STESICHORUS

HISTORIES of literature tend to treat Stesichorus as just one of the lyric poets, like Alcman or Anacreon. But the vast scale of his compositions puts him in a category of his own. It has always been known that his *Oresteia* was divided into more than one book; *P. Oxy.* 2360 gave us fragments of a narrative about Telemachus of a nearly Homeric amplitude; and from *P. Oxy.* 2617 it was learned that the *Geryoneis* contained at least 1,300 verses, the total being perhaps closer to two thousand.[1] Even allowing for the shorter lines, this was as long as many an epic poem. Indeed, these *were* epic poems, in subject and style as well as in length: epics to be sung instead of recited. What was behind them? Who was this Stesichorus, and how did he come to be, in Quintilian's phrase, 'sustaining on the lyre the weight of epic song'?

The biographical problem must be tackled first. The question of Stesichorus' historical setting and date is confused by legendary elements as well as by contradiction in the sources. On the whole scholars remain spellbound by the specious precision of the *Suda*'s dates (632–556), although it has long been realized that they are founded on nothing but the assumption that Stesichorus was younger than Alcman and older than Simonides.[2] There have been excellent discussions by Wilamowitz and Maas,[3] but they seem to have had little influence.

Stesichorus in South Italy

Everyone in Magna Graecia before the reign of Hiero moves in a cloud of legend. A fair-sized portion of the cloud is Pythagorean territory, and almost anyone is liable to find himself entendrilled from that quarter, whether he belongs there or not. So it is with Stesichorus, particularly when he is connected with the mainland of Italy.

1. He came, it is said, from Matauros, a Locrian foundation. (St. Byz. s.v. *Μάταυρος*, where he is called *Ματαυρῖνος γένος*; *Suda*.)
2. Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1395[a]1 (cf. 1412[a]22), alludes to an evidently familiar apophthegm of Stesichorus uttered at Locri (*ἐν Λοκροῖς*). This is one of four stories in which Stesichorus warns a city against violence or tyranny. He

[1] Cf. Barrett and Page in *Lyrica Graeca Selecta* (O.C.T.), 264. The permutation-cycle of triads and papyrus columns shows that nearly 400 verses (or a multiple thereof!) separated Geryon's death in fr. 4 ii from his speech contemplating it in fr. 13.

[2] 632 is forty years after the date for Alcman (apparently a *floruit*) given by the *Suda* (cf. eand. s.v. *Στησίχορος*, *τοῖς δὲ χρόνοις ἦν νεώτερος Ἀλκμᾶνος*). 556 is the birth of Simonides, fixed by a statement of his own. The dates are probably Apollodorus', see Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, 197 ff.

[3] *Sappho und Simonides* (hereafter *SS*), 233 ff.; *R.-E.* s.v. Stesichoros. Wilamowitz's unattractive hypothesis that there were two early Stesichoruses has perhaps led to undue neglect of his treatment of the evidence. Twelve years later he wrote: 'Dass Stesichoros, der Verfasser der berühmtesten Gedichte, selbst Orestie und Helene, der Lokrer war, der im Peloponnes lebte, jünger als Ibykos, wird mir immer sicherer. Gerade die Analyse der Sagen scheint es zu fordern. Darauf, dass dieser Ansatz, der dem antiken Glauben widerspricht, sich auch heute nicht ohne starken Widerspruch durchsetzen würde, war ich gefasst. Aber durchsetzen wird er sich schon' (*S.P.A.W.* 1925, 46 n. = *Kl. Schr.* v (2). 61 n. 1). The prediction has not so far been fulfilled.

warned the Himeraeans against Phalaris (*c.* 570), or Gelon (491); and he put an end to civil strife somewhere by musical psychotherapy.[1] The association of music and moderate politics seems to reflect Pythagorean interests. Pythagoras too is made to confront Phalaris.[2]

3. One of the names given for Stesichorus' father is Euetes.[3] A Euetes appears as a Locrian in the list of early Pythagoreans in Iambl. *VP* 267.[4] It can hardly be a coincidence that in the same list, and elsewhere in Iamblichus' *Life*, there appears a Rhegine lawgiver Phytios, which is the name of the father of Ibycus.[5]
4. Other names given for Stesichorus' father are Euphemus (so Plato) and Euphorbus. The Homeric Euphorbus is the most commonly mentioned of Pythagoras' earlier incarnations.[6] A Euphemus appears in the list of Pythagoreans; he comes from Metapontum.
5. Stesichorus is credited with two brothers: Helianax, a lawgiver, and Mamertius (or something similar), a notable geometer between Thales and Pythagoras. The 'lawgiver' reminds us of Ibycus' father, and the name 'Helianax' suggests that religious glorification of the sun which Sophocles attributes to *οἱ σοφοί*.[7] Mamertius was known to Hippias (86 B 12 D.–K.) as a figure in the history of mathematics, and can hardly have figured in any but a Pythagorean tradition. The name looks Italian; there was a town Mamertion near Rhegium. One of the variants is *Μάμερκος*, which appears elsewhere as the name of a son of Pythagoras.[8]
6. How did Stesichorus know that Helen was the cause of his blindness? According to Plato, *Phaedrus* 243 a, he understood it *ἅτε μουσικὸς ὤν*. But there was a story that she sent him a message to Himera from the White Island, by a man from Croton who had been wounded in battle against Locri by the Locrian Ajax, and who had had to visit Ajax in the heroes' island to obtain healing.[9] The battle is perhaps to be dated *c.* 550–540.[10] Stesichorus is only loosely linked with it: someone thought that his discovery of Helen's anger could do with an explanation, and combined it

[1] Arist. *Rhet.* 1393^{b}8, Conon 26 F 1. 42; Diog. Bab. *ap.* Philod. *Mus.* p. 18 Kemke (*SVF* iii. 232. 31 Arnim).

[2] Iambl. *VP* 215 ff.; cf. Tzetz. in Hes. *Op.* p. 16 Gaisford (1820) *ὁ δὲ Στησίχορος οὗτος σύγχρονος ἦν Πυθαγόρᾳ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ καὶ τῷ Ἀκραγαντίνῳ Φαλάριδι.*

[3] Wilamowitz's emendation of *ὑέτης* in the *Suda*. All other names for Stesichorus' father begin with Eu-.

[4] Not as a Crotoniate, as Wilamowitz says. On the origins of the document see W. Burkert, *Weisheit und Wissenschaft*, 94 n. 40.

[5] Cf. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*^{2}, 241. A Pythagorean writer called Ibycus (Ath. 69 e) is usually emended away, and probably rightly. (The name Ibycus had occurred in 57 f.)

[6] But Antipater's claim that 'Homer's soul made its second home in Stesichorus' breast according to Pythagoras' account of nature' (Antip. Thessal. 74 Gow–Page, *A.P.* 7. 75) is an autoschediasm.

[7] Fr. 752 P.; cf. *O.T.* 660. In *El.* 62–4 *οἱ σοφοί* may well include Pythagoras, cf. Burkert, op. cit. 136–41. Sophocles' friend Ion of Chios was certainly interested in Pythagoreanism. Elsewhere (fr. 582) Sophocles made the sun the chief god of the Thracians. But this might be an echo of the *Bassarai* of Aeschylus, where a sun-worshipping Orpheus may have appeared in Thrace (fr. 83 Mette; Linforth, *TAPA* lxii [1931], 11 ff. is sceptical); and Aeschylus' Orpheus might be the Orpheus of Pythagorean fancy.

[8] Plut. *Aem. Paul.* 2. 1, *Numa* 8. 9; Festus p. 22 L. Casaubon conjectured it for *Μάρμακος* as the name of his father in D.L. 8. 1. Cf. M. Detienne, *Rev. hist. rel.* clii (1957), 142; Burkert, op. cit. 395 n. 114.

[9] Conon 26 F 1. 18; Paus. 3. 19. 11–13 ('the Crotoniates and Himeraeans say'); Hermias on Plato l.c.

[10] So T. J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, 359 f.; according to another line of argument, *c.* 580–570 (P. J. Bicknell, *Phoenix*, xx [1966], 294–301).

with the Crotonian story about a man who went to the White Island and met various celebrated heroes. Wilamowitz may be right in saying that the story implies a Locrian and not a Himeraean Stesichorus.

What this all adds up to is a persistent tradition of a Mataurine Stesichorus who was active at Locri as well as at Himera; and a good deal of fable, some of it coloured by Pythagorean elements. There is no suggestion of an association with Pythagoras himself. It is difficult to draw any chronological conclusions from this kind of material. Phalaris, Mamertius, and the battle between Croton and Locri would imply that he was thought to have flourished before Pythagoras; Gelon and Euetes/Euphemus would put him after.

Stesichorus in Himera and elsewhere

'Stesichorus of Himera' is how he was known to Plato and many others, and it is implied by Plato's contemporary 'Stesichorus of Himera the Second'.[1] There is no reason why a Mataurine Stesichorus should not have spent much time at Himera, and extended residence there is suggested by those features of his dialect that differ from epic. Besides numerous Doric elements[2] he has εἶν for εἶναι *P. Oxy.* 2617 fr. 4 i 7, known from Euboean Ionic (and Chian), and κρέσσον (ib. fr. 13. 11) should probably also be regarded as Ionic.[3] The mixture agrees happily with what Thuc. 6. 5. 1 says of the dialect of Himera: μεταξὺ τῆς τε Χαλκιδέων καὶ Δωρίδος ἐκράθη.

Another tradition transfers Stesichorus to the Greek mainland. In Ozolian Locris, as well as in the Italian Locri, there was an important tradition of music and poetry in the sixth and fifth centuries,[4] and stories were told about poets of the past. The *Ναυπάκτια ἔπη* give evidence of literate Locrian interest in genealogical poetry, and it would not be surprising if some of the mass of poetry that bore Hesiod's name was current there.[5] At any rate, Hesiod was said by the local people to have died there (Thuc. 3. 96). The fuller story comes in *Certamen* 13–14, from Alcidamas and Eratosthenes. Hesiod was killed because he had seduced a local girl, or was thought to have. In Eratosthenes' version she hanged herself for shame, but in a version known to Aristotle and Philochorus, which I take to be the Locrian version, she gave birth to Stesichorus.[6] The story presupposes that Stesichorus' poetry, like Hesiod's, was

[1] See Wil. *SS* 233. Plato: *Phaedr.* 244 a. Wilamowitz infers from ps.-Plut. *de mus.* 7 that Glaucus of Rhegium too called Stesichorus a Himeraean; Maas is more cautious.

[2] To those listed by Lobel in his introductions to *P. Oxy.* 2617 and 2619 add ἰαρός *Mel.* 185. 3, 2359 ii 6; πέποσχ(α) *Mel.* 261 (also in Epicharmus); ποταύδη *Mel.* 264, and perhaps similarly πίτνη 2803 fr. 11. 1; ὥραν- 2360 i 3; γαμέν 2618 fr. 1 ii 9?; εἶμεν 2619 fr. 13. 5 (also in Epicharmus); αὐτεῖ 2619 fr. 47. 8. In *Mel.* 184. 2 παγᾶς is now uncertain, see *Lyrica Graeca Selecta*, 264.

[3] Lobel says it is 'neither Homeric nor Doric, so far as is known'. It is now found in a papyrus of Hes. *Op.* 210, however (Maehler, *Mus. Helv.* xxiv [1967], 64), and it has been suspected that Homeric κρείσσων is an Atticism of the tradition. Cf. Chantraine, *Gramm. hom.* i. 256. Sicilian Doric had κάρρων (Epicharmus, Sophron, ps.-Pythagorica).

[4] Oldfather, *R.-E.* xiii. 1281 ff., 1359 f., collects the evidence, but needs to be read critically. Cf. Wil. *SS* 238.

[5] The date of the *Ναυπάκτια ἔπη* is uncertain, but not later than the fifth century, since it was known to Charon of Lampsacus (262 F 4) *ap.* Paus. 10. 38. 11. According to Charon it was composed by one Carcinus of Naupactus, but Pausanias claims that it was generally ascribed to a Milesian. Bergk conjectured that this was Cercops, who was also named as alternative author for the Hesiodic *Aigimios*; cf. the testimonia in *Fragmenta Hesiodea*, 151.

