UDC 821.14

Citharodic *Nomos* and *Prooimion*

Nina A. Almazova

St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; n.almazova@spbu.ru

A citharodic performance typically included a προοίμιον that preceded a νόμος. Theoretically, there are three possible options: a *prooimion* (1) was an inseparable introduction to a specific main part; (2) was not performed independently, but could precede various main parts; (3) was an independent piece. Most evidence points to option 2. Standard circumstances of performance must have stereotyped the subject matter that appeared in the introduction, so the proem became an autonomous song that could precede any narrative part, and even be performed independently (if there were no agonistic connotations and transitional formulas). Pseudo-Plutarch's notions of ancient citharody (*De mus*. 1132B–C; 1132D; 1133B–C) are interpreted as follows: a proem addressed to the gods was a citharode's own composition (hence ὡς βούλονται, despite its formal character and epic metre). It was immediately followed by a nome, whose epic narration could be either original or taken from Homer and other poets and set to music according to one of melodic patterns systemized by Terpander. Terpander's proems likely offered two proofs of this theory: they ended with a formula of transition to another song, which itself did not follow. Apparently, the option to use someone else's poetry in the main body led to the practice of writing down the proems without the subsequent nomes, so that they were seen as independent works. It is likely that Pseudo-Plutarch's source was referring to minor Homeric hymns, since they correspond perfectly with the information that we have about citharodic proems.

Keywords: Ancient Greek music, citharodic *nomos*, *prooimion*, Homeric hymn.

This paper examines the correlation between νόμος and προοίμιον as musical-poetical terms.

The etymology of the word προοίμιον is disputable: since ancient times it has been derived from either οἴμη 'song'[1] or οἶμος 'way'[2] (Quint. 4. 1. 1–3). Solving this problem

---

[1] This is the prevailing view: see e. g. Böhme 1937, 28–30; Koller 1956, esp. 191; Nagy 1990, 353.

[2] Maslov 2012, 198–203. Chantraine 1974, 783, admits that οἶμος and οἴμη are themselves kindred words.

---

is irrelevant to this present study. In surviving texts, προοίμιον can mean introduction, prelude, proem and, metaphorically, any beginning.[3]

Authors from the classical period speak of the *prooimion* as something typical of many different genres: rhapsody,[4] chorus[5] and solo[6] melic poetry, rhetoric,[7] and in general, "all kinds of music" (πάσης μούσης) and "anything related to the voice" (ὅσων φωνὴ κεκοινώνηκεν), as Plato puts it.[8] It is well known that the Homeric hymn to Apollo (*HH* 3) is called προοίμιον in Thucydides (3. 104. 4–5).[9] The very possibility of calling an extensive epic poem of 546 verses, with a complete narrative subject, a "proem" needs explaining.[10] This designation is not attested for minor, non-narrative Homeric hymns, but it would seem an apt identification for them, all the more so because some hymns (both major and minor) end with a promise of "another song",[11] which formally labels them as proems. Since F. A. Wolf,[12] it has been supposed that Homeric hymns literally served as introductions: while the minor ones preceded longer songs, the major ones could open an entire festival or one of its program events.[13] The alternative, and more convincing, explanation is an etymologically unfounded extension of the name προοίμιον from the minor to the major hymns due to their technical resemblance.[14] In fact, below we shall see that

---

[3] LSJ s. v.: "I. 1) *opening, introduction*; in Music, *prelude, ouverture*; in Ep. poems, *proem, preamble*; in speeches, *exordium*; 2) metaph. of *any prelude or beginning*; 3) of *premonitory symptoms* of disease".

[4] Pind. *Nem.* 2. 1–3: Ὅθεν περ καὶ Ὁμηρίδαι / ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων τὰ πόλλ᾽ ἀοιδοὶ / ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου… Koller 1956, 190, argues that προοίμιος is an adjective here, an epithet of Zeus, but cf. Maslov 2012, 193, n. 6: "there is no evidence that such an epithet of Zeus ever existed".

[5] Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 3–4 (of the phorminx): πείθονται δ᾽ ἀοιδοὶ σάμασιν / ἀγησιχόρων ὁπόταν προοιμίων ἀμβολάς τεύχῃς.

[6] Plat. *Leg.* 4. 722d: καὶ δή που κιθαρῳδικῆς ᾠδῆς λεγομένων νόμων καὶ πάσης μούσης προοίμια θαυμαστῶς ἐσπουδασμένα πρόκειται. Cf. below n. 28.

[7] The earliest evidence of using this term with regard to rhetoric is in Critias (ca 420 BC), who wrote a treatise likely called Περὶ δημηγορικῶν προοιμίων (Critias fr. 43, II. 316 D–K: ἐν τοῖς Δημηγορικοῖς προοιμίοις): see Costantini, Lallot 1987, 19. Plat. *Phdr.* 266d: a *prooimion* is πρῶτον ὡς δεῖ τοῦ λόγου λέγεσθαι ἐν ἀρχῇ. Aristot. *Rhet.* 3. 1414b19–21: Τὸ μὲν οὖν προοίμιόν ἐστιν ἀρχὴ λόγου, ὅπερ ἐν ποιήσει πρόλογος καὶ ἐν αὐλήσει προαύλιον.

[8] Plat. *Leg.* IV, 722d: λόγων πάντων καὶ ὅσων φωνὴ κεκοινώνηκεν προοίμιά τέ ἐστιν…; see above n. 6.

[9] Thucydides quotes not the beginning of the hymn, but the lines 146–150 and 165–172, which makes it clear that he applies the word προοίμιον to the whole poem. Aelius Aristides (*Or.* 34. 35 Keil) likely follows Thucydides, as he calls the same hymn προοίμιον (Allen, Halliday, Sikes 1963, LXXI, 186–187).

[10] Rabinovich 2008 (Рабинович Е. Г. "Заметки о номинации". In: Б. А. Успенский, Ф. Б. Успенский (ред.). *Факты и знаки: исследования по семиотике.* Выпуск 1. М., ЯСК, 2008, 9–24), 15–16. The relative brevity of the *prooimion* follows from its very function as an introduction and is proved by evidence: Quint. 4. 1. 2 *pauca illa*; cf. Philostr. *Vita Apoll. Tyan.* 4. 39 βραχὺν διεξελθὼν ὕμνον (without using the term προοίμιον). Power 2010, 201 (on *HH* 3): "its great length would probably have completely deferred the narrative *epos* that normally followed the recitation of the prooimion", cf. Nagy 1990, 354.

[11] The closing verse σεῦ δ᾽ ἐγὼ ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον occurs three times (*HH* 5. 293; 9. 9; 18. 11). In 12 hymns, a more evasive expression is used: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ᾽ ἀοιδῆς (*HH* 2. 495; 3. 546; 4. 580; 6. 21; 10. 6; 19. 49; 28. 18; 30. 19) / αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὑμέων καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ᾽ ἀοιδῆς (*HH* 25. 7; 27. 22; 29. 14; 33. 19). This may not be an indication of an immediate transition to another song, but a promise of singing more praises of the same divinity in the future: see Richardson 2002, 324, for various possible explanations. Yet De Martino 1980, 232–240, adduces numerous parallels demonstrating that this is rather a transitional formula.

[12] Wolf 1795, CVI–CVII with n. 78: "compositos a rhapsodis esse Hymnos, quibus solemni recitationi Homericorum et aliorum Carminum praeluderent".

[13] See e. g. Crusius 1887, 1384–1385; Schmid, Stählin 1929, 232; Aloni 1980, 27, 30–31.

[14] E. g. Allen, Halliday, Sikes 1936, XCIII–XCV. Rabinovich 2008, 14–18, points at common metrical (hexameter) and pragmatic (prayer) parameters in major (epic) and minor (non-epic) hymns. Maslov 2012,

there is more evidence of applying this word to clearly independent compositions.[15] In any case, the corpus of Homeric hymns offers examples of poetical production that might have been called προοίμια in antiquity.

