CrossMark

The Classical Quarterly 70.1 131–136 © The Classical Association (2020)
doi:10.1017/S0009838820000245

SOME THOUGHTS ON THEODECTAS' *MAVSOLVS**

The *Suda* tells us the following about the elder Theodectas, the Phaselian orator and tragedian:[1]

Θεοδέκτης, Ἀριστάνδρου, Φασηλίτης ἐκ Λυκίας, ῥήτωρ, τραπεὶς δὲ ἐπὶ τραγῳδίας, μαθητὴς Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἰσοκράτους καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους. οὗτος καὶ ὁ Ἐρυθραῖος Ναυκράτης καὶ Ἰσοκράτης ὁ ῥήτωρ, ὁ Ἀπολλωνιάτης, καὶ Θεόπομπος, ἐπὶ τῆς ρς´ ὀλυμπιάδος εἶπον ἐπιτάφιον ἐπὶ Μαυσώλῳ, Ἀρτεμισίας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ προτρεψαμένης. καὶ ἐνίκησε μάλιστα εὐδοκιμήσας ἐν ᾗ εἶπε τραγῳδίᾳ. ἄλλοι δέ φασι Θεόπομπον ἔχειν τὰ πρωτεῖα. δράματα δὲ ἐδίδαξε ν´. τελευτᾷ δὲ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐτῶν ἐνὸς καὶ μ´, ἔτι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ περιόντος. ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τέχνην ῥητορικὴν ἐν μέτρωι, καὶ ἄλλα τινα καταλογάδην.

Theodectas, son of Aristander, from Phaselis in Lycia, an orator, then he turned to tragedy, a pupil of Plato, Isocrates and Aristotle. This man [that is, Theodectas] and Naucrates from Erythrae and Isocrates the orator from Apollonia and Theopompus, in the 106th Olympiad [356/5–353/2 B.C.], gave funeral speeches for Mausolus, at the instigation of his widow Artemisia. And [Theodectas] won, gaining great honour in the tragedy which he spoke. Others, however, say that Theopompus won first prize. He [that is, Theodectas] produced fifty plays. He died in Athens at the age of 41, being survived by his father. He also wrote an *Art of Rhetoric* in verse, and some other works in prose.

As with many entries in the *Suda*,[2] the information provided contains various errors and is the source of much debate. This includes incorrectly dating the funeral games for King Mausolus to the 103rd Olympiad (368/7–365/4 B.C.),[3] and uncertainty over the identity of Theodectas' father,[4] which Isocrates competed in the funeral

* I would like to thank Oliver Thomas and the anonymous reader for their helpful comments and thoughts on this note.

[1] *Suda* θ 138 Adler = *TrGF* I 72 T 1 = *FGrHist* 115 T 6a.

[2] Even just among Theodectas' fellow fourth-century tragedians, the *Suda* contains a large number of errors, labelling Chaeremon a 'comic poet' (κωμικός, *Suda* χ 170 Adler = *TrGF* I 71 T 1 with H. Bartsch, *De Chaeremone poeta tragico* [Mainz, 1843], 11–17) and assigning Carcinus II one victory rather than the twelve (eleven Dionysian, one Lenaean) attested in inscriptional records (*IG* II^2 2325 Ia col. III.9, *SEG* XXVI 203 col. I.11 = *TrGF* I 70 T 2; *Suda* κ 394 Adler = *TrGF* I 70 T 1 with U. Köhler, 'Die von Herrn Bohn auf der Akropolis gefundenen Inschriften', *MDAI(A)* 5 [1880], 317–30, at 326). The *Suda* also describes how Astydamas I was a pupil of Isocrates before becoming a tragedian (α 4264 Adler = *TrGF* I 59 T 1), impossible since this Astydamas debuted in 398 B.C., whereas Isocrates was not a professional educator until the 390s B.C. Instead, this information should be assigned to Astydamas' homonymous son, also a tragedian and the subject of the next entry (α 4265 Adler = *TrGF* I 60 T 1, thus E. Capps, 'Chronological studies in the Greek tragic and comic poets', *AJPh* 21 [1900], 38–61, at 44).

[3] ρς´ in the above text is owed to Jacoby (*FGrHist* IIB page 527), corresponding with Diod. Sic. 16.36.2 which dates Mausolus' death to 353/2 B.C.

