

Manuscript Problems in Euripides' *Hecuba*

Kjeld Matthiessen

A NEW CRITICAL EDITION of Euripides' *Hecuba*, on which I began work in 1962, is now almost completed. Since much time will be required in press, however, a preliminary report may be useful to scholars at work in similar fields—particularly future editors of *Orestes* and *Phoenissae*—and may provoke constructive criticism in time for revisions to be made.

One must begin with a survey of Euripidean manuscript problems in general. The nineteen plays preserved under the name of Euripides¹ can be divided into three groups, according to their different kinds of transmission:

1. The so-called 'Byzantine triad' (*Hecuba*, *Orestes*, *Phoenissae*).
2. The ten plays equipped with scholia, except the triad: *Medea*, *Hippolytus*, *Andromache*, *Alcestis*, *Rhesus*, *Troades*, *Bacchae*. The *Bacchae* has no scholia in the extant manuscripts, but there are sufficient indications that it still had scholia in mediaeval times.²
3. The nine plays without annotations or so-called 'alphabetical plays', because their titles begin with *E*, *H*, *I*, and *K*. They look like the remnants of an alphabetical collection of Euripidean plays:³ *Helena*, *Electra*, *Heraclidae*, *Hercules Furens*, *Supplices*, *Iphigenia Aulidensis*, *Iphigenia Taurica*, *Ion*, *Cyclops*.

In a way similar to the extant plays, the extant manuscripts also can be divided into three classes:

1. Mss containing the plays of all three groups: L P.

¹ The fragment of *Danae* which is preserved only in P (fol. 147^v–148^r) will be entirely disregarded in the present study. The origin of this fragment is a difficult problem of its own.

² See *Hermes* 93 (1965) 148–58. A different but less convincing explanation of how *Rhes. Tro. Bacch.* entered the manuscript tradition is given by A. Tuilier, *Recherches critiques sur la tradition du texte d'Euripide* (Études et Commentaires 68, Paris 1968) 116–22.

³ See B. Snell, "Zwei Töpfe mit Euripides-Papyri," *Hermes* 70 (1935) 119–20. For a different theory see Tuilier, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2).

2. Mss containing the plays of groups 1 (triad) and 2 (other plays with scholia): M H B A V, and about twenty less important Mss.

3. Mss containing the triad only: more than 250 Mss.⁴

Each of the three groups of plays raises its particular difficulties. In discussing these difficulties I begin with the third group, namely the plays without scholia, or 'alphabetical plays'. All of them are transmitted in two Mss only, L and P. Therefore only one manuscript problem must be solved, the relation between L and P.⁵ The textual problems, however, are rather difficult, for L is a good witness, but it contains a considerable number of errors; P, if it has independent value at all, offers very few variants that are worth discussing. So in most cases we are unable to eliminate the errors of L by manuscript evidence, and emendation becomes necessary. Papyri and ancient quotations give little help because they are not numerous.

The editor of a play of the second group (plays with scholia, excluding the triad) is better provided with Mss. In most cases there are more than two, and they are representatives of different families. On the other hand there are not very many of them, so that manuscript work is neither too complicated nor too time-consuming. The establish-

⁴ We do not have complete lists of the Mss of Eur. The first attempt to compose such a list was made by Chr. D. Beck (*Euripidis Tragoediae, Fragmenta, Epistulae* . . ., vol. III cur. C. D. Beckius [Leipzig 1788] ix-xiii: "Recensio codicum vel collatorum vel nondum collatorum"). His list contains 164 items, but he notes that it is far from being complete. In his time many libraries were still inaccessible. Not until 150 years later was the next attempt made, by J. A. Spranger ("A Preliminary Skeleton List of the Manuscripts of Euripides," *CQ* 33 [1939] 98-107). His list contains 274 items. A. Turyn gives a "General List of the Manuscripts of Euripides," containing 268 items (*The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of Euripides* [Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 43, Urbana 1957] 3-9). Turyn discovered a great number in addition to Spranger, but on the other hand he does not mention most of the Mss that are later than 1500. He has good reasons for omitting them, for in 1503 the Aldine appeared, the first printed edition of all Euripidean tragedies (except *El.*). A substantial number of the later Mss depend more or less on the Aldine, or on other editions that in turn depend on the Aldine. Besides, I can say from my own experience that the quality of the text declines sensibly in the Mss written in the last decades of the XV century. Putting together Turyn's and Spranger's lists and avoiding any double-counting, we get the sum of 316 Mss. In the meantime some additional Mss have been found. Probably our knowledge is still incomplete, but for the important age before 1500 Turyn's list is a reliable instrument.

⁵ Because L is the older and, at least for the 'alphabetical' plays, the far better Ms, there are only two possibilities: P is either a *gemellus* or a copy of L. For a couple of years it seemed as if G. Zuntz (*An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* [Cambridge 1965] 1-15) had found the right solution and had proved that P is indeed a copy of L. But now that serious objections have been put forward by Tuilier, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 196-209, a modification of Zuntz's theory might become necessary.

ment of a *stemma codicum* seems to be not beyond the reach of our knowledge. It has to be admitted that there is a fair amount of contamination.⁶ But one should at least try to establish a stemma before resigning. The quality of the text that can be established by an editor relying on manuscript evidence alone is far better than in the 'alphabetical' plays. In comparing the edition of the 'alphabetical' *Helena* by Karin Alt (Leipzig 1964) and that of the annotated *Hippolytus* by W. S. Barrett (Oxford 1964), I find that within the same number of lines Alt has to put an emendation into the text twice as often as Barrett does.

As for the triad (*Hecuba*, *Orestes*, *Phoenissae*), however, manuscript problems are really discouraging. For each of the three plays the number of extant Mss ranges between 200 and 300. Most of them, of course, are worthless, but it is impossible to know beforehand which is worthless and which is not. Every editor of a triad play has to find his own way of handling such an excessive number of Mss. Before describing my solution, I should like to discuss that of A. Kirchhoff, the most influential editor of Euripides in modern times. As a solution it is both simple and convenient, but it is dangerous, too. One needs to know that Kirchhoff began his work on Euripides with his edition of *Medea* (Berlin 1852), that is to say, with an edition of a play of the second group. He used all available witnesses, and here began to form his opinion about the quality and the relationship of the different Mss. His next step was an edition of the *Troades* (Berlin 1852). But for the *Troades* there are only few Mss, so in editing this play he could not learn anything by which he could get a broader view of manuscript problems outside of *Medea*. After editing two plays he felt confident enough to generalize his observations and to edit the whole of the corpus according to the same rules that he found useful in *Medea*.⁷ What this procedure means for *Hecuba* and the other triad plays is obvious. For *Medea*, since it is not a triad play, Mss of the third class do not exist. So Kirchhoff considered it justified to eliminate all Mss of the third class, which means all Mss that contain only the triad. This *eliminatio recentiorum* is a common feature in all editorial

⁶ See V. di Benedetto, *La tradizione manoscritta euripidea* (*Προαγῶνες*, Studi 7, Padova 1965) 53–122.

⁷ Euripidis *Tragoediae* ex rec. A. Kirchhoffii, I (Berlin 1855) xii: "Textum poetae . . . constitui . . . ea ratione, cuius exemplum proposui in editione *Medae*."

work of that time. It is moreover a legitimate part of the method of K. Lachmann. One has to remember that Lachmann developed his method in his edition of Lucretius.⁸ And on the Latin side, the humanistic Mss (written not earlier than 1400) are indeed heavily interpolated and consequently very unreliable. In order to establish a text that is superior to the *textus receptus* of the early printed editions, one must begin with the elimination of all later Mss and must go back to the oldest available witnesses and use them as basis for the new text.

Kirchhoff called the entire third class of Mss "*recentiores*" or "*Byzantini*"; and he presumed that all of them were derived from a selection made at a very late date and that they do not represent genuine tradition.⁹ Besides M B A V L P he uses for his edition eight minor Mss.¹⁰ All of them belong to the second class, because they are not exclusively triad Mss but contain at least part of the seven plays of the second group. The editors after Kirchhoff tried to reduce the number of necessary Mss as much as possible. Prinz and Murray quoted the minor Mss only sporadically. Wilamowitz tried to dismiss even B, and Barrett disregarded P even in a play with scholia.¹¹ The final point seems to be reached by the editors of Euripides in the Collection Budé. Here only M B A V L P are mentioned individually in the *Conspectus Siglorum* and in the apparatus; the old and very interesting Jerusalem Palimpsest H is disregarded entirely,¹² and the minor Mss are quoted collectively as "*rec.*" wherever Murray quotes one of them.

