

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01118-1 - Euripides, Volume 3
Edited by Frederick Apthorp Paley
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Classics

From the Renaissance to the nineteenth century, Latin and Greek were compulsory subjects in almost all European universities, and most early modern scholars published their research and conducted international correspondence in Latin. Latin had continued in use in Western Europe long after the fall of the Roman empire as the lingua franca of the educated classes and of law, diplomacy, religion and university teaching. The flight of Greek scholars to the West after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 gave impetus to the study of ancient Greek literature and the Greek New Testament. Eventually, just as nineteenth-century reforms of university curricula were beginning to erode this ascendancy, developments in textual criticism and linguistic analysis, and new ways of studying ancient societies, especially archaeology, led to renewed enthusiasm for the Classics. This collection offers works of criticism, interpretation and synthesis by the outstanding scholars of the nineteenth century.

Euripides

Frederick Apthorp Paley (1815–1888) published Volume 3 of his English commentary on Euripides in 1860. It contains the Greek text of Euripides's plays *Hercules Furens*, *Phoenissae*, *Orestes*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Iphigenia in Aulide*, and *Cyclops*, each with an introductory essay. Paley's detailed commentary is given at the foot of each page of Greek text. It discusses Euripides' language and style, explaining difficult grammatical structures, syntax and vocabulary; poetic form and Euripides' innovative approach to composing tragedy; textual variation between manuscripts; the historical and literary context of each play; and their reception history. Paley's work greatly influenced Euripidean scholarship: for over a century it was a widely used teaching tool in schools and universities. An outstanding piece of classical scholarship and a key text in the history of Euripidean interpretation, it deserves continued consideration by future generations of scholars and students.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01118-1 - Euripides, Volume 3
Edited by Frederick Athorp Paley
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01118-1 - Euripides, Volume 3
Edited by Frederick Athorp Paley
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Euripides

With an English Commentary

VOLUME 3

EDITED BY FREDERICK APTHORP PALEY
EURIPIDES



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01118-1 - Euripides, Volume 3
Edited by Frederick Athorp Paley
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108011181

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2010

This edition first published 1860
This digitally printed version 2010

ISBN 978-1-108-01118-1 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA.

EDITED BY

GEORGE LONG, M.A.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

EURIPIDES,

WITH AN ENGLISH COMMENTARY,

BY

F. A. PALEY.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

WHITTAKER AND CO. AVE MARIA LANE;

GEORGE BELL, FLEET STREET.

1860.

E U R I P I D E S.

WITH AN ENGLISH COMMENTARY

BY

F. A. PALEY,

EDITOR OF AESCHYLUS, ETC.

.....

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

.....

LONDON:

WHITTAKER AND CO. AVE MARIA LANE;
GEORGE BELL, FLEET STREET.

1860.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01118-1 - Euripides, Volume 3
Edited by Frederick Athorp Paley
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

P R E F A C E.

IN editing the third and concluding Volume of EURIPIDES, full use has been made of Adolph Kirchhoff's critical recension and notes¹. The aid of this, the latest and by much the best German edition of the poet, was unfortunately wanting in the two preceding volumes, the present work having been commenced just about the time when the other was published, and the very existence of it having remained so far unknown to the Editor, residing in the country and enjoying few opportunities of consulting or even hearing of new publications. Much and sincerely as this omission is regretted, chiefly on account of the copious and accurate collations of the best MSS. supplied by Kirchhoff's notes, it has proved practically of the less importance, because both editions were undertaken on the same general principle, of restoring as far as possible, and as far as was consistent with the now established canons both of language and of metre, the most authentic readings, and eliminating *many hundreds* of barely probable conjectural emendations, which had gradually found sanction and acceptance under the great names of Valckenaer, the Dindorfs, Hermann, Elmsley, and others of the same school. The result of a long continued tampering with the old traditional text was, that the modernized and altered one had begun to assume almost the authority of a *textus receptus* in the well-known and extensively used *Poetae Scenici* of W. Dindorf. With a full consciousness of the

¹ Euripidis Tragoediae. Ex recensione Adolphi Kirchhoffii. Berolini, 1855. A most careful and judicious revision of the text, with an *apparatus criticus* giving the readings of all the really good MSS., so far as they are certainly ascertained, and a brief but valuable preface, with an analysis of the families of existing MSS., and their comparative critical value.

general folly, not to say the impossibility of *going back*, where any real and sure advances have been made in either science or criticism, it did appear to the present editor (and the opinion is held in common by many eminent scholars), that an undue sympathy, so to speak, with mere empirical and tentative criticism had been tacitly gaining ground in the editions of Euripides, and that the time was come when a judicious editor was called upon seriously and thoughtfully to reconsider much that had been arbitrarily innovated, much also that had been too hastily adopted, as easier and simpler, on the authority of very inferior copies². This view, independently conceived, but not intended to be carried out to the extent of rejecting any really good and evidently true emendation, is in the main the same as that which Kirchhoff had also proposed to himself; the chief difference being, that he has somewhat more closely and rigorously adhered to the MSS., even where the readings do not seem fairly defensible. Consequently, a collation of the text of the two preceding volumes of this edition with Kirchhoff's (which seems likely to become henceforth the standard one), exhibits comparatively few variations³, and those generally in passages where Kirchhoff could command a better collation of the good MSS. than was to be obtained from previous editions. Beside this, Kirchhoff was the first to show, what Porson and others of his successors assuredly did not know⁴, the exact value of the

² Between these two opposite schools of critics, the emendators and the non-emendators, there is internecine war. The first condemns the second as irrational "sticklers for the old text," and unable to see what the sense and the genius of the language *evidently* require. On the other hand, the conservative critics treat with ridicule, as extravagantly improbable, a system which is founded on the assumption that the old texts have come down to us extremely corrupt, and which undertakes the restoration of them by a series of guesses, in which hardly two guessers ever agree, each naturally thinking his own remedy the surest and the best. Dr. Badham's recent editions of the *Helena*, the *Ion*, and the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and still more Dr. Monk's Cambridge edition of the two *Iphigenias*, are instances of works avowedly carried out according to the extreme licence of conjectural emendation. That even Porson could be somewhat rash, will be shown in the notes to the present volume. Every one knows that Hermann's later editions went very far indeed in the same direction. *Emendation* became latterly with him a restless passion.

³ The principal variations have been noticed in the preface to the reprint of the text of Vol. ii.

⁴ The Aldine edition, in two small 8vo. volumes, was published in 1503. An

Aldine and the *editio princeps* of four plays by Janus Lascaris. He pointed out the important fact, that these were taken from still existing MSS., the text of which was altered and emended occasionally on the conjecture of their respective editors, as a collation of those MSS. indisputably proves. Obviously therefore, when the readings of such MSS. can still be ascertained by actual inspection, the printed impressions cease to be of any critical value.

