Philology, broadly defined as the practice of making sense of texts, is a fundamental human activity that has been repeatedly institutionalized in widely separated places and times. In the wake of the formation of the modern academic disciplines in the nineteenth century and their global spread, it became difficult to understand the power and glory of older western philology, and its striking parallels with other pre- and early modern forms of scholarship around the globe. This class seeks to create a new comparative framework for understanding how earlier generations made sense of the texts that they valued, and how their practices provide still-vital models for us at a time of upheaval in the format and media of texts and in our scholarly approaches to them. Students will encounter key fields of philology—textual criticism, lexicography, grammar, and, above all, commentary—not in the abstract but as instantiated in relation to four foundational works—the Confucian Analects, the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki, the Aeneid, and the Tale of Genji—and the scholarly traditions that grew up around them. We are never alone when we grapple with the basic question of how to read texts whose meaning is unclear to us. Over the course of the semester, this class will foster a global understanding of the deep roots and strange parallels linking contemporary reading and interpretation to the practices of the past. The course satisfies the Global Core requirement.

Eligibility: This is an introductory class open to all undergraduates. Some familiarity with a classical language is helpful but not required; all readings are in English, and there are no prerequisites. However, students who have not already encountered the Aeneid in Literature Humanities are required to read the following short assignment during the first week of class and make an additional Courseworks posting (300 words) on it by Friday 27 January: Introductory summary and Book I in the Ahl translation (Frederick Ahl, Aeneid [Oxford World’s Classics, 2007], xx-xliv and 3-27).

A note about graduate students: Graduate students may only take this class if the undergraduate enrollment does not reach the cap of 22; if any such students are allowed into the course, additional work making use of a classical language must be arranged with the instructor.

Source texts:

NOTE: Substitution of other translations of these works is not permitted; if ordering used copies online, be sure to obtain the correct edition. These books have been ordered from Book Culture and are on reserve at multiple Columbia libraries. Other primary sources and secondary readings will be available as PDFs on Courseworks.

Requirements and Grading Breakdown
It should go without saying that students are expected to attend every class. One unavoidable absence may be excused, but in such cases students must contact the instructor beforehand and arrange to submit notes or otherwise respond to the content of the missed session.

1) 30% = Active participation in class discussion, informed by solid preparation.
2) 30% = Courseworks postings each week (due by 11pm on Sunday) and occasional brief presentations on selected secondary readings. The Courseworks postings should be 400-500 words (no longer than a page) and will discuss specific aspects of the primary source(s) in connection with at least one of the other readings. (NOTE: In the schedule of readings, primary sources are surrounded by a box.) POSTINGS MUST BE PASTED OR TYPED INTO THE TEXT SUBMISSION BOX; DO NOT ATTACH A FILE. Presentations, on one of the selected secondary sources listed on the syllabus, will be no longer than 10 minutes, and will summarize the points of interest of that source and suggest topics for in-class discussion. Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor while preparing for their presentation. Presenters are excused from making a Courseworks posting that week.
3) 10% = Essay on ‘digital humanities,’ due on Monday 20 March (see schedule for details)
4) 30% = Final paper to be submitted by 4pm on Friday 12 May as a hard copy in 407 Kent Hall AND as an emailed attachment. (Electronic submission alone is not acceptable.) If an extension has not been requested and granted in advance, overdue papers will lose one-half letter grade (e.g., from B+ to B) for each day they are late. The final paper (approx. 3000 words) may be a research paper on an aspect of philology in one of the traditions considered in this class, or in another with which the student is familiar; it may also be a metacommentarial analysis of the strategies and assumptions at work in the interpretations offered by one of our commentators, or by another from outside the course readings. Students are required to consult the instructor about their paper topic at least once before the end of the first week of April.

Grading Rubric:
Students who wish to receive a B range grade will have, at minimum: prepared for class by doing most of the assigned reading; made prompt and regular postings; attended class consistently and participated in discussion; made cogent presentations; and submitted clearly written and well-supported papers that demonstrated understanding of the broader themes of the course. Students receiving an A range grade will have, in addition: done all (or virtually all) of the assigned reading; made thoughtful, creative, and well-written postings; participated actively in class discussion; made a presentation that showed insight into the assigned readings; and submitted eloquent and thoughtful papers that uncovered significant connections within or beyond the overall subject matter of the class.
Statement on Academic Integrity:
Students will do their own work on all assignments for this class, in accordance with the Faculty Statement on Academic Integrity and the Honor Code of Columbia College and the School of General Studies:

http://www.college.columbia.edu/faculty/resourcesforinstructors/academicintegrity/statement
http://www.college.columbia.edu/ccschonorcode

Since academic integrity violations undermine our intellectual community, students who cheat, plagiarize, or commit any other act of academic dishonesty will fail the class and be referred to the Dean’s Discipline process. It is students’ responsibility to ensure that their work maintains the standards expected. See this website for more information:

http://www.college.columbia.edu/academics/academicintegrity

Schedule:

1) 23 Jan.: Introduction and Orientation
What is philology? Why is it ubiquitous? What will considering it explicitly—studying other people studying texts—do for us?

