

Nina Almazova

ALEXANDER POLYHISTOR AND GLAUCUS OF
RHEGIUM AS SOURCES OF PSEUDO-PLUTARCH'S
TREATISE *DE MUSICA*

I–II

To the memory of Andrew Barker

The treatise *On Music* preserved in Plutarch's corpus is unique in containing a section dedicated to the history of music (the speech of Lysias, chapters 3–12). The present paper will focus on the sources of this particular section.¹ In chapters 11 and 12 the author takes his information from Aristoxenus.² In the preceding section the sources he names are: *Collection of Musical Achievements* (or *Celebrities*) by Heraclides of Pontus (fourth century BC);³ *On Ancient Poets and Musicians* by Glaucus of Rhegium (late fifth to early fourth century BC);⁴ the Sicynonian

¹ The treatise *De musica* is cited from the edition of Ziegler (Ziegler–Pohlenz 2¹⁹⁵⁹). Beside traditional references to the pages of Stephanus edition (numbers 1131–1147 with Latin letters added) and the chapters of Wyttenbach 1800, 625–689 I adduce the numbers of pages and lines in Ziegler whenever a precise reference to definite phrases and words is required.

² In ch. 11 Aristoxenus is referred to by name. On ch. 12, see Weil–Reinach 1900, 53; Visconti 1999, 135–139; Meriani 2003, 77–79.

³ 1131 F: ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ τῶν ἐν μουσικῇ – sc. <ἐύρημάτων> (Lasserre), <ἐύδοκιμησάντων> (Weil–Reinach), <διαλαμψάντων> (Bergk, Wehrli); Ercoles 2013, 555 n. 972 considers the transmitted title as complete. A hypothesis has been proposed that the *Συναγωγή* was not a separate work, but formed part of Heraclides' book *Περὶ μουσικῆς*: Voß 1896, 76–77; Weil–Reinach 1900, VI; Wehrli 1969, 112–113; Gostoli 2020, 135. On Heraclides' lifetime see Voß 1896, 8–19; Wehrli 1968, 675–677. In 361 BC he was not too young to substitute Plato in the Academy, as his teacher left for Sicily (Suid. η 461 s.v. Ἡρακλείδης = Heracl. fr. 2 Wehrli), and in 339 BC not too old to take part in the elections of the leader of the Academy (Philodem. *Hist. Acad.*, *PHerc.* 1021 col. VI. 41 – VII. 10 = Heracl. fr. 9 Wehrli). Having lost the elections, he departed to Heraclea and had probably lived there for some decades (cf. Plut. *Alex.* 26. 1–7; id. *De Is. et Os.* 361 E–F = Heracl. fr. 140; 139 Wehrli): Gottschalk 1980, 4–5; Mejer 2009, 27–29. Therefore, his writings can be dated to ca. 360–310.

⁴ 1132 E: Γλαῦκος ὁ ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἐν συγγράμματι τινι τῷ *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν τε καὶ μουσικῶν*. See Hiller 1886, 400–401; Huxley 1968, 47; Lanata 1963, 270–271; 274; Gostoli 2015, 127–128 on the title and Hiller 1886, 398–399;

chronicle⁵ quoted by Heraclides; the so-called “harmonians”; some poets; and *Collection of Information about Phrygia* by Alexander Polyhistor (first century BC).⁶ According to the *communis opinio*,⁷ the main source of Ps.-Plutarch for this part was Heraclides, to whom he owes almost all the other references. Alexander Polyhistor is the only evident exception: Heraclides could not have quoted him, as he lived much later.⁸ Neither could Alexander transmit the data of Heraclides to Ps.-Plutarch, since most facts concerned in *Περὶ μουσικῆς* would be out of place in a book about Phrygia.

Alexander (just like Heraclides) is named only once in the treatise of Ps.-Plutarch, and only several lines in ch. 5 are attributed to him by most modern scholars.⁹ However, an assumption that the compiler once thought it worth troubling to address a complementary book – that of Polyhistor – only to write out a couple of phrases,¹⁰ and never unrolled it again, seems unlikely.¹¹ My hypothesis is that Ps.-Plutarch rested *pari passu* upon two books (not counting Aristoxenus) while composing his

Weil–Reinach 1900, XI; Jacoby 1912, 1418; Lanata 1963, 270; Presta 1965, 88; Huxley 1968, 47; Gostoli 2015, 125–126 on the date.

⁵ 1132A: ἐκ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τῆς ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀποκειμένης (*FGrHist* 550 F 1); 1134 B: ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀναγραφῇ τῇ περὶ τῶν ποιητῶν (*FGrHist* 550 F 2), most probably an epigraphical document. See Weil–Reinach 1900, IX–XI; Franklin 2010–2011, 756–759; Barker 2014, 32–33; 49–51.

⁶ 1132 E ἐν τῇ *Συναγωγῇ τῶν περὶ Φρυγίας*. See Schwarz 1894, 1449; Jacoby 1943, 248–250 (*FGrHist* 273) on the date.

⁷ Rose 1863, 545; Westphal 1865, 69–72; Voß 1896, 76–77; 81; Weil–Reinach 1900, VIII–IX; XI–XIII; Kleingünther 1933, 139; Ziegler 1951, 815; Wehrli 1969, 112; D’Alfonso 1980, 137 n. 2; Gostoli 1990, 98; Barker 2009, 278–281; D’Ippolito 2011, 211; Gostoli 2011, 38; Pöhlmann 2011, 16; Ercoles 2013, 556; Barker 2014, 29–37. For a recent attempt to refute it see Lucarini 2020. As will be clear from what follows, I do not find it convincing in every respect.

⁸ No other authority named by Ps.-Plutarch postdates the third century BC: the latest are Anticlides (late 4th cent.) and Ister (3rd cent.) in ch. 14, 1136 A and Dionysius Iambus (3rd cent.) in ch. 15, 1136 C. Weil and Reinach assume that the compiler knew Ister and Dionysius at first hand, whereas Anticlides was cited by Ister (Weil–Reinach 1900, XX; 57). Unlike Alexander, they are quoted for referring each time to a single fact, not mentioned or discussed otherwise in the treatise.

⁹ See below n. 31, and n. 33 and 69 for exceptions.

¹⁰ The oddity is still greater if one shares the impression of Pöhlmann 2011, 16 that the compiler quotes Polyhistor “only for an irrelevant detail”.

¹¹ Weil–Reinach 1900, XXIII note that Ps.-Plutarch uses a small account of readily available sources, and Barker 2009, 279 observes that he tends to make extensive use of them (e.g. he uses Aristoxenus continuously throughout long passages in ch. 17–21 and 31–36). See n. 8 above for two exceptions.

first section: that of Heraclides and of Alexander. Addressing the latter source was likely due to the fact that the former provided no information on the history of instrumental aulos¹² music.¹³

I

The only blatant and irrevocable inner contradiction in the “historical” section of the treatise is exactly between the data of these two sources. It is the question of who was the first citharode. Indeed, there are other cases in *Περὶ μουσικῆς* where mutually exclusive versions are adduced,¹⁴ but each time they are provided with a reference to somebody’s opinion and leave no doubt that a debated point is touched upon consciously. As regards the discrepancy concerning the first citharode, Ps.-Plutarch in no way marked it, apparently because it slipped his attention. The alternative version is mentioned in passing, as something already known. Let us start with addressing this contradiction.

In ch. 3 (1131 F – 1132 C) the author adduces the information provided by Heraclides, who in his turn refers to the Sicyonian chronicle.¹⁵ According to this version, the inventor of citharody was Amphion, who had been taught by his father Zeus. The musicians of his time (κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν

¹² Solo cithara-playing did not attract Ps.-Plutarch’s notice at all, probably because it was much less widespread than aulos-playing (see e.g. Barker 2014, 20).

¹³ Of course, we cannot be sure, given that the musical treatise of Heraclides has not survived. However, this is a very plausible hypothesis, see Barker 2014, 37–38. Judging by the use Ps.-Plutarch made of Heraclides, A. Barker concludes that the Pontic scholar, being a Platonist, paid little attention to purely instrumental music, even although – unlike me – he believes that all the passages concerning aulos-playing were transmitted by Heraclides.

¹⁴ (1) The inventor of citharodic nomes was Terpander (ch. 3, 4) / Philammon (ch. 5); (2) the inventor of aulodic nomes was Clonas (ch. 3, 4) / Ardalos (ch. 5); (3) the author of the Tripartite nome was Clonas (ch. 4, 8) / Sacadas (ch. 8); (4) Polymnestus composed aulodic nomes (ch. 3, 4, 10) / Orthian nomes (ch. 9, 10); (5) Clonas was a native of Tegea / Thebes (ch. 5); (6) Hipponax was a contemporary of Terpander / lived later than he (ch. 6); (7) the Many-headed nome was created by the elder Olympus / the younger Olympus / Crates (ch. 7); (8) the Chariot nome was composed by Olympus / Mysian auletes (ch. 7); (9) the Phrygian aulete was named Marsyas / Masses (ch. 7); (10) the dactylic rhythm was borrowed from Olympus / from the Orthian nome (ch. 7); (11) Xenodamus composed paeans / hyporchemes (ch. 9); (12) Thaletas composed paeans / something else (ch. 9, 10); (13) Xenocritus composed paeans / dithyrambs (ch. 9, 10).

¹⁵ The text has a form of indirect speech: *acc. cum inf.* governed by λέγει p. 3, 9; ἔφη p. 3, 26; λέγει p. 4, 3.

