

EURIPIDES AND THE
'TALES FROM EURIPIDES':
SOURCES OF APOLLODOROS'
'BIBLIOTHECA'?

In their search for the arguments of lost Euripidean tragedies scholars have often taken recourse to the mythographic manuals from Roman times, the *Fabulae* of Hyginus and the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodoros. However, the quality (direct or indirect) and the relative importance of the dependence of these mythographers on the tragic poet, who lived some five or six centuries before¹), have never been elucidated. The question has been complicated by the discovery of several papyrus-fragments of an alphabetic collection of tragic hypotheses of Euripides, the so-called *Tales from Euripides*, a book of which the existence had already been surmised by Wilamowitz²). Ever since, it has been stated again and again that

1) The date of the *Library* remains uncertain and can vary between 50 B. C. and 250 A. D. Most authors thought of the second century A. D. (see for example C. Robert, *De Apollodori Bibliotheca*, diss., Berolini 1873, 38 ff.; M.-M. Mactoux, *Panthéon et discours mythologique. Le cas d'Apollodore*, RHR 206 [1989] 247), but G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides*, Oxford 1955, 138–139 preferred the first century B. C., M. Van der Valk, *On Apollodori Bibliotheca*, REG 71 (1958) 167 the first century A. D., and J. C. Carrière, B. Massonie, *La Bibliothèque d'Apollodore, traduite, annotée et commentée (Lire les polythéismes, 3)*, Paris 1991, 11 even date the work to the end of that century or the beginning of the following on the ground of Pausanias' obvious ignorance of the work.

2) U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Analecta Euripidea*, Berlin 1875, 182–184. Ever since, many separate papyrus-fragments have been published: see the surveys in O. Bouquiaux-Simon, P. Mertens, *Les témoignages papyrologiques d'Euripide: liste sommaire arrêtée au 1/6/1990* in: *Papiri letterari greci e latini*, A

both mythographers relied to a great extent or even exclusively on this collection for their knowledge of Euripides' plots. In view of the importance of these texts for the reconstruction of fragmentary tragedies, it is worthwhile to examine the specific question whether they relied directly on these plays or on hypotheses or on other intermediary sources. In this paper I will focus only on Apollodoros: as to Hyginus, the question is obscured even more by the heterogeneous and poorly transmitted text and the fact that the Greek original of this Latin translation is lost.

There is much uncertainty about Apollodoros' sources in general: the mythographer explicitly quotes Hesiod, Homer, Pherekydes, Akousilaos as well as some other minor mythographers and poets of the epic cycle, but also Euripides (four times) and the tragedians (three times)³). However, the author follows other sources as well, without naming them, such as Hellanikos, used by Apollodoros for his presentation of Trojan history⁴). It is clear, indeed, that the explicit references, often grouped in "Zitatennester", always deal with specific variants or deviations from the version currently followed by the mythographer. Sometimes these variants concern only proper names or other details. The question then arises whether the author borrowed, on the one hand his main argument, and on the other the variants, from the original works, or from later epitomes, hypotheses, learned commentaries or a mythographical manual or manuals. Although C. Robert, the first scholar to study the question in detail, thought that Apollodoros had consulted Pherekydes, Akousilaos and Asklepiades directly, he defended his dependence on intermediary sources, mainly scholiasts and hypotheses, for his knowledge of other authors, such as Homer and the tragedians⁵). However, most scholars of the late 19th century and

cura di M. Capasso, Lecce 1992, 106–107; H. Van Looy, Les fragments d'Euripide. Première partie: Αἰγεύς – Ἴππόλυτος Καλυπτόμενος, AC 61 (1992) 297–299 (with bibliography on each hypothesis). One should add now the recently published fragments of a hypothesis of the *Hippolytos Kalypptomenos* (cf. W. Luppe, Die Hypothese zum ersten 'Hippolytos' (P. Mich. inv. 6222A), ZPE 102 [1994] 23–39), and of the *Bacchae* (P. Oxy. 60.4017).

3) Carrière, Massonie (cf. supra n. 1) 12–17; M. Rodriguez de Sepulveda, Apollodoro, Biblioteca, Introd. de J. Arce, Madrid 1985, 22–28; C. Jourdain-Annequin, Héraclès aux portes du soir. Mythe et histoire (Centre de recherches de l'université de Besançon, 89), Paris 1989, 235–242.

4) Cf. Van der Valk (cf. supra n. 1) 134–143.

5) Cf. Robert, De Apollodori... (cf. supra n. 1) 55; C. Robert, Bild und Lied, Berlin 1881, 242 ff.

early 20th century, such as Wilamowitz, E. Schwartz, E. Bethe, W. Radtke, R. Wagner and A. Söder⁶), defended a variant of the thesis of the intermediary sources. Only for some specific passages, such as Apollod. 3.5.7 ff. [48 ff.] on the Oidipous-legend, did Schwartz and Robert argue a direct dependence on Greek tragedy, in casu the prologue of Euripides' *Phoinissai* and extracts from Sophokles' *Oidipous Tyrannos*, a theory which was criticized by Bethe⁷). But in more recent scholarship there is a tendency to reassess the author as one who had consulted the original sources, and to appreciate his erudition and acquaintance with the original achievements of classical, often even archaic literature⁸), the predilection for the epic cycle and the older mythographers is indeed noteworthy and may reflect the archaizing fashion of the Second Sophistic.

Instead of going into this question in general, the purpose of this paper is to analyze the limited number of passages in which Apollodoros refers to Euripides or else relies on him without ex-

6) Wilamowitz (cf. supra n. 2); E. Schwartz, *De scholiis ad historiam fabularem pertinentibus* (Neue Philologische Jahrbücher. Suppl.-Bd. 12), 1881, 405 (already suggested the dependence of both Apollodoros and the comparable ἱστορίαι in the Homeric scholia on several mythographic compendia from the Hellenistic period); M. Wellmann, *De Istro Callimachio*, diss., Gryphiswaldiae 1886, 44–70 (tried to show that the *Συναγωγή τῶν Ἀτθίδεων* of Kallimachos' disciple Istros was used by Apollodoros as a source of his chapters on the Attic mythological past); E. Bethe, *Quaestiones Diodoreae mythographae*, diss., Gottingae 1887 (defended the hypothesis of a mythographic manual from the first half of the first century B. C. as a common source for Diodoros, Hyginus and Apollodoros); W. Radtke, *De Lysimacho Alexandrino*, diss., Strassburg 1893, esp. 102 ff. (the *Νόστοι* and *Θηβαικῶν παραδόξων συναγωγή* of this historian from the fourth or third century B. C. are considered an important source for Apollodoros or the mythographic compendium on which he depended); R. Wagner, *Epitoma Vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca*. *Accedunt curae mythographae de Apollodori bibliothecae fontibus*, Leipzig 1891 (defended the thesis that Apollodoros had used a kind of summaries of the Epic cycle for his treatment of the Trojan saga); A. Söder, *Quellenuntersuchung zum 1. Buch der Apollodorschen Bibliothek*, Würzburg 1939, esp. 166–169 (concluded that Apollodoros used prose summaries of epic poems, hypotheses, commentaries etc. but never the original texts). See also C. Lütke, *Pherecydea*, diss., Gottingae 1893, 32 ff., who showed at least for the Herakles-legend that Pherekydes cannot have been a direct source for Apollodoros.

7) C. Robert, *Oedipus*. *Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum*, Berlin 1915, I 544–546; Schwartz (cf. supra n. 6) 450 ff.; Bethe (cf. supra n. 6) 85–86.

8) Already Van der Valk, who adopted the theory of the mythographical manual as a source only for specific parts of the *Library*, such as the life story of Heracles (cf. supra n. 1, 146 ff.), but certainly Rodriguez de Sepulveda (cf. supra n. 3) 27 and Carrière, Massonie (cf. supra n. 1) 11 ff.

PLICIT reference. This specific case-study may throw new light also on the general question of Apollodoros’ sources. I deal first with the explicit references to tragedies of Euripides⁹).

