

## ON THE MANUSCRIPTS AND TEXT OF EURIPIDES, *MEDEA*<sup>1</sup>

### I. THE MANUSCRIPTS

Murray's edition of *Medea* (1902) made use of five manuscripts: BAVLP. Page (1938) added a sixth, the Jerusalem palimpsest, H. But *Medea* is preserved in six more manuscripts (I do not count apographs), which Murray and Page cite rarely or never. I investigate here the value and affiliations of these six and of a fragmentary seventh (F), which they do cite. The seven manuscripts are:

- O (Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, 31. 10), late twelfth century<sup>2</sup>
- C (Vatican, Vaticano greco 910), fourteenth century; lacks 880–4, 1050 to the end<sup>3</sup>
- D (Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, 31. 15), fourteenth century<sup>4</sup>
- E (Athos, *Μονή Ἱβήρων* 209, formerly 161), early fourteenth century; lacks 731–825, 1029–1133, 1339 to the end<sup>5</sup>
- F (Venice, Bibl. Nazionale Marciana, gr. 468), c. 1300? Only the *hypothesis* and lines 1–42<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I refer to the following books by their author's name only: Page = D. L. Page, *Euripides: Medea* (Oxford, 1938), Turyn = A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana, 1957), Barrett = W. S. Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964). Note also Dawe, *Studies* = R. D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Leiden, vols i–ii 1973, vol. iii 1978), Diggle, *Studies* = J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981). A list of editions of *Medea* which I have used will be given in Part II. – I am indebted to Dr K. Matthiessen for the loan of photographs of CHNv, to Mr P. J. Parsons for furnishing transcriptions of unpublished papyri, to Prof. H. Maehler for furnishing information about *IT*<sup>12</sup> in advance of publication, to Dr R. D. Dawe for many valuable observations, and to the Wolfson Foundation for a generous grant which enabled me to acquire microfilms and visit libraries in Paris and Florence.

<sup>2</sup> See Turyn, 333–5; for the date, N. G. Wilson, *Scrittura e Civiltà* 7 (1983). Fairly full but unreliable reports in Elmsley, Matthiae, and Kirchhoff (on whom see next note); thereafter only very occasional readings reported by editors. Collated by me from microfilm; doubtful readings checked by autopsy.

<sup>3</sup> See Turyn, 358. Collated (negligently and incompletely, as he admits) by Elmsley; reported by Matthiae and by Kirchhoff in his separate edition of *Medea* (Berlin, 1852) but not in his later edition of Eur. (Berlin, 1855). (My knowledge of the 1852 ed. is derived from V. Di Benedetto, *La Tradizione Manoscritta Euripidea* (1965), 14–16; cf. also K. Matthiessen, *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides* (1974), 47.) Thereafter ignored by editors. Collated in *Hi.* by Barrett (from whom I have adopted the *siglum* C). Collated by me from photographs.

<sup>4</sup> See Turyn, 335–7. Fairly full but unreliable reports in Elmsley, Matthiae and Kirchhoff; thereafter only very occasional readings reported by editors. Collated by me from microfilm; doubtful readings checked by autopsy.

<sup>5</sup> See Turyn, 325–9. Not previously collated, except in *Hi.* by Barrett (from whom I have adopted the *siglum* E). Collated by me from a microfilm loaned by the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (Paris).

<sup>6</sup> Dated 'early 14<sup>th</sup> cent.' by Turyn, 360; but see G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (1965), 162 n. ‡, K. Matthiessen, *GRBS* 10 (1969), 299 and *Studien* (n. 3 above), 47. Reported by Prinz and Wecklein; but no inferences should be drawn from their silence, which has led Murray and Page into one serious misstatement (F has *νέον* not *κακόν* at 37). Collated by me from photographs.

Hn (Copenhagen, Gamle Kongelig Samling 417), c. 1475<sup>7</sup>

Nv (Naples, Bibl. Nazionale, Vindobonense greco 17), c. 1500<sup>8</sup>

The other manuscripts which I cite are HBAVL(Tr)P.<sup>9</sup> There is a clear division between HBAV and LP. Three gnomologies are sometimes available:

gV (Athos, *Μονή Βατοπεδίου* 36), twelfth century<sup>10</sup>

gB (Vatican, Vaticano Barberini greco 4), c. 1300<sup>11</sup>

gE (Escorial, X. 1. 13), early fourteenth century<sup>12</sup>

I cite also the following papyri, which may be identified by the reference which I give to the numbering in Pack's collection:<sup>13</sup>

Π<sup>1</sup> Pack 401    Π<sup>4</sup> Pack 404    Π<sup>7</sup> Pack 426<sup>15</sup>

Π<sup>2</sup> Pack 402    Π<sup>5</sup> Pack 405<sup>14</sup>    Π<sup>8</sup> Pack 407

Π<sup>3</sup> Pack 403    Π<sup>6</sup> Pack 406    Π<sup>9</sup> Pack 408

With the generous permission of the Egypt Exploration Society I am able to add to this list three further unpublished papyri, transcribed by Dr D. Hughes and Mr P. J. Parsons:

Π<sup>10</sup> P. Oxy. inv. 36 4B. 110/D (1–2) a, third-fourth century A.D.; lines 139–47

Π<sup>11</sup> P. Oxy. inv. 36 4B. 110/H (1–3) c, third century A.D.; lines 718–37

The third is P. Oxy. inv. 23 3B. 1/Q (1–3) b (lines 748–52, 1007–9, 1345–6), which is identified by Dr Hughes as being further fragments of Π<sup>5</sup>. I add finally two papyri, one recently published, the other to be published shortly:

Π<sup>12</sup> P. Berol. 21218 fr. 9–12 + 13231 E fr. 10, 12, fifth century A.D. (to be published by H. Maehler, *Arch. f. Pap.*); lines 410–27, 501–10, 545–54, 836–40, 884–7, 1054–6, 1059–64, 1098–1103)

Π<sup>13</sup> P. Heid. 1385, first century B.C. (ed. R. Seider, *ZPE* 46 (1982), 33–6); lines 547–50, 591–5

<sup>7</sup> See Turyn, 329–31, R. Prinz, *RhM* 30 (1975), 129–33. Fairly full but unreliable reports in Elmsley, Matthiae, and Kirchhoff; thereafter only very occasional readings reported by editors. Collated by me from photographs.

<sup>8</sup> See Turyn, 348–51, Matthiessen, *Studien*, 129. Not previously collated. Collated by me from photographs.

<sup>9</sup> I report these manuscripts from my own collations, made either from published facsimiles (HBLP) or from photographs (AV). Doubtful readings in B and L have been checked by autopsy. – By the symbol Tr I refer to Triclinius, corrector of L. That P is a copy of a copy of L in *Medea* (and the other annotated plays), first argued by Vitelli (*Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica* 3 (1890), 287–300) and accepted by e.g. Barrett, 73, seems to me far more probable than the alternative hypothesis (of e.g. Turyn, 264 ff.) that P is a twin of L. Zuntz (*Inquiry*, 35–8) offers evidence from *Medea* which strongly supports the former hypothesis, but afterwards (175–80) argues in favour of the latter (positing an intermediate copy between P and the source of L), on grounds which I find inadequate. Like Matthiessen (*Studien*, 32–3), but unlike Barrett, I do not regard acceptance of the former hypothesis as justifying the exclusion of P from the apparatus criticus.

<sup>10</sup> See G. A. Longman, *CQ* n.s. 9 (1959), 129–41.

<sup>11</sup> See K. Matthiessen, *Hermes* 93 (1965), 148–58.

<sup>12</sup> See Matthiessen, *Hermes* 94 (1966), 398–410.

<sup>13</sup> R. A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt* (ed. 2, 1967).

<sup>14</sup> Pack says that this papyrus is in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. Only part of it is there (lines 1156–60, 1165–77, 1191–9). The rest is still in the Central Library of the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham (see J. E. Powell, *The Rendel Harris Papyri* (1936), v).

<sup>15</sup> I am indebted to the Institut de Papyrologie, Université des Sciences Humaines, Strasbourg, for sending me a microfilm of this papyrus, from which I was able to have made a photograph of excellent quality. Some of the comparatively little that has emerged from an inspection of this photograph is reported in Part II. Very much more has recently been achieved in the parts of the papyrus which preserve *Phoenissae* by D. J. Mastronarde, *ZPE* 38 (1980), 1–42. The papyrus is dated c. 250 B.C. by E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (1971), 60.

I use the following symbols:<sup>16</sup>

[A]	A is illegible or unavailable
<A>	A's reading is based on inference (usually inference from the nature of the correction which obscures it)
A?	A's reading is probable or possible but not certain
A <sup>uv</sup>	A <i>ut videtur</i>
(A)	A with some inessential variation
A <sup>s</sup>	A <i>supra lineam</i> , by the first hand
A <sup>c</sup>	A after correction by an unspecified hand
A <sup>2</sup>	A after correction by the second hand
(~ A <sup>c</sup> )	A <sup>c</sup> agrees with the other mss. against A
A <sup>r</sup>	a reading written by the rubricator of A
A <sup>gl</sup>	a gloss in A
A <sup>γρ</sup>	a variant in A accompanied by the sign γρ(άφεται)
Σ <sup>a</sup>	scholium in A
<sup>i</sup> Σ <sup>a</sup>	a reading implied by the scholium in A
<sup>1</sup> Σ <sup>a</sup>	lemma to the scholium in A

# §I: OCDEF<sup>17</sup>

## 1 OC

That OC share a common ancestor is proved by the following readings, where they conspire (or nearly conspire) against the other manuscripts.<sup>18</sup>

107 τάχ'] τάχιστ' OC 242 βία(ι) φέρων ζυγόν] φέρων ante βία(ι) DE, post ζυγόν OC 245 καρδίαν ἄτης fere HBDEAVPL<sup>c</sup>: καρδίαν ἄτην H<sup>s</sup> et (postmodo deletum) L<sup>s</sup>: καρδίας ἄτην OCgE 254 συνουσία HBDEAVLPO<sup>gl</sup>: κοινωνία OCH<sup>gl</sup>B<sup>gl</sup>A<sup>r</sup>γρgE 385 αὐτοῖς] αὐτοῖς OC 416 φάμαι BDELP: φάμαι AV: φῆμαι OC 433 κραδία(ι)] καρδία(ι) OC 543 κάλλιον DEAVLPgV: βέλτιον OCgE: βέλτιστον B 555 κνίζη(ι)] κνίση O, κνίσση C 562 δόμων ἐμῶν] ἐμῶν δόμων OC 680 δράσει(ι)ς] δράσεις O; -εις in -ης aut -ης in -εις mut. C 683 γῆς ἄναξ] ἄναξ γῆς OC 704 γ' om. OCgE (~ O<sup>2</sup>) 705 αὐ λέγεις κακόν BDEVLp: αὐ κακόν λέγεις OCgE: ἀγγέλλεις κακόν A 812 νόμοις βροτῶν] βροτῶν νόμοις O: β[ροτῶν νόμοις C: [E] 896 διαλλάχθηθ' EAVLPB<sup>2</sup>: διαλλάχθηθ' B: διαλεχθηθ' D: διαλλάγηθ' O: ἀλλάγηθ' C 1044 χαιρέτω] ἐρρέτω OCgE: [E]

But OC are not copied directly from the same ancestor, for there are numerous disagreements between them. In the first half of the play (1–700), whenever the manuscripts are divided (isolated errors of O or C aside), OC agree 157 times, disagree 43 (I count the original reading and disregard corrections). While most of the disagreements are trivial, some are not. Here are the most significant disagreements:

106 ἀρχῆς CHBDEAVTr: ἔξ ἀρχῆς O(L)PV<sup>s</sup>Σ<sup>v</sup> 234 τοῦτ' CHDEAVgE: τοῦδ' ἔτ' fere LP: τοῦτό γ' OB 267 δράων CPV<sup>3</sup>: δράων E: δράων OBDAE<sup>s</sup>: δράων VL 307 ἔχει μοι OBLP: ἔχοιμι CDEAVgE 698 πιστὸς CBALPD<sup>c</sup>: πιστὸς δ' ODEV 752 λαμπρὸν ἡλίου τε φῶς CALP: λαμπρὸν θ' ἡλίου φάος OBDV (θ' om. B): λαμ[προν] [IT<sup>5</sup> (θ') uel φ[ pot. qu. η)] [E] 926 τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θῆς

<sup>16</sup> They roughly correspond with those adopted by Barrett, 92–3.