ἠλικίαν, 1132 B) were Linus of Euboea (threnody), Anthes of Boeotia (hymns), Pierus of Pieria (poems about the Muses), and Philammon of Delphi (on the wandering of Leto). It is not clear if Thamyras the Thracian, the best singer of his time (πάντων τῶν τότε), was their contemporary.¹⁶ Next come Demodocus and Phemius, characters of Homer, that is, contemporaries of the Trojan war. There follows Heraclides' argument that ancient poets used "epic" and not "free" measure. One example adduced is Terpander, the inventor of citharodic nomos, who came after Homer (whose poems he set to music). Next, we have the authors of aulodic nomos: Clonas, his younger contemporary (ὁ ὀλίγω ὕστερον Τερπάνδρου γενόμενος, 1133 A), and Polymnestus, a representative of the next generation (τὸν μετὰ τοῦτον γενόμενον, 1132 C).

Ps.-Plutarch tells us explicitly that Heraclides borrowed the claim that Amphion was the first citharode from the Sicyonian chronicle (1131 F – 1132 A, p. 3, 2–7). Besides, he indicates that Heraclides based his list of poets and musicians on this inscription (1132 A: δι' ἧς ... τοὺς ποιητὰς καὶ τοὺς μουσικοὺς ὀνομάζει). Since it is known that the list of Clonas' nomos (1132 D) is also taken from the Sicyonian chronicle (see 1134 B, cf. 1133 A), other names of musicians in this list (in ch. 3) are most probably derived from the same document.

We are not aware as to whether the list of musicians from the Sicyonian chronicle leading up to Polymnestus has been handed down to us in full. In particular, it is not known whether Clonas was indeed the first composer of aulos music (be it auletic or aulodic pieces), or his predecessors were simply omitted – either by Heraclides or Ps.-Plutarch. It has been claimed¹⁷ that for Heraclides and his source, the history of music started with the stringed instruments. This is quite possible, but one should remember that this has never been explicitly stated. Perhaps Heraclides – who was not interested in instrumental music – simply did not care to establish the chronological correspondence between the inventions of aulos-playing and citharody.

There is also no guarantee that the Sicyonian list of citharodes up until Terpander is reproduced completely. Strictly speaking, we are not sure

¹⁶ It looks more probable that Thamyras belongs to a later age. In Paus. 4. 33. 3 and 10. 7. 2 he is called the son of Philammon. Lasserre 1954, 154 underlines that Thamyras was not a son of some deity, but an adversary of the gods. Barker 2009, 288 assumes that he formed the same group with Demodocus and Phemius, since, like them, he was also mentioned in Homeric poems (*Il.* 2. 594–600), and besides, he could hardly have been the greatest singer of his time, living in the same era as Amphion or Linus.

¹⁷ Barker 2014, 21; 23; 24; 35; Wilson 2009, 54.

that all the musicians named in this list can even be called citharodes.¹⁸ A clear definition of melic poets according to the accompanying instruments can first be traced in the passage dedicated to the regulation of the nomos – the citharodic by Terpander and the aulodic by Clonas, and it disappears again in ch. 9–10. In fact, lament, the genre of Linus, is rather associated with the aulos in historical times.¹⁹ Hymns could be performed with both stringed and wind accompaniment²⁰ and involve choral performance,²¹ whereas the term κιθαρωδία implied solo singing.²² For the same reason the organization of choruses ascribed to Philammon also has nothing to do with the art of citharody. Finally, the very wording of Ps.-Plutarch contradicts the notion that we are dealing only with the history of citharody: how can the idea of Amphion as the first citharode be compatible with the stated existence of musicians who worked κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡλικίαν? Presumably, the inventions of Amphion's contemporaries dealt with other fields of music. Only from Thamyras onwards does it become clear that it is the citharodes that are being listed.

Anyway, Orpheus is missing from this list – which is noteworthy for two reasons. Firstly, Orpheus appears suddenly in the treatise *On Music* beginning from ch. 5, without considering the discrepant information adduced above. Secondly, there is a fragment of Heraclides (fr. 159 Wehrli = *Sch. Eur. Rhes.* 346)²³ where Orpheus is called the son of Calliope (the inventress of epic poetry) and the greatest of citharodes.²⁴

That Orpheus is not listed among the citharodes has made some scholars suspect that the author of the Sicyonian chronicle excluded him intentionally – but this cannot be proven. There are many cultural heroes in the realm of music, so it would be quite natural to omit some of

¹⁸ As is often supposed, e.g. Bartol 1998, 302 n. 9; Gostoli 2011, 32; ead. 2015, 130; ead. 2020, 140. Barker 2009, 286 distinguishes in this passage the invention of at least three different genres – citharody, lament and hymn. Cf. the cautious approach of Ercoles 2013, 556.

¹⁹ Reiner 1938, 67–69.

²⁰ Furley–Bremer 2001, I, 34–35.

²¹ Furley–Bremer 2001, I, 20–28.

²² See Power 2010, 401–403 on the opposition of choral and citharodic performance; Ercoles 2013, 496–497.

²³ φησὶ δέ (sc. Heraclides): ‘ἑβδόμη δὲ Καλλιόπη ποιήσιν εὖρεν ἐπῶν (εὖρε πάντων codd.) καὶ συνοικήσασα Οἰάγρω γεννᾷ Ὀρφέα τὸν πάντων μέγιστον ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῇ κιθαρωδικῇ τέχνῃ γενόμενον...’. This contradiction was first noticed by Lucarini 2020, 83.

²⁴ In the same fragment Calliope is the seventh Muse, and Euterpe, who invented aulos music, is the eighth, but the order of enumeration need not correspond to chronological order of inventions, *pace* Lucarini 2020, 83, and does not allow the claim that Heraclides thought stringed instruments to appear earlier than wind ones.

them when listing inventors. An accusation of Hellenic chauvinism²⁵ is unfounded, given that the author did not exclude Thamyras the Thracian. It is more probable that identifying Amphion as the first citharode stemmed from Sicyonian patriotism,²⁶ but one cannot prove that the composer of the inscription knew the version that assigned this part to Orpheus²⁷ and consciously contradicted it.

One cannot rule out that, while Heraclides might have begun his *Συναγωγή* with an affirmation such as: “According to the inscription preserved in Sicyon, Amphion was the founder of citharody” (hence πιστοῦται in 1132 A), he might later have refuted these data. Possibly, this latter refutation might have been lost due to incompetence on behalf of the compiler. On the other hand, one cannot be sure that Heraclides’ (or any other author’s) views always remained consistent.

Finally, it is not impossible that Orpheus did feature in the Sicyonian chronicle somewhere after the list of poets contemporary to Amphion. Ancient dating of mythological characters often varies widely: while the *Suida* places Orpheus eleven generations earlier than the fall of Troy,²⁸ his participation in the expedition of the Argonauts allowed the chronographers to place him in the generation immediately preceding the Trojan war.²⁹ The same *Suida* claims that Orpheus was a pupil of Linus, which would put him in the second generation of citharodes according to the Sicyonian version; whereas in Ps.-Apollod. 1. 14 Orpheus and Linus are brothers, sons of Oeager.

Be that as it may, the information we find in ch. 5 (which starts with the reference to Alexander Polyhistor) is incompatible³⁰ with that of the

²⁵ Weil–Reinach 1900, 10 § 24; 21 § 49. Barker 2014, 38; 41 addresses this incrimination to Heraclides himself, mainly based on his fragment (Athen. 14. 624 C = Heraclid. fr. 163 Wehrli), where the harmonies of barbaric origin are deprived of the very right to be called harmonies. It should be noted that the text of *De musica* does not confirm this charge: Thamyras draws no objections, and I believe that Hyagnis, Marsyas and Olympus miss Heraclides’ attention as instrumentalists and not as Phrygians.

²⁶ Jacoby 1955, 477; Lanata 1963, 283. Antiope, the mother of Zethus and Amphion, fled to Sicyon from Thebes and married the local king Epopeus (Ps.-Apollod. 3. 42).

²⁷ Here are other cases of ascribing musical inventions to Orpheus: sung poetry – Tatian. *Or. ad Graecos* 1. 1; cithara – Plin. *NH* 7. 204 (*Amphion, ut alii, Orpheus, ut alii, Linus*); Nicomach. *Excerpta* 1 (Orpheus was taught by Hermes and became the teacher of both Linus and Amphion); a certain string of the cithara – Diodor. 3. 59. 6.

²⁸ *Suida* ο 654 s.v. Ὀρφεύς: γέγονε δὲ πρὸ ἰα' γενεῶν τῶν Τρωϊκῶν, καὶ φασὶ μαθητὴν γενέσθαι αὐτὸν Λίνου.

²⁹ See Ziegler 1939, 1207–1215 (ch. III, “Antike zeitliche Ansätze des Orpheus”).

³⁰ Franklin 2010–2011, 743; Barker 2014, 21; 23–24; Lucarini 2020, 75.

Sicyonian inscription: not only is Orpheus mentioned for the first time, but it is explicitly reported that there were no citharodes before him. Let us reflect on the source of this information.

