408

FURTHER CRITICAL NOTES ON EURIPIDES' *HIPPOLYTUS*[1]

29–33. Phaedra's ἔρως must at first (at Athens) have been *without betraying symptoms*, by contrast with the change at Trozen to symptoms of νόσος (still unexplained) as described in 34–40. We need to be told that explicitly, in preparation (μέν) for 34ff. (ἐπεὶ δέ . . .) and in conjunction with the potentially revealing foundation of a temple to Aphrodite. We therefore need not only Jortin's ὀνομάσουσιν for ὠνόμαζεν in 33, but also my ἄδηλον for ἔκδημον (v.l. ἔκδηλον) in 32.[2] The nearby ἔκδημον in 37 will have played a part in the corruption.

42. †δείξω δὲ Θησεῖ† (Θ- δὲ δ- V) πρᾶγμα κἀκφανήσεται. Obelization is commended by the combination of questionable sense (much discussed), V's variant and the enigmatic divergence of *Π²* (. . .]τοις πρα[. . .). Broadhead argued well that we need τό with πρᾶγμα, but his θήσω δ' ἐγὼ τὸ πρᾶγμα needs an adverb.[3] Better therefore δείξω δ' ἐγώ (or δέ πως?) τὸ πρᾶγμα, on the supposition that both Θησεῖ (differently placed in V) and *Π*'s dative plural came in as intended clarifications. But better still would be δειχθήσεται τὸ πρᾶγμα κἀκφανήσεται (which could otherwise have generated Θησεῖ). For the asyndeton thus, cf. *Med.* 365–6 ἀλλ' οὔτι ταύτηι ταῦτα, μὴ δοκεῖτέ πω· | ἔτ' εἴσ' ἀγῶνες . . . *Π²* may then have had δειχθησετ αυ]τοις or ασ]τοις.[4]

67–71[–2].

ἅ<τε> μέγαν κατ' οὐρανὸν		ch ia
ναίεις εὐπατέρειαν αὐ-		gl
λὰν Ζηνὸς πολύχρυσον [οἶκον]·		ph
χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ μάλιστα καλ-	70	ch ia

[1] My previous notes in *CQ* n.s. 18 (1968), 11–43, related mainly to W. S. Barrett's edition (Oxford, 1964). Since then we have had the new texts of J. Diggle (*Euripides Fabulae* i, Oxford, 1984), D. Kovacs (*Euripides* ii, Loeb 1995), and W. Stockert (*Euripides Hippolytus*, Teubner 1994), all with supporting critical studies: respectively *Studies on the text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981) and *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994); *The Heroic Muse* (Baltimore, 1987), 'Conjectanea Euripidea', *GRBS* 29 (1988), 125, and *Euripidea altera* (Leiden, 1996); 'Zum Text des Euripideischen Hippolytos', *Prometheus* 20 (1994), 211–33. Of other studies, more than one reference will be made to: J. W. Fitton's review of Barrett in *Pegasus* 8 (1967), 17–43; H. D. Broadhead, *Tragica* (Christchurch, 1968); L. P. E. Parker, 'Split resolution in Greek dramatic lyric', *CQ* 18 (1968), 241–69; J. A. J. M. Buijs, 'Studies in the lyric metres of Greek tragedy', *Mnemosyne* 38 (1985), 62–92, and 39 (1986), 42–73; A. Sommerstein, 'Notes on Euripides' *Hippolytus*', *BICS* 35 (1988), 23–41; T. C. W. Stinton, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990); M. R. Halleran (trans. with comm.) (Warminster, 1995). I have benefited greatly from correspondence or direct contact with Professor Diggle, Professor Kovacs, and Dr Stockert; Professor C. Collard also has made many helpful comments. My review of Stockert's edition (to which these notes may be read as complementary) is in *JHS* 118 (1998), 213. Some observations on metrical issues anticipate fuller treatment in my projected *Cantica Tragica*.

[2] ἄσημον would suggest that only the *object* of the ἔρως was unknown. Hartung's excision of 29–33 has been revived by H. Van Looy (*Studi . . . De Falco* [Naples, 1971], 135–40); remedial indeed, but the five lines are not convincingly accounted for as an interpolation (*ex hypothesi*, with the text unemended), whether as from the earlier *Hippolytus* or as composed *ad hoc.* G. Danek (*WSt* 105 [1992], 19ff.) contributes little of value.

[3] LSJ τίθημι A.vii, cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 262–5.

[4] False elision of -αι is frequent in the tradition (always false in tragedy, cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 313).

<div align="center">λίστα τῶν κατ' Ὄλυμπον [παρθένων Ἄρτεμι].   *ph*</div>

67 ἄ<τε>] αἳ (et ναίετ' 68) <L>P et B^c, ἄ cett.   68 εὐπατέρει' ἀν' Gaisford   69 οἶκον del. Cobet   70 μάλιστα Kovacs: καλλίστα codd.   72 παρθένων ἄρτεμι om. (del. Nauck)

67. *El.* 153 (alone) is insecure support for the contextually unusual lekythion.[5] Weil's μεγάλαν has been commended;[6] but μέγαν οὐρανόν is epic (*Il.* 1.497, etc.). ἄ<τε> is a better way of obtaining *ch ia* (as 70 and 1387 below, qq.v.): a characteristic hymnic use, cf. *Hec.* 445, *IT* 1237, *Ion* 882, 908, *Or.* 321, S. *El.* 151, etc.[7]

68–9. Gaisford's εὐπατέρει' ἀν' for -ειαν (not mentioned by Barrett or Diggle, merely disparaged by Stockert in conjunction with μεγάλαν) merits more consideration than it has received. *Pace* Halleran, the extended use of εὐπατέρεια with αὐλή is peculiar, since εὐπατ-words always elsewhere describe *persons* as 'having a good father', and A.R. 1.570–1 εὐπατέρειαν Ἄρτεμιν could well be an echo of our passage, if not of a common source. On balance the shortage of parallels for the placing of such a nominative epithet within such a second-person relative clause is a deterrent; and the simple accusative with ναίεις is stylish (especially in conjunction with κατ' οὐρανόν, cf. *El.* 992 οἳ φλογερὰν αἰθέρ' ἐν ἄστροις ναίουσι). But -ει' ἀν' could yet be right.[8]

Be that as it may, οἶκον is otiose after αὐλὰν Ζηνός, cf. τὴν Διὸς αὐλήν *PV* 122, Ζηνός . . . αὐλή *Od.* 4.74 (associated there with gold, electrum, silver, and ivory). It is certainly *de trop* with Gaisford's emendation; but for the phrase-pattern without οἶκον, if we keep εὐπατέρειαν, cf. *Med.* 212–13 ἁλμυρὰν Πόντου κλῆιδ' ἀπέραντον (-ατον Blaydes). This excision also gives a not unwelcome reduction to a standard *gl ʃ ph* dicolon, more in line with the pattern of this song; and cf. the certain interpolation at the end of the stanza.[9]

70–1. χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ καλλίστα καλλίστα . . . resists satisfactory metrical analysis. Diggle's division after – ◡ – ◡ – – – is odd (Stockert strangely calls it an aristophanean), but better than either χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ καλλίστα καλ-/λίστα . . ., or χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ καλλί-/στα καλλίστα . . . The former (as Barrett) is rightly rejected by Buijs (1985) as having word-division after long penult.; moreover – ◡ – – – – – exists only as a form of paroemiac (*2an*ᴧ) or contraction of – ◡ ◡ – – ◡ ◡ – (as at *Pho.* 136). Both divisions give overlap following a verse ending with three long syllables:[10] such commonly terminal verses, as I shall argue elsewhere, virtually always end with full word-division and usually clear pause.

Kovacs's sparkling conjecture μάλιστα καλλίστα is surely right, giving – ◡ ◡ – ◡ – ◡ – again, straightforwardly followed, with two-syllable overlap, by a clausular pherecra-

---

[5] Professor Diggle has drawn my attention to *Cresphontes* fr. 453.9 and *Telephus* fr. 149A (727c K).5. In the former I prefer Bergk's ἴθι μοι, πότν[ι]α, πόλιν to Diggle's <ἴθ'> ἴθι μοι, πότνια, πόλιν. An ionic verse there associates well with the preceding φιλοστεφάνους τε κώμους, akin to – ◡ – ◡ – ◡ – –. In the latter, εὐθὺς Ἰλίου πόρον Ἀτρεΐδας ἰδέσθαι should be taken together as *e ◡ D : ba*, akin ◡ *e ◡ D : ba* at *Alc.* 231–2 γυναῖκα κατθανοῦσαν ἐν ἄματι τῶιδ' ἐπόψηι (as I shall argue further elsewhere).

[6] M. L. West, *BICS* 27 (1980), 9.   [7] Diggle, *Euripidea* 325.

[8] ἀν' αὐλάν, cf. ἀν' ὕλην 17, χρυσέαν κατ' αὐλάν *Hcld.* 916, etc. The authority for such relative clauses is E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig, 1913), 168–76, but cf. also Kühner–Gerth 2.419. εὐπατ-, cf. also εὐπάτειρα (of Artemis?) at *Cretans* fr. 472bc K.8.

[9] Cobet deleted οἶκον, but he also got rid of αὐλάν (proposing αἰγλήεντα with οὐρανόν). The status of οἶκον here is similar to that of ἐστίν at *Hcld.* 376 (del. Blomfield).

[10] ὦ καλλί-/στα also gives word-end after overlapping long anceps, in conflict with a colometric rule which it must suffice merely to adumbrate here.

tean.[11] For the corruption, cf. *Hec*. 620–1 ὦ πλεῖστ᾽ ἔχων μάλιστά τ᾽ εὐτεκνώτατε |
Πρίαμε, where all the MSS have καλλ- for μάλ-.[12] μάλιστα καλλίστα is both more
strikingly assonant and a stronger superlative than the merely reduplicated καλλίστα.
Attention is thus strongly focused on the *extravagant* adoration of Artemis, with a
progression from καλλίστα πολύ, in terms more conventionally proper to Aphrodite
(*Hel.* 1348–9 καλλίστα . . . μακάρων Κύπρις, *IA* 553, *Phaethon* 232D). It is not
simply Hippolytus' servants who thus utter a veiled insult to the Love-goddess. That
would indeed be surprising. But we should recognize, and the staging should make
clear, that this is the entry-song of Hippolytus himself, behaving (with attendants) in
such a way as to invite the wrath of Aphrodite.[13] The implicit point is scarcely too
abstruse, in the light of lines 10–16 in Aphrodite's immediately preceding prologue-
speech. There is a comparable veiled comparison of Artemis and Aphrodite in the
Parodos, where the main chorus speculates about the hypothetical agency of Artemis,
when we know the agent to be Aphrodite, in terms applicable to Aphrodite (especially
at 148–50 φοιτᾶι γάρ . . . δίναις ἐν νοτίαις ἅλμας).

