



Timotheus' Eleven Strings: A New Approach (PMG 791.229-36)

Author(s): Pauline LeVen

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 106, No. 3 (July 2011), pp. 245-254

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/661545>

Accessed: 02/04/2012 06:44

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

TIMOTHEUS' ELEVEN STRINGS: A NEW APPROACH (PMG 791.229–36)

νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις
ῥυθμοῖς τ' ένδεκακρουμάτοις 230
κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει,
θησαυρὸν πολύυμνον οἷ-
ξας Μουσαῖν θαλαμευτό[ς]ιν·
Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νιν ἅ
θρέψας' ἅ | δωδεκατειχέος 235
λαοῦ πρωτέος ἐξ Ἀχαιῶν.

And now Timotheus renews the kithara with eleven-stringed metres and rhythms, opening the many-songed chambered treasury of the Muses; it is Miletus that nurtured him, the city of a twelve-walled people, first among the Achaeans.¹

With these words, Timotheus of Miletus presents his contribution to the history of *mousikê* in the final lines of the *sphragis* of his kitharodic nome, the *Persians*.² After evoking Sparta's (real or invented) hostile reception of his music (lines 206–12) and defining his own aesthetic approach to song (213–20), Timotheus presents himself in a catalogue of mythical kitharodes: first came Orpheus, son of Calliope, who begot the (lyre?) of intricate music (πρῶτος ποικιλόμουσον Ὀρ-/φεῦς † υν † ἐτέκνωσεν / υἱὸς Καλλιόπα<ς, 221–24), then Lesbian Terpander, who yoked music on ten (notes?) (Τέρπανδρος δ' ἐπὶ τῷ δέκα / ζευξε Μοῦσαν ἐν ᾧδαϊς, lines 225–28), and finally Timotheus, who revived the *kitharis* μέτροις ῥυθμοῖς τ' ένδεκακρουμάτοις (229–36).

In the context of the recent renewal of interest in the so-called New Music Revolution of the late fifth century, it is worth revisiting this important passage. My specific interest here lies in the interpretation of the compound ένδεκακρουμάτοις. Many ancient and modern critics have interpreted this neologism as a reference to a technical innovation (the addition of extra strings

I would like to thank Egbert Bakker, Victor Bers, and Andrew L. Ford, as well as Will Brockliss and Jelle Stoop, for their detailed comments and meticulous reading of this paper in its different stages. I am also very grateful to the two anonymous *CP* referees for their critical remarks and suggestions for improvement. All remaining errors are entirely my own.

1. PMG 791.229–36, trans. Hordern 2002. The text is also from Hordern 2002, which, in the lines quoted above, follows *PMG*. Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

2. On the *sphragis* as the penultimate part of a kitharodic nome, see Poll. *Onom.* 4.66. On the *sphragis* of the *Persians*, see Wilamowitz 1903, 65–80, 99; Janssen 1984, 126–48; Barker 1984, 95–98; West 1992b, 361–64; Power 2001, 189–215; Hordern 2002, 228–48; Csapo and Wilson 2009.

to the traditional seven-string kithara),³ and more generally as a statement about Timotheus' adhesion to *polychordia* and *poikilia*.⁴ Commentaries gloss the phrase by explaining the meaning of the noun κρούματα and exploring the significance of the number eleven: virtually all critics agree that, since κρούμα (strike) refers to the striking of string instruments with the plectrum,⁵ the number of κρούματα mentioned by Timotheus corresponds to the number of (open) strings on the instrument played by the poet. But critical agreement stops here. In the following pages, I shall examine three points: (1) the range of issues brought up by Timotheus' statement about playing a many-stringed instrument, from the very *existence* of an eleven-stringed kithara at the end of the fifth century B.C.E. to the problem of the *invention* of extra strings by Timotheus; (2) the importance of the rhetorical function played by the expression ἑνδεκάκρουμάτοις in the passage of the *sphragis*; and, building on these two preliminary stages, as a form of conclusion, (3) an alternative (non-organological) hypothesis to understand the expression μέτροις / ῥυθμοῖς τ' ἑνδεκάκρουμάτοις / κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει (229–31).

(1) Several ancient anecdotes and documents have contributed to support and advertise the image of Timotheus as a radical innovator, introducing shocking changes in traditional *mousikê* and entering into conflict with Sparta's conservative musical critics for his overstringed instrument.⁶ Yet scholars have felt unease at Timotheus' claim to be the *inventor* of the eleven-string instrument, given that another testimony, a fragment of Ion of Chios (32 West) predating Timotheus, celebrates an eleven-string instrument (ἑνδεκάχορδε λύρα), and that a comic fragment of Pherecrates (*PCG* 155) ascribes a twelve-string lyre already to one of Timotheus' predecessors, the mid-fifth-century Melanippides (and possibly to another, Phrynīs). Attempts at reconciling Timotheus' statement with a true history of string instruments based on the above-mentioned literary witnesses and iconographic evidence have ranged from utter scepticism about the existence of any such instrument in the late fifth century,⁷ to discussions of the philological, literary, and musicological difficulties involved in the three passages and in Timotheus'

3. Ancient accounts of the exact number of strings that Timotheus added vary: according to "Censorinus," Timotheus added the seventh, eighth, and ninth strings; to Pliny (*HN* 7.204), the ninth only; to Pausanias (3.12.10), the eighth through the eleventh; and to the *Suda* (s.v. T 620), the tenth and eleventh. For a summary of inventors to whom extra strings have been attributed, see Hordern 2002, 244.

4. For *poikilia* and *polychordia* as features of New Music, see [Plut.] *De mus.* 1137a–b, 1141c, 1142b–c. On the technical and musical innovations of New Music, see Visconti 1999, 129–63; Csapo 2004; d'Angour 2006; on Ion of Chios' *polychordia*, see Power 2007.

5. On the semantic field of κρούω, see Rocconi 2003, 32–51.

6. Plutarch (*Inst. Lac.* 17.238c, *Agis* 10.7) tells how Timotheus was asked by the Spartan ephors whether he wanted his instrument's upper or lower strings cut out. The same story is told about Phrynīs (Plut. *Prof. virt.* 13.84a, *Agis* 10.4) and in a slightly different form in Artemon (Ath. 636e–637f). On these anecdotes, see Prauscello 2009.

7. Maas (1992, developing ideas already in Maas and McIntosh Snyder 1989, 154–55) denies the existence of an eleven-string kithara in the fifth century. For her (p. 85), *lyra* (the instrument to which Ion refers) and kithara belong to different families of instruments, the *lyra* (also called *magadis*) being a form of harp. Her view has been presented as highly unlikely by West (1992b, 62–64, with a table at 63 for the iconographic evidence supporting the existence of a kithara with more than seven strings in the late fifth century). For a different approach, see Sarti 1992 and 2003, especially 54–59, where the author (56) points out the difficulty of using the visual evidence to infer actual features of instruments.

claim to inventing the extra strings,⁸ to a reconsideration of the larger cultural significance of Timotheus' claim to his use of an eleven-string instrument in the *sphragis*. The last approach has led to sophisticated studies of the politics of Timotheus' *kitharôidia*, such as those by Timothy Power, Lucia Prauscello, and Eric Csapo and Peter Wilson.⁹ Power sums up:

polychordia indeed emerges in the conservative elite cultural criticism of the later 5th and 4th century—comedy, Plato, Aristotle, Aristoxenus—as the most vivid emblem of the excesses of professional virtuoso performers, of the idiotic *poikilia* of the musical innovations that grew out of control under the vulgar *theatrokratia* of radical Athenian democracy. The polychord lyre is the decadence, the too-muchness of illicit *kainotomia* (“innovation”)—and the political culture that promotes it—made visible.¹⁰

Yet, while these readings are not all concerned with the historicity of the eleven-stringed kithara per se, but with the interpretation of the symbolic significance of *polychordia* and *poikilia* in Late Classical culture, they assume that the compound indeed refers to an eleven-string instrument. But what if it does not? As opposed to both Ion and Pherecrates, who explicitly use a word for string (χορδή), Timotheus uses a rather vague expression (μέτροις ῥυθμοῖς τ' ἑνδεκακρουμάτοις) that allows a variety of translations, some without any overt statement about the number of strings. Tjitte Janssen, for example, translates “with eleven beats (on the strings),”¹¹ Andrew Barker “eleven-struck,” while Martha Maas and Jane McIntosh Snyder understand “a rhythmic pattern involving eleven beats rather than the use of eleven different strings,” and Martin West “with eleven-note.”¹²

While Csapo and Wilson only tentatively offer that “stories [about the invention of extra strings] were perhaps encouraged by Timotheus' own words in *Persians* (PMG 791.230),” I believe that Timotheus' compound precisely constructs ambiguity around the exact nature of the poet's musical and poetic contribution.¹³ The technical vagueness of μέτροις ῥυθμοῖς τ' ἑνδεκακρουμάτοις and the musical and historical difficulties the compound entails function in context as a powerful rhetorical tool. It invites us not so much to focus on the expression as an isolated problem of musical archaeology, but to consider, more generally, the function of the expression in the *sphragis*. Let me now turn to this aspect.

8. On Ion's passage: Levin (1961, 296) notes that Reinach 1901 “has shown that attempts to render the Greek intelligible are difficult to understand musically, while interpretations making musical sense have depended on violent emendations of the words”; see also Borthwick 1967, 146; Comotti 1972; West 1992a, 23–28. On Pherecrates: Düring 1945, 176–87; Borthwick 1968; Restani 1983; Zimmermann 1993; Dobrov and Urios-Aparisi 1995; Power 2001, 81–85.

9. Power 2001, 207–8, and 2007; Csapo 2004; Csapo and Wilson 2009; Prauscello 2009.

10. Power 2007, 186.

11. Janssen (1984, 142–43) introduces some ambiguity by referring to “beats,” a term that can be confused in the English translation with rhythmical beats in a modern sense. He justifies his denial of the many strings by suggesting that Timotheus might rely on the *strobilus* to modulate between *harmoniae*, a technical innovation that he attributes, without details, to Phrynichos (at 142) and to Phrynys (at 150, using the authority of Pherecrates). But this invention is not well attested: see Düring 1945, 186–94; Barker 1984, 237 n. 201.

12. Barker 1984, 96; Maas and Snyder 1989, 62; West 1992b, 63 and 362. LSJ (s.v. ἑνδεκακρούματος) gives “employing eleven notes.”

13. Csapo and Wilson 2009, 283.

(2) First, what Timotheus seeks to “bring to new life” (ἐξανατέλλει) is the κίθαρις. The noun is found in Homer and refers both to an instrument, the *kitharis*, also called *phorminx* (the four-stringed, round-based box lyre), and to the art itself of playing that instrument.¹⁴ Although the *kitharis* appears in a few instances after Homer (in two Homeric hymns, once in Alcman, once in Pindar, once in Aristophanes, and twice in Timotheus’ contemporary, Euripides),¹⁵ in all these cases, the noun is used only in connection with divine or heroic figures—Apollo, Leto, Hermes, and Orpheus. From the outset, the use of κίθαρις thus casts doubt on the notion that a historical musical reality is being conveyed in Timotheus’ lines. The important point is that Timotheus’ image of the awakening of the *kitharis* relies on the poetic past of this word and the heroic and Homeric authority associated with it. This process of relying on the authority of the poetic tradition is even more clearly illustrated in the next lines: in lines 232–33, the poet adds to the metaphorical treasure house (θησαυρὸν πολύμυτον)—the poetic tradition—by appropriating a Pindaric image (*Pyth.* 6.5–9) and transforming the metaphor, while introducing a linguistic coinage, the neologism θαλαμευτόν. In the same way, Timotheus appropriates the image of the (Homeric) *kitharis*, concentrates the epic past of the instrument or practice in one noun and qualifies it with an ambiguous linguistic coinage (μέτροις ῥυθμοῖς τ’ ἐνδεκακρούματις). This reliance on images and words evoking the poetic past and their use in new collocations colored by newly coined adjectives is only one aspect of a more general process that can be called the “rhetoric of tradition.”

A second aspect of this rhetoric is illustrated by the use of ἐνδεκακρούματος in the series of musicians. In the priamel of poets in which Timotheus presents himself and his μέτρα ῥυθμοί τ’ ἐνδεκακρούματοι, the number eleven follows the “ten” somethings to which Terpander yoked the Muse in his songs (ἐπὶ τῷ δέκα, 225–26), and precedes the “twelve” of the twelve-walled people of Miletus (δωδεκατειχὺς λαοῦ, 235–36). Granted, this series does not make much sense as a whole: what do the ten (strings? notes? songs?)¹⁶ of Terpander have to do with the twelve walls of the people (“perhaps with reference to the Ionian confederation of 12 cities . . . of which Miletus was a member”¹⁷)? But I suggest that, in a manner typical of New Music aesthetics, the suggestion of an imaginary chronological and numeric unfolding is more important than the strict logical sense of the series:¹⁸ just as numbers in a series, 10-11-12, Timotheus caps the series of innovative poets and brings it to a close—a feeling of closure reinforced by the ring composition created by the use of πρώτος/

14. Barker 1984, 96 n. 17. On the Homeric *kitharis*, see Maas and Snyder 1989, 6–31; West 1992b, 50–55.

15. *Hom. Hymn. Ap.* 131, 188; *Hom. Hymn. Merc.* 499, 509, 515; Alcman *PMG* 41; Pind. *Pyth.* 5.65; Ar. *Thesm.* 124, in a parody of a hymn by “Agathon.” Euripides uses the noun *kitharis* twice, in connection with Thracian Orpheus (*Hyps.* 752g.10) and once in connection with the Asian *aulos* (*Erechth.* frag. 370.8). About the “‘New Musical’ associations of some sort” between “Asian kithara” and Orpheus, Euneus, and Dionysos, Wilson (2004, 305 n. 82) suggests that it might be “another case of the innovators developing an archaizing tradition for their instrument.”

16. For interpretation, see Barker 1984, 96 (“to the ten songs”); West 1992b, 362 (“with ten strings?”), and Hordern 2002, 242–43 (“on ten notes”).

17. Hordern 2002, ad loc.

18. See Csapo 2004, 226. For the numeric progression, see also Barker 1984, 96.

πρωτέος in the opening and closing lines of the priamel (221 and 236).¹⁹ Again, taken in isolation, the *kitharis* and its eleven strikes might not make musical and historical sense, yet it fits not only in the catalogue of mythical kitharodes (Orpheus and Terpander) but also in another sequence, parallel and both more abstract and more obvious—that of the numbers 10-11-12.

A third aspect of this rhetoric of innovation deserves attention. In another late-fifth-century poetic passage presenting Timotheus' contribution to musical history, Pherecrates (*PCG* 155) also adopts the priamel form. *Mousikē* starts her complaint by describing the changes introduced by Melanippides (lines 2–7), who loosened her with his twelve strings (*χαλαρωτέραν τ' ἐποίησε χορδαῖς δώδεκα*, 5). She then describes Cinesias (8–13) and Phrynis (14–18), who bent and twisted her into a total wreck with twelve ways of tuning on five strings (?) (*κάμπτων με καὶ στρέφων ὄλην διέφθορεν / ἐν πέντε χορδαῖς δώδεχ' ἁρμονίας ἔχων*, 15–16),²⁰ and finally Timotheus (19–25), who stripped her and unraveled her with his twelve strings (*ἀπέλυσε κἀνέλυσε χορδαῖς δώδεκα*, 25). But while most critics see in Pherecrates' priamel a reference to the *sphragis* of the *Persians*, it is tempting, in light of Timotheus' own use of invective topoi earlier in the *sphragis*, to see the lyric poet borrowing the persona and the technique of his comic contemporary.²¹ This idea has already been explored by Power, but some aspects of Pherecrates' text can be further examined:²² one of its important features is its reliance on and distortion of the priamel form. A recurring feature of the passage is its use of the number twelve, employed three times in *χορδαῖς δώδεκα* with respect to Melanippides (line 5), Phrynis (16), and Timotheus (25). Whether we want to read *χορδαῖς δώδεκα* as historically accurate or as poetically vague (as a generic term for many),²³ the expression seems to be used in the three instances in which it occurs in Pherecrates as a form of technical sounding language. The sense of an evolution toward more and more decadence that Pherecrates' *Mousikē* wishes to convey is actually at odds with how she describes it: just as the repetition of the expression *ἀλλ' οὖν ὅμως οὗτος μὲν ἦν ἀποχρῶν ἀνὴρ / ἔμοιγε* ("all the same, I found him sufferable enough")²⁴ contributes to placing the musical offenders Melanippides, Cinesias, and Phrynis on the same level of debauchery, the repetition of *χορδαῖς δώδεκα* does not single out Timotheus as particularly innovative in matters of instrumental setup. Moreover, the second of the three times that the audience hears *χορδαῖς δώδεκα*, it does not make sense as a grammatical unit. Although in all three instances it occupies

19. One could add that the reference to the (Pierian?) Muse in 223–24 (οὐδὲς Καλλιόπας † περιάσσει †) might even suggest a number 9 before the 10-11-12 sequence.

20. West (1992a, 28–29) underlines the difficulties of playing twelve *harmoniae* on five strings and emends *ἐν τοῖς*. I suggest that it is part of the comic rewriting and appropriation of technical language that twelve *harmoniae* on five strings might be musically impossible, but that they precisely contribute to the impression of fake expert discourse, using the buzzwords of the time.

21. The dating of both poems is a matter of debate. Hordern 2002, 15–17, sums up the scholarship on Timotheus' *Persae*. On the dating of Pherecrates, see Wilamowitz 1903, 74–75; Düring 1945, 177; Nesselrath 1990, 250; Power 2001, 81–82.

22. Power 2001, 198–200.

23. As suggested by Düring 1945, 182; Maas 1992, 78; Zimmermann 1993, 41.

24. There are slight variations between the expression in lines 6–7, *ἀλλ' οὖν ἀνεκτὸς οὗτος ἦν ὅμως ἐμοί* in 13, and *ἀλλ' οὖν ἐμοιγε χούτος ἦν ἀποχρῶν ἀνὴρ* in 17, but their repetition conveys a "formulaic" feeling.

the same rhythmic position (long + iambic metron), in the second instance it does not correspond to a syntactic unit: χορδαῖς is modified by πέντε, and δώδεκα agrees with ἁρμονίας. Pherecrates' use of χορδαῖς δώδεκα thus adds a technical color to Pherecrates' priamel but conveys at the same time a feeling of musical stagnation or of uniformity between the different musicians. If we follow Power's attractive suggestion that Timotheus is responding to Pherecrates, the use of numbers in Timotheus' priamel is a witty yet effective response to the comic poet: the ἑνδεκακρουμάτοις of Timotheus introduces musical coloring and uses the same kind of (parodic?) technical language used by Pherecrates. At the same time, it picks up on the repetition of δώδεκα to correct the stagnant view of lyric history offered by Pherecrates and replaces it with a history of lyric practice that proceeds by slight incremental additions and transformations of a tradition. While the introduction of Timotheus in Pherecrates' text is presented as the ultimate catastrophe, the same formula (νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος) is used by Timotheus himself to achieve resolution.

(3) These remarks contribute to justifying the importance of Timotheus' use of the number eleven in the passage. Yet they leave open the question of the interpretation of the κρούματα: what do the strikes refer to? Building on the observations presented above, I should like, in the rest of this paper, to explore a nontechnical interpretation of ἑνδεκακρουμάτοις.

While there are morphological similarities between ἑνδεκακρουμάτοις and other compounds referring to a musical instrument, such as ἐπτακτύπου φόρμιγγος (Pind. *Pyth.* 2.70–71), φόρμιγγ' ἐπτάγλωσσον (Pind. *Nem.* 5.24), or ἐπτάτονον γάρυν (Bacchyl. frag. 20B.2), a semantic, nonmusical parallel for “eleven-struck” provides a new and economical approach to the problem. Eleven strikes appear in the parabasis of Aristophanes' *Knights*. At this point of the play, the coryphaeus comes forward and in something close to a defensive *sphragis* praises the poet for producing his play in his own name for the first time and concludes with a *propemptikon* to wish him good luck upon embarking on his poem (544–50):

... τούτων οὖν οὐνεκα πάντων,
 ὅτι σωφρονικῶς κοῦκ ἀνοήτως εἰσπηδήσας ἐφλυάρει, 545
 αἵρεσθ' αὐτῷ πολὺ τὸ ῥόθιον, παραπέμψατ' ἐφ' ἑνδεκα κώπαις,
 θόρυβον χρηστὸν ληναίτην,
 ἵν' ὁ ποιητὴς ἀπὶ χαίρων
 κατὰ νοῦν πράξας,
 φαιδρὸς λάμποντι μετώπῳ. 550

So for all these reasons, that he [the poet] acted discreetly, and didn't leap mindlessly in and spout rubbish, raise a big wave of applause for him, and give him an eleven-oar cheer worthy of the Lenaea, so that our poet may go away happy and successful, gleaming to the top of his shining head! (trans. Henderson 1998)

The coryphaeus' invitation to raise a clamor or cheer (θόρυβον) and a big wave of applause (ρόθιον) in the poet's honor, and to “escort him, upon eleven oars” (ἐφ' ἑνδεκα κώπαις) has much puzzled ancient and modern commentators, and the interpretation of the expression remains an unsolved problem.²⁵

25. The passage extends the image of ῥόθιον, the sound of the rushing of waves or the beating of oars, to that of applause, making it a synonym of θόρυβος.

A scholiast suggested that it is “a nautical command,” and the *Suda* proposes the same explanation.²⁶ But in his *Nautica* of 1895, Samuel Naber proposed to interpret the phrase as a riddling reference to the striking of the ten fingers and the tongue:

iam intelligis apud Aristophanem αἰνιγματωδῶς indicari decem digitos cum una lingua. iubet poeta spectatores voce adclamare et manibus plaudere; nam pedum supplotiones omisit.

One understands now that in Aristophanes it is a riddling reