

Sezione I

Scholarly Digital Editions (SDE)



<https://dig-ed-cat.acdh.oeaw.ac.at/>

! explore the catalogue (/browsing/editions/)

Browse Catalogue | Download ▼

last time synced 2020/12/30 08:36:28 by gfranzini

Basic search options

Name of the Project

Humbo...

The name of the project.

Institution

Bologna...

Name(s) of institution(s) involved in the project.

Repository of Source Material(s)

Variou...

The institution(s) that house the source text(s).

Manager

e.g. Dániel Kiss

Name of project manager(s).

Url contains

The URL of the project.

Period

Middle Ages
Early Modern
Antiquity
Middle Ages; Early Modern

Historical period to which the source text belongs.

Language

lat
ger
eng
wel

The language(s) of the source text. Three-letter ISO Codes are used.

Filter

Show/Hide Advanced search options

Reset search

Total results: 19

ID	Edition name	Institution
10	Codex Sinaiticus	St. Catherine's Monastery, Leipzig University Library, National Library of Russia, British Library
17	Euripides Scholia	University of California Irvine
24	Inscriptions of the Northern Black Sea (IOSPE)	Russian Academy of Sciences, The State Hermitage, King's College London (Department of Digital Humanities)
57	The Derveni Papyrus	Università degli Studi di Genova, Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Casa Editrice Leo S. Olschki
58	The Gospel according to St. John	University of Birmingham
65	The Online Critical Pseudepigrapha	Society of Biblical Literature
73	Digital Nestle-Aland	University of Münster
86	Inscriptiones Graecae in Croatia Repertae (IGCR)	University of Zagreb
92	Inscriptions of Aphrodisias Project	University College London, King's College London (Department of Digital Humanities), University of North Carolina, University of Heidelberg
93	Inscriptions of Roman Cyrenaica	British School at Rome, King's College London (Department of Digital Humanities), University of North Carolina
100	Galenus' commentary on Hippocrates' "On the articulations"	Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften
111	John Foxe's The Acts and Monuments Online	University of Sheffield, British Academy, University of Ohio
116	Inscriptions of Israel/Palestine	Brown University
163	Septuaginta LXX	not provided
198	George Etheridge's Encomium on Henry VIII addressed to Elizabeth II, British Library Royal MS 16 C X	British Library, Hellenic Institute of Royal Holloway
223	Sappho's Poems	N/A
231	Bibliotheca Iuris Antiqui (BIA)	Istituto di Teoria e Tecniche dell'Informazione Giuridica (ITTIG-CNR)
244	Digital Athenaeus	University of Leipzig
311	Inscriptions of Greek Cyrenaica - Greek Verse Inscriptions of Cyrenaica	King's College London, Università degli Studi di Bologna, Université Paris-Sorbonne, Università di Macerata


[About](#)
[Other Resources](#)

a catalog of **Digital Scholarly Editions**

v.4.034 2020ff, edited by Patrick Sahle et al., last change 2021-03-02

Editions catalog entries

[https://digitale-edition.de/exist/apps/editions-browser/\\$app/index.html](https://digitale-edition.de/exist/apps/editions-browser/$app/index.html)

Edenda

- ☐ single work 4
- ☐ collected works 2
- ☐ collection of texts 2
- ☐ single manuscript 4
- ☐ papers
- ☐ serial documents
- ☐ letters
- ☐ diaries
- ☐ charters
- ☐ inscriptions 5

Subject

- ☐ history 9

Sort

Title

▼ Sort direction

▼ 🔍 Filter

Editions: 18

Suda On Line: Byzantine Lexicography

Directed by David Whitehead (Senior Editor) and Raphael Finkel (Technical Director). Stoa Consortium, 2000-2014.

[more...](#)

[single work](#) [greek](#) [early ma](#) [history](#) [2000](#)

A horizontal timeline with a blue line. A grey circle at the left end is labeled '1988'. A blue circle at the right end is labeled '2020'.

Created by Donald E. Mas, Charles J. Berkeley (SRI), University of California Berkeley, 2010, Beta Version 1.1. 2020, Version 1.1

M. M., *Digital editions of ancient Greek texts*, in N. Reggiani (ed.), *Digital Papyrology II: New Methods for the Digital Edition of Ancient Papyri and Related Sources*, Berlin 2018, 87-102.

