

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Ancient models for the new musicians

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Ercoles Marco (2021). Ancient models for the new musicians. GREEK AND ROMAN MUSICAL STUDIES, 9(2), 258-270 [10.1163/22129758-bja10024].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/832213> since: 2021-09-14

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1163/22129758-bja10024>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Ercoles, M. (2021). Ancient Models for the New Musicians, Greek and Roman Musical Studies, 9(2), 258-270.

The final published version is available online at:

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/22129758-bja10024>

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Ancient Models for the New Musicians

MARCO ERCOLES

Alma Mater Studiorum — Università di Bologna
marco.ercoles@unibo.it

Abstract

On the symbolic role assumed by mythical musicians (esp. Marsyas, Olympus, Orpheus, Thamyras) in the debate on music in the second half of the 5th century BC, with particular attention to them in the fragments of New Musicians (Melanipp. *PMG* 758 and 766, Tim. *PMG* 791, 221-224, Telest. *PMG* 805 and 806). For Timotheus and the other New Musicians, the appeals to these ancient 'colleagues' were a way to construct distant and authoritative models for their way of making music by projecting back onto them key-features of their style, namely *poikilia*, inventiveness and virtuosity.

Keywords

New Music -- musical myths -- Linus -- Olympus -- Orpheus -- Marsyas -- Thamyras --
Melanippides of Melos -- Telestes of Selinous -- Timotheus of Miletus

As is well known, in the second half of the 5th century BC Athens experiences a marked change in musical taste: the compositions which meet the favour of the larger audience in theatres are those characterized by a complex and virtuoso style. At the basis of this style — the so-called New Music — lies a new conception of *mousike*, which has been explored in recent years by E. Csapo¹. Here I am going to focus on a particular aspect of this musical ideology, namely the relationship with musical tradition.

It is hardly a mere chance that in the second half of the 5th century musical historiography takes the first steps²: the discontinuity with the past claimed by the New Musicians (cf. Tim. *PMG* 796) and condemned by their critics (cf. *e.g.* Ar. *Nu.* 961-978, Pherecr. fr. 155 K.-A., Plat. *Leg.* 700a-701b, Heracl. Pont. fr. 157 Wehrli) entails the need to define musical tradition. This is done by both the ones and the others, from different perspectives and, obviously, with different results. Critics of the New Music contrast the ‘perverted’ new songs of contemporary composers with the good music of the past, simple, noble and ethically oriented. The bulwark of this tradition is recognized by them in (an idealized image of) Sparta, Crete, and sometimes Egypt³, but also in earlier Athens, namely in the city of those Athenians who fought the Persian Wars⁴. On the other side, the New Musicians are “also driven to invent a tradition of their own, in which ritual Dionysiac music is particularly prominent, as are appeals to founding figures like Orpheus, Olympos, or the Korybants”⁵, and also Linus, Marsyas and Thamyras.

Three of these mythical musicians became a favourite iconographic subject in vase-paintings in the last third of the 5th century, as has been shown by A. Heinemann (2013): they

¹ See esp. Csapo 2004 and 2011. On New Music see also D’Angour 2006 and, more recently, the articles from the conference *The Revolution of the New Music* (Oxford, Jesus College, 28-30 July 2017) published in this journal (*GRMS* 6.2 and 7.1).

² Let us think of Glaucus of Rhegium and Hellanicus of Lesbos; cf. Franklin 2010; Barker 2014.

³ Cf. *e.g.* Plat. *Leg.* 660b; for other passages and discussion see Gostoli 1988 and Csapo 2004, 241–4.

⁴ Cf. *e.g.* Ar. *Nu.* 961-978 and Plat. *Leg.* 700a-701b.

⁵ Csapo 2011, 129.

are Marsyas, Orpheus and Thamyris⁶. These figures are represented by painters even before then, but by that time their iconography undergoes an interesting development, which seems to reflect the changes in contemporary musical culture. Let us follow this trend.

From the sixties of the century, the Thracian citharodes Orpheus and Thamyris appear with some frequency on Greek vases⁷; on the contrary, the Phrygian aulete Marsyas is not attested in vase-paintings before the last third of the century, but around the middle of the century is the subject of the famous sculptural group by Miron dedicated on the Athenian Akropolis and representing the satyr with Athena⁸. Shortly before, Marsyas appears, together with Orpheus, Thamyris and Olympus, in the famous Polygnotus' painting of the *Nekya*, realized around 470/460 BC for the Lesche of the Knidians in Delphi. According to Pausanias' description (10.30.6-9) of this lost piece of art,

ἀποβλέψαντι δὲ αὐθις ἐς τὰ κάτω τῆς γραφῆς, ἔστιν ἐφεξῆς μετὰ τὸν Πάτροκλον οἷα ἐπὶ λόφου τινὸς Ὀρφεὺς καθεζόμενος, ἐφάπτεται δὲ καὶ τῇ ἀριστερᾷ κιθάρας, τῇ δὲ ἐτέρᾳ χειρὶ ἰτέας ψαύει· κλώνες εἰσιν ὧν ψαύει, προσανακέκλιται δὲ τῷ δένδρῳ. τὸ δὲ ἄλλος ἔοικεν εἶναι τῆς Περσεφόνης, ἔνθα αἵγειροι καὶ ἰτέαι δόξη τῇ Ὀμήρου πεφύκασιν· Ἑλληνικὸν δὲ τὸ σχῆμά ἐστι τῷ Ὀρφεϊ, καὶ οὔτε ἡ ἐσθῆς οὔτε ἐπίθημά ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ Θράκιον [...]. Θαμύριδι δὲ ἐγγὺς καθεζομένῳ τοῦ Πελίου διεφθαρμένοι αἱ ὄψεις καὶ ταπεινὸν ἐς ἅπαν σχῆμά ἐστι καὶ ἡ κόμη πολλὴ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, πολλὴ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν τοῖς γενείοις· λύρα δὲ ἔρριπται πρὸς

⁶ As far as Linus and Olympus are concerned, there is no trace of a similar interest on behalf of Attic vase-painters in the last third of the 5th century, with the exception of one depiction of Olympus on a Panathenaic amphora (on which see below). On Linus in Greek art, see Boardman 1992; on Olympus, see Weis 1994, esp. 43f. and van Keer 2008, 45-50.

⁷ Orpheus: Garezou 1994, 99-101; Bundrick 2005, 121-126. Thamyris: Nercessian 1994; Bundrick 2005, 126-131; Sarti 2010/2011. On these mythical figures see Portulas 2000, esp. 295-298 (Thamyris); Bernabé 2002; Iannucci 2009; Ercoles 2009 (Orpheus), all with further bibliography.

⁸ Cf. Weis 1992, 373 (nos. 43-46), 376. See also Boardman 1956, 18-20; Sarti 1992, esp. 101-103; Castaldo 2000, 34-37; Bundrick 2005, 131-139; Heinemann 2013, 294-300.

1 τοῖς ποσὶ, κατεαγότες αὐτῆς οἱ πῆχεις καὶ αἱ χορδαὶ κατερρωγυῖαι. ὑπὲρ τούτου
2 ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πέτρας καθεζόμενος Μαρσύας, καὶ Ὀλυμπος παρ' αὐτὸν παιδὸς ἐστὶν
3
4
5 ὠραίου καὶ αὐλεῖν διδασκομένου σχῆμα ἔχων.
6
7
8
9

10 Turning our gaze again to the lower part of the picture we see, next after Patroclus,
11 Orpheus sitting on what seems to be a sort of hill; he grasps with his left hand a
12 kithara, and with his right he touches a willow. It is the branches that he touches,
13
14
15 and he is leaning against the tree. The grove seems to be that of Persephone, where
16
17
18 grow, as Homer thought, black poplars and willows. The appearance of Orpheus is
19
20
21 Greek, and neither his garb nor his head-gear is Thracian [...]. Thamyras is sitting
22
23
24 near Pelias. He has lost the sight of his eyes; his attitude is one of utter dejection;
25
26
27 his hair and beard are long; at his feet lies thrown a lyre with its horns and strings
28
29
30 broken. Above him is Marsyas, sitting on a rock, and by his side is Olympus, with
31
32
33 the appearance of a boy in the bloom of youth learning to play the aulos. (Transl.
34
35 by W.H. Jones, with few adjustments)
36
37
38
39

40 The close association of Marsyas, Orpheus and Thamyras in this painting is probably due
41
42 to their common destiny of violent death, which could be part of Greek mythological tradition
43
44 already in the first half of the 5th century⁹. As for Olympus, nothing is known about the
45
46
47 circumstances of his death; his closeness to Marsyas in the depiction and the way he is
48
49
50 represented make it clear that his presence is justified by the mythical tradition according to
51
52 which he was disciple or *eromenos* of Marsyas¹⁰.
53
54
55
56

57 ⁹ Cf. Stansbury-O'Donnell 1990, 225f. and Beschi 1991, 40.

