

A PROPOS THE NEW EDITION OF EURIPIDES' TROADES

The new edition of Eur. *Troades* by Werner Biehl (BT 1970)¹ has been reviewed in detail by K.H. Lee in *Gnomon* (1973) 296 ff; the three notes ventured here deal with problems not touched by Lee.

I. "*Stob* (= P . . .)"? (v. ap. crit. *ad* 98 and 101 ff.)

Biehl's ap. crit. *ad* 98 reads: . . . *choro tribuit etiam Stob*.

This statement is not precise, as 98 ff. are not found in Stobaeus. What Biehl may have intended to indicate by it seems to become clear from his ap. crit. *ad* 101 f.: *choro tribuit Stob* (= P; v. *ad* 98): since 101 f. continue 98 ff., and 98–101 ff. (= 98–104) are not divided between different personae in either of the traditions, the whole passage being attributed by VQ¹ to Hecuba but to the chorus by P — Stobaeus (or his *Vorlage*) will have quoted from a text which began with 98 attributed to the chorus, i.e. a text of the P tradition.

Which may, but need not, be true. It seems that attribution to Chorus by Stobaeus may have been influenced by factors outside the MS tradition of the Greek tragedians.

From the twenty-two² passages in *Stob*. attributed to the chorus³ five only

¹ It is the second in the BT series of the plays of Euripides which was started with the *Helen* (ed. K. Alt) in 1964, and has been followed recently by the *Hecuba* (ed. S.D. Daitz, 1973).

² "Chor." (or the like) not being indexed in either Meinecke's edition of Stobaeus (BT 1855–7) nor in that of Wachsmuth-Hense (Berlin 1884–1912), the detection of the passages marked as choral is possible only by thorough perusal of the whole corpus of *Stob*. in both editions, with their app. critt., as Hense seems to have exiled into his such designation from passages in preserved plays the utterer of which is not the chorus, e.g. Eur. Hipp. 203–7 = *Stob*. 4.44.34 (*sunt potius nutricis verba*) and Eur. *IA* 28 ff. = *Stob*. 4.41.6 (*falso*). Some passage or passages may have been overlooked; however, it is hoped that the results achieved by a more precise technique would not be different in kind from the ones offered here; while it must be borne in mind that even the most accurate results will be based on a far from sound tradition, as attribution to chorus seems to be found in one only of the MSS (Hense's S = Meinecke's Vind.), which carries part only of the Stobaeian corpus (it is not represented in vols. 1 and 2 of the Wachsmuth-Hense edition) and even that not complete; moreover, the notae chori seem to have been added rather haphazardly (S *appos.*, *praef.*, *add.* or signed *in extremo* (or other) *marginē* the notam chori, which too differs from place to place; v. ap. crit. *ad* 4.39.29; 4.39.2; 4.16.11; 4.48.17; 4.44.34; 4.41.6).

All references are to the Wachsmuth-Hense edition.

³ There may be more. The twenty-two are (W.-H.):

3. 8. 2,	Soph. <i>Acrisios</i>	(= fr. 58 N ²)
3. 22. 22,	Soph. <i>Tereus</i>	(= fr. 531 ")

are from preserved plays (Soph. *El.* 1082 ff.; Eur. *Hipp.* 203 ff.; Eur. *Tro.* 101 f.; Eur. *Bacch.* 389 ff.; Eur. *IA* 28ff.)⁴. Only in these is it possible to verify the attribution, which turns out to be correct in Soph. *El.* 1082 ff. and Eur. *Bacch.* 389 ff.; in neither Eur. *Hipp.* 203 ff. nor *IA* 28 ff.⁵ is Stobaeus' false attribution found also in a MS of Greek tragedy.