«The Catalogue of Digital Editions, the most complete “attempt to survey and identify best practice in the field of digital scholarly editing”, gathers 256 [313] ‘digital editions’, among which 12 [19] edition of ancient Greek texts (30.10.2017). In fact, **none of them is a new edition based on textual criticism applied to a multi-manuscript tradition**: 11 [16] editions are catalogued as ‘digital scholarly editions’; six [10] of them are editions of a text transmitted by unique witness (4 [6] are editions of epigraphic collections, two involve the text transmitted either by a single or by a peculiar and very valuable ancient manuscript), two [3] are the digitization of the standard, ‘traditional’ editions of the Old and New Testament in Greek language (ID 163 = LXX Septuaginta – <http://septuaginta.net>; 73 = Digital Nestle-Aland – <http://nestlealand.uni-muenster.de>), one is the edition that gathers the electronic editions of the Gospel according to St. John in Greek, Latin, Syriac and Coptic (ID 58 = <http://www.iohannes.com>)» (pp. 88s.).

Malaspina in E. Malaspina– E. Della Calce, *Classici e computer: verso la transdisciplinarietà?*, in *Humanities e altre scienze. Superare la disciplinarietà*, a c. di M. Cini, Roma, 49–65.

«Con la formula ‘edizione digitale’ oggi si intende praticamente di tutto: riproduzioni di epigrafi, scansioni di brogliacci, collazioni di varianti e così via. Anche se si aggiunge l’aggettivo ‘critica’, che nella filologia classica tradizionale indicherebbe un prodotto ben definito, non si ottiene un quadro più omogeneo e soprattutto si vede spesso gabbellato per ‘critico’ ciò che sarebbe più onesto definire ‘diplomatico’, ovvero la mera trascrizione di un testimone e/o la giustapposizione di varianti senza nemmeno porsi il problema della vera *lectio*» (pp. 58s).

D.S. Olson, *Further notes on the apparatus criticus*, «CJ» CXIV (2019) 330–344.

«Despite Keeline (2017) 350, the technical hurdles this migration [i.e., editorial practices migrating across the electronic frontier] faces appear to be significant, which must be among the reasons why no fully digital edition of a classical text has yet appeared even after many years of discussion and considerable investment of resources» (p. 331 n. 3).

F. Fischer, *Digital classical philology and the critical apparatus*, in M. Berti (ed.), *Digital Classical Philology. Ancient Greek and Latin in the Digital Revolution*, Berlin-Boston 2019, 203–220.

«The few digital editions of classical texts that exist are meritorious for being both scholarly and online. However, they are based on a flat data model or, rather, on a print-oriented data model, such as those exported from the widely used Classical Text Editor. This is why they cannot yet live up to the great expectations of content and feature rich, truly digital editions. In fact, these editions would fall short of Sahle’s restrictive definition of being digital: “A digital edition cannot be given in print without a significant loss of content and functionality” (2016, 27). Because they can» (p. 212).

P. Monella, *Why are there no comprehensively digital scholarly editions of Classical Texts?*, in A. Cipolla (ed.), *Digital Philology: New Thoughts on Old Questions*, Padova 2018, 141–159.

«By a “comprehensively digital” scholarly edition, I mean here one based (1) on a complete digital transcription of all primary sources and (2) on an automated collation of those transcriptions – the main model that I have in mind is that of the *Canterbury Tales Project*. In this admittedly rather restrictive concept of a “comprehensively digital” scholarly edition, I concur with Peter Robinson: “A digital edition should be based on full-text transcription of original texts into electronic form, and this transcription should be based on explicit principles”» (p. 149).

«Digital scholarly editions are very good at two things:

1. At focussing on documents;
2. At accounting for the plurality of the texts – for the textual variance – that these documents bear.

1. Scholars focussing on the document:

- **Codicologists**, interested in the document as a cultural object (for example, an artistically valuable enlightened manuscript, or one having a specific historical value);
- **Epigraphists**, **papyrologists** and **editors** of documentary manuscripts who mostly work on texts borne by one textual source only;
- **Palaeographers**, studying the specific graphical encoding conventions of a document

P. Monella, *Why are there no comprehensively digital scholarly editions of Classical Texts?*, in A. Cipolla (ed.), *Digital Philology: New Thoughts on Old Questions*, Padova 2018, 141–159.

