FIVE LATE MANUSCRIPTS OF EURIPIDES, *HIPPOLYTUS*

Pv	(Vatican, Palatino greco 343), 2nd half of the fifteenth century; only 20–386, 447–939[1]
Hn	(Copenhagen, Gamle Kongelig Sammling 417), c. 1475[2]
Ox	(Oxford, Bodl. Auct. T. 4. 10), sixteenth century[3]
Nv	(Naples, Bibl. Nazionale, Vindobonense greco 17), c. 1500[4]
N	(Naples, Bibl. Nazionale, II. F. 41), early sixteenth century[5]

Barrett[6] has given a brief account[7] of the affiliations of Hn with the manuscripts which he has collated. He derives his information about the readings of Hn from the reports of nineteenth-century editors, and he does not report this manuscript in his apparatus criticus. He concludes that 'In three instances (72, 641, 817) Haun. has the truth, or an approximation to it, where the rest of our tradition is at fault (though in two of them there are traces of the same reading in O)...in each case the reading can be accounted for as a lucky accident, and so I judge it in fact to be.'[8] Of the other four manuscripts, which editors have not collated, he gives no account. 'From a number of readings cited by Turyn it appears that they are all more or less closely related to Haun.' K. Matthiessen[9] has voiced a mild regret that Barrett did not settle the question by collation. I have collated these five manuscripts from photographs or microfilms.

I use the following symbols:[10]

[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 with some inessential variation
A[s]	A *supra lineam*, by the first hand
A[c]	A after correction by an unspecified hand
A[2]	A after correction by the second hand
(∼ A[c])	A[c] agrees with the other manuscripts against A
A[γρ]	a variant in A accompanied by the sign $\gamma\rho(\check{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota)$
Σ[a]	scholium in A
[i]Σ[a]	a reading implied by the scholium in A
[l]Σ[a]	lemma to the scholium in A

1 PvHnOxNvN as a group

That these manuscripts are related to each other is proved by the following passages, where they all (or the other four, when Pv is not available) agree in readings which

[1] See A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana, 1957), pp. 357–8.

[2] See Turyn, pp. 329–33.   [3] See Turyn, pp. 351–2.

[4] See Turyn, pp. 348–51.   [5] See Turyn, pp. 345–8.

[6] W. S. Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 75–6.

[7] Which I summarise below, p. 39.

[8] I discuss these instances below, pp. 39–40.

[9] K. Matthiessen, *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides* (Heidelberg, 1974), p. 32.

[10] They roughly correspond with those adopted (with fuller explanation) by Barrett, pp. 92–3.

are not known from the other manuscripts.[11] I designate their agreement by the symbol Φ.[12]

49 τὸ μὴ οὔ] τοῦ μὴ οὐ D(P)V³: τοῦ μὴ Φ 80 εἰς] ἐς D: ὡς Φ 243 μου κρύψον] μου κρύψω D: κρύψον μου Φ 308 τέκνοισι] τέκνοις Φ 387 ἤστην] ἤσθην HnOxNvN: [Pv]   707 κἀπεχείρησας] κἀπεκύρωσας PvHnOxNv⟨N⟩   855 πάλαι] rasura in L: πάλιν Φ[13]   866 ἐκδοχαῖς] ἐν super ἐκ- B²: ἐν διαδοχαῖς PvHnOxNv: ἐν διδαχαῖς N   897 χώρας] γῆς Φ 1024 κακούς] καλούς HnOxNvN: [Pv]

They also agree quite often in a reading which is otherwise poorly attested:

202 ὤμοις] ὤιμοις O: ὤμοι ΦDM² et ¹Σ^{mv}: οἴμοι P: φεῦ φεῦ ΥΡΣ^{mv}   235 πώλων] πώλοις ΦM⟨B⟩ et ¹Σ^m ($\sim$ Σ^{mnbv} et M²B²)   291 θ'] δ' ΦCE ($\sim$ C² ut uid.)   337 τλῆμον] μῆτερ ΦVE   μῆτερ] τλῆμον HnV: τλήμον' PvOxNvN: τλῆμον (pot. qu. -ων) E²   352 coῦ] cὺ ΦgE   354 οὐκ prius] οὐκέτ' ΦV   379 τόδε] τάδε ΦMPgV   406 τε LP et flor.: δὲ plerique et ¹Σ^n: om. HnOxNvNO: [Pv] 467 βίον λίαν βροτούς] βίον βρ- λ- O: λ- βίον βρ- ΦV   527 οὐς] οἷς B²M²B²: αἷς Φ⟨E⟩ (ἃς E^c)   541 cεβίζομεν] cεβάζ- PvHnOxNvCgE:cεβιάζ- N   563 πάντα γε πιτνεῖ ΦOV (for the other mss. see Barrett)   657 ἄφρακτος] εὐφ- ΦE   659-60 χθονὸς / θηςεὺς] θηςεὺς / χθονὸς ΦV   660 ἕξομεν] ἕξομαι ΦBE   811 ἰὼ ἰὼ] ἰὼ ΦO   830 μέλεα μέλεα τάδε πάθη] μέλεα (bis V³) πάθη τάδε ΦV   834 τάδ'...κακά] τόδ' ($\sim$ V³; δ'N)...κακόν ΦV   889 φύγοι] φύγη ΦC (φυγή C^{ac?}): φύγ E: φύγω O ($\sim$ O^s)   911 δ' om. ΦVgV   949 κακῶν] κακῶν τ' HnOxNvNCE et P^{ac} ut uid.: [Pv]   1072 τότε] τότε δὴ HnOxNvNV: [Pv] 1077 μηνύει] δεικνύει HnOxNvNV ($\sim$ V³ΥΡ): [Pv]

2 PvHnOx $\sim$ NvN

Within Φ there is a division between PvHnOx (which I shall designate ϕ) and NvN. ϕ are often isolated (or nearly isolated) in error.

