

Subject name/code:	Textology and Philology/ BDI-DK-0070A
Subject coordinator:	Head of the Doctoral School
Lecturer(s) of the subject:	Dr. Zolt Almási, Dr. habil. Tamás Karáth
Credits:	5
Lesson type:	Lecture
Brief subject description:	This course explores textual scholarship and the evolving methodologies and theories of philology. We trace the transformative role of editors throughout centuries. We examine the traditional functions of editors, and how these functions have evolved in response to changing literary and technological environments. The course demonstrates how editorial methodologies must be fine-tuned to every literary text when preparing new, scholarly editions. The course develops students' understanding of the fundamental concept of the embodied nature of a literary text.
Theoretical knowledge to be acquired:	Manuscripts are analysed critically, or, where manuscripts are not available, early print editions as tangible artefacts. The course explores the intricate web of textual variants, unravelling the nuances and complexities inherent in multiple versions of a single work. Moving into the contemporary era, students address the emergence of digital philology. This course provides a comprehensive understanding of the intersection between traditional and digital textology and consequently traditional and digital philology, highlighting how technology has reshaped the landscape of textual editing and analysis. Students become familiar with the basic concepts of editorial work, such as ultima manus, copy text, derivative text, the shifting objectives of editorial work and their relatedness to the multiplicity of textual variant. The basic elements of a digital database of literary texts, the backend and the frontend, the files types (txt, xml, json, image files, html, css) and standards (TEI, Dublin Core Initiative), the advantages and disadvantages of each., the layers of and evolution of the www as a context for digital textology.
Practical knowledge to be acquired:	
List of the most important required literature (2–4 pieces) with bibliographical details (author, title, edition or specific pages, ISBN)	Jowett, John. <i>Shakespeare and Text</i> . Oxford—New York: OUP, 2007, 158-169. Hayles, Katherine N. <i>My Mother was a Computer</i> . Chicago—London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005. 89-116.
List of the most important recommended literature (2–4 pieces) with bibliographical details (author, title, edition or specific pages, ISBN)	Meyrowitz, Joshua. "Medium Theory" in David Crowley and David Mitchell (Eds.), <i>Communication Theory Today</i> , Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1994, 50-77.  Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories and Practices. Matthew James Driscoll (editor), Elena Pierazzo (editor), Open Book Publishers, 2016 ISBN 9781783742387

Theory to practice ratio:	Number of theoretical contact hours: 90 minutes/week	Number of practical contact hours:0
Applied teaching methods:	Traditional frontal lecture with visual aid. Students are encouraged to ask questions during the lecture, and each lecture includes a questions & answers session.	
Method of assessment:	Oral examination, in which students are expected to demonstrate to have mastered the course material and should demonstrate that they can establish a clear connection between the course material and their individual PhD thesis projects.	
Assessment criteria:	<p><b>Participation</b>  <i>Attendance at lectures is compulsory, the maximum rate of absence from lectures is 25% of the class time.</i></p> <p><b>Assessment</b>  <i>The student's performance are assessed:  - on a three-point scale: excellent (5), pass (3), fail (1).  (A subject passed with a grade of better than unsatisfactory will result in the credits allocated to it.</i></p> <p><b>Marking defined in more detail:</b>  <i>Excellent is awarded for the completion of the course to a student who is active (students are allowed to ask questions during the lecture, and each and every lecture includes a question &amp; answer session), has independent thoughts, ideas, questions, constructive This student prepares and presents the chosen topic during the examination in accordance with the requirements, thoroughly and at a high standard. During the oral presentation, the student convincingly demonstrates his/her competence and proficiency in the given topic. The nature of the task allows the student to apply individual and creative solutions.  For example.  Average (3): the student participates in the course with a fluctuating level of activity, independent thoughts, ideas and questions do not dominate, but still strives to do so. He/she prepares only partially or incompletely for the examination. Knowledge of required literature is sketchy or partial. The learning outcomes mostly meet the requirements in terms of content and format, with minor errors and gaps.  Unsatisfactory (1): The student does not attend or is a passive participant in the class. He/she is not interested in the subject, has no independent ideas, creative insights. They have insufficient knowledge of the lecture material and the secondary sources.</i></p>	

<p>How the subject contributes to the achievement of the learning outcomes at level 8 of the MKKR, as identified as learning outcomes in the doctoral school's training programme?</p> <p>Elaborate on the way in which competence elements specified in the Training and Outcome Requirements are/may be achieved <i>(Note: do not simply copy the competence elements from the Training and Outcome Requirements)</i></p>	<p>Doctoral students demonstrate research-level command of textology and philology as editorial scholarship. They can identify the field's main trajectories, internal debates, and methodological limits of past and existing practices.</p> <p>They command the core conceptual systems and terminology that govern modern textual criticism, including copy-text theory, , revision, accidentals and substantives, and the ethics of emendation and annotation.</p> <p>They competently interpret the evidential status of documents and editions, distinguishing witnesses, states, and versions, and constructing defensible rationales for editorial choice within an explicitly stated set of principles.</p> <p>They synthesise close reading with quantitative and digital methods, using TEI as an editorial metalanguage and deploying collation software, versioning workflows, and stylometric inference to generate new perspectives on textual variation and transmission.</p> <p>They can recognise and solve unforeseen problems, such as contaminated copy, typographical drift across reprints, unstable punctuation systems, or conflicting authorial documents, by reconstructing the bibliographical and historical contexts that produced them.</p> <p>They work confidently with a largely print-based corpus (c. 90%), while maintaining a competence in manuscript studies (c. 10%).</p> <p>Their scholarly attitude reflects professional commitment, patient perseverance in collation and verification, and a sustained openness to new editorial pathways, including born-digital editions and reproducible research pipelines.</p> <p>They initiate new knowledge and practices with creative autonomy, designing transparent apparatuses, interoperable encoding, and evaluative protocols.</p> <p>They participate as equal discussion partners with editors, bibliographers, librarians, and digital humanists, defending arguments with evidence and translating specialised findings into academic prose.</p>
---	---