2. Scholars focussing on textual variance:

- “Genetic” editors of modern and contemporary texts, for whom textual variants bear a high cultural value;
- Historical linguists, who may study the evolution of language and orthography through “errors” in inscriptions, in manuscripts and in modern print materials throughout the centuries.

Very simply put, classical philology generally:

1. Does not focus on documents (and texts) but on the Text;
2. Considers the textual variance introduced in medieval times as merely instrumental to the goal of the (asymptotic) reconstruction of the “original” text» (pp. 152s.).

«Since the inception of electronic textuality, there have been many articles which have proclaimed a revolution in textual editing (Deegan and Robinson; Smith; Robinson, “The Digital Revolution”). One might easily lose count of how many conference presentations and project proposals promised that everything was going to change. At times, scholars focused on the delivery system of the digital editions, on how these texts were going to be presented. At other times, those who had taught themselves to code attempted to produce tools that were reliable and so easy to use that they would not require specialized help and thus might bring the benefits of the digital world to a wider group of interested scholars. This article examines the methodologies of those objects called digital scholarly editions and compares the methodologies implemented for their production with those used in the past in the making of scholarly editions in print form. The aim is to assess the degree of difference between digital and analogue scholarly editions. The article concludes that the advent of digital tools, despite some notable contributions (speed, re-workability), has not translated into fundamental changes in textual scholarship. Moreover, what should be one of the most significant advantages of digital scholarship, that it enables the creation of base work that could be redeveloped for use in multiple projects, has not managed to prevail over individual interests and nineteenth-century notions of copyright» (pp. 7s.).

«Deegan, Marilyn, and Peter Robinson. “The Electronic Edition.” *The Editing of Old English*. Ed. Scragg, Donald S. and Paul E. Szarmach. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1994. Print.

Smith, Martha Nell. “Electronic Scholarly Editing.” *A Companion to Digital Humanities*. Ed. Ray Siemens, Susan Schreibman, and John Unsworth. Blackwell, 2004. Web. 26 June 2017. <<http://www.digitalhumanities.org/companionDLS/>>.

Robinson, Peter. “The Digital Revolution in Scholarly Editing.” *Ars Edendi Lecture Series*. Ed. Barbara Crostini, Gunilla Iversen, and Brian Jensen. IV. Stockholm: Stockholm UP, 2016. 181–207. Print.

Smith, Martha Nell. “Electronic Scholarly Editing.” *A Companion to Digital Humanities*. Ed. Ray Siemens, Susan Schreibman, and John Unsworth. Blackwell, 2004. Web. 26 June 2017. <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/companionDLS/>».

«Pierazzo and Sahle have presented a series of separative characteristics that place digital editions in their own category, quite apart from printed editions [...].

In a section of her book entitled “Digital Editorial Models,” Pierazzo presents three models that she considers are innovations brought in by the use of computers:

1-Phylogenetic

2-Social Editing and Social Editions

3-Crowdsourcing and Editing [...].

According to Sahle, the digital paradigm is defined by multimediality (or transmediality, as he calls it later on), hypertextuality, modularization, and fluidity» (pp. 12s.).

«Pierazzo, Elena. *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories, Models and Methods*. Oxford: Routledge, 2015. Print.

Sahle, Patrick. “What Is a Scholarly Digital Edition?” *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories and Practices*. Ed. Matthew Driscoll and Elena Pierazzo. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2016. 19–40. Print».

Sezione II

Apparato critico, tra edizione critica tradizionale e *SDE*

F. Fischer, *Digital classical philology and the critical apparatus*, in M. Berti (ed.), *Digital Classical Philology. Ancient Greek and Latin in the Digital Revolution*, Berlin-Boston 2019, 203–220.

