CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

REVIEW OF W. STOCKERT, EURIPIDES HIPPOLYTUS
(TEUBNER, 1994)1


The apparatus includes corrected or expanded attributions at 224, 227, 231, 246, 277, 503, 558, 586, 625–6, 814, 867, 1041, 1180, 1338, 1391, and some forty conjectures additional to those in D. (again mostly commended in ‘Prom.’), including one of Diggle’s own ‘per

1 JHS 118 (1998), 213.
litt.’ (1133 λίμναν). S.’s own suggestions offered here are: 277 ἄςὴμ’—
421 μὴ’ οὖς ἐτίκτον παϊδας — 840 κλύδων τίς; or τίς ὁ κλύδων; — 953
βίον — 1144–5 ἀ. τάλαινα μάτηρ | ἐτεκές с’—1193 θανόντων ... δεδορκότων (or -ο... -ο). Many more conjectures appear in the
Appendix Critica (inappropriately given the Weckleinian subtitle
‘conjecturae quaedam minus probabiles’, since it includes some
items followed by ‘fort. recte’ and many others worth a place at the
top table). Further suggestions of S. here are: 271 ἐλεγχές μ’—458
ζυμφοράς — 826 τίνα λόγω ... τίνα — 867–8 (μή τινος) τύχας (c)
deleting μὲν οὖν ὀβιτος βίον, after Burges and Maas) — 993 εἰκόρα —
[1313–24] — 1459 ὅ κλειν’ Ἐρεχθέως κτλ. Of all S.’s own proposals
perhaps only the last mentioned, already accepted by Kovacs in the
new Loeb, seems likely to be hailed as palmary; but his decisions to
obelize are often welcome, and his discussions at worst show
sensitivity and provoke thought. Many meritorious conjectures are
given a further airing, offset by only a small proportion unworthy of
mention. He is also much to be commended for giving the exact
source (economically identified) of all the conjectures mentioned.
In the abbreviations there are some inconsistencies (e. g. ‘Wil.,
Anal.’ usually appears later as ‘Wil.’, but also as ‘Wilamowitz,
Anal.’), and the typography of Notae (i) is bizarre. The Testimonia
are inflated with matter of possible relevance to a commentary but none
for constitution of the text: sometimes mere thematic parallels (e. g.
‘cf. Eur. Hipp. 1179’ at v. 54), but also the 24 lines laboriously listing
ancient allusions to the famous ἡ γλῶσσ’ ὀμόμοχ’ ... Heaven preserve
us from a text of Hamlet behaving thus.
There are more misses than hits in the attention paid to relevant
metrical studies, e. g. at 143–4/153–4 the reversion to B.’s colometry
runs counter to Buijs (1985), 63 ff. and the notation ‘wilam.’ for ω <!-- --> ω
κλείν’ at 147/157 counter to Itsumi (1982). Other oddities in the
Appendix metrica (in general leaning too heavily on Barrett) include
‘arist.’ for at 70, ‘wilam.’ also for at 164
and (amazingly) for at 163, and ‘colarium’ as a catch-all
(variously — , — , — , — , — , — ). Nothing
verifies period-end after v. 58, where the pendent short is certainly
link-anceps; contrariwise period-end should have been indicated
after 120–1/1131–2.
In sum, however, this is a thoroughly worthy addition to the
Teubner series: scholarly, very well proof-read (but read 669 ss. for
368 ss. on p. 31 and for 668 ss. on p. 52, and οὐδὲ for οὐδὲν on p. 107