123–4. My transposition πα-/γὰν ῥυτὰν has become the vulgate. I now think it
wrong, or at least unnecessary. ῥυτὰν παγὰν can be satisfactorily accommodated in a
different colometry: Ὠκεανοῦ τις ὕδωρ | στάζουσα πέτρα λέγεται, βαπτὰν |
κάλπισι ῥυτὰν (*ia*) : παγὰν προιεῖσα κρημνῶν (*hag*) ~ τειρομέναν νοσερᾶι | κοίται
δέμας ἐντὸς ἔχειν οἴκων, | λεπτὰ δὲ φάρεα (φάρη) : ξανθὰν κεφαλὰν σκιάζειν.
D | – D : – – (× D × –) is similar to the opening D | – D : *ba* at *Alc.* 435–6 (~445–6)
ὦ Πελίου θύγατερ, | χαίρουσά μοι εἰν Ἀίδα δόμοισιν | . . ., and there is advantage
in ending a verse at the comma after οἴκων in ant. The iambic metra thus are in
accurate responsion.[14]

141, 145. †σὺ γάρ† . . .; †σὺ δ᾽† . . .; For the new proposals σίγ᾽ ἄρ᾽ (A. Rijksbaron)
and ὧδ᾽, see *Mnemosyne* 51 (1998), 712–15 and 715–18.

165.   δι᾽ ἐμᾶς ἧιξέν ποτε νηδύος ἅδ᾽ αὔρα·   165

Not . . . ἅδ᾽ | αὔρα· Metre and syntax can be expected to proceed in harmony
in non-strophic verse. ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – (*A* × –) is a favourite length (as *Alc.*
396–7, *Andr.* 480, *Ion* 716, etc.), here with the same contraction of *A* as in *Andr.* 794
καὶ ἐπ᾽ Ἀργώιου δορὸς Ἄξενον ὑγρὰν | . . . The context is enoplian,[15] and the
following (concluding) sentence is straightforward D/e: τὰν δ᾽ εὔλοχον οὐρανίαν |
τόξων μεδέουσαν αὔτευν | Ἄρτεμιν, καί μοι πολυζήλωτος αἰεὶ | σὺν θεοῖσι φοιτᾶι
(– D : – D – : e – e – e – : *ith*).

---

[11] A conjecture χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ καλὰ καλ-/λίστα . . . is wrongly attributed to me by Kovacs. The
idea (no longer favoured) which I had communicated to him was in fact <χαῖρε> χαῖρέ μοι ὦ |
καλλίστα . . . (cf. 64, where only A has the anadiplosis); – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – | . . . as 545, etc.

[12] Corr. Harry; cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 232–3.

[13] The sentiments expressed by the προσπόλων ὀπισθόπους κῶμος (54–5) cannot be other
than those of their royal ἔξαρχος. Editors differ as to the speaker-indications at 58 and 61. My
inclination would be simply to print ΙΠΠΟΛΥΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΩΜΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΠΟΛΩΝ at 58,
with no further indication of speaker. In general, song designated as 'choral' may often in
practice have been initiated by a single vocalist as 'Leader'.

[14] For the split resolution after long anceps in str. (Parker 252), cf. S. *El.* 212, *Phil.* 201. Eur. has
both φᾰρ- and φᾱρ- (more often φᾱρ-). On ῐ before ρ-, see Diggle, *Euripidea* 456–8.

[15] 'Enoplian' as defined (so as to include D/e) in my commentary on *Orestes*, p. xx.

170–2.   ἀλλ' ἥδε τροφὸς γεραιὰ πρὸ θυρῶν   170
              τήνδε κομίζουσ' ἔξω μελάθρων
              <στείχει . . . >·
              στυγνὸν δ' ὀφρύων νέφος αὐξάνεται·

Diggle relegates to his apparatus the unconvincing transposition of line 172 to follow 180 (Wilamowitz, Barrett). Stockert is rightly dissatisfied with the text (unlike Kovacs and Halleran); but Murray's excision of 172 is too arbitrary. Perhaps rather there is a lacuna after line 171. Confirmation comes from the baldness of τήνδε after ἥδε τροφὸς γεραιά, and the absence of a finite verb in the approach-announcement. It is not hard to devise an appropriate supplement beginning with στείχει . . . (cf. *Med.* 46–7 ἀλλ' οἵδε παῖδες ἐκ τρόχων πεπαυμένοι | στείχουσι . . .), vulnerable to a skip before στυγνὸν . . . One might then simply complete a monometer with νύμφαν (cf. *Med.* 150); but one looks for something more in preparation for the comment on Phaedra's '*increasing* frown' in 172 (presumably after further observation). So perhaps something like στείχει νύμφαν δύσθυμον (or σκυθρωπὸν) ἰδεῖν, or στείχει μογεράν βασίλειαν (the latter with pause at a paroemiac full close). These supplements also serve to clarify which lady is frowning (cf. 290). Or indeed a case might be made for a larger lacuna (clarifying also the change from the *veiled head* described in 134–5).

276–7.   Χο. πότερον ὑπ' ἄτης †ἠ† θανεῖν πειρωμένη;
              Τρ. θανεῖν· ἀσιτεῖ δ' εἰς ἀπόστασιν βίου.

There is little likelihood of θανεῖν in 277 having extruded something like οὐκ οἶδ' (Wilamowitz, Barrett, Kovacs) or ἄδηλ' (Musgrave). Murray's interrogative θανεῖν; accepted by Diggle with Purgold's γ ' for δ ', gives a response inappropriately 'indignant or incredulous' according to Diggle's own evidence ('cf. *Studies* 50–2'). In reply to a question about ἄτη and about the motive for Phaedra's fasting, the Nurse will naturally affirm the wish *to die* (cf. 139–40), without commitment as to ἄτη; and for that my θανεῖν <γ '> is easy, but perhaps unnecessary. The problem really lies in 276, where the alternatives propounded are not mutually exclusive. 'Attempting to die' is consistent with, indeed likely to be the consequence of, some disturbance of the mind's balance, such παρακοπή (cf. *Ag.* 223) being in turn consistent with ἄτη (madness being in general attributed to some supernatural cause). What then of ἤ? A question can be posed with πότερον and without a following 'or' (sc. 'or not'; LSJ πότερος II.3); at the same time 'or' might well be erroneously introduced in such a place. One might then consider changing ἤ to καὶ ('even') or κατ- or δὴ or του ('some ἄτη'). But it may suffice to change the accent: πότερον ὑπ' ἄτης (sc. οὕτως ἀσιτεῖ)ἔ ἦ θανεῖν πειρωμένηἔ This is a common verse-pattern in stichomythia (if not elsewhere with πότερον), ἦ in the second question having either neutral or (as here) some 'surprised/ disbelieving' force; cf. especially *Andr.* 1062 ποίαν περαίνων ἐλπίδ'; ἦ γῆμαι θέλων; (similarly concerned with motive and with the leading verb twice understood), also *Cyc.* 117, *Hec.* 1256, *El.* 967, *IT* 503, 1168, *Pho.* ?269, 388, *Ba.* 1290; [A.] *PV* 773, S. *OT* 622, *El.* 407, *OC* 643. More often than not the ἦ is wrongly transmitted as ἤ.[16]

---

[16] I should now (with LSJ s.v. ἦ II.1.a) write ἦ also in *Or.* 1425 σὺ δ' ἦσθα ποῦ τότ'; ἦ πάλαι φεύγεις φόβωι; (so also Biehl, ed. Teubner, but perhaps merely by accident since he does not comment). 'Where were *you* at that time? *Can it be that* (you were not present to give aid because) you had already run away?' 'Or' does indeed make sense, but the many parallels cited favour ἦ. A reader points out that in such sequences the ἦ . . . ἔ question is nearly always epexegetic. So here: 'Is she mentally afflicted (as the cause of this apparently suicidal fasting)? Can she really be trying to die? (which would be evidence of παρακοπή)'.

328. σοῦ (σου) μὴ τυχεῖν is odd phrasing, and scarcely constitutes a κακόν than which none is μεῖζον. Nauck's σε μὴ εὐτυχεῖν remains plausible, or Broadhead's μή σ᾿ εὐτυχεῖν.

365. The variants ἰώ μοι (MBOA), ἰώ μοί μοι (KLP), and οἴμοι οἴμοι (VCDE) are likely enough to conceal simply ὤμοι or οἴμοι: cf. *Herc.* 1065, S. *Ant.* 1265. We can then keep ὦ Γᾶ καὶ Φῶς in 672 (see further below).

366. ὤ (*sic*) τάλαινα τῶνδ᾿ ἀλγέων (sc. ἐγώ).[17] Everyone seems explicitly or tacitly to have taken 366 as addressing Phaedra in line with 372 ὦ τάλαινα παῖ Κρησία. Rather, the chorus are here *self-pityingly* expressing their own shocked anguish. For such idiom with ἐγώ understood (here following ὀλοίμαν ἔγωγε πρὶν σᾶν, φίλα, κατανύσαι φρενῶν· ὤμοι, φεῦ φεῦ), cf. 822, 837, *IT* 869, *Hel.* 240, and similarly οἴμοι (ὤμοι) τάλαινα *El.* 1109, S. *Aj.* 340, ἰὼ τάλας *OC* 876, etc. Theirs are 'these griefs' (ἄλγη), as sympathetic φίλαι. Phaedra's predicament would more naturally be described as τάδε πάθη (cf. 363) or κακά (cf. 368). For this more egotistic interpretation, with stronger (even hyperbolic) emphasis upon the grief of the chorus, see further on 669–82 (especially 679) and 1142–6 below. It may well have been confusion over the interpretation that prompted the changed line-order 367–6 in part of the tradition, with 366 ὤ τάλαινα ... moved next to the address to Phaedra in 368–9.

505–6.   τἀισχρὰ δ᾿ ἢν λέγῃς καλῶς,   505
                  ἐς τοῦθ᾿ ὃ φεύγω νῦν †ἀναλωθήσομαι†.

Broadhead, whose discussion has been neglected, was right to question ἀναλωθήσομαι. The passive of 'spend' or by extension 'get rid of, destroy' combines ill with 'into what I am running away from' (the admittedly unparalleled metaphor accepted by Barrett as at once 'intelligible and effective'). But rather than ἀνειληθήσομαι I should prefer ἄγαν ὠθήσομαι (or ὠσθ-, cf. *Med.* 335; but see also Kühner–Gerth 1.114–16 on future middle with passive force). Phaedra is already resisting a 'thrust' towards ἔρως; a *further* push (πέρα 504) will be too much for her. For that, we need the transmitted λέγῃς in 505, not Broadhead's λέγω; but his καλά for καλῶς remains a possibility. One might also consider writing ἐς τοῦθ᾿ ὃ φεύγω λῦμ᾿ ... in 506 ('defilement' or 'bane', cf. Jebb on *OC* 805).

525–6. The rare construction Ἔρως (voc.) ... ὁ ... στάζων (Bothe) has been contested by R. Slings.[18] S. *Ant.* 1121–3 affords an overlooked parallel, with the 'certain' corrections accepted by Jebb but neglected by Dawe and Lloyd-Jones/ Wilson: Δηοῦς ἐν κόλποις, | [ὦ] (om. Tr) Βακχεῦ, Βακχᾶν | <ὁ> (Musgrave) ματρόπολιν Θήβαν ‖ ναιετῶν παρ᾿ ὑγρὸν κτλ. ~ 1132–4 κισσήρεις ὄχθαι | χλωρά τ᾿ ἀκτὰ | πολυστάφυλος πέμπει ‖ ἀμβρότων ἐπέων κτλ. That restores exact symmetry:

---

[17] Editorial practice varies as to ὤ and ὦ (see also n. 26 below). Mine, after some consultation, is to write ὦ everywhere in second-person address (with or without a vocative, indifferently before or after an imperative, whether or not 'exclamatory'), and ὤ otherwise, thus clarifying self-pitying exclamations. I should similarly write ὤ τάλας at 822, and ὤ τλάμων at 837 (where, *pace* Barrett, the exclamatory self-pity is unexceptionable between the wish for death and the explanation τῆς σῆς στερηθεὶς φιλτάτης ὁμιλίας).