58 ¹⁰ For literary sources on Olympus see Campbell 1988, 272-285 and Gentili-Prato 2002, 1-9 (for Olympus as
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
disciple or *eromenos* of Marsyas see Plat. *Symp.* 215c [test. 2 Gent.-Pr.] and *Min.* 318b [test. 13 Campb.]),
with Barker 2011; see also Weis 1994, 43f. and van Keer 2008.

1 The theme of the unfortunate destiny of Thamyras is depicted also on a red-figure hydria
2 from ca. 430 BC (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, G 291), sharing many iconographic traits with
3 Polygnotos' painting: the musician appears seated on a rock after the contest with the Muses,
4 blind, caught while throwing away his instrument¹¹. The contest itself is the subject of other
5 four vase-paintings realized between the sixties and the thirties of the 5th century BC:
6 Thamyras, generally seated, plays his instrument among the Muses. It is likely that these
7 scenes are reminiscent of Sophocles' *Thamyras*, probably staged in the sixties of the 5th
8 century. As it seems from the scanty remains, the tragedy was centred on the musical contest
9 and the defeat of the Thracian citharode as a consequence of his 'hybristic' competitive
10 ambition. This aspect was associated with Thamyras' ability as a performer and with the
11 power of his music, as we can infer from the following words of an unknown character of the
12 play (fr. 245 Radt²):
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 μουσομανεῖ δ' ἐλήφθην
33

34 ἀνάγκᾳ, ποτὶ δ' εἶραν
35

36 ἔρχομαι ἔκ τε λύρας
37

38 ἔκ τε νόμων, οὓς Θαμύρας
39

40 περίλλα μουσοποιεῖ
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 And I was seized by an urge to be mad for music, and went to the place of
48 assembly, an urge inspired by the lyre and by the *nomoi* [*i.e.* 'melodic conventions'
49 or traditional melodic lines] with which Thamyras makes music supremely.
50
51
52
53
54
55 (Transl. by H. Lloyd-Jones, with adjustments).
56
57
58
59
60

61 ¹¹ Cf. Bundrick 2005, 127; Sarti 2010/2011, 222.
62
63
64
65

1 The emphasis on the music ability is the main feature of the representations of Thamyris
2 on the vase-paintings from the last three decades of the 5th century, when the theme of the
3
4 unfortunate destiny after the defeat appears to have been neglected¹². A similar development
5
6 involves Orpheus' depictions: the murder of the citharode by the Thracian women is figured
7
8 by Athenian vase-painters especially from 490/480 to 430/420 BC, when another kind of
9
10 scene gets more prominence: Orpheus playing among the most savage and *amousoi* people,
11
12 the Thracians, who listen to his music completely captured by it¹³.
13
14
15

16
17 As far as Marsyas is concerned, his appearance on vase-paintings dates from the last
18
19 third of the 5th century, when the Kadmos and the Pothos Painters depict him as seated and
20
21 playing either the aulos or a stringed instrument¹⁴, while Apollo and other deities stand
22
23 nearby. The agonal element is not prominent in these scenes: "in various instances the
24
25 onlooking god is depicted without his own instrument, suggesting more of an audition than an
26
27 actual contest; only the tripod column figuring on a few vessels of the series may hint at an
28
29 agonistic setting. Explicit references to the satyr's eventual demise do not occur before the
30
31 turn of the century"¹⁵. Moreover, Marsyas is sometimes depicted while playing a stringed
32
33 instrument, what seems to point to the irrelevance of the kind of instrument played by the
34
35 satyr: the crucial point of these representations is not the opposition between lyre and aulos,
36
37 but the display of the performer's musical *technē*. Perhaps, it is possible to explain along these
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 ¹² A first example of this trend is the Attic red-figure krater from Spina (Ferrara, National Museum 3033 – *ca.*
47 420 BC), where Thamyris is represented as a standing, professional citharode playing a large concert
48 kithara (see Bundrick 2005, 130f.; Menichetti 2007; Sarti 2010/2011, 222-224, 227 no. B.3, 235 fig. 4). The
49 iconographic structure of this painting is quite complex, merging together traits of previous representations
50 of Thamyris and other characteristic of vase-paintings from the last third of the century (see Bundrick 2005,
51 130f.; Sarti 2010/2011, 223f.); in the latter, however, the musician is generally portrayed as seated.

52 ¹³ See Garezou 1994, 100. The theme of Orpheus enchanting Thracians with his cithara/lyre is documented
53 from the sixties of the 5th century, but it is in the last fourth of the century that it seems to oust the theme of
54 Orpheus' murder.

55 ¹⁴ Marsyas playing a lyre is a mythical variant generally thought to derive from Melanippides' *Marsyas*,
56 probably a dithyramb. The hypothesis was firstly advanced by Boardman (1956) and has been favourably
57 considered by many scholars. Though, it is worth noting that it rests on highly conjectural basis and that
58 both Melanippides and the vase-painters could depend on a common mythical tradition (for a fuller
59 discussion, see my forthcoming edition of Melanippides, comm. on fr. 2.).

60 ¹⁵ Heinemann 2013, 295.
61
62
63
64
65

lines also the only representation of Olympus in 5th-century Attic pottery, that has not been taken into account by Heinemann (2013)¹⁶. In the Panathenaic amphora preserved in Naples (Museo Nazionale, 81401 [H 3235]; circle of Meidias; 420-400 BC)¹⁷, the mythical aulete is portrayed as a young man, seated with a lyre in his hands, beside a bearded Marsyas holding a double aulos; around them are the Muses Thaleia, Kalliope and Urania, a satyr (ΤΥΡΒΑΣ), a nude youth and a goose (or a swan). According to Weis (1994, 43), “the lyre can be a love-gift, a symbol re-enforced by the presence of the bird and, perhaps, Urania at bottom left”. Indeed, it is plausible to see in this scene a reference to the tradition of Olympus as disciple or *eromenos* of Marsyas (see above n. 10). However, the association of Olympus with the lyre instead of the double aulos seems to suggest that the crucial point of the narrative is the musical skill itself of the performer, regardless of the musical instrument. The Panathenaic nature of the vase could account for the presence of the lyre and the aulos in the scene, since the Panathenaic contests involved both wind- and string-instruments.

Be that as it may, though the interpretation of the above scene involving Olympus is uncertain, the representations of Marsyas, Orpheus and Thamyras on Attic vases in the last three decades of the 5th century betray a general and consistent trend. The vase-painters do not appear to have been any more interested in their cruel destiny, but in their musical skills: they are depicted while performing in front of a public of gods (as it is the case with Thamyras and Marsyas, playing and singing in front of Apollo and the Muses) or Thracians (as it is the case with Orpheus), who are delighted and enchanted by their music¹⁸. As Heinemann pointed out, the tendencies observed in these representations “correspond to what is known from written sources about changes in the contemporary culture of *mousike*. These developments,

¹⁶ See, however, Heinemann 2016, 306 (only on Marsyas’s iconography).

¹⁷ *ARV*² 1316,1, with *Add.*² 362; cf. Weis 1994, 39 nr. 3, with further bibliography.

¹⁸ Cf. Schmidt 2001, 295. The theme of Orpheus enchanting Thracians with his cithara/lyre is documented from the sixties of the 5th century; the scenes with Thamyras and Marsyas playing in front of Apollo and the Muses come from the three last decades of the same century. For bibliographical references on such iconography see above nn. 20f.

namely a growing professionalization of musicians (especially pipers) and its flipside, a newly defined culture of competent spectatorship, may have their beginnings earlier in the century, but fully come to the fore in its second half as concomitants of the so-called New Music”¹⁹.

The testimony of vase-paintings presents us, so to speak, the point of view of the audience and testifies to the musical taste of contemporary Athens. The mythical musicians are quintessential virtuoso performers playing in front of their public, virtually including not only gods, Muses, or Thracians, but also Athenian symposiasts, since these scenes were generally painted on sympotic vessels: looking at them, the symposiasts were “turned into metaspectators of the musical feats by the undisputed masters of *mousike*”²⁰.

A different perspective is offered by the appeals to these mythical figures by the New Musicians. In the scanty remains of their poems, there are five references: Melanipp. *PMG* 758 (Marsyas), 766 (Linus), Tim. *PMG* 791,221-224 (Orpheus), Telest. *PMG* 805 (Marsyas), 806 (Olympus). Among these passages, the most instructive is the one from Timotheus’ *Persae*: in the *sphragis* of this citharodic *nomos*, the composer outlines a brief history of Greek citharody (vv. 221-236) from Orpheus to Timotheus himself, passing through Terpander.

πρῶτος ποικιλόμουσος²¹ Ὀρ-

φεὺς <χέλ>υν ἐτέκνωσεν

υἱὸς Καλλιόπα<ς ~ –

– σ > Πιερίᾱθεν·

¹⁹ Heinemann 2013, 299f.

²⁰ Heinemann 2013, 300.

