

**UNIVERSITÉ PARIS IV - SORBONNE
ÉCOLE DOCTORALE MONDES ANCIENS ET MÉDIEVAUX**

(N° d'enregistrement attribué par la bibliothèque)

T H È S E
pour obtenir le grade de

**DOCTEUR DE L'UNIVERSITÉ PARIS IV
Discipline : Lettres Classiques**

présentée et soutenue publiquement par

Pauline Anaïs LeVen

le 25 novembre 2008

**LES NOUVEAUX VISAGES DE LA MUSE
AU IV^e SIÈCLE AV. J.-C.**

**(THE MANY-HEADED MUSE: TRADITION AND INNOVATION
IN FOURTH-CENTURY B.C. GREEK LYRIC POETRY)**

Co-directeurs de thèse: Monique Trédé et Andrew Ford

Jury:
M. Claude Calame
M. Eric Csapo
M. Paul Demont
M. Dider Pralon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of contents	iii
Acknowledgments	v
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 <u>A collection of Unrecollected Authors?</u>	13
1. The corpus	14
2. The methods	35
Chapter 2 <u>New Music and its Myths</u>	43
1. Revisiting newness	43
2. New Music from the top	63
Chapter 3 <u>Poet and Society: the “lives” of fourth-century poets</u>	91
1. <i>Mousikê</i> and middleness	94
2. <i>Opsophagia</i> and <i>philo-xenia</i>	103
3. Poetry and <i>parrhêsia</i>	115
Chapter 4 <u>Poetics of Late-Classical Lyric</u>	137
1. Stylistic innovations	139
2. Thematic features	164
3. A case-study: Philoxenus’ <i>Cyclops</i> or <i>Galatea</i>	190
Chapter 5 <u>Sympotica: Genre, Deixis and Performance</u>	203
1. Changing sympotic practices	204
2. Nouvelle cuisine and New Dithyramb	213
3. Deixis and performance context in Ariphron’s paeon	231
4. Aristotle’s hymn to Hermias	239
Chapter 6 <u>A canon set in stone?</u>	250
1. The new classic: Aristonous	258
2. Old song for a new god: Asclepius in 4 th -cent. paeans	264
3. New song for an old god: Philodamus’ paeon to Dionysus	284
Conclusion	295
Bibliography	301

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

After seven years spent between Princeton and Paris, I am following Solon's wisdom and moving on to a new stage, knowing how much I owe to the people with whom I spent my graduate career, and how much they contributed to making my work, and myself, into what they are now.

My first thanks go to my two advisers, Andrew Ford at Princeton, and Monique Trédé at the Ecole Normale Supérieure. I owe most of the Greek I know to Professor Trédé, who has been my mentor for ten years. Providing me with generous advice and faithful support, she made it possible for me to come to the US for a first visit in 1998 and gave me her blessing (and numerous signatures) to return to the East Coast and work on a *thèse de cotutelle*. Her energy, sense of humour and elegance, as well as her love and knowledge of Greek and French literature make her, as a woman, a teacher and a scholar, a model for me to emulate.

Professor Ford supervised most of my studies on the other side of the Atlantic; our dialogue started with a reading of Plato's *Protagoras* in the fall of 2001, and ended, in a nice ring-composition effect, with a parallel study of Aristotle's *Hymn to Virtue* in the spring of 2008. His reading of ancient and modern texts has been a constant source of inspiration for me, and words can barely express my gratitude for his attentive tutelage over the years, which has combined patient feedback (including on dozens of compulsive, never finished drafts) with warm encouragements to find my own voice as a scholar.

Secondly, I would like to thank my dissertation committee, Josh Katz and Josiah Ober. I am very fortunate to have benefited from their complementary feedback:

Acknowledgments

Josh Katz was at my side for the whole thesis process, listening to my developing thoughts, providing bibliographical insights, and asking the questions that helped me move ahead. Josh Ober offered me invaluable help in thinking about the larger issues brought up by my topic, and I am indebted to him for much of the backbone of my dissertation. He made himself (and his research) available even when living on the opposite coast, and often articulated my arguments in a more clear-minded, elegant and convincing form than I ever could have done myself.

I am also indebted to two scholars whose work and presence in our department greatly influenced my ways of reading texts and writing about them: Leslie Kurke, who sparked my curiosity for “the New Dithyramb” and opened avenues of thought in her 2004 Wisdom Literature seminar; and Froma Zeitlin, who, with her wonderful classes and generous help all throughout the years, including for a special topic on *Daphnis and Chloe*, has been an endless source of intellectual stimulation and delightful conversations (ranging from Helen to peacocks, and from jewelry to vegetarians).

The Princeton Classics Department and the Departement d’Etudes Anciennes have provided most of the highlights of my social and academic life in the past years. I would need a thousand tongues to acknowledge all the guises in which individual members of the faculty helped me: Yelena Baraz, Denis Feeney, Andrew Feldherr, Mikael Flower, Constanze Güthenke, Marc-Domingo Gygax, Bob Kaster, Nino Luraghi, Brent Shaw, Christian Wildberg all contributed in some way to the present, many-headed, shape of this project, helping me develop my thoughts, look into new directions - and keep to an acceptable timetable.

Acknowledgments

My graduate colleagues, both in Paris and Princeton, have been wonderful and forgiving friends and allies: the “classicists of tomorrow” educated me in more ways than I can acknowledge here. Special thanks go to their feedback on a chapter presented at the Dissertation Colloquium, and to Anna, for reading my dissertation and helping me look further.

A good part of the logistics of graduate school would not have been possible without the help and dedication of Stephanie Lewandowski, the department’s administrator; without the great contribution of Leslie B. Forrest, who donated me seven boxes of classical books; from the Casa Shermana’s *gîte, couvert et questions classiques* in 2006-2008; from the Princeton Classics Department’s funding over the years; and from the Phi Beta Kappa Society’s financial support for 2007-2008, that allowed me to devote myself to research and writing; I am very grateful to have been chosen as the Sibley fellow in Greek studies this past year and wish to thank them again for this honour.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends for the conversations, the coffees, the music, the trips, the barbecues, the love and all the fun on both sides of the Atlantic; my father for his kooky wisdom, my mother for her endless love and patience (and article clippings), and Thomas for his inexhaustible energy, support, and inspiring companionship. To him I dedicate this work.

INTRODUCTION

...because he found nothing so depressing as the collected works of unreclected authors, although he did not mind an occasional visitor's admiring the place's tall bookcases and short cabinets...

V. Nabokov, *Ada*

The topic of this thesis is the melic poetry (solo or choral songs accompanied by string- or wind-instrumental music, exclusive of the songs of drama)¹ composed and performed in Greece in the century starting with a “New Music” revolution first documented by Aristophanes in the *Clouds* of 423 BC and ending with the close of the classical period in 323 BC.²

As archaeological, epigraphic and literary evidence suggests, lyric poetry did not cease to be composed and performed between the death of the last great lyric poet of the classical period, Pindar, and the much-admired lyric corpora of Theocritus and Callimachus in the third century BC. However, from its original reception by the comic

¹ On the definition of lyric, see the opening paragraphs of M. L. West 1993, vi: “‘Greek lyric poetry’ is a conventional catch-all term covering more or less all the Greek poetry of the centuries down to 350 BC apart from epic, didactic and other verse composed in hexameters, and drama. It cannot be considered a single genre. It is commonly subdivided into melic poetry, elegy, and iambus. But this division is not without its problems.” Seminal studies on the classification and definition of the lyric genre and subgenres include A. E. Harvey 1956 and M. Davies 1988. See also I. Rutherford 1995; C. Calame 1998; E. Cingano 2003.

² All dates are BC, unless otherwise specified. The period under consideration roughly corresponds with the period beginning with the Peloponnesian War and the end of Pericles' Athens, and ending with the coming of Hellenistic age. On the “periodization” of the fourth century, see for example T. L. B. Webster 1956, 4: “Apart from the fact that no clear boundary divides the fourth century from the fifth, a knowledge of the late fifth-century background is so necessary for the understanding of early Plato that my procedure needs no justification. At the other end of the century I have been concerned above all to show new Comedy as a final flowering of Greek dramatic genius and I have not hesitated to include as many works of the third century as I needed, but new developments such as Alexandrian poetry, Epicureanism, and Stoicism, however important they may be for the future, do not concern me.”

poets, the lyric production of the New Musicians of the late fifth and early fourth century has been the butt of jokes, the subject of witty anecdotes or an object of mere disdain. Modern scholars have inherited the biases of ancient critics, and apart from a monograph and a (to this date unpublished) Ph.D. dissertation on Timotheus,³ there is no comprehensive study of the New Music texts.⁴ Moreover, if the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century saw great philological activity in the field of edition (not only Timotheus' *Persians*, but also Delphic and Epidaurian poetic inscriptions), the eight hundred extant lines of lyric verse produced between 425 and 323 BC have never been presented as a whole nor received scholarly attention as a corpus.⁵ It is this gap in our knowledge of Greek poetry and the history of lyric's "missing generation" that my project proposes to examine.

The overall goals and nature of the project

The main goal is to shed new light on a body of texts that come from different sources and are rarely presented as a whole. The dissertation combines close attention to interpretations of the remaining individual (and overlooked) poems with hypotheses for understanding the missing 'larger framework' and aims to provide a general picture

³ Respectively J. Hordern 2002 and T. Power 2000.

⁴ E. Csapo 1999-2000, 400-401 noted the need both for a study of Euripidean music and for a volume on New Music. This second wish has been fulfilled by several excellent studies focusing on the phenomenon of New Music, starting with Csapo's own articles (E. Csapo 1999-2000, 2003, 2004), R. Martin's and P. Wilson's in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.) 2003 and in P. Murray and P. Wilson (eds.) 2004. The emphasis is not on texts though, but on New Music as a cultural phenomenon.

⁵ For an example of the treatment of fourth-century poetry: "This stroll through the poetry of the 4th century was not over-enjoyable; *we did not catch anywhere the sound of true poetry which might touch our hearts over the centuries*, and the impression is forced upon us that this has not been caused merely by the unkindness of the tradition" (my emphasis) (A. Lesky 1966, 651). "By the middle of the fifth century *the creative force vivifying early elegy and lyric had largely spent itself*" (my emphasis) (A. Podlecki 1984, 251). "It is the dithyramb of the Pindaric period which it would be most worthwhile to know; *of the late dithyramb, the extant fragments are perhaps enough*" (my emphasis) (Sir A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 69).

– even if composite and frustratingly paradoxical – of the lyric poetry composed and performed in the late-Classical period.

The second goal is to analyse the characteristics and the place of late-Classical lyric production in its original socio-cultural context (the ‘larger picture’). Not only does the archaeological and epigraphic evidence (from lists of victors in poetic competitions to inscriptions of cultic compositions) suggest that lyric performance was still widespread in the fourth century, but in addition, testimonies about the reality of fourth-century lyric composition, performance and re-performance of older lyric are embedded in the work of contemporary prose writers (Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle and the Attic orators). This is what R. Martin notes, in connection with dramatic performance, and with a fitting parallel with modern L.A.:⁶

This hum of voices – songs in memory, speaking stones – amplified the ‘buzz’ about performance that must have permeated ancient Athens as it does large swathes of modern Los Angeles. An inventory of just the verbal offshoots of dramatic competitions in the fifth through fourth centuries BCE would have to include (apart from the actual dramatic texts), casual compliments, abuse, or anecdotes about poets and actors; oratory and history in which they are mentioned; reminiscences of performances; official didascallic records of the winners; choregic inscriptions; sepulchral inscriptions of those who had once been involved in performance; talk at symposia; and songs, poems, and prose works (such as Plato’s *Symposium* and the *Epidēmiāi* of Ion of Chios) that are based wholly or in part on performers and their art. And of course the visual inventory, from vases to portrait busts, extended the impact of the stage even further in space and time.

All of these venues for “listening” to after-sounds of drama could be explored for lyric, too, but they have so far not received the careful examination they deserve.⁷ By

⁶ R. Martin 2006, 36.

⁷ This study therefore does not aspire to be exhaustive, since there are many aspects of the “lyric culture” that remain to be examined. An exhaustive study would in particular include quotations of, allusions to, or silences about lyric poetry in Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle, Isocrates, the Attic orators, the historians... Some studies on aspects of that problem include: H. North 1952, S. Perlman 1964, J. Ober 1989, J. Ober and B. Strauss 1989, Y. L. Too 1995, A. Ford 1999, A. Ford forthcoming.

analysing not only the texts of, but also some aspects of the *discourse* about *mousikê*, in the late-Classical period, I examine how lyric interacts with contemporary contexts (social, cultural, religious, political), and how it is presented as an integral aspect of the practice of late-Classical civic and private life (through symposiac singing and choral performance of hymns for example).

Finally, the third goal of this project is to study the reception of the fourth-century lyric corpus and to understand the reasons why it has been the object of condemnation or neglect. Two answers are traditionally given to explain the alleged demise of lyric after the death of Pindar: the Romantic notion that genres have to die and succeed each other, and the idea that after the end of the fifth century, talent went into genres other than lyric (philosophical prose and rhetoric in particular).⁸ My dissertation takes another stance: without wanting to impute to these lyric poems a genius that critics have in general denied them for twenty-five centuries, I question the idea of a ‘lyric decline’ in the fourth century, seeking to examine texts as belonging to a canon of their own and offering literary interpretations that do not judge texts only according to ‘classical’ standards.⁹

⁸ On the “invention of prose,” the social and conceptual developments of the fifth and fourth century, and the contest of authority between the voice of the poet and the voice of the prose-writer, see S. Goldhill 2002, especially 5-6

⁹ A very lucid parallel is provided by O. Taplin’s reflections on fourth-century vases (O. Taplin 2007, 16): “I have heard fourth-century Western Greek vase-painting dismissed as “spät und schlecht” (late and lousy). This is clearly a judgment that takes Athenian painting, especially that of the early fifth century, as its ideal of Classical Art. This yearning for noble simplicity can be taken back to the eighteenth-century intellectual Johann Winckelmann; but in the appreciation of vase-painting, it was (Sir) John Beazley, the great connoisseur of art historian, who did the most to canonize the Attic ideal.”

The method and layout of chapters

My general approach to these questions is an archaeology of fourth-century lyric. Late-Classical poetry is not easily available to modern readers; a good part of it has come down to us through literary fragments quoted by different generations of authors. These authors not only filtered texts through their own historical and literary screens, but also created a literary history of their own: the New Music poets were parodied by comic playwrights, accused by philosophers and made the objects of unflattering anecdotes; at the same time, some of them were presented as part of the later lyric canon and quoted by Imperial authors on more or less equal grounds with the canonical poets. Finally, some poets never made it into the canon, and the survival of their work is due to accidents of material history, ones that happened to preserve their name, or oeuvres, on inscriptions.

These various aspects of the reception of late-Classical lyric represent different layers of interpretation that need to be taken into account to understand ‘what’ fourth-century lyric poetry has come to us, how it came down to us and why we speak about it the way we do. By approaching the texts in this way, uncovering layer after layer of prejudice against late-Classical lyric, and layers of literary history, I hope to avoid both considering, on the one hand, as representative of the whole period texts that were selected by authors with a specific purpose and audience in mind, and making general assumptions about the characteristics, or quality, of the whole production on the basis of the scanty remaining literary evidence, on the other.

Moreover, I am examining a corpus of texts, the epigraphic hymns, that have rarely been studied as literary works.¹⁰ Most approaches to these inscriptions focus on the documentary evidence they provide for cultic practice or political propaganda. Focusing on them as literary texts provides a valuable synchronic comparison with the creations of the New Musicians and other poets of the fourth century recorded by our literary sources, as well as a diachronic comparison with other (especially later) inscribed texts. This allows us to understand the changes in literary practices between the early-Classical period and the beginning of the Hellenistic era.

The whole study specifically takes the form of an investigation in the issue of tradition and innovation in fourth-century poetry:¹¹ while most studies tend to emphasize exclusively either the scandalously disruptive innovations introduced by the New Musicians of the later fifth and early fourth century, or the continued tradition of cultic hymn-composition, my goal is to examine how the fourth century was a period that combined forms of tradition and innovation of all sorts, in various proportions, and for different purposes. A natural objection to this approach is that the issue of tradition and innovation is the general angle through which it is possible to examine any literary, musical, visual or intellectual (or, actually, pretty much any other) development in any

¹⁰ With the recent exception of A. Kolde's monograph on Isyllus of Epidauros (A. Kolde 2003), and M. Vamvouri-Ruffy's comparative study of the epigraphic, Homeric and Callimachean hymns (M. Vamvouri-Ruffy 2004).

¹¹ In the Princeton library catalogue, I have found 48 volume titles (in English, French, Italian and German) containing the idea of "tradition and innovation", from "tradition and innovation in the poetry of Dafydd ap Gwilym," to "tradition and innovation in French garden art," including the most illuminating *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* by M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter 2004, and *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica* by R. Pretagostini 1993. "Tradition and innovation" seems to be a quite recent subject of concern, since all the titles date after 1960, a phenomenon that Fantuzzi and Hunter describe as symptomatic of postmodernity: as the two authors emphasize in the 2004 preface (vii), reflecting back on the preface to the Italian book, they "drew attention to the sympathy which one might expect the modern age to have for a literature [the Hellenistic literature] which was self-consciously belated, in which meaning was created by a confrontation, both direct and oblique, with the classical works of the past."

period.¹² But there are two reasons that make it a question that has more relevance for the fourth century than for any other period.

First, as R. Osborne has most recently stated (focusing on the implications of constructing history as involving continuous change or revolutionary rupture), “if change is a historical constant, the nature of change in any particular cultural manifestation is not for that reason uninteresting, nor are all changes equal.”¹³ Osborne’s edited book and project focus on the “the anatomy of revolution,” but the author still notes that “[a case for revolution] might be as readily deconstructed as it is constructed.”¹⁴ In the next pages indeed, Osborne states most clearly what his project is about, and his definition is most useful for contextualizing my argument:

It is precisely the way in which the changes at the end of the fifth century are so readily open to redescription that offers justification for this project. (...) The minimum aim of the project, and of this book, then, is to build a wigwam argument, in which arguments which are individually less than completely compelling offer support to one another which strengthens each of them, or to show that one cannot be built: either to bolster the claims for changes in the field by showing that they can be better understood in the context of changes in other fields, or to undermine the claims that particular changes constitute a revolution by showing that there is no coherent pattern of change. That minimum aim demands that we achieve a fuller description of late fifth-century culture, in its individual elements and as a whole, than has previously been offered by other scholars, and that we set those elements in some sort of context.

While some of my argument follows Osborne’s description in presenting a mosaic view of poetic evolution, a significant part of my dissertation also focuses on the “rhetoric of change” and the importance of the claim of newness as an integral part of a traditional project.

¹² This is for example stated by Gentili: “The diachronic setting for the phenomenon of lyric is the middle ground between tradition and innovation” (B. Gentili 1988, 61).

¹³ R. Osborne 2007, 2-3.

¹⁴ R. Osborne 2007, 5.

There is a second reason why the *problématique* of “tradition and innovation” is particularly appropriate to the study of late-classical lyric: as Osborne’s overall project, again, makes clear, the end of the fifth century is a period in which changes of all forms, especially in Athens, take shape, feed off of each other and constitute the background of the intellectual culture.¹⁵ Whether or not they introduced a revolution (as opposed to a series of changes) in lyric poetry and music performance, the “new musicians” lived in a culture where they would have rubbed shoulders not only with “new sculptors,”¹⁶ “new architects”, “new vase-painters”,¹⁷ “new philosophers,” but also “new politician-rhetoricians,”¹⁸ “new banker-financiers,” “new jurists,” “new military strategists”... It is in this context of “innovation hype” that the general problem of “tradition and innovation” takes particular significance in relationship to the lyric of the period, and it is only by analyzing the more general context of evolution at the end of the fifth century that the specific angle of “changes and continuities” in lyric poetry takes all its significance.

To examine this issue, the dissertation is divided into two three-chapter parts, one devoted to sources and methods to approach the corpus of late-classical lyric poetry and its reception; the other, to the texts themselves (and their contexts). Chapter 1 starts with an overall presentation of the corpus, in its diversity, and seeks to avoid

¹⁵ For the effects of the Peloponnesian War on economy, culture and society, see S. Hornblower 1983, 153-180 who defines the fourth century as an age of professionalism in general (156); B. Akrigg in R. Osborne (ed.) 2007, 27-43, whose main claim is that “looking at the economic history of Athens can suggest reasons for supposing that a cultural revolution really did take place over this period” (27).

¹⁶ For changes in sculpture at the end of the fourth century, see T.B.L. Webster 1956; P. Schultz in R. Osborne (ed.) 2007, 144-187.

¹⁷ See K. Lorenz in R. Osborne (ed.) 2007, 116-143.

¹⁸ See C. Taylor in R. Osborne (ed.) 2007, 72-90.

the generalizations often offered especially in critics' descriptions of the New Music phenomenon. The chapter emphasizes the specific problems associated with the lyric corpus and defines the method used to interpret the extant texts and fragments. Chapter 2 aims at deconstructing the traditional story about the "decline of lyric" that resulted from the musical innovations of the New Musicians. It examines the passages where the New Musicians present their own practice and analyses how their discourse mixes a 'rhetoric of the old' along with the traditional motifs of newness. I show how it is precisely these passages that gave rise to the discourse on innovation and decline offered by ancient historians of *mousikê* and shaped our reception of fourth-century lyric. Chapter 3 offers views on the more general discourse on the evolution of poetry in society by examining anecdotes related to a (paradigmatic) figure for the fourth-century New Music poet, the dithyrambist Philoxenus. By showing how the various anecdotes, despite their different purposes and genres, represent the New Musician as negotiating his place in different social networks, I argue that it is the very relationship of lyric poetry and society, and not simply the specific position of one poet in different fictional situations, that the stories reflect upon.

The second part of my dissertation presents analyses three main venues of performance and subgenres of lyric poetry: dithyramb, sympotic lyric and hymns. Chapter 4 discusses the stylistic changes in the dithyrambic poetry of the New Musicians and presents the poetics of the fourth-century corpus. I argue that the 'dithyrambic style' does not amount simply to a series of linguistic and musical innovative features; these features (which in themselves are not new, but innovative by their accumulation) are only the most obvious aspect of a general reorientation of

poetic interests. The fourth-century corpus is defined by a change in the choice of themes, representations of modes of discourse and construction of the relationship with the audience. Chapter 5 then explores this idea in the field of the symposium. It describes how the links among genre, themes and performance context that could be observed in the archaic period change in the late-Classical period: while the poetic song-types traditionally found at the symposium evolved and lost their performative political function, the symposium became a literary *topos* to negotiate between public and private realms in which poetry was performed. The chapter ends on a reading of Aristotle's hymn to Virtue in the light of contemporary funerary epigrams, and shows how Aristotle operates the same kind of blurring between private and public sphere as the fourth-century epigrams. Finally, Chapter 6 focuses on the less canonical authors of the fourth century and their hymnic (especially paeanic) inscribed compositions. I focus on how the surviving inscriptions, for the most part hymns or paeans for 'new' gods, rather than repeating archaic poetic forms that have become devoid of social function, continue a lyric tradition of poetic experiences in their own right.

PART I – SOURCES AND METHODS

Chapter 1 – A collection of unrecollected authors?

In the preface to his edition of the second volume of *Carmina epigraphica Graeca*, J. Hansen writes, “Notwithstanding one or two adverse comments, I have reason to believe that I have general backing in preferring dull fact to exciting fiction.”¹⁹ In the case of the corpus of fourth-century lyric poetry, “dull facts” and “exciting fiction” are not easy to disentangle since it is often the comic parodies and anecdotes about the fourth-century poets, rather than their own poetic production, that are remembered, and since it is the poets’ supposed lack of fame that made them famous – as Plutarch remarked about Cinesias.²⁰ Rather than proceeding as do most surveys of late fifth- and early fourth-century poetry, with historicizing attempts at providing the biographies of the main poetic figures,²¹ the following pages present an inventory of names, as well as of the corpus of lyric texts of the fourth century, compiled from a variety of literary, epigraphic and papyrological sources. If in refraining, for now, from offering details about the lives of the poets “I have been too skeptical,” to quote the words that introduce a famous volume on the lives of the canonical Greek poets, “it is in the hope of offering a corrective to the too eager credulity of the past.”²² In the second section of this chapter, I will review the specific problems associated with this composite corpus and the approaches proposed so far and will define the method that I will adopt throughout.

¹⁹ P. Hansen 1989, preface, xii.

²⁰ Plutarch, *De gloria Atheniensorum* 5 (*Moralia* 348b).

²¹ For which, see A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 38-58; M. L. West 1992, 357-368.

²² M. Lefkowitz 1981, viii.

1. The corpus

1.1 The poets

The names of a few figures dominate most accounts of the lyric poetry of the late-Classical period: Melanippides of Melos, Cinesias of Athens, Timotheus of Miletus, Philoxenus of Cythera (and/or Leucas), Telestes of Selinous, Polyidus of Selembria and the musicians Phrynus of Mytilene and Pronomus of Thebes.²³ Most of these poets and musicians appear in a passage of a comedy of Pherecrates, the *Cheiron* (fr. 155 K-A), often quoted to describe the innovations introduced in traditional *mousikê* at the end of the fifth century BC. They constitute in large part the canon of “New Music”²⁴ and were also recorded on the *Marmor Parium*,²⁵ on a few inscriptions²⁶ and by historiographers. Diodorus of Sicily, for example, describing the poetic intelligentsia with whom Dionysius of Sicily surrounded himself *ca.* 400 BC, offers a list of names that presents the same figures:²⁷

²³ Each name is associated with an innovation: Melanippides is said to have introduced *anabolai* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1409b), and the Lydian mode in the lament for Pytho (*De musica* 1136 = Aristoxenus fr. 80 W); Phrynus for adding strings to the lyre (*De musica* 1132bc), from seven to nine, and introducing harmonic modulations; Pronomus for the multimodal *auloi* (Pausanias 9. 12. 5, Athenaeus 15. 631e). To this list, one should add Crexus (for whom no home town is recorded), who is credited for technical innovations on the lyre, and the introduction of polyphony and recitation (*De musica* 1135 cd, 1142a). For Crexus, see M. L. West 1992, 359.

²⁴ On the New Music phenomenon in general, E. Csapo 2004, A. d’Angour 2006. For general bibliography on the evolution of the dithyramb, that includes descriptions of the New Dithyramb, see A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962; B. Zimmermann 1992, A. d’Angour 1997, and H. Maehler 2003 (who focuses on Bacchylides, but his introduction provides invaluable help for understanding features of the dithyramb); for recent reinterpretations of the history of the genre, see A. d’Angour 1997; J. Franklin forthcoming. Less is available on the nome (this solo piece performed either on the *kithara* or the *aulos*, mainly at competitive festivals): see pseudo-Aristotle, *Problems* 19. 28. Also H. Grieser 1937, E. Laroche 1949, 166-171, H. Koller 1956, T. Fleming 1976, M. L. West 1992, 214-217; J. Hordern 2002, 25-33. On the classification of the different *nomoi*, see A. Barker 1995, 249-255, I. Rutherford 1995, J. Franklin forthcoming.

²⁵ *Marmor Parium*, Ep. 65 (Telestes) - Ep. 76 (Timotheus).

²⁶ On Cinesias, see IG ii² 3028 and IG ii² 18. On Oeniades, son of Pronomus, see IG ii² 3064.

²⁷ Diodorus of Sicily, 14. 46. 6. On Diodorus’ sources and methods, see P. Stylianou 1998 (25-139).

ἤκμασαν δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν οἱ ἐπισημότατοι διθυραμβοποιοί, Φιλόξενος Κυθήριος, Τιμόθεος Μιλήσιος, Τελέστης Σελινούντιος, Πολύειδος ὃς καὶ ζωγραφικῆς καὶ μουσικῆς εἶχεν ἐμπειρίαν.

At that time [that of the tyrant Dionysius, 398 BC], the most notorious composers of dithyrambs were in their prime, Philoxenus of Cythera, Timotheus of Miletus, Telestes of Selinus and Polyidus, who was also an expert in painting and music.

Sources agree on presenting these lyric poets (none of whom, with the exception of Cinesias, was originally from Athens)²⁸ as star composers of theatre lyric – in the genre of dithyrambs and *nomes*²⁹ – and associated with the highly criticized phenomenon of New Music.³⁰

In addition to the poets on whom most of the discourse on fourth-century innovation focuses, two dozen or so names of fourth-century performers are recorded in a variety of later sources (mainly Athenaeus and Plutarch, but also Lucian, Dionysus of Halicarnassus, Pausanias): some kitharodists, like Stratonicus of Athens,³¹ Propis of Rhodes,³² Aristonous (of Corinth?),³³ Nicocles of Taras³⁴ and Cephisodotus of Archarnae,³⁵ some singers, like Argas,³⁶ and some *aulos*-players, the “unsung heroes of

²⁸ Plutarch notes that exception in the *De gloria Atheniensorum* 5 (*Moralia* 348 b) = test. 12 in D. Campbell 1993. This is underlined by Justice in the Pherecratean fragment, when she asks about Timotheus (“Timotheus who? The red-head from Miletus,” fr. 155, 20-21 K-A).

²⁹ All fragments of and testimonies about the “New School of Poetry” are collected in D. Campbell 1993. See also the very helpful edition of C. del Grande 1946 (valuable for parallels with earlier lyric); J. Edmonds (rev. ed.) 1988; D. Sutton 1989. G. Ieranò 1997 has a whole section (205-232) devoted to “tradizione e innovazione: da Laso agli esperimenti del ditirambo ‘nuovo’”.

³⁰ The term “New Music” itself was not used by the Ancients. It is the translation of the phrase *musica nova* inherited from the Renaissance (about the transformation of music at the end of the Middle Ages); ancient critics talk about “theatre music” or “dithyrambic music.” On which, see A. D’Angour 2006.

³¹ On Stratonicus, see Athenaeus 8. 348b ff.; also *SH* 737. See also D. Gilula 2000.

³² On Propis: Athenaeus 8. 347 f.

³³ On Aristonous: Plutarch, *Life of Lysander*, 18.4. Possibly identical to Aristonous of Corinth, who composed a hymn to Hestia and a paean to Apollo, on which see chapter 6.

³⁴ On Nicocles of Taras: Pausanias 1. 37. 2.

³⁵ On Cephisodotus: Athenaeus 4. 131c quoting Anaxandrides’ *Protesilaus*, fr. 16. 4, 42. 17 K-A.

³⁶ On Argas: Athenaeus 4. 131c, quoting Anaxandrides’ *Protesilaus*, fr. 16. 4, 42. 17 K-A.

New Music,”³⁷ like Meles (father of Cinesias), Chrysogonus,³⁸ Telephanes of Megara,³⁹ Eucles,⁴⁰ Andron of Catana, Cleolas,⁴¹ Antigenidas,⁴² Euius,⁴³ Telles,⁴⁴ Dorion,⁴⁵ Ismenias,⁴⁶ Kaphisias,⁴⁷ Pronomus,⁴⁸ Oeniades⁴⁹ and Timotheus.⁵⁰

Apart from the New Music poets, and the musicians associated with the phenomenon, literary sources record several other fourth-century poets that seem not to have been associated with the New Music revolution: Licymnius, Aripbron, Cleomenes, Lamynthius, Gnesippus, Meletes, Stesichorus II, Lycophonides, Hermolochus, Leotrophides,⁵¹ Dionysodotus,⁵² Spondon,⁵³ Isodemus of Troezen,⁵⁴ Eurytus of Lacedaemon⁵⁵ and Cypselas of Crete.⁵⁶ Most poets (quoted by a single source and often with no epigraphic evidence to corroborate their existence) are impossible to

³⁷ E. Csapo 2004. On aulos-players in general: “we know the names (but little more) of about a dozen *didaskaloi* who performed at the Thargelia, and those of about ten *aulos*-players”, P. Wilson 2007, 160-162.

³⁸ On Chrysogonus: Duris *FGrH* 76 F 70; IG ii² 1951 100.

³⁹ On Telephanes of Megara: pseudo-Plutarch, *De musica* 1137 f- 1138 a; IG ii², 3093 - *CEG* 552; Nicarchus *HE* 2747-50; Pausanias 1. 44. 6; Athenaeus 8. 351e.

⁴⁰ See inscriptions in table 1.

⁴¹ On Cleolas: see M. L. West 1992, 106, quoting the evidence of Theophrastus, fr. 92 Wimmer.

⁴² On Antigenidas: Plutarch *Moralia* 335f, pseudo-Plutarch, *De musica* 1138b. Also H. L. M. Dinse 1856; L. Prauscello 2006, 48-51.

⁴³ On Euius: Athenaeus 12. 538f.

⁴⁴ Plutarch, *Saying of Kings and Commanders*, (*Moralia* 193 b).

⁴⁵ On Dorion: Athenaeus 8. 337b - 338a. Also see M. L. West 1992, 369.

⁴⁶ On Hismenias: Plutarch, *Moralia* 1095d.

⁴⁷ On Kaphisias: A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 55-56.

⁴⁸ On Pronomus: Pausanias 4. 27. 7, 9. 12. 5-6 = *PMG* 767; also Athenaeus 4. 184d (Προνόμου τοῦ μεγίστην ἐσχηκότος δόξαν), 14. 631e. On the Pronomus vase, see the forthcoming proceedings of *Pronomos: His Vase and Its World*, conference held 26th - 27th September 2006 at Magdalen College – P. Wilson and B. Kowalzig (eds.).

⁴⁹ On Oeniades: IG ii² 3064; *PMG* 840. E. Csapo 2004 notes that he is “the only *aulos*-player to be recorded on a victory-monument with the addition of patronymic.”

⁵⁰ On Timotheus: Lucian, *Harmonides* 1 (= *PMG* 777). For another celebrated harpist: see Plutarch *Moralia* 41 d-e).

⁵¹ On Leotrophides: Scholiast to Aristophanes’ *Birds*, 1405, quoting Theopompus’ *Shop-Girls* (fr. 25 K-A) and Hermippus’ *the Men-Monkeys* (fr. 36 K-A).

⁵² On Dionysidotus: Athenaeus 15. 678c.

⁵³ Plutarch, *Life of Lycurgus*, 28.10.

⁵⁴ Lucian, *Encomium of Demosthenes*, 27.

⁵⁵ Lydus, *De mensibus* 4, 154.

⁵⁶ Gregorius Corinthius, p. 371.

date precisely, and one would wish to know more about such especially intriguing figures as Hermolochus (quoted once by Stobaeus) and Lycophronides (quoted by Clearchus), for each of whom only a few lines survive. Problems of chronology get even more difficult to address when two authors deal with a similar topic (Ariphron and Aristotle, for example) and when style is used as an argument to date the poems.⁵⁷

The epigraphic record provides a much wider dossier of names of lyric poets and performers. Some names have been known from the end of the nineteenth century: the inscription at Delphi that records a paean to Dionysus gives the name of its dedicator, and composer, Philodamus of Scarpheia, and so does the stele, also found at Delphi, that contains two hymns of Aristonous of Corinth.⁵⁸ Nothing is known about the poets, except for the reputation they acquired and the privileges they got with their poems. By far the largest corpus attesting to the names of lyric composers (in particular composers of dithyrambs) or *didaskaloi* of choruses (whether they were poets or not) is provided by choregic inscriptions.⁵⁹ The table below may give some idea of just how many reputed dithyrambists must have been active in Greece in the fourth century BC, all writers to whom the literary record fails to give us access:⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Against this tendency, see C. Bowra 1933. Given the amount of formalism, and habit to use the same motifs in lyric poetry, I do not believe in dating one author by reference to another on the basis of intertextuality, one “borrowing” from the other.

⁵⁸ All collected in J. Powell 1925 = *CA* 132-141; 162-171.

⁵⁹ On this aspect, see P. Wilson 2007, 160-162.

⁶⁰ Table compiled from D. F. Sutton 1989. Most of the evidence concerns Athens, but some additional material about performance of dithyrambs in the demes is available in P. Wilson 2000 (305-307). Asking whether the practice of honouring (tragic, comic, and dithyrambic) choruses at the local level was different from that at Athens, Wilson answers (244): “khoragic monuments (as well as decrees honouring khoregoi) represent one of the most enduring signs of the collective life of the demes and, most significantly, they demonstrate a desire to lavish wealth on local theatrical activity, as well as to perpetuate its memory and that of its benefactors, in a manner directly comparable to practice in the city. (...) The dithyrambic *khoroï* which loom so large on the horizon of the city’s choral culture are correspondingly less conspicuous, almost invisible.” He further notes (245): “dithyrambic *agônes* for Dionysos outside the city thus have the appearance of being exceptional: it might not be going too far to say that the performance and memorialization of dithyrambs in Attike has a ‘centripetal’ quality. The

Chapitre 1 – A collection of unrecollected authors?

contest	victor	date	source	place	festival	notes
boys dith.	Nicostratus	After 450	IG I ² 769 (undated)	Athens	Dionysia	IG I ² 768 (undated) records Nico[...]’s vict. at Ath. Thargelia
dith.	Archestratus	Late 5th	SEG 30 (1980) 125			
dith.	Aristarchus	415/4 BC	IG I2 770a	Athens	Dionysia	
dith.	Paedeas	Early 4th	IG II/III ² 3093	Salamis	Dionysia	cf. Wilson 2000, 244f.
dith.	Nicostratus (comic poet? Dithyrambic?)	Early 4th	IG II/III ² 3094	Icaria	?	author id. unsure.
dith.	Kinesias	Early 4th	IG II/III ² 3028	Athens	Dionysia	
dith.	Telesias of Athens	Early 4th	IG II/III ² 3029	Athens	Dionysia	
dith.	-Dicaeogenes -Speuseades?	Early 4th	IG II ² 3092.2	Acharnae	Rural Dionysia	also author of tragedy cf. Wilson 2000, 306
dith.	Ariphron Polychares of Comon	Early 4th	IG II ² 3092.2			
dith.	Telestes of Selinus	402/1	Marmor Parium (FGRH 239)	Athens	Dionysia	
dith.	Polyidus of Selymbria	399/8 – 380/79	Marmor Parium (FGRH 239)	Athens	Dionysia	
dith.	Oeniades of Thebes	384/3	IG II/III ² 3064 also SEG 26 (1976-7) 220			aulode
dith.	Philophron	384/3	SEG 18 (1982) 69 (IG II/III ² 3064)	Athens	Thargelia	
dith.	Philoxenus of Cythera	381/0	Marmor Parium 69 (FGRH 239)	Athens		
dith.	Diophon	375/4	IG II/ III ² 3037	Athens	Dionysia	
dith.	Stesichorus II of Himera	369/8	Marmor Parium (FGRH 239)	Athens	Dionysia	
boys d.	Eucles	365/4	IG II/III ² 3065	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Eucles	364/3	IG II/III ² 3066	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Polyzelus of Thebes	363/2	SEG 27 (1977) 12	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Eucles	362/1	SEG 27 (1977) 13	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Eucles	361/0	SEG 27 (1977) 14	Athens	Thargelia	
dith.	Aristarchus	Mid/ late 4 th	IG I2 770	Athens	Thargelia	

demes may have offered a training ground for choral and poetic performance in the city, but the very performance and scale of the Great Dionysian and Thargelian (to which one could add Panathenaic) *kykliai khoroi*, with perhaps more than 1600 Athenian men and boys in their circles each year, may have largely filled Attike’s need, and exhausted its resources.”

Chapitre 1 – A collection of unrecollected authors?

boys d.	Eucles	360/359	SEG 27 (1977) 15	Athens	Thargelia	
dith.	Hegemon of Phleia	359/8	SEG 27 (1977) 16	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Antiphilus of Megara	357/356	SEG 26 (1976-7) 220	Athens	Thargelia	
dith.	Hegemon of Phleia	350/8	SEG 27 (1977) 16	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Eucles	355/4	SEG 27 (1977) 17	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Lysiades of Athens	352/1	IG II/III ² 3039	Athens	Dionysia	
boys d.	Corinnus of Opuntia	352/1	SEG 27 (1977) 18	Athens	Thargelia	
dith.	Eucles	Bef. 350	IG II/III ² 3067	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Herm[mid IVth	IG II/III ² 3070	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Pheidias of Opuntia	349/8	SEG 27 (1977) 19	Athens	Thargelia	
boys d.	Epicurus of Sicyon	344/3	IG II/III ² 3068	Athens	Thargelia	
dith.	Nauplius	344/3	IG II/III ² 3069	Athens	Thargelia	also IG II/III ² 3060 (Ath. Tharg 350 BC)?
boys d.	Lysiades of Athens	335/4	IG II/III ² (3042)	Athens	Dionysia	
dith.	?	335	SEG 9, 18 SEG 48, 2052	Cyrene		cf. Ceccarelli and Milanezi 2007
dith.	Nauplius?	Circa 350	IG II/III ² 3060 SEG 30 (1980) 127	Athens	Thargelia	
dith.	Charilaus of Locri	328/7	IG II/III ² 3052	Athens	Dionysia	
boys d.	(Corinnus? Pheidias? Moiragenes I) of Opuntia	327/6	SEG 23 (1968) 45f.	Athens	Dionysia	
boys d.	Pamphilus of Hagnus	323/2	IG II/III ² 3054	Athens	Dionysia	
dith.	Carcidamus of Sotium	320/19	IG II/III ² 3056	Athens	Dionysia	
boys d.	Timotheus	320/319	IG II/III ² 3055	Athens	Dionysia	Reperformance of the <i>Elpenor</i>
dith.	Speuseades of Athens (name not certain)	IVth	IG II/III ² 3106	Acharnia	rural Dionysia	victory at κυκλίωι χορῶι
dith.	Amein[IVth	IG II/III ² 3061	Athens	Dionysia	
dith.	Meidogenes	IVth	IG II/III ² 3057	Athens	Dionysia	

Table 1 - Epigraphic record for dithyrambic victors

1.2 – The texts

Only a few poetic texts from the fourth century BC have survived in non-fragmentary form: an anonymous paean found in four copies in different places in the Graeco-Roman empire,⁶¹ two hymns of Aristonous,⁶² a hymn to Health by Ariphron⁶³ and a hymn to Virtue by Aristotle⁶⁴ and Philodamus of Scarphaeus' paean to Dionysus.⁶⁵ We also have a long papyrus fragment that corresponds to a substantial part of Timotheus of Miletus' *Persians*.⁶⁶ The rest of the corpus is composed of significantly smaller and more fragmentary passages of fourth-century poets, quoted in later authors, scholiasts and commentators. Since no other survey of the poetry of the fourth century presents the literary and epigraphic corpus together, it is useful to review both the evidence and the problems linked with each type of source.

Epigraphic evidence

The first type of source is epigraphic and amounts to about 300 lines. The table below lists not only the author, the genre, the date and the place where each inscription was found, but also some formal and thematic features, which will be useful when we compare with the literary evidence.

⁶¹ CA 136-138; for a bibliographical survey, see chapter 6.

⁶² CA 162-165; for a bibliographical survey, see chapter 6.

⁶³ PMG 813; for a bibliographical survey, see chapter 5.

⁶⁴ PMG 842; for a bibliographical survey, see chapter 5.

⁶⁵ CA 165-171; for a bibliographical survey, see chapter 6. Three strophes are missing (on which R. Vallois 1931), but we have the beginning and the end of the composition.

⁶⁶ The beginning of the composition is missing. On the average length of the nome, see J. Hordern 2002, 29: "Smyth conjectures that the nomes of Timotheus 'would seem on average to have been slightly shorter than the shortest books of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*' (p. lxxvii), which seems plausible in the light of the *Persae*, and may well hold true for the earlier period."

Chapitre 1 – A collection of unrecollected authors?

poem / genre	author / line #	date	place / source	meter / structure	subject	mode of discourse	performance	other
Ery-thraean paeon (iê paeon)	? / 27 (x 4)	380-360	Ery-thrae + 3 other places (later inscr.)	D-E strophic	genealogy of Asclepius	-Address to <i>kouroi</i> to sing Paian -Praise of Asclepius -prayer to Asclepius	cult of Asclepius	4 different specimens, 27 lines each + 4 for one version)
hymn / paean ? / PMG 813 **	Ari-phron / 10	early 4 th cent.	Athens Epi-dauros	D-E astrophic	Health	-prayer -priamel	sung at dinner to finish <i>Deipno-sophistae</i>	γνώριμότατον (Lucian, <i>de lapsu</i> 6)
paean/hymn? / PMG 842 **	Aristotle / 21	341	Athens	D-E astrophic	virtue / friendship / Hermias	-praise / gnomic	sung at dinner?	discussion about the genre
paean (iê paean)	Philo-damus of Scar-phaea / 156	339-340	Delphi	aeolic and ionic, strophic (with refrain)	Dionysos, genealogy and aretology	-praise of the god -prayer for help	Theonexia / reconstruction of the temple of Apollo	
paean (iê paean)	Aristonous / 48	333	Delphi	glyconics astrophic	Apollo	-praise of Apollo	cult of Apollo	
hymn to Hestia	Aristonous / 17	333	Delphi	D-E astrophic	Hestia, Apollo	-praise -prayer	cult of Hestia	
paean (iê paean)	Isyllus / 85	300?	Epi-dauros	Mix of meters (paean: ionics) + prose -astrophic	Asclepius, genealogy and aretology, politics, religion	-gnomic -prayer -praise	embedded performance of paean: at procession	
paeon (iê paeon)	Make-doni-(k)os / 32	?	Ascle-peion in Athens	dactylic system, astrophic	Asclepius' genealogy & aretology	-address to <i>kouroi</i> -praise of Asclepius	cult of Asclepius	stone dates from Roman period, song maybe from Isyllus' time(CA)
hymn Cure-tum	? (66)	4 th -3 rd	Palai-kaströ (Crete)	dactylic, strophic	Zeus Kourete, fertility	-praise -prayer	cult of Zeus Kourete	proso-dion (Powell)
hymn Dacty-los Idaeö	? (35)	4 th -3 rd	Crete	dactylic	Dactyls, fertility	-praise? -narration?	Idean Dactyls	

<i>hymn to Pan</i>	? / 19	4 th ?	<i>Epi-dauros</i>	<i>trochaic dimeters</i>	<i>Pan, music</i>	<i>-praise</i>	<i>Pan</i>	
<i>hymn to mother of the Gods</i>	? / 26	4 th ?	<i>Epi-dauros</i>	<i>telesille-an</i>	<i>Erring of Mother goddess</i>	<i>-praise</i>	<i>cult of mother goddess</i>	<i>2 half choruses ?</i>
<i>hymn to all the gods</i>	? / 15	4 th ?	<i>Epi-dauros</i>	<i>Mix of lyric and hexam.</i>	<i>All gods</i>	<i>-praise</i>	<i>cult</i>	<i>Pan-Hellenic ?</i>

Table 2 - epigraphic hymns of the fourth century BC

Note 1: Hymns for which a fourth-century date is not secure, but has been proposed, are indicated in italics.

Note 2: ** = These hymns also come down to us in quotation form.

The first problem related to the nature of the epigraphic corpus is dating the poetry. The dating of epigraphic poems is in most cases problematic, and it is not rare to find dates ranging from the 5th century BC to the 3rd century AD (for some of the Epidaurian hymns, for example).⁶⁷ Two issues are linked to the dating of fourth-century lyric: the first concerns the dating of the stones on which the poems are inscribed; the second, the dating of the poems themselves. Some stones may have been inscribed in the fourth century BC but record much more ancient poems, as seems to be the case with the hymn to the Dactyls;⁶⁸ and some late third-century AD stones can record texts from the fourth century BC (as is the case with the reinscription of the Erythraean paeans). Three poems of the corpus are dated by prose dedications that indicate the archonship

⁶⁷ In the table, I have relied on epigraphists' dating of the stones and offered the most inclusive list (and italicized all the songs for which a possible composition date of 4th century BC is not ruled out, but not securely attested); in my discussion however, I have abstained from making any conclusion based on the analysis of poems for which a fourth-century BC date is not firmly secured. The discussion of other possibly fourth-century songs, like the hymn to Poseidon, to the Kouretes or the hymn to Pan, does not have any bearing on the central argument and would only reinforce the point if the poems were proved to have been composed in the late-Classical period.

⁶⁸ On the dating of the hymn to the Dactyls, see J. Powell 1933, 49-50; on the dating of the hymn to the Kouretes, see M. L. West 1965; J. Powell 1933, 50-53; M. Alonge 2005. On the hymn to the Mother of the gods, see J. Powell 1933, 204-208; M. L. West 1970, 212-215; R. Wagman 1995, 109-146.

under which the inscription was made,⁶⁹ and Aristotle’s poem (also attested in literary sources) can be dated thanks to references given by Athenaeus (or his source, Hermippus).

Unlike earlier hymns, transmitted orally and preserved inside temples, these hymns were inscribed in public places, and most probably were destined to be read (as suggests the fact that the refrain of some songs was inscribed in full, for example).⁷⁰ If the geographic and physical setting in which the poems were found might give some information about their real-life performance context, or about the relationship between the text as artefact and the text as poetry, nothing is known about their authors: were they famous local poets in their time who remained unrecorded by the tradition? Or itinerant poets composing for a fee? Or local people composing poetry as an educated pastime? I. Rutherford has recently briefly discussed the phenomenon of *poeti vaganti* in the Hellenistic period⁷¹ (for which most of the evidence concerns the third and second centuries BC), and his forthcoming co-edited volume will provide additional material to better understand this practice, which might explain the production of some of our fourth-century epigraphic poems.

⁶⁹ About the date of Philodamus of Scarphaea, the most complete dossier is B. Rainer 1975. On Aristonous, see M. Vamvouri-Ruffy 2004.

⁷⁰ W. Furley 1995, 29, states: “Until the fourth century BC temple authorities did not normally have the texts of cult songs inscribed.” There is also isolated evidence for the inscription of some (non cultic) songs, for example the testimony of Gorgon, author of a *περὶ θυσιῶν*, who reports that Pindar’s *Olympian* VII was so admired that it was inscribed in the sanctuary of Athena Lindia in Rhodes. The case of the *Olympian* ode is slightly different, since it suggests that the poem was inscribed *inside* the temple, as a way of preserving the text, and not displayed for public reading of the inscriptions, which seems to be the case with the fourth-century texts.

⁷¹ I. Rutherford 2007, 284-286. The decrees that Rutherford analyses (documented in the past by M. Guarducci 1929) are “fascinating in their detail” (284): “These decrees do not mention contests, but rather commemorate a presence, an *epidemia* to use the Greek term, and the poet’s behaviour – his/her *anastrophe* – in the sanctuary.” Also 286: “another question we can ask about the *poeti vaganti* is: to what extent does the role of the poet who visits the sanctuary resemble that of *theoroi*.” On *poeti vaganti*, see R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (eds.) forthcoming.

Papyrological evidence

The second kind of evidence is papyrological. One papyrus has fortunately survived, that of Timotheus' *Persians* – incidentally the oldest surviving literary papyrus. It was found in the tomb in Egypt where it had been deposited (or lost? or discarded?) “in the time of Alexander the Great at the latest, and possibly somewhat earlier.”⁷² Details are scarce about the connection between this late fourth-century papyrus and the dead man in whose tomb it was found.⁷³ Unlike the literary fragments that come with some (true or untrue, minimal or explicit) explanatory notes from the author quoting the poems, the archeological evidence surrounding the papyrus does not provide any suggestion on the relationships between text and historical context; however, it attests to the fact that these texts were circulating. This is also suggested by a contemporary of Alexander's, Onesicritus, who in his *History*, mentions copies of dithyrambs available for circulation in book form (βιβλίου, probably rolls of papyrus recording the texts of the poems) at the time of Alexander:⁷⁴

Τῶν δ' ἄλλων βιβλίων οὐκ εὐπορῶν ἐν τοῖς ἄνω τόποις Ἄρπαλον ἐκέλευσε πέμψαι, κακείνος ἔπεμψεν αὐτῷ τὰς τε Φιλίστου βιβλίου καὶ τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους καὶ Αἰσχύλου τραγωδιῶν συχνὰς καὶ Τελέστου καὶ Φιλοξένου διθυράμβους.

⁷² See U. von Wilamowitz 1903 for the first edition of the *Persians*. Other editions: T. H. Janssen 1984, J. Hordern 2002. P. Berol. 9875 was found in 1902 at Abusir in a Greek necropolis excavated by Ludwig Borchardt and his German archaeological team – “Une heureuse, une admirable découverte,” according to T. Reinach 1903. The dating of the papyrus was done by comparing the dating of coins discovered in the tomb along with the papyrus: the coins do not depict Alexander, “as might have been expected from perhaps the middle of his reign and certainly later.” On the description of the papyrus, see J. Hordern 2002, 62-73.

⁷³ According to J. Hordern 2002, 64-65 who lists the additional items found along with the roll: “there is little reason to connect the papyrus with the dead man” about whom, once again, it is difficult to make any suggestions. Evidence about his being a musician or a poet would be an interesting find. Suggestions have been made about him being a scribe but none is conclusive.

⁷⁴ Plutarch, *Vita Alexandri*, 8. 3 = *FGrH* 134 F38 = test. 3 C. Telestes in D. Campbell 1993. On this passage, and the interpretation of βιβλίου as referring to *Lesetexte* and not musical scores, see L. Prauscello 2006, 43, note 129, arguing against A. Bélis 1999, 30 who seems to be arguing for a reference to musical scores.

And when he ran out of other books in the up-country, he ordered Harpalus to send him some, and Harpalus send him the papyrus-rolls of Philistus and many of the tragedies of Euripides, Sophocles, and Aeschylus, and the dithyrambs of Telestes and Philoxenus.

But apart from this chance find, there is no other papyrus, or manuscript gathering the writings of the “fourth-century lyric poets” or of *dithyrambopoioi*.⁷⁵ This is mainly due to the fact that, as opposed to the canon of the nine archaic *melici*, the Alexandrians did not compile an edition of the late-Classical poets.⁷⁶ First, at the time when the Alexandrians were compiling the canon of archaic and early-Classical poets, the texts of the dithyrambic poets were already available in written form and circulating as “singles” – as attested by the example of Timotheus’ *Persians* and the testimony of Onesicritus. But another fact accounts for the absence of an edition of the New Musicians: most of their compositions were theatrical and were still performed, and the need for recording them might not have been felt since they were very much part of the (local) culture of the early Hellenistic time.⁷⁷ Reperformances are attested by literary sources, by Lucian for example, who in the second century AD represents the late fourth-century BC aulete Harmonides talking about his teacher’s success (the aulete Timotheus) in his (re)performance of Timotheus’ *the Madness of Ajax*, and by Plutarch, who describes a reperformance of Timotheus’ *Persians* in Nemea in 207 BC for

⁷⁵ Papyrus finds however have revealed prose works quoting fourth-century poets: the Rainer papyrus (dated from the 1st century BC or 1st century AD), which records a prose work (c. 200 BC) quoting dithyrambic fragments in which the names Melanippides, Philoxenus and possibly Telestes occur

⁷⁶ On the Alexandrians’ attitude towards lyric, see U. von Wilamowitz 1900, especially 1-24, 63-71. For the taxonomy of lyric poetry (inherited from the Alexandrians), see A. Harvey 1955, M. Davies 1988.

⁷⁷ U. von Wilamowitz 1900, 11. On the success of the New Music, see later in this chapter. The absence of text of the *dithyrambopoioi* might be connected with the evolution of the recording practices of the lyric parts of tragedy and comedy. Starting with the latest plays of Aristophanes, the lyric songs stopped being written out on the papyrus and replaced by the mention of *χόρον*. This is most often analysed as the loss of lyric songs, that turned into “repertoire pieces”/musical intermezzo and could be performed indifferently for various pieces. Against this view, and arguing for different *recording*, as opposed to different *performance* practice, and for the liveliness of dramatic practice in the fourth century, see P. Levêque 1955; K. S. Rothwell 1992.

Philopoemen.⁷⁸ In the large epigraphic dossier about performance of theatrical lyric in the Hellenistic period, an inscription records the victory of a boys chorus in a reperformance of Timotheus' dithyramb *Elpenor*, in 320/19 BC.⁷⁹

If we have some information about the transmission of the text, information about the textual transmission of the music is scarce.⁸⁰ One example of manuscript with musical notations (P. Berol. n° 6870, first published by Schubart, who “left the musical notation for others to analyse”)⁸¹ had been analysed by A. Bélis as fragments of the score for the performance of a dithyramb, Timotheus' *Ajax*, but E. Pöhlmann and M. L. West have most recently argued for the musical notation for a tragedy of the Classical or early Hellenistic period.⁸² There is no other known musical papyrus noting fourth-century dithyrambic musical texts, but Pöhlmann and West have proposed that a series of fragments (Pap. Ashm. Ino. 89B/29-32, dated third-second century BC) “might [be expected (...)] to be citharodes' repertoire, either excerpts from tragedies or citharodoic nomes or dithyrambs.”⁸³

Most recently L. Prauscello's study of “music between practice and textual transmission” has provided material for our understanding of the transmission of musical texts. After examining the flaws of the two major scholarly opinions on the

⁷⁸ Plutarch, *Life of Philopoemen* 11 = *PMG* 788.

⁷⁹ I.G. ii² 3055 = *PMG* 779. ἀίσμα is the word used, a term used in the Hellenistic period to describe dithyrambs. On which, see J. Ma 2007, especially 242.

⁸⁰ E. Pöhlman and M. L. West 2001; section II (40-60; fr. 7-18) is devoted to fragments of the late-Classical to early Hellenistic periods.

⁸¹ E. Pöhlman and M. L. West 2001, 58.

⁸² A. Bélis 1998, commenting on P. Berol. n° 6870; “l'analyse musicologique du passage, centrée sur la mise en musique du texte poétique montre qu'il ne peut s'agir ni d'un fragment d'époque “classique” ni d'un morceau tiré d'une tragédie. L'échelle irrégulière, l'étirement des syllabes, l'audace mélodique militent en faveur d'une oeuvre du iv^e s. av. J.-C., et plus précisément d'un dithyrambe.” Against this, E. Pöhlman and M. L. West 2001, 58, remark that the papyrus points to strophic responsion, while “Timotheos' *Ajax* dithyramb of which nothing is known but the title, [...] would have been astrophic,” with further reference to M. L. West 1992, 361-4.

⁸³ E. Pöhlman and M. L. West 2001, 38.

subject (Fleming and Kopff on the one hand,⁸⁴ who see an early symbiosis between *Lesetexte* and *Bühnenexemplare*, and Pöhlmann on the other hand, who separates the textual tradition from the scenic),⁸⁵ Prauscello cautiously concludes:

Summing up, an interlocking analysis of the different documentary evidence that we have at our disposal, scanty as it may be, does not allow us to trace back already to the beginning of the fifth century BC any positive evidence supporting a well-rooted symbiosis between textual and musical tradition in terms of channels of transmission and reception. Restricted circles of professional musicians could well have occasionally resorted to musical scores by that time, but this is quite different from positing a whole strand of musical transmission closely associated with the textual one.

Because most of the material she considers predates our texts, her method and conclusions are only helpful insofar as they show that, if musical and textual notation were transmitted together at some point in the fourth century (as Bélis has proposed for one isolated instance), it is difficult to make this practice go back to the early-Classical time.

Literary fragments

The third and last kind of evidence available for the fourth-century poets is literary. Table 3 below presents the forty-five fragments (amounting to about 220 lines) of late-Classical lyric poetry that have survived in literary works written between the early fourth century BC and the late fifth century AD. Out of these, more than 80 % of the quotations (37 out of 45) come from the canon of “New Musicians.” Our main

⁸⁴ T. Fleming and E. Kopff 1992.

⁸⁵ L. Lomiento in her BMCR review (2007/04/57) of L. Prauscello’s 2006 book notes: “Both representations, observes Prauscello, verge on oversimplification in attributing an implausible stability to the textual tradition, whose evolution would have been less straightforward. As against these rigid patterns, Prauscello outlines a richer picture, where the “true” mode of transmission of a text across different periods seems to have been “its inner capability of being adapted to changed performance practices without losing its own identity.”

literary sources are Athenaeus, Plutarch, and Stobaeus who respectively provide us with 21 fragments amounting to 175 lines (or 80% of the total lines), 8 fragments or 11 lines (or 5%) and 4 fragments of 10 lines (or 4.6%).

LITERARY SOURCES	Literary tradition (biographical information, anecdotes about author, elaborate context of quotation) (source authors in parenthesis, in chronological order)	No tradition (no biographical information in source, only mention of name) (source author in parenthesis)
Fragments (number of preserved lines in bold – doesn't include paraphrases of original in source author)	<p>Melanippides (23) (Pherecrates, Xenophon, Aristotle, Philodemus, Plutarch, Clement of Al., Athenaeus, Marcellinus, Stobaeus, Palatine Anthology, Suda)</p> <p>Licymnius (8) (Plato, Aristotle, Philodemus, Parthenius, Dion. of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, Athenaeus, Sextus Empiricus, Stobaeus)</p> <p>Timotheus (31) (Pherecrates, Aristotle, Machon, Chrysippus, Satyrus, Hephaestion, Polybius, Diod. Siculus, Dion. of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, Lucian, Athenaeus, Themistius, Diog. Laertius, Macrobius, Stephanus of Byzantium, Stobaeus, Suda)</p> <p>Telestes (26) (Apollonius, Philodemus, Plutarch, Pliny, Athenaeus, Suda)</p> <p>Philoxenos of Cythera (12+) (Aristophanes, Plato com., Aristotle, Hermesianax, Antigonus of Carystus, Philodemus, Diod. Sic., Plutarch, Pliny, Zenobius, Athenaeus, Synesius, Hesychius, Stobaeus, Suda,</p> <p>Philoxenos of Leucas (if different from above Philoxenos (91+) (Athenaeus)</p> <p>Aristotle (34) (Athenaeus, Olympiodorus, Diog. Laertius, Eustates, Suda)</p>	<p>Ariphron (12) (Athenaeus)</p> <p>Lycophronides (8) (Athenaeus)</p> <p>Castorion (7) (Athenaeus)</p> <p>Hermolochus (5) (Stobaeus)</p> <p>+ anonymous fragments</p>
No preserved fragments	<p>Cinesias (Pherecrates, Aristophanes, Plato, Lysias, Philodemus, Erotian, Plutarch, Galen, Athenaeus, Apostolius)</p> <p>Phrynis (Pherecrates, Aristophanes, Aristotle, Plutarch, Athenaeus, Proclus)</p> <p>Polyidus (Plutarch, Athenaeus)</p> <p>Crexus (pseudo-Plutarch)</p> <p>Pronomus (Pausanias)</p> <p>Gnesippus (Cratinus, Chionides, Epicrates, Telecleides, Plutarch)</p> <p>Cleomenes (Chionides, Epicrates, Dicaearchus, Athenaeus)</p> <p>Lamynthus (Epicrates, Athenaeus, Photius)</p> <p>Leotrophides (Theopompus, Hermippus)</p> <p>Stesichorus II (Didymus, Strabo)</p>	<p>Asopodorus (Athenaeus)</p> <p>Oeniades (Didymus)</p> <p>Sophocles II (Suda)</p>

Table 3 - Fourth-century fragments preserved by literary sources

Athenaeus' overwhelming presence as a source should make us aware of some biases in the surviving corpus: it is mostly Athenaeus' interests that are illustrated in the selection of fragments.⁸⁶ However, long thought to be interesting only for his encyclopaedic mind, and for the encyclopaedically-minded reader, Athenaeus' monstrous opus has recently been reevaluated and a much more nuanced view of his interests and methods has surfaced:⁸⁷ A. Barker for example has accounted for Athenaeus' interest (or lack thereof) in music and shown how the quotations have been filtered through a process of selection that leaves out "anything truly interesting for students of music."⁸⁸ This is in itself an important consideration, given the overall interest of the *deipnosophists* for music and convivial practices of earlier times, and their conservative ideology. As I will present in more detail in chapter 2, careful attention to Athenaeus' history of lyric poetry in particular reveals that the guests "filter" their presentation of the classical past through their understanding of Plato (and Plato's understanding of musical history).

Other authors come with other biases, which also account for the specific shape of the surviving corpus of fourth-century poetry. The paedagogical purpose of

⁸⁶ Thus many fragments focus on sympotic matters, wine, food and musical entertainment. This interest is the reason why we have Philoxenus' *Deipnon* (only preserved by Athenaeus), but also many passages of Telestes devoted to music. The fact that only meta-musical passages from Telestes have survived suggests that Athenaeus was already using a compilation from the New Music poet (compiled by Aristoxenus, who had a *Life of Telestes?*), not the text of the poet himself.

⁸⁷ For the traditional view, see E. Bowie 2000: "Put a piece of poetry in front of [Athenaeus] that 'Longinus' might pick out for sublimity, or Plutarch for a profound moral lesson, and [Athenaeus] will home in unhesitatingly on the unusual word or form." This is barely true of the fourth-century corpus. For a reevaluation of Athenaeus and his method, see J. Wilkins and D. Braund (eds.) 2000. For a revision of this view, see most recently D. Lenfant's study of Athenaeus' fragments of historians (D. Lenfant 2007).

⁸⁸ See A. Barker 2000, 437. After a "rather impressive list of musical topics with which Greek writers regularly concern themselves, and in which this text appears to have no interest at all," he provisionally concludes: "it seems that the available material has been passed, whether deliberately or subconsciously, through a distinctly curious process of filtration, which has systematically sieved out everything that had ever been of interest to genuine students and connoisseurs of music."

Stobaeus' collection and the moralizing approach of Plutarch guide their selection of poetry; given Stobaeus' didactic goal in compiling passages from Greek literature for his son, it is not surprising to find fragments of classical lyric dealing with moral subjects, which are not very different from archaic poetry. Nothing in the diction, or in the themes, of a passage of Hermolochus (*PMG* 846) for example quoted by Stobaeus distinguishes it from a passage of an archaic author.

Finally, there remains a last category of passages that are not attributed to any poet, but whose style recalls that of the New Music and that are quoted in technical treatises on poetry. Dionysius of Halicarnassus for example, commenting on rhythms, quotes a series of lines, some of which may have been composed by fourth-century poets:⁸⁹ οἱ δ' ἐπείγοντο πλωταῖς ἀπήναισι χαλκεμβόλοις (and they led on their bronze-beaked nautical chariots) has been attributed to Timotheus' *Persians* by Usener, Diehl, Wilamowitz, Edmonds, and deemed "not out of place in the iambo-trochaics of the *Persae*" by Hordern.⁹⁰ Other passages are more generally ascribed to "the school of fifth- or fourth-century dithyrambic poets": *PMG* 926 for example, from a papyrus of Aristoxenus' *Rhythmics* quotes passages that display some of the features of the "dithyrambic style,"⁹¹ and a prose work of around 200 BC (*PMG* 929) quotes dithyrambic fragments in which the names Melanippides, Philoxenus, and possibly Telestes occur.⁹² Finally Aelian, in the context of a description of dolphins' love of song and pipe-music, quotes a hymn of thanksgiving to Poseidon that he attributes to

⁸⁹ *On Literary Composition* 17 = *PMG* 1027.

⁹⁰ J. Hordern 2002, 131. This seems to me a very plausible attribution, in the light of the poetics of the *Persians* that I describe in chapter 4.

⁹¹ P. Oxy. 2687 (= P. Oxy. 9+): see L. Pearson 1989, 36ss., 77ss.

⁹² H. Oellacher 1932.

Arion. Campbell and others have noted that “the poem is in the dithyrambic manner of *ca.* 400 BC.”⁹³

Other anonymous fragments, mostly found on papyri, have also been attributed to fourth-century poets, on the basis of their style.⁹⁴ However, I would be cautious in taking style as a criterion to determine authorship or date, since style is precisely what can easily be parodied or imitated, or can evolve between periods or individuals. Some Pindaric passages for example are very Hellenistic, and some dithyrambic images remind of Bacchylidean epinicia, while some Hellenistic passages strive to sound archaic.

1.3 Questions of genre and reception

A first remark concerns the genre of the pieces most of the evidence belongs to. The bulk of the data concerns the public forms of lyric: the hymns composed for regular festivals and the dithyramps and nomes,⁹⁵ the “theatre” genres of the New Music artists, performed not only at the Panathenaea and the Dionysia, but also at a variety of festivals, the Theoxenia, the Thargelia, and many other festivals that had

⁹³ D. Campbell 1993, 361. On the poem, see C. Bowra 1963, M. L. West 1982, M. Mantziou 1989.

⁹⁴ *PMG* 925 for example, from Hibeh papyrus dated 280-240 BC, contains six fragments on the topic of Odysseus’ meeting with his mother in the underworld. “Gerhard, editor of the Heidelberg fragments, saw evidence also for the story of Elpenor, who fell to his death from Circe’s roof (*Od.* 11. 51ff.). He assigned the fragments to the fragments to the *Elpenor* of Timotheus (*PMG* 779), but Page, *Select Papyri iii* 397 ff., showed how frail the evidence is” (D. Campbell 1993).

⁹⁵ It is difficult to be more precise about the genre of some specific compositions, since there is a general uncertainty in the ancient testimonies about the song-types composed by the New Music poets: the Suda calls Telestes κωμικός, (Suda iv 518 Adler, T 265 = Test. 1 Campbell 1993), his production δράματα (and so Philoxenus’ *Galatea* - on which issue, see D. F. Sutton 1983). Philoxenus himself is called διθυραμβοποιὸς ἢ τραγοδοδιδάσκαλος, or simply τραγικός (Schol. to *Plutus*, v.290, l.15 and 19, (scholia vet. et fort. recent. sub auctore Moschopulo and in Schol. Tzet. v.290, l.1). See also J. Hordern 1999. These poets are mostly called διθυραμβοποιοί, διθυραμβοδιδάσκαλοι, but never διθυραμβογράφοι as opposed to the πατινογράφοι attested in a passage of Apollonius’ *Marvellous Stories* quoting Aristoxenus (on which, see note 526).

musical *agônes*.⁹⁶ The Suda also refers to other genres the poets composed in: Melanippides composed ᾄσματα λυρικά καὶ διθυράμβους (lyric songs and dithyrambs),⁹⁷ and Timotheus δι' ἐπῶν νόμους μουσικῶς (musical nomos in hexameters), προοίμια (preludes), διασκευὰς (adaptations), ἐγκώμια (encomia), διθυράμβους (dithyrambs), ὕμνους, (hymns) καὶ ἄλλα τινά (and other works).⁹⁸ Because of the absence of an edition of fourth-century lyric poets however, and as opposed to the corpus of archaic lyric, we have a lot fewer fragments belonging to the more private kind of lyric production: although not totally non-existent, the corpus of sympotic lyric, epithalamia, epinicia, or partheneia is very limited.⁹⁹

The second aspect is connected not so much to the fortune of the corpus as to the fortune of the poets. Although most New Music poets are presented as responsible for major technical and musical innovations, they appear to soon have become classics.¹⁰⁰ Already in the fourth century, the “New Music” poets were considered part of a canon. This is attested by several Late-Classical and Hellenistic sources: an aristocrat in Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* for example sees no difficulty in making Melanippides equal to Homer, Sophocles, Polycleitus and Zeuxis in their respective art

⁹⁶ On the diversity and complexity of these festivals, and the rich picture of musical life they allow us to get a glimpse at, see P. Wilson 2007 (ed.), especially the articles of W. Slater, P. Wilson, P. Ceccarelli and S. Milanezi and J. Ma. See also A. Rotstein (forthcoming).

⁹⁷ Test. 1 in Campbell 1993 = *Suda* iii 350 Adler, M 454.

⁹⁸ Test. 2 in Campbell 1993. The *Artemis*, *Persians*, *Nauplius*, *Sons of Phineus*, *Laertes* however are not included in these categories. This might be a sign of how disconcerted by the production of the New Musicians later critics were.

⁹⁹ For sympotic lyric, see chapter 5. For epithalamia, see *PMG* 828. For epinicians, S. Hornblower presented evidence for fourth-century and Hellenistic patrons of epinicians at the epinician conference held at UCL in July 2006, of which the proceedings are forthcoming in P. Agocs *et al.*

¹⁰⁰ This is not the case of the scholars of the school from Aristotle, who clearly set in opposition the lyric poets of the old school with those of the New. On this point, see A. Podlecki 1969. U. von Wilamowitz 1900, 15, notes that Dicaearchus wrote about Alceus; Chamaeleon about Anacreon, Pindar, Simonides, Lasos, Stesichorus; Archytas about Alcaeus and Aleman (Athenaeus 13. 600 f.) – but none of them however wrote on the New Musicians, except for Aristoxenus’ *Life of Telestes*.

and genre;¹⁰¹ Aristotle, who is mostly silent, and rarely enthusiastic, about contemporary lyric poetry, underlines the major contribution of Timotheus;¹⁰² the Hellenistic poet Hermesianax groups Philoxenus with Euripides in his historical catalogue of canonical poetic lovers.¹⁰³ More surprisingly perhaps, at the end of the second century BC, Polybius describes how children in Arcadia learn to sing the songs of Philoxenus and Timotheus as part of their patriotic repertory:¹⁰⁴

Ταῦτα γὰρ πᾶσιν ἐστὶ γνῶριμα καὶ συνήθη διότι σχεδὸν παρὰ μόνοις Ἀρκάσι πρῶτον μὲν οἱ παῖδες ἐκ νηπίων ἄδειν ἐθίζονται κατὰ νόμους τοὺς ὕμνους καὶ παιᾶνας οἷς ἕκαστοι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους ἥρωας καὶ θεοὺς ὕμνοῦσι· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοὺς Φιλοξένου καὶ Τιμοθέου νόμους μανθάνοντες ...

For everyone is familiar with the fact that in Arcadia and scarcely anywhere else the boys are trained from early childhood first of all to sing according to musical rules the hymns and paeans in which they celebrate in traditional fashion the heroes and gods of each locality; and later they learn the nomes of Philoxenus and Timotheus ... [trad. Campbell 1993]

Again, a second-century BC Teian inscription honours a kitharode, Menekles, who performed in the different styles of Timotheus, Polyidus and our old poets,¹⁰⁵ “as befits a gentleman”:¹⁰⁶

ἐπεδείξατο Μενεκλῆς μετὰ κιθάρας πλεονάκις τά τε Τιμοθέω καὶ Πολυίδω καὶ τῶν ἀμῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καλῶς καὶ ὡς προσῆκεν ἀνδρὶ πεπαδευμένῳ

¹⁰¹ *Memorabilia* 1.4.3. The classification of genres is interesting in itself. It seems to go from the least mimetic of the verbal arts (epic) to the most mimetic (tragedy), with dithyramb in the middle, and does the same thing with the visual arts, with the most mimetic first (sculpture) to the least (painting).

¹⁰² Aristotle *Metaphysics* α 1. 993b 15: εἰ μὲν γὰρ Τιμόθεος μὴ ἐγένετο, πολλὴν ἂν μελοποιίαν οὐκ εἶχομεν· εἰ δὲ μὴ Φρῶνις, Τιμόθεος οὐκ ἂν ἐγένετο.

¹⁰³ Fr. 7 CA, 96-105. On Hermesianax, see C. Caspers 2006.

¹⁰⁴ Polybius (4. 20. 8-9). We should not forget that this image might very well be Polybius’ projection of his vision of an idyllic Arcadia (his home territory) and corresponds to the image of an ideal conservative musical culture. Whether this is true, or Polybius is “projecting” anti-Athenian values on Arcadia and using *mousikê* as a cultural symbol, is a question that chapter 2 and 4 will develop more fully.

¹⁰⁵ The styles of Timotheus and Polyidus are themselves opposed in the *De musica*, where Polyidus is said to have written medleys (καττύματα): pseudo-Plutarch, *De musica* 1138 a-b. On these καττύματα, see E. Borthwick 1968.

¹⁰⁶ IC I viii. 11 = CIG 3053 = Le Bas III 1 n.81. Most recently: I. Rutherford 2007, 285.

Menekles often performed on the cithara the songs of Timotheus and Polyidus and our old poets [Cretan?], beautifully and as befits a gentleman.

The New Musicians' contribution continued being recognized as part of the canon, as Themistius for example suggests in the third century AD.¹⁰⁷

This phenomenon is also illustrated by the authors' choice of quotations. Plutarch, for example, quotes fourth-century poets at key points in his works, and seems to consider them as belonging to the canon, and known from every educated gentleman: he introduces his *How to read the poets* by a quotation of Philoxenus¹⁰⁸ and quotes Melanippides in the *Erotikos* (thus assuming that everybody knows whom he was referring to),¹⁰⁹ and asks where a line of Philoxenus comes from, right after quoting Sappho, as if it were as natural to know Philoxenus as it is to know Sappho.

One author who seems to quote the New Musicians just as often as Pindar or the archaic *melikoi* is Philodemus: Wilamowitz was the first to recognize this, in a footnote to *Zukunftsphilologie!*, where he notes how Philodemus, by contrast with other authors, is interested in late-Classical lyric. The footnote (“eine Ausnahme macht Philodemus, der sie auffallend häufig citiert”) corrects the lyrical statement about the loss of most dithyrambic poetry:¹¹⁰

Wie viele Hundert Gedichte waren für die so überaus beliebten kyklischen Chöre erforderlich, ein wie kleiner Teil ward überhaupt erhalten, und welch Millionstel ist uns einmal trümmerhaft durch Zufall erhalten, da ja namentlich

¹⁰⁷ *Oratio* 26. 316e: καὶ τῆ γραφικῆ οὐδὲν εἰσήνεγκεν Ἀπέλλης οὐδὲ Τέρπανδρος τῆ κιθάρα οὐδὲ Τιμόθεος τοῖς ἀλλοῖς;

¹⁰⁸ Plutarch, *De audiendis poetis* 1 = PMG 836 (f).

¹⁰⁹ Plutarch, *Erotikos* 15 (*Moralia* 758c).

¹¹⁰ U. von Wilamowitz 1872, 21, footnote 28. On this passage, see A. Henrichs 1984, 56-57, who concludes the article with: “selbst so erweist sich “de Pietate” wieder einmal als Fundgrube verlorener Dichtung, und Wilamowitz zeigt sich bereits in jungen Jahren, noch vor der ersten Italienreise und der Autopsie der herkulanischen Rollen, als seltener Kenner antiker Überlieferung, der mit klarem Blick die Sonderstellung Philodems erkannt hat.”

die Grammatik aber eigentlich die gesamte spätere Zeit diese Dichtungen vor der klassischen Melik völlig vernachlässigte.

At the same time, his remark is the first step in the direction of correcting the view that “lyric died” in the fourth century – a view that I will examine in the next section of this chapter.

2- Tradition and innovation in fourth-century poetry – methods

This corpus, because of its composite nature, raises a set of overlapping questions. Each of them has already been thoroughly debated by historians of literature, critics interested in genre-theory, and by social historians. The first question concerns the very nature of the extant corpus: as I have already underlined, about two thirds of the evidence for fourth-century lyric production concerns New Music, and only the most representative figures of that movement, while a lot less is available about the less public, or less showy, forms of performance (symptotic lyric, epithalamia, partheneia...).¹¹¹ If available, these compositions would give us a more nuanced idea of what late-Classical musical culture was like, and of how some lyric practices remained (or not) unchanged, along with the most spectacular innovations of New Music.¹¹²

Secondly, and on another level, although the New Musicians were credited with a variety of innovations in musical composition and performance,¹¹³ it remains difficult to evaluate how much change the New Musicians introduced in the genres of

¹¹¹ About the epinician genre: we have a fragment of an epinician by Euripides, in elegiacs, for the victory of Alcibiades (J. Edmunds vol. 3, texts 1-2), and another possible epigram by Philoxenus, *A.P.* 9. 319.

¹¹² Chapter 4 and 5 try to reconstitute some aspects of these traditional practices.

¹¹³ Some of which I have mentioned in note 16.

dithyramb and nome, since very little is known about the forms of these genres before the late-Classical period, and the oeuvre and testimonies about Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides can barely be representative of the whole genre.¹¹⁴ Up until twenty years ago, two main types of approach were illustrated in criticism about the relationship between tradition and innovation in fourth-century BC lyric. A first trend, text-based literary history, consisted in analysing the critical vocabulary associated with the New Music revolution and the formal changes introduced by the poets in melic compositions and dramatic lyric. Critics analysed, and compared, different kinds of literary evidence: passage like those of the comic playwrights supposedly describing, and reacting to, contemporary changes,¹¹⁵ and the testimonia of the poets themselves (both their metamusical passages, and the surviving fragments). This mainly text-based approach is the first critical model, mostly illustrated by French, German and Italian scholars, used to present the chronological evolution of lyric poetry in the late-Classical period and it is also illustrated by most commentaries and studies that emphasized the influence of New Music on the plays (especially tragedies) written after 415 BC.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ On this topic, J. Franklin (forthcoming) offers a very stimulating interpretation of how the New Musicians *returned to the tradition* of kithara choral music, rather than introduced innovation. A productive way of looking at the “New Music revolution” of the late fifth century is to compare it to the “New Music revolution” of the early fifth century, and even with the late sixth-century Argive efflorescence noted by Herodotus (3. 131 ff.). On the late sixth- and early fifth- century musical revolution, see P. Wilson 1999, R. Wallace 2003, A. D’Angour 2006, L. Prauscello (forthcoming).

¹¹⁵ This is the case for example of D. Restani 1983, analysing the Pherecrates fragment listing the New Musicians, B. Zimmermann 1992b, G. Dobrov and E. Urios-Aparisi 1995, M. Trédé 2000. Also Franklin (forthcoming).

¹¹⁶ One of the most influential studies treating the connection between New Music and tragedy remains W. Kranz’ 1933 *Stasimon* that devotes 34 pages to New Music (from the *καὶνῶν ὕμνων* of *Troades*, 511), Kranz focuses on the “dithyrambic stasima” (the choral odes of Euripidean plays which, in terms of narrative content, are both self-sufficient and do not bear much relationship with the tragic plot). His answer to analyse the “what is new in new music” is “[die neue Tragik] ist die Frucht eines neuen Lebensgefühls, das mehr zur Resignation neigt als zu heroischem Kampf und Widerstand.” This material was revisited in O. Panagl’s 1971 dissertation, *Die “dithyrambischen Stasima” des Euripides* that offers a series of close readings of ten “new songs” (from *Hekabe*, *Troades*, *Electra* (2), *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Helen*, *Phoenissae* (2) and *Iphigenia in Aulis* (2)) with a focus on their narrative, compositional and

Comparing the testimonies about the New Music poets and the surviving tragic texts, they more or less agreed on four stylistic and structural characteristics: the introduction of *embolima*; the greater use of actors' monodies; the loss of strophic responion in both solo and choral lyric; and finally the use of a greater variety of rhythms throughout the lyric passages, associated with the use of dithyrambic diction in general – features described in part by Aristotle himself in the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*.¹¹⁷ These formal changes were generally analysed as a “quest for novelty” in an age of innovation and interpreted as masterpieces of literary virtuosity and intertextual plays.

The second approach, a “text-based cultural history” of lyric consists in a mix of this formal approach and a contextualization of the texts. The focus is, understandably, on the most public, dramatic, genres of dithyramb, tragedy and comedy. The first to illustrate this approach was Sir A. Pickard-Cambridge in his *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy*. “A monument of common-sense and (...) for the controversialist a pattern of good manners,”¹¹⁸ the book contains many sobering statements such as “we must be content to be ignorant of much we should like to know about all that the term ‘dithyramb’ would have suggested to Plato’s generation”¹¹⁹ and

stylistic structure. The most stimulating part is the final synthesis, in which he raises the question of the chorus' status in the dithyrambic stasima. Panagl's study was roughly contemporary with two volumes of T. B. L Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (1967) and *The Greek Chorus* (1970); these studies provide, in addition to detailed metrical analyses of both choral odes and monodies, many stimulating insights into the relationship between Euripidean tragedy and contemporary culture. M. Pintacuda's analysis of music in *La Musica nella tragedia greca* (1978) also offers general considerations on music in tragedy but despite the promising title of the last part ‘gli innovatori ed Euripide’ does not offer a clear idea of the mechanisms of the interactions between New Music and drama – a criticism that can be extended to the sister-volume on music in Aristophanic comedy.

¹¹⁷ On *embolima*, *Poetics* 1456a ff. On dithyrambic style and compound adjectives, *Poetics* 1459a. For a presentation of the formal changes introduced in late-Classical dithyramb, and the analysis and parody given by Aristophanes, see N. Dunbar excellent commentary on the parody of Cinesias in Aristophanes *Birds* (commenting on vv. 1372-1409).

¹¹⁸ Review by J.T.S, in *JHS* 1928, about the first edition of *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy* (1927).

¹¹⁹ A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 220.

does not venture a “formal” definition of the dithyramb, independent of an historical context.¹²⁰ The critic emphasizes the necessity of considering the sociocultural context of *mousikê* to understand the evolution of the formal features of the dithyrambic genre.¹²¹

By the last quarter of the fifth century BC *the change which had been taking place gradually in the literary and social atmosphere of Athens* was practically complete, and the character of the later dithyramb is closely connected with this change (my emphasis).

In the same way, B. Zimmermann’s 1992 *Dithyrambos* accounts for the evolution of the dithyramb as a consequence of changes in social and political conditions. He examines how the dithyramb evolves from cult poetry (archaic *ritual* dithyramb) to civic manifestation (classical *civic* dithyramb, acted by the community “performing” its citizenship) to pure *l’art pour l’art* showpiece in the fourth century, a sign of the decadence of the democracy.¹²²

So sind die Phänomene Gattungsmischung, Manierismus und Archaismus letztendlich Ausdruck derselben grundlegenden Änderung der Kommunikationsverhältnisse: des Zusammenbruchs des demokratischen Konsenses, der die Grundlage der Gattungen der Polis darstellte.¹²³

¹²⁰ Pindaric dithyramb: “an antistrophic composition dealing with special themes taken from divine and heroic legend, but still maintaining its particular connexion with Dionysus who is celebrated, apparently at or near the opening of the song, whatever its subject” (A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 24).

¹²¹ A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 53 (with reference to U. von Wilamowitz 1900, 11-15). By contrast, between Pickard-Cambridge’s 1962 volume and the next large synthesis on the dithyramb genre in 1992, several scholars have offered to define the genre by its formal features. For example R. Seaford in a 1977-78 article, on the salient features of the dithyramb after 450 BC (elaborately compound epithets, frequency and aggregation of epithets, periphrasis, often of a riddling nature, and repetition). Seaford (92) also remarks: “in respect of language at least the deviants from the dithyrambic tradition were not the later dithyrambists but Pindar and Bacchylides... The fragments of Pindar’s dithyrambs are in fact not without affinity with the language of later dithyramb.” R. Hamilton 1990 reexamines all of these claims and offers that (216-217) “despite the exiguous remains, there are at least three traits that appear repeatedly in Pindar’s dithyrambs and, conversely, do not occur in his other poems: the so-called *schema Pindaricum*, reference to spring flowers, and the word *τελετή*.”

¹²² Decadence is a particularly apt word, since it is the very one used by Nietzsche to describe Wagnerian music, a parallel that Pickard-Cambridge himself draws with the music of the New Dithyramb.

¹²³ B. Zimmermann 1992, 134-6.

But this sociopolitical evolution (and decadence) is itself taken for granted more than it is presented, discussed, or explained, and the discourse on the changes that occurred in the late-Classical period (that is, the loss of community values and civic ideology associated with the performance of civic choral lyric), most often as interpreted from the testimonies of the comic poets and moral philosophers, is taken as the framework to understand the evolution of the literary production.¹²⁴

In the past fifteen years however, the corpus of lyric poetry of the fourth century and the changes introduced in the field of *mousikê* have received particular attention, in a series of volumes that represent a third main approach: a material-based cultural history of lyric, that explores the intersection between socio-political history, musical discourse and cultural practices. The critics' main interest resides in analysing how the New Music corpus makes sense in the social and cultural context that the study of material culture give us access to.¹²⁵ In the introduction to his latest volume, P. Wilson explains this revision of the way one writes the history of *mousikê*:¹²⁶

The approach collectively exemplified in this volume advocates recognition of the specificity and complexity of the material conditions of dramatic production as they varied over time and place; and the recognition of the importance of close contact with the raw data relating to the organization and operation of theatre and festivals. Attention to such information need not represent a retreat to naïve empiricism. Analysed with the appropriate care and sophistication, the documentary evidence can become a more eloquent testimony to the ideological and historical complexity of its societies. Interpretation arrives at an apprehension of such complexity through a 'bottom-up' approach, from the evidence for material conditions, rather than via the 'top-down' method of some of the more abstract forms of structuralism and post-structuralism.

¹²⁴ This is also what I. Rutherford 1995 suggests, in analysing the lonely paean of Ion in the *Ion*. This, according to him, reflects the staging, at the end of the fifth century, of the end of a culture where communal performance of music constituted a major aspect of civic life.

¹²⁵ This is the case with P. Wilson's 1999 article on the *aulos* in Athens, R. Martin's 2003 article on the conceptualization of musical performance in Athens, and the 2004 volume of P. Murray and P. Wilson (eds.).

¹²⁶ P. Wilson 2007, 2-3.

This materialist approach to musical culture has resulted in impressive volumes, like Wilson's own *Khoregia*, which transformed the framework for thinking about *mousikê*.¹²⁷ It thus allows offering some answers to the traditional claims made about the decline of lyric culture, and about the demise of *mousikê* in conjunction with the decline of democracy. In contrast with histories of the genre focusing on the surviving literary evidence, this recent work has considered theatre music not so much in "formal" terms (and looked for the essential features of the genre of dithyramb and nome), but in terms of context of performance, and with the goal of examining "the links between the socio-economic, professional, technical, stylistic, ethical, and political sides of the New Music."¹²⁸ Rather than describing the loss of communal values linked to a supposed decline of democracy, P. Wilson shows how the material evidence suggests the continuity of a very strong theatre culture in the late-Classical period, not only in Athens, but in the Greek world in general.¹²⁹ In one of his most explicit assertions, Wilson states: "The best part of a century of lavish festival expenditure was to pass before, in the last third of the 4th century, both the ongoing

¹²⁷ P. Wilson 2000. In the introduction to the volume (3), Wilson offers some methodological remarks that shed light for this study: "the reasons for such a demarcation [between socio-cultural analysis and literary studies] of analysis are not hard to divine. The materials on which any study of the khoregia can be based are of a diverse and difficult range of media: from fragmentary inscriptions from the wreck of monuments set up to commemorate a choral victory, to abstract philosophical rumination on the motivating psychology of the leitourgist. But the *khoregia* is precisely as exciting and revealing a subject as it is difficult, for it ramifies into virtually all areas of Athenian life: not simply theatrical production, but a range of various other choral forms with which the Athenians honoured their gods and pleased themselves, in particular the elusive and little-studied, but extraordinarily widespread dithyramb."

¹²⁸ E. Csapo 2000. For an argument *contra* E. Csapo, see S. Scullion 2002.

