

CRADIAS NOMOS

Nina A. Almazova

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

Both existing testimonies regarding the Fig nome (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1133F and Hesych. κ 3918) probably originate in the same passage of Hipponax. It recorded that Mimnermus played this nome on the aulos during the rite of expelling a “scapegoat”, who was beaten with fig branches whilst driven out of the polis. Such detail could only have been known to Hipponax, who lived a century later, if Mimnermus had been not only the performer but also the composer of the Fig nome, which from then on was traditionally played at this ceremony. The hypothesis that Hipponax’ words had a metaphorical meaning — that is, mocking Mimnermus, whose mourning elegies he believed to be only worth performing to scapegoats, — is unacceptable. An unexpected reference to elegies set to the music in the text of Pseudo-Plutarch is a result of unskillful excerpting, and does not prove that the Fig nome had anything in common with elegies.

Keywords: Ancient Greek music, nomes, Fig nome, Mimnermus, Hipponax, elegy.

There are only two testimonies on the musical tune called the Fig nome, in Pseudo-Plutarch (*De mus.* 1133F, called Κραδίας νόμος in the mss.) and in Hesychius (κ 3918, spelled as Κραδίης). Both indicate that the nome was auletic.

In both cases the evidence originates from Hipponax. This poet (whose ἀκμή is about 540 BC¹) provides the earliest data on the rite of expelling a “scapegoat” (φαρμακός)². This purgatorial ceremony was held regularly in Ionian cities as well as in Athens at the festival of Thargelia, and also in cases of emergency, in order to avert plague or famine. Victims were chosen among the most hated and wretched men (hence the development of a pejorative meaning for the term φαρμακός); they were fed at public expense and then — whilst beaten — were driven out of the polis, so that they should take all the evil with them.

The surviving fragments of Hipponax³ show that he dedicated quite a few lines to this rite (though it is hard to determine whether it was all in one poem or in several). Presumably these are elements of an invective, in which the poet hopes to see his enemy in the role of a scapegoat (Masson 1962, 109, ad fr. 1–5). It is from Hipponax that we know an important detail of the Ionian ceremony in the sixth century BC⁴: the pharmakoi were beaten with fig branches (fr. 5, 6, 9 W. = 6, 27, 29 Dg., 92 W., cf. 10 W. = 30 Dg.). Therefore one can assume that Hesychius (κ 3918) gathered information about the Fig nome⁵ from Hipponax:

¹ *Marm. Par.* 42 — ca. 540/541 BC; Plin. *NH* 36, 11 — Ol. 60 (540–537 BC).

² For a short summary of this rite, see: Bremmer 2000, 750, and for bibliographic references, Compton 2006, ch. 1 n. 1.

³ Fr. 5–10, 92 v. 4 (?), 104 v. 49, 152, 153 W. = 26, 6, 27–30, 95 v. 4 (?), 107 v. 49, 203, 146 Dg. Degani 1991, 26, ad fr. 6 hypothesized that fr. 37, 65, 95a, 118E, 128 v. 4 W. = fr. 46, 31, 19, 130, 126 v. 4 Dg. treat the same subject.

⁴ Even if Hipponax did not describe a rite as actually taking place, he evidently alluded to the details well known to his audience. Yet it is impossible to link the scapegoat rite in Hipponax with some definite city: the poet was born in Ephesus, but then lived in Clazomenae, whereas Mimnermus mentioned by him was living either in Colophon or Smyrna: West 1974, 72; Bonnechere 1994, 293 n. 57.

⁵ As well as Hesych. κ 3914 s. v. κραδησίτης = Hippon. fr. 152 W. = 203 Dg.

Κραδῆς νόμος· νόμον τινὰ ἐπαυλοῦσι τοῖς ἐκπεπομένοις φαρμακοῖς, κράδαις καὶ θρίοις ἐπιραβδίζομενοις.

On the other hand, Cradias Nomos is listed among the auletic⁶ νόμοι by Pseudo-Plutarch, as the third and the last one after the Many-Headed and the Chariot nomes (*De mus.* 1133F–1134A)⁷:

Καὶ ἄλλος δ' ἐστὶν ἀρχαῖος νόμος καλούμενος Κραδίας, ὃν φησὶν Ἴππώναξ Μίμνερμον αὐλῆσαι.

It is plausible that Hesychius and Pseudo-Plutarch refer to the same passage of Hipponax, which contained the words Κραδῆς νόμος⁸ and linked the aulos-playing of Mímnermus (the second half of the seventh century BC⁹) with the rite of expelling a scapegoat.

The text of Pseudo-Plutarch that follows immediately (1134A) shows quite an unexpected line of thought that even made some editors resort to the transposition of the whole passage¹⁰:

ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἐλεγεία μεμελοποιημένα οἱ αὐλωδοὶ ἤδον· τοῦτο δὲ δηλοῖ ἡ τῶν Παναθηναίων <ἀνα>γραφὴ ἢ περὶ τοῦ μουσικοῦ ἀγῶνος. γέγονε δὲ καὶ Σακάδας <ὁ> Ἀργεῖος ποιητὴς μελῶν τε καὶ ἐλεγείων μεμελοποιημένων· ὁ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ αὐλητὴς ἀγαθὸς καὶ τὰ Πύθια τρις νενικηκῶς ἀναγέγραπται.

