EURIPIDES AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FABULAE OF HYGINUS

GEORGE ADAM KOVACS

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-93037-8
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-93037-8

EURIPIDES AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *FABULAE* OF HYGINUS

by

George Adam Kovacs

A thesis submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Classics

Memorial University of Newfoundland

St. John's, Newfoundland

Table of Contents

Abstract

This study will focus on the *Fabulae*, a mythographic collection of short entries dating to approximately the second century CE and attributed in the manuscript tradition to C. Iulius Hyginus. There are two questions that this thesis will attempt to answer. First is the question of authorship. The *Fabulae* are not, as previously believed, the product of a single author. Numerous instances of repeated content, contradictory entries and evidence of different levels of comprehension of the Greek language indicate that at least two authors penned the *Fabulae*. The second question is one of source and directly relates to the plays of Euripides. Did the author(s) of the *Fabulae* have access to the plays of Euripides? Direct access to the plays does not seem likely in the case of most *Fabulae*, but evidence exists that didascalic information was available to the author(s). We can then compare the *Fabulae* to the fragments and testimonia of the non-extant plays to determine if the *Fabulae* constitute a useful tool in the reconstruction of lost tragedy. This is a process that must be carried out on an individual basis: some *Fabulae* appear to have drawn on non-extant tragedy, while others, as best as it can be determined, do not.

Abbreviations

Cropp-Fick = Cropp, M.J. & Fick, G. 1985. *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: The Fragmentary Tragedies*. London.

EGM = Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore.

SFP 1 = Collard, C., Cropp, M.J. & Lee, K.H., edd. 1995. *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays, Volume 1*. Warminster.

TGFS = Diggle, J., ed. 1998. *Tragicorum Graecorum: Fragmenta Selecta*. Oxford.

T&T = Reynolds, L.D., ed. 1983. *Texts and Transmission*. Oxford.

Names of various figures appear in both their Greek and Latin forms, according to the source being discussed. For example, Heracles is used when discussing Euripides, but Hercules is used for the *Fabulae*.

All passages of the *Fabulae* in Latin are from Marshall's Teubner text; passages in English are from Grant's *The Myths of Hyginus*. References to the *Fabulae* are given with *Fabula* and line number as found in Marshall.

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

The *Fabulae* are a collection of 277 numbered short entries that together comprise a mythographic work. Aside from these entries, the manuscript also preserves an Index, listing the titles of each entry and numbering them in Roman numerals.[1] There is also a *praefatio*, which is only 87 lines in length. It is not narrative in form, but is rather a single long genealogy of the gods, which gives it the feeling of a cosmogony.

Most of the *Fabulae* themselves are narrative in form, but not all. Roughly the last quarter of the *Fabulae* (221-277), and a number of others spread throughout the earlier *fabulae*, are in the form of lists. These generally group various figures of myth together according to a single characteristic or shared fate. These *fabulae* are known as the *indices*.[2]

Our *editio princeps* bears the title *C. Iulii Hygini Augusti liberti Fabularum liber, ad omnium poetarum lectionem mire necessarius & antehac nunquam excusus*. The work was referred to in antiquity as the *Genealogia* (*Hermeneumata* 56.27-57.4, see p. 9).

1.1 Figures Named Hyginus

The third edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* now lists four figures known as Hyginus. The second and fourth Hygini were once thought to be a single person, a surveyor known as Hyginus Gromaticus.[3] However, evidence suggests that this Hyginus lived in the first century CE, while the only surviving work to be attributed to him dates

[1] Manuscript F uses Arabic numerals.
[2] Throughout, the italicized *indices* will refer to these *fabulae*. The capitalized Index will referr to the list of contents that is preserved in the MS tradition.
[3] The title is from the Latin *groma*, the name given to the long staff with a small crosspiece at one end that was the surveyor's trademark tool.

to the late second or third century.[4] This work, given the title *On Camp Fortifications* in the early 16th century, is a dissertation on how to determine dimensions, lay fortifications and make other arrangements for preparing an army camp.

The first figure listed in the *OCD*[3] is one C. Iulius Hyginus. Suetonius (*De Grammaticis*, 20c) tells us that he was a Spaniard, and a freedman of the emperor Augustus. He was known to Ovid, and indeed addressed by him in one of his poems (*Tristia*, 3.14). He wrote on a variety of subjects, from agriculture to mythology, including one work entitled *On Trojan Families*, and another *On the Qualities of the Gods*. He was perhaps best known to ancient scholars for a commentary on Virgil. Several fragments and titles survive, mostly from Servius, Aulus Gellius and Macrobius.[5]

Our Hyginus, supposed author of the *Fabulae* and the *Astronomica*,[6] is none of the above figures. In the case of both works, the authorship is attributed to a Hyginus because that is what is found in the manuscripts, though some scholars are still prepared to take this at face value.[7] It is not uncommon for certain names to become common pseudonyms for unknown writers and this may be what is happening here: "Le nom d'Hyginus pourrait s'être generalizé pour designer un auteur de recueils mythologiques et recouvrir ainsi les noms d'érudits versés en cette matière."[8] The *Library* of Apollodorus is now known to be a similar case: it has picked up the name of Apollodorus for its author, even though Apollodorus the Athenian and the *Library* itself could not have been

[4] Lenoir (1979) viii. See Gemoll (1877) for the dating of the various fragments of Hyginus Gromaticus, found in Frontinus, Siculus Flaccus and Iunius Nipsus.
[5] The fragments are collected in Funaioli's Teubner edition.
[6] That the *Fabulae* and the *Astronomica* are by the same author is shown by *Astr*.2.12.2, which refers to the *Genealogia*.
[7] Le Bœuffle (1983) xxxi-xxxviii.
[8] Maeck-Desmedt (1973) 26.

contemporary.[9] While it is convenient to speak of Hyginus as author of the *Fabulae*, nothing can be affirmed.

1.2 Date of the Fabulae

Only one piece of external evidence exists for the date of the *Fabulae*. The *Hermeneumata* are a collection of "bilingual schoolbooks" (i.e. written in Latin and Greek) dating anywhere from the first to the fourth centuries CE. There are four distinct sections that can exist in any of the eight redactions of the *Hermeneumata*, and would not look out of place in a modern language textbook: an alphabetical dictionary; a topical dictionary (*capitula*); a collection of scenes from everyday life using common language for easy translation (*colloquia*); and a selection of actual texts.[10] In the preface to one of the redactions (56.27-57.4), the *Hermeneumata Leidensia*, we are given a date:

> Μαξίμῳ καὶ Ἄπρῳ ὑπάτοις πρὸ γ' εἰδῶν Σεπτεμβρίων Ὑγίνου γενεαλογίαν πᾶσιν γνωστὴν μετέγραψα, ἐν ᾗ ἔσονται πλείονες ἱστορίαι διερμηνευμέναι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βιβλῴ. θεῶν γὰρ καὶ θεάων ὀνόματα ἐν δευτέρῳ ἐξεπλέξαμεν.
>
> Maximo et Apro consulibus tertio id. Septembr. Hygini genealogiam omnibus notam descripsi, in qua erunt plures historiae inerpretate in hoc libro. Deorum enim et dearum nomina in secundo explicuimus.
>
> When Maximus and Aper were consuls, on the eleventh of September, I made a copy of Hyginus' *Genealogia*, known to all, in which many narratives will be explained. In the second [book], I will expound upon the names of the gods and goddesses.

The preface was originally assigned to Dositheus, but this been discarded by Rose in

[9] van der Valk (1958) 167. Also wrongly attributed to Apollodorus is the work known as Γῆς περίοδος (Chart of the Earth).
[10] Dionisotti (1982) 86.

favor of a *magistellus ignotus*.[11] From this passage, which suggests that the work was known in antiquity as the *Genealogy* rather than as the *Fabulae*, we have a *terminus ante quem* for the *Fabulae*. Though it is unlikely (as this study will show) that we now possess the *Fabulae* in its original form, we can at least imagine that some form of the *Fabulae* existed in the consulship of Maximus and Aper – 207 CE. This is the only date found in the all of the *Hermeneumata*. Scholars have attempted to use this passage to date the *Hermeneumata* itself, though we would do well not to trust a piece of information that "if it were not so useful would probably have been square-bracketed as an interpolation."[12] The date, if it is to be believed, can only be accepted in dating the *Fabulae*. This suggests that the *Fabulae* were written sometime in the late first century, or perhaps the very early second. This would make it more or less contemporary with other mythographic works, such as the *Library* of Ps.-Apollodorus[13] and many extant mythographic papyri.

1.3 Manuscript Tradition and Textual Criticism

Our text survives complete only in the *editio princeps*, printed by Jacobus Micyllus in 1535 from what we now know was a ninth or tenth century Beneventan manuscript of which scraps were found in bindings in 1864 in Regenberg (= Freising 237) and in 1942 in Munich (= Ordinariatsarchiv 934).[14] This Beneventan manuscript was dismembered by 1558, perhaps due to the redundancy resulting from Micyllus' new edition.[15] Unfortunately, Micyllus had great difficulties interpreting the Beneventan

[11] Rose (1929) 96.
[12] Dionisotti (1982) 89.
[13] van der Valk (1958) 167.
[14] Assigned to Capua by Lowe, xxvii.
[15] *T&T*, 189.

script, so many errors now exist in the manuscript tradition that are likely traceable back to him.

Apart from minor corrections, modern editors do not differ greatly from Micyllus' (though one major emendation, suggested but never implemented by modern editors, will be discussed below and in the next section). Whether or not this is the *Fabulae* as it appeared in antiquity has been the source of some speculation. *Fabulae* 258-261 have been taken from Servius and some *Fabulae* are no longer found in the manuscript (207-218, 262-268, 272), though all are listed in the Index.[16] The greatest reason to suspect that the *Fabulae* existed in a different form than it does today is found in *Fabula 137: Merope*. This *fabula* was at some point divided into two pieces. The first few lines have remained in the manuscript tradition as *Fabula 137*, but the larger part of it has somehow been moved to the end of *Fabula 184: Pentheus et Agaue*. This may indicate that the order of the *Fabulae* has been disrupted from its original form on a larger scale.[17]

1.4 Organization of the Fabulae

To help determine that original form, we must define the function of the *Fabulae* in antiquity: the *Fabulae* is a mythographic work. It is important to determine exactly what this means, and how it affects our approach to the content of the *Fabulae*. There are two ways information for such a work might be selected and arranged. One way is to provide background material for a major author. This usually takes the form of a commentary or a collection of *scholia*. The other way is to create an independent collection of myths organized around an accepted theme. What this theme is, and the

[16] Grant (1960) 2.
[17] Rose (1934) xvi; see Harder (1985) 49 as the only major dissenter, stating that the narrative of the "reconstructed" *fabula* does not flow smoothly enough. See p. 109 for the full text of *Fabula 137*.

general intent of the author, can affect the treatment of material within a specific work.[18] A work can be arranged thematically, as we see in work like Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, in which like myths are presented together. The theme can be more clinical, however, such as in the *Library* of Ps.-Apollodorus, in which material is arranged genealogically.

The *Metamorphoses* is intended by Ovid to be a work of art, to be appreciated not only as an entertaining story, but also for language, structure and style. Preservation of previous academic traditions, or even acknowledgement of them, does not fit into the agenda, even if Ovid is aware of them. This is not to say that Ovid is ignoring the literary sources available to him; it simply means that he is allowing himself to select and even alter the myths that he records in order to produce a unified work arranged around certain themes. One of these themes is the concept of repetition in myth, as Ovid continually groups similar myths together. There is also a sense of some temporal arrangement: "The repetition of similar narrative patterns in the *Metamorphoses* is complemented by the sequential combination of different narrative patterns into larger narratives with a beginning, middle and end."[19] The *Metamorphoses* begins on a cosmological scale, with the creation of the universe, and ends in the political environment of Ovid's own time. Although there is no overall plot in the *Metamorphoses*, these themes of repetition, chronological sequence and others take turns acting as the plot or pattern of organization.[20]

Ps.-Apollodorus' *Library* operates with a very different agenda. Making no pretensions that he is producing a literary form, Ps.-Apollodorus is able to shape his work in any way that he sees fit. Content becomes the governing principle in the organization

[18] Henrichs (1986) 243.
[19] Wheeler (2000) 49.
[20] Wheeler (2000) 51.

of his work. Arranging stories that follow each other naturally, using genealogical and geographical links allows later readers to find specific passages more easily. No allegiance to a particular tradition needs to be made; different variants can be listed simultaneously, particularly in the case of names.[21] The work is intended, at least in part, to be didactic: it aims to educate. This in turn results in a desire to make the work appear academically sound and hence the need to identify and even compare sources within the work itself, a process that Ovid went through before writing the *Metamorphoses*. The sources of Ps.-Apollodorus can be more easily identified (i.e. it is easier to determine where specific information has originated). The *Library*, for this reason, becomes much more useful than the *Metamorphoses* for tracing the development of different traditions of myth.[22] Another factor that has been suggested for the selection and arrangement of material in the *Library* is "decency", which suggests that the *Library* was intended for younger minds, and provides further evidence that the *Library* was an educational tool.[23]

The *Fabulae* can be divided into three general categories: genealogical information, narratives, and the *indices*. The genealogy can be seen in the preface to the *Fabulae*.[24] Hesiodic in nature, the preface forms out of the divine family trees a sort of cosmogony. The *indices* are *Fabulae 221-277*, roughly the last fifth of the work as it is now preserved. These are straightforward lists of information, usually focusing on characters with similar characteristics or fates, such as *Fabula 221: Septem sapientes* or *242: Qui se ipsi interfecerunt*. They are often grouped together, not genealogically as we shall see for the remaining *fabulae*, but rather thematically. Table 1 shows the division of

[21] Frazer (1921) xvii.
[22] Simpson (1976) 1-2.
[23] van der Valk (1958) 101-102.
[24] Found in all manuscripts between the Index and *Fabula 1*. See Marshall (1993) 10-14.

story arcs found in the narrative *fabulae* and the themes around which the *indices* are arranged.

Table 1: Story Arcs and Themes in the Fabulae[25]

Preface	
1-6*	Cadmus and descendants
7-11*	Antiope and descendants of Niobe
12-27*	Argonautica, including Medea and descendants
29-36*	Hercules
37-48*	Theseus
49-51*	Admetus
52-55*	Lovers of Jupiter
58-59*	Metamorphoses
60-62*	Infernal punishments
66-76*	Oedipus
77-81*	Daughters of Tyndareus
82-88*	Sons of Atreus
89-94*	Dardanids
95-124*	Trojan War
125-128*	Odyssey
129-134*	Bacchus
138-154*	Cosmogony
155-162	Children of the gods
168-170*	Danaus and descendants
171-175*	Meleager
176-177*	Callisto
178-184*	Europe and descendants of Cadmus
186-188*	Lovers of Neptune
191-203*	Metamorphoses (including Lovers of Apollo)
204-207*	Incestuous loves
208-218	Missing
219*	Archelaus
Indices:	
221-223	Groups of Seven
226-233	Mortals who slept with gods
234-245	Those who killed relatives, friends or themselves
254-257	Duty, piety and chastity
257-261	Attributed to Servius
262-268	Missing
269-271	Famous or Handsome people
272	Missing
273-277	Founders and Inventors (except 276: Largest Islands)

[25] Story arcs marked * are taken from Boriaud (1997) xxviii. I have begun the Trojan War story arc with *Fabula 95*, though Boriaud has it begin in 94. This is the only place he considers a story arc to begin

Several lists similar to the *indices* are found throughout the earlier *fabulae*, each placed to fit the context of the entries around it. Omitted from the above list are *fabulae* which do not fit directly into any of the story arcs.[26] Also omitted are a number of *indices*, *Fabulae 246-253*, unrelated to each other.

Table 2: Indices not found in Fabulae 221-277[27]

14	Argonautae
21	Phrixi filii
30	Herculis athla
31	Parerga eiusdem
38	Thesei labores
48	Reges Athenienses
70	Reges septem Thebas profecti
76	Reges Thebani
81	Helenae proci
90	Priami filii
97	Qui ad Troiam et quot nauibus ierunt
112	Prouocantes
113	Quem quis occidit
114	Graeci quot occiderunt
115	Troiani quot occiderunt
124	Reges Achiuorum
151	Ex Typhone et Echidna geniti
155	Iovis filii
156	Solis filii
157	Neptuni filii
158	Vulcani filii
159	Martis filii
160	Mercuri filii
161	Apollonis filii
162	Herculis filii
170	Filiae Danai quae quos occiderunt
173	Qui ad aprum Calydonium ierunt
181	Diana, et canum nomina

Not all of the above may be *indices* in the same sense as those found after *Fabula 220*.

---

within a *fabula*, a division which is not necessary, though perhaps it does indicate the strength of the transition between two relevant story arcs.

[26] These are *Fabula 28: Otus et Ephialtes; 56: Busiris; 57: Stheneboea; 63: Danae; 64: Andromeda; 65: Alcyone; 135: Laocoon; 136: Polyidus; 137: Merope; 163: Amazones; 164: Athenae; 165: Marsyas; 166: Erechthonius; 167: Liber; 185: Atalanta; 189: Procris; 190: Theonoe.*

[27] In Table 1, the story arcs are titled in English. Here, however, I am quoting the titles directly from the *Fabulae*, and so have used the Latin.

Some of them, *Fabulae 14, 30, 31* and *181*, contain a certain amount of narrative, and so may not necessarily belong to this category. The other entries, however, are all dependant upon their titles to make sense. *Fabula 90*, for instance, is simply a list of names. There is no explicit statement within the text of the *fabula* explaining what element might be common to those names; it is the title of the entry, *Priami filii*, which identifies them as the names of Priam's offspring. This might suggest that the *indices* were never without titles. This cannot be said of other *fabulae*. In the discussion of Phaethon (see p. 117), we shall see that *Fabula 154: Phaethon Hesiodi* was clearly not titled by the author of that entry. Some *fabulae* are titled by their author, others are not; this will affect the question of authorship, to be dealt with later in this chapter and throughout this study.

Genealogies and lists of names are commonly found in works of mythography, so it is not unusual to find them in the *Fabulae*.[28] With the exceptions noted above, *Fabulae 1-220* are not mere genealogies or lists but do in fact present narrative. This is what we might expect of the *Fabulae*, given the meaning of the Latin. These *fabulae* are arranged (albeit loosely) around the genealogies of major mythic families.

Complications arise, however, when we consider *Fabula 137* and *184*. As noted in the previous section (see p. 11), it seems likely that the second half of *Fabula 184*, as it is found in the current tradition, belongs with *Fabula 137*. If this is the case, we must explain how *Fabula 137* came to be split in half. It may have been the result of a single page in a codex coming loose and being restored to the wrong place in the *Fabulae*. However, Rose noted that most of the intervening *Fabulae* between *137* and *185* deal with the gods and cosmogony, while those before and after treat the myths of mortal

[28] Henrichs (1986) 248.

heroes and their families. His suggestion was that the entire group of *Fabulae 138-184* has become displaced, rather than just a single page. Given that the earlier of these *fabulae*, particularly *Fabulae 138-154* deal with content similar to that of the preface, and that many of the last of these (178-181, 184) lead into the Cadmean story arc, this displaced block of *fabulae* belongs, Rose hypothesized, at the beginning of the *Fabulae*. *Fabula 138* would then be renumbered to become *Fabula 1*; *Fabula 1*, no longer at the beginning but following the former *184*, would become *Fabula 47*; those *fabulae* that followed the former *184* would still occupy the same position, as seen in Table 3.

Table 3: The Fabulae as suggested by Rose[29]

Current Numbering	[New Numbering]	Story Arc
Preface		
138-154	[1-17]	Cosmogony
168-170	[31-33]	Danaus and descendants
171-175	[34-38]	Meleager
176-177	[39-40]	Callisto
178-185	[41-48]	Europe and descendants of Cadmus
1-6	[49-54]	Cadmus and descendants
7-11	[55-59]	Antiope and descendants of Niobe
12-27	[60-75]	Argonautica, including Medea and descendants
29-36	[76-83]	Hercules
37-48	[84-95]	Theseus
49-51	[96-98]	Admetus
52-55	[99-102]	Lovers of Jupiter
58-59	[105-106]	Metamorphoses
60-62	[107-109]	Infernal punishments
66-76	[113-123]	Oedipus
77-81	[124-128]	Daughters of Tyndareus
82-88	[129-135]	Sons of Atreus
89-94	[136-141]	Dardanids
95-124	[142-171]	Trojan War
125-128	[172-175]	Odyssey
129-134	[176-181]	Bacchus
186-188	[186-188]	Lovers of Neptune
191-203	[191-203]	Metamorphoses (including Lovers of Apollo)
204-207	[204-207]	Incestuous loves
208-218	[208-218]	Missing
219	[219]	Archelaus
221-277	[221-277]	Indices

This re-arrangement is not followed by any editor, not even Rose himself. All modern editors preserve the arrangement found in the manuscript tradition, though all acknowledge the validity, and even likelihood, of Rose's hypothesis.[30]

[29] I have not included the indices in *Fabulae 221-277*, which would be unaffected by the switch. I have also preserved the original numbering of the *Fabulae* to maintain clarity.
[30] Rose (1934) xv-xvi; see Boriaud (1997), Marshall (1998).

1.5 Authorship of the Fabulae

We have already looked into the identity of the figure known as Hyginus, and determined that, aside from the possible date of 207 CE, which itself is no more than a *terminus ante quem* of a some early edition of the *Fabulae*, we have virtually no biographical information about him. We do not even know if the *Fabulae* were written by a single author or whether they are the composition of several authors writing at different times. This study will attempt to determine if the *Fabulae* are the product of a single author. It will also attempt to determine if the *Fabulae* were written, translated, or compiled from other sources.

Most commonly accepted is the idea that the *Fabulae* are the product of an epitomator. The possibility that a figure named Hyginus wrote, in Latin, a single work that epitomized various Greek and Latin works is generally rejected. Favored is the idea that a Greek writer compiled summaries of various works and that the figure identified as Hyginus in the manuscript tradition simply produced a loose translation of that work.[31] Of course, we have no hint of this Greek writer's identity: "Name and time unknown, [this author] was apparently a learned person with a wide acquaintance with epic and tragic writing, and with prose writings as well."[32] Rose even suggests that Hyginus, if he is indeed the translator of an original Greek epitome, was a young man or even a boy at the time, perhaps a student learning Greek. This would account for many errors that seem to arise out of a misunderstanding of the Greek language.[33]

We shall see in the body of this study, however, evidence that more than one author has contributed to the *Fabulae*. Certain pairs of the *Fabulae* treat the same

[31] Rose (1934) viii.
[32] Grant (1960) 2.
[33] Rose (1934) viii.

general material, as is the case with *Fabulae 1* and *4*, *7* and *8* and *50* and *51*. These doublets can demonstrate comprehension of Greek in some *fabulae*, but not in others: *Fabula 7*, for instance, preserves Greek etymologies, while others, like *Fabula 137*, cannot even determine the gender of proper names. Furthermore, there is the radically different nature of the *indices*, which are clearly written with a different intent than the narrative-based *fabulae*. The entry titles of many narrative *fabulae* may well have been written by a different hand again (see p. 117).

We can accept the titles and *indices* to be the product of a single author, though this distinction is beyond the scope of this study, and not relevant to the use of Euripides as a source. I would further suggest that we can group all of the narrative *fabulae* into two broad categories. In the first group we can place all the *fabulae* that demonstrate a poor knowledge of the Greek language. We can also place in this group any *fabula* whose content is repeated in a fuller *fabula*. For the sake of clarity throughout this study, a single author for this group will be assumed and labeled Hyginus A. A second group will be Hyginus B, and will contain the *fabulae* that demonstrate proficiency in Greek and/or demonstrate a superior knowledge of content found in other *fabulae*.

The question of authorship can thus be at least partially answered by determining the nature of the relationship between Hyginus A and Hyginus B. If it appears that Hyginus A is an earlier contributor to the *Fabulae*, then Hyginus B is a later author attempting to revise and improve the work. If Hyginus B is the earlier author, then the *Fabulae* have been subjected to bad editing and revision on the part of Hyginus A. It also remains to be determined if the *indices* and entry titles are the product of either Hyginus A or B, or if we are dealing with three distinct periods of authorship. This is a more

complex picture than is generally supposed, but it is a simplification for the purposes of this thesis. In actuality, each of these stages may involve further subdivision; there may be earlier sources, and later corruptions and accretions.

1.6 Relation to Euripides

If either Hyginus A or B demonstrates a greater awareness of Euripidean traditions, we could perhaps assume that that author had a closer relationship to the works of Euripides, through direct contact with the plays, *hypotheses*, or some other source or epitome. There are a number of possible relationships between Euripides and the *Fabulae*, most of which have been suggested by scholars over the past 200 years. The best survey of this scholarship is found in Marc Huys' article, "Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides': Sources of the *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus?" which I will paraphrase here.[34]

During much of the 19th century, the scholarly opinion, expressed by Hartung, Welcker and Lange, was that Hyginus was working directly from copies of Euripidean plays, regardless of their present condition – extant or non-extant – in the modern world. If this is the case, then content and plot of a *fabula* will correspond directly to that of the appropriate play. Any discrepancies could be blamed on post-Hyginus grammarians and scribes. However, there is likely more at work here. For one thing, the author (or authors) of the *Fabulae* is writing not only in a different genre, but is presenting his material in a completely different medium. Euripides was producing for the stage. As such, he was using the staging conventions imposed by the rules of fifth-century dramatic competition. His audience came from a single cultural background. The author of the *Fabulae* is not following any staging conventions: a story may be easier to tell with a

[34] Huys (1996) 169-171.

meeting of more than three characters at any given time. The *Fabulae*, which appear to have enjoyed at least some public circulation, have readers who are not likely from any single cultural or ethnic background, but may well be spread all over the Roman empire. This differs from any staged production of fifth-century Athens, which had an audience of spectators who were familiar with the same myths and traditions. Information that would normally be given in a prologue or in a closing *aition* can be included as part of the regular narrative of a *fabula*.

The *hypothesis* of a play is another possible source that informs the *Fabulae*. We know that the *hypotheses* to many plays were published separately as is the case, in a volume often referred to as "The Tales of Euripides", and might have been available to the author(s) of the *Fabulae*, even when the original plays were not. In some occasions, the *hypotheses* even have information not found in the plays themselves, such as the names of characters not provided in the play.

Huys presents two conclusions. The first of these is that "there seems to be no direct relationship between the 'Tales from Euripides' and the *Fabulae*".[35] The second is to caution any modern scholar against accepting unconditionally the *Fabulae* as a source for non-extant tragedy. However, one of the assertions of the current study will be that the *Fabulae* are not the product of a single author. If this is the case, we must then determine if Huys' conclusions apply to one or both of these hypothetical authors.

Other sources may have been used by the author of the *Fabulae*, which could have been dependant upon Euripides for their information. Ps.-Apollodorus, for instance, seems to have on occasion followed the traditions established by Euripides. This would have the author(s) of the *Fabulae* following a tradition of myth found in Euripides

[35] Huys (1997) 30.

without any direct relationship to the play.

Whether the author(s) of the *Fabulae* has access to a play, a *hypothesis*, or some other epitome, there is the question of priority of a source. It is possible that any one of these – play, *hypothesis*, indirect source – could be the sole source informing a given *fabula*, though other possibilities exist. Any of the above could be the primary source for a tradition of myth preserved in the *Fabulae*, but then supplemented with information found in other sources, sources not linked to Euripides. There is also the possibility that a non-Euripidean source is being used as the primary source of material for a *fabula*, but then information from a play has somehow been used to supplement it. This may again be a marker for multiple authorship – a later author providing information not available to an earlier one.

1.7 Arrangement and Methodology

Thirty five plays of Euripides will be given consideration in this study. The first standard characteristic by which the plays are categorized should be a concrete one. The first of the three main body chapters in this study will consider the plays of Euripides that are extant. The next chapter will examine all of the non-extant, fragmentary plays, with the exception of two. These two plays, *Ino* and *Antiope*, are both cited as sources within the *Fabulae*. The division of extant and non-extant plays is one that was already being established when the *Fabulae* were written with the establishment of a manuscript tradition of select plays (see p.30), and so could possibly be connected to the issue of source. The non-extant plays give us the reason for this study. It is as a source for the reconstruction of lost plays that Hyginus and the *Fabulae* could be most useful.

In the interest of presenting a cohesive and progressive argument, plays can be

grouped by the less objective criterion of relationship to Euripides within in each chapter. Plays that appear to have little or no connection to Euripides can be dealt with first, while plays that do seem to be at least somewhat or wholly preserved in the *Fabulae* are reserved for later comment.

The discussion of each play will include an examination relevant content in the *Fabulae*, a discussion of current scholarship on the play and its relationship to the *Fabulae*, and a look at some of the known mythography on the subject matter. This standardized approach will be modified from play to play to fit the availability of evidence and relevant literature.

The two questions of source and authorship are both difficult to answer and, when combined, the complexity of the issues increases almost exponentially. There are clearly sources other than Euripides behind the *Fabulae*. I have occasionally made reference to and even speculation on some of these other sources, but it is not my purpose here to go into a full source analysis of the *Fabulae*. Thus, study of the various traditions of myth are limited to a small number of sources outside of Euripides, and I often rely on Gantz' *Early Greek Myth* to identify some of the more important or more likely sources. This is not done to deny or exclude other possible sources, but this study is meant to diagnose one particular source relationship, inspired by the large amount of scholarly interest in fragmentary tragedy and the large number of papyrus fragments that have been published in recent years.[36] Similarly, to fully answer the question of authorship, a myriad of criteria must be used, while within this study, I have only used two: the relationship to a single source, and the disparity between individual entries as they exhibit differing levels of comprehension of the Greek language. Since the structure of the *Fabulae* is a key

[36] *TGFS*, *SFP 1*, *Jouan-Van Looy*, etc.

element to the arguments and conclusions of this study, the whole *Fabulae* must be considered. The result is that many plays will receive only cursory consideration.

The indications are that further study into both source and authorship would in fact support my conclusions, though they must here be tentative. The two main conclusions of this study, that the *Fabulae* can only be used as a source for Euripides when the structure of the *Fabulae* is taken into account, and that future discussions of the *Fabulae* cannot assume a unified work, are being combined here for the first time. Ultimately, this study will hopefully serve as a roadsign pointing to possible avenues for further study.

Chapter 2: The Fabulae and Extant Euripides

This chapter will compare the *Fabulae* to the extant plays of Euripides. Plays will be considered individually using a standardized approach. First, any mention of the main character or characters in the *Fabulae* as a whole is examined. Occurrences within the *indices*, those *Fabulae* composed of lists, will be considered first, as they are generally the simplest references, reducing most figures to items on a list mentioned only for a single common characteristic. Next, there are often one or two full entries in the *Fabulae* that will correspond with the events of a given play. In this case, the relevant *fabula* is compared with the play point by point.

Each *fabula* is compared to Ps.-Apollodorus and other mythographers. Along with the *hypotheses*, the mythographers are a stage in the preservation of traditions of myth, though neither *hypothesis* nor mythographer is necessarily dependant on the other, or even present in any given tradition of myth. An *hypothesis*, by definition, implies the original author as its source, while the source for a mythographer must be deduced if it is not explicitly stated. Thus, if the content of a certain *fabula* corresponds with an *hypothesis* well enough that we can establish that *hypothesis* as a source for that *fabula*, we then know the relationship of that *fabula* to Euripides, i.e. the tradition goes from Euripides to the *hypothesis* to the *fabula*. If a mythographer corresponds to a *fabula*, we must then look into the question of source for that mythographer.

Van Rossum-Steenbeek dedicates a chapter to the classification and standardization of dramatic *hypotheses*, looking at *hypotheses* preserved both in manuscripts and in papyri. Her focus, however, is on papyri, and she divides the extant *hypotheses* into four categories: (1) narrative and (2) learned *hypotheses* deal with

tragedy, while (3) descriptive and (4) Menandrean *hypotheses* apply to comedy. The learned *hypotheses*, best represented by those of Aristophanes of Byzantium, seem generally to follow a fixed pattern, though exceptions abound, with elements of information presented in an established order, which van Rossum-Steenbeek designates with the letters A-F. Much of the information focuses on details of production: section C gives incidental information, like the identity of the chorus and the setting of the play; section E is the didascalic information, with production dates and competition results. Sections A, B and D are potentially most relevant to the *Fabulae*. Section A is a resumé, summing up the play in one or two sentences. Section B, the μυθοποιία, looks at the treatment of the appropriate myth by Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. Section D, the κεφάλαιον, presents the events and subjects of the play.

