

An Ancient Hypothesis to *Rhesus*, and Dicaearchus' *Hypotheseis*

Vayos Liapis

AN ANCIENT HYPOTHESIS to *Rhesus* purports to quote Dicaearchus. This paper offers a re-examination of this hypothesis, with the following objectives: to clarify textual matters (section 1), to identify to what extent the purported quotation from Dicaearchus can be safely attributed to him (section 2), and to offer a fresh examination of, and a new solution to, the problem of the authenticity and the content of Dicaearchus' Ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων (section 3).

1. Textual matters

The *Rhesus* has been transmitted with no prologue: it begins with the entrance of the Chorus of Trojan guards. However, the ancient Hypothesis b Diggle = III Zanetto mentions two prologues to the play that were in circulation in antiquity, and quotes parts thereof:¹

πρόλογοι δὲ διττοὶ φέρονται. ὁ γοῦν Δικαίαρχος (fr.81 Wehrli = 114 Mirhady) ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως (Eur. fr. dub. 1108 Nauck = 660a Snell):

Νῦν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἢ διφρήλατος
καὶ ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕτερός τις φέρεται πρόλογος,
πεζὸς πάνυ καὶ οὐ πρέπων Εὐριπίδῃ· καὶ τάχα ἄν τινες τῶν

¹I reproduce the text of Diggle's OCT edition, *Euripidis Fabulae* III (Oxford 1994).

ὑποκριτῶν διεσκευακότες εἶεν αὐτόν. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως (Eur. fr.1109 Nauck = *TrGF* II adesp. F *8 1).

⟨HPA⟩ ὦ τοῦ μεγίστου Ζηνὸς ἄλκιμον τέκος
 Παλλάς, τί δρῶμεν; οὐκ ἐχρῆν ἡμᾶς ἔτι
 μέλλειν Ἀχαιῶν ὠφελεῖν στρατεύματα.
 νῦν γὰρ κακῶς πράσσουσιν ἐν μάχῃ δορὸς
 5 λόγῃ βιαίως Ἑκτορος στροβούμενοι.
 ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἄλγιον βᾶρος,
 ἐξ οὗ γ' ἔκρινε Κύπριν Ἀλέξανδρος θεᾶν
 κάλλει προήκειν τῆς ἐμῆς εὐμορφίας
 καὶ σῆς, Ἀθάνᾳ, φιλτάτης ἐμοὶ θεῶν,
 10 εἰ μὴ κατασκαφεῖσαν ὄψομαι πόλιν
 Πριάμου, βίᾳ πρόρριζον ἐκτετριμμένην.

Two prologues have been transmitted. Dicaearchus, for one, presenting the plot-summary of *Rhesus*, writes exactly as follows: “Now the chariot-driven <?Dawn dispels>² the bright glow of the moon,” while in some of the copies another prologue is found, extremely prosaic and unworthy of Euripides; perhaps it is an interpolation by some actors; it reads as follows: “<HERA> O mighty child of greatest Zeus, Pallas, what are we to do? We should no longer delay to offer our assistance to the armies of the Achaeans. For now they fare badly in battle, being violently whirled by Hector’s spear. For nothing has caused me greater pain, since Alexander judged Cypris to surpass in beauty my own lovely figure and yours, Athena, dearest of all gods to me, unless I witness Priam’s city being razed to the ground and violently crushed, foundations and all.”

One would expect that Δικαίαρχος, Nauck’s emendation of the MSS. δικάϊαν (**VLP**, om. **Q**), should have met with universal approval; in the words of A. Kirchhoff, “Δικαίαρχος ist eine evidente besserung ..., an deren richtigkeit nur völlige kritische impotenz zweifeln konnte.”³ As W. Luppe further pointed out,

²My tentative supplement is based on Diggle’s suggestion <“Ἐως διώκουσ’> in his app. crit. to *Rhesus* (*init.*).

³*Philologus* 7 (1852) 562.

δικαίαν must be due to a misunderstanding of an abbreviated form of Δικαίάρχος (*viz.* ΔΙΚΑΙ^A or ΔΙΚΑΙΑ^P).⁴ In the last twenty years, however, Nauck's emendation has been rejected by at least two scholars: A. Tuilier paved the way by suggesting that the *lectio tradita* should be maintained,⁵ while P. Carrara attempted fully to develop the case.⁶ Carrara thought that ὁ γούν δικαίαν ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ... γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως is impeccable Greek, and translated it as "colui che espone per davvero ... esatta (δικαίαν) la trama del dramma, dice precisamente ecc."⁷ This is a violation of Greek usage:

(a) δίκαιος is, to my knowledge, *never* predicated of a text as a designation of its "genuineness," or "correctness," and a look at the lexis suffices to show that the parallels adduced by Carrara are irrelevant. One instance which could, *prima facie*, lend some support to Carrara's contention, but which he does not cite, is Hdt. 7.108.3 ἡ δὲ χώρα αὕτη πάλαι μὲν ἐκαλέετο Γαλλαϊκή, νῦν δὲ Βριαντική· ἔστι μέντοι τῷ δικαιοτάτῳ τῶν λόγων καὶ αὕτη Κικόνων. At first sight, δικαιοτάτῳ appears to mean "most precise" (it is translated "exact" by LSJ). The context, however, makes it clear that δίκαιος preserves here the traditional meaning *sua cuique tribuens*, as exemplified in the famous definitions of δικαιοσύνη in Book 1 of Plato's *Republic*.⁸ To point out that, despite the variety of its names, a χώρα in

⁴ZPE 84 (1990) 12.