[4] Plutarch names Theodectas' father as Aristarchus in *De frat. amor*. 478B, though manuscript W of this treatise gives Aristomachus. The tendency has been to accept the *Suda* as correct, emending Plutarch accordingly.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

games,[5] and whether the statement concerning Theodectas' death at the age of 41 should be assigned to his homonymous son, also an orator and subject of the following entry in the *Suda*.[6] One sentence, however, has attracted little comment despite its textual difficulties: καὶ ἐνίκησε μάλιστα εὐδοκιμήσας ἐν ᾗ εἶπε τραγῳδίᾳ. As it currently stands, this sentence is textually defective. The most likely construal of ἐν ᾗ εἶπε τραγῳδίᾳ is as a relative clause which has suffered absorption with attraction, that is, that this phrase in its uncompressed form is ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ ἣν εἶπε. This means that the relative clause is incomplete, missing, for example, a direct object for εἶπε or perhaps an adverb. Various scholars have attempted to make sense of this sentence. Shrimpton translates it as 'Theodectas won with great distinction because he spoke in tragic verse', Heath as 'and he [Theodectas] won, after gaining much approval for his tragic oration', and Morison gives 'and (Theodektes) won, having been especially esteemed because he spoke in tragic verse in his (oration)'.[7] All three versions, however, have their limitations: Shrimpton lends the relative clause a causal force, Heath paraphrases the relative clause and in doing so makes τραγῳδίᾳ adjectival, and Morison similarly renders the relative clause causally and supplies the plausible but non-existent 'oration'. A new solution is required: emendation.

Indication of how this sentence could be corrected is given by εὐδοκιμήσας. As Hartwig has demonstrated,[8] εὐδοκιμέω can be used to refer to success in a dramatic

[5] [Plut.] *Vit. X Orat.* 838B assigns a eulogy for Mausolus to the Athenian Isocrates, and Aulus Gellius may also have assumed this Isocrates to have competed at the funeral games given his comment that 'there are even some who attest that Isocrates himself competed with [the other entrants in the contest of eulogy]' (*sunt etiam qui Isocratem ipsum cum his certauisse memoriae mandauerint*, *NA* 10.18.5 = *TrGF* I 72 T 6 = *FGrHist* 115 T 6b). The *Suda* is almost certainly correct in identifying Isocrates as the Apollonian orator (thus F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* [Leipzig, 1887–98^2], 449), since it is unlikely to have confused the Apollonian Isocrates with his far more famous Athenian counterpart (thus M.A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century* B.C. [Oxford, 1994], 56).

[6] L. Radermacher, 'Θεοδέκται', *AAWW* 74 (1939), 62–9 among others transferred τελευτᾷ δὲ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐτῶν ἐνὸς καὶ μ΄, ἔτι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ περιόντος to *Suda* θ 139 Adler (= *FGrHist* 113 T 1), the entry for the younger Theodectas, on the basis of Plut. *Alex*. 17.8 (= *TrGF* I 72 T 4?). Here, Plutarch details a visit made by Alexander the Great to Phaselis, during which he and a group of his companions garlanded a statue of Theodectas which stood in the agora. The date of Alexander's visit (335/4 B.C.) provides a *terminus ante quem* for Theodectas' death, which would date his birth to *c*.376/5 B.C. in line with the *Suda*. These dates, however, are incompatible with that of Theodectas' first victory in the City Dionysia, which occurred at some point between 371 and 365 B.C. (*IG* II^2 2325.11 = *TrGF* I 72 T 3; P.J. Wilson, 'Amymon of Sikyon: a first victory in Athens and a first tragic khoregic dedication in the city? (*SEG* 23, 103b)', *ZPE* 118 [1997], 174–8, at 178 prefers 371 B.C.; Capps [n. 2], 40 suggests 365 B.C.) Given this and since Theodectas is also unlikely to have been invited to the funeral games for King Mausolus in 353/2 B.C. at the age of 23 or 24 (thus Capps [n. 2], 41), Radermacher assigned the sentence concerning Theodectas' death to the younger Theodectas. Capps (n. 2), 39–41 and T.B.L. Webster, 'Fourth-century tragedy and the *Poetics*', *Hermes* 82 (1954), 294–308, at 303, however, prefer to keep this sentence in *Suda* θ 138 Adler. They argue that Plutarch does not indicate a date for when the statue was set up nor for Theodectas' death, meaning that he could have died and that his statue could have been erected many years before Alexander's visit, perhaps shortly after Theodectas' participation in the funeral games (thus Capps [n. 2], 40). This would date Theodectas' birth to *c*.390 B.C. (thus Webster [n. 6], 303), fitting with the inscriptional evidence for his career as a tragedian.