The other type of tragic *hypothesis* discussed by van Rossum-Steenbeek is the narrative *hypothesis*, which deals exclusively with context:

> Several characteristics revealed by most hyp[otheses] suggest that they ultimately stem from one single collection written by one author. They may be read perfectly well without the text of the plays or knowledge of them, and supply information not found in the tragedies when this is needed for understanding the story, for example, genealogical information, names, etc. The hyp[otheses] ordered alphabetically by play title. Both the title and the citation of the first line of the play link the hyp[othesis] to the play.[37]

A few important points arise from this summary. First is the suggestion that the *hypotheses* were collected as a separate work. This means that any potential author of a *fabula* may have had access to information about the plays without actually having access to the plays themselves. Also relevant is the presence of information not found in the

[37] Van Rossum-Steenbeek (1998) 48.

plays, but found in the *Fabulae* – a common occurrence. The entries in the *fabulae* that correspond to *Medea*, *Hippolytus* and *Andromache*, for example, all contain names not found in Euripides (see pp. 47, 50, 53). Van Rossum-Steenbeek states that there is little to indicate a direct link between the *hypotheses* and mythographers like Ps.-Apollodorus and Hyginus, except perhaps as a last resort on the part of the mythographer. However, they are difficult to compare beyond mythical content, as van Rossum-Steenbeek notes:

> The nature of the narrative hyp[otheses] is quite different from that of Ap[ollodorus] and Hyg[inus]: the unity of the contents and the link with the underlying tragedies has no equipment to the comprehensive writings of the mythographers...the stories in Hyg[inus] occur at least partly in a thematic or genealogical context.[38]

This raises the issue of arrangement. As noted in Chapter 1 (see p. 11), the *Fabulae* are arranged by a genealogical and temporal sequence of myth. In fifth-century Athens, however, the length of a play must be considered, lest the attention of the audience wander. This leads to a certain economy of information, what Robinson calls "dramatic grammar."[39] Information an audience doesn't need, or might reasonably be expected to know, is omitted from a play. Necessary background information is relegated to a fairly compact prologue and events to follow the play are related in an *aition* or *deus ex machina*. The fabulist, on the other hand, is free to include prologue information as part of his narrative, and given that his audience may not be as familiar with a particular myth, might even be expected to provide more information than a playwright.

Classifying the relationship of the *Fabulae* to individual extant plays of Euripides is difficult. There does not appear to be any correlation between any standard of

[38] Van Rossum-Steenbeek (1998) 50.
[39] Robinson (1969) 44.

classifying the extant plays and the awareness of mythic traditions on the part of the author(s) of the *Fabulae*. In other words, looking at the ways in which the plays are now often categorized turns up no useful patterns.

The simplest method would be to examine the plays of Euripides in chronological order. This would involve examining each play according to its date of production. In the case of unknown dates, we could follow the metrical analysis of Martin Cropp and Gordon Fick.[40] In addition to these, we could integrate two more plays, *Cyclops*, omitted from that study because it is a satyr play, and *Rhesus*, omitted due to its questionable authorship. For the first play, we can assume a date of 408, suggested by Seaford and argued by Marshall.[41] As for *Rhesus*, "the evidence of resolution in the iambic trimeter puts *Rhesus* with the earliest group of Euripides' works, *Alcestis* (438), *Medea* (431), *Heraclidae* and *Hippolytus* (428)" and "the evidence of lyric meter and structure agrees closely with that of iambic trimeter."[42] The earliest play, *Alcestis*, dates to 438. The latest plays, *Bacchae* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*, date to 406. This means that all the plays fall within a time period of only 32 years. This is a very small period of time in respect to a mythographic tradition. Add to the short time frame the fact that the plays are all by the same author, and we must conclude that there is almost no distinction between any of the plays of Euripides on a mythographic level. We will see this lack of distinction in the plays as they relate to the *Fabulae*. The author(s) of the *Fabulae* are demonstrably aware of *Alcestis*, *Medea*, and *Hippolytus* which are among the earliest plays of Euripides, but

---

[40] Cropp-Fick, 23 arranges the extant plays in the following order (brackets indicate no secure date): *Alcestis*, *Medea*, *Hippolytus*, (*Heraclidae*), (*Andromache*), *Hecuba*, *Suppliant Women*, (*Electra*), (*Heracles*), *Trojan Women*, (*Ion*), (*Iphigenia among the Taurians*), *Phoenician Women*, *Orestes*, *Bacchae*, *Iphigenia at Aulis*.

[41] Seaford (1982) argues for the last five years of Euripides' life, with 408 being the most likely year of production. Marshall (2001) dates the play to 408 with much greater certainty.

[42] Ritchie (1964) 358.

not of *Heraclidae*, which falls into the same chronological group. Of the plays that were performed between 420 and 410, we see awareness of *Heracles* and *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, but not of *Electra*, *Ion*, *Helen* or *Trojan Women*. Thus, for this study, the chronology of the extant plays is not a useful system of classification of the mythic traditions that they preserve.

Another classification we might use is more in keeping with the function of the *Fabulae* as a mythographic work. The preservation of myth is one of the purposes of the *Fabulae*, and so it might be beneficial to examine the plays according to their state of preservation. The extant plays of Euripides as we now know them are derived from two manuscript traditions. The first set of plays are the "select" plays: these are ten plays (*Hec.*, *Or.*, *Ph.*, *Hipp.*, *Med.*, *And.*, *Alc.*, *Rh.*, *Tro.*, *Ba.*) that survive, complete with *scholia*, because they were collected together in antiquity, perhaps for use as a school text.[43] Within this set is a smaller group of plays known as the Byzantine triad. These are plays that were selected from the other ten as the best three, and so have an even more widespread manuscript tradition than the others – there are, for instance, some 115 manuscripts dating between the tenth and sixteenth centuries that preserve *Phoenician Women*.[44] The remaining nine plays (*Hcld.*, *Sup.*, *El.*, *Her.*, *Ion*, *I.T.*, *Hel.*, *I.A.*, *Cyc.*) are preserved in two manuscripts. Manuscripts L (Laurentianus 32) and P (Palatinus gr. 287) – the latter a copy of the former –[45] preserve, in addition to the select plays, what appears to be part of an alphabetized collection of the plays of Euripides. Thus we have a

---

[43] Barret (1964) 51.
[44] Mastronarde (1994) 50.
[45] Turyn (1957) and others upheld that P was in fact a twin of L, and that both manuscripts derive from a single parent manuscript, Λ. This is because P does not show all of the corrections, now attributed to Triclinius, made in L. Zuntz (1975), however, showed that L was in fact corrected by Triclinius on three separate occasions, as indicated by the three distinct ink colors used in those corrections. P is a copy of Tr^1, made before Tr^2 and Tr^3. See Diggle (1990) 289-304: "The Relationship between L and P in Heraclidae."

selection of plays whose titles begin with the Greek letters ε, η, ι, or κ. Manuscript P also preserves the most complete text of the *Bacchae*. The *Bacchae* is considered a select play, because manuscript L does not preserve it in full – only the first 755 lines are to be found in manuscript L. The *Bacchae* and the alphabetical plays have not been preserved with any extant *scholia*. Only the manuscripts of the select plays have *scholia* included.

This distinction, between select and alphabetical, which was likely in place by the time the *Fabulae* were first published (copies of the select plays were likely already more frequent), does not appear to apply to the plays as they relate to the *Fabulae*. While there is an awareness of the content of many extant plays, the author(s) of certain *fabulae* are clearly unaware of the contents of *Hecuba* (though there are traces of them) or *Trojan Women* (see p. 39). Likewise, the author(s) is unaware of many of the alphabetic plays, yet knows the events of *Heracles* (see p. 69), *Iphigenia among the Taurians* (see p. 62), and *Iphigenia at Aulis* (see p. 62). To conclude that there is a source relationship between only the select plays and the *Fabulae* would certainly be attractive (it would say a great deal about the distribution of the select plays in the ancient world), but the evidence does not allow us to make such a claim.

In the end, the best approach is to categorize the plays, not by an arbitrary system of classification distinct from the *Fabulae*, but rather by their relationship to the *Fabulae*. Using this approach, we can group the extant plays of Euripides into four broad categories. (1) There are plays whose content is to be found nowhere in the *Fabulae* (see 2.1-2.5). (2) There are plays that do not perfectly correspond with entries in the *Fabulae* but have at least some elements in common (see 2.6-2.11). (3) There are plays that correspond closely enough to the *Fabulae* that they might be considered source material

(see 2.12-15). (4) Finally there are plays that correspond to some entries in the *Fabulae*, but not to others, suggesting that certain *fabulae* have different authors than others (see 2.16-2.17). The distinction between these four categories is blurred at best, particularly between categories (2) and (3), as elements of interpretation come into play. Nevertheless, they do provide a useful guide.

This chapter will begin with two unique cases in the Euripidean corpus. *Cyclops* stands out among the plays of Euripides as the only extant satyr play.[46] The dubious authorship of *Rhesus* sets it apart as well. These two plays might be expected to be unknown to the author(s) of the *Fabulae*.

2.1 Cyclops

Cyclops is one of the alphabetical plays, so no *scholia* exist for it. Though not dated by Cropp-Fick because it is a satyr play, it can most likely be assigned to 408.[47]

Euripides' *Cyclops* focuses on the meeting of Odysseus and the Cyclops Polyphemus and the subsequent blinding of the Cyclops. This same general content is treated in *Fabula 125: Odyssea* (10-24). Indeed, this is the only mention of the Cyclops in the *Fabulae*:

> inde ad Cyclopem Polyphemum Neptuni filium. huic responsum erat ab augure Telemo Eurymi filio ut caueret ne ab Ulysse excaeraretur. hic media fronte unum oculum habebat et carnem humanam epulabatur. qui postquam pecus in speluncam redegerat, molem saxeam ingentem ad ianuam opponebat. Qui Ulyssem cum sociis inclusit sociosque eius consumere coepit. Ulysses cum uideret eius immanitati atque feritati resistere se non posse, uino quod a Marone acceperat eum inebriauit, seque Utin uocare dixit. Itaque cum oculum eius trunco ardenti exureret, ille

[46] The only other extant fourth position play, *Alcestis*, treats its plot in the style of tragedy, does not employ a chorus of satyrs and so can be considered a non-satyr play.
[47] See n. 41 above.

> clamore suo ceteros Cyclopas conuocauit, eisque spelunca praeclusa dixit, "Utis me excaecat." Illi credentes eum deridendi gratia dicere neglexerunt. At Ulysses socios suos ad pecora alligauit et ipse se ad arietem, et ita exierunt.
>
> From there he went to the Cyclops Polyphemus, son of Neptune, to whom a prophecy had been given by the augur Telemus, son of Eurymus, that he should beware of being blinded by Ulysses. He had one eye in the middle of his forehead, and feasted on human flesh. After he drove his flock back into the cave he would place a great stone weight at the door. He shut Ulysses and his comrades within, and started to devour the men. When Ulysses saw that he could not cope with his size and ferocity, he made him drunk with the wine he had received from Maro, and said that he was called Noman. And so, when Ulysses was burning out his eye with a glowing stake, he summoned the other Cyclopes with his cries, and called to them from the closed cave, "Noman is blinding me!" They thought he was speaking in sport, and did not heed. But Ulysses tied his comrades to the sheep and himself to the ram, and in this way they got out.

The very title of this entry suggests that it is meant to follow the account of *Odyssey* 9, though we cannot of course know that the author of the *fabula* and the author of the title are one and the same. Nevertheless, the details here match those found in the *Odyssey*. The wine Odysseus gives to Polyphemus does indeed come from Maro and Polyphemus is warned of Odysseus by Telemus, son of Eurymus. The escape is contracted, omitting Polyphemus throwing rocks and cursing Odysseus (*Od.* 9.462-542), but this passage is one event in the summary of a much larger work, and the omission is likely due to word economy rather than to ignorance.[48]

One important note lies in the use of language in this entry. Rather than preserve the Greek οὖτις for the pseudonym given to the Cyclops by Odysseus, this *fabula* instead

[48] The *Cyclops* is, in the *Fabulae*, explicitly one eyed. Though it is not directly stated in the *Odyssey*, the blinding with one stroke presupposes a single eye, and archaic art depicts only one eye. See Heubeck (1989) 20, Snodgrass (1998) 93.

uses *Utis*. This name *Utis* has been transliterated from the Greek and is in fact *hapax legomenon*.[49] To the Greekless reader, then, Ulysses is no longer "No Man" but rather he is just "Utis," which becomes a meaningless name. If the author of this *fabula* expected his audience to know Greek, then there would have been no need to transliterate οὔτις. If, on the other hand, he was expecting readers without Greek, he might have explained the etymology, as we see in other *fabulae*. *Fabula 99: Auge*, for example, explains, in Latin, the etymology of Telephus' name: *quoniam cerua nutrierat* ("because he was nurtured by a doe"). This passage is then useful to a reader who understands only Latin, by explaining that an etymology does exist, without feeling the need to fill that etymology out with the Greek. *Fabula 7: Antiope*, on the other hand, explains the etymology of the names Zethus and Amphion in Greek, seemingly expecting its audience to be fluent enough in Greek to understand. This suggests that, while *Fabula 125* is the product of a Greekless Hyginus A, *Fabulae 7* and *99* are the product of Hyginus B. It is also possible that the transliteration to *Utis* is the result of the textual tradition. Micyllus, we know, had difficulty reading the Beneventan script of his original, and he may not have been the only person to have difficulty. The Greek of *Fabula 7* is fairly long and complicated, while the Greek οὔτις of *Fabula 125* is fairly short and simple: the Greek letters all resemble Latin letters, and so might easily lend themselves to accidental transliteration.

As for *Cyclops*, there is nothing in *Fabula 125* that is unique to that play. In *Cyclops*, Odysseus is on stage before the blinding is accomplished (a necessity of the

[49] LSJ s.v.

medium of drama) and he does not require the sheep to escape.[50] There is no mention in the *fabula* of the location of the island of the Cyclops; in Euripides, it is located on Sicily, near Mount Etna (Cyc. 20).[51] Homer, or another author who has epitomized all or parts of Homer,[52] is more likely the source for this *fabula*.

2.2 Rhesus

Because of the question over authorship, *Rhesus* is also omitted by Cropp-Fick. If we do admit the play as genuine, the metrics would date it to the same time period as *Alcestis* (see p. 29). *Fabula 113: Nobilem quem quis occidit* tells us that Diomedes killed both Dolon and Rhesus in the Trojan War, the only occurrence of these two names in all of the *Fabulae*. This is consistent with Euripides' play, but the *Iliad* also covers the two major events in this play and this *fabula*, with the deaths of Dolon (10.454-6) and Rhesus (481-97). The index-like nature of this list suggests that perhaps it is a much later addition to the *Fabulae*.

Hector, the other major figure in this play, appears in the *Fabulae* sixteen times,[53] plus one entry title: *Fabula 106: Hectoris lytra*. These entries are generally consistent with the *Iliad*. There is no mention of Hector that coincides with the events of Rhesus, which may well indicate that the author of this *fabula* is not familiar with the play. Omitted are the slaughter of the Thracians and the theft of Rhesus' team of horses, which are found in both Euripides' *Rhesus* and Homer's *Iliad* (10.472-510). This suggests that, rather than using Euripides or Homer as a source, the author of *Fabula 113* is using an

---

[50] Seaford (1984) 51.
[51] Seaford (1984), citing Thuc. 6.2 and Strabo 1.2.9, notes that although this location is not Homeric, it is not original to Euripides either.
[52] Such authors did exist. See Davies (1989) 6-8, who lists Proclus Χρεστομάθια as one example.
[53] *Fab.* 90.2; 103.5; 106.11, 13, 16; 107.2, 11; 109.8; 111.3; 112.7, 8 (*bis*), 13 (*bis*); 113.2; 115.2.

epitome of Homer.

2.3 Ion

While Rhesus appears only once, the name of Ion does not appear at all in the *Fabulae*. Nevertheless, it is worth looking at some of the other major characters of the play in order to determine whether the author(s) of the *Fabulae* is ignorant of the play, or is choosing to omit the particular tradition of myth presented by Euripides. While the name of Xuthus, like his "son" Ion, is absent from the *Fabulae*, Creusa's is not.

In Euripides' *Ion*, Creusa, daughter of Erechtheus (*Ion* 10-11), is mother of Ion. There are three figures named Creusa in the *Fabulae*, and each is mentioned once. The first is the daughter of Creon, slain by Medea (25.10), who is also identified as Glauce in the same passage (25.6). This figure will be discussed below (see p. 47). The second Creusa is last in the list of Priam's children (90.12). Only the third is the daughter of Erectheus, and so could correspond to the figure found in Euripides' play. Here, however, she is listed only as the mother of Cephalus, son of Hermes (160.3). In two other passages of the *Fabulae*, Cephalus is the son of Deion or Pandion (189.2, 270.6).[54] According to Ps.-Apollodorus, however, the mother of Cephalus is not Creusa, but Herse (3.14.3) or Diomede (1.9.4, a daughter of Xuthus, to whom Creusa is married in *Ion*). Cephalus' father in the latter passage is Hermes, though in other passages in the *Library*, it is Deion (1.9.4; 3.15.1). Ps.-Apollodorus seems aware of the Creusa from *Ion*: she is recognized as both the daughter of Erectheus and the mother of Ion in the same passage

[54] There is some great confusion over the names here, by which no one seems bothered. In *Fabula 189: Procris*, Pandion is the father of Procris, wife to Cephalus. Rose (1934) 189 notes that the likely father of Procris is actually Erechtheus (and that Pandion may actually be the same figure as Erechtheus), which would then make it consistent with *Fabula 253: Quae contra fas concubuerunt*. If this is the case, might not the name of Pandion been intended for Cephalus' father? The text may easily have been corrupted at this point, and this emendation would make *Fabulae 189* and *270* consistent with each other.

(1.7.3).

It would seem that the *Fabulae* are not aware of Xuthus or Creusa as the parents of Ion, nor of Ion himself. Ion's absence from two indices is significant. He is not listed in *Fabula 161: Apollonis filii*, which shows that the story of Creusa's rape by Apollo is not known to any fabulist. Neither Ion or Xuthus are present in *Fabula 48: Reges Atheniensium.*

2.4 Helen

Unlike the previous characters who rarely appear in the *Fabulae*, Helen is mentioned fifteen times.[55] In addition to these, there are two entry titles with the name Helen: *Fabulae 79: Helena* and *81: Proci Helenae.*

There is very little that coincides with the subject matter of any extant play that includes Helen as a character. Often she is mentioned in relation to her family. *Fabula 77: Leda*, tells us that she and Pollux are the children of Jupiter by Leda, while Castor and Clytemnestra are the children of Tyndareus. Immediately following that, *Fabula 78: Tyndareus*, tells us that Tyndareus fathered Clytemnestra and Helen, [56] a detail unique to the *Fabulae*.[57] There is no attempt within the *Fabulae* to reconcile these two versions. However, this is the only mention of Tyndareus as Helen's father in the *Fabulae*, while Jupiter is twice more mentioned in this role (80.19; 240.3).

Much of the subject matter concerning Helen in the *Fabulae* is beyond the scope of any of the extant plays that feature Helen as a character. *Fabula 78*, after reporting

---

[55] *Fab.* 77.4; 78.3,4, 9; 79.3, 13; 80.19; 92.13, 18; 118.10; 122.17; 224.4; 240.3; 249.4; 270.5.
[56] The verb is *procreauit.* Grant's translation, "became the father of" is inaccurate, as it could be interpreted to have the sense of "adopted," which would suggest a reconciliation of the two traditions that does not exist in the *Fabulae.*
[57] *EGM*, 319 states that no source makes this suggestion without considering this passage.

Helen's parentage, focuses on Helen choosing Menelaus as her husband. *Fabula 79: Helena* has, in fact, little to do with Helen:

> Theseus Aegei et Aethrae Pitthei filiae filius cum Pirithoo Ixionis filio Helenam Tyndarei et Ledae filiam uirginem de fano Dianae sacrificantem rapuerunt et detulerunt Athenas in pagum Atticae regionis. quod Iouis eos cum uidisset tantam audaciam habere ut se ipsi ad periculum offerrent, in quiete eis imperauit ut peterent ambo a Plutone Pirithoo Proserpinam in coniugium; qui cum per insulam Taenariam ad inferos descendissent et de qua re uenissent indicarent Plutoni, a furiis strati diuque lacerati sunt. quo Hercules ad canem tricipitem ducendum cum uenisset, illi fidem eius implorarunt; qui a Plutone impetrauit eosque incolumes eduxit. ob Helenam Castor et Pollux fratres belligerarunt et Aethram Thesei matrem et Phisadiem[58] Pirithoi sororem ceperunt et in seruitutem sorori dederunt.
>
> Theseus, son of Aegeus and Aethra, daughter of Pittheus, along with Pirithous, son of Ixion, carried off the maiden Helen, daughter of Tyndareus and Leda, from the shrine of Diana while she was sacrificing, and took her to Athens, to a district of the Attic region. When Jove saw that they had such audacity as to expose themselves to danger, he bade them in a dream both go and ask Pluto on Pirithous' part for Proserpina in marriage. When they had descended to the Land of the Dead through the peninsula Taenarus, and had informed Pluto why they had come, they were stretched out and tortured for a long time by the Furies. When Hercules came to lead out the three-headed dog, they begged his promise of protection. He obtained the favor from Pluto, and brought them out unharmed. Castor and Pollux, Helen's brothers, fought for her sake, and took Aethra, Theseus' mother, and Phisadie, Pirithous' sister, and gave them in servitude to their sister.

The dream that sends Theseus and Pirithous into the underworld appears to be unique to this passage, which indicates an unknown source for this *fabula*. We are also told in this *fabula* of Aethra and Phisadie,[59] mother and sister to Theseus and Pirithous, who are enslaved for Helen by Castor and Pollux. *Fabula 81* is an index listing those who were

[58] Rose rightly marks this word as corrupt. The sense is in any case clear.
[59] Thisidae at *Fabula* 92.20.

suitors to Helen. *Fabula 92: Iudicium Paridis* mentions her as Venus' reward in the judgment of Paris, and she is taken from Menelaus' household by Paris. The fact that, in this *fabula*, Helen is allowed to take two handmaidens to Troy with her suggests that Hyginus is here recording a Helen willing to go to Troy. She also appears willing in *Fabula 270: Qui formosissimi fuerunt*, where she follows Paris to Troy: *Paris...quem Helena secuta est* (270.5). *Fabula 249: Faces sceleratae* records Helen waving the firebrand from the walls of Troy.

There are two more *fabulae* that need to be discussed. *Fabula 122: Aletes* has the only mention of Helen as the mother of Hermione in the *Fabulae*. Orestes' marriage to Hermione is consistent with Euripides' *Orestes*, which will be discussed below (see p. 61). *Fabula 118: Proteus* is the only entry that mentions Menelaus' presence in Egypt on the way home from Troy. However, the account of Menelaus in Egypt is so radically different than the events described in Euripides' *Helen*, that the play cannot here be a source. There is simply no mention of the phantom Helen which, according to Euripides' *Helen* (follwing a tradition established by Stesichorus[60]), went to Troy in the stead of the real Helen.

2.5 Suppliant Women

There is little to indicate that Hyginus was aware of *Suppliant Women*. Aethra is only mentioned as mother of Theseus and slave of Helen (79.13-16), and is discussed in the previous section.

2.6 Electra

There are three figures in the *Fabulae* who bear the name Electra; the daughter of

[60] Frazer (1921) 175.

Agamemnon is mentioned seven times.[61]

There is no action of Electra mentioned in the *Fabulae* that falls within the scope of Euripides' *Electra*, strongly suggesting that the events of that play are not known to any author of the *Fabulae*, even though they are treated by all three of the major playwrights. The popularity of the house of Atreus in fifth-century drama makes it difficult to identify any single play as a source for the *Fabulae*. We have mention of Electra being used as the bribe put forward by the Greek army at Troy that causes Polymestor to attempt the murder of Polydorus in *Fabula 109: Ilione*. We are told in *Fabula 254: Quae piissimae uel qui piissimi* that she is faithful to her brother Orestes. Her only involvement in the murder of Clytemnestra, as far as the *Fabulae* are concerned, is in *Fabula 117: Clytemnestra*, where we are told *Electra Agamemnonis filia Orestem fratrem infantem sustulit* (117.8-9). Her role in the plot against Clytemnestra seems to end with her saving Orestes as a child, unlike in Aeschylus' *Libations Bearers*, or the Electra plays of both Sophocles and Euripides.

The only other mention of Electra is in *Fabula 122: Aletes*, which will be discussed below (see p. 62).

2.7 Trojan Women and Hecuba

These two plays both follow events immediately following the Trojan War and will be dealt with together. The reception of Helen by Menelaus at the end of the Trojan War, described in *Trojan Women*, is not mentioned at all. In fact, there is little in the *Fabulae* to indicate awareness of the story found in *Trojan Women*. Talthybius is mentioned only once in all the *Fabulae*: he is listed as a herald in *Fabula 97: Qui ad*

[61] *Fab.* 109.11; 117.8; 122.2, 6, 10, 19; 254.4. The other two Electras are one of the Danaids (170.15) and one of the Pliades (pr. 16, 35; 155.10; 192.18, 19; 250.9).

Troiam expugnatem ierunt et quot naues (97.52), which records none of his actions in the Trojan War or its aftermath. It is also worth noting that Talthybius is not mentioned in the catalogue of ships in Book 2 of the *Iliad*. The throwing of Astyanax from the walls of Troy is mentioned only briefly in *Fabula 109: Ilione* (and there is no hint of Talthybius taking the child, as in *Trojan Women* 785), along with the bribing of Polymestor to kill Polydorus.

The enslavement of Hecuba to Ulysses, explicit first in Euripides in *Trojan Women*,[62] is mentioned only once, in *Fabula 111: Hecuba*, but there it is mentioned alongside her transformation into a dog, which is not mentioned in *Trojan Women*. In all, Hecuba appears in the *Fabulae* only nine times,[63] plus the entry title of *Fabula 111*.

There is another element common to Euripides and the *Fabulae*. Many sources agree that Astyanax was thrown from the battlements of the city of Troy.[64] However, this *fabula* agrees with Euripides and Seneca in saying that Astyanax was killed in cold blood after the Trojan War rather than during the war itself, or even during the actual sacking of Troy, a time at which emotions might be expected to run high.[65]

There is some discrepancy with the members of Hecuba's family. In Euripides' *Hecuba*, Polydorus identifies himself as Ἑκάβης παῖς γεγὼς τῆς Κισσέως (*Hec.* 3). This is inconsistent with other traditions of the myth of Polydorus:

> [The genealogies] presented here are in all likelihood the playwright's own invention. In the *Iliad* (21.84-85) Polydorus is the son of Laothoë rather than Hecuba; his reassignment here is fundamental to Euripides' plot, which

[62] *EGM* 661.
[63] *Fab.* 91.3, 7; 93.2; 109.2; 111.2; 243.2; 249.2; 256.4; 270.5.
[64] Eur. *Tro.* 719-739, 1133-1135, *And.* 8-11; Pausanias 10.26.9; Quintus Smyrnaeus *Posthomerica* 13.251-257; Tryphiodorus *Excidium Ilii* 644-646; Tzetzes *Schol.* on Lycophron 1263; *Schol.* on Euripides *And.* 10; Ovid *Metamorphoses* 13.415-417; Seneca *Tro.* 524, 1063; Ps.-Apollodorus *Epitome* 5.22.
[65] Frazer (1921) 239.

> is postulated on a mother's loss of two children in succession. Euripides diverges further from the *Iliad* by making Hecuba's father not Dymas (*Il.* 16.718) but Kisseus. The playwright seems to have assimilated Hecuba's father to Kisses, the Thracian king who is mentioned by Homer (*Il.* 6.299, 11.223) as father of Theano and grandfather of Iphidamas.[66]

Hecuba's parentage three times is mentioned three times in the *Fabulae*, and each time Cisseus is named first, and Dymas is the alternative. *Fabula 111: Hecuba* indicates that Hyginus thinks Cisseus the prime candidate for Hecuba's father: *Ulixes Hecubam Cissei filiam, uel ut alii auctores dicunt Dymantis...duceret* (111.2-3). Homer is among the *allii auctores*. The other two instances are less specific, but still list Cisseus first, with *siue Dymantis* added in apposition (91.3; 243.2). Apollodorus has it the other way round, and adds a third figure, the river Sangarius:

> Πρίαμος...ἔγημεν Ἑκάβην τὴν Δύμαντος, ἢ ὡς τινές φασι Κισσέως, ἢ ὡς ἕτεροι λέγουσι Σαγγαρίου ποταμοῦ καὶ Μετώπης.
>
> Priam...married Hecuba, daughter of Dymas, or as some say of Cisseus, or as some others say of the river Sangarius and Metope. (Ap. 3.12.5)[67]

Ultimately, as Gregory notes in the passage above, Homer appears to be the original source for Dymas, while Cisseus is Euripides' invention. Virgil follows the Euripidean tradition (*Aeneid* 7.320; 10.705).

The events that come closest to overlapping with Hecuba are those found in *Fabula 109: Ilione*:

> Priamo Polydorus filius ex Hecuba cum esset natus, Ilionae filiae suae dederunt eum educandum, quae Polymestori regi Thracum erat nupta, quem illa pro filio suo educauit; Deipylum autem quem ex Polymestore procreauerat, pro

[66] Gregory (1999) 40 (l.3); see also *EGM* 561.
[67] Frazer (1921) 45 n.3 notes more sources for both Cisseus (Nicander) and Dymas (Pherecydes).

suo fratre educauit, ut si alteri eorum quid foret, parentibus praestaret. sed cum Achiui Troia capta prolem Priami exstirpare uellent, Astyanacta Hectoris et Andromachae filium de muro deiecerunt et ad Polymestorerm legatos miserunt, qui ei Agamemnonis filiam nomine Electram pollicerentur in coniugium et auri magnam copiam, si Polydorum Priami filium interfecisset. Polymestor legatorum dicta non repudiauit, Deipylumque filium Priami interfecisse. Polydorus autem ad oraculum Apollinis de parentibus suis sciscitatum est profectus, cui responsum est patriam incensam, patrem occisum, matrem in seruitute teneri. cum inde rediret et uidit aliter esse ac sibi responsum fuit <ratus> se Polymestoris esse filium, ab sorore Ilionea inquisit quid ita aliter sortes dixissent; cui soror quid ueri esset patefecit, et eius consilio Polymestorem luminibus priuauit atque interfecit.

When Polydorus, son of Priam by Hecuba, was born, they gave him to Priam's daughter Ilione to be reared. She was the wife of Polymestor, King of the Thracians, and she brought him up as her own son. She brought up Deipylus, whom she had conceived by Polymestor, as if he were her brother, so that if anything happened to either of them she could give the other to her parents. But when, after the fall of Troy, the Achaeans wanted to destroy the race of Priam, they cast down Astyanax from the walls, and sent messengers to Polymestor promising him Electra in marriage if he would put Polydorus, son of Priam, to death. Polymestor did not oppose the words of the ambassadors, and slew his own son Deipylus unwittingly, thinking he had killed Polydorus, son of Priam. Polydorus, however, went to the oracle of Apollo to inquire about his parents, and was told that his city was burned, his father killed, and his mother held in servitude. When he returned and saw that things were not as the oracle had said...thinking he was the son of Polymestor, he asked his sister Ilione why the oracle had spoken falsely. His sister revealed the truth to him, and by her advice he blinded Polymestor and killed him.

The *fabula* tells the story of Polydorus, who is given away at birth to Ilione, wife of Polymestor, to be raised. Polymestor, bribed by the Greeks, attempts to kill Polydorus, but accidentally kills Deipylus, his own son. When Polydorus learns his true parentage, he blinds Polymestor and then kills him. There are obvious inconsistencies in this entry:

the blinding of Polymestor is redundant if he is to be killed as well. Not only does the blinding of Polymestor appear to be original to *Hecuba*, included for surprise and shock value,[68] but even Polymestor himself appears to be an Euripidean invention.[69] Despite the presence of Polymestor, however, there are many differences between Euripides' *Hecuba* and this entry: Polymestor, in *Hecuba*, acts of his own volition and desire for gold sent with Polydorus; in *Fabula 109*, he is bribed by the Greeks with marriage to Electra. The murder of Deipylus and survival of Polydorus indicate that the author of this *fabula* is preserving a very different tradition of myth. The element of the blinding of Polydorus, common to Euripides and *Fabula 109*, is redundant in the *fabula*. This one common element is enough perhaps to link Euripides to *Fabula 109* as a secondary source or perhaps to assume a post-Euripidean tradition, but this *fabula* must originally be constructed from a different source.

Twice Hecuba's dream in which she gives birth to a firebrand is mentioned (91.3; 249.2), but this fits into the discussion of *Alexander* (see p. 90).

2.8 Heraclidae

Iolaus is mentioned often in the *Fabulae*, partly because, due to his rejuvenated youth, he figures in several generations of myth. He is an Argonaut (14.112), he participates in the Calydonian boar hunt (173.5), and he is the first to die in the Trojan War (103.6). That this is the same figure every time is shown by the fact that he is invariably referred to as the son of Iphicles. It is interesting to note that, though Iolaus is recorded through all these stories, there is no mention of his rejuvenation or any attempt

[68] Collard (1991) 185 notes that we would expect Polymnestor to be killed, and Mossman (1995) 190-2 suggests that his blinding would have had a stronger effect on the Athenian audience than the murder of his children.
[69] Mossman (1995) 30; *EGM* 660.

to explain why he is able to participate in events belonging to different generations. This may be the result of different authors recording different events in the life of Iolaus or of negligence. The author of *Fabula 10*, in contrast, feels the need to explain the extreme age of Nestor, saying that Apollo granted him the years taken from his father and brothers when they were slain by Hercules (10.8-10).