[6] Arist. fr. 565, Philoch. 328 F 213. Eratosthenes will have been aware of the

well known in Locris. This may be a reflection of his special association with Italian Locri.

Although it is not on record that he visited Sparta, it was guessed from the fact that he placed Agamemnon's palace there instead of at Mycenae (*Mel.* 216), which appears to reflect Spartan propaganda of the mid sixth century.[1] It now seems to be confirmed by *P. Oxy.* 2735 fr. 1.[2]

Other chronological considerations

1. Simonides, at some date before 468, mentioned Meleager's record-breaking javelin throw at the funeral games for Pelias, and then specified authorities: *οὕτω γὰρ Ὅμηρος ἠδὲ Στασίχορος ἄεισε λαοῖς*. It follows that Stesichorus' poems, or at least the *Ἆθλα ἐπὶ Πελίᾳ*, had become 'classic', but it does not follow that they were composed before 550.
2. Eusebius, Cyril, and the *Suda* (s.v. *Σαπφώ*) make Stesichorus a contemporary of Sappho, Alcaeus, and Pittacus. It is odd that he should be named in this company, but the dating is consistent with Apollodorus' 632–556 and will have the same basis.
3. Cicero knew a tradition that Stesichorus died an old man (*de sen.* 23), and he was so represented in sculpture (id. *Verr.* 2. 2. 87); the author of ps.-Lucian *π. μακροβίων*, who has a penchant for attributing the age of 85 to notable people, attributes it also to Stesichorus. The longevity may reflect a genuine memory, or only the struggles of chronographers to reconcile the story of Hesiod's paternity with other evidence. That Stesichorus was not cut short in extreme youth, however, may be argued from the sheer quantity of his poetry.
4. The Parian Marble, under 485/4, says *Στησίχορος ὁ ποιητὴς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀφίκετο*. This may be connected with the Gelon version of the tyrant story,[3] and with the presence of Euetes of Locri in the Pythagorean list. On other grounds it is an improbably late dating.
5. It is clear, especially from *P. Oxy.* 2360 = *Mel.* 209, that Stesichorus followed specific epic models. If we could identify and then date the epics, we would have a *terminus post quem*. There is one case in which it may be possible to get a useful result from this approach. The Argument to the Hesiodic *Shield*, after giving the opinions of Aristophanes, Megacl⟨id⟩es, and Apollonius Rhodius on the poem's authenticity, says *καὶ Στησίχορος δέ φησιν Ἡσιόδου εἶναι τὸ ποίημα* (*Mel.* 269). This may well come from Megaclides, who has just been mentioned; for he discussed elsewhere Stesichorus' treatment of Heracles, and spoke of a reference in Stesichorus to an earlier poet (*Mel.* 229). Now if it is true that Stesichorus named Hesiod in connection with the subject of his *Kyknos*, and if the *Shield* was the poem he was thinking of, a date hardly before 550 would be indicated. The

chronological difficulty, and perhaps eliminated Stesichorus from the story for that reason. A variant made Stesichorus the son of a daughter of Hesiod (Cic. *Rep.* 2. 20, apparently); this too will be a chronological expedient (Mommsen, *Rh. Mus.* xv [1860], 167). We do not know what Alcidamas' version was. If it involved the birth of Stesichorus, he may have postponed that from the section of his *Museum* that the *Certamen* draws on to a later one on Stesichorus.

[1] Cf. the importation of the bones of Orestes *κατὰ τὸν κατὰ Κροῖσον χρόνον καὶ τὴν Ἀναξανδρίδεώ τε καὶ Ἀρίστωνος βασιληίην*, and Bowra, op. cit. 112–15.

[2] Cf. my discussion in *Zeitschr. f. Pap. u. Epigr.* (hereafter *Z.P.E.*) iv (1969), 146–9.

[3] E. Dopp, *Quaest. de marm. Par.*, 1883, 47.

art of *c.* 580–570 gives a *terminus post quem* for the *Shield*, and a certain time would be needed for it to become attributed to Hesiod and then to reach the ears of Stesichorus. On the other hand, the same kind (if not degree) of suspicion must attach to the report about Stesichorus as to the reports that Callinus and Archilochus named Homer as the author of the *Thebaid* and *Margites* respectively. See J. A. Davison, *Eranos*, liii (1955), 134 ff. = *From Archilochus to Pindar*, 79 ff.

6. Many of the themes of Stesichorus' poems were popular subjects in seventh- and sixth-century art.[1] But as they must all have been current in epic poetry before him, it is in principle unlikely that we shall be able to establish direct influence of his poetry on vase-painting or vice versa. It would be well to refrain from bringing them into the argument until some incontrovertible connection is made out.
7. The influence of Stesichorus' (?) *Helen* is perhaps to be recognized in Ibycus' Polycrates poem, which dates from the forties or thirties of the sixth century.[2]
8. Stesichorus spoke of a total eclipse of the sun (*Mel.* 271), perhaps in a paean, if the existence of paeans by him is rightly read out of Timaeus 566 F 32 (*Mel.* 276). Astronomers apart, nobody talks about eclipses except when they happen. It is not likely to have been the eclipse of 28 May 585 (Schmid–Stählin), which was not total in Greece south of Thessaly or in Italy south of Tarentum. It is likely to have been the one of 19 May 557, whose narrow path of totality crossed the toe of Italy, a few miles north of Locri, and then Ozolian Locris, the northern Peloponnese, and Attica. No other total eclipse was visible as such in South Italy or Sicily in the seventh or sixth century.[3]

Leaving aside the constructions of ancient chronography, none of this evidence indicates that Stesichorus was active any earlier than 570, and some of it points more to the period 560–540. His working life may have been long; but it seems likely that it fell wholly within the sixth century.

