



### Science Meeting – Scientific Report

**The scientific report (WORD or PDF file - maximum of seven A4 pages) should be submitted online within two months of the event. It will be published on the ESF website.**

***Proposal Title:** Toward a new social contract between publishers and editors*

***Application Reference N°:** 5813*

#### 1) Summary (up to one page)

The event brought together publishers and scholarly editors in order to discuss how best to produce digital editions which are at the same time both economically viable and in keeping with scholarly standards.

In the pre-digital world, publishers and editors normally collaborated: the editors would produce the edition, following the guidelines provided by the publishing house, which for its part would take care of marketing and distribution, as well as essential scholarly services such as peer review. Digital scholarly editions, on the other hand, tend to be self-published by scholars within their own universities, most often without any connection with a publishing house – an arrangement which is hardly sustainable, for various reasons, and often not available to younger researchers producing their first editions and without access to suitable funding. At the same time, publishers are increasingly engaging with the digital, in particular in connection with tablet distribution. But the majority of such eBooks are generally not up to the standards expected by the scholarly community: in many ePubs, for instance, basic features such as footnotes are a luxury – to say nothing of a proper critical apparatus. How can we best address these issues, to the mutual benefit of all involved parties – editors, publishers and the scholarly public? These were the questions that were asked at the conference.

The speakers were split more or less equally between scholarly editors and publishers; people came from Denmark, United Kingdom, Luxemburg, Poland, Norway, Germany, Netherlands, Portugal and France, covering therefore a large part of Europe. The discussion centered over several points, but in particular: what is the contribution of publisher in scholarly communication? What are the obstacles that prevent to move digital editions in an Open Access framework? Which is the price to pay to be able to

publish texts with a small readership? What can editors do to meet the demands of publishers and what publisher can offer in exchange?

## **2) Description of the scientific content of and discussions at the event (up to four pages)**

The symposium aimed at favoring a dialogue between publishers and editors meant to question the fact that the collaboration between these two figures, once so consolidated, is far from natural in the era of digital editions. If the digital editions exist from more than thirty years now, they are often produced outside the traditional publishing channels. Paradoxically, noted Elena Pierazzo introducing the day, some editors do without publishers, and vice versa, creating a situation that in practice harms everyone, as it is accompanied by a general underestimation of the value of scholarly editions, which makes them even harder to afford. If the consequences of the absence of an editor seem pretty obvious, the absence of a publisher itself may not have been fully felt by the first scholars to publish digital editions, more or less "homemade", when the methods and spaces of the dissemination of the digital were still to be invented.

The experience of recent decades tends to show the complementarity of work of publishers and editors, but in the digital age the terms of their cooperation must be discussed again to adapt to the new conditions of their work. The aim of the day was then to give voice to representatives of both sides, to allow for better mutual understanding and thus facilitate the discussion and design a new contract between the editors and publishers.

To represent publishers were Pierre-Yves Buard (Presses Universitaires de Caen - II), Rupert Gatti (Open Book Publishers - VIII), Pierre Mounier (Open Editions - IV), Louise Schouten (Brill - X) Brad Scott (Brambletye publishing - VI), and to represent editors were Hilde Boe (Munch Museum, Oslo - V), Caroline Macé (Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main - I), Cécile Meynard and Thomas Lebarbé (Université "Stendhal" Grenoble 3 - IX) Espen Ore (University of Oslo - III) and Manuel Portela (University of Coimbra - VII). Coming from different European countries, the participants were able to outline a broad and rich set of practices in the field of digital edition. To facilitate dialogue, the program alternated between interventions of publishers and editors (whose order is indicated in Roman numerals above): in this report, it was decided to group the different actions according to their thematic affinities or problems in order to put more emphasis.

In their introductory speeches, Elena Pierazzo and Matthew Driscoll highlighted the problems posed by the technical aspects of digital publishing: it does not exist so far, and perhaps will never exist, a software that allows you to create from A to Z a real (and professional looking) digital critical edition. To do that, it takes money (which is problematic in a context of general crisis of research funding, especially for young researchers), "traditional" philological skills, but also technical expertise, which includes web design and maintenance issues. The latter aspect is often neither considered nor evaluated by the university community: M. Driscoll recalled so that it is not enough to know how to type on the computer to make a digital edition, and not enough to finance

the construction only edition, because the lifespan of a digital edition without maintenance is very low (about six months).

