Remembering Music in Early Greece

John C. Franklin

Forthcoming in S. Mirelman (ed.), *The Historiography of Music in Global Perspective*
(Piscataway, NJ, Gorgias Press)

Introduction

Greek authors often refer to earlier music.[1] Sometimes these details are of first importance for the modern historiography of ancient Greek music. Uniquely valuable, for instance, is Herodotus' allusion to an Argive musical efflorescence in the late sixth century, nowhere else explicitly attested (3.131–2). In other cases we learn less about real musical history than an author's own biases and predilections. Thus Plato describes Egypt as a never-never-land where no innovation was ever permitted in music; it is hard to know whether Plato fabricated this statement out of nothing to support his conservative and ideal society, or is drawing, towards the same end, upon a more widely held impression—obviously superficial—of a foreign, distant culture (*Leg.* 656e–657f). The frequent lament by fifth- and fourth century authors about the 'demise of music', due to the rise of a more vulgar, exhibitionist art, clearly reflects some real historical development; but its obviously elite bias shows that we are getting only one side of the story (Franklin in press-d). These cases, and many others that could be cited, attest a continuous interest in the musical past. They are also enough to show, as one would anyway expect, that 'ancient music' might take on a range of appearances, depending on the observer, and on the material observed.

But 'historiography' implies something more systematic—a 'scientific' undertaking in the literal sense: the 'creation of knowledge' (*scientia* + *facere*) through a sustained and purposeful engagement with vestiges of the past. By the fourth century the Greeks probably used the word *archaiologia* in precisely this sense: a reasoned historical account, based upon a variety of sources (not limited to the material record, like the word's narrower modern counterpart). The usage was apparently known to Plato (*Hipp. maj.* 285d: the issue of the work's authenticity need not detain us), and later writers often apply *archaiologia* to the lost historical treatises which began to proliferate in the late fifth and early fourth centuries. A number of these dealt with the history of music; all have been lost, but some are represented by large enough fragments to let us form an opinion of the sources available to these scholars, and their methodology. These are the world's first efforts worthy of the name 'music archaeology'—the term currently preferred (e.g. Hickmann 1993).

Yet one must first consider a number of passages from earlier Greek poetry which also bear on the musical past. The poets themselves approached the subject in a systematic enough way—and with the express goal of commemoration—that one may reasonably consider their efforts a form of music archaeology *avant la lettre*. To the extent that their goal was the preservation of musical 'knowledge', one may use the term 'science' advisedly. This material will often not seem very objective to us: the constructions of poetry, for instance, were sometimes motivated by considerations of genre. But this reservation must confront the Greeks' own early conception of 'truth' (*alêtheia*) as 'that which is unforgotten', or 'unforgettable', as well as the poets' esteemed status as 'masters of truth' (Detienne 1996, *et al.*). The later historiographers are not without their own biases, and for the early periods especially are often no more 'scientific' than the poets—who were after all their principal 'sources' for the remote past, besides being musical sources in their own right. So it becomes arbitrary to distinguish between the two bodies of evidence. They constitute a real continuum, united by a constant concern for earlier music: it is a continuous, self-reflective musical tradition. The oral dimension of Greek 'literary' culture was still alive and well even in the literate

---

[1] Abbreviations of classical authors and reference collections follow the Oxford Classical Dictionary, where available, or otherwise the *LSJ*. Journals follow the system in *L'Année philologique*.

fourth century. And the *musical* tradition in the narrower sense—recalling that Greek poetry of the Archaic and Classical periods was almost always sung—remained predominantly aural and oral even after the notation system reached its full maturity in the Hellenistic period (see now Hagel 2009). Hence scholars could still refer directly to performance traditions that were believed to be, and probably were indeed, archaic styles.

So an understanding of the poets' means of, and goals in, preserving past musical knowledge is a necessary precursor to assessing the historiographical fragments themselves.

The Epic Vision of the Musical Past

The Greek epic singer was a memory-specialist. He presented his compositional process—a sophisticated oral poetics relying on an extensive system of formulaic diction—as channeling the Muse or Muses (Hom. *Il.* 1.1, *Od.* 1.1; Hes. *Theog.* 1–115, etc.). These goddesses were the embodiment of traditional memory—both mythologically as daughters of Mnemosyne, and etymologically as the power of 'Mind' (accepting the derivation of *Mousa*, via **Monsa*, from Proto-Indo-European root *men*–, 'mind'). The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the various poems of the larger epic cycle purported to represent the heroic past, or what we would call the Late Bronze Age—some five centuries or more before the singers themselves. Their portrait of the ancient world is accurate in some ways, and in others not. Thus while Homer 'remembers' that chariots were a normal feature of warfare, he does not understand how they were used. He knows that there were great palaces, but betrays no awareness of the elaborate scribal bureaucracy which administered them.[2] In general the singers and their audience seem to have believed that their vision of the past was accurate, to judge from the innumerable approving citations of Homer by later authorities. Even so demanding a critic as Thucydides, while warning that poets will exaggerate or distort for dramatic effect—what modern scholars call 'epic distance', the construction of a heroic world as an alternative reality with men stronger, faster, braver, and wiser than our own—balances this with the advice that one should not be unnecessarily skeptical (1.10). Thus, while the historian rationalizes the Trojan War as a political and economic struggle between two leading states which the poets have romantically recast as a tale rape and revenge, he does not doubt the historicity of the conflict itself.

When considering epic's representation of the musical past, we should expect to find a similar composite of truth and fiction. We are fortunate that these first-attested authors were singer-musicians, since this made them naturally interested in musical details. Of course this might lead to an artificial evaluation of the position of music generally, and specifically that of epic as against other forms of music. But one can hardly doubt Homer's general portrait of the epic singer (*aoidos*) as a normal part of palace life, considering that some epic formulae are of demonstrably Mycenaean antiquity (West 1988, 156–9; Janko 1992, 89–93); that a lyre-singer is represented in the throne-room fresco at Pylos (Lang 1969); and that 'two lyrasts' (*sic*) are now attested among the personnel at Mycenaean Thebes (TH Av 106.7: Aravantinos 1996). Moreover, a sub-repertoire of formulae dealing with the *aoidos*, his technique, and his social position all attest a long tradition of professional self-presentation (Franklin 2003). Obviously it was in the singer's professional interests to glorify his own role. Although he was a 'public worker' (*dêmioergos*, *Od.* 17.383), his stock-in-trade was *kleos*, fame, a patron's for his own. By 'making known (*kleiousin*) the deeds of gods and men' (*Od.* 1.338), a singer himself became widely renowned (*periklutos*, 1.325, 8.367), worthy of being summoned from afar (*klêtoi,* 17.283–6). Paradigmatic is Hesiod's analogy between patron-singer and Zeus-Apollo (*Theog.* 93–6 etc.). Superficially this subordinates the singer to a patron's power. But since only Apollo is privy to the 'Will of Zeus' (*Dios boulê*), and it is he from whom singers come (94 f.), singer quietly trumps king, making himself indispensible to legitimate government. These ideas, like the conceit of the singer-king (Odysseus, Achilles), which conflates the figures of patron and poet (Franklin in press-b), clearly derive from professional self-interest. Yet these need not be *inaccurate* reflections of

---

[2] For these and other examples see Snodgrass 1974.

the musical past. On the contrary, the longevity and importance of the epic tradition probably guarantees that the exalted singer is an authentic 'document', valid not only in Homer's day, but still more so in past, while kingship was still dominant—a changing state of affairs in Homer's time. Consider the poet's assertion that Agamemnon entrusted Clytemnestra to the care of a singer when leaving for Troy (*Od.* 3.267–72, cf. Scully 1981). This seemingly gratuitous self-compliment becomes rather more realistic when seen against Bronze Age archival sources from the Near East. The Chief Singer (*nargallum*) at Old Babylonian Mari, for instance, was an important official whose duties were not limited to the performance of music, but conducted sensitive state missions, including the negotiation of royal marriages (Ziegler 2007; Franklin 2007b, 32).

A number of allusions to other forms of music-making are found in Homer, Hesiod, and the Homeric Hymns. Their terseness shows that the poets artificially amplified the position of epic, and muffled the broader musical culture. Yet this very fact encourages us in accepting these details as fairly faithful musical data. The more pressing question is whether this muted musical landscape really echoes the earlier centuries, or is merely drawn from Homer's own knowledge of contemporary society. Of course the two positions become simultaneously true when one can confirm that the vignettes represent *traditional* forms of music. Homer mentions healing incantations (*Od.* 19.457), which are likely to an ancient: it is not surprising that no example are found in Linear B texts, but comparative evidence shows that such spells had a place in many Indo-European traditions. Mycenaean iconography also shows that there was a continuous tradition of formal lamentation-singing down to Homer's time (Alexiou 2002, 4–23 *passim*; problematized by Burke 2008). The Shield of Achilles contains a vintage scene involving the Linos-song (*Il.* 18.561–72), a citharodic 'lamentation' ([Hes.] fr. 305 M-W) with analogues in the ritual laments of the Bronze Age Near East (Franklin 2006, 48), and almost certainly of equal antiquity in the Aegean. The paean-singing that propitiates Apollo's plague (*Il.* 1.472–4) may well preserve knowledge of a Minoan musical tradition, since Paiawon was a Minoan god whose powers were gradually absorbed by Apollo during the Dark Age (cf. *Ap.* 475–523). It is unsurprising that the musical mayhem of Cybele-cult, described in one relatively late Homeric hymn (14.3f.), finds no place in Homer's own world, since this cult was a relatively late arrival to Greece (see generally Munn 2006). Homer's virtual neglect of the *aulos* may or may not be a case of erroneous epic distance—double-pipes are attested for the Minoans, but not yet the Mycenaeans (West 1992, 82). But this may equally be a case of generic exclusion, for epic was a world of lyrists (Franklin in press-a). The mention of choral song and *dance at a wedding (*Il.* 18.490–5, cf. [Hes.] *Scut.* 270–85) probably acknowledges, however tersely, the antiquity and fundamental social importance of traditional choral forms, including the maiden-songs (*partheneia*) and other musical rites-of-passage which were basic to archaic society (see *inter alios* Calame 1977; Kowalzig 2004). These passages, and the citharodic narratives with dance accompaniment among the Phaeacians (*Od.* 8.250–369), are the only hints of the 'lyric' or 'melic' tradition which one must posit on the basis of Sappho and Alcaeus, with their very ancient 'Aeolic' meters; and Stesichorus, whose 'epico-lyric' diction may ultimately precede the full development of Homer's own dactylic hexameter (Russo 1999). Indeed it may be right to detect an almost hostile relationship between epic and melic, if this may be inferred from the figure of Thamyris (cf. Wilson 2009). Blinded for offending the Muses, Thamyris may represent the purposeful exclusion of a competing sub-tradition, whose desired defeat is symbolized by the loss of 'god-uttered song', epic's great prerogative (*Il.* 2.599f., cf. 1.328, 8.498, *Merc.* 442; cf. *Od.* 17.385, Hes. *Theog.* 31 f.). The Muses make him 'forget his lyre-playing' (2.600), thus negating the poetic *mnêmosynê* which is the spic singer's professional birthright.