42 κἀκφανήσεται] κἀναφαν- O: καὶ φαν- ϕ 94 γε] om. E: τε ϕ 190 κοὐκ] οὐκ ϕ 213-14 λόγον post τάδε (τόνδε Ox) non post ῥίπτουςα ϕ 220 αἰγείροις] -ραις ϕ 224 κυνηγεςίων καὶ coί] coὶ κυνηγεςίων ϕ 268 δυστήνους (K)MBOAVLP: -νου NvNCDE: δυςτύχους PvHnOx^c (-χας Ox ut uid.)   274 κατέξανται] -ξαται ϕE   288 παῖ om. ϕ 300 ἄθρηςον] ἄθροιςον ϕ 305-6 coὺς / παῖδας] / 306 coὺς παῖδας ϕ 356 cῶμ' ἀπαλλαχθήςομαι] cῶμα κἀπαλλ-

---

φ   385 οὐ κακή] οὖν καλή φ   552 φονίοις] φοινίοις φC   562 φονίω(ι)]
φοινίω(ι) φ   566 δόμοισι] δόμοις φ   589 τήν] τῶν φ   638 ῥᾶ(ι)cτον] ῥᾶ(ι)ον
φ   688 δεῖ με δή MBAELPOᶜ: δεῖ με δεῖ O: δεῖ μοι δεῖ V: δεῖ μοι δὴ φ: δεῖ με
NvN: δεῖ CD   708 ἄπελθε] ἔξελθε φ   709 θήcομαι] γε θήcω φ   715 καλῶc]
καλῶc δ' φ   737 θ' Pv⟨Hn⟩Ox (∼ Hn²)   746 cεμνὸν] -νὴν φ   778 οὐκέτ']
οὐκ φ   784 πάρειcι] πάριτε φ (-ιτε Pvᶜ, -ιπε Pv)   797 τύχηι] ψυχή D: δίκη φ
828 χερῶν] χειρὸc φ   874 ἄλλο] ἄλλω(ι) NvNE: ἄλγοc φ   903 cπουδῆι
om. φ

There is no need to cite instances of HnOx isolated in error where Pv is not available;
but I cite a few instances where they agree in error with only one or two other mss.

387 ἔχοντε] -οιτε E (∼ E²): -οντεc HnOxC: -οντα AN: ἔχουcαι Nv   1041 ταῦτα
κάρτα L: κάρτα ταῦτα NvNMBOAVDE: πάντα ταῦτα P: κάρτα HnOxC   1104
παραιρεῖ] παραινεῖ HnOxBO (∼ B²)   1125 ἱέμενον] ἱέμενον NvE: ἱόμενον
HnOxO   1398 μοι προcφιλήc γ' BOAV: τοι δύcποτμόc τ' LP: τοι δύcποτμοc
NvCD: μοι δύcποτμοc HnOxE: τοι δύcποτμόc γ' N

NvN are also found isolated (or nearly isolated) in error:

50 ὥcτε μοι] ὥcτ' ἐμοὶ LP: ὥcτε μου C: ὥcτε μὴ NvN   96 γε alterum om.
NvNCEgV 166 δ' om. NvN   169 θεοῖcι] θεοῖc NvN   205 μετά θ'
ἡcυχίαc] μεθ' ἡcυχίαc NvNP   220 παρά] περὶ NvN   227 coι] τοι NvN   585
caφὲc] caφῶc NvNBO   688 δεῖ με NvN (for the other mss. see above)   813
cυγχέαι δόμουc] δ- c- NvN   834 ὦναξ (ἄναξ MA) ἦλθε (ἐπῆλθε MO)] ὦν (ὦν
Nv) ἐξῆλθε NvN   854 καταχυθέντα] καταχθέντα NvN (∼ Nᵞᴾ)   874 ἄλλοc]
ἄλλω(ι) NvNE: ἄλγοc φ   904 δ' om. NvN   920 ἔνεcτι] ἔcτι NvNAgB   927
τ' om. NvNDE   947 δεῦρ' om. NvN   976 γε om. NvN   988-9 coφοῖc
/ φαῦλοι] 988 coφοῖc φαῦλοι / NvN   994 ἔνεcτ'] ἔcτ' NvN   997 τε om. NvN
μὴ ἀδικεῖν] μὴ 'δικεῖν LP: μηδ' ἀδικεῖν NvNV²gB   1016 κρατεῖν] κρατῶν
NvNV (∼ V³ᵞᴾ)   1024 ἄν] δ' ἄν NvN   1028 ἀκλεῆc] ἀκλεῆc τ' NvN   1029
ἀλητεύων] ἀλιτ- NvND(P)   1032 ἀπώλεcεν] ἐπώλεcεν NvN   1049 ἀντλή-
cειc] ἀρτήcειc NvN   1071 γε MBOACV³gV: τε HnOxVDELP: om. NvN: [Pv]

The general affinity of φ with NvN, together with the degree of separation which
exists between them, is well illustrated by these two passages: 321 κακῶc] ποτέ φ:
ποτέ κακῶc NvN   829 μοι] μὲν C (∼ Cᶜ): που φV (∼ V³ᵞᴾ): πω NvN

In the following passages the disagreement of φ and NvN reflects a disagreement
in the rest of the tradition.