<sup>17</sup> In this section no inferences about the readings of Hn and Nv should be drawn from my silence. Nor do I report testimonia.

<sup>18</sup> In *Hi.* (the only other play which C preserves) there is no such relationship between O and C.

EAVL (θήκομαι V<sup>3</sup>, θήσω V<sup>3</sup>ΥΡ): τῶνδε θήκομαι D: τῶνδε νῦν θήκομαι OB: νῦν τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω P: ἐγὼ τῶνδε[ C

The manuscript which is most often found in agreement with OC is B. In lines 1–700, when the manuscripts are divided, B and OC agree 122 times. The next commonest agreements are with: D 102, V 101, A 101, E 97. Agreements with LP are comparatively uncommon: with L 37, P 43. Since H is present for only lines 1–255 in this part of the play, I give the numbers of agreements in these lines: with B 51, D 48, A 44, E 43, H 40, V 39, L 17, P 16. Against the 122 agreements of B and OC are to be set 27 disagreements.

## 2 O alone

I list the most significant agreements of O (when it disagrees with C) and one other manuscript.

### (i) OB

234 τοῦτό γ' OB (see the preceding list) 287 ἀπειλεῖν c' L<sup>uv</sup> et Tr: -εἶν AVP: -εἶς OB: -εἰ c' DEB<sup>2</sup>: -ῆς C 685 κοινῶσαι κοινωνῆσαι O<B> (~ B<sup>2</sup>) 725 προσημαίνω DEAVLP: -μανῶ OB: προσημ[ C<sup>19</sup> 926 τῶνδε νῦν θήκομαι OB (see the preceding list) 1039 ἐς DAVLPB<sup>s</sup>: εἰς O<sup>g1</sup> B<sup>2g1</sup>: om. OB: [CE] 1269 συνω(ι)δὰ uel -δὰ(ι) fere codd.: σύνουδα OB<sup>2</sup>: ξύνουδα V<sup>3</sup>ΥΡ: [C]

### (ii) OL(P)

106 ἀρχῆς CHBDEAVTr: ἐξ ἀρχῆς O<L>PV<sup>s</sup>Σ<sup>v</sup> 367 μιχροὶ OLP: μικροὶ CBDEAVgE 1367 κηξίωσας OLP: γ' ῆξ- HBDAY: [CE] 1399 ὤ(ι)μοι BDAY: αἶ αἶ uel αἶ αἶ OLPV<sup>3</sup>ΥΡ: [CE] 1404 ἔπος BDgE: δ' ἔπος AV: λόγος OLPV<sup>3</sup>: [CE] 1411 τέκνα κτείνας' OLP: τέκν' ἀποκτείνας' BDAY: [CE]

### (iii) OH

1303 ἐκώσων] ἐκώσαι OHP<sup>2</sup>: [C]

'A curious variant' said Page, unaware of O, whose agreement with H makes it yet curiuser. The infinitive with a verb of motion is acceptable: to Page's examples add *IT* 938, *A. Eum.* 488.

## 3 C alone

The most significant agreements of C (when it disagrees with O) and one other manuscript are with gE:

16 πάντα ι] τὰ πάντα CgE 23 κυρεῖ] κυροῖ C<sup>2</sup>gE 34 δ' ἦ] δὲ CgE 78 ἄρ'] ἄν CgE: ἄ c' D 99 κραδίαν] κραδίην CgE 264 κίδηρον] κίνδυνον CgEgB 298 καινὰ προσφέρων] προσφέρων καινὰ CgE 372 ἐξὸν] ἐξῆν CgE 411 στρέφεται] στρέφονται CgE 414 οὐκέτι om. CgE 470 ἐναντίου] ἐναντία CgE 495 σύνοισθα] συνῆ(ι)σθα CgE 580 ἄδικος ὦν] ὦν ἄδ- CgE 739 μὲν om. CgE: [E] 798 ζῆν LP: ζῆν ἔτι OBDAY: ζῆν ἔστι CgE: [E] 913 γυναικός] γυναικός γάρ CgE

C and gE are clearly derived from the same source (gE is not derived from C, since it contains verses omitted by C). There are very few places where C and gE agree with other manuscripts against each other:

76 κηδευμάτων] βουλευμάτων EgE 235 λαβεῖν ELPV<sup>3</sup>ΥΡgE: λάβει H: λάβη(ι) OCBDAV 470 δράσαντ' OBDEAVLPgE: δράσαντες CgV 535 κνίζη(ι) BDEAVLPgE: κνίση O: κνίση C

<sup>19</sup> *IT*<sup>11</sup> omits 725–6 and continues with 729, 727, 728 in that order. This is surely the right solution to this problematic passage.

C and gE have the same close relationship in *Hi.*:<sup>20</sup>

238 ὦ παῖ om. CgE 424 ἦ(ι) εἶ D: εἶη CgE 501 ἐκώσσει γέ ce ΩVHDE:  
-κει cé γε CgE: -κειέ ce LP 541 σεβίζομεν] σεβάζομεν CgE 610 τοι] τε  
OCgE 616 δὴ om. CEGE 699 ἀβουλόμην] -λοίμην CgE 701 γὰρ] δὲ CgE  
936 φεύ] φεύ CgE 987 ἤλικας] ἤλικα C: ἤλικα gE 1016 μὲν κρατεῖν]  
κρατεῖν μὲν CgE 1018 εὐτυχεῖν ἀεὶ] ἀεὶ εὐτυχεῖν CgE

There appears to be no place in *Hi.* where gE *cannot* have used the same source as C.

#### 4 DE

That DE share a common ancestor is proved by the following readings, where they conspire (or nearly conspire) against the other manuscripts.<sup>21</sup>

140 ἔχει... τυράννων] ἦδη... τυράννων ἔχει DE: [I<sup>10</sup>] 242 βία(ι) φέρων  
ζυγόν] φέρων ante βία(ι) DE, post ζυγόν OC 287 ἀπειλείν c' L<sup>uv</sup> et Tr: -εἶν AVP:  
-εἶς BO: -εἶ c' DEB<sup>2</sup>: -ἦς C 349 δὴ BCAVLPgE: δὲ O: om. DE 367  
κηδεύσασιν] κηδεύμασιν DE 408 ἐς μὲν om. E, ἐς μὲν ἔσθλ' om. D 411 δίκαι]  
δίκα gE: δίκαια DE 478 πυρπνόνων] πυριπνόνων DE 559 μὲν om. DE  
604 φευξοῦμαι] φεύξομαι DE 607 τυράννοισ] -ους C: -ων DE 616 οὐτ'] οὔτ'  
DE τοῖσι coïc] coïc C: coïc DE

But DE are not copied directly from the same ancestor, for there are numerous disagreements between them. In 1–700, whenever the manuscripts are divided (isolated errors of D or E aside), DE agree 166 times, disagree 44. While most of these disagreements are trivial, some are not. Here are the most significant disagreements:

143 φρένα EBOCVLPH<sup>2</sup>A<sup>r</sup>gE: om. DHA: [I<sup>10</sup>] 235 λαβεῖν ELPV<sup>3</sup>γP gE:  
λάβει H: λάβη(ι) DBOCAV 257 οὐχὶ DBOCAVgE: οὐδὲ ELP 306 οὐν  
EALP: αὐ DBOCV 926 τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω EAVL (θήσομαι V<sup>3</sup>, θήσω V<sup>3</sup>γP):  
τῶνδε θήσομαι D: τῶνδε νῦν θήσομαι BO: νῦν τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω P: ἐγὼ τῶνδε[ C  
937 δυσμενὴς εἶναι EOCAVLP: εἶναι δυσμενὴς DB

In 1–700, when the manuscripts are divided, DE show the following number of agreements with the other manuscripts: with A 124, B 118, O 106, C 95 (but C is defective in six places where it might have been expected to agree with O: so say 101), V 101, L 54, P 58. Since H is present for only lines 1–255 in this part of the play, I give the numbers of agreements in these lines: with A 48, B 46, O 44, C 43, H 38, V 32, L 24, P 23. Thus it appears that the manuscript most commonly agreeing with DE is A: against 124 agreements are to be set 37 disagreements. Not far behind comes B: against 118 agreements are to be set 41 disagreements. Then come OCVH. LP have the lowest frequency of agreements.

#### 5 D alone

I list the most significant agreements of D (when it disagrees with E) and one other manuscript.

##### (i) DB

737 ἀνώμοτος <L<sup>2</sup>>DB<sup>2</sup> et IΣ<sup>uv</sup> ad 735: ἐνώμοτος BOCVPL<sup>c</sup> et Σ<sup>uv</sup> ad 737:  
[I<sup>11</sup> E] 746 ὄμνυ OVLP: ὄμνυ DBV<sup>s</sup>: ὄμνυμι A: [C] 894 λέιπετε] λίπετε  
DB 937 δυσμενὴς εἶναι] εἶναι δ- DB 1118 τῶν DBV<sup>3</sup>: τὸν OAVLPgE:

<sup>20</sup> The evidence of gE was not available to Barrett. The most telling evidence from C was not available to Matthiessen when he published the readings of gE, since it consists of the agreement between gE and C in unique errors, and Barrett (reasonably enough) does not record C's unique errors. I cite C from my own collation, made from photographs.

<sup>21</sup> DE are also closely related in *Hi.*: see Barrett, 69–72, Turyn, 336.