[18] *Mnemosyne* 49 (1996), 53–5.

————— ⋮ —— ⋮ —— as in *Ant.* also at 844–3/863–4, cf. *Phil.* 836/853; × – ᵕ ᵕ ——— ‖ as *Aj.* 199, 200, 704/717, *Tra.* 848/859, *Med.* 851/861, etc.

542–4. διὰ πά-/σας ἰόντα συμφορᾶς | θνατοῖς is defensible,[19] and should be restored. The commended responsion of Dobree's ἰέντα with ἴησιν 533 (in a quite different sense) is scarcely probative; cf. ἰέντ- in responsion with ἰόντ- at A. *Pers.* 636/643. Barrett himself conceded the shortage of parallels in support of ἰέντα here. His argument against ἰόντα took no account of the fact that the subject is a *god*. διὰ πάσας συμφορᾶς (ἰέναι τινί) is indeed somewhat different from διὰ μάχης, διὰ λόγων (πάσας makes a further difference); but the extension seems possible, in default of more compelling arguments for emendation.

550–2/560–2. δρομάδα Ναΐδ' ὅπως τε Βάκ-/χαν σὺν αἵματι σὺν | καπνῶι φονίοισι νυμφείοις ~ τοκάδα τὰν διγόνοιο Βάκ-/χου νυμφευσαμένα | πότμωι φονίωι κατηύνασεν. Divide thus, not as gl ∫ gl | ᵕ – – – – – – (a verse which occurs elsewhere only as an ionic clausula, as at *Ba.* 72).[20] – � – – ᵕ ᵕ – reflects 545 (~555) τὰν μὲν Οἰχαλίαι. × – ᵕ ᵕ – ᵕ – – – is frequent (*tl sp* akin to *gl sp*): cf. 130/140, *Alc.* 576/586, S. *Aj.* 597/609, etc. The anceps syllables ποτμ- and καπν- are then, in effect, link-ancipites in the sequence *dod* ˙˙ ⋮ × *dod + sp.*

563–4.   δεινὰ γάρ· πάνται γ' ἐπιπνεῖ,   *wil*
          μέλισσα δ' οἷά τις πεπόταται.   ᵕ *e* ᵕ *d* –

563 πάντα γ OAV (-ε ἐπιπιτνεῖ A, -ε πιτνεῖ OV): πάντα τ' <L>P, πάντ' ἐστ' C, πάντα BDE, πάντ' M; τὰ πάντ' Tr   564 fort. μέλισσα θ' οἷά τις MBOAC: οἷά τις VDEL   πεπότηται MOAV

Buijs (1985) rightly divides as above (~553–4 Ἀλκμήνας τόκωι Κύπρις ἐξ-/έδωκεν· ὢ τλάμων ὑμεναίων). The usual lineation gives an odd '12-syll. blunt' verse with terminal overlap at οἴ-/ᾱ (*sic*; the less acceptable with this word-end after overlapping long anceps, cf. on the unacceptable division ὢ καλλί-/στᾱ ⋮ ... at 70–1; but οἷά τις should be read, as argued below). The concluding sequence ᵕ – ᵕ – ᵤ – ᵕ ᵕ – – (*ia* plus *rz* or ᵕ *e* × *d* –) is like *Aj.* 427 (~409) ... τὰ νῦν δ' ἄτιμος ὧδε πρόκειμαι, cf. also *OT* 896/910 (... | – ᵕ – ᵤ – ᵕ ᵕ – –).

563. Cf. *Med.* 44 δεινὴ γάρ· οὗτοι ..., also *Tra.* 497 (Stinton, 221). Barrett evidently did not consider the possibility of similar punctuation here. His note otherwise failed to establish that 'γ' cannot be right': 'Denniston 120' sufficiently illustrates γε with 'adverbs expressing ... intensity' and includes two instances of it following γάρ. πάντᾱ(ι) has the merit *prima facie* of colouring all that follows, especially if emphasized with γε, not going only with ἐπιπνεῖ (for ἐπιπνεῖν absolute Barrett himself cited *Sept.* 343).

564. τε for δέ might clarify that 'everywhere' goes also with πεπόταται; but the mild adversative is not out of place in the 'bee' simile. οἷά τις, cf. *El.* 151, *Hel.* 187, *Or.* 1492, *Hypsipyle* 35 D (1.2.18), 261D (64.77), S. *Tra.* 105, A. *Ag.* 1142, etc. (LSJ οἷος V.2). The vulgate οἷα τις is doubtfully idiomatic—in this case perhaps established by mere oversight, since Barrett did not discuss the variant readings; at the same time his paraphrase plainly implies an adverbial point of comparison. As often (e.g. *Med.* 629/638,

---

[19] Cf. Stinton ap. Lloyd-Jones, *JHS* 85 (1965), 168.
[20] D. Korzeniewski's defence of φονίοις ὑμεναίοις in responsion with φονίωι κατηύνασεν did not merit a place in Stockert's appendix and hence a place in his bibliography.

Andr. 770/781) the unequal anceps at ὦ τλᾱμων ~ οἷα τις is associated with a different word-division.

598–604.   Xo.   πῶς οὖν; τί δράσεις, ὦ παθοῦσ' ἀμήχανα;
         Φα.   οὐκ οἶδα πλὴν ἕν· κατθανεῖν ὅσον τάχος,
              τῶν νῦν παρόντων πημάτων ἄκος μόνον.   600

         Ιπ.   ὦ Γαῖα μῆτερ Ἡλίου τ' ἀναπτυχαί,
              οἵων λόγων ἄρρητον εἰσήκουσ' ἔπος.
         Τρ.   σίγησον, ὦ παῖ, πρίν τιν' αἰσθέσθαι βοῆς.
         Ιπ.   οὐκ ἔστ' ἀκούσας δεῖν' ὅπως σιγήσομαι.

Kovacs, in line with articles by W. D. Smith[21] and S. Østerud,[22] takes Phaedra into the Palace 'just before' Hippolytus' entry with the Nurse, and brings her back in time to be addressed by the Coryphaeus at 680. There is indeed a strong case for a staging which makes it clear (a) that Hippolytus is aware of the presence only of the Nurse and chorus in his altercation with the former (601–15) and his long tirade in 616–68; (b) that Phaedra does not hear Hippolytus' assurances in 656–62. There are also strong arguments (see further below) for not giving 669–79 to Phaedra. But I agree with Halleran—my arguments complement his—that Phaedra should remain in the view of the audience, though not of Hippolytus. (i) If she goes into the Palace at 600 she can scarcely avoid a collision with the persons emerging. If there is a pause sufficient to avoid that, there should be some text (*Xo.*) to bridge the gap. (ii) If 599–600 is an exit speech, the audience will be expecting immediate fulfilment of the implicit suicidal intention (in reply to τί δράσεις;), and Phaedra's re-entry at 680 will be the wrong kind of surprise. (iii) It is also unnatural for Phaedra at 600 to set off *towards* the intimidating voice of Hippolytus, heard within. She will more naturally retreat towards the side of the acting area; and we can plausibly imagine her veiling her head during most of what follows. (iv) It is, after all, appropriate that Phaedra should hear at least the first part of 601–68: notably what Hippolytus says at 604 about 'inability to keep silence' and at 612 in the notorious verse ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος. It is partly in the light of these verses, but also of 664–8 (defended below), that Phaedra at 689ff. will say οὗτος γὰρ ὀργῇ συντεθηγμένος φρένας | ἐρεῖ καθ' ἡμῶν πατρὶ σὰς ἁμαρτίας | πλήσει τε πᾶσαν γαῖαν αἰσχίστων λόγων.

601. Γαῖα . . . Ἡλίου . . ., cf. on 672 below, with n. 30.

660, 662. σῖγά θ' (for σῖγα δ') ἕξομεν στόμα still seems right, but should have been credited by me to Elmsley (reported in Stockert's appendix as having proposed σῖγά τ'). In 662 my suggested νω for νιν ('him *and me*') has gone unnoticed, and still seems plausible.

664–8. Against Barrett's suspicion of these five verses (after Valckenaer), echoed by Diggle, and now Kovacs's deletion of them, it is by no means inappropriate that Hippolytus should end his tirade addressed to the Nurse in Phaedra's hearing (see above)—a tirade against the whole female sex (616–50), not merely 'you . . . and your mistress' (651–62)—with the thematic and well-phrased distich

[21] *TAPhA* 91 (1960), 162–77.   [22] *GRBS* 11 (1970), 307–20.

ἢ νῦν τις αὐτὰς σωφρονεῖν διδαξάτω,
ἢ κἄμ᾽ ἐάτω ταῖσδ᾽ ἐπεμβαίνειν ἀεί.

Phaedra knows that no σωφροσύνη in her case can prevail against the power of Κύπρις (cf. 398–401), so that the forecast of 'trampling' in 668 (with ταῖσδ᾽ nicely ambiguous, as between women in general and the particular women in view) adds the final motivation for her pre-emptive counter-action. There is no inconsistency with 79ff., *pace* Kovacs, who cites as a 'telling point' in Diggle's apparatus the sentence 'certe ex Hippolyti sententia (79 seqq.) σωφροσύνη non discendo capitur'. Hippolytus has aligned himself with paragons 'in whom nothing is διδακτόν and to whom there has been given (εἴληχε) σωφροσύνη εἰς τὰ πάντα': a position which by no means denies that manifestations of σωφροσύνη may occur (whether by teaching or otherwise) in persons not regarded by him as acceptable associates; cf. his culminatingly paradoxical judgement of Phaedra at 1034: ἐσωφρόνησε δ᾽ οὐκ ἔχουσα σωφρονεῖν. At the same time, of course, 667 is spoken as a rhetorical ἀδύνατον, given the view of women that Hippolytus has expressed. Such accurate thematic plotting is more plausibly atttributed to Euripides than to an interpolator.

What, then, of 664–6 (with which 667–8 certainly cohere)?

ὄλοισθε· μισῶν δ᾽ οὔποτ᾽ ἐμπλησθήσομαι
γυναῖκας, οὐδ᾽ εἴ φησί τίς μ᾽ ἀεὶ λέγειν·   665
ἀεὶ γὰρ οὖν πως εἰσι κἀκεῖναι κακαί·

Against 664–5, to the subjective points in Barrett's discussion Kovacs adds the illogicality of λέγειν (sc. ὅτι μισῶ), such that 'these lines do not quite succeed at saying what they are intended to say'. The fault seems venial. But, such as it is, it is easily removed by writing ψέγειν (sc. αὐτάς), postulating a familiar kind of corruption (cf. *Andr.* 419 and further on 671 below). In favour of authenticity is the apt characterization in οὐδ᾽ εἴ φησί τις . . . : Hippolytus is ever sensitive to any criticism that might affect his status as a paragon *sans reproche*. For another instance of such anticipation of criticism, cf. on 911–15 below.

