Stefanie Acquavella-Rauch

Digitality between Authorship and Music Editions

> Wohl kaum eine andere ästhetische Kategorie war in den letzten Jahrzehnten so stark von Paradigmenwechseln betroffen wie die der Autorschaft, wobei der Wandel von strukturalistischen zu dekonstruktivistischen und postmodernen Perspektiven Kunst und Wissenschaft gleichermaßen betraf. Positionen wie die vom 'Tod des Autors' oder – als Reaktion darauf – dessen Reetablierung prägten und prägen künstlerische Vorstellungen ebenso wie analytische Herangehensweisen an musikalische Werke.[1]

As Susanne Kogler summarizes, various concepts of authorship have been discussed over the past six decades in the humanities as well as in other disciplines like law studies.[2] As much as authorship is being defined through the structural relation between the author as writer and creator, and their 'text' or creation, when thinking about the relationship between editors, authors and the created 'text' especially Uwe Wirth's text *Der Tod des Autors als Geburt des Editors* comes into mind. In his concept of 'editorial framing' the roles of authors are widened, he combines Michel Foucault's and Roland Barthes' ideas with paratextual and hypertextual aspects as they were discussed by George P. Landow and Simone Winko:[3]

> Während Winko – vor dem Hintergrund der These von der Rückkehr des Autors – den Schluss einer Verdopplung des Autorbegriffs zieht – einmal der Autor *als Verfasser*, zum

---

1 "Probably no other aesthetic category has been as affected by paradigm shifts in recent decades as that of authorship, with the shift from structuralist to deconstructivist and postmodernist perspectives affecting art and academia alike. Positions such as that of the 'death of the author' or – in reaction to this – its re-establishment have shaped and continue to shape artistic ideas as well as analytical approaches to musical works." Susanne Kogler, "Autorschaft, Genie, Geschlecht Einleitende Überlegungen zum Thema", in: Kordula Knaus / Susanne Kogler (Ed.), *Autorschaft, Genie, Geschlecht. Musikalische Schaffensprozesse von der Frühen Neuzeit bis zur Gegenwart* (= Musik – Kultur – Gender 11), Köln / Weimar / Wien 2013, pp. 9–22; 9.

2 For a good introduction to the category of authorship and 'the' author see Torsten Hoffmann / Daniela Langer, "Autor", in: Thomas Anz (Ed.), *Handbuch Literaturwissenschaft. Gegenstände – Konzepte – Institutionen*, Vol. 1: *Gegenstände und Grundbegriffe*, Stuttgart / Weimar 2013, pp. 131–170; and Fotis Jannidis et al. (Ed.), *Texte zur Theorie der Autorschaft*, Stuttgart 2000. Especially in certain areas of musicological research, authorship is being discussed strictly in the sense of creatorship, discussing whom a composition can be ascribed to; see for example Klaus Pietschmann (Ed.), *(Re-)Constructing Renaissance Music: Perspectives from the Digital Humanities and Music Theory* (= troja. Jahrbuch für Renaissancemusik 17/2018), https://doi.org/10.17879/31149608645. There are only very few contributions to the field of authorship and editorship – especially when digital media are involved. An exception is certainly Alina Ng's text about legal aspects of authorship in the digital age: Alina Ng, "When Users Are Authors: Authorship in the Age of Digital Media", Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2010-01, Mississippi College School of Law 2010, online: https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1545005 (27 July 2022).

3 See Uwe Wirth, "Der Tod des Autors als Geburt des Editors", in: *Text und Kritik* 152 (2009), pp. 54–64, online: http://publikationen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/12878. He references George P. Landow, *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporacy Critical Theocy and Technology*, Baltimore / London 1997; Simone Winko, "Lost in hypenext? Autorkonzepte und neue Medien", in: Fotis Jannidis et al. (Ed.): *Rückkehr des Autors. Zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs*, Tübingen 1999, pp. 511–533; Roland Barthes, "La Mort de l'Auteur", in: *Essais Critiques IV, Le Bruissement de la Langue*, Paris 1984, pp. 61–67; and Michel Foucault, "Was ist ein Autor?", in: Fotis Jannidis et al. (Ed.), *Texte zur Theorie der Autorschaft*, Stuttgart 2000, pp. 198–229.