The whole question of the present state of our classical texts is one demanding a most careful and lengthened inquiry. If we cannot have them perfect, which is not to be hoped for, we must make up our minds to choose between adhering to the authority of the best existing MSS., or freely admitting the conjectural restorations of eminent critics, or we must adopt a cautious mean between the two, which consists in correcting *obvious* errors, to the rejection of all purely *speculative* or only plausible alterations. Each method of editing has its advocates; and the consequence is, that a considerable discrepancy exists in the texts of the more corrupt classic authors, as put forth by their several editors. The first of these rival schools, as far as Euripides is concerned, is represented by Kirchhoff, the second by Hermann and the Dindorfs; the third method, as on the whole

edition of four plays, the *Medea*, *Hippolytus*, *Alcestis*, and *Andromache*, had previously been printed at Florence by Janus Lascaris, in 1496, in uncial or capital letters. Porson tells us, on the *Medea*, that he collated the edition of Lascaris “*summa cum religione, ne dicam superstitione,*” adding as a reason, “*cum et rarissima sit, et impenso pretio veneat.*” Adolph Kirchhoff has shown, that Lascaris merely printed, with very slight conjectural emendations, the Paris transcript of Flor. 2 (marked 2886—8), consulting also in the *Medea* Par. 2818. Aldus chiefly adopted the text of the Palatine MS. (which belonged to his editor, Marcus Musurus, as Kirchhoff has shown, Praef. pp. ix, xi), as far as the plays are included in that copy; but he added the *Helena* and the *Hercules Furens* from the Paris transcript of Flor. 2, marked 2817.

The *Electra* was not known to him. It was first published by Pietro Vettori (Petrus Victorius) at Rome in 1545, from the Florentine MS. 2, which alone contains it. The editor, Musurus, introduced into the Aldine many conjectural alterations of the text, which greatly invalidate the critical authority of the work. In the *Ion*, the *Cyclops*, and the *Heraclidae*, he followed Par. 2817 rather than the Palatine, which contains the two latter plays imperfect. Elmsley did not know the sources of the Aldine text. He says in the Preface to the *Bacchae*, “*Quid factum sit codice, quo usus est Aldus, hodie penitus ignoratur.*”

the best, has been aimed at in the present work. Certainly, the time seems to have arrived when some limit must be placed on the extravagant licence of conjectural emendation. At the same time, the present accurate knowledge of the Greek idiom has enabled critics to proceed with tolerable safety up to a certain point, especially where the laws of the language are constant, and the errors of transcribers in the same matters are found to be habitual. But passages really corrupt should be marked as avowedly corrupt, not patched up and almost rewritten, as Hermann latterly fell into the habit of doing. It is impossible for us to say how far the ancient texts have been tampered with in the successive revisions they are known to have undergone by the Alexandrine and Byzantine grammarians. Every such recension doubtless obtained more or less credit in its particular school, according to the authority or reputation of the reviser. It is but too probable that each revision was a further departure from the exact text of the author, because successive transcriptions were likely to induce errors that a reviser had to remove by conjecture, in default of earlier and better copies⁵. Hence corrupt passages would gradually become more deeply corrupt, and the chance of our restoring them by conjecture at the present day has become very slight, because several steps backward have to be traced, with little or no data to guide us in doing so. Little confidence is to be placed in the study of palaeography, for this at furthest extends only to the correction of *accidental* errors of transcription; whereas there is great reason to fear that *intentional alteration* is the chief mischief with which the critic has to deal. That happy guesses too often meet with a ready acquiescence is

⁵ Modern editions which admit extensive conjectural changes are in fact but repetitions of the very same sort of recensions to which we owe, for the most part, the perplexing variations in MSS. If a MS. copy of Kirchhoff's text had to be made, with marginal variants from the text of the *Poetae Scenici*, the result would astonish many. Kirchhoff enumerates four principal sources of these various readings of MSS.; (1) Ancient variants added in the margin of an archetypus; (2) *Glosses*, marginal or interlined, written at the time or added afterwards; (3) alterations in the text of an archetypus made on the sole conjecture of a subsequent transcriber; (4) mere mistakes or blunders of transcribers.

not unnatural; a reader will generally prefer that which makes sense to that which is nonsense, without troubling himself very much about the authority there may be for a plausible reading presented to him. He is content to know that the vulgate is certainly wrong, and the guess may possibly be right. But to have no further object than this in view⁶, is grossly to abuse the true province of a critic.

It is a very common opinion, that Porson was one of those who held precisely the right mean in settling the text of Euripides in his four plays. As many of his conclusions have been freely questioned in the course of these notes, it may be well here to show some grounds, not for unjustly or invidiously disparaging so great a scholar, but for not invariably adhering to his judgment in critical matters.

To a considerable extent it may be alleged, what at first sight may seem a paradox, that Porson's singular sagacity and aptitude for *emendation* (his great forte) has indirectly done harm to sound scholarship. It has set other and inferior minds upon *guessing*, instead of arriving at results by following out principles. There is a certain celebrity and admiration which is the just tribute to a very clever conjecture, and which is sufficient in itself to incite scholars to aim at this, one of the honourable rewards of classical learning. In a word, Porson was the founder of a school of conjectural criticism of a peculiar kind. He was essentially a *verbal* critic. He did not much concern himself about meaning, consistency, or logical sequence in the text⁷, if he could get hold of the right *word*, where MSS. differed and editors had been at fault. He had no taste nor inclination for *interpreting* his author. He declined it knowingly and intentionally, on the plea that his book would thus be too

⁶ Kirchoff well says, in reference to his own design (Praef. p. xii), "Meminerint velim lectores, haec non scripta esse iis, qui cum voluptate legere cupiunt, quae a poeta aut potuerint scribi aut debuerint, verum antiquitatis studiosorum usibus melius inservire solis, quorum nihil intersit videri sciri, quae sciri nequeant."