- p. 4, 24 καὶ
 τοῖς χρόνοις δὲ σφόδρα παλαιός ἐστι (sc. Terpander)· πρεσβύτερον γοῦν
 αὐτὸν Ἀρχιλόχου ἀποφαίνει Γλαῦκος ὁ ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἐν
 συγγράμματί τινι τῷ Περί τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν τε καὶ
 p. 5, 1 μουσικῶν· φησὶ γάρ αὐτὸν δευτέρον γε-
 νέσθαι μετὰ τοὺς πρώτους ποιήσαντας ἀλφιδίαν.
 5 Ἐλέξανδρος δ' ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ τῶν περὶ Φρυγίας
 κρούματα Ὀλυμπον ἔφη πρῶτον εἰς
 10 τοὺς Ἑλληνας κομίσει, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἰδαίους Δακτύ- 1132 F
 λους· Ὑγνιν δὲ πρῶτον ἀύλησαι, εἶτα τὸν τούτου υἱὸν
 Μαρσύαν, εἶτ' Ὀλυμπον· ἐξήλωκεναι δὲ τὸν Τέρπανδρον
 Ὀμήρου μὲν τὰ ἔπη, Ὀρφέως δὲ τὰ μέλη. ὁ δ' Ὀρφεὺς
 οὐδένα φαίνεται μεμνημένος· οὐδεὶς γάρ πω γεγένητο,
 10 εἰ μὴ οἱ τῶν ἀλφδικῶν ποιηταί· τούτοις δὲ κατ' οὐθὲν
 τὸ Ὀρφικὸν ἔργον ἔοικε. | Κλονᾶς δ' ὁ τῶν ἀλφδικῶν 1133 A
 νόμων ποιητής, ὁ ὀλίγω ὕστερον Τερπάνδρου γενόμενος,
 ὡς μὲν Ἀρκάδες λέγουσι, Τεγεάτης ἦν, ὡς δὲ Βοιωτοί,
 15 Θηβαῖος. μετὰ δὲ Τέρπανδρον καὶ Κλονᾶν Ἀρχιλόχος
 παραδίδεται γενέσθαι.

A question arises, where the quotation from Alexander Polyhistor ends. Most scholars following R. Westphal³¹ trace it only up to εἶτ' Ὀλυμπον (p. 5, 7), on the grounds that a discussion of Terpander, Homer and Orpheus would be out of place in a work dedicated to Phrygia. Meanwhile, judging by way the speech is formed (*acc. cum inf.*), the quotation must go as far as to the words ἐξήλωκεναι δὲ τὸν Τέρπανδρον Ὀμήρου μὲν τὰ ἔπη, Ὀρφέως δὲ τὰ μέλη, which depend on ἔφη.³² On the other hand, the subsequent,

³¹ Westphal 1865, 67–69; Weil–Reinach 1900, 6–8 § 22–24; 21 § 48; Lasserre 1954, 155; Lanata 1963, 270–272; Barker 1984, 210 n. 33; Franklin 2010–2011, 743; Pöhlmann 2011, 16 n. 3; 25 n. 2; Gostoli 2015, 131; ead. 2020, 140. Voß 1896, 81 ends the quotation even earlier, at p. 5, 6 (Ἰδαίους Δακτύλους).

³² Those who think the contents of these lines incompatible with the *Phrygian Collection* of Polyhistor try to explain *acc. cum inf.* by either textual corruption or the compiler's inaccuracy. The most popular solution is that of Westphal 1865, 68 who considered the phrase Ἀλέξανδρος ... εἶτ' Ὀλυμπον (p. 5, 3–7) as a parenthesis (for his argument, see below p. 275). Hiller 1886, 404 claimed that the *acc. cum inf.* appeared by mistake of the compiler, who read ἐξήλωκε etc. in his source, but erroneously ascribed this statement to Polyhistor quoted immediately above (this made him conclude that Ps.-Plutarch used an intermediate source of the Imperial

grammatically independent phrase (p. 5, 8–11) is clearly linked to the previous one, as they share the same subject – the succession of citharodes. Moreover, it is the end of the argument over Orpheus which explains how a reference to instrumental aulos music found its way into this section (dealing with the composers of citharody and aulody), as well as why the citharodes featured in a passage dedicated to the Phrygian auletes: the author claims that Orpheus (who served as a model to Terpander) was not influenced by the composers who created music for wind instruments, in spite of living later than them. One can imagine that it is precisely the reference to Terpander that made the compiler insert this quotation here, in the section about the inventors of sung nomes, before proceeding from Terpander to Clonas and Polymnestus. Therefore, I conclude that the quotation from Alexander Polyhistor ends with *τούτοις δὲ κατ’ οὐθὲν τὸ Ὀρφικὸν ἔργον ἔοικε* (p. 5, 11).³³

C. M. Lucarini thinks that the quotation from *Συναγωγή τῶν περὶ Φρυγίας* seeks to refute the immediately preceding thesis of Glaucus: Alexander argued that Orpheus lived and worked in a period between the first aulodes and Terpander, whereas Glaucus believed that Terpander belonged to the generation that followed the first aulodes. This is what leads him to think that the quotation from Alexander goes up to *ἔοικε* (p. 5, 11).³⁴

However, it is clear from other references to Glaucus in the treatise that he acknowledged the activity of Orpheus and placed him before Terpander in the list of citharodes.

Ch. 7, 1133 E–F, p. 7, 10–16: “The fact that the Chariot nome was the invention of Olympus may be learned from Glaucus’ book about the ancient poets, which also informs us that Stesichorus of Himera took as his model not Orpheus or Terpander or Archilochus or Thaletas, but Olympus, since Stesichorus used the Chariot nome and the dactylic species of rhythm, which some people say is derived from the Orthian nome”.

period). Weil–Reinach 1900, 21 § 48 supposed that a later addition made by Plutarch himself was misplaced by a scribe. Barker 2009, 279 n. 17 thought the quotation from Alexander was an intruded marginal gloss aimed at explaining who were *τοὺς πρώτους ποιήσαντας ἀλφιδίαν*. To my mind, two circumstances make this unlikely: a scrupulous reference to Polyhistor indicating not only the author, but also the title of his book, and the repetition of the same data in ch. 7, where Ps.-Plutarch does not refer to Alexander.

³³ The quotation from Polyhistor is traced up to *ἔοικε* (p. 5, 11) by Jacoby *FrGrHist* 273 F 77 (who admits the possibility that the material of Alexander is used also below in ch. 5, p. 5, 11–15: Jacoby 1912, 1417, cf. id. 1943, 287) and Lucarini 2020, 75.

³⁴ Lucarini 2020, 75.

Ch. 10, 1134 D–E, p. 9, 4–11: “Glaucus says that Thaletas lived later than Archilochus, and that he imitated Archilochus’ songs, though extending them to a greater length; and he says that Thaletas incorporated paeonic and cretic rhythms in his compositions. These, he claims, had not been used by Archilochus, nor indeed by Orpheus or Terpander: it is from the auletics of Olympus that Thaletas is said to have developed them, and thus to have acquired his reputation as an excellent composer”.³⁵

As has been repeatedly noted, Glaucus ascribed an important part in the history of music to the Phrygian aulete Olympus and even claimed that he influenced sung poetry (namely Thaletas and Stesichorus).³⁶ Besides, it is evident that Glaucus placed the poets and musicians in chronological order, paid special attention to the influence of the earlier authors on those who came later, and based his conclusions on empirical analysis of their works.³⁷ As we see, the sequence Orpheus – Terpander – Archilochus – Thaletas, as deduced by Glaucus, occurs twice in *Περὶ μουσικῆς*. It is obvious that in 1133 F they are named in chronological order (Glaucus claims that Terpander is older than Archilochus in 1132 E, and that Archilochus is older than Thaletas in 1134 D). Thus, Glaucus could not deny Orpheus’ existence claiming that Terpander immediately followed Hyagnis, Marsyas and Olympus.

Of course, one could assume that Glaucus believed Orpheus and Olympus to be contemporaries, while placing Terpander in the next generation (although even in this case it would be more natural to compare Terpander with Orpheus than with Olympus). Yet one more consideration arises: the argument dealing with Orpheus in ch. 5 (p. 5, 7–11, a part of the quotation from Alexander, as was argued above) is itself almost certainly taken from Glaucus.³⁸ It perfectly matches the train of thought of the Rhegian scholar as seen in 1133 E–F and 1134 D–E – that is, the same problem of succession is being resolved concerning the same characters, and the conclusion is made that Terpander imitated Orpheus, who in

³⁵ Translation: Barker 1984, 212–213; 215, with minor changes. The Greek text will be analyzed in part IV (forthcoming in *Hyperboreus* 28: 1).

³⁶ Weil–Reinach 1900, XII; Huxley 1968, 50; Ercoles 2009, 161; 167; Barker 2014, 35.

³⁷ Hiller 1886, 406; 411; Weil–Reinach 1900, XII; Jacoby 1912, 1419–1429; Lanata 1963, 272; Presta 1965, 90–92; Barker 2007, 85–86; id. 2009, 283–284; id. 2014, 34–35; Franklin 2010–2011, 743.

³⁸ Westphal 1865, 67–68; accepted almost unanimously, e.g. by Hiller 1886, 403; Lanata 1963, 271–272; Huxley 1968, 49; Barker 1984, 210 n. 33; Franklin 2010–2011, 743; Gostoli 2015, 131.

his turn was free of any influence, particularly (an aspect Glaucus was especially interested in) from the influence of Olympus and the preceding auletes. Moreover, the conclusion that Orpheus owed nothing to wind music is made in a way typical of Glaucus: it is based on the comparison of the works attributed to him (τὸ Ὀρφικὸν ἔργον) with the alleged heritage of the Phrygian auletes.

Westphal supposed that Ps.-Plutarch, after inserting the statement of Alexander as a parenthesis, returned without warning to Glaucus' quotation making ἐξηλωκέναι δὲ τὸν Τέρπανδρον etc. governed by φησὶ γὰρ (p. 5, 1).³⁹ In this case the quotation from Polyhistor sought to explain that οἱ πρῶτοι ποιήσαντες αὐλωδίαν (p. 5, 2) were Hyagnis, Marsyas and Olympus (and the Idaean Dactyls⁴⁰). The same musicians are implied by οἱ τῶν αὐλωδικῶν ποιηταί (p. 5, 10). Since they are described as instrumentalists, Westphal proposed changing αὐλωδίαν to αὐλητικὴν and αὐλωδικῶν to αὐλητικῶν. However, at least two problems remain.