anderen der Autor *als Verknüpfer* – scheint mir die These einer Verdopplung der Herausgeberfunktion weitaus plausibler zu sein. Beim Verfassen von Texten wird der *Scripteur* erst durch sein eigenes *editoriales Framing* zum *Auteur*, wenn nicht sogar die Figur eines *fingierten Editeur* die Rahmungsfunktion übernimmt. Beim Verknüpfen von Texten durch das Herstellen von Links füllt dagegen ein *hypertextueller Editeur* die Lücken auf und vollzieht seine Macht zum Mischen, welche die Macht zum Kommentieren mit einschließt, indem er den Befehl zum 'Setzen eines Links' [...].[4]

While Wirth is thinking about constructions of authorship and editorship in context of online published co-writing-text-projects written by multiple authors, his ideas are very fruitful also for the world of scholarly researching, writing, and editing – particularly after the digital turn.[5] One of the first characterizations of the connection of new technologies, the subject of an edition and 'the' editor were made by Eduardo Urbina and his colleagues from Texas A&M University:

The new paradigm of textual editing thus created by the new technology profoundly affects non only the relationship between the text (author) and editor but the role of the editor as agent of knowledge, and the role of the reader, no longer a passive receptor of filtered or absent documentation, but instead a fully informed and active participant.[6]

When they made their statement back in 2002, they gave a good description of what they call "the hype and anticipation brought about by the digital revolution, along with the somewhat prematurely declared death of the editor and of traditional editing".[7] It seems as if by thinking about the use of information technologies, two major discussions in the humanities quietly found their way into the world of scholarly editing:

1. The first one is the discussion about the narrativity of historiographical texts in historical studies, which had been going on since the 1970s whereas
2. the second one can be seen in the debates on the phenomena of textual communication and authorship since the 1960s – e. g. in Wirth's text.[8]

---

4   "While Winko – against the background of the thesis of the return of the author – draws the conclusion of a doubling of the author concept – once the author *as writer*, secondly the author *as linker* – the thesis of a doubling of the editor function seems far more plausible to me. When writing texts, the *scripteur* only becomes an *auteur* through his own *editorial framing*, if not the figure of a *fictitious editeur* takes over the framing function. When linking texts by making links, however, a *hypertextual editeur* fills in the gaps and executes his power to mix, which includes the power to comment, by giving the command to 'set a link' […]." Wirth, *Tod des Autors* (as note 3), p. 61.
5   See also Stefanie Acquavella-Rauch, *Musikgeschichten: Von vergessenen Musikern und ›verlorenen Residenzen‹ im 18. Jahrhundert. Amateure und Hofmusiker – Edinburgh und Hannover* (= Methodology of Music Research 11), Berlin et al. 2020, online: https://doi.org/10.3726/b16546; especially pp. 20–29, 335–338.
6   Eduardo Urbina et al., "Critical Editing in the Digital Age: Informatics and Humanities Research", in: John Frow (Ed.), *Proceedings of a Conference on The New Information Order and the Future of the Archive. March 2002.* Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, University of Edinburgh (UK), online: http://cervantes.dh.tamu.edu/cervantes/pubs/critical-editing-edinburgh.pdf (3 June 2022), p. 8.
7   Ibid., p. 4.
8   See Wirth, *Tod des Autors* (as note 3) as well as Maurice Biriotti / Nicola Miller (Ed.), *What is an Author?*, Manchester 1993; Seán Burke (Ed.), *Authorship – From Plato to the Postmodern*, Edinburgh 1995; Corina Caduff / Tan Wälchli (Ed.), *Autorschaft in den Künsten. Konzepte – Praktiken – Medien* (= Zürcher Jahrbuch der Künste 4), Zürich 2008; Focault, *Was ist ein Autor?* (as note 3); Felix Philipp Ingold / Werner Wunderlich (Ed.), *Fragen nach dem Autor. Positionen und Perspektiven*, Konstanz 1992; Fotis Jannidis et al. (Ed.), *Rückkehr des Autors. Zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs*, Tübingen