The idea that the terms προοίμιον and νόμος are interchangeable (just like προοίμιον and ὕμνος[16]) goes back to Th. Bergk[17] and was shared by some scholars in the 19th century,[18] but it is unfounded. Bergk's main argument rested on the fact that a quotation from Terpander (Terp. fr. 2 Gostoli) is sometimes attributed to a *prooimion*[19] and sometimes to a nome[20] in scholia and lexica (although never by the same author). However, we can easily land upon other explanations: e. g. by assuming that *prooimion* referred to the beginning of a nome (inseparable from its main body), or considering that some of the grammarians were in error (in that they knew several names of the nomes from classical literature and tried to ascribe Terpander's quotation to one of them at random).[21]

There is only one passage which seems, on the face of it, to consider the *prooimion* and the nome to be the same thing (*Suda* α 1701): Ἀμφιανακτίζειν· ᾄδειν τὸν Τερπάνδρου νόμον, τὸν καλούμενον ὄρθιον, ὃ αὐτῷ προοίμιον ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν εἶχεν·"ἀμφί μοι αὐτὸν ἄνακτ᾽ ἑκατηβόλον ἀοιδέτω φρήν". According to the manuscript reading, νόμον is an antecedent of ὃ προοίμιον: "to sing Terpander's nome called Orthian, that proem of his, which had such a beginning…". However, this is apparently impossible Greek, and ὃ αὐτῷ προοίμιον needs emendation, such as proposed by Bergk: οὗ τὸ προοίμιον ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν εἶχεν.[22]

Thus, using the terms νόμος and προοίμιον synonymously is never actually attested. Yet there is a problem as to whether a *prooimion* was the first part of a nome or else an isolated (subsidiary or even self-sufficient) piece within a citharode's repertoire. Both meanings are attested in respect to other genres. On the one hand, by saying that Athens is "the best proem" for his ode, Pindar obviously means something to begin a song with.[23]

191–192, 194, n. 10, supposes the extension of meaning "an introduction including an address to the gods" to "a poem that is addressed to the gods".

[15] Cf. LSJ s. v.: "II. *hymn or short poem*, such as those attributed to Homer".

[16] The word ὕμνος is applied to Homeric hymns in Diod. Sic. 1. 15. 7; 3. 66. 3; 4. 2. 4; Paus. 4. 30. 4; 9. 30. 12; 10. 37. 5; Athen. 1. 40, 22c. However, Aloni 1980, 28–32, argues that the name of προοίμιον was substituted for that of ὕμνος in the course of time.

[17] Bergk [4]1882, 9; Bergk 1883, 213 with n. 32.

[18] Lübbert 1885/1886, XXII; Crusius 1887, 1385 (assuming that νόμος has a broader meaning: προοίμιον is a νόμος that precedes a religious ceremony or a rhapsodic performance, and therefore a minor one); Dippe 1888, 1051 (claiming that only hexametric νόμοι were called προοίμια, see below n. 55).

[19] Schol. **R** ad Aristoph. *Nub.* 595cα (p. 132 Holwerda): ἀμφί μοι αὖτε· μιμεῖται τῶν διθυραμβοποιῶν καὶ κιθαρῳδῶν τὰ προοίμια. συνεχῶς γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι ταύτῃ χρῶνται τῇ λέξει· διὸ καὶ ἀμφιάνακτας αὐτοὺς ἐκάλουν. ἔστι δὲ τοῦ Τερπάνδρου "ἀμφ᾽ ἐμοὶ ἄνακτα ἑκατηβόλον". *Ibid.* 595cβ: ἀμφί μοι αὖτε· ἐκ τῶν Περιάνδρου προοιμίων. *Suda* α 1700: Ἀμφιανακτίζειν· τὸ προοιμιάζειν. διὰ τὸ οὕτω προοιμιάζεσθαι. Περίανδρος (Τέρπανδρος Bergk)· ἀμφί μοι αὖτις ἄνακτα.

[20] Hesych. α 3944 Latte: Ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα· ἀρχὴ νόμου κιθαρῳδικοῦ. Phot. *Lex.* α 1304 Theodoridis: Ἀμφὶ ἄνακτας· ἀρχή τίς ἐστι νόμου κιθαρῳδικοῦ Βοιωτίου ἢ Αἰολίου, ἢ τοῦ Ὀρθίου.

[21] The awareness of those who tried to relate the quotation to different nomes referred to in classical literature deserves no credit: most probably, these are the guesses of grammarians who did not know Terpander's work. The papyrus *P. Flor.* II 112 (*CLGP* I. 1.4 no. 28), frr. E+D+C, col. I. 5–10, shows that the task of indicating a definite nome was set during the time of Didymus, that is, in the late 1st century BC, and its solution was not obvious. Earlier evidence is lacking.

[22] Bergk [4]1882, 9. Cf. Wilamowitz 1903, 92, n. 2: ὅτι αὐτοῦ προοίμιον.

[23] Pind. *Pyth*. 7. 1–2: Κάλλιστον αἱ μεγαλόπολιες Ἀθᾶναι προοίμιον…

Pausanias refers to the address to the Muses in Hesiod's *Works and Days*[24] as a προοίμιον (however, his Boeotian informants notably disagreed that this proem was authored by Hesiod, thus seeing it as something separable the main poem). Most likely, as Pausanias refers to Mimnermus' *prooimion* to the elegy about the battle of the Smyrnaeans and the Lydians, he similarly means to the first lines of the *Smyrnaeis* (fr. 13 West).[25] On the other hand, there are several mentions of independent compositions called *prooimia* (by accident or not, they are all dedicated to Apollo). According to Plato, Socrates first experimented with poetry shortly before his execution, setting some of Aesop's fables into verse and composing τὸν εἰς τὸν Ἀπόλλω προοίμιον. This was clearly an autonomous piece, and Diogenes Laertius refers to it as a paean.[26] The same Diogenes Laertius identifies a "proem" to Apollo among Empedocles' works.[27] Identical wording in Pausanias, ἐν προοιμίῳ τῷ ἐς Ἀπόλλωνα,[28] makes one think that an analogous self-sufficient song in honour of Apollo was composed by Alcman. Just like the Homeric hymn to Apollo, these compositions were probably never conceived as preludes or introductions to anything else. Even accepting thus an extreme view that only hymns dedicated to Apollo could be called προοίμια, one must admit that addressing this god would be particularly suitable for a citharode's performance.[29]

Therefore, three cases are theoretically possible:

1) a προοίμιον was composed as an introduction to a definite main part and could not be separated from it to become a preface to any other piece (such a unity could be provided by touching upon the contents of the main part in the proem);

2) προοίμια were not performed independently, but the same προοίμιον could be used as a prelude to different main parts (in this case it could reflect the typical circumstances of performance and include a formula of transition to another song);

3) a προοίμιον was a self-sufficient piece that could be performed independently.

As regards citharody, the picture is complicated by Pollux' evidence of the structure of Terpander's nome:[30] its initial two parts were called ἀρχά and μεταρχά, and we do not know how they correlated with a proem. Pollux makes it clear that ἀρχά is a part (μέρος) of a nome. The impression is that the word ἀρχά (ἀρχή) was not applied to an isolated piece, whereas the word προοίμιον can mean both the first lines inseparable from the whole poem and an independent song. J. H. Hordern points out that fragments are never said to be from an ἀρχά of a nome[31] (and in general, no ancient author appears aware of

---

[24] Paus. 9. 31. 4: Βοιωτῶν δὲ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἑλικῶνα οἰκοῦντες παρειλημμένα δόξῃ λέγουσιν ὡς ἄλλο Ἡσίοδος ποιήσειεν οὐδὲν ἢ τὰ Ἔργα· καὶ τούτων δὲ τὸ ἐς τὰς Μούσας ἀφαιροῦσι προοίμιον, ἀρχὴν τῆς ποιήσεως εἶναι τὸ ἐς τὰς Ἔριδας λέγοντες.

[25] Paus. 9. 29. 4: Μίμνερμος δέ, ἐλεγεῖα ἐς τὴν μάχην ποιήσας τὴν Σμυρναίων πρὸς Γύγην τε καὶ Λυδούς, φησὶν ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ θυγατέρας Οὐρανοῦ τὰς ἀρχαιοτέρας Μούσας, τούτων δὲ ἄλλας νεωτέρας εἶναι Διὸς παῖδας.

[26] Plat. *Phaed*. 60d: τὸ εἰς τὸν Ἀπόλλω προοίμιον. Diog. La. 2. 42: ἀλλὰ καὶ παιᾶνα κατά τινας ἐποίησεν, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή· "Δήλι' Ἄπολλον χαῖρε, καὶ Ἄρτεμι, παῖδε κλεεινώ".

[27] Diog. La. 8. 57: γράψαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄλλα ποιήματα τήν τε Ξέρξου διάβασιν καὶ προοίμιον εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα.

[28] Paus. ἤκουσα δὲ καὶ ἄλλο τοιόνδε, τὸ ὕδωρ τῇ Κασταλίᾳ ποταμοῦ δῶρον εἶναι τοῦ Κηφισοῦ. τοῦτο ἐποίησε καὶ Ἀλκαῖος ἐν προοιμίῳ τῷ ἐς Ἀπόλλωνα.

[29] Cf. Power 2010, 189–190.