²¹ This is the form transmitted by *P. Berol.* 9875 (MP³ 1537; *LDAB* 4123) and retained by D.L. Page and D.A. Campbell, but corrected into ποικιλόμουσον by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, who referred the adjective to the following <χέλ>υν (v. 222). Wilamowitz correction has been accepted by many editors (E. Diehl, C. Del Grande, J.M. Edmonds, T.H. Janssen). In both the cases, the substance of the argument does not change: Orpheus’ music was featured by *poikilia*.

Τέρπανδρος δ' ἐπὶ τῷιδε κα-

225

τηῦξε²² μοῦσαν ἐν ὠιδᾷς·

Λέσβος δ' Αἰολία ν<ιν> Ἄν-

τίσσαι γείνατο κλεινόν·

νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις

ῥυθμοῖς τ' ἐνδεκακρουμάτοις

230

κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει,

θησαυρὸν πολύυμνον οἷ-

ξας Μουσᾶν θαλαμευτόν·

Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νιν ἅ

θρέψας ἅ δυωδεκατειχέος

235

λαοῦ πρωτέος ἐξ Ἀχαιῶν.

Orpheus, whose muse was intricate, Calliope's son [...], from Pieria, was the first to beget the tortoise-shell lyre. After him, Terpander reared the muse to fuller bloom with his songs: Aeolian Lesbos bore him at Antissa as a glory. Now Timotheus brings to new life the kithara with eleven-stringed metres and rhythms, opening the Muses' chambered treasury of many hymns. The city of Miletus, home of a twelve-walled people, first of the Achaeans, nurtured him.

²² κατηῦξε is Aron' correction of the transmitted κατευξε (for the metrical question, cf. Ercoles 2017b, 150 n. 66). Alternatively, I have suggested κα<τέ>τευξε: see Ercoles 2010, 122-128, with the discussion of different proposals, to which a further possibility can be added now (κά<ρ>τ' ηῦξε proposed by Borsoni Ciccolungo 2018).

At vv. 221-224, Orpheus is portrayed in a telling way: he is not only the first citharode, but also the first promoter of an intricate musical style. The adjective ποικιλόμουσος (v. 221) clearly points to the debate on New Musicians's style in classical Athens²³, and shows that Timotheus aims to present the ancient musician as a forerunner of his own elaborate music. To put it another way, innovation is presented as a feature of Greek music from its very beginnings, so that the melodic and rhythmical changes introduced by Timotheus are integral part of this history. In this perspective, innovating is not synonymous with betraying musical tradition, but, on the contrary, with pursuing it and enhancing its expressive power with new resources.

Another interesting passage comes from Telestes' *Asclepios* (PMG 806), where the Phrygian aulos-player Olympus is remembered as the inventor of the Lydian mode:

ἡ Φρύγα καλλιπνόνων αὐλῶν ἱερῶν βασιλῆα,
Λυδὸν ὃς ἄρμοσε πρῶτος
Δωρίδος ἀντίπαλον μούσας νόμον αἰολομόρφοις
πνεύματος εὐπτερον αὔραν ἀμφιπλέκων καλάμοις²⁴.

or the Phrygian king of the fair-breathing holy pipes, who was the first to tune the Lydian strain, rival of the Dorian muse, weaving about the quivering reeds the fair-winged gust of his breath. (Transl. by D.A. Campbell)

The introduction of this mode seems to have been credited to Olympus also by Melanippides in a fragment *sine ipsissimis verbis* (9 in my forthcoming edition = test. 5 Campbell): if my

²³ On musical *poikilia* see Barker 1995 and Leven 2013.

²⁴ The Greek text of v. 3 is uncertain: the ms. A of Athenaeus, who quotes Telestes' fragment, presents †νομοαἰόλον ὁρφναί†. *Exempli gratia*, I have printed above the correction proposed by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (*ap. Kaibel* 1890, 361), accepted by D.A. Campbell in his Loeb edition.

1 interpretation of [Plut.] *Mus.* 15.1136b-c is right²⁵, the dithyrambographer reported that
2 Olympus had invented the *harmonia* while composing the *epikedeion* for Python killed by
3 Apollo.
4
5

6
7 All in all, Melanippides and Telestes present the mythical aulete as an innovator,
8 therefore as a composer of ‘new’ music. Since the context of the above fragments is lost, it is
9 unclear whether the two dithyrambographers suggested in some way an explicit parallel
10 between Olympus’ and their own innovations. In any case, the choice of the myth and the
11 focus on the invention of a new mode are *per se* meaningful.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 Possibly, an analogous implication was behind Melanippides’ narration of Linus’ story
20 (*PMG* 766 = fr. 11), but nothing is known about this poem apart from its subject: the
21 exegetical scholium to *Il.* 18.570c¹ Erbse only says that ἡ [...] περὶ τὸν Λίνον ἱστορία καὶ παρὰ
22 Φιλοχόρῳ ἐν τῇ ιθ’ (*FGrHist* 328 F 207) καὶ παρὰ Μελανιππίδῃ. If the close association
23 between the poet and the historian implies that both reported the same story, it would be
24 possible to add some detail about Melanippides’ poem, since the scholium goes on reporting
25 Philochorus’ narration. The Attidographer told that Linus was killed by Apollo, for he was the
26 first to ret the flax and to use it for the chords of a lyre (ὁ δὲ Φιλόχορος ὑπ’ Ἀπόλλωνός φησιν
27 αὐτὸν ἀναιρεθῆναι, ὅτι τὸν λίνον καταλύσας πρῶτος χορδαῖς ἐχρήσατο εἰς τὰ ὄργανα): again,
28 the story of a musical invention!
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Some final comment deserves the myth of Marsyas recounted by Melanippides (*PMG*
45 758) and Telestes (*PMG* 805a-c), who seem to have been the New Musicians more interested
46 in mythical *mousikoi*. According to Athenaeus of Naukratis (14.616e-617), the first poet
47 recounted the myth in his *Marsyas* according to the widespread version, in order to show his
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 ²⁵ Cf. Ercoles 2017a. The passage reads as follows: “Ὀλυμπον γὰρ πρῶτον Ἀριστόξενος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ
57 μουσικῆς (fr. 80 Wehrli) ἐπὶ τῷ Πύθωνί φησιν ἐπικήδειον ἀυλῆσαι Λυδιστί. εἰσὶν δ’ οἱ Μελανιππίδην
58 τούτου τοῦ μέλους ἄρξαι φασίν. The implausible attribution of the invention to Melanippides is probably
59 due to the compiler’s misunderstanding of his source, a mistake analogous to other cases in the treatise
60 (1136d and 1136e): in the light of these, it is more reasonable to think of Melanippides as the source of the
61 story concerning the invention of the *epikedeion* than as its inventor.
62
63
64
65

own rejection of the aulos, while the latter, doubting this mythical story, ‘took up arms against Melanippides’ (616f τῷ Μελανιππίδῃ ἀντικορυσσόμενος) to defend the art of aulos playing in his *Argos*. As P. Leven (2010) has pointed out, there are strong reasons for doubting the historicity of such a debate between the two composers of dithyrambs (a genre generally performed to aulos music in classical Athens!): the historical context provided by Athenaeus does not appear a credible reflection of the contemporary aesthetics and strategies of the poets and their works. On the contrary, it is possible to show that the author of *Deipnosophists* – or, as I believe, his source in this section – “follows the structure of Aristotle’s discussion of *aulos* playing in Book 8 of the *Politics* and illustrates the Aristotelian argument by poetic examples, which he reads in a historicist manner (as authors expressing their own opinions in the first-person and taking positions on contemporary issues). The statement that, rather than analysing or interpreting fragments, Athenaeus strings them together is not original of course; much more important, however, is the claim that there is an argumentative structure, and an ideological bias, behind an apparently loose stringing-together of quotations”²⁶. Therefore, we need to extract from the fragments themselves all the informations about the treatment of this myth by Melanippides and Telestes.

In both the cases, the lines of the poems quoted by Athenaeus do not concern Marsyas’ musical activity and do not help us to understand in which terms the poets represented the ancient aulos player. In Telestes’ fragments from *Argos*, however, the implications of the mythical account are clear enough: he calls the aulos a ‘clever instrument’ (*PMG* 805a,1f. σοφόν ... / ... ὄργανον) and says that the traditional story about its rejection by Athena ‘idly flew to Greece, told by idly-talking Muse-followers, a tale unsuited to the choral dance, an invidious reproach brought among mortals against a clever skill’ (805b)²⁷, where the ‘clever

²⁶ Leven 2010, 44. For a different view, favourable to the historicity of Athenaeus’ account, see now Fongoni 2016, with further bibliography.

²⁷ Transl. by D.A. Campbell.