In the world of scholarly music editing, James Grier was among the firsts who focused on the role of the editor and on the actions – he calls them "series of choices" – involved in making an edition. By differentiating between composers and editors, he reflects about the (obvious) two parties involved when making a scholarly edition while not involving the category of the 'reader' or 'user': "Editing, therefore, consists of series of choices, educated, critically informed choices; in short, the act of interpretation. Editing, moreover, consists of the interaction between the authority of the composer and the authority of the editor."[9]

This is very notable, since it took until the first decade of the 21st century for the authorship debate to be discussed in the connected discipline, musicology.[10] Of course, questions of authorship in music have been of interest for much longer.[11] But outside the editorial world, the authority of the almighty author – it being either the composers or the scholars themselves – and the way music stories are presented had not been questioned for a long time.

Eduardo Urbina and his colleagues developed their theoretical ideas while preparing editions of Cervantes' writings. For them it was due to the driving force of digitality that elements of the authorship debate had to be (re)considered while editing:

> This level of access to textual information in the form of digital facsimiles and documentary texts […] has as a consequence not only a more direct and universal way of gathering and sharing knowledge but implies a change in the rationale and function of the critical apparatus[…]. […] [T]extual access makes superfluous to a large extent notes and other items describing the accidentals of the texts, while […] it obviates the need for many editorial choices, since the editor is no longer driven by the need to reconstruct and publish a unique

---

1999; Jannidis et al., *Autorschaft* (as note 2); Peter Jaszi / Martha Woodmansee (Ed.), *The Construction of Authorship. Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*, Durham 1994; Erich Kleinschmidt, *Autorschaft. Konzepte einer Theorie*, Tübingen / Basel 1998; Giaco Schiesser, *Autorschaft nach dem Tod des Autors. Barthes und Foucault revisited*, http://blog.zhdk.ch/giacoschiesser/files/2010/12/Autorschaft.pdf (21 September 2014), 1st publ. in: Caduff / Wälchli, *Autorschaft* (as same note); Ulf Wuggenig, "Den Tod des Autors begraben", in: *republicart.net* 2004, http://www.republicart.net/disc/aap/wuggenig03_de.html (3 June 2022).

9   James Grier, *The Critical Editing of Music: History, Method, and Practice*, Cambridge / New York 1996, p. 2.

10 See e. g. Michele Calella, "Patronage, Ruhm und Zensur: Bemerkungen zur musikalischen Autorschaft im 15. Jh.", in: Christel Meier / Martina Wagner-Egelhaaf (Ed.), *Autorschaft: Ikone, Stile, Institutionen*, Berlin 2011, pp. 145–162; Michele Calella, "Praestantissimi artifices: Aspekte der musikalischen Autorschaft in den musikalischen Drucken des deutschsprachigen Raums", in: Birgit Lodes (Ed.), *NiveauNischeNimbus, 500 Jahre Musikdruck nördlich der Alpen,* Tutzing 2010, pp. 113–132; Michele Calella, *Musikalische Autorschaft: Der Komponist zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit*, Habilitationsschrift Universität Zürich 2003, Kassel 2014; Rebecca Grotjahn, "Die Teufelinn und ihr Obrister. Primadonnen, Komponisten und die Autorschaft in der Musik", in: Marion Gerards / Rebecca Grotjahn (Ed.), *Musik und Emanzipation. Festschrift für Freia Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, Oldenburg 2010, pp. 131–140; Rebecca Grotjahn, "Zyklizität und doppelte Autorschaft im 'Liebesfrühling' von Clara und Robert Schumann", in: Helmut Loos (Ed.), *Robert Schumann. Persönlichkeit, Werk und Wirkung. Bericht über die Internationale Musikwissenschaftliche Konferenz vom 22. bis 24. April 2010 in Leipzig*, Leipzig 2011, pp. 69–89; Rebecca Grotjahn, "Blutiger Ernst und nachsichtslose Strenge – Autorschaft, Interpretation und Werkherrschaft in Schönbergs 'Pierrot lunaire'", in: Camilla Bork et al. (Ed.), *Ereignis und Exegese – Musikalische Interpretation – Interpretation der Musik. Festschrift für Hermann Danuser zum 65. Geburtstag*, Schliengen 2012, pp. 572–580; Kordula Knaus / Susanne Kogler (Ed.), *Autorschaft – Genie – Geschlecht. Musikalische Schaffensprozesse von der frühen Neuzeit bis zur Gegenwart* (= Musik – Kultur – Gender 11), Köln / Wien 2013; Christel Meier (Ed.), *Autorschaft: Ikonen – Stile – Institutionen*, Berlin 2011.