With three out of five demonstrable⁶ attributions wrong, and of these three only one found also in a Euripidean MS, the agreement in error seems to be accidental, each MS having arrived at it independently of the other and, most probably, for different reasons. P may have misunderstood the self-address of Hecuba⁷ as an address by others⁸. With Stobaeus the question to be asked ought not to be limited to *Tro.* 101 f. but to be general: what may have induced Stob. to attribute to the chorus passages not uttered by it?

No solution to this question is given here. The clue may be metrical — out of the twenty-two passages noted XOP only one (Stob. 4.29.13 = Eur. fr. 261

3. 37. 4,	Soph. <i>El.</i> 1082 ff.	
3. 38. 14,	Eur. <i>Phoenix</i>	(= fr. 814 N ²)
3. 38. 26,	Soph. <i>Creusa</i>	(= fr. 327 ")
4. 14. 1,	Eur. <i>Cresph.</i>	(= fr. 453 ")
4. 14. 4,	Eur. <i>Erechth.</i>	(= fr. 369 ")
4. 16. 11,	Eur. <i>Bacch.</i> 389 ff.	
4. 29. 13,	Eur. <i>Archel.</i>	(= fr. 261 ")
4. 22.176,	Eur. <i>Hipp.</i>	(= fr. 429 ")
4. 39. 2,	Eur. <i>Alex.</i>	(= fr. 52 ")
4. 39. 29,	Soph. <i>Tyro</i>	(= fr. 606 ")
4. 32. 39,	Eur. <i>Archel.</i>	(= fr. 230 ")
4. 34. 39,	Soph. <i>Tereus</i>	(= fr. 533 ")
4. 41. 6,	Eur. <i>IA</i> 28 ff.	
4. 41. 17,	Eur. <i>Andromeda</i>	(= fr. 153 ")
4. 34. 15,	Eur. <i>Tro.</i> 101 f.	
4. 44. 34,	Eur. <i>Hipp.</i> 203 ff.	
4. 34. 47,	Eur. <i>Alex.</i>	(= fr. 46 ")
4. 48. 17,	Eur. <i>Andromeda</i>	(= fr. 119 ")
4. 52. 29,	Eur. <i>Philoct.</i>	(= fr. 791 ")
4. 53. 1,	Soph. <i>Tant.</i>	(= fr. 518 ")

N.B.: None from Aeschylus, although he is represented in Stob. *Florileg.*

⁴ For the numbers in Stob. (W.-H.) see n. 3.

⁵ The attribution to chorus by Stob. is not mentioned in the ap. crit. of Murray and Barrett.

⁶ Nothing can be proved about the fragmentary quotations. It may be worthwhile to point out that there is a problem with Stob. 4.14.4 (Eur. fr. 369 N²): the chorus of the Erechtheus is known to have consisted of women, but the fragment is masc.; v. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin 1875) 174.

⁷ Vocative: line 98; imperatives: lines 98, 99, 101, 102, 103.

⁸ When Hecuba, in 105–6, switches over to the first person singular, P gives the lines to her.

N²) is in iambic trimeter; the rest are lyrics⁹ or anapaests¹⁰. Stobaeus may have been inclined to use "chorus" as a metrical term = not iambic; or, at least, connected metre different from the iambic trimeter with choral utterance. This view seems to be supported by the lack of XOP with the choral ia. trim. comments between tragic ῥήσεις (or the like) which are not infrequently found in the Stob. collection¹¹; but is contradicted by (a) the one passage in iambic trimeters which does bear the sign XOP, and (b) the presence in the Stob. corpus of both lyrical and anapaestic passages not signed XOP.¹²

This, however, may be a problem for the scholar of Stobaeus. As to Eur. *Tro.* 101 f. no further investigation seems to be required to show that the XOP of Stob. 4.34.15 does not necessarily support the tradition of P.

II. *Tro.* 12 (11–12)

Biehl follows Parmentier (Paris, Budé 1925) and Murray (Oxford 1913)³ in his preference of V βρέτας over P and Q¹ βάρος; in the ap. crit. he supports his choice (as did Parmentier) by reference to ξόανον which stands for the Trojan Horse in 525.