[30] Poll. 4. 66: μέρη δὲ τοῦ κιθαρῳδικοῦ νόμου, Τερπάνδρου κατανείμαντος, ἑπτά· ἀρχά, μεταρχά, κατατροπά, μετακατατροπά, ὀμφαλός, σφραγίς, ἐπίλογος.

[31] As regards the attribution of quotations in Aristophanes: Τερπάνδρου ἐστὶ(ν) [ἡ] ἀρχή (*POxy* 2737, *CLGP* I. 1. 4 no. 27, fr. 1, col. I. 22–23) and Ἀλκμᾶνος ἡ ἀρχή (*ibid*., col. II. 18–19), I believe that the "beginning" of Aristophanes' song (the ode and the antode of the parabasis respectively) is implied.

Pollux' scheme).[32] Meanwhile, everything has its own beginning, including the proems themselves, cf. *Suda* α 1701: προοίμιον ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν εἶχεν.[33]

Only one, and fragmentary, work known to a citharodic nome has survived to present day: Timotheus' *Persae* (Tim. frr. 788–791 Hordern, late 5th century BC).[34] Aside from that, only some titles are available to us, and most of them give no indication of the subject matter. Since we have no texts to analyse, there is nothing else left for us to do but examine what eye-witnesses of citharodic performances say.

From Plato up to Cicero and Quintilian, it goes without saying that citharodes perform proems. On the one hand, *gen. possessivus* and *dat. possessivus* are grammatical indications that the *prooimion* belongs to a nome,[35] which implies that a προοίμιον was not an independent piece. On the other hand, Plato specifically separates προοίμιον from (αὐτὸς ὁ) νόμος.[36] Moreover, already when speaking of Terpander, the father of citharody, Heraclides of Pontus (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 4. 1132D) treats νόμοι and προοίμια as two different types of his works:

> οἱ δὲ τῆς κιθαρῳδίας νόμοι πρότερον <οὐ> πολλῷ χρόνῳ τῶν αὐλῳδικῶν κατεστάθησαν ἐπὶ Τερπάνδρου· ἐκεῖνος γοῦν τοὺς κιθαρῳδικοὺς πρότερος ὠνόμασε, Βοιώτιόν τινα καὶ Αἰόλιον Τροχαῖόν τε καὶ Ὀξὺν Κηπίωνά τε καὶ Τερπάνδρειον καλῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ Τετραοίδιον. πεποίηται δὲ τῷ Τερπάνδρῳ καὶ προοίμια κιθαρῳδικὰ ἐν ἔπεσιν.

> The nomes belonging to citharody were established rather earlier, in the time of Terpander, and it was Terpander who first gave names to the citharodic nomes, calling them Boeotian and Aeloian, *Trochaios* and *Oxys*, *Kepiōn* and *Terpandreios*, and finally *Tetraoidios*. Terpander also composed citharodic preludes in epic metre.[37]

Editors collected citharodic προοίμια into separate books. Thus, in the *Suda*, 2000 verses of "proems" are ascribed to Arion,[38] and Timotheus is said to have composed 19 nomes, 36 proems, and 21 hymns.[39] Mismatching numbers of νόμοι and προοίμια make it probable that the proems could either precede various nomes or be performed independently of them.

---

[32] Hordern 2004, 124.

[33] Cf. Pind. *Pyth*. 1. 4: προοιμίων ἀμβολάς, of an instrumental prelude before singing.

[34] Fr. 788 (κλεινὸν ἐλευθερίας τεύχων μέγαν Ἑλλάδι κόσμον) must belong to the beginning of *Persae*. Hordern 2002, 127, considers it to be the first line of the *prooimion*, which to my mind is not evident.

[35] Plat. *Leg*. 4. 722d: τὰ δ᾿ ἔμπροσθεν ἦν πάντα ἡμῖν προοίμια νόμων. 723c: πᾶσίν γε νόμοις ἔστιν προοίμια.

[36] Plat. *Resp*. 7. 531d: πάντα ταῦτα προοίμιά ἐστιν αὐτοῦ τοῦ νόμου. 532d: ἐπ᾿ αὐτὸν δὴ τὸν νόμον ἴωμεν, καὶ διέλθωμεν οὕτως ὥσπερ τὸ προοίμιον διήλθομεν. *Tim*. 29d: τὸ μὲν οὖν προοίμιον θαυμασίως ἀπεδεξάμεθά σου, τὸν δὲ δὴ νόμον ἡμῖν ἐφεξῆς πέραινε.

[37] Here and below, translations from *De musica* are by Barker 1984, with minor changes.

[38] *Suda* α 3886 s. v. Ἀρίων: ἔγραψε δὲ ᾄσματα· προοίμια εἰς ἔπη ͵β.

[39] *Suda* τ 620 s. v. Τιμόθεος: γράψας δι᾿ ἐπῶν νόμους μουσικοὺς ιθ᾿, προοίμια λϛ᾿, Ἄρτεμιν, διασκευὰς η᾿, ἐγκώμια, Πέρσας ἢ Ναύπλιον, Φινείδας, Λαέρτην, διθυράμβους ιη᾿, ὕμνους κα᾿, καὶ ἄλλα τινά. Cf. Steph. Byz. *Ethnica* s. v. Μίλητος (III, 184 Billerbeck, Lentini, Neumann-Hartmann): καὶ Τιμόθεος κιθαρῳδός, ὃς ἐποίησε νόμων κιθαρῳδικῶν βίβλους ιη᾿ εἰς ἐπῶν ͵η τὸν ἀριθμόν, καὶ προνόμια ἄλλων ͵α. Rohde 1901, 376, plausibly assumed that the source of both lexicographers was Philo of Biblos, *Περὶ πόλεων καὶ οὓς ἑκάστη αὐτῶν ἐνδόξους ἤνεγκεν*, 2nd cent. AD. In this case, προνόμια must be the same thing as προοίμια (Reimann 1882, 17; Hordern 2002, 10).

Prooimia themselves could be objects of aesthetic estimation.[40] Plato mentions the amazing thoroughness of their composition: προοίμια θαυμαστῶς ἐσπουδασμένα (*Leg.* 4. 722d). Satyrus[41] reports that Euripides bore up Timotheus, who could not win the favour of the Athenians, and even composed a proem to his nome *Persae*, which brought Timotheus victory and acknowledgement. We have every reason to doubt the credibility of this story, but it reflects a notion of a certain autonomy of the *prooimion.* An anecdote from the treatise "On friendship" by Clearchus of Soli[42] produces an analogous impression: Stratonicus, a citharist of the 4th century BC, famous for his witticisms, once listened to a citharode in Byzantium, who performed the proem well, but the rest badly. Stratonicus stood up and declared that he would pay 1000 drachmas to anyone who could reveal the man who sang the proem.

Plato's favourite metaphor — an introduction to the philosophical discourse as a "proem of the nome"[43] — points to the correlation of their content. However, Cicero (*De or.* 2. 80) makes it clear that in his time thematic links between preludes and the main bodies were notoriously missing in citharodes' performances:

Connexum autem ita sit principium consequenti orationi, ut non tamquam citharoedi prooemium affictum aliquod, sed cohaerens cum omni corpore membrum esse videatur.

Let the exordium, also, be so connected with the sequel of the speech, that it may not appear, like a citharode's prelude, to be something merely attached, but a coherent member of the whole body.[44]

For Quintilian as well (4. 1. 1–3), a *prooimion* means the opposite of addressing the essence of the matter both in rhetoric and citharody:

Quod principium Latine vel exordium dicitur, maiore quadam ratione Graeci videntur προοίμιον nominasse; quia a nostris initium modo significatur, illi satis clare partem hanc esse ante ingressum rei, de qua dicendum sit, ostendunt. Nam sive propter ea, quod οἴμη cantus est, et citharoedi pauca illa, quae antequam legitimum certamen inchoent, emerendi favoris gratia canunt, prooemium cognominaverunt, oratores quoque ea, quae, priusquam causam exordiantur, ad conciliandos sibi iudicium animos praeloquuntur eadem appellatione signarunt, sive, quod οἶμον iidem Graeci viam appellant, id quod ante ingressum rei ponitur, sic vocare est institutum.

---

[40] Power 2010, 189, n. 13.