[CE] 1134 ὧλοντο] ὄλοντο DB: [C] 1139 ἦν πολὺς EAVLP: ἦν DB: ἡμῶν ἦν O:  
 [C] 1259 κατάπαυσον] κατάπαυς DB: [C] 1311 τέκνων] παίδων DB: [C]  
 1377 κλαῦσαι] καῦσαι DB: [CE] 1395 ἄμορος DPTTr: ἄμμορος D<sup>s</sup>BP<sup>2</sup>: ἄμοιρος  
 OAV: ἄμ\*\*ρος L: [CE] 1395 τέκνων] παίδων DB: [CE] 1404 ἔπος DBgE:  
 δ' ἔπος AV: λόγος OLPV<sup>3</sup>: [CE] 1410 μοι] μου DB: [CE] note also  
 896 διαλλάχθηθ' EAVLPB<sup>2</sup>: διαλλάχθηθ' B: διαλεχθηθ' D: διαλλάγηθ' O: ἀλλάγηθ' C  
 (ii) DL(P)

130 ἀπέδωκεν] ἀπέδωκαν DL (~ D<sup>s</sup>Tr) 323 μενεῖς D<sup>2</sup>LPV<sup>3</sup>γρ: μένη(ι)ς  
 BOCEAVD<sup>c</sup> 357 om. DLP 502 πότερα] πότερον DP 588 οὖν μοι DLP:  
 οὖν cū OAV: οὖν σοι C: οὖν BE 687 γε] δὲ DLP 802 τίσει BOAV: δώσει DLP:  
 [CE] 875 κοιράνοις] τυράννοις DP 985 πάρα νυμφο- fere DLV<sup>3</sup> et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>b(v)</sup>:  
 παρानυμφο- BOCEAVP 1179 κυμφοράν DLP: -άς BOEAV: [C] 1208 τίς c'  
 BOELV<sup>3</sup>: τις δ' A: τίς DP: τίς c' V: [C] 1289 τε] δὲ DP: δὴ L: [CE] 1395  
 ἄμορος DPTTr: ἄμμορος D<sup>s</sup>BP<sup>2</sup>: ἄμοιρος OAV: ἄμ\*\*ρος L: [CE]

D has several unique agreements with LP; with the other manuscripts, apart from B, few or none. In the second half of the play it has numerous unique agreements with B. That at some point in the play D abandons its original model and follows a different one (either B or a manuscript derived from or closely related to B) was observed by Turyn and is suggested by the following facts:

(a) In 1–700, when the manuscripts are divided, the proportion of agreements to disagreements between B and D is 160:60, i.e. 2.65:1. In 701–1449 the proportion is 190:34, i.e. 5.5:1.

(b) In 1–700 there are at least ten firm instances of D's adherence to a tradition different from B: 37 νέον DEFALPV<sup>3</sup>γρ: κακόν BOCVgE 234 τοῦτ' DHCEAVgE:  
 τοῦδ' ἔτ' L(P): τοῦτό γ' BO 307 ἔχει μοι BOLP: ἔχοιμι DCEAVgE 357 om.  
 DLP 440 μένει BCVO<sup>2</sup>: μῖμνει DEALP: om. O 501 δ' BOCLP: om. DEAV  
 509 ἐλληνίδων LPV<sup>3</sup>γρ: καθ' ἐλλάδα (IT<sup>12</sup>)DEAV: ἀν' ἐλλάδα BOC 543  
 κάλλιον DEAVLPgV: βέλτιον OCgE: βέλτιστον B 588 οὖν μοι DLP: οὖν cū  
 OAV: οὖν σοι C: οὖν BE 633 μήποτ' BOCV et A in ras.: μηδέ ποτ' fere DELP  
 Σ<sup>b</sup>.

In 701–1449 there are four: 710 τῶν IT<sup>4</sup> DEAL: om. BOCVP 751 ζῶν  
 BOC<L>PV<sup>3</sup>γρ Trγρ: γῆς (IT<sup>5</sup>) DAVTr: [E] 802 τίσει BOAV: δώσει DLP: [CE]  
 982 αὐτὰ uel αὐτῇ DEAVLP et fort. IT<sup>7</sup>: om. BOCgE

(c) In 1–700 the proportion of agreements to disagreements between D and E is 166:44, i.e. about 4:1. In the parts of 701–1449 where E is available (i) 701–30, 826–1028, (ii) 1134–1338 the proportion is (i) 52:22, (ii) 52:23, i.e. about 2.5:1 in each case.

At what point does D change to its B-source? The first of the unique agreements is inconclusive (894 λείπετε] λίπετε BD).<sup>22</sup> But the next is striking (937 δυσμενῆς εἶναι] εἶναι δυσμενῆς BD). After 894 disagreements between B and D (isolated errors in either manuscript aside) are mostly trivial (and several of them are nullified by a correction in B):

908 οὐδ' B<sup>c</sup>OCDEVgE: οὐκ <B<sup>2</sup>>ALP 926 τῶνδε θήσομαι D: τῶνδε νῦν  
 θήσομαι BO (see above, pp. 341–2) 968 ψυχῆς BOCEALPV<sup>3</sup>γρ: ψυχᾶς DV<sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>bν</sup>  
 969 εἰσελθόντε BOLP: -τες CDEAV 979 δύστανος D: ἄ δύστανος LP: δύστηνος  
 BOEAVgE: δ]ύστηνος C: δυστ[ IT<sup>7</sup> 982 αὐτὰ uel αὐτῇ DEAVLP et fort. IT<sup>7</sup>: om.  
 BOCgE 985 πάρα νυμφο- fere DLV<sup>3</sup> et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>b(v)</sup>: παρानυμφο- BOCEAVP 993  
 βιοτᾶι BV<sup>3</sup>: -τὰν B<sup>2</sup>DOEAVLP: -τῇν C 1008 αἶ bis <IT<sup>5</sup>>BOCLPgE: ter A: quater

<sup>22</sup> cf. *Alc.* 23 (V), *Hi.* 907.

DEV 1009 ἀγγέλλων BAP<sup>2</sup>gE: -έλων DOEV: -έλω LPV<sup>c</sup>: [I<sup>7</sup>5C] 1012 δαὶ  
BOEAL: δὲ CVP: δῆ D 1029 ἄρ'] τ' ἄρ' DgE: [CE] 1039 ἐε B<sup>s</sup> DAVLP: om.  
BO: εἰς B<sup>2</sup>Q<sup>1</sup>: [CE] 1070 ἀπάσασθαι BALP: -ασθε DOV: [CE] 1118 καὶ  
δῆ BOAVgE: καίτοι LP: καὶ νῦν D: [CE] 1144 δέσποινα δ'] δέσποιναν δ' D:  
δέσποιναν V (~ V<sup>2</sup>): [C] 1172 τινος θεῶν] θεῶν τινος D (~ D<sup>c</sup>) et ut uid. I<sup>7</sup>9 (θεῶν  
τινο)c: [C] 1179 συμφορὰν DLP: -άς BOEAV: [C] 1194 τόσως LP<sup>2</sup>O<sup>2</sup>: τοσῶς  
O: τόσως τ' A: τοσῶς τ' BV: τοσόνδ' DE: τόσον τ' B<sup>2</sup>V<sup>3</sup>γP: τόσον P<sup>2</sup>? : [C] 1208  
τίς c' BOELV<sup>3</sup>: τις δ' A: τίς DP: τίς c' V: [C] 1289 τε BHOAVI<sup>7</sup>: δὲ DP: δῆ  
L: [CE] 1314 κλήιδας BOEVLP: κλειδὰς DAH<sup>c</sup>: [CH] 1365 οὔτοι νιν BA<sup>c</sup>:  
οὔτοι νιν uel οὐ τοῖνυν B<sup>2</sup>DH<sup>uv</sup>O<A>VLP: [CE] 1395 ἄμορος DPTr: ἄμμορος  
BD<sup>s</sup>P<sup>2</sup>: ἄμοιρος OAV: ἄμ\*\*ρος L: [CE]

It is tempting to suppose that the change in D's affiliation may be connected with the dislocation of its text after 795: lines 796–903 are written not in their proper place but at the end of the play. We might imagine that the scribe abandoned his original model at 795, then took up a different one but started copying at the wrong place (904), and then, realising his omission, added the omitted lines at the end. But, for all its economy, this hypothesis will not work: for as late as 982 D has a reading not derived from B (see the above list).<sup>23</sup> And this reading undermines Turyn's claim (which he offers no evidence to support) that the change occurred 'ca. 923' (p. 336). From 982 onwards, at any rate, the evidence is compatible with the assumption that D is derived from B.

## 6 E alone

I list the most significant agreements of E (when it disagrees with D) and one other manuscript.

### (i) EL(P)

30 δέρην] κάρα <E<sup>2</sup>>L (~ E<sup>2</sup>) 80 ἀτὰρ] αὐτὰρ EP 171 μικρῶ(ι)] μ-  
E<L>P 173 ἀμετέραν] ἡμ- EP 235 λαβεῖν ELPV<sup>3</sup>γPgE: λάβει H: λάβη(ι)  
BOCDVAV 257 οὐχί] οὐδέ ELP 439 οὐδ' ἔτ' EL: οὐδέ τ' BOCDVAVPTTr  
445 ἐπέστα ELP: -τη BDA: ἐ[ C: μετέστη O: ἀνέστη V 457 ἀνίεις] ἀνίης EL  
et L<sup>s</sup> (~ L<sup>c</sup>) 610 τι ELPV<sup>2</sup>: τε BOCDVAV 635 στέργου] στέργει EP: [C]  
867 ἄμαρτοις] -της ELP<sup>2</sup> τοὔδε γ' ELP: τοὔδε τ' uel τοὔδ' ἔτ' BOCDVAV 871  
c' BOCDVAVgE: γ' ELP 893 τάδε ELPV<sup>3</sup>: τόδε BOCDVAVgE 1256 αἶμα  
ELPV<sup>2</sup>: αἶματι BODV: αἶμα τι A: [C] 1332 προδότιν] -την EL<P>: [C]

### (ii) EH

140 τὸν EH, sicut coni. Musgrave: ὁ H<sup>s</sup>BOCDVAVLP: ος I<sup>7</sup>10

E (like D) shows clear traces of the LP-tradition. Its agreement in the truth with H at 140 is striking.

## 7 F

No clear picture of F's affiliations emerges from lines 1–45. So I begin with the *hypothesis*, where the picture is clear. Here F is regularly associated with DE and always agrees (isolated errors aside) with E. The line numbers are Murray's.

2 τὴν FDE<sup>2</sup>BOATr: τὴν τοῦ CV: τοῦ P: τ\*\* E: [L] 4 πρὸς BOCVPTTr: ὥς FDE:  
om. A: [L] 6 χρησαμένη BOCATr: διαχρ- FDEVp: [L] δὲ om. FETr: [L]

<sup>23</sup> Note also that with this hypothesis we should have to accept that D went back to its original model in order to copy 769–903. For these lines cannot have been copied from the B-model: see 802 (τίσει BOAV: δώσει DLP: [CE]) and possibly 875 (κοιράνοιο BOCEAVL: τυράννοιο DP). The latter corruption is not necessarily evidence of affiliation, since it is so frequent (1299, I<sup>7</sup> 1080 (P), Ph. 1643, fr. 337, A. Ag. 549, [A.] PV 958, Ar. Ach. 472).

