

UNPUBLISHED RENAISSANCE EMENDATIONS OF ARISTOPHANES

FRED SCHREIBER

Herbert Lehman College

"Nicasium Ellebodium ab adspectu numquam novi, optime a nomine." Justus Lipsius¹

For those who have kept abreast with developments in the textual tradition of Aristotle's *Poetics* the name of Nicasius Ellebodius will not be totally unfamiliar. R. Kassel, the editor of the Oxford text of the *Poetics* (1965), tells us² how he became intrigued by B. Weinberg's allusion to a MS in the Ambrosian Library in Milan containing *notae* by the nearly forgotten sixteenth-century humanist, Nicasius Ellebodius, which suggest "numerous improvements of the Greek text" of Aristotle's *Poetics*.³ This led Kassel to consult the MS (Cod. Ambr. R 123 sup.), in which he discovered among Ellebodius' *notae* numerous valuable emendations which anticipated the proposals of more recent scholars, and which have been adopted in most modern editions. While collecting material for my own forthcoming critical bibliography of Aristophanes, I found in P. O. Kristeller's *Iter Italicum* I (London and Leiden 1963) 322-23 mention of Ambrosian MSS containing unpublished Latin versions "cum scholiis" of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Lysistrata* by that same Ellebodius. Kristeller's description made it clear, furthermore, that the "scholia" in question were Ellebodius' own glosses. Therefore, in view of Kassel's valuable discovery, I felt justified in finding the phrase "cum scholiis" full of promise. Upon consulting the appropriate MSS I found that a large proportion of Ellebodius' scholia indeed consisted of textual emendations. After closer examination

¹ In a letter to Andreas Dudithius, written in 1584 (Justi Lipsi *Epistolarum selectarum centuria prima miscellanea* [Antverpiae 1605] 110).

² "Unbeachtete Renaissance-Emendationen zur aristotelischen Poetik," *RhM* 105 (1962) 111.

³ B. Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago 1961) 520.

I became convinced that these emendations warranted, in the apparatus of the two Aristophanic comedies, revisions even more substantial than those effected in that of the *Poetics* by Kassel's discovery. Here again, not only has Ellebodius often anticipated his successors by proposing emendations which have since made their way into modern editions, but also in numerous instances his conjectures have received subsequent confirmation from MS authorities. Furthermore, a few of his emendations are still totally original (since they have never been duplicated) and deserve our most serious consideration.

I

There is no need here to relate at great length the facts about the life and works of Ellebodius. Since Weinberg's discovery there has grown an ever-increasing interest concerning this neglected Renaissance humanist, beginning with Kassel's Aristotelian researches and culminating in a recent specialized bio-bibliographical monograph.⁴ It may be useful, however, to review the essential facts briefly.

Nicasius Ellebodius (Nicaise Helbault, Van Ellebaudt or Ellebode) was born c. 1535 in Cassel (French Flanders). He studied philosophy at Padua, where his love for Greek literature was inspired in him by his teacher and friend, Michael Sophianos.⁵ In 1565 Ellebodius produced his major published work, the *editio princeps* of Nemesius' *Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*.⁶ His interests then turned towards medicine. As a medical student, at Padua, he lived in the home of one of his patrons, the patrician Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535-1601), to whose fabulous library scholars congregated from all over Europe. In Pinelli's house, as well as on his travels, Ellebodius formed friendships with some of the most illustrious *literati* of the day. These included churchmen (Cardinal de Granvelle, Bishop Stephan Radéczi), philologists and scientists (Carolus Clusius, Andreas Dudithius, Dionysius Lambinus, Paulus Manutius, Hieronymus Mercurialis, Antonius

⁴ D. Wagner, *Zur Biographie des Nicasius Ellebodius* (†1577) und zu seinen "Notae" zu den aristotelischen *Magna Moralia* (Heidelberg 1973); hereafter, Wagner. See also T. Klaniczay, "Nicasius Ellebodius és Poétikája," *Reneszánsz-Füzetek* 10 (1971) 24-34.

⁵ On Sophianos, see E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique* 2 (Paris 1885) 168-76; cf. also below, page 328.

⁶ For a complete list of Ellebodius' publications, see Wagner 24-27.

Riccobonus, Johannes Sambucus, Carolus Sigonius, Petrus Victorius, et al.). In 1571 he received an invitation from his other patron, Stephan Radéczi, Bishop of Eger, to come to Hungary. In May of the same year Ellebodius arrived in Pressburg (i.e., Bratislava), where he lived until he fell victim to the plague, on June 4, 1577.

Ellebodius' untimely death left several of his works, which were intended for publication, in manuscript form. These are now gradually being evaluated and (when their contents warrant) published.⁷ Among these unpublished documents are the annotated Latin versions of Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Lysistrata*,⁸ which occupied Ellebodius during the last three years of his life. In his dedicatory preface to Pinelli he states that his attention turned to Aristophanes in Eperies (i.e., Prešov), to which he had accompanied Radéczi who was discharging his duties as newly-appointed Governor of Hungary:

Cum venissem Epirias, quae est civitas in Jazygum et Sarmatanum sita confinio, in comitatu amplissimi viri Stephani Radecii episcopi Agriensis, quod illi solemne est iter ad minuendas controversias earum dioecesium, et provocationes disceptandas pro eo quod regium tuetur locum in Hungaria; neque in gravioribus studiis operam curamque ponere poteram: et quod a libris meis aberam, et quod anni tempore calidissimo conclusus intra vallium anfractus solis vapor seseque constipans, vix animam nos ducere patiebatur; et nihil tamen agere inertissimae segnitiae ducebam. itaque converti me ad Aristophanem, quem in paucis mecum attuleram.⁹

His *modus operandi* was first to translate the two comedies literally into Latin, and then to add notes to explain the more obscure passages:

ad verbum de graeco in latinum sermonem converti, ut iis prodessem qui minus illi quidem graece intelligunt, ad cognitionem tamen graecarum

⁷ Cf. D. Donnet, "Une Préface grecque inédite de l'humaniste Nicaise van Ellebode," *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 21 (1972) 189-95 (this consists of the preface to Ellebodius' projected edition of the Syntax of Michael Synkellos: I thank Professor Walther Ludwig for making this article available to me). Wagner also announces (page 36, note 129a) his forthcoming work on Ellebodius' Latin version with *notae* of Aristotle's *Magna Moralia*.