At the beginning of the 19th century J. V. Francke dismissed Hesychius' evidence regarding it as “*meras nugae*” (Francke 1816, 129). Following him P. Volkmann (Volkmann 1856, 84; 85) considered that Κραδίας νόμος had a human name as its title, like Κηπίων (*De mus.* 1132D) or Πολύμνηστος (1133A). He assumed the name Κράτης, which occurs above in Pseudo-Plutarch (1133E: ἄλλοι δὲ Κράτητος εἶναι φασὶ τὸν Πολυκέφαλον νόμον, γενομένου μαθητοῦ Ὀλύμπου), to be an accidental distortion of Κραδίας. J. Flach also believed that this nome was named after its composer Kradias or Kradios (Flach 1883, 152 with n. 3). Yet this point cannot be sustained, since, as noted already by O. Crusius, there are no names with the stem κραδο- in Greek onomastics (Crusius 1884, 168 n. 1).

The hypothesis of C. Del Grande that the Fig nome should be related to the Laconian cult of Artemis Orthia (Del Grande 1960, 426) is completely unfounded: Sparta is not to be confused with Ionia, and there is no evidence that fig branches were used for ritual flogging of epheboi; on the contrary, words with the stem μαστιγ-, which refer to whips rather than twigs, steadily occur in our sources (e.g. Xen. *De rep. Lac.* 2. 9; Plut. *Inst. Lac.* 40. 293D; Lucian. *Anach.* 38; Paus. 3. 16. 10–11; Suid. λ 824; evidence is collected in Kennell 1995, 149–161 App. 1).

⁶ Volkmann's emendation αὐλητικούς for αὐλωδικούς in Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1133D (Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοὺς αὐλωδικούς νόμους καὶ καθαρωδικούς ὁμοῦ τοὺς ἀρχαίους ἐμπεφανίκαμεν, μεταβησόμεθα ἐπὶ [μόνους] τοὺς αὐλητικούς) is quite certain, since the aulodic nomes are listed above (1132D, 1133A) and since we have independent firm evidence (Pind. *Pyth.* 12) that the Many-Headed nome was instrumental and not vocal.

⁷ The edition of *De musica* cited here is Ziegler — Pohlenz 1959.

⁸ Editors of Hipponax unite the passages of Pseudo-Plutarch and Hesychius into the same fragment: Hipp. fr. 96 Bergk = 153 Masson = 153 West = 146 Degani. Only Francke 1816, 128–129 and F. Th. Welcker 1817, 91–92 denied the link between Hesychius and Hipponax, but see already Schneidewin 1844, 106: “die Hesychische Glosse, die man unbedenklich auf Hipponax selbst beziehen muss”.

⁹ See West 1974, 73–74.

¹⁰ ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ — τοῦ Τριμεροῦς νόμου: Westphal 1865, 7 ad loc. (to 1134C); Weil — Reinach 1900, 24 n. 57 ad loc. (to 1133B).

Whereas other auletic nomes mentioned by Pseudo-Plutarch are attested in the classical period and have agonistic connotations¹¹, Κραδίας νόμος provides a marked difference, for the evidence dates back to the seventh and the sixth centuries and refers to a specific ritual of the Ionian region. Given that the Fig nome was intended for a purgatorial rite, it was most probably never performed at musical contests, concerts, or feasts: such an improper use would have been certainly supposed to court disaster. Thus, if Mimnermus performed it, he could only do so when accompanying a scapegoat rite.

Pseudo-Plutarch's words that follow a mention of Κραδίας νόμος have let many scholars to identify or liken the Fig nome with elegy; in doing so they usually confuse instrumental music with singing to an aulos, and imply that elegy was necessarily threnodic¹².

For further conjecturing about the nature of the Fig nome it is crucial to restore the context in which Hipponax could mention Mimnermus, a poet who lived a century before him. However modern scholars usually prefer to refrain from judgment on this¹³, and assessments made thus far are unsatisfactory. According to the prevailing view, the mention of Mimnermus amounted to a scornful attack on behalf of Hipponax: namely, his elegiac poetry seemed so lachrymose to the abusive iambographer that it was only good for performing to scapegoats. This implies that both Mimnermus' works and the Fig nome were exemplary cases of lamentation. An additional reason for mockery was supposed to be the low social status of Mimnermus as a professional aulete (F.G. Welcker 1829, 218; Brink 1851, 66; Crusius 1884, 168 n. 1; id. 1905, 2267; Sternbach 1886, 68; Hiller 1888, 133; Rohde 1900, 149 n. 1; Gerhard 1913, 1904; Brecht 1930, 10; Gentili 1969, 58–59). F.G. Welcker emphasized the metaphorical character of Hipponax' stinging remark: it would not follow that Mimnermus actually accompanied a purgatorial rite, or that the notion 'Κραδίας νόμος' had some other meaning. H. Ulrici claimed that the mockery was well-founded, because Mimnermus really used the melody of this ancient "aulodic" nome composing his elegiac poetry¹⁴ (which seems improbable at least on religious grounds: as noted above, it was hardly possible to play the Fig nome outside the scapegoat rite).

This account raises a number of objections.

1. It seems strange — though of course not impossible — that Hipponax would so malign a poet who died a century before his own time¹⁵. What's Mimnermus to him?

¹¹ Πολυκέφαλος νόμος: Pind. *Pyth.* 12 (490 BC, the Pythian Games). Ἀρμάτειος νόμος: Eur. *Or.* 1384. Ἀθηνᾶς νόμος (see *De mus.* 1143B): Plat. *Cratyl.* 417E; Himer. *Or.* 74, p. 247 Colonna (1st half of the 4th cent., the Pythian Games). We do not have direct evidence that the Chariot nome was agonistic, but it seems probable, see Almazova 2014, 536.

