

HYPERBOREUS

STUDIA CLASSICA

ναυσι δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὐροῖς
ἔς Ἵπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν

(Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 29–30)

EDITORES

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA
DENIS KEYER ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

PETROPOLI

Vol. 20

2014

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
VERLAG C.H.BECK MÜNCHEN

ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡ ΑΡΕΤΑΣ

Donum natalicium
BERNARDO SEIDENSTICKER
ab amicis oblatum

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
PETROPOLI
MMXV

CONSPECTUS

Carmen natalicium	5
Vorwort	7
WOLFGANG RÖSLER	
Die Hikesie des Phemios und die Bedeutung von ἀὐτοδίδακτος in der <i>Odyssee</i> (22, 344–353)	11
THERESE FUHRER	
Teichoskopie: Der (weibliche) Blick auf den Krieg	23
GERSON SCHADE	
Archilochus, 196a <i>IEG</i> ²	42
NINA ALMAZOVA	
When Was the Pythian Nome Performed?	56
MICHAEL GAGARIN	
Aeschylus' Prometheus: Regress, Progress, and the Nature of Woman ...	92
OLIVER TAPLIN	
A Couple of Conjectures that Point to Hands in Sophocles	101
VICTOR BERS	
“Dame Disease?”: A Note on the Gender of Philoctetes' Wound	105
JENS HOLZHAUSEN	
“Fürchten oder Lieben?” Zu Sophokles, <i>Oidipus Tyrannos</i> , Vers 11 ...	109
PATRICIA E. EASTERLING	
Σεμνός and its Cognates in the Sophoclean Scholia	120
ISTVÁN BODNÁR	
A Testimony of Oenopides in Pliny	126
KLAUS HALLOF	
De epigrammate Coe aetatis classicae	137
RALF KRUMEICH	
Silen und Theater. Zu Ikonographie und Funktion des betagten Halbtieres in der attischen Vasenmalerei des 5. Jhs. v. Chr.	139
ALEXANDER VERLINSKY	
Lysias' Chronology and the Dramatic Date of Plato's <i>Republic</i>	158
NORBERT BLÖSSNER	
Platons Demokratiekapitel (Pl. <i>Rep.</i> 555 b 4 – 562 a 3) und das sokratische Argument	199

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке
Summary in Russian and English

BERND MANUWALD	
Bürger als politische Akteure. Überlegungen zur allgemeinen Politikkompetenz bei Platon und Aristoteles	225
ECKART E. SCHÜTRUMPF	
Aristotle on the Philosophical Nature of Poetry. The Object of <i>Mimesis</i> According to <i>Poet.</i> 9	244
WIDU-WOLFGANG EHLERS	
<i>Libertino patre nati</i>	274
DENIS KEYER	
<i>Venimus ad summum Fortunae</i> : Prosperity and Flourishing of Arts in Horace (<i>Epist.</i> 2. 1. 32–33)	279
ALEXANDER GAVRILOV	
Who Wrote the <i>Encheiridion</i> of Epictetus?	295
FRITZ FELGENTREU	
Κτήμα ἐς ἀεί. Überlegungen zu Eigentum und Historiographie in den Plinius-Briefen	317
CARLO M. LUCARINI	
Emendamenti a Svetonio	331
PETER HABERMEHL	
Origenes' Welten Frühchristliche Kosmologie im Spannungsfeld zwischen Platonismus und Heilsgeschichte	350
ELENA ERMOLAEVA	
A School Ancient Greek Epic Parody from Kellis	370
REINHART MEYER-KALKUS	
Deklamation im antiken Theater und im 18. Jahrhundert. Die Re-Interpretation von Melopoie und Rhythmopoie durch Abbé Dubos und Gotthold Ephraim Lessing	383
STEFAN REBENICH	
Eduard Schwartz und die Altertumswissenschaften seiner Zeit	406
DANIEL P. TOMPKINS	
What Happened in Stockholm? Moses Finley, the Mainz Akademie, and East Bloc Historians	436
Bernd Seidensticker Schriftenverzeichnis	453
Hyperborei vol. XI–XX conspectus	462
Hyperborei vol. XI–XX auctores alphabetico ordine dispositi	472
Key Words	481
Правила для авторов	484
Guidelines for contributors	486

WHEN WAS THE PYTHIAN NOME PERFORMED?

In 586 BC the Pythian festival in Delphi underwent regulation and its program was extended. Pausanias (10. 7. 4–7) reports that in 586 BC aulodic (held only once and removed at the following festival) and auletic contests were added to the ancient citharodic one, and in 558 BC the citharistic agon was introduced.¹ Other sources (*Sch. Pind. Pyth.* hyp. d, vol. II p. 4. 24–26 Dr.; Strab. 9. 3. 10, p. 421; Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 674 D) do not explicitly contradict Pausanias, but omit some details, such as the short-lived introduction of aulody and the succession of adding new musical contests. Strabo states that during the reorganization citharodes were supplemented with instrumentalists – auletes and citharists, and both were obliged to perform the so-called νόμος Πυθικός.² There are three descriptions of this nome, which depicted the victory of Apollo over Python: in Strabo (9. 3. 10, p. 421–422), Pollux (4. 84) and the scholia to Pindar (*Schol. Pind. Pyth.* hyp. a, vol. II p. 2. 8–15 Dr., without mentioning the name νόμος Πυθικός). Bringing this evidence together, we can imagine a five-part structure: an introduction (ἄμπειρα); central section, in two parts, depicting the appearance of Python and his defeat (κατακελευσμός and ἱαμβικόν), and celebrating the victory of the god in a solemn movement and then a lively one (σπονδεῖον / δάκτυλος and καταχόρευσις). Impressive onomatopoeic tricks (σαλπιστικά κρούματα and σύριγγες / ὄδοντισμός, the latter imitating the agony of Python) seem to have shaped or simply adorned one of the central movements.

¹ Paus. 10. 7. 4: τῆς δὲ τεσσαρακοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος καὶ ὀγδῶς, ἦν Γλαυκίας ὁ Κροτωνιάτης ἐνίκησε, ταύτης ἔτει τρίτῳ ἄθλα ἔθεσαν οἱ Ἄμφικτύονες κιθαρωδίας μὲν καθὰ καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, προσέθεσαν δὲ καὶ αὐλωδίας ἀγώνισμα καὶ αὐλῶν· ἀνηγορεύθησαν δὲ νικῶντες Κεφαλὴν τε Μελάμπους κιθαρωδία καὶ αὐλωδὸς Ἄρκας Ἐχέμβροτος, Σακάδας δὲ Ἄργειος ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐλοῖς· ἀνείλετο δὲ ὁ Σακάδας οὗτος καὶ ἄλλας δύο τὰς ἐφεξῆς ταύτης πυθιάδας. *Ibid.* 7: ὀγδῶν δὲ πυθιάδῃ προσενομοθέτησαν κιθαριστὰς τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν κρουμάτων τῶν ἀφῶνων· καὶ Τεγεάτης ἐστεφανοῦτο Ἄγέλαος.

² Strab. 9. 3. 10, p. 421: προσέθεσαν δὲ τοῖς κιθαρωδοῖς αὐλητὰς τε καὶ κιθαριστὰς χωρὶς ὥδῆς, ἀποδώσοντάς τι μέλος ὃ καλεῖται νόμος Πυθικός.

The testimony of Strabo resulted in the wide-spread tendency to treat the participation of auletes and citharists of any period in the Pythian Games mechanically as playing the νόμος Πυθικός.³ The aim of the present paper is to revise this point of view, drawing on all evidence possessed regarding the performance and transmittance of the nome dedicated to Apollo's dragon-fight.

Sacadas the aulete, a native of Argos, is reputed to be the author of the Pythian nome. We are informed (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1134 A; Paus. 6. 14. 10, 10. 7. 4), that he had three successive wins at the first Pythian auletic contests in 586, 582 and 578 BC. Pausanias (2. 22. 8–9) indicates, without using the word νόμος, that the Argive musician was the first to play τὸ Πυθικὸν αὐλήμα in Delphi⁴ – thus Sacadas is not called the first author of this piece, but rather the first to have performed it at the Pythian Games. In Pollux (4. 78) he appears as the inventor of the Pythian nome, standing in the same line as Marsyas, Olympus and other πρῶτοι εὐρεταί of the νόμοι.⁵

Yet before becoming an official subject of the contests, the Pythian nome ought to have already existed for a certain period of time. Sacadas was remembered as the first, and the triple, winner of the Pythian Games; it is probable that his auletic composition became exemplary for his successors. Still even at the first festival his rivals must have played some similar pieces,⁶ so Sacadas could not literally be the πρῶτος εὐρετής of the Pythian nome.

Those sources that ascribe the Pythian nome to Sacadas testify that it was an auletic nome. Strabo states that it was played by auletes as well as by citharists at the Pythian Games.⁷ Indeed it is probable that instrumentalists had similar tasks to fulfill and the citharistic contest, which was introduced later, modeled itself on the auletic one.⁸

³ See, e.g., Schreiber 1879, 25 n. 71; Reisch 1899, 2435 line 33; Chandezon 1998, 40; Strasser 2002, 97; Barker 2011, 51 and n. 2; below n. 73, 87, 88. Cf. Westphal 1869, 72–73: “eine oft wiederholte Composition des griechischen Alterthums, gleichsam das Stabat mater der hellenischen Welt”.

⁴ Paus. 2. 22. 8: ὀλίγον δὲ τῆς ἐπὶ Κυλάρῳβιν καὶ τὴν ταύτη πύλην ἀποτραπέϊσι Σακάδα μνήμᾳ ἐστίν, ὃς τὸ αὐλήμα τὸ Πυθικὸν πρῶτος ἠύλησεν ἐν Δελφοῖς.

⁵ Poll. 4. 78: νόμοι δ' Ὀλύμπου καὶ Μαρσίου Φρύγιοι καὶ Λύδιοι, ὁ δὲ Σακάδα νόμος Πυθικός, οἱ δ' Εὐίου κύκλιοι, καὶ Ὀλύμπου ἐπιτυμβίδιοι etc.

⁶ Cf. Guhrer 1875/76, 334.

⁷ Since we possess unequivocal evidence on the auletic Pythian nome, there is no reason to relate ἀποδώσοντας etc. only to κιθαριστάς (as e.g. Rotstein 2010, 249). Barker 1982, 267–268 notes that the wording of Strabo itself does not rule out the playing of the Pythian nome as a duet of a cithara and an aulos, but as far as we know, an agonistic nome was always a solo piece. The error of Westphal 1869, 73, repeated by Wagner 1888, 3, who imagined that auletes and citharists were engaged to assist the performance of citharodes, has been long since corrected by Hiller 1876, 82–83.

⁸ Hiller 1876, 82–83; Barker 1982, 268; West 1992, 214.

As regards the vocal, citharodic Pythian nome, only one source mentions it explicitly: Plutarch ascribes its performance to Arion, before the legendary singer flung himself into the sea from the ship.⁹ Yet Herodotus, who recounts the same story, mentions νόμον τὸν ὄρθιον¹⁰ instead (1. 24). Traditional νόμοι were still performed in Herodotus' times, so it is unlikely that he would make a reference to an unsuitable type of nome, whereas Plutarch was no expert in music of bygone eras.¹¹ It should be noted that Plutarch describes the Pythian nome as a prayer to a sea god for a prosperous outcome in a dangerous situation – thus it has more in common with a paean than with the descriptions of an instrumental Pythian nome known to us.

Besides, several sources, the earliest being Timaeus of Tauromenium (ca. 356–260¹²), tell the legend of how in Delphi a cicada substituted a torn string for the citharode Eunomus of Locri.¹³ It follows from the account of Clement of Alexandria that Eunomus performed an epitaph to Python at a Delphic contest;¹⁴ the narrator describes it ironically as “either a hymn or a threnody to the serpent”, and then notes that the song of the

⁹ Plut. *Sept. sap. conv.* 161 C–D: ἐσκευασμένος ὄν καὶ προειπὼν ὅτι προθυμία τις αὐτὸν ἔχει τῶν νόμων διελθεῖν τὸν Πυθικὸν ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς νεῶς καὶ τῶν ἐμπλεόντων, καταστάς παρὰ τὸν τοῖχον ἐν πρύμνῃ καὶ τινα θεῶν πελαγίαν ἀνάκλησιν προανακρουσάμενος ἄδοι τὸν νόμον.

¹⁰ The ὄρθιος νόμος is otherwise known as citharodic (*Schol. Aristoph. Ach.* 1042, *Eq.* 1278 a, 1279 a, *Ran.* 1282, *Eccl.* 741; Poll. 4. 65; Suid. εἰ 146, λ 753, ν 478, ο 574, 575, 585 Adler; Phot. *Lex.* α 1303, ν 302 Theodoridis) and auletic (*Schol. Aristoph. Ach.* 16; Poll. 4. 73; Suid. ο 573 Adler).

¹¹ Already Hiller 1876, 82–83 dismissed Plutarch's testimony on the citharodic Pythian nome considering it mere carelessness. Cf. another case of Plutarch's divergence from other sources (apparently by mistake), as regards the name of a nome: he mentions ἀρμάτειος (*De Alex. fort. aut virt.* 335 A) instead of Ἰαθηνᾶς (Dio Chrys. 1. 1; Suid. α 1122; ο 573; τ 620 Adler; see Almazova 2014, 524). There are more errors of detail showing that Plutarch was writing from memory: e.g. Tenedos (*Them.* 12. 8) instead of Tenos (Hdt. 8. 82); Salamis (*Them.* 15. 3) instead of Artemisium (Hdt. 8. 11); see Hamilton ²1999, 1.

¹² See Laqueur 1936, 1078.

¹³ Eunomus cannot be dated: cf. E. Graf, “Eunomus 10”, *RE* 6 (1907) 1133; Stephanis 1988 [I. E. Στεφανίς, *Διονυσιακοὶ τεχνίται. Σύμβολες στὴν προσοπογραφία τοῦ θεάτρον καὶ τῆς μουσικῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων Ἑλλήνων* (Ἡρακλεῖο 1988)] 182 no. 973. Timaeus (*FGrHist* 566 F 43a–b) is referred to in Strab. 6. 1. 9, p. 260; Antig. Caryst. *Parad.* 1. See also: Konon, *FGrHist* 26 F 1 = Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 186 p. 131 b 32–40; *Anth. Pal.* 6. 54, 9. 584; Eustath. *Comm. in Dionysii periegetae orbis descriptionem* 364, p. 282. 5–11 Müller.

¹⁴ Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* 1. 1. 2: πανήγυρις Ἑλληνικῆ ἐπὶ νεκρῷ δράκοντι συνεκροτεῖτο Πυθοῖ, ἐπιτάφιον ἔρπετοῦ ἄδοντος Εὐνόμου· ὕμνος ἢ θρήνος ὄφεως ἦν ἢ ᾠδή, οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν. Ἀγὼν δὲ ἦν καὶ ἐκίθარიζεν ὥρα καύματος Εὐνόμου...

cicadas was better than the “nomes” of Eunomus (τῶν Εὐνόμου βελτίονα νόμων). Two other sources relate Eunomus’ performance explicitly to the Pythian Games;¹⁵ none but Clement mention its contents. Yet an epitaph to Python can hardly be identified with the Pythian nome. Rather, the description of Clement makes one recollect another (auletic) piece on a similar subject – an Ἐπικήδειον, that is, a funerary song dedicated to Python.¹⁶ However, the words of Clement (cf. id., *Protrep.* 2. 34. 1) could well be nothing more than a bringing together of everything he happened to know about the Pythian cult of Apollo, composed as a biting report on absurd pagan superstitions. He could easily have invented the fact that the dragon was praised in a nome, in order to sharpen the contrast between the ridiculous subject of Eunomus and the God-inspired song of cicadas.