That leaves only 666, which economically explains the reversion in 664–5 to cursing women in general (γυναῖκας . . . κἀκεῖναι) after the narrower focus in 651–62(–3). The subject of ὄλοισθε is still in the first instance 'you and your mistress', before the progressive-corrective continuation at μισῶν δ᾽ . . . The particles γὰρ οὖν, obscurely impugned by Kovacs, accurately mean 'for indeed, in sooth' (Denniston, *GP* 446); and πως 'in one way or another' relevantly reflects the wide-ranging condemnation in the earlier part of the ῥῆσις, even as κακαί reflects κακὸν μέγα in 627. It might be suggested that 666 (del. Nauck) is inorganic; but ἀεὶ γὰρ οὖν . . . links aptly with ἀεί 665, and ἢ νυν . . . in 667–8 follows better after 666 than it would after 665.

669–82. Χο. τάλανες ὦ κακοτυχεῖς γυναικῶν πότμοι·   2cr δ
              τίν᾽ ἢ νῦν τέχναν ἔχομεν ἢ λόγον   670   δδ
              σφαλεῖσαι κάθαμμα λύειν †λόγου τέ   δδ ||
[Φα.] ἐτύχομεν δίκας·   δ
              ὦ Γᾶ καὶ Φῶς·   2sp
              πᾶι ποτ᾽ ἐξαλύξω τύχας;   cr δ
              πῶς δὲ πῆμα κρύψω, φίλαι;   cr δ
              τίς ἂν θεῶν ἀρωγὸς ἢ τίς ἂν βροτῶν   675   3ia
              πάρεδρος ἢ ξυνεργὸς ἀδίκων ἔργων   δδ

φανείη; τὸ γὰρ παρ’ ἡμῖν πάθος   δδ
†παρὸν† δυσεκπέρατον ἔρχεται βίου·   3ia
κακοτυχεστάτα γυναικῶν ἐγώ.   δδ

[Xo. φεῦ φεῦ, πέπρακται, κοὺ κατώρθωνται τέχναι,   680
      δέσποινα, τῆς σῆς προσπόλου, κακῶς δ’ ἔχει.]
 Φα. ὦ παγκακίστη . . .

669ⁿ χο. (et 672ⁿ φα.) MOVELP; φα. A et in ras. B; Τρ. Bothe   669 τάλανες AᶜLᶜ: -αιν- codd.
670 τίν’ ἢ νῦν Page, Conomis: τ- ν- ἢ DELP (cf. Σ alter), ἢ om. cett. (τίνας et τέχνας B²), τίν’
αὖ Nauck λόγους MAV+   671 κάθαμμα ᴧΣ: καθ’ ἅμ(μ)α fere codd.   λύειν Musgrave: λύσιν
vel λύσειν codd.   λόγου] -ους MV et Σ alter; ψόγου Purgold   674 κρύψω φίλαι πῆμα BL+
675 ἂν βροτῶν] ἀνθρώπων MBOA   678 πόρον Kayser, olim Well; fort. ῥοπὰν δυσεκπέρατον
BACDLP: -ντον MOV, -στον E   680-1 vv. delendos censeo (Nutrici trib. Reiske) κατόρθ-
MAVDE -ωται   τέχνη fere V (τέχνης) M² (τέχναι) A et Σ alter

669–79, responsive to 362–72, is given by most editors and commentators to
Phaedra; by a minority, now including Kovacs, to the Nurse. Both these assignations
require us to accept a phenomenon without parallel in Greek tragedy: the assignation
to an actor of the antistrophe to a choral strophe.[23] Symmetrical assignation is the
more to be expected here, supporting the responsion *at a distance*. Both strophe and
antistrophe are certainly choral in the other tragic instances of widely separated
strophic stanzas (*Or.* 1353–65/1537–48, *Rh.* 454–66/820–32, *Phil.* 391–402/507–18, all
like ours in iambo-dochmiac metre). There is a similar vocative φίλαι, certainly to
other choristers, at *Or.* 1540. There may, of course, be internal divisions within a
choral strophic stanza, not necessarily symmetrical, without affecting the propriety of
the notation *Xo*.[24]

So let us try the effect of choral assignation, which no recent commentator seems
even to have considered as a possibility. At once we may observe an interesting
structural symmetry: in both places the chorus are 'reacting' in the presence of the
Nurse and Phaedra (whom we have *not* taken offstage); and their grieving sentiments
in both stanzas—at 366ff. 'shocked', here rather 'despairing'—*are such as might
equally well be voiced by the Nurse* (who is not a singing character).[25] They share her
emotion as committed φίλαι; and, as elsewhere, the magnitude of their grief is
expressed with hyperbole.

669. The opening sentiment plainly suits the chorus.[26]

670–1. The feminine plural σφαλεῖσαι is an obvious stumbing-block on Phaedra's
lips (unconvincingly explained by Barrett). The Nurse's 'we' can be 'my mistress and I';
but the chorus too have been 'disappointed'. As to the text, (i) the choice remains close
between τίν’ ἢ . . . and τιν’ αὖ . . .[27] (ii) Many, most recently Sommerstein, Kovacs,
and Stockert, have expressed dissatisfaction with . . . λόγον (v.l. λόγους) | . . . λόγου.

---

[23] The responsion of solo strophe with choral antistrophe in the Parodos of *Helen* is likely to
have been a novelty; see my discussion in *CQ* 40 (1990), 77ff.

[24] Cf. my commentary (p. 302) on *Or.* 1535–65, where I may have inclined too far towards
unison utterance. Weil gave the whole of 362–72 to the Coryphaeus, but a shocked reaction there
from all fifteen choristers, as also from the Nurse (353–61), is what the context calls for.

[25] The chorus in *Supplices* takes such 'vicarious' song a stage further; *CQ* 40 (1990), 347–8.

[26] Diggle has τάλανες ὦ . . . here, and conversely ἄϊες ὦ, ἔκλυες ὦ . . . at 362 in second-
person address (cf. n. 17 above). ὦ . . . πότμοι here and ὦ πόνοι . . . at 367 are like *Sept.* 739 and
Ch. 466 (ὦ West; contrast Lloyd-Jones/Wilson at *Aj.* 1197, *El.* 201, 203, *Phil.* 177–8).

[27] The thinly attested reading τίνας νῦν τέχνας (B²) is negligible, associable with the wrong
λόγους.

Purgold's ψόγου, mentioned *en passant* by Barrett and among many other conjectures in Stockert's appendix, has not received the attention which it merits.[28] Crucial is the meaning of κάθαμμα, a very rare word, likely to have been used with etymological precision in relation to the cognate καθάπτω 'fasten (A to B)'. What there is no available τέχνη or λόγος to 'loose, undo' is the 'attachment' to Phaedra of (undeserved) δύσκλεια and to the Nurse of (deserved) 'reproach'; last but not least the chorus may have incurred reproach by their complicity, and in general as members of an impugned sex. For the metaphor, cf. *Or.* 828–30 μὴ . . . ἐξανάψηι δύσκλειαν ἐς αἰεί (reminiscent of *Od.* 2.86 μῶμον ἀνάψηι). For the frequent confusion of ψόγ- and λόγ-, cf. Collard on *Su.* 564–5.

672. ἐτύχομεν δίκας, presumably as having tacitly acquiesced in the Nurse's disastrous approach to Hippolytus; but throughout, the chorus strongly 'identify' with the predicaments and sentiments of the principals. ὦ Γᾶ καὶ Φῶς: everyone accepts Heath's ἰώ to obtain another dochmius, in responsion with ἰώ μοι, φεῦ φεῦ in 365. But whereas corruption of ὦ to ἰώ is very common, the reverse is not,[29] and for ὦ in this exclamation, cf. *Med.* 148, *Or.* 1496, also 601 above.[30] 2*sp* is as likely as a dochmius for these exclamatory phrases (cf. 813, S. *Phil.* 1086/1106, etc.), and it is easy to obtain the same in 365 (see above).

677–8. τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν πάθος is an expression apter on the lips of sympathetic φίλαι than of Phaedra herself. In 678 Barrett praised Wilamowitz's πέραν as 'palmary'. But the trope πέραν δυσεκπέρατον . . . βίου, obscure in sense, is not supported by 883 δυσεκπέρατον . . . κακόν (a very different sort of phrase, considered further below). πόρον is better than Barrett allowed; but I should prefer ῥοπὰν (even closer to the letters of παρὸν), cf. *Tra.* 82 ἐν ῥοπῆι τοιᾶιδε κειμένωι (similarly of a *life-or-death* crisis), also *OC* 1508 (with βίου), *Hel.* 1090, etc. δυσεκπέρατον (better than -πέραντον) may mean either 'hard to get past' or 'not good in the getting past'.

679. The first-person singular is, of course, no guarantee of solo utterance.

680–1. This now follows oddly, even with a pause followed by a change of voice to the Coryphaeus (Reiske's assignation to the Nurse is negligible). Choral lyric may be followed by a choral approach-announcement, as at *Alc.* 1006; but speech does not otherwise follow a lyric stanza without a change of speaker. It seems likely, therefore, that this distich was interpolated to separate 672–9 from 682ff. in a tradition wrongly assigning both to Phaedra (as in all the MSS). Suspicion once aroused is strengthened

---

[28] Kovacs (1996) does not mention it in his discussion, arguing for his conjecture . . . ἢ τίνας | σφαλεῖσαι κάθαμμα λύειν λόγους. On his own evidence the need for the repeated interrogative arises only if there is a difference of number, i.e. if we accept the v.l. λόγους.

[29] Triclinius' ὦ for ἰώ at *Aj.* 1197 was not simply 'a favourite device' of his (Zuntz, *Inquiry* 23), but an instance of a frequently needed correction: for other accepted (if not universally agreed) instances of this corruption in the *cantica* of tragedy (not including ὤμοι → ἰώ μοι, as at *Aj.* 900, 901, 909, etc.), cf. *Ch.* 466; *Eum.* 511, 512, 785; *Ant.* 1276, 1286; *El.* 121; *OC* 1085; *Alc.* 92, 435, 568; *Hp.* 852; *Andr.* 1204; *Hec.* 1033, 1074; *Herc.* 115; *Tro.* 580; *Hel.* 191, 362; *Pho.* 226, 1500–1 (*Π⁵*); *Or.* 332, ?976; Kannicht on *Hel.* locc. cit. The corruption may have been encouraged by 'prevocalic consonantalization in vulgar speech' (cf. West, *GM* 14); it is less likely that ἰώ could actually be scanned as a monosyllable in tragedy, in addition to the scansions ‿ – and – –. The reverse corruption of ἰώ to ὦ, as apparently in part of the tradition at *OT* 1186, is surprisingly rare (omission of an iota being so easy), and editorial ἰώ is at best doubtful not only here and in 884 (q.v.), but also at *IT* 143; and further corrections of ἰώ may be needed (as I shall argue elsewhere) at *Sept.* 97; *Aj.* 348/356; *Ant.* 1146, ?1261; *OT* 163 (ὦ ὤ), 1207/1216; *El.* 1273; *Hec.* 1091 (twice); *Hel.* 335.

