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entre la documentation et nous, dans une quête perpétuelle pour valider ou invalider ce qui doit l'être, admettre également que nous ne pouvons tout savoir, mais la encore cette préoccupation n'est pas l'apanage des seuls spécialistes de l'Antiquité car la contextualisation des données est un impératif universel ! S'interroger sur la notion de source pour l'Antiquité rejoint donc les préoccupations de tous ceux qui travaillent sur le passé, avec une acuité peut-être seulement plus intense que pour les périodes plus récentes. Ce n'est pas le moindre mérite de ces journées que de nous avoir mieux fait prendre conscience de ce phénomène.
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Fragmentary mythography as a source
Neoptolemos at Delphi in the Tragodímena

Nereida Villagra Hidalgo

Asclepiades of Tralles was a disciple of Isocrates who composed a work in six books entitled Tragodímena in the 4th century B.C. His work has come down to us in a fragmentary state and is edited in Felix Jacoby's Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker as number twelve. It is comprised of four Historia and thirty-two fragments, which have been transmitted by scholia, lexicographers and mythographers, i.e. encyclopaedic and exegetical works. Although the amount of preserved material is scanty, Asclepiades is a relevant figure in the history of Greek literature for he is said to be the first mythographer (Wendel 1935, p. 1333). In his fragments some scholars have found evidence that he contrasted different versions of tragic myths—also with lyric and epic sources (Robért 1873, p. 78-79; Wilamowitz 1875, p. 181; Wendel 1935, p. 1333-4; Jacoby 1898, p. 484; Graf 1993, p. 193). However, when the text itself is studied in the light of the nature of the transmitting source—in this case, the scholia to Pindar—several questions arise in relation to its state and to what kind of information can be inferred from this type of fragments.

This paper focuses on fragment 15, which deals with Neoptolemos' death at Delphi. The fragment has been considered as the confirmation of Asclepiades' contrasting activity, for it has been interpreted as a verbatim quotation of the Tragodímena.

1 This paper has been written with the financial support of the FIB scholarships of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, and is part of the Research Project directed by Jordi Piñeros, Los míos en Grecia. Edición y comentario de los mitógrafos antiguos (EFF2010-14301), and of the Research Project directed by Francesc Cuarteroni, Institucions i mitologies a la Grècia antiga: estudis d'ací des de a partir de les fonts gregues (AGAUR 2009SGR 1330). I want to thank my thesis supervisor prof. Francesc Cuarteroni Imera, Charles DeLattre, prof. Robert Fowler and Jordi Piñeros for reading this paper and for their criticism. I also thank Kasia Nierzewska for her suggestions to improve the English version.

2 The former editions of Asclepiades' fragments are those of Francesco Xavier Werker 1815, p. 499-502 and of Carl and Theodor Müller 1844, p. 301-306.

3 Several descriptions of mythography have been attempted, but the heterogeneity of the works considered to be mythographic poses some difficulties. Cf. Wendel 1935; Henrichs 1980; Pelkau 1993; Fowler 2003; Alagna 2006; Fowler 2014; Hiepler 2017.
In the first part of this paper, I will present the text of fragment 15 taking into account a context wider than the one displayed in F. Jacoby’s edition. I will point out its typical scholastic features, in order to stress that the nature of the transmitting source has a very important bearing on how the information is exposed. In the second part of the paper, it will be assessed whether the text is likely to contain a literal quotation or not, as well as the implications of this matter for the reliability of the data of such a fragment. The third part offers a brief mythographical commentary of this particular version of Neopolemos’ death.

Fragment 15 = Sch. Pl. N. 7,62abc

The fragment numbered 15 is a mythographical scholiad to Pindar’s seventh Neomus. Its comments on the verse 42 (color 63) of the poem, «έλασκεν αυτή» γέροντα, is comprised of three thematic parts which have been edited as a, b and c (bold is mine) by Andreas Ibrin Drachmann (1997, p. 125).