Firstly, the proposal of Westphal still leaves us with two mutually exclusive historical constructions, both attributed to Glaucus: with and without Orpheus between the first auletes and Terpander. This contradiction would be removed if one could understand δεύτερον μετὰ τοὺς πρῶτους ποιήσαντας αὐλωδίαν (or αὐλητικὴν) as indicating the *second* generation *after* Olympus, whereas Orpheus belonged to the *first* generation *after* him.⁴¹ Yet this seems impossible.⁴² One proof thereof is an analogous expression μετὰ ταύτην δευτέρα in 1131 D, where the Music is certainly the next, and not the third, discipline concerned with sound after the Grammar. I shall return to this problem in a little while.

Secondly, it remains unclear as to why whichever artist Glaucus is implying must be explained through a quotation from Polyhistor. The comparison with Orphic production surely concerns the Phrygian auletes, which means that Glaucus could not but mention them beforehand. Therefore, it makes more sense to take the construction Ἀλέξανδρος ... ἔφη ... ἐξηλωκέναι δὲ τὸν Τέρπανδρον etc. in its proper sense and to accept that the statement of Glaucus was adduced by Polyhistor.

³⁹ Westphal 1865, 68–69.

⁴⁰ Clem. *Strom.* 1. 15. 73 also quotes a point of view which makes the Idaean Dactyls wise men from Phrygia responsible for the invention of several musical rhythms.

⁴¹ Westphal 1865, 72.

⁴² Hiller 1886, 408. His own solution (*ibid.*, 408; 425, accepted by Jacoby 1912, 1418) is that the compiler made a mistake in his reckoning and erroneously believed that Glaucus' words concerned Terpander (who was called δεύτερος), rather than Orpheus.

Even if one imagines that Alexander had sufficient musical education (of which there is no evidence), he could hardly have made a comparison between τὸ Ὀρφικὸν ἔργον and Phrygian aulos-music himself: numerous examples of conjectural or erroneous arguments of ancient commentators⁴³ make it clear that the ancient nomes, which were still performed in the fifth and the fourth centuries,⁴⁴ were completely lost by the first century BC. No doubt a classical source was cited in *Συναγωγή τῶν περὶ Φρυγίας* on this point, and to all appearance this was *On Ancient Poets and Musicians* by Glaucus of Rhegium. Due to his attention to the role of the Phrygian Olympus in the history of Greek music, it was most suitable for Alexander to include this into his *Collection of Information about Phrygia*. One might even assume that Polyhistor did in fact mention Glaucus in this passage, but his name did not find its way into the treatise *On Music*, because the compiler retreated in the face of a stylistic difficulty – a necessity to provide, after two successive references to Glaucus and Alexander, an additional indication that Alexander, in his turn, quoted Glaucus. Otherwise, perhaps Polyhistor cited Glaucus' work extensively and for this reason did not make still another reference to him in the passage copied by Ps.-Plutarch.⁴⁵

If this is true, it follows that Glaucus placed Orpheus after Olympus (and certainly before Terpander) and thought that the Thracian citharode had the opportunity to borrow from the Phrygian aulete, who was his predecessor, but did not. In this case we need to rethink the correlation between this thesis of Glaucus and the one that is quoted in the end of ch. 4 (φησὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν δεύτερον γενέσθαι μετὰ τοὺς πρώτους ποιήσαντας ἀλωδίαν).

It is now important to specify who is implied by τοὺς πρώτους ποιήσαντας ἀλωδίαν (p. 5, 2). It should be emphasized that Ps.-Plutarch (unlike some other authors of the Roman time), following his sources, is consistent in distinguishing between ἀλησις (instrumental wind music) and ἀλωδία (singing to the aulos accompaniment). The mythical Phrygian musicians Hyagnis, Marsyas and Olympus are depicted in *Περὶ μουσικῆς*

⁴³ In particular see on the nomes of Olympus: Many-headed (1133 D) – *Schol. Eur. Or.* 1384; *Phot. Lex.* α 2835 Theodoridis; *Etym. magn.* p. 145. 25–47 Gaisford; *Hesych.* α 7302 Latte; *Eustath. Comm. ad Hom. Il.* IV 640 van der Valk; *Suid.* α 3967; *Chariot* (1133 E) – *Schol. Pind. Pyth.* 12, 39 a, vol. II p. 268. 8–15 Dr.

⁴⁴ E. g. the music ascribed to Olympus was well known to Aristophanes (*Equ.* 9–10) and Glaucus (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 7, 1133 F), Plato (*Symp.* 215 c) and Aristoxenus (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 11, 1134 F – 1135 C).

⁴⁵ I owe this explanation to Prof. A. Verlinsky.

exclusively as auletes.⁴⁶ Aulodes and the inventors of aulodic nomes that feature in the treatise are Clonas and Polymnestus (and Ardalos as an alternative version, 1133 A).⁴⁷ This did not go unnoticed by those editors⁴⁸ that accepted the conjecture ἀλλητικὴν in place of ἀλφοδιάν, wishing it to be a reference to the legendary Phrygian musicians.⁴⁹

Only one case contradicts Ps.-Plutarch's common word usage:⁵⁰ in Alexander Polyhistor's quotation, Hyagnis, Marsyas and Olympus are identified in the manuscripts as οἱ τῶν ἀλφοδικῶν ποιηταί (p. 5, 10). No wonder Westphal proposed the conjecture ἀλλητικῶν; however, it does not remove all difficulties. Besides a semantic error,⁵¹ the manuscript text is suspect for the use of the adjective ἀλφοδικῶν as a substantive, which is attested neither in the treatise *On Music* nor in any other ancient text. The word ἀλλητική can mean ἀλλητικὴ τέχνη, but not in plural, and besides, nowhere else does Ps.-Plutarch use it as a substantive.⁵² Hence

⁴⁶ 1132 F: Ὑαγνιν δὲ πρῶτον ἀλῆσαι; 1133 D: Ὀλυμπον, ἀλλητὴν ὄντα τῶν ἐκ Φρυγίας, ποιῆσαι νόμον ἀλλητικὸν...; *ibid.*: οὗτος γὰρ (sc. Olympus) παιδικὰ γενόμενος Μαρσύου καὶ τὴν ἀλῆσιν μαθὼν παρ' αὐτοῦ; 1133 E: εἶναι δ' αὐτὸν (sc. Marsyam) Ὑάγνιδος υἱόν, τοῦ πρώτου εὐρόντος τὴν ἀλλητικὴν τέχνην; 1134 E (a quotation from Glaucus): ἐκ τῆς Ὀλύμπου ἀλῆσεως. Cf. 1132 E: Olympus brought instrumental music (κρούματα, see Huchzermeyer 1931, 5–6; Thiemer 1979, 70–72; Barker 1984, 109–110 n. 30) to Greece.

⁴⁷ 1132 C: Κλονᾶν, τὸν πρῶτον συστησάμενον τοὺς ἀλφοδικοὺς νόμους; 1132 D: Οἱ δὲ νόμοι οἱ κατὰ τούτους ... ἀλφοδικοὶ ἦσαν; 1133 A: Κλονᾶς δ' ὁ τῶν ἀλφοδικῶν νόμων ποιητὴς; *ibid.*: Ἄρδαλον ... πρότερον Κλονᾶ τὴν ἀλφοδικὴν συστήσασθαι μοῦσαν; 1134 D: Καὶ Πολύμνηστος δ' ἀλφοδικοὺς νόμους ἐποίησεν.

⁴⁸ Westphal 1865; Weil–Reinach 1900.

⁴⁹ However, Ps.-Plutarch (and Glaucus in the passages quoted by him) does use not the substantivated ἀλλητική, but ἀλλητικὴ τέχνη (1133 E) or ἀλῆσις (1134 E). – The conjecture κιθαρωδιάν (Bury) implies a reference either to Orpheus, according to Polyhistor's version (which does not suit the plural τοὺς πρώτους ποιήσαντας, since in Polyhistor Orpheus had no predecessors among the citharodes), or the sequence from Amphion up to Demodocus and Phemius, according to Heraclides (which makes the reference too vague: it is not clear how to define the bounds between τοὺς πρώτους and the rest of citharodes, if the Homeric singers belong to the category of πρῶτοι, and Terpander does not join it).

⁵⁰ The manuscript reading ἀλφοδικούς in ch. 7, 1133 D, p. 6, 21 is an evident scribal mistake, and its correction to ἀλλητικούς by Volkmann 1856 has never created any doubt.

⁵¹ The admission (Guhrauer 1880, 692, accepted by Hiller 1886, 407) that ἀλφοδική meant all archaic aulos music for Glaucus and Heraclides, since singing to the aulos has essentially disappeared and been replaced by solo aulos-playing in their time, is certainly unfounded (for evidence on ἀλφοδία in the classical period see Almazova 2008, 11–12; 14).

⁵² See above n. 49.

the attempts to change ἀλφδικῶν to ἀλητικῶν νόμων (Bergk) and to ἀλφδιῶν (Voß). Meanwhile, we clearly have a mechanical mistake here: the scribe's eye slipped to the line below where Clonas is called ὁ τῶν ἀλφδικῶν νόμων ποιητής (p. 5, 11–12). I would tentatively propose the changing οἱ τῶν ἀλφδικῶν ποιηταί in line 10 to οἱ ἀληταί or οἱ πρῶτοι ἀληταί (such an expression as οἱ τῆς ἀλήσεως ποιηταί would provide still more similarity to the next line, but it has no parallels). After removing this mistake, the use of the terms 'aulete', 'aulode' and their derivatives becomes quite consistent in Ps.-Plutarch's treatise, so "the first creators of ἀλφδιά" (p. 5, 2) cannot refer to the Phrygian auletes.