Alcmene, the other major figure in *Heraclidae*, receives little attention in the *Fabulae*. Generally she is only mentioned in passing as Heracles' mother.[70] The only exception is *Fabula 29: Alcimena*:

> Amphitryon cum abesset ad expugnandum Oechaliam, Alcimena aestimans Iouem coniugem suum esse, eum thalamis recepit. qui cum in thalamos uenisset et ei referet quae in Oechalia gessisset, ea credens coniugem esse cum eo concubuit. qui tam libens cum ea concubuit ut unum diem usurparet, duas noctes congeminaret, ita ut Alcimena tam longam noctem ammiraretur. postea cum nuntiaretur ei coniugem uictorem adesse, minime curauit, quod iam putabat se coniugem suum uidisse. qui cum Amphitryon in regiam intrasset et eam uideret neglegentius securam, mirari coepit et queri quod se aduenientem non excepisset; cui Alcimena respondit: Iam pridem uenisti et mecum concubuisti et mihi narrasti quae in Oechalia gessisses. quae cum signa omnia diceret, sensit Amphitryon numen aliquod fuisse pro se, ex qua die cum ea non concubuit, quae ex Ioue compressa peperit Herculem.
>
> When Amphitryon was away subduing Oechalia, Alcimena, thinking Jove was her husband, received him in her chamber. When he had entered her room, and told her what he had done in Oechalia, she lay with him, thinking he was her husband. He lay with her with so much pleasure, that he spent one day and doubled two nights, so that Alcimena wondered at such a long night. Later when the word came to her that her husband was at hand, she showed no concern, because she thought she had already seen her husband. When Amphitryon came in the palace, and saw her carelessly unconcerned, he began to wonder and to complain that she did not welcome him when he

[70] *Fab.* 14.55; 155.3; 224.3; 240.5.

> appeared. Alcimena replied: You already came and lay with me, and told me what you had done in Oechalia. When she had given him all the evidence, Amphitryon realized that some divinity had assumed his form, and from that day did not lie with her. But she, from the embrace of Jove, bore Hercules.

This *fabula* is most similar to the account that survives in Plautus' *Amphitryon* (which itself may be an adaptation of a Greek source): Amphitryo returns from war (though *Fabula 29* records Oechalia as his foe, while all other extant accounts record Teleboea)[71] to find that his wife has spent a supernaturally extended night with Jupiter. Amphitryo's subsequent refusal to touch his wife, though found in this *fabula*, is absent in Plautus. This refusal is also absent from the fragments of Euripides' *Alcmene*. The Plautine play ends, in fact, with Amphitryo entering his house to spend time with his wife. Overall, however, the two accounts are similar, and this similarity would seem to rule out Euripides as a source. Plautus' *Rudens* 85-7 tells us that the *Alcmene* of Euripides featured a great wind storm:

> detexit uentus uillam – quid uerbas opust?
> non uentus fuit – uerum Alcumena Euripidi,
> ita omnis de tecto deturbant tegulas;
>
> The wind deroofed the house – what good are those words?
> That was no wind – it was in fact Euripides' Alcmene
> how it took all the tiles from the roof.[72]

Fragments and vase evidence suggest that the storm is one sent to put out the flames of a pyre, on which Amphitryo, assisted by Antenor, is attempting to burn Alcmene, whom he believes to be unfaithful.[73] This rainstorm appears to have been a central event in Euripides' play. That it is absent suggests another source is being used both by Plautus

[71] The Teleboans are part of the narrative by at least as early as the sixth century BCE, where they appear in the *Scutum*, attributed to Hesiod.
[72] Sedgewick (1960) 2.
[73] Webster (1967) 93; see Christenson (2000) 48.

and Hyginus. Sedgewick suggests the lost *Amphitryon* of Sophocles as Plautus' source. This is an attractive idea, particularly given the matching titles to the two plays, but there is so little evidence from Sophocles' play that we cannot do more than speculate.[74]

2.9 Medea

The name Medea appears in the *Fabulae* thirty-two times in the body of the text.[75] There are also two occurrences in entry titles: *Fabulae 25: Medea* and *26: Medea exul.* This is a lot, compared to almost all figures discussed in this chapter (only Hercules is mentioned more often), and is due in part to the amount of time spent on the story of the *Argonautica* in the *Fabulae.*

Fabula 14, Argonautae convocati, by far the longest entry in the *Fabulae*, mentions Medea only once. She is mentioned as the aunt of Argus,[76] Melas, Phrontides and Cylindrus, who join the Argonauts on their journey to Colchis after being found on the island of Dia. Rose suggests that *hoc caput magna ex parte manufeste Apollonii Rhodii scholiastae debetur.*[77] The *Argonautica* appears to be a primary source for this *fabula* either directly, or through a scholiast, with supplements from another source or

---

[74] Only one fragment can be assigned with confidence (Fr.122 = Schol. LR on O.C. 390) and it only raises more questions without answering any:

> ἐπεὶ δὲ βλάστοι, τῶν τριῶν μίαν λαβεῖν
> εὔσοιαν ἀρκεῖ
> And when it has come into being, it is enough for one
> of the three to attain safety.

See Lloyd-Jones (1996) 48-9.

[75] Pr. 77; *Fab.* 3.21; 14.143; 21.13, 14; 22.13, 15 (*bis*), 17, 20; 23.2, 12, 15, 16, 21; 24.4, 8, 14, 16, 19; 25.2, 7, 11; 26.2, 4, 7, 10; 27.6, 9; 182.6; 239.3; 275.12.

[76] There is some confusion with Argus' place in the myth. He is a son of Phrixus and Chalciope in the *Fabulae* (14.143-5), Apollonius (2.1119) and Ps.-Apollodorus (1.9.1). However, Ps.-Apollodorus identifies him as the Argus who built the Argo (1.9.16), while both Hyginus and Apollonius keep him separate (Apollonius identifies the ship-building Argus as a son of Arestor).

[77] Rose (1934) 14.

sources: *Fabula 14*, for instance, lists more Argonauts than Apollonius.[78]

The first three entries, that concern the story of Jason and Medea, are mostly consistent with the *Argonautica*. *Fabula 21: Phrixi filii* differs with the mention of Medea recognizing Jason from a dream sent by Juno, which may be from an Alexandrian source.[79] *Fabula 22: Aeeta* is also consistent, except for an oracle given to Aeetes that he would maintain his rule of Colchis as long the Golden Fleece remained on the shrine of Mars. There is no known source for this oracle. The murder of Absyrtus in *Fabula 23: Absyrtus* follows the judgment of Alcinous and marriage of Jason and Medea, rather than preceding it, as in the *Argonautica*. The judgment and marriage, however, do correspond well with *Argonautica* 4.1106-69.

Here the similarities to the *Argonautica* of course end, as the *Fabulae* pass beyond the events described by Apollonius. *Fabula 24: Iason: Peliades* covers the events between the *Argonautica* and Euripides' *Medea*. Although we do know of a *Peliades* of Euripides, the fragments are not very helpful in determining content. There is some resemblance here to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 6.297-351, which describes the destruction of Pelias by his daughters through the trickery of Medea. However, there is far too much information omitted by Ovid for him to serve as a source for this *fabula*: Medea bidding Jason to hide their ship (24.5); Alcestis challenging Medea's abilities (24.8); Jason's taking over the palace (24.14) or their subsequent flight to Corinth (24.15). The names of the daughter's of Pelias are also absent, though names are a more difficult detail by which to identify source. Errors can be made, as in *Fabula 14* when

[78] Apollonius lists 55; this *fabula* has 67. The extremes are found in Apollodorus, who lists the fewest (only 45) and the scholia to Lycophron, which lists 100, see Bouriaud (1997) 19.
[79] Rose (1934) 25.

the Argonauts pick up Cylindrus instead of Cytisorus.[80] Names can also be supplied to fill in gaps in information, as we see in *Fabula 25: Medea*, which seems to be based closely on the events of the play:

> Aeetae Medea et Idyiae filia cum ex Iasone iam filios Mermerum et Pheretem procreasset summaque Concordia uiuerent, obiciebatur ei hominem tam fortem ac formosum ac nobilem uxorem aduenam atque ueneficam habere. huic Creon Menoeci filius rex Corinthius filiam suam minorem Glaucen dedit uxorem. Medea cum uidit se erga Iasonem bene merentem tanta contumelia esse affectam, coronam ex uenenis fecit auream eamque muneri filios suos iussit nouercae dare. Medea ubi regiam ardere uidit, natos suos ex Iasone Mermerum et Pheretem inerfecit et profugit a Corintho.
>
> When Medea, daughter of Aeetes and Idyia, had already borne to Jason sons – Mermerus and Pheres – and they were living in great harmony, it was cast in his teeth that a man so brave and handsome and noble should have as wife a foreigner and sorceress. To him, Creon, son of Menoecus, King of Corinth, gave his younger daughter Glauce as wife. When Medea saw that she, who had been Jason's benefactress, was treated with scorn, with the help of poisonous drugs she made a golden crown, and she bade her sons give it as a gift to their stepmother. Creusa took the gift, and was burned to death along with Jason and Creon. When Medea saw that the palace was on fire, she slew Mermerus and Pheres, her sons by Jason and fled from Corinth.

Names have been supplied, both for the children of Medea, and for the daughter of Creon. In the *Fabulae*, Creusa is also named Glauce and Medea's sons are named Mermerus and Pheres. Glauke is named in the manuscript *hypothesis*, and may be so named in the papyrus as well.[81] The naming of the children is consistent with a number of other sources, including Ps.-Apollodorus 1.9.28, Pausanias 2.3.6 and a *scholion* to

[80] Rose (1934) attributes this mistake, which is repeated in *Fabula 3*, to Hyginus.
[81] Huys (1997) 12 and Luppe (1984) 54.

Medea 117.[82] Some discrepancies do exist: the use of only a crown, without a garment, as the instrument of murder; the death of Jason with Creon and Creusa and the burning of the palace. However, fire plays an important role in the death of Creusa as described in the messenger speech of Euripides' *Medea* (1186-1202). It is a not unnatural development in the tradition to expound the role of fire to consume the whole palace, and if Jason were thought to be present, his death would also be included. The murder of the children seems redundant after the death of Jason: the intentional killing of the children seems to be an Euripidean invention, and no source mentions any other motivation except for revenge.[83]

Fabulae 26 and *27* take place following the events of the play, with Medea's marriage to Aegeus, and the story of Medus, who is not mentioned in any pre-Alexandrian source.[84]

2.10 Hippolytus

The name of Hippolytus occurs eight times in the *Fabulae*,[85] plus one instance as an entry title, *Fabula 47: Hippolytus*. The fullest account in the *Fabulae* is found in *Fabula 47*, and so it would be worthwhile to contrast both plays with this *fabula*:

> Phaedra Minois filia Thesei uxor Hippolytum priuignum suum adamauit; quem cum non potuisset ad suam perducere uoluntatem, tabellas scriptas ad suum uirum misit, se ab Hippolyto compressam esse, seque ipsa suspendio necauit. et Theseus re audita filium suum moenibus excedere iussit et optauit a Neptuno patre filio suo exitium. itaque cum Hippolytus equis iunctis ueheretur, repente e mari Taurus apparuit, cuius mugitu equi expauefacti Hippolytum distraxerunt uitaque

[82] Page (1938) lvi.
[83] *EGM* 369-371.
[84] Grant (1960) 45.
[85] *Fab.* 47.2,5,8,9; 49.3; 243.21; 250.5; 251.10.

priuarunt.

> Phaedra, daughter of Minos and wife of Theseus, loved her stepson Hippolytus. When she could not bend him to her desire, she sent a letter to her husband saying that she had been attacked by Hippolytus, and slew herself by hanging. Theseus, when he heard this, ordered his son to leave the city and prayed to Neptune his father for his son's death. And so when Hippolytus was driving his team of horses, a bull suddenly appeared from the sea. The horses, terrified at its bellowing, dragged Hippolytus, rending him limb from limb, and caused his death.

Because Euripides wrote two Hippolytus plays, there are two traditions that might in this case be considered "Euripidean." There is little known about the original *Hippolytus*, also known as *Hippolytus Kalyptomenos*.[86] From the fragments, it appears that Theseus banishes his son in a face-to-face confrontation. It is unclear whether the exile was ordered in the same way in the above entry, or whether it was done in Hippolytus' absence, as is the case in the second play. More certain in the fragments is the order of events surrounding Phaedra's suicide. In *Kalyptomenos*, Phaedra does not kill herself until after Hippolytus' banishment, and perhaps even after his death.[87] This is not the order of events in *Fabula 47*.

There is only one point that is in direct conflict with Euripides' second play, *Hippolytus Stephanias*. While Phaedra's accusatory suicide note is delivered to Theseus in the above entry the suicide note in Euripides is found in her hand, after she has hanged herself. The delivery of the note is the only detail in *Fabula 47* to contradict directly Euripides' second *Hippolytus*, and it is on these grounds that Huys dismisses the play as a source for this *fabula*. Huys then notes (and ultimately seems to reject) the possibility

---

[86] Pollux 9.50 and a variant *Katakalyptomenos* in *schol.* Theocritus 2.10. The second play is known both as *Hippolytus Stephanias* (arg. *Hipp.* 28) and *Stephanephoros* (Stobaeus 4.44.34, Hesychius s.v. ἀνασειράζω, and some medieval mss.) see Barrett (1964) 10.
[87] Halleran (1995) 27.

that the *fabula* derives from the first Hippolytus play,[88] though as noted above, the sequence of events indicated by the fragments makes this seem unlikely. A number of plot developments unique to *Stephanias* are omitted in this *fabula*. One such device is found in the prologue: "Euripides...was impelled towards the introduction of Aphrodite into his play by the decision that Phaedra should not herself declare her passion to Hippolytus."[89] Aphrodite is not mentioned in *Fabula 47*. The character of the nurse, who betrays Phaedra's confidence and informs Hippolytus of Phaedra's love, is omitted entirely, even though she is integral to the plot (again to prevent Phaedra from confronting Hippolytus with her love). The nurse appears to have been a character in the earlier Hippolytus as well, though the nature of the role is uncertain.[90]

Two more entries correspond well with the extant play, but again, contain no identifying features of Euripides' *Hippolytus*. *Fabula 243: Quae ipsae interfecerunt* tells us that Phaedra dies by hanging herself, which is how she dies in the second play. *Fabula 250: Quae quadrigae rectores suos perdiderunt* further corresponds by outlining the death of Hippolytus after being dragged by his own horses. This entry, however, includes a detail not found in Euripides, when it provides the name Antiope for Hippolytus' mother. In Euripides, she is mentioned only four times and only referred to as Ἀμαζών.[91] This is consistent with what we have seen in other entries. For instance, the names of Medea's children, Mermerus and Pheres, are added by the author of *Fabula 25*. The difference here, however, is that the *hypothesis* for *Hippolytus* also provides a name, though the name given there is Hippolyta.

---

[88] Huys (1997) 175. The possibility of connecting *Fabula 47* to the first play is found in Luppe (1994) 32.
[89] Griffin (1990) 135.
[90] Halleran (1995) 26.
[91] Barrett (1964) 8 n. 3. Hippolytus' mother is mentioned at lines 10, 307, 351, 581.

Fabulae 251: Qui licentia parcarum ab inferis redierunt and *49: Aesculapius* are both beyond the scope of the play, mentioning the possible resurrection of Hippolytus by Aesculapius. Here the source may well be *Aeneid* 7.761, which, like *Fabula 251*, mentions the renaming of Hippolytus as Virbius. *Fabula 49*, however, carries on beyond the resurrection of Hippolytus to outline the same events mentioned in the prologue of *Alcestis*: as punishment for resurrecting a mortal, Jupiter destroys Aesculapius with a thunderbolt. In retaliation, Apollo destroys the Cyclopes, who forged the thunderbolts, and his punishment was a year of hard labor in the service of Admetus.

2.11 Andromache

The name of Andromache appears only twice in the *Fabulae*. In *Fabula 109: Ilione*, she is simply named as the mother of Astyanax.[92] As mother of Astyanax, Andromache is here consistent with any other tradition of myth in which she figures. The second mention of Andromache, however, is more interesting. *Fabula 123: Neoptolemus* bears considerable resemblance to Euripides' *Andromache*:

> Neoptolemus Achillis et Deidamiae filius ex Andromacha Eetionis filia captiua procreauit Amphialum. sed postquam audiuit Hermionen sponsam suam Oresti esse datam in coniugium, Lacedaemonem uenit et a Menelao sponsam suam petit. cui ille fidem suam infirmare noluit, Hermionenque ab Orestes iniuria accepta Neoptolemum Delphis sacrificantem occidit et Hermionen recuperauit; cuius ossa per fines Ambraciae sparsa sunt, quae est in Epiri regionibus.
>
> Neoptolemus, son of Achilles and Deidamia, begat Amphialus by captive Andromache, daughter of Eetion. But after he heard that Hermione his betrothed had been given to Orestes in marriage, he went to Lacedaemon and demanded her from Menelaus. Menelaus did not wish to go back on his word, and took Hermione from Orestes and

[92] Grant chooses to omit this information in her translation.

> gave her to Neoptolemus. Orestes, thus insulted, slew Neoptolemus as he was sacrificing to Delphi, and recovered Hermione. The bones of Neoptolemus were scattered through the land of Ambracia, which is in the district of Epirus.

As Rose notes, this entry *uix digitum latum ab Andromache Euripidis discedit* ("scarcely strays a finger's breadth from Euripides' *Andromache*").[93] We learn of Orestes losing Hermione through the judgment of Menelaus in the scene between Orestes and Hermione, particularly through Orestes' speech at *And.* 957-986. Neoptolemus' death at the hands of Orestes may well be Euripidean invention.[94] Huys disagrees with Rose, based on some minor details: the absence of Helenus, whom Hermione will apparently marry (*And.* 1245); the fact that Neoptolemus requests Hermione from Orestes rather than from Menelaus; the naming of the child; the burial of Neoptolemus.[95] The latter two complaints will be shown below to be minor corruptions from later traditions. The involvement of Andromache in the story at all seems to be purely Euripidean in invention,[96] and so the tradition is, though augmented from other sources, Euripidean. *Fabula 122: Aletes* may suggest awareness of other traditions, when it states that Orestes married Hermione *Neoptolemo interfecto*, which may or may not imply Orestes' involvement in Neoptolemus' death. We do know that Sophocles wrote a *Hermione* (= *Phthiotides*?[97]). We have a summary of that play given by Eustathius (*Od.* 1479.10) that tells us the play was concerned with Orestes receiving Hermione, in the absence of Menelaus. She is taken from Orestes by Menelaus and given to Neoptolemus. However, Neoptolemus is killed at Delphi (there is no mention of Orestes being involved) and

---

[93] Rose (1934) 88.
[94] Lloyd (1994) 2. Stevens (1971) 5.
[95] Huys (1997) 25.
[96] *EGM* 693.
[97] Lloyd-Jones (1996) 331.

Hermione is restored to Orestes. We have no date for *Hermione*, and the date of *Andromache* itself is uncertain,[98] and so we cannot say which play came first. The messenger speech at 1085-1165 is consistent with what we read here in *Fabula 123*.

There are two more points where this *fabula* differs from the play, which are easily answered. The first is the inclusion of names not found in Euripides' play. This *fabula* is alone in naming the child Amphialus.[99] In the play he is only referred to as a male child (*And.* 24, 26, 47 etc). Furthermore, Andromache's father is nameless in Euripides, while the fabulist assigns him the name Eetion. With this name, *Fabula 123* is not alone: Homer and Ps.-Apollodorus both use the name Eetion (*Il.* 6.395; *Lib.* 3.12.6). As we have seen in the sections on *Medea* and *Hippolytus*, to supply a name to a nameless character is not uncommon in the *Fabulae* and does not mean that the author of this *fabula* is drawing from a different source or tradition; he is simply supplementing from another source.

The second point concerns the burial of Neoptolemus. *Andromache* 1239-42 tells us that Neoptolemus is to be buried at Delphi. This *fabula*, however, tells us that his remains are to be spread across Ambracia. Rose here notes a remarkable similarity to the account of Ovid:

---

[98] Stevens (1971) 19, based on what little external evidence exists and metrical evidence, suggests a date for *Andromache* of 425, or perhaps slightly earlier. Cropp-Fick, 23, have more recently dated the play to somewhere around 424-421. Allan (2000) 150 refutes the testimony of the *Schol. And.* 445, which states that the play was produced outside of Athens, and concludes that the play was produced in Athens not long after the start of the Peloponnesian War. The date of *Hermione* is uncertain. Allan (2000) 16 prefers to have *Hermione* predate *Andromache*, but admits that the evidence for this is slim at best.

[99] Rose (1934) 88. see Frazer (1921). The child is named Molossus in Ps.-Apollodorus *Epitome* 4.12; Pausanias 1.11.1; *Schol.* to *Odyssey* 3.188. This name may in fact be more in keeping with Euripides than the one assigned by *Fabula 123*. Ps.-Apollodorus implies that the child was named Molossus because he was conceived in the land of the Molossians. This is where Andromache is fated to go, according to Thetis, after the events of *Andromache*. There she will marry Helenus (who is said by Ps.-Apollodorus to have founded the city of Molossia) and be the mother of a line of kings in that city. The name Molossus is also found in the *hypothesis* to the play attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium, in the *dramatis personae* of the ms, and is accepted by Kovacs (1980) 12n.10, though it is not used in the play.

nec tua quam Pyrrhi felicius ossa quiescant,
sparsa per Ambracias quae iacuere uias.

And let your bones rest no more easily than those of Pyrrhus,
which are spread along the roads of Ambracia. (*Ibis* 303-4)

To this line of Ovid, the scholiast adds that in Ambracia *Orestes a Furiis agitatus ossa illius sparsit* ("Orestes, driven by the furies, spread his bones"). The similarity is not only in subject matter, but language as well, with the repetition of words like *ossa...sparsa per Ambracias*.

2.12 Bacchae

From the *Bacchae*, both Pentheus and Agave are mentioned in the *Fabulae*. Pentheus appears in the *Fabulae* only three times, while Agave appears seven times.[100] Added to these occurrences is the title to *Fabula 184: Pentheus et Agaue.*

Pentheus appears independent of Agave only once, in *Fabula 76: Reges Thebanorum*. Here he is simply the son of Echion and a king of Thebes. As for Agave, *Fabula 179: Semele* mentions her as a daughter of Cadmus. *Fabulae 240: Quae coniuges suos interfecerunt* and *254: Quae piissimae fuerunt uel qui piissimi* both report the story of Agave killing Lycotherses in Illyria in order to give rule of that kingdom to her father, Cadmus. This is outside the scope of the *Bacchae*, and the story seems to be unique to the *Fabulae*.[101] However, we are missing a large portion of Dionysus' final speech in Euripides' play. There seem to be at least fifty lines missing, that were once located between lines 1329 and 1330 of the text as we now have it.[102] The *hypothesis* found in manuscript P tells us that the play ended with Dionysus making an unknown

[100] *Fab.* 76.3; 184.2; 239.11; Fab. 179.4; 184.2, 4, 5; 239.10; 240.4; 254.11.
[101] Grant (1960) 142.
[102] Dodds (1943) in his commentary on this line, notes that the lines have been missing for a relatively short time, citing evidence that scholars up to the twelfth century knew the lines.

announcement to all characters on stage (the foundation of his cult?) and then private announcements to each telling them their fate. It is entirely possible that Agave is told she will travel to Illyria.

If Agave is told she will go to Illyria, *Fabula 184: Pentheus et Agaue* is consistent with *Bacchae*:

> Pentheus Echionis et Agaues filius Liberum negauit deum esse nec mysteria eius accipere uoluit. ob hoc eum Agaue mater cum sororibus Ino et Autonoe per insaniam a Libero obiectam membratim laniauit. Agaue ut suae mentis compos facta est et uidit se Liberi impulsu tantum scelus admisisse, profuguit ab Thebis; quae errabunda in Illyriae fines deuenit ad Lycothersen regem, quam Lycotherses excerpit.
>
> Pentheus, son of Echion and Agave, denied that Liber was a god, and refused to introduce his mysteries. Because of this, Agave his mother, along with her sisters Ino and Autonoe, in madness sent by Liber tore him limb from limb. When Agave came to her senses and saw that at Liber's instigation she had committed such a crime, she fled from Thebes. In her wanderings she came to the territory of Illyria to King Lycotherses, who received her.[103]

Absent is any mention of Cadmus, who could have been included as the catalyst for the removal of Agave's madness and Tieresias, who warns Pentheus to mend his ways. Everything else is consistent. Pentheus is the son of Echion and Agave[104] and it is the three daughters of Cadmus who destroy Pentheus (*Bacc.* 1122-1131).

2.13 Phoenician Women

The myth of the house of Labdacus is a famous one. As a result, there are many different extant traditions of the myth. The story arc in the *Fabulae* can be said to begin

[103] This is not the entire *fabula* as it appears in the *editio princeps*. For discussion of the displacement of the second half to *Fabula 137* (see p. 11).
[104] *Bacc.* 213, 229, 265, 507, 540, 995, 1015, 1030, 1119, 1274.

with *Fabula 66: Laius* and extend through the story of the seven against Thebes to end with *Fabula 72: Antigona*. There is little in any of these *fabulae* that is consistent with or unique to any Greek tragedy. This is particularly noticeable with *Fabula 67: Oedipus*:

> postquam Oedipus Laii et Iocastes filius ad puberem aetatem peruenit, fortissimus praeter ceteros erat, eique per inuidiam aequales obiciebant eum subditum esse Polybo, eo quod Polybus tam clemens esset et ille impudens; quod Oedipus sensit non falso sibi obici. itaque Delphos est profectus sciscitatum de <...> in prodigiis ostendebatur mortem ei adesse de nati manu. idem cum Delphos iret, obuiam ei Oedipus uenit, quem satellites cum uiam regi iuberent, neglexit. rex equos immisit et rota pedem eius oppressit; Oedipus iratus inscius patrem suum de curru detraxit et occidit. Laio occiso Creon Menoecei filius regnum occupauit; interim Sphinx Typhonis in Boeotiam est missa, quae agros Thebanorum uexabat; ea regi Creonti simultatem constituit, si carmen quod posuisset aliquis interpretatus esset, se inde abire; si autem datum carmen non soluisset, eum se consumpturam dixit neque aliter de finibus excessuram. rex re audita per Graeciam edixit; qui Sphingae carmen soluisset, regnum se et Iocasten sororem ei in coniugium daturum promisit. cum plures regni cupidine uenissent et a Sphinge essent consumpti, Oedipus Lai filius uenit et carmen est interpretatus; illa se praecipitauit. Oedipus regnum paternum et Iocasten matrem inscius accepit uxorem, ex qua procreauit Eteoclen et Polynicen, Antigonam et Ismenen. interim Thebis sterilitas frugum et penuria incidit ob Oedipodis scelera, interrogatusque Tiresias quid ita Thebae uexarentur, respondit, si quis ex draconteo genere superesset et pro patria interiiset, pestilentia liberaturum. tum Menoeceus Iocastae pater se de muris praecipitauit. dum haec Thebis geruntur, Corintho Polybus decedit, quo audito Oedipus moleste ferre coepit, aestimans patrem suum obisse; cui Periboea de eius suppositione palam fecit; item Menoetes senex, qui eum exposuerat, ex pedum cicatricibus et talorum agnouit Lai filium esse. Oedipus re audita postquam uidit se tot scelera nefaria fecisse, ex ueste matris fibulas detraxit et se luminibus priuauit, regnumque filiis suis alternis annis tradidit, et a Thebis Antigona filia duce profugit.
>
> After Oedipus, son of Laius and Jocasta, had come to manhood, he was courageous beyond the rest, and through

> envy his companions taunted him with not being Polybus' son, since Polybus was so mild, and he so assertive. Oedipus felt that the taunt was true. And so he set out for Delphi to inquire [about his parents. In the meantime] it was revealed to Laius by prodigies that death at his son's hands was near. When he was going to Delphi, Oedipus met him, and when servants bade him give way to the King, he refused. The King urged on his horses, and a wheel grazed Oedipus' foot. Enraged, he dragged his father from the chariot, not knowing who he was, and killed him. After Laius' death, Creon, son of Menoeceus, ruled; in the meantime the Sphinx, offspring of Typhon, was sent into Boeotia, and was laying waste the fields of the Thebans. She proposed a contest to Creon, that if anyone interpreted the riddle which she gave, she would depart, but that she would destroy whoever failed, and under no other circumstances would she leave the country. When the King heard this, he made a proclamation throughout Greece. He promised that he would give the kingdom and his sister Jocasta in marriage to the person solving the riddle of the Sphinx. Many came out of greed for the kingdom, and were devoured by the Sphinx, but Oedipus, son of Laius, came and interpreted the riddle. The Sphinx leaped to her death. Oedipus received his father's kingdom, and Jocasta his mother as wife, unwittingly, and begat on her Eteocles, Polynices, Antigona, and Ismene. Meanwhile barrenness of crops and want fell on Thebes because of the crimes of Oedipus, and Tiresias, questioned as to why Thebes was so harassed, replied that if anyone from the dragon's blood survived and died for his country, he would free Thebes from the plague. Then Menoeceus [father of Jocasta] threw himself from the walls. While these things were taking place in Thebes, at Corinth Polybus died, and Oedipus took the news hard, thinking his father had died. But Periboea revealed his adoption, and Menoetes, too, the old man who had exposed him, recognized him as the son of Laius by the scars on his feet and ankles. When Oedipus heard this and realized he had committed such atrocious crimes, he tore the brooches from his mother's garment and blinded himself, gave the kingdom to his sons for alternate years, and fled from Thebes, his daughter Antigona leading him.

Although Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* might be said to be the most influential source on this myth, it is clearly not the only source for this *fabula*. There are many details that contradict or are absent from Sophocles' play: his companions, not a servant of Polybus

cast doubt on Oedipus' parentage; he kills Laius on his way to Delphi, i.e. before he receives the oracle and not after; the fight at the crossroads is instigated by Laius running over Oedipus' foot with a chariot; Creon offers the kingdom and his sister Jocasta as a prize for defeating the Sphinx; the oracle telling Oedipus to search out the murderer of Laius is replaced by the prophecy given by Tieresias that leads to Menoeceus to throw himself from the walls of Thebes; Periboea reveals to her adopted son, Oedipus, his true parentage, rather than the servant who first cast doubt in Oedipus' mind (in Sophocles, Oedipus' adopted mother is Merope, not Periboea). Oedipus' accident with the chariot is interesting. It would seem that, according to the author of this *fabula*, it is the chariot incident that causes the swelling of Oedipus' foot. If this is the case, then the fabulist is ignorant of the dominant tradition, in which Oedipus' feet are wounded when he is exposed as a child. Does this then indicate that the fabulist is aware of the etymology of Oedipus' name and is searching for some way to fulfill it?

Only at the end of the *fabula* are there any details that might be from Sophocles: the old shepherd who exposed Oedipus (now named Menoetes) recognizes him and confirms the truth about his parentage and Oedipus blinds himself with brooches from his mother's clothing. The details of Polyneices and Eteocles taking command of the city, and Antigone leading her father away may come from the other Theban plays.

There are few details unique to *Phoenician Women* that are to be found in the *Fabulae*. The offering of Jocasta as reward for ridding Thebes of the Sphinx is mentioned by Jocasta in the prologue; this is not mentioned in Sophocles. *Fabula 69: Adrastus* describes the marriage of Polyneices to Argia, daughter of Adrastus. In *Phoenician Women*, this marriage is first mentioned by Jocasta (lines 337-346) and then

explained in detail by Polyneices in stichomythia (lines 409-425). The author of *Fabula 69*, however, differs from Euripides in interpreting the oracle given to Adrastus. Adrastus is told, according to both authors, that he will marry his daughters to a boar and a lion. *Fabula 69* tells us that Polyneices and Tydeus arrive wearing the skin of a lion and a boar. Euripides, however, tells us that Adrastus sees the two as animals because they fight over a sleeping place. The most significant discrepancy between Euripides and the *Fabulae* is the imprisonment of Oedipus by his sons, which is not mentioned at all in the *Fabulae*. Since this drives a significant portion of the plot of *Phoenician Women*, there seems to exist no necessary source relation between Euripides and this *fabula*.

2.14 Orestes

Orestes appears quite frequently in the *Fabulae*: nineteen times,[105] plus one entry title: *Fabula 119: Orestes*. The popularity of the house of Atreus in extant Greek tragedy makes source analysis difficult here as with Oedipus. Some instances of the name of Orestes could be derived from almost any source.

Fabula 254: Quae piissimae fuerunt uel qui piissimi tells us that Electra was loyal to her brother, while *Fabula 257: Qui inter se amicitia iunctissimi fuerunt* tells us the same thing of Pylades. *Fabula 244: Qui cognatos suos occiderunt* tells us that Orestes killed Aegisthus. *Fabula 124: Reges Achiuorum* lists Orestes as part of the chain of rulers in Mycenae: he is the son of Agamemnon and the father of Tisamenus.

Much of the remaining material covers subject matter found in other plays. However, there are a few points that may derive from this play. The final sentence of *Fabula 119: Orestes* reads:

[105] *Fab.* 101.8; 117.8; 119.2, 6, 9, 11, 13; 120.2, 10, 14, 24; 121.3, 15; 123.4, 7; 124.7, 8; 244.7; 254.4; 257.3; 261.13, 23.

> quem Tyndareus cum accusaret, Oresti a Mycenensibus fuga data est propter patrem; quem postea furiae matris exagitarunt.
>
> When Tyndareus accused him, Orestes was allowed to go into exile by the people of Mycenae because of his father. Later the Furies of his mother pursued him.

The involvement of Tyndareus as a persecuting force or blocking figure seems to be an invention of Euripides. In *Orestes*, Tyndareus has to explain his presence in Argos (471): he is visiting Clytemnestra's tomb.[106] What we are told by Apollo of Orestes' exile in Euripides (1643-1659) is unique to this play and even contradicts other plays. His marriage to Hermione is to be uncomplicated with conflict with Neoptolemus, as it is in *Andromache*; his trial at Athens will be successful in a way not implied in *Iphigenia among the Taurians* or *Electra*.[107] There would appear to be an awareness of the events of *Orestes* in the *Fabulae*, though perhaps there is a greater awareness of *Andromache*.

2.15 The Iphigenia Plays

In the *Fabulae*, we see the name Iphigenia 11 times,[108] plus two occurrences in entry titles: *Fabulae 98: Iphigenia* and *120: Iphigenia Taurica*. *Fabula 98* corresponds to the events of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*:

> Agamemnon cum Menelao fratre et Achaiae delectis ducibus Helenam uxorem Menelai quam Alexander Paris auexerat repetitum ad Troiam cum irent, in Aulide tempestas eos ira Dianae retinebat, quod Agamemnon in uenando ceruam eius uiolauit superbiusque in Dianam est locutus. is cum haruspices conuocasset et Calchas se respondisset aliter expiare non posse nisi Iphigeniam filiam Agamemnonis immolasset, re audita Agamemnon recusare coepit. tunc Ulysses eum consiliis ad rem pulchram transtulit; idem Ulysses cum Diomede ad Iphigeniam

[106] West (1987) 30, 215.
[107] Willink (1986) 353.
[108] *Fab.* 98.8, 11, 16; 120.14, 23; 121.12; 122.8, 9, 11; 238.2; 261.8.

> missus est adducendam, qui cum ad Clytaemnestram matrem eius uenissent, ementitur Ulysses eam Achilli in coniugium dari. quam cum in Aulidem adduxisset et parens eam immolare uellet, Diana uirginem miserata, est et caliginem eis obiecit ceruamque pro ea supposuit, Iphigeniamque per nubes in terram Tauricam detulit ibique templi sui sacerdotem fecit.
>
> When Agamemnon with his brother Menelaus and chosen leaders of Asia[109] were going to Troy to recover Helen, wife of Menelaus, whom Alexander Paris had carried off, a storm kept them at Aulis because of the anger of Diana. Agamemnon had wounded a deer of hers in hunting, and had spoken rather haughtily against Diana. When he had called together the soothsayers, and Calchas had declared that he could expiate in no other way than by sacrificing his daughter, Iphigenia, Agamemnon at first refused. Then Ulysses by his advice won him over to a fine scheme. The same Ulysses along with Diomede was sent to get Iphigenia, and when he came to Clytemnestra her mother, he falsely said she was to be given in marriage to Achilles. When she was brought to Aulis, and her father was about to sacrifice her, Diana pitied the girl, cast mist about her, and substituted a deer in her place. She bore Iphigenia through the clouds to the Tauric land, and there made he a priestess of her temple.

This *fabula* is consistent with *Iphigenia at Aulis* up to the point of sacrifice, with the only exception being the dispatch of Odysseus and Diomedes to fetch Iphigenia to Aulis. Gantz suggests that Clytemnestra does not accompany Iphigenia to Aulis, but this need not be inferred from the text.[110] We know that the subject was treated by both Aeschylus and Sophocles as well as by Euripides. The little evidence that exists for Aeschylus' *Iphigenia* (there are only four one-line fragments, three of which are attributed to different plays by different sources) tells us nothing of its subject matter.[111] About Sophocles' *Iphigenia* we can at least note that Achilles appears to have been party to the

[109] Grant is here using the text preserved by Rose. Micyllus actually read *aliisque* but emended it to *Asiae*. Marshall emends it to *Achaiae*.
[110] *EGM* 588.
[111] Lloyd-Jones (1983) 411.

deception of Clytemnestra and, as Webster notes, the deception, perhaps devised by Odyesseus, who appears in the play,[112] was likely central to the plot, unlike Euripides' play, in which the successful outcome of the deception is included immediately after the *parados*: Clytemnestra arriving at Aulis with her daughter Iphigenia.[113]

The second half of this *fabula* is consistent with both Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians* and the *Cypria* as it is summarized by Proclus.[114] Both the sacrifice of Iphigenia and her subsequent rescue are decidedly un-Homeric.[115] It is certain that Euripides drew upon the *Cypria* as a source, but whether the author of *Fabula 98* was drawing on Euripides or directly on the *Cypria* is uncertain.

Fabula 120 is interesting for its title. The addition of Taurica strongly suggests that a specific tradition of the myth is being referred to here, and is supported by the presence of *Taurinam* in the text of the *fabula*. There is, however, no acknowledgment of any other tradition: it is never considered that Iphigenia dies at Aulis. The title then distinguishes *Fabula 120* from *98* not on the basis of version (indeed they appear to follow the same tradition) but rather on the basis of chronology: the events of *Fabula 98* precede those of *120*. Nevertheless, the content of the *fabula* comes quite close to what is found in *Iphigenia among the Taurians*:

> Orestem furiae cum exagitarent, Delphos sciscitatum est profectus quis tandem modus esset aerumnarum. responsum est ut in terram Taurinam ad regem Thoantem patrem Hypsipyles iret indeque de templo Dianae signum Argos afferret; tunc finem fore malorum. sorte audita cum Pylade Strophii filio sodale suo nauem conscendit celeriterque ad Tauricos fines deuenerunt, quorum fuit institutum ut qui intra fines eorum hospes uenisset templo

[112] *EGM* 588.
[113] Webster (1967) 258.
[114] Davies (1988).
[115] Davies (1989) 46.

Dianae immolaretur. ubi Orestes et Pylades cum in spelunca se tutarentur et occasionem captarent, a pastoribus deprehensi ad regem Thoantem sunt deducti. quos Thoas suo more uinctos in templum Dianae ut immolarentur duci iussit, ubi Iphigenia Orestis soror fuit sacerdos; eosque ex signis atque argumentis qui essent, quid uenissent, postquam resciit, abiectis ministeriis ipsa coepit signum Dianae auellere. quo rex cum interuenisset et rogitaret cur id faceret, illa ementita est dicitque eos sceleratos signum contaminasse; quod impii et scelerati homines in templum essent adducti, signum expiandum ad mare ferre oportere, et iubere eum interdicere ciuibus ne quis eorum extra urbem exiret. rex sacerdoti dicto audiens fuit; occasione Iphigenia nacta, signo sublato cum fratre Oreste et Pylade in nauem ascendit uentoque secundo ad insulam Zminthen ad Chrysen sacerdotem Apollinis delati sunt.

When the furies were pursuing Orestes, he went to Delphi to inquire when his sufferings would end. The reply was that he should go to the land of Taurica to King Thoas, father of Hypsipyle, and bring to Argos from the temple there the statue of Diana; then there would be an end to his sufferings. Upon hearing this oracle, along with Pylades his companion, son of Strophius, he embarked and quickly came to the land of the Taurians. It was their custom to sacrifice at the temple of Diana whatever stranger came within their borders. When Orestes and Pylades were hiding in a cave waiting for an opportunity, they were seized by shepherds and brought to King Thoas. Thoas, as was his custom, ordered them to be brought bound into the temple of Diana to be sacrificed. The priestess there was Iphigenia, sister of Orestes, and when by tokens and questioning she found out who they were and why they had come, she herself, casting aside the vessels for sacrifice, started to remove the statue of Diana. When the king came up and asked her why she was doing this, she made pretense and said that since the men were accursed they had defiled the statue; because impious and wicked men had been brought into the temple, the statue should be taken to the sea for cleansing. She bade him make a proclamation forbidding citizens to go outside the city. The king complied with the words of the priestess. Iphigenia, seizing the opportunity, took the statue, embarked with Orestes and Pylades, and by a favoring breeze was borne to the island Zminthe to Chryses, priest of Apollo.

For the most part, this *fabula* corresponds well with *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, with

a few minor exceptions. We learn in Orestes' initial speech that he has indeed been sent to the land of the Taurians by the Oracle of Apollo to bring back the image of Artemis (*IT* 77-92). The association of this Thoas with the father of Hypsipyle is unique to the *Fabulae*. The father of Hypsipyle is indeed a Thoas, and this is consistent with a number of other sources, including Ps.-Apollodorus (1.9.17) and Apollonius (1.621). The father of Hypsipyle is, by all accounts, the only survivor when the women of Lemnos massacre the men. Ps.-Apollodorus tells us only that Hypsipyle saves him by hiding him. According to the *Argonautica*, she places him in a chest and lets him drift out to sea, until he is taken to the island of Oenoe (later renamed Sicinus) in the Cyclades (1.622-626). That this fabulist truly associates this Thoas with the Taurian Thoas, and is not making a simple mistake in *Fabula 120*, is made clear in *Fabula 15: Lemniades* which tells us that all the women killed their fathers and husbands *praeter Hypsipyle, quae patrem suum Thoantem clam in nauem imposuit, quem tempestas in insulam Tauricam detulit* (15.6-8: "except Hypsipyle, who secretly placed her own father Thoas into a boat, which was borne by a storm to the Taurian Island"). Here, as in the *Argonautica*, chance brings Thoas to land, but the fabulist is clearly associating both Thoas figures with the land of the Taurians.

The capture of Orestes and Pylades is described in the herdsman's speech at 260-335. The author of *Fabula 120* does not feel the need to explain Iphigenia's presence in this land, as he accepts this tradition as the predominant one. The tokens by which Iphigenia recognizes Orestes and Pylades are not described in the *Fabulae*, which is unfortunate, as they might positively identify Euripides as the source here. However, the rejection of her duties by Iphigenia and her subsequent pretense to Thoas and escape with

Orestes follow very closely the events of Euripides' play. One feature of this *fabula* is immediately evident: it is quite long in comparison to most of the other *fabulae* studied in this chapter. The author of this passage, and of the next entry, *Chryses*, seems either to have access to more specific information, or is spending more time in writing the entry, with a greater eye for detail. This may indicate that *Fabula 120* is the product of a better informed fabulist, and may thus be tentatively assigned to Hyginus B. Only the arrival of Orestes and Iphigenia on the island of Zminthe is not within the bounds of the play, though this may well be covered in the events of Sophocles' *Chryses*.

Fabula 121 can be divided into two parts: the first half describes the events of *Iliad* 1, in which Agamemnon seizes Chryseis, daughter of Chryses, priest of Apollo. In revenge, Apollo sends a pestilence (it is a famine in the Iliad, and Rose attributes this discrepancy to the similarity of λιμός (famine) and λοιμός (pestilence), which may lead us to assign this *fabula* to Hyginus A[116]) upon the army until Agamemnon gives her back. The second half of the *fabula* deals with what may well be the plot of Sophocles' lost *Chryses*:

> postea, Chryses Thoanti eos cum reddere uellet, Chryses audit senior Agamemnonis Iphigeniam et Orestem filios esse; qui Chrysi filio suo quid ueri esset patefecit, eos fratres esse et Chrysen Agamemnonis filium esse. tum Chryses re cognita cum Oreste fratre Thoantem interfecit et inde Mycenas cum signo Dianae incolumes peruenerunt.
>
> Later when Chryses was about to return Iphigenia and Orestes to Thoas, he [Chryses the Elder] learned that they were children of Agamemnon, and revealed to Chryses his [grand]son the truth – that they were brothers and that he was a son of Agamemnon. Then Chryses, thus informed, with Orestes his brother, killed Thoas, and from there they came safe to Mycenae with the statue of Diana.

[116] Rose (1934) 87.

That the author of this *fabula* considers this to be part of the same story arc as *Fabula 120* is clear from the fact that they are still attempting to return to Greece with the image of Diana. Little survives of Sophocles' play (Lloyd-Jones cites only four definite fragments, each a line in length[117]) and so it is impossible to determine if this is the plot of that play. Both Rose and Grant criticize this entry as being confused and poorly written. The presence of two figures named Chryses causes confusion: which Chryses is about to return Iphigenia and Orestes to Thoas?[118] This story is unknown to any other author.

There is one final entry that should be discussed here, as it completes the Orestes-Iphigenia story arc. *Fabula 122: Aletes* tells the story of their return to Greece:

> Ad Electram, Agamemnonis et Clytemnestrae filiam, sororem Orestis, nuntius falsus uenit fratrem cum Pylade in Tauricis Dianae esse immolatos. id Aletes Aegisthi filius cum rescisset, ex Atridarum genere neminem superesse, regnum Mycenis obtinere coepit. at Electra de fratris nece Delphos sciscitatum est profecta; quo cum uenisset, eodem die Iphigenia cum Oreste uenit eo. idem nuntius qui de Oreste dixerat, dixit Iphigeniam fratris interfectricem esse. Electra ubi audiuit id, truncum ardentem ex ara sustulit uoluitque inscia sorori Iphigeniae oculos eruere, nisi Orestes interuenisset. cognitione itaque facta, Mycenas uenerunt et Aleten Aegisthi filium Orestes interfecit et Erigonam ex Clytaemnestra et Aegistho natam uoluit inerficere, sed Diana eam rapuit et in terram Atticam sacerdotem fecit. Orestes autem Neoptolemo interfecto Hermionen Menelai et Helenae filiam adductam coniugem duxit; Pylades autem Electram Agamemnonis et Clytemnestrae filiam duxit.
>
> To Electra, daughter of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra, a messenger came, falsely saying that her brother and Pylades had been sacrificed in Taurica to Diana. When Aletes, Aegisthus' son, heard that no one of the race of the Atridae survived, he seized the kingly power in Mycenae.

---

[117] Lloyd-Jones (1996) 340-3.

[118] Rose (1934) 87, though the repetition of Chryses in the first sentence, with *Chryses senior* in the main clause, might suggest that the Chryses in the *cum* clause is the younger grandson. However, the *Fabulae* are susceptible to repetition without cause, and *Chryses senior* may still be a possibility.

> But Electra went to Delphi to inquire about her brother's violent death. She came there the same day that Iphigenia and Orestes arrived. The same messenger who had reported about Orestes, said that Iphigenia was the murderess of her brother. When Electra heard this, she seized a burning firebrand from the altar, and in her ignorance would have blinded her sister Iphigenia if Orestes had not intervened. After this recognition they came to Mycenae, and Orestes killed Aletes, son of Aegisthus, and would have killed Erigone, daughter of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, but Diana rescued her and made her a priestess in the Attic land. Orestes, moreover, after Neoptolemus was slain, married Hermione, daughter of Menelaus and Helen, and Pylades married Electra, daughter of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra.

This entry reads much like the synopsis of a play: the first two sentences describe the situation, much like a prologue; the next four sentences describe the action in Delphi, complete with messenger speech; a scene change would bring the play to Mycenae, where a *dea ex machina* would proclaim the marriages of Orestes and Pylades to Hermione and Electra. These marriages are both found in *Orestes*, which suppresses the other popular version of the myth, found in *Andromache*, that Orestes was promised Hermione in marriage, but then deprived when Menelaus gave her to Neoptolemus.[119] *Orestes* may be the source for these marriages.

2.16 Heracles

The name of Heracles appears in the *Fabulae* 76 times, more than any other figure discussed in this study. We can more accurately look at the relationship between the *Fabulae* and Euripides' *Heracles* by looking at two of the less prolific characters in the play: Megara and Lycus.

Megara is mentioned in passing in both *Fabulae 72: Antigona* and *241: Qui*

[119] Willink (1986) 355.

coniuges suas occiderunt. In the former, she is given to Heracles in marriage by her father Creon. In the latter, she is killed by her husband. These are both common details, and need not be specific to a single source. Lycus is mentioned in a number of places. He is listed in both *Fabulae 76: Reges Thebanorum* and *157: Neptuni filii.* There may be some confusion with the Lycus who was husband to Dirce, ancestor to this Lycus, mentioned in *Fabulae 7: Antiope* and *8: Eadem Euripidis quam Ennius scribit* (see p. 130).

Fabulae 30 to *35* form the story arc of Heracles' labors and the incidental deeds that surround them. *Fabula 31: Parerga eiusdem*, in a broad summary of Heracles' deeds outside the twelve labours, tells us that Heracles killed Lycus for attempting to murder his wife and sons. It also tells us that Heracles himself later murders the same wife and sons. Twice in this *fabula* the names of Heracles' children are given as Therimachus and Ophites. While we have seen the addition of names in other cases that seem close to plays, this instance appears to be general. The next four *fabulae*, *32-35*, expand with more detail the events listed in *Fabula 31.*

Fabula 32: Megara is significant to this discussion:

> Hercules cum ad canem tricipitem esset missus ab Eurystheo rege et Lycus Neptuni filius putasset eum periisse, Megaram Creontis filiam uxorem eius et filios Therimachum et Ophiten interficere uoluit et regnum occupare. Hercules eo interuenit et Lycum interfecit; postea ab Iunone insania obiecta, Megaram et filios Therimachum et Ophiten interfecit. postquam suae mentis compos est factus, ab Apolline petiit dari sibi responsum quomodo scelus purgaret; cui Apollo sortem quod reddere noluit, Hercules iratus de fano eius tripodem sustulit, quem postea Iouis iussu reddidit, et nolentem sortem dare iussit. Hercules ob id a Mercurio Omphalae reginae in seruitutem datus est.
>
> When Hercules had been sent for the three-headed dog by

> King Eurystheus, and Lycus, son of Neptune, thought he had perished, he planned to kill his wife Megara, daughter of Creon, and his sons, Terimachus and Ophites, and sieze the kingdom. Hercules prevented him and killed Lycus. Later, when madness was sent upon him by Juno, he killed Megara and his sons Therimachus and Ophites. When he came to his right mind, he begged Apollo to give him an oracular reply on how to expiate his crime. Because Apollo was unwilling, Hercules wrathfully carried off the tripod from his shrine. Later, at the command of Jove, he returned it, and bade him give the reply, though unwilling. Hercules because of this offence was given in servitude to Queen Omphale by Mercury.

Euripides' *Heracles* treats the same material as this *fabula*, and is one of the earliest sources to present the madness of Heracles,[120] and is first to identify Hera as the cause.[121] Amphitryo tells us in the prologue that Heracles is away fetching Cerberus (lines 24-25) and that in his absence, Lycus has seized power (lines 31-34). Iris tells us that the madness which leads Heracles to murder his wife and sons is commissioned by Hera (lines 831-832). There are, however, some differences between Euripides' play and *Fabula 32*. Theseus, in *Heracles*, takes Heracles to Athens, but he is not mentioned in this *fabula*. Instead, we have the story of Heracles stealing the tripod from Apollo's shrine and being given in servitude to Queen Omphale, which is not from Euripides. In this *fabula*, Heracles has two sons, named Therimachus and Ophites, while in the play, he has three sons who are not named.[122] Once again, we see names being added from a later source, and this later source is clearly not deriving names from Euripides. Other sources

---

[120] Barlow (1996) 1.
[121] *EGM* 380.
[122] The first line of the *hypothesis* reads:
Ἡρακλῆς γήμας Μεγάραν τὴν Κρέοντος ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐγέννησε < >. Wilamowitz (1895) determined that either the number of the children (presumably τρεῖς to agree with the play) or the name of the children had dropped out of the text of the *hypothesis*, though he concedes that since the children are not named in the play, it is less likely that they are named in the *hypothesis*. *Schol.* Pind. Isth. 4.104 tells us that Euripides named the children Therimachus, Deicoon and Aristodemus, though it is unknown from where this information is coming. Rindar himself reported eight children, while Pherecydes mentions five, see *EGM* 380.

of this myth have the madness of Heracles precede the labors of Heracles, but Euripides reverses the two events.[123] That *Fabula 32* follows this order as well strongly suggests that the author of this entry is following a Euripidean tradition.[124]

2.17 Alcestis

Alcestis' name appears twelve times in the *Fabulae*,[125] plus one instance as the entry title for *Fabula 51: Alcestis*.

Alcestis is mentioned in the *Fabulae* in connection to events beyond the scope of Euripides' play several times. The earliest occurrence of her name is as one of the daughters who are tricked by Medea into murdering their father Pelias (24.8, 13). She is listed as the mother of Eumeus in *Fabula 97: Qui ad Troiam expugnatum ierunt et quot naues*.

There are three more entries that mention her briefly, but they do correspond with Euripides. In *Fabula 243: Quae se ipsae interfecerunt*, we are told that Alcestis dies on Admetus' behalf. In *Fabula 251: Qui licentia parcarum ab inferis redierunt*, Alcestis is listed as one of those who are able to return from the dead, and she is considered one of the "women most chaste" in *Fabula 256*.

There are two longer entries, which discuss the fate of Alcestis in more detail. *Fabula 50: Admetus*, describes Admetus' victory as a suitor for Alcestis (the italics are my own):

> Alcestim Peliae filiam cum complures in coniugium peterent et Pelias cum multos eorum repudiaret, *simultatem his constituit, ei se daturum qui feras bestias ad currum iunxisset*: is quam vellet aueheret. *itaque Admetus ab*

[123] Wilamowitz (1895) 1.81; Kamerbeek (1966) 3.
[124] Rose (1934) 35.
[125] *Fab.* 24.8, 13; 50.2, 8; 51.2, 5, 9,11; 97.24; 243.16; 251.8; 256.5.

> *Apolline petiit ut se adiuuaret.* Apollo cum *ab eo esset liberaliter* tractatus cum in servitium fuit ei traditus, *aprum et leonem ei iunctos tradidit, quibus ille Alcestim in* coniugum *auexit.*
>
> When great numbers of suitors were seeking Alcestis, daughter of Pelias, in marriage, and Pelias was refusing many of them, he set a contest for them, promising that he would give her to the one who yoked wild beasts to a chariot. [He could take away whomever he wished.] And so Admetus begged Apollo to help him. Apollo, since he had been kindly treated when given in servitude to him, provided him with a wild boar and lion yoked together, and with these he bore off Alcestis in marriage.

The servitude of Apollo is mentioned in the prologue of *Alcestis*, but the only favor granted by Apollo in that play is the possibility of a vicarious death, which is mentioned only in *Fabula 51: Alcestis*:

> Alcestim Peliae et Anaxibies Biantis filiae filiam complures proci petebant in coniugium; Pelias uitans eorum condiciones repudiauit et *simultatem constituit, ei se daturum qui feras bestias ad currum iunxisset et Alcestim in coniugio avexisset. Itaque Admetus ab Apolline petiit ut se adiuuaret.* Apollo autem quod *ab eo in seruitutem liberaliter esset* acceptus, *aprum et leonem ei iunctos tradidit, quibus ille Alcestim auexit.* et illud ab Apolline accepit, ut pro se alius uoluntarie moreretur. pro quo cum neque pater neque mater mori uoluisset, uxor se Alcestis obtulit et pro eo uicaria morte interiit; quam postea Hercules ab inferis reuocauit.
>
> Many suitors sought in marriage Alcestis, daughter of Pelias and Anaxibia, Bias' daughter; but Pelias, avoiding their proposals, rejected them, and set a contest promising that he would give her to the one who yoked wild beasts to a chariot and bore her off. Admetus asked Apollo to help him, and Apollo, because he had been kindly received by him while in servitude, gave to him a wild boar and a lion yoked together, with which he carried off Alcestis. He obtained this, too, from Apollo, that another could voluntarily die in his place. When neither his father nor his mother was willing to die for him, his wife Alcestis offered herself, and died for him in vicarious death. Later Hercules called her back from the dead.

Huys states that "the *fabulae* 49-51 form one continuum," but this does not take into account the repetition that occurs between *Fabulae 50* and *51*.[126] Though only the second entry mentions the prolonging of Admetus' life, both mention the yoking of wild beasts. In fact, *Fabula 51* repeats not only the material, but also much of the wording of the previous *fabula* (note the italics in both passages above). This strongly suggests that the longer *Fabula 51* is in fact a revision of the first and was meant not to follow, but to replace the original entry. Rose's suggestion is that the fabulist is here following two epitomizers. The second half of *Fabula 51* follows closely the events of *Alcestis*, indicating that the author of *Fabula 51* had access to the text or a *hypothesis* that the author of the original entry, *Fabula 50*, did not. We will see this again with the discussion of the *Ino* fragments (see p. 125).

There appears to be evidence of mis-read Greek in *Fabula 50*. Rose suggests that the phrase *in coniugium* is a mistranslation of ἐν ξυνωρίδι, which referred not to marriage, as the author of this *fabula* believed, but to the actual chariot in which Admetus took Alcestis away. *Fabula 51* does not make this error. It is possible that the revision, based partly on *Fabula 50* and partly on Euripides' *Alcestis*, simply omitted the phrase by chance. It is also possible that the author of *Fabula 51* was correcting the error found in *Fabula 50*.

2.18 Conclusion

This chapter agrees with the conclusions of Huys insofar as it would appear that no extant play serves as a direct, single source for any *fabula*. However, a number of traditions that began with Euripides, or were made popular in the fifth century by

[126] Huys (1997) 14.

Euripides have survived to be included in the *Fabulae* with relatively little distortion. Some plays, like *Rhesus* and *Cyclops*, have simply been overridden by other traditions, like that of Homer. However, plays like the Iphigenia plays and *Orestes* appear to have survived. *Alcestis* is perhaps the closest to being an actual source – it is very neatly summed up in *Fabula 51*.

In the end, at least five plays are not used by the author(s) of the *Fabulae*: *Cyclops*, *Rhesus*, *Ion*, *Helen* and *Suppliant Women* are either inconsistent with the *Fabulae*, or their general content is absent. We do see the influence of *Hecuba*, *Medea*, *Hippolytus* and *Andromache*, though none of these can be said to be a direct source for any *fabula*. Only a handful of plays can be said to be directly influencing the *Fabulae*: *Bacchae*, *Phoenician Women*, the Iphigenia plays and *Orestes*. The most significant plays studied in this chapter, however, are *Heracles* and *Alcestis*, which provide strong indications of multiple authorship for the *Fabulae*.

Chapter 3: The Fabulae and Non-Extant Euripides

The primary purpose of the previous chapter was to test the validity of the testimony found in the *Fabulae*, by comparing it to the plays extant in their entirety. One goal of this study is to apply any valid testimony the *Fabulae* might produce in order to increase our understanding of the non-extant material and to explore what this means to the nature of the text of the *Fabulae*. This chapter will do both. The extant fragments and evidence of certain lost tragedies will be compared to the passages in the *Fabulae* that best correspond to them to determine if these passages rely on Euripides in any way. If the relevant passages of the *Fabulae* seem to be following the tradition as it appears in the fragments and *testimonia*, then they will be applied to the reconstruction of the lost plays. This process of reconstruction is where study of Hyginus could prove to be most useful.

The *fabulae* in question cannot of course be compared directly to the plays in the same manner as they were in the previous chapter. Instead, other elements will take on much greater importance. *Hypotheses*, if they are extant, will have to be considered with more care. If a *fabula* agrees in content and subject with a particular *hypothesis*, three possibilities exist:

1) The author of that *fabula* is using a play of Euripides as his source, and the *hypothesis* is the agent by which we are able to determine this relationship.
2) The author is not using the play directly, and the *hypothesis* itself is the source for that *fabula*.
3) The author is using some other source derived from Euripides.

This distinction is difficult to make without the play. As it is, it is only possible to

determine if the *hypothesis* is not the source, in the instances where a *fabula* contains more detail than the *hypothesis*. Evidence and *testimonia* will also be considered. If the content of a given myth is being presented in a *fabula* in a contracted form similar to another source, that *fabula* may be plausibly linked to that source. If there are strong similarities in wording or language, then the connection between *fabula* and source is more than plausible, but is in fact probable. The *fabula* could resemble that source in terms of content and details of myth being presented, order of events, or wording and language. The fragments themselves will of course be of use, though not as often as we might expect. Many fragments are preserved in later writers to focus on the use of a particular word or to quote a gnomic expression. Often we are not given context for a particular fragment, beyond perhaps being told that it is from Euripides, or from a certain play, and sometimes even that information is lacking. One final element that has potential use is respect of the dramatic form. This can be gauged by asking the question, what might Euripides have done with this tradition of myth? Factors include staging conventions, audience expectations, previous traditions of the given myth and even the perceived "style" of Euripides. One attempt to define dramatic form in terms of the desired emotional effect on an audience was made by Robinson, who assigned two rules to what he called "dramatic grammar":

1) In the interest of time, each scene must have "some appropriate dramatic effect."
2) The audience's ignorance of what is to come is important for some "dramatic events" to have full effect.[127]

The element of dramatic form is, of course, a matter of opinion and based on guesswork,

[127] Robinson (1969) 44. It should be noted that for the second point, the unexpected might not be a specific event, but the way in which the event unfolds onstage. In the case of *Philoctetes* (the subject of Robinson's article), for example, the audience may know that Philoctetes will go to Troy, but not know how: is he persuaded, forced, bribed?

educated or otherwise. Thus it must be used with extreme caution and is far more useful as a diagnostic tool, guiding the direction of research and supposition, to be backed up by later evidence.

There were a number of possibilities to consider for the selection and arrangement of plays in this chapter. Perhaps the simplest method would have been to use the selections of other modern editors, such as Diggle's *Oxford Classical Text* or the *Selected Fragmentary Plays vol. 1* edited by Collard, Cropp and Lee. However, each of these editions have their own individual criteria for the selection of plays. Diggle's agenda is not only to provide the reader with a broad survey of the non-extant plays, but also to highlight interesting or well-written passages that have been preserved. Collard, Cropp and Lee select plays for which there is a significant amount of material, in order that a commentary might be justified and only their first volume is presently available. The selections of both of these editions will of course overlap with the selections made for this chapter.

Two general criteria were considered when selecting plays for this chapter. First was availability of information, in the form of fragments and *testimonia*, for the treatment of plot within the play itself. If nothing is known about the tradition of myth presented in a particular play, it is obviously difficult to compare it to the *Fabulae*. The second criterion is the content of the *Fabulae* itself. There must be a reasonable amount of *testimonia* in the *Fabulae* on the appropriate myth to make a comparison to the fragments of a play worthwhile. As long as there is enough material in the evidence or in the *Fabulae* to generate discussion, it is enough for this preliminary study. The inclusion of each play in this chapter will be individually rationalized, according to these and other

case-specific criteria.

As in the previous chapter, the plays will not be arranged according to date of composition or production. Nevertheless, date is worth brief discussion; in some cases the date can affect how we interpret the evidence to determine dramatic treatment. Instead, the plays will be loosely arranged according to their relationship to the *Fabulae*. This naturally implies judgment of each case before it is discussed. Yet in the interest of constructing a logical and coherent argument and producing an overall picture of the relationship of the *Fabulae* to Euripides, it is perhaps the most forgivable approach. In each case, the tradition of myth will be examined, as it is preserved in the *Fabulae*, and then as it appears to have been dealt with in Euripides and other sources. Plays that appear to have no relation to the *Fabulae* will be considered first (3.1-3.6). Next will be the traditions of myth in the *Fabulae* that do seem to be influenced by Euripides, either directly through access to his plays or indirectly through summaries such as the *hypotheses*. Finally will come any plays that suggest multiple authorship for the *Fabulae*.

3.1 Erechtheus

The name of *Erechtheus*' title character is mentioned eight times in the *Fabulae*,[128] and is also included in one entry title, *Fabula 46: Erechtheus*. He is, at various points in the *Fabulae*, the son of Pandion (48.2), father of Creusa (160.3), Cthonia (238.6), and Procris, with whom he slept to father Aglaurus (253.5). He is also maternal grandfather of the flying Argonauts Zetes and Calais (14.92). The play *Erechtheus* by Euripides appears to have focused on Erechtheus sacrificing his own

[128] *Fab.* 14.92; 46.2, 8, 10; 48.4; 160.3; 238.6; 253.5.

daughter so that the Athenian army might defeat the army of Eumolpus in battle. This account is mirrored in *Fabula 46*:

> Erechtheus Pandionis filius habuit quattuor, quae inter se coniurarunt se una earum mortem obisset, ceterae si interficerent. in eo tempore Eumolpus Neptuni filius Athenas uenit oppugnaturus, quod patris sui terram Atticam fuisse diceret. is uictus cum exercitu cum esset ab Atheniensibus interfectus, Neptunus ne filii sui morte Erechtheus laetaretur expostulauit ut eius filia Neptuno immolaretur. itaque Chthonia filia cum esset immolata, ceterae fide data se ipsae interfecerunt; ipse Erechtheus ab Ioue Neptuni rogatu fulmine est ictus.
>
> Erechtheus, son of Pandion, had four daughters who promised each other that if one met death, the others would kill themselves. At that time Eumolpus, son of Neptune, came to attack Athens because he said the Attic land was his father's. When he and his army were defeated and he was slain by the Athenians, Neptune demanded that Erechtheus' daughter be sacrificed to him so that Erechtheus would not rejoice at his son's death. And so when Chthonia, his daughter, had been sacrificed, the others in accordance with their oaths killed themselves. Erechtheus himself at Neptune's request was smitten with a thunderbolt by Jove.

The presence of four daughters might seem to contradict the other *fabulae*, which only name three daughters. However, the other *fabulae* only name individual daughters of Erechtheus; none provide a head count like *Fabula 46*. This *fabula* seems to have little in common with what we know of Euripides' *Erechtheus*. The fragments are not numerous, but *testimonia* do exist:

> The outline is given in Lycurgus (Leocr. 98) and Plutarch (*Moralia* 310D). Athens was facing an invasion from Eleusis by Eumolpus, son of Poseidon, and his Thracians. Erechtheus inquired of Delphi and was told to sacrifice his daughter. With the agreement of his wife Praxithea, he did so and the invasion was repelled.[129]

[129] Webster (1967) 129.

The most significant fragments that survive come from Praxithea's speech in which she offers up her daughter for sacrifice. It is clear from the *testimonia* and the fragments that the account recorded in the *Fabulae* differs greatly from the account found in Euripides (and in fact from any extant account). The main focus of the play seems to be the dilemma of daughter sacrifice, much like the focus of *Iphigenia at Aulis*. Erechtheus must make a choice, similar to Agamemnon's: either he must sacrifice his own child, or his people will be destroyed in war. Wilkins groups *Erechtheus* with *Heraclidae*, separate from other plays of self-sacrifice, including *Hecuba*, *Phoenician Women* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*, since it is only the first two that take place in Athens.[130] However, in Euripides' *Erechtheus*, it appears to be Praxithea who volunteers her daughter (Fr. 360 N ll 4-6 = Lycurg. Leocr. 100):

> ἐγὼ δὲ δώσω παῖδα τὴν ἐμὴν κτανεῖν.
> λογίζομαι δὲ πολλά· πρῶτα μὲν πόλιν
> οὐκ ἄν τιν' ἄλλην τῆσδε βελτίω λαβεῖν.[131]
>
> And I will give my daughter to be killed.
> I am considering many factors; and the first is that
> one cannot find another city better than this one.

If the daughter of Erechtheus does indeed go willingly to be sacrificed, that portion of the play is no longer extant.

In the *Fabulae*, the daughter of Erechtheus is not killed before the battle, but rather after. Erechtheus does not kill his daughter at the request of the oracle, but is in fact punished by Neptune for defeating his son Eumolpus. The fragments indicate that, in

---

[130] Wilkins (1990) 189.

[131] If we accept the translation of Petrie (1922) and take λαβεῖν with δώσω, to create the sense, I am prepared to give my daughter, and I reckon that there is no other city more worthy to receive her, the sense of Athenian propaganda is heightened. Diggle (1997) 104 considers this, noting that it would only require the replacement of τιν' with the enclitic νιν to make the grammar work, but rejects it in favour of the traditional translation found in *SFP 1*, 159.

Euripides, Erechtheus himself was killed in the battle against Eumolpus:

> ⟨Πρ.⟩ τί φῄς; τέθνηκεν ἢ φάος βλέπε[ι τόδε;
> ⟨Αγ.⟩ τέθνηκ'·
>
> Pr. What are you saying? Is he dead, or does he see the light of day?
> Mess. He is dead.[132]

In the *Fabulae*, Erechtheus lives beyond the end of the battle to be forced to sacrifice his own daughter. There is also no mention of Athena, who appears in the same fragment as above in what seems to be the final scene of *Erechtheus*. She does inform us, however, that the sisters of the sacrificed daughter have in fact killed themselves as well.

Unfortunately, we cannot use material from the *Fabulae* to supplement our knowledge of this play. It would be attractive, based on the testimony of the *Fabulae*, to assign the name of Chthonia to the daughter sacrificed in Euripides to conform to *Fabulae 46*. This is similar to the case of Heracles' daughter who sacrifices herself in *Heraclidae*: she is unnamed in the play, but the *hypothesis*, which may be the earliest known source for her name, calls her Makaria.[133] However, the rest of *Fabula 46* is so different from Euripides, we cannot make that claim. To make Creusa a daughter of Erechtheus, however, in accordance with *Fabula 160*, might not be so much of a stretch, as she (and her marriage to Xuthus) is mentioned in the prologue to *Melanippe Sophe*, which may well have been produced with *Erechtheus*.[134]

3.2 Telephus

Euripides' *Telephus*, produced in 438 in the trilogy of plays for which *Alcestis*

---

[132] 370 K, 65 A = *PSorb.* 2328, ll. 20-21. The self-sacrificing daughter is absent from the *Fabulae* as well. In the interest of consistency, all fragments and *hypotheses* are taken from *TGFS*.
[133] Wilkins (1993) 111.
[134] Webster (1967) 127 dates both plays to 422. Calder (1969) 148, follows a close reading of Plutarch *Nic.* 9.5 to indicate a date of 422. Though *SFP I*, 155 suggests that the reading of Plutarch is pressed too hard, and Cropp-Fick assign a range of 421-411, a date of 422 is desirable here as well: "An adjustment in the text of Fr.370.117 brings 422 even closer to statistically founded 'plausibility'".

was the fourth place entry, was a memorable event in fifth-century Athens, as parodies in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* and *Thesmophoriazusae* clearly show. This is especially significant in the case of *Thesmophoriazusae*, which did not even explicitly name *Telephus*, despite the fact that it was produced in 411 – some twenty seven years later.[135] The name of Telephus appears in the *Fabulae* fifteen times,[136] plus one instance in an entry title, *Fabula 101: Telephus*. He is consistently the son of Hercules and Auge (162.3; 252.2); the etymology of his name – he was nurtured by a deer as an infant – is mentioned twice (99.7; 252.2);[137] he kills his uncles Hippothous and Nereus (244.5); and he is one of the beaten competitors when Paris wins the footrace held in his own honor (273.49). *Fabula 100: Teuthras* tells of Telephus' quest to find his mother, and his unwitting attempt to murder her. *Fabula 101: Telephus* tells of the events when Telephus infiltrates the Greek camp, including the ransoming of the baby Orestes for a chance to be healed by Achilles' spear:

> Telephus Herculis et Auges filius ab Achille in pugna Chironis hasta percussui dicitur. ex quo uulnere cum in dies taetro cruciatu angeretur, petit sortem ab Apolline, quod esset remedium; responsum est ei neminem mederi posse nisi eandem hastam qua uulneratus est. hoc Telephus ut audiuit, ad regem Agamemnonem uenit et monitu Clytemnestrae Orestem infantem de cunabulis rapuit, minitans se eum occisurum nisi sibi Achiui mederentur. Achiuis autem, quod responsum erat sine Telephi ductu Troiam capi non posse, facile cum eo in gratiam redierunt et ab Achille petierunt ut eum sanaret. quibus Achilles respondit se artem medicam non nosse. tunc Vlysses ait

[135] MacDowell (1995) states that Aristophanes deliberately avoids mentioning the name Telephus. Since less than half the audience present in 411 would have seen the original production twenty seven years earlier, not naming Telephus allows the parody to stand as a funny scene on its own, while allowing the older audience members to understand the joke on the level of parody. However, while the play *Telephus* may at this time be twenty seven years in the past, this scene is not. We know it was seen in *Acharnians* in 425, only fourteen years previous, and we are safe to presume that this was not the only incident of a Telephus joke in Greek comedy in the years between *Telephus* and *Thesmophoriazuosae*.
[136] *Fab.* 99.7; 100.3, 6, 11, 13, 15, 16; 101.2, 6, 11; 162.3; 244.5; 252.2; 273.49.
[137] Both use the Latin *cerua*.

"Non te dicit Apollo sed auctorem uulneris hastam nominat." quam cum rasissent, remediatus est. a quo cum peterent ut secum ad Troiam expugnandam iret, non impetrarunt, quod is Laodicen Priami filiam uxorem haberet; sed ob beneficium quod eum sanarunt, eos deduxit, locos autem et itinera demonstrauit; inde in Moesiam est profectus.

Telephus, son of Hercules and Auge, is said to have been wounded by Achilles in battle with the spear of Chiron. When for days he suffered cruel torture from the wound, he sought oracular advice from Apollo as a remedy. The answer came that no one could heal him except the very spear that wounded him. When Telephus heard this, he went to King Agamemnon, and by Clytemnestra's advice snatched the infant Orestes from his cradle, threatening to kill him if the Achaeans did not heal him. Then since the Achaeans had been given an oracle too, that Troy could not be taken without the leadership of Telephus, they readliy made peace with him, and begged Achilles to heal him. Achilles replied that he didn't know the art of healing. Then Ulysses said: "Apollo does not mean you, but calls the spear the inflictor of the wound." When they scraped it, he was healed. When they begged him to go with them to attack Troy, they did not obtain their request, because he had as wife Laodice, daughter of Priam. But in return for their kindness in healing him, he led them there, pointing out places and ways. From there he departed to Moesia.

The fragments indicate some difference between the account found here and that found in Euripides' *Telephus*. When the first oracle is reported in *Fabula 101*, it is very direct, stating that the spear of Achilles is the required agent of healing for Telephus' wound. In Euripides (and in Sophocles' *Telepheia* trilogy as well[138]), this was probably much less explicit, stating only that the one who harmed would be the one who healed.[139] However, the statement of Ulysses in *Fabula 101*, in which he correctly interprets the oracle,

---

[138] Robinson (1969) 50 notes the deliberate ambiguity of the oracle in Sophocles: "Sophocles did not want the audience at this play to think of the oracle of Helenus as though it were a prophecy so clear, full and specific that no doubts could ever arise over the relative importance for the capture of Troy or Philoctetes himself as opposed to his bow." see Hinds (1967) 169-180 for the opposing view, to which Robinson is responding.

[139] *SFP 1*, 17.

suggests that the oracle was originally ambiguous, and was simply reported incorrectly the first time.[140] The oracle received by the Greeks seems to be wrongly recorded as well. According to *Fabula 101*, the Greeks need Telephus to take them to Troy, while the play fragments seem to indicate that the oracle is less specific, calling only for a native born Greek.[141] However, in light of the previous oracle, we might do well to discount the significance of this as well.

Ultimately, however, the impact of *Telephus* was visual, and its greatest influence over the tradition of the Telephus myth was based on two events: Telephus' disguise as a beggar, which allows him to infiltrate the Greek camp, and the staging of the hostage scene. The costume we know of from Aristophanes *Acharnians* (432-434):

> ὦ παῖ, δὸς αὐτῷ Τηλέφου ῥακώματα.
> κεῖται δ' ἄνωθεν τῶν Θυεστείων ῥακῶν,
> μεταξὺ τῶν 'Ινοῦς.
>
> Hey boy, give him Telephus' rags!
> They lie above the rags of Thyestes,
> between those of Ino.

There is no mention in the *Fabulae* of Telephus arriving at the Greek camp disguised as a beggar. The hostage scene is treated in *Fabula 101*, though there seems to be some difference. The snatching of Orestes may be of Euripidean origin, but may also be preceded by Aeschylus' *Telephus*.[142] Furthermore, the costume seems to be an integral part of the scene – it gives Telephus access to the baby Orestes, while in *Fabula 101*, Clytemnestra appears to grant that access. When the scene was staged,[143] it could only allow three actors. The first was of course Telephus himself. The second would have

---

[140] Rose (1934) 75.
[141] Webster (1967) 47.
[142] *EGM* 579.
[143] This scene was often thought to have not been staged at all, but rather reported in a messenger speech. It was Heath (1987) 275 who ended this train of thought, noting that "Aristophanes took the scene and twice produced an extensive burlesque – why, unless his audience had seen it on the stage?"

been Clytemnestra, to explain the presence of the baby Orestes[144] and the third was most likely Agamemnon.[145] It seems likely that Achilles does not appear until after this scene, and that Telephus does not agree to guide the Greek army until after his arrival.[146] This *fabula* seems to imply Telephus is able to address all of the Achaean army at once, though in *Telephus*, it is possible that Agamemnon or the chorus can be seen to represent the entire army.

3.3 Stheneboea and Bellerophon

The characters of Bellerophon and Stheneboea are almost inseparable within the *Fabulae*. Stheneboea never appears without Bellerophon and Bellerophon himself is only twice mentioned on his own: he is a son of Neptune and Eurynome in *Fabula 157: Neptuni filii*; and he wins a horserace in the games conducted by Acastus in *Fabula 273: Qui primi ludos fecerunt usque ad Aeneam quintum decimum*. There are two other instances in which Bellerophon is mentioned, and both are connected to Stheneboea. In *Fabula 243: Quae se ipsae interfecerunt*, we are told that Stheneboea kills herself over Bellerophon. This account of her death is consistent with *Fabula 57: Stheneboea*:

> Bellerophon cum ad Proetum regem exsul in hospitium uenisset, adamatus est ab uxore eius Stheneboea; qui cum concumbere cum ea noluisset, illa uiro suo mentita est se ab eo compellatam. at Proetus re audita conscripsit tabellas de ea re et mittit eum ad Iobaten regem, patrem Stheneboea. quibus lectis talem uirum interficere noluit, sed ad

---

[144] The taking of the "baby" occurs onstage in both *Acharnians* and *Thesmophoriazusae*, and so it is most likely that the baby Orestes would have been onstage at the onset of this scene, rather than fetched from offstage by Telephus. Heath (1987) 278 reasonably speculates that she may be returning from somewhere, such as a temple, with the baby in her arms.

[145] Webster (1967) 46-47, cites the evidence of three vases: a Campanian *hydria* (Naples, RC141), featuring Telephus on the altar with Orestes, and Agamemnon being restrained by Clytemnestra; a Campanian bell *krater* (Naples 2293), with Telephus and Orestes on the altar and Agamemnon approaching; and an Attic *pelike* (Thessaloniki 34.263) which shows Telephus with Orestes and two bearded men, likely Agamemnon and Odysseus, standing nearby.

[146] *SFP 1*, 17.

> Chimaeram eum interficiendum misit, quae tripartito ore flammam spirare dicebatur. idem: prima leo, postrema draco, media ipsa chimaera. hanc super Pegasum sedens interfecit, et decidisse dicitur in campos Aleios, unde etiam coxas eiecisse dicitur. at rex uirtutes eius laudans alteram filiam dedit ei in matrimonium. Stheneboea re audita ipsa se interfecit.
>
> When the exiled Bellerophon came into the hospitality of king Proetus, he was adored by his wife Stheneboea; when he refused to lay with her, she lied to her husband that she had been forced by him. And Proetus, hearing this, wrote letters about his situation and sent him to king Iobates, father of Stheneboea. When he read these he refused to kill such a man, but sent him to kill the Chimaera, which was said to spew flames from triple mouths. This was it: the first part was lion, the last serpent, and in its middle it was a goat. Seated upon Pegasus, he killed it, and is said to have landed in the Aleian field, where he is said to have dislocated his hip-bone. And praising his virtues, the king gave to him his other daughter in marriage. Hearing this, Stheneboea killed herself.

Because the two characters are so closely linked in the *Fabulae*, it seems best to examine Euripides' *Stheneboea* and *Bellerophon* together.

Of the two plays, we can speak more confidently of the plot and content of *Stheneboea*, though not of its date.[147] This is due in part to the fact that the *hypothesis* can be reconstructed almost in its entirety:

> Προῖτος Ἄβαντος μὲν ἦν υἱός, Ἀκρισίου δὲ ἀδελφὸς, βασιλεὺς δὲ Τίρυνθος. Σθενέβοιαν δὲ γήμας ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐγέννησε. Βελλεροφόνοτην δὲ φεύγοντα ἐκ Κορίνθου διὰ φίνον αὐτὸς μὲν ἥγνισε τοῦ μύσους, ἡ γυνὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν ξένον ἠγάπησε. τυχεῖν δὲ οὐ δυναμένη τῶν ἐπιθυμημάτων διέβαλεν ὡς ἐπιθέμενον ἑαυῇ τὸν Κορίνθιον. πιστεύσας δὲ ὁ Προῖτος ἐξέπεμψεν αὐτὸν εἰς Καρίαν ἵνα ἀπόληται· δέλτον γὰρ αὐτῷ δοὺς ἐκέλευσε πρὸς Ἰοβάτην διακομίζειν. ὁ δὲ τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἀκόλουθα πράττων προσέταξεν αὐτῷ διακινδυνεῦσαι πρὸς τὴν Χίμαιραν. ὁ δὲ ἀγωνισάμενος τὸ θηρίον ἀνείλε.

[147] Cropp-Fick give it a *terminus ante quem* of 422.

πάλιν δὲ ἐπιστρέψας εἰς τὴν Τίρυνθα τὸν μὲν Προῖτον κατεμέμψατο, ἀνέσεισε δὲ τὴν Σθενέβοιαν ὡς εἰς Καρίαν ἀπάξων· μαθὼν δὲ παρ' αὐτῆς ἐκ Προίτου δευτέραν ἐπιβουλὴν φθάσας ἀνεχώρησεν. ἀναθέμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Πήγασον τὴν Σθενέβοιαν μετέωρος ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἤρθη· γενόμενος δὲ κατ ὰ Μῆλον τὴν ἐκείνην ἀπέρριψεν. ταύτην μὲν οὖν ἀποθανοῦσαν ἁλιεῖς ἀναλαβόντες εἰς τὴν Τίρυνθα διεκόμισαν, πάλιν δὲ ἐπιστρέψας ὁ Βελλεροφόντης πρὸς τὸν Προῖτον αὐτὸς ὡμολόγησε πεπραχέναι ταῦτα· δὶς γὰρ ἐπιβουλευθεὶς παρ' ἀμφοτέρων δίκην εἰληφέναι τὴν πρέπουσαν, τῆς μὲν εἰς τὸ ζῆν, τοῦ δὲ εἰς τὸ λυπεῖσθαι.[148]

Proetus was the son of Abas and brother of Acrisius, and king of Tiryns. He married Stheneboea and got children by her. When Bellerophon came in refuge from Corinth because of a murder, Proetus purified him of his pollution but his wife fell in love with their guest. Unable to achieve her desires she traduced Bellerophon as having assaulted her. Proetus believed her and sent him away to Caria, to be killed: he gave him a letter and told him to take it to Iobates, who acted in accordance with what was written and ordered Bellerophon to risk his life against the Chimaera; but he fought the beast and destroyed it. Returning to Tiryns he held Proetus to blame but excited Stheneboea with the pretence that he would take her off <to> Caria. Told by someone of a second plot from Proetus, he anticipated it by going away. He put Stheneboea up on Pegasus and flew high in the air towards the sea. When he was near the island of Melos he threw her off. Fishermen recovered her after her death and brought her to Tiryns. Returning once more to Proetus Bellerophon confessed that he had done these things himself: since he had twice been the subject of plots, he had exacted the appropriate penalty from both of them, her life from her and his misery from him.[149]

Similarities do exist between this *hypothesis* and *Fabula 57*, but it would appear that a different tradition is in fact being used. The earliest account of Bellerophon's encounter with the Chimaera occurs in the *Iliad* (6.160-183), as Glaucus relates his family history to

[148] Reconstructed in *TGSF* from Iohannes Logothetes, Gregory of Corinth, *POxy.* 2455 and *PStrasb.* 2676 B(d).
[149] Translation *SFP 1*, 85.

Diomedes on the battlefield. There are minor differences between the account of Homer and the account found in the *fabulae*. The wife of Proetus is not known in Homer as Stheneboea (as she is in both the *Fabulae* and Euripides), but rather as Anteia. Iobates is not even named (as, again, he is in both the *Fabulae* and Euripides), but is simply referred to as the king of Lycia. However, the description of the Chimaera is worth looking at in Homer:

> ἡ δ'ἄρ' ἔην θεῖον γένος, οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων,
> πρόσθε λέων, ὄπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα,
> δεινὸν ἀποπνείουσα πυρὸς μένος αἰθομένοιο.
>
> And she was born of the gods, not of men,
> a lion in the front, a serpent in the back, and a goat in the middle,
> breathing forth the mighty rage of blazing fire.[150]

The description of the Chimaera – a lion in the front, a serpent in the back, and a goat in the middle (the Greek χίμαιρα for goat names the creature) – is exactly reproduced in *Fabula 57*, including the non-sequential order of the body parts. This tradition, starting with Homer, is passed on through Latin authors. The description of the Chimaera in this *fabula* is an exact reproduction of Lucretius 5.905: *prima leo, postrema draco, media ipsa chimaera.* However, the consistency with Euripides suggests also that the author has access to either the *hypothesis* or the play itself and is using it to supplement the information found in Homer.

The only major discrepancy with both Homer and Euripides is the manner of Stheneboea's death, but it is significant. In the *Fabulae*, she commits suicide after Bellerophon marries. In the play of Euripides, however, she is thrown by Bellerophon from the back of Pegasus. Her murder and Bellerophon's admission of guilt seem to form the final scenes of *Stheneboea*, and are the main focus of the play. For them to be

[150] *Iliad* 6.180-182. The translation is my own.

left out is a strong indication that we are not looking at the same tradition of myth.

The *hypothesis* of *Bellerophon* is extremely fragmented (Diggle doesn't even reproduce it in his *OCT*). Only a few intelligible words survive in the two pieces from *POxy.* 3651 and 4017. The play itself is not in much better shape, and it is difficult to make any positive statement about content, plot or date.[151] The surviving *testimonia* focus on Bellerophon's assault on the gods, and preserve mostly portions of the speech in which Bellerophon declares his angst against the gods.[152] The remaining fragments are not of a useful type: "The gnomic character of nearly all the thirty or so book fragments, and scantiness of secondary information, frustrate reconstruction."[153] Even the cause of Bellerophon's assault on the gods is unknown. This makes it extremely difficult to prove or disprove any connection between the play and the *Fabulae.*

3.4 Alexander

Although the plays in this chapter are not considered according to date, it may well be worthwhile to study all the plays from a single production. *Trojan Women* was discussed in the last chapter (see p. 39), and with the inclusion of *Alexander* and *Palamedes* in this chapter, the entire trilogy of 415 can be studied.[154]

---

[151] Cropp-Fick date give a *terminus post quem* of 425.
[152] Pind. *Isthm.* 7.43-7; *Schol.* Ar. *Peace* 147 A,B; Ar. *Peace* 58-176, *Ach.* 426.
[153] *SFP 1*, 98.
[154] Of *Sysiphus*, the satyr play produced with the Trojan trilogy of 415, virtually nothing is known. Only two fragments can be confidently assigned: Fr. 467 N is only one word, ἐλίσσων. Hesychius ε 2116 tells us it is used with the same sense as ψευδόμενος; this is not surprising in a play about the trickster figure Sisyphus. Fr. 673 N is slightly longer:

χαίρω σέ τ', ὦ βέλτιστον Ἀλκμήνης τέκος,
τόν τε μιαρὸν ἐξολωλότα.

What Heracles is doing in this play is unknown. The only known myth that associates Heracles and Sisyphus, found in Probus on Vergil *Geor.* 3.267, has Sisyphus stealing the horses of Diomedes after Heracles delivers them to Eurystheus. The myth as we know it does not require any interaction between Heracles and *Sisyphus*, see Scodel (1980) 122-123. In any event, there is no way of even knowing if this myth was the subject of Sisyphus, though Burnett (1998) 73 n. 32 seems confident it is, noting that many satyr plays "titled with the names of notorious villians or monsters" often included themes of theft and

The character of Alexander is one that occurs frequently in the *Fabulae*. The character is mentioned, as Paris, Alexander, or both, some 21 times,[155] plus two occurrences in the titles of *Fabulae 91: Alexander Paris* and *92: Paridis iudicium*. Many of these instances are passing or trivial. *Fabula 90: Priami filii et filiae numero LIV* simply lists Alexander as one of the many children of Priam (see discussion of Rhesus and Hector p. 35). Many other references are to the judgment of Paris and the subsequent removal of Helen to Greece. *Fabulae 92* and *98: Iphigenia* both tell us that Paris took Helen with him to Troy, though *Fabula 270: Qui formossissimi fuerunt* claims that Helen in fact followed Paris. The Latin of *270*, *secuta est*, makes it clear that Helen followed Paris. *Fabulae 92* and *98*, however, are more ambiguous, with no clear verb of motion: in *92*, Helen is given (*dare*) to Paris and in *98*, Paris desires (*auexerat*) Helen. Others focus on the actions of Paris in the Trojan War. *Fabula 115: Troiani qui quot occiderunt* tells us that Alexander killed three people in the Trojan War, and we are informed that Alexander, acting as the agent of Apollo, slays the arrogant Achilles in *Fabulae 107: Armorum iudicium* and *113: Nobilem quem quis occidit*. In the *Iliad*, Alexander is responsible for killing three men: Mnestheus (7.9); Euchenor (13.705); Deiochus (15.348). Thus, this passage of *Fabula 115* is consistent with Homer, though the names of the figures killed are omitted. None of these figures is named anywhere else in the *Fabulae*,[156] and they may be omitted simply to avoid introducing obscure figures. It is also possible that the author of *Fabula 115* is working from an epitome of Homer, that

---

revenge. Such plays included Aeschylus' *Ostologoi*, Sophocles' *Cedalion*, Euripides' *Autolycus*, *Eurystheus*, and *Cyclops* plays by Euripides, Aristeas, Epicharmus and Callias.

[155] *Fab.* 90.3; 91.8, 10, 14, 17; 92.8, 15, 18; 98.3; 107.4; 110.7; 112.1 (*bis*), 19(*bis*); 113.2; 115.2; 270.4; 273.50, 51.

[156] There is a figure named Mnestheus, who competes in the games put on by Aeneas in *Fabula 273*, though he is obviously not the Mnestheus killed by Alexander.

counts those killed, but does not provide names. There is no explicit statement in the *Iliad* that Achilles is killed by Alexander, but it seems that Homer did know the story. Achilles' death is foreshadowed in the prophecy made to Achilles by his horse, Xanthus (*Il.* 19.415-6):

> ἀλλὰ σοὶ αὐτῷ
> μόρσιμόν ἐστι θεῷ τε καὶ ἀνέρι ἶφι δαμῆναι.
>
> But as for you
> doom will come at the hands of a god and a man.

Ps.-Apollodorus (*Ep.* 5.3) does have Achilles killed by Alexander, working under the influence of Apollo. In the Epic Cycle, the *Aethiopis* mentions that Apollo and Alexander together slay Ahcilles, but it is Vergil's *Aeneid* (6.56-8) that first explicitly states that it is by an arrow shot by Alexander and guided by Apollo.[157]

Fabula 91 focuses on the birth of Paris and his triumphant return to the city of Troy:

> Priamus Laomedontis filius cum complures liberos haberet ex concubitu Hecubae Cissei siue Dymantis filiae, uxor eius praegnans in quiete uidit se facem ardentem parere ex qua serpentes plurimos exisse. id uisum omnibus coniectoribus cum narratum esset, imperant quicquid pareret necaret, ne id patriae exitio foret. postquam Hecuba peperit Alexandrum, datur interficiendus, quem satellites misericordia exposuerunt; eum pastores pro suo filio repertum expositum educarunt eumque Parim nominauerunt. is cum ad puberem aetatem peruenisset, habuit taurum in deliciis; quo cum satellites missi a Priamo ut taurum aliquis adduceret uenissent, qui in athlo funebri quod ei fiebat poneretur, coeperunt Paridis taurum abducere. qui persecutus est eos et inquisiuit quo eum ducerent; illi indicant se eum ad Priamum adducere <ei>, qui uicisset ludis funebribus Alexandri. ille amore incensus tauri sui descendit in certamen et omnia uicit, fratres quoque suos superauit. indignans Deiphobus gladium ad eum strinxit; at ille in aram Iouis Hercei insiluit; quod cum

[157] *EGM* 625.

> Cassandra uaticinaretur eum fratrem esse, Priamus eum agnouit regiaque recepit.
>
> After Priam, son of Laomedon, had had many children by Hecuba, daughter of Cisseus or of Dymas, his wife, again pregnant, in a dream saw herself giving birth to a glowing firebrand from which many serpents issued. When this vision was reported to all the seers, they bade her slay whatever child she should bear to avoid its being the ruin of the country. After Hecuba gave birth to Alexander, he was handed over to be killed, but the servants out of pity exposed him. Shepherds found the child, raised him as their own, and named him Paris. When he came to young manhood, he had a favorite bull. Servants sent by Priam to bring a bull to be given as prize in funeral games in Paris' honor, came and started to lead off the bull of Paris. He followed them and asked them where they were leading him. They stated that they were taking him to Priam ... [to be prize] for the victor in the funeral games of Alexander. He, out of fondness for the bull, went down and won everything, even over his own brothers. In anger Deiphobus drew his sword against him, but he leaped to the altar of Zeus Herceus. When Cassandra prophetically declared he was her brother, Priam acknowledged him and received him into the palace.

There are some similarities to the fragments of the play, but there are many inconsistencies as well. If we follow the *hypothesis* to the play, these inconsistencies will soon become apparent. According to the *hypothesis*,[158] Hecuba has her dream of the firebrand, and Priam orders the child to be exposed. He is raised by a shepherd as a son. This is presumably the information conveyed in the prologue of the play.[159] The first

---

[158] *POxy.* 3650.

[159] The identity of the prologue speaker is unknown, and so the subject of much debate. Several scholars have favoured the idea of a divine prologue. Snell (1964) 3 assigns the prologue to Cassandra. Webster (1967) 167 rules this out, noting that "Kassandra might see this in a prophetic frenzy but only a god could tell it in a flat prologue." He also points out that Apollo is ruled out by a Latin fragment of Ennius' translation of the play. Webster himself favours Aphrodite. Scodel (1980) 24 rejects Aphrodite, considering it unlikely for her to have any interest in the life of Alexander before the judgement, unless the judgement has already occurred. Scodel's solution is to suggest the aged shepherd who raised and named Alexander. This circumvents the need for a divine prologue, and avoids an early prophecy from Cassandra, when the *hypothesis* indicates that her place is late in the play. However, we do not need a god with specifically vested interests to deliver a divine prologue. Athena and Poseidon, for instance, are not directly related to the events of *Trojan Women*, the third play of this very trilogy. We cannot say anything

major discrepancy between this *fabula* and Euripides occurs when Paris is brought before Priam. According to the *Fabulae*, Paris comes to the city of Troy when servants of Priam take a bull that is prized by Paris. In the *hypothesis*, however, we are told that Paris' noble blood makes him superior to the base shepherds around him, and so he is bound and brought to Priam by the shepherds, due to his arrogance. The bull of Paris is not mentioned in the *hypothesis*, nor is there any indication of it in the fragments, suggesting that it was not included in the play. *Fabula 273: Qui primi ludos fecerunt usque ad Aeneam quintum decimum* tells us that Priam instigates the games in Paris' honor and that Paris is victorious in the footrace against Nestor (not the aged Greek, but rather a lesser known Trojan warrior), Helenus, Polites, Cygnus, Sarpedon and Deiphobus. *Fabula 91* tells us that he won "everything," which is more consistent with the *hypothesis*, which tells us that Paris won the footrace, the pentathlon and the boxing competition.[160] The altar of Zeus Herceus is unique to the account of Hyginus,[161] but could plausibly be staged. The resolution of the action, with the murder plot between Hecuba and Diephobus against Paris, is more difficult to sort out. "Il reste très peu de place à la fin mutilée de l'hypothesis, ce qui ne prouve pas grand chose, car souvent celles-ci ne résument l'action qu'à grands traits."[162] That Cassandra is involved in the recognition scene between Hecuba and Paris seems to be indicated both by *Fabula 91* and the *hypothesis*, but this raises obvious problems. Ought not the prophecies of Cassandra be unheeded by the other characters on stage? Certainly, it is evident from the *hypothesis*

---

with confidence in this matter, though a divine prologue might well be in keeping with the theme of Athena's petty and shifting loyalties that will later be found in *Trojan Women*.

[160] The absence of the chariot race as a competition in the games, so important to the messenger speech of Electra – and Sophocles' *Electra* and *Iliad* 23 as well – is not surprising, since the chariot race is a symbol of wealth and status, and Paris is still considered to be a slave, see Scodel (1980) 32.

[161] Scodel (1980) 37.

[162] Jouan – Van Looy (2000) 57.

that Cassandra predicts Paris' involvement in the destruction of Troy but is not heeded by Hecuba, who is overjoyed to have her son back.

At least one discrepancy can be ruled out, however. Huys suggests that "Euripides is likely to have chosen for only one character exposing the infant and raising it, whereas Hyginus distinguishes between the king's 'satellites' and the 'pastores'".[163] The closest tragic parallel – the survival and raising of an infant after being exposed to prevent the fulfillment of an oracle – is Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrranos*, in which not only do separate figures expose and raise the child, both appear on stage (or at least, in the case of the Corinthian shepherd, a figure representing the adoptive parents).