11 See Pietschmann, *(Re-)Constructing Renaissance Music* (as note 2).

or single edited text. Any reader can at anytime visualize the text of any particular copy or edition without the need to accept the hidden choices or personal conjectures of the editor.[12]

Urbina et al. ascribe editorial transparency almost entirely to digital technologies, for them the possibilities of making sources visible even mean that all decisions of the editor can be retraced. This does not only imply that the old forms of a 'physical' written critical apparatus might be questionable concerning the editorial decisions they really reveal. It also shows a turn for the role of the reader, although they do not theoretically discuss the concept on a theoretical level like Wirth.

Another consequence of this newly gained level of editorial transparency is hidden in their statement that there is "no […] need to reconstruct and publish a unique or single edited text". Urbina et al. conclude that through digital means, it is possible to change the core responsibilities of an editor. But is that really the case? Well, three years earlier, in 1999, Peter L. Shillingsburg had already pointed out the real meaning behind Urbina's statement, revealing that it is merely another change of editorial concepts instead of a new abstract editorial theory:

> Oh, but you say, we don't want editions to do what those old editions did. For example, we don't want an edition that represents the aesthetic tastes of editors in the 1890s; we don't want the clear reading text representing some 1960s editor's notion of what the author's final intentions might have been; […] a clear reading text of a historical edition from which the influences of the production process have been purged. Well, how long do you suppose that the current fashion of disdaining these achievements will last? And how long will it be before we start hearing that scholars do not want multiple texts, historical or otherwise, for the works they wish to interpret? or that they do not want to sift through a range of artifacts glimmering from the screen of a computer? And, if I had the imaginative power to predict the future editorial delights, I would tell you now for what new textual goals our editions will be abandoned.[13]

Shillingsburg – a scholar of textual criticism, editorial theory and practice himself – addresses the major problem behind many editorial discussions since the eighteen hundreds: Each new concept including its backing theories carries its own criticism by being part of what he calls "current fashion[s]".[14] Sixteen years later, Joachim Veit offers a solution to this dilemma, following Shillingsburg's thoughts and taking into consideration that the availability of new digital possibilities alone does not guarantee new knowledge:

> Dort, wo Befunde mehrere Deutungen zulassen, sollten auch mehrere Edierte Texte angeboten werden können bzw. sollten die Interpretationsmöglichkeiten und -spielräume offengelegt und die Entscheidungen letztlich dem Nutzer überlassen werden – ohne ihn bei

---

12 Urbina et al., *Critical Editing* (as note 6), p. 8.
13 Peter L. Shillingsburg, "Negotiating Conflicting Aims in Scholarly Editing: The Problem of Editorial Intentions", in: *Problems of Editing* (= Beihefte zu Editio 14), Berlin / New York 1999, https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110939958 (8 March 2021), p. 3.
14 Ibid.

der Suche nach Argumentationshilfen oder nach Hinweisen auf Argumentationszusammen-
hänge alleine zu lassen.[15]

This can, he argues, be realized based on new coding forms of music like the Music
Encoding Initiative where for example, alternative interpretations can be included and
connected. Veit's statement as well as that of Urbina et al. also provokes questions we
have not considered so far: Who are the readers of an edition and what is their role?

First and foremost, with musical editions we cannot only think about scholars of
music and music enthusiasts, we also have to consider musicians who might like to use
the insight and knowledge of a critical scholarly edition for their performances. Does
that imply that certain editorial concepts kept the reader somewhat uninformed before
digitality enabled them to be mature and take up some of the classical responsibilities of
the editor? As Ute Daniel and Felix Philipp Ingold suggested for the field of literary
studies, the interaction between research and its presentation changes the role of the
reader: "[D]ie […] Entmächtigung des Autors [zieht] unweigerlich die Aufwertung des
Lesers nach sich. Der Leser wird nicht auf ein bestimmtes Textverständnis festgelegt,
sondern ist aufgefordert, anhand eines offenen Textangebots möglichst viele Bedeu-
tungen zu eruieren."[16]

Digital musical editions can do exactly the same, they can offer texts that are either
directly open for interpretation or that allow the reader to gain an insight into how
editorial decisions were made – if they themselves have the necessary abilities and
equipment to use the digital edition to its full extent. Recent developments in music
publishing like the newzik platform[17] already help musicians in various ensemble
settings to perform directly out of a tablet computer. The use of scholarly digital editions
in that context will have to be discussed in the near future – if performing the edited
music is intended by the editorial concept. However, is it the role of a musical editor to
also provide usable access to their editions? This brings us back to our initial question:
What is the role of an editor, especially of an editor working in the field of digital music
editions?

Digitality and the Different Roles of Editorial Scholars

Taking a closer look at the people who act digitally in musicological editions, personally
and collectively,[18] it becomes clear that every editorial scholar has their own portfolio of

---

15 "Where findings permit several interpretations, it should also be possible to offer several edited texts, or
    the possibilities and scope for interpretation should be disclosed and the decisions ultimately left to the
    user – without leaving him or her alone in the search for argumentation aids or for references to
    argumentation contexts." Joachim Veit, "Musikedition 2.0: Das 'Aus' für den Edierten Notentext?", in:
    Editio 29/1 (2015), pp. 70–84; 81. https://doi.org/10.1515/editio-2015-006.
16 "[T]he […] disempowerment of the author inevitably entails the upgrading of the reader. The reader is
    not fixed to a certain understanding of the text, but is challenged to elicit as many meanings as possible
    on the basis of an open textual offer." Felix Philipp Ingold, "Schreiben heißt geschrieben werden: Zu
    Edmond Jabès", in: the same (Ed.), *Im Namen des Autors: Arbeit für die Kunst und Literatur*, München
    2004, pp. 193–215; 202; see also Stuart Hall, "Encoding/Decoding", in: Meenakshi Gigi
    Durham / Douglas M. Kellner (Ed.), *Media and cultural studies: keyworks*, Malden, MA / Oxford / Carlton
    ²2006, pp. 163–173; 171–173.
17 https://newzik.com/ensemble/ (3 June 2022).
18 Vgl. Felix Stalder, *Kultur der Digitalität*, Berlin 2017, pp. 17–18.

digital expertise: They are dealing with text programs, administration software, edition software, presentation software, and so on, depending on the scholarly and on the editorial question. Nowadays, digitality can be found in many work areas, in the underlying digital methods, in the "medientechnischen Grundlagen kulturwissenschaftlichen Arbeitens: Speicher-, Visualisierungs- und Schreibtechniken",[19] and in the follow-up questions resulting from the research questions and their outcomes. In relation to digitality, the field of music editions has to do with two sides of the same coin, so to speak: one in terms of musicology, and one in terms of information technology, both of which offer possible starting points for future developments. The edge of the coin – that is, what holds everything together – is the people that are involved, first and foremost the editors.

One goal of the discipline of historical musicology is to tell a historical story – or multiple ones – which means to reveal a connection, to follow a research question, and to present it in a selected way.[20] Editions are one form of this "story-telling" – despite the fact that they are very often seen as basic research that is preparing and presenting sources for further research. Depending on the type and stage of research, scholars take on different roles and cooperate with other experts for their digital expertise. I understand the core roles of editorial scholars as being researchers and mediators. As researchers, they are acting as editors and authors. Usually, the decision as to which story is told and which methods are being used is developed based

a) on the sources,

b) on the research question, and

c) on the editorial concept.