⁷ This fault is continually objected to Porson by Hermann. Matthiae is equally severe on him occasionally, on metrical and grammatical grounds. But our students are taught to disregard this, as resulting from the petty jealousies of rival editors.

long⁸. But his emendations, not so much on the four plays as on the scenic poets generally, were so numerous and so brilliant, and often so self-evidently true, that he soon had many followers, who have been more or less eminent in the same department, and done more or less of mixed good and harm to the old texts. Blomfield, Dobree, Monk, Burges, Elmsley, in our own country, and a host of German scholars headed by Hermann, devoted the greatest part of their lives and their best energies in endeavouring to rival their master and predecessor in the art. Considered strictly as an editor of Euripides, “in usum tironum,” Porson has perhaps been held in too high estimation. He is deficient in nearly all the points that constitute a practically useful book for learners⁹. Much of his fame rests on some of his long discursive notes, as those on *Hec.* 68², 1161. *Med.* 139, 675, 1314. These however, though full of ingenious emendations, and exhibiting prodigious reading, are mere rambling essays¹, the outpourings of his scrap-books, *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*. They are out of place as notes, appended to the text of a play which the student only requires to understand. We may undertake to say there never was a “tiro” yet who read through, and perhaps few tirones have cared even to glance over, any one of these long notes. Nothing is gained by overrating a man’s labours². The simple truth is, that Porson, like other mortals, was any thing but infallible. The progress

⁸ “Interpretandi et illustrandi labore, utilissimo sane, supersedendum duxi, *partim* ne libellus in librum excresceret.” (Praef. ad *Hec.* p. 11.) He does not specify his other motive.

⁹ It may be said with some appearance of truth, that he wrote for the learned rather than for the learner,—rather for his equals and brother critics than for inferiors. He himself however distinctly says in the first sentence of his preface, that “tironum usibus haec opella potissimum destinata est.”

¹ He was quite conscious of this, for he playfully says on v. 675 of the *Medea*, “Jam inde ab Orest. 5 lectorem monebam me longas, imo longissimas, *nihil ad rem pertinentes*, notas scribere potuisse.”

² Professor Scholefield calls Porson “praestantissimus Euripidis editor” (Praef. p. viii), and so unable was he to realize the notion that a Porson *could* be wrong, that he passes over or apologizes for some acknowledged deficiencies as matters of trifling moment, and even endeavours to defend the solecisms against Attic syntax which Porson occasionally committed.

of scholarship since his time has been immense, and has proved, as might be expected, that he was sometimes in the wrong.

In the first place, the text of his four plays is far from perfect³. In *at least* three hundred passages he has introduced, or allowed to remain, readings undoubtedly false; being either those of very inferior MSS., or improbable and useless conjectures, or errors left unquestioned from the Aldine and subsequent texts, in default of the much earlier and better MSS. which have since been more or less carefully collated. Of these MSS., or at least the greater part of them, nothing was known in Porson's time. On the first three plays he had only the late and inferior class of MSS. to consult. On the *Hecuba* and the *Orestes* he seems to have collated eight or nine of these MSS.⁴ Not one of them contains the *Medea*, on which he seems to have had no critical aid beyond the *editio princeps* of Lascaris (1496). He might have inspected many more MSS. on the other plays than he did. A considerable number exist in this country, and not less than twenty have been seen and examined by the present editor. He does not any where show a just discrimination of the relative merits of those MSS. which he had, but adopts a reading that suits his taste from the very worst as freely as from the best. Moreover, he attributed too much weight to the agreement of several copies in the same reading. Of course, the reading of any one *good* MS. is worth that of fifty others of the late Byzantine recension. The very first duty of a critic is to do what Porson did not do, viz. to determine

³ He himself was aware of this, for he says (Praef. Hec. p. 9), "Quaedam intacta reliqui, in quibus tamen errorem latere posse suspicatus sim." Prof. Scholefield says too much when he asserts that "textum omni ex parte elaboratum reliquit."

⁴ Viz. MS. Corp. Christ. Cant., three in the Public Library at Cambridge, and three in the British Museum (Harl. 5725, 6300, and Ayscough 4952), and two belonging to the Royal Society, which King had already used. In the *Phoenissae* he appears to have consulted, if not collated, some of the Bodleian MSS. He was himself aware that none of the then known MSS. were of first-rate merit. "Omnes fere codices parum ab antiquitate commendabiles sunt, et quo frequentius describuntur, eo gravius interpolantur." (Praef. Hec. p. 11.) Kirchoff evinces great contempt for the host of late MSS. of the *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phoenissae*. "Hanc varietatis farraginem equidem totam abjiciendam statui, quippe cujus nullus usus esset futurus sanæ mentis critico." (Praef. p. vii.)

what family or class of MSS. to follow in preference to others.

Porson was deficient in a knowledge of choral metres, though he defined so accurately the laws of the iambic, trochaic, and anapaestic verse. Of the dochmiac, a measure scarcely less important to tragedy, as being eminently characteristic of mental passion, he had scarcely any knowledge; in fact, it had not been fully investigated in his time. This therefore was no fault of his. Still it is a grievous disfigurement to his text to find long dochmiac passages arranged so unmetrically that the true scansion only appears here and there, as if by accident⁵.

Lastly, Porson made not a few injudicious and unnecessary alterations in his text, which subsequent critics have generally agreed to reject. He attributed far too much weight to the capricious emendations of Brunck and Valckenaer, both of whom he appears to have held in the highest estimation. On the whole, it is remarkable how few of Porson's own conjectures on the four plays have been confirmed by the better MSS. since collated⁶. In truth, he laid down for himself some unsound principles of criticism, among which the following stands conspicuous, though he acted on it very sparingly; "Tutissima corrigendi ratio est vocularum, si opus est, transpositio⁷;"—a process which Hermann somewhere aptly compares to an edged tool in the hands of a child. Porson remarks, that the transcribers often transposed words. But this is only true of the Byzantine scribes of the latest age, who had a strange fancy for

⁵ We might instance the opening dialogue of the *Phoenissae*, v. 101 seqq., the monody of Jocasta in the same play, v. 308 seqq., and especially the narrative of the Eunuch in *Orest.* v. 1363 seqq. In single verses several instances might be quoted where he corrupts a good dochmiac verse by a needless alteration, e. g. in *Orest.* 316 (322), for *ταναν αἰθέρ' ἀμπάλλεσθ' αἵματος*, he gives *ἀμπάλλεθ'*, while in the antistrophe he admits Musgrave's violent and improbable change *ἀναβακχιῶι* for *ἀναβακχεύει*. In v. 154 of the same play *τίνα τύχαν εἶπω, τίνα δὲ συμφορὰν*, he destroys the metre by giving *τίνας δὲ συμφοράς*; In v. 1246, for *τίνα θροεῖς αὐδᾶν, πότνια, παραμένει κτλ.*, he reads *τίνα θροεῖς αὐτᾶν, ᾧ πότνια; παραμένει κτλ.* Sometimes, retaining the true reading, he prints dochmiacs as monometers, e. g. *Orest.* 1230—4.