(2.1.4 = 11) Βῆλος δὲ ὑπομείνας ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ βασιλεύει μὲν Αἰγύπτου, γαμεῖ δὲ Ἀγχινόην τὴν Νείλου θυγατέρα, καὶ αὐτῷ γίνονται παῖδες δίδυμοι, Αἴγυπτος καὶ Δαναός, ὡς δὲ φησιν Εὐριπίδης, καὶ Κηφεὺς καὶ Φινεὺς προσέτι.

That Belos also fathered Kepheus and Phineus is nowhere mentioned in extant Euripidean tragedy, but it probably refers to the *Andromeda*, where the genealogy of the heroine, Kepheus’ daughter, is likely to have been given in the prologue¹⁰). Somewhat surprisingly, however, schol. E. Supp. 318 informs us that ὁ Εὐριπίδης φησὶ πέντε παῖδας εἶναι Βήλου, Αἴγυπτον, Δαναόν, Φοίνικα, Φινέα, Ἀγήνορα. H. J. Mette suggested that the scholiast had erroneously omitted Κηφέα here and that he in fact was referring to the same *Andromeda*-passage as Apollodoros, but F. Babel has denied this quite convincingly¹¹). The explicitation that Belos had five sons is indeed an additional difference, and the *Phoenix* of Euripides is certainly another possibility. Elsewhere, the version according to which Kepheus is the son of Belos seems to occur only in Hdt. 7.61 (παρὰ Κηφέα τὸν Βήλου); on the other hand, schol. in Arat. 179 calls Kepheus Belos’ grandson¹²).

(3.6.8 = 74–75) Ἴσμαρος μὲν γὰρ Ἴππομέδοντα ἀπέκτεινε, Λεάδης δὲ Ἐτέοκλον, Ἀμφίδικος δὲ Παρθενοπαῖον. ὡς δὲ Εὐριπίδης φησὶ, Παρθενοπαῖον ὁ Ποσειδῶνος παῖς Περικλύμενος ἀπέκτεινε. Μελάνιπτος δὲ ὁ λοιπὸς τῶν Ἀστακοῦ παίδων εἰς τὴν γαστέρα Τυδέα τιτρώσκει.

The reference to Parthenopaios’ death by the hands of Periklymenos agrees with a detail told in the messenger speech of Euripides *Phoenician Women* (1153–7), where a similar indication of his descent is added: ἐναλίου θεοῦ Περικλύμενος παῖς. It is clear that Apollodoros only mentions this as a particular variant since the remaining ‘catalogue of killings’ does not derive from

9) All extracts from the *Library* quoted are taken from Mythographi Graeci. I. Apollodoros. Peditasimus, ed. R. Wagner, Leipzig²1926.

10) Cf. F. Babel, Euripides’ *Andromeda* (Palingenesia 34), Stuttgart 1991, 24.

11) H. J. Mette, Euripides (insbes. für die Jahre 1939–1968), 1. Hauptteil: Die Bruchstücke, Lustrum 12 (1967) 57 (F *208); Babel (cf. supra n. 10) 19.

12) On Kepheus’ descent, see Preller, Robert, Griechische Mythologie, II 1, Berlin 1920, 237.

Euripides. The variant, however, is not exclusively Euripidean: Paus. 9.18.6 informs us that Asphodikos killed Parthenopaios according to the Thebans¹³), but that the Thebaid reserved the feat for Periklymenos, and from a scholion to Ph. 1156 we know that the killing was also recorded by Aristodemos, who specified that Periklymenos struck Parthenopaios with a stone¹⁴).

(3.7.7 = 94–95) Εὐριπίδης δέ φησιν Ἄλκμαίωνα κατὰ τὸν τῆς μαρίας χρόνον ἐκ Μαντοῦς Τειρεσίου παῖδας δύο γεννησάι, Ἀμφίλοχον καὶ θυγατέρα Τισιφόνην, κομίσαντα δὲ εἰς Κόρινθον τὰ βρέφη δοῦναι τρέφειν Κορινθίων βασιλεῖ Κρέοντι, καὶ τὴν μὲν Τισιφόνην διενεγκοῦσαν εὐμορφία ὑπὸ τῆς Κρέοντος γυναικὸς ἀπεμποληθῆναι, δεδοικυίας μὴ Κρέων αὐτὴν γαμετὴν ποιήσῃται. τὸν δὲ Ἄλκμαίωνα ἀγοράσαντα ταύτην ἔχειν οὐκ εἰδότα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα θεράπαιναν, παραγενόμενον δὲ εἰς Κόρινθον ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν τέκνων ἀπαίτησιν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν κομίσασθαι. Καὶ Ἀμφίλοχος κατὰ χρησμούς Ἀπόλλωνος Ἀμφιλοχικὸν Ἄργος ὤκισεν.

Scholars unanimously agree that this passage, added by Apollodoros as an appendix to the legend of Alcmeon, reproduces the argument of Euripides' posthumous *Alcmeon at Corinth*¹⁵). The legend indeed seems to have been invented to a large extent by Euripides himself and is not further attested apart from this Apollodorean addition. It is striking, however, that the action of the play is covered only by the clause παραγενόμενον δὲ εἰς Κόρινθον

13) Ἀσφόδικος was corrected by Dindorf to Ἀμφίδικος on the basis of the passage quoted from the *Library*, but Ἀσφόδικος is attested as a proper name in Herodianus 3.1, p. 152.7, 3.2, p. 445.3, 3.2, p. 926.20. More probably, the Apollodorean Ἀμφίδικος should be corrected to Ἀσφόδικος, as suggested by Wilamowitz: cf. F. Vian, *Les origines de Thèbes. Cadmos et les Spartes* (Études et commentaires 48), Paris 1963, 203. According to the collation made by M. Parathomopoulos, *Pour une nouvelle édition de la Bibliothèque d'Apollodore*, 26 (1973) 22, the manuscript R has Ἀμφόδικος.

14) Cf. Radtke (cf. supra n. 6) 99. R. Klotz, *Euripidis Phoenissae, rec. et commentariis instr.*, Berlin 1841, 181 and C. Robert, *Griechische Mythologie*, II. *Die griechische Heldensage* 3.1, Berlin 1921, 940, were convinced that Euripides derived his version from the *Thebaid*. See for the fragment of Aristodemos, probably taken from the *Ἐπιγράμματα Θηβαικά* of Aristodemos of Thebes, the pupil of Aristarch, also W. Radtke, *Aristodemos Ἐπιγράμματα Θηβαικά*, *Hermes* 36 (1901) 49.

15) F. A. Basedow, *De Euripidis fabula quae inscribitur Ἄλκμειών ὁ διὰ Κορίνθου*, Berlin 1872; Th. Zielinski, *De Alcmeonis Corinthii fabula Euripidea*, *Mnemosyne* 50 (1922) 305–327; T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides*, London 1967, 265; H. Van Looy, *Zes verloren tragedies van Euripides* (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België 25.51), Brussel 1964, 103.

ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν τέκνων ἀπαίτησιν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν κομίσασθαι (ἀνακομίσασθαι *corr.* Hercher), whereas the preceding text exclusively deals with the προγεννημένα and the last sentence contains a prophecy probably spoken by Apollo as a *deus ex machina*¹⁶). It seems, then, that Apollodoros' source was an ancient hypothesis of the play but that the mythographer omitted the summary of the actual intrigue; even the recognition of Alcmeon's son and daughter is not mentioned¹⁷). The text indeed contains some typical characteristics of the *Tales from Euripides*: it begins with the proper name of the title-hero (Ἀλκμαίωνα); the use of the participle παραγενόμενος to indicate the first entrance of a hero on stage (hyp. Alex., Andr., Hec.)¹⁸); the preference for balanced μὲν-δέ-constructions (τὴν μὲν Τισιφόνην . . . , τὸν δὲ Ἀλκμαίωνα . . .)¹⁹).

(3.9.2 = 109) Ἡσίοδος δὲ καὶ τινες ἕτεροι τὴν Ἀταλάντην οὐκ Ἰάσου ἀλλὰ Σχοινέως εἶπον, Εὐριπίδης δὲ Μαινάλου, καὶ τὸν γήμαντα αὐτὴν οὐ Μελανίωνα ἀλλὰ Ἴππομένην. ἐγέννησε δὲ ἐκ Μελανίονος Ἀταλάντη ἢ Ἄρως Παρθενοπαῖον, ὃς ἐπὶ Θήβας ἐστρατεύσατο.