[30] I write Φῶς, in conjunction with 'allocutory' ὦ (cf. n. 17 above, and exclamations like ὦ Ζεῦ). Earth is a goddess, and Light stands for Sun (often appealed to as 'all-seeing', etc.).

by the somewhat clumsy mixture of singular and plural verbs, and by the anticipatory undercutting of line 778, where φεῦ φεῦ, πέπρακται (by no means a cliché) refers to Phaedra's death.

682ff. Phaedra's ῥῆσις at 373ff. immediately followed the strophe. Now she has another (somewhat shorter) speech immediately following the antistrophe.

715–18.   Φα.   καλῶς ἔλεξαθ᾽· †ἐν δὲ προτρέπουσ᾽ ἐγὼ   715
               εὕρημα δή τι τῆσδε συμφορᾶς ἔχω†
               ὥστ᾽ εὐκλεᾶ μὲν παισὶ προσθεῖναι βίον
               αὐτή τ᾽ ὄνασθαι πρὸς τὰ νῦν πεπτωκότα·

715 ἔλεξας O   προτρέπουσ᾽ D<L> et Bᶜ, πρέπουσ᾽ C   πρόσθ᾽ εἰπούσ᾽ ἐρῶ Hadley, πρὸς τούτοις ἐρῶ Barrett   716 εὕρημα] ἴαμα vel ἄκημα Stockert   δή τι BCDELP: δῆτα cett. ἔχω] ἄκος Kirchhoff, Nauck

πρὸς τούτοις ἐρῶ, though commended by Diggle ('fort. recte') and accepted by Kovacs, does not begin to account for -τρέπουσ᾽. Stockert justly obelizes †προτρέπουσ᾽ . . . εὕρημα† for the further doubt hanging over the construction εὕρημα . . . συμφορᾶς (as to which he should have mentioned Broadhead's discussion, also Kirchhoff's συμφορᾶς ἄκος, accepted by Nauck, who also wrote ηὕρηκα). Other conjectures include Wecklein's ἐν δὲ πᾶν στρέφουσ᾽ (Weil) ἔπος | εὑροῦσ᾽ ἄκος δή. The oddly elaborate (composite?) scholion ζητοῦσα καὶ ἐρευνῶσα· μετατρέπουσα, φησί, καὶ πολλὰ δοκιμάζουσα καὶ εἰς πολλὰ μεταφέρουσά μου τὴν γνώμην . . . may suggest that the problems in our text have been caused by the loss of a line, e.g.

               ἐν δὲ πρῶτ᾽ εἰπούσ᾽ ἐγὼ   715
            <ἄπειμι· πάντηι νοῦν τρέπουσ᾽ ἀκεσφόρον>
            εὕρημα δή τι τῆσδε συμφορᾶς ἔχω (κτλ.)

τρέπουσ᾽ is then explicable as an intrusion from the following (subsequently omitted) verse.[31] For the idiom thus with τρέπουσα, cf. *IT* 1322 μὴ 'νταῦθα τρέψηις σὴν φρέν᾽. πρῶτα, cf. *Alc.* 1105 ἄπεισιν, εἰ χρή· πρῶτα δ᾽ εἰ χρεὼν ἄθρει. ἐγώ, sc. in grateful reply to *your* καλοὶ λόγοι.

814–16.   βιαίωι θανοῦσ᾽ ἀνοσίωι τε συμ-   δδ
               φορᾶι, σᾶς πάλαισμα μελέας χερός·   815   δδ
               †τίς† ἄρα σάν, τάλαιν᾽, ἀμαυροῖ ζόαν;   δδ

814 βιαίωι(ι) D (Bothe): -ως cett.   815 πάλαισμα μελέας χερός Enger: χ- π- μ- codd.   816 τί (δ᾽) Stockert   ζόαν Monk: ζωάν codd.

814. βιαίωι is likely to be the truth.

815. Enger's transposition, similar to Elmsley's in 841 below, should be accepted. Dochmiacs of the form × – ⏑ ⁝ ⏑ ⏑ – with split resolution are very rare, appearing elsewhere in Euripides (doubtfully) only at 841 (if κραδίαν is written) and 883 below (qq.vv.), and *IT* 840 πρόσω τάδ᾽ ἀπέβα (leg. τάδ᾽ ἀπέβα πρόσω?); not in Sophocles; in Aeschylus only *Eum.* 840 = 870 ἅπαντά τε κότον (s.v.l.); *PV* 573 τε νῆστιν ἀνὰ τὰν. δs

---

[31] Hadley intended his πρόσθ᾽ εἰπούσ᾽ ἐρῶ as simply introducing a restatement of Phaedra's view of death as κράτιστον (401–2); but 717–21 certainly alludes (with a fine terminal ambiguity in 721) to her discovery of a *new* plan, productive of compound ὄνησις.

of the form × ‿‿ ‿ : ‿ ‿ –, apart from *Tro.* 310 λαμπάσι τόδ' ἱερόν (s.v.l.) and *Ba.* 988 τίς ἄρα νιν ἔτεκεν, occur only in Aeschylus (*Sept.* 239, *Su.* 691, 692, *Ag.* 1173, *Ch.* 967). Entirely resolved δs of the form × ‿‿ ‿ : ‿ ‿ ‿‿ (nearly all with eight short syllables) behave differently, occurring with *increasing* frequency: A. *Ag.* 1410, S. *OT* 1314/1322, *El.* 1246, 1267, E. *El.* 1170, *IT* 871, *Or.* 176, *Ba.* 995 = 1015. Stockert is deterred here by reference to Parker 266; but Parker there lumped together all δs of the form × ‿‿ ‿ : ‿ ‿ ‿‿, rather than giving separate treatment, as on pp. 258ff., to split resolution after a long syllable.

816. The chorus are indeed disingenuously feigning ignorance (Barrett); but even so the question here should not be 'What *person* brings to nought your life?' (since the obvious answer to that is Phaedra herself), but simply '*What* (is it that) brings . . .?' So read τί σὰν ἄρα, τάλαιν' . . . ἔ ἄρα very often follows τίς directly (hence the corruption), but cf. *Or.* 1269 τίς ὅδ' ἄρ' . . . ἔ *Ba.* 556 πόθι Νύσας ἄρα . . . ἔ etc. (*GP* 40).

840–1.   †τίνος κλύω† πόθεν θανάσιμος τύχα,   840   δδ
       γύναι, σάν, τάλαιν', ἔβα καρδίαν;   δδ

841 τάλαιν' ἔβα Elmsley: ἔβα (ἐπέβα MBOA) τάλαινα codd. (quocum κραδίαν Kirchhoff)

840 corresponds with 822 κατακονὰ μὲν οὖν ἀβίοτος βίου. For the certainly corrupt τίνος κλύω Stockert suggests either κλύδων τίς ἔ or τίς ὁ κλύδων ἔ But the 'wave' metaphor is too bald (the more so in a question). Kovacs more plausibly follows Kraus in accepting Enger's τοῦ δὲ κλύω . . . ἔ Other possibilities are [τίνος] ἀλύω· πόθεν . . . ἔ ('I am bewildered', cf. *Or.* 277) and τίς νόσος ἢ πόθεν . . . ἔ (κλύω would be a natural supra- scription following lipographic reduction of τισνοσος to τίνος).[32]

866–8.   *Xo.*   φεῦ φεῦ,
       τόδ' αὖ νεοχμὸν ἐκδοχαῖς ἐπεισφέρει   3ia
       θεὸς †(κακὸν) ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖνᾳ ἀβίοτος βίου   δδ (?)
       τύχα πρὸς τὸ κρανθὲν εἴη τυχεῖν·   δδ

867 ἐπεισφέρει BVCDEL: ἐπιφ- MOA   868 κακὸν om. CDEL, del. Wilamowitz   aliquid e v. 821 irrepsisse vid. Burges et Maas   fort. θεὸς ἐμοί· μὴ (iam Stockert) νῦν κτλ.   ἀβίοτος MOCP: -ωτος BAVDEL

ἐπεισφρεῖ (J. U. Powell) has become the vulgate, with φεῦ φεῦ . . . θεός scanned as *ia* : δ : δ. But ἐπεισφέρει is unexceptionable, ending a trimeter (single, cf. 368/675, 371/678, 813). Barrett failed to show that the metrical division must be ἐπεισφρεῖ θεὸς | . . . rather than ἐπεισφέρει | θεὸς . . . Nor indeed could he, since he regarded ἐμοὶ . . . τυχεῖν as 'corrupt beyond remedy' as a consequence of substantial intrusion. Although Barrett denied it, κακόν, absent from several MSS, is very likely to be false, νεοχμόν = νέον sufficiently implying 'unwelcome'. If so, it may after all suffice to correct just enough so as to obtain four dochmiacs from θεός to τυχεῖν. The corruption here is indeed likely to owe something to μὲν οὖν ἀβίοτος βίου in line 821 above; but it is by no means certain that the whole of μὲν οὖν ἀβίοτος βίου here is an intrusion from that source. It is in Euripides' manner to echo thematic words and phrases (cf. δυσεκπέρατον 678 and 883). Stockert plausibly looks for a deprecatory

---

[32] Previously I proposed οὐδὲ κλύω or ἔκλυον, not οὐδὲν as stated in Stockert's appendix.

wish with μή . . ., but too radically proposes to write μή τινος τύχας in place of κακὸν ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν ἀβίοτος βίου τύχα. Given the rejection of κακόν, μὴ νῦν for μὲν οὖν seems sufficient (the monosyllables cohering sufficiently to make the word-end after long penult. unobjectionable). For ἀβίοτος describing something other than βίος, cf. also *Ion* 764 (ἄχος).

877–8. The verses should be redivided, partly for the reason given by Diggle in *Euripidea* 475, n. 158, namely that βάρος κακῶν· ἀπὸ γὰρ ὀλόμενος οἴχομαι as a trimeter lacks the usual caesura, but also because ἀπὸ γὰρ ὀλόμενος οἴχομαι as a self-contained dimeter is in line with a common 'sub-dochmiac' pattern, cf. *Hec.* 1031, *Or.* 1253/1273, A. *Sept.* 157/165, *Ag.* 1097, *Ch.* 155, *Eum.* 161/168, etc.). Before it, βοᾷ βοᾷ : δέλτος ἄλαστα· πᾶι φύγω βάρος κακῶν; can be either treated as a tetrameter (or *ia ch ʃ 2ia*, which comes to the same thing) or divided after βοᾷ βοᾷ; cf. *Herc.* 763–4/772–3, *Hel.* 370.

882–5.   Θη.   τόδε μὲν οὐκέτι στόματος ἐν πύλαις   δδ
                     †καθέξω δυσεκπέρατον ὀλοὸν (ὀλοὸν) κακόν†.   ?

                  ὦ πόλις πόλις.   hδ (?)

                  Ἱππόλυτος εὐνῆς τῆς ἐμῆς ἔτλη θιγεῖν . . .