¹²⁹ Until recent years, most scholarship focusing on fourth-century dithyrambs (Pickard-Cambridge and Zimmermann) underlined the loss of cultic elements in late-Classical dithyramb; this changed with E. Csapo and P. Wilson's study of the context of performance of dithyramb, and their emphasis on the "come-back of Dionysus" (which I discuss in chapter 4); the most recent revision of the history of the evolution of the dithyramb and its cultic ties is D. Fearn 2007, especially 163-225.

rhetorical and ideological ‘debate’ and actual practice show significant shifts.” Even more clearly:¹³⁰

What th[e] testimony [of Lykurgos’ activity at the head of Athenian finances and public policy] certainly shows is that the *khoros* as a social and poetic form continued to be an important tool of social and cultural formation in late fourth-century Athens. This is one argument to add to others against the familiar story of choral decline as concerns drama in the fourth century. The persistent flourishing of non-dramatic choral performance does not of course prove the necessary persistence of the *khoros* in drama. But it is something to set against the argument, largely from silence, for the early death of the dramatic *khoros*.

To these conclusions, that show the continued importance of choral practice in the late-classical period, one should add the conclusions of E. Csapo: looking for historical changes in the performance of theatre lyric (and starting from the epigraphic and archaeological record), E. Csapo has shown how starting in 440 BC, a new era opens, when larger theatres are built. From this decade on, the whole scale of theatrical production changes from “sponsor-directed” theatres to something that resembled more the “mass entertainment industry.”¹³¹ In connection with these material changes, the socio-cultural status of actors, musicians and singers changed: the demand for such performers grew, the nature of the performance changed (from amateur singing to professional singing) as well as the nature of the theatrical experience. Lyric practice, in connection with other areas of knowledge, became something professional: this was the beginning of the star system, which fully developed in the fourth century, with famous virtuoso performers (in specific genres).¹³² The story told about the lyric of the fourth century is rather different from the ones presented above: far from being a

¹³⁰ P. Wilson 2000, respectively 265 and 267.

¹³¹ The first expression is Bremer’s (J. Bremer 1991, 59); the second Csapo’s (E. Csapo 2000, 402).

¹³² Neoptolemus and Theodorus for tragic roles for example, with a specialisation in female roles for the latter, and Satyrus for comedy. On this, see E. Hall 2002 and 2006.

decline of choral lyric, these scholars present the expansion of the scale on which it is produced.

But because they mainly draw from material history to rectify the distorted image of New Music inherited from historicist approaches based on the reading of texts, their interpretation of the lyric poems themselves is often not contextualized in the lyric tradition. Thus one of my goals in the chapters that follow will be to keep the middle road between relying mostly on ancient texts as source and read them in a diachronic (literary) history of *mousikê*, and taking mainly material history as the synchronic context to read poems. Moreover, there is another balance to strike, between studying musical culture, and lyric texts: while my main interest is literary, I do not wish to pursue in the way opened by New Critics and considered the (already fragmentary) remains of fourth-century poetic “things” in a cultural vacuum. My goal is to keep the middle-road between a study of cultural sociology of fourth-century music, and literary criticism of lyric poetry.

Chapter 2 – New Music and its Myths: “A New Sound for Old-What’s-His-Name”

The subtitle of this chapter comes neither from Aristophanes or pseudo-Plutarch’s *De musica* nor from the *sphragis* of Timotheus’ *Persians*; it comes from the *New York Times* of Sunday, September 10, 2006 and refers to the release of rapper Puff Daddy’s latest record. The article reports: “He [Sean Combs, a.k.a. Puff Daddy, Diddy] never seemed stressed by the complex agenda. *What did seem to make him nervous was the potential reaction to his new music*” [my emphasis]. The “new music” the journalist refers to might not have much in common with the “New Music” of Timotheus and Philoxenus. However, the very issue raised by the title in the *Times*, that is, the relationship between musical innovation and figure of tradition (‘old what’s-his-name’), is the central issue treated in this chapter. The following pages examine in the Greek musical scene of 425-380 BC what the journalist underlines with respect to Diddy: the musicians’ strategies of self-representation, the audience’s horizon of expectations, and the critical reception of meta-musical discourse (or the role of meta-musical discourse in shaping reception).

1- Revisiting Newness

As I have started to describe in the previous chapter, most approaches to New Music start either with a passage of Pherecrates describing the troubles that good old *Mousikê* had to go through on account of a group of musical ruffians, or with an examination of Plato’s and Aristotle’s considerations on musical culture in their political writings (the *Laws* and the *Politics*, respectively). A second kind of source is adduced to buttress this contextual reading of the fourth-century poems: the testimonies

of the Imperial writers dealing with musical history, pseudo-Plutarch's *De musica* and Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*.¹³³ Rather than a synchronic examination of the cultural context, these two works offer a way of diachronically situating “New Music” as a “movement” in a history of music. It is with the conjunction of these two kinds of discourse (synchronic socio-politics of music and diachronic musical history) that most scholars give their reader access to late fifth- and fourth-century texts and propose a neat theory that accounts for the musical revolution. On the one hand, the meta-musical fragments surviving from the compositions of the New Musicians (Telestes, Timotheus and Philoxenus) are read as voicing values that allowed the theatre-going late fifth- or early fourth-century Athenian audience of these songs (and some of the dramatic lyric of Euripides or Aristophanes) to define themselves by opposition to the ‘other’ (male/female, few/many, Athenian/foreigner, self-controlled/irrational, Dorian/Phrygian...). On the other hand, New Music is portrayed as having created a dramatic break in the “good old music” and as responsible for the demise of Music.¹³⁴

The above-described approach to the poems can be defined as “from the outside in”: critics who quote a meta-musical fourth-century passage refer to the historical context provided by Athenaeus and pseudo-Plutarch to understand what kind of social, political and material setting the poems were composed for and received in. I propose to examine the meta-musical passages of the New Musicians from another perspective – “from the inside out” – and to read them not for what they might tell us about social

¹³³ Both of these authors rely heavily on peripatetic sources, Heracleides of Pontus and Aristoxenus. For Athenaeus' relationship to musical history (and in particular his book 14, mostly devoted to the topic of *mousikê*), see D. Restani 1988, A. Barker 2000. On pseudo-Plutarch's sources for musical history, see L. Gamberini 1979.

¹³⁴ The *locus classicus* for the notion of decline of music at the beginning of the fifth century is Plato, *Laws* 700 a-701b. For theories that place other musical revolutions in both the sixth and the early fifth centuries, see R. Wallace 2003, J. Franklin forthcoming, L. Prauscello forthcoming.

and cultural history but for how they could induce our sources to offer the discourse they offer.

1.1 Athenaeus' New Music

New Poets on an old myth: Athena and the *auloi*

The majority of surviving quotations of fourth-century poets come from Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*.¹³⁵ The interest of the author for the sociopolitics of music leads him to record poetic statements that can be read as programmatic, or as commentaries on their own poetic practices, and to favour fragments or anecdotes that allow him to link a poet with his world. This is illustrated by the author's selection of passages from not only the archaic lyric poets, but also the late fifth-century and early fourth-century composers Melanippides and Telestes.¹³⁶

In book 14 of the *Deipnosophistae* (616 e-f), a guest opens a discussion about entertainment with a quotation from Melanippides' *Marsyas* (PMG 758), a passage supposedly superbly disparaging *aulos*-playing (καλῶς ἐν τῷ Μαρσύᾳ διασύροντα τὴν ἀύλητικὴν):

ἄ μὲν Ἀθήνα
τῶργαν' ἔρριψέν θ' ἱερῶς ἀπὸ χειρὸς
εἶπέ τ' ἔρρετ' αἴσχεα, σώματι λύμα·
ἐμὲ δ' ἐγὼ οὐ κακότεατι δίδωμι.

Athena cast the instrument away from her holy hand and said: “damned you, shameful things, outrage to my body! I, at least, don't give myself to

¹³⁵ See chapter 1, and Table 3 in particular.

¹³⁶ This is for example the case with his presentation of Alcaeus (composing poetry while drunk, 10.429, composing martial poetry, 14.629) or Alcman (13.600). For the chronology and controversy over (the one or two?) Melanippides, see chapter 1 and the section that presents sources.

debasement!”¹³⁷

In the usual manner of the sophists at Larensis’ dinner party, another guest responds by producing a quote that displays an equal amount of erudition: the passage he cites is from Telestes, who “took arms against” Melanippides (ἀντικορυσσόμενος) in the following lines of his *Argo* (PMG 805):

(a) † ὄν † σοφὸν σοφὰν λαβοῦσαν οὐκ ἐπέλομαι νόῳ
δρυμοῖς ὀρείοις ὄργανον
δίαν Ἄθάναν δυσόφθαλμον αἰσχος ἐκφοβη-
θεῖσαν αὐθις ἐκ χερῶν βαλεῖν,
νυμφαγενεῖ χειροκτύπῳ φηρὶ Μαρσύα κλέος·
τί γάρ νιν εὐηράτοιο κάλλεος ὄξυς ἔρωσ ἔτειρεν,
ᾧ παρθενίαν ἄγαμον καὶ ἄπαιδ' ἀπένειμε Κλωθῶ; 5

That the clever goddess took the clever instrument, I cannot fancy in my mind – that divine Athena immediately threw it away from her hand in the thick bushes, frightened by the shameful sight unpleasant to see, to be the *kleos* of the hand-clapping nymph-born beast Marsyas! As a matter of fact, why would a keen love for lovely beauty bother her, to whom childless and husbandless virginity was the lot decided by Clotho?

The guest then paraphrases the passage before continuing to quote Telestes:

ὡς οὐκ ἂν εὐλαβηθείσης τὴν αἰσχρότητα τοῦ εἴδους διὰ τὴν παρθενίαν,
ἐξῆς τέ φησι
(b) ἀλλὰ μάταν ἀχόρευτος ἄδε ματαιολόγων
φάμα προσέπαθ' Ἑλλάδα μουσοπόλων
σοφᾶς ἐπίφθονον βροτοῖς τέχνας ὄνειδος.
μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ ἐγκωμιάζων τὴν ἀύλητικὴν λέγει·
(c) ἂν συνεριθοτάταν Βρομίῳ παρέδωκε, σεμνᾶς
δαίμονος ἀερθὲν πνεῦμ' αἰολοπτέρυγον
σὺν ἀγλαῶν ὠκύτατι χειρῶν.

[So he says,] because she, being a virgin, does not care about the ugliness of her features, and he goes on:

(b) But this is a tale unsuitable for the chorus that has flown to

¹³⁷ All translations of the poems are mine, unless otherwise specified. The text of this fragment is uncertain but I choose to print P. Maas’ text. His solution follows the reading of the manuscripts and the logic of the myth, with Athena contrasting her attitude towards the *aulos* with Marsyas’. D. Campbell prints ὕμμε δ’ ἐγὼ κακότητα δίδωμι and translates “I consign you to ruination.” On the meter, see U. von Wilamowitz 1921, 492-3.

Greece, idly told by idle servants of the Muses, an invidious insult to the clever art among mortals.

Then he praises the art of *aulos*-playing and says:

(c) [The art that] was given as the most helpful servant to Bromios, flashing upward-winged breath of the august goddess, with the speed of divine hands.

The general picture we get from Athenaeus' account of the two quotations is that at the end of the fifth century BC, the playing of the *auloi* was such a contested entertainment practice that it prompted contemporary poets to take sides on the topic, either condemning or defending it in their poems.¹³⁸ Melanippides and Telestes are seen as representatives of these opposite positions, and their poetic treatment of the topic is praised for its literary quality (Melanippides being qualified as *καλῶς*, Telestes (later) as *κομψῶς*). We should note however that the kind of dialogue imagined between Melanippides and Telestes strangely resembles the kind of dialogue Athenaeus' sophists hold with one other: the verbs (*διασύρω* and *ἀντικορύσσομαι*) used to describe the relationship between the two poets are typically Athenaeus' everywhere else indicate a response that one guest addresses to another, in a battle of erudition.¹³⁹ I take this as an indication that Athenaeus, in his enterprise to collect little-known passages, read two poets dealing with the same myth as in a dialogue and presented them as engaged in contemporary polemics.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ Athenaeus makes no mention of the other tradition (represented in particular by Pindar, *Pythian* 12) that makes Athena the inventor of the *aulos* (on which, see this chapter, 2.3). It is also useful to note that Athenaeus *only* quotes passages from Telestes related to musical practice. We could infer from this that the author of the *Deipnosophistae* was using an anthology of musical passages (compiled by Heracleides for example) – an hypothesis that reinforces the overall argument presented in section 2.

¹³⁹ The verb *διασύρειν* is used 5 other times in the *Deipnosophistae*, always to describe a literary polemic (real or not): 131a (of Anaxandrides about the symposium of Iphicrates); 187c (of Plato about Agathon, Alcibiades, and many other “*neoi*”); and in quotations of comic authors. As for *ἀντικορύσσειν*, it is used three other times, always of the *deipnosophists* responding to each other on matters of erudition.

¹⁴⁰ On the reading method and filing cabinet of Athenaeus, see C. Jacob 2000.

Athenaeus backs up the idea that *aulos*-playing was becoming a contested practice at the end of the fifth century BC by quoting another passage, from Pratinas' *hyporchêma* (PMG 708) that seems to describe a debate over the place of the *auloi*, linked to a revolution in musical (especially instrumental) practice:¹⁴¹

Πρατίνας δὲ ὁ Φλιάσιος ἀύλητῶν καὶ χορευτῶν μισθοφόρων κατεχόντων τὰς ὀρχήστρας ἀγανακτεῖν τινὰς ἐπὶ τῷ τοὺς ἀύλητάς μὴ συναυλεῖν τοῖς χοροῖς, καθάπερ ἦν πάτριον, ἀλλὰ τοὺς χοροὺς συνάδειν τοῖς ἀύληταῖς· ὃν οὖν εἶχεν κατὰ τῶν ταῦτα ποιούντων θυμὸν ὁ Πρατίνας ἐμφανίζει διὰ τοῦδε τοῦ Ὑπορχήματος:

τίς ὁ θόρυβος ὄδε; τί τάδε τὰ χορεύματα;
 τίς ὕβρις ἔμολεν ἐπὶ Διονυσιάδα
 πολυπάταγα θυμέλαν;
 ἐμὸς ἐμὸς ὁ Βρόμιος· ἐμὲ δεῖ κελαδεῖν, ἐμὲ δεῖ παταγεῖν
 ἀν' ὄρεα σύμενον μετὰ Ναιάδων
 οἶά τε κύκνον ἄγοντα ποικιλόπτερον μέλος. 5
 τὰν ἀοιδὰν κατέστασε Πιερὶς βασιλείαν· ὁ δ' ἀύλος
 ὕστερον χορευέτω, καὶ γάρ ἐσθ' ὑπηρετάς.
 κώμοις μόνον θυραμάχοις τε πυγμαχίαισι νέων θέλοι
 παροίωνων
 ἔμμεναι στρατηλάτας.
 παῖε τὸν φρυγίου ποικίλου πνοᾶν ἔχοντα, 10
 φλέγε τὸν ὀλεσισιαλοκάλαμον,
 λαλοβαρύοπα μελορυθμοβάταν
 ὑπὸ τρυπάνῳ δέμας πεπλασμένον.
 ἦν ἰδοῦ· ἄδε σοι δεξιᾶς καὶ ποδὸς διαρριφά·
 θριαμβοδιθύραμβε, κισσόχαιτ' ἄναξ, 15
 – ἄκου· ἄκουε τὰν ἐμὴν Δώριον χορείαν.

But Pratinas of Phlius, when auletes and dancers who performed for hire took over the dance-floors, took offence at the way the auletes failed to play accompaniments for the choruses, as had been traditional, but the choruses, instead, sang accompaniments to the auletes. Pratinas showed his anger against the people who did this in the following *hyporchêma*:

“What is this hullabaloo? What are those choral dance-steps? What loud-banging hubris has taken over the Dionysiac altar? Mine, mine is Bromios! It is my role to clang away, my role to bang away, as I run through the hills with the Naiads, singing the tune dapple-winged like a swan. It is Song that the Pierian Muse has made queen: let the *aulos* come after in the chorus, for it is its servant. In the revel (*kômos*) only

¹⁴¹ For discussion of *hyporchêma* as a subgenre of choral lyric, see M. Di Marco 1973-4; A. Barker 1995, 39-40, n. 4 (introduction to the Homeric Hymn to Apollo), 214-215 (Pindar's writing of dithyrambs). On discussion of *hyporchêma* as “a vague catch-all not found before Plato,” see A. Ford 2006, 282.

let it be commander-in-chief, and in the street fights and in the fist-fights of wine-up youths. Hit the one with the dapple breath of a toad; burn the spittle-wasting reed, loud-idle-voiced that perverts rhythm and step of the song, with a body fashioned by a drill. Look here! This is how you throw right hand and foot: thriambodithyrambus, ivy-crowned lord, listen, listen to my Dorian choral dance.”

The chorus (the “I” in this passage) deploras a change in the hierarchy between *aulos* music and song, Song playing second fiddle to Music. This passage has received a lot of attention in recent years. Athenaeus’ “historical contextualization” of Pratinas and presentation of the poet after the two New Musicians have led critics to make the poet a late fifth-century New Musician, connected to the musical revolution usually associated with Timotheus and Philoxenus and thus underlining a break within the lyric tradition.¹⁴² However, many points of detail in his poem are hard to account for, and critics have tried many equations to square the final allusion to the Dorian (manly, stern and respectable) *harmonia* with the circular chorus of Dionysus (usually associated with the Phrygian mode).¹⁴³ Instead of trying to make sense of independent details in Pratinas’ lines, I propose to focus on the connection between Athenaeus’ introduction and the series of fragments and to examine how the passages quoted might have given rise to Athenaeus’ historical contextualization. In order to do this, I need to take one step back and contextualize Athenaeus’ reflections on *aulos*-playing.

¹⁴² The details of the debate over Pratinas’ chronology have been most recently discussed and documented by J. Franklin, and there is little to add to his bibliography. For an early date: R. Seaford 1977, G. B. D’Alessio forthcoming “does not rule out the hypothesis that 708 *PMG* might be a fifth-century pseudo-epigraphic piece ascribed to the sixth-century Pratinas.” For an early fifth-century date: D. Campbell 1984, 13-14; 1988; 1994a, 268 n.349); G. Ieranò 1997, 219-26; M. Napolitano 2000; A. Barker 2002, 56; P. Cipolla 2003. Also L. Prauscello 2006. For a late fifth-century date: T. B. L. Webster 1962, 17-20; H. Lloyd-Jones 1966; B. Zimmermann 1986 and 1989, 29-30; R. Hamilton 1990. For reasons I will point out below (section 1. 3), I favour an early fifth-century date. On the identity of the chorus, see E. Csapo 2004, who argues that the chorus of this late fifth-century piece is a pastiche of conservative critics.

¹⁴³ On this question, the most detailed analysis is W. Anderson’s (W. Anderson 1994, 88-93). See also A. d’Angour 1997.

The book of the *Deipnosophistae* in which Melanippides and Telestes' passages are cited (book 14) is entirely devoted to forms of entertainment and music. An interpretation of Athenaeus' overall method in his oeuvre would be out of place here, but three points should be emphasized to better understand Athenaeus' book 14. First, Athenaeus' debt to Plato and Aristotle is immense all throughout the *Deipnosophistae* and many critics have underlined the author's reliance on these two philosophers as sources.¹⁴⁴ It is particularly obvious in the presentation of musical matters, where long passages are quoted from Aristoxenus, Heracleides of Pontus, and other authors of musical treatises (Damon and Peripatetics authors). Secondly, Athenaeus' choice of quotations about music and entertainment suggests a process of selection. All the passages quoted, as I have briefly mentioned earlier and as A. Barker has described in detail in a 2000 article, show a fascination for the sociopolitics of music, but very little interest for the technical subtleties of organology, music theory or practice.¹⁴⁵ Finally, Athenaeus' version of musical history and lament over the changes from "the good old times" are only one expression, in a larger set of issues, of the author's and characters' appropriation of Hellenism under the Roman empire.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁴ See M. Trapp 2000, 357: "In terms of numbers of named references (admittedly a crude measure), Aristotle's name comes up about 170 times, Plato's about 140, Theophrastus's about 110, Clearchus's and Socrates's around 80, Posidonius' about 40, Epicurus' about 35, and Speusippus' and Aristoxenus' about 30 apiece." Also 362: "for attentive examination of Athenaeus' "Platonism" can significantly enhance our appreciation of a number of important general features of the *Deipnosophistae* as a whole. I have stressed the care Athenaeus has taken to include not only quotation and summary of Plato's own works, but also elements from subsequent scholarly and critical debate over them, and how in the process he has displayed both positive and negative evaluations of this classic oeuvre."

¹⁴⁵ A. Barker 2000, 427: "it seems that the available material has been passed, whether deliberately or subconsciously, through a distinctly curious process of filtration, which has systematically sieved out everything that had ever been of interest to genuine students and connoisseurs of music."

¹⁴⁶ Lament over the *mousikê* of the "good old times": *Deipnosophistae* 14. 633b: συνέβαινε δὲ τὸ μὲν παλαιὸν φιλομουσεῖν τοὺς Ἕλληνας; μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα [whenever that is, probably with the New Music] ἀταξίας καταγηρασάντων σχεδὸν πάντων τῶν ἀρχαίων νομίμων [...]; 14. 628e, on dance, that was εὐσχημον τότε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὲς in the past, before becoming vulgar. The distinction between the construction of the good old past and historical reality is crucial in investigating the dynamics of

Keeping in mind these three all too brief remarks, I now propose to show how Athenaeus' contextualization of the four fragments (Melanippides, Telestes and Pratinas) presented above owes specifically to his reading of Aristotle's *Politics*, how his understanding of Aristotle's views lies behind the succession and interpretation of quotes, and how what we take for musical history is actually antiquarian literary criticism. This will allow us to better understand how the traditional way of reading Melanippides, Telestes and the other New Musicians on the background of the "context" of Athenaeus is problematic.

Aristotle on flute-playing

In book 8 of his *Politics*, Aristotle discusses civic education. In the last three sections, he turns to the role of *mousikê* in *paideia* and focuses more particularly on the evolution of instrumental practice and the role of *auloi*-music in society. It is in this context that the philosopher refers to the "old poets who have mythologized on the *auloi*" and presents different ways of interpreting a myth that seems to be the one Melanippides and Telestes refer to:¹⁴⁷

εὐλόγως δ' ἔχει καὶ τὸ περὶ τῶν αὐλῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων μεμυθολογημένον. φασὶ γὰρ δὴ τὴν Ἀθηναίαν εὐροῦσαν ἀποβαλεῖν τοὺς αὐλοὺς. οὐ κακῶς μὲν οὖν ἔχει φάναι καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην τοῦ προσώπου τοῦτο ποιῆσαι δυσχεράνασαν τὴν θεόν· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ μάλλον εἰκὸς ὅτι πρὸς τὴν διάνοιαν οὐθέν ἐστιν ἡ παιδεία τῆς αὐλήσεως, τῇ δὲ Ἀθηναίᾳ τὴν ἐπιστήμην περιτίθεμεν καὶ τὴν τέχνην.

The myth told by the old poets on the topic of the *auloi* makes sense. For according to them, after Athena found the instrument, she threw it away. It is not a bad point to make that she did it out of disgust for the indecency of her

"tradition and innovation." For a parallel, see T. Whitmarsh 2000, 305, who "explores Athenaeus' representation of the power relationship between Greek and Roman as a literary and cultural strategy, not simply as an observation of an externally existing reality" (my emphasis).

¹⁴⁷ Aristotle, *Politics* 1341b.

features: but it is more likely that it was because education in flute-playing has nothing to do with intelligence, while we make science and technical skills the province of Athena.

Aristotle introduces the story as an acceptable fiction (εὐλόγως δ' ἔχει) and starts by presenting the most traditional interpretation of the myth (οὐ κακῶς ἔχει φάναι) - the one that Melanippides seems to be relying on and that Telestes objects to: Athena rejected the *aulos* because she realized it made her face look ugly. But like Telestes, Aristotle questions Athena's rejection of the *aulos* for aesthetic reasons only, and attributes it, more verisimilarly (οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰκὸς) to the goddess' involvement with ἐπιστήμη and τέχνη.¹⁴⁸ With this remark, Aristotle connects the myth with the Athena of "our" Athens, and his overall purpose - education. It is thus not an alternate version of the story that he offers, but a different interpretation. In his account, flute-playing, as an education matter, is opposed to *dianoia* and is foreign to the province of science and technical skills attributed to Athena.

Aristotle continues by condemning "the technical education in instruments and performance" (τῶν ὀργάνων καὶ τῆς ἐργασίας τὴν τεχνικὴν παιδείαν). Professional playing (i.e. playing at musical contests) only aims at the listeners' depraved pleasure, not at the player's personal edification or relaxation and is considered "a task not appropriate to free men, but most menial" (οὐ τῶν ἐλευθέρων τὴν ἐργασίαν, ἀλλὰ θητικωτέραν). Aristotle develops this idea by describing changes in music connected to professional playing:

ὁ γὰρ θεατὴς φορτικὸς ὢν μεταβάλλειν εἴωθε τὴν μουσικὴν, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς τεχνίτας τοὺς πρὸς αὐτὸν μελετῶντας αὐτούς τε ποιούς τινος ποιεῖ καὶ τὰ σώματα διὰ τὰς κινήσεις.

¹⁴⁸ On *Politics* 8, see R. Kraut 1997. Kraut describes how Aristotle reads Plato in the same terms he reads poetry.

Because of its depraved character, the audience is bound to causing changes in music, to the point that it fashions both the characters of the technical experts who attend to it, and their bodies, because of the movements involved.

The kind of musical revolution that Aristotle describes (μεταβάλλειν ... τὴν μουσικὴν) quite surprisingly does not come from the poets, nor the performers, but from the audience (ὁ θεατῆς), qualified by its depravity (φορτικὸς ὄν). It is only because the technical experts attend to the audience (πρὸς αὐτὸν μελετῶντας) and want to satisfy its (base) tastes that both the character of the music and the body of the performer changed, to adapt to popular demand.

The last section of the *Politics* discusses the *harmoniai* and rhythms fit to be used, especially in education.¹⁴⁹ Aristotle accepts the division of melodies proposed by “some contemporary musical experts and these philosophers who have been well acquainted with education in music” [1341b]. Unlike Plato, however, he does not reject some *harmoniai* on a moral basis, but argues that they should not all be used in the same way, for musical education does not have one single aim (to lead to virtue) but several (including catharsis, relaxation, and recreation). Because his discussion of music always includes attention to these last aims, the passage concludes with a sociology of the theatre: there are two different kinds of spectators, one free and educated (ἐλεύθερος καὶ πεπαιδευμένος), the other a vulgar crowd of artisans, labourers, and the like (ὁ δὲ φορτικὸς ἐκ βαναύσων καὶ θητῶν καὶ ἄλλων τοιούτων συγκείμενος) [1342a]. Some modes, corresponding to the “natural character” of a certain kind of audience, can be played by professionals, to suit this set of listeners. The

¹⁴⁹ On the distinction between the two, see A. Barker’s commentary, A. Barker 1984, 179.

passage ends with an argument against Plato on the topic of the Phrygian mode¹⁵⁰ and a note on the dithyramb, acknowledged as Phrygian (and illustrated by the example of the fourth-century lyric poet Philoxenus who had started his dithyramb the *Mysians* in the Dorian mode but ended up “falling back naturally” (ὕπὸ τῆς φύσεως αὐτῆς) to the natural (Phrygian) *harmonia* of the dithyramb). The last words before the concluding paragraph are devoted to the Dorian (middling) mode, in which young people should be taught.

This Aristotelian text provides, I suggest, the background to Athenaeus’ first discussion of *aulos*-playing in book 14: although Aristotle is not acknowledged as a source, the succession of quotations in Athenaeus seems to be illustrations of Aristotle’s argument in these three sections of the *Politics*.¹⁵¹ First the two quotations of Melanippides and Telestes (*PMG* 758 and *PMG* 805) appear to illustrate the idea that the ancient poets had a good tale about Athena’s rejection of the *auloi* [1341b]. Athenaeus even uses synonyms to present the literary quality of the authors’ poetry (καλῶς for οὐ κακῶς and εὐλογῶς).¹⁵² Secondly, Athenaeus quotes another passage from Telestes, from a different piece (the *Argo*) that elegantly describes the use of *auloi* (κομψῶς ... ἐδήλωσε τὴν τῶν αὐλῶν χρείαν) (*PMG* 806):

ἦ Φρύγα καλλιπνῶν αὐλῶν ἱερῶν βασιλῆα,
Λυδὸν ὃς ἤρμοσε πρῶτος
Δωρίδος ἀντίπαλον μούσης νόμον αἰόλον ὀμφᾶ
πνεύματος εὐπτερον αὔραν ἀμφιπλέκων καλάμοις.

¹⁵⁰ Aristotle hints at the Socrates of Plato’s *Republic* 399 a-c.

¹⁵¹ In other words, my hypothesis is that when trying to recreate the kind of discourse about *aulos*-playing that an educated Greek would have held in the classical period, Athenaeus turned to Aristotle. He does not need to quote Aristotle, just cover the topics covered by Aristotle and quote “supporting” poetry that proves his education.

¹⁵² If this is indeed the case, and if Athenaeus is drawing from Aristotle to present the topic of *aulos*-playing, then it would mean that he had no problem in assimilating Melanippides and Telestes with the οἱ ἀρχαῖοι that Aristotle refers to.

the Phrygian King of holy *auloi* with beautiful breath, who was the first to fit together the Lydian song with changing voice, opponent of the Dorian Muse, weaving around it on his reeds the well-winged breeze of his breath.

The vocabulary and imagery of this passage is reminiscent of the Telestian passage quoted right before, where the virtuoso aspect of *aulos*-playing is suggested by the repetition of images of winged and light things (αἰλοπτέρυγον πνεῦμα and ἀγλαᾶν ὠκύτατι χειρῶν in 805c, καλλιπνόων ἀλῶν and εὔπερον αὔραν in 806) and the use of alliterations that mimic the difficulty of aural articulation (especially in the repetition of p/t, p/n). This virtuosity is precisely the feature of *aulos*-playing described by Aristotle (χειρουργικῆς ἐπιστήμης [1341a]) and the reason why the philosopher rejects the instrument for education (although not for the theatre). Additionally, the passage seems to perfectly “illustrate” the notion discussed by Aristotle in the next section of the *Politics*: the use of *harmoniae*. All the musical terms in Telestes’ fragment have an ethnic marker that also applies to musical *harmoniae*: Phrygian *auloi*, Lydian *nomos* and Dorian Muse. The two passages also link *aulos*-playing with the East and with Dionysiac religious experience (*PMG* 805c) – two aspects that Aristotle discusses in [1342a]. I would even go further and suggest that the Phrygian king referred to by Telestes (*PMG* 806) is the Olympus that Aristotle describes in [1340a]. Finally, the reference to the “Dorian” Muse in this passage recalls the very last topic discussed by Aristotle in book 8, and announces the reference to Dorian choral dance in Pratinas. In this context, Pratinas’ fragment, with its reference to musical change, its anti-democratic ideology (with the reference to the democratization of music, the attack on the banausic dimension of *aulos*-playing and the praise of the Dorian mode) and its

condemnation of the power of the *aulos*-performer seems illustrations of Aristotle's point about μεταβάλλειν τὴν μουσικὴν and κινήσεις.

If the close connection between all the topics discussed by Aristotle in the last three sections of the *Politics* and presented by Athenaeus in book 14 of the *Deipnosophistae* strongly suggests that Athenaeus relies on Aristotle in his treatment of *aulos*-playing, two additional remarks are necessary to qualify Athenaeus' use of the Aristotelian material.¹⁵³ First, in a manner characteristic of the method of the whole *Deipnosophistae*, instead of discussing general themes, Athenaeus relies on quotations that (presumably) illustrate the points of Aristotle's text. The fit, however, is not always perfect, and Athenaeus is not consistently a good (or honest) reader: the myth of Athena rejecting the *auloi* for example is interpreted by Aristotle as proving Athena's foreignness to technical skill and her connection with intellectual disciplines (*sophia* and *technê*). Yet the quote that Athenaeus offers makes the reverse point: Telestes *also* refers to *sophia* and *technê*, but *in connection with* Athena's playing of the *auloi*: she is σοφάν and would not reject the σοφὸν ὄργανον (805a, vv. 1-2); the tale about her rejection of the *auloi* is a disgrace to this σοφῶς τέχνας (805b, v. 3).

Secondly, when introducing Pratinas' passage, Athenaeus misses the point of the argument in the Aristotelian text, since for Aristotle the source of decline is located in the audience, not in the performer. Athenaeus' discussion of Pratinas is thus doubly misleading: on the one hand, Athenaeus quotes poetic lines that seem to describe the kind of phenomenon described by Aristotle (the power of *aulos*-music, including its

¹⁵³ Another supporting argument: Aristotle discusses the modes very little in *Politics* 8, and so does Athenaeus in connection with *aulos* playing. He has a much longer passage on this subject (inspired by Heracleides of Pontus), in 624ff.

kinetic power) but in doing so, misses the Aristotelian focus on the depraved taste of the audience, to whom the performers conform. On the other hand, Athenaeus recreates a social context that explains the motivation behind the poetic lines of Pratinas: according to Athenaeus' historicist reading of Pratinas, if the poem expresses some anger at the growing power of *aulos*-music, it must be because there *actually* was some change in the performance of music at the time of Pratinas.¹⁵⁴ The 'contextualization' and musical history that Athenaeus proposes (the imagined polemic over the use of *auloi* between Melanippides and Telestes, and the 'historical event' that Pratinas' fragment refers to) has therefore little value to understand Melanippides and Telestes: it is a "contextualisation" of fifth-century fragments that seems to illustrate Aristotle's theory.

1.2 The four characteristics of New Music according to the *De musica*

Pseudo-Plutarch's *De musica*, a treatise whose importance "lies in its lack of originality,"¹⁵⁵ illustrates the same kind of second-hand use of the late-fifth and fourth-century poets. The treatise relies mostly on fourth-century sources and paraphrases of Aristotelian moral philosophy. I propose to briefly present the passages of the *De musica* connected with New Music, and show how, on the one hand, pseudo-Plutarch's

¹⁵⁴ A close look at the other passages that Athenaeus quotes however shows that Pratinas was interested in metapoetic statements: see for example *PMG* 709, *PMG* 710, *PMG* 712 and in musical history *PMG* 713, from pseudo-Plutarch's *De musica*.

About Pratinas: many scholars have taken this passage to show that Pratinas was a late fifth-century poet. If in this passage Athenaeus seems to make him contemporary with Melanippides and Telestes, elsewhere, Athenaeus quotes him in contexts where he talks about archaic poets. (The reference to body movement, the anti-democratic tone, the use of *harmoniae* and same vocabulary and technique as the New Musicians make him sound like a New Musician *avant la lettre*).

¹⁵⁵ A. Barker 1984, 205. On the *De musica*, see H. Weil and T. Reinach (eds.) 1900, F. Lasserre 1954, L. Gamberini 1979.

(and his sources’) presentation is strongly ideologically biased, and how, on the other hand, this presentation may come from the reading of the meta-musical passages of the poems themselves.

One of the characters, Lysias (who claims to have been mostly educated not in musicology but in performance, χειρουργικῶ μέρει τῆς μουσικῆς ἐγγεγυμνάσμεθα, 1135e) starts by presenting a general history of music and its innovators; the last words of his speech (sections 11-12) are devoted to New Music. The description presents *aulos*-playing and the revolution introduced by the music of Melanippides, Timotheus, Philoxenus and Telestes - after which nothing more is said about the history of music, as if *Mousikê* had died with them and were bound to silence. The vocabulary used in the description has political overtones (1135d):

Κρέξος δὲ καὶ Τιμόθεος καὶ Φιλόξενος καὶ οἱ κατὰ ταύτην τὴν ἡλικίαν γεγενότες ποιηταὶ φορτικώτεροι καὶ φιλόκαινοι γεγόνασι, τὸ φιλόανθρωπον καὶ θεματικὸν νῦν ὀνομαζόμενον διώξαντες· τὴν γὰρ ὀλιγοχορδίαν τε καὶ τὴν ἀπλότητα καὶ σεμνότητα τῆς μουσικῆς παντελῶς ἀρχαϊκὴν εἶναι συμβέβηκεν.

Crexus, Timotheus and Philoxenus and other poets of the same period displayed more vulgarity and a passion for novelty, pursued the style nowadays called “popular” or “profiteering.” The result was that music limited to a few strings, and simple and dignified in character, went quite out of fashion.

The passage is reminiscent of the Aristotelian anti-democratic tone of *Politics* 8 that I have described above: φορτικώτεροι (more vulgar) is precisely the adjective used twice in *Politics* [1341b] to describe the tastes of the mob; θεματικὸν (profiteering) places music in the domain of market economy, as φιλόανθρωπον (looking for popular success). Both express the elite perspective from which the passage is written, and that reminds of Aristotle’s description of the professional musicians as θητικώτερ[οι]. The scenario that Lysias offers is one of musical decadence: before the New Musicians, the

tendency to innovate (illustrated by composers from Terpander to Sacadas) was still ruled by “good” taste (αὐται οὐκ ἀφεστῶσαι τοῦ καλοῦ).¹⁵⁶ The New Music’s first characteristic is its intemperate love for innovation (τὸ φιλόκαινον), equated with a base quest for success. More than a history, Lysias seems to be offering an evaluation in moral terms of the democratisation of music (that lost the σεμνότης that belongs to elite ideology).

The same mix of historical description and ideologically biased evaluation can be found in the discourse of another character, Soterichos. In [1141c-d], Soterichos describes the relationship between aulete and chorus-trainer and the change introduced at the time of Melanippides in terms reminiscent of Aristotle’s:

Τὸ γὰρ παλαιόν, ἕως εἰς Μελανιπίδην τὸν τῶν διθυράμβων ποιητὴν, συμβεβήκει τοὺς ἀύλητάς παρὰ τῶν ποιητῶν λαμβάνειν τοὺς μισθοὺς, πρωταγωνιστοῦσης δηλονότι τῆς ποιήσεως, τῶν δ' ἀύλητῶν ὑπηρετούντων τοῖς διδασκάλοις· ὕστερον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο διεφθάρη (...).

In the old days, up to the time of Melanippides the composer of dithyrambs, the auletes used to receive a salary from the poets, which shows that poetry was the main actor, and the auletes were subordinate to their instructors. Afterwards however, even this was destroyed (...).

The verb chosen to describe the relationship between music and song is formed on the noun (Doric ὑπηρετάς, Attic ὑπηρετής) used in Pratinas’ poem itself (v. 8), a verb that does not otherwise appear in the *De musica*.¹⁵⁷ It is thus very tempting to interpret this as meaning that pseudo-Plutarch’ source read from Pratinas and constructed the sociocultural context *from* the poem. This is all the more probable that this method of reading is illustrated in the next lines, where the speaker describes the demise of music

¹⁵⁶ This is again expressed in Sotesichorus’ discourse [1140f]: εἴποι τις ὅ τῶν, οὐδὲν οὖν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων προσεξέυρηται καὶ κεκαινοτόμηται, φημι καὶ αὐτὸς ὅτι προσεξέυρηται, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ σεμνοῦ καὶ πρέποντος.

¹⁵⁷ In the writings transmitted in the pseudo-Plutarchian corpus, the only other time the noun is used is in a quotation of Euripides.

by quoting Pherecrates' passage in his *Cheiron* (fr. 155 K-A) devoted to the New Musicians.¹⁵⁸ So the first two characteristics (base quest for popular success by use of innovations, and change in the relationship between *aulos*-players and choreutes) associated with the Musical Revolution are, I propose, paraphrases of different sources, interpreted on the background of Aristotelian (conservative) ideology.¹⁵⁹

A third characteristic is associated with New Music and described (in 1141d) as a result of a growing tendency to *kainotomia* and changes in *aulos*-music: *polychordia* (many-stringedness).

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Μελανιπίδης ὁ μελοποιὸς ἐπιγενόμενος οὐκ ἐνέμεινε τῇ προϋπαρχούσῃ μουσικῇ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Φιλόξενος οὐδὲ Τιμόθεος· οὗτος γάρ, ἑπταφθόγγου τῆς λύρας ὑπαρχούσης ἕως εἰς Τερπανδρὸν τὸν Ἀντισσαῖον, διέρριπεν εἰς πλείονας φθόγγους, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ <ή> ἀύλητικὴ ἀφ' ἀπλουτέρας εἰς ποικιλωτέραν μεταβέβηκε μουσικὴν (...).

The composer Melanippides did not remain within the kind of music that had preceded him, and neither did Philoxenus or Timotheus. Thus the notes of the lyra, of which there had been seven as far back as Terpander of Antissa, were scattered about and increased in number by Timotheus. There was also a change from simplicity to greater complexity in the music of the *aulos* (...).

The hybridic addition of strings to the lyre is a feature of New Music illustrated by many anecdotes.¹⁶⁰ If one keeps in mind the passage from *Politics* 8 referred to earlier, it becomes clearer what ideological value is associated with many strings: many sounds

¹⁵⁸ On this passage, see chapter 3. The process of reading from the sources and either 'making up' the historical context starting from the poem, or glossing the text, is illustrated elsewhere in the treatise. Barker has argued this point in his discussion on the *nomoi*, compositions that took their name later on, when people were looking for a justification (see A. Barker 1984, 250-255).

¹⁵⁹ Moreover, the hierarchy between song and poetry is expressed with a participle (πρωταγωνιστούσης) used by Aristotle in *Politics* 8, 1338b. This leads me to suggest that the reason why both Athenaeus and pseudo-Plutarch associate, in the passages I have quoted, Pratinas with the late fifth-century musical is because they rely on a source that itself relies heavily on Aristotle *Politics* 8 and quotes passages from the New Musicians and Pratinas.

¹⁶⁰ The Suda gives Timotheus as "from Miletus, lyric poet. He added the tenth and eleventh strings to the lyre, and he made the old-fashioned music more effeminate." This last note is a variation (still in the realm of perception of gender and reflexion on self and sex) on Pherecrates' description of the misadventures of Music in his *Cheiron*. Other composers are accused of the same fault, e.g. Terpander.

(πλείονας φθόγγους) suggest democratic multiplicity, which can lead to the *thorubos* of the crowd that Plato and Aristotle qualify as vulgar. However, as opposed to the other features of New Music for which no aural witnesses survive, more than a thousand artefacts representing lyres have survived, and the visual evidence widely suggests that the lyre kept its seven traditional strings all throughout Antiquity.¹⁶¹ So where did this tradition of “Timotheus the strings-adder” arise? I propose that Timotheus’ *sphragis* of the *Persians* itself gave rise to this idea, with Timotheus’ enigmatic expression νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις / ῥυθμοῖς τ’ ἔνδεκακρουμάτοις / κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει (*PMG* 791, vv. 229-231). This expression, read with Platonician and Aristotelian criticism of *polychordia* in mind, seems to have suggested the tradition of decadent many-stringedness in New Music.

Finally, the last characteristic of New Music described in this passage (*poikilia*, variegation) is developed in another anecdote, which summarizes particularly well the ideology associated with New Music (1142b-c):

Τῶν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ [i.e. Aristoxenus] ἡλικίαν φησὶ Τελεσία τῷ Θηβαίῳ συμβῆναι νέῳ μὲν ὄντι τραφῆναι ἐν τῇ καλλίστῃ μουσικῇ καὶ μαθεῖν ἄλλα τε τῶν εὐδοκιμούντων καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ Λάμπρου καὶ τὰ Πρατίνου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὅσοι τῶν λυρικῶν ἄνδρες ἐγένοντο ποιηταὶ κρουμάτων ἀγαθοί· καὶ αὐλῆσαι δὲ καλῶς καὶ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ μέρη τῆς συμπάσης παιδείας ἱκανῶς διαπονηθῆναι· παραλλάξαντα δὲ τὴν τῆς ἀκμῆς ἡλικίαν, οὕτω σφόδρα ἐξασπατηθῆναι ὑπὸ τῆς σκηνικῆς τε καὶ ποικίλης μουσικῆς, ὡς καταφρονῆσαι τῶν καλῶν ἐκείνων ἐν οἷ ἀνετρέφη, τὰ Φιλοξένου δὲ καὶ Τιμοθέου ἐκμανθάνειν, καὶ τούτων αὐτῶν τὰ ποικιλώτατα καὶ πλείστην ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔχοντα καινοτομίαν...

In his own time, he [Aristoxenus] says, Telesias of Thebes was in his youth brought up on the best music and dance and he learned the music of reputable composers, especially that of Lamprus, Pratinas and the other lyric composers who produced good lyric pieces; he was also a good *aulos*-performer, and thoroughly studied the other parts of a complete education. But

¹⁶¹ M. Maas 1988, against O. J. Gombosi’s idea that the initial lyres had 3 to 5 strings and the classical lyre, eleven to twelve (in O. J. Gombosi 1939).

when he passaged the prime of his youth, he was so seduced by the variegated theatre music, that he started to despise all the famous beautiful pieces in which he had been brought up, and learned the compositions of Philoxenus and Timotheus, and among these composers' pieces, the most variegated and containing the maximum innovation.

This passage is reminiscent of Lysias' speech (where the New Musicians were φιλόκαινοι) but assimilates the attraction to *kainotomia* with *poikilia*. Again, this description may have sprung from a reading of terms evoking *poikilia* in the meta-musical fragments of the New Poets: νόμον αιόλον ὄμφα (*PMG* 806, v. 3), πνεῦμ' αιολοπτερύγον (*PMG* 805 c, v. 2) to describe the breath of the goddess blowing into the *auloi* and ποικιλόμουσος used by Timotheus in his *sphragis* to describe the novelty introduced by Orpheus.¹⁶²

Conclusion to section 1

Four characteristics thus stand out from reading the *De musica* passages describing the New Music revolution: New Music is a moment in late fifth-century culture when poets (1) deliberately strived for novelty (καινοτομία); (2) introduced changes in the relationship between song and musical accompaniment, especially *auloi* music; (3) introduced many-stringedness (*polychordia*) in *kithara* music and (4) used greater musical complexity (ποικιλία). These four ideas, and only these, constitute the core of what pseudo-Plutarch says of New Music. The same characteristics of, and the same biases against, New Music can be read in Athenaeus' paraphrase and explanation of a few meta-musical fragments of the New Musicians in the *Deipnosophistae*. In analysing the structural, lexical and ideological connections between fourth-century

¹⁶² There is no proof or example quoted by pseudo-Plutarch to justify or qualify the claim that the New Musicians introduced *poikilia*.

fragments and the historical context offered by Plutarch and Athenaeus, I have suggested that what we take for a “historical contextualization” of the fragments is likely to be derived from the Imperial authors’ face value reading of the meta-musical passages, a reading influenced by Plato’s description of the catastrophic history of *mousikê* in the *Laws* and Aristotle’s comments on New Music in the *Politics*.

I now propose to start from the poems and see how the “myths” of *kainotomia*, *poikilia*, *polychordia*, and contested *aulos*-music function in the poets’ self-presentation. It should be clear by now that I do not mean to deny altogether that the “New Music revolution” existed, or that Telestes’ and Timotheus’ claims were not connected to some social, musical or technical reality: P. Wilson’s and E. Csapo’s work on the social history and material culture of the late fifth century has provided considerable grounds for understanding the importance of the transformation of musical practice in the classical period.¹⁶³ But to complement these scholars’ music-centred analysis, I would like to offer a mytho-centred analysis, and show how the terms examined above (*kainotomia*, *poikilia*, etc.) were important in the New Musicians’ self-representation and key for the rhetoric of legitimization they used to negotiate their place in the lyric tradition.

2. New Music From the Top

2.1 *Kainotomia* or the rhetoric of the new

¹⁶³ In addition to the volumes already mentioned, see P. Wilson’s collection of essays and articles on the Greek theatre and festivals (P. Wilson 2007).

The New Muse is as old as Homer. Telemachus, a prototype of the literary critic, is the first to use the New Muse *topos* and state the appeal of novelty in songs:¹⁶⁴

τὴν γὰρ ἀοιδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπικλείουσ' ἄνθρωποι,
ἢ τις ἀκούοντεςσιν νεωτάτη ἀμφιπέληται.

For men praise most the song that comes the newest to their ears.

Most lyric poets made the same claim about novelty, while using traditional diction and figures, including Pindar in one of his earliest epinician:¹⁶⁵

λάμβανέ οἱ στέφανον, φέρε δ' εὖμαλλον μίτραν,
καὶ περόεντα νέον σύμπεμψον ῥυμνον.

Take a crown for him, bring the headdress of fine wool, and send my winged new song.

When Timotheus in the *sphragis* of the *Persians* (vv. 202-205) calls Apollo the one “who protects the new-fashioned Muse,” he thus continues a long lyric tradition of relying on the innovation motif to appeal to his audience. I focus in what follows on this Timothean passage since it is representative of the “rhetoric of the new” used most generally by the New Musicians:

ἀλλ' ὦ χρυσεοκίθαριν ἀέ-
ξων μοῦσαν νεοτευχῆ,
ἐμοῖς ἔλθ' ἐπίκουρος ῥυμ-
νοῖς ἴητε Παιάν· 205
ὁ γὰρ μ' εὐγενέτας μακραί-
ων Σπάρτας μέγας ἀγεμῶν
βρύων ἄνθεσιν ἦβας
δονεῖ λαὸς ἐπιφλέγων
ἐλαῖ τ' αἴθοπι μώμωι, 210
ὅτι παλαιότεραν νέοις

¹⁶⁴ *Od.* 1.351-2. Plato quotes a slightly different and less “listener’s response”- oriented kind of criticism in *Republic* 424 bc. On this passage, see A. d’Angour 2006, 268 ff.

¹⁶⁵ *Isthmian* 5.60-61. Pindar also refers to the novelty of his song by using an image that will become a favourite of the Hellenistic poets: that of the narrow, untrodden path (see *Paeon* 7b.10 ff.: κελαδήσαθ' ῥυμνους/ Ὀμήρου [δὲ μὴ τρι]πτὸν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν/ ἰόντες, ἀ[λλ' ἀλ]λοτριαις ἀν' ἵπποις...) For another Pindaric view on novelty, see *Olympian* 9. 47-9: ἔγειρ' ἐπέων σφιν οἶμον λιγύν,/ αἶνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ' ῥυμνων/ νεωτέρων.

ὕμνοις μοῦσαν ἀτιμῶ·
 ἐγὼ δ' οὔτε νέον τιν' οὔ-
 τε γεραὸν οὔτ' ἰσήβαν
 εἶργω τῶνδ' ἐκάς ὕμνων· 215
 τοὺς δὲ μουσοπαλαιολύ-
μας, τούτους δ' ἀπερύκω,
 λωβητῆρας ἀοιδᾶν,
 κηρύκων λιγυμακροφώ-
 νων τείνοντας ἰυγᾶς. 220

But you who protect the new-fashioned Muse with the golden *kithara*, come and help me defend my hymns, Iê Lord Paeon. For the well-born and ancient Spartan people, a powerful big leader, swarming with the flower of youth inflames me, driving me about, and chases me with burning reproach, because with my new hymns I dishonour the old Muse. But I don't push anybody, either young or old or a peer, away from my songs. It is the corruptors of the ancient Muse that I reject, debauchers of songs straining the howling of far-shouting heralds.

This passage has often been presented in connection with *PMG* 796, also quoted by Athenaeus (122c-d), and read as illustrating Timotheus' defense of a poetics of *kainotomia*:

οὐκ ἀεῖδω τὰ παλαιά,
 καινὰ γὰρ ἀμὰ κρείσσω·
 νέος ὁ Ζεὺς βασιλεύει,
 τὸ πάλαι δ' ἦν Κρόνος ἄρχων·
 ἀπίτω Μοῦσα παλαιά 5

I don't sing the ancient songs, because new ones are better. It is the young Zeus who is king, but in the past Kronos was the ruler. Let the ancient Muse go away!

What the parallel with the reigns of Cronos and Zeus makes clear is Timotheus' rhetoric: by using the metaphor of divine genealogy and a form that reminds of gnomic poetry or proverbs (νέος ὁ Ζεὺς βασιλεύει etc.), Timotheus draws on the authority of tradition in general and that of Hesiod in particular, to do away with tradition. I propose to look further into the poet's strategy of self-representation and show how it is based

on three features: a subtle weaving and constant modulation between traditional themes and innovative diction, and innovation themes with traditional diction; a literary judgement of his critics and contemporaries; and a presentation of his progressive vision of literary history.

The fabric of the new

Timotheus combines the *topos* of the New Muse with several other traditional thematic or stylistic aspects of archaic poetry, especially lyric, and hymnic, poetry. First, the reader familiar with Homer will recognize two paradigms in the appeal to the $\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ νεοτευχής: on the one hand, the adjective is found in Homer and thus gives a respectable pedigree to invention, poetic and technological.¹⁶⁶ On the other hand, the epithet is found *only* in Homer and *only once* – and the use of a Homeric hapax suggests archaism and erudition.¹⁶⁷ Readers familiar with Pindar will also recognize not only the lexical features of a cletic hymn (with the invitation ἔλθ', the epithet χρυσεοκίθαριν to qualify the god¹⁶⁸ and the participle ἀέξων in relationship with the song),¹⁶⁹ but also the traditional markers of lyric culture (with the singing of the paean and the reference to choral harmony). The reference to paean singing, right before the *sphragis* (196-201), is particularly interesting:

¹⁶⁶ In *Iliad* 5.193-4 δίφροι/ καλοί πρωτοπαγεῖς νεοτευχέες. By using an adjective that applies to chariots, Timotheus makes his poetic invention close to a craft.

¹⁶⁷ See Janssen *ad loc.*: “In all these cases the reason of the choice cannot have been the wish to mask some modernism, but T[imotheus]’ inclination to the rarely occurring, old-fashioned words which were to lend his poem a certain dignity.”

¹⁶⁸ This compound adjective is never used by the lyric poets but Pindar, *Pythian* 1.1-2 uses χρυσέα φόρμιγξ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων / σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον... See also *Nemean* 5.23-25: Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός, ἐν δὲ μέσαις, φόρμιγγ' Ἀπόλλων ἐπτάγλωσσον / χρυσεῶ πλάκτρῳ διώκων / ἀγείτο παντοίων νόμων.

¹⁶⁹ *Olympian* 6.105 χρυσαλακάτοιο πόσις/ Αμφιτρίτας, ἐμῶν δ' ὕμνων ἄεξ' εὐτερπὲς ἄνθος. Fr. 70a. 13-5: εὐάμπυκες/ ἀέ]ξετ' ἔτι, Μοῖσαι, θάλος αἰοιδᾶν/] γάρ εὐχομαι.

οἱ δὲ τροπαῖα στησάμενοι Διός
 ἀγνότατον τέμενος, Παιᾶν’
 ἐκελάδησαν ἰήιον
 ἄνακτα, σύμμετροι δ’ ἔπε-
 κτύπεον ποδῶν 200
 ὑψικρότους χορείαις.

But [the Greeks] set up trophies to be a most holy sanctuary of Zeus, and sang Paian, the healer lord, and they stamped their feet in tempo in dances resounding with marked beat.

In these lines, the poet describes the setting up of trophies in celebration of the Greek victory after the battle of Salamis, accompanied by a song to Paian. The reference to the loud celebration (ἐκελάδησαν), with feet marking the beat (vv. 199-201) is reminiscent of features of the Telestes passage quoted above, where Marsyas is described as a “hand-clapping beast” (χειροκτύπῳ φηρί, *PMG* 805a, v. 4).¹⁷⁰ Again in the Pratinas fragment, the chorus proposes a proper display, with high tossing of hand and feet (δεξιᾶς καὶ ποδὸς διαρριφά, *PMG* 708, v. 14). This marking of the beat in all three passages is important to ensure the communal dimension of singing and dancing. So with this song to Παιᾶν ἰήιον ἄνακτα, Timotheus roots the whole nome in a ritual song-and-dance performance, one emphasizing the link between the victorious Greeks and their civic identity.¹⁷¹ This political and civic dimension of the performance, I suggest, is just as important for the performers themselves (the Salaminian soldiers) at the beginning of the fifth century as for the listeners of Timotheus’ nome at the end of

¹⁷⁰ Commenting on this passage, J. Herington 1985, 154 suggests that the kitharode performing the *Persians* may have accompanied the paean with marching dance-steps, (a scenario discussed by pseudo-Aristotle in his *Problems*, 19.15), but J. Hordern 2002, 224 notes that “this [...] would be more convincing if the rhythm were here anapestic.” The movement does, however, not need to be a military march, matching anapestic rhythm: the prefix ἐπ- can mean “in accompaniment” and may refer to the marking of tempo.

¹⁷¹ Most recently I. Rutherford 2001, 61-63: paean singing “has the integrative function of articulating a sense of community among the members, and of expressing this sense before the *polis* as a whole.”

the century.¹⁷² These are the features that correspond to the old and that most likely appeal to the conservative crowd. To these stylistic features, one could add the calculated thematic and metrical “oldness” of the opening line, in dactylic hexameters, celebrating the Greek civic virtue *par excellence*, *eleutheria*, in dactylic hexameters: κλεινὸν ἐλευθερίας τεύχων μέγαν Ἑλλάδι κόσμον (PMG 788).¹⁷³ These opening lines voice traditional virtues in traditional diction, as if to frame the tone of the whole poem.

The explicit reference to the stamping of the feet (and the aurally mimetic element in the alliteration in [p], 199-200) can also be read with more generic concerns in mind. As A. Ford has shown in his investigation of the definition of paean,

[w]e can better understand the elusive paean if [we] put aside the quest for a timeless, ideal pattern and notice instead certain religious and rhetorical dynamics of the paian-cry itself.¹⁷⁴

Considering “paeans as structures designed to pronounce paian—or its functional equivalent,” Ford emphasizes the importance of right naming in this genre, “reflected in the ambiguity of the word itself, simultaneously a name for a particular kind of song, what one says in that song to evoke the god, and the proper name of the god the song invites to appear.” Reading another paean by Timotheus (PMG 800), Ford notes that

¹⁷² T. Power 2001, 176 presents this point particularly well: “[...] Timotheus, by casting the beginning of his *sphragis* as a paean, invites the identification of the performance of the *nomos* with the iconic performance of *archaia mousikê* that is paean (a) [the paean sung by the Greeks around *tropaia*]: the latter serves as a validating ‘classical’ model for the former. A link from the music of the past to the new music of the present performance, what Timotheus in his own paean calls *mousa neoteuchês* (203) is thus forged along the lines of generic assimilation: the ancient paean is represented by the new citharodic *nomos* and the *nomos* in turn represents itself as a paean – significantly, by way of introducing the *sphragis*, in which Timotheus will assume, *in propria persona*, a variety of conventional, socially inclusive positions for himself and his music.”

¹⁷³ The meter is that used by Amphion in the opening line of his kitharodic nome in Euripides’ *Antiope*). Some fragments thematically contribute to the “rhetoric of the old”: σέβεσθ’ αἰδῶ συνεργὸν ἀρετᾶς δοριμάχου (PMG 789), and Ἄρης τύραννος: χρυσὸν Ἑλλάς οὐ δέδοικε (PMG 790).

¹⁷⁴ A. Ford 2006, 279.

the space between [the crucial word ‘paean’] and the initial vocative is filled with justification for bestowing the potent name on the sun. Timotheos figures the sun as “striking” (βάλλων) to invite the epithet paian interpreted as paiein (cf. “ἴε”); this version of the etymology is supported by evoking Apollo’s traditional image as archer (cf. ἐκαβόλον... βέλος).

If we follow Ford’s argument in our reading of the *Persians*, when the poet weaves the invocation of the god (Παιῶν’, v. 197) between the word τέμενος (v. 197) and the rhythmical stamping of feet (vv. 198-9), he reactivates the meaning of the song and its association with the god: the hitting (present in κτύπεον and ὑψικρότοις) is an invitation to read ‘paean’ (v. 197) as *paiein*, just as the use of the epithet ἰήϊον ἄνακτα (vv. 198-9) contributes to bringing the god closer to the ritual cry (ἴε) that celebrates him.¹⁷⁵

This innovative etymological interpretation of the *epiphthegma* reinforces the bond with the tradition of choral practice, with the community of listeners of the nome, and constitutes the pious background to the *sphragis*: the appeal to the same ἰήιε Παιῶν in vv. 202 and 205 allows transferring the positive value associated with the communal paean song to Apollo onto the poet’s private invocation of the “new-fashioned Muse” (μοῦσαν νεοτευχῆ). In more general terms, the paradoxical mix of traditional appeal to innovativeness and innovative recourse to archaism is typical of Timotheus’ style.

Timotheus as literary critic

¹⁷⁵ In A. Ford’s words, “to the extent that it mimics the dynamics of the *paian* cry, the *paean* can perhaps be most proximately described as a song that masters a new situation by reaffirming, vocally, adherence to traditional forms, including the most ancient names of all” (A. Ford 2006, 286).

Timotheus' readiness to weave both innovation and tradition in the fabric of his text is illustrated in the following lines of his apology (vv. 206-221), where the poet describes his detractors' criticism and states his "inclusive" poetics. Scholars have speculated on the identity of Timotheus' critics, but it is worth noting, once again, that the "attack" does not need to be historical:¹⁷⁶ although many anecdotes emphasize the difficult relationship Timotheus had with Spartan power, we should bear in mind that these anecdotes may be derived from a reading of this part of the poem.¹⁷⁷ More importantly, the attack allows Timotheus to define his own poetics and his critical reception of other poets.

The passage revolves around the use of praise / blame rhetoric: Timotheus starts by exposing the attacks made against him (vv. 206-212), then contrasts them with his own attitude to poetry (ἐγὼ δ' ... vv. 213-215), and finally states his own poetic *credo* (τοῦς δὲ ... vv. 216-220). In his presentation of the Spartan critics' attack, Timotheus uses not only common words in praising Sparta for its noble origins (εὐγενέτας), ancestry (μακροαίων) and the vigour of its people (βρύων ἄνθεσιν ἤβας), but also specific images referring to her military aggressiveness: Spartan detractors hound him (δονεῖ, ἐλαῖ), and their attack is described in military terms (ἐπιφλέγων, αἴθοπι).¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁶ T. Janssen 1984 for example offers that the "old, young and peer" correspond to the three age-groups represented in musical festivals. I have trouble seeing the connection between these age groups and the possible audience (rather than performers) of Timotheus' song. More convincing is the idea that Timotheus is referring to the different groups of listeners and possible professional critics of his songs: the old people (and poets who composed in the previous generation), the young people (the "next generation" of poets) and his contemporaries (and competitors).

¹⁷⁷ See testimonia 6 (Satyrus, *life of Euripides*), 7 (Plutarch, *Spartan Customs* 17 (*Moralia*, 238c)) in D. Campbell 1993. The next chapter focuses entirely on the issue of these anecdotes and their interpretation.

¹⁷⁸ There is a form of semantic and poetic continuity between the 'new' presentation of his subject in the body of the poem and the 'old' critics that he condemns. For φλέγω in a literal sense, see Timotheus, *Persae* 27: περίβολα πυρὶ φλεγόμεν'. For ἐπιφλέγω (in a positive sense) as a term of literary praise: Pindar, *Olympian* 9. 20-3: ἐγὼ δὲ τοι φίλαν πόλιν/ μαλεραῖς ἐπιφλέγων ἄοιδαῖς,/ καὶ ἀγάνορος ἵππου/

This adapting to Spartan praise language and a Spartan set of values is a rhetorical strategy that aims at accentuating the unfairness of the critical reception to his poem: as opposed to him, who is ready to embrace Spartan imagery when describing his critics, his detractors only receive Timotheus' new poetry according to their own values and their love of the past.¹⁷⁹

Moreover, this displacement onto Sparta of any potential criticism is also the way Timotheus wards off any critics in Athens (if this is indeed the place of performance):¹⁸⁰ In condemning his “new hymns,” his Athenian critics would have the same attitude as (or at least the attitude associated with) their current political opponent, the Spartans, and would show the same cultural backwardness.¹⁸¹ J. Hordern reads the passage as ironic:

[T]hat Sparta was culturally deprived was at least a common Athenian opinion [...]; their supposed backwardness and musical conservatism would be aptly satirized by the traditional phrase βρύων ἄνθεσιν ἦβας and the epithet μακρᾶίων.¹⁸²

This reading is in keeping with Timotheus' overall use of praise / blame rhetoric and is reminiscent of Telestes' reception of poetic myths (*PMG* 805b): Telestes insured the validity of his own tale by blaming, in the name of Choral Poetry, poets who, on

θάσσον καὶ ναὸς ὑποπτέρου παντᾶ. In a metaphorical sense (and musical context) in Aeschylus, *Persae* 395: σάλπιγξ δ' αὐτῆ πάντ' ἐκεῖν' ἐπέφλεγεν.

¹⁷⁹ T. Power 2001, 206 (especially note 526): “The use of the *mómos* ‘blame, reproach’ or *phthonos* ‘envy’ of hypothetical critics as validating foil for the superior achievement of the victor and / or the work of the poet is a well-known commonplace of epinician rhetoric: the blame and envy expressed by the unworthy are assumed to be the inevitable, and in a sense definitive, flipside of praise of the worthy.” Again this ‘blame poetry’ strategy used by the poet is reminiscent of Aristophanes’ in the *Knights*, on which, see T. Hubbard 1991, 71-78.

¹⁸⁰ On Athens as place of performance, see S. Bassett 1931; T. Janssen 1984, 13-22; J. Herington 1985; T. Power 2001, 93-115; J. Hordern 2002. On Miletus: U. von Wilamowitz 1903, 61 ff.

¹⁸¹ T. Power, agreeing with T. Janssen, argues further that “Timotheus’ characterization of the Spartan ‘aristocracy’ was made particularly repulsive to Athenians by its implicit Persian colouring. ὁ μέγας ἀγεμῶν, a personification of Spartan power used only here, could recall (ὁ) μέγας βασιλεύς, the common personification of Persian power.”

¹⁸² For another view, of Sparta as a musical culture (that ended up integrating Timotheus and Philoxenus in their poetic canon), see Polybius 4. 20.

account of their *phthonos*, offered unsatisfying versions of the myth (ἀχόρευτος ... ματαιολόγων / φάμα ... μουσοπόλων ... / ἐπίφθονον ... ὄνειδος 805b, vv. 1-3).

In the next lines (vv. 216-220), Timotheus refines his own response to potential detractors by defining his poetics. Using a series of dithyrambic compound words reminiscent both of comic diction and of sophistic style, he rejects the μουσοπαλαιολύμας (old corruptors of the Muse – or corruptors of the old Muse) and λωβητήρας ἀοιδᾶν (destroyers of songs).¹⁸³ What he criticizes is not so much the *old* Muse, in a vehement defense of *new* Poetry, but *bad* poetry as opposed to (his) *good* poetry. At vv. 217-220, Timotheus is close to the Aristophanes of the *Frogs* in his use of the register of literary criticism: his attack is not so much a trope as it is actually a quite precise definition of what bad poetry (both its composition and performance) is. He starts by adopting a technical vocabulary to describe the quality of the voice of the people he rejects: with the verb τείνω (strain, v. 220), found in tragedy to describe female lament or long-winged discourse, he points to some kind of aural malfunction in poetic diction, that can refer both to performance and composition.¹⁸⁴ Bad poets both strain their voice when performing and strain the Muse by their use of words that sound like shrieks. Moreover, by opposing in v. 217 his own poetic (singular) voice to that of the (plural, indiscriminated) τούσδε, Timotheus relies on the same metonymy (voice = poet) used in the *Frogs* to emphasize the gap between good and bad poetry: just as the

¹⁸³ Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* [1405b] criticizes Gorgias' "frigid" (ψυχρά) use of the compound πρωχομουσολόλας (fr. B.15 D.K.). This parallel is particularly interesting for our understanding of the "literary community" in late fifth-century Athens and the critics' jargon that developed.

¹⁸⁴ In Aeschylus, *Persae* vv. 571-6: στένε καὶ δακνά-/ζου, βαρὺ δ' ἀμβόασον/ οὐράνι' ἄχη, ὁᾶ/ τεῖνε δὲ δυσβάυκτον/ βοᾶτιν τάλαιναν αὐδᾶν. See also Euripides, *Medea* v. 201 τί μάτην τείνουσι βοήν ; Also in the sense of "make long-winged discourses" as e.g. in Aeschylus, *Eumenides* v. 201: τοσοῦτο μήκος ἔκτεινον λόγου, Euripides, *Hecuba* v. 1177: ὡς δὲ μὴ μακροῦς τείνω λόγους. Whether one connects the verb with tragic (female) expressions of lament or with the words τόνος and ἐντείνω, it has a technical dimension.

ἰυγαί (v. 220) of bad poets belong to the realm of exclamations (of joy or pain) and sounds, not to that of poetry, the voice of those described as λιγυμακρόφων[οι] κήρυκ[ες] does not belong to the sacred sphere of the inspired poet anymore, but rather to the social sphere of “mediatic communication.”¹⁸⁵ Finally, Timotheus uses about the poets he criticizes the same kind of vocabulary (μουσοπαλαιολύμας, λωβητήρας) that Aristophanes’ Dionysus employs about the young tragedians in the *Frogs*:¹⁸⁶ the difference is that, when Timotheus uses these nouns, he refers neither to new nor old poets – he rejects *bad* ones, whether old or new. This seems to me to be the point of the compound: by using an expression that makes the meaning ambiguous (Corruptor of old Muse? Old corruptor of the Muse? Corruptor of the old Muse that shares with the Muse the characteristic of being old?), Timotheus defines his own view of poetic composition and poetic competition. In the end, what he sets into opposition is not so much old and new music (although it is an opposition he obviously plays with), but two different attitudes to composing and performing lyric poetry.¹⁸⁷ Reproducing the “critics’ chatter” that might have been heard in the literary milieu at Athens (and that has a lot in common with Aristophanes’ own description of the poetic scene), he

¹⁸⁵ λιγυμακρόφωνων κηρύκων seems to build up an expression from the epic register: see κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγοισι in *Iliad* 2.50, 2.442, 9.10, 23.39, *Odyssey* 2.6. For the possibility that the expression refers to another form of “artistic” competition (between heralds announcing victory), see Pollux 4.91, Demosthenes 19.338 and *PMG* 863, 865.

¹⁸⁶ The passage (*Frogs* 92-95) ἰσ ωρπη θυοτινγ ἰν φυλλ· Ἐπιφυλλίδες ταῦτ' ἐστὶ καὶ στωύματα,/ χελιδόνων μουσεῖα, λωβηταὶ τέχνης,/ ἃ φροῦδα θάττον, ἦν μόνον χορὸν λάβη,/ ἄπαξ προσουρήσαντα τῇ τραγωδίᾳ./ Γόνιμον δὲ ποιητὴν ἂν οὐχ εὐροις ἔτι/ ζητῶν ἂν, ὅστις ῥῆμα γενναῖον λάκοι. Dionysus appears here as a conservative critic: the young poets are λωβηταὶ τέχνης, the old, γόνιμο[ι]. Except for this occurrence in Aristophanes the noun is very rarely used. Hordern also quotes Antiphanes, *GP* 775 (*AP* 11.322.5) “ποιητῶν λῶβαι (of grammarians), although there is no indication that the word (or related words) had a specific technical meaning in artistic contexts.” More relevant I think is the fact that pseudo-Plutarch has (30) ποιεῖ δὲ τὴν Δικαιοσύνην διαπυθνομένην τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς λῶβης etc., which might indicate that he was (again) deriving the noun from the Pherecratean passage introducing the lines quoted right after.

¹⁸⁷ On the competitive atmosphere of late fifth-century Athens (or on the image that the later authors have of that period), see *PMG* 778(b) (Cinesias mocking Timotheus), *PMG* 785 (Dorion mocking Timotheus), *PMG* 792 (Stratonicus on Timotheus), *PMG* 802 (Timotheus on Phrynus).

describes in technical terms the characteristics of bad poetry and the sociology of lyric audience, torn between the reactionaries (who hold tradition and the virtues of “old music” over all else and impede poetic growth) and his own progressive attitude to lyric poetry, that consists in following the natural trend of poetry, a tradition of innovations.

Timotheus as a historian of poetry

This dynamic vision of poetic culture and musical history is illustrated in the last lines (vv. 221-240), where the poet describes the “innovators” of the past.

πρῶτος ποικιλόμουσος Ὀρ- φεὺς <χέλ>υν ἐτέκνωσεν υἱὸς Καλλιόπας ~ - - = Πιερίαθεν·	
Τέρπανδρος δ' ἐπὶ τῷ δέκα ζεῦξε μούσαν ἐν ᾠδαῖς·	225
Λέσβος δ' Αἰολία ν<ιν> Ἄν- τίσσαι γείνατο κλεινόν· νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις ῥυθμοῖς τ' ἑνδεκακρουμάτοις	230
κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει, θησαυρὸν πολύυμνον οἴ- ξας Μουσᾶν θαλαμευτόν· Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νιν ἅ θρέψασ' ἅ δωδεκατειχέος	235
λαοῦ πρωτέος ἐξ Ἀχαιῶν. ἀλλ' ἐκαταβόλε Πύθι' ἀγνᾶν ἔλθοις τάνδε πόλιν σὺν ὄλβωι, πέμπων ἀπήμονι λαῶι τῶιδ' εἰρήναν θάλλουσαν εὐνομίαι.	240

Orpheus of the dapple-Muse, son of Calliope native of Pieria, was the first to give birth to the tortoise-shell lyre. Terpander yoked the Muse to the ten (?) by means of his songs. Aeolian Lesbos gave birth to this man to give fame to Antissa. And now Timotheus with his meters and rhythms of eleven strokes makes the *kithara* spring up, opening the treasure of the Muses hidden in the thalamus. It is the city of Miletus that brought him up, twelve-walled, the first of the Achaean people. Now far-shooting Pythian, come to this holy city with

wealth, and send to this people, to be protected from plagues, the peace that flourishes in good civic and musical order.

Timotheus starts his “history of the lyric tradition” with the mythological hero Orpheus. The son of a Muse is credited with the invention of the turtle-lyre (the prototype *kithara*) and associated with the most ancient and venerable art. The reference to his birthplace, Pieria, also reinforces his connection to the Muses of the *Theogony*. With this first biography, Timotheus can give a divine origin to his own musical practice (kitharody) and ascribe to the mythical poet a characteristic (*poikilia*) often, but not exclusively, associated with the New Musicians.¹⁸⁸

The poet then proceeds to praise Terpander. Although in most accounts Terpander is credited with the creation of the nome and the addition of extra strings to the *kithara*, Timotheus says nothing specific about his innovations but contents himself with reminding his audience of the fame Terpander gave to Antissa - despite (or because of) his introduction of innovations.¹⁸⁹ Terpander’s “yoking of the Muse to the ten (?) by means of his songs” is difficult to interpret: whether we take the number to refer to the amount of songs he composed, of strings/notes he played, or of meters he used, the solution is not entirely satisfactory.¹⁹⁰ What seems more important than the exact reference is, again, the riddling language that Timotheus uses and the pattern he follows: just like Orpheus’ “resume” started by a reference to his native place, his fame

¹⁸⁸ Another version of the myth makes it an invention of Hermes (Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*). On the “culture of kitharodia,” see T. Power forthcoming. On *poikilia*, see section 2. 3. For now it suffices to say that both the practice of *poikilia*, typical of Pindar’s own poetry (on which, see W. Race 1983; M. Trédé 1992, 103-106), and the term (that appears twice in Pratinas) is illustrated by Telestes’ use of αἰολοπτέρυγον (*PMG* 805c, v. 2) and αἰολομόρφους (*PMG* 806).

¹⁸⁹ On those two aspects, see Suda, s.v. Τέρπανδρος. Terpander’s invention of the nome: pseudo-Plutarch, *De musica* 1132de, Pollux 4.66. On his addition of strings to the *kithara*: pseudo-Plutarch, 1141c, with only seven (and not ten) strings.

¹⁹⁰ J. Hordern 2002, 243-4, presents possible interpretations of this reference to the (untraditional) number ten.

and his introduction of a musical innovation, the same kind of description is used for Terpander - and subsequently for Timotheus himself.¹⁹¹ Timotheus' self-presentation works the same way: it combines his titles for respect (his association with the *thalameuton* of the Muses), technical innovation (the riddling μέτροις ῥυθμοῖς τ' ἑνδεκακρουμάτοις, eleven-stroke rhythms and meters) and the place he gave fame to (Miletus).¹⁹² These three elements make Timotheus the true follower of the mythical musical heroes.

Timotheus' vision of literary history is finally not restricted to the world of myth, but integrates considerations on political history. In his last appeal to Apollo, Timotheus hints at the change in the place of political power: just as the series of numbers (10 songs/notes, 11 strokes, 12 walls) was giving a sense of smooth succession in time without referring to a series of items of the same nature, the progression from Pieria to Lesbos to Miletus (v. 234) to “this holy city” (v. 238) gives a sense of succession in place and in both literary and political history. With the final pun on *eunomia* (good singing in the *nome* genre / good administration of the city, with all its Solonian, archaic and aristocratic components), Timotheus ties together the two elements of his *apologia*: his literary critic vocabulary and his reliance on traditional motifs to legitimize his novelty.¹⁹³

¹⁹¹ For another view on literary genealogies, see M. L. West 1983.

¹⁹² As I have already pointed out, the “eleven strokes” or *kithara* strings attributed to Timotheus in the anecdotes might well have sprung from the reading of this poem; see for example testimonia 1 (Pherecrates, fr. 155), 2 (Suda), 7 (Plutarch, *Moralia* (*Spartan Customs* 17) 238c) in D. Campbell 1993.

¹⁹³ The reference to *eunomia* reinforces the point: the noun echoes the title of Tyrtaeus' archaic poem on the Spartan constitution and points to conservative “good civic order.” There is a form of ring-composition between the first word (ἐλευθερίας) and the last one, with the focus going back on Panhellenic ideas, and to the tone of political elegy (such as Simonides' Platea elegy, and Tyrtaeus' and Solon's *Eunomia*).

2.2 Poikilia, polychordia, harmoniae

This section considers three other myths associated with New Music, as presented in the *De musica* and *Deipnosophistae*: *poikilia*, *polychordia* and the use of *harmoniae*. These *topoi* are familiar from archaic lyric, but just as was the case of *kainotomia*, the New Musicians used the motif in a new way, both to legitimize their innovation and to give a “label” to their style.

In archaic lyric, *poikilia* is often associated with the natural world, to qualify animals (snakes and birds) and vegetal (flowers) or natural phenomena (wind) that display an intriguingly changing and variegated quality in colour or movement.¹⁹⁴ This intricacy is what links it to its other main use, in connection with objects that illustrate *sophia* and/or the technical abilities of mortals, as in female handiwork¹⁹⁵ and male technical inventions.¹⁹⁶ *Poikilia* links the two aspects, the aesthetic and sensorial (especially visual, but also aural) and the intellectual (by referring to the cunning skills of the designer or user). It plays a particularly important role in Pratinas’ fragment, where the adjective *poikilos* appears twice.¹⁹⁷ Commenting on the term, J. Franklin notes:

¹⁹⁴ *Poikilia* qualifying a dragon/snake: Alcman fr. 1. 66, Pindar *Pythian* 8. 46, *Pythian* 10. 46. Qualifying a bird: *Pythian* 4. 249 (in a cluster with *sophia*), Alcaeus fr. 345. 2; a horse: *Pythian* 2. 8; flowers in *Isthmian* 3/4. 36 (in a cluster with the will of the gods). Also connected with the wind, in Simonides, *PMG* 508, 6.

¹⁹⁵ In Sappho: *poikilia* qualifies the throne of Aphrodite fr. 1. 1; sandals fr. 39. 2; a headband, fr. 98(a). 11. In Anacreon: of sandals *PMG* 358, 3. In Bacchylides: 11. 33. Ibycus: of clothes *PMG* 316, 1.

¹⁹⁶ It qualifies a bow in Bacchylides 10. 43 and in Pindar *Pythian* 4. 214; also an instrument: Pindar *Olympian* 3. 8, a phorminx, *Olympian* 4. 2, a kithara *Nemean* 4. 14. Finally it has connections with the intellectual and poetic realm of language: lies (similar to truth): Pindar: *Olympian* 1. 29; counsels *Nemean* 5. 28; mind: Alcaeus fr. 69. 7.

¹⁹⁷ *PMG* 708 κύκνον ἄγοντα ποικιλόπτερον μέλος (5), τὸν φρυγέου ποικίλαν πνοὰν ἔχοντα (10). In each instance, the adjective allows linking the natural world (of swan and toad) to the musical world (of melody and *aulos*).

The poet asserts his right, and that of his chorus, to be a ‘swan leading a woven-winged tune’, whereas the *aulos*, which should be a servant, ‘belches the breath of a fancified [*poikilos*] frog.’ Therefore central to the controversy over the rise of professional auletes and their music was a contest over what aspects of music were acceptable subjects of *poikilia*, musical artifice — *a semantic haggling typical of Greek oral poetics already in the Archaic period* (my emphasis).

More generally, Franklin defines *poikilia* as “whatever aspect of his artificiality a poet (or his critic) wished to call attention to, be it diction, metre, melody or accompaniment.”¹⁹⁸ This is true of Sappho’s poetics where *poikilia* combined with *habrosyne* and *charis* defines artefacts and the whole atmosphere conveyed by the description of such terms.¹⁹⁹ In Pindar, in addition to the many objects and natural elements described as *poikilos*, *poikilia* qualifies two aspects of *mousikê*; of the six times when the term is used, three refer to the poem, while three others refer to the music of the *kithara*.²⁰⁰

The process of *poikilia* (the use of a variegated, rich, tightly woven textual fabric) is characteristic of the New Music fragments, especially of the metamusical fragments I have been focusing on.²⁰¹ Telestes in particular is particularly fond of the mimetic use of the aural features of language: verbal echoes and sound repetition, as well as the reliance on the mimetic aspect of words able to create meaning by their aural features, allow weaving a tightly connected textual fabric, variegated yet homogeneous. This is illustrated in Telestes’ use of lexical repetitions (σοφὸν σοφάν 805a, 1) and polyptotes (εὐηράτοιο ἔρως 805a, 5; μάταν ματαιολόγων, 805b, 1;

¹⁹⁸ J. Franklin forthcoming, 10 and 2, respectively.

¹⁹⁹ For Sappho, see J. Snyder 1997, 91-95.

²⁰⁰ For *poikilia* in Pindar, see W. Race 1983, J. T. Hamilton 2003. For the song: ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων *Nemean* 5.42, ποικίλον ὕμνον *Olympian* 6.87. For the lyre: φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν/ καὶ βοᾶν ἀύλων *Olympian* 3.18, ποικιλοφόρμιγγος ἀοιδᾶς *Olympian* 4.2, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων *Nemean* 4.14.

²⁰¹ B. Zimmermann 1992, 123-4.

καλλιπνόνων... πνεύματος, 806, 1-4) and play with sound echoes (εὐηράτοιο ἔρωσ ἔτειρεν 805a, 5; ἄγαμον καὶ ἄπαιδ' ἀπένειμε 805a, 6; πνεύματος εὐπτερον αὐραν ἄμφιπλέκων 806, 4). These processes contribute to giving virtuosity and aural depth to the passage: the repetition of words implies the repetition of sounds and creates echo. Telestes' poem describing the virtuosity of the *auloi* thus imitates the richness and range of the instrument, from the dental sounds (for the sound production through the reeds, in 805a, 6 or 805c, 2) to the breezy and airy sounds produced by the instrument, [s] and [ph] in 805a, 1, especially connected with the 'polycephal nome').²⁰²

This mimetic phenomenon extends over the different Telestian fragments: the clever art of 805b, 3 (σοφᾶς τέχνας) picks up the σοφὸν ὄργανον of 805a, 1-2, the image of the winged *Phama* (φάμα προσέπταθ' 805b, 2) is replicated in the winged breath of the goddess (πνεῦμ' αἰολοπτέρυγον 805c, 2). This is complemented by the use of a series of reoccurring aural and visual patterns that bring a strong sense of continuity in the description of the song and the music of the *aulos*: πνεύματος εὐπτερον (806, 4) picks up πνεῦμ' αἰολοπτέρυγον (805c, 2), and the variegated shape of the song (νόμον αἰολον ὀμφᾶ 806, 3) itself mirrors the variegated breath of the goddess (πνεῦμ' αἰολοπτέρυγον 805c, 2).²⁰³

I suggest that when a term describing the notion of *poikilia* appears in New Music fragments (as αἰόλος in *PMG* 805c, 2 and *PMG* 806, 3, or Timotheus' description of Orpheus as ποικιλόμουσος in *PMG* 791, 221), it is used in order to recall a key concept of archaic lyric (used to describe a song's poetics). It is however

²⁰² On the characteristics of the *nomos*, see A. Barker 1984, appendix A, 249 ff.

²⁰³ The idea of virtuosity present in the description of the playing is noted by Athenaeus who describes the passage as κομψῶς (a word that nicely picks up the *poikilia*).

not used to describe the poet’s own technique (in the three cases it refers to instrumental music), although the process of *poikilia* is employed throughout the fragments (not only the ones I have focused on but more extensively in the texts examined in chapter 3). The familiarity of the “label” *poikilia* is transposed from the poet’s song to the music he describes and serves as a legitimizing marker.

I will only say a few words about *polychordia* and the use of *harmoniae* because they belong to the more technical field of organology and musicology, with which I am not primarily concerned here. Apart from the reference to the “meters and rhythms of eleven strokes” that Timotheus mentions in relation with his kithara (*PMG* 791, 229-230) and to the strings of the instrument that Telestes describes as μάγαδιν πενταρράβδω χορδῶν ἄρθμῳ (*PMG* 808, v. 2-3), neither the noun (*polychordia*) nor the adjective is used by the New Musicians. It appears however in an illuminating anecdote reported by Artemon:²⁰⁴

Ἄρτέμων δ’ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ Διονυσιακοῦ Συστήματος Τιμόθεόν φησι τὸν Μιλήσιον παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς δόξαι πολυχорδοτέρῳ συστήματι χρῆσασθαι τῇ μαγάδι· διὸ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Λάκωσιν εὐθυνόμενον ὡς παραφθείροι τὴν ἀρχαίαν μουσικὴν, καὶ μέλλοντός τινος ἐκτέμνειν αὐτοῦ τὰς περιττὰς τῶν χορδῶν, δεῖξαι παρ’ αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχοντα Ἄπολλωνίσκον πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ σύνταξιν ἰσόχορδον λύραν ἔχοντα καὶ ἀφεθῆναι.

According to the first book of Artemon’s [of Cassandreia] *On the Dionysiac Guilds*, Timotheus of Miletus is held by most authorities to have used an instrument with many strings, the magadis; this is why when he was on the point of being chastised by the Lacedaemonians for trying to corrupt ancient music, and someone was about to cut out the extra strings, he showed them a little Apollo who had the same arrangement of strings on his lyre, and so was acquitted.

²⁰⁴ Quite interestingly, the anecdote (in the first book of his work *On the Dionysiac Guild* and quoted by Athenaeus (14. 636 e) is not included in D. Campbell’s list of testimonia and just appears as a note (77); it introduces an interesting variant to the anecdote also often associated with Terpander, since in that story, Timotheus is acquitted after deploying his (silent) rhetoric.

Two points are important in this anecdote: first, the fact that Timotheus used the validating model of Apollo to justify his playing a many-stringed instrument and that the silent reference to this model is enough to legitimize his playing a many-stringed instrument; and second, the fact that the many-stringedness concerns an instrument called *magadis* (a form of harp, the instrument also mentioned by Telestes in *PMG* 808), not a traditional *kithara*.²⁰⁵

As for *harmoniae*, as L. Prauscello states in an ambitious article about “epinician sounds,” the “widespread assumption of a broader correlation between certain genres and melodic frames” has resulted in “dividing the critics between the ‘true believers’ of a straightforward correlation between rhythmic and melodic pattern (a line of thought starting with Boeckh) and supporters of the maximum doubt approach (most recently Anderson 1994).”²⁰⁶ On the basis of the reference to terms that apply to *harmoniae* in Telestes’ *Asclepius* and *PMG* 810, it would be idle to speculate on the straightforward correlation between melody and “metamusical” adjectives. In these two passages, the poet uses a language that can describe musical modes, but the adjectives apply quite loosely to song or performer: this is the case with Phrygian king (presumably Olympos, *PMG* 806, 1) and the Phrygian song to the Mountain Mother (*PMG* 810, 3), with the Lydian strain rival to the Dorian muse (*PMG* 806) and the Lydian hymn sung to the plucking of the *pectis* (*PMG* 810, 4-5).²⁰⁷ In the case of the relationship between Dorian muse and Lydian song, I would interpret their being

²⁰⁵ On the *magadis*, see G. Comotti 1983, A. Barker 1985, 1988 and 1998, J. Hordern 2000b.

²⁰⁶ L. Prauscello, forthcoming.

²⁰⁷ These three terms (Dorian, Phrygian and Lydian) are precisely the ones used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus to describe the innovation in tunings (τρόποι) introduced by οἱ κατὰ Φιλόξενον καὶ Τιμόθεον καὶ Τελέστην: see testimony 10 in D. Campbell 1993 = Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De compositione verborum*, 19.

“rivals” (ἀντίπαλον) in terms of aetiology: the passage plays with the *prôtos eurêtês* motif and presents both Peloponnese and Lydia as rivals to claim early *aulos*-music.²⁰⁸ Rather than describing modulations between *harmoniae*, or a deviant use of the modes used in choral lyric (what the New Music critics associate with New Music), the two Telestian passages underline syncretism between East and West: this is clear in *PMG* 810, where the Greeks start singing Eastern tunes accompanied by string music.²⁰⁹ The context makes it impossible to say whether Telestes was using the ethnic terms in a self-referential way (whether the piece mixed Dorian and Lydian *harmoniae*, as ancient critics presume, followed by modern scholars); I would offer a less ambitious interpretation and emphasize how in the four cases where Telestes uses a musicological sounding term, it is in a narrative context concerned with origins. The poet seems to use those stories to justify the use of such *harmoniae* in general.²¹⁰ Instead of using, as Pindar or Bacchylides do, the *topoi* of musical *harmoniae* (that might, or not, have referred to the actual mode of performance), Telestes mythologizes about music, and thus legitimizes the New Music by referring to its mythical ancestors.

2.3 Aulos-playing

Let me come back to the first topic discussed, that of the *auloi*. According to Athenaeus’ narrative, Telestes (in the passage of the *Argo*) responded to Melanippides

²⁰⁸ See ἄρμοσε πρώτος νόμον *PMG* 806, and πρώτοι ἄεισαν νόμον *PMG* 810.

²⁰⁹ On Eastern themes, see chapter 4. On the interpretation of this passage, N. Robertson 1996, 255, who disagrees and states that “line 4 requires emendation either τοὶ δέ for τοῖς δέ (Musurus), or ὄξυφῶνοι ... ψαλμοὶ for ὄξυφῶνοις ... ψαλμοῖς (Wilamowitz); Whichever is adopted, the Lydian tune is performed by the Lydian companions, not by “the Greeks.”