⁶ His "audacious conjectura" on *Orest.* 1259, *παλινοσκοπῖαν* for *ἄλλην σκοπῖαν*, is now found in the best Venice MS.

⁷ Praef. ad Hec. p. 9.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01118-1 - Euripides, Volume 3
 Edited by Frederick Apthorp Paley
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PREFACE.

xiii

ending senarii with words accented on the penultima⁸, and besides were much less scrupulous than their predecessors when any metrical theory had to be indulged by a little coaxing of the text. His general neglect of the scholia too has led him to omit several important critical hints and readings to be derived from them. He says, too absolutely, "Scholiastarum auctoritas nulla est." (Praef. p. 10.) This remark, like the last, is only applicable to the *late* scholia of the Byzantine grammarians. The genuine and ancient scholia, many of which are given even in Barnes' folio edition, are of considerable value and authority.

Viewing Porson's edition as a whole, and quite apart from any prejudice, favourable or unfavourable, we must conclude that his primary object was not so much the illustration of his author⁹, as to make the work a vehicle and a medium for criticism of the most general kind on the dramatic writers. Of course, there is no fault to be found with this. It is well for the learned world that he chose such a course. But when we come to the question of the real *usefulness* of a work continually placed in the hands of mere learners, the case is altogether different. The total absence of all assistance as to the author's meaning,—whether it arose from Porson's comparative indifference to it, as we believe, or from that seeming easy to him which seems difficult to others, as the public good-naturedly believe,—his avoiding every where the office of commentator, is a decided and serious drawback to the work as a school-book, for which it was professedly intended. At the present day, when the scholastic system is wholly changed, and the intellectual appreciation of an author's mind is substituted for dull and profitless discussions about various readings, we must be content

⁸ See Kirchhoff, Praef. p. v. Instances of Porson's transposing words are Orest. 171—2, 689, 991—3, Phoen. 683, 808.

⁹ He intended, it appears, shortly to publish the whole of Euripides. "Monendus est lector, ceteras Euripidis fabulas ordine vulgato *mox* prodituras, si modo hoc specimen reipublicae literariae non displicere intellexero." (Praef. Hec. ad fin.) There seems no reason (at least from the context) to interpret *ceteras* of *the other three*.

to hold Porson's edition as much behind the wants of our time, as it was in advance of the learning and the critical science of his own time¹.

Something now remains to be said of the existing MSS. of Euripides². To enumerate the whole of these,—the vast majority of them being late transcripts of only three plays, the *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phoenissae*,—would be of little use or interest to the general reader, who may find them duly catalogued in Matthiae's edition, or as an introduction to W. Dindorf's critical notes on this author. The main fact to be remembered is this; that as of Aeschylus and Sophocles only seven, so of Euripides only nine plays were in common use in the schools of the grammarians of the middle ages³. To the *Hecuba*, the *Phoenissae*, the *Orestes*, the *Medea*, the *Hippolytus*, the *Alceste*, and the *Andromache*, we have scholia remaining more or less complete. To the *Rhesus* and the *Troades* some rather brief and imperfect, though valuable, scholia have been recovered, and published by W. Dindorf and others from the Vatican MS. 909. Of most of these plays (the two last only forming to some degree an exception), a pretty large number of good MSS. have been collated, none of them however reaching a greater antiquity than the twelfth century. The remaining ten are known to us only by the fortunate preservation of two

¹ Professor Scholefield endeavoured, but not very successfully, because much too briefly, to supply explanatory comments to a few of the more difficult passages in Porson's text. In so far as he did this, he bore testimony to the truth of the estimate made above. The very great difficulty of combining, in a moderate space, sufficient both of critical and explanatory information, is only known to those who have tried it. In the case of Euripides, the only complete edition, in which both have been given tolerably fully, is Matthiae's, which every one knows is far beyond the limits desirable for ordinary students. One *must* choose between a certain degree of incompleteness, and a tediously elaborate, and therefore nearly useless, commentary. Kirchhoff's edition, containing *only* various readings, extends to above 1100 pages of close print.

² The classification of MSS. here given is compiled from Kirchhoff's Prefaces to his complete edition (1855), and to his *Medea* (1852). Some remarks on this subject, with facsimiles of MSS., were promised in p. lvi of Vol. i. This promise the editor has now fulfilled to the best of his power. A series of facsimiles from the Bodleian MSS. had been prepared by him accordingly, but were unfortunately lost.

³ The later grammarians, as has been already stated, reduced this number to *three of each*, which, from this circumstance, rather than from any superior merit, are still most frequently placed in the hands of young students. See the note on p. liii of Vol. i.

MSS. and a few apographs or transcripts from one of them, viz. the Palatine MS., in the Vatican (No. 287), which has thirteen plays of Euripides, and the Florentine (Flor. 2), which contains all the plays except the *Troades*, and from which the transcripts alluded to were made⁴. Both these MSS. are reputed to be of the fourteenth century, so that in point of antiquity as well as number of codices, comparatively little critical aid is to be obtained for more than half the extant plays of Euripides. The absence of scholia on these plays is an additional reason for supposing that they were very little read, and for that reason very sparingly transcribed in the middle ages. It is the opinion of Kirchhoff, who has the high merit of having first classified and set the true value on the various MSS. and early editions of Euripides, that the nine plays first enumerated (viz. those with scholia) have been all perpetuated by a copy made about A.D. 1100 from an archetypus containing the recension of some grammarian of unknown date, but probably of the ninth or tenth century. Of these nine plays, or of several of them, he enumerates five authentic apographs now known to exist, all of which he has made use of in his recent edition. In still later times (viz. about the fourteenth century) a further selection was made from the nine plays by the grammarians of Byzantium. They took the *Hecuba*, the *Orestes*, and the *Phoenissae*, as the favourite plays for their schools; they augmented with worthless interpolations the ancient scholia⁵, and what was

⁴ Viz. Par. E, Par. G, Flor. 1, and perhaps two others, for which see the note in p. x of Kirchhoff's Preface. Elmsley (Praef. ad Bacch. p. 6) had remarked that Flor. 1 is a mere transcript of Flor. 2, of the latest period, and by an ignorant scribe. There is something singular in the history of this *Troades*. Of none of the nine more commonly read plays are there so few MSS. existing as of this. It is the only one of the nineteen plays not contained in Flor. 2; it is found however in one of the very best MSS. (Vat. 909), in the late Harleian MS., in the *codex Havniensis* (also late), and in a paper MS. of the fourteenth century preserved in the Museo Borbonico at Naples (ii. F. 9), which has (in this play) the same origin with Vat. 909, and like it contains the ancient scholia on the *Troades*, which are found in no other copy. Another singular fact is, that the *Troades* seems to have been hardly known to Stobaeus, who quotes so frequently from the rest of the plays.

