

teiphy: A Python package for converting TEI XML collations to NEXUS and other formats

Joey McCollum¹ and Robert Turnbull²

¹ Institute for Religion and Critical Inquiry, Australian Catholic University, Australia ² Melbourne Data Analytics Platform, University of Melbourne, Australia

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

Software

- Review [↗](#)
- Repository [↗](#)
- Archive [↗](#)

Editor: [Open Journals](#) [↗](#)

Reviewers:

- [@openjournals](#)

Submitted: 01 January 1970

Published: unpublished

License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#)).

Summary

Textual scholars have been using phylogenetics to analyze manuscript traditions since the early 1990s ([Robinson & O'Hara, 1992](#)). Many standard phylogenetic software packages accept as input the NEXUS file format ([Maddison et al., 1997](#)). The teiphy program takes a collation of texts encoded using the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) guidelines and converts it to a NEXUS format so that it can be used for phylogenetic analysis. The package can also convert to other formats such as to Stephen Carlson's [STEMMA](#) format or to a NumPy array ([Harris et al., 2020](#)).

Statement of Need

The TEI aims to provide an international standard for digital encoding textual information for the humanities ([Ide & Sperberg-McQueen, 1995](#)). The TEI guidelines describe an XML format for encoding a critical apparatus ([Consortium, 2022](#)). Due to its rich and well-documented set of elements for expressing a wide range of features in manuscript transcriptions, collations, and critical editions, TEI XML has become the *de facto* format for textual data in the digital humanities ([Fischer, 2020](#)). Its expressive power has proven increasingly valuable since its release, as scholars have learned—sometimes the hard way—that digitized texts should

1. preserve as much detail as they can from their material sources, including paratextual features;
2. reproduce the text of their sources as closely as possible, with editorial regularizations to things like orthography, accentuation, and scribal shorthand encoded alongside rather than in place of the source text;
3. uncertainties about what a source read, both in transcriptions and collations, should be described as accurately as possible, allowing for degrees of uncertainty and multiple choices for disambiguations if necessary.

Such principles have much bearing on the editing of critical texts, a task fundamental to both digital humanities and classical philology. Within the digital humanities, phylogenetic algorithms have been popular approaches to this task. Taking the most arduous part of reconstructing a textual tradition and delegating it to a computer proved to be a promising technique, and its successful demonstration with a portion of *The Canterbury Tales* was a milestone in the development of the field ([Barbrook et al., 1998](#)). Soon after this, the same methods were applied more comprehensively to the tradition of *Lanseloet van Denemerken* in a work that would formalize many practical rules for computer-assisted textual criticism ([Salemans, 2000](#)). Since then, phylogenetic methods have quickly evolved ([Felsenstein, 2004](#)), and textual critics have adapted the improvements and even added their own innovations to make the process more suitable for their purposes ([Carlson, 2015](#); [Edmondson, 2019](#); [Hyytiäinen, 2021](#); [Spencer et al., 2002, 2004](#); [Turnbull, 2020](#)).

41 As their name might suggest, phylogenetic methods originated in the setting of evolutionary
42 biology. They have a natural place in textual criticism given the deep analogy between the two
43 fields: a sequence alignment, which consists of taxa, sites or characters, and the states of taxa
44 at those characters, corresponds almost identically to a collation, which consists of witnesses
45 to the text, locations of textual variation (which we will call “variation units” from here on),
46 and the variant readings attested by witnesses at those points.

47 Most phylogenetic software, however, expects inputs not in TEI XML format, but in NEXUS
48 format (Maddison et al., 1997). This format was conceived with versatility in mind, and this
49 design choice has been vindicated in its applicability with textual data, but NEXUS is not
50 equipped or meant to express the same kinds of details that TEI XML is. Conversely, for those
51 interested primarily in working with the collation as an alignment, TEI XML is overkill. Thus,
52 a great chasm has been fixed between the two formats, and the only way to cross over it is by
53 conversion.

54 Another format of value for text-critical phylogenetics is the input format associated with
55 the [STEMMA software](#) developed by Stephen C. Carlson for his phylogenetic analysis of the
56 Epistle to the Galatians (Carlson, 2015). Carlson’s software expands on traditional maximum
57 parsimony-based phylogenetic algorithms with rules to account for contamination or mixture in
58 the manuscript tradition. While it has so far only been applied to books of the New Testament,
59 it is just as applicable to other traditions, and a way of converting TEI XML collations of other
60 texts to a format that can be used by this software could help bridge this gap.