Thus in both cases our evidence is from a much later period, concerns fantastic occasions, and neither performance resembles the subject matter of the instrumental Pythian nome.

Considering information on the most ancient citharodic contest at the Pythian Games, we must note that its subject is nowhere referred to as νόμοι: according to Strabo (9. 3. 10, p. 421), the citharodes performed a παῖάν to Apollo, according to Pausanias (10. 7. 2), a ὕμνος. Four Pythian victories in the seventh century BC are ascribed to Terpander,¹⁷

¹⁵ Strab. 6. 1. 9, p. 260: Πυθίοις ἀγωνιζομένους τοῦτόν τε καὶ Ἀρίστωνα Ῥηγίνον; Eustath. *Comm. in Dionysii periegetae orbis descriptionem* 364, p. 282. 8 Müller: ἐν Πυθίοις ποτὲ ἀγωνιζομένου τοῦ Εὐνόμου.

¹⁶ Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 15, 1136 C = Aristox. fr. 80 Wehrli: Ὀλυμπον γὰρ πρῶτον Ἀριστοῦξενος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ μουσικῆς ἐπὶ τῷ Πύθωνι φησιν ἐπικήδειον ἀυλῆσαι Λυδιστί. εἰσὶ δ’ οἱ Μελανιππίδην τούτου τοῦ μέλους ἄρξαι φασί. Schreiber 1879, 25: “scheint es für den auletischen Νόμος Πυθικός das Vorbild gegeben zu haben”; West 1992, 214 n. 56: “This sounds like a variation on the *Pythikos nomos*”. There is other, though late, evidence that paying tribute to Python was not incompatible with the Delphic cult: some authors (Hygin. *Fab.* 140. 5; Clem. Alex. *Protrep.* 2. 34. 1; Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 190 p. 153 a 1–5; Ioann. Antioch. *Hist. chron.* fr. 1 Müller *FHG* IV p. 539 = fr. 21* Roberto) claim that the Pythian Games were founded as funeral games for the serpent; *Sch. Pind. Pyth.* hyp. c, vol. II p. 4. 9–11 Dr. and Plutarch’s interpretation of the rite of S(t)epherion (Plut. *Aet. Rom. et Gr.* 293 C; *De def. or.* 418 B) shows that purification of Apollo after its murder was felt appropriate (see Nilsson ²1995, 150–157). Yet Mommsen 1878, 170–173 plausibly ascribes the transformation of a bloodthirsty monster, as it occurs in the Homeric hymn to Apollo, into a legitimate guardian of the oracle to a later rationalist alteration of the *vulgata* (first attested in the first half of the 4th century BC). At any rate, the mood of the Pythian nome seems to be quite the opposite: it depicts the triumph of Apollo.

¹⁷ According to Pseudo-Plutarch (*De mus.* 1132 E; 1133 A), Terpander was one generation older than Archilochus, so his activity can be dated to the first half of the seventh century BC. Terpander is named the first winner at the Carneia in Ol. 26 (676–

the legendary *πρῶτος εὔρετής* of the citharodic *nomos*.¹⁸ Yet, first, there is no direct evidence that exactly *νόμοι*, not to speak of the Pythian *nomos*, were performed by Terpsander at the Pythian Games; second, there is no mention of the Pythian *nomos* among the *νόμοι* of Terpsander.

As is indicated already by H. Guhrauer – the author of the first fundamental research dedicated to the Pythian *nomos*, – program instrumental music cannot be understood if the subject is not known to the audience in advance.¹⁹ Westphal and Guhrauer argued that the plot of the *νόμος Πυθικός* was taken from an analogous citharodic *nomos*, a song about the victory over Python accompanied on a cithara.²⁰ We have seen that the evidence of such a *nomos* is not quite reliable, but there can be no doubt that the *ἱερός λόγος* of the Pythian festival, that is, the story of Apollo slaying Python, was reproduced in Delphi²¹ in every possible way since the earliest of times. There are several poetic versions of this story: the Homeric hymn to Apollo (*Hymn. Hom.* 3. 300–304, 353–374), the hymn by Callimachus (*Hymn.* 2. 97–104), the song of Orpheus in Apollonius of Rhodes (2. 705–713), choral paeans by Athenaeus (or an unknown author from Athens) and by Limenius;²² later Lucian (*De salt.* 38) names Πύθωνος ἀναίρεσιν among the subjects proper to pantomime. Apparently, the prototype of all these works was rooted in the ritual,²³ which presupposed the rendering of

673 BC): Athen. 14. 37, p. 635 e. The Parian Marble (*Marmor Parium* ep. 34 = *IG XII*, 5, 444_{49b}) dates his ἀκμή to 645/644 BC, and Eusebius (*Chron. can.* p. 88 Schoene *He*) to Ol. 36 (636–633 BC).

¹⁸ Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 4, 1132e: ἔοικε δὲ κατὰ τὴν τέχνην τὴν κιθαρωδικὴν ὁ Τέρπανδρος διενηνοχέειν· τὰ Πύθια γὰρ τετράκις ἐξῆς νενικηκῶς ἀναγέγραπται. Yet Terpsander dates back to a much earlier period than the regulation of the Pythian games in 586 BC, so we can doubt whether the victories were already documented during his lifetime. The record of Pseudo-Plutarch seems more like a story of Dioscuri and Heracles as the winners of the Pythian contests crowned personally by Apollo (see *Schol. Pind. Pyth., hyp.* a, vol. II p. 2. 22 – 3. 4 Dr.): it seemed natural to relate the famous “father of citharody” to the Pythian Games.

¹⁹ Guhrauer 1875/76, 336; Guhrauer 1904, 8.

²⁰ Westphal 1869, 75; Guhrauer 1875/76, 336; Guhrauer 1904, 7.

²¹ Probably along with other deeds of the god: e.g., in Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1132 A the narrative about the wanderings of Leto and the birth of the divine twins is ascribed to the legendary Philammon.

²² Athenaeus: Powell 1925, 141–148; Furley, Bremer 2001, II, 85, l. 19–22; Pöhlmann, West 2001, no. 20, l. 21–24. Limenius: Powell 1925, 149–159; Furley, Bremer 2001, II, 93, l. 23–30; Pöhlmann, West 2001, no. 21, l. 23–30. Most likely, both paeans were performed at the Athenian Pythais of 128 BC, though arguments were also adduced for dating one of them to the previous (138 BC) or the next Pythais (106 BC): see Furley, Bremer 2001, I, 129–131.

²³ Kolk 1963, 42.

this story, perhaps with a series of compulsory details, be it in a narration of the priests, dramatic performance, rhapsodic recitation, choral hymn, or solo citharody, and so on. Instrumental music must have achieved a breakthrough, when it became more than a mere accompaniment to ritual, and gained its own autonomy.²⁴

Thus the citharodes at the Pythian festival probably praised the deeds of Apollo from time immemorial. However, we are not aware, as to whether the term νόμος Πυθικός was applied to the pieces performed by them, and if so, in what period.

Sixteen auletes (not accompanied by a chorus) and one citharist, which won at the Pythian Games in Delphi, are known from literary (till the fourth century) and epigraphical (in the Roman period) sources (see Appendix). Aside from the first winners of the reorganized agon dating back to the first half of the sixth century, we are never told whether they played a Pythian nome. For the most part we know nothing about the contents of their performance, but in two cases there are direct indications that other pieces not dedicated to Apollo's victory were performed.

It is most probable that Midas the aulete won the Pythian victory in 490 BC playing a πολυκέφαλος νόμος about the slaying of Medusa by Perseus (Pind. *Pyth.* 12). If the word τέχνη in lines 6–7 (αὐτόν τέ νιν Ἑλλάδα νικάσαντα τέχνα, τάν ποτε Παλλάς ἐφεῦρε) can signify the art of composing and performing the Many-headed nome,²⁵ this is indicated explicitly in the text. Even if τέχνη refers to the art of aulos-playing in general, the performance of exactly the Many-headed nome by Midas is still highly plausible.²⁶

According to Himerius, Antigenidas the aulete (first half of the fourth century BC) rehearsed the nome of Athena for the Pythian contest (*Or.* 74, 2, p. 247 Colonna: καὶ αὐτόν ἄγων τὸν τῆς ἀγωνίας Ἀθηνᾶς ἐπικαλούμενον νόμον).

This information in itself puts into question the possibility of equating competition at the Pythian Games to performance of the Pythian nome.

E. Pöhlmann, on the basis of Pind. *Pyth.* 12, argues that pieces dedicated to Apollo formed the compulsory program for the participants, while those on other subjects were optional.²⁷ In order to prove that the

²⁴ Guhrauer 1875/76, 332, 336; Kolk 1963, 43 n. 15.

²⁵ Cf. *LSJ* s.v. τέχνη IV: = τέχνημα work of art, handwork: Soph. *OC* 472; fr. 156 Radt.

²⁶ See Almazova 2001 [Н. А. Алмазова, “К характеристике инструментально-го нома”], 81–83, 87 n. 27.

²⁷ Pöhlmann 2012, 273–282, esp. 275, 282.

πολυκέφαλος νόμος was performed before the beginning of the contests, he cites an epithet of this nome in verse 24: εὐκλεᾶ λαοσσόων μναστήρ ἄγωνων, with the comment of Wilamowitz: “Er mahnt also das Volk, das Publikum, zu den Spielen zu eilen”.²⁸ However, the verse may simply imply that the Many-headed nome was agonistic, that is, associated with the contests (μναστήρ < μέμνημαι) or inseparable from them (< μνάομαι).

It seems much more plausible that the program of every contest was strictly defined and required an equal number of the pieces to be performed by every participant – most probably just one, since our sources indicate only one νόμος, which brought victory to Sacadas, Midas, or Antigenidas.²⁹ Therefore I prefer another explanation. An agonistic occasion inspired for novelty, which resulted in the pieces performed losing their ritual character.³⁰ Just as the contents of dithyramb and drama at the Athenian Dionysia and Lenaea ceased to have anything to do with Dionysus, as time went by,³¹ the agonistic pieces played by the musicians at the Pythian Games could have lost the connection to Apollo and gained more variety: either the term ‘νόμος Πυθικός’ became more inclusive (which is less plausible, since this term was still known to Strabo and Pollux as the name of a nome about Python), or the Pythian nome was not the only nome permitted.³² Judging from the evidence of Pindar, this happened rather early, by the start of the fifth century BC.

As an argument in favour of his hypothesis about the compulsory and optional programs of the Pythian Games, Pöhlmann refers to epigraphical hymns to Apollo and Hestia by Aristonous (third quarter of the fourth century BC).³³ Yet there is no indication that Aristonous took part in

²⁸ Pöhlmann 2012, 282 n. 65, 66, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1922, 144. Farnell 1932, 236 and Burton 1962, 30 also admit that this phrase may point to the use of πολυκέφαλος νόμος as a prelude to the whole festival, but Burton thinks it equally possible that it was a piece for competition.

²⁹ The only indication of the opposite is late evidence from Argos in *SEG* 29 (1979) 340: see below p. 76.

³⁰ Pickard-Cambridge² 1962, 32, 39; Comotti 1989, 24.

³¹ Cf. the famous proverb οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον. Suid. ο 806, Phot. *Lex.* ο 357 Theodoridis; Zenob. *Centuria* 5, v. 40.

³² Almazova 2001, 87.

³³ Diehl 1925, II, 297–302, *Poetae melici* XVI 1a (Δελφοὶ ἔδωκαν Ἀριστονόφω, ἐπεὶ τοὺς ὕμνους τοῖς θεοῖς ἐποίησεν), αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκγόνοις προξενίαν κτλ.), 1b (Ἀριστόνοος Νικοσθένου Κορίνθιος [Ἀ]πόλλωνι Πυθίῳ τὸν ὕμνον), 2a (Ἀριστονόφω Ἔστί[α]); see Powell 1925, 162–165; Furley, Bremer 2001, I, 116–121; II, 38–52.

a contest at the Pythian Games,³⁴ and no evidence whether his hymns were performed by a soloist or by a chorus. The strophic structure of the hymn to Apollo makes one think rather of a choral performance, which has nothing in common with the contest of solo virtuosi performing the Pythian nome.³⁵ Analogous evidence for various musical and poetic productions required for religious ceremonies at Delphi is provided by epigraphical monuments. Choral paeans of Athenaeus and Limenius³⁶ were a dedication to Apollo from the Athenian Guild of the artists of Dionysus, and their performance during an Athenian Pythais was not agonistic. In a Delphic decree of ca. 227 BC (*SIG*³ 450) an Athenian poet Cleochares is praised for composing a prosodion, a paean and a hymn for Apollo during his stay in Delphi; all three pieces were meant to be performed by a children's chorus during a sacrifice at the festival of Theoxenia. No contests are implied.

Therefore, whereas the purpose of praising other deities alongside Apollo and performing music outside the contests in Delphi is beyond any doubt, the assumption that the program of the Pythian contests was divided into compulsory and optional cannot be proven.

Let us now analyze evidence (or what might be considered evidence) for the performance of the Pythian nome. Aside from the passages indicated above (Strabo, Pollux and Plutarch), there are no cases of using the expression νόμος Πυθικός.

1) In Paus. 2. 22. 8 (see above n. 4) τὸ Πυθικὸν ἄλλημα is certainly the same as the Pythian nome, for Pausanias calls as such the piece of Sacadas.

2) There are good reasons to assume that Pythocritus of Sicyon, who, according to Pausanias (6. 14. 9–10), was the next Pythian winner at aulos-playing after Sacadas and gained six victories successively, played the Pythian nome. Firstly, since in 558 BC this nome formed the program of the newly introduced contest of citharists, it is unlikely that it would have disappeared from the program of auletes at that point; meanwhile, Pythocritus remained the continual winner of the Pythian Games till 554 BC. Secondly, Pausanias provides an unexpected detail: Pythocritus,

³⁴ Pace Pöhlmann 2012, 282, who says that the hymns of Aristonous were created for the Pythian games of 334/3 BC. Furley, Bremer 2001, I, 120–121, think that these hymns were designated for the Delphic Theoxenia.

³⁵ The hymn to Apollo of Aristonous is certainly not a Pythian nome, since the dragon-fight is not even mentioned, but bears formal traits of a paean (i.e. a paean-refrain) instead.

³⁶ See above n. 22.

as an outstanding aulete, accompanied the pentathlon contests at six Olympic Games.³⁷ In another passage dealing with founding the Olympic Games by Heracles (Paus. 5. 7. 10), the music that sounded at this contest is called τὸ αὐλημα τὸ Πυθικόν, and the custom to perform it during the jumping contest at the pentathlon is explained by the fact that Apollo, to whom this piece is dedicated, once participated in this contest.³⁸ Therefore, in Pausanias, τὸ Πυθικόν αὐλημα is nothing else but the Pythian nome, and we are surprised to learn that in the sixth century BC it was used as accompaniment to the athletes in Olympia.