882 τόδ' ἐμὸν MOC   883 δυσεκπέραντον MOC   ὀλοὸν semel MOAC, bis cett.   884 ὦ πόλις πόλις BVDELP: ὦ πόλις ὦ πόλις C, ὦ πόλις MOA

The vulgate has -πέρᾱτὸν ὀλόὸν | κᾰκὸν. ἰῶ (Elmsley) πὸλῑς as two dochmiacs. The form ◡ – ◡ : ◡ ◡ – is a rarity (see on 814–16 above); likewise the postulated corruption of ἰώ to ὦ (see on 672 above). A more definite fault, though no one seems to have been troubled by it, is the absence of period-end for a drawing of breath, and probable stage movement, before Theseus' loud appeal to the city. This dramatically important κραυγή (cf. on 902–4 below) cannot begin in the middle of a verse; *a fortiori*, in the middle of a resolved syllable. There is indeed a metrical problem in 883; but we should regard a full stop at κακόν as a datum from which to work backwards. The doubled ὀλοόν, metrically questionable,[33] is probably false here, as at *Or.* 999.[34] Single ὀλοόν does indeed still leave a metrical problem: neither δ *ia cr* nor *ba ia* δ is likely.[35] The chances are that a syllable has dropped out somewhere, but not as supplied by Elmsley. Of various possibilities contemplated, I should now suggest καθέξομεν for καθέξω, giving a straightforward *2ia* δ.[36] It may be relevant that the other occurrence of

---

[33] δ *ia* δ would be unparalleled in Eur., who has single iambic metra in dochmiac context only at the beginning of a sequence and then probably only when the *ia* is exclamatory; cf. *CQ* 41 (1991), 527, n. 12. One might consider supplementation to *3*δ, e.g. with <γ' ὄν> or <περ> after δυσεκπέρατον, but scarcely with enthusiasm.

[34] My commentary there includes some observations about Eur.'s practice in the doubling of adjectives (much rarer than verbs and nouns). 'Dittography is a less common fault than haplography, but is commoner than may generally be supposed' (Diggle, *Euripidea* 381).

[35] *El.* 1153–4 πατρίδα δεκέτεσι | σποραῖσιν ἐλθόντ' ἐμάν ~ 1161–2 πόσις, ὅ τι ποτὲ τὰν | τάλαιναν ἔσχεν κακόν is δ | *ia cr* in Diggle's colometry, but should be taken rather as *ending* with a dochmius, i.e. as ◡2ia ʃ δ, akin to *2ia ʃ* δ (n. 36 below); likewise *Tro.* 1227–8, *Pho.* 1286ff./1298ff. (twice), *Rh.* 136/200, A. *Ch.* 944–5. For the extreme rarity of ◡ – – – ◡ – ◡ – (*ba ia*) before late Euripides (and nowhere followed by a dochmius), see Stinton, 113ff.

[36] *2ia* : δ is very common. For *2ia ʃ* δ with short-syllable overlap, cf. *Med.* 1281/1292, *Or.* 329/345, already at *Eum.* 158–9/165–6 (not as West).

δυσεκπέρατον at 678 is in an iambic verse (likewise in iambo-dochmiac context). Such a first-person plural here will be in line with, and perhaps an echo of, Hippolytus' ἕξομεν στόμα at 660.[37]

All three transmitted variants in 884 are now possible. But cf. *Hec.* 684 ὦ τέκνον τέκνον, where ὦ τέκνον and ὦ τέκνον ὦ τέκνον are minority readings.

902–4.   Ἱπ.   κραυγῆς ἀκούσας σῆς ἀφικόμην, πάτερ,
                         σπουδῆι· τὸ μέντοι πρᾶγμ' †ἐφ' ὧιτινι στένεις†
                         οὐκ οἶδα, βουλοίμην δ' ἂν ἐκ σέθεν κλύειν.

Barrett printed his conjecture ἐφ' ὧι στήσας ἔχεις 'with some confidence'. Diggle prints his own ὅτωι στένεις ἔπι with presumably equal or greater confidence, but without supporting advocacy. The latter has been widely accepted, despite Barrett's objection to στένεις as 'the wrong word' (countered only by Halleran). Barrett was right thus far: the context, in conjunction with the phrase κραυγῆς ἀκούσας, leaves no room for doubt, *pace* Halleran, as to 'what Hipp. is imagined to have heard'; and he has no reason whatever to infer lamentation, rather than (e.g.) some apprehended danger to the πόλις. On this, see also Broadhead's neglected discussion. Stockert also mentions Barthold (ἐφ' ὧι καταστένεις) and Fitton (ἐφ' ὧι στένεις ἔτι). These can be rejected for the same reason and as otherwise inferior to Diggle.

Broadhead in a footnote suggested τείνας as an improvement upon Barrett's στήσας, with supporting citation of τείνουσι βοήν (*Med.* 201, with Page's note), τεῖνε . . . αὐδάν (*Pers.* 574, with his own note), and ἐντεινάμενος φωνήν (Aeschines 2.157).[38] One might equally consider ὅτωι τείνεις ἔπι as an improvement of Diggle. But neither quite satisfies: it is a little awkward to understand αὐτήν (sc. the κραυγή), since τείνειν can be used intransitively; and, though ὅτωι . . . ἔπι means the same as ἐφ' ὧι, it is not obvious why the former should be corrupted to the latter.

If we start by substituting τείνεις for τινιστένεις, we have room for another word. On that basis I suggest ἐφ' ὧι τείνεις <ὄπα> '. . . why you are (thus) *exerting your voice*'. For ὄπα 'voice, utterance' at the end of a verse in Euripides, cf. 602, 1321, *Hec.* 555, *Su.* 204, *Ion* 1204–5, *Hel.* 1596, *Or.* 1669.[39] The supposition will be that ὄπα was extruded following corruption of ωι τεινεις . . . to ωιτινι σ . . . and subsequent supra-scription of τε(ι)νεις.

911–15.   σιγᾶις; σιωπῆς δ' οὐδὲν ἔργον ἐν κακοῖς·
                         ἢ γὰρ ποθοῦσα πάντα καρδία κλύειν
                         κἂν τοῖς κακοῖσι λίχνος οὖσ' ἁλίσκεται,
                         οὐ μὴν φίλους ἄαγε, κἄτι μᾶλλον ἢ φίλους,
                         κρύπτειν δίκαιον σάς, πάτερ, δυσπραξίας.   915

All recent editors, mistaking the sense, have followed Barrett in excising 912–13. No one has effectively countered or even mentioned my defence. οὐ μὴν . . . γε (cf. 285, etc.) is the negative correlate of γε μὴν 'adversative, often answering μέν' (*GP* 348).[40]

---

[37] For the equivalence of singular and plural, cf. Kühner–Gerth 1.84. For confusions in the tradition, cf. Diggle, *Euripidea* 263 and 344–5. There is a variant ἔξομαι at 660, which might suggest καθέξομαι as an alternative here; but LSJ offer no support for that.

[38] Broadhead ended by proposing ἐφ' ὧι . . . πονεῖς without commitment as to 'what τινι represents'. He should not have regarded *Chr. Pat.*'s τὰ νῦν as 'at least a possibility'.

[39] Aesch. and Soph. by contrast have ὄπα only in lyric; once each as things stand, but Blaydes plausibly proposed ὄπα χεῖται (χ- Musgrave) for ὑπόκειται at *Phil.* 190.

[40] οὐ μὴν . . . γε is surprisingly not given separate notice by Denniston. One instance (*Phil.*

So here 912–13 is to be understood as the first limb of an explanatory antithesis: in effect 'a desire to be told everything is indeed reprehensible . . ., but you should not conceal your troubles from your nearest and dearest'. For γάρ without expressed μέν at the beginning of such an antithesis, cf. 1340–1 τοὺς γὰρ εὐσεβεῖς . . . τούς γε μὴν κακοὺς . . ., Or. 1083 οὐ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔστι, σοί γε μήν, El. 754 μακρὰς γὰρ ἕρπει γῆρυς, ἐμφανής γε μήν. Certainly something is needed between 911 σιωπῆς δ’ οὐδὲν ἔργον ἐν κακοῖς and the adversative οὐ μὴν . . . γε . . .,0,0 in 914–13; and what 912–13 offers is just right, and well characterized. λίχνος ('always disapproving' as Barrett says) is a word rare in tragedy, but the sense '(objectionably) inquisitive' is well attested (LSJ s.v.), occurring also in fr. 1063.8 τοῦ κεκρυμμένου λίχνος. Its pejorative force is just what the context requires (properly understood). Hippolytus characteristically wishes to distance himself from any imputation of 'vulgar curiosity'; cf. on 665 above.

Not only the particles and sentence-structure have been misconstrued. Another error, of which I too was previously guilty, has been to mistake κακοῖσι in 913 as meaning the same as κακοῖς in 911. For the correct interpretation 'even in/among κακοί persons' (sc. 'unlike you and me'), cf. τοῖς κακοῖσ(ι) 81, 412, 980, Hcld. 259, Ion 399 κἂν ταῖς κακαῖσιν, etc.; the definite article makes all the difference.

1008–16.   δεῖ δή σε δεῖξαι τῶι τρόπωι διεφθάρην·
                  ποτέρα τὸ τῆσδε σῶμ’ ἐκαλλιστεύετο
                  πασῶν γυναικῶν; ἢ σὸν οἰκήσειν δόμον   1010
                  ἔγκληρον εὐνὴν προσλαβὼν ἐπήλπισα;
                  μάταιος ἆρ’ ἦν, οὐδαμοῦ μὲν οὖν φρενῶν·
                  ἀλλ’ ὡς τυραννεῖν ἡδὺ τοῖσι σώφροσιν;
                  [ἥκιστά γ’ εἰ μὴ τὰς φρένας διέφθορεν
                  θνητῶν ὅσοισιν ἀνδάνει μοναρχία·]   1015
                  ἐγὼ δ’ . . .

1014–15 del. Nauck (1012 del. Wecklein, 1012–15 susp. Barrett, del. Kovacs, 1013–15 susp. Stockert)

J. H. Kells has explained the passage convincingly, while defending verse 1013.[41] As he points out, the sequence of rhetorical questions is similar to that in *Andr*. 194ff. The first two questions following the challenge in 1008 self-evidently expect the answer 'No' (the second, since Phaedra is not a widow so that her εὐνή cannot be ἐπίκληρος). Not thus can Theseus account for the corruption of a σωφροσύνη which Hippolytus regards as an incontrovertible fact (994–5). The third question by contrast might be answered with 'perhaps so'—so Hippolytus continues with ἐγὼ δ’ . . . . 1013 is thus integral to the argument, and 1014–15 are surely spurious (perhaps also corrupt, but my διέφθαρεν does not suffice to save the lines). Interpolators were apt to elaborate answers to apparently unanswered questions. But the case against 1012 is evanescent, a verse accurately expressing in blameless idiom what must otherwise be 'understood' (for the argument) at this point in the sequence of questions.

1029, 1045–50. I should still argue for retention of 1029 ἄπολις ἄοικος φυγὰς ἀλητεύων χθόνα (*prima facie* a finer verse than 1048 ἀλλ’ ἐκ πατρώιας φυγὰς

811) appears under μήν (p. 331); others (*Ag*. 1279, *OT* 810, *Hp*. 285, *PV* 268 [not 270], *Hcld*. 885, *Hp*. 914, *IT* 1004, *Hcld*. 885, *IA* 1004, *Rh*. 958) under οὐ μὴν 'adversative' (335), still others (*Cretans* fr. 472e K.16, *Hel*. 571, *Pho*. 1622) under μήν 'strong adversative' (335–6). To these add *Sept*. 538.