«The critical apparatus is an essential part of any scholarly edition, philology's most notorious feature, a manifestation of textual criticism itself. It provides the aura of a scientific, scholarly, reliable and authoritative text. The apparatus makes any text distinct to just ordinary texts, randomly published or passed on. **In a way, the apparatus is to philology what the halo is to Christian iconography: an element to distinguish the saint from the sinner.** And just like the halo is vanishing in a secularized world, so does the critical apparatus seem to disappear in digital scholarship. While other areas within the domain of classical philology have taken advantage of new possibilities offered by the digital medium and even turned out to prosper (as demonstrated by the other contributions in this volume), the fate of the critical apparatus in digital classical philology has been mostly unfortunate so far [...]. Yet from the other perspective, in the eyes of many digital and non-digital readers, **the critical apparatus appears to be a graveyard of variants**, with no bearing on the conditions of the living. **Some have even gone so far as to express their contempt (or ignorance) by calling it outright “crapparatus”** (as reported by Keeline 2017, 349)» (pp. 204s.).

F. Fischer, *Digital classical philology and the critical apparatus*, in M. Berti (ed.), *Digital Classical Philology. Ancient Greek and Latin in the Digital Revolution*, Berlin-Boston 2019, 203–220.

«In fact, in recent years a rather proactive international research group has reinforced the field of stemmatology as an integral part of digital textual scholarship resulting in the publication of the *Parvum Lexicon Stemmatalogicum* and a handbook on Stemmatalogy in the Digital Age. This brings us back to a very practical question.

Underneath the text, according to Maas (1927 §§ 23–24), **deviations from the archetype should be noted: rejected variants, sub-variants and groups of variants from lower down in the stemma may or may not be indicated, as well as uncertainties, changes of witnesses and brief justifications of editorial decisions.** The discussion about what exactly to put in the apparatus has always been vital among philologists ever since.

Nowadays, the selection of variant readings for the critical apparatus can be categorized as two opposing editorial practices, **the maximalist and the minimalist approach [...]. In digital philology, for one thing, the question of what to put in the apparatus has become less existential. Digital editions are able to combine both approaches, the maximalist and the minimalist»** (pp. 207s.).

M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart 1973.

«Critical apparatuses have more than one use. **The most essential one is to inform the reader which parts of the printed text depend on emendation and which parts are subject to uncertainty.** But apparatuses are also what most people depend on for instruction about the character of particular manuscripts and scribes, and of manuscripts and scribes generally» (p. 86).

C. Dué-M. Ebbott, The Homer Multitext within the history of access to Homeric epic, in M. Berti (ed.), *Digital Classical Philology. Ancient Greek and Latin in the Digital Revolution*, Berlin-Boston 2019, 239-256.

«We have also decided not to simply replicate the practice of the apparatus criticus, and that decision also has a basis in considerations of access. We have argued elsewhere the problems inherent in a typical apparatus. To be blunt, **the conventional apparatus is a barrier rather than a means to access** (and to be even blunter, some people seem to like that about it). Only the most specialized consultants of an apparatus criticus can decode what it is attempting to convey, and even they will be often at a loss as to what the original sources actually say. There are types of information, such as how the layout of the page creates relationships between texts, that an apparatus simply cannot convey. **Digital tools of textual analysis, developed for texts in many languages across many formats of publication, also make the conventional apparatus obsolete**» (pp. 252s.).

D.S. Olson, *Further notes on the apparatus criticus*, «CJ» CXIV (2019) 330–344.

«Keeline is correct to maintain that “the apparatus is, in effect, an argument in condensed form that justifies the editor’s constitution of the text.” Precisely at this point, however, Keeline makes a significant turn in his argument, by asserting that the traditional critical apparatus is not just “a poor medium” to do this work but actually “unusable.” This is an extremely important assertion, because it represents Keeline’s initial response to the problem with which his article begins: the critical apparatus as we know it is not used, he maintains, because it is unusable» (p. 333).

Vd. T. Keeline, *The apparatus criticus in the digital age*, «CJ» CXII (2017) 342–363.

«Keeline’s three examples of a critical apparatus thus admirably perform their traditional scholarly function as e.g. West defines it. Put another way, Keeline’s standard of “usability” appears to be a different—and strikingly non-traditional— one, which depends on an unexpected use of the term “argument” that begins with the claim that “the apparatus is, in effect, an argument in condensed form that justifies the editor’s constitution of the text”. This is correct, in the sense that (as noted earlier) all assertions of “fact,” including those made in critical apparatuses, are “arguments.” But neither West nor anyone else has ever maintained that an apparatus ought to contain the sort of extended discussion Keeline refers to as an “argument”. Instead, what Keeline describes here is the typical content of an existing but separate genre, the commentary, which (assuming that one has been produced on the text in question) routinely supplies the sort of information Keeline rightly observes is absent from a standard printed critical apparatus» (p. 333).

R. Afferni-A. Borgna-M. Lana-P. Monella-T. Tambassi, '*... but what should I put in a digital apparatus?*' A not-so-obvious choice. *New types of digital scholarly editions*, in P.Boot-A. Cappellotto-W. Dillen-F. Fischer-A. Kelly-A. Mertgens-A.M. Sichani-E. Spadini-D. Van Hulle(eds.), *Advances in Digital Scholarly Editing*. «Papers Presented At The Dixit Conferences In The Hague, Cologne, And Antwerp», Leiden 2017, 141-143.

«If the digital critical edition is a type of digital scholarly edition containing an apparatus that analyses and describes the state of the text in the witnesses, then we can conceive e.g.

- the **digital scholarly geographical edition of a work** – whose apparatus contains an analytical description of the geographical knowledge contained in the placenames;
- the **digital critical geographical edition** whose geographical apparatus is layered over a base critical edition [...].

By '**base critical edition**' we do not necessarily mean a previously published edition with a critical text already established. The best model would be an **integrated edition where the critical discussion on (and selection of) textual variants and the interpretive extraction of geographical knowledge are integrated and both 'born digital'**.

The knowledge contained in the text must be expressed in a highly formal manner – the same way that the critical apparatus is a highly formal device – by means of an ontology. The ontology both from a philosophical or a computer science point of view is a structure aimed to analyse and describe the categorical hierarchy of a specific domain, analysing its basic constituents (entities like objects, events, processes, etc.), the properties characterizing them and the relationships which correlate them. The resulting (structural) representation of knowledge allows to resolve conceptual or terminological inconsistencies, providing a dictionary of terms formulated in a canonical syntax and with commonly accepted definitions. It also provides a lexical or taxonomic framework for the representation of knowledge, shared by different communities of information systems that can range across several domains» (pp. 141s.).

Στησιγόρω [fig. 40] ἐπόμενος τόξα φησὶν αὐτὸν εἰληφέναι παρὰ
 Ἀπόλλωνος. ἔδει οὖν τὸν ὑποκριτὴν τόξα λαβόντα τοξεύειν. οἱ δὲ νῦν
 ὑποκρινόμενοι τὸν ἥρωα αἰτοῦσι μὲν τὰ τόξα, μὴ δεχόμενοι δὲ σχηματί-
 ζονται τοξεύειν. εἰ δὲ καὶ μαινόμενος ἐπ' ἐνίων ὑγαίνει, μὴ θαυ-
 5 μάζωμεν. ἡ γὰρ νόσος ποικίλη τῶν μεμνημένων· ὥς κὰν ταῖς Τρωάσιν
 ἢ Κασάνδρᾳ [369]· 'τοσόνδε δ' ἐκτὸς στήσομαι βακχευμάτων': — MTB
 270 μανιάσιν λυσσήμασιν: ταῖς μανιώδεσι λύσσαις. σχῆμα δὲ
 ἐστὶ περίφρασις: — M¹TAB
 μανιάσιν λυσσήμασιν: ὥς τὸ 'φοίνικι λίνῃ', ἀρσενικὸν μετὰ οὐ-
 10 δετέρου. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἡ μανιάς τὸ μανιάσι: — M¹TB
 μανιώδεσι λυσσήμασιν· ἡ μανιάς καὶ λυσσήμασιν: — M²TB
 272 εἰ μὴ ἔαμείψει: εἰ μὴ ἀποστήσεται τις τῶν Ἑρινύων τοῦ
 ἐμοῦ προσώπου: — MTAB¹
 275 τί θῆτα μέλλετ' ἐξακρίζετ' αἰθέρα: στιγμὴ εἰς τὸ μέλ-
 15 λετε. τὸ δὲ ἐξῆς· εἰς τὰ ἄκρα τοῦ αἰθέρος πέτεσθε καὶ μέμψεσθε
 τὰ λόγια τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ μὴ ἐμέ: — MTAB
 τὰ ἄκρα τοῦ αἰθέρος καταλαμβάνετε: — MT
 περωτὰς καὶ οὗτος τὰς Ἑρινύας ὑπέθετο: — MTAB
 277 † ἔα: ἐκπληκτικὸν ἢ θαυμαστικὸν ἐπὶ ῥήματι τὸ ἔα: — TA
 20 τί χρῆμ' ἀλύω: διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν ἀδμονῶ: — MTB¹
 ἄλλως: τί τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ τίς ἡ νόσος αὐτῇ, καθ' ἣ ἀδμονῶ καὶ
 ὑπόρρημαι. παρὰ τὴν ἄλγιν· 'ἡ δ' ἀλύουσ' ἀπεβήσεται' [E 352]: — MTAB
 279 ἐκ κυμάτων γὰρ αὐθις αὐ γαλήν' ὀρώ: κεκωμῶδεται ὁ

