. Work on texts is named after the medical and ethical operation of rectification: it is a case of correcting deviations. This correction assumes a therapeutic viewpoint, which establishes a diagnosis, identifies symptoms and identifies the problems hidden beneath the surface indicators.

Why, how and when is there awareness of textual corruption? What are the semantic, grammatical and graphical indicators of corruption? Corruption in relation to which linguistic or semantic norm, in relation to which original state of the text and which authorial intention? How does one move from the correction of obvious errors (error in copying, repetition of a line, lacuna etc.) to a systematic examination, a generalized suspicion?

Correction aims to reconstruct and to nullify the sequence of accidental alterations, deliberate or involuntary operations which have distorted an earlier or original state of the text. This original state is directly accessible when an authorial exemplar has been preserved. Most frequently, it is lost. The tools for correction are the philologist's conjecture, relying – or not – on the testimony of other manuscripts, that is on the comparison between different exemplars of the same text. This empirical comparison is one stage towards the systematic review of all the known manuscripts, their classification and the visualization of their family links.

When it does not rely on attested variants, conjecture brings the skill of the corrector into play. It then has certain similarities with a form of 'divination'. The editor assumes authorial power: he takes decisions in specific textual loci on the basis of his conception of the state of the language, tenets, style and, indeed, the thought of the author.

The error is thus at the centre of the European philological tradition. It is a heuristic tool, since, in the most recent stages of the development of the discipline, it enables organization of the manuscript tradition. The typology of errors defines not only manuscript families, but also levels of successive corruption in relation to an original postulated or observable state.

In a relatively brief methodological text, originally published in 1927, but which has appeared in many editions and in an English translation,<sup>26</sup> the German philologist Paul Maas clearly defined this conception of textual criticism, where quasi-epidemiological observation of the propagation of errors enables the relative dating of manuscript sources. The archetype is defined as the state of the text anterior to splittings in the manuscript tradition and, consequently, as lacking the errors introduced by successive scribes. The error is conceived as an automatic, transmittable and cumulative process.

Maas then formulates a series of laws, some examples of which follow:

- if a manuscript A displays all the errors of B, but with additionally one or more specific to itself, then A derives from B;
- if A and B display the same errors compared with all the other manuscripts, but with one distinct error or errors specific to each, then they are descended from the same exemplar, different from that from which all the other manuscripts are descended;
- if, for instance, in one of two manuscripts derived from the same lost manuscript, a variant can be identified as an explicable error, then the reading of the other manuscript should be retained.

The errors enable the derivation of the manuscript to be established, but also the rediscovery of the correct text at the level immediately above the branching. Paul Maas attempted to introduce a principle of prediction and the laws of logic into what would otherwise be only a random process. To do this, he resorted to the genealogical model of the transmission of errors and the contamination of manuscripts. An error introduced at a given moment of transmission constituted a 'genetic marker' that could be pinpointed in the latest stages of the tradition. Tradition is ruled by conservatism.

Such an observation assumes that one accords great importance to formalizing and rendering foreseeable the mechanisms generating the error, from objective factors (faults in reading, for example in the shift from one script to another) or psychological and intellectual (associations of ideas, tendency to simplify and skirt round difficulties, but also corrections and variants introduced by the scribe).<sup>27</sup> Philology should thus incorporate knowledge of the genesis of linguistic malformations, the mechanisms producing graphical aberrations – by means of substitution, addition, suppression, splitting in two, inversion of letters or words. Thus is fashioned the 'mechanical archaeology of the *lapsus*'.<sup>28</sup>

Paul Maas himself has proved to us that the genealogical metaphor carries fantasmatic connotations:

the diagram which shows the interrelation of the sources is called the *stemma*. The term comes from genealogy: sources are joined to an original a little like the descendants of a man are joined to their ancestor. One could perhaps illustrate the transmission of errors along a thread of the same lines by considering all the female descendants as sources of errors.<sup>29</sup>

Errors multiply like a virus, by contamination. As Bernard Cerquiglini has stressed, 'Philology is a bourgeois, paternalist and sanitary conception of family, which cherishes consanguinity, hounds the adulterer, fears contamination'.<sup>30</sup> One would have to ascertain whether documented correspondences can be found in medical science and philology, whether the first could have supplied the second not only with functional metaphors but also with models of intelligibility and an understanding of the phenomenon of propagation. In a Foucauldian perspective this would mean that one follows parallel developments in the two fields of learning, to identify the epistemological thresholds and the new conceptual configurations. An investigation of this kind has been made for medicine and philology separately. A systematic comparison of the two fields has, to my knowledge, not been attempted.

