

Arsenius and *Parisinus Graecus* 2070

Ole Langwitz Smith

I

Robortello's Edition of Scholia to Aeschylus

IN AN earlier article¹ I tried on the basis of the scholia to the *Supplices* to argue for the theory that Robortello for his edition of the scholia to Aeschylus² took his text of the scholia to the plays outside the triad from a *gemellus* to the Paris ms, *Ancien fonds grec* 2070³ written by Arsenios of Monembasia (Aristoboulos Apostolides). Since I wrote that paper I have had opportunity to study the text of *Par.* 2070 in the *Oresteia*-part also.⁴ This study both confirms and modifies my earlier view. On the one hand I have found more differences than the single one I found in the scholia to the *Supplices*, on the

¹ *ClMed* 28 (1970) 77f.

² *Scholia in Aeschyli Tragoedias omnes ex vetustissimis libris manuscriptis collecta atque in hoc corpus redacta* a Francisco Robortello Utinensi. Venetiis ex officina Erasmiana Vincentii Valgrisii MDLII.

³ This ms contains on ff.1–160 Planudes' translation of Cicero, *Somnium Scipionis*, with Macrobius' commentary. On ff.161–244^v we have Arsenios of Monembasia's recension of the scholia Medicea to Aeschylus. I have not been able to identify the scribe of ff.1–160, but this man also wrote ff.1–47 in *Par.* 2151. *Par.* 2070 consists of three different parts, each of which has on its first folio the owner's note of J. Fr. Asulanus; see ff.1^r, 161^r, 189^r. The watermarks indicate a date *ca.* 1520. As Arsenios was in Florence in 1518, the ms would seem to have been written at that time.

The end of the scholia to *Eumenides* has been lost. Three leaves were lost from the sixth quire in the third part of the ms. This quire now consists of only 5 leaves. The loss probably occurred after the volume had been bound at Fontainebleau, as ff.229, 230 and 231 have been repaired. On f.231^v the scholia to *Eumenides* end after 866 *δόφυλον*.

Headlines are in red ink, while the scholia have been written in brown. The underlinings until f.162^v are also in red; later they are in the same ink as the text. On f.189^r, the first folio of the third part of the ms, there is the note "cómento di Aeschilo." This is probably by Asulanus. Another hand wrote the verse Ter. *Andr.* 309 on f.193^r. This same hand is found in another Arsenios ms in Paris, *Ancien fonds grec* 3058 (the *Ἰωνία*); so possibly this was Arsenios himself. On the preliminary folio we have the index of the volume in Palaeo-kappa's hand.

⁴ Through a generous grant from the University of Aarhus I have been able to study the ms in the original at the Bibliothèque Nationale. I am deeply grateful to Professor H. Friis Johansen and the governing body of the University.

other I think that I have discovered decisive proof for the connection between Arsenios' recension and the edition of Robortello.

As in the scholia to the *Supplices*, we also in the *Oresteia*-part find that not only the scholia proper but also the lemmata are in the main identical. Some of the more puzzling errors in Robortello can be explained only on the theory that they originated from a faulty understanding of the readings of a ms similar to *Par.* 2070. I mention the following instances:

<i>Cho.</i> 649	^{σω} αιμάτων	<i>Par.</i> 2070	δωμάτων	Rob.
<i>Cho.</i> 681	τὸ ἐξαγνώς lemma	<i>Par.</i> 2070	τὸ ὑξαγνώς	Rob.
<i>Eum.</i> 139	ἔπου ^ο lemma	<i>Par.</i> 2070	ἔπον	Rob.
<i>Eum.</i> 140	πρά	<i>Par.</i> 2070	πράτη	Rob.
<i>Eum.</i> 181	ἦ ^α	<i>Par.</i> 2070	ἦλον	Rob., ἰόν M
<i>Eum.</i> 186	ἀποκεφαλι ^ε	<i>Par.</i> 2070	ἀποκεφαλίας	Rob.