31 ἐγκαθείcατο φAL et (P. Sorb. 2252): -θίc- NvNMBVDEP: -θίcτ- O: -θήc-
C   160 ψυχά φMOAELV²: -άν NvNCDBˢV³: -ᾶ(ι) BVP   349 εἷμεν NvN et fere
KMBHCDLP: ἦμεν φOAVE   445 ἄν NvNMBOV⟨L⟩PAᶜ: αὖ HnOxACDETrgE:
[Pv]   491 διιcτέον NvNBOVCDEL: διοιcτέον φMAHP   500 καλῶν
NvNBACLPM²V²H²E²: κακῶν φKMOVHDE   525 ὃ NvNBCDEM²gB: ὁ
M: ὃc φOAVLPB²   817 τάλαc L: τάλαινα NvNBVCDEPgB: πόλιc φMOAV³ᵞᴾ
823 ὥcτε φBCDELPgB: ὡc NvNMOAV   854 cᾶ(ι) φMOACTr: τᾶ(ι) cᾶ(ι)
NvNBVDELP   871 cφήλη(ι)c φBVCDELP: cφάλη(ι)c NvNMOAV³

3 PvHn ∼ Ox

Within φ a close connection exists between Pv and Hn. This is shown by a number
of minor errors which are common to them but are not shared by Ox (or the other
mss.).

270 βουλοίμεθ'] -όμεθ' PvHn   348 ἥδιcτον] ἥδυcτον PvHn   385 διccαί]
διcαί MC: διδαὶ PvHn   504 ὑπείργαcμαι] ὑπείργαcον PvHn   686 κακύνομαι]

κἀκείνομαι PvHn   762 πεισμάτων] πης- PvHn   '803 παχνωθεὶς'] παγχν-
PvHn   846 ἀπωλόμην] ἀπολώμην PvHn   862 τύποι] τύπος PvHn

4 Hn a copy of Pv?

Ox is not copied from Pv or Hn. This is proved by the passages cited above in §3.
Nor is either Pv or Hn copied from Ox: for Ox has casual errors from which they
are free. Nor is Pv copied from Hn: for Hn has casual errors from which Pv is free.
Turyn (pp. 330–1, 357–8) asserts that Hn is copied from Pv. Barrett's scepticism ('he
cites only coincidences, which are merely compatible with his belief', p. 76 n. 2) is
justified. The following two passages prove that Hn is not a copy (at least, not a direct
copy) of Pv.

567 ἐκμάθω HnOxNvN plerique: ὡς μάθω PvVTr   637 δυςτυχές HnOxNvN
codd.: δυςχερές Pv

5 PvHnOxNv ~ N

The ms. whose adherence to Φ is least stable is N. This ms. (*a*) frequently
agrees with other mss. in truth, when the rest of Φ (i.e. φNv) are wrong, (*b*) less
frequently agrees with other mss. in error, when the rest of Φ are right.

(*a*) 25 ceμνῶν] -ῶς φNv   28 βουλεύμαcι(ν)] τοξεύμαcι φNv   32 ἔκδημον
NBAPTr: ἔκδηλον φNvMOVCDELB[2]   37 ἐνιαυcίαν NADLP: -αύcιον φNvMB
OVCE   40 ξύνοιδε δ' NTr: cύνοιδε δ' φNv plerique et gE: ξύνοιδεν ⟨L[?]⟩P   οὔτις]
οὐδεὶς φNvO⟨L⟩ (~ Tr)   41 χρὴ NLP: δεῖ φNv cett.   62 γένεθλον]
γενέθλιον φNv   82 κόμης] κόμας φNv   84 τοῦτ' ἐμοὶ γέρας βροτῶν] γέρας
τ- ἐ- β- C: τ- ἐ- β- γέρας φNvO   86 ὁρῶν NOCPL[1c] et P. Sorb. 2252: ὁρῶ
φNvMBAVDE⟨L⟩   95 ἐcτί] ἔcται φNv   144 φοιτᾶc NM et (incertum quo loco
positum) Σ[mnbv]: φοιταλέου Nv et fere cett.: φοιταλέου φοιτᾶc φ   149 χέρcον]
χέρcων φNv   150 ἅλμαc] -μαις B: -μης φNvN[s] (-μης Pv[s], -μιc Pv)
152 εὐπατρίδαν] -δα O: -δην φNv   178 λαμπρὸc NMA: -ὸν φNvBOVCDELP
301 πόνουc] λόγουc φNvO   303 τ' NBOVLP: δ' φNvKMACDE   329 ἐμοὶ
τιμὴν] τ- ἐ- φNv   350 ἀνθρώπων] -που φNvC   360 ἄλλο] ἄλλο τι φNv   365
ἰώ μοι NMBOA: ἰώ μοι μοι KLP: οἴμοι οἴμοι VHCDE: ὤμοι φNv   368 ἐξέφ-
ηναc] -φανας φNv   393 μὲν om. HnOxNv: [Pv]   438 ἀπέσκηψαν NBOACDELP:
ἐπ- HnOxNvMVE[2]Tr: [Pv]   457 θεούc] θεῶν φNv (~ Nv[s])   476 ἐβουλήθη]
ἠβ- φNv   485 ἀλγίων] ἀλγίω H: ἄλγιον φMO: ἀλγεινὸc Nv   593 μήcομαι
NBCDELV[3] et (P. Oxy. 2224): μνήc- A: μητίc- φNvMOVA[2]   628 προcθεὶc]
προθ- φNv   603 ἀτηρὸν εἰς δόμους] εἰς δ- ἀ- φNv   638 τὸ om. φNv   640
δὲ] δέ γε φNv   665 φηcί] φήcει φNvV   700 ἂν om. φNv   702 γὰρ]
καὶ φNvM[?]OA   703 λόγοιc] λόγουc φNvMO (~ Nv[2]M[2])   758 ἀπ'] ἐπ' φNv
759 ἐκ γᾶc] ὀργᾶc E (η super ᾶc): ἐκ γῆc φNvC   778 οὐκέτ'] οὐκ φNv   958
τοῦτό c'] τοῦτ' HnOxNv: [Pv]

(*b*) 20 νῦν φNvMBOA: οὖν VCDTrgE: γὰρ E: γ' οὖν NP: [L]   34 λείπει]
λεῖπε C: λίπε N⟨L⟩P   43 νεανίαν φNvMBOAVCE: πεφυκότα NLPV[s]: ν- π-
D   100 cου] cὸν NAP (~ A[c])   123 κάλπιcι] κάλπη(ι)cι N⟨L⟩E[2] (~ Tr)   132
κοίτα(ι) om. NM, post ἔχειν habet O, post δεcποινα C   317 ἔχει μίαcμά τι]
ἔχεται μιάcματι NV (μιάcματι etiam AD)   447 ἀν'] ἐν ND   500 τάδ'] τῶνδ'
ṆBE (~ B[s]): δ' H[2] ut uid.: om. HD   869 ὀλομένουc] ὀλουμένουc NBVTr

As a consequence of N's unstable behaviour, there are several places where N,
deserting Nv, agrees with φ in truth, while Nv agrees with other mss. in error.

36 τήνδε φNOACDELPB[2]V[2]: τῆ(ι)δε NvMBVV[3γρ]   41 ταύτη(ι) φNDE-

LPV³ʸᴾ et (P. Sorb. 2252): -της NvMBOAVC   105 cε δεῖ φNACDELPgVgE:
γε δεῖ NvVE²gB: γ' ἔδει MBO   109 μέλεcθε] μέλλεcθε V: ἔλεcθε NvO
270 καὶ om. NvD   503 δέ] τάδε NvM   745 νέμει] -ειν D: -οι NvMO
816 τάλαιν'] -αιναν CP: ὦ τάλαινα NvE

6 N and the Aldine edition

Turyn observed (p. 348) that from 1078[14] to the end N appears to be copied from
the Aldine edition of 1503.[15] He cites a few passages where N and the Aldine agree
in a reading which is not found in any other mss. I give a full list of such agreements.

1127 ὦ δρυμὸς ὄρειος] δρυμός τ' ὄρειος NAld   1167 τοῦ om. NAld   1169
θ' om. NAld   1235 ἐπῆδων] ἐπεπήδων NAld   1238 πρὸς] πρὶν NAld   1274
κραδίαι NAld: καρδία(ι) cett.   1294 ἔν τ' OAV³: ἐν HnOxNvBVHDELPgV: ἐν
τοῖc Tr: τοῖc NAld   1307 οὖν δίκαιον LP: ἦν δίκαιον NAld: ὦν δίκαιος cett. (ὦν
om. Ox)   1336 δ'] γ' NAld   1338 μὲν νῦν coι HnOxBOADE: μὲν οὖν coι Nv:
μέν coι νῦν V: νῦν δή coι L: νῦν coι P: νῦν coι που NAld   1352 τ' HnOxELPgB:
δ' BOAVD: γ' NAld   1398 τοι δύcποτμός γ' NAld (for the other mss. see above,
p. 36)

The Aldine's text (from 1078 onwards: I have not investigated the earlier part) is
constituted from L and P,[16] and so there are several places where N and the Aldine
share a reading which is found only in L or P or both.

1090 ἄραρεν] ἄρηρεν NAldTr   1108 ἄλλοθεν] ἄλλοτ' NAldLP   1128 ἐπέβαc]
ἐπέβα NAldLP   1148 τάλαν' NAldTr: τάλαν A⟨E⁷L⟩PB³: τάλαιν' fere cett.
1178 ἔχων] φέρων NAldP   1201 βροντῇ] φωνῇ NAldP   1248 ὅποι BO: ὅπη V:
ὅπου HnOxNvADEL: ὅπωc NAldP   1277 ὀρεcκόων NAldL: -ώ(ι)ων cett.
1299 θάνη(ι)] θάνοι NAldLP et (ut uid.) Hˢ   1314 οἰμώξῃ(ι)c] -ξῃ(ι) NAldP et
Σᵇ (-ζῃ Σⁿ): -ξειc DL^?(~ Tr)   1323 παρέςχεc HnOxNvBOAV: γ' ἔνειμας
NAldLP: ἔνειμας D: ἔμεινας HE   1345 οἷον] οἷος NAldL uel Tr   1372 με om.
NAldLP   1393 τοῖcιδ' OAV: τοῖcιν HnOxB: τοῖcδέ γ' NAldL: τοῖcδ' NvEPC²: τίc
δ' C^?: τὶc D

Evidence which might disprove the hypothesis that N is copied from the Aldine
(namely, disagreements between N and the Aldine, excepting casual slips by N) is
slight.