3) An obscure passage by Philochorus deals with the reformatory activities of the citharist Lysander of Sicyon.³⁹ Lysander is known only from this fragment. M. West dates him to the early fifth, and A. Barker, to the late sixth century BC, assuming that, since Epigonus, who is mentioned in the text, stayed for a long period in Sicyon, Lysander himself could belong to οἱ περὶ Ἐπίγονον.⁴⁰ We are told, in particular, that Lysander was the first to play ἰάμβους and συριγμόν on the cithara. Meanwhile, ἰαμβοὶ and συριγμός were elements of the Pythian nome. This is hardly

³⁷ Paus. 6. 14. 9–10: παρὰ δὲ τὸν Πόρρον ἀνὴρ μικρὸς αὐλοὺς ἔχων ἐστὶν ἐκτετυπωμένος ἐπὶ στήλῃ. τούτῳ Πυθικαὶ νίκαι γεγόνασιν τῷ ἀνδρὶ δευτέρῳ μετὰ Σακάδαν τὸν Ἀργεῖον· Σακάδας μὲν γὰρ τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν τεθέντα ὑπὸ Ἀμφικτυόνων οὐκ ὄντα πω στεφανίτην καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ στεφανίτας δύο ἐνίκησε, Πυθόκριτος δὲ ὁ Σικυώνιος τὰς ἐφεξῆς τούτων πυθιάδας ἕξ, μόνος δὴ οἶδος αὐλητῆς· δῆλα δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι τῷ Ὀλυμπίᾳ στήλῃ ἐπὶ πέντάθλῳ. Πυθοκρίτῳ μὲν γέγονεν ἀντὶ τούτων ἢ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ στήλῃ καὶ ἐπίγραμμα ἐπ' αὐτῇ, “Πυθοκρίτου <τοῦ> Καλλινίκου μνάμα ταύλητᾶ <τά>δε”.

³⁸ Paus. 5. 7. 10: νικῆσαι δὲ ἄλλοι τε λέγονται καὶ ὅτι Ἀπόλλων παραδράμοι μὲν ἐρίζοντα Ἑρμῆν, κρατήσαι δὲ Ἄρεως πυγμῆ. τούτου δὲ ἔνεκα καὶ τὸ αὐλημα τὸ Πυθικόν φασὶ τῷ πηδήματι ἐπεισαχθῆναι τῶν πεντάθλων, ὡς τὸ μὲν ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸ αὐλημα ὄν, τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα δὲ ἀνηρημένον Ὀλυμπικὰς νίκας.

³⁹ Philochor. *FGrHist* 328 F 23 = Athen. 14. 42, p. 637 f – 638 a: Φιλόχορος δ' ἐν γ' Ἀτθίδος “Λύσανδρος, φησὶν, ὁ Σικυώνιος κιθαριστῆς πρῶτος μετέστησε τὴν ψιλοκιθαριστικὴν, μακροὺς τοὺς τόνους ἐντέINAS καὶ τὴν φωνὴν εὐογον ποιήσας, καὶ τὴν ἔναυλον κιθάρισιν, ἢ πρῶτοι οἱ περὶ Ἐπίγονον ἐχρήσαντο. καὶ περιελὼν τὴν συντομίαν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ἐν τοῖς ψιλοῖς κιθαρισταῖς χρώματά τε εὐχρῶα πρῶτος ἐκιθάρισε καὶ ἰάμβους καὶ μάγαδιν, τὸν καλούμενον συριγμόν, καὶ ὄργανον μετέλαβεν μόνος τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα αὐξήσας χορὸν περιεστήσατο πρῶτος”.

⁴⁰ West 1992, 69, 214; Barker 1982, 266. On Epigonus, see: Aristoxen. *El. harm.* p. 7. 19–22 Da Rios = 3. 20–25 Meibom; Athen. 4. 81, p. 183 d; Poll. 4. 59. Epigonus can be dated no more precisely than to the sixth century BC (Sicyon became attractive for the musicians since the rule of Cleisthenes [ca. 600–565 BC]: von Jan, Graf 1907, 69). Aristoxenus names the pupils of Epigonus together with Lasus and accuses them of the same mistake: see Barker 2007, 80.

mere coincidence, so A. Barker⁴¹ considers two possibilities. Lysander's innovations could be intended specifically for the citharistic contest at the Pythian Games, that is, for performing the obligatory Pythian nome. Otherwise, Philochorus was not referring exactly to the Pythian nome (therefore there is no explicit mention of it); more probably, Lysander generally aimed at producing on a cithara all the special effects mastered by contemporary auletes, which were required, among other pieces, for the Pythian nome as well. In this case the evidence of Philochorus is not necessarily related to the Pythian nome, so it neither rules out nor proves its performance by Lysander.

Yet the discrepancy between the records of Philoxenus and other sources must be taken into account: according to Pausanias and Strabo, the Pythian nome, with its iambic section and *σύριγγες*, was performed by the citharists at the Pythian Games from 558 BC, and it was not Lysander, but Agelaus of Tegea who won the first victory. How can we reconcile this evidence? It is hardly plausible that *ἴαμβοι* and *συριγγμός*, which Lysander was the first to play on a cithara, were something quite different from the movements of the Pythian nome. One could suppose that solo cithara-playing was still primitive at the time of its introduction at the Pythian Games, so Agelaus, even while performing the Pythian nome, had to do without *ἴαμβοι* and *συριγγμός*. In this case, the description of Strabo deals primarily with the auletic νόμος Πυθικός⁴² – or with the citharistic one as well, but as it was later in the course of development.⁴³ Yet the decision to include solo cithara-playing among the Pythian contests was most probably prompted by its rapid and considerable progress. Therefore it is more tempting to suppose that Lysander's activities preceded Agelaus' victory at the first citharistic contest in Delphi. The dating of Lysander is based entirely on the no less hypothetic dating of Epigonus: the words *πρώτος μετέστησε ... τὴν ἔναυλον κιθάρισιν, ἣν πρῶτοι οἱ περὶ Ἐπίγονον ἐχρήσαντο* imply that Epigonus and his school were Lysander's predecessors.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Barker 1982, 267–268.

⁴² Most of the data we possess deals with the *auletic* Pythian nome, therefore, it has probably become the most original and most famous – a Pythian nome *κατ' ἐξοχήν*: Guhrauer 1875/76, 350; Schreiber 1879, 29.

⁴³ Likewise, in a report about the Pythian Games Strabo does not mention that aulody was introduced and then withdrawn, and that cithara-playing did not appear at the same time with aulos-playing.

⁴⁴ The expression *πρῶτοι ἐχρήσαντο* cannot mean that the disciples of Epigonus were the first to use the invention of Lysander, since in Athenaeus it is always synonymous to 'contrive, invent': Athen. 6. 91; 11. 101; 12. 11, 27; 14. 37, 40, 42; 15. 37.

It seems possible that Epigonus, Lysander and Agelaus were roughly contemporary and active around the second and the third quarters of the sixth century. In this case the discoveries of Lysander, aiming at getting over ἡ συντομία ἢ ὑπάρχουσα ἐν τοῖς ψιλοῖς κιθαρισταῖς, prepared the breakthrough in cithara-playing and consequently its appearance at the Pythian Games of 558 BC. As for borrowing ἔναυλος κιθάρισις from the school of Epigonus, this can be related to a later period of his activity (thus it would be possible not to locate the followers of Epigonus too far from Lasus, considering that Aristoxenus mentions them together).

In this case the fragment of Philochorus would provide additional indirect evidence that the Pythian nome was performed in the first half of the sixth century BC.

4) Aristoph. *Av.* 857–858 (414 BC):

ἴτω ἴτω ἴτω δὲ Πυθιάς βοά,
συναυλείτω δὲ Χαῖρις ᾠδᾶ.

Schol. Aristoph. Av. 857:

Πυθιάς βοά· Βοᾶ ὁ ἀύλητής· εἴρηται ὅτι ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις ἠύλουν.
Ἄλλως (= Suid. π 3130)· ἡ μετ' αὐλοῦ γινομένη βοή· τὸ Πύθιον μέλος.
ἔνθεν καὶ πυθαύλης γίνεται· οὕτω δὲ ἔλεγον τὸν παιᾶνα· καὶ τοῦτο
δὲ ἐκ Πηλέως.

The chorus of birds performs a prosodion,⁴⁵ that is, a song in honour of the gods that accompanies a procession approaching an altar for sacrifice. For this strophe the scholia indicate borrowings from Sophocles' *Peleus*; it is hard to define the limits of the quotation precisely, but the expression Πυθιάς βοά was evidently part of it.⁴⁶ The scholiast interprets it in two different ways: (a) sounds of an aulos or (b) sounds accompanied by an aulos; the latter are explained as τὸ Πύθιον μέλος, which is in its turn a

⁴⁵ Προσόδια (sc. μέλη), v. 853. It is the only known case of using the word προσόδιον in the Classical period.

⁴⁶ *Schol. Aristoph. Av.* 851 ὁμοροθῶ· Σοφοκλέους ἐκ Πηλέως, 857 Πυθιάς βοά· καὶ τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ Πηλέως. As Dunbar 1995, 505 ad v. 851–858, indicates, ἴτω δὲ Πυθιάς βοά is a phrase proper of a tragedy and forming a regular iambic dimeter (Aristophanes could repeat ἴτω three times to produce an impression of a birds' song, like in v. 228); on the other hand, it is possible that Aristophanes took only the words Πυθιάς βοά from Sophocles and completed the line in a tragic mood (cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 964; Soph. *Tr.* 207–209; Eur. *El.* 879).

paean. Surely the word βοή in a poetic text can signify the loud sounds of a musical instrument.⁴⁷ Yet in Aristophanes the chorus sings to the aulos accompaniment, so the βοά must be produced by the chorus-members (still more so, since the whole strophe deals with their actions and intentions, whereas the instrumental accompaniment is first mentioned only in the next line). Most probably Πυθιάς βοά is the same as ᾠδά in v. 858, that is, the song performed by the chorus; it is also possible that the “Pythian cry” is just a ritual exclamation ἠ παϊάν.⁴⁸ The scholiast must be right in relating Πυθιάς βοά to a paean:⁴⁹ the paean (both as a song and a ritual cry) did not lose its clear association with Apollo (hence the possibility of the adjective ‘Pythian’), and at the same time it suited a great number of occasions: prayer for good fortune, averting evil and expression of joy.⁵⁰ Anyway, Πυθιάς βοά in Aristophanes cannot signify a Pythian nome.

5) A certain arrangement on an aulos used by professional musicians was called σύριγξ.⁵¹ One testimony is provided by Aristoxenus (ap. Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1138 A):

αὐτικά Τηλεφάνης ὁ Μεγαρικὸς οὕτως ἐπολέμησε ταῖς σύριγξιν,
ὥστε τοὺς ἀύλοποιοὺς οὐδ’ ἐπιθεῖναι πάποτ’ εἶασεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀύλους,
ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Πυθικοῦ ἀγῶνος μάλιστα διὰ τοῦτ’ ἀπέστη.

⁴⁷ Hom. *Il.* 18. 495 (aulos, phorminx); Pind. *Ol.* 3. 8; Bacchyl. 9. 68; Ion Chios fr. 23 N. = Athen 14. 35, p. 634 c (aulos); Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 39 (lyre).

⁴⁸ Dunbar 1995, 505 ad v. 851–858. Cf. Rutherford 2001, 65: the Πυθιάς βοά must be the παϊάν-cry, and it suggests that the songs the chorus is going to sing are παϊάνες. The assumption of Dunbar, that the chorus could indeed produce this ritual cry at the end of the song – perhaps three times (cf. the triple ἕτω), – does not seem convincing: in the strophe under review ritual actions are named rather than reproduced in detail. In other cases the manuscripts of Aristophanes do not omit ἠ παϊάν: see below n. 50.

⁴⁹ It is true that in some sources a prosodion is mentioned alongside with a paean and is not identical to it: *SIG*³ 698 C, Delphi, 2nd cent. BC; *Schol. Aristoph. Av.* 918; Athen. 6. 62, p. 253 b; Ael. Arist. *Ἀσκληπιάδαι* 46; Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 239 p. 319 b 36. But cf. *Schol. Pind. Isthm.* 1 inscr. b, vol. III p. 197. 1 Dr.: προσοδιακὸν παϊάνα (even if understood as a rhythmical term προσοδιακόν must be etymologically connected to a cult procession).

⁵⁰ See Rutherford 2001, 36–58. Cf. in Aristophanes: *Ach.* 1212 – a prayer for healing; *Pax* 453, *Vesp.* 874 – a prayer for good luck; *Eq.* 408, 1318, *Pax* 555, *Av.* 1763, *Lys.* 1291, *Th.* 1034–1035 (a quotation from Euripides) – exultation (including celebration of a victory and a wedding).

⁵¹ Aristox. *El. harm.* p. 26. 8–27. 3 Da Rios = 20. 32–21. 5 Meibom; Ps.-Aristot. *De audibilibus* in Porphyrius, *Εἰς τὰ Ἀρμονικὰ Πτολεμαίου ὑπόμνημα* 75. 31–33 Düring; Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1138 A.

Telephanes was active in the fourth century BC.⁵² It follows from the passage that in his lifetime it was normal for professional auletes and obligatory for participants in the Pythian contests to have a σὺριγξ on an aulos, therefore the prescribed program could not be managed without it.⁵³ Most probably a σὺριγξ was a speaker hole for facilitating the overblowing.⁵⁴

A theory suggests itself,⁵⁵ that σὺριγξ was needed to imitate the agony of Python (σύριγγες / σύριγμα / ὄδοντισμός⁵⁶) in a Pythian nome. According to E. Pöhlmann,⁵⁷ this passage proves that the Pythian nome was still part of the compulsory program of the Pythian Games. Yet it appears from our sources that συριγμός was a wide-spread effect in aulos-playing.⁵⁸ A joke of Antisthenes in Xenophon demonstrates that its typical application was depicting negative emotions.⁵⁹ Even if it owes its initiation to the Pythian nome, later such mimetic effects became used in other solo auletic pieces as well. It seems that onomatopoeia was one of the most impressive elements of every instrumental nome:⁶⁰ in a Many-headed nome it was used to mimic the cries of the gorgons and hissing of the snakes on their heads; in a Chariot nome, possibly, the sound of a rushing chariot.⁶¹ We can suppose that at the Pythian Games of the fourth century onomatopoeic effects were required from virtuoso

⁵² Dem. 21. 17; *Anth. Pal.* 7. 159; see Guhrauer 1875/76, 342–343; Stephanis 1988, no. 2408; Bélis 1999, 201; Hagel 2012, 491–492.

⁵³ We do not know when the aulos σὺριγξ came into use. However, considering evidence on musical innovations of the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century BC, it seems more probable that Telephanes struggled against a new invention of the period, than against a device which had been used for more than two centuries, starting from the times of Sacadas: see Hagel 2012, 494–495.

⁵⁴ Howard 1893, 32–35; for support of the hypothesis of Howard by new archaeological evidence and a solution of the problems debated, see Hagel 2012, 489–518.

⁵⁵ Bélis 1999, 202.

⁵⁶ Apparently ὄδοντισμός in Pollux can be identified with συριγμός in Strabo and the scholia to Pindar, since both are the final sounds of an agonized Python.

⁵⁷ Pöhlmann 2012, 277.