Apollodoros clearly means here that Euripides differed from all other authors in calling Atalante the daughter, not of Schoineus or Iasos, but of Mainalos – the reference to the varying versions of the heroine's husband should not be related to Euripides but to 'Hesiod and some others'²⁰). He refers to E. Ph. 1162: τῆ καλλιτό-

16) The text of Apollodoros suggests that Amphiloichikon Argos was founded by Alcmeon's son, whereas Thuc. 2.68.3 specifies that this Amphilochos was Alcmeon's brother: so Euripides must have followed another version, unless Apollodoros' account is inaccurate here – Carrière, Massonie (cf. supra n. 1) 229 wrongly suggest that it may be an interpolation.

17) Carrière, Massonie (cf. supra n. 1) 229 therefore suggest a lacuna after ἀπαίτησιν to be filled out with ἀναγνωρίσαι or ἀναγνωρίσασθαι, but this seems artificial.

18) Cf. J. Krenn, Interpretationen zu den Hypothesen in den Euripideshandschriften, diss., Graz 1971, 17, 191; W. Luppe, Die Hypothese zu Euripides' 'Alexandros', Philologus 120 (1976) 14 (hyp. E., Alex. 30); W. Luppe, Zur 'Alexandros'-Hypothese (P. Oxy. 3650), ZPE 63 (1986) 7–8.

19) Cf. J. Diggle, The Papyrus Hypothesis of Euripides' Orestes (P. Oxy. 2455 fr. 4 col. IV 32–9 + fr. 141), ZPE 77 (1989) 3–5.

20) It cannot be doubted that most modern translations are wrong: J. G. Frazer, Apollodoros. The Library (Loeb Classical Library), 1921, I 403; K. Aldrich, Apollodoros, The Library of Greek Mythology, transl. with notes and indices, Lawrence, Kansas 1975; Rodriguez de Sepulveda (cf. supra n. 3) 166; Carrière, Massonie (cf. supra n. 1) 102 ("Euripide en fait la fille de Mainalos et lui donne pour époux Hippoménès, et non Mélanion"). Frazer even thought that the names of the father and husband of Atalante figured in the lost *Meleagros*, ignoring the reference to the *Phoinissai*. But it is known from fr. 74 M.-W. from the Γυναικῶν

ξω μητρὶ Μαινάλου κόρη: this is a periphrasis for Atalante, the mother of Parthenopaios. Ever since the time of the scholiasts, there has been disagreement among critics as to whether Μαινάλου κόρη should be interpreted as ‘the daughter of Mainalos’ or as ‘the girl of (i. e. staying on, roaming on) Mount Mainalos’. Mainalos, like Lykaon, was indeed known in antiquity both as name of a mountain and as a personal name²¹). The ancient scholion on the *Phoinissai*-line prefers the latter possibility: τῆ ἀπὸ Μαινάλου ὄρους Ἀρκαδίας, but mentions the alternative reading Μαινάλου χθόνα, probably a conjecture that must have resulted from the uncertain interpretation of the line. I think, however, that Apollodoros is right and that Scherling justly explained the preference of the ancient scholiast: “Doch scheint dies nur eine Vermutung des Scholiasten zu sein, um die Ungleichheit in den Angaben über den Vater zu beseitigen”. Elsewhere in Euripidean tragedy κόρη with the genitive of a proper name always means “the daughter of...” (cf. Med. 1234: κόρη Κρέοντος; Hipp. 15, 713: Ἄρτεμιν, Διὸς κόρη; Andr. 897, 1049: Μενέλεω κόρη(v); Ba. 2: Κάδμου κόρη; IA 701: Νηρέως κόρη, 1444, 1543: Διὸς κόρη). Moreover, it is known from schol. Apoll. Rh. 1.769 that Hellanikos, a contemporary of Euripides, already connected the figure of Atalante not only with the mountain, but also with the hero Mainalos (= FG̃rHist 4 F 162): Μαίναλος δὲ ὄρος Ἀρκαδίας, ἐν ᾧ ἡ Ἀταλάντη διήγεν, ἀπὸ Μαινάλου τοῦ Ἀρκάδος, ὡς φησιν Ἑλλάνικος²²).

It is striking that two of the four references to Euripides concern the same passage from the *Phoinissai* about the killing of the hero Parthenopaios. In either case Euripides is referred to for a

Κατάλογος that Hippomenes was connected with Atalante in this work: cf. J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodica*, diss., Paris 1960, 129.

21) Cf. Scherling in RE XIV 1, Stuttgart 1928, coll. 576–578, s. v. Mainalos (-on). See Apollod. 3.8.1.3 and schol. Apoll. Rh. 1.168 (for other references see FG̃rHist I a: Nachträge, Kommentar, ed. F. Jacoby, Leiden 1957, 470). Paus. 8.3.4 calls Mainalos the founder of the city Mainalos and Paus. 8.36.7–8 describes Mainalos as an Arcadian mountain and a plain as well as a city.

22) Mainalos as a personal name is accepted by L. C. Valckenaer, Euripidis tragoedia Phoenissae, Lugduni Batavorum 1802, 369; Klotz (cf. supra n. 14) 182; Preller, Robert (cf. supra n. 12) 94; Scherling (cf. supra n. 21) col. 578, but explicitly rejected by Jacoby (cf. supra n. 21) 470; E. Craik, Phoenician Women, edited with translation and commentary, Warminster 1988, 236; J. M. Grové, Euripides. Phoinissai, van inleiding, tekstkritiese apparaat en kommentaar voorsien, Port Elisabeth 1984, 140; Euripides. Phoenissae, ed. with intr. and comm. by D. J. Mastronarde, Cambridge 1994, 474. The same controversy exists in connection with Statius, Theb. 6.541 *Maenaliae Atalantes* in a line criticized by the scholiast and deleted by some scholars.

learned variant that is also treated in the scholia. Very probably, then, both references go back to Hellenistic scholarship, perhaps Didymos, from which also the mythographic D-scholia derive²³). Concerning the Atalante-passage, J. Schwartz already concluded²⁴): "c'est sans doute à un commentaire de tragédie que nous devons ce fragment." Also in the first passage, the reference to Euripides concerns a genealogical detail that seems borrowed from some learned commentary rather than from the reading of the original tragedy.

In the following three passages Apollodoros does not refer to Euripides personally but to the tragedians in general:

(2.1.3 = 5) Ἄργου δὲ καὶ Ἰσμήνης τῆς Ἀσωποῦ παῖς Ἴασος, οὗ φασιν Ἴω γενέσθαι. Κάστωρ δὲ ὁ συγγράψας τὰ χρονικὰ καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν τραγικῶν Ἰνάχου τὴν Ἴω λέγουσιν· Ἡσίοδος δὲ καὶ Ἀκουσίλαος Πειρήνος αὐτὴν φασιν εἶναι.

The vague πολλοὶ τῶν τραγικῶν certainly points to Aischylos (Prom. 589), Sophokles (El. 4 and probably Inachus F 269 d 23, 284 Radt) and Euripides (Supp. 629: ἰὼ Ζεῦ, τᾶς παλαιομάτορος παιδογόνε πόριος Ἰνάχου), but possibly also to a play by a minor tragedian, such as Chaeremon's *Io*²⁵). The vagueness of the reference to the tragic texts and its insertion in a chain of references²⁶) make it again very doubtful that Apollodoros would have consulted here the tragic passages themselves: rather he used learned commentaries or previous mythographers.

(2.1.5 = 23) Ἀμυμώνη δὲ ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος ἐγέννησε Ναύπλιον. οὗτος μακρόβιος γενόμενος, πλέων τὴν θάλασσαν, τοῖς ἐμπίπτουσιν

23) On the link between these scholia and Apollodoros, see Wagner, *Mythographi Graeci*. I ... (cf. supra n. 9) XXXIII-XXXVI; A. Diller, *The Text History of the Bibliotheca of Pseudo-Apollodoros*, TAPA 66 (1935) 297-300; Van der Valk (cf. supra n. 1) 143-152, and on some of their predecessors found on papyrus: F. Montanari, *Studi di filologia omerica antica I* (Biblioteca di studi antichi 19), Pisa 1979, 14-15.