In a moment we will start to look into the nature of his poetry and the manner of its performance. Just before we do, it may be noted that he did not stand alone. There are traces of an Italian tradition. We have some direct knowledge of Ibycus, the heroic side of whose poetry has clear enough connections with Stesichorus for us to regard it as a legacy of his Italian training.[4] There was at least a third South Italian poet who wrote lyric poems of the type we are interested in: Xenocritus or Xenocrates of Locri, who was considered by Glaucus of Rhegium to be later than Thaletas (who was himself later than Archilochus). He was a ποιητὴς ἡρωικῶν ὑποθέσεων πράγματα ἐχουσῶν, which some classed as paeans and others as dithyrambs (ps.-Plut. *de mus.* 9–10). Then there was one Xanthus, whose home town is not recorded. Megaclides stated that Stesichorus both named him and made much use of him: πολλὰ δὲ τῶν Ξάνθου παραπεποίηκεν ὁ Στησίχορος, ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν Ὀρεστείαν καλουμένην (*Mel.* 699). There seems a good chance that he too was a westerner.

[1] Geryones, in relation to Stesichorus, is the subject of a detailed study by Martin Robertson in *C.Q.* xix (1969), 207 ff.

[2] Cf. *Z.P.E.* iv (1969), 149; *C.Q.* xx (1970), 208.

[3] See the charts in F. K. Ginzel, *Spezieller Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse für das Ländergebiet der klass. Altertumswissenschaften und den Zeitraum von 900 v. Chr. bis 600 n. Chr.*, 1899.

[4] Cf. Wilamowitz, *Textgesch. d. gr. Lyriker*, 33 n. 2; Bowra, op. cit. 242 f., 252 ff.; *Z.P.E.* l.c.

Stesichorus and the citharodes

We must now examine section 3 of the *de musica*, where a historical survey by Heraclides Ponticus (fr. 157 Wehrli) is summarized. It is necessary to bear in mind the distinction prevailing in Heraclides' time between two kinds of performer of old poetry, the rhapsode who declaimed it and the citharode who sang it to the lyre. Plato, in a passage where he distinguishes *αὔλησις*, *κιθάρισις*, *κιθαρῳδία*, and *ῥαψῳδία*, classes Homer's Phemius as a rhapsode (*Ion* 533 b), although he used the lyre. Whatever the reason, it cannot have been very strong, for Heraclides includes Phemius, with Demodocus and Thamyris, in a list of early citharodes beginning with Amphion and Linus. The *λέξις* of their poems, he says, was not *λελυμένη* and *μέτρον οὐκ ἔχουσα*—meaning not in the free, astrophic style of people like Timotheus[1]—but was like that of Stesichorus and the *ἀρχαῖοι μελοποιοί* who composed verse and clothed it with melody. For Terpander too, when he composed citharodic nomes, used melody as a clothing for verses, both his own and Homer's.

Presently (section 4, no longer given on Heraclides' authority) we hear that Terpander composed *προοίμια κιθαρῳδικὰ ἐν ἔπεσιν*, and later (6) that the ancient citharodes *τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὡς βούλονται ἀφοσιωσάμενοι ἐξέβαινον εὐθὺς ἐπί τε τὴν Ὁμήρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποίησιν· δῆλον δὲ τοῦτό ἐστι διὰ τῶν Τερπάνδρου προοιμίων*. We possess a number of rhapsodes' *προοίμια*, collectively ascribed to Homer, and from the formulae of transition with which they end we might say of the rhapsodes exactly what ps.-Plut. says of the citharodes. There existed, evidently, a corresponding set of citharodic prooimia addressed to the gods, closing with formulae of transition suitable for following excerpts from the epics, and collectively ascribed to Terpander.[2] The opening of one of them has come down to us:

ἀμφί μοι αὖτε ἄναχθ' ἑκαταβόλον ἀειδέτω φρήν.[3]

The verses which were taken as proof that Terpander increased the lyre's strings from four to seven,

σοὶ δ' ἡμεῖς τετράγηρυν ἀποστέρξαντες ἀοιδὴν
ἑπτατόνῳ φόρμιγγι νέους κελαδήσομεν ὕμνους

(*Mel.* p. 363), also probably come from a prooimion. They are usually regarded as a forgery designed to secure Terpander's authentication of the technical innovation ascribed to him by some.[4] There is an alternative possibility: that the lines come from the transition at the end of the prooimion, being parallel to e.g. *Hymn. Aphr.* 292 f.,

χαῖρε θεὰ Κύπροιο ἐυκτιμένης μεδέουσα·
σέο δ' ἐγὼ ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον.

If so, they may express, not a new phase in the history of music, but the transition from a piece played on four notes to one that called for seven. There was

[1] See Proclus quoted below, p. 308, and Hephaestion p. 64. 24 Consbr.

[2] Wilamowitz, *Textgesch.* 7; *Timotheos*, 92.

[3] *Mel.* 697. (The sources give *αὖτις* or *αὖ τὸν*, but *αὖτε* must be right, cf. Stes. 193. 9 *δεῦρ' αὖτε θεὰ φιλόμολπε*, and the Aristophanic prelude on which the scholiast quotes the 'Terpander', *Nub.* 595 *ἀμφί μοι αὖτε Φοῖβ' ἄναξ κτλ.*, which does not construe and can only be explained as a quotation of a stereotyped formula.) The fifth century is suggested by the metre (cf. E. Fraenkel, *Kl. Beitr.* i. 215 n. 1) and by the function attributed to *φρήν* (cf. Sim. 519 fr. 35b. 10, Pind. *P.* 6. 36, *pae.* 4. 50, Aesch. *Th.* 966, *Mel. adesp.* 955).

[4] Timotheus, *Pers.* 237, however, credits him with a ten-stringed lyre.

a nome known as the τετραοίδιος νόμος (ps.-Plut. 4, *Suda*), and there seems a possibility that it was used in prooimia, in order to establish the harmonic skeleton of the following, more elaborate exercise.[1] Since the prooimia collectively were ascribed to Terpander, and hardly anything else was, it is easy to see an origin for the belief that musicians down to his time had used only a four-stringed instrument.