⁵⁸ Cf. Poll. 4. 83: μέρη δ' ἀλλημάτων κρούματα, συρίγματα, τερετισμοί τερετίσματα, νίγλαροι.

⁵⁹ Xen. *Symp.* 6. 5: καὶ ὁ Καλλίας ἔφη: Ὅταν οὖν ὁ Ἀντισθένης ὄδ' ἐλέγχει τινὰ ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ, τί ἔσται τὸ ἀλλημα; καὶ ὁ Ἀντισθένης εἶπε: Τῷ μὲν ἐλεγχομένῳ οἶμαι ἄν, ἔφη, πρέπειν συριγμόν.

⁶⁰ Guhrauer 1875/76, 8: onomatopoeia in the Pythian and the Many-headed nomes was a pièce de résistance. Pöhlmann 1960, 71: “Glanzstück der Tonmalerei des Nomos”.

⁶¹ Almazova 2014, 526–527.

auletes in any piece, and by this time (unlike the time of Sacadas) they could be reproduced with due perfection only by means of a σὺριγξ. A question could be raised: if applying such effects was compulsory for participation in the Pythian Games, yet at the same time the program was not restricted to the Pythian nome, how could their presence in a competitive piece be controlled in advance? Perhaps the rules were like those of modern free skating: only performing complicated elements made the victory possible. Therefore I think that the fragment of Aristoxenus neither excludes nor proves performance of the Pythian nome in fourth-century Delphi.

6) According to Pausanias, during the founding of Messene (369 BC) building the walls was accompanied by Boeotian and Argive aulos music, primarily the pieces of Sacadas and Pronomus (an eminent aulete of the turn of the fifth to the fourth century BC).⁶² This important evidence shows that the music of Sacadas was transmitted at least until the middle of the fourth century BC. It is probable that among the masterpieces preserved by tradition there was his famous Pythian nome (or Pythian nomes).

7) Himerius (*Or.* 39. 3, p. 160 Colonna) tells the story of how Ismenias the aulete at the same time received both a request from Alexander of Macedon to play in honour of a victory over the Persians and an invitation from the Delphic ambassadors to perform at a Pythian πανήγυρις. The aulete combined both requests, considering that praising Delphi as a reward gained by Apollo for his victory would be thematically suitable for the Macedonian king as well. The episode can be dated to 334–331 BC (the Persian campaign of Alexander).

ἀκούω δὲ καὶ Ἴσμηνίαν τὸν αὐλητὴν Θήβαθεν ὑπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου καλούμενον, ἵν' ἐπηγήσῃ τῷ Περσῶν φόνῳ τὰ νικητήρια, περὶ τὴν Φωκίδα πυθόμενον, ὅτι θύουσι Δελφοὶ τὰ Πύθια, καὶ τινος τάχα καὶ πρεσβείας παρ' αὐτὸν ἐλθούσης μὴ σιγῇ αὐτοῖς παραδραμεῖν τὴν πανήγυριν, δέξασθαί τε τὴν πρεσβείαν, καὶ καθάπερ τι δεξιὸν τῷ βασιλεῖ σύμβολον τὴν πόλιν προσᾶσαι, ὡς τῆς νίκης ἄθλον Ἀπόλλωνος.

⁶² Paus. 4. 27. 7: καὶ τὴν μὲν τότε ἡμέραν πρὸς θυσίαις τε καὶ εὐχαῖς ἦσαν, ταῖς δὲ ἐφεξῆς τοῦ τεύχους τὸν περίβολον ἡγειρον καὶ ἐντὸς οἰκίας καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐποιοῦντο. εἰργάζοντο δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ μουσικῆς ἄλλης μὲν οὐδεμιᾶς, αὐλῶν δὲ Βοιωτῶν καὶ Ἀργείων· τὰ τε Σακάδα καὶ Προνόμου μέλη τότε δὴ προήχθη μάλιστα ἐς ἄμιλλαν.

Here we have an auletic performance with a narrative subject, namely dedicated to the victory of Apollo that brought him sovereignty over Delphi. Most probably we are dealing with a performance of a Pythian nome, though at a religious ceremony rather than at a contest (NB $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$; if it were not for Ismenias, the festival would run the risk of being held $\sigma\iota\gamma\eta$; a personal invitation in advance rules out ordinary participation in an agon). Of course we lack the data for firm conclusions, but it is possible that by Ismenias' time, performing a Pythian nome had been transferred from the program of the contests to the program of adjacent cult ceremonies. This would have given creative freedom to the artists and helped to combine traditionalism with novelty, that would have been worthy of the most prestigious of the Greek musical contests.

8) The passage in Athen. 12. 54, p. 538 f = Chares *FGrHist* 125 F 4 relates the events at the wedding of Alexander the Great after the victory over Darius III, in Susa in 324 BC:

παρήλθον δὲ καὶ ἀύληταί, οἱ πρῶτον τὸ Πυθικὸν ἠύλησαν, εἰθ' ἕξις μετὰ τῶν χορῶν, Τιμόθεος, Φρύνιχος, Καφισίας, Διόφαντος, ἔτι δὲ Εὖιος ὁ Χαλκιδεύς.

As a matter of fact, we do not know which solo pieces were performed by the five auletes. However, considering that in those days Alexander had no reason to worship Apollo Pythius in particular, it hardly seems credible that the king and his guests listened to the Pythian nome five times in succession. Rather the expression τὸ Πυθικόν means "classical" instrumental music, such as one performed by solo virtuosi at the main Panhellenic musical festival, as opposed to playing together with a chorus. If Athenaeus reproduces the wording of Chares, Alexander's court historian, this is the earliest case of Πυθικός meaning 'solo', as in later agonistic documents (see below). It seems that *any* music performed by solo instrumentalists could be described as 'Pythian' only if the pieces performed at the Pythian Games were not restricted to the νόμος Πυθικός. Thus the passage of Athenaeus can be interpreted as a testimony against compulsory performance of this nome in Delphi rather than in favour of it.

9) A similar expression is reconstructed in an inscription of the middle of the third century BC found in Thespieae.⁶³ At that time the ancient Thespian festival of Museia was reorganized as ἀγῶν θυμελικός

⁶³ *IG VII 1735 = BCH 19 (1895) 324 no. 2.*

στεφανίτης ἰσοπύθιος, and in the document under review Athens accepts its new status. In particular, Athenians, who win a victory at the Museia, are granted the same rewards as the Pythian winners (col. b, 4–10):

τὰ δὲ ἄθλα τοῖς νικῶσιν Ἀθηναίων τὰ Μουσεῖα ὑπάρχειν ὕσα] καὶ τοῖς τὰ Πύθια νικῶσιν τοῖς τε] ἐπῶν ποιηταῖς καὶ ἀύλωιδοῖς καὶ] τοῖς ἀύληταῖς τοῖς τὰ Πυθ[ικὰ ἀύλοῦσι] καθὰ [ἀ]ξιούσιν Βοιωτοὶ καὶ [ἢ πόλις ἢ] Θεσπιέων.

It is impossible that the auletes at a festival dedicated to the Heliconian Muses were eternally confined to playing a nome about Apollo the dragon-fighter. Therefore τὰ Πυθικά means ‘pieces for a solo aulos’ here.

10) If the transmitted text of Strabo is to be trusted (9. 3. 10, p. 421),⁶⁴ Timosthenes of Rhodes, admiral of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283–246), composed a Pythian nome; E. Pöhlmann even thinks that he took part in an auletic contest at the Pythian Games.⁶⁵ Yet this passage needs emendation, as proved already by Guhrauer, who justly supposed a lacuna after ἐμελοποίησε μὲν οὖν.⁶⁶ Firstly, it is clear that Timosthenes could not be the first inventor of a nome that had been performed since the sixth century BC. At the same time it is hardly possible to infer from the text that Timosthenes created a new variety of the Pythian nome three centuries after Sacadas, because the passage evidently deals with the invention of this nome: Strabo speaks of its introduction into the program of the Pythian Games, enumerates its five parts, mentions Timosthenes and then comments on the five sections named above. Secondly, Timosthenes the nauarchus is otherwise known as a geographer⁶⁷ and not as a musician.

⁶⁴ προσέθεσαν δὲ τοῖς κιθαρῳδοῖς ἀύλητάς τε καὶ κιθαριστάς χωρὶς ῥῆθης, ἀποδώσοντάς τι μέρος ὃ καλεῖται νόμος Πυθικός. πέντε δ’ αὐτοῦ μέρη ἐστίν, ἄγκρουσις ἄμπειρα κατακελευσμός ἴαμβοι καὶ δάκτυλοι σύριγγες. ἐμελοποίησε μὲν οὖν Τιμοσθένης, ὁ ναύαρχος τοῦ δευτέρου Πτολεμαίου ὁ καὶ τοὺς λυμένας συντάξας ἐν δέκα βίβλοις. βούλεται δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸν πρὸς τὸν δράκοντα διὰ τοῦ μέλους ὑμεῖν, ἄγκρουσιν μὲν τὸ προοίμιον δηλῶν, etc.

⁶⁵ Boeckh 1811, 182 n. 16; Westphal 1869, 73; Rohde 1870, 74; Hiller 1876, 80; Wagner 1888, 3–4; Tresp 1914, 51; Abert 1920, 1768; Gisinger 1937, 1312; Pöhlmann 2012, 277–278.

⁶⁶ Guhrauer 1875/76, 313–317, accepted by Mommsen 1878, 193 n. 1; Schreiber 1879, 27; Susemihl 1891, 662 n. 87; Radt 2004, 90 l. 28; Radt 2008, 78. Rutherford 2001, 26 n. 12 also thinks that assigning the Pythian nome to Timosthenes must be mistaken.

⁶⁷ Susemihl 1891, 660–662; Gisinger 1937, 1310–1322.

Strabo makes several references to this author as a source and object of polemic⁶⁸ – apparently here, as in other cases, Timosthenes was quoted as a source.⁶⁹

Alternatively, one might think that in Strabo's work there was a reference to a composer named Timosthenes, which was later erroneously supplied with a gloss, or that Τιμοσθένης was the result of a corruption of some musician's name beginning with Τιμο-, such as 'Timotheus'.⁷⁰ Yet none of the musicians with such a name known to us would fit the date of 586 BC and thus be referred to as the author of the first Pythian nome, as the context of Strabo implies. As regards an unknown artist, our sources are too unanimous in indicating Sacadas as its first performer at the Pythian Games to be dismissed. Thus it seems reasonable to postulate ἐμελοποίησε μὲν οὖν <Σακάδας> at the beginning of the lacuna, with further reference to Timosthenes⁷¹ who reported on the partition of the Pythian nome.⁷²

⁶⁸ Strab. 1. 2. 21, p. 29; 2. 1. 40, p. 92; 2. 1. 41, p. 94 (two times); 3. 1. 7, p. 140; 13. 2. 5, p. 618; 17. 3. 6, p. 827. – Guhrbauer eliminates the words from ὁ ναύαρχος to βίβλοις as a gloss, arguing that Strabo did not need to introduce Timosthenes to his readers once more in such an unsuitable context. But the previous (and the only other) comment on Timosthenes occurs in the second book of Strabo (2. 1. 40, p. 92: ὑπὸ Τιμοσθένους τοῦ τοῦς λιμένας συγγράψαντος), whereas the Pythian nome is concerned in the ninth.

⁶⁹ It is hard to indicate a work, in which the Ptolemaic geographer mentioned the Pythian nome. Περί λιμένων would itself be possible, since Crisa was a harbour, but καί in ὁ καὶ τοῦς λιμένας συντάξας implies that Strabo referred to some other treatise. One might think of Ἐξηγητικόν, which contained historical and mythological data (see *Schol. Ap. Rhod.* 3. 847, p. 241 Wendel): Guhrbauer 1875/76, 316 n. 3; Susemihl 1891, 662 n. 87; Gisinger 1937, 1312. Yet Tresp 1914, 51 and Jacoby 1949, 253 n. 74 considered that Timosthenes the author of Ἐξηγητικόν was not the same person as the Ptolemaic admiral.

⁷⁰ Guhrbauer 1875/76, 317 n. 3.

⁷¹ In the phrase βούλεται δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸν πρὸς τὸν δράκοντα διὰ τοῦ μέλους ὑμνεῖν etc. Guhrbauer 1875/76, 316 takes Timosthenes to be the subject of βούλεται, assuming that βούλεται means 'affirms' (cf. Plut. *Quom. adol. poet. audire debet* 4, 19 F; *Quaest. conv.* 4, 668 B), and reading ὑμνεῖσθαι instead of ὑμνεῖν (otherwise a subject of ὑμνεῖν in *acc.* might be inserted). But Mommsen 1878, 193 n. 1 rightly responds that this meaning would imply preference of one of several versions, which does not work here, and makes νόμος the subject of βούλεται and of the following δηλῶν (adducing Poll. 4. 84 δῆλωμα δ' ἐστὶν ὁ νόμος τῆς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος μάχης πρὸς τὸν δράκοντα); otherwise the subject could be Σακάδας (Radt 2008, 78).

⁷² Susemihl 1891, 662 n. 87: ἐμελοποίησε μὲν οὖν <Σακάδας ὁ Ἀργεῖος· Ἔγραψε δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἐξηγητικῷ> Τιμοσθένης.

Thus the passage of Strabo can hardly be considered evidence on the composition of a Pythian nome in the third century BC.

Therefore, only two of the passages examined above (nos. 1, 2) evidently and two other (nos. 6, 7) probably deal with the performance of a Pythian nome. It is worth noticing that nos. 2, 6 and 7 speak of its performance outside of a Pythian contest – that is, at the Olympic Games, at the foundation of Messene, and at an instance in Delphi unrelated to the agones.

Now let us see if any information on the performance of a Pythian nome can be extracted from the use of the adjective Πυθικός⁷³ in agonistic technical terms which signify musicians and their instruments.

In the documents dated to the Roman period two types of professional auletes steadily oppose one another: these are πυθικοί ἀλληταί⁷⁴ or πυθαύλαι (*pythaulae*),⁷⁵ on the one hand, and κύκλιοι

⁷³ Guhrauer 1875/76, 350 approves of relating the expressions Πυθικὸν ἀΐλημα, Πυθικὸν μέλος, τὸ Πυθικὸν ἀΐλεϊν, ἀλλητῆς Πυθικός, ἀλλοὶ Πυθικοί and even τὰ Πύθια ἀΐλεϊν to performing the νόμος Πυθικός. However, as I have argued above and shall argue below, only Πυθικὸν ἀΐλημα really indicates the Pythian nome, and, remarkably, not in every case, but only in Pausanias (see above nos. 1, 2).

⁷⁴ *Arch. Anz.* 81 (1966) 457, Pergamon, 1st cent. AD; *CIG* 1720 = *FdD* III 6, 143 = *BCH* 126 (2002) 104–109, Delphi, AD 138–161; *FdD* III 4, 86, Delphi, 2nd cent. AD; *PMichigan* 4682₁₃, Karanis, end of the 2nd – early 3rd cent.; *CIG* 2758 (cf. *SEG* 38 [1988] 1053), Aphrodisiae, ca. AD 200; *CIG* 1586 = *BCH* 19 (1895) 345 no. 18 = *IG* VII 1776₁₇ (see *BCH* 126 [2002] 112–117), Thespieae, after AD 212; *BCH* 27 (1903) 297_{13–14}, Acraephia, early 3rd cent. AD; *FdD* III 1, 550 = *BCH* 126 (2002) 124–128, Delphi, early 3rd cent. AD; *IK* 14, 1137, Ephesus, 3rd cent. AD; *IK* 14, 1149, Ephesus, 3rd cent. AD.

