

DID EURIPIDES' *ANDROMACHE* PREMIERE OUTSIDE ATHENS?

ABSTRACT

This article re-examines the scholium on Euripides, *Andromache* 445, which several scholars have used to support the claim that *Andromache* premiered outside Athens, and concludes that both the scholium itself and a remark in the play's hypothesis rather suggest that the play was produced in Athens as part of a dramatic competition.

Keywords: Euripides; *Andromache*; Callimachus; *Didascaliae*; ancient scholarship; Greek inscriptions; Greek tragedy; dramatic hypotheses

According to an ancient scholium, the *Andromache* of Euripides was not performed in Athens and therefore could not be dated precisely.¹ Taking this statement at face value, several scholars have concluded that the play premiered outside Athens. Accordingly, *Andromache* features prominently in the growing corpus of scholarship on theatre beyond Athens,² its performance located in such diverse places as Thessaly, Argos or the court of the Molossians in Epirus.³ Yet scholarship contains little discussion of the scholium as a whole, and few attempts have been made to understand the relationship among the individual statements that are made in it. This paper reassesses the scholium, both in its own right and in the light of the fragmentary remains of Athenian didascalical records and ancient scholarship on them. My conclusion is that the scholium does not point to a non-Athenian premiere of the play, but rather offers clues to the existence of an Athenian performance during Euripides' lifetime. The scholium, I argue, bears traces of an ancient debate and of Callimachus' research on

¹ Schol. MNOA *Andr.* 445 = Eur. *TrGF* Test. 64, quoted below.

² See e.g. E. Stewart, *Greek Tragedy on the Move: The Birth of a Panhellenic Art Form c. 500–300 BC* (Oxford, 2017), 139–44; V. Vahtikari, *Tragedy Performances Outside Athens in the Late Fifth and the Fourth Centuries BC* (Helsinki, 2014), 222–4 (with aporetic conclusion); P.E. Easterling, 'Euripides outside Athens: a speculative note', *ICS* 19 (1994), 73–80, at 79.

³ Epirus: W. Schmid and W. von Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur* (Munich, 1908), 1.343; D.S. Robertson, 'Euripides and Tharyps', *CR* 37 (1923), 58–60; M.P. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund, 1951), 83; J.L. Butrica, 'Democrates and Euripides' *Andromache*', *Hermes* 129 (2001), 188–97; M. Centanni, '*Andromaca* di Euripide', *AION* 33 (2011), 39–57, at 41–3 (Dodona); Stewart (n. 2). Thessaly: R. Goossens, *Euripide et Athènes* (Brussels, 1962), 376–7; A. Bernand, *La Carte du Tragique: La géographie dans la tragédie grecque* (Paris, 1985), 238–41; O. Taplin, 'Spreading the word through performance', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Performance, Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge, 1999), 33–57, at 45. Epirus or Thessaly: F. Cairns, 'Pyrrhic dancing and politics in Euripides' *Andromache*', *QUCC* 100.1 (2012), 31–47, at 39. Argos: T. Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (Berlin, 1884), 3.169, 486 n. 70 (but see below, n. 4); A. Nauck, *Euripidis Tragoediae*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1889³), xvii; D.L. Page, 'The elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*', in C. Bailey et al. (edd.), *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray* (Oxford, 1936), 206–30, at 223–8. Sicyon: A. Lesky, *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen* (Göttingen, 1972³), 338 n. 90. A minor venue in Attica: E. Scharffenberger, '*Andromache*', in A. Markantonatos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Euripides* (Leiden, 2020), 1.139–57, at 144. For a summary of the *vexata quaestio* see W. Allan, *The Andromache and Euripidean Tragedy* (Oxford, 2000), 149–60.

Athenian didascalical records. In its general outline, this view is not entirely new.⁴ It is here revived with several new arguments, taking into account recent scholarly work on relevant materials, especially the inscriptional records of Athenian drama.

