

**The Lesbian Singers:
Towards a Reconstruction of Hellanicus' *Karneian Victors***

John C. Franklin
The University of Vermont

Under review for D. Castaldo/A. Manieri (eds.),
Poesia, musica e agoni nella Grecia antica
(proceedings of the 2010 MOISA conference)

*Abstract*¹

Hellanicus of Lesbos (c. 480–395), an almost exact contemporary of Herodotus and Euripides,² was a prolific mythographer, ethnographer and pioneer of annalistic chronography.³ He also produced the first known treatment of musical history, *The Karneian Victors* (οἱ Καρνεονῆκαι), which at the same time was probably the earliest work on a major pan-Hellenic musical contest. In this paper I shall attempt to recover the main outlines of this lost work. The prospect might seem hopeless, given that F. Jacoby identified only two certain fragments, and a third possible notice (4 F 85–6). But two further passages—from Euripides' *Alcestis* and the *De musica* of Ps. Plutarch—have recently been proposed to derive from, or show the influence of, the *Karneian Victors*. I shall support both of these suggestions with additional observations, arguing moreover that they may be productively combined to allow still further deductions. The 'new' material allows us to re-examine the known fragments in an expanded context, and this revision—which must be combined with consideration of the methods, scope and development of Hellanicus' work as a whole—may enable a better picture of the *Karneian Victors* and clarify or dispel some long-standing assumptions. In particular, I shall argue that Jacoby's grouping of it with Hellanicus' other two annalistic works (the

¹ This paper was inspired by a memorable trip to Greece in 2009, to participate in the 'Sapphofest' sponsored by the Center for Hellenic Studies. I gratefully recall the many stimulating discussions I had there with G. Nagy, T. Power, L. and M. Muellner, D. Frame, R. Olson, S. Psaroudakes, Ch. Terzes, C. Murray, Donovan, Gypsy Dave—and especially G. Fawkes. I would also thank P. Ambrose for discovering a number of infelicities. All references to the fragments and testimonia of Hellanicus and other historians are according to Jacoby's enumeration in *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (= *FrGrHist*), where available.

² The Arginusae fragment (323a F 25 = *schol.* Aristoph. *Ran.* 694) shows that the *Attike Syngraphe* was (probably) not complete until after 407/6. Jacoby, in accord with his theory of historiographical development, wished to make Hellanicus somewhat younger than Herodotus; but this view has been increasingly questioned, and the relatively early dating of many lost fifth-century historians has been positively reappraised (*cf.* already GOMME 1945–1981, 1, pp. 2 n. 2, p. 6–7 n. 3; PARKER 1996; MÖLLER 2001, pp. 242–8). A conservative treatment of an ancient statement that Hellanicus reached the age of 85 (Ps. Luc., *Macrob.* 22 = 4 T 8), and assertions of Hellanicus' position relative to Herodotus and Thucydides, permit a reliable date range of c. 480–395, 485–400, or even 496–412 (for the last, see GOMME *loc. cit.*, suggesting that F 25 was a posthumous 'update': for convenience I shall continue to assume that Hellanicus' *Attike Syngraphe* went down to at least 407/6): sources and arguments in DREWS 1973; AMBAGLIO 1980, pp. 13–18; PARKER 1996, esp. p. 66 with reference to 4 T 12, 323a T 2b, 687a T 1. For the connection between Euripides and Hellanicus, see further below.

³ For Hellanicus generally, see JACOBY 1913; PEARSON 1939; JACOBY 1949, *passim*; AMBAGLIO 1980; HARDING 1994, pp. 9–10, 42, 48–49; PARKER 1996; MÖLLER 2001.

Argive Priestesses and the *Attike Syngraphe* or *Atthis*) is misguided.⁴ Crucial here is the new *terminus ante quem* of 438 promised by Euripides' *Alcestis*; if correct, this makes the *Karneian Victors* a relatively early work. As such, it may not have been annalistic at all, nor as universalizing as is generally thought. I shall suggest that it had more in common with Hellanicus' early mythographic and ethnographic writings, with their persistent epichoric focus. I shall argue in fact that the *Karneian Victors* may really have meant 'Famous Lesbian Singers at the Karneia'; it may even have formed a subsection of a more general work on Lesbos (the *Lesbiaka*).

Introduction: The Development of Hellanicus' Annalistic Chronography

Since the fundamental work of Jacoby, Hellanicus has been recognized as the first of the so-called Atthidographers—local historians of Athens who arranged their work in chronicle format, whereby a sequence of magistrates is accompanied by annotations of important events for each year (κατ' ἐνιαυτόν).⁵ In a work which Thucydides calls *Attike Syngraphe*,⁶ Hellanicus established the precedent of following the sequence of Athenian archons, a system which was observed by all subsequent Atthidographers and was sometimes even adopted outside of Athens (e.g. the *Parian Marble*: see below).⁷ Despite a recent attempt to derail this view,⁸ Hellanicus' use of the complete archon-list, from its believable beginning with a certain Kreon in 683/2,⁹ is beyond reasonable doubt. An Aristophanic scholiast reports his dating of the battle of Arginusae to the archonship of Antigenes in 407/6.¹⁰ That this date-citation was more than a casual reference is proven by a combination of two passages in Thucydides. The historian criticizes Hellanicus' treatment of the Pentekontaetia as composed 'tersely and without chronological accuracy (βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς, 1.97.2).¹¹ When this is combined with Thucydides' insistence (5.20) on the inadequacy of mere annual dating ('since it is inexact', οὐ γὰρ ἀκριβὲς ἔστιν) and his call for separating events into summer and winter gradations, it becomes certain that Hellanicus did indeed offer an annalistic account in the *Attike Syngraphe*—however deficient in detail—for at least the period of 480–407.

In fact this range may be confidently extended back to the first archon, since many other fragments show that Hellanicus also dealt in detail with the myths and legends of early

⁴ JACOBY 1913, p. 138 and in *FrGrHist*; AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 22.

⁵ JACOBY 1949.

⁶ Thuc. 1.97.2. I shall continue to use *Attike Syngraphe* to refer to this work, even if Thucydides' usage does not prove that it was Hellanicus' own title: JACOBY 1949, pp. 81–2; AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 158.

⁷ JACOBY 1949, p. 171. *Marmor Parium*: JACOBY 1904 and *FrGrHist* 239.

⁸ JOYCE 1999. His argument from Dion. Halic. *Thuc.* 5.1—who groups Hellanicus with those fifth-century historians who wrote regional histories (κατὰ τόπους) rather than chronicles—does not distinguish between the Lesbian's earlier mythographic and ethnographic works, and a developing interest in chronography in the latter part of his career. This crucial point will be developed below.

⁹ The complete obscurity of Kreon, and the fact that there remained a gap between him and the end of the royal period, strongly suggest that the archon-list was authentic throughout, whatever document may have preceded the new inscription of c.425: HARDING 1994, p. 10.

¹⁰ 4 F 171; 323a F 25 = *schol.* Aristoph. *Ran.* 694.

¹¹ For Thucydides' critique of Hellanicus' system, see Jacoby in *FrGrHist* IIIb (Supplement) 1, pp. 17–18; LENDLE 1964; AMBAGLIO 1980, pp. 158–60; SMART 1986; HORNBLOWER 1987, pp. 83–4; MÖLLER 2001, pp. 259–61. The Pentekontaetia is the fifty-year interval between the Persian Wars and the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.

Athenian kings.¹² Here he relied on the methods he used in his mythographic works. By bringing together disparate figures of Attic mythology, culling variants which best met his needs, and making a few discrete ‘discoveries’, Hellanicus ‘established’ for the first time a continuous king-list going back Cecrops, and before him to the primeval Ogyges (323 F 10). Although his heavy-handed methods were later criticized by Philochorus (328 F 92), Hellanicus’ achievement was nevertheless pioneering, and its impact on subsequent chronography decisive and permanent.

Hellanicus’ use of the archons is undoubtedly connected somehow with the publication of an official version of the list c. 435–415, probably in the agora.¹³ This event is generally interpreted in terms of the ‘contemporary antiquarian interest’ which is also attested by numerous sophistic and historical works known from the same period, including of course Herodotus’ *Histories*, but otherwise now largely lost.¹⁴ This point can be valid even if the new inscription replaced an older, worn-out version.¹⁵ But it is not impossible that it was Hellanicus’ research which stimulated the new inscription, and not the reverse.¹⁶ Although his *Attike Syngraphe* was not complete until after 407/6,¹⁷ he may well have needed twenty years or more to complete such a grand work (especially if one allows that a scholar may develop more than one book at a time), and securing a chronological framework will have been a desirable (and perhaps necessary) first step. Jacoby showed, on the basis of other known lists from the Archaic and Classical periods, that the underlying material of the archon-list was probably authentic throughout, presumably based on records kept by the archons themselves (and assuming that these had survived largely intact); at the same time, he demonstrated the great unlikelihood that that these records could have come down with any significant historical annotations of their own (thereby thoroughly refuting Wilamowitz).¹⁸ So whatever Hellanicus’ relation to the list itself, the material which he assigned to each archon came largely from oral

¹² JACOBY 1949, p. 60; PEARSON 1939, pp. 210–22 remains a useful discussion of the mythological material.

¹³ See BRADEEN 1963 = MEIGGS/ LEWIS 1969, no. 6, both agreeing that any reconstruction of the fragments must take the list back to 683/2 (so too STROUD 1978, p. 41 n. 57); both also reproduce the original dating to c. 425 proposed by MERITT 1939, but STROUD 1978, p. 41 n. 57, warns that where letter-forms alone are the sole dating criterion one should allow 10 years on either side.

¹⁴ *Cfr.* KLEINGÜNTHER 1933, esp. 135–43 for contemporary interest in musical/literary history specifically; JACOBY 1949, pp. 173, 346 n. 20; MEIGGS/ LEWIS 1969, quotation p. 11.

¹⁵ GOMME 1945–1981, 2, p. 2; *cfr.* STROUD 1978, p. 33. But as THOMAS 1989, p. 288, points out, if the new inscription replaced an older one, ‘it would be remarkable that it took so long for archon dates to be used at all consistently’.

¹⁶ Although HORNBLLOWER 1987, p. 128 envisions such a scenario under Hippias (note esp. Plat. *Hipp. mai.* 285e; *cfr.* MEIGGS/ LEWIS 1969, p. 11), he recognizes (n. 76) that ‘Hellanicus’ Attic researches, as opposed to his finished *Atthis*, may date to the 420s’. It is a small step, and logical, to crediting Hellanicus too with some role in stimulating publication of the archon-list. Nor is such a scholarly intervention incompatible with a subsequent promotion of the archon-list as a standard chronological scheme in Attica generally (for which see JACOBY 1949, p. 346 n. 20). One may compare the work undertaken by Aristotle and Callisthenes on the Pythian victor-list (Diog. Laert. 5.26)—whatever was involved—for which the Delphians passed a public decree of thanksgiving: Dittenberger *Syll.*³ I, 275.

¹⁷ See n. 2 above.

¹⁸ JACOBY 1949, pp. 58 and 281 n. 47, 357–8 n. 26, *et passim*, against WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1893. MÖLLER 2001, pp. 253–4, proposes that the first Greek chroniclers, in the absence of annotated annals in Archaic Greece, were inspired by a ‘documentary model’ from the Ancient Near East (detailed royal annals had been a standard practice of e.g. the Neo-Assyrian imperial apparatus).

tradition. Hellanicus' researches must therefore have made him a rather visible figure in cultured Athenian society.

This in turn should discourage us from imposing modern ideas of publication too rigidly. Elements of Hellanicus' work may well have been known at earlier stages of composition, whether through public presentations comparable to what is attributed to Herodotus,¹⁹ or through some less formal means of 'information sharing' among fellow intellectuals (one may compare e.g. the striking thematic coincidences observable among the dramatists, or verbal parallels between Euripides and Timotheus).²⁰ Thus it is perfectly believable that not only Thucydides but even Herodotus may have borrowed from Hellanicus, both this work and others.²¹

Yet even allowing for a long gestation, it is important to stress that Hellanicus' most important contribution to Greek chronography—the use of an annalistic sequence—probably came relatively late in his career. Much of his other work (*Phoronis*, *Deukalionia*, *Atlantis*, *Asopis* 4 F 1–22) was concerned with the rationalization of regional mythologies, organizing and manipulating disparate figures and 'events' into coherent systems arranged by generations. It is reasonable to see much of this work, in which he followed the lead of Hecataeus and Acusilaus,²² as belonging to the first part of his career, even if in dealing with Athenian legends he continued to use such methods (what else could he do?). Broadly speaking, that is, the genealogical, mythographic approach to chronography was methodologically younger than the annalistic, as Jacoby rightly held.²³ Now in Hellanicus' ethnographic fragments one observes a recurrent desire—no doubt reflecting the genealogical pretensions of various noble families—to connect the legendary past with the epichoric present through eponymous ancestors, etiologies, *nostoi* and migrations. It may have been this impulse which eventually led him to recognize the need for a more reliable, finely-resolved dating scheme for the historical period.

But the *Attike Syngraphe* was probably not Hellanicus' first work to combine mythography and chronicle. His *Argive Priestesses* ((αἱ) ἱέρειαι αἱ ἐν Ἄργει, 4 F 74–84) used an ostensible sequence of the Argive Heraion's priestesses as a basis for a work whose scope was not limited to Argos—the mythology of which Hellanicus dealt with separately in the *Phoronis*—but embraced Greek 'history' as a whole, tracing it deep into the legendary past; it is the first work which aspired to being a universal chronicle. Besides the explicit testimony of Dionysius

¹⁹ For the implications of the metrical version of the *Karneian Victors*, see further below. As to Herodotus, while the precise historicity of some sources may be questionable (Diyllus ap. Plut. *Mor.* 826b; *cfr.* Luc. *Herodot.* 1), the allusion in Aristoph. *Ach.* 513–29 requires that the beginning of Herodotus' work was well-known to the broad public, and for this the most realistic explanation is a well-attended public recital (of the sort alluded to by Thuc. 1.21–2).

²⁰ Thus e.g. Ameipsias in the *Konnos* (fr. 7–11 K-A) satirized Socrates 'going back to school' in the same competition that Aristophanes presented *Clouds* (423). For Timotheus and Euripides, see recently FIRINU 2009.

²¹ *Cfr.* GOMME 1945–1981, 1, pp. 362–3 n. 2; FOWLER 1996, p. 76: 'On the evidence available it seems more prudent to date the advent of these (*scil.* Hellanicus' chronographical) methods to the lifetime of Herodotus. Perhaps he and Hellanicus had a few discussions' (*cfr.* *Sud.* s.v. Ἑλλάνικος; . . . διέτριψε δὲ Ἑλλάνικος σὺν Ἡροδότῳ παρὰ Ἀμύντῃ κτλ.). ROBERTSON 2002/2003, p. 21 has suggested, for instance, that at 1.147.1–2 Herodotus 'very likely knew' Hellanicus' etymology of the Apaturia festival via some trick (*ἀπατή*) played by the Nestorid Melanthus (323a F 23); yet this aetiology is attributed to the *Attike Syngraphe*, supposedly not 'published' before 407/6. Similarly DREWS 1973, pp. 23–4, has argued that Herodotus availed himself of Hellanicus' *Persika*, on the basis of Plut. *Mor.* 869a (= *FrGrHist* 4 F 183) and Dion. Halic. *Ad Pomp.* 3.7.

²² AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 23.

²³ JACOBY 1909.

of Halicarnassus that its structure was annalistic,²⁴ one remarkable fragment shows that, in discussing a migration by the Sicels three generations before the Trojan War, Hellanicus was no longer content with generations, but dated the event to the twenty-sixth year of the priestess Alcione!²⁵ We see here that the new annalistic approach has led to a revision of older mythographic method, obviously to allow greater discrimination between legendary events which were otherwise considered to belong to the same generation. The fragment gives some impression of how much material Hellanicus must have embraced, and how much has been lost.