Obviously, the digital presents great advantages such as the possibility of proposing different reading paths to the users, which can become actors (or even authors) of their path. This possibility is based on a layered encoding of the text, which allows for different views (and can also be a source of further research), but also on the flexibility of the digital format, designed to be able to evolve continuously.

Focusing on the needs and standards connected to the edition of an ancient text, digital or not, Caroline Macé pointed out that if you want to produce a publication of equal scientific dignity with respect to the print, it is not enough to provide it with the philological "status symbol" such as the stemma, the critical apparatus, the introduction, nor even submit it to peer review and ensure a proper dissemination; it is also necessary to produce "quotable" versions by the scholarly community, and therefore they must be well identifiable and durably traceable, both requirements posing some problems.

The interventions Espen Ore and Hilde Boe have also highlighted the centrality and the interdependence of financial and institutional factors and. H. Boe has thus reminded that there is a market of the critical edition. Since philology is not taught at the University before master level, Norway lacks a public able (and willing) to use these products - which also reminds us of the importance of teaching. As also noted E. Ore, the Norwegian landscape of publishing scholarly editions is fragmentary: projects are not organized into a network and university centers, but around the archives of the great Norwegian authors like Ibsen, studied in isolation by teams of editors.

The Portuguese situation, presented by Manuel Portela, is a further confirmation of the impact of the needs of the university infrastructure development and format of digital critical editions. Since many projects do not seem economically viable for strictly commercial publishers, financial support of public funding agencies is critical. But the needs of universities (for example for the evaluation of research and then career advancement) combined with the attachment of the people to "traditional" book (printed), means that the format "book" is the point of reference for both academic publisher as IUC, whose digitization program aims to produce "digital books" that look like books and how books are made. Portela then presented the case of the research center (CLP), which is not limited to digitize its early publications but also produces critical editions directly in digital format, without worry about giving a form "book" edition. The primacy of the format "book" in the imagination of the editors and publishers has deep consequences on the development of digital editions, such as the fact that the web designers intervene very late in the production process despite their vital role.

The project "Manuscrits de Stendhal" was presented by Cécile Meynard and Thomas Lebarbé showcases those changes evoked by Portela, even if a "book" it was made. One of the merit of the project is to be designed from the beginning as a polymorphic product, destined to different users and so to have different outputs, deliberately complementary. The printed version, a collaboration between the project team and ELLUG, embodies one of these outputs, while the digital edition, where the user can create, for example, their own path of reading, is another. To achieve this, the team has developed a specific workflow, created to respond to the needs and difficulties that progressively emerged. The manuscript page, associated to an image, was considered the base unit of the corpus, and two digital outputs were produced (a pseudo-diplomatic, and a more linear with no corrections or return to the line) to match the different ways of use of 'edition.

Pierre-Yves Buard presented the workflow and the very convincing achievements of Presses Universitaires de Caen. According to the principles of the single source publishing, a single stream of information encoded in XML-TEI, it is the basis of the workflow. The publishers derive from this file all the necessary information for the different formats of reading edition. The advantage of this system is that you can add multiple layers of coding preserving the unity of the file: for the display, a commercial publisher may only use some of the markup, while scholars can use others for their own research. They have created an interface adapted to the copy-editors but also work with researchers to build the TEI scheme and interface that accompanies it. According P.-Y. Buard, the content may have different formats, but they are just different and complementary views of a single research product, embodied by the TEI file: according to him, is this file have to contain all information deemed relevant by the scholar, and having to be stored.

According to Rupert Gatti, director of OpenBook Publishers, we must be very careful not to give in to commercial publishers rights to this file XML-TEI: as Buard said, the publisher will never use all the information that the scholar has entered, which were the result of their research; But if you do not retain the intellectual property over such file, you run the risk of not being able to use these results in other publications.

Most publishers seem so consider coding in XML-TEI relevant for the dissemination and preservation of research products. It is also the case of Pierre Mounier, representative platform OpenEdition. It deals with the dissemination of research and includes four platforms: revue.org, OpenEdition books, Calenda and Hypotheses. His publications are truly digital, in the sense that they are not printed texts processed to be put online. P. Mounier has reminded in the world of scientific publication the choice of the TEI is still very much a minority and professionals continue to use traditional publishing standards. Choosing XML-TEI is, in fact, an option that has a strong meaning in their eyes: it translate their desire to integrate into the community of digital humanities, facilitating dialogue and work with other members, strangers to the world publishing. For now, OpenEdition does not propose critical editions, but they feel now urged to.