ἀλητεύων χθονός from which it is supposed to have been interpolated) and excision of 1047–50 (not 1050 only). I would only add that in 1047 ταχὺς γὰρ Ἅιδης ῥᾷστον ἀνδρὶ δυστυχεῖ is surely the superior reading (ῥᾷστος pler.): 'the easiest *thing*', not 'the easiest kind of death'. A quick death is, after all, easiest for *everyone*.

1102–4.   Χο.   ἦ μέγα μοί τι θεῶν μελεδήμαθ᾽, ὅταν φρένας ἔλθηι,
                       λύπας παραιρεῖ·

1102 μοί τι] μοι τὰ codd.

Verrall's extraordinary assignation of the strophes 1102–10 and 1120–30 to a different male chorus, accepted by Diggle, has been convincingly refuted by Sommerstein (in line with my note in *CQ* 18 [1968]), followed by Kovacs and Stockert. That issue has distracted attention from the one considered by R. P. Winnington-Ingram.[42] For Barrett, and some others before and since, τὰ θεῶν μελεδήματα means 'the gods' care for men' ('for men' to be somehow understood). Kovacs more correctly takes it as 'thoughts about the gods'. μελεδήματα that enter φρένες cannot easily be understood as thinking done by someone else. Moreover μελεδήματα with objective gen. is established poetic idiom: cf. *Od.* 15.7–8 (cited by Winnington-Ingram) Τηλέμαχον δ᾽ οὐχ ὕπνος ἔχε γλυκύς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνὶ θυμῶι | νύκτα δι᾽ ἀμβροσίην μελεδήματα πατρὸς ἔγειρεν. Winnington-Ingram suggested advancing the first comma to follow τὰ θεῶν, but was evidently less than happy with the result. What we need is rather τι for τὰ. That has unlooked-for beneficial effects. (i) Kovacs's translation, which neglects the definite article, becomes more evidently correct. (ii) The construction of παραιρεῖ with acc. μέγα τι ('a great *amount/part*') and gen. λύπας becomes straightforward and unambiguous ('take away X from Y'). As things stand we have to take it on trust that μέγα is 'adverbial' (Barrett) and that λύπας is 'more likely' (Halleran) to be genitive singular than accusative plural. In fact adverbial μέγα never stands at a great distance from what it qualifies; nor is there an apparent parallel for it with a verb of 'taking'.

1122–5.   ἐπεὶ τὸν Ἑλλανίας   ia cr
                φανερώτατον ἀστέρ᾽ †ἀθάνας†   paroem
                εἴδομεν εἴδομεν ἐκ πατρὸς ὀργᾶς   4da$_\wedge$
                ἄλλαν ἐπ᾽ αἶαν ἱέμενον.   1125   2ia

1123 ἀθάνας V: ἀθήν- cett. (-αις MO, -ης B)

Fitton's Ἀφαίας, accepted by Diggle and commended by Stockert ('fort. recte'), has been justly contemned by Sommerstein, Kovacs, and Halleran. As Barrett argued, we expect a genitive of place with 'star of'; and there is no evidence for the non-tragic Ἀφαία at Trozen, or for Ἑλλανία as a cult-epithet of that goddess. Kovacs and Halleran fall back on Hartung's ἀστέρα γαίας, which is unlikely to be the truth (despite apparent consistency with the scholion ἐπειδὴ τὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γῆς φανερώτατον ἀστέρα, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς). The corruption is hard to credit;[43] and as Sommerstein has

[41] *CQ* 17 (1967), 181–3.
[42] *BICS* 16 (1969), 50–1.
[43] Halleran should not have called the change of αθανας to αγαιας 'paleographically not difficult'. Barrett considered it 'not obvious but not unthinkable'. I think it incredible: a misreading (?) unlikely in itself, and away from straightforward sense (in line with a scholion).

pointed out, ἄλλαν in 1125 should not not mean 'other than Greece', since it is not from Greece that Hippolytus is being exiled.[44]

My neglected suggestion Ἀθανᾶν 'from Athens ... driven to another land' gives the problem-free sense required, while changing only one easily corruptible letter.[45] For the simple genitive, cf. γῆς ἐλᾶν Κορινθίας Med. 70, Πυθῶνος ... ἔβας OT 152, etc. For ʽΕλλανία 'Greece' (without γῆ, χθών, or αἶα), cf. Herc. 411, Hel. 1147. The word-order is unusual indeed, with 'from Athens' advanced ahead of εἴδομεν εἴδομεν ἐκ πατρὸς ὀργᾶς; but this is a relatively small price to pay. The sense 'from Athens' is sufficiently unmistakable, the moment the word Ἀθανᾶν is heard, and the advancement in the word-order is rhetorically appropriate. Following the mention of 'Greece', 'from Athens' needs stressing for clarity (as italicized above); it is also particularly shocking that such a 'star' should be exiled from Athens (of all πόλεις).

1142–6.   ἐγὼ δὲ σᾶι δυστυχίαι δάκρυσιν διοίσω,   ‿ e D ba ‖
             ἄποτμον πότμον· ὦ τάλαινα μᾶτερ,   T ba ‖
             ἔτεκές <μ'> ἀνόνατα· φεῦ,   1145   T
             μανίω θεοῖσιν·   ith

1143 δάκρυσιν Barthold: -σι codd. 1144 ἄποτμον πότμον] πότμον ἄποτμον codd. 1145 ἔτεκές <μ'>] ἔτεκες codd.; με desideravit Maas ἀνόνατα MOA: -ητα cett.

Diggle has discussed the metre of 1143–4 (Euripidea, 402). His analysis ἐγὼ δὲ σᾶι δυστυχίαι (ia ch) | δάκρυσιν διοίσω (ith) | πότμον ἄποτμον· ὦ τάλαινα μᾶτερ (cr ith) is better than those rejected, but has a questionable twice-resolved cretic with a harsh resolution before syncopation at sentence-end. πō̄τμον ᾱ̆πō̄τμον would give a smoother rhythm, and ch ia ba (as Rh. 457/823) would be in line with the opening ia ch | ...; but, though πō̄τμος occurs (Su. 623, Or. 190), ᾱ̆πō̄τμος is less likely: Euripides has δύσποτμος seven times, always with -πō̄τμ-.

This is non-strophic composition in which metre and rhetoric should go hand in hand (cf. on 165 above). The first thing to establish, therefore, is the sense of the passage, the more necessarily since Halleran (against Barrett) takes πότμον as Hippolytus' fate, and Kovacs offers that interpretation as an alternative. There really can be no argument here: the Greek is not ambiguous. It is certainly the spending of future life in tears that is regarded as a πότμος ἄποτμος, i.e. a 'lot, fate' of negative quality and/or value (ἄποτμος, pejoratively 'negating', resists exact translation). Hippolytus' δυστυχία has been sufficiently dwelt on in the preceding verses 1122–41 (following 1120–1 οὐκέτι γὰρ καθαρὰν φρέν' ἔχω ... ἐπεί ...). Now at 1142–3 the epode reverts with ἐγὼ δέ ... to the chorus's reaction to that δυστυχία. The focus is entirely on *their* tears; and hyperbolically (as often in tragic expressions of grief) they wish, in effect, that that they had never been born. This forecast of future tears also looks forward to

---

[44] Sommerstein's own Ἀληθηπίας has little appeal, however: another long shot, which frigidly demotes Hippolytus from 'brightest star of Greece' to 'brightest star of Trozen' and implies exile only 'to a land other (than Trozen)'. A reader (favouring γαίας) objects that ξένην ἐπ' αἶαν in 898 and 1049 has created the impression that Hippolytus' exile will be in a non-Greek land. Not so: ξένος is not the same as βάρβαρος. At 898 ξένην ἐπ' αἶαν is straightforwardly antithetic to τῆσδε χώρας, and at 1049 (interpolated, as argued in CQ 18 [1968]) antithetic to πατρῴας χθονός.

[45] A hybrid form Ἀθηνᾶν may be possible (cf. Barrett on 155–8 and Björck, Das Alpha impurum, 368ff.); but Burges was doubtless right at Tro. 803 λιπαραῖσί τε κόσμον Ἀθάναις (ἀθήναις VP), and similarly Triclinius at Hcld. 359; cf. attestations of ἀθάν- at Alc. 452, Ion 184, Pers. 286 (dub.), 976, Aj. 1222.

1423ff., where we shall hear from Artemis a forecast of grieving for Hippolytus sublimated in a ritual annually performed by young women.

A comma is appropriate (corresponding with metrical catalexis) after διοίσω, the object of which is not πότμον but rather βίον understood (cf. *Rh*. 982 ἄπαις διοίσει). The negating phrase then follows in looser apposition, initiating a new period, both metrically and rhetorically, with a strongly predicative point developed in what follows; cf. 757–8 ἐπόρευσας ἐμὰν ἄνασσαν ὀλβίων ἀπ' οἴκων, ‖ κακονυμφοτάταν ὄνασιν· ἦ γὰρ . . . (there *T* �’ : *D* . . . following *T* �’ *ith*). For this second period, the easiest of transpositions gives a favourite verse (*T ba* in my notation), cf. *Alc*. 437/447, 442/452, 460/470, *Med*. 650/659, *Hec*. 926/936, *Herc*. 1080, *IT* 1251/1275, *Rh*. 461/827, 531/550, 900/911, S. *Tra*. 648/656. Inversion of the words ἄποτμον πότμον is variously explicable: the negating word more often comes second in such oxymora, but cf. *Or*. 164–5, 319, *Hec*. 194, *IT* 144, 203–4; πότμον ἄποτμον may have been preferred following a vowel, but the hiatus is now unexceptionable; or an erroneous ἄποτμον bis (cf. *Pho*. 1306) or πότμον bis could have been corrected in the wrong place. Before that, Diggle's *ia ch* | *ith* is possible; but ˘ *e* : *D* ˙ *ba* is likelier. ˘ – ˘ – : – ˘ ˘ – ˘ ˘ – recurs in 1147 (ἰὼ ἰὼ συζύγιαι Χάριτες); cf. S. *Tra*. 94/103, etc. The metrical context is enoplian, in which *D ba* is as much at home as *ith* (*e ba*).