⁵*Sileno* 9 (1983) 21–22.

⁶ZPE 90 (1992) 40–42.

⁷*Supra* n.6: 40–41. In another connection, M. Ragone (*RAAN* n.s. 44 [1969] 93) had similarly asserted that ὁ γούν δικαίαν κτλ. means "colui che espone la retta ipotesi al *Reso*," and that Nauck's ὁ γούν Δικαίάρχος κτλ. is therefore erroneous. Ragone's assertion is part and parcel with his theory that δικαίαν ὑπόθεσιν refers to Hypothesis a Diggle = I Zanetto, which was thought to describe not the *Rhesus* transmitted to us but another play of the same title. Such an assumption naturally ought to have given rise to discussion as to the authenticity of the transmitted *Rhesus*, but Ragone (92) fails to explain why it did not.

⁸331C τὴν δικαιοσύνην, πότερα τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐτὸ φήσομεν εἶναι ἀπλῶς οὕτως καὶ τὸ ἀποδιδόναι ἂν τίς τι παρά του λάβῃ, *cf.* 331D; 331E τὸ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα ἐκάστῳ ἀποδιδόναι δίκαιόν ἐστι, *cf.* 332A.

Thrace actually belongs to the Kikones is to give “to each his own,” and thereby to preserve balance and propriety. Such a sense is glaringly absent from our Hypothesis.⁹

(b) As Tuilier rightly remarks, “[d]ans la proposition participiale ὁ γοῶν δικαίαν ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου, l’article explicite effectivement la phrase précédente Πρόλογοι δὲ διττοὶ φέρονται et désigne en tout état de cause le premier prologue de la pièce.”¹⁰ Now, this would require that the prologue be *personified* as γράφων κατὰ λέξιν! And to try to save the case, as Carrara does,¹¹ by positing “the poet,” *i.e.* Euripides, as the implied referent of ὁ ἐκτιθεὶς, is both insensitive to the run of the sentence (*cf.* the quotation from Tuilier above) and foists on the author of the Hypothesis a circular argument, namely that the first prologue is the authentic one, because the tragedian who presents (ἐκτιθεὶς) the “authentic” (δικαίαν) subject-matter or plot (ὑπόθεσιν) is the one who wrote the first prologue. On the other hand, reading ὁ γοῶν Δικαίαρχος ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν κτλ. instantly elucidates the meaning of the passage and the intention of its author: a quotation explicitly taken from Dicaearchus is used in order authoritatively to settle the problem of the two prologues once and for all; and ἐκτιθέναι is precisely an instance of the scholiastic jargon standardly used to indicate quotations from earlier scholars.¹²

⁹The same sense of balance is present also in Hdt. 2.149.3 αἱ δ’ ἑκατὸν ὄργυιαὶ δίκαιαι εἰσι στάδιον ἐξάπλεθρον, ἐξαπέδου μὲν τῆς ὄργυιης μετρεομένης κτλ., where the primary meaning of δίκαιαι is “balanced,” *i.e.* neither excessive nor wanting. The sense of balance is most graphically exemplified in Xen. *Cyr.* 2.2.26 οὔτε γὰρ ἄρμα δήπου ταχὺ γένοιτ’ ἂν βραδέων ἵπων ἐνότων οὔτε δίκαιον ἀδίκων συνεζευγμένων.

¹⁰*Supra* n.5: 22.

¹¹*Supra* n.6: 42, *cf.* 41 n.30.

¹²*Cf. e.g.* schol. Eur. *Alc.* 968 (II 239.4 Schwartz), *Med.* 9 (II 142.11 S.), *Or.* 1384 (I 221.1 S.), *Rhes.* 5 (II 326.14 S.); schol. Ar. *Lys.* 447 (p.25 Hangard), *Ran.* 218a (pp.39–40 Chantry); see also 325 *infra*. What is more, I can find no parallel for the concept of a tragedian “presenting” his *subject-matter* (ὑπόθεσις) rather than his *drama* (*cf.* Tz. *ad Ar. Nub.* 581a [p.524 Holwerda] κωμωδίας ἐκτιθεσθαι). The parallel from Arist. *Poet.* 1454a34 adduced by Carrara collapses upon closer scrutiny: see W. D. Lucas’ commentary (Oxford 1968) *ad loc.*

2. One prologue or two? The precise extent of the quotation from Dicaearchus

To summarize: the Hypothesis to *Rhesus* quoted above (313f) contains information on two *Rhesus* prologues that were known in antiquity; one of the prologues was certainly known to Dicaearchus, who is quoted as giving its *incipit* (Νῶν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἢ διφρήλατος).

As for the second prologue, however, it is not clear whether it was known to Dicaearchus. If, as Kirchhoff first suggested,¹³ Dicaearchus knew both prologues, then the two prologues were in circulation *ca* 320–300 B.C. (Dicaearchus' *floruit*) but had both vanished by (probably) the latter part of the third century, as may be deduced by a note in the Hypothesis attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium (c Diggle = II Zanetto) which suggests that the *Rhesus* known to Aristophanes began with the entrance of the Chorus: ὁ χορὸς συνέστηκεν ἐκ φυλάκων Τρωϊκῶν, οἱ καὶ προλογίζουσι. On the other hand, if one assumes that Dicaearchus knew only the first prologue—*i.e.* that the Dicaearchus quotation in our Hypothesis breaks off at ἢ διφρήλατος—then one is forced to make a number of (ultimately uncomfortable) assumptions:

(a) The author of the Hypothesis (or his source) no longer had access to the first prologue, as is evident from the fact that he could do no more than quote the *incipit* from Dicaearchus; however, he *did* have access to several copies (*cf.* ἐν ἐνίοις τῶν ἀντιγράφων) containing the second prologue, which he deemed to be an actor's interpolation.¹⁴ This means that the first prologue disappeared *after* Dicaearchus (who knew it) and

¹³ *Supra* n.3: 563–564. He has been followed by C. H. Moore, *HSCP* 12 (1901) 297.

¹⁴ That the second prologue is indeed an interpolation—a patchwork sewn together from passages of classical drama—has been demonstrated in detail by Th. K. Stephanopoulos, *ZPE* 73 (1988) 208–209, *pace e.g.* W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge 1964) 111–112.

before Aristophanes (who, as we saw, knew neither prologue), while the second prologue became available *after* Dicaearchus (who, as we have assumed, did not know it) only to disappear *before* Aristophanes, *i.e.* before 100 years had elapsed. This is an implausibly narrow margin for such a lengthy and complex process to take place.

(b) The only remaining alternative is to try to show that Aristophanes of Byzantium *did* know of the two prologues: the text of the first prologue he could no longer recover (he knew only its *incipit* through Dicaearchus), but he could still read the entire second prologue “in some of the copies.” With this alternative, we are free to assume that the second prologue would have been lost at some unspecified time *after* Aristophanes.¹⁵ However, advocates of this view have found it very hard to adduce sufficient supporting evidence. For instance, Tuilier (13–14) attached excessive importance to the fact that in codd. **LP** the information on the two prologues follows directly upon the Hypothesis attributed to Aristophanes (c Diggle = II Zanetto): for him, this is evidence that this information is derived from Aristophanes of Byzantium. The argument, however, collapses when one recalls that, in the ancient Hypothesis to Aesch. *Ag.* (cod. **M**), a remnant of Aristophanes’ Hypothesis containing didascalical information has been tacked onto a later Hypothesis.¹⁶ Tuilier also advanced a second argument, namely that “il est impossible de croire qu’un texte de cette importance ne remonte pas à l’époque hellénistique en général et à Aristophane de Byzance en particulier” (14). This, however, is circular and has been rightly criticized by Carrara, who suggested that the

¹⁵Tuilier (*supra* n.5: 23–26) argues that the second prologue was identified as non-Euripidean and dropped by the Alexandrian editors. However, omission of suspect lines was *not* practiced by the Alexandrians: see *e.g.* R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) 115, 173–174.

¹⁶See the comments of Moore (*supra* n.13) 293–294, and *cf.* G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester 1955) 134 n.2.

Hypothesis in question is more likely to go back to Didymus.¹⁷ Carrara, now, who still wanted Aristophanes to have known of the two prologues, took a different approach (39 n.25): he argued that ὁ χορὸς συνέστηκεν ἐκ φυλάκων Τρωϊκῶν, οἱ καὶ προλογίζουσι is basically what Aristophanes wrote, except for οἱ καὶ προλογίζουσι which might be a later addition meant to adjust Aristophanes' description to a *Rhesus* which, both of its prologues having disappeared, began with the entrance of the Chorus. However, Carrara's argument runs counter to the plentiful evidence which suggests that Aristophanes' Hypotheseis *did* contain information on the speaker of the prologue.¹⁸

(c) The assumption that the Dicaearchus quotation breaks off at ἡ διφρήλατος is also made problematic by the fact that the information about the prologues is prefaced by γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως, a scholiastic formula denoting verbatim quotation. For as Ritchie has pointed out,¹⁹

it would seem superfluous, if one were merely quoting one verse of Euripides on the authority of Dicaearchus, to say "Dicaearchus writes word for word as follows." For who would imagine that an iambic line was being quoted otherwise than verbatim? On the other hand, if one were quoting Dicaearchus' own arguments, it would be natural to emphasize that his exact words are preserved.²⁰

¹⁷ *Supra* n.6: 36–37 with nn.7–9.