It must be admitted that Kirchhoff's and Murray's system works quite well in so far as in the triad no part of the Euripidean text is missing in M B A V L P. There is nothing like the striking case of

⁸ Compare S. Timpanaro, *La genesi del metodo di Lachmann* (Florence 1963).

⁹ Kirchhoff, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) vii: "Posteriore mox aetate exarescentibus paullatim doctrinae rivulis magister quidam Byzantinus sylloges amplioris compendium confecit trium fabularum . . . quam varietatis farraginem equidem totam abiiciendam statui, quippe cuius nullus usus esset futurus sanae mentis critico." For a similar judgement see G. Murray ed., Euripides, *Fabulae* I (Oxford 1902) viii.

¹⁰ The Florentine part of P was used by Kirchhoff only in his 2nd ed. (Berlin 1867–68).

¹¹ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie*² (Berlin 1906) 207 n.171: "Paris. B, den man jedoch eigentlich auch nur in der Alkestis nötig hat"; W. S. Barrett ed., Euripides, *Hippolytos* (Oxford 1964) 73, 429. It is worth mentioning, however, that Barrett for the first time since Kirchhoff used some Mss outside of M B A V L P in a systematic manner: H O and his group C D E (*Vaticanus* 910, *Laurentianus* 31, 15, *Athous Iberorum* 209).

¹² See now S. G. Daitz, *The Jerusalem Palimpsest of Euripides, a Facsimile Edition with Commentary* (Berlin 1970).

Oedipus Tyrannus 800, which for Sophocles destroys the whole concept of a *codex unicus*.¹³ But in the three plays I have counted 36 cases where (mostly in minor matters, but not always so) M B A V L P are all wrong, and where Murray relies on the *Byzantini* (sometimes called *novicii*) alone. One might suppose that in all these cases the superior variant is no genuine tradition but brilliant Byzantine emendation.¹⁴ But there are too many “emendations” of this kind, so that one begins to doubt whether this assumption is altogether right.¹⁵

Therefore it seems inevitable for an editor of a triad play to use also the third class of Mss in one way or another. So I decided to enter that labyrinth, which I should not have dared to do without the help of Turyn’s book. Like Ariadne’s clue it prevented me from going astray. Turyn divides the whole bulk of triad Mss into two groups: first, the Mss influenced by the Byzantine grammarians of the Palaeologean period (the “*Byzantini*”), and second, those that are free from such influence (the “*veteres*”). We know these grammarians from their scholia and introductions to several Greek authors. Their names are Maximus Planudes, Manuel Moschopulus, Thomas Magister and Demetrius Triclinius; their activity falls between 1260 and 1340. In some Mss certain chains of scholia are attributed by certain signs to one or another of them. The key Ms for the triad of Euripides is T, written partially by the hand of Demetrius Triclinius himself. Here we find a clear distinction between Moschopulean, Thoman and Triclinian scholia. Another key Ms is Y, equipped with Planudean and Moschopulean scholia.¹⁶

¹³ E. Schwartz, *Scholia in Euripidem* I (Berlin 1887), uses M B V and C (*Taurinensis* B.iv.13) as basic Mss, but often a minor Ms is used to supply a superior variant or to fill a gap in M C B V.

¹⁴ So does for instance V. di Benedetto ed., Euripides, *Orestes* (Florence 1965) x: “Nei pochi casi in cui R S Sa [Turyn’s main representatives of the *recentiores*] presentano una lezione esatta contro il resto della tradizione ci si trova di fronte a congetture, per lo più di origine moscopulea.”