Hellanicus probably selected the Argive priestesses because they alone could permit the construction of an unbroken sequence reaching far enough back; for priestesses of Hera had figured in the local mythology of Argos and Tiryns.²⁶ Somewhere in the list, of course, historical priestesses with known lengths of office must have yielded to such legendary figures. Some consider it possible that a genuine sequence of names could have been preserved through oral tradition: since the office was held for life—Thucydides treats it as a matter of course that a priestess might preside for fifty years or more (2.2.1, 4.133.3–4)—a list going back to the mid-second millennium might comprise thirty names, more or less.²⁷ But while ethnographic analogies for such genealogical memory-work in oral cultures are not unknown, clear parallels are lacking for early Greece.²⁸ And even in the later, more ‘historical’ parts of the list, when epigraphic sources become more likely—yet still perhaps only scattered votive inscriptions—Hellanicus’ annual discriminations may often have been contrived. Much of his chronology was probably cobbled together from oral tradition; for the Argives themselves apparently did not reckon official time by Hera’s priestesses.²⁹

While ‘practical’ considerations suffice to account for Hellanicus’ use of the Argive priestesses,³⁰ Ambaglio has suggested that political motives were also involved. This was to be a universal chronicle, and Argos was neutral at the start of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.9). The Argives were drawn into the war on the side of Athens in 421, but following an oligarchic revolt in 417 became aligned with Sparta (Thuc. 5.76–81). At some point during these unsettling events, Ambaglio suggests, Hellanicus may have withdrawn to the greater security of Athens.³¹ Whatever Hellanicus’ political inclinations, some such scenario, involving an interruption of the historian’s working environment between Argos and Athens, would indeed account very well for several puzzles regarding the relationship of the *Argive Priestesses* to the *Attike Syngraphe*.

First, why would Hellanicus take the trouble to develop *two* distinct annalistic dating systems? It is true that in his mythographic and ethnographic work his attention ranged from one location to another, so that one might see the development of parallel local chronologies as an outgrowth of this interest. But while the *Attike Syngraphe* might be compared to one of the

²⁴ Dion. Hal. *Antiqu. Rom.* 1.72 (= 4 F 84): τὰ καθ’ ἐκάστην (*scil.* ἱερείαν) πραχθέντα; *cfr.* MÖLLER 2001, p. 246.

²⁵ 4 F 79b = Dion. Hal. *Antiqu. Rom.* 1.22: ὡς μὲν Ἑλλάνικος ὁ Λέσβιος φησι, τρίτη γενεῆ πρότερον τῶν Τρωικῶν, Ἀλκυόνης ἱερωμένης ἐν Ἄργει κατὰ τὸ ἕκτον καὶ εἰκοστὸν ἔτος κτλ.

²⁶ For the following discussion, see JACOBY 1913, p. 146; JACOBY 1949, pp. 59, 357–8 n. 26; AMBAGLIO 1980, pp. 39–41; MÖLLER 2001, pp. 255–9; and especially MÖLLER 2001, pp. 256–8.

²⁷ *Cfr.* AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 39, n. 143.

²⁸ THOMAS 1989, pp. 127–8, 130–1, 187–95, *et passim*.

²⁹ As asserted by e.g. MARCHANT 1978 < 1891, p. 128; the scholion to Thuc. 2.2.1 (ἡρίθμουν δὲ τοῦς χρόνους οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερείων) is a guess with no broader basis than the passage in question. For the alternatives (by kings?), see JACOBY 1949, pp. 59 and 282 n. 54), see MÖLLER 2001, pp. 257–8 with further references.

³⁰ *Cfr.* MÖLLER 2001, p. 256.

³¹ AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 41 and n. 147; cited with approval by MÖLLER 2001, p. 255.

epichoric treatises, the argument will not hold for the *Argive Priestesses* which, with its universal scope, suggests something like a grand synthesis of Hellanicus' earlier studies. Then there is the awkward fact that the two works contained overlapping material. The *Attike Syngraphe* must have dealt, however succinctly, with most or all of the Peloponnesian War, since it included the earlier Pentekontaetia (Thuc. 1.97.2) and went down at least as far as Arginusae in 407/6 (323a F 25). But a fragment of the *Priestesses* very probably refers to an event of 429 BCE—the Spartan campaign to Acarnania alongside the Ambraciots and Chaonians.³² It is also generally held that Thucydides' reference (4.133) to a fire at the Argive Heraion in 423, caused by the carelessness of the priestess Chrysis, implies knowledge of the *Argive Priestesses*.³³ Some have doubted this on the grounds that such a catastrophe might well have 'made news' independently.³⁴ It is no doubt true that Thucydides did not *need* Hellanicus for this event. But the catastrophe's notoriety provides only the weakest explanation for why he would bother mentioning what is otherwise extraneous to his normally air-tight narrative.³⁵ It seems inevitable that the reference has a definite function as a 'datazione collaterale'; but there must be more to it than 'un certo fascino' that Thucydides had once felt for Hellanicus' methods.³⁶

A ready explanation of the overlapping material is that Hellanicus began his account of contemporary events under one reckoning system, but completed it under another, transferring material from one treatise to the next. The attested archon-date which Hellanicus gave for Arginusae, and his known treatment of the Pentekontaetia in the *Attikê Syngraphê*, make it quite certain that it was the last-named work which featured the historian's final chronicle—at least of fifth-century events, in which Athens loomed large (see below)—with much material having been transferred, or at least duplicated, from the later sections of the *Argive Priestesses*. It may well be significant, therefore, that Thucydides' synchronism with the *Priestesses* is with an event of 423: Jacoby believed that the work came down only that far, with a final publication date of 423–1. That hypothesis would accord well with the epicentral date of c.425 for the erection of the Athenian archon-list, and Hellanicus' possible role therein (see above): whatever the precise relationship between his two annalistic works, the process of coordinating them probably required him to begin by developing some kind of table akin to a *comparatio numerorum*.

It has been plausibly supposed that the Heraion fire induced Hellanicus to abandon the priestesses as a dating scheme.³⁷ In this case Thucydides' reference to the event may have served to pinpoint exactly where, within the continuous flow of his own narrative, Hellanicus' work had terminated. Yet by itself the conflagration does not sufficiently explain why Hellanicus would alter a dating system in which he was heavily invested: after all, as Thucydides attests, a new priestess was promptly appointed at the Heraion, so in theory Hellanicus might certainly soldier on. Nor can the political considerations outlined by Ambaglio tell the whole story. The crucial point, I feel, is that the flight of Chrysis vividly exemplifies the deficiency in dating solely by official years, without the finer gradations of summer and winter which Thucydides called for elsewhere (see above). That Thucydides recognized this is clear from his wording:

³² 4 F 83. See PEARSON 1939, p. 226.

³³ See e.g. AMBAGLIO 1980, 42.

³⁴ PEARSON 1939, p. 226.

³⁵ *Cfr.* JACOBY 1909, p. 117; AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 42.

³⁶ AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 42: 'non c'è altro modo di intendere questo se non presumendo che la cronologia fornita da Ellanico nelle Sacerdotesse esercitasse, quanto meno all'inizio, un certo fascino su Tucidide'.

³⁷ PERRIN 1901, 42–3; JACOBY 1913, col. 148.

Also that same summer the temple of Hera in Argos was burned down . . . and (the priestess) Chrysis . . . fled to Phlius. But they (the Argives) installed another priestess, Phaeinis by name. And (*scil.* the tenure of) Chrysis comprised (ἐπέλαβεν) eight years of the war and half of a ninth, when she began her exile.³⁸

Thus the appointment of the new priestess fell in the middle of what, from the perspective of a chronicler κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, was an annalistic 'term'. But while this event would make an excellent example for Thucydides' methodological argument at 5.20, where he warns against the inadequacy of using annual officials to underpin a chronographic system, here he makes no point of pedantry, letting the problem speak for itself. His purpose is therefore deeper. This is indeed a 'collateral dating', but it is hardly haphazard, nor whimsically motivated. Thucydides is synchronizing his own history with Hellanicus at precisely the point where an ambiguity could arise between their respective chronologies. This would also explain why the cross-reference is to the *Priestesses* specifically, rather than the *Attike Syngraphe*, although that work too will have covered this period: the sequence of Athenian archons was not broken by a random event at this time, and indeed the archons, as annually elected officials, were always less likely to present a sequential problem than a priestess whose tenure could be interrupted at any time by ill-fortune. Perhaps Hellanicus abandoned his priestesses abruptly in 423 in favor of Athenian archons precisely because he now confronted the very problem to which Thucydides draws attention at 5.20—a theoretical wrinkle which was now an awkward reality.³⁹ His methodological crisis, one may speculate, may have been a current topic among contemporary historians (of whom there were rather more than Jacoby's arrangement of the fragments might suggest⁴⁰). In this case the elliptical nature of Thucydides' reference becomes more readily intelligible—even if the historian was not generally shy of brevity and compressed expression.

Yet despite his criticism of Hellanicus, that Thucydides took the trouble to provide a careful synchronism clearly implies that the Lesbian historian's chronological system was a prevailing standard.⁴¹ Hellanicus' stature is further indicated by the fact that he is the only fellow historian whom Thucydides ever names.⁴² But this gesture is not merely a sign of grudging professional respect, nor solely a service to contemporary readers accustomed to Hellanicus' dating. He needed to anchor his own account, which was to be 'a possession for all time', into the full sweep of Greek history which Hellanicus had established. It was this pan-Hellenic canvas of the *Argive Priestesses* which guaranteed its enduring importance,⁴³ despite Hellanicus' eventual decision to use the *Attike Syngraphe* as the privileged venue for contemporary events. The *Argive Priestesses* remained for some time a basic historiographical resource, especially important for the chronology of the distant past. This is best illustrated by the so-called Sicyonian Inscription, to be considered further below, which may have incorporated elements of Hellanicus' own music historiography.

³⁸ 4.133.2–3 καὶ ὁ νεῶς τῆς Ἥρας τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεῖρου ἐν Ἄργει κατεκαύθη . . . καὶ ἡ Χρυσὶς . . . ἐξ Φλειοῦντα φεύγει· οἱ δὲ ἄλλην ἰέρειαν . . . κατεστήσαντο Φαεινίδα ὄνομα. ἔτη δὲ ἡ Χρυσὶς τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε ἐπέλαβεν ὀκτὼ καὶ ἕνατον ἐκ μέσου, ὅτε ἐπεφεύγει.

³⁹ This can then explain why at 5.19, for events of 421, Thucydides provides a synchronism with ephor and archon, but not Argive priestess.

⁴⁰ See FOWLER 1996.

⁴¹ See the astute remarks of GOMME 1945–1981, 1, pp. 1–8 (noting Thucydides' assumption at 1.12.3 of definite annalistic dates for the Trojan War and Dorian migration) and 3 pp. 624–5. *Cfr.* MÖLLER 2001, p. 261.

⁴² *Cfr.* HORNBLOWER 1987, p. 83.

⁴³ For traces of the work's influence, see MÖLLER 2001, pp. 257–8.

The looming authority of the *Argive Priestesses* is best inferred from Thucydides' famous synchronism for the start of the Peloponnesian War, which he located in

the fifteenth year (*scil.* of the Thirty Years' Peace), in the forty-eighth year of the priestess-ship of Chrysis at Argos, in the ephorate of Aenesias at Sparta, in the last month but two of the archonship of Pythodorus at Athens, and six months after the battle of Potidaea and in the beginning of Spring.⁴⁴

This six-fold time-stamp certainly creates an impression of 'solemnity'.⁴⁵ It may also have been intended to offer a chronological correction of Hellanicus' own account.⁴⁶ But it goes beyond this. Here too Thucydides needed to connect himself with a prevailing scheme. He also demonstrates his ability to provide the greater exactness he demands: prior to launching into his account according to successive seasons,⁴⁷ Thucydides exerts himself to ensure that the exact month in which the war began (as he saw it) would never be in doubt.

The passage strongly implies that the three methods of annual reckoning adduced constitute all major systems then current. Or rather *historiographical* systems. The Spartan and Athenian officials are certainly appropriate given the main actors in the conflict. But since the Argive priestesses did not constitute an official reckoning system at Argos itself (see above), Thucydides' ultimate concern is historiographical; and this is reinforced by the emphatic first position which Chrysis enjoys over Aenesias and Pythodorus. Certainly, by the time Thucydides wrote this passage, Hellanicus will have bent the Athenian archon-list to his scholarly will. It then becomes practically certain that the Spartan ephor-list had been made to serve the same function. Since Hellanicus used both priestesses and archons as systems of reckoning, and since he surely anticipated Thucydides in coordinating the two as a basis for his Athenian investigations, a new question imposes itself. Does the third synchronism with the Spartan ephors also originate with Hellanicus? The rhetorical structure might seem to support this, and one might then associate the three parallel systems with the *Argive Priestesses*, the *Karneian Victors*, and the *Attike Syngraphe* respectively. On the other hand, Thucydides' exhaustive synchronism becomes still more impressive if we suppose that he is targeting *all* of his chronographic rivals.⁴⁸ Here one must recall Charon of Lampsacus, probably an older contemporary of Herodotus and Hellanicus, who is credited with a work on Spartan officials. Unfortunately, we do not know whether Charon's work—if it ever existed—relied upon an annual sequence of ephors (or kings), or was a more general treatise.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Thuc. 2.2.1: τῷ δὲ πέμπτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει, ἐπὶ Χρυσίδος ἐν Ἄργει τότε πεντήκοντα δυοῖν δέοντα ἔτη ἱερωμένης καὶ Αἰνησίου ἐφόρου ἐν Σπάρτῃ καὶ Πυθοδώρου ἔτι δύο μῆνας ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίους, μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ποτειδαία μάχην μηνὶ ἕκτῳ καὶ ἅμα ἦρι ἀρχομένῳ κτλ.

⁴⁵ HORNBLOWER 1991–2008, 1, p. 236.

⁴⁶ LENDLE 1964; AMBAGLIO 1980, pp. 158–9; SMART 1986, p. 28 *et passim*.

⁴⁷ *Cfr.* 2.1: γέγραπται δὲ ἐξῆς ὡς ἕκαστα ἐγένετο κατὰ θέρος καὶ χειμῶνα.

⁴⁸ For this point, MÖLLER 2001, p. 260. Her description of 5.20.2 as entailing an 'anonymous plural', however, is slightly misleading. Although Hornblower's translation (which she uses) presents it thus, the construction is actually an indefinite singular with third-person imperative (*σκοπεῖτω δέ τις κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους καὶ μὴ τῶν ἕκασταχοῦ ἢ ἀρχόντων ἢ ἀπὸ τιμῆς τινός κτλ.*). The inference of multiple predecessors with separate systems is not reasonable, but as it stands the syntax is future oriented: Thucydides addresses himself to the unknown individual (n.b.) who would write history.

⁴⁹ *Sud.* s.v. Χάρων, Λαμψακηνός: . . . πρυτάνεις Λακεδαιμονίων (but note the suggested emendation to πρυτάνεις τῶν Λαμψακηνῶν by Westerman). See generally JACOBY 1938; PEARSON 1939, pp. 138–51; JACOBY 1949, pp. 59 and 282 n. 55 (noting that these *prytaneis* might have been either ephors or kings); DREWS 1973, p. 156 n. 19, with further bibliography; FOWLER 1996, p. 67 resuscitates the older dating of the ancient biographical traditions against Jacoby's attempts to

Nevertheless, since Thucydides shows that a three-way concordance had been established by his own time, and since he himself will not have done this, one may at least assume that the system, wherever and whenever it originated, was not unfamiliar to Hellanicus. So what we would really like to know is whether Hellanicus knew the ephor-list system early enough to use it for the *Karneian Victors*. We shall have to consider the following questions. Do the surviving fragments of the *Karneian Victors* give any hint of the chronological scheme which Hellanicus adopted for it? If it appears to have followed an annalistic structure, is it necessary to posit an otherwise unattested Hellenic system, or can it be sufficiently accounted for in terms of one which Hellanicus certainly used—whether by generations (as in his early work), by the annalistic sequence of Argive priestesses,⁵⁰ or by some combination of the two (as in the *Argive Priestesses* itself)? Finally, do we have any indications of when the work was written? For while we have no solid idea of how early an ephor-list was available, or when Hellanicus first established the Argive priestess-series, the earlier one can place the *Karneian Victors* the more likely it is to be independent of an annalistic structure.