¹² E.g. Müller 1844, 330: "Man schlug in Ionien die Sühnopfer mit Feigenstäben und Meerzwiebeln, und spielte dazu einen aulodischen Nomos, der von jenen Κραδίης hieß, und nach Hipponax Zeugnis von Mimnermos in elegischem Maaße behandelt wurde". Gentili 1988, 34: "The 'song of the fig tree' was a poem with the distinctive characteristics of a threnodic elegy, one marked from the start as a genuine *elegos* by the context for which it was intended".

¹³ Masson 1962, 176, ad fr. 153: "Selon le Pseudo-Plutarque, cet air aurait été joué notamment par Mimnerme: on ignore en quelles circonstances, et pourquoi Hipponax avait fait allusion à Mimnerme". Degani 1991, 148, ad fr. 146: "quo animo quoque occasione dixerit, incertum".

¹⁴ Ulrici 1835, 176; 179 with n. 140: "den alten Nomos Kradias, der ohne Zweifel threnetischen Inhalts war [seiner Bestimmung nach, cf. Hesych.]" ; 180 n. 143. Besides he supposes that ἀλῆσαι means 'sing to the aulos accompaniment' in Ps.-Plut.

¹⁵ Brinck 1851, 66 claimed that Hipponax criticized the scolia by Pythermus of Teos. Yet the passage cited in Athen. 14. 625c contains no criticism; it is not certain whether the quotation is by Hipponax or Ananius; and there is no reason to assume that Pythermus was not their contemporary, though his dating

2. This would not fit in well with other cases in which Hipponax mentions the scape-goat rite: he obviously does not use this image metaphorically for literary polemic.

3. The thesis about mocking Mimnermus for his humble position as an aulos-player is questionable: we do not know if being a professional musician was considered unworthy in archaic Ionian society¹⁶, and if indeed Mimnermus had not just played an aulos, but earned his living in this way (Allen 1993, 16–17). Besides, the poetic “I” of Hipponax, a vagrant beggar, is not likely to be that conceited.

4. The thesis regarding the threnodic character of archaic elegy is monotonously repeated by ancient theoreticians (evidence is collected in Page 1936, 209–210), and no wonder it influenced nineteenth century scholars. However since then good reasons have been adduced to doubt it (see inter alia Reitzenstein 1893, 49 n. 2; Friedländer — Hoffleit 1948, 65–70; Gentili 1988, 32–33).

It can be stated, as proved by M. West (West 1974, 3–6), that the metrical term ἔλεγειον (first attested in the fifth century BC, see West 1974, 3–4; Bowie 1986, 25–26) is derived from ἔλεγος, just as ἰαμβεῖον from ἰαμβος. It follows that the metre called ἔλεγειον was “characteristic of ἔλεγχοι, though not necessarily the sole metre used for them, and there was no other named genre of which it was more characteristic” (West 1974, 7). So we must search for archaic ἔλεγχοι among the elegiac couplets.

Now there are no examples of threnody in the surviving corpus of early elegiac poetry (Page 1936, 214; Bowie 1986, 22–23)¹⁷, and on the contrary, θρήνοι are attested as a lyric and not elegiac genre (Bowie 1986, 26). The only evidence which might support the theory of early lamentatory elegy is at the same time the only case of using the word ἔλεγος referring to the archaic period: Pausanias (10. 7. 5–6) records that aulodic contest held at the Pythian Games in 586 BC was removed at the following festival, explains its withdrawal by the gloomy character of elegiac pieces performed, and cites as a proof the dedicatory inscription of Echembrotus, the only Pythian winner in aulody:

καὶ αὐλωδῖαν <τό>τε κατέλυσαν, καταγνόντες οὐκ εἶναι τὸ ἄκουσμα εὐφημον· ἡ γὰρ αὐλωδία μέλη τε ἦν αὐλῶν τὰ σκυθρωπώτατα καὶ ἔλεγεία [θρήνοι] προσαδόμενα τοῖς αὐλοῖς, μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι καὶ τοῦ Ἐχεμβρότου τὸ ἀνάθημα, τρίπους χαλκοῦς ἀνατεθειὸς τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ τῷ ἐν Θήβαις· ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ὁ τρίπους εἶχεν·

Ἐχέμβροτος Ἀρκὰς θῆκε τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ
νικήσας τόδ' ἄγαλμ' Ἀμφικτυόνων ἐν ἀέθλοισι,
“Ἐλλησι δ' αἰείδων μέλεα καὶ ἔλέγους.

κατὰ τοῦτο μὲν τῆς αὐλωδίας ἐπαύσθη τὸ ἀγώνισμα...

Yet M. West (West 1974, 5) reasonably pointed out that Pausanias (or his source) had no means to know why the Amphictyons decided to abolish the aulodic contests — he could only state the absence of aulody since 582 BC using the register of Pythian winners. The adduced reason is in itself implausible: it is quite evident that singing to the aulos was not entirely mournful, so even if a particular participant performed something

to the sixth century BC (Ziegler 1963, 514) is based only on this quotation by either Hipponax or Ananius.

¹⁶ As accepted by Wilamowitz, who considered Mimnermus' aulos-playing as a proof of his low origin: “ein Plebejer ... und ein Flötenspieler dazu” (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1913, 280).