⁵ So the *Prometheus*, *Seven against Thebes*, and *Persians* of Aeschylus, and the *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles, were selected by the Byzantines from the seven. Hence of these plays alone numerous, but inferior, MSS. exist, and in

much worse, they deteriorated the text by numerous conjectures made on grounds either metrical or grammatical. Of these three plays, or of some one or two of them, the existing MSS. are very numerous. But for obvious reasons their critical value is but small; and it is clear that one single copy of a period anterior to this critical mal-treatment is worth the whole of the later copies taken together. The reason why Porson selected these three plays is now apparent; there were plenty of MSS. of them, though of the inferior character of most of these he was not, perhaps, fully aware; they stood first, for the same reason, in most of the early editions⁶; and their traditional reputation (though in fact they are in some respects inferior as plays) had secured to them a certain scholastic popularity.

It has been stated already, that of the remaining ten plays (without scholia) we have not only much fewer, but decidedly inferior MSS., and that the Palatine MS. and Flor. 2 are in fact the sole resources remaining to us. These were derived from the recension of some grammarian who considered that interpolation and conjecture in metrical and syntactic difficulties were fair, or at least necessary means in producing readable texts. Consequently, the present state of the text in these plays is not only far less satisfactory, but the absence of scholia leaves us no other hope of restoring the many corrupt passages, than the vague and uncertain resources of critical ingenuity.

Kirchhoff further contends⁷ that not only the select nine, but *all* the extant plays of Euripides, including such scholia as we have, came from a MS. of the ninth or tenth century, which he supposes to have contained seven of Aeschylus, seven of Sopho-

most of them the ancient scholia are largely augmented and interpolated with comparatively futile comments.

⁶ Probably for no other reason than that it followed next, he selected the *Medea*, and also because it was one of the four plays in the *editio princeps* of Janus Lascaris. Of the *Medea* very few first-class MSS. now exist; but it is contained in at least two of the best. One of these (Vat. 909) was carefully collated by Elmsley, the other (Par. A. No. 2712) very carelessly by Musgrave and Brunck (Kirchhoff, *Præf.* p. v). Of neither Porson had any knowledge, beyond what he obtained from the two last-mentioned critics.

⁷ In his elaborate Preface to the *Medea*, published singly in 1852.

cles, and about twenty of Euripides⁸. These plays were not simply copied from an earlier MS., but were the new recension of some anonymous grammarian. Kirchhoff, at least, infers this (though his inference does not seem a very valid one), from the circumstance that to the end of the scholia in two of the plays, the *Orestes* and the *Medea*, is appended a note, that they were collated with various copies (*πρὸς διάφορα ἀντίγραφα*)⁹, and also that the scholia of the grammarian Dionysius were given entire with extracts from Didymus and others. The Byzantines of the subsequent ages used this sylloge alone, and seem to have known no other play and no other recension of any of the tragic writers.

From this revised archetypus then two kinds of MSS. were transcribed; one class containing the select plays, the other the whole of them. Of the nine select plays a copy was transcribed about A.D. 1100; and from that again two families were propagated, which may be recognized among the now existing MSS.

I. Of this family there are five, all of which are to be regarded as of primary authority, viz. :—

(1.) A MS. in the library of St. Mark, Venice¹, of the twelfth century, a quarto on parchment, marked 471, and containing the *Hecuba*, the *Orestes*, the *Phoenissae*, the *Andromache*, the *Hippolytus* as far as v. 1234, with marginal scholia and interlined glosses.

(2.) The “codex Vaticanus,” No. 909, also of the twelfth century², on glossy paper (*bombycinus*), contains (with the loss

⁸ Up to that period, perhaps, which was not very long subsequent to the destruction of the great Alexandrine library, other plays were extant, and more or less known, of the great dramatic writers.

⁹ It was probably a common custom of transcribers either to have more than one copy open before them, or to collate their transcript, when finished, with some other. Hence we may explain the marginal readings often given by the original hand, and showing that the scribe was in doubt which to take. Sometimes, no doubt, these variants were simply taken from the margin of the MS. before him.

¹ Kirchhoff calls this “Codex Marcianus,” and refers to it under the letter A in his critical notes. He pronounces it “omnium facile praestantissimum,” and collated the whole of it himself at Venice. Hermann marks it Ven. a.

² Marked Rom. A by Elmsley. There is a late transcript of this in the Vatican

of some leaves at the beginning and the end) the *Hecuba*, the *Orestes*, the *Phoenissae*, the *Medea*, the *Hippolytus*, the *Alcestis*, the *Andromache*, the *Troades*, the *Rhesus*. This MS. also has scholia and interlined glosses, and it has been carefully collated for W. Dindorf and Kirchhoff.

(3.) “Codex Havniensis³,” a somewhat late paper MS., but a transcript from a valuable copy of the same class as Vat. 909, though interpolated with worthless conjectures. It contains the same nine plays as the last. Kirchhoff considers that in the *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phoenissae*, the transcriber used another and very inferior copy.

(4.) “Codex Parisinus” (No. 2712), on parchment, of the thirteenth century, containing seven plays, viz. the same as the preceding, the *Troades* and the *Rhesus* being omitted. It has interlined glosses and a very few marginal scholia. Kirchhoff complains that no adequate collation of the whole of this MS. has yet been made. He considers it generally of high authority, though a little deteriorated by the alterations of grammarians.

(5.) Another “codex Marcianus” is preserved at Venice (No. 468), written on glossy paper (*bombycinus*) in the thirteenth century. It contains only the *Hecuba*, the *Orestes*, the *Phoenissae*, and a fragment of the *Medea* (v. 1–42), besides some plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles. This MS. has interlined glosses and scholia of the later class. Kirchhoff, who collated it at Venice, pronounces it “correcturis jam infectior.”

II. The second family of the MSS. of the nine plays or several of them contains another and distinct recension of a Byzantine grammarian of the thirteenth century. Here we find arbitrary interpolations, transpositions, and pedantic metrical arrangements. Of course, the authority of this family of MSS. is quite secondary. Kirchhoff enumerates only four which he considered worth collating. These are,

(Pal. 98, or Rom. B), collated by Elmsley on the *Medea*, and of no particular value except in the concluding verses of the *Rhesus*, which are lost in Rom. A.

³ Called, we believe, from *Hafniae*, or Copenhagen. Elmsley (Praef. ad Bacch.) thinks this is identical with a MS. supposed to be lost, known as “codex Vossianus,” or Flor. A, which Kirchhoff enumerates among his MSS. of the second class.

