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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 Valkenau, 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 Sceoni of W. Dindorf. With a full consciousness of the

¹ Euripidis Tragediae. Ex recensione Adolphi Kirchhoffii. Berolini, 1856. 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.
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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 copies. 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 variations, 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 know, the exact value of the

---

2 Between these two opposite schools of critics, the emendators and the non-emendators, there is interminable 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 Helen, the Ion, and the Iphigenia in Tauris, and still more Dr. Monk’s Cambridge edition of the two Iphigenias, are instances of works awkwardly carried out according to the extreme licence of conjectural emendation. That even Porson could be somewhat rash, will be shown in the Preface to the reprint of the text of Vol. ii.

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 veniat." Adolph Kirchhoff has shown, that Lascaris merely printed, with very slight conjectural emendations, the Paris transcript of Flor. 2 (marked 2836—8), consulting also in the Medea Par. 2818. Aldus chiefly adopted the text of the Pauline 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 2317.

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 Hecale, he followed Par. 2817 rather than the Pauline, which contains the two latter plays imperfect.ELSLEY did not know the sources of the Aldine text. He says in the Preface to the Bacchae, "Quid factum sit codice, quo neus 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 copies\footnote{Modern editions which admit extensive conjectural changes are in fact but repeti-
tions 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 Scenic, 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.}. 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 transcrip-
tion; 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
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 view, is grossly to abuse the true province of a critic.

It is a very common opinion, that Porson was one of those who hold 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 text, 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 Kirchhoff well says, in reference to his own design (Praef. p. xii), “Meminerint velim lectores, haec non scripta esse ipsis, quae cum voluptate legere cupiunt, quae a poeta aut potius aut scribi aut debuerint, verum antiquitates studioseus usibus me malusse inservire soli, quorum nihil interst it videri scri, quae scire nequem.”

7 This fault is continually objected to Porson by Herrmann. Mattheus 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.
long\textsuperscript{8}. 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, \textit{\textquotedblleft in usum tironum\textquotedblright}, Porson has perhaps been held in too high estimation. He is deficient in nearly all the points that constitute a practically useful book for learners\textsuperscript{9}. 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 essays\textsuperscript{1}, the outpourings of his scrap-books, \textit{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 \textit{\textquotedblleft tiron\textquotedblright} yet who read through, and perhaps few tirones have cared even to glance over, any one of these long notes. Nothing is gained by over-rating a man's labours\textsuperscript{2}. The simple truth is, that Porson, like other mortals, was any thing but infallible. The progress

\textsuperscript{8} \textit{\textquotedblleft Interpretandi et illustrandi labore, utilissimo sane, supersedendum duxi, partim ne libellus in librum excresceret.\textquotedblright} (Praef. ad Hec. p. 11.) He does not specify his other motive.

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{\textquotedblleft tironum usibus haec opolit potissimum destinata est.\textquotedblright}

\textsuperscript{1} He was quite conscious of this, for he playfully says on v. 675 of the Medea, \textit{\textquotedblleft Jam inde ab Orest. 5 lectorem monebam me longas, imo longissimas, nihil ad rem pertinentes, notas scribere potuisse.\textquotedblright}

\textsuperscript{2} Professor Schoefeld calls Porson \textit{\textquotedblleft praestantissimus Euripidis editor\textquotedblright} (Praef. p. viii), and so unable was he to realize the notion that a Porson \textit{could} be wrong, that he passses over or apologizes for some acknowledged deficiencies as matters of trivial 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 perfect 3. 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. Schodelford 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 fore codices param ab antiquitate commendabiles sunt, et quo frequentius describuntur, eo gravius interpolantur.” (Praef. Hec. p. 11.) Kirchhoff evinces great contempt for the host of late MSS. of the Hecuba, Orestes, and Phoenissae. “Hanc varietatis farresiginem equidem totam abjiciendam statui, quippe cujus nullus usus esset futurus sano 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 accident ⁶.

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 collated ⁶. 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 vocabularum, si opus est, transpositio?;”——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

⁶ 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 Enauch 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 ταῦτα δὲ ἡμῶν ἢμώνατος εὑς, he gives ἢμώνατος, while in the antistrophe he admits Musgrave’s violent and improbable change ἀναβακχεῖν for ἀναβακχέως. In v. 154 of the same play τίνα τόχαν εἶπο, τίνα δὲ συμφόρας, he destroys the metre by giving τίνας δὲ συμφόρας; In v. 1246, for τίνα θρεῖ τινὰ, πότινα, παρακάμειν κτλ., he reads τίνα θρεῖ τινὰ, δὲ πότινα; παρακάμειν κτλ. Sometimes, retaining the true reading, he prints dochmiacae as monometers, e. g. Orest. 1290—4.

⁷ His “audacio conjectura” on Orest. 1250, παλισσωπίαν for ἄλην σποιάν, is now found in the best Venice MS.
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ending senarii with words accented on the penultima ⁸, 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.” (Præf. 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 author ⁹, 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, Præf. p. v. Instances of Porson’s transposing words are Orest. 171—2, 683, 991—3, Phoen. 683, 989.