One other possible source for *Fabulae 91* and *273* is Ennius' *Alexander*. This, however, is ruled out by Webster, who notes that in the fragments of Ennius that survive, Hecuba dreams of the firebrand, but not of the snakes as included in *Fabula 91*.[164] Also, in the *Fabulae*, the name Alexander is given to the son of Priam when he is still a baby. We know that Ennius had the name Alexander assigned to him on his return to Troy, when he was grown up and had proven himself a ruler of men. Webster takes this to mean that, in Euripides, the name Alexander was given to Paris after he grew up, though the possibility still exists that the name was given while Paris was still a child.[165]

As Huys notes, "there may still be elements of Euripides' tragedy in the *fabula*," but it is unlikely that Euripides is an actual source for this *fabula* – most likely information is being gleaned from some intermediate source, perhaps Ennius, as Huys suggests.[166]

---

[163] Huys (1997) 21.
[164] The snakes appear to be unique to the *Fabulae*. See Rose (1934) 67.
[165] Webster (1967) 173.
[166] Huys (1997) 21.

3.5 Palamedes

As for *Palamedes*, *Fabula 160: Mercurii filii* mentions him as the father of Libya and grandfather of Libyus. *Fabula 277: Rerum inventores primi* records him as the inventor of eleven letters of the Greek alphabet. The primary story arc for Palamedes in the *Fabulae* (though it is clearly not one of great importance to the author(s), as the *fabulae* involved are far from consecutive) is the story of his exposing the faked madness of Ulysses in *Fabula 95: Vlixes*, his death as a result of Ulysses' revenge in *Fabula 105: Palamedes*, and the revenge of Nauplius on the entire Greek army for the death of his son in *Fabula 116: Nauplius*. *Fabula 105* describes the betrayal of Palamedes and his death at the hands of the Achaean army:

> Vlysses quod Palamedis Nauplii dolo erat deceptus, in dies machinabatur quomodo eum interficeret. tandem inito consilio ad Agamemnonem militem suum misit qui diceret ei in quiete uidisse ut castra uno die mouerentur. id Agamemnon uerum existimans castra uno die imperat moueri; Vlysses autem clam noctu solus magnum pondus auri, ubi tabernaculum Palamedis fuerat, obruit, item epistulam conscriptam Phrygi captiuo ad Priamum dat perferendam, militemque suum priorem mittit qui eum non longe a castris interficeret. postero die cum exercitus in castra rediret, quidam miles epistulam quam Vlysses scripserat super cadauer Phrygis positam ad Agamemnonem attulit, in qua scriptum fuit "Palamedi a Priamo missa"; tantumque ei auri pollicetur quantum Vlysses in tabernaculum obruerat, si castra Agamemnonis ut ei conuenerat proderet. itaque Palamedes cum ad regem esset productus et factum negaret, in tabernaculum eius ierunt et aurum effoderunt, quod Agamemnon ut uidit, uere factum esse credidit. quo facto Palamedes dolo Vlyssis deceptus ab exercitu uniuerso innocens occisus est.
>
> Ulysses, because he had been tricked by Palamedes, son of Nauplius, kept plotting day by day how to kill him. At length, having formed a plan, he sent a soldier of his to Agamemnon to say that in a dream he had been warned that the camp should be moved for one day. Agamemnon, believing the warning true, gave orders that the camp be

> moved for one day. Ulysses, then, secretly by night hid a great quantity of gold in the place where the tent of Palamedes had been. He also gave to a Phrygian captive a letter to be carried to Priam, and sent a soldier of his ahead to kill him not far from the camp. On the next day when the army came back to the camp, a soldier found on the body of the Phrygian, the letter which Ulysses had written, and brought it to Agamemnon. Written on it were the words: "Sent to Palamedes from Priam," and it promised him as much gold as Ulysses had hidden in the tent, if he would betray the camp of Agamemnon according to agreement. And so when Palamedes was brought before the king, and denied the deed, they went to his tent and dug up the gold. Agamemnon believed the charge was true when he saw the gold. In this way Palamedes was tricked by the scheme of Ulysses, and though innocent, was put to death by the entire army.

The fragments of the play by Euripides do not tell us much. For one thing, it is very difficult to assign specific fragments to Euripides: all three of the major tragedians wrote a *Palamedes*, as well as Astydamas the Younger and all of these versions seem to have been fairly similar in content.[167] The fragments we can be confident about appear to be from the defense speech of Palamedes, and a speech delivered by Odysseus, acting as the prosecutor. We know also, from the testimony of Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousae* 770, that Oeax[168] throws oar blades out to sea to let his father know of Palamedes' death, either on stage or off. Scodel concludes that of all extant accounts of these events, this *fabula* seems to come closest to the Euripidean version.[169] However, there is no mention of the oar blades anywhere in the *Fabulae*, and Aristophanes' parody of that scene

[167] Scodel (1980) 43.
[168] The only mention of Oeax in the *Fabulae* is in *Fabulae 117: Clytemnestra*, in which he informs Clytemnestra that Agamemnon is bringing home Cassandra as a concubine in order to get revenge on Agamemnon for the murder of his brother, Palamedes.
[169] Scodel (1980) 53. The other accounts she looks at are Ps.-Apollodorus 3.8; Servius *ad Aen.* 2.81 and the scholia to Euripides' *Orestes* 432.

indicates that they were a strong visual element in the play.[170] It is likely that the oar blades were thrown into the orchestra and potentially into the audience and that it is the physical staging of this scene that is being parodied in *Thesmophoriazusae*, rather than the idea. This would certainly not be evident to a later source that is only reading Euripides' *Palamedes*.

There seems to be no indication of any awareness of any of the plays of 415 in the *Fabulae* at all. The three plays are set at very different points of the very large story arc of the Trojan War. It is possible that the author(s) of the *Fabulae* rely on another source for all information on the Trojan War, and that source overrides the information that might be found in these plays.

3.6 Philoctetes

The figure of Alexander was discussed earlier in this chapter (see p. 90). The only references not discussed at that point were those that discussed his death. We are told by *Fabula 114: Achiui qui quot occiderunt* that Philoctetes killed three people in the Trojan War and *Fabula 112: Prouocantes inter se qui cum quo dimicarunt* specifies Alexander as one of these three. This is inconsistent with Homer and with *Fabula 115*. Unlike the case of Alexander, there is no mention of anyone being killed by Philoctetes in Homer: his story was part of the Epic Cycle, mentioned in the *Cypria*, the *Little Iliad* and Proclus. Aside from the extant play of Sophocles, we know that Aeschylus and Euripides also wrote a *Philoctetes*, and that the latter was produced in 431 with *Medea*. All three plays dealt with the attempts of the Greeks to recover Philoctetes and/or the bow of

[170] MacDowell (1995) 267 suggests the scene took place offstage, to be reported by Oeax later on. However, the scene in Aristophanes is much stronger if a visual image is being parodied, rather than a messenger speech being acted out.

Heracles from where they had abandoned him.[171] *Fabula 102: Philoctetes* is the only entry that treats these events:

> Philoctetes Poeantis et Demonassae filius cum in insula Lemno esset, coluber eius pedem percussit, quem serpentem Iuno miserat, irata ei ob id quia solus praeter ceteros ausus fuit Herculis pyram construere, cum humanum corpus est exutus et ad immortalitatem traditus. ob id beneficium Hercules suas sagittas diuinas ei donauit. sed cum Achiui ex uulnere taetrum odorem ferre non possent, iussu Agamemnonis regis in Lemno expositus est cum sagittis diuinus; quem expositum pastor regis Actoris nomine Iphimachus Dolopionis filius nutriuit. quibus postea responsum est sine Herculis [sagittis] divinis Troiam capi non posse. tunc Agamemnon Vlyssem et Diomedem exploratores ad eum misit; cui peruasserunt ut in gratiam rediret et ad expugnandam Troiam auxilio esset, eumque secum sustulerunt.
>
> When Philoctetes, son of Poeas and Demonassa, was on the island of Lemnos, a snake struck his foot. Juno had sent it, angry with him because he alone rather than the others had dared to build the funeral pyre of Hercules when his human body was consumed and he was raised to immortality. Because of this favor Hercules gave him his marvelous arrows. But when the Achaeans could not endure the offensive odor of the wound, by Agamemnon's order he was left on Lemnos together with the marvelous arrows. A shepherd of King Actor, named Iphimachus, son of Dolops, cared for the abandoned man. Later an oracle was given to them that Troy could not be taken without the arrows of Hercules. Then Agamemnon sent Ulysses and Diomedes as scouts to visit him. They persuaded him to be reconciled and to help in attacking Troy, and took him off with them.

This *fabula* is clearly drawing from a different tradition than Sophocles. In Sophocles' version, it is Neoptolomus, rather than Diomedes, who accompanies Odysseus to the deserted island of Aulos, rather than the populated Lemnos of Euripides (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 52.14). Webster, referring to a summary found in Dio Chrysostom 59, states that the Euripidean *Philoctetes* included: a chorus of Lemnians, who apologize to Philoctetes for

[171] Jebb (1890) xviii, discusses all three, relying heavily on the account of Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 52.

not visiting him more; the character of Actor as a friend of Philoctetes;[172] and Diomedes, who accompanies Odysseus to retrieve Philoctetes. The account of the *Fabulae* is similar to this, though it does not correspond exactly. In Sophocles, the oracle is never explicitly stated: it is unclear whether the Achaeans require Philoctetes, the bow of Heracles, or both. *Fabula 102* states clearly that it is the arrows of Hercules that are needed, and it is difficult to say if Euripides would have been that explicit. Apollodorus, however, agrees with this *fabula*: Odysseus and Diomedes are dispatched to reconcile Philoctetes to the Greek army and the Achaeans need the bow and arrows of Heracles (*Ep.* 5.8). The presence of Odysseus and Diomedes is consistent with Euripides. Two other events that Dio Chrysostom mentions are absent from *Fabula 102*. First, we are told that in the prologue, Odysseus informs the audience that he has been disguised by the goddess Athena. Second, the Trojans send an embassy to Philoctetes (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 52.13):

> φησί τε πρεσβείαν μέλλειν παρὰ τῶν Τρώων ἀφικνε ῖσθαι πρὸς τὸν Φιλοκτήτην, δεησομένην αὐτόν τε καὶ τὰ ὅπλα ἐκείνοις παρασχεῖν ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς Τροίας βασιλείᾳ
>
> [Odysseus] said that an embassy on behalf of the Trojans was about to approach Philoctetes, offering to place him and his weapons upon the throne of Troy.

Neither of these events are mentioned in the *Fabulae*, though with the amount of information given, these could easily be omitted.

The presence of Diomedes and Odysseus in the *Fabulae* is consistent with Euripides, as is the setting of the island of Lemnos. Huys considers this a discrepancy with Euripides.[173] The *hypothesis*[174] states that the wounding of Philoctetes and the

[172] Fr. 17 = *POxy.* 2455 indicates that Actor himself brought food for Philoctetes.
[173] Huys (1997) 23.
[174] *Poxy.* 2455 Fr. 17.248-251.

action of the play take place ἐπὶ τὴν παρακειμένην Λ[ῆ]μνον ("on the island located *near* Lemnos") as opposed to the island of Lemnos itself. This is an easy corruption, however, and need not be seen as a major divergence from the Euripidean tradition. Another apparent contradiction is found in the dispatch of Diomedes and Odysseus.[175] The *fabula* states that Agamemnon sent them to Lemnos, while Dio Chrysostom states that Athena urged Odysseus in a dream (59.3). However, the princes (βασιλέας) have already bid Odysseus to go to Lemnos. By obeying Athena, he is obeying the Achaean leaders as well, and Agamemnon is among them. The only major discrepancy is the presence in the *fabula* of Actor, who Dio Chrysostom states is absent from the Euripidean play (52.8). Both these elements appear to have been present in the Aeschylean play as well.[176] The dramatic tradition seems at least to have influenced this *fabula*. Homer is not a possible source like he was for *Alexander* and *Palamedes*, due to the narrative scope of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The greatest difference to be accounted for is the Trojan embassy. Other than that, *Fabula 102* seems to match the Euripidean plot fairly closely.

3.7 Phrixus A and B

The character of Phrixus is mentioned in only a few of the earlier *fabulae*, and not at all in the later *indices*. In those earlier *fabulae*, his name appears thirteen times,[177] plus two instances of entry titles: *Fabulae 3: Phrixus* and *21: Phrixi filii*. He is, in the *Fabulae*, consistently the son of Athamas and Nebula (1.2; 2.2). He is also the father, with Chalciope, of four sons, Argus, Melus, Phrontides and Cylindrus, who are picked up by the Argonauts on the island of Dia after Phrixus was killed by Aeetes (3.17; 14.143;

[175] Huys (1997) 23.
[176] Jebb (1890) xiii.
[177] *Fab.* 1.2; 2.2, 9, 10, 16; 3.2, 9, 13, 17; 12.9; 14.143; 21.6; 22.3.

21.6). He is also, in the *Fabulae*, the figure responsible for bringing the Golden Fleece to Colchis (3.9; 12.9; 22.3). In *Fabula 2: Ino*, Phrixus offers to sacrifice himself for the good of the city:

> Ino Cadmi et Harmoniae filia, cum Phrixum et Hellen ex Nebula natos interficere uoluisset, init consilium cum totius generis matronis et coniurauit ut fruges in sementem quas darent torrerent, ne nascerentur; ita ut, cum sterilitas et penuria frugum esset, ciuitas tota partim fame, partim morbo interiret. de ea re Delphos mittit Athamas satellitem, cui Ino praecipit ut falsum ita referret: si Phrixum immolasset Ioui, pestilentiae fore finem. quod cum Athamas se facturum abnuisset, Phrixus ultro ac libens pollicetur se unum ciuitatem aerumna liberaturum. itaque cum ad aram cum infulis esset adductus et pater Iouem comprecari uellet, satelles misericordia adulescentis Inus Athamanti consilium patefecit; rex facinore cognito, uxorem suam Ino et filium eius Melicerten Phrixo dedidit necandos. quos cum ad supplicium duceret, Liber pater ei caliginem iniecit et Ino suam nutricem eripuit. Athamas postea, ab Iunone insania obiecta, Learchum filium interfecit. at Ino cum Melicerte filio suo in mare se praecipitauit; quam Liber Leucotheam uoluit appellari, nos Matrem Matutam dicimus, Melicerten autem deum Palaemonem, quem nos Portunum dicimus. huic quinto quoque anno ludi gymnice fiunt, qui appelantur Ἴσθμια.
>
> Ino, daughter of Cadmus and Harmonia, wishing to kill Phrixus and Helle, Nebula's children, formed a plan with the women of the entire tribe, and conspired to parch the seed grain to make it unfertile, so that, when sterility and scarcity of grain resulted, the whole state should perish, some by starvation, others by sickness. With regard to this situation Athamas sent a servant to Delphi, but Ino instructed him to bring back a false reply that the pestilence would end if he sacrificed Phrixus to Jove. When Athamas refused to do this, Phrixus voluntarily and readily promised that he alone would free the state from its distress. Accordingly he was led to the altar, wearing the fillets (of sacrifice), but the servant out of pity for the youth, revealed Ino's plans to Athamas. The king, thus informed of the crime, gave over his wife Ino and her son Melicertes to be put to death, but Father Liber cast mist around her, and saved Ino his nurse. Later, Athamas, driven mad by Jove,

slew his son Learchus. But Ino, with Melicertes her son, threw herself into the sea. Liber would have called her Leucothea, and Melicertes, her son the god Palaemon, but we call her Mater Matuta, and him Portunus. In his honor every fifth year gymnastic contests are held, which are called Isthmian.

Fabula 3: Phrixus tells the story of Phrixus' and Helle's journey on the back of the golden ram:

Phrixus et Helle insania a Libero obiecta cum in silua errarent, Nebula mater eo dicitur uenisse et arietem inauratum adduxisse, Neptuni et Theophanes filium, eumque natos suos ascendere iussit et Colchos ad regem Aeetam Solis filium transire ibique arietem Marti immolare. ita dicitur esse factum; quo cum ascendissent et aries eos in pelagus detulisset, Helle de ariete decidit, ex quo Hellespontum pelagus est appellatum, Phrixum autem Colchos detulit; ibi matris praeceptis arietem immolauit pellemque eius inauratam in templo Martis posuit, quam seruante dracone Iason Aesonis et Alcimedes filius dicitur petisse. Phrixum autem Aeeta libens recepit filiamque Chalciopen dedit ei uxorem; quae postea liberos ex eo procreauit. sed ueritus est Aeeta ne se regno eicerent, quod ei responsum fuit ex prodiciis ab aduena Aeoli filio morte caueret: itaque Phrixum interfecit. at filii eius, Argus Phrontis Melas Cylindrus, in ratem conscenderunt, ut ad auum Athamantem transirent: hos Iason cum pellem peteret, naufragos ex insula Dia sustulit et ad Chalciopen matrem reportauit, cuius beneficio ad sororem Medeam est commendatus.

While Phrixus and Helle under madness sent by Liber were wandering in a forest, Nebula their mother is said to have come there bringing a gilded ram, offspring of Neptune and Theophane. She bade her children mount it, and journey to Colchis to King Aeetes, son of Sol, and there sacrifice the ram to Mars. This they were said to have done, but when they had mounted, and the ram had carried them over the sea, Helle fell from the ram; from this the sea was called the Hellespont. Phrixus, however, was carried to Colchis, where, as his mother had bidden, he sacrificed the ram, and placed its gilded fleece in the temple of Mars – the very fleece which, guarded by a dragon, it is said Jason, son of Aeson and Alcimede, came to secure. But Aeetes gladly welcomed Phrixus, and gave him his daughter Chalciope in

> marriage. She later bore him children, but Aeetes feared that they would drive him from his kingdom, because he had been warned by prodigies to beware of death at the hands of a foreigner, a son of Aeolus. Therefore he killed Phrixus. But Phrixus' sons – Argus, Phrontis, Melas, and Cylindrus – took ship to go to their grandfather Athamas. They were shipwrecked, however, and Jason, on his trip for the fleece, rescued them from the island of Dia, and took them back to their mother Chalciope. By her favor he was recommended to her sister Medea.

The two *fabulae* might cover the events of the two *Phrixi* plays. The two plays were known in antiquity only as Φρίξος Α and Β, or the "first" and "second" *Phrixus*. In other words, they were only numbered, and never assigned epithets, like *Melanippe Sophe* and *Desmotis* or *Hippolytus Kaluptomenos* and *Stephanias*. This makes it difficult to distinguish between the two plays, or to assign fragments to one play or the other. We have 19 citations or references that mention a "first" or "second" *Phrixus*, but we have no idea what the "first" and "second" refer to:

> Perhaps one *Phrixus* was a revision of the other, or perhaps the two were independent plays written at different times or concerning different phases of the hero's life. But perhaps it is also possible that "first" and "second" refer simply to their position in an alphabetical list of the kind found in *POxy*. 2455...the compiler of *POxy*. 2455 simply followed the alphabetical order in arranging his two *Phrixi* and put the one beginning with εἰ ahead of the one beginning with Σιδώνιον.[178]

The dates of the plays are unknown – Cropp-Fick only give them both a *terminus ante quem* of 416 – so it is impossible to say if the plays were produced in the order they are found in *POxy*. 2455. There is no guarantee that any classical source referring to either *Phrixus A* or *B* is consistent with another source: two authors may be speaking of different plays when they cite, for example, *Phrixus A*.

[178] Butrica (2001) 57-58.

It is possible that, following the example of the *Hippolytus* plays, that one *Phrixus* play is a revision of the other. This would make it nearly impossible to tell the fragments of one play apart from another, even if the ordinal references of "first" and "second" were consistent with one another. Webster calls the revision of *Hippolytus* "a very special case," and does not find a revision of one *Phrixus* play to be a very likely possibility.[179] He cites the *Melanippe* plays, noting that they are two very different versions of the same story. This is not strictly true, however, as the *Melanippe* plays, though they do not appear to follow exactly the same tradition, are set many years apart from each other, which we see in the changing age of the children: newborns in *Melanippe Sophe* and young adult men who are speaking characters in *Melanippe Desmotis*. However, the evidence of the *hypotheses* supports a relationship between the *Phrixus* plays more akin to that between the two *Melanippe* plays.

Following the convention of modern editors,[180] the plays shall be known by their place in *POxy*. 2455, which preserves portions of the *hypotheses* to both plays, even if this arrangement may only be based on the alphabetic order of the first lines of each play. Though little of the *hypotheses* remains, some conclusions may still be drawn concerning plot. For one thing, the setting changes between plays. *Phrixus A* is set in Thessaly: Ἀθάμας υἱὸς μὲ[ν] ἦν Αἰόλου, Βασιλεὺς δὲ Θετταλῶν ("Athamas was son of Aeolus and king of Thessaly").[181] *Phrixus B*, on the other hand, is set in Orchomenos: Ἀθάμας ἐν Ὀρχομε[νῷ βασι]λεύ[ω]ν ("Athamas was king of Orchomenos").[182] Athamas is said to be king of Thessaly in *Fabula 4: Ino Euripidis*, but no setting is

[179] Webster (1967) 131.
[180] *TGFS*, 160.
[181] *POxy*. 3652 & *POxy*. 2455.
[182] *POxy*. 2455

mentioned in either *Fabula 2* or *3*.

The *hypothesis* of *Phrixus A* is the more fragmentary of the two. It seems to indicate, however, that the play is about Ino's attempt to make the grain infertile. We know that someone is sent εἰς Δελφοὺς and will likely return to demand the sacrifice of Phrixus. This indicates that *Phrixus A* is more akin to the account of *Fabula 2*, but it is impossible to say how closely. The *hypothesis* of *Phrixus B* indicates that that play was concerned with the escape of Phrixus and Helle to the land of Colchis. Whether the play dealt with the fall of Helle from the back of the golden ram, the *hypothesis*, as it currently exists, does not say. Huys notes that much of the action in the *fabula* appears to have little connection to either *Phrixus* play, and so does not see a close connection.[183]

One other note is the presence of the Greek word Ἴσθμια at the end of *Fabula 2*, which indicates an author with some knowledge of Greek. There seems to be a concentration of entries that preserve Greek in this part of the *Fabulae*: not only *Fabula 2*, but as will be seen in the next chapter, *Fabulae 4* and *7* as well (see pp. 125, 130). This apparent knowledge of Greek allows us to attribute all of these *fabulae* to Hyginus B.

3.8 Hypsipyle

The character of Hypsipyle is mentioned ten times in the *Fabulae*,[184] plus one occurrence in a title, *Fabula 74: Hypsipyle*. She is the daughter of Thoas (74.3) and both *Fabulae 15: Lemniades* and *120: Iphigenia Taurica*, make her the daughter of the same Thoas who sacrifices Greek visitors in the land of the Taurians. *Fabula 254: Quae piissimae fuerunt vel qui piissimi* tells us that she alone of the Lemnian women did not

[183] Huys (1996) 174.
[184] *Fab.* 15.6, 10, 12, 15; 74.3, 7, 12; 120.5; 254.6; 273.25.

kill her father. *Fabula 273: Qui primi ludos fecerunt usque ad Aeneam quintam decimum* identifies her as the mother of Jason's children, Euneus and Deipylus. There is also *Fabula 74*:

> Septem ductores qui Thebas oppugnatum ibant deuenerunt in Nemeam, ubi Hypsipyle Thoantis filia in seruitute puerum Archemorum siue Ophiten Lyci regis filium nutriebat; cui responsum erat ne in terra puerum deponeret antequam posset ambulare. ergo ductores septem qui Thebas ibant aquam quaerentes deuenerunt ad Hypsipylen eamque rogauerunt ut eis aquam demonstraret. illa timens puerum in terram deponere...apium altissimum erat ad fontem, in quo puerum deposuit. quae dum aquam eis tradit, draco fontis custos puerum exedit. at draconem Adrastus et ceteri occiderunt et Lycum pro Hypsipyle deprecati sunt, ludosque puero funebres instituerunt, qui quinto quoque anno fiunt, in quibus uictores apiacam coronam accipiunt.
>
> The chieftains on their way to attack Thebes came to Nemea, where Hypsipyle, daughter of Thoas, as a slave, was caring for the boy Archemorus or Ophites, son of King Lycus. He had been warned by an oracle not to put the child on the ground until he could walk. When the seven leaders who were going to Thebes came to Hypsipyle in their search for water, and asked her to show them some, she, fearing to put the boy on the ground,...[found] some very thick parsley near the spring, and placed the child in it. But while she was giving them water, a dragon, guardian of the spring, devoured the child. Adrastus and the others killed the dragon, and interceded for Hypsipyle to Lycus, and established funeral games in honor of the boy. They take place every fifth year, and the victors receive a wreath of parsley.

The fragments of Euripides' *Hypsipyle* indicate a fairly similar storyline. All indications are that Hypsipyle herself delivers the prologue, which would announce the arrival of the seven against Thebes, particularly Amphiarus, who appeared on stage at least twice: first to convince Hypsipyle to take them to the spring, and then to speak in Hypsipyle's

defense.[185] If this is the case, the prologue would carry a fair amount of background information, i.e. how she came to be a slave in Nemea, and thus the play would in fact contain more information than *Fabula 74*. This is unusual – if anything, most of the *Fabulae* contain more background information than the plays to which they may correspond – but it is no reason to deny any relation between Euripides and the *Fabulae*. The king of Nemea, named Lycus in the *Fabulae*, is named Lycurgus in Euripides, and does not seem to appear on stage. Instead, Eurydice, wife of Lycurgus, provides Hypsipyle with a figure of aggression, against whom Hypsipyle must be defended by Amphiarus. The children of Hypsipyle, named Euneus and Thoas, rather than the Euneus and Deipylus of *Fabula 273*, appear on stage, but are not mentioned in *Fabula 74*. There was also a *deus ex machina* scene featuring Dionysus that is not mentioned at all in *Fabula 74*. In the *fabula*, two names are recorded for the child: *Archemorum siue Ophiten* (74.4). This reflects the tradition that the child, named Opheltes in life, is renamed Archemorus after his death.[186] The name Archemorus predates Euripides (Aeschylus uses it in his lost *Nemea*), but the post-mortem name change may not. The *hypothesis* has little information to add. What remains of it does not include the names of Euneus, Thoas, Eurydice, Opheltes/Archemorus or Dionysus.

The absence of Amphiaraus in particular makes it seem unlikely that Euripides is a primary source for this *fabula*. Also not mentioned in this *fabula* is the founding of the Nemean games, though this is a tradition not unique to Euripides.[187]

---

[185] Webster (1967) 213.
[186] *EGM* 511.
[187] Pindar *Nemean* 9.9; Aeschylus *Nemea*; see *EGM* 511.

3.9 Cresphontes

The second half of *Fabula 184: Pentheus et Agaue* in the manuscript tradition is an account of the story of Cresphontes. However, this passage is now transposed to complete *Fabula 137: Merope* by all modern editors, starting with an 1868 edition produced by Bursian. Previously, this *fabula* was only two lines introducing the myth of Merope. The restored version of *Fabula 137* reads as follows:

> Polyphontes Messeniae rex Cresphontem Aristomachi filium cum interfecisset, eius imperium et Meropem uxorem possedit.[188] cum quo Polyphontes occiso Cresphonte regnum occupauit. filium autem eius infantem Merope mater quem ex Cresphonte habebat absconse ad hospitem in Aetoliam mandauit. hunc Polyphontes maxima cum industria quaerebat, aurumque pollicebatur si quis eum necasset. qui postquam ad puberem aetatem uenit, capit consilium ut exsequatur patris et fratrum mortem. itaque uenit ad regem Polyphontem aurum petitum, dicens se Cresphontis interfecisse filium et Meropes, Telephontem. interim rex eum iussit in hospito manere, ut amplius de eo perquireret. qui cum per lassitudinem obdormisset, senex, qui inter matrem et filium internuntius erat, flens ad Meropen uenit, negans eum apud hospitem esse nec comparere. Merope credens eum esse filii sui interfectorem qui dormiebat, in chalcidicum cum securi uenit inscia ut filium suum interficeret. quem senex cognouit et matrem ab scelere retraxit. Merope postquam uidit occasionem sibi datam esse ab inimico se ulciscendi, redit cum Polyphonte in gratiam. rex laetus cum rem diuinam faceret, hospes falso simulauit se hostiam percussisse, eumque interfecit, patriumque regnum adeptus est.
>
> When Polyphontes, King of Messenia, had killed Cresphontes, son of Aristomachus, he gained possession of his kingdom and his wife Merope [with whom Polyphontes, after slaying Cresphontes, seized the kingdom]. But Merope hid the infant son whom she had borne to Cresphontes and sent him to a guest-friend in Aetolia. Polyphontes kept hunting for him with great assiduity, and promised gold to the one who killed him.

[188] *Fabula 137* ends here in the manuscript tradition.

> After he came to man's estate, he planned to avenge the deaths of his father and brothers, so he came to King Polyphontes to claim the gold, saying that he had killed the son of Cresphontes and Merope – Telephon. In the meantime the king bade him remain as a guest, in order to find out more about him. When he had fallen asleep through weariness, the old man who was an intermediary between mother and son came weeping to Merope, saying that he wasn't at the guest-friend's home, nor could he be found. Merope, believing that the one who was asleep was the slayer of her son, went into the chamber with an axe, unaware that she was about to kill her son. The old man recognized him and kept the mother from the crime. When Merope saw she had opportunity to avenge herself on her foe, she became reconciled with Polyphontes. While the king was joyfully making sacrifice, his "guest" falsely pretended to strike the victim to be offered, killed him, and secured his father's kingdom.

The possibility of this entry in the *Fabulae* being closely connected to the version of Euripides, dated to anytime between 455 and 424, is great: "This [*fabula*] makes a dramatic sequence comparable in obvious ways with Aesch. *Cho.*, Soph. *El.*, and especially Eur. *El.*"[189]

The best evidence for the text is Fr. 448a K, reproduced from *POxy.* 2458 and *PMichInv.* 6973, which preserves 128 lines of the prologue and *parodos*, though in a very fragmented state. In the prologue the young Cresphontes, returning to his father's kingdom, learns that Polyphontes has killed the elder Cresphontes and his sons. One of those sons, Cresphontes himself, however, was smuggled away as a baby and now poses a potential threat to Polyphontes:

> εἷς ἐστι παίδων λοιπ[ός], εἴπερ ἔστ' ἔτι.
>
> One of the children remains, if he yet lives.[190]

The second half of the play is somewhat more difficult to reconstruct. As Burnett notes:

---

[189] *SFP I*, 122.
[190] Fr. 448a K = *POxy.* 2458.

> The argument for the continuation of the play is thus based upon Hyginus, whose report of the mock reconciliation and the mock sacrifice plainly reflects theatrical convention; it is also, however, based upon what is known of the opening of the play with its preparation for the vengeance murder of Polyphontes.[191]

The only other strong piece of evidence that we have for the end of the play comes to us from Plutarch (*Mor.* 998E = Fr.456):

> †ὠνηστέραν† δὴ τήνδ' ἐγὼ δίδωμί σοι
> πλαγήν.
>
> ..... is this blow that I give to you.[192]

Plutarch tells us that this line is delivered by Merope as she raises an axe, indicating that Merope is physically involved in the attempted murder of the sleeping Cresphontes. This has caused a great deal of speculation on how the attempted murder and resulting recognition scene were staged.[193] If it was done on stage, and we are to take into account both *Fabula 137* and Plutarch, the murder/recognition scene would have required three actors: one to play the sleeping Cresphontes (who presumably wakes up at some point); one to play Merope, who is physically involved in the murder attempt, and therefore required; and one to play the old man, who, according to the *Fabulae*, is required to facilitate the recognition. Though there are difficulties in staging a scene that would likely take place indoors, this is preferable to losing the recognition scene.

---

[191] Burnett (1971) 21.
[192] Translation from *SFP 1*, 135.
[193] There are a number of possibilities. Burnett (1971) 18 favours featuring the attempted murder in a messenger speech, or reported by Merope herself. This is quite possible: once on stage, Merope could be followed by Cresphontes and the recognition scene, which began indoors, could then run its full course. Merope and the old man plot the murder on stage, enter the *skene* building, chase Cresphontes out onto the stage and effect the recognition scene there (*SFP 1*, 146). Webster (1967) 142 and Hourmouziades (1965) 105-6 (the latter is the stronger argument) favour the use of the *ekkyklema*. Other possibilities, generally rejected by most, include having the scene take place on one side of the stage area or having Merope and the old man attack the door of the skene building, which is much more reminiscent of Roman New Comedy than Greek Tragedy. The possibility also exists that the scene does not occur at all in Euripides and the line in Plutarch refers to something else, though the layout of *Fabula 137*, as noted above in *SFP 1* and Burnett (1971), strongly suggests that a tragic account is being followed.