[7] G.S. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian* (Montreal, 1991), 199; M. Heath, 'theta, 138', in D. Whitehead (ed.), *Suda On Line* (2001) [http://www.stoa.org/sol-entries/theta/138], consulted 02/01/2019, and W.S. Morison, 'Theopompos of Chios (115)', in *BNJ* (2014) [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a115], consulted 02/01/2019.

[8] A. Hartwig, 'The date of the *Rhabdouchoi* and the early career of Plato Comicus', *ZPE* 174 (2010), 19–31, at 24.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

context. In his hypothesis to Sophocles' *Antigone*, Aristophanes of Byzantium recounts how it was alleged that Sophocles was deemed worthy of a generalship on Samos after a successful production of his *Antigone*: φασὶ δὲ τὸν Σοφοκλέα ἠξιῶσθαι τῆς ἐν Σάμῳ στρατηγίας, εὐδοκιμήσαντα ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῆς Ἀντιγόνης.[9] Here, Aristophanes uses εὐδοκιμήσαντα to indicate Sophocles' triumph. εὐδοκιμέω is also found in a papyrus fragment dated to the second century A.D. and containing a commentary on one of Aristophanes' comedies (conjectured to be *Anagyrus*).[10] This fragment preserves a remark made by the Alexandrian scholar Eratosthenes that the plays of the comic poet Plato enjoyed great success when produced by others, but that *Rhabdouchoi*, produced by Plato himself, finished fourth and saw him relegated back to the Lenaea: Ἐρατοσθένης περὶ Πλάτωνος ὅτι ἕως μὲν [ἄλ]λοις ἐδίδου τὰς κωμῳδίας εὐδοκίμει, δι' αὐτοῦ δὲ πρῶτον διδάξας τοὺς Ῥαβδούχους καὶ γενόμενος τέταρτος ἀπεώσθη πάλιν εἰς τοὺς Ληναϊκούς.[11] Here too, εὐδοκίμει retains a similar meaning to the previous passage, describing Plato's success in dramatic competitions. The *Suda*'s εὐδοκιμήσας most likely has the same technical sense, especially given its juxtaposition near ἐνίκησε. This means that τραγῳδίᾳ should be understood as referring to a tragedy rather than to a 'tragic verse' or 'tragic oration'. Moreover, Aristophanes' use of εὐδοκιμήσαντα with ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ in his hypothesis to Sophocles' *Antigone* provides a parallel for understanding the *Suda*'s ἐν ᾗ εἶπε τραγῳδίᾳ as a relative clause which has suffered absorption with attraction. This would confirm that τραγῳδίᾳ is its antecedent, with the clause presumably giving further details about the tragedy. If εἶπε still stands, then the extra information would most likely be a quotation from the play or a paraphrase of one of its verses as the main function of this verb in the *Suda* is to introduce both.[12] Excerpts from, or a summary of, part or all of *Mausolus* are, however, unlikely to feature in the entry for Theodectas, since the *Suda*'s biographies of tragedians do not cite lines from their subjects' plays or give paraphrases, providing only a list of titles by each tragedian.[13] This means that information in the relative clause was most likely the play's title and that εἶπε should be emended. The likeliest alteration is to a verb such as ἐπέγραψε, with γραψε incorrectly omitted by copyists presumably as an error after mistakenly writing εἶπε. Elsewhere, ἐπέγραψε can be used to provide the title of a play. For example, in his biography of Menedemus, Diogenes Laertius uses ἐπέγραψεν to cite Lycophron's *Menedemus* as the satyr drama in which Lycophron discusses the dining habits of the philosopher: ἃ πάντα φησὶν ὁ Λυκόφρων ἐν τοῖς πεποιημένοις σατύροις αὐτῷ, οὓς Μενέδημος ἐπέγραψεν.[14] Given this emendation and from comparison with the content of the *Suda*'s biographies of other tragedians, a gap containing the title of Theodectas' now-lost play, the direct object of ἐπέγραψε, should also be placed in the relative clause.