⁷⁵ Epigraphical sources: *CIG* 1719 = *BCH* 68–69 (1944–1945) 123–125 no. 36 = *BCH* 126 (2002) 99–104, Gortyn, ca. AD 90–120; *FdD* III 1, 547 (see *BCH* 126 [2002] 109–110), Delphi, after AD 138; *CIG* 1720 = *FdD* III 6, 143 = *BCH* 126 (2002) 104–109, Delphi, AD 138–161; *IGR* I 442 = *IG* XIV 737, Nicomedia, the middle of the 2nd cent. AD; *CIG* 1585 = *BCH* 19 (1895) 341 no. 15 = *IG* VII 1773₁₈, Thespieae, shortly before AD 161; *BCH* 19 (1895) 345 no. 17_{19–20} (see *BCH* 126 [2002] 117–118), Thespieae, AD 161–169; Le Bas – Waddington 1620 d = *MAMA* VIII 420 = *CIG* 2759, Aphrodisiae, 2nd cent. AD; *CIG* 6829 = *IGR* IV 468₁₇, loc. incert., AD 198–209; *FdD* III 4, 476, Delphi, 2nd–3rd cent.; *SEG* 29 (1979) 340, Isthmus, 2nd–3rd cent.; *IG* VII 2726₂, Acraephia, early 3rd cent. AD; *IGUR* 551, Italy, 1st–3rd cent.; *IG* V 1, 758, Sparta, the Roman period. Literary sources: *Schol. Aristoph. Av.* 857 = Suid. π 3130; Phrynich. *Ecloga nominum et verborum Atticorum* 138 (2nd half of the 2nd cent. AD); Lat. *pythaulae* or *pythaula*: Varro, *Sat. Men.* 561; Hygin. *Fab.* 273. 7; Sen. *Ep.* 76. 4; *Script. hist. Aug., Car.* 19. 2. Cf. a paraphrasis instead of transliteration: Hor. *Ars poet.* 414–415 (below p. 81).

αὐληταί⁷⁶ or χοραῦλαι (*choraulae*),⁷⁷ on the other.⁷⁸ There is also an analogous division for citharists, though it occurs much more rarely:

⁷⁶ *CIG* 3068 = *Michel* 1016 C, Teos, 2nd cent. BC; *I. von Olympia* 56₅₅, Naples, late 1st cent. AD; *CIG* 1720 = *FdD* III 6, 143 = *BCH* 126 (2002) 104–109, Delphi, AD 138–161; *CIG* 2810 = *BCH* 126 (2002) 132–134, Aphrodisiae, 2nd cent. AD; *IGR* III 231 = *CIG* 4081, Pessinus, 2nd–3rd cent.; *BCH* 14 (1890) 192 no. 21 = *IG* VII 4151₁₀, Acraephia, 2nd–3rd cent.; *PMichigan* 4682_{5, 6}, Karanis, end of the 2nd – early 3rd cent.; *CIG* 2758 (cf. *SEG* 38 [1988] 1053), Aphrodisiae, ca. AD 200; *CIG* 1586 = *BCH* 19 (1895) 346 no. 18 = *IG* VII 1776₂₁ (see *BCH* 126 [2002] 112–117), Thespieae, after AD 212; *BCH* 27 (1903) 297_{13–14}, Acraephia, early 3rd cent. AD. Cf. literary evidence: Phrynich. *Ecloga nominum et verborum Atticorum* 138.

⁷⁷ Greek epigraphy: *I. von Priene* 113₇₈, Priene, 1st cent. BC; *CIG* 2758 (cf. *SEG* 38 [1988] 1053), Aphrodisiae, ca. AD 200; *IGUR* 746 = *CIL* VI 2, 10122 = *ILS* 5236, Rome, 2nd half of the 1st cent. AD (*choraule* = χοραυλις); *FdD* III 3, 129 = *SIG*³ 795A, Delphi, 1st cent. AD; *CIG* 6788c = *IGR* I 21 = *IG* XIV 2499 = *BCH* 126 (2002) 138–142, Nimes, 1st–2nd cent.; *CIG* 1719 = *BCH* 68–69 (1944–1945) 124, Gortyne, 1st–2nd cent.; Cockle 1975, 59–60, Oxyrrhynchus, 1st–2nd cent.; *FdD* III 2, 250, Delphi, AD 119; *IGR* I 442 = *IG* XIV 737, Nicomedia, middle of the 2nd cent. AD; *CIG* 1585 = *BCH* 19 (1895) 341 no. 15 = *IG* VII 1773_{27–28}, Thespieae, shortly before AD 161; *IGUR* 798 = *IGR* I 310 = *IG* XIV 1865, Rome, 4th quarter of the 2nd cent. AD; Le Bas – Waddington 1620 d = *MAMA* VIII 420 = *CIG* 2759, Aphrodisiae, 2nd cent. AD; *MDAI Ath.* 76 (1882) 255 no. 26, Cyzicus, 2nd cent. AD; *FdD* III 4, 476, Delphi, 2nd–3rd cent.; *FdD* III 4, 478 (see *BCH* 126 [2002] 110), Delphi, 2nd–3rd cent.; *SEG* 29 (1979) 340, Isthmus, 2nd–3rd cent.; *SEG* 3 (1927) 334₅₀ = *Λαογραφία* 7 (1923) 179, Thespieae, after AD 212; *IG* VII 2726₂, Acraephia, early 3rd cent. AD; *IGUR* 551, Italy, 1st–3rd cent. Latin epigraphy: *CIL* 6. 975 a II 40; 10119; 10120; 10121, Rome, the Imperial period; *CIL* 13. 8343, Cologne, 2nd cent. AD. Greek literary sources: Strab. 17. 1. 11, p. 796 (χοραυλεῖν); *Divis. Aristot.* 9 [60], p. 12 l. 17 Mutschmann (χοραυλητικῆ); Plut. *Anton.* 24. 2; Lucill. *Ant. Pal.* 11. 11. 1; Ephr. Syr. *Quod ludicris rebus abstinendum sit christianis* vol. 5, p. 241, l. 9 Phrantzoles; *Interrogationes ac responsiones* p. 222, l. 1 Phrantzoles (χοραυλεῖν), *Sermo de communi resurrectione...* p. 64, l. 11 Phrantzoles; *Sermo in pretiosam et vivificam crucem...* p. 146, l. 8 Phrantzoles (χοραυλιῶ); *Const. apost.* 8, 32; Greg. Naz. *De vita sua* 909 Jungck; Ioann. Chrysost. *In epist. ad Coloss.* cap. IV, homil. X, MPG vol 62, p. 372, l. 59; *Hist. monach. in Aegypto* 19. 3, p. 116. 10, 15–16 Festugière; Ps.-Zonaras, *Lexic.* χ, p. 1856, l. 11 Tittmann. Latin literary sources (*choraules* or *choraula*): Petron. *Sat.* 53. 13, 69. 5; Plin. *NH* 37. 6; Iuven. *Sat.* 6. 76–77; Mart. *Ep.* 5. 56. 9, 6. 39. 19, 9. 77. 6, 11. 75. 3; Suet. *Nero* 54. 1; *Galba* 12. 3; Hygin. *Fab.* 273. 7; Apul. *Met.* 8. 26; *Soc.* 14; *Script. hist. Aug., Car.* 19. 2, 20. 5; Serv. *In Ecl.* 5. 89.

⁷⁸ For a convenient list of κύκλιοι αὐληταί and χοραῦλαι see Strasser 2002, 129–130. Strasser warns (*ibid.*, 128–129) that these should be distinguished from *choraulae* accompanying pantomime: “Il convient d’établir au préalable une distinction fondamentale entre deux types des choraules. On ne saurait en effet confondre les choraules qui accompagnent les pantomimes et ceux qui se consacrent, dans les concours ou dans des exhibitions, à l’exécution de nomes écrits pour *aulos* et choeurs”. Yet, although surely not all the *choraulae* belonged to the elite musicians competing at the

πυθικοί κιθαρισταί⁷⁹ or ψιλοὶ κιθαρισταί⁸⁰ / ψιλοκιθαρισταί (*psilocitharistae*)⁸¹ are opposed to κύκλιοι κιθαρισταί⁸² or χοροκιθαρείς / *chorocitharistae*.⁸³ Interpretation of these terms is not open to question,⁸⁴ and it is confirmed by explanations of ancient authors:⁸⁵ ‘Pythian’ auletes and citharists were solo-players, whereas ‘circular’ musicians were accompanied by a chorus.⁸⁶ The only matter for discussion is why the ‘Pythian’ instrumentalists were called so: whether because of playing a Pythian nome or because of performing at the Pythian Games in general?

sacred Games, there seems to be no indication that this term was applied to members of an orchestra accompanying pantomimes (which would be an improbable expansion of its meaning, since in pantomime it was neither the aulete nor the chorus, but the dancer who played the leading part and was accompanied, and even if a *tibicen* acted as a ‘conductor’ of the orchestra, the name πρωταύλης would be most likely) or to other “joueurs d’αὐλὸς χορικός” not performing to the chorus accompaniment.

⁷⁹ *Hesperia* Suppl. XV (1975) 62₄₄₋₄₅ = *FdD* III 2, 48₃₁₋₃₂ = *SIG*³ 711 L₃₁₋₃₂, Delphi, 97 BC; *PMichigan* 4682₂₈, Karanis, late 2nd – early 3rd cent.; *CIG* 1586 = *BCH* 19 (1895) 346 no. 18 = *IG* VII 1776₁₉ (see *BCH* 126 [2002] 112–117), Thespieae, after AD 212; *REG* 19 (1906) 255 no. 148 bis = Robert 1930, 29–30, Aphrodisiae, temp. incert.

⁸⁰ *BCH* 14 (1890) 192 no. 21 = *IG* VII 4151₁₀, Acraephia, 2nd–3rd cent.; Poll. 4. 66. Cf. ψιλὴ κιθάρισις: Plat. *Leg.* 669 e (as well as ψιλὴ αὐλησις); Athen. 8. 46, p. 352 c–d = Phainias fr. 32 Wehrli; 14. 42, p. 637 f = Menaechm. *FGrHist* 131 F 5; 14. 42, p. 637 f – 638 a = Philochor. *FGrHist* 328 F 23; κιθαρίσαι ψιλῆν: Diod. Sic. 3. 59. 2.

⁸¹ Suet. *Dom.* 4. 4 (*psilocitharistae*); Le Bas – Waddington 1620 d = *MAMA* VIII 420 = *CIG* 2759, Aphrodisiae, 2nd cent. AD; Athen. 10. 78, p. 452 f; 12. 54, p. 537 f = Chares *FGrHist* 125 F 4; 14. 42, p. 637 f – 638 a = Philochor. *FGrHist* 328 F 23 (ψιλοκιθαριστική).

⁸² *I. von Olympia* 56₅₅, Naples, late 1st cent. AD; *PMichigan* 4682_{24, 29}, Karanis, end of the 2nd – early 3rd cent.

⁸³ Suet. *Dom.* 4. 4 (*chorocitharistae*); *SEG* 6 (1932) 58₁₃ = *JRS* 16 (1926) 251 = *IJR* III 210, Ancyra, 2nd quarter of the 2nd cent. AD; *CIG* 2758 (cf. *SEG* 38 [1988] 1053), Aphrodisiae, ca. AD 200; *CIG* 2759 = Le Bas – Waddington 1620 d = *MAMA* VIII 420, Aphrodisiae, 2nd cent. AD; *IG* XIV 611, Sardinia, temp. incert.

⁸⁴ Frei 1900, 60–62, 67–70; Robert 1930, 55; Bélis 1988, 230–232, 242–244; West 1992, 93 n. 63.

⁸⁵ Hygin. *Fab.* 273. 7 (see below p. 81). Poll. 4. 81: ἡὐλοῦν δὲ τὸ ἄχορον αὐλημα, τὸ Πυθικόν. Phrynich. *Ecloga nominum et verborum Atticorum* 138: ‘Πυθαύλης’ μὴ λέγε, ἀλλὰ ‘ψιλὸς αὐλητής’. Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexic. χ.*, vol. 2 p. 1856, l. 11 Tittmann: Χοραύλης. ὁ ἐν τῷ χορῷ αὐλῶν. Cf. Hesych. κ 4474: κύκλιοι αὐλοῖ· οὕτω τινὲς ἐκαλοῦντο. εἶεν δ’ ἂν οἱ χορικοί.

⁸⁶ Κύκλιος χορός was an established name for a dithyrambic chorus: see e.g. *Schol. Aristoph. Av.* 1403; Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 239 p. 320 A. This term was explained in ancient times by scaenographic reasons, as a dithyrambic chorus formed a circle (Athen. 5. 10, p. 181 c clearly opposes κύκλιοι χοροὶ to τετράγωνοι), probably around the musician (*Schol. Aeschin.* 1. 10: ἐν δὲ τοῖς χοροῖς τοῖς κυκλίους μέσος ἵσταται αὐλητής). See Pickard-Cambridge ²1962, 32; D’Angour 1997, 342, 346–350.

Relating the terms *πυθικός ἀύλητής* / *πυθαύλης* and *πυθικός κιθαριστής* to the νόμος *Πυθικός*⁸⁷ has led many scholars to the assumption that performing this nome remained forever typical of said musicians.⁸⁸ This thesis should be revised.

The only hint at what the *πυθαῦλαι* could perform is provided by an inscription in honour of L. Cornelius Corinthus.⁸⁹ The list of his victories reads: *πυθαύλης περιδονείκης, νεικήσας τὴν περίοδον, νεικήσας δὲ τὴν ἕξ Ἴργου Ἄσπίδα ἐνὶ νόμῳ, τῶν ἀνταγωνιστῶν δυσὶ νόμοις ἐύληκῶτων*.⁹⁰ This testimony proves that instrumental music performed at the contests of soloists was still called νόμοι in the Imperial period. The circumstances of Corinthus' victory at the Argive games⁹¹ show that performing a second piece was not a duty, but a right of the contestants.⁹² In any case we cannot deal with a Pythian nome here: it is quite improbable that at a festival dedicated to Hera of Argos each *pythaulēs*

⁸⁷ Von Jan 1888, 81; Frei 1900, 61–62; Robert 1930, 30, 55; Bélis 1988, 232. The opposite view, that is, that *πυθαῦλαι* were called so because of the fact that they played at the Pythian games, was maintained by Bulenger 1601, 228: “Pythaulēs e tibia numero fuit, diciturque, qui ludis Pythiis canit” (quoting Hor. *Ars poet.* 414–415 and Artemidor. *Onirocrit.* 1. 56). He was challenged by Frei, *op. cit.*

⁸⁸ This assumption is not even restricted just to the Pythian Games in Delphi. Cf. Liermann 1889, 123: “Sane fateor me punctum temporis parum voluisse credere, saeculo tam late provento [he deals with a *pythaulēs* taking part at the contest of Flavius Lysimachus in Aphrodisia in the 2nd cent. AD, *CIG* 2759. – *N. A.*] tibiae idem argumentum imitatum esse. Sed tollitur dubitatio, si rationem habemus mirae tenacitatis, qua Graeci in ritibus agonisticis usque ad agones ipsos extinctos quovis tempore usi sunt”. Drawing only from the catalogues *CIG* 1585 and 1586, where Pythian auletes are mentioned, Liermann goes so far as to draw a conclusion about the performance of a Pythian nome at the Museia in Thespieae. – J. Frei seems to assume that at the Pythian games not all the auletes performed a Pythian nome: “*tibicines plerique Pythicam victoriam sectantes huic nomo studuerunt*”; “*Πυθικόν illud ἀύλημα celeberrimum tibiaeque sine choro canentium maxime proprius fuit cantus*” (Frei 1900, 61–62, my italics. – *N. A.*).

