TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN AR. THESM.

μακρύς ὁ δρόμος,
γεμάτος περιπέτειες, γεμάτος γνώσεις.

While Cavafy’s Ithaka-bound traveller hopes to enter λιμένας πρωτειδωμένους and to acquire beautiful σεντέφια καὶ κοράλλια, κεχριμπάρια καὶ ἐβενοὺς, an editor of Aristophanes and the Comic Poets enters libraries and - mirabile dictu - discovers gold in the early printed editions and the unpublished notes of earlier scholars*. For the comic fragments I can mention Guillaume Morel and Dirk Canter, whose pioneering work in the XVIth Century has been rescued from oblivion: their names and emendations now adorn the pages of PCG¹. As regards Thesmophoriazusae, a

* Cavafy urges his traveller to visit many cities, να μάθης καὶ να μάθης ἀπ’ τῶς σπουδασμένους. Some of the problems discussed here were read to friendly and receptive audiences at the Queen’s College, Oxford (March 1987) and at the Universities of Genoa, Rome, Ioannina, Bonn and Cologne (May-June 1988). For warm and generous hospitality as well as helpful comments I am greatly indebted to Angus Bowie, Laetitia Edwards and Hugh Lloyd-Jones in Oxford, Umberto Albini, Chico Rossi, Silvia Rizzo and Albio Cassio in Italy, Mary Mantziou and her colleagues in Epirus, Rudolf Kassel and Otto Zwierlein in Germany. The following pages show how much I owe to Eric Handley and Harry Sandbach in Cambridge. Sir Kenneth Dover in St. Andrews and Alan Sommerstein in Nottingham contributed some illuminating comments. In London Soteroula Constantinidou helped me to unearth some hidden treasures in the British Library, as did Marcel Chantry in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Finally, a special word of thanks to Mary Mantziou, who, at the foot of Mt. Tomaros,

καλῶς ὁδηγοῦσ’, οἷα δὴ ἔτη ἔχουν,
ἐγνωκε φωνὴν τῆς πολυγλώσσου δρυὸς,

and, as a consequence, very kindly saw to it that this issue of Dodone would preserve a true record of my ὅρατο ταξίδι.
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galaxy of stars - Biset, Ellebodius, Casaubon, Faber, Bentley, Daubuz, Kaibel, Wilamowitz and others - is illuminating our text as never before. Let us follow these λαμπρούς δυνάστας as they shine through the ages from the Renaissance to the XXth Century.

* * *

Odoard (= Édouard) BISET (XVIth Cent.)

In the *Pitheoeana, sive excerpta ex ore Francisci Pithoei, anno 1616*, we read: «BIZET, qui a fait sur l’Aristophane, étoit Controller des guerres et Seigneur de Charlaï. Il demeurait en cette ville et se retira pour la Religion. Il a tout pris des Dictionnaires Grecs. Il étoit notre cousin»¹. Biset was born at St. Paul-Trois-Châteaux, the Roman Augusta Tricastinorum, north of Orange (in the Drôme). His father, like the Pithou brothers, was from Troyes (in the Aube). He had been «contrôleur des guerres» under Henri II († 1559) and later died in exile at Basle². Biset himself had to leave his country «for reasons of religion»³ and seek refuge abroad. His «Aristophane» is now in the Cambridge University Library (Rare Books Room: Adv. a. 2. 1) and can be dated «circa 1570»⁴. It is an interleaved and heavily annotated copy of the large folio edition of Gelenius (Basel 1547). Besides the nova scholia in Greek, which were posthumously edited at Geneva in 1607, Biset’s autograph contains numerous unpublished emendations (especially on Thesm. and Lys.), which often anticipate the proposals of later scholars (Scaliger, Bentley, etc.).

«Iterum iterumque te monitum velim, ut probe tibi caveas a Porto» wrote Bentley⁵. The task of transcribing and sorting out Biset’s notes

---

¹. I quote from the collection of *Scaligerana, Thuana, Perroniana, Pitoeana* ... I (Amst. 1740) p. 498. On the famous Pithou brothers (Pierre and François) see Wilamowitz (above p. 61, n. 1), p. 55 (in the footnote ’1691’ is a misprint: François died in 1621).


³. «a fact which had grave consequences for Greek studies in France», as Wilamowitz notes (above p. 61, n. 1), p. 55; see also p. 58: «France has had to pay dearly for casting out her most distinguished sons on grounds of religion». See below for Casaubon and Daubuz.

⁴. See Chr. Saxius, *Onomasticon Literarium*, III (Traiect. ad Rh. 1780) p. 455, where Biset and Florent Chrestien (= ‘Florens Christianus’, 1540-1596) are listed together. For Chrestien’s work on Aristophanes see below p. 64.

was undertaken by the Cretan Scholar Aemilius Portus (1550-1614/5). In his haste or incompetence (or both) Portus, as it now transpires, managed to pass over in silence scores of excellent readings, which Biset had included in his text or added in the margin with the letters μ.χ. (= μέτρου χάριν). Perhaps Portus felt more at home composing his Epistola Dedicatoria to Biset (dated 1 June 1589), which now appears sandwiched in between his Preface in Greek Προς Φιλέλληνας and his Preface in Latin Ad Lectorem. The latter contains a detailed and lively account of how, some years before (ante aliquot annos), Portus had met a noble Frenchman in Lausanne, who handed over to him the copy of Aristophanes he had annotated when he was younger (dum esset iunior), and even authorized him to revise it and prepare it for publication, «on condition», he added, «that you do not reveal my name» (ea tamen lege, ut nomini parcas).

Accepta ego conditione... writes Portus. But he promptly broke his word and, to make matters worse, soon lost all interest in the project. A bungled edition came out years later: Aristophanis Comoediae Undecim ...Aureliae Allobrogum, Sumptibus Caldorianae Societatis, MDCVII. Portus had no hand in it: «bibliopola enim ipse suo arbitrio editionem postea curavit. Aemilius Portus neque instruxit neque

1. The son of Franciscus Portus (†1581), Casaubon’s teacher and predecessor as «Professor» of Greek at Geneva. The Vita Aemili Porti by C. F. Weber (Marburg 1854) is marred inter alia by the false claim (p. 8) that Portus, not Biset, wrote the notes on Thesm. and Lys. On the contrary, Biset, like Ellebodius at roughly the same time (see below p. 64), concentrated his efforts on these two plays. In Dindorff’s reprint (= vol. XI of Invernizzi’s edition, Leipzig 1823) Biset’s commentarii on Thesm. and Lys. add up to 73 and 105 pages respectively, whereas his other scholia barely average 10 or 12 pages per play. The additional fly-leaves he used for Thesm. and Lys. are not in Cambridge, but by a lucky chance I was able to locate them in Paris (Suppl. gr. 395), bound up (p. 85-173) in a composite manuscript which now bears the title ‘Theodoretus Philotheus’. Biset’s large and round handwriting is the same as in his autograph in Cambridge. Pages 1-84 of the same manuscript contain «scholia et castigationes in Aristophanis comœdias», a hasty and clumsy attempt to translate into Latin some of Biset’s notes on Eccl., Thesm. and Lys. The hand is quite different.

2. A handful of corrections appeared for the first time in the Geneva edition and are now ascribed to ‘Portus’ by modern editors. Biset’s copy shows where Portus got them from. Note for example Pac. 1307 (ἐμβάλλετε) and see below for Thesm. and Appendix II for Lys. and Eccl.

3. See Appendix I for a reprint of the relevant section.

4. In 1592 he left Lausanne for Germany, where he spent the rest of his life. See C. Bursian, Geschichte der classischen Philologie in Deutschland, I (München 1883) p. 232-234.
The edition also contained Florent Chrestien's unpublished notes and translations of *Vesp.* and *Lys.*, as well as a reprint of his work on *Pac.* which his son Claude had sent from Paris to Geneva to be included in the volume. Claude was horrified when he saw the mess the publishers had made. «Je n'ose vous parler de l'Aristophane», he wrote to Scaliger on 10 September 1608, «car l'ouvrage en est si laid que je ne le puis avouer pour parent. Le mal est arrivé de l'avoir envoyé hors d'icy et en ville où ils ne croyent aujourd'hui que leur teste. (Ils) ont mesprisé l'ordre que je leur avois envoyé, ont retranché plusieurs choses de mon pere, l'épistre mesme à Monsieur de Thou sur l'Irene, et y en ont mis de gens qui n'ont du tout rien contribué à l'oeuvre puis ont tellement meslé ce que je leur avois baillé qu'il semble que leur dessein ayt esté plusot de l'estoufer que de luy faire voir le jour.»

So ended this strange and sorry saga. Biset and Chrestien deserved better. To quote Bentley again: «valeant Genevenses».