I may also draw attention to the following common errors:

<i>Ag.</i> 106–07	ἔσπέρας	<i>Cho.</i> 528	κρανοῦται
<i>Cho.</i> 23b	συγκόψομαι ⁵	<i>Cho.</i> 813	ὀλιγικώτατος
<i>Cho.</i> 413	τρώσεται	<i>Eum.</i> 176	ἰὼν

Obviously Robortello's source was a ms with scholia only. These scholia had lemmata probably underlined. This can be demonstrated by referring to the numerous cases where Robortello confounded lemmata and scholia. I shall confine myself to two telling cases:

Ag. 1153f runs as follows in Robortello:

Δυσφάτωι κλάγγει] ἀσαφεί ἀνιγματώδει ἢ διὰ τὸ δυστυχή μαν-
τεύεσθαι ἢ διὰ τὸ προειδέναι τὰ δεινὰ ἀνωφελῶς θεσπίας τῆς
μαντικῆς.

It is evident that *θεσπίας* is the lemma for *τῆς μαντικῆς*; in the poetic text Robortello read *θεσπεσίας*. Obviously he just took over what he found in his source. In this ms the underlining may have been missing, or Robortello may have overlooked it. In *Par.* 2070 we find the same text as in Robortello, but with *θεσπίας* underlined.

⁵ *συγκόψομαι* is found as late as Dindorf and Kirchhoff. The reading of *Laur.* 32, 9 is quite unmistakably *κόψομαι*.

The other instance is *Cho.* 290 and 296, where Robortello exhibits:

Λυμανθέν] λυμανθέντα κακῶ. Ταριχεφθέντα] καὶ ὁ κώφρων
κτλ.

In *Par.* 2070 we find:

λυμανθέν· λυμανθέντα· κακῶ ταριχεφθέντα· καὶ ὁ
κώφρων κτλ.

The puzzling κακῶ now appears to be the κακῶς of the poetic text line 296.⁶

But this is not all. At *Ag.* 36 the scholium on βούς ἐπὶ γλώσσει in *Laur.* 32,9 runs:

ἢ βάρος ἐπικεῖται ἢ φοβοῦμαι ζημίαν ἐπικεισομένην μοι.

This is neither in Robortello nor in *Par.* 2070. Instead we find on *Ag.* 36 the following note:

παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ δυναμένων παρρησιάζεσθαι.

Now it is hardly a coincidence that this is found in *Par.* 2070. As is well known Arsenios had a special interest in παροιμίαι, and this particular one is also found together with the explanation ἐπὶ . . . παρρησιάζεσθαι in his collection *Ἰωνία*.⁷ The appearance of the same scholium in Robortello would seem to be proof of the connection.⁸ However there is decisive evidence.

Schol. *Eum.* 540 has been written twice in *Par.* 2070, in both cases at the wrong place. It has been written in the margin of f.228^v, obviously in order to follow schol. *Eum.* 527; and it is also found on f.229^r after schol. *Eum.* 569. This state of affairs may be explained in this way. When Arsenios copied the scholia from *Laur.* 32,9,⁹ he copied 569

⁶ In Schütz's edition of 1821 this κακῶι still appears.

⁷ *Arsenii Violetum*, ed. C. Walz (Stuttgartiae 1832) 143.

⁸ This 'scholium' was taken over by Victorius, and from there it continued to disfigure the editions. It is found as late as in van Heusde. On the composite nature of Victorius' scholia, see Fraenkel's edition of *Agamemnon*, I (Oxford 1950) 34.

⁹ Though I agree with A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York 1943) 23, that *Par.* 2070 is a direct copy of *Laur.* 32,9, there are occasional additions from other sources; at PV 18 Arsenios added the scholium Dindorf p.170, 18–24.