The Fragments of the Karneian Victors

The Spartan Karneia was a nine-day festival of obscure origins which are barely illuminated by a variety of foundation myths. Falling in the early autumn in Sparta, it served as the final stage in a sequence of rites-of-passage through which new warriors were integrated into the Spartan citizen body.⁵¹ That other Doric states had their own versions of the festival, which gave its name to a month in most Doric calendars, shows that this was an ancestral institution.⁵² But the Spartan festival was apparently re-launched as a pan-Hellenic event, with musical contests, in the early seventh century. This is doubtless connected with the emergence of Sparta as a power of international stature at this time. This efflorescence was made possible partly at the expense of the Messenians, whose subjugation unfolded over several generations, and caused growing pains within Sparta itself.⁵³

The two developments come together in the figure of Terpander of Lesbos. According to tradition, the Lesbian citharode was invited to Sparta, at the behest of the Delphic oracle, to quell some kind of social unrest through his music.⁵⁴ He was also remembered as the first victor of the Karneian contest. Our earliest authority for this is Hellanicus himself, in the first of the fragments attributed explicitly to the *Karneian Victors*, cited by Athenaeus:

And that Terpander too is older than Anacreon is clear from the following: ‘Terpander first of all men wins (*sic*: νικᾷ) the Karneia’, as Hellanicus records (ἱστορεῖ) in his metrical *Karneian Victors*, and in the prose version. And the establishment of the Karneia was in the twenty-sixth Olympiad, as Sosibius says in his *Chronicle*.⁵⁵

down-date Charon. Herodotus knew lists of Spartan kings from Leonidas and Leotyichides back to Heracles (7.204 and 8.131); but these are not made to do chronographic work: *cfr.* MÖLLER 2001, p. 252–3. For Timaeus’ use synchronisms by Spartan king and ephor, see below, n. 64.

⁵⁰ We may eliminate the Athenian archon-list, since the *Attike Syngraphe* was definitely a local work.

⁵¹ BURKERT 1985, 234–6; ROBERTSON 2002/2003.

⁵² BURKERT 1985, p. 234; ROBERTSON 2002/2003 *passim*.

⁵³ See generally GOSTOLI 1988; introduction to GOSTOLI 1990.

⁵⁴ See with references GOSTOLI 1988; FRANKLIN 2006, pp. 59–60; POWER 2010, pp. 394–402.

⁵⁵ 4 F 85a (= Athen. 635e): ὅτι δὲ καὶ Τέρπανδρος ἀρχαιότερος Ἀνακρέοντος δῆλον ἐκ τούτων· τὰ Κάρνεια πρῶτος πάντων Τέρπανδρος νικᾷ, ὡς Ἑλλάνικος ἱστορεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἐμμέτροις Καρνεονίκαις

Note first the remarkable fact that Hellanicus composed both prose and verse editions of the *Karneian Victors*. It has been suggested that the metrical version was the work of a later hand in the Hellenistic period,⁵⁶ but Jacoby rightly upheld the ancient biographical tradition on this point, noting that it was in accord with the prevailing sophistic climate, and that the *Emmetroi politeiai* of Critias was a ‘vollständige Parallele’.⁵⁷ So the metrical *Karneian Victors* was intended to make a splash through the same sort of public performances or displays that one associates with Herodotus and Hippias.⁵⁸ This will be important when considering the possible impact of the *Karneian Victors* on Euripides and Herodotus. This song about the history of song is a fascinating reflection of the fifth-century transition from song-culture to prose historiography, from σοφός to σοφιστής.

It would greatly assist our understanding of the *Karneian Victors* if we could be certain that Hellanicus offered an exact date for the first Karneia. This would imply that the work was at least able to consult an annalistic scheme, and it would raise the related question of whether Hellanicus had at his disposal not only an ephor-list, but a continuous inscribed sequence of victors. The optimist might then envision a year-by-year chronicle, down to the historian’s own time, in which Hellanicus presented whatever he could learn from documentary sources and oral tradition about each victor. The mind would boggle at the amount of obscure musical information which has been lost. But if, conversely, Hellanicus did *not* offer a fixed date for Terpander’s victory, as Jacoby believed,⁵⁹ and relied only on a relative dating—presumably by the older method of generational synchronisms—the implications are very different. We would then expect him only to have treated the major figures whose memory was retained by oral tradition, and perhaps to link them with various epochal figures and events. Such a work, in its prose version, would resemble more an historical treatise (or pamphlet). Therefore we must consider, first, the implications of the fragment just cited, along with the related F 85b; and, second, the nature of the sources on which Hellanicus could have drawn in any case.

Jacoby denied that Hellanicus provided a fixed date for Terpander’s victory, on two grounds: that Athenaeus goes on to cite an Olympic synchronism from the Laconian historian Sosibius (c. 250–150 BCE); and the report of Clement of Alexandria that Hellanicus dated Terpander to the time of Midas of Phrygia (4 F 85b).⁶⁰ Let us consider these points in turn. An important detail in Athenaeus is the present tense ‘wins’ (νικᾷ). This should not be seen as a mere historic present, but as deriving from an annalistic entry. That this is (at least largely) a quotation is clear, since Athenaeus offers the sentence—asyndetically marked—as an authoritative confirmation of Terpander’s relative antiquity (δῆλον ἐκ τούτων·). But how far does the quotation extend? And is τὰ Κάρνεια πρῶτος πάντων Τέρπανδρος νικᾷ a verbatim quotation of Hellanicus himself, as ὡς Ἑλλάνικος ἱστορεῖ seems to indicate? If so, did Athenaeus quote the historian directly? Or does all the material in the passage come from Sosibius—who incorporated Hellanicus through quotation or paraphrase—with Athenaeus rearranging it for rhetorical effect?

κάν τοῖς καταλογάδην. ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ θέσις τῶν Καρνείων κατὰ τὴν ἕκτην καὶ εἰκοστὴν ὀλυμπιάδα, ὡς Σωσιβίος φησιν ἐν τῷ Περὶ Χρόνων (595 F 3).

⁵⁶ AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 38 and n. 138.

⁵⁷ JACOBY 1913, col. 143; *cfr.* MÖLLER 2001, pp. 245–6, n. 22. Critias: *D-K* 88 B 6. Tzetzes’ description of Hellanicus as ‘singing’ (ἀεῖδει) the capture of Troy is certainly dubious (*Posthom.* 770 = 4 F 152b, *cfr.* AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 38, n. 137), but the *Suda*’s report cannot be so dismissed (s.v. *Hellānikos* = 4 T 1: συνεγράψατο δὲ πλεῖστα πεζῶς τε καὶ ποιητικῶς).

⁵⁸ For Hippias, see Plat. *Hipp. mai.* 285d, *Hipp. min.* 368c–d. *Cfr.* JACOBY 1913, col. 143.

⁵⁹ 4 F 85b (= Clem. Al. *Strom.* I 21, 131, 6): ναὶ μὴν καὶ Τέρπανδρον ἀρχαῖζουσὶ τινες: Ἑλλάνικος γοῦν τοῦτον ἱστορεῖ κατὰ Μίδαν γεγονέναι.

⁶⁰ JACOBY 1913, col. 143; *FrGrHist* I, p. 458; MÖLLER 2001, p. 245.

On the one hand, the limited parallels suggest that the present-tense νικᾷ would be more characteristic of Sosibius.⁶¹ Still, τὰ Κάρνεια πρῶτος πάντων Τέρπανδρος νικᾷ is not far from fitting into a dactylic hexameter; and Athenaeus' phrasing could privilege the metrical version over the prose as the ultimate source. If Hellanicus has passed through two (or more) hands, any metrical issues could then be explicable as distortions of quotation and paraphrase. Admittedly the language would be heavily spondaic; but since Terpander seems to have been associated with such rhythm (*frgg.* 3 and dub. 8 Gostoli), a special programmatic effect may have been intended—particularly appropriate for the first entry in a work on Karneian victors.⁶² The balance of evidence suggests that Athenaeus never saw the Lesbian's original work,⁶³ but took the datum and quotation from Sosibius—one of his regular authorities—who, with his well-attested interest in early Spartan customs, and especially performance culture, will not have failed to mention Terpander's victory when dating the Karneia.⁶⁴ Yet this still does not prove that Hellanicus himself offered no absolute date. He did not deal in Olympiads, of course, for that system was not current in his time.⁶⁵ Yet Sosibius could simply have modernized a date which Hellanicus had originally given in terms of ephors or Argive priestesses.⁶⁶

The synchronism of Terpander's birth with Midas in F 85b is equally inconclusive. Historically it is basically compatible with an inaugural Karneia in 676/3, to judge not only from Midas' position in the mature Greek chronographic tradition (Eusebius), but references in Neo-Assyrian annals to both Mita of Mushki and the Cimmerian incursions which led to his downfall.⁶⁷ This is a rather encouraging confirmation of traditional memory, which will support confidence in several points to be considered later. Jacoby was inclined to believe that the notice related not to the *Karneian Victors*—presumably because of its supposed incompatibility with an annalistic dating scheme—but to the *Lesbiaka*, where the famous

⁶¹ See 595 F 2. By contrast Hellanicus, in the direct quotations from the *Argive Priestesses*, uses aorists (4 F 79, 82). The *Parian Marble* uses mostly aorists, but also occasional (and inconsistent) annalistic presents with τελευτᾶν and βασιλεύειν (*FrGrHist* 239, §§49, 61, 69, 74, 101/2, 116, 119).

⁶² Note also BURKERT 1994, 46–8 and CASSIO 2000, who associate a heavily spondaic verse in the Derveni Papyrus with an Orphic/Terpandrian style of singing cultivated by the Euneidai, a generally obscure γένος of Athenian citharode-priests. See too POWER 2010, 283 n. 249 for the anonymous spondaic verse quoted by Dionys. Hal. *Comp.* 17. The authenticity of the Terpander fragments need not detain us: see further BEECROFT 2008 and POWER 2010, pp. 327–30, both of whom adopt Nagy's ideas of oral 'crystallization' (*cf.* NAGY 1990, pp. 52–81) in interpreting both the fragments and Terpander himself.

⁶³ KLEINGÜNTHER 1933, p. 137.

⁶⁴ See e.g. the fragments of his Περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι θυσιῶν (*FrGrHist* 585), four of which are quoted by Athenaeus; and those from his work on Alcman (again four from Athenaeus).

⁶⁵ There is of course Hippias' *Olympionikai* (Hippias 6 F 2 = Plut. *Num.* 1 = *frg.* 3 D-K), but while Hellanicus and Hippias overlap chronologically, Thucydides' triple synchronism discussed above indicates that Olympic dating was not yet a current scheme; this is confirmed by his own references to Olympic victories, which are never made to carry chronological weight (GOMME 1945–1981, 1 p. 8 n. 3). Moreover, the accuracy of Hippias' treatment of the Olympic victors was suspect even in antiquity (Plut. *Num.* 1.4; *cf.* KLEINGÜNTHER 1933, p. 137; JACOBY 1949, p. 58). It was apparently only several generations later that this system came into its own, when Timaeus (c. 345–250) provided Olympic equivalences for the other three systems mentioned by Thucydides: 566 T 10 = Polyb. 12.11. The Spartan kings, whom Timaeus included with ephors, became basic to the calculations of Eratosthenes and Apollodorus: *cf.* MÖLLER 2001, p. 253. For the full evolution of the Olympic system, CHRISTESEN 2007.

⁶⁶ So already KLEINGÜNTHER 1933, p. 137 n. 92, positing an Argive-priestess date.

⁶⁷ AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 146; GOSTOLI 1990, p. IX–XI.

Terpander, he thought, was also likely to have featured.⁶⁸ But there is no reason it could not have featured in either or both: the *Argive Priestesses* exhibits the fusion of generational and annalistic dating, and the same may have been true even for the legendary stretches of the *Attike Syngraphe*.⁶⁹ Of course Terpander's birth would necessarily fall outside of an annalistic scheme based on a hypothetical victor-list starting with himself. One might see the inclusion of Midas as a collateral date to help integrate the *Karneian Victors* with one or more of Hellanicus' other works, published or in progress.⁷⁰ A parallel may be found in a fragment of the *Attike Syngraphe* which shows that Hellanicus offered an Athenian synchronism for the fall of Troy, thus linking it with his earlier *Troika* and *Argive Priestesses*.⁷¹

So we cannot know from these two notices whether or not Hellanicus gave a fixed date for the first Karneia. Yet one might reasonably wonder, if Sosibius himself could provide such exactitude, why Hellanicus could not have availed himself of the same source—assuming that Sosibius' date is not itself a scholarly calculation. This leads to the question of the kind of sources that may have been available for the early Archaic period in Sparta.⁷² Some scholars are prepared to accept the existence of a continuous victor list going back to Terpander.⁷³ Jacoby himself, however, was very tentative on this point, noting that panathenaic victors were not annually inscribed until the fourth century (e.g. *IG*² ii 2311), and that public display of early dramatic victors needed the researches of Aristotle.⁷⁴ While the political situation in Athens was of course quite distinct, convincing parallels for early Archaic victor-lists are still lacking. Misleading in this regard are the oft-drawn parallels with Hippias' lost *Olympic Victors* and the *Pythian Victors* of Aristotle and Callisthenes, since these evidently involved a certain amount of literary fabrication.⁷⁵ A continuous ephor-list, on the other hand, is believable enough—in whatever form—given the parallel of the Athenian archon-list. But in neither case, victors or ephors, can we suppose that any significant annotations accompanied a list.⁷⁶ Thus even if Hellanicus could dispose of an annalistic structure, he would have had to cobble together his account primarily from oral tradition. And for the seventh century, and even the sixth, only a handful of the most famous participants will have been remembered in

⁶⁸ JACOBY 1913, col. 143; *FrGrHist* I p. 458. Ambaglio 1980, p. 146 is skeptical, but it is really not a problem of multiplying difficulties, since a work on Lesbian history and lore is highly likely to have contained notice of Terpander; and because Hellanicus appears to have been inclined to duplicate material, as Ambaglio himself recognizes (p. 37; *cfr.* PERRIN 1901, 40–41, and see below).

⁶⁹ For the fall of Troy in the *Argive Priestesses* (4 F 79b), see n. 25. That Hellanicus provided dates *κατ' ἐνιαυτῶν* for the legendary phases of the *Attike Syngraphe* might be inferred from 323a F 21b (= Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 104, 2: Ἑλλάνικος δὲ δωδεκάτηι Θαρρηλιῶνος μηνὸς (*scil.* τὴν Τροίαν ἠρῆσθαί φησιν), *cfr.* 21c; this is found in the *Parian Marble* as well (see below).

⁷⁰ Note for instance 4 F 17, from the second book of the *Deucalion*, which shows that he discussed the Phrygian site of Midaeion, probably linking its foundation to Midas (Μιδάειον· πόλις, Φρυγίας. <Ἑλλάνικος> ἐν β Δευκαλιωνείας).

⁷¹ 323a F 21b–c (see n. 68 above).

⁷² Two Spartan inscriptions mention Karneian victors, but these are not lists, and are quite late: *IG* 5, 1 209.20 (1st BCE); *IG* 5, 1 82.2 (c. 120 CE).

⁷³ Ambaglio 1980, p. 146.

⁷⁴ JACOBY 1949, pp. 58–9 and 281 n. 40. MÖLLER 2001, p. 245, points out the lack of clear evidence in the fragments for any annalistic structure. THOMAS 1989, p. 287, in her appendix on early lists, includes the Karneian victors among cases where 'there was no recorded list in writing . . . we must assume literate and scholarly organization and expansion'.