Let us also take into account that by the end of ch. 4, Lysias, who delivers the first speech, has only listed the composers of ἀλφδιά to his audience – he has not yet introduced the founders of αὔλησις. Meanwhile the reference to τοὺς πρῶτους ποιήσαντας ἀλφδιαν, without indicating definite names, should rather point to characters that have already been mentioned. (I admit that this argument is of secondary value, since Ps.-Plutarch is notoriously capable of logical inaccuracy.)

One might admit⁵³ that the first authors of aulodic nomes (Clonas and Polymnestus) need not be the inventors of aulody in its entirety, so there may be some mythical predecessors who are being implied by Glaucus. An analogy with the art of singing to the cithara (Amphion being the first citharode, and Terpander the first author of citharodic nomes) makes this theoretically possible, but in this case one has to rely on evidence other than Ps.-Plutarch. E. Hiller thinks of Hyagnis and Marsyas as aulodes (based on scholia to Aeschylus⁵⁴), adds Ardalus (1133 A) to the mythical generation (since he is called the son of Hephaestus and the inventor of aulos in Pausanias⁵⁵) and separates them from Olympus, who is definitely an aulete. On the contrary, A. Gostoli proposes Olympus as the likely candidate, based upon *Suid.* ο 219 s.v. Ὀλυμπος, the only testimony of twenty four in Gentili–Prato (fr. 1) to ascribe poetry to him. However, hypothetical first aulodes are never named in *De musica* – Hyagnis, Marsyas and Olympus are surely instrumentalists in Ps.-Plutarch.⁵⁶

⁵³ Hiller 1886, 406–408; Bergk 1914, 4; Huchzermeyer 1931, 4; Gostoli 1990, 74; Almazova 2008, 19 n. 85.

⁵⁴ *Sch. Aesch. Pers.* 940: τὸν δὲ Μαρριανδυνὸν αὐξῆσαι μάλιστα τὴν θρηνητικὴν ἀλφδιαν, καὶ διδάξαι Ἰαγνιν τὸν Μαρσύου πατέρα.

⁵⁵ Paus. 2. 31. 3: οὐ πόρρω δὲ ἱερὸν Μουσῶν ἐστὶ, ποιῆσαι δὲ ἔλεγον αὐτὸ Ἄρδαλον παῖδα Ἡφαίστου· καὶ αὐλὸν τε εὐρεῖν νομίζουσι τὸν Ἄρδαλον τοῦτον... The only mention of Ardalus in Ps.-Plutarchus originated not in Glaucus: see below n. 65.

⁵⁶ See above n. 46.

It is therefore natural to think that τούς πρώτους ποιήσαντας αὐλωδίας refer to Clonas and Polymnestus. However, Glaucus could hardly prove the antiquity of Terpander by placing him after these musicians. It is true that neither aulode is called by name in quotations supplied with a direct reference to Glaucus. Still the compiler twice – and relatively near the passage under review (in ch. 4 and 5) – reproduces the point of view⁵⁷ that Clonas is younger than Terpander.⁵⁸ If the chronological calculations of Glaucus contradicted this view, even Ps.-Plutarch could hardly adduce them here without any comments.

The solution of the problem is to refer αὐτὸν in the expression αὐτὸν δεύτερον γενέσθαι (p. 5, 1) not to Terpander, but to Archilochus who had just been mentioned previously.⁵⁹ The confusion is caused by the inaccurate wording of Ps.-Plutarch: he failed to take into account that the previous αὐτὸν (πρεσβύτερον γοῦν αὐτὸν Αρχιλόχου, p. 4, 26) referred to Terpander and did not adduce the complete chronological calculation. The train of thought indistinctly recounted by the compiler can be reconstructed as follows: “Terpander is a very ancient poet; at least (γοῦν), he is older than Archilochus,⁶⁰ which is clear from Glaucus, who argues that Archilochus belongs to the generation after the first aulodes, [and Terpander is older than these aulodes]”. This interpretation is backed up by the passage that follows the quotation from Alexander (ch. 5, 1133 A, p. 5, 14–15): μετὰ δὲ Τέρπανδρον καὶ Κλονᾶν Ἀρχίλοχος παραδίδεται γενέσθαι. Apparently, in both cases we have the exposition of the same statement of Glaucus.⁶¹

If understood in this way (and I see no other way of understanding), the quotation from ch. 4 helps to make several conclusions about Glaucus’ work and its use by the later authors. Firstly, it follows that Glaucus referred to Clonas. This means that the name of Clonas cannot prove that we are dealing with the information of the Sicyonian chronicle, nor

⁵⁷ This is undoubtedly the view of Heraclides, since it is adduced in ch. 4 concerning the list of nomes taken from the Sicyonian chronicle.

⁵⁸ 1132 D: οἱ δὲ τῆς κιθαρωδίας νόμοι πρότερον <οὐ> πολλῶ χρόνῳ τῶν αὐλωδικῶν κατεστάθησαν ἐπὶ Τέρπανδρου; 1133 A: Κλονᾶς ... ὁ ὀλίγῳ ὕστερον Τέρπανδρου γενόμενος.

⁵⁹ Thus tentatively Gostoli 1990, 74; ead. 2015, 130 n. 4.

⁶⁰ Polemics concerning the chronological correlation of Terpander and Archilochus dates back to the fourth and even the fifth century: Hellanicus considered Terpander a contemporary of Midas, whereas Phaenias of Eresus argued that Archilochus and Leschus were older than Terpander (Athen. 14. 635 E; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1. 21. 131).

⁶¹ The reason for adducing it twice is probably that the first time the compiler was dealing with Terpander, and the second time with Clonas.

of Heraclides who followed it (*pace* Lucarini⁶²). The same conclusion suggests itself for Polymnestus, but in this case more caution is required: it was indicated above that Polymnestus was younger than Clonas (1132 C: τὸν μετὰ τοῦτον γενόμενον, cf. 1132 D: ὑστέρῳ δὲ χρόνῳ καὶ τὰ Πολυμνήστεια καλούμενα ἐξευρέθη), that is, strictly speaking, he ought to be a contemporary and not a predecessor of Archilochus. Perhaps the words τοὺς πρώτους ποιήσαντας ἀλωδῖαν in Ps.-Plutarch is a periphrastic indication of Clonas alone.⁶³ It should be noted that according to ch. 5 Archilochus lived “after Terpander and Clonas” and not “after Clonas and Polymnestus”.

Secondly, I do not reject the common conception that for Glaucus, the history of music began with wind and not stringed instruments,⁶⁴ but this concept must rest upon the information garnered in ch. 5, rather than ch. 4. Meanwhile, in ch. 5, the claim that only auletes existed before Orpheus makes no explicit reference to the Rhegian scholar. Therefore, as we ascribe this point of view to Glaucus, we deal not with an attested fact, but with a result of reconstruction.

Thirdly, as was already noted, the juxtaposition of Glaucus’ fragment from ch. 4 with the phrase μετὰ δὲ Τέρπανδρον καὶ Κλονᾶν Ἀρχίλοχος παραδίδεται γενέσθαι (ch. 5, 1133 A) allows us to identify the latter as one more, latent quotation from Glaucus.⁶⁵ It is from his work that the placing of poets before and after Archilochus is borrowed: this poet forms part of his “sequence of citharodes”, and all the other cases of dating poets in relation to Archilochus in the treatise (ch. 4, 1132 E and ch. 10, 1134 D–E) are adduced with references to Glaucus.⁶⁶

Finally, information concerning Clonas, a native of Peloponnesus, compared to Polymnestus of Colophon and Archilochus of Paros, would hardly be appropriate in a treatise of Alexander Polyhistor dedicated to Phrygia (if only they lacked Phrygian influence in Glaucus’ eyes). Whereas references to Glaucus in 1133 F and 1134 D–E are concerned

⁶² Lucarini 2020, 76.

⁶³ Cf. the definition οἱ περὶ + *acc.* in 1134 C.

⁶⁴ E.g. Lanata 1963, 272–273; Presta 1965, 91; Power 2010, 238; Ercoles 2013, 547; 552; Gostoli 2020, 140.

⁶⁵ Some scholars (Westphal 1865, 71; Franklin 2010–2011, 743) trace the quotation from Glaucus without interruption until παραδίδεται γενέσθαι (p. 5, 15). Still it cannot be proven that the argument on the native land of Clonas also originated in Glaucus. The passage on Ardalus (p. 5, 15–17) marks the end of the quotation: it is provided with the reference to ἄλλοι δὲ τινες τῶν συγγραφέων, whereas the preceding παραδίδεται must refer to Glaucus.

⁶⁶ Lasserre 1954, 156 supposed that Archilochus was chosen as the starting point because he could be plausibly dated as a contemporary of Gyges.

with the influence of Olympus and thus could, in theory, belong to Alexander's book, the quotation on Archilochus and the first aulodes (1132 E, cf. 1133 A) must have been adduced by someone else. I share the accepted view that it was Heraclides, to whom the whole ch. 4 and the ch. 5 beginning from 1133 A (i.e. the whole chapter but the quotation from Alexander) must be traced. Now, if the assumption that Alexander exposed Glaucus' point of view concerning the models of Orpheus and Terpander is true, it follows that his book on ancient poets was used by both direct sources of Ps.-Plutarch.

A parallel between Terpander and Homer is stated by Heraclides in ch. 3 (1132 C), so addressing the same subject seems to prove that chapters 4 (1132 D–E) and 6 (1134 C) also derive from Heraclides.⁶⁷ My analysis leads us to the conclusion that Glaucus also considered Terpander an imitator of Homer (p. 5, 7–8). The reason for this accordance might be that the Pontic scholar knew the work of the Rhegian, but it seems more likely that the similarity of Terpander's verse to the epic poetry of Homer was evident to everyone, such that Heraclides noticed it himself, without having to refer to Glaucus.