1181 ἀπαλλαχθεὶc fere codd. et NʸᴾNvAld: ἀποπλαχθεὶc B et primitus uoluit O:
ἀλλαχθεὶc NHnO¹ᶜ: ἀπαλλαγεὶc B²   1396 οὐ θέμις N codd.: οὐδέ μιc Ald.

Slight though this evidence is, it raises some doubts. In 1181 the reading of N does
not look like a mere accident, since it is attested in two other mss. In 1396 it was

---

[14] Not earlier, because at 1077 N has δεικνύει with V, while the Aldine has μηνύει with the
rest.

[15] '…a printed text, most probably the Aldine edition' (p. 348). Of the other printed texts
which come into question, we may rule out that of Lascaris (c. 1494), which has fundamental
differences from that of the Aldine and N (cf. Sicherl [below, n. 16] 206 n. 5); also the ed.
Hervagiana² (1544) and the edition of Canter (1571), both of which correctly give πρὸc for πρὶν
at 1238. (Canter has further divergences.) So far as I can see, we cannot rule out the ed.
Hervagiana¹ (1537) or the ed. Brubachiana¹ (c. 1558; I have not investigated the ed. Brubachiana²,
c. 1560), whose texts appear to be faithful copies of the Aldine's (n.b. Hervag.¹ repeats the
Aldine's misprint at 1396 [see below on this page]; it is corrected in Hervag.² and Brubach.¹).

[16] It is not, however, a direct copy of either of these mss.: see M. Sicherl, 'Die Editio Princeps
Aldina des Euripides und ihre Vorlagen', Rh. Mus. 118 (1975), 205–25, esp. 206–12. The only
divergence which I have noticed between LP and the Aldine is 1442 πατρὶ NAldBOAV³: πατρὸc
HnOxNvVCDELPB³. But the reading of LP is unmetrical, and the Aldine editor was capable
of restoring the truth without the help of other mss.

perhaps not beyond the scribe's powers to restore the truth by conjecture out of the Aldine's misprint; but it would have required some percipience on the part of the scribe.[17] It is not possible to argue that the relationship postulated by Turyn should be reversed – that the Aldine is a copy of N. This argument would be refuted by N's omission at 1376 of διαμοιρᾶcαι, which the Aldine does not omit. I can think of two hypotheses which would explain the facts. First, the hypothesis that N is a copy of the Aldine at one remove, the intervening ms. having received the two alterations at 1181 and 1396 from collation with another ms. This hypothesis is weakened by the fact that at 1181 the alteration imported into the intervening ms. is not a correction of an error but is itself an unmetrical error. The second hypothesis is that N is a twin of the Aldine, copied from the text which was supplied to the printer of the Aldine.[18]

7 Affiliations of PvHnOxNvN with the other mss.

Barrett's description of the affiliations of Hn with the mss. which he has collated (pp. 76–7) is valid for the whole group Φ and the sub-group φ: Φ is descended from V (or a twin of V), and its divergences from V are the result of contamination from two sources, a ms. related to O and a ms. related to CDE. NvN, when they disagree with φ, show signs of possible contamination from a further source, LP (see 205 μετά θ' ἡcυχίαc] μεθ' ἡcυχίαc NvNP; 220 ξανθὰν NvNL: -ὴν cett.; 1069 ξυνοικούρουc] ξυν- HnOxNvNDLP: cυν- cett., -οικούρουc NvNLP: -οικουροὺc cett.), but Nv on its own (when abandoned by N, and not agreeing with φ) shows no sign of contamination from this source,[19] nor does any one of PvHnOx when it disagrees with the other two. N, when it abandons Nv and does not agree with φ, shows clear traces · of contamination from LP (see 20, 34, 40, 41, 100).[20]

8 Isolated preservation of truth in PvHnOxNvN

Barrett (see above, p. 34) records three instances where the truth, or nearly the truth, is preserved by Hn, while the other mss. collated by him agree in error. In all three instances some or all of the other Φ-mss. agree with Hn. I transcribe Barrett's apparatus criticus, to which I add my own information in angular brackets.

(i) 72 post ὄλυμπον habent παρθένων ἄρτεμι codd. ⟨et N⟩ (postmodo, ut uid., add. O), θεῶν Haun. ⟨et PvOx⟩, ⟨θεῶν ἄρτεμι Nv⟩; del. Nauck.

παρθένων and ἄρτεμι are two separate glosses, which have been incorporated into the text; θεῶν is an alternative gloss for παρθένων. In O the words παρθένων ἄρτεμι, although written as a continuation of the preceding text, are written in the margin and so give every appearance of being an afterthought. φ and Nv are partly in agreement, against the other mss. (half of Nv's reading is peculiar to φ, half is shared with the other mss.). N, as often, has deserted Nv and sides with the other mss.

(ii) 641 πλείον' Haun.[2]⟨PvOxNv⟩: πλεῖον codd. (πλέον O⟨N⟩) et Haun.⟨gVgE⟩.

[17] The first printed editions to correct the Aldine's misprint are the ed. Hervag.[2] (of which N cannot be a copy) and the ed. Brubach.[1] (of which, in theory, it can): see above, p. 38 n. 15.

[18] N[2] appears to have derived most of his corrections from the Aldine. In numerous places his corrections agree with unique errors of P reproduced in the Aldine (e.g. 53 τόπων] δόμων N[2]PAld). But that his source was the Aldine, not P, is suggested by 1010 οἰκήcειν codd. et P: -ῆcαι N[2]Ald.

[19] See the instances cited above, pp. 37–8. (§5(b) ad fin.). I observe (in view of the agreement of Nv with M at 503) that M is closely related to O (see Barrett, p. 65). N, also, has unique agreements with M at 132 (above, p. 37) and 144 (above, p. 40).

[20] Cited on p. 37.

The true reading is now seen not to owe its origin to the second hand of Hn (since Pv, at least, is not a descendant of Hn).

(iii) 817 ἔπαθον Haun.⟨PvOx⟩: ὧν ἔπαθον M?BOVCDEL⟨PNvNgB⟩: ὢ ἔπαθον A.

The omission of ὧν is explicable as a casual error of haplography (after the preceding κακῶν).

I have found three further instances of the truth preserved solely in one or more of Φ:

    130 πρῶτα Pv: πρῶτα HnOxNvN codd.

    580 ἔνεπε δ' ἔνεπέ Ox: ενεπε[P. Oxy. 2224: ἔννεπε δ' ἔννεπέ cett.

    1070 δακρύων HnOx, sicut coni. Wilamowitz: δακρύων τ' NvN codd. et (gV): [Pv].

In the first instance Pv has made either a conscious or an unconscious change (so that the adjective agrees with the following noun φάτις); as for the second, ἐνεπ- and ἐννεπ- are constantly interchanged without regard for metre;[21] in the third the source of HnOx presumably omitted τ' by mere accident.

9 The *hypothesis* in HnOxNv

The relationship established for HnOxNv in the text also holds good in the *hypothesis*. A common origin for HnOxNv is proved by:[22]

    1 υἱὸς DEPN (bis E) et post ποσειδῶνος HnOxNv: om. cett.   δὲ] om. BE: δὲ ἦν ὁ θησεὺς HnOxNv   7 τῆς om. HnOxNv   17–18 αὐτῆ(ι) προσηρτημένην δέλτον δι' ἧς] ἐν τῆ(ι) χειρὶ αὐτῆς χάρτην δι' ὃν (ἦν Nv) HnOxNv   31–2 (dramatis personae) ἀφ. ἱπ. χο. θε. τρ. φα. ἀγ. ἡμιχ. θη. ἀρ. οἰ. HnOxNv (for the other mss. see Barrett).

Hn and Ox are found alone in agreement at:[23]   20 ἐπακούσας] ὑπακούσας HnOx; 22 θησεῖ] τῶ θησεῖ HnOx

10 The *hypothesis* in N

Once again, N is the odd man out. Although it shares one reading with Nv, when Nv disagrees with Hn and Ox,[24] that reading is shared by Nv and N with other mss.; there is no instance of Nv and N alone in agreement, as there was in the text.[25]

N has several unique (or nearly unique) readings, and some of them have been accepted by editors.

(i) 7 cυνέβαινε] cυνέβη N.

Not accepted by modern editors.

(ii) 11 τέλος...ἐπέθηκε (PN: ἔθηκε(ν) cett.).

Not actually unique, since shared with P (a fact not recorded by Barrett); universally accepted. We have seen that a relationship exists between P and N in the text.[26] In a literary work we should certainly expect the compound verb (see LSJ s.u. τέλος I.

    [21] The Aldine restored half of the truth: ἔνεπε δ' ἔννεπε. Similarly at 573 ἔνεπε AldOx: ἔνν- codd.

    [22] The line numbers are Barrett's. The (very fragmentary) evidence of P. Mil. Vogl. 44 for the *hypothesis* is given by Barrett, pp. 431–2. I have reported this papyrus only where it is available. Where I do not report it, it may be assumed to be not available.

    [23] See above, pp. 35–6, for their unique agreements in the poetical text.

    [24] At 1 αἴθρας καὶ ποσειδῶνος MVPNvN: αἰ- ἱππολύτης καὶ π- ⟨B⟩OACHnOx (αἰ- υἱὸς καὶ π- B²): π- καὶ αἰ- D: π- E.

    [25] See above, p. 36.

    [26] See above, p. 38.

1, II. 2, s.u. ἐπιτίθημι A. IV); but in a *hypothesis* we cannot say that the uncompounded verb is unacceptable.[27]

(iii) 12 γὰρ N: δὲ cett.

Accepted by Barrett and others. I see no cause to reject δὲ, which is the only connecting particle used elsewhere in the narrative part of the *hypothesis*.

(iv) 12 ἡ φαίδρα N: om. cett.

Accepted by Barrett and others. The name makes for clarity, but it is hardly indispensable.

· (v) 13 κατεπαγγειλαμένη MBOVDPNv: -αγγειλαμένην A: -ηγγειλαμένη CEHn: -ηγγειλαμένην Ox: ἡ δὲ κατεπηγγείλατο N.

The text is corrupt and the truth is a matter for conjecture. The required sense is given by ⟨ἥτις⟩ κατεπαγγειλαμένη...[ἥτις] παρὰ κτλ. (Schwartz, and again J. Whittaker, *CR* n.s. 21 (1971), 9).

(vi) 22 οὐ κατεμέμψατο OAD(E)HnOxNv: οὐκ ἐμέμψατο N: οὐκ ἀπεπέμψατο M⟨B⟩VCP (ἀπεμέμ- Bᶜ).

N's reading is an evident trivialisation.

(vii) 24 ἐπιχωρίουc N: γῆc MBOAVCPHnOx: τιc Nv: om. DE: γῆι Valckenaer.

ἐπιχωρίουc is accepted by Barrett and others and is very much more interesting than the flat γῆc. But Valckenaer's γῆι is an easy correction: for the dative cf. *IT* 982 Μυκήναιc ἐγκαταcτήcω.

