present in O: 263. 14 demo; 263. 16 cum dativo; 264. 16 intellectus; 265. 17 frequenter balneas. In addition, in 262. 13, both L and M omit the words *agilis agillimus non agilissimus*, which are retained by P and O. It should be noted that O has the correct spelling for *agilissimus*, where P has *agillissimus*. Certainly the scribe of O, if copying from P, M, or L, could not possibly have restored the lacunae found in these manuscripts individually. It must be concluded, therefore, that O, though from the same archetype as PML, represents an independent tradition and thus has potential value as a new source of readings for the text of Bede.

This potential becomes an actuality in the following cases in which O provides readings superior to those found in other manuscripts. In 261. 5, where M reads *cum galum*, P *cum vel gaium*, L *cum Caesarem*, O alone has the correct *cum Gaium*. In 262. 2, O adds *est* after *praelatus*, where *est* is omitted by PML. In 263. 8–9, where PM read *pares sunt contraria potestate sunt* and L has *pares sunt contraria potestate*, Keil adopts the reading *pares sed contraria potestate sunt*, partly on the basis of the texts of Diomedes and Dositheus, which read *pares* (om. Diomedes) *contraria potestate sunt*. The reading of O at this point is *pares contrariae potestatis sunt*, which, by omitting the *sunt* found after *pares* in PML, comes closer to the readings of Diomedes and Dositheus. In 265. 6, O restores *est* after *dicendum* where it is omitted by PML, and in 265. 11 *est* is added in O after *masculino* where it is omitted by PML. In 263. 19, O joins with M in reading *et* before *dico*. Since *et* is found in the Biblical text, it should be restored on the evidence of OM, even though it is omitted by PL.

Although this high percentage of correct readings attests the worth of the O text, it is not without errors, beyond those in which it agrees with PML. Yet the majority of errors, both in the Latin and the Greek text, can be ascribed to minor spelling variants. For example, in transcribing the Greek words in 262. 8, 11, 17, 29, 30 and 263. 13, 15, the scribe exhibits a marked tendency to confuse omicron and omega, as well as mu and omega, although in each instance the word's meaning is clear. There is, moreover, one lengthy omission, owing to homoeoteleuton, which occurs in 263. 10–11: "tribunal et ad tribunal venire non unum est quia ad."

It should be noted that there are two additions to the text which do not appear in the other manuscripts: 261. 7 attende: nota] attende D nota (where the insertion of the letter *D* anticipates the ensuing phrase *cum Decium sola significat*); and 261. 8 quingentos L sola] quingentos G gaudium L sola (where the *G gaudium* insertion follows the established alphabetical sequence).

Because of its relatively early date and accurate text, it is suggested that O's existence deserves to be noted by scholars interested in the *De orthographia*.

VALERIE M. LAGORIO
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

THE ETIOLOGY OF A MISINTERPRETATION: ARISTOPHANES *BIRDS* 30

We have all heard the truism that each generation must read and discover the classics for itself, see them through its own eyes. This process of rediscovery, however, as Eduard Fraenkel once observed, is becoming increasingly difficult as our classical texts are more and more deeply overlaid by the crusts of centuries of scholarly industry.[1] More often than we realize, when we are most sure to have finally uncovered our author's *ipsissima verba*, we are in fact blunting our wits against the adamantine surface of yet another, invisible exegetic crust. In what follows I attempt to bring

1. *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. vii.

to light such a crust, one that has obtruded with perverse tenacity—all the more perverse in that its existence has hitherto remained totally unnoticed—between the reader and the Aristophanic text.