¹⁸ Cf. the Hypotheseis to Aesch. *Ag., Pers.; Soph. Aj., El., Ant., OC; Eur. Alc., Med., Heracl., Andr., Hec., IT, Phoen., Or.* (apparently quite close to Aristophanes' *ipsissima verba*), *Bacch.* See also A. Trendelenburg, *Grammaticorum Graecorum de arte tragica iudiciorum reliquiae* (diss. Bonn 1867) 4–5, 22–23; Moore (*supra* n.13) 287; Th. O. H. Achelis, *Philologus* 72 (1913) 528–533; F. G. Schneidewin, "De hypotheseibus tragoediarum Graecarum Aristophani Byzantio vindicandis commentatio," *AbhGöttingen* 1854.6 1–38 (*non vidi*).

¹⁹ *Supra* n.14: 31.

²⁰ W. Luppe objects that "[d]ie Kürze des Zitats braucht neben ausdrücklichem κατὰ λέξιν m.E. keine Bedenken zu erregen: Aus der Hypotheseis-Sammlung war nur dies zu entnehmen, weil darin diesbezüglich nichts weiter gestanden hat." But this still fails to explain the pleonastic κατὰ λέξιν. The quotation is from W. Luppe, "Neues aus Papyrus-Hypotheseis zu verlorenen Euripides-Dramen," in W. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf, edd., *Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation, and Discussion* (New Brunswick/London 2001) 330.

Indeed, this scholiastic formula regularly prefaces *extensive* quotations; cf. schol. Eur. *Med.* 264 (II 159.16ff Schwartz): Παρμενίσκος γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως· ταῖς Κορινθίαις οὐ βουλομέναις κτλ. (a twelve-line quotation); schol. Pind. *Ol.* 2.29b (I 67.12ff Drachmann): φησὶν ὁ Δίδυμος ... γράφων κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως· Πολυζήλω τοίνυν τῷ τοῦ Ἰέρωνος ἀδελφῷ κτλ. (a ten-line quotation which, being lacunose, must have been originally even longer). The same holds also for the similar formula γράφει/γράφων οὕτως.²¹ Admittedly, it could be argued that the quotation from Dicaearchus *was* originally lengthier but has subsequently suffered abbreviation; after all, a lacuna must in all probability be posited after γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως, as Schwartz first indicated.²² Still, it is hard to think of a more extensive supplement than Luppe's <Ῥῆσος, οὗ ἀρχή·>, which makes the quotation only three words longer.²³

In (a), (b), and (c) above we have presented the difficulties resulting from the assumption that the Hypothesis' section on *Rhesus*' "second prologue" did *not* form part of Dicaearchus' text. These difficulties, taken both individually and cumulatively, give us sufficient reason to maintain that Dicaearchus *was* in all likelihood familiar with, and *did* provide information on, *Rhesus*' "second prologue."²⁴

²¹Cf. the instances assembled by Ritchie (*supra* n.14) 31 n.1. The shortest of these quotations is more than two lines long and includes much more substantial information than the mere quotation of a play's opening line (schol. Eur. *Hec.* 131 [II 26.2–5 Schwartz]).

²²*Scholia in Euripidem* II (Berlin 1891) 324.12.

²³*Supra* n.4: 13. Schwartz (in app. crit.) had suggested *exempli gratia* the slightly longer <τοῦ ἑτέρου προλόγου ἡ ἀρχὴ ἔχει οὕτως>.

²⁴Ritchie (*supra* n.14) 31 makes too much of the objection that the remarks preceding the "second prologue" passage "are, in both conte[n]t and expression, wholly typical of a later period of scholarship." As Ritchie himself is aware, too little remains of Peripatetic literary criticism for us to be certain that Dicaearchus could not have written like this; cf. also M. W. Haslam, *GRBS* 16 (1975) 155, and Luppe (*supra* n.20) 330–331.

3. Dicaearchus' *Hypotheseis*: What were they?

Having established that the author of the Hypothesis b Diggle = III Zanetto quotes Dicaearchus for both of the *Rhesus* prologues, we must now ask whether Dicaearchus' work could have included the critical material with which he is credited by the author of the Hypothesis. Answering this question requires a fresh examination of the evidence on Dicaearchus' work on tragedy and of the secondary literature.