Turyn does not advance any proof, but a passage like schol. *Cho.* 595 shows beyond doubt that Arsenios had *Laur.* 32,9 before him when he wrote *Par.* 2070: τίς λέγοι· τίς λέγοι καὶ γυν (καὶ γυν was deleted immediately) φρεσὶν κτλ. The deleted words came from the poetic text 595 τίς λέγοι καὶ γυναικῶν.

after 582 because 569 is written on top of f.164^v in *Laur.* 32,9 without a reference sign to the poetic text to show where it does belong. Accordingly Arsenios did not know where to place it. Having copied 569 he became aware of 540, which is the first regular scholium on this page; or perhaps he just copied it by oversight, failing to observe that it would be wrongly placed in that way. Whether he detected his error immediately or later we cannot know, but in *Par.* 2070 both lemma and scholium are underlined, the line under the scholia no doubt being a deletion-mark.¹⁰ Having deleted this wrongly placed scholium he added it in the margin where he thought it did belong, though still not correctly. In Robortello we find schol. 540 written twice, after 527 and after 569. This disposes of the *gemellus*-theory: there is no reason to suppose that Arsenios would have committed the same error twice, or rather the same series of errors. There is only one way of explaining the evidence: Robortello's main source was an apograph of *Par.* 2070.¹¹ It must be remembered that Robortello could not have used *Par.* 2070 itself; when Robortello prepared his edition, *Par.* 2070 was in the library at Fontainebleau.¹² Besides, there are a number of features in Robortello which cannot be found in *Par.* 2070. So Robortello must have had access to another ms from which he drew supplementary matter.¹³

¹⁰ There is a perfect parallel at schol. *PV* 494 on f.196^r, where Arsenios wrote the scholium thus: δαίμοσι πρὸς ἡδονήν ἐμπρόδεκτα πρὸς ἡδονήν θεοῖς. The deletion of the intruded lemma is indicated by the underlining.

¹¹ When *Par.* 2070 was copied in the ms used by Robortello this deletion was not understood, and accordingly schol. *Eum.* 540 was copied twice.

I should like to add that the apograph used by Robortello cannot have been any of the existing apographs of *Par.* 2070. Of these only *Mon.* 91 and *Vat.gr.* 1464 come in for consideration. These two are the only ones that have the whole text. In the case of both mss nothing is gained by identifying any of them with Robortello's source. Where their readings depart from *Par.* 2070, Robortello follows the parent ms.

¹² In 1542 Asulanus' mss were bought by G. Pélicier for Francis I. The catalogue of the mss in the library of Fontainebleau prepared by Vergikios and Palaeokappa exhibits *Par.* 2070 as no.15. See H. Omont, *Catalogues des manuscrits grecs de Fontainebleau sous François I et Henri II* (Paris 1889) 6.

¹³ From this source Robortello took schol. *Cho.* 621 and *Eum.* 386b, apart from parts of lemmata and scholia not found in *Par.* 2070. Some of these additions could very well have been made from the poetic text.

There are in *Par.* 2070 some mysterious lacunae which cannot all be ascribed to the illegibility of the exemplar. I am unable to see why Arsenios hesitated at *Ag.* 135–38, where he wrote τῶν κυ διός, and at *Cho.* 51, where he did not copy μύκος but left the blank space for five letters. On the other hand, at *Pers.* 41 it is difficult to read more than οἱ λυ και in *Laur.* 32,9, and accordingly Arsenios wrote οἱ και. The same thing happened at

How do these results fit with Robortello's own statement about his sources? If we are to believe him, he had at his disposal two mss: "*librum ad me pervetustum misisti in quo erant postremae huius authoris Tragoediae descriptae . . . aliumque praeterea in quo tu ipse multa adnotaras.*"

So he says in the preface to Mariano Savello. But this is about the poetic text; in the preface to the scholia he mentions only one: "*antiquissimum ad me misisti librum in quo tres hae manu vetusti cuiusdam ac bene docti hominis accurate descriptae fuerunt cuius ope in primis omnia vulnera tam praeclari poetae sanavimus atque omnia fere collegimus quae adiumento omnibus erunt ad loca difficilia intelligenda.*"

Most scholars seem to identify Savello's "*antiquissimum librum*" with *Laur.* 32,9. But how can Savello have got hold of this ms? In his preface to *L'Eschilo Laurenziano*, Rostagno¹⁴ seems to imply that *Laur.* 32,9 was in Savello's possession at Padua in 1551. This simply cannot be true. As far as we know, the famous ms was at Florence at this time, and it is quite impossible to imagine that Savello, about whom we know next to nothing,¹⁵ owned the ms. The Savelli were not commonly known as bibliophiles or manuscript collectors, though Giacomo Savello,¹⁶ Mariano's brother, was a very learned cardinal. Mariano himself, if we can trust Robortello, had a liking for philosophy, as did so many educated men at that time. Mariano was a young man in 1551 and was probably studying at Padua, from where he sent the mss to Robortello, who may have been at Venice.