10 ἡ μήδεια om. FDE: [L] ἀνεψήcaca BOCVPTTr: ἐψήcaca fere FDEA: [L]  
 13 ἡβώωντα BATr<sup>c</sup>: ἡβόωντα FDEVPTTr: [OCL] 14 εἰδυίη(ι)ci fere FDEVTr:  
 εἰδείηci A: ἰδυίηci B: ἰδίη(ι)ci PTTrA<sup>s</sup>: [OCL] 16 καὶ BDAVLp: om. FE: [OCL]  
 18 τὸν ἰάcονa BAVLP: om. FDE: [OCL] 19 αὐτὴν BAVPTTr: -τῇ D: -τῇ FE:  
 [OCL] 4 (25) τῶ(ι) ante ἰάcονι FE: om. DAP: [BOCVLTTr]

The same affiliation with DE is maintained in 1–45:

24 ἀλγῆδοσι(ν) FDEAVLP<sup>i</sup>Σ<sup>b</sup>: -δόνι BOCgE et Σ<sup>b</sup> ad 97 31 ἀποιμώξη BCLP:  
 -ξει O: -ζη FE<sup>2</sup>: -ζει DEAV 33 ὄc F<sup>c</sup>E<sup>c</sup>OPB<sup>2</sup>: ὄ FEDBAVL: ὡc C 37 νέον  
 FDEALPV<sup>3</sup>γP: κακόν BOCVgE 39 τέ FDBOCAV: δέ LP: γε E 42 τόν τε  
 FDBOCAVP<sup>2</sup>L<sup>c</sup>: τόνδε V: τόν γε E: τόν \*\* L

The close relationship between E and F is observed by Turyn, p. 326.

## 8 The nature of OCDE summarised

OCDE belong to the side of the tradition which is represented by (H)BAV, as opposed to the side represented by LP (see p. 340). In general Turyn's assessment of each of OCDE individually is correct. O, as he says, is 'closely related to B' and is a 'valuable witness' of the B-tradition (p. 334); though he fails to observe the traces of its connection with the LP-tradition. C he describes as 'closely related to the B-like tradition' (p. 358). This is true, though its closest relative is O not B. Traces of a connection between C and a non-B tradition are slight. D, as he observes, is 'closely related' to E in the first half of the play and to B in the second half (p. 336). That it is a 'direct copy' of B in the second half is possible but not provable. E he describes as a 'gemellus' of D (p. 326) in the first half of *Medea* and in *Hippolytus*. This is not strictly correct. That its 'eclectic and mixed' text is 'deprived of any essential value' in both plays (p. 328) is a misjudgement.

## 9 Isolated preservation of the truth in OCDE

Three of these four manuscripts conspire to preserve the truth at 261: δίκην CDE, sicut coni. Elmsley:<sup>24</sup> δικη(ι) BOAVLP. In two places one of the four supports a reading hitherto known only from H: 140 τὸν HE, sicut coni. Musgrave: ὁ BOCDAVLp et H<sup>s</sup>: oc IT<sup>0</sup>; 1303 ἐκώcων] ἐκώcαι OH (etiam P<sup>2</sup>). The former is certainly right, the latter is possible (see p. 342). Once D alone has the truth (unless L also had it), though the reading was known to the scholia (from which it may have been taken, as happens elsewhere, by B<sup>2</sup>): 737 ἀνώμοτος <L<sup>?</sup>>DB<sup>2</sup> et <sup>i</sup>Σ<sup>b</sup> ad 735: ἐνώμοτος BOCAVPL<sup>c</sup> et Σ<sup>b</sup> ad 737: [IT<sup>1</sup>E]. And D deserves some credit for preserving the truth at 979: δύcτανος D, sicut coni. Aldina: ἁ δύcτανος LP: δύcτηνος BOEAVgE: δ]ύcτηνος C: δυcτ[ IT<sup>1</sup>. O has the correct accentuation at 1195: πίτνει O: πιτνει BDEAVO<sup>2</sup>gE: πίπτει LP: πε[ IT<sup>0</sup>: [C]. One of the infrequent scholia in C reflects the truth at 290: ἀπεχθέcθαι Elmsley et <sup>i</sup>Σ<sup>b</sup> (ἀπεχθῆ φανῆναι): ἀπεχέcθαι D: ἀπέχθ- OEVLPB<sup>2</sup>: ἀπέχ- BcAgVgE. And E alone preserves the truth at 189: ὀρμηθῆ(ι) E, sicut coni. Brunck: ὀρμαθῆ(ι) cett. et gE.

There are, in addition, several places where one of OCDE has a claim to unique (or virtually unique) preservation of the truth. These require longer exposition.

(a) 159 ...τάκου δυρομένα cὸν εὐνέταν.

εὐνάταν O<sup>2</sup>E<sup>s</sup>, sicut coni. Tyrwhitt: -νέταν O<sup>c</sup>: -νάτην E

For the sake of exact resposnion with 183 (πένθος γὰρ μεγάλως τόδ' ὀρμάται) Brunck proposed εὐνήταν, and Tyrwhitt<sup>25</sup> changed this to εὐνάταν, which is now found to

<sup>24</sup> In his 'Annotatio' (for which see Part II, n. 1), p. 14.

<sup>25</sup> *Coniecturae in Euripidem* (1822), 28–30.



Whether metre really does require acceptance of εὐνάταν has recently been questioned by T. C. W. Stinton, *JHS* 97 (1977), 129, 132 (cf. *BICS* 22 (1975), 99 with n. 39). He observes that ‘-υ- in the close of glyconics is well attested... , also as the close of enoplians of various lengths’. It is true that υ- is commonly found in the close of aeolo-choriambics, but only when it follows immediately after the choriamb (- x | - υ υ - | υ - Hi. 741 ~ 751, El. 144 ~ 162 (?),<sup>29</sup> Ion 206 ~ 220,<sup>30</sup> Ba. 867 ~ 887, IA 1056 ~ 1078, S. OT 1187 ~ 1197, Ph. 1128 ~ 1151, - | - υ υ - | υ - - El. 730 ~ 740, - υ υ - | υ - υ - Alc. 216 ~ 229, A. Su. 101 ~ 109). To the second part of Stinton’s statement the following passages are relevant: Andr. 480 ~ 487 υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ -, A. ScT 222 ~ 229 υ υ υ υ υ υ υ -,<sup>31</sup> If we extend the net more widely, so as to catch instances of a cretic corresponding with a molossus at the end of a colon of whatever metrical form, we may add these: (i) in the second metron of an iambic dimeter (υ υ υ υ | υ - υ -): El. 1149 ~ 1157, Or. 171 ~ 192;<sup>32</sup> (ii) after two molossi (- - - | - - - | υ - υ -): S. OC 1559 ~ 1571; (iii) after a dochmiac (υ - υ υ υ - | υ - υ -): Ion 676 ~ 695;<sup>33</sup> (iv) after an apparent run of dactyls: Andr. 834-5 ~ 838-9 - υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ υ -. This last passage, however it is interpreted in metrical terms, and however its beginning is emended,<sup>34</sup> does offer at the end the same sequence and correspondence as Med. 159 ~ 183 (- υ υ υ υ υ υ -). An instance of υ - υ - following the choriamb in aeolo-choriambics has been introduced by conjecture at S. Ph. 209 δὰ τρυεάνωρ· διάστημα γάρ θροεῖ ~ 218 -γάζων ὄρμον· προβοᾷ τι γὰρ (Wunder: γάρ τι codd.) δεινόν. Stinton<sup>35</sup> advocates acceptance of Wunder’s conjecture (denying that we also need Dindorf’s θρηγεῖ for θροεῖ to restore exact correspondence),<sup>36</sup> and he believes that this conjecture and the transmitted εὐνάταν at Med. 159 offer each other

<sup>36</sup> *θρηνηεῖ* (with Wunder's conjecture) is accepted by R. D. Dawe (Teubner, 1979). Dr Dawe reminds me that *θροεῖν* is a well attested variant for *θρηνεῖν* at S. *Ai.* 582.

mutual support. The question is incapable of final decision. The irregular responson entailed by *εὐνέταν* may be permissible, in the light of the passages quoted above. The claim of *εὐνάταν* may be thought to be higher now that it is attested as a manuscript reading; but it could just as well be a scribal slip.

(b) 181–2

... φίλα καὶ τὰδ' αὖδα,  
 σπεύσασά τι πρὶν κακῶσαι τοὺς ἕω.

182 *σπεύσασά* Schöne: *σπεύσαι* HBOCDA: *σπεύσον* VLP: *σπεῦδε* E: *σπεῦσον* δὲ Hermann *τι πρὶν* C: *πρὶν τι* cett. *ἕω* Brunck: *εἴω* codd.

Arguments in favour of this restoration of the text are given by Page. I find them convincing. If this is the right answer, then either C has made a most abnormal mistake or it has uniquely preserved the truth. The placing of *τι* outside the clause to which it belongs (as at *Herc.* 1388 *λύπηι τι παίδων μὴ πάθω μονούμενος*) is in accord with the tendency of enclitics to move towards the front of the sentence, which I have illustrated (in relation to *τις*) in *CQ* n.s. 27 (1977), 236. For the corruption see S. *Ph.* 218 (quoted in the note on 159 above), 861 *ἀλλά τις ὥς* (Wunder: *ὥς τις* codd.).

Editors impute *τι πρὶν* to Hermann as a conjecture. In fact Elmsley had reported C's reading and Hermann merely accepted it.

(c) 319–20

γυνὴ γὰρ ὀξύθυμος, ὥς δ' αὖτως ἀνὴρ,  
 ῥάων φυλάσσειν ἢ *σιωπηλὸς* σοφός.

320 *ῥά(ι)ων* BODEAVLPgE et Hn<sup>2</sup>Nv<sup>s</sup> et Sud. i. 254. 4 Adler et Anecd. Bekker i. 412: *ῥάων* C: *ῥάων* gV et <Hn<sup>2</sup>>Nv

C's *ῥάων* may be an idiosyncratic error, since C is derived from the same source as gE (see p. 342), which has *ῥάων*. But more probably the divergence is an indication that the source had *ῥάων*, which is precisely what we find in Nv (on which see p. 355). The neuter is also found in gV and should be taken seriously, for a neuter predicate is commonly used in gnomic statements: see Kühner–Gerth i. 58–9, Schwyzer ii. 605, Barrett on *Hi.* 443. Its use is particularly common when 'woman' is the subject: 928 *γυνὴ δὲ θῆλυ* (*θῆλυς* AV<sup>3</sup>) *κάπι* *δακρύοις ἔφθ*, *El.* 1035 *μῶρον μὲν οὖν γυναικες*, *Hel.* 830 *γυναικὶ πρόσφορον γυνή*, fr. 4 *πέφυκε γάρ πως παῖσι πολέμιον γυνή | τοῖς πρόσθεν*, fr. 544 *ἄλλως δὲ πάντων δυσμαχώτατον γυνή*, fr. 822 *γυνὴ γὰρ ἐν κακοῖσι καὶ νόσοις πόσει | ἡδιστόν ἐστι*, S. *Ai.* 580 *κάρτα τοι φιλοίκτιστον γυνή*, Verg. *Aen.* 4. 569–70 *uarium et mutabile semper | femina*. For the attachment of an infinitive to the neuter predicate see [E.] fr. 953. 11 *εἰ τᾶλλα κρίνειν ἐστὶν ἀνόητον γυνή*.<sup>37</sup>

But the lines still harbour a problem, clearly formulated by Housman: 'What... perplexes me is the gender of *σιωπηλός* and *σοφός*: I do not understand why the parenthetic *ὥς δ' αὖτως ἀνὴρ* exerts this influence, considering especially that the speaker's whole practical concern is with a woman'.<sup>38</sup> Nor do I understand it: *ἀνὴρ*, placed in a parenthesis, may not affect the gender of an adjective outside the parenthesis.<sup>39</sup> Wecklein's '*σιωπηλὸς σοφός* nach *γυνή ὀξύθυμος*, weil nach dem Zusatz *ὥς δ' αὖτως ἀνὴρ* das allgemeine *ἄνθρωπος ὀξύθυμος* vorschwebt' is just the sort of fanciful pleading (much the same, at greater length, may be found in Hermann)

<sup>37</sup> The fragment is not Euripidean: see Diggle, *Studies* 85, 104.