61 Other basic machine-learning approaches to textual criticism, which are frequently based on
62 clustering and biclustering algorithms (Finney, 2018; McCollum, 2019; Thorpe, 2002), expect
63 the collation data to be encoded as a matrix with a row for each variant reading and a column
64 for each witness. Thus, a means of converting the essential data from TEI XML collation to
65 a NumPy array (Harris et al., 2020) and other related formats is a need for applications like
66 these.

67 Design

68 While the conversion process is a straightforward one for most collation data, lacunae, retrover-
69 sions, and other sources of ambiguity occasionally make a one-to-one mapping of witnesses to
70 readings impossible, and in some cases, one disambiguation may be more likely than another
71 in a quantifiable way. Mechanisms for accommodating such situations exist in both TEI XML
72 and NEXUS, and for likelihood-based phylogenetic methods, “soft decisions” about the states
73 at the leaves and even the root of the tree can provide useful information to the inference
74 process. For these reasons, we wanted to ensure that these types of judgments, as well as
75 other rich features from TEI XML, could be respected (and, where, necessary, preserved) in
76 the conversion process.

77 Collations should preserve as much detail as possible, including information on how certain
78 types of data can be normalized and collapsed for analysis. Since one might want to conduct
79 the same analysis at different levels of granularity, the underlying collation data should be
80 available for use in any case, and only the output should reflect changes in the desired level of
81 detail. Likewise, as noted in the previous section, uncertainty about witnesses’ attestations
82 should be encoded in the collation and preserved in the conversion of the collation.

83 For text-critical purposes, differences in granularity typically concern which types of variant
84 readings we consider important for analysis. At the lowest level, readings with uncertain
85 or reconstructed portions are almost always considered identical with their reconstructions
86 (provided these reconstructions can be made unambiguously) for the purpose of analysis.
87 Defective forms that are obvious misspellings of a more substantive reading are often treated
88 the same way. Even orthographic subvariants that reflect equally “correct” regional spelling
89 practices may be considered too common and of too trivial a nature to be of value for
90 analysis. Other readings that do not fall under these rubrics but are nevertheless considered

91 manifestly secondary (due to late and/or isolated attestation, for instance), may also be considered
92 uninformative “noise” that is better left filtered out.

93 Use Case

94 Due to the availability of extensive collation data for the Greek New Testament, and because
95 this project was originally developed for use with such data, we tested this library on a
96 collation of the book of Ephesians in over 200 textual witnesses (including manuscripts,
97 correctors’ hands, translations to other languages, and quotations from church fathers).
98 The manuscript transcriptions used for this collation were those produced by the University
99 of Birmingham’s Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing (ITSEE) for the
100 International Greek New Testament Project (IGNTP); they are freely accessible at <https://itseeweb.cal.bham.ac.uk/epistulae/XML/igntp.xml>. To achieve a balance between variety
101 and conciseness, we restricted the collation to a set of forty-two variation units in Ephesians
102 corresponding to variation units in the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament (Aland et
103 al., 2014), which highlights variation units that affect substantive matters of translation. As a
104 result, this collation is by no means complete, and some witnesses are lacunose for the entirety
105 of the collation. Still, it is complete enough to serve as a sufficient example of the types of
106 details outlined in previous sections.
107

108 In our example collation, witnesses are described in the `listWit` element under the `teiHeader`.
109 Because most New Testament witnesses are identified by numerical Gregory-Aland identifiers,
110 these witnesses are identified with `@n` attributes; the recommended practice is to identify such
111 elements by `@xml:id` attributes, but this software is designed to work with either identifying
112 attribute (preferring `@xml:id` if both are provided), and we have left things as they are to
113 demonstrate this feature.

114 Each variation unit is encoded as an `app` element with a unique `@xml:id` attribute. Within a
115 variation unit, a `lem` element without a `@wit` attribute presents the main text, and it is followed
116 by `rdg` elements that describe variant readings (with the first `rdg` duplicating the `lem` reading
117 and detailing its witnesses) and their attestations among the witnesses. (Situations where
118 the `lem` reading is not duplicated by the first `rdg` element, but has its own `@wit` attribute,
119 are also supported.) For conciseness, we use the `@n` attribute for each reading as a local
120 identifier; the recommended practice for readings that will be referenced elsewhere is to use
121 the `@xml:id` attribute, and this software will use this as the identifier if it is specified, but we
122 have only specified `@xml:id` attributes for `rdg` elements referenced in other variation units to
123 demonstrate the flexibility of the software. For witnesses with missing or ambiguous readings
124 at a given variation unit, we use the `witDetail` element. For ambiguous readings, we specify
125 their possible disambiguations with the `@target` attribute and express our degrees of certainty
126 about these disambiguations using `certainty` elements under the `witDetail` element.