The quotation from Dicaearchus (ὁ γοῦν Δικαίαρχος ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου κτλ.) has naturally been taken to come from the Ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων attributed to him by Sextus Empiricus *Adv.Math.* 3.3.²⁵ As the title suggests, the work must have contained Ὑποθέσεις, *i.e.* short summaries of the plots (the word is thrice used in this sense in the extant fragments of Dicaearchus: fr.78, 81, 82 Wehrli = 112, 114, 115A Mirhady).²⁶ As is evident from the *Rhesus* Hypothesis quoted above, each summary must have been prefaced by the first verse of the respective play, evidently for purposes of identification. Indeed, this is the standard format of the fragmentary *Hypotheseis* recovered on papyrus from 1933 onwards²⁷ which have been considered by some as

²⁵ Cf. fr.78 Wehrli = 112 Mirhady, and see Haslam (*supra* n.24) 150–155.

²⁶ Although Δικαίαρχου in fr.82 Wehrli = 115A Mirhady (Ὑπόθεσις Ἀλκήστιδος Δικαίαρχου) is a Triclinian addition in *Laur.* 32.2 (see the bibliography cited by J. Rusten, *GRBS* 23 [1982] 360 n.19), it is probable that Triclinius assumed the Hypothesis' Dicaearchan authorship on the basis of the similarity of the *Alcestis* Hypothesis to other Euripidean *Hypotheseis* (what seems to be an extended version of the same *Alcestis* Hypothesis turned up in *P.Oxy.* XXVII (1962) 2457 = Dicaearchus fr.115B Mirhady; see W. Luppe, *Philologus* 126 [1982] 10–16). This of course is no guarantee that Dicaearchus actually *wrote* the Ὑποθέσεις; see Rusten 361.

²⁷ The first papyrus of this kind was published by C. Gallavotti, *RivFil* n.s. 11 (1933) 177–188, and subsequently in *PSI* XII 1286; discussion in F. Sisti, *BPEC* n.s. 27 (1979) 109–111; new edition with corrections by W. Luppe, *Anagennesis* 2 (1982) 74–82. These *Hypotheseis* are conveniently printed together in C. Austin, *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta* (Berlin 1968) 88–103. For material published afterwards see L. Koenen, *ZPE* 4 (1969) 7–11; H. J. Mette, *ZPE* 4 (1969) 173; R. A. Coles, *A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus: The Hypothesis of Euripides' Alexandros* (*BICS* Suppl. 32 [London 1974]); *P.Oxy.* LI 3650–53, LX 4017.

specimens of Dicaearchus' Ὑποθέσεις.²⁸ These texts consist solely of first verses and plot-summaries invariably presented in the form:

<Title of play>, οὐδ'ἦς/ῶν ἀρχή <incipit>. ἡ δὲ ὑπόθεσις κτλ.

The papyrus finds seem to add momentum to the contention, most forcefully put forward by Haslam,²⁹ that the work did *not* deal with questions of philology and literary history, and that its scope did not extend beyond that of a compendium of tragic plots. Unambitious though this may sound, Haslam argued, it has a striking parallel in the case of a respectable Peripatetic, namely Heraclides of Pontus, who did not, apparently, deem it beneath him to engage in an activity that was to earn him the hardly enviable designation ὁ τὰ κεφάλαια συγγράφων Εὐριπίδῃ.³⁰ Nonetheless, others (most notably Zuntz)³¹ felt uneasy with the concept of a scholar of Dicaearchus' stature limiting himself to such an undistinguished kind of sub-literary activity. In a more specific fashion, Rusten³² has argued that it would be untypical of Dicaearchus not to express his views on *e.g.* matters of literary history, as he famously did (although in a different work, namely the Βίος Ἑλλάδος, fr.63 Wehrli = 62 Mirhady) with regard to Euripides' appropriation of the plot of Neophron's *Medea*. What is more, according to Rusten, if the extant papyrus fragments containing plot-summaries and first

²⁸For arguments in favour of this view, and for a list of adherents thereof, see Haslam (*supra* n.24) 152–155 with n.12. At any rate, these Ὑποθέσεις must go back to a single work consisting entirely of such texts: see Rusten (*supra* n.26) 357 with literature.

²⁹*Supra* n.24: 154–155. A similar view has been taken also by W. Luppe, in J. Wiesner, ed., *Aristoteles: Werk und Wirkung Paul Moraux gewidmet I* (Berlin/New York 1985) 610–612, and (*supra* n.20) 331–332.

³⁰Antiphanes fr.111 K.-A. = Heraclides fr.10 Wehrli; *cf.* also Heraclides fr.180, and Wehrli's comments *ad locc.*

³¹*Supra* n.16: 146 (*cf.* 138–139). *Cf.* already Wilamowitz, *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin 1875) 184.