⁸ Although it has become standard to print these two comedies in the order *Lys.*, *Thesm.*, Ellebodius followed the reverse order, which was traditional until the last century; to avoid confusion I deal with the two plays in the sequence followed by Ellebodius.

⁹ Cod. Ambr. D 478 inf., fol. 1^r. The date of Ellebodius' stay at Eperies is firmly established by a letter which he sent from there to Pinelli on June 14, 1574 (Cod. Ambr. D 196 inf., epist. 64). Cf. also Wagner 21.

litterarum adspirant. Adscripsi praeterea pauca quaedam . . . ad confragosa . . . loca, quae legentis iter vel strennui et expediti tardare posse suspicabar.¹⁰

Since his scrupulous *ad verbum* translation forced him to examine carefully the exact meaning of each Greek word, whenever he encountered difficulties or ambiguities he communicated his questions (or emendations) to Pinelli. The first such communication is dated January 3, 1575: "Io traduco adesso le Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι ad verbum, et ci trovo molta difficulta, de quibus alias."¹¹ After this date the letters in which Ellebodius discusses his "dubii" concerning the Greek text become more and more abundant. Through them we learn that his original intention had been to publish the Greek text along with his translations and scholia; in fact, he postponed publication to allow Pinelli time to locate ancient MS authority which could shed light on the numerous textual difficulties: "Differisco l'editione d'Aristofane per fino a tanto che V.S. m'aggiunti con testi antichi . . . non mi piace di darlo fuori in Latino ma piu presto in Greco."¹² But by late January 1577 he must have received a negative report from his patron for he resigns himself "mettere l'ultima mano ad Aristofane,"¹³ and to publish the Latin translations only with his scholia based on the Greek text:

Non enim graece edimus Aristophanem, ut omnia vel minima librariorum errata corrigere, aut versus quosque ad suos numeros revocare, aut notas omnes figurasque comicas apponere debuerimus; quae omnia sine veterum librorum auxilio recte fieri posse nego: sed hoc unum nobis fuit propositum, ut interpretatione sententiae, et apta personarum interloquentium descriptione, quantum in nobis esset, viam sterneremus hominibus studiosis ad commodiorem harum comoediarum intelligentiam (dedication, fol. 1^r).

Ellebodius' annotated translations of *Thesm.* and *Lys.* are found in three Ambrosian MSS:

1. Cod. Ambr. D 478 inf., fols. 1^r–58^v. This bears the title: "Anonymi

¹⁰ The tortured Latinity of this dedicatory preface seems to indicate that it was left unrevised at its author's death.

¹¹ Cod. Ambr. D 196 inf., epist. 80.

¹² *Ibid.* epist. 92, dated October 15, 1575.

¹³ *Ibid.* epist. 107, dated January 31, 1577.

qui Patavii Michaelis Sophiani auditor fuit, Aristophanis Thesmo-phoriazusas (sic) et Lisistrata Latine redditae cum scholiis." Fol. 1^{r-v}: dedicatory preface to Pinelli; fols. 2^r-39^v: Latin translations of *Thesm.* and *Lys.*; fols. 40^r-58^v: scholia to both comedies. This is a clean scribal copy¹⁴ (the original draft of the translations is found in Cod. Ambr. I 159 inf. [see below]). There is no question that the "anonymus" of the title is to be identified with Ellebodius: this is proven from Cod. Ambr. I 159 inf., and from the numerous letters from Ellebodius to Pinelli in which he discusses his Aristophanic translations, scholia, and the dedication.¹⁵

2. Cod. Ambr. D 247 inf., fols. 75^r-152^r. Fols. 75^r-85^r: scholia to *Thesm.*; fols. 89^r-102^v: scholia to *Lys.*; fols. 104^r-127^v: translation of *Lys.*;¹⁶ fols. 130^r-152^r: translation of *Thesm.* This too is a clean copyist's copy, but in a different hand from D 478 inf.

3. Cod. Ambr. I 159 inf., fols. 205^r-245^r: translations only of the two comedies. It bears the title "Aristophanis Comoedia Nicasii Hellebodii manu." This is clearly an autograph draft, containing numerous erasures and revisions in Ellebodius' hand. There is no autograph copy of the scholia.

To these three MSS should be added Cod. Ambr. D 196 inf., which contains Ellebodius' letters to Pinelli. References to his work on Aristophanes are found in letters 80, 82, 83, 85-87, 90-93, 97, 98, 104, 105, and 107.

II

Ellebodius' work is a pioneering effort in several respects. In the sixteenth century it was highly unusual for anyone who set out to edit or translate a comedy of Aristophanes to devote his attention to any play not included in the Byzantine triad (*Plutus*, *Nubes*, *Ranae*). Thus,

¹⁴ I cannot agree with Wagner (31) who claims that all three MSS "von der Hand des Ellebodius stammen." Comparison with the letters reveals that only one (I 159 inf.) is an autograph draft.

¹⁵ P. O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum* 1 (London and Leiden 1963) 323, had already suggested this identification.

¹⁶ Wagner (32) erroneously lists *Thesm.* first; but the copyist has here oddly reversed the order.

by the time Ellebodium completed his edition there had already appeared eighteen separate editions and translations of *Plutus* (the most popular Aristophanic comedy of the Renaissance),¹⁷ eight of *Nubes*, and five of *Ranae*. On the other hand, there had never been a separate edition or translation of *Lysistrata* (and there was not going to be one until the nineteenth century); of the *Thesmophoriazusae* one separate edition had appeared in 1545. A major factor contributing to making these two plays the most neglected Aristophanic comedies was that they had been discovered later than the rest. They had not been included in the *editio princeps* of Aristophanes (the 1498 Aldine) and were not printed until 1516. Then for some unexplainable reason, they were again omitted from three of the subsequent collected editions: the second Juntine of 1525, the Gourmont of 1528, and the third Juntine of 1540. Furthermore, they were the only two comedies without a body of ancient scholia,¹⁸ and consequently, they were fraught with more unresolved mysteries than the other nine. It is certainly this very neglect, combined with their notorious difficulty, which summoned Ellebodium to the challenge of translating and annotating these two plays. We may indeed detect a causal relationship in this statement from the dedication: "converti me ad Aristophanem . . . et binas eius comoedias Thesmophoriazusae et Lysistratam, quae praeter ceteras obscurae sunt et difficiles; quod et mendae illis plures velut tenebrae offusae sunt, et veteribus scholiis nullis ut ceterae illustrantur."