[41] Satyrus, *Vita Euripidis* (*P. Oxy.* 9. 1176) 39. 22 Arrighetti: τοῦ Τιμοθέου παρὰ τ[οῖ]ςῬἙλλη[σι]ν διὰ [τ]ὴν ἐ[ν τ]ῆι μου[σι]κῆ[ι] καινοτ[ο]μίαν καὶ κ[α]θ᾽ ὑπερβολὴν ἀθυμήσαντος ὥστε κα[ὶ] τὰς χεῖρας ἑαυτῶι διεγνωκέναι προσφέρειν, μόνος Εὐριπίδης ἀνάπαλιν τῶν μὲν θεατῶν καταγελάσαι, τὸν δὲ Τιμόθεον α[ἰσ]-θόμενος ἡλίκος ἐστὶν ἐν τῶι γένει παραμυθήσασθαί τε λόγους διεξιὼν ὡς οἷόν τε παρακ[λ]ητικωτάτους, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ τῶν Περσῶν προοίμιον συγγράψαι, τοῦ τε νικῆ[σ]αι παύσασθ[αι] κατα<[..]ο[....]ενον<[]ντι[]…

[42] Athen. 8. 42, 350a: ἐν δὲ Βυζαντίῳ κιθαρῳδοῦ τὸ μὲν προοίμιον ᾄσαντος εὖ, ἐν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποτυγχάνοντος, ἀναστὰς ἐκήρυξεν "ὃς ἂν καταμηνύσῃ τὸν τὸ προοίμιον ᾄσαντα κιθαρῳδόν, λήψεται χιλίας δραχμάς".

[43] E.g. Plat. *Leg.* 4. 722d: τὰ δ᾽ ἔμπροσθεν ἦν πάντα ἡμῖν προοίμια νόμων. τί δὲ ταῦτ᾽ εἴρηκα; τόδε εἰπεῖν βουληθείς, ὅτι λόγων πάντων καὶ ὅσων φωνὴ κεκοινώνηκεν προοίμιά τέ ἐστιν καὶ σχεδὸν οἷόν τινες ἀνακινήσεις, ἔχουσαί τινα ἔντεχνον ἐπιχείρησιν χρήσιμον πρὸς τὸ μέλλον περαίνεσθαι. Cf. *Tim.* 29d; *Resp.* 7. 531d, 532a, d; *Leg.* 4. 723c–d. Given that Plato was attracted by the pun νόμος 'nome' / 'law', this metaphor is not the reason to conclude (*pace* Koller 1956, 183, 188; Power 2010, 189) that a musical *prooimion* was mainly associated with a nome.

[44] Translated by Watson 1860, 178 with minor alterations.

The commencement or *exordium* as we call it in Latin is styled a *prooimium* by the Greeks. This seems to me a more appropriate name, because whereas we merely indicate that we are beginning our speech, they clearly show that this portion is preliminary to the subject on which the orator has to speak. It may be because οἴμη means a *song*, and citharodes have given the name of *prooimion* to the few words which they sing in order to win favour before entering the regular contest, that orators have also called so the few introductory remarks they make to gain the good will of the judges before beginning to plead. Or it may be because οἶμος in Greek means a *way*, that the practice has arisen of calling the remarks that precede the main body of speech a *prooimion*.[45]

Standard, oft-repeated circumstances of a citharodic performance must have led to a stereotyping of the issues that should be touched upon in the introduction, thus causing the disconnectedness of the proem, so that it became an autonomous song that could precede any narrative part. A typical proem must have contained an invocation to a deity and *captatio benevolentiae*. Parallels from Homeric hymns show that a singer could ask the gods for benevolence towards the listeners and the polis of performance, as well as good fortune for himself,[46] including victory in the contest.[47] A proem must have been about gaining not only the favour of the gods, but also that of men: this is attested for rhetorical introductions[48] and is likely implied by Quintilian (*emerendi favoris gratia canunt*).[49] Still, if agonistic matters were not explicitly mentioned, this made it theoretically possible to use the *prooimion* as a piece in its own right, a self-sufficient independent prayer.

Pseudo-Pluratch, basing his argument on Heraclides of Pontus,[50] claims that Terpander used epic[51] metre to compose both the nomes (*De mus.* 3. 1132B–C) and the *prooimia* (4. 1132D, see above), and that in the days of old, citharodes set not only their own verse to music, but also that of Homer and other poets.

Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 3, 1132B–C: οὐ λελυμένην δ᾽ εἶναι τῶν προειρημένων τὴν τῶν ποιημάτων λέξιν καὶ μέτρον οὐκ ἔχουσαν, ἀλλὰ καθάπερ <τὴν> Στησιχόρου τε καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων μελοποιῶν, οἳ ποιοῦντες ἔπη τούτοις μέλη περιετίθεσαν· καὶ γὰρ τὸν Τέρπανδρον ἔφη κιθαρῳδικῶν ποιητὴν ὄντα νόμων, κατὰ νόμον ἕκαστον τοῖς ἔπεσι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τοῖς Ὁμήρου μέλη περιτιθέντα ᾄδειν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν·

---

[45] Translation based on Butler 1995 (1921), 7, with considerable alterations.

[46] *HH* 2. 494: πρόφρονες ἀντ᾽ ᾠδῆς βίοτον θυμήρε᾽ ὀπάζειν; 11. 5: Χαῖρε θεά, δὸς δ᾽ ἄμμι τύχην εὐδαιμονίην τε; 13. 3: Χαῖρε θεὰ καὶ τήνδε σάου πόλιν; 15. 9: Χαῖρε ἄναξ Διὸς υἱέ· δίδου δ᾽ ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον; 20. 9: Ἀλλ᾽ ἴληθ᾽Ἥφαιστε· δίδου δ᾽ ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον; 26. 12–13: δὸς δ᾽ ἡμᾶς χαίροντας ἐς ὥρας αὖτις ἱκέσθαι, / ἐκ δ᾽ αὖθ᾽ ὡράων εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐνιαυτούς.

[47] *HH* 6. 19–20: δὸς δ᾽ ἐν ἀγῶνι νίκην τῷδε φέρεσθαι; 10. 5: δὸς δ᾽ ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδήν; 13. 3: ἄρχε δ᾽ ἀοιδῆς; 24. 5: χάριν δ᾽ ἅμ᾽ ὄπασσον ἀοιδῇ; 25. 6: Χαίρετε τέκνα Διὸς καὶ ἐμὴν τιμήσατ᾽ ἀοιδήν.

[48] Ps.-Plut. *De vita et poesi Homeri* 163, p. 438 Bernardakis: ἀεὶ τοίνυν χρωμένων τῶν ῥητόρων πάντων τοῖς προοιμίοις ὑπὲρ τοῦ προσεκτικώτερον ἢ εὐνούστερον ποιεῖν τὸν ἀκροάτην…

[49] Power 2010, 191.

[50] Cf. evidence of Alexander Polyhistor, most probably taken from Glaucus of Rhegium (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 5. 1132F): ἐζηλωκέναι δὲ τὸν Τέρπανδρον Ὁμήρου μὲν τὰ ἔπη, Ὀρφέως δὲ τὰ μέλη.

[51] I share the opinion of B. Gentili (Gentili 1977, 34–36) that, judging by the reference to Stesichorus, ἔπη must mean not only hexameters, but also other kinds of dactylic and dactyl-epitrite (κατ᾽enoplion-epitrite, to use Gentili's term) verse. Cf. Wilamowitz 1903, 91: "Die Texte, die man singt, sind episch, wobei wir diesen Begriff mindestens so weit fassen müssen wie das heroische Mass reicht, aber man wird nicht fehl gehen, wenn man auch Elegie und Iambus zugelassen denkt"; Bowra 1963, 145: "This shows that ἔπη could be used also for lines of lyric poetry"; Russo 1999, 346: "'Lyrical dactyls' is a more accurate equivalent to ἔπη in this context, since it suits the realities of Stesichorus' metrical form".

The diction in the poems of the people I have mentioned [i. e. from Amphion son of Zeus up to Homer's Demodocus and Phemius] was not rhythmically indisciplined or lacking in metre, but resembled that of Stesichorus and the ancient composers of songs, who composed poems in epic metre and set them to music. Heraclides says also that Terpander, a composer of citharodic nomes, set his own epic verse and those of Homer to music appropriate to each nome, and sang them in competitions.

Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 6. 1133B–C: Τὸ δ' ὅλον ἡ μὲν κατὰ Τέρπανδρον κιθαρῳδία καὶ μέχρι τῆς Φρύνιδος ἡλικίας παντελῶς ἁπλῆ τις οὖσα διετέλει· οὐ γὰρ ἐξῆν τὸ παλαιὸν οὕτως ποιεῖσθαι τὰς κιθαρῳδίας ὡς νῦν οὐδὲ μεταφέρειν τὰς ἁρμονίας καὶ τοὺς ῥυθμούς· ἐν γὰρ τοῖς νόμοις ἑκάστῳ διετήρουν τὴν οἰκείαν τάσιν. διὸ καὶ ταύτην <τὴν> ἐπωνυμίαν εἶχον· νόμοι γὰρ προσηγορεύθησαν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐξῆν παραβῆναι <τὸ> καθ' ἕκαστον νενομισμένον εἶδος τῆς τάσεως. τὰ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὡς βούλονται ἀφοσιωσάμενοι, ἐξέβαινον εὐθὺς ἐπί τε τὴν Ὁμήρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποίησιν. δῆλον δὲ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ διὰ τῶν Τερπάνδρου προοιμίων.