¹⁷ As demonstrated by Page 1936, 211–214, sepulchral epigrams in elegiac metre cannot be considered examples of threnodic elegy, because their mood is not threnodic, and they begin to outnumber epitaphs in hexameters only in the mid-sixth century.

not εὔφημον, this would hardly cause withdrawal of the whole competition. The inscription of Echembrotus does not mention anything sorrowful and on the whole provides no information on what the archaic ἔλεγχοι actually were (it is not even composed in elegiac metre). However, since in the Roman times it was already a copy-book maxim that ἔλεγχος meant 'lamentary elegy', and since lamentation seemed — understandably — an unsuitable subject for the Pythian festival, the hypothetical explanation adduced by Pausanias was invented.

A factor that might prove the existence of the archaic mournful elegy is the usage of the word ἔλεγχος in the fifth century BC: it occurs six or seven times (at least five times in Euripides and once in Aristophanes¹⁸), always with the meaning 'sung lament'. Furthermore Euripides makes his Andromache sing a unique threnody in elegiac metre (*Andr.* 103–116).

Thus West was forced to conclude that ἔλεγχος in the archaic period really meant 'threnodic elegy' (West 1974, 7). He believed that examples of this sub-species were known to fifth century authors and that the metrical term ἐλεγχεῖον was coined from the name of precisely this type of elegiac poetry (although threnodic elegy was not necessarily the origin of the whole genre). West had to suppose that other pieces in elegiac metre simply did not have a collective name that could be used for creating a metrical term.

This conclusion seems to me less probable than the hypothesis of E. L. Bowie, who argues that exactly ἔλεγχοι was a name by which elegiac poetry as a whole was known. He notes that all evidence from the fifth century falls within a short period of approximately 415–408 BC and is almost restricted to Euripides, whose usage could in itself explain that of Aristophanes. Bowie supposes that Euripides was captivated by some contemporary theory that used etymological arguments (such as deriving ἔλεγχος from ἔλεγειν vel sim., see West 1974, 7–8) and possibly referred to elegiac sepulchral epigrams to prove that ἔλεγχος *ought to mean* 'lament' (Bowie 1986, 25–27). Later scholarly tradition on the mournful character of ἔλεγχοι could succeed precisely because it was backed up by Euripides studies.

The fragments of Simonides' Plataea elegy (published in 1992, *P. Oxy.* 2327) may appear to reopen the question of the existence of threnodic elegy¹⁹, since this piece is dedicated to the commemoration of those who fell at Plataea. Yet it is after all not an example of archaic elegy, and it is not just funerary, but also celebratory, exhortatory and narrative (Aloni 2009, 170; 178–179), so it demonstrates rather the capacity of elegy to be adapted to different subjects, including a funerary lament.

Even if early threnodic elegy was not a mere artificial invention of fifth century theoreticians, still Hipponax had hardly any reason to think of Mimnermus as primarily a lamentary poet: he was famous not only as a poet of love, pleasure and youth, but also as the author of "Smyrneis", probably a narrative poem addressing the foundation of Smyrna (see Bowie 1986, 28–30), and there is military appeal in his verse (see fr. 9, 13a, 14 W.).

5. It is equally implausible that a mournful character suited the purpose of the Fig nome.

¹⁸ Eur. *Tro.* 119; *IT* 146; 1091 as an adjective; *Hel.* 185; *Hypsip.* 1 III 9; conjectured in *Or.* 968; Aristoph. *Av.* 217.

¹⁹ Aloni 2009, 179. The reasoning of C. Nobili (Nobili 2011), who tries to revive Page's hypothesis of a Peloponnesian tradition of funerary elegy, seems ill-founded: for the most part her points are either erroneous or unprovable.

Ethnographical parallels collected by J.G. Frazer show that proper emotions expressed by people during a scapegoat ceremony were: fear and disgust towards the pharmakos; anger against him as the focus of all evil; or joy at the coming deliverance from him (Frazer 1913, 211–213, 228). Pity for the victim was therefore not a factor.

The same must be true for the Greeks, though there seems to be no relevant Greek evidence. J.E. Harrison emphasized that the beating of the scapegoat itself was intended not only to expulse evil influences, but also to relieve the feelings of the beaters (Harrison 1908, 101). F.M. Cornford argued that a loser of an agon in comedy reflected a pharmakos in the ritual and referred to the *Knights* of Aristophanes where the Paphlagonian is contemptuously reviled ἐκείνος ὁ φαρμακός (1405). Since the Chorus declares in lines 404–408 that — should the Paphlagonian's luck run out — it would be a fitting occasion to sing ἡ παιῶν and βακχέβακχον, Cornford conjectured that the song indicated in ἡπαιωνίσαι and βακχέβακχον ἔσαι was the Κραδῆς νόμος (Cornford 1934, 77). Generally his reasoning is unconvincing²⁰, but I agree that bloodthirsty joy would better suit the scapegoat rite than pity.

The mood of the ceremony could plausibly be identified if it was possible to understand why fig plants were chosen²¹. In considering this point it should be noted that figs are also mentioned as amulets which human scapegoats put on (in Athens), as their food, and even as wood for the fire on which the victims were allegedly burnt²², and that other plants — namely squills — were used for beating alongside with fig branches and leaves²³. Another detail of note is that in Hipponax' record (fr. 10 W. = 30 Dg.) the pharmakos was beaten seven times on the genitals. Though fig branches are not mentioned in this fragment, they occur in Tzetzes (*Sch. Aristoph. Plut.* 454b) together with squills. Therefore some scholars (T.G. Welcker 1829, 217; Masson 1962, 112) reduce the ritual beating accompanied by the Fig nome to these seven blows. Yet the wording of Hesychius (ἐπαυλοῦσι τοῖς ἐκπεμπομένοις φαρμακοῖς) evidently implies a whole procession driving a scapegoat out of the city (Keramopullos 1923, 117), and a musically accompanied procession is typical of Greek religion.