(1.) A Paris MS. of the thirteenth century, No. 2713⁴, on parchment, now much mutilated. It contains the *Hecuba*, the *Phoenissae*, the *Hippolytus*, the *Medea*, the *Alcestis*, the *Andromache*. Except on the last-named play, for which it was used by Lenting, it does not appear that this MS. has yet been sufficiently examined.

(2.) "Codex Florentinus," said to have been collated by Isaac Voss, and to be now missing. Whatever be its fate or its identity, Kirchhoff holds it in no estimation. It contained all the nine plays except the *Orestes*.

(3.) Another Florence MS. (Flor. 10) of the fourteenth century, is a large quarto on paper. It contains the whole of the nine plays except the *Troades*, the *Rhesus* however being mutilated in the latter part. The critical value of this MS. is thought not to surpass the last.

(4.) A third Florence MS. (Flor. 15) of the fourteenth century, on paper, a folio now in a very damaged state, has the *Hippolytus*, the *Medea*, the *Alcestis*, the *Andromache*, with marginal scholia. This and the last-named MS. were carelessly collated for Matthiae by Francisco De Furia. There are several other existing MSS. of the same class in the Vatican and Venice (St. Mark's) libraries, which have been inspected by Elmsley, Kirchhoff, and others, but are neither ancient (except perhaps Marcianus 470, on parchment) nor critically valuable.

It has been said that from a revised archetypus of about the ninth century one class of copies was transcribed, which contained all or nearly all the nineteen plays. Of this class, which appears to have met with very little notice in the middle ages, only two⁵ MSS. now are known, viz. the Palatine and the second Florentine, already briefly alluded to, and now more fully to be described. These copies, both of the fourteenth

⁴ Commonly known as Par. B, as distinguished from Par. A, No. 2712.

⁵ Or three, if we include with Kirchhoff the late paper MS. Harl. 5743, which has only the *Rhesus*, *Troades*, and part of the *Alcestis*. The only grounds for referring this MS. to this family, appear to be a certain deterioration in the text of the *Rhesus* and *Troades*, part of the latter representing Pal. 287.

century, are thought to have come from an intermediate recension of perhaps the twelfth century, by which process the text was seriously tampered with; added to which, the indifference with which this class of MSS. was regarded led to a more careless transcription⁶.

The Palatine MS. in the Vatican library (No. 287, called by others Rom. C, by Kirchhoff *B*, and to be distinguished from Pal. 98, or Rom. B, a copy of Vat. 909) is a folio on parchment, written in double columns. It contains, besides some plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles, thirteen of Euripides⁷, viz. the *Andromache*, the *Medea*, the *Supplices*, the *Rhesus*, the *Ion*, the two *Iphigenias*, the *Hippolytus*, the *Alcestis*, the *Troades*, the *Bacchae*, the *Cyclops*, the *Heracleidae*. Elmsley collated this MS. on the *Medea* and the *Bacchae*, and W. Dindorf on the *Ion*. The rest of the plays were collated by Freyburger at the request of Kirchhoff.

The Laurentian MS. C of Elmsley, better known as Flor. 2, is on paper, and contains (beside other plays and Hesiod) eighteen of Euripides,—being all but the *Troades*. The *Bacchae* is entitled the *Pentheus*, the *Hippolytus* the *Phaedra*, and the *Orestes* the *Electra*⁸. This is on the whole a good MS., though manifestly less authentic than the best copies of the nine plays, in which therefore its text is not rashly to be followed. The inference is, that in those plays which this MS. *alone* contains, viz. the *Helena*, the *Hercules Furens*, and the *Electra*, its au-

⁶ Kirchhoff, Praef. p. viii, "Hujus generis libri incuriosius fere habiti sunt a librariis et descripti negligentius."

⁷ It is remarkable that this MS. omits the three plays of which by far the greater number of later copies exist, the *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phoenissae*: while Flor. 2 contains these the *last* in the list, as if superadded by an after-thought to the transcript of those less frequently found. The primary object of the transcribers of both seems to have been the preservation of the plays which were then becoming rare. That the Palatine MS. belonged to the editor of the Aldine edition has been already stated. It is not quite certain, as Kirchhoff assumes, that it was his when the Aldine was published in 1503, though he has left his name at the end with the date 1511.

⁸ This variation of the titles seems to indicate a distinct recension. In some of the later copies, the *Orestes* is called the *Electra*; and possibly those copies would prove to belong to the same recension, and not to the triad of the latest Byzantine school.

thority is not more implicitly to be trusted. It is however greatly to be regretted that it has never yet been minutely and accurately collated throughout. Kirchhoff trusts rather to the Paris transcripts from it than to De Furia's collation made for Matthiae, "negligentissime," as he complains.

The writing of this MS. is by several hands; two at least are recognized in the plays of Euripides⁹, viz. the *Rhesus*, *Ion*, and two *Iphigenias* are different from the rest. The *Bacchae* extends only to v. 754, and ends with οὐ δεσμῶν ὑπο. Elmsley is of opinion that in this, the first part of that play, the readings of Flor. 2 are superior to those of the Palatine. This seems a questionable judgment. He admits that these supposed superior readings are *corrections*, but then he thinks they *may* have come from the collation of a better MS. It is difficult to say; but the probability is, they are only the conjectures of some learned grammarian. Kirchhoff uniformly attributes to the Palatine a greater authority than to Flor. 2.

The two MSS. agree so closely, even in minutiae, in most of the plays, that they must have come from one common source, while their discrepancies are sufficient to prove that the one was not copied directly from the other. There are considerable varieties of reading as compared with the best MSS. of the nine plays, but not greater than is to be accounted for on the supposition of a subsequent grammatical recension.

The *codex Neapolitanus*, already mentioned as containing an excellent text, with the genuine scholia, of the *Troades*, has also the *Hecuba*, the *Orestes*, and the *Phoenissae*, written in the fourteenth century. These three plays however have the later Byzantine scholia, and were probably derived from a copy of inferior value, as was the case in the codex Havniensis.

H. Stephens makes frequent mention of certain MSS. which he consulted in his journey in Italy. Of these nothing is now known, and it is generally believed that he feigned them, as a pretext for many of his own conjectural emendations. Some

⁹ See Elmsley, *Praef. ad Bacch.* p. i.

suppose that he really did consult one or two MSS. at Florence, probably Flor. 1 and 2, if not Flor. 10 or 15.