Overall, then, I conclude that Homer presents us with what he intends to be an accurate representation of the musical past—and which actually is in many respects. Like other singers in the tradition, he skewed the picture in favor of his own genre, usually through simple emphasis, but occasionally through deliberate sins of omission or distortion. Epic's professional goal, in its commemoration of the 'famous deeds of men' (*klea andrôn*, *Il.* 9.189 etc.), was essentially a kind of early *archaiologia*—literally 'an account of the past'. Because singers were the agents of this, and were concerned to write themselves into the heroic past, Homer and the other epic poets are a surprisingly

reliable source of information about earlier music.

Musical Memory in the Archaic Period (c. 700–500)

Two major developments in the Archaic Period (c. 700–500) had an important impact on the later historiography of music. First was the rise of pan-Hellenic musical contests, for instance at Delphi, Sparta, Argos, and eventually Athens. Second was the advent of writing in the early eighth century. The two came together in the emergence of official inscriptions, including eventually the recording of festival-victor lists on a year-by-year basis. These documents would provide vital statistics for later 'archaeologists', more precise and objective—at least in theory—than material that could be mined from Homer and other epic poets. (In practice these sources ere not without their own problems: see below on the inscriptions of Delphi and Sicyon.) The contest categories were for individuals performers, or at most a pair; the festivals included, variously and at various times, lyre-singing (*kitharôidia*), instrumental lyre music (*kitharistikê*), instrumental pipe music (*aulêtikê*), and singing to the pipes (*aulôidikê*). Ensemble music (*synaulia*: Ath. 617F–618B), though a regular and important feature of Greek musical life, notably in ritual, civic and military contexts (Huchzermeyer 1931, 48 *et passim*), was not represented in the contests themselves. This organization, combined with the widespread fame brought by victory, laid the ground for the emergence of individual celebrities. But it also presented later scholars with a limited picture of earlier musical culture, and so helped determine the shape of their accounts.

Fortunately a second major effect of literacy helped to counteract this bias. Writing also enabled the more general emergence of knowable poets, whose creative productions could now be captured in fixed form. Thus later scholars had at their disposal a literary corpus, the individual specimens of which could be studied for distinctive and changing characteristics. From these could be deduced interrelationships between poets, and developing trends could be traced. Often they must have strained to make such connections in the interests of developing a unified history. The fabrication of teacher-student relations between poets exhibiting similar characteristics, or false inferences about a poet's life on the basis of his or her poems, are well-known symptoms of Greek biographical scholarship (Lefkowitz 1981). But the fact remains that this was the first period for which Classical scholars had *any* solid documentary evidence.

The pan-Hellenic festivals, together with the emerging literacy of poet-musicians, must have created an increasing sense of shared musical history. If this was true for the public generally, it must have been still more so for the musicians themselves: they could best appreciate and evaluate a victory in a given contest, or some other public context, and be memorably struck by some decisive innovation or musical milestone. Festivals provided regular occasions for the congregation of Greece's leading musicians, who would observe each other, learn from rivals, and discuss matters of technical and historical import. Symposia and tyrants' courts will have provided another such venue. Under these circumstances it would be logical to expect poets to include professional self-reflections in their poetry (see generally Bowie 2009). One may compare Aristophanes' early comedies, where the *parabasis* (and more specifically the so-called anapests) provided a forum for the poet to discuss own work and career, and that of his rivals and colleagues (see generally Hubbard 1991). While the bulk of archaic Greek poetry is lost to us, enough remains for us to observe a similar phenomenon. The following examples may serve as a representative catalogue of technical self-reflection, enough to justify the assertion that this dimension of poetic production constituted a mechanism for the purposeful preservation of past musical information:

Terpander (Lesbos, active in Lydia, Sparta, and Delphi, early to mid seventh century), fr. 4 (Gostoli): an exhortation to pass from 'four-voiced song' to 'new songs on the heptatonic *phorminx*'. The interpretation of this fragment remains disputed, but may relate to a change in musical styles: see Franklin in press-c.

Alcman (Sparta, late seventh century), [Plut.] *De mus.* 1133a *PMGF*: allusion to Polymnestos, a contemporary or slightly earlier aulete from Colophon.

Hipponax (Ephesus, mid sixth century), [Plut.] *De mus.* 1133f: mentioned a piece (*nomos*) called *Kradias* by Mimnermus, an elegiac poet from Colophon active in the late seventh century.

Pratinas (Phlius, active at Athens c. 500), [Plut.] *De mus.* 1133e: attributed the invention of the 'many-headed piece' (*poylkephalos nomos*) to a younger Olympus, thus attesting tradition of reflection on the identity and date of the legendary aulete (see above).

— *PMG* 708: the famous 'hyporcheme' dealing with the proper position of the *aulos* vis-à-vis the voice. The dating of this fragment is disputed, and some posit a second, younger poet of the same name: see Franklin in press-d, n. 16, with further references.

— [Plut.] *De mus.* 1134d: mentioned the hyporchemes of Xenodamus.

Pindar (Thebes, active early fifth century), *Pyth.* 12: treated the myth of Athena and the *aulos*, in a victory ode addressed to the aulete Midas of Akragas (notice the appropriateness of a Phrygian professional name).

— Frr. 70b + 81 + 346: dealt with innovations in the history of the dithyramb, and probably a the asigmatic odes of Lasus of Hermione (Argolid, late sixth century). See D'Angour 1997; Lavecchia 2000, 30–7; Porter 2007.

— Fr. 125: alluded to Terpander (see above) and his invention of the *barbitos* (a baritone lyre typical of the symposium) on the model of the harps he had heard at Lydian banquets. Note that Sardis was a major performing center and area of patronage at this time: see Franklin 2007a.

— Fr. 126, perhaps from the same poem as the previous fragment: attributed the invention of sympotic drinking songs (*skolia*) to Terpander. See further Franklin 2007a, 200.

— Fr. 140b: mentioned a *paian* by Xenocritos.

— Fr. 157: mentioned Olympus, the (semi-?)legendary, Phrygian founding father of the *aulos* tradition.

— Fr. 178 (= Strabo 14.1.29, cf. [Plut.] *De mus.* 1133a): also mentioned Polymnestos (See Alcman above).

— Fr. 282 (Paus. 9.30.2; [Plut.] *De mus.* 1134a): composed a 'prelude' (*prooimion*) which mentioned the innovative Argive aulete Sakadas. Cf. Wallace 2003, 80; Porter 2007, 19 *et passim*; Franklin in press-d.

— [Plut.] *De mus.* 1136c: In a *paian* traed the invention of the Lydian *harmonia* to the wedding of Niobe.

Note how Pindar usually treated such material outside of his epinician odes, which were addressed to individual patrons, and so were largely private affairs despite the public glory an athletic victor enjoyed in his home town. It would be more appropriate for a chorus to sing of music-historical matters in pieces of a more broadly civic character, where they could join the poet in a communal reflection on shared musical experiences of the past; for the chorus, by giving voice to a poet's music, were essential collaborators in the song-act. The exceptions prove the rule: the ode to Midas of Akragas was for victory in a *musical* competition. The reflection on Terpander came in a *skolion* addressed to Hieron—a drinking song in which Pindar commented on the history of drinking songs. Note also the wide geographical and chronological spread between the alluding poets and the poets to whom they allude. This is symptomatic of the growing pan-Hellenism of the period (for which see generally Nagy 1990).

It seems reasonable to consider the foregoing material as evidence of a general concern by poets to preserve the memory of their professional past. As with Homer, we see an ongoing impulse towards an archaeology of music. The period's strong oral tradition is certainly sufficient to account for such material. But it is worth considering the possibility that poets sometimes retrieved such material directly from inscriptions at festival sites, which they would be free to consult these documents during their periodic professional congregations. At the very least a victorious poet who was added to an inscription would have had every reason to peruse the earlier reaches of that monument, to glory fully in his own position in the tradition. But it seems likely enough that musicians generally would have been keenly interested in such material. Of course, this scenario

would depend on normal literacy among poets. But surely poets loomed large among the early literati, especially by the later Archaic period. This is when, for instance, the impact of literacy on epic diction becomes detectable through false archaism and other self-conscious deviation from the tradition's organic linguistic development (Janko 1982 *passim*).

