Alexandra Trachsel – Monica Berti

Introduction:
The editing of a work, which has only been preserved in fragments, raises other issues than the edition of entirely preserved works. One of the many differences is the fact that the former are preserved directly in manuscrits, most of the time in several manuscripts, which may of course sometimes be fragmentary, but which still give a rather large sequence of text that has been composed, or is perceived as one coherent and meaningful work. With the latter, the fragmentary text, the difficulty comes from the fact that in most of the cases we have only an indirect access to the primary text. They are most of the time (exceptions are papyri and inscriptions) quotations and text reuses in subsequent works, where we must believe that the quoting author had an intention while quoting and may have altered the quoted sequence. They are therefore embedded in a "cover text" which renders our access different from the one to works preserved through the medieval manuscript tradition. In our session we will present the issues related to a digital approach to such texts, considering two different point of views: 1) the perspective of the quoted author (issues and needs of an edition of Demetrius of Skepsis) and 2) the perspective of the quoting author (issues and needs of an edition of Athenaeus' Deipnosophists):

Part I: quoted author (Alexandra Trachsel)
issues and needs of an edition of Demetrius of Skepsis (perspective of the quoted author)

While working on the preserved evidence about the work of Demetrius of Skepsis, it became quite soon clear how much we rely in our apprehension of his achievements on the the way he has been read and quoted by later authors. It is therefore the ancient perceptions of Demetrius' work we can access rather than the actual work and this situation makes it crucial to preserve in any dealing with such kind of evidence the relation between the statement or quoted sequence and the text in which they are embedded (the so called "cover text"). This means that while working on such remains from Antiquity we have to take into account several issues:

• first of all, the fact that these textual sequences are embedded in a "cover text" means that they cannot be analysed independently from the way they have been reused by later authors. Even the task to define these pieces as quotations can sometimes be quite difficult, as the quoting methods in Antiquity varies greatly and modern scholars do often not agree about the length, category or accuracy of the quoted elements.
• these textual sequences are also taken out of their original context which makes it difficult to understand the scope of the work or to arrange the preserved statements in a collection of fragments.
• a statement may have been quoted several times by different authors and the wording may be different in each quotation. So we sometimes have a multiple transmission of the same textual sequence.
• a collection of fragments attributed to one author (e.g. Demetrius of Skepsis) is most of the time composed by textual sequences coming from more than one quoting author (e.g. Demetrius is quoted by Strabo and Athenaeus). Each of these "cover texts" has its own history of transmission and this may also influence our modern understanding of the textual elements quoted in these texts.

Part II: quoting author (Monica Berti)
issues and needs of an edition of Athenaeus' Deipnosophists (perspective of the quoting author)

When referred to lost literary texts, the term "fragment" is inappropriate because what we have are

not fragments of the original works but quotations and text reuses of texts that are now lost. As a consequence, the first responsibility of a scholar is to work with the so called "cover texts", i.e. with the (con)texts that preserve information about lost authors and works.

Nowadays digital tools allow us to work with "cover texts" in a way that was not possible in a printed culture, because now for the first time we can really work within the context preserving quotations and text reuses of lost texts.

This is the reason why I am producing a digital edition of the Deipnosophists of Athenaeus of Naucratis (http://www.dh.uni-leipzig.de/wo/projects/open-greek-and-latin-project/digital-athenaeus/). This complex and fascinating work is not only an erudite and literary encyclopedia of a myriad of curiosities about classical antiquity, but also an invaluable collection of many different kinds of quotations and text reuses of ancient authors, ranging from Homer to tragic and comic poets and lost historians.

The primary goal of this project is to analyze the quotations of the learned banqueters with a twofold purpose: 1) provide an inventory of authors and works cited in the Deipnosophists; 2) build a repository of quotation schemes used by Athenaeus when alluding to his sources of information. In order to achieve these goals, the work is focusing on:
• editing the TEI XML file of the Deipnosophists (Kaibel and Meineke editions).
• annotating and conducting a systematic survey of the citations preserved in the Deipnosophists.
• building a fully comprehensive repository of "citable analyses" for the annotation of quotations and text reuses in the text of Athenaeus using the CTS/CITE Architecture.
• providing linguistic annotations of the text of Athenaeus.