³²*Supra* n.26: 362.

verses are actually to be attributed to Dicaearchus, then we have to accept two improbabilities: (a) that Dicaearchus had a *complete* edition of the tragedies at his disposal, which seems unlikely in the present state of our evidence, and (b) that, if the papyrus ὑποθέσεις are anything to go by, Dicaearchus' arrangement of the material was alphabetical, which is contradicted by the fact that the alphabetical criterion does not seem to have been in use before the third century B.C.³³ Therefore, Rusten argued, Dicaearchus never wrote such a work as the Ὑποθέσεις, and the ὑποθέσεις preserved on papyri derive from a later work (probably of the first or second century A.D.) which was falsely attributed to Dicaearchus.³⁴

Thus far two approaches to the problem have emerged: the Haslam/Luppe thesis, according to which Dicaearchus wrote a compendium of tragic plots (perhaps as a basis for more ambitious studies on drama), which is the ancestor of the ὑποθέσεις preserved on papyri; and the Zuntz/Rusten thesis, according to which Dicaearchus never wrote such a work, and the papyrus ὑποθέσεις derive from a pseudepigraphic later work, which Zuntz nicknamed "Tales from Euripides"³⁵ or Εὐριπίδου Ἱστορίαι, and Rusten (366) suggested must have been actually called Ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου μύθων.

I shall argue for a third solution, which transcends the two approaches discussed above.³⁶ An appropriate starting point

³³For the rationale behind, and the evidence for, both objections see Rusten (*supra* n.26) 363–364.

³⁴Rusten (*supra* n.26) 366 with n.45. His view has won the approval of R. Kassel, "Hypothesis," in *Σχόλια: Studia ... D. Holwerda oblata* (Groningen 1985) 53 (= *Kleine Schriften*, ed. H.-G. Nesselrath [Berlin/New York 1991] 207).

³⁵Zuntz (*supra* n.16) 135–136. As Rusten (*supra* n.26: 358 n.7) reminds us, the analogy between this later work and Ch. and M. Lamb's *Tales from Shakespeare* was first suggested by Wilamowitz, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin 1889) 134 n.19, 170.

³⁶This solution is in fact considered by Rusten (*supra* n.26) 364, who discards it.

would be Luppe's argumentation³⁷ against the first of Rusten's objections:³⁸ both the writing of plot summaries and, more importantly, the inclusion of the first verse of each play for purposes of identification imply the *absence* of a complete standard edition. The quotation of the plays' opening lines would have been pointless if the ὑποθέσεις were, as Zuntz³⁹ and Rusten⁴⁰ maintain, autonomous works meant merely as substitutes for the actual plays for the sake of those who lacked the background or the motivation to read the texts themselves. On the other hand, if the plot-summaries were meant as short introductions to be studied along with, or as complementary to, the actual plays, then quotation of the *incipit* would have served the obvious purpose of immediately identifying the respective play. It is likely that these plot-summaries and *incipits*, which had come to be regarded as a separate work by Sextus' time, belonged originally to a work of a much wider scope, which included also didascalic information and addressed questions of literary history and, perhaps, of authenticity: in point of fact, fr.75, 76, 77, 79, 80, 83, 84 W. (= 99, 100, 102, 113, 101, 103, 104 M.), which are transmitted *sine operis titulo*, actually evidence Dicaearchus' interest in such questions. This work need not have been, and probably was not, a *complete* inventory of tragic plots, nor need it have followed the alphabetical arrangement of the later ὑποθέσεις—the thematic criterion would have been more appropriate.⁴¹

³⁷ *Supra* n.29: 610–612; (*supra* n.20) 332.

³⁸ As to Rusten's second objection see *infra* n.41.

³⁹ *Supra* n.16: 135. A similar view had already been put forward by Wilamowitz (*supra* n.31) 181–183.

⁴⁰ *Supra* n.26: 358.

⁴¹ Cf. Luppe (*supra* n.29) 611: "Dieses—unbestrittene—literarhistorische Interesse des Dikaiarchos schließt m.E. jedoch keineswegs aus, daß derselbe Autor auch daran interessiert sein konnte darzulegen, *auf welche Weise* ein oder zwei berühmte Dramatiker des 5. Jahrhunderts einen Mythos behandelten" (his emphasis). This, incidentally, answers Rusten's second objection (cf. *supra* 323).

What the title of that work was is impossible to say. The Περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγώνων (fr.75 W. = 99 M.) is an obvious candidate,⁴² but one should remain non-committal, as it is not clear whether the other titles preserved under Dicaearchus' name (Περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων, fr.88–89 W. = 89–90 M.; Παναθηναϊκός, fr.86 W. = 84 M.; Ὀλυμπικός, fr.87 W. = 85 M.) belong to distinct works, or are alternative titles for the *same* general work.⁴³ At any rate, the point is that this work does not seem to have had the limited scope suggested by the title Ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων. We know of another modestly-phrased title (we cannot tell whether original or not) of a probably ambitious work, namely the Περὶ Αἰσχύλου μύθων by a certain Γλαῦκος, who is probably to be identified with Glaucus of Rhegium.⁴⁴ A fragment of this work, preserved in the Hypothesis to Aeschylus' *Persians* (Glaucus fr.7 Lanata ≈ Phrynichus *TrGF* I 3 T 5), reveals striking similarities to Dicaearchus' work:

Γλαῦκος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Αἰσχύλου μύθων ἐκ τῶν Φοινισσῶν Φρυνίχου φησὶ τοὺς Πέρσας παραπεποιηθῆσαι· ἐκτίθησι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ δράματος ταύτην· “τάδ’ ἐστὶ Περσῶν τῶν πάλαι βεβηκότων” (*TrGF* I 3 F 8)· πλὴν ἐκεῖ εὐνοῦχός ἐστὶν (ὁ) ἀγγέλλων ἐν ἀρχῇ τὴν Ξέρξου ἦτταν στορνύς τε θρόνους τινὰς τοῖς τῆς ἀρχῆς παρέδροις.

Noteworthy here are the quotation of the play's first line and the preoccupation with literary borrowing (for Dicaearchus' interest in the latter see again *supra* 322). Other works that

⁴²Cf. Pfeiffer (*supra* n.15) 193: “The summaries prefixed to the plays in our manuscripts ... refer several times to [Dicaearchus]; he seems to have dealt with the contents of tragedies and comedies and with questions of scenic poetry in writings on festivals with poetical competitions, of which one was entitled Περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγώνων.”

⁴³Wehrli, for one, tended to regard all these fragments (and some more) as parts of one and the same work: *Die Schule des Aristoteles*² I (Basel 1967) 67.

⁴⁴See E. Hiller, *RhM* N.F. 41 (1886) 428–431; F. Jacoby, “Glaukos (36),” *RE* 13 (1910) 1418.45–56; further discussion in G. Lanata, *Poetica pre-platonica: Testimonianze e frammenti* (Florence 1963) 278–279. See also 327 *infra*.

might be comparable, certainly in title and perhaps in scope, with Dicaearchus' are Heraclides of Pontus' *Περὶ τῶν παρ' Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους* (fr.180 Wehrli), and Asclepiades' *Τραγωδοῦμενα* (*FGrHist* 12 FF 1–15). Both Heraclides' and Asclepiades' works must have dealt with the content of the plays, but we cannot say whether they gave plot-summaries.⁴⁵

How the traditional title came about is of course a matter of speculation. I suggest that, as the plot-summaries were the part of Dicaearchus' work that was most readily exploitable for practical purposes (*e.g.* school books, or mythographical compendia,⁴⁶ or rhetorical handbooks⁴⁷), they were liable to become later separated from the main body and assume a literary life of their own—perhaps after being contaminated with material from other sources, such as mythographic works, learned commentaries, etc.⁴⁸ A special title (namely *Ἐπιθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου μύθων*) was subsequently devised in order to mark them as a distinct text. There is a striking parallel to this process, namely the textual history of Theophrastus' *Characters*. This short treatise is held by many to have originally formed part of

⁴⁵As regards Heraclides, F. Wehrli (*Die Schule des Aristoteles*² VII [Basel 1969] 123) seems hesitant. Asclepiades, as Wilamowitz saw (*supra* n.31: 181 n.3), "tragoediarum argumenta non narravit, sed historiam fabulosam, qualis post tragicorum curas longe alia reddita erat atque qualem ex epicis lyricisque carminibus v.c. Pherecydes narraverat." Heraclides' *Περὶ τῶν τριῶν τραγωδοποιῶν*, fr.179 W., has been thought by Wehrli (123) "nicht weit über das Biographische hinausgehen."

⁴⁶C. Robert, *De Apollodori Bibliotheca* (diss. Berlin 1873) 54–91, esp. 82–83, was the first to see that Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* utilised a collection of tragic Hypotheseis as well as earlier mythographical sources such as Pherecydes, Acusilas, Asclepiades of Tragilos, etc.; cf. Wilamowitz (*supra* n.31) 182–183; Rusten (*supra* n.26) 357 with n.2. Especially on the "Tales from Euripides" as a (probably indirect) source of the *Bibliotheca* see M. Huys, *RhM* 140 (1997) 308–327.

⁴⁷For an important specimen see H. Rabe, *RhM* 63 (1908) 144–149.