Ellebodium's scholia present the first truly "scientific" commentary on Aristophanes.¹⁹ There had been only two previous attempts at annotating Aristophanic comedies on a substantial scale:²⁰ in 1545 Gilles Bourdin published an edition of the *Thesmophoriazusae* for which he drafted scholia whose most outstanding feature was that they were

¹⁷ The reasons for this predilection are explained in W. Süss, *Aristophanes und die Nachwelt* (Leipzig 1911) 23-24, and now also in K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (London 1972) 226.

¹⁸ Ancient scholia to *Lys.* were first published in 1710, by Küster, and to *Thesm.* in 1829, by Bekker.

¹⁹ The non-textual portions of the commentary deserve a separate treatment, which I hope to present in the near future.

²⁰ I do not take into account the edition of *Nubes* and *Plutus* with notes (based on the ancient scholia) by Melanchthon (Haguenau 1528); the "scholia brevissima" with which it is equipped are by no means a full-scale commentary, but were intended to ease the approach to Aristophanes' Greek for school-boys.

composed in ancient Greek.²¹ This was followed, in 1549, by Charles Girard's dilettantish commentary on *Plutus*.²² But Ellebodius' notes eclipse these two earlier commentaries, both in depth of scholarship and in the range of sources cited. He has at his ready command all periods and genres of Greek literature, from the Homeric epics to the Byzantine commentaries. His most frequent source is the *Suda*, which he seems to have combed through for citations from, and references to, his two comedies. He also adduces illustrations and evidence from, among others, Aristotle, Theophrastus' botanical treatises, Philo, Dioscorides, Galen, Pausanias, Pollux, Hesychius, Eustathius, Gregorius Corinthius, and the Aristophanic and Platonic scholia.

Finally, and perhaps most important for our purpose, Ellebodius' textual notes manifest the first really critical approach to the text of Aristophanes. All earlier editions were printed according to the notorious—but nonetheless condoned—practice of the time: the editor would print directly from whatever MS happened to be available to him. In the absence of MS authority, he simply copied a previous edition. If he found it necessary to correct the text, he emended “silently.”²³ It is quite evident, however, that Ellebodius, contrary to the accepted practice, did not blindly follow any one MS or printed edition, but rather constantly weighed the individual merits of each variant which he encountered. His scrupulousness in this respect may be observed in his postponing publication, as we have seen, until such time as Pinelli might provide him with evidence from some ancient codex. Furthermore, that he constantly compared several printed texts is clear from such comments as the following:

²¹ Τὰ τοῦ Αἰγιδίου βουρδίνου σχόλια εἰς τὴν τῶν τοῦ Ἀριστοφάνους Θεομοφοριαζουσῶν κωμῶδιαν (Parisii 1545).

²² *Aristophanis Poetae comici Plutus, iam nunc per Carolum Girardum Bituricum & Latinus factus, & Commentariis insuper sane quam utiliss. recens illustratus* (Parisii 1549). Girard based his commentary in great part on the ancient scholia.

²³ By this I mean that the editor would incorporate his own emendations without indicating whether they were original or based on MS authority. Some of these early “silent” emendations are still often admitted into modern texts, cf. e.g., Coulon's text and apparatus at *Lys.* 97, 253, *Thesm.* 10, 248; for the practice in general, see E. J. Kenney, *The Classical Text. Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley 1974) 52 (Beroaldus on Apuleius and Rhenanus on Tacitus); Kenney also discusses the uncritical use of MSS (4–5; 79 n. 4), and the practice of the editor to base his text on that of his immediate predecessor (18).

Thesm. 355 ὅσαις προσήκει. In aliis scriptum est ὅσαι. sed rectius in alio ὅσα.

Thesm. 381 σίγα, σιώπα. Vel a praecone dicitur, vel, ut est in aliis libris, ab alia muliere.

Thesm. 811 pro ζεύγη in quibusdam φεύγη scribitur.

Thesm. 1019 in aliis legitur προσειδοῦσα pro προσεδουσσαί.

In addition, as will be demonstrated, Ellebodius had available at least one MS (possibly two) against which he occasionally compared the printed variants.

III

Since Ellebodius relied to a significant extent on printed texts, it may be useful to list the editions of Aristophanes containing *Thesm.* and *Lys.* which had been published before he undertook his own annotated translations of these two comedies:

1. Junta. Florence 1516²⁴ (*editio princeps* of *Thesm.* and *Lys.*)
2. Grynaeus (printed by Cratander). Basel 1532.
3. Zanetti. Venice 1538.
4. Wechel, Paris 1540.
5. Farraeus. Venice 1542.
6. Grynaeus (printed by Brubach, and hence hereafter referred to as "Brubach"). Frankfurt 1544.
7. Bourdin. Paris 1545 (*Thesm.* only).
8. Gelenius (printed by Froben). Basel 1547.
9. Caninius (printed by Gryphius). Venice 1548.

Of these the only one specifically identified by Ellebodius in the course of his commentary is the 1516 Junta.²⁵ The variants which he cites, however, reveal that he consulted most (if not all) of the rest. It is

²⁴ I.e., 1516 New Style: Bernardo Giunta's preface is dated "x. ianuarii. MDXV" and the colophon reads, "His summa manus imposita est, quinto kl. Februarii M.D.XV. Leonis Papae nostri anno tertio."