1—6 scholio p. 125,20—22 adi. MT, add. δὲ post Στ. B 1 στησιγόρωσ MT
 παρὰ om. MT 2 ἀπόλλων M τόξα om. MT 2—5 οἱ—μεμνημένων] ὁ δὲ
 νόσος νόμειοι τὸν ἥρωα αἰτοῦσι μὲν τὸ [δεχόμενοι δὲ σχηματίζον
 |.... εἰ δὲ καὶ μαινόμενος ὅπ |.... νει· μὴ θαυμάζωμεν· ἡ γὰρ |
 μεμνημένων B et spatiis et rasuris mutilatus 3 ἐγόμενοι MT 4 ὅπ ἐνίων
 MT 7. 8 scholio quod praecedit adi. B add. δὲ post μανιάσι 7 τὸ δὲ
 σχῆμα A 8 ἐστὶ om. A 9. 10 scholio quod praecedit adi. M¹TB add. ταῖς
 ante μανιάσι 11 scholio quod praecedit adi. B 12 τις] τί φησι A
 post Ἑρινύων ins. φησι M 14. 15 στιγμὴ—ἐξῆς om. A 16 ἡλύω A in
 fine rep. μέμψεσθε A 18 scholio 17 adi. MT, scholio 14—16 AB, add. δὲ post

στίχους διὰ Ἡγέλοχον τὸν ὑποκριτὴν· οὐ γὰρ φθάσαντα διελεῖν τὴν συνα-
 λισφὴν ἐπιειψάντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις τὴν γαλήν δόξαι
 λέγειν τὸ ζῆλον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τὰ γαλήνα. πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν αὐτὸ διέπαιξαν
 τῶν κωμικῶν, Ἀριστοφάνης * * καὶ Στράτις ἐν Ἀνθρωποραίστῃ [fig. 1].
 καὶ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων οὐκ ἐμέλησέ μοι μελῶν, 5
 Εὐριπίδου δὲ δῶμα δεξιότατον
 διέκναισ' Ὀρέστην, Ἡγέλοχον τὸν Κυντάρου
 μισθωσάμενος τὰ πρῶτα τῶν ἐπῶν λέγειν.
 καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις παίζων φησὶ [fig. 60].
 γαλήν' ὀρώ. — ποῖ πρὸς θεῶν, ποῖ ποῖ γαλήν· 10
 — γαλήνα. — ἐγὼ δ' ᾤμην σε γαλήν λέγειν ὀρώ.
 καὶ Σαννυρίων ἐν Δανάῃ [fig. 8].
 τί οὖν γενόμενος εἰς ὀπὴν ἐνδύσομαι·
 ζητητέον. φέρ' εἰ γενοίμην † γαλή·
 ἀλλ' Ἡγέλοχος (εὐθύς) με μηνύσειεν (δὴν) 15
 ὁ τραγικὸς ἀνακράγει τ' δὴ [εὐθύς] εἰσιδὼν μέγα·
 'ἐκ κυμάτων γὰρ αὐθις αὐ γαλήν ὀρώ': — MTAB
 284 σὺ μὲν γὰρ ἐπένευσας τὰ δ', εἴργασται δ' ἐμοί: ἐγὼ
 μὲν εἰργασάμην, σὺ δὲ ἐπένευσας. θέλει δὲ εἰπεῖν ὅτι οὐ μετέχεις τοῦ
 φόνου, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ ἔπραξας· διὸ οὐδὲ ὀφείλεις ἄχθεσθαι: — MTAB 20