**

Nicaise Helbault (c. 1535-1577), better known as ELLEBODIUS

Ellebodius originally came from Cassel in French Flanders (not far from Calais). He died of the plague, aged 42, in Pressburg (Bratislava), before completing several major works. His *Aristophanis Thesm. et Lysistrata Latine redditae cum scholiis* are now in the Ambrosian Library in Milan. Dr. Zsigmond Ritoók (Budapest) is preparing an edition, to be published under the auspices of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. From a microfilm in my possession I offer some *addenda* to Fred Schreiber's excellent article «Unpublished Renaissance Emendations of Aristophanes», *TAPhA* 105 (1975) 313-332. In a letter dated 3 January 1575

---


2. Q. Septimii Florentis Christiani *In Aristophanis Irenam vel Pacem Commentaria Glossemata* (Lutet. 1589).


Ellebodius wrote: "Io traduco adesso le Θεσμοφορίζουσαι ad verbum, et ci trovo molta dificolta". This helps to establish the sequence Biset-Ellebodius-Chrestien in rebus Aristophanicis.

Isaac CASAUBON (1559-1614)

Casaubon, a Protestant like Biset, came to England in 1610 after the murder of Henri IV. His copy of Gelenius is now in the British Library (C. 77. g. 12). His unpublished marginalia are few and far between, but include some rare gems. Some of his emendations are preceded by the abbreviation ις (?) (=ιςως).

His Notae in Equites, which form the substance of lectures he gave in 1601/2 to a circle of friends in his Paris house, were printed by Kuster in his 1710 Amsterdam edition (from a manuscript in the Bibliotheque Nationale).

Tannegui Le Fevre (1615-1672), better known as Tanaquil FABER

Faber, the father of Anne Le Fèvre, the celebrated Mme Dacier (1654-1720), was born at Caen and died at Saumur. His translation and notes on Eccl. were published during his lifetime. His copy of the 1624 Leyden edition (printed by J. Maire) is now in the Bibl. Nat. (Réserve Yb. 740) and contains numerous unpublished marginalia and corrections to the Latin translation of Andreas Divus. A note on the front page bears the indication "iterum legi coeptus e anno MDCXLVI mense Maio". But some plays he read more than twice: for Thesm. he notes "bis. ter", for Plut. "bis cum scholiis. tertium. quartum", forθ

1. Schreiber (p. 326) mistakenly lists Biset among Ellebodius' successors. As one travels back through the centuries, the πρώτος εύρετής of many an emendation turns out to be a very elusive bird indeed.

2. See Rudolf Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850 (Oxf. 1976) p. 120-122.

3. See Mark Pattison, Isaac Casaubon, 2nd ed. (Oxf. 1892) p. 44 and 483 f.


Nub. "quintum", etc. And we know that his daughter «avait pousé la passion pour Aristophane jusqu'à lire certaines de ses pièces deux cents fois avec le même plaisir»¹.

**

Richard BENTLEY (1662-1742)

«An edition of Aristophanes was the work which would have best suited the genius of Bentley: and every scholar must regret that he did not devote to this task some of the time which was passed in college squabbles, or in defending new readings of the Latin poets». So wrote Bishop Monk². Bentley's annotated copy of Gelenius is now in the British Library (676. h. 13). From it a series of «Bentleii Emendationes Ineditae in Aristophanem» was published (anonymously) by G. Burges in seven instalments in the Classical Journal 11-14 (1815-1816). In the introduction to the series³ Burges speaks of his own incuria and complains that Bentley's manus et animus are not always easy to follow: «ille enim notas nunc margini superiori, nunc inferiori, nunc inter lineas, nunc ad latus adscripsit, prout spatium charta pura praebebat». Autopsy has revealed that Burges' collation is often unreliable and incomplete. In Thesm. alone Burges misreports Bentley several times and leaves out a fair number of good suggestions, which are now attributed to later critics. For Plut. and Nub. a fuller and more accurate list was given by Bishop Monk in Museum Criticum II (1826) 126-138. Monk also published there (p. 418-456) the full text of two of the three splendid Epistulae Criticae on Plut. and Nub., which Bentley had sent to Kuster in the summer of 1708⁴. Short extracts from these were printed by Kuster at the back of his edition (1710)⁵.

---


³. CIJ 11 (1815) 132. G. Burges (1786?-1864) was a very rash textual critic, as can be seen from the «De Carminibus Aristophanis Commentarius» he published in 8 parts in CIJ 13-19 (1816-1819). James Diggle, Eur. fab. I (OCT 1984) p. vii finds his edition of Troades «perversitatis plenam».

⁴. Reprinted as letters CXXVII (24 July 1708) and CXXIX (21 August 1708) in The Correspondence (above p. 62, n. 5).

Charles DAUBUZ (1673-1717)

Daubuz was born in the province of Guienne at Nérac near Agen (now in the department of Lot-et-Garonne). Like Casaubon, he was the son of an Huguenot pastor. He came to England at the age of twelve, after the revocation of the edict of Nantes (1685). He was admitted a Sizar of Queens' College, Cambridge, in 1689, was Librarian of his College from 1693 to 1695, and obtained his M.A. in 1697. From 1699 till his death he was vicar of Brotherton in Yorkshire. His massive commentary (over 1000 pages) on the «Apocalypse» was posthumously published. His successor at Brotherton recorded that «when he had finished his book he went to consult Dr. Bentley (the then great critic of the age); but the doctor (as is supposed), thinking Mr. Daubuz would outshine him in learning, and eclipse his glory, did not encourage him to publish it. Upon which poor Mr. Daubuz returned home unhappy in mind and weary in body, sickened of pleuritic fever, and died in a few days».

Daubuz' copy of Gelenius is now in the British Library (1348. i. 1). It contains the collation of the Codex Arundelianus of Plut. and Nub. (=Ln1 in White's list), which Kuster used in his edition of 1710. It also contains a wealth of unpublished notes on all the plays. Daubuz often refers to his predecessors. His own suggestions are signed «CD» and are often followed by the letters «mg(r)» = metri gratta, like Biset's μ(έτοου) χ(άριν).

Georg KAIBEL (1850-1901)

In 1963 the late Eduard Fraenkel proudly showed me what he called «my most treasured possession»: Kaibel's lecture notes on Thesm., some

1. A Perpetual Commentary on the Revelation of St. John (Lond. 1720).
2. See the entry in Leslie Stephen's Dictionary of National Biography, XIV (1888) p. 95 f.
3. See Kuster's Preface: collationem...benevole mecum communicavit vir doctissimus et literarum harum amantissimus, Carolus Daubuz, verbi divini in Ecclesia Anglicana minister.
4. For Thesm. he refers to Crat (= the 1532 Basel edition printed by Cra-tander), Cald (=the 1607 Geneva edition, see above p. 63), Scal (=Scaliger's notes, first printed in the 1624 Leyden edition), EU (=editio ultima, the 1670 Amsterdam edition).
80 pages of detailed commentary written in German circa 1890 in an interleaved copy of v. Velsen's 1883 Leipzig edition. In 1965, when I had completed my D. Phil., he very kindly allowed me «to go fishing for pearls» in «this precious little book». Fraenkel died in 1970 and the little book is now kept in the Librarian's room in the Ashmolean.

**

Ulrich von WILAMOWITZ - MOELLENDORFF (1848-1931)

In 1964 the late Paul Maas' library came up for sale at Thornton's in Oxford and I was lucky enough to pick up for myself his interleaved copy of v. Leeuwen's 1904 Leyden edition of Thesm. Not only does it contain the draft of notes Maas had once published himself, it also preserves an interesting record of a reading class, attended also by G. Klaffenbach and J. Sykutris, and held by Wilamowitz in his Berlin house in the late 1920ies. Many of these notes are followed by «Wil»: some repeat ideas Wilamowitz had already published on the play, but the majority are new.

**

THE EARLY PRINTED EDITIONS (XVI Cent.)

Many editions were printed in the XVIth Century. Four are still referred to in Coulon's Budé apparatus:

Iuntina (1515) = the editio princeps by Eufrosyno Bonini
(Florence 1516).

---

1. Fraenkel himself refers to «Georg Kaibel in a lecture note on Ar. Thesm. 489» in his commentary on Aesch. Ag. 1081.
2. Kaibel published 3 notes on Thesm. in Hermes 22 (1887) 497-500. For his unpublished work on the fragments of Old Comedy see CGFP p. ix and PCG IV p. viii.
5. On this famous Graeca, see F. Solmsen, «Wilamowitz in his last ten years», GRBS 20 (1979) 89 ff.
7. Aristophane tome IV, texte établi par V. Coulon et traduit par H. van Daele (Paris 1929).
8. For the date see Schreiber (above p. 64) p. 320.
Veneta Ί (1538) = the Venice edition, *in aedibus Bartholomaei Zanetti*.


Between them these four editions contain some sixty correct emendations of *Thesm.*, the best and most numerous by Zanetti and Grynaeus. I have consulted the other early editions but found nothing of interest in them, except in one place (see below on l. 307). Mention should also be made here of the first translation of Aristophanes, that into Latin by Andreas Divus (Venice 1538). Although it was rightly described by Gilles Ménage as «pleine d'ignorances, et pour le Grec, et pour le Latin», it nevertheless contains, like Daléchamp's famous 1583 translation of Athenaeus, a fair number of *ad verbum* renderings, which tacitly remove for the first time an obvious corruption in the Greek text. Should Divus not be given some credit for these «Latin» emendations?

**

1 ἡρὰ πότε R (cf. Schol. πότε): ἡρὰ ποτε Biset and Faber, both anticipating Kuster (in his *Notae*, 1710), who however mistranslates *quando tandem?*, and Wellauer (*De Thesmophorii*, Vratisl. 1820, p. 51), whose *num quando?* is correct.

2 Reiske's ἀλοῶν with short υ (*Ad Eur. et Ar. Animad*v., Lips. 1754, p. 217), advocated by Maas (*Kl. Schr.* p. 54-56) and printed by Coulon, is Epic: ὅ always in Tragedy and Comedy. R's ἀλοῶν is confirmed by Schol.

---

1. For the first Basel edition (ed. Grynaeus) see above (p.67, n. 4) under *Crat* and below on l. 307.
2. Coulon is very careless in his attribution of conjectures: at lines 16, 50 and 86 he attributes to Kuster and Scaliger what belongs to Grynaeus. At 657 he credits Gelenius with a wrong conjecture the latter did not make, etc. J. F. Gannon, *Thesmophorizasuee restitutae* (Diss. Yale 1982) p. 8-15 lists some of the shortcomings of Coulon's apparatus, but his list is far from complete.
(≡Sud. α 1330) and by Phot. α 1029 = Lex. Bachm. p. 75, 26 ἀλοῶν· ἀν-τὶ τοῦ περιάγων, διί οἱ ἀλοῶντες βόες. ὦτως 'Αριστοφάνης. See further on Ar. fr. 932 K.-A. The metaphor is from threshing. «Daher scheint ἀλοῶν von den βόες, nicht von den ἐλαύνοντες τοὺς βόας gesagt zu werden. Also intransitiv = περιεῖ» Kaibel. See also Felix Solmsen, Unters. zur gr. Laut- und Verslehre (Strassb. 1901) p. 1062.

11 «Εὐρ. Bentley: om. R» notes Coulon. Bentley was anticipated by Casaubon.

18 ἀκοήν δεχοάνης R: ἀκοῆς δὲ γράφην Biset (before Scaliger). For a defence of this reading («die leichteste Änderung» Kaibel) see Kamerbeek in ΚΩΜΩΙΔΟΤΡΑΓΗΜΑΤΑ (Amst. 1967) p. 74. Kassel compares ἀκοῆς τρήματα in Diod. II 56,4. Wil. prefers Dobree's ἀκοῆί δὲ γράφην. This is possible, but Rogers's argument that «the dative ἀκοή is required as a parallel to ὦ: μὲν βλέπειν χρή two lines above» is wrong-headed: as Sandbach notes «whereas ὦ: is a dative of instrument», (quo quidem cernere oportet Divus), «ἀκοῆί would be a dative of recipient» (for the hearing Dobree Adv. II p. 237).

23 ἐξεύροιμ' R: «ἐξεύροις mit Reiske» Maas ms., but, as Sandbach points out «Euripides already knows and does not need to discover: cf. 22 you could have many such lessons from me. On the other hand the idea of discovering how to learn something is natural (cf. Soph. OT 120 ἐν γὰρ πόλλη ἀν ἐξεύροι μαθεῖν) and the elaborate phrase, suggesting an effort of search, builds up the suspense to be deflated by the ridiculous χωλός εἶναι τῷ σκέλει».

30 ἀγάθων R: the article or aspirate, here and at 95, as well as 405 (ἀδελφός R) was added by Biset (before Scaliger and Bentley). At 409 (ἀνδρεῖς R) it was added (before Dindorf) by Brunck in a ms. note in his own copy of vol. I of his 1783 Strasburg edition (Bibl. Nat. Rés. m. Yb 1).

58 áγριώτας R: Bentley's áγροι- was anticipated by an anonymous critic in the early XVIIth Century ('Anon. Par.') in the margin of his copy of the small 1600 Leyden edition (Ex officina Plantiniana, apud C. Raphelengium). This copy is full of marginalia in red and black ink and is now in the Bibl. Nat. (Rés. Yb 739).

60 «κατά supra versum add. R²» notes v. Velsen. The omission of the preposition in the Munich manuscript (Mu2) and in ed. pr., both copied from R, shows that it is a modern conjecture. It was first printed by Invernizzi in 1794 («ita liber noster» he notes, vol. II p. 431). Kuster and Brunck had suggested inserting διά, but Faber writes «puto legendum κατά τοῦ θριγκοῦ (θρ. metaphorice pro podice)». v. Leeuwen prints Blaydes' ἐς τοὺς θριγκοῦς.


74 ἐμὸν R: ἐμέ Valckenaer (ap. Dobree Adv. II p. 237), followed by Wil. and Kaibel («Die Hauptsache ist das Obiect: mir solltest du's nicht verbergen»). But ἐμέ is hardly needed after the emphatic εγώ in 72 and a good case for keeping ἐμὸν was made by C.O. Zuretti in RFIC 29 (1901) 556. For κηδεστὴν referring to Euripides cf. 210 ὁ φύλατ' ὁ κηδεστά.

83 περὶ εμοῦ R: περὶ μου Biset and Bentley (before Brunck).

86 δι' καὶ' ἄν R: διίκαια (γ') ἄν Grynaeus, «an sich sehr gut, cf. Lys. 403. Aber v. 87 schwierig: ἐκ ταύτης vielsach corrigiert. ἐκ τοῦτων Bergler unprobabel. Es muss vorher ein subst. stehen, das Noth oder Strafe bedeutet: καὶ δικαίαι ἄν πάθος Wil. ad Eur. Herc. 681 (καὶ δικαίαι γ' ἄν?), d.i. πάθησιν Kaibel, but this is very artificial, as is Rogers' «ἐπιβουλής, understood from ἐπιβεβουλεύκασι just above». Is μηχανὴ ἄν a usual phrase? «crux» notes Wil. ap. Maas. Coulon prints ἐκ τοῦτων and points out in his Essai sur la méthode de la critique conjecturale appliquée au texte d' Aristophane (Paris 1933) p. 21 that it means, not pour te tirer de là (v. Daele), but puisqu'il en est ainsi. For ἐκ τοῦτων =quaecum ita sint cf. Vesp. 346 and Aesch. Pers. 788. But why should this be corrupted here to ἐκ ταύτης? Comparing Hdt. III 152 πάσας μηχανὰς
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έπεποιήκε ες αύτους Δαρείος, Sandbach suggests ες ταύτας, against these women: «if EIC were read as EK, ταύτας would inevitably become ταύτης».


91 φανερόν R: «φανερώς Cobet¹ falsch. Wie kann jemand nicht φανερώς λέγειν εν τῇ εκκλ. (cf. 431)? Gemeint ist als der, der er ist, d.h. als Mann, also φανερόν οντα, wie das folgende zeigt» Kaibel. So also Wil. («φανερόν masc.») and Zuretti (above on 74) p. 558.

95 τί δ' εστιν R: anticipating v. Leeuwen and Wil., Kaibel notes: «Zu schreiben τί εστιν; Unterschied: wenn jemand auf etwas eingeht und nach Erklärung verlangt, sagt er τί δ' εστιν; (cf. 582) aber wer gerufen wird, fragt nach dem Grunde τί εστι; (cf. 193)». See on Lysipp. fr. 1,1 (PCG V p. 619).

96 ποιο εστίν ούτος R: ποῦ (σθ'; (Εύ.) οπού) 'στίν; ούτος Meineke (ποῦ iam Dobree), approved by both Kaibel and Wil. For the saut du même au même see Coulon Essai p. 39.

97 ή R: ή Biset (before the Leyden ed. of 1624).

99 άν R: οὖν Ellebodius (translating Divus' utique?). Bentley has «αδ' Gry(naeus)», which seems a slip for «αδ' Scal(iger)». Casaubon and 'Anon. Par.' (see above on 58) also suggested αδ' and Bergler (1760) compared Av. 226 οὖποφ μελωδείν αδ' παρασχευάζεται. Rogers, following Meineke (Vind. Ar., Lips. 1865, p.145) objected that «there the Hoopoe had, while here Agathon has not, already sung» and he prints νῦν. Several colleagues (K. Tsantsanoglou, Luigia Achillea Stella and Peter Rau) find αδ' «permissible, though not strictly logical, after the servant's song, all the more so as the same actor performs both parts» (Rau). Bergk's γάρ was anticipated by Burges in ClJ 22 (1820) 281. Kaibel found it

1. Meineke (1860) attributed the conjecture to Cobet, but I have not traced it in any of Cobet’s writings listed on p. vi of his Preface (vol. I). At 715 he likewise ascribes to Brunck a reading he should probably have claimed for himself.
«unwahrsch(einlich)». It is true that ΓΑΡ could easily have dropped out in front of ΠΑΡ (Coulon Essai p. 145, Gannon Diss. p. 88 f.), but where did άν come from? Palaeographically simpler would be my own δή (PCPhS 200, 1974, 1), which was anticipated by Syk(utris) ap. Maas. See below on 400 and for δή used with a verb Denniston Gr. Part. p. 214-216. I have also thought of restoring ίη, see there, used parenthetically, as at Men. Dysc. 910 and Theocr. 8, 26.