The identification can also be proved wrong in another way. As M. Dopchie¹⁷ has recently shown, the poetic text in Robortello could not

the notorious crux PV 364, where he wrote $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$. The lacunae Robortello filled from his second source.

¹⁴ *L'Eschilo Laurenziano*, facsimile ed. E. Rostagno (Florence 1896) 10.

¹⁵ I have searched in vain for information about him. M. E. Cosenza, *Dictionary of the Italian Humanists* (Boston 1962) s.n., only knows about him from Robortello, but does not seem to have read the prefaces. There is some material on the family in G. Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica* 61 (Venice 1853) 294ff. The few treatments of the history of this family naturally concentrate on the earlier members. Mariano Savello was bishop at Nicastro from 1554 to 1556 and at Gubbio from 1560 until his death in 1599. The Mariano Savello, to whom Simon Portius in 1521 dedicated his *De mente humana disputatio*, probably was the uncle of our Mariano.

¹⁶ Cf. M. L. Shay in *New Catholic Dictionary* (New York 1929) s.n.

¹⁷ "L'Humanisme italien et l'Agamemnon d'Eschyle," *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 37 (1966) 99ff. In this paper Dopchie points out that Robortello's distinction between *Agamemnon* and *Choephoroe* probably was the work of Victorius' assistants Bartolomeo Barbadoro and Girolamo Mei. Dopchie does not refer to the scholia, where Robortello did not distinguish between the two plays. This means that at least in November 1551

have been taken from *Laur.* 32,9. Robortello expressly mentions which readings he and Sophianos corrected in Savello's ms, and these have nothing to do with *Laur.* 32,9. Besides, the corrections very often are identical with the readings found in that ms.

Now, the apograph of *Par.* 2070 cannot be identified with the Savello ms, as that ms contained both text and scholia. The statement of Robortello's that he took the scholia from Savello's ms cannot be true. The ms cannot have been as old as Robortello implies; I should guess that it probably was a run-of-the-mill ms from the end of the XV century, and of course a direct or indirect copy of the Medicean ms.¹⁸ The apograph of *Par.* 2070 cannot well have been more than 35 years old, and one is astonished that Robortello did not see that.¹⁹

The 'author' of Robortello's scholia will probably replace Robortello in the apparatus of future editions of the scholia to Aeschylus. In my previous article I pointed out that a number of corrections normally ascribed to Robortello were in fact made by Arsenios. This is not Arsenios' main contribution to classical scholarship; still, credit should be given to whom it is due.

Robortello did not know that his *Agamemnon* in fact was two different plays. As Robortello at that time used Savello's ms, it is obvious that he did not distinguish between the two plays with the help of the ms, as he claims in the preface. It is therefore pretty certain that Robortello used the results of Barbadoro and Mei, of which he must have become aware during the few months between the issue of the scholia and the issue of the text. Without access to the *Laur.* 32,9 he could hardly have found the solution himself, nor does he seem to have seen any problem.

