

The Hypotheses of Euripides and Sophocles by ‘Dicaearchus’

Gertjan Verhasselt

OVER THE PAST two centuries, there has been much controversy about the hypotheses attributed to Dicaearchus, the late fourth century BCE Peripatetic from Messene and pupil of Aristotle. This philosopher wrote on Greek poets and drama as well as other topics.¹ Attested titles include *On Alcaeus* (FF 105–106, 108) and *On Dionysiac Contests* (F 99); he is also said to have written about Homer and Euripides (Plut. *Mor.* 1095A = F 92).² Today, debate primarily concerns the link with the so-called narrative hypotheses.³ These are plot

¹ Dicaearchus’ fragments have been edited by F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles I*² (Basel 1967), and D. C. Mirhady, “Dicaearchus of Messana. The Sources, Text and Translation,” in W. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (eds.), *Dicaearchus of Messana. Text, Translation, and Discussion* (New Brunswick 2001) 1–142; I cite the fragment numbers of the latter. For an overview of Dicaearchus’ literary studies see M. Cannatà Fera, “Gli studi letterari di Dicaearco,” in B. Gentili and A. Pinzone (eds.), *Messina e Reggio nell’ antichità. Storia, società, cultura* (Messina 2002) 97–110.

² See also FF 93–95 on Homer and F 102 on Euripides. Dicaearchus also discussed Euripides’ plagiarism of Neophron in his *Life of Greece* (F 62).

³ This collection is often dubbed the “Tales from Euripides.” This name was coined by G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester 1955) 135, who probably drew inspiration from the comparison with Charles and Mary Lamb’s “Tales from Shakespeare” in U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Euripides. Herakles I* (Berlin 1889) [repr. *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin 1907)] 133 n.19. Most scholars now call them “narrative hypotheses,” since similar plot summaries have been found for Sophocles as well. This term was introduced by R. Van Hemelryck, “Een collectie narratieve tragediehypothesen. De Tales from Euripides,” *Handelingen der Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- & Letterkunde en Geschiedenis* 33 (1979)

summaries, which originally circulated as a separate collection, as can be seen from numerous papyri, and were only later prefaced to the plays.⁴ In this article, I will first give an overview of the extant fragments and will then explore the link with the “learned” hypotheses (a theory launched by Budé) and the identification with the narrative hypotheses (defended by Haslam and Luppe).

1. The fragments

There are four *nominatim* citations of Dicaearchus’ hypotheses.

(1) Sext. Emp. *Math.* 3.3⁵ (= F 112):

τάξεως δὲ ἔνεκα προληπτέον ὅτι πολλαχῶς μὲν καὶ ἄλλως ὑπόθεσις προσαγορεύεται, τὰ νῦν δὲ ἀπαρκέσει τριχῶς λέγεσθαι, καθ’ ἓνα μὲν τρόπον ἢ δραματικὴ περιπέτεια, καθὸ καὶ τραγικὴν καὶ κωμικὴν ὑπόθεσιν εἶναι λέγομεν καὶ Δικαιάρχου τινὰς ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων, οὐκ ἄλλο τι καλοῦντες ὑπόθεσιν ἢ τὴν τοῦ δράματος περιπέτειαν.

And for the sake of the sequence, I first need to state that the word ‘hypothesis’ is used in many different senses. Just now it will suffice to mention three. In one sense, it denotes the dramatic plot. Thus we say that there is both a tragic and a comic hypothesis and certain hypotheses of the tales from Euripides and Sophocles by Dicaearchus, calling hypothesis nothing other than the plot of the play.

289–300, and popularized by M. van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri* (Leiden 1998), esp. 1–2. These hypotheses have been edited with a commentary by C. Meccariello, *Le ipotesi narrative dei drammi euripidei. Testo, contesto, fortuna* (Rome 2014). See also van Rossum-Steenbeek 1–32, 185–231, for the papyrus hypotheses, and J. Krenn, *Interpretationen zu den Hypothesen in den Euripideshandschriften* (diss. Graz 1971), for those preserved in medieval MSS.

⁴ Already before the discovery of the papyri, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin 1875) 183–184, had conjectured the existence of a separate collection.

⁵ H. Mutschmann and J. Mau, *Sexti Empirici Opera* III (Leipzig 1961) 107.

(2) hyp. Soph. *Aj.*⁶ (= F 113):

ἐν οἷς (sc. τοῖς τετράποσι) ἐστι καὶ κριός τις ἔξοχος, ὃν ᾤετο (sc. Αἴας) εἶναι Ὀδυσσεά, ὃν δήσας ἐμαστίγωσεν, ὅθεν καὶ τῇ ἐπιγραφῇ πρόσκειται “Μαστιγοφόρος,” ἢ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ Λοκροῦ. Δικαίαρχος δὲ “Αἴαντος θάνατον” ἐπιγράφει. ἐν δὲ ταῖς διδασκαλίαις ψιλῶς “Αἴας” ἀναγέγραπται.

Among these (sc. the quadrupeds) there was also a ram, which stood out. He (sc. Ajax) believed that it was Odysseus, tied it down, and whipped it. Therefore, “the whip carrier” is added to the title, in order to distinguish it from the *Ajax Locrus*. Dicaearchus entitles it the *Death of Ajax*. In the *didascaliae*, it is simply recorded as *Ajax*.

(3) hyp. b Eur. *Rhes.*⁷ (= F 114 = *TrGF* II adesp. F 81 = V.2 (60) i a):

τοῦτο τὸ δρᾶμα ἔνιοι νόθον ὑπενόησαν, Εὐριπίδου δὲ μὴ εἶναι· τὸν γὰρ Σοφόκλειον μᾶλλον ὑποφαίνειν χαρακτηριστῆρα. ἐν μέντοι ταῖς διδασκαλίαις ὡς γνήσιον ἀναγέγραπται, καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰ μετάρσια δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πολυπραγμοσύνη τὸν Εὐριπίδην ὁμολογεῖ. πρόλογοι δὲ διττοὶ φέρονται. ὁ γοῦν Δικαίαρχος ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως·

νῦν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἢ διφρήλατος
καὶ ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕτερός τις φέρεται πρόλογος,
πεζὸς πάνυ καὶ οὐ πρέπων Εὐριπίδῃ· καὶ τάχα ἂν τινες τῶν ὑποκριτῶν διεσκευακότες εἶεν αὐτόν. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως·

ὦ τοῦ μεγίστου Ζηνὸς ἄλκιμον τέκος,
Παλλάς, τί δρῶμεν; οὐκ ἐχρῆν ἡμᾶς ἔτι
μέλλειν Ἀχαιῶν ὠφελεῖν στρατεύματα.
νῦν γὰρ κακῶς πράσσουσιν ἐν μάχῃ δορός,
λόγῃ βιαίως Ἴκτορος στροβούμενοι.
ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἄλγιον βάρος,
ἐξ οὗ γ’ ἔκρινε Κύπριν Ἀλέξανδρος θεᾶν
κάλλει προήκειν τῆς ἐμῆς εὐμορφίας
καὶ σῆς, Ἀθᾶνα, φιλτάτης ἐμοὶ θεῶν,
εἰ μὴ κατασκαφεῖσαν ὄψομαι πόλιν
Πριάμου, βία πρόρριζον ἐκτετριμμένην.

⁶ A. Dain, P. Mazon, and J. Irigoin, *Sophocle II* (Paris 1981) 7.

⁷ J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae III* (Oxford 1994) 430–431.

Some have suspected that this play is spurious and does not belong to Euripides. For it shows the character of Sophocles instead. However, in the *didascaliae* it is recorded as genuine. The interest in celestial phenomena too fits Euripides. Two prologues are in circulation. Dicaearchus, when setting out the hypothesis of the *Rhesus*, writes exactly this: “Now the chariot-borne (goddess brings?) the bright moonlight.” But in some copies another prologue is also transmitted, which is very prosaic and unworthy of Euripides. It may have been created by a couple of actors. It runs as follows: “Mighty child of the great Zeus, Pallas, what shall we do? We should no longer wait to help the Achaean armies. For they are struggling now in the spear fight, being violently whirled around by Hector’s javelin. For no grief is more painful to me since Alexander judged the goddess Cypris to surpass in beauty my own lovely figure as well as yours, Athena, dearest among the gods to me, if I will not see Priam’s city demolished, utterly wiped out with violence.”

(4) hyp. a (1) Eur. *Alc.*⁸ (= F 115a):

ὑπόθεσις Ἀλκίησιδος Δικαιάρχου. Ἀπόλλων ἠτήσατο παρὰ τῶν Μοιρῶν ὅπως Ἄδμητος τελευτᾶν μέλλων παράσχη τὸν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ ἐκόντα τεθνηξόμενον, ἵνα ἴσον τῷ προτέρῳ χρόνον ζήσῃ. καὶ δὴ Ἄλκηστις, ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ Ἄδμήτου, ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτήν, οὐδετέρου τῶν γονέων ἐθελήσαντος ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀποθανεῖν. μετ’ οὐ πολὺ δὲ ταύτης τῆς συμφορᾶς γενομένης Ἡρακλῆς παραγενόμενος καὶ μαθὼν παρὰ τινος θεράποντος τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἄλκηστιν ἐπορεύθη ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον καὶ Θάνατον ἀποστήναι ποιήσας ἐσθῆτι καλύπτει τὴν γυναῖκα, τὸν δὲ Ἄδμητον ἠξίου λαβόντα τηρεῖν. εἰληφέναι γὰρ αὐτὴν πάλης ἄθλον ἔλεγεν. μὴ βουλομένου δὲ ἐκείνου ἀποκαλύψας ἔδειξεν ἦν ἐπένθει.