In his speech, Brad Scott has also insisted on the complementarity between the two professions, commenting on the evolution of practices in the field of digital publishing over the last twenty years. Having worked for Routledge (as part of the Arden Shakespeare), for Semantico (software publishers) and most recently as a consultant for Oxford Scholarly Editions online, he has found that the same questions underlying all these publishing projects: who is the audience? What use will be made of them? Which features are required? How has to produce them? And above all, how to make them economically viable? The needs and challenges evolve, but professionals continue to find adequate answers, because that is precisely their job.

The added value from the experience of publishers was a point also emphasized by Louise Schouten, representative of a publishing house that has more than six centuries of activity and hundreds of titles published annually, both in print and in digital format. The place of Brill publishing and their turnover, consolidated over the centuries, allows the publisher to venture into long-term projects (up to twenty years), something nearly impossible elsewhere. Since 2000, all journals of Brill are online, and the company is developing digital projects, always trying to combine high scientific quality (for example, ensuring a thorough peer review) and economic sustainability. Oxford Scholarly Editions is so resorted to a subscription system to lower the selling price for scholars, while Brill recently proposed a new option ("MyBook"), that is to offer discounts to scholars enrolled in institutions to "subscribe" to service for the purchase of their academic books.

This brings us back to the fact that, in a context of contraction of the book market, the production of critical editions (which are not a "product of large consumption", except perhaps for some giant of world literature) depends very much on the possibilities offered or not, or at least subsidized, by institutions with a vetted interest in the production of scholarly editions (universities, publishing houses, etc.).

The final discussion also highlighted the need to defend the scientific quality of the critical editions, digital or not: scholarly editions are a research projects per se, and therefore deserve to be supported as such. It is therefore the task of the scholars to defend the value of their productions in front of the scholarly community: if we do digital critical editions, it is because they offer new possibilities and are richer than their print counterparts.

In this perspective, the improvement of the collaboration between editors and publishers seems to be a way to increase the visibility and dissemination of critical editions produced, but also their acceptance by the scientific community. In this framework, it was repeated many times the necessity of developing standards for encoding and preparation of critical editions, which could be used by both sides. In this context, XML-TEI has been cited repeatedly as a possible common language, able to meet the needs of publishers and editors. Obviously, these standards will not solve all the problems, particularly those related to research funding.

Finally, we can recall the invitation of Matthew Driscoll to take the opportunity offered by the exceptional situation that is offered to us. Digital publishing is still in a transition phase (often compared to the period of the incunabula for printing), which allows us to participate in the development of models that may become the norm in the coming decades. For this reason, according to Driscoll, the editors do not have to be satisfied with what is available, but work hard to create together with the publishers the infrastructure and editions they are dreaming about.

### **3) Assessment of the results and impact of the event on the future directions of the field (up to two pages)**

The day has been a resounding success: the topic covered, the quality of the interventions and of the discussion let all the participants with the desire to take it further and many asked to be able to publish at least some of the outcomes of project in a way or the other. The two convenors have asked all the speakers to send their slides as well as anything they have produced for the event, in order to evaluate the best course of action.

One of the ideas that we are discussion is to publish a monographic issue in a journal, and one obvious venue is the Journal of the Text Encoding Initiative, but other venues are being considered as well. This will be accompanied by a repository of the raw material provided by the speakers which will be made available shortly. A summary article outlining the main issues discussed during the day will be published in the Italian Journal *Ecdotica*, written by Elise Moisson-Leclerc and Elena Pierazzo; another one in English will be produced by Elena Pierazzo and Matthew Driscoll.

Many people from afar have contacted us in order to be able to access some of the content produced and a detailed report of the discussions has been used a base of discussion for a strategic meeting held by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

The content will also be elaborate by one of the DiXiT ITN fellow, Anna-Maria Sichani, bases in The Hague, and a paper focussed on the outcomes of the day has just been accepted for the forthcoming conference of the European Society of Textual Scholarship. It is not clear at the present time here this discourse will be continued; during the discussion we have vented the possibility of putting together a large collaborative project in order to build a publishing network and infrastructure able to support the work of the editors and in particular of early career. We will explore the options offered by the forthcoming Horizons 2020 calls in that sense.