The archival concerns of festival organizers would thus engender ongoing acts of creative music archaeology, which would in turn feedback into the source material. This would constitute a quite remarkable hybrid of art and scholarship—not unlike the concerns of Hellenistic scholar-poets, but within a living musical environment which was gradually passing from orality and literacy.

The First Musical Treatises (c.500–400)

The interplay of oral and written continued throughout the fifth and even the fourth century (Havelock 1963). Elsewhere I have collected fragments of quasi-technical musical phraseology in Greek epic diction, and showed that some of this language reappears in Aristoxenus and later technical writers; it probably featured some lost intermediaries of the fifth century, a hold-over from the oral tradition.[3] This period saw the production of a number of prose works on music, which variously emphasized the subject's technical, philosophical, ethical or historical aspects. A catalogue of musicographical works credited to Classical authors may be found in the Appendix. Most of these titles, and even their very existence, cannot be verified. And even if a work did exist, it is often impossible to know, on the basis of its title, whether it would have included historiographical material. The example of Plato suggests that many will have been mainly concerned with ethical or philosophical issues. Yet Aristoxenus' *Harmonic Elements* show that even a work which was primarily technical could have an historiographical dimension, to the extent that it documented or commented on earlier states of music, or the work of earlier *mousikoi*. And the fragments of Aristoxenus' lost works show that he scattered historical material quite generally through all of his output, even where the title gives no clear indication of such an interest, for instance his *On Melodic Composition* or even the *Sympotic Miscellanies* (see Appendix). A brief survey of some of this early musical activity will serve to illustrate the ongoing, intimate relationship between music-historiography and musicography more generally.

Lasus of Hermione seems to have produced the first work 'On Music' (*Peri mousikês*: *Suda* s.v. *Lasos*), if that is a true title and not just a generic description. There is no good reason to doubt the existence of this treatise. Lasus is a most likely figure: a progressive 'polyphonic' aulete from the Argolid known for his technical innovations, he was later active in the court of Pisistratus, and may have been instrumental in organizing dithyrambic contests for the new Athenian democracy as part of the Cleisthenic reforms (Franklin in press-d). In other words, he was one of the most eminent authorities in a period of rapid musical and social change. Although it is not improbable, we have no hint that Lasus dealt with historical issues. Yet the work raises issues which bear closely upon later historiography, namely the conditions under which musicological thought was propagated during the fifth century. Martianus Capella (9.965) alleges that Lasus divided musical activity into three categories; but the terms he gives—*hylikon*, *apergastikon*, and *exangeltikon* or *hermêneutikon* (roughly 'material', 'composition', and 'performance' or 'interpretation')—have been condemned as Peripatetic or otherwise anachronistic (Privitera 1965, 36–42), thus calling into doubt the work's very existence (Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1922, 112 n.2). The idea of a tripartition itself, however, may be genuine, being recast in later terminology (Privitera 1965, 38 f.). It would provide an attractive precedent for Aristoxenus' own segregation of *harmonikê* and *rhythmikê* from *melopoiia* and *rhythmopoiia*, and in turn from *organikê* ([Plut.] *De mus.* 1141c–d). At the same time, it is clearly independent of the Aristoxenian

---

[3] Thus for example the expression *kata melos*, 'along the scale', which appears first in the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes* (53, 419, 501) as integral to the process of tuning, and reappears three times in Aristoxenus (*Harm.* 27–9) in the same context (i.e. in connection with the rule of *synecheia*, the 'continuity' which results from tuning): Franklin 2003, 303 f.

taxonomy, the very fact of which is hospitable to its being pre-Aristoxenian. Over four centuries later Theon of Smyrna (59.22-60.4) could still discuss aspects of Lasus' work, including perhaps the mathematical division of lyre strings using harmonics—surely how the concordant ratios were first discovered. While Martianus and Theon may be dismissed as dependent upon or distorted by some intermediate source—a Peripatetic biographer like Aristoxenus, Chamaeleon, or Hermippus (Brussich 2000, 16)[4]—it remains to explain how genuine details of Lasus' work could persist for two centuries and more after his death (Aristox. *Harm.* 7; Th. Sm. 59.4–21). Thus, for example, Aristoxenus attributes to Lasus a doctrine that musical notes had 'width' (*Harm.* 7: Privitera 1965, 64–8), and this resonates well with the statement in ps.-Plutarch that Lasus, 'cultivating the *polyphônia* of the *auloi*, using more and scattered notes, induced a transformation of music as it had previously been' ([Plut.] *De mus.* 1141c: for this passage, see further references in Franklin in press-d, n. 53). The latter passage itself may well derive from one of Aristoxenus' lost historical works. How did such material come down to Aristoxenus across two centuries?

Harmonics and other musical topics were regular treated by the fifth-century sophists—an environment which remained largely 'apodeictic' despite the regular production of literary works.[5] In this respect the sophists themselves were the heirs of the Archaic poets, both intellectually and by etymology: it was the poets who originally enjoyed the honorific *sophos* and, like the sophists, were often itinerant (essays in Hunter/Rutherford 2009). Hippias, a contemporary of Socrates, is presented by Plato as typical for lecture tours in which he discoursed on rhythms, tunings or modes (*harmoniai*), letters and syllables (*Hipp. maj.* 285d, *Hipp. min.* 368d). Aristoxenus mentions various (and undatable) 'schools' of *harmonikoi* centered around Epigonus of Sicyon, Pythagoras of Zacynthus, and Agenor of Mytiline (Aristox. *Harm.* 7, 46). Such groups, and other unnamed *harmonikoi*, suggest face-to-face learning and in-house lectures (see generally Barker 1978; Wallace 1995). Damon of Oa, an associate of Pericles whose musical meddling in the affairs of Athens may have occasioned his eventual ostracism,[6] is a particularly interesting figure for having had great and enduring influence on the moral and psychological dimensions of musical thought, apparently without leaving any writings of his own (so Wallace 1991). Aristophanes and Plato give some hints of this Damonian induction, including perhaps the latter's appeal to the ethical effects of various *harmoniai* (*Nub.* 650–4; *Rep.* 400b, 424c). Damon himself was said to have studied within a school of *aulos* teachers whose 'family tree' may be traced back for three generations, with a branch connecting to Lasus and Pindar (Wallace 2003, 74 and n. 6). In part this may be a construction of later biographers: the surviving evidence shows that a determined scholar, for instance Aristoxenus in his *On Aulos-Players* (fr. 100), could have devised an extensive 'reconstruction' of the *aulos* tradition. I present a hypothetical, maximal scenario in fig. 1, which at the very least illustrates clearly the two phases of the 'aulos revolution', and the real geographical trends of the Archaic and early Classical periods (see further Franklin in press-d). Whatever the truth of individual biographical connections, one has the clear impression of a vibrant musical scene—exploding in the Argolid, and migrating to Athens—in which music was cultivated side-by-side with musical thought.

---

[4] That Theon himself did not have *direct* access to a book by Lasus is shown by the expression 'as they say', *hôs phasi*, 59.3 f.

[5] Note the Arcadian festival called *Apodeixeis*, instituted in the later seventh or early sixth century: [Plut.] *De mus.* 1134c.

[6] It is possible that this was somehow due to his role in the cultural program of Pericles (Wallace 2004), perhaps especially in connection with the new Odeion. What has never been discussed, to the best of my knowledge, is the probable victorious performance by the controversial Phrynis at the inaugural contests (schol. Ar. *Nub.* 971 = Ister *FGrH* 334 F 56; cf. West (1992), 348, 360 n. 15), for which musical 'rules' were set by Pericles (Plut. *Pericles* 13.11). Probably relevant to this puzzle is the curious mid-fourth century vase from Paestum which represents Phrynis apparently under some form of arrest by a certain 'Pyronides' (Trendall 1987, 2/19). This figure, probably modeled on Myronides and acting as a kind of ghost of moral past (à la Dikaios Logos in *Clouds*), seems to have featured in the *Demes* of Eupolis (which may in fact be illustrated by the vase; cf.). For problems of the Odeion's history and purpose, see recently Miller 1997.

An offhand detail in Theophrastus' shows that semi-public lectures by *harmonikoi* were still a familiar occurrence in the later fourth century (*Char.* 5.10). Aristoxenus refers to such lectures of his own (*Harm.* 31). Yet pure oral tradition cannot explain all the facts. The above catalogue is enough to show that musical writings were not uncommon by the later fifth century, even if we cannot verify all of the attributions made by Diogenes Laertius and other sources. While a work by Simmias may well be a phantom, the output of Democritus can hardly be dismissed altogether (see below). The considerable geographical and chronological spread between the various figures and schools just mentioned, combined with Aristoxenus' explicit reference to earlier 'diagrams' (*diagrammata*, *Harm.* 6, 12, 36), shows that, whatever their internal pedagogical methods, most of these groups must have generated written accounts which were in general circulation among specialists. And if Damon himself wrote nothing, his disciples evidently did. Aristides Quintilianus, writing in perhaps the third century CE (Mathiesen 1999, 521–4) reproduces a number of irregular scales (*harmoniai*) which, he avers, were those known to Plato in the famous musical discussions of the *Republic*. These are almost certainly to be connected with 'the followers of Damon' (*hoi peri Damona*) and 'the *harmoniai* handed down by him' whom he mentions elsewhere (*tais hup' autou paradedomenais harmoniai*, 2.14: cf. Barker 1982; West 1992, 174 f. and n. 47). These 'scales', which are evidently auletic (Franklin 2005, 26 and n. 50) are certainly 'ancient'—though note that, in the grand view of Greek musical history, the fifth century was quite modernist. A. Barker has recently argued that Aristides Quintilianus retrieved these *harmoniai* from an Aristoxenian work (though he now questions Damon as their source: Barker 2007). This would fit perfectly with S. Hagel's demonstration that Aristoxenus had these very tunings in mind when criticizing an unnamed group of predecessors for their abortive attempt to develop a system of *tonoi*, 'keys' (Hagel 2000, 165 ff.). Moreover, Damon's theories of musical ethos (if they are indeed his: Anderson 1966) are a subject of attack in the Hibeh Papyrus on music (no. 13), composed not before the early fourth century. The attribution of this text to Alcidamas (Brancacci 1988) is, I believe, considerably less plausible than the case for Aristoxenian influence. The principal evidence for the latter position—which no one has yet argued in full—comes from Aristoxenus' allusion to the contents of a series of his own lectures, mentioned above (*Harm.* 31), and evidently abstracted by ps.-Plutarch (*De mus.* 1142b–44e *passim*).