24) J. Schwartz (cf. supra n. 20) 129.

25) On the play of Chaeremon, see C. Collard, *On the Tragedian Chaere-mon*, JHS 90 (1970) 26. It is striking that modern scholars surveying the different genealogies of Io ignore the Euripidean passage: cf. Engelmann, in: *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, hrsg. v. W. H. Roscher, II.1, Leipzig 1890-1894, col. 125; Eitrem in RE IX 2, Stuttgart 1916, s. v. Io, col. 1732; Fr. Stoessl, *Der Prometheus des Aischylos als geistesgeschichtliches und theatergeschichtliches Phänomen* (Palingenesia 24), Stuttgart 1988, 56.

26) φασιν is a correction of B. Aegius for φησὶν, but one might also think of an omitted author's name: cf. Carrière, *Massonie* (cf. supra n. 1) 177.

ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ἐπυροσφόρει. Συνέβη οὖν καὶ αὐτὸν τελευτῆσαι ἐκείνῳ τῷ θανάτῳ ὥπερ ἄλλων τελευτησάντων ῥέδυσφόρει, πρὶν τελευτῆσαι. Ἔγημε δὲ ὡς μὲν οἱ τραγικοὶ λέγουσι, Κλυμένην τὴν Κατρώως, ὡς δὲ ὁ τοὺς νόστους γράφας, Φιλύραν, ὡς δὲ Κέρκωψ, Ἡσιόνην, καὶ ἐγέννησε Παλαμήδην Οἶακα Ναυσιμέδοντα.

Again the reference to the tragedians is embedded in a series of quotations. But this time the tragic texts to which it refers are lost: we only know that Nauplios was the title-hero of plays by Aischylos, Sophokles, Philokles I (24), Astydamos II (60 F 5) and Lykophron (100 F 4a) and that tragedies were composed on his son Palamedes by the three great tragedians, as well as by Astydamos II (60 F 5a) and Theodotos (157). Apart from this, Palamedes also figured in Euripides' *Philoktetes* where at least his father's name was mentioned according to the paraphrase in D. Chr. 59.8. The descendance of Palamedes from Nauplios and Klymene is also mentioned in Apollod. 3.2.2 [15] and Epit. VI 8, but otherwise it is only known from schol. E. Or. 432 (Ναυπλίου καὶ Κλυμένης τῆς Ἀτρώως [cod. M] ἐγένοντο Οἶαξ καὶ Παλαμήδης). It was suggested by R. Wagner that the Apollodorean account (see also Epit. III 8) depended on Euripides' *Palamedes*²⁷), whereas, according to C. Robert, followed by F. Stoessl, F. Jouan, R. Aéliou and C. W. Müller, the *Orestes*-scholion would summarize a hypothesis of this play²⁸). However, T. B. L. Webster, and especially R. Scodel²⁹), who analyzed this question most fully, refute this: Scodel derives the Euripidean version from Hyg., F. 105, where the lineage of Nauplios is lacking.

(2.2.1 = 25) καὶ κρατήσας Ἀκρίσιος Προῖτον Ἄργους ἐξελαύνει. ὁ δ' ἦκεν εἰς Λυκίαν πρὸς Ἰοβάτην, ὡς δὲ τινὲς φασί, πρὸς Ἀμφιάνακτα: καὶ γαμῆ τὴν τούτου θυγατέρα, ὡς μὲν Ὀμηρος, Ἄντιαν, ὡς δὲ οἱ τραγικοὶ, Σθενέβοιαν.

27) Wagner, *Epitoma Vaticana ... Curae Mythographae ...* (cf. supra n. 6) 180. However, a possible correspondence between the Palamedes-fabula of Hyginus and the tragedy of Euripides is not excluded.

28) Robert (cf. supra n. 14) 1133; F. Stoessl, *Die Palamedestragödien der drei großen Tragiker und das Problem der Hypotheseis*, WS 74 (1966) 100–101; F. Jouan, *Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens. Des origines de la guerre de Troie à l'Iliade* (Collection d'études anciennes), Paris 1966, 345; R. Aéliou, *Euripide héritier d'Eschyle* (Collection d'études anciennes) I, Paris 1983, 48–53 with further bibliography on p. 51 n. 23; C. W. Müller, *Der Palamedesmythos im 'Philoktetes' des Euripides*, RhM 133 (1990) 203–204.

29) R. Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* (Hypomnemata 60), Göttingen 1980, 47–54; Webster (cf. supra n. 15) 175.

Stheneboia figured both in Euripides’ homonymous play and in his *Bellerophon*tes. In this case Apollodoros needed no detailed knowledge of Euripides’ work, since the heroine figured in the title of one of his plays and the marriage of Proitos with Stheneboia was recorded in the hypothesis of that play: Προϊτος . . . γήμας δὲ Σθενέβοιαν. Of the other tragic poets we know only that Astydamos II also wrote a *Bellerophon*tes (TrGF 60 F 1g) – as far as we know, Sophokles and Aischylos did not treat this legend.

The three last passages are taken from the two first paragraphs of the second book. All three references to the tragedians probably include Euripides, but none of them seems to derive from direct reading³⁰). The swift succession of these references points to a source only used in this part of the work³¹), perhaps a commentary – the reference of τραγικοί also occurs in some scholia quoting mythographical variants (schol. Il. 9.481a2; schol. Od. 11.260). All the examples studied, then, confirm the impression that Apollodoros did not consult the tragic text of Euripides, but only indirect sources deriving from the tradition of Hellenistic scholarship.

However, a number of passages without explicit reference have also been interpreted as deriving from Euripides or at least from hypotheses of his tragedies. Ever since Robert and Wilamowitz it is commonly accepted that some short sequences from the *Library* reflect Euripidean hypotheses³²), and a warning

30) Van der Valk (cf. supra n. 1) 162 n.224 oversimplifies when he writes that “Bibl. thrice mentions the tragedians, while he then has in mind Sophocles (once) and Euripides (thrice)”.

31) See also Robert (cf. supra n. 1) 60.

32) Robert (cf. supra n. 1) 83 [Apollod. 1.9.28]; U. von Wilamowitz, *Analec-ta Euripidea*, Berlin 1875, 183–184; Robert, *Bild . . .* (cf. supra n. 5) 243 [Apollod. 3.5.2]; Wagner (cf. supra n. 6) 199; R. Wagner, *Proklos und Apollodoros*, *Jbb. f. cl. Phil.* (1892) 242–244 [Epit. VI 26–27]; Frazer (cf. supra n. 20) I 18 + n. 4, 5 [Apollod. 1.9.15, 1.9.28]; C.H. Moore, *Notes on the Tragic Hypotheses*, HSCP 12 (1901) 297 [Apollod., Epit. III.5]; Söder (cf. supra n. 6) 131–132, 161 [Apollod. 1.9.15, 1.9.28]; Krenn (cf. supra n. 18) 2, 84–85, 94–96, 111 + n. 3, 116, 165, 167, 189, 202, 208–209, 214 n. 2, 215; B. Zühlke, *Euripides’ Stheneboia*, *Philologus* 105 (1961) 8 n. 3 [Apollod. 1.9.15, 2.8.1, 3.5.2 sq., 3.5.7, Epit. I 18 sq., III 21 sq., VI 23–25, VI 26 sq.]; Zuntz (cf. supra n. 1) 136, 141 n. 6, 145 [Apollod. 1.9.28; 3.5.2; 3.13.8]; A. W. A. M. Budé, *De hypotheseis der Griekse tragedies en komedies. Een onderzoek naar de hypotheseis van Dicaearchus*, diss., ’s Gravenhage 1977, 109–110; P. Carrara, *Dicaearco e l’hypotheseis del Reso*, *ZPE* 90 (1992) 38–39: “La collezione dei Tales come tale, invece, ebba una discreta voga nell’età imperiale, come dimostrano . . . i . . . significativi echi e riutilizzi da parte di mitografi (Biblioteca di Apollodoro . . .)”; M. Haslam, *The Authenticity of Euripides*, *Phoenix* 1977, 1–2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1, *GRBS* 16 (1975) 152 n. 10, 154: “the mythographers

remark like that of Rusten is quite exceptional³³): "... not every narrative of a myth which happens to resemble a Euripidean plot (e. g. Bibl. 3.5.2 [36], 3.13.8 [174]) is necessarily derived directly from a collection of hypotheses". The passages from Apollodoros which may be related to or depend on a Euripidean hypothesis are the following:

1.9.1 [80–2] ≈ hyp. Phrixos A; 1.9.15 [105–6] ≈ hyp. Alk.; 1.9.27 [144] ≈ hyp. Peliades; 1.9.28 [145–6] ≈ hyp. Med.; 2.3.1–2 [30] ≈ hyp. Stheneboia; 2.4.1 [34–5] ≈ hyp. Danae³⁴); 2.7.4 [146–7] and 3.9.2–4 [103–4] ≈ hyp. Auge; 2.8.1 [167–8] ≈ hyp. Her.; 2.8.4–5 [177–8] ≈ hyp. of a Temenos-drama (P. Oxy. 27.2455 fr. 9, fr. 10)³⁵); 3.5.2 [36] ≈ hyp. Ba.; 3.5.5 [42–4] ≈ hyp. Antiope³⁶); 3.6.4 [64–5] ≈ hyp. Hyps.; 3.5.7–3.6.1 [48–58] and 3.6.6–3.7.1 [68–78] ≈ hyp. Phoinissai; 3.12.5 [148–50] ≈ hyp. Alex.; 3.13.8 [174] ≈ hyp. Skyrioi; Epit. I 2–3 ≈ hyp. Skeiron; Epit. I 18 sq. ≈ hyp. Hipp.; Epit. III 5 ≈ hyp. Hel.; Epit. III 27 and V 8 ≈ hyp. Philoktetes; Epit. V 23 ≈ hyp. Tr.; Epit. VI 23–25 ≈ hyp. El.; Epit. VI 26–27 ≈ hyp. IT.

Apart from these parallels, other passages have been connected with lost hypotheses, such as 1.8.2–3 [65–71] ≈ Meleagros; 2.4.1–2 [36] ≈ Diktys; 2.4.3 [43–4] ≈ Andromeda; 2.4.8 [61–2] ≈

... show that our Euripidean hypotheses enjoyed popularity – were standard, even – in the early centuries of the Empire"; J. Rusten, *Dicaearchus and the Tales from Euripides*, GRBS 23 (1982) 357 n. 2 [Apollod. 3.5.5]; W. Luppe, *Euripides-Hypothesen in den Hygin-Fabeln 'Antiope' und 'Ino'?*, *Philologus* 128 (1984) 44–45 [Apollod. 3.5.5]; W. Luppe, *Die Hypothese zu Euripides' 'Skyrioi'*, *Anagennesis* 2 (1982) 268 [Apollod. 3.13.8]; W. Luppe, *Hypothese zum ersten Phrixos des Euripides*, *APF* 32 (1986) 7–13 [Apollod. 1.9.1]; W. Luppe, *Zwei Hypothesen zu Euripides-Dramen der Temenosage* (P. Oxy. 2455 fr. 9 und fr. 10), *Prometheus* 13 (1987) 194–197 [Apollod. 2.8.3–4].

33) Rusten (cf. supra n. 32) 361 n. 21.

34) It remains possible that this hypothesis is a Byzantine forgery, but W. Luppe, *Die Hypothese zu Euripides' 'Danae'*, *ZPE* 87 (1991) 1–7 and *Nochmals zur 'Danae'-Hypothese*, *ZPE* 95 (1993) 65–69 has convincingly demonstrated that, except for some changes possibly of a later date, it belongs to the ancient *Tales*-type.

35) These two scraps of the hypotheses-roll must be interpreted as fragments of a tragedy on the Temenos-legend: cf. A. Harder, *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos*, Leiden 1988, 279, 288; W. Luppe, *Zwei Hypothesen...* (cf. supra n. 32) 193–203.

36) This hypothesis is lost, but has been reconstructed by W. Luppe, *Euripides-Hypothesen in den Hygin-Fabeln 'Antiope' und 'Ino'?*, *Philologus* 128 (1984) 41–59 on the basis of Hyg., F. 8, a fable specifically introduced as being an argument of Euripides' *Antiope*.

Alkmene; 2.5.11 [116–7] ≈ Bousiris; 2.8.5 [180] ≈ Kresphontes; 3.1.3 [8–11] ≈ Kretes; 3.3.1 [17–20] ≈ Polyidos; 3.7.5 [89–90] ≈ Alkmeon Psoph.; 3.13.8 [175] ≈ Phoinix; 3.15.4–5 [201–4] ≈ Erechtheus; Epit. I 5–6 ≈ Theseus; Epit. II 3–7 ≈ Oinomaos; Epit. III 8 ≈ Palamedes; Epit. III 19–20 ≈ Telephos; Epit. III 21–22 ≈ IA; Epit. III 30 ≈ Protesilaos.

Usually, in the quoted passages, the narrative of Apollodoros to a greater or lesser degree resembles that of the corresponding hypothesis. Sometimes, similar accounts are interrupted by significantly different details. According to the Epitome, for example, Hermes' abduction of Helen to Egypt was the will of Zeus (κατὰ βούλησιν Διός), whereas the manuscript hypothesis of the *Helen* correctly specifies that this happened Ἡρας βουλήν. Yet, the variant of the Epitome may derive from a misunderstanding of E. Hel. 44–48 or from E. El. 1282³⁷). Likewise, the Apollodorean account of the legend of Phrixos' sacrifice closely follows the fragments of hyp. Phrixos A (P. Oxy. 27.2455, XVI 221 ff.; P. Oxy. 52.3652, II 16 ff.), but Ἀθάμας, Βιωτίας δυναστεύων is in striking contrast with the hypothesis where Athamas is called the king of Thessaly – note, however, that Orchomenos is the place of residence of Athamas in hyp. Phrixos B (P. Oxy. 27.2455, XIX 270). Similar variations have been shown to exist between the Apollodorean accounts on Menoikeus, on Kadmos the dragon-slayer and the foundation of Thebes and the corresponding episode of Euripides' *Phoenician Women* and its hypothesis by F. Vian³⁸).

Generally speaking, the accounts in the *Library* are much shorter than the hypotheses and concentrate on the events essential for the continuation of the legend. This narrative material is often found at the beginning of the hypotheses, the part corresponding with the exposition of the προγεγεννημένα in the prologue, whereas details of the Euripidean plot, usually summarized by the hypotheses, are omitted or reduced to a single event in the *Library*. We have already suggested this procedure in the case of the *Alkmeon at Corinth*, and another nice example is Apollod. 3.12.5 [148–50], where the story of Alexander's birth, abandonment and growing up among the herdsmen corresponds to a greater or lesser degree with the former half of the hypothesis of the *Alexandros* (P.

37) Euripides, *Helena*, hrsg. u. erkl. v. R. Kannicht, Bd. II: Kommentar, Heidelberg 1969, 30 n. 12.

38) Cf. Vian (cf. supra n. 13) 28–29, 212. This author concluded that the text of Euripides could not have been Apollodoros' source; more probably he used a commentary on the play.

Oxy. 52.3650, I 1–14)³⁹), while only one short sentence (καὶ μετ’ οὐ πολὺ τοὺς γονέας ἀνεῦθε) matches the whole remaining part of the hypothesis, which summarizes the actual plot of Euripides’ play. On the other hand, Van der Valk⁴⁰) has shown that Apollodoros goes back to Hellanikos here, an author who seems to have been used frequently by Euripides⁴¹). Even the short manuscript hypothesis of the *Trojan Women* mentions the debate scene between Helen and Hecuba (Ἐκάβη δὲ τῆς μὲν Ἑλένης κατηγορήσασα), which is probably a specifically Euripidean scene, whereas most details of the legend common to the Apollodorean Epitome and the hypothesis, such as the murder of Astyanax and the sacrifice of Polyxena, are also found in other sources.