I suggest that our unquestioned interpretations of certain verses in the plays of Aristophanes may in fact be unsuspected blunders which are traceable directly to an individual whose influence on modern Aristophanic exegesis has been totally ignored, and indeed, whose very name is probably unfamiliar to most Hellenists. Andreas Divus, the author of the first complete translation of Aristophanes, is a most obscure figure in the annals of classical scholarship; he is not mentioned by Sandys, and is not listed in either Eckstein's *Nomenclator philologorum*, or Pökel's *Philologisches Schriftsteller-Lexikon*. We know nothing about him beyond the fact that he was born in Capodistria,[2] sometime in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, and that he was the author of literal Latin prose renderings of Homer (1537), Aristophanes (1538), and Theocritus (1539), all intended to be used as trots by students of the Greek texts. The few sources which do mention Divus invariably do so in the most disparaging terms: his *ad verbum* Latin prose rendering of Aristophanes was characterized by Gilles Ménage as being "pleine d'ignorance et pour le Grec, et pour le Latin," while his scholarly accomplishments in general were perhaps most accurately summarized by Tanneguy Lefèvre, who said: "Bonus ille Divus vix alternos versus Comici nostri intellexit, qui nullum hellenismi sensum haberet."[3]

The most casual glance at this notorious translation reveals that Lefèvre was not in the least exaggerating when he claimed that Divus did not understand two consecutive verses in Aristophanes. Among his numerous other basic errors, Divus was unable to distinguish among voices, moods, tenses, and persons. The result, as one might expect, is often chaotic: at *Frogs* 469–72, for example, Aeacus, who has mistaken Dionysus for Heracles, warns him that this time he will not escape so easily as after his last visit to Hades, when he dognapped Cerberus: ἀλλὰ νῦν ἔχει μέσος· / τοία Στυγός σε μελανοκάρδιος πέτρα / Ἀχερόντιός τε σκόπελος αἱματοσταγὴς / φρουροῦσι. Not recognizing in ἔχει a middle, Divus finds a subject for it in πέτρα, which he modifies with the masculine adjective μέσος: "sed nunc habet media talis Stygis te nigri cordis petra." By a reverse process of confusion, at *Peace* 137, he mistakes an active for a middle. Trygaeus is setting forth the economic advantages of flying to Olympus on a dung-beetle; indeed, if he mounted an "ordinary" winged horse, he would need a double supply of provisions: ἀλλ', ὦ μέλ', ἄν μοι σιτίων διπλῶν ἔδει. Divus translates the imperfect ἔδει as if it were the second person of the future ἔδεσθαι: "sed o miser mihi panes duplices comedes."

Now, if we bear in mind the high popularity of Divus' version—his translations of some of the plays were standard for over 170 years[4]—and if we also bear in mind the significant role played by such word-for-word Latin prose renderings of Greek authors in the education of humanists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,[5] we may readily

2. This we learn from the title page of Divus' translation of Aristophanes, where he is called "Iustinopolitanus" (see n. 4). The article by E. Teza ("Quale era il casato di Andreas Divus vecchio traduttore di Aristofane?" *Rivista di storia antica*, N.S. VII [1903], 85–98) unfortunately asks more questions than it answers.

3. Both quoted by J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*[4], II (Hamburg, 1791 [repr. Hildesheim, 1966]), 388.

4. Divus' translation of all eleven comedies was first printed in 1538 in Venice (*Aristophanis comicorum principis comoediae undecim e graeco in latinum, ad verbum, translatae; Andrea Divo Iustinopolitano interprete*, Venetiis apud D. Iacob a Burgofrancho Papiensem, Mense Iunio M.D. XXXVIII). It was reprinted in 1539 (Basel), 1542 (twice: Venice and Basel), 1548 (Venice), 1552 (Basel), 1554 (Lyons), and 1597 (Venice). His versions of *Birds*, *Thesmophoriazusae*, and *Ecclesiazusae* were reproduced in the bilingual editions of Aristophanes published in 1607 (Geneva), 1608 (Geneva), 1614 (Geneva), 1624 (Leyden), 1625 (Leyden), and finally in 1670 (Amsterdam). The deathblow was dealt by Ludolf Küster who, in his edition of 1710 (Amsterdam), refused to reprint any part of Divus' version: "sed quae [versio]," he explained, "adeo inepta est, et tot vitiis ubique scatet, ut indignam eam judicaverimus, cui in editione nostra locum concederemus."

5. The practice is well illustrated by the example of the young Scaliger, who "with the inexperience of his years . . . had imagined that he had but to sit at the feet of Turnèbe, and that the Greek language would flow into him from the lips of his master. He commenced a diligent attendance in the professor's lecture room, and to his great disappointment found that he derived no benefit . . . He was listening to a course calculated for advanced students, while he had not

appreciate to what extent this version was influential in fixing the meaning of many a verse in Aristophanes. To be sure, most of Divus' more blatant mistranslations (such as the pair I have singled out) were quickly caught and rectified by his immediate successors, notably Nicodemus Frischlin and Florent Chrestien (both of whom, incidentally, set out to provide new Latin versions of some of the comedies precisely to serve as a corrective to Divus); but their translations did not appear until late in the sixteenth century,[6] long after Divus had left his imprint on the young Scaliger, Casaubon, Lipsius, and other future lights of classical philology whose education took place during that period. Although it would be difficult to prove that all these men first read Aristophanes with the assistance of Divus' version, it is nevertheless a safe assumption: Lipsius in fact owned a copy of the 1539 Basel edition; so did Rabelais—no mean Hellenist.[7]

Moreover, Divus' deleterious influence had become further compounded by the publication, in 1545, of the Italian prose version of the brothers Bartolomeo and Pietro Rositini:[8] it can easily be shown that this was by no means a translation of Aristophanes' Greek (despite the authors' claim to that effect in their preface, and the words *tradutte di Greco* on the title page), but rather a shameless word-for-word rendering of Divus' Latin. Thus, the examples from *Frogs* and *Peace* mentioned above were "translated" by the Rositini brothers as: "ma la meza petra de'l Stige da'l negro cuore ti ritiene," and "o misero, tu mangiarai a me doi pani." How uncritically faithful to Divus this so-called translation was may best be evidenced by its translating even misprints! At *Peace* 34, Divus had translated the phrase ὥσπερ παλαιστής as *tamquam luctator*, and through some typographical error this phrase was repeated at line 66, where it resulted in intrusive nonsense. The Rositini, who apparently never checked the Greek (one suspects that they were intellectually unequipped to do so), seeing the phrase in Divus' text, not only translated it, but even managed to fit it in the context: "Ecco il male ch'io diceva. udite un' essempio di matezza, come un luttatore che dice quando gli è montato la colera."[9]

Although, as I have pointed out, Frischlin, Chrestien, and others after them eventually corrected Divus' more blatant misinterpretations, nevertheless his Latin version remained for a long time the only available translation for most of the comedies of Aristophanes, and its influence remained totally unchecked and unchallenged for at least a half-century.[10] It is not inconceivable that this influence was subsequently filtered through the centuries, by a process which was recently described as the "Loeb Library Syndrome."[11] It is also probable that a

learnt the accidence and the rules of syntax. It dawned upon him that one must begin at the beginning . . . He shut himself up in his chamber to grapple with the mysteries of the language by sheer force of intellect. He seized not a grammar, but a Greek Homer with a Latin translation. His choice of Homer was perhaps guided by finding in the title-page . . . the tempting promise that 'by the aid of their word for word rendering . . . beginners might master the poet without the aid of a teacher'" (Mark Pattison, "Life of Joseph Scaliger," in H. Nettleship (ed.), *Essays*, I [Oxford, 1889], 197–98). The practice, it seems, was still flourishing in the last century: the great French entomologist Jean Henri Fabre (1823–1915), "taught himself Greek by comparing Greek texts with their Latin equivalents" (*The New Yorker*, May 27, 1972, p. 109; I thank my colleague Gerald M. Quinn for calling my attention to this reference).

6. Frischlin's translations of *Acharnians*, *Knights*, *Clouds*, *Frogs*, and *Plutus* appared first in 1586; Chrestien's translation of *Peace* appeared in 1589, and that of *Wasps* and *Lysistrata* in 1607. The only Aristophanic comedy to appear in translation before Divus' work was *Plutus*, a Latin version of which had been published as early as 1501. (The annotated bibliography of Aristophanes, on which I am presently at work, will, I hope, clarify our knowledge of early editions and translations of Aristophanes.)

7. A. Gerlo and H. D. L. Vervliet (eds.), *La Correspondence de Juste Lipse conservée au Musée Plantin-Moretus* (Antwerp, 1967), p. 264; J. Plattard, *L'Oeuvre de Rabelais* (Paris, 1909), p. 175.

8. *Le Comedie de'l facetissimo Aristofane, tradutte di Greco in lingua commune d'Italia, per Bartolomeo & Pietro Rositini de Prat'Alboino* (Venetiis, 1545).

9. Another telling example occurs at *Frogs* 530, where Divus' text reads *hos* (apparently a misprint for *hoc*) *autem sperare;* this the Rositini translated: "se hai speranza in quelli." They could not possibly have made this error had they consulted the Greek text: τὸ δὲ προσδοκῆσαι . . .

10. The Rositini volume cannot be considered an independent version, since, as I have shown, it is virtually an Italian carbon copy of Divus.

11. M. R. Lefkowitz, "Cultural Conventions and the Persistence of Mistranslation," *CJ*, LXVIII (1972), 36.

sediment of some of Divus' misinterpretations still lurks unsuspected among the accepted and unquestioned meanings we attach to certain Aristophanic verses. We should naturally expect this situation to be most prevalent in the case of verses whose meanings are ambiguous, for this would account for these misinterpretations having eluded detection for so long.

I believe that such a verse occurs at *Birds* 30. Euelpides addresses the audience and says: *ἡμεῖς γὰρ ὦνδρες οἱ παρόντες ἐν λόγῳ / νόσον νοσοῦμεν τὴν ἐναντίαν Σάκᾳ* (30–31).[12] Divus took *οἱ παρόντες ἐν λόγῳ* as referring to *ὦνδρες* and accordingly translated: "nos enim, o viri praesentes in sermone, aegrotationem aegrotamus . . ." Syntactically this rendering makes good sense, and therefore Divus' meaning has been propagated since the Renaissance. All translators and commentators have adopted it, taking the line to mean something like: "For, gentlemen who are present at our speech, we suffer from a disease . . ."[13] However, this traditional interpretation cannot possibly be the one intended by Aristophanes: *οἱ παρόντες ἐν λόγῳ* must refer not to *ὦνδρες* but to *ἡμεῖς*, and what Aristophanes meant was: "For, gentlemen, we who appear in the plot suffer from a disease . . ."

This interpretation depends on a new syntactical arrangement and involves imposing a different lexical value on *λόγῳ*. The former change is effected naturally, for it may easily be demonstrated not only that the new syntax is most consistent with Aristophanic usage, but that the traditional one actually does violence to it. Aristophanes very commonly introduces the appositive to the personal pronoun of the first person (or its equivalent) with the article: *ἄγ', ὦνδρες, αὐτοὶ δὴ μόνοι λαβώμεθ' οἱ γεωργοί* (*Peace* 508); *οὐκ ἂν ἔτι δοίην τῶν θεῶν τριώβολον, / εἰ πορνοβοσκοῦσ' ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς οἱ βροτοί* (*Peace* 848–49); *τὸν ἄνδρα χαίρειν οἱ θεοὶ κελεύομεν / τρεῖς ὄντες ἡμεῖς* (*Birds* 1581–82); *οὕτω τὰς γυναῖκας ἐβδελύχθη κεῖνος, ἡμεῖς δ' / οὐδὲν ἧττον τοῦ Μελανίωνος, οἱ σώφρονες* (*Lys.* 795–96). On the other hand, the article hardly ever stands in apposition to the vocative *ἄνδρες*: the form occurs 48 times in Aristophanes (excluding the instance under discussion), and in no case, except possibly one, is it ever apposited by the article.[14] The one possible exception (*Ach.* 496)—also an address to the audience, incidentally—reads in all printed texts: *μή μοι φθονήσητ', ἄνδρες οἱ θεώμενοι*. But a look at the apparatus[15] reveals that the Ravennas, our oldest and best manuscript, reads *ἄνδρες ὦ θεώμενοι*: this is probably the correct reading, for not only would it more accurately capture the paratragic tone of this passage, but it may also be shown that the insertion of *ὦ* between a vocative and an attributive is very much in keeping with Aristophanic usage, e.g.: *Εὐριπίδιον ὦ γλυκύτατον καὶ φίλτατον* (*Ach.* 475); *Ἰὼ Λάμαχ', ὦ βλέπων ἀστραπάς* (*Ach.* 566). Therefore, our traditional interpretation of *Birds* 30 would make it the only instance (out of 49 in Aristophanes) where the article stands in apposition to the vocative *ἄνδρες*.