The two lines just discussed are hexameters, and ps.-Plutarch's ἐν ἔπεσιν implies that most of the collection was in hexameters.[2] The citharodes, like the rhapsodes, came to concentrate on performance instead of poesy, and to use a fixed text of someone else's, especially Homer; becoming accustomed to sing hexameters, they developed the habit of composing their prooimia in hexameters. The verse on Duris' well-known cup, shown written in a book being used in a tutorial, *ΜΟΙΣΑ ΜΟΙ ΑΦΙ* (ἀμφὶ) *ΣΚΑΜΑΝΔΡΟΝ ΕΥΡΩΝ* (εὑρροον) *ΑΡΧΟΜΑΙ ΑΕΙΝΔΕΝ* (ἀείδειν) (*Mel.* 938 (e)), is ungrammatical and cannot be a real quotation; but it was meant to represent something a boy might learn to sing to the lyre. (The boy in the picture is not holding a lyre, but one hangs on the wall, and lyre-playing is being taught adjacently.) It is a hexameter in the epic style with Aeolic (literary Doric) *Moῖσα*.[3]

So when we hear that Terpander composed hexameter prooimia, and set Homer to music, that is simply a projection back to the πρῶτος εὑρετής of the practices of citharodes of the classical period. It is part of the same construction that not only his prooimia but his nomes are said to have been hexametric.

ps.-Plut. 4

πεποίηται δὲ τῷ Τερπάνδρῳ καὶ προοίμια κιθαρῳδικὰ ἐν ἔπεσιν. ὅτι δ' οἱ κιθαρῳδικοὶ νόμοι οἱ πάλαι ἐξ ἐπῶν συνίσταντο, Τιμόθεος ἐδήλωσεν· τοὺς γοῦν πρώτους νόμους ἐν ἔπεσι διαμιγνύων διθυραμβικὴν λέξιν ᾔδεν, ὅπως μὴ εὐθὺς φανῇ παρανομῶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν μουσικήν.

Proclus *ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* 320^{b}5

δοκεῖ δὲ Τέρπανδρος μὲν πρῶτος τελειῶσαι τὸν νόμον ἡρῴῳ μέτρῳ χρησάμενος. ἔπειτα Ἀρίων . . . Φρῦνις δὲ ὁ Μυτιληναῖος ἐκαινοτόμησεν αὐτόν· τό τε γὰρ ἑξάμετρον τῷ λελυμένῳ συνῆψε, καὶ χορδαῖς τῶν ἑπτὰ πλείοσιν ἐχρήσατο. Τιμόθεος δὲ ὕστερον εἰς τὴν νῦν αὐτὸν ἤγαγε τάξιν.

Of course there is no proof that Terpander's nomes were not hexametric, but it is more likely that the hexametric nomes are to be assigned to the singers of Homer, and that Terpander, clearly an eminent figure in Spartan music of the early seventh century, made his name by something more creative. He will have sung to the lyre heroic narratives[4] of his own composition, in metres of a mainly dactylic cast but not in stichic hexameters. Even in the fifth century hexameters were not invariable, as we see from ἀμφί μοι αὖτε ἄναχθ' ἑκαταβόλον

[1] A similar function is fulfilled by the *ālāpa* which precedes the performance of a *rāga* in classical Indian music. Cf. A. Bake in the *New Oxford History of Music*, i. 212 f.

[2] A hymn to various gods, in hexameters followed by a verse D — D — e — (Stob. 1. 1. 31 a+b) is regarded as a late citharodic prooimion by Wilamowitz, *Timotheos* 91 n. 2.

[3] Clement quotes a fragment of the *Little Iliad* in Aeolic or Doric form (12 Allen): could his source have used a citharode's text? One Zopyrus of Magnesia, and Dicaearchus, said that the *Iliad* ought to be read in Aeolic (*Vita Romana* p. 32. 25 Wil.): because μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά showed that Homer sang? Elegiacs too were probably coloured Doric when sung, cf. Eur. *Andr.* 103–16.

[4] Plut. *apophth. Lac.* 238 c τὸν Τέρπανδρον . . . ἄριστον ὄντα τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν κιθαρῳδῶν καὶ τῶν ἡρωικῶν πράξεων ἐπαινέτην prima facie refers to Terpander's own compositions. Cf. the notice of Xenocritus' poems on p. 306 above.

ἀειδέτω φρήν, and from Ar. *Ran.* 1281 ff., where Aeschylean songs are exposed as made from citharodic nomes:

> ὅπως Ἀχαιῶν δίθρονον κράτος Ἑλλάδος ἦβας —
> τοφλαττοθραττοφλαττοθρατ —
> Σφίγγα δυσαμεριᾶν πρύτανιν κύνα πέμπει —

and the rest.

Heraclides knew of this older, creative citharody in which the performer composed his own words, and he ascribed it to Terpander (as well as the melodizing of Homer) and to Terpander's forerunners from Amphion on. His choice of Stesichorus and the ἀρχαῖοι μελοποιοί as an illustration is interesting, but does not prove that he thought of Stesichorus as a soloist. Nor is it necessarily significant that Chamaileon in a work on Stesichorus recorded that people used to set to music Homer, Hesiod, Archilochus, Mimnermus, and Phocylides.[1] But one reason for bringing in Stesichorus in discussing citharodes might be that he was thought to be, not indeed a 'citharode' (for a 'citharode' sang other people's verse, even in Terpander's time), but something analogous, a singing poet. Such an opinion can be supported by a fragment of the poet himself in which composer and singer are identified (*Mel.* 212):

> τοιάδε χρὴ Χαρίτων δαμώματα καλλικόμων
> ὑμνεῖν Φρύγιον μέλος ἐξευρόντας ἁβρῶς
> ἦρος ἐπερχομένου.