I report here the text of the scholium in its entirety with a minimal apparatus:

ὁ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποισιν· ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀνδρομάχης προσήματι φησιν Εὐριπίδης λοιδορούμενος τοῖς Σπαρτιάταις διὰ τὸν ἐνεστώτα πόλεμον. καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ παρεσπονθήκεσαν πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, καθάπερ οἱ περὶ τὸν Φιλόχορον ἀναγράφουσιν. εἰλικρινῶς δὲ τοὺς τοῦ δράματος χρόνους οὐκ ἔστι λαβεῖν· οὐ δεδίδακται γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν. ὁ δὲ Καλλιμάχος ἐπιγραφήναι φησι τῇ τραγωδίᾳ Δημοκράτην. ἐξῆς δὲ αὐτοὺς εἰς τε τὰ ἄλλα καὶ φιλοχρημασίαν κακῶς λέγει. καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ τοῦτο ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ τῶν Λακωνῶν πολιτείᾳ καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ θεοῦ αὐτοματισθὲν προστίθησιν ἔπος· ἅ φιλοχρημασία Σπάρταν ὀλεῖ, ἄλλο δὲ γ' οὐδέν'. φαίνεται δὲ γεγραμμένον τὸ δράμα ἐν ἀρχαῖς τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου.

δεδίδακται Cobet: δέδεικται codd. | εἰλικρινῶς ... Δημοκράτην om. A

[Most hateful] to all [among mortals, inhabitants of Sparta]: It is Euripides who says this through the character of Andromache, blaming the Spartans because of the current war. For indeed they had violated the truce with the Athenians, as Philochorus records (*FGrHist* 328 F 124). Yet the date of the play cannot be clearly established, for it was not staged in Athens; but Callimachus (fr. 451 Pfeiffer) says that the name of Democrates was attached to the tragedy. In what follows he (*sc.* Euripides) criticises them for other reasons and especially their greed. Aristotle too relates this in his *Constitution of the Spartans* and adds the verse uttered by the god: 'Greed will ruin Sparta, and nothing else' (Arist. fr. 544 Rose = 550.1 Gigon, cf. Zen. *Prov.* 2.24, Diod. Sic. 7.12.5). The play was evidently written at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war.

The polyphony of the scholium was unravelled by Bergk.⁵ Commenting on the anti-Spartan tirade that opens Andromache's speech to Menelaus (445–63), the scholium opens with a blunt statement: that the character is just a mouthpiece for the anti-Spartan sentiment of Euripides himself, who would be railing at Sparta 'because of the present war'. The scholium then refers to the Spartans' 'violation of the truce', presumably the Thirty Years' Peace, the breach of which started the Peloponnesian War.⁶ The remark on the uncertainty of the date responds to this political interpretation, which requires *Andromache* to be a product of the war's early years. After a further remark on Democrates, ascribed to Callimachus (more on which soon), the scholium goes back to Euripides' criticism of Sparta. A final sentence returns to the date, concluding that the play was written at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. The phrasing here, especially the vague φαίνεται and the 'bookish' γεγραμμένον, indicates that this is likely to be a secondary inference, and at any rate not a statement based on a record of the play's performance.

⁴ See especially T. Bergk *ap.* G. Hinrichs, 'Philologische Paralipomena Theodor Bergks', *Hermes* 18 (1883), 487–95; this is a later stance than the one quoted in n. 3, despite its earlier year of publication. Other scholars have tacitly or succinctly supported the thesis of an Athenian performance: see e.g. Snell on *TrGF* I 124 Test. 2 'Callimachus in didascalii invenisse videtur "Andromacham" Democratis actam Euripidis temporibus'. Allan (n. 3), 150–1 also states that the scholium, 'if correctly reported and based on didascalical records, suggests that the play was produced in Athens', but he is ultimately more inclined toward other possibilities.