In general, the style of singing to the cithara employed by Terpander continued in a quite simple form down to the time of Phrynis.[52] In the old days, cithara songs were not allowed to be performed as they are now, or to include modulations of *harmoniai* and rhythm, since in each nome the pitch which belonged to it was maintained throughout. This is why these pieces were given their name: they were called '*nomoi*' [i. e. laws] because deviation from the form of pitching established for each type was not permitted. After dedicating themselves to the gods in any way they wished, performers proceeded at once to the poetry of Homer and other authors. This is clear from the preludes of Terpander.

This is one of the key passages reflecting ancient theoretical conception of a nome as a genre. In confirmation of his words, Pseudo-Plutarch refers to Terpander's προοίμια. However, his commentators are puzzled by the question: how can the claims made above about *nomes* (in particular, about their pitching and rhythm) become clear from the *prooimia*?[53] To Bergk, this passage served as another proof that νόμος and προοίμιον were synonyms, and therefore nomes, just like Homeric hymns, were performed as introductions to Homer's songs.[54] This conclusion contradicts *De mus.* 4. 1132D, where nomes and proems are clearly two distinct kinds of compositions. Bergk argued that in ch. 4 the compiler arbitrarily added the phrase πεποίηται δὲ τῷ Τερπάνδρῳ καὶ προοίμια κιθαρῳδικὰ ἐν ἔπεσιν to the list of nomes, as he erroneously concluded from ch. 6 that Terpander's proems were not the same as his nomes.[55]

---

[52] I. e., middle 5th century BC.

[53] E.g., Jüthner 1892, 5, ascribed such a reasoning to the compiler: εὐθύς should mean "ohne Wechsel der τάσις"; "Die einheitliche Composition der Nomen wird demnach bewiesen durch den unmittelbaren Übergang vom einleitenden Anrufe der Götter zur Dichtung Homers und der anderen, indem sowohl der erstere als die letztere in Harmonie und Rhythmus übereinstimmen mussten; kein Zweifel also, dass hier unter Nomos die Zusammenfassung dieser beiden Theile zu einem Ganzen verstanden wird"; *ibid.* 6: "zwar hatte er [sc. the citharode] beim Anrufe der Götter … bezüglich der Harmonie freie Wahl …, musste aber die einmal gewählte Tonart auch in dem Haupttheile beibehalten". Cf. Westphal 1865, 79: whereas the same εἶδος "in Tonart und Tonlage" was observed, there was a change concerning the text: it was one's own in the proem and Homer's or another poet's in the main part (alternatively, Westphal assumed a lacuna); Koller 1956, 184: "weil es hexametrische Prooimia gibt, muß auch die dem Prooimion folgende Partie des Nomos hexametrisch sein".

[54] Bergk 1883, 213 with n. 32.

[55] Dippe 1888, 1051, proposes a still less conclusive understanding of the phrase πεποίηται δὲ τῷ Τερπάνδρῳ καὶ προοίμια κιθαρῳδικὰ ἐν ἔπεσιν: he argues that in ch. 4 the epic proems are distinct from the nomes allegedly in trochaic and orthian iambic metre. Deducing the identity of nomes and *prooimia* from

Although this hypothesis helps to give the passage from ch. 6 a sort of logical consistency, it should be refuted. Firstly, the author of *De musica* does not make any conclusions of his own and never adds any original claims.[56] Secondly, we have already seen abundant evidence that separates nomes from *prooimia*.

To my mind, we have here an example of Pseudo-Plutarch's usual unskillful excerpting.[57] As a matter of fact, despite the particle γάρ (τὰ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὡς βούλονται ἀφοσιωσάμενοι),[58] the argument dealing with the combination of the citharode's own and other poets' verse is not meant to explain directly the discourse over lack of modulations in ancient citharody.[59] Probably there was an indirect causal relationship: Heraclides pointed to the epic (that is, invariable and arranged κατὰ μέτρον) metre of the nomes and noted on that score that poetic texts for them could be taken from Homer. As regards the reference "This is clear from Terpander' *prooimia*", it only illustrates the last point: citharodes from Terpander until Phrynis first called upon the gods using their own discretion (this was a προοίμιον), and then came over to the poetry of Homer and others (this was a νόμος).[60] Heraclides could likely find two bits of evidence corroborating this thesis in Terpander's proems: firstly, they ended with a formula of transition to another song;[61] secondly, the text of "another song" itself did not follow. One can conceive that the possibility of using someone else's poetry in the main part of the performance promoted the practice of writing down the proems without the following nomes, so that they were seen as independent works and collected in separate books.

---

ch. 6, he concludes that Terpander's nomes were of two different types — hexametric (alias προοίμια) and not hexametric (which for that reason were given peculiar names).

[56] Almazova 2022, 55–59.

[57] The same is underlined by Jüthner 1892, 5, although his reconstruction of the train of thought is different.

[58] Cf. other cases of using the explanatory γάρ in Pseudo-Plutarch, where either a logical mistake has been made, or the train of thought has become unclear due to missing links: Almazova 2016, 26–28 (8. 1134A: ἐν ἀρχῇ **γὰρ** ἐλεγεῖα μεμελοποιημένα οἱ αὐλῳδοὶ ᾖδον); Hiller 1886, 414, n. 9; Almazova 2022, 62–67 (10. 1134D: Γλαῦκος **γὰρ** μετ' Ἀρχίλοχον φάσκων γεγενῆσθαι Θαλήταν…).

[59] Cf. Westphal 1865, 79: "Der Satz ἀφοσιωσάμενοι ἐξέβαινον ist an den vorausgehenden durch γάρ angeschlossen. Aber ein Zusammenhang zwischen beiden Sätzen findet nicht statt". Weil, Reinach 1900, 19, § 45: "Il manque une transition necessaire entre les §§ 67–68 [ἐν γὰρ τοῖς νόμοις — εἶδος τῆς τάσεως] où il est question des modes des nomes, et notre § 69 [τὰ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς — προοιμίων] qui se rapporte non auz nomes, mais aux proèmes, et s'occupe de leur texte, non de leur mélopée" (the editors suppose a lacuna or a misplaced parenthesis). Lasserre 1954, 157, points to the analogous treatment of nomes in *De mus.* 6 and Proclus, *Chrest.* p. 45–52 Séveryns ap. Phot. *Bibl.* Cod. 239 Bekker 320a33–b30 and notes: "la notice sur les proèmes de Terpandre jointe à ce passage lui est en réalité étrangère: γάρ est un artifice du Ps.-Plutarque qui l'a extraite d'un autre contexte" (that of the end of ch. 3).

[60] The same interpretation of τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς as corresponding to a *prooimion*, and τὴν Ὁμήρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποίησιν to a nome, has been proposed by Susemihl 1874, 653–654. Otherwise, it has been argued that the term νόμος covers both calling upon the gods (in the proem) and performing epic verse by Homer and other poets: Reimann 1882, 17–18 (he imagined a nome as consisting of a recitative epic part surrounded by songs at the beginning and the end); Jüthner 1892, 5; van Groningen 1955, 182 (nome = proem + Homeric text + σφραγίς); Costantini, Lallot 1987, 17. Lasserre 1954, 157, creates confusion by identifying pieces composed ὡς βούλονται with the *proems*, but at the same time also with those *nomes* where Terpander's own, rather than Homer's, poetry was used: "Ps.-Plutarque [at the end of ch. 3] divise d'après Héraclide les nomes de Terpandre en deux parties: vers personnels (proème, évoqué ici [ch. 6] par ὡς βούλονται) et vers homériques (nome proprement dit)".

[61] Westphal 1865, 79; Jüthner 1892, 6.