In some cases, it is by no means certain whether Apollodoros, despite obvious similarities, follows a Euripidean version. Epit. III 27, for example, very probably reflects the tradition of the Κύπρια, whereas V 8 seems to follow a post-Euripidean version, in which Helenos and Machaon of Euripides’ *Philoctetes* were replaced by Kalchas and Podaleirios respectively⁴²). Especially for the cases where there is no hypothesis left, the supposed correspondences

39) It remains a matter of debate how far the parallelism goes between the two texts. At any rate Hekabe’s dream as the cause of child exposure (but not necessarily the interpretation by Aisakos), the description of the act of abandonment and the name-giving by the herdsman are striking correspondences, although much depends on the interpretation of the first hypothesis-lines: see on this knotty subject R. A. Coles, *A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus: The Hypothesis of Euripides’ Alexandros*, BICS Supplement 32, London 1974, 17–18; M. Huys, *Some Reflections on the Controversial Identity of the πρῶσβυς in Euripides’ “Trojan Women”* and in his “Alexander” (fr. 43, col. III, 12), AC 54 (1985) 245–246 with n. 10. Certainly the old theory that Apollodoros’ account reproduces the contents of Euripides’ tragedy, whereas that of Hyginus, F. 91 would summarize the contents of the *Alexandros* of Sophokles (cf. G. Wentzel, F. Spiro, *Epithalamion für Wolfgang und Helen Passow*, Göttingen 1890, 54; I. Rasch, *Sophocles quid debeat Herodoto in rebus ad fabulas exornandas adhibitis*, Jena–Leipzig 1912, 43 n. 2, 47 n. 2, 50–52) is outdated, just as the opposed thesis, defended by C. Lefke, *De Euripidis Alexandro*, diss., Bochum 1936, 17–19, that Hyginus would derive from the *Alexandros* of Euripides and Apollodoros from the tragedy of Sophokles.

40) Van der Valk (cf. supra n. 1) 137–139.

41) Cf. Aélion (cf. supra n. 28) 210 n. 60; FGrHist. 4 F 43: (concerning the Alope-legend) ... ὡς Ἑλλάνικός τε ἐν β’ Ἀτθίδος καὶ Εὐριπίδης; 4 F 96–99: Hellanikos has the same versions as those used by Euripides in his *Phoinissai*, 4 F 126 (placed the residence of king Athamas in Orchomenos, just as Euripides in his *Phrixos B*). See already on the common link between Atalante and Mount Mainalos supra p. 313f.

42) Cf. Joann (cf. supra n. 28) 313–314; C.W. Müller, *Patriotismus und Verweigerung. Eine Interpretation des euripideischen Philoktet*, RhM 135 (1992) 104–106 n. 2, 3, 4.

are often debatable, certainly for fragmentary plays. The Epitome's account on Telephos, for example, seems to derive in one way or another from the Κύπρια, whereas the connexion with Euripides' tragedy is uncertain⁴³). Another example is the Epitome's version of the Polyidos-legend, which has been connected with Aischylos' *Kressai* as well as with Sophokles' *Manteis* and Euripides' *Polyidos*⁴⁴). And for the Meleagros-legend critics generally agree that Apollod. 1.8.2 [65–71] corresponds with the Euripidean version, but several details such as Meleagros' marriage with Kleopatra are more probably borrowed from Homer, Sophokles or even from other traditions⁴⁵).

Looking subsequently at the formulation, one observes that the total number of verbal parallels between the relevant passages in Apollodoros and the text of the hypotheses is not particularly impressive either:

(1) Apollod. 1.9.1 = 81: εἰς Δελφούς . . . ἀνέπεισε . . . τὴν ἀκαρπῖαν, ἐὰν σφαγῇ Διὶ ὁ Φοῖξος ≈ hyp. Phrixos I: ἀκαρπίας [. . .] λυσιν, εἰ Φοῖξος [. . .] εἰς Δελφούς ἀπ[. . .] λον ἐπεισε . . .

(2) 1.9.15 = 106: Ἀπόλλων . . . ἠτήσατο παρὰ μοιρῶν ≈ hyp. Alc.: Ἀπόλλων ἠτήσατο παρὰ τῶν μοιρῶν. Note that ἐξητήσατο is attested in the same mythical context in schol. E. Alc. 12.

(3) 1.9.28 = 145: τοῦ τῆς Κορίνθου βασιλέως Κρέοντος τὴν θυγατέρα Γλαύκην Ἰάσων ἐγγυῶντος ≈ hyp. Med.: Ἰάσων . . . ἐγγυᾶται καὶ τὴν Κρέοντος τοῦ Κορινθίων βασιλέως θυγατέρα Γλαύκην. The verb ἐγγυᾶω is not used in the *Medeia* of Euripides, but is ordinary classical Greek, both active ('to betroth': cf. E. IA 703) and medium ('to become engaged to': cf. Dem. or. 57,41).

(4) 1.9.28 = 146: λαβοῦσα παρὰ Ἥλιου ἄρα πτηνῶν δρακόντων ≈ hyp. Med.: ἐπὶ ἄρματος δρακόντων πτερωτῶν, ὃ παρ' Ἥλιου ἔλαβεν. In (3) as well as in (4), it is striking that the *Medeia*-hypothesis and Apollodoros both give details lacking in the text of the Euripidean tragedy, viz. the name Glauke and the winged dragons pulling the chariot of Helios. However, the name Glauke is known from other mythographical sources (D.S. 4.54.2; schol. E. Med. 19; schol. E. Med. 405; Hyg. F 25; etc.)⁴⁶), just as the

43) Wagner (cf. supra n. 6) 190; Jouan (cf. supra n. 28) 225; Aéliion (cf. supra n. 28) I 34 with n. 17.

44) Aéliion (cf. supra n. 28) I 297–299.

45) Cf. Söder (cf. supra n. 6) 88–90; G. Arrigoni, *Atalanta e il cinghiale bianco*, *Scripta Philologica* 1 (1977) 38–43; Aéliion (cf. supra n. 28) I 315 n. 1, 316 n. 8.

46) For a more complete list and for diverging traditions, see Robert (cf. supra n. 14) 871 n. 3.

dragons (cf. schol. E. Med. 1320: δρακοντίνοις ἄρμασι); besides, the dragon-chariot of Triptolemos is described in similar terms in several sources: cf. Apollod. 1.5.2 [32]: δίφρον ... πτηνῶν δρακόντων; Corn. ND 28 (p. 54, 1 Lang): πτερωτῶν δρακόντων ὄχημα; Suda ρ 50 (s. v. Ῥαριάς): ἄρμα πτηνῶν δρακόντων. Probably the dragon-chariot was already used in the *Medeia* of Euripides, although it is not described as such in the text⁴⁷).

(5) 2.3.1 = 30: πρὸς Ἰοβάτην κομίσαι (Wagner; κομίζειν Bekker) ≈ hyp. Sthen.: πρὸς Ἰοβάτην διακομίζειν.

(6) 2.4.1 = 34: Ζεὺς μεταμορφωθείς εἰς χρυσὸν καὶ διὰ τῆς ὄροφῆς εἰς τοὺς Δανάης εἰσρνεὶς κόλπους ≈ hyp. Danae: ὁ Ζεὺς ... χρυσὸς γενόμενος καὶ ὄυεις διὰ τοῦ τέγουσ εἰς τὸν κόλπον τῆς παρθένου. The formulation is paralleled not only by Luc. Dial. Mar. 12: Δία χρυσὸν γενόμενον ὄυῆναι διὰ τοῦ ὀρόφου ... δεξαμένην δὲ ἐκείνην ἐς τὸν κόλπον, but also by Men. Sam. 590–1: γενόμενος χρυσὸς ὁ Ζεὺς ἐρρῶ / διὰ τέγουσ. This is a strong indication that the terminology used derives from the Euripidean *Danae* itself⁴⁸).

(7) 3.5.2 = 36: Πενθεὺς δὲ, γεννηθεὶς ἐξ Ἀγαύης Ἐχίονι, παρὰ Κάδμου εἰληφῶς τὴν βασιλείαν ≈ hyp. Ba.: Πενθεὺς δὲ, ὁ τῆς Ἀγαύης παῖς, παραλαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν⁴⁹).