In his edition of Asclepiades’ fragments, F. Jacoby only displayed part b, because it is the one where Asclepiades’ name appears. However, the three of them have been transmitted by two manuscripts of the Vatican recension: the Vaticanus gr. 1312 (B) from the 12th century, the main representative of the tradition, and the Laurentianus 32, 52 (D) from the 14th century. This implies that, at some point of the manuscript tradition, these three notes were considered as a single comment. Therefore, it is preferable to envisage the entire scholiad as one unit. Correspondingly, the fragment is here presented taking parts a and c into account, in order to assess the context of the reference to Asclepiades.


10 μετά δὲ κατακόρου Μελέτου φόνον ανέλγη, καὶ τὸν τρόμον ποιήσας αὐτῷ τὸν Μελέτον, τὸν Νεοπολήμον παρεῖ βασιλέως ἄρης, διἀ τὸ τελευταίον τοῦ Μελέτου φόνον αὐτῷ εἶναι τίνας. c. τίνας.

2 Translations in this paper are mine; otherwise the translator is indicated in a footnote.

3 In fact, the seventh Neomus is said to be one of the most obscure poems of Pindar and it has puzzled scholars from antiquity until nowadays. About this poem in particular and its interpretation cf. I. K. Forshall (1932)1968, p. 389-396; Segal 1967; Togniak 1972; Pernice 1972, p. 162-169; Woodberry 1976-Sepulcro de la Torre 1992, p. 153-176; Lucisano 2004; Curcio 2005, p. 295-324.

3 This is by means of the Ανάξ in the Ανάξ, the solution from the habit of Νέομος 2009, p. 11-12.
other sources. The sacrificial knife is translated by Λίπδα, a banalisation of the text very common in scholastic commentaries.

An ἀλλαξε separates parts a and b. In fact, this word is used in scholia to «list alternative explanations without indicating which alternative is to be preferred» (Nünlist 2008, p. 12). It also indicates very often-though not always-that the notes come from different sources. Indeed, whereas part a draws on an anonymous source, part b is attributed to Asclepiades and it provides a new explanation by telling a different version of the myth, according to which Neoptolemos' killer is called Μαγγρύπης, an obvious noun paradox derived from ἡμιγρύπης. Explanations based in popular etymology are also very common to scholia.

Another characteristic feature of part b is that it expands the information about Neoptolemos’ death, even when it is not strictly necessary for the understanding of the verse which is being commented on. Indeed, scholia often display a high level of erudition and take the opportunity 'to provide a mythographical handout' (Nünlist 2009, p. 16; 279 Cl. also Mückensturm-Pouille 2009, p. 88).

In relation to Asclepiades' fragment, F. Jacob considered that it ended after τρίπτυχον (line 7). However, the repetition of the verb μακρύπανθος, in singular (line 9), must be referred to the subject of the former sentence, i.e. Neoptolemos. Therefore, it would be preferable to consider that this whole part draws on the poem itself. In fact, it is not surprising that the Triptolemos had contained information about the genealogy of Machaerus, for many of its fragments deal with genealogical variants.

Finally, part c exposes the cause of Neoptolemos’ death, again a common procedure in scholia, which often take the form of question and answer (Nünlist 2009, p. 11 16). The three cases have presented seem to go back to the poem itself and to the explanations already provided by Pindar. Certainly, if we compare the text to the Homeric, obvious parallels can be found:

Therefore, with the verb τρίπτυχον (line 8) the scholiast must refer to Pindar himself. In fact, when he reproduces the poet's voice, his name is recurrently omitted (Dickey 2007, p. 12-122; Mückensturm-Pouille 2009, p. 79-87; David 2009, p. 63-64). The paraphrase is the most common device in literary commentaries: it reformulates the poem in order to make its sense clear. Such a manoeuvre can be found already in the Alexandrian philologists, as paraphrases are sometimes attributed to Aristarchus and Didiymus (Doss 1931, p. 10, 22). Also, the existence of a complete paraphrase of the Pindaric poems composed in the 2nd century has also been postulated. Whether this notion can derive from this wording or not, is difficult to state.