¹⁵ *Hec.* 80, 116, 128, 274, 535, 605, 1025, 1078, 1195; *Or.* 160, 293, 349, 373, 378, 782, 960, 999, 1027, 1266, 1278, 1289, 1300, 1387, 1507, 1653; *Phoen.* 604, 608, 619, 636, 878, 1235, 1403, 1485, 1527, 1690, 1758.

¹⁶ My manuscript symbols are the same as Murray’s and Turyn’s. New symbols are:

- Aa *Ambrosianus* C 44 sup., saec. XIV
- G *Ambrosianus* L 39 sup., ca. A.D. 1320
- Ga *Athous Vatopedianus* 36, *Gnomologium* saec. XII
- K *Laurentianus* conv. *suppr.* 66, saec. XIV *ineuntis*
- Le *Leidensis Vossianus* Q 33, ca. A.D. 1500
- Ms *Mosquensis* 508, saec. XV

Turyn's procedure in classifying the Mss is as follows. Since we know, for instance, the Moschopulean scholia from T, we must try to find Mss which are exclusively equipped with scholia of that type. Such Mss are representative of the edition of Moschopulus. They have in common not only introductions and scholia, but also certain features in the text itself of the three plays. Turyn calls them "Moschopulean interpolations" and takes them for deliberate changes made by Moschopulus himself. (My impression, however, is that they are, in most cases, rather ordinary errors.) Using these common features of the text as evidence for Moschopulean character, one might identify as Moschopulean (or, in a similar way, as Thoman, or Triclinian) even those Mss that by chance have no scholia.

In this way it becomes possible to divide the approximately 200 Mss of the triad that are not *codices descripti* into five classes,¹⁷ three classes of "Byzantini" and two classes of "veteres":

- (1) 114 Moschopulean Mss (for instance X Xa Xb).
- (2) 24 Thoman Mss (for instance Z Zb Zc Zm Zu).
- (3) 21 Triclinian Mss (for instance T).

(4) About 20 "veteres recentiores," which means Mss that are free of the characteristics of the "Byzantini" and of certain common errors of M B A V (dividing errors of M B A V against the "recentiores"), but have in common certain errors of their own (for instance R S Sa).

(5) About 20 "veteres vetustiores," Mss that share the common errors of M B A V, but do not share the common errors of R S Sa nor the common features of the "Byzantini" (for instance G K).

So far Turyn's divisions and subdivisions of manuscripts. I had to give them in full detail in order to show the starting point of my own studies.

The first part of my studies consisted entirely of collations. I collated, partly in the original, partly in microfilm, the text and the argument of *Hecuba* in M B A V L P, in H, in Ga, in F and O, in all

Pa	<i>Parisinus</i> 2801, saec. XIV
Pb	<i>Parisinus</i> 2810, saec. XV <i>exeuntis</i>
Pr	<i>Remensis</i> 1306, saec. XIII <i>exeuntis</i>
Rf	<i>Laurentianus</i> 32, 33, saec. XIII <i>exeuntis</i>
Rw	<i>Vindobonensis phil.</i> 119, saec. XIII <i>exeuntis</i>
Vb	<i>Vaticanus</i> 53, saec. XV <i>exeuntis</i>

¹⁷ Two less important classes do not appear in our classification: the five Mss with Planudean and Moschopulean scholia (e.g. Y) are counted as Moschopulean, and the 27 representatives of the late Byzantine dyad (for instance J U) are disregarded entirely. The contribution of both classes to the text of *Hec.* is next to nothing.