None of this provides a definitive proof of an *On Music* by Lasus, nor any other alleged treatise for which he have only a putative title. What is certain is that, through a combination of oral and written transmission, most or all of the main musicological developments of the fifth century were still available for study by historians even in the late fourth century.

Hellanicus of Lesbos

So far as our evidence goes, the first musical historiography, in a stricter sense, was produced near the end of the fifth century. Two figures seem to share the glory, Hellanicus of Lesbos and Glaucus of Rhegium, pioneers in their use of sources, combining data from Archaic inscriptions from festival sites (see above), local oral and mythological traditions, and material from the poets. These were also, apparently, the first works to present continuous historical narratives focused on music. Both Hellanicus and Glaucus appear to have presented universal histories of the art down to their own day.

Hellanicus was also a pioneer in the development of chronography.[7] Often considered the first of the Atthidographers—antiquarians who mined the local history of Attica and Athens, like the later Philochorus—Hellanicus' scope was actually much broader. He coordinated regional inscriptions—the priestess-list from the temple of Hera at Argos, the Eponymous-Archon list of Athens, and perhaps the list of Spartan ephors (cf. Thuc. 2.2.1, 4.133.2–3)—to develop an historical framework within which to present his wide-ranging researches into mythology, ethnography, genealogy, geography, and of course more recent historical events. These researches could then be used by other

---

[7] For a recent survey of Hellanicus, with a doxographical survey of previous literature, see Möller 2001.

historians as a timeframe for their own works (for the Sicyonian inscription, see below). Hellanicus traced 'history' deep into the legendary past—the *Argive Priestesses* included events going back at least three generations before the Trojan War (fr. 4 F 79b), while the *Atthis* began with the primeval Attic king Ogyges (323 F 10). Philochorus would later criticize him for fabricating continuous genealogical sequences (*FGrH* 328 F 92, cf. Hellanic. 4 TT 18, 24). Nevertheless Hellanicus' fragments are a treasury of obscure and precious information.

Of musical relevance was some discussion of the Homeridai, the Chian singers' guild which alleged descent from Homer himself (4 F 20, from the *Atlantis*). In the *Barbarian Customs* (*Barbarikoi nomimoi*) he recounted a version of Pythagoras' life, including a journey to Thrace where the mystic preached a doctrine of immortality (4 F 73). It is not impossible that Hellanicus touched upon the harmonic ratios or other musical matters here. But his most important work for the present discussion was the *Carnean Victors* (*hoi Karneonikai*, *FGrH* 4 F 85–86), apparently an exegetical treatment of official Spartan inscriptions going back to the festival's organization in 676.[8] It is not certain, but quite probable, that this epigraphic material was entirely genuine—that is, Terpander's inaugural victory ([Plut. *De mus.* 1132e = Glaucus fr. 2 *FHG*: see below) was indeed inscribed on the spot, at the time, and this practice was kept up during the following years. Remarkably, this treatise existed in two versions, one in prose and the other verse, presumably epic hexameters (metrical version: *FGrH* 4 F 85a, cf. 152b *aeidei* (Tzetzes); *Suda*. s.v. *Hellanikos*). It is not clear why Hellanicus felt moved to 'sing' his history, but it constitutes a fascinating transition from the proto-archaeological material of the early poets to the mature prose historiography of the fourth century (see below). It was an epic song about ancient singing.

The *Carnean Victors* is represented by only three real fragments, but this is enough for profitable speculation in light of what other fragments tells us of the historian's methods and interests. Hellanicus told how 'Terpander first of all men won the Carneia' (Ath. 625E = 4 F 85a). While this is clearly no more information than the inscription itself would have yielded, Clement of Alexandria adds that Hellanicus dated Terpander to the time of Midas of Phrygia (85b). This datum, since Midas fell to the Cimmerians some twenty-five years before the first Carneia, shows that Hellanicus introduced further biographical material to clarify his victors. That this ranged well beyond the immediate Spartan performance context is shown by 4 F 86 (schol. Ar. *Av.* 1403), from which we learn that Hellanicus attributed the invention of the dithyramb not to Lasus but to another Lesbian poet, Arion of Methymna. This may be confidently connected with a number of other sources that locate Arion's dithyrambic activity at the court of Periander in Corinth (see Franklin in press-d). Clearly then the *Carnean Victors* was no mere catalogue, but a more universal history like Hellanicus' other works (Möller 2001, 246). He must have used the victor list as a window onto the wider world of Greek music in the Archaic period. He must have given special attention to the early Lesbian citharodes, motivated both by pride in his native land, and because these musicians reigned supreme at the Carneia for many generations. The magic of this movement lingered on in the proverbial expression 'after the Lesbian singer', an early version of which already appears in a fragment of Sappho (fr. 106 V)—contemporary with the events Hellanicus related.[9]

Given this inevitable Lesbian focus, it is thus tempting to trace several further testimonies about the professional (n.b.) citharodes of early Lesbos—Terpander, Arion, and the more obscure Kepion and Periclitus—back to Hellanicus.[10] A passage in ps.-Plutarch seems fairly certain, as M. L. West has already suggested (1992, 330):

---

[8] Actually this was probably a reorganization intended to promote a pre-existing festival for a more pan-Hellenic audience, since the Carneia was celebrated in a number of other Dorian areas, and so was probably an ancestral institution: Burkert 1985, 234 ff.

[9] Sapph. fr. 106 (Voigt); cf. *inter alios* Cratin. fr. 263 K-A (= Phot. *Lex*. s.v.); Arist. fr. 545 Rose ('Aristotle says in the *Constitution of Sparta* that the expression "After the Lesbian singer" signified Terpander; and they say that afterwards, in his honor, his inheritors would be called first [*sc.* to perform], and then any other Lesbian who was on hand, and then the rest'); Plut. *De sera num. vind.* 558a; Zen. 5.9 (1.118 Leutsch/Schneidewin).

[10] Recall, however, the figure of Theodorus who is called an authority on Terpander and later poets: see above.

They say that Periclitus was the last citharode of Lesbian birth to win the Carneia in Sparta. And when he died the continuous winning-streak of the citharodic dynasty on Lesbos met its end ([Plut.] *De mus.* 1133d).

If West is right—Hellanicus is not cited in the text, but ps.-Plutarch could be drawing on an intermediary source, or simply have failed to mention him—one may also readily add the immediately preceding material, which concerns the enigmatic expression 'Asiatic *kithara*'. Ps.-Plutarch states that the '*kithara* was called Asiatic because of its use by the Lesbian citharodes, whose homes face towards Asia'. A fragment of Duris, sometime tyrant of Samos in the later fourth or early third century, is closely related, but not simply derived from it: they probably share a common source, which may be Aristotle.[11] The expression 'Asiatic *kithara*' must indeed be quite old: 'Asia' derives from Aššuwa, the ancient Anatolian name for the region later known as Lydia (e.g. Talamo 1979, 99–107); its sense was then extended, through Lydian imperialism, and eventually applied by geographers and historiographers (e.g. Hecataeus) to the entire continent east of Greece (compare e.g. Hdt. 1.15 and 4.45 with 2.16, and see Mazzarino 1947, 52–71). Several later sources, scholiastic and lexicographical, record the original force of 'Asia', and sometimes adduce it specifically to elucidate 'Asiatic *kithara*'.[12] The musical connection between Lesbos and an 'Asiatic' lyre finds a ready explanation in the vibrant Greco-Lydian musical movement of the seventh-century, centered on Sardis, which according to Herodotus and other sources drew the intelligentsia from all over Greece (see Franklin 2007a). The Lesbian poets in particular were intimately involved due to their proximity. The 'Asiatic *kithara*' might therefore designate a new kind of lyre deriving from this milieu. Some would see it as an early name for the *barbitos*, whose invention Pindar attributes to Terpander and his activity at Lydian banquets (see above; cf. Barker 1984–1989, 1.211 n. 45). A more likely correlation, I feel, is another assertion found in ps.-Plutarch—that 'the form (*schêma*) of the *kithara* was first established by Kepion, the student of Terpander' ([Plut.] *De mus.* 1133c; cf. West 1992, 53, 329, 330 n. 8). Kepion is an obscure enough figure to inspire some confidence in this construction. The report may be related to an historical transition, observable in vase paintings of the mid to late seventh century, from ancient round-based lyres which had survived from the Bronze Age, to the elaborate, flat-based concert instruments so familiar from Classical representations. This shape resonates much more clearly than the barbitos with the morphology of Anatolian lyres, an ancient tradition going back to the Hittite period (a famous early example is the Nandi vase, and *zinar* is abundantly attested in Hittite texts). The Anatolian representations, with a few later Hellenizing exceptions, are always flat based.[13]

In any case, 'Asiatic kithara' is a genuinely early linguistic artifact, and it is an attractive guess that Hellanicus offered some explanation of it in connection with the Lesbian school, and perhaps specifically Kepion. If the *Carnean Victors* may be dated early enough—there is no reason it could not

---

[11] [Plut.] *De mus.* 1132d, 1133c; Duris *FGrH* 76 F 81. Weil/Reinach 1900, 29 and Jacoby *FGrH* ad loc. favored Heraclides of Pontus as the common source. The sequence of quoted material in ps.-Plutarch offers no decisive support for either party. The Duris fragment involves a textual issue. The reading of the MSS (*Dourin . . . Aristotelês*) cannot stand, since Duris (c.340 – 260) was significantly younger than Aristotle. Hullemann proposed an inversion to *Douris . . . Aristotelên*: see Jacoby's apparatus in *FGrH*, but note also Müller's attractive solution in *FHG.*

[12] Note especially schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.777–9: 'The kithara is called 'Asiatic' since it was first invented in Lydia' (*hê kithara Asia<tis?> legetai epei en Ludiai proton heurethê*; cf. *Et. Magn. s.v. Asiatis*; Hesych. s.v. *Asias*.