⁸⁹ *SEG* 29 (1979) p. 340, Isthmus, 2nd – 3rd cent. See Michaud 1970, 946, 948–949; J. and L. Robert 1971, 436 no. 308; Clement 1974, 36–39; *SEG* 31 (1981) p. 293; Stephanis 1981 [I. Στεφανής, “Κυκλιοὶ καὶ πυθικοὶ ἀύληται”, *Ἑλληνικά* 33: 2], 399–402.

⁹⁰ *εὐληκῶτων* = *ἠύληκῶτων* (*ἀύλω*): Michaud 1970, 949. This participle ought to govern the accusative *δύο νόμους*: Clement 1974, 37; the use of dative is probably influenced by *νεικήσας* ... ἐνὶ νόμῳ above.

⁹¹ According to J. and L. Robert 1971, ἐνὶ νόμῳ etc. refers to the victories in *περίοδος* as well, but see contra Stephanis 1981, 400–401.

⁹² J. and L. Robert 1971: the rivals of Corinthus, playing the second piece, could make amends for the slips which occurred in the first one.

performed a nome about Apollo Pythius, all the more so, twice, one after another.

Whatever the initial reason for calling solo-playing musicians ‘Pythian’ was, its etymological meaning was erased during the course of time. It is evident that at any rate the Pythian nome could not be the only piece performed by *πυθαῦλαι* or *πυθικοὶ κιθαρισταί*: we have seen that even for the Pythian Games there is evidence of playing other *νόμοι*, and no one would deny the performing of other solo pieces at other festivals. On the other hand, the contests of the Pythian auletes took place not only at the Pythian Games,⁹³ but at a great number of other agones dedicated to various deities,⁹⁴ so that it seems hard to imagine a musical festival of the Roman period that would not include such a contest. Agones of the Pythian citharists, judging by the scanty evidence, were less frequent, but certainly not restricted to Delphi;⁹⁵ moreover, we have no documents at all that would connect them to the Pythian Games.⁹⁶ Phrynichus, an Atticist of the second half of the second century AD, advises (*Ecloga nominum et verborum Atticorum* 138): ‘Πυθαύλης’ μὴ λέγε, ἀλλὰ ‘ψιλὸς ἀὐλητής’, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄτερος ‘κύκλιος ἀὐλητής’. This puristic recommendation confirms that the word *πυθαύλης* was not used by Attic authors of the Classical period and shows that *πυθαύλης* eventually did not bear a special connotation either to the Pythian nome or to the Pythian Games.

Still it is of interest if the connection of the term ‘Pythian’ with the Pythian nome can be proven at least by the time that it was first applied to the instrumentalists, which would imply the lasting importance of this nome in that period.

⁹³ On *πυθαῦλαι* at the Pythian Games, see Appendix.

⁹⁴ See representative lists of festivals e.g. in *BCH* 19 (1895) 345 no. 17; 27 (1903) 297; 68–69 (1944–45) 124; *IG* VII 1773; 1776; 2726; XIV 737; *FdD* III 1, 547; 550 (see Robert 1930, 53–55); III 4, 476; III 6, 143; *CIG* 2810; *Arch. Anz.* 81 (1966) 457; *SEG* 29 (1979) 340. It is often indicated that *ἀγῶνες* *θεματικοί* (*ταλαντιαῖοι*) with money prizes, which were inferior to *ἀγῶνες* *στεφανῖται*, are omitted. – P. Aelius Antigentidas, *pythaulēs* (and *choraulēs*), achieved no Pythian victory during his career (*IG* XIV 737).

⁹⁵ A contest called an agōn of ‘Pythian citharists’ is evidenced for only one festival, the *Museia* in Thespieae (*IG* VII 1776₁₉). ‘*Psilocitharistae*’ are present at the Roman *Capitolia* (Suet. *Dom.* 4, 4), at the *Ptoia* in Acraephia (*IG* VII 415_{13–14}) and at the agōn of Flavius Lysimachus in Aphrodisiae (*CIG* 2759 = *MAMA* VIII 420).

⁹⁶ The only ‘Pythian citharist’ appears in Delphi at the Athenian *Pythais* of 97 BC (*SIG* 711 L = *FdD* III 2, 48_{31–32}); despite an ‘agōn’ mentioned in the inscription, there is just one Pythian citharist in the list of participants.

The first evidence for the terms *πυθαύλης*⁹⁷ and *πυθικὸς κιθαριστής*⁹⁸ dates back to the first century BC. In earlier agonistic documents only the terms *αὐλητής* and *κιθαριστής* are used for solo instrumentalists.⁹⁹ Yet it seems that the development of ‘Pythian’ as a technical term can be traced back even earlier. Apparently the specification ‘Pythian’ / ‘choral’ should become necessary by concurrence of two circumstances: (a) when both solo contests and chorus contests take part on the same occasions, and (b) when the musician, who was previously an accompanier of a chorus, rises to the leading position, gets the credit for the performance and is crowned as a winner.

The gradual increase of the aulete’s importance in dithyramb has been studied already by E. Reisch:¹⁰⁰ by the second half of the fourth century the name of an aulete (which was initially lacking) comes to precede that of a didaskalos in the dedicatory inscriptions of Athenian choregoi. Whereas at the time of Antiphon the poets-didaskaloi were distributed between the choregoi according to a lot (*Antiph. De choreuta* 11) and it was the task of a didaskalos to find an accompanying aulete, in the second half of the fifth century, in Melanippides’ lifetime, the system changed owing to the increasing role of the instrumentalist (*Ps.-Plut. De mus.* 1141 C–D), and so at the time of Demosthenes a lot was used to distribute the auletes among the choregoi (*Dem.* 21, 13). The designation of a dithyrambic contest as a contest ‘of auletes’ is first evidenced in Demosthenes, and since the third century BC it occurs frequently in agonistic inscriptions: the choregoi are called choregoi of auletes; didaskaloi of the chorus, *διδάσκαλοι αὐλητῶν*; the expression *ἄνδρες / παῖδες αὐληταί* means *αὐληταί ἀνδρῶν / παίδων*.¹⁰¹ Thus the leading role of an instrumentalist¹⁰² at the chorus contests is testified at least since the second half of the fourth century BC. We have seen (above nos. 8, 9) that already by the fourth century BC *τὸ Πυθικόν / τὰ Πυθικά* was probably used to mean ‘solo instrumental music’: although both testimonies are themselves not wholly

⁹⁷ The first occurrence is Varro, *Sat. Men.* 561. Yet the very fact of its borrowing in Latin shows that the term was already in common use in the Greek language.

⁹⁸ Delphi, 97 BC: see above n. 79.

⁹⁹ As noted already by Frei 1900, 61; 68.

¹⁰⁰ Reisch 1885, 27–38; Reisch 1899, 2434–2436.

¹⁰¹ See Reisch 1885, 59 n. 1; 101; Robert 1938, 34–35.

¹⁰² It seems that the citharists followed in the auletes’ footsteps. The difference is that evidence of stringed instruments accompanying choral performances is sporadic; traditionally at the agones of *κύκλιοι χοροί* it was an aulete who played the accompaniment. Therefore we can suppose that a new kind of contests for citharists accompanied by a chorus – and thus the terms *κύκλιοι* and *πυθικοὶ κιθαρισταί* – were formed not as a result of gradual development of choral performances, but under the direct influence of musicians playing wind instruments.

infallible, they agree with the reconstruction of the general situation in music. Therefore it can be assumed that the designation ‘Pythian’ in the meaning ‘without a chorus’¹⁰³ was an invention of the fourth century BC.

Since we have assumed above (nos. 6, 7) that the Pythian nome was still heard in the fourth century, it cannot be ruled out that Pythian auletes and citharists owed their name to their ability of performing it: for example if it was still considered the most technically complicated instrumental piece. However this is not a necessary assumption. It is even more plausible that this name was connected in general to participating in the contest of solo virtuosi at the Pythian Games, since it always required the greatest possible skill, even if it did not require obligatory playing of the Pythian nome any more.

The reason for calling the solo-playing instrumentalists ‘Pythian’ would be evident if it could be proven that at the Pythian Games there were no contests of choral aulos-players. J.-Y. Strasser¹⁰⁴ argues that choral auletes were not yet present at the sacred games of the Hellenistic period,¹⁰⁵ and the first firm evidence for their victories at ἀγῶνες στεφανῖται appears at the turn of the first to the second century AD; moreover, he is certain that contests of χοραὶ were not introduced at the great sacred games of the Eastern part of the Roman empire, and particularly in Delphi, until, under influence from the West (the Sebasta in Naples and probably the Capitolia in Rome founded in 86 AD), the Pythian Games sought to present an equally ample program to maintain the status of the main musical festival.

Indeed, it may seem that in Delphi until the turn of the first to the second century AD the requirements of the public for this popular art were satisfied by wandering virtuosi outside the contests. Satyrus of Samus (early second century BC) performed an ᾠσμα μετὰ χοροῦ after the contest, but the inscription on the base of his statue does not imply that the chorus participated in the contest itself – it is only said about Satyrus: ἀλῆσαι τὸν ἀγῶνα.¹⁰⁶ The earliest evidence of a choraules in Delphi

¹⁰³ An expression μετὰ χοροῦ is applied to musicians playing with a chorus in several cases: Athen. 12. 54, p. 538 f = Chares *FGrHist* 125 F 4 (above no. 8); *BCH* 18 (1894) 85 = *FdD* III 3, 128 = *SIG*³ 648 B = Michel 959, Delphi, early 2nd cent. BC; *BCH* 9 (1885) 147–149 = *IG* XI 2, 133^{70. 74–75}, Delos, 172 or 169 BC (which may be regarded as providing a *terminus post quem* for the establishment of the term χοραὶ); Athen. 14. 4, p. 615 b (on the events of 167 BC); below n. 109.

¹⁰⁴ Strasser 2002, 130–134.

¹⁰⁵ The first evidence for the term κύκλιος ἀλῆτης dates back to the 1st half of the 2nd cent. BC; for χοραὶ, to the 1st cent. BC (see above n. 76, 77, and Strasser 2002, 130).

¹⁰⁶ *BCH* 18 (1894) 85 = *FdD* III 3, 128 = *SIG*³ 648 B = Michel 959, Delphi.

(ca. AD 29) does not deal with the Pythian Games: Musaeus of Magnesia on the Maeander was awarded a proxeny not for participating in a contest, but for another professional service.¹⁰⁷ The first known χοραύλης who won the Pythian Games is Tiberius Scandilianus Zosimus of Gortyn (late first or early second century AD), of whom it is said: *νεικήσαντα Πύθια πυθαύλας καὶ χοραύλας πρῶτον ἀπ' αἰῶνος τῇ αὐτῇ πενταετηρίδι*.¹⁰⁸ It is true that the words *πρῶτον ἀπ' αἰῶνος* can relate to the victory in two contests at the same festival, but it is also possible that the inscription concerns the victory at the first, newly introduced choraulic contest at the Pythian Games. Plutarch also provides evidence from nearly the same time on the presence of *αὐλετες μετὰ τοῦ χοροῦ* in the program.¹⁰⁹

Yet, firstly, if Strasser is right to assume that choral aulos-players did not participate in (at least most of) the Hellenistic sacred games, then the possibility for an aulete to take part only in a solo competition could not be considered as a specific feature of the Pythian festival. In this case a reason to associate solo aulos-playing precisely with these games could only be their unique reputation among the musical contests. It is well known that among the four agones that enjoyed the particular status of panhellenic – the Olympic, Pythian, Isthmian and Nemean Games¹¹⁰ – the Delphic festival remained the only one with the musical contests at least until the Hellenistic period.¹¹¹ The prestige of famous local festivals was inferior to the exceptional authority of the most ancient Pythian Games. It is no chance that other festivals tried to achieve the status of ‘isopythian’ for their musical contests.

¹⁰⁷ *FdD* III 1, 129 = *SIG*³ 795 A: *ἐνδημήσας εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν τῷ τε θεῷ ἀπήρξατο καὶ τὴν παρεπιδημίαν ἐποιήσατο εὐσχήμονα καὶ ἀξίαν τειμῆς*.

¹⁰⁸ *CIG* 1719 = *BCH* 68–69 (1944–1945) 124.

¹⁰⁹ Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 7. 5, p. 704 C–D: *Ἐν Πυθίοις Καλλίστρατος, τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων ἐπιμελητής, αὐλωδόν τινα πολίτην καὶ φίλον ὑστερήσαντα τῆς ἀπογραφῆς τοῦ μὲν ἀγῶνος εἶρξε κατὰ τὸν νόμον, ἐστιῶν δ' ἡμᾶς παρήγαγεν εἰς τὸ συμπόσιον ἐσθῆτι καὶ στεφάνοις, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀγῶνι, μετὰ τοῦ χοροῦ κεκοσμημένον ἐκπρεπῶς*. Here, as in several other cases beginning from the end of the 1st cent. AD, *αὐλωδός* = *αὐλητής*: see Almazova 2008, 28–32.

¹¹⁰ The notion of these four games as panhellenic and thus distinct in their peculiar importance from the local festivals can already be detected at the beginning of the 5th cent. BC: see e.g. Funke 2003, 58–60, 63–65.

¹¹¹ We do not know exactly, when the musical contests were first introduced at the Isthmian and the Nemean Games. One reason for their dating is the documents from the middle of the third century BC, which first mention the artistic Guild of Isthmus and Nemea (*SIG*³ 460; 457): the very name of this Guild suggests that it was founded for the sake of the musical contests at the Isthmian and the Nemean Games and therefore soon after their introduction.

Secondly, the discipline of choral auletes is generally acknowledged a successor of dithyramb of the Classical time. Meanwhile, there is direct evidence on dithyrambic contests at the Pythian Games, and it dates to the fourth century BC,¹¹² the point at which *πυθικός* probably became a technical term. It would be a strange assumption that particularly in Delphi – a centre of the most advanced musical achievements – choral performances were so conservative that they did not undergo the changes that made an aulete their main participant. Yet apparently these contests did not enjoy prestige comparable to the solo agones at the same festival. It is not known when and where choral performances started to be organized agonistically in Greece; our first firm evidence concerns Athens of Cleisthenes' time.¹¹³ It seems that originally there were no choral contests at the Pythian Games, for they are not mentioned in the scholia to Pindar, or in Strabo, or in Plutarch, or in Pausanias.¹¹⁴ Probably, as regards the *κύκλιοι χοροί*, Athens and not Delphi served as a model for the rest of Greece. Meanwhile the Pythian competition of soloists was a musical agon *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. Therefore it seems that the ancients spoke about the 'Pythian' solo pieces just as we now speak about 'Olympic' sports.

It can be added that Horace (*Ars poet.* 414–415) interprets the term 'Pythian aulete' as derived from 'the Pythian Games': *qui Pythia cantat tibicen* is evidently a paraphrasis of the Greek *πυθαύλης*, and *Pythia* (as a noun, neutr. pl.) always means 'the Pythian Games'.¹¹⁵ Nearly the same expression occurs in the transmitted text of Hyginus (*Fab.* 273. 7), but, I believe, as a gloss:¹¹⁶ *his quoque ludis* (sc. Nemeis) *pythaulēs [qui Pythia cantauerunt] septem habuit palliatos qui uoce cantauerunt, unde postea appellatus est choraules*. Possibly the wording of the gloss was influenced by the verse of Horace.

¹¹² A paean to Dionysus by Philodamus, 340/339 BC (see Powell 1925, 165–171; Furley, Bremer 2001, I, 121–128; II, 52–83), v. 131–136: Πυθιάσιν δὲ πενθετήροισι [τ]ροπαίς ἔταξε Βάκχου θυσίαν χορῶν τε πο[λλῶν] κυκλίαν ἄμιλλαν ... τεύχειν.

¹¹³ Reisch 1899, 2431.

¹¹⁴ The claim of Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1132 A that Philammon was the first to establish choruses in the Delphic sanctuary (*χορούς πρῶτον περὶ τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱερὸν στήσαι*) does not necessarily imply the *contests*. From a questionable story in Procl. ap. Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 239 p. 320 a 36 – b 4 (apparently dealing with Delphi, cf. Paus. 10. 7. 2) it follows that praising of Apollo by a chorus was substituted by solo singing of a citharode due to the invention of Chrysothemis since time immemorial.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Ovid. *Met.* 1. 447, Vitruv. *Arch.* 9. pr. 1. 1, Hygin. *Fab.* 140. 5, Lucan. *BC* 6. 409, Festus, *De verb.* 217. 6, Aul. Gell. *NA* 12. 5. 1. 1, Apul. *Pl.* 1. 2. 13. Frei 1900, 61 is wrong ascribing to *Pythia* the meaning 'τὸ Πυθικὸν ἀῶλημα'.

¹¹⁶ Understanding *Pythia* as "les Hymnes d'Apollon" is unacceptable, *pace* Bori-aud 1997, 165–166.

Thus the motivation to interpret any mention of a ‘Pythian’ aulete or citharist as evidence for performing the Pythian nome is unfounded.

The attribute ‘Pythian’ was also applied to musical instruments intended for elaborate solo performance and evidently supplied with every technical resource available at the time.¹¹⁷ According to the aulos classification going back to Aristoxenus,¹¹⁸ ἀύλοὶ τέλειοι (‘perfect’) were also called ἀύλοὶ Πυθικοί, and were used for playing τὸ ἄχορον αὐλήμα, τὸ Πυθικόν; they had a low range, as opposed to ἀύλοὶ χορικοί, which produced notes of a higher range.¹¹⁹ Similarly, there was a Pythian cithara, a professional instrument of solo citharists.¹²⁰

Apparently the names of professional instruments are derived from the names of professionals – Pythian auletes and citharists. We have no more reason to connect performing the Pythian nome with these names than we do with the terms designating the musicians themselves. This conclusion helps to avoid several incorrect interpretations. For example, we do not have a safe explanation, why the Pythian cithara was alternatively called δακτυλικόν (Poll. 4. 66),¹²¹ but it lacks foundation to relate this term to playing the dactylic movement of the Pythian nome:¹²² besides decisive general reasons concerning lack of circulation of this nome, one is puzzled why just one, and just this section should influence the terminology.

In “The Interpretation of Dreams” of Artemidorus (second century AD), to dream of playing a Pythian aulos is a bad sign (*Onirocrit.* 1. 56, p. 63. 7–10 Pack):

¹¹⁷ West 1992, 59; 69–70; 93.

¹¹⁸ Athen. 14. 36, p. 634 e–f, quotes from Didymus a reference to Aristoxenus, *περὶ Αὐλῶν Τρήσεως*.

¹¹⁹ Poll. 4. 81: ἤρμοττον δὲ πρὸς ὕμνους μὲν οἱ σπονδειακοί (sc. αὐλοί), πρὸς παιᾶνας δ’ οἱ Πυθικοί· τελείους δ’ αὐτοὺς ὠνόμαζον, ἤϋλουν δὲ τὸ ἄχορον αὐλήμα, τὸ Πυθικόν, οἱ δὲ χορικοί διθυράμβοις προσηύλουν. Arist. Quint. 2. 16, p. 101 Meibom = 85 Winnington-Ingram: Ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἐμπνευστοῖς ἄρρην μὲν ἄν τις ἀποφῆναιτο τὴν σάλπιγγα διὰ τὸ σφοδρὸν, θῆλυ δὲ τὸν αὐλὸν τὸν φρύγιον γοερὸν τε ὄντα καὶ θρηνώδη, τῶν δὲ μέσων αὐτὸν μὲν πυθικὸν πλέον ἄρρηνότητος μετέχοντα διὰ τὸ βάρος, τὸν δὲ χορικὸν θηλυτέτητος διὰ τὸ ἐξ ὀξύτητα εὐχερές.

¹²⁰ Poll. 4. 66: τὸ μέντοι τῶν ψιλῶν κιθαρῖστων ὄργανον, ὃ καὶ Πυθικὸν ὀνομάζεται, δακτυλικόν τινες κεκλήκασιν.

¹²¹ West 1992, 59–60: the name δακτυλικόν “perhaps refers to its being played with all ten fingers instead of five plus a plectrum”. As regards the name Πυθικόν, West justly relates the Pythian cithara to the Pythian musical contests and emphasizes that “‘Pythian kithara-playing’ became a recognized art form that could be displayed anywhere”.

¹²² Pace Bélis 1988, 243.

αὐλεῖν δὲ πυθικοῖς¹²³ αὐλοῖς πένθος ἢ ἀνάλογον πένθει λύπην σημαίνει καὶ τοὺς νοσοῦντας ἀναιρεῖ. καλάμοις δὲ αὐλεῖν ἀγαθὸν πάσι καὶ σπονδαυλεῖν.

This interpretation is not provided with a comment, and is not clear, which is strange, since Artemidorus intended to leave only the most evident cases unexplained.¹²⁴ Commentators beginning with L. Robert unanimously explain the connection of the Pythian aulos with evil and death by the fact that the Pythian nome depicted the agony and death of Python.¹²⁵ Yet, firstly, the two parts of this nome dedicated to celebrating the victory of Apollo would have complicated such an interpretation considerably. Secondly, our analysis shows that we have no evidence on performances of the Pythian nome in the Imperial period. Artemidorus' questionable conclusions can be explained in another way, if we consider the dreams of a salpinx discussed above in the same section (*Onirocrit.* 1. 56, p. 62. 15 – 63. 2 Pack):

Σαλπίζειν δοκεῖν σάλπιγγι τῇ ἱερᾷ ἀγαθὸν τοῖς βουλομένοις συγγενέσθαι τισὶ καὶ τοῖς ἀπολωλεκόσιν ἀνδράποδα ἢ τινὰς τῶν οἰκετῶν ... καὶ τοὺς νοσοῦντας ἀναιρεῖ· σύγκειται γὰρ ἐξ ὅστων καὶ χαλκοῦ, δι' ὧν ἕξεισι μὲν τὸ πνεῦμα, οὐχ ὑποστρέφει δέ. ... στρογγύλη δὲ σάλπιγγι σαλπίζειν πονηρόν· οὐ γὰρ ἱερὸν τὸ ὄργανον ἀλλὰ πολεμιστήριον, καὶ ὅσα τῷ στόματι λέγει ὁ τῷ ὄργανῳ τοῦτο χρώμενος, ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἀνατρέχει.

Perhaps the comments about dreaming of an aulos are lacking just because they are the same as dealing with a salpinx.¹²⁶ Indeed, these

¹²³ Hercher 1864, 53 proposed a conjecture πενθικοῖς instead of πυθικοῖς, which was accepted by R. A. Pack in his Teubner edition (Pack 1963, 63) and subsequently by several translators. Yet it must be rejected, since, as Pack later realized (Pack 1979, 121–122), the reading πυθικοῖς is proved by the Arabic translation.

¹²⁴ Artemid. *Onirocrit.* prooem. p. 2. 21–27 Pack: ὅθεν μοι περιγέγονεν ... τὰς ἀποδείξεις φανεράς καὶ πάσιν εὐκαταλήπτους ἀποδοῦναι ἐξ ἀπλῶν, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τι εἶη οὕτω σαφές, ὡς περιττὴν ἠγήσασθαι τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐξηγήσιν.

¹²⁵ Robert 1970–1971, 236–237; Festugière 1975, 64; Pack 1979, 121–122. Harris-McCoy 2012, 450 accepts this argument and adds an unhappy observation that in Pind. *Pyth.* 12 Athena invents an aulos in order to depict the mourning cries of the gorgons. But it has been repeatedly proven that the aulos in general (just like any other instrument) cannot be related exceptionally to mournful music: see e.g. Bowie 1986, 22–27; Pozdnev 2007 [M. M. Позднев, “Об одном мотиве застольной поэзии: Theogn. 1041 sq.”], 27–30. The very passage of Artemidorus demonstrates this once more: it indicates that dreaming of an aulos can be a good omen as well.

¹²⁶ As are those about being a herald, 1. 56, p. 63. 5–6 Pack: τὸ δὲ κηρύσσειν τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ σαλπίζειν σημαίνει.

passages are similar: in both cases an omen can be fortunate or unfortunate, depending, on the one hand, on the material (ἐξ ὀστών καὶ χαλκοῦ is bad, καλάμοις is good), and on the other hand, on the occasion of playing an instrument (prosperous is performing at a sacred ceremony – σαλπίζειν σάλπιγγι τῇ ἱερῇ / σπονδαυλεῖν). It is likely that playing a Pythian aulos is an ill omen and portends death to sick people, because (a) οὐ γὰρ ἱερὸν τὸ ὄργανον, and (b) the instrument is made of bones and bronze – in this case the passage of Artemidorus can be treated as evidence that a professional agonistic aulos was made of bones or bronze and not of reed.

Thus the information on performing a Pythian nome is very scarce. We only possess a direct indication that it formed the prescribed program of instrumentalists by the time of the introduction of auletic (586 BC) and citharistic (558 BC) contests at the Pythian Games, that is, during the initial period of these contests' existence, and that it was used as accompaniment at the Olympic Games at the same period. The sacred nature of this nome and the poetic evidence (still in the Hellenistic period) of the enduring importance of the victory over Python in the aretalogy of Apollo in Delphi suggest that the tradition of playing it at the Pythian Games went on for a long time. Yet the latest evidence that can be interpreted as indicating the performance of the Pythian nome dates back to the fourth century BC and does not imply an agonistic context (above nos. 6, 7). Since all the poetic parallels we know in Delphi (choral praises to Apollo at the Athenian Pythais or at the Theoxenia) are related not to the agones, but to the cult practice, it is likely that the instrumental Pythian nome was also performed outside the contests at that time.

Indirect confirmation that this nome had been already forgotten by the beginning of the Christian era can be seen in the wording of Strabo (9. 3. 10, p. 421) ἀποδώσοντάς τι μέλος, ὃ καλεῖται νόμος Πυθικός. The author evidently implies that his audience has never heard about the Pythian nome: the fact that the first auletes and citharists ought to perform it is mentioned in a report on the founding of an ancient festival as a curious historical peculiarity. This makes us think that in Strabo's lifetime (ca. 64/63 BC – ca. AD 23/24), despite a great number of musical contests and the great authority of the Pythian Games, performing this and other traditional νόμοι had died out.

This is further proved by discordant word usage of the authors of the Roman period. The expression τὸ Πυθικὸν αὐλήμα means 'a nome about the victory over Python' only in Pausanias, who tells about the musicians of the sixth century BC (2. 22. 8, 5. 7. 10: above nos. 1, 2). In Pollux (4. 81: see n. 119), τὸ Πυθικὸν αὐλήμα is the same as τὸ ἄχορον αὐλήμα, as in agonistic terminology. Plutarch (*Sept. sap. conv.* 161 C–D: see

n. 9) seems to imagine a Pythian nome as a traditional paeon – a prayer for rescue from danger, of which the proem may address a sea god.¹²⁷ One can compare this with *Schol. Aristoph. Av.* 857, which claims that a paeon was called τὸ Πύθιον μέλος during the time of Sophocles and Aristophanes (above no. 4). Perhaps these passages reflect the difficulties felt by ancient theoretical thought in distinguishing between a citharodic nome and a paeon.¹²⁸

Yet more indirect proof of this is the scarcity of evidence on the Pythian nome. Its omission by the author of *De musica*, though he carefully writes out the names of ancient νόμοι and evidently aims at giving a complete account, seems almost scandalous. Agonistic documents of the Roman period, and in particular adducing the number of the Pythian victories and honorary titles πυθιονίκης, περιοδονίκης among the merits of the artists, show unequivocally, how prestigious and desired by every professional musician a Pythian victory was at least till the third century AD. If playing a Pythian nome remained an indispensable condition of such victories, we could expect much more awareness and information from their contemporaries. Yet the witnesses seem to maintain a conspiracy of silence on the subject, whereas all our principal sources – Strabo, scholia to Pindar and Pollux – have a strongly marked antiquarian character.

As a result it can be asserted that the Pythian nome was obligatory for instrumentalists at the Pythian Games in the first half of the sixth century BC, but no longer obligatory by the early fifth century; I admit its episodic performance as late as in the fourth century BC (when it was probably performed outside the musical contests), but deny its existence in the Roman period.

Nina Almazova
Saint Petersburg State University;
Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana
nialm@inbox.ru

¹²⁷ Plutarch himself kept in close touch with Delphi from his youth (*De E ap. Delph.* 385 B), and in his later years he was a Delphic priest (*An seni resp. ger. sit* 17, 792 F; *Quaest. conv.* 7. 2, 700 E; *SIG*³ 829 A) and probably even an agonothete of the Pythian Games (see *An seni resp. ger. sit* 4, 785 C and *Praec. ger. reip.* 813 D, but cf. Ziegler 1951, 657). So he would have known the nome about Apollo's victory at first hand, if it was still performed.

¹²⁸ In Proclus (ap. Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 239 p. 320 a 33–34; 320 b 23–25) a nome and not a paeon is opposed, as a genre of Apollo, to the orgiastic Dionysian dithyramb. According to Rutherford 2001, 27 n. 17; 103–104, it was disputed, which was the true Apollonian genre.