²⁵ At *Thesm.* 158: "ἐστὶν ὡς ἐγὼ . . . etsi in libro quidem Florentiae impresso, ubi primum hae duae comoediae sunt editae plane scriptum est ἐστὶν ὡς."

also beyond doubt that his base-edition (i.e., that from which he cites his lemmata) is the Gelenius edition.²⁶

Ellebodius' unfailing critical judgment is immediately evident from the choices he makes from among the variants presented in these editions. Almost invariably posterity has vindicated his choices. In the following list I present some of the variants which were current in Ellebodius' day. In each instance I first cite Ellebodius' choice together with one of the editions from which he may have derived it; next I cite the reading which he rejected and at least one of the editions which printed it. This list becomes all the more indicative of Ellebodius' unerring feeling for Greek in general, and for Aristophanes in particular, if we bear in mind that in every case listed his choice is that adopted in the Budé text of Coulon, generally considered the most reliable modern edition of Aristophanes—although its apparatus is not entirely free from errors; I note these when they occur (R=Ravennas 137, 4A; Γ=Laurentianus plut. 31.15 and Leidensis Voss. Gr. F.52).

THESMOPHORIAZUSAE:

474 *εἰ* Brubach, Ellebodius: *ῆ* Gelenius R.

490 *εἰφ' ὀράτ'* Brubach, Ellebodius R: *ἐφωράτ'* Gelenius.

506 *βοώη* Brubach, Ellebodius R: *βοῶν* Gelenius.

697 *καὶ τροπαῖον* Zanetti, Ellebodius: *τροπαῖον* Gelenius R (here Ellebodius also cites the evidence of the scholiast on *Plutus* 453 and Greg. Cor. 22).

793 *μαίνεσθ'* Zanetti, Ellebodius: *μαίνεθ'* Gelenius R.

846 *ἴλλος* Junta, Ellebodius R: *ἄλλος* Gelenius (here Ellebodius cites the evidence of the *Suda* and refers to the parallel at Lucian, *Lex.* 3, where he incidentally suggests emending *σίλλος* to *ἴλλος*).

947 *παίσωμεν* Zanetti, Ellebodius: *πέσωμεν* Gelenius R.

969 *εὐλύραν* Zanetti, Ellebodius: *ἐλύραν* Gelenius R.

1125 *δεσμά* Brubach, Ellebodius: *δέμας* Gelenius R.

²⁶ This is evident not only from the lemmata (e.g., *ἐστηκώς* in the preceding note was the exclusive reading of Gelenius), but also from the letters to Pinelli, in which Ellebodius refers to the text of Aristophanes by citing the Gelenius page. In fact, this handsome folio, with its ample margins, was always found ideal for harboring the annotations of scholars: thus the British Museum owns one copy of the Gelenius edition with marginalia by Casaubon and another with those of Bentley.

LYSISTRATA:

167 σφῶν ταῦτα Zanetti, Ellebodius (Coulon wrongly attributes the conjecture to Chrestien [1607]): ταῦτα σφῶν ταῦτα Gelenius RΓ.

307 αὐτοῦ Zanetti, Ellebodius Γ: αὐτὸν Gelenius R.

311 καπνῶ πιέζειν Zanetti, Ellebodius R: καπιέζειν Gelenius.

357 τύπτοντ' Zanetti, Ellebodius R: τύπτον Gelenius.

518 εἶτ' ἡρόμεθ' ἄν Zanetti, Ellebodius R: εἶ τηρόμεθ' ἄν Gelenius.

666 ὄτ' ἦμεν Zanetti, Ellebodius R: ὄτ' ἦ μὲν Gelenius.

866 ᾿ξῆλθεν Brubach, Ellebodius (Coulon wrongly attributes the conjecture to Chrestien): ξυνῆλθεν Gelenius R.

1096 ἔσθος Junta, Ellebodius R: ἔθος Gelenius.

IV

The following list consists of those conjectures which have subsequently gained the support of MS authority. "Conjecture" may be a misnomer, since later I attempt to show that Ellebodius may have relied on MS authority more often than in the single instance where he adduces such evidence (cf. below, on *Lys.* 499). Inasmuch as one of our two comedies (*Thesm.*) is the most precariously attested of the Aristophanic corpus, a brief preliminary account of its survival will be useful in order to assess Ellebodius' emendations and my hypothesis concerning the possible origin of some of them.

If we turn to the table of sigla which is prefixed to the text of *Thesm.* in either of the two most recent editions of Aristophanes (Coulon's [1929] and Cantarella's [1956]) we come away with the (partly) mistaken notion that the text of this comedy is preserved by only one codex. In the modern era the history of this codex, the Ravennas (R), our oldest and best MS of Aristophanes, begins in early sixteenth-century Florence, where we know that Bernardo Giunta used it to print the *editio princeps* of *Thesm.* and *Lys.* in 1516.²⁷ After

²⁷ The "antiquissimum Aristophanis exemplar ex Urbinate bibliotheca," from which Giunta claimed to have printed the two plays, was identified as the Ravennas over a century ago independently by W. G. Clark (*Journal of Philology* 3 [1871] 153 ff.) and F. A. von Velsen (*Über den Codex Urbinas der Lysistrata und der Thesmophoriazusen des Aristophanes* [Halle 1871]). Cf. also J. W. White, "The Manuscripts of Aristophanes," *CP* 1 (1906) 6 and 256.

this date all traces of R were lost, until it was rediscovered in the late eighteenth century by Invernizi,²⁸ who used it for his multi-volume edition which began appearing in 1794. Since Ellebodius repeatedly laments the unavailability of a *vetus codex*, he could hardly have known of its existence, for R is a venerable medieval book, written in c. A.D. 1000. Nevertheless, as I argue below, Ellebodius may have had MS evidence for *Thesm.* as well as for *Lys.*; although in the absence of positive proof, it is perhaps wiser to present the following emendations as “conjectural” (MSS=R and at least one other MS; Σ=scholium; S=*Suda*; edd=the editions known to Ellebodius [cf. above, page 320]).²⁹

THESMOPHORIAZUSAE:

128 ἄγαλλε Ellebodius R: ἄλλε and ἄλλα edd.

129b ὁλολύζει ὁ γέρων Ellebodius (from S) Σ: ὁλολύζεις γέρων R edd (see further on this verse below, p. 327).

258 κεφαλῇ Ellebodius (from Eustathius on *Il.* 22.470 and Pollux 2.35) SΣ: κεφαλῇ R: κεφαλῇ edd.

263 χαλαρὰ γοῦν Ellebodius (from S), Reiske (1754, same source) R²: χαλαρά γ' οὐ R edd (retained by Coulon).