1 skill' (v. 3 σοφᾶς ... τέχνας) is auletic art. The version of the myth that Telestes follows (or
2 invents?) does not include any more the episode of Athena rejecting the aulos: the 'clever'
3 goddess (805a,1 σοφάν) gives as a gift to Dionysos the 'clever instrument' together with the
4 'clever skill' of playing it (cf. 805c). It follows that, in this account, it was the god to give the
5 aulos to the satyr Marsyas, who then became a skillful performer. The myth is thus explicitly
6 intended by Telestes to serve as a defence and a celebration of the aulos, the most
7 representative instrument of New Music. Marsyas is not any more the focus of the story in the
8 *Argos*, as he apparently was in Melanippides' *Marsyas*, but is only a single tessera of a complex
9 mosaic: the myth as it is presented (or shaped) by Telestes. In this case, the musical polemic
10 becomes a polemic on myth, as the authorial voice itself clearly states.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 The fragments examined so far, though scanty and generally brief, nonetheless allow us
26 to appreciate the symbolic role that mythical musicians may have played in the debate on
27 music in the second half of the 5th century. For Timotheus and the other New Musicians, the
28 appeals to these figures were a way to construct distant and authoritative models for their own
29 way of making music by projecting back onto those ancient colleagues key-features of their
30 style, namely *poikilia*, inventiveness and virtuosity²⁸. As seen in the previous part of this work,
31 an echo of the involvement of Marsyas, Orpheus and Thamyras in this musical debate can be
32 found in the new iconographies of these figures appearing on Attic vessels by the last third of
33 the fifth century, when they begin to be portrayed as virtuoso performers who enchant their
34 audience.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Bibliography

55
56
57
58
59 ²⁸ For an antithetical interpretation of the mythical musicians as representants of an old, noble music style see
60 *e.g.* Heracl. Pont. fr. 157 Wehrli.
61
62
63
64
65

- Anderson, W.D. (1994). *Music and Musicians in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- Barker, A. (1984). *Greek Musical Writings, I. The Musician and his Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barker, A. (1995). Heterophonia and *poikilia*: accompaniments to Greek melody. In: B. Gentili-F. Perusino, eds, *Mousike. Metrica ritmica e musica greca in memoria di Giovanni Comotti*, Pisa/Roma: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, pp. 41-60.
- Barker, A. (2014). The music of Olympus. *QUCC* n.s. 99, pp. 43-57.
- Barker, A. (2014). *Ancient Greek Writers on their Musical Past*. Pisa/Roma: Serra.
- Bernabé, A. (2002). Orfeo. De personaje del mito a autor literario. *Ítaca* 18, pp. 61-78.
- Beschi, L. (1991). Mousikè Téchnē e Thánatos: l'immagine della musica sulle lekythoi funerarie attiche a fondo bianco. *Imago musicae* 8, pp. 39-59.
- Boardman, J. (1956). Some Attic fragments. Pot, plaque and dithyramb. *JHS* 76, pp. 18-25.
- Boardman, J. (1992). Linos. In: *LIMC* 6.1, p. 290.
- Borsoni Ciccolungo, E. (2018). Una nuova proposta per Tim. PMG 791,225s. *Eikasmos* 19, pp. 251-260.
- Bundrick, S. (2005). *Music and Image in Classical Athens*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Campbell, D.A. (1988). *Greek Lyric*, Vol. 2. *Anacreon, Anacreontea, Early Choral Lyric*. London/Cambridge, Mass.: HUP
- Castaldo, D. (2000). *Il Pantheon musicale. Iconografia nella ceramica attica tra VI e IV secolo*. Ravenna: Longo.
- Csapo, E. (2004). The Politics of the New Music. In: P. Murray and P. Wilson, eds, *Music and the Muses: the Culture of 'Mousikē' in the Classical Athenian City*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 207-248.
- Csapo, E. (2011). The Economics, Poetics, Politics, Metaphysics and Ethics of the 'New Music'.

In: D. Yatromanolakis, ed., *Music and Cultural Politics*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, pp. 65-131.

Ercoles, M. (2009). Orfeo apollineo (tra lirica arcaica e critica letteraria d'età classica). *AOFL* 4/2, pp. 47-67.

Ercoles, M. (2010). Note a Timoth. PMG 791,221-228. *Eikasmós* 21, pp. 111-133.

Ercoles, M. (2017a). [Plut.] *Mus.* 15, 1136b-c: un nuovo frammento di Melanippide? *QUCC* n.s. 117, pp. 37-44.

Ercoles, M. (2017b). 'Nuova Musica' e agoni poetici. Il dibattito sulla musica nell'Atene classica. In: A. Gostoli, ed., *Poeti in agone. Competizioni poetiche e musicali nella Grecia antica*, con la collab. di A. Fongoni-F. Biondi, Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 131-161.

Fongoni, A. (2016). Atena e l'aulos nel Marsia di Melanippide (fr. 785 Page/Campbell) e nell'Argo di Teleste (fr. 805 a-c Page/Campbell). In: L. Bravi, L. Lomiento, A. Meriani and G. Pace, eds, *Tra lyra e aulos. Tradizioni musicali e generi poetici*, Pisa-Roma: Serra, pp. 233-245

Franklin, J. C. (2010). Remembering Music in Early Greece. In: S. Mirelman, ed., *The Historiography of Music in Global Perspective*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, pp. 9-50.

Garezou, M.-X. (1994). Orpheus. In: *LIMC* 7.1, pp. 81-105.

Gentili, B.-Prato, G. (2002). *Poetae elegiaci. Testimonia et fragmenta*. Ed. altera. Berolini-Novi Eboraci: De Gruyter.

Gostoli, A. (1988). Terpendro e la funzione etico-politica della musica nella cultura spartana del VII sec. a.C. In: B. Gentili-R. Pretagostini, eds, *La musica in Grecia*, Roma-Bari: Laterza, pp. 231-237.

Heinemann, A. (2013). Performance and the Drinking Vessel: Looking for an Imagery of Dithyramb in the Time of the 'New Music'. In: B. Kowalzig, and P. Wilson, eds., *Dithyramb in Context*, Cambridge: CUP, pp. 282-309.

- Heinemann, A. (2016). *Der Gott des Gelages. Dionysos, Satyrn und Mänaden auf attischem Trinkgeschirr des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Iannucci, A. (2009). Il citaredo degli Argonauti. Orfeo e la poetica dell'incanto. In: A.M. Andrisano and P. Fabbri, eds, *La favola di Orfeo. Letteratura, immagine, performance*, Ferrara: UnifePress, pp. 11-22.
- Kaibel, G. (1890). *Athenaei Naucraticae Dipnosophistarum libri XV*, III, Stutgardiae: Teubner.
- LeVen, P. (2010). New music and its myths: Athenaeus' reading of the aulos revolution (Deipnosophistae 14.616e-617f). *JHS* 130, pp. 35-47.
- Leven, P. (2013). The Colors of Sound: Poikilia and Its Aesthetic Contexts. *GRMS* 1, pp. 229-242.
- Menichetti, M. (2007). Thamyras, il cantore della politica cimoniana e il cratere di Polion a Ferrara. In F. Giudice and R. Panvini, eds, *Il greco, il barbaro e la ceramica attica. Immaginario del diverso, processi di scambio e autorappresentazione degli indigeni. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (14-19 maggio 2001, Catania-Caltanissetta-Gela-Camarina-Vittoria-Siracusa)*, IV, Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, pp. 107-122.
- Meriani, A. (2007). Il *Thamyras* di Sofocle. In P. Volpe Cacciatore, ed., *Musica e generi letterari nella Grecia di età classica. Atti del II Congresso CUG (Fisciano, 1 dicembre 2006)*, Napoli: Arte Tipografica, pp. 37-70.
- Nercessian, A. (1994). Thamyras, Thamyras. In: *LIMC* 7.1, 902-904
- Portulas, J. (2000). Poetas míticos de Grecia. In: E. Crespo and M.J. Barrios Castro, eds, *Actas del X congreso español de estudios clásicos (21-25 de septiembre de 1999)*, Vol. 1, Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, pp. 289-312.
- Sarti, S. (1992). Gli strumenti musicali di Apollo. *AION(archeol)* 14, pp. 95-104.
- Sarti, S. (2010/2011). Un esempio di competizione musicale nel mito in Grecia: Tamiri. In: D. Castaldo, F.G. Giannachi, A. Manieri, eds., *Poesia, musica e agoni nella Grecia antica /*

1 *Poetry, Music and Contests in ancient Greece. Atti del IV convegno internazionale di*
2 *MOISA / Proceedings of the IVth international meeting of MOISA (Lecce, 28-30 ottobre*
3
4 *2010)*, Galatina (LE): Congedo, pp. 219-240.
5
6

7 Schmidt, S. (2001). Die Athener und die Musen: die Konstruktion von Bildern zum Thema
8
9 Musik im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. In: R. von den Hoff-S. Schmidt, eds, *Konstruktionen von*
10
11 *Wirklichkeit : Bilder im Griechenland des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Stuttgart:
12
13 Steiner, pp. 281-298.
14
15
16

17 Stansbury-O'Donnell, M.D. (1990). Polygnotos' *Nekyia*: a reconstruction and analysis. *AJA* 94,
18
19 pp. 213-235.
20
21