Dicaearchus’ hypothesis of *Alcestis*. Apollo requested the Fates that Admetus, when he was about to die, might provide someone willing to die in his place, in order that he may live for as long as he had lived before. And Alcestis, Admetus’ wife, volunteered, since neither of his parents was willing to die for their child. Shortly after this awful event had taken place, Heracles arrived. From a servant, he learnt the news about Alcestis. He went to the grave, forced

⁸J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae* I (Oxford 1984) 33.

Death to give way, and disguised the woman. He asked Admetus to take her and look after her. For he said that he had received her as a wrestling prize. But when he did not want this, he revealed her and showed the woman whom he was mourning.

2. Dicaearchus and the learned hypotheses

In his dissertation on the Greek tragic and comic hypotheses, Budé assumed that Dicaearchus' hypotheses contained both plot summaries and historical information⁹ and therefore saw remnants of this work in the so-called learned hypotheses (or "sage-hypotheseis," as he called them). Recurring features are (1) a discussion of the *μυθοποιία*, (2) a summary, (3) a comment about the title, (4) a note on the prologue, (5) didascalical information, (6) a reference to Dicaearchus,¹⁰ (7) ethical considerations, (8) observations about the dramatic technique, (9) questions of authenticity, and (10) a citation of the *didascaliae*.¹¹ Budé included the following under the learned hypotheses:

- hyp. Aesch. *Pers.*
- hyp. Soph. *Aj.*
- hyp. 2 Soph. *OT* Dain-Mazon-Irigoin
- hyp. 2 Soph. *OC* Dain-Mazon-Irigoin
- hyp. a (1) Eur. *Alc.* Diggle
- hyp. Eur. *Hel.*
- hyp. b Eur. *Rhes.* Diggle
- hyp. a 1–2 Eur. *Med.* Van Looy (= hyp. a (1) Diggle)

However, the *Oedipus Tyrannus* hypothesis probably belongs

⁹ See also M. Fuhr, *Dicaearchi Messenii quae supersunt* (Darmstadt 1841) 47–48; K. Müller, *FHG* II (Paris 1848) 227, 247–248; Van Hemelryck, *Handelingen der Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij* 33 (1979) 299; and D. W. Lucas and N. G. Wilson, "Hypothesis, Literary (1)," in *OCD*⁴ (2012) 717.

¹⁰ For the first six features see A. W. A. M. Budé, *De hypotheseis der Griekse tragedies en komedies. Een onderzoek naar de hypotheseis van Dicaearchus* ('s-Gravenhage 1977) 171, 175–187, 214–216.

¹¹ See hyp. Soph. *Aj.* and hyp. b Eur. *Rhes.* Diggle. Although hyp. 2 Soph. *OC* Dain-Mazon-Irigoin does not explicitly mention the *didascaliae*, these are probably the source for the information that the play was staged by Sophocles' grandson in the archonship of Micon.

to Salustius instead.¹² This late antique grammarian wrote commentaries on Herodotus, Demosthenes, and probably also Callimachus.¹³ The hypothesis recurs in a papyrus codex, which also contains a fragment of Salustius' *Oedipus in Colonus* hypothesis.¹⁴ Budé rejected this attribution because of its learned citations.¹⁵ However, similar citations recur e.g. in Salustius' *Antigone* hypothesis (Ion's dithyrambs and Mimermus).¹⁶ Budé also objected to the absence of the aesthetic judgment, typically found in Salustius. However, medieval hypotheses randomly select material, as can be seen from the Aristophanic ones. The *Oedipus Tyrannus* hypothesis is probably an extract from an originally more extensive one. The aforementioned Sophocles codex might in fact have exclusively contained Salustian hypotheses,¹⁷ perhaps prefaced by a biography of the tragedian.¹⁸ Other learned hypotheses too might belong to this grammarian, as they show some of the features listed

¹² See already F. G. Schneidewin, *De hypothesibus tragoediarum Graecarum Aristophani Byzantio vindicandis commentatio* (Göttingen 1853) 20, and Wilamowitz, *Euripides. Herakles I* 197–198.

¹³ On Salustius see G. Ucciardello, "Sal(l)ustius [2]," in F. Montanari (ed.), *Lessico dei grammatici greci antichi* (2005) (<http://www.aristarchus.unige.it/lgga/>).

¹⁴ P. Vindob. G inv. 29779 fr.3a+b ↓ (Soph. *OT*) and fr.3a+b → (Soph. *OC* ~ hyp. 4 Soph. *OC* Dain-Mazon-Irigoïn), MPER N.S. 1, 24 (LDAB 3948 = TM 62760).

¹⁵ Budé, *De hypothesibus* 203–205.

¹⁶ Hyp. 2 Soph. *Ant.* Dain-Mazon-Irigoïn.

¹⁷ Other fragments in the codex concern the *Philoctetes* (fr.2 →) and *Ajax* (fr.4 ↓); fr.5 → and 5 ↓ cannot be identified with certainty. The codex also contains a metrical hypothesis in fr.2 ↓ and a list of *dramatis personae* in fr.4 →. The former is written in a different hand and is therefore probably not part of the original text. The latter might point to a hypothesis by Aristophanes of Byzantium, who typically included this kind of information (see §3 below), although it may have also been independently deduced from the play itself.

¹⁸ See W. Luppe, "P. Vindob. G 29779 – ein Sophokles-Kodex," *WS N.F.* 19 (1985) 89–104, at 91.

above.¹⁹ Salustius tends to include (1) a summary and to discuss (2) other versions of the myth, (3) the title, and (4) the artistic qualities.²⁰

Budé's inclusion of the *Alcestis* and *Helen* hypotheses among the learned hypotheses is questionable as well. These merely give a summary without any of the other features and are closer to the narrative hypotheses (see §3 below).

Since the learned hypotheses mention no sources postdating Dicaearchus, Budé attributed all their information to him through an intermediate compiler.²¹ In other fragments, however, the philosopher rarely mentions authorities or alternative versions of a story, although he occasionally quotes poets (see FF 56a and 72). Moreover, the citations of Dicaearchus in the learned hypotheses are not all of the same type. The *Medea* hypothesis mentions his *Life of Greece* and not a hypothesis (F 62). In the *Alcestis* hypothesis (F 115a) he is cited in the heading, not in the text itself.

Budé was mainly inspired by Schrader's interpretation of the passage in Sextus Empiricus (no. 1 above), which discusses three meanings of the word ὑπόθεσις. For the meaning ἡ δραματικὴ περιπέτεια or ἡ τοῦ δράματος περιπέτεια, Sextus cites Dicaearchus' ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων. According to Schrader, he uses περιπέτεια in the supposedly Aristotelian sense of "change with respect to the traditional myths."²² However, Aristotle actually uses περιπέτεια of a sudden change in the dramatic action, a turn for the worse (*Poet.* 1452a, ἔστι δὲ περιπέτεια μὲν ἢ εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν πραττομένων μεταβολή). Moreover, in *Math.* 3.6 Sextus

¹⁹ This is probably not the case for the medieval *Ajax* hypothesis, since it does not match fr.4 ↓ in the Sophocles codex.

²⁰ Hyp. 2 Soph. *Ant.*, hyp. 4 Soph. *OC*, and hyp. 2 Soph. *OT* Dain-Mazon-Irigoin.

²¹ Budé, *De hypothesis* 173–174, 197–201; see already Zuntz, *The Political Plays* 143.

²² H. Schrader, *Quaestionum peripateticarum particula* (Hamburg 1884) 5–8; see Budé, *De hypothesis* 197, 206, 216–217.

repeats the three meanings and now explains the first as δραματικὴ διάταξις “dramatic arrangement.” Ancient lexicographers too explain περιπέτεια as περιοχὴ ‘summary’.²³ Therefore, Sextus must mean ‘plot’, ‘plot summary’, or ‘content’.²⁴ Consequently, Schrader and Budé were wrong to consider μυθοποιία the central topic of the Dicaearchian hypotheses.²⁵

Budé’s theory is also based on a questionable demarcation of FF 101 and 114. F 101 is found in the second hypothesis of Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus*, which has the heading “why it is entitled *Tyrannus*” (διὰ τί Τύραννος ἐπιγράφεται) and is probably an extract from Salustius (see above).

hyp. 2 Soph. *OT*:²⁶

ὁ Τύραννος Οιδίπους ἐπὶ διακρίσει θατέρου ἐπιγράφεται. Χαριέντως δὲ “Τύραννον” ἅπαντες αὐτὸν ἐπιγράφουσιν ὡς ἐξέχοντα πάσης τῆς Σοφοκλέους ποιήσεως, καίπερ ἡττηθέντα ὑπὸ Φιλοκλέους, ὡς φησι Δικαίαρχος. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ “Πρότερον,” οὐ “Τύραννον,” αὐτὸν ἐπιγράφοντες, διὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῶν διδασκαλιῶν καὶ διὰ τὰ πράγματα· ἀλήτην γὰρ καὶ πηρὸν Οιδίποδα τὸν ἐπὶ Κολωνῷ εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀφικνεῖσθαι.

The *Oedipus Tyrannus* has this title to distinguish it from the other play. Everyone graciously gives it the title *Tyrannus*, believing that it stands out above all of Sophocles’ work, even though it was defeated by *Philocles*, as Dicaearchus says. Some also call it the *First Oedipus*, not *Oedipus Tyrannus*, because of the chronology of the productions and because of the events. For Oedipus in *Colonus* is said to have arrived at Athens banished and blind.

Most scholars attribute the comment on the title to Dicaearchus.²⁷ However, until the mid-third century BCE, Sophocles’

²³ Hsch. π 1795 Hansen; *Synagoge versio A* π 379 Cunningham. See also Cyril. *Lexicon* v 124 Hagedorn (ὑπόθεσις· περιοχὴ· αἰτία).

²⁴ See also the discussion in Meccariello, *Le hypotheseis narrative* 67–69.

²⁵ D. Holwerda, review of Budé, *De hypotheseis*, in *Mnemosyne* SER. IV 36 (1983) 173–176, at 174, rightly pointed out that no fragment of Dicaearchus deals with μυθοποιία.

²⁶ Dain-Mazon-Irigoin, *Sophocle* II 69.

²⁷ See especially Wehrli, *Die Schule* I² 68; Budé, *De hypotheseis* 178–179,

two plays were simply called *Oedipus*.²⁸ The titles *Oedipus Tyrannus* and *Oedipus in Colonus* were probably introduced by Alexandrian grammarians.²⁹ Their earliest known attestation is in Aristophanes of Byzantium.³⁰ Similarly, Sophocles’ *Ajax* plays and Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Aulis* were recorded in the *didascaliae* as *Ajax* and *Iphigenia* respectively.³¹ Since Dicaearchus is unlikely to have already used the title *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the fragment must be limited to the information about Sophocles’ defeat and probably belongs to *On Dionysiac Contests*. The only fragment discussing the title of a play is F 113, but see §3 on this witness.

According to Luppe, however, ὡς φησιν Δικαίαρχος was originally not connected with καίπερ ἠττηθέντα ὑπὸ Φιλο-

200–201; and F. Montanari, “L’esegesi antica di Eschilo da Aristotele a Didimo,” in A.-C. Hernández (ed.), *Eschyle à l’aube du théâtre occidental* (Geneva 2009) 379–433, at 387.

²⁸ Arist. *Poet.* 1454b, 1455a, 1462b; Clearchus F 91a Wehrli²; Satyrus F 4 Schorn. Clearchus is probably also the source for Ath. 453E.

²⁹ See A. E. Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks* (Oxford 1896) 400, and O. Taplin, “The Title of Prometheus Desmotes,” *JHS* 95 (1975) 184–186, at 185.

³⁰ Hyp. 3 Soph. *OT* Dain-Mazon-Irigoin. Although the heading does not mention Aristophanes, the hypothesis in all likelihood goes back to him. It also lists the main action(s) (τὸ κεφάλαιον), a feature of Aristophanic hypotheses (see §3). Homonymous plays by the same tragedian are also discussed in hyp. (2) Eur. *Hipp.* Diggle, which probably belongs to Aristophanes as well. W. J. Slater, *Aristophanis Byzantii fragmenta* (Berlin 1986) x, 172, rejected Aristophanes’ authorship for all hypotheses, but, despite the late date of the testimonia (Lactantius Plac. *In Statii Thebaida commentum* 12.510 and *Etyim.Gen.* s.v. πίναξ p.245 Miller = *Etyim.Magn.* s.v. πίναξ p.672 Kallierges [citing the Byzantine grammarian Choeroboscus]), such skepticism seems unnecessary. See also R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) 192–194, and A. Bagordo, *Die antiken Traktate über das Drama* (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1998) 41–42. A. L. Brown, “The Dramatic Synopses Attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium,” *CQ* 37 (1987) 427–431, especially rejected the brief plot summaries as un-Aristophanic, but his arguments are unconvincing.

³¹ Hyp. Soph. *Aj.* (= Arist. F 623 Rose = F 419 Gigon) and *IG* II² 2320.2 (= p.65 Millis-Olson = *TrGFI* DID A 2).

κλέους but with εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ “Πρότερον,” οὐ “Τύραννον,” αὐτὸν ἐπιγράφοντες, i.e. Dicaearchus was actually cited for the alternative title Οἰδίουπος Πρότερος. Luppe’s suggestion is based on the fact that the narrative hypotheses, which he attributed to the Peripatetic Dicaearchus (see §3 below), use numbers to distinguish homonymous plays (see *Phrixus I* and *II* in *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2455.221 and 267).³² However, changing the text on the basis of Dicaearchus’ supposed authorship of the narrative hypotheses is too much of a *petitio principii*. The text is perfectly sound without such an intervention.

The other problematic fragment is F 114, contained in the learned *Rhesus* hypothesis. The author first defends the authenticity of the play, arguing that (1) the *didascaliae* record it as genuine and (2) the interest in celestial phenomena (μετάρσια) seen in the *Rhesus* befits Euripides. He then comments on the two prologues that circulated.³³ For the first, he cites Dicaearchus “who sets out the hypothesis of the *Rhesus*.” He then

³² W. Luppe, “Dikaiarchos und der Οἰδίουπος Τύραννος,” *Hermes* 119 (1991) 467–469, and “Neues aus Papyrus-Hypothesen zu verlorenen Euripides-Dramen,” in *Dicaearchus of Messana* 329–341, at 331 n.5. Other plays identified in this way are Sophocles’ *Athamas I+II*, *Phineus I+II*, and *Tyro I+II*, Euripides’ *Autolycus I+II*, and Lycophron’s *Oedipus I+II*. Similarly, Euripides’ *Hippolytus Stephanephorus* was sometimes called Ἰππόλυτος Δεύτερος: hyp. (2) Eur. *Hipp.* Diggle (probably from Aristophanes of Byzantium).

³³ Neither prologue is found in the transmitted text of the *Rhesus*. The comment ὁ χορὸς συνέστηκεν ἐκ φυλάκων Τρωϊκῶν, οἱ καὶ προλογίζουσι, “the chorus consists of Trojan guards, who also speak the prologue,” in the Aristophanic hypothesis in hyp. c Eur. *Rhes.* Diggle might suggest that at the time of Aristophanes of Byzantium the play no longer had a prologue: see W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge 1964) 33–34, and A. Fries, *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus* (Berlin 2014) 26. According to V. J. Liapis, “An Ancient Hypothesis to *Rhesus*, and Dicaearchus’ *Hypotheses*,” *GRBS* 42 (2001) 313–328, at 317–320, both prologues therefore predate Aristophanes. According to P. Carrara, however, “Dicaecharco e l’hypotesis del Reso,” *ZPE* 90 (1992) 35–44, at 39 n.25, it cannot be excluded that the list of dramatis personae was devised independently of Aristophanes and that therefore οἱ καὶ προλογίζουσι may be based on the medieval text of the play.

quotes a second prologue found in some copies *in extenso* but rejects it as an actors’ interpolation.

Δικαίαρχος is a generally accepted conjecture, first proposed by Nauck.³⁴ The name was probably abbreviated as δικαί^α or δικαί^αρ and later corrupted to δικαίαν.³⁵ Tuilier and Carrara unsuccessfully tried to defend the original text, ὁ γοῦν δικαίαν ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως, which they translated as “le prologue qui expose correctement l’argument de *Rhésos* s’exprime de cette manière” and “[c]olui che espone per davvero [...] esatta (δικαίαν) la trama del dramma, dice precisamente ecc.” respectively.³⁶ Tuilier considered ὁ πρόλογος the subject of the sentence. However, a prologue cannot be said to “write” anything (hence Tuilier’s inaccurate translation “express oneself” for γράφει).³⁷ Carrara’s supposed parallels for δίκαιος meaning “correct” are also unconvincing; it is never used to call something “genuine.”³⁸ According to Carrara, the subject is the poet, but he can hardly be thought to “set out the plot”; this is the activity of a writer of hypotheses. It is also unclear what “set out the plot correctly” should mean in reference to the poet: it is absurd to claim that he does not tell his own story correctly.

Many scholars have tried to link the section on the two prologues to the preceding discussion of authenticity. According to Wehrli and Budé, the original first prologue attested Euripides’ interest in celestial phenomena, one of the arguments adduced in favor of Euripides’ authorship.³⁹ Since the line itself does not

³⁴ A. Nauck, *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta* (Halle 1848) 254.

³⁵ See W. Luppe, “Dikaiarchos und der ‘Rhesos’-Prolog,” *ZPE* 84 (1990) 11–13, at 12.

³⁶ A. Tuilier, “Nouvelles remarques sur le *Rhésos* d’Euripide,” *Sileno* 9 (1983) 11–28, at 22; Carrara, *ZPE* 90 (1992) 40–41.

³⁷ See Liapis, *GRBS* 42 (2001) 316, and Cannatà Fera, in *Messina e Reggio* 100.

³⁸ See Liapis, *GRBS* 42 (2001) 315–316.

³⁹ Wehrli I² 68; Budé, *De hypotheseis* 136–137.

support this, they adopted Wilamowitz' conjecture καὶ τ.έ. "et cetera" for καί after the quotation of the *incipit*.⁴⁰ However, the μετόρσια probably refer to Eur. *Rhes.* 527–536 instead, where the guards observe the constellation to indicate the time of the night.⁴¹ Moreover, a hypothesis often juxtaposes unrelated observations with little coherence, usually because these go back to different sources.⁴²

According to Ritchie and Liapis, γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως indicates a long excerpt and therefore needs to include the second prologue as well.⁴³ However, if the first prologue no longer existed when the hypothesis was compiled, it makes perfect sense to stress that the *incipit* has been lifted verbatim from 'Dicaearchus'.

In Kirchhoff's view, the reference to the present in ἀναγέγραπται "is recorded" and φέρονται "circulate" points to Dicaearchus, who supposedly consulted the *didascalíae* and the two prologues.⁴⁴ However, the Aristotelian redaction of the *didascalíae* may have still been available to the author of the hypothesis. Moreover, the comparison with other copies is typical of later scholarship.⁴⁵ For these reasons, the fragment of Dicaearchus need not include more than the *incipit* of the first prologue.

⁴⁰ Wehrli I² 30; Budé, *De hypotheseis* 132.

⁴¹ Crates of Mallus (F 89 Broggiato = schol. vet. Eur. *Rhes.* 528 Schwartz) criticized this section in Euripides. Euripides' interest in astronomy is also pointed out by schol. vet. Eur. *Alc.* 963 Schwartz.

⁴² See also Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus* 29–30.

⁴³ Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus* 31–35; Liapis, *GRBS* 42 (2001) 319–320, "Rhesus Revisited. The Case for a Fourth-Century Macedonian Context," *JHS* 129 (2009) 71–88, at 86 n.94, and *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Oxford 2012) 64. Ritchie nevertheless concluded that Dicaearchus quoted only the first prologue, while at the same time arguing that the second prologue already existed in Dicaearchus' time.

⁴⁴ A. Kirchhoff, "Das argument zum Rhesos," *Philologus* 7 (1852) 559–564, at 563.

⁴⁵ See Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus* 31.

In conclusion, there is no evidence for the identification of the learned hypotheses with Dicaearchus’ work. The alphabetical order in which four Sophoclean plays are listed in the *Ajax* hypothesis (Ἀντηνορίδαι, Αἰχμαλωτίδες, Ἑλένης Ἀρπαγή, Μέμνων) is in fact an additional argument against Dicaearchus’ authorship (see below on alphabetization).

3. Dicaearchus and the narrative hypotheses

The narrative hypotheses were first attributed to Dicaearchus by Gallavotti⁴⁶ and later also by Haslam and Luppe.⁴⁷ The papyrus hypotheses present the plays in alphabetical order and have the following structure:

the title (often indented) – οὐ̂/ῆς/ῶν ἀρχή – the *incipit* (often at a new line) – ἡ δὲ ὑπόθεσις (often at a new line and indented) – a plot summary

These elements recur in the fragments of Dicaearchus’ hypotheses: F 113 cites the title;⁴⁸ F 114 quotes the *incipit*; F 115a

⁴⁶ C. Gallavotti, “Nuove *hypotheses* di drammi euripidei,” *RivFil* 61 (1933) 177–188, at 188. Gallavotti later dated the collection to the Roman period: *PSI* XII (1951) p.191.

⁴⁷ M. W. Haslam, “The Authenticity of Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1,” *GRBS* 16 (1975) 149–174, at 152–156; W. Luppe, “Die Hypotheses zu Euripides’ ‘Alkestis’ und ‘Aiolos’. P. Oxy. 2457,” *Philologus* 126 (1982) 10–18, at 16, “Dikaiarchos’ ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου μύθων (mit einem Beitrag zur ‘Troades’-Hypothese),” in J. Wiesner (ed.), *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung* I (Berlin 1985) 610–615, at 610–612, *Hermes* 119 (1991) 467–469, in *Dicaearchus of Messana* 329–332, and “Σχόλια, ὑπομνήματα und ὑποθέσεις zu griechischen Dramen auf Papyri,” in W. Geerlings and C. Schulze (eds.), *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter. Beiträge zu seiner Erforschung* (Leiden 2002) 55–77, at 66–67. See also T. Gelzer, “Sophokles’ Tereus, eine Inhaltsangabe auf Papyrus,” *Jahresbericht der Schweizerischen Geisteswissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft* (1976) 183–192, at 186–187; F. Wehrli, G. Wöhrle, and L. Zhmud, “Dikaiarchos aus Messene,” in H. Flashar (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*² III (Basel 2004) 568–575, at 572; and H. Hofmann, “Kritische Nachlese zur Hypothese des Sophokleischen *Tereus* (P. Oxy. 3013),” in S. Eklund (ed.), *Συγγράμματα. Studies in Honour of Jan Fredrik Kindstrand* (Uppsala 2006) 87–112, at 94–96, 106–107.

⁴⁸ Montanari, in *Eschyle à l’aube du théâtre* 387, attributed the fragment to *On Dionysiac Contests* instead. However, Dicaearchus is unlikely to have used

contains a plot summary, introduced by the word ὑπόθεσις and the title. In F 114, τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ has given rise to some confusion. The expected substantive to introduce the *incipit* is ἀρχή, not ὑπόθεσις. Luppe therefore conjectured ὁ γοῦν Δικαίαρχος ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως· <Ἰησος, οὗ ἀρχή·> “νῦν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἢ διφρήλατος.”⁴⁹ However, ὑπόθεσις might also denote the whole block consisting of title, *incipit*, and summary, from which the writer only lifts the *incipit*.

Since there is no papyrus hypothesis for the *Ajax*, it is impossible to verify whether this collection indeed used the title Αἴαντος Θάνατος. The same holds true for the *incipit* of the *Rhesus*, since the beginning of the papyrus hypothesis (*PSI* XII 1286) is lost. The only overlap is found in the *Alcestis* hypothesis. The medieval version, however, is shorter than the papyrus one, as can be seen from the following table.⁵⁰

<i>P.Oxy.</i> XXVII 2457.1–17	hyp. Eur. <i>Alc.</i>
	ὑπόθεσις Ἀλκῆστιδος Δικαίαρχου. Απόλων ἠτήσατο παρὰ τῶν Μοιρῶν ὅπως Ἄδμητος τελευτᾶν μέλλων παράσχη τὸν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ ἐκόντα τεθνηξόμενον, ἵνα ἴσον τῷ προτέρῳ χρόνον ζήσῃ. καὶ δὴ Ἀλκῆστις, ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ Ἀδμήτου, ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτὴν, οὐδετέρου τῶν γονέων ἐθελήσαντος ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀποθανεῖν.
]ιον ... [] ἔλυσεν πα[συ]μφορὰν οπ[] χης αὐτ[δ]ακρυμειν[μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ταύτης τῆς συμφορᾶς γενομένης Ἡρακλῆς παραγενόμενος

the title *Death of Ajax* (see below).

⁴⁹ Luppe, *ZPE* 84 (1990) 13.

⁵⁰ *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2457, as reedited by Meccariello, *Le hypotheses narrative* 124. For discussion of the two versions see Luppe, *Philologus* 126 (1982) 11–16, and Meccariello 125–127. According to Meccariello's estimate, the medieval text is half as long as the papyrus text. Mirhady, in *Dicaearchus of Messana* 112–113, included the papyrus hypothesis as F 115b.

<p> Ξ]μαθεν παρ[α παρ]αγενόμεν[ος]ν τὸν Θάν[ατον ν]εκρὰ καὶ[]...[]ν Ἄλκηστι[ν σ]υγκαλυ[] λαβόντ[α]αὶ πάλης ἄθ[λον]ίου χάριν τ[] ἐκκαλύψα[ς]..[...][.] [..] </p>	<p> καὶ μαθὼν παρὰ τινος θεράποντος τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἄλκηστιν ἐπορεύθη ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον καὶ Θάνατον ἀποστῆναι ποιήσας, ἐσθῆτι καλύπτει τὴν γυναῖκα· τὸν δὲ Ἄδμητον ἠξίου λαβόντα τηρεῖν. εἰληφέναι γὰρ αὐτὴν πάλης ἄθλον ἔλεγεν. μὴ βουλομένου δὲ ἐκείνου, ἀποκαλύψας ἔδειξεν ἦν ἐπένθει. </p>
---	--

Other medieval narrative hypotheses, by contrast, stay closer to the original, only changing an occasional word and sometimes skipping a sentence.⁵¹ Unlike the narrative hypotheses, the medieval *Alcestis* summary begins with a reference to Apollo and not with the name of the protagonist, followed by υἱὸς μὲν ἦν or a circumstantial participle. Moreover, the typical μὲν ... δέ and μὲν οὖν constructions are absent, and the particle δὴ in καὶ δὴ Ἄλκηστις ἢ γυνὴ τοῦ Ἀδμήτου ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτήν is unexpected.⁵² The medieval hypothesis therefore seems to be an abbreviated version of the original.⁵³ A similar adaptation of a

⁵¹ The end of the medieval *Rhesus* hypothesis has οὐδ’ Ἀχιλλεῖ φησιν ἀδάκρυτον ἔσεσθαι τὴν στρατείαν, τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν θανάτῳ τὴν ἰδίαν παραμυθουμένη λύπην, “she says that for Achilles the expedition will not be without tears either, easing her own pain by the shared death of the distinguished heroes,” as opposed to *PSI XII* 1286.24–25, which has only οὐδ’ Ἀχιλλεῖα | φησὶν ἀδάκρυτον ἔσεσθαι, “she says that Achilles will not be without tears either.” See W. Luppe, “Die Hypothese zum ‘Rhesos’,” *PSI* 1286, Kolumne I,” *Anagennesis* 2 (1982) 74–82, at 81, and Meccariello, *Le hypotheses narrative* 277. A similar expansion is seen at the end of the medieval *Andromache* hypothesis: Meccariello 157.