376 ἦ μάλισθ Ellebodius (ἦ ἄλῃς ἐσθ Portus [1607], Scaliger [1624]: ἦν ἀλίσθωμεν Bentley: εἴ γ' ἄλῃς ἐσθ' Dawes) R: ἦν ἄλίσθ' edd.

390 ἔμβραχυ Ellebodius (from S), Küster (1710) Σ*Plat.*: ἐν βραχὺ R edd.

428 τοῦτω Ellebodius R: τοῦτο edd.

430 τῷ τέχνῃ Ellebodius, Bergler (1760) R: τῇ τέχνῃ edd.

609 τίτθῃ νῇ Δί' Ellebodius R: τίτθῃ ἡδὲ edd.

647 ἰσθμόν . . . κάτω Ellebodius restored this verse, which appears as a marginal addition in R, from S: *om.* edd.

²⁸ “Rediscovered” in the sense that Invernizi was the first modern scholar to make use of the *Ravennas*. It had in fact been *seen* in 1728 by D’Orville, who simply catalogued it; cf. White (above, note 27) 261.

²⁹ I make no apologies for some of the inconsistencies which will be detected in this list: absolute consistency in such a list is simply not possible. Thus, by “MS authority” I occasionally understand the evidence of S; by “conjectures” I understand conjectural emendations as well as emendations based on such sources as S. Finally I have now and then listed the names of scholars whose proposals Ellebodius anticipated.

LYSISTRATA:

178 συντιθώμεθα Ellebodius MSS: σκντιθώμεθα (-ζώ-, -σθώ-) edd.

291 ἐξιπώκατον Ellebodius, Brunck (1783) Γ²: ἐξεπιώκατον RΓS edd. (Ellebodius writes ἐξιπώκατον, which is demonstrably a slip of the pen, since it is evident from his explanation that he was familiar with the etymology of the word: "nam ἵπουν 'premere' significat." He also cites ῥόδα ἐξιπωθέντα from Dioscorides, and refers to Hdt. 2.94, where the Egyptian technique of pressing [ἀπιποῦσι] the castor-oil plant is described.)

306 θεῶν ἔκατι Ellebodius MSS (first printed by Küster [1710] from Cod. Palatinus 67): ἔκατι edd.

354 βδύλλεθ' Ellebodius Γ: βδύλλεσθ' R edd.

459 οὐχ ἔλκετ' Ellebodius Γ: οὐκ ἐξέλκετ' R edd.

472 κυλοιδιᾶν Ellebodius Γ: κυλιδ[ι]αν Π: κοιλιδιᾶν R edd.

499 ὥς σωθήσει . . . ἀγανακτεῖς. This verse, which was omitted by all the editions known to Ellebodius, was restored by him from a MS in Pinelli's possession. His note on the previous verse includes this statement: "Sequitur hunc versum alius, qui in libris impressis desideratur. eum ex codice manuscripto nobis impertiit vir omni genere bonorum ornatissimus, et de me optime meritus Joannes Vincentius Pinellus" (then follows the missing verse). This is the only case where Ellebodius cites MS authority, but, as I attempt to show below, perhaps not the only case where he consulted such evidence. The verse is now confirmed by a marginal addition in R and by the other MSS, and is universally accepted as Aristophanic³⁰ (see further below, p. 328).

500 ἀλλὰ ποιητέα Ellebodius R (ποιητέα): ἀλλ' ἀποκτέα (or ἀποδεκτέα) edd.

506 γραῦσανυτῇ Ellebodius (from S?) Γ: γραῦς αὐτῇ R edd.

509 ἡρέσκετέ γ' Ellebodius Γ: ἡρέσκετ' R edd.

526 ταῖσι Ellebodius Γ: ταῖς R edd.

528 ἄν Ellebodius Γ: om. R edd.

553 ῥοπαλισμούς Ellebodius (from S?) Γ: ῥοπαλιμούς R: ῥοπαλινούς edd.

³⁰ Not by Rogers, however, to whom it seemed "a great pity that it was ever discovered," cf. the appendix of his edition, page 226.

596 *τούτου* Ellebodius *Γ*: *τοῦτο* R edd.

643 *ῆ* Ellebodius MSS: *ῆ* edd.

678 *ἂν ἀπολίσθοι* Ellebodius, Dawes R: *ἀναπολίσθαι* (and *-λείται*) edd.

702 *κάγαπητήν* Ellebodius *Γ*: *καμπητήν* R edd.

704 *τούτων* Ellebodius *Γ*: *om.* R edd.

911 *τὸ τοῦ* Ellebodius *Γ*: *τοῦτο* R edd.

1081 *ἐλσών* Ellebodius B (Parisinus Regius 2715): *ἐλθών* R edd.

1281 *Ῥήιον* Ellebodius MSS: *ίκιον* and *οἰκεῖον* edd.

Either we must concede to Ellebodius a prodigious divinatory gift, such as allowed him to restore entire words (e.g., at *Lys.* 306),³¹ and to succeed where such extraordinary critics as Scaliger, Bentley, and Dawes were not even to come close (cf. *Thesm.* 376), or we must assume that he consulted MS evidence more often than on the solitary occasion where he mentions doing so (*Lys.* 499). The high degree of correspondence between his emendations and the text of *Γ* makes it almost certain that the codex which Pinelli showed him was related to that MS. This may be the case for *Lysistrata*, but assuredly not for the *Thesmophoriazusae*. As we have seen, editors are quick to point out that the only source for the text of this comedy is the Ravennas. This is not entirely true. In the fifteenth century a transcript for the text of *Thesm.* and *Lys.* was made directly from the Ravennas, and this survives today as Cod. Monacensis 492. It first came to light in the late eighteenth century and was used by Brunck (1783), who named it "Augustanus." Since it has long ago been firmly established that this codex is merely a direct copy of the Ravennas,³² it is judiciously dismissed by all modern editors, who often do not even mention its existence. But, although an apograph of R may be worthless to the modern editor, to the sixteenth-century humanist, who did not have the benefit of the original, such a copy would have been invaluable. Furthermore, since one could not suspect the real worth of a codex which had been written as recently as the previous century, its

³¹ It is also possible, of course, that in this case Ellebodius was influenced by such passages as A. *Ch.* 436, E. *Ion* 1357, Pi. *I.* 4.1, etc.

³² Cf. Clark (above, note 27) 160, von Velsen (above, note 27) 7, White (above, note 27) 260. The Monacensis has been variously named, and White assigned to it the siglum Mu2. In this paper I shall refer to it by the less cumbrous siglum "M."

availability would not invalidate the search for a *vetus codex*. It is thus not beyond the realm of possibility that Ellebodius knew the Monacensis from which he may have derived some of his "conjectures" on *Thesm.*, and that subsequently it lay unnoticed (like R) until the end of the eighteenth century. I submit this pair of additional instances, which present a striking correspondence between Ellebodius' emendations and M on two of those rare occasions where the latter disagrees with R:

489 $\kappa\upsilon\beta\delta'$ Ellebodius, Bergler (1760) M (also a late correction in R): $\kappa\upsilon\beta\delta'$ Meineke (adopted by Coulon in his text, but he later reverted to $\kappa\upsilon\beta\delta'$, in his *Essai sur la méthode de la critique conjecturale appliquée au texte d'Aristophane* [Paris 1933] 175 n. 2): $\kappa\upsilon\nu\delta'$ R edd.

606 $\eta\delta'$ η Ellebodius, Portus (1607) M (printed by Cantarella): $\eta\delta\epsilon$ R edd ($\eta\delta\iota$ Brubach, adopted by Coulon with change to oxytone).

It should be evident, however, that until a systematic collation is made of all of Ellebodius' emendations of *Thesm.* with the text of M, the question whether or not he in fact knew this codex must remain strictly hypothetical.

V

We now come to the emendations with which Ellebodius anticipated the proposals of later scholars, and for which there is no MS authority. It is by no means hyperbolic to state that, had he lived to see his work in print, Ellebodius' name would today be the most conspicuous in the apparatus of these two comedies. One has but to glance over the list and note how often he has anticipated scholars of the caliber of Scaliger and Bentley by proposing emendations which have now been admitted to the Aristophanic vulgate. I should point out that in the following list I have included both those emendations which are now allowed to stand in the text of most modern editions, and also those, which although not universally admitted in the text, nevertheless deserve to be recorded in the apparatus. I must also indicate that it has not always been possible to establish precedence among Ellebodius' successors, since the emendations of several of them (e.g., Biset, Chrestien, Scaliger, Bentley, Porson) were published only posthumously. Conse-

quently I have occasionally listed two names when two scholars may have independently lighted on a common solution.

THESMOPHORIAZUSAE:

24 προσμάθοιμι Ellebodius, Wellauer (1820): προσμάθοι μὴ R edd.

129b ὁλολύζει ὁ γέρων. Ellebodius was the first (followed by Bentley and Küster) to recognize in these words a stage-direction (cf. below, 276b and 1187b).

162 οἷπερ Ellebodius (probably from S), Biset (1607): οἶπερ R edd (Coulon, who printed οἷπερ, subsequently had a change of mind: cf. REG 66 [1953] 45–46, where he defends the reading of R).

196 καὶ γὰρ ἄν Ellebodius (probably from S), Küster (who, however, deleted the second ἄν), Brunck: καὶ γὰρ R edd.

276b ὁλολύζουσι τὸ ἱερὸν ὠθεῖται Ellebodius, Fritzsche (1838): ὁλολύζουσί τε (or γε) ἱερὸν ὠθεῖται R edd. Here too (cf. 129b) Ellebodius was the first to spot a *παρεπιγραφή* (thus anticipating Biset).

480 οὔσαν ἐπτέτιν Ellebodius (from Pollux 3.42), Biset: ἐπτέτιν οὔσαν R edd.

704 ἐξαράξω Ellebodius (he also suggests the alternate emendation, ἐξαράξαι), Bentley, Reiske (1754): ἐξάρξω R edd.

773 εἰ ταδὶ Ellebodius (perhaps from S), Scaliger (1624): εἶτα διὰ R edd (some read εἰ τάδε).

982 χάριν Ellebodius, Biset: χαίρειν R edd (some had χεροῖν).

1015 ἐπέλθοιμι Ellebodius, Brunck: ὑπέλθοιμι Bentley: ἀπέλθοιμι R edd.

1047 ἄτεγκτε Ellebodius, Biset: ἀνέτικτε R edd (see further on this verse below, pp. 330–331).

1101 ναυστολῶν Ellebodius, Biset (Coulon incorrectly attributes this emendation to the 1624 Leiden edition): ναυτολῶν R edd.

1187b ἀνακύπτει . . . ἀπεψωλημένος. Ellebodius was the first to recognize a stage-direction, thus preceding Bentley (cf. above on 129b and 276b).

LYSISTRATA:

113 ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἄν Ellebodius, Dawes (1745): ἐγωγ' ἄν καὶ R edd.

144 γα Ellebodius, Scaliger: γε R edd.

156 *παρενιδών* Ellebodius (from S), Portus (1607): *παρ' ἐνιδών* R edd.

304 ἢ πότ' Ellebodius, Bothe (1808 [Reiske had already suggested ἢ ποτ']): *εἰ ποτ'* R edd.

499 *δεινόν* <γ> add. Ellebodius, Brunck: *om.* R. We have already seen (above, p. 324) that Ellebodius restored this verse from Pinelli's codex. In all the MSS which now attest it, it is metrically deficient, and Brunck's emendation is generally accepted. Strangely, Ellebodius mentions no metrical irregularity, and in fact reads the verse as it is now universally printed, with Brunck's correction. Could it be that Ellebodius emended "silently" (influenced perhaps by such passages as *Lys.* 529, *Ec.* 812, etc.)? Or did he read the uncorrupted version in Pinelli's codex?

519 *ἔφασκεν εἰ* Ellebodius, Reiske: *ἔφασκε. κ' εἰ* R edd.

565 *δυναται* Ellebodius, Porson: *δύνασθε* R edd.

592 *καὶ θήμετερον* Ellebodius, Bergler (1760): *καθ' ἡμέτερον* R edd.

645 *καῖτ' ἔχουσα* Ellebodius, Bentley: *καταχέουσιν* edd: *καταχέουσα* R (for a recent vindication of the reading of R, see C. Sourvinou, *CQ* N.S. 21 [1971] 339-42).