⁷⁵ For Hippias' *Olympionikai*, *cfr.* n. 64 above. The *Pythionikai* (Diog. Laert. 5.26, with *Elenchoi Pythionikôn* listed as a separate work) probably contained legendary material, to judge from the treatment of Demodocus by Demetr. Phal. fr. 144 *SOD*: see GOSTOLI 1986; WILSON 2004, p. 270.

⁷⁶ KLEINGÜNTHER 1933, p. 137 n. 90; JACOBY 1949, p. 59. See above, n. 18.

any significant detail. So with or without an annalistic scheme, Hellanicus' *Karneian Victors* will have been open to the same criticism which Thucydides leveled at his *Pentekontaetia*: its execution was at best summary (βραχέως) and chronologically inexact (τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς).

This conclusion is well supported by Jacoby's third and final notice (4 F 86), which again deals with a celebrity—Arion of Methymna—whom Hellanicus credited with being the first 'to establish circular (i.e. dithyrambic) choruses'. Our source, an Aristophanic scholiast, contrasts this with a competing tradition which favored the later Lasus of Hermione; but note that we need not assume that Hellanicus himself saw these two traditions as standing in strict opposition (see below).⁷⁷ At any rate, the fragment shows that, here at least, Hellanicus ranged beyond the immediate Spartan performance context, since Arion's dithyrambic activity is elsewhere always located in Corinth at the court of Periander (c.627–585⁷⁸). This is generally taken to mean that the *Karneian Victors* was in fact of broader scope than its title alone might imply. Ambaglio, on the basis of the synchronism of Terpander and Midas, would even see the work as a universal history like the *Argive Priestesses*.⁷⁹ But this goes well beyond the evidence, and most scholars, since Jacoby, would rather see the *Karneian Victors* as a chronicle of important milestones in the history of music and poetry, for which 'the Karneian victors'—with or without an historical list—provided a chronological frame-of-reference.⁸⁰

Yet neither is this prevailing view, I suggest, very well justified. Despite Arion's persistent association with Corinth, one may surely infer, from his inclusion in a work called the *Karneian Victors*, that he too was presented as a καρνεονίκης.⁸¹ Thus while his dithyrambic activity superficially widens the work's geographical focus, it was of second-order importance, and we are actually brought back to Sparta. And the trail does not stop there: Arion actually defines the work's focus ever more closely since he, like Terpander, was both Lesbian and a citharode. One should note Strabo's description of Arion and Terpander as having cultivated 'the same music' (τῆς αὐτῆς μουσικῆς); this occurs in a catalogue of famous Lesbians, and may well go back to Hellanicus, whom the geographer adduces immediately afterwards as another celebrated islander.⁸²

An illuminating parallel for Hellanicus' treatment of Arion comes from Herodotus' introduction to the famous story of wicked sailors and friendly dolphins. A marvel occurred during the reign of Periander:

Arion of Methymna was brought out (*scil.* of the sea) at Taenarum—on a dolphin!—being a citharode second to none of those who were then alive, and the first man of whom we

⁷⁷ 4 F 86 (= *schol.* Aristoph. *Av.* 1403): Ἀντίπατρος δὲ καὶ Εὐφρόνιος ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασί φασι τοὺς κυκλίους χοροὺς στήσαι πρῶτον Λᾶσον τὸν Ἑρμιονέα· ὁ δὲ ἀρχαιότεροι Ἑλλάνικος καὶ Δικαίαρχος Ἀρίονα τὸν Μηθυμναῖον, Δικαίαρχος μὲν ἐν τῷ Περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγῶνων, Ἑλλάνικος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Καρνεονίκαις.

⁷⁸ For Herodot. 1.23–4 and Luc. *Dial. mar.* 8, see below. As Ambaglio 1980, p. 146, notes, a synchronism with Periander accords with Eusebius, who dated Arion's *floruit* to 618 BCE.

⁷⁹ AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 38: 'avvenimenti sia del mondo greco che di quello barbarico che nulla avevano a che fare con la storia della letteratura e della musica'.

⁸⁰ JACOBY 1913, col. 143; KLEINGÜNTHER 1933, p. 137; JACOBY 1949, p. 59.

⁸¹ AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 146, notes that it would be easy for Arion to travel from Corinth to Sparta, but still considers Arion's dithyrambic activity 'estranea alla gara delle Carnee'. But how 'extraneous' it was will depend on the stance adopted in the work: keep reading.

⁸² Strab. 13.2.4. Arion and Terpander are also linked in Boeth. *De inst. Mus.* 1.1 (185.16 ff.) for their musical catharses among the Lesbians and Ionians: *cfr.* FRANKLIN 2006, p. 59. Note too that Herodotus has Arion saving himself through the ὄρθιος νόμος, traditionally associated with Terpander (Pollux 4.65): *cfr.* NAGY 1990, 87–8.

know to compose, name, and train (*scil.* a chorus for) a dithyramb at Corinth.⁸³

Such heurmatological descriptions of major past figures are typical of the period's historians—including Hellanicus—who often organized cultural history around a series of 'first inventors' (πρῶτοι εὐρεταί).⁸⁴ But note how Herodotus places Arion's dithyrambic 'invention' only after the more general assertion that the Lesbian, in his own time, was an unsurpassed citharode. This position, if taken to its logical extreme, implies that Arion will have been victorious at any contest in which he competed: as Herodotus says, he was 'second to none' (οὐδενὸς δεύτερον). Now for Hellanicus, we have seen, these venues will have included, above all, the Karneia. To put it another, less circular way, if Hellanicus used a series of Karneian victors as a point-of-departure for a history of early music on the grounds that the Karneia was the pre-eminent citharodic competition in early Greece, he would quite naturally have presented each victor, in turn, as the reigning champion of the Greek world. But while Arion would have to share that honor with Terpander and all other Karneian victors, Herodotus, like Hellanicus, distinguished Arion for a unique contribution connected with the dithyramb at Corinth (whatever this means in real terms). Compare this with Hellanicus' larger treatment of Terpander, as can be inferred from the terse *frg.* 85a. Terpander is credited with two separate, if related distinctions. First, he was victorious at the Karneia—the essential criterion for inclusion in a work called *Karneian Victors*—and so the pre-eminent citharode of his time. But he is also assigned a key 'first' in the greater sweep of history—he was the 'first of all men' to enjoy that great honor. So the profiles of Terpander and Arion offered by Hellanicus and Herodotus are characterized by a very similar structure. I submit that in fact Herodotus has drawn here on Hellanicus' account of Arion in the *Karneian Victors*. If Herodotus does not specify a Karneian victory, that is readily explicable by the macroscopic requirements of his own narrative.

If some of the foregoing argument has verged on the circular, the problem is alleviated by Herodotus' own admission that he had at his disposal a specifically Lesbian account of Arion. The historian is careful to note, twice, that the Lesbians and Corinthians alike vouched for the tale.⁸⁵ This double appeal to two-fold epichoric authority seems somewhat otiose, until one compares Lucian's version of the story, which preserves a specifically Lesbian variant wherein the same essential adventure unfolds in a different geographical theatre—Arion's voyage is from his home-city of Methymna, and not a concert-tour of Sicily.⁸⁶ Re-reading Herodotus with this in mind, one sees that his citations of Lesbian-Corinthian agreement are carefully placed to support, not the tale in every detail, but the basic rescue by dolphins, and Arion's debarkation at *Taenarum*, on which both 'parties' agreed. Clearly Herodotus compared two versions of the story, one of which he knew to be specifically Lesbian. By itself this could imply a random Lesbian informant. But when it is seen against the opening description of Arion's musical credentials, the hypothesis of Hellanic authority becomes increasingly economical. One may speculate that Herodotus' failure there to attribute to Arion a Karneian victory, which would clearly evoke Hellanicus, would be in keeping with his decision to privilege the Corinthian account of Arion's itinerary. Note the immediate and organic connection between the programmatic description of Arion landing at Taenarum (n.b.) and

⁸³ Herodot. 1.23–4: Ἀρίονα τὸν Μηθυμναῖον ἐπὶ δελφῖνος ἐξενειχθέντα ἐπὶ Ταίναρον, ἔοντα κιθαρωδὸν τῶν τότε ἔόντων οὐδενὸς δεύτερον, καὶ διθύραμβον πρῶτον ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ποιήσαντά τε καὶ ὀνομάσαντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἐν Κορίνθῳ; rephrased by Fronto as *cithara et dithyrambo primus* (*Epist.* 241.1).

⁸⁴ KLEINGÜNTHER 1933, p. 137 *et passim*; for Hellanicus, see e.g. AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 33.

⁸⁵ Herodot. 1.23–4: λέγουσι Κορίνθιοι (ὁμολογεύουσι δὲ σφι Λέσβιοι) . . . Ταῦτα μὲν νυν Κορίνθιοί τε καὶ Λέσβιοι λέγουσι.

⁸⁶ Luc. *Dial. mar.* 8, noted by AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 146.

Arion's musical achievements. It could well be that Hellanicus included the dolphin story when discussing Arion's choral activity at Corinth (it is perhaps worth noting, however, that Taenarum is substantially closer to Sparta). One might then suppose that Terpander's entry was equally fleshed out by further biographical material, of which a relative abundance survives in other sources, for instance his role in the 'first institution' (πρώτη κατάστασις) of musical activity at Sparta,⁸⁷ and his 'purification' of civic discord there (see above). One might even draw a parallel between Hellanicus' dating of Terpander by reference to Midas, and Arion's synchronism with the generation of Periander (Herodotus locates the tale 'in his life', ἐν τῷ βίῳ). One should note here the relatively early date for the *Karneian Victors* which would be required for Herodotus to have drawn on it (see further below).

In any case—whatever the relationship between Herodotus and Hellanicus—we must resist jumping to the conclusion that the *Karneian Victors* was quite the same kind of universal musical history which one may deduce from the fragments of Glaucus of Rhegium and Damastes.⁸⁸ If far-reaching inferences are to be drawn from two or three meager notices—and obviously I have no problem with that—one should at least follow the direction most clearly indicated. To judge from the fragments alone, it would appear that the *Karneian Victors* only ever treated a handful of celebrities, organized as a series of 'firsts'; and that the spotlight remained quite strictly on the Karneia—and specifically the Lesbian singers who competed there.

One might argue that this impression is illusory, for two reasons. First, that later authors will have been most interested in major early figures like Terpander and Arion, so that these are the notices most likely to survive. Second, that because the Lesbian citharodes were indeed historically pre-eminent in the early Archaic period, their inclusion in a work on the Karneia was inevitable, so that Hellanicus' own Lesbian paternity becomes irrelevant.

I hasten to acknowledge that the reality of a brilliant flowering of Lesbian κιθαροδία in the seventh and sixth centuries is beyond doubt. Crucial here is a verse of Sappho, who can already refer to something as 'Outstanding, as when a Lesbian singer (*scil.* performs) among foreigners'.⁸⁹ It is also reflected in a popular proverb, 'after a Lesbian singer'.⁹⁰ The precise meaning of this saying is not quite clear, and probably was not even in the Classical period, given the variety of explanations found in our sources. It may have evolved over time, perhaps originally alluding, like Sappho, only to the excellence of Lesbian singers generally. But we find a persistent connection with Terpander and his Lesbian successors. According to Aristotle and others it referred specifically to the privileged position of performing first which the Spartans granted to Terpander's 'descendants' (ἀπόγονοι), followed by other Lesbian citharodes, in recognition of Terpander's services to their state.⁹¹

⁸⁷ Ps. Plut. *Mus.* 1134b: Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη κατάστασις τῶν περὶ τὴν μουσικὴν ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ, Τερπάνδρου καταστήσαντος, γεγένηται.

⁸⁸ From respectively the *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν* and *Περὶ ποιητῶν καὶ σοφιστῶν*—the main comparisons offered by JACOBY 1913, col. 143–4; so too MÖLLER 2001, pp. 245–6.

⁸⁹ Sapph. *frg.* 106 L-P: πέρροχος, ὡς ὄτ' αἰοῖδος ὁ Λέσβιος ἀλλοδάποισιν. For T. Power's reading of Sappho's manipulation of professional citharodic ideology, see further below. See also NAGY 1990, p. 418 who sees Sappho as already referring to Terpander as a symbol of an ancestral Aeolic/Lesbian song tradition.

⁹⁰ Cratin. *frg.* 263 K-A (= Phot. *Lex.* s.v. μετὰ Λέσβιον ᾠδόν); Aristot. *frg.* 545 (Rose); Plut. *Sera num. vind.* 558a; Zen. 5.9 (I.118 Leutsch/Schneidewin); Hsch. s.v. Λέσβιος ᾠδός and μετὰ Λέσβιον ᾠδόν; *Sud.* s.v. μετὰ Λέσβιον ᾠδόν; *cfr.* Ael. Dion. 1.7. Most of these are conveniently assembled by Rose alongside the Aristotle fragment.

⁹¹ Aristot. *frg.* 545 Rose (Eustath. ad *Il.* 1, 129): 'Aristotle says in the *Constitution of Sparta* that the expression 'After the Lesbian singer' signified Terpander; and they say that afterwards, in his

But an historical seventh-century efflorescence is one thing, and its reconstruction in the later fifth, largely on the basis of oral tradition, quite another. There can be little doubt that Hellanicus would have had to exercise some creativity in establishing a continuous history of the early *καρνεονῖκα*. The above objections would beg the question of Hellanicus' own motives for composing this work in the first place, and indeed his role in establishing the view of early citharodic history which has come down to us. Are we obliged to believe that he gave equal attention to those Karneian victors who were *not* from Lesbos, say Execestides, a now largely obscure fifth-century *καρνεονίκης*, probably from Athens?⁹² Or was Hellanicus' goal specifically to glorify the musical history of his own countrymen?⁹³

Some would even see Hellanicus' choice of Terpander as first victor, and the privileging of Arion over Lasus as *πρῶτος εὔρετής* of dithyrambic choruses, as artificial, motivated by 'lesbischen Lokalpatriotismus'.⁹⁴ But this is overly cynical, and insufficiently historicized. Terpander as the first victor must have been independently current in Spartan tradition, and was very probably a fixed part of pan-Hellenic musical lore, and the portfolio of this semi-legendary singer, long before Hellanicus (*cf.* NAGY 1990, pp. 86–90, 418). Nor is the Arionic dithyramb mere blind patriotism. Arion and Lasus symbolize two distinct historical phases in the genre's choral development: an important facet of Arion's fame was his guiding position in the musical 'scene' at Periandrian Corinth specifically, so that in any case Lasus becomes irrelevant.⁹⁵ Conversely, unlike Arion, there is no reasonable justification for connecting Lasus with the Karneia: his activity is to be associated rather with Argos, which Herodotus reports (3.131–2) was the pre-eminent musical city in the time of Polycrates (ruled c. 540–22).⁹⁶ One may well wonder, by the way, on what authority Herodotus makes that assertion—noting that here too, as with Arion, a simple political synchronism is used to anchor a clearly articulated phase of musical history (see further below).

But even if Hellanicus' inclusion of Terpander and Arion was well justified, it must be emphasized that our familiar idea of the Lesbians' early primacy rests very largely upon a specific passage in Ps. Plutarch's *De musica*. This contains two details which M. L. West has recently proposed as deriving from the *Karneian Victors*. In the following section I shall expand upon this assertion to argue that Ps. Plutarch's discussion as a whole is derivative of Hellanicus, and that its further details support the reconstruction of the *Karneian Victors* which I have been developing.