²¹⁰ Whether the *harmoniae* evoked corresponded to the *harmoniae* actually played, it is impossible to say, since each anecdote or testimony attesting of the modulation between *harmoniae* displays different biases.

who had criticized *aulos*-playing. First, verbal echoes between the fragments indeed prompt the reader to interpret Telestes’ fragment as a response.²¹¹

	Melanippides	Telestes
Movement:	ἔρριψε ἀπὸ χειρὸς (1)	χερῶν ἐκβαλεῖν (a3)
Description of hands:	ἱερᾶς χειρὸς (2)	ἀγλαᾶν χειρῶν (c3)
Reaction:	αἴσχεα (3)	δυσόφθαλμον αἴσχος (3)
Moral judgment:	σώματι λύμα (3)	ἐπίφθονον ὄνειδος (b3)

These lexical parallels and Telestes’ “upping” of each of Melanippides’ singular nouns with either a plural expression or an accompanying epithet justify why one (and Athenaeus in particular) could imagine a dialogue between the two poems and present them as engaged in polemics (a view transmitted only by the *Deipnosophistae*, for all it is worth). But there is a slight slip in Telestes’ response that would make him a rather sloppy (or superbly sophistic) reader of Melanippides, if he were indeed responding directly: whereas it is to the *auloi* that the outrage (λύμα) referred in Melanippides, ὄνειδος qualifies the tale about Athena in Telestes; and whereas the hands were said to be ‘sacred’ *in contrast with* the degrading *auloi*, they are sacred *in connection with* the *auloi* in Telestes. These are the first hints that Telestes’ response is not as straightforward as Athenaeus thinks: Telestes objects and responds to Melanippides’ myth, but he also changes the grounds of the argument.

Moreover, in this passage Telestes seems to be relying on the Pindaric rhetoric of “myth revision” and criticism of alternate versions. Using a Pindaric vocabulary to describe poetry and poetic oral culture (φάμα... μουσοπόλων, *PMG* 805b, v.2) and

²¹¹ Given these verbal echoes, we should not exclude the possibility that Melanippides and Telestes play with a third (lost) text, to whose imagery or phraseology both allude.

relying on the Pindaric motif of the critics' *phthonos* (ἐπίφθονον ὄνειδος, *PMG* 805b, v. 3), Telestes describes the myth of Athena rejecting the *aulos* as offensive for the art of Poetry: it is ἀχόρευτος - unfit for a chorus.²¹² But at the same time as he engages in a form of literary criticism, he also points out the fittingness of the *aulos*-theme and the Marsyas myth to the genre of dithyrambic composition (performed to *aulos* music).²¹³

Telestes' passage is indeed a clever rewriting, not so much of Melanippides in particular as other musical and instrumental aitiologies in the lyric (and hymnic) tradition. The rewriting of the myth starts by what looks like the traditional discourse about the body in connection with *aulos*-playing: how could the virgin Athena, the chorus asks, care about her disfigured features, since aesthetic issues are out of the realm of concerns of virgins? Yet far from denying any sexuality to Athena in stating the goddess' presumed lack of interest in good looks, the poet suggests sexuality by the mere fact of naming what the goddess does not have (ἄγαμον καὶ ἄπαιδα) and by accumulating erotic images - the mountain thickets (a favourite place for sexual predators of nymphs and other vulnerable females), the "nymph-born beast" (the satyr Marsyas), the "distressing love for lovely beauty" (εὐηράτοιο κάλλεος ὄξυς ἔρωος) and the very multiplication of love in the phrase describing it.²¹⁴ Moreover, Telestes plays with the sexual connotations of the *aulos* – a motif that was already exploited by Pratinas: the "clever instrument" (σοφὸν ὄργανον) belongs to the same phallic realm as

²¹² Or amusical, meaning non cultivated. In both cases, it shows a lack of "musical" education.

²¹³ The interest for the Marsyas myth at the end of the fifth century is indeed attested in the visual arts: "The scene [of Marsyas, Athena, and the *auloi*] is one which, with a number of variants, had first become popular in Attic vase painting by the beginning of the last quarter of the fifth century [...];" "An early fourth-century crater in Berlin may be, as it were, a commentary on the conversion [...]. The earliest of all these representations was Myron's group of Athena and Marsyas on the Athenian Acropolis." J. Boardman 1956, 18 and 20. On the relationship between the poem and the sculpture's dedication, see P. Wilson 1999, 62-3.

²¹⁴ Before Telestes, the adjective εὐηράτος is only used by Pindar (*Olympian* 5.9, *Olympian* 6.98, *Pythian* 9.8, fr. 333a 14) and Bacchylides: fr. 7.19.

the satyr. In Telestes' fragment, the instrument is presented in its wild setting (the mountain thickets) although the instrument is traditionally “domesticated” in the world of the symposium. P. Wilson has very nicely presented the sexual ambiguity associated with the *aulos*:

The symposium provides one of the very few frames for the playing of the *aulos* by an Athenian citizen. Aristotle (*Pol[itics]*.8.1339b9-10) envisages the only situations in which the free man will himself take up the instrument to be ‘when drunk or having fun’: at a symposium, of course, he is likely to be both. [...] This is a world rather removed from those in which most of the evidence I discuss circulates – the Akropolis and theatre, for instance. [...] At the imaginary extreme of that release [that consists in ‘playing at the outsider’ within the closed world of the symposium], *the Athenian becomes the satyr, the figure constantly implicated in the use of the aulos, its creation and development*. Like the satyr, the *aulos* serves as an exploratory device for Athenian male identity. But unlike the satyr, it is not forever confined to the realm of the imaginary, of pure representation (my emphasis).

It is clear that Telestes offers much more than a defense of *aulos*-playing in this passage of the *Argo*: on the one hand, Telestes appropriates lyric, especially Pindaric, diction and motif of “myth revision” and thus legitimizes his place in the lyric tradition. On the other hand, the poet offers an alternate version of the invention of the *aulos* reminiscent of two other invention myths: *Pythian 12* and the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*. I will briefly examine how Telestes uses these two models to give authority to his own narrative.

Pythian 12, the only victory-ode composed for a musician (Midas, victor at the 490 BC *aulêtikê* competition) is one of the competing versions of the origins of the *aulos* and makes Athena the inventor of the instrument and the art:

... τέχνα, τάν ποτε
Παλλάς ἐφεύρε θρασειᾶν Γοργόνων
οὔλιον θρήνον διαπλέξαισ' Ἀθάνα. [...]
ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ τούτων φίλον ἄνδρα πόνων
ἐρρύσατο παρθένος αὐλῶν τεύχε πάμφωνον μέλος,

6

ὄφρα τὸν Εὐρυάλας ἐκ καρπαλιμῶν γενύων 20
 χριμφθέντα σὺν ἔντεσι μιμήσαιτ' ἐρικλάγκταν γόον.
εὐρεν θεός· ἀλλά νιν εὐροῖσ' ἀνδράσι θνατοῖς ἔχειν,
 ὠνύμασεν κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμον,
εὐκλεᾶ λαοσσόων μναστήρ' ἀγώνων, 25
 λεπτοῦ διανισόμενον χαλκοῦ θαμὰ καὶ δονάκων,
 τοὶ παρὰ καλλίχορον ναίοισι πόλιν Χαρίτων
 Καφισίδος ἐν τεμένει, πιστοὶ χορευτῶν μάρτυρες.

... the art that Pallas Athena once invented, weaving the deathly *threnos* of the fierce Gorgons. [...] But once she had delivered her dear hero (Perseus) from those toils, the maiden fashioned the all-voiced song of the *auloi*, to imitate by the means of an instrument the far-resounding scream that assailed her ears from the fast-moving jaws of Euryales. The goddess was the inventor. But she invented it for mortal men to have, she called it the ‘many-headed nome’ destined to be a famous reminder in popular musical contests, a tune that quickly passes through the delicate bronze and the reeds growing close to the city of the Graces, city of beautiful choruses, in the precinct of Cephisus’ daughter, trustworthy witnesses of dancers.

In Pindar, Athena’s body is conspicuous by its absence: the *parthenos* (v. 19) who invented the *aulos* is connected to other maidens (παρθενίοις ὑπό τ' ἀπλάτοις ὀφίων κεφαλαῖς, Medusa and her sisters, v. 9). The adjective that qualifies one virgin’s face (of beautiful cheeks εὐπαράου κράτα, v. 16) can apply to the other; this feature is strikingly opposed to the monstrous aspect of Euryales’ fast-moving jaws in the next line (ἐκ καρπαλιμῶν γενύων, v. 20). This is too many cheeks in four lines to not think of the aulete’s own features while playing the *aulos*. This “constructed silence” about Athena’s own face, situated between two other female figures shows the goddess’ impossible position between her beautiful *parthenos* side (the Medusa side) and her more technical, functional, banausic side (the Euryale side). This passage is strongly

indebted to elite ideology and discourse of the body (as can also be seen in the fragment of Pratinas cited before).²¹⁵

Telestes' passage plays with the elite tradition of discourse about the instrument as reported in Pindar, but instead of rejecting the banausic, technical aspects of music-playing, it endorses it (especially in *PMG* 805 c, which describes the virtuosity involved in divine *aulos*-playing) and mixes it with another tradition, which connects the *aulos* with the East and Dionysios: the *aulos* is bestowed by Athena on Dionysus (συνεριστοτάταν Βρομίω παρέδωκε *PMG* 805c, v.1), the god of the dithyramb. I see this as a way for Telestes to legitimize the instrumental practice of the New Musicians: by “rejecting” the traditional myth of Athena and the *auloi*, he both recalls it (in diction and scenario) and legitimizes the practice of virtuoso playing by associating it with another myth (the transmission of the *aulos* from Athena to Dionysus). This is the way Telestes connects the instrument with Dionysus (who is introduced with an epithet, Bromius, that most clearly marks his connection with wild ritual celebration).

Finally, the myth revision itself is modeled on the pattern of another musical aitiology: that of the invention of the lyre in the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*. The most explicit reference to the other myth is in the repetition of σοφὰ τέχνα, a lexical repetition that only appears within that text (and appears twice within 30 lines):

ὅς τις ἂν αὐτὴν
τέχνη καὶ σοφίη δεδαημένος ἐξερρεΐνη
φθεγγομένη παντοῖα νόῳ χαρίεντα διδάσκει (vv. 482-484)

²¹⁵ Pratinas describes the flute as ὑπὸ τρυπᾶνῳ δέπας πεπλασμένον. The expression not only “taint[s the *aulos*] with a banausic slur” (to use Wilson’s expression) by associating it with the realm of *techne*, but the mere mention of the drill in connection with the *aulos* plays with the sexual anxieties present in the discourse about the instrument in classical Athens, the *aulos* being the (pathic) victim of physical penetration (by the drill).

and whoever cunningly enquires with art and skill to play it, him she teaches, uttering all sorts of delightful things for the spirit.

and

αὐτὸς δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρης σοφίης ἐκμάσσατο τέχνην·
συρίγγων ἔνοπὴν ποιήσατο τηλόθ' ἀκουστήν (vv. 511-512)

but he in turn found the art of another skill: he created the voice of the syrinx that resound afar.

The verbal parallel with both the art of lyre-playing and syrinx-playing is striking. More importantly, the verbal echo underlines the structural parallels of the two scenes: an instrument (the lyre / the *aulos*) is handed over by its inventor god (Hermes / Athena) to become the *timê* of another god (Apollo / Dionysos). The inventor is not the player, and was never meant to, but the instrument keeps the original characteristics of its inventor (*sophia* of Athena and *mêtis* of Hermes) while integrating the cultural values of the god it is handed over to.²¹⁶

By replicating the structural framework of the Homeric Hymn in relation to *aulos*-playing, and by rejecting Marsyas from the realm of the myth and musical aitiology, Telestes replicates the scenario used by Sophocles in his *Ichneutai*, where Hermes and Apollo argued and competed over the lyre under the eyes of the satyrs.

²¹⁶ The parallels between the two myths do not stop here: just as the lyre of Hermes / Apollo was associated with a series of inversions, the *auloi* of Athena / Dionysus embody the same phenomenon. The lyre is a mix of animal (turtle shell, cattle horns, strings) and vegetal (the reeds that make the bridge), its invention story mixes death and violence with light-hearted play and joyful celebration. In the same way, the *auloi* is a mix of vegetal (the reeds that make the mouth-piece) and metal (the body of the *aulos*) and mixes death and violence (in *Pythian* 12) with future joyful celebration (as announced in Pindar and illustrated in Telestes 805). Both the *aulos* and the “body” of the *kithara* are qualified by the same adjective: αἰόλον (v. 33 *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*). Both inventors transform something that comes from the wild into a companion to civilization, from something alive and natural into something ritualized. The parallels between the two instruments and their invention have already been pointed out by B. Leclercq-Neveu 1989. Her account, however, seems to ignore the religious aspects at stake in the interpretation of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, brilliantly exposed in N. Brown 1947. N. Brown, who refuses this “harmonious division of labour” (96-101) argues that the Hymn, more than an aetiological story about the division of musical provinces between Hermes and Apollo, is a narrative that underlines the problem of the Hermes cult at the beginning of the fifth century. The point of the Hymn is religious, and its “musical” interpretation had never convinced “the partisans of Apollo, including Pindar, Plato and Callimachus.”

This rejection of Marsyas, I propose, has a critical function: Telestes defines the proper terrain of the dithyramb: Marsyas and the negative connotations of the satyrs are left to the wild, while the fragment argues for the Dionysiac legitimacy of the dithyramb: Dithyrambos are the Dionysiac Athenian genre *par excellence*, since the art of *aulos*-playing (that accompanies dithyramb performance) was bestowed onto Dionysus by Athena (goddess of the city).²¹⁷

Conclusion to section 2

This section has shown that the stylistic features that Imperial authors have associated with New Music were part of the poets' rhetoric of legitimization: *kainotomia*, *poikilia*, the vocabulary of *harmoniae* and musical aetiologies are traditional *topoi* of lyric poetry, which the New Musicians used to qualify their poetics and compositions, but used in a new way. The New Musicians refer to *aulos*-playing, variegation, novelty or Eastern-sounding melodies not mainly to refer to what they were actually singing or playing but to connect themselves to the lyric tradition and to put a name on their music. This is particularly clear in the case of *poikilia* and the use of *harmoniae*: the words (that might have been self-referential in the archaic poets) work as labels destined to remind the audience of earlier associations, but are carefully transferred from song to the instrumental music described in a narrative. The *poikilia* of Pindar's lyric was presumably different from the *poikilia* of the New Musicians, but the word allowed linking the New Musicians' song with a traditional metamusical concept

²¹⁷ On the strategy of self-representation according to which New Music "imagined their project as the (re-)creation of an authentically Dionysian music," see E. Csapo 2000, 425.

and prepared the reception of the “New Music” by emphasizing the continuity within the lyric tradition. In the same way, the New Musicians used the vocabulary of *harmoniae* in a way meant to recall the use of such terms by the archaic poets, but used them not as self-referential but in a narrative that justified the mixing of *harmoniae* by referring to the origins of such mixing, and anchoring them in the mythical past. As for the subject of *aulos*-playing, I have shown how the fragments of Melanippides and Telestes should not so much be taken as representing opposite authorial positions, but as pieces rewriting a familiar myth of musical aetiology, in a period that shows an increased interest in musical heroes and themes – as we can tell from the dramatic staging of heroes like Thamyras,²¹⁸ Amphion,²¹⁹ Orpheus, Eueues²²⁰ and other plays dealing with musical aetiologies.²²¹

²¹⁸ Thamyras, the lyre-player who challenged Apollo and was blinded for his *hybris* was the subject of a play by Sophocles. According to the biographical tradition (*Life of Sophocles*, 5), Sophocles was the main actor; whether the anecdote is true or not, it suggests that the performance, in a tragedy, of a string instrument foreign to the Attic stage might have been the *clou du spectacle*. See M. Lefkowitz 1981, 78; S. Sutton 1984, 139-141. Thamyras is not present in the *Rhesus* but he is the father of the hero by a Muse. On Thamyras and the Muses, see G. Devereux 1987.

²¹⁹ Another mythical *kithara*-player, Amphion “only one of a set of musical heroes and gods who featured much more prominently on the tragic stage than the fortunes of survival might suggest” (P. Wilson 2000, 431) appears in Aeschylus’ *Edonoi*, as well as in Euripides’ *Antiope*. For the *Antiope*, see J. Kambitsis 1972, A. Podlecki 1996. He is also always in the background of Euripides’ Theban plays.

²²⁰ In Euripides’ *Hypsipyle*, on which see F. Zeitlin 1993, 178: “Music is the Dionysiac theme that finally seems to organize the three dramas [*Antiope*, *Phoenissae*, *Hypsipyle*] into a triptych or pedimental shape, in which the full force of negation in the Theban scenario, exemplified in the *Phoenician Women*, is contrasted by the two plays on its periphery. They each celebrate the power of Dionysus precisely through the magical and beneficent power of music, which draws its mysterious and creative energy from its associations with the realm of Orpheus, the sweetest singer of all. (...) Thus, in addition to the major import of the Dionysus-Semele paradigm, the music of Dionysus also has its vital part to play in invoking the redemptive aspects of Dionysiac myth.”

²²¹ This might have been the case with (Critias’?) *Tennes*, on which P. Wilson 2003, 188-189: “[it] was clearly a drama that engaged with musical matters. (...) Perhaps this was a tragedy that gave the stage musician a role within the drama itself, as is plausibly the case in a number of comedies.”

Chapter 3 – Poet and Society: the “lives” of the fourth-century poets

While the previous chapter has examined the discourse on poetic tradition and innovation in lyric texts, the focus of this chapter is the discourse on the evolution of the status of poet and poetry in late fifth- and fourth-century society, and on the figure of the New Musician. First, it is obvious to state that the interpretation of the transformations of lyric culture, and the degree of rupture with previous practices, in the fourth century depends on how one interprets the political and social changes that occurred over the fourth-century period in general, and whether one stresses mainly continuity, or change, with the practices of the fifth century (that saw the most radical political, social, economic and cultural transformations compared to the archaic period). I have alluded to some of these fourth-century changes in the introduction, as a way of setting the stage for understanding the evolution of lyric practices and thinking about evolutions of all sorts, influencing and reflecting each other, in that period.²²²

This chapter uses another approach for understanding the evolving position of the poet in society: sources have preserved many anecdotes and stories about the New Musicians and present their dealings with their fellow-citizens in the theatre, at the market-place or in bed, as well as their relationship with tyrants and kings.²²³ While a traditional historicizing approach (illustrated for example by the mini-biographies of the lyric poets one might find in Pickard-Cambridge’s or West’s overview of New

²²² For “debating the Athenian cultural revolution,” see R. Osborne 2007.

²²³ By “anecdote” I mean the categories of discourse that *chreia* and *hupomnêmonemata* cover: short narratives about the life of the poet or presenting the wit of a character in a real-life situation. For ancient definitions of the *chreia*, and the difference with *hupomnêmonemata*, see A. Theon (in M. Patillon 1997) and Aphthonius (in R.F. Hock and E.N. O’Neil 1986).

Music)²²⁴ would consist in collecting testimonia about the poets' culinary tastes, *bons mots* and physique,²²⁵ and compiling elements of a coherent biography of Timotheus, Philoxenus, Telestes or their likes, critics have shown the importance of re-evaluating the status of such episodes.²²⁶ M. Lefkowitz in particular has emphasized the unreliability of the ancient biographical tradition of the poet, and her influential studies have left few critics still willing to take any anecdote as illumination on the poet's actual life. Yet, her *Lives of the Greek Poets* does not include a chapter on the New Musicians. If such a chapter were written, it would emphasize, for example, the suspicious connection between Timotheus' twelve-string lyre, at the center of several anecdotes, and the *sphragis* of the *Persians* where the poet refers to a twelve-string instrument, or between Philoxenus' love for food and the gastronomic theme of the

²²⁴ Among the most famous and most influential, see A. Pickard-Cambridge 1964, M. L. West 1992, 356-372. Also M. Pintacuda 1978, 157-164.

²²⁵ Many sources for example comment on Cinesias' thinness: Aristophanes *Birds* 1372 ff., *Frogs* 152, 366, 404, 1437, and scholiast to the passage. Galen, *On the aphorisms of Hippocrates*, 18.1; Athenaeus 12. 551a - 552. Also A. Cameron 1995, 488-492, for comments on various "thin gentlemen."

²²⁶ Ancient biographical notes about the New Musicians present a series of recurring features, and what G. Most says of the tradition of Sappho's biography is true of the New Musicians': "in [attempting to come to terms with a complex set of data about Sappho's life], authors have tended to apply one or the other of three basic strategies: duplication, narrativization, and condensation" (G. Most 1995, 14). "Condensation" is illustrated in Suda entries devoted to the New Musicians, which accumulate chronological connections between the poets: Melanippides is made the grandson of an earlier Melanippides, also a poet; Phrynis is said to have been a pupil of Aristocleitus, who was descended from Terpander (Scholiast to Aristophanes' *Clouds* v. 969); and Philoxenus a slave of Melanippides (Suda Φ 393 (iv 728s. Adler). "Duplication" is all the more frequent that the poets' life was from the start so poorly documented. Biographers thus offer "double" hypotheses to account for discrepancies in discordant data: the Suda lists two Melanippides (Suda iii 350 Adler - about the controversial existence of two Melanippides, see H. W. Garrod 1920, 132.); Aristotle is said to have distinguished two Cinesias, (Scholiast at Aristophanes' *Aves* 1379); and Athenaeus mixes at least three Philoxenoi, to make sense of a Philoxenus' alleged love of fish, the preserved fragments of a poem about a dinner by another Philoxenus ("of Leucas") and the dithyrambic production of a third Philoxenus ("of Cythera") - Athenaeus: 4.146 f-147 e; 15.685 d. On the identity of Philoxenus of Cythera and Philoxenus of Leucas, see chapter 4. Finally, "narrativization" can be observed in narratives multiplying the connections between the New Musicians: they are presented as a tight group at the forefront of the public stage, eclipsing everybody else: Euripides is said to have been a friend of Timotheus (P. Oxy. 1176 fr. 39 col. xxii = *Vita Euripidei*, 17-18), Phrynis and Timotheus appear to have been in competition, and Stratonicus, Dorion and Cinesias were fierce critics of their contemporaries. At the same time, most of the anecdotes are paradigmatic, to the point that some characters are interchangeable and that stories about Phrynis appear in other passages as anecdotes about Timotheus or Terpander, or even Empedocles or Plato.

Dinner.²²⁷ The goal of the following pages is not to write such a chapter, but, focusing on the one New Music figure for whom the most numerous anecdotes have survived (Philoxenus) to suggest new ways in which this chapter could be written.²²⁸

Alternate approaches to that of M. Lefkowitz have of course already been offered,²²⁹ notably by E. Irwin, in several articles on poetic biographies and most recently on that of Solon. Underlining the uneasiness that she perceives in Lefkowitz's own treatment of the life of the poet and lawgiver, Irwin uses a particular story (the Salamis episode) associated with Solonian biography in order

to focus on the problems involved in handling the detailed stories of the biographies of poets, [and] to occupy a Solonian middle ground between approaches either gullible or dismissive in their approach to these rich stories. I will ask: what are these stories good for? what can they tell us about both poet and poetry? and can they, ultimately, have any historical value?²³⁰

More specifically, in the next few pages she offers three methodological remarks that are most useful for my own approach to anecdotes related to the New Musicians:

First, one can engage with the details of the biographical tradition without passing judgment on their historicity. Studies that identify the common topoi within traditional narratives, the legends surrounding wise man, lawgiver or poet, are of course valuable, but they do not eliminate the need to deal with the specific elements and logic of the individual narratives. (...) After all, poets did have lives. Second, the biographical traditions of poets can contain important and often early evidence for the reception of both the poets and their poetry precisely because these traditions are derived largely from their poetry (often lost to us). Finally, in those cases where it seems as arbitrary to accept as to reject events in the biographical tradition, one should try to pursue the consequences of both positions.

²²⁷ For Timotheus, see chapter 2; for Philoxenus, see chapters 4 and 5.

²²⁸ It is worth considering why Philoxenus is the poet for whom most anecdotes survive. Is it because of his particularly appropriate name, Philo-xenos, which reveals some of the social dynamics of the fourth century (the opening up of Athenian markets and cultural life in general?).

²²⁹ See for example J. Bell 1978 on Simonides; for an overview of approaches to biography, see S. Saïd's introduction to S. Dubel and S. Rabau 2001.

²³⁰ E. Irwin 2006, 15-16.

Both Irwin's method and conclusions are appealing and many of her suggestions can be extended to our corpus. So instead of starting from the (Lefkowitzian) claim that most biographical information about the poets is fiction, I would like to take the anecdotes at face value: although they might not give us access to the "historical" new musicians, they do give us access to the image of the poets as perceived, and projected, by the author of the anecdote. This assumption is not a return to the "naïve historicism of the past" (an expression used as a foil to define the method of the *Lives of the Greek Poets*) nor a nostalgic antiquarian taste for trivia: these stories focus on the position of the poet in society, and the details they provide about the poet *qua* poet and about the social networks in which he is portrayed, as well as the ideological paradigms used to describe his activity, have relevance to understand the musician's poetic, social, and political stance. Ultimately, these stories open onto the cultural narrative of fascinating figures and their time, and on the perception of evolution in musical and social history.

1- Mousikê and middleness

Pherecrates' *Cheiron*

The fragment of Pherecrates' *Cheiron* that describes technical innovations (fr. 155 K-A) is most often read as a comic allegory of musical innovation;²³¹ despite the elaborateness of some readings, that underline the subtle dynamics between remarks on the body and on poetic activity, I propose to focus on a slightly different issue and examine the embedded discourse on social change and continuity, which overlaps with the other themes of the passage. In Pherecrates' fragment indeed, *Mousikê* presents the

²³¹ See in particular G. Pianko 1963; E. Borthwick 1964, 1968; D. Restani 1983; B. Zimmermann 1993; G. Dobrov and E. Urios-Aparisi 1995.

New Musicians as a series of men who pleased themselves with her. While most commentators describe *Mousikê* as a victim of sexual mistreatment at the hands of the New Musicians, they do not note the tone that she adopts: if she is a victim, she is certainly not a traumatized one. She introduces her story as some heroic tale that brings pleasure to both poet and audience:²³²

(Μουσ.) λέξω μὲν οὐκ ἄκουσα· σοί τε γὰρ κλυεῖν
ἐμοί τε λέξαι θυμὸς ἠδονὴν ἔχει.

I will be happy to tell you: for it brings pleasure to your heart to listen, and for me to tell.

The framework in which she is going to discuss musical innovation is itself reminiscent of traditional solo lyric performance (something confirmed by *Mousikê* herself, who underlines that she was “walking by herself” - μοι βαδιζούση μόνη):

ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἦρξε τῶν κακῶν Μελανιπίδης,
ἐν τοῖσι πρῶτος ὃς λαβὼν ἀνήκέ με
χαλαρωτέραν τ' ἐποίησε χορδαῖς δώδεκα. 5
ἀλλ' οὖν ὅμως οὗτος μὲν ἦν ἀποχρῶν ἀνὴρ
ἔμοιγε – – – πρὸς τὰ νῦν κακά.
Κινησίας δέ < μ ' > ὁ κατάρατος Ἄττικός,
ἔξαρμονίους καμπὰς ποιῶν ἐν ταῖς στροφαῖς
ἀπολώλεχ' οὕτως, ὥστε τῆς ποιήσεως 10
τῶν διθυράμβων, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσιν
ἀριστερ' αὐτοῦ φαίνεται τὰ δεξιά.
ἀλλ' οὖν ἀνεκτὸς οὗτος ἦν ὅμως ἐμοί.
Φρῦνις δ' ἴδιον στρόβιλον ἐμβαλὼν τινα
κάμπτων με καὶ στρέφων ὅλην διέφθορε, 15
ἐν πέντε χορδαῖς δώδεχ' ἁρμονίας ἔχων.
ἀλλ' οὖν ἔμοιγε χούτος ἦν ἀποχρῶν ἀνὴρ·
εἰ γὰρ τι κάξήμαρτεν, αὐτίς ἀνέλαβεν.
Ὁ δὲ Τιμόθεός μ' , ᾧ φιλότατη, κατορώρυχε
καὶ διακέκναικ' αἴσχιστα. (Δικ.) ποῖος οὕτοσιν 20
ὁ Τιμόθεος; (Μουσ.) Μιλήσιός τις πυρρίας.

²³² The use of the verb κλυεῖν rather than ἀκούειν emphasizes the “archaism” of the picture. Dobrov and Urios-Aparisi interpret this phrase as convoluted language typical of the dithyramb, a paradox already investigated by B. Zimmermann 1993, 40, who notes: “on the one hand we find harsh criticism in Aristophanes of these musical innovations while on the other we often find the very same musical innovations being imitated in his own comedies.”

κακὰ μοι παρέσχευ οὔτος, ἅπαντας οὖς λέγω
 παρελήλυθεν, ἄγων ἐκτραπέλους μυρμηκιάς.
 κᾶν ἐντύχηι πού μοι βαδιζούσηι μόνηι,
 ἀπέδυσε κἀνέλυσε χορδαῖς δώδεκα 25

...

ἔξαρμονίους ὑπερβολαίους τ' ἀνοσίους
 καὶ νιγλάρους, ὥσπερ τε τὰς ῥαφάους ὄλην
 καμπῶν με κατεμέστωσε

Melanippides started my troubles. He was the first of them: he grabbed me and pulled me down and loosened me up with his countless notes. For all that, he was a good enough man to me, compared with my current troubles. That damned Cinesias of Attica has done me so much damage with the ‘exharmonic’ twists he makes inside the strophes, that you’d mistake his ‘left turn’ for his ‘right’ in the composition of his dithyrambs and shield-dance. For all that I could still put up with him. Then Phrynis shove in his own peculiar screwbold all his own, bending and twisting me me into pentachords. For all that, even he was sufferable enough: he went wrong, but he made up for it later. But Timotheus is another matter. He’s shoveled me into the earth, my dear, and ground me down disgustingly! (Justice asks): Who is this Timotheus? (Music replies): Some red-head from Miletus. The things he did to me were worse than all the others put together, with those perverted ant-crawlings he went in for. And when he found me out for a walk by myself, he stripped me and unraveled me with his innumerable notes.

... exharmonic high-pitched blasphemous warbles – he stuffs me like a cabbage, (rolling me up) with wriggling caterpillars. [tr. Barker 1997, modified].

I am not concerned with the musical novelties that Pherecrates metaphorically translates into another register, but with the general choice of register that the poet uses to talk about music: Pherecrates describes musical innovations as sexual acts, but the vocabulary is not that of sex as a private business, but of sex as a social affair. In the first three instances where *Mousikê* describes a New Musician for example, she underlines, in a nearly formulaic way, that his offense was, after all, tolerable.²³³ The

²³³ About Melanippides, ἀλλ' οὖν ὅμως οὔτος μὲν ἦν ἀποχρῶν ἀνὴρ ἔμοιγε πρὸς τὰ νῦν κακά; about Cinesias, ἀλλ' οὖν ἀνεκτὸς οὔτος ἦν ὅμως ἐμοί; and about Phrynis, ἀλλ' οὖν ἔμοιγε χούτος ἦν ἀποχρῶν ἀνὴρ. Although the meter is iambic trimeters, the repetition of the same line builds the feeling of formulaic poetry. The same is true of the expression χορδαῖς δώδεκα (5, 16, 25). A proof that the emphasis is more on the verbal repetition than on the meaning is the fact that the two words, although seemingly a formula, do not belong to the same expression in 16: χορδαῖς goes with ἐν πέντε, while

standard she sets is not personal, but ethical. However, the vocabulary she uses when describing Timotheus' assault is the vocabulary of the *kaloskagathos*: what Timotheus did to her was αἴχιστα, ἐκτραπέλους, the latter an adjective used by Theognis in a couplet encapsulating aristocratic ideology.²³⁴

Moreover, the vocabulary used to describe the innovations has political resonances in the context of late fifth-century Athens, as presented in the last chapter: these musicians introduce different kinds of “bends” (καμπτ...) that are quite not inkeeping with the “straight” moral and ethical standards associated with the good citizen in archaic poetry.²³⁵ Moreover, the novelties have political resonances, and the critique of *poikilia*, modulations, and the disruption of tradition “was a common elitist posture in Old Comedy (which poets such as Aristophanes were often at pains to reconcile with the popular “carnavalesque” aspects of their appeal to the demos)”.²³⁶

So what the passage reveals is that *Mousikê*'s speech makes three types of categories overlap in her presentation of the New Musician: the poetic and musical (with the description of the innovations introduced by the dithyrambic poets, and the use of comedy's favourite allegorical (sexual) vocabulary), the moral (with Music's insistence on what is acceptable or not), and the socio-political (with terms that can only echo the discourse on political innovation and revolution, and the imagery of the

δώδεκα goes with ἀρμονίας ἔχων. Despite their grammatical unrelatedness, they seem to repeat the same pattern as 5 and 25. This might be reproducing the critics' chatter about “the twelve-string business”: the sound of the discourse on the twelve-string music is everywhere.

²³⁴ *Theognidea*, 289-90: νῦν δὲ τὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν κακὰ γίνεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν / ἀνδρῶν ἠγγέονται δ' ἐκτραπέλοισι νόμοις. I owe this point to H. Schmidt. Thanks to him for kindly showing me his paper.

²³⁵ On the vocabulary of moral straightness, and the connection between straightness and status, see Theognis, 535-6 for example: οὐποτε δουλειῆ κεφαλὴ ἰθεῖα πέφυκεν, / ἀλλ' αἰεὶ σκολιή, καύχένα λοξὸν ἔχει.

²³⁶ G. Dobrov 1995, 154 (parentheses are mine). Commenting on the passage, he also notes, 157: “Pherecrates' conspiracy of metaphor, vagueness, repetition and comic topoi continues to engage students of Greek music such as Düring, Borthwick, Barker, and Restani who have advanced a variety of conflicting interpretations.”

symposium). The New Musician appears as a stranger to her social (aristocratic) milieu, and probably a foreigner *tout court* (presented as an unknown “red-head from Miletus”), violating the ethical norms (including in terms of sexual practices) of the elite society that *Mousikê* uses as a reference. The fact that the quotation belongs to the *Cheiron* of Pherecrates might moreover suggest that *Mousikê* was referring to a specific genre of discourse, the “precepts of Cheiron,” and to the specific context of performance (the symposium) in which they were transmitted. As L. Kurke has argued in a 1990 article, the *Cheironos Hypothekai* had been, since Hesiod, a distinct genre of poetry, concerned with the education of young men and transmission of wisdom.²³⁷ Other fragments of Pherecrates’ play present reminiscences of the sympotic practices of the past (fr. 157-8 K-A) and considerations on youth and old age (fr. 156 K-A), which, again, seem to confirm that this passage echoed the more general concerns of the play, and that *Mousikê* used an aristocratic frame of reference (including perhaps some use of *Cheironos Hypothekai*) to judge the New Musicians.

The Poet’s Voice and the Poet’s Throat

A similar kind of connection between discourse on music, (aristocratic) sympotic frame of reference and ethical reflections appears in a second story. The anecdote, quoted by Athenaeus, belongs to the mid third-century BC comic poet Machon’s *Chreiai* (a collection of passages presenting the witty sayings of hetaerae, parasites and musicians or poets, and whose purpose is a matter of debate.)²³⁸ As in the previous

²³⁷ L. Kurke 1990. On Pherecrates: “the collocation of μουσική and Chiron tends to confirm the inference that the Χείρωνος Ὑποθήκαι was a text associated with the education of young men” (93).

²³⁸ A. Gow 1965, 23-24; L. Kurke 2002.

fragment, Machon’s passage underlines the importance of appetite and violation of norms in connection with the New Musician Philoxenus.²³⁹

Φιλόξενός ποθ', ὡς λέγουσ', ὁ Κυθήριος
ἠϋξάτο τριῶν σχεῖν τὸν λάρυγγα πήχεων,
Ὅπως καταπίνω, φησίν, ὅτι πλεῖστον χρόνον
καὶ πάνθ' ἅμα μοι τὰ βρώμαθ' ἡδονὴν ποιῆ.

Philoxenus of Cythera, as the story goes, once prayed his throat were four foot long, “so that I could take, he said, as much time as possible to drink, and so that all the food could cause me pleasure at once.”

The anecdote revolves around the poet’s peculiar eating preferences, focuses on the use of the body and the satisfaction of its desires and apparently does not have much to do with Philoxenian poetics or social standing. In a remark mostly made of superlative terms (such as ὅτι πλεῖστον χρόνον, πάνθ' and ἅμα), the poet expresses his wish for a monstrously long throat, meant to maximize the pleasure he gets from food and drink. This obsession over quantity is accentuated by a love for *mélanges*: Philoxenus does not make any distinction between the consumption of food and drink, he not only wants to enjoy all the food at the same time (ἅμα), but also uses to describe the food he consumes a plural noun (πάντα βρώματα) which obliterates the individual qualities of the fare. The image that stands out from this anecdote is that of a poet defending both the pragmatics of gluttony and the aesthetics of mixing.

Although this initial reading reveals little connection between the poet’s throat and the poet’s voice, I would first like to suggest that the discourse on the poet’s gastronomic choices is a commentary on his poetic stance. The four lines condense a discourse on performance and pleasure, where Philoxenus’ remark collapses the role of the audience and that of the poet: the poet presents himself at the same time as potential

²³⁹ Athenaeus 8. 341 d = fr. 10 Gow.

performer (offering a marvellous sight) and as audience (experiencing pleasure). Poet and food have switched places: the subject of the verb for poetic activity (ποιεῖν) is the generic τὰ βρώματα, not the poet, and Philoxenus is only an indirect object (μοι) in this pleasure-creating process. What is more, the choice of the oversized throat (as opposed to the tongue or the belly) as the organ of gastronomic pleasure is particularly apt for the musical discourse on the lyric poet: even if in discussing the optimal use of the body, Philoxenus says nothing specifically of the musical possibilities of a formidable larynx, the emphasis on the throaty features of Philoxenus underline his proximity with natural lyricists – the birds.²⁴⁰ The kind of correlation between body and poetry that Deborah Steiner reads in descriptions of eating practices in archaic and early-classical poetry can be read in the four lines of Machon.²⁴¹ Here too, there is a definite connection between what travels down the poet’s throat and what comes out of it: the mixing of food and drink that Philoxenus refers to recalls the mixing of modes that the New Musician was accused of,²⁴² and one of the main adjectives used to describe his style (*poikilos*) applies before anything else to the natural world, and the variegated throat of birds in particular.²⁴³

²⁴⁰ I have not found any convincing argument to explain how πῆχυς, which can be used of the arms of the lyre (LSJ III), could have a musical meaning in this passage.

²⁴¹ D. Steiner 2002, for example 297: “I want to suggest that composers in a variety of poetic genres were working within a social and linguistic paradigm that constructed intimate links between decorous dining and decorous speaking, and that saw breaches in the registers of eating and speech as joined and expressive of one another: what goes into the mouth and what comes out turn out to be very closely related.”

²⁴² See for example Dionysus of Halicarnassus, *De Comp. Verb.* 131 (for modulation between harmoniae within the same piece).

²⁴³ In other sources, the poet asks more specifically for a bird’s throat (that of a crane), to be able to enjoy his food for as long as possible. A passage of Aristophanes’ *Frogs* features an Eryxis son of Philoxenus, in a line that provides an interesting parallel between visual and musical features of the birds’ throat (ξουθός). Parodying the complex style of Aeschylus, Dionysus says (930-934):

Διώνυσος	νή τοὺς θεοὺς ἐγὼ γοῦν
Αἰσχύλος	ἤδη ποτ' ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ νυκτὸς διηγρύπνησα τὸν ξουθὸν ἰππαλεκτρούνα ζητῶν τίς ἐστὶν ὄρνις. σημεῖον ἐν ταῖς ναυσὶν ὠμαθέστατ' ἐνεγέγραπτο.

But if one can read this anecdote as reinforcing Philoxenus’ poetic stance as a New Music poet, another reading is possible, focusing this time on the social stance of Philoxenus. While Athenaeus reads Machon’s passage as a biographic statement and includes Philoxenus among other famous *opsophagoi* in his book 8 (devoted to discussions of fish, musicians, and fish-obsessed musicians),²⁴⁴ there is more to the story:²⁴⁵ as J. Davidson has so convincingly shown, talking about food is never just talking about food. First, it is worth remembering that, as the epitome of the *Deipnosophistae* states, the story was not attributed only to Philoxenus but also (in slightly different formulations) to other characters.²⁴⁶ Moreover, it is only one version of a paradigm featuring several characters’ appetite and asocial eating practices.²⁴⁷ These two remarks should warn us already that the “biographic” reading finds some serious limitations in

Διώνυσος ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν Φιλοξένου γ' ὄμην ἔρουξιν εἶναι.
Εὐριπίδης εἶτ' ἐν τραγωδίαις ἐχρῆν κάλεκτρούνα ποιῆσαι;

It is unclear whether the man whose name translates “Mr. Burp, son of Mr. Hospitality” has anything to do with our poet, or is a comic monstrous invention (“the blond / trilling gryphon”). The same expression appears again in the *Birds* 800 and in *Peace* 1177. Neither Dunbar nor Sommerstein in their commentary of the *Birds* refer to the passage of *Frogs* or *Peace*. In his commentary to *Peace*, Sommerstein notes: ““a tawny horsecock”: the phrase caught his fancy, and he uses it again in *Birds* 800 (likewise of a strutting military officer) and *Frogs* 930-4. The adjective *xouthos* is here translated “tawny” merely for convenience; it is doubtful whether the fifth-century poets who used the word (mainly in describing birds and bird-like creatures) could have assigned any definite meaning to it.” Both he and Olson refer to M. Silk 1983 on the problem of the translation of *xouthos*.

²⁴⁴ On book 8 of the *Deipnosophistae*, see A. Marchiori’s chapter in Braund and Wilkins 2000. The book contains many quotations about flute-players, but this material has never been examined.

²⁴⁵ In the context in which it is quoted, it is only one anecdote in an excursus listing fish-lovers (from the fourth-century music-master Dorion to the queen Gatis of Syria), gleaned from the comic poets and anecdotists such as Lynceus of Samos, Callisthenes, Hegesander, and Aristodemus. Athenaeus’ interest in Machon’s passages is biographical: Philoxenus is one representative of a passion for fish that took different forms in different people, and that Athenaeus lists in encyclopaedic fashion.

²⁴⁶ Athenaeus 1.6 d = Clearchus fr. 55 W, on a Philoxenus son of Eryxis and the tragic poet Melanthius.

²⁴⁷ Philoxenus, among others, is said to have trained himself to be able to manually handle his food so hot that he would be the only one to have access to the dishes. The epitome of the *Deipnosophistae* also mentions Chrysippus’ statement about a Philoxenus plunging his hand in scalding water (1.5 d); a passage of Crobylus (1.5 e) featuring a character (Philoxenus of Cythera? Archytas? Someone else) with “Idea fingers” and “giving his throat a vapour bath”; a passage of Theophilus (1.6 b) about Philoxenus son of Eryxis (wishing for the neck of a crane); Clearchus on Melanthius (1.6 c) wishing to have the gullet of a long-neck bird, to be able to linger over the pleasure of food. Clearchus (1.6 c-d) about Pithyllus who sheathed his tongue. It ends with two longer anecdotes, different in tone, that I will discuss in the second section of this chapter.

the multiplication of figures and stories. For while all these testimonies seem to be variations on the same theme, there is something specific to Machon's narrative: despite all its superlativeness, it is not simply hunger, nor real insatiable greed, nor gross gluttony that Machon's passage underlines, but the poet's attention to the ideal way to consume food. Again, it is not so much what, nor how much to eat, but how to obtain an ideal eating experience. Aristotle's references to this anecdote in two passages suggest the type of discourse which Philoxenus, as a figure, is associated with: the discourse on profligacy (ἀκολασίαν) and excess.²⁴⁸ The same is true of a chapter of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems* (XXVIII), devoted to the question of self-control (σωφροσύνη), continence (ἐγκράτεια) and their opposite: Philoxenus is presented as a representative of the profligate man as regards food-matters.²⁴⁹ This vocabulary does not belong to the food-critic but to the philosophers, and the reference is again ethical.

This last interpretation of Philoxenus' wish suggests another, political, reading of Machon's anecdote: as in Pherecrates' passage, Philoxenus is presented on the background of aristocratic ideology, and in comparison with the figure of the poet as provider of wisdom (especially in the context of the symposium).²⁵⁰ The lyric poet appears as an intemperant (*akolastos*) who challenges the values both of sympotic poetry and aristocratic ideology, and ignores all the values associated with the good

²⁴⁸ *Eudemian Ethics* 1231a and *Nicomachean Ethics* 1118a 33.

²⁴⁹ The assimilation of individuals to types has indeed been analysed as a trend in anecdotal and biographical writing; W. Gemoll 1924 explored how anecdotes, taken as slices of life, illustrate virtues and vices. See also A. Momigliano 1993, 69-70. B. Scardigli 1995, 11-12.

²⁵⁰ Stories present Philoxenus as dispensing traditional wisdom: Stobaeus 2. 31 (on training and education, and time as the greatest aid to education); *Flor. Mon.* 260, 261 (on honouring your teachers more than your parents, and on blushing as the colour of virtue); Plutarch *On borrowing* (*Moralia* 831f), on moderation in the use of luxury.

citizen. By being an incarnation of the profligate (as opposed to the “middling”) man, Philoxenus turns on their head the traditional features of lyric poetry (praise of pleasure in wine, music and good company, long life and requited love) and the acceptable “measure” of the society he belongs to.²⁵¹ The personal hedonistic ideal he describes (physical monstrosity, or animality, to satisfy bodily desires) could not be more opposite to sympotic virtues: self-control and temperance associated with the *kaloskagathos*, and the pride over physical integrity proper to the good citizen. What Philoxenus prays for is actually an anti-symposium: the solitary, self-indulgent and undiscerning consumption of food and wine, in a deformed body.

2- Opsophagia and philo-xenia

Two longer anecdotes, also attached to Philoxenus, lend themselves particularly well to the same kind of layered reading, joining literary critical analysis and socio-political approach. The first one is another passage of Machon, quoted in book 8 of the *Deipnosophistae* right before the passage just discussed. Between apophthegms of the third-century poet Antagoras and of the orator Hyperides, Athenaeus presents a story staging – again – Philoxenus’ appetite:²⁵²

Ὑπερβολῇ λέγουσι τὸν Φιλόξενον
τῶν διθυράμβων τὸν ποιητὴν γεγονέναι

²⁵¹ This anecdote illustrates the same kind of ideology of “excess” of the New Musicians as the stories (quoted in the previous chapter) told about Timotheus’ or Phrynis’ supernumerous lyre-strings and the ephors’ concern to cut the top or the bottom (“extra”) strings so as to conform to the traditional seven-string lyre (Plutarch, *Inst. Lac.* 17. 238c, *Apoph. Lac.* 8. 220c; also, about Phrynis, *Agis* 10.4). In that anecdote, the ephors are representatives of acceptable metrics, and in the version of the story told about Phrynis, the ephor’s name (Ecrepes or Mr. *Comme-Il-Faut*) fittingly underlines the issue at stake: what is important is the “appropriate” number of strings, and what counts most, the “middle” strings. Both narratives can be read on different levels: as discourses on lyric practice and their evolution, as discourse on moral norms and on the “outsider” place in society of the one who does not respect acceptable metrics.

²⁵² Athenaeus 8. 341b = Machon fr. 9 Gow.

ὄψοφάγον. εἶτα πουλύποδα πηχῶν δυεῖν
 ἐν ταῖς Συρακούσαις ποτ' αὐτὸν ἀγοράσαι
 καὶ σκευάσαντα καταφαγεῖν ὅλον σχεδόν
 πλὴν τῆς κεφαλῆς, ἀλόντα δ' ὑπὸ δυσπεψίας
 κακῶς ἔχειν σφόδρ'. εἶτα δ' ἰατροῦ τινος
 πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσελθόντος ὃς φαύλως πάνυ
 ὀρῶν φερόμενον αὐτὸν εἶπεν, Εἴ τί σοι
 ἀνοικονόμητόν ἐστι διατίθου ταχύ,
 Φιλόξεν', ἀποθανῆ γὰρ ὄρας ἐβδόμης.
 κάκεινος εἶπε, Τέλος ἔχει τὰ πάντα μοι,
 ἰατρέ, φησί, καὶ δεδιώκηται πάλαι.
 τοὺς διθυράμβους σὺν θεοῖς καταλιμπάνω
 ἠνδρωμένους καὶ πάντας ἐστεφανωμένους,
 οὓς ἀνατίθημι ταῖς ἑμαυτοῦ συντρόφοις
 Μούσαις. Ἀφροδίτην καὶ Διόνυσον ἐπιτρόπους-
 ταῦθ' αἱ διαθήκαι διασαφοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ
 ὁ Τιμοθέου Χάρων σχολάζειν οὐκ ἔα,
 οὐκ τῆς Νιόβης, χωρεῖν δὲ πορθμὸν ἀναβοᾷ,
 καλεῖ δὲ μοῖρα νύχιος ἧς κλύειν χρεῶν,
 ἴν' ἔχων ἀποτρέχω πάντα τὰμαυτοῦ κάτω
 τοῦ πουλύποδός μοι τὸ κατάλοιπον ἀπόδοτε.

They say that Philoxenus the dithyrambic poet was excessively fond of *opson*. One day in Syracuse, he bought an octopus 3 feet wide, prepared it and ate nearly all of it except the head. Seized by dyspepsia, he was very seriously ill, and a doctor arrived, who on seeing his poor condition said “if any of your affairs is not in order, Philoxenus, work on them at one, since you will die before the seventh hour.” Philoxenus replied, “everything is complete (τέλος), doctor, and had been in order for a long time. By the gods’ grace I leave my dithyrambs behind grown to manhood and crowned with garlands, all of them, and I dedicate them to the Muses with whom I was brought up (συντρόφοις); Aphrodite and Dionysius as their guardians (ἐπιτρόπους) – my will makes all this clear. But since Timotheus’ Charon, the one in his *Niobe*, does not allow delaying but shouts that the ferry-boat is leaving, and gloomy Fate, who must by obeyed, is summoning me – so that I may have all my belongings with me when I run off down below, fetch me the rest of that octopus!”

Just as the core of the previous story was the monstrous wish for an outsized throat, the core of this one is the divorce between heads and bodies, the octopus’ and the dithyrambic poet’s. And just as the head of the octopus is left untouched while its body is consumed, what we would call the ‘head’ of Philoxenus (his *phrên*, the seat of emotions and rational thinking) remains untouched while his body is in pain. The

passage is introduced by ὑπερβολῆ, a term that keys the reader into the main theme of the passage.²⁵³ excess in consumption habits, the cause of Philoxenus' dyspepsia and imminent death. The anecdote revolves around an unresolved tension between two images of Philoxenus.

On the one hand, after indulging in too much food and showing his lack of self-control, Philoxenus appears to be a model citizen when it comes to his last moments: when he answers the doctor, the poet emphasizes the successful *paideia* he gave his “children” (his dithyrambic compositions), their status as respectable *andres*, crowned with the wreath of the agonic victor (or that of the symposiast). He has done everything that needed to be done, established a will, made a dedication, given forethought to guardians. These details suggest that Philoxenus has prepared himself (at least logistically) for death and suggests comparison with the figure of Socrates.

On the other hand, Philoxenos places himself on a plane different to that of citizens: as a poet, he is not simply a citizen having arranged for his heirs' future, not even a recipient of the gift of the Muses, an inspired poet, as Archilochus (Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος, fr. 1 W.). He presents himself as belonging to the world of heroes brought up by, and with, mythical characters (he is a σύντροφος of the Muses).²⁵⁴ The only guardians susceptible of taking care of his offspring are, naturally, gods - Aphrodite and Dionysus, the gods associated respectively with the Charites (as in the opening lines of Pindar's *Pythian* 6) and with the dithyramb. The passage presents the poet's words as a sort of *sphragis* with which he emphasizes his status as a

²⁵³ The adverb appears in two other anecdotes of Machon, and in all three cases signals excess in appetites (for sex or food).

²⁵⁴ See Gow's note ad. loc; “so in A.P. 7.26 (Antipater Sid.) Anacreon is φιλακρήτου σύντροφος Ἀρμονίης.

poet. It is all the more so true that he inscribes himself in the poetic and mythological worlds by referring to the words of a poem of his contemporary Timotheus, thus making Charon's injunction in the *Niobe* addressed to him.²⁵⁵ So this story reinforces Philoxenus' stance as an inspired poet, even belonging to the world of mythological and heroic figures.

But on the model of many other stories, the anecdote concludes with a *catastrophe*: the inspired poet, whose 'head' was far from the discomforts of the body, is now going back to the depth of the wretched *gaster*. Philoxenus who had showed himself a good citizen and a sort of philosopher prepared for death concludes his life by a hybristic act that negates everything else he has said before: he now wants to consume the head of the octopus.²⁵⁶ This ultimate act of *hybris* is jarring by contrast with the rest of the poet's attitude, but it takes additional meaning when compared with Socrates' end. First, Philoxenus' last words as presented by Machon seem to parody Socrates': τοῦ πουλύποδός μοι τὸ κατάλοιπον ἀπόδοτε echoes the ὦ Κρίτων, ἔφη, τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ ὀφείλομεν ἀλεκτρούονα: ἀλλὰ ἀπόδοτε καὶ μὴ ἀμελήσητε of the last lines of the *Phaedo* (118 a), while substituting the cock owed to Asclepius with the octopus

²⁵⁵ One can compare this with the anecdote staging Diogenes' death (also by eating a raw octopus): Diogenes Laertius vi. 76; Athenaeus 8. 341e. Or with Zeno's death: Diogenes Laertius vii. 28, Strabo 3.7.44.

²⁵⁶ The choice of the octopus for the creature that ended Philoxenus' life is particularly apt. In his discussion of fish in book 7 of the *Deipnosophistae* (316 a – 319 a), Athenaeus has a long paragraph on the octopus, which throws light on the symbolism of the mollusc here. Three of the octopus' characteristics are worth pointing out: first, the polyp's intelligence, its versatility and skill to adapt (attested in a proverb of Clearchus and lines of Theognis (v. 215-218)). Moreover, a quote from Eupolis' *Demoi* shows the connection between the ways of the polyp and those of Odysseus (on which, see M. Telò's commentary). Secondly, with its eight arms, the octopus is the embodiment of the sense of touch, a perfect icon for the poet who is described elsewhere as an *akolastos*. Finally, the octopus is also known for its aphrodisiac capacities (Athenaeus 7. 316 c = Diocles, 171 Wellman) and provides a perfect mirror for an *akolastos*. All these remarks take an added layer of significance when read in connection with other anecdotes. Do we have to read something specific in the *head* of the octopus? A passage of the *Harp-Singer* of Clearchus might help: it describes the glutinous parts of the conger-eels as beneficial for the voice: Γόγγρων τε λευκῶν πᾶσι τοῖς κολλώδεσι/ Βρόχθιζε. Τούτοις γὰρ τρέφεται τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ/ τὸ φωνάριον ἡμῶν περισσάρκον γίνεται.

to Philoxenus. But despite the similarities in the two men's last words, Philoxenus presents a conception of death opposite to Socrates'. For while Socrates' execution is determined by the arrival of the boat from Crete, Philoxenus presents his death as determined by the mythical departure of Charon's boat, as evoked in Timotheus' *Niobe*: it is as if even the poet's time was determined by poetry. Finally, as opposed to Socrates who covers his face in a dignified sign of denial of the existence of the body after death,²⁵⁷ Philoxenus presents death as a physical event in which the body participates (ἀποτρέχω κάτω) and where “belongings” (ἔχων πάντα τὰ μαντοῦ) still matter.

How to explain the parallel with the philosopher's death, and what is at stake in this anecdote? One level of understanding implies poetic and generic considerations. This anecdote belongs to Machon's *Chreiai*, a type of exercise which, in the rhetorical tradition, mostly stages wise men and reports their pithy sayings or meaningful acts.²⁵⁸ But as L. Kurke has underlined in an article on “gender, politics and subversion in the *Chreiai* of Machon”:

When we ask why Machon should choose to parody this philosophical genre by recasting it as the doings and sayings of Athenian low-lives, we run up against

²⁵⁷ *Phaedo* 118a: Ἡδη οὖν σχεδόν τι αὐτοῦ ἦν τὰ περὶ τὸ ἦτρον ψυχόμενα, καὶ ἐκκαλυψάμενος - ἐνεκεκάλυπτο γάρ - εἶπεν -ὃ δὴ τελευταῖον ἐφθέγγετο.

²⁵⁸ According to Gow, 13, “To the rhetors of the imperial age the word *chreiai* had a technical and specific meaning, and Hermogenes, Theon, and Aphthonius all devote a section of their progymnasmata to the subject (...). *The literary genre however had existed since at least the fourth century B.C.*” (my emphasis). For use of *Chreia* in Progymnasmata, see R.F. Hock and E.N. O'Neil, 1986, especially 3-60. It is possible to interpret most of the stories gathered under the generic term “anecdotes” according to the rhetorical principles presented by ancient rhetoricians, among whom Theon and Aphthonius: some *chreiae* are “logical *chreiae*” (or “*chreiae* of discourse”, either circumstantial or general), others are “action *chreiae*.” On Machon's contribution to the literary genre, see L. Kurke 2002. She qualifies Machon's book in the following words (21): “read all together, the individual anecdotes of the *Chreiai* are short and punchy (...), funny (when we can figure out the joke), and frequently highly obscene (...). But most of all, Machon's *Chreiai* seem oddly subversive or askew in relation to the values and hierarchies we expect to find.”

the problem that there are no extended examples of ‘straight’ philosophical *Chreiai* extant.²⁵⁹

The anecdote staging Philoxenus as a hero of *chreia* might be a case in which the intertext with philosophical models is the clearest: Machon draws the attention to the image of the poet as wise man,²⁶⁰ while at the same time presenting a debunking of philosophical death, and presenting Philoxenus as an anti-Socrates.

It would take a much more nuanced study to underline how this anecdote relates to the rest of Machon’s stories, and how it can be read in parallel (or counterpoint?) with the stories related to courtesans, as a form of discourse on power.²⁶¹ Here I propose to see a contrast in the moral and social position between the two men, as underlined by the parallel with Socrates’ death. As opposed to Socrates who dies for the sake of the city, Philoxenus withdraws himself from his position of *kaloskagathos* showing the ideal civic attitude, and presents himself as an *akolastos*: instead of a lesson to the city, it is the spectacle of the selfish and momentary satisfaction of desire that Philoxenus offers. The consumption of the whole octopus shows the extent to

²⁵⁹ L. Kurke 2002, 22. She then explains how “several scholars have recently attempted to read (or perhaps, to mine) Machon for historical content and contexts. (...) Traditionally, this kind of reading has been done in the service of positivist historical reconstruction, as already for Gow, whose preface justifies attention to the *Chreiai* as ‘of considerable interest both as a document of social history and as representing a type of literature of which, though popular and extensive in antiquity, little has survived’ (Gow 1965, ix).”

²⁶⁰ As noted above, about time, about education, about borrowing. See also Ephorus, Athenaeus 8. 352c = *FGrH* 70 F2, who compares the poet’s style with the wise Simonides’: ζηλωτής δὲ διὰ τῶν ἐντραπέλων λόγων τούτων ἐγένετο ὁ Στρατόνικος Σιμωνίδου τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ὡς φησιν Ἐφορος ἐν δευτέρῳ περὶ εὐρημάτων, φάσκων καὶ Φιλόξενον τὸν Κυθήριον περὶ τὰ ὅμοια ἐσπουδακέσαι.

²⁶¹ L. Kurke’s challenging re-reading of Machon’s poetry consists in underlining that “there are good reasons to read Machon’s low-life characters politically, as representatives of Athens speaking for the Athenians as voices of resistance” (27). The next paragraph is particularly important for our reading of the anecdote in a series of discourses on the place of the poet in society (27-28): “If this is what’s going on in the *Chreiai*, it’s worth emphasising how unusual Machon’s representational strategy is. The much more conventional choice is symbolically to contrast the proper order of the democratic *polis* with the corrupt demi-monde of prostitutes, parasites, and hired musicians, so that the prostitute becomes the very figure for a debased private sphere invading or encroaching upon the public.” This inversion, or rather invasion of the private into the public discourse is precisely what I have suggested in the previous anecdotes.

which Philoxenus has adopted wisdom of the octopus itself – as presented in Pindar’s advice.²⁶²

ὦ τέκνον, ποντίου θηρὸς πετραίου
χρωτὶ μάλιστα νόον
προσφέρων πάσαις πολίεσσιν ὀμίλει·
τῷ παρεόντι δ’ ἐπαινῆσαις ἐκὼν ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλοῖα φρόνει.

My son, let your mind behave like the skin of the rocky beast of the sea, and consort with men of all nations. Praising willingly who is present, change your mind according to the circumstances.

This is precisely what the poet brings to another level: while the image, in Pindar, might be a metaphor for the poet’s flexible position vis-à-vis a patron, Philoxenus takes it as an invitation to adapt his social conduct to best suit the circumstances and his own wishes. Thus, the consumption of the rest of the octopus confirms his overwhelmingly selfish appetite, his concern for private enjoyment rather than public affairs, and his refusal to be a model for the city. It is ultimately not the *nomoi* of the city, but another private call, from Timotheus’ *nomos*, that convinces Philoxenus that it is time to die.

From movable feast to market economy

Another anecdote revolving, again, around Philoxenus’ eating habits reinforces this interpretation. It is a fragment from the fourth-century Peripatetic philosopher Clearchus quoted in the epitome of the *Deipnosophistae*.²⁶³ It might have come from Clearchus’ *Lives* (a work that presents moralizing anecdotes about political, artistic and

²⁶² Fr. 43 S-M; on which see B. Gentili 1988, 133.

²⁶³ In the series of anecdotes about homonymous Philoxenoi already referred to: Athenaeus 1. 6b = fr. 57 W. According to Athenaeus (14. 701b): Κλέαρχος ὁ Σολεὺς οὐδενὸς ὦν δεύτερος τῶν τοῦ σοφοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους μαθητῶν. The philosopher must have had a good knowledge of, or at least interest for, fourth-century poetry and linguistic and poetic phenomena (fr. 88, 91a W), since he is one of our rare sources (or the only one) for several fourth-century figures: Lycophronides (fr. 22 W, fr. 24 W) and Castorion (fr. 88 W) and Eriphanis (fr. 32 W).

poetic figures)²⁶⁴ and stages the same elements as the previous stories: food, social habits, and the poet’s position in the *polis*:

Κλέαρχος δέ φησι Φιλόξενον προλουόμενον «ἐν τῇ πατρίδι κὰν ἄλλαις πόλεσι» περιέρχεσθαι τὰς οἰκίας, ἀκολουθούντων αὐτῷ παίδων [καὶ] φερόντων ἔλαιον οἶνον γάρον ὄξος καὶ ἄλλα ἡδύσματα. ἔπειτα εἰσιόντα εἰς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας οἰκίας τὰ ἐψόμενα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀρτύειν ἐμβάλλοντα ὧν ἦν χρεία, κᾶθ’ οὕτως † εἰς ἑαυτον † κάπαντα εὐωχεῖσθαι. οὗτος εἰς Ἔφεσον καταπλεύσας εὐρῶν τὴν ὀψόπωλιν κενὴν ἐπύθετο τὴν αἰτίαν. καὶ μαθὼν ὅτι πᾶν εἰς γάμους συνηγόρασται λουσάμενος παρῆν ἄκλητος ὡς τὸν νυμφίον. καὶ μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον ἄσας ὑμέναιον, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή· γάμε θεῶν λαμπρότατε πάντας ἐψυχαγώγησεν, ἦν δὲ διθυραμβοποιός. καὶ ὁ νυμφίος· Φιλόξενε, εἶπε, καὶ αὐρίον ὧδε δειπνήσεις. καὶ ὁ Φιλόξενος· ἂν ὄψον, ἔφη, μὴ πωλῆ τις.

According to Clearchus, Philoxenus used to go round among the houses in his own city and others as well, freshly bathed, with an escort of slaves carrying oil, wine, fish-paste, vinegar, and other delicacies/seasonings (*ἡδύσματα*). He would then enter strangers’ houses and season whatever was cooking for the rest of the company, throwing in what was lacking. Then he would stoop and greedily feast on the food. He once landed at Ephesus, and finding the deli/fish market (*ὀψόπωλιν*) empty inquired the reason. When he learned that everything had been sold out for a wedding, he bathed and went uninvited to the bridegroom’s house. And after the dinner he sang the wedding song beginning “marriage, most radiant deity” and delighted everybody (for he was a dithyrambic poet). The groom then said, “Philoxenus, shall you dine in this way tomorrow also?” “Yes” said Philoxenus, “if there is no *opson* for sale.”

The anecdote is twofold: the first part shows the peculiar dining habits of Philoxenus, the second is a particular dinner-story at Ephesus²⁶⁵ that retrospectively sheds light on

²⁶⁴ Clearchus wrote an *About Lives* (περὶ βιωῶν fr. 37-62 W). His work demonstrates an interest for the figure of the parasite (Athenaeus 4. 157c = fr. 38 W) and for the overlap between social and moral categories (fr. 42 W, on which Wehrli: “die Abrechnung mit Parrhasios ist wesentlich konfuser, weil sich die moralischen Kategorien mit solchen des sozialen Vorurteils vermengen; K. scheint zu versuchen, anekdotische Ueberlieferung ethisch umzubiegen”). Once again, we may wonder if the selection of Clearchus that has come down mainly through Athenaeus is not biased by Athenaeus’ own process of selection (in particular his interest for the socio-politics of poetry): although with Clearchus we are closer to the source, there is still a level of filter (Athenaeus’ process of selecting anecdotes) between the text and the reader. Clearchus’ moral interest in the rest of the fragments: insistence on *truphê* and eating habits, as representative of people’s behaviour. The fragment the most representative of Clearchus’ interest is fr. 63 W. See Wehrli’s commentary: “mit den Lehrmesitern erotischer und kulinarischer ἡδονῆ mag sich schon vor K. eine moralische Schrift auseinandergesetzt haben.”

²⁶⁵ Ephesus was a city “oligarchic in temper”, that took sides with Sparta after it revolted in 412 BC; the very location of the anecdote, in Ephesus (the town of Hipponax), and its Spartan connection underlines the importance of the discourse on *mousikê* (Sparta is known for its musical conservatism).

Philoxenus' character as presented in the first part. The story revolves around the relationship between food, poetry and socio-economic webs of relationship and, again, questions the convivial practices of a New Musician on the background of Classical Athenian culture.

In the first sentences of the passage, Clearchus presents Philoxenus as a strange hybrid. On the one hand, Philoxenus has all the trimmings of an elite citizen evolving in an aristocratic culture: before entering people's house, he bathes (προλουόμενος) like one does before going to a symposium.²⁶⁶ He is the one who provides *opson* (the condiments, the most delicate part of the meal) for the dinner preceding the symposium and by generously seasoning his guests' food, he lives up to his name (*philo-xenos*), for it is not the *sitos* but the *opson* that transforms eating into a social practice.

On the other hand, the poet is the 'movable feast:' Philoxenus appears like a frenetic *opson*-consumer: he cannot go around without it, and brings it to other people's place. What he does to other people's food (τὰ ἐψόμενα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀρτύειν ἐμβάλλοντα ὧν ἦν χρεία) is the gastronomic illustration of his poetry: the verb ἀρτύω is used 'of things that require skills or cunning' and suggests an obvious parallel between the use of cookery and that of poetry, and the participle ἐμβάλλοντα recalls the *embolima* (or *anabolai*) that the New Musicians introduced.²⁶⁷ So in presenting Philoxenus as a skilful *saucier*, Clearchus is only translating the poet's activity in the

²⁶⁶ On bathing: λούεσθαι in Aristophanes (*Birds*, 132 and *Plutus*, 615) is associated with feasting and celebration. The word functions as a marker: when hearing that there is a wedding, Philoxenus bathes (λουσάμενος παρῆν ἄκλητος ὡς τὸν νυμφίον), like Plato's Socrates in the *Symposium* 174a3 (οἱ Σωκράτη ἐντυχεῖν λελουμένον τε καὶ τὰς βλαύτας ὑποδεδεμένον, ἃ ἐκεῖνος ὀλιγάκις ἐποίει).

²⁶⁷ See for example Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1409b.

realm of food: he brings more delight to people's life by providing ἄλλα ἡδύσματα.²⁶⁸

But Philoxenus is neither really an aristocratic guest (since he is not invited) nor a host (since he goes to other people's houses): he makes himself a guest and a host wherever he goes. It is hard not to read an echo of Homer's Odysseus (especially in the light of the tradition that makes Philoxenus the author of an allegoric *Cyclops or Galatea* that was a parody on the poet's unfortunate relationship with Dionysius of Sicily's girlfriend):²⁶⁹ like Odysseus, Philoxenus barges into the Cyclops' place and helps himself to the Cyclops' food. In the same manner as Odysseus, who brings wine as *opson* (and quite ironically, the flesh of the companions Polyphemus will feast on as well), Philoxenus brings in the *opson* to his hosts. The adjective ἄκλητος actually makes him a very special kind of guest: this standard epithet, along with ἀσύμβολος, in Greek comedy cues the reader into linking Philoxenus with a parasite.²⁷⁰ The attitude of Philoxenus at the banquet confirms this: he is depicted as an intemperate glutton: κᾶθ' οὕτως † εἰς ἑαυτον † κάψαντα εὐωχεῖσθαι. The sentence illustrates his lack of

²⁶⁸ See the parallels between cooking and rhetoric in Plato's *Gorgias*: 462e - 463e. According to Plato's Socrates, both are forms of κολακεία εἶναι τι ἐπιτήδευμα τεχνικὸν μὲν οὐ, ψυχῆς δὲ στοχαστικῆς καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ φύσει δεινῆς προσομιλεῖν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Also the participle used in Aristotle's definition of the function of poetic language in tragedy in the *Poetics* 1449b 25: ἡδυσμένῳ λόγῳ. This parallel between the two registers is also used in another genre, comedy: see for example Damoxenus, *Foster Brothers* (Athenaeus 3. 102 f – 103 a = fr. 2 K-A), where the poet presents a stock figure of New Comedy, the cook, who acts like a composer and uses the vocabulary of the *harmonikoi* to describe his cooking.

²⁶⁹ For the anecdote, see *PMG* 816, that I comment on in the last pages of this chapter.

²⁷⁰ The rich social history of the *akletoi* has been underlined by B. Fehr 1990, 185-6: “other people, who contribute to the entertainment of the symposiasts as well, arrive without being called (*akletoi*). They do not possess property and - for whatever reasons - do not earn their livelihood by some useful *technē*. Driven by their hungry stomachs they appear wherever they hope to gain a meal. These *akletoi* had a not unimportant role in the Archaic cultural and social history of the *symposion*. (...) The very first *akletos* is Odysseus.(...) The most important variants of the *akletos* in later literature are the *kolax* and close to him, the *parasitos*.” On the rise of parasites in fourth-century Middle and New Comedy, Antiphanes (Athenaeus 1. 4f = fr. 227 K-A): οὗτοι δὲ <πρὸς> τὰ δεῖπνα τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει / ἀφορώσιν <ἀεὶ> καὶ πέτονται δεξιῶς / ἐπὶ ταῦτ' ἄκλητοι (...) οὐς ἔδει, τὸν δῆμον ἐκ κοινοῦ τρέφειν, ἀεὶ θ' ὄπερ / Ὀλυμπιάσι φασὶ ταῖς μύαις ποιεῖν / βούν τοῖς ἀκλήτοις προκατακόπτειν πανταχοῦ.

control, no matter what reading we choose²⁷¹ – or rather, it underlines how Philoxenus plays the parasite and acts according to how an *akletos* is expected to act, that is, greedily. This ‘performance aspect’ is what B. Fehr emphasizes:

Firstly, during the banquet the *akletos* displays his ugliness, weakness, voracity, or whatever by chance and unintentionally, thus making the invited guests laugh as they feel their superiority. Secondly, the physical and moral inferiority of the *akletos* is revealed consciously and on purpose: the *akletos*, as it were, *performs himself*. Thus he confirms the image the invited guests have of people of his sort; enjoying this, they become inclined to give the *akletos* what he asks for and are less likely to use violence.

Philoxenus thus plays by the rules of the game that he has just invented: coming as an uninvited host seasoning simple fare, he performs the hungry guest.

The relationship between his generosity and greed acquires a new level of significance in the next part of the story: when there is nothing for sale at the deli, Philoxenus literally ‘sings for his supper,’ and delights people (πάντας ἐψυχαγώγησεν) - a typically Platonic verb used to refer to the power of language, both poetry and rhetoric.²⁷² Philoxenus thus always ends up escaping classifications: although he comes uninvited, as a parasite, to the wedding and acts as is expected of him (both as a parasite and as a poet for a patron), at the end he changes the rules of the game, or rather underlines his refusal to play by old rules: he will not be the poet playing for a patron. Indeed in the last sentence, he switches from the vocabulary of symbolic value used by the groom (“will you dine with us in this way, (as a guest)”)

²⁷¹ Either Müller’s reading in Athenaeus: ἀνακάμψαντα - gulp down, or the Suda’s εἰς ἑαυτὸν κούψαντα: bend over, that has, like the English translation, sexual connotations (root of ‘kubda,’ one of the positions referred to in ancient sex manuals). On the reading of this passage, see K. Bartol 2004. G. Roskam 2006.

²⁷² Plato uses the verb (and his compounds) 6 times: *Phaedrus* 261a, 271 c (Ἐπειδὴ λόγου δύναμις τυγχάνει ψυχαγωγία οὔσα), *Timaeus* 71a, *Laws* 909b. Aristotle uses the verb twice, in the *Poetics*: 1450a: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τὰ μέγιστα οἷς ψυχαγωγεῖ ἡ τραγωδία τοῦ μύθου μέρη ἐστίν. 1450 b: τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἢ μελοποιία μέγιστον τῶν ἡδυσμάτων, ἢ δὲ ὅψις ψυχαγωγικὸν μὲν...

ὠδε δειπνήσεις) to that of market economy (“if there is no *opson* for sale” ἂν ὄψον μὴ πωλή τις). With this remark, as with the parallel with Odysseus the wanderer, Philoxenus appears as a character questioning the social networks he enters: neither really a guest-friend, nor a good symposiast, not a poet playing at a court and not quite a parasite, he shows, with his question, what is at stake in his singing lyric poetry in fourth-century society.²⁷³

So what image of the lyric poet does Clearchus present in this anecdote? Before anything else, Philoxenus is presented as a performer: he always plays ‘at’ something. For the alleged sake of *opson*, this gastronomic Odysseus is as ready to play the parasite as to play the sympotic host treating his guests to a delicate dinner, being true to his name (Philo-xenos). At the same time however, when he performs, he refuses to perform poetry as a form of disguised commodity exchange: he will only sing for his supper if he has to (if the deli is closed) – otherwise, he will improvise another feast and play the hungry guest. This last reply shows an aspect of Philoxenus that had surfaced in the previous anecdote: Philoxenus points at the ambiguity of the status of the poet in the city. In Machon’s anecdote, the discourse of the poet on food and the body appears at odds with the traditional discourse of food and body in the sympotic tradition; in Clearchus’ anecdote, Philoxenus is a figure integrated in the life of the Greek *poieis* but questions the traditional relationship between lyric poet, patron and

²⁷³ The same kind of hesitation about the social status of the court poet can be read in an anecdote about Timotheus (Plutarch, *de fort. Alex.* 1 = *PMG* 801): Ἀρχελάω δὲ δοκοῦντι γλισχροτέρω περὶ τὰς δωρεὰς εἶναι Τιμόθεος ἄδων ἐνεσήμαινε πολλάκις τοῦτ’ ἰσχυρότατον·

σὺ δὲ τὸν γηγενέταν ἄργυρον αἰνεῖς·

ὁ δ’ Ἀρχέλαος οὐκ ἀμούσως ἀντεφώνησε· σὺ δέ γ’ αἰτεῖς. In that anecdote, Timotheus is acting in the traditional way of the poet at the court of a tyrant and recalls the figure of Simonides (about whom see J. M. Bell 1978; B. Gentili 1988, 161-163, especially 162: “In breaking away from the traditional mold of the inspired poet and the model of the poet as master of truth, Simonides inaugurates a process of secularization that replaces a special, privileged type of knowledge with what is essentially a lay person’s knowledge, more accessible and political.”)

audience in an aristocratic setting. By acting as symposium-man, Philoxenus also questions the role of the lyric poet in the democratic city, and in his last reply, he points out the mechanisms involved in the private banquet: by making his singing a form of money (he pays for his dinner by singing), and refusing to see it in any other way (while the groom insists on the ‘psychagogic’ effect of his song and focuses on the status of the poet in archaic society), he points out unambiguously that for him, poetry belongs to something that can be sold.²⁷⁴ But he also underlines the divorce between status and economics: Philoxenus plays at the parasite, but not for economic reasons (since he has the expensive stuff). He refuses the social, political and economic ties that used to link the poet with a patron, but also blurs the lines between social and economic status; ultimately, it is between the traditional image of the poet as attached to a patron or an aristocratic community, and the image of the (non-Athenian) poet, performing a new kind of wisdom for the city.²⁷⁵ The last section of this chapter will focus on that aspect.

3- Poetry and *parrhesia*

The two anecdotes I will present here are set in a slightly different setting. Rather than taking place in a democratic context, they stage the poet’s dealings with the Sicilian tyrant Dionysius, and deal with the issue of frank speech. While several

²⁷⁴ This is also what an anecdote about Philoxenus reported by Diogenes Laertes underlines: in the story (4.6.11), when the poet heard brickmakers singing one of his songs badly, he crushed their bricks and said “just as you destroy my work, I destroy yours.” In this story, Philoxenus puts his work in the same kind of network as the bricks of the brickmakers, something that belongs to the mercantile world. This anecdote is somewhat reminiscent of Homer’s dealing with the potters (as told in the pseudo-Herodotus *Life of Homer*, 32).

²⁷⁵ For a similar kind of ambiguity in the kind of social system to which the poet belongs in Pindar’s poetry, see L. Kurke 1991.

volumes entirely devoted to the issue of *parrhêsia* have appeared in the past few years,²⁷⁶ none of them has paid attention to two fourth-century figures embodying the concept: Stratonicus and Philoxenus. In the last section of this chapter, and in the context of the case-study I have offered, I will only focus on Philoxenus, while noting that the anecdotes related to Stratonicus would provide an instructive complementary (and counter-point) reading.²⁷⁷

Critic in the Quarries

Despite the difference of setting, an anecdote related by Diodorus of Sicily shares characteristics with the story of Clearchus just discussed: the poet presents a divided portrait of the dithyrambist, part profligate incapable of putting his appetites (either his big belly or his big mouth) in check, part aristocrat illustrating elite ideals, and part democratic citizen, testing the limits of *parrhêsia*. The story belongs to an aside in Diodorus' narrative and presents the literary activities of Dionysius in time of peace:²⁷⁸

²⁷⁶ I. Sluiter and R. Rosen (eds.) 2004, A. Saxonhouse 2006.

²⁷⁷ On Stratonicus as an important figure of fourth-century lyric culture: see the dramatic setting of the opening of [Plato]'s *Sisyphus*: “we waited for you when we were going to a show by Stratonicus.” Machon, Clearchus and Callisthenes (author of an opus of reminiscences of Stratonicus) offer us a variegated picture of the character. The *chreiae* featuring the musician revolve around three themes: musical skills, regionalism, and general wisdom. (In most anecdotes featuring Stratonicus, the musician underlines his lack of belonging to any place in particular). According to D. Gilula 2000, 433, Stratonicus is “a travelling harpist, no longer a member of any community but living of all, a music expert whose opinion is valued; he is a traveller with a keen eye and a sharp tongue. To this we may add what Stratonicus is not: he is not an ambassador of a *polis*, does not reveal interest in politics nor is his advice sought by politicians or kings. He is not asked questions about religion or ethics. What he is asked about pertains to his professional expertise, to places he saw in his travels and the loyal characteristics of people he met.” He is reported by Athenaeus as having been condemned because of his *parrhêsia*: Athenaeus 8.352d.

²⁷⁸ Most of book 14 and the beginning of book 15 of Diodorus of Sicily are devoted to Dionysius' rule. Diodorus (or his source) is careful to remind the reader of the literary culture of the time: ἤκμασαν δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν ἑνιαυτὸν οἱ ἐπισημότατοι διθυραμβοποιοί, Φιλόξενος Κυθήριος, Τιμόθεος Μιλήσιος, Τελέστης Σελινούντιος, Πολύειδος, ὃς καὶ ζῳγραφικῆς καὶ μουσικῆς εἶχεν ἐμπειρίαν (14. 46). On “an estimate of Dionysius, of his character and actions,” see P.J. Stylianou 1998, 69-70. Also: “Chapters 6-7 (...) largely taken up with Dionysius' literary concerns, namely his great fondness

Κατὰ δὲ τὴν Σικελίαν Διονύσιος ὁ τῶν Συρακοσίων τύραννος ἀπολελυμένος τῶν πρὸς Καρχηδονίους πολέμων πολλὴν εἰρήνην καὶ σχολὴν εἶχεν. διὸ καὶ ποιήματα γράφειν ὑπεστήσατο μετὰ πολλῆς σπουδῆς, καὶ τοὺς ἐν τούτοις δόξαν ἔχοντας μετεπέμπετο καὶ προτιμῶν αὐτοὺς συνδιέτριβε καὶ τῶν ποιημάτων ἐπιστάτας καὶ διορθωτὰς εἶχεν. ὑπὸ δὲ τούτων διὰ τὰς εὐεργεσίας τοῖς πρὸς χάριν λόγοις μετεωριζόμενος ἐκαυχᾶτο πολὺ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τοῖς ποιήμασιν ἢ τοῖς ἐν πολέμῳ κατορθωμένοις.

In Sicily, once the tyrant Dionysius of Syracuse had abandoned the war against the Carthaginians, he had plenty of peace and leisure. Hence he started writing poems with great zeal and he invited over the famous poets of the time, granted them great honour and spent time in their company, having them as instructors and editors of his poems. Flying high with the words with which these men were repaying his benefactions, Dionysius boasted a lot more about the poems than about his success in the war.

This introductory paragraph already sheds light on the ambiguous character of the tyrant. Two aspects are emphasized: on the one hand, Dionysius' love of letters (ποιήματα γράφειν ὑπεστήσατο μετὰ πολλῆς σπουδῆς) and his features as an enlightened ruler, on the other hand, the tyrannical aspect of his relationship with poetry.²⁷⁹ For the tyrant, poetry is only another way of managing his power in times of peace and the famous poets of the time play along the game of the tyrant, feeding his hybristic appetite for recognition (μετεωριζόμενος).²⁸⁰

Philoxenus' attitude contrasts with that of his contemporaries. His refusal to praise the tyrant's poetry is described in the next sentences:

[a] τῶν δὲ συνόντων αὐτῷ ποιητῶν Φιλόξενος ὁ διθυραμβοποιός, μέγιστον ἔχων ἀξίωμα κατὰ τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ ἰδίου ποιήματος, κατὰ τὸ συμπόσιον ἀναγνωσθέντων τῶν τοῦ τυράννου ποιημάτων μοχθηρῶν ὄντων ἐπηρεωτήθη περὶ τῶν ποιημάτων τίνα κρίσιν ἔχει. ἀποκρινάμενος δ' αὐτοῦ παρρησιωδέστερον, ὁ μὲν τύραννος προσκόψας τοῖς ῥηθεῖσι, καὶ

for writing poetry and with the problems this created (...) [lend themselves] to anecdote and the anecdotal nature of the chapters is obvious. Isocrates provides evidence (*Archid.* 44f.) that the truth about the tyrant became confused with legend while the tyrant still lived" (P.J. Stylianos 1998, 80).

²⁷⁹ See M. P. Lloicq-Berger 1966.

²⁸⁰ The honours (προτιμῶν) Dionysius gives to poets is the money he pays them for his poetic education (ἐπιστάτας καὶ διορθωτὰς), and benefactions in return (εὐεργεσίας) motivate their appreciation of poetry (τοῖς πρὸς χάριν λόγοις). The poems are to peace what military successes are to war; the parallel is reinforced by the use of the verb κατορθωμένοις, that reminds of his poetic tutors διορθωτὰς.

καταμεμψάμενος ὅτι διὰ φθόνον ἐβλασφήμησε, προσέταξε τοῖς ὑπῆρέταις παρακρήμα ἀπάγειν εἰς τὰς λατομίας. [b] τῇ δ' ὑστεραία τῶν φίλων παρακλούντων συγγνώμην δοῦναι τῷ Φιλοξένῳ, διαλλαγῆς αὐτῷ πάλιν τοὺς αὐτοὺς παρέλαβεν ἐπὶ τὸ συμπόσιον. προβαίνοντος δὲ τοῦ πότου, καὶ πάλιν τοῦ Διονυσίου καυχωμένου περὶ τῶν ἰδίων ποιημάτων, καὶ τινὰς στίχους τῶν δοκούντων ἐπιτετεῦχθαι προενεγκαμένου, καὶ ἐπερωτῶντος Ποῖά τινά σοι φαίνεται τὰ ποιήματα ὑπάρχειν; ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν εἶπε, τοὺς δ' ὑπῆρέτας τοῦ Διονυσίου προσκαλεσάμενος ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀπαγαγεῖν εἰς τὰς λατομίας. τότε μὲν οὖν διὰ τὴν εὐτραπελίαν τῶν λόγων μειδιάσας ὁ Διονύσιος ἤνεγκε τὴν παρρησίαν, τοῦ γέλωτος τὴν μέμψιν ἀμβλύνοντος. [c] μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ τῶν γνωρίμων ἅμ' ἐκείνου καὶ τοῦ Διονυσίου παραιτουμένων τὴν ἄκαιρον παρρησίαν, ὁ Φιλόξενος ἐπηγγείλατο παράδοξόν τινα ἐπαγγελίαν. ἔφη γὰρ διὰ τῆς ἀποκρίσεως τηρήσειν ἅμα καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὴν εὐδόκησιν τοῦ Διονυσίου, καὶ οὐ διεψεύσθη. τοῦ γὰρ τυράννου προενεγκαμένου τινὰς στίχους ἔχοντας ἐλεεινὰ πάθη, καὶ ἐρωτήσαντος Ποῖά τινα φαίνεται τὰ ποιήματα; εἶπεν Οἰκτρά, διὰ τῆς ἀμφιβολίας ἀμφοτέρα τηρήσας. ὁ μὲν γὰρ Διονύσιος ἐδέξατο τὰ οἰκτρά εἶναι ἐλεεινὰ καὶ συμπαθείας πλήρη, τὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα εἶναι ποιητῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐπιτεύγματα, ὅθεν ὡς ἐπηνεκότα αὐτὸν ἀπεδέχετο· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι τὴν ἀληθινὴν διάνοιαν ἐκδεξάμενοι πᾶν τὸ οἰκτρὸν ἀποτεύγματος φύσιν εἰρήσθαι διελάμβανον.

[a] Among the company of poets surrounding him, there was Philoxenus, who had a great reputation for the elaborateness of his own poems. During the symposium, after the tyrant's poems were read (they were truly wretched), he was asked what was his judgement of the poems. When Philoxenus replied in a very frank way, the tyrant was offended by his words, and reproaching him for slandering him out of jealousy, ordered his attendants to immediately bring the poet to the quarries. [b] The next day, after the tyrant's friends petitioned him to give his absolution to Philoxenus, Dionysius invited the same group to the symposium. As the drinking advanced, when once again Dionysius was bragging about his own compositions, he recited some lines that seemed to him to be well composed and then asked: "what do you think of these poems?" The poet said nothing else but calling Dionysius' attendants, he ordered them to bring him [Philoxenus] to the quarries. So this time, because of the way the poet had spoken, the tyrant smiled and could take the frankness, since the reproach had been blunted by the joke. [c] Soon after though, when Philoxenus' acquaintances and Dionysius himself asked him to stop using untimely frankness, the poet made a paradoxical offer. He would, he said, at the same time respect the truth and show respect to Dionysius, and he didn't lie. Indeed, the tyrant read some lines that depicted miserable events. When asked: "what do you think of these poems?" the poet answered "Pitiful," thus keeping both promises thanks to the vagueness of the term. For Dionysius took 'pitiful' to mean miserable and deserving pity, the very effects achieved by good poets, and hence understood him as approving them. The rest of the company however, understanding the real meaning, took it to mean 'wretched endeavour.'

In [a], we are confronted with a typical case of inappropriate *parrhesia*: the poet, asked to give his opinion, tells the unadulterated and unflattering truth. By doing so, he reinforces his independence vis-à-vis the tyrant and his status as a professional poet: Philoxenus is not ready to compromise his poetic standards to please a tyrant. But the tyrant’s response is not surprising, and brings us back to the world of politics, not literary criticism: true to his tyrant name, Dionysius punishes whoever does not recognize, or seems to belittle, his status. The unspoken rule of tyranny is that everybody goes by the tyrant’s rule: saying the tyrant’s poems are bad is saying the tyrant is bad.²⁸¹ His poetry is only a synecdoche for his power. There is no law, nor any appeal to protect Philoxenus, who has to follow the rules set by Dionysius – only the personal appeal of the poet’s friends (οἱ φίλοι) can gain him the forgiving of the monarch (τῶν φίλων παρακλούντων συγγνώμην δοῦναι τῷ Φιλοξένῳ).

In [b], Philoxenus, forgiven, is once again called upon to give his advice. This time, instead of straightforwardly opposing the ruler, he phrases his criticism in a witty way: he anticipates the tyrant’s reaction to criticism, and by making the tyrant deduct the poet’s critical judgement (rather than hearing a harsh statement) and draw conclusions for himself, he avoids raising Dionysius’ ire. The process involved here is known, in rhetoric manuals, as *λόγος ἐσχηματίσμενος* - figured speech.²⁸² Philoxenus’

²⁸¹ On *parrhesia* in democracy, see Carter in Sluiter and Rosen (eds.) 2004, and A. Saxonhouse 2006, who describes (88) the two important aspects of *parrhesia* in the following words: “1) the daring and courageous quality of the practice; those who spoke openly in Athens may have been at risk of legal action if they spoke on behalf of proposals contrary to the established laws and if they questioned the fundamental principles of their system of government; and 2) the unveiling aspects of the practice that entailed the exposure of one’s true thoughts, the resistance to hiding what is true because of deference to a hierarchical social and political world or a concern with how one appears before the gaze of others, that is, shame.”