103 χορεύσασθαι R: -άσθε 'Anon. Par.' (see above on 58), before Daubuz, Bentley and Kuster, tripudiate Divus. Sandbach suggests taking ἵεραν in 101 with βοάν in 103 rather than with λαμπάδα in 102. For associated words placed first and last in the clause see his note on Men. Dysc. 236 τοῦτο...ποιοῦντα, to which he adds Soph. OT 1477 γνων...πά-λα, Men. Sicyon. 136 f. ζηθε...εὶς Καρίων, Phryn. ccl. 393 Fischer τοῦτο...εἰπόν, Hippocr. De liquid. 1 οτι τοῦτο...ποτόν, Polyb. III 6,10 οὐδεὶς...τὸν βαρβάρων, and especially Lucan V 242 ff. paene fideles/per tot bella manus satiatae sanguine tandem / destituere ducem, where a reciter would have to guard against his hearers associating paene and fideles. The sacred cry corresponds to the sudden voice at 127 f. and refers to the ὄλωνγμός raised by the Muses in the assembly of the gods (Av. 782 f.). The κούραι in 102 are clearly the Muses (cf. 41). On the other hand, how easily can one dissociate χθονίαιν from ίεράν (genitive of the divinity, cf. Plut. 937), and consequently ἵεραν from λαμπάδα?

107 ἀγε νῦν ὀπλίζε μοῦσα R: ἀγε νῦν ὀλβίζε μοῦσα: Fritzsche Ind. lect. Rost. 1859/60 p. 6, combining the suggestions of Bentley (ὁλβίζε) and Bergk (μοῦσα). For a defence of this reading see Fraenkel, Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes (Roma 1962) p. 111-114. But if, as is likely, the κούραι of 102 are the Muses (see on 103), the dative μοῦσα in an address to them seems to strike a false note. Wil.'s Μοῦσα (Isyll. p. 157) looks more promising. Moreover, at 103 and 115, Agathon uses the plural in addressing his chorus. Should he not do the same here and at 128? Gannon (Diss. p.92) reads ἀγε νῦν ὀλβίζετε Moûsa, which perhaps solves the problem. For ἀγε νῦν followed by a plural verb cf. 947, Ran. 383, Eccl. 268. For ἀγε νῦν (here parody of tragedy) cf. φέρε νῦν at Eur. Or. 1281. For the «irregular» ionic metron υυυ-- at the beginning of the line cf. 105. In line with this, I suggest we read ἀνακτητ' ἀγάλλετε Φοίβον in 128, with a normal ionic preceded by an iambic metron (as at 1. 120: an iambic before ionics also occurs at Alcm. PMG 50 and [Eur.] Rhes. 363 = 373).
111-113 Wil. notes «ἀοιδάς scil. ἐμαῖς, τιμαῖς scil. ἡμετέραις, γέρας scil. σὸν» and translates the first line «freue dich bei unserem schonen Gesang». So there is no need to read καλλίστας ἀοιδάς with Dobree («ordo est γέρας ἀοιδάς») or καλλίστας ἀοιδάς with Cobet Mnem. 2 (1853) 210 (with the accusative in apposition to γέρας?). Kaibel has: «ἀοιδάς miss-verstanden; auch ist nicht ἐμαῖς zu ergänzen (wie dreist und eitel!) sondern es ist einfach der Dativ zu προφέρων i.e. διαφέρων (προ = πρὸ ἄλλων)». But the meaning is not that Apollo wins the prize for the best song. Rather, as the god of music, he is naturally the first to be greeted by the Muses «with their loveliest songs» and this is «the sacred privilege he displays (προφέρων) in their fair musical celebrations».

115 ἀείσαντ' R: ἀείσατ' Zanetti: laudate Divus.

120 χρούματα τ' 'Ασιάδος R: Divus translated saltationesque Asiaticae terrae, an interpretation revived by Bothe (Lect. Ar., Berol. 1808, p. 114) and Burges CIL 14 (1816) 231f. (who both read 'Ασιδος), and by Pearson on Soph. fr. 287 ἐπίκρουμα χθονὶς Ἀργείας. But Ellebodius rightly saw that the meaning is et pulsus lyrae, as shown by l. 124. See the note in Schol. and the references given by Theodoridis on Phot. a 2956. Aristophanes borrowed the phrase 'Ασιάδος χρούματα from Euripides' Erechtheus (fr. 370 N. = 64 Au.).

127 ἡμετέρας R: ὑμετέρας Nietzsche (in 1866, see his Werke IV, München 1937, p. 32), who was the first to understand the passage correctly: «durch sie (dh. die Cithara) und in Folge eurer enthusiastischen Stimme kam Freude (φῶς Hesych. ἡ χαρά) den ὑμμασι τῶν δχ-μύνων». So also Bachmann, Conjecturarum Observationumque Aristophaneorum Spec. I, Göttingen 1878, p.120 f. and Taillardat REG 85 (1972) p. xxii f., who however keep ὑμ- (ὑμ- Meineke). Wilamowitz Isyll. p. 157, followed by Coulon REG 50 (1937) 454-458, curiously took ὑμμασιν to be the dative of agent and τα the dative of destination, not vice versa. But this is clearly impossible.


1. See also his Briefwechsel I 2 (Berlin / New York 1975) n° 526 (Nov. 1866) p. 182.
clearly means «entsprechend den Gedanken die mich bewegen» (Kaibel). Dr. Diggle quotes André Gide’s *Les Faux-Monnayeurs* (ch. 7) «mes pensées sont toujours de la couleur de mon costume». Coulon *Essai* p. 32 and Gannon *Diss.* p. 95 f. adopt Meineke’s ἄμα (<τῆς>). This is possible (TH dropping out before ΓΝ), but the article is normally omitted in this type of phrase (ἀπὸ γνώμης, ἐν γνώμηι, κατὰ γνώμη, etc.).

159 ἀλλ’ ὡς τ’ R: ἀλλως τ’ Gelenius: *praetera* Divus.


204 As Kaibel and Wil. note, R’s vulgar νυκτερείσια (from ἐρείδω *sens. obsc.*, cf. 488) has no place in Agathon’s euphemistic verse. Read νυκτερήσια (with Dobree), an adj. formed like ἡμερήσιος (Aesch. *Ag.* 22), and cf. Hom. λ 246 φιλοτήσια ἔργα. Dover and Sommerstein do not rule out an obscenity embedded in a parody for comic effect, as though the actor were instructed to mispronounce the word: «say νυκτερήσια but make it sound obscene» (Sommerstein).

217 ἂν R: ἂν Faber, anticipating Fritzsche (1838) and H. Richards, *Aristophanes and Others* (Lond. 1909) p. 43. Faber translates certe nunquam me prorsus tradere debueram. Richards compares *Eccl.* 145 ἂν μοι μὴ γενειάν κρείττον ἢν. Hamaker’s ὡς (*Mnem.* 5, 1856, 293), advocated by both Coulon, *REG* 66 (1953) 50 and Gannon *Diss.* p. 99, is unlikely: *Ran.* 955 («So you ought...») is different. But R’s ἂν = otherwise seems in order. As Sandbach points out, the meaning is: «If I refuse consent, I ought not to have put myself in a position where it is going back on my word to do so». For the text of the rest of the line see Fraenkel *Beob.* p. 115 f.

219 «τι verdächtig» Kaibel, who notes «möglich wäre ἣμῖν ξυρὸν ὡς χρῆσον», a suggestion already made by Hermann (*Opusc.* VIII p. 296). But τι can be kept if we take it to be a diffident and polite way of asking. Cf. Men *Epitr.* 381 ἔχεις κοιτίδα τινά;

223 ἀπατάτα: ἀπαταί R: ἀπαταῖ ἀπαταί Biset (before the Leyden ed. of 1624).

232 αὗ R: ei Herwerden (Anal. Crit., Traiect. ad Rh. 1868, p. 52), followed by Wil. Sommerstein notes: «Citizens who served in the army normally served not as ψιλοί but as hoplites or cavalry. Can R’s text mean It’s back to the army again for me - but this time as a ψιλός (which for an ex-hoplite would be a demotion)?».

234 σαυτόν R: σαυτόν Biset and Bentley, before Bergler (1760).

235 κλεισθένη R: Dindorf’s Κλεισθένη was anticipated by Brunck in a ms. note in the Bibl. Nat. (Suppl. gr. 354) where he writes: «edendum erat Κλεισθένη ut Lys. 1092 et infra 763».

242 πρωκτόν R: Bentley’s πρωκτόν (αὐτόν) was anticipated by Biset, but the true reading is πρωκτόν ἐτερον, as restored by Silvio M. Medaglia from the Florence Papyrus. See ZPE 57 (1984) 58.