Lesbian Singers in Glaucus of Rhegium and Ps. Plutarch

honor, his descendants would be called first [*scil.* to perform], and then any other Lesbian who was on hand, and then the rest' (Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτείᾳ τὸ μετὰ Λέσβιον ῥῶδον τὸν Τέρπανδρὸν φησι δηλοῦν. ἐκαλοῦντο δέ, φησί, καὶ ὕστερον εἰς τὴν ἐκείνου τιμὴν πρῶτον μὲν ἀπόγονοι αὐτοῦ, εἶτα εἴ τις ἄλλος παρῆν Λέσβιος, εἴθ' οὕτως οἱ λοιποὶ μετὰ Λέσβιον ῥῶδον). A connection with Terpander's catharsis is made by some of the other sources in the above note.

⁹² Polemon *frg.* 47 Preller ap. *schol.* ad Aristoph. *Av.* 11: ὁ δὲ Ἐξηκεστίδης, κιθαρωδὸς πυθιονίκης, νικᾷ δὲ καὶ τὸν τῶν Καρνείων ἀγῶνα τὸν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι, καὶ Παναθήναια δις. Note again the annalistic present. Could this derive from an *Atthis*? For Execestides and the later history of the Karneia, see further POWER 2010, pp. 334 n. 51 and 486 n. 193; cf. STEFANIS 1986, 161 no. 842.

⁹³ *Cfr.* WEST 1992, p. 330 n. 8, and see further below where I discuss his attribution of a passage in Ps. Plutarch to the *Karneian Victors*.

⁹⁴ JACOBY 1913, col. 143 and Jacoby *FrGrHist* I, p. 458; KLEINGÜNTHER 1933, p. 137.

⁹⁵ See further FRANKLIN in press.

⁹⁶ For the 'Argive efflorescence', see further FRANKLIN in press.

Ps. Plutarch's *De musica*, as is well known, is a workmanlike collage of earlier, often discordant authorities. The author sometimes cites sources, but not consistently—mainly, it seems, for the sake of a scholarly veneer. Thus at 1132f, following a sketch of early musical history based in part on Heraclides of Pontus, he suddenly focuses on Terpander, switching gears to Glaucus of Rhegium (c. 400: *FHG* II 23, *frgg.* 5–6), who is cited for dating the Lesbian singer prior to Archilochus, and just after the first αὔλοϛ-singers (*frg.* 2). This last point justifies a quick, expansive shift to Alexander Polyhistor (first century BCE), whose lost work on Phrygian lore he raids for points about Olympus, the Idaean dactyls, Hyagnis, and Marsyas.⁹⁷ The definite Phrygian associations of all four figures make it clear that Ps. Plutarch has tacitly reverted to Glaucus when he goes on to say that Terpander imitated the ‘diction’ (ἔπη) of Homer, but the ‘melodies’ (μέλη) of Orpheus, but that Orpheus had not imitated anybody, since his only predecessors were aulodes.⁹⁸ It is important to observe that with Orpheus as primal citharode, Ps. Plutarch is moving within a new historical construction at variance with his earlier narrative, where a comparable position was enjoyed by Amphion (cited from Heraclides of Pontus via the Sicyonian Inscription: see below). Now the desire to trace lines of influence, and especially the evolving relationships between genres, is typical of Glaucus’ other fragments in this work, as is his concern with establishing the relative chronology of musicians (*frgg.* 3–4). These features make it clear that Ps. Plutarch is still following Glaucus when he goes on to discuss the dating of the aulete Clonas and Archilochus vis-à-vis Terpander. Ps. Plutarch then shifts to other unnamed authorities (ἄλλοι δὲ τινες τῶν συγγραφέων, 1133a) for several further points about chronology and generic affiliations. There then follows the crucial passage:

In general, the style of κιθαρωδία practiced by Terpander persisted even unto the time of Phrynīs as one which was altogether simple⁹⁹ . . . And the form of the κιθάρα was first made in the time of Kepion, the student of Terpander; and it was called ‘Asiatic’ on account of its use by the Lesbian citharodes, who dwelled facing Asia. And they say (φασι, n.b.) that Periclitus was the last (*scil.* Lesbian) citharode to win the Karneia at Sparta; and that, with his death, the Lesbians’ continuous succession (*scil.* of Karneian victories) in κιθάρα-singing met its end. And some people err in believing that Hipponax was born during the same period as Terpander: but even Periclitus is obviously older than Hipponax.¹⁰⁰

Two points make it quite certain that with this succinct treatment of the Lesbian singers Ps. Plutarch has once again returned without warning to Glaucus (and not Heraclides, as

⁹⁷ Συναγωγή τῶν περὶ Φρυγίας, *FrGrHist* 273 F 77.

⁹⁸ So rightly BARKER 1984–1989, 1 p. 210 n. 33, following WEIL/REINACH 1900, 6, 20 (who violently transpose the digression to an earlier position in the work).

⁹⁹ I ellipse here a brief digression on the non-modulatory nature of traditional ‘Terpandrian’ κιθαρωδία: elsewhere I have argued that this is an authentic detail, related to the one-tuning-per-piece practice attested for the heptatonic system of the ancient Near East: see further FRANKLIN 2002, pp. 697–8; FRANKLIN in press. It will be relevant to my concluding remarks on Phrynīs.

¹⁰⁰ Ps. Plut. *Mus.* 1133b–d: Τὸ δ’ ὅλον ἢ μὲν κατὰ Τέρπανδρον κιθαρωδία καὶ μέχρι τῆς Φρύνιδος ἡλικίας παντελῶς ἀπλῆ τις οὖσα διετέλει . . . ἐποιήθη δὲ καὶ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς κιθάρας πρῶτον κατὰ Κηπίωνα, τὸν Τερπάνδρου μαθητὴν· ἐκλήθη δ’ Ἀσίας διὰ τὸ κεχρηῆσθαι τοὺς Λεσβίους αὐτῇ κιθαρωδοῦς, πρὸς τῇ Ἀσίᾳ κατοικοῦντας. τελευταῖον δὲ Περικλείτον φασι κιθαρωδὸν νικῆσαι ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι Κάρνεια, τὸ γένος ὄντα Λέσβιον· τούτου δὲ τελευτήσαντος, τέλος λαβεῖν Λεσβίους τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς κατὰ τὴν κιθαρωδίαν διαδοχῆς. ἔνιοι δὲ πλανώμενοι νομίζουσι κατὰ τὸν <αὐτὸν> χρόνον Τερπάνδρῳ Ἰππώνακτα γεγονέναι· φαίνεται δ’ Ἰππώνακτος καὶ Περικλείτος ὦν πρεσβύτερος.

WEIL/REINACH 1900, p. 27 believed). First, of course, the topic of Terpander and his followers naturally resumes the earlier thread, taken from Glaucus, which traced κίθαροφῳδία from Orpheus to Terpander. Second, observe the closing chronological comparison of Hipponax with Terpander, and in turn with Periclitus. Not only are such concerns typical of Glaucus, as mentioned above, but here too Terpander is treated as a privileged point of reference. It seems as if Glaucus was either attempting to rationalize two (or more) earlier historiographical constructions, or to harmonize additional material into a pre-existing scheme. In either case, it would seem that, by the time of Glaucus, Terpander was already established as a chronological reference point in a system which also included Periclitus; and that this construction was considered more authoritative than the competing tradition that would synchronize Terpander with Hipponax.

Now M. L. West has asserted that two details in this passage—the final Karneian victory by Periclitus, and the explanation of the Asiatic κίθαρα—“must surely come from Hellanicus’ work on Karneian victors, in which he celebrated the successes of his native Lesbos” (WEST 1992, 330 n. 8). As to Periclitus, this must be right: what other source can one posit for this otherwise unknown figure, whose only known distinctions are distinctly Hellenic: his Lesbian origin, his Karneian victory, and his being first at being the last successive victor? We cannot say why Glaucus considered Periclitus older than Hipponax (fl. 541/0 in the *Parian Marble*), but presumably this emerged from his rationalizing efforts, probably on the basis of a synchronism offered for Periclitus which trumped some datum for Hipponax given by another authority. The natural inference is that this synchronism was offered by Hellanicus himself.

That Ps. Plutarch does not cite Hellanicus explicitly—as would befit his scholarly pretensions—is an important point: evidently Glaucus himself did not name his authority. We have here one of many examples of early historiographers only identifying their predecessors when they wished to disagree (and not always then). Everything else might be considered common knowledge (hence φᾶσι here, ‘they say’). An apt parallel is Thucydides’ probable and uncredited use of Hellenic material for his Sicilian archaeology (4.2–5).¹⁰¹ The implication is that—not surprisingly—Hellanicus’ authority on the Lesbian citharodes was considered unimpeachable. One may also compare the situation with F 85a above, where it seemed likely that Athenaeus was dependent on Sosibius for his knowledge of what Hellanicus himself had written. Similarly F 86 suggests that Hellanicus’ stance on dithyrambic history had been compiled with that of other authorities before it was ever cited by the Aristophanic scholiast.¹⁰² Finally one should note the extreme compression of the Ps. Plutarch passage, which would be in keeping with its derivation from a secondary source.

This leads to consideration of the passage as a whole. Once the inevitable paternity of Periclitus is granted, one must wonder how much more is ultimately Hellenic. Indeed it is difficult to separate Periclitus from the rest of the material, which together constitutes a schematic but coherent outline of the Lesbian γένος, from first to last. Kepion stands in the middle of the sequence, inextricably linked to Terpander by the familiar biographical tactic of the teacher-student relationship; hence it is an easy assumption that he too was a καρνεονίκης. T. Power has suggested that Kepion ‘may represent a Boeotian incursion into the Terpendrian *diadokhê*’, on the basis of the dialectal variant ‘Kapion’ found in epichoric inscriptions (and

¹⁰¹ For the early practice of citing for disagreements, see esp. Ios. Flav. *Contra Ap.* 1.16, who includes among his examples Ephorus’ exposures of Hellanicus’ errors. Hellanicus and Thucydides’ Sicilian archaeology: AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 42. Thucydides’ tacit criticisms of Hellanicus: HORNBLOWER 1987, pp. 84–6.

¹⁰² AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 21, has made a parallel case, on the basis of Hellanicus’ geographical fragments, for supposing that the historian was already widely excerpted in the Hellenistic period, and notes that this could help account for a proliferation of Hellenic book-titles.

Pollux 4.65).¹⁰³ If so, it becomes especially interesting to observe how tightly he has been incorporated among the Lesbians. Here perhaps we may glimpse Hellanicus at work—an artificial Lesbianization of the few early *καρνεοῦνται* who were recalled in popular tradition.

Be this as it may, Kepion, like Terpander, Arion, and Periclitus, is further distinguished by his own ‘first’—the classical form of the *κιθάρα*, which here is explicitly tied to Lesbos by the epithet *Ἀσιάζ* and its explanation. A full discussion of the ‘Asiatic *κιθάρα*’ is beyond the scope of this paper: elsewhere I shall support West’s suggestion in detail, arguing that Hellanicus is the source for a sudden and brief spate of interest in this expression on the part of Euripides and the New Musicians from around 422–405.¹⁰⁴ But a few words are necessary here. Kepion, like Periclitus, is an obscure enough figure to inspire some confidence in the construction. Here we should recall the basic accuracy of Hellanicus’ synchronism of Terpander’s birth with Midas. The musical connection between Lesbos and an ‘Asiatic’ lyre finds a ready explanation in the vibrant Greco-Lyidian musical movement of the seventh-century, centered on Sardis, which according to Herodotus and other sources drew the intelligentsia from all over Greece.¹⁰⁵ The Lesbian poets in particular were intimately involved due to their proximity. An ‘Asiatic *κιθάρα*’ would very aptly designate a new kind of lyre deriving from this milieu. Note that, while the ethnic adjective clearly conveys a Greek perspective, it could hardly be applied by other Greeks to a Lesbian instrument simply because Lesbos was close to ‘Asia’: in other words, the expression only makes sense as originating in Lesbos itself, at a time when Lesbians adopted an instrument clearly identifiable to themselves as ‘Asian’. Some would see it as an early name for the *βάρβιτος*, whose invention Pindar attributes to Terpander and his activity at Lydian banquets (*frg.* 126 S-M).¹⁰⁶ But Terpander is excluded from the present construction, and anyway *κιθάρα* has quite definite morphological associations in the fifth-century, denoting the elaborate, flat-based concert instruments of professional citharodes. Therefore the ‘Asiatic *κιθάρα*’ is much more likely to correspond to the historical transition, observable in vase paintings of the mid- to late-seventh century, from the ancient round-based lyres descending from the Bronze Age, to the instruments so familiar from Classical representations.¹⁰⁷ And this shape resonates much more clearly than the *βάρβιτος* with the morphology of Anatolian lyres—an ancient tradition going back to the Hittite period—which are always flat-based.¹⁰⁸ So with Kepion’s ‘Asiatic *κιθάρα*’ we again seem to have a surprisingly reliable tradition—and one quite distinctly Lesbian in origin.

Now the very idea of a citharodic *διαδοχή*, combined with an annual contest, implies a rather improbable situation in which Lesbian singers are imagined to have placed first every year for perhaps 125 years. If indeed there was no victor-list available to Hellanicus, he would have had to take the handful of famous names recalled by tradition and stretch them out over the period which needed to be spanned. Consequently, the most economical solution available to him would be to apply his mythographic approach of proceeding by generations, and

¹⁰³ POWER 2010, p. 296 and n. 295.

¹⁰⁴ See for now comments in FRANKLIN 2010.

¹⁰⁵ See generally FRANKLIN 2007.

¹⁰⁶ *Cfr.* BARKER 1984–1989, 1, p. 211 n. 45.

¹⁰⁷ Maas/Snyder 1989, pp. 31–2, 41.

¹⁰⁸ Herodotus’ reference to Lydian lyre-playing as *κιθαρίζειν* may be significant (1.155). For an illustrated catalogue of Anatolian instruments, see SCHUOL 2004, pp. 57, 107–108 and esp. figs. 28, 39, 42, 43, 45. Note, however, that these lyres typically have asymmetrical arms, contrasting with Greek models. I suggest therefore that we are dealing with a hybridized form, appropriate to the Greco-Lyidian movement itself: the symmetry of traditional Aegean lyres persisted as the overall body shape was strongly Lydianized. A bilateral approach can also help explain a few Hellenizing Anatolian specimens from the Archaic period, which indicate an equal and opposite flow of influence.

assume that each successive celebrity had always won first place during his own epoch. One may compare the four consecutive octennial victories which were attributed to Terpander at Delphi; this too was apparently known to Glaucus (see below), and it may be that Hellanicus' treatment of Terpander was borrowed by whoever anticipated Aristotle and Callisthenes in tackling the early history of the Pythian festival. Whatever the original meaning of 'After a Lesbian singer', the proverb may have provided Hellanicus with a structuring motif for the *Karneian Victors*, justifying the presentation of Lesbian singers as the sole victors during the Karneia's early history. Hellanicus may have known a few other names not included in the present passage—where Arion himself has apparently fallen to the epitomizer's knife—and perhaps especially for the period following the continuous διαδοχή (for the Lesbian Aristoclitus, see below). But there were probably not many more.

Finally one must note the role of both Orpheus and Phrynis. Orpheus, we have seen, began the section of Ps. Plutarch's narrative deriving from Glaucus. He is given no citharodic predecessor and is then linked immediately to Terpander. This is a specifically Lesbian mytheme, attested in several distinct variants, which relates to the fate of Orpheus' lyre, and sometimes head, after his death.¹⁰⁹ The sources differ on details, but in every case Lesbos is the ultimate destination. The closest parallel is the first of the so-called Nicomachean *Excerpts*. There is not space to discuss this passage here in detail, but not only does it contain the transmission of Orpheus' lyre to Terpander on Lesbos, it presents Orpheus as a sort of first inventor, receiving the seven-stringed tortoise-shell lyre directly from Hermes (the absence of Apollo accords with an epichoric origin). I have suggested elsewhere that this excerpt derives from Hellanicus,¹¹⁰ and will offer further arguments elsewhere in connection with the 'Asiatic κithάρα' and the sphragis of Timotheus' *Persians*. For now the important point is that Glaucus chose to follow a specifically Lesbian version of citharodic history. Once again this accords with the argument that Hellanicus is his underlying authority.