[13] Herodotus refers to Lydian lyres at 1.155. For an illustrated catalogue of Anatolian instruments, see Schuol 2004, esp. figs. 28, 39, 42, 43, 45. Note, however, that these lyres typical have asymmetrical arms, contrasting with Greek models. I suggest that we are dealing with a hybridized form, appropriate to the Greco – Lydian movement itself. Hence the symmetry of traditional Aegean lyres persisted as the overall body shape was strongly Lydianized.

have been available as early as 438[14]—it may account for a small flurry of interest in the expression among poets of the later fifth century, including Euripides, Aristophanes, and perhaps Timotheus. I shall explore this problem in detail elsewhere (Franklin forthcoming). Here I would note only the possibility that Hellanicus' work, as it was made available, influenced the poets of Athens, where he worked for years on his *Atthis*.[15] This would provide a very interesting case of music-archaeological material passing from inscription to versified history, and then feeding back into the music stream.

At the very least it is clear that Hellanicus, in composing his *Carnean Victors*, used local oral traditions, drawn from Lesbos, Sparta, and perhaps elsewhere, to flesh out the bare data of the official festival inscriptions, and developed a broader cultural history of music in various geopolitical theatres.

Glaucus of Rhegium

Glaucus of Rhegium seems to have produced his *On the Ancient Poets and Musicians* (*Peri tôn archaiôn piton te kai mousikoi*, fr. 2 *FHG*) around the end of the fifth century, or early fourth. It is worth noting immediately that he must have had to travel abroad from Italy to execute this work. Only seven fragments survive. But three of these (2–4) are extensive enough—excerpted by ps.-Plutarch for the *De musica*—to give us an idea of Glaucus' methods and sources. Unfortunately the exact boundaries of these fragments are not always clear.[16] Fragment 2 may serve as an example:

> Terpander seems to have distinguished himself in the art of singing to the *kithara*. For he is recorded (*anagegraptai nenikêkôs*) as having won the Pythian contest four times straight. Regarding his era, he is very ancient. At least, Glaucus of Italy, in a certain book—the *On the Ancient Poets and Musicians*—indicates that he was older than Archilochus. For he says that Terpander came second after those who first composed *aulos*-songs.

From this we learn, at the very least, that Glaucus concerned himself with the relative chronology of musicians, and viewed the *aulos* and *kithara* as parallel sub-traditions with unique if interacting histories. But it does seem reasonably certain, as most believe, that the assertion of Terpander's four successive victories also comes from Glaucus, being in fact the justification for the dating he proposes. Unfortunately *anagegraptai*, 'it is recorded' is somewhat ambiguous. The verb may imply an actual inscription, like the Sicyonian *anagraphê* which ps.-Plutarch mentions as a source for Heraclides of Pontus ([Plut.] *De mus.* 1132a = Heracl. Pont. fr. 157 Wehrli: see further below). But this primary meaning engendered the secondary sense of a literary 'record' or 'register', clearly required elsewhere in ps.-Plutarch (1133a, *hoi anagegraphotes*), who indeed refers to Glaucus' book elsewhere as *hê Glaukou anagraphê* (1133f). Still, the two meanings are naturally linked by the practice of building literary accounts on epigraphic evidence. And the detail of 'four in a row' (*tetra is hexês*) does seem to evoke, ultimately, an actual lapidary list. There is a similar reference later to the three straight Delphic victories of Sacadas (1134a), which perhaps also comes from Glaucus; Pausanias gives exact and

---

[14] Hellanicus was an older contemporary of Herodotus, and closely coeval with Euripides: *Suda* s.v. *Hellanikos*; Gell. *Noct. Att.* 15.23; *Vit. Eurip.* 2.5; [Lucian] *Macrob.* 22). See also next note for Hardie's suggestion about Euripides' use of *mousopolos*, which could imply publication of the *Carnean Victors* by 438.

[15] A. Hardie has suggested a parallel in Euripides' use of *mousopolos* in the *Alcestis* (438 BCE), where the context is again the Carneia. The word was of course used by Sappho of the member of her 'circle'. Hardie speculates that 'Sappho adapted a local citharoedic/guildic coinage to her circumstances, and that Hellanicus' work on Terpander (*Carnean Victors*) prompted its re – use at Athens' (communication, 2004). Another case involving Euripides may be Hellanic. *FGrH* 323 F 6.

[16] Thus

probably correct dates for these victories (10.7.4–5).[17] The work of Hellanicus shows that there would be nothing implausible in consulting such a source; indeed the *Carnean Victors* probably made this *de rigueur*. So one may reasonably see Glaucus as consciously emulating Hellanicus, addressing himself to the Delphic material as his predecessor had the Spartan. If this is right, we have important confirmation that there existed a Delphic victors list before Aristotle and Callisthenes addressed themselves to the subject (see below).

Ps.-Plutarch follows this passage with a brief citation from Alexander Polyhistor (first century BCE). It is not clear if what then follows is still by Alexander (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 273 F 77), or has tacitly reverted to Glaucus (Barker 1984–1989, 1.210 n. 33). The chronological relationship between Terpander and Archilochus does eventually recur in the sequel. But it is not perfectly safe to assume that all the intervening information comes from Glaucus. I am inclined to believe that ps.-Plutarch interwove his source material more thoroughly—and more cunningly—than is often assumed. It is sobering to consider that, as argued above, he probably cited material from Hellanicus without ever naming this important (perhaps the material came to him indirectly). At any rate it will be best to limit the present discussion to what may be quite certainly attributed to Glaucus.

Fragment 3 (1133f) shows that Glaucus dealt with traditional repertoire: ps.-Plutarch cites his attribution to Olympus of the so-called 'Chariot Piece' (*harmatios nomos*). The early 'nomes' (Grieser 1937) seem to have been semi-structured modal entities of some sort, performed in a variety of contexts including rituals (in the later fifth century *nomos* came to be applied to virtuosic solo works). It is not clear whether Glaucus made this 'authorial' connection himself, or was merely reporting popular belief. I suspect the latter. Many nome-names are attested in a variety of later sources, including Ps.-Plutarch, Athenaeus, and the lexicographers. There must still have been traditional repertoire from the Archaic period (and probably earlier) which could be heard and studied by the Classical historians. Aristoxenus discussed traditional *aulos* music which, he tells us, was attributed to Olympus by 'the musicians' (hoi mousikoi, fr. 83 Wehrli: Winnington-Ingram 1928; Hagel 2006). While *mousikoi* sometimes refers to what we would call musicologists—Aristoxenus himself was later known as *ho mousikos*—the word's more basic sense was simply 'musicians' (as in Heracl. Pont. fr. 157 Wehrli = *FGrH* 124 T 23). And when Plato declares that one could go and hear the music of Olympus, he clearly envisages a living tradition (*Symp*. 215c; *Minos* 318b [authenticity doubtful]). At the same time, A. Barker (1984–1989, 1.249–55) has shown that our sources give a misleadingly systematic impression of these early 'nomes': many of the names must have been contrived later to account for details of early and otherwise obscure poetic texts—details of both form (rhythm and meter, register or other harmonic and tonal features) and content (self-reflective phrases which could be abstracted as proper titles).

Actually, one may probably suppose that such retroactive analysis was itself an ancient and ongoing feature of the musical tradition, as older repertoire gradually became disconnected from its origins and reworked and re-imagined by successive generations. In the remainder of fragment 3 it is hard to discriminate between the fine shades of these processes:

> Stesichorus of Himera imitated neither Orpheus nor Terpander not Archilochus nor Thaletas, but Olympus, using his *Harmatios nomos* and 'the dactylic species of rhythm' (trans. Barker), which they say (*phasi*) comes from the *Orthios nomos*.

Glaucus may have been responsible for all, some, or none of these constructions. How is one to evaluate, for instance, the force of 'they say' (*phasi*): does this indicate ps.-Plutarch's own awareness of further written authorities besides Glaucus? Does it reproduce Glaucus' own appeal to musicians' tradition? Or to earlier historiography (and if so, what?).

---

[17] Note too that the Delphic inscription which thanked Aristotle and Callisthenes for their work on the Pythian Victors list also contains the same perfect passive participle, here *nen]ikêk[ot]ôn*: Dittenberger *Syll.*3 I, 275; *CID* IV.10: see further below.

What *is* reasonably certain is that Glaucus gave some stylistic analysis of every figure he treated—recall his book's title—and connected them all into a continuous historical sequence. He apparently began from some 'first inventor' (*prôtos heuretês*: Kleingünther 1933) for each instrument or art—Orpheus and Olympus feature as fountainheads for the *kithara* and *aulos* traditions respectively—and traced its development through successive ages down to his own time (for the Cypria, Empedocles and Democritus, see below). His treatment of mythological musicians is further seen in fragment 1, which attests a discussion of Musaeus. A genuine belief in such founding-fathers was clearly already part of the living tradition, as we have seen for Olympus. Glaucus must then have digested every famous name, and perhaps some minor ones known only or mostly to musicians. A notable innovator was typically presented as combining qualities from two predecessors. This procedure is well illustrated by the longer fragment 4, also from ps.-Plutarch, which deals with Thaletas, the Cretan musician who is said to have executed musical catharses at Sparta—a well-attested aspect of Archaic *kithara* music (Franklin 2002, 16). Again Archilochus is invoked as a chronological point-of-reference, but this time there is a stylistic consequence: Thaletas emulated his melodies or scales (*melê*), but on a grander scale, and introduced the 'Cretic rhythm' (*Krêtikon rhythmon*) which (Glaucus asserts) was alien to earlier citharodic tradition—represented here by Orpheus and Terpander—originating rather in the *aulos* tradition of Olympus (*tês Olumpou aulêseôs*). Some suspect that Thaletas' connection here with Cretic rhythm may be due to no more than his own Cretan origin (cf. Ephorus *FGrH* 7 F 149 with Barker 1984–1989, 1.215 n. 75). Of course this may be a case of chicken and egg: as a Cretan he may well have used Cretic rhythm (if such rhythm was indeed native to Crete as the name implies). And the obvious Cretan connection makes it quite striking that Glaucus would derive this aspect of Thaletas' work from Olympus, who was believed to be not from Crete but Phrygia! And yet there is remarkable external evidence that here Glaucus was drawing on the living musical tradition. This is shown by the Cretic rhythm used by Athenaeus in his *paian*, inscribed at Delphi in the early second century BCE (Pöhlmann/West 2001, no. 20). The opening sections of this piece use precisely the scalar material which Aristoxenus, more than a century earlier, had attributed to Olympus on the basis of what he learned from 'the musicians' (*hoi mousikoi*: see above). The Delphic hymn's companion piece, the *paian* of Limenius, also stands in this tonal tradition (Furley/Bremer 2001, 130 f.), and a Delphic inscription of 97 BCE refers to a performance of 'the ancestral paian' (*patrios paian*, Fantuzzi in press, 194). Finally one may note that a recently discovered inscription from Hellenistic Mylasa that Cretan ambassadors performed songs which they believed to be by Thaletas (Chaniotis 1988).

So Glaucus did not invent everything from nothing. His historical constructions were built, as far as possible, on 'real' source material. I would assert that, as often as not, Glaucus was merely recording what he had heard *from musicians*, some version of their shared history—which was itself, no doubt, somewhat multiform. Mythological figures like Orpheus and Musaeus are obviously problematic: an increasing number of forgeries were foisted on their names in the sixth and fifth centuries (West 1983, 353–67), and even simple musicians must have found it irresistibly attractive to see themselves standing in some grand and sacred tradition. And yet in one sense they really were! Even when one may well doubt the precise historicity of these received developments, the overall fiction constitutes a fair approximation of the processes by which music does indeed evolve under the appropriate circumstances.

Glaucus evidently gave some attention to literary discussion too, if fr. 6a is correctly assigned: a scholion to Euripides' *Hecuba* cites a Glaucus for an alternative version of the Trojan Queen's death, found in the *Cypria*. It is interesting that the scholiast does not cite the *Cypria* directly: this episode, occurring after the action covered in the *Iliad*, belongs to an earlier state of the poem, before it its truncation(s) to form part of the Epic Cycle in the narrow sense of the term (Burgess 2002; Franklin in press-b). So the scholiast probably knew this version of the myth only through Glaucus' summary.

Glaucus' treatment of the fifth century is represented by a lost discussion of Empedocles, including at least the visit the new Athenian colony of Thurii (fr. 6 = Diog. Laert. 8.51). This inclusion of Empedocles in a musical history is noteworthy. Aristotle would have considered it a stretch to rank him among 'the ancient poets and musicians': in the *Poetics* he asserts that Empedocles

was rather a *physiologos*, sharing nothing with poets but the use of meter (*Poet.* 1447b18). Aristotle's assessment is not valueless: Empedocles was obliged to break largely with traditional formulaic diction in order to express his novel cosmological concepts. And yet there remains the testimony of Athenaeus (620d) that Empedocles' *Purifications* (*Katharmoi*) were in the repertoire of the rhapsode Cleomenes, and so were clearly performed in a traditional musical setting. This datum confirms the judgment of Glaucus, which must be allowed to balance or even trump that of Aristotle. We must broaden our conception of the *aoidos* beyond the simple epic singer (Franklin 2002, 19).

The final fragment (fr. 5 = Diog. Laert. 9.38) shows that Glaucus dealt with another pre-Socratic philosopher, Democritus of Abdera, active in the second half of the fifth century. While nothing further can be deduced, it is also worth reflecting on Democritus' inclusion in a work of musical history. Best known for his atomic theory, Democritus wrote prodigiously on many other subjects, and addressed music and poetry from a number of angles (see Appendix). He also wrote on the senses, and advanced a theory of hearing in terms of atomism (fr. 126a, 135). A strong case has been made for believing that, in elaborating a coherent worldview, Democritus treated letters as analogous to atoms, and euphonious poetry as a sort of *kosmos*—even if he did not himself use the term *stoicheia* (variously 'letters' or 'elements': Armstrong 1995; Janko 2000, 173 ff.). A similar argument could be developed for his treatment of 'rhythms and *harmonia*'. The comparison of proper sequences of musical tones to the grouping of letters in syllables and words appears frequently enough in Peripatetic writings to assume that it was a well-established *topos.* This doubtless stemmed from the pairing of *mousikê* and *grammata* in education. Indeed, Aristoxenus and Archytas both held that *grammatikê* was properly subordinate to *mousikê.*[18] It is of more than passing interest that Aristoxenus named his treatise the 'Harmonic Elements' (*Harmonika stoikheia*). The Greek notation itself is a perfect fusion of the musical and grammatical, with notes designated by letters. An early stage of the system may thus have provided Democritus with an archetype for the analogy of musical notes and letters, a basis for elaborating some musical theory in accord with his atomist program. So it may be that Democritus is ultimately responsible for the Peripatetic topos. One wonders whether Epicurus, who developed Democritus' atomism and was a rough contemporary of Aristoxenus, may also have been attracted to such ideas in his *On Music* (*Peri mousikês*, Diog. Laert. 10.28).

Conclusion: A Peripatetic Case Study

After Glaucus music historiography exploded. As ps.-Plutarch states, 'most of the Platonists and the best of the Peripatetics . . . and all the most cultivated experts in the sciences of grammar and harmonics have also given (*music*) a great deal of attention' (1131f). They were moved to do so, he asserts, by the feeling that the art was in a state of decline, and the desire to preserve knowledge of what it had been like in the good old days. The political and social bias of this perspective, peculiar to Classical Athens with its popular audiences who promoted new demotic forms, has been often discussed (see Franklin in press-d with further references). But, as I hope to have shown, it is likely that at any given point of Greek history people felt nostalgia for older music as it faded from hearing, and cultivated various techniques for remembering it.

For the Peripatetics, in particular, we possess many fragments and titles (see *Appendix*). It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine all of these fragments: a representative sample will be found in Ps.-Plutarch's *De musica*, to which this paper has referred regularly. That work gives a fair impression of what some of the lost historiographical treatises must have been like; a number of studies have been devoted to explicating its sources (Weil/Reinach 1900; Lasserre 1954; Conti Bizzarro 1994; Barker 1984–1989, 1.205–57). The remainder of the Peripatetic fragments are collected in *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, with Wehrli's commentary. Heraclides and Aristoxenus are of course enormously important figures in the Greek historiography of music, and problems remain in

---

[18] Ps.-Arist. *Pr.* 19.20; Aristox. *Harm.* 27, 37, *Rhythm.* 2.8, fr. 72; Philodem. *Poem.* 1.94.22–5; ps. – Plut. *De mus.* 1144a–c; Quint. *Inst.* 1.10.17; Isid. *Etym.* 3.16.2. Cf. D'Angour 1999; Janko 2000, 173 ff.

the interpretation of their work. But going through their fragments here would add little that was new from a methodological point of view. The foregoing discussion of Hellanicus and Glaucus, and their antecedents in the living tradition, has already touched upon most of the sources and methods that would be developed by the fourth-century and later writers. I should add here that archaeological evidence is occasionally cited (musical sculpture: [Plut.] *De mus.* 1136a; Paus. 9.35.3). Ethnographic analogy is sometimes also invoked, as with the Agathyrsoi of Thrace who are cited to support the idea that Greek laws had once been sung (ps.-Arist. *Prob.* 19.28).

It will suffice to conclude this essay with a brief sketch of what I take to be a new problem of Peripatetic historiography (a complete investigation must await a separate paper). Ps.-Plutarch alludes to a work by Heraclides which he calls the '*Collection of Men <Famous> in Music*' (or perhaps '*Collection of Musical Matters*': *hê synagôgê tôn en mousikêi <dialampsantôn vel sim.?>*). In this, Heraclides asserted that Amphion was the 'first-inventor' of *kithara*-singing, 'and he guarantees (*pistoutai*) this from the inscription (*anagraphê*) which is preserved at Sicyon, through which he names (*di' hês . . . onomazei*) the priestesses in Argos and the poets and the musicians' (fr. 157 Wehrli = *FGrH* 124 T 23). It is generally assumed that this inscription was a sort of musical and literary history by some anonymous hand, and that it must postdate Hellanicus' work on the Argive priestesses, since it uses that for its chronological scheme (Griffin 1982, 159 f.).