⁵ Bergk (n. 4), 489–92. Bergk's identification of the scholars responsible for the different layers of the note, however, is highly speculative. Even more so is his thesis that the *Fasti* inscription *IG* II² 2318 (*TrGF* I DID A 1.118) preserves the *Andromache* slate under the name of [Me]necrates (422 B.C.E.), of which the scholium's Democrates would be a corruption.

⁶ The breach, in this case, would probably consist in the Spartan invasion of Attica (Thuc. 1.125.2). For alternatives, see P.T. Stevens, *Euripides. Andromache* (Oxford, 1971), 16.

The central portion of the scholium, εἰλικρινῶς ... Δημοκράτην, interrupts the linear progression from the previous discussion of Euripides' anti-Spartan sentiments to the following reference to his denunciation of the Spartans' greed. Therefore, the two remarks contained in this portion are likely to be additional takes on the same issue, and possibly responses to what precedes. This is clear in relation to the first sentence (εἰλικρινῶς ... Ἀθήνησιν), as we have seen; and there is no reason that the second (ὁ δὲ Καλλίμαχος ... Δημοκράτην) should introduce an unrelated topic.

The phrasing of the first sentence combines performance location and dating in a way that unmistakably indicates that the play was not to be found in the *Didascaliae*: as these recorded the results of the dramatic competitions at the City Dionysia and Lenaea year by year, any Athenian performance at those venues would have been datable.⁷ Taken in isolation, the statement could indicate either (a) that the scholiast was somehow aware that the play was not performed in Athens, and concluded on those grounds that it would not be found in the *Didascaliae*, or (b) that the scholiast (or his source) had looked in vain for the play's date in the *Didascaliae*, and its absence had led him to conclude that it was not performed in Athens. At first sight, (a) seems to be literally what the scholium states. However, the fact that the scholiast does not say where the play was staged, but uses a negative sentence, strongly suggests that his conclusion is based on an argument from silence: it was the play's absence from the *Didascaliae* that indicated it was not performed in Athens.

The following sentence, ὁ δὲ Καλλίμαχος ἐπιγραφήναι φησι τῆ τραγωδία Δημοκράτην, confirms this interpretation. The meaning of ἐπιγραφήναι is crucial here. While the verb itself may well indicate authorship of a work (LSJ V 2), a remark on authorship would be inexplicable here. This statement only makes sense within the logic of the scholium if it is related to the dating issue.

In the context of dating, and attempted dating through didascalical records, ἐπιγραφήναι is likely to refer to the dynamics of theatrical production. Both ἐπιγράφω and its cognate⁸ ἐγγράφω can indeed be found in several passages concerning Aristophanes' collaboration with Philonides and Callistratus in the production of some of his comedies.⁹ For example, the anonymous treatise *On Comedy* states that Aristophanes staged comedies for the first time during the archonship of Diotimus (428/427 B.C.E.) 'through Callistratus' (ἐδίδαξε δὲ πρῶτος ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Διοτίμου διὰ Καλλιστράτου), and that Callistratus and Philonides produced his political plays and those against Euripides and Socrates respectively. Only after acquiring a reputation for himself was Aristophanes ἐπιγραφόμενος to his own comedies.¹⁰ The inevitable implication is that Aristophanes was not ἐπιγραφόμενος to

⁷ The extant inscriptional records of the Athenian *Didascaliae*, IG II² 2319–24, are re-edited with commentary in B.W. Millis and S.D. Olson, *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens* (Leiden, 2012) together with the *Fasti* (IG II² 2318) and the *Victors' Lists* (IG II² 2325). See also B.W. Millis, 'Inscribed public records of the dramatic contests at Athens', in E. Csapo et al. (edd.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century BC* (Berlin and Boston, 2014), 434–40 for description and discussion. Most references to the *Didascaliae* in literary and paratitular sources, however, are likely to be references to Aristotle's *Διδασκαλία* (fr. fr. 618–30 Rose, 415–62 Gigon), which also reflected archival records of dramatic competitions. See M. Talin, 'From Aristotle to the *hypotheseis*: Didascalical information between Athens and Alexandria', *Aevum* 95 (2021), 39–68 for a recent assessment and caveats.