In 1145–6 Maas (*Kleine Schriften* [1973], 48–9) rightly understood the singers as alluding to their own mothers (while wrongly attributing the epode, after Murray, to a separate chorus of young maidens), and justly suspected that με had dropped out. Fr. 385 τί με δῆτ' ὦ μελέα μᾶτερ ἔτικτες; (= Ar. *Vesp*. 312) offers strong support for an expression of self-pitying grief in such terms.[46] Barrett saw merit in this interpretation, but rejected it as unintelligible without an expressed με, excluded (for him) by metrical considerations. He overlooked that with μ' added at the natural place after ἔτεκες we have the same dicolon (*T ith*, related to *T ba*) as *Alc*. 400 ὑπάκουσον ἄκουσον ὦ / μᾶτερ ἀντιάζω ~ 412 ἀνόνατ' ἀνόνατ' ἐνύμ-/φευσας οὐδὲ γήρως.[47]

1272–6.	ποτᾶται δὲ γαῖαν εὐάχητόν θ'		δδ
	ἁλμυρὸν †ἐπὶ† πόντον,		δ
	θέλγει δ' Ἔρως ὧι μαινομέναι κραδίαι		3ia
	πτανὸς ἐφορμάσηι	1275	δ(*D*)
	χρυσοφαής, φύσιν ὀρεσκόων (κτλ.)		δ∧∧δ

1272 δὲ Seidler: δ' ἐπὶ fere codd. (δ' om V) fort. εὐάχεταν θ'   1273 leg. ἀμ πόντον   1274 κραδίαι Ald.: καρδ- codd.   1276 χρυσοφαῆς <στίλβων> (e.g.) Diggle   1277 ὀρεσκόων L: -ώ(ι)ων cett.

1272. Dochmiacs with long penult. are almost always followed by full diaeresis, if not actual syntactical pause. There are two striking exceptions, with word-overlap not merely weak diaeresis, in late plays (*Or*. 326–7 φοιτᾶ-'λέου, *Ba*. 1005–6 θηρεύου-'σα s.v.l.); otherwise the rule is virtually absolute.[48] *εὐάχέτας (cf. ἀχέτας and εὐαχής) is in itself as likely a coinage as εὐάχητος (elsewhere only at *Ion* 884).

---

[46] It should not be argued that reference to Hippolytus' mother here is confirmed by the 'echo' of Hippolytus' lament ὦ δυστάλαινα μῆτερ, ὦ πικραὶ γοναί at 1082. Rather, we may cite 1082 as an instance of the same self-pitying idiom, lamenting *one's own* birth.

[47] Cf. also the sequence *T ith* ‖ *T* ˘ *ith* (or *T ba*?) at *Hec*. 653–5, another epode.

[48] There are no other exceptions in Eur. and none in Soph. In Aesch., apart from a very doubtful conjecture in the apparatus at *Su*. 829, West's text offers only *Sept*. 629–30 (~ 566–7) ἐπιμόλους· πύργων δ' ἔκτοθεν βαλὼν | Ζεύς σφε κάνοι κεραυνῶι, where a different division gives *cr* : δ followed by a hipponactean like *Ag*. 1488/1512, *Ch*. 469–70, 474–5.

1273. $- \smile \smile \smile \smile - -$ is not an acceptable dochmius (nor, in this context, can it plausibly be taken as an ithyphallic with split resolution). Stockert vainly appeals to Parker 260, who cited also '*Ant*. 1344' (*sic*), '*OC* 1561 and, perhaps, *Eum*. 844'; but Parker herself doubted *Ant*. 1342 (*sic*) on her p. 266 (πρὸς πότερον ἴδω; πᾶι as a dochmius also has impossible word-end after long penult.); *OC* 1561 is doubtless $- \smile \smile \smile \smile -$ (... βαρνάχεῖ, cf. δυσαχής, βαρυάλγητος); and *Eum*. 844 is negligible (see the texts of Page, West, and Sommerstein). Similarly to be rejected are the three other hypothetical forms of δ ending with . . . $\smile - -$.[49] The likeliest remedy is substitution of a less obvious preposition for ἐπί (intrusive again, as in 1272 in all MSS?). ἐπί + acc. is standard for 'flying *over*' (as in 735); but here a more generally 'environmental' preposition is needed (cf. 17 χλωρὰν ἀν' ὕλην, etc., and my note on *Or*. 329–31), embracing also 'on' and 'in', since the power of love affects even the σκύμνοι πελάγιοι (1277). For the force 'up and down, throughout' as needed here, cf. *OT* 477ff. φοιτᾶι γὰρ ὑπ' ἀγρίαν | ὕλαν ἀνά τ' ἄντρα καὶ | πέτρας (s.v.l.), Hdt. 1.96 ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Μηδικήν, etc. (LSJ ἀνά C.2); for the form ἄν/ἄμ (liable to corruption), cf. *El*. 466 (Seidler), *Herc*. 389 (Musgrave), *Pho*. 1516 (Willink), A. *Pers*. 566, *Su*. 351, S. *Aj*. 1190 (Ahrens), *Il*. 8. 441, etc.

1275–6 is by no means certainly defective. δ *cr* is common enough (or rather $\delta_{\wedge\wedge}\delta$ in my now-preferred notation); and exactly the same . . . | $- \smile \smile - : \smile \smile\smile - - |$ . . . (with an apparent choriamb) occurs in dochmiac context at *Med*. 1256–7 αἷμα πίτνειν φόβος ὑπ' ἀνέρων ~ 1266–7 καὶ ζαμενὴς φόνος ἀμείβεται (Diggle offers unneeded supplements in both stanzas), *Rh*. 699–700 Θεσσαλὶς ἢ παραλίαν Λοκρῶν ~ 717–18 πολλὰ δὲ τὰν βασιλίδ' ἑστίαν, and similarly *Eum*. 270–1 ἢ θεὸν ἢ ξένον τιν' ἀσεβῶν.

1379–81.	μιαιφόνον τι σύγγονον		2ia
	παλαιῶν προγεννητόρων ἐξ-	1380	3ba
	ορίζεται οὐδὲ μένει κακόν,		$\smile D \smile -$

1381 οὐδὲ μένει κακόν] κακὸν οὐδὲ μέλλει (μένει Wilamowitz) fere codd.

As things stand (given μένει for μέλλει), the period ends with a surprising anapaestic monometer, and doubt hangs over the colometric interpretation of μιαιφόνον . . . ἐξορίζεται. See Stinton (123), who questioned the vulgate 2ia | 3ba ia as including a form of dimeter (ba ia) which he showed to be anomalous; whereas Barrett was dissatisfied by the alternative 2ia ba || δ hδ | an (a weird mixture). The proposed transposition in 1381 gives an enoplian verse $\smile D \times -$ frequent in comparable contexts, as *Andr*. 827, 831, 841, etc. (cf. my commentary on *Orestes*, p. 288). For the overlap ἐξ-/ορίζεται, cf. 1269–70 ποι-/κιλόπτερος, *Herc*. 1068 ἐξ-/εγειρόμενος (no need for Diggle's emendation); cf. also *Hec*. 686–7 . . . ἐξ | ἀλάστορος ἀρτιμαθὴς νόμον, *Tro*. 275–6 τριτοβά-/μονος χερὶ δευομένα βάκτρου (in my colometry). A probable 3ba with overlap recurs at once in 1384–6 ἰώ μοι· τί φῶ; πῶς ἀπαλλά-/ξω βιοτὰν ἐμὰν | τοῦδ' ἀνάλγητον πάθους; (ἰώ μοι VCD; ἰώ μοί μοι BOAE).

1387–8.	εἴθε με κοιμίσειε τὸν	ch ia
	δυσδαίμον' Ἅιδα μέλαι-	ia cr
	να νύκτερός τ' ἀνάγκα.	$2ia_{\wedge}$

1387 κοιμίσειε AV: κοιμήσειε BO, κοιμάσειε cett.

[49] Conomis (*Hermes* 92 [1964], 23ff.) nos. 24, 27, 29; but this must be pursued elsewhere.

All editors since Murray read κοιμάσειε (against Weil, Hadley, and others). Corruption from -μάσ- to -μίσ- by way of -μήσ- is indeed likely enough in itself. But the reverse is also possible, as probably at *Rh.* 669. It could well be that κοιμίσειε, κοιμήσειε, and κοιμάσειε were all current readings here in antiquity. According to Sch. *Il.* 16.524 (cited by Ellendt, *Lex.Soph.*), κοιμῆσαι for -ίσαι is Aeolic. Barrett should not, without investigation, have declared -μάσ- and -μίσ- to be 'equally acceptable' for the metre. *ch ia* (restored at 67 and 70 above) occurs elsewhere in Euripides at *Alc.* 88/100, *Hcld.* 910/919, *Su.* 72/80?, *Ion* 506, *Ba.* 109/124, *Rh.* 361/371, to which may be added lyric trimeters beginning/ending with *ch ia*, as *El.* 181–2/204–3, *Or.* 811/823, *Rh.* 242–3/253–4, 457/823, 464/829 (as Headlam), 466/831 (*ch ia sp*, not δ ‿ – – –). All these are – ‿ ‿ – ‿ – ‿ –, and there is no contrary instance of *ch ia* with long anceps (not *Alc.* 216, where better colometry gives *D* ⦂ ‿ *D* ⦂ – *e* | *ar*; nor *Or.* 840, see my commentary). The position is similar in Sophocles (*OC* 1055/1070 is *d* – *e* in a D/e context). – ‿ ‿ – ‿ . . . is properly the norm, since *ch ia* is the non-catalectic correlate of *ch ba* (= *ar*). On the rarity of long anceps after choriamb see also Diggle, *Euripidea* 505–6. Even if κοιμά- is the 'older' form (Barrett), that does not make it likelier in Euripides, in whom (not counting *Rhesus*) κοιμίζειν occurs at *Hec.* 474 (lyr.), 826, ?*Tro.* 594 (lyr., but the transmitted κόμισαι could be right) and *Pho.* 184 (lyr.); κοιμᾶν only at *Andr.* 390 (non-lyric ἐκοιμήθης βίαι).

1452–3.   Θη.   ὦ φίλταθ', ὡς γενναῖος ἐκφαίνηι πατρί.
        Ιπ.   †ὦ χαῖρε καὶ σύ† χαῖρε πολλά μοι, πάτερ.

Recent opinion has rightly turned against Wilamowitz's line-transposition 1452–5–4–3 (accepted by Barrett) as insufficiently, if at all, remedial.[50] But it has not, *pace* Diggle, Kovacs, and Halleran, convincingly vindicated ὦ χαῖρε καὶ σύ . . . in response to a verse that is in no way 'valedictory'. Commonsense refutes Halleran's claim that 'Hipp. can construe the previous line as a subtle and tactful farewell from Th.'. Stockert laudably obelizes (†καὶ σύ†) and mentions Barthold's ὦ χαῖρέ μοι σύ. I still prefer my proposal ὦ καὶ σύ (sc. φίλτατος)· χαῖρε χαῖρε πολλά μοι, πάτερ (with an echo of 64 χαῖρε χαῖρε μοι in Hippolytus' entry-song); for the elliptical start to the verse (here particularly effective on the lips of a dying man, with almost his last breath), cf. *Med.* 584 ὡς καὶ σύ and 964 μή μοι σύ (not otherwise closely parallel). For ὦ . . . with part of the predicate to be supplied, cf. Ar. *Lys.* 857 ὦ πρὸς θεῶν (sc. ἐκκάλεσον Μυρρίνην, to be supplied from 850). Rather than emending, one might perhaps consider the possibility of line-loss before 1453; but at least two verses would be needed. Corrupt phrasing is otherwise the likelier fault, since it is proper that the dying Hippolytus should be the first to say 'farewell'.

Highgate, London   C. W. WILLINK

[50] Cf. C. Segal, *GRBS* 11 (1970), 101–7. But his defence of the paradosis is less persuasive.