22 Van Keer, E. (2004). The Myth of Marsyas in Ancient Greek Art: Musical and Mythological
23
24 Iconography. *Music in Art* 29, pp. 20-37.
25
26

27 Van Keer, E. (2008). Olympus the musician in Greek literature and art: mythology and music
28
29 history. Diss. Liège: ULG (available online:
30
31 <[https://figshare.com/articles/thesis/Olympus_the_musician_](https://figshare.com/articles/thesis/Olympus_the_musician_in_Greek_literature_pdf/3442808/2)
32
33 [in_Greek_literature_pdf/3442808/2](https://figshare.com/articles/thesis/Olympus_the_musician_in_Greek_literature_pdf/3442808/2)>).
34
35
36

37 Weis, A.H. (1992). Marsyas I. In: *LIMC* 6.1, pp. 366-376.
38

39 Weis, A.H. (1994). Olympos I. In: *LIMC* 7.1, pp. 38-45.
40
41

42 Wilson, P. (2009). Thamyras the Thracian: The Archetypal Wandering Poet? In: R. Hunter and
43
44 I. Rutherford, eds, *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture. Travel, Locality and Pan-*
45
46 *Hellenism*, Cambridge, pp. 46-79.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

As is well known, in the second half of the 5th century BC Athens experiences a marked change in musical taste: the compositions which meet the favour of the larger audience in theatres are those characterized by a complex and virtuoso style. At the basis of this style — the so-called New Music — lies a new conception of *mousike*, which has been explored in recent years by E. Csapo¹. Here I am going to focus on a particular aspect of this musical ideology, namely the relationship with musical tradition.

It is hardly a mere chance that in the second half of the 5th century musical historiography takes the first steps²: the discontinuity with the past claimed by the New Musicians (cf. Tim. *PMG* 796) and condemned by their critics (cf. *e.g.* Ar. *Nu.* 961-978, Pherecr. fr. 155 K.-A., Plat. *Leg.* 700a-701b, Heracl. Pont. fr. 157 Wehrli) entails the need to define musical tradition. This is done by both the ones and the others, from different perspectives and, obviously, with different results. Critics of the New Music contrast the ‘perverted’ new songs of contemporary composers with the good music of the past, simple, noble and ethically oriented. The bulwark of this tradition is recognized by them in (an idealized image of) Sparta, Crete, and sometimes Egypt³, but also in earlier Athens, namely in the city of those Athenians who fought the Persian Wars⁴. On the other side, the New Musicians are “also driven to invent a tradition of their own, in which ritual Dionysiac music is particularly prominent, as are appeals to founding figures like Orpheus, Olympos, or the Korybants”⁵, and also Linus, Marsyas and Thamyras.

Three of these mythical musicians became a favourite iconographic subject in vase-paintings in the last third of the 5th century, as has been shown by A. Heinemann (2013): they are Marsyas, Orpheus

¹ See esp. Csapo 2004 and 2011. On New Music see also D’Angour 2006 and, more recently, the articles from the conference *The Revolution of the New Music* (Oxford, Jesus College, 28-30 July 2017) published in this journal (*GRMS* 6.2 and 7.1).

² Let us think of Glaucus of Rhegium and Hellanicus of Lesbos; cf. Franklin 2010; Barker 2014.

³ Cf. *e.g.* Plat. *Leg.* 660b; for other passages and discussion see Gostoli 1988 and Csapo 2004, 241–4.

⁴ Cf. *e.g.* Ar. *Nu.* 961-978 and Plat. *Leg.* 700a-701b.

⁵ Csapo 2011, 129.

and Thamyris⁶. These figures are represented by painters even before then, but by that time their iconography undergoes an interesting development, which seems to reflect the changes in contemporary musical culture. Let us follow this trend.

From the sixties of the century, the Thracian citharodes Orpheus and Thamyris appear with some frequency on Greek vases⁷; on the contrary, the Phrygian aulete Marsyas is not attested in vase-paintings before the last third of the century, but around the middle of the century is the subject of the famous sculptural group by Miron dedicated on the Athenian Akropolis and representing the satyr with Athena⁸. Shortly before, Marsyas appears, together with Orpheus, Thamyris and Olympus, in the famous Polygnotus' painting of the *Nekya*, realized around 470/460 BC for the Lesche of the Knidians in Delphi. According to Pausanias' description (10.30.6-9) of this lost piece of art,

ἀποβλέψαντι δὲ αὐθις ἐς τὰ κάτω τῆς γραφῆς, ἔστιν ἐφεξῆς μετὰ τὸν Πάτροκλον οἷα ἐπὶ λόφου
τινὸς Ὀρφεὺς καθεζόμενος, ἐφάπτεται δὲ καὶ τῇ ἀριστερᾷ κιθάρας, τῇ δὲ ἐτέρᾳ χειρὶ ἰτέας ψαύει·
κλώνες εἰσιν ὧν ψαύει, προσανακέκλιται δὲ τῷ δένδρῳ. τὸ δὲ ἄλσος ἔοικεν εἶναι τῆς Περσεφόνης,
ἐνθα αἵγειροι καὶ ἰτέαι δόξη τῇ Ὀμήρου πεφύκασιν· Ἑλληνικὸν δὲ τὸ σχῆμά ἐστι τῷ Ὀρφεῖ, καὶ
οὔτε ἡ ἐσθῆς οὔτε ἐπίθημά ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ Θράκιον [...]. Θαμύριδι δὲ ἐγγὺς καθεζομένῳ τοῦ
Πελίου διεφθαρμέναι αἱ ὄψεις καὶ ταπεινὸν ἐς ἅπαν σχῆμά ἐστι καὶ ἡ κόμη πολλὴ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς
κεφαλῆς, πολλὴ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν τοῖς γενείοις· λύρα δὲ ἔρριπται πρὸς τοῖς ποσὶ, κατεαγότες αὐτῆς οἱ

⁶ As far as Linus and Olympus are concerned, there is no trace of a similar interest on behalf of Attic vase-painters in the last third of the 5th century, with the exception of one depiction of Olympus on a Panathenaic amphora (on which see below). On Linus in Greek art, see Boardman 1992; on Olympus, see Weis 1994, esp. 43f. and van Keer 2008, 45-50.

⁷ Orpheus: Gareizou 1994, 99-101; Bundrick 2005, 121-126. Thamyris: Nercessian 1994; Bundrick 2005, 126-131; Sarti 2010/2011. On these mythical figures see Portulas 2000, esp. 295-298 (Thamyris); Bernabé 2002; Iannucci 2009; Ercoles 2009 (Orpheus), all with further bibliography.

⁸ Cf. Weis 1992, 373 (nos. 43-46), 376. See also Boardman 1956, 18-20; Sarti 1992, esp. 101-103; Castaldo 2000, 34-37; Bundrick 2005, 131-139; Heinemann 2013, 294-300.

1 πῆχεις καὶ αἱ χορδαὶ κατερρωγυῖαι. ὑπὲρ τούτου ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πέτρας καθεζόμενος Μαρσύας, καὶ
2
3 Ὀλύμπος παρ' αὐτὸν παιδὸς ἐστὶν ὠραίου καὶ ἀγλὲϊν διδασκομένου σχῆμα ἔχων.
4
5
6
7

8 Turning our gaze again to the lower part of the picture we see, next after Patroclus, Orpheus
9
10 sitting on what seems to be a sort of hill; he grasps with his left hand a kithara, and with his
11
12 right he touches a willow. It is the branches that he touches, and he is leaning against the
13
14 tree. The grove seems to be that of Persephone, where grow, as Homer thought, black
15
16 poplars and willows. The appearance of Orpheus is Greek, and neither his garb nor his head-
17
18 gear is Thracian [...]. Thamyris is sitting near Pelias. He has lost the sight of his eyes; his
19
20 attitude is one of utter dejection; his hair and beard are long; at his feet lies thrown a lyre
21
22 with its horns and strings broken. Above him is Marsyas, sitting on a rock, and by his side is
23
24 Olympus, with the appearance of a boy in the bloom of youth learning to play the aulos.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 (Transl. by W.H. Jones, with few adjustments)
32
33
34
35
36

37 The close association of Marsyas, Orpheus and Thamyris in this painting is probably due to their
38
39 common destiny of violent death, which could be part of Greek mythological tradition already in the first
40
41 half of the 5th century⁹. As for Olympus, nothing is known about the circumstances of his death; his
42
43 closeness to Marsyas in the depiction and the way he is represented make it clear that his presence is
44
45 justified by the mythical tradition according to which he was disciple or *eromenos* of Marsyas¹⁰.
46
47
48
49
50

51 The theme of the unfortunate destiny of Thamyris is depicted also on a red-figure hydria from *ca.*
52
53 430 BC (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, G 291), sharing many iconographic traits with Polygnotos' painting:
54
55
56

57 ⁹ Cf. Stansbury-O'Donnell 1990, 225f. and Beschi 1991, 40.

58 ¹⁰ For literary sources on Olympus see Campbell 1988, 272-285 and Gentili-Prato 2002, 1-9 (for Olympus as disciple or
59 *eromenos* of Marsyas see Plat. *Symp.* 215c [test. 2 Gent.-Pr.] and *Min.* 318b [test. 13 Campb.]), with Barker 2011; see also
60 Weis 1994, 43f. and van Keer 2008.
61
62
63
64
65

1 the musician appears seated on a rock after the contest with the Muses, blind, caught while throwing
2 away his instrument¹¹. The contest itself is the subject of other four vase-paintings realized between the
3
4
5 sixties and the thirties of the 5th century BC: Thamyras, generally seated, plays his instrument among
6
7 the Muses. It is likely that these scenes are reminiscent of Sophocles' *Thamyras*, probably staged in the
8
9 sixties of the 5th century. As it seems from the scanty remains, the tragedy was centred on the musical
10
11 contest and the defeat of the Thracian citharode as a consequence of his 'hybristic' competitive ambition.
12
13 This aspect was associated with Thamyras' ability as a performer and with the power of his music, as we
14
15 can infer from the following words of an unknown character of the play (fr. 245 Radt²):
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 μουσομανεῖ δ' ἐλήφθην

25 ἀνάγκῃ, ποτὶ δ' εἶραν

26 ἔρχομαι ἔκ τε λύρας

27 ἔκ τε νόμων, οὓς Θαμύρας

28 περὶ ἅλλα μουσοποιεῖ

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 And I was seized by an urge to be mad for music, and went to the place of assembly, an urge
41
42 inspired by the lyre and by the *nomoi* [*i.e.* 'melodic conventions' or traditional melodic lines]
43
44 with which Thamyras makes music supremely. (Transl. by H. Lloyd-Jones, with
45
46 adjustments).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The emphasis on the music ability is the main feature of the representations of Thamyras on the
55
56 vase-paintings from the last three decades of the 5th century, when the theme of the unfortunate destiny
57
58
59

60
61 ¹¹ Cf. Bundrick 2005, 127; Sarti 2010/2011, 222.
62
63
64
65

after the defeat appears to have been neglected¹². A similar development involves Orpheus' depictions: the murder of the citharode by the Thracian women is figured by Athenian vase-painters especially from 490/480 to 430/420 BC, when another kind of scene gets more prominence: Orpheus playing among the most savage and *amousoi* people, the Thracians, who listen to his music completely captured by it¹³.

As far as Marsyas is concerned, his appearance on vase-paintings dates from the last third of the 5th century, when the Kadmos and the Pothos Painters depict him as seated and playing either the aulos or a stringed instrument¹⁴, while Apollo and other deities stand nearby. The agonal element is not prominent in these scenes: "in various instances the onlooking god is depicted without his own instrument, suggesting more of an audition than an actual contest; only the tripod column figuring on a few vessels of the series may hint at an agonistic setting. Explicit references to the satyr's eventual demise do not occur before the turn of the century"¹⁵. Moreover, Marsyas is sometimes depicted while playing a stringed instrument, what seems to point to the irrelevance of the kind of instrument played by the satyr: the crucial point of these representations is not the opposition between lyre and aulos, but the display of the performer's musical *technē*. Perhaps, it is possible to explain along these lines also the only representation of Olympus in 5th-century Attic pottery, that has not been taken into account by Heinemann (2013)¹⁶. In the Panathenaic amphora preserved in Naples (Museo Nazionale, 81401 [H 3235];

¹² A first example of this trend is the Attic red-figure krater from Spina (Ferrara, National Museum 3033 – ca. 420 BC), where Thamyras is represented as a standing, professional citharode playing a large concert kithara (see Bundrick 2005, 130f.; Menichetti 2007; Sarti 2010/2011, 222-224, 227 no. B.3, 235 fig. 4). The iconographic structure of this painting is quite complex, merging together traits of previous representations of Thamyras and other characteristic of vase-paintings from the last third of the century (see Bundrick 2005, 130f.; Sarti 2010/2011, 223f.); in the latter, however, the musician is generally portrayed as seated.

¹³ See Gareizou 1994, 100. The theme of Orpheus enchanting Thracians with his cithara/lyre is documented from the sixties of the 5th century, but it is in the last fourth of the century that it seems to oust the theme of Orpheus' murder.

¹⁴ Marsyas playing a lyre is a mythical variant generally thought to derive from Melanippides' *Marsyas*, probably a dithyramb. The hypothesis was firstly advanced by Boardman (1956) and has been favourably considered by many scholars. Though, it is worth noting that it rests on highly conjectural basis and that both Melanippides and the vase-painters could depend on a common mythical tradition (for a fuller discussion, see my forthcoming edition of Melanippides, comm. on fr. 2.).

¹⁵ Heinemann 2013, 295.

¹⁶ See, however, Heinemann 2016, 306 (only on Marsyas's iconography).

1 circle of Meidias; 420-400 BC)¹⁷, the mythical aulete is portrayed as a young man, seated with a lyre in his
2 hands, beside a bearded Marsyas holding a double aulos; around them are the Muses Thaleia, Kalliope
3 and Urania, a satyr (ΤΥΡΒΑΣ), a nude youth and a goose (or a swan). According to Weis (1994, 43), “the
4 lyre can be a love-gift, a symbol re-enforced by the presence of the bird and, perhaps, Urania at bottom
5 left”. Indeed, it is plausible to see in this scene a reference to the tradition of Olympus as disciple or
6 *eromenos* of Marsyas (see above n. 10). However, the association of Olympus with the lyre instead of the
7 double aulos seems to suggest that the crucial point of the narrative is the musical skill itself of the
8 performer, regardless of the musical instrument. The Panathenaic nature of the vase could account for
9 the presence of the lyre and the aulos in the scene, since the Panathenaic contests involved both wind-
10 and string-instruments.

11 Be that as it may, though the interpretation of the above scene involving Olympus is uncertain, the
12 representations of Marsyas, Orpheus and Thamyras on Attic vases in the last three decades of the 5th
13 century betray a general and consistent trend. The vase-painters do not appear to have been any more
14 interested in their cruel destiny, but in their musical skills: they are depicted while performing in front of
15 a public of gods (as it is the case with Thamyras and Marsyas, playing and singing in front of Apollo and
16 the Muses) or Thracians (as it is the case with Orpheus), who are delighted and enchanted by their
17 music¹⁸. As Heinemann pointed out, the tendencies observed in these representations “correspond to
18 what is known from written sources about changes in the contemporary culture of *mousike*. These
19 developments, namely a growing professionalization of musicians (especially pipers) and its flipside, a

17 ARV² 1316,1, with *Add.*² 362; cf. Weis 1994, 39 nr. 3, with further bibliography.

18 Cf. Schmidt 2001, 295. The theme of Orpheus enchanting Thracians with his cithara/lyre is documented from the sixties of the 5th century; the scenes with Thamyras and Marsyas playing in front of Apollo and the Muses come from the three last decades of the same century. For bibliographical references on such iconography see above nn. 20f.

newly defined culture of competent spectatorship, may have their beginnings earlier in the century, but fully come to the fore in its second half as concomitants of the so-called New Music”¹⁹.

The testimony of vase-paintings presents us, so to speak, the point of view of the audience and testifies to the musical taste of contemporary Athens. The mythical musicians are quintessential virtuoso performers playing in front of their public, virtually including not only gods, Muses, or Thracians, but also Athenian symposiasts, since these scenes were generally painted on sympotic vessels: looking at them, the symposiasts were “turned into metaspectators of the musicals feats by the undisputed masters of *mousike*”²⁰.

A different perspective is offered by the appeals to these mythical figures by the New Musicians. In the scanty remains of their poems, there are five references: Melanipp. *PMG* 758 (Marsyas), 766 (Linus), Tim. *PMG* 791,221-224 (Orpheus), Telest. *PMG* 805 (Marsyas), 806 (Olympus). Among these passages, the most instructive is the one from Timotheus’ *Persae*: in the *sphragis* of this citharodic *nomos*, the composer outlines a brief history of Greek citharody (vv. 221-236) from Orpheus to Timotheus himself, passing through Terpander.

πρῶτος ποικιλόμουσος²¹ Ὀρ-

φεὺς <χέλ>υν ἐτέκνωσεν

υἱὸς Καλλιόπα<ς> ~ –

– > Πιερίαθεν·

Τέρπανδρος δ’ ἐπὶ τῷιδε κα-

225

¹⁹ Heinemann 2013, 299f.

²⁰ Heinemann 2013, 300.

²¹ This is the form transmitted by *P. Berol.* 9875 (MP³ 1537; *LDAB* 4123) and retained by D.L. Page and D.A. Campbell, but corrected into ποικιλόμουσον by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, who referred the adjective to the following <χέλ>υν (v. 222). Wilamowitz correction has been accepted by many editors (E. Diehl, C. Del Grande, J.M. Edmonds, T.H. Janssen). In both the cases, the substance of the argument does not change: Orpheus’ music was featured by *poikilia*.

τηῦξε²² μοῦσαν ἐν ᾠδαίς·

Λέσβος δ' Αἰολία ν<ιν> Ἄν-

τίσσαι γείνατο κλεινόν·

νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις

ῥυθμοῖς τ' ἐνδεκακρουμάτοις

230

κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει,

θησαυρόν πολύυμνον οἷ-

ξας Μουσᾶν θαλαμευτόν·

Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νιν ἅ

θρέψας ἅ δυωδεκατειχέος

235

λαοῦ πρωτέος ἐξ Ἀχαιῶν.

Orpheus, whose muse was intricate, Calliope's son [...], from Pieria, was the first to beget the tortoise-shell lyre. After him, Terpander reared the muse to fuller bloom with his songs: Aeolian Lesbos bore him at Antissa as a glory. Now Timotheus brings to new life the kithara with eleven-stringed metres and rhythms, opening the Muses' chambered treasury of many hymns. The city of Miletus, home of a twelve-walled people, first of the Achaeans, nurtured him.

At vv. 221-224, Orpheus is portrayed in a telling way: he is not only the first citharode, but also the first promoter of an intricate musical style. The adjective ποικιλόμουσος (v. 221) clearly points to the debate on

²² κατηῦξε is Aron' correction of the transmitted κατευξε (for the metrical question, cf. Ercoles 2017b, 150 n. 66). Alternatively, I have suggested κα<τέ>τευξε: see Ercoles 2010, 122-128, with the discussion of different proposals, to which a further possibility can be added now (κα<ρ>τ' ηῦξε proposed by Borsoni Ciccolungo 2018).

New Musicians's style in classical Athens²³, and shows that Timotheus aims to present the ancient musician as a forerunner of his own elaborate music. To put it another way, innovation is presented as a feature of Greek music from its very beginnings, so that the melodic and rhythmical changes introduced by Timotheus are integral part of this history. In this perspective, innovating is not synonymous with betraying musical tradition, but, on the contrary, with pursuing it and enhancing its expressive power with new resources.

Another interesting passage comes from Telestes' *Asclepios* (PMG 806), where the Phrygian aulos-player Olympus is remembered as the inventor of the Lydian mode:

ἡ Φρύγα καλλιπνόνων αὐλῶν ἱερῶν βασιλῆα,
Λυδὸν δς ἄρμοσε πρῶτος
Δωρίδος ἀντίπαλον μούσας νόμον αἰολομόρφοις
πνεύματος εὔπτερον αὔραν ἀμφιπλέκων καλάμοις²⁴.

or the Phrygian king of the fair-breathing holy pipes, who was the first to tune the Lydian strain, rival of the Dorian muse, weaving about the quivering reeds the fair-winged gust of his breath. (Transl. by D.A. Campbell)

The introduction of this mode seems to have been credited to Olympus also by Melanippides in a fragment *sine ipsissimis verbis* (9 in my forthcoming edition = test. 5 Campbell): if my interpretation of

²³ On musical *poikilia* see Barker 1995 and Leven 2013.

²⁴ The Greek text of v. 3 is uncertain: the ms. A of Athenaeus, who quotes Telestes' fragment, presents †νομοαἰολον ὀρφναί†. *Exempli gratia*, I have printed above the correction proposed by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (*ap.* Kaibel 1890, 361), accepted by D.A. Campbell in his Loeb edition.

[Plut.] *Mus.* 15.1136b-c is right²⁵, the dithyrambographer reported that Olympus had invented the *harmonia* while composing the *epikedeion* for Python killed by Apollo.

All in all, Melanippides and Telestes present the mythical aulete as an innovator, therefore as a composer of ‘new’ music. Since the context of the above fragments is lost, it is unclear whether the two dithyrambographers suggested in some way an explicit parallel between Olympus’ and their own innovations. In any case, the choice of the myth and the focus on the invention of a new mode are *per se* meaningful.

Possibly, an analogous implication was behind Melanippides’ narration of Linus’ story (*PMG* 766 = fr. 11), but nothing is known about this poem apart from its subject: the exegetical scholium to *Il.* 18.570c¹ Erbse only says that ἡ [...] περὶ τὸν Λίνον ἱστορία καὶ παρὰ Φιλοχόρῳ ἐν τῇ ιθ’ (*FGrHist* 328 F 207) καὶ παρὰ Μελανιππίδῃ. If the close association between the poet and the historian implies that both reported the same story, it would be possible to add some detail about Melanippides’ poem, since the scholium goes on reporting Philochorus’ narration. The Attidographer told that Linus was killed by Apollo, for he was the first to ret the flax and to use it for the chords of a lyre (ὁ δὲ Φιλόχορος ὑπ’ Ἀπόλλωνός φησιν αὐτὸν ἀναιρεθῆναι, ὅτι τὸν λίνον καταλύσας πρῶτος χορδαῖς ἐχρήσατο εἰς τὰ ὄργανα): again, the story of a musical invention!

Some final comment deserves the myth of Marsyas recounted by Melanippides (*PMG* 758) and Telestes (*PMG* 805a-c), who seem to have been the New Musicians more interested in mythical *mousikoi*. According to Athenaeus of Naukratis (14.616e-617), the first poet recounted the myth in his *Marsyas* according to the widespread version, in order to show his own rejection of the aulos, while the latter,

²⁵ Cf. Ercoles 2017a. The passage reads as follows: “Ὀλυμπον γὰρ πρῶτον Ἀριστόξενοσ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ μουσικῆς (fr. 80 Wehrli) ἐπὶ τῷ Πύθωνί φησιν ἐπικήδειον αὐλήσαι Λυδιστί. εἰσὶν δ’ οἱ Μελανιππίδην τούτου τοῦ μέλους ἄρξαι φασίν. The implausible attribution of the invention to Melanippides is probably due to the compiler’s misunderstanding of his source, a mistake analogous to other cases in the treatise (1136d and 1136e): in the light of these, it is more reasonable to think of Melanippides as the source of the story concerning the invention of the *epikedeion* than as its inventor.

doubting this mythical story, ‘took up arms against Melanippides’ (616f τῷ Μελανιππίδῃ ἀντικορυσσόμενος) to defend the art of aulos playing in his *Argos*. As P. Leven (2010) has pointed out, there are strong reasons for doubting the historicity of such a debate between the two composers of dithyrambs (a genre generally performed to aulos music in classical Athens!): the historical context provided by Athenaeus does not appear a credible reflection of the contemporary aesthetics and strategies of the poets and their works. On the contrary, it is possible to show that the author of *Deipnosophists* – or, as I believe, his source in this section – “follows the structure of Aristotle’s discussion of aulos playing in Book 8 of the *Politics* and illustrates the Aristotelian argument by poetic examples, which he reads in a historicist manner (as authors expressing their own opinions in the first-person and taking positions on contemporary issues). The statement that, rather than analysing or interpreting fragments, Athenaeus strings them together is not original of course; much more important, however, is the claim that there is an argumentative structure, and an ideological bias, behind an apparently loose stringing-together of quotations”²⁶. Therefore, we need to extract from the fragments themselves all the informations about the treatment of this myth by Melanippides and Telestes.

In both the cases, the lines of the poems quoted by Athenaeus do not concern Marsyas’ musical activity and do not help us to understand in which terms the poets represented the ancient aulos player. In Telestes’ fragments from *Argos*, however, the implications of the mythical account are clear enough: he calls the aulos a ‘clever instrument’ (*PMG* 805a,1f. σοφόν ... / ... ὄργανον) and says that the traditional story about its rejection by Athena ‘idly flew to Greece, told by idly-talking Muse-followers, a tale unsuited to the choral dance, an invidious reproach brought among mortals against a clever skill’ (805b)²⁷, where the ‘clever skill’ (v. 3 σοφᾶς ... τέχνας) is auletic art. The version of the myth that Telestes

²⁶ Leven 2010, 44. For a different view, favourable to the historicity of Athenaeus’ account, see now Fongoni 2016, with further bibliography.

²⁷ Transl. by D.A. Campbell.

1 follows (or invents?) does not include any more the episode of Athena rejecting the aulos: the 'clever'
2 goddess (805a,1 σοφόν) gives as a gift to Dionysos the 'clever instrument' together with the 'clever skill' of
3 playing it (cf. 805c). It follows that, in this account, it was the god to give the aulos to the satyr Marsyas,
4
5 who then became a skillful performer. The myth is thus explicitly intended by Telestes to serve as a
6
7 defence and a celebration of the aulos, the most representative instrument of New Music. Marsyas is not
8
9 any more the focus of the story in the *Argos*, as he apparently was in Melanippides' *Marsyas*, but is only a
10
11 single tessera of a complex mosaic: the myth as it is presented (or shaped) by Telestes. In this case, the
12
13 musical polemic becomes a polemic on myth, as the authorial voice itself clearly states.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 The fragments examined so far, though scanty and generally brief, nonetheless allow us to
22
23 appreciate the symbolic role that mythical musicians may have played in the debate on music in the
24
25 second half of the 5th century. For Timotheus and the other New Musicians, the appeals to these figures
26
27 were a way to construct distant and authoritative models for their own way of making music by projecting
28
29 back onto those ancient colleagues key-features of their style, namely *poikilia*, inventiveness and
30
31 virtuosity²⁸. As seen in the previous part of this work, an echo of the involvement of Marsyas, Orpheus and
32
33 Thamyris in this musical debate can be found in the new iconographies of these figures appearing on
34
35 Attic vessels by the last third of the fifth century, when they begin to be portrayed as virtuoso performers
36
37 who enchant their audience.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Bibliography

52
53
54
55

56 Anderson, W.D. (1994). *Music and Musicians in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
57

58
59 ²⁸ For an antithetical interpretation of the mythical musicians as representants of an old, noble music style see e.g. Heracl.
60 Pont. fr. 157 Wehrli.
61
62
63
64
65

- Barker, A. (1984). *Greek Musical Writings, I. The Musician and his Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barker, A. (1995). Heterophonia and *poikilia*: accompaniments to Greek melody. In: B. Gentili-F. Perusino, eds, *Mousike. Metrica ritmica e musica greca in memoria di Giovanni Comotti*, Pisa/Roma: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, pp. 41-60.
- Barker, A. (2014). The music of Olympus. *QUCC* n.s. 99, pp. 43-57.
- Barker, A. (2014). *Ancient Greek Writers on their Musical Past*. Pisa/Roma: Serra.
- Bernabé, A. (2002). Orfeo. De personaje del mito a autor literario. *Ítaca* 18, pp. 61-78.
- Beschi, L. (1991). Mousikè Téchnē e Thánatos: l'immagine della musica sulle lekythoi funerarie attiche a fondo bianco. *Imago musicae* 8, pp. 39-59.
- Boardman, J. (1956). Some Attic fragments. Pot, plaque and dithyramb. *JHS* 76, pp. 18-25.
- Boardman, J. (1992). Linos. In: *LIMC* 6.1, p. 290.
- Borsoni Ciccolungo, E. (2018). Una nuova proposta per Tim. PMG 791,225s. *Eikasmos* 19, pp. 251-260.
- Bundrick, S. (2005). *Music and Image in Classical Athens*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Campbell, D.A. (1988). *Greek Lyric*, Vol. 2. *Anacreon, Anacreontea, Early Choral Lyric*. London/Cambridge, Mass.: HUP
- Castaldo, D. (2000). *Il Pantheon musicale. Iconografia nella ceramica attica tra VI e IV secolo*. Ravenna: Longo.
- Csapo, E. (2004). The Politics of the New Music. In: P. Murray and P. Wilson, eds, *Music and the Muses: the Culture of 'Mousikē' in the Classical Athenian City*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 207-248.
- Csapo, E. (2011). The Economics, Poetics, Politics, Metaphysics and Ethics of the 'New Music'. In: D. Yatromanolakis, ed., *Music and Cultural Politics*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, pp. 65-131.

- Ercoles, M. (2009). Orfeo apollineo (tra lirica arcaica e critica letteraria d'età classica). *AOFL* 4/2, pp. 47-67.
- Ercoles, M. (2010). Note a Timoth. PMG 791,221-228. *Eikasmós* 21, pp. 111-133.
- Ercoles, M. (2017a). [Plut.] *Mus.* 15, 1136b-c: un nuovo frammento di Melanippide? *QUCC* n.s. 117, pp. 37-44.
- Ercoles, M. (2017b). 'Nuova Musica' e agoni poetici. Il dibattito sulla musica nell'Atene classica. In: A. Gostoli, ed., *Poeti in agone. Competizioni poetiche e musicali nella Grecia antica*, con la collab. di A. Fongoni-F. Biondi, Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 131-161.
- Fongoni, A. (2016). Atena e l'aulos nel Marsia di Melanippide (fr. 785 Page/Campbell) e nell'Argo di Teleste (fr. 805 a-c Page/Campbell). In: L. Bravi, L. Lomiento, A. Meriani and G. Pace, eds, *Tra lyra e aulos. Tradizioni musicali e generi poetici*, Pisa-Roma: Serra, pp. 233-245.
- Franklin, J. C. (2010). Remembering Music in Early Greece. In: S. Mirelman, ed., *The Historiography of Music in Global Perspective*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, pp. 9-50.
- Garezou, M.-X. (1994). Orpheus. In: *LIMC* 7.1, pp. 81-105.
- Gentili, B.-Prato, G. (2002). *Poetae elegiaci. Testimonia et fragmenta*. Ed. altera. Berolini-Novi Eboraci: De Gruyter.
- Gostoli, A. (1988). Terpanandro e la funzione etico-politica della musica nella cultura spartana del VII sec. a.C. In: B. Gentili-R. Pretagostini, eds, *La musica in Grecia*, Roma-Bari: Laterza, pp. 231-237.
- Heinemann, A. (2013). Performance and the Drinking Vessel: Looking for an Imagery of Dithyramb in the Time of the 'New Music'. In: B. Kowalzig, and P. Wilson, eds., *Dithyramb in Context*, Cambridge: CUP, pp. 282-309.
- Heinemann, A. (2016). *Der Gott des Gelages. Dionysos, Satyrn und Mänaden auf attischem Trinkgeschirr des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.

- Iannucci, A. (2009). Il citaredo degli Argonauti. Orfeo e la poetica dell'incanto. In: A.M. Andrisano and P. Fabbri, eds, *La favola di Orfeo. Letteratura, immagine, performance*, Ferrara: UnifePress, pp. 11-22.
- Kaibel, G. (1890). *Athenaei Naucratis Dipnosophistarum libri XV*, III, Stutgardiae: Teubner.
- LeVen, P. (2010). New music and its myths: Athenaeus' reading of the aulos revolution (Deipnosophistae 14.616e–617f). *JHS* 130, pp. 35-47.
- Leven, P. (2013). The Colors of Sound: Poikilia and Its Aesthetic Contexts. *GRMS* 1, pp. 229-242.
- Menichetti, M. (2007). Thamyris, il cantore della politica cimoniana e il cratere di Polion a Ferrara. In F. Giudice and R. Panvini, eds, *Il greco, il barbaro e la ceramica attica. Immaginario del diverso, processi di scambio e autorappresentazione degli indigeni. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (14-19 maggio 2001, Catania-Caltanissetta-Gela-Camarina-Vittoria-Siracusa)*, IV, Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, pp. 107-122.
- Meriani, A. (2007). Il *Thamyras* di Sofocle. In P. Volpe Cacciatore, ed., *Musica e generi letterari nella Grecia di età classica. Atti del II Congresso CUG (Fisciano, 1 dicembre 2006)*, Napoli: Arte Tipografica, pp. 37-70.
- Nercessian, A. (1994). Thamyris, Thamyras. In: *LIMC* 7.1, 902-904
- Portulas, J. (2000). Poetas míticos de Grecia. In: E. Crespo and M.J. Barrios Castro, eds, *Actas del X congreso español de estudios clásicos (21-25 de septiembre de 1999)*, Vol. 1, Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, pp. 289-312.
- Sarti, S. (1992). Gli strumenti musicali di Apollo. *AION(archeol)* 14, pp. 95-104.
- Sarti, S. (2010/2011). Un esempio di competizione musicale nel mito in Grecia: Tamiri. In: D. Castaldo, F.G. Giannachi, A. Manieri, eds., *Poesia, musica e agoni nella Grecia antica / Poetry, Music and Contests in ancient Greece. Atti del IV convegno internazionale di MOISA / Proceedings of the IVth international meeting of MOISA (Lecce, 28-30 ottobre 2010)*, Galatina (LE): Congedo, pp. 219-240.

- Schmidt, S. (2001). Die Athener und die Musen: die Konstruktion von Bildern zum Thema Musik im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. In: R. von den Hoff-S. Schmidt, eds, *Konstruktionen von Wirklichkeit : Bilder im Griechenland des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Stuttgart: Steiner, pp. 281-298.
- Stansbury-O'Donnell, M.D. (1990). Polygnotos' *Nekyia*: a reconstruction and analysis. *AJA* 94, pp. 213-235.
- Van Keer, E. (2004). The Myth of Marsyas in Ancient Greek Art: Musical and Mythological Iconography. *Music in Art* 29, pp. 20-37.
- Van Keer, E. (2008). Olympus the musician in Greek literature and art: mythology and music history. Diss. Liège: ULG (available online: <https://figshare.com/articles/thesis/Olympus_the_musician_in_Greek_literature_pdf/3442808/2>).
- Weis, A.H. (1992). Marsyas I. In: *LIMC* 6.1, pp. 366-376.
- Weis, A.H. (1994). Olympus I. In: *LIMC* 7.1, pp. 38-45.
- Wilson, P. (2009). Thamyras the Thracian: The Archetypal Wandering Poet? In: R. Hunter and I. Rutherford, eds, *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture. Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, Cambridge, pp. 46-79.