The epidemiological model should not be the only comparative factor between medicine and philology. Philology is a form of therapy: it cares for the texts, restores their condition. Like medicine, it relies on signs, symptoms, indications, manifest traces which may lead to the diagnosis of a certain kind of alteration. Observation and semiology are at the base of these two disciplines. The curative treatment of correction is closely akin to the actions of the antique-restorer, who obliterates dust and rust, restores an artwork and puts it on its feet again.<sup>31</sup>

Now semiology is also linked to another field, that of criminology and law. What is a sign? How can one arrive at a conclusion from partial, indirect and ambiguous evidence? This dimension of philological enquiry was, remarkably, formulated by Erasmus. In 1515 he published Seneca's *Letters* at Basel, with the title of *Lucubrationes*. He 'consulted two

manuscripts in England, one belonging to the library of the archbishop of Canterbury and the other to King's College, Cambridge.'

These [manuscripts] were imperfect and even more full of error than the current copies . . . One thing, however, helped me: they did not agree in error, as is bound to happen with printed texts set up from the same printers' copy; and thus, just as it sometimes happens that an experienced and attentive judge pieces together what really took place from the statements of numerous witnesses, none of whom is telling the truth, so I conjectured the true reading on the basis of their differing mistakes. Besides this, I tracked down many things as it were by scent, following the tail of actual letters and strokes of the pen. In some places, I had to guess; although I did so sparingly . . .<sup>32</sup>

Following the tail of errors, philology seeks to reconstitute a vanished text by a method which has elements of palaeontology, comparative zoology and divination. It would be possible to investigate the status of this conjectural knowledge which sought, between the Renaissance and the nineteenth century, to equip itself with a common method and criteria for validation and verification.

One of the principal endeavours of the philology of classical texts, in Europe, was to draw up a typology of errors and of the causes of textual change, by phonetic analogy, visual confusion or psychological mechanisms. We can ask whether this process of textual corruption, inherent in the very fact of their reproduction (manuscript or printed) falls within the orbit of general and universal typology, where the same causes would produce the same effects, or whether on the contrary they are determined by cultural variants, resulting from the sociological milieu of the copyists, their working methods and their knowledge of the texts. Such a question is raised by the quotation from Alphonse Dain which prefaces my discussion.

Language and writing are important cultural factors: faults in reading and in copying assume different forms depending on whether alphabetic, syllabary, pictographic, cursive or calligraphic writing is employed, whether it is in minuscules or capitals, with words split up or not. Similarly, the nature and frequency of errors result from forms of reading and copying (a visual copy from an exemplar placed in front of one, accompanied or unaccompanied by vocalization, an auditory copy from dictation). They are equally connected to the values with which the act of copying is itself invested: is it a question of a spiritual practice? a servile task? a remunerated commercial activity? a process enabling the acquisition of a copy of text that one needs personally?

The complexity of the copying processes was already analysed by Erasmus in his introduction to the *Letters of Jerome* (1516):<sup>33</sup> '[NB: I quote the English text from d'Amico] One man copies not what he reads but what he thinks he understands; another supposes everything he does not understand to be corrupt and changes the text as he thinks best, following no guide but his own imagination; a third detects perhaps that the text is corrupt, but while trying to emend it with an unambitious conjecture he introduces two mistakes in place of one, and while trying to cure a slight wound inflicts one that is incurable'.

At the most fundamental level, it could be said that not only the generation of errors results from a group of cultural variables, but that error is itself a cultural concept. Error in relation to what norm? In relation to what conception of the text?

Let us take a first hypothetical case: the corrector collates two exemplars to rectify one in relation to the other (the reference text and the copy). What are the levels of corruption which render a text unreadable? Do variants between two copies of the same text necessarily present a problem? Does this problem not presuppose a cultural concept of the text, as the outcome of an authorial intention, subject to a norm of fixity?<sup>34</sup>

Or take another hypothetical case: this is at a time when it is no longer possible to check the copy against the original. A given text is irreparably diffracted into a collection of variants. Each transmission's step has added a layer of alterations while repeating earlier errors.

In relation to what norm should these faults be identified? These are cultural criteria which define the linguistic, stylistic, ethical, religious or political norm: the status of the homeric language, of Attic Greek, of classic Latin, elegance and rhetoric. The Alexandrian philologists who corrected Homer according to their concepts of the Homeric language were not far distant from the Italian humanists: for the latter, the practice of Neo-Latin eloquence defined the norms of correction for classical Latin authors. Are trivialities compatible with the style expected from a great author? How should one deal with obscure points? The corrector is guided by implicit and normative criteria, by a notion of what the coherence of the work should be: can repetition, redundancy, ellipsis and structural defects be admitted? Likewise, he has to reconstruct the text by choosing the level of reading which will give it meaning: allegorical, literal, esoteric.

At the heart of correction lies the author, his intention, his own genius. This author can be a cultural and retrospective construction, relying on the internal evidence of the work, as Aristarchus' formula bears witness: 'to elucidate Homer by means of Homer'. The work is the implicit reference-point for taking critical decisions. The context is the determining factor in the correction of the text, to preserve coherence, and continuity of argument or narrative. Comparison between texts of the same period or the same genre allows the use of analogy: a form or turn of phrase observed in one author are mobilized to resolve a particular problem.<sup>35</sup> Comparison establishes normalcy.

It is therefore broadly the same conceptual and normative tools which enable the error to be identified and corrected.

## **What is at stake in a comparative history of philologies**

To end, I should like to return to what seem to me to be the advantages of the comparative approach in the field of the history of philological traditions.

There would first be comparison between the academic disciplines of today which, often focused on one cultural area, indeed on a particular technical object within it, have developed their own palette of concepts and methodological principles, their own problematic questionings, often directly tied to the nature of the available sources, but also to their own history. Greek, Chinese, Indian and Islamic studies, and the humanities, do not necessarily have many opportunities to compare their objects and their 'problematics'.

One of the aims of this interdisciplinary dialogue will be to compare philological practices themselves in specific cultural contexts, and no doubt to report a certain number of similarities or differences in the ways of proceeding and in the formal character of practices and artefacts. One may, through examination of the sources themselves, reflect on



the degree of thought and clarification which those who played a part in the edition and transmission of texts, and more generally the society in which they lived, had upon their practices: commentaries on their work, indeed technical and didactic manuals aiming to formalize rules of method, teaching traditions, explanatory, justificatory and programmatic texts (prefaces to editions in the West being an example of the last), the critical attitude of their peers, but also of the intellectual milieu, and of the holders of power (political, religious, academic).

Identifying analogies and constants, nevertheless, only constitutes the most immediate level of comparison. The latter should have a heuristic value, making differences and cultural specificities stand out. Not only oppositions, term by term, but also structural differences, chains of cultural determinants which give a particular meaning to objects, actions and practices. In fact, more than local correspondences or differences, the comparative approach should introduce a new degree of complexity into the history of the cultural traditions. The most important lies perhaps in the display of the technical, social, institutional, religious, metaphysical, political, linguistic, graphical and intellectual components of the project to preserve and transmit corpora of texts and to intervene in their literal form to preserve their meaning.

The purpose of such an approach would therefore be to give a historical and anthropological dimension to the function of libraries through history: they were places not only of conservation but also of the transmission and the configuration of literary inheritances. The history of philology is unquestionably a favoured access-route to understanding the benefits of the reading of a classical and canonical corpus, indeed of its preservation and transmission, as a fundamental element of a cultural, linguistic or religious identity, or even as a legitimating factor of social supremacy or political power.

The history of philology is that of the appropriation of a corpus of texts by a society and, within it, by communities of readers distinguished by their requirements, their level of expertise and their practices. Philology is a technique which makes it possible to optimize the profits or effects which this society and these groups intend to draw from that corpus, whether aesthetic pleasure or a preliminary to writing and rhetorical composition, whether deriving knowledge, wisdom or experience, or communing with a revelation by going to its very fountainhead.

Christian Jacob

CNRS, Centre Louis Gernet, Paris  
(translated from the French by Juliet Vale)

## Notes

1. Notable among the works on the library at Alexandria are P.M. Fraser (1972 repr. 1998) *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, Clarendon Press), esp. ch. 6; L. Canfora (1990) *The Vanished Library: A Wonder of the Ancient World* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press); idem. (1992) *La Bibliothèque d'Alexandrie et l'histoire des textes* (Université de Liège, Centre de documentation de papyrologie littéraire).
2. Strabo, *Geography*, 13. 1. 27; Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*, 8. 2.
3. For a critique of the assumptions of modern philology from a medievalist's point of view, see B. Cerquiglini (1989) *Éloge de la variante: histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris, Éditions du Seuil). See also the essential work by G. Nagy (1996) *Poetry as Performance. Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), which defines the successive phases of the history of the text of Homer: orality, transcript, script, writing.