¹⁸ Among the extant apographa of the Medicean ms only *San Marco* 222, *Bon.* 2271 and *Guelf.Gud.gr.* 88 are qualified to be considered identical with the Savello ms. *San Marco* 222 is the least probable candidate as its scholia are not very numerous. *Bon.* 2271 in 1551 was in the library of San Salvatore at Bologna (M.-H. Laurent, *Fabio Vigili et les bibliothèques de Bologne* [*Studi e Testi* 105, Vatican 1943] 270). We know nothing at present of the whereabouts of *Gud.gr.* 88 at that time. The non-triadic part, ff. 131–193, was written ca. 1492–96 in Florence by Michael Souliardos, as I venture to conclude from the specimen of his writing in H. Omont, *Facsimilés de manuscrits grecs des XV^e et XVI^e siècles* (Paris 1887) pl. 38. Souliardos worked in the Medicean library at that time; see E. Lobel, *The Greek Mss of Aristotle's Poetics* (Oxford 1933) 54f, and D. Young, *Scriptorium* 7 (1953) 17. In 1518 the ms was with Asulanus when he was preparing the Aldine Aeschylus. G. F. Tomasini, *Bibliothecae Patavinae mss. publicae et privatae* (Utini 1639) 114, mentions this ms as being with Nic. Trevisano at Padua. Its readings, however, do not show any close similarity to those mentioned by Robortello.

¹⁹ Compare the similar but not so glaring case mentioned by A. Dain, *Histoire du texte d'Élien le Tacticien* (Paris 1946) 318f.

II

Franchini's Source for Aristophanes, *Pax* 948–1011

IT IS well-known that the passage *Pax* 948–1011 was not included in the *editio princeps* of Aristophanes by Musurus in 1498¹ and that these lines were restored by Antonio Franchini in his edition of 1525.² In the preface to Benedetto Accolti, Franchini mentions the help he had from Arsenios:³ “*ad hoc (i.e. the recension of Aristophanes) Arsenii Cretensis Archiepiscopi Monembasiae magna eruditione viri acerrimo iudicio usi, dum is Florentiae adolescentulos illos, quos Leo, Pont. Max. ad reparandam graecae linguae iacturam ex media Graecia accersiverat, instituit.*” As Arsenios probably left Florence at Leo X's death in 1521 and went back to Crete, he must have worked with Franchini in 1521 at the latest.⁴ We do not know the exact share Arsenios had in Franchini's work;⁵ perhaps this did not amount to much, as most of Franchini's text was taken from the Aldine.⁶ At one point, however, Franchini's text was superior to that of Musurus, as he says in the preface: “*In qua quidem recognitione hoc in primis gloriari licet, nos omnium primos in Comoedia cui titulus est Εἰρήνη ad sexaginta versiculos nostra diligentia repertos restituisse.*” This seems to show that Franchini took for himself the honor of having restored the text. There is evidence, however, for Arsenios having a share of it.

In Franchini's edition on ff.347–48 the line *εἶτα μονωδεῖν ἐκ μηδείας* (1012) has been printed twice. Why did this happen? Obviously because the missing lines were supplied from a copy of this part where lines 947 and 1012 had been added in order to show where the missing lines did belong. By an oversight the line *εἶτα μονωδεῖν ἐκ μηδείας* was

¹ Ἀριστοφάνους κωμωιδίαι ἐννέα... Venetiis apud Aldum 1498.

² Ἀριστοφάνους κωμωιδίαι ἐννέα. Μετὰ σχολίων πολλῶν παλαιῶν καὶ πάνυ ὠφελίμων πρὸς τοῖς πρότερον ἐντετυπωμένων, σὺν πίνακι ἀφθονοτάτῳ τῶν ἀπάντων εἰς ἃ δεῖ τὸν νοῦν προσέχειν. Florentinae per heredes Philippi Juntae . . . 1525.

³ Extracts from this preface have been printed in E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique* . . . XV^e et XVI^e s., II (Paris 1885) 156. Quoted in full in A. M. Bandini, *De Florentina Iuntarum Typographia* II (Lucae 1791) 194f.

⁴ On Arsenios and his work in this period see D. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1962) 187 with notes and literature quoted.

⁵ A. Renouard, *Annales de l'imprimerie des Aldes*³ (Paris 1834) 17, asserts that the scholia were edited by Arsenios. There is nothing about this in the preface, though the guess may be correct, since Arsenios wrote the scholia in *Par.* 2070.

⁶ See e.g. W. G. Rutherford, *Scholia Aristophanica* I (London 1896) xv.

printed twice because it was found both in the copy of the missing part and in the main text used for printing.

As far as I know no such excerpt has yet been found. No manuscript exhibiting the lines *Pax* 947–1012 seems to have been recorded.⁷

While I was doing preliminary researches for a new edition of the scholia to Aeschylus I investigated the Paris ms *Ancien fonds grec* 2070, which was known to contain the scholia Medicea copied directly from *Laur.* 32,9 by Arsenios.⁸ On ff.242ff this ms exhibits in a hand different from that of Arsenios⁹ the lines *Pax* 947–1012. This part of the ms seems to have escaped the notice of former investigators, and it is not mentioned in Omont.¹⁰ There are scholia to the text in the hand of Arsenios. As I am presently going to show, the excerpt is a direct copy of the *Codex Ravennas* 137,4A.

The history of the Ravenna ms in the first quarter of the XVI century is not sufficiently clear. In 1515 or early in 1516 the ms was with B. Giunta when he edited *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Lysistrata*. It may have been in the possession of Euphrosynus Boninus¹¹ afterwards, and we know that it was bought in Pisa in 1712¹² for the Bibliotheca Classensis in Ravenna. We may guess that Arsenios met Boninus in Florence in 1518, as Boninus had edited some Greek works for the Giunta press in the period 1514–17. He may still have been there when Arsenios arrived in 1518. What happened was probably that Arsenios and another scribe copied from the *Ravennas* in Boninus' possession

⁷ I have checked J. W. White's lists (*CP* 1 [1906] 9ff) and subsequently published information as far as I have been aware of it.

⁸ Cf. A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York 1943) 23, and my edition of the scholia to Aeschylus' *Supplices* in H. Friis Johansen, *Aeschylus, The Suppliants I* (Copenhagen 1970) 150. For a description of the ms see the preceding article, section I above, n.3.

⁹ The hand of Arsenios is well known. Specimens of his writing in H. Omont, *Facsimilés de manuscrits grecs des XV^e et XVI^e siècles* (Paris 1887) pl.5 and 6. See also M. Wittek, *Album de paléographie grecque* (Gand 1967) pl.43 and 46. The writing in *Par.* 2070 is so different from Arsenios' that it cannot possibly be his hand in the poetic text.

¹⁰ H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale II* (Paris 1888) 187. Neither is it mentioned in Vergikios' and Palaeokappa's catalogue of 1550 published by Omont, *Catalogue des mss. grecs de Fontainebleau* (Paris 1889). Our ms is no.15 in the alphabetical list.

¹¹ Cf. J. W. White, *CP* 1 (1906) 257; J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis comoediae undecim cum scholiis. Codex Ravennas 137.4A phototypice editus* (Leiden 1904) vi. On Boninus, cf. Bandini, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) I.67ff.

¹² Van Leeuwen, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.11) v.

the missing part of text and scholia. As White has argued,¹³ Franchini did not have access to the *Ravennas* in 1525, and Arsenios probably made a copy of his excerpt for Franchini's use when he left Florence. This may explain the slight inconsistencies between the edition and our excerpt. That *Par.* 2070 is a direct copy from the Ravenna ms may be seen from the blank spaces in schol. 968, where the *Ravennas* is illegible. *Par.* 2070 exhibits the following text:

τοῦτο οὖν ἐποιοῦν οἱ σπένδοντες . . . συνειδότες τί ἑαυτοῖς . . .
ἐκχωροῖεν τῶν σπονδῶν (= 968,38 Dübner)

The blank spaces correspond exactly with the illegible parts in the *Ravennas*. The same thing happened at 1001 (= Dübner 1001,37) καὶ πρῶια . . . ὅτι δὲ; 1008,11 Dübner διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὺς κολα . . . ὡς γαστριμάργους; and 1008,13 Dübner ὅπως τὸ ε . . . ἴσως. Arsenios also omitted some scholia,¹⁴ as he did in the recension of the Aeschylean scholia.