Altogether, this mythographically scholion is a very representative example of the procedure found in scholastic texts, where the paraphrase is used to a great extent and a mixture of materials is to be found: scholastical own remarks run along with older materials, which can go back to the commentaries of Alexandrian philologists. It has been traditionally proposed that the corpora of scholia were compiled in the 4th and 5th century combining material from the Alexandrian ομοιομορφος and other sources. The Pindaric scholia are considered to go back to Ditymmyus commentary, the first complete exegetical...

---

18 Together with Ditymmyus' commentary and other scholars' work on Pindar, this paraphrase was the source for the commentary of the archetypal, according to Letus 1875; Doss 1931, p. 65-71; Brigitte 1992, p. 104-105.
19 Doss (1931, p. 69) accepting the existence of such a paraphrase, considers "quite impossible" that the one preserved in the scholia is a derived from the second-century one, in the wold "disregard the long-continued processes of rewriting, rearranging and reshuffling which the scholia have passed through since then."
20 Reynolds, Wilson 1994, p. 11-15; 45-66. On some specifications about the genesis of scholia cf. also Wilson 1967, who responds to Zonta's view according to which the scholia match their form in the ninth century (Zonta 1958). An up-to-date state of the question is to be found in Montano 2011.
work on Pindar's poems, which in turn had gathered information from former partial scholarly works. Furthermore, the many quotations and references to historians in the scholia to Pindar are considered to come through Didymus (Deas 1931, p. 22). Therefore, the reference to Asclepiades is likely to derive from him, directly or through a former summary. Indeed, in the scholia to the seventh Nemean, the most often quoted authorities are Aristarchus and Didymus four times each one. This agrees with the situation in the entire corpus Didymus is the second most quoted authority (Deas 1931, p. 19). Also, it seems very unlikely if not out of the question that the scholar himself had excerpted the six-book Tragodiae to write such a specific comment. However, the fact that the references to historians can go back to Alexandrian scholars, implies neither that these scholars quoted their sources verbatim, nor that the Alexandrian texts could not be summarized or paraphrased afterwards. In fact, since paraphrasing is attested for Aristarchus and Didymus, and since these commentators and the scholia underwent a process of manipulation which lasted centuries (cf. note 19), it is very likely that the redaction of many mythographical scholia, as we have them today, comes from the scholar or his intermediate source.

The text: quotation or paraphrase?

According to E. Iacobi, the passage which runs from τοῖς (line 4) to τεύχευ (line 7) is a literal quotation of Asclepiades' Tragodiae. However, there are several elements which point to the fact that it is not a verbatim quotation, but a rearrangement of the original text.

To start with, some textual questions prevent us from taking this passage as a piece of the original work. First of all, the scholiast refers to the Tragodiae with the proposition δι, which seems an uncommon proposition to indicate the localization of a passage. Accordingly, several emendations have been proposed: August Brehk, in his edition of the scholia to Pindar, corrected it for δὲ οὐ, and Carl Müller proposed Νῦ οὐ σειβ' (1849, p. 503). However, both manuscripts have οὐ, and, as it is the least difficult, it should be respected. Besides, both Francesco Xavier Werfer (1815, p. 517), the first editor of Asclepiades' fragments, and August Nock (1930, p. 698) pointed out that although this might seem an unusual use of the proposition, it has several parallels in late texts. If these analogous uses are analysed, one can come to the conclusion that the expression does not refer to an exact passage in the text, but to the work (book or poem) in general, in the sense that the information to be read throughout or in the course of the book or the works.

As a consequence, the use of this proposition provides an evidence against the interpretation of the fragment as a literal quotation, for the expression τῶν θραγμονομάτων would mean that in the course of the Tragodiae, one could conclude that Asclepiades said that almost all poets agree on Neoptolemos' death. Thus, the scholiast—or the intermediate source—would be summarizing.