It has been said, that none of our present MSS. are earlier than the twelfth century, and that they probably all came from a transcript made about A.D. 1100. Assuming this to be true, a high critical importance attaches to a discovery made by the Rev. H. A. Coxe, of the Bodleian library, during his tour of research in the East. At the convent of Mar Saba in the Levant he found a palimpsest MS. of the *Orestes* and *Phoenissae*, of the *beginning of the eleventh century*, and therefore unique as pertaining to a text anterior to the assumed transcript of 1100. This MS. was overwritten with a comment on the Greater Prophets; but the earlier writing was generally easily to be made out. What is equally important, it contained copious scholia. Mr. Coxe was promised that this very interesting codex should be sent to him for more accurate inspection at Jerusalem, and was even led to entertain the hope that it might be purchased; but both these expectations were unfortunately disappointed.

In another respect this MS. has a peculiar value. It seems to show that the *Orestes* and the *Phoenissae* were select popular plays not only in the later Byzantine schools, but at an early period of the middle ages. Perhaps the partiality is to be accounted for from these being the latest efforts of the poet's pen, full of incident, brilliant in the epic or narrative department, and with a pathos and naturalness which is well sustained throughout their great and unusual length.

To recapitulate briefly the foregoing account of the principal MSS. :—

- (1) Codex 1. Marcianus (saec. xii.).
- (2) ——— Vaticanus (saec. xii.).
- (3) ——— Havniensis (saec. xv.?).
- (4) ——— 1. Parisinus (saec. xiii.).
- (5) ——— 2. Marcianus (saec. xiii.).
- (6) ——— Harleianus (saec. xvi.).
- (7) ——— 2. Parisinus (saec. xiii.).
- (8) ——— 1. Florentinus (Flor. 10) (saec. xiv.).

PREFACE.

xxiii

- (9) Codex 2. Florentinus (Flor. 15) (saec. xiv.).
 (10) ——— Palatinus (saec. xiv.).
 (11) ——— 3. Florentinus (Flor. 2) (saec. xiv.).
 (12) ——— Neapolitanus (saec. xiv.).

And the general result of the critical resources on the several plays will be seen by the following table:—

VOL. I.

- Rhesus, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 11.
 Medea, 2, 3, 4, 5 (to v. 42), 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
 Hippolytus, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
 Alcestis, 2, 3, 4, 6 (from v. 1029), 8, 9, 10, 11.
 Heraclidae, 10, 11.
 Supplices, 10, 11.
 Troades, 2, 3, 6, 10, 12.

VOL. II.

- Ion, 10, 11.
 Helena, 11.
 Andromache, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
 Electra, 11.
 Bacchae, 10, 11.
 Hecuba, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12.

VOL. III.

- Hercules Furens, 11.
 Phoenissae, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12.
 Orestes, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12.
 Iphigenia in Tauris, 10, 11.
 Iphigenia in Aulide, 10, 11.
 Cyclops, 10, 11.

Manuscripts of Euripides appear to be common in all the great libraries of Europe; but the great majority of them are limited to the *Hecuba*, the *Phoenissae*, and the *Orestes*; and

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01118-1 - Euripides, Volume 3
 Edited by Frederick Athorp Paley
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

xxiv

PREFACE.

probably¹ nearly all of them are after the latest Byzantine recension, and so of little or no critical value. In this country alone above twenty exist; but very few indeed of these contain any other of the plays. Probably not nearly the whole of them have ever been carefully collated². Those of which a brief account now follows have been actually inspected by the present editor; but beyond occasionally reading over a speech, or comparing the readings of a given passage with those of the better copies enumerated above, he has not attempted the Herculean task,—probably one that would have proved disappointing in its results,—of a complete collation.

The Bodleian Library contains the following MSS. of Euripides;—

Misc. 248. (Auct. T. 4. 10.)

— 249. (Auct. T. 4. 11.)

— 99. (Auct. F. 3. 25.)

— 100. (Auct. F. 4. 1.)

Barocc. 120.

— 37. (3.)

— 34. (144.)

Laud. 54. (1.)

Canon. 86. (5.)

D' Or. x. 1. 3. 13, 14.

All these are on paper³, and none of them seem older than the end of the fourteenth century. The first (Auct. T. 4. 10) is a small quarto, very neatly written, apparently of saec. xv., if not

¹ Not *certainly all*, since it has been shown that a preference for these plays existed in times long before the latest Byzantine school; and it is quite possible that some of these MSS. of the triad may represent early and good copies.

² Porson on the *Phoenissae* now and then refers to the testimony of “Bodleiani omnes, teste Burtono.”

³ The kind of paper called *bombycinus* is of a fine thick glossy texture, like our better kinds of hot-pressed paper, and somewhat tough and fibrous. It was manufactured from the cotton-plant, and was very commonly employed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Earlier than this, parchment (*membrana*) was more frequently used, and later than this true paper (*charta*), resembling that of our times, but, like that employed in the early editions, of a very fine and durable material made probably entirely of linen.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01118-1 - Euripides, Volume 3
 Edited by Frederick Athorp Paley
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PREFACE.

XXV

later. It contains the *Hippolytus*, with a few marginal scholia, but without interlined glosses. The characters are written in a faint red ink. This play appears to have been carefully copied from a good MS. Next follows the *Hecuba*, by a different hand, and in a coarser style of writing, but of about the same age. This play has interlinear glosses and very scanty scholia, often by different hands. It seems a fairly good MS., and is not hard to read, though a good many contractions are introduced. The *Orestes* comes next, and is much interlined, but only here and there a marginal scholium is added. The *Phoenissae* concludes the volume, but extends only to οὐ μεμπτός ἡμῖν ὁ γάμος ἐς τὸδ' ἡμέρας (v. 425).

Auct. T. 4. 11, is a small quarto containing only the *Hecuba* and the *Orestes*. There are neither scholia nor glosses. The *Orestes* is by a different and rather inferior hand. This seems a late MS. of little critical value.

Auct. F. 3. 25, is a moderately thick quarto, written on fine glazed paper (*bombycinus*), in clear black ink, probably at the end of saec. xiv. This MS. comprises the *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Oedipus Rex*, with scholia. Then follow the Life of Euripides, the *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phoenissae*, all written with a lighter ink. The writing is clear and easy to read. There are some marginal scholia, and here and there interlined glosses of a word or two by the same hand. The characters are prefixed in red ink. A collation of the messenger's speech (*Orest.* 886—956) gave promise of this proving a very good MS.

Next come the first eight Idylls of Theocritus, ending with καὶ νύμφαν ἄκρηβος ἐὼν ἐτι ναῖδα γάμεν, and accompanied with scholia. Then we have the *Ἔργα* of Hesiod, also with scholia, and written in the same clear hand and black ink as the Sophocles. Lastly, Pindar's *Olympia*, with scholia, by a different, but not very dissimilar hand.