Modern writers assume almost universally that since Stesichorus composed in triads, he wrote for a chorus. The assumption is groundless (see below, p. 313), and our new knowledge of the length of his poems makes it all the more troublesome. One might imagine him accompanying a group of dancers, as Demodocus does in one of his three songs (*Od.* 8. 258, cf. *Il.* 18. 590 ff. with the full text of 604–5). Wilamowitz thought of this too (p. 238), remarking that it would be well described by what the *Suda* says, ἐκλήθη δὲ Στησίχορος ὅτι πρῶτος κιθαρῳδίᾳ χορὸν ἔστησεν. But the chorus there is brought in to explain the poet's name; the significant thing is that when it is brought in, it is combined with citharody.[2]

The nomes

There is a further piece of evidence that takes us back to the late fifth century. Ps.-Plut. 7, discussing the ἁρμάτειος νόμος, says it was invented by the piper Olympus. ὅτι δ' ἐστὶν Ὀλύμπου ὁ ἁρμάτειος νόμος ἐκ τῆς Γλαύκου συγγραφῆς τῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν (fr. 2 Lanata, *Poetica Pre-Platonica* 272) μάθοι ἄν τις, καὶ ἔτι γνοίη ὅτι Στησίχορος ὁ Ἰμεραῖος οὔτ' Ὀρφέα οὔτε Τέρπανδρον οὔτ' Ἀρχίλοχον οὔτε Θαλήταν ἐμιμήσατο ἀλλ' Ὄλυμπον, χρησάμενος τῷ ἁρματείῳ νόμῳ καὶ τῷ κατὰ δάκτυλον εἴδει. Glaucus elsewhere linked Orpheus, Terpander, Archilochus, and Thaletas in one line of succession, which was continued by Xenocritus (ps.-Plut. 4+10 = fr. 1+3 Lanata). Next in line one might expect Stesichorus, but Glaucus picks on a feature of Stesichorus' music in order to contradict precisely this notion—which must therefore have been the more obvious one.

The νόμοι, 'routines', 'conventions'—one might say 'canons' if that had not

[1] Ath. 620 c. Cf. Wil. *SS* 239 n. 3.

[2] A 'Stesichorus the citharode' appears with an 'Aeschylus the aulete' in *Suda* s.v. ἐπιτήδευμα ('fort. Aelian.' Adler): ours? Cf. Vürtheim, *Stesichoros' Fragmente und Biographie*, 109 n. 1.

acquired another sense in music—seem in the early period to have been a set of traditional patterns in which music was cast. They had individual names, and the citharodic and citharistic nomes differed from the aulodic and auletic. Each had particular rhythmic and modal implications which gave it an individual character.[1] The statement in Proclus *ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* 320^{b}18 that the nome differed from the dithyramb by being in the Lydian mode of the citharodes (the dithyramb being in Phrygian or Hypophrygian) must refer to ἡ νῦν τάξις for which Timotheus was responsible; the same applies to the distinction he has just made in rhythm and diction. This opposition between nome and dithyramb, as between genres on the same logical footing, is inapplicable to the early nomes. The names known to us,[2] and other evidence, make it clear that they were schemes used for the singing of all kings of verse, for epic, elegy,[3] iambus,[4] epinicians,[5] dithyrambs;[6] and for the poetry of Stesichorus.

Stesichorus, according to Glaucus, used the ἁρμάτειος νόμος. Glaucus had evidently heard performances which he believed to be faithful renderings of Stesichorus' original music, and, coming as he did from Rhegium, he may have been in a good position to hear them. He identified the nome as one attributed to Olympus, i.e. as an auletic one. There is a story that the ἁρμάτειος νόμος was played on the *aulos* to Alexander, who οὕτω παρεξέστη καὶ διεφλέγη τὸν θυμὸν ὑπὸ τῶν μελῶν ὥστε τοῖς ὅπλοις ᾄξας ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας ἐγγὺς παρακειμένοις (Plut. *Alex. fort. aut virt.* 335 a; here too the nome has heroic qualities). The Phrygian's lament on the fall of Troy in Eur. *Or.* 1369 ff., no doubt an aulody, is a ἁρμάτειον ἁρμάτειον μέλος (1384). The scholia on the line, among a number of arbitrary explanations of the term, give two details that are not derived from etymological speculation but show genuine musicological learning: it was the same as the νόμος Ἀθηνᾶς, and it was high-pitched (i. 220. 1, 3, 5, 25 Schw., cf. *Et. magn.* 145. 34 ff.). The νόμος Ἀθηνᾶς is mentioned as a nome of Olympus, or as an auletic nome, by ps.-Plutarch 33 (who says it was in the Phrygian mode, and gives some other technical details) and by Pollux 4. 77. All this is consistent with Stesichorus' own reference to his *Oresteia* as a Φρύγιον μέλος (*Mel.* 212. 2). We need not, however, conclude that he sang to the *aulos*, for there was also a citharistic νόμος Ἀθηνᾶς (Pollux 4. 66). It was not necessarily identical with the auletic, but it may have been similar enough for

[1] *Suda* s.v. νόμος. Alcman applies the term to the characteristic songs of different birds, *Mel.* 40.

[2] Mostly from ps.-Plut. 4, 7, 29, 33, Pollux 4. 65–83, Hesychius, and the *Suda*.

[3] ἔλεγοι is an aulodic nome, ps.-Plut. 4.

[4] Apollod. *ap.* Hesych. s.v. παριαμβίδες. ἴαμβοι, (ἰαμβίδες,) παριαμβίδες, (-οι), are citharistic nomes designed for *aulos* accompaniment, Epicharmus fr. 109, Pollux 4. 65, 83, Phot. s.v. παρίαμβοι. It should be noted that for Epicharmus ἴαμβοι is a genre that may include anapaests, cf. fr. 88, with Kaibel, *C.G.F.*, p. 87.

[5] Pind. *O.* 1. 102.

[6] The aulodic σχοινίων νόμος (ps.-Plut. 4) is apparently alluded to at the beginning of Pindar's second dithyramb:

πρὶν μὲν ἔρπε σχοινοτένειά τ' ἀοιδὰ διθυράμβων
καὶ τὸ σὰν κίβδηλον ἀνθρώποισιν ἀπὸ στομάτων.

The ancients found here a reference to Lasus' asigmatic ode; and there is a connection. The explanation of Lasus' fastidiousness is given by Aristoxenus (fr. 87 W.) *ap.* Ath. 467 a: the *s*-sound was σκληρόστομον and ἀνεπιτήδειον αὐλῷ, i.e. it was not conducive to distinct hearing of the words against the pipe, because the pipe was too like it. Pindar is saying that in the traditional dithyramb in the aulodic σχοινίων νόμος, the *s* did not come out true from men's mouths, it did not live up to its promise, because of the pipe accompaniment. His new dithyramb has quite a different sound, justified by a vision of a Dionysiac rite among the gods, with drums, κρόταλα, and wild cries.

Glaucus, wishing to prove a point, to identify it with Olympus' ἁρμάτειος and draw a novel inference about Stesichorus' affinities. If he had had reason to think that the poems were aulodies, he would surely have appealed directly to this fact in order to argue the connection with Olympus, instead of to the particularity of the nome—though it would hardly have been left to him to make the connection, and the view which he contradicts (that Stesichorus was a follower of Orpheus, Terpander, and Archilochus) would never have been current.

Stesichorus, then, was a citharode. Glaucus seems to say that the ἁρμάτειος νόμος was his only or at least his regular nome, and as his works, so far as we can tell, were generally alike in nature, purpose, and rhythm,[1] we have no reason to expect that a variety of nomes were used. Glaucus links the ἁρμάτειος νόμος with τὸ κατὰ δάκτυλον εἶδος, and the name is perhaps descriptive of the kind of motion that was suggested by dactylo-dactylo-epitrite verse of the Stesichorean type: bucketing along, not quite evenly, bumping to a halt at the end of a long run. The picture cannot be dissociated from the idea of the poet's chariot of song (Bacch. 5. 176, Pind. *O.* 6. 22 ff., both dactylo-epitrite; cf. Parm. 1, Emp. 3. 5), to which πεζός expresses the antithesis (Soph. fr. 16 with Pearson). Rhythmical terms like τροχαῖος, χωλός, and σκάζων also characterize types of verse in terms of locomotion.

Rhythm and melody

In analysing Stesichorus' metres[2] I observed that the substitution of – for ⏑⏑ in dactylic sequences is restricted. An important part is played by cola d^1 (–⏑⏑–), D (–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–), D^2 (–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–), in which such substitution is largely avoided; and within the period, accumulation of more than three long syllables does not occur. The avoidance of accumulated longs was not, I believe, merely the consequence of an aversion to 'heaviness', but has a musical significance. In the music of Stesichorus' time, each syllable was sung on a single note. The practice of dividing long syllables between more than one note became common among the *avant-garde* of the later fifth century.[3] Simonides may have done it occasionally;[4] but it must have been alien to the traditional music that was regarded as the antithesis of the new music, and of which Stesichorus was considered a sterling representative. So where ⏑⏑ alternates with – in a Stesichorean melody, we may infer that the two short syllables were sung on the same note. Conversely, where ⏑⏑ does not admit the alternative –, a sufficient reason would be that those two short syllables were sung on different notes. If Stesichorus had designed his music in such a way as to allow himself free substitution of – for ⏑⏑ in any position, a considerable

[1] There is a possibility of extensive agreement in rhythms, and so perhaps in melody, between the strophe of the *Iliu Persis* and that of the poem (*Helen*?) represented in *P. Oxy.* 2735 fr. 1: *Z.P.E.* iv (1969), 145. But see R. Führer, ib. v (1970), 15 f., for other reconstructions.

[2] *Z.P.E.* l.c. Führer in the article just cited brings valuable modifications to the metrical scheme of the *Iliu Persis*. See further *Z.P.E.* vii (1971), 262.

[3] Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 1348; I. Henderson in the *New Oxford History of Music*, i. 368 f., 393 f.

[4] *Mel.* 543. 9 κνοώσσεις (if that is the right reading, and if it is not a genuine uncontracted form) and 587 πύυρ show a prosodic division of a long syllable which *may* have gone with a melodic division, but was not necessary for it (by later standards) and does not entail it. It would not be surprising if Simonides occasionally did something that later became standard; Mozart has the occasional crashing dissonance.

limitation would have been placed on melodic freedom and variety. The implications of this, in relation to the observed tendencies in the distribution of 'monosyllabic biceps', are:

1. At the beginning of the period it was not Stesichorus' practice to set initial ⏑ ⏑ on different notes; the melodic line began its movement at a later point.
2. Within the period a certain mobility was maintained. The music tended to settle down into melodic phrases varying in length from d^1 to D^2, the intermediate length D being particularly common.

The avoidance of monosyllabic biceps at period-end, however, need not mean that the last ⏑ ⏑ was habitually set on a falling or rising cadence. Consider the epic hexameter, which is akin to the kind of verse used by Stesichorus, its basic structure being D ⏑⏑ D –. It developed as a recitation metre; classical citharodes sang it, but its normal melody was that of speech.[1] Accordingly it admits monosyllabic biceps in every position and in accumulation; even wholly spondaic lines occur. But there remains one position where it admits it relatively rarely: the last. In only about one verse in twenty is the fifth foot a spondee. In the elegiac pentameter (= D|D), spondees in the second colon are avoided entirely, at least at the literary level. These restrictions are analogous to what we find in Stesichorus' dactyls, and clearly call for a non-musical explanation. It may have been felt that a clausula only sounded satisfactory, and like a clausula, when it stood out as a modification of the basic rhythm, which therefore needed to be asserted immediately before it.

Triadic structure

The *Suda*, in interpreting the saying *οὐδὲ (τὰ) τρία Στησιχόρου γινώσκεις*, says that all Stesichorus' poetry was triadic (*Mel.* 275b), and the *Geryoneis*, *Iliu Persis*, and (?) *Helen* have turned out to conform to the rule. The performer sang a sequence of melodic periods, with lyre continuo.[2] A group of such periods made up a melodic whole, which, when it was complete, was repeated; and then a different melody (with similar rhythms) followed, giving the feeling of rounding-off in a still larger unit. Whether Stesichorus was the first to formalize the principle, we cannot say. But the basic architectural formula AAB can be found in more than one earlier lyric poet, and may be regarded as a traditional pattern in Greek melodic structure.[3]

Often the B is an expanded version of the A. In Alcman fr. 1 the repeated sequence trochaic dimeter, ⏑ 3 *da* $\overset{\smile}{\wedge\wedge}\,\overset{-}{-}$ is expanded into a sequence of ten trochaic metra followed by a longer series of dactyls and the same clausula (8 *da* $\overset{\smile}{\wedge\wedge}\,\overset{-}{-}$ with 8 *da* $\wedge\wedge$ as a variant). In the Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas, B is almost the sum of two A's:

Sapphic A – ⏑ – × – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ×
– ⏑ – × – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – A
B – ⏑ – × – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – × – ⏑ ⏑ – –

[1] Hence the preservation of ancient accentuations down to Alexandrian times. Cf. Wackernagel, *Kl. Schr.* 1094 ff.