²⁸² [Dionysius of Halicarnassus], *Techne Rhetorike*, chap.8.1: τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ σχῆμα λέγον μὲν ἂ βούλεται, δεόμενον δὲ εὐπρεπείας ἢ δι’ ἀξίωσιν τῶν προσώπων, πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος, ἢ δι’ ἀσφάλειαν πρὸς τοὺς

wit is here displayed, as is his mastery over rhetoric. It is a form of communication that consists in disguising frank advice-giving to a ruler, and making it more amenable to the recipient by including him in the process of sense-making. This is precisely what happens with Dionysius: instead of being a criticism addressed to Dionysius, Philoxenus' comment is a remark that shows both the poet's willingness to not insult the tyrant directly (by openly criticizing him), and relies on the tyrant's understanding and appreciation of wit. It is not criticism addressed as among equals in a democratic setting, but wit to be played along by the tyrant, in a hierarchic relationship that makes him aware, once again, of his superiority and flatters his pride. The text even identifies the rhetorical process at stake: διὰ τὴν εὐτραπελίαν τῶν λόγων μειδιάσας ὁ Διονύσιος ἤνεγκε τὴν παρρησίαν, τοῦ γέλωτος τὴν μέμψιν ἀμβλύνοντος. Both the form (τὴν εὐτραπελίαν τῶν λόγων) and the principle (τοῦ γέλωτος τὴν μέμψιν ἀμβλύνοντος) are pointed out.²⁸³

At the same time, this kind of un-straightforward speech can be paralleled with the kind of rhetoric that works at the symposium, requires equality between the speaker and the recipient and supposes the sharing of certain communication codes.²⁸⁴ This

ἀκούοντας. καὶ τούτῳ μὲν τῷ εἶδει οὐκ ἀντιλέγουσιν οἱ ῥητορικοί, ἀλλὰ καλοῦσιν αὐτὸ χρῶμα. τοὺς γὰρ εὐπροσώπους λόγους, οὐκ οἶδα ὅποθεν ὀρμηθέντες, οὕτως ὀνομάζουσιν, ὅταν ἢ πρὸς πατρίδα τις διαλέγηται ἢ πρὸς ἀριστέα ἢ πρὸς στρατηγὸν ἢ πρὸς ἀρχὴν τινα ἢ πρὸς ὅλην πόλιν. Figured speech is not a democratic practice, but the tool used by pseudo-Plato for example in his Seventh Letter, to address Dionysius.

²⁸³ Εὐτραπελία = wit. Aristotle's definition: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ εὐτραπελία μεσότης, καὶ ὁ εὐτράπελος μέσος τοῦ ἀγροίκου καὶ δυστραπέλου καὶ τοῦ βωμολόχου. ὥσπερ γὰρ περὶ τροφὴν ὁ σικχὸς τοῦ παμφάγου διαφέρει τῷ ὃ μὲν μηθὲν ἢ ὀλίγα καὶ χαλεπῶς προσίεσθαι, ὃ δὲ πάντα εὐχερῶς, οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἄγροικος ἔχει πρὸς τὸν φορτικὸν καὶ βωμολόχον: *Eudemian Ethics* 1234a and as πεπαιδευμένη ὑβρις *Rhetoric* 1389b. The "middling" connotations of this figure of style are clear in Aristotle's quotation.

²⁸⁴ On this aspect, see G. Nagy 1990, 148-150, quoting Theognis 681-682: ταῦτα μοι ἠνίχθω κεκρυμμένα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν./ Γινώσκου δ' ἄν τις καὶ κακὸν ἄν σοφὸς ἦ. In his description of the *ainos*, Nagy underlines the three dimensions that listeners must have: *sophoi*, *agathoi*, *philo*, of which the last one is defined as "those who are 'near and dear' and who are thereby interconnected to the poet and to each other, so that the message that is encoded in the poetry may be transmitted to them and through

might be the game that Philoxenus plays with the tyrant. The last part of the story confirms this idea: in [c], the tyrant and the poet's acquaintances address the question of Philoxenus' untimely frankness (ἄκαιρον παρρησίαν). The issue at stake is once again that of power-management: even Philoxenus' wit is untimely, since ultimately, what the tyrant wants is unequivocal praise and affirmation of his superiority. The apparently paradoxical solution Philoxenus proposes (pleasing the tyrant and being frank) is founded on another strategy: it is not a question of rhetoric anymore, but of hermeneutics. Once again, Philoxenus' mastery over language and wit is illustrated here as he proposes a term ambiguous enough to accept several interpretations (ἀμφιβολίας). It is the recipient's will and the *homophronêsis* of the audience that will motivate the right interpretation: with this ambiguous answer, 'pitiful,' Philoxenus resorts to a *sophos* statement, that can be understood differently whether the one who interprets it shares the knowledge of his interlocutor or not. The unspoken principle is that those who share the poet's mind will understand the true meaning of the words (οἱ δ' ἄλλοι τὴν ἀληθινὴν διάνοιαν ἐκδεξάμενοι).

So in the course of the story, Philoxenus has covered the ground from democratic *parrhesia* [a] to sympotic *sophos* discourse [c], while trying the type of figured speech addressed to a tyrant [b]. The anecdote summarizes the main characteristic of tyranny: from the start the tyrant wants to be admired but does not want to see the mechanisms of admiration or criticism. With the (unnamed) “*en vogue* poets of his times,” everything works fine: they admire Dionysius in compensation for the honours he gives them at his court. In the eyes of a democrat, this is flattery and

them: communication through community” (148). The same dynamics are at stake in Philoxenus' response, the message being encoded in the poet's direct speech to Dionysius.

demagoguery, but for the tyrant, this kind of exchange is fair. Philoxenus questions this political system of speech management: in part [a], he simply refuses to admire bad poetry and speaks his mind, illustrating the *parrhesia* of the democratic citizen who takes risks when speaking openly. In parts [b] and [c] he uses his wit to point out the mechanisms of the relationship between speech and power: without *actually* exercising free-speech and straightforward (literary) criticism, he shows in [b] that he is ready to face the consequence of his *parrhesia* (by accepting to be carried to the quarries) but goes around it by positing himself as an equal of the tyrant, sharing the same kind of discourse. Part [c] illustrates another model of relationship between speech and power: form is not the issue anymore, but reception. It is the social networks the recipient belongs to that determine the meaning: using an ambiguous word (‘pitiful’), the poet exercises a form of *parrhesia* for a certain audience (the ones who are in the know) while addressing an acceptable discourse to the tyrant.²⁸⁵

Ultimately, the anecdote reinforces the image of Philoxenus as a master of words, acting at the same time as critic, wise man and court poet: his unwillingness to compromise his poetic status by praising bad poetry threatens his social and political position: at the tyrant’s court, the two worlds cannot coexist, and Philoxenus shows his refusal to change his poetic standards to fit at a patron court.

²⁸⁵ There is one more aspect to the “politics of literary criticism” that is made clear in the next chapter of Diodorus’ / Ephorus’ narration. This part is devoted to Dionysius’ treatment of Plato (the philosopher). About Plato, Diodorus writes: δεῖ τὸν σοφὸν τοῖς τυράννοις ἢ ὡς ἥκιστα ἢ ὡς ἥδιιστα ὀμιλεῖν (7.1) Both the rhetorical and the hermeneutic tricks are meant to soften the blow and make the frequentation ‘sweeter.’ One more dimension is added in connection with Plato’s story: in 7.2, Ephorus underlines that “Dionysius did not renounce his zeal for poetry but dispatched to the Olympic Games actors with the most pleasing voices (εὐφρονότατους) who should present a musical performance of his poems for the assembled throng.” After the disastrous reception of his poem (and despite the first fresh interest for the actors’ pleasing voices (εὐφρονίαν ἐξέπληττον), Dionysius fell victim of melancholy, and soon suspected everybody of jealousy (φθονεῖν) for his compositions. The *demos* is less easily satisfied with flattery and sweetness than the tyrant is.

Philoxenus' fishy tyrant: Dionysius and Galatea

The last passage I would like to analyse comes from another Peripatetic author, Phaenias.²⁸⁶ It is perhaps the most complex because it involves all the elements discussed previously. The story involves again Philoxenus and the Sicilian tyrant Dionysius, and probably came from Phaenias' *On the Tyrants in Sicily*:²⁸⁷

Φαινίας δέ φησιν ὅτι Φιλόξενος ὁ Κυθήριος ποιητής, περιπαθῆς ὢν τοῖς ὄψοις, δειπνῶν ποτε παρὰ Διονυσίῳ ὡς εἶδεν ἐκεῖνον μὲν μεγάλην τρίγλαν παρατεθεῖσαν, ἑαυτῷ δὲ μικράν, ἀναλαβὼν αὐτὴν [εἰς τὰς χεῖρας] πρὸς τὸ οὖς προσήνεγκε. πυθομένου δὲ τοῦ Διονυσίου τίνος ἕνεκεν τοῦτο ποιεῖ, εἶπεν ὁ Φιλόξενος ὅτι γράφων τὴν Γαλάτειαν βούλουτό τινα παρ' ἐκεῖνης τῶν κατὰ Νηρέα πυθέσθαι· τὴν δὲ ἠρωτημένην ἀποκεκρίσθαι διότι νεωτέρα οὖσα ἀλοίη· διὸ μὴ παρακολουθεῖν· τὴν δὲ τῷ Διονυσίῳ παρατεθεῖσαν πρεσβυτέραν οὖσαν εἰδέναι πάντα σαφῶς ἃ βούλεται μαθεῖν. τὸν οὖν Διονύσιον γελάσαντα ἀποστεῖλαι αὐτῷ τὴν τρίγλαν τὴν παρακειμένην αὐτῷ. συνεμέθυε δὲ τῷ Φιλοξένῳ ἡδέως ὁ Διονύσιος. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν ἐρωμένην Γαλάτειαν ἐφοράθη διαφθεῖρων, εἰς τὰς λατομίας ἐνεβλήθη· ἐν αἷς ποιῶν τὸν Κύκλωπα συνέθηκε τὸν μῦθον εἰς τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν γινόμενον πάθος, τὸν μὲν Διονύσιον Κύκλωπα ὑποστησάμενος, τὴν δ' αὐλητρίδα Γαλάτειαν, ἑαυτὸν δ' Ὀδυσσεά.

According to Phaenias, Philoxenus the poet of Cythera, an amateur of delicacies, was once having dinner with Dionysius when he saw that a large mullet had been served to the tyrant and a small one to himself; he took the small fish, put it to his ear. When Dionysius asked what he was doing that for, Philoxenus replied that he was writing a *Galatea* and wanted some information about Nereus from the mullet, but the fish had replied that she was too young when she was caught and so could not follow what he said; the fish that had been served to Dionysius on the other hand was older and had a clear understanding of all he wanted to know. Dionysius laughed and passed to Philoxenus the fish that was set in front of him.

Dionysius also used to like getting drunk with Philoxenus. But when the poet was caught making advances to Dionysius' mistress Galateia, he was thrown to the quarries, where, working on his *Cyclops*, he made into a story what had happened to him, casting Dionysius in the role of the Cyclops, the flute-girl in that of Galateia, and himself as Odysseus.

The anecdote is twofold. The first part presents the poet at dinner with the Sicilian tyrant; the second covers post-dinner entertainment, what would correspond to the

²⁸⁶ On Phaenias' literary production, see Wehrli's commentary to Phaenias, 30-34. Also A. Podlecki 1970. He probably also composed a *On the Slaying of Tyrants for Motives of Revenge*.

²⁸⁷ Athenaeus 1. 6e - 7a = fr. 13 W.

Greek sympotic part of the evening, but what turns out to be more like a *kômos*.²⁸⁸ The two parts are strongly thematically connected and deal with the representation of the relationship between desire, poetry and politics, and between Philoxenus' poetic, social and political status.²⁸⁹

The anecdote starts with food, but not any kind of food. It is fish again, the *opson par excellence*; in this anecdote that stages seduction, it is worth recalling Davidson's remark that fish is a luxury dish that was "treated as quite irresistible, lusted after with a desire that comes close to a sexual one" in ancient Greece.²⁹⁰ It is neither the farinaceous element of man's diet (the *sitos*) that is served to the tyrant, nor the meat that was mostly enjoyed by citizens at civic (festival) meals, but food fit for a gourmet. This is why the question the poet brings to the table does not match what is on his plate: seeing that the tyrant gets a big fish while he is served a small one, the poet wittily finds a way of pointing out the inequality in portions.²⁹¹ The question of who gets what, in what proportion and what justifies the attribution of parts (either at dinner or in politics) is at the centre of the Athenian democratic system and comes up in

²⁸⁸ The Platonic symposium soon breaks up after Alcibiades' *kômos*' violent entrance (on which see B. Pütz 2003).

²⁸⁹ On Dionysius' relationship with the arts, see M. P. Loicq-Berger 1966. Cicero called him *doctus a puero et artibus ingenuis eruditus* (*Tusculanes*, V. 63).

²⁹⁰ On *opson*, see Plato's discussions in the *Republic*, and Davidson's remarks underlining the continuity between Athens and Sicily in matters of fish appreciation: "The strength of this Athenian appetite is demonstrated most graphically by passages in which fish are involved in a literary or metaphorical seduction." (8). Red mullet was, among fish, one of the finest and most appreciated. See Gow 1965, 67, commenting on a passage of Machon that involves red mullet, with reference to D.W. Thompson 1947.

²⁹¹ For other anecdotes showing Philoxenus' unease with tyranny, and the tyrannical ideology, see for example Plutarch *On Borrowing* (*Moralia* 831f): καὶ τί δεῖ τούτους λέγειν, ὅπου Φιλόξενος ὁ μελοποιὸς ἐν ἀποικίᾳ Σικελικῇ, κλήρου μετασχὼν καὶ βίου καὶ οἴκου πολλὴν εὐπορίαν ἔχοντος, ὀρών δὲ τρυφὴν καὶ ἡδυπάθειαν καὶ ἀμουσίαν ἐπιξωριάζουσαν μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς, εἶπεν, ἐμὲ ταῦτα ἀγαθὰ οὐκ ἀπολεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ταῦτα καὶ καταλιπὼν ἐτέροις τὸν κλῆρον ἐξέπλευσεν. This passage from Plutarch is an interesting counterpoint to other stories about tyranny, as it depicts the poet as a wise man praising middleness.

particular in the apportionment of meat-pieces after the sacrifice.²⁹² This is why by pointing out that the big man will eat a big fish and the poet a small one, Philoxenus engages with a clearly political question and points out the difference between tyranny and democracy, their mechanisms and justifications.²⁹³

It thus appears, at first sight, that Philoxenus acts as a witty critic of tyranny, again using free (if indirect) speech to underline the obvious discrepancy in the repartition of fish-portions. Because of the allegorical nature of the poet's remark (the subterfuge of talking to the fish), the tyrant Dionysius does not take offence and accepts switching portions with a smile.

Philoxenus however does not make his speech a piece of political oratory to address the topic of 'what is fair and what is not' in matters of fish-eating; he presents himself, as we have seen many times, primarily as a poet, busying himself with poetic matters and gathering mythological material for a new piece, not as a citizen of a democratic *polis* making a point in the agora about civic and sociocultural practices. It is the riddling language of the symposiast that he uses, not speaking straightforwardly but as among equals sharing the same language (as seen in the b part of the previous anecdote), and expecting fellow-drinkers to understand sentences imbued with

²⁹² Athens dealt with that by attributing pieces of meat on the basis of lots-casting (on which, see P. Schmitt-Pantel 1992).

²⁹³ It is worth observing that the tyrant did not grab the bigger fish for himself, he was served the biggest fish. The same is true of Polycrates' fish, in Herodotus' *Histories*. Contrasting this fish to Domitian's turbot, Davidson comments that Herodotus' story is "a neat way of making the tyrant's power the very mechanisms that gets the fish back to his own table, but the idea of a fish 'worthy of your rule' is a perfectly plausible notion in Greek terms." In a general discussion of tyranny and revolution, J. Davidson 1997, 299: "In the light of Greek insistence on the equality of the sacrificial community, then, an equality re-enacted in practice at every blood-sacrifice, the descriptions of politicians eating greedily has automatic overtones of a power-grab."

sophia.²⁹⁴ There is thereby a slight paradox in his position: while making a political point that relies on democratic ideology, he uses the rhetoric and ‘policing techniques’ of the aristocrat attending the symposium. But it is precisely the poetic *persona* he assumes that allows him to make a political point; in a way, Philoxenus continues the Herodotean tradition of the wise man visiting the tyrant and delivering a piece of wisdom, and presents himself not as a court poet but as an independent inspired poet.

But there is more to the anecdote. For one thing, Philoxenus does not stop at the discourse: thanks to his witty rhetorical trick, the poet ends up getting the best (at least the biggest) share of fish, like good tricksters do. Moreover, the discourse that we have so far read as political also has erotic connotations: Philoxenus presents himself as working on a ‘Galatea’ – a story that takes its name from a Nereid, and that very likely presented her, like most of her mythical sisters and their land counterparts (the nymphs), as a love object. He starts his little political skit by taking the mullet (τριγλα, female in Greek)²⁹⁵ in his hands: ἀναλαβὼν αὐτήν [εἰς τὰς χεῖρας] πρὸς τὸ οὖς προσήνεγκε. Not only the verb (λαμβάνω) indicates violence (including the violence of unwilling sex), but even the εἰς τὰς χεῖρας involves more physical contact with the fish than a Greek used to proper table manners would want. Even the fish’s supposed talk is full of sexual innuendoes, as if she were playing with the poet’s desire by using the vocabulary of the hunt (with ἀλοίη), usually associated with the quest for the

²⁹⁴ On that aspect, see Theognis 681-2: ταῦτά μοι ἠνίχθω κεκρυμμένα τοῖσ' ἀγαθοῖσιν/ γινώσκοι δ' ἄν τις καὶ κακόν, ἄν σοφὸς ᾖ. On the relationship between symposium and politics, and the symposium as a miniature city, see Nagy-Figueira 1985.

²⁹⁵ On ‘sea animals’ as double-entendre for sexual organs: see J. Henderson 1991, 142. Henderson only mentions the fish called τὸ θαλάσσιον αἰδοῖον, the cavity of seashells and the urchins as specific puns on sexual parts. Hetaira is hidden: her language too. Is he indulging in pleasure, all the way, from persuasion (like hetaera) to consumption. For other parallels between fish/hetaera/politics, see *Wasps* 493-502.

beloved, and by referring to her tender age (νεωτέρα).²⁹⁶ Phaenias' language indicates that Philoxenus might desire his fish more than he wants to show: his “consuming passion” (to use Davidson's subtitle) for the mullet might be even stronger than his desire for making a political point for the hungry tyrant. In this light, Philoxenus appears like a character with an appetite more tyrannical than a tyrant's, rather than as a wise man delivering a political philosophy lesson to a hungry ruler. How are we to reconcile those two images, or readings, of Philoxenus?

The second part of the anecdote might provide an answer. After getting drunk with Dionysius (συνεμέθυε), the poet tries to seduce the tyrant's mistress Galatea. As a punishment for his misbehaviour, Dionysius (just as in the previous anecdote) has him thrown into the quarries. Philoxenus, who previously underlined the non-isonomic attribution of portions and was adopting the riddling language of the elite has behaved as a bad symposiast, showing *hybris* and lack of *sophrosyne*, in his incapability to contain his appetite for drink and sex – Philoxenus is here the fourth-century version of Alcibiades, a fellow symposiast who displays *paranomia*, “this kind of disregard for norms (...) considered dangerous in any society and (...) typical of tyrants.”²⁹⁷ This anxiety about tyrannical behaviour that accompanies, or is manifested by, excessive drinking is typical of wisdom poetry, as illustrated by the *Theognidea*:

οἶνόν τοι πίνειν πουλὸν κακόν: ἦν δέ τις αὐτὸν
πίνῃ ἐπισταμένως, οὐ κακὸς ἀλλ' ἀγαθός. (211 - 212)

Drinking lots of wine is bad; but if one drinks it reasonably, he is not a bad man,

²⁹⁶ On the link between eros and hunt, see Schnapp 1989. One only has to look at the beginning of the *Protagoras* and Socrates' allusion to his hunting Alcibiades. (On that aspect, see H. Segvic 2006, 248-250).

²⁹⁷ J. Davidson 1997, 300. See also *Ion* of Chios (fr. 26 W, vv.14-16): εὐθύμων συμποσίων πρύτανι, / χαῖρε· δίδου δ' αἰῶνα καλῶν ἐπήρανε ἔργων / πίνειν καὶ παίζειν καὶ τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν.

but a gentleman.

It is closely connected to injunctions to moderation and ‘middleness’ associated to civic behaviour:

Μηδὲν ἄγαν ἄσχαλε ταρασσομένων πολιητέων
Κύρνε, μέσην δ' ἔρχε τὴν ὁδὸν ὡσπερ ἐγώ. (219 - 220)

Don't get excessively distressed, Kurnos, when your fellow-citizens are causing trouble, but follow the middle road, as I do.

So in the second part of the story, Philoxenus does not behave as a democratic citizen teaching a lesson on how to share food, or an aristocrat displaying the ethics of middleness: the poet is presented as the real tyrannical man, a slave to his belly and a threat to his fellow symposiasts, and Dionysius, the amenable ruler in the first part of the story, turns out to be the proper symposiarch, the one who regulates excess (εὐθουντήρα κακῆς ὕβριος ἡμετέρης, Theognis, 40), rules out the potential tyrant and brings an unruly gathering of fellow-drinkers back to order (*kosmos*) and good measure (*metron*). This image of the poet (incapable of resisting his bodily desires and bound to various kinds of excess, physical, social and political) ends up confirming the one presented by Aristotle: the *akolastos*.

In retrospect, the first part of this anecdote was only preparing the second: the alleged subject of Philoxenus' first dithyramb (Galatea) announces the second, real one, that the poet will end up composing, by the name of the tyrant's mistress. Moreover, by a not-so-subtle conflation of images, the poet's seizing of the fish paves the way to the seizing of the homonymous girl, and the poet's uncontrollable appetite

for the tyrant's fish was a hint of his desire for the tyrant's girl.²⁹⁸ The two parts are indeed closely linked, thematically and structurally: the transformation of the status of the object of desire, from an object of gaze into a subject of discourse, is a *topos* in Greek literature, from Sappho's poetry to the novels.²⁹⁹ It is also at the centre of this anecdote: Philoxenus starts by seeing (ὡς εἶδεν ἐκείνω μὲν μεγάλην τριγλαν παρατεθείσαν, ἑαυτῷ δὲ μικράν), then silently performs (seizes the fish) and finally makes the connection with his poetry (when he answers Dionysius). The next part of the anecdote involves the same elements (gaze, action and poetry) but in a reverse order: this time, it is Philoxenus who is seen (ἐφωράθη διαφθείρων) in the act of seducing the tyrant's mistress and he is the object of a violent action (ἐνεβλήθη seized and thrown to the quarries). The subject of his miseries (τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν γεγόμενον πάθος), he transforms into a poem.

Most commentators have refused to read the anecdote at face value, and presented it as a historicist fiction destined to explain the creation of the *Galatea*. Yet the story tells us more about the way the poet and his place in society was perceived and projected in the fourth century than about the actual circumstances of the poetic composition of the *Galatea*. For there was an alternate origin given for the composition of the *Galatea*, recorded by Theocritus' scholiast:³⁰⁰

²⁹⁸ J. Davidson 1997, 10: "Fish seduces and conquers. It functions like the forces of persuasion, or the allure of a heatera, or the magical power of charms." 288: "Fish very often features in these power banquets." After the description of Domitians's turbot, 16: "Fish you were free to fall in love with, grabbing the best bits for yourself. Here in this very small section of the Athenian economy in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE we have what looks like a fully-fledged system of consumer objects."

²⁹⁹ On desire, gaze and discourse, see S. Goldhill 2002, 374: "the erotics of gaze is a hot topic. The "look" has become a privileged site for articulating the tensions and ambiguities of how 'erotic experience' is conceptualized in contemporary society."

³⁰⁰ Schol. Theocr. 6 (f) (p.189 Wendel). For the importance of Philoxenus' poetry for the Hellenistic poets, see J. Hordern 2004.

Δοῦρίς φησιν (*FGrH* 76 F 58), διὰ τὴν εὐσοβίαν τῶν θρεμμάτων καὶ τοῦ γάλακτος πολυπλήθειαν τὸν Πολύφημον ἰδρύσασθαι ἱερὸν παρὰ τῇ Αἴτνῃ Γαλατείας. Φιλόξενον δὲ τὸν Κυθήριον ἐπιδημήσαντα, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον ἐπινοῆσαι τὴν αἰτίαν, ἀναπλάσαι, ὅτι Πολύφημος ἦρα τῆς Γαλατείας.

According to Duris, in gratitude for the rich pasturage for his flocks and of the abundant supply of milk (gala), Polyphemus built a shrine to Galatea near mount Aetna. But Philoxenus of Cythera, when he visited, unable to find the reason for the shrine, invented the story that Polyphemus was in love with Galatea.

In this version, there is no reference to the recasting of roles, just the etymological guesswork attributed to Philoxenus, and no identification between Philoxenus and Odysseus, Philoxenus is presented as a not so clever poet with romantic concerns in mind.

Yet the end of the anecdote gives another aetiology for Philoxenus' *Galatea* and the myth of Polyphemus in love: Phaenias makes the dithyramb an allegory of the anecdote just told. While it would be most helpful here to have Aristotle's testimony on the *Cyclopes* of Timotheus and Philoxenus in comparison with their epic counterpart, the poor state of the *Poetics*' text only adds confusion to the matter. Whether the *Galatea* is indeed an allegory of the poet's experience at Dionysus' court, or the anecdote was invented to make sense of the features of the dithyramb, it is impossible to tell. But taking the anecdote at face value throws some additional light on the image of Philoxenus as perceived by the Peripatetic author of the anecdote. For first, by using an epic figure and reworking an epic subtext, Philoxenus makes a generic statement about his poetry: it is the more romantic, fantastic, comic parts of the epic tradition that Philoxenus appropriates for his dithyramb – a tendency that is also illustrated in other mythological romantic inventions, like Licymnius' *Nannis* and other fictions (on which see chapter 4). At the same time, by staging Homeric characters in lyric form,

Philoxenus imbues his characters with the qualities of their epic counterparts, but by the same token, attributes some of their socio-political qualities to the allegorized characters: thus the Cyclops' character is a projection of Dionysius', Galatea's of the tyrant's mistress', and Odysseus' of Philoxenus'. Dionysius appears as the same kind of powerless insular creature as the Cyclops: both are blind,³⁰¹ confused over the rules of hospitality (what to do when a Greek does not act as a proper *xenos* but enters your home and has a go at your cheese / fish / mistress?) and violently over-react against guests who go too far. As far as Galatea goes, although she appears in Homer, there is no earlier attestation of Polyphemus' love for her, but by her very name and nature, she is (like the tyrant's mistress?) a likely prey. Finally and most importantly, Philoxenus takes on Odysseus' characteristics: they share rhetorical skill, *polytropos*-ness and a *mêtis* that Philoxenus has shown in the previous part of the story, with his ability to change the situation to his benefit.³⁰² This last, explicit, example of Philoxenus as an Odyssean figure constitutes a crowning conclusion to a series of other stories in which Philoxenus' Odyssean features could be read.

Conclusion to chapter 3

Despite the variety of settings in which the anecdotes depict Philoxenus, several recurring features about the poet have emerged. Whether these traits represent the

³⁰¹ Scholiast on Aristophanes' *Plutus*, commenting on vv.296 ff.: and testimonium of Didymus on 'Demosthenes,' Answer to Philips' Letter (p.45s Pearson-Stephens): (trans. Campbell) "At the siege of Methone Philip lost his right eye... The story (from Duris of Samos, FGH76) about the pipers is told in the same terms by Marsyas: when Philip is holding musical competitions shortly before his accident it happened by a strange coincidence that all the pipers performed the *Cyclops*, Antigenides that of Philoxenus, Chrysogonus that of Stesichorus, Timotheus that of Oeniades."

³⁰² According to Synesius' letter (Patr. Gr. 66. 1500 b-d = PMG 818), paraphrasing Philoxenus' *Cyclops*, Odysseus presented himself as a charlatan, a sorcerer: γόης γάρ εἰμι (...) ἀλλ' ἐγώ τοι καὶ ἐπωδάς οἶδα καὶ καταδέσμοις καὶ ἐρωτικὰς κατὰναγκας, αἷς οὐκ εἰκὸς ἀντισχεῖν οὐδὲ πρὸς βραχὺ τὴν Γαλάτειαν. This reinforces the connection with Odysseus.

actual historical poet, or not, is hard to tell in most cases, and determining where history gives place to fiction has not been the object of this chapter. What I have looked for are hints about how the relationship between poet and society in the fourth century was perceived, and represented, by later authors, through the examination of one figure, the dithyrambic poet Philoxenus.

It has appeared that most anecdotes can be read on three levels: first they all present a discourse on the poet's stance (as critic of poetry, or as entertainer and master of rhetoric); whether at the tyrant's court or at a private wedding, the poet's authority is never contested. However, the anecdotes depict the ways in which the poet conveys his poetic authority in different ways: he sometimes presents himself in the tradition of inspired poets and wise men, sometimes as a court poet making his speech sound like the riddling speech of a symposiast addressing similarly-minded drinkers.

Secondly, most of the anecdotes integrate a moral component and deal to some degree with the question of managing desire (for food, drink or sex), and excess (in food, sex and speech), in society. On one level, it still relates to questions of literary criticism and can be read as illustrations or representations of the poet's new musical excesses (by contrast with the norm set by "old" music). On another level, it is connected with the discourse on social norms: it is not only by their poetry but by their position in society that the New Musicians appear "out of bounds."

This is the third way the anecdotes can be read: as discourse on the social and political place of the New Musician in society. In the contexts depicted in the anecdotes, the place of the poet in society is a complex one: on the one hand, he is presented in situations reminding of the contexts of performance of archaic society

(symposium, wedding, at the court of a tyrant), and seems to adopt some of the traditional roles of the lyric poet. On the other hand, he presents himself as refusing to belong to those sociability networks: either at the private banquet or at the tyrant's table, Philoxenus refuses to belong to networks and shows his independence. He displays the language of democracy, but paradoxically uses his position as poet to do so and approach the important fourth-century problems of *isegoria* and *parrhesia*.

PART II – TEXTS AND CONTEXTS

Chapter 4 – Poetics of Theatre Lyric

While the previous chapters have focused on the discourse about the musical revolution and the changing place of the poet in fourth-century society as reflected in anecdotes, the pages that follow concentrate on the texts themselves. Each chapter focuses on one major lyric subgenre and performance context, the first of which is the dithyrambic production.³⁰³

Most of our textual evidence for fourth-century lyric is indeed related to a “minor” (according to Slater) aspect of the festivals, the dramatic contests, which has so far justified the scholarly focus nearly exclusively on “theatre lyric”. A new contextual approach however, informed by the results of archaeological studies and taking into consideration the material conditions of the festival, has proved the usefulness of thinking about the dithyramb in terms of performance. This is illustrated, for example, by E. Csapo’s article on the Politics of New Music.³⁰⁴ As opposed to most critics, who justify the changes of poetic style observed in most late fifth- and fourth-century compositions only by a vague reference to the thirst for innovation in a new age,³⁰⁵ Csapo attributes the material cause of verbal innovation to pipe music³⁰⁶ and

³⁰³ A recent paper of W. Slater has showed how “festival” itself is a vast and varied category and how Greek festivals are “not only are defined differently: they are different. Drama, even religious performance, was in fact mostly a minor aspect of one part of some Greek festivals” (W. Slater in P. Wilson 2007, 22).

³⁰⁴ E. Csapo 2004.

³⁰⁵ A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 51: “On the one hand, it was clearly a movement in the direction of freedom and adequacy of expression, a revolt against stereotyped forms which had come to be felt artificial. On the other hand, it was perverted by the passion for *mimesis* in the sense of mere reproduction of sounds (often non-musical) sounds and other effects.”

³⁰⁶ E. Csapo 2004, 217.

defines a series of phonetic, syntactic, and semantic features as characteristic of the “poetics of New Music.”

Although Csapo’s detailed analysis is remarkably helpful in tying together the musical and verbal aspect of New Music,³⁰⁷ and the connection between the dramatic events and other musical performances occurring during the festival, his emphasis on “contextual change” does not account for some important trends observable in the texts. The features he underlines as typical of the poetics of the New Dithyramb (the “extravagant compounds, concatenations of adjectives, nouns, or participial phrases, the stringing of subclauses, usually paratactically, often asyndetically”) are the features that most (ancient and modern) critics present, but a good characterization of Timotheus’ style requires more.³⁰⁸ For example, even though the “agglutinative syntax of New Music” can be explained by the “potentiality of the pipes for indefinitely sustained tones and phrases,” one has to recognize (as Csapo does, but only briefly) that these stylistic features are themselves typical of the dithyrambic genre (as far as we can tell from the remains of Pindar’s and Bacchylides’ dithyrambs); moreover, this focus on the material aspect of music does not permit to justify, to only mention one example, the choice of imagery for Timotheus’ *Persians*.

This chapter thus endeavours to analyze the poetics of New Music texts, not only as songs in context, but also as texts belonging to a poetic tradition. Rather than isolating features that critics have seen as “representative of the innovations of the New Dithyramb,” I propose to combine attention to context with attention to the tradition.

³⁰⁷ See especially his treatment of melism (223) and pitch accent (223-225); on which see also J. Irigoin 2004 and 2007.

³⁰⁸ For an different take on the syntax of the *Persians*, see G. Brussich 1970, 64-66 (“la struttura della frase è semplice (...) Il grande numero di indicativi concorda con la struttra generalmente paratattica del periodo. Le proposizioni raramente sono asindetice”); J. Hordern 2002, 50-55.

1- Stylistic innovations in New Music

The testimony of the comic poet Antiphanes contrasting Philoxenus (who had, by that time become a classic) with the newest generation of poets is helpful in thinking about the dynamics between tradition and innovation. The poet's condemnation of the newest generation of New Poets is ironically representative of the accusations against both aspects (verbal and musical) of New Music itself.³⁰⁹

ταῦτα καὶ ὁ Κυθήριος Φιλόξενος, ὃν ἐπαινῶν Ἀντιφάνης ἐν τῷ
Τριταγωνιστῇ φησι·
πολύ γ' ἐστὶ πάντων τῶν ποιητῶν διάφορος
ὁ Φιλόξενος. πρώτιστα μὲν γὰρ ὀνόμασιν
ἰδίοισι καὶ καινοῖσι χρῆται πανταχοῦ
ἔπειτα τὰ μέλη μεταβολαῖς καὶ χρώμασιν
ὡς εὖ κέκραται. θεὸς ἐν ἀθρώποισιν ἦν
ἐκεῖνος, εἰδὼς τὴν ἀληθῶς μουσικὴν.
οἱ νῦν δὲ κισσόπλεκτα καὶ κρηναῖα καὶ
ἀνθεσιπότατα μέλεα μελέοις ὀνόμασι
ποιοῦσιν ἐμπλέκοντες ἀλλότρια μέλη.

These are the lines of Philoxenus of Cythera, whom Antiphanes praises in the *Third Actor* in the following words:

By far superior to all other poets is Philoxenus. For first he uses his own words, and new, everywhere, and then he uses well modulations and colours in his songs. He is a god among men, that great man who truly knows song and dance. But contemporary poets compose miserable songs that are ivy-twined, and fountains, and flower-flitting, and weave the tunes of others with miserable words.

In a manner typical of comic rewriting of other genres, Antiphanes reproduces the style of the lyric poets to condemn the stylistic features of their poetry: he uses compound-adjectives and mixed metaphors, themselves typical of the way archaic poets described

³⁰⁹ Athenaeus 14. 643 d-e = fr. 207 K-A. On this passage, see W. D. Anderson 1968, 161; F. Conti Bizzarro 1993-1994; A. Fongoni 2005, for a non-ironic reading. The passage can of course be read as ironic, but if read at face value, it brings an interesting light on the “afterlife” of the New Musicians, i.e. their immediate successors.

their poetry.³¹⁰ Moreover, he attributes to the new poets, whom he disapproves of, the very features that other critics attribute to Philoxenus, whom he admires.

Rather than presenting the formal and verbal innovations associated with New Music (among others, the use of words that are not only ἴδια καὶ καινὰ but also κισσόπλεκτα καὶ κρηναῖα καὶ ἀνθρσιπότατα),³¹¹ I would like to suggest elements of a definition of a “fourth-century poetics” and show how the verbal features that are often set apart as typical of “dithyrambic diction” cannot be understood in isolation, but should rather be analysed as part of a larger set of thematic and rhetorical changes in the lyric poetry of the period.

1.1 ‘Extravagant’ compounds

Compound words are one of the striking features of fourth-century dithyrambic poetry, as Aristotle notes in both the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric*.³¹² Most fragments contain at least one compound, several contain a string of them. A fragmentary address to Health by Licymnius is representative of this feature:³¹³

λιπαρόμματε μᾶτερ ὑψίστα θρόνων
σεμνῶν Ἀπόλλωνος βασιλεια ποθεινὰ
πραύγελως Ὑγία

gleaming-eye mother, highest queen of the holy throne of Apollo, gentle-
laughed Health...

³¹⁰ Including the metaphor of flight and weaving, both used to describe the poet’s activity in Pindar (on the flight metaphor, see for example G. Most 1985, 150-151; for weaving, see D. Steiner 1986).

³¹¹ See A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 51: “there can be little doubt that Timotheus, and perhaps some of his contemporaries, did not know where to stop, and often became ludicrous, both in sound and language – the more so because the excessive predominance of the music tended to make the libretto vapid and silly.”

³¹² Respectively 1459a and 1406b (where he analyses the appropriateness of the use of compound words (ὀνόματα τὰ διπλᾶ καὶ τὰ ἐπίθετα πλείω) for orators who want to “enthuse” their audience). On this aspect, see A. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 21.

³¹³ *PMG* 769, possibly not a dithyramb but what Sextus Empiricus calls a prelude: προειπῶν (or an address?) in dactylic meters, before a dithyramb?

These compounds can barely be called “extravagant” however, for most of the time, they are either variations on Homeric compounds or creations that are not difficult to analyse:³¹⁴ for example, the first adjective of the fragment, λιπαρόμματε,³¹⁵ can be compared to Bacchylides’ λιπαρόζωνος (Ode 8. 49), the Homeric and Pindaric λιπαροπλόκαμος (*Il.* 19. 126; fr. 33c S-M) and Pindar’s λιπαρότροφος (Paeon 12. 6 S-M = G1 Rutherford). In the same way, the second one, πραύγελως, although not found before Licymnius but used later in *AP* 9. 229 and 10. 4, can be compared to Pindar’s πραύμητις (*Ol.* 6.42) and Erinna’s πραυλόγος (fr. 2). In the case of Timotheus, G. Brussich has already offered a list of the compounds found in the surviving lines of the poet and noted the prevalence of words that come from Homer and the tragic poets.³¹⁶

This corresponds to a

gusto per la ricerca del termine insolito, inteso come raffinato ornamento del discorso poetico, che comincia a diffondersi proprio verso la fine del V sec. a.Cr. per opera del suo coetaneo Antimaco di Colofone e che avrà i suoi maggiori continuatori nell’ età alessandrina.³¹⁷

A note qualifies Timotheus’ tendency to *glossare*: the glosses are not “vistose o antichissime come quelle dell’ autore del Rhesos o di Antimaco di Colofone” but constitute a first step in the direction of qualifying Timotheus’ technique.³¹⁸

Moreover, some papyrus fragments have been identified as lists of compound adjectives and associated with the dithyrambic school; they are more a puzzle for interpretation in terms of the function of such lists than in terms of the listed items

³¹⁴ There are only a few hapaxes: διφρούχοις *PMG* 757, 3; ἀειζώου *PMG* 762, 2.

³¹⁵ Also used by Aristotle in his *Physiognomy* 808a, in a passage where compounds abound.

³¹⁶ G. Brussich 1970, 72-76.

³¹⁷ G. Brussich 1970, 70.

³¹⁸ I will examine more at length in section 2.

themselves.³¹⁹ For example, *PMG* 927 has three items, of which the last two are triple compounds:

- v. 49 χρυσὸς αἰγλήεις
- v. 55 βοτρυοκαρποτόκος
- v. 56 ἀστερομαρμαροφεγγής

gleaming gold,³²⁰ grape-bearing clusters,³²¹ star-flashing light.³²²

And *PMG* 928 offers an alphabetical list of heteroclite adjectives:

- ἀλογενέτωρ
- δαιτόποινος
- ἐτυμόγλωσσος
- ἐτυμόμαντις
- ἐτυμόφανος
- ἐτυμοφάς
- καμψίγουνος
- καμψίχειρ
- κυανοέθειραι
- μιλτοπάραιος
- σιδηροπέρης
- φοινικοπάραιος

sea-begetter,³²³ avenger of the feast (?), true-tongued, true-prophet, true-revealing, true-speaking, knee-bending, hand-bending, dark-haired, red-cheeked, iron-destructive, crimson-cheeked.

Their construction varies: some are built on the model noun + noun (ἀλογενέτωρ, δαιτόποινος (?)), some on adjective + noun (ἐτυμόγλωσσος) and some on adjective + adjective (ἐτυμόφανος). Some are Homeric (μιλτοπάραιος, *Il.* 2. 637, *Od.* 9. 125; φοινικοπάραιος, *Od.* 11. 124) and refer to ships; the compound based on a noun in the plural (κυανο-έθειραι) seems typically Homeric (ἔθειραι is found only in the plural in

³¹⁹ Hamburg papyrus 128, c. 250 BC, Theophrastus, *On Diction* = *PMG* 927; and Hibeh papyrus (c. 270-230 BC) = *PMG* 928. These adjectives all seem to be applicable to Dionysus.

³²⁰ Homeric formula: of Olympus (αἰγλήεντος Ὀλύμπου *Il.* 1. 532 *Od.* 20. 103). Also στρεπταίγλαν in *Clouds* 331 = *PMG* 830.

³²¹ Other βοτρυο- compounds: βοτρυηφόρος (Philo, 1. 681); βοτρυόδωρος (Aristophanes, *Pax* 520, in a paratragic passage); βοτρυόπαις (Theocritus *Ep.* 4. 8; *AP* 11. 33).

³²² Μαρμαρο- compounds appears twice in the *Persians*: μαρμαροπτύχαις, 38; μαρμαροφεγγεῖς, 92.

³²³ Xenophanes has πόντος γενέτωρ νεφέων ἀνέμων τε (fr. 30. 5 W).

Homer, where it describes only a horse's mane and the horsehair crest on helmets, for example *Il.* 16. 795, 19. 832, 22. 315). Others apply to a war context (σιδηροπέρης and perhaps δαιτόποινος).

The use of compounds, however, is far from being a feature specifically proper to fourth-century poetry.³²⁴ It is a feature of all Greek poetry, and of some early-classical poets in particular, Pindar and Aeschylus.³²⁵ The latter in the *Frogs* is accused of using words that are on their high horses, as it were, and difficult to grasp (ρήμαθ' ἰπλόκρημνα,/ ἄ ξυμβαλεῖν οὐ ράδι' ἦν, *Frogs* 929); the character Euripides describes Aeschylus' style as full of ῥήματ' βόεια, (...) ὀφρῶς ἔχοντα καὶ λόφους, δειν' ἄττα μορμωπά,/ ἄγνωτα τοῖς θεωμένοις (words as big as an ox, with crests and brows, terrible and hideous to behold, unknown to the spectators, *Frogs* 924-6),³²⁶ and this complicated vocabulary results in a lack of *sapheia*.³²⁷ This is an important part of Aeschylus' dramatic poetics, and not unique to the New Musicians, but it does not get more than a footnote in Csapo's presentation.³²⁸

1.2 Periphraseis and obscurity

In addition to using a number of compounds that seem comparatively greater than in any other surviving poetry, the poets often use riddling circumlocutions. This

³²⁴ Denniston *GPS* 129 refers to the experiments of Gorgias, Thrasymachos, and Antiphon. Janssen 1984, 130 (quoting Breitenbach): “and it is very much true of Timotheus: his literary language (=Kunstsprache) can only be estimated at its true value, when one has acquired some insight in to the *prose* that he (=Euripides) knew: the prose of the elevated literary language, whose artistic moulding by the sophists Euripides witnessed, is one of the most important sources.”

³²⁵ For a list similar to the one in *PMG* 927 and *PMG* 928, see *P.Hibeh* II 172 = *SH* 991, and Maehler 2004, 26-27, who notes that four of the compounds of such a list are found only in Bacchylides.

³²⁶ For a good characterization of Aeschylus' language, see C. Collard 2002, lvi-lv.

³²⁷ Aeschylus' lack of clarity is criticized in the *Frogs*, 927: σαφές δ' ἂν εἶπεν οὐδὲ ἔν; 1122: ἀσαφής γάρ ἦν ἐν τῇ φράσει τῶν πραγμάτων; and 1445: πῶς; οὐ μανθάνω./ ἀμαθέστερόν πως εἶπε καὶ σαφέστερον.

³²⁸ E. Csapo 2004, 226-7, note 81.

aspect of the poetic language of New Music is often mocked by the comic playwrights.

Antiphanes, for example, parodying dithyrambic diction, says of wine and water:³²⁹

A: Βρομιάδος δ' ἰδρῶτα πηγῆς;

B: οἶνον εἰπὲ συντεμών

A: λιβάδα νυμφαία δροσώδη;

B: παραλιπὼν ὕδωρ φάθι

A: the sweat of Bacchic source?

B: cut it out and say wine!

A: the dewy streams of the nymphs?

B: leave it and say water!

Or of a cooking pot:³³⁰

ἄλλος ἐπὶ τούτῳ μέγας
ἤξει τις ἰσοτράπεζος εὐγενής - (B) τίνα
λέγεις; (A) Καρύστου θρέμμα, γηγενής, ζέων -
(B) εἴτ' οὐκ ἂν εἴποις; ὕπαγε. (A) κάκκαβον λέγω.
σὺ δ' ἴσως ἂν εἴποις λοπάδ'. (B) ἐμοὶ δὲ τοῦνομα
οἶει διαφέρειν, εἴτε κάκακβόν τινες
χαίρουσιν ὀνομάζοντες εἴτε σίττυβον;
πλὴν ὅτι λέγεις ἀγγεῖον οἶδα.

A) and then in addition to this one, there will be another big noble one, equal to a table. B) What do you mean? A) A nursling of Carystos, earthborn, fiery hot. B) Won't you say it? Get on with it! A) I say a cooking pot. But perhaps one would say a frying pan? B) You think that the name makes a difference for me, whether one takes pleasure calling it a cooking pot or a Dutch oven? All I know is that you're talking about a pot.

But this circumlocutory aspect of language is, again, not unique to the dithyrambic poets. In the *Clouds*, Aristophanes compares the “song-benders of circular choruses”³³¹ with prophets, writers of medical theory, idlers, sophists and other men-with-their-head-in-the-sky, who all draw their inspiration from the clouds, “great divinities for

³²⁹ Fr. 55 K-A, from the *Aphrodisios*. The comic poet acts as critic and suggests ways of getting rid of excess language with the participles: συντεμών, παραλιπὼν.

³³⁰ Fr. 180 K-A, from the *Parasitos*. This passage in particular seems to be a parody of Philoxenus' *Dinner* (see ἰσοτράπεζος) on which see chapter 4.

³³¹ *Clouds* 331-334: Κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἄσματοκάμπτας a periphrastic expression with a compound, that reproduces the diction of the dithyrambists while describing it, and that uses in the compound one of the elements that comes back twice in the list PMG 928 – καμπτ- (often associated with the modulations and virtuosic turns of the “New Music”). On which, see J. Franklin forthcoming.

idle men, who provide us with thought and reason and fairy-story (τερατεΐαν) and circumlocution (περίλεξιν) and show-off (κροῦσιν) and comprehension (κατάληψιν).”³³² The connection between the language of the dithyrambic poets and that of the sophists is worth investigating.³³³

Several sources indeed suggest a specific connection between the language of New Music and the art of the sophists and rhetoricians.³³⁴ Verbal coinage (a feature that Antiphanes describes as proper to Philoxenus: ὀνόμασιν ἰδίοισι καὶ καινοῖσι) is associated in the *Clouds* with sophistry. To win over the youth and have him study under his tutelage, Worse Argument promises (943):³³⁵

ῥηματίοισιν καινοῖς αὐτὸν καὶ διανοίαις κατατοξεύσω
I will shoot at him new words and reasonings.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus quotes Agathon and Licymnius as models with whom Plato’s rhetorical elegance could be compared,³³⁶ and Plato himself in the *Phaedrus* pays tribute to Licymnius:³³⁷

³³² *Clouds* 317-318: οὐ γὰρ μὰ Δί’ οἶσθ’ ὅτι πλείστους αὐται βόσκουσι σοφιστάς / Θουριομάντιες, ἰατροτέχνας, σφραγιδονυχαργοκομήτας / Κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἄσματοκάμπτας, ἄνδρας μετεωροφένεκας / οὐδὲν δρῶντας βόσκουσ’ ἀργούς, ὅτι ταύτας μουσοποοῦσιν.

³³³ M. Croiset 1903, 338-339 explained the periphraseis of the *Persians* by the influence of prose: “La prose procède tout autrement [que la poésie]; et elle y est tenue par sa nature même, car elle vise d’abord à faire comprendre, par conséquent à expliquer. Les narrations de Thucydide sont les modèles de ce genre. Or, elles attestent des manières de penser nouvelles, qui tendaient à déposséder la poésie de quelques-uns de ses domaines, en particulier de la description historique. Manifestement, à la fin du v^e siècle, on voulait qu’un récit ne visât pas seulement à donner des impressions, mais qu’il éclairât les faits. Et quand le narrateur ne les comprenait pas lui-même, il devrait du moins se donner l’air de les comprendre, en les expliquant. (...) Et il me semble bien que l’étrangeté du style de Timothée, son horreur du mot propre, son goût pour les périphrases qui ressemblent à des énigmes, tiennent justement à ce prosaïsme fondamental. C’est quand la pensée est prosaïque qu’on éprouve le besoin des expressions compliquées, qui la dissimulent” (my emphasis).

³³⁴ This adds to the interest of Plato’s *Protagoras* (whose dramatic date is ca. 415 BC) and Protagoras’ claim about poetry being a form of sophistry in disguise. Polyidos himself is called a sophist in Aristotle’s *Poetics* 1455a, and the *Suda* calls Licymnius a rhetor.

³³⁵ Also interest for “new words” (ὀνόματα καινά) is illustrated by Antiphon: fr. 76 Blass-Thalheim, *Banqueters* of Aristophanes (fr. 205 K-A, on which see A. C. Cassio 1977, 32-36; A. C. Cassio 1983).

³³⁶ Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Demosthenes* 26 = *PMG* 773. Commenting on a sentence in the *Menexenus* 236e (δεῖ δὴ τοιοῦτου τινὸς λόγου, ὅστις τοὺς μὲν τετελευτηκότας ἱκανῶς ἐπαινέσει, τοῖς δὲ ζῶσιν εὐμένως παρανέσει - we need a speech such that it praise adequately the dead, but gently

ὀνομάτων τε Λικυμνείων ἃ ἐκείνῳ ἔδωρήσατο πρὸς ποίησιν εὐεπείας.

and of the words of Licymnius, which were given as a present to this great man (Polus) for his composition of beautiful verse.

Licymnius is also quoted by Aristotle for both his writing on rhetoric, and his pleasantness as a dithyrambic poet.³³⁸ In the latter context, Aristotle draws a parallel to the style of the logographers, who can be enjoyed in reading, without a performance:

βαστάζονται δὲ οἱ ἀναγνωστικοί, οἷον Χαιρήμων (ἀκριβῆς γὰρ ὥσπερ λογογράφος) καὶ Λικύμνιος τῶν διθυραμβοποιῶν.

Most popular are the authors who can be read, like Chaeremon (he is precise as a speech-writer) and Licymnius among the dithyrambic poets.

Several fragments of the dithyrambic poets do show an interest in the relationship between the sound and meaning of words, as well as in “expressive” etymologies (as illustrated by Hermogenes in Plato’s *Cratylus*). *PMG* 759 for example shows how Melanippides derives the name of the Acheron from ἄχρα (pains), thus suggesting a strong connection between sound and meaning:

καλεῖται δ’ εἵνεκ’ ἐν κόλποισι γαίας
ἄχε’ εἴσι προχέων Ἀχέρων.

It is called Acheron because of the pains that it goes pouring in the bosom of the earth.

Additionally, the alliteration in the occlusives [g], [k], [kh] contributes to imitating the pangs and the beating effect that the words describe. Licymnius illustrates the same

encourages the living), the critic shows how ἐπίρρημα ἐπιρρήματι ἀντιπαράκειται καὶ ῥήματι ῥῆμα, τὸ μὲν ἱκανῶς τῷ εὐμένῳ, τῷ δ’ ἐπαινέσει τὸ παραινέσει, καὶ ταῦτα πάρισα; οὐ Λικύμνιοι ταῦτ’ εἰσὶ οὐδ’ Ἀγάθωνες οἱ λέγοντες ὕβριν ἢ Κύπριν, † μισθῷ ποθὲν ἢ μόχθον πατρίδων, † ἀλλ’ ὁ δαιμόνιος ἐρμηνεύσει Πλάτων.

³³⁷ *Phaedrus* 276b. According to the scholiast on the passage, Licymnius was Polus’ teacher, and according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Lysias* 3 and *Thucydides* 24) both were students of Gorgias.

³³⁸ Respectively *Rhetoric* 1405b: “But one must only adopt a name to express a distinct species or a real difference; otherwise, it becomes empty and silly, like the terms introduced by Licymnius in his “Art,” where he speaks of “being wafted along,” “wandering from the subject,” and “ramifications.” And 1413: “Metaphors should also be derived from things that are beautiful, the beauty of a word consisting, as Licymnius says, in its sound or sense, and its ugliness in the same.”

mimetic process in *PMG 770*: while proposing an etymology for Acheron (from ἄχρα, pains), Licymnius suggests by accumulating occlusive sounds the feeling of pain he evokes:

- (a) μυρίαις παγαῖς δακρύων ἀχέων τε βρύει
καὶ πάλιν
(b) Ἀχέρων ἄχρα πορθμεύει βροτοῖσιν

- (a) with thousands of sources it rushes with tears and pains
and again
(b) the Acheron carries pains for mortals.

Although this sensitivity to the mimetic potential, and effects, of language is of course not unique to the New Musicians, it is associated at the end of the fifth century in particular with the Gorgianic style.³³⁹

The *recherché* language of the New Musicians is thus reminiscent both of the obscurity of early-Classical poets like Pindar and Aeschylus and of the linguistic experiments of the sophists; it belongs both to the poetic tradition, and to the intellectual avant-garde.

1.3 Concatenation of adjectives

Far more representative of the dithyrambic style than compound words and periphrases is the abundant use of adjectives (many of which are indeed compounds). About the language of Bacchylides, H. Maehler makes comments that could apply to the New Music style:³⁴⁰

While variation of Homeric compounds is a feature which B. shares with Pindar and most of the earlier choral lyric poets, one characteristic of Bacchylides' personal style seems to be his preference for graphically descriptive

³³⁹ Homoioteleutes for example: *PMG 778*: θυιάδα φοιβάδα μαινάδα λυσσάδα.

³⁴⁰ H. Maehler 2003, 19-21. Also noted by R. Seaford, see note 121 in chapter 1.

compounds, many of which refer to colour. (...) The function of epithets is not merely decorative. B. often employs them (...) in order to evoke in the audience's imagination certain aspects or qualities of key figures in his narrative.

One of the features of fourth-century poetry indeed is that the adjectives compensate for the relative simplicity of the syntax by offering a multi-layered picture of the object described. This is particularly striking in longer fragments, such as Philoxenus' *Dinner* or Timotheus' *Persians*, for example, which I will use as case studies for the "dithyrambic style."

The former poem (*PMG* 836) is structured around a list of dishes. As opposed to the lists of comedy, where the mere accumulation, juxtaposition and random order of the items in the list create a comic effect,³⁴¹ the list Philoxenus offers makes each new dish the object of careful attention. It starts with the baskets of bread, qualified by an adjective that almost personifies them (*μάζας χιονόχρους*, 6). This descriptive adjective mixes both the visual (the white of the snow) and the tactile (the surface of the skin or that of the snow), allowing the poet to mix the different senses, and thus to create a sort of synaesthetic poetics: what describes the colour of the bread (white) also describes its skin-like texture (soft under a thin crust). The same technique is used to describe the cuttlefish, *σηπιοπουλυποδείων τῶν ἀπαλοπλοκάμων* (12-13): what describes its visual aspect (the tentacles, seen as tender locks of hair, with many-

³⁴¹ On a comic list related to the symposium: see Anaxandrides in *Protesilaus* ridiculing Iphicrates who married the daughter of the Thracian king Cotys (quoted in Athenaeus 4. 131 = fr. 4 K-A). Also Alexis in *Crateias* or the *Apothecary* (quoted in Athenaeus 3. 107 = fr. 115 K-A).

coloured reflection, can remind one of the multicoloured skin of the cuttlefish, the ‘chamaeleon of the sea’) also describes the texture of the mollusc (*ἀπαλός*).³⁴²

With all these adjectives, Philoxenus asks the audience for a response of a different kind from the response expected from, for example, the use of Homeric adjectives. The picture created with the use of adjectives is more layered, requiring a medial term between connecting the reality described and the adjective used to describe it. With the adjective *ἀπαλοπλοκάμος* for example, Philoxenus elaborates on the *εὐπλοκάμος* or *καλλοπλοκάμος* of epic and lyric poetry, by adding a tactile detail to the metaphor of a lock of hair for the octopus’ tentacles, while conjuring up the image of the (female) characters described by these adjectives.³⁴³ Just like *†λιπαροντες†* (gleaming? if this is the correct reading of the text) that describes the eels, the adjectives that Philoxenus applies to food traditionally qualify people, and in particular women, and the poetic memory associated with the word contributes to enriching the image: *χιονόχροας* mixes for the audience reminiscences of the Homeric formulae *τέρενα χροά* or *χροά λειριόεντα* (both used of a female or soft warrior, and suggesting the whiteness of youth). This makes in a way Philoxenus an Alexandrian *avant la lettre*: the adjective seems not to be chosen not only for what it describes but

³⁴² The use of *ἀπαλός* adds one dimension of perception to the use of the merely visual *πολύπου πολυπλόκου* (Theognis, 215) or *πουλύποδές τε πολυπλόκαμοι* (Marcellinus’ *De piscibus fragmentum*, 36).

³⁴³ Epic: *Iliad* 18. 407, *Θέτι καλλιπλοκάμω*, 18. 592 *καλλιπλοκάμω Ἀριάδνη*. *Odyssey* 12. 448· *Καλυψῶ εὐπλόκαμος*. For example Pindar, *Olympian* 3. 1: *Τυνδαρίδαις τε φιλοξείνοις ἀδεῖν καλλιπλοκάμω θ’ Ἑλένα*. Or *Pythian* 1. 1-2: *Χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον*. Pindar, fr. 33 S-M: *χαῖρ’, ὦ θεοδμάτα, λιπαροπλοκάμου / παίδεσσι Λατοῦς ἡμεροέστατον ἔρνος*. But also Archilochus fr. 8. 1 W: *πολλὰ δ’ εὐπλοκάμου πολιῆς ἄλως ἐν πελάγεσσι / θεσσάμενοι γλυκερὸν νόστον*.

also for the literary memory it triggers. The pleasure at hearing the lines thus comes as much from the recognition of the literary model as from the image suggested.³⁴⁴

This use of adjectives and personification goes even further: in the last fragment (*PMG* 842e, 5-9), the depiction of a “white milky custard” turns into an ekphrasis that combines all the features presented above and creates a visual world parallel to the object described, qualified by a series of adjectives that only apply to that imaginary world:

ταῖς δ' ἐν μέσαισιν
5 ἐγκαθιδρύ-
 θη μέγα χάρμα βροτοῖς λευ-
 κὸς μυελὸς γλαγερός
6 λεπτᾶς ἀράχνας ἐναλιγηκί-
 σοισι πέπλοις
7 συγκαλύπτων ὄψιν αἰσχύ-
 νας ὕπο, μὴ κατίδη τις
8 πῶυ τὸ μαλογενές λι-
 πόντ' ἀνάγκᾳ
9 ξηρὸν ἐν ξηραῖς Ἄρισταί-
 ου παλιρρύτοισι παγαῖς

in the middle had been placed, great joy for mortals, a white milky custard, hiding its face for shame under a veil that resembled a spider's fine web, lest anyone should see that it had of necessity left the sheep-born flock dry in the dry backward-flowing fountains of Aristaeus. (trans. Campbell)

It is hard to fathom how the mere sight of a pudding can suggest the complex emotional picture described; the description requires the audience to create a whole world of sensations and emotions of its own, quite independent of the object described. All the linguistic traits typical of New Music presented above are illustrated in these five lines: the use of some compound adjectives (*μαλογενές*, *παλιρρύτοισι*); the great number of adjectives generally (nine adjectives for nine nouns, and sometimes two uncoordinated

³⁴⁴ See for example for *τέρενα* χρώα: *Iliad* 4. 237, 13. 553, 14.406, Hesiod, *Theogony* 5, *Works and Days*, 552; χρώα *λειριόεντα*, *Iliad* 13. 839.

adjectives for a noun: λευκὸς μυελὸς γλαγερός; ξηραῖς Ἄρισταίου παλιρρῦτοισι παγαῖς); the synaesthetic use of adjectives (in the last two cases, the noun is surrounded by two adjectives that underline different sensual aspects); the personification of objects and their attribution of mental states (συγκαλύπτων ὄψιν αἰσχύνας ὕπο, μὴ κατίδη τις πῶν τὸ μαλογενὲς λιπόντα); and mythological learnedness (as with the backward flowing fountains of Aristaeus).³⁴⁵

The *Persians* displays the same kind of elaborate use of adjectives. Again, the richness of the descriptions contrasts with the simplicity of the syntax. As opposed to Pindar’s epinicia, where subordinate clauses abound and are often intertwined, there are few subordinate clauses in the *Persians*.³⁴⁶ The movement and expressivity of the texts come from the vocabulary and images. The description of the sea provides a significant example of how the images work: she is almost everywhere personified, described as emerald-hair (σμαραγδοχαίτας, v. 31) and as having a fish-wreathed bosom with shining folds (ἰχθυοστέφεσι μαρμαροπτύχοις κόλποισιν Ἄμφιτρίτας, vv. 37-39).³⁴⁷ If its colour (σμαραγδο-, emerald) seems slightly odd at first, it might be explained by the fact that the adjective works in a series, including with μαρμαρο- six

³⁴⁵ On Aristaeus, see Hesiod, fr. 159 Most (= Servius on Virgil’s *Georgics* 1.14), 160 Most (= P. Oxy. 2489); Pindar, *Pythian* 9, 59 ff.; also: Apollonius Rhodius 2. 500-27; Callimachus fr. 75. 33-7 Pf. I have not found a satisfactory explanation for the image of “backward-flowing fountains of Aristaeus”, but the πάλι(ν) (backward-) compounds appear very frequently in the New Musicians (see e.g. *PMG* 791: πάλιν 10, 86, παλίμπορον 162, παλινπόρευτον 173, ὀπισσοπόρευτον; *PMG* 836 e: πάλιν, 2).

As for the image of the pudding’s shame (αἰσχύνας), there is a parallel with a passage of Alexis (Athenaeus 3. 107e = fr. 7 K-A) describing a liver: καὶ πλεκτάνην στιφρὰν σφόδρ’ ἐν τούτοις τέ που / αἰσχυνόμενον ἦπαρ καπρίσκου σκτοφάγου. Moreover, the passage of Athenaeus where Alexis’ passage is quoted contains a reference to Hegesander of Delphi’s *Commentaries* (fr. 29, *FHG* iv. 419), which reported the courtesan Metaneira’s exclamation when picking up a lung from a platter of wrapped livers: ἀπόλωλα πέπλων μ’ ὄλεσαν περιπτυχαί (adesp. tr. fr. 91). The image is the same as that of the pudding’ *peplos*.

³⁴⁶ Even the independent clauses are linked with a very narrow range of particles: most often δέ, ἀλλά, γάρ, καί, τε and μέν. There are very few, or no instances of δή, ἄρα, ἄταρ, τοι, ἦτοι, γε.

³⁴⁷ Just as the folds of the wave remind of the folds of a dress, the movement of the waves can remind of the movement of hair.

lines later (and with again μαρμαροφεγγεῖς v. 92), which underlines the jewel-like shininess of the sea; it also works in connection with ἐφοινίσσετο, which already in the preceding lines (vv. 32-33) has introduced an idea of luxury in addition to the colour. Most of the expressions used are not new, and appear in epic or earlier lyric: Homer calls the sea Amphitrite in *Odyssey* 3. 91 and 12. 60; the expression πόντον ... ἰχθυόεντα, is used both in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (*Il.* 9. 4: *Od.* 3. 177); the shining of the sea is described in the *Iliad* (14. 273) as ἄλα παραρέην, where she is qualified by her folds (*Il.* 18. 140 θαλάσσης εὐρέα κόλπον). What makes Timotheus' description distinctive though is the multiplication of images, or, rather, the different layers of senses connotated by the juxtaposition of adjectives: in the expression ἰχθυοστέφεσι μαρμαροπτύχοις κόλποισιν Ἀμφιτρίτας, the sea is *at the same time* personified, described by her depth, her shininess, and her movements. This is the first feature of the characterization of the sea: the description resorts to the kind of “synaesthetic poetics” described above (where the different adjectives all belong to different realms of sensation).³⁴⁸

Moreover, and this is the second specific aspect of Timotheus' language, the poet mixes both abstract and concrete images. A few lines after the expression quoted above (vv. 79-81), the sea is again personified and called οἰστρομανὲς παλεομίσημ' ἄπιστόν τ' ἀγκάλισμα κλυσιδρομάδος αὔρας (gadfly-crazy, an ancient object of

³⁴⁸ This has been already described by E. Csapo, 2004, 226: “The longer syntactic units added to the impetus of the music; they compelled the intellect to press onwards, with the surge of the music, in search of elusive grammatical closure. Unsited to the development of clear logical progressions, the new verse cultivated a (more musical) logic of association, bypassing the intellect and appealing to the senses, the subconscious and the emotions.” 227: “the preference for images to concepts is typically combined with an appeal to the senses, especially to the ears and eye of the mind.”

hatred,³⁴⁹ and untrustworthy darling of the wind that races and drenches.) The threats uttered by the Phrygian man against the sea describe her with adjectives fit for people: the feature emphasized is her violent and passionate nature, but the focus is as much on “psychological” features (οἰστρομανὲς παλεομίσημ’ ἄπιστόν) as on the physical aspect of her violence (κλυσιδρομάδος αὔρας). In the preceding lines, the Persian had described her with a mix of psychological and physical terms: she was θρασεῖα (72) and threatened to be yoked: πάρος/ λάβρον αὐχέν’ ἔσχες ἐμ/πέδαι καταζευθεῖσα λινοδέτωι τεόν (72-73). The image of the neck of the sea comes back again in 89-90: μακραυχενόπλους. Again, the image of yoking, and the personification were used by Aeschylus in the *Persians*: ζυγὸν ἀμφιβαλὼν αὐχένι πόντου (70). The difference between the 2 images however is that Aeschylus contents himself with the metaphor of the yoked sea, while Timotheus qualifies the yoking with an adjective (λάβρον, 73) that itself suggests a new idea, or rather “packs in” another image (that of the wind).³⁵⁰ The mixing of several types of vocabulary (psychological and physical, abstract and concrete) contributes to creating a layered picture of the sea, not only of what she looks like, but of what she connotes for a shipwrecked Persian.

The same can be said about other elements described by periphrases: not only are the boats personified, but parts of the boats are synecdoches of the body. The oars

³⁴⁹ J. Hordern 2002, 172 proposes that it is a “reference to the loss of Mardonius’ fleet near Mt. Athos in 492 (Herodotus 6.44), or perhaps to the destruction of Xerxes’ first ship-bridge over the Hellespont and to the disaster at Artemisium.”

³⁵⁰ For other intertexts with Aeschylus’ *Persians*, see M. Croiset 1903, 330 ff.: “Eschyle avait dit admirablement: v. 72 ζυγὸν ἀμφιβαλὼν αὐχένι πόντου. Timothée dit à son tour, avec moins de force d’ailleurs (v. 83 ff.), passage dans lequel se mêle au souvenir indiqué celui du v. 68 des *Perses*, λινοδέσμων σχεδία πορθμὸν ἀμείψας. (...) Notons encore, à la fin de cet episode, v.96 les mots βρύχιον ἄλμαν, d’autant plus remarquables qu’ils n’ont guère de sens (...). N’est-ce pas parce qu’Eschyle avait écrit au v. 397 ἔπαισαν ἄλμην βρύχιον “ils frappèrent de leurs rames l’eau profonde”? L’adjectif est extrêmement rare. Il sera resté dans la mémoire de Timothée, ainsi attaché au mot ἄλμη, qui l’a ramené au jour avec lui.”

are the χεῖρας ἐλατίνας (5-6),³⁵¹ or the ὀρείους πόδας ναός (90-1), the spears have a body;³⁵² parts of the boats (probably) are described as [ἀναιδῆ] γυῖα (14) and they are equipped like bodies, with σιδαρέωι κράνει (20). More than synecdoque, these images work as periphrasis and kennings, which pack a lot of meaning into expressions. This is the case also with the ναίοις ... ταλάγμασι (drops of blood from boats, 33). Hordern comments: "... the adjective is infelicitous, since the blood should strictly belong to the sailors." The point is precisely, I think, that the listener takes the shortcut and makes the connection, for there is a logic to the accumulation of kennings, and a grammar of images to get familiar with: the sea is a body (that the barbarians fight against),³⁵³ the boats are bodies (also fighting against this marine body), and boat parts, body parts.

Moreover, the boundaries between maritime and land elements are blurred: the sea is a plain where a furrow is traced (32): πόντος ἄλοκα ναίοις ἐφοίνισσερο σταλάγμασι. It is again a πέδιος (40), a πεδία πλόιμα νομάσι ναύταις (78),³⁵⁴ and the first time dry land is described, it is still very much a maritime landscape ἀκταῖς ἐνάλοις (98), and the analogy continues when land is described with one of the terms that described the sea earlier: while the sea was ἰχθυοστεφέσι μαρμαροπτύχοις (38), Mysia is δενδροθέηραι πτυχαί (105). In the same way, the ships are first πολυκρότους πλωσίμους πεύκας (12), then the continuity between land and sea is underlined by the metaphor πεύκαισιν ὀριγόνοισιν... πεδία πλόιμα (78), with ὀριγόνοισιν replacing πλωσίμου. So there is a poetic logic to the images: both the

³⁵¹ See *Helen*, 1461 (in a "dithyrambic" ode): εἰλατίνας πλάτας; also *Hypsipyle* I.iii.14 Bond.

³⁵² See J. Hordern 1999, 436.

³⁵³ Πλαγὰ ῥηξίκοπος, 8-9; see especially 75-77: νῦν δέ σ' ἀναταράξει / ἐμὸς ἄναξ ἔμος πεύ-/ καισιν...

³⁵⁴ See also δελφινοφόρον πόντου πεδίων διαμειψάμεναι, Aeschylus fr. 150 Radt.; the sea is also described as ὑγρὰ κέλευθα in Homer (always in the adonic clausula): *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 452; *Il.* 1. 312; *Od.* 3. 71; 4. 842; 9. 252; 15. 474.

compounds and the many adjectives underline the continuity between land and sea, and the violent confrontation between boats, sailors, and sea. The adjectives describe many sensual, psychological and emotional layers of the object they describe, and function in a paradigm.

But despite this repetitive use of images, in patterns that are recognizable and expectable, some metaphors or expressions are strikingly baroque.³⁵⁵ This is the case with the kenning μαρμαροφεγγεῖς παῖδες συγκρουόμενοι (the shining children of the mouth struck together, 92-3). Such a periphrasis seems unjustified in the midst of an already very thick descriptive texture, and the attention to the description of such a detail (the breaking of teeth) seems even ridiculous given the war context and the apocalyptic narration. But the irruption of “children struck together” (even if it is only the children “of the mouth”) in the midst of such a martial context creates a feeling of disproportionate violence. Again, the image of “unbacchic rain” to describe sea-water, and of “alimentary vessel” for the stomach (63) might seem preposterous.³⁵⁶ But the image underlines the pathos of drinking while in the water, with a matter of fact

³⁵⁵ Again, bold metaphors are not only reserved to the New Musicains. One can think of Pindar's metaphor of the rooster shedding leaves of glory in *Olympian* 12, 14, or the implied comparison in *O.* 10 [11], 11, of the wave that washes over a pebble that represents the paying back as a friendly favor. (On the image of ‘The Leaves of Triumph and Mortality’ in *Olympian* 12: F. Nisetich 1977). Gildersleeve on the metaphors of Pindar: “The number of metaphors properly called mixed is not so large in Pindar as is supposed; nor, in any case, are we to count as mixed metaphor a rapid shifting of metaphors. This is to be expected in the swift movement of Pindar's genius. The disjointedness of Emerson's style has been ingeniously defended on the ground that each sentence is a chapter. And so Pindar's metaphors are slides that come out in such quick succession that the figures seem to blend because the untrained eye cannot follow the rapid movement of the artist.” I would compare Timotheus' metaphors with a superposition of slides, which can appear dark and murky “to the untrained eye” but reveals many shades and depths when one stares at it long enough.

³⁵⁶ See I. Waern 1951 on kennings. Her treatment of the “mannerism” of Ion of Chios and Timotheus is, to say the least, hasty. She qualifies Timotheus' kennings as “never appositional, nor are they possessed of any other kind of elucidation. Their solution is left completely to the listener's imagination, sometimes to his knowledge (...) Timotheos's kennings seem to have been used, to a high degree as l'art pour l'art. (...) They make a rather cold impression because they are quite unpathetic. The complete absence of the affective kenning also suggests the lack of pathos” (97-98). On this passage, see T. Gargiulo 1996.

description of the stomach drinking something “unbacchic” (ἀβακχίωτος ὄμβρος 62). These expressions do shock, but the absurdly refined pictures underline even more pointedly the inversion of common practices in war, and the loss of point of reference with reality in the midst of a battle. Moreover, as T. Gargiulo has underlined, Timotheus is playing with the phraseology, and ideology of the symposium, and on the frequent parallels between symposium and sailing, wine and sea. With the periphrasis in v. 62, “avremmo un prezioso, quanto raro, rovesciamento” of sympotic discourse.³⁵⁷

Thus, it is not the vocabulary or the images used by the New Musicians that are innovative, but their abundance and the dense semantic texture they create. This texture itself presumes a different type of relationship with the audience. While adjectives in Homer are often formulaic, Timotheus or Philoxenus defamiliarize the audience with the use of adjectives: the words sound familiar but at the same time introduce a new relationship with the audience, since the listener / reader has to create a new connection between noun and adjective. The adjectives are always more than ornamental, they function in paradigms and construct a multi-layered, sensual, image of the reality described. The kennings themselves belong to this dense texture: in the two cases noted in Timotheus, they have an emotional function. Their oddity stands out in the rest of the passage, and each time, it is to underline some change of scale in the narrative, or to zoom in on a detail. While most of the passage of the *Persians* describes a sea battle as a dramatic scene, the two kennings have a narrative function, that of interrupting the flow of images and introducing a new, much more minute motive: that of an isolated

³⁵⁷ Although Gargiulo does not cite parallels, there are interesting similarities with Dionysios Chalcus: εἰρεσίη γλώσσης (oarage of the tongue = poetry); Μουσῶν ἐρέται (oarsmen of the Muses = poets); εἰρεσία Διονύσου (oarage of Dionysus = banquet); συμποσίου ναῦται (mariners of the carouse); κυλίκων ἐρέται (oarsmen of the cups = poets).

body (with the “shining children of his mouth” and his “alimentary vessel”) in this outsized battle.

Some of the disconcerting images present in the shorter passages might have been part of a longer paradigmatic chain, and the context might have explained the use of certain images. In Timotheus’ *Cyclops* for example (= *PMG* 780) Timotheus uses a metaphor / periphrasis to describe the mixing of wine and water (probably used to get the Cyclops drunk):³⁵⁸

ἔγχευε δ' ἔν μὲν δέπας κίσσινον μελαίνας
σταγόνας ἀμβρότας ἀφρώϊ βρυάζον,
εἴκοσιν δὲ μέτρ' ἐνέχευ', ἀνέμισγε
δ' αἶμα Βακχίου νεορρύτοισιν
δακρύοισι Νυμφῶν.

He [Odysseus?]³⁵⁹ poured into it one ivy-wood cup brimming with the foam of the black ambrosian drops, and then he poured in twenty measures, and mixed the blood of Bacchus with the newly-poured tears of the Nymphs.

The description combines use of descriptive terms (the ivy-wood cup, or ivy-decorated cup), with metaphorical language (blood of Bacchus) and suggests many layers of perceptions (on the sensual, especially visual, level, but also on the mythical level). This is particularly clear if compared with the Homeric model. The fragment draws from two passages in *Odyssey* 9:

κισσύβιον μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχω μέλανος οἴνου (346)
I hold with my hands the ivy-cup of dark wine

And

τὸν δ' ὅτε πίνοιεν μελιηδέα οἶνον ἐρυθρόν,
ἔν δέπας ἐμπλήσας ὕδατος ἀνά εἴκοσι μέτρα
χευ', ὀδμὴ δ' ἠδεῖα ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ὀδώδει,

³⁵⁸ A passage probably paraphrased in Antiphanes, fr. 55 K-A.

³⁵⁹ On this passage, A. Ford suggested to me that if it not Odysseus but the Cyclops speaking, this would constitute a major shift from the *Odyssey* and the *Cyclops*: the savage Polyphemus would be using exquisite language to express his awe at a new, indescribable sight. The periphrastic language would be the most appropriate to express the character’s delight at an unusual sight.

θεσπεσίη... (208-211)

And when he drank the honey-sweet red wine, he filled one cup and poured on top twenty measures, a sweet smell came from the crater, divine...

Timotheus' description itself captures many more sensual nuances (colour, texture, movement) than the Homeric one, and adds some mythical connotations (with the metaphors of Bacchus' blood and the nymphs' tears). The passage works as a whole, and the network of images might have been developed on a larger scale: the adjectives used in the description of the cup anticipate the metaphor and contribute to condensing the image, μέλανος being an adjective also used for blood, σταγόνος also qualifying drops of blood, and νεορρύτοισιν applying to freshly flowing water.³⁶⁰ The use of the synecdoche and metonymy "blood of Bacchus" thus condenses the poetic texture: the Dionysiac presence felt in the ivy-imagery, and possibly in the βρυάζον,³⁶¹ announces the Bacchic image in the last line. The metaphors themselves imbue the text with more narrative allusions: the blood of Dionysus announces the blood of the wounded Cyclops, and the tears of the nymphs announce his tears.

These are the main lexical and poetic features of the language of the New Musicians. The innovation does not consist only in the choice of vocabulary or images but at least as much in the construction of longer chains of meaning, that allow developing complex and layered images, and in the use of some striking images that interrupt this flow.

³⁶⁰ Only found in this sense in Sophocles' *Electra*, of a source (νεορρύτους πηγὰς γάλακτος, 894-5), and metaphorically in Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*, of a sword (σὺν νεορρύτῳ ξίφει, 1351. It is also a favourite term of Nonnus, who uses it 8 times. The image of the water to be mixed with wine as "tears of the Nymphs" also appears in Euenus fr. eleg. 2.3: Βάκχος χαίρει κιννάμενος δὲ τρισὶν Νύμφαισι τέταρτος.

³⁶¹ On these images, see J. Hordern 2002.

1.4 Poetics of lightness

One more characteristic remains to be examined: Aristophanes consistently associates the new, especially dithyrambic poets with “lightness.” Throughout Aristophanes’ plays, New Musicians are found wandering up in misty heights, craving for elevation, wings, aetherial things. In the *Peace*, Trygaios upon his return from Olympus tells how he saw “two or three souls of διθυραμβοδιδάσκαλοι up in the sky” (829). In the *Birds*, “Cinesias” starts his monody by describing his aspiration to flight: (1372)

ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον περύγεσσι κούφαις
πέτομαι δ’ ὁδὸν ἄλλοτ’ ἐπ’ ἄλλαν μελέων

I soar towards Olympus on light wings, I fly this path of songs, then another... The first line, a quotation of Anacreon (ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον περύγεσσι κούφαις / διὰ τὸν Ἔρωτ’ ὃ γὰρ ἐμοὶ θέλει συνηβᾶν ...),³⁶² again shows how *traditional* the dithyrambist’s choice of flight metaphor is: Aristophanes’ Cinesias uses the image that Anacreon employed for love (an image also often used in reference to the poet’s activity and quite common in Greek poetry)³⁶³ and combines it with another metaphor, that of the path of song, deeply traditional and used many times by Pindar.³⁶⁴ As shown in the previous section, the innovation comes not only from the mix of these two traditional images, but from developing the images to the point that the metaphorical terms or images become the primary point of reference. This is the case in

³⁶² PMG 378.

³⁶³ In addition to Homer’s ἔπεα πτέροεντα: Theognis 237ff., Pindar *Pythian* 8, 33; *N.* 7, 22. Pindar *Olympian* 2 86-8 (the poet is an eagle); *Nemean* 3. 80, *Nemean* 5.21.

³⁶⁴ *Od.* 8, 73-4; Pindar *Olympian* 1, 110; *Pythian* 4, 247-8; *Pythian* 9, 47; *Pythian* 11, 39; *Nemean* 6, 46-7, 54. Bacchylides 3.98: Κηϊάς ἀηδόνοσ of the poet; 5.16-33: αἰθέρα ξουθαῖσι τάμων ὑψοῦ περύγεσσι ταχεί-/αισ αἰετὸς... νομάται δ’ ἐν ἀπύτῳ χάει / λεπτότριχα σὺν ζεφύρου πνοι-/αῖσιν ἔθειραν...

the lines that follow, where Cinesias more precisely defines his dithyrambic poetics (or at least the comic version of it):

Κι·	ὑπὸ σοῦ περωθεὶς βούλομαι μετάρσιος ἀναπτόμενος ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν καινὰς λαβεῖν ἀεροδομήτους καὶ νιφοβόλους ἀναβολάς.	1385
Πε·	ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν γὰρ ἄν τις ἀναβολὰς λάβοι;	
Κι·	Κρέματαί μὲν οὖν ἐντεῦθεν ἡμῶν ἡ τέχνη. Τῶν διθυράμβων γὰρ τὰ λαμπρὰ γίγνεται ἀέρια καὶ σκοτεινὰ καὶ κυανουγέα καὶ πτεροδόμητα: (...)	1390
	Ἄπαντα γὰρ δίδειμί σοι τὸν ἀέρα.	1392
	εἶδωλα πετηνῶν αἰθεροδρόμων οἰωνῶν ταναοδείρων (...) ἀνάδρομος ἀλάμενος ἅμ' ἀνέμων πνοαῖσι βαίην	1395

Cinesias: Once you give me wings, I want to soar up high, to get from the clouds new preludes, air-whisked and snow-bearing.

Peisetaerus: From the clouds? One can get preludes?

Cinesias: It is the stock from which our art draws. The most brilliant dithyrambs are airy, obscure, dark-rayed and wing-whisked. (...) I will go through all the airs for you: “phantom of winged coursers of the aither, of long-necked birds... leaping and shooting up, may I go on the breath of the winds...”

What is so appropriate about Aristophanes' use of these airy, light metaphors for the New Musicians? On the one hand, according to the principle of the poetic scales used at the end of the *Frogs*, the dithyrambic lines might be “light” because of their syntax:³⁶⁵ just as Aeschylus wins the weight-contest by offering the anadiplosis ἐφ' ἄρματος γὰρ ἄρμα, καὶ νεκρῶ νεκρός when Euripides offers the simple σιδηροβριθές τ' ἔλαβε δεξιῶ ξύλον, the poets might be light because of their “continuous style” (defined as λέξις εἰρομένη καὶ τῷ συνδέσμῳ μία by Aristotle - continuous and united by connecting particles) as opposed to the periodic style of the antistrophes of the

³⁶⁵ On the weighing scene, see A. Verrall 1908. It is curious however that the compounds themselves (that obviously “Euripides” in the *Frogs* took for a sign of weightiness) do not weigh the poets down.

ancient poets (κατεστραμμένην καὶ ὁμοίαν ταῖς τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν).³⁶⁶ The explanation that Aristotle gives about the continuous style (a style that does not have a precise destination, as opposed to the periodic style, which is more grounded and predictable, since the antistrophe will respond to the strophe) might be a justification for the “lightness” of the dithyrambists.

On the other hand, again according to the scales principle in the *Frogs*, their lightness may come from their choice of subject: indeed, a surprising number of New Music fragments shows an interest for celestial phenomena and descriptions of things that belong to the upper regions.³⁶⁷ Plutarch for example quotes a line ascribed to ‘one of the dithyrambic poets’ that describes a misty atmosphere:³⁶⁸

ὁ γὰρ ἥλιος ἀνίσχων, ὡς τις εἶπε τῶν διθυραμβοποιῶν
εὐθύς ἀνέπλησεν ἀεροβατᾶν μέγαν οἶκον ἀνέμων.

For the rising sun, as one of the dithyrambic poets said,
Immediately filled the great house of the air-walking winds.

In the same way, the expression ὑγρᾶν Νεφελᾶν στρεπταίγλαν δάιον ὀρμάν (the destructive launch of the moist twisting-and-flashing Clouds) used by Strepsiades in the *Clouds* (v. 335) is according to the scholiast a Philoxenian coinage,³⁶⁹ and another

³⁶⁶ Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1409 a-b: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ αἱ περίοδοι αἱ μακραὶ οὖσαι λόγος γίνεται καὶ ἀναβολῇ ὅμοιον, ὥστε γίνεται ὁ ἔσκωπεν Δημόκριτος ὁ Χίος εἰς Μελανιπίδην ποιήσαντα ἀντὶ τῶν ἀντιστρόφων ἀναβολᾶς: (fr. 930 K-A) οἱ τ’ αὐτῶ κακὰ τεύχει ἀνὴρ ἄλλω κακὰ τεύχων./ ἡ δὲ μακρὰ ἀναβολὴ τῷ ποιήσαντι κακίστη. But a few sentences later, the continuous style itself is defined as the ancient one (ἡ μὲν οὖν εἰρομένη λέξις ἡ ἀρχαία ἐστίν. ... ταύτη γὰρ πρότερον μὲν ἅπαντες, νῦν δὲ οὐ πολλοὶ χρῶνται). Also in Aristotelian *Problems* 19.15.)

³⁶⁷ This is also true of tragedy: in many ‘dithyrambic odes,’ the character wishes to take off and fly; in this context, ἀναπέτομαι is a favourite Euripidean word, as S. Barlow 1971, 44 has underlined.

³⁶⁸ *De primo frigido* 17 = *PMG* 1006. But maybe ascribed because it refers to a theme usually associated with the poets.

³⁶⁹ *PMG* 830. The other expressions parodied in the *Clouds*, refer to food, and as Dover notes, might be referring to Philoxenus’ *Dinner*. It would have to be in the revised text of the *Clouds* though, not in the original production of 423 BC, since Philoxenus was supposedly born in 435/4. “If the identification [of Philoxenus’ lines] were true” notes Dover, “there would be an extra point in 338f., but to gain this point, it would be necessary to reject the chronological evidence.”

passage says that Philoxeus calls the Zephyr's breath sweet (ἠδεῖαν).³⁷⁰ Several other fragments show an interest in heights, or things sky-related.³⁷¹ For example, a couple of lines by Timotheus quoted by Plutarch about childbirth suggest that the poet was describing some activity that takes place in the skies:³⁷²

διὰ κυάνεον πόλον ἄστρον
διὰ τ' ὠκυτόκοιο σελάνας.

Through the dark-blue vault of the stars and of the moon who gives childbirth. So Aristophanes' representation of the lightness of the dithyrambic poets might come not only from their style, but also from their choice of topics.³⁷³

I suggest there is a justification for this poetic of lightness: the poets' choice of point of view. What "Cinesias" tries to achieve is a sort of bird's-eye view of the world – or rather, with all the adjectives, compounds, and the syntax he uses, the poet tries to project an image of the world that is not rooted in reality, but that the audience has to connect to through some kind of mental projection – thus achieving something κοῦφον.³⁷⁴ This very visual metaphor allows understanding the poets' choice of mode of representation: it is an "airy" poetics that is illustrated, which combines choice of topics, choice of syntax, and choice of point of view, and it can better be understood

³⁷⁰ *PMG* 834, quoted by Theophrastus *On Winds*.

³⁷¹ So does Praxilla's dithyramb that gave rise to the proverb: κάλλιστον μὲν ἐγὼ λείπω φάος ἠελίοιο, / δεύτερο ἄστρα φαεινὰ σεληναίης τε πρόσωπον ... (*PMG* 747) .

³⁷² *Quaestiones conviv.* 3.10.3 = *PMG* 803. Several other passages show an interest in the Sun: Timotheus, *PMG* 800; *PMG* 804, which recalls an expression by Mimnermus, fr. 2; also *PMG* 834, where Pliny recalls the myth of the birth of amber (*electrum*): "quoniam sol vocitatus sit elector, plurimi poetae dixere, primique ut arbitror Aeschylus (*Heliades*, fr. 73 Radt), Philoxenus, Euripides, Nicander, Satyrus.

³⁷³ Again, noted by Demetrius *on Style* 143 = *PMG* 963: γίνονται δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ λέξεως χάριτες ἢ ἐκ μεταφορᾶς, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ τέττιγος, ἢ ἐκ συνθέτου τοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ διθυραμβικοῦ· δέσποτα Πλούτων μελανοπερύγων· τουτὶ δεινὸν † προπερύγων αὐτὸ ποίησον †, ἃ μάλιστα δὴ κωμωδικὰ παίγνια ἔστι καὶ σατυρικά.

³⁷⁴ It is indeed the adjective used in the Rainer papyrus (to describe the *style*, not the *music*, as opposed to most analyses of the New Dithyramb) along with ἠρωικὴ ὑπόθεσις, λέξις εἰρομένη, ἰδέα φλεγμαίνουσα, διπλᾶ ὀνόματα (on which see J. Powell 1933, 210), and by Plato, calling poetry a light, winged and holy thing in the *Ion*.

with a parallel in the visual arts. J. Elsner’s study about the revolution in the visual arts in the fifth century is remarkably helpful to understand the phenomenon of the dithyrambic style:³⁷⁵

Many of the other major innovations of Athenian culture in the fifth century BC can be defined broadly by the shift from a voice of authority making direct contact with its audience *to a performative model whereby the viewer observes an imaginary world that is insulated within its own context and to which he or she must relate by identification or some form of wish-fulfillment fantasy*. While the changes in tragedy took place in the early fifth century, at about the same time as those in the visual arts, the fundamental analogous changes in comedy and philosophy came in the fourth century (my emphasis).

I would connect the change perceptible in the late fifth- and fourth-century dithyramb to the “wish-fulfillment fantasy” that J. Elsner describes. His comments allow tying in the various elements of style and themes of the New Musicians. All the stylistic features described above, whether those collected from a reading of the fragments or from a reading of the ancient critics, can be connected to this innovation in point of view, and relationship with the audience. As I have started suggesting, the adjectives allow defamiliarization, through a special interpretation of the images on the audience’s part, and appeal to their imagination.

Conclusion to section 1

In this section I have proposed to interpret the stylistic changes introduced by the poets not simply as a series of verbal innovations (use of compound words, of periphraseis and adjectives). These features are themselves traditional poetic diction (Homeric and older lyric); what is different in the fourth-century style is the poet’s recourse to a synaesthetic poetics, and a different way of relating to an audience,

³⁷⁵ J. Elsner 2006, 89.

informed by an attempt at representing the world in a different way: the New Music poets rely on the audience’s interpretation of an elaborate grammar of poetic images.

It is from this perspective that I propose to interpret Philodemus’ comment on the difference between early- and late-Classical style. According to Philodemus, if the poetic *τρόποι* (style) at the time of Pindar and at the time of Philoxenus were compared, there would be no difference, but a great difference in the characters (*ἦθη*) represented.³⁷⁶

Καὶ τοὺς δειθυραμβικοὺς δὲ τρόπους εἴ τις συγκρίαι, τὸν τε κατὰ Πίνδαρον καὶ τὸν κατὰ Φιλόξενον, μεγάλην εὐρεθήσεσθαι τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν ἐπιφαινομένων ἠθῶν, τὸν αὐτὸν δ’ εἶναι τρόπον.

And if one compared the dithyrambic styles of the time of Pindar and of the time of Philoxenus, there would be a great difference in the characters shown, but the style would be the same.

The difference in *ἦθη*, and the changes introduced in the lyric poetry, are connected with new thematic choices.

2- Thematic features of the corpus

This change in narrative orientation is obvious from an overview of the titles of the pieces composed by the New Dithyramb poets.³⁷⁷ The two dozens titles that Athenaeus and Plutarch have handed down to us fall into three main categories. The first one is divine material. Despite the assumption that dithyrambos are songs about the birth of Dionysus (illustrated most famously in Plato’s passage in the *Laws*, 700 a-d),

³⁷⁶ Philodemus, *De musica* 1.23.

³⁷⁷ This approach can seem dodgy, since scenes concerned with Dionysus could appear in non-Dionysus titled pieces. But as S. Scullion (2002, 110) argues in defense of his own approach to Dionysus-titled tragedies: “these are, of course, only the titles of Dionysiac tragedies that have been preserved in the tradition that has come down to us – but the same tradition has given us the titles of something on the order of five hundred tragedies.” The “same tradition” has not been as generous with the number of titles of dithyrambos, but the point is still valid.

only one piece mentioned by literary sources bears a title that evokes a connection with Dionysus and his birth:³⁷⁸ Timotheus' *Birth-Pangs of Semele* (PMG 792).³⁷⁹ Another possible Dionysiac title might be Melanippides' *Oenus*.³⁸⁰ Among the other surviving divine titles, Telestes had a *Birth of Zeus* (PMG 809), and other composers had more Apollinian-sounding topics: Telestes had an *Asclepius* (PMG 806), as probably did Cinesias (PMG 774), Timotheus had an *Artemis*, Melanippides a *Persephone*.

The second field from which the titles of the poems draw is mythical and heroic material (especially *nostos* material). This list comprises titles like Timotheus' *Elpenor* (PMG 779),³⁸¹ *Cyclops* (PMG 780), *Laertes* (PMG 785), *Scylla* (PMG 796) and *Madness of Ajax* (PMG 777), as well as Philoxenus' *Cyclops or Galatea* (PMG 815-823) that all seem related to themes evoked in the *Odyssey*. Other heroic subject matters include Timotheus' *Nauplius* (PMG 785), his *Sons of Phineus* (PMG 795); Telestes' *Argo* (PMG 805) and Philoxenus' *Genealogy of the Aeacides* (PMG 814), Cleomenes' *Meleager* (PMG 838).

The last category of titles suggests connection to a non-mythological setting (such as the *Komastes* (?) of Philoxenus (PMG 825), and his *Deipnon* (PMG 836)),

³⁷⁸ This Dionysiac origin of the dithyramb is probably what led Wilamowitz to emend, for example, in PMG 768, Argynnus to Dionysius.

³⁷⁹ The fragments of dithyramps quoted by metricians or music-critics give a very different impression: PMG 926 (from Aristoxenus or a scholar from his school) contains quotations of fragments which belong to 5th or 4th c. BC fragments and seem dithyrambic. They describe bacchic choruses, spring flowers, dancing maidens and Dionysus: ἔνθα δὴ ποικίλων ἀνθέων ἄμβροτοι λ<ε>ίμακες / βαθύσκιον παρ' ἄλσος ἀβροπαρθένους / εὐιότας χοροὺς ἀγκάλαις δέχονται. (On which, see J. Powell 1933, 178-179; R. Hamilton 1990). Again, PMG 929 b celebrates the return of Dionysus after twelve months and refers to the spring flowers: ἀναβόασον αὐτῶι / Διόνυσον ἀ[ύ]σομεν / ἱεραῖς ἐν ἀμέρα[ι]ς / δώδεκα μῆνας ἀπόντα / πάρα δ' ὄρα, πάντα δ' ἄνη. It is striking that the authors of technical treatises quote passages that have a much more Dionysiac tone. Are they traditional cult poems, as opposed to the most elaborate and apparently less dionysiac experiments of the New Poets?

³⁸⁰ There is no reference to such a dithyramb title in our sources, but Hartung 1855 attributed to Melanippides 2 fragments, one connected to wine (PMG 761), and underlining the etymology of Oenius, the other connected to the description of the Centaurs' hatred for wine (PMG 760).

³⁸¹ With possibly PMG 925 Hibeh papyrus as fragments – see Page *Select Papyri* iii 397 ff. for such an argument. But there is little evidence for this.

with a particular interest for the East, or for non-Greek models – as with Timotheus’ *Persians* (PMG 791) or Philoxenus’ *the Syrian* (PMG 827).³⁸²

Some of the titles suggest potential for *opsis*, even *grand spectacle*, or a topic especially appropriate for a dithyrambic performance (as with the *Danaids* of Melanippides, who could be impersonated by the fifty choreutes of the dithyramb).³⁸³ This is also the case with the musical topic of Melanippides’ *Marsyas* (PMG 758), the *Niobe* of Timotheus (PMG 786) or Telestes’ *Hymenaeus* (PMG 808) – all these titles suggested themselves as musical topics.³⁸⁴ In addition to the information that these titles give us about some of the interests of the New Musicians, I would like to present three trends that appear throughout fourth-century poetry, not only in the New Music poets, but also in isolated fragments, and which can be connected with the change in authorial voice presented above.

2.1 Mythical gaps and silences

In the surviving corpus of fourth-century poetry, one encounters very few heroes from the Homeric tradition, apart from the *Ajax* of Timotheus. Most of the heroic subjects treated in the New Musicians’ compositions tend to fill in “Homeric gaps,” or rather explore short episodes of the Homeric narrative. This is the case with

³⁸² Also the name of a tragedy by Sophocles and a comedy by Menander.

³⁸³ On the model of Bacchylides 15 = dith.1, the fifty sons of Antenor. Maehler on Bacch.: “This suggests that the fifty singers who formed the chorus that performed this dithyramb somehow represented the fifty ‘Sons of Antenor.’”

³⁸⁴ Of course the title does not have to suggest music to provide opportunities for meta-musical statements: interestingly, of all the passages that have survived, the surviving passages of Telestes that deal with music do not come from pieces whose title suggest music (the *Asclepius*, the *Argo*, and the *Hymenaeus*).

Cleomenes' *Meleager*,³⁸⁵ Timotheus' titles, *Cyclops*, *Elpenor*, *Scylla*, *Laertes*, four pieces that cover aspects of the *Odyssey* narrated in the *apologoi*, and that could have, together, composed an "Odyssey" cycle.³⁸⁶ The theme of the Cyclops appears to have been particularly popular among the New Musicians. *PMG* 840 attests to the reperformance in Philip's time of several *Cyclopes* composed by New Musicians:³⁸⁷

περὶ μ(έν) γ(άρ) τὴν Μεθώνης πολιαρκίαν τὸν δεξιὸν ὀφθαλμ[ὸ]ν ἔεκόπη (sc. Φίλιππος)... τὰ μ(έν) γ(άρ) περὶ τῶν ἀύλητ(ῶν) ὁμολογεῖται κ(αὶ) παρὰ Μαρσύαι, διότι συντελοῦντι μουσικοὺς ἀγῶνας αὐτῶι μικρὸν ἐπάνω τῆς συμφορ(ᾶς) κ(ατὰ) δαίμονα συνέβη τὸν Κύκλωπα πάντας ἀύλησαι, Ἀντιγενεΐδην μ(έν) τὸν Φιλοξένου, Χρυσόγονον δ(ὲ) τὸν [Στ]ησιχόρου, Τιμόθεον δ(ὲ) τὸν Οἰνιάδου (Οἰνιάδην... τὸν Τιμοθέου ci. Foucart).

At the siege of Methone Philip lost his right eye.... The story about the pipers is told in the same terms by Marsyas: when Philip was holding musical competitions shortly before his accident it happened by a strange coincidence that all the pipers performed the *Cyclops*, Antigenides that of Philoxenus, Chrysogonus that of Stesichorus, Timotheus that of Oeniades.

It is worth examining why the Cyclops was such an interesting theme for the New Musicians.³⁸⁸ On the one hand, the theme had been exploited in the classical period, mainly as a comic theme: in addition to Aristias' and Euripides' satyr-plays named *Cyclops*,³⁸⁹ the episode of book 9 of the *Odyssey* also gave material to Cratinus, who wrote an *Odyssees* that appears to have treated of the Cyclops.³⁹⁰ Aristotle also seems to have assimilated the Cyclops with a comic theme, since in a (difficult) passage of the

³⁸⁵ Athenaeus 9. 402a = *PMG* 838.

³⁸⁶ On which, see J. Hordern 2002, 12-13.

³⁸⁷ *PMG* 840 = Didymus' commentary on 'Demosthenes' *Answer to Philip's Letter*, 11.22, col. 12.43 ss. On the blinding of Philip and the matter it gave for anecdotes, see A. Riginos 1994.

³⁸⁸ One can add *PMG* 925 e = Hibeh papyrus: mentions the Cyclops; *PMG* 966 (from a *Cyclops*); *PMG* 997, "unconvincingly ascribed to Pindar by Schneidewin; fr. 104b Snell" (Campbell). The milk theme is prominent.

³⁸⁹ Aristias' *Cyclops*: *TrGF* 9 F 4; on Euripides' *Cyclops*, see Seaford. For the pre-Euripidean versions: "we can say little more than they seemed to have followed the Homeric outline" P. Arnott 1961, 165.

³⁹⁰ On Cratinus' *Odyssees* and the mutual influences of Euripides' *Cyclops* and Cratinus' *Odyssees*, see R. H. Tanner 1915.

Poetics he associates Timotheus’ and Philoxenus’ *Cyclops* with lower characters.³⁹¹ If the comic potential of the *Cyclops* seems to have inspired several New Comedy pieces, like Nicochares’ *Galatea* (fr. 3-6 K-A), Antiphanes’ *Cyclops* (fr. 129-31 K-A), and Alexis’ (fr. 37-40 K-A),³⁹² we should not forget the dramatic (acting) potential provided by the drunkenness and the blinding of the *Cyclops* (two aspects demonstrated in other New Music pieces). Philoxenus’ *Cyclops* however introduced a real innovation, the love of Polyphemus for Galatea, an aspect of the myth not recorded before the fourth century, and that inspired Hellenistic writers, not only Theocritus in two *Idylls*, but also Callimachus, Hermesianax, and Bion.³⁹³ (I will comment on Philoxenus’ *Cyclops* more at length in the last section of this chapter).

More generally, it seems that poets (dithyrambists and other) cover the least familiar aspects of mythology, or had a special interest in minor heroes, a feature that the Hellenistic poets started developing more systematically in the third century BC. Melanippides for example is said to have written about the hero Linus, as did the third-century Attic historian Philochorus.³⁹⁴ Both the story of the baby hero Linus, and the grown-up musician Linus had musical (funeral) potential, as Pindar himself underlined (128c S-M, 7-9):³⁹⁵

ἀ μὲν εὐχαίταν Λίνον αἴλινον ὕμνει,
 δ’ Ὑμέναιον, <ὄν> ἐν γάμοισι χροιζόμενον

³⁹¹ *Poetics* 1448a 11 = *PMG* 782. For an attempt at solving the difficulty on philological grounds, see J. Hordern 2002, 107-109.

³⁹² See T. B. L. Webster 1970(2), 20-1.

³⁹³ Callimachus ep. 46 46.1-6 Pf. (*HE* 1047-52), Hermesianax, fr. 7. 69 ff Powell (*CA* 100 = *PMG* 815), and Bion (fr. 16 Reed). On the Hellenistic compositions, see J. Hordern 2004.

³⁹⁴ ἡ δὲ περὶ τὸν Λίνον ἱστορία καὶ παρὰ Φιλοχόρῳ ἐν τῇ ιθ’ καὶ παρὰ Μελανιπίδῃ. *PMG* 766 = scholiast T. Hom. Il. 18.579c (iv. 556 Erbse). For Philochorus: *FGrH* 328 F 207. Philochorus is known for his compilation of Attic (funerary) epigrams and “credited with a passion for collecting ‘oracles in verse’ (*FGrH* 328 T 6)” M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter 2002, 297.

³⁹⁵ On Linus as a hero, or baby hero, see C. Pache 2004, 66-83. Linus is also the subject of a comedy by Alexis.

.. κτ' σύμπρωτον λάβεν ἔσχατος ὕμνων.

One sings the miserable beautiful-haired Linus, and another Hymenaeus, whom [the Moira?] took, first touched in his wedding, last of the hymns.

The other hero, Hymenaeus, mentioned by Pindar in the passage also appears in fourth-century compositions: in addition to giving his name to a song-type (the hymenaeon) known since the archaic period,³⁹⁶ Hymenaeus is also the name of a dithyramb by Telestes. The piece might have exploited the hero's musical associations, since the passage that Athenaeus quotes (*PMG* 808) deals with musical matters - the *magadis*. But in the surviving lines, there is no explicit connection between the hero and music (the music mentioned is instrumental, and the subject is not expressed), and it is hard to make any further conclusions.³⁹⁷ Slightly more information about the hero is available in Licymnius' piece *Dithyrambos*:³⁹⁸

Λικύμνιος (Reinesius: Ἄλκύνιος cod. A) δ' ὁ Χίος ἐν Διθυράμβοις Ἀργύννου φησὶν ἐρώμενον Ὑμέναιον (Musurus: ὕμαινεον A) γενέσθαι

Licymnius of Chios says, in his *Dithyrambos*, that Hymenaios was the lover of Argynnus.

It is not clear whether he was the subject of a whole composition, or mentioned as part of a larger story. Another source, Philodemus, informs us about the treatment of the myth of Hymenaeus by Licymnius:³⁹⁹

φησὶν δὲ καὶ [Κλε]ιώ τὴν Μοῦσα[ν ἀνδρὸς] ἐρασθῆναι [Λι]κύ[μ]νιος, οἱ δὲ καὶ [τὸ]ν Ὑ[μ]ένα[ιο]ν υἱ[ὸν α]ὐτῆς [εἶν]αι νο[μί]ζουσι[ν].

³⁹⁶ Although no hymenaeon from the late-Classical period seems to have survived, Clearchus (Athenaeus 1. 5f-6b = fr. 57 W= *PMG* 828) describes a performance by Philoxenus, going uninvited to a wedding and singing after the dinner: καὶ μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον ἄσας ὕμέναιον οὐδ' ἠ ἀρχή: / Γάμε θεῶν λαμπρότατε. In the surviving line, *gamos* is personified.

³⁹⁷ On the *magadis*: G. Comotti 1983.

³⁹⁸ Athenaeus 13. 603d = *PMG* 768. The plural in the title “*Dithyrambos*” maybe suggests that the piece (by a poet / theoretician) was meant to illustrate Licymnius' language theory? But the plural might also refer not to a title but to the proper noun in the plural.

³⁹⁹ Philodemus, *On Pity*: P. Herc. 243 VI 12-18 = *PMG* 768A.

According to Licymnius, the Muse Clio as well fell in love with a man, and some think that Hymenaios was her son.

This version adds to the musical heritage of the figure, and it reinforces the impression that the fourth-century poets were interested in learned mythological investigations and alternate versions to Homeric or heroic narratives.⁴⁰⁰

2.2 Love, romance, sentimentality

This is connected to a second main characteristic of the Late-Classical production: the poets' treatment of the themes of romance and love. These themes are of course treated all throughout the Greek poetic corpus, from Homeric epic and hymns to the archaic poets and Attic tragedy. But the fourth-century poets (not only the New Musicians but other poets who are not presented as New Musicians) seem to have innovated not only in the figures whose love they represent, but also in the way they depict love, and in the genre of songs on the topic of love.

First, love-songs (τάρωτικά) are a genre, or topic of composition, that our sources (especially comic) attribute specifically to a group of poets: Lamynthius, Gnesippus, Meletes and Cleomenes. This is what a fragment of Epicrates' *Antilaiis* attests:⁴⁰¹

τάρωτικ' ἐκμεμάθηκα ταῦτα παντελῶς
Σαπφοῦς, Μελήτου, Κλεομένου, Λαμυνθίου.

I have learned by heart the love-songs of Sappho, Meletes, Cleomenes and Lamynthius.

⁴⁰⁰ On this passage of Licymnius, see A. Henrichs 1984. He notes (56): “der zum Musensohn gewordene personifizierte Hochzeitsruf scheint demnach ein beliebtes Thema der neuen, experimentierenden Chorlyrik gewesen zu sein.”

⁴⁰¹ Athenaeus 14. 620d = fr. 14 K-A.

The humorous enumeration (Sappho and three late fifth-century poets) is more a testimonial on the comic poets' predilection for making fun of Sappho than a joke on the three poets themselves:⁴⁰² although the thematic content of τάρωτικά seems obvious, the genre of song, and its context of performance is a matter of debate. The verb (ἐκμεμάθηκα) used by the speaker of the *Antilaiis* suggests boasting about one's sympotic skills (and ability to hold one's place at a symposium). This is also what suggests another comic passage (Aeschylus' criticism of Euripides in Aristophanes' *Frogs*) that mentions a Meletes:⁴⁰³

οὔτος δ' ἀπὸ πάντων μὲν φέρει, πορνωδιῶν,
σκολίων Μελήτου, Καρικῶν ἀύλημάτων,
θρήνων, χορειῶν.

this man picks from everywhere: prostitute songs, *skolia* of Meletus, Carian aulos-songs, threnoi, choral dances.

The “list effect” of the Aristophanic line contributes to tainting the “*skolia* of Meletus” (whether the dramatic poet or the poet mentioned by Epicrates) with the connotations both of ‘prostitute songs’ and ‘aulos-song’ (of the *aulêtris* at the symposium), and to giving the poet's songs connotation of low-class entertainment.

A phrase of Philoxenus quoted by Athenaeus might signal that Philoxenus too composed these *tarôtika* (songs on the subject of love that seem to have been songs composed for performance at a symposium):⁴⁰⁴

ἐπεὶ δ' ἔνταῦθα τοῦ λόγου ἐσμέν,
συμβαλοῦμαί τι μέλος ὑμῖν εἰς ἔρωτα

⁴⁰² For the comic poets' predilection for jokes on Sappho, see G. Most 1995.

⁴⁰³ On that line (1302), Dover hesitates to identify Meletus with the tragic poet: “if σκολίων and Μελήτου belong together it is unlikely that we are meant to think of the tragic poet Meletos (or there were two of them, of either of those two (...). There is, however, a possibility that we should punctuate after σκολίων, thus introducing deliberate ambiguity (maybe a near-pause but not quite a pause after σκολίων), and thus a swipe at the tragic poet.”

⁴⁰⁴ Athenaeus 15. 692d = *PMG* 833.

κατὰ τὸν Κυθήριον ποιητὴν

Since we have reached this point in the conversation,
I will contribute for you a song to love
as the poet of Cythera says.

This is all that survives from the song, but both its paraphrase in Plato's *Symposium* and its use in the narrative framework of the *Deipnosophistae* suggest most likely a sympotic performance,⁴⁰⁵ for a group of people (ὄμῳ).

However, it might also come from a dithyramb, since according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the dithyrambic poets had a predilection for erotic themes; commenting on Plato's *Menexenus* he quoted as typical expressions of Licymnius and Agathon "hybris or Cypris."⁴⁰⁶ Lamynthius is also said elsewhere by Athenaeus (quoting Clearchus) to have written a *Lyde* in lyric meters, just as Antimachus wrote one in elegiac.⁴⁰⁷ Although we know no other details about Lamynthius' *Lyde*, we may presume that it was an "*Antilyde*" in lyric meters (just as Epicrates had an *Antilaiis*).⁴⁰⁸ The surviving fragments of Licymnius substantiate Dionysius' analysis, since most of them are related to the subject of love. A story of Parthenius for example draws from Licymnius of Chios and Hermesianax, to tell the story of Nanis and Croesus, a tale of seduction and promises, persuasion and deception, in an Eastern setting.⁴⁰⁹ A quotation

⁴⁰⁵ See the parallel with Plato's *Symposium*, 185c: ταῦτά σοι, ἔφη, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ παραχρημα, ὦ Φαίδρε, περὶ Ἑρωτος συμβάλλομαι. Dionysius Halicarnassus: *Comp.* 1.6. [fragmentum Bergk *Cyclopi* poemati tribuit.] It is impossible to determine whether the passage was from the *Cyclops*. If it were, who would the second person plural refer to?

⁴⁰⁶ *Demosthenes* 26 = *PMG* 773, quoted note 336.

⁴⁰⁷ Athenaeus 13. 596f – 597a = *PMG* 839, quoting Clearchus fr. 34 Werhli.

⁴⁰⁸ The long and bombastic *Lyde* of Antimachus in elegiacs might have been a model to emulate for him, on a lighter tone. On Antimachus' *Lyde*, see V. Matthews 1996. On the difference of meters to treat different "levels" of poetry in the Hellenistic poets, see M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter 2002, 34 (note 138); 69.

⁴⁰⁹ *PMG* 772. It is interesting to see paired out a poet of the late-Classical period and a Hellenistic poet. Hermesianax is also ascribed a *Persica* (fr. 12 *CA*) "but Powell, Rohde, and Susemihl have all doubted its existence" (J. L. Lightfoot 1999, 504).

from Licymnius in Athenaeus provides another example: it describes the love story of Sleep and Endymion:⁴¹⁰

Ἵπνος δὲ χαίρων
ὀμμάτων ἀγᾶϊς, ἀναπεπταμένοις
ὄσσοις ἐκοίμιζεν κόρον.

And Sleep, rejoicing in the rays of his eyes, would lull the boy to rest with eyes wide open.

To the story of Sleep’s love of Selene as narrated by Sappho, Licymnius seems to prefer a homosexual version (Sleep’s love of Endymion).⁴¹¹ This emphasis on homosexual love is particularly interesting, since a fragment from the Rainer papyrus⁴¹² quotes lyric passages quoted in a prose work that cites lines from the dithyrambic poets that illustrate a certain “softness” / effeminacy:

(a) μέλος μαλακὸν ἠ]γεῖτο πολλαχοῦ μὲν ἀποφαίνε[σ]θαι, μάλιστα δ’ ἐν τῶι
τίς ἄρα λύσσα νῶι τιν’ ὑφαι[

He believed that effeminate song was often in evidence, but particularly in:
What madness, pray, (robs?) us two of a...?

Although the passages that appear later in the papyrus seem connected with Dionysus, there is one fragment (g) that evokes not only the same theme (Sleep), but also the same images (that of the soft eyes and tenderness), creating a charming little tableau:

]ε μαλακόματος ὕπ-
νος [γ]υῖα περὶ πάντα βαλών,

⁴¹⁰ Athenaeus 13. 564 c-d = *PMG* 771.

⁴¹¹ Other versions: other mythological versions make him the son of Aethlios and Kalyke, fr. 10(a), 60-62 = Merkelbach/West 229; he was loved by Hera (Epim. 12 = Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.57-8) or Selene (Acusilas Argeus fr. 36). On Endymion, see N. Agapiou 2005; the first part presents the different traditions: 1) the Helladic/occidental tradition of Endymion king; the Asia Minor/oriental tradition of Endymion and Selene. About Licymnius’ version, Agapiou 2005, 33, only notes that “Likymnius de Scio (*sic*) (...) nous donne une version singulière du mythe” and compares it with frescoes from Pompei, and scenes on two Roman sarcophagi. “L’apparition d’Hypnos en tant que dispensateur du sommeil d’Endymion est une innovation des débuts de l’Empire” (note 107, p. 33). Agapiou also notes the transformation of the myth in the Hellenistic period, especially in [Theocritus’] Idyll 20. The passage we have of Licymnius suggests a switch from tales of love to sentimentalism.

⁴¹² Dated from the 1st c. BC or 1st c. AD. = *PMG* 929.

ὡσεὶ μάτηρ παῖδ' ἀγαπα-
τ]ὸν χρόνιον ἰδοῦσα φίλωι
κ]όλπωι πτέρυγας ἀμφέβαλεν

Soft-eyed Sleep (came), embracing all his/her limbs, as a mother on seeing her dear son after a long absence folds him with her wings to her loving breast.

The delicacy of the simile (and of the metaphor of the mother's "wings"), the attention to details and intimate atmosphere (with the insistence on the softness of sleep: μαλακόμματος) is not without evoking the delicate descriptions of love by the Hellenistic artists.⁴¹³

Other fragments also display a change of emphasis with the archaic treatment of erotic myths. A passage of Lycophronides combines a favourite theme of elegiac poetry (praise of to *kosmion* and *aidôs*) but extends the moral theme to a priamel that includes all love objects: boys, girls and women.⁴¹⁴

οὔτε παιδὸς ἄρρενος οὔτε παρθένων
τῶν χρυσοφόρων οὐδὲ γυναικῶν βαθυκόλπων
καλὸν τὸ πρόσωπον, ἀλλ' ὃ κόσμιον πεφύκει·
ἡ γὰρ αἰδῶς ἄνθος ἐπισπείρει.

Neither in a male child, nor in gold-bearing girls nor in deep-bosomed women is the face pretty, if it is not naturally decorous; for modesty sows the flower [of beauty].

The priamel is unusual insofar as it makes beauty contingent neither on gender nor age (the most traditional criteria of beauty in archaic lyric),⁴¹⁵ but upon modesty. The natural imagery rejuvenates the old elegiac wisdom: the notion of τὸ καλόν, τὸ κόσμιον and ἡ αἰδῶς appear in archaic elegy, as do the vegetal images;⁴¹⁶ but rarely boy, women and girls are treated in the same breath, except in a negative form in a

⁴¹³ For "Hellenistic Aesthetics" and reference to Sleep, see B. Fowler 1989, 148.

⁴¹⁴ Athenaeus 13. 564a-b = Clearchus fr. 22 Wehrli = *PMG* 843.

⁴¹⁵ On flowers as a metaphorical term, see D. Steiner 1986, 28-39, esp. 30.

⁴¹⁶ Compare Solon 25. 1-2 W (quoted in Plutarch's *Amatorius*).

passage of Mimnermus, where the poet describes how old age makes one *a detestable object for boys and women*.⁴¹⁷ The difference between our fragment and the archaic passage is that Lycophronides describes how modesty makes boys, girls and women (all described with an adjective, in the typical manner described above) *desirable objects*. There is no clear homosexual or heterosexual orientation, and the adjectives do not so much describe physical features as insist on the social status (boy, unmarried woman, and established lady).

The same vegetal image (θέρος) and the same verb (σπείρω) used in Lycophronides' lines are also used by Melanippides:⁴¹⁸

γλυκὺ γὰρ θέρος ἀνδρὸς ὑποσπείρων πραπίδων πόθον
for sowing desire, a sweet harvest in the heart of man...

This quotation in Plutarch's *Amatorius* has a rather “georgic” tone, with the rustic image of the crop, and might, again, remind one of the elegiacs of Mimnermus and his considerations on aging exploring the vocabulary of nature. But the metaphor (which appears in Philoxenus' *Cyclops*, as I will develop in the next section), rather than assimilating the times of life with nature (on the model of both Homer and Mimnermus), compares love and harvest. It is also demythologized, and the “sweetness” of love usually associated with Eros γλυκύπικρος is conferred to another image.

The emphasis on nature and the bucolic tone of the fragment also appear in another fragment of the same author which takes the form of a romantic dedication:⁴¹⁹

⁴¹⁷ Mimnermus, fr. 1 W.

⁴¹⁸ The verb is used twice in Pindar, *Nemean* 1, 13; *Nemean* 8, 39. See G. McCracken 1934 on vegetal imagery in Pindar.

⁴¹⁹ *PMG* 844. On that fragment, see M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter 2004, 177; A. Sens, in M. Fantuzzi 2006, 164.

ὄθεν Λυκοφρονίδης τὸν ἐρῶντα ἐκεῖνον αἰπόλον ἐποίησε λέγοντα·
τόδ' ἀνατίθημί σοι ῥόδον
καλὸν ἄνθημα, καὶ πέδιλα καὶ κυνέαν
καὶ τὰν θηροφόνον λογχίδ' , ἐπεὶ μοι νόος ἄλλα κέχυται
ἐπὶ τὰν Χάρισιν φίλαν παῖδα καὶ καλάν.

This is why Lycophronides makes his goatherd in love say:
This rose I dedicate to you, beautiful dedication, and these sandals and
cap, and beast-slaying javelin, since my thoughts are poured out
everywhere, towards the girl who is dear to the Graces and beautiful.

This kind of dedication is found in Hellenistic literary epigrams, such as the following
one from Theocritus:⁴²⁰

Δάφνης ὁ λευκόχρως, ὁ καλᾶ σύριγγι μελίσδων
βουκολικούς ὕμνους, ἄνθετο Πανὶ τάδε
τοὺς τρητοὺς δόνακας, τὸ λαγωβόλον, ὅζυν ἄκοντα,
νεβρίδα, τὰν πήραν, ᾧ ποκ' ἐμαλοφόρει.

White-skinned Daphnis, who modulates bucolic songs on his beautiful
syrinx, dedicated these things to Pan: his pierced reeds, his shepherd
staff and sharp javelin, his fawn-skin and the leather pouch in which he
once carried apples.

Both passages function in the same way: they heavily rely on *deixis* to create a little
drama, where the locutor dedicates objects linked to the bucolic and pastoral world.
Lycophronides' passage however is spoken in the first person (by a goatherd, according
to Athenaeus), while Theocritus is spoken in the third. Moreover, while Theocritus'
epigram does not indicate why Daphnis dedicated his things to Pan, Lycophronides
describes (in a more naïve way? In a more artistically naïve way?) the reason for his
dedication: ἐπεὶ μοι νόος ἄλλα κέχυται / ἐπὶ τὰν Χάρισιν φίλαν παῖδα καὶ καλάν.⁴²¹

⁴²⁰ Epigram 2 Gallavotti.

⁴²¹ The metaphor itself (of his *noos* being spilled) is unique: Sappho talks about the “love spilling over
delightful face” (ἔρος δ' ἐπ' ἰμέρω κέχυται προσώπῳ ... fr. 112 V.) but the image is different. (The
closest parallel would be φόβῳ δ' οὐ κεχείμανται φρένες, Pindar, *Pythian* 9.32, where the image
functions in a similar manner, with the noun for the seat of emotion being described by concrete verb).

Other “bucolic” love titles - a *Daphnis*, *Calyce* and *Rhadine* - figure among the spuria for Stesichorus I (*PMG* 277-9) and can be attributed to Stesichorus II, the poet mentioned in the passage describing the performance of the various *Cyclops* cited above (*PMG* 840) and recorded on the *Marmor Parium*.⁴²² The fragment of the *Rhadine* is particularly interesting, and combines the two themes that I have presented so far: an interest for minor heroes and for romance, (and music).⁴²³ Written in stichic meters (greater Asklepiadeans), the couplet suggests to Rose that it was composed by “a drawing-room singer”:

καὶ ἡ Ῥαδινὴ δέ, ἣν Στησίχορος ποιῆσαι δοκεῖ, ἥς ἀρχὴ
ἄγε Μοῦσα λίγει, ἄρξον ἀοιδᾶς ἐρατωνύμου
Σαμίων περὶ παίδων ἐρατᾶι φθεγγομένα λύραι.
ἐντεῦθεν λέγει τοὺς παῖδας.

And the *Rhadine*, that seems to have been composed by Stesichorus and starts: “come clear-voiced Muse, start the song of gracious fame and tell the story of the Samian children, accompanied by your lovely lyre.” And then it talks about the children.

Another fragment, from the *Calyce*,⁴²⁴ is described by Aristoxenus and connected to Stesichorus (the theorist does not specify which one). This song that old women sang (ἦδον αἱ ἀρχαῖαι γυναῖκες Καλύκην τινὰ ὠδήν) was a tale about a maiden, Calyce, who flung herself from the Leucadian cliff, out of despair caused by her love of a young man.⁴²⁵ The passage is itself quoted by Athenaeus in book 14 of the *Deipnosophistae*, in a context that describes several kinds of bucolic songs involving female deaths and musical aitiologies: the preceding quote from Clearchus’ *Erôtica*,

⁴²² On which M. L. West 1970, 206: “Aelian tells a story about Daphnis, and says that this was the original subject of τὰ βουκολικὰ μέλη, and that Stesichorus of Himera τῆς τοιαύτης μελοποιίας ὑπάρξασθαι”; H. J. Rose 1932 also argues for attributing them to Stesichorus II.

⁴²³ Polyidus also presents his Atlas as a sheperd, *PMG* 837.

⁴²⁴ Athenaeus 14. 619d.

⁴²⁵ The reference to the women of old might seem to refer to the period of Stesichorus I, but in several instances, including in Aristotle and Plato, poets of the previous generation are called ἀρχαῖοι.

told the story of Eriphanis (the lyric poetess in love with Menalcas and inventor of the *nomion*), and the next stories, from Aristoxenus' *Brief Notes* and Nymphis in his *On Heracleia* tell the story respectively of Harpalycê (responsible for the invention of a song-contest called *Harpalycê* among the maidens in her honour) and of the Bormus dirge (sung among the Mariandynians during a certain festival).

Thus, the different titles, fragments and testimonies all underline the poets' interest in love plots, old and new, and in "nature and countryside" themes.

2.3 Easternness and exoticism

Finally, the last subject among those that seem to have been en vogue in fourth-century poetry is Easternness.⁴²⁶ A general interest for Oriental and exotic characters is attested in other late fifth-century genres, tragedy and comedy.⁴²⁷ In addition to Timotheus' *Persians*, sources record a dithyramb the *Mysians* by Philoxenus and a *Syros* (the *Syrian*).⁴²⁸ I have already mentioned above Licymnius of Chios' *Nanis* (the love story of Nanis and Croesus),⁴²⁹ and Lamynthius' *Lyde*, the tale, in lyric meters, of

⁴²⁶ The penultimate sentence of M. Miller's "afterthought" in her beautiful book on Athens and Persia in the fifth century BC reads: "This study does not pretend to be exhaustive; interesting results are likely to arise from investigation in other areas, such as the 'New Music' of the late fifth century, and the evidence for the expansion of cuisine" (M. Miller 1997, 258).

⁴²⁷ The East appears in all genres: Euripides' Phrygian slave in the *Orestes* is the most extravagantly Eastern, but there are many other Eastern characters in Euripides (including the Phoenissan women, who call themselves βάρβαροι on three occasions). On exoticism in Euripides, see S. Saïd 1984. Easternness also appears in, for example, Choerilus' *Persica* and fr. 685 TGrF (on which see E. Hall 1996); in Aristophanes' plays (including the "new" foreign gods Sabazius and Cybele in the *Birds*), Pherecrates had a play called *Persians*, Antiphanes, the *Scythians*, and in *Oenomaus* or *Pelops*, fr. 170 K-A he "presents a Persian description of the differences between Greek and Persian eating which is similar to those found in *Acharnians*" (J. Wilkins 2000.). Finally, in elegy: Antimachus' *Lyde*, on which V. Matthews 1996, 26-39.

⁴²⁸ Aristotle *Politics* 1342 b = *PMG* 826. Appeal to the glens of Mysia in Timotheus, *PMG* 780, 120. See also pseudo-Plutarch *De musica* 1142f.

⁴²⁹ *PMG* 772.

the poet's love for a foreign girl.⁴³⁰ An exotic feeling also imbues a fragment of the *Danaids* of Melanippides, a passage that describes their unusual mode of life and non-feminine occupations:⁴³¹

οὐ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων φόρευν μομφὰν ὄνειδος
οὐδὲ τὰν ὀργὰν γυναικείαν ἔχον
ἀλλ' ἐν ἀρμάτεσσι διφρού-
χοις ἐγυμνάζοντ' ἀν' εὐ-
ήλι' ἄλσεα πολλάκις
θήραις φρένα τερπόμεναι,
<αἰ δ' > ἱερόδακρυν λίβανον εὐώ- 5
δεις τε φοίνικας κασίαν τε ματεῦσαι
τέρενα Σύρια σπέρματα

For they neither carried the reproachful rebukes of people, nor did they have the temperament of women, but they exercised on chariots in sunny glens, often delighting their heart at hunting, and seeking sacred-teared incense, and fragrant dates, and tender seeds of cinnamon.

The Danaids are presented as the non-Greek women *par excellence* and Melanippides emphasizes the contrast with (the archetypal Athenian) woman: they seem independent and do not care about the public eye (οὐ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων φόρευν μομφὰν ὄνειδος); they do not have a woman's temper; their space is outside, not inside, in the sun, and not even in the city but in the woods. They take the place of men (on the chariots), exercise and hunt.⁴³² At the same time, the passage creates a strange mix of genders: the vocabulary of men (chariot, hunt and exercise) contrasts with that of women (pleasure, shade, perfumes). Despite the Eastern markers (the *τέρενα Σύρια σπέρματα*),⁴³³ there

⁴³⁰ PMG 839: τῆς βαρβάρου Λύδης εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν καταστάς ἐποίησεν (...) [Λαμύνθιος ὁ Μιλήσιος] ἐν μέλει τὸ καλούμενον ποίημα Λύδην.

⁴³¹ PMG 757. See E. Hall 1989, 202.

⁴³² As presented above, the passage shows a particular sensitivity for adjectives that give a feeling for texture, sensuality, or details that require the listener's participation in creating a complex image: εὐήλι' ἄλσεα (the spectacle of groves with sun piercing through the branches); the ἱερόδακρυν λίβανον (that might have a mythical flavour, see PMG 834); the smell (εὐώδεις φοίνικας) and the surface (κασίαν τέρενα). On the passage, and the gender-blurring, see A. Moreaux 1994-1995.

⁴³³ Also in fragment: PMG 929 (e) 3: waterless Lybia.

is no real reference to luxury and voluptuousness (“sunny glens” suggest more a *locus amoenus* than exotic luxury).

The interest for the East is best displayed in Timotheus (of Miletus)’s *Persians*, which until the *sphragis* focuses on the side of the dying Persians. Surprisingly however, there is no description of what is associated with Easternness in earlier poets: as opposed to what especially the fourth-century comic poets depict as typically barbarian,⁴³⁴ there is no description of *habrosyne*, no luxury, no “barbarism” (except in the bad Greek spoken by one of the shipwrecked men).⁴³⁵ As opposed to the description of Eastern luxury in Aeschylus’ *Persians* or Euripides’ *Orestes*, where even in a situation of panic and murder-attempt, the luxury of Eastern lifestyle is suggested (from Helen’s fans to the Phrygian slave’s slippers), there is no such depiction in Timotheus’ *Persians*. While it is undeniable that the war context does not lend itself to lavish descriptions of *habrosyne*, there is a marked difference with Aeschylus’ *Persians*, where, for example, the leitmotif of the torn precious robes functions as a visual metaphor for the ruin of the Persian empire:⁴³⁶ in Timotheus’ *Persians*, the only description of Persian wealth is in the *στολήν εὐυφῆ* (vv. 167-68) (to very modestly describe the clothes that the Persians rip in their grief), in the *τετράορον ἵππων ὄχημα* (vv. 190-191) and the bland *ἀνάρτιμον ὄλβον* (vv. 191-2) and *πλούτου* of the King (v.

⁴³⁴ See J. Wilkins 2000, 275 on the concept of luxury among both Athenians and their neighbours.

⁴³⁵ It is mostly a feature of comedy illustrated especially by Aristophanes (see H. Bacon 1961, 115-140; E. Hall 2006, 225-254). On linguistic barbarism: “gorgeously cacophonous passages like those of Aeschylus do not occur in Euripides” (H. Bacon 1961, 143, note 29).

⁴³⁶ More powerful I think than descriptions of riches is the reference to the ‘fair-woven warmth’ that the wave has ripped away from the Persian’s body: *περὶ γὰρ κλύδων / ἄγριος ἀνέρρηξεν ἅπαλ / γυίων εἶδος ὑφαντόν* 134-6. The image of the torn rich fabric (a leitmotif, as noted above, of Aeschylus’ *Persians*) has nearly lost its symbolic power to only suggest the violence of the sea, taking away the warmth of the Persian’s body.

195).⁴³⁷ E. Hall has underlined particularly Eastern *mores* in this passage and the many “images and terminology drawn from the ‘vocabulary of barbarism,’ the orientalist discourse which had been developed in Greek culture from at least as early as Aeschylus’ tragic *Persians*”:⁴³⁸ she points out the extravagant displays of lamentation, inappropriate in men, their abject positions of supplication, their feminization. While it is true that the lamentations of the dying Persians occupy a good part of the end of the song, and that the Eastern characters are depicted in positions of submission to the Greeks, there are some interesting deviations from the ‘orientalist discourse’: first the Greeks themselves appear “othered”, dragging the Persians by the hair, in a barbarian gesture (v. 144);⁴³⁹ moreover, the discourse of the mourning Persian army interweaves Greek patriotic *topoi* and Eastern attitudes. In their general lament, the Persians pray for being rescued from Salamis (ἐνθένδε), lest “[their] city will never welcome [their] body again” (οὐ γὰρ ἔτι ποτ’ ἀμὸν σῶμα δέξεται πόλις, vv. 108-109). I take this as a concern for returning and giving proper treatment to the body of the dead – a concern that would resonate particularly strongly in the Athenians’ hearts after the battle of Arginusae. Moreover, it works in ring-composition with the last lines of the imploration, where the Persians fear for the treatment of their body and the threat “[of lying] there, a pitiable feast for the tribes of birds” (ἔνθα κείσομαι οἰκτρὸς ὀρνίθων ἔθνεσιν ὠμοβρῶσι θοίνα, v. 137). Even more striking than the orientalist discourse is

⁴³⁷ While the King’s description of the destruction is very detailed and rich in adjectives (178-186), the description of the riches itself is negative, ἀν-ἀριθμον, an adjective that in itself contains the tragic dimension of the King’s position (his riches will indeed soon be “countless”).

⁴³⁸ E. Hall 2006, 276 ff. See also 184-224 on “recasting the barbarian” for an overview of the methodological approaches and the recent scholarship on Persia and the ‘barbarian.’

⁴³⁹ On the inversion of Greek and foreign attitudes at the end of the fifth century, see E. Hall 1989, ‘the polarity destructured’, 201 ff.

the fact that the collective voice of the Persian defeated army concludes its imploration with a Homeric image.⁴⁴⁰

In the face of this East, Greece is presented as a unity: in the extant corpus of five hundred lines of dithyrambs and nomos (however unrepresentative of the whole production our corpus might be), there is no mention of particular Greek places (except in the *sphragis* of Timotheus' *Persians*, which mentions Sparta). Hellas is always presented as a unity, as if seen from the outside, as several examples illustrate.⁴⁴¹ Telestes in *PMG* 805 b, 2: φάμα προσέπταθ ' Ἑλλάδα (a tale flew to Greece), or Timotheus in the opening verse of the *Persians* (*PMG* 788): κλεινὸν ἐλευθερίας τεύχων μέγαν Ἑλλάδι κόσμον (fashioning this famous great ornament of freedom for Greece), in *PMG* 789 σέβεσθ' αἰδῶ συνεργὸν ἀρετᾶς δοριμάχου (worship honour, the helpmate of battling valour), and in *PMG* 790: Ἄρης τύραννος; χρυσὸν δ' Ἑλλάς οὐ δέδοικε (War rules; but Greece does not fear gold).⁴⁴²

This is also particularly striking in an epitaph to Euripides,⁴⁴³ attributed to “either Thucydides the historian or Timotheus the lyric poet,” where there is a strong feeling of Panhellenism – and beyond (with the inclusion of Macedon in the tragic poet's biography and claim to inheritance):

μνήμα μὲν Ἑλλάς ἅπασ' Εὐριπίδου, ὅστέα δ' ἴσχει
γῆ Μακεδῶν, ἥπερ δέξατο τέρμα βίου.

⁴⁴⁰ The threat of animal's maltreatment of the body of the dead is an epic *topos*: *Iliad* 1. 4-5; 2. 393; 2. 459 (ὀρνίθων ... ἔθνεα); 8. 379; 11. 395, 453; 22. 66-75; 22. 339. See also Sophocles *Antigone*, 29-30; *Ajax*, 830; Euripides *Phoenissae*, 1634.

⁴⁴¹ This is particularly clear about tales about Eastern music - as I have shown above, they are constructed so as to oppose the use of instruments: the “Dorian” muse is opposed to the “Lydian” hymns and the narrative suggests an eventless syncretism between East and West.

⁴⁴² In these last two instances, Greece and East are opposed and the poet employs key words (ἐλευθερία and χρυσόν) that contribute to opposing the two in a stereotypical way that reminds of Herodotus 8.144. On χρυσόν, Hordern notes Demosthenes' insistence on the Greek immunity to bribery during the Persian wars (*Philippic* 3. 36-40).

⁴⁴³ *Vita Euripides*, *FGE*, 307 ff.

πατρὶς δ' Ἑλλάδος Ἑλλάς, Ἀθῆναι· πλεῖστα δὲ Μούσαις
τέρψας ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ τὸν ἔπαινον ἔχει.

All of Hellas is a monument to Euripides, but the land of Macedonia holds his bones, where he reached the end of his life. His fatherland was the Hellas of Hellas, Athens; much pleasure he gave thanks to his poetry, and he is much praised.

All these isolated examples tend to prove that the poets' interest for the East, more than political or ethical as in fifth-century tragedy, was an interest for a “géographie imaginaire”; Even on an historical theme like the Persian Wars, where the poet switches between depicting the Greeks as barbarians, and participating in the discourse of orientalism, the way these foreign composers (from Miletus, Cythera, Selinous, Thebes, to name only a few places of origin of the dithyrambic poets) represent Greece and non-Greece does not seem to follow any ideological line.⁴⁴⁴

Most of the references to the East indeed concern the religious more than the material or political world. In the *Persians* for example, the man from Phrygian Celaenae implores the local Artemis:⁴⁴⁵

ἐγὼ σοι μὴ δεῦρ', ἐγὼ
κεῖσε παρὰ Σάρδι, παρὰ Σοῦσα
'Αγβάτανα ναίων·
Ἄρτιμις ἐμὸς μέγας θεὸς
παρ' Ἐφεσον φυλάξει.

me I don't go there to you, me there to Sardis, to Susa, because me live in Agbatana. Artimis my great god will protect me to Ephesus.

⁴⁴⁴ The point is even stronger if we read the lament of the man from Celaenae quite literally. His first sentence is † ἐγὼ μοι σοι † κῶς καὶ τί πρᾶγμα; (Me for me for you, how and what thing?) Hordern, who offers a summary of the attempted reconstructions of the texts, concludes: “Timotheus may have made his Celaenae begin with a deliberate muddle, and only afterwards speak anything approximating to sense.” What the man seems to underline, in this line and after, is the distance between Greece and Persia, and his intention to maintain the distance (some reconstructions offer “how am I of any concern to you?” (Ebeling, citing Kühner-Gerth)).

⁴⁴⁵ As opposed to Aeschylus' *Persians*, who mostly speak the Greek of tragedy (with some neologisms), this Persian talks like an Aristophanic character.

The goddess is likely to be the one also implored in Timotheus' *Artemis*, the Eastern version of Apollo's sister, said to be:⁴⁴⁶

θυιάδα φοιβάδα μαινάδα λυσσάδα
mantic, frantic, Bacchic, fanatic

As an anecdote about Cinesias' reaction suggests (Κινησίας ὁ μελοποιὸς ἐκ τῶν θεατῶν ἀναστὰς 'τοιαύτη σοι' εἶπε 'θυγάτηρ γένοιτο: the lyric poet Cinesias stood from the audience in the theatre and said "may you have as great a daughter!"), Timotheus' line offered a radical twist on the chaste Artemis presented for example in the (second) Homeric Hymn to Artemis:⁴⁴⁷ Timotheus depicts the goddess (or a worshipper?) not as the virgin huntress, shunning all contact, but as a bacchant (all four adjectives are used of Dionysus).

Several other compositions attest of the interest of the New Musicians for Eastern cults. In addition to the prayer to Artemis, the *Persians* includes a prayer to the Mountain Mother:

...πρὸς μελαμ-
πεταλοχίτωνα Ματρὸς οὐρείας
δεσπόσυνα γόνατα πεσεῖν 125
εὐωλένους τε χεῖρας ἀμφιβάλλων
λίσσοιτο· "σῶσον χρυσοπλόκαμε
θεὰ Μᾶτερ ἰκνοῦμαι
ἐμὸν ἐμὸν αἰῶνα δυσέκφευκτον"...

[if one could fall] at the queenly knees of the black-leaf-robed Mountain Mother and embracing them with beautiful arms would say: "save me, gold-tressed

⁴⁴⁶ PMG 778. Dicaearchus in his *on Greek Culture* (fr. 60 Wehrli = PMG 955) quotes a song (ᾄσμα) about Artemis in which the goddess is celebrated to the sound of gold-shining bronze-cheeked castanets. Antimachus also had an *Artemis* (on which see V. Matthews 1996, 39-45). According to Hordern: "Her cult had close affinities with that of Cybele, although direct recognition of the connection is made only rarely: cf. e.g. Diogenes, TrGF 45 = Semele F 1, κλύω δὲ Λυδάς Βακτρίας τε παρθένους ποταμῶι παροίκους "Ἄλυι Τμωλίαν θεὸν δαφνόσκιον κατ' ἄλσος "Ἄρτεμιν σέβειν, where the goddess of Tmolus is obviously Cybele (Farnell ii. 473-4)."

⁴⁴⁷ On that passage, see G. Brussich 1990, 33-34. As in Homeric Hymn to Artemis, 2: "Ἄρτεμιν ἀεῖδω χρυσηλάκατον, κελαδεινήν,/ παρθένον αἰδοίην, ἐλαφηβόλον, ἰοχέαιραν... (vv. 1-2).

goddess mother, I implore you, save my life for which there is hardly an escape.”...

This goddess from Lydia (assimilated to Cybele)⁴⁴⁸ also appears in other New Music fragments:⁴⁴⁹ Philodemus in the *On Piety* suggests that two New Music poets had an interest in her cult, Melanippides and Telestes:⁴⁵⁰

Μελανιπ[πί]δης δὲ Δήμητρ[α καὶ] Μητέρα θεῶν φ[η]σιν μίαν ὑπάρχ[ειν].
Καὶ Τελέστης ἐν Διὸς γοναίς το . . . (.) καὶ ῥέαν ...

Melanipides says that Demeter and the Mother of the gods are one and the same. And Telestes in his *Birth of Zeus* says [the same?] and that Rhea...

More generally, the poets seem to have been interested in presenting aspects of mystery religions: according to Stobaeus, Melanippides wrote a *Persephone*,⁴⁵¹ Telestes mentions the Mountain Mother in a fragment;⁴⁵² the Mother goddess also appears in the puzzling penultimate stasimon of Euripides' *Helen*, and in an anonymous fragment dated from the 4th century BC by Wagman.⁴⁵³

This interest for the Mountain Mother / Great Mother has been interpreted by Csapo as the evolution of dithyramb and theatre music in the late-Classical towards a “come-back to Dionysus”:⁴⁵⁴

Far from embodying the final collapse of the religious impulse, New Music constitutes a revival of the Dionysian element in theatre music, at a time when it

⁴⁴⁸ For worship of Cybele in Lydia, see *Bacchae*, 15, 140, 463. Also N. Robertson 1996.

⁴⁴⁹ On her cult, see R. Parker, 159; N. Robertson 1996, 239-304; D. R. West 1995 (76-81). Her cult was also linked to Pan, as already attested in Pindar. *PMG* 829 (from Philoxenus) describes a temple on Parnassus that later Pausanias associates with the cult of Pan (no cult is described in the quotation by Antigonus of Carystus).

⁴⁵⁰ *De pietate* (p. 23 Gomperz) = *PMG* 764.

⁴⁵¹ Stobaeus, 1.49. 50 (i. 418 Wachsmuth) = *PMG* 759. Although Philodemus does not refer to the *Persephone*, this piece as well might have explored this aspect of the relationship between Demeter and the Great Mother.

⁴⁵² Athenaeus 14. 625e- 626a = *PMG* 810: πρῶτοι παρὰ κρατήρας Ἑλλάνων ἐν αὐλοῖς / συνοπαδοὶ Πέλοπος Ματρὸς ὀρείας / Φρύγιον ἄεισαν νόμον.

⁴⁵³ *IG* iv² 131 = *PMG* 935. On which, see P. Maas 1933, 134 ff.; M. L. West 1970; R. Wagman 1995, 115-146.

⁴⁵⁴ E. Csapo 2000, 416-17: “New Music had, after all, something to do with Dionysus.”

had come close to extinction, to judge from the dithyrambs of Bacchylides and the dramatic music of Sophocles and early Euripides. The New Musicians present themselves as the preservers of cultic tradition, *even if such traditions were invented under the spell of contemporary mystery and orgiastic cult*: Their appeals are notably to mystic/Dionysian role-models like Orpheus, Olympus, or the Korybants.

(...) The later Euripides and the New Musicians self-consciously put their music in cultic and Dionysiac dress. New Musical song frequently evokes Dionysiac music, Dionysiac cult, and Dionysiac dance (my emphasis).

While Csapo draws most of his evidence from Euripidean tragedy, the occurrences of Dionysus-related fragments in the fragments of the New Musicians are more problematic. I have already noted the relative scarcity of Dionysus in dithyramb titles.⁴⁵⁵ More generally, the fragments that contain Dionysiac references are mostly connected to wine or possession: Telestes uses the god's epithet Bromius when describing Dionysus' inheritance of the *aulos* from Athena (but there is no cultic reference);⁴⁵⁶ a fragment of Timotheus' *Cyclops* describes the mixing of wine and water and refers to Dionysus in metaphorical terms;⁴⁵⁷ and a few lines of Melanippides (*PMG* 760) describe the intoxicating effects of Dionysus.⁴⁵⁸ Apart from these instances, in which the mention of Dionysus is a synecdochic reference to wine and intoxication, it is very hard to see how "the New Musicians present themselves as the preservers of cultic tradition, even if such traditions were invented under the spell of contemporary mystery and orgiastic cult." It is of course true that the Eastern deities most often encountered in the fragments of the New Musicians (the Great Mother and Artemis)

⁴⁵⁵ Only the Timotheus' *Birth-Pangs of Semele*, as well as the possibly Melanippidean *Oeneus*.

⁴⁵⁶ *PMG* 805c.

⁴⁵⁷ *PMG* 780, but the reference to the god is barely surprising in a context where wine is evoked. Two expressions of Philoxenus are quoted by Athenaeus as referring to wine: *PMG* 831 and *PMG* 832, and a fragment of the *Deipnon* is, again, devoted to wine: fr. 836c. In the two former fragments, wine is associated with its loosening power: it is εὐρείτας οἴνου πάμφωνος (and it gives voice); it is also metaphorically called ἄρκεσίγιον (limb-helper).

⁴⁵⁸ On Centaurs? Or on Cyclopes?

have Dionysiac characteristics, but their cultic status in Greece is problematic: the Mountain Mother in particular, already privately worshiped by Pindar,⁴⁵⁹ embodies the constantly changing dynamics of tradition and innovation in Athenian religion. This has been pointed out by L. Roller:⁴⁶⁰

The rites of an ecstatic cult were powerful precisely because they were the antithesis of normal Greek civic cult practice and its socially binding tendencies. (...) The polarities between public cult and private ecstatic cult appear to have become more pronounced during the second half of the fifth century BC as the lines separating Athenian citizens and non-citizens, Greeks and barbarians, men and women, were more sharply drawn. Because of these dichotomies, *the two conflicting images of Meter, the respected political deity and the wild barbarian outsider*, seem to have created further uncertainty concerning this deity's role in Athenian cult practice. (my emphasis)

His analysis, and the emphasis on the two conflicting images of the Mother Goddess, whose origins were foreign but whose shrine was located at the center of Athenian political life, reinforces the idea that Eastern motifs are used by the New Musicians as a way of combining Greek and “other”, old and new, not as opposed to each other, but as coexistent: while the cult of the Mother Goddess had been introduced in Athens as early as the sixth century, she always remained a foreign goddess, a “new” god despite her established status.⁴⁶¹

⁴⁵⁹ Pindar *Pythian* 3, 77-79; 70b 8-11 S-M.

⁴⁶⁰ L. Roller 1996, 309-310.

⁴⁶¹ L. Roller 1996 notes the ambiguity of the use of Eastern religion in Euripides in particular (319): “Yet Euripides chooses to stress, not hostility, but the inclusive and intrinsically Greek nature of the Meter cult. In this way as in so many other ways, the tragic poet was at odds with the prevailing attitudes of his times. To him, the Phrygian goddess is not the representative of a marginal group, but the deity of the whole city, as she is physically placed in the city center, the Agora. (...) The poet stresses that the foreign deity is necessary to the city precisely because of that deity's ability to break down barriers between public and private cult.”

An important testimony provided by Hephaestion in his *Handbook on Meters* better allows making sense of the dynamic of tradition and innovation in the use of the “Easternness” of the Mountain Mother:⁴⁶²

Τοῦτο μέντοι (τὸ τετράμετρον καταληκτικόν) καὶ γαλλιαμβικόν καὶ μητρωακόν [[καὶ ἀνακλώμενον]] καλεῖται - ὕστερον δὲ <καὶ> ἀνακλώμενον ἐκλήθη - διὰ τὸ πολλὰ τοὺς νεωτέρους εἰς τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν γράψαι τούτῳ τῷ μέτρῳ (...), ὡς καὶ τὰ πολυθρύλητα ταῦτα παρδείγματα δηλοῖ
Γάλλαι μητρὸς ὀρείης φιλόθυρσοι δρομάδες
αἷς ἔντεα παταγεῖται καὶ χάλκεα κρόταλα.

This (sc. the catalectic tetrameter) is known as both the galliambic and the metroac – later it was also called the broken rhythm – because the new school of poets often addressed the Mother of the Gods in this meter (...), as these much-repeated examples show:⁴⁶³

Gallae of the mountain mother, racers friends of the thyrsus, by whom instruments and bronze castanets are clashed.

In the line quoted, it is the traditionally wild musical character of the cult of the Mountain Mother that the poet underlines. More than a return to cult, it seems that it is a justification for wild music that the New Musicians look for.⁴⁶⁴ So rather than seeing the New Dithyramb as an attempt to go back to cultic roots and to the Dionysiac origins of the genre, I would rather take the references to Dionysiac or Eastern deities as connected to the same concern for legitimization of musical innovations as presented in the previous chapter: the New Musicians treat the old theme of Eastern cult practice as a way of justifying in practice their virtuoso, spectacularly wild, musical practice.

Conclusion to section 2

⁴⁶² Hephaestion, *Handbook of Metres* 12.3 (p. 38 s. Consbruch) = *PMG* 1030.

⁴⁶³ The quotation might come from Callimachus (fr. 761 incert. Auct. Pfeiffer).

⁴⁶⁴ Already in the Homeric Hymn to the Mother of the Gods, the cult emphasises the loud music that accompanies the worship of the goddess (14): μητέρα μοι πάντων τε θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων / ὕμνει, Μοῦσα λίγεια, Διὸς θυγάτηρ μέγαλοιο, / ἧ κροτάλων τυπάνων τ' ἰαχὴ σὺν τε βρόμος αὐλῶν / εὔαδεν, ἠδὲ λύκων κλαγγὴ χαροπῶν τε λεόντων....

In this section, I have presented how the fragments of fourth-century dithyramb suggest an interest for a specific set of themes: minor heroes, romantic stories, and Eastern motifs. These motives allow the poets both to explore the poetic past and offer rewriting of some archaic themes or motifs, but also to delineate the specific province of lyric poetry (by opposition to tragedy for example). In the case of the first two themes (minor heroes and love and romance), the poets' choice of *mythos* seems to announce the Hellenistic age, in particular in the exploration of bucolic themes and depictions of private scenes. As for the last one (the East), the New Musicians do not seem to explore the motif so much for its political or ethical potential, as for its religious dimension: rather than seeing it as an enterprise to present the dithyramb as a come-back to traditional cults, I suggest that it corresponds to another way of legitimizing the musical innovations by reference to Eastern traditions.

In particular, the newness of the themes and characters (νῆθη) prompts the audience's ability to imagine, rather than remember, the subjects described by the poets. Even if the poets show their deep knowledge of the tradition (especially of the Homeric material and of Bacchylidean diction), they choose to propose to their audience a different stylistic experience: their language, whether it describes a storm or a love dedication, does not prompt interpretation according to some traditional schemes, but creates a more "spectacular" description - spectacular in the sense that the audience is prompted to take part of the spectacle. Again the words of J. Elsner can hardly be improved on:⁴⁶⁵

As in the rise of naturalism and in Attic tragedy, in both philosophy and comedy the audience's participation has moved from direct interrogation to a

⁴⁶⁵ J. Elsner 2006, 90-1.

‘voyeuristic’ spectacle of a world of which one is not part, but might become so through imaginative identification. (...)

The construction of the audience’s, reader’s or listener’s subjectivity as one which observes a reality of multiple responses from the outside, as it were, and then is expected to respond by judging the credibility of what it hears extends [to other genres].

In the last part of this chapter, I would like to show how Philoxenus’ *Cyclops or Galatea* illustrates this aesthetic, and to underline the virtuosity of the poet not simply in the innovative treatment of a Homeric theme, but also in the construction of “an audience’s subjectivity as one which observes a reality of multiple responses from the outside.”⁴⁶⁶

3- The case of Philoxenus’ *Cyclops or Galatea*

Of the *Cyclops or Galatea*, barely more than a few words have survived, but ten testimonia from various sources (*PMG* 815-824) inform us about some of its plot and language. The poem, a dithyramb,⁴⁶⁷ sums up many of the questions about fourth-century compositions presented above: not only in the style, but also in the thematic choices (and use of archaic models) and poetic tools (use of modes of discourse, *deixis*, etc.).

The exact composition date of the *Cyclops* is unknown, but it probably postdates 406 BC, the beginning of the rule of Dionysius I of Sicily (at whose court Philoxenus is said to have composed it, and with whom the composition of the *Galatea*

⁴⁶⁶ This case study is all the more interesting that the *Cyclops* was deemed the most beautiful dithyramb of the poet’s: Aelian Var. Hist. 12.44: τὸν κύκλωπα εἰργάσατο τῶν ἑαυτοῦ μελῶν τὸ κάλλιστον.

⁴⁶⁷ As I have noted before, twice the scholiast to Aristophanes’ *Plutus* calls Philoxenus a tragic poet (τραγικὸν and τραγιδωδιδασκαλόν), and once the *Galatea* is called a drama. A testimony (*PMG* 840) tells us that the *Cyclops* of Philoxenus was performed, to the music of the pipe, at a musical competition, which makes it reasonable to think that it was a dithyramb.

is commonly associated)⁴⁶⁸ and predates 388 BC, the date of Aristophanes' *Plutus* in which, according to the scholiast, the chorus parodies Philoxenus' *Cyclops* (290-301).⁴⁶⁹ Previous treatments of the poem underlined its satirical purpose, and the possibly dramatic nature of its performance. These views were challenged in a 1999 article by J. Hordern who argued three points: first, that "the main value of [the] tradition is that it reveals Philoxenus' comic treatment of his subject"; second, that "while the Galatea motif has previously been considered the essential element in this comic treatment, it was probably a small part of the plot, perhaps only briefly alluded to." Finally, that there are "reasons for doubting the prevalent view that the performance included dramatic elements."⁴⁷⁰

The most important piece of evidence about Philoxenus' *Cyclops* is the parody of the poem with which the late fourth-century AD Christian writer Synesius starts a letter to Athanasios.⁴⁷¹ The (Odyssean) dramatic situation is stated very clearly in the opening sentence of the letter: Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔπειθε τὸν Πολύφημον διαφεῖναι αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ σπηλαίου (Odysseus was trying to persuade Polyphemus to let him out of the cave). While it is difficult to determine to what degree Synesius was faithful exclusively to Philoxenus' plot or diction, the convergence between the different testimonies seems to indicate that Philoxenus was following the Homeric plot:

⁴⁶⁸ On Dionysius' rule, see Diodorus of Sicily, 13.95-6. Also testimony connecting the composition of *Cyclops* or *Galatea* with the court of Dionysius and Sicily: *PMG* 816 and my chapter 3.

⁴⁶⁹ J. Hordern 1999 suggests that "the Aristophanic parody of the work may well point to a recent performance in Athens, perhaps the first, and it is hard to identify any more significant reason for mentioning the poem" (445).

⁴⁷⁰ J. Hordern 1999, 445.

⁴⁷¹ *PMG* 818. At the end of the nineteenth century, Bergk identified Philoxenus' *Cyclops* as the source of the paraphrase. See note 11 in J. Hordern 2004, 450-1. G. R. Holland 1884, 192-6, argues that Synesius knew the story through Middle Comedy. This is all the more plausible that the attack made against the diluter of wine in Synesius recalls the comic poet Aristias' fragment about inebriation (see J. Hordern 2004 on that).

Odysseus blinds the Cyclops,⁴⁷² used the *Outis* trick, and escapes successfully,⁴⁷³ after having been trapped in the cave.⁴⁷⁴ The setting is reminiscent of the *Odyssean* one, with the door (a main element in *Odyssey* 9, 241-2) that Odysseus refers to, and with signs of a pastoral life (the dung and goat-smell of the cave - τῶν κωδίων ὁ γράσος)⁴⁷⁵ - two elements absent in the more sophisticated life-style of Euripides' Cyclops.

However, there are two main differences with the Homeric story: in the plot, and in the way the characters are depicted. The first element is Philoxenus' creation of Polyphemus' love for Galatea, a feature that inspired the Hellenistic poets (especially Theocritus, in *Idylls* 6 and 11, Callimachus, Bion and Hermesianax).⁴⁷⁶ Duris attributes it to Philoxenus' lack of understanding of the Sicilian landscape and folklore.⁴⁷⁷

Δοῦρίς φησι διὰ τὴν εὐβοσίαν τῶν θρεμμάτων καὶ τοῦ γάλακτος πολυπλήθειαν τὸν Πολύφημον ἰδρύσασθαι ἱερὸν παρὰ τῇ Αἴτνῃ Γαλατείας· Φιλόξενον δὲ τὸν Κυθήριον ἐπιδημήσαντα καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον ἐπινοῆσαι τὴν αἰτίαν ἀναπλάσαι ὡς ὅτι Πολύφημος ἦρα τῆς Γαλατείας.

According to Duris, in return for the rich pasture for his flocks and for the abundance of milk (gala), Polyphemus built a temple to Galatea near Mount Etna, but Philoxenus of Cythera when he visited and was unable to find the cause invented the story that it was because of Polyphemus' love for Galatea.

In the rustic setting that both Synesius' and Aristophanes' parodies refer to, Polyphemus appears as the prototype of the bucolic lover. In the *Odyssey*, the rusticity of the Cyclops is underlined many times, but it is a rusticity that is midway between

⁴⁷² On the blinding, see scholiast, *PMG* 820: ἐμνήσθη δὲ καὶ τῆς τυφλώσεως ὡς οὔσης ἐν τῷ ποίηματι.

⁴⁷³ The conclusion of Synesius' parody states ὁ μὲν οὖν Ὀδυσσεύς, ἠδκεῖτο γὰρ ὄντως, ἔμελλεν ἄρα τῆς πανουργίας· σὲ δέ, Κύκλωπα μὲν ὄντα τῇ τόλμῃ ...)

⁴⁷⁴ *PMG* 824, from Zenobius' *Proverbs*: οἶψι μὲν ὁ δαίμων τέρατι συγκαθεῖρξεν, said to be uttered by Odysseus shut in the cave of the Cyclops (περιχεθεὶς τῷ τοῦ Κύκλωπος σπηλαίῳ) in a play (δρᾶμα) by the poet Philoxenus.

⁴⁷⁵ On a political reworking of the Cyclops episode, via a Posidippean epigram, see E. Livrea 2004.

⁴⁷⁶ For an argument that the romance might come from the Sicilian tradition, see A. Anello 1984. J. Hordern 1999 argues that the love motif might not have been central.

⁴⁷⁷ *FGRH* 76 F58 = *PMG* 817. The linguistic connection between Galatea and gala however is tenuous.

utopia and monstrosity, or a-civilization. The Homeric text depicts the Cyclops' relationship with nature as both fusional (as illustrated for Polyphemus' tenderness for the ram) and primitive (as illustrated by his ignorance of hospitality and sociability practices). The rustic aspect, which was absent from Euripides' satyr-play, appears in Philoxenus, as the commentary of the scholiast on Aristophanes' *Plutus* confirms: Philoxenus' Cyclops is a vegetarian equipped with the accessories of a country bumpkin:⁴⁷⁸

πήραν ἔχοντα λάχανά τ' ἄγρια δροσερά
with your leather-bag and dewy wild veggies

The Philoxenian line parodied (or quoted) by Aristophanes is a curious mix of lowly objects (the leather pouch and the vegetables)⁴⁷⁹ and tragic diction (δροσερά). While in the *Odyssey*, it is the Cyclops himself who is ἄγριος, here the only wilderness is that of the herbs; at the same time, the leather-bag, which is an attribute of Odysseus disguised as a beggar upon returning to Ithaca, becomes in our text an attribute of the Cyclops himself. On this passage, the scholiast comments:

(RV) Πήραν ἔχοντα: Φιλοξένου ἐστὶ παρηγμένον καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ῥητόν... (Junt.) ἐνταῦθα ὁ ποιητὴς παιγνιωδῶς ἐπιφέρει τὰ τοῦ Φιλοξένου εἰπόντος πήραν βαστάζειν τὸν Κύκλωπα καὶ λάχανα ἐσθίειν. οὕτω γὰρ πεποίηκε τὸν τοῦ Κύκλωπος ὑποκριτὴν εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν εἰσαγόμενον. Ἐμνήσθη δὲ καὶ τῆς τυφλώσεως ὡς οὔσης ἐν τῷ ποίηματι. ταῦτα δὲ πάντα διασύρων τὸν Φιλόξενον εἶπεν ὡς μὴ ἀληθεύοντα: ὁ γὰρ Κύκλωψ, ὡς φησιν Ὅμηρος, κρέα ἤσθιε καὶ οὐ λάχανα: ἃ τοίνυν ἔφησεν ἐκεῖ ὁ Φιλόξενος, ταῦτα ὁ χορὸς εἰς τὸ μέσον ἀναφέρει.

(1) “with your leather bag”: this expression too is introduced from Philoxenus
(2) Here the poet playfully attacks the passage in Philoxenus where he says that the Cyclops carries a leather bag and eats herbs, for that is how he equipped the actor who played the part of the Cyclops. Aristophanes mentions the blinding too, since it was in the poem. All this he said to mock Philoxenus for not telling

⁴⁷⁸ Scholiast ad Aristophanes *Plutus* 296 = *PMG* 820.

⁴⁷⁹ The leather pouch (πήρα) is found for example in the Theocritus epigram / dedication quoted above and is characteristic of country-life.

the truth: for the Cyclops, as Homer tells, ate meat, not herbs; and what Philoxenus said in his poem the chorus now repeats on the stage. (tr. Campbell).

But more than the meat-eating habits that the scholiast underlines,⁴⁸⁰ it is the bucolic picture and feeling of the passage that is important: the tragic *δροσερά* embodies the attention given to natural details. In addition to the pastoral activities of the Cyclops and the (humorous) depiction of the country-life, the poet seems to have made the Cyclops into a lover and a poet. Some lines quoted by Athenaeus suggest that the Cyclops addressed a poem to Galatea (*PMG* 821):

ὦ καλλιπρόσωπε χρυσεοβόστρυχε [[Γαλατεία]]
χαριτόφωνε θάλος Ἐρώτων.

O beautiful-faced, golden-tressed Galatea, grace-voiced offshoot of the Loves Athenaeus interprets the lack of reference to the nymph's eyes as a sign (or premonition) of the Cyclops' own blindness, and contrasts it with the praise that Ibycus addresses to Euryalus (*PMG* 288):

Εὐρύαλε γλαυκέων Χαρίτων θάλος, < Ὠρᾶν >
καλλικόμων μελέδημα, σέ μὲν Κύπρις
ἄ τ' ἀγανοβλέφαρος Πει-
θῶ ῥοδέοισιν ἐν ἄνθεσι θρέψαν.

Euryalos offshoot of the grey-eyed Graces, concern of the beautiful-haired Hours, it is you that Cypris and soft-eyed Persuasion have nursed among roses

While Ibycus' poem uses Hesiodic expressions,⁴⁸¹ the Cyclops' address to the nymph uses only the vegetal imagery of Ibycus' passage (the *θάλος*) and unlike Ibycus neither uses an abstract noun (like *μελέδημα*) nor refers to the Hesiodic goddesses (Cypris and

⁴⁸⁰ The scholiast's conviction that Polyphemus was a meat-eater is somewhat puzzling, since the Cyclops in Homer eats mainly cheese, and only occasionally feasts on (human) meat. (Leaf-eating is mentioned in Callias' *Cyclopes*, fr. 7 K-A, at the end of dinner: φυλλάς ἢ δειπνῶν κατάλυσις ἢδε καθάπερ σχημάτων.)

⁴⁸¹ See *Works and Days*, 73-5: Χαριτέες τε θεαὶ καὶ πότνια Πειθῶ ... ἀμφὶ δὲ τὴν γε Ὠραι καλλίκομοι στέφον ἄνθεσιν.

Peitho – although they can be felt present in the *χαριτόφωνε* and *Ἐρώτων*): the couplet is demythologized, only the most visual elements remain: the face, the hair, and the voice.

Yet, Athenaeus does not do justice to Polyphemus’ (or Philoxenus’) skills as a love poet: the couplet displays many features of the opening of a praise hymn, with a *Du-Stil* address to the girl, and adjectives praising her (*καλλιπρόσωπε χρυσεοβόστρυχε*) and describing her power (*χαριτόφωνε*). These adjectives themselves are traditional and recall Sappho’s or Alcman’s poetry addressed to young women,⁴⁸² but the expression “offshoot of the Loves” is particularly appropriate to the bucolic world of the Cyclops.⁴⁸³ The (asyndetic) accumulation of adjectives reveals the Cyclops as quite an elegant poet; he uses a tricolon of compound adjectives, going from the most generic (the beauty of the face) to the most personal and expressive (the voice).

This sensitivity of the Cyclops to voice (a sign, again of his blindness?) is also expressed in another passage of Philoxenus that describes how the Cyclops cures his love *Μούσαις εὐφώνοις* (with the tuneful Muses).⁴⁸⁴ This aspect is also underlined by

⁴⁸² See for example: Alcman: *ἀ δὲ χαιῖτα / τὰς ἐμὰς ἀνεψιῶς / Ἄγησιχόρα ἐπανθεῖ / χρυσὸς ὄτ ἄκῆρατος*, *PMG* 1, 51-4 = 3 Calame, with commentary (see also C. Calame 1977, (vol. 2) 112); Anacreon: *καλλιπρόσωπε παίδων* *PMG* 346, 3; Stesichorus: *Χαρίτων καλλικόμων* (fr. 35.1); also Euripides: *χρυσεοβόστρυχον ὦν Δίος ἔρνος* (Ἄρτεμι) *Phoenissae* (191-2).

⁴⁸³ The expression is only paralleled in the Alexandrian poet Hedyllus, who has a similar expression in an epigram: *ἦν γὰρ Ἐρώτων / καὶ Χαρίτων ἢ παῖς ἀμβρόσιόν τι θάλος*. (Epigram 292, 4). On which, see A. Cameron *Greek Anthology* 369-79. In the *Persians* too, the prayer to the Mountain Mother start by a praise of her hair (*PMG* 780, 128: *χρυσοπλόκαμε θεὰ Μᾶτερ*).

⁴⁸⁴ Plutarch, *Quaestiones convivales* 1.5 (*Moralia* 622c) = *PMG* 822. The lack of context makes it impossible for us to interpret what the “beautiful voiced Muses” was referring to, but it is interesting that the mention of this verse comes in a context where Sappho’s poetry is quoted, and that for the character of Plutarch’s *Symptica* quoting Sappho, it was equally natural to refer to the *Cyclops* in love (although slightly less familiar, as suggests the hesitation on the origin of the quotation).

the Scholiast to Theocritus 11, that reports how Polyphemus was trying to cure his love with music:⁴⁸⁵

καὶ Φιλόξενος τὸν Κύκλωπα ποιεῖ παραμυθούμενον ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς Γαλατείας ἔρωτι καὶ ἐντελλόμενον τοῖς δελφῖσιν ὅπως ἀπαγγείλωσιν αὐτῇ ὅτι ταῖς Μούσαις τὸν ἔρωτα ἀκείται.

And Philoxenus makes his Cyclops console himself about his love for Galatea and tell the dolphins to tell her that he is healing his love with the Muses.

Both the picture of the Cyclops wounded by love (as described also in Plutarch *ἰᾶσθαί φησι τὸν ἔρωτα Φιλόξενος*), and the use of music and poetry to cure it are features that the Hellenistic poets will elaborate on, as markers of bucolic poetry and typical of pastoral love, away from the world of the city.⁴⁸⁶

The musical activity, and bucolic character, of the Philoxenian Polyphemus are also attested by the scholiast to Aristophanes' *Plutus*, who explains the word “threttanelo” in the text of the *Plutus* as reproducing on paper (*μιμούμενος ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι*) the actual playing of the cithara on stage, and singing to his sheep:⁴⁸⁷

... διασύρει δὲ Φιλόξενον τὸν τραγικόν, ὃς εἰσήγαγε κιθαρίζοντα τὸν Πολύφημον. Τὸ δὲ θρεττανελὸ ποιὸν μέλος καὶ κρουμάτιόν ἐστι· τὸ δὲ ἄλλ' εἶα τέκεα θαμίν' ἐπαναβοῶντες ἐκ τοῦ Κύκλωπος Φιλοξένου ἐστι. Φιλόξενον τὸν διθυραμβοποιὸν ἢ τραγωδοδιδάσκαλον διασύρει, ὃς ἔγραψε τὸν ἔρωτα τοῦ Κύκλωπος τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ Γαλατεία. εἶτα κιθάρας ἦχον μιμούμενος ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι, τοῦτό φησι τὸ ῥῆμα ‘θρεττανελό’· ἐκεῖ γὰρ εἰσάγει τὸν Κύκλωπα κιθαρίζοντα καὶ ἐρεθίζοντα τὴν Γαλατείαν...

... Aristophanes is making fun of the tragic poet Philoxenus, who introduced Polyphemus playing the kithara. The word *threttanelo* is a kind of tune and at the same time striking sound. The rest “come on children! cry out again and again!” comes from Philoxenus' *Cyclops*. It is Philoxenus the dithyrambic or

⁴⁸⁵ Scholiast to Theocritus 11, 1-3b (p. 241 Wendel).

⁴⁸⁶ On the “ideology of love as something to be cured” and on “the intellectualizing condemnation of the passion of love,” see M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter 2000, 180-1. At the same time, Philoxenus uses an old model of inspiration, the Muses. This archaic model is abandoned in the bucolic mimes of Theocritus (on which, see M. Fantuzzi 2000, chapter 1 section 1). Also parallel with Theocritus 1.128-130 (on which S. Stephens in M. Fantuzzi 2006, 105).

⁴⁸⁷ Scholiast ad loc. p. 341 Dübner.

tragic poet whom he is mocking, the poet who wrote about the love of the Cyclops for Galatea; and to imitate the sound of the kithara in his composition, he uses the word “threttanelo” for in that piece he introduces the Cyclops playing the kithara and provoking Galatea...

This testimony is often taken as evidence for the introduction of instrumental music, more precisely *kithara* music, in the dithyramb, and more generally with the general “dramatization” of the dithyramb at the end of the fifth century:⁴⁸⁸

For its narrative and performance style, New Music borrowed directly from drama. Boardman ([1956] 19) argues that Melanippides first incorporated instrumental solos into *Marsyas*, a dithyramb narrating the contest for musical supremacy between Apollo and Marsyas, in turn displaying the god’s virtuosity on the lyre and the satyr’s skill on the newly invented pipes. If so, the mythical contest was not merely narrated by the chorus, but acted by the musician in the style of a dramatic *agôn*. This would be the first known occurrence of a general trend towards dramatic *mimesis* in choral and musical performance. Dramatization offered musicians an opportunity to display their virtuosity conspicuously, standing, virtually as actors, at the focal point of the narrative as well as the performance.

This greater use of verbal, musical, and even physical *mimesis* is indeed attested by many sources about New Music.⁴⁸⁹ Aristophanes himself in his parody represented the Cyclops as a musician, even a New Musician: the participle used by Cario (*qua* Polyphemus) before introducing the parody of the Philoxenian lines is characteristic of the swaying to the sound of the *aulos* typical of New Music’s spectacular performance

⁴⁸⁸ E. Csapo 2004, 213. The same evolution towards more instrumental music onstage is illustrated in Euripides’ plays, the *Hypsipyle* and the *Antiope* (on which, see notes at the end of chapter 2). See also E. Hall 2006, 255: “with the advent of the New Music, which used melody and tonal effect in unprecedentedly mimetic ways, both performances by auletes and citharodic dithyrambs (sic) became ever more theatrical.”

⁴⁸⁹ Testimonies abound about the spectacular nature of dithyrambic performances: Athenaeus records Stratoniceus’ horror at the performance of Timotheus’ *Birth-Pangs of Semele* (Athenaeus 8. 352a = *PMG* 792): ἐπακούσας δὲ τῆς Ὠδίνος τῆς Τιμοθέου, εἰ δ’ ἐργολάβον, ἔφη (sc. ὁ Στρατόνικος), ἔτικτεν καὶ μὴ θεὸν, ποίας ἂν ἠφίει φωνάς. Similarly, Aristotle describes the indecorous movement of auletes (and tragic actors) imitating/embodying (μιμεῖσθαι) the subject matter of the poem they were performing: ἔστιν δὲ παράδειγμα ... τοῦ δὲ ἀπρεποῦς καὶ μὴ ἀρμόττοντος ὃ τε θρῆνος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν τῇ Σκύλλῃ... Also: πολλὴν κίνησιν κινουῦνται, οἷον οἱ φαῦλοι ἀλύηται κυλιόμενοι ἂν δίσκον δέη μιμεῖσθαι καὶ ἔλκοντες τὸν κορυφαῖον ἂν Σκύλλαν ἀλῶσιν (respectively *Poetics* 1454a and 1461b = *PMG* 793).

style (τοῖν ποδοῖν παρενσαλεύων, 291),⁴⁹⁰ and the chorus (*qua* Odysseus and his companions?) is similarly portrayed as bad (or New?) musicians, bleating (βληχόμενοί, 293) to accompany the Cyclops.

The second important aspect of Philoxenus' treatment of the Cyclops' theme (after the the innovation of the Cyclops as bucolic lover of Galatea), is the use of the comic mode.⁴⁹¹ The first way in which the dithyramb plays with the epic episode is lexical: Philoxenus engages with the Homeric text to rewrite the Cyclops' story and the Cyclopic character. Rather than a man-eating brute, Polyphemus is presented as a witty reader of Homer. The Suda notes how Philoxenus seemingly misappropriated an Homeric expression (from *Odyssey* 9. 231: ἔνθα δὲ πῦρ κείαντες ἐθύσαμεν):⁴⁹²

ἔθυσσα, ἀντιθύση.
τοῦτο παρὰ Φιλοξένω ὁ Κύκλωψ λέγει πρὸς τὸν Ὀδυσσεά. ἀπεκδέχονται γὰρ τὸ ἔνθα δὲ πῦρ κείαντες ἐθύσαμεν' παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ εἰρηῆσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρνῶν, οὐχὶ δὲ τὸ † ἀπεθύσαμεν † (ἐθυμιάσαμεν ci. Bernhardt) νοεῖσθαι.

You have sacrificed: you will be sacrificed.

This is what the Cyclops says to Odysseus in Philoxenus. They misinterpret Homer's "then we lit a fire and made a sacrifice" as referring to the lambs, as opposed to "we made offerings."

Rather than being a bad Homer-scholar and misinterpreting the meaning of θύειν (taking it as bloody sacrifice as opposed to offerings), the Cyclops is a good rhetorician: while recognizing the archaic model, he defines himself as a fourth-century

⁴⁹⁰ Philostratus (*Vita Apollonii* 2. 13) uses the same word to describe other μιμήσεως ἐρασταί – elephants: γράφουσι γοῦν καὶ ὀρχοῦνται καὶ παρενσαλεύουσι πρὸς αὐλὸν καὶ πιθῶσιν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐκεῖνοι.

⁴⁹¹ See also Telestes in *PMG* 805, with obscene references to the flute, and rewriting of Pindar.

⁴⁹² Suda E. 336 = *PMG* 823.

man, who is aware of the Homeric past, and knowledgeable in Homeric diction, but plays with the semantic range of words, as a good sophist.⁴⁹³

In the same way, Philoxenus' Odysseus is a fourth-century copy of his Homeric model: he is not simply *polytropos*, he is a γόης, a sophist who knows ἐπιδάς, καταδέσμους καὶ ἐρωτικὰς κατανάγκας.⁴⁹⁴ Just as the archaic Odysseus is a hero of his times, the Philoxenian Odysseus is a man of late-Classical culture: he is a professional, ready to sell his services for a service in return, both somebody who knows the traditional art of enchantment,⁴⁹⁵ and the *techne* of persuasion. He illustrates his skilfulness in the first lines, when, instead of trying to persuade Polyphemus to let him escape, he uses figured speech⁴⁹⁶ and asks the Cyclops to let him go out so that he can *come back* in to the cave in a flash with Galatea.⁴⁹⁷ This sort of argument is a humorous twist on the Homeric Cyclops: just as in Homer, Odysseus uses the Cyclops' appetites and pretends to be ready to please. But as opposed to the hero's success over the Cyclops' gastronomic appetite in the *Odyssey*, the fourth-century Odysseus does not succeed in winning over the Cyclops' romantic appetite. In that context, the Philoxenian Cyclops is a man who sees through people, knows how to use abuse poetry

⁴⁹³ Moreover, the Cyclops is transgressing the rules of sacrifice, since he is going to offer a human victim (while θυμιάω suggests incense offering). Synesius' paraphrase also underlines another Philoxenian reinterpretation of epic gesture: the Cyclops teases Odysseus by touching the hero's chin, not to entreat him as a suppliant, but in a mocking gesture (although it is of course legitimate to ask to what extent this gesture was Synesius' invention, or an extrapolation from a stage direction).

⁴⁹⁴ He recalls the Socrates of the *Charmides*, who presents himself as a γοῆς, who knows incantations, to try and seduce Charmides: 156a ff. See also *Symposium* 203d, of love himself: δεινὸς γόης καὶ φαρμακεὺς καὶ σοφιστής.

⁴⁹⁵ The mention of ἵυγξι connects him more specifically with sorceresses like Medea (in *Pythian* 4. 214 for example) and Circe.

⁴⁹⁶ On this rhetorical technique, see Pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ars Rhetorica* 8 and 9 (Usener-Radermacher).

⁴⁹⁷ This turns the relationship between Odysseus and the Cyclops into a rhetorical exercise. (Nothing is said about the companions of Odysseus). This is due to the representation of Odysseus that Philoxenus offers. The originality is that the Cyclops is portrayed differently, in a comic way. It is not so much the language, nor the means (solo in dithyramb) but the kind of characters.

(Odysseus is δριμύτατον ἀνθρώπιον, ἐγκατατετριμμένον ἐν πράγμασιν) and has some mastery over the vocabulary of literary criticism (he uses ποικίλλειν to describe Odysseus' persuasion skills, again a very fourth-century meta-poetic term).

Philoxenus' play with language also shows in Odysseus' speech. When trying to use the Cyclops' desire for the nymph to his benefit, Odysseus uses a language appropriate to the kind of attitude he wants to create in his addressee (although it is difficult to make remarks about the vocabulary, since we only have knowledge of the piece through the paraphrase): he starts by a periphrasis for the nymph θαλάττιον ἔρωτα and later evokes the game of love that the Cyclops could play with the nymph: καὶ δεήσεταιί σου καὶ ἀντιβολήσει, σὺ δὲ ἀκκιῆ καὶ κατειρωνεύση.

Philoxenus, according to Synesius' paraphrase, suggests a range of emotions and mental attitudes in his characters. After Odysseus' self-presentation as a successful master of charms and love rhetoric, the hero plays with a second aspect of his *persona*: when trying to establish a bargain relationship with the Cyclops, he plays on Polyphemus' sense of pity (ἐμοὶ μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀκρωτήριον εἶναι φαίνεται), then he presents himself as worried about the nymph's reaction (ἀτὰρ μεταξύ μέ τι καὶ τοιοῦτον ἔθραζε). Finally, after describing the kind of person Galatea is, Odysseus gives appropriate advice (on domestic arrangements for the girl), and transforms, in his description, the smelly room of the bachelor in a *locus amoenus* for a loving couple.⁴⁹⁸

The paraphrase suggests, on the whole, that Philoxenus had the ability to characterize a scene, imagine feelings and change of mood in his characters, and the perceptions or

⁴⁹⁸ This contributes to the bucolic atmosphere created in the passage. See Rossi 2001, 33: "Pan, or the Nymphs or else the *locus amoenus*, for example, are not *in themselves* sufficient to characterise an epigram as bucolic, but they are all markers of a generically *rural* setting, since not only shepherds, cowherds and goatherds, but also farmers, hunters and bee-keepers can address their prayers to Pan and the Nymphs or else act against the background of a *locus amoenus*."

habits of the characters (the nymph for example is κόρη τρυφώση καὶ λουομένη τῆς ἡμέρας πολλάκις).

The salient feature of what we can reconstruct of the *Cyclops* is the poetic versatility, and the ability of the poet to go from praise poetry, to prayer, to curse, to comic rhetoric and Homeric parody. This use of humor, and revision of traditional myths is also illustrated in the few lines of Telestes' fragment of the *Argo*, where the first-person speaker offers a comic rewriting of the myth of Athena and the *aulos*, and even more clearly in Timotheus' *Persians*, where the virtuosity of the poet is expressed in his use of many kinds of discourse, alternating between battle narrative, prayers, curse, and comic parody of Asiatic speech, after a solemn opening, and before a traditional-sounding ending.

Conclusion to section 3

This section has shown how Philoxenus' *Cyclops*, one of the few dithyrambs for which we have more than a title, is a virtuoso variation on a Homeric episode. It is difficult to make any substantial comment on the language, although some preserved lines do show the characteristics of the fourth-century style described previously. The specific features of the piece are the use of the comic mode, the versatility of the poet in the mix of modes of discourse (from sophistic argumentation to love poem) and the innovative use of the Homeric theme: the Cyclops is not described as a brute but as a bucolic lover and poet, and Odysseus appears not only as a good rhetorician, but as a sophist.

It also illustrates Philoxenus' virtuosity in different types of discourse, illustrated within the same piece.⁴⁹⁹ Rather than illustrating *Kreuzung der Gattungen*, this variety is better qualified as *polyeideia*: this is the very feature of the late-Classical dithyramb that Plato underlined in the *Laws* 700 d (claiming that contemporary dithyrambists composed in order to please each member of their audience, whether they knew good music or not), and that encapsulates the new kind of relationship with the audience that Elsner described in the passages quoted above.

⁴⁹⁹ This is also what Gildersleeve said about Timotheus: "ibis-like, he swallowed all departments of Greek poetry, epic, lyric, dramatic."

Chapter 5 – Symptotica: genre, deixis, and performance

Some thematic features explored in the previous chapter have given us access to aspects of the fourth-century that announce features of the poetry of the Hellenistic period; although I have not raised the question of how the surviving fragments of poets like Licymnius or Lycophronides might have been performed, I have suggested a focus on less public themes in their fragments. This chapter is concerned more precisely with the dynamics of public and private, in theme and performance, and takes the symposium as the ideal locus to examine the intricateness of the relationship between tradition and innovation in non-theatrical lyric.

Numerous studies have focused on the connection between the symposium as a place of socio-political interaction and as a context of performance, or reperformance, for several poetic genres (elegy, iambs and various lyric forms like epinician, encomion, etc.).⁵⁰⁰ One of the main changes that historians of literature present in connection with the sociopolitical changes in the classical period is the progressive evolution of the symposium, from place of performance of political poetry to a place of mere literary entertainment.⁵⁰¹ They also emphasize the disappearance of the traditional forms of political elegy, and passages in Aristophanes are often adduced to present the evolution of the sympotic tradition.⁵⁰² My goal in this chapter is to reexamine a variety

⁵⁰⁰ W. Rösler 1983; B. Gentili 1988; L. Kurke 1991 (introduction); E. Stehle 1997; A. Ford 2002, chap. 2-3; E. Irwin 2005. Also on elegy, E. Bowie 1986.

⁵⁰¹ Typical of this kind of claim is B. Seidensticker 1995, 189: “Auch wenn Xenophons und Platons *Symposia* wohl kaum als repräsentativ für das Symposion angesehen werden dürfen, so ist die Entstehung dieser neuen literarischen Gattung doch paradigmatisch für die im 4. Jh. *weitgehend abgeschlossene Verwandlung des Symposion vom politischen, sozialen und kulturellen Zentrum des gesellschaftlichen Lebens zu einem fiktiven literarischen Ort*” (my emphasis). For a presentation of the evolution of the symposium in the fourth century BC, see U. von Wilamowitz 1900, 14-15.

⁵⁰² See K. Gützwiler 1998, 119-121: “although the symposium survives into the Hellenistic period with many of its external trappings intact, the social function of the gathering has clearly changed

of testimonies and texts and show, first, how the symposium as a context of performance for lyric evolved, but did not disappear,⁵⁰³ and, secondly, how the institution of the symposium and the memory of sympotic performance were used by the fourth-century poets.

1- Changing sympotic practices

One element closely connected to the examination of changing cultural and social practices in the fourth century is the introduction of literacy. E. Havelock's examination of the introduction of alphabetism in a traditionally oral society has greatly contributed to the understanding of the mechanisms of social change in the classical period.⁵⁰⁴ Building on Havelock's work, K. Robb has analysed whether "the degree of literacy acquired replaced in the *fifth* century the traditional, oral methods for transmitting the Hellenic *paideia* to a new generation."⁵⁰⁵ At the term of his analysis, Robb underlines that

an increasing popular literacy in the fifth-century Athenian democracy seems clearly to have been oriented to civil, legal, and diplomatic matters, with some mercantile development, *not to producing a revolution in the methods of traditional education*. We must resist the automatic assumption of an alliance between literacy and *paideia* based on a model familiar to us, however natural.

dramatically. No longer are the guests bound together by family connections and shared civic and political aspirations but by looser and more shifting bonds based on personally chosen social and intellectual interests."

⁵⁰³ Against the alleged decline of symposium practices, A. Cameron 1995 states (73): "I am delighted to report that such a connoisseur of the field [Oswyn Murray] shares my conviction that no such loss had taken place by the age of Callimachus." For new genres performed at fourth-century symposia, B. Seidensticker 1995, 187: "War das Symposium in der archaischen Zeit neben den Festen der wichtigste Raum für die Produktion und Rezeption fast aller kleineren Formen der Poesie, so fungierte es in klassischer Zeit immer noch als bedeutungsvoller Ort ihrer Reproduktion und damit der Bewahrung der lyrischen Tradition." 189: "so führt die Popularität des Dramas dazu, daß bevorzugt Lieder und Rheseis aus beliebten Tragödien und Komödien vorgetragen werden; dazu kommen Fabel und Griphos, aber auch allerlei niedere Formen dramatischer Unterhaltung."

⁵⁰⁴ E. Havelock 1953 and 1982.

⁵⁰⁵ K. Robb 1994, 189.

ὅμως δὲ τὸν θυμὸν δακῶν ἔφη· σὺ δ' ἀλλὰ τούτων
λέξον τι τῶν νεωτέρων, ἅττ' ἐστὶ τὰ σοφὰ ταῦτα. 1370
ὁ δ' εὐθὺς ἤγ' Εὐριπίδου ῥῆσιν τιν', ὡς ἐκίνει
ἀδελφός, ὦ' λεξίκακε, τὴν ὁμομητρίαν ἀδελφήν.

however, biting my anger, I said: at least recite some passage of the new poets, whatever these clever things are. And immediately he recited a rhesis of Euripides, how a brother – o averter of evils! – screwed his uterine sister.

Many critics, taking the comic poets at face value, do not hesitate to write a history of lyric at the end of the fifth century that tells the demise of the old *mousikê*,⁵⁰⁸ and assume that the portrayal of Pheidippides in the *Clouds* reflects a general change in education practices, and in the influence that new disciplines (philosophy and sophistry) had on poetry.⁵⁰⁹

Reflecting on the conflict between fathers and sons in late fifth-century Athens, and also starting from the evidence gathered from the comic poets, B. Strauss offers some welcome qualification to this picture:⁵¹⁰

comedy bites best when it touches raw nerves. [...] Aristophanes' use of father-son conflict does not in itself indicate that such conflict was prevalent, although it may demonstrate that it was feared by some (fathers) and wished by others (sons).

Although many scenes in Aristophanes do depend on this father-son dynamic, and on the failure of the father to educate his son in the old ways, an important element resides in the fact that father and son still have a lot in common: what we observe at the end of the *Wasps*, in the scene where Philocleon educates Bdelycleon in the ways of the

⁵⁰⁸ For such a view, see A. Pickard-Cambridge 1927, 54: “The younger generation were impatient of the old-fashioned discipline and literature; the lyric poetry of the older writers – Stesichorus, Pindar, and others, – a knowledge of which seems to be assumed in his audience by Aristophanes, was no doubt read by cultivated persons, but became gradually more and more unfamiliar and out of date.”

⁵⁰⁹ Against this reading, see A. Bowie 1997, 5: “the collapse of relationship within the oikos is figured through the collapse of the symposium” (my emphasis). Thus Aristophanes' use of the symposium is not meant to reflect contemporary reality, but the institution itself and its codes are used as a norm, thanks to which one can evaluate changes in reality (as I have already suggested in connection with Pherecrates).

⁵¹⁰ B. Strauss 1993, 4-5; 153-166.

symposium, is a conversion of the father to the ways of the son who aspires to elite status (and thus assimilates with its traditional education model – the symposium). More than a difference in generation, it is the cultural gap between different social groups that Aristophanes underlines, and the way he figures this gap is by talking about symposium manners. Although things are turned on their head in the *Wasps*, with the son teaching his father, the passage plays with the idea of cultural conservatism, and the symposium becomes an icon of aristocratic culture and status, a cultural symbol of the elite: it is not the practice of the late fifth-century symposium that Bdelycleon describes, but an atemporal, ideal, aristocratic gathering.⁵¹¹

The *Clouds* on the other hand show a slightly different picture of sympotic practices: although the young man does not want to sing a skolion, he still *performs* – not a song but a recitative (a *rhesis* of Euripides), influenced by contemporary sophistry and public oratory.⁵¹² This new kind of recitation (not in a sung meter, but probably in iambic trimeters) constitutes an innovation in sympotic practice, which will continue until the Roman Empire, as Plutarch attests.⁵¹³

Finally, a fragment of Eupolis describes another type of change in musical entertainment at the symposium:⁵¹⁴

τὰ Στησιχόρου τε καὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος Σιμωνίδου τε
ἀρχαῖον ἀείδειν, ὁ δὲ Γνήσιππος ἔστ' ἀκούειν.
κεῖνος νυκτερὴν ἠῦρε μοιχοῖς ἀείσματ' ἐκκαλεῖσθαι
γυναικας ἔχοντας ἰαμβύκην τε καὶ τρίγωνον

⁵¹¹ On this point, see also A. Bowie 1997, 3.

⁵¹² On Euripides and the sophists, see D. Conacher 1998, and W. Allan 1999-2000.

⁵¹³ For sympotic practices under the Roman Empire, see Plutarch, *Quaestiones convivales* (*Moralia* 713e). On sympotic practices during the late-Classical and Hellenistic periods, see A. Cameron 1995, 71 ff., especially 74: “despite the popularity of dramatic recitation at Hellenistic symposia, singing was not entirely a thing of the past. The clearest proof is one of the most interesting of all extant symposium texts, a papyrus published by Wilamowitz and Schubart in 1907, the Elephantine papyrus, which contains the text of several songs, on which see especially F. Ferrari 1989.”

⁵¹⁴ The *Helots*, quoted by Athenaeus 14. 638e = fr. 148 K-A.

It is old-fashioned to sing the songs of Stesichorus and Alcman and Simonides – Gnesippus, this is the one to hear! For he has invented serenades for adulterers, to attract the ladies with iambuca and triangle

The passage, just as the passage in the *Clouds*, emphasizes the rejection of traditional sympotic poetry, adoption of “new” authors and even a new kind of performance. J. Davidson draws from this testimony, the example of Xenophon’s *Symposium* and a passage from Chionides’ *Beggars* describing Gnesippus as παιγνιογράφου τῆς ἰλαρῆς μούσης (writer of *paignia* of the merry Muse)⁵¹⁵ to argue that the new kind of songs that Gnesippus was composing in the 420s was erotic mimes, acted by “performers usually drawn from the ranks of the *mousourgoi*, the singing-girls but it seems possible that the guests themselves might sometimes participate to a greater or lesser extent.”⁵¹⁶ Two articles, by J. Hordern and L. Prauscello, have contested Davidson’s views on different accounts, and proposed a different scenario.⁵¹⁷ Prauscello’s conclusion is particularly interesting because it offers a hypothesis about the sociology of the symposium, its entertainment practices, and the reaction it caused in the late fifth century; she uses a fragment of Cratinus as an argument to describe a change in the sociology of songs:⁵¹⁸

⁵¹⁵ Athenaeus 14. 638d = fr. 4 K-A.

⁵¹⁶ J. Davidson 2000, 51. Davidson draws on the evidence provided by Xenophon’s *Symposium*, whose dramatic date is supposed to be the 420s, but which was probably composed in the 360s. For a different interpretation of *paignia*, see J. Hordern 2003, 609: “Related to this may be a fragment of Aristophanes which mentions someone putting on ῥήματά τε κομψὰ καὶ παίγνια (fr. 719). Davidson suggests that this could refer to putting on mimic pieces, but although the verb (ἐνδεικνύναι) can be used in this way, the juxtaposition of παίγνια with ῥήματα is important; one does not put on ‘smart words (or speeches) and mimes’. However, the language would be very appropriate as a slighting description of display-oratory in the Gorgianic or Thrasymachean style (‘smart words and farcical ideas?’).” This very much describes Philoxenus’ *Deipnon*, which I discuss in the next section of this chapter.

⁵¹⁷ J. Hordern 2003, 613: “Gnesippus’ poetry was certainly nothing out of the ordinary, and belonged, whatever individual elements he added himself, to a lyric tradition which went back well into the archaic period.”

⁵¹⁸ Athenaeus 14. 638f = fr. 276 K-A.

ἴτω δὲ καὶ τραγωιδίας
ὁ Κλεομάχου διδάσκαλος
† μετὰ τῶν † παρατιλιτριῶν
ἔχων χορὸν Λυδιστὶ τιλ-
λουσῶν μέλη πονηρά

Let Cleomachus' son, the producer of tragedy, go away with his chorus of slave-girls plucking vile limbs/songs to a Lydian tune.

According to her:

what engenders the bitter reproach of Cratinus fragments 17 and 276 is Gnesippus' literary appropriation of the civic social body represented by the chorus itself, transferring his indecent Muse from the private sphere of symposia (*kitharodia*) to the institutionalized one of public space (tragedy). If this is the case, we might see in Gnesippus one of the first examples of a social trend that is well attested in the fourth century BCE: Amphis fragment 14 (from a play significantly entitled *Dithyrambos*) does testify to the “clearly elitist attitude which sees dithyrambic poets bringing tit-bits from the cultural riches of the upper-class private world of pleasure into the public world of the mob.”⁵¹⁹

These interpretations, far from assuming that the institution of the symposium disappeared, and with it, lyric performance, all present both some degree of continuity in the practice, and some change in the themes, as well as in the sociological function of the gathering.

There is one more aspect of the symposium, as a context of performance for poetry, that I would like to briefly review: several works of the fourth century start describing the professional philosophical symposium. Whereas Xenophon's *Symposium* described various musical performances (including possibly erotic mime), it is well known that Plato's *Symposium* starts with the expulsion of the flute-girls. This pronouncement about what role *mousikê* is going to play in the gathering is important not so much for what it tells us about Plato's views on music and poetry nor on

⁵¹⁹ L. Prauscello 2006 (b), 62-63, quoting P. Wilson 2000, 70.

common aspects of the symposium, but for what it tells us about the relationship between new, specialist, higher education and old institution; for *mousikê* seems to remain at the center of the symposium’s concerns – if not in practice, at least as a topic of discourse, and as a sociologically discriminating discipline.⁵²⁰

This is what a passage of Aristoxenus suggests.⁵²¹ The philosopher describes an elite’s reaction (καθ’ αὐτοὺς γενόμενοι ὀλίγοι) to the democratization of music, and the rise of music theory:

ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὰ θέατρα ἐκβεβαρβάρωται καὶ εἰς μεγάλην διαφθορὰν προελήλυθεν ἡ πάνδημος αὕτη μουσική, καθ’ αὐτοὺς γενόμενοι ὀλίγοι ἀναμιμνησκόμεθα οἷα ἦν ἡ μουσική.

Since the theatres have been barbarized, and since public *mousikê* has undergone great demise, a few of use gathered together are reminiscing about what *mousikê* was like.

Whereas in the archaic period, musical practice was the province both of the educated and of the professional (with the elite man being educated toward being able to achieve a high degree of musical proficiency, close to that of a professional, without performing), *mousikê* is described by Aristoxenus as being itself a subject at symposia. Just as both memories of heroes and tales of the past, and musical proficiency defined elite status in the archaic and classical past, in the same way, the memory of old *mousikê* and mastery of musical theory defines the new elite – and the new professional. A testimony of Plutarch confirms this view. In a passage of *That Epicurus*

⁵²⁰ The treatment of Simonides’ poem at the heart of Plato’s *Protagoras* is only one example of the way lyric poetry continues to be important in the late-classical period: poetry is still present in the culture, both as re-performances and as cultural memory.

⁵²¹ Athenaeus 14. 632b = fr. 124 Wehrli. For the idea of “barbarization” of music used by an Imperial author, see G. Bowersock 1995, especially 5-6. Bowersock’s article sheds light on the culture in which Athenaeus was writing, and on Athenaeus’ use of Aristoxenus’ discourse on barbarization: “the report of Aristoxenus would suggest that it consisted in the collective forgetfulness of Greek language as well as ritual. But manifestly not all of it disappeared, and the Hellenism of the late Republic received an infusion of new imperially fueled energy that animated a kind of Italian Hellenism in a way that had never been seen before” (G. Bowersock 1995, 13).

actually makes a pleasant life impossible,⁵²² the moralist evokes the Epicurean rejection of music and poetry, by opposition to the contemporary interest of the Academy and the Lyceum for questions of music theory:⁵²³

ποιὸς γὰρ ἂν αὐλὸς ἢ κιθάρα διηρμοσμένη πρὸς ᾠδὴν ἢ τίς χορὸς
εὐρύοπα κέλαδον ἀκροσόφων
ἀγνύμενον διὰ στομάτων
φθεγγόμενος οὕτως εὐφρανεν Ἐπίκουρον καὶ Μητρόδωρον ὡς Ἀριστοτέλη
καὶ Θεόφραστον καὶ Δικαίαρχον καὶ Ἱερώνυμον οἱ περὶ χορῶν λόγοι καὶ
διδασκαλιῶν καὶ τὰ αὐλῶν προβλήματα καὶ ῥυθμῶν καὶ ἀρμονιῶν;

For what pipe or lyre tuned for song, what chorus “uttering the wide-voiced shout bursting from high-skilled mouths” could have given as much pleasure to Epicurus and Metrodorus as discussion of choruses and the productions of plays and questions about pipes and rhythms and tunings gave to Aristotle and Theophrastus and Dicaearchus and Hieronymus?⁵²⁴

And a few lines later:⁵²⁵

τί λέγεις ὦ Ἐπίκουρε; κιθαρωδῶν καὶ αὐλητῶν ἔωθεν ἀκροασόμενος εἰς τὸ
θέατρον βαδίζεις, ἐν δὲ συμποσίῳ Θεοφράστου περὶ συμφωνιῶν
διαλεγόμενου καὶ Ἀριστοξένου περὶ μεταβολῶν καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ
Ὁμήρου τὰ ᾠδα καταλήψῃ ταῖς χερσὶ δυσχεραίνων καὶ βδελυττόμενος; εἴτ'
οὐκ ἐμμελέστερον ἀποφαίνουσι τὸν Σκύθην Ἀτέαν, ὃς Ἰσμηνίου τοῦ
αὐλητοῦ ληφθέντος αἰχμαλώτου καὶ παρὰ πότον αὐλήσαντος ᾤμοσεν ἥδιον
ἀκούειν τοῦ ἵππου χρεμετίζοντος;

What’s this, Epicurus? To hear singers to the cithara and performers on the flute, you go to the theatre at an early hour, but when at a banquet Theophrastus holds forth on concords, Aristoxenus on modulations, and Aristotle on Homer, you will clap your hands over your ears in annoyance and disgust? Do the Epicureans not make the Scyth Ateas look as if he had more music in his soul – who swore, when the [celebrated fourth-century] flute-player Hismenias was a

⁵²² Plutarch, *Moralia* 1095 (*That Epicurus actually makes a pleasant life impossible* 13) = PMG 1008.

⁵²³ For another view on Epicurus’ ideal banquet, see D. Sider in D. Obbink 1995, 40: “We can probably get a good idea of Epicurus’ ideal banquet from his Symposium, which Athenaeus tells us described a banquet whose company, unlike those in Plato and Xenophon, comprised only Epicurean philosophers, whom Athenaeus calls “prophets of atomism” (fr. 56 Usener = Athenaeus 5.187b). It is such an audience as this that Philodemus had on the bay of Naples, in his and Siro’s modest houses and in the more grand villas of their Roman acquaintances who were their students and patrons sometimes both at the same time.”

⁵²⁴ The poetic quotation might be from Pindar. Just as Plutarch criticizes Epicurus for his lack of musical sensitivity, he shows his own “musical” culture, by referring to what seems to be archaic choral poetry.

⁵²⁵ *Moralia* 1095e.

prisoner and performed at a banquet that he found greater pleasure in the whinnying of his horse?

As this passage underlines, the appreciation of music theory, even if not accompanied by musical practice, defines the new intellectual elite of philosophers in the fourth century, just as the appreciation of *mousikê* was a cultural symbol in the past. By Plutarch's time it seems that it is both – both the ability to talk about the technical matter, and to recall anecdote and use *mousikê* as a way of discriminating between *pepaideumenos* and barbarian (like the Scythian Ateas).

Conclusion to section 1

These various testimonies show that if the institution of the symposium in the fourth century does not have much to do with the archaic institution of the symposium, it is still an important space. As elegantly noted by A. Bowie, “like a myth, symposia seem to be good to think with.”⁵²⁶ What the critic meant in connection with his analysis of Aristophanes' view of the symposium is even truer of the late-classical period.

Rather than continuing to focus on the sociopolitical transformations of the symposium, I would like to explore three main dynamics of the use of the symposium in the late-classical period: first, in the move from the symposium as a real performance context to the symposium as narrative framework: traditional themes of sympotic lyric are explored on the most public stage (that of the dithyramb), and the context of performance of archaic (and early-classical) lyric becomes part of the “mythos” of the dithyramb. This is what I will present in an analysis of Philoxenus' *Deipnon* in the next section. Secondly, the themes of the symposium are important for

⁵²⁶ A. Bowie 1997, 1.

one kind of poetry that survived throughout the classical period: the sympotic paean, as illustrated by Ariphron's paean to health (and possibly Aristotle's paean to Virtue).⁵²⁷ What I will show in this part is how the paean uses the themes and form of archaic sympotic lyric (especially the *skolion*) but constructs a different audience: just as the archaic *skolion*, the song is meant for expressing values shared by a community, but it refers differently to the performance itself, and to the context in which the song is performed. Finally, and this is the most complex phenomenon, the symposium and sympotic forms become the framework for a new conception of literary genre: it is neither the occasion that imposes the form, nor the social function played by the song: the "symposium" is a literary construction, a game with performance conventions played by the author, which by many aspects, announces Hellenistic poetry.

2 - Nouvelle Cuisine and New Dithyramb

The traditional setting and activities of the symposium are central for our understanding of a poem of Philoxenus, the *Deipnon* (PMG 836 a-e). Our only source for this piece is Athenaeus, who quotes five fragments that amount to about 75 lines of dactylo-epitrites.⁵²⁸ It is an astrophic composition, written in a mix of Ionian and Doric dialects, which narrates (in the first person for the most part, with addresses to a second person narratee) a dinner and drinking party; it is reminiscent of many of the features of

⁵²⁷ Discussed in function 5. f in I. Rutherford 2001, 50-52.

⁵²⁸ On Philoxenus, L. Berglein 1843; G. Bippart 1843; U. von Wilamowitz 1900, 85-88; A. Dalby 1987; J. Hordern 1999; J. Wilkins 2000, 350-354. See also Antiphanes fr. 172 K-A.

symptotic lyric. Everything else about the poem however is unknown or problematic: its author, its date, its genre, its interpretation remain a matter for speculation.

Authorship and date

Out of the five passages where Athenaeus quotes the *Deipnon*,⁵²⁹ four times he uses the phrase ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Δείπνῳ and attributes the piece to Philoxenus of Cythera (fr. d and e), otherwise known as the author of the famous dithyramb the *Cyclops or Galatea* and a notorious gourmand, or simply to Φιλόξενος δ' ὁ διθυραμβοποιὸς (fr. a and c). In the fifth instance however, Athenaeus introduces some doubt as regards the identity of the *Deipnon*'s author by attributing it to

Φιλόξενος δ' ὁ Κυθήριος ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Δείπνῳ, εἶπερ τούτου καὶ ὁ κωμωδιοποιὸς Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Φάωνι ἐμνήσθη καὶ μὴ τοῦ Λευκαδίου Φιλοξένου, τοιαύτην ἐκτίθεται παρασκευὴν δείπνου·

Philoxenus of Cythera in the work entitled *Dinner - if indeed he is the one Plato Comicus mentions in his Phaon and not Philoxenus of Leucas* - describes the following dinner preparation: ...

Modern editors and critics, including Bergk, Smyth, Diehl, Wilamowitz, Page and Campbell take Athenaeus' hesitation seriously and attribute the *Deipnon* to Philoxenus of Leucas.⁵³⁰ But given the absence of any other evidence about Philoxenus of Leucas, this is barely enough to justify their emphatic refusal to attribute it to the dithyrambic poet or to see the piece as a dithyramb. These two problems, that of the genre of the piece and that of its authorship, are different but I will treat them as two aspects of the

⁵²⁹ Athenaeus 4. 146f-147e, 11. 476de, 11. 487ab, 14. 642f-643d (ἐν τῷ Δείπνῳ), 15. 685d. Last instance: fr. b = Athenaeus 4. 146 f, where the authorship of Philoxenus of Cythera is doubted.

⁵³⁰ For a different take: Gulick, Webster, and Dalby believe that there was only one dithyrambic poet called Philoxenus. J. Wilkins 2000, 347 sums up the problem: "it is not easy to see how the Philoxeni are to be disentangled from each other given their similar areas of interest, their use of an identical poetic form, their contemporaneity and the similar place they share in the discourse of luxury."

same issue: this attribution to “another Philoxenus” seems to be a symptom of the discomfort that the *Deipnon* causes. Since the content of the poem (the narrative of a lavish dinner) does not match generic expectations attached to the “traditional” dithyramb (a choral poem sung at city festivals, on heroic themes, and with references to Dionysus), the need was felt to divide the roles between a dithyrambic poet and “another” poet. The two (or more) Philoxenoi (of Cythera, of Leucas and “son of Eryxis”) are thus ancient and modern interpreters’ solution to make sense of the variety of the Philoxenian production, or the oddity of the *Deipnon* in the dithyrambist’s production.⁵³¹

The arguments for a Philoxenus “of Leucas” do not resist close scrutiny. The passage that Athenaeus quotes to justify the attribution of the passage to another Philoxenus comes from the comic poet Plato’s *Phaon*:

τοῦ Φιλοξένου δὲ τοῦ Λευκαδίου Δείπνου Πλάτων ὁ κωμωδιοποιὸς μέμνηται· (fr. 189 K-A)

(A) ἐγὼ δ’ ἐνθάδ’ ἐν τῇ ἐρημίᾳ
 τουτὶ διελθεῖν βούλομαι τὸ βιβλίον
 πρὸς ἑμαυτόν. (B) ἐστὶ δ’, ἀντιβολῶ σε, τοῦτο τί;
 (A) Φιλοξένου καινὴ τις ὀψαρτυσία.
 (B) ἐπίδειξον αὐτὴν ἥτις ἔστ’. (A) ἄκουε δὴ.
 ἄρξομαι ἐκ βολβοῖο, τελευτήσω δ’ ἐπὶ θύννον.
 (B) ἐπὶ θύννον; οὐκοῦν † τῆς τελευτ † πολὺ
 κράτιστον ἐνταυθὶ τετάχθαι τάξεως.
 (A) βολβοὺς μὲν σποδιᾶ δαμάσας καταχύσματι δεύσας
 ὡς πλείστους διάτρωγε· τὸ γὰρ δέμας ἀνέρος ὀρθοῖ...

⁵³¹ This tendency to divide the poet’s biography in several units in order to make sense of contradicting pieces of evidence has been pointed out by G. Most, in Greene 1996, 15-25 (see also chapter 3). What he says of the ancient treatment of the image of Sappho can be said of the modern treatment of the image of Philoxenus: “The reception of Sappho can be interpreted as a series of attempts to come to terms with the complexity of this set of data. In doing so, authors have tended to apply one or the other of three basic strategies: duplication, narrativization, and condensation. Most of the ancient scholars who tried to make sense of this mass of information seem to have used the first strategy: (...) declaring that there were in fact two Sapphos, they assigned some features to the one and others to the other, in such a way as to create two individuals, both named Sappho, each one internally consistent or at least plausible, but distinguishable by reference to a set of contradictory attributes.”

Plato the comic poet mentions the *Banquet of Philoxenus of Leucas*:

“And in this deserted spot here, I want to go through this book by myself. B: What is it, I pray you? A: A new Cuisine by Philoxenus. B: show me what it’s like. A: Alright, listen. “I will start from the purse-tassel bulb and will end with the tuna.” B: With the tuna? So it’s much better to be placed here at the back then. (A) The purse-tassels, cover them in ash, cover them with a sauce, and eat as many as you can. For it erects the manlyhood ...

Most of the fragments we have of the *Phaon* (fr. 188 - 198 K-A) are concerned to some degree with the apothecary of love (love-formulae, love-potions etc.), and both the title and mention of Leucas introduce a special connection with Sappho’s life.⁵³²

Phaon was allegedly the lyric poetess’ lover, for whom she jumped from the Leucadian rock. The passage quoted by Athenaeus and cited above differs from the Philoxenian *Deipnon* not only by its meter (dactylic hexameters, while the *Deipnon* is dactylo-epitrites), its style and theme, but also insofar as none of the food items listed by Plato appears in Philoxenus’ poem. Thus, rather than a direct quotation, the passage seems to be a parody of Philoxenus, in dactylic hexameters, and a systematic adaptation of the food items described by the poet for the Aphrodisiac needs of the comic character.⁵³³

The hypothesis of a parody allows justifying why Plato would call Philoxenus of Cythera “Philoxenus of Leucas.” Leucas stood for a metonymy for destructive *eros*, as in Anacreon (*PMG* 376):

ἀρθεις δηῦτ’ ἀπὸ Λευκάδος
πέτρης ἐς πολὺν κύμα κολυμβῶ μεθύων ἔρωτι

once again taking off from the Leucadian rock I dive into the wine wave, drunk with love.

⁵³² On the old comedy poets’ interest for Sappho, see D. Campbell 1993, test. 25 and 26 and note 1. “Other comedies which may have dealt with Sappho were *Phaon* by Plato Comicus and Antiphanes (...) and *the Leucadian* by Menander, Diphilus, Alexis, Antiphanes and Amphis.”

⁵³³ See D. Olson and A. Sens on that aspect, xli-xliii.

“Leucas” thus works as a form of joke on Philoxenian poetics: the dithyrambic poet of Cythera, who wrote about the Cyclops in love, could be a citizen of Leucas, just as Sappho is Leucadian because of her love poetry and tumultuous romantic biography.⁵³⁴

As for the date of the *Deipnon*, it is unknown, but the passage of Plato quoted above provides us with a *terminus ad quem*: in the fragment of the *Phaon* (itself dated 391 BC by the E Scholiast to Aristophanes’ *Wealth* 179), the character refers to Philoxenus’ *Deipnon* as *καινή*. Whether the adjective refers to the date of the piece (Philoxenus’ “most recent” piece) or to the style of the poem (the “new” dithyramb, with its neoterics aesthetics), several details suggest that Plato is referring to the *Deipnon* as a ‘hot’ piece, that arouses curiosity in his interlocutor, and that was recent enough to be on people’s mind, and so should probably be dated not much before 391 BC.⁵³⁵

Genre

Five fragments of the *Deipnon* have survived. They describe different phases of a dinner party (both dining and drinking parts). Fragment a (3 lines) narrates the preparation of the guests; fragment b (43 lines) describes dinner implements (tables, serving dishes, pots and pans) and dishes served: bread (6) fish course (8-16; 19-27), cakes and pastry (16-18), meat and birds (27-36), bread and sweets (37-38), end of the

⁵³⁴ The same kind of process is used by Aristophanes for example: when calling “Socrates the Miletan” to refer to Socrates (of Athens), Aristophanes mixes together two characters, Socrates and Diagoras the Miletan, who shared a reputation of impiety.

⁵³⁵ Like Dionysius in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (52-54): *Καὶ δῆτ' ἐπὶ τῆς νεῶς ἀναγιγνώσκοντί μοι / τὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν ἐξαίφνης πόθος / τὴν καρδίαν ἐπάταξε πῶς οἶει σφόδρα*. In the same way, the first comic character needs a secluded spot (*ἐνθάδ' ἐν τῇ ἐρημίᾳ*) to read the poem all by himself (*πρὸς ἑμαυτόν*), as people do with something objects of *πόθος* (people or objects). Contra: see U. von Wilamowitz 1900, 85-88.

meal and purification (38-43). Fragment c (3 lines) and d (2 lines) comment on drinking practices. Fragment e (23 lines) is a description of “second tables” with another set of deserts and symposium entertainment. The narrative develops exactly according to the (imaginary) sequence described in Aristophanes’ *Wasps* (1216 ff.):

Bd: ὕδωρ κατὰ χειρός· τὰς τραπέζας εἰσφέρειν·
 δειπνοῦμεν· ἀπονεύιμμεθ’ ἤδη σπένδομεν.
 Phi: πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, ἐνύπνιον ἐστιώμεθα;
 Bd: ἀλύητρις ἐνεφύσησεν. οἱ δὲ συμπόται
 εἰσὶν Θέωρος, Αἰσχίνης, Φᾶνος, Κλέων, 1220
 ξένος τις ἕτερος πρὸς κεφαλῆς Ἀκέστορος.
 τούτοις ξυνῶν τὰ σκόλι’ ὅπως δέξει καλῶς.

Bd: water for our hands! Bring in the tables! Dinner... hand-washing...
 now we’re pouring libations...
 Phi: by the gods, are we eating in a dream?
 Bd: the *aulos*-player has started. Your fellow-symposiasts are Theoros,
 Aischines, Phanos, Cleon, and another foreign guest at Ascetor’s head.
 In this company, make sure to take up the scolia well...

The critics’ reticence about calling this piece a dithyramb is caused, it seems, by the fact that the *Deipnon* fits uneasily in the category represented by the few surviving songs of Pindar and Bacchylides classified as “dithyramb.”⁵³⁶ More precisely, there is a disjunction between the theme that the narrative presents (a lavish dinner party) and the internal performance context that it suggests (a symposium), and the performance context that we can imagine for a piece with the formal features, and poetics, displayed by the text.

⁵³⁶ D. Campbell 1993, 181 (strongly against making it a dithyramb). The *Deipnon* in general is “viewed with suspicion by historians of the genre” (J. Wilkins 2000, 350). On this aspect, see also D. Sutton 1989, 70-3; B. Zimmermann 1989, 143-4. J. Wilkins (*ib.*) offers a very subtle stimulating reading of the poem (that he takes as a dithyramb: “This is food for display, for demonstrating wealth in the size and variety of the foods rather than in the refinement sought in Archestratus. Philoxenus introduces the textures of foods such as eels and parts of animals and describes high-quality white barley – these imply an approach to food as it is to be eaten and enjoyed as well as a vehicle for poetic elaboration.” (J. Wilkins 2000, 351).

This disjunction has been observed many times, and critics, struggling with the genre problem, and with the expectations of what a dithyramb should be (in thematic terms), have preferred to see the *Deipnon* as an example of the tradition of hexameter gastronomic textbooks inspired by Sicilian cookery.⁵³⁷ An example of this type was Arcestratus of Gela's *Hedypatheia* (Life of Luxury) composed in the late fourth century. The *Dinner* shares with the *Hedypatheia* both the subject matter (luxury eating) and the paraenetic mode (a description addressed to a second person narratee, on the model of wisdom literature, Hesiod's *Works and Days* and the *Theognidea*), and might have been the paradigm from which Arcestratus inspired himself.⁵³⁸ However, as opposed to Arcestratus' poem, Philoxenus' *Deipnon* does not refer to any technical aspect of food or cooking: it never mentions the origin or mode of preparation of the dishes described, and it is devoted mainly to their visual description rather than to their taste, smell or texture – three differences that make it difficult to assimilate the *Deipnon* with a cookbook.

There is one generic model from which the poem seems to borrow: that of sympotic elegies, with which it shares many narrative, thematic, and verbal features. In introducing the first fragment (a) that presents the beginning of the party, Athenaeus himself uses a mode of discourse of a traditional symposium – the riddle:

⁵³⁷ On cookery books and Greek culture and cuisine in the fourth century, see Olson and Sens 2000, xxviii-xxxii. For another poem (in hexameters) called *Deipnon*, by Hegemon, see xxxiii. On the relationship between the *Deipnon* and the *Hedypatheia*, D. Olson and A. Sens 2000, xlii: "Although it is worth considering the possibility that what we have in these fragments is merely Plato's adaptation of Arcestratos' poem, mockingly assigned to another 'gastronomic' author and with some sexually oriented humour added, therefore, it seems far more likely that the text preserved or parodied in the *Phaon* is in fact an independent and most likely earlier representative of the genre represented more fully in the fragments of the *Hedypatheia*. Indeed, given the specific verbal similarities between the two works, the simplest conclusion would seem to be that Philoxenos' work was known to Arcestratos and served as a literary model for his poem."

⁵³⁸ For performance of *Hedypatheia*, see D. Olson and A. Sens 2000, xxxv.

ἀρχὴν ποιεῖται τὸν στέφανον τῆς εὐωχίας οὕτωςι λέγων·	
κατὰ χειρὸς δ'	1
ἤλιθ' ὕδωρ ἀπαλὸς	2
παιδίσκος ἐν ἀργυρέαι	
πρόχῳ φορέων ἐπέχευεν.	
εἶτ' ἔφερε στέφανον	3
λεπτᾶς ἀπὸ μυρτίδος εὐ-	
γνήτων ⁵³⁹ κλαδέων δισύναπτον	

he makes the wreath the ‘beginning of the feast,’ using these words:

on our hands a tender youth poured fourth much water that he carried in a silver pitcher. Then he brought a wreath made of well-born twigs of delicate myrtle, double-plaited.

This way of introducing the passage by renaming the most common objects of the symposium (the wreath) in an *ainos* (“what is the beginning of the feast?”) is itself a typical sympotic practice. Whether this periphrasis (ἀρχὴν τῆς εὐωχίας) was inspired by an expression in Philoxenus’ poem (in the lines preceding our fragment) or was Athenaeus’ interpretation, the phrase gives us a clue on the genre that Athenaeus’ ancient readers might have assimilated this beginning with.

Moreover, the typically sympotic implements (wreaths, pitcher and washing/purifying apparatus) mentioned by Philoxenus in the first fragment are the standard paraphernalia of archaic and classical elegies, as illustrated by passages of Xenophanes (fr. 1W, 1-6) and Ion of Chios (fr. 27 W, 2-4; 7-10), which provide structural and verbal parallels with the *Deipnon* for example:

νῦν γὰρ δὴ ζάπεδον καθαρὸν καὶ χεῖρες ἀπάντων
καὶ κύλικες· πλεκτοὺς δ' ἀμφιτιθεῖ στεφάνους,
ἄλλος δ' εὐῶδες μύρον ἐν φιάλῃ παρατείνει·
κρητὴρ δ' ἔστηκεν μεστὸς εὐφροσύνης·
ἄλλος δ' οἶνος ἐτοῖμος, ὃς οὐποτε φησι προδώσειν,
μείλιχος ἐν κεράμοις, ἄνθεος ὀζόμενος·

For now the floor is pure and the hands of all, and the cups; [a servant] places woven garlands on us, while another proffers fragrant myrrh in a dish; the

⁵³⁹ Bergk: *forte* εὐγνάπτων (influenced by the *Cheiron* passage?).

mixing bowl stands there, full of festive joy; another wine is ready, promising to never abandon us, mild in the jars, giving out its bouquet.

and

ἡμῖν δὲ κρητῆρ' οἰνοχόοι θέραπεες
κιρνάντων προχύταισιν ἐν ἀργυρέοις † ὁ δὲ χρυσοῦν
οἶνον ἔχων χειρῶν νιζέτω εἰς ἔδαφος. †

Let the wine-pouring servants mix the crater for us in silver pitchers; and let the one who holds the golden wine wash our hands onto the floor.

Even the presence of the tender boy (*ἀπαλὸς παιδίσκος*) mentioned in the second line of Philoxenus' fragment a builds some generic expectation. In other sympotic contexts, the young wine-pourer allows the transition between the objects he carries and his being himself an object of desire for symposiasts. He adds, just like the myrtle branches (that belong to the worship of Aphrodite) to the erotic potential of the gathering.⁵⁴⁰

Finally in addition to mentioning the *kottabos* game (in fr. e) and referring to post-symposium *komos* (*ἐν βακχία*, fr. c, 1), Philoxenos himself uses modes of discourse of the symposium, such as the *ainos* (the wine-cakes for example are called ὀμφαλὸς θοίνας - navel of the feast, fr. b, 19) and didactic discourse (*τὰς ἐφήμεροι καλέοντι νῦν τραπέζας <δευτέρας> / ἀθάνατοι δὲ τ' Ἀμαλθείας κέρας* - creatures of one day call [desserts] “second tables” but the immortals call them “the horn of Amalthea.”) This mode of discourse, the paedagogical insistence in fr. e on giving things their right name,⁵⁴¹ as well as the construction of an internal audience, (a dear

⁵⁴⁰ See the anecdote about Sophocles and the handsome wine-pourer, reported by Ion of Chios and quoted by Athenaeus (13. 603 f – 604 d = *FGrH* 2 F 46). After water, wine and wreathes, sympotic poetry usually introduces Eros. φέρ' ὕδωρ, φέρ' οἶνον, ὦ παῖ, φέρε ἀνθεμόεντας ἡμῖν / στέφανους: ἔνεικον, ὡς δὴ πρὸς Ἔρωτα πυκταλίζω (bring in water, bring in wine, boy; bring us flowery wreathes: bring them, so that I may box against Eros).

⁵⁴¹ Fr. e opens with a focus on the naming, and renaming, of food and food-related objects. There are no fewer than five allusions to naming. First the metaphor that the narrator uses for the tables (*πορθημίδας*, 2), the (epic?) distinction (3-4) between the name given by mortals and that given by gods, the different metaphorical terms used to describe ‘dessert,’ the name of the milky custard itself (*muelos – amulos*,

friend called φίλε and φιλότας, fr. b, 7, 16, 23 and 35) all recall the context of wisdom poetry performed at symposia: the familiarity between narrator and addressee is suggested by asides like παρά γ' ἐμὴν καὶ τίν, σαφ' οἶδα - at your house and at mine, as I know well, fr. b, 19, or ὦ φιλότας, ἔσθοις κε - you would gladly eat that, dear friend, fr. b, 35. By using these tools, the poem thus reinforces the closeness between the imagined *hetairoi* and the social bond of the participants in this opulent party. At the same time, this narrative technique allows the external audience to feel as if it had been given access to something private and to relish the description as all the more special.

Yet despite the thematic similarities with a sympotic elegy, and despite the fact that it seems perfectly at home in the context of Athenaeus' "sophists at dinner" (who recite this piece right before being served dessert) and could indeed have been professionally sung at a symposium, three reasons lead me to suggest that the piece was not performed in the context which it describes (a symposium).

First, the main topic is exquisite food, a subject hardly ever dealt with in archaic sympotic poetry or even in surviving fourth-century symposium prose literature.⁵⁴²

Food itself is much more at home on the comic stage, and most of the dishes

with the odd repetition of this noun to describe a presumably very different dish, 18), and finally the reference to the 'dessert of Zeus' (Ζανὸς καλέοντι τρώγματα 12). They are all condensed in the first twelve lines. In the rest of the poem, there is no more mention of naming.

⁵⁴² The discourse on food is usually found in comedy: "philosophy, like tragedy, was exploited by the comic poets to sharpen comedy's own identity. We shall see both philosophers and tragic poets fitting uncomfortably into the city as comedy presented it, with jarring juxtapositions of comic materialism against abstraction and comic foods forced into tragic verse" (Wilkins xvii). Again, one should note the generic crossover. Also *Marriage of Hebe* 42. 10-11, on which J. Wilkins 2000, 352: "Just as Epicharmus adapted Ananius into his *Muses* or *Marriage of Hebe*, so Philoxenus adapted from his comic predecessor into dithyramb the interest of the gods in food. (...) The principal contrast with Old Comedy also lies in the eager participation of the narrator in the meal. (...) These elements in Philoxenus herald the Attic development of the *mageiros* who can produce food pleasing to the gods and pleasing to the appetite."

catalogued in lines 27-37 all appear in comedy. A passage of Eubulus provides the clearest parallel (the *Laconians* or *Leda*, fr. 63 K-A) with the gastronomic content of Philoxenus' dinner:

πρὸς τούτοισιν δὲ παρέσται σοι
θύννου τέμαχος, κρέα δελφακίων,
χορδαί τ' ἐρίφων ἤπάρ τε κάπρου,
κριοῦ τ' ὄρχεις, χόλικές τε βοός,
κρανία τ' ἄρνων, νῆστις τ' ἐρίφου,
γαστήρ τε λαγῶ, φύσκη, χορδή,
πνεύμων, ἀλλᾶς τε.

Beside these, you will be served a slice of tunny, *filet-mignon*, kids' tripes, boar's liver, ram testicles, beef guts, lambs' heads, a kid's intestine, a hare's belly, a sausage, black-pudding, lung, and salami.

Additionally, the choice of meat parts (snout, head, feet) and the mode of food consumption do not correspond to sympotic aristocratic ideology: both the apparently inexhaustible appetite of the guests (as illustrated in *χερσὶν δ' ἐπέθεντο τότε οὐκέτι στόμιον μαλεραῖς* fr. e, 10) as well as their delight taken in fatty food (sausage and fatty pork ribs: fr. b, 31) are markers not only of comedy, but also of iambos – or more generally of the mode of abuse.⁵⁴³ Both of these aspects seem at odd with an elite, discriminating audience who would flatter itself of its select culinary and poetic tastes.

In relation to that first point, a second aspect distinguishes Philoxenus' poem (and the reception it implies) from the performance context that it describes: the poem is mostly descriptive, and devoid of the prescriptive tone of wisdom poetry usually associated with symposium literature. In particular, there is no prescription of moderation, no ideal of *to metron*: unlike the poem of Dionysius Chalcus quoted by Athenaeus at the very end of the *Deipnosophistae*, that encapsulates sympotic ritual

⁵⁴³ As D. Steiner has suggested, excessive consumption of food and flouting are two correlative ideas in archaic poetics (EHESS, April 2005 lecture).

and ideology in the συμπόσιον κοσμῶν καὶ τὸ σὸν εὖ θέμενος (fr. 1, 4-5 W), there is no concern for the erotics, or the right metrics of the symposium: there is no reference to the erotic element of wisdom transmission (although a tender boy appears in the first lines, there is no further reference to eros), and the *metrios* and the *kosmos* so central to Solon's elegies (among others) are replaced by unrestricted drinking (c: ἐν βακχίᾳ, d: ἔβρεχοντο / δ' οὐ κατὰ μικρὸν).⁵⁴⁴ There is no mention of religious concern (unlike the καθαρὸν of Xenophanes or the libations that follow in the next lines of Ion: σπένδοντες δ' ἄγνως, fr. 2, 5) in the description of the preparation; no reference to the ethics of drinking and dining. Correlatively, the language itself is unbridled, very far from the contained style of sympotic elegy, whereas in Philoxenus, the verbal daintiness of the piece matches the elaborateness of all the elements of the party, objects and dishes: while in Xenophanes or Ion, the wreath is enough to signify the event, in Philoxenus, a whole line is used to describe the refinement of the wreath, or devoted to the washing of hands (v. 3). More precisely, in fragment a, all nouns (except one) are singular and qualified by an adjective.

This lexical choice reproduces the aesthetics of the poem: everything is soft (ἀπαλός), delicate (λεπτός) and elaborate. Natural materials (twigs fr. a, 2, horns fr. d, 2) are turned into objects of art (ἐν χρυσείαις προτομαῖς / τελέων κεράτων) and even the drink offered (νεκτάρειον πῶμ') seems to be a transformation of a more natural liquid (suggested by εὐδροσον).⁵⁴⁵ The *recherché* character of the vocabulary (εὐγνήτων = hapax for εὐγενῶν) illustrates the poet's concern to set aside all the

⁵⁴⁴ On the *kosmos* - sympotic order, and *metron* – sympotic aesthetics, see A. Ford 2004, 45.

⁵⁴⁵ See LSJ: with plenteous dew, abounding in water, παγαί Euripides *Iphigenia in Aulis* 1517 (lyr.); τόποι Aristophanes *Birds* 245; νασμοί Aristonous 1. 42: δροσόεντας Sappho 95. 12: “it is striking that the adjective *drossoeis*, rather rare in all of Greek literature, appears for the first time precisely in Sappho as a poetic epithet” L. Rossi 2001, 123-4.

elements of the feast and qualify them as special. In the same way, in fragment c, the after-washing cup (μετανιπτρίδα, 2) is described in great details: it is εὐδροσον and brings πρᾶν ... γάνος. The connotation of the noun γάνος (literally “brightness, sheen”) was announced in the preceding line by the adjective (well-bedewed).

It is not only the verbal elaboration that contributes to making this poem on the theme of a symposium a poetic experience very different from that of sympotic poetry. The variety of the vocabulary is matched by a variety of generic moments embedded in the poem: in addition to the comic and iambic foods, signature dishes of the mode of abuse, the style occasionally reaches epic heights, when “we companions had reached our fill of food and drink” (with the Homeric-sounding ὅτε δ’ ἤδη βρωτύος ἠδὲ ποτᾶτος ἐς κόρον ἦμεν ἐταῖροι fr. b, 39) and with a form of *recusatio* ἔγωγ’ ἔτι, κοῦ κε λέγοι τις πάνθ’ ἃ παρῆν ἐτύμως ἄμμιν, παρέπεισε δὲ θερμὸν σπλάγχνον (and no one could truly tell all that was there for us, but my rash heart has persuaded me, fr. b, 25). The epic references however are never so obscure that it would require from the audience great familiarity with Homeric epic to enjoy the poem (by contrast with Matro of Pitane’s *Attic Dinner Party*, a parody and cento of Homer.)⁵⁴⁶

The final, and most important, difference with sympotic elegy is that there are very few references to the pleasure of music and poetry performed at a symposium.⁵⁴⁷ The musical element comes from the poem, and the dinner itself embodies the poetics of the text. The aesthetics introduced by fragment a is developed throughout the poem: the softness of the boy is recalled by various compounds of ἀπαλός:

⁵⁴⁶ On Matro, see D. Olson and A. Sens 1999.

⁵⁴⁷ The only adjectives that would apply to music (γλυκυόξεες, θεοτερπές ἀνδ γλυκίστα) describe a plate of eels, wine-cakes, and a sausage (fr. b, 9, 18 and 33). Even the gods are more busy with sausage than the arts: fr. b, 34 ἀν δὴ φιλέοντι θεοί.)

σηπιοπουλυποδείων ἀπαλοπλοκάμων (fr. b, 13), τυρὸν ἀπαλόν (fr. b, 37-38), ἀπαλαῖς θάλλοντες ὄραις (fr. e, 20) and the comfort provided by χλιεροθαλπές ὕδωρ ἐπεγγέοντες τόσσον ὅσον <τις> ἔχρηζ' (fr. b, 41).⁵⁴⁸ The delicateness of the myrtle wreath (λεπτᾶς ἀπὸ μυρτίδος a3) is echoed by the spider's web λεπτᾶς ἀράχνας (fr. e, 10). A whole atmosphere of lightness and softness is conjured up by the various adjectives: μελικαρίδες κοῦφαι (light, fr. b, 16), μαλακοπτυχέων ἄρτων (breads with soft folds, fr. c, 37) μαλακοφλοίδων (soft-leafed fr. e, 21) and by the infinitive χλιδῶσαι (to be soft, fr. b, 4). This softness and delicacy in texture is replicated in the passage's attention to lights and reflections (λιπαρῶπα fr. b, 1, ἔστιλβον αὐγας, fr. b, 3, λιπαροντες ἐγχελεατινες fr. b, 8), white or light colours (μάζας χιονόχροας fr. b, 6, κᾶξανθισμένα εὐπέταλοι χλοεραί φρ. b, 17, σχελίδας λευκοφορινοχρόους fr. b, 31, ξανθόν μέλι fr. b, 37).

In the end, the main source of musical entertainment does not come from the party described, but from the song itself: the list of deserts for example fills the ear as much as it fills the eye, with the alternation between alliteration in liquids ([m], [n]) and plosives ([k], [p] [t]), and the duplication of words from line to line, in a sort of echo and counterpoint (fr. e, 17-20):

... <u>μελίπακτα</u> τετυγμέν'	
ἄφθονα <u>σασαμόφωκτα</u>	
<u>τυρακίνας</u> δὲ γάλακτι	18
καὶ <u>μέλι</u> συγκατάφυρτος	
ἦς ἄμυλος <u>πλαθανίτας</u>	
<u>σασαμοτυροπαγῆ</u> δὲ	19
καὶ <u>ζεσελαιοπαγῆ</u>	
<u>πλατύνετο</u> <u>σασαμόπλαστα</u>	

⁵⁴⁸ ἀπαλός (found 3 times in Philoxenus) appears 13 times in Homer (and by contrast, never in Pindar); in Archilochus, it is always linked with desire: see Archilochus fr. 188, 191 W (even more explicit in 247: ἀπαλός κέρασ for *membrum virile*).

πέμματα...

20

honey-cakes, sesame-sprinkled and toasted, prepared in abundance; and there was a cheese-cake, well mixed with milk and honey, made with fine flour and baked in a mould; and sesame-sprinkled cakes lay flat, a sesame-cheese mixture done

Moreover, as I have suggested with the c fragment, the deictics do not point to the song as song, in a self-referential way and with the goal to reinforce the relationship with the addressee, but to the party itself. It is the party that becomes more and more vivid, as the use of verbs suggests: the “real time” of the party is created by the text. The dinner slowly unfolds in front of us: the long lines, repetition and the feeling of duplication (διπλόοι, ἑτέραν δ' ἑτέροις) reproduce the long preparation:

εἰς δ' ἔφερον διπλόοι
 παῖδες λιπαρῶπα τράπεζαν
 ἄμμ', ἑτέραν δ' ἑτέροις,
 ἄλλοις δ' ἑτέραν, μέχρ' οὐ
 πλήρωσαν οἶκον

a pair of boys brought in for us a gleaming faced table, and another one for other, and another for others, until they filled the room.

This reproduces the narrator's delight at the preparation, but also allows making the audience experience a sense of completion: the narrator / performer / audience reaches the end of a long line only when the servants reach the room's full capacity. Again in line 7, the narrator will play with his audience's sense of expectation by introducing interruption, apostrophe and a form of suspense: οὐ κάκκαβος, ᾧ φιλότας, ἀλλ' ἄλλοπλατεῖς τὸ μέγιστον... There is a strong sense of narrative development, which is achieved through the repetitive use of ἦλθε or one of its compounds to introduce each new dish (line 7, 10, 13, 16, 20, 28, 37), and to a lesser degree παρέθηκε 29, or

παρεβάλλετο 36, πάρφερον, as a second motif at the end of the poem.⁵⁴⁹ The verbs actually disappear in the last fragment, as if the enumeration itself was enough to suggest the narrative development, as do the appeals to the addressee: whereas there is an appeal to the internal addressee, or a reference to a second person in lines 2, 7, 16, 19, 23, 26, 35, 39 of fragment a, the addressee seems to have disappeared from the last fragment, to the point that the narrative concludes with the use of a third person plural.

So if there is no symptotic music in the description of this dinner party, it is because there is no party, it is only a song: the private symptotic context, I suggest, is only a foil for the actual performance of this poem. Because of the aesthetic, literary and ideological preferences marked in the text, a display for a large audience, in a civic context, seems an appropriate context of performance, more so than a performance at a private gathering. It is even tempting to see the *Deipnon* as achieving the ultimate democratic experience described in Pericles' Funeral Oration, by collapsing the distinction between two spheres described as bringing pleasure to Athens:

καὶ μὴν καὶ τῶν πόνων πλείστας ἀναπαύλας τῇ γνώμῃ ἐπορισάμεθα, ἀγῶσι μὲν γε καὶ θυσίαις διετησίοις νομίζοντες, ἰδίαις δὲ κατασκευαῖς εὐπρεπέσιν, ὧν καθ' ἡμέραν ἡ τέρψις τὸ λυπηρὸν ἐκπλήσσει. ἐπεσέρχεται δὲ διὰ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως ἐκ πάσης γῆς τὰ πάντα, καὶ ξυμβαίνει ἡμῖν μηδὲν οἰκειότερα τῇ ἀπολαύσει τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὰ γιγνόμενα καρποῦσθαι ἢ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων.

Further, we provide plenty of means for the mind to refresh itself from business. We celebrate competitions and sacrifices all year round, and the elegance of private homes forms a daily source of pleasure and brings relaxation from toil to the spirit; while the magnitude of our city draws the produce of the world into our harbour, so that to the Athenian the fruits of other countries are as familiar a luxury as those of his own.

⁵⁴⁹ I could not recognize any specific place in the line, or specific metrical pattern in the different uses of this verb.

The public pleasure of competitions and festivals (ἀγώνες καὶ θυσίαι), and the private pleasure of an elegant home (ιδίαι κατασκευαί εὐπρεπεῖς) are mixed in the *Deipnon*; the piece takes precisely a theme that has become popular in the fourth century (gastronomy and art of private living) and displays it in the civic context of a public performance to bring its audience “relaxation from toil to the spirit.” The poem itself describes the intended reception of the dinner, and of the *Dinner* as a poem: the party is something that “revels in every skilful invention for good living, enticement for the spirit” (fr. b, 4-5). The last lines of fr. e conclude with “something new was said, a smart playful thing (τι καινὸν, κομψὸν ἄθυρμάτιον), that they admired and praised.”⁵⁵⁰ These two sentences encapsulate the dinner’s, and the *Dinner*’s aesthetic: it is a showpiece, which strives at novelty and entertainment, and at the delectation of its audience, who might even enjoy recognizing snippets of various poetic forms (comedy, elegy, and epic). A testimony of Aristotle supports this idea: in a spiteful comment about contemporary popular culture, he says:⁵⁵¹

Ἄριστοτέλης δὲ [Φιλόξενόν] φιλόδειπνον ἀπλῶς, ὃς καὶ γράφει πού ταῦτα·
δημηγοροῦντες ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις κατατρίβουσιν ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν τοῖς
θαύμασι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ Φάσιδος ἢ Βορυσθένους καταπλέοντας,
ἀνεγνωκότες οὐδὲν πλὴν εἰ τὸ Φιλοξένου Δείπνον οὐχ ὅλον.

Aristotle simply calls [Philoxenus] a dinner-lover, and even writes somewhere: “they spend the whole day among the jugglers making clap-trap in the crowds, and to people who sail from the Phasis or the Borysthenes, and have read nothing except Philoxenus’ *Banquet*, and not even the whole thing!”

This remark presents Philoxenus’ *Dinner* as an iconic text for artists interested in crowd-pleasers – but it describes it also as something that could be read and that might have circulated in book form.

⁵⁵⁰ See note about the use of kompson as the aesthetic of the new symposium.

⁵⁵¹ Athenaeus 1. 6, quoting Aristotle, fr. 63 Rose.

Thus, it is neither the language, the theme nor the mode of discourse that formally distinguishes the *Deipnon* from other genres: if the theme is familiar from comedy, the style is reminiscent of the dithyramb, and the paraenetic mode, of sympotic elegy. This mix of features contributes to creating the kind of relationship with the audience described in the preceding chapter, and requires the work of the imagination to participate in the “dream-fulfilment fantasy.”

Conclusion to section 2

This mix of generic markers, which illustrates the *polyeideia* that I was describing in connection with Philoxenus’ *Cyclops*, is characteristic of the import, on the dramatic, dithyrambic, democratic stage of topics that used to belong to the world of the private symposium. I have suggested that only the context of performance, a performance at a civic festival for a popular audience happy to be given access to a private feast, allows making sense of this strange dish, best described in the words of the poet itself as *kompson athurmaton*.

The *Deipnon* also illustrates the phenomenon described by Amphis (in his comedy *Dithyrambos*) and presented in the first section of this chapter, which P. Wilson describes as “dithyrambic poets bringing tit-bits from the cultural riches of the upper-class private world of pleasure into the public world of the mob.”⁵⁵² In the case that I have presented, the symposium is not so much a context of performance as a topic. It marks an important change not only in the ideology of food consumption (since there is no prescription of measure in the symposium described), but also in the

⁵⁵² P. Wilson 2000, 70.

use of some specific poetic tools, especially the deictic references: while deictics were used in the past to connect the *hetairoi* between each other during sympotic performance, they are used in the context of the theatrical presentation of the symposium with the goal of creating the illusion of sympotic performance, but are devoid of any social function.

3- Deixis and performance context in Ariphron's paean to health

The same loss of social function can be read in another poem of the fourth century, Ariphron's song to health (*PMG* 813).⁵⁵³ Athenaeus describes it as a paean, although the song does not have paeanic formal markers (like a paian cry or an appeal to Apollo), and does not refer to a sympotic performance context; it is quoted on the last page of his *Deipnosophistae* to cap off his encyclopedia of sympotic practices. Other sources show that the song was widely popular: according to Lucian, it was τὸ γνωριμώτατον ἐκεῖνο καὶ πᾶσι διὰ στόματος during his lifetime,⁵⁵⁴ and inscribed in

⁵⁵³ On Ariphron: *Pro lapsu inter salut.* 6. i 449 = *PMG* 813. It is also quoted by Plutarch (*Virt. Moral.* 450a, *de frat. amor.* 479a), by Max. Tyr. 7.1 and by Sext. Emp. *Adv. math* 11.49, Stobaeus 4.27.9. It came down to us in two manuscripts, that of Athenaeus and an anonymous Greek codex Ottobonianus 59 II fol. 31^v. The song was also inscribed on an Athenian stone: (*IG* ii² 4533 (lapis Cass.), *IG* IV 1.132 (lapis Epidaur.)). On which: U. von Wilamowitz 1921, 494-495 (on meter); K. Keyssner 1932, 29ff.; P. Maas 1933, 148 ff.; K. Keyssner, 1933; J. Bremer 1981, 210-11; R. Wagman 1995, 159-178; W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001, (vol. 1) 224-227; I. Rutherford 2001, 37-38. The exact composition date of the poem is a matter of debate: an inscription of the early 4th century (*I. G.* ii³ 1280) celebrates the victory of a chorus trained by a certain Ariphron, but Ariphron was a name popular in the classical period, and the poet recorded in the inscription might not have anything to do with the author of this song. Many features of Aristotle's Paean to Virtue (dated 341 BC) seem to imitate it, but again, there is no certainty on the relationship between the two (on which C. Bowra 1938). The thematic way of dating the poem to the late fourth century (with the reference to kingly power l. 4 and love matters l. 5, that seem to "evoke Hellenistic culture rather than classical times") that Furley and Bremer propose is far from convincing. In the absence of any other argument to propose a secure date, I will follow the consensus dating of early 4th century.

⁵⁵⁴ Lucian, *de lapsu* 6. It is also quoted in different forms by Plutarch (*Moralia* 450b, *Moralia* 479a), Maximus Tyrius vii, and Sextus Empiricus, *adv. math.* 11. 49.

several places, including in Athens and Epidauros.⁵⁵⁵ In the next pages, I would like to examine how Ariphron’s song innovates on a traditional motive of the symposium, the celebration of health. The main innovation of the poem, I would like to argue, is its use of some deictic markers that do not emphasize the connection between performer and real context of performance: although the song recalls the features of sympotic songs, it is not connected to the setting were it used to be sung, but creates another “adaptable” setting (to the point that this sympotic song can be inscribed on a stone).

That paeans were sung in archaic symposia is suggested by a fragment of Alcman.⁵⁵⁶

θοίνας δὲ καὶ ἐν σιάσοισιν
ἀνδρείων παρὰ δαιτυμόνεσσι
πρέπει παιᾶνα κατάρχειν.

At feasts and men’s dinner-parties, it is befitting to take up the paean among the diners.

In this passage, the use of the verb κατάρχειν suggests that the paean was sung (or at least lead off) by a soloist; but not much else is known of the sympotic paean before the classical period.⁵⁵⁷ On the other hand, Alcman’s fragment itself probably refers to its own performance context (the feast and the dining);⁵⁵⁸ the presentation of the concern for what is *prepon*, a typical concern of sympotic fragments, contributes to connecting the symposiasts around a set of values they share, and the παρὰ δαιτυμόνεσσι is a form of deictic, connecting the speaker with the rest of the company. These features are not present in Ariphron’s song.

⁵⁵⁵ Stone dated 200 AD, and a stone in the Asclepion at Epidauros. See R. Wagman 1995.

⁵⁵⁶ *PMG* 98 = 129 Calame = R4. On the sympotic function of the paian, see I. Rutherford 2001, 50-52.

⁵⁵⁷ Other reference to sympotic paean singing: Plato, *Symposium* 176a. Also Archilochus 120 W.

⁵⁵⁸ See C. Calame 1980, 531: “Selon la proposition déjà faite par Von der Mühl (...), il est probable que ces vers soient eux-mêmes extraits d’un péan chanté dans le cadre des syssities.” On this poem, also W. Rösler 1980, 148-158.

- (A) Ἰγίεια βροτοῖσι πρεσβίστα μακάρων, μετὰ σεῦ
ναίοιμι τὸ λειπόμενον βιοτᾶς, σὺ δέ μοι πρόφρων ξυνεΐης·
- (B) εἰ γάρ τις ἢ πλούτου χάρις ἢ τεκέων
ἢ τὰς ἰσοδαίμονος ἀνθρώποις βασιληίδος ἀρχᾶς ἢ πόθων
οὓς κρυφίοις Ἄφροδίτας ἔρκεσιν θηρεύομεν, 5
ἢ εἴ τις ἄλλα θεόθεν ἀνθρώποισι τέρψις ἢ πόνων
ἀμνοῶ πέφανται,
- (A) μετὰ σεῖο, μάκαιρ' Ἰγίεια,
τέθαλε καὶ λάμπει Χαρίτων ὀάροις·
σέθεν δὲ χωρὶς οὔτις εὐδαίμων ἔφυ. 10

Health, for the human race the most honoured of the blessed ones, may I dwell with you for what remains of my life, and may you gladly be with me. For if any pleasure found in wealth or children or in the regal power that gives to men a status equal to that of the gods or in the desires that we hunt with the concealed nets of Aphrodite, or again if any other delight god-sent to men or any respite from toil exists, it is with you, blessed Health, that it blooms and shines in the converse of the Graces; and without you no man is happy.

The paean is a short monostrophic poem in lyric koinê, in dactyloepitrites, with a circular structure. The first section (A, 1-2) starts with an invocation to Health, and a prayer for Health to live with the performer for the rest of his life. The second section (B, 3-7) is a priamel that enumerates the good things of life that men can enjoy if they are granted health. The last section (A, 8-10) is again a prayer to and glorification of Health.

This is not the first celebration of Health: there is a long tradition of praising health and being healthy in wisdom / elegiac / sympotic poetry, but these songs do not celebrate Health as a mythical abstraction, connected to Apollo or Asclepius. In archaic and classical songs, Health is part of the good things that a *kaloskagathos* has to have, it is even the condition for all other goods. This idea is expressed in the Attic skolion

which Plato quotes in the *Gorgias* (451e), variously attributed to Simonides (*PMG* 651) or to Epicharmus (fr. 262):⁵⁵⁹

ΣΩ. οἶομαι γάρ σε ἀκηκοέναι ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις ἄδόντων ἀνθρώπων τοῦτο τὸ σκολιόν, ἐν ᾧ καταριθμοῦνται ἄδοντες ὅτι ὑγιαίνειν μὲν ἄριστόν ἐστιν, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον καλὸν γενέσθαι, τρίτον δέ, ὡς φησιν ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦ σκολιοῦ, τὸ πλουτεῖν ἀδόλως.

ΓΟΡ. Ἀκήκοα γάρ· ἀλλὰ πρὸς τί τοῦτο λέγεις;

Socrates (addressing Gorgias): you've heard, I'm sure, people sing at the symposium this *skolion* in which the singers count health as the greatest good, then beauty in second place, and third, as the author of the *skolion* says, wealth rightly acquired.

Gorgias: I've heard it indeed; but what's your point?

The text of a *skolion* (*PMG* 890) is also quoted by Athenaeus; when the *deipnosophists* discuss the quote, they do not challenge the fundamental claim that health is first, but discuss the order of the other elements in the *priamel*:

ὑγιαίνειν μὲν ἄριστον ἀνδρὶ θνητῷ
δ δεύτερον δὲ καλὸν φῦαν γενέσθαι,
τὸ τρίτον δὲ πλουτεῖν ἀδόλως
καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ἡβᾶν μετὰ τῶν φίλων.

Αἰσθέντος δὲ τούτου καὶ πάντων ἡσθέντων ἐπ' αὐτῷ καὶ μνημονευσάντων ὅτι καὶ ὁ καλὸς Πλάτων αὐτοῦ μέμνηται ὡς ἄριστα εἰρημένου, ὁ Μυρτίλος ἔφη Ἀναξανδρίδην αὐτὸ διακεχλευακέναι τὸν κωμωδιοποιὸν ἐν Θησαυρῷ λέγοντα οὕτως·

ὁ τὸ σκόλιον εὐρῶν ἐκεῖνος, ὅστις ἦν,
τὸ μὲν ὑγιαίνειν πρῶτον ὡς ἄριστον ὄν
ὠνόμασεν ὀρθῶς· δεύτερο δ' εἶναι καλόν,
τρίτον δὲ πλουτεῖν, τοῦθ' ὄρα, ἐμαίνετο·
μετὰ τὴν ὑγίειαν γὰρ τὸ πλουτεῖν διαφέρει
καλὸς δὲ πεινῶν ἐστὶν αἰσχροὺς θηρίων.

Health is the best for a mortal, second comes beauty, third wealth rightly acquired and fourth youth in the company of friends.

When this song had been sung, to everybody's pleasure, who remembered that the noble Plato also mentions it as something very well said, Myrtilus pointed out that the comic poet Anaxandrides made fun of it in his *Treasure* (fr. 18 K-

⁵⁵⁹ For the attribution of the *skolion*, Clement of Alexandria ascribed it to Simonides and Aristotle, Stobaeus to an unknown Sclerias. Commentators have given the dramatic date of ca. 405 BC for the *Gorgias* although there are disconcerting inconsistencies in the temporal indications in the dialogue. The point is that Socrates refers to a presumably famous song that predates Aiphron's poem.

A) in these lines: “the man who devised the skolion, whoever he was, was right to name health first as the best thing; but to put a handsome beauty second and wealth third he was out of his mind, of course, for wealth is next best to health: a handsome man who is poor is an ugly beast.”

This passage presents particularly strikingly how the symposium uses the song to Health as part of an aristocratic programme. The other three elements praised are all the aristocratic virtues expressed in sympotic lyric (physical beauty, well-acquired wealth, youth and friendship). The same idea is expressed by Theognis in an even more condensed form (255-6 W):⁵⁶⁰

Κάλλιστον τὸ δικαιοτάτον· λῶιστον δ' ὑγαίνειν·
πράγμα δὲ τερπνότατον, τοῦ τις ἐραῖ, τὸ τυχεῖν.

Most beautiful is what is most just: best is to be healthy: but the most pleasant thing is to chance upon the one one loves.

Health comes naturally first in the context of a statement on moral values.⁵⁶¹ But in all these gnomic statements in archaic poetry, Health is not addressed as an abstraction; it is only Critias who makes Health a divinity present at the ideal symposium (the moderate Spartan symposium), along with Piety and Temperance: (fr. 6 W):

... καλῶς δ' εἰς ἔργ' Ἀφροδίτης
πρὸς θ' ὕπνον ἤρμοσται, τὸν καμάτων λιμένα,
πρὸς τὴν τερπνοτάτην τε θεῶν θνητοῖς Ἰγίειαν
καὶ τὴν Εὐσεβίης γείτονα Σωφροσύνην.

it prepares beautifully towards the deeds of Aphrodite, and towards sleep, the harbour of pains, and towards Health the most enjoyable of the gods for the mortals, and towards Temperance, neighbour of Piety.

Although health is deemed a sacred thing before Aripbron's poem,⁵⁶² she is never presented as a deity.⁵⁶³

⁵⁶⁰ See parallel with Sophocles, fr. 356: λῶιστον δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἄνοσον.

⁵⁶¹ On the ethical meaning of *hygies* as “sound and healthy,” see B. Gentili 1988, 70.

⁵⁶² This divinisation of health was already suggested by Simonides: in the passage where he quotes Aripbron's hymn to Health, (*ap. Mathem.* XI 49=*PMG* 604), Sextus Empiricus paraphrases Simonides,

Ariphron’s poem celebrating Hygieia thus introduces a change by not insisting on the common values shared by (aristocratic) performers at the symposium, but by reinforcing (twice) the tie between health and a performing “I”: μετὰ σεῦ ναίοιμι τὸ λειπόμενον βιοτᾶς, σὺ δέ μοι πρόφρων ξυνείης (1-2). Deictics are used throughout the poem to reinforce the impression that Health is present, and addressed directly (8 σεῖο and 10 σέθεν). This expression not only reinforces the bond between health and man, but it is also a variation on the cletic “may you come and visit”. Here, the place is not specified, and the performer can transport the prayer wherever he goes, without having to belong to a community of performers (as opposed to the sympotic poems quoted above). This formula adaptable in place is also adaptable in time: the ‘what is left’ has a different meaning every time the song is sung, and the very meaning of the song is reactivated by each utterance of this line (the healthier I am, the more I will be able to sing this song to health).

Moreover, while sympotic elegies introduce abstract categories (with the infinitives), Ariphron uses a personification. The poem opens by an address that reminds one of the opening of Homeric Hymns: Health is presented in the same terms as the oldest divinities (Gaia for example in the Hymn to Gaia, also called *πρεσβίστα*).⁵⁶⁴ In the same way in the priamel, the paeon refers to some of the elements mentioned in the skolion: after health, wealth (*πλουτοῦ* in Ariphron 3, *πλουτεῖν* in the skolion, 3) and some enjoyment that come from the gods. As opposed to the abstract

who qualifies health as *σεμνή*: Σιμωνίδης μὲν γὰρ ὁ μελοποιός φησι μηδὲ καλᾶς σοφίας εἶναι χάριν εἰ μὴ τις ἔχοι *σεμνὴν ὑγίαν*. Simonides the lyric poet says that there is not even the pleasure of beautiful wisdom if one doesn’t have venerable Health.

⁵⁶³ Except as mythical daughter of Asclepius, on which see next chapter.

⁵⁶⁴ Homeric Hymn to Gaia: Γαίαν παμμήτειραν ἀείσομαι, ἠυθέμεθλον, / πρεσβίστεν... (1-2). Scholars have debated whether the adjective meant oldest or most revered – what is important here is the fact that the new divinity is invoked with the adjective for one of the most fundamental deities, Gaia.

categories used in the skolion, Ariphron uses specific images. Additionally, the paean leaves aside some important didactic elements of the skolion: wealth in Ariphron is mentioned first, and there is no reference to the way it is acquired. Indeed, moral straightness (ἀδόλως) characteristic of the aristocrat is replaced by aspiration to power in ἰσοδαίμονος ἀνθρώποις βασιλίδος ἀρχᾶς.⁵⁶⁵ Moreover, the priamel of the paean adds some more private joys: the children (τέκνων, 3) that the skolion does not refer to, some fun (τέρψις ἢ πόνων ἀμυνοῶ) and sex (πόθων οὖς κρυφίοις Ἐφροδίτας ἔρκεσιν θηρεύομεν, 4-5).

Furthermore, the poem positions itself differently as regards the *chareis*: Ariphron's text does not offer a scale of good things. All the *chareis* are introduced in a conditional system (εἰ γὰρ τις ἢ πλουτου ... ἢ εἴ τις ἄλλα θεόθεν ἀνθρώποισι τέρψις, 3, 6). It is only in the last section, 8-9, that the main clause appears, and that the poem makes sense. The logic is the reverse to what one might expect: it is not a proposition such as “if there is health, then these things are possible” but if these good things exist, then with you they flourish and shine – thus demonstrating the power of health. The purpose of the poem is to insure the fulfillment of the prayer, not to state a moral point that contributes to reinforcing an ideological and social tie between members of an audience.

Finally, the last three lines (8-10), respond to the A section with a direct address: the poet states one last time in gnomic form his desire to live in the company of health (σέθεν δὲ χωρὶς οὐτις εὐδαίμων ἔφυ), and refers to the company of the Charites (Χαρίτων ὁάροις). Here all the themes of the song are tied together: health is

⁵⁶⁵ The adjective ἰσοδαίμων is only found here, in Pindar and Aeschylus, in contexts that refer to kings: Pindar, *Nemean* 4.84: βασιλεῦσιν ἰσοδαίμονα... φῶτα; Aeschylus, *Persians* 634: ἰσοδαίμων βασιλεύς.

what brings the good things (*charites*) in life, and the song (the product of the *Charites*) is both an enjoyable thing (among the good things of life, that Aripbron mentions, power, money and sex), and a hymn, an offering (*charis*) to the divinity sung.⁵⁶⁶ Rather than contributing to reinforcing the moral and social ties between fellow-drinkers as in archaic sympotic elegy praising health, Aripbron emphasizes the appropriateness of singing the song for an individual, at any point of his life. Indeed, Aripbron interweaves the *topoi* of sympotic communal praise of health, that allows connecting the symposiasts around a set of values, with the private model of the prayer.⁵⁶⁷

Conclusion to section 3

Thus, as opposed to sympotic skolia, or elegies, celebrating health and soundness as an aristocratic value, there is a disjunction between context of performance and form (the priamel and use of the Muses authorizing the poetry): the song uses the *topoi* of elegy and skolion, but does not use it so as to reinforce the ties within the community that sings the song. The performance context is more a pretext

⁵⁶⁶ Aripbron also refers to an old model of inspiration, the Muses, and thus authorizes the theme and its treatment by reference to an archaic authority.

⁵⁶⁷ Aripbron's poem to a personified Health shares many features with the above-mentioned fragment of another fourth-century composition from Licymnius (*PMG* 769). The fragment is also an address to Health, mainly constituted of adjectives. It is presented as a prelude (προειπών) by Sextus Empiricus, who quotes it between Simonides' and Aripbron's passages:

λιπαρόματε μάτερ ὑψίστα θρόνων
σεμνῶν Ἀπόλλωνος βασιλεία ποθεινὰ
πράγελως Ὑγίεια

Gleaming-eyed mother, highest queen of the venerable throne of Apollo, desirable, gentle-laugh
Health

The address combines the description of Health as a divine being related to Apollo (on the model of an Olympian), and as a personification of an abstraction. Two kinds of adjectives are used to describe her. On the one hand, epithets describing her 'top goddess' status and power (ὑψίστα, σεμνῶν, βασιλεία); on the other hand, epithets anthropomorphizing her and representing precisely what she gives to mortals (the gleaming eyes, the gentle laugh and the desirability, all attributes of the healthy person). Like Aphrodite in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, she is what she gives: because she brings desire in people, she is desirable, because she makes eyes shiny, she has shiny eyes, because she allows people to laugh, she has a gentle laugh.

than really used; and the “you” and “I” used do not a connection with a social reality, but with a religious one. This is another way in which, as in the previous instance of Philoxenus’ *Dinner*, the symposium is used not as a real context of performance, as in archaic society where the song had a sociopolitical function, but as a foil; the old sympotic model is recuperated for a new literary function.

4- Aristotle’s Hymn to Hermias

The poem composed by Aristotle to honour his friend and relative Hermias (*PMG* 842) offers a last example that allows us to study the way in which the sympotic model is used as a device to “frame” the song, and think about the new context of performance for a poem.⁵⁶⁸

As opposed to what is the case for most poems, we know some details about the circumstances of the composition of Aristotle’s poem;⁵⁶⁹ its genre however (a hymn? a paean? a skolion? an encomion?) has been a problem since Antiquity.⁵⁷⁰ According to Athenaeus, who quotes it, it was composed to celebrate the memory of the philosopher’s deceased friend and father-in-law Hermias, the ‘philosopher king’ who had been tyrant of Atarnaeus (*ca.* 355-341BC), before he was treacherously murdered by the Persian King.⁵⁷¹ The form chosen by Aristotle however was too reminiscent of a

⁵⁶⁸ On which: C. Bowra 1938, W. Jaeger 1948, R. Renehan 1982, A. Santoni 1993, W. Furley and J. Bremer (vol. 1) 262-266; (vol. 2); A. Ford forthcoming.

⁵⁶⁹ On this point, see especially D. Wormell 1935.

⁵⁷⁰ Athenaeus 15. 696a-697b = *PMG* 842. Also quoted in Diogenes Laertius (V. 7) and found in the papyrus of Didymus commentary to Demosthenes (10. 32 ff.).

⁵⁷¹ For an ancient account of Hermias’ death in Didymus: Callisthenes’ encomion to Hermias and Theocritus’ epigram against Aristotle, with D. Runia 1986. For various descriptions of the political setting in which Aristotle’s poem was composed, see C. Bowra 1938, W. Jaeger 1948, I. Düring 1957, R. Renehan 1982, W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001, (vol.1), 263-4.

religious hymn and the philosopher was accused of impiety on account of his poetic composition:

- τούτων λεχθέντων ὁ Δημόκριτος ἔφη· ἄλλα μὴν καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ πολυμαθεστάτου γραφὲν Ἀριστοτέλους εἰς Ἑρμείαν τὸν Ἀταρνέα οὐ παιᾶν ἐστίν, ὡς ὁ τὴν τῆς ἀσεβείας κατὰ τοῦ φιλοσόφου γραφὴν ἀπενεγκαχάμενος Δημόφιλος ἐξέδωκε παρασκευασθεῖς ὑπ' Εὐρυμέδοντος, ὡς ἀσεβοῦντος καὶ ἄδουντος ἐν τοῖς συσσιτίοις ὁσημέραι εἰς Ἑρμείαν παιᾶνα. ὅτι δὲ παιᾶνος οὐδεμίαν ἔμφασιν παρέχει τὸ ἄσμα ἀλλὰ τῶν σκολίων ἐν τι καὶ αὐτὸ εἶδος ἐστίν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς λέξεως φανερόν ὑμῖν ποιήσω
- A) Ἄρετὰ πολύμοχθε γένει βροτείωι,
θῆραμα κάλλιστον βίωι,
σᾶς πέρι, παρθένε, μορφᾶς
καὶ θανεῖν ζηλωτὸς ἐν Ἑλλάδι πότμος
καὶ πόνους τλῆναι μαλεροῦς ἀκάμαντας· 5
τοῖον ἐπὶ φρένα βάλλεις
καρπὸν ἰσαθάνατον χρυσοῦ τε κρείσσω
καὶ γονέων μαλακαυγήτοιό θ' ὕπνου.
- (B) σεῦ δ' ἔνεκεν <καὶ> ὁ δῖος
Ἑρακλῆς Λήδας τε κοῦροι 10
πόλλ' ἀνέτλασαν ἐν ἔργοις
σὰν †[.]έποντες δύναμιν†·
σοῖς τε πόθοις Ἀχιλεὺς Αἴ-
ας τ' Αἶδαο δόμους ἦλθον·
σᾶς δ' ἔνεκεν φιλίου μορφᾶς Ἀταρνέος 15
ἔντροφος ἀελίου χήρωσεν ἀυγάς.
- (A) τοιγὰρ ἀοίδιμος ἔργοις,
ἀθάνατόν τέ μιν ἀυξήσουσι Μοῦσαι,
Μναμοσύνας θύγατρεις, Δι-
ὸς ξενίου σέβας αὔξου- 20
σαι φιλίας τε γέρας βεβαίου.

When these [skolia] had been recited, Democritus said: “what’s more, the poem written by the erudite Aristotle in honour of Hermias of Atarnea is not a paean, as opposed to what Demophilus says, - the man who, prepared by Eurymedon, had carried the accusation of impiety against the philosopher, on the grounds that Aristotle was showing impiety by singing his paean to Hermias every day in the syssities. But that the song does not show any mark of a paean, but is a unique form of skolion, I will make clear to you by the diction of the poem.

Virtue, who bring many toils to the mortal race, most beautiful thing to be hunted in one’s life, it is for the sake of your beauty, maiden, that even death, and the bearing of cruel and indefatigable pains, is an enviable lot in Greece: so great is the fruit that you put in people’s heart to make it equal to an immortal’s, and better than gold, and parents, and sweet-eyed sleep. For your sake, even the divine Heracles and the sons

of Leda suffered many things in their deeds, [acknowledging]⁵⁷² your power; because of their desire for you, Achilles and Ajax went to the dwellings of Hades. For your dear beauty, the nursling of Atarnaeus bereaved his eyes from the light of the sun. So he is celebrated in song for his deeds, and the Muses will foster him as an immortal, the daughters of Mnemosyne while fostering the majesty of Zeus of Hospitality, and the part of honour of our strong friendship.”

The generic criterion that Aristotle’s accuser Demophilus uses to condemn the philosopher is the inappropriateness, even the impiousness, of singing a paean to a man (as opposed to a god);⁵⁷³ what Democritus points out in defense of Aristotle is the fact that the paean does not have paeanic markers, but constitutes a unique example of *skolion*. R. Renehan’s verdict on Demophilus’ accusation is as clear a statement as it gets: “whatever the specific genre, the charge is an obvious sham.”⁵⁷⁴ This however does not allow solving the main question: “the problem of the poetic genre to which the composition belongs remains a real difficulty.”

Rather than trying to provide yet again another solution to determine what genre the poem “belongs to”, I propose to present how the text precisely explores the limits of the different genres and contexts of performance, including the performance of a sympotic song, to promote its own purpose (celebrating the memory of a friend). My goal is thus to show how the symposium is used partly as an imagined context of performance and reception (through the use of some sympotic *topoi*)⁵⁷⁵ as a way of

⁵⁷² I am not translating any of the proposed reconstructions for this participle, σὸν ἴ[.]έποντες, or ἀναγορεύοντες or ἀγρεύοντες, but ‘filling in’ the meaning. Christian Wildberg suggested to me βλέπόντες = beholding the power of virtue, which makes a lot of sense in the context.

⁵⁷³ Paeans sung to dead men were attested already in the late fifth century: paean to Lysander: Plutarch *Life of Lysander* 18. 5 (quoting Duris, *FGRH* 76 F 71) = *PMG* 867.

⁵⁷⁴ R. Renehan 1982, 254.

⁵⁷⁵ The symposium becomes a function of the text. Both Philoxenus’ and Aristotle’s poems defy any strict generic categorization in terms of form, style or theme: different generic moments are embedded in the poem and the use of a narrative framework suggesting a specific context of performance (an elite symposium) only stages the question of the poem’s own performance. Thus the generic uncertainty that we attribute to our lack of access to the texts is a function of the text itself.

constructing its own audience, and reception. This approach is in a way close to Renehan's. After summing up the various critical positions taken in the past by scholars from Grote to Düring, the critic notes:⁵⁷⁶

here surely, in this very diversity of opinion, lies the solution. Scholars, in ancient times and modern, have failed to agree on the genre of the poem precisely because it cannot be put into any single category without Procrustean measures. It is untypical, even as is its immediate occasion.

Let us turn to the poem again. It is an astrophic composition in dactylo-epitrites with a circular structure: the A section is the *invocatio* to Virtue, and a glorification of her power. The B part describes the power that Virtue bestows on those who possess her, and proceeds to naming mythological exempla. The last part is a glorification of the addressee of the poem, Hermias, and of the poet himself and his power of immortalization.

What I would like to underline is how Aristotle uses the fictional framework of a sympotic aristocratic gathering to achieve his purpose. The dynamic of the song resides in the idea of performance among a small group of same-minded participants, but the performance of the song itself does not have any social function. This idea of genre, as not connected to performance, but with the idea of performance “framing” the reception of the poem, shows Aristotle in the role of one of a number of fourth-century poets we have seen who anticipate the aesthetic of the first Hellenistic poets.

On the one hand, the poem uses some keywords of the archaic aristocratic symposium. The mention of the piety of Zeus of hospitality in the last lines (Διὸς ξενίου σέβας, 19-20), and of the part of honour of secure friendship (φιλίας γέρας βεβαίον) signs off the text with typical archaic aristocratic values. The mention of

⁵⁷⁶ R. Renehan 1982, 256.

these elements aims at reinforcing the social and ethical link between the guests. They are also found in the priamel (5-8), which presents the same values as described by the skolion quoted above: Aristotle uses the foils of gold, parents and sleep to underline the value of Arete. Bowra has already showed the structural, metric, and lexical parallels between Aristotle and Ariphron, but the differences (underlined by Renehan) between the two compositions are more telling than the parallels, as they underline how Aristotle refers to more archaic sets of value. They are all meant to reinforce the social, ethical and political cohesion between guests: whereas Ariphron presents wealth, Aristotle uses gold, the most symbolic kind of riches, the metal associated with kings, gods, and aristocrats. In the same way, while Ariphron describes the pleasure brought by children, Aristotle mentions *τεκέων* (parents).⁵⁷⁷ Finally, while Ariphron suggests the hidden pleasures of Aphrodite in the longest colon of the text, Aristotle soberly refers to “soft-eyed sleep” – not so much the joys of Aphrodite as well-deserved rest.⁵⁷⁸

But rather than subscribing to an aristocratic ideology and trying to revive a certain genre, Aristotle, I suggest, uses the form to create the illusion of a performance context. This is also suggested by the use of deictics and the anaphoric forms *σᾶς πέρι*, 3, *σεῦ δ' ἔνεκεν*, 9, *σοῖς τε πόθοις*, 13, *σᾶς δ' ἔνεκεν*, 15. The poem presents itself as meant for a private setting, and the “nursling of Atarnae” is a riddling way of naming Hermias, meant to be understood only by the happy few.

⁵⁷⁷ On this passage, see R. Renehan 1982, 261-2. Two interpretations are possible, the narrow one of parents, and the larger one of “noble ancestry,” of which “Wilamowitz, Smyth, Jaeger, Wormell, Diehl-Beutler all approve.” Renehan argues for parents, on the force of the parallel with *Odyssey* 9.34-35 (*ὥς οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἤς πατρίδος οὐδὲ τοκίων γίγνεται*) and Pindar *Isthmian* 1.5 (*τί φίλτερον κεδνῶν τοκέων ἀγαθοῖς;*)

⁵⁷⁸ See R. Renehan 1982, 262-3. The interpretation of sleep as rest does not contradict the initial statement about the erotic overtones of the poem: while eros is not present in the mention of sleep, it is the underlying thematic motif used in the myth. For it is literally for the sake of a couple of shapely maidens (Helen and Briseis) that so many Homeric heroes died.