⁵² See Zuntz, *The Political Plays* 144–145, and Krenn, *Interpretationen zu den Hypothesen* 187. A similar unusual particle recurs in hyp. a Eur. *Rhes*. Diggle ἐξαπατηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀθηνᾶς ὡς **δῆθεν** ὑπὸ Ἀφροδίτης ἄπρακτος ὑπέστρεψεν vs. *PSI XII* 1286.6–8 [ἐξαπατηθεὶς δ’] ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς | [ὡς Ἀφροδίτ]ης ἄπρακτος ἐπέστρεψεν]. See Meccariello, *Le hypotheses narrative* 275.

⁵³ The medieval narrative hypothesis also recurs alongside the Aristo-

narrative hypothesis is found in the second part of the *Helen* hypothesis.⁵⁴

In *Laurentianus* XXXII 2 (L), the hypothesis has been added by Demetrius Triclinius with ὑπόθεσις Ἀλκήστιδος Δικαιάρχου as its heading. Since other manuscripts have only ὑπόθεσις Ἀλκήστιδος, some scholars have rejected Δικαιάρχου as a conjecture by Triclinius.⁵⁵ However, there is no obvious reason for Triclinius to do this. The supposed conjecture cannot be based on the reference to Dicaearchus in the *Medea* hypothesis, since Triclinius' manuscript does not have this section and that text does not cite a hypothesis but Dicaearchus' *Life of Greece*.⁵⁶ Triclinius does not know Dicaearchus from Salustius' *Oedipus Tyrannus* hypothesis (= F 101) or the learned *Rhesus* hypothesis (= F 114) either: the Laurentian manuscript does not contain the former and reads δικαίαν in the latter (written by his brother Nicolaus Triclinae).⁵⁷ Triclinius may have known Dicaearchus from the *Ajax* hypothesis (= F 113), but that fragment only discusses the title.⁵⁸

phanic one in schol. Pl. *Symp.* 179B, 18 Cufalo. They were probably copied from a Byzantine MS. of Euripides closely related to the *Vat.gr.* 909 (V).

⁵⁴ According to Krenn, *Interpretationen zu den Hypothesen* 211, 220, it is a Byzantine adaptation. Budé, *De hypothesibus* 153–156, unconvincingly tried to defend the antiquity of the entire hypothesis. The first part of the medieval *Helen* hypothesis (on the version of the myth in Herodotus and Homer) in fact seems to belong to a Byzantine grammarian: see R. Kannicht, *Euripides. Helena II* (Heidelberg 1969) 8–9, and Meccariello, *Le hypothesibus narrative* 188–189. Kannicht attributed it to Johannes Catrares, the scribe of the *Vaticanus Palat.gr.* 287, the sole witness for the hypothesis.

⁵⁵ G. Raddatz, "Hypothesibus," *RE* 9 (1914) 414–424, at 415; A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1957) 286 n.286; Carrara, *ZPE* 90 (1992) 38 n.22.

⁵⁶ See Budé, *De hypothesibus* 148, and Meccariello, *Le hypothesibus narrative* 73–74 n.21.

⁵⁷ See Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition* 229, and G. Zanetto, *Euripides. Rhesus* (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1993) viii. *Vat.gr.* 909 (V) confirms that this is the reading of the *archetypus*.

⁵⁸ Budé, *De hypothesibus* 148–149. Budé also pointed out the heading Εὐριπίδου Ἀλκήστιδος ὑπόθεσις Δικαιάρχου in *Marc.gr.* 9.10. This MS. was

Triclinius is in fact unlikely to have invented information on the spot. He never introduces such conjectures in other narrative hypotheses. If Δικαίάρχου were truly a personal intervention, he would have added it more often. Likewise, he never adds Ἀριστοφάνους to the Aristophanic hypotheses of Euripides, even where the stereotypical structure makes the authorship obvious. Therefore, Δικαίάρχου is probably based on a lost codex. According to Meccariello, it might ultimately go back to the *inscriptio* of a manuscript of narrative hypotheses, which opened with the *Alcestis*; at a later stage, Dicaearchus' name may have been attached to the initial hypothesis instead of the entire collection. This would indeed explain why no other medieval hypothesis cites Dicaearchus in its heading.⁵⁹

Therefore, in all likelihood, the narrative hypotheses are identical with the "hypotheses of the tales from Euripides and Sophocles" attributed to Dicaearchus by Sextus Empiricus (= F 112). The papyri (dating from the late first to the third century CE) show that the collection indeed circulated at Sextus' time. It is also unlikely that two different collections of plot summaries with the same format existed at the same time.⁶⁰ The other types of hypotheses show significant differences and cover other aspects. The Aristophanic ones are basic introductions to the plays, consisting of a brief synopsis (often only two sentences), the treatment of the myth in the Great Three, information about the setting and *dramatis personae*, the main plot points (κεφάλαια), didascalical information (the archon year, the contest for which the play was performed, and the results of that contest), and occasionally a brief judgment.⁶¹ The metrical

copied by Janus Lascaris from his personal manuscript, *Paris.gr.* 2713 (B). However, Δικαίάρχου might be derived from Triclinius, since Lascaris knew the Laurentian manuscript and adopted occasional readings from it: see Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition* 87 with n.142, 376, 228 with n.209.

⁵⁹ Meccariello, *Le ipotesi narrative* 74–75.

⁶⁰ See J. Rusten, "Dicaearchus and the Tales from Euripides," *GRBS* 23 (1982) 357–367, at 361.

⁶¹ See A. Trendelenburg, *Grammaticorum Graecorum de arte tragica iudiciorum*

hypotheses attributed to Aristophanes are poetic summaries of the stories. For the learned hypotheses and Salustius, see §2.

Moreover, Sextus Empiricus does not mention Aeschylus, who is indeed absent from the narrative hypotheses. Some scholars leave open the possibility of Dicaearchan hypotheses of Aeschylus;⁶² however, Sextus then would have mentioned all of the Great Three. If he only cited the other two *exempli gratia*, it is more natural to omit Sophocles as well and only speak of Euripides, who was more popular in the Roman period.⁶³ Furthermore, he calls the work ὑποθέσεις τῶν μύθων, not ὑποθέσεις τῶν δραμάτων. Indeed, the narrative hypotheses are mainly mythographical works: they are not concerned with representing the plays accurately but often skip entire scenes and add back-story and other mythographical information, e.g. on genealogy.⁶⁴

Kassel, however, questioned Sextus' reliability on the basis of a parallel in the excerpts from Anatolius in Hero Mechanicus (*Def.* 138.8):⁶⁵

reliquiae (Bonn 1867) 3–29; Raddatz, *RE* 9 (1914) 415–417; T. O. H. Achelis, “De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum,” *Philologus* 72 (1913) 414–441, 518–545, and 73 (1914) 122–153; Budé, *De hypothesibus* 33–39; and van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?* 32–34.

⁶² Wehrli, *Die Schule* I² 68; Budé, *De hypothesibus* 194; Bagordo, *Die antiken Traktate* 25. Budé even assumed hypotheses of Aristophanes' comedies for Dicaearchus.

⁶³ The papyrus hypotheses of Euripides far outnumber those of Sophocles: the known Sophoclean ones are *P.Oxy.* LII 3653 (*Nauplius Catapleon* and *Niobe*) and XLII 3013 (*Tereus*).

⁶⁴ See Zuntz, *The Political Plays* 138; R. Hamilton, review of R. Coles, *A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus. The Hypothesis of Euripides' Alexandros*, in *AJP* 97 (1976) 65–70, at 67–70; Van Hemelryck, *Handelingen der Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij* 33 (1979) 292–295; and van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?* 4–7.

⁶⁵ J. L. Heiberg, *Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia* IV (Stuttgart 1912) 166.

λέγεται δὲ ὑπόθεσις τριχῶς ἢ καὶ πολλαχῶς, καθ’ ἓνα μὲν τρόπον ἢ δραματικὴ περιπέτεια, καθ’ ὃν λέγονται εἶναι ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου δραμάτων.

The word ‘hypothesis’ is used in three or even in many senses. In one sense, it denotes the dramatic plot; in this sense there are said to be hypotheses of Euripides’ plays.

Anatolius clearly draws on the same source as Sextus Empiricus but does not mention Dicaearchus. According to Kassel, Sextus himself has added the reference to Dicaearchus.⁶⁶ However, even if this is true, Sextus still implies that the collection circulated under Dicaearchus’ name. This is also confirmed by FF 113–115a, where ‘Dicaearchus’ is cited for information typically found in the narrative hypotheses. Moreover, Anatolius is not necessarily more accurate. He does not mention e.g. Sophocles either. τριχῶς ἢ καὶ πολλαχῶς is also clumsier than the parallel in Sextus, who first speaks of many senses (πολλαχῶς μὲν καὶ ἄλλως), of which he then singles out three (τριχῶς).

Therefore, the narrative hypotheses probably circulated under Dicaearchus’ name, at least from the late second century CE onwards. However, the Peripatetic Dicaearchus is unlikely to be their author.⁶⁷ The alphabetical order of the plays in the papyri speaks against a late fourth century BCE writer.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ R. Kassel, “Hypothesis,” in W. J. Aerts et al. (eds.), *Σχόλια. Studia ad criticam interpretationemque textuum Graecorum et ad historiam iuris Graeco-Romani pertinentia D. Holwerda oblata* (Groningen 1985) 53–59 [repr. *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin 1991) 207–214].