“*veteres vetustiores*” and “*recentiores*,” and in some representatives of the three classes of “*Byzantini*.” The first of my results was to find that Turyn is often wrong in dating Mss. My impression is that in particular he tends to date Mss on paper too late.¹⁸ Sometimes the watermarks demand an earlier date, sometimes the size of the paper is of an earlier type, sometimes the character of the handwriting gives an earlier impression, sometimes the internal evidence by which Turyn was induced to date the Ms turns out to be at least doubtful. Perhaps one might think that a change in dating of about fifty years does not make much difference. That is true in most cases, but sometimes it really does matter. A good instance is F (*Marcianus* 468), dated by Turyn to the early XIV century. It belongs to the second class of Mss because in addition to the triad it contains *argumentum Medeae* and *Medea* 1–41. It seems to offer a good version of the triad, but according to Turyn its value is diminished by the fact that there are some Moschopulean, Thoman, even Triclinian interpolations.¹⁹ The handwriting, however, suggests an earlier date of about 1290.²⁰ The consequence is that the so-called Triclinian interpolations can no longer be regarded as such, for we know that Triclinius was not occupied with the text of the triad before 1305. Therefore the assumed Triclinian interpolations in F turn out to be traditional matter, that is, either mistakes that afterwards also the scribe of T adopted from the Ms he copied, or variants that afterwards Triclinius also took from Mss similar to F and inserted into his own. The same can be said about the presumed Thoman interpolations in F, and Moschopulean influence is at least doubtful. Whenever an observation of this kind can be made several times, the whole pattern begins to change.

This is what has happened in our case. Turyn dated all Mss of the third class not earlier than 1300. Consequently, for him all agreements between “*veteres vetustiores*” and “*recentiores*” on the one hand and “*Byzantini*” on the other prove an influence of the Byzantine grammarians on these Mss. I found that at least half a dozen “*vetustiores*”

¹⁸ Some dates are corrected already by J. Irigoin, *RevPhil* 32 (1958) 323, J. Martin, *REG* 73 (1960) 286, and Zuntz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 161 nn.1–2, 162 n.2.

¹⁹ For instance *Hec.* 50 *χέρας* (Moschopulean), 53 *σκηνην* (Thoman), 922 *ἐμβεβῶτα* (Triclinian). The first and third cases are *a limine* suspicious because the “interpolation” is actually the superior variant adopted in our editions. For the second case see Zuntz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 156.

²⁰ See J. Irigoin, *REG* 67 (1954) 510; H. Erbse, in *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur* I (Zürich 1961) 275; Zuntz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 162 n.2.

and "recentiores" should be dated towards the end of the XIII century. Consequently many so-called Byzantine interpolations appear in Mss that are earlier than the grammarians themselves, so they can no longer be regarded as interpolations and turn out to be widespread errors or variants.²¹ The trend in this direction seems to be strong enough to raise the question whether there were any Byzantine interpolations at all; but there remains a hard core of fifteen cases in the text of *Hecuba* where it is highly probable that a Byzantine grammarian altered the text deliberately.

Another consequence of the new dating of some Mss of the third class (or "recentiores" in Murray's terminology) is that some of them turn out to be as old as A V L P (the youngest "basic manuscripts"), or even older. We therefore should get used to the idea that there are only four really old manuscripts, M B H and Ga, all of them written before 1204, the year of the conquest of Constantinople by the knights of the Fourth Crusade. Then follows a gap, and all the rest of our Mss are written after 1261, when the capital was recaptured by the Greeks. My collation shows clearly that it is no longer possible to maintain Turyn's division between "veteres vetustiores" and "recentiores."²² There is only one rather homogeneous group of *veteres*, and the only possible subdivision lies between the old witnesses M B H Ga and the rest. The difference between these two groups has no stemmatic character, but concerns age and quality only.

There is, in the text of the triad, an incredibly large number of contaminations, and, to quote P. Maas, "Gegen die Kontamination ist kein Kraut gewachsen."²³ In consequence, it is impossible to form a stemma for the triad. The only thing that can be made out is a number of manuscript groups, but many of them cannot be divided clearly from one another. We should therefore admit that the text of the triad of Euripides is not transmitted in a closed tradition, but in an entirely open one like those of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, or the *New Testament*.²⁴

The later Mss differ considerably in quality. When establishing the text, we have above all to rely on the four old witnesses, M B H Ga.

²¹ Some observations of Zuntz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 151-74, point in the same direction.

²² My observations confirm the opinion of di Benedetto, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 81-92.

²³ *Textkritik*⁹ (Leipzig 1957) 31.

²⁴ R. D. Dawe, *The Collation and Investigation of Manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1964), comes to similar conclusions for the transmission of Aeschylus.