[2] We gather from Aristophanes (cf. p. 309) that all Aeschylus needs to turn his songs into citharodic nomes is a bit of *tophlatto-thrat* between the periods.

[3] See D. Korzeniewski, *Gr. Metrik*, 12 and 129 f.

Alcaic A	× – ∪ – ×	– ∪ ∪ –	∪ –
A	× – ∪ – ×	– ∪ ∪ –	∪ –
B	× – ∪ – × – ∪ – ×	– ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ –	∪ – –[1]

These internal relationships give the whole melodic structure an effective shape. But their effect is based on the contrast of trochaic and dactylic rhythm, and the limited scale of the whole. In the larger structures and simpler rhythms of Stesichorus they would not have been so effective, and analysis shows that they are not there. When A was mainly a river of dactyls, expansion was not the kind of consummation wanted. The epode need be no longer than the strophe, just different. We observe some rhythmic differences: in the *Geryoneis*, the periods all begin ∪ ∪ – in the strophe, but two out of three in the epode begin – ∪ ∪; in the *Iliu Persis* the clausula ∪ ∪ – – does not occur in the strophe, but five times in the epode (which is altogether characterized by short periods). The nature of the melodic variation is beyond ken.

It is sometimes supposed that triadic structure has an essential connection with dancing, and was somehow imposed on the poet by the evolutions of the dance. In fact it can be understood as a purely musical principle of composition, as I hope the above remarks will have made clear. If a chorus was dancing to triadically composed music, one would suppose that it arranged its doings accordingly. But the fact that Stesichorus' poetry is triadic is no evidence that it was choral.

Historical sketch

Here is how I see the development of narrative singing in so far as it concerns Stesichorus. In early times, heroic poetry might be intoned, with or without musical accompaniment and space-filling; or it might be sung in the true sense. In the first case, hexameters were used, at least in Ionia; in the second case, more varied dactylic measures. The Homeric Demodocus and Phemius may be portraits of either kind of artist. Demodocus used a prooimion to a god before his tale of the wooden horse (*Od.* 8. 499); so did the classical citharode, and so did the rhapsode. It was possible for Plato to put Phemius in the one category and for Heraclides to put him in the other.

But the melic style may not have flourished in Ionia. Terpander is the great name, and Doric dialect colouring remains the rule. From the mainland—from Sparta, perhaps, or Locris—the art came to the west. There, in the late seventh or early sixth century, an important development took place which affected the appearance of history. People took to writing such compositions down (if not up). Consequently, whereas Terpander was known only for the collection of citharodes' prooimia and perhaps a few other short pieces, whole melic narratives of Italian poets were preserved: of Xanthus (if that is where he lived), Xenocritus, Stesichorus, Ibycus. Antiquity did not generally treat these poets as 'citharodes', because that term had come to mean something else, a performer who sang a 'Terpandrean' prooimion followed by a piece of Homer or another of the standard poets. But investigators such as Heraclides and Chamaileon may have known that there was a relationship.

Stesichorus sang for potentates (*P. Oxy.* 2735 fr. 1) and for the people

[1] Cf. also Alc. 130, Sapph. 94.

(cf. *Mel.* 212 δαμώματα). He will have begun his performance with a prooimion to a god. Those who ascribed to him the hymn beginning

Παλλάδα περσέπολιν δεινὰν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον

(*Mel.* 735) may have been mistaken, but they will have known similar openings by him. When Aristides, who read Stesichorus, says μέτειμι δ' ἐφ' ἕτερον προοίμιον κατὰ Στησίχορον (*Mel.* 241), he may be inaccurately echoing a transition from a Stesichorean prooimion, something on the lines of χαῖρ' ἄναξ· τεοῦ δὲ προοιμίου ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον.

After the prooimion, the main song. If what Stesichorus sang matched in length what he wrote out, a work such as the *Geryoneis* would have taken him well over an hour to perform; no doubt he rested at intervals, like Demodocus (*Od.* 8. 87 ff.), but even so he must have had a good voice, with a naturally high register, to sustain the nome of Athena for such a time.

His productivity, his talent, and his diligence in giving his compositions written circulation made him a classic in Simonides' lifetime. But the day of the creative citharode, like that of the creative rhapsode,[1] was nearly done. Stesichorus had not come down to setting Homer to music, but he was leaning heavily on existing epics. The process could not be continued indefinitely. There was little scope for further work on the traditional lines. Much of the material had been used up (Choerilus' complaint in the field of hexameter epic); the artistic revolution pushed the old nomes into the background, and though they could still be heard towards the end of the fourth century, later writers knew them only from books. The fashion was for a more flexible, expressive music that could follow the sense of the words and highlight particular details. Yet the change was not so sudden as to destroy the sense of continuity. The new compositions were still called nomes and dithyrambs; Timotheus represented himself as the heir of Terpander; and the poet of an aulodic *Cyclops* chose the title Stesichorus of Himera the Second.

University College, Oxford M. L. WEST

[1] People often assume that ῥαψῳδός *meant* a reciter of fixed texts as opposed to the earlier, creative poet. That is certainly what rhapsodes *were* in Plato's time and earlier, and ῥαψῳδέω came to mean 'recite'; but 'stitcher of song' implies the formulaic technique of creative poets. Another thing that is often forgotten is that epic composition in the traditional style flourished unabated well into the fifth century. The real change to 'pen-poet technique' did not come when epic poets first took up pens; it came after Panyasis, with Choerilus and Antimachus.