On the other hand there are some cases where the scholia in *Par.* 2070 have a somewhat different form from the *Ravennas*. At 969 the marginal scholium in the *Ravennas* has been divided in *Par.* 2070. Arsenios wrote τοῖς χορευταῖς. καταχεῖ γάρ on line 968 and ἐπὶ γέλωτι κτλ *s.l.* on line 972. The reason for this abnormal procedure can be seen from the facsimile of the *Ravennas* (f.105^v). The scholium has been written in the *Ravennas* in the left margin opposite lines 968–73, and line 970 divides the two parts of the scholium in such a way that a mistake is very easily made. At schol. 981 *Par.* 2070 has ἡμὲν ἀνακλῖναι ἡδ' ἐπιθεῖναι πυκινὸν νέφος. Obviously Arsenios tried to supply the missing words in the *Ravennas*, which has ἡμὲν ἀνακλῖναι πυκινὸν νέφος, but inserted the supplement in the wrong place. At schol. 1008,15 Dübner, Arsenios seems to have been able to read ἦν δὲ after λίχνον¹⁵—we can rule out that he had access to the *Venetus*. At schol. 1007,2 Dübner, he seems to have been unable to understand the *Ravennas* τοῦ πο²; *Par.* 2070 has τοῦ πο ἐν ᾧ κτλ..

These differences, when explained, confirm that *Par.* 2070 is a copy of the *Ravennas*.¹⁶ But how is this text compared with Arsenios' final version in the Giunta edition of 1525? Apart from the omission of

¹³ White, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.11).

¹⁴ E.g. schol. 960, 962.

¹⁵ Cf. A. Martin, *Les scolies du manuscrit d'Aristophane à Ravenne* (BEFAR 27, Paris 1882) 138 *ad loc.*: "je crois, d'après l'étendue de la lacune, que les mots ἦν δὲ étaient dans le ms."

¹⁶ Some differences are clearly printer's errors, e.g. 948 δῆξον for δεῖξον.

schol. 965, 995, 1008, 1009 and 1011, Arsenios made the following changes:

959 *Ἡρακλεῖ* *Par.* 2070, ἐν *Ἡρακλεῖ* Giunta.

959 μέλλων . . . δαλίονι *om.* Giunta, obviously because Arsenios could not make sense of his copy of the *Ravennas*, where he omitted τόκος by an oversight. The word is easy to read in the facsimile.

969. *Par.* 2070 omits, as we have seen, αὐτῶν ὕδωρ, which words are restored in the Giunta. This is a remarkable feat if Arsenios did not have a second look at the *Ravennas*—and there is nothing to prove that he did.

969. In the Giunta Arsenios omitted the lacunose part of his excerpt τοῦτο οὖν . . . σπονδῶν. This was too much for him.

981. Arsenios noticed his wrong supplement and dropped it. Did he not have a Homer at hand?

991. In his excerpt Arsenios, maybe because he was in a hurry, did not write the articles which are added in the edition. They are found in the *Ravenna ms.*

1001. In the Giunta Arsenios supplied the lacuna *εἰκνα γίνονται*; this is good but not really astonishing, as we have *πρώιαι εἰκναι* (*Par.* 2070) in the following. The *Ravennas* clearly reads *πρώιμοι*, however, and this is restored in the Giunta. In this case one may wonder whether Arsenios did not after all have access to the *Ravennas* after he had made his excerpt. It is of course impossible that the Giunta text was taken direct from the *Ravennas*.¹⁷

I add a few remarks on the poetic text in our excerpt. This was not written by Arsenios as far as I can see, nor by any of his closer associates,¹⁸ as far as can be judged from published specimens.

¹⁷ I only mention the repeated line 1012 and the fact that there are no scholia in the Giunta which are not in *Par.* 2070.

¹⁸ Cf. M. Wittek, *Scriptorium* 7 (1953) 290ff, on the scriptorium of M. Apostolis. A list of published specimens of their writing, *ibid.*, 296.

There are occasional good conjectures. At 972 Reiske's *τοῦθ' ἐστᾶς* was anticipated; 959 *ἐμβάψω* (the exemplar has *ἐμβάμψω*); 981 *αἱ κείναι* (*Rav.*), *ἐκεῖναι* *Par.* 2070. At 967 the change of speakers was restored, anticipating Brunck.

AARHUS UNIVERSITET
January, 1971