•Old Babylonian school tablet with lexical lists, from Niek Veldhuis, History of the Cuneiform Lexical Tradition (Ugarit-Verlag, 2014), 8-9
•http://genius.com/De-la-soul-the-magic-number-lyrics

2) 30 Jan.: Textual Criticism I: The Aeneid
•Sheldon Pollock, “Philologia Rediviva?” Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences (Summer 2015), 34-36

•opening of the Aeneid: Frederick Ahl, Aeneid (Oxford World’s Classics, 2007), 3-4 (to line 33)
•Ovid, Tristia lines 491-545 (trans. Peter Green, Ovid: The Poems of Exile, University of California, 2005), 38-39

•SKIM: R.G. Austin, “Ille Ego Qui Quondam...,” Classical Quarterly 18:1 (1968), 107-115
•SKIM: P.A. Hansen, “Ille Ego Qui Quondam... Once Again,” Classical Quarterly 22:1 (1972), 139-149

3) 6 Feb.: Textual Criticism II: The Tale of Genji
4) 13 Feb.: Commentary I: Analects


AC 12.1


5) 20 Feb.: Commentary II: Rāmāyaṇa


- Selected commentaries on *R* passages: *sarga* 36 lines 15-16 (pp. 391-392); *sarga* 41 line 24 (p. 400); *sarga* 47 line 22 (pp. 412-413); *sarga* 63 line 18 (pp. 446-447); *sarga* 73 line 16 (p. 463); *sarga* 79 lines 19-20 (p. 471); *sarga* 95 line 29 (p. 501); *sarga* 98 line 42 (p. 506); *sarga* 99 lines 5-6 (p. 508); *sarga* 104 lines 13 and 22 (pp. 518-519)

FRIDAY 24 FEB.: Lecture by Prof. Stephen Chrisomalis (Wayne State University) on: The Philology of Numerals, Heyman Center Common Room, 5pm

6) 27 Feb.: Commentary III: Genji


- “The Paulownia Pavilion” (*Kiritsubo*) and “The Broomtree” (*Hahakigi*), *G* 1-44
7) 6 March: Commentary IV: *Aeneid*

- Martin Irvine, “*Enarratio I*: Commentaries on Vergil from Donatus to Fulgentius,” in *The Making of Textual Culture: Grammatica and Literary Theory*, 350-1100 (Cambridge, 1994), 118-161
- “Servius, Commentary on the *Aeneid*, ca. 400-420,” in Rita Copeland and Ineke Sluiter, eds., *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300-1475* (Oxford, 2009), 125-140
- Christopher McDonough et al., *Servius’ Commentary on Book Four of Virgil’s Aeneid* (Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2004)
- Fulgentius and allegorical interpretation: Jan Ziolkowski and Michael Putnam, eds., *The Virgilian Tradition: The First Fifteen Hundred Years* (Yale, 2008), 660-672

8) 20 March: Philology and Digital Humanities

**THIS WEEK CLASS DOES NOT MEET**; read all seven of the following online articles and compose a 1000-word essay addressing the following two questions: What are the “digital humanities”? And what is their relationship to philology? **ESSAY IS DUE ON COURSEWORKS BY MIDNIGHT, MONDAY MARCH 20TH**


9) 27 March: Lexicography

- Jonathon Green, *Chasing the Sun: Dictionary-Makers and the Dictionaries They Made* (Jonathan Cape, 1996), 13-75
- Victor Mair, “*Tzu-shu* or *tzu-tien,*” in *The Indiana Companion to Traditional Chinese Literature*, vol. 2 (Indiana University Press, 1998), 165-72

10) 3 April: Grammar
• Vivien Law, “From Literacy to Grammar: Describing Language Structure in the Ancient World,” in *The History of Linguistics in Europe: From Plato to 1600* (Cambridge, 2003), 52-93
• Priscian’s analysis of the first sentence of *Aeneid* Book XII: Ziolkowski and Putnam, *The Virgilian Tradition*, 649-660
• Hsuan Tsang et al. on Sanskrit grammar, in J.F. Staal, ed., *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians* (MIT Press, 1972), 4-19

MONDAY 3 APRIL.: Lecture by Prof. Christopher Woods (University of Chicago) on: Philology and Ancient Mesopotamia, Heyman Center Common Room, 5pm

11) 10 April: Commentary V: Analects
• Benjamin Elman, *From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China* (Harvard Council on East Asian Studies, 1984), 26-49, 57-70
• AC 2.16
• Bernhard Fuehrer, “Did the Master Instruct his Followers to Attack Heretics? A Note on Readings of Lunyu 2.16,” in *Reading East Asian Writing: The Limits of Literary Theory*, ed. Michel Hockx and Ivo Smits (RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), 117-138
• AC: Selections with commentary by Zhu Xi: 6.3, 6.27, 7.32, 8.4, 9.17, 9.19, 10.1, 10.11, 11.10, 11.12, 11.15, 14.4, 15.6, 15.27, 15.35, 17.1, 17.9; and by Qing scholars Huang Shisan, Jiao Xun, and Liu Baonan: 7.18, 9.1, 12.1, 14.42, 15.3, 19.20

12) 17 April: Commentary VI: Rāmāyaṇa
13) 24 April: Commentary VII: *Genji*

- “The Twilight Beauty” (*Yūgao*) and “The Fireflies” (*Hotaru*), G 53-80 and 453-464

**MONDAY 24 APRIL.: Lecture by Prof. Jeffrey Schnapp (Harvard University) on:**

Digital Philology, Heyman Center Common Room, 5pm

14) 1 May: The Once and Future King? The Present and Future of Philology

- James Turner, *Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities* (Princeton, 2014): “The Modern Humanities in the Modern University,” and “Epilogue,” 231-235 and 381-386, as well as one of the following:
  1) “Between History and Nature: Linguistics after 1850,” 236-253
  2) “Literature, 1860-1920,” 254-273
  5) “Anthropology Congeals into a Discipline, 1840-1910,” 328-356

**FINAL PAPER DUE FRIDAY 12 MAY BY 4PM**