⁶⁷ Pace Zuntz, *The Political Plays* 138–139, 146, and Rusten, *GRBS* 23 (1982) 361–362, the “uninspired” (Zuntz) plot summaries do not exclude Dicaearchus *a priori*: see Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus* 8, and Haslam, *GRBS* 16 (1975) 155. Theopompus, for instance, also made an epitome of Herodotus (*FGHist* 115 T 1 and FF 1–4), and Heraclides Lembus wrote *Histories* in at least thirty-seven books (*FHG* III 168–169 FF 1–5) alongside epitomes of Sotion (FF 8–17), Satyrus (F 6), Hermippus (*P.Oxy.* XI 1367), and the Aristotelian *Constitutions* (ed. Diltz).

⁶⁸ See Rusten, *GRBS* 23 (1982) 363–364, and Meccariello, *Le hypotheseis narrative* 78–79. Only one papyrus suggests a thematic order: P.IFAO inv. 248 (LDAB 917 = TM 59813) seems to summarize Euripides’ *Peliades*, fol-

Luppe's claim that this was an innovation by Dicaearchus is implausible.⁶⁹ Alphabetization seems to have been introduced in the course of the third century BCE. In lexicography, the phenomenon is first attested in *P.Hib.* II 175, a poetic onomasticon, datable to the mid-third century BCE.⁷⁰ The first epigraphic examples are from Cos in the early second century BCE, listing the participants in the cult of Apollo and Heracles.⁷¹ The earliest epigraphic list of works is a library catalogue from Rhodes, belonging to the late second century BCE.⁷² In documentary papyri, alphabetization is first found in *Pap.Lugd. Bat.* XXIX Text 4 (*SB* XXIV 16229; *TM* 45409), datable to ca. 114/3 BCE.⁷³

In all likelihood, the alphabetization of Euripides' plays goes

lowed by a *Medea* hypothesis. However, it is probably an excerpt rather than a fragment of the original collection; it introduces the *Medea* hypothesis as "the second (hypothesis)" (β' Μήδεα). On this papyrus see D. Colomo, "Euripides' *Ur-Medea* between *Hypotheses* and Declamation," *ZPE* 176 (2011) 45–51, at 45–48.

⁶⁹ Luppe, in *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung* I 611–612, and in *Dicaearchus of Messana* 332.

⁷⁰ On alphabetization in lexicography see E. Esposito, "Fragments of Greek Lexicography in the Papyri," *Trends in Classics* 1 (2009) 255–297, at 259–263. A glossary of epic words is found in *P.Heid.* I 200 = *P.Hib.* I 5 verso + *P.Ryl.* I 16a verso + *P.Bad.* VI 180 verso, paleographically datable to the late third century BCE: Esposito 288. An old alphabetic Homer lexicon might be found in *P.Yale* II 124 verso (the recto preserves ends of Homeric hexameters), which S. A. Stephens, *P.Yale* II (1985) p.121, assigned to the third century BCE.

⁷¹ *IG* XII.4 103 and 104. See L. W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Brussels 1967) 18–19.

⁷² Maiuri, *Nuova silloge* 11; M. Segre, "Epigraphica," *RivFil* 63 (1935) 214–225, at 215. See Daly, *Contributions* 21–22.

⁷³ See A. M. F. W. Verhoogt, *Menches, Komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris* (Leiden 1998) 215. In Demotic, however, it is already attested from the fourth century BCE onwards with *P.Carlsb.* 3 pp.35–39 (*TM* 48731) and *P.Saqqara Dem.* I 27 (*TM* 56128). See also J. Kahl, "Von *h* bis *k*. Indizien für eine 'alphabetische' Reihenfolge einkonsonantiger Lautwerte in spätzeitlichen Papyri," *Göttinger Miszellen* 122 (1991) 33–47.

back to the Alexandrian library, where scholars were faced with the task of arranging the vast collection. Although they probably did not invent alphabetization, they seem to have been the first to apply it to the classification of literary works on a large scale.⁷⁴ Callimachus' *pinakes*, for instance, were probably alphabetically arranged as well.⁷⁵ If Dicaearchus had made a collection of hypotheses, it would have been thematic, e.g. grouping together the plays on the Labdacid dynasty, on Medea, on Theseus, etc.

The narrative hypotheses also presuppose a collected edition of Euripides, which was first compiled in Alexandria, probably by Aristophanes of Byzantium.⁷⁶ According to Luppe, summaries of Euripides' plays were an even greater desideratum when no complete Euripides edition existed, and the quotation of the *incipit* would be "learned dead weight" otherwise.⁷⁷ However, the latter feature perfectly fits the practice of the Alexandrian grammarians.⁷⁸ Callimachus' *pinakes* too recorded both the title and the *incipit*.⁷⁹ Moreover, the narrative hypotheses do not contain plays already lost in the Alexandrian

⁷⁴ Van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?* 4 with n.13, tried to downplay the importance of the alphabetical order and quoted Haslam's statement that "4th-cent. pinakia and inventories show that by Dicaearchus' time alphabetization [...] had been in use in Athens for years" (APA Abstracts 1994), but cited no document as evidence.

⁷⁵ This is suggested by the alphabetical list of cake-bakers in Callim. F 435 Pfeiffer². See R. Blum, *Kallimachos. The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography* (Madison 1991) 155, 187.

⁷⁶ See Zuntz, *The Political Plays* 145–146; Rusten, *GRBS* 23 (1982) 363; and Meccariello, *Le ipotesi narrative* 77.

⁷⁷ Luppe, in *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung* I 611, and in *Dicaearchus of Messana* 332.

⁷⁸ See Meccariello, *Le ipotesi narrative* 77.

⁷⁹ The *incipit* is quoted in Callim. FF 433 and 434 Pfeiffer²; see also FF 436 and 444. The title is cited in FF 438, 440, 441, 443, and 448; see also FF 432 and 445. Title and *incipit* are also cited in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' catalogue of Dinarchus' works (*Din.* 10–13), perhaps adopted from Callimachus: see E. Nachmanson, *Der griechische Buchtitel* (Göteborg 1941) 45–46, and Blum, *Kallimachos* 196–199.

period, such as Euripides' *Theristae*,⁸⁰ and include tragedies that were probably spurious.⁸¹

The title *Death of Ajax* in F 113 suggests a later grammarian as well. If Dicaearchus had used it, his contemporaries would not have known which play he meant, since its official title as recorded in the *didascaliae* (Arist. F 623 Rose = F 419 Gigon) was simply *Ajax*. Attempts at distinguishing homonymous plays by the same writer probably commenced with the Alexandrians (see §2).

Linguistic and stylistic features of the narrative hypotheses also suggest a later date. Krenn and Meccariello have pointed out vocabulary characteristic of the late Hellenistic period,⁸² while Diggle has identified rhetorical clauses typical of the Asiatic school of rhetoric.⁸³ Meccariello also cited the un-

⁸⁰ Aristophanes of Byzantium recorded the *Theristae* as lost (hyp. A 6 Eur. *Med.* Van Looy [= hyp. a (1) Diggle]). See N. Pechstein, *Euripides Satyrographos. Ein Kommentar zu den Euripideischen Satyrspielfragmenten* (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1998) 37.

⁸¹ The spurious plays are the *Pirithous* (schol. Hermog. *De methodo vehementiae* 28; Gregory of Corinth 17 [VII.2 1312–1313 Walz] + Johannes Logotheta, ed. H. Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften. 5. Des Diakonen und Logotheten Johannes Kommentar zu Hermogenes Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος," *RhM* 63 [1908] 127–151, at 144–145), *Rhadamanthys* (*PSI* XII 1286 fr.A.ii.1–8), and *Tennes* (*P.Oxy.* XXVII 2455.172–183): see Eur. *TrGF* V.1 T 1.A.9. This might also apply to the *Rhesus* (hyp. a Eur. *Rhes.* Diggle and *PSI* XII 1286 fr.A.i), whose authenticity was questioned in antiquity (hyp. b Eur. *Rhes.* Diggle) and is often rejected today. See Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus*; A. Feickert, *Euripidis Rhesus* (Frankfurt am Main 2005) 40–57; Liapis, *A Commentary on the Rhesus* lxxvii–lxxv; and Fries, *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus* 22–47.

⁸² Krenn, *Interpretationen zu den Hypothesen* 1, 3, 230–233, passim; Meccariello, *Le ipotesi narrative* 75–77. Krenn dated the collection to the first century BCE.

⁸³ J. Diggle, "Rhythmical Prose in the Euripidean Hypotheses," in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (eds.), *Euripide e i papiri* (Florence 2005) 27–67, who dated the hypotheses between the second century BCE and the first century CE. They were indeed used for educational purposes: see Meccariello, *Le ipotesi narrative* 83–86. According to J. Mossman, "Reading the Euripidean Hypothesis," in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds.), *Condensing*

Aristotelian use of ὑπόθεσις in the sense of ‘summary’ or ‘content’ as evidence against Dicaearchus.⁸⁴

The narrative hypotheses are in fact incompatible with Dicaearchus’ language and style, which can be seen in a few verbatim fragments:

Phld. *Historia Academicorum*, *P.Herc.* 1021.i (F 46a)⁸⁵

Porph. *Abst.* 4.2.3–8 (F 56a)⁸⁶

Steph. Byz. s.v. Χαλδαῖοι p.680 Meineke (F 60)

Steph. Byz. s.v. πάτρα pp.511–512 Meineke (F 64)⁸⁷

ps.-Demetr. *Eloc.* 182 (F 71)⁸⁸

Ath. 641E–F (F 80)⁸⁹

Texts – Condensed Texts (Stuttgart 2010) 247–267, at 252–260, the collection was even compiled as a rhetorical sourcebook for declamations.