⁸ Textual corruption cannot be ruled out; ΕΓΓΡΑΦΩ is an easy slip for ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΩ.

⁹ A full discussion of this technical usage in Butrica (n. 3), 193–4.

¹⁰ *Proleg. de Com.* lines 38–41 Koster (PCG III.2 Test. 4): ἐδίδαξε (sc. Aristophanes) δὲ πρῶτος ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Διοτίμου διὰ Καλλιστράτου. τὰς μὲν γὰρ πολιτικὰς τούτω φασὶν αὐτὸν διδόναι, τὰ δὲ

the plays he produced through Callistratus and Philonides, who, in turn, were ἐπιγραφόμενοι to several Aristophanic plays. In other words, ἐπιγράφω indicates the name officially associated with a theatrical production, that is, the name of the producer, which usually coincided with that of the author, but did not need to.¹¹

The Callimachean remark must refer to a similar case. Correcting the previous statement that *Andromache* was not performed in Athens, the sentence indicates that a Euripidean performance of *Andromache* could not be found in the *Didascaliae* because the name of Democrates was attached to it instead of that of Euripides. Neither a dispute about the play's authorship¹² nor a reference to a later, post-Euripidean revival by Democrates¹³ would fit the logic of the scholium, which therefore provides not evidence that *Andromache* was not staged in Athens, but clues as to an Athenian performance, which someone had failed to locate in didascalical records because the recorded *didaskalos* was not Euripides.

This interpretation of the scholium implies that when poet and *didaskalos* were not the same person, only the name of the *didaskalos* would be attached to the performance in official records; or, at least, that this was the case with *Andromache*. Unfortunately, no recognizable example of how the *Didascaliae* treated such cases survives. A seminal article by Capps concluded that, in such cases, the official records would include the name of the poet;¹⁴ but the validity of this conclusion is limited to the *Victors' Lists* (*IG* II² 2325A–H), where a single example is available. This inscription probably records Aphareus and his two victories at the City Dionysia in the mid-fourth century B.C.E. (Ἀφᾶ]ρεὺς followed by the number 'two' at 2325A.46), but we know from [Plut.] *X orat.* 839D (*TrGF* I 73 Test. 2.18–19) that he performed διὰ Διονυσίου. Moreover, the so-called 'Roman fragments' (*IGUR* 216, 215, 218), which record all finishings of Athenian comic poets in chronological order, seem to have reported, in one case, both the name of the poet and that of the *didaskalos* (*IGUR* 218.9 [- - - διὰ Ἀνα]ξίππου in the section on Anaxandrides, mid-fourth century B.C.E.).

Neither inscription, however, is indicative of how a performance would be recorded in the official records, or in the *Didascaliae* and *Fasti*. Millis and Olson have underscored the peculiarity of the *Victors' Lists* in this respect, as their 'implied

κατ' Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σωκράτους Φιλωνίδη. διὰ δὲ τούτων νομισθεὶς ἀγαθὸς ποιητῆς ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐπιγραφόμενος ἐνίκᾳ. Cf. schol. Ar. *Eq.* 507f ὅτι ὁ ποιητῆς τοῦτο πρῶτον τὸ δρᾶμα δι' ἐαυτοῦ καθῆκε, τὰ δ' ἄλλα δι' ἐτέρων προσώπων. ὑποκριταὶ γὰρ αὐτοῦ Καλλίστρατος καὶ Φιλωνίδης ἦν, δι' ὧν ἐδίδασκε τὰ δρᾶματα αὐτοῦ; hyp. Ar. *Ran.* lines 27–8 Chantry (text of M and E) Φιλωνίδης ἐπεγράφη καὶ ἐνίκᾳ; schol. Ar. *Plut.* 179 Φιλωνίδην... τὸν ἐν τοῖς Ἀριστοφανεῖσι ἐγγεγραμμένον δρᾶμασιν. The bibliography on the matter is immense. A reasonable assessment of the issue and further bibliography in T.K. Hubbard, *The Mask of Comedy* (Ithaca and London, 2011), 227–30; see also below, n. 19.