But besides, especially where M B H Ga are wrong or disagree, some later Mss turn out to be very helpful:

- (1) K and O
- (2) T²⁵
- (3) G (a Ms probably related to K, but later)
- (4) P (L is rather disappointing in *Hecuba*), F and X Xa Xb (the best representatives of the Moschopulean class)

R S Sa and some Thoman Mss are also useful, but to a smaller degree. All later Mss mentioned above were written between 1280 and 1350. Later on the quality begins to decline, although there are still some quite good Mss.

It is an interesting question why about 1300 some Mss are of such good quality. R. Browning suggests that there were historical reasons:²⁶ "It is likely that when Michael VIII recaptured Constantinople in 1261 books from Nicaea and elsewhere were brought to the capital . . . A little later the gradual loss of most of Asia Minor to the Turks is likely to have led to a fresh influx of books to Constantinople, as refugees from these regions brought their possessions with them. These might include the contents of monastic libraries." But this is only a partial explanation. It explains only the availability of good Mss in the capital. Something in addition was necessary—intelligent men who could make the right use of them. We have to suppose that there were several such men, not only the well-known scholars Moschopulus, Thomas and Triclinius, but many other attentive scribes and correctors whose names we do not know. The traces of their work can be found in the "minor" Mss of the period about 1300.

Now I should like to give some instances of what may be expected from a collation of the later Mss.

In *Hec.* 332–33 the chorus comments on the pitiless discourse of Odysseus:

αἰαί· τὸ δοῦλον ὡς κακὸν πέφυκ' ἀεὶ
τολμᾷ θ' ἄ μὴ χρή, τῇ βία νικώμενον.

The majority of Mss have *πεφυκέναι*, and schol. V tries to expound it: *φεῦ φεῦ, ὡς κακὸν τὸ πεφυκέναι τινὰ δοῦλον. τῇ βίᾳ γὰρ ὁ δοῦλος*

²⁵ The quality of T is of course due partly to Triclinius' corrections. But here I take into consideration only those cases where Triclinius probably took the superior variant from Mss, and not the three cases where he emended (*Hec.* 164 *δαίμων ἔστ' ἐπαρωγός*, 911 *καπνοῦ ὀμ.*, 932 *ἔς ὀμ.*).

²⁶ R. Browning, "Recentiores non Deteriores," *BICS* London 7 (1960) 12.

κρατούμενος τολμᾶ πράττειν ἅ μὴ χρή. Beyond doubt superior is the variant πέφυκ' αἰεί, which appears not only in the *Byzantini* (X^{γρ} Χα^{γρ} Xb^{γρ} Z^{γρ} Za^{γρ} Zb Zc Zm Zu T), but also in several later Mss (F^s G K^{γρ} L^{γρ} O^{γρ} P), some of them, as for instance F, probably pre-Moschopulean. Moreover it appears in Stobaeus. Therefore we should believe Triclinius, who writes in the margin of T: τὸ πέφυκ' αἰεὶ ἐν τινι λίαν παλαιῶ τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὔρηται.²⁷ How difficult it was to find the right solution by emendation can be seen from fruitless efforts in the margin of later Mss to emend the text (πέφυκέ τι schol. T, πέφυκεν ἂν and πέφυκ' ἔτι Zb^{γρ}, πέφυκέ πως Ms^{γρ} Pb^{γρ}). Even modern editors had their difficulties with this line. Many of them preferred to follow Porson in emending τολμᾶ in v.333 to τολμᾶν instead of accepting πέφυκ' αἰεί. Only in 1867 was πέφυκ' αἰεί definitely adopted by Kirchhoff.

In vv. 739–40 Agamemnon addresses Hecuba:

τί μοι προσώπων νῶτον ἐγκλίνασα σὸν
 δύρη, τὸ κρανθὲν δ' οὐ λέγεις; τίς ἐσθ' ὄδε;

Nearly all Mss read *πραχθέν*, and so does B³. Only in B *ante correctionem* we find *κραθὲν* (for *κρανθὲν*, with a common slip). Murray and Méridier esteemed this variant so little that they did not even record it. But whenever *κρανθείς* appears in tragic discourse in concurrence with *πραχθείς*, it deserves to be preferred. Compared with the flat *πραχθείς*, it is the exquisite, poetic term. Besides, it is more often used by Euripides than *πραχθείς*. While *πραχθέν* is a possible gloss for *κρανθέν*, the reverse can be excluded. Meanwhile we know that *κρανθέν* is better attested in our line than Murray and Méridier thought. It is a variant in G, it appears (corrected from *κραθὲν*) in K, *κραθὲν* is found also in *POxy.* 876 from the V century. We learn from this case that sometimes even isolated variants in later Mss can be traced back into antiquity.