We feel that a collaboration among editors and publishers could be highly profitable and fruitful, and that only in an International setting it will be possible to tackle the big questions that we have to address in order to guarantee the survival of one of the most important asset of the scholarly communication in the Humanities, namely the scholarly edition.

#### 4) Annexes 4a) and 4b): Programme of the meeting and full list of speakers and participants

##### Annex 4a: Programme of the meeting

9:30-10:00: **Elena Pierazzo** (Université 'Stendhal' Grenoble 3) and **Matthew Driscoll** (University of Copenhagen): *Introduction*

10:00-11:30: 3 papers

- **Caroline Macé** (Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main): *A view from the inside: what are publishers doing for scholarly editors? The case of the Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca*
- **Pierre-Yves Buard** (Presse Universitaires de Caen): *Éditions multimodales - proposition d'organisation du travail*
- **Espen Ore** (University of Oslo): *Digital editions and digital «editions» in Norway*

11:30-12:00 Coffee

12:00-13:00 2 papers

- **Pierre Mounier** (Open Editions): *TEI for publications : why we chose it. A quick look into OpenEdition and Presses Universitaires de Caen partnership*
- **Hilde Boe** (Munch Museum, Oslo): *bokselskap.no – the Norwegian solution*

13:00-14:00 lunch

14:00-15:30 3 papers

- **Brad Scott** (Brambletye Publishing): *Now are our labours crown'd with their reward : Resourcing digital scholarly editions in British publishing houses, 1995-2015*
- **Manuel Portela** (University of Coimbra): *Dilemmas of Hybrid Publication of Scholarly Editions: Digitizing, Designing, Distributing*
- **Rupert Gatti** (Open Book Publishers): *Opportunities and challenges publishing digital scholarly editions: reflections from an Open Access book publisher*

15:30-16:00 coffee

16:00-17:00 2 papers

- **Cecile Meynard** and **Thomas Lebarbé** (Université 'Stendhal' Grenoble 3): *Réflexions autour du projet d'édition*

*électronique/imprimée de manuscrits de Stendhal : le livre est mort, vive le livre! vers un triumvirat éditeur scientifique/éditeur commercial/lecteur ?*

- **Louise Schouten** (Brill), *From Reader to User: Brill's Digital Publication Programme in a Changing Environment*

17:00-18:00 Roundtable and discussion

#### Annex 4b: Full list of speakers and participants

Convenor(s)			2	
Name	City, Country	Type		
Professor Driscoll Matthew	Copenhagen, (DK)	Convenor	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Professor Elena Pierazzo	Grenoble, (FR)	Convenor	<a href="#">Edit</a>	

Speakers			11	
Name	City, Country	Type		
Dr. Hilde Boe	Oslo, (NO)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Mr. Rupert Gatti	Cambridge, (UK)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Professor Thomas Lebarbé	Grenoble, (FR)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Caroline Macé	Frankfurt Am Main, (DE)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Cécile Meynard	Grenoble, (FR)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Mr. Pierre Mounier	Marseille, (FR)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Espen Ore	Oslo, (NO)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Buard Pierre-Yves	Caen, (FR)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Professor Manuel Portela	Coimbra, (PT)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Louise Schouten	Leiden, (NL)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Mr. Brad Scott	Forest Row, (UK)	Speaker	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>

Participants			16	
Name	City, Country	Type		
Ms. Nathalie Arlin	Lyon, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Florentina Armaselu	Sanem, (LU)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Pavel Bem	Warsaw, (PL)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Francesco Beretta	Lyon, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Ms. Florence Bistagne	Avignon, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Marjorie Burghart	Lyon, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Ms. Giulia Cacciatore	Grenoble, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Ms. Emmanuelle Corne	Charenton-le-Pont Cedex, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Filippo Fonio	Grenoble, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>

Dr. Françoise Leriche	Grenoble, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Elise Moisson-Leclerc	Grenoble, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Ms. Emmanuelle Morlock	Lyon, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Andrea Penso	Grenoble, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Denise Pierrot	Lyon, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Peter Stokes	London, (UK)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>
Dr. Daniel Stôkl	Paris, (FR)	Participant	<a href="#">Edit</a>	<a href="#">DELETE</a>