261 τουτί λάμβαν* R: τουτί λάβ’ Daubuz (= Bentley and Kuster in notes). For the variation in tense (λάμβανε in 262) cf. Ach. 1103 f. ἐνεγχε...φέε and see Denniston on Eur. El. 888. In his text Coulon printed Reisig’s φέρ’ γυμνολον τι, but he later changed his mind (Essai p. 83): «on écrira donc avec Bergk φέρ’, γυμνολον ποў; Voyons, où y-at-il un mantelet?, d’ autant plus sûrement qu’ Agathon répond où il faut le prendre: λάμβαν’ ἀπ’ τῆς χλινίδος». This is attractive, but it is perhaps making too much of «l’accent de ce τοῦ incompréhensible».

287 f. πολλάκις μὲ σοι θύειν: Daubuz was the first to compare Eur. El. 805. See Fraenkel Beob. p. 118 f.

307 τὸν δῆμον τὸν ἄθροισθαι R: the reading τ. δ. τὸν ’Αθ. is attributed to Dindorf by modern editors, but I find it printed in Grynaeus’ 1532 Basel edition (p. 439) and in the editions of Zanetti (Venice 1538), Wechel (Paris 1540), Farreus (Venice 1542), Gryphius (Venice 1548) and Rapheleng (Leyden 1600), but not (surprising-
ly) in Grynaeus' second edition (Frankfurt 1544) nor in Gellenius (Basel 1547). And the later editions before Dindorf all have R's text.

325 ἐναλίον R: εἰν- Bentley (before Brunck).

337 Μήδοις R: Biset (before Scaliger) supplied the τ' which is now confirmed by the quotation in Satyrus' Life of Euripides (Pap. Ox. 1176, fr. 39 col. xii 14).

344 ἄν R (with scriptio plena): ἄν Faber, and this was first printed in the Amst. ed. of 1670 (long before Brunck).

347 χοὸς R and Suda χ 394. Coulon attributes the correction χω-ως to Hall-Geldart, but see Elmsley ad Acli. 1000. I now find it written by Brunck himself in the margin of his own edition (see above on 30) p. 93. For the spelling see Kühner-Blass I p. 498 and PCG IV p. 224 (on Cratin. fr. 199, 3 K.-A.).

352 ξυνευχόμεθα R: -μεσθα Daubuz, before Bothe (1808), but R's text may be right: see A.M. Dale, The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama (2nd. ed., Cambr. 1968) p. 80.

357 εξαπατώσι R: -σιν Bentley, before Bothe (1808).

365 f. In a recent note (Rev. Phil. 60, 1986, 183-186) A. Blanc and J. Taillardat follow Willems (Aristophane, II, Paris / Brux. 1919, p. 551 ff.) in keeping the text of R, but it goes without saying that we cannot have side by side the two phrases τῇς χώρας ούνεκα «pour l'amour de notre pays» and ἐπὶ βλάβης «au détriment commun», even if we try to find in τῇς χώρας «un jeu de mots dont personne ne s'est encore avisé». In the context the word can only mean «notre pays» and nothing else. That ἐπὶ βλάβης is sound is shown by l. 337, which is echoed here. This reflects official language (cf. e. g. ὀπλα...ἐπιφέρειν ἐπὶ πημονη λοι in the treaty at Thuc. V 18,4). It follows that ἐπὶ βλάβης at 360 can hardly be right. Indeed, l. 360 ought perhaps to be ejected. What is the hiatus doing at the end of the line in this string of glotonic, which include synapheia at the end of 363 and 364? I suspect that 360 originally followed 365, but got displaced when the words τῇς χώρας (arising from a gloss τῇ χώραι?) took the place of τῶν κερδῶν. The verb ἐπάγουσι is used here as at Hdt. IX 1 ἐπήγον τὰν Πέρ-
σην. For τῶν κερδῶν with the article cf. Soph. _Ant._ 1047 τοῦ κέρδους χάριν, _OT_ 388 ἐν τοῖς κερδήσεσιν. Deletion of 360 also restores a neat series of 2-line clauses (358/9 = 361/2 = 363/4 = 365/6). On the other hand, the hiatus at the end of 366 is deliberate, as the chorus pauses for breath at the climax, but (exactly like the chorus-leader at 349) cannot bring itself to curse a fellow-woman (cf. ὀπόσα in 356). So the actual curse is replaced by a lame statement of fact (cf. 670 f., 685). The slow and solemn build-up is thus effectively and ironically deflated.


394 ἀνδράσι R: -σιν Bentley and Daubuz (= Kuster).

400 ἐάν τις πλέκηι R: a syllable is missing. Kuster’s ἐάν (γε) was anticipated by Biset, Rogers’ τις (νῶν) by Faber and by Joshua Barnes (in a marginal note in his copy of Gelenius, now in the Wren library). For other suggestions see the editions of Blaydes (1880), Rogers and v. Leeuwen: add ἐὰν πλέκεσθαι τίς (πλέκηι). Willems (above on 365 f., p. 553). Coulon prints Dobree’s τις (τινα) and notes in his _Essai_ (p. 34): «Le substantif στέφανον a besoin du pronom indefini comme σκεύος dans le vers 402». But this is hardly compelling. Sommerstein favours Dobree’s other suggestion τις (καί) «if a woman so much as makes a garland - a perfectly common and innocent activity, yet it arouses suspicion». I suggest ἐάν (δή), cf. Mach. 429 G. μέγαν (δή). At 1150 below «δή ist nichts als mechanische Dittographie des folgenden αν» (Wil. _Gr. Versk._ p. 592). For the common uncial confusion of AN and ΔΗ see Porson’s _Tracts_ (Lond. 1815) p. 182, Pearson on Soph. fr. 106, Russell on Longin. 30,1 and for the sequence ἐάν δή τις cf. carm. pop. _PMG_ 848, 17 ἐάν δή τι.

443 ἐνεκ* αὐτῆ R: Bothe’s ἐνεκεν αὐτη (ed. 1, 1830) was anticipated by Biset and Faber, but this is not as good as Rogers’ (μὲν) ἐνεκ’ αὐ-
τη or Porson's palmary ἐνεκα καυτη in his review of Brunck (Maty's New Review 4, 1783, 65 = Tracts p. 30).

449 Casaubon's comment on ἡμικάκως is: «Ital. cosi cosi». For his colloquial renderings of Aeschylus see Fraenkel's Agamemnon I p. 74.


474 ἦ δι' R: ει δι' Grynaeus (1544): si duo Divus.

488 εφειδόμην R: ἦρ- Bentley (= Kuster).

495 ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους R: the article was first deleted by Biset (before Bentley).

500 ὑπ' αὐγάς οἶν έστιν R: In Le Monde Grec. Hommages à Claire Préaux (Brux. 1975) p. 186 f. I accepted Bachmann's conjecture (above on 127, p. 27) οἶν (γ') ὑπ' αὐγάς έστιν. Kaibel in Herm. 22 (1887) 498 called it «non certa». Later, in his lecture notes, he wrote: «Umstellung (Bachm.) falsch». Coulon prints Hermann's (i-deīν) ὑπ' αὐγάς οἶν (ἔστιν) (Opusc. VIII p. 300, in his review of Enger). But earlier, in his review of Fritzsche (Z. Alt. 5, 1838, 683), Hermann had suggested reading ὑπαυγάς' οἶν έστιν. This is attractive, provided we give the verb ὑπαυγάσαι the meaning not of glänzen but of looking at from under. The simple αὐγάζων is used at Soph. Phil. 217 in the active sense of seeing (όρων Schol.), and various compound forms of the verb are attested both in the active (έσ-, έν-, προσ-) and in the middle (άπ-, έπ-, κατ-) with the idea of beholding, looking at, examining, uppermost. So I take ὑπαυγάσαι to mean ίδεῖν ὑπ' αὐγάς. The scribe of R regularly splits up compound verbs and writes the preposition separately: note 186 ὑπὲρ ἀποκρίνη, 504 περί ἠρχετ', 601 σῶν ἔξευρ, 803 παρὰ βάλλουσαι, 1175 ἐπ' ἀναφύσα, 1221 κατὰ λάβοις. Hence the corruption here to ὑπ' αὐγάς. For the free use of the infinitive see Wil. on Lys. 1220.

501 μυχόν R: μοιχόν Grynaeus (1544): adulterum Divus. See above on 392 and Blaydes' critical note ad loc. for other examples of the ο/υ confusion.
512 ἓ ἕφερε R post corr.: ἓ ’φερεν Bentley (before Brunck).

533 Ἄγραυλον R: «filiam Cecropis Suid. [a 268] vocat ’Αγλαυ-

533 ρον» Daubuz, anticipating Brunck. For the spelling see L. Threat-


537 γε R: Reiske’s τε has found much favour, but not with Wil. («γε cod. recte», cf. *Kl. Schr.* IV p. 28). See also Enger’s com-

545 ώς R: ὡς Grynaeus (1544): qui Divus.

555 Bentley’s τήν (γε), advocated by Coulon (*Essai* p. 109),

was anticipated by Faber.

580 -είτε bis R: -ητε bis Biset (= Portus).