But the picture has become more complicated if indeed, as seems probable, we should restore Amphion as the first victor also in the Delphic victors list.[19] This would clearly require that Aristotle and Callisthenes, in their *Examinations of the Pythian Victors* (*Elenchoi Pythionikôn*)—for which they received a public thanksgiving at Delphi (Dittenberger *Syll.* 3 I, 275; *CID* IV.10)—will have discussed the festival's history from mythical times (centuries before the sanctuary's actual activity). This had already been suspected on the basis of material in the Peripatetic statesman Demetrius of Phaleron, who describes a visit to the oracle by Agamemnon before going to Troy; the king found Demodocus there, and brought him to his palace to guard Clytemnestra (fr. 144 *SOD* with Wilson 2004, 270). This is clearly contrived on the basis of several passages in Homer, developing a back-story to connect them (Gostoli 1986). But the mythological phase of Delphi's history was equally grounded in local tradition: the *pythikos nomos*, a mimetic competition piece already in the sixth century, presupposes the foundation myth of Apollo slaying the Python. We have also seen, from Glaucus of Rhegium, that epigraphic evidence must already have existed at Delphi before Aristotle. It is highly probable that this went back at least to the games' reorganization after the First Sacred War (c. 595–1: generally Davies 1994, inter al.), and possibly some generations earlier if Glaucus did indeed find Terpander's four octennial victories inscribed there (see above). Presumably Aristotle and Callisthenes followed in the footsteps of Hellanicus, supplementing the available epigraphic material with local lore, mythology, and straightforward fabrication to compose a universal history for the delight of the Delphians.

So one must now consider a causal relationship between the Delphic and Sicyonian inscriptions. It is not impossible that Amphion could have found his way independently into both. But three points arouse suspicion. First is the obviously artificial nature of these mythological constructions: one account must have come first, and it is unlikely that the author of the latter was unaware of the former. Second is the professional association of Aristotle and Heraclides. Third is the relatively narrow window in which the Sicyonian inscription must have been composed, between Hellanicus and Heraclides. One should therefore contemplate the possibility that Heraclides, though he presented the *anagraphê* as the foundation of his treatise, had actually fabricated the earlier reaches of this document himself, using Hellanicus' chronological framework (as others had done) and copying the initial sequence from Aristotle's *Pythian Victors*. He then used this 'document' as a 'pledge' (cf. *pistoutai*) of his treatise's scientific rigor. Perhaps this material did find its way into an actual

[19] Franklin in press-d, n. 43. Thus *ap'*[*Amphiona nen*]*ikêk*[*ot*]*ôn*, rather than *ap*[*o Gulida* (Dittenberger) or *ap*' [*aiônos* (*CID* IV.10). Two characters span a 'single position' elsewhere, combinations with iota being frequent: Homolle 1898, 261 and n. 1.

inscription at Sicyon; perhaps he was commissioned for the same service Aristotle and Callisthenes had performed at Delphi. And there is another parallel: compare Heraclides' historicization of Homer's two bards, Demodocus and Phemius, as crediting them with precisely the songs Homer has them sing (fr. 157)! This is very much of a piece with the material in Demetrius of Phaleron. This problem is potentially a most revealing window onto the complex methods and aims of the Peripatetic historiography of music.

Appendix:

The following list of attested works of music-historical interest does not claim to be exhaustive—post-Peripatetic works are not given at all—nor does it imply belief in the authenticity of all the works given.

Early Classical Musicography:

Lasus of Hermione (late sixth–early fifth century)
  On Music (*Peri mousikês*): *Suda* s.v. *Lasos.*

Democritus of Abdera, Diogenes Laertius (9.47) lists the following works as dealing with 'musical matters' (*ta mousika*):
  On Rhythms and Tuning (*Peri rhythmôn kai harmoniês*)
  On Poetry (or On Composition: *Peri poiêsios*)
  On the Beauty of (Epic) Verses: (*Peri kallosunês epeôn*)
  On Good-Sounding and Bad-Sounding Letters (*Peri euphônôn kai dusphônôn grammatôn*)
  On Homer, or On Proper Diction and Vocabulary (*Peri Homêrou ê orthoepeiês kai glôsseôn*)
  On Singing (*Peri aoidês*)
  On Words (or 'Utterances': *Peri rhêmatôn*)
  On Matters of Names (*Onomastikôn*). Diog. Laert. 9.47.

Damon of Oa, active in Athens, mid to late fifth century. Wallace 1991 has argued that the 'lost' works attributed to him were later forgeries. See further below.

Antisthenes (c. 446–366 B.C.), Diog. Laert. 6.16–17.
  On Theognis (Peri Theognidos)
  On Music (Peri mousikês)
  On Homer (Peri Homêrou)
  On the Minstrel's Staff (Peri tês rhabdou).
  A number of his other works dealt with specific subjects of literature and mythology.

Simon, Diog. Laert. 2.123.
  On Music (Peri mousikês).
  On Poetry (Peri poiêseôs).

Simmias of Thebes, Diog. Laert. 2.124. Diogenes Laertius credits him with twenty-three dialogues, including two on musical topics:
  On Music (Peri mousikês)
  On Verses (Peri epeôn)

For Philolaus and Archytas, see Huffman 1993; Huffman 2005

Date Unkown:

Theodorus, Diog. Laert. 2.104: An authority upon singers of *nomoi* (traditional modal pieces) beginning from Terpander: ho peri tôn nomopoiôn pepragmateumenos, arxamenos apo Terpandrou.

Euphranor, Pythagorean, Ath. 182c etc.
Treatise on Auloi (*Suggrama peri aulôn* [vel sim.])

Peripatetic Musicography:

Aristotle, Diog. Laert. 5.26:
Olympian Victors (*Olympionikai*)
Pythian Victors (*Pythionikai*, with Callisthenes), presumably the same as the *Examinations of the Pythian Victors* (*Elenchoi Pythionikôn*).
On Music (<*Peri*> *mousikês*)
(*Dramatic*) *Victories at the* (*City*) *Dionysia* (*Nikai Dionusiakai*)
On Tragedies (*Peri tragôidiôn*)
Dramatic Records (*Didaskaliai*)

Ps.-Aristotle
Problems (*Problêmata*): Books 11 and 19 especially contains details relevant for musical history.

Theophrastus, Diog. Laert. 5.47–9:
On Poetry (*Peri poiêtikês*)
On Comedy (*Peri kômôidias*)
On Music (*Peri mousikês*, three books
On the Musicians (*Peri tôn mousikôn*)

Heraclides of Pontus, Diog. Laert. 5.87:
On the Antiquity of Homer and Hesiod (*Peri tês Homêrou kai Hêsiodou hêlikias*)
On Archilochus and Homer (*Peri Archilochou kai Hômêrou*)
On issues in Euripides and Sophocles (*Peri tôn par' Euripidêi kai Sophoklei*)
On Music (*Peri mousikês*)
Homeric solutions (*Luseôn Homêrikôn*)
On the three tragedians (*Peri tôn triôn tragôidopoiôn*)
On Poetry and the Poets (*Peri poiêtikês kai tôn poiêtôn*).
Collection of Men Famous in Music (*hê sunagôgê tôn en mousikêi* <*dialampsantôn*> [*vel sim.*])

Aristoxenus of Tarentum:
On Music (*Peri mousikês*): frr. 69–90 Wehrli.
Musical Hearing (*Mousikê akroasis*).
Praxidamanteia: frr. 91–92
On Melodic Composition (*Peri melopoiias*): fr. 93. Largely technical, but did it contain material on Olympus and the *spondeion*?
Fragments 94–102 are drawn variously from:
On Instruments (*Peri organôn*)
On Auloi (*Peri aulôn*)
On Aulos-Players (*Peri aulêtôn*)
On the Boring of Auloi (*Peri aulôn trêseôs*: fr. 101)
Fragments 103–112:
On Choruses (*Peri chorôn*)
On Tragic Dancing (*Peri tragikês orchêseôs*)
On Tragedians (*Peri tragôidopoiôn*) frr. 113–116

Life of Telestes (*Telestou bios*), fr. 117
Sympotic Miscellanies (*Summikta sumpotika*), frr. 122–7
Notes (*Hypomnêmata*), frr. 128–139

Dicaearchus frr. 73–89 Wehrli:
On Musical Contests (*Peri mousikôn agônôn*)
On Dionysian contests (*Peri Dionusiakôn agônôn*)
Panathênaikos
Olumpiakos

Later Works: A number of other music-historical works are mentioned by Ps.-Plutarch, Athenaeus, and other authorities. Some of the surviving musical writers—Nicomachus, Aristides Quintilianus, Boethius, et al.—also contain historiographical passages of various sorts.

REFERENCES

Alexiou, M. (2002). The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition. Lanham, Maryland and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
Anderson, W. D. (1966). Ethos and Education in Greek Music. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Aravantinos, V., (1996). 'New Archaeological and Archival Discoveries at Mycenaean Thebes.' Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies 41: 135–136.
Armstrong, D. (1995). 'The Impossibility of Metathesis: Philodemus and Lucretius on Form and Content in Poetry.' In: Philodemus and poetry: poetic theory and practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace, ed. Obbink, D. Oxford University Press: 210–232.
Barker, A., (1978). 'Hoi Kaloumenoi Harmonikoi: The Predecessors of Aristoxenus.' Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society 24: 1–21.
— (1982). 'Aristides Quintilianus and Constructions in Early Music Theory.' The Classical Quarterly n.s. 32: 184–197.
— (1984–1989). Greek Musical Writings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
— (2007). *The Science of Harmonics in Classical Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bowie, E. L. (2009). 'Wandering poets, archaic style.' In: Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Panhellenism, ed. Hunter, R./Rutherford, I. Cambridge University Press: 105–36.
Brancacci, A. (1988). 'Alcidamante e PHibeh 13 "De musica": Musica della retorica e retorica della musica.' In: Aristoxenica, Menandrea, Fragmenta Philosophica., ed. Brancacci, A./al., e. 61–84.
Brussich, G. F. (2000). Laso di Ermione. Testimonianze e frammenti. Pisa: ETS.
Burgess, J., (2002). 'Kyprias, the "Kypria", and Multiformity.' Phoenix 56.3/4 (Autumn 2002): 234–245.
Burke, B. (2008). 'Mycenaean Memory and Bronze Age Lament.' In: Lament: studies in the ancient Mediterranean and beyond, ed. Suter, A. Oxford University Press: 70–92.
Burkert, W. (1985). Greek Religion. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Calame, C. (1977). Les choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque. Rome:
Chaniotis, A., (1988). 'Als die Diplomaten noch tanzten und sangen. Zu zwei Dekreten kretischer Städte in Mylasa.' Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 71: 154–6.
Conti Bizzarro, F., (1994). 'Note a Ps.-Plutarch. de musica.' Museum Criticum 29: 259–261.