Or, as Veit put it: Editors are as much dependent on the current state of academic knowledge about a period as they are on their subjective perception and the preliminarily made decisions about the specific editorial guidelines.[21] The author of a text and its editor – and in the further process of an edition also the publisher – whose editorial decisions transform them at least partly into an author themselves, are always the subject of processes that shape culture. As such, authors and editors are involved in a wide variety of contexts, just like readers, which does also lead to a general disability of being objective in academic contexts:

> Es hat sich innerhalb der letzten Jahre wohl allgemein die Einsicht durchgesetzt, daß die jeweiligen Interessen des Autors/Forschers/Wissenschaftlers in das zu beobachtende Objekt einfließen. Die Distanz zu dem zu erforschenden Gegenstand kann nicht gewonnen werden, indem eine fiktive Objektivität vorgegaukelt wird, sondern indem die eigenen Voraussetzungen bewußt reflektiert werden.[22]

---

19 "[M]edia-technical basics of working in cultural studies: storage, visualization and writing techniques", Karin Harrasser, *Digitalität in der Kulturwissenschaft*, https://digigeist.hypotheses.org/123, ⟨2⟩ (3 June 2022).

20 See Acquavella-Rauch, *Musikgeschichten* (as note 5), pp. 20–29, 335–338.

21 See Veit, *Musikedition 2.0* (as note 15), p. 181.

22 "Within the last years it has become generally accepted that the respective interests of the author/researcher/scholar flow into the object to be observed. The distance to the object to be researched cannot be gained by pretending a fictitious objectivity, but by consciously reflecting one's own presuppositions." Eva Rieger, *Frau, Musik und Männerherrschaft. Zum Ausschluß der Frau aus der deutschen Musikpädagogik, Musikwissenschaft und Musikausübung*, Frankfurt am Main / Berlin / Wien 1981, p. 17.

However, communicating and conveying results of research and editing requires transparency that is based on the interaction of the roles scholars play. In contrast to Roland Barthes' emphatic statement, "[t]he birth of the reader is to be paid for with the death of the author,"[23] research-related authorship and editorship is also dealing with negotiating authority in a triple sense through multiple actions of communication, that is: authority as researcher, as editor and as author. Credibility and academic expertise, i. e. 'authority', are – even 45 years after Foucault – still dependent on the style of representation and the impression of 'expertise' that the researcher in their roles as author and editor can convey to their mostly very specific readership. Foucault already stated that academic credibility, once an authority as researcher and editor has been gained, can also be based on the name.[24] One might wonder, why the roles of author – researcher – editor are still being discussed together. Therefore it is necessary to differentiate those concepts – starting with authorship that I have used but not clearly described so far. Harold Love

> define[s] it in relation to a series of functions performed during the creation of the work rather than as a single, coherent activity. The term 'authorship' […] will not therefore denote the condition of being an originator of works, but a set of linked activities (authemes) which are sometimes performed by a single person but will often be performed collaboratively or by several persons in succession.[25]

According to this, a 'work' – for example an edition – is the compilation of multiple actions that take place in specific contexts. Love therefore differentiates four aspects of authorship: The first three, which are precursory, executive, and declarative authorship, are happening before a piece of work "is judged suitable for publication in one or another form"[26] and when "Foucault's 'author-function' [is activated]".[27] According to this, every editor acts as executive author at least for the preface and for the additional explanatory texts of an edition – and fullfills aspects of what Wirth called editorial framing.[28] Editors can also claim revisionary authorship through their editorial actions and the changes within the edited text.[29] It is the function of editorial transparency to avoid any illusion of possible objectivity – again in the spirit of Barthes. Therefore, I do agree with the thoughts that James Grier developed in his book *The Critical Editing of Music* from 1996 in two ways:

---

23 Roland Barthes, *Der Tod des Autors*, in: Fotis Jannidis et al. (Ed.), *Texte zur Theorie der Autorschaft*, Stuttgart 2000, pp. 185–193; 193. Following the theory of Barthes, the reader replaces the author: "le lecteur est l'espace même où s'inscrivent, sans qu'aucune ne se perde, toutes les citations dont est faite une écriture" (Barthes, *La Mort de l'Auteur* (as note 3), pp. 63–69; 66). Therefore, the context of the act of reading — or listening — has a considerable influence on the creation of a piece.