<sup>38</sup> CR 4 (1890), 10 = *Classical Papers* 116.

<sup>39</sup> Even a second subject added non-parenthetically need not affect the gender: *Herc.* 774–6 *ὁ χροῦς ᾧ τ' εὐτυχία... δύναισι ἄδικον ἐφέλεκων*.

which Housman was trying to combat. Dawes<sup>40</sup> tackled the problem with a simple bold expedient (which, since Wecklein omits to record it, is unknown to modern editors), ἀνὴρ γὰρ ὀξύθυμος, ὥς δ' αὖτως γυνή, invoking Σ<sup>b</sup> on 320 ῥάϊων ἐστὶ φυλάττεσθαι, φησίν, ὀξύθυμος ἀνὴρ, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ γυνή (Σ<sup>b</sup> on 319 has πᾶσα γάρ, φησίν, ὀξύθυμος γυνή, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἀνὴρ). But since, in Housman's words, 'the speaker's whole practical concern is with a woman', syntactical purity is gained at some loss to the sense.

Other proposals are thoroughly bad: κοφοῖς Bothe, εφοδρός F. W. Schmidt,<sup>41</sup> κιωπηλόστομος Housman (on which see Page), κιωπηλὴ κοφῶς Wecklein olim, κιωπηλὸς χόλος Gomperz.<sup>42</sup> G. Müller<sup>43</sup> deletes 319–20, passing a harsh verdict on the language ('319–20 sind sehr unschön gebaut, mehr gestammelt als geredet. ὥς δ' αὖτως ἀνὴρ hinkt schauderhaft nach. Das masculinum κιωπηλὸς κοφῶς ist sehr ärgerlich'). E. Christmann<sup>44</sup> has rightly contested the deletion, but he fails to face Müller's very proper objection to the masculines.

Write κοφή for κοφός. Then κιωπηλός becomes a feminine form (like ὀξύθυμος before). The adjective, not attested again in tragedy, is just the kind of adjective to which Euripides would deny a separate feminine termination: for illustration of this practice see Kühner–Blass i. 535–7, Wecklein, *SBAM* 1898, 385–409, Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* ii. 49–50, Dodds on *Ba.* 991–6, Kannicht on *Hel.* 335, W. Kastner, *Die griechische Adjektive zweier Endungen auf -ΟΣ* (1967). At 839 Π<sup>6</sup> gives μετρι]ου for μετρίας, perhaps rightly (cf. *Pl. Tim.* 59d).<sup>45</sup> Pindar has κυνηλός as a feminine at *Pyth.* 9. 92.

For the reverse corruption (of κοφοί to κοφαί) see 385, where I regard the conjecture κοφοί as inescapable. My only uncertainty (which I see no means of resolving) is whether its proposer was Tate or Dalzel: see *Museum Criticum* 1 (1826), 326–37.

(d) 925–6                    Μη. οὐδέν· τέκνων τῶνδ' ἐννοουμένη πέρι.  
                                   Ia. θάρρει νυν· εὖ γὰρ τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω πέρι.

926 τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω EAVL (θήσομαι V<sup>3</sup>, θήσω V<sup>3</sup>ΥΡ) et Chr. Pat. 926: τῶνδε θήσομαι D et Nv: τῶνδε νῦν θήσομαι BO: νῦν τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω P: ἐγὼ τῶνδε[ C: τῶνδε νῦν θήσω Hn

D's reading (which appears also in Nv: see p. 355) used to be reported by editors. It was accepted by Brunck, Porson, Elmsley, Bothe, Kirchhoff, and C. E. S. Headlam. But it is ignored by Murray, Méridier, Page, and Valgiglio.

The variations in the manuscripts suggest that different attempts have been made by the scribes to amend a metrically defective verse. The readings can be accounted for if we suppose that the ancestor of our manuscripts gave the verse in the form θάρρει νυν· εὖ γὰρ τῶνδε θήσω πέρι. Then νῦν, ἐγὼ, and θήσομαι will have been introduced (first, perhaps, above the line) in order to repair the metre: EAVL adopted ἐγὼ, D adopted θήσομαι, BO adopted both νῦν and θήσομαι (for there is no reason why alternatives should not have been superscribed), P adopted both νῦν and ἐγὼ. A

<sup>40</sup> *Miscellanea Critica* (1745), 97 (= ed. Kidd [1827], 188–9).

<sup>41</sup> *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern* ii (1886), 333–4.

<sup>42</sup> *SBAM* 143 (1901), 8–9; cf. Weil, *REG* 13 (1900), 417, E. Pistelli, *SIFC* 11 (1903), 446.

<sup>43</sup> *SIFC* 25 (1951), 80.

<sup>44</sup> *Bemerkungen zum Text der Medea des Euripides* (diss. Heidelberg, 1962), 53–7; an excellent dissertation, which deserves to be better known.

<sup>45</sup> Roberts believed that a second hand may have written α over ους. Dr R. A. Coles, who kindly inspected the papyrus for me under the microscope, believes that the trace is more likely to be the accent above ι.

superscribed reading is likely to be incorporated in the wrong place:<sup>46</sup> hence C, we may surmise, finding ἐγὼ above τῶνδε, copied it before instead of after that word.<sup>47</sup>

This suggestion about the origin of the variants, even if it is right, does not help us to decide between ἐγὼ θήσω and θήσομαι. For either (a) τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω may be right (ἐγὼ omitted by accident, then written above the line, like the false alternatives νῦν and θήσομαι); or (b) τῶνδε θήσομαι may be right (θήσομαι corrupted to θήσω, then written above the line, like the false alternatives νῦν and ἐγὼ; the same corruption has occurred at *Hi.* 709 τὰμὰ θήσομαι καλῶς] τὰμὰ γε θήσω καλῶς Hn et Pal. gr. 343 et Bodl. Auct. T. 4. 10,<sup>48</sup> *Andr.* 1210 ἐπιθήσομαι] -θήσω V). νῦν, at any rate, I think may be dismissed as a stop-gap. It has no special fitness here, and the single arrangement in which it suits the metre is presented only by Hn.

There is a further possibility worth considering: that the variants are amendments of an original τῶνδε θήσομεν πέρι, where the use of the plural for the singular may have provoked the change. This is precisely what has happened at *Hi.* 1079 πᾶσχομεν] πᾶσχομαι Hn, πᾶσχω Bodl. Auct. T. 4. 10; similarly 1382 προσάψομεν BDA<sup>c</sup>V: -άψομαι ALPV<sup>3</sup>, *Hi.* 660 ἔξομεν] ἔξομαι BEHnNv et Pal. gr. 343, Bodl. Auct. T. 4. 10, Neap. II. F. 41, *Andr.* 760 ἄρχομεν] ἄρχομαι B, *Hec.* 1236 φήσομεν] φήσομαι FRS al., *Tr.* 361 ὑμνήσομεν V: ὑμνήσομαι PQ, *Or.* 111 πέμφομεν] πέμφομαι ALP, A. *Pe.* 229 θήσομεν] θήσομαι GFP<sup>s</sup>; cf. *El.* 871 (Lenting).

The choice between the active verb (θήσω, θήσομεν) and the middle (θήσομαι) is very difficult. The relevant facts are these:

(i) εὖ τίθεσθαι is well attested: *Herc.* 605 τὸδ' εὖ θέσθαι, 938 εὖ θέσθαι τάδε, *IT* 1003 τὸ αὐτοῦ θέμενος εὖ, *Ba.* 49 τὰνθένδε θέμενος εὖ, *IA* 672 θέμενος εὖ τὰκεῖ, *S. El.* 1434 τὰ πρὶν εὖ θέμενοι, *OT* 633 νεῖκος εὖ θέσθαι; similarly *Andr.* 378–9 εἰ μὴ θήσομαι | τᾶμ' ὡς ἄριστα. Some non-tragic instances are quoted by LSJ s.u. τίθημι A. VII and by Fraenkel, *Agamemnon*, pp. 20 n. 3, 414, 801 n. 2.

(ii) καλῶς τίθεσθαι is also attested: *Hi.* 709 τὰμὰ θήσομαι καλῶς, *S. fr.* 350P θέσθαι καλῶς... τὴν βλάβην, LSJ loc. cit.<sup>49</sup>

(iii) καλῶς τιθέναι is well attested: *Hi.* 521 ταῦτ' ἐγὼ θήσω καλῶς, *Hec.* 875 πάντ' ἐγὼ θήσω καλῶς, *El.* 648 καὶ μὴν ἐκείνὰ γ' ἡ τύχη θήσει καλῶς, *Or.* 1664 τὰ πρὸς πόλιν δὲ τῶιδ' ἐγὼ θήσω καλῶς, *IA* 401 τᾶμ' ἐγὼ θήσω καλῶς, *Ant.* 34 Page (fr. xlviii. 37 Kambitsis) ἡμ]εῖς καὶ σὺ θήσομεν καλῶς, *S. Tr.* 26 τέλος δ' ἔθηκε Ζεὺς ἀγώνιος καλῶς.

(iv) εὖ τιθέναι, however, is rare: the only instances cited by LSJ (and I can find no others) are Theogn. 845–6 εὖ μὲν κείμενον ἄνδρα (ἄνδρῖ Hermann) κακῶς θέμεν εὐμαρές ἐστιν, | εὖ δὲ θέμεν τὸ κακῶς κείμενον ἀργαλέον, *Ar. Lys.* 243 τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν εὖ τίθει.

(v) τιθέναι is occasionally found with similar adverbs or adverbial phrases: *Andr.* 737 ὅταν δὲ τὰκεῖ θῶ κατὰ γνώμην ἐμήν, *Hel.* 346–7 ἐς τὸ φέρτερον τίθει | τὸ μέλλον, fr. 287. 3 τὰ πράγματ' ὁρθῶς ἦν τιθῆναι, A. *Pe.* 282–3 πάντα Πέρσαις παγκάκως | <θεοῖ> ἔθεσαν, *Ag.* 912–13 τὰ δ' ἄλλα... θήσει δικαίως.

<sup>46</sup> See p. 352.

<sup>47</sup> For similar attempts in our manuscripts to remedy an accidental omission see 588 καλῶς γ' ἂν οἶμαι (Nauck: οὖν σὺ OAV: οὖν σοι C: οὖν BE) τῶιδ' ὑπηρέτει (OCDALPV<sup>2</sup>: -έτης V: -έτης E: ἐξυπηρέτει B) λόγῳ, where the variants appear to be different attempts to amend καλῶς γ' ἂν οὖν τῶιδ' ὑπηρέτει; 1139 δμῶς δι' ὧτων δ' εὐθὺς ἦν πολὺς (ἦν πολὺς EAVLP: ἦν BD: ἡμῶν ἦν O) λόγος.

<sup>48</sup> On these manuscripts (and Neap. II. F. 41, mentioned below) see Barrett, 76. I have discussed their relationship with the other manuscripts of *Hi.* in *CQ* n.s. 33 (1983), 34–43.

