CHAPTER TWENTY

EURIPIDES, HIPPOLYTUS 145–50*

†cò δ’ ἀμφὶ ἑαυτῷ πολύθηρον 145
Δίκτυνναν ἀμπλακίαις
ἀνίέρος ἀθότων πελανῶν τρύχηι;
ϕοιτάι γάρ καὶ διὰ Λίμνας
χέρσον θ’ ὑπὲρ πελάγους
dίναις ἐν νοτίαις ἄλμας.

These verses continue and conclude the stanza whose opening verses 141–4 are discussed by Dr A. Rijksbaron with the new proposal ｃｉγ’ ἀρ’ for ｃò γάρ in line 141. It is common ground (Barrett, Diggle, Stockert, Kovacs, Halleran) that both ｃò γάρ in 141 and ｃò δ’ in 145 are corrupt. As to 145 in particular, whether or not δέ is an acceptable co-ordination of the speculative sentences, no parallel is in view for the continuation ｃò δὲ …; without a change of subject. The proposals for 145 considered by Stockert in Prometheus 20 (1994), 214, with a well-justified lack of enthusiasm, are: ἄρ’ (Barrett), εἶτ’ (Nauck), μηδ’ (Fitton), ἦ κάμφι (H. Schwabl), ἦ κάπι (Metzger). Barrett had previously disposed of ἦ κ(αί), and also of ｃò γάρ … ｏὖδ’ (Lachmann, Tyrrell). Nauck’s ἦ γάρ … εἶτ’ is open to the further objection that alternative direct questions are never posed in the form ἦ (or ἦ) … εἶτε …;3 Fitton’s μὴ γάρ …; μηδ’ …; does maintain a tenuous link with the transmitted ｃò γάρ …; ｃò δ’ …; But it will not do, partly for the reason given above by Rijksbaron, but also because 148–50 makes it clear that the explanation of Phaedra’s πάθος contemplated by the chorus in 145–7 is not δ’ being rejected as improbable. At one time I considered ἀλλ’ …; as an overlooked possibility (ἈΛΛΑ dropping out before ἈΜ); but the ἀλλὰ …; that

1 Ibid. 712–15. Acknowledgements are mutual. Rijksbaron’s conjecture came first. Exchanges by fax then generated mine, and it was agreed that we should offer our proposals in tandem.
2 Apart from ｃò δ’ the text of 145–50 is uncontroversial. The slight difference in lineation in my text is irrelevant to the present issue.
3 Cf. Denniston, GP 506–7. εἶτε can of course mean ‘or’ following an expressed or understood ἦ or εἶτε. But where such a disjunction is interrogative, the context must be already interrogative, as at S. Tra. 236 ποῦ γής; πατριώις, εἶτε βαρβάρου; λέγε (where the (ἡ) … εἶτε … is epexegetic, not in itself directly interrogative).
interrogatively suggests a different hypothesis (Denniston, *GP* 9–10) needs to follow explicit rejection of the previous suggestion, and we still have not accounted for cù δ’ (except, somewhat arbitrarily, as an interpolation).

It has been generally assumed that, in place of cù δ’, we need a monosyllable meaning, or at least implying, ‘or …?’. As Barrett put it, ‘all we need is ἦ, but hiatus forbids’. The assumption is apparently in line with the two further questions in the antistrophe 151–60 (η …; ἦ …), offering alternative human explanations of Phaedra’s behaviour. A pattern of four hypotheses in the two stanzas has a superficial appeal, with 145–50 (‘or …?’) in the strophe symmetrical with 155–60 (‘or …?’) in the antistrophe. It is clear, however, that conjecture in that sense has reached an impasse. Though accepted by Kovacs, it was merely as a pis aller that Barrett offered his ἀρ’, looking for support to ‘the apparent ἦ ἥνα in S. Ai. 177’.

Ajax 172 ff. variously merits fuller consideration:

In this complex but accurately nested syntax (nesting of a kind nowadays very familiar in computer-language), the main disjunction ἦ ἥνα … Ἀρτεμίς … ἦ … ἑνυάλιος … speculatively contemplates alternative deities hypothetically offended by the hero and consequently causative of his madness. Within the longer first section, ἦ ἥνα at 177 introduces the first of a parenthetical pair of alternatives, epexegetic of the speculation ἦ πού τινος νίκας ἀκαρπώ-του χάριν, ἦ ἥνα κλυτόν ἐνάρων ψευθεῖε’ ἀδώροις ἐίτ’ ἐλαφαβολίαις, ἦ χαλκοθόρος ἐτ’ ἑνυάλιος …

In this complex but accurately nested syntax (nesting of a kind nowadays very familiar in computer-language), the main disjunction ἦ ἥνα … Ἀρτεμίς … ἦ … ἑνυάλιος … speculatively contemplates alternative deities hypothetically offended by the hero and consequently causative of his madness. Within the longer first section, ἦ ἥνα at 177 introduces the first of a parenthetical pair of alternatives, epexegetic of the speculation ἦ πού τινος νίκας ἀκαρπώ-του χάριν (ἡ ποῦ Ven.: ἦ ποῦ codd.). There should be no question of taking ἦ ἥνα here, or anywhere else, as ‘or’ (as opposed to ‘either’).  

---

4 LJ/W persevere in error, against reviewers of their Oxford Text and *Sophoclea* (1990), in *Sophocles: Second Thoughts*, 14. They still surprisingly neglect Kamerbeek, who had correctly observed that ‘The words ἦ … χάριν suppose the general reason for the anger of Artemis, while ἦ ἥνα … εἴτ’ splits up the general reason into two possibilities’ (comparing Alc. 114–15 στείλας ἦ Λυκίον εἴτ’ ἐφ’ ἐδρας ἀνύδρους Ἀμφινώδος). The cited sequences ἦ τις … ἦ ἥνα νῦ ποῦ … ἦ … in Od. 21. 397–9 and ἦ ἅρ’ … ἦ (sic) … in Il. 21. 62 are not irrelevant, with ἦ ἥνα (ἀρ’) similarly in the first κῶλον of a disjunction.—A minor issue is whether this strophe is ‘speculative-