There are still two inconsistencies with Euripides. First, the prologue of the play indicates that Merope sent the baby Cresphontes to her father, rather than to a guest-friend. Second, there is no indication that Cresphontes used the name Telephon in Euripides, though there is also no indication that he did not. It is certainly not necessary: other tragedies include names shared by figures in different generations of the same family – *Fabula 121* suggests that two Chryses figured in Sophocles' play of that name, and Euripides' *Hypsipyle* included her father and son, who shared the name Thoas. The name Telephon appears nowhere else, and modern editors of *Cresphontes* suspect a mistake on the part of the fabulist or a corruption of the text.[194] It is possibly a disguise used by Cresphontes as he infiltrates the palace of Polyphontes, though there is the strong possibility of corruption by either the author of this entry or a later scribe. In Ps.-Apollodorus (2.8.5), the child is named Aepytus, but there is no evidence for that name before Ps.-Apollodorus, so it is not known if that name would have even been used in Euripides' time.[195]

While the tradition followed by this *fabula* may have originally been Euripidean, the deviations in content make any direct connection unlikely. This conclusion is consistent with modern scholarship.[196]

3.10 Melanippe Sophe and Desmotis

Only two *fabulae* mention the figure of Melanippe. *Fabula 252: Qui lacte ferino nutriti sunt*, which uses a variant spelling of the name (Menalippe[197]), simply informs us

[194] Harder (1985) 52.
[195] *SFP 1*, 124.
[196] Harder (1985) 48; *SFP 1*, 121-2; Huys (1997) 24-5; Jouan-Van Looy (2000) 264.
[197] The use of the name Menalippe appears to be unique to Hyginus. It certainly destroys the etymology of her name, which originally meant "Dark Horse". Rose (1934) 155 suggests this is a corruption influenced by *Fabula 69: Adrastus*, which includes the character Menalippus. Ps.-Apollodorus does not mention the

that the two children of Melanippe, Aeolus and Boeotus were nurtured as infants by a cow. The other, *Fabula 186: Melanippe*, includes more detail:

> Melanippen Desmontis filiam, siue Aeoli ut alii poetae dicunt, formosissimam Neptunus compressit, ex qua procreauit filios duos. quod cum Desmontes rescisset, Melanippen excaecauit et in munimento conclusit, cui cibum atque potum exiguum praestari iussit, infantes autem feris proici. qui cum proiecti essent, uacca lactens ueniebat ad infantes et ubera praestabat. quod cum armentarii uidissent, tollunt eos ut educarent. interim Metapontus rex Icariae a coniuge Theano petebat ut sibi liberos procrearet aut regno cederet. illa timens mittit ad pastores ut infantem aliquem explicarent quem regi subderet. qui miserunt duos inuentos, ea regi Metaponto pro suis supposuit. postea autem Theano ex Metaponto peperit duos. cum autem Metapontus priores ualde amaret, quod formosissim essent, Theano quaerebat ut eos tolleret et filiis suis regnum seruaret. dies aduenerat ut Metapontus exiret ad Dianam Metapontinam ad sacrum faciendum. Theano occasione nacta indicat filiis suis eos suppositicios priores esse: "Itaque cum in uenatione exierint, eos cultris interficite." illi autem matris monitu cum in montem exissent, proelium inter se commiserunt. Neptuno autem adiuuante Neptuni filii uicerunt et eos interfecerunt; quorum corpora cum in regia allata essent, Theano cultro uenatorio se interfecit. ultores autem Boeotus et Aeolus ad pastores ubi educati erant confugerunt; ibi Neptunus eis indicat ex se esse natos et matrem in custodia teneri. qui ad Desmontem peruenerunt eumque interfecerunt et matrem custodia liberarunt, cui Neptunus lumen restituit. eam filii perduxerunt in Icariam ad Metapontum regem et indicant ei perfidiam Theanus. post quae Metapontus duxit coniugio Melanippen, eosque sibi filios adoptauit, qui in Propontide ex suo nomine condiderunt Boeotus Boeotiam, Aeolus Aeoliam.

> Neptune seduced Melanippe, a very beautiful girl, daughter of Desmontes or as other poets say, of Aeolus, and begat by her two sons. When Desmontes found this out, he blinded Melanippe, and shut her in a prison, with commands that only scant food and water be given to her, and that the

---

story of Melanippe at all. The only occurence of the name is in the *Epitome* 1.16 as an alternate, along with Hippolyta for the name Antiope, which is the name of Theseus wife. The name of Boeotus also does not appear in Ps.-Apollodorus, although Aeolus is mentioned (*Lib.* 1.7.3)

> children be thrown to the wild beasts. When they had been thrown out, a cow in milk came to the children and offered them her udders, and cowherds, seeing this, took the children to rear. In the meantime Metapontus, King of Icaria, demanded of his wife Theano that she bear children to him, or leave the kingdom. She, in fear, sent to the shepherds asking them to find a child she could present to the king. They sent her the two babies they had found, and she presented them to King Metapontus as her own. Theano later bore two sons to Metapontus. Since, however, Metapontus was exceedingly fond of the first two, because they were very handsome, Theano sought to get rid of them and save the kingdom for her own sons. A day came when Metapontus went out to perform sacrifices to Diana Metapontina, and Theano, seizing the opportunity, revealed to her sons that the older boys were not her own. "So, when they go out to hunt, kill them with hunting knives." When they had gone out in the mountains, at their mother's instructions, they started fighting. But with the aid of Neptune, Neptune's sons overcame them and killed them. When their bodies were borne into the palace, Theano killed herself with a hunting knife. The avengers, Boeotus and Aeolus, fled to the shepherds where they had been reared, and there Neptune revealed to them that they were his sons and that their mother was held in custody. They went to Desmontes, killed him, and freed their mother, whose sight Neptune restored. Her sons brought her to Icaria to King Metapontius, and revealed Theano's treachery to him. After this, Metapontius married Melanippe, and adopted the two as his sons. In Propontius they founded (towns) called by their names – Boeotus, Boeotia, and Aeolus, Aeolia.

This *fabula* covers the content of both of Euripides' *Melanippe* plays. *Melanippe Sophe* tells of the hiding and subsequent discovery of the twin sons of Melanippe and Poseidon. Because they are hidden and found in a stable being nursed by a cow, they are assumed to be monsters. Melanippe's father, Aeolus, at the persuasion of his father Hellen, orders the children destroyed. Melanippe attempts to defend the children without revealing their parentage. The *hypothesis*, which appears to be complete, preserves the story up to this point, ending its account by stating:

ἡ δὲ καὶ τὸν κόσμον αὐτοῖς ἐπέθηκε καὶ λόγον εἰς παραίτησιν ἐξέθηκε φιλότιμον.

And she prepared them properly and spoke out an honour-loving speech for them.[198]

This is the story of *Fabula 186* up to the point where the cowherds take the children. *Melanippe Desmotis* is probably not a direct sequel to the first play, but takes place sixteen years later, when the children have grown up. Of the two surviving secondary sources, *Fabula 186* and Diodorus 4.67, this *fabula* is probably closer to the account of Euripides.[199] However, there are still many problems with Hyginus' account. Doubts have been raised about the likelihood of Melanippe's father being killed by Aeolus and Boeotus.[200] We have at least two distinct versions of the family tree. *Fabula 186* tells us that Hellen is the father of Aeolus, who is the father of Melanippe, who is the mother of Aeolus and Boeotus. Aeolus and Boeotus are, in turn, the eponymous ancestors of the Aeolians and Boeotians. *Fabula 4*, however, preserves the same tradition as Ps.-Apollodorus (*Lib.* 1.7.3): Hellen is the father Aeolus. Aeolus in turn is father of Athamas and is also the eponymous ancestor of the Aeolians. This tradition does not seem to account for Melanippe as a daughter of Aeolus. It is would seem that Euripides is following the former of these two traditions, though it is possible that he is trying to work Melanippe into the latter. Regardless, the indication in *Melanippe Sophe* is that Aeolus, son of Hellen, is father of Melanippe and founder of the Aeolians.[201] In *Melanippe Sophe*, we have no indication of the names of the twin sons of Melanippe. In the fragments of *Melanippe Desmotis*, however, the only son to be identified is Boeotus:

---

[198] Fr. 668 a M = Ioannes Logothetes, Comm. on Hermogenes' Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος 28.
[199] *SFP 1*, 242.
[200] *SFP 1*, 243.
[201] Fr. 665a-c = Ioannes Logothetes, Comm. on Hermogenes' Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος 28.

...τὸν δ'ἀμφὶ βοῦς ῥιφέντα Βοιωτὸν καλεῖν.

...to call the one tossed among the cows "Boeotus."[202]

Much of *Fabula 186*, particularly after line 15 (*cum autem Metapontus...*) has a strong tragic structure. The information that precedes could be derived from a prologue, but is more likely from a tradition of myth perhaps originating from *Melanippe Sophe.*

There is one other point to consider. In the play of Euripides, Melanippe's father is Aeolus, namesake to one of the twins. The *Desmontes* found in the *Fabulae* is clearly a misreading of the Greek title of *Melanippe Desmotis*. The author of this *fabula* may have had difficulty with two figures with the name Aeolus and, in searching for the father, found the erroneous Desmontes. The acknowledgement of *poetae alii* (who are unnamed in the text as we have it) which consider Aeolus to be the father of Melanippe indicates that the author of this entry is aware of multiple versions of the story. If the author of this passage had access to the Euripidean play, or even to the fragments we now have in our possession, he would know that Aeolus is always the father of Melanippe. It seems likely that the author of *Fabula 186* has only the title of *Melanippe Desmotis*, and is reconstructing the story from Latin sources or that he has the play, but has such a poor knowledge of Greek that rather than read the play, he has only looked at the title and depended on Latin sources in reproducing the story. In either case, *Fabula 186* is clearly a product of Hyginus A. This is also consistent with the conclusions of Huys: there is no access to the plays, or even to the *hypotheses* as near as we can determine, but still some awareness of the play exists. This awareness may stem from direct access to didiscalic records on the part of the author of this *fabula*, or it has been passed on from an earlier source, perhaps an earlier mythographer.

---

[202] Fr. 489 = Dion. Hal. *Art Rhet.* 9.11.

3.11 Phaethon

The presence and treatment of Phaethon in the *Fabulae* is complex. He is mentioned only seven times,[203] plus two occurrences in entry titles, *Fabula 152a: Phaethon*[204] and *154: Phaethon Hesiodi.* He is listed in *Fabula 156: Solis filii* and *250: Quae quadrigae rectores suos perdiderunt.* The treatment of Phaethon becomes confusing when dealing with the two entries that include Phaethon in the title. Following the current arrangement of the *Fabulae*, the first of these is *Fabula 152a*:

> Phaethon Solis et Clymenes filius cum clam patris currum conscendisset et altius a terra esset elatus, prae timore decedit in flumen Eridanum. hunc Iuppiter cum fulmine percussisset, omnia ardere coeperunt. Iouis ut omne genus mortalium cum causa interficeret, siulauit se id uelle extinguere; amnes undique irrigauit omneque genus mortalium interiit praeter Pyrrham et Deucalionem. at sorores Phaethonis, quod equos iniussu patris inuxerant, in arbores populos commutatae sunt.
>
> Phaethon, son of Sol and Clymene, who had secretly mounted his father's car, and had been borne too high above the earth, from fear fell into the river Eridanus. When Jupiter struck him with a thunderbolt, everything started to burn. In order to have a reason for destroying the whole race of mortals, Jove pretended he wanted to put out the fire; he let loose the rivers everywhere, and all the human race perished except Deucalion and Pyrrha. But the sisters of Phaethon, because they had yoked the horses without the orders of their father, were changed into poplar trees.

A different account is preserved in *Fabula 154*:

> Phaethon Clymeni Solis filii et Meropes nymphae filius, quam Oceanitidem accepimus, cum indicio patris auum Solem cognouisset, impetratis curribus male usus est. nam cum esset propius terram uectus, uicino igni omnia conflagrarunt, et fulmine ictus in flumen Padum cecidit; hic amnis a Graecis Eridanus dicitur, quem Pherecydes primus

[203] *Fab.* 152a.2, 9; 154.2, 10; 156.3; 250.3.
[204] This *fabula* is not listed in the Index, and so is referred to as *152a* to differentiate it from *Fabula 152: Typhon.*

> uocauit. Indi autem, quod calore uicini ignis sanguis in atrum colorem uersus est, nigri sunt facti. sorores autem Phaethonis dum interitum deflent fratris in arbores sunt populos uersae. harum lacrimae, ut Hesiodus indicat, in electrum sunt duratae; Heliades tamen nominantur. sunt autem Merope Helie Aegle Lampetie Phoebe Aetherie Dioxippe. Cygnus autem rex Liguriae, qui fuit Phaethonti propinquus, dum deflet propinquum in cygnum conuersus est; is quoque moriens flebile canit.
>
> Phaethon, son of Clymenus, son of Sol, and the nymph Merope, who, as we have heard, was an Oceanid, upon being told by his father that his grandfather was Sol, put to bad use the chariot he asked for. For when he was carried too near the earth, everything burned in the fire that came near, and, struck, by a thunderbolt, he fell into the river Po. This river is called Eridanus by the Greeks; Pherecydes was the first to name it. The Indians became black, because their blood was turned to a dark color from the heat that came near. The sisters of Phaethon, too, in grieving for their brother, were changed into poplar trees. Their tears, as Hesiod tells, hardened into amber; [in spite of the change] they are called Heliades [daughters of Helios]. They are, then, Merope, Helie, Aegle, Lampetie, Phoebe, Aetherie, Dioxippe. Moreover, Cygnus, King of Liguria, who was related to Phaethon, while mourning for his relative was changed into a swan; it, too, when it dies sings a mournful song.

It should be noted that Grant is here trying to clarify this account with her translation, but is in fact altering the original *fabula*, hence the square brackets.[205] The Heliades, according to the author of this *fabula*, are not the daughters of Helios, but rather the granddaughters. While this term could still apply, there is no indication in the Latin of *Fabula 154* that the author has any idea what is meant by the term "Heliades": the Latin *Sol* is used for the sun, not the Greek *Helios*. In any event, these two *fabulae* are consistent with other extant sources, though Phaethon is usually not actually killed by the team of horses, but rather by the thunderbolt of Jupiter when he loses control of the

[205] Grant (1960) 125.

horses. In both he is the son of Sol and Clymene.

There are many differences between the two accounts. *Fabula 152a* deviates further from other extant accounts:

> Most writers do not say that Phaethon mounted the chariot secretly, or that he fell from fear, or that his sisters yoked the horses, or that the thunderbolt rather than the erratic course of the chariot caused the fire. Finally no one except a scholiast (who may go back to Hyginus)[206] joins the flood story with the story of Phaethon.[207]

The account in *Fabula 154* is more consistent with other surviving versions, though there are still problems. First and foremost is the issue of Phaethon's parentage. In Euripides, and indeed elsewhere, Phaethon is the son of Helios and Clymene. Clymene is married to Merops, and so Phaethon is raised as his son, though neither Phaethon nor Merops appear to be aware of this fact until Phaethon is grown.[208] The author of *Fabula 154* has had difficulty reading the Greek: Merops and Clymene have switched genders to become Merope and Clymenus, and Phaethon is no longer adopted by a mortal, but is rather the grandson of Sol. One matter that does correspond with Euripides is Phaethon's own understanding of his parentage. In Ovid, Phaethon grows up insisting that his father is the sun god.[209] In Euripides, however, Phaethon is not told his parentage until he is grown, presumably before the prologue to the play. This seems to be consistent with what we see in *Fabula 154*, which tells us that Phaethon flew the chariot of the sun upon being told his parentage.

There is also the matter of geography. The matter of Indians being turned black rather than Ethiopians is one of vocabulary more than one of geography. The exact

---

[206] *Schol.* Strozz. Germ. (p. 174 Breysig). See Rose (1934) 110.
[207] Grant (1960) 125.
[208] *SFP 1*, 196.
[209] Knox (1988) 538.

physical location of "Ethiopians" in Greek literature is hardly fixed.[210] Even within Euripides, the geography is unstable: the Ethiopians in *Archelaus*, for example, seem to be living at the source of the Nile, contrary to those in *Phaethon*, who are neighbors of Eos in the far east, as we learn in the prologue to the play, delivered by Clymene:

> Μέροπι τῆσδ' ἄνακτι γῆς,
> ἣν ἐκ τεθρίππων ἁρμάτων πρώτην χθόνα
> Ἥλιος ἀνίσχων χρυσέαι βάλλει φλογί.
> καλοῦσι δ' αὐτὴν γείτονες μελάμβροτοι
> Ἕω φαεννὰς Ἡλίου θ' ἱππστάσεις
>
> [I was given in marriage] to Merops, ruler of this country,
> which Helios, when rising, strikes first with golden
> light from his four-horsed chariot.
> The black peoples nearby call it
> the stables of Eos and Helios.[211]

The geography of Sol's stables is not mentioned in any of the *Fabulae*. Euripides places it in the far east, as does Ovid.[212]

Carl Robert attempted to reconcile the two *fabulae* by combining them into a single account of the story of Phaethon.[213] This theory was soundly refuted by Diggle, who noted that the attempt required the omission of information from both *fabulae*. Instead he concluded that *Fabulae 152a* and *154* "must be explained as variants deriving from separate sources."[214]

The question of source is an important one, since the title of *Fabula 154* claims to follow the account of Hesiod. However, the *fabula* itself attributes only one minor detail explicitly – the hardening into amber the tears of the Heliades – to Hesiod. This makes certain suggestions about the title of this entry: "The suprascription, it may be assumed, is

---

[210] Hall (1989) 141.
[211] Fr. 771 = Strabo 1.2.27. Translation is my own.
[212] Knox (1988) 542 states that it is Ovid who first places the stables of Helios in the east. Knox is apparently unaware that Euripides did it first.
[213] Robert (1883).
[214] Diggle (1970) 20.

a later addition prompted by the appearance of Hesiod's name in the body of the narrative."[215] The title also does not account for the mention of Pherecydes, who apparently names the river Eridanus. The rest of the account, with the exception of Phaethon's parentage and naming of the Heliades, corresponds very well with the account of Ovid.

The evidence of a misunderstood Greek source in *Fabula 154* might suggest separate authorship from other *fabulae*. Following the pattern that has been established throughout this study, we can suggest that *Fabula 154* is the product of an earlier author. The conflicting *Fabula 152a* might well be written by another author at a later date. In the manuscript tradition, the Index to the *Fabulae* does not include *Fabula 152a*. A marginal note of Micyllus' edition, *hoc caput in indice non numeratur* ("this chapter is not numbered in the Index"), tells us not only that *Fabula 152a* was in the *Fabulae* as Micyllus received it, and that the Index was not his own addition, but also that *Fabula 152a* was already treated as a separate entry. We can assume that *Fabula 154* was entered into the *Fabulae* at an earlier date, while *Fabula 152a* was "under the influence of a variant and less common account."[216]

3.12 Conclusion

To summarize the analyses of the plays in this chapter: *Erechtheus*, *Stheneboea*, *Alexander*, *Palamedes*, *Hypsipyle*, *Phaethon* all appear to have no connection to the *Fabulae*. *Philoctetes*, *Melanippe Sophe* and *Desmotes* seem to have strongly influenced some entries in the *Fabulae*. There is not enough evidence to make such a judgment on *Bellerophon*, *Phrixus A* or *B*, *Cresphontes*.

---

[215] Diggle (1970) 23.
[216] Diggle (1970) 22. *EGM* 33 tentatively suggests Aeschylus' *Heliades*.

Fabula 2, with its preservation of the Greek Ἴσθμια suggests dual authorship for the *Fabulae* and is probably the product of Hyginus B. *Fabula 186*, with its misreading of the title of *Melanippe Desmotis* also suggests dual authorship, and lends itself to Hyginus A, but suggests access to didiscalic records: the misunderstood Greek implies that the title of the play was known. The two *Phaethon* entries, *Fabulae 152a* and *154* are clearly by different authors as well, with *Fabula 154* probably being by Hyginus A and *Fabula 152a* by Hyginus B.

Chapter 4: References to Euripides in Hyginus

Four times is the name of Euripides mentioned in the *Fabulae* of Hyginus. He is once listed as a son of Apollo in *Fabula 161: Apollonis filii*, and we are told that Euripides is among those who are killed by their own dogs in *Fabula 247*. He is also twice cited as a source for a *fabula*, mentioned in the titles of two *fabulae*. This chapter will focus on those two *fabulae* and the plays that correspond to them.

Historical figures do not generally appear as figures in the *Fabulae*, and the passage in *Fabula 161*, *Euripides ex Cleobula* ("Euripides, [son of Apollo] by Cleobula"), is highly suspect. Huys proposes two possible emendations to the text, based on the earlier musings of other scholars.[217] The first follows an 1872 edition by Schmidt and would emend *Euripides* to *Myrtilus*, who was son of Cleobula and Hermes, and move the passage to the preceding *fabula*, *Mercurii filii*.[218] Huys prefers this option, but it is a rather large emendation, and even given the difficulties of the textual tradition of the *Fabulae*, it is difficult to see how so gross a corruption could have occurred. The second, expanding on a suggestion first made by Rose,[219] is to emend the text so as to make a reference to Euripides as a source: *ut Euripides indicat or sed ut ait Euripides*. This would parallel the reference to *Phaethon* in the text of *Fabula 152a*, and would be the only explicit reference to Euripides as a source in the text of the *Fabulae* (the others are found in entry titles).

Fabula 247: Qui a canibus consumpti sunt does not deal with Euripides as a source: *Euripides tragoediarum scriptor in templo consumptus est* ("Euripides, writer of

[217] Huys (1996) 171.
[218] Schmidt (1872) 15.
[219] Rose (1934) 114.

tragedies, was consumed in a temple"). This passage is partially consistent with the *Vita* (though the reference to a temple may well belong to Thasias, mentioned immediately before Euripides[220]). This passage, however, is the best indication within the text of the *Fabulae* of an awareness of Euripides as a source, even if he is not being so used here.

The two *fabulae* that claim Euripides as a source are *Fabulae 4: Ino Euripidis* and *8: Eadem Euripidis quam Ennius scribit.*[221] The title of *Fabula 4* is responding to *Fabula 2: Ino*, which covers different events in the myth of Ino. The subject matter corresponds more closely with *Fabula 1*, a relationship which will be discussed below. The intervening *Fabula 3: Phrixus* concerns the myth of Phrixus, first son of Athamas and Nebula, and his journey to Colchis, and so does not reflect on the events of the play *Ino* and has been discussed in the previous chapter (see p. 125). The title of *Fabula 8* is responding to *Fabula 7: Antiope*, and is differentiating between the two stories, and this will also be discussed below (as well as the title of *Fabula 8* and the reference to Ennius).

We do have some significant fragments of *Antiope*, but there is not very much left of *Ino*.[222] Nevertheless, we do know a little about the plays. Subject matter is remarkably similar. Both are about women who have somehow been ousted from their marriages and upon their return find another woman in their place. Murder is the result in both cases, with Ino deceiving Themisto into murdering her own children, and Antiope's sons killing Dirce. Treatment of the subject matter in the *Fabulae* is also similar. Both are being held up against other traditions of the same myth, which have been outlined in previous *Fabulae*.

---

[220] Rose (1934) 153.
[221] The antecedent of *eadem* is uncertain. It may be Antiope herself: "The same Antiope of Euripides". However, it is more likely to be *fabula*. This could refer to another entry in the *Fabulae*, or it could refer to a play by Euripides: "The same version/play of Euripides."
[222] *Antiope*: Jouan – Van Looy (1998) 214-274; *Ino*: Jouan – Van Looy (2000) 185-209.

4.1 Ino

The twenty-five surviving fragments of *Ino* only make up seventy-nine lines.[223] There are three traditions of myth that we wish to consider here. The first is the tradition which the entry title implies is non-Euripidean: *Fabula 1: Themisto*. The second is the tradition that we are told is "Euripidean": *Fabula 4: Ino Euripidis*. This tradition will be referred to as "Euripidean," with quotation marks, to differentiate it from the third and final tradition, a reconstruction of the actual Euripidean tradition from the fragments and other *testimonia*. It is the goal of this chapter to determine if the quotation marks can be removed from the second, "Euripidean" tradition, i.e. to decide if it is in fact derived from Euripides.

The non-Euripidean tradition is found in *Fabula 1*:

> Athamas Aeoli filius habuit ex Nebula uxore filium Phrixum et filiam Hellen, et ex Themisto Hypsei filia filios duos, Sphincium et Orchomenum, et ex Ino Cadmi filia filios duos, Learchum et Melicerten. Themisto, quod se Ino coniugio priuasset, filius eius interficere uoluit; intraque in regia latuit clam et occasione nacta, cum putaret se inimicae natos interfecisse, suos imprudens occidit, a nutrice decepta quod eis vestem perperam iniecerat. Themisto cognita re ipsa se interfecit.
>
> Athamas, son of Aeolus, had by his wife Nebula a son Phrixus and a daughter Helle, and by Themisto, daughter of Hypseus, two sons, Sphincius and Orchomenus, and by Ino, daughter of Cadmus, two sons, Learchus and Melicertes. Themisto, robbed of her marriage by Ino, wished to kill Ino's children. She hid, therefore in the palace, and when an opportunity presented itself, thinking she was killing the sons of her rival, unwittingly killed her own, deceived by the nurse who had put the wrong garments on them. When Themisto discovered this, she killed herself.

Fabula 2 covers a different series of events than the play: it describes Ino's attempt to destroy the children of Nebula. Ino then throws herself into the sea and Themisto does not appear in this version of the story. This is the story preserved in Ps.-Apollodorus

[223] Jouan – Van Looy (2000) 189.

(*Lib.* 1.9), and though he does add Themisto after these events it is almost as an afterthought – she bears four children, and there is no mention of their murder.

Fabula 4 corresponds with the events described in *Fabula 1*:

> Athamas in Thessalia rex cum Inonem uxorem, ex qua duos filios <susceperat>, perisse putaret, duxit nymphae filiam Themistonem uxorem; ex ea geminos filius procreauit. postea resciit Inonem in Parnaso esse, quam bacchationis causa eo peruenisse; misit qui eam adducerent; quam adductam cleauit. resciit Themisto eam inuentam esse, sed quae esset nesciebat. coepit uelle filios eius necare; rei consciam quam captiuam esse credebat ipsam Inonem sumpsit, et ei dixit ut filius eius suos candidis uestimentis operiret, Inonis filius nigris. Ino suos candidis, Themistonis pullis operuit; tunc Themisto decepta suos filios occidit; id ubi resciit, ipsa se necauit. Athamas autem in uenatione per insaniam Learchum maiorem filium suum interfecit; at Ino cum minore filium Melicerte in mare se deiecit et dea est facta.
>
> When Athamas, king of Thessaly, thought that his wife Ino, by whom he begat two sons, had perished, he married Themisto, the daughter of a nymph, and had twin sons by her. Later he discovered that Ino was on Parnassus, where she had gone for the Bacchic revels. He sent someone to bring her home, and concealed her when she came. Themisto discovered she had been found, but didn't know her identity. She conceived the desire of killing Ino's sons, and made Ino herself, whom she believed to be a captive, a confidant of the plan, telling her to cover her children with white garments, but Ino's with black. Ino covered her own with white, and Themisto's with dark; then Themisto mistakenly slew her own sons. When she discovered this, she killed herself. Moreover, Athamas, while hunting, in a fit of madness killed his older son Learchus; but Ino with the younger, Melicertes, cast herself into the sea and was made a goddess.

As we have seen, neither of these two *fabulae* cited above present Nebula or her children: that tradition of myth is reserved for *Fabula 2*. However, there may well be reference to the attempted murder of Nebula's children in the play. Ino seems to acknowledge her plot against Athamas' first children in Fr.2:

Φίλοι γυναῖκες, πῶς ἂν ἐξ ἀρχῆς δόμους
Ἀθάμαντος οἰκήσαιμι τῶν πεπραγμένων
δράσασα μηδέν;

O dear women, how could I dwell in the house
of Athamas and not commit the wrongdoings
from before?[224]

Euripides has Ino remembering her attempts against two of her husband's children as she contemplates killing two more. These previous murder attempts may well have been outlined in the prologue.

The three versions, non-Euripidean, "Euripidean" and the Euripidean, are for the most part in agreement, though two things distinguish the Euripidean version. Athamas is mentioned as the son of Aeolus in *Fabula 1*, and this makes him king either in Thessaly or sometimes in Boeotia (Ps.-Apollodorus records both, *Lib.* 1.9, 1.7 respectively). *Fabula 4* mentions him as king of Thessaly, and Fr. 25 suggests that the play was set in Thessaly:

Πολλοὶ παρῆσαν, ἀλλ' ἄπιστα Θεσσαλῶν.

There are many here, and other untrustworthy of Thessalians...[225]

The presence of Thessalians certainly suggests Thessaly as the setting.

The only major difference lies in the order of Athamas' marriages. In *Fabula 1*, we are told that Athamas marries Nebula, Themisto and Ino – in that order. Thus the plot of *Fabula 1* is one of revenge for the usurpation of Themisto's marriage. In *Fabula 4*, however, Athamas marries Themisto believing that Ino is dead. When Themisto learns that Ino is alive, and has been brought back by Athamas, she plans to kill the children of Ino as a pre-emptive strike, a motive which becomes stronger if Euripides presents us

[224] Fr.2 (399 N) = Plut. *De sera numinis uindicta* 556a. Fragment numbers in this chapter come from Jouan – Van Looy. *TGFS* includes only Antiope (though it also includes 175 N, which many still assign to *Antigone*) and *SFP 1* includes neither play.
[225] Fr. 25 (422 N) = *Schol.* Aristophanes *Plutus* 521. All translations of these fragments are my own.

with an Ino who has already tried to murder her husband's children out of jealousy. Fr.8 gives us what may be part of a speech delivered by Athamas to Ino, in defense of his remarrying and having more children:

> Τὴν εὐγένειαν, κἂν ἄμορφος ᾖ γάμος,
> φιλοῦσι πολλοὶ προσλαβεῖν τέκνων χάριν.
>
> Many wish to take a noble woman, even if she is
> an unseemly wife, for the sake of children.[226]

If this is Athamas defending his decision to marry Themisto, then Athamas has married Themisto after the loss of Ino.

The murder plot seems to remain the same, though *Fabula 1* is a little short on detail. Here it is a nurse (who may or not be Ino) who puts the wrong clothes on the children: there is no mention of black and white garments as there is in *Fabula 4* (4.11). It is *Fabula 4* that tells us that Ino is the disguised collaborator who betrays Themisto by switching the color of the children's clothes. There is no mention of the plot device of the black and white garments in the fragments. We do have what appears to be Athamas giving to Themisto the disguised Ino as a slave:

> Τοιάνδε χρὴ γυναικὶ πρόσπολον τἐᾶν
> ἥτις τὸ μὲν δίκαιον οὐ σιγήσεται,
> τὰ δ' αἰσχρὰ μισεῖ καὶ κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς λέγει.
>
> Such a servant must obey the wife
> indeed she will not be silent about justice
> but she hates shameful things and will say so to your face.[227]

Two further fragments, Fr. 16 and 19 are clearly from the conference between Themisto and Ino plotting the death of Ino's children, with Themisto imploring Ino to keep silent about the plot:

---

[226] Fr. 8 (405 N) = Stobaeus 4.29c.
[227] Fr. 11 (410 N) = Stobaeus 4.28.

Ἄνασσα, πολλοῖς ἔστιν ἀνθρώπων κακά,
τοῖς δ' ἄρτι λήγει, τοῖς δὲ κίνδυνος μολεῖν.
Κύκλος γὰρ αὐτὸς καρπίμοις τε γῆς φυτοῖς
θνητῶν τε γενεᾷ.

Queen, there are evils for many men,
for some danger lies far off, for others it is at hand.
For the same cycle exists for the fruits of the land and
the race of mortals.[228]

Ἴστω δὲ μηδεὶς ταῦθ' ἃ σιγᾶσθαι χρεών·
μικροῦ γὰρ ἐκ λαμπτῆρος Ἰδαῖον λέπας
πρήσειεν ἄν τις, καὶ πρὸς ἄνδρ' εἰπὼν ἕνα
πύθοιντ' ἂν ἀστοὶ πάντες ἃ κρύπτειν χρεών.

Let no one know these things which must be kept silent;
for someone could set alight all the crag of Ida
with a little torch, and by telling one man
all towns could learn what must be kept hidden.[229]

Of the aftermath of the murder, there is little evidence in the fragments. Both *fabulae* tell that Themisto kills herself. *Fabula 4* then includes the madness of Athamas which drives him to kill Learchus. Ino takes Melicertes, her youngest child, and leaps into the sea and becomes a sea goddess. This is an ending common to all stories of Ino – *Fabula 2* tells us that Ino is transformed by Liber (Dionysus) into Leucothea and Melicertes becomes Palaemon. Fr. 27 and 28, if they are properly attributed to Ino,[230] confirm this fate in the play:

Ἰνὼ μετὰ τὴν μανίαν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς μανίας πάθη θεὸν δοξά-
ζουσι γεγονέναι πόντου πλάνητες Λευκοθέαν ἐπώνυμον,
καὶ τὸν παῖδα αὐτῆς·
σεμνὸς Παλαίμων ναυτίλοις κεκλήσεται.