In the second place, οὖν is a modal adverb which is mainly used as anaphoric in classical texts. Nevertheless, in later sources it has very often a cataphoric sense. οὖν is usually interpreted as the adverb which announces a verbum motum, but the fact that it can be translated by as follows does not necessarily imply that the scholiast means that he is quoting verbatim. It often appears in structures in which it correponds to κατ' οὗν, where it recovers the idea expressed by means of the comparison. Moreover, the fact that it appears in an expression such as τὸ Νῦ οὐ σειβ', which introduces a reformulation of the text in order to make it clearer, shows that it can also announce a paraphrase. In fact, the adverb points to how something is said, and this how can both refer to the style and to the content. Another very significant example would be the scholiion to Olympian 1, 127b 6 where οὖν is used several times to introduce genealogical catalogues: these catalogues are clearly summarized and their authority is mentioned anonymously.

In sum, this construction is not enough evidence by itself for the literality of a quotation. In the third place, it is interesting to state that there is no agreement between the two manuscripts regarding the position of the particle οὖν in 23. The term does not appear in Eleon Dickey's glossary, which focuses on grammatical terms. 2007, p. 219-265), nor in Horn Nummela's (2009, p. 262-380). 24. In her article on the introduction formulae initiative paraphrase in the scholia to Pindar, Sylvia David also discusses the character of the expression τὸ Νῦ οὐ σειβ', which introduces a reformulation of the text in order to make it clearer 2009, p. 74-75. 25. οὖν is used several times to introduce genealogical catalogues: these catalogues are clearly summarized and their authority is mentioned anonymously. In sum, this construction is not enough evidence by itself for the literality of a quotation. In the third place, it is interesting to state that there is no agreement between the two manuscripts regarding the position of the particle οὖν in.
the text: the manuscript B displays it after πην με, whereas the manuscript D displays it after τῆς αἴθου μεν. If we accept the reading of B, the particle would indicate that the information coming from Asclepiades starts in the sentence πην τοῦ θεοῦ συνήματεις οτι ποιμνι ελπισθείσαν. Of course, the difference of position can be due to a confusion in the copying process, for in both manuscripts οτι is placed after a μεν. But, if the variant process, i.e., the adding of a sentence in the intermediate source 27, the fact that the addition of the scholiast or the intermediate source can be a comment, a brief digression of the scholiast or an intermediate source 27. The fact that this form of interpolation is very rarely appears with an infinitive clause and that this construction is not attested until Diodor Seclusus and Dionysos of Halicarnassos would speak in favour of such a reading, though is it conclusion of evidence. Be it as may, the important point is that manuscripts allow room for more than one interpretation: this mere fact poses several questions in relation to how Asclepiades’ words are transmitted. In fact, the degree of literal accuracy in ancient quotations is a problematic issue. 28 Several linguistic studies have pointed out that quotations are never an exact copy of the original text. Instead, there is a process of «negotiation» between the citation and its new context (Darbo-Peschanski 2004a, p. 9-16). The texts are manipulated to some degree in order to be integrated in its new milieu. Besides, quotations are done with a specific intention and as a result, a new meaning emerges from the addition of the quoted and the cover text. Therefore, it is necessary to study citations within their context, not isolated.

On the other hand, the device of quoting is a common resource in Greek literature, attested at least since Plato and Thucydides. However, the concept itself of the quotation as a tool for the study of texts did not fully develop until Alexandria times, within the context of the librarian and philological culture, which has a main focus on textual criticism and text commentary. Accordingly, grammarians and scholiasts used verbatim quotations of texts to provide evidence for their particular purposes (Darbo-Peschanski 2004b, p. 299-300). This means that not all quotations have the same character 29. As regards the scholiast under discussion, it is not engaged in commenting on the linguistic structure of the verse, but deals with an explanation of the Pindaric allusion to the death of Neoptolemos. As well, the supposed quotation is embedded between two comments which are both mainly paraphrastic: a alludes to an anonymous source and brings an account in indirect speech; c, on the other side, is reformulating Pindar’s words. In addition, a verbatim quotation of the Tragedomenos would be pointless for the argumentation of the scholiast, as part b only aims to clarify-by amplifying-the alluded narrative of Neoptolemos’ decease.