¹¹ Similar cases are known for Eupolis' *Autolycus* (*PCG* Test. 15 = Ath. *Deipn.* 5.216d), Plato Comicus (*PCG* Test. 7 = *P.Oxy.* 2737, line 44), Anaxandrides (*PCG* Test. 5.9 = *IGUR* 218.9, see below) and Aphareus (*TrGF* I 73 Test. 2.18–19 = [Plut.] *X orat.* 839C; see below). Another possible case concerns Iophon and Sophocles (*TrGF* I 22 Test. 5c = schol. Ar. *Ran.* 78).

¹² For this interpretation see G. Jachmann, *De Aristotelis Didascalii* (Göttingen, 1909), 28. See also the translation of the scholium in E. Csapo and W.J. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor, 1995), 15: 'Callimachus says he found the name of Democrates inscribed as author of the tragedy'. U. von Wilamowitz initially accepted the didascalical meaning (*Analecta Euripidea* [Berlin, 1875], 148: 'docta per Democratem'), but his later, slightly more diffuse treatments (discussed in Butrica [n. 3], 189–91) simultaneously posit that Callimachus had access to a copy of the play under the name of Democrates.

¹³ Butrica (n. 3), 196–7 argues that Callimachus refers to a revival of the play in which Democrates was the main actor.

¹⁴ E. Capps, 'Epigraphical problems in the history of Attic comedy', *AJPh* 28 (1907), 179–99.

audience [...] would seem to be more interested in a summary accounting of the accomplishments of great figures from Athens' literary and dramatic past than in pedestrian or technical questions' on the performances, such as the identity of the *chorégos* and *didaskalos* of each production.¹⁵ As for the 'Roman fragments', this inscription is thought to derive from Alexandrian work, as the reference to plays' survival at *IGUR* 216.9 makes likely. Körte even suggested that the inscription might be a copy of Callimachus' Πίναξ καὶ ἀναγραφή τῶν κατὰ χρόνους καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένων διδασκάλων, mentioned in the *Suda*.¹⁶ Therefore, neither the *Victors' Lists* nor the 'Roman fragments' can be used to ascertain how the official records treated cases of substitute *didaskaloi*. Conversely, the *Fasti* are believed to reflect more closely the official records, as they were compiled earlier (between 347/6 and 343/2)¹⁷ and record the *chorégos* and the producer: a typical entry would include 'X ἐχορήγει' and 'Y ἐδίδασκε' for both the winning comedy and the winning tragedy of a given year. While, again, we have no clear example of whom the *Fasti* would record when the *didaskalos* and the poet did not coincide in the fifth century, the extant records do contain one instructive example. For the year 387, the *Fasti* report a victory of Araros, Aristophanes' son, at the City Dionysia (*IG* II² 2318.1004), but the *Suda* (α 3737 s.v. Ἀραρώς = Araros *PCG* Test. 1.2–3) states that he won his first victory in the hundred-and-first Olympiad (376/372 B.C.E.). Araros is known from hyp. Ar. *Plut.* IV to have been in charge of the production of his father's late comedies *Cocalus* and *Aeolicon*, and it is reasonable to conclude that in 387 Araros won with a play by his father. This is a good indication that, at least in some cases, the official records, which the *Fasti* are likely to reflect more directly than the *Victors' Lists* or the 'Roman fragments',¹⁸ did not include the name of the actual poet; but other more casual channels such as contemporary gossip, book circulation and later research could shed light on authorship even in such cases.¹⁹ The original performance of *Andromache* seems precisely to be a case in which a Hellenistic scholar reconstructed the dynamics of the play's production by supplementing didascalical information with data drawn from other sources. That this scholar was Callimachus is perfectly in line with his compiling a chronological catalogue of *didaskaloi* and with his criticism of the *Didascaliae* in chronological matters, as known from a scholium on Aristophanes.²⁰ Callimachus,

¹⁵ Millis and Olson (n. 7), 157.

¹⁶ A. Körte, 'Inschrifliches zur Geschichte der attischen Komödie', *RhM* 60 (1905), 425–47, at 443–7; *Suda* κ 227 s.v. Καλλιμάχος.

¹⁷ Millis (n. 7), 434.

¹⁸ For a tentative stemma showing the relationships among the different inscriptions, Aristotle's *Didascaliae* and Alexandrian work, see J.S. Starkey, 'Aristophanes, Apollodorus, and the Dionysian actors' contest', *ZPE* 192 (2014), 45–58, at 53.

¹⁹ What little we know of Aristophanes' collaboration with Philonides and Callistratus also suggests that during the early stages of his career only the producer's name was officially recorded, not the poet's, since Aristophanes' entrusting theatrical productions to other individuals was, at least initially (i.e. before *Knights*), a way for him to remain behind the scenes. See especially *Eq.* 512–44 and *Vesp.* 1016–22 as interpreted in D.M. McDowell, 'Aristophanes and Callistratus', *CQ* 32 (1982), 21–6, and Hubbard (n. 10). However, the fact that Aristophanes resorted to substitute *didaskaloi* later as well, including with *Wasps*, indicates that this choice could be due to different reasons, and that poets could choose how to manage such cases. See also R. Blum, *Callimachos. The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, transl. H.H. Wellisch (Madison, 1991), 38–9.

²⁰ Schol. vet. Ar. *Nub.* 553 = Arist. fr. 621a Rose = 441 Gigon, Call. fr. 454 Pfeiffer: δῆλον ὅτι πρῶτος ὁ Μαρικᾶς ἐδιδάχθη τῶν δευτέρων Νεφελῶν. Ἐρατοσθένης δέ φησι Καλλιμάχον ἐγκαλεῖν ταῖς Διδασκαλίαις, ὅτι φέρουσιν ὕστερον τρίτῳ ἔτει τὸν Μαρικᾶν τῶν Νεφελῶν,

the *Andromache* scholium suggests, traced the slate of Euripides' *Andromache* in the *Didascaliae*, which someone else failed to find because they did not realise that Democrates had acted as *didaskalos* for that performance, the name of Euripides not being reported in the official records on that occasion.

A further indication that *Andromache* was staged as part of a traceable competitive performance comes from the hypothesis prefixed to the play in the medieval manuscripts, where *Andromache* is said to be a play τῶν δευτέρων.²¹ This is most reasonably understood as referring to the placing of the play in a theatrical competition.²² The only parallel, τὸ δράμα τῶν πρώτων, is found in the hypothesis prefixed to *Hippolytus*, part of a tetralogy that won indeed the first prize.²³ A similar use of πρώτος in Athenaeus is unambiguously about placing in a dramatic contest.²⁴ At 9.373f the deipnosophist Myrtilus states that Anaxandrides' play *Tereus* 'was not judged among the first' (μὴ κεκριμένον ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις). He then quotes an anecdote from Chamaeleon (fr. 46 Martano) about Anaxandrides' habit of disposing of his plays if they had failed to win the first prize, and expresses surprise at the survival of *Tereus* μὴ τυχῶν νίκης ('since it did not win'). The passage in its entirety clearly indicates that the sequence μὴ ... ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις conveys the results of a dramatic contest, not a general qualitative judgement.

Since πρώτος, δεύτερος, and τρίτος are regularly used in the hypotheses' didascalical sections to indicate finishings in dramatic competitions, any other meaning of the ordinal number in the *Hippolytus* and *Andromache* hypotheses would be opaque. Moreover, each of the other options is otherwise problematic. A chronological connotation is unlikely, since *Hippolytus*, staged in 428, would not be chronologically far from *Andromache*, which modern scholars tend to date to ca. 425 on internal grounds; and with Euripides' debut in the year 455, it seems hard to justify the use of πρώτος for *Hippolytus*, unless we assume a bipartite periodization with the turning point from πρώτα δράματα to δεύτερα δράματα conveniently falling between *Hippolytus* and *Andromache*.²⁵ Alternatively, the numeral could indicate the position of the play within its tetralogy, but there seems to be no particular interest in such a question in ancient scholarship.²⁶ A qualitative judgement has often been posited on

σαφῶς ἐνταῦθα εἰρημένου, ὅτι πρώτος καθεῖται 'It is clear that *Maricas* was produced before the second *Clouds*. Eratosthenes says that Callimachus finds fault with the *Didascaliae* because they record *Maricas* two years after *Clouds*, whereas here *Maricas* is clearly said to have been performed first'. See R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 1968), 132.

²¹ Hyp. Eur. *Andr.* line 22 Diggle.

²² See e.g. G. Hermann, *Euripidii Tragoediae*, vol. II 2: *Andromacha* (Leipzig, 1838), viii; F.G. Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus* (Bonn, 1839), 2.533.

²³ Hyp. Eur. *Hipp.* line 30 Diggle. For this remark's probably later date than, and different intended readership from the one of the didascalical section see D.J. Mastronarde, *Euripides: Phoenissae* (Cambridge, 1994), 168 n. 2.

²⁴ Ath. *Deipn.* 9.373f–4b (= Anaxandrides PCG Test. 2). See B.W. Millis, *Anaxandrides: Introduction, Translation, Commentary* (Heidelberg, 2015), 26–7.

²⁵ At any rate, δεύτερος may not be the most natural adjective to use for chronological grouping: Plut. *Comp. Ar. et Men.* 853F uses τὰ πρώτα, τὰ μέσα and τὰ τελευταῖα for Menander's plays. A chronological interpretation of the *Andromache* hypothesis remark is suggested by A. Garza, *Euripide, Andromaca* (Naples, 1963²), xii. Proposed dates, based on metre, style and other internal elements, range between c. 430 and 417: see the doxographical surveys in A. Giuliani, *La città e l'oracolo* (Milan, 2001), 156 n. 36; Allan (n. 3), 149 n. 3; also above, n. 6.

²⁶ A.W. Verrall, *Essays on Four Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1905), 22 suggested that the phrase might indicate that *Andromache* was a sequel: 'The note may refer to a list, distinguishing those of the plays contained in some collection which were known or conjectured to be sequels; and it may possibly signify that the *Andromache* is one of them.' Later scholarship has often

the basis of the observation that similarly structured remarks in other hypotheses convey a general evaluation of the play. However, this is problematic for *Andromache*, as δεύτερος would convey a negative evaluation,²⁷ but the remark is immediately followed by a longer positive evaluation of several sections of the play.²⁸ To solve the inconsistency, Stevens suggests the meaning 'of second-prize quality', which he takes to be 'a complimentary expression',²⁹ but this is even harder to infer from the phrasing. As Stevens remarks, there are indeed numerous parallels, in hypotheses, for τὸ δὲ δῶμα τῶν + adjectival phrase conveying a positive evaluation, but all of them are unambiguous,³⁰ whereas δεύτερος meaning 'deserving second prize' is ambiguous both in isolation and in the context of hypotheses that regularly use ordinal numbers to indicate actual placing in dramatic contests.

Hence this detail of the hypothesis and the scholium on *Andr.* 445 concur in indicating that *Andromache* was indeed staged in Athens as part of a dramatic contest and won the second prize, with a producer named Democrates. On the reasonable assumption that the play premiered at the City Dionysia or, less probably, the Lenaea,³¹ we can conclude that one or three more plays by Euripides were produced by Democrates—and therefore the reason for this choice need not lie in any feature of *Andromache*.

University of Exeter

CHIARA MECCARIELLO
c.meccariello@exeter.ac.uk

interpreted this suggestion as referring to the play's position in its tetralogy: see, for instance, H. Erbse, 'Euripides' 'Andromache', *Hermes* 94 (1966), 276–97, at 276.

²⁷ Cf. Erbse (n. 26), 276: 'zweitklassig'.

²⁸ It is not impossible that the hypothesis tacitly combined different views, but the evaluations of *Phoenissae* prefixed to the play show a clear demarcation between positive remarks and the single negative comment: see hyp. c Diggle τὸ δῶμά ἐστι μὲν ταῖς σκηναῖς ὄψεσι καλόν, ἔστι δὲ καὶ παραπληρωματικόν (accepting Kirchoff's necessary ἔστι δὲ for the transmitted ἐπεὶ δὲ or ἐπει: the μὲν in the previous clause ensures the presence of a responding δέ) and the preceding hyp. b Diggle, which contains only positive remarks. Hyp. Eur. *Or.* line 43 Diggle τὸ δὲ δῶμα τῶν ἐπὶ σκηνῆς εὐδοκμοῦντων, χειρίστον δὲ τοῖς ἦθεσι contains no appreciative remark beyond recording that *Orestes* was popular on stage, and the second δέ makes the commentator's stance unambiguous.

²⁹ Stevens (n. 6), 27–8.

³⁰ Hyp. 2 *Soph. Ant.* line 3 Xenis τὸ μὲν δῶμα τῶν καλλίστων Σοφοκλέους; hyp. 1 *Soph. OC* line 15 X. τὸ δὲ δῶμα τῶν θαυμαστών; hyp. Eur. *Phoen. (Argumentum Thomanum)* line 102 Mastronarde ἔστι δὲ τὸ παρὸν δῶμα τῶν ἄγαν ἐξαιρέτων; hyp. Ar. *Ach.* line 28 Wilson τὸ δὲ δῶμα τῶν εὖ σφόδρα πεποιημένων; hyp. *Eg.* line 25 Jones τὸ δὲ δῶμα τῶν ἄγαν καλῶς πεποιημένων; hyp. I *Nub.* line 24 Holwerda τὸ δὲ δῶμα τῶν πάντων δυνατῶς πεποιημένων; hyp. III *Pax* line 27 H. τὸ δὲ δῶμα τῶν ἄγαν ἐπιτετευγμένων; hyp. I *Av.* lines 7–8 H. τὸ δῶμα τοῦτο τῶν ἄγαν δυνατῶς πεποιημένων; hyp. I *Ran.* line 39 Dübner τὸ δὲ δῶμα τῶν εὖ πάντων καὶ φιλολόγως πεποιημένων; hyp. iii *Ran.* line 32 Dübner τὸ δὲ δῶμα τῶν εὖ καὶ φιλοπόνως πεποιημένων. That the structure does not need to convey qualitative judgements is shown by schol. *Thesm. ante* I Dübner τοῦτο τὸ δῶμα τῶν κατ' Εὐριπίδου πεποιημένων; cf. hyp. Eur. *Supp.* lines 2–3 Diggle τὸ δὲ δῶμα ἐγκόμιον Ἀθηνῶν.

³¹ We have no evidence that Euripides ever competed at the less prestigious Lenaea, although this cannot be ruled out. However, if it is not a coincidence that Aristophanes' Lenaea-plays do not use the *méchané*, whilst all of his comedies that do use it are certainly or probably Dionysia-plays (see I.C. Storey, *Aristophanes: Peace* [London and New York, 2019], 108), then we should be reluctant to postulate a Lenaea premiere for *Andromache*, which features a *deus ex machina*. Euripidean premieres at the Rural Dionysia are also unlikely, as the evidence for dramatic performances in Attic demes is more likely to refer to reperformances, and a performance at the Rural Dionysia not preceded (or at least followed) by one at the Great Dionysia is unlikely for well-established playwrights: P.J. Finglass, 'Ancient reperformances of Sophocles', *Trends in Classics* 7 (2015), 207–23, at 213.