(viii) 25 ἐδιδάχθη] ἐδιδάχθη δὲ CNᶜ (25b–30 om. N).[28]

The δὲ of CNᶜ is not reported by editors. The only testimony in favour of δέ after ἐδιδάχθη which I can find is *Med.* second *hyp.* 17 (Murray): δὲ habet D, om. FAP. For ἐδιδάχθη without δέ see *Alc. hyp.* 16 (Murray), A. *ScT hyp.* 4 (Page), *Ag. hyp.* 21 (Page), S. *Ph. hyp.* 17 (Pearson).

(ix) 26 π̅ζ̅ BDE: ἐπὶ π̅ζ̅ MAC: ἐπὶ ν̅ζ̅ V: γὰρ π̅ζ̅ Nᶜ.

No comment needed.

(x) 27 τρίτοc] καὶ τρίτοc Nᶜ.

That καὶ is unwanted (and, in these lists, against analogy). V has similarly interpolated a καὶ before the preceding δεύτεροc.

(xi) 28 cτεφανίαc] cτεφανηφόροc primitus Nᶜ.

Not reported by editors. The epithet cτεφανηφόροc is used by N in the title of the *hypothesis* and in the title of the play (so also by A and P. Mil. Vogl. 44), and is found in the *subscriptio* in several mss. (see Barrett, p. 10 n. 1).

Schwartz[29] was the first editor to report N (though only partially) in the *hypothesis*, and later editors have taken all their information about N from him. No later editor, nor even Turyn, has remarked that the readings of N reported by Schwartz are all to be found in the Aldine edition (except for lines 25b–30, which the Aldine omits). The Aldine's text of the *hypothesis* is identical with that of N. In addition to the eleven readings quoted above, the Aldine and N have the same (unique) list and order of *dramatis personae* (31–2 Barrett),[30] after which they both add προλογίζει δὲ ἡ Ἀφροδίτη (E, alone of the other mss., adds προλογίζει ἀφροδίτη). We have seen reasons for believing that N copied the Aldine from 1078 onwards.[31] It may be assumed

---

[27] 'Verba τέλοc...ἐπέθηκε inutilia', said Wecklein. O actually omits 11–12 τοῖc...χρόνωι, and P. Mil. Vogl. 44, which is not available at the crucial point, evidently had a text different from (and shorter than) ours at 10–12.

[28] See below, p. 42 (§ 10 (*a*), (*c*)).

[29] *Scholia in Euripidem* ii (1891), pp. 1–2.

[30] See below, p. 42.

[31] See above, pp. 38–9.

that N also copied the *hypothesis* from the Aldine.[32] Here is some evidence which supports that assumption.

(*a*) The Aldine's *hypothesis* ends at 25 with the sentence ἡ ϲκηνὴ . . . ἐν Θήβαιϲ κεῖται. The behaviour of the mss. from 25 onwards is multifarious. The salient facts may be formulated as follows: 25a ἡ ϲκηνὴ . . . ἐν θήβαιϲ κεῖται hoc loco habent CN (et Aldina), post 32 MHnOxNv: ἡ ϲκηνὴ . . . ὑπόκειται ἐν θήβαιϲ post 32 habent AV, in scholiis B, om. ODEP; 25b (ἐδιδάχθη κτλ.) –30 hoc loco habent CDE et (exceptis 30 τὸ . . . πρώτων) N^c, post 32 MAV, in scholiis B, om. OPHnOxNvN^{ac} (et Aldina). From this formulation it may be seen that in 25a the only mss. which agree with the Aldine are C and N; and that the only ms. which agrees with the Aldine in its treatment of the whole of 25–30 is N^{ac}.

(*b*) The layout of the *index personarum* (31–2), in two vertical columns, is exactly the same in both the Aldine and N. In both, the item Χορὸϲ ἐκ Τροιζηνίων γυναικῶν is divided between two lines (at Τροι/ζηνίων). In both, the words προλογίζει δὲ ἡ Ἀφροδίτη appear in an identical position (centrally, beneath the two columns of names). The presentation of the *index* in two vertical columns is characteristic of the Aldine. For N's usual practice I have available only the evidence of the *hypothesis* of *Andromache*, where the names are presented in a continuous series.

(*c*) The missing parts of 25–30 (absent from the Aldine) were not added in N until after the *index personarum* had been copied. They were squeezed into the vacant space between the right-hand column of names and the margin. So far as I can judge (from microfilm), it was either the first hand or (more probably) the writer of the continuous scholia[33] (if his is a different hand) who added them. It was not, at any rate, the same hand (N²) which made corrections throughout the poetical text.[34] We cannot tell what was the source of N^c for 25b–30: the only significant shared readings are 25 ἐδιδάχθη δὲ (CN^c: δὲ om. cett.), 26 ὀλυμπιάδοϲ VN^c (-άδι cett.).