It seems, however, that the case of βάρος¹³ ought to be reconsidered and that it may be arguable both negatively and positively:

a. βρέτας seems to have been used¹⁴ exclusively¹⁵ to designate sculptured cult-images of anthropomorphic gods¹⁶ — so much so that the word was explained as derived from βροτός¹⁷ — and it is therefore hardly applicable

⁹ 13: 3.8.2; 3.37.4; 3.38.14; 3.38.26; 4.14.4; 4.16.11; 4.22.176; 4.39.2; 4.39.29; 4.34.39; 4.48.7; 4.52.29.

¹⁰ 8: 3.22.22; 4.32.39; 4.41.6; 4.41.17; 4.34.15; 4.44.34; 4.34.47; 4.53.1.

N.B.: The three wrong attributions, Eur. *Hipp.* 203 ff., *Tro.* 101 f., *IA* 28 ff. are anapaestic.

¹¹ e.g. *Andr.* 181–2 (= 4.22.164), 727–8 (= 4.50.73); *Tro.* 608–9 (= 4.54.4), *Ion* 381 (= 4.34.43a), *IA* 376–7 (= 4.27.3).

¹² e.g. *Soph. Aj.* 157 ff. (= 4.1.19), *OT* 873–4 (= 4.8.11), Eur. *Heracl.* 625 (= 3.29.5), *Bacch.* 386–8 (= 3.36.13).

¹³ βάρος was preferred by 19th cent. editors, e.g. Paley 1857.

¹⁴ βρέτας is not attested before Attic tragedy, and in the Classical period in Attic drama only, not in *Soph.* but in *A. Pers.* 809; *Supp.* 429, 463, 885; *Th.* 96, 98, 185, 212; *Eu.* 80, ? 171 ?, 242, 259, 409, 439, 446, 1024, in Eur. *Alc.* 974; *Heracl.* 936; *Andr.* 311; *El.* 1254; ? *Tro.* 12 ?; *IT* 980, 986, 1040, 1044, 1165, 1179, 1199, 1291, 1453, 1477, 1481, 1489; *Phoen.* 1250, 1473, and in *Ar. Ec.* 31, 32; *Lys.* 262.

¹⁵ In the relevant period. See also n. 17, end.

¹⁶ A.: βρέτας Ἀθηνᾶς, θεᾶς, δαιμόνων, θεῶν.

E.: βρέτας θεᾶς, τῆς θεοῦ, Παλλάδος, Διός, Ζηνός, θεῶν.

N.B.: Where not explicitly stated, the "whose" is always inferable.

¹⁷ Σχ. *ad Phoen.* 1473: βρέτας ἄγαλμα. λέγεται κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν βροτῶν εἴκελον. Hesychii Lexicon: βρέτας: . . . παρὰ τὸ βροτῶ εἰοικέναι.

Indeed, the one and only instance of βρέτας used not to designate a sculptured cult-image of an anthropomorphic god seems to be in an inscription (*IG* 7, 118; 2nd cent. A.D.) where it serves for the wooden image of a man.

here. ξόανον, referred to for support, had a much wider range of meaning: explained as derived from ξέω¹⁸ it served¹⁹ for (wooden?) structures of different kinds, including, besides cult images²⁰, also (the wooden frame of?) a musical instrument²¹; it was thus well suited to denote the structure of the Trojan ("Wooden") Horse.

b. βάρος, in addition to its literal meaning, would also continue the metaphor of pregnancy²² in ἐγκύμον' ἵππον τευχέων²³. Moreover, the reading δλέθριον βάρος with the interpretation here suggested may have been known to Ennius, as seems likely from *gravidus armatis equus qui suo partu . . . perdet Pergama*²⁴, where *partu perdet* may reflect δλέθριον βάρος.