Much the same may be said of Phrynis, who with Terpander serves to frame the immediate Ps. Plutarch passage; but when this is expanded to include Orpheus, Phrynis will join with the mythical singer to delimit a complete Lesbian citharodic history. The somewhat artificial nature of making Phrynis the end of classical 'Terpandrian' music may be seen by comparing the famous fragment of Pherecrates' *Chiron*, in which Μουσική presents a concise history of the New Music (fr. 155 K-A). Here it is not Phrynis who leads the charge, but Melanippides and Cinesias. In part this can be explained in generic terms, since innovations in κithαρῳδία apparently trailed behind the dithyramb.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, it can hardly be accidental that Phrynis, like Terpander and Periclitus, was a Lesbian citharode. Thus the passage, which Ps. Plutarch, following Glaucus, offers as a general history of κithαρῳδία, originated really as a history of the Lesbian tradition, probably conceived as the *only* valid strand. The position of Phrynis therefore mirrors that of Orpheus, providing a Lesbian epilogue to the age of the islanders' primacy at the Karneia, just as Orpheus hints at a specifically Lesbian back-story.

I conclude from this larger Lesbian architecture, together with the give-away detail of Periclitus, that Ps. Plutarch has epitomized a section of Glaucus which was itself an epitome—with his own intrusive, rationalizing expansions—of Hellanicus' *Karneian Victors*. Proclus seems to have used the same armature in his *Chrestomathy*, in which his history of the citharodic *nomos* follows the sequence Terpander–Arion–Phrynis (ap. Phot. *Bibl.* 320b5–11).

¹⁰⁹ Phanocles *frg.* 1.11–22 (Powell, *CA*); Ps. Nicom. *Excerpt.* 1; Ov. *Met.* 11.50; Luc. *Adv. indoct.* 11. *Cfr.* POWER 2010, pp. 351–5, esp. 354: 'it is entirely possible that there were distinct citharodic oral traditions, perhaps originally elaborated within the context of a local Antissan cult of Orpheus, relating how the Orphic lyre came at some point into the sole possession of Terpander'.

¹¹⁰ See FRANKLIN 2003, p. 302 n. 12.

¹¹¹ See generally FRANKLIN in press.

If this reconstruction is correct, the inclusion of Orpheus and Phrynis gives a better idea of the work's original scope. Once again, as argued above, there is little indication that this was a universal musical history. It was rather an account of Lesbian κιθαρωδία, the centerpiece of which was the golden age of Lesbian supremacy at the Karneia. There is still no sign of an annalistic structure. Such indications as there are point rather to a generational scheme with synchronisms to major historical figures, combined with an element of myth in the case of Orpheus. Perhaps Herodotus' throw-away reference to the Argive efflorescence in the age of Polycrates derives from Hellanicus' account of what happened after Periclitus. While Phrynis falls outside the narrow bounds of the continuous διαδοχή, he too is said to have competed—unsuccessfully—at the Karneia, where the Spartan authorities cut away his strings in excess of seven. The historicity of this anecdote, which was also told of Timotheus and even Terpander himself, need not detain us.¹¹² The important point is that Phrynis, like his predecessors in the passage, represents another important first in Lesbian citharodic history—the end of the Terpandrian style, and probably the first Lesbian defeat at the Karneia (see further below).

Lesbian Singers at the Karneia in Euripides' Alcestis

Another piece of the puzzle was proposed recently by A. Hardie, who suggests that a passage in Euripides' *Alcestis*, staged in 438, implies knowledge of the *Karneian Victors*. Immediately after the loyal heroine has died in place of her narcissistic husband, the lamenting chorus praises her selfless virtue, and predicts her immortality in songs to be sung one day both in Athens and Sparta:

Many melodies will the muse-attendants (μουσοπόλοι) / Sing to the heptatonic mountain / Tortoise, celebrating also in songs without lyres— / At Sparta when there comes around the circling season of the / Karneian month, when all night long suspended is the moon, / And in splendid blessed Athens. / Such a play of melodies you left the singers when you died.¹¹³

Prior to Euripides, the word μουσοπόλοι is known only from Sappho, who applied it, in the Lesbian form μοισ-, to herself and the members of her 'circle'—famously asserting that lamentation (θρήνον) has no sanctioned place in her 'house of muse-attendants'.¹¹⁴ Hardie has attractively suggested that Sappho was creatively appropriating 'an East Greek coinage applied to professional musicians, perhaps given later currency at Athens by Hellanicus'.¹¹⁵ The basis for this assertion is threefold: the professional context of the *Karneia* in Euripides; parallel formations in -πολος which typically imply a sense of 'busi-ness'; and a second century BCE Theban inscription referring to a professional synod of μουσοπόλοι.¹¹⁶ T. Power has further developed Hardie's suggestion that 'Sappho may be adapting guildic terminology to the circumstances of her household circle',¹¹⁷ pointing to evidence in her fragments that she

¹¹² Plut. *Prof. virt.* 84a (Phrynis); Timotheus, Plut. *Inst. Lac.* 238c–d (Timotheus and Terpander); *cf.* Athen. 628b. See e.g. PRAUSCELLO 2009; POWER 2010, pp. 172–3, 334–5 n. 51, 340, 536 n. 347.

¹¹³ Eur. *Alcest.* 445–54: πολλά σε μουσοπόλοι / μέλψουσι καθ' ἐπτάτονόν τ' ὀρείαν / χέλυον ἔν τ' ἄλδροις κλέοντες ὕμνοις, / Σπάρται κυκλάς ἀνίκια Καρνείου περινίσεται ὦρα / μηνός, ἀειρομένας παννύχου σελάνας, / λιπαραῖσί τ' ἐν ὀλβίαις Ἀθάναις. / τοίαν ἔλιπες θανοῦσα μολπὰν μελέων ἀοιδοῖς.

¹¹⁴ Sapph. *frg.* 150 L-P: οὐ γὰρ θέμις ἐν μοισοπόλων †οἰκία / θρήνον ἔμμεν'. οὐ κ' ἄμμι τάδε πρέποι.

¹¹⁵ HARDIE 2005, pp. 14–16, quotation 15; *cf.* POWER 2010, pp. 281, 389.

¹¹⁶ *IG VII 2484*: τεχνιτῶν μουσοπόλων σύνοδος, also discussed by LANATA 1966, p. 14.

¹¹⁷ HARDIE 2005, p. 16.

cast her own ‘amateur’, if sometimes public,¹¹⁸ activity in terms of travelling celebrities like Terpander and Arion; and thus for instance one may explain the otherwise puzzling (later) representation of Sappho playing the professional concert κιθάρα.¹¹⁹ So evidently it is Euripides, not Sappho, who represents μουσοπόλοι in their true environment—the professional contest. It is tempting to suppose in fact that Euripides himself actually used the Lesbian form, which was later normalized in transmission.

Hardie’s suggestion may be supported by several further observations. Note first that, if one assumes a Lesbian force to the plural μουσοπόλοι, one receives the image of the Karneia as an exclusive preserve of Lesbian lyre-singers; nobody else is worth mentioning. As an annual festival, such a Karneia would once again yield a continuous Lesbian διαδοχή. This is surely no coincidence.

Also important, I feel, is the ethnographic flavor of the passage. One may reasonably wonder how much detailed knowledge most Athenians would have had of Spartan religious festivals (*cf.* Thuc. 1.20.3 on the prevailing ignorance about the Spartan political structure). The *Karneia* was, admittedly, a pan-Hellenic musical event, and Euripides and other musicians professionally active in Athens (e.g. Phrynis, Timotheus) will not have been entirely ignorant about it. But the detailed vignette of the *Alcestis* seems almost Alexandrian in its allusive compactness. The poet provides the *Karneia*’s essential conditions, defining it as an all-night festival when the moon was prominent in the sky (ἀειρομένας παννύχου σελάνας)—celebrating the full moon, in fact, as we know from other accounts.¹²⁰ This detail takes on striking emphasis in light of G. Ferrari’s compelling new reading of Alcman *frg.* 1 as a mimetic ritual with choruses enacting the Hyades and Pleiades at the beginning of the plowing season. Their ‘cousin’ Hagesichora, the silver-faced ‘chorus-leader’ with whose brilliance they cannot compete, is the Moon herself (Selene and the Pleiades were indeed cousins according to mythic genealogy).¹²¹ So Euripides’ description reveals a fairly intimate understanding of the ritual and calendrical context of the *Karneia*.

The same may be said of the passage’s musical details, notably the contrasting modes of performance, one using the tortoiseshell-lyre, the other avoiding it. Such a neat antithesis is perfectly in keeping with Euripides’ taste for paradox. Yet the environment so evoked seems too peculiar and specific—and with no obvious relevance to the tale of Alcestis herself—to be dismissed as pure invention. The epithet ἄλυρος, in tragic usage, often relates to contexts of lamentation, and is to be explained by the lyre’s common use in glad settings like symposium or festival: it is joyous behavior which must be temporarily eschewed during a period of mourning. That this sense is operative in the present passage is guaranteed by Admetus’ application of the idea to himself elsewhere in the play (343–7). The coexistence of songs which are both ‘lyric’ and ἄλυρος is probably to be explained by reference to the programmatic arc of many festivals which, while ending joyously, enacted a larger ritual progression which included a phase of symbolic mourning and lamentation. In terms of ritual poetics, this commemorated some ‘tragic’ event (*cf.* the Hyacinthia at Sparta itself). Thus many of the early pan-Hellenic festivals were imagined as originating in funeral games (NAGY 1999, 117). The *Karneia* itself probably involved such a cycle, to judge from recurrent motifs

¹¹⁸ For the ‘new’ public and choral Sappho, see *inter al.* LARDINOIS 1996.

¹¹⁹ ‘Sappho and the Citharodes’, Athens June 4, 2010, expanding on suggestions in POWER 2010, pp. 262 n. 187, 466 n. 132.

¹²⁰ ROBERTSON 2002/2003, p. 36 *et passim*.

¹²¹ FERRARI 2008. This reading helps confirm the natural supposition that choral dance was involved at the *Karneia*, as at the other Spartan festivals: for which see with references POWER 2010, 281 n. 238.

in the various etiologies which ancient sources offer.¹²² Presumably the citharodic competition transpired at the festive climax, when the mood was no longer ἄλυρος. This might also help explain why Sappho could reject lamentation from a house of Lesbian μουσοπόλοι (although in Euripides they are equally described as ἀλύροις κλέοντες ὕμνοις).

At the same time, Euripides is ingenious enough to justify a secondary reading of ἄλυρος as ‘an apposite bit of choral self-reference’—evoking the αὐλός, which emerged as the lyre’s musical antithesis in fifth-century Athens, where it alone accompanied tragedy.¹²³ This leads to consideration of the related organological point—Euripides’ specification that the μουσοπόλοι will use the tortoise-shell lyre. Now if indeed Euripides and Ps. Plutarch both reflect knowledge of the *Karneian Victors*, their details should be compatible, and perhaps even mutually illuminating, provided that they derive from passages which were sufficiently contiguous—literally and/or conceptually—in the original work. We have seen reason to be basically confident in the attribution of the κιθάρα’s form to the generation of the obscure Kepion. It should follow that Terpander—according to the construction—used some other kind of instrument at the first Karneian victory. Euripides and Ps. Plutarch may therefore be combined to generate an image of Terpander performing on the tortoise-shell lyre. That this is no accident is confirmed by the persistent Lesbian tradition discussed above—assumed by Glaucus, and latent in Ps. Plutarch—whereby the tortoise-shell lyre of Orpheus is brought to Lesbos, and in one version to Terpander’s very hands.

For this reading of Euripides vis-à-vis Hellanicus to work, the tragedian must imagine his Alcestis songs unfolding in an *archaic*, ‘Terpandrian’ Karneia. This appears probable, although his vision is enriched by transhistorical insinuations. Since the chorus ‘knows’ of the Karneia, their prediction might suggest that the Spartan festival was imagined as current in the legendary past, much as the Pythian festival was retrojected into the age of Agamemnon.¹²⁴ Yet since the chorus is projecting a future occasion this assumption is not inescapable, and there need be no contradiction with the tradition known to Hellanicus—again probably pan-Hellenic by the fifth-century—that the first Karneia had transpired only with Terpander.¹²⁵ Thus the choral prediction may be just that, an inspired vision. This will also account for the self-referential inclusion of Athens, where the performative ‘lyre-less’ present intrudes on the imagined, ‘lyrical’ past. Both dramatic anachronisms may be accounted for as deriving from a sort of choral ecstasy, appropriate to the Dionysian context: the singers achieve a prophetic state, as though enjoying the kind of oracular powers which come at the moment of death.

So Euripides’ Karneian vignette can certainly represent a future occasion. Yet it can hardly represent *fifth-century* performance conditions at Sparta with complete accuracy. Professional competitors in the poet’s own day had long been true citharodes, performing on the ‘modern’

¹²² See ROBERTSON 1987, esp. pp. 67–71, for the Dorian myths of Karnos (or Kerynos), a seer killed by the ‘invading’ Dorian army. Alternatively, the festival was said to placate Apollo (*cfr.* Apollo Karneios), angered by the cutting of cornel trees (κράνεια) for the Trojan horse—an appropriate function for ritual lamentation. Note that Alcman *frg.* 1 also involved a dimension of lamentation in its treatment of the Phaethon myth (FERRARI 2008, *passim*).

¹²³ POWER 2010, 281, with n. 238.

¹²⁴ Demetr. Phal. fr. 144 *SOD*. See above, above n. 74.

¹²⁵ There is no evidence that the Karneian musical contest was ever given a legendary back history, as happened with the Delphic contests (see e.g. Demetr. Phal. fr. 144 *SOD*, with GOSTOLI 1986; WILSON 2004, pp. 269–70). One might of course consider Terpander’s first victory itself to be legendary; but note that the dating of this event to 676/3—whoever was responsible—is rather later than Spartan tradition would place the great Lycurgus, who might otherwise be expected to have absorbed some credit for the first Karneia. Such an impulse may perhaps be inferred from another tradition which made Terpander a contemporary of Lycurgus: Hieronymus ap. Athen. 635f.; *cfr.* NAGY 1990, 86 n. 24.

concert κithάρα which Lesbian tradition associated with Kepion.¹²⁶ Ps. Plutarch's Periclitus, coming after Kepion's invention, also implies true κithαρῳδία at the Karneia. It is probably equally significant that Herodotus represents Arion with the instrument (1.24.5). One must also assume the κithάρα for performances by Phrynis and Timotheus. Significantly the anecdotes regarding these two innovators reflect the problematic status of contemporary κithαρῳδία there, with the excision of supernumerary strings enforcing a return to an archaic musical state typified by the tortoiseshell lyre (*H. Merc.* 51; *Eur. Alc.* 446–7, *Ion* 881; *Call. Del.* 253–4; further sources in FRANKLIN 2002, 686 n. 47). Whatever the historical basis of those tales, it does seem certain that Euripides, despite his allusion to present-day Athenian performance, is offering us an antiquarian vision of the Karneia. This chronological disjunction is probably reflected in the poet's ordering of the material, with the early Spartan performances acting as a bridge between the legendary past and the Athenian present.