Nor is it clear what was the Aldine's source. We have seen[35] that in the poetical text (from 1078 at least) the Aldine is based on LP. The *hypothesis* is omitted by L, but Tr has added an *index personarum*. P, if it was a source for the Aldine's *hypothesis*, was not the only source, for P and the Aldine differ in a few places (2 ἀμαζονίδων] ἀμαζόνων DE et Aldina; 11 τὴν om. P; 25a ἡ ϲκηνὴ . . . κεῖται om. P). In the *index* the Aldine shows the influence of Tr. The respective lists are: (Tr) ἀφ. ἱπ. χο. θε. τροφὸϲ φαίδραϲ φα. ἄγ. θη. ἕτεροϲ ἄγγελοϲ ἄρ.; (Ald. N) ἀφ. ἱπ. χο. ἐκ τροιζηνίων γυναικῶν θε. τροφὸϲ φαίδραϲ φα. θη. ἡμιχόριον (-ίχοροϲ N, -ίχορον N^c) ἄγ. (ἄγγελοϲ N) ἕτεροϲ ἄγγελοϲ ἄρ. Both lists give the same (unique) order for the first six items and the last two. They differ only in the middle section: (Tr) ἄγ. θη., (Ald. N) θη. ἡμιχ. ἄγ. Both are unique in their reference to ἕτεροϲ ἄγγελοϲ (in the other mss. he is called οἰκέτηϲ) and in adding φαίδραϲ after τροφόϲ. Both lists also have similarities with the lists in HnOxNv (given above, p. 40). These three mss. agree with Tr and the Aldine in the order of the first six items and with Tr in the order of the seventh. Only they and the Aldine (and N) introduce ἡμιχόριον into the list.

The testimony of N should disappear from the apparatus criticus of the *hypothesis*,

[32] Everything which I say about the Aldine in this section holds good for the edd. Hervag. (1537, 1544), the ed. Brubach.¹ (c. 1558), and the edition of Canter (1571). The only difference which I have noticed between any of these editions and the Aldine is that ed. Brubach.¹ writes Τροιζῆνι in the margin as a correction for Θήβαιϲ at 25, and Canter puts this in the text. – According to Turyn (p. 346) N copied the *hypothesis* of *Hecuba* from the Aldine; cf. Matthiessen (above, n. 9), 129.

[33] See below, p. 43.

[34] See above, p. 39 n. 18.   [35] See above, pp. 38–9.

and we should say farewell to γὰρ (12), ἡ φαίδρα (12), and ἐπιχωρίους (24), together with the rest of N's unique readings, in the conviction that they are the private embellishments of the Aldine editor.

11 The scholia and lemmata in N

While the poetical text and *hypothesis* of N are of no value to an editor and have merely a slight historical interest, the scholia are a different matter. This is because 'the scholia in general were not written to accompany the texts to which they were later appended; and in consequence they time and again preserve evidence for the text which is independent of the mss. in which they now appear' (Barrett, p. 78).

There are two sets of scholia in N: sparse marginal and interlinear scholia, and fuller continuous scholia written in a separate section at the end of the poetical text. The continuous scholia are reported by Schwartz and are, indeed, valuable;[36] and Barrett has made use of them, from Schwartz's reports. But Schwartz generally fails to report the lemmata,[37] and these are not without interest, for a lemma may attest a reading different either from the reading in the poetical text or from the reading attested or implied by the scholium itself (or different from either reading). My reports of lemmata in other mss. are based on my own collations. Where I report no other lemmata, it may be assumed that there are no lemmata (or scholia) to be reported.[38]

The lemmata very commonly disagree with the poetical text of N and were clearly designed to accompany a text different from N. Occasionally they attest a reading which is otherwise only very poorly attested:

19 βροτείας] -αις D (~ D²) et ¹Σⁿ (in marg., et supra lin. in textu) (~ ¹Σᵐᵛᵈ et ¹Σⁿ in textu) 104 ἄλλος] ἄλλως O et ¹Σⁿ 123 κάλπισι] κάλπη(ι)σι ⟨L⟩(~ Tr)NE² et ¹Σⁿ (et ¹Σⁿ in marg.) 201 μοι] μου LP et ¹Σⁿ (~ ¹Σᵐᵇᵛ) 245 δάκρυ P. Oxy. 3152 et DLᶜ et ¹Σⁿ: δάκρυα cett. et gV et ¹Σᵛ 271 ἐλέγχους' (P. Oxy. 3152) BAVCDELPN et ¹Σᵇ et Σᵐⁿᵛ et ¹Σᵐⁿᵇᵛ: ἐλέγχους O et ¹Σⁿ: ἐννέπουσα M 447 ἀν'] ἐν DN et ¹Σⁿ (et fort. ¹Σᵈ ante corr.) 660 ἕξομεν] ἕξομαι BEN (et PvHnOxNv) et ¹Σⁿ 669 τάλανες AᶜLᶜ et ¹Σⁿ: τάλαινες codd. et ¹Σᵇᵛ 828 ὥς τις] ὅστις VD (~ V²Dᶜ) et ¹Σⁿ et (in ὥς τις mut.) ¹Σᵛ (~ ¹Σᵇ) 927 τ' om. DEN (et Nv) et ¹Σⁿ (~ ¹Σᵇᵛ) 1047 ῥᾱ(ι)στος] -ον CE et ¹Σⁿ (~ ¹Σᵇ).

It appears that the lemmata in N bear witness to a text which was no less eclectic than N itself.

Queens' College, Cambridge   JAMES DIGGLE

---

[36] 'Summi momenti est codex in Hippolyti scholiis quorum optimam recensionem praebet', Schwartz ii p. iii. Cf. Turyn, p. 348, Barrett, pp. 78–81.

[37] The lemmata are given twice: once in the continuous text of the scholia, and once in the margin. I mention this in view of the reports on 19 and 123.

I draw attention to the lemmata to the scholia on *Andromache* in Ottob. graec. 339 (Turyn, p. 355). Again, they are for the most part ignored by Schwartz; but they are of great interest.

[38] Except in the case of Σᵈ, where I have checked the lemmata only at 19 and 447.