594 οἶμοι γωγ’ R: οἶμαι ’γωγ’ ’Anon. Par.’ (see above on 58),

before Bentley.

596 πεπύσμην R: ’πεπ- Faber, before Bentley.

632 τί δὲ τρίτον R: τί δ’ αὖ τρίτον Bentley (his τί δαί refers to the

previous line, as Rogers rightly points out. Burges’s transcript is

misleading): τί δαί Elmsley (ad *Ach.* 105). Coulon printed this in

his edition, but changed his mind in his *Essai* (p. 110): «Il faut gar-

der le δὲ après celui du v. 631», and he there follows Enger in filling

up the line by adding σῦ at the end of the first sentence (cf. 615 πολύν

γε χρόνον οὗρεῖς σῦ, *Pac.* 847 πόθεν δ* έλαζες ταύτας σὺ;). A simpler so-

lution would be to transpose the three words, τρίτον δὲ τί; For

the word order cf. *Nub.* 201 τοῦτι δὲ τί; 1186 νοεί δὲ τί; *Ran.* 630 λέγεις

dὲ τί;

653 οἶχεται R: οἶχησεται Faber (before Bentley).

657 εἰσελήλυθεν R: «legendum εἰσελήλυθε vel εἰσῆλθεν» Faber.

εἰσελ- anticipates Bentley and Kuster (for Coulon’s wrong attribu-
tion see p. 69, note 2), εἰσηλθεν was also suggested by Biset and Daubuz (before Elmsley ad Ach. 42). ες is not used before a vowel in comedy (see my note in CLR 87, 1973, 133) and εις too is the wrong preposition here. «Es kann nicht verstanden werden ες το Ιερ αν. Denn erstlich sind sie nicht drinnen, zweitens aber wollen sie ihn auch draussen suchen» Kaibel, who finds Fritzsche’s ἐνελήλυθε «sehr wahrscheinlich». Rogers called it «a very infelicitous alteration, since the question is not who has ascended the hill on which the Temple stood, which anybody might do», but this is not a valid objection, cf. e. g. 585. Another solution, which is palaeographically simpler, is Handley’s ἐπελήλυθε used in a hostile sense, has come against us. In certain uncial scripts Π and IC are very easily confused.


662 ὑφή R: Bentley’s ὑφὴ is out of line with ὑφή at 655, 659 and 660. Porson’s ὑφή is better, but somewhat peremptory. I prefer ὑφὴ (μ’), the chorus-leader taking the initiative in the search. And τῆν πρώτην does not have to be taken adverbially, like πρώτιστα at 659. It can agree with (μ’): cf. 603 τοις ἓ πρώτη τί; Lys. 207 πρώτην μ’.

666 Kaibel’s supplement καὶ τὰ τῇδε καὶ τὰ κεῖσε καὶ τὸ δεύρο neatly restores not only the triple sequence we find at A v. 425 καὶ τὸ τῇδε καὶ τὸ κεῖσε καὶ τὸ δεύρο, but also the proper metrical response in this little trochaic system. We now have two short stanzas consisting of two dimeters, one monometer and one catalectic dimeter each.


741 δέκα R: (καὶ) δέκα Biset (= Portus).

768 «οὐ φαίνετ’, οὐπω so interpungirt, gut. Damit das Ausspähen geschildert» Kaibel (οὐ φαίνεται τὸ Dobree).
771-2 Coulon, following Wil. *Kl. Schr.* IV p. 556, brackets the words ἀλλ' οὖ πάρεισιν αἰ πλάταια and the second πόθεν and conflates the two lines into one:

ρίψω γράφουν, πόθεν οὖν γένοιντ' ἂν μοι πλάταια;

with the note «verba cancellis saepta om. S» (= Suda π 45). But, as Gannon points out (*Diss.* p. 121), the quotation there is interrupted by a longish comment and it is not clear that any omission was intended. Kaibel's paraphrase shows that the bracketed words are genuine: «αἰ πλάταια, die in der Tragödie vorkommenden. Daher auch πάρεισιν, sie existiren zwar, sind aber nicht hier. Wenn nun keine πλάταια da sind, so fragt er natürlich wo kriege ich welche her? Denn der Gedanke dass es πλάταια nicht nothwendig zu sein brauchen, kommt ihm noch nicht, erst mit τί δ' ἂν κτλ.» The correction γένοιντ' ἂν (Grynaeus 1544, cf. *fierent* Divus) gets some support from Suda's corrupt γ' έκείντό (γένοιτ' ἂν R). In 772 fin. Biset has πόθεν; (σχό-πει). In his *scholia* he had suggested πόθεν; (πλάται:). Sandbach's (πλάταια) πόθεν; is a neat improvement on this and would account for the omission. Scaliger's πόθεν; (πόθεν;) is not very convincing, as we hardly need a triple repetition. Alternatively read πόθεν; (φέρε,), cf. 768. For φέρε followed by a question see also *Nub*. 769 φέρε, τί δήτ', εί... , *Plut.* 131 f. φέρε, τί δήτ', εί... ; *Eur.* *Hel.* 1043 φέρε, τί δ', εί... ;

773 εῖτα διὰ R: ταξι Sud. π 45: εἰ ταξί Biset and Ellebodius (before Scaliger).

776-7 «Der Hiatus ὁ χεῖρες ἔμαι, ἐγχειρεῖν ist echt, ein Kniff des Euripides, um den Anruf der χεῖρες wirksamer abzuheben. cf. 1065 (= Eur. *Androm.* fr. 114 N.) ὁ νῦς τερά, ὡς μαχρὸν ἱππεῦμα διόκες, wo unnütz emendirt wird» Kaibel. We then have another deliberate hiatus in the next line after χρῆ (see above on 662 and cf. 784) and again after πορίμωι. These three «hiatus falsa ab editoribus deleti» (G. Lange, *Quaest. in Ar. Thesm.*, Diss. Gott. 1891, p. 20) produce a nice *reductio ad absurdum* as Aristophanes makes fun of Euripides' metrical trick. Dover and Rau object to the second hiatus. «Possis transponere ἐργωτ' χρῆ» noted Blaydes, approved by Dover: «corruption caused by bringing noun and adjective together is common.»

783 καθόδους R: καθ' ὀδοὺς Biset (= Portus).
784 ταύτα R: ταύται; Grynaeus (1544): hac Divus.

789 ει και κακόν R: ει κακόν Zanetti: si malum Divus.

797 ζητεῖ τὸ κακόν τεθεάσθαι R, def. Wil. ap. Maas with reference to Gr. Versk. p. 349 for the use of the perfect infinitive. Cf. also δέδορκα, τεθαύμακα, Kühner-Gerth I p. 148f. And the singular ζητεῖ is perfectly in place in between ζητεῖ in 796 and πᾶς ἐπιθυμεῖ in 798. Sandbach suggests ζητεῖ τὸ κακόν γε θεάσθαι with the γε added, like τοῦτο in 796, «to introduce variety in the string of 5 repetitions of τὸ κακόν, this κακόν of yours, your κακόν». But this is perhaps less likely. Bishop Kaye’s τὸ κακόν ζητεῖτε θεάσθαι, which was formerly «universally accepted» (Rogers), leaves it unclear whether Aristophanes himself would have intended ζητεῖτε θεάσθαι or ζητεῖ τεθαύμακα: written in uncial ZHTEITEΘΕΑΣΘΑΙ is ambiguous.

804 δηλαδή τ’ ἀργα R: δηλα δὲ τάργα Biset (= Portus): manifesta quidem sunt facta Divus.

805 χείρων R: χείρων Zanetti: pejor Divus.

815 ποθοῦντας R: ποθοῦντας Zanetti: facientes Divus.

825 ἀπόλωλε R: -λεν Bentley and Daubuz (before Brunck).

839 δὲ πόλεις R: δὲ πόλεις Gelenius: o civitas Divus.

842 ἡν χρήν R: ἢν χρήν Scaliger: cui oportebat Divus.

852 ἡ τί R and Sud. x 2534: «dele istud ἡ» Faber (before Bentley).


943 ἐδοξεῖν R: -ε Biset (before Scaliger).

945 ιαππαπαιάξ R: ιατταταιάξ Biset (before Bentley). Ellebodius notes «σχετλίασμός: attamen initio Equitum scriptum est ἱατταταιάξ». 
947 ταῖς R: ταῖσι Daubuz (= Bentley).

952 μέλειν R: μέλειν Zanetti: curae esse Divus. Casaubon curiously suggests μολεῖν, «ut crebra sibi redeant celebrata ipsa or­ gia», and so also 'Anon. Par.' (see above on 58).

966 ἀλλὰ χρῆ (σ') Maas ms., but Wil. rightly keeps R's χρῆ (cf. 958, and see above on 622 and 777). The hiatus marks the sudden break. The order is addressed to the whole chorus. As Laetitia Edwards suggests, following Enger, the little stanza 966-968 does not actually correspond with 959-962 = 963-965, but is best taken on its own. Enger interpreted the whole chorus as follows: 953-958 proode, 959-962 = 963-965 strophic pair; 966-968 mesode, 969-976 = 977-984 strophic pair; 985-989 mesode, 990-994 = 995-1000 strophic pair. 
«ut tria sunt in hoc carmine saltationis genera, ita tres strophae, quau­ rum unamquamque praeedid proodus, qua ad novum se convertere saltationis genus chorus iubetur» Enger (1844 p. 159).