A tortoise-shell Terpander in a fifth-century source has a very good chance of being a somewhat artificial construction, relating to the heated contemporary debate—in and out of Athens—about the nature and status of the New Music.¹²⁷ Important here is the famous fragment, attributed to Terpander himself, in which the singer calls for 'new hymns to the heptatonic *phorminx*' (*frg.* 4 Gostoli). While epic's practically exclusive use of the word *phorminx* is itself clearly a generic artifice, since *lyra* was already current in Mycenaean times (FRANKLIN 2011), one can hardly suppose a tortoiseshell lyre in the Terpadrian fragment. An ancient Karneia focused on that instrument would evoke a simpler, more innocent musical atmosphere. And this idea could be quite readily applied to Sparta, now famously conservative and functioning for some contemporary critics as a foil for the restless innovations of demotic Athens. That the Karneia itself was a locus of heated controversy precisely in the age of Hellanicus is famously attested by Timotheus in the *sphragis* of his *Persians*, a passage which, as it happens, is also the oldest text which explicitly connects Terpander with the *chelys*-lyre, and makes him an immediate heir to Orpheus. So in Timotheus too one finds a Lesbianizing vision of citharodic history from the later fifth-century. Given this, it is surely no accident that the tale of Timotheus' confrontation with the ephors was also told of the earlier Phrynis of Lesbos.¹²⁸

To sum up, Hardie's proposal can be extended to account for other details in Euripides' Karneian idyll. This vignette, despite its concision, is rich in ethnographic detail, and may be well read as an epitome of some contextual description offered by Hellanicus in the *Karneian Victors*. Moreover the passage can be fruitfully combined with the proposed epitome of the *Karneian Victors* in Ps. Plutarch, allowing one to infer an historiographic construction—the tortoise-shell Terpander—which is known on independent grounds to derive from Lesbian tradition. It is clearer than ever, therefore, that Hellanicus presented the myth of Orpheus' lyre coming to Terpander.

Conclusions

¹²⁶ See N. ALMAZOVA in this volume, who assembles evidence for fifth-century amateur competitions to the tortoise-shell lyre. Could these be relics of early Archaic professional practice? Compare the famous lead figurines from seventh-century Sparta, and a brilliant seventh-century vase depicting a tortoise-shell lyrist accompanying a chorus of female dancers (Athens 313, Hydria from Anatolos: see MAAS/ SNYDER 1989, p. 48 fig. 13a).

¹²⁷ See generally WILSON 1999; WALLACE 2003; MARTIN 2003; CSAPO 2004; FRANKLIN in press; POWER 2010, *passim*.

¹²⁸ See above, n. 112. I shall explore this point more fully in connection with the 'Asiatic κithάρα'.

If Euripides has indeed drawn on Hellanicus, we gain a very valuable datum: the *Karneian Victors* must have been published before 438—that is, relatively early in the historian’s career, quite probably early enough to be fully independent of his annalistic work.¹²⁹ It is not impossible that Hellanicus offered a few ‘fixed’ (and mostly fictive) dates, either by ephor or (more probably) Argive priestess, although such evidence as there is indicates rather a system of generational synchronisms, and I shall offer a synthetic explanation below. Yet even assuming an annalistic scheme, this will not have run very deep: victors cannot have been presented on a year-by-year basis for the early Archaic period, and I very much doubt that Hellanicus attempted this even for the fifth-century. The balanced structure of Orpheus—Terpander + ἀπόγονοι—Phrynīs strongly suggests that his main focus was on the great early Lesbian singers and their achievements. These were arranged as a series of ‘firsts’, and fleshed out by further anecdotal and mythological material, including probably Arion and the Dolphins, the voyage of Orpheus’ lyre, and doubtless some of the many other ‘firsts’ attributed to Terpander in other sources. It was therefore probably not a very long treatise, which would accord well enough with Hellanicus’ decision to cast it into verse for public recitation. And given the work’s tight Lesbian interests, one should also consider the possibility that the prose version was not—or not only—a self-standing work, but found its way into Hellanicus’ *Lesbiaka*. It was a common ancient practice to cite subsections of a work by separate, sometimes impromptu titles.¹³⁰ So ‘*The Karneian Victors*’ could be a post-Hellanic naming-act by readers / listeners struck by its principal focus, and eliding the common-knowledge detail that Hellanicus’ καρνεονῖκαι were all Lesbians.

The *Karneian Victors* should therefore be seen as, at most, transitional between Hellanicus’ earlier regional mythography and his mature chronographical efforts. In fact the proposed reconstruction happens to agree closely with Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ characterization of Thucydides’ contemporaries and immediate predecessors, among whom he includes Hellanicus. These authors, he says, had a single goal:

to make public (ἐξενεγκεῖν) for the common knowledge of all however many traditions (μνῆμαι) were preserved among the regional peoples, both by *ethnos* and *polis* . . . just as they received them, neither adding nor subtracting anything. Among these were also certain tales (μῦθοι) which had been believed from deep antiquity.¹³¹

Given a *terminus ante quem* of 438 for the work, it is very tempting to associate its publication with Phrynīs’ debut victory in κίθαρωδία at the Panathenaea, probably in 446.¹³²

¹²⁹ JACOBY 1913, pp. 107–111 argued that most of Hellanicus’ works postdated 425; von FRITZ 1967, 1.1, p. 479 was prepared to believe that some appeared before 425. More recently, DREWS 1973, p. 23, has strongly and rightly insisted that, given the large and varied output attributed to him, ‘undoubtedly Hellanicus’ literary career began some time prior to 430’. Hellanicus may well have begun the ambitious *Argive Priestesses* by the early 430s.

¹³⁰ Although this work is cited by name (if name it is) only for points of Lesbian topography (4 F 33–5), 4 F 150 shows Hellanicus’ dealing with the heroic period of Lesbos (presumably from the *Troika*); 4 F 92 presented the Lesbian site of Metaon as a ‘Pelasgian’ settlement (*Phoronis*?).

¹³¹ Dion. Halic. *Thuc.* 5.1 (ed. Radermacher/Usener): ὅσαι διεσώζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνῆμαι κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις . . . ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἀπάντων γνῶσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν, οἷας παρέλαβον, μῆτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μῆτε ἀφαιροῦντες· ἐν αἷς καὶ μῦθοι τινες ἐνήσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ πεπιστευμένοι χρόνου κτλ.

¹³² Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 971a: ὁ Φρῦνις κίθαρωδὸς μιτυληναῖος. οὗτος δὲ δοκεῖ πρῶτος παρ’ Ἀθηναίους κίθαρωδικῆ νικῆσαι Παναθήναια ἐπὶ Καλλίου ἄρχοντος. ἦν δὲ Ἀριστοκλείτου μαθητής. ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοκλείτος τὸ γένος ἦν ἀπὸ Τερπάνδρου. The date 446 depends on M. H. E. Meyer’s

This event made a big splash, to judge from Phrynis' long-term impact on local musical practice and memory (Aristoph. *Nub.* 964–72, 423 BCE). He was recalled as a controversial and decisive milestone in the evolution of the New Music (Pherecr. *frg.* 155 K-A; Procl. *Chrest.* ap. Phot. *Bibl.* 320b5–11). His notoriety was apparently due to his adaptation of traditional κιθαρωδία to the trendy new tonalities of the αὐλός. This is the natural inference of an anecdote registered by an Aristophanic scholiast, who alleges that Phrynis began as an αὐλός-player, but then studied the κιθάρα with a certain Aristoclitus (or Aristoclitides) whose acme was during the Persian Wars (*schol.* Aristoph. *Nub.* 971a).¹³³ Though Aristoclitus is obscure, that he traced his professional descent (γένος)—whether literal or notional—from Terpander is important for several reasons. First, here is a living example of the ancient proverb: if he ever competed at the Karneia, he may well have enjoyed the honor of performing first (assuming that the ancient etiologies, whether historically accurate or not as regards the proverb's *original* meaning, have at least some basis in the realities of *fifth-century* performance). Second, it indicates that Lesbos was still home to singers who viewed their own citharodic history *in terms of generations*. This too could have provided Hellanicus with a ready structural model for his work. Indeed he must have found in these latter-day Lesbian singers an important source of traditional, anecdotal material, which can in turn explain the strong Lesbian bias of a work whose transmitted title superficially indicates something rather different. So it may be that Hellanicus, to quote Dionysius, 'neither added nor subtracted anything', and he should probably not be held solely responsible for the telescoped vision of Lesbian καρνεονίκαι which he purveyed.¹³⁴ Indeed, Hellanicus may never have gone to Sparta at all, and cared nothing for an ephor-list.

Finally, the idea of 'kinship' was very potent in Greek thought. If Aristoclitus presented himself as perpetuating the 'true blood' of Terpander, his 'birth' will have made him morally incapable of such base actions as are attributed to Phrynis. Significantly then Phrynis is said in the same scholion to have come to Aristoclitus as a slave (= Ister 334 F 50). As the scholiast points out, if this were true Aristophanes would have made more of it; but it remains a significant slur, and likely enough to originate in Old Comedy all the same (*cf.* POWER 2010, 417). With Phrynis the line of descent from Terpander was broken. He cannot be expected to have placed first at the Karneia: he was neither καλός nor ἀγαθός, and therefore both unworthy and unable to uphold τὸ καλόν in music. This accords of course with the well-documented discourse on the position of the demotic New Music, and in particular the αὐλός, in Athenian society at this time.¹³⁵ Probably Hellanicus, as a fellow Lesbian, was rather apologetic in his presentation of Phrynis as the end of an era. It is the same kind of critical intervention that underlies a fourth-century representation, presumably derived from Old Comedy, of Phrynis being dragged off by 'Pyronides', perhaps in some utopian action of the Areopagus (*cf.* TAPLIN 1993, p. 42; POWER 2010, 514). The reality was, however, that Phrynis was a public success for a style which Dikaios Logos calls 'those difficult-to-bend bends à la Phrynis' ([scil. καμπὰς] τὰς κατὰ Φρῦνιν ταύτας τὰς δυσκολοκάμπτους, Aristoph. *Nub.* 971), and which one might well describe as ἄλυρος κιθαρωδία.

So Phrynis' Athenian debut, and his reported mishap at the Karneia, would have made very topical a work which traced the history of the Lesbian γένος at the Spartan contest from Terpander down to Phrynis. I would therefore propose a publication range of 445–439 for the *Karneian Victors*, perhaps promoted by a memorable verse recitation in Athens. This dating is

probable emendation of ἐπὶ Καλλίου to ἐπὶ Καλλιμάχου. See DAVISON 1958, p. 41; WEST 1992, 360 n. 15.

¹³³ For various others nuances of this biographical construction, see POWER 2010, pp. 416–9.

¹³⁴ For similar readings of the Lesbian citharodes' living lore, see POWER 2010, *passim*.

¹³⁵ See references in n. 126.

also attractive for logistical reasons, since it would let Hellanicus visit Sparta for research prior to the outbreak of the war, had that been needed. It will also account for the work's proposed influence on Herodotus, as well as the first attestation of 'After a Lesbian singer' in a fragment of Cratinus' *Chirons* (263 K-A), which has been dated between 440–430 (POWER 2010, p. 403). It is further compatible with the sudden Athenian interest in the 'Asiatic κιθάρα' from at least 422–405: the basic point I shall argue elsewhere is that Phrynīs directly inspired the New Musicians to give a polemical twist to the expression, which had recently been presented by Hellanicus as a crucial innovation of the early Lesbian citharodes. Euripides and his colleagues thereby reveled in the 'oriental softness' with which they were taxed by critics, reversing the charge by insinuating that the Terperandrian ἀπόγονοι were themselves 'Asiatic', all the while sheltering ironically behind the antiquarian authority of the renowned historian who was eventually responsible for unearthing Athens' distant, patriotic past.

Excursus: Hellanicus and the Sicyonian Inscription

A final complication should be considered: the possibility that Hellanicus duplicated 'data' from the *Karneian Victors* in the universalizing *Argive Priestesses*, which he probably treated in part as a grand synthesis of his earlier studies.¹³⁶ This could have generated secondary synchronisms, e.g. of Terperander with Midas, and a fixed date for the first Karneia.¹³⁷

By itself this suggestion may seem unnecessarily speculative. But it becomes more tangible with the evidence of the so-called Sicyonian Inscription.¹³⁸ This lost document, probably displayed publically at Sicyon, was a sort of universal musical and literary history which Heraclides of Pontus, a member of Aristotle's school, seems to have drawn on for his own *Collection of Men <Famous?> in Music*.¹³⁹ It cannot have been composed too long after the time of Hellanicus, since evidently Heraclides followed its lead in adopting the dating scheme of the *Argive Priestesses*.¹⁴⁰ Heraclides, we are told, asserted that Amphion was the first inventor of κιθαρωδία,

and he guarantees this from the inscription preserved in Sicyon, through which (δι' ἧς) he names the Argive priestesses and the poets and musicians.¹⁴¹

Heraclides' relationship to this document is hardly clear. What is the precise force of δι' ἧς? A simple idea of agency (LSJ A III b) seems natural, but why would Heraclides expect the inscription to provide greater ancient authority than he could gain by citing the *Argive*

¹³⁶ Cfr. JACOBY 1913, col. 148.

¹³⁷ In this scenario Clement (or his source) may simply have relayed the synchronism of Terperander and Midas without giving its annalistic underpinning.

¹³⁸ See e.g. KLEINGÜNTHER 1933, pp. 138–9.

¹³⁹ Or perhaps *Collection of Musical Matters*: Ps. Plut. *Mus.* 1131f: ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ τῶν ἐν μουσικῇ, which has been variously supplemented (e.g. with εὐδοκιμησάντων in Ziegler's edition).

¹⁴⁰ It has been suggested that the inscription's failure to use the Sicyonian kings for an annalistic framework indicates that the Inscription was not some traditional local chronicle (JACOBY 1949, p. 357 n. 24; MÖLLER 2001, pp. 257–8). Certainly its universal compass is indicated by the Inscription's second fragment, concerning the aulode Klonas, traditionally associated with both Tegea and Thebes. But the argument is not cogent, since a Sicyonian king-list would obviously not stretch as far back as Amphion without some further scholarly intervention.

¹⁴¹ Ps. Plut. *Mus.* 1132a = Heraclid. Pont. *frg.* 157 Wehrli = *FrGrHist* 550 F 1: πιστοῦται δὲ τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τῆς ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀποκειμένης, δι' ἧς τὰς τε ἱερείας τὰς ἐν Ἄργει καὶ τοὺς ποιητὰς καὶ τοὺς μουσικοὺς ὀνομάζει.

Priestesses directly? That Hellanicus' important work had not yet been lost seems certain from the nature of the surviving fragments, many preserved by significantly later authorities. We *have* seen indications (e.g. Glaucus) that the historian's material had begun to be absorbed and extracted at a rather early date.¹⁴² Yet it is more likely, I suggest, that Heraclides, in using the document to 'guarantee' (πιστοῦται) his 'facts', believed, or wished his readers to believe, that the priestess-list had not been largely concocted by Hellanicus, but was an authentic document stretching back to the dawn of time. And of course it may be that only this inscription offered the particular 'data' he required.

This leads to the question of the extent and nature of the inscription's debt to the *Argive Priestesses*. Did the compiler follow only Hellanicus' dating scheme for an otherwise completely original chronicle? Or did it also borrow some of the work's annalistic material, extracting its specifically musical entries? Note the ambiguity in the expression τὰς ἱερείας τὰς ἐν Ἄργει, which appears verbatim elsewhere as a variant of the work's title (4 F 84). So the sense could perhaps be 'through which he names (i.e. cites) the *Argive Priestesses*, and *its* poets and musicians'.

A very close parallel for this process is the *Parian Marble*, another anonymous chronicle, inscribed and publically displayed in 264/3 BCE, in which a foreign annalistic sequence deriving ultimately from Hellanicus—the Athenian kings and archons—formed a rather sketchy universal framework for other events. While these are quite often political, especially for the fourth and third centuries, there is an equally heavy emphasis on milestones in the history of poetry and music—largely Athenocentric from the fifth century onwards.¹⁴³ The relevance of this here is that, since the Marble is obviously an atthidographic epitome, a conscious *selection* was made with an eye especially on musical information. Because the synchronism of the first Panathenaea with Erichthonius (§10, 1506/5 BCE!) is independently attested for Hellanicus (323a F 2), it is reasonable to assume that some further musical details also go back ultimately to Hellanicus' *Attike Syngraphe*.