Opinions on the meaning of figs diverge too widely for any safe conclusion. The plants mentioned in the testimonies give a strong smell and, if eaten, have a purgative effect, so they are natural purifiers (Harrison 1908, 100). Therefore a cathartic and an apotropaic effect has been ascribed to figs (F.G. Welcker 1829, 217; Rohde 1894, 363 n. 2; Parker 1983, 226; Bonnechere 1994, 294), but there is no consensus, if they ought to avert evil from the pharmakos himself and increase his reproductive energy (if, for instance, he personified the reviving spirit of vegetation, as Frazer argued [Frazer 1913, 226–228;

²⁰ In particular it is improbable that the scapegoat rite was dedicated to Apollo, or Dionysus, or any other deity: Gebhard 1926, 49; Pfister 1929, 97–98.

²¹ I do not find it reasonable to speculate on why aulos music was accompanying this rite, though Schwenn 1915, 38 with n. 3 thought it a special means of exorcising evil spirits, and Bonnechere 1994, 294, mechanically attributed an orgiastic effect to it. Musical accompaniment was normally provided for a Greek cult ceremony, and aulos was the most common and universal instrument.

²² Helladius in Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 279, 534a Bekker: ὁ μὲν τῶν ἀνδρῶν μελαίνας ἰσχάδας περὶ τὸν τράχηλον εἶχε, λευκάς δ' ἄτερος. Hippon. fr. 8 W. = 29 Dg.: ἰσχάδας τε καὶ μάζαν / καὶ τυρόν οἶον ἐσθίουσι φαρμακοί. Tzetzes, *Sch. Aristoph. Plut.* 454b: τῇ χειρὶ τε δόντες ἰσχάδας, μάζαν καὶ τυρόν, ἐς τὸ αἰδοῖόν τε ἐπτάκις ῥαπίσαντες σκίλλαις τε καὶ ἀγρίαις συκαῖς, καὶ μέση τῇ ἀγορᾷ πυρὰν ὑπάναντες ξύλοις ἀγρίοις τε καὶ ἀκάρποις κτλ.

²³ Hippon. fr. 6 W. = 27 Dg.: ῥαπίζοντες / κράδησι καὶ σκίλλησιν ὥσπερ φαρμακόν; see Tzetzes, *Sch. Aristoph. Plut.* 454b in the previous note.

255–259; 272–273]); or protect other people from his malignant influence (Schwenn 1915, 38); or deprive the polluted creature of any possibility of reproduction (Bonnechere 1994, 294); or increase his power of an animate remedy (Pfister 1929, 97). According to J. Bremmer, wild figs simply signified the scapegoat’s marginality (Bremmer 1983, 313), whereas W. Burkert thought figs to emphasize the contrast to the actual situation: “they point to sweetness, luxury, licentiousness, a breath of a golden age from which reality must be rudely distinguished” (Burkert 1985, 83). So no definite emotion can be reconstructed. Besides, possibly, the original significance of the ritual actions was not realized any more by the time of Mimnermus, so the music which was evidently much later than the rite itself did not have to correspond to it.

One observation by J. Harrison may be relevant (Harrison 1908, 101–102): she refers to the passage *Ar. Ran.* 621–622, where Xanthias offers Aeacus to torture his slave any way he likes, and encourages not to pity him saying: πλὴν πράσω / μὴ τύπτε τοῦτον μηδὲ γητείω νέω. Mentioning as peculiar an action as hitting with a stalk of leek or young onion probably refers to a purgatorial rite and implies that ceremonial blows accepted by a victim, as was well known to Aristophanes’ auditory, did not really hurt²⁴. If so, revealing pity for a scapegoat was still less appropriate.

For all these reasons, I think we must abandon the idea that Κραδίας νόμος was a lamentatory elegy, or as lamentatory as an elegy, and infer from Hipponax’ testimony, as Pseudo-Plutarch (or rather his source) did, that Mimnermus did indeed play the Fig nome.

Thus the question arises: how did the iambographer come to know about such a performance that occurred in the previous century? Playing music is an ephemeral art, and a detail concerning a performing aulete could only be conveyed in text. There is no evidence and little probability that participants of the scapegoat ceremonies were recorded in public documents, or that Hipponax studied them. One might suppose that Mimnermus himself mentioned playing Κραδίας νόμος in his verse, but in this case our sources would have cited Mimnermus instead of Hipponax.

However Mimnermus’ fame could have been preserved orally if he was not only the performer, but also the composer of the Fig nome which was subsequently traditionally played at the Thargelia. Performing one’s own compositions is natural for an archaic Greek musician. In this case Hipponax, while speaking about the scapegoat rite in his usual way, could mention its typical accompaniment and its author: “the Fig nome Mimnermus once played”. He must have used the verb ἀλῆσαι, which prevented Pseudo-Plutarch’s source from referring to Mimnermus as a composer²⁵.

It remains to explain, why Pseudo-Plutarch gave a sudden reference to elegy and the repertoire of ἀλφδοί, if elegiac poetry had nothing in common with Κραδίας νόμος.

Initially, one can assume that the author of *De musica* had at his disposal lists of aulodic and citharodic nomes (1132D) adduced by his source (presumably Heraclides, who

²⁴ Of course fig branches can be more harmful than leeks, but note θρίοις also mentioned in Hesychius. Cf. Frazer 1913, 255: “the scourging of the victim with squills, branches of the wild fig, and so forth, cannot have been intended to aggravate his sufferings, otherwise any stick would have been good enough to beat him with”.

²⁵ Referring to Mimnermus as the author of the Fig nome: Christ 1912, 172; Salazar 1954, 312; Garzya 1963, 68; *contra* Lasserre 1954, 35 (he adds that the tender elegist could only be forced to accompany the gruesome ritual under threat of violence).

used the Sicyonian Chronic²⁶), but he did not find an analogous list of auletic nomes (not connected with poetry), and so tried to compose it himself, writing the titles out of a work dedicated to other matters (such as the heritage of Olympus, including the Many-Headed and the Chariot nomes). This would explain why the structure of the section about auletic nomes is different from that about aulodic and citharodic ones: Pseudo-Plutarch enumerates them not in a list, but one by one, alternated with comments. He did not quite succeed in his enterprise. For example, he omitted the auletic nome of Athena in this section, though he discussed it later (1143B). His failure to recollect the famous Πυθικὸς νόμος by Sacadas (Paus. 2. 22. 8; Poll. 4. 78–79; 84), whose Pythian victories — with exactly this nome — he just mentioned (1134A), is mystifying. Pseudo-Plutarch was often criticized by modern scholars for his inability in writing compendia²⁷.

Perhaps the section where he found the Fig nome dealt with the theory of early elegy as a musical genre²⁸. Apart from its lamentatory character, it was argued in antiquity (plausibly²⁹) that initially elegies were sung to the aulos accompaniment³⁰. Evidence that Mimnermus, whom the public would know mostly as an elegiac poet, was an aulos-player occurs more than once (beside Ps.-Plut., see also Strab. 14. 1. 28, p. 643; Hermesianax fr. 7. 35–40 ap. Athen. 13. 71, p. 598a). This information was probably transmitted both for the sake of Mimnermus' biography and as proof of a connection between elegy and aulos: namely, persons were referred to that were famous as elegiac poets and auletes at the same time, such as Mimnermus and Sacadas.³¹ As one such testimony the passage of Hipponax about Mimnermus playing the Fig nome was cited. In this case Pseudo-Plutarch perhaps made a mistake commonly made by inexperienced students extracting relevant informa-

²⁶ Westphal 1865, 70–71; Weil — Reinach 1900, VII–VIII; X; 17 ad § 41; 21 ad § 51; 23 ad § 55; Pollux (4. 65) must have dealt with the same source with fixed lists of vocal nomes.

²⁷ E. g., Weil — Reinach 1900, IV–V; Henderson 1957, 379; Rosenmeyer 1968, 222; Barker 1984, 213 n. 58 notes that linking two sentences referring to Mimnermus with γάρ in Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1134A is probably a result of unskillful excerpting.

²⁸ Cf. Weil — Reinach 1900, 24: “les mots ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἐλεγεία μεμελοποιημένα, etc., supposent qu'il vient d'être question d'élégies mises en musique”.

²⁹ See Donohue 1949, 85; West 1974, 12; 13; 18–19; Bowie 1986, 14; 27. The counter-argumentation of Campbell 1964 only shows that exceptions were possible — a fact that few scholars would dispute. When Aristotle, in the introductory section of his *Poetics*, assumes as an obvious truth that elegiac poetry is non-musical (Rosenmeyer 1968, 217), he only speaks about his own time, when it was perfectly true.

³⁰ Cf. Paus. 10. 7. 5 above; evidence is contradictory (as noted by Campbell 1964, 67–68; Rosenmeyer 1968, 222 n. 27) in Athen. 14. 620c (according to Chamaeleon, Mimnermus' and Phocylides' verse was sung) and 632d (elegiac poets, including Phocylides, did not set their poems to music). Bartol 1989, 249–250 supposed that, on one hand, elegiac distiches could be thought rather strophic than stichic and thus close to the sung poetry, but on the other hand overestimating their resemblance to hexameters led to including them into the category of recited verse. The thesis of musical elegy could deal with the criteria of classifying poetry and possibly faced polemic of Aristotelian school, which steadily opposed elegy to melic (see Färber 1936, 4–7; 23). However no source explicitly includes elegy in melic poetry, or explicitly refuses such a possibility, and believing that it was initially sung did not prevent extracting it into a separate genre, especially since it had later lost its musical nature. — Bartol 1989, 247–248 is certainly wrong in claiming that the passage of Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1134A ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἐλεγεία μεμελοποιημένα οἱ αὐλωδοὶ ἤδον implies absence of music for the types of archaic ἐλεγεία other than the aulodes sang: being μεμελοποιημένα is opposed not to other contemporary species, but to later elegy.

³¹ Other such persons can be found in Suda: Olympos (ο 219) and Tyrtaeus (τ 1205). Perhaps for the same reason Heraclides indicated that Clonax and Polymnestus were authors of both aulodic nomes and elegy (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1132C).

tion from works on a subject other than theirs: he was distracted from his own point by his source's argument.³²

Returning to the Fig nome, not much can be established about it with any certainty. There can be little, if any, doubt that it was intended to accompany the scapegoat rite in archaic Ionia; therefore it was hardly possible to perform this ill-omened piece on any other occasion. Perhaps Mimnermus was the composer of one such nome, or even of the only one. Yet assuming any further details would inevitably be based solely on how one imagines music that would suit a stern purgatorial ritual.³³

References

- Allen, A. (ed.) *The Fragments of Mimnermus. Text and Commentary*, Palingenesia. Monographien und Texte zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 44. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1993.
- Almazova, N. Ἀμύτιος νόμος. *MAIA* 2014, 66 (3), 518–538.
- Aloni, A. Elegy. Forms, Functions and Communication, in: F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, 168–188.
- Barker, A. *Greek Musical Writings. I. The Musician and his Art*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Bartol, K. Der musikgeschichtliche Dialog Plutarchs und das Problem des melischen Charakters der griechischen Poesie (De musica 1132B und 1134A), in: J. Ebert, H.-D. Zimmermann (Hgg.) *Innere und äußere Integration der Altertumswissenschaften. Konferenz zur 200. Wiederkehr der Gründung des Seminarium Philologicum Halense durch F. A. Wolf am 15.10.1787*. Halle (Saale), Martin-Luther-Universität, 1989, 242–250.
- Bonnechere, P. *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne*, Kernos — Supplément 3. Athènes — Liège, Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique, 1994.
- Bowie, E. L. Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival. *JHS* 1986, 106, 13–35.
- Brecht, F. I. *Motiv- und Typengeschichte des griechischen Spottepigramms*, *Philologus Suppl.* XXII, Heft 2. Leipzig, Dieter, 1930.
- Bremmer, J. Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece. *HSCP* 1983, 87, 299–320.
- Bremmer, J. Pharmakos. *DNP* 2000, 9, 750.
- Brink, B. ten. Hipponactea. *Philologus* 1851, 6, 35–80; 215–227.
- Burkert, W. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Campbell, D. A. Flutes and Elegiac Couplets. *JHS* 1964, 84, 63–68.
- Christ, W. von. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. Unter Mitwirkung von O. Stählin bearb. von W. Schmid. München, C. H. Beck, 1912.
- Compton, T. M. *Victim of the Muses: Poet as Scapegoat, Warrior and Hero in Greco-Roman and Indo-European Myth and History, Greco-Roman and Indo-European Myth and History*. Washington, DC, Center for Hellenic Studies, 2006.
- Cornford, F. M. *The Origin of Attic Comedy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- Crusius, O. Die Fabiani in der Lupercalienfeier. *RhM* 1884, 39, 164–168.
- Crusius, O. Elegie. *RE* 5, 1905, 2260–2307.
- Degani, H. *Hyponactis testimonia et fragmenta*. Stuttgart — Leipzig, Teubner, 1991².

³² Still the reasoning in Ps.-Plut. is after all not quite inexplicable; it is similarly reconstructed in Campbell 1964, 67 and Rosenmeyer 1968, 222: “(1) Mimnermus performed a nomos on the aulos; (2) (but wasn't Mimnermus an elegist?); (3) (Yes, but) in the old days elegiac involved aulos playing”.

³³ E.g. Bremmer 1983, 314; 317 assumed that the Fig nome was unharmonious, referring to the division of ritual music pointed out by Marcel-Dubois 1968, 340. This cannot be excluded, but his reasons are not convincing: (1) he claims that Hipponax mentioned Mimnermus to mock his music as not particularly harmonious; (2) a parallel from Tibet (“blasts from long trumpets, beating of drums, clashing of cymbals, and incantations by the officiating lamas”) shows more distinction than resemblance: though using trumpets, percussion and ritual cries for ecstatic rites was well known to the Greeks, accompanying the Ionian scapegoat ceremony was confined to aulos music.