967 ὠσπέρ ἐργὸν αὖ τι καυνόν R: read ὡς πρὸς ἐργὸν αὖ τι καυνόν (ὡς ἐπ' Enger, but πρὸς is preferable, cf. Pac. 555, Av. 1450, Thesm. 586, Ran. 884). The ἐργὸν καυνόν is the celebration of the gods (cf. 961 f.), as rightly explained by Schol. ἐπειδὴ μέλλουσιν ἔλθειν εἰς τὴν ὧδην. Ole Thomsen, Class. et Med., Diss. ix (1973) p. 30 fails to see that αὖ here does not mean again but simply «marks transition to a fresh item» (MacDowell on Vesp. 28): cf. ἐτερον αὖ at 459, ἔλλος αὖ at 664.

968 Thomsen (see on 967) rightly takes πρῶτον to mean «before we start extolling the Olympians», but wrongly thinks (p. 31) that στῆσαι βάσιν means the same as ἱστᾶσαι χρόν. So also Burton, Pindar's Pyth. Odes (Oxf. 1962) p. 94 «we should first have begun...». But, as Rogers and v. Leeuwen saw, the phrase here must mean sis­ tere gradum, cf. Eur. Bacch. 647 στῆσον πόδα, Soph. Trach. 339 ἐφι­ στασαί βάσιν (Schol. ἱσταίς καὶ κωλύεις). The «graceful step of the beautiful round dance», which started at 953, is halted here for a mo­ ment, «since we are proceeding now to a new task», and resumes at 969 with the celebration of the gods Apollo, Artemis, Hera, Hermes, Pan and the Nymphs, and later changes direction at 985 with the call to Bacchus to lead the way.
Textual Problems in Ar. Thesm.


1001 οἰμῶξε: R: Bentley has οἰμῶξε (not - ξι as reported by Burgess. οἰμῶξε was first suggested by Brunck).

1005 At the end of the line R has τατταταί: ιατταταί Faber (before Bentley). Cf. 223.


1013 δῆλον οὖν ἐσθ' ὅτι R: a syllable is missing. Biset's new <νῦν> ἐσθ' is probably as good as Dobree's <τοῦτ> ἐσθ' which is adopted by all modern editors. For the sequence οὖν νῦν cf. A. v. 1076.

1017 λάβομι R: λάθομι Ellebodius and Casaubon (before Bentley).


1041 φεύγουσαν R: χέουσαν fundentem fletus Casaubon, anticipating Kaibel (who compared Aesch. Cho. 449), Rogers (who compared Eur. Suppl. 773) and Peter Rau (Paratragodia, München 1967, p. 75139, who suggests χέουσα and refers to both passages).

1047 ἁνετικτε R: ἁτεγχτε Biset and Ellebodius, ἁτεγχτε Casaubon, hitting the nail on the head before Wil. Kl. Schr. IV p. 4851.

1052 λεύσεν R: λέσοσεν Biset (= Portus).

1061 καί αὐτή R: καυτή Biset (= Portus). Scriptio plena (cf. 344, also 747).

1070 περὶ ἄλλα R: περὶ αλλα Biset and Ellebodius (who paraphrases ἐξόχως, ύπερβολικῶς and refers to Soph. OT 1218 and Theocr. 12,28).

1086 πωτε το πωνη R post corr.: «πῶτε, das ω nur dem Metrum zu Liebe» Kaibel. πότε (= πόθεν) τή ποονή Wil. (= Blaydes 1880).

1101 ναυτολῶν R: ναυστολῶν Biset and Ellebodius: navigans Divus.
1114 μητι R: μη τι Biset: nunquid Divus.

1115 δεύρο δεύρο R: δεύρο Biset and Faber (before Bentley). Ellebodius too called the second δεύρο «supervacaneum».

1119 τω πρωκτω R: το πρωκτο Biset (= Portus).

1124 έξοπισθο R: έξοπιστο Daubuz (before Brunck).

1129 αν δεξιατο R: αν αποδ- Biset, not as good as Kuster’s αν ένδ-

1132 τοτο πρέπουσαν R: τοτων πρ- Zanetti: huic conveniens Divus.

1133 επιτηκιζει R: -ζι 'Anon. Par.' (see above on 58) and Bentley (before Blaydes).

1181 άνωθεν (R) has often been suspected: see Blaydes and Maas Kl. Schr. p. 180. Willems (above on 365 f.) p. 579 kept it and understood «par en haut, c’est-à-dire en le passant par-dessus la tête», and so also Kaibel («man muss sich vorstellen, dass sie sich das Uebergewand über den Kopf abzieht... so geht’s rascher») and Wil. («er nimmt ihr das Gewand von oben herunter»).

1198 κομιζεις R: κομιεις Biset (before the Leyden ed. of 1624). Wil. follows Bothe (1830) in reading (Ευ.) επετη κομιεις αυθις (αυθις iam Faber, αυτις 'Anon. Par.' before Dobree).

1231 ανταδοίτων R: ανταπο- Grynaeus (1544), followed by Bentley (error in Burges): ανταποδοίτην Daubuz, who also notes «ανταπο- δοίτων ut apud Eur. Med. 1073 ευδαιμονοίτων» (see Page ad loc.).
APPENDIX I: Biset’s Aristophanes.

(Extract from the Latin Preface of Portus: see above p. 63).

Ante aliquot annos accidit, ut nobilis quidam Gallus qui se (ea fuit viventis modestia) non fuisset passus nominari, Lausanna iter faciens, ut longius progredertur, ibi dies nonnullus sibi obiter te-rendos putari, ut quorundam veterum amicorum precibus ac votis indulgeret. Eius enim conspectus et praesentia, cum ob morum sua-vitatem ac insignem vitae probitatem, tum quia nec ἀμοῦσος nec ἀ-παίδευτος inter doctos habebatur, omnibus longe gratissima erat. Quoniam autem ipsum in primis linguæ Graecæ et amantissimum et studiosissimum ab omnibus amicis praedicari intellexeram, ego, qui sum φιλέλλην, φιλόμουσος καὶ φιλομαθῆς, summo desiderio ami-citiaque familiaritatis cum tanto viro contrahendae flagrare coe-pi. Quod non admodum difficile fuit, siquidem ambo συμπαθείαes qua-dam affecti bonas literas amore pari prosequebamus. Non multo post, cum in amici communis aedibus una pranderemus, inter familiaria variis de rebus co-loquia, ut est moris, sermo factus est de Poetis Graecis. Tunc ille summis laudibus Aristophanem evehere, tum ob ingenii acumen et festivitatem, tum quod in eo praecipue linguæ proprietas et Atticus lepos ubique eluceret. Addebat illius lectione (qua vel maximum illud Theologorum lumen Iohannem Chrysostomum olim delectatum ferunt) se quoque mirificè delectari, et illius fre-quenti repetitione multa, quae in vulgatis exemplaribus depravata leguntur, emendasse. Multa in antiquis scholiis aut omissa aut ne-gligeniis tractata explicasse ac illustrasse. Quin etiam in duas pos-

1. On his way to Basel, where his father had taken refuge (see above p. 62)?
2. cf. Gilles Ménage (above p. 69, n. 3) p. 48: «l’Auteur le plus ancien qui ait fait mention de cet Amour de St. Jean Chrysostome pour les Comédies d’Aristophane, c’est Alde Manuce dans sa Dédicace des Oeuvres de ce Comique à Daniel Clarius [see W. Suess, Aristophanes und die Nachwelt, Leipzig 1911, p. 22 and 50]: si ce n’est qu’on voulût interpréter de St. Jean Chrysostome, ce qui est dit dans le Roman d’Achillés Tatius qu’un certain Prêtre, qui étoit fort éloquent, étoit imitateur d’Aristophane» (=Ar. test. 73 K.-A.).
tremas Comoedias\(^1\), quae ad hoc usque tempus nudae in lucem pro-
dierant, iustos et accuratos commentarios ad reliquarum normam
iam pridem construxisse. Horum ut fidem faceret Aristophanem a
famulo in medium afferri iussit, in cuius margine multa manu anno-
tata, multa diversis foliis seorsum, et passim, ut tumultuarie inter
legendum sese obtulerant, descripta extabant. Cum autem haec ocu-
lis raptim pro temporis exiguitate percurrissem, statim animadver-
ti iuventutem linguae Graecae studiosam, non parvam utilitatem,
doctiores vero non leevm voluptatem inde percepturos. Illum igitur
oravi ut haec mihi per otium accuratos legcnda ac perpendenda per-
mitteret. At is recusare et negare dignam esse rem quae in hominum
conspectum veniret, quod haec, dum esset iunior, animi gratia utque
Aristophanem sibi familiariorum ac notiorem redderet, sibi soli ceu
quoddam Atticae linguae penum parasset. Scopas esse dissolutas,
ali quando forasse melius colligandas, ac proinde intra bibliothecae
claustra continendas. Multa alia huiusmodi afferebat. Tandem ta-
men meae et amicorum qui tum aderant sententiae precibus ac-
dens, «Imo», inquit, «mi Porte, fac ut lubet: quicquid id est, hoc tuo
arbitrio et censurae committo. Si ex his levioribus magis aliquid in
commune literatorum commodum putas accessurum, tibique tan-
tum superest otii, ut tua lima expolire et exornare, atque adeo in-
hoatum opus absolvire et velis et possis, esto, per me licet, in lucem
etiam haec, qualiacunque tandem futura sunt, emittas, ea tamen le-
ge, ut nomini parcas»....Quid multis opus? Accepta ego conditione
domum reversus operi manum admovere coepi, diligentius singula
perpendens et in ordinem redigens. Hoc certe ingenue fatebor me in
his Aristophanicis observationibus sexcentos locos, qui ante aut de-
pravati aut minus perspicui erant, summo cum iudicio et incredibili
dexteritate ac felicitate correctos invenisse.