D'Angour, A., (1997). 'How the Dithyramb Got its Shape.' The Classical Quarterly 47: 331–51.
— (1999). 'Archinus, Eucleides and the Reform of the Athenian Alphabet.' Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies 43: 109–130.
Davies, J. (1994). 'The Tradition about the First Sacred War.' In: Greek Historiography, ed. Hornblower, S. Oxford University Press: 193–212.
Detienne, M. (1996). The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece. New York: Zone Books.
Fantuzzi, M. (in press). 'Sung Poetry: The Case of Inscribed Paeans.' In: Companion to Hellenistic Literature, ed. Clauss, J./Cuypers, M. 181–196.
Franklin, J. C., (2002). 'Harmony in Greek and Indo-Iranian Cosmology.' The Journal of Indo-European Studies 30/1–2: 1–25.
— (2003). 'The Language of Musical Technique in Greek Epic Diction.' Gaia. Revue interdisciplinaire sur la Grèce archaïque 7: 295–307.
— (2005). 'Hearing Greek Microtones.' In: Ancient Greek Music in Performance, ed. Hagel, S./Harrauer, C. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: 9–50.
— (2006). 'Lyre Gods of the Bronze Age Musical Koine.' Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions 6.2: 39–70.
— (2007a). 'A Feast of Music. The Greco-Lydian Musical Movement on the Assyrian Periphery.' In: Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia, ed. Collins, B. J., et al. Oxbow: 193–203.
— (2007b). 'The Global Economy of Music in the Ancient Near East.' In: Sounds of Ancient Music, ed. Westenholz, J. G. Keter: 27–37.
— (forthcoming). 'The ‘Asiatic Kithara’: Orpheus, Terpander, and the *Carnean Victors* of Hellanicus.'
— (in press-a). 'Aulos.' In: The Homer Encyclopedia, ed. Finkelberg, M. Blackwell: s.v.
— (in press-b). Greek Epic and Kypriaka: Why “Cyprus Matters”.' In: Yuval. Studies of the Jewish Music Research Centre. Vol. 8: Sounds from the Past: Music in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean Worlds, ed. Maurey, Y., et al. The Magnes Press / The Hebrew University.
— (in press-c). 'Music.' In: The Homer Encyclopedia, ed. Finkelberg, M. Blackwell: s.v.
— (in press-d). '"Song-Benders of Circular Choruses": Dithyramb and the "Demise of Music".' In: Song Culture and Social Change: The Contexts of Dithyramb, ed. Wilson, P./Kowalzig, B. Oxford University Press.
Furley, W. D. / Bremer, J. M. (2001). Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
Gostoli, A. (1986). 'La figura dell'aedo preomerico nella filologia peripatetica ed ellenistica: Demodoco tra mito e storia.' In: Scrivere e recitare, ed. Cerri, G. 103–126.
Grieser, H. (1937). Nomos: Ein Beitrag zur griechischen Musikgeschichte. Heidelberg: Bilabel.
Griffin, A. (1982). Sikyon. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hagel, S. (2000). Modulation in altgriechischer Musik: Antike Melodien im Licht antiker Musiktheorie. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.
— (2006). 'The Context of Tunings: Thirds and Septimal Intervals in Ancient Greek Music.' In: Musikarchäologie im Kontext: Archäologische Befunde, historische Zusammenhänge, soziokulturelle Beziehungen. Serie Studien zur Musikarchäologie 5, ed. Hickmann, E., et al. Verlag Marie Leidorf: 281–304.
— (2009). Ancient Greek Music: A New Technical History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Havelock, E. A. (1963). Preface to Plato. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Hickmann, E. (1993). 'Musikarcha□ologie—Metapher und Methode.' In: Miscellanea archaeologica Thaddaeo Malinowski, ed. Roznowski, F. Sorus: 177–187.
Homolle, T., (1898). 'Inscription de Delphes.' Bulletin de correspondance hellénique 22: 260–270.
Hubbard, T. (1991). The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Huchzermeyer, H. (1931). Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit. Emsdetten: Lechte.
Huffman, C. A. (1993). Philolaus of Croton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— (2005). Archytas of Tarentum: Pythagorean, philosopher, and mathematician king. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hunter, R. / Rutherford, I. (2009). Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Panhellenism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Janko, R. (1982). Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
— (1992). The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume IV: books 13-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
— (2000). Philodemus On Poems. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kleingünther, A. (1933). Prôtos heuretês. Leipzig: Dieterich.
Kowalzig, B. (2004). 'Changing Choral Worlds: Song-Dance and Society in Athens and Beyond.' In: Music and the Muses. The Culture of 'Mousikê' in the Classical Athenian City, ed. Murray/Wilson. 39–65.
Lang, M. (1969). The Palace of Nestor at Pylos, II. The Frescoes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Lasserre, F. (1954). Plutarch. De la musique. Olten-Lausanne: Urs Graf Verlag.
Lavecchia, S. (2000). Pindari Dithyramborum Fragmenta. Rome and Pisa: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
Lefkowitz, M. (1981). The Lives of the Greek Poets. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Mathiesen, T. J. (1999). Apollo's Lyre: Greek Music and Music Theory in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Lincoln, Neb. and London: University of Nebraska Press.
Mazzarino, S. (1947). Fra Oriente e Occidente; ricerche di storia greca arcaica. Florence: La Nuova Italia.
Miller, M. C. (1997). Athens and Persia in the fifth century B.C.: a study in cultural receptivity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Möller, A. (2001). 'The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*.' In: The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus, ed. Luraghi, N. Oxford University Press: 241–262.
Munn, M. (2006). The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the Tyranny of Asia. A Study of Sovereignty in Ancient Religion. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Nagy, G. (1990). Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Pöhlmann, E. / West, M. L. (2001). Documents of Ancient Greek Music. Oxford Oxford University Press.
Porter, J., (2007). 'Lasus of Hermione, Pindar, and the Riddle of *S*.' Classical Quartlery 57.1: 1–21.
Privitera, G. A. (1965). Laso di Ermione nella cultura ateniese e nella tradizione storiografica. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
Russo, J. (1999). 'Stesichorus, Homer, and the Forms of Early Greek Epic.' In: Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and Its Legacy in Honor of D. M. Maronitis, ed. Kazazis, J. N./Rengakos, A. Steiner: 339–348.
Schuol, M. (2004). Hethitische Kultmusik. Eine Untersuchung der Instrumental- und Vokalmusik anhand hethitischer Ritualtexte und von archäologischen Zeugnissen. Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf.
Scully, S., (1981). 'The Bard as Custodian of Homeric Society: *Ody.* 3.261–272.' Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica 37: 67–83.
Snodgrass, A. M., (1974). 'An Historical Homeric Society?' The Journal of Hellenic Studies 94: 114–125.
Talamo, C. (1979). La Lidia arcaica: tradizioni genealogiche ed evoluzione istituzionale. Bologna: Pàtron Editore.
Trendall, A. D. (1987). The Red-Figured Vases of Paestum. Rome: British School at Rome.
Wallace, R. W. (1991). 'Damone di Oa ed i suoi successori: un'analisi delle fonti.' In: Harmonia Mundi: Musica e Filosofia nell'Antichità, ed. Wallace, R. W./MacLachlan, B. 30–53.
— (1995). 'Music Theorists in Fourth-Century Athens.' In: Mousike: Metrica Ritmica e Musica Greca in memoria di Giovanni Comotti, ed. Gentili, G./Perusino, R. 17–40.

— (2003). 'An Early Fifth-Century Athenian Revolution in Aulos Music.' Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 101: 73–92.
— (2004). 'Damon of Oa: A Music Theorist Ostracized?' In: Music and the Muses. The Culture of 'Mousikê' in the Classical Athenian City, ed. Murray/Wilson. 249–267.
Weil, H. / Reinach, T. (1900). Plutarque. De la musique. Édition critique et explicative. Paris: E. Leroux.
West, M. L. (1983). The Orphic Poems. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
— (1988). 'The Rise of Greek Epic.' The Journal of Hellenic Studies 108: 151–172.
— (1992). Ancient Greek Music. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. v. (1922). Pindaros. Berlin: Weidmann.
Wilson, P. (2004). 'Athenian Strings.' In: Music and the Muses. The Culture of 'Mousikê' in the Classical Athenian City, ed. Murray/Wilson. 269–306.
— (2009). 'Thamyris the Thracian: the archetypal wandering poet?' In: Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Panhellenism, ed. Hunter, R./Rutherford, I. Cambridge University Press: 117–187.
Winnington-Ingram, R. P., (1928). 'The Spondeian Scale.' The Classical Quarterly 22: 83–91.
Ziegler, N. (2007). Les Musiciens et la musique d'après les archives royals de Mari. Paris: Societe pour l'Etude du Proche-Orient Ancien.