⁸⁴ Meccariello, *Le hypotheseis narrative* 35–36, 80.

⁸⁵ Philodemus’ *Historia Academicorum* is a collection of excerpts from various Hellenistic writers. Because the avoidance of hiatus varies from one excerpt to another, K. Gäiser, *Philodems Academica. Die Berichte über Platon und die Alte Akademie in zwei herkulanensischen Papyri* (Stuttgart 1988) 87–88, concluded that Philodemus cites his sources verbatim. *P.Herc.* 1021.Y might also be a fragment of Dicaearchus: see the discussion in G. Verhasselt, “A New Reading in Philodemus’ *Historia Academicorum* (*PHerc.* 1021, Col. 2) with Observations on Dicaearchus in Col. Y (F 46b Mirhady),” *CronErcol* 43 (2013) 17–26.

⁸⁶ Studies of Porphyry’s method have shown that he usually follows his sources verbatim. See J. Bernays, *Theophrastos’ Schrift über Frömmigkeit. Ein Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin 1866) 23–28, on his quotation from Joseph. *Bj* 2.119–133, 137–159 (*Abst.* 4.11.3–4.13.9), and W. Pötscher, *Theophrastos. Περὶ εὐσεβείας* (Leiden 1964) 5–14, on his quotation from Plut. *De soll. an.* 2–5, 959E–963F (*Abst.* 3.20.7–3.24.5). This is also seen when he quotes Pl. *Th.* 173C–174A in *Abst.* 1.36.3–4. Another verbatim quotation might be found in Porph. *V.Pythag.* 18–19 (F 40).

⁸⁷ Stephanus often quotes ancient writers to attest the geographic terms under discussion. On his method see M. Billerbeck, “Sources et technique de citation chez Étienne de Byzance,” *Eikasmos* 19 (2008) 301–322. His lemma on πάτρα contains two quotations from Dicaearchus.

⁸⁸ Pseudo-Demetrius quotes a short phrase from Dicaearchus as an example of an elegant composition. This is followed by similar verbatim quotations from Plato.

⁸⁹ Athenaeus quotes Dicaearchus for the phrase δευτέρα τράπεζα in his

Ath. 594E–595A (F 81)⁹⁰

Ath. 141A–C (F 87)⁹¹

schol. vet. Ar. *Nub.* 1364c Holwerda (F 90)⁹²

A first difference concerns the use of particles. In the narrative hypotheses, these are generally limited to δέ, μέν ... δέ, γάρ, καί, and μέν οὖν;⁹³ occasionally τε καί is used,⁹⁴ though far less often than the simple καί. The negative particles οὐδέ and οὔτε are rare,⁹⁵ and οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλὰ καί is attested only once.⁹⁶ No emphatic particles are used. Dicaearchus, by contrast, displays a more varied use:

μέν γάρ (F 46a.12, F 56a.3); καὶ γάρ (F 81); οὐδέ (F 56a.8, F 81); οὔτε/μήτε ... οὔτε/μήτε (F 56a.3, 4); εἶτε ... εἶτε (F 90); τε καί (F 56a.8, F 64); τε (F 90); οὖν (F 46a.1); οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλὰ καί (F 46a.24–27); ἀλλὰ (F 81); ἀλλὰ μήν (F 56a.5); γε (F 46a.7, 23, F 56a.3, F 80, F

catalogue of words for ‘dessert’. His lexicographical interest shows that this is a verbatim quotation; he even leaves out the original context of the fragment.

⁹⁰ Athenaeus quotes Dicaearchus without any regard for the original context: Dicaearchus compared the sight of the monument for the courtesan Pythionice in Athens to another experience (ταὐτὸ δὲ πάθοι τις ἄν), in which Athenaeus is not interested.

⁹¹ Athenaeus quotes Dicaearchus when discussing the Spartan symposia; this section also contains numerous quotations from other authors.

⁹² The scholiast introduces the fragment with Δικαίαρχος ἐν τῷ Περὶ μουσικῶν <ἀγώνων>, followed by the information in direct speech, which implies a verbatim quotation.

⁹³ See van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests?* 7.

⁹⁴ Hyp. Eur. *Tro.* + *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2455.163–164 Ἀθηνᾶ τε | [καὶ Ποσειδῶνι], 226 Ἑλλη[ν τε κ]αὶ Φρίξον, 272–273 [Ἑλλην τε | καὶ Φ]ρίξον), 283 Φρίξον τε καὶ Ἑλλην; hyp. (1) Eur. *Hipp.* Diggle + *P.Mil.Vogl.* Π 44.i.9–10 [κάλλει τε κ]αὶ σω[φροσύνη].

⁹⁵ Hyp. a Eur. *Phoen.* Diggle οὐδὲ τοὺς παρὰ τὴν δυστυχίαν ἐλεήσας; hyp. a Eur. *Rhes.* Diggle + *PSI* XII 1286 fr.A.i.24 οὐδ’ Ἀχιλλεῖ / οὐδ’ Ἀχιλλεῖα] (see n.51 above); hyp. Eur. *Heracl.* οὔτε γὰρ ἰδίαν οὔτε τῶν πολιτῶν τινος θυγατέρα.

⁹⁶ Hyp. (1) Eur. *Bacch.* Diggle οὐ λέγων μόνον ὅτι θεὸς οὐκ ἔστι Διόνυσος, ἀλλὰ καὶ etc.

81); $\pi\omega$ (F 56a.3); ἤδη (F 56a.7, 8, F 87); δὴ (F 46a.9, F 56a.7, F 64); -περ (F 64, F 81); ἄρα (F 81)

His way of connecting sentences too is more creative. Apart from the particles listed above, he also uses $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$ (F 81), $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha$ (F 87), $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron/\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ (F 87), and $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ (F 46a.21, F 56a.5, F 64). His use of modal adverbials such as $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\omicron}\tau\omega\varsigma$ (F 56a.3, 6) and $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ (F 46a.13) also contrasts with the narrative hypotheses, where adverbs are rare in general.⁹⁷

The syntax is different as well. In the narrative hypotheses, parataxis is ubiquitous, usually with $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$. Occasionally, a subordinate clause is found, although it rarely goes beyond the first degree. Instead, the hypotheses extensively use circumstantial participles and genitive absolute constructions.⁹⁸ Dicaearchus, by contrast, has a more complex syntax and uses longer periods:

F 56a.4:

$\tau\omicron$ δ' $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron$

$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\sigma\chi\omicron\lambda\eta\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ (object infinitive)

$\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\eta\tau\omicron$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\acute{\iota}\varsigma$

$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\delta\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\upsilon$ $\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\nu\varsigma$, (object infinitive)

$\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\tau\eta$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\gamma\lambda\alpha\phi\upsilon\rho\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ $\iota\alpha\tau\rho\omega\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$

$\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\acute{\iota}\alpha$, (conditional clause)

$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\mu\eta$ $\nu\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$. (object infinitive)

F 56a.7:

$\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\omicron}$ $\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$,

$\kappa\alpha\theta'$ $\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\eta\delta\eta$ $\kappa\tau\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\zeta\acute{\omicron}\phi\omega\nu$

$\eta\psi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$, (relative clause)

$\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (circumstantial participle)

$\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\chi\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu$ $\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$, (object clause)

$\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\gamma\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\chi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}$.

F 56a.8:

$\eta\delta\eta$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ $\acute{\alpha}\zeta\iota\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$ $\kappa\tau\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\upsilon\pi\eta\rho\chi\omicron\nu$,

$\acute{\alpha}$ $\omicron\acute{\iota}$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omicron$ $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\tau\iota\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\delta\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron$, (relative clause)

$\acute{\alpha}\theta\rho\iota\zeta\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$,

(circumstantial participle)

⁹⁷ See van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?* 10.

⁹⁸ See van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?* 9.

οἷ δ' ἐπὶ τὸ διαφυλάττει.