The poem mixes several forms used in performances at a symposium: it mixes both what is typical of sympotic elegies, and a type of discourse that is reminiscent of epinician poetry. The problematic θήραμα κάλλιστον βίῳ (most beautiful object of hunt in one's life) for example can be understood in parallel with motifs of erotic hunt (this is what the parallel with Ariphron suggests, where he uses Ἄφροδίτας θηρεύοντες), itself an aristocratic image.⁵⁷⁹ Moreover, the whole poem can be read as a sort of riddle, developing the idea contained in the initial address and anthropomorphization of Virtue. The quest and desire for a maiden for the sake of whom heroes died is an allegory not only for virtue, but for what the myth-section develops: Virtue is a sort of Helen, a beautiful maiden who sows desires in men's heart, and lead them to their death.⁵⁸⁰

With its address first to an abstraction, the poem is also reminiscent of the invocations to abstractions by which some of the Pindaric epinicia start: this is the case of *Nemean* 7 (appeal to Eleithuia), *Olympian* 14 (appeal to the Charites), but especially of appeals to Tyche (in *Olympian* 12), Hesychia (in *Pythian* 8), and Theia (in *Isthmian* 5).⁵⁸¹ After the invocation, the poem develops a myth (with the mention of Heracles, the Dioscuri, Achilles and Ajax), in a very elusive way. The vocabulary, which Renehan qualifies as “dithyrambic,” indeed contains some Pindaric and Bacchylidean expressions, but they are all also found in epinicia: some are transformation of tragic diction use in a new way (like πολύμοχθε, taken in its active sense, that causes pain,

⁵⁷⁹ The motive of the object of love being hunted appears in Ibycus. It also perhaps appears in ἀγρεύοντες, depending on the reading, and is typical of amatory poetry performed at symposia (as shows the use of the motive of Eros-hunter in Plato's *Symposium*); it is also an answer to the “ti kalliston” game, played at symposia.

⁵⁸⁰ This is not the first time that Virtue is anthropomorphized; already in a passage of the *Works and Days*. Renehan however notes how irrelevant it is to refer to the passage of Prodicus referring to virtue.

⁵⁸¹ W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol.1), 265.

while it usually has a passive meaning, that endures pain),⁵⁸² some are epic (like ἐπὶ φρένα βάλλεις; in Homer’s texts, the formula σὺ δ’ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσι means “throw in your heart”, that is, “listen to me, I’m telling you.”),⁵⁸³ again tweaked in a new way. The expression ‘nursling of Atarnaeus’ in particular (in parallel with ‘Ajax, nursling of Salamis’) functions as a name-cap in an epinician.⁵⁸⁴ Finally, the celebration of the poet’s skills in the last lines strengthens the ties with epinician poetry: what the poet does, thanks to the support of the Muses (Μοῦσαι, Μναμοσύνας θύγατρεις) is to make Hermias famous in song (ἀοιδίμος) by the celebration of his deeds (ἔργοις). In a way, Aristotle’s song is the last epinician of the classical age, and it presents itself as such by playing with the motifs of the symposium.

Conclusion – and coda – to section 4

Aristotle’s song thus straddles different poetic forms – hymn, sympotic paean, skolion, epinician – that all have in common to be performed in private settings. With this mixture of features, Aristotle explores the limits of genre boundaries. It is only the aristocratic gathering at which these song types were performed that brings unity to the poem, and that offers the background on which to understand the intent of Aristotle’s piece: Athenaeus tells us that the song was sung everyday at the common meal, and it is, I propose, the memory of the archaic or early-Classical aristocratic symposium,

⁵⁸² πολύμοχθος. The adjective is typical of tragic diction and usually has a passive meaning (= who suffers many pains of Euripides in particular: *Hecuba* 95, *Electra* 1330, *Hercules* 1197, *Phoenissae* 784, 800, *Iphigenia in Aulis* 1330 (twice), fr. 916, fr. 645. Only once in Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus*, 165.

⁵⁸³ ἄλλο δέ τοι ἔρέω, σὺ δ’ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσι is a formula used 17 times (20 if we include variants and uncertain lines) in hexametric poetry (including the Hymns).

⁵⁸⁴ Aristotle both insists on the Greekness of his friend (often accused of being a slave of foreign origin) and on his being a hero. (On which, see R. Renehan 1982, 266).

where the performance of poetry had a social function, that explains the purpose and form of Aristotle’s strange poem.

There is one more parallel with another poetic genre, which has, to the best of my knowledge, never been underlined by commentators and which sheds light on the form of the poem and some of the issues associated with it: that genre is that of funerary epigrams.⁵⁸⁵ First, as a quick survey of Hansen’s *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca* reveals, the fourth century, ἀρετή is the one word that comes back most often in funerary inscriptions.⁵⁸⁶ As C. Tsagalis has most recently shown in a thorough monograph,⁵⁸⁷

Both ἀρετή and σωφροσύνη belong to a system or canon of virtues, which had been considered of cardinal importance since the archaic period. In late archaic and during a significant part of the classical period, ἀρετή and σωφροσύνη were basically deemed civic virtues pertaining to an aristocratic *Weltanschauung*. (...) Sheltered under the umbrella of μεσότης, μετριότης and κοσμιότης, the old-time virtues of ἀρετή and σωφροσύνη began to be reinterpreted in fourth-century Athens, in an attempt to obliterate dangerous excessiveness leading to pride and arrogance.

Understanding the way these values are used in fourth-century Attic grave epigrams is of paramount importance for interpreting both their typology and function.

The main evolution in the meaning of ἀρετή and σωφροσύνη, as Tsagalis reads it from the evidence provided by Attic grave epigrams, is a

⁵⁸⁵ Despite the similarities that I point out, the main difference is the meter, the (stichic) elegiac distich, and the lyric meter of Aristotle’s poem. On epigrams and the difference in meters, see M. Fantuzzi in M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter 2004, 18-21. As G. Robertson 1997 remarks, in funerary epigrams, there is no statement that the dead man gave his life for the city. They celebrate individual prowess and the survival of memory.

⁵⁸⁶ The noun appears over 50 times in *CEG* (2), 32 times in the Attic epigrams. For a list of all the instances, see C. Tsagalis 2007, 135. Also, 135: “[The use of ἀρετή and σωφροσύνη] within a funerary context is already known from the fifth century, where the relevant number are 6 and 2 respectively. This significant difference regarding the frequency by which these two principal virtues are attested in grave epigrams of the 5th and 4th centuries in Attica clearly reveals their increasing importance for fourth-century Athenian society.”

⁵⁸⁷ C. Tsagalis 2007, 135-136, 137.

re-channeling of interest from the field of civic activity to that of family-oriented interest. In this light, old-time aristocratic virtues, such as ἀρετή and σωφροσύνη, were transformed into an incipient ‘privatized-world’, for which fourth-century Athens provided the necessary seedbed.

This might already shed some light on the “horizon of expectation” created by the funerary epigrams that were part of the mental landscape of fourth-century Athenians and on the context in which Aristotle’s ἀρετή could be received.

In addition to using a theme predominant in funerary epigrams, Aristotle uses not only some diction frequent in epigrams, but also the same kind of imagery. This is the case with ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν, which Aristotle uses in anaphoric form (9 and 15), and which appears, for instance, in *CEG* 645 (a marble stele, perhaps from the end of the fourth century, now in Thessaly):

σῆς ἀρετῆς μνημεῖα, Τελευτία, ἐνθάδε φρουροὶ
στήσαν ἀποφθιμένοι μνήμα τόδ’ ἀθάνατον·
εἰ δ’ ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν θνητῶν ὠικτειρέ τιν’ Ἄιδης,
οὐ τᾶν ἐξέλιπεν φέγγος ὄδ’ ἠελίου.

It is as a memorial of your virtue, Teleutia, that guardians have set here, for the deceased, this immortal memory: if Ades took pity on any of the mortals on account of their virtue, the light of the sun would have not have left you.

In addition to the motif of ἀρετή, mentioned twice in four lines, and the reference to the issue of memory (twice also, μνήμα and μνημεῖα, a term to which Tsagalis devotes several pages),⁵⁸⁸ Aristotle uses the very two forms of poetic imagery recurrently employed in funerary epigrams (and of which one is illustrated in the poem quoted above): the light of life and the chambers of Persephone.⁵⁸⁹ The first image appears in 15-16: σᾶς δ’ ἔνεκεν φίλιου μορφᾶς Ἀταρνέος/ ἔντροφος ἀελίου χήρωσεν αὐγάς and

⁵⁸⁸ C. Tsagalis 2007, 150-158; Tsagalis underlines the difference between the two terms, 151: “the use only of μνημεῖον and not μνήμα for ἀρετή and σωφροσύνη is a covert indication of the new function of these virtues. The μνήμα in the archaic and early (fifth-century) classical period expressed the passage from the σῆμα (mound) to the memorial safe-guarding the survival of the deceased’s memory.”

⁵⁸⁹ On the poetic imagery of the fourth-century epigrams, see C. Tsagalis 2007, 63-134.

constitutes a variation on the *λίπον ἡλίου ἀυγᾶς* (itself, according to Tsagalis, an expression not attested before the 4th century BCE, but used in *CEG* 590). To the metaphoric expression of “leaving the rays of the sun,” Aristotle adds an emotional dimension, inkeeping with the depiction of virtue as a maiden with whom mortals fall in love: on account of virtue, Hermias “widows” the rays of the sun of his presence. Moreover, the expression suggests that it is the rays of the sun themselves that go through the feeling of loss, rather than Hermias.

The second poetic image recurring in fourth-century funerary inscriptions is that of the Chamber of Persephone (*Φερσεφώνης θάλαμος*), which according to Tsagalis, “is not used before the 4th century and seems to have replaced expressions such as *δῶμα* or *δῶματα Ἀΐδαο/Ἀΐδου*.”⁵⁹⁰ The use of the possibly “older” formulation might lessen the parallel I am aiming to establish between the conventions of funerary epigrams and Aristotle’s poem. But a remark of Tsagalis commenting on *CEG* 489 might justify why Aristotle shuns from using this expression. Reading into the tradition of the expression “chambers of Persephone,” Tsagalis notes:

For females, the use of the expression *Περσεφώνης θάλαμος* would have been of special value, for it would have helped the reader of the inscription visualize, on the one hand, the (bridal) chamber a married woman possessed when she was alive, and on the other hand, the new, dark and gloomy, abode she dwells in after her death.

This gives an idea of why Aristotle would not use the expression: the eroticism of the bridal chamber of a female deity clashes against the network of (eroticized) images of Virtue that Aristotle has constructed from the start of the poem. The only maiden is *Aretê* and desire crystallizes around her figure.

⁵⁹⁰ C. Tsagalis 2007, 91.

The last aspect on which Tsagalis focuses in his study of epigrams is the poetique technique of the artists. Under this large category, he examines how, between the two extremes of the non-literary epigrams and the sophisticated Hellenistic book-epigram, “there is a transitional period during which epigrams begin to show features of subliterariness, of increasing concern with matters that we traditionally connect with the existence of a personal epigrammatist.” This last aspect of the problem is also connected to the issue of the context in which the inscription will be received, and of the relationship between written form and oral reconstruction (by means of deictics, address to the passer-by, etc.), and will be better examining in the following chapter, devoted to the lyric inscriptions of the fourth century.

Chapter 6 – Cult songs: a canon set in stone?

This last chapter is a more shadowy counterpart to chapter 4. While chapter 4 focused on a “minor” (according to Slater) part of festivals, the (mostly Attic) theatrical lyric, the following pages concentrate on the other lyric performances at festivals: the hymns, prosodia, paeans, partheneia, (and perhaps dithyrambos) performed at public festivals, all over the Greek world, and not only on the stage. In terms of the number of lines preserved, it is this kind of hymnic poetry, and most specifically the paean, that is the most well-represented in the late-Classical period: about 300 lines (or 10 texts) have survived. But as opposed to the material analyzed in chapter 4, which was mainly transmitted by literary means, these songs have come down to us either on inscriptions only (7), or on inscription and literary quotations (3).⁵⁹¹

Most surveys of these songs, discovered and edited at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, have focused on questions of genre (more specifically, because of the nature of the evidence, on the evolution of the paean genre).⁵⁹² Most often, because of this focus on genre theory, the reading of the texts is informed by assumptions about literary and cultural history: with the exception of Ian Rutherford, scholars usually read the paeans of the fourth century assuming that these texts were isolated lyric specimens in times when communal performance of song-and-dance had disappeared, and when poetic talent had gone somewhere else, to the most

⁵⁹¹ In this count I have only included songs for which a fourth-century date is attested, not including the hymns for which a fourth-century date is possible.

⁵⁹² The first one was A. Fairbanks 1900. A long time elapsed before other surveys, but the past 15 years have seen a burst of interest in the paean genre: three book-length surveys have appeared, by Lutz Käppel in 1992, Stephan Schröder in 1999, and most importantly Ian Rutherford in 2001. In addition to these books, (and the two volumes of *Greek Hymns* by Furley and Bremer), two recent articles focus on the issue of genre and its understanding, by M. Depew in 2000 in her edited volume *Matrices of Genre*, and A. Ford, the “genre of genre” in 2006.

popular and spectacular genres of dithyramb and nome performed on the theatre stage.⁵⁹³ This reading is, again, principally inherited from a passage of Plato's *Laws*, which states the decline of *mousikê* and generic contamination, over time, between genres which existed in pure form before:⁵⁹⁴

[700b] καὶ τι ἦν εἶδος ᾠδῆς εὐχαὶ πρὸς θεοῦς, ὄνομα δὲ ὕμνοι ἐπεκαλοῦντο: καὶ τούτῳ δὴ τὸ ἐναντίον ἦν ᾠδῆς ἕτερον εἶδος--θρήνουσ δὲ τις ἂν αὐτοὺς μάλιστα ἐκάλεσεν--καὶ παίωνες ἕτερον, καὶ ἄλλο, Διονύσου γένεσις οἶμαι, διθύραμβος λεγόμενος. νόμους τε αὐτὸ τοῦτο τοῦνομα ἐκάλουν, ᾠδὴν ὡς τινα ἕτεραν: ἐπέλεγον δὲ κιθαρωδικούς. τούτων δὴ διατεταγμένων καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν, οὐκ ἐξῆν ἄλλο [700c] εἰς ἄλλο καταχρησθῆναι μέλους εἶδος. (...) [700d] καὶ μὴ τολμᾶν κρίνειν διὰ θορύβου: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου, ἄρχοντες μὲν τῆς ἀμούσου παρανομίας ποιηταὶ ἐγίνοντο φύσει μὲν ποιητικοί, ἀγνώμονες δὲ περὶ τὸ δίκαιον τῆς Μούσης καὶ τὸ νόμιμον, βακχεύοντες καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦ δέοντος κατεχόμενοι ὑφ' ἡδονῆς, κεραννύντες δὲ θρήνουσ τε ὕμνοις καὶ παίωνας διθυράμβοις, καὶ αὐλωδίας δὴ ταῖς κιθαρωδαῖς μιμούμενοι, καὶ πάντα εἰς πάντα συνάγοντες, [700e] μουσικῆς ἄκοντες ὑπ' ἀνοίας καταψευδόμενοι ὡς ὀρθότητα μὲν οὐκ ἔχει οὐδ' ἠντιοῦν μουσική, ἡδονὴ δὲ τῇ τοῦ χαίροντος, εἴτε βελτίων εἴτε χείρων ἂν εἴη τις, κρίνοιτο ὀρθότατα.

[700b] one class of song was that of prayers to the gods, which bore the name of “hymns”; contrasted with this was another class, best called “dirges”; “paeans” formed another; and yet another was the “dithyramb,” named, I fancy, after Dionysus. “Nomes” also were so called as being a distinct class of song; and these were further described as “citharoedic nomes.” So these and other kinds being classified and fixed, it was forbidden to set one kind of words to a different class of tune. [...] [700d] In the matter of music the populace willingly submitted to orderly control and abstained from outrageously judging by clamor; but later on, with the progress of time, there arose as leaders of unmusical illegality poets who, though by nature poetical, were ignorant of what was just and lawful in music; and they, being frenzied and unduly possessed by a spirit of pleasure, mixed dirges with hymns and paeans with dithyrambs, and imitated flute-tunes with harp-tunes, and blended every kind of music with every other; [700e] and thus, through their folly, they unwittingly bore false witness against music, as a thing without any standard of correctness, of which the best criterion is the pleasure of the auditor, be he a good man or a bad. [trad. R.G. Bury]

Building on what I have presented in the previous chapters, I would like to start from the texts and examine how they use the traditional rhetoric of the genre to negotiate

⁵⁹³ Genre-theory, ultimately, is too often a tool to explain the poetic inferiority of the fourth-century texts by contrast with the archaic and early-classical model.

⁵⁹⁴ Plato, *Laws* 700 a-d.

changes in the social and religious context of the fourth century, and how they give us access to aspects of late-classical poetic culture. In an attempt at situating these poems in the lyric panorama, I will propose that, rather than seeing them as the poor ugly and artless cousins of the “book-paeans” of Pindar or Callimachus’ *Hymns*, or as un-innovative specimens reproducing the same basic pattern over time in an age where paeon singing was devoid of any social meaning,⁵⁹⁵ we should consider them as resourceful creations, informing us about the “lyric consciousness” of some lesser known poets:⁵⁹⁶ they show us how cultural and literary evolution are intertwined, and how something like a “New Paeon” can exist as a parallel to the “New Dithyramb.”⁵⁹⁷

Before examining specific cases of surviving poems, three remarks are necessary. The first one concerns the status of our sources. I qualified this chapter by “shadowy” by reference to chapter 4 devoted to theatre performances, on which most of the spotlight is directed. But it is simply not true that, in the fourth century, the composition of cult poetry (hymns, paeans, prosodia...) was only the province of minor authors, while the most famous and successful artists composed for the more popular

⁵⁹⁵ This is the view held by J. Haldane 1977, quoted by W. Furley and J. Bremer (from the manuscript entrusted to the two authors by Prof. Colin Austin, 2000, from the late Joan Haldane’s papers). “We find that the ὕμνος, despite all the vicissitudes of literary fashion and religious thought which it undergoes in the course of its long history, maintains a remarkable consistency from age to age. The same basic pattern, the same formulas, even long after their original meaning has been forgotten, and the same time-honoured myths are repeated down the centuries as long as the Olympian religion survives.”

⁵⁹⁶ A close analysis of the texts allows revising a statement like Käppel’s: “Es ist jene Art von Texten, die im Gegensatz zu Werken der hohen Literatur, wie wir sie in den beiden vorangegangenen Interpretationen vorgestellt haben, als kunstlose Gebrauchstexte für jedermanns einfache Bedürfnisse in bestimmten Situationen des profanen oder religiösen Lebes Verwendung fanden” (L. Käppel 1992, 189).

⁵⁹⁷ The idea of a ‘New Paeon,’ absent for example from E. Csapo’s and M. Miller’s figure listing the “innovation in and transformation of genres and styles,” (in E. Csapo and M. Miller 1998) has not been explored, except for I. Rutherford’s analysis of Ion’s paeon in Euripide’s *Ion* (I. Rutherford 1995). It is however what a forthcoming paper of M. Fantuzzi (devoted to ‘New’ paeans for ‘New’ gods) explores. I thank him very warmly for sharing his paper with me before publication.

(and commercial) genres of dithyramb and nomes. For the most famous “New Musicians” are recorded as having composed hymnic poetry, commissioned by a city or a community. These poems have unfortunately not survived, but some testimonies give us a good idea of the variety of activities of the most famous poets. This is the case of Timotheus for example, recorded by the Hellenistic poet Alexander of Aetolia in an elegy entitled *the Muses*.⁵⁹⁸ Our source for the passage, Macrobius, reports how the *poeta egregius* Alexander described the enthusiasm with which the Ephesians ensured that the most talented poets of the day (*qui tunc erant poetae ingeniosissimi*) composed various songs in honour of the goddess Diana (*in deam carmina diversa compenerent*), on the occasion of the dedication of the temple. Alexander celebrated in particular Timotheus’ poetic skill:

ἀλλ' ὄγε πευθόμενος πάγχυ Γραικοῖσι μέλεσθαι
Τιμόθεον κιθάρης ἴδιμονα καὶ μελέων
υἱὸν Θερσάνδρου κλυτὸν ἤνεσεν ἀνέρα σίγλων
χρυσείων ἱερὴν δὴ τότε χιλιάδα
ὕμνησαι ταχέων τ' Ὀπιν βλήτειραν οἴστῶν
ἢ τ' ἐπὶ Κεγχρείῳ τίμιον οἶκον ἔχει, 5

et mox

μηδὲ θεῆς προλίπη Λητωίδος ἄκλεα ἔργα.

but [the people of Ephesus] hearing that among the Greeks Timotheus, son of Thersander, was regarded for his skill on the cithara and in songs, asked the famous man to sing in return for golden shekels, the sacred millennium and Opis [Diana] of the swift arrows who gloriously inhabits Kenchreios

and a few lines later:

and not leave the deeds of Leto’s divine daughter be unglorious.

⁵⁹⁸ Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 5.22.4 s = PMG 778. (Also CA, 124-125).

It has been suggested that the poem in question was Timotheus' *Artemis*, in particular on the basis of a line quoted by Cinesias referring to that song, and which suggests the oriental connotations of the Artemis described, appropriate for the Ephesian goddess.⁵⁹⁹

In the same way, a note of Pausanias that accompanies his description of the statue of Pronomus in Thebes tells us how the famous New Musician also composed religious songs:⁶⁰⁰

ἀνδριάς τέ ἐστι Προνόμου ἀνδρὸς αὐλήσαντος ἐπαγωγότατα ἐς τοὺς πολλούς. (...) καὶ οἱ καὶ ᾄσμα πεποιημένον ἐστι [[ἐς]] προσόδιον ἐν Δήλον τοῖς ἐπ' Εὐρίπῳ Χαλκιδεῦσι.

There is also the statue of the Pronomus whose pipe-playing was mesmerizing for the crowd. (...) and he even composed a song, a processional hymn (prosodion) to Delos for the Chalcidians on the Euripus.

Nothing else is known of this prosodion, but the fact that the procession's destination was Delos suggests that Pronomus' song, commissioned by the Chalcidians (τοῖς ἐπ' Εὐρίπῳ Χαλκιδεῦσι), worshipped Apollo or Artemis.⁶⁰¹

A last anecdote again attests that the most *en vogue* artists did not limit themselves to the theatrical genres but composed religious songs. The story stages the tyrant of Sicily, Dionysius I, famous for surrounding himself with the most famous artists of his time and for his literary aspirations,⁶⁰² and Democles, a flatterer of Dionysius, accused of having injured the general interests of the tyrant. The latter's

⁵⁹⁹ On the passage: see G. F. Brussich 1990, who fixes the composition of the *Artemis* to the period 399-390 (after Timotheus' stay at the court of Archelaus, who died in 399, and before Cinesias' death in 390), more precisely 395 BC. Also J. Hordern 2002, 101-104 (who discusses the textual problem line 4 (ἱερὴν ... χιλιάδα)). It is interesting to observe that Alexander underlines the lavishness of the Ephesians, who paid golden shekels to have a magnificent celebration of their goddess. Is it an indication of how exorbitant a price the Ephesians paid to secure a first-class talent?

⁶⁰⁰ Pausanias 9. 12. 5-6 = *PMG* 767.

⁶⁰¹ About Delos songs, see W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol.1), 138-158. Also, on the *theoriai* at Delos, see I. Rutherford 2004.

⁶⁰² Athenaeus 6. 250c = Edelstein and Edelstein T. 603. The source is Timaeus, in his twenty-second book of his histories (*FGrH* 566 F 32). For Dionysius' love of poetry, see chapter 3.

reply to the ruler proves both the liveliness of music-related questions and of the status of novel literary compositions:

σφόδρα τοῦ Διονυσίου ὀργισθέντος ἔφησεν (...), ὅτι μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον ἐκείνοι μὲν τῶν Φρυνίχου καὶ Στησιχόρου, ἔτι δὲ Πινδάρου παιάνων τῶν ναυτῶν τινὰς ἀνειληφότες ἦδον, αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τῶν βουλομένων τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ Διονυσίου πεποιημένους διεπεραίνετο. καὶ τούτου σαφῆ τὸν ἔλεγχον παρέξειν ἐπηγγείλατο· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κατηγοροῦς οὐδὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ᾠσμάτων κατέχειν, αὐτὸς δ' ἔτοιμος εἶναι πάντας ἐφεξῆς ἄδειν. λήξαντος δὲ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ Διονυσίου πάλιν ὁ Δημοκλῆς ἔφη· "χαρίσαιο δ' ἂν μοί τι, Διονύσιε, κελεύσας τινὶ τῶν ἐπισταμένων διδάξαι με τὸν πεποιημένον εἰς τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν παιᾶνα· ἀκούω γάρ σε πεπραγματεῦσθαι περὶ τοῦτον."

that differences had arisen between himself and his colleagues, because after supper they took a paean of Phrynichus or Stesichorus, and some of them took one of Pindar's and sang it; but he, with those who agreed with him, went entirely through those [paeans] which had been composed by Dionysius himself. And he undertook to bring forward undeniable proof of this assertion. For that his accusers were not acquainted even with the number of his songs, but that he on the contrary was ready to sing them all through in order. And so, when Dionysius was pacified, Democles continued, and said, "But you would do me a great favour, O Dionysius, if you were to order any one of those who knows it to teach me the paean that you composed in honour of Asclepius; for I hear that you have taken great pains with that."

The anecdote captures two interesting aspects: first, it confirms that an important distinction was felt between the old generation (Phrynichus, Stesichorus, and Pindar) and the Nouvelle Vague, represented by Dionysius, an aspiring "New Musician"; secondly, it shows that a man who was flattering himself for his modernity composed not only the dramatic, dithyrambic music *en vogue* in the fourth century, but also cultic poetry (with a song itself concerned with religious innovation: a paean to Asclepius).

That said, if these anecdotes attest of the composition of hymns and paeans by famous fourth-century poets, the majority of extant hymns and paeans was composed by artists of much lesser repute, even in ancient times. A passage of Aristoxenus' *Life of Telestes* (paraphrased in Apollonius' *Marvellous Stories*) attests to the composition

of healing paeans in Italy at the time of Telestes, by “many writers” whose identity, even in antiquity was not recorded:⁶⁰³

... ὥπερ ἐν Ἰταλία συνεκύρησεν, ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν γίγνεσθαι πάθη, ὧν ἔν ἐῖναι καὶ τὸ περὶ τὰς γυναῖκας γενόμενον ἄτοπον· ἐκστάσεις γὰρ γίγνεσθαι τοιαύτας, ὥστε ἐνίοτε καθημένας καὶ δειπνούσας ὡς καλοῦντός τινος ὑπακούειν, εἶτα ἐκπηδᾶν ἀκατασχέτους γινομένας καὶ τρέχειν ἐκτὸς τῆς πόλεως. μαντευομένοις δὲ τοῖς Λοκροῖς καὶ Ῥηγίνοις περὶ τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ πάθους εἶπεν τὸν θεόν, παιᾶνας ἄδειν ἑαρινούς [δωδεκάτησ] ἡμέρας ξ΄. ὄθεν πολλοὺς γενέσθαι παιανογράφους ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ.

When [Telestes] was visiting Italy, strange things were happening, among which one concerned the women: they were the object of such ecstatic fits that sometimes when they were sitting at the dinner table they would seem to hear somebody calling them, and would uncontrollably jump to their feet to run outside the city. When the Locrians and the Rhegians consulted an oracle and asked about the way to get rid of the condition, the god responded that they should sing [twelve] spring paeans for 60 days. This is why there were many paean writers in Italy.

Again, whether or not the anecdote is historical, whether or not the women were really object of ecstatic fits does not matter as much as the fact that Aristoxenus needed to state and explain the fact that there were many paean-writers in Italy at the time of Telestes' visit.⁶⁰⁴ This is a particularly important piece of evidence, since it is a lot more difficult to find testimonies for compositions by poets whose poetry were not as widely publicized as those of the (scandalous or beloved) New Musicians.⁶⁰⁵

This brings me to the second remark: most of the fourth-century hymns that have survived are only known from epigraphic sources and are not attested anywhere

⁶⁰³ Apollonius, *Historia Mirabilis* 40 (O. Keller 1877, 53) = test. 5 in D. Campbell 1993. Aristoxenus: fr. 117 W.

⁶⁰⁴ It is not clear whether there is a difference between these poets called *παιανόγραφοι*, and the dithyrambic poets called *διθυραμβοποιοί* or *μελοποιοί*.

⁶⁰⁵ Two more points are important: first, the fact that the frenzy is gendered. It is women, in typical maenadic fashion, who are victims of the fits. This is linked to the second fact, the cure ordered contributes to reinforcing the opposition between orderly Apollinian paean and frenetic Dionysiac dithyramb. Finally, it also allows presenting the paean-writers in the role of singers-healers.

else. Their author is unknown, and the texts are not part of the canon: they are not anthologized, not quoted as examples, not taken into consideration by literary history. This, however, does not mean that they were not popular: most remarkably, an anonymous paean to Asclepius, first inscribed in 380/360 BC, was recorded in four different places of the Greco-Roman world over 600 years and attests again of the continuity of some practices. Again, as seen in the previous chapter, Aripbron's hymn to Hygia was also "on everyone's mouth" and recorded on stone.⁶⁰⁶ This gives us very interesting insights into what was deemed worth recording, what was known and in circulation, and how it compares to the "literary" canon; moreover, it gives us a fresh look not only on individual poets, but also on the specific way otherwise unknown authors participate in the continuation, and constant reshaping, of a genre.

Finally, and in connection with this last point, the epigraphic hymns and paeans of the fourth century offer an interesting comparative case with both archaic and Hellenistic poems: while most archaic hymns are anonymous, were mostly transmitted orally and only occasionally inscribed, most of these surviving fourth-century composition are inscribed, associated with the name of their composer and integrate reflections upon the convention of written poetry. At the same time, they occupy a middle ground in the study of "book poetry," since they are written on stone and not on a media meant for circulation.⁶⁰⁷ The relationship between poetics of the song and means of transmission was a question brought up in the previous chapter by Aristotle's use of the funerary epigrams' register in his hymn. One question that the detailed

⁶⁰⁶ See chapter 5, section 3.

⁶⁰⁷ On this issue, see D. Meyer 2005 (especially chapter 1), which focuses on the transition between stone and book epigram.

reading of the poems will focus on is that of the song's engagement with the issue of its performance and transmission: I will concentrate in particular on the poetic means used by the texts to negotiate the relationship between oral performance and written form.

1- The new classic: Aristonous

The first texts that I would like to examine are two hymns composed by a poet from Corinth, Aristonous; the poems were so popular that they owed their author privileges at Delphi.⁶⁰⁸ They were inscribed, probably along with other compositions, on a stone found in the area of the treasury of the Athenians at Delphi. The most interesting feature of these two poems is their “classicism”: the inscription is dated to the last part of the fourth century and confirms that new hymns were still composed and performed for the cult of Hestia, Apollo (and other gods). Both compositions refer to lyric performance and use motives familiar from archaic lyric.

The hymn to Hestia is a form of *do ut des* hymn, in dactyloepitrites. The structure of the song is reminiscent of that of short Homeric Hymns, with an introduction that invokes the goddess (1-2), a main part presenting her function and power (2-10), and a conclusion that includes a farewell formula and a prayer (11-17).⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁸ According to the *suscriptio* (text in *CA*, 164), Delphi awarded Aristonous and his descendants privileged rights of access to the Delphic oracle: Δελφοὶ ἔδωκαν Ἄριστονό[ωι, ἐπεὶ] τοὺς ὕμνους τοῖς θεοῖς ἐπο[ίησεν] αὐτῶι καὶ ἐκγόνοις, προξ[ενίαν], εὐεργεσίαν, προμαντείαν, προ[εδρίαν], προδικίαν, ἀσυλίαν πολέμου [καὶ εἰρήνης, ἀτέλειαν πάντων, καὶ ἐπιτι[μὰ]ν καθάπερ Δελφοῖς. Ἄρχοντος [Δα]μοχάρους, βουλευόντων [Α]ντάνδρου, Ἐρασίππου, Εὐαρχίδα. For the date, see M. Vamvouri-Ruffy 2004, 211-215. In the same way, Philodamus and his brothers are said (in the *suscriptio* of the inscription, text in *CA*, 170) to have received honours upon inscription of their song: . . . ντίδαι αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκ[γόνοις] προξενίαν προμαντείαν προεδρίαν προδικ[ίαν] / [ἀτέ]λειαν ἐπι[τιμ]ὰν καθ[άπερ Δε]λφοῖς ἄρχοντος Ἐτυμώνδο βουλευόντων ...

⁶⁰⁹ On the structure of the hymns, see W. Race 1982.

The song's main function is to ask the goddess to grant the performers bliss in exchange for their prayers, a prayer that is expressed with choral imagery.⁶¹⁰

Ἑστία, δίδου δ' ἀμοιβὰς
ἐξ ὀσίων πολὺν ἡμᾶς
ὄλβον ἔχοντας ἀεὶ λιπαρόθρονον
ἀμφὶ σάν θυμέλαν χορεύειν.
Hestia, and give us in exchange for our prayers, much happiness and to sing and
dance around your sacred glimmering throne.

The hymn seems self-reproducing: the result expected by the performers from addressing a prayer to Hestia is to be able to sing and dance in honour of the goddess, as a manifestation of happiness.

Most critics have agreed on the literary merits of the piece on account of, or despite, its classicizing character.⁶¹¹ Indeed, the poem relies mostly on traditional elements of hymnic diction and structure, like Χαῖρε, Κρόνου θύγατερ, 1 (= *Homeric Hymn to Hestia*, 13) and δίδου... ἔχοντας ... χορεύειν, 14-17, “a common closing formula of hymns.”⁶¹² Most expressions have parallels not only in lyric but also in dramatic texts, especially the Delphic plays (Aeschylus' *Eumenides* and Euripides' *Ion*).⁶¹³ Compare for example the description of Hestia's place in Aristonous,

ἄ καὶ Ὀλυμπον

⁶¹⁰ On the hymn: U. von Wilamowitz 1921, 496-7; J. Powell 1925, 163-4; G. Danielewicz 1978, W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol. 1) 116-118; (vol. 2) 38-45. (I quote from Furley and Bremer's text).

⁶¹¹ G. Danielewicz 1978 (although he dates the poem from the Alexandrian period): “Aristonoi hymnus, quem hic explicare mihi proposui, post Callimachi mortem conscriptus, stabilitam etiam tum speciei litterariae formam testificatur” (55); “Aristonoi hymnus, etsi clarissimis lyricorum operibus impar, κατὰ κόσμον certe, ut Graeci dicebant, compositus est; si autem ea quoque, quae ad speciei litterariae historiam cognoscendam afferat, respexerimus, contempionem eius haud dubie ponemus” (60). Also the judgment of W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001.

⁶¹² W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001, (vol. 2), 44: also with references to *Pythian* 5. 1 ff. and *Olympian* 1, 22 for ὄλβον ἐξ ὀσίων διδοῦς.

⁶¹³ As Furley and Bremer point out, most of the phrases have parallels in the archaic or early-Classical lyric poets: from πυρὶ φλέγουσα, 12-13 (for which parallels from Pindar to Euripides can be found), to μυχός used of Delphi (μυχὸν μαντήιον, Pindar *Pythian* 5. 68-9, or μαντικῶν μυχῶν Aeschylus *Eumenides* 180) and the description of her throne as λιπαρόθρονον 16-17 (an adjective found in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* 806, λιπαροθρόνοισι ἡμένας ἐπ' ἑσχάταις, “on which Aristonous' expression seems to be modelled,” W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001, (vol. 2) 45).

μυχὸν γαίας μεσόμφαλον αἰεὶ
Πυθίαν τε δάφναν κατέχουσα
ναὸν ἄν' ὑψίπυλον Φοίβου χορευεῖς (2-5)

[you] whose realm forever is both Olympus and the omphalos of the earth and the Delphic laurel tree. You dance in the lofty temple of Phoibos...

with Euripides' description of the seat of the Delphic oracle in the *Ion* (461-464):⁶¹⁴

Φοιβήιος ἔνθα γὰς
μεσόμφαλος ἐστία
παρὰ χορευομένωι τρίποδι
μαντεύματα κραίνει.

Where Phoibos' umbilical hearth of the earth offers oracles near the tripod circled by dances.

Both use the same choral vocabulary to describe the rituals associated with the temple. Again, the description of Apollo playing the seven-tone golden kithara in Aristonous (χρυσέαν φόρμιγγ' Ἀπόλλων ὀπήϊκ' ἄν' ἐπτάτονον κρέκων, 7-9) combines an expression emphasizing the sound (like ὦ τὰς ἐπταφθόγγου μέλπων κιθάρας, *Ion* 881) of the kithara with its sight (like χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον, *Pythian* 1. 1-2, to only quote the most famous example), creating a variation on both models.⁶¹⁵ This allows to link the (visual) realm of Hestia (whose power resides in μούνα πυρὶ φλέγουσα βομοῦς/ ἀθανάτων ἐριτίμους (12-13) with the choral vocabulary used for Apollo's worship.

While the poem is a direct address to the goddess, uttered by a chorus speaking in the first person plural (ὕμνήσομεν, 2; ἡμᾶς, 14), there is no other deictic nor

⁶¹⁴ These expressions seem to have been traditionally associated with Delphi, since Aeschylus has ἐστία μεσόμφαλος (*Agamemnon*, 1056), μεσόμφαλόν θ' ἵδρυμα (*Choephoroi*, 1031), etc. See W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol. 1) 40-41.

⁶¹⁵ The passage also has features of an ode of Bacchylides (Ode 14b) that starts with an invocation to Hestia: Ἐστία χρυσόθρον', εὐ-/δοξῶν Ἀγαθοκλεαδᾶν ἄτ' ἀφνε[ῶν]/ ἀνδρῶν μέγαν ὄλβον ἀέξεις/ ἡμένα μέσας ἀγυιάς (1-4). Rather than saying that Aristonous is directly inspired by the ode, I would say that he uses the same tropes and language as Bacchylides. Thus the use of compound adjectives in the hymn does not necessarily have to be connected to the experiments of the New Musicians and the dithyrambic style. It is a very traditional feature of hymnic invocation.

indications that the song is connected to a place in particular and that the song might be playing with its own materiality, a fact all the more difficult to explain that the poem was composed by a poet from Corinth and “found in the area of the Athenian treasure-house.”⁶¹⁶

The same is true of Aristonous’ paeon to Apollo. While the hymn to Hestia was monostrophic, this paeon is composed of 6 strophes of aeolic meters.⁶¹⁷ Each strophe repeats twice the pattern of 3 glyconics followed by a pherecratean and has a meshymnion “iê ié Paian” and an epiphthegma “ô ié Paian.” Despite the presence of these specifically paeanic markers, the inscription qualifies the song as a hymn to Pythian Apollo (Ἀριστόνοος Νικοσθένους Κορίνθιος Ἀπόλλωνι Πυθίῳ τὸν ὕμνον). Nothing is known about the occasion of composition of the poem, but Furley and Bremer, arguing from the importance of Athena and other gods in this hymn to Apollo, have proposed composition for the Theoxenia. The poem starts by an invocation to Apollo, develops the god’s genealogy, his mantic and musical skills, the way he came to power and his relationship to other gods. It ends with a prayer for the god to come to the city and protect the inhabitants.⁶¹⁸

There are some unsurprising parallels with the previous hymn, in the presentation of the double power of Apollo, mantic and musical (χρησιμοῖς εὐφθόγγου τε λύρας αὐδαῖς, 16, that recalls χρυσέαν φόρμιγγ’ Ἀπόλλων ἐπτάτονον, 7-8), in the

⁶¹⁶ Furley and Bremer (W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001, vol. 1, 120), note that (according to Audiat) this was not the original location of the inscription.

⁶¹⁷ On the poem: U. von Wilamowitz 1921, 243; J. Powell 1925, 162-4; J. Audiat 1932; O. Panagl 1969; L. Käppel 1992 (Paian 42); W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol. 1) 119-121; (vol. 2) 45-52; M. Vamvouri-Ruffy 2004, 94-96; 206-215; F. Bommelaer 2005.

⁶¹⁸ M. Vamvouri-Ruffy’s analysis underlines the vocabulary of gift and exchange between gods and suggests that it constitutes the paradigm for the reciprocal relationship that men hope to establish with Apollo (94-96).

prayer for ὄλβον ἐξ ὀσίων διδοῦς, 46-47, that recalls ἐξ ὀσίων πολὺν ἡμᾶς ὄλβον ἔχοντας, 15-16). The diction however is more elaborate than in the previous hymn and in a way reminiscent of the “fourth-century poetics” that I have described above. It is especially clear in the use of hapaces⁶¹⁹ (θεσπιόμαντιν, 3; χλωρότομον, 10; φρικώεντος, 13; ἀνθοτρόφον, 21; ἐξαβρύνω, 43), which all contribute to adding layers of imagery to the traditional diction.⁶²⁰ Moreover, the poem abounds in adjectives multiplying and superposing images: in the first stanza, all nouns are accompanied by an adjective, most of which underline the sanctity of the place and the divinity of the god. In the rest of the poem however, the function of the adjectives is slightly different: they all contribute to underlining the smoothness of Apollo’s arrival at Delphi (welcomed by Themis “with beautiful locks”, as in the version told by Aeschylus in the *Eumenides*),⁶²¹ and the harmonious relationships between the gods (especially in the enumeration of the gifts offered to the god upon his settling in Delphi) – a version of the myth of Apollo’s accession to power that differs from the violent one told by Euripides in the *Iphigenia in Tauris* for example.⁶²² As Furley and Bremer have noted:⁶²³

[this poem] is remarkable for its syntactical interweaving of attributes (*symplokê*) of Apollo and his domain within extended metrical periods: this was

⁶¹⁹ Gaia for example is nowhere else ἀνθοτρόφον. This adjective seems to me to condense very different images: that of a nurturing female power, but also that of seductive female power, the flowery meadow being the place where maidens dance (or get abducted in myth). Similarly, χλωρότομον combines two simultaneous ideas, that of the cutting, and that of the colour and texture (of something still fresh and green). Again φρικώεντος suggests the reaction created, in a very sensorial way, by a spectacle, while the more common φρικώδης applies directly to the spectated sight.

⁶²⁰ It is again reminiscent of tragic diction, especially Δελφίδ’ ἀμφὶ πέτραν ἀεὶ θεσπιόμαντιν ἔδραν (vv. 2-3), which echoes ἃ θεσπιέπεια Δελφὶς πέτρα (Sophocles, *Oedipus King*, 463-4); also echoes of Euripides’ *Ion* (94 ff. and 145 ff.) in the image of a beautifying bath in the waters of Kastalia.

⁶²¹ This aspect is underlined by Rutherford 2001, 28, and Vamvouri-Ruffy 2004, 208-210.

⁶²² For a comparison with the song to Apollo in the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, see W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001, text 10. 4, with commentary.

⁶²³ W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001, (vol.1) 121.

the essence of the hymn-writer’s act: to express elaborate praise of the god – within traditional parameters – using the full range of the lyric poet’s art.

Although there is no extended narration of a myth, the praise of the god and his deeds is marked by the poet’s care to not mention any narrative element that might indicate tension between the Olympians, and by the glorification of Apollo and Athena: Athena is the one whom Apollo, “remembering the old *charis*,” thanked with sumptuous honours.

The use of adjectives, and the verbal texture of the text, also compensates for the lack of description of actual performance of the poem: whereas in the hymn to Hestia, choral worship was suggested throughout the poem in the activity of the goddess, here it only appears in Apollo’s activity, and in the final prayer of the performers, who ask the god to receive their hymn. As Vamvouri-Ruffy has showed⁶²⁴

la correspondance entre le monde des hommes et l’univers divin apparaît (...) dans les correspondances lexicales par lesquelles la transaction entre les dieux tend à se confondre avec l’échange que les hommes veulent établir avec Apollon.

Thus, ὑψίσταις ἐφέπεις τιμαῖς (31-32) is echoed by σώζων ἐφέποις ἡμᾶς (47-48), the χάριν (29) that Apollo received is replicated by the favor that he bestowed to her as a token of his appreciation what she had done in the past (χαρίτων, v. 29), and it is finally replicated in the pleasure (χαρεῖς, 45) that the god is supposed to find in the performers’s song (ὕμνοις ἡμετέροις, 45).⁶²⁵ If there is no reference to choral singing

⁶²⁴ M. Vamvouri-Ruffy 2004, 95-6.

⁶²⁵ Vamvouri-Ruffy also notes the parallel between δωροῦνται (33) and διδούς (46); and ἀεί (3), αἰὲν (23), αἰδίους (30), ἀεί (47). “On le voit clairement, la persuasion du dieu se fait sur le mode du *da quia hoc dare tuum est* dans la mesure où on lui demande un échange conformément à ses habitudes. Mais le type d’argument est aussi celui du *do ut des* étant donné que les orants offrent leur Péan et demandent de recevoir en retour la protection et la bienveillance divines (46)” (M. Vamvouri-Ruffy 2004, 96).

other than in the last line, it is because the performance of the poem itself, again, enacts what the poem asks for.

While the goal of Aristonous' two poems is to celebrate the gods at Delphi (mainly Apollo, but also Athena, Hestia, and other Olympians) and the concord between the gods, the compositions are not a simple repeat of ready-made expressions, as critics seem to assume when describing “traditional hymnic poetry” but combine echoes of earlier lyric and tragic diction, and poetic verbal creations. However, although musical performance is linked with the worship of Apollo, there is no textual construction of performance in the text.

2- Old song for a new god: Asclepius in fourth-century paeans

If Aristonous' compositions illustrated aspects of continuity within the practice of hymn singing in the fourth century, several other extant late-classical songs show a striking feature that distinguish them from earlier compositions and that marks innovation in the fourth century: the presence of Asclepius, not celebrated in paeanic form before the end of the fifth century. In addition to the paeans to Asclepius by Isodemus of Troeze (about whom nothing else is known),⁶²⁶ and that of Sophocles, supposedly originally composed for the introduction of the cult of Asclepius to Athens (part of which is quoted in an inscription),⁶²⁷ two texts of the fourth century have

⁶²⁶ Attested by Pseudo-Lucian *Encomion to Demosthenes* 27, iii. 274 Macleod. R47 in I. Rutherford 2001, 41; Rutherford does not say anything about the poem, except that “there is some uncertainty about the name” of the composer.

⁶²⁷ For the inscription: IG2 II 4510, edited by J. Oliver 1936, 112-113. The text figures in *TrGF* iv. T67-9; *PMG* 737. Testimonies for the composition of the paeon: Philostratus *Vita Apollonii* 3. 17. 4 on a portrait of Sophocles notes ὁ παιὰν ὁ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους ὄν Ἀθήνησι τῷ Ἀσκληπίῳ ᾄδουσιν. Also

survived, the ‘Erythraean’ paean, and Isyllus’ paean to Asclepius, two texts that provide models for later compositions, like Mace(donius)’ paean to Asclepius.⁶²⁸ This poetic innovation corresponds to a religious evolution: the introduction of the cult of Asclepius in Athens in 420 BC.⁶²⁹ This introduction prompted a wave of compositions, in different genres, as illustrated in several titles of the New Musicians.⁶³⁰ Philodemus attributes to Telestes (and possibly to Cinesias) poems that take the name of the healing god:⁶³¹

Ἄσκληπιὸν δὲ Ζεὺς ἐκεραύνωσεν, ὡς μὲν ὁ τὰ Ναυπακτικὰ
συνγράψας (fr. 3B Davies) [κᾶν Ἄσκληπιῶι Τελ]έστης καὶ Κεινη[σίας] ὁ
μελοποιός, ὅ[τι τὸν Ἰππόλυτον [παρα]κληθεὶς ὑπ’ Ἀρ[τέμι]δος
ἀνέστ[η]σε[ν, ὡς δ’] ἐν Ἐριφύληι Σ[τησίχο]ρος ὅτι Καπ[ανέα καὶ
Λυ]κοῦργον...

Zeus killed Asclepius with his thunderbolt, according to the author of the *Naupactia* and Telestes in his *Asclepius* and Cinesias the lyric poet, because he raised Hippolytos from the dead at Artemis’ request; according to Stesichorus in his *Eriphyle*, it was because he raised Capaneus and Lycurgus.

Imagines 415, 7 Kaiser: Ἄσκληπιὸς δ’ οἶμαι, οὗτος παιᾶνά που παρεγγυῶν γράφειν καὶ κλυτόμη<τ>ις οὐκ ἀπαξιῶν <παρὰ> σοῦ ἀκοῦσαιμ βλέμμα τε αὐτοῦ πρὸς σὲ φαιδρότητι μεμιγμένον τὰς παρὰ μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐπιξενώσεις αἰνίττεται. Also in the *Etymologium Magnum* s.v. Δεξιῶν and the confused report in the *Vita Sophoclis* (in the OCT vol of Soph. par. 11). For Sophocles as the author of the Erythraean paeans, see I. Rutherford 2001, 38-41. His note 8 refers to secondary literature on Sophocles’ introduction of a paean to Asclepius: A. Henrichs 1985, 298f; M. Lefkowitz 1981, 83ff; Lehnus 1980, 21ff. Also Edelstein and Edelstein 1945 (vol. 1) T 589; S. B. Aleshire 1989, 49-50; D. J. Geagan 1991; L. Käppel 1992; W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol. 1), 261-262; (vol. 2) 219-221.

⁶²⁸ *CA* 138-140.

⁶²⁹ About the cult of Asclepius, see R. Garland 1992, 116-134. The earliest material evidence for the worship of the god comes from Epidaurus in the early fifth century but “we know very little about [it] before its arrival in Athens” (116). “[Its] entry into the Piraeus in the late 420s not only constituted an important new addition to the Athenian pantheon but also heralded a radical shift in the religious outlook of the whole community, since previously magical healing had been largely confined to hero shrines of limited, local importance” (116). R. Parker 1996, 175-185, emphasises the interesting dynamic between tradition and innovation in the introduction of the cult of Asclepius: “the coming of Asclepius occurred ‘during the Great Mysteries’. In commemoration, one of his two main festivals, the ‘Epidauria’, was celebrated for ever after on 18th Boedromion (...). Was this timely arrival, seen in the pious legend as a significant coincidence, in fact designated? Was the healer deliberately associated with two ‘saviours’ of older type? The incident can be seen as a rare illustration of the down-to-earth politics of polytheism, the way in which the advent of a new god could be made possible through the interest of the priesthood of an old” (179).

⁶³⁰ In the anecdote quoted above about Dionysius of Syracuse, the tyrant’s composition was also a paean to Asclepius.

⁶³¹ *De pietate* p. 52 Gomperz = *PMG* 774.

None of these compositions of the New Musicians have survived, but the fragment suggests that they chose alternate versions of the myth: here Telestes and the author of the *Naupactia* give a version for Asclepius' death different from the Stesichorean (and Pindaric) one.⁶³² The narrative detail provided by Philodemus about Asclepius' death (ἐκεραύνωσ]εν) seems in accord with the New Musicians' predilection for the spectacular - death from a thunderbolt suggests some sort of sound and light spectacle, with a very important 'opsis' part if the death were to be represented, or at least involving a mimetic aesthetic of light and sound spectacle.⁶³³ We may suggest that these compositions of the New Musicians were meant for spectacular performance in the theatre of Dionysus; in any event, they belong to the corpus of poetry composed for a "new god" whose characteristics I shall now examine.

Erythraean paean to Asclepius

The first text is that of the Erythraean paean; the text was found in four different places in the empire, but the earliest version (dated 380-360) was found in the Asklepeion of Erythra, on a marble stele inscribed on both sides.⁶³⁴ On the front, the stone presents a *lex sacra*, instructions for ritual gestures to be performed by patients seeking the help of the healing god Asclepius.⁶³⁵ These included, along with descriptions of sacrificial victims, repeating three times a paean to Apollo while

⁶³² For Stesichorus (and his version of the death of Asclepius in his *Eriphyle*), see Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Professors* 1.261 (194 in D. Campbell, vol. 4); for Pindar, *Pythian* 3. 54, and the scholiast on the passage.

⁶³³ As suggested by D. Mendelsohn 1991-2, this adjective is particularly Dionysiac, and might be associated with the dithyramb – the genre of the *Asclepius*?

⁶³⁴ Several later copies of the song exist and were found all over the Greek world: in Egypt (Ptolemais (P), copy datable to 97 AD), in Athens (in the Athenian Asklepeion, (A) copy, dating from 1st or 2nd century AD) and in Dion, Macedonia (the (D) copy probably dates from the 2nd century AD).

⁶³⁵ For details on the *lex sacra*, see U. von Wilamowitz 1909 (= H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, 1972). L. Käppel 1992, 189-193.

standing (or dancing) around the altar of the god.⁶³⁶ The stone is broken diagonally and the paean to Apollo itself did not survive entirely, except for the words that are recorded as *PMG* 933:

ἰὴ Παιών, ὦ, ἰὴ Παιών
ἰὴ Παιών, ὦ, ἰὴ Παιών
ἰὴ Παιών, ὦ, ἰὴ Παιών
ὦ ἄναξ Ἄπολλον φείδευο κούρων
φείδευο

iê paion, o iê paion! (ter) O Lord Apollo protect the young men, protect...

The main text is *PMG* 934:

[Παιᾶνα κλυτό]μητιν ἀείσατε
[κοῦροι Λατοῖδαν Ἔκ]ατον,
ἰὲ Παιάν,
ὄς μέγα χάρ[μα βροτοῖσιν ἐγείνατο
μιχθεῖς ἐμ φιλότῃ Κορ]ωνίδι 5
ἐν γὰι τᾷ Φλεγυεῖαι,
ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἄσκληπιὸν
δαίμονα κλεινό[τατ]ον,
ἰὲ Παιάν,
[Το]ῦ δὲ καὶ ἐξεγένοντο Μαχάων 10
καὶ Πο[δα]λείριος ἠδ' Ἰασώ,
ἰὲ Παιάν,
Αἴγλ[α τ'] ἐοῶπις Πανάκειά τε
Ἐπιόνας παῖδες σὺν ἀγακλυτῷ
ἐοαγεῖ Ὑγείαι- 15
ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἄσκληπιὸν
δαίμονα κλεινότατον,
ἰὲ Παιάν,
Χαῖρέ μοι, ἴλαος δ' ἐπίνισεο
τᾶν ἐμᾶν πόλιν εὐρύχορον, 20
ἰὲ Παιάν,
δὸς δ' ἡμᾶς χαίροντας ὄρᾶν φάος
ἀελίου δοκίμους σὺν ἀγακλυτῷ
ἐοαγεῖ Ὑγείαι-
ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἄσκληπιὸν 25
δαίμονα κλεινότατον,

⁶³⁶ Although the ritual is also mentioned in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*, 1467-1484, in connection with Artemis; L. Käppel 1992, 191, notes that the ritual itself seems typically Erythraean.

ἰὲ Παιάν.

Sing boys, far-darting Paian, Apollo the son of Leto, iê paian, famous for his skill, he who engendered a great boon for mortals, when he mingled in love with Coronis in the land of Phlegyas, Iê paeon. Iê Asclepios, most famous divinity, iê paian.

From him descend Machaon and Podaleirios and Iasus [Healer]- iê Paeon! - and [Radiance] and Panacea [Cure-All], children of Epione along with shining Health, all famous; sweet-eyed Aigla and Panacea, the children of Hêpione along with the brilliant and fair-eyed Aegle famous Health – iê paian, Asclepios, most famous divinity, iê paian. Hail, may you come propitious to me, in my large-plained city, iê paian, giving us to rejoice in seeing the light of the sun and be famous with brilliant and famous health, iê paian, Asclepios most famous divinity, iê paian.

It is composed of 3 strophes in lyric dactyls, with a refrain (marked as a refrain on the stone), ἰὲ Παιάν, Ἴσκληπιὸν/ δαίμονα κλεινότατον,/ ἰὲ Παιάν at the end of each strophe. The first strophe starts by an invitation to young men (*kouroi*) to sing “Paian, the far-shooter, son of Leto” (3). In the myth part, the poet accounts for the birth of Asclepius (son of Apollo and Coronis) and qualifies his attributes (he is μέγα χάριμα βροτοῖσι, a dactylic expression also found in the Homeric Hymn to Asclepius χάριμα μέγ’ ἀνθρώποισι). The second strophe enumerates the descendents of the god - Machaon and Podaleirios (the doctors of the *Iliad*)⁶³⁷ and the well-named Iasos (Healer), Aigla (Brightness), Panacea (All-remedy) and Hygieia (Health).⁶³⁸ The last strophe invokes the god directly (may you come and visit our city), offers a final prayer for the good health of the inhabitants of the city, and farewell to the god.

This is of course not the first text that mentions Asclepius: the god’s literary fortune starts in the *Iliad*, where he is mentioned as a pupil of Cheiron, and father of the doctors (Machaon and Podelerios) who lead a contingent to Troy and tended to

⁶³⁷ *Iliad* 4. 194; 11. 518.

⁶³⁸ Asclepius and his family are also represented in the visual arts: see *LIMC* s.v. Asclepius, n. 59, 204, 248. Also a painting, mentioned by Pliny, *Natural History* 35.137.

wounded warriors; he is the subject of a short Homeric Hymn, and figures as a central figure in Pindar's *Pythian* 3, in the story of the love-affairs of Coronis, daughter of the Thessalian Phlegyas, and Apollo.⁶³⁹ All throughout this short song, the focus is on glorifying the god and his descendents. With a concern for *euphêmia*, the poet ignores the scandalous tradition reported by Pindar's *Pythian* 3 about Asclepius' mother's affair with a stranger after her impregnation by the god, and does not mention the later fault and punishment of Asclepius. This pious attention to using the right names and adjectives, the sobriety of the narrative part, and the mention of the offering in the last lines lead Käppel to argue for an automatization of paean-composition in the classical period:⁶⁴⁰ according to him, all the formal elements of the songs (iê paian cry, adjectives and structure) are dictated by their religious function. Against this theory, Schröder has argued, followed by D'Alessio,⁶⁴¹ that

the series of simple and similar texts epigraphically transmitted (all connected, in some way, to the so called "Erythraean paean") do not represent a stage in the evolution towards the predominance of formal factors in the definition of the genre (Käppel's thesis) but rather *an example of the less elaborated cultic poems* (as opposed to the literary creations of the major lyric poets) that must have circulated also at an earlier period.

Yet these readings seem to ignore an important aspect of the text: its careful legitimization of the use of the paean cry for Asclepius, and its extension from Apollo to Asclepius. Rather than being a "mould" used for the new god Asclepius, the poem recreates the dynamic involved from calling Apollo Paian to calling his son Paian. It is this dynamic that I would like to examine in the next few pages.

⁶³⁹ About Asclepius and his Thessalian origins, see E. Aston 2004.

⁶⁴⁰ L. Käppel 1992, 200-206.

⁶⁴¹ G. B. D'Alessio in BMCR review of S. Schröder, 2000/01/24.

The initial word of the poem is Παιᾶνα, the object of the sung celebration (ᾄείσατε). Instead of being a direct address to “Paian”, the opening line is an invitation (in the second person singular) to young men to sing the god. This casts the performers of the song, whoever they actually are, in the role of a typical paeanic chorus and echoes the instructions inscribed at the back of the stone, in the paeon to Apollo. The back and forth between the front and the back of the stone that starts with the appeal to *kouroi* continues with the use of the cry *iê paian*, since the cry is repeated three times in each of the three strophes. This is the song’s first manipulation of verbal deixis and of performance context, since it seems to reproduce the dynamic of the traditional song inscribed on the other side of the stone, in order to legitimize a paeon for a new god.

The first line develops the main object of the sentence, Παιᾶνα, with traditional epithets of Apollo – Λατοίδαν Ἑκατον – but also with an adjective rarely used for him, κλυτόμητις, (yet close enough in sound to the more frequent κλυτόμαντις of the paeans of Pindar).⁶⁴² This adjective κλυτόμητις was, according to Philostratus, used by Sophocles in his paeon to Asclepius.⁶⁴³ This would confirm the idea that the poem legitimizes the use of the paeon form for Asclepius, as it moves from celebrating the father, Apollo, with a term previously applied to the son (κλυτόμητις in Sophocles) to celebrating the son, Asclepius, with an adjective used for the father (κλεινότατον).

In line 4, right after the relative pronoun traditionally introducing the narrative part, the first expression qualifying Asclepius (μέγα χάρμα βροτοῖσι – great boon for mortals) comes before the verb. Again, the expression can grammatically agree either

⁶⁴² For example: A2, 22 R.(=Pa. X(a)); D6, 2 R. (=Pa. VI). Also B2, 1 R.(=Pa. VIII): κλυτοὶ μάντι[ες] Ἀπόλλωνος.

⁶⁴³ On Philostratus’ description of Sophocles’ paeon, see note 627 above.

with the subject (Apollo Paian, ὄς), or with the direct object of ἐγγείνατο, Ἴασηπιόν, introduced after 3 lines of delay in line 7, as a sort of “name cap” to ἐγγείνατο. In that case again, the religious syncretism operates on the grammatical and poetic level: the “great boon for mortals” is as much Apollo as Asclepius. The last expression of the refrain (δαίμονα κλεινότατον, ἰὲ Παιάν) reinforces the proximity between father and son, since the adjective κλεινότατον (1.9) (most-famed), picks up the root of κλυτόμητιν (skill-famed), 1.1, and would apply more to the most-famed father than to the skill-famed son.

In the second strophe, Asclepius is not the grammatical subject of the sentence and the cry *iê paian* is not directly addressed to him either. The god does not even figure in the strophe by name, but his power, and Apollo’s, are embodied in the “fair-eyed” Aigla, and “shining” Hygieia, the “all-famous.” Although Asclepius is not yet celebrated as Paian, the adjectives used develop the theme of his aretology: his offspring are what he gives (radiance and health) and what he does (cure and heal).

It is only in the last strophe that Asclepius is addressed directly in the second person, and by the time the *meshymnion* comes, line 21, it is clear that *he* is Paian, and addressed as such. The text in the last lines constructs a different deictic context from the beginning: it evolves from the projection of the performers in the role of *kouroi* in the first lines, to a real deictic (vv. 20 and 22: visit my city, and give us to enjoy the sun’s abundant light accompanied with health) that does not refer to imagined performers but refers to the real performer(s) of the song. This deictic move, and the use of *charis* twice in the last strophe (in χαῖρε μοι and χαίροντας), marks the poem

not simply as a prayer, but as an offering.⁶⁴⁴ Rather than underlining the direct “enactment” of the *lex sacra* in the poem (as the first lines seemed to do with ἀείσατε, κοῦροι), the last line thus transform the “cult” poem into a real offering. While Käppel interprets the use of certain dactylic formulae as “gattungsindifferent” and belonging to the stock of hymnic poetry, I prefer to see other specific features of the poem as a sign of the poet’s working in a genre and tradition but trying to innovate.⁶⁴⁵

So rather than amounting to an automatized use of the formal features, or to the reuse of an “old” cultic song adapted to a new god, this song is an interesting exploration of the flexibility of the paean form and a testimony of the poetic and generic consciousness of the poet composing the Erythraean Paean, and responding to a religious innovation (the introduction of the cult of Asclepius). In the next part of this chapter, I would like to compare this poem to another song celebrating Asclepius: Isyllus’ paean.

Isyllus

A composition by the late fourth-century poet Isyllus also celebrates Asclepius in paeanic form. The 79-line inscription was discovered in 1885 by P. Kabbadias in the sanctuary of Epidaurus.⁶⁴⁶ The date of composition of the inscription has been an object

⁶⁴⁴ χαῖρε, as Mary Depew has noted “is present as a dedicatory formula in countless inscriptions, and is, of course, common in hymnic sign-offs.” Quoting Joseph Day, she shows that *charis* refers to the quality that all *agalmata*, or top-rank gifts, possess: “*Charis*..., closely tied [as it is] to *chairô* ... is the pleasure-causing quality of [a] gift [and of the occasion of its giving], its charm, beauty, and glamour.” M. Depew 2000, 62, quoting J. Day 1994, 57-58.

⁶⁴⁵ For the use of dactylic formulae: compare v. 1 with *Homeric Hymn* 20. 1 Ἥφαιστον κλυτόμητιν ἀείδεο; compare v. 4 with *Homeric Hymn* 16. 2, τὸν ἐγείνατο δια Κορωνίς ... χάσμα μέγ’ ἀνθρώποισιν; compare v. 22 with *Homeric Hymn* 26. 12, δὸς δ’ ἡμᾶς χαίροντας ἐς ὥρας αὐτίς ἰκέσθαι.

⁶⁴⁶ A major study on the inscription was published by A. Kolde, 2003. I am using her text and line numbers. For commentary or full interpretation, see also (quoted in Kolde’s bibliography): U. von

of scholarly debate since the end of the nineteenth century: the shape of the letters seems to indicate a date of late fourth century or beginning of the third century,⁶⁴⁷ while an internal reference to the invasion of “Philip” makes it possible to date the inscription either to the fourth century (if the text alludes to Philip II’s invasion of Laconia in 338 BC), to the third (if it alludes to Philip III and his expedition to mount Ithome in 317), or to the second century BC (if the Philip in question is Philip V, who invaded Sparta in 219 BC). I have followed Kolde’s dating (the most up-to-date and exhaustive investigation of the question), who proposes, on account of a historical and paleographic study, a very late fourth-century date and a reference to Phillip II.⁶⁴⁸

This inscription is remarkable for its structural elaborateness: it falls into seven narrative segments, all composed in different meters.⁶⁴⁹ The prose introduction (1-2)⁶⁵⁰ states that Isyllus (son of Socrates, citizen of Epidaurus) is making a dedication (ἀνέθεκε) to Apollo Maleas and Asclepius. The object of the dedication however remains unspecified: is it the stele that is dedicated? The paean?⁶⁵¹ With its use of the Doric dialect (Ἀσκλαπιῶι) and the mention of Apollo ‘Maleatas’ (a local cult name of Apollo), the inscription builds two kinds of expectation:⁶⁵² first, it seems to emphasize

Wilamowitz 1886; A. Fairbanks 1900, 109-112; J. Powell 1925, 132-136; L. Käppel 1992, n° 40; P. Sineux 1999; W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol. 1), 180-192; (vol. 2) 227-240. On the discovery of the inscription, see A. Kolde 2003, 1-3.

⁶⁴⁷ “La forme des lettres est encore proche de la forme dite géométrique, utilisée plus ou moins jusqu’au début de la période hellénistique,” A. Kolde 2003, 4.

⁶⁴⁸ “Celle que propose P. Kavvadias et qu’adoptent la plupart des autres philologues” (A. Kolde 2003, 260). U. von Wilamowitz 1922, J. Powell 1925, E. Edelstein and L. Edelstein 1945, W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol.1 – 233-236), favour a late fourth-century date. For a third-century date: I. Rutherford 2001, 41. For a more exhaustive review of the historical data that allows dating, see A. Kolde 2003, 257-301.

⁶⁴⁹ For metrical analysis of the poem: A. Kolde 2003, 18-40.

⁶⁵⁰ The numbers refer to the line number in Kolde’s edition.

⁶⁵¹ For a formula of dedication in fourth-century lyric, τὸδ’ ἀνατίθημι σοι ῥόδον, Lycophronides *PMG* 844.

⁶⁵² The cult is attested in Epidaurus (see A. Kolde 2003, 50 for a list of inscriptions attesting of the cult there) and Sparta (Paus.3.12.8).

the local characteristic of the song, secondly, the mention of Apollo and Asclepius creates the expectation of a paeanic song.

The following lines (A, 3-9) however do not respond to this expectation: the (spoken, not sung) trochaic tetrameters introduce general political considerations on the best form of government and the benefits of aristocracy. Presented in the first person, the statement uses several deictic markers (τόκ', νῶν, 17) and directly engages with the question of the materiality of the inscription (ἀνγράψεν, 8).⁶⁵³

The next part (B, 10-26) states, in dactylic hexameters, how Isyllus (designated this time in the third person) established, under the inspiration and guidance of the gods, a sacred law, with both political and religious aspects. According to this law, the whole people of Epidaurus is to say a prayer accompanied by ritual gestures, while chosen best men (wearing white garments and crowned with laurel and olive tree leaves) celebrate Apollo and his son Asclepius, in a ritual procession, and ask the gods to bring to all the citizens a series of good things (lovely health, concord, peace, well-acquired wealth, and gentlemanliness). The segment concludes with a remark about the cosmic implication of the law, in a heroic-sounding line expressed in the first person (plural) statement (οὕτω τοί κ' ἀμῶν περιφείδοιτ' εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς, 26).⁶⁵⁴

A third section (C, 27-31, in dactylic hexameters / pentameter) describes, without any connection with the previous part other than the mention of the cult of Asclepius, the establishment of the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas, by a certain Malos,

⁶⁵³ The expected paeon only comes at line 37 of the inscription.

⁶⁵⁴ For Homeric parallels, see A. Kolde 2003, 106-107. Other Homeric sounding words in this section give it a heroic character: ἄφθιτον ἀέναον γέρας (11), ἐς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν (13), οἳ κεν ἀριστεύωσι πόλιος τᾶσδ' Ἐπιδαύρου (14).

and the connection between this sanctuary and the sanctuary of Asclepius.⁶⁵⁵ After a statement in the third person, the lines directly address (in the second person singular) a potential reader of the inscription (οὐδέ κε Θεσσαλίας ἐν Τρίκκηι πειραθείης ... εἰ μὴ ... θύσαις, 29-31), in the form of a general interdiction.

A fourth section (D, 32-35, in prose) relates how the Delphic oracle was consulted to determine whether it was preferable (λῳίόν) to inscribe the paean referred to in Isyllus' sacred law (of section B). The narrative switches back to the third person singular, but uses a deictic referring to a present time (αὐτίκα, 36). The verdict that it is, indeed, preferable to inscribe the paean, leads into the next section (E, 36-61, in ionics): the paean itself to Apollo and Asclepius.

The inscription concludes with a last part (F, 62-84, dactylic hexameters) on the aretology of Asclepius. The narrative is addressed (in the second person) to Asclepius and concludes with a dedicatory formula which works as ring-composition (78-79), recalling the opening segment:

ταῦτα τοί, ὦ μεγ' ἄριστε θεῶν, ἀνέθηκεν Ἴσυλλος
τιμῶν σὴν ἀρετήν, ὦναξ, ὥσπερ τὸ δίκαιον.

These, o great and best of the gods, Isyllus dedicated in your honour, celebrating your virtue, o Lord, as is just.

As this paraphrase of the poem makes clear, the narrative structure is far from being linear. On the one hand, two different temporal sequences are mixed, the story of the creation of the cult of Asclepius at Epidaurus (its mythical past, the aretology of

⁶⁵⁵ Most scholars make Apollo Maleatas a healing god older than Apollo and later assimilated to him. Various etymologies have been proposed: from the derivation form μᾶλον (apple, an important fruit in the cult of chthonian gods) to μῆλον (sheep). Scholars also underline the parallel with the toponyme Μαλέα, or the name Malos, later found in the poem: “Aux yeux de Wilamowitz, Malos ne doit son existence qu’au besoin du poète de trouver une origine au nom du dieu, tout comme le roi Ἴσκλης a été créé pour les besoins de l’étymologie d’Asclépios; du point de vue linguistique, cette étymologie serait de plus fautive.” A. Kolde 2003, 51. For the local origin of Asclepius, see E. Aston 2004.

Asclepius, the aetiology of the cult, the aetiology of the *lex sacra*), and the story of the making of the inscription (the vow, the decision, the inscription, the double dedication, in the first and final lines). On the other hand, each of these temporal sequences mixes different modes of address: first-person narrative (singular and plural, sometimes in the same sequence), address in the second person (either to the god or to a potential reader), and narrative in the third person. This elaborate composition, and framework in which the paeon is embedded, is what makes the inscription such a rich document both for religious and political history, and for literary history: the text offers a way to reflect on the relationship between this text and other inscriptions performing a similar kind of function (dedications to Asclepius, or *iamata*, and *lex sacra*), and on the way a poem can reflect on the media of its transmission. All these narrative strategies contribute to throwing into relief the song itself and to emphasizing the various creative narrative processes used to address a paeon to Asclepius. It is these processes that I will now examine.

First, unlike the Erythraean paeans written in dactylic meters, Isyllus' song uses stichic lyric meters, ionics.⁶⁵⁶ While not attested in any other paeon of the classical period, the use of a stichic meter is particularly interesting, since it corresponds to the development of "literary" lyric in the Hellenistic period.⁶⁵⁷ In addition, the use of the *epiphthegma* (*iê paian, iê paian*) creates a sense of circular structure: the poem starts by a four-line introduction (injunction to sing the god Ἴε Παῖνα θεὸν and

⁶⁵⁶ According to Wilamowitz, Isyllus' lines are very close to Attic dithyrambs. The ionics might be used in processional lyric, as underlined by W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol. 2), 183, citing a parallel with "Aeschylus' *Suppliants* 1018-1073, a long processional hymn composed almost entirely of *ionici a minore*; id. *Cho.* 827-830, an ephymnion accompanying Orestes' attack in his mother."

⁶⁵⁷ On which, see the introduction of M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter 2004, concisely situating lyric composition in the rest of the literary panorama of the Hellenistic period.

introduction of the myth, l. 37) and closes on a four-line conclusion (cry *ἰὲ παιάν ἰὲ παιάν*, celebration of Asclepius and injunction for him to bless the city with health, ll. 56-7). This sense of unity within the poem is also reinforced by the emphasis on the local aspect of the song: it starts with an initial address to the people of Epidaurus (*λαοὶ ἐνναέται τᾶσδ' Ἐπιδαύρου*, l. 37) and concludes on an address to the god (*τὰν σὰν Ἐπίδουρον ματρόπολιν αὔξων*, 54-55) and the first hero introduced in the myth is Phlegyas, *ὅς πατρίδ' Ἐπίδουρον ἔναιεν*, 41-42.

Despite the use of those typical paeanic markers, the whole song is concerned with legitimizing the use of the paean form for Asclepius. First, unlike other hymns, this song has no real ‘cletic’ address to the god. There is no enumeration of adjectives qualifying the deity;⁶⁵⁸ after the initial *Ἰὲ Παιᾶνα θεὸν*, there is only one address to Apollo (*ὦ Φοῖβ' Ἀπολλων*, 39) and Asclepius’ ‘definition’ only comes 18 lines after the beginning of the song: *τὸν νόσων πύστωρα, δωτῆρ ἕγειρας, μέγα δῶρημα βροτοῖς* (52-53).⁶⁵⁹ This leads to the final (and only) direct address to Asclepius, qualified by *Ἰὲ Παιάν*, 56). This scarcity of direct address to Asclepius is to be linked with the confusion between the identity of Apollo and Asclepius: from the opening line, the dedicatee of the song remains undefined. It starts with *Παιᾶνα θεὸν* (37) but the direct address shifts from Apollo (39) to an indefinite second person singular (*σέβομαι σε*, 48) (still referring to Apollo), then it shifts from an reference to Asclepius in the 3rd person singular (*νιν ... Ἀσκληπιὸν*, 51) to an address in the second person singular (*Ἄσκληπιέ, σὺν ματρόπολιν*, 54). The assimilation of the two gods is

⁶⁵⁸ In contrast with the Erythraean paeans, which open with *Παιᾶνα κλυτόμητιν Λατοίδαν Ἑκατον...* (1-2) and the Homeric Hymn to Asclepius: *ἰητῆρα νόσων* (1), *κακῶν θελκτῆρ ὀδυνῶν* (4).

⁶⁵⁹ An expression comparable to the Erythraean paeans: *μέγα χάριμα βροτοῖσιν* (4) and to the Homeric Hymn to Asclepius: *χάριμα μέγ' ἀνθρώποισι* (4).

thus very gradual, and never taken for granted. This illustrates the same point already described in regard of the Erythraean paeans: by delaying the prayer to the god and the string of adjectives defining the god, Isyllus ‘goes aetiological.’ He does not deliver a formalized prayer but reproduces, with the narrative progression, the creation of Asclepius, the local god, not only in the myth that he relates (or invents), but in the song he composes. It is only when Asclepius is born (in the chronological progression of the poem) that the god gets his adjectives (cessator of pains, great boon for mortals, etc.). The adjectives do not precede his being made a god. This is why the local aspect is so important: Isyllus singles out this poem by making the song as ‘local’ as possible, and thus goes back to the origins of singing a paean to Asclepius.⁶⁶⁰

For this legitimization of the paean form plays at another level: Isyllus strives to emphasize Asclepius’ Epidaurian origins. While in other songs, the myth part is usually introduced after a direct address to the god with a relative pronoun, Isyllus presents the myth as already a ‘tradition’: φάτις ἐνέπουσ’ ἦλυθ’ ἐς ἀκοὰς (39).⁶⁶¹ It is part of the

⁶⁶⁰ There are two additional verbal parallels with Pindar that make me incline to think that Isyllus was very conscious of the tradition he was working with, but transformed it to make it as local as possible. In a couple of instances, Isyllus takes an expression Pindar uses in his version of the story but changes it for a crucial detail. The first one is the contrast between Pindar (Pythian 3, 11): Εἰς Αἶδα δόμον ἐν θαλάμῳ κατέβη and Isyllus (48-49) ἐμ Μάλου δόμοις παρθενίαν ὄραν ἔλυσε / λεχέων δ’ ἡμεροέντων ἐπέβη. The two movements are opposed, the descent to the house of Hades and the ascension to fame for Malos. The second one is the adjective / substantive ματρόπολιν (59): the adjective appears in Pindar’s *Pythian* 3, but in a different meaning. While in the ode it applies to Eleithuia (Ματροπόλῳ σὺν Ἐλειθυίᾳ, 9) and describes ‘the one who revolves around the mother,’ in Isyllus, it designates Epidaurus (ματρόπολιν ἀΰξων, 58), the mother city (the most important concept of the paean). A. Kolde 237-253 on “la poésie et le genre littéraire.”

⁶⁶¹ W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001 (vol. 2), 188: “If this were true it would be an interesting reference to oral transmission of a sacred legend; Sineux (1999, 166) suggests that the reference to oral tradition (whether existent or not) is intended to lend his account the dignity of cyclic epic. It is precisely because of the fluidity of oral tradition that inscriptions on temples and statues have the power either to fix existing traditions or establish new ones. Interest in written records on stone begins in the 5th century (Hdt. 1.51, 3.88, etc.; Thuc. 6.54.7) and culminates in Hellenistic works such as Philochorus’ collection of Attic epigrams of Crateros’ ψηφισμάτων συναγωγή with historical commentary. Isyllus’ appeal to oral transmission of course allows him to relate a version of Asclepius’ descent without naming authorities or sources.”

local aetiology, and, I propose, part of the fiction of the origins and inscription of the paean: this local mythology of Asclepius is closely tied with the prose inscription (describing the institution of the sanctuary of Malos), and with the next section (his arêtology, and his having revealed himself already to the inhabitants of Epidaurus). The narrative portion of the paean itself picks up Asclepius' genealogy further upstream than any other paean: although no other version of the myth confirms this, Zeus is said to have betrothed the Muse Erato to Malos, a native of Epidaurus. Isyllus thus denies the Arcadian origin that Pindar for example gives Coronis' lover (ξένου ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίας, *Pythian* 3, 25-26) or the Thessalian origins that Pausanias attributes him (Pausanias 2. 26. 3-6). Finally, with the list of meaningful names of female figures, Isyllus insists on the legitimacy of Asclepius:⁶⁶² the whole inscription shows constant concern over naming and inscribing, and it is significant that the heroic Kleo-PHEME and the radiant Aigla, elsewhere unattested in Asclepius' genealogy, are announced or picked up in other part of the inscription and myth of Asclepius: "Aigla" (the etymology that Isyllus gives for Asclepius) is announced in αἴγλαισεν (28), and connotations of her name are picked up in the reference to bright health (ἐναργῆ ὑγίειαν, 55), the brilliant arms (λαμπόμενος χρυσεόις, 64) and bright words (ἔλεξας

⁶⁶² On this aspect, see A. Kolde 2003, 160-161. While in the Erythraean paean, the myth part was concerned with the descendents of Asclepius (and their connection with the boons that praying to Asclepius provides), in Isyllus' paean, the legitimacy of Asclepius' power comes from his parents, and the god's name justifies and legitimizes his power: no fewer than 4 terms in 3 lines underline the process of naming the god, and thus justify his connection with Epidaurus (43-45) Κλεοφήμα δ' ὀνομάσθη· Εγ δὲ Φλεγύα γένετο Αἴγλα δ' ὀνομάσθη· τόδ' ἐπώνυμον τὸ κάλλος δὲ Κορωνίς δὲ Κορωνίς ἐπεκλήθη. The same process is repeated a few lines later (50-51): ἐπικλήσιν δὲ νιν Αἴγλας ματρὸς Ἀσκλαπιὸν ὀνόμαζ' Ἀπόλλων...

ἐναργῆ, 67) in the last part,⁶⁶³ and Κλεο-φήμα (43), Asclepius' grand-mother, is introduced by the φάτις (38) and picked up by σώτειραν φήμαν (75) in the next part.

While some parts of the inscription share many characteristics with other epigraphic forms (especially the *lex sacra*),⁶⁶⁴ and while the paean could have been inscribed without any other justification (like the Erythraean paean), Isyllus constructs a framework where the inscription justifies its own existence, and where the paean is the centre-piece of a larger poetic project. It is not simply the recording of a song sung by the community, there is something of a real individual imprint on the text (underlined, perhaps clumsily, in the last part of the inscription where the poet underlines his special connection with the god). The object (the stele) reproduces all the steps in the socio-political and religious project of Isyllus: thus, even the inscription of the paean is ratified by the Pythian oracle's approval. This Delphic approval (described in the prose section) serves not only a religious and political purpose, but also a (legitimizing) literary purpose: the inscription is about its own creation and displays a poetic self-consciousness and awareness both of its materiality and its literariness that is typical of Hellenistic poets.⁶⁶⁵

⁶⁶³ It is also reinforced by the use of the light imagery, first with the then with the shiny arms, 63-64 (ὄπλοισιν λαμπόμενος χρυσεόις) and the words of the gods themselves, described (67) as. The text insists on the colours: after the shining of Aigla, there is the gold of Phoibos' bow and his hair.

⁶⁶⁴ On this aspect, see A. Kolde's very useful comparative study of other *leges sacrae*, 107-113.

⁶⁶⁵ In the conclusion of her (over-generalizing) article "Is Isyllos of Epidaurus' Poetry Typically Hellenistic?," A. Kolde states: "as opposed to false epigraphy much in vogue in Hellenistic epigram, Isyllos' text is a real inscription, concerned with the spreading of political and religious messages. (...) In this sense Isyllos is not concerned with the construction of new poetics, and we are probably closer to a general level of cultural awareness than to the 'reality effect' created by elite literary production" (163). Then come two successive qualifications: "But, in general, the incorporation of 'modern' Hellenistic features in Isyllos' poetry is relatively limited. However, it is important to be aware of the complexities in Isyllos' poetry so that we don't ignore what it actually owes to the wider context of early Hellenistic culture as a whole" (163-164). This series of slightly contradictory qualifiers in the conclusion is a symptom of Kolde's uneasiness with the nature of Isyllus' project. In her 2003 book, she offers a much more convincing conclusion.

There is one last type of legitimizing strategy that Isyllus relies on, and that contributes to throwing into relief the originality of the paean. By using distinctively different metric patterns in its different sections, the whole inscription stages its own modes of performance, from inscription in prose to hexametric poetry (the meter used for stone or literary epigrams), and from spoken meters (trochaic tetrameters) to sung rhythms (ionics). Indeed, the opening trochaic tetrameters where Isyllus states his belief in aristocracy (1-2), echo the voice of Solon the nomothete:

δᾶμος εἰς ἀριστοκρατίαν ἄνδρας αἰ προάγοι καλῶς,
αὐτὸς ἰσχυρότερος ὀρθοῦται γὰρ ἐξ ἀνδραγαθίας.

if the people leads its men well towards aristocracy, it is itself stronger: for it sets itself straight from manly goodness.

The topic, the vocabulary and diction, and the assertive tone (each couplet seems like a *gnome*) recall Solon's poetry in general, and specifically Solon's fragment 6 W, a couplet that employs the same three key words (*dēmos*, *agein*, and *aristos*) in an optative statement:⁶⁶⁶

δῆμος δ' ὦδ' ἂν ἄριστα σὺν ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἔποιτο,
μήτε λίην ἀνεθείς μήτε βιαζόμενος·

may the people follow the best things with leaders, neither let too lose nor oppressed.

Additionally, the idea of right measure expressed by Solon in the passage quoted above is the idea set forth by Isyllus in the next two lines (3-4):⁶⁶⁷

αἰ δέ τις καλῶς προαχθεὶς θιγγάνοι πονηρίας
πάλιν ἐπαγκρούων, κολάζων δᾶμος ἀσφαλέστερος.

⁶⁶⁶ Even more than the idea of leadership of the *demos* (δῆμον ἄγειν, found three times in Solon), it is the structure of the line that reminds of Solon's diction: out of the 10 times Solon uses the substantive δῆμος, 7 are instances where δῆμος is the first word of the line.

⁶⁶⁷ The idea of straightening is itself found in another Solonian fragment (fr. 4 W: εὐθύνει δὲ δίκας σκολιάς, ὑπερήφανά τ' ἔργα πραύνει).

If someone raised well, however, touches baseness, it is by putting him back on track and chastising him that the people will be more secure.

This resemblance all point to Isyllus' attempt to portray himself as a Solon figure: by presenting himself as both poet and nomothete, especially in the lines τάνδε τὰν γνώμαν τόκ' ἦχον καὶ νῦν λέγω (7), he claims for himself the authority of Solon and thus justifies his own literary project.

This idea that Isyllus claims for himself the authority of other poets by borrowing from different poetic forms is confirmed by his use of dactylic hexameters for the most authoritative statements. In the B part (10-26) Isyllus describes (in the 3rd person) the institution of his sacred law (10-11):

τόνδ' ἱαρόν θείαι μοίραι νόμον ἤρυν Ἴσυλλος
ἄφθιτον ἀέναον γέρας ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.

This sacred law in accordance with divine providence Isyllus founded, eternal and undying part of honour to the immortal gods.

By qualifying the law ἄφθιτον ἀέναον γέρας for the gods, with an adjective ἄφθιτον that is usually associated with the *kleos* of heroes, Isyllus keys the audience in the heroic world and bestows the weight of epic and foundation poetry onto the law. At the same time, by juxtaposing his own name at the end of the line with ἄφθιτον ἀέναον γέρας at the beginning of the next one, Isyllus guarantees himself 'by proxy' a part of this honour and the authority of the epic bard. The Homeric tone of the passage is confirmed by the last reference, to loud-sounding Zeus (εὐρύοπα Ζεύς), who may take care of the citizens if the Epidaurians respect this law from season to season.

Thus, all the elements of the inscription reinforce each other and contribute to making it, through its metric diversity, a cohesive politico-religious, and literary project: the sacred law being ratified "not without the gods" justifies the performance

of the paean, the paean asserts the local origin of the god and his cult, and its inscription is ratified by the Pythian oracle - even Isyllus' word is ratified by his special position vis-à-vis the god.⁶⁶⁸

From these remarks, I would like to conclude that this fascinating poem, one of the testimonies of the continuation of lyric practice in continental Greece at the end of the fourth century, is also a rich literary experiment: in addition to justifying the use of the paean form for Asclepius, Isyllus makes the inscription the testimony of its own creation. To achieve this, he uses the forms of poetry that give the most legitimacy to his statements, and each section of the text relates to another one. Without seeing Isyllus as a pre-Alexandrian critic holding a prescriptive idea of genres, Isyllus uses the most traditional meter (and diction) for the topic to legitimize his enterprise. Rather than seeing his activity at the end of a process of paean writing, in a culture where lyric practice has lost social function, Isyllus can be seen as innovating: it is not an “automatic” use of the paean, but quite the opposite, a context-based understanding of genre. What makes genre is not a series of formal features but features that are associated in the audience's mind with a certain topic and the function of a certain type

⁶⁶⁸ Depending on how one interprets the ὁ παῖς, either Isyllus as a boy or Isyllus accompanying his son received a sign from the god that he was under his protection. When the god speaks to Isyllus, he does so in a way that recalls the preceding parts of the inscription itself, especially in the *μαντευσάμενος Λυκοῦργος* (71), that echoes the *Ἴσυλλος ἐπέθηκε μαντεύσασθαι* (32), and in the address to the god (74: ὦ μέγ' ἄριστε θεῶν), which uses the political vocabulary of the first lines (3, ἀριστοκρατίαν, 14, ἀριτεύουσι) moreover, ἄριστος is rarely used for a god, and the record of the virtue of the god is done in words that remind of the virtue of the good citizen. This retrospective form of “Dichterweihe,” on the model of Hesiod's, Archilochus' or Callimachus' account of their meeting with the god when they were young, is more an aretology of Isyllus than an aretology of Asclepius and retrospectively provides the audience with a framework of reception for Isyllus' law and the whole project.

of poetry: authoritative statements in hexameters, inscriptions in elegiac couplets, song in stichic meters, dedications in prose...⁶⁶⁹

While Kolde presents Isyllus as a pre-Alexandrian poet, conscious of the limits of the genre and using “erudition”, I would be more hesitant in using “pre-Alexandrian” – for one, because Isyllus might very well compose in the Alexandrian period, but mostly because the context in which he composes (a stele dedication, not a book) does not seem to presuppose a select audience ready for elaborate games. This poem was inscribed on a stone in Epidaurus, for people of the town, and undoubtedly also for people visiting the sanctuary: it is not erudition that the poem supposes, but a common knowledge of the archaic models.⁶⁷⁰ It provides us with the interesting case of an (aspiring? Itinerant?) poet whose work has only been transmitted by this inscription: the text of the paean itself (whether traditional or composed by Isyllus himself) is embedded in a complex framework that provides both indications about the actual performance context of the paean (a procession) and about its other uses (inscribed paean to be read by the reader of the inscription in Epidaurus, celebrating the arête of Asclepius).

3- New Song for old god: Philodamus of Scarpheia’ Paean to Dionysus

The last text that I would like to present, a “paean to Dionysus”, seems to be an “old song for a new god”; it breaks down the age-long opposition (presented, most

⁶⁶⁹ Other hypotheses can be envisaged: the inscribed paean could be the record of an archaic song, performed by Isyllus, who ‘legitimized’ the song with an imagined performance context? It is also possible that the ‘context’ was added and engraved around the old paean – a case not unparalleled, see for example the Serapion monument, on which J. Oliver 1936).