831 *ἄνδρ' <ἄνδρ'> ὁρῶ* add. Ellebodius, Chrestien (1607): *om.* R edd.

864 *καταβᾶσα* MSS edd: *ἀναβᾶσα* Ellebodius, Reiske, Herwerden.

1057 *ἄν* Sophianus (*apud* Ellebodium), Bentley, Brunck: *ἄν* MSS edd. In his comment on this verse Ellebodius states: "Michael Sophianus Chius, praestantissimus ingenio vir cuius immatura morte [he died in 1565] omne Graeciae lumen extinctum est, legebat *ἄν* λάβη."³³ *ἄν* is printed by Cantarella (who, however, fails to indicate that it is a conjecture);³⁴ Wilamowitz printed the reading of R, while Coulon adopts Willems' *ἦν*.

1096 *ἀμβαλώμεθα* Ellebodius, Brunck: *ἐμβαλώμεθα* R edd.

³³ Sophianos, who had collaborated with Ellebodius on the text of the *Poetics* (cf. Kassel [above, note 2] 111-13), also assisted him on Aristophanes in Padua, as we learn from the dedicatory preface: "Adscripsi praeterea pauca quaedam, quae olim Patavii, cum tua, et Michaelis Sophiani Chii, quo suae, hoc est graecae linguae peritiorum neque nostra neque avorum aetas vidit, suavissima consuetudine, et in omni parte studiorum meorum politissimo iudicio uteretur, adnotaram ad confragosa quidem loca."

³⁴ It would appear that Dover (above, note 17) 154 also reads *ἄν*, for he translates, "And if peace ever comes, whoever has borrowed anything from us now needn't pay back what he's received."

1121 διδῶσι Ellebodius, Küster: δίδωσι R edd.

1153 ἑταίρους Ellebodius (probably from S), Scaliger: ἑτέρους R edd. Ἰππίου Ellebodius (he also suggests the alternate Ἰππία, from S), Scaliger: ἱππίους R edd.

1174 γὰ πρῶτα ναὶ τῷ σιῷ R edd (γαῖ): γὰ πρῶ ναὶ τῷ σιῷ Biset (adopted by Coulon): γὰ πρῶτα ναὶ [τῷ] σιῷ *del.* Ellebodius, Brunck. This is one of the most disputed verses of the play; the MS reading is hypermetrical, and critics cannot agree on the meaning of πρῶτα. The numerous attempts at emending the word (besides Biset's πρῶ) include Elmsley's ποτι (Doric form of πρὸς), Bergk's πρόκα, and Reisig's λῶ. Ellebodius keeps πρῶτα, and translates: "ATH. iam terram colere nudus exutus volo. LAC. ego vero stercus agere primum per Deos." Wilamowitz, who obelizes after γὰ on metrical grounds, nevertheless defends πρῶτα ("Wer bedenkt, dass man erst düngt und dann pflügt, sieht, dass das überlieferte πρῶτα für den Sinn passt . . ."). For the meaning πρῶτα = πρότερον, cf. *Ec.* 1079, and for the use of ναὶ σιῷ without the article, cf. *Lys.* 81 (the reading of the MSS, unjustifiably emended by Reisig: see Rogers' objections in the appendix of his edition, pages 215-16). Ellebodius' emendation, therefore, has the advantage of restoring the meter in the simplest way possible, while preserving the meaning intended by the poet.

VI

In view of this imposing list of conjectures, tested both by subsequent MS discoveries and the independent proposals of distinguished critics, some of Ellebodius' remaining emendations (i.e., those which, as far as I could discover, he alone has suggested) have a legitimate claim to our closest consideration. Since he usually introduces his proposals with a laconic formula (e.g., "videtur legendum" or "scribendum," "puto legi oportere," "lego," "lege," "γρ.," etc.), and does not (in most instances) offer any argument in their support, I have added my own comments to some of them.

THESMOPHORIAZUSAE:

475 εἶπε δρώσας R edd (some had δράσας): εἶπ' ἑάσας Ellebodius (cf. εἶτ' ἑάσας Reiske). Ellebodius is the first in a long line of critics

who were embarrassed by the syntax of this verse. Biset, who read *δράσας* and understood Euripides as the subject, derived the internal object *δράματα* from the participle; in this he was surely influenced by the notorious Latin version of Andreas Divus,³⁵ which read with characteristic obscurity: "Quid haec vitia habentes, illum accusamus? graviterque ferimus si duo nostrum vel tria mala cognoscens dixit cum fecerit infinitas fabulas." The great majority of editors, however, read *δρώσας*, which they then proceeded to decline in all cases; thus Bentley suggested alternately the dative and the accusative, emending *ἡμῶν* (474) to *ἡμῖν* and *ἡμᾶς* respectively. Van Leeuwen, not content with printing the genitive in his text, also suggested the nominative in his apparatus. However, none of these attempts succeeded in removing the awkwardness.³⁶ Ellebodius' emendation has the advantage of removing the ambiguity while remaining palaeographically faithful; he translates the passage: "... si duo nostrorum aut trium malorum conscius ea dixit, omissis sexcentis?" This is surely the meaning that we expect.

630 *φέρ' ἴδω τί πρῶτον ἦν*; R edd: *φέρ' ἴδω τί μέντοι πρῶτον ἦν* R²S: *φέρ' ἴδω τί ἦν*; *τί πρῶτον ἦν*; Bentley: *φέρ' ἴδω φέρ' ἴδω τί πρῶτον ἦν*; Ellebodius.

704 Ellebodius punctuates: *οἶον*; *ὑμῶν ἐξαράξω τὴν ἄγαν αὐθαδίαν* ("CH. Quidnam hoc rei gessit, amicae, quidnam? MN. Quidnam? vestram frangam nimiam contumaciam.")