Independently from the problem of βρέτας vs. βάρος, a change in punctuation seems advisable in *Tro.* 11–12: by the removal of the comma from the end of 11 to between the 7th and 8th element of 12, ἐγκύμον' ἵππον τευχέων becomes the direct object both of the participle ξυναρμόσας and the verb ἐπεμψεν, with δλέθρ.β. as apposition — which may be preferable.

III. *Metrica.*

The reader who scans Biehl's edition is aided by signs indicating (a) lengthening by position in cases of *muta cum liquida* (e.g. 3: ἴχ'νος), (b) epic correction (e.g. 145: τύφεται Ἴλιον) and (c) synizesis (e.g. 142: χαλκεγγέων, 981: μὴ ἀμαθεῖς) .But

1. these signs, though frequent, are not consistent²⁵ and therefore mislead the reader who comes to rely on them;
2. epic correction may not need indication in this context — in tragedy it may rather be hiatus which would call for such;
3. the lengthening of a short vowel before μν ought, perhaps, not to be

¹⁸ Hsch. ξόανα: . . . κυρίως . . . τὰ ἐκ ξύλων ἐξεσμένα, ἢ λίθων.

¹⁹ In the relevant period. Not in A. and Ar.; in Soph. and Eur. only in the passages referred to in notes 20 and 21 in addition to *Tro.* 525.

²⁰ Eur. *Tro.* 1074, *IT* 1359, *Ion* 1403.

²¹ Soph. fr. 217 N²: ξόαν' ἡδυμελῆ.

²² cf. A. *Cho.* 992: τέκνων . . . βάρος.

²³ The horse and its contents are interchanged also in *Tro.* 561.

²⁴ Ennius fr. XXVI, 72–3, ed. Jocelyn (Cambridge 1967).

²⁵ I missed the indicating sings for

(a) 84 (νεκρῶν), 93 (πατρός), 379 (ἐγίγνετο), 594 (νεκρῶν), 620 (μέτρον, ἀριθμός), 627 (πέπλους), 628 (προσφαγμάτων), 739 (νεκρόν), 743 (γίγνεται), 746 (μέλαθρον), 754 (πατρός), 986 (Ἀμύκλαις), 1058 (δλεθρος), 1064-5 (καπνόν), 1099 (ἔδραι), 1141 (κέδρου), 1152 (νεκρόν), 1184 (προσφθέγματα);

(b) 161 (οἱ ἐγώ), 511 (μοι Ἴλιον), 533 (πεύκα ἐν), 788 (καὶ ἀναιδεία), 826 (δαίεται ἠῖνες);

(c) 27 (θεῶν), 86 (θεούς), 414 (Ἀτρέως), 444 (Ὀδυσσέως), 451 (θεῶν), 623 (Ἀχιλλέως), 797 (μὴ οὐ), 932 (θεᾶς), 969 (θεαῖσι), 979 (θεῶν), 982 (μὴ οὐ), 1126 (Νεοπτόλεμος), 1127 (Πηλέως), 1177 (δστέων), 1225 (Ὀδυσσέως), 1280 (θεοί).

There may be more.

considered optional (as is implied by $\mu^{\prime}\nu$ in 139 and elsewhere²⁶): the rare $\mu\nu$ being controversial²⁷, it seems that $-\mu\nu$ should be assumed;

4. $\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa^{\prime}\rho^{\prime}$ (in 993) should be $\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\rho^{\prime}$ —as it stands, the length of the iota would be wrongly assumed to be due to position.

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

RAANANA MERIDOR

²⁶ This too is not marked consistently. Cf. 139 (Ἀγαμεμ'νονίαις), 206 (σεμ'νῶν), 214 (σεμ'νάν), 385 (ὄμ'νήσει), 650 (ἔμιμ'νον); but 495 (δεμνίῶν), 512 (ὄμων), 563 (δεμνίσις), 834 (γυμνασίῶν), 1296 (τέραμνα).

²⁷ v. E. Fraenkel *ad A. Ag.* 991 discussed *ad* 978.