<sup>49</sup> *Or.* 512 is rather different (see Fraenkel, 414 n. 1).

Now, ἐγὼ is very apt<sup>50</sup> and is commended by the parallels quoted in (iii) above; and ἐγὼ entails θήσω. On the other hand, the active verb is much less common than the middle when combined with εἶ (only two examples quoted in (iv) above, neither from tragedy).

There is another fact which must be taken into consideration. In each of the instances quoted above, τιθέναι / τίθεςθαι has a direct object.<sup>51</sup> Ours is the only instance in which the object is suppressed – unless at A. *Ag.* 1672–3 we accept <ἐγὼ> | καὶ cὺ θήσομεν κρατοῦντε τῶνδε δωμάτων <καλῶς> (supplemented by Canter and Auratus on the strength of the scholium ἐγὼ, φησί, καὶ cὺ κρατοῦντες τῶνδε τῶν δωμάτων διαθησόμεθα τὸ καθ' αὐτοὺς καλῶς). This restoration is accepted by Denniston and Page (with some hesitation) and by Page (OCT) but is rejected by Fraenkel on the ground that a direct object is indispensable.<sup>52</sup>

If a direct object is indeed indispensable with εἶ / καλῶς τιθέναι / τίθεςθαι, by far the most attractive solution is to write βίον for πέρι with Leo and Wecklein.<sup>53</sup> βίον, spoken by a father who does not know that his children are condemned to die, is grim irony (compare Jason's words at 1303 ἐμῶν δὲ παίδων ἤλθον ἐκσώσων βίον).<sup>54</sup> πέρι may have intruded from the end of the preceding line: cf. *Hi.* 106–7 θεῶν | ... χρεῶν (θεῶν V<sup>ac</sup>), A. *ScT* 393–4 -μαίνων μένει | ... μαίνει κλύων (-μαίνων μένει uel -μαίνει μένων codd.), *Ag.* 1216–17 φροιμίους †ἐφημένους† | ... ἐφημένους, *Ch.* 772–3 γαθούσῃ φρενί | ... ὀρθοῦται λόγος (ὀρθούσῃ φρενί M), S. *OT* 1280–1 †κακά† | ... κακά (see, further, Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1216–17).

The question whether we should prefer θήσω or θήσομαι (or even θήσομεν) remains unanswered and unanswerable.

(e) 1201 γναθμοῖς BODAVLP et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>bv</sup>: γναθοῖς E

The manuscripts are divided between γναθμοῖς and γνάθοις at *Hi.* 1223. γνάθος is the usual tragic form, and Barrett rejects γναθμοῖς as due to 'epicizing copyists'. I think that for the same reason we should write γνάθοις here, as Blaydes suggested.<sup>55</sup> E has preserved (or unconsciously restored) the right form but with the wrong accent.

(f) I end this section with a passage where D offers not a unique reading but an agreement with LP.

357–9 δύστανε γύναι,  
φεῦ φεῦ, μελέα τῶν σῶν ἀχέων,  
ποῖ ποτε τρέψει...;

357 δύστανε γύναι om. DLP et Hn (~ Hn<sup>2</sup>), del. Matthiae

<sup>50</sup> 'The ἐγὼ is here clearly emphatic: "fear not for your children; I will take care of them"' (Paley). But to claim that the pronoun is indispensable (Matthiae) is to go too far.

<sup>51</sup> Reiske first drew attention to the anomaly: 'non placet πέρι, non quidem ideo, quod versum proxime superiorem pariter claudat, sed magis, quod incongrua dictio sit θήσω περὶ τῶνδε εἶ pro θήσω τὰ τῶνδε εἶ'. At *Ant.* 34 (in (iii) above) supply τὰ δ' ἐνδον ἡμῖν (Arnim) or the like.

<sup>52</sup> Editors of *Ag.* do not mention *Med.* 926. But Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 15 [1880], 497) quotes the restoration of *Ag.* 1672–3 in support of τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω πέρι.

<sup>53</sup> Leo (*Hermes* 15 [1880], 315 n. 1) proposed τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω βίον. This was listed by Wecklein (*Bursian* 1881, 49) as one of Leo's 'wenig probable und zum Theil unmethodische Vermuthungen'. In his 1891 edition Wecklein misreported Leo's conjecture as θήσομαι βίον. In his 1899 edition he reported 'τῶνδ' ἐγὼ θήσω βίον... coniciebam'.

<sup>54</sup> Blaydes's πότμον (*Adversaria Critica in Euripidem* (1901), 34) is a less choice word. Other emendations may be found in Wecklein.

<sup>55</sup> *Adv. Crit.* 41; wrongly attributed to Wecklein by Diehl.

The words *δύστανε γύναι* are bracketed by Matthiae, Hartung, Wecklein, C. E. S. Headlam, Murray, Earle and Méridier. If they were omitted by LP alone or by D alone, we might attribute the omission to the carelessness of the immediate copyist. We have seen that D elsewhere has unique agreements with LP (p. 344); and here that agreement indicates that the omission occurred at some earlier stage in the tradition.<sup>56</sup> The omission may be of no significance. On the other hand, we should be better off without *δύστανε γύναι* at the head of this sentence, which begins rather more naturally with *φεῦ φεῦ*. And yet why should *δύστανε γύναι* have been interpolated? Since *δύστανε γύναι* need not stand at the head of the sentence (cf. 442, Tr. 573), perhaps we should read

*φεῦ φεῦ, μελέα τῶν σῶν ἀχέων,  
δύστηνε γύναι,  
ποῖ ποτε τρέψει...*

This transposition was proposed by Barthold.<sup>57</sup> And I suggest that DLP's omission is a pointer to this order of words. On numerous occasions, when words have been transposed from their proper place in some of the manuscripts, those words are omitted by others of the manuscripts. The reason is not far to seek. When the fact of omission was recognised by the copyist, he added the omitted words above the line or in the margin, and they were then in danger of being either overlooked or inserted in the wrong place by the copyist who came next.

We can see the process at work in *Med.* 840, where *ἡδυπνόους* is written before *αὔρας* by Π<sup>6</sup> Π<sup>12</sup> LP, omitted by the other manuscripts, and added after *ἡδυπνόους* by V<sup>3</sup>. Since I have not seen this phenomenon systematically documented, I give a good many of the examples which I have found: *Alc.* 401 ἐγὼ (prius) ante *c(ε)* LP: post *μάτερ* BV: om. O; *Med. hyp.* 3 τοῦ ante *Κρέοντος* A: post *Kp-* V: om. cett.; *hyp.* 10 φαὲν post *Σιμωνίδης* plerique: post *ἀνεψήσασα* C: om. OV; *Med.* 328 νῦν post non ante *μνείαν* Hn: om. C (see p. 354); 368 ἄν post *γάρ* BOCDEVG: post *ποτ(ε)* LP: om. A; 539 οὐσαν post non ante *Ἕλληνες* Nv: om. D (~ D<sup>s</sup>) (see p. 355); 645-6 ἔχουσα post non ante *δυσπέρα(ν)τον* O: om. Nv (see p. 355); 785-6 inuerso ordine A (~ A<sup>r</sup>): 785 om. Hn (~ Hn<sup>c</sup>) (see p. 357); 853-4 πάντες πάντως <L>P: πάντως πάντες BDEAVTr: πάντως πάντως O: πάντες C;<sup>58</sup> 1262 ἄρα post *μάταν* Musgrave (cf. Π<sup>7</sup>): ante *μάταν* BODEAV: om. LP; 1282 μίαν (alterum) aut ante aut post *δῆ* non post *κλύω* ut uid. Π<sup>7</sup>: om. A (see Part II); *Hi. hyp.* 1 υἱὸς post *Θησεύς* DEP (bis E): om. plerique: post *Ἀθράς* B<sup>2</sup>: post *Ποσειδῶνος* HnNv et Bodl. Auct. T. 4. 10;<sup>59</sup> *Hi.* 63 χαῖρε bis A: semel cett., sed alterum χαῖρε post *κόρα* CLP; 99 εὐ post non ante *σεμνήν* L: om. P (cf. Turyn, p. 284); 132 κοίτα(ι) om. M: post *ἔχειν* O: post *δεσποινα* (sic) C; 233 δῆ post non ante *μὲν* VC et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>mv</sup>: om. O (cf. Turyn, p. 318); 269 ἐστίν ante non post *ἦτις* L: om. Neap. II. F. 41;<sup>60</sup> 281 γὰρ ante non post *ὦν* OP: om. C; 312 αἰδοῖς ante non post *ἀνδρός* A: om. Neap. II. F. 41; 1041 ταῦτα κάρτα L: κάρτα ταῦτα plerique: πάντα ταῦτα P: κάρτα C; *Hec. hyp.* 10 αὐτὸν ante non post *κηγνάς* Pa: om. RwZc;<sup>61</sup> *Hec.* 247-8 post 250 RS al.: om. AVa (~ A<sup>r</sup>); 393

<sup>56</sup> For the agreement of Hn with D and LP see pp. 354-5. Editors, misled by Matthiae's note, wrongly ascribe the deletion to Seidler. See Seidler's *Epistola Critica* appended to Lobeck's *Ajax* (1809), 433.

<sup>57</sup> In his 1886 edition, known to me only from *Bursian* 1886, 296. I have written *δύστηνε* for *δύστανε*, since these cannot be lyric anapaests.

<sup>58</sup> Herwerden's *πάντη πάντως* (*Mnem.* n.s. 5 [1877], 25) should be accepted; but instead of *πάντη* we need *πάνται* or *πάντᾱ*: cf. Schwyzer i. 550, Barrett on *Hi.* 563.

<sup>59</sup> On this manuscript see n. 48.

<sup>60</sup> On this manuscript see n. 48.

<sup>61</sup> I owe my information about the mss of *Hecuba* to the generosity of Dr Matthiessen. For explanation of the *sigla* see his *Studien* (above, n. 3).

τε ante non post νεκρῶι L al.: om. PS; 435 γὰρ cὸν cὸν γὰρ FPr: cὸν A: γὰρ Rw al.; 464–5 θεᾶς χρυσέαν τ' FL al.: τε θ- χ- plerique: τε θ- χ- τ' Pa al.: θ- χ- O;<sup>62</sup> 477 καπνῶι post non ante κατερείπεται S al.: om. V (~ V<sup>s</sup>); 666 δὲ ante καιρὸν pars codd.: post κ- pars: om. pars; 877 γραῖα post non ante φῶτα GKS: om. H; 909 δορὶ δὴ δορὶ δὴ post δορὶ alterum S al.: om. AL<sup>ac</sup>PPa al.; 1145 παιδὸς post non ante γνοῦσα Pa al.: om. M<sup>ac</sup>V<sup>ac</sup>; 1179 τις ante non post ἔστιν A: om. S al.; Tr. 1033 τ' ἀξίως Seidler: ἀξίως τε P: ἀξίως V; A. *Pe.* 446 δὲ ante non post μύρωι IO: om. VNNdDXP<sup>ac</sup>; ScT 517 post 516 plurimi et M<sup>c</sup>: post 519 M: post 518 I<sup>c</sup>O<sup>c</sup>PQ<sup>ac</sup>: om. AI;<sup>63</sup> S. OT 906 παλαιὰ post Λαίου AXrXsZc: ante Λ- HVDZr(NO): om. LCFPGR;<sup>64</sup> *Ant.* 623 φρένας post non ante θεὸς S: om. V; Hes. *Theog.* 19 ante 18 Π<sup>2</sup>S: ante 15 K: om. Π<sup>18</sup>L; Pl. *Leg.* 903d προσηκούσης ante non post τῆς Eus.: om. AO (add. in marg. A<sup>3</sup>); [Verg.] *Aetna* 276–8 post 257 recte G: om. L: post 272 uel 275 cett. For further examples from Latin texts see L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale* (1911), 352–3, J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism* (1972), 149.