⁶⁷⁰ The main objection is “L’importance du sanctuaire d’Epidaure pour la poésie fournit un élément: jeux pentétériques, Asclepieia, qui comprenaient des concours musicaux” (Edelstein and Edelstein 1945: 208-211) and Plato *Ion* 530a.

famously, in the passage of the *Laws* quoted above) between paean for Apollo / dithyramb for Dionysus. The 156-line composition was inscribed on the (sixth) temple of Apollo in Delphi, which was reconstructed between 370 and 320 BC, after its destruction in 373 BC.⁶⁷¹ The prose *subscriptio* gives the name of the dedicators: Δελοφοὶ ἔδωκαν Φιλοδάμ[ωι Αἰν]ησιδάμου Σκαρφεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς Ἐπι[γ]ένει - Philodamus of Skarpheus and his brothers. As for the date of the inscription, it is given as under the archonship of Etymondas, of which the date has been established by B. Rainer as 340/39 BC.⁶⁷² The poem is a twelve-strophe song that combines aeolic and ionic meters. Each strophe is composed of a first 4-line part, then the appeal (line 5 of each strophe) to Εὐοῖ ᾧ ἰὸ Βάκχ', ᾧ ἰὲ Παῖάν (cry 'Euhoi, Io Bacchos, Ie Paian!) followed by a 5-line text that concludes with a refrain.

The poem starts by an invocation of Dionysus, with a prayer either to come (δεῦρε)⁶⁷³ or to listen (κλῦθι)⁶⁷⁴: in both reconstructions, the emphasis is on creating direct contact between god and performer. Strophes 2, 3 and 5 describe the god's birth in Thebes, the joy brought by his birth, and his reception in various places, first Delphi, then Eleusis, finally Thessaly and Olympus. In stanza 9, after a break of three unrecoverable stanzas, the poem switches from mythical past to contemporary context: it points to two different types of real life settings: the reconstruction of the temple of Apollo (specifically 105, when Apollo orders the Amphictyons to attend to “the matter” (that is, the reconstruction) fast. In the same stanza, the poet refers to the second real life context, the festival on the occasion of which the paean was performed,

⁶⁷¹ On Philodamus, see W. Vollgraff 1924; J. Powell 1925, 164-171; B. Rainer 1975; A. Stewart 1982; L. Käppel 1992, 207-284, 375-380; W. Furley and J. Bremer 2001, (vol. 1) 121-128; (vol. 2) 53-84.

⁶⁷² B. Rainer 1975, 75-141.

⁶⁷³ In Powell's reconstruction of the first line of the text.

⁶⁷⁴ In Wilamowitz's reconstruction.

the Theoxenia, where sacrifices are made for all the gods and prayers sung for the prosperity of the place.⁶⁷⁵ In stanza 10-11, the poet turns to the future: it starts by a *makarismos*, and glorifies the honours given to Dionysus (temple, statue, and competition in dithyrambs) while the twelfth and last stanza addresses a plural you to welcome (δέχεσθε) Dionysos and dance in the honour of the lord of health.

My interest in the paean is for what it might tell us about an otherwise unknown poet, Philodamus of Scarpheia, his interpretation of the tradition of paean writing and his justification of the use of the paean form to sing Dionysus. Two aspects are striking: on the one hand the paean's use of 'cultic' markers (the use of a refrain, the use of many of the god's epithets and the reference to the contemporary context of performance); on the other hand, its remarkable poetic memory and description of mythical musical performance. Following the masterful exegesis by Käppel, I would like to show how the paean carefully negotiates the adaptation of the genre to Dionysus, and how it uses the rhetoric of the paean to legitimize what seems to be a religious innovation (year-round dithyrambic singing at Delphi).

As opposed to the paean to Asclepius described above, where Asclepius is gradually "made" Paian through the poem, Philodamus introduces Dionysus as Paian right from the start, without any justification: the poem starts like a cletic hymn (1-3):

Δεῦρ' ἄνα Διθύραμβε, Βάκχ'
Εὔιε, Ταῦρε κισσοχάι-
τα, Βρόμι' ...

Come here, lord Dithyrambos, Bacchos, Euios, ivy-crowned Tauros, Bromios...

⁶⁷⁵ The same festival Pindar's Sixth Paean was composed for and for which he uses the same kind of expression: θύεται γὰρ ἀγλαῆς ὑπὲρ Πανελλά-/δος, (62-3).

In the first line, Διθύραμβε sounds like the poem's generic signature, and all the epithets (Bacchos, Euios, even Tauros) are familiar from cultic contexts.⁶⁷⁶ Dithyrambos are certainly not foreign to Delphi: the connection of Dionysus with the seat of the Apollinian oracle is old, and attested already in Bacchylides (Dithyramb 16) where the poet describes how for the three winter months, dithyrambos are sung at Delphi in honour of Dionysus.⁶⁷⁷ But our poem transforms this traditional association, and signals it from the start with the mention of spring flowers (ἱεραῖς ἐν ὄραιοις, 4): just as these *spring* songs are 'un-seasonal' for Dionysus in Delphi, a *paean* for Dionysus is quite unnatural.

The *meshymnion* and the refrain already announce the conflation between the two gods, Apollo and Dionysus, with the repeated use of the ritual cries and adjectives issued from them: the first adjective εὔιος (2 and 6) derives from the cry Εὐοῖ (found in the meshymnion, 5) and is remarkably close to the adjective associated with Apollo (εὐαίων, found for example in the refrain to Ion's paean in Euripides' *Ion* 126 and 142). So the blending of the two genres starts at the aural level, but reveals much deeper poetic dynamics: it is the process of calling Dionysus Paian that is problematized.

With the relative pronoun that introduces the mythic narrative (from 6 to 105), Apollo and Dionysus start blending. Not only is the poet silent about the modalities of the (double) birth of Dionysus, and about the pains of Semele, but even the birth itself

⁶⁷⁶ For tauros as a cultic adjective, *PMG* 871.

⁶⁷⁷ Bacchylides 16, 11-12: τόσα χοροὶ Δελφῶν / σὸν κελάδησαν παρ' ἀγκαλέα ναόν. On which Maehler 2004: "According to Plutarch (*Mor.* 398c), the Delphians performed paeans with their sacrifices during most of the year, but from the beginning of winter they replaced the paean by the dithyramb for three months, calling on Dionysos instead of Apollo." Also I. Rutherford 2001, 88-90; D. Fearn 2007, 171-174.

is described in terms that recall that of Apollo.⁶⁷⁸ Moreover, later in the poem, Dionysus himself is described in terms that remind one of Apollo: he is the one shining (φαίνων, 22) and with the starry appearance (ἀστερόεν δέμας, 21), a visual conflation of the two gods that is even more strongly emphasized in the tenth stanza (with the reference to the golden imagery).⁶⁷⁹ The same is true of Dionysus' welcome: there is no mention of his hostile reception at Thebes as retold for example in the Homeric Hymn to Dionysus or the *Bacchae*.

The syncretism between Apollo and Dionysus thus functions at the lexical, narrative, and visual level; there is nothing that differentiates Dionysus' birth, and by the same token, there is no reference to the most "marked" forms of the gods: Semele is called by her more obscure name Thione (also in the Hymn to Dionysus), and the name of Dionysus is only introduced in the twelfth strophe, as if the paean could just not accommodate the name "Dionysus", just as it cannot accommodate "Phoibos" Apollo.

So the use of adjectives, and the myth, show that there is a real concern, and negotiation, of the way Dionysus can be represented as Apollo. This concern for legitimization is reproduced on a grander scale, through the exploration of the issue of performance, that culminates in the fifth stanza. Dances start with the birth of the god,

⁶⁷⁸ The reference to beautiful children is usually a marker of Leto (εἰ μὴ σε Λητώ καλλιπαις ἐγείνατο Trag. Adep. F 178 Sn.-Kn.); τὸν Λατοῦς εὐπαιδα γόνον (Euripides, *Hercules Furens*, 689) There are even some lexical echoes of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo and the birth and welcome of Apollo (listed by Käppel 1992, 230): σὲ ... Λητώ τέκε χάριμα βροτοῖσι (25), χαῖρε δὲ Δῆλος (61), Δῆλος μὲν μάλα χαῖρε γόνῳ ἐκάτοιο ἄνακτος (90), μείδησε δελ γαῖ ὑπένερθεν (118), θεαὶ δ' ὀλόλυξαν ἅπασαι (119), χαῖρε δ' Λητώ (125).

⁶⁷⁹ On the imagery of Apollo and Dionysus, and the blending of the two, A. Stewart 1982, 210 (on the statue of Dionysos at Delphi, from the West pediment of the sixth temple of Apollo at Delphi): "in this statue, then, one may perhaps recognize Dionysos confronting the viewer with the evidence that it is he who has attained true insight into the real meaning of the ancient Apolline virtues, texts of which were of course prominently displayed on the temple." 213-214: "in this statue [of the Cyrene Apollo], Apollo and Dionysos have become totally fused into one for the first time since the composition on the Delphi temple, a century and a half earlier."

with mortals and gods expressing their joy (χάρην σαῖς γένναις, 9-10) by choral dancing (χόρευσαν, 8-9). The mention of *charis* allows expressing two ideas, that of joy, but also that of worship and functions as a generic marker. The aural proximity of the two activities (χάρην and χόρευσαν) placed in the same position in the line, is used again in the next stanza, when the μάκαιρα χώρα of line 20 echoes the end of the previous line, χόρευεν again (19). The motif of dance thus allows joining the traditional forms of Dionysiac celebration, the wild bacchic, (“neo-dithyrambic”?) dance that Thebes dances, 14, and that Eleusis dances, 28) and the more ordered choral song (ὕμνοβρύης, 19, and maiden songs, 22). The fifth strophe introduces the last kind of choral dancing, the most important one: the circular dance of the Muses under the musical leadership of Apollo (59). It brings to completion a central aspect of the poem, since it *stages* the attribution of the term “Paian” used so far without any strategy of justification to qualify Dionysus: “they all sang and danced around you, proclaiming you to be ‘Forever immortal and famous Paian.’”

Just as the singing of the Erythraean paean made Asclepius come into being Paian, the singing of Philodamus’ poem re-enacts the decision of making Dionysus “Paian” by Apollo. While up to this point in the text, the poem was extending the refrain “iê paian, come saviour,” after the description of Apollo’s performative language, the use of the refrain is fully legitimized, since it is Apollo himself who made Dionysus Paian.

Do these references to song and dance tell us anything about the actual context of performance of the song? As opposed to what is happening in Isyllus’ song, there is no reference to the materiality of the text itself, no appeal to the reader of the

inscription, no apparent switch in the narrative voice between a poetic “I” and the description of the performance of the paean. On the one hand, just as in Pindaric paeans, the dancing described in the song could reproduce the dancing that the performers are engaged in, at the Theoxenia in honour of Dionysus at Delphi.⁶⁸⁰ As Rutherford has presented, one of the theories about the performance of Pindaric paeans is that the description of the performance context allows future audiences, who obviously are not on the original site of performance, to see the song-and-dance as if it were taking place.⁶⁸¹ But this is not the description of an actual locale, since it is taking place on the occasion of the birth of the god, and the mention of the places does not correspond to any actual procession route. On the other hand, this process of description could be close to “choral projection” (a term that A. Henrichs used mainly of tragedy), to describe the use, by the poet, of choral imagery to project the activity of the performers onto another, imagined, chorus. But rather than any reference to performance in this part of the poem, I prefer to see this song-and-dance description as meant to legitimize the very form of the song, a paean to Dionysus authorized by Apollo himself. Information about the actual context of performance should be looked for in the next stanzas.

When the text is readable again, in stanza 9, the narration has moved from the mythical past to a form of mythical present. Stanzas 9, 10 and 11 are concerned with the reconstruction of the temple and the establishment of Dionysiac worship and future celebration of the god. Scholars have explained the significance of this part of the poem

⁶⁸⁰ On this aspect, see M. Vamvouri-Ruffy 2004, 190-193.

⁶⁸¹ I. Rutherford 2001, 58-68 on performance. About performance of paeans at the Thargelia, he points to the Ὀρχησταί, prominent Athenians who danced around the temple of Delian Apollo at the Thargelia and held συμπόσια (on which, see Athenaeus 10. 424 e-f).

in socio-political terms, and seen how Philodamus' paeon participated in Delphic propaganda. Maria Vamvouri-Ruffly is only one representative of many scholars who understate the poetic skills of Philodemus and focus on the pragmatic function of the song:⁶⁸²

Etant donné son statut réflexif par rapport à ce qui se fait dans le présent culte et sa valeur d'argument par rapport à ce qui doit être fait à l'avenir, on peut raisonnablement penser que la biographie divine a subi dans son contenu l'impact du contexte historique de la performance du *Péan*. (...) On doit donc tenir compte de la relation dialectique qui existe entre ce texte et le contexte de sa performance. (...)
En un mot, le péan visait à légitimiser une pratique culturelle émergente à Delphes, et d'autre part à hater l'achèvement du temple.

This judgement seems to ignore the whole rhetorical and poetic strategy of the composition: it is only because the order comes from Apollo that Dionysus can be called Paian, and that there can be a competition in dithyrambos. The song thus finishes where it has started, with the appeal to "dithyrambe". We now realize that initially calling Dionysus "Dithyrambe" and having him associated with all his dithyrambic paraphanelia was a sign of the power and authority of Apollo.⁶⁸³

So Philodamus does not apply the "form" that sings Apollo to celebrate Dionysos but constructs a framework to call the god paeon by mixing the imagery and narrative used for the two gods. This legitimization of the celebration of the Dionysos at Delphi in the spring season of the Theoxenia is achieved by mixing several poetic models (from the cultic dithyramb usually attributed to Dionysus, to narratives recalling the Homeric Hymns for example) and by the traditional reference to choral dancing used in archaic paeans.

⁶⁸² M. Vamvouri-Ruffly 2004, 206. In other part of her analysis however Vamvouri-Ruffly points out Philodamus' poetic memory, for example 196-7.

⁶⁸³ On this point, see M. Vamvouri-Ruffly 2004, 190-191.

Conclusion to section 3

At the term of this survey of fourth-century paeans and hymns, is it possible to answer the questions that I had set out at the beginning? Is there something like a “new” paean? Genre-theorists like Käppel and Schröder have argued in very different ways against this by interpreting the fourth-century texts as either cult poetry, or “automatized” poetry, but I hope to have shown that these texts are in themselves literary experiments, and attest to the inherent adaptability of the paean in its use by some fourth-century poets. On the one hand, the paeans we have read are paeans for “new” gods (or rather gods untraditionally celebrated by paeans); on the other hand, they are careful experiments in negotiating the enlargement of the scope of the paean genre. Poets use traditional poetic techniques and the rhetorical dynamic of the paean itself to legitimize their adapting the paean form to new gods, Asclepius or Dionysus, and abstraction, like Health (as seen in the previous chapter). Rather than being testimonies of the recycling of old cult poetry (by nature un-innovative and repeating the same set of formulas that have pleased the gods before), these compositions, I suggest, are new songs that can be read as testimonies for the poetic creativity of minor fourth-century poets adapting to new religious needs (singing Asclepius or Dionysus in a new context).

My second hope is that I have started presenting a much more composite picture of hymnic lyric in the fourth century than usually presented, and began unsettling some firmly rooted binary oppositions that mark our understanding our lyric poetry: the dichotomy between dithyramb for Dionysus and paeans for Apollo; the distinction between cult poetry and literature, and even the opposition between

canonical composition, and more popular literature. What these texts do ultimately, is to allow us a different view on literary history, one that has not passed through the “filter” of Alexandrian scholars and Athenaeus’s compilation. Plato’s view of lyric subgenres (as presented in the *Laws*) thus ends up being justified: the forms of paeon and dithyramb do mix, but not so much as a result of decadence after a golden age of pure forms but as a result of the use and manipulation of the flexibility of the form and its adaptation to new needs.

CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters, I have presented and analysed various aspects of the surviving corpus of lyric texts composed between 425 and 323 BC. Two thirds of the evidence (texts and testimonies) is related to the New Music phenomenon, (and in this number, most of the evidence concerns a handful of poets – Melanippides, Cinesias, Timotheus, Philoxenus, Telestes – and musicians – Phrynis, Stratonicus and Pronomus –) and emphasizes the introduction, at the end of the fifth century, of technical, musical and poetic innovations, and of a break in the tradition of song-and-dance. But a close examination of the remaining texts and testimonies, including of the poetic inscriptions, suggests a much more complex relationship between tradition and innovation. What emerges from a reading of these two sets of texts (literary and epigraphic) is a many-faceted picture of lyric composition and performance in the fourth century.

In my analysis of the poems, I have showed a constant back-and-forth between tradition and innovation operating in five domains. The first is the image of the New Musician, and the function that this figure plays in the discourse about innovation. Among the many anecdotes told about the New Musician, a distinctive trend emerges: the New Musician is presented as inverting the values that defined the relationship between poet and society in the archaic and early-classical period, as upsetting traditional institutions (such as the symposium, the transmission of wisdom literature, and the economical ties with a patron), and introducing a form of democratic discourse (emphasizing political *parrhesia*, *isonomia* and economic independence of the poet). The poet is featured as underlining the changes between archaic and classical times,

and speaking as a representative of democratic values in front of foreign tyrants, while at the same time negotiating a change in the place he occupies in Athenian society.

The dialectic relationship between tradition and innovation plays at a second level: in the New Musicians' presentation of their own innovations, and in their critics' reception of their discourse on tradition and innovation (starting with Plato and Aristotle). On the one hand, the New Musicians legitimize their technical and musical innovations with a complex "rhetoric of the new": not only do they refer to ancient tropes (like that of novelty, or *poikilia*) to refer to their musical novelty, but they also use old poetic material in a new way. On the other hand, Imperial authors writing about the history of *mousikê* do not hesitate to take these claims at face value to underline the demise of music in the fourth century. I have showed how numerous modern critics have relied on these sources to describe the diachronic evolution of *mousikê* and proposed an ideologically biased story of the "demise of lyric" in the late-classical period: I have argued that far from experiencing decline, the fourth century had a very active tradition of lyric composition and performance, especially in the field of theatre music.

In the fourth chapter, I have underlined how the style of late-classical lyric, which is most often taken as a sign of the decadence of lyric poetry in the late-classical period encapsulates the poetics of New Music: its distinctiveness comes not simply from verbal or metrical innovations, but from the combination of traditional vocabulary and traditional meters into complex and versatile sequences of images and rhythms. This is where the specificity of fourth-century dithyrambic style comes from: the poets rely on a synaesthetic poetics, combining a variety of sensual nuances (usually

conveyed by the means of adjectives) into one image, and working in long, extended paradigms. I have examined how these images work in the longest extant examples of the genre (Timotheus' *Persians* and, I argue, Philoxenus' *Dinner*) and suggested that this way of thinking about the images is the most productive one to understand the poetics of some fragments. Moreover, an examination of the themes treated by the New Poets (minor heroes, love and romance, and the East) has showed how the poets chose to develop new aspects of old themes, or emphasize new themes (especially the bucolic, that anticipate the interests of the Hellenistic poets).

In the fifth chapter, I have analysed the sociological changes associated with the symposium in the late-classical period, and showed how several subgenres of lyric still belonged to the world of the symposium, and how some subgenres (erotic songs) seem to have been introduced (or at least radically transformed from what might have preceded them) in the fourth century. Moreover, I have shown how the symposium is not simply the context of performance that accounts for the genre of poetry, but also how it becomes itself a motive in different genres: its themes are transferred on the public stage of the dithyramb (as in Philoxenus' *Dinner*), and the rhetorical force of the notion of the symposium as performance context is used by Aristotle and Aripbron in two poems to negotiate tradition and innovation (songs to abstractions).

In the last chapter, I have focused on some cultic inscriptions and underlined a fifth theme: how the "decline" or mechanisation that is often associated with fourth-century epigraphic poetry does not stand up to close scrutiny: not only do some of the fourth-century poetic features presented above appear in some "traditional" hymns, but

Conclusion

some hymns introducing innovations (like paeans to Dionysus or to Asclepius) can be read as skilful poetic projects legitimizing their own novelty.

Thus “tradition and innovation” has been a useful framework to understand issues related (but not limited) to fourth-century lyric in three interconnected fields. The first one is that of literary criticism: tradition and innovation, or, as A. Ford has elegantly put it, “the antithetical forces of repetition and difference” are what the notion of genre always puts in play, and dynamics that I have explored more specifically in relationship with the evolution of the genres of dithyramb and paean.⁶⁸⁴ The second field is that of cultural history; the notions of change and continuity are at the heart of the constantly evolving dynamic between song-and-dance and society, not only in the performance and reception of poetry, but also in the transmission of the image associated with the poet and in the discourse about *mousikê* in the city. The last field is that of reception and literary history; the notions of canon-making and canon-evolution, of the making of innovations into a tradition, and conversely of the rhetorical use of the motifs of old and new, allow accounting for the reception that the New Musicians received in their own time, and for the critical discourse that originated with them and continued in modern scholarship.

The expression ‘many-headed Muse’ encapsulates the complexity of the lyric poetry of the fourth century poetry. The compound adjective is a reference to the invention of the *nomos* that Pindar describes in one of his first epinicians (*Pythian* 12, 23: κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμον), but it is used in a new way: while Pindar uses it in

⁶⁸⁴ A. Ford 2006, 296.

Conclusion

reference to the naming of the nome after the many heads of the dying Medusa of the myth in *Pythian* 12, the compound adjective in my title refers to the many forms of lyric poetry that continued to be heard in the late-classical period. The use of an adjective that recalls the early-classical lyric tradition in order to legitimize innovation, the transformation of the way both adjective (many-headed) and model of inspiration (the Muse) are used and diverted from their original use, and the baroque image their conflation suggests illustrate some of the important poetic processes of fourth-century lyric poetry described in this dissertation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adrados, F. R., and M. V. Sakellariou (eds.) (1996). *Colloque international démocratie athénienne et culture*. Athens.
- Africa, T. W. (1995). 'Adam Smith, the Wicked Knight, and the Use of Anecdotes', *G&R* 42 (1): 70-75.
- Agapiou, N. (2005). *Endymion au carrefour: la fortune littéraire et artistique du mythe d'Endymion à l'aube de l'ère moderne*. Berlin.
- Agocs, P., C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds.) (forthcoming). *Proceedings of the Epinician Conference, London July 2006*.
- Aleshire, S. B. (1989). *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, Their Dedications, and the Inventories*. Amsterdam.
- (1991). *Asklepios at Athens: Epigraphic and Prosopographic Essays on the Athenian Healing Cults*. Amsterdam.
- Allan, W. (1999-2000). 'Euripides and the Sophists: Society and the Theatre of War', in Cropp, Lee and Sansone (eds.), 145-156.
- (2004) 'Religious Syncretism: The New Gods of Greek Tragedy', in *HSCP* 102: 113-155.
- Alonge, M. (2005). 'The Palaikastro Hymn and the Modern Myth of the Cretan Zeus', Princeton / Stanford Working Papers in Classics.
- Anderson, W. D. (1966). *Ethos and Education in Greek Music; the Evidence of Poetry and Philosophy*. Cambridge, Mass.
- (1994). *Music and Musicians in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca.
- Anello, P. (1984). 'Polifemo e Galatea', *Seia* 1: 11-51.
- Arnott, P. (1961). 'The Overworked Playwright. A Study in Euripides *Cyclops*', *Greece and Rome* 8.2: 164-169.
- Arrighetti, G. (1994). 'Riflessione sulla letteratura e biografia presso i Greci', in F. Montanari (ed.), *La Philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine - Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt*. Genève.
- Aston, E. (2004). 'Asclepius and the Legacy of Thessaly', *CQ* 54: 18-32.
- Audiat, J. (1932). 'L'hymne d'Aristonoos à Hestia', *BCH* 56: 299-312.
- Avezzù, G. (1994). 'Papyrus Hibeh i, 13: anonymi fragmentum de musica', *Musica e Storia* 2: 109-137.
- Bacon, H. (1961). *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy*. New Haven.
- Barlow, S. (1971). *The Imagery of Euripides: A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Images*. London.
- Barker, A. (1982). 'Innovations of Lysander the Kitharist', *CQ* 32: 266-269.

Bibliography

- (1984). *Greek Musical Writings: i. The Musician and his Art*. Cambridge.
- (1995). ‘*Heterophonia* and *Poikilia*: Accompaniments to Greek Melody’ in Gentili and Perusino (eds.), 41-60.
- (1998). ‘Telestes and the “Five-Rodded Joining of Strings”’, *CQ* 48.1: 75-81.
- (2000) ‘Athenaeus on Music’, in Braund and Wilkins (eds.), 434-444.
- Bartol, K. (1992). ‘Where Was Iambic Poetry Performed?: Some Evidence From the Fourth Century BC’, *CQ* 42: 65-71.
- (1992). ‘How was iambic Poetry Performed?: A Question of Ps.-Plutarch’s Reliability: (*De mus.* 1141 A)’, *Euphrosyne* 20: 269-276.
- (2004). ‘What did he do? Clearchus on Philoxenus (ap. Athenaeus 1.5f-6a = Clearch. Fr. 57 Wehrli)’, *CQ* 54: 292-296.
- Bassett, S. E. (1931). ‘The Place and Date of the First Performance of the *Persians* of Timotheus’, *CP* 26: 153-165.
- Battezzato, L. (2005). ‘The New Music of the *Trojan Women*’, *Lexis* 23: 73-104.
- Beck, M. (2000). ‘Anecdote and the Representation of Plutarch’s Ethos’ in L. Van der Stockt (ed.), *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch*. Paris, 15-32.
- Bélis, A. (1997). ‘Euripide Musicien’ in Pinault (ed.), 27-51.
- (1998). ‘Un « Ajax » et deux Timothée: (P. Berol. N° 6870)’, *REG* 111: 74-100.
- (1999). *Les Musiciens dans l’antiquité*. Paris.
- Bell, J. M. (1978). ‘κίμβιξ καὶ σοφός: Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition’, *QUCC* 28: 29-86.
- Benecke, E. F. M. (1896). *Antimachus of Colophon and the Position of Women in Greek Poetry*. London.
- Berglein, L. A. (1843). *De Philoxeno cytherio, dithyramborum poeta*. Göttingen.
- Beschi, L. (1992). ‘La democrazia e il mondo della musica’, in Adrados (ed.), 35-50.
- Betz, H. D. (ed.) (1978). *Plutarch’s Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*. Leiden.
- Bierl, A. (1991). *Dionysos und die griechische Tragödie: Politische und ‘metatheatralische’ Aspekte im Text*. Tübingen.
- Bing, P. (1985). ‘Kastorion of Soloi’s Hymn to Pan (*Supplementum Hellenisticum* 310)’, *AJP* 106: 502-509.
- (1988). *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Göttingen.
- Bipart, G. (1843). *Philoxeni, Timothei, Telestis dithyrambographorum reliquae. De eorum vita et arte commentatus est, carminum fragmenta collegit et explicuit*. Leipzig.

Bibliography

- Blok, J. H. and A. Lardinois (eds.) (2006). *Solon of Athens, New Historical and Philological Approaches*. Leiden and Boston.
- Boardman, J. (1956). 'Some Attic Fragments: Pot, Plaque, and Dithyramb', *JHS* 78: 18-25.
- Boedeker, D. and K. Raaflaub (eds.) (1998). *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*. Cambridge, Mass and London.
- Boedeker, D. and D. Sider (eds.) (2001). *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford and New York.
- Boegehold, A and A. Scafuro (eds.) (1994). *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*. Baltimore and London.
- Bolonyai, G. (1998). 'Lyric Genres in Aristotle's *Poetics*', *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 38: 27-39.
- Bommelaer, J.-F. (2005). 'Un peu d'air des îles à Delphes ?', *Ktêma* 25: 65-74.
- Bonaria, M. (1996). 'Le cosiddette "invenzioni" di Saffo nel campo della musica', *Humanitas* 48: 3-7.
- Borthwick, E. K. (1967). 'Some Problems in Musical Terminology', *CQ* 17: 145-157.
- (1968). 'Notes on the Plutarch *de Musica* and the *Cheiron* of Pherecrates', *Hermes* 96: 60-73.
- Bowerstock, G. (1995). 'The barbarism of the Greeks', *HSCP* 97: 3-14.
- Bowie, A. (1997). 'Thinking with Drinking: Wine and the Symposium in Aristophanes', *JHS* 117: 1-21.
- Bowie, E. (1986). 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106: 13-35.
- (1996). 'Plutarch's Citations of Early Elegiac and Iambic Poetry', in R. Palerm, C. Schrader, and J. Vela (eds), *Plutarco y la Historia: actas del V Simposio Español sobre Plutarco*, Zaragoza, 20-22 de junio de 1996. Zaragoza, 99-108.
- (2000). 'Athenaeus' Knowledge of Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry', in Braund and Wilkins (eds.), 124-135.
- Bowra, C. M. (1938). 'Aristotle's Hymn to Virtue', *CQ* 32: 182-189.
- (1963). 'Arion and the Dolphin', *Museum Helveticum* 20: 121-134.
- Brann, E. (2004). *The Music of the Republic: Essays on Socrates' Conversations and Plato's Writings*. Philadelphia.
- Braund, D., and J. Wilkins (eds.) (2000). *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Exeter.
- Brenner, G. (1949). *Die Polyphemdichtungen des Euripides, Kratinos und Philoxenos und ihr Verhältnis zur Odyssee*. Vienna.

Bibliography

- Brodie McDiarmid, J. (1987). 'Pindar *Olympian* 6.82-83: The Doxa, the Whetstone, and the Tongue', *AJP* 108: 368-377.
- Brown, N. O. (1947). *Hermes the Thief; The Evolution of a Myth*. Madison.
- Brussich, G. F. (1970). 'La lingua di Timoteo', *Quaderni triestini per il lessico della lirica corale greca* 1: 51-80.
- (1990). 'L'Inno ad Artemide di Timoteo', *QUCC* 34: 25-38.
- Cairns, F. (2000). 'A Testimonium to a New Fragment of Philoxenus of Cythera?: (Machon 77-80 = Fr. 9. 14-17 Gow and Hermesianax Fr. 7. 69-74 Powell)', *ZPE* 130: 9-11.
- Calame, C. (1974). 'Réflexions sur les genres littéraires en Grèce archaïque', *QUCC* 17: 113-128.
- (1977). *Les Choeurs de jeune filles en Grèce archaïque*. Vol. 1: morphologie, fonction religieuse et sociale. Vol. 2: Alcman. Rome.
- (1995a). *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Greece. Ithaca and London* (2nd edn. of orig. 1986 Paris).
- (1995b). 'Variations énonciatives, relations avec les dieux et fonctions poétiques dans les *Hymnes homériques*', *Museum Helveticum* 52: 2-19.
- (1998). 'La Poésie lyrique grecque, un genre inexistant?', *Littérature* 111: 87-110.
- Cameron, A. (1991). 'How thin was Philitas?', *CQ* 41: 534-538.
- (1993). *The Greek Anthology: From Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford and New York.
- (1995). *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.
- Campbell, D. (1993). *Greek Lyric – The New School of Poetry and Anonymous Songs and Hymns* (volume 5). Cambridge.
- Capps, E. (1900). 'Studies in Greek Agonistic inscriptions', *TAPA* 31: 112-137.
- Carey, C. (1991). 'The Victory Ode in Performance: a Case For the Chorus', *CP* 86: 192-200.
- Carpenter, T. and C. Faraone (eds.) (1993). *Masks of Dionysus*. Ithaca.
- Carter, D.M. (2004). 'Citizen Attribute, Negative Right: A Conceptual Difference Between Ancient and Modern Ideas of Freedom of Speech', in Sluiter and Rosen (eds.) *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*.
- Caspers, C. (2005). 'Hermesianax Fr. 7.75-8 Powell', *Mnemosyne* 58: 575-581.
- Cassio, A. (1971a). 'Laso e Damone "sofisti" e "novatori"', *PP* 26: 275-280.
- (1971b). 'ENTEINEΣΘΑΙ, ENTONOΣ ed il nomos orthios', *RFIC* 99: 53-57.
- (1977). *Aristofane Banchettanti*. Pisa.
- (1984). 'Il carattere dei dialetti greci e l'opposizione Dori-Ioni. Testimonianze antiche e teorie di età romantica.' *AION(ling)* 6, 113-136.

Bibliography

- (1991). *L'Inno tra rituale e letteratura nel mondo antico*, Napoli 21-24 ottobre 1991.
- , D. Musti, and L. E. Rossi (eds.) (2000). *Synaulia: cultura musicale in Grecia e contatti Mediterranei (AION filol.-lett. 5)*. Naples.
- Castagna, L. (1991). 'Pindaro in Plutarco', in D'Ippolito and Gallo (eds.), 163-185.
- Caven, B. (1990). *Dionysius I, War-Lord of Sicily*. New Haven and London.
- Ceccarelli, P. and S. Milanezi, (2007). 'Dithyramb, Tragedy – and Cyrene', in Wilson (ed.), 185-214.
- Chailley, J. (1956). 'Le mythe des modes grecs', *Acta Musicologica* 28: 137-63.
- Cingano, E. (2003). 'Entre skolion et enkomion: réflexions sur le "genre" et la performance de la lyrique chorale grecque' in Jouanna and Leclant (eds.), 17-45.
- Cipolla, P. (1999). 'Un iporchema Riscoperto?: (Prat. *TrGF* 4 Fr. 3)', *Eikasmos* 10: 33-46.
- (2003). *Poeti minori del dramma satiresco*, Amsterdam.
- Collard, C., M. Cropp, and K. H. Lee (eds.) (1995). *Selected Fragmentary Plays*. Warminster.
- Collard, C. (2002). *Oresteia*. Oxford and New York.
- Comotti, G. (1972). 'L'endecacordo di Ione di Chio', *QUCC* 13: 54-61.
- (ed.) (1979). *La musica nella cultura greca e romana*. Torino.
- (1980). 'Atena e gli auloi in un ditirambo di Teleste (fr. 805 P.)', *QUCC* 34: 47-54.
- (1983). 'Un'antica arpa, la *mágadis*, in un frammento di Teleste (fr. 808 P.)', *QUCC* 44: 57-71.
- (1988). 'I problemi dei valori ritmici nell'interpretazione dei testi musicali della Grecia antica' in Gentili and Pretagostini (eds.), 17-25.
- (1989a). 'L'anabolè e il ditirambo', *QUCC* 31: 107-117.
- (1989b). 'Melodia e accento di parola nelle testimonianze degli antichi e nei testi con notazione musicale', *QUCC* 61: 91-108.
- (1993). 'Il "canto Lidio" in due frammenti di Teleste (fr. 806; 810 P.)', in Pretagostini (ed.), vol. 2, Rome, 513-520.
- , B. Gentili, and F. Perusino (eds.) (1995). *Mousike: metrica ritmica e musica greca: in memoria di Giovanni Comotti*. Pisa and Roma.
- Conacher, D. J. (1998). *Euripides and the Sophists: Some Dramatic Treatments of Philosophical Ideas*. London.
- Conti Bizzarro, F. (1993-1994). 'Una testimonianza su Filosseno nella commedia di messo. Antifane Fr. 207 Kassel-Austin'. *Rend. Acc. Archeol. Lett. Belle Arti Napoli* 64: 143-157.

Bibliography

- (1994). 'Note a Ps.-Plutarch *De Musica*', *Museum Criticum* 29: 259-261.
- (1999). *Poetica e critica letteraria nei frammenti dei poeti comici greci*. Naples.
- Cooper, C. (2002). 'Aristoxenos, *Peri biôn and Peripatetic Biography*', *Mouseion* 2: 307-339.
- Couat, A. (1931). *Alexandrian Poetry under the First three Ptolemies, 324-222 B.C. With a Supplementary Chapter by Émile Cahen, translated By James Loeb*. New York.
- Cricca, E. (1984). 'Note ai *Persiani* di Timoteo (fr. 15 P.) i', *GFF* 7: 105-109.
- Cricca, E. (1985). 'Note ai *Persiani* di Timoteo (fr. 15 P.) ii', *GFF* 8: 9-14.
- Croiset, M. (1904). 'Observations sur les *Perses* de Timothée de Milet', *REG* 16: 323-348.
- Cropp, M., K. Lee, and D. Sansone (eds.) (1999-2000). *Euripides and Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century (ICS 24-25)*. Champaign.
- Csapo, E. (1997). 'Riding the Phallus For Dionysus: Iconology, Ritual, and Gender-Role De/Construction', *Phoenix* 51: 253-295.
- (1999-2000). 'Later Euripidean music', in Cropp, Lee and Sansone (eds.), 399-426.
- (2000). 'From Aristophanes to Menander? Genre Transformation in Greek Comedy'. in Depew and Obbink (eds), 115-133.
- (2003). 'The Dolphins of Dionysus', in E. Csapo and M. Miller (eds.), *Poetry, Theory, Praxis. The Social Life of Myth, Word and Image in Ancient Greece. Essays in Honour of William J. Slater*. Oxford, 69-98.
- (2004). 'The Politics of the New Music', in Murray and Wilson (eds.), 207-248.
- and M. Miller (1998). 'Democracy, Empire, and Art: Toward a Politics of Time and Narrative' in Boedeker and Raaflaub (eds.), 87-125.
- D'Alessio, G. B. (1997). 'Pindar's Prosodia and the Classification of Pindaric Papyrus Fragments', *ZPE* 118: 23-60.
- D'Alfonso, F. (1989). 'Stesisoro e gli ARXAIOI MELOPOIOI in un passo del *De Musica* Pseudo-plutarcho (1132 b-c)', *BollClass.* 10: 137-148.
- D'Angour, A. (1997). 'How the Dithyramb Got Its Shape', *CQ* 47: 331-351.
- (2006). 'The New Music – So What's New?', in Goldhill and Osborne (eds.), 264-283.
- Dalby, A. (1987). 'The Banquet of Philoxenus: a New Translation with Culinary Notes', *Petits Propos Culinaires* 26: 28-36.
- (1996). *Siren Feasts: A History of Food and Gastronomy in Greece*. London.
- Dale, A. M. (1950). 'Stasimon and Hyporcheme', *Eranos* 48: 14-20.
- (1968). *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* (2nd edn.). London.

Bibliography

- (1971). *Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses*. London.
- Damon, C. (1995). 'Greek Parasites and Roman Patronage', *HSCP* 97: 181-195.
- Danielewic, G. (1978). 'De Aristonoi hymno in Vestam', *Eos* 66: 55-60.
- Davidson, J. (1997). *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. London
- (2000). 'Gnesippus Paigniagraphos: The Comic Poets and the Erotic Mime', in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 41-64.
- Davies, J. (1995). 'The Fourth Century Crisis: What Crisis?', in Eder (ed.), 29-36.
- Davies, M. (1988). 'Monody, Choral Lyric and the Tyranny of the Handbook', *CQ* 38: 52-64.
- Day, J. (1994). 'Interactive Offerings: Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual', *HSCP* 96: 37-74.
- De Giorgi, M. C. (1994). 'Sul discorso intorno alla musica del P. Hibeh i 13', *Proceedings of the 20th international congress of papyrologists : Copenhagen, 23-29 August, 1992*. Collected by A. Bülow-Jacobsen. Copenhagen, 295-298.
- Degani, E. (1995). 'Problems in Greek Gastronomic Poetry; on Matro's *Attikon Deipnon*', in Wilkins, Harvey, and Dobson (eds.), *Food in Antiquity*. Exeter, 413-428.
- DeJean, J. (1989). *Fictions of Sappho, 1546-1937*. Chicago.
- Del Grande, C. (1946). *Ditirambografi; testimonianze e frammenti*. Naples.
- Depew, D. (1991). 'Politics, Music and Contemplation in Aristotle's ideal State', in Keyt and Miller (eds.), *A Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Oxford, 346-380.
- Depew, M. (1997). 'Reading Greek Prayers', *CA* 16: 229-258.
- (2000). 'Enacted and Represented Dedications: Genre and Greek Hymn', in Depew and Obbink (eds.), 81-96.
- and Obbink, D. (eds.) (2000). *Matrices of Genres - Authors, Canon, Society*. Cambridge, MA.
- Détienne, M. (1979). *La Cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*. Paris.
- Devereux, G. (1987). 'Thamyris and the Muses. An Unrecognized Oedipal Myth', *AJP* 108: 199-201.
- Di Benedetto, V. (1971-4). 'Il rinnovamento stilistico della lirica dell'ultimo Euripide e la contemporanea arte figurative', *Dionisio* 45: 326-333.
- Di Marco, M. (1973-4). 'Osservazioni sull' iporchema', *Helikon* 13-14: 326-348.
- Dihle, A. (1994). *A History of Greek Literature, From Homer to the Hellenistic Period*. London.
- Dinse, H. L. M. (1856). *De Antigenida thebano musico*. Berlin.

Bibliography

- D'Ippolito G. and Gallo I. (eds.) (1991) *Strutture Formali dei Moralia di Plutarco: atti del III Convegno plutarco, Palermo, 3-5 maggio 1989*, Naples.
- Dobrov, G. W. (ed.) (1995). *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. Atlanta.
- and Urios-Aparisi, E. (1995). 'The Maculate Music: Gender, Genre and the *Chiron* of Pherecrates' in Dobrov (ed.), 139-174.
- Dorjahn, A. P. (1927). 'Poetry in Athenian courts', *CP* 32: 85-93.
- Dougherty, C., and Kurke, L. (eds.) (1998). *Cultural Poetics in archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. New York.
- (eds.) (2003). *The Cultures within ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. Cambridge and New York.
- Dover, K. (1985). 'What are Anecdotes Worth?', *PCA* 82: 21-22.
- Dubel, S., and S. Rabau (eds.) (2001). *Fiction d'auteur? Le discours biographique sur l'auteur de l'Antiquité à nos jours*. Paris.
- Duff, T. (1999). *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*. Oxford.
- Düring, I. (1945). 'Studies in Musical Terminology in 5th-Century Literature', *Eranos* 43: 176-197.
- (1957). *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*. Göteborg.
- Easterling, P. and Hall, E. (eds.) (2000). *Actors and Acting in Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- (eds.) (2002). *Greek and Roman Actors - Aspects of an Ancient Profession*. Cambridge.
- Ebeling, H. L. (1925). 'The *Persians* of Timotheus', *AJP* 46: 317-31.
- Edelstein, E. and Edelstein, L. (1945). *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*. Baltimore.
- Eder, W. 'Die Athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Krise oder Vollendung?', in Eder (ed.), 11-28.
- (ed.) (1995). *Die Athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Vollendung oder Verfall Einer Verfassungsform?: Akten Eines Symposims 3.-7. August 1992*, Bellagio.
- Edmunds, J. (1922-1927). *Lyra Graeca: Being the Remains of All the Greek Lyric Poets from Eumelus to Timotheus Excepting Pindar* (3 vol.). London
- Edmunds, L. and R. Wallace (eds.) (1997). *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore.
- Elsner, J. (2006). 'Reflections on the 'Greek Revolution' in Art: From Changes in Viewing to the Transformation of Subjectivity', in Goldhill and Osborne (eds.), 68-95.

Bibliography

- Engelmann, H. and Merkelbach, R. (eds.) (1972). *Die inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai* (2 vol.). Bonn.
- Fairbanks, A. (1900). *A Study of the Greek Paeon*. Ithaca.
- Fairweather, J. (1974). 'Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers', *Ancient Society* 5: 231-275.
- (1983). 'Traditional Narrative. Inference and Truth in the Lives of Greek Poets' in *Papers of the Liverpool Seminar* 4.
- Fantuzzi, M. (1980). 'La contaminazione dei generi letterari nella letteratura greca ellenistica: rifiuto del sistema o evoluzione di un sistema?' in *Lingua e Stile* 15: 433-450.
- (2000). 'Theocritus and the 'Demythologizing' of Poetry', in Depew and Obbink (eds.), 135-152.
- and R. L. Hunter (2004). *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge and New York.
- and T. D. Papanghelis (eds.) (2006). *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*. Leiden and Boston.
- Fearn, D. (2007). *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*. Oxford and New York.
- Fehr, B. (1990). 'Entertainers at the Symposion: The *Akletei* in the Archaic Period', in Murray (ed.), 185-195.
- Feickert, A. (2004). *Euripidis Rhesus, Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Fernández García, A. J. (2000). 'La teoría musical de Platón en el tratado « De Musica » de ps. Plutarco', *X congreso español de estudios clásicos* 1: 391-399.
- Ferrari, F. (1988). 'P. Berol. inv. 13270: i canti di Elefantina', *SCO* 38: 181-227.
- Figueira, T. J. and G. Nagy (1985). *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*. Baltimore.
- Fisher, N. (2000). 'Symposiasts, Fish-Waters and Flatterers: Social Mobility and Moral Concerns in Old Comedy', in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 355-396.
- Flacelière, R. (1953). *Plutarque: dialogue sur l'amour*. Paris.
- Fleming, T. (1977). 'The Musical Nomos in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', *CJ* 72: 222-233.
- and E. Kopff (1992). 'Colometry of Greek Lyric Verses in Tragic Texts', in *Atti del convegno internazionale di Antichità Classica della F.I.E.C, Pisa 24-30 agosto 1989, SIFC* s. III, 10: 758-70.
- Flower, M. A. (1994). *Theopompus of Chios - History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC*. Oxford.
- Fongoni, A. (2005). 'Antifane e Filosseno', *QUCC* 81: 91-98.

Bibliography

- Ford, A. (1999). 'Reading Homer from the Rostrum: Poems and Laws in Aeschines' Against Timarchus', in Goldhill and Osborne (eds.), 231-256.
- (2004a). *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton.
- (2004b). 'Catharsis: The Power of Music in Aristotle's *Politics*', in Murray and Wilson (eds.), 309-336.
- (2006). 'The Genre of Genres: Paeans and Paian in Early Greek Poetry', *Poetica* 38: 277-296.
- (forthcoming). *Aristotle as Poet*.
- Fowler, B. H. (1989). *The Hellenistic Aesthetic*. Madison.
- Fowler, R. L. (1954). *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric*. Toronto.
- Franklin, J. C. (2002). 'Diatonic Music in Greece: A Reassessment of its Antiquity', *Mnemosyne* 55: 669-702.
- (forthcoming). 'Song-Benders of Circular Choruses': Dithyramb and the 'Demise of Music' in Wilson and Kolwazig (eds.) (forthcoming), *Song Culture and Social Change: The Contexts of Dithyramb*. Oxford.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1994). 'Athéna et l'invention de la flûte', *Musica e Storia* 2: 239-267.
- Furley, W. (1993). 'Types of Greek Hymns', *Eos* 81: 21-41.
- (1995). 'Praise and Persuasion in Greek Hymns', *JHS* 115: 29-46.
- (1999-2000). 'Hymns in Euripidean Tragedy', in Cropp, Lee and Sansone (eds.), 183-197.
- and J. M. Bremer (2001). *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs From the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*. (2 vols). Tübingen.
- Gabba, E. (1983). *Tria Corda: scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*. Como.
- Gallo, I. and C. Moreschini (2000). *I generi letterari in Plutarco, atti Del VIII Convegno Plutarcheo Pisa, 2-4 Giugno 1999*. Naples.
- Gallo, I. and L. Nicastrì, (eds.) (1995). *Biografia e autobiografia degli antichi e dei moderni*. Naples.
- Gamberini, L. (1979). *Plutarco, della musica*. Florence.
- García Romero, F. (2000). 'The Dithyrambs of Bacchylides: Their Position in the Evolution of the Genre', in Bagordo, A. and Zimmermann, B. (eds.), *Bacchylides. Hundert Jahre Nach Seiner Wiederentdeckung*. Munich, 47-57.
- Gargiulo, T. (1996). 'Mare e vino nei *Persiani*: una congettura a Timoteo, fr. 791, 61-62 Page', *QUCC* 54: 73-81.
- Garland, R. (1992). *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion*. London.
- Garrod, H. W. (1920). 'The Hyporcheme of Pratinas', *CR* 34: 129-136.

Bibliography

- Gemoll, W. (1924). *Das Apophthegma*. Wien.
- Gentili, B. (1995). *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*. Eng. trans. A. Cole. Baltimore and London.
- and C. Cerri (1988). *History and Biography in Ancient Thought*. Amsterdam
- and F. Luisi (1995). ‘La Pitica 12 di Pindaro e l’aulo di Mida’, *QUCC* 49: 7-31.
- and F. Perusino (eds.) (1995). *Mousike: metrica ritmica e musica greca: in memoria di Giovanni Comotti*. Pisa and Rome.
- and R. Pretagostini (eds.) (1988). *La musica in Grecia*. Bari.
- Giangrande, G. (1974). ‘La Danse des dauphins chez Arion et chez Anacréon’, *RPh* 48: 308-309.
- Gibson, S. (2005). *Aristoxenus of Tarentum and the Birth of Musicology*. Oxford.
- Gilula, D. (2000). ‘Stratonicus, the Witty Harpist’ in Braund and Wilkins (eds.), 423-433.
- Girone, M. (1998). *Iamata: guarigioni miracolose di Asclepio in testi epigrafici*. Bari.
- Goldhill, S. (1986). ‘Framing the Polyphony: Readings in Hellenistic Poetry’, *PCPS* 212: 25-52.
- (1991). *The Poet’s Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- (2002). *The Invention of Prose*. Oxford.
- and R. Osborne (eds.) (1999). *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge and New York.
- and R. Osborne (eds.) (2006). *Rethinking Revolutions Through Ancient Greece*. Cambridge and New York.
- Gombosi, O. J. (1939). *Tonarten und Stimmungen der antiken Musik*. Kopenhagen.
- Gostoli, A. (1982). ‘Le ‘invenzioni’ di Archiloco nella testimonianza del de musica dello Ps. Plutarco; asinarteti ed epodi’, *AION(filol)* 4-5: 25-36.
- (1995). ‘L’armonia frigia nei progetti politico-pedagogici di Platone e Aristotele’, in Gentili and Perusino (eds.), 133-44.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1965). *Machon: The Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Gray, V. (1992). ‘Xenophon’s *Symposion*: The Display of Wisdom’, *Hermes* 120: 58-75.
- Greene, E. (ed.) (1996). *Re-reading Sappho: Reception and Transmission*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Gützwiler, K. (1981). *Studies in the Hellenistic Epyllion*. Königstein.
- (1998). *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley.
- (2006). ‘The Herdsman in Greek Thought’ in Fantuzzi and Papanghelis (eds.), 1-23.

Bibliography

- Hägg, R. (ed.) (1994). *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence. Proceedings of the Second International Seminar of Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22-24 Nov. 1991. Acta Instituti Atheniensis regni Sueciae 8.13.* Stockholm.
- Hall, E. (1989). *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy.* Oxford.
- (2000). 'Female Figures and Metapoetry in Old Comedy', in Harvey and Wilkins (eds.), 407-18.
- (2006). *The theatrical Cast of Athens: Interactions Between Ancient Greek Drama and Society.* Oxford and New York.
- Halliwell, S. (2002). *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems.* Princeton.
- Halliwell, S., J. Henderson, A. Sommerstein and B. Zimmermann (eds.) (1993). *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis - Papers From the Greek Drama Conference, Nottingham, 18-20 July 1990.* Bari.
- Hamilton, R. (1990). 'The Pindaric Dithyramb', *HSCP* 93: 211-222.
- Hansen, P. (ed.) (1983). *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca: Saeculorum VIII-V a.Chr.n.* Berlin.
- (ed.) (1989). *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca: Saeculi IV A.Chr.n.* Berlin.
- Harder, A. (1990). 'Untrodden Paths: Where Do they Lead?', *HSCP* 93: 287-309.
- Harvey, A. E. (1955). 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry', *CQ* 5: 157-175.
- Harvey, D. and J. Wilkins (eds.) (2000). *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy.* London.
- Havelock, E. (1953). 'Why was Socrates tried?', in M. E. White (ed.), *Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood.* Toronto, 95-109.
- (1982). *The Literate Revolution in Greece and its Cultural Consequences.* Princeton.
- (1986). *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy From Antiquity to the Present.* New Haven and London.
- Helmbold, W. C. and E. O'Neil (1959). *Plutarch's Quotations.* Oxford.
- Henderson, J. (1991)². *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy.* New York.
- Henrichs, A. (1976). 'Despoina Kybele: Ein Beitrag zur Religiösen Namenkunde', *HSCP* 80: 253-286.
- (1984). 'Ein Neues Likymniosfragment Bei Philodem', *ZPE* 57: 53-57.
- (1996). 'Dancing in Athens, Dancings on Delos: Some Patterns of Choral Projection in Euripides', *Philologus* 140: 48-62.

Bibliography

- Herrington, J. (1985). *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Hermann, J. (1984). *In the Shadow of the Acropolis: Popular and Private art in 4th Century Athens*. [exhibition] Brockton Art Museum/Fuller Memorial, Brockton, Massachusetts, September 1984-August 1987. Brockton.
- Hock, R., and E. O'Neil (1986). *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric. Vol. 1: The Progymnasmata*. Atlanta.
- Holland, G. R. (1884). 'De Poliphemo et Galatea', *Leipziger Studien* 7: 139-312.
- Holzhausen, J. (2000). *Paideía oder Paidiá: Aristoteles und Aristophanes zur Wirkung Der Griechischen Tragödie*. Stuttgart.
- Hordern, J. (1998). 'Two Notes on Greek Dithyrambic Poetry', *CQ* 48: 289-291.
- (1999a). 'Some Observations on the *Persae* of Timotheus', *CQ* 49: 433-438.
- (1999b). 'The Cyclops of Philoxenus', *CQ* 49: 445-455.
- (2000a) 'Machon and Philoxenus', *ZPE* 133: 42.
- (2000b). 'Telestes, *PMG* 808', *CQ* 50: 298-300.
- (2002). *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford.
- (2003). 'Gnesippus and the Rivals of Aristophanes', *CQ* 53: 608-613.
- (2004). 'Cyclopea', *CQ* 54: 285-292.
- Hose, M. (1990). *Studien zum Chor Bei Euripides (teil 1 & 2)*. Stuttgart.
- Householder, F. (1941). *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian*. New York.
- Hubbard, T. K. (1991). *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis*. Ithaca and London.
- (1998). *The Pipes of Pan, Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition From Theocritus to Milton*. Ann Arbor.
- Huxley, G. (1968). 'Glaukus of Rhegion', *GRBS* 9: 47-54.
- Ieranò, G. (1997). *Il ditirambo di Dioniso: le testimonianze antiche*. Pisa.
- Irwin, E. (2005). *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation*. Cambridge and New York.
- 2006. 'The Biographies of Poets: The Case of Solon', in B. McGing and J. Mosmann (eds.), *The Limits of Ancient Biography*. Swansea.
- Jacoby, F. (1904). *Das Marmor Parium*. Berlin.
- (ed.) (1923). *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (FGRH)*. Berlin.
- Jaeger, W. W., and R. Robinson (1948). *Aristotle; Fundamentals of the History of His Development* (2d. edition.). Oxford.

Bibliography

- Janko, R. (1981). 'The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: a Study in Genre', *Hermes* 109: 9-24.
- Janssen, T. H. (1984). *Timotheus 'Persae'*. Amsterdam.
- Jouanna, J. and J. Leclant (eds.) (2003). *Colloque: la poésie grecque antique. Actes, Cahiers de la Villa Kérylos* vol. 14, Paris.
- Kambitsis, J. (1972). *L'Antiope d'Euripide*. Athens.
- Käppel, L. (1992). *Paian, Studien zur Geschichte Einer Gattung*. Berlin and New York.
- Katsouris, A. G. (1997). 'Euripides' *Cyclops* and Homer's *Odyssey*', *Prometheus* 23: 1-24.
- Keyssner, K. (1932). *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im Griechischen Hymnus*. Stuttgart.
- (1933). 'Die Hygieiahymnen Des Ariphton und des Likymnius', *PW* 53: 1289-1296.
- Kinstrand, J. F. 1986. 'Diogenes Laertius and the Chreia Tradition', *Elenchos* 7:217-243.
- Kolde, A. (2003). *Politique et religion chez Isyllus d'Epidaure*. Basel.
- (2002-2003). 'Is Isyllus of Epidauros' poetry typically Hellenistic?', *Hermathena* 173-174: 155-164.
- Koller, H. (1956). 'Das Kitharodische Prooimion. Eine Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung', *Philologus* 100: 159-206.
- Korzeniewski, D. (1974). 'Die Binnenresponion in den Persern des Timotheos', *Philologus* 118: 22-39.
- Kranz, W. (1933). *Stasimon. Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie*. Berlin.
- Kraus, C., [et al.] (eds.) (2006). *Visualizing the Tragic: Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature: Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin* Oxford and New York.
- Kraut, R. (1997). *Aristotle Politics Books VII and VIII*. Oxford.
- Kugelmeier, C. (1996). *Reflexe Früher Und zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der alten Attischen Komödie*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Kurke, L. (1990). 'Pindar's Sixth Pythian and the Tradition of Advice Poetry', *TAPA* 120: 85-107.
- (1991). *The traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca.
- (2002). 'Gender, Politics, and Subversion in the *Chreiai* of Machon', *PCPS* 40: 20-65.
- Lambin, G. (1993). 'L'origine du skolion', *Eranos* 91: 32-37.

Bibliography

- Lane, E. (ed.) (1996). *Cybele, Attis, and Related Cults. Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaseren*. Leiden, New York, Köln.
- Laroche, E. (1949). *Histoire de la racine nem- en grec ancien (nemô, nemesis, nomos, nomizô)*. Paris.
- Lasserre, F. (1954). *Plutarque, de la musique*. Lausanne.
- Leclercq-Neveu, B. (1989). 'Marsyas, le martyr de l'aulos', *Mètis* 4: 251-268.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1978). 'The Poet as Hero: Fifth-Century Autobiography and Subsequent Biographical Fiction', *CQ* n.s. 28 (2): 459-469.
- (1981). *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. Baltimore.
- Lenfant, D. (ed.) (2007). *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens: actes du colloque de Strasbourg (16-18 juin 2005)*. Paris.
- Leo, E. (1901). *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*. Leipzig.
- Lesky, A. (1966). *A History of Greek Literature*. transl. by Willis J. and Heer C. de. New York.
- Lévêque, P. (1955). *Agathon*. Paris.
- Levin, F. R. (1961). 'The Hendecachord of Ion of Chios', *TAPA* 92: 295-307.
- Lightfoot, J. L. (1999). *Parthenius of Nicaea*. Oxford.
- Livrea, A. (2004). 'Un epigramma di Posidippo e il *Cyclops* di Filosseno di Citera', *ZPE* 146: 41-46.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. (2003). *In the Grip of Disease, Studies in the Greek Imagination*. Oxford.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1968). 'Melanippides Fr. 1, 1-2 (Page *PMG* 757)'. *Philologus* 112: 119.
- and Parsons P. (1983). *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin and New York. (*SH*)
- Loicq-Berger, M.-P. (1966). 'Le 'Bruxellensis' 11282 et l'activité littéraire de Denys l'Ancien'. *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire: Belgisch tijdschrift voor Philologie En Geschiedenis*, 44: 12-20.
- Longman, G. A. (1954). 'Timotheus, *Persae* 162', *CR* 4: 208-209.
- López, J. G. (1999). 'Banquete, vino y teoría musical en Plutarco: Quaestiones Convivales (*Moralia* 612c-748d)', in J. G. Montes Cala [et al.] (eds.), *Plutarco, Dioniso y el vino, Actas del VI simposio español sobre Plutarco : Cádiz, 14-16 de mayo de 1998*. Madrid, 243-253.
- Ma, J. (2007). 'A Horse from Teos: Epigraphical Notes on the Ionian-Hellespontine Association of Dionysiac Artists', in Wilson (ed.), 215-245.
- Maas, M. (1992). 'Polychordia and the Fourth-Century Greek Lyre', *Journal of Musicology* 10: 74-88.

Bibliography

- and Snyder, M. (eds.) (1988). *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece*. New Haven.
- Maas, P. (1933). *Epidaurische Hymnen*. Halle.
- MacLachlan, B and R. Wallace (eds.) (1991). *Harmonia Mundi. musica e filosofia nell' antichità*. Rome.
- Maehler, H. (2003). *Bacchylides: Carmina cum fragmentis* (11th edition).
- (2004). *Bacchylides: A Selection*. Cambridge and New York.
- Mantziou, M. (1989). 'A Hymn to the Dolphins: fr. adesp. 939 PMG', *Hellenica* 40: 229-237.
- Marcovich, M. (1975). 'Philodamus' Delphic Hymn to Dionysus', *ZPE* 18: 167-68.
- Martin, H. J. (1984). 'Plutarch, Plato and Eros', *CB* 60: 82-8.
- Martin, R. (2003). 'The Pipes are Brawling: Conceptualizing Musical Performance in Athens', in Dougherty and Kurke (eds), 153-180.
- (2006). 'Outer Limits, Choral Space', in Kraus (ed.), 35-62.
- Matthews, V. J. (1979). 'Antimachean anecdotes', *Eranos* 66: 43-50.
- (1996). *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary*. Leiden.
- Maul, S. M., [et al.], (eds.) (1998). *La Biographie antique: huit exposés suivis de discussions* - Entretiens de la fondation Hardt. Genève.
- McClure, L. (2003). *Courtesans at Table: Gender and Greek Literary Culture in Athenaeus*. New York and London.
- McCracken. (1934). 'Pindar's Figurative Use of Plants', *AJP* 55: 340-45.
- McGing, B. and J. Mossman (eds.) (2006). *The Limits of Ancient Biography*. Swansea.
- Mendelsohn, D. (1991-92). 'Synkeraunoô: Dithyrambic Language and Dionysiac Cult', *CJ* 87: 105-124.
- Meriani, A. (ed.) (2003). *Sulla musica greca antica: studi e ricerche. Quaderni Del Dipartimento Di Scienze Dell'Antichità*. Salerno.
- Meyer, D. 2005). *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen: das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart.
- Miller, M. (1997). *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century B.C.: A Study in Cultural Receptivity*. Cambridge.
- Miller, P. A. (1994). *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness. The Birth of a Genre From Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*. London and New York.
- Miralles, C. (1993). 'Dioniso Calco: tradizione e innovazione nell' elegia del V secolo' in Pretagostini (ed.), 501-512.
- and J. Portulas (1983). *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry*. Rome.
- Momigliano, A. (1993). *The Development of Greek Biography (expanded edition)*. Cambridge, MA and London.

Bibliography

- Moreau, A. (1994-5). 'Les Danaïdes de Mélanippidès: la femme virile', *CGITA* 8: 119-151.
- Morgan, K. A. (ed.) (2003). *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Ancient Greece*. Austin.
- Mosconi, G. (2000). 'La democrazia ateniese e la 'nuova' musica', in Cassio, Musti, and Rossi (eds.), 217-305.
- Most, G. W. (1985). *The Measures of Praise. Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seven Nemean Odes*. Göttingen.
- (1995). 'Reflecting Sappho', *BICS* 40: 15-38.
- (ed.) (1997). *Collecting Fragments - Fragmente Sammeln*. Göttingen.
- Moutsopoulos, E. (1959). *La Musique dans l'oeuvre de Platon*. Paris.
- Munn, M. (2006). *The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the Tyranny of Asia. A Study of Sovereignty in Ancient Religion*. Berkely, Los Angeles and London.
- Murray, O. (ed.) (1990). *Symptotica, a Symposium on the Symposium*. Oxford and New York.
- Murray, P. and P. Wilson (eds.) (2004). *Music and the Muses: the Culture of 'mousike' in the Classical Athenian City*. Oxford and New York.
- Musti, D. (2000), 'Musica greca tra aristocrazia e democrazia' in Cassio, Musti and Rossi (eds.), 7-55.
- Nagy, G. (1990). *Pindar's Homer: the Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.
- (1996). *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge and New York.
- (2002). *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: the Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens*. Washington.
- (2003). 'Transmission of Archaic Greek Symptotic Songs: From Lesbos to Alexandria'. *Critical inquiry*.
- Napolitano, M. (1999). 'Odisseo simposiarca fraudolento e Polifemo simposiasta raggirato nel « Ciclope » di Euripide', in Arrighetti, G. (ed.), *Letteratura e Riflessione Sulla Letteratura Nella Cultura Classica: tradizione, erudizione, critica letteraria, filologia e riflessione filosofica nella produzione letteraria antica: atti Del Convegno, Pisa, 7-9 Giugno 1999*. Pisa, 51-63.
- Napolitano, M. (2000). 'Note all'iporchema di Pratina: (PMG 708 = TrGF i 4 F 3)', in Cassio, Musti, and Rossi (eds), 111-155.
- Neumann-Hartmann, A. (2004). 'Der Paian Des Philodamos an Dionysos und der Ausbruch des 4. Heiligen Krieges', *Mus. Helv.* 61: 9-31.
- Nicolai, R. (2003). *Rysmos: studi di poesia, metrica e musica greca offerti dagli allievi a Luigi Enrico Rossi per i suoi settant'anni*. Roma.
- Nieddu, G. (1993). 'Parole e metro nella *sphragis* dei *Persiani* di Timoteo (PMG fr.791.202-236)', in Pretagostini (ed.), 521-529.

Bibliography

- Nisetich, F. (1977). 'The Leaves of Triumph and Mortality: Transformation of a Traditional Image in Pindar's *Olympian 12*', *TAPA* 107: 235-264.
- North, H. (1952). 'The Use of Poetry in the Training of the Ancient Orator', *Traditio* 8: 1-33.
- Obbink, D. (1995). *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*. Oxford and New York.
- (1996). *Philodemus on Piety: Critical Text with Commentary*. Oxford and New York.
- Ober, J. (1989). *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*. Princeton.
- (2008). *Democracy and Knowledge – Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens*. Princeton.
- and B. Strauss (1989). 'Drama, Political Rhetoric and the Discourse of Athenian Democracy' in J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin (eds.), *Nothing to do with Dionysus: Athenian Drama in its Social Context*. Princeton, 237-70.
- Oellacher. (1932). 'Eine exegetische Schrift zum späteren Dithyrambos' in *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien* (1). Vienna, 136-42.
- Oliver, J. (1936). 'The Serapion Monument and the Paeon of Sophocles', *Hesperia* 5: 91-122.
- Olson, S. D. and A. Sens (1999). *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE*. Atlanta.
- (2000). *Archestratus of Gela. Archestratos of Gela: Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE : Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Onians, J. (1979). *Art and thought in the Hellenistic Age: the Greek World View, 350-50 BC*. London.
- Osborne, R. (ed.) (2007). *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy, and Politics 430-380 BC*. Cambridge.
- Ophuijsen, J. M. v. (1987). *Hephaestion on Metre*. Leiden and New York.
- Pache, C. (2004). *Baby and Child Heroes in Ancient Greece*. Urbana and Chicago.
- Page, D. L. (1962). *Poetae melici Graeci*. Oxford.
- (1981). *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge and New York.
- Panagl, O. (1969). 'Stationen Hellenischer Religiosität am Beispiel Des Delphischen Sukzessionsmythos', *Kairos* 11: 161-71.
- (1970). 'Apollons Pythonkampf und die delphische Orakelgründung im Spiegel antiker Mythenkritik', *Kairos* 12: 31-41.
- (1971). *Die 'dithyrambischen Stasima' Des Euripides, Untersuchungen zur Komposition Und Erzähltechnik*. Vienna.

Bibliography

- Papadopoulou, Z. and V. Pirenne Delforge (2001). 'Inventer et réinventer l'aulos: autour de la XIIe Pythique de Pindare', in P. Brulé and Ch. Vendries (eds.), *Chanter les dieux. Musique et religion dans l'antiquité grecque et romaine*, Rennes, 37-58.
- Pardo, F. P. (1999). 'El Banquete De Plutarco: ¿ficción literario o realidad histórica?' in J. G. Montes Cala [et al.] (eds.), *Plutarco, Dioniso y el vino, Actas del VI simposio español sobre Plutarco : Cádiz, 14-16 de mayo de 1998*. Madrid, 379-92.
- Parker, L. P. E. (1997). *The Songs of Aristophanes*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. (1996). *Athenian Religion – A History*. Oxford and New York.
- Patillon, M. (1997). *Progymnasmata - Aelius Théon; texte établi et traduit par Michel Patillon; avec l'assistance, pour l'Arménien, de Giancarlo Bolognesi*. Paris.
- Peddie, I. (ed.) (2006). *The Resisting Muse: Popular Music and Social Protest*. Aldershot and Burlington.
- Perlman, S. (1964). 'Quotations from Poetry in Attic Orators', *AJP* 85: 155-72.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1955). 'The Future of Studies in the Field of Hellenistic Poetry', *JHS* 75: 69-73.
- Pianko, G. (1963). 'Un comico contributo alla storia della musica greca, Chirone di Ferecrate', *Eos* 53: 56-62.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1962). *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (2nd edition). Oxford.
- , Gould, J., & D. M. Lewis (1968). *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (2nd ed.). London and Oxford.
- Pinault, G.-J. (ed.) (2001). *Musique et poésie dans l'antiquité: Actes Du Colloque De Clermont-Ferrand, Université Blaise Pascal 23 Mai 1997*. Clermont-Ferrand.
- Pintacuda, M. (1978). *La musica nella tragedia greca*. Cefalù.
- (1982). *Interpretazioni musicali sul teatro di Aristofane*. Palermo.
- Podlecki, A. J. (1969). 'The Peripatetics as Literary Critics', *Phoenix* 23 = Studies Presented to G. M. A. Grube on the occasion of His Seventieth Birthday (Spring 1969), 114-137.
- (1979). 'Simonides in Sicily', *La Parola del Passato* 34: 5-16.
- (1980). 'Festivals and Flattery: the Early Greek tyrants as Patrons of Poetry', *Athenaeum* 68: 371-395.
- (1984). *The Early Greek Poets and their times*. Vancouver.
- (1996). 'Had the Antiope of Euripides Political Overtones?', *Ancient World* 27.2: 131-146.
- Pöhlmann, E., & M. L. West (2001). *Documents of ancient Greek Music: the Extant Melodies and Fragments*. Oxford and New York.

Bibliography

- Pordomingo, P. F. (1991). 'Las citas de carmina popularia en Plutarco', in D'Ippolito and Gallo (eds.), 213-22.
- Powell, J. U. (1921). *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Recent Discoveries in Greek Poetry and Prose of the Fourth and Following Centuries B.C.* Oxford.
- (1925). *Collectanea Alexandrina. Reliquae miore poetarum graecorum aetatis ptolemaicae 323-146 AC, epicorum, elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum.* Oxford. (CA)
- (1933). *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Third Series. Some Recent Discoveries in Greek Poetry and Prose of the Classical and Later Periods.* Oxford.
- and E. A. Barber (1929). *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Second Series. Some Recent Discoveries in Greek Poetry and Prose, Chiefly of the Fourth Century B.C., and Later times.* Oxford.
- Power, T. C. (2001). *Legitimizing the Nomos: Timotheus' Persae in Athens.* Unpublished Thesis (Ph. D.), Harvard University, 2001.
- (forthcoming). *The Culture of Kitharodia.*
- Prauscello, L. (2006a). 'Looking For the 'other' Gnesippus: Some Notes on Eupolis Fragment 148 K-A', *CP* 101: 52-66.
- (2006b). *Singing Alexandria: Music Between Practice and Textual Transmission.* Leiden and Boston.
- (forthcoming). "'Epinician Sounds' and their Reception: Pindar and Musical Innovation", in P. Agocs, Carey C., and Rawles R. (ed.s), *Proceedings of the Epinician Conference, London July 2006.*
- Pretagostini, R. (ed.) (1993). *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da omero all'età ellenistica - scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili.* Rome.
- Privitera, G. A. (1979). 'Il ditirambo fino al IV Secolo', in R. B. Bandinelli (ed.), *Storia e civiltà dei greci. vol. 5: la crisi della polis. Storia, letteratura, filosofia,* Milan, 311-325.
- Race, W. (1982). 'Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns', *GRBS* 23: 5-14.
- (1990). *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes.* Atlanta.
- (1997a). *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes.* Cambridge, Mass.
- (1997b). *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments.* Cambridge, Mass.
- Rainer, B. L. (1975). *Philodamus' Paeon to Dionysus: A Literary Expression of Delphic Propaganda.* Unpublished Thesis (Ph. D.). Champaign.
- Raaflaub, K. A. (2004). 'Aristocracy and Freedom of Speech in the Greco-Roman World' in I. Sluiter and R. Rosen (eds). *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity.*
- Relihan, J. H. (1992). 'Rethinking the History of the Literary Symposium', *ICS* 17: 213-244.

Bibliography

- Renahan, R. (1982). 'Aristotle as Lyric Poet: The Hermias Poem', *GRBS* 23: 251-274.
- Restani, D. (1983). 'Il *Chirone* di Ferecrate e la "nuova" musica greca'. *Rivista italiana di musicologia* 18: 139-192.
- (1988). 'Problemi musicali nel XIV libro dei *Deipnosophistai* di Ateneo: una proposta di lettura', in Gentili (ed.), 26-31.
- Richardson, N. J. (1975). 'Homeric Professors in the Age of the Sophists', *PCPS* 21: 65-81.
- Richter, L. (1968). 'Die neue Musik der Griechischen Antike. Teil i: Die Literarische Überlieferung', *Archiv Für Musikwissenschaft*, 1-18.
- (1983). 'Die Musik der griechischen Tragödie und ihre Wandlungen unter veränderten historischen Bedingungen', in H. Kuch (ed.), *Die Griechische Tragödie in ihrer Gesellschaftliche Funktion*. Berlin, 115-139.
- (2000). *Pathos und Harmonia: Melodisch-tonale Aspekte Der attischen Tragödie*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Riginos, A. S. (1994). 'The Wounding of Philip II of Macedon: Fact and Fabrication'. *JHS* 114: 103-119.
- Ringwood, i. C. (1927). *Agonistic Features of Local Greek Festivals Chiefly From inscriptional Evidence. Part 1: Non-Attic Mainland and adjacent islands, Except Euboea*. Poughkeepsie.
- Robb, K. (1994). *Literacy and Paideia in Classical Greece*. Oxford and New York.
- Robertson, G. (1997). 'Evaluating the Citizen in Archaic Greek Lyric, Elegy, and Inscribed Epigram', in L. Mitchell, and P. J. Rhodes (eds.), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*. London and New York, 148-157.
- Robertson, N. (1996). 'The Ancient Mother of the Gods: A Missing Chapter in the History of Greek Religion' in Lane (ed.), 239-304.
- Rocconi, E. (2003). *Le parole delle muse. La formazione del lessico tecnico musicale nella Grecia antica*. Rome.
- Roller, L. (1991). 'The Great Mother at Gordion: The Hellenization of an Anatolian Cult', *JHS* 111: 128-143.
- (1996). 'Reflections on the Mother of the Gods in Attic Tragedy', in Lane (ed.), 305-321.
- Rose, H. J. (1932). 'The Rhadine Fragment', *CQ* 26: 89-92.
- Roskam, G. (2006). 'Philoxenus Once Again', *CQ* 56: 652-656.
- Rösler, W. (1980). *Dichter und Gruppe: eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher Griechischer lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*. München.
- Rossi, Laura (2001). *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: a Method of Approach*. Leuven.

Bibliography

- Rossi, Luigi E. (1971). 'I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche', *BICS* 18: 69-94.
- (1988). 'La dottrina dell' 'ethos' musicale e il simposio', in Gentili and Pretagostini (ed.), 238-245.
- (2000). 'Musica e psicologia nel mondo antico e nel mondo moderno', in Cassio, Musti and Rossi (eds.), 57-96.
- Rothwell, J. K. S. (1992). 'Identity of the Fourth-Century Chorus', *GRBS* 33: 209-225.
- Rundin, J. (1996). 'A Politics of Eating: Feasting in Early Greek Society', 117: 179-215.
- Runia, D. T. (1986). 'Theocritus of Chios' Epigram Against Aristotle', *CQ* 36: 531-534.
- Russell, D. (1997). 'Plutarch, *Amatorius* 13-18', in Mossman J. (ed.), *Plutarch and His Intellectual World*. London, 99-111.
- Russell, D. A. (1968). 'On Reading Plutarch's *Moralia*', *Greece and Rome* 15: 130-146.
- Rutherford, I. (1994-1995). 'Apollo in ivy: the tragic Paean', *Arion*, 3.1: 112-35.
- (1995). 'Apollo's Other Genre. Proclus on *nomos* and his Source', *CP* 90: 354-61.
- (2001). *Pindar's Paeans, A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* Oxford and New York.
- (2004). 'χορός εἰς ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως ... (Xen. *Mem.* 3.3.12): Song-Dance and State-Pilgrimage at Athens', in Murray and Wilson (eds.), 67-90.
- (2007). 'Theoria and Theatre at Samothrace: The *Dardanos* by Dymas of Iasos', in Wilson (ed.), 279-293.
- Saïd, S. (1984). 'Grecs et barbares dans les tragédies d'Euripide: la fin des Différences', *Ktéma* 9: 27-53.
- Sancho Royo, A. (1983). 'Análisis de los motivos de composición del "Ciclope" de Filoxeno de Citera', *Habis* 14: 33-49.
- Sanders, L. J. (1987). *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny*. London, New York, Sidney.
- Santoni, A. (1993). 'L'inno di Aristotele per Ermia di Atarneo', in Arrighetti G., and Montanari, F. (eds.), *La Componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario: atti del convegno: Pisa, 16-17 maggio 1991*. Pisa, 179-195.
- Saxonhouse, A. W. (2006). *Free Speech and Democracy in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge.
- Scardigli, B. (ed.) (1995). *Essays On Plutarch's Lives*. Oxford.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1966). *Monolog und Selbstgespräch: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte Der Griechischen Tragödie*. Berlin, Zürich, Dublin.

Bibliography

- Schläpfer, H. (1950). *Plutarch und die klassischen Dichter - Ein Beitrag zum Klassischen Bildungsgut Plutarchs*. Zürich.
- Schnapp, A. (1989). 'Eros the Hunter' in Bérard, C. [et al.] (eds.), *A City of images: iconography and society in Ancient Greece*, Princeton, 71-87.
- Schröder, S. (1999). *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian: eine Kritische Untersuchung mit einem Ausblick auf Behandlung und Auffassung der lyrischen Gattungen bei den alexandrinischen Philologen*, Stuttgart.
- Scullion, J. S. (2000). 'Tradition and Invention in Euripidean Aitiology', in Cropp, Lee and Sansone (eds.), 217-33.
- (2002). '“Nothing To Do With Dionysus”: Tragedy Misconcieved As Ritual', *CQ* 52: 102-137.
- Seaford, R. (1976). 'On the origins of Satyric Drama', *Maia* 28: 216-19.
- (1977-8). 'The 'Hyporchema' of Pratinas', *Maia* 29-30: 81-99.
- (1981). 'Dionysiac Drama and the Dionysiac Mysteries', *CQ* 31: 252-75.
- (1984). *Euripides Cyclops*. Oxford.
- Segal, C. (1985). 'The *Bacchae* as Metatragedy', in P. Burian (ed.), *Directions in Euripidean Criticism - A Collection of Essays*. Durham, 156-176.
- (1994). 'The Gorgon and the Nightingale: the Voice of Female Lament and Pindar's Twelfth Pythian ode', in L. Dunn and N. Jones (eds.), *Embodied Voices: Representing Female Vocality in Western Culture*. Cambridge and New York, 17-34.
- Seidensticker, B. (1995). 'Dichtung und Gesellschaft im 4. Jahrhundert: Versuch eines Überblicks', in Eder (ed.), 175-198.
- Segvic, H. (2006). 'Homer in Plato's *Protagoras*', *CP* 101: 247-262.
- Shapiro, A. (1992). 'Mousikoi Agones: Music and Poetry at the Panathenaia', in J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*. Princeton, 53-76.
- Sineux, P. (1999). 'Le Péan d'Isyllos: forme et finalité d'un chant religieux dans le culte d'Asklépios à Epidaure', *Kernos* 12: 153-66.
- Slater, W. (1991). *Dining in a Classical Context*. Ann Arbor.
- and B. Zimmermann (1993). *Intertextualität in der griechisch-römischen Komödie*. Stuttgart.
- Sluiter, I. and R. Rosen (eds.) (2004). *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden and Boston.
- Snell, B. (1961). *Poetry and Society; The Role of Poetry in Ancient Greece*. Bloomington.
- Snyder, J. M. (1988). *The Woman and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome*. Carbondale.

Bibliography

- Sokolowski, F. (1936). 'Sur le péan de Philodamos', *BCH* 60: 135-143.
- Stehle, E. (1997). *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in Its Setting*. Princeton.
- Steiner, D. (1986). *Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*. London.
- (2002). 'Indecorous Dining, Indecorous Speech: Pindar's First « Olympian » and the Poetics of Consumption', *Arethusa* 35 (2): 297-314.
- Stephens, S. A. (2002-3). 'Linus song', *Hermathena* 173-174: 13-28.
- (2006). 'Ptolemaic Pastoral', in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papangheli (eds.), 91-117.
- Stewart, A. (1982). 'Dionysos at Delphi: the Pediments of the Sixth Temple of Apollo and Religious Reform in the Age of Alexander', *Studies in the History of Art*, 10: 205-227.
- (ed.) (2000). *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch*. Louvain.
- Strauss, B. S. (1993). *Fathers and Sons in Athens: Ideology and Society in the Era of the Peloponnesian War*. Princeton.
- Strauss Clay, J. (1992). 'Pindar's twelfth Pythian: Reed and Bronze', *AJP* 113: 519-525.
- (1999). 'Pindar's Symptotic Epinicia', *QUCC* 62: 25-34.
- Stylianou, P. J. (1998). *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus, Book 15*. Oxford.
- Sutton, D. F. (1983). 'Dithyramb as DRAMA: Philoxenus of Cythera's *Cyclops* or *Galatea*', *QUCC* 42: 37-43.
- (1984). *The Lost Sophocles*. Lanham.
- (1989). *Dithyrambographi graeci*. Hildesheim.
- Tanner, R. H. (1915). 'The *Odysses* of Cratinus and the *Cyclops* of Euripides', *TAPA* 46: 170-206.
- Taplin, O. (2000). *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective*. Oxford.
- (2007). *Pots and Plays: interactions Between Tragedy and Greek Vase-painting of the Fourth Century B.C.* Los Angeles.
- Teodorsson, S. T. (1989). 'The Etymology of Scolion', *Eranos* 87: 127-132.
- Thomas, R. (1992). *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Thorp, J. (1991). 'Aristoxenus and the Ethnoethical Modes', in Wallace and Maclachlan (eds.), 54-68.
- Too, Y. L. (1995). *The Rhetoric of Identity in Isocrates: Text, Power, Pedagogy*. Cambridge and New York.

Bibliography

- Toye, D. L. (2000). 'Plutarch on Poetry, Prose, and Politeia', *Ancient World* 31: 173-181.
- Trapp, M. (2000). 'Plato in the Deipnosophistae', in Braund and Wilkins (eds.), 353-363.
- Trédé, M. (1992). *Kairos, l'à-propos et l'occasion (le mot et la notion, d'Homère à la fin du IVe siècle av. J.-C.)*. Paris
- (2000). 'Aristophane critique littéraire', in Leclant and Jouanna (eds.), *Le théâtre grec antique: La comédie: actes du 10ème colloque de la villa Kérylos à Beaulieu-sur-Mer, les 1er et 2 octobre 1999*. Paris, 129-139.
- (2003) 'Présence et image des poètes lyriques dans le théâtre d'Aristophane', in Jouanna and Leclant (eds.): 169-183.
- and S. Saïd (2001)³. *Littérature grecque d'Homère à Aristote*. Paris
- Tritle, L. A. (ed.) (1997). *The Greek World in the Fourth Century - From the Fall of the Athenian Empire to the Successors of Alexander*. London and New York.
- Vallois, R. (1931). 'Les Strophes mutilées du péan de Philodamos', *BCH* 55: 241-364.
- Vamvouri Ruffy, M. (2004). *La Fabrique du divin: les hymnes de Callimaque à la Lumière des Hymnes Homériques et des Hymnes épigraphiques*. Liège.
- Van Der Stockt, L. (1992). *Twinkling and Twilight: Plutarch's Reflections on Literature*. Brussel.
- Van Der Valk, M. (1974). 'On the Composition of the Attic Skolia', *Hermes* 102: 1-20.
- Van Minnen, P. (1997). 'The Performance and Readership of the *Persai* of Timotheus', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und Verwandte Gebiete* 43: 246-260.
- Verrall, A. W. (1908). 'The Verse-Weighing Scene in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes', *CR* 22.6: 172-175.
- Vierlinger, F. (1939). *Die Gestalt des Kyklopen Polyphemos in der Griechischen und Römischen Dichtung*. Vienna.
- Vollgraff, W. (1924). 'Le péan delphique à Dionysos', *BCH* 48: 97-208.
- Waern, I. (1951). *Gês ostea. The kenning in pre-Christian Greek poetry*. Uppsala.
- Wagman, R. (1995). *Inni di Epidauro*. Pisa.
- (2000). *L'Inno Epidaurico a Pan. Il culto di Pan a Epidauro*. Pisa.
- Wallace, R. W. (1994). 'Frammentarietà e trasformazione: evoluzioni nei modi della comunicazione nella cultura ateniese tra V e IV Sec.', *QUCC* 46: 7-20.
- (1995). 'Speech, Song and Text, Public and Private: Evolutions in Communications Media and Fora in Fourth-Century Athens', in Eder (ed.), 199-217.
- (1997). 'Music Theorists in Fourth-Century Athens', in Gentili and Perusino (eds.), 17-40.

Bibliography

- (2003). ‘An Early Fifth-century Athenian Revolution in aulos Music’, *HSCP* 101: 73-92.
- (2004). ‘Damon of Oa: a Music Theorist Ostracized?’ in Murray and Wilson (eds.), 249-267.
- Webster, T. B. L. (1956). *Art and Literature in Fourth Century Athens*. London.
- (1964). *Hellenistic Poetry and art*. London.
- (1967). *The Tragedy of Euripides*. London
- (1970). *The Greek Chorus*. London.
- Wehrli, F. (1944). *Die Schule des Aristoteles, Text und Kommentar*. Basel.
- Weil, H. (1895). ‘Un Péan Delphique à Dionysos’, *BCH* 19: 393-418.
- Weil, H. (1897). ‘Un Péan Delphique à Dionysos’, *Supplement BCH* 21: 510-513.
- Weil, H., & Reinach, T. (1900). *De la Musique*. Paris.
- West, M. L. (1965). ‘The Dictaeon Hymn to the Kouros’, *JHS* 85: 149-159.
- (1970). ‘Melica’, *CQ* 20: 205-215.
- (1981). ‘The Singing of Homer and the Modes of Early Greek Music’, *JHS* 101: 113-129.
- (1982). ‘Metrical analyses; Timotheus and Others’, *ZPE* 45: 1-13.
- (1983). ‘Tragica, VI’, *BICS* 30: 63-82.
- (1986). ‘The Singing of Hexameters: Evidence from Epidauros’, *ZPE* 63: 45-46.
- (1992). *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford.
- (1993). *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Oxford.
- (1999). ‘Sophocles with Music? Ptolemaic Music Fragments and Remains of Sophocles (Junior?)’, *Achilleus*, *ZPE* 126: 43-65.
- Wet, B. X. D. (1988). ‘Plutarch’s Use of the Poets’, *Acta Classica* 31: 13-25.
- White, S. (1994). ‘Callimachus on Plato’, *TAPA* 2: 135-161.
- Whitehead, D. (1986). *The Demes of Attica, 508/7-ca. 250 B.C.: A Political and Social Study*. Princeton.
- Whitmarsh, T. (2000). ‘The Politics and Poetics of Parasitism: Athenaeus on Parasites and Flatterers’, in Braund and Wilkins (eds.), 304-315.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. (1872). *Zukunftsphilologie! Eine Erwiderung auf Friedrich Nietzsches ... ‘Geburt Der Tragödie’*. Berlin.
- (1886). *Isyllos von Epidauros*. Berlin.
- (1900). *Die Textgeschichte Der Griechischen Lyriker*. Berlin.
- (1903). *Die Perser - Aus Einem Papyrus von Abusir im Auftrage der deutschen Orientgesellschaft*. Leipzig.

Bibliography

- (1909). *Nordionische Steine mit Beiträgen von Dr. Paul Jacobsthal*.
- (1921). *Griechische Verskunst*. Berlin.
- Wilkins, J. (2000). *The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy*. Oxford.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1938). 'Philodemus on Ethos in Music', *CQ* 32: 174-181.
- Wilson, P. (1996). 'Tragic Rhetoric: The Use of Tragedy and the Tragic in the Fourth Century', in M. S. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond*. Oxford, 310-331.
- (1999). 'The aulos in Athens', in Goldhill and Osborne (eds.), 58-95.
- (1999-2000). 'Euripides' Tragic Muse', in Cropp, Lee and Sansone (eds.), 427-449.
- (2000). *The Culture of Khoregia: the Chorus, the City and the Stage*. Cambridge.
- (2003). 'The Sound of Cultural Conflict: Kritias and the Culture of Mousikè in Athens', in Dougherty and Kurke (eds.), 181-206.
- (2004). 'Athenian Strings', in Murray and Wilson (eds.), 269-306.
- (2007a) (ed.). *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies*. Oxford and New York.
- (2007b). 'Performance in the *Pythion*: The Athenian Thargelia', in Wilson (ed.), 150-184.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. (1936). *Mode in Ancient Greek Music*. Cambridge.
- (1956). 'The Pentatonic Tuning of the Greek Lyre: A Theory Examined', *CQ* 50: 169-186.
- Wormell, D. E. W. (1935). 'The Literary Tradition Concerning Hermias of Atarneus', *YCS* 5: 57-92.
- Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. (1980). *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy*. Athens.
- Yunis, H. (1988). *A New Creed: Fundamental Religious Beliefs in the Athenian Polis and Euripidean Drama*. Göttingen.
- Zanker, P. (1996). *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity* (Alan Shapiro, trans.). Berkeley.
- Zeitlin, F. (ed.) (1991). *Mortals and Immortals. Collected Essays, Jean-Pierre Vernant*. Princeton.
- (1993). 'Staging Dionysus Between Thebes and Athens', in Carpenter and Faraone (eds.), 147-182.
- Zimmermann, B. (1986). 'Überlegungen zum Sogenannten Pratinasfragment', *Mus. Helv.* 43: 145-154.
- (1988). 'Critica ed imitazione. La nuova musica nelle commedie di Aristofane', in Gentili and Pretagostini (eds.), 199-204.

Bibliography

- (1989). ‘Gattungsmischung, Manierismus, Archaismus. Tendenzen des griechischen Dramas und Dithyrambos am Ende des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.’, *Lexis* 13: 25-36.
- (1992a). *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung*. Göttingen.
- (1992b). ‘Comedy’s Criticism of Music’, in Slater and Zimmermann (eds.): 39-50.