4. The best account of the entirety of this scholarly activity within the Alexandrian Library remains the book by R. Pfeiffer (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, Clarendon Press).
5. See e.g. G. Pasquali (1974) *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Milan, Mondadori), 266–9, 278, on the reference to editions of Atticus in the manuscript traditions of Plato and Demosthenes.
6. Cerquiglini (1989) 43.
7. *Des Alexandries: du livre au texte*. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 23–5 June 1999. A second symposium, *Des Alexandries: les métamorphoses du lecteur*, will take place at the Bibliotheca Alexandrina in Egypt, 27–30 Nov. 1999.
8. For a primary outline of these practices, see C. Jacob (1996) *Lire pour écrire: navigations alexandrines*, in M. Baratin and C. Jacob (eds.), *Le pouvoir des bibliothèques: la mémoire des livres en Occident* (Paris, Albin Michel), 47–83.
9. See P. Nelles (1996) 'Juste Lipse et Alexandrie: les origines antiquaires de l'histoire des bibliothèques', in M. Baratin and C. Jacob (eds.), *Le pouvoir des bibliothèques*, 224–42.
10. See A. Grafton (1997) *Commerce with the Classics. Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers* (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press), ch. 1.
11. John F. D'Amico (1988) *Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism: Beatus Rhenanus between Conjecture and History* (Berkeley, University of California Press), 13; Grafton (1997), 22–3.
12. See the factors conveyed in E.J. Kenney (1974) *The Classical Text. Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley, University of California Press), 86–91.
13. A.E. Housman (1972) The application of thought to textual criticism, in *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman*, ed. J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear, 3 vols. continuously paginated (Cambridge, University Press), 1069.
14. I rely here on the book of Régis Blachère (1959 repr. 1991) *Introduction au Coran*, 2nd edn (Paris, Maisonneuve et Larose).
15. I follow here the excellent synthesis of Anne Cheng (1984) *La Trame et la Chaîne: Aux origines de la constitution d'un corpus canonique au sein de la tradition confucéenne*, *Extrême Orient/Extrême Occident*, 5, 13–26. This text anticipates her book (1985) *Études sur le Confucianisme Han: l'élaboration d'une tradition exégétique sur les Classiques* (Paris, Institut des hautes études chinoises).
16. See S. Cherniack (1994) Book culture and textual transmission in Sung China, *HJAS*, 54, 15–17.
17. Confucius, *Analects*, VII. 1 (2) (trans. A. Cheng).
18. Cherniack (1994), 19–21.
19. See Jean-Pierre Drège (1991) Les classifications bibliographiques, in J.-P. Drège, *Les bibliothèques en Chine au temps des manuscrits (jusqu'au X<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (Paris, Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, 161), ch. 2.
20. For an account of research on Alexandrian philology, see (in addition to R. Pfeiffer's book), the collective volume, Franco Montanari (ed.) (1994) *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine: sept exposés suivis de discussions* (Fondation Hardt, vol. 40), as well as J. Irigoien (1997) *Tradition et critique des textes grecs* (Paris, Les Belles Lettres), esp. 245–64. See also his contribution to this issue of *Diogenes*.
21. See F. Montanari (1997) The fragments of Hellenistic scholarship, in G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments/ Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht), 273–88.
22. See *Revue de la Bibliothèque nationale de France*, issue 2, co-ordinated by Jean-Marc Châtelain (Paris, June 1997), on the annotated book.
23. This history has been retraced by S. Timpanaro (1981) *La genesi del metodo del Lachman*, 2nd edn (Padua; 1st edn Florence, Le Monnier, 1963), which is followed here.
24. For this broader history, see G. Barsanti (1992) *La scala, la mappa, l'albero. Immagini e classificazioni della natura fra Sei e Ottocento* (Florence, Sansoni Editore).
25. See Cerquiglini (1989), 112–16.
26. I refer to the text in the English translation, which incorporates the changes of the third German edition: Paul Maas (1958) *Textual Criticism*, trans. Barbara Flower (Oxford, Clarendon Press).
27. This scheme is presented in exemplary fashion in Louis Havet (1911) *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris, Hachette).
28. Cerquiglini (1989) 76.
29. Maas (1958), 20 (§ 21).

30. Cerquiglini (1989) 76.
31. Kenney (1974) 21–2.
32. Cited by D'Amico (1988) 34.
33. Cited by D'Amico (1988) 35.
34. See Cerquiglini (1989), who demonstrates the inadequacy of the categories of text and author applied to medieval literature.
35. See the remarks of D'Amico (1988), 23, on the criteria for the 'consensus of authors' in Ermolao Barbaro (fifteenth century).