ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA


Hipp. 136 (cf. p. 40). If τάνδ’ ἀβρωσίαι στοματος ἀμέραν is read, the sequence – ο – ο – ο – ο – (preferably with πόρφυρέα φάρη ... in str., cf. p. 418 n. 88 above) should be interpreted as ἥδ’ δ’ rather than as two hypodochmiacs with the second resolved; cf. (exactly) 852 ὁ τάλας, ὁσον κακὸν ἔχει δόμοις and similarly 879 ὅσον ὅσον εἰδον μέλος ἐν γραφαίϲ (p. 522 above). The statement on p. 46 above that ‘hypodochmi come nowhere else in the play’ was erroneous; but 136 (unlike 852, 879, Hec. 694, Ion 799, etc.) is not in a dochmiac context, and the case for ἐκάς (accounting for -ε κατ’) remains persuasive.

Hipp. 661–3 (cf. pp. 26 and 281). One might alternatively consider a lacuna after 663, e. g.

θέασομαι δὲ εὼν πατρὸς μολὼν ποδὶ
πῶε νῳ προκοήη, καὶ σʾ καὶ δέσποταν σʾ;
τῆς εῆς δὲ τόλμης ἐκομοί γεγευμένος
(τι χῆρ με φαίνειν τῆδ’ ἀναιδεῖας πέρι).

‘I shall know, having experienced your audacity, what I must reveal ...’. Barrett’s argument that ‘... and your mistress’ must be the last words of Hippolytus’ speech lacks force (Hipp. 664–8 are defended on pp. 281 and 663 above).

Hipp. 680–1. G. W. Most (CQ 58, 2008, 44–6) persuasively advocates Reiske’s neglected assignation of this distich to the Nurse.

Hipp. 879. See above on Hipp. 136.

Hipp. 1045–6 (cf. p. 37). A different remedy (still deleting 1047–50) gives a smoother text without interrupted syntax:

ὡς ἀξιον τὸδ’ εἰπας· ἄλλα’ ὡτῳ θανήᾳ
textTheme δἐ χαυτῷ τόνδε προὐθήκας νόμον.

Theseus agrees that death is merited (ὡς at once ‘asseverative’ and ‘exclamatory’). But death will come to Hippolytus not directly from Theseus but rather in the manner in which he previously invoked death upon himself in his self-curse (viz. death in exile); ἄλλα’ as in Ar.
Ach. 364 ἀλλή ἐπερ αὕτὸς τὴν δίκην διωρίσο. For ὡσπερ thus correlative with οὖτῳ(ς), cf. S. Tra. 475, etc. (LSJ). Theseus is unambiguously referring to what Hippolytus said at 1028–31, and it is natural then for Hippolytus to react with a protest against the implied sentence of exile, evidently about to be re-affirmed (cf. τόνδε).

**Supp. 44–5** (cf. p. 252). The proposal

ἀνε μοι (L ἄνοιμοι) τέκνα λύσαι,
φθιμένον νεκύων οἱ
καταλείπουσι μέλη ...

plausibly changed only one letter; but the word-order was questioned as inviting misinterpretation of φθιμένων νεκύων as the antecedent of οἱ. There is no real risk of that misinterpretation, since there is no temptation for the ear to construe φθιμένων νεκύων as governed by τέκνα λύσαι (as if for the sense ‘children of dead corpses’). At the same time the ear is expecting the subject of λύσαι to be defined, as it is in due course by οἱ καταλείπουσι κτλ. (equivalent to τοὺς καταλείποντας). For the genitive phrase thus advanced for emphasis, cf. Or. 338 ματέρος αἶμα cāc ʻc ἀναβακχεύει (on which see also p. 345 above).

Kovacs (Eur. Tertia 165–6) argues for ἀνόμων ἀπο λύσαι νέκυαι φθιμένον οἱ καταλείπουσι μέλη ... without mentioning my discussion and proposal.


– ἀγὼν ὄδ' ἄλλος ἔρχεται ἐργόν γόων
διάδοχος, ὀχοίς προσπόλοιν· χέρες·

There is certainly corruption at γόων γόων (usually ‘corrected’ to γόων γόως or γόως γόων); the asyndeton at ὀχοίς is uncomfortable; and there is also a responsion-flaw (though nothing prima facie wrong with 2ia : ia : ia + lk).

A different line of attack here (but similarly in dimeters) gives

ἀγὼν ὄδ' ἄλλος ἔρχεται
γόουν διάδοχον ἀ-
χοίς προσπόλοιν χέρες·

The asyndeton is now straightforwardly ‘epexegetic’ (cf. S. Tra. 497–8), and the ‘further ἀγὼν’ is more clearly defined as ‘responsive γόως + κομμός’. Genitive (rei) is as likely as dative with διάδοχος (see LSJ). The corruption is easily explained: γόουν γόουν all too easily became γόουν γόουν, and διάδοχος then had to be adjusted into agreement