[9] Ar. Byz. *hyp.* Soph. *Ant.*

[10] Thus H. Hofman, 'Ein Kommentar zum "Anagyros" des Aristophanes (*P.Oxy.* 2737)', *ZPE* 5 (1970), 1–10.

[11] *P.Oxy.* 2737 fr. 1 col. ii.10–17 = Ar. fr. 590.44–51, Plato Com. T 7 K.–A. See further Hartwig (n. 8), 24 for this use of εὐδοκιμέω.

[12] Cf. e.g. *Suda* α 3909 Adler = Eur. *Bacch.* 836; *Suda* ν 28 Adler = Men. *Ship Owner* fr. 246 K.–A.

[13] The sole exception is the *Suda*'s biography for Carcinus II (κ 394 Adler = *TrGF* I 70 T 1) which may cite the opening words of his *Semele*, though in this entry the *Suda* is quoting Ath. *Deipn.* 13.559f (= *Semele* fr. 2 *TrGF*) to indicate the source of its information for Carcinus' plays; see further T. Sims, 'A commentary on the fragments of fourth-century tragedy' (Diss., University of Nottingham, 2018), 127, 158.

[14] Diog. Laert. 2.140 = Lycoph. *Menedemus* fr. 3 *TrGF*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We happen to know of a tragedy by Theodectas whose title would fit this newly created lacuna. In his *Attic Nights*, Aulus Gellius records a contest of eulogies at the funeral games of King Mausolus:[15]

id monumentum Artemisia cum dis manibus sacrum Mausoli dicaret, agona, id est certamen laudibus eius dicundis, facit ponitque praemia pecuniae aliarumque rerum bonarum amplissima. ad eas laudes decertandas uenisse dicuntur uiri nobiles ingenio atque lingua praestabili, Theopompus, Theodectes, Naucrates; sunt etiam qui Isocratem ipsum cum his certauisse memoriae mandauerint. sed eo certamine uicisse Theopompum iudicatum est. is fuit Isocratis discipulus. extat nunc quoque Theodecti tragoedia, quae inscribitur *Mausolus*; in qua eum magis quam in prosa placuisse Hyginus in *Exemplis* [fr. 12 Funaioli] refert.

When Artemisia dedicated this sacred monument to the soul of Mausolus, she instituted an *agōn*, that is to say, a competition in singing his praises, and she set very generous prizes of money and other goods. Men distinguished for their genius and excellent eloquence are said to have come to compete in praising him, Theopompus, Theodectas and Naucrates; there are even some who attest that Isocrates himself competed with them. But in this contest, it was judged that Theopompus was victorious; that man was a pupil of Isocrates. There is still extant today a tragedy by Theodectas, which is entitled *Mausolus*, in which Hyginus in his *Examples* reports that he was more pleasing than in his prose works.

The title of Theodectas' *Mausolus* and Gellius' inclusion of this play in an anecdote concerning the funeral games must surely indicate some connection with the Halicarnassian king, with the tragedy most likely performed at the games, if not enjoying its premiere there and being produced specifically for the occasion.[16] Since Gellius explicitly describes *Mausolus* as a tragedy and as the *Suda* now records that Theodectas was victorious with a tragedy, *Mausolus* was almost certainly the tragedy which earned Theodectas his prize at the funeral games. This means that Μαύσωλον should be inserted into the relative clause ἐν ᾗ ἐπέ<γραψε> in the *Suda*'s entry for Theodectas, perhaps previously omitted through haplography with Μαυσώλῳ found just before discussion of the tragedy. With these emendations, the restored sentence now reads: καὶ ἐνίκησε μάλιστα εὐδοκιμήσας ἐν ᾗ <Μαύσωλον> ἐπέ<γραψε> τραγῳδίᾳ ('and [Theodectas] won, gaining great honour for the tragedy he entitled <*Mausolus*>').

This emendation allows us an insight into one of Theodectas' most intriguing plays, particularly its performance context. The *communis opinio* is that there were two competitions at the games, one of eulogies which Theopompus won and at which

[15] *NA* 10.18.5 = *TrGF* I 72 T 6 = *FGrHist* 115 T 6b; see discussion in n. 5 above.