Auct. F. 4. 1, is on paper, much stained, probably of saec. xv. The form is large octavo. This contains the Life of Euripides, the *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, and *Phoenissae*. Here and there only are marginal scholia. There are interlinear glosses in red ink as

far as fol. 169, after which they are written in black. The writing is not good, but it is not difficult to read. In the *Orestes* two leaves are lost, so that (ἀμ-)φι μέλαθρον πελάῃ (sic) σὸν ἀγρότας ἀνὴρ (v. 1270) follows καὶ δὴ πέλας νιν δωμάτων εἶναι δοκῶ (v. 1214). The *Phoenissae* ends with σεμέλας θίασον ἱερὸν (sic) ὄρεσιν ἀνεχώρευσα (v. 1756).

Barocc. 120 is a quarto on paper, of saec. xiv. or xv. It contains the Life of Euripides, followed by the *Hecuba*. The first part of this play is written in a brown (faded) ink, with interlined glosses in later black ink. At v. 330, θαύμαζε δ' ὡς ἂν ἡ μὲν Ἑλλὰς εὐτυχῆ (sic), a blacker ink is used, while the interlined glosses are fainter. There are a few marginal scholia, which are difficult to read. The characters are written in red ink. The play seems to have been copied at intervals, by the same hand. Next comes the *Orestes*, which is here entitled *Electra*. It is written by the same (or a very similar) hand, with interlined glosses and a few scholia. Next is the *Phoenissae*, generally in a lighter ink, also with glosses and occasional scholia. This play appears to be by a different hand. Here only the *dramatis personae*, and not the persons of the dialogue, are written in red ink. The pages are much stained, but the writing generally is very legible.

Barocc. 37. 3, is a small quarto, containing the *Electra* and *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles, and the *Phoenissae*. It is a recent paper MS., neatly written, but probably of no critical value. There are no scholia nor glosses. Within the cover at the beginning is written, "A vile recent MS., T. K." Also "To the *Phoenissae* of Euripides collated by J. H." (or J. J. S.)

Barocc. 34 contains the *Phoenissae*, without notes or glosses, as far as σύ τ' αὖ πρόσωπον πρὸς κασίγνητον στρέφε (v. 457). It is a small quarto on paper, of a late date. It also contains the *Plutus*, with a few scholia and interlinear glosses.

Laud. 54 is a folio on paper of saec. xv. The contents of this volume are miscellaneous. First is the *Hecuba* up to κἀγὼ γὰρ ἦν ποτ', ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκ εἴμ' ἔτι (v. 284). Next comes the *Orestes* from φόνον ὁ λοξίας ἐμᾶς ματέρος (v. 165), to the end. Then

ὄφρασι πρῶτον δαναόν:
 μετ' ἄρον θάνατον θῶν
 ἔε, ἢ πρὸς ἄετος ὄον
 γῆλος τιμωρηθῆναι
 θανάτων. ἔος μαθῶν,
 μετὰ ἀφείστον ἄσμάχ
 ἦλθεν.

ὄφρα δὲ γλῶσσον ἐν γῆρα καὶ θάνατον ἴσχυρις,
 οὐ φασὶ πρῶτον δαναον ἀγλαῖαν δέκα
 ἀσ κοινήν ἐστὶ
 οὐδὲν ἄλλο σοὶ σαγλαῶν εἰς κρινὰς ἔδρας.
 πολιτῶν τίνα ἠρώτησα δὲ
 ἄστων δὲ δὴ τὴν ἠρόμην ἄλλοις σμί' ἰδῶν
 τίνεον ἔπον ἄλλω ἔρα τὶ ἦ
 τί καὶ γόν ἄρχει. μόν τὶ πολεμίον παρὰ —

Harl. M. S. 5725. fol. 260.

ἦ ἔτεο κλέους μὴ οὐκ ἀμ κλέους ἀμ
 ἀντιπῶν ἔτι / θέλοισ
 χρηματὶς ἔπτεσρον. οὐδὲ πᾶν χρήσιμα
 δὴσυχῶν / ἔμακρῶν
 λέβω. νοσῆ γὰρ ἠδὲ τὰ πολλὰ κρέον
 χέονου τὸ κῆ πηρέ τένεθ
 ἔξου τῆ κνωθ κλάισσ βία θεῶν.
 τρῶν τὸ ἔφ ὕσε ἐπὶ μέλεον αἰδὶ πτω.

Harl. M. S. 6300. fol. 131.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01118-1 - Euripides, Volume 3
 Edited by Frederick Apthorp Paley
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

PREFACE.

xxvii

follows the *Phoenissae*, then the *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles. Next we have the *Ἔργα* of Hesiod, with numerous scholia. Then come the first eight Idylls of Theocritus (ending with *Ναΐδα γάμεν*), also with scholia. After these we have Pindar's *Olympia*, and finally the first book of the *Iliad*, with the second as far as *ἀρχοὺς αὐτῶν ἐπέω νῆός τε προπάσας* (v. 493). To the Homer ample scholia are added. All the pages (except in the Homer) have interlined glosses in red ink, and occasional scholia.

Canon. 86 is a folio containing the *Hecuba*, with interlinear glosses in red ink, and here and there a scholium in the same colour. The *Orestes* follows in similar writing, and then the *Ajax*.

D' Or. x. 1. 3. 13 (Auct.) contains the *Hecuba* and the *Orestes*, neatly and legibly written on paper.

D' Or. x. 1. 3. 14, has the same plays, with the scholia of Thomas Magister. This is probably a good MS., and seems of the close of saec. xiv.

These two last are doubtless the MSS. mentioned by Porson in his list prefixed to the *Orestes*, "Codices Dorvilliani duo, nuper inter Bodleianos repositi." But it is clear that he only consulted them here and there, and never collated them.

In the British Museum there are several MSS. of plays of Euripides; but none of them appear to be of a high class, either for antiquity or for critical value.

MS. Harl. 6300 is a small quarto, on paper, probably of the commencement of saec. xv. It contains the *Hecuba* and the *Orestes*, in rather coarse and poor handwriting, but by no means difficult to read. The characters are marked in black ink. There are interlined glosses, but no scholia. In fol. 72 a few verses of the *Orestes* (829—844) seem copied by a different hand, though perhaps a change of pen will account for the variance. The iota is pretty regularly subscribed. At fol. 89 commences a different hand to the end of the play, *οἱ ἐγὼ τίνας τοῦσδ' εἰσορῶ; Ορε. σιγᾶν χρεών.* (v. 1347.) Here there are no glosses. Next comes the *Phoenissae*, in a different hand, and