(8) 3.6.1 = 59: ἐπὶ Θήβας ... συνήθροισεν ≈ hyp. Phoin.: συνήθροισεν ... ἐπὶ Θήβας. Συνήθροισεν(ν) and συνήθροισε(ν) are common Greek forms for the gathering of military forces: cf. Apollod. 2.7.7 [156], Xen. Hell. 1.1.15, Paus. 4.17.10, D.S. 19.4.2, D.H. AR 10.14.1, Flav. Jos. AJ 13.337.

(9) 3.6.4 = 65: δεικνυούσης δὲ τὴν κρήνην ≈ hyp. Hyps. (P. Oxy. 27.2455, fr. 14, XIV 190: κρήνην ἐδιξι).

(10) 3.6.7 = 73: Ἄρει σφάγιον ≈ hyp. Phoin: σφάγιον Ἄρει. Σφάγιον is paralleled in hyp. E. Hec., where it refers to another

47) On the question whether this dragon-chariot was actually shown to the audience in the production of the play by Euripides, see M. P. Cunningham, *Medeia ἀπὸ μηχανῆς*, CPh 49 (1954) 152. It is important to note that *Medeia*'s flight on a dragon-chariot is also known from the visual arts, already from Italian vases from about 400 B. C.: cf. Robert (cf. supra n. 14) 874 n. 6; A. Lesky, *Medeia*, RE 29, Stuttgart, 1931, 62; M. Schmidt, *Medeia*, LIMC 6, München/Zürich 1992, 391–393, 396, nr. 35 ff.

48) Van der Valk (cf. supra n. 1) 117–123 thought that Apollodoros borrowed the whole story of Danae and Perseus directly from Pherekydes, but there the formulation of Danae's conception, if it is verbally quoted in schol. A. R. 4.1091, is slightly different: (FGrHist 3 F 10) Ζεὺς ... ἐκ τοῦ ὀρόφου χρυσῶ παραπλήσιος ῥεῖ. ἢ δὲ ὑποδέχεται τῷ κόλπῳ ...

49) Probably the text of the recently published papyrus hypothesis P. Oxy. 60.4017.15–17 (ed. H. M. Cockle, London 1994, 19, 22) corresponds verbatim or almost verbatim with that of the manuscript hypothesis.

human sacrifice, viz. that of Polyxena. But in the specific meaning of human sacrifice the term is current both in Euripidean tragedy (cf. *Hec.* 119, 305: Polyxena; *Tr.* 747: Astyanax; *IA* 135, 1200: Iphigeneia) and later (*Ant. Lib.* 27.2: Iphigeneia, *Suda* β 75: Makaria).

(11) 3.6.7 = 73: *ἑαυτὸν... ἔσφαξε* ≈ *hyp.* *Phoin.*: *ἑαυτὸν ἀπέσφαξεν*. The expression may derive from the tragedy of Euripides itself, where it refers to the self-sacrifice of Menoikeus (cf. *I.* 1010: *σφάξας ἑμαυτὸν*), but it is also ordinary classical Greek for a suicide (cf. *Thuc.* 2.92.3; *Xen. An.* 8.29).

(12) 3.6.8 = 74: *μονομαχοῦσι, καὶ κτείνουσι ἀλλήλους* ≈ *hyp.* *Phoin.*: *μονομαχήσαντες ἀλλήλους ἀνείλον*. The mutual fratricide by Polyneikes and Eteokles is also described as *ἀνείλον ἀλλήλους* in *D.S.* 4.65.8 and *schol. Pi. O.* 2.73b, and as *μονομαχήσαντας ἀποθάνειν ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων* in *Paus.* 9.25.2. However, the use of this phrase is not limited to the sons of Oidipous, as is apparent from *schol. Ar. Pax* 284a: *μονομαχήσαντες ὃ τε Κλέων καὶ ὃ Βρασίδας ἀλλήλους ἀνείλον*. But whereas the verb *μονομαχεῖν* is used already in *E. Ph.* 1220, *ἀλλήλους ἀνείλον* is only found in later sources: see also *D.S.* 5.50.7 and 51.2.

(13) 3.7.1 = 78: *Κρέων ... βασιλείαν παραλαβὸν* ≈ *hyp.* *Phoin.*: *Κρέων παρέλαβε τὴν βασιλείαν*. The expression *παραλαβεῖν (τὴν) βασιλείαν* occurs in (7) as well as in (13), and is current in Apollodoros (compare 3.8.2 [99] and 3.12.2 [140]) and in many authors of the Roman period: e.g. *D.S.* 4.69.3, 11.68.7, *D.H.* 1.70.3, *Flav. Jos. AJ* 7.381, 8.2, *Plu. Comp. Lyc. et Num.* 4.4, *Comp. Agis et Cleom.* 24.1⁵⁰).

(14) 3.12.5 = 148: *ἔδοξεν Ἐκάβη καθ' ὕπνου* (SR, *καθ' ὕπαο* A) ≈ *hyp.* *Alex.*: *Ἐκάβης καθ' ὕπνον ὄψεις*. Compare, for the expression used by Apollodoros, with Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* (Exc. *Salmasiana*), Boissevain 3, p. 763: *ἔδοξε καθ' ὕπνου*, and for the hypothesis with *Plu. Brutus* 41.7: *καθ' ὕπνον ἰδόντος ὄψιν*. Both expressions, then, are ordinary literary Greek in the first centuries A.D.

(15) 3.12.5 = 149: *βρέφος, δίδωσιν ἐκθεῖναι* ≈ *hyp.* *Alex.*: *ἔ]δωκεν ἐκθεῖναι βρέφος*. The combination of a form of the verb *δίδωμι* with *ἐκθεῖναι* is customary in descriptions of the act of child exposure: cf. *Apollod.* 3.5.7 [48]: *τὸ γεννηθὲν ἐκθεῖναι δίδωσι νομεῖ;*

50) For examples from inscriptions see Krenn (cf. *supra* n. 18) 27, who calls the expression typical of *koinè*-Greek. This seems dubious, as the earliest examples date back to the fourth century B.C.: cf. *Isoc. Pan.* 126, *Evag.* 35.

hyp. E. Melanipp. Sap.: ἔδωκε τῇ τροφῶ θε[ἴν]αι; Hyg. F. 187.1: *dedit exponendum* (a literal translation of a Greek original). The combination ἐκθεῖναι βρέφος sounds very Euripidean: compare Ph. 25, where it refers in a prologue to the abandonment of Oidipus.

(16) 3.12.5 = 150: ὡς ἴδιον παῖδα ἔτρεφεν, ὀνομάσας Πάριν ≈ hyp. Alex.: ἐξέθρεψεν υἷὸν ... [Π]άριν προσαγορεύσας. Compare with D.S. 4.33.11: ὡς ἴδιον υἷὸν ἔτρεφε, προσαγορεύσας Τήλεφον..., on the discovery of the abandoned Telephos by the herdsman Korythos.

(17) 3.13.8 = 174: κρύψασα ἐσθῆτι γυναικεία ... Λυκομήδει παρέθετο ≈ hyp. Skyrioi (PSI 1286, col. II, 11. 15–16): κόρης ἐσθῆτι κρύψασα παρέθε[ι]το Λυκομήδει⁵¹). The *editio princeps* had κόρης ἐσθῆτι[α καὶ παρέθε]το Λυκομήδει. I accept here the supplements proposed by Luppe. At least παρέθε[ι]το is very attractive: “to give a person in charge to” is an ordinary meaning of the verb (cf. LSJ s.v. B 2) and we have it again in schol. T 326: πρὸς Λυκομήδην τὸν βασιλέα παρέθετο τὸν Ἀχιλλέα.

(18) Erit. I 19: ἐαυτὴν ἀνήρτησε ≈ hyp. Hipp.: αὐτὴν δὲ ἀνήρτησε. The expression ἐαυτὴν ἀνήρτησε(v) regularly refers to suicide by hanging in contemporary literature: cf. Flav. Jos. AJ 7.229; Ant. Lib. Met. 13.4; Plu. Lucull. 18.6; Apollod. 1.9.27 [143], 2.7.7 [159], 3.5.9 [56], 3.12.6 [155], 3.14.7 [192].