\(^1\) i. e. Thesm. and Lys., which were always printed last and without scholia
APPENDIX II: Lys. and Eccl.

Lysistrata. I offer here a very provisional list of Addenda and Corrigenda to Jeffrey Henderson's Coni. in Ar. Lys. Repertorium (HSCPPh 82, 1978, 87-119) and Apparatus to his recent edition of the play (Oxf. 1987).

Biset anticipates the proposals of the following scholars (in chronological order):

Ellebodius: 113 (εγώ δέ γ' ἀν).
Florent Chrestien: 83 (χρήμα τιτθίων), 94 (τό), 466 (ἐξάν γε).
Portus: 157 (ἀφιώσ'), 1214 (προαγορεύω), 1244, 1249 and 1253 (the Doric endings in -ως).
Scaliger: 141 (τὸ πρᾶγμα σωσάμεθ' ἔτι, = Mu2), 245 (ἐκλαισι'), 1216 (παραγορεῖν οὗ θέλεισ).

Bentley: 237 (συνεπόμνυμθ'), 377 (λουτρόν γ' ἐγώ: this also Daubuz), 429 (ἐντεύθεν δ* ἐγώ), 565 (δύνασθ' ὑμείς: this also Daubuz), 888 (δή 'σθ' ἃ: this also Casaubon).
Kuster: 240 (τοῦτ...οὐγώ, «hoc est τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο δ ἐγώ ἔλεγον»).
Bergler: 118 (ἡπα).
Brunck: 116 (παραταμοῦσα), 244 (κατάλιφ').
Reisig: 740 (τούτο συ).
Dindorf: 357 (τύπτοντ' ἐχρῆν: this also Casaubon).
Bergk: 1081 (παντάι, cf. 1096).

Casaubon and Faber anticipate Tyrwhitt at 144 (μάν'), Faber anticipates Bentley at 281 (ὁμώς) and 565 (ὑμῖν δυνατόν).

Daubuz has the same suggestions as Bentley at 64 (θοῦκάτει- 

on ἦρετο: «id est uxor Theagenis consuluit 'Εκάτης ἄγαλμα antequam veniret. salse inridet uxorem ipsam pro marito qui valde fuit superstitosus ut testatur Suidas [Θ 80]», 94 (μύσιδδέ τοι), 377 and 565 (see above under Biset), 1246 (ὑμίς ὕρων). He anticipates Kuster at 851 («del. τήν»), Maittaire at 986 (ἐγωγα), Porson at 519 (ἀν ἐ-
φασκ', εί), 551 (τε)1) and 705 (λαβών τις ύμας), and Bothe at 1190 (έστι μοι). At 230 f. he has a long note: «Interpretes non videntur veram mentem horum versuum cepisse. allsum enim est ad duas Veneris figuras, quibus mulieres cum viris coeunt. Illae enim resupinae et adversae, hae pronae et aversae petuntur. κύβδα, τετραποδηδόν, ἀπδ γονατίου dixit Lucian. Asin. [10]. Hinc quoque explicandus Martialis lib. X ep. 81, 4 ille pedem sustulit, hic tunicam, Publ. Syrus apud Petron. [55, 6, 11] tollat pedes indomita in strato extraneo, Cicero Ad Att. lib. II ep. 1, 5 [=21 S. B.] 'at ego' inquit 'noveus patronus instituam. sed soror, quae tantum habeat consularis loci, unum mihi somum pedem dat.' 'noli' inquam 'de uno pede sororis queri; licet etiam alterum tollas'. 'non consulare' inquies 'dictum.' fateor; sed ego illum odi male consularem». And for good measure the learned vicar adds at the foot of the page: «E Martialis Epigr. 28 lib. II sex fuisse turpium rerum modos intelligas. 1 Paedicari vel cinaedium esse (περαίνεσθαι), 2 Paedicare (περαίνειν), 3 Futuere (βινείν), 4 Irrumare (λεσβιάζειν), 5 Fellare (φοινικίζειν), 6 Masturbari (δέφεσθαι) »2.

Ecclesiazusae.

BISET anticipates Portus at 490 (ἄρμωμεθ') and 887 (θραίς ἀντάσσομαι), Faber at 836 (ὑμῖν), Bentley at 34 (θρυγανώσα) and 794 (μή ἵνα). Ussher's recent edition (Oxf. 1973) is not very reliable. At 23 he attributes to Coulon what belongs to A. Palmer (κώλα θίζομένας, see The Quarterly Review 158, 1884, 371), at 64 to Bergk what had already been proposed by Boissonade (Ar. t. IV, Par. 1829, p. 254: see Coulon Essai p. 106), etc.3

1. Henderson says Bothe (1808), but Porson's notae, though first published in 1820, were jotted down in his copy of Gelenius (now in the Wren library: Adv. a. 3. 1) «anno circiter 1782» (Dobree p. ii of Porson's Aristophanic). 2. He does'nt get it quite right about 4 and 5: see Housman as quoted by H. D. Jocelyn in PCPhS 206 (1980) 37. 3. See also N. G. Wilson in CLR 90 (1976) 14 who notes that «as far as the app. crit. is concerned this edition takes a significant step backwards ... everything important is submerged under a huge mass of trivialities». 
Ecclesiazusae.
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2. He doesn't get it quite right about 4 and 5: see Housman as quoted by H. D. Jocelyn in PCPhS 206 (1980) 37.

3. See also N. G. Wilson in CIR 90 (1976) 14 who notes that «as far as the app. crit. is concerned this edition takes a significant step backwards ... everything important is submerged under a huge mass of trivialities». 
Further evidence about the Biset family has now emerged from a Basel document dated 8 November 1585 (Burgerbuch D4 fo. 63 b.). I am extremely grateful to Professor Leonard Forster who kindly located it for me in the Staatsarchiv and provided me with a transcript. It states inter alia that «des le vingt cinquiesme jour du mois d'octobre dernier passé Genereulx Edoard Biset Gentilhomme Champanois seroit comparu par devant nous declarant que pour obéir au commandement du Roy de France son souuerain seigneur porte par son Edict dudict mois d'octobre Il soit party du village de Charley ou Il faisoyt sa residence distant de la ville de Troye d'enuiron une Lieue & seroit venu avec sa femme & famille en ce pays, Nous suppliant tresinstamment luy vouloir permettre d'habiter et resider aupres de nous en ceste ville Ce que luy auons accorde Le receuant pour nostre habitant....». Professor Forster further confirms 1594 as the date of Biset’s death. He writes: «It was a plague year in Basel. The chief medical officer of the city, Professor Felix Platter, a famous man in his day, wrote a report on it. In this he notes that ‘der Bise-tus’ died in August, but that his servant girl (‘des herr Biseti magt’) recovered. (Felix Platter, Beschreibung der Stadt Basel und Pestbericht, ed. Valentin Lötscher, Basel 1987, =Basler Chroniken Bd. 11). After his death Biset’s widow felt the need to become a citizen of Basel in her own right. She was granted citizenship on 3 May 1596: ‘frouw Maria Bartholme von Paris, herrn Biset von Troy seligen wittib’».

The question now arises: which Biset was granted citizenship in the Basel attestation? The father, according to E. and E. Haag (above p. 62, n.2), who drew a distinction between ‘Odoard de Troyes’ and his son ‘Odoard sr du Charloys’. But since Charley (variously spelt Charlai, Charlais, Charlay) is described as «environ une lieue» from Troyes, I am not so sure. The dates given here fit in very well with Portus’ account of the younger Biset (see above p. 63) and in his Latin Preface the nobilis Gallus is no longer alive at the time of writing (ea fuil viventis modestia). Only one Odoard Biset
is listed in the new IBN (*Index Bio-Bibliographicus Notorum Hominum*, Pars C. 1. vol. 18, Osnabrück 1980, p. 8296): the references given there have telescoped the two.

C.A.