The phenomenon which I have illustrated may be adduced in support of the following emendations: *Alc.* 130 βίου τίν' ἔτ' Hartung: τίν' ἔτι βίου V: τίν' ἐπὶ βίου BO: τίνα βίου LP; *Hi.* 670 τίν' ἦ νῦν Page, Conomis (*Hermes* 92 (1964), 36): τίνα νῦν ἦ Λ: τίνα νῦν ΩV et Tr; *Andr.* 215 τὴν χιόνι Blaydes (dubitanter iam Hermann): χιόνι τὴν MBVLP: χιόνι A;<sup>65</sup> 833 τί δὲ στέρνα δεῖ (τί δέ με δεῖ c- MAVLP: τί δέ με c- B) (I offer this as a possible alternative to the emendation which I proposed in *ICS* 6. 1 (1981), 95–8); 909 δίσκ' ἔν' ἄνδρ' Grotius: ἔν' ἄνδρα δίσκ' HMBVP: ἄνδρ' ἔνα δίσκ' L: ἄνδρα δίσκ' A: α]νδρα δισκα Π; 1254 post 1235 Jackson (*Marg. Scaen.* 51): post 1253 codd. qui exstant: om. codd. plerique sec. Σ; S. OT 1101 cé γ' εὐνάτειρά τις Arndt et Bergk: cé γε θυγάτηρ LHNOPaV: cé γέ τις θυγάτηρ cett.<sup>66</sup>

## §II: HnNv

These are hybrid manuscripts, with constantly shifting allegiances. Their text results from the collation of the readings of the older manuscripts. I leave open for the moment the question whether they have access to any independent tradition (see pp. 356–7). To show something of their nature, I begin by listing their unique agreements with other manuscripts individually and with pairs like OC and DE.<sup>67</sup>

### 1 (a) Hn

#### (i) BHn

345 c' om. <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>b</sup>HnNv 752 λαμπρὸν ἡλίου φάος BHn (see p. 341)

#### (ii) OHn

84 ἀλίσκεται] εὐρίσκεται O<sup>61</sup>Hn (~ Hn<sup>2</sup>) 646 δυσπέρατον] -ατον B: -αντον

<sup>62</sup> This is an interesting case. All mss except O have τε in one place or another, a few have it in both places. The majority have it before θεᾶς: highly abnormal word-order, though accepted by most editors (the scholia show disquiet: Σ<sup>m</sup> δ τε πλεονάζει, Σ<sup>re</sup> τοῦτο τὸ τε πρὸς τὸ χρυσέαν ἄμπυκα cύναπτε). Few mss have it after χρυσέαν, which (if it is to be accepted) is its proper place. If we do not accept it there, we must omit it altogether, as Murray does (with O). But if O is right, it is hard to see why it got into the text. It is more plausible to assume that it originally stood after χρυσέαν, was accidentally omitted, was placed above the line, and was then replaced in the wrong position.

<sup>63</sup> Page's report of the reading of 'plurimi' in his OCT is mistaken, as G. Zuntz points out (*PCPS* n.s. 27 [1981], 93).

<sup>64</sup> See Dawe, *Studies* i. 245–6.

<sup>65</sup> For the rhythm (third foot monosyllable followed by tribrach) see Diggle, *Studies* 112.

<sup>66</sup> See Dawe, *Studies* i. 253.

<sup>67</sup> In order to avoid repetition I have sometimes not transcribed the readings of the other mss in full but instead have referred to an earlier page where this information may be found.

OHn (~ Hn<sup>c</sup>) 1139 ἡμῶν ἦν OHn (~ Hn<sup>2</sup>VP) (see n. 47) 1181 δρόμου] δόμου  
OHn (~ O<sup>2</sup>)

(iii) CHn

313 δὲ uel δῆ] om. C<sup>c</sup>Hn (totum uersum scr. C<sup>c</sup>, om. C) 320 ῥᾶον <Hn<sup>2</sup>> NvgV  
(~ Hn<sup>2</sup>Nv<sup>s</sup>): ῥῶον C (see p. 348) 607 τυράννους CHn (see p. 343) 648  
δαμείην] δραμείην CHn 769 πέφανται] -αται V: -αται CHnNv note also 328  
νῦν μνείαν] μνείαν C: μνείαν νῦν Hn (see p. 352)

(iv) (B)OCHn

433 κραδία(ι)] καρδ- OCHnNv 504 γ' ἂν οὖν LPV<sup>3</sup>Hn<sup>2</sup>: τ' ἂν οὖν EAV: τὰ  
νῦν BOCHn: om. D 543 βέλτιον OCgEHnNv (see p. 341)

(v) DHn

979 δύστανος DHn, recte (see p. 346)

(vi) BDHn

1134 ὄλοντο BDHn (see p. 344)

(vii) EHn

311 ἔδρας] ἔδρασας EHnNv note also 651 πρὶν ante ἀμέραν EV<sup>g1</sup>Hn<sup>2</sup>

(viii) DEHn

349 δῆ] δὲ O: om. DEHn

(ix) AHn

1017 εἰς] τῶνδ' AHn 1251 τε om. AHn 1315 διπλοῦν κακόν] διπλὸν κακῶ  
H<sup>2</sup>: διπλὰ κακά AHn note also 785–6 inuerso ordine A (~ A<sup>r</sup>): 785 om. Hn  
(~ Hn<sup>c</sup>) (see pp. 352, 357); 1083 ἦ AgE: ἦ Hn: εἰ cett. et A<sup>s</sup>

(x) VHn

33 νῦν] νιν V<sup>2</sup>: μιν Hn 88 τούδε γ' εὐνής] τούδ' εὐγ' εὐνής V<sup>c</sup>: τούδ'  
εὐγ\*\*\*\*c V: τούδ' εὐγενεῖς Hn: τούδ' εὐγενής Nv 120 πολλὰ] πολλῶν VHn<sup>2</sup>  
(~ V<sup>s</sup>) 138 μοι] μὴ V<sup>2</sup>TrHn<sup>2</sup> 245 ἄρης] ἄτης VHn<sup>2</sup>Nv<sup>s</sup> (see p. 341) 281  
γῆς τῆςδε] τῆςδε γῆς VHn<sup>2</sup> 365 πω] πως VHn 573 χρῆν OCDLPgVgBgE:  
χρῆν B: χρῆ EAV: ἔχρῆν V<sup>3</sup>Hn 1058 σε] με VHn<sup>2</sup> 1092 προφ-] προσφ-  
V<sup>ac</sup>?ΣVHn 1186 πλόκος] κόσμος VHn<sup>2</sup> 1248 λαθοῦ BDALPV<sup>3</sup>VP: λάθου OE:  
λαβοῦ VHn<sup>2</sup>: λάβου Nv note also 651 πρὶν ante ἀμέραν EV<sup>g1</sup>Hn<sup>2</sup>

(xi) L(P)Hn

178 μήτοι BOVL<sup>c</sup>: μή μοι HCDEAPTr: μή τι LHn 246 φίλον] φίλων L<sup>2</sup>Hn  
(~ L<sup>c</sup>) (see p. 356) 650 θανάτω(ι) θανάτω(ι)] θανάτω LHnNv see also 138  
(under (x) above)

(xii) Other shared readings of interest

102 μηδέ] καὶ μὴ HAHn: μὴ D<sup>1c</sup> (om. D) 357 δύστανε γύναι om. DLP HN  
(~ Hn<sup>2</sup>) (see p. 351) 588 οὖν BEHnNv (οὖν cὺ Hn<sup>2</sup>) (see n. 47) 1303 ἐκ-  
κώων] ἐκκώσαι HOP<sup>2</sup>Hn (see p. 342)

(xiii) HnNv

88 -δέ γ' εὐνής] -δ' εὐγενεῖς Hn: -δ' εὐγενής Nv (see under (x) above) 638  
ἀκόρεστά τε] ἀκορέστατα Nv: -τάτη Hn 871 c' BOCDVgEHn<sup>s</sup>: γ' ELP: om.  
HnNv 1116 τοι AVLp: δῆ BOD: τι Hn<sup>2</sup>: om. HnNv 1132 τοῖς γε] τοῖσι  
HnNv (~ Hn<sup>2</sup>) (see p. 357) 1182 ἀνθήπτετο] ἀνθήπετο HnNv (~ Hn<sup>c</sup>) 1267  
φόνος] φόβος HnNv

# 1 (b) The nature of Hn summarised

Turyn's estimate that Hn is 'manifestly related to the B tradition, though it is not derived directly from B' (p. 330) does not do justice to the composite nature of Hn's text. While Hn shares several unique readings with BOC either individually or collectively (these three being the manuscripts which I should allow to be representatives



of what Turyn calls the 'B tradition'), it also shares unique readings with D, E, A, and possibly LP. With Turyn's verdict that Hn is 'a secondary product and can be disregarded by future editors' I fully agree.<sup>68</sup> I cite a few of its unique aberrations: 490 γεγώτων] ἔτ' ὄντων Hn; 1152 παύσει...στρέψει] παύσαι...στρέψον Hn; 1164 βαίνουσα παλλεύκωι ποδί] κινούσα (~ Hn<sup>2</sup>) πάλλευκον πόδα (see p. 357); 1286 ἄλμην] καλαμίνα Hn.