An objection may be raised to interpreting *ἐν λόγῳ* as "in the plot": most commentators are quick to point out the parallel at *Acharnians* 513: *ἀτάρ, φίλοι γὰρ οἱ παρόντες ἐν λόγῳ*. But the contexts of the two passages are totally

12. I deliberately omit punctuation in order to reproduce the passage just as Divus himself read it in one of the editions of the Greek text printed before 1538: in all of these the passage was unpunctuated.

13. That the Greek is ambiguous is evident from the difficulties which the line seems to cause translators; most of them simply gloss over it: thus, the most recent English version (by Patric Dickinson, London, 1970) has: "I tell you, you in the audience . . ." Dickinson's predecessors have been even more laconic, e.g., "Yes, dear people" (Arrowsmith); "Gentlemen" (Murray, Fitz); "Spectators" (Rogers); "My friends" (Webb). It may also be noted that since nearly every commentator feels it obligatory to explain this line, the *sensus receptus* has not found universal acceptance. It has in fact been called in question by A. M. Desrousseaux (*Aristophane: Les Oiseaux* [Paris, 1950], pp. 105–106), who, after characterizing the passage as "en général incompris," illustrates it from the oracular pronouncement *οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ*, seeing in these words a flattering address to the audience: "L'acteur flatte le public en lui disant qu'il n'est pas là seulement pour faire nombre; c'est de sa qualité qu'on tiendra compte." Yet Desrousseaux does not really swerve from the tradition, for he still takes *οἱ παρόντες ἐν λόγῳ* as referring to *ὦνδρες*.

14. *Ach.* 53, 56, 238, 328, 496; *Knights* 242, 266, 654; *Clouds* 1437; *Wasps* 240, 245, 270, 340, 908, 950; *Peace* 9, 13, 244, 276, 292, 318, 322, 383, 426, 484, 500, 508, 509, 560, 571, 1342; *Birds* 685, 687; *Lys.* 350, 615, 1044, 1074, 1122; *Frogs* 597; *Eccl.* 229, 285, 289; *Plut.* 254, 284, 322, 628, 802; Frag. 496.

15. Not Coulon's, however; the Budé editor did not record this variant. But see the apparatus (*ad loc.*) of Starkie, Van Leeuwen, and Cantarella.

different: Dicaeopolis is saying that he is speaking among friends, and ἐν λόγῳ here clearly means "at my speech."[16] But in Aristophanes λόγος often refers to the "plot" of a drama, e.g., ἐκεῖνο τήρει, μὴ σφαλεὶς καταρρυῇς / ἐντεῦθεν, εἶτα χωλὸς ὢν Εὐριπίδῃ / λόγον παράσχῃς καὶ τραγῳδία γένῃ (*Peace* 146–48); the word is invariably used in this sense when spoken by a participant of the prologue (as in the passage under discussion): ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν λόγον γε τοῖσι παιδίοις / καὶ τοῖσιν ἀνδρίοισι καὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν . . . φράσω (*Peace* 50–52); φέρε νυν, κατείπω τοῖς θεαταῖς τὸν λόγον (*Wasps* 54). On this latter passage the scholiast clearly defines λόγον as τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ δράματος, just as on the passage under discussion a Byzantine scholion glosses ἐν λόγῳ with ἐν τῇ ὑποθέσει.[17] The phrase can hardly apply to the spectators.