[16] The general consensus from C.F.T. Märcker, *De Theodectis Phaselitae vita et scriptis commentatio prima* (Mainz, 1835), 26 onwards is that Theodectas composed his *Mausolus* specifically for the funeral games. Snell (*TrGF* I page 228), however, suggests an Athenian premiere, though the title of Theodectas' play must surely support the *communis opinio*. G. Xanthakis-Karamanos, *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy* (Athens, 1980), 17 also argues that poor relations between Athens and Mausolus' regime in the 350s B.C. would rule out Theodectas' producing this play at Athens (Diod. Sic. 16.7.3). None the less, *Mausolus* could have had an Athenian re-performance after the 350s B.C., especially if, as conjectured by S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (Oxford, 1982), 261, 335–6, the play focussed on an invented mythical namesake; cf. Euripides' *Archelaus* which may have similarly been performed at Athens (see further S. Scullion, 'Euripides and Macedon, or the silence of the *Frogs*', *CQ* 53 [2003], 389–400). Cf. also Dionysius I who, after many decades of hostility between Athens and Syracuse, competed several times in Athenian dramatic competitions in the 360s B.C., winning first prize at the Lenaea of 367 B.C. with a dilogy comprising *Ransoming of Hector* and another tragedy whose title is now lost (Diod. Sic. 15.74, Tzetz. *Chil.* 5.178–81 = *TrGF* I 72 T 1, 3, thus Webster [n. 6], 298).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theodectas may have delivered a speech, the other a dramatic contest where Theodectas was victorious with *Mausolus*.[17] The presence of εὐδοκιμήσας and the use of this verb in relation to success in a dramatic competition might seem to support the two-contest hypothesis. But since Gellius and the *Suda* are otherwise unaware of any dramatic competition, εὐδοκιμήσας may have been used simply because Theodectas was victorious with a tragedy.

Perhaps an alternative solution is possible. In his account of the games, Gellius is aware of just one competition, listing its entrants and giving Theopompus as the victor. The *Suda* provides a similar list of competitors, but notes confusion over the eventual winner, giving both Theodectas with *Mausolus* and Theopompus. The details found in both works indicate that the funeral games featured a contest of eulogies which Theopompus won, but how to account for Theodectas' victory with *Mausolus*? The wider dramatic tradition may supply an answer. Between 472 and 468 B.C., Aeschylus visited Sicily on the invitation of Hieron I of Syracuse and, while there, produced his *Women of Aetna*, a tragedy commemorating the foundation of Aetna and perhaps performed not for a dramatic contest but simply in a celebratory function (that is, in a non-competitive context).[18] Similarly, a re-performance of an 'old tragedy' featured as part of the City Dionysia at Athens from 386 B.C.[19] While these 'old tragedies' were produced in a competitive setting, they were not part of the main contest itself, performed before the 'new tragedies'. Might Theodectas have composed his *Mausolus* in a similar context? In this case, Theodectas would have been invited to participate in the funeral games, specifically to produce a play honouring Mausolus. This invitation may have been extended to Theodectas because of, among other reasons, his success in Athenian dramatic competitions, coming first at the City Dionysia on seven occasions,[20] and, while at Halicarnassus, Theodectas was awarded a prize for his play. Later writers were unaware of the reason for Theodectas' prize, but knew of its existence, Theodectas' presence at the funeral games, the contest of eulogies (or at the very least in honouring Mausolus) and its victor Theopompus, and a play by Theodectas entitled *Mausolus*.[21] Since Theodectas was also an orator like the other competitors, writers may have assumed that he too participated in the contest of eulogies where he produced *Mausolus*.[22] This in turn would have then led to confusion over the victor in the competition of the eulogies with the *Suda* or with one of its sources positing

[17] Thus Märcker (n. 16), 26 and W. Ridgeway, 'Euripides in Macedon', *CQ* 20 (1926), 1–19, at 10–11.

[18] *Vit. Aesch.* 9 with C.J. Herington, 'Aeschylus in Sicily', *JHS* 87 (1967), 74–85, at 75–6; see also E. Stewart, *Greek Tragedy on the Move: The Birth of a Panhellenic Art Form c.500–300 B.C.* (Oxford, 2017), 103–4.

[19] *IG* II^2 2318.201–3. Known examples of re-performed plays include one of Euripides' *Iphigenia* tragedies in 341 B.C. and Euripides' *Orestes* in 340 B.C. (*IG* II^2 2319–23.1–2, 18–19 respectively).