Appendix

Pythian winners in solo aulos- and cithara-playing

No.	NAME, SPECIALITY	DATE	SOURCE	NOTES
ARCHAIC PERIOD				
1	Sacadas of Argos, aulete	586, 582, 578 BC	Ps.-Plut. <i>De mus.</i> 1134 A; Paus. 6. 14. 10, 10. 7. 4 (Stephanis 2207)	The first winner in aulos-playing, the first performer of the Pythian nome at the Pythian Games
2	Pythocritus of Sicyon, aulete	574, 570, 566, 562, 558, 554 BC	Paus. 6. 14. 9–10 (Stephanis 2175)	The successor of Sacadas. Performed the Pythian nome at the Olympic contest of pentathlon
3	Agelaus of Tegea, citharist	558 BC	Paus. 10. 7. 7 (Stephanis 35)	The first winner in cithara-playing at the Pythian Games
CLASSICAL PERIOD				
4	Midas of Acragas, aulete	490 BC	Pind. <i>Pyth.</i> 12 (Stephanis 1702)	Probably performed the Many-headed nome
5	Chrysogonus, aulete	late 5 th cent. BC	Plut. <i>Alc.</i> 32. 2 (Stephanis 2637)	Πυθιονίκης, said to have played at the ship of Alcibiades in 408 BC
6	Antigenidas of Thebes, aulete	1 st half of the 4 th cent. BC	Himer. <i>Or.</i> 74. 2, p. 247 Colonna (Stephanis 196, 13)	Performed the nome of Athena
HELLENISTIC PERIOD				
7	Satyrus of Samos, aulete (no term)	1 st half of the 2 nd cent. BC	<i>FdD</i> III 3,128 = <i>SIG</i> ³ 648B = <i>Michel</i> 959 (Stephanis 2240)	τούτῳ πρώτῳ συμβέβηκεν μόνῳ ἄνευ ἀνταγωνιστῶν ἀυλῆσαι τὸν ἀγῶνα
8	Ariston of Cos, aulete (no term)	2 nd –1 st cent. BC	<i>Inscr. Cos</i> 58 (Stephanis 387)	A victory in Pytho is mentioned in a poetic inscription

No.	NAME, SPECIALITY	DATE	SOURCE	NOTES
IMPERIAL PERIOD				
9	Tib. Scandili- [a]nus Zosimus of Gortyn, pythauls and chorauls	ca. AD 90–120	<i>CIG</i> 1719 = <i>BCH</i> 126 (2002) 99–104 (Stephanis 1039)	Won as pythauls and chorauls at the same Pythian Games
10	P. Aeli[us Ae]lianus, pythauls	post AD 138	<i>FdD</i> III 1, 547 (Stephanis 82)	περιοδονεΐκης, the list of victories includes Πύθια
11	T. Aelius Aurelius (Aurelianus?) Theodotus, πυθικός καὶ κύκλιος ἀδλητής	ca. AD 150–160	<i>CIG</i> 1720 = <i>FdD</i> III 6, 143 = <i>BCH</i> 126 (2002) 104–109 (Stephanis 1147)	Won at the Pythian Games as pythauls and chorauls (probably once each)
12	D[ad]juchus, πυθικός ἀδλητής	2 nd cent. AD	<i>FdD</i> III 4, 86 (Stephanis 568)	Acquired a πολιτεία in Delphi as a Pythian winner
13	M. Aur[e] lius O[- -]lon of Ancyra, pythauls and chorauls	2 nd –3 rd cent. AD	<i>FdD</i> III 4, 476 (Stephanis 480)	The list of victories includes Πύθια; won both as pythauls and chorauls
14	L. Cornelius Corinthus, pythauls	2 nd –3 rd cent. AD	<i>SEG</i> 29 (1979) 340 (Stephanis 1480)	περιοδονεΐκης, the list of victories includes Πύθια (one time)
15	Bentidius Sotas, pythauls	late 2 nd – early 3 rd cent. AD	<i>IGR</i> IV 468 = <i>CIG</i> 6829 (Stephanis 2366)	περιοδονεΐκης, archon of the Dionysian Guild of artists, AD 198–209
16	??, πυθικός ἀδλητής	3 rd cent. AD	<i>FdD</i> III 1, 550 = <i>BCH</i> 126 (2002) 124–128 (Stephanis 3021)	Won the περίοδος; the list of victories includes Πύθια (three times)
17	T. Aelius Aure- lianus Beryllus, πυθικός ἀδλητής	3 rd cent. AD	<i>IK</i> 14, 1149, cf. <i>IK</i> 14, 1137 (Stephanis 521)	περιοδονεΐκης

Bibliography

- H. Abert, "Sakadas", *RE* 2. R. 1 (1920) 1768–1769.
- N. Almazova, "K kharakteristike instrumental'nogo noma" ["Instrumental *nomos*: Some Considerations"], *Hyperboreus* 7 (2001) 80–90.
- N. Almazova, "On the Meaning of ἀὐλωδία, ἀὐλωδός", *Hyperboreus* 14: 2 (2008) 5–34.
- N. Almazova, "Ἀρμάτειος νόμος", *MAIA* 66: 3 (2014) 518–538.
- A. Barker, "The Innovations of Lysander the Kitharist", *CQ* n.s. 32 (1982) 266–269.
- A. Barker, *The Science of Harmonics in Classical Greece* (Cambridge 2007).
- A. Barker, "The Music of Olympus", *QUCC* n.s. 99: 3 (2011) 43–58.
- A. Bélis, "Les termes grecs et latins désignant des spécialités musicales", *Revue de philologie* 62 (1988) 227–250.
- A. Bélis, *Les musiciens dans l'antiquité* (Paris 1999).
- A. Boeckh, *De metris Pindari* (Lipsiae 1811).
- J.-Y. Boriaud (ed. and transl.), Hygin, *Fables* (Paris 1997).
- E. L. Bowie, "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival", *JHS* 106 (1986) 13–35.
- J. C. Bulenger, *De theatro* II: *De ludis musicis et scenicis* (Parisiis 1601).
- R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford 1962).
- G. Comotti, *Music in Greek and Roman Culture*. Tr. by R. V. Munson (Baltimore 1989).
- C. Chandezon, "La base de Satyros a Delphes: le théâtre classique et son public a l'époque hellénistique", *Cahier du GITA* 11 (1998) 33–58.
- P. A. Clement, "L. Kornelius Korinthos of Corinth", in: D. W. Bradeen, M. F. McGregor (eds.), *ΦΟΡΟΣ. Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt* (Locust Valley, N. Y. 1974) 36–39.
- W. E. H. Cockle, "The Odes of Epagathus, the Choral Flautist: Some Documentary Evidence for Dramatic Representations in Roman Egypt", in: *Proceedings of the XIVth International Congress of Papyrologists, Oxford, 24–31 July 1974* (London 1975) 59–65.
- A. D'Angour, "How the Dithyramb Got Its Shape", *CQ* 47: 2 (1997) 331–351.
- E. Diehl, *Anthologia lyrica Graeca* (Lipsiae 1925).
- N. Dunbar (ed.), *Aristophanes Birds* (Oxford 1995, repr. 2004).
- L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar. Critical Commentary* (London 1932).
- A. J. Festugière (transl., comm.), Artémidore, *La clef des songes (Onirocriticon)* (Paris 1975).
- J. Frei, *De certaminibus thymelicis*. Diss. (Basel 1900).
- P. Funke, "Gli ombelichi del mondo. Riflessioni sulla canonizzazione dei santuari 'panellenici'", *Geographia antiqua* 12 (2003) 57–65.
- W. D. Furley, J. M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns* (Tübingen 2001).
- P. Gisinger, "Timosthenes 3", *RE* 2. R. 6 (1937) 1310–1322.
- E. Graf, "Eunomus 10", *RE* 6 (1907) 1133.

- H. Guhrer, “Der pythische Nomos. Eine Studie zur griechischen Musik-Geschichte”, *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie*, Supplbd. VIII (1875/76).
- H. Guhrer, *Altgriechische Programm-Musik*, Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Programm des Melanchton-Gymnasiums (Wittenberg 1904).
- S. Hagel, “The *aulos sýrinx*”, in: *Poetry, Music and Contests in Ancient Greece. Proceedings of the IVth International Meeting of MOISA*. Eds. D. Castaldo, F. G. Giannachi, A. Manieri (Galatina 2012) = *Rudiae. Ricerche sul mondo classico* 22–23 (2010–2011) vol. II, 489–518.
- J. R. Hamilton (ed.), *Plutarch. Alexander* (Bristol 21999).
- D. E. Harris-McCoy (ed.), *Artemidorus’ Oneirocritica* (Oxford 2012).
- R. Hercher (ed.), *Artemidori Daldiani Oneirocriticon libri V* (Lipsiae 1864).
- E. Hiller, “Sakadas der Aulet”, *RhM* 31 (1876) 76–88.
- A. A. Howard, “The *aulos* or tibia”, *HSCP* 4 (1893) 1–63.
- F. Jacoby, *Atthis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford 1949).
- K. von Jan, “Die musischen Festspiele in Griechenland”, *Verhandlungen der neununddreissigsten Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Zürich vom 28. September bis 1. Oktober 1887* (Leipzig 1888).
- K. von Jan, E. Graf, “Epigonos 7”, *RE* 6 (1907) 69.
- D. Kolk, *Der pythische Apollonhymnus als aitiologische Dichtung*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 6 (Meisenheim am Glan 1963).
- R. Laqueur, “Timaios 3”, *RE* 2. R. 6 (1936) 1076–1203.
- O. Liermann, *Analecta epigraphica et agonistica*, Diss. philol. Halenses X (Halle 1889).
- J.-P. Michaud, “Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1968 et 1969”, *BCH* 94 (1970) 883–1164.
- A. Mommsen, *Delphika* (Leipzig 1878).
- M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der attischen* (Leipzig 21995).
- R. A. Pack (ed.), *Artemidori Daldiani Oneirocriticon libri V* (Lipsiae 1963).
- R. A. Pack, “Artemidoriana qualiacumque”, in: *Studies Presented to Orasmus M. Pearl. Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 16: 1–2 (1979) 121–124.
- A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford 21962).
- E. Pöhlmann, *Griechische Musikfragmente: Ein Weg zur altgriechischer Musik* (Nürnberg 1960).
- E. Pöhlmann, “Pythikos and Polykephalos Nomos. Compulsory and Optional Exercise in the Pythian Contest”, in: *Poetry, Music and Contests in Ancient Greece. Proceedings of the IVth International Meeting of MOISA*. Eds. D. Castaldo, F. G. Giannachi, A. Manieri (Galatina 2012) = *Rudiae. Ricerche sul mondo classico* 22–23 (2010–2011) vol. I, 273–282.
- E. Pöhlmann, M. L. West, *Documents of Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford 2001).
- J. U. Powell (ed.), *Collectanea Alexandrina. Reliquiae minores poetarum Graecorum aetatis Ptolemaicae 323–146 A.C.* (Oxonii 1925, repr. 1970).
- M. Pozdnev, “Ob odnom motive zastol’noj poezii: Theogn. 1041 sq.” [“One Subject of Symptic Poetry: Theogn. 1041 sq.”], *Tradita non explorata, Philologia classica* VII (St Petersburg 2007) 25–32.

- S. Radt (ed.), *Strabons Geographika* III (Göttingen 2004).
- S. Radt (ed.), *Strabons Geographika* VII (Göttingen 2008).
- E. Reisch, *De musicis Graecorum certaminibus capita quattuor* (Vindobonae 1885).
- E. Reisch, “Χορικοί ἀγῶνες”, *RE* 3 (1899) 2431–2438.
- L. Robert, “Études d'épigraphie grecque”, *Rev. philol.* 56 (1930) 25–60.
- L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris 1938).
- L. Robert, “Épigraphie grecque et géographie historique du monde hellénique”, *Annuaire de l'École pratiques des Hautes Études*, IV^e section (1970–1971) 233–240.
- J. Robert, L. Robert, *Bull. ép.*, in *RÉG* 84 (1971) 436 no. 308.
- E. Rohde, *De Julii Pollucis in apparatu scaenico enarrando fontibus* (Lipsiae 1870).
- A. Rotstein, *The Idea of Iambos* (Oxford – New York 2010).
- I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford 2001).
- Th. Schreiber, *Apollon Pythoktonos. Ein Beitrag zum griechischen Religions- und Kunstgeschichte* (Leipzig 1879).
- I. Stephanis, “Kyklioi kai pythikoi aulites”, *Hellinika* 33: 2 (1981) 397–402.
- I. E. Stephanis, *Dionysiakoi technitai. Symboles stin prosopografia tou theatrou kai tis mousikis ton archaion Ellinon* (Heraklion 1988).
- J.-Y. Strasser, “Chorales et pythales d'époque impériale. À propos d'inscriptions de Delphes”, *BCH* 126 (2002) 97–142.
- F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit I* (Leipzig 1891).
- A. Tresp, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Kultschriftsteller, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten XV.1* (Gießen 1914).
- E. A. Wagner, *Die Erdbeschreibung des Timosthenes von Rhodos*. Diss. (Leipzig 1888).
- M. L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford 1992).
- R. Westphal, *Prolegomena zu Aeschylus Tragödien* (Leipzig 1869).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922).
- K. Ziegler, “Plutarchos von Chaironeia”, *RE* 21 (1951) 636–962.

According to Strabo, the Pythian nome, which depicted Apollo's victory over Python, formed the program of auletic and citharistic contests from their introduction at the Pythian Games (586 and 558 BC respectively). Yet interpreting any solo Pythian victory as proof of performing a Pythian nome is unfounded. The existence of the vocal, citharodic Pythian nome is not well evidenced. For instrumentalists it was likely only obligatory at the beginning. In 12 of 17 known cases we are not aware what the Pythian winners played, and in two cases (in the early 5th and in the 4th century BC) other nomes were performed at the Pythian contests. A hypothesis that the program was divided into compulsory and optional cannot be proven; rather an agonistic occasion stimulated gradual loss of ritual character of the pieces performed and the acquiring of more variety, whereas

musical representation of a dragon-fight was probably transferred from the agonistic to the cult program of the festival. References to the Pythian nome are scarce; the latest of what may be considered as evidence on its performance concerns the 4th cent. BC and indicates non-agonistic occasions. Using *πυθικός* as a technical term meaning ‘soloistic’, which is typical of the Roman period, does not imply playing a Pythian nome; even at the point at which this terminology was first established it referred more likely to the Pythian Games in general. In Roman times, the scarcity of evidence (even though Pythian victories remained prestigious and were sought for) and discordant word usage of the authors show that the Pythian nome no longer existed.

По свидетельству Страбона, пифийский ном, изображавший победу Аполлона над Пифоном, должен был исполняться на состязаниях авлетов и кифаристов с момента их введения на Пифийских играх (в 586 и 558 г. до н.э. соответственно). Однако интерпретация всякой сольной пифийской победы как исполнения этого нома лишена оснований. Само существование вокального (кифародического) пифийского нома надежно не засвидетельствовано. Для инструменталистов этот ном, видимо, оставался обязательным лишь первое время. В 12 из 17 случаев содержание выступления пифийских победителей неизвестно, а в двух (в нач. V и в 1-й пол. IV в. до н.э.) на Пифийских состязаниях исполнялись другие номы. Гипотеза о том, что программа делилась на обязательную и факультативную, не подтверждается – скорее в обстановке состязаний выступления музыкантов постепенно теряли ритуальный характер и их репертуар расширялся, а музыкальное изображение битвы с Пифоном, возможно, было перенесено из агональной программы праздника в культовую. Из немногочисленных сообщений, которые можно трактовать как свидетельства бытования пифийского нома, два наиболее поздних относятся к IV в. до н.э. и касаются его исполнения за рамками состязаний. Употребление эпитета *πυθικός* в терминологическом значении ‘сольный’, характерное для римского времени, вовсе не подразумевает исполнения пифийского нома; даже в момент установления эта терминология была связана скорее с Пифийскими играми в целом. В римское время скудость сведений, несмотря на то что пифийские победы сохраняли престиж, и расхождения в словоупотреблении поздних авторов показывают, что пифийский ном прекратил свое существование.