F 64:

ἐκλήθη δὲ πάτρα μὲν εἰς τὴν δευτέραν μετάβασιν ἐλθόντων ἢ
κατὰ μόνας ἐκάστῳ πρότερον οὔσα (attributive participle)
συγγένεια,

ἀπὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου τε καὶ μάλιστα ἰσχύσαντος ἐν τῷ γένει τὴν
ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχουσα, (circumstantial participle)
ὄν ἂν τρόπον Αἰακίδας ἢ Πελοπίδας εἶποι τις ἄν. (relative
clause)

F 64:

οὐ γὰρ ἔτι τῶν πατριωτικῶν ἱερῶν εἶχε κοινωνίαν ἢ δοθεῖσα,
ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν τοῦ λαβόντος αὐτὴν συνετέλει πάτραν,
ὥστε (consecutive clause)

πρότερον πόθῳ τῆς συνόδου γιγνομένης ἀδελφαῖς σὺν ἀδελφῷ,
(genitive absolute)

ἕτερα τις ἱερῶν ἐτέθη κοινωνικὴ σύνοδος,
ἣν δὴ φρατρίαν ὠνόμαζον. (relative clause)

F 81:

καὶ γὰρ

ἐνταῦθα καταστάς (circumstantial participle)

οὗ ἂν φανῆ τὸ πρῶτον ὃ

τῆς Ἀθηναῖς ἀφορώμενος (attributive participle)

νεῶς καὶ τὸ πόλισμα, (relative clause)

ᾧσεται

παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτὴν ᾠκοδομημένον μνήμα (supplementary
participle)

οἷον οὐχ ἕτερον οὐδὲ σύνεγγυς οὐδὲν ἐστὶ τῷ μεγέθει. (relative
clause)

F 81:

τοῦτο δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον,

ᾧπερ εἰκός, (relative clause)

ἢ Μιλτιάδου φήσειεν <ἂν> σαφῶς ἢ Περικλέους ἢ Κίμωνος ἢ τινος
ἑτέρου τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν

εἶναι, (*accusativus cum infinitivo*)

<καὶ> μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως δημοσίᾳ κατασκευασμένον,

εἰ δὲ μή, (relative clause)

δεδομένον

κατασκευάσασθαι. (object infinitive)

4. Pseudo-Dicaearchus or a homonymous grammarian?

I have argued that (1) the learned hypotheses do not go back

to Dicaearchus, (2) the fragments of Dicaearchus' hypotheses (FF 113–115a) belong to the narrative hypotheses, and (3) the Peripatetic Dicaearchus is unlikely to be their author. Rusten may have been right to consider it a pseudepigraphic work like Pseudo-Apollodorus' *Library* and Pseudo-Eratosthenes' *Catasterismi*.⁹⁹ Dicaearchus' name is indeed also attached to another spurious work: the Ἀναγραφή τῆς Ἑλλάδος, preserved in *Paris. suppl.gr.* 447.¹⁰⁰

According to Liapis and Montanari, the narrative hypotheses are an epitome of Dicaearchus.¹⁰¹ Liapis assumed that the plot summaries were part of Dicaearchus' *On Dionysiac Contests*¹⁰² and were later singled out and expanded with further material in the narrative hypotheses. However, there is no evidence for such a radical makeover. The identification with a section of Dicaearchus' *On Dionysiac Contests* is also unlikely. The citation ἐν τῷ Περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγώνων in F 99 instead of ἐν τῷ + book number or ἐν τοῖς suggests that it consisted of one book-roll. The narrative hypotheses themselves are already a vast collection. Since one papyrus hypothesis is about one and a half columns long, Luppe estimated two rolls for Euripides and three for Sophocles (whose oeuvre was indeed larger).¹⁰³ Although large papyrus rolls do exist, one single roll seems too small to contain plot summaries of both Euripides and Sopho-

⁹⁹ Rusten, *GRBS* 23 (1982) 364–367.

¹⁰⁰ This is a geographic poem by “Dionysius, son of Calliphon,” as the acrostic in the opening lines shows (*GGM* I 238–243), interrupted by prose excerpts from Heraclides Criticus' *On the Cities in Greece* (*FGrHist* 2022 = *BNJ* 369A).

¹⁰¹ Liapis, *GRBS* 42 (2001) 325–326; Montanari, in *Eschyle à l'aube du théâtre* 388–389.

¹⁰² See already Wehrli, *Die Schule* I² 68, and “Dikaiarchos,” *RE* Suppl. 11 (1968) 526–534, at 533. Later, however, Wehrli, *Die Schule* X² (1969) 124, considered the hypotheses an independent work.

¹⁰³ Luppe, in *Dicaearchus of Messana* 331. In his view, the first roll of Euripides covered the letters A–Λ and the second M–X. *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2455 (the longest papyrus) indeed contains only plays belonging to the second half of the alphabet.

cles and additional didascalie information.

More plausible is Reinesius' and Wilamowitz' attribution to the grammarian Dicaearchus of Sparta, who is known only from *Suda* δ 1063: Δικαίαρχος, Λακεδαιμόνιος, γραμματικός, ἀκροατὴς Ἀριστάρχου.¹⁰⁴ The hypotheses would certainly fit a second century BCE pupil of Aristarchus better than a late fourth century BCE Peripatetic. The *communis opinio*, however, rejects the existence of this grammarian.¹⁰⁵ The ethnic is usually thought to go back to the Peripatetic's stay in the Peloponnese (Cic. *Att.* 6.2.3 = F 79) and the law in Sparta according to which his *Spartan Constitution* was to be read annually in the council of ephors (*Suda* δ 1062 = F 2). The claim that he was a disciple of Aristarchus was supposedly fabricated on the basis of testimonies such as Apollonius Dyscolus *Pron.* p.48 Schneider = p.60b–c Bekker, where Aristarchus is said to have adopted a certain reading in Homer from him (= F 94).¹⁰⁶ If the namesake

¹⁰⁴ T. Reinesius, *Ad viros clarissimos D. Casp. Hoffmannum. Christ. Ad. Rupertum professores Noricos Epistolae* (Leipzig 1660) 608; C. G. Müller, *Thomae Reinesii observationes in Suidam* (Leipzig 1819) 68; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "Excursus zu Euripides Herakliden," *Hermes* 17 (1882) 337–364, at 355 ("Dikaiarchos dem jüngeren"). Wilamowitz, *Euripides. Herakles* I 134 n.19, later withdrew this theory. It has recently been advanced again by Meccariello, *Le ipotesi narrative* 80–82.

¹⁰⁵ See F. Osann, "Über einige Schriften Dikäarchos, des Peripatetikers," in *Beiträge zur Griechischen und Römischen Litteraturgeschichte* II (Kassel/Leipzig 1839) 1–119, at 119, and *Anecdota Romanum de notis veterum criticis in primis Aristarchi Homericis et Iliade Heliconia* (Gießen 1851) 280; Fuhr, *Dicaearchi Messenii quae supersunt* 44, 60–61 n.30; Müller, *FHG* II 225, 245–246; A. Daub, *Studien zu den Biographika des Suidas* (Freiburg/Tübingen 1882) 96–97; A. Blau, *De Aristarchi discipulis* (Jena 1883) 4–5; L. Cohn, "Dikaiarchos 4," *RE* 5 (1903) 563; E. Martini, "Dikaiarchos 3," 546–563, at 554; Wehrli, *Die Schule* I² 44; and Cannatà Fera, in *Messina e Reggio* 105 n.48. So also Zuntz, *The Political Plays* 146: "In looking round for another possible author for the 'Tales' one will be careful not to raise the ghost of the supposed later namesake of Dicaearchus."

¹⁰⁶ Pace A. Buttmann, *Quaestiones de Dicaeargo ejusque operibus quae inscribuntur Βίος Ἑλλάδος et Αναγραφὴ Ἑλλάδος* (Naumburg 1832) 3, and Meccariello, *Le ipotesi narrative* 81, the fragment does not concern the Spartan Dicaearchus. Similarly, Aristophanes of Byzantium (Aristarchus' master)

did exist, however, no other fragments on music and literature can be attributed to him, since these generally cite Dicaearchus as the “Messenian” and/or pupil of Aristotle or mention him alongside other old writers.¹⁰⁷

Finally, Sextus Empiricus seems to have the Peripatetic Dicaearchus in mind as well. Elsewhere, he cites Dicaearchus’ work on the soul¹⁰⁸ and does not distinguish the writer of the hypotheses, for instance by adding an ethnic. Yet Sextus may have mistakenly identified the two writers. It is also worth considering whether τινος in Δικαιάρχου τινὸς ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων might be an error for τινος,¹⁰⁹ i.e. whether Sextus actually spoke of “a certain Dicaearchus.” In either case, the Peripatetic Dicaearchus is excluded as the author of the narrative hypotheses. Although a spurious work remains possible, the Spartan Dicaearchus should not be excluded too rashly.¹¹⁰

May, 2015

KU Leuven
gertjan.verhasselt@arts.kuleuven.be

cited a reading of Dicaearchus in Alcaeus (F 110 = Ar. Byz. F 367 Slater). Dicaearchus might also be mentioned alongside Aristarchus in *P.Oxy.* XXIX 2506 fr.6a and 79 (F 111); see D. L. Page, *P.Oxy.* XXIX (1963) pp.35, 44, and F. Montanari, “44. Dicaearchus. 1T (?)” in *Corpus dei papiri filosofici* I.1** (Florence 1992) 30–32.

¹⁰⁷ See FF 105 and 106 from *On Alcaeus*, F 100 on Sophocles, and F 48 on the proverbial bad poet Tellen. Dicaearchus is mentioned alongside his fellow-student Aristoxenus in F 89 (from *On Musical Contests*) and F 93 (on Homer), alongside Hellanicus as one of ἀρχαιότεροι in F 99 (from *On Dionysiac Contests*), and alongside Aristotle and Heraclides Ponticus in F 92 (on Homer and/or Euripides).

¹⁰⁸ Sext. Emp. *Pyr.* 2.31 (= F 18) and *Math.* 7.348–349 (= F 24).

¹⁰⁹ See Fuhr, *Dicaearchi Messenii quae supersunt* 70 n.59.

¹¹⁰ This article is based on my Ph.D. research on the fragments of Dicaearchus, which was funded by Onderzoeksfonds KU Leuven/Research Fund KU Leuven. I thank my former supervisors, Stefan Schorn and Willy Clarysse, for their useful comments and suggestions. My thanks also go to Michael McOsker for proofreading an earlier draft of this article.