An assumption suggests itself that Heraclides had in mind those Homeric hymns that have come down to us or analogous pieces.[62] Justified or not,[63] the idea that epic metre and in particular hexameter was typical of early citharody is well attested for the classical period. Beside the claims of Heraclides (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 3. 1132B–C; 4. 1132D–E; 6. 1133B–C)[64] and Glaucus (5. 1132F; 7. 1133F) preserved in *De musica*, one can recollect that Sophocles and Euripides composed hexametric songs for the legendary citharodes Thamyras and Amphion;[65] in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (1264–1295) Euripides mocks Aeschylus' dactylic lines that seem to be taken "from the citharodic nomes";[66] Timotheus of Miletus — likely paying tribute to the old tradition — used hexameter at the beginning of *Persae*.[67]

Alongside the common metre, coinciding formulaic beginnings and endings are attested for citharody and Homeric hymns. The initial formula of naming a deity the subject of the song and using the preposition ἀμφί with accusative occurs in four Homeric hymns.[68] On the other hand, this is how Terpander's proem began (Terp. fr. 2 Gostoli: ἀμφί μοι αὖτις ἄναχθ' ἑκατηβόλον / ἀειδέτω φρήν). This trite exordium was mocked by comic poets including Aristophanes (see *Nub.* 595: ἀμφί μοι αὖτε, Φοῖβ' ἄναξ), and the scholia explain that it was abused in citharody and dithyramb[69] (and possibly also in tragedy[70]), which was the reason for calling their authors ἀμφιάνακτες.

On the other hand, in Ἀττικὰ ὀνόματα Aelius Dionysius (2nd century AD) quoted ἐξόδια that he thought typical of citharody, comedy, rhapsody, and tragedy, identifying

---

[62] Koller 1956, 184: "Denkbar ist, daß er die Sammlung HH in Auge hat".

[63] There is at least reason to doubt that the citharodes of old did not actually use any other metre but dactylic. Orthian iambus and semantic trochee were ascribed to Terpander (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 28. 1140F). Pure hexameter justly appears too monotonous for a musical performance, cf. West 1971, 308: "it is more likely … that Terpander, clearly an eminent figure in Spartan music of the early seventh century, made his name by something more creative"; West 1986, 46: "it is unlikely that citharodes simply repeated ancient tunes for hundreds of years without modifying them or inventing new ones". Yet on the other hand, only ever using one metre would make it possible to choose one of the seven given melodies to set the text to (see below n. 86).

[64] Cf. Procl. ap. Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 239 Bekker 320b5–6: Δοκεῖ δὲ Τέρπανδρος μὲν πρῶτος τελειῶσαι τὸν νόμον, ἡρῴῳ μέτρῳ χρησάμενος. It is conceivable that this view originated with Heraclides, who may have been Proclus' indirect source for the section on νόμοι (Rutherford 1995, 360–361).

[65] Soph. *Thamyras* fr. 242 Radt *TGF* = 221 Nauck² (Thamyras singing): ἐκ μὲν Ἐριχθονίου ποτιμάστιον ἔσχεθε κοῦρον / Αὐτόλυκον, πολέων κτεάνων σίνιν Ἀργεῖ κοίλῳ. Eur. *Antiope* fr. 182a Kannicht *TGF* = 225+ 1023 Nauck² (Amphion singing): Αἰθέρα καὶ Γαῖαν πάντων γενέτειραν ἀείδω.

[66] Aristoph. *Ran.* 1282: ἐκ τῶν κιθαρῳδικῶν νόμων. See Almazova 2016, 116–118.

[67] Fr. 788 Hordern (see above n. 34). Cf. Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 4. 1132D–E: ὅτι δ' οἱ κιθαρῳδικοὶ νόμοι οἱ πάλαι ἐξ ἐπῶν συνίσταντο, Τιμόθεος ἐδήλωσε· τοὺς γοῦν πρώτους νόμους ἐν ἔπεσι διαμιγνύων διθυραμβικὴν λέξιν ᾖδεν, ὅπως μὴ εὐθὺς φανῇ παρανομῶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν μουσικήν.

[68] *HH* 7. 1–2: Ἀμφὶ Διώνυσον Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος υἱὸν / μνήσομαι… *HH* 19. 1: Ἀμφί μοι Ἑρμείαο φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε Μοῦσα… *HH* 22. 1: Ἀμφὶ Ποσειδάωνα θεὸν μέγαν ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν… *HH* 33. 1: Ἀμφὶ Διὸς κούρους ἑλικώπιδες ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι… Cf. a description of Hermes singing to the lyre in *HH* 4. 54–57: θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδεν / … / ἀμφὶ Δία Κρονίδην καὶ Μαιάδα καλλιπέδιλον.

[69] *Schol. Aristoph. Nub.* 595c α (see above, n. 19). Cf. Suid. α 1700: Ἀμφιάνακτας ἔλεγον καὶ τοὺς διθυραμβοποιούς· συνεχῶς γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι ταύτῃ ἐχρῶντο τῇ λέξει.

[70] Phot. *Lex.* α 1304 Theodoridis names Ion, a lyric and tragic poet, among the ἀμφιάνακτες. Cf. Eur. *Tro.* 511–514: ἀμφί μοι Ἴλιον, ὦ Μοῦσα, καινῶν ὕμνων ᾆσον σὺν δακρύοις ᾠδὰν ἐπικήδειον. Cerri 1984–1985, 174, assumed that Euripides was inspired by citharodic Ἰλίου πέρσις by Stesichorus. Gostoli 1990, 130, notes that κατ'ἐνόπλιον-epitrites betray the citharodic nature of this passage. In other words, tragedy could borrow this beginning from lyric poetry.

the words ἀλλ’ ἄναξ μάλα χαῖρε as a specifically citharodic conclusion.[71] The exact same words (that is, likely, ἀλλὰ Ϝάναξ μάλα χαῖρε) cannot be found in Homeric hymns. However, other quotations make it clear that Dionysius wrote out not the formulae, but rather definite examples of respective genres.[72] Meanwhile, on the whole the traditional character of the clausula combining the imperative χαῖρε with a god's name, epithet or invocation ἄναξ cannot be denied. Such an ending consistently occurs in Homeric hymns, including χαῖρε ἄναξ / ἄνασσα six times.[73]

Thus, the traditional repertoire of citharodes is being described as pieces in epic metre, with the formula ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα at the beginning and χαῖρε ἄναξ at the end. This implies at least morphological affinity,[74] if not identity, of citharody and Homeric hymns. If their metre was common, the only difference could be the way of performance — either singing to the lyra accompaniment or recitation without music.[75] In this case, they could not be differentiated on the basis of a written text. Perhaps this explains the almost total lack of such an important archaic genre as citharody in the corpus of texts that have come down to us.

Yet if indeed Heraclides was speaking of the Homeric hymns, did he consider them to be nomes or *prooimia*?

Only two considerations might work in favour of nomes: we know that the hymns from the corpus we now possess were indeed ascribed to Homer in the classical period (Thuc. 3. 104. 4, 6), and it clearly follows from Heraclides' words in *De mus.* ch. 3 that Terpander used Homer's poetry in the nomes (κατὰ νόμον ἕκαστον τοῖς ἔπεσι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ

---

[71] Zenob. 5. 99 (*Paroem. Gr.* I, p. 160, 1 sqq. Leutsch — Schneidewin): Σὺν δὲ θεοὶ μάκαρες· τοῦτο ἐπιλέγουσιν οἱ ῥαψῳδοί· **ὡς καὶ οἱ κιθαρῳδοὶ, Ἀλλ’ ἄναξ μάλα χαῖρε**. Eustath. *ad Il.* p. 239, 20 (1. 364. 5–9 van der Valk): Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ "ἀλλ’ ἄναξ", ὅπερ ἐνταῦθα παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ κεῖται [*Il.* 2. 360], **ἀρχή τις ἐξοδίου κιθαρῳδικοῦ τὸ "ἀ λ λ ὰ ἀλλ’ ἄναξ"**, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Αἴλιος Διονύσιος [Ael. Dionys. α 76, p. 102 Erbse = fr. 38 p. 102 Schwabe], ὥσπερ, φησί· κωμικοῦ μὲν ἥδε· "καλλιστέφανος", ῥαψῳδοῦ δὲ αὕτη· "νῦν δὲ θεοὶ μάκαρες τῶν ἐσθλῶν ἄφθονοί ἐστε", τραγικοῦ δέ "πολλαὶ μορφαὶ τῶν δαιμονίων". Hesych. α 3113 Latte s. v. **ἀ λ λ ’ ἄ ν α ξ· ἐξόδιον κιθαρῳδικὸν τοῦτο**, καθάπ<ερ ῥαψ>ῳδόν καὶ τὸ "νῦν <δὲ θεοὶ …>". Phot. α 987 Theodoridis s.v. **ἀ λ λ ’ ἄ ν α ξ· ἐξόδιον κιθαρῳδικοῦ ἀρχή**, ὥσπερ κωμικοῦ μὲν "ἥδε καλλιστέφανος", ῥαψῳδῶν δὲ "νῦν δὲ θεοὶ μάκαρες τῶν ἐσθλῶν ἄφθονοί ἐστε". *Suda* σ 1454: Σ ὺ ν δ ὲ θ ε ο ὶ μ ά κ α ρ ε ς· τοῦτο ἐπέλεγον οἱ ῥαψῳδοί, ὡς **οἱ κιθαρῳδοὶ ἀ λ λ ’ ἄ ν α ξ χ α ῖ ρ ε**· εἰσὶ γὰρ ἐπιφωνήματα παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς ποιηταῖς. Based on a contestable conjecture by Bergk, the quotation was included in Terpander's fragments (fr. 7 Gostoli).