For all that, it is not likely that the responsible of this note would have taken the trouble to quote verbatim the original text of the Tragedomenos. Furthermore, Asclepiades was not comparable to Homer, Hesiod, Plato, Herodotus or Thucydides, who deserved the consideration of Greek canonical authors. On the contrary, the Tragedomenos are considered to be part of what will fully develop in Roman times as the genre of mythography. Most probably, this work was not engaged in studying the language of tragedies, but their mythical variants. As a consequence, it would have been a relevant work due to its content, rather than due to its use of the language. For that reason, later philologists and commentators would have paraphrased and summarized it, rather than quoted it verbatim.

If we accept that the scholiast contains a paraphrase of the Tragedomenos, new questions arise: to what degree can we credit this type of reformulation? As it has been pointed out, any paraphrase alters the original text creating a new message (Fuchs 1994). Hence, how is such a fragment to be interpreted? Can we still consider it a fragment of an original work? Or is it possible to rely on it as a source for the study of fourth-century literature? 30 In my opinion, the situation described in this paper allows room only to state that a late and irretrievable source, which may go back to Didymus’ work on Pindar, referred to the Tragedomenos as if it had contrasted different mythical versions of the same myth. However, we never find unequivocal evidence for such a treatment in the fragments which have come down to us. It is worth noting that in this case, the fact that the references to historians in the scholia to Pindar can be related to Didymus suggests that they should deserve some credit, for these scholars surely had access to his work in better conditions than scholiasts did or than we do. Nonetheless, the recurrent use of paraphrase and the style of the text impose great caution in envisaging them as fragments from the original work and, therefore, as straightforward evidence.

Tragic, poetic and prose variants

As regards the mythical version attributed to Asclepiades, the fact that a reference to his work has been preserved, points to the relevance of such an account. It must be a different, therefore worth saying, narrative of the death of Neoptolemos. According to our text, Asclepiades version—or versions—said the following: 1) Machaerious, the son of Daitas, killed Neoptolemos at Delphi. 2) Neoptolemos was first buried under the threshold of the temple and was then moved by Menelaus to the sacred precinct of the temple.

Since the title Τριγυιεσιον suggests a close relation of this work to tragedy, the tragic versions will be set out first. Only one play portraying this
episode has survived: Euriptides' Andromache, where the assassination of Neoptolemos is not the central issue of the piece but is, nevertheless, a relevant detail, its placement just before the scene ex machina shows. In this version, Orestes is the moral responsible of Neoptolemos' death and the Delphians are the material ones. The connection between Orestes and Neoptolemos in Hermione, who had been promised first to Agamemnon's son, but was then given in marriage to Neoptolemos. This relation seems to have been known also by Sophocles, as a scholiast to the Odyssey and Eustathius explain. According to them, the argument of his lost tragedy Hermione ran as follows: Hermione had been promised to Orestes by Tyndareus when Menelaus was in Troy but, afterwards, Neoptolemos stole her. When he was killed at Delphi by Machaerius, she was given back to Orestes. Hence, it seems that in Sophocles' version there was no relation between Neoptolemos' marriage and his death.

A scholiast to Euriptides' Andromache offers a catalogue of variants on the descendants of Neoptolemos and Hermione. The tragedians Theognis and Philocles are there mentioned for having said that Hermione had been given in marriage first to Orestes and then, already pregnant, to Neoptolemos. It is not possible to know if they portrayed also Neoptolemos' death in their plays, which, on the other hand, remain untitled. Nevertheless, it is likely that Neoptolemos had a relevant role in them. Some lines below in that same scholiast, Asclepiades and Sophocles are also mentioned as references for a version according to which Hermione and Neoptolemos had a son ultimately derives from one of the tragedies alluded in fragment 15, there

would have been a piece where Neoptolemos would have married Hermione and would have had a son (F23). Then, he would have gone to Delphi, where he would have been killed by Machaerius and he would have been buried there (F15). However, the fact that five different tragedies—as far as we know, given the fragmentary state of the surviving Greek tragedy—have composed different plays, in which Neoptolemos probably had a relevant role, puts forward the possibility that all these elements are derived from different works. This would agree with the plural voice expressed by the words ὅσοις ἄνισοις οἱ νομοί εἰς τῷ παρατείνουσιν.