The *Parian Marble* thus encourages one to suppose that the compiler of the *Sicyonian Inscription* took more than just priestess dates from Hellanicus. This need not have been a wholesale transposition: one would expect some conscious intervention to make the structure accord with the compiler's epichoric traditions and/or personal predilections. Such adjustments would be paralleled at Athens itself, where Hellanicus' atthidographic successors felt free to revise his chronicle as they saw fit.¹⁴⁴ A likely example of this at Sicyon would be

¹⁴² Cfr. AMBAGLIO 1980, p. 21.

¹⁴³ JACOBY 1904; *FrGrHist* 239. A compilation of the *Marble's* musical milestones may be helpful: §10 Hyagnis the aulete invents Phrygian *harmonia*. First Panathenaea (1506/5); §§14–15 Orpheus (1399/8), Eumolpos (s. d.); §§28–9 Hesiod (s. d.), Homer (907/6); §34 Terpander's citharodic revolution (645/4); §36 Saphho (s. d.); §39 First comic chorus established (between 582–560!); §42 Hipponax' *floruit*, 541/0; §43 Thespis as first actor (s. d.); §46 Choral competitions (i.e. in Athens, 510/9); §47 Melanippides of Melos victorious at Athens (495/4); §48 Aeschylus at Marathon (491/0); §49 Simonides victorious in Athens (490/89); §50 Aeschylus' first tragic victory; birth of Euripides; Stesichorus' arrival to Greece (!) (486/5); §54 Simonides' victory in Athens as choral trainer (477/6); §55 Epicharmus' *floruit* (472/1); §56 Victory of Sophocles (470/69); §57 Death of Simonides (469/8); §59 Death of Aeschylus (457/6); §60 Euripides' first victory (443/2); §63 Euripides' death (409/8); §64 Death of Sophocles (407/6); §65 Victory of Telestes at Athens (403/2); §68 Polyidos of Selymbria's dithyrambic victory at Athens (s. d.); §69 Death of Philoxenus (380/79); §70 (Victory of) Anaxandrides, comic poet (377/6); §71 373/2 Victory of Astydamos at Athens; §73 Victory of Stesichorus 'the second' at Athens (s. d.); §76 Death of Timotheus (s. d.); §78 Victory of ? (357/6); §108 Victory of Philemon (328/7); §115 Victory of Menander (316/5); §116 Death of the poet Sosiphanes (313/2); §123 Birth of the poet Sosiphanes (sic, 306/5).

¹⁴⁴ HARDING 1994, pp. 49–50; HARDING 2007, p. 10.

Amphion himself, since Hellanicus seems to have promoted Orpheus rather aggressively as an ultimate musical ancestor, deriving from him the descent of both Homer and Hesiod across ten generations in the *Phoronis* (4 F 5a–b). I have also argued that Hellanicus offered Orpheus as a professional forebear of Terpander.

If one grants that the universalizing *Argive Priestesses* probably offered musical milestones for the Sicyonian compiler, it becomes tempting to suppose that some of this material originated in Hellanicus' other, tributary works—viz. the *Karneian Victors*. We have seen that Hellanicus probably indulged in such reduplication between the *Argive Priestesses* and the *Attike Syngraphe*,¹⁴⁵ and it seems probable that he pursued a somewhat cumulative publication strategy throughout his career—a natural tendency, as we all know. While most of the *Parian Marble's* material relates specifically to Athens, as one would also expect for the *Attike Syngraphe*, this ceases to be true prior to Thespis (presumably in 534)—that is, before the historical emergence of Athens as an international performance center under the Pisistratids. It is quite conceivable, however, that some of the earlier, more pan-Hellenic entries may be vestiges, however distant, of Hellanican historiography, deriving ultimately from the *Argive Priestesses* or even the *Karneian Victors*.

As an example let us consider the *Marble's* entry on Terpander's citharodic καινοτομία in 645/4. The apparent conflict with Sosibius' date of 676/3 for the first Karneia is not necessarily insurmountable. The two might be neatly bridged by Ps. Plutarch's assertion that Terpander 'has been recorded (inscribed?) as having won the Pythian contest four times in succession'.¹⁴⁶ Note that here too Ps. Plutarch's authority could well be Glaucus, cited immediately afterwards, just as he was the intermediate source for the passage which I take to epitomize the *Karneian Victors*. Since the Pythian contest was held to have been octennial in this period, Terpander's first victory there may have been constructed to follow the first Karneia at an eight year interval, thus yielding the sequence 676, 668, 660, 652, 644. In this case the *Parian Marble* would record the closing date for a Terpandrian 'epoch', which would accord with the posited structure of the *Karneian Victors* as proceeding by successive generations of a Lesbian *diadoché*. At the same time it would require an underlying annalistic structure; but this could have arisen from the incorporation of the *Karneian Victors* material with a later annalistic work like the *Argive Priestesses*.

REFERENCES

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| AMBAGLIO 1980 | D. AMBAGLIO, <i>L'opera storiografica di Ellanico di Lesbo</i> , Pisa 1980. |
| BARKER 1984–1989 | A. BARKER, <i>Greek Musical Writings</i> , Cambridge 1984–1989. |
| BEECROFT 2008 | A. J. BEECROFT, 'Nine Fragments in Search of an Author: Poetic Lines Attributed to Terpander', <i>CJ</i> 103, 2008, pp. 225–242. |

¹⁴⁵ While this was especially clear for fifth century events involving Athens (see above), note also 323 F 21b–c, an Athenian synchronism for the fall of Troy.

¹⁴⁶ Ps. Plut. *Mus.* 1132e: τὰ Πύθια γὰρ τετράκις ἐξῆς νενικηκῶς ἀναγράφεται. Unfortunately ἀναγράφεται, 'it is recorded' is somewhat ambiguous. The verb may imply an actual inscription. But this primary meaning engendered the secondary sense of a literary "record" or "register," clearly required elsewhere in Ps. Plutarch (1133a, οἱ ἀναγεγραφότες), who indeed refers to Glaucus' book elsewhere as an ἀναγραφή (1133f).

- BRADEEN 1963 D. W. BRADEEN, 'The Fifth-Century Archon List', *Hesperia* 32, 1963, pp. 187–208.
- BURKERT 1985 W. BURKERT, *Greek Religion*, Cambridge, Mass. 1985.
- BURKERT 1994 W. BURKERT, 'Orpheus, Dionysos und die Euneiden in Athen: das Zeugnis von Euripides' Hypsipyle', in A. BIERL / P. V. MÖLLENDORFF, *Orchestra. Drama, Mythos, Bühne*, Stuttgart, 1994, pp. 44–49.
- CASSIO 2000 A. C. CASSIO, 'Esametri orfici, dialetto attico e musica dell'asia minore', in A. C. CASSIO/D. MUSTI / L. E. ROSSI, *Synaulia: cultura musicale in grecia e contatti mediterranei*, Naples, 2000, pp. 97–110.
- CHRISTESEN 2007 P. CHRISTESEN, *Olympic victor lists and ancient Greek history*, Cambridge and New York 2007.
- CSAPO 2004 E. CSAPO, 'The Politics of the New Music', in MURRAY / WILSON, *Music and the Muses. The Culture of 'Mousikē' in the Classical Athenian City*, Oxford, 2004, pp. 207–248.
- DAVISON 1958 J. A. DAVISON, 'Notes on the Panathenaea', *JHS* 78, 1958, pp. 23–42.
- DREWS 1973 R. DREWS, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*, Washington, D.C. 1973.
- FERRARI 2008 G. FERRARI, *Aleman and the cosmos of Sparta*, Chicago 2008.
- FIRINU 2009 E. FIRINU, 'Il primo stasimo dell' Ifigenia Taurica euripidea e i Persiani di Timoteo di Mileto: un terminus post quem per il nomos?' *Eikasmos* 20, pp. 109–31.
- FOWLER 1996 R. L. FOWLER, 'Herodotos and His Contemporaries', *JHS* 116, 1996, pp. 62–87.
- FRANKLIN 2002 J. C. FRANKLIN, 'Diatonic Music in Greece: A Reassessment of its Antiquity', *Mnemosyne* 56.1, 2002, pp. 669–702.
- FRANKLIN 2003 J. C. FRANKLIN, 'The Language of Musical Technique in Greek Epic Diction', *Gaia* 7, 2003, pp. 295–307.
- FRANKLIN 2006 J. C. FRANKLIN, 'Lyre Gods of the Bronze Age Musical Koine', *JANER* 6.2, 2006, pp. 39–70.
- FRANKLIN 2007 J. C. FRANKLIN, 'A Feast of Music. The Greco-Lyidian Musical Movement on the Assyrian Periphery', in B. J. COLLINS/M. R. BACHVAROVA / I. RUTHERFORD, *Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia*, Oxford, 2007, pp. 193–203.
- FRANKLIN 2010 J. C. FRANKLIN, 'Remembering Music in Early Greece', in S. MIRELMAN, *The Historiography of Music in Global Perspective*, Piscataway, NJ, 2010, pp. 9–50.
- FRANKLIN 2011 J. C. Franklin, 'Phorminx', in M. FINKELBERG, *The Homer Encyclopedia*, Oxford, 2011, pp. s.v.
- FRANKLIN in press J. C. FRANKLIN, "'Song-Benders of Circular Choruses": Dithyramb and the "Demise of Music"', in P. WILSON / B. KOWALZIG, *Song Culture and Social Change: The Contexts of Dithyramb*, Oxford, in press, pp.
- FRITZ 1967 K. V. FRITZ, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung*, Berlin 1967.
- GOMME 1945–1981 A. W. GOMME, *A historical commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford 1945–1981.

- GOSTOLI 1986 A. GOSTOLI, 'La figura dell'aedo preomerico nella filologia peripatetica ed ellenistica: Demodoco tra mito e storia', in G. CERRI, *Scrivere e recitare*, Rome, 1986, pp. 103–126.
- GOSTOLI 1988 A. GOSTOLI, 'Terpandro e la funzione etico-politica della musica', in B. GENTILI / R. PRETAGOSTINI, *La musica in Grecia*, Rome, 1988, pp. 232–237.
- GOSTOLI 1990 A. GOSTOLI, *Terpandro: Introduzione, testimonianze, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Rome 1990.
- HARDIE 2005 A. HARDIE, 'Sappho, the Muses and Life After Death', 154, 2005, pp. 13–32.
- HARDING 1994 P. HARDING, *Androtion and the Atthis: the fragments translated with introduction and commentary*, Oxford 1994.
- HARDING 2007 P. HARDING, 'Local History and Atthidography', in J. MARINCOLA, *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Malden, MA, 2007, pp. 180–188.
- HORNBLOWER 1987 S. HORNBLOWER, *Thucydides*, Baltimore 1987.
- HORNBLOWER 1991–2008 S. HORNBLOWER, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford 1991–2008.
- JACOBY 1904 F. JACOBY, *Das Marmor Parium*, Berlin 1904.
- JACOBY 1909 F. JACOBY, 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* 9, 1909, pp. 80–123.
- JACOBY 1913 F. JACOBY, 'Hellanikos', *RE* VIII, 1913, pp. cols. 104–43.
- JACOBY 1938 F. JACOBY, 'Charon von Lampsakos', *SIFC* 15, 1938, pp. 207–242.
- JACOBY 1949 F. JACOBY, *Atthis, the local chronicles of ancient Athens*, Oxford 1949.
- JOYCE 1999 C. JOYCE, 'Was Hellanikos the First Chronicler of Athens?' *Histos* 3, 1999, pp. 1–17.
- KLEINGÜNTHER 1933 A. KLEINGÜNTHER, *Prôtos heuretês*, Leipzig 1933.
- LANATA 1966 G. LANATA, 'Sul linguaggio amoroso di Saffo', *QUCC* 2, 1966, pp. 63–79.
- LARDINOIS 1996 A. LARDINOIS, 'Who Sang Sappho's Songs', in E. GREENE, *Reading Sappho: contemporary approaches*, Berkeley, 1996, pp. 150–172.
- LENDLE 1964 O. LENDLE, 'Die Auseinandersetzung des Thukydides mit Hellanikos', *Hermes* 92.2, 1964, pp. 129–143.
- MAAS/ SNYDER 1989 M. MAAS / J. SNYDER, *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece*, New Haven and London 1989.
- MARCHANT 1978 < 1891 E. C. MARCHANT, *Thucydides: Book II*, Bristol 1978 < 1891.
- MARTIN 2003 R. P. MARTIN, 'The Pipes are Brawling: Conceptualizing Musical Performance in Athens', in C. DOUGHERTY / L. KURKE, *The cultures within ancient Greek culture: contact, conflict, collaboration*, Cambridge and New York, 2003, pp. 153–180.
- MEIGGS/ LEWIS 1969 R. MEIGGS / D. LEWIS, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1969.
- MERITT 1939 B. D. MERITT, 'Greek Inscriptions (14-27)', *Hesperia* 8.1, 1939, pp. 48–82.

- MÖLLER 2001 A. MÖLLER, 'The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*', in N. LURAGHI, *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford, 2001, pp. 241–262.
- NAGY 1990 G. NAGY, *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*, Baltimore 1990.
- NAGY 1999 G. NAGY, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Art and Poetry. Rev. ed.*, Baltimore 1999.
- PARKER 1996 R. L. PARKER, 'Herodotus and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116, 1996, pp. 62–87.
- PEARSON 1939 L. I. C. PEARSON, *Early Ionian historians*, Oxford 1939.
- PERRIN 1901 B. PERRIN, 'The Iepeiai of Hellanicus and the Burning of the Argive Heraeum', *AJA* 22.1, 1901, pp. 39–43.
- POWER 2010 T. POWER, *The Culture of Kitharoidia*, Cambridge, Mass. 2010.
- PRAUSCELLO 2009 L. PRAUSCELLO, 'Wandering poetry, travelling' music: Timotheus' muse and some case-studies of shifting cultural identities', in R. HUNTER / I. RUTHERFORD, *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Panhellenism*, Cambridge, 2009, pp. 168–94.
- ROBERTSON 1987 N. ROBERTSON, 'Government and Society at Miletus, 525–442 B. C.' *Phoenix* 41, 1987, pp. 356–398.
- ROBERTSON 2002/2003 N. ROBERTSON, 'The Religious Criterion in Greek Ethnicity: The Dorians and the Festival Carneia', *AJAH* 1.2, 2002/2003, pp. 5–74.
- SCHUOL 2004 M. SCHUOL, *Hethitische Kultmusik. Eine Untersuchung der Instrumental- und Vokalmusik anhand hethitischer Ritualtexte und von archäologischen Zeugnissen*, Rahden 2004.
- SMART 1986 J. D. SMART, 'Thucydides and Hellanicus', in I. S. MOXON/J. D. SMART / A. J. WOODMAN, *Past perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman historical writing*, Cambridge and New York, 1986, pp. 19–35.
- STEFANIS 1986 I. E. STEFANIS, *Dionysiakoi technitai: symvoles stēn prosōpographia tou theatrou kai tēs mousikēs tōn archaiōn Hellēnōn*, Iraklion 1986.
- STROUD 1978 R. S. STROUD, 'State documents in archaic Athens', in *Athens comes of age: from Solon to Salamis*, Princeton, 1978, pp. 20–42.
- THOMAS 1989 R. THOMAS, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 1989.
- WALLACE 2003 R. W. WALLACE, 'An Early Fifth-Century Athenian Revolution in Aulos Music', *HSCP* 101, 2003, pp. 73–92.
- WEIL/REINACH 1900 H. WEIL / T. REINACH, *Plutarque. De la musique. Édition critique et explicative*, Paris 1900.
- WEST 1992 M. L. WEST, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1893 U. V. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Aristoteles und Athen*, Berlin 1893.
- WILSON 1999 P. WILSON, 'The Aulos in Athens', in S. D. GOLDHILL / R. OSBORNE, *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Oxford, 1999, pp. 58–95.

WILSON 2004

P. WILSON, 'Athenian Strings', in MURRAY / WILSON, *Music and the Muses. The Culture of 'Mousikê' in the Classical Athenian City*, Oxford, 2004, pp. 269–306.