[72] Gostoli 1990, 146. For example, a typical tragic ending is taken from Euripides: *Alc.* 1159 = *Andr.* 1284 = [*Bacch.* 1388] = [*Hel.* 1688].

[73] *HH* 15. 9: Χαῖρε ἄναξ Διὸς υἱέ· δίδου δ’ ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον. *HH* 16. 5: Καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε ἄναξ· λίτομαι δέ σ’ ἀοιδῇ. *HH* 19. 48 = 21. 5: Καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε ἄναξ, ἵλαμαι δέ σ’ ἀοιδῇ. *HH* 31. 17: Χαῖρε ἄναξ, πρόφρων δὲ βίον θυμήρε’ ὄπαζε. *HH* 32. 17: Χαῖρε θεὰ λευκώλενε δῖα Σελήνη. One should confess that this kind of formula occurs not only in Homeric hymns, but also in Hesiod (*Theog.* 104: χαίρετε τέκνα Διός, δότε δ’ ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδήν; lines 36–115 with an address to the Muses are actually a proem, see Friedländer 1914, esp. 12; Koller 1956, 181–182; Nagy 1990, 354, 359) and in lyric poetry composed in different metres (Archilochus fr. 324 W.: χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεις; *IG* IV I² 131 = Page *PMG* fr. adesp. 935. 25–26: χαῖρ’ ὦ μεγάλα ἄνασσα Μᾶτερ Ὀλύμπου).

[74] Power 2010, 188: "at least some of the *Homeric Hymns* could have been derived from or even common to the repertoire of citharodes. Rhapsodic and citharodic *prooimia* were more morphologically and phraseologically alike than different; they shared, after all, the same generic DNA". Cf. Wilamowitz 1993, 91; van Groningen 1955, 191; Bowra 1961, 23; Pavese 1972, 237.

[75] Ford 1988, 303, n. 25: "Citharody and rhapsody may be seen as alternative treatments of the same poetic texts". The possibility of singing Homeric hexameters was defended by van Groningen 1955, 183–184; Koller 1956, 163–167. West 1971, 308, argued that concerning Terpander this was "simply a projection back to the πρῶτος εὑρετής of the practices of citharodes of the classical period".

καὶ τοῖς Ὁμήρου μέλη περιτιθέντα ᾄδειν). This passage was considered a reference to the Homeric hymns by those scholars who regarded it unthinkable that ancient citharodes sang excerpts from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[76] However, this is a weak argument: on the one hand, Heraclides could imply any epic poetry ascribed to Homer, and on the other hand, it is possible that he knew some of the Homeric hymns as attributed to Terpander. Besides, the little that we know about citharodic nomes (some titles of the classical period, Nero's repertoire,[77] parallels with instrumental nomes[78]) leads us to postulate narrative subjects for them. Therefore, if citharodic nomes should be sought for among Homeric hymns altogether, only the major ones must be considered.[79] The hymn to Apollo shows how proems could be incorporated into them.[80] Possibly, the connection of a *prooimion* to a nome might be closer than usual, if the nome itself narrated the myth of a god, rather than a hero.

As for the minor hymns, they perfectly fit in with the image of a citharodic *prooimion* emerging from all the evidence considered above.[81] Their brevity corresponds to the words *pauca illa* in Quintilian. The promise of "another song" illustrates the transition to "the poetry of Homer and other authors" mentioned by Pseudo-Plutarch. Invocation to the gods is the subject matter of the proems (τὰ … πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς … ἀφοσιωσάμενοι). That the opening formula ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα belonged specifically to the *prooimia* and not to the nomes of the citharodes is attested by the earliest and the most reliable source — the scholion to Aristophanes (*Sch.* **R** *Aristoph. Nub.* 595cβ, p. 132 Holwerda): ἀμφί μοι αὖτε· ἐκ τῶν Περιάνδρου προοιμίων. The plural προοιμίων indicates that the scholiast implied not the first lines of one of Terpander's pieces, but rather the corpus of his προοίμια that he likely still possessed — as well as Heraclides (*De mus.* 1133C δῆλον δὲ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ διὰ τῶν Τερπάνδρου προοιμίων). There is no equivalent certainty as to what the citharodic closing formula belonged to (in fact, χαῖρε follows the narrative part in the major hymns to Apollo, *HH* 3. 544; Hermes, 4. 578; Aphrodite, 5. 292; Dionysus, 7. 58),[82] but if the address to the god was enclosed within the proem, it is easy to imagine it framed by ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα and χαῖρε ἄναξ.

The phrase τὰ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὡς βούλονται ἀφοσιωσάμενοι aims to underline the divergence between the nomes (allegedly subject to strict laws) and the proems. B. Maslov[83] draws attention to the verb ἀφοσιόομαι that can mean 'to acquit oneself of an obligation' and thus 'to do a thing for form's sake, i. e. do it perfunctorily' (LSJ s. v. II. 2).

[76] E. g., Crusius 1888, 267: "es wäre die reine Barberei, aus jenen Epen (sc. *Iliad* and *Odysee*) Stücke herauszureißen und — melodisch oder recitativ — zu komponieren"; Susemihl 1874, 653–654.

[77] *Nauplius*: Tim. fr. 785 Page = Campbell = Hordern; Suet. *Nero* 39. 3; *AP* 9. 429; 11. 185. *Niobe*: Suet. *Nero* 21. 2. Ἄττιν τινὰ ἢ Βάκχας: Cass. Dio 61. 20. 2. *Troianum excidium*: Tac. *Ann.* 15. 39.

[78] The Pythian nome depicted the victory of Apollo over Python (Strab. 9. 3. 10, Poll. 4. 84); the Many-headed nome, the victory of Perseus over the gorgons (Pind. *Pyth.* 12).

[79] Böhme 1937, 44, equated the Homeric hymns to the nomes. Crusius 1888, 266–268, considered Homeric hymns, especially *HH* 3 to Apollo, to be "die Vorstufe, von der Terpander ausgegangen ist".

[80] See *HH* 3, 14: χαῖρε μάκαιρ' ὦ Λητοῖ.

[81] Weil, Reinach 1900, 19, § 45: "*Les prétendus hymnes homériques ne son que des proèmes (Thucydide, III, 104) et doivent appartenir en majeure partie à Terpandre et à son école*"; 28, § 69: "*Les proèmes homériques, dont nous avons déjà signalé l'origine « terpandrienne » (note 45), confirment parfaitement la définition de Plutarque*".

[82] Power 2010, 188, relates this formula to the conclusion of the *prooimion*; Gostoli 1990, 147, consideres the conclusion of a nome, equating ἐξόδιον in Aelius Dionysius to ἐπίλογος in Poll. 4. 66 (see above n. 30).

[83] Maslov 2012, 193–194.

Thus, in Pseudo-Plutarch's passage it should mean "addressing the perfunctory things to the gods". That the proem's contents were formal seems highly likely,[84] and Maslov justly notes that "this notion of *prooimion* is incompatible with narrative *Homeric Hymns*". However, there is an inner contradiction in his description: "the form of prooimial compositions ascribed to Terpander was relatively free (ὡς βούλονται) as well as largely perfunctory". How can a piece be formal and free at the same time? And on the whole, what does ὡς βούλονται mean,[85] if the issues to touch upon were predefined by tradition and occasion of performance, and the metre was always epic, according to Heraclides? The contradiction disappears if one supposes that, in Heraclides' eyes, the proems were simply a citharode's own compositions, whereas for the epic poems in the main part, ready-made melodies or melodic patterns were used — that is, one or another of the nomes fixed by Terpander.[86]

Addressing a citharodic performance, it is important to distinguish a *prooimion* from a nome proper and not to underestimate the possible degree of its independence. Of course, it would be odd to assume that in the centuries-old history of citharody, a προοίμιον was never integrated into a nome, forming an inseparable whole with it, and on the contrary, that it could never be performed independently — say, as a cult hymn. Still, our evidence shows that conventionally a citharode's proem was intended for performing before a nome, but could display considerable autonomy.