## 2 (a) Nv

### (i) BNv

345 c' om. <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>b</sup>NvHN 585 ἐκτενεί c' DEAL<P>Hn et Σ<sup>1</sup> et E<sup>b</sup>γρ et <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>v</sup>: κτενεί c' V: σε κτενεί BgENv: σε τεκνεί C: ἄν κτενεί c' O 752 ἡλίου θ' ἄγνόν ἐβας Nv: cf. Σ<sup>b</sup>γρ (et Tr<sup>γ</sup>ρ) ad 746 ἡλίου θ' ἄγνόν ἐβας (see above p. 341, below pp. 356–7) 1300 φεύξεσθαι] φεύζεται Σ<sup>b</sup>Nv (see p. 356)

### (ii) ONv

361 ἐξευρήσεις] εὐρήσεις ONv 393 κεῖ] κᾶν ONv 664 κάλλιον] κάλλιστον ONv 816 σὺν σπέρμα LP: σὺν παῖδε fere AVB<sup>2</sup>Hn: σὺν παῖδα BDC: σὺς παῖδας ONv 835 ῥοαῖς] ῥοῶν B<sup>2</sup>: ῥοὰς A<sup>2</sup>: ῥοᾶς ONv (~ O<sup>c</sup>) 963 προθήσει] προσθ- ONv note also 645–6 (cited above p. 352)

### (iii) CNv

287 ἀπειλῆς CNv (see p. 342) 320 ῥᾶον Nv<Hn<sup>2</sup>>gV (~ Nv<sup>s</sup>Hn<sup>2</sup>): ῥῶον C (see p. 348) 559 οἰκοῖμεν] οἰκοῦμεν CNv 736 γαίας] γαίης CNv 769 πέφαται CNvHn (see p. 354) 1035 ὄλωλε] ὦλωλε CNv et fort. V (~ C<sup>c</sup>V<sup>c</sup>Nv<sup>s</sup>)

### (iv) (B)OCNv

24 ἀλγηδόσι(v)] -δόνι BOCgENv 107 τάχ' ] τάχις' OCNv 242 βία(ι) ζυγὸν φέρων OCNv (see p. 341) 433 κραδία(ι)] καρδ- OCNvHn 543 βέλτιον OCGENvHn (see p. 341) 562 δόμων ἐμῶν] ἐμῶν δόμων OCNv

### (v) DNv

362 σε om. DNv 926 τῶνδε θήσομαι DNv (see p. 349) 1355 ἐγγελῶν] ἀγγελῶν DNv note also 539 οὐσαν Ἑλληνες] ἔλληνες D (~ D<sup>s</sup>): ἔλληνες οὐσαν Nv (see p. 352)

### (vi) BDNv (see pp. 343–5)

937 δυσμενῆς εἶναι] εἶναι δυσμενῆς BDNv 1139 ἦν BDNv (see n. 47) 1395 τέκνων] παίδων BDNv 1410 μοι] μου BDNv

### (vii) ENv

49 παλαιόν] -ὼν ENv 311 ἔδρας] ἔδρασας ENvHn 400 κῆδος] κῦδος ENv 484 ἰωλκὸν] ἰολκὸν ENv 505 οἴκοις] οἴκους ENv 870 συγγνώμον'] -μων' Nv (~ Nv<sup>s</sup>), ὡν super ὡν E (sed postea deletum ut uid.) note also 29 νουθητουμένη] -ημένη EVNv (~ V<sup>2</sup>)

### (viii) DENv

411 δίκαι] δίκαια gE: δίκαια DENv 604 φευξοῦμαι] φεύξομαι DENv 607 τυράννων DENv (see p. 343)

### (ix) VNv

88 see p. 354 245 ἄτης] ἄτης VNv<sup>s</sup>Hn<sup>2</sup> (see p. 341) 317 βουλευέση(ι)ς] -ηι V<sup>3</sup>: -η Nv 332 ζεύ] ζεύς VNv (~ V<sup>2</sup>) 1248 λαθοῦ] λάθου OE: λαβοῦ VHn<sup>2</sup>: λάβου Nv (see p. 354) note also 29 (under (vii) above)

### (x) L(P)Nv

313 πράσσετε] πράσσετε <L>PgENv 650 θανάτω(ι) θανάτω(ι)] θανάτω LNvHn 1012 κατηφέει] -ῆς L<sup>s</sup>Nv see also 752 (under (i) above)

<sup>68</sup> He was not the first to pronounce this verdict. See, for example, Wilamowitz, *Analecta Euripidea* (1875), 254.

(xi) Other shared readings of interest

588 οὖν BENvHn (see n. 47)

(xii) NvHn

See p. 354.

## 2 (b) The nature of Nv summarised

Turyn's statement that Nv is 'a direct apograph of B... The scribe made occasional modifications in the text' (p. 350) is quite mistaken. He supports it by quoting four readings common to B and Nv; each of them is shared by at least one other manuscript. The text of Nv, like that of Hn, is a composite text, showing more unique agreements with each of OCDE severally than with B. No less mistaken is the statement, for which no evidence is offered, that 'The arguments to *Medea*... seem to have been copied from D'. Two readings of D which are reported by Schwartz (*Scholia in Euripidem* ii. 137–9) probably account for this mistake: 19 αὐτῇ] αὐτῇ D (and Nv), 1 [22] παρὰ νεόφρονος D<sup>s</sup> (and Nv). Neither reading is unique to DNv (19 αὐτῇ (sic) EF, 22 παρὰ ν- E). That Nv is not copied from D is proven by: 13 αὐτίκα δ' BFAVLPNv: οὔτου D; 17 [38] ἐδιδάχθη FAPNv: ἐδιδάχθη δὲ D. Perhaps the most interesting feature of Nv is that it presents two readings hitherto known only from the scholia in B (752,<sup>69</sup> 1300<sup>70</sup>). I cite a few of its unique aberrations: 289 δράσειν τι ταῦτ' οὖν] διάσειν τε πολλά, τοὺς Nv; 318 πέποιθά] πρόεσθαί Nv; 608 ἀραία γ' οὐκα] ἀρὰς διδοῦσα Nv; 1209 τίς τὸν γέροντα τύμβον] τίς ἐμὲ τὸν γέροντα.

## 3 Isolated preservation of the truth in HnNv

While it is not inconceivable that two such late manuscripts as Hn and Nv should have access to a genuine tradition independent of our other manuscripts, the chances are against it. Their text appears to be a conflation, debased by idiosyncratic errors, of readings already known from other manuscripts. I list the passages where one or both of Hn and Nv may be thought to have a reading preferable to that of the others.

(i) 17 αὐτοῦ Hn: αὐτοῦ cett.

Right, but scribal conjecture.

(ii) 246 ἡ πρὸς φίλον τιν' ἡ πρὸς ἡλικά τραπέϊς.

φίλων L<sup>ac</sup>?Hn ἡλικας Hn

φίλων is possible, and ἡλικας (conjectured by Porson; ἡλίκων W. Headlam) mends the metre. Both presumably conjectural. Wilamowitz rightly deleted the verse.<sup>71</sup>

(iii) 512 γε HnNv et cod. Haun. Herodiani (Walz viii. 590): τε BOCDEAV: δὲ LP: ce uel om. Herod. codd. cett.

Since neither τε nor δὲ makes sense, γε was an easy conjecture.

(iv) 721 ἔπειτα παίδων ὧν ἐπαγγέλλημι γονάς.

ὧν Hn: ὦ\*\*L: ὧν μ' BOCDEAVPTrHn<sup>2</sup>: [Π<sup>5</sup>Π<sup>11</sup>]

Since μ', interpreted as με, makes no sense, it may be that the scribes tolerated it because they took it for elided μοι. If the scribe of Hn thought about the matter at all, he may have realised that the elision was impermissible. Or the omission may be a lucky slip.

(v) 752 λαμπρὸν ἡλίου τε φῶς CALP: λαμπρόν θ' ἡλίου φάος BODVHn (θ' om. BHn): λαμ]προν. [ Π<sup>5</sup> (θ' [ uel φ[ pot. qu. η[ ]): ἡλίου θ' ἀγνὸν céλας Nv: cf. 746 ἡλίου θ' ἀγνὸν céβας Tr<sup>γρ</sup> et Σ<sup>γρ</sup> (pro πατέρα θ' "Ἥλιον πατρός), quam lectionem ad 752 rettulit Musgrave, qui etiam céλας coni.

<sup>69</sup> See pp. 355, 356–7.

<sup>70</sup> On this passage see most recently M. W. Haslam, *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M. W. Knox* (1979), 95–6.

<sup>71</sup> I am not convinced by the elaborate attempt of Christmann, *op. cit.* (n. 44), 47–53, to show that the verse (with ἡλικας) is indispensable.

This is very interesting. Musgrave had seen that the variant reported by Σ<sup>b</sup>ΥΡ (and TrΥΡ) on 746 must relate not to 746 but to 752.<sup>72</sup> Nv not only confirms that he was right; it also anticipates his change of *céβac* to *έλαc*. The latter change, at least, is to be resisted: for, while *ήλίου cέλαc* is regular enough (*El.* 866, *Tr.* 860; cf. *Su.* 469, *Rh.* 331), the presence of *άγνόν* commends *céβac* (see *Cycl.* 580, *A. Eum.* 885, *S. OT* 830, *Ph.* 1289); note also fr. 582 P *Ἡλιε, φιλίπποις Θρηξί πρέcβιcτον céβac* (Bothe: *cέλαc* codd.). Slight though its credentials are, *ήλίου θ' άγνόν céβac* could be right. If we do not accept it, Page's *φώς τε λαμπρόν ήλίου* remains the best solution.

(vi) 785 om. Hn (~ Hn<sup>e</sup>), del. Valckenaer

The line is spurious; but the hand which corrected the omission was probably the original hand, and this suggests that the omission was accidental. For a possible explanation of the accident see p. 352.

(vii) 926: see pp. 349–51.

(viii) 984 *χρυcότευκτον* HnΣ<sup>v</sup>, *χρυcότευτον* Nv: *χρυcέότευκτον* cett. (Ιευκτον C) A lucky slip, rather than conjecture.

(ix) 1094 οί μέν άτεκνοι δι' άπειροcύνην  
μέν Nv, sicut coni. Porson: μέν γ' Π<sup>7</sup> (μεγγε), sicut coni. Reiske: μέν τ' BODAVPTr:  
μέν\* L

The deletion of a meaningless τ' was not Porson's greatest feat of *άγχίνοια*. But the scribe of Nv (or of an ancestor) deserves credit for anticipating Porson rather than Reiske.

(x) 1132–3 έχω τι κάγώ τοίc γε coίc έναντίον  
λόγοιcιν είπέιν.

1132 τοίc γε] τοίcι HnNv (~ Hn<sup>2</sup>)

The γε is most unwelcome. I believe that τοίcι is right: cf. *Herc.* 204–5 λόγοι μέν οἷδε τοίcι coίc έναντίαν | γνώμην έχουcι. It was accepted by Nauck,<sup>73</sup> Weil, Wecklein (1891 ed.), von Arnim, C. E. S. Headlam, and Blaydes,<sup>74</sup> and it is very much better than Lascaris' τοίcδε, which was accepted by Porson, Wecklein (1899 and 1909 edd.), Earle, and Méridier. τοίcι coίc became τοίc coίc and γε was then added to restore metre: cf. *Alc.* 1024 coίcι] coί VVa: coίc γε Va<sup>c</sup>; *Hec.* 292 τοίcι δούλοιc] τοίc δούλοιc MF al.: τοίc γε δ- P: τοίc δούλοιc nonnulli. If τοίcι is conjectural, it deserves applause; but it is as likely to be the lucky result of miscopying.

(xii) 1159 ήμπέcχετο] ήμπίcχετο gEHn (~ Hn<sup>e</sup>), sicut coni. Portus  
A conjecture (or slip), and not certainly right: cf. Page (to the passages which he cites add *Ar. Equ.* 893), Kühner–Blass ii. 35, 435, Schwyzer i. 656.

(xiii) 1164 cτέγac, άβρόν βαίνουcα παλλεύκωι ποδί  
κινούcα (~ Hn<sup>2</sup>) πάλλευκον πόδα Hn

I mention this here because editors commonly report it. It is a trivialisation, and has no place in the apparatus criticus.

(To be continued)

Queens' College, Cambridge

JAMES DIGGLE

<sup>72</sup> For another trace of a connection between Nv and Σ<sup>b</sup> see p. 355.

<sup>73</sup> *Euripideische Studien* i (Mém. Ak. Imp. Sc. St. Pétersbourg, ser. vii. 1 [1859], 106–39), 133.

<sup>74</sup> *Adversaria Critica*, 39.