In vv. 918–22 the chorus sings of the last moments before the sack of Troy:

πόσις ἐν θαλάμοις ἔκειτο,
 ξυστὸν δ' ἐπὶ πασσάλῳ,
 ναύταν οὐκέθ' ὄρων ὄμιλον
 Τροίαν Ἰλιάδ' ἐμβεβῶτα.

²⁷ So already Zuntz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 154–55. Turyn, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 107, mentions *πέφυκ' αἰεὶ* in his list of Moschopulean interpolations.

ἐμβεβῶτα is necessary for metrical reasons. Forming an interesting word respension it corresponds to ἐμβατεύσω in the strophe. But nearly all Mss have ἐμβεβαῶτα. The same is found in T *ante correctionem* in a page that is written by Triclinius himself (fol. 34^r). He corrects it to ἐμβεβῶτα and writes in the margin: ἐμβεβῶτα χρῆ γράφειν, οὐκ ἐμβεβαῶτα· οὐχ οὕτω γὰρ ἔχει πρὸς τὸ μέτρον ὀρθῶς, ἀλλ' ἐκείνως. So one might think that ἐμβεβῶτα is a Triclinian emendation.²⁸ But it also appears in the later Mss Aa F G K, among which F and K are beyond doubt pre-Triclinian. Therefore it is more probable that here, after discussing two transmitted variants, Triclinius, who was excellent in *metricis*, preferred the one because of its soundness.

In vv. 1054–55 Hecuba wants to avoid the blinded Polymestor, who enters the stage. She steps aside saying:

ἀλλ' ἐκποδῶν ἄπειμι κάποστήσομαι
θυμῷ ζέοντι Θρηκὶ δυσμαχωτάτῳ.

The majority of Mss read *ρέοντι*, but *ζέοντι* is found in the text of U and Zb, and as a variant in Le Pr Zm. U and Le are late and unreliable witnesses, but Zb and Zm are good representatives of the Thoman class, and Pr, a pre-Thoman Ms probably written before 1300, shares some interesting variants with B and O (e.g. in the same line, *Hec.* 1055 *δυσμενεστάτῳ* O^{γρ} Pr^{γρ}, *δυσγενεστάτῳ* B^{γρ}). The case is discussed by Zuntz, who prefers *ζέοντι*.²⁹ For *θυμῷ ζέοντι* he gives many parallels, of which the most striking is Soph. OC 434 (ἔζει θυμός). The abundance of datives in v.1055, confusing at first glance, has a good parallel in Soph. *Trach.* 445–46 (τῷ μῶ τ' ἀνδρὶ τῆδε τῆ νόσῳ | ληφθέντι μεμπτός εἶμι).³⁰ In order to avoid the double dative, Ruhnken emends to *θυμὸν ζέοντι*, Hartung to *θυμοζέοντι*. But the line is sound and needs no emendation.

In vv. 1192–94 Hecuba ends her invective against pettifogging orators:

σοφοὶ μὲν οὖν εἰς' οἱ τάδ' ἠκριβωκότες,
ἀλλ' οὐ δύνανται διὰ τέλους εἶναι σοφοί,
κακῶς δ' ἀπώλοντ'· οὔτις ἐξήλυξέ πω.

²⁸ So does Turyn, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 190.

²⁹ Zuntz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 156–57.

³⁰ ἐκποδῶν is construed either with the genitive or with the dative (cf. vv.52–53 γεραιῶ δ' ἐκποδῶν χωρήσομαι | Ἐκάβη; the same is valid for ἀφίστασθαι (cf. Dem. 8.37 ἀφέστατε δῆλον ὅτι αὐτῷ). θυμῷ is either causal ('boiling with rage') or local ('in his mind').

Most Mss offer the unmetrical ἀπώλοντο κοῦτις. The same can be read in T *ante correctionem*, but Triclinius corrects it to ἀπώλοντ' οὔτις. L has ἀπώλοντο κοῦτις, but in the margin we find the sign ∴; a common *signum corruptelae*. The metrically correct ἀπώλοντ' οὔτις³¹ is attested by Ga G O P Vb. Again the question arises whether Triclinius emended or took the superior variant from a Ms. G O P and Vb (a late relative of P) may be influenced by Triclinius, but the same cannot be said about the *Gnomologium* Ga that was written about 1200. So it seems more probable that Triclinius took ἀπώλοντ' οὔτις from a Ms than that he emended.³² Very interesting indeed are the reactions of the modern editors in the present case. The Aldine and the other editions of the XVI and XVII centuries kept ἀπώλοντο κοῦτις; only King (1726) preferred ἀπώλοντ' οὔτις, the variant of his favorite *Codex Regius*.³³ Brunck, who used A as his basic Ms, returned to ἀπώλοντο κοῦτις, the variant of A, and emended it to ὄλοντο κοῦτις; he was followed by Hermann (ὄλοιנט' ἄν κοῦτις) and Hartung (ἐπηῦρον κοῦτις). Kirchhoff in his first edition kept the metrically intolerable ἀπώλοντο κοῦτις, because it is transmitted unanimously by his basic Mss M B A V L. In the apparatus he mentioned ἀπώλοντ' οὔτις, but he considered it a correction made by the scribe of the *Codex Regius*. Only in his second edition of 1867, when he used the Florentine part of P for the first time, did he definitely accept ἀπώλοντ' οὔτις. Such a case gives us the opportunity to observe how the XIX-century editors tended to trust their own emendatory powers more than the testimony of Mss, in particular whenever these Mss did not belong to the time-honoured choice of “basic” witnesses. I hope that the prepared edition will contribute to the final demolition (at least with regard to the triad) of the highly esteemed, but nevertheless shaky, doctrine that there is *nulla salus extra ecclesiam* and no good variant outside of M B A V L P.

Finally, a few words about the shape of the edition. The text will be based on the old Mss M B H Ga, the later Mss A F G K L O P Pa Pr R Rf Rw S Sa V (Va), some good representatives of the *Byzantini* (X Xa Xb, Z Zb Zc Zm Zu, T), and on five papyri (POxy. 876 and 877 [Pack² 389, 390], OBerol. 12319 [Pack² 1567], PCantab. [Fitzwilliam Museum]

³¹ For the asyndeton see Kühner-Gerth⁹ II.2 p.345.

³² Turyn, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 190, considers ἀπώλοντ' οὔτις in Ga an excellent correction made by the scribe that by chance is identical with Triclinius' emendation. The probability of such a coincidence, however, is extremely small.

³³ London Royal Society 7, probably a Triclinian Ms.

inv. 2 [Pack² 1571], *PHamb.* 118b col. i [Pack² 434 suppl.]. All of these thirty-two witnesses will be quoted wherever they attest the text and wherever at least two of them agree in error. Errors of single witnesses will be mentioned only when interesting from palaeographical or other points of view. Thirty-two later Mss are quoted only where they give a good or at least an interesting variant. The *Apparatus Testimoniorum* will be based on the indications of R. Prinz's edition (Leipzig 1883), but enlarged by more than thirty new items. The text of these ancient or Byzantine quotations will be mentioned in the apparatus in every case where they disagree with the Mss or where the Mss disagree with one another. The edition will be published in the series *Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern* (Winter, Heidelberg). The first volume, containing a general introduction and the text, is scheduled to appear in 1970 or 1971; the second volume, with interpretation and commentary, will appear some years later.³⁴

UNIVERSITÄT MÜNSTER
October, 1969

³⁴ I am grateful to Bernard M. W. Knox, Stephen G. Daitz, Alexander Kleinlogel, and to the other Junior Fellows of the Center for Hellenic Studies in 1968–69 for their valuable suggestions to me. Horst D. Blume helped me to reformulate some crucial passages.