⁴⁸Cf. again Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*, which has been shown to be the result of such contamination: see Huys (n.46) 320–327.

a larger work⁴⁹ (whether on comedy,⁵⁰ or on some other subject, is of no importance to my argument). This part later evolved into a separate work which lent itself to various educational uses: as a course in moralising ethics, as an inventory of stock-character portrayal for use in speech-making,⁵¹ as a manual for rhetorical exercises in *χαρακτηρισμός*, etc.⁵² A second (perhaps only a little less striking) parallel is Glaucus' *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου μύθων*,⁵³ which may also have been originally part of a broader synthesis, namely his *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν*. This work seems programmatically to have dealt with the most diverse authors: Terpander (fr.1 Lanata), Empedocles (fr.6), Democritus (fr.5), and Musaeus (fr.4) were among them,⁵⁴ and

⁴⁹The view that the *Characters* originally formed part of a larger work goes back to Schneider's edition of 1799, who argued vaguely that the work consists of extracts from some larger ethical treatise; see in general R. C. Jebb, ed., *Θεοφράστου Χαρακτήρες: The Characters of Theophrastus* (London/Cambridge 1870) 21–37. Recently, R. J. Lane Fox (*PCPhS* 42 [1996] 139–142) has tried to reinstate the *Characters* to their sometime autonomy by presenting them as an independent work combining “philosophical classification and comic caricature” (141) and meant merely to amuse; cf. also, with different emphasis, M. Stein, *Definition und Schilderung in Theophrasts Charakteren* [Beitr.z. Altertumsk. 28] (Stuttgart 1992) 21–45.

⁵⁰As A. Rostagni thought, *RivFil* 48 (1920) 417–443; cf. also R. G. Ussher, ed., *The Characters of Theophrastus* (London 1960) 4–6 with Addenda 302–303, and *G&R* 24 (1977) 75–79; W. W. Fortenbaugh, *RhM* 124 (1981) 245–249 with n.4; full doxography in E. Matelli, *S&C* 13 (1989) 332–333 n.10. Heraclides of Pontus also wrote a *Χαρακτήρες* (fr.165 W.), a treatise on literature, to judge from the fact that it is transmitted by Diog. Laert. 5.88 amongst Heraclides' *μουσικὰ συγγράμματα* and is immediately followed in the list by a work *Περὶ ποιητικῆς καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν* (cf. Rostagni 437 with n.1). However, as Wehrli (*supra* n.45: 119) remarks, *χαρακτήρες* may perhaps have been meant as a *stylistic* term (*χαρακτήρες λέξεως*).

⁵¹See esp. O. Immisch, *Philologus* 57 (1898) 193–212 (esp. 204–212), with Matelli (*supra* n.50) 333 n.11.

⁵²Cf. D. J. Furley, *SymbOslo* 30 (1953) 60; Ussher (*supra* n.50) 10, and especially Matelli (*supra* n.50) 382–383 with nn.147–151; cf. also W. W. Fortenbaugh in Fortenbaugh and D. C. Mirhady, edd., *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle* (New Brunswick/London 1994) 15–35. From the fact that the *Characters* are transmitted in miscellaneous MSS. which contain mostly rhetorical exegesis, Matelli (335–386) has argued in detail that they were probably used in rhetorical education.

⁵³See *supra* 325.

⁵⁴See Jacoby (*supra* n.44) 1417–18.

there is no reason why Aeschylus should not have been included as well.⁵⁵ In that case, Περὶ Αἰσχύλου μύθων would have been later separated from the rest of the work and begun an individual career, perhaps as a student companion to Aeschylus.

In conclusion, there are reasonable grounds to believe that Dicaearchus' work on drama included both plot-summaries, from which some of the later Hypotheseis derived, and critical and literary material. This work was meant as a companion to the study of tragedy, although it later lent itself to a variety of uses. The information provided by the Hypothesis b Diggle = III Zanetto on the two prologues to *Rhesus* seems to fit the above description: the *incipit* of the genuine prologue is provided; a second prologue is quoted on the evidence of "some manuscripts" (ἐν ἐνίοις τῶν ἀντιγράφων); the second prologue is pronounced "unworthy of Euripides" on grounds of style and written off as an actor's interpolation.⁵⁶

December, 2002

Department of Classics
University of Cyprus
P.O. Box 20537
CY-1678 Nicosia, Cyprus
liapis@ucy.ac.cy

⁵⁵Cf. G. Huxley, *GRBS* 9 (1968) 47, 51–52. Hiller (*supra* n.44) 429 n.1, while acknowledging the diversity of Glaucus' subject-matter, states without argument that "[e]ine Absurdität ist die mitunter geäußerte Vermuthung, die Schrift περὶ Αἰσχύλου μύθων sei ein Theil der Schrift περὶ ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν gewesen."

⁵⁶I am grateful to the Program in Hellenic Studies, Princeton University, for a Stanley J. Seeger Visiting Research Fellowship which greatly facilitated research for this paper. An anonymous referee for *GRBS* made insightful remarks which greatly improved both the argument and its presentation. My warm thanks also go to Professor Jeffrey Rusten, who tactfully commented on an earlier draft. Since he is in disagreement with my main thesis, and I have not always been wise enough to follow his suggestions, I alone must be held responsible for all errors.