127 The [TEI XML file](#) for this example is available in the examples directory in the GitHub
128 repository.

129 Availability

130 The software can be installed through the Python Package Index (PyPI), and the source code
131 is available under the MIT license from the [GitHub repository](#). The automated testing suite
132 has 100% coverage.

133 Acknowledgements and Funding

134 The authors wish to thank Stephen C. Carlson for his feedback on this project. This work was
135 supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship.

References

- Aland, B., Aland, K., Karavidopoulos, J., Martini, C. M., & Metzger, B. M. (Eds.). (2014). *The Greek New Testament* (5th ed.). Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Barbrook, A. C., Howe, C. J., Blake, N., & Robinson, P. (1998). The Phylogeny of The Canterbury Tales. *Nature*, 394, 839. <https://doi.org/10.1038/29667>
- Carlson, S. C. (2015). *The Text of Galatians and Its History*. Mohr Siebeck. ISBN: 978-3-16-153323-5
- Consortium, T. (2022). *TEI P5: Guidelines for Electronic Text Encoding and Interchange: Critical Apparatus [v.4.4.0]*. <https://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/TC.html>.
- Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *An Analysis of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method Using Phylogenetics*. University of Birmingham. <http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9150>
- Felsenstein, J. (2004). *Inferring Phylogenies*. Sinauer Associates.
- Finney, T. J. (2018). How to Discover Textual Groups. *Digital Studies/Le Champ Numérique*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.16995/dscn.291>
- Fischer, F. (2020). Representing the Critical Text. In P. Roelli (Ed.), *Handbook of stemmatology: History, methodology, digital approaches* (pp. 405–427). De Gruyter.
- Harris, C. R., Millman, K. J., van der Walt, S. J., Gommers, R., Virtanen, P., Cournapeau, D., Wieser, E., Taylor, J., Berg, S., Smith, N. J., Kern, R., Picus, M., Hoyer, S., Kerkwijk, M. H. van, Brett, M., Haldane, A., del Río, J. F., Wiebe, M., Peterson, P., ... Oliphant, T. E. (2020). Array programming with NumPy. *Nature*, 585, 357–362. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2>
- Hyytiäinen, P. (2021). The Changing Text of Acts: A Phylogenetic Approach. *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, 26, 1–28.
- Ide, N. M., & Sperberg-McQueen, C. M. (1995). The TEI: History, Goals and Future. *Computers and the Humanities*, 29(1), 5–15.
- Maddison, D. R., Swofford, D. L., & Maddison, W. P. (1997). NEXUS: An Extensible File Format for Systematic Information. *Systematic Biology*, 46(4), 590–621. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/46.4.590>
- McCollum, J. (2019). Biclustering Readings and Manuscripts via Non-negative Matrix Factorization, with Application to the Text of Jude. *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 57(1), 61–89.
- Robinson, P., & O'Hara, R. J. (1992). Report on the Textual Criticism Challenge 1991. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 3(4), 331–337.
- Salemans, B. J. P. (2000). *Building Stemmas with the Computer in a Cladistic, Neo-Lachmannian, Way: The Case of Fourteen Text Versions of Lanceloet van Denemerken*. Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. <https://hdl.handle.net/2066/147058>
- Spencer, M., Wachtel, K., & Howe, C. J. (2002). The Greek Vorlage of the Syra Harclensis: A Comparative Study on Method in Exploring Textual Genealogy. *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, 7. <http://jbtc.org/v07/SWH2002/index.html>
- Spencer, M., Wachtel, K., & Howe, C. J. (2004). Representing Multiple Pathways of Textual Flow in the Greek Manuscripts of the Letter of James Using Reduced Median Networks. *Computers and the Humanities*, 38, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:CHUM.0000009290.14571.59>

- 180 Thorpe, J. C. (2002). Multivariate Statistical Analysis for Manuscript Classification. *TC: A*
181 *Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, 7. <http://jbtc.org/v07/Thorpe2002.html>
182 Turnbull, R. (2020). *The Textual History of Codex Sinaiticus Arabicus and Its Family*. Ridley
183 College.

DRAFT