- Del Grande, C. *Enciclopedia Classica. Sezione II: Lingua e letteratura. Volume V: La lingua greca nei mezzi della sua espressione. Tomo II: La metrica greca.* Torino, Società Editrice Internazionale, 1960.
- Donohue, J. J. *The Theory of Literary Kinds. Vol. II: The Ancient Classes of Poetry.* Dubuque, Iowa, Loras College Press, 1949.
- Färber, H. *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike.* München, Neuer Filser-Verlag, 1936.
- Flach, J. *Geschichte der griechischen Lyrik, von nach den Quellen dargestellt.* Bd. I. Tübingen, F. Fues, 1883.
- Francke, J. V. *Callinus, sive Quaestio de Origine Carminis Elegiaci; accedunt Tyrtaei Reliquiae.* Altonae, I. F. Hammerich, 1816.
- Frazer, J. G. *The Golden Bough. A Study of Magic and Religion,* 3rd ed., in 12 vols. Vol. 9: *The Scapegoat.* London, MacMillan and Co., 1913.
- Garzya, A. Nomos elegiaco in Euripide, in: id., *Studi sulla lirica greca da Alcmane al primo Impero.* Messina — Firenze, D'Anna, 1963. 175–179.
- Gebhard, V. *Die Pharmakoi in Ionien und die Sybacchoi in Athen.* Diss. München, Max Hueber, 1926.
- Gentili, B. Epigramma ed elegia, in: *L'épigramme grecque,* Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 14. Vandoeuvres — Genève, Fondation Hardt, 1968. 37–90.
- Gentili, B. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece from Homer to the Fifth Century.* Transl., with an Introd., by A. Thomas Cole. Baltimore — London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.
- Gerhard, G. A. Hipponax 1. *RE* 8, 1913, 1890–1907.
- Harrison, J. E. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1908.
- Henderson, I. Ancient Greek Music, in: *The New Oxford History of Music* I. London, 1957, 336–403.
- Hiller, E. Jahresbericht über die griechischen Lyriker (mit Ausschluss Pindars) und die griechischen Bukoliker bis 1886 und 1887, *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft,* hrsg. von Conrad Bursian u. a. 1888, 16, 129–203.
- Jacoby, F. Studien zu den älteren griechischen Elegikern. II. Zu Mimnermos, *Hermes* 1918, 53, 262–307.
- Kennell, N. M. *The Gymnasium of Virtue. Education and Culture in Ancient Sparta.* Chapel Hill — London, U. North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Keramopullos, A. D. *O apotypanismos. Symbolē archaiologikē eis tēn istorian tu poinikoy dikaiou kai tēn laographian.* Athēnai, Hestia, 1923.
- Lasserre, F. (ed.) *Plutarque. De la musique. Texte traduction commentaire précédés d'une étude sur l'éducation musicale dans la Grèce antique.* Olten — Lausanne, Urs Graf, 1954.
- Marcel-Dubois, C. Musiques cérémonielles et sociétés rurales, in: *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnographical Sciences.* Vol. 2. Tokyo, Science Council of Japan, 1968, 340.
- Masson, O. *Les fragments du poète Hipponax. Édition critique et commentée,* Études et commentaires 43. Paris, C. Klincksieck, 1962.
- Müller, K. O. Die Dorier. Bd. I. Breslau, Fr. Schneidewin, ²1844 = Hildesheim, Weidmann, 1989.
- Nobili, C. Threnodic Elegy in Sparta, *GRBS* 2011, 51, 26–48.
- Parker, R. *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion.* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Pfister, F. Rezension: Gebhard. Die Pharmakoi in Ionien [s. Gebhard 1926], *Gnomon* 1929, 5, 94–98.
- Reitzenstein, R. *Epigramm und Skolion.* Giessen, J. Ricker, 1893.
- Rohde, E. *Psyche. Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen.* Bd. II. Leipzig, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1894.
- Rohde, E. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer.* Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel, ²1900.
- Rosenmeyer, T. G. Elegiac and Elegos. *Calif. St. in Class. Ant.* 1968, 1, 217–231.
- Salazar, A. *La música en la cultura griega.* Mexico, El Colegio de México, 1954.
- Schneidewin, F. W. *Beiträge zur Kritik der Poetae Lyrici Graeci, ed. Th. Bergk.* Göttingen, Dieterische Buchhandlung, 1844.
- Schwenn, F. *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern,* Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 15, 3. Gießen, Töpelmann, 1915.
- Sternbach, S. L. *Meletemata Graeca.* Vol. I. Wien, Gerold, 1886.
- Ulrici, H. *Geschichte der Hellenischen Dichtkunst.* Zweiter Theil: *Geschichte der Hellenischen Lyrik bis zum vierten Jahrhundert v. C.* G. Berlin, Duncker und Humblot, 1835.
- Volkmann, R. (ed.) *Plutarchi De musica.* Leipzig, Teubner, 1856.
- Weil, H., Reinach, Th. (eds.) *Plutarque. De la Musique. Édition critique et explicative.* Paris, Leroux, 1900.
- Welcker, F. Th. (ed.) *Hipponactis et Ananii iambographorum fragmenta.* Göttingen, J. C. Baier, 1817.
- Welcker, F. G. Stesichoros (1829), in: id., *Kleine Schriften.* Bd. I. Bonn, E. Weber, 1844. 148–219.

- West, M. L. *Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 14. Berlin — New York, W. de Gruyter, 1974.
- West, M. L. (ed.) *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Aexandrum cantati*. Vol. I. Ed. 2. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Westphal, R. (ed.) *Plutarch über die Musik*. Breslau, Leuckart, 1865. 33.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. *Sappho und Simonides*. Berlin, Weidmann, 1913.
- Ziegler, K. Pythermos 2. *RE* 24, 1963, 514.
- Ziegler, K. und Pohlenz, M. (eds.) *Plutarchi Moralia*. Vol. 6, fasc. 3. Lipsiae, Teubner, 1959.

For citation: Almazova N. A. Cradias nomos. *Philologia Classica* 2016, 11(1), 20–30.
DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu20.2016.102

СМОКОВНИЧНЫЙ НОМ

Нина Александровна Алмазова

Оба существующих свидетельства о Смоковничном номе (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 1133F и Hesych. к 3918), очевидно, восходят к одному и тому же пассажиу Гиппонакта, где говорилось, что Мимнерм исполнял этот ном на авле во время церемонии изгнания «козла отпущения», которого били фигурными ветвями, выводя из города. Такая информация могла дойти до Гиппонакта, жившего веком позже, если Мимнерм был не только исполнителем, но и автором Смоковничного нома, традиционно сопровождавшего этот ритуал. Предположение о том, что слова Гиппонакта надо понимать в переносном смысле — как насмешку над Мимнермом, чьи скорбные элегии казались ему не лучше Смоковничного нома, — не выдерживает критики. Неожиданное упоминание о положенных на музыку элегиях в тексте Псевдо-Плутарха — следствие небрежного реферирования, и из него нельзя делать вывод, что у Смоковничного нома было что-то общее с элегией.

Ключевые слова: Древнегреческая музыка, номы, Смоковничный ном, Мимнерм, Гиппонакт, элегия.

Received: 18.03.2016

Final version received: 19.05.2016