II

The next passage dealing with the history of instrumental music is in ch. 7–8 (1133 D – 1134 A). The way of representing the *nomes* changes radically: whereas ch. 4 contained simple lists of names, with only the authors indicated in addition, here the *nomes* are enumerated one by one, and with comments (although here too, the main emphasis is on debated authorship). I believe⁶⁸ that Ps.-Plutarch felt it necessary to adduce a list of auletic *nomes* in his treatise, analogous to that of the citharodic and aulodic *nomes*, but he did not find such a list in his sources and so tried to form it himself, extracting the names of the *nomes* from books on other matters.

The authorship of Polyhistor⁶⁹ is denoted by the close affinity of subject. Here, in a section dedicated to instrumental music, the discussion

⁶⁷ Wilamowitz 1903, 89; Barker 1984, 211 n. 42; Gostoli 1990, 20; 97–98 (T32); 22 (T34); Ercoles 2008, 130 n. 11; Barker 2009, 100; Power 2010, 241.

⁶⁸ Almazova 2016, 26–28.

⁶⁹ Weil–Reinach 1900, VI n. 1 and Jacoby 1904, 52; id. 1943, 287 (*FGrHist* 273 F 77 Komm.) attribute to Alexander Polyhistor 1133 E, p. 7, 7–10 (τὸν δὲ Μαρσύαν – αὐλητικὴν τέχνην). Voß 1896, 81 adds to these lines p. 6, 26 – 7, 2 (οὗτος γὰρ – τῶν θεῶν). Wilamowitz 1994, 286 n. 2 also traced the data of ch. 7 (not specified) back to Polyhistor.

turns again to the auletes Hyagnis, Marsyas and Olympus, and the same information is reproduced as was borrowed from Alexander in ch. 5: Hyagnis is the *πρῶτος εὐρετής* of auletics, Marsyas is his son (p. 7, 9–10), while Olympus is the first to introduce the art of aulos-playing to the Greeks (p. 6, 27 – 7, 1). One auletic nome is named in ch. 8 as well, but since no “Phrygian trace” can be noted there and the musicians under review come from other regions, I think that the extract from Polyhistor is limited to ch. 7.⁷⁰ Ps.-Plutarch found only two auletic nomes in his book – naturally those ascribed to Olympus, that is, the Many-headed and the Chariot nomes.

It is hardly possible to state what information of Polyhistor’s is founded in the work of Glaucus. One can only cautiously assume that Glaucus did not limit himself to discussing Olympus and postulated, as he was wont to, a certain succession of Phrygian musicians, since the plural is used when speaking of auletes who preceded Orpheus (p. 5, 10). The achievements of the three legendary Phrygians get confused in the catalogues of discoveries⁷¹ – hence the later chroniclers felt the need to systematize the correspondence between them postulating ‘father–son’ or ‘teacher–pupil’ relations. F. Jacoby thought that in the system accepted by Glaucus there was no Hyagnis, and though his own argument is not satisfactory,⁷² this is possible, for the idea of Olympus as the pupil of Marsyas is safely attested in the classical period,⁷³ while Hyagnis is far

⁷⁰ I think it possible that evidence from the end of ch. 6 and the beginning of ch. 8 sat together in Heraclides. Both passages mention Hipponax, perhaps both times in a chronological context: his reference to Mimnermus could prove that he lived later. Once adduced, this quotation led Heraclides to argue that elegiac poetry was sung to the aulos accompaniment in ancient times, and thus the poets who composed it ought to master this instrument. Such a subject would account for dealing with auletics in Heraclides’ book: instrumental music only interested him in connection with poetry. Ps.-Plutarch, in his turn, took his cue from a mention of the Fig nome to insert a list of auletic nomes.

⁷¹ Jacoby 1904, 50–51. E.g., inventor of the Phrygian harmony: Hyagnis – Aristoxen. fr. 78 Wehrli (apud Athen. 14. 624 B); Theophr. fr. 726 B app. FHS&G (apud Eustath. *Comm. ad Hom. Il.* vol. III p. 907. 4–6 van der Valk); Marsyas – *Sch. Plat. Min.* 318 b; Clem. *Strom.* 1. 16. 76; all the three auletes – Anon. Bell. 28.

⁷² Jacoby 1904, 50. Jacoby thinks (with no sufficient grounds, see Almazova 2014, 536–537) that the Chariot nome, which Glaucus ascribes to Olympus, is the same as the nome of the Mother, which the Parian chronicle ascribes to Hyagnis.

⁷³ Cf. a painting by Polygnotus in the Lesche of the Cnidians in Delphi – see Paus. 10. 30. 9: ὑπὲρ τούτου (sc. Thamyrae) ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πέτρας καθεζόμενος Μαρσύας, καὶ Ὀλυμπος παρ’ αὐτὸν παιδός ἐστιν ὠραῖου καὶ αὐλεῖν διδασκομένου σχῆμα ἔχων. *Plat. Symp.* 215 c: ἃ γὰρ Ὀλυμπος ἤλκει, Μαρσύου λέγω, τούτου διδάξαντος. The first clear representation of Olympus as a student of Marsyas in vase-painting is an

less rooted in tradition: he is first identified as a cultural hero (the inventor of the Phrygian harmony) by Aristoxenus and Theophrastus.⁷⁴

Besides, one gets the impression that Glaucus did not distinguish between two Olympi:⁷⁵ judging by quotations in *Περὶ μουσικῆς*, he never gave Olympus qualifying attributes such as “the first” “the elder”, “the one beloved by Marsyas” and so on. In particular, 1133 E is significant: the assertion that the Chariot nome was created by the first Olympus is adduced with a reference to an anonymous source (λέγεται), next come facts about Marsyas (who had nothing to do with this nome), and only after this does the author appeal to Glaucus’ authority in order to prove that this piece was composed by Olympus (ὅτι δ’ ἐστὶν Ὀλύμπου ὁ Ἀρμάτειος νόμος, ἐκ τῆς Γλαύκου συγγραφῆς ... μάθοι ἄν τις) – but not the fact that it was the elder Olympus.

In ch. 7 only one of the authors who distinguished between two Olympi – Pratinas – is referred to by name; other references are anonymous (λέγεται, φασιν). The synopsis in Ps.-Plutarch is not only disorderly – it contains an inner contradiction. The numbers I have inserted in square brackets point to different versions adduced in the treatise:

- p. 6, 21 [1] λέγεται γὰρ τὸν προειρημέ-
νον Ὀλυμπον, αὐλητὴν ὄντα τῶν ἐκ Φρυγίας, ποιῆσαι νό-
μον αὐλητικὸν εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα τὸν καλούμενον Πολυκέ-
φαλον· [2] εἶναι δὲ τὸν Ὀλυμπον τοῦτον φασιν ἓνα τῶν ἀπὸ
25 τοῦ πρώτου Ὀλύμπου τοῦ Μαρσίου <μαθητοῦ>, πεποιη-
κότος εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς νόμους· οὗτος γὰρ παιδικὰ γενό-
μενος Μαρσίου καὶ τὴν αὐλησιν μαθὼν παρ’ αὐτοῦ, τοὺς 1133 E
p. 7, 1 νόμους τοὺς ἀρμονικοὺς ἐξήνεγκεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα οἷς
<ἔτι καὶ> νῦν χρῶνται οἱ Ἕλληνας ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς τῶν θεῶν. [3] ἄλλοι
δὲ Κράτητος εἶναι φασὶ τὸν Πολυκέφαλον νόμον, γενομέ-
νου μαθητοῦ Ὀλύμπου· [4] ὁ δὲ Πρατίνης Ὀλύμ-
που φησὶν εἶναι τοῦ νεωτέρου τὸν νόμον τοῦτον.

Thus, the first opinion adduced [1] is that the “above-mentioned” Olympus was the author of the Many-headed nome. The aforementioned Olympus (in ch. 5) was the third aulete after Hyagnis and Marsyas, and therefore, undoubtedly the elder. The following claim [2] contradicts the one just made: “*this* (i.e. the aforementioned) Olympus is said to

Apulian calyx crater of the 4th cent. BC, see Herrmann 1975, Pl. 32, 3; 5 (according to Herrmann 1975, 89, Polygnotus’ *Nekyia* could be its prototype).

⁷⁴ Jacoby 1904, 52–53. See n. 71.

⁷⁵ Lucarini 2020, 79.

be one of the descendants of the first Olympus”, – and then, instead of concentrating on the newly introduced younger Olympus, all attention is focused on the elder man (although he did not compose the Many-headed nome, according to the version considered in that moment).⁷⁶ The third opinion [3] is that the Many-headed nome was an invention of Crates, a pupil of Olympus (it is not clear, of which one). Finally, a claim of Pratinas [4] that the younger Olympus was the author of this nome is added. The claim repeats what is already mentioned [2], but presents it as new information.

In order to remove the contradiction between [1] and [2], Lucarini⁷⁷ proposed athetizing προειρημένον (p. 6, 21–22). Yet this solution does not spare us all the difficulties: in this case, in [1], [2] and [4] the same author of the Many-headed nome, namely the younger Olympus, would be proposed. Meanwhile, the reference to Pratinas [4] seems to be refuting the attribution of the Many-headed nome to the elder Olympus – which means that the latter ought to be called its author somewhere above. Besides, referring to a nome by the first Olympus in [1] would suit the context better: in line with aulodic and citharodic nomes, Ps.-Plutarch is likely to have named first the works of the inventor of the genre.

