Almost a century ago \textsuperscript{1}) it was realized that there might be serious textual problems in \textit{Hecuba} 59-215. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (UvWM) defended the view that vv. 73-78, 90-97 and 211-215 could not belong to the original text of Euripides' play \textsuperscript{2}). His paper came too late (1909) for Murray, whose edition of Euripides had appeared as early as 1902; but Murray never saw reason to discuss UvWM's attack on the MSS tradition of this part of the play, let alone to leave these lines out of the text. In this respect Murray has been followed by all other scholars who produced either an edition \textsuperscript{3}) of the \textit{Hecuba} or a commentary \textsuperscript{4}). Without even referring to UvWM they all print and, \textit{casu quo}, explain the traditional text. This is not to say that nobody ever agreed with UvWM's views. The grand old man just lived to see Nestle and Pohlenz \textsuperscript{5}) acknowledge the necessity to remove these lines. Friedrich \textsuperscript{6}) later agreed that the 'Traumhexameter' (i.e. 73-78 and 90-91) should go, but

\textsuperscript{*} I am much indebted to Prof. Kamerbeek, Prof. Ruijgh, and to Mr van der Ben for criticism and advice on an earlier draft. Mr A. H. M. Kessels was helpful on the subject of 'dreams in tragedy'.

\textsuperscript{1} Baier had raised the question in 1874, Rassow and Maass proposed solutions in Hermes 22 (1887), 515-534 and \textit{ibidem} 24 (1889), 509-519.

\textsuperscript{2} Hermes 44 (1909), 446-449, now more easily accessible in his \textit{Kleine Schriften, IV} (Berlin 1962), 225-229.

\textsuperscript{3} Méridier (Paris 1956).

\textsuperscript{4} Italie (Zwolle 1929, a second edition in 1950); Tierney (Dublin 1946); Garzya (Roma-Napoli 1955).

\textsuperscript{5} W. Nestle, \textit{Die Struktur des Eingangs in der attischen Tragödie} (Stuttgart 1930\textsuperscript{1}, Hildesheim 1967\textsuperscript{2}), 61; and M. Pohlenz, \textit{Die griechische Tragödie} (Leipzig 1930\textsuperscript{1}, Göttingen 1954\textsuperscript{3}), I, 278 and II, 117.

he preferred to regard 92-97 as authentic. Biehl, after having studied the textual criticism and problems of interpolation in the Orestes, published a paper on the Hecuba in 1957, in which he agreed with UvWM on the essential points, and gave some new arguments. Because it seems to me that UvWM's views, even after Biehl's valuable contribution, did not receive the careful attention they deserve, I propose to go over the matter once again and to add some points which might be relevant. After (A) discussing 59-97, I shall restate and expand UvWM's theory of actors' interpolation (B), and finish with a discussion (C) of 154-215.

A. It is well to realize from the start that the assumption of interpolation is, if often the easiest, certainly not always the best way to solve textual problems. Miss A. M. Dale, who has done admirable work on the text of Euripides' Alcestis and Helen, observes in her introduction to the latter: "It may of course be hard to decide where corruption rather than interpolation is the cause of our difficulties; what should be decisive is the combination of clumsy expression or doubtful grammar or limping metre with expendability of sense". In cauda venenum. In our case this means that if the expendability of sense of 73-78 and 90-97 cannot be proved (as such demonstrations go), emendation of cruces are the only resources left to the critic.

Therefore it is necessary first to read the whole passage 59-97, and to take into consideration its setting between the prologue (1-59) and the parodos (98ff.). This prologue is a fairly complete exposition of all facts past, present and future which are relevant to the action of this play. In this respect it is comparable to virtually

3) M. Imhof, Bemerkungen zu den Prologen der Sophokleischen und Euripideischen Tragödien (Winterthur 1957), 78, rejects 73-78, 90-97 and (hesitatingly) 211-215 without giving any arguments; he simply refers to Nestle and Pohlenz. In a similar way W. Steidle, Studien zum antiken Drama (München 1968), does not go beyond stating succinctly (47, n. 22) that Biehl's arguments have convinced him as far as 73-78 and 90-97 are concerned.
4) P. xxxii.