Ὀρέστη Εὐριπίδου προστάνας αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῇδε τῇ στίχῳ 'ἐκ κυμάτων
 γὰρ αὐθις αὐ γαλήν' ὀρώ' ἀφινδῶς οὐ φθῆναι συν(έβη) διελόντα τὴν συναλοι-
 φήν ... 1. 2 συναλίσφην MTB 2 γαλήν MTA 4 ἀνθρωποραίστη B
 ἀνθρωποραίστη MTA 6 εὐριπίδης B 7 δι' αἰκνέας A ὀρέστη T
 ὀρέστη B ἡ Ἡγέλοχον A ^{τε} κύν A Κυντάρου Bentley Κυντάρου Dindorf
 10 γαλήν M γαλήν TA γαλήν B ποῖ A ποῖ ποῖ MTB θεόν MT
 post ποῖ ποῖ ins. χρῆ με παρὰ τὸ θέλημα ποιῆν A, quae corrigas τί χρῆ με π.
 τ. θ. ποιεῖν et ad vs. 277 referas γαλήν M γαλήν TA 11 γαλήνα TB
 γαλήνα MA δὲ MTAB γαλήν M γαλήν TA ὀρώ A γαλήν
 λέγειν σ' ὀρᾶν Dindorf 12—17 καὶ—ὀρώ om. A 12 θαν.. M θανάη T
 θανάη B 14 πείσω MT γαλή M γαλή TB συναλίσφην ἀπονημῆς ἀπολῆ



Euripides Scholia

An Open-Access Online Edition

[About](#) | [Preface](#) | [The Manuscripts](#) | [Edition](#) | [Sigla Tables](#) | [Bibliography](#) | [Abbreviations](#)

Set to display: Details to display:

Or. 279.01 (vet exeg) **ἐκ κυμάτων γὰρ αὐθις αὐ γαλήν' ὀρώ:** ¹κεκωμώδεται ὁ στίχος διὰ Ἑγέλοχον τὸν ὑποκριτὴν· ²οὐ γὰρ φθάσαντα διελεῖν τὴν συναλοιφὴν ἐπλείψαντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις τὴν γαλήν δόξα λέγειν τὸ ζῶον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τὰ γαληνά. ³πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν αὐτὸ διέπαιξαν τῶν κωμικῶν, Ἀριστοφάνης < ... > καὶ Στράτις ἐν Ἀνθρωπορέστη [Strattis fr. 1 K–A (Kock)]·

⁴καὶ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων οὐκ ἐμέλησέ μοι μελῶν,
⁵Εὐριπίδου δὲ δράμα δεξιώτατον
⁶διέκναισ' Ὀρέστην, Ἑγέλοχον τὸν Κυντάρου
⁷μσθωσάμενος τὰ πρῶτα τῶν ἐπῶν λέγειν'.

⁸καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις παίζων φησί [Strattis fr. 63 K–A (60 Kock)]·

⁹A: γαλήν' ὀρώ. B: ποῖ πρὸς θεῶν, ποῖ ποῖ γαλήν;
¹⁰A: γαληνά. B: ἐγὼ δ' ὦμην σε γαλήν λέγειν ὀρώ'.

¹¹καὶ Σαννυρίων ἐν Δανάῃ [Sannyrion fr. 8 K–A (Kock)]·

¹²τί οὖν γενόμενος εἰς ὀπὴν ἐνδύσομαι·
¹³ζητητέον. φέρ' εἰ γενοίμην < – > γαλή·
¹⁴ἀλλ' Ἑγέλοχος <εὐθύς> με μηνύσειεν <ἄν>
¹⁵ὁ τραγικὸς ἀνακράγοι τ' ἄν {εὐθύς} εἰσιδὼν μέγα·
¹⁶ἐκ κυμάτων γὰρ αὐθις αὐ γαλήν ὀρώ'.

—MBCPr, partial VKRw