⁹ He intended, it appears, shortly to publish the whole of Euripides. “Monendus est lector, ceteras Euripidis fabulas ordine vulgato max profiuras, si modo hoc specimen reipublicae literariæ non dispuisses intellecor.” (Præf. Hec. ad fin.) There seems no reason (at least from the context) to interpret ceteras of the other three.
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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 ma-
ajority 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 cata-
logued in Matthiae's edition, or as an introduction to W. Din-
dorf's critical notes on this author. The main fact to be re-
membered 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 Alcestis, 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. ivi 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 made. 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 scholia, 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 Stobæus, 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 editions; 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 contends 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-

\[\text{xvi} \quad \text{PREFACE.}\]
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cles, and about twenty of Euripides⁴. 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 ἀντί-

⁴ ⁴ ἀγαλματικά), 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, Venice ¹, of the twelfth century, a quarto on parchment, marked 471, and containing the Heomba, 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 century ², on glossy paper (bombycinus), contains (with the loss

¹ ⁵ 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.

² ¹ Kirchhoff calls this “Codex Marcianus,” and refers to it under the letter A in his critical notes. He pronounces it “omniae facile praestantisimum,” and collated the whole of it himself at Venice. Hermann marks it Ven. a.

² ² Marked Rom. A by Elmsley. There is a late transcript of this in the Vatican VOL. III.
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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 Havniensis,” 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 (bombyeinun) in the thirteenth century. It contains only the Hecuba, the Orestes, the Phoenissae, and a fragment of the Medea (v. l—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 infection.”

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. 96, 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 (Præf. 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.
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(1.) A Paris MS. of the thirteenth century, No. 2713, 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.

(1.) 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 two \(^4\) 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 century, are

\(^{4}\) 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.
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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 transcription.

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 Euripides, viz. the Andromache, the Medea, the Supplices, the Rhesus, the Ion, the two Iphigenias, the Hippolytus, the Alcestis, the Troades, the Bacchae, the Cyclops, and the Heroicae. 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 Penthes, the Hippolytus the Phaedra, and the Orestes the Electra. 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 habitu sunt a libraris 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.
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In this work, authority 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 Euripides, viz. the Rhesus, Ion, and two Iphigenias are different from the rest. The Bacchae extends only to v. 754, and ends with ὦ δειμμῶν 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.

II. 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.).
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(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.
Heraclidæ, 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.
Bacchæ, 10, 11.
Hecuba, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12.

VOL. III.

Hercules Furens, 11.
Phoenissæ, 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 Phoenissæ, and the Orestes; and
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probably\(^1\) 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 collated\(^2\). 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 paper\(^3\), 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, taste 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.
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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 οὖ μεμπτός ἡμᾶν ὁ γάμος ἐς τὸν ἡμέρας (v. 425).

Anot. 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.

Anot. F. 3. 25, is a moderately thick quarto, written on fine glazed paper (bombyczium), in clear black ink, probably at the end of saec. xiv. This MS. comprises the Ajax, Electra, and Oedipus Rer, 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 ἀκριβθος ἕων ἐτι ναδα γάμειν, and accompanied with scholia. Then we have the Εργα 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.

Anot. 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.
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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 πελα (sic) σὸν ἄγρατος ἀνήρ (v. 1270) follows καὶ δὴ πέλας νυν δωμάτων εἶναι δοκῶ (v. 1214). The *Phoenissae* ends with σεμέλας θλασον ἱερὸν (sic) ὀρεσιν ἀνεχόρευσα (v. 1756).

Baroec. 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, θαύμαξε δ ὲς ἄν ἡ μὲν Ἐλλᾶς ἐτυγχή (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.

Baroec. 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.)

Baroec. 34 contains the *Phoenissae*, without notes or glosses, as far as σὺ τ’ αδι πρόσωπων πρός κασάγητου στρέφε (v. 457). It is a small quarto on paper, of a late date. It also contains the *Plautus*, 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 κώγῳ γαρ ἣν ποτ’, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκ εἰμ’ ἐτή (v. 284). Next comes the *Orestes* from φόνον ὁ λοξίας ἐμᾶς ματέρος (v. 165), to the end. Then
Δελαν' ἀπαθῶς ἐν ψυχῇ,
όροι δὲ λέγειν αἰτίλας ἢ
καὶ ὁ αἰτούς πάνεκερι,
οὐ γὰρ πρὸς τὸν διάλογον
οὐ καὶ ὁ θεὸς σὲ δείκνυς
καὶ κοινὴν ἐλεύθερον ἔργον
δασκάλη μου 


Τὰ ἐτεορχεία σαμβοῦν ἐκπαθήσας μὲν
ἀμέλητα
χρησμασάμεστον. οὐδὲ πάντως ἔρεισθεν
δύσπηκα
καὶ ἔσω. νυφήγοραδικην πολικράντων
χέρων ἐκείπρεπένδει
ἐς ἐν τῇ κυριακάζων διαλειῶν.

τριφύλλη ἠευτερίμελεον ὁδίπτου

Herl. M. S. 6300. fol. 131.
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follows the Phoenissae, then the Ajax, Electra, and Oedipus Rex of Sophocles. Next we have the Ἐργα of Hesiod, with numerous scholia. Then come the first eight Idylls of Theocritus (ending with Ναῦος γὰμον), also with scholia. After these we have Pindar’s Olympia, and finally the first book of the Iliad, with the second as far as ἄρχοντι αὖ νηῶν ἐρέω νῆας τε προπόσας (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 (Anct.) 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, ἀς ἔγω τίνας τούσδε εἰσορῶ; Οπε. νυγάν χρεών. (v. 1347.) Here there are no glosses. Next comes the Phoenissae, in a different hand, and