Before reviewing the treatment of the myth in Pindar, it is interesting to point out that the scholiast refers to οἱ παράλληλοι instead of τοιχοψιανοί. This fact has suggested that Asclepiades compared the tragic myths to other poetic versions (cf. above). However, two objections can be made to this assumption: if this passage derives from a work which dealt with tragedy—tbe Tragedians itself or an intermediate source on tragedy—τοιχοψιανοί could have been used to speak only about the tragedians, as the adjective τοιχοψιανοί would not have been necessary for it would have been already understood thanks to the context. On the other hand, the wording of the text—not the content—must be fruit of the scholiast himself or an intermediate source, as I have defended. Therefore, it is likely that the expression οἱ παράλληλοι refers also to Pindar, since the text belongs to a commentary on Pindar. However, this does not imply that it was Asclepiades the one who referred to him.

Neoptolemos is an important figure in the exempla mythica in the seventh Nemean and in the sixth Parn. These texts have puzzled ancient and modern scholars, for Pindar seems to contradict himself. As regards the episode of his death, in the Nemean Neoptolemos goes to Delphi to offer the spoils from Troy. Once there, he quarrels over the sacrificial victims with a man with a knife who kills him. The Delphians feel a great sorrow, but he reaches his destiny by remaining in the God's house to supervise the sacrifices. In contrast, in the sixth Parn the hero dies as a punishment imposed by Apollo, because he had killed Priam next to Zeus' altar. Both variants are radically different from the version in fragment 15, and somehow agree with Euriptides that the Delphians—here only one Delphian—were the material killers of the hero. Therefore, one wonders why the scholiast, or the intermediate source, would have used such an expression, "almost all poets agree", when two main versions are attested: Neoptolemos was killed either by the Delphians (being the instigator Apollo or Orestes), or by Machaerius (Sophocles' and Asclepiades' version). It is tempting, then, to suggest that the key for this conundrum can lay in the redaction of the text: it is such an abridged reformulation that it has distorted whatever information the Tragedians had put forward originally, leading to this inconsistency.

31 Verses 52 f., 100 f., 1106-1150.
32 It is worth noting that in this version Neoptolemos is stabbed by different ships: instruments (cf. v. 1524-4) instead of τοιχοψιανοί (Soph., l. 3275, 3276, 3277), where παράλληλοι is not mentioned) and also stored.
33 Contraerentes, E. Chr. 160-55, where it is said that the Neoptolemos will not marry Neoptolemos, as he will die at Delphi when he has demanded compensation to the god for his father's death. Cf. Suárez de la Torre 1997, p. 134.
34 TCG 4 Hyp. Hermione (S. Hom., Od. 4.1 = Eust. 1.141).
35 Suárez de la Torre (1997, p. 154-5) suggests that "οἱ παράλληλοι are a secondary development (and Hermione's interpretation looks like an artificial link between both heroics)."
36 Sch. E. And. 32. Such lists of references are considered as the result of a long tradition of excising, summarizing and reorganizing previous commentators (Camerota 2004, p. 526-586).
37 The possibility to know whether his attribution derives from the same source as the scholiast under discussion or not. If it did, this would provide evidence that F15 depends on an intermediate source and does not come directly from the Tragedians.
38 TCG 24 Filochos 2.28 Thauris 2.2.
39 This name or a very similar one seems to have been given also to the shepherd who rose up (Scholiers), according to a scholiast to the Iliad, where Asclepiades is quoted as well, and this edit it with a cross departure.