(19) Erit. III 5: Ἐλένη μὲν ὑπὸ Ἐρμού ... κομισθῆναι κλαπεῖσαν εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ δοθεῖσαν Πρωτεί τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων φυλάττειν ≈ hyp. Hel.: κλέψας γὰρ αὐτὴν ὁ Ἐρμῆς ... Πρωτεί τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς Αἰγύπτου φυλάττειν παρέδωκε. The expression ἔδωκε φυλάττειν is common Greek (cf. Isoc. 21.2) and corresponds with E. Hel. 910: ἔδωκε σφῆξιν. Therefore, and because of differences of content (cf. supra), Kannicht denied any direct connection between this hypothesis and the Eritome⁵²).

(20) Erit. V 23: Ἀστυάνακτα ἀπὸ τῶν πύργων ἔρριψαν, Πολυξένην δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀχιλλέως τάφῳ κατέσφαξαν ≈ hyp. Tr.: Πολυξένην ... μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ταφῆς ἐσφαξαν, Ἀστυάνακτα δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν τειχῶν ἔρριψαν. This bipartite sentence⁵³) is paralleled by D. Chr. 11.153: Ἀστυάνακτα μὲν ...

51) Cf. C. Gallavotti, Nuove Hypotheses di drammi euripidei, RFIC 11 (1933) 177–188; W. Luppe, Die Hypothesis zu Euripides' 'Skyrioi', Anagennesis 2 (1982) 268–269.

52) Cf. Kannicht (cf. supra n. 37) II 241.

53) On this passage of the *Library*, which probably corresponds with a version by Arktinos or Lesches, see Wagner (cf. supra n. 6) 243–245, 253–254.

ἀνελεῖν ῥίψαντας ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους . . . , Πολυξένην δὲ παρθένον ἀποσφάττειν ἐπὶ τάφῳ.

So, some correspondences quoted above may be simply accidental, the result of the treatment of the same legendary event in a mythographic fashion and with the vocabulary characteristic of that period, whereas others, such as the use of the verb *μονομαχεῖν* for the duel between Polyneikes and Eteokles, may be due to a common indirect source, viz. the drama of Euripides itself⁵⁴). Examples pointing with a measure of certainty to a closer connection between the *Library* and the *Tales* are particularly rare: in my opinion the comparison between hyp. Alk. and the corresponding sequence from the *Library* yields the most striking verbal parallel. Söder concluded that the correspondences between the two texts "verraten die Verfasser von Kompendien als Benützer solcher Hypotheseis". But two lines further, Apollodoros already diverges from the Euripidean version, writing that Kore sent Alkestis back up from the Underworld. Euripides is meant here with the periphrastic plural ἔνιοι, who opted for the variant of Herakles' bringing her back⁵⁵). Once again, several sources have been intermingled. Still, this case proves that the *Library* contains sequences that go back at least to material used also by the author of the *Tales from Euripides*. Although it is my personal view that these *Tales* of the type found on papyrus are not from the hand of Dikaiarchos himself, but should probably be dated to the later Hellenistic age or the first century A.D., they seem to be rooted in Hellenistic scholarship – the introductory formula (title οὗ ἀρχή, the first line of the play, ἡ δ' ὑπόθεσις) is indeed close to that of the Callimachean Πίνακες⁵⁶). It must be stressed also that there seems to have been more than one type or collection of the *Tales from Euripides*: we have one papyrus with hypotheses arranged not in an alphabetical order but according to another principle (IFAO, PSP. 248)⁵⁷), and some important examples of hypotheses preserved in Byzantine sources together with part of the prologue of the play con-

54) According to Bethe (cf. supra n. 6) 86, the mythographic manual on which both Apollodoros and Diodoros depended here closely followed the text of the *Phoinissai* itself.

55) Cf. Söder (cf. supra n. 6) 132.

56) Cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968, 129, 195.

57) Cf. M. Papatomopoulos, *Un argument sur papyrus de la Médée d'Euripide, Recherches de papyrologie* 3 (1964) 37–47: in this edition the hypothesis of the *Medeia* is preceded by a hypothesis of the *Peliades*: so the summaries seem to have been arranged according to their legendary content.

cerned (*Stheneboia*, *Melanippe Sophe* and perhaps *Peirithous*)⁵⁸ – it has been argued by D. F. Sutton that a separate collection of such hypotheses may have existed in Byzantine times, consulted also by Joannes Tzetzes⁵⁹). Finally there seems to have been a shorter or abridged type of hypotheses, of which some have been preserved in the manuscripts of Euripides. For example, as was already observed by Zuntz⁶⁰), the manuscript hypothesis of the *Alkestis* is of a much shorter and more concentrated type than the usual *Tales*, and the manuscript hypothesis of the *Medeia* as well as the second half of that of the *Helen* exhibit the same characteristics. Luppe and other authors have argued that the manuscript hypothesis of the *Alkestis* is a later abridgement of the hypothesis of the *Tales*, known from fragment P.Oxy. 27.2457⁶¹). The arguments used, however, do not rule out the possibility that hypotheses of both types circulated from the same date onwards or that the author of the *Tales* had used for convenience portions of an existing hypothesis.

It seems likely, then, that one of these collections of hypotheses was a source of the *Library*, but it cannot be proved that the mythographer himself excerpted this source. As to the possibility that he would have consulted the text of Euripides, this seems very improbable, and even for the prologues, which might have been included in a collection of hypotheses, the arguments used do not convince me. Apollodoros was indebted, directly or more probably indirectly, perhaps through the intermediary of a mythographic manual, to Alexandrian scholarship, hypotheses and learned commentaries. This has been amply demonstrated for some specific cases, e. g. for Apollodoros' treatment of the legend of Medeia's infanticide, by scholars such as Robert and Söder⁶²). Thus, Bethé's warning remains valid: "mihi persuasum habeo, saepissime praecipue in bibliotheca et in Hygini fabulis multorum fontium frustula ita esse confusa et contaminata, ut omnino non possint distingui", as does the conclusion of Söder: "Das mannigfach verschlungene und verstrickte Gewebe der mythographischen

58) It is not certain that the quotation preserved from the last play actually comes from the prologue: cf. D.F. Sutton, *Two Lost Plays of Euripides*, New York 1987, 33–34, 95–96.

59) Cf. D.F. Sutton, *Evidence for Lost Dramatic Hypotheses*, GRBS 29 (1988) 90–92.

60) Zuntz (cf. supra n. 1) 144–145.

61) W. Luppe, *Die Hypothesen zu Euripides' 'Alkestis' und 'Aiolos'*. P. Oxy. 2457, *Philologus* 126 (1982) 10–18; other authors are quoted on p. 10 n. 2.

62) Robert (cf. supra n. 1) 83; Söder (cf. supra n. 6) 160–162.

Literatur im einzelnen entwirren zu wollen, erscheint so aussichtslos.⁶³⁾ Too often this has been forgotten when using the *Library* for the reconstruction of lost tragedies. To consider a passage from the *Library* as an argument from a Euripidean tragedy and a *fabula* of Hyginus as the argument of the Sophoklean treatment of the same legend or vice versa is too simplistic⁶⁴⁾. Sometimes, indeed, these passages do contain material from tragic hypotheses and scholarly commentaries on tragic texts, but their contamination by other sources is often impossible to disentangle. My conclusion, then, accords with that reached recently by P. Dräger⁶⁵⁾ after an extensive comparison of Bibl. 1.9.16 [107–109] and Pherekydes FG^rHist 3 F 105, viz. that the *Library* does not depend directly on the original source but constitutes a late phase of mythographical activity going back to Hellenistic scholarship. The sometimes abstruse elucubrations of Van der Valk and the somewhat naive adoration of Carrière and Massonie have attributed to our booklet a scholarly originality to which it can lay no claim.

Leuven

Marc Huys

63) Bethe (cf. supra n. 6) 99; Söder (cf. supra n. 6) 169.

64) Cf. supra n. 39.

65) P. Dräger, *Argo Pasimelousa. Der Argonautenmythos in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*, I: *Theos Aitios* (Palingenesia 43), Stuttgart 1993, 42–63, esp. 62. However, I do not follow this author (97 n. 281) in his criticism on Söder; his thesis that the authors of the tragic hypotheses used the *Library* instead of the other way round remains unexplained.