Scholarship in interaction: case studies at the intersection of codework and textual scholarship
Zundert, J.J. van

Propositions belonging to the thesis "Scholarship in Interaction" by Joris J. van Zundert

Propositions on the subject of the dissertation

1) The hallmark of textual scholarship is accountability. Specifically with regard to this aspect textual scholarship has so far failed to augment its methods with new digital and computational abilities to improve transparency and accountability.

2) In current (digital) textual scholarship the methodological contribution and effects of bespoke software code remain almost completely invisible, and there is a severe lack of theoretical and practical reflection on their impact.

3) The preoccupation of digital textual scholarship with representing books instead of texts has led to a methodological inertia that borders on intellectual laziness. This inertia resulted in the condition of textual scholarship being methodological unfit to care for digital and computational forms of text legacy.

4) Textual scholarship and the application of bespoke code within it should both be regarded as non neutral revisionary authorship. Both should be subject to formal academic evaluation.

Propositions regarding the subject areas of the dissertation

5) Digital textual scholarship has provided impressive utility and convenience to textual scholarship, but has achieved disappointingly little with respect to advancing epistemology.

6) Assuming scholarly reasoning is not purely speculative there are logical constraints to hermeneutic thinking. Therefore an intrinsic hermeneutic computer language must be possible.

7) As an analytical metaphor the ethnography of "hybrid scholars" yields more insight into methodological innovation than that of "trading zones".

8) Purpose built code potentially introduces technology-delegated scholarship.

Propositions on wider societal subjects

9) The solution to the serious health risks posed by academic writing should be sought in a complete ban on stringent deadlines.

10) It is unproductive and unacademic to hide, cancel, or eradicate from collective memory and public debate historical events, objects, or opinions. Instead it is our common and perpetual intellectual obligation to remember, recontextualize, and rethink them.