363 Woodbury 1979, p. 95-133, especially p. 95-96 where he summarises the problem and gives further references. For a date of the art up-to-date cf. Curran 2005, p. 323-341. More references in note 8.
Some words about other prose notices on this episode: Machaerus is also Neoptolemos’ killer in Strabo and in the Library of Apollodorus. Pherecydes—who tells the very particular version that Neoptolemos committed suicide—is the only source to agree with Asclepiades in the fact that Neoptolemos was buried under the threshold of the temple. However, as far as I know, Asclepiades is the single testimony according to which Menelaus moved Neoptolemos’ body from the threshold to the sacred precinct of the temple. The burial inside the shrine can be explained in relation to the pattern of stories on enemies who are later worshipped as heroes (Visscher 1982, p. 407, 409-410). As well, Menelaus is depicted in Euripides’ Andromache as Neoptolemos’ enemy. It is not possible to know whether he was also portrayed as hostile in the tragedy—or tragedies—referred to in Asclepiades’ fragment. But, if he was so, this element could be also in connection with this kind of heroic cult.

As regards the name of Machaerus’ father Dattis, Asclepiades is again the only witness, if our interpretation of the text is accepted (c. above). It is important to stress that both names are unique in particular Machaeras, “the sacrificial knife” in the son of Dattis, “the feast.” In fact, the popular etymology is a device attributed in rationalist interpreters of the myth as the fourth-century B.C. Palaiphanes, the author of Ἡ περί ἡμέρησιν. It would be worth noting that many of the fragments of Asclepiades offer a rationalised version of the myth.

Altogether, it appears that the single consistent element in all the passages, poetic and prose, is the fact that Neoptolemos was killed and buried at Delphi, which is obviously related to Neoptolemos’ tomb and cult there, attested already by Pindar and by Pausanias.

Conclusions

Asclepiades may have contrasted different versions of the same myth, as later mythographical texts, such as the Library do. However, fragment 15 is by itself not an unquestionable prove of it. It is hazardous to take this type of fragmentary texts as sources which provide straightforward evidence, because the state of their text and the nature of their transmitting sources usually allows room for more than one interpretation, being all highly conjectural.
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Abstracts

Fragment 15 of Asclepiades of Traglos, a fourth-century mythographer who composed a work titled Tragodoumen, is a scholion which explains col. 62 of Pindar's seventh Nemean and it gives an account of Neoptolemos' death at Delphi. A sentence in the scholion has been interpreted as the evidence which proves that Asclepiades contrasted different versions of myths in his work. However, being a fragment preserved in scholias, its text must have undergone a process of manipulation, therefore it is difficult to state that the current form is that of the original Tragodoumena. In this paper, in order to discuss if the fragment is likely to be a verbatim quotation, a linguistic analysis on the vocabulary and on the structure is being conducted. The reference to Asclepiades is also being discussed, as the preposition poieita a textual problem. On the other hand, the extant versions of Neoptolemos's death are put forward in order to examine their relation to our text.

Le fragment 15 d'Asclepiades de Traglos, un mythographe du IVe siècle d'âge, a composé un ouvrage intitulé Tragodoumen, consiste en une scholie au col. 62 de la septième Némée de Pindare, où est narre la mort de Neoptoleme à Délos. Une phrase issue de cette scholie a pu être interprétée comme la preuve de ce qu'Asclepiades comparait dans son ouvrage différentes versions des mythes évoqués. Toutefois, la nature du fragment laisse supposer que son texte a pu faire l'objet de modifications ultérieures; il demeure par conséquent difficile d'établir a priori si le texte conservé correspond réellement à la version originelle des Tragodoumena. Ce problème ne peut être résolu qu'au moyen d'une analyse linguistique du vocabulaire employé et d'une étude de la structure du passage. La référence faite à Asclepiades au début du fragment est également remise en question, dans la mesure où la préposition pose dans ce cas un problème textuel. Enfin, l'article se penche sur le rapport du fragment 15 avec d'autres versions de la mort de Néoptoleme que la tradition a conservées.