In order to make the affirmation [2] opposed and not carrying on with [1] both by contents and formally, I propose to change εἶναι to ἔνιοι in the phrase (p. 6, 24) εἶναι δὲ τὸν Ὀλυμπον τοῦτόν φασι (cf. references to ἔνιοι in 1133 D and 1141 B). This emendation only slightly improves the illogical and inconsistent composition of the passage on the Many-headed nome. An ideal solution would be to eliminate any mention of the younger Olympus from [2] altogether⁷⁸ – in this case explanations considering the elder Olympus (p. 6, 25 – 7, 2) would not seem an irrelevant digression, and a reference to Pratinas [4], a repetition. However, anyone acquainted with Ps.-Plutarch’s style is aware that such

⁷⁶ Wilamowitz 1994, 286 n. 2 (= 1931, 292 n. 1): “An der ersten Stelle [sc. ch. 7, p. 6, 25] muß S. 493, 22 Bern. Μαρσίου gestrichen werden, denn der erste Olympos, der Erfinder der νόμοι, ist παιδικά des Marsyas, der zweite ist Nachkomme des ersten und führt die κρούματα nur bei den Hellene ein, Kap. 5”. However, this is a mistake made through lack of attention: according to the text (ch. 5, p. 5, 4–5 and ch. 7, p. 6, 26 – 7, 2), it was the same first Olympus who delivered κρούματα to the Greeks.

⁷⁷ Lucarini 2020, 78 n. 22.

⁷⁸ E.g. one could suppose substantial corruption of the text, including a lacuna, and restore its contents as follows: some people claim that there was only one Olympus (ἔνα) and do not distinguish the second Olympus from the first (ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου). Westphal 1865, 6–7, followed by Weil–Reinach 1900, 30–31, placed εἶναι – νόμους (p. 6, 24–26) after τὸν νόμον τοῦτον (p. 7, 5).

shortcomings are typical of him,⁷⁹ so we have no grounds to get rid of them by means of textual criticism. Moreover, I admit that even the contradiction between [1] and [2] can result not from a scribe's mistake, but from that of the compiler himself, who did not verify which Olympus was mentioned above and just mechanically copied the word *προειρημένον* from Polyhistor.⁸⁰

The fact that Ps.-Plutarch lost his train of thought and adduced details about the elder Olympus that were inappropriate to a discussion of the Many-headed nome, and details about Marsyas that were irrelevant to the Chariot nome, proves that the nomes did not form the main subject matter of his source, but were mentioned in passing, whereas the focus was on the succession and interrelation of musicians.

Ps.-Plutarch's data shows that Alexander's book on Phrygia contained a section dedicated to the Phrygian music and its influence upon the Greek one. The author claimed the Phrygian origin of the art of aulos-playing. He communicated available evidence on the *πρῶτοι εὐρεταί* of auletics – Hyagnis, Marsyas and Olympus, including the 'father – son' and 'teacher – pupil' relations, which helped to restore their succession, and achievements ascribed to them (with alternative attributions of famous pieces).

Let us revise once more the reasons that allow considering Glaucus as the source of Polyhistor. In ch. 5 Alexander is mentioned by name and Glaucus can be recognized from the contents of the passage which is analogous to two quotations of his work (and it was the book of Alexander that contained this passage, as the grammatical structure of the phrase clearly shows). In contrast, in ch. 7, Polyhistor can be identified by the contents that correspond to the quotation in ch. 5, while Glaucus is named in a reference that forms an organic part of the discussion (his authority confirms the argumentation). Finally, since Glaucus traced the role of the Phrygian Olympus in the history of Greek music, his data fitted quite well with the subject of Alexander's treatise. To my mind, all this makes the assumption that Polyhistor used Glaucus quite probable.

⁷⁹ Cf., e.g., a digression on Marsyas in a report about the nome of Olympus: p. 7, 7–10; a repetition of the data from 1132 D in 1133 A, p. 5, 19–21: *περὶ δὲ Κλονᾶ ὅτι τὸν Ἀπόθετον νόμον καὶ Σχοινίωνα πεποηκῶς εἶη μνημονεύουσιν οἱ ἀναγεγραφότες.*

⁸⁰ Cf. his notorious references to "present-day" music and musicians copied from his sources such as Heraclides and Aristoxenus: see Weil–Reinach 1900, V; D'Alfonso 1980, 137 n. 2; Ercoles 2009, 136. The most blatant case is 1138 A (Antigenides and Dorion are called *οἱ νῦν*, see Barker 1984, 226 n. 138 on their lifetime); cf. 1133 B (with the commentary of Barker 1984, 111 n. 42), 1133 E, 1135 B, 1135 D, 1136 B, 1137 F, 1138 B bis, 1140 D, 1140 E (see Barker 1984, 233 n. 174, 176); 1141 B, 1145 A.

An additional remark seems appropriate. In scholarly literature the notion of Glaucus' partiality to wind music has almost become *opinio communis*.⁸¹ However, if Ps.-Plutarch got his information from *Collection of Information about Phrygia*, this impression may be misleading. There is no doubt that Glaucus ascribed an important part in the history of music to the aulos, and there is certainly polemical ardor in his judgments, but the general picture may be distorted if Polyhistor intentionally selected quotations dealing with Olympus' influence. As we have seen, Glaucus relates without prejudice that the Phrygian tradition did not influence Orpheus (1132 F), and below (1134 D) he calls Archilochus Thaletas' model alongside with Olympus.

To be continued.

Nina Almazova
 Saint Petersburg State University
 n.almazova@spbu.ru

Bibliography

- N. Almazova, "On the meaning of ἀλωφῶδία, ἀλωφῶδός", *Hyperboreus* 14: 2 (2008) 5–34.
- N. Almazova, "Ἀρμάτειος νόμος", *MAIA* 66: 3 (2014) 518–538.
- N. Almazova, "Cradias Nomos", *Philologia Classica* 11: 1 (2016) 20–31.
- A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings I* (Cambridge 1984).
- A. Barker, *The Science of Harmonics in Classical Greece* (Cambridge 2007).
- A. Barker, "Heraclides and Musical History", in: W. W. Fortenbaugh, E. Pender (eds.), *Heraclides of Pontus. Discussion*, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 15 (New Brunswick – London 2009) 273–298.
- A. Barker, *Ancient Greek Writers on their Musical Past. Studies in Greek Musical Historiography* (Pisa–Rome 2014).
- K. Bartol, "The Importance of Appropriateness: Rethinking the Definition of *nomos*", *Philologus* 142: 2 (1998) 300–307.
- Th. Bergk, *Poetae lyrici Graeci III. Poetae melici* (Lipsiae 1914).
- F. D'Alfonso, "Stesicoro e gli ἀρχαῖοι μελοποιοί in un passo del *De Musica* Pseudo-Plutarcho (1132 b–c)", *Bolletino dei Classici* 10 (1980) 138–148.

⁸¹ Weil–Reinach 1900, XII supposed that he came from a family of auletes. Jacoby 1912, 1419; id. 1941, 100 n. 1 and Huxley 1968, 50 believed he was a professional aulete himself. Barker 2014, 44–45 assumed that Glaucus' polemics aimed at supporting those auletes who represented the "New Music". See also Lanata 1963, 276; Gostoli 2015, 132; ead. 2020, 140; 141; Lucarini 2020, 82.

- G. D'Ippolito, "Il *De musica* nel corpus plutarco: una paternità recuperabile", *QUCC* 99 (2011) 207–225.
- M. Ercoles, "La citarodia arcaica nelle testimonianze degli autori ateniesi d'età classica. Ovvero: le insidie delle ricostruzioni storiche", *Philomusica Online* 7 (2008) 124–136.
- M. Ercoles, "La musica che non c'è più... La poesia greca arcaica nel *De musica* pseudo-plutarco", in: D. Castaldo, D. Restani, C. Tassi (eds.), *Il sapere musicale e i suoi contesti da Teofrasto a Claudio Tolomeo* (Ravenna 2009) 145–169.
- M. Ercoles, *Stesicoro. Le testimonianze antiche* (Bologna 2013).
- J. C. Franklin, "The Lesbian Singers: Towards a Reconstruction of Hellanicus' *Karneian Victors*", *Rudiae* 22–23 (2010–2011) 719–763.
- W. D. Furley, J. M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns I–II* (Tübingen 2001).
- A. Gostoli, *Terpander* (Rome 1990).
- A. Gostoli, "Da Demodoco a Timoteo: una storia della lirica greca nel *De musica* attribuito a Plutarco", *QUCC* 99 (2011) 31–42.
- A. Gostoli, "Glauco di Reggio musicista e storico della poesia greca nel V secolo a. C.", *QUCC* 110 (2015) 125–142.
- A. Gostoli, "Le fonti storiografiche del *De musica* attribuito a Plutarco", in: G. B. D'Alessio, L. Lomiento, C. Meliaddò, G. Ucciardello (eds.), *Il potere della parola. Studi di letteratura greca per Maria Cannatà Fera* (Alessandria 2020) 133–145.
- H. Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus* (Oxford 1980).
- H. Guhrauer, "Zur Geschichte der Aulosmusik. Eine Entgegnung", *JbClPhil* 121 (1880) 689–705.
- A. Herrmann, "Two Hellenistic Groups and their Forerunners", *Antike Kunst* 18: 2 (1975) 85–92.
- E. Hiller, "Die Fragmente des Glaukos von Rhegion", *RhM* 41 (1886) 398–436.
- H. Huchzermeyer, *Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Aufgang der klassischen Zeit* (Emsdetten 1931).
- G. L. Huxley, "Glaukos of Rhegion", *GRBS* 9 (1968) 47–54.
- F. Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin 1904 [Nachdr. Hildesheim 2008]).
- F. Jacoby, "Glaukos 36", *RE* 7 (1912) 1417–1420.
- F. Jacoby, "The Date of Archilochos", *CQ* 35 (1941) 97–109.
- F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (FGrHist) IIIa. Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie): Kommentar zu Nr. 262–296* (Leiden 1943).
- F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (FGrHist) IIIb. Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie): Kommentar zu Nr. 297–607* (Leiden 1955).
- A. Kleingünther, "ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung", *Philologus* Supplbd. 26, Heft 1 (Leipzig 1933).
- G. Lanata (ed., tr., comm.), *Poetica pre-platonica. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Firenze 1963).
- F. Lasserre (ed.), *Plutarque. De la musique* (Olten – Lausanne 1954).