1047 *ἀνέτικτε* R edd (*ἀνάτεγκτε* Zanetti): *ἄτεγκτε* Ellebodius, Biset (printed by Coulon): *ἂν ἔτικτε* Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 64 [1929] 467 n. 1; accepted by Coulon, *REG* 44 [1931] 13; cf. *RhM* 100 [1957] 186): *ἄνοικτε* Ellebodius (Mitsdörffer).³⁷ Although Wilamowitz'

³⁵ See my "The Etiology of a Misinterpretation: Aristophanes *Birds* 30," *CP* 70 (1975) [forthcoming], where I demonstrate the deleterious influence of this, the earliest complete translation of Aristophanes in any language (Venice 1538).

³⁶ It is only fair to point out that a case can be made for the reading of R: for the accusative after *εἶπε*, cf. *Thesm.* 551–52 οἱ' *εἴρηκεν ἡ πανούργος ἡμᾶς ἀπάσας*; for the accusative participle referring to a pronoun in the genitive, cf. Kühner-Gerth 2.111–12 (with examples).

³⁷ W. Mitsdörffer, "Das Mnesilochoslied in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*," *Philologus* 98 (1954) 87. I have not listed this emendation among those in section V because Mitsdörffer's suggestion (which was incidental to his larger subject) is too recent to have had any considerable effect (thus, Cantarella [1956] did not seem to know it, for he does not list it in his apparatus).

emendation is probably correct, Ellebodius' ἄνοικτε is worth defending. His emendation to ἄτεγκτε, which has become the accepted reading through Biset, was merely an alternate suggestion.³⁸ His original proposal, ἄνοικτε, is palaeographically much closer to ἀνέτικτε than is ἄτεγκτε. Moreover, it is used in the same mock-Euripidean monody a few lines preceding (1022). The word is in fact attested, both adjectivally and adverbially, four times in Euripides (*Hec.* 91, *Tr.* 756, 787, and fr. 120), while ἄτεγκτος occurs but once (*HF* 833).³⁹ Although admittedly not an ironclad proof, this 4:1 ratio nevertheless points to ἄνοικτε as being the more likely subject of Euripidean lampooning.

1129 ἂν δέξαιτο R edd: ἂν ἐνδέξαιτο Küster (adopted by Coulon): ἂν ἀνδέξαιτο Ellebodius (cf. ἂν ἀναδέξαιτο Reiske).

LYSISTRATA:

173 ἀσσοῦδᾶς R (ἀς σποῦδᾶς edd): ἀς σποδᾶς Γ: ἀς πόδας Valckenaer (printed by Coulon): ἀς στολᾶς Ellebodius ("σποῦδᾶς ἔχοντι non video quam habeat sententiam probabilem . . . neque sane spondeus admodum placet loco secundo; proinde arbitror scribendum στολᾶς ἔχοντι, hoc est στελλονται, 'navigant classes'").

281 ὁμῶς RΓ: ὁμῶς Bentley: ὅπλοις Ellebodius.

466 εἰάν R edd: εἰάνπερ Γ: εἰάν <μῇ> add. Ellebodius ("LYS . . . an mulieribus non putas bilem inesse? PROB. non per Apollinem; immo multam sane, si in propinquo caupo non sit.") Indeed, is it not the *absence* rather than the proximity of a tavern which elicits feminine wrath in Old Comedy? Adherence to the reading of Γ forces editors to attach an unparalleled meaning to χολή (465) as understood by the proboulos. Thus Rogers made him take the word as "thirst" ("LYS. Think you we women feel no thirst for glory? MAG. Thirst enough, I trow; no doubt of that, when there's a tavern handy.") This is undoubtedly the most unconvincing interpretation of the passage, despite Rogers' citation of a questionable "parallel" from John Chrysostom's Sixty-Third Homily on St. Matthew. Van Leeuwen wants the proboulos to understand the women as having meant *spiritus*, in support of which he quite inappropriately cites the proverbial ἐν τῷ καπήλῳ νοῦς ἐνεῖναι μοι δοκεῖ,

³⁸ Ellebodius also suggested a third alternate: ἀνέλικτε.

³⁹ I do not list the other known occurrence (E. fr. 122), for this = *Thesm.* 1047.

from Plato Comicus. Wilamowitz, who interprets the word as "Mut," strangely assumes that there exists a precedent for this use in Archilochus (234 West), and comments: "Der Probulos macht den kaum hergehörigen Witz, dass sie [i.e., the women] sich den Mut erst antrinken." But Ellebodius' conjecture unquestionably restores the Aristophanic meaning: the proboulos understands *χολή* in the only sense in which it can be understood, "gall," "bile," or metaphorically, "bitter anger," "wrath" (cf. *Pax* 66, *Ra.* 4, *Th.* 468, *V.* 403).

It would be misleading to close without acknowledging that Ellebodius was also given to nodding.⁴⁰ In one important respect, however, he rarely failed: he was not only the first to *solve* numerous problems, but also the first to *detect* them. If not consistently convincing, at least his emendations hardly ever center on verses which posterity did not also agree were in need of emendation. It is evident from the recent discoveries of Weinberg, Kassel, Klaniczay, Donnet, and Wagner, that when the next history of classical scholarship is written, a place should be made in it for Nicasius Ellebodius.⁴¹ It is hoped that the present essay will prove to be responsible for further drawing the name of this forgotten humanist out of an undeserved obscurity, while, at the same time, contribute something to the interpretation of Aristophanes.⁴²

⁴⁰ E.g., at *Thesm.* 495 his suggestion to delete *ἀνὴρ* results in an unmetrical verse; at *Thesm.* 811 he rather incongruously suggests the exclamatory *φεῦ γῆ* ("heu terra") for *φεύγει* (or *ζεύγει*) of the edd.

⁴¹ Ellebodius is not mentioned by Sandys; although, as Kassel (above, note 2) points out (112), he deserved at least passing mention as the *editor princeps* of Nemesius (see above, page 314).

⁴² I am deeply grateful to the referee of the Association, to Dr. Colin Austin, of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and to my colleagues, Gerald M. Quinn and James V. Romano, for their valuable criticisms. I also wish to thank Dottore Angelo Paredi, of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, for his most gracious assistance in providing me with microfilms and photographs of Codd. Ambr. D 196 inf., D 247 inf., D 478 inf., and I 159 inf. Finally, it is a pleasure to record my gratitude to the Research Foundation of the City University of New York for a generous Faculty Research Award enabling me to purchase microfilms of the Ambrosian manuscripts used in this article.