24 "If a discourse has an author's name, [...] this means that this discourse does not consist of everyday, indifferent words, not of words that pass, drift by, pass by, not of immediately consumable words, but of words that are defined to be received wisely and to have a certain statute in a given culture." Focault, *Was ist ein Autor?* (as note 3), p. 210.

25 Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship. An Introduction*, Cambridge et al. 2002, p. 39.

26 Love, *Attributing Authorship* (as note 25), p. 43.

27 Ibid., p. 45.

28 See Wirth, *Tod des Autors* (as note 3), pp. 59–61.

29 Love, *Attributing Authorship* (as note 25), p. 47.

1. that "editorship [is still] a purely interpretative undertaking. [...] [T]here is no such thing as objectivity. In every stage of editing, including transcription, there will arise many questions for which there are no clear-cut right or wrong answers: ambiguities between parallel passages [...], [...] competing readings between sources, text underlay, conflicting key signatures, and so on."[30]
2. that "[c]ritical editions should generate critical users. The advantage a critical edition offers its users is guidance from a scholar who has devoted a considerable amount of time, energy and imagination to the problems of the piece and whose opinion is therefore worth considering."[31]

Based on this, digital music editions reveal their strength as long as the editor establishes ways of communicating the results of their work in a digital way either by themselves – which happens very rarely – or by cooperating with a team including experts for information technologies who will help build the actual digital edition. Various interlinked facets of a digital edition are responsible for offering a better understanding of the editorial decisions to readers – or users – of the edition:

1. Additionally provided material and newly composed explanatory texts help readers to develop the necessary background of knowledge.
2. Annotations can be directly connected through hypertext, e. g. with digital images of the sources.
3. Editors and it-specialists develop ways of presenting the different aspects of the edition in a user-friendly way.
4. Through the generation of descriptive, structural, administrative, referencial and statistical metadata, the data of an edition can be archived, preserved, and reused in other research contexts.

Editors do not act alone, although this myth probably never existed anyway considering the involvement of publishing houses, proofreaders, musicians, note engravers etc. from the early beginning of edited music on. Digital editions are undertakings of a group of people, a single editor is only responsible for a certain part of the editing process, and therefore of the edition. Attributing a so-called framing function to the technical infrastructure, Wirth argues that 'the death of the author' should really be called the birth of the "éditeur automatique" meaning that the information-technological structures predetermine the roles of editors.[32] Still, this concept alone does not help determining many facets of editor roles. Following Harold Love's concepts of executive, declarative, and revisionary authorship, there is not just one but multiple roles that editors take during the edition process, including those of 'the' author. In their role as executive editors they are responsible for the edition before thinking about forms of its presentation, whereas the role of declarative editors is used for example to sell the edition on the music market. For Wirth these two roles are the ones of "des ersten 'Zusammen-lesers' und des 'letzten Autors'. Hierbei geht es im Wesentlichen um die editoriale

---

30 Grier, *Critical Editing* (as note 9), p. 180.
31 Ibid.
32 Wirth, *Tod des Autors* (as note 3), pp. 61–63.

Macht, das Projekt zu beginnen und zu beenden."[33] Declarative editors seem to have the power to shape the essentials of an edition – however at least in digital editions this is only partly true due to the information-technological frame work, and the scholars responsible for it. Furthermore, revisionary authorship has always been executed by editors in scholarly editions alongside with proofreaders, sometimes with musicians trying out the music, and again with the team that transforms the edition to the digital medium. This role has not changed in digital editorial setting. Editors act as researchers, as authors, as mediators and as correctors of their editorial decisions that are transformed into the final digital edition through various forms of authorship and editorship being performed parallelly during the entire editorial process.

---

33 The function "of the first reader summing up and of the last author. This is essentially about the editorial power to start and finish the project." Wirth, *Tod des Autors* (as note 3), pp. 60–61.