- C. M. Lucarini, “Herakleides Pontikos und die ps.-plutarchische Schrift *Περὶ μουσικῆς*”, *Hyperboreus* 26: 1 (2020) 71–87.
- J. Mejer, “Heraclides’ Intellectual Context”, in: W. Fortenbaugh, E. Pender (eds.), *Heraclides of Pontus. Discussion*, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 15 (New Brunswick – London 2009) 27–40.
- A. Meriani, “Tracce Aristosseniche nel De musica pseudoplutarcheo”, in: id., *Sulla musica greca antica. Studi e ricerche* (Salerno 2003) 49–81.
- E. Pöhlmann, “Ps. Plutarch, *De musica*. A History of Oral Tradition of Ancient Greek Music”, *QUCC* 99 (2011) 11–30.
- T. Power, *The Culture of Kitharōidia* (Cambridge, Ma. – London 2010).
- A. Presta, “Glauco di Reggio”, *Almanacco calabrese* 15 (1965) 87–95.
- E. Reiner, *Die rituelle Totenklage bei den Griechen* (Tübingen 1938).
- V. Rose, *Aristoteles pseudepigraphus* (Lipsiae 1863).
- E. Schwartz, “Alexandros 88”, *RE* 1 (1894) 1449–1452.
- H. Thiemer, *Der Einfluß der Phryger auf die altgriechische Musik* (Bonn – Bad Godesberg 1979).
- A. Visconti, *Aristosseno di Taranto. Biografia e formazione spirituale* (Naples 1999).
- R. Volkmann (ed.), *Plutarchi De musica* (Leipzig 1856).
- O. Voß, *De Heraclidis Pontici vita et scriptis* (Rostochiae 1896).
- F. Wehrli, “Herakleides der Pontiker”, *RE* Suppl. 11 (1968) 675–686.
- F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar. VII. Herakleides Pontikos* (Basel–Stuttgart 1969).
- H. Weil, Th. Reinach (eds.), *Plutarque. De la Musique. Édition critique et explicative* (Paris 1900).
- R. Westphal (ed.), *Πλουτάρχου Περὶ μουσικῆς. Plutarch über die Musik* (Breslau 1865).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Timotheos, Die Perser* (Leipzig 1903).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen I* (Darmstadt 1994 [1931]).
- P. Wilson, “Thamyris the Thracian: the Archetypal Wandering Poet?”, in: R. Hunter, I. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge 2009) 46–79.
- D. Wyttenbach, *Plutarchi...moralia graeca* V (Oxonii 1800).
- K. Ziegler, “Orpheus”, *RE* 18: 1 (1939) 1200–1316.
- K. Ziegler, “Plutarchos von Chaironeia”, *RE* 21 (1951) 636–962 [= K. Ziegler, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart 1949)].
- K. Ziegler, M. Pohlenz (eds.), *Plutarchus. Moralia* VI, 3 (Lipsiae 21959).

The role of Alexander Polyhistor as the source of Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* seems underestimated. The paper argues that in ch. 3–10 of his treatise the compiler regularly used Alexander to address the history of instrumental music (ignored by Heraclides of Pontus). Two mutually incompatible historical constructions, one identifying Amphion as the first citharode (ch. 3), and the other Orpheus (ch. 5),

betray two different sources, neither of which took the other into account. These are most probably Heraclides and Alexander. The latter, in his turn, based his description of Phrygian impact in Greek music on the data of Glaucus of Rhegium, and it is from his book that all Glaucus' quotations concerning the role of Olympus originate. A diffused assumption of Glaucus' partiality to wind music may be misleading, if Polyhistor intentionally chose data dealing with Olympus' influence for his "Collection of Information about Phrygia".

The first such quotation (ch. 5, p. 5, 7–11 Ziegler 1959) lacks the reference to Glaucus and must be attributed to him by its contents. The discrepancy between two phrases of Glaucus, one of which seemingly places Terpander immediately after the first inventors of aulos music, the other inserting Orpheus between them, is eliminated by (a) referring αὐτὸν δεύτερον γενέσθαι (p. 5, 1) to Archilochus instead of Terpander and (b) interpreting οἱ τῶν ἀλφδικῶν ποιηταί (p. 5, 10) as a scribe's mistake prompted by ὁ τῶν ἀλφδικῶν νόμων ποιητής immediately below (p. 5, 11–12).

The next passage taken from Polyhistor is ch. 7, as the shared subject with ch. 5 clearly shows. Its particularly chaotic composition may be due to the fact that the compiler tried to compose a list of auletic nomes, which were not organized in a list in any of his sources, but was distracted now and then by the topics discussed in the books he used. The incongruity consisting in a reference to "above-mentioned" Olympus as the second one – where he was really the first – may be removed by changing εἶναι to ἔνιοι in p. 6, 24. The reference to Glaucus confirms the argument and thus forms an organic part of Alexander's report on the Phrygian inventors of wind music. The mention of the instrumental Fig nome in ch. 8 lacks the "Phrygian trace" and was probably taken from Heraclides' discussion on the need for archaic elegiac poets to master aulos-playing.

At the same time, some of Glaucus' chronological calculations (such as p. 4, 25 – 5, 2 and 5, 14–15) could be cited by Heraclides as well. If so, his treatise on ancient poets and musicians remained an important reference book for a certain period.

Роль Александра Полигистора как источника трактата Псевдо-Плутарха "О музыке" представляется недооцененной. В статье доказывается, что в гл. 3–10 компилятор регулярно использует труд Александра "Свод знаний о Фригии", обращаясь к истории инструментальной музыки (которой не интересовался другой его источник – Гераклид Понтийский). Две взаимоисключающие исторические схемы, в одной из которых первым кифаредом был Амфион (гл. 3), а в другой – Орфей (гл. 5), указывают на два разных источника, не учитывавшие друг друга. По всей вероятности, это Гераклид и Александр. Последний, в свою очередь, говоря о фригийском влиянии на греческую музыку, заимствовал данные у Главка из Регия, так что именно в его книге Псевдо-Плутарх нашел все цитаты из Главка о роли Олимпа. Распространенное представление о том, что Главк преимущественно ценил музыку для авла, возможно, неверно, если Полигистор умышленно отбирал для своего "Свода знаний о Фригии" только сведения о влиянии Олимпа.

В первой такой цитате (гл. 5, р. 5, 7–11 Ziegler 1959) нет упоминания о Главке, так что она атрибутируется ему по содержанию. Для того чтобы снять противоречие между двумя фразами Главка, в одной из которых, на первый взгляд, Терпандр отнесен к следующему поколению после первооткрывателей музыки для авла, а в другой между ними и Терпандром вставлен Орфей, нужно (а) относить αὐτὸν δεύτερον γενέσθαι (р. 5, 1) к Архилоху, а не к Терпандру, и (б) признать οἱ τῶν ἀλφεικῶν ποιηταί (р. 5, 10) ошибкой переписчика, спровоцированной словами ὁ τῶν ἀλφεικῶν νόμων ποιητής в следующей строке (р. 5, 11–12).

Следующий пассаж, заимствованный у Полигистора, – гл. 7, как ясно показывает общее с гл. 5 содержание. Особая беспорядочность композиции этой главы, видимо, связана с тем, что компилятор не нашел готового списка авлетических номов ни в одном из своих источников и предпринял попытку составить его самостоятельно, но постоянно сбивался на темы, которые обсуждались в использованных им книгах. В тексте говорится о “вышеупомянутом” Олимпе как о младшем, хотя выше упоминался старший, – чтобы снять это противоречие, предлагается заменить εἶναι на ἔνιοι (р. 6, 24). Ссылка на Главка служит для подкрепления аргументации и составляет неотъемлемую часть рассказа Александра о первооткрывателях духовой музыки. В сообщении об авлетическом смоковничном номе в гл. 8 отсутствует “фригийский след”, так что он был, вероятно, упомянут Гераклидом, рассуждавшим о том, что древние авторы элегической поэзии должны были уметь играть на авле.

В то же время, некоторые хронологические выкладки Главка (в частности, р. 4, 25 – 5, 2; р. 5, 14–15) мог приводить и Гераклид. Если так, трактат Главка о древних поэтах и музыкантах некоторое время оставался незамеченным “справочным изданием”.

CONSPECTUS

RADIM KOČANDRLE	
Heaven as the Outermost Periphery of the Earth in Archaic Ionian Cosmologies	185
CHRISTIAN LAES	
Most Subversive Suffering: Pain and the Reversal of Roles in Graeco-Roman Antiquity	213
JENS HOLZHAUSEN	
Kleinigkeiten im <i>Kyklops</i> des Euripides	238
NINA ALMAZOVA	
Alexander Polyhistor and Glaucus of Rhegium as Sources of Pseudo-Plutarch's Treatise <i>De musica</i> . I–II	266
ANASTASHIA PAVLOVA	
Reattributing Heracl. Pont. F 102 Schütr.	291
ARINA STARIKOVA	
Posidonius as a Possible Source of Diodorus' Description of the Dead Sea (Diod. 2. 48. 6–8; 19. 98–99)	299
MARTIN RACKOW	
Zum Telos des Philänenexkurses in Sall. <i>Iug.</i> 79	316
CARLO M. LUCARINI	
Congetture alle <i>Metamorfosi</i> di Apuleio	328
Keywords	346