It is said that Ino, after her madness and the suffering caused by
that madness, became a god, they say, named Leucothea by those who
wander the sea and her child

[228] Fr. 16 (415 N) = Stobeaus 4.14.
[229] Fr. 19 (411 N) = Stobaeus 3.41.
[230] Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1935) 201 first assigns this passage to *Ino* as part of a *deus ex machina*.

by sailors was called divine Palaemon.[231]

And so there seems to be no discrepancy between the fragments and *Fabula 4*, though some elements, such as the color of garments placed on the children may be unique to the *Fabulae*.[232] However, the repetition and expansion of material from *Fabula 1* to *Fabula 4* would indicate that the two *fabulae* are the products of different authors. The longer, more detailed *Fabula 4* was likely written later and seems to have been written as a replacement for *Fabula 1*, which itself derives from a less complete source, not so directly connected to the Euripidean tradition. We have suggested that Hyginus B knows this play, and it is clear that the author of the titles of these entries is aware of Hyginus B's sources. However, we may not conclude that the author who wrote the titles is Hyginus B, as is seen in the following discussion of *Fabulae 7* and *8*.

4.2 Antiope

From *Antiope* we have a much greater number of fragments, thanks in part to the identification of numerous papyrus fragments as being from this play rather than Euripides' lost *Antigone*, as many believed.[233] Most of these fragments are centered around the *agôn* between Zethus and Amphion, in which the twin brothers argue whether it is best to lead the life of an athlete or the life of a musician. The fragments attributed to Zethus are set before those of Amphion. Most modern editors do so due to a preconceived notion of how an *agôn* works. At the end of the play, Amphion will inherit the throne from Lycus, and so most critics want him to "win" the *agôn*: i.e. deliver his speech in the second, "stronger" position. This is not the case, however. In numerous

[231] Fr. 27-28 (*Adesp.* 100-101) = Athenagoras *Legatio pro Christianis* 29.
[232] Webster (1967) 100.
[233] Kambitsis (1972) does not include 175 N = *POxy.* 3317 and Diggle (1975) does not comment – the papyrus was not published until 1980. *TGFS* includes the fragment with *Antiope*, while Jouan – Van Looy (1998) 199 leave it with *Antigone*. See also Luppe (1981, 1989, 1990) and Scodel (1982).

extant plays, including *Medea*, *Andromache*, and *Phoenician Women*, the weaker argument is the second, and beyond that, rarely does a speaker gain anything by "winning" the *agôn*.[234] In the end, there is not enough evidence to prove the order of speakers one way or the other.

Once again, we can consider three traditions of myth: the non-Euripidean, the "Euripidean" and the Euripidean as it appears in the fragments. The non-Euripidean tradition of the Antiope myth is presented in *Fabula 7: Antiope*:

> Antiope Nyctei filia ab Epapho per dolum est stuprata, itaque a Lyco uiro suo eiecta est. hanc uidam Iuppiter compressit. at Lycus Dircen in matrimonium duxit, cui suspicio incidit uirum suum clam cum Antiope concubuisse; itaque imperauit famulis ut eam in tenebris uinctam clauderent. cui postquam partus instabat, effugit ex uinculis Iouis uoluntate in montem Cithaeronem; cumque partus premeret et quaereret ubit pareret, dolor eam in ipso biuio coegit partum edere. quos pastores pro suis educarunt et appellarunt Zeton, ἀπὸ τοῦ ζητεῖν τόπον, alterum autem Amphionem, ὅτι ἐν διόδῳ ἢ ὅτι ἀμφὶ ὁδὸν αὐτὸν ἔτεκεν, id est quoniam in biuio eum edidt. qui postquam matrem agnouerunt, Dircen ad taurum indomitum deligatam uita priuarunt, ex cuius corpore in monte Cithaerone fons est natus qui Dircaeus est appellatus, beneficio Liberi, quod eius baccha fuerat.
>
> Antiope, daughter of Nycteus, was by a trick violated by Epaphus, and as a consequence was cast off by her husband Lycus. Thus widowed, Jupiter embraced her. But Lycus married Dirce. She, suspecting that her husband had secretly lain with Antiope, ordered her servants to keep her bound in darkness. When her time was approaching, by the will of Jove she escaped from her chains to Mount Cithaeron, and when birth was imminent and she sought a place to bear her child, pain compelled her to give birth at the very crossroads. Shepherds reared her sons as their own, and called one Zethus, from "seeking a place," and the other Amphion, because "she gave birth at the crossroads, or by the road." When the sons found out who

[234] Lloyd (1992) 15-17.

their mother was, they put Dirce to death by binding her to an untamed bull; by the kindness of Liber, whose votary she was, on Mount Cithaeron a spring was formed from her body, which was called Dirce.

The "Euripidean" tradition (or so we are told) is to be found in *Fabula 8: Eadem Euripidis quam Ennius scribit*:

> Nyctei regis in Boeotia fuit filia Antiope; eius formae bonitate Iuppiter adductus grauidam fecit. quam pater cum punire uellet propter stuprum minitans periculum, Antiope effugit. casu in eodem loco quo illa peruenerat Epaphus Sicyonius stabat; is mulierem aduectam domo matrimonio suo iunxit. id Nycteus aegre ferens, cum moreretur Lyco fratri suo per obtestationem mandat, cui tum regnum relinquebat, ne impune Antiope ferret; huius post mortem Lycus Sicyonem uenit; interfecto Epapho Antiopem uinctam adduxit in Cithaeronem; parit geminos et reliquit, quos pastor educauit, Zetum et Amphionem nominauit. Antiopa Dirce uxori data erat in cruciatum; ea occasione nacta fugae se mandauit; deuenit ad filios suos, ex quibus Zetus existimans fugitiuam non recepit. in eundem locum Dirce per bacchationem Liberi illuc delata est; ibi Antiopem repertam ad mortem extrahebat. sed ab educatore pastore adulescentes certiores facti eam esse matrem suam, celeriter consecuti matrem eripuerunt, Dircen ad taurum crinibus religatam necant. Lycum cum occidere uellent, uetuit eos Mercurius, et simul iussit Lycum concedere regnum Amphioni.
>
> Antiope was the daughter of Nycteus, king of Boeotia; entranced by her great beauty, Jupiter made her pregnant. When her father wished to punish her on account of her disgrace, and threatened harm, Antiope fled. By chance, Epaphus, a Sicyonian, was staying in the place to which she came, and he brought the woman to his house and married her. Nycteus took this hard, and as he was dying, bound by oath his brother Lycus, to whom he left his kingdom, not to leave Antiope unpunished. After his death, Lycus came to Sicyon, and slaying Epaphus, brought Antiope bound to Cithaeron. She bore sons, and left them there, but a shepherd reared them, naming them Zetus and Amphion. Antiope had been given over to Dirce, Lycus' wife for punishment. When opportunity presented itself, she fled, and came to her sons. But Zetus, thinking her a runaway, did not accept her. Dirce, in the revels of Liber, was

> brought to the same place. There she found Antiope and was dragging her to her death. But the youths, informed by the shepherd who had reared them that she was their mother, quickly pursued and rescued their mother, but slew Dirce, binding her by the hair to a bull. When they were about to kill Lycus, Mercury forbade them, and at the same time ordered Lyucus to yield the kingdom to Amphion.

One of the best fragments that ties the play to the *Fabulae* is Fr. 2.:

> τὸν μὲν κίκλησκε Ζῆθον· ἐζήτησε γὰρ
> τὸκοισον εὐμάρειαν ἡ τεκοῦσά νιν.
>
> And you called one Zethus, for she was seeking
> a proper place to give birth to them.[235]

We are told by the *Etymologium Genuinum* (α 838), a lexicon dating from the 9th or 10th century and based upon Methodius and other *scholia* and lexica, that Fr. 3, Ἀμφίων, is part of the accompanying etymology for Amphion. There is therefore some relation to the original play, and the inclusion of this etymology in the *Fabulae*. The problem is that the etymology is in the wrong *fabula*: *Fabula 7*, rather than *Fabula 8: Eadem Euripidis quam Ennius scribit*. There are two possible explanations for this. First, is the possibility of "bleeding" entries, i.e. the information from one *fabula* has managed to find its way into an adjacent *fabula* that preserves the same mythological material, by scribal error or by error on the part of the compiler. The alternative is that the etymologies were present in the sources for both entries.

There is also the matter of the title of *Fabula 8: Eadem Euripidis quam Ennius scribit* ("The same [play: sc. *fabula*] of Euripides, which Ennius wrote"). This is the only known reference to any *Antiope* written by Ennius. This is because the ascription is most likely a mistake: the source that the author was likely thinking of was the *Antiope* of Pacuvius. The confusion likely stems from Cicero *Fin.* 1.4, when he writes about *Enii*

[235] Fr. 2 (181 N) = *Et. Gen.* ζ 35.

Medeam aut Antiopem Pacuuii ("Medea of Ennius, Antiope of Pacuvius").[236] Cicero identifies them as *iisdem fabulis Euripidis* ("the same plays of Euripides") which suggests that they may be translations or adaptations of Eurpidean originals. This does not mean that the plays of Euripides and the Latin writers will correspond closely or at all, as translation was a loose concept in the ancient world. This mistaken attribution to Ennius suggests that the titles of the *Fabulae* were written later than the entries themselves. The scribe knew that the play of Euripides had a Roman successor/translator/adaptor, and so included this knowledge in the title of *Fabula 8*. What he did not know was that *Fabula 7* describes the events of that Roman play. *Fabula 7* may have been written to replace the *Fabula 8*, with more information, including the full explanation of the etymology of the names Amphion and Zethus. The titles could then have been written later, with the scribe attempting to explain why two entries covered the same general content.

If *Fabulae 7* and *8* are to be attributed to different authors, then we can potentially assign *Fabula 7*, with its Greek etymology, to Hyginus B. This leads us to assign *Fabula 8* to Hyginus A by default. This then means that Hyginus A has some knowledge of drama, without necessarily knowing Euripides. If Pacuvius is indeed the source for *Fabula 8*, then Hyginus A must be said to have access to Pacuvius, or an epitome of Pacuvius.

The best fragment of *Antiope* that we have, however, is Fr. 42, a papyrus fragment of over a hundred lines. In it, we have Lycus learning of the death of Dirce:

AM τὴν δ' ἐν νεκροῖσιν οὐ στένεις δάμαρτα σήν;
ΛΥ ἦ γὰρ τέθνηκεν; καινὸν αὖ λέγεις κακόν.
AM ὁλκοῖς γε ταυρείοισι διαφορουμένη.

[236] Rose (1934) 10; Maeck-Desmedt (1972) 71.

Am: Will you not weep for your wife among the dead?
Ly: She is dead? You tell of evil after evil!
Am: She is torn apart, drawn by a bull.[237]

After they have tied Dirce to the bull, Amphion and Zethus prepare to kill Lycus. This is interrupted by the arrival of Hermes, who prevents the twins from killing Lycus and calls upon Lycus to hand over rule of the kingdom to Amphion. Lycus is also directed in the disposal of Dirce's body:

ὀστᾶ πυρώσας Ἄρεος εἰς κρήνην βαλεῖν,
ὡς ἂν τὸ Δίρκης ὄνομ' ἐπώνυμον λάβῃ.

Burn the bones and throw them into the spring of Ares
that it may receive the name of Dirce.[238]

This corresponds well with *Fabula 7*, although in that entry it is Dionysus who transforms her body into a spring. This fragment only mentions Zeus and Hermes (and Ares, whose spring is renamed) and her body gives the name to an already existing spring. The *aition* of the naming of the spring may have existed in the plays of both Pacuvius and Euripides but varied slightly in each.

One last point that can be made about both *Fabulae 4* and *8* is their similarity to the *hypotheses* of the plays of Euripides. The format of the *hypotheses*, as noted in chapter 2 (see p. 26), is quite regular: some background information, followed by the events of the play and concluded with the announcement of things to come. Both *Fabulae 4* and *8* follow this format. The events of *Ino* must have begun either with Athamas' discovery of Ino on Parnassus or with her return to the palace, two or three sentences into *Fabula 4*. The fragments of *Antiope* indicate that it begins with her return to the palace. Both *Fabulae* conclude with the promise of things to come: Ino and

[237] Fr. 42 60-63 (223 N) = *PPetrie* 1.
[238] Fr. 42 82-83.

Melicertes will become sea gods, and Amphion will become king in Boeotia. *Fabula 7* also follows this format, suggesting that it too, is written in the form of an *hypothesis* or uses as its source an existing *hypothesis*. The only exception from the *Fabulae* that has been discussed in this chapter is of course *Fabula 1*, for which *Fabula 4* appears to have been a replacement.

4.3 Conclusion

From this chapter, we can draw two conclusions. First, the fragments of *Ino* correspond well with *Fabulae 1* and *4*. However, *Fabula 1* is clearly a less informed entry meant to be replaced by the more thorough and more accurate *Fabula 4*. Second, the fragments of *Antiope* match *Fabula 7*, which is set up in contrast to Pacuvius' play of the same name, represented by *Fabula 8*. These two conclusions allow us to attribute to Hyginus A *Fabulae 1* and *8*, the latter of which demonstrates a knowledge of Roman drama. To Hyginus B, we can assign *Fabulae 4* and *7*.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

This chapter will summarize the discussions of the previous chapters, and present the conclusions of this study in brief. Source will be discussed, with a look at the *fabulae* which can be considered Euripidean. The question of authorship will also be addressed. All conclusions and assessments will be brought together into a single unifying statement about Euripides and the authorship of the *Fabulae*.

5.1 Sources

It is best to start out with the *fabulae* that cannot be assigned to Euripides. In many cases this is because we can see another source at work. There is also a fair amount of material found in the *Fabulae* that cannot be found in any other extant source. This does not necessarily mean that this material has been invented by the author(s) of the *Fabulae*, but it is worth noting:

Table 4: Material unique to the *Fabulae*

Fabula	Event
4	Ino dressing children in black and white
15 & 120	Taurian Thoas father of Hypsipyle
46	Sacrifice of Erechtheus daughter Chthonia
69	Wounding of Oedipus' foot
79	Dream of Theseus and Pirithous
91	Altar of Zeus Herceus
	Hecuba's dream of snakes
137	Cresphontes using name Telephon
179 & 254	Agave killing Lycotherses

There is no specific pattern to these *fabulae* that can be defined within the scope of this study. Some (*Fabulae 4, 120*) have been assigned in this study to Hyginus B, but by no means all. This table simply demonstrates that the *Fabulae* do indeed present a reasonable amount of material that has no other extant source. We can also list a few

fabulae that appear to follow, directly or indirectly, an Euripidean tradition.

Table 5: "Euripidean" *Fabulae*

4	Ino Euripidis
7	Antiope
25	Medea
32	Megara
47	Hipploytus
51	Alcestis
98	Iphigenia
119	Orestes
120	Iphigenia Taurica
123	Andromache
137	Merope
184	Pentheus et Agaue
186	Melanippe

None of the *fabulae* listed above can be said to be influenced solely by a play of Euripides. In every case, there are minor inconsistencies, with details either omitted or added from the Euripidean original. Also, other *fabulae* exist which appear to have been influenced by the Euripidean tradition, though the consistent details are too minor for Euripides to be considered a primary source. *Fabulae 109: Ilione* and *152a: Phaethon* may well fit into this category.

There are also the few *fabulae* that indicate a non-Euripidean source. Though *Fabula 154: Phaethon Hesiodi* was shown to have little real connection to Hesiod, there is still some connection (see p. 117). *Fabulae 107: Armorum iudicium* and *125: Odyssea* both have strong connections to Homer or at least to the Epic Cycle. *Fabulae 113: Nobilem quem quis occidit* and *115: Troiani qui quot occiderunt* both seem to follow Homer as well, but present material that goes beyond the scope of the *Iliad*. *Fabula 8: Eadem Euripidis quam Ennius scribit* was shown in Chapter 4 to have Pacuvius as a source (see p. 130). *Fabula 121: Chryses* may indicate an awareness of Sophocles'

plays. This would show that the authors of the *Fabulae* had access to drama other than Euripides. As has been noted in numerous places in this study, various *fabulae* take on a form similar to a *hypothesis*, or can be plausibly seen as having a dramatic precedent. This access to drama might account for that quality in these *fabulae*, even if we cannot draw a direct connection between any given *fabula* and the plays of Euripides.

5.2 Multiple Authorship of the Fabulae

Each chapter of this study has provided some evidence of multiple authorship. This evidence usually appears in the form of repeated or contradicted material between separate *fabulae*. In the discussion of the *Fabulae* and extant Euripides, at least two, and a possible three, examples were seen of material repeated and either expanded or contradicted. The possible third is to be found in *Fabulae 31-35* (see p. 69). *Fabula 31: Parerga eiusdem* outlines the incidental labors. The four *fabulae* that follow *Fabula 31* expand on a number of those deeds. While others were meant to replace the original *fabula*, this is a case where a later author had access to more information on certain points, and simply wished to expand on the work of a previous author. *Fabulae 50* and *51* have a similar relationship. *Fabula 51: Alcestis* repeats *verbatim* so much of *Fabula 50: Admetus* that it is impossible not to accept that *Fabula 51* is in fact copied from the former. *Fabula 51* is more than just a copy, however, as it ends with an extra sentence outlining the events of Euripides' *Alcestis*. A potential error in the understanding of a Greek source in *Fabula 50* may also be corrected by the author of *Fabula 51*, with the incorrect translation of ἐν ξυνωρίδι being removed from the latter.

The study of the non-extant plays yields a further example. *Fabulae 152a: Phaethon* and *154: Phaethon Hesiodi* cannot be the product of the same author. The

absence of *Fabula 152a* from the Index suggests that it is a later addition to the *Fabulae*. Furthermore, in terms of content, the two *fabulae* cannot be reconciled.

Two more examples of non-extant plays can be found in the discussion of occurrences of Euripides' name. The subject matter of *Fabula 1: Themisto* is found again in *Fabula 4: Ino Euripidis*, though the treatment of content has changed and been expanded. Likewise, *Fabula 7: Antiope* provides a more thorough version of the Antiope myth, and one that is more consistent with what we know of the play by Euripides, than is found in the following *Fabula 8: Eadem Euripidis quam Ennius scribit.*

5.3 Hyginus A

In Chapter 1 (see p. 19), Hyginus A was hypothesized as the author of all entries that appeared to indicate a poor understanding of Greek. Any *fabulae* that indicate dual authorship have been divided and some of these too have been attributed to Hyginus A. The *fabulae* which seemed to be less informed of the Euripidean tradition were added to the list of plays attributed to Hyginus A.

In Chapter 2, we see a number of entries that may be attributed to this author. If two authors are responsible for the series of entries on Heracles, *Fabulae 30-35*, then we might assign *Fabula 31: Parerga eiusdem* to Hyginus A. Much of the material presented in this *fabula* is repeated and expanded in the following four *fabulae*. *Fabula 78: Tyndareus* is contradicted by the *fabulae* around it, in the story arc of the children of Tyndareus. *Fabulae 50, 121* and *125* all indicate some difficulty with a Greek original. In *Fabula 121*, the confusion of λιμός (famine) for λοιμός (pestilence) is enough to allow us to attribute this *fabula* to Hyginus A. The transliteration of οὖτις to *Utis* in *Fabula 125* suggests that the author or a later scribe had difficulty identifying the nature

of the text. Further, this entry corresponds to the *Odyssey* closely enough that Homer or an epitome of Homer must be the source of this *fabula*. *Fabula 50: Admetus* is repeated almost *verbatim* in *Fabula 51: Alcestis*, and so must be a product of one author or the other. The fact that *Fabula 50* is less detailed than than the one which follows suggests that it may be a product of Hyginus A. There is also the possibility of misinterpreted Greek, with the Greek phrase ἐν ξυνωρίδι being translated into *in coniugum* in Latin.

In Chapter 3, *Fabulae 46: Erechtheus* appears not to follow the Euripidean tradition at all. *Fabula 154: Phaethon Hesiodi*, although Hesiod is clearly not the direct source, is not taken from the Euripidean tradition either. This *fabula* must be by a different author than *Fabula 152a: Phaethon*. *Fabula 186: Melanippe* appears to have some correspondence with Euripides. However, the author of this entry has had difficulty reading the Greek title of *Melanippe Desmotis*, and has made Melanippe the daughter of a figure named Desmontes. This last demonstrates that Hyginus A, while not having access, or the ability to read the plays of Euripides, must at least have had access to didascalic information.

Chapter 4 deals with two pairs of entries which strongly indicate multiple authorship for the *Fabulae*. Of these, *Fabulae 1: Themisto* and *8: Eadem Euripidis quam Ennius scribit* appear to be the product of the less informed Hyginus A. *Fabula 1* is repeated and expanded with more detail in *Fabula 4: Ino*. *Fabula 8*, despite the claims of its title, is derived neither from Euripides nor Ennius, but more likely Pacuvius, which shows that Hyginus A must have been aware of at least some of the plays of Pacuvius, if not of Euripides. *Fabula 7* contains the same story, but in more detail, and preserves Greek etymologies not found in *Fabula 8*.

The conclusions of Huys, that there is no direct connection to the plays or even the *hypotheses* of Euripides, and that we must exercise extreme caution in using the *Fabulae* as a source for non-extant tragedy, seem to best apply to Hyginus A. The difficulties Huys finds in the *Fabulae* can be said to stem from both the lack of Greek and an ignorance of Greek tragedy as a whole. Access to didiscalic information, however, has allowed Hyginus A to produce entries in the *Fabulae* that appear as if they are following a reliable source.

5.4 Hyginus B

To Hyginus B, we may assign any *fabulae* that demonstrate an understanding of the Greek language. We can also place in this category any *fabulae* that, along with a one that has been assigned to Hyginus A, demonstrates dual authorship. On this premise, we can assign *Fabulae 32-35*, as they expand on the material first presented in *Fabula 31*. *Fabulae 77* and *80* are contradicted by *Fabula 78*. In Chapter 3, *Fabula 152a* was shown to contradict *Fabula 154*. *Fabula 2* presents a different tradition than *Fabula 1*. *Fabulae 4* and *7* also contrast with *Fabulae 1* and *8* respectively.

To these we can add the few *fabulae* that appear to have extensive knowledge of the plays, even though there may be further information added. *Fabula 120: Iphigenia Taurica* reflects the general content of *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, just as *Fabula 98: Iphigenia* agrees with *Iphigenia at Aulis*. *Fabula 119* describes the events of *Orestes*.

These are perhaps the *fabulae* that Huys has the most difficulty explaining away. Though none corresponds perfectly to the appropriate play of Euripides, all can be said to be informed at some level by a play or *hypothesis*. This then explains the weaker points in Huys' argument while still preserving his conclusions.

5.5 Indices and Hyginus A and B

It seems unlikely that Hyginus A is the author of the *indices* or the entry titles. We see this in *Fabula 154*, which cannot actually be based on Hesiod, as its title claims – only one minor point is being attributed to Hesiod in that *fabula*. *Fabula 78* actually contradicts one of the *indices*, *Fabula 240*, on the nature of Tyndareus' relationship to Helen.

There is nothing that says Hyginus B cannot be the author of the *indices*. We cannot state for certain that these authors are one and the same, but in the interest of simplicity, we might do well to combine the two.

5.6 Conclusion and Summary

As stated in the introduction, the narrow scope of this study must result in tentative conclusions. By limiting the focus of this study to only two basic criteria, the correspondance between the *Fabulae* and the extant and fragmentary plays of Euripides, and the disparities between various *fabulae* and the knowledge of Greek they exhibit, we make several statements that, while necessarily uncertain, do seem to point to the inevitable results of further, more thorough study.

In respect to the question of source, elements of Euripidean traditions are clearly in evidence. Although some *fabulae* demonstrate a coincidence near enough to material found in Euripides to indicate a primary source relationship, there is no Euripidean tradition that survives in the *Fabulae* without some corruption from other sources. Many other *fabulae* are clearly written in ignorance of Euripidean tradition. This inconsistency of source can often be linked to the issue of authorship.

It can be stated with confidence that the *Fabulae* were not produced by a single

hand. Revisions and additions have been made. Even some entry titles and the Index appear not to be written by the author of certain *fabulae*. In this discrepancy between *fabulae*, we see evidence of two (or more) writers operating at different levels of awareness, with at least one author able to provide more information on different plays of Euripides.

Bibliography

Editions and Commentaries

Micyllus, J. ed. 1535. *Fabularum Liber.* Reprinted in *The Renaissance and the Gods* no.6 1976.

Bursian, K. 1868. *Ex Hygini genealogiis excerpta a Conrado Bursian restituta.* Zurich.

Schmidt, M. 1872. *Hygini Fabulae.* Jena.

Rose, H.J. 1934. *Hygini Fabulae.* London.

Grant, M. 1960. *The Myths of Hyginus.* Lawrence.

Bouriaud, J-Y. 1997. *Hygin: Fables.* Paris.

Marshall, P.K. 1998. *Hygini Fabulae.* Stuttgart.

General Bibliography

Allan, W. 2000. *The Andromache and Euripidean Tragedy.* Oxford.

Barlow, S., ed. 1996. *Euripides: Heracles.* Warminster.

Barrett, W.S., ed. 1964. *Euripides: Hippolytos.* Oxford.

le Bœuffle, A., ed. 1983. *Hygin: Astronomie.* Paris.

Bond, G.W., ed. 1963. *Euripides: Hypsipyle.* Oxford.

Burnett, A. P. 1971. *Catastrophe Survived.* Oxford.

———. 1998. *Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy.* Los Angeles.

Butrica, J. 2001. "The Lost *Thesmophoriazousae* of Aristophanes," *Phoenix* 55: 44-76.

Calder, W. M. 1969. "The date of Euripides' *Erechtheus*," *GRBS* 10: 147-156.

Christenson, D. M., ed. 2000. *Plautus: Amphitruo.* Cambridge.

Collard, C., ed. 1991. *Euripides: Hecuba.* Warminster.

———, M.J. Cropp and K.H. Lee, edd. 1995. *Euripides: Select Fragmentary Plays 1.* Warminster.

Cropp, M. and G. Fick. 1985. *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides.* London.

Davies, M., ed. 1988. *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Göttingen.

———. 1989. *The Epic Cycle.* Bristol.

Diggle, J., ed. 1970. *Euripides: Phaethon.* Cambridge.

———. 1975. "*L'Antiope* d'Euripide," *Gnomon* 47: 288-291.

———. 1990. *Euripidea.* Oxford.

———. 1997. "Notes on Fragments of Euripides," *CQ* ns 47: 98-108.

Dionisotti, A.C. 1982. "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and its Relatives,"

JRS 72: 83-125.

Dodds, E.R., ed.1960. *Euripides: Bacchae*. Oxford.

Frazer, J. G., ed. 1921. *Apollodorus: The Library*. Cambridge [Mass.].

Funaioli, H., ed. 1969. *Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta*. Stuttgart.

Galinsky, G. K. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Oxford.

Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore.

Gemoll, A. 1877. "Über das Fragment De munitionibus castrorum," *Hermes* 11: 164-178.

Goetz, G. 1892. *Hermeneumata: Pseudositheana, Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. Lipsiae.

Gregory, J. 1999. *Euripides: Hecuba, Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Atlanta.

Griffin, J. 1990. "Characterization in Euripides: *Hippolytus* and *Iphigenia in Aulis*," in Pelling, C., ed. *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (Oxford) 128-149.

Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian*. Oxford.

Halleran, M.R., ed. 1995. *Euripides: Hippolytus*. Warminster.

Harder, A., ed. 1985. *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos*. London.

Heath, M. 1987. "Euripides' *Telephus*," *CQ* n.s. 37: 272-280.

Henrichs, A. 1986. "Three Approaches to Greek Mythography," in Bremmer, J. et al., edd. *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*. (Totowa) 242-277.

Heubeck, A. & A. Hoekstra. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Volume II* Oxford.

Hinds, A.E. 1967. "The Prophecy of Helenus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*," *CQ* n.s. 17: 169-180.

Hourmouziades, N. 1965. *Production and Imagination in Euripides*. Athens.

Huys, M. 1996, 1997. "Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides': Sources of the *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus?" *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandt Gebiete* 42: 168-178 and 43: 11-30.

Jebb, R.C., ed. 1890. *Sophocles: Philoctetes*. Cambridge.

Jouan, F. and Van Looy, H. &, edd. 1998, 2000 *Euripide: text établi et traduit v. 8 & 9.* Paris.

Kambitsis, J., ed. 1972. *L'Antiope* d'Euripide. Athens.

Kamerbeek, J.C. 1966. "Unity and Meaning of Euripides' *Heracles*," *Mnemosyne* 19: 1-16.

Knox, P. 1988. "*Phaethon in Ovid and Nonnus*," *CQ* n.s. 38: 536-551.

Kovacs, P.D. 1980. *The Andromache of Euripides*. Chico.

Lenoir, M., ed. 1979. *Pseudo-Hygin: Des fortifications du camp*. Paris.

Lloyd, M. 1992. *The Agon in Euripides*. Oxford.

———, ed. 1994. *Euripides: Andromache*. Warminster.

Lloyd-Jones, H. appendix to Smyth, H.W., ed. 1983. *Aeschylus II: Oresteia and Fragments*. Cambridge [Mass.].

———., ed. 1996. *Sophocles III: Fragments*. Cambridge [Mass.].

Luppe, W. 1981. "Das Neue Euripides-Fr. *POxy*. 3317", *ZPE* 42: 27-30.

———. 1984. "Die Μήδεια-Hypothesis." *Anagennesis* 4.

———. 1984a. "Euripides, Hypotheseis in den Hygin-Fabeln Antiope und Ino?" *Philologus* 127 41-59.

———. 1989. "Nochmals zur Zuordnung des Tragiker-Fragments *POxy*. 3317," *ZPE* 77: 13-17.

———. 1990. "Neue Erkenntnisse aus Euripides Papyri," *Acta Antiqua* 33: 39-44.

———. 1994. "Die Hypothesis zum ersten Hippolytos (P.Mich. inv. 6222a)," *ZPE* 102 23-39.

MacDowell, D. M. 1995. *Aristophanes and Athens*. Oxford.

Maeck-Desmedt, C. 1972. "Fabulae Hygini: VIII Eadem Euripides quam Ennius scribit," *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 50: 70-77.

———. 1973 "Fabulae Hygini," *Bolletino di studi latini* 3: 26-34.

Marshall, C.W. 2001. "The Consequences of Dating the *Cyclops*," in Joyal, M., ed. *In Altum: Seventy-Five Years of Classical Studies in Newfoundland*. (St. John's) 225-242.

Mastronarde, D.J., ed. 1994. *Euripides: Phoenissae*. Cambridge.

Mossman, J. 1995. *Wild Justice: A Study of Euripides' Hecuba*. Oxford.

Page, D.L., ed. 1938. *Euripides: Medea*. Oxford.

Petrie, A., trans. 1922. *Lycurgus, The Speech against Leocrates*. Cambridge.

Ritchie, W. 1964. *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides*. Cambridge.

Robert, C. 1883. "*Erat. Catast. Rel.* 214-20," *Hermes* 18: 434-41.

Robinson, D.B. 1969. "Topics in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*," *CQ* n.s. 19: 34-56.

Rose, H.J. 1929. "An Unrecognized Fragment of Hyginus, *Fabulae*," *CQ* 23: 96-99.

Rossum-Steenbeek, M. van. 1998. *Greek Reader's Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri*. Leiden.

Scodel, R. 1980. *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*. Göttingen.

———. 1982. "*POxy*. 3317. Euripides' *Antigone*," *ZPE* 46: 37-42.

Seaford, R. 1982. "The Date of Euripides' *Cyclops*," *JHS* 102: 163-72.

———, ed. 1984. *Euripides: Cyclops*. Oxford.

Sedgewick, W.B., ed. 1960. *Plautus: Amphtruo*. Manchester.

Simpson, M. 1976. *Gods and Heroes of the Greeks: The Library of Apollodorus*. Amherst.

Snell, B. 1964. *Scenes from Greek Drama*. Berkeley.

———. 1964. Supplementum in Nauck, A. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Hildesheim.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1998. *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art*. Cambridge.

Stevens, P.T., ed. 1971. *Euripides: Andromache*. Oxford.

Turyn, A. 1957. *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides*. Urbana.

van der Valk, M. 1958. "On Apollodori Bibliotheca," *Revue des Études Grecques* 71: 100-168.

Webster, T.B.L. 1967. *The Tragedies of Euripides*. Oxford.

West, M.L., ed. 1987. *Euripides: Orestes*. Warminster.

Wheeler, S.M. 2000. *Narrative Dynamics in Ovid's Metamorphoses. Classica Monacensia* Band 20. Tübingen.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1895. *Euripides: Herakles*. Second edition. Berlin. Reprinted: Bad Homburg, 1959.

———. 1935. *Kleine Schriften*. Band 1. Berlin.

Wilkins, J. 1990. "The State and the Individual: Euripides' plays of Voluntary Self-Sacrifice" in Powell, A., ed. *Euripides, Women and Sexuality* (London and New York) 177-194.

Willink, C.W., ed. 1986. *Euripides: Orestes*. Oxford.

———, ed. 1993. *Euripides: Heraclidae*. Oxford.

Zuntz, G. 1965. *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides*. Cambridge.