Why, then, has no one understood this verse correctly?[18] Simply because no student ever first approaches a notoriously difficult author such as Aristophanes without the assistance of lexica, commentaries, or translations. Since these instruments depend as much on each other as they do on long tradition, our interpretations of specific Aristophanic passages may not always be our own, but may have been inherited, or prejudiced, from the very beginning. Recently K. J. Dover stated that "certain attitudes towards [Aristophanes] can be traced as continuous strands from the Byzantine scholars of the ninth century to modern editors, commentators, readers and spectators."[19] Similarly, I suggest that we may have inherited some of our interpretations of specific Aristophanic verses partly, of course, from the Alexandrian and Byzantine scholiastic traditions, but partly also from a hitherto unsuspected Renaissance source: the Latin version of Andreas Divus, the first work to provide an interpretation of the text of Aristophanes in a language other than the playwright's own.[20]

FRED SCHREIBER

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE, CUNY

16. See also Eur. *Rhes.* 149.

17. See J. W. White, *The Scholia on the "Aves" of Aristophanes* (Boston, 1914), p. 305, and W. J. W. Koster (ed.), *Scholia in Aristophanem*, IV.3 (Groningen, 1962), 1132.

18. The verse was understood correctly at least once, but curiously enough, out of its context: in his edition of Suidas (Cambridge, 1705) Küster had translated the verse (which appears there as an illustration of the phrase ἐν λόγῳ) as "Nos enim, viri, qui in fabula praesentes sumus . . ." It is highly suggestive, however, that five years later, the same Küster allowed Hemsterhuys to translate the verse in the traditional manner in the edition of Aristophanes which he himself supervised: "Nos etenim, o viri, qui spectatores adestis in fabula . . ."

19. K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (London, 1972), p. 224.

20. I am indebted to my colleagues Gerald M. Quinn and James V. Romano for their helpful advice on the original version of this paper, which was read at the 104th meeting of the APA, in Philadelphia (December, 1972).

ΘΡΟΝΟΣ, ΔΙΦΡΟΣ, AND ODYSSEUS' CHANGE FROM BEGGAR TO AVENGER

Of the six words for "chair" that appear in the *Odyssey*, three—κλισίη, ἕδρη, and θῶκος—are used only rarely, or do not indicate precisely a specific type of chair,[1] but the other three words for chair appear more frequently, and do seem to imply certain definite characteristics. The most common word is θρόνος, the stately chair that is used, for example, by Athena, Nestor and his family, Telemachos, Hermes, Alkinoos, the Phaiakian nobles, Demodokos, Theoklymenos,[2] and, of course, the suitors, both singly and as a group;[3] it is never used by women (although it is by goddesses)[4] or by

1. Thus κλισίη, while carefully described (19. 55: all references are to the *Odyssey* unless specified otherwise), appears only twice (4. 123 and 19. 55); θῶκος appears in contexts indicating that it refers to the chairs used in councils or assemblies, but is used only twice (2. 14, 12. 318; cf. 5. 3, 15. 468); and ἕδρη can be used of a mean seat of brushwood and fleece, of the seats in an assembly, or of the seats for the nobles in the palaces of Nestor and Alkinoos (16. 42, 8. 16, 3. 429, 13. 56).

2. 1. 130, 3. 389, 4. 51, 5. 86, 6. 308, 7. 95, 8. 65, 17. 86.

3. E.g., 1. 145, 16. 408, 18. 157 (Amphinomos), 21. 166 (Leiodes).

4. The same distinction is preserved in the *Iliad*, where female deities such as Athena (*Il.* 15. 124), Thetis (*Il.* 18. 389) and Hera (*Il.* 8. 199 and 15. 150) sit upon θρόνοι, while mortal women never do. An interesting corollary to this may be provided by compound adjectives in -θρονος such as εὔθρονος and χρυσόθρονος which, in the *Odyssey* at least, are applied