References

Allen T. W., Halliday W. R., Sikes E. E. (eds) *The Homeric Hymns*. Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1963 (1936).

Almazova N. A. Cradias nomos. *Philologia Classica* 2016, 11 (1), 20–30.

Almazova N. Daktylus und Enhoplios in Damons Rhythmuslehre. *Hyperboreus* 2016, 22 (1), 94–126.

Almazova N. Alexander Polyhistor and Glaucus of Rhegium as Sources of Pseudo-Plutarch's Treatise *De musica*. III–IV. *Hyperboreus* 2022, 28 (1), 53–70.

Aloni A. *Prooimia*, *Hymnoi*, Elio Aristide e i cugini bastardi. *QUCC* 1980, 4, 23–40.

Barker A. *Greek Musical Writings*. I. *The Musician and his Art*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Bergk Th. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* III. Lipsiae, Teubner, ⁴1882.

Bergk Th. *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* II. Berlin, Weidmann, 1883.

Böhme R. *Das Prooimion, eine Form sakraler Dichtung der Griechen*. Bühl, Konkordia, 1937.

Bowra M. *Greek Lyric Poetry: From Alcman to Simonides*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1961.

Bowra M. Two Lives of Eumelus. *CQ* 1963, 13 (2), 145–153.

Butler H. E. (transl.) *Quintilian. Institutio oratoria*. Books IV–VI. London — Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1995 (1921).

Cerri G. Dal canto citarodico al coro tragico: La *Palinodia* di Stesicoro, l'*Elena* di Euripide e le Sirene. *Dioniso* 1984–1985, 55, 157–174.

Chantraine P. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque* III. Paris [s. n.], 1974.

Costantini M., Lallot J. Le προοίμιον est-il un proeme?". In: P. Hoffmann, J. Lallot, A. Le Boulluec (eds). *Le texte et ses representations*, Études de littérature ancienne 3 (Paris: PENS, 1987), 13–27.

Crusius O. Zur Nomosfrage. *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 1887, 45 (4), 1380–1385.

Crusius O. Über die Nomosfrage. *Verhandlungen der 39. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner, Zürich 1887*. Leipzig [s. n.], 1888, 258–276.

De Martino F. ΑΛΛΗ ΑΟΙΔΗ (in coda all'inno omerico, 545–546). *L'Antiquité Classique* 1980, 49, 232–240.

---

[84] See Janko 1981 for revealing the formal structure of the Homeric hymns.

[85] Note the perplexity of Volkmann 1856, 9, who placed ὡς βούλονται after οὐκ ἐξῆν παραβῆναι.

[86] Cf. Westphal 1865, 79; Jüthner 1892, 8; Gostoli 1990, XXII; Power 2010, 229–230.

Dippe A. Über die Frage der Terpandrischen Komposition. *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 1888, 32/33, 1018–1021; 34, 1050–1053; 35, 1082–1086; 36, 1114–1118.

Ford A. The Classical Definition of ΡΑΨΩΙΔΙΑ. *CPh* 1988, 83 (4), 300–307.

Friedländer P. Das Proömium der Theogonie. *Hermes* 1914, 49 (1), 1–16.

Gentili B. Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro, *QUCC* 1977, 26, 7–37.

Gostoli A. *Terpander*. Roma, Ed. dell'Ateneo, 1990.

Hiller E. Die Fragmente des Glaukos von Rhegion. *RhM* 1886, 41, 398–436.

Hordern J. H. (ed., comm.) *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus.* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004.

Janko R. The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre. *Hermes* 1981, 109 (1), 9–24.

Jüthner J. Terpanders Nomengliederung. *Wiener Studien* 1892, 14, 1–17.

Koller H. Das kitharodische Prooimion. *Philologus* 1956, 100, 159–206.

Lasserre Fr. *Plutarque. De la Musique. Texte, trad., comm., précédés d'une étude sur l'éducation musicale dans la Grèce antique*. Olten — Lausanne, Urs Graf Verlag, 1954.

Lübbert E. *Commentatio de poesis Pindaricae in archa et sphragide componendis arte.* Bonn, Caroli Georgi Univ. Typogr., 1885/1886.

Maslov B. The Real Life of the Genre of Prooimion. *CPh* 2012, 107 (3), 191–205.

Nagy G. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Pavese C. O. *Tradizioni e generi poetici della Grecia arcaica.* Roma, Ed. dell'Ateneo, 1972.

Power T. The Culture of Kitharôidia. Cambridge, Mass., — London, Harvard University Press, 2010.

Rabinovich E. G. Notes on Nomination. In: B. A. Uspensky, F. B. Uspensky (eds) *Fakty I znaki: Issledovaniia po semiotike* 1. Moscow, IaSK, 2008, 9–24 (in Russian).

Reimann H. *Studien zur griechischen Musik-Geschichte. A. Der Νόμος*. Ratibor, Riedinger, 1882.

Richardson N. J. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002 (1974).

Rohde E. Philo von Byblos und Hesychius von Milet (1879). In: *Kleine Schriften von Erwin Rohde*. Bd. I: *Beiträge zur Chronologie, Quellenkunde und Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*. Tübingen — Leipzig, Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1901, 365–379.

Russo J. Stesichorus, Homer, and the Forms of Early Greek Epic. In: J. N. Kazazis, A. Rengakos (eds). *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis.* Stuttgart, Steiner, 1999, 339–348.

Rutherford I. Apollo's Other Genre: Proclus on νόμος and His Source. *CQ* 1995, 90 (3), 354–361.

Schmid W., Stählin O. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. I. Teil: *Die Klassische Periode der griechischen Literatur*, von W. Schmid. I. Bd.: *Die griechische Literatur vor den attischen Hegemonie*. München, Beck, 1929.

Volkmann R. (ed.) *Plutarchi De musica.* Lipsiae, Teubner, 1856.

Watson J. S. *Cicero on Oratory and Orators*. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1860.

West M. L. Stesichorus. *CQ* 1971, 21, 302–314.

West M. L. The Singing of Hexameters: Evidence from Epidaurus. *ZPE* 1986, 63, 39–46.

Westphal R. (ed.) Πλουτάρχου περὶ μουσικῆς. *Plutarch über die Musik.* Breslau, Verlag Leuckart, 1865.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff U. von. *Timotheos, Die Perser.* Hildesheim, Olms, 1973 (1903).

Wolf F. A. *Prolegomena ad Homerum sive de operum Homericorum prisca et genuina forma variisque mutationibus et probabili ratione emendandi.* Halis Saxonum: e libraria orphanotrophei, 1795.

Кифародический ном и проэмий

Нина Александровна Алмазова

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; n.almazova@spbu.ru

Выступление кифареда обычно включало проэмий, который предшествовал ному. Теоретически возможны три случая: 1) проэмий был неотделимым вступлением к конкретной основной части; 2) не исполнялся самостоятельно, но мог предшествовать разным основным частям; 3) был независимым произведением. Большинство свидетельств соответствуют варианту 2. По-видимому, стандартные обстоятельства исполнения обусловили темы, которых полагалось касаться во введении (в том числе обращение к богам и *captatio benevolentiae*), что и сделало возможным обособление проэмия в самостоятельную песнь, которая могла предшествовать любому нарративу, а при отсутствии агональных коннотаций и формулы перехода к другой песне — и исполняться независимо. Представления о древней кифародии, отраженные у Псевдо-Плутарха (*De mus.* 1132B–C; 1132D; 1133B–C), интерпретируются так: обращенный к богам проэмий был собственным сочинением кифаредов (поэтому о нем сказано ὡς βούλονται, несмотря на формальный характер содержания и заданный эпический метр); в номе, непосредственно следовавшем за проэмием, эпическое повествование можно было создать самому или взять у Гомера и других поэтов, а в музыке использовался один из шаблонов, систематизация которых приписывалась Терпандру. Должно быть, проэмии Терпандра подтверждали это воззрение тем, что содержали формулу перехода к другой песне, текст которой, однако, не приводился. Очевидно, возможность использовать в основной части чужие стихи способствовала тому, что проэмии записывались без следовавших за ними номов, воспринимались как самостоятельные произведения и составляли отдельные сборники. Правдоподобно, что под проэмиями Терпандра источник Псевдо-Плутарха подразумевал малые гомеровские гимны, которые полностью соответствуют дошедшим до нас сведениям о кифародических проэмиях.

Ключевые слова: древнегреческая музыка, кифародический ном, проэмий, гомеровские гимны.