[20] *IG* II^2 2325.11 = *TrGF* I 72 T 3. Theodectas' funeral inscription indicates that he was victorious eight times in dramatic competitions (Steph. Byz. 660.3–4 = *FGE* 1574–5 = *TrGF* I 72 T 2); the eighth victory could have been at the Lenaea or at another Athenian festival (thus Xanthakis-Karamanos [n. 16], 20). Assuming that each of Theodectas' victories in the City Dionysia was with at least a trilogy, twenty-one of Theodectas' plays would have won first prize. Since Theodectas wrote fifty plays, this is a forty-two-percent victory rate, far higher than that of his rivals Astydamas II and Carcinus II; see further Sims (n. 13), 71, 74–5, 135, 137, 249–50.

[21] Manuscripts of *Mausolus* must have been in circulation until at least the second century A.D. given Gellius' remark that the play was extant when he was writing.

[22] Later writers may also have added Theodectas to this list since he, like the other competitors, was a pupil of the Athenian Isocrates; perhaps there was a tendency to treat this group of individuals as a unit (cf. Phot. *Bibl.* 176 page 120b.31–2 = *TrGF* I 72 T 8 = *FGrHist* 115 T 3a).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

two winners: Theodectas with *Mausolus* and Theopompus. This would also explain why the *Suda* uses language better suited to the context of a competition in relation to *Mausolus* (ἐνίκησε μάλιστα εὐδοκιμήσας), because of the assumption that it was for winning a contest, here that of eulogies.

As for the plot of *Mausolus*, little can be said. The attestation of its performance at the funeral games of Mausolus together with its title must surely confirm the hypothesis, which can scarcely be doubted, that the play was written in praise of its subject.[23] The best conjecture for the plot of *Mausolus* remains that of Hornblower, who posits that the play dealt with an invented heroic namesake on the basis of Pseudo-Plutarch's *De fluuiis*.[24] This work mentions the river Indus, noting that it was previously named Mausolus after the son of Helios: Ἰνδὸς ποταμός ἐστι τῆς Ἰνδίας, ῥοίζῳ μεγάλῳ καταφερόμενος εἰς τὴν τῶν Ἰχθυοφάγων γῆν· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ πρότερον Μαυσωλὸς ἀπὸ Μαυσωλοῦ τοῦ Ἡλίου.[25] Hornblower suggests that the river referred to in this section is the Indus in Caria (the river Dalaman Çayı in modern-day Turkey) rather than the more famous river in India, and thus that Theodectas' play connected the deceased king with the son of Helios.[26] The lack of information, however, means that other suggestions are possible, including that the play was a historical or biographical tragedy,[27] which treated an episode from Mausolus' life or that of one of his ancestors.[28]

Though a great deal of uncertainty remains over the *Suda*'s entry for Theodectas, our emendation hopefully goes some way to dealing with one of the most difficult sections of the text. In turn, by emending our problematic sentence, we have gained a new insight into Theodectas' *Mausolus*, a play which, until any new evidence comes to light, must remain tantalizingly, but frustratingly, beyond our grasp.

Nottingham High School THOMAS SIMS
sims.t@nottinghamhigh.co.uk

[23] Thus B.L. Ullman, 'History and tragedy', *TAPhA* 73 (1940), 25–53, at 30.
[24] Thus Hornblower (n. 16), 335–6.
[25] *De fluuiis* 25.1.
[26] Thus Hornblower (n. 16), 336.
[27] Thus B. Snell, *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen* (Berlin, 1971), 137. Except for Python's *Agen*, a satyr drama whose surviving fragment ridicules Harpalus and his lust for courtesans, no other fourth-century biographical or historical tragedies are known. Dionysius I supposedly wrote biographical plays which treated the death of his wife Doris (frr. 9–10 *TrGF* with L.J. Sanders, *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny* [New York, 1987], 2) and his encounters with Plato (fr. 11 *TrGF* with W. Suess, 'Der ältere Dionys als Tragiker', *RhM* 109 [1966], 299–318, at 300). The citation of all three fragments, however, in a section of Lucian's *Aduersus indoctum* (31.15), which ridicules Dionysius' abilities as a tragic poet, must surely reduce our confidence in the existence of such plays.
[28] Thus M. Cropp, 'Lost tragedies: a survey', in J. Gregory (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 2005), 271–92, at 291 and T.B.L. Webster, *Art and Literature in Fourth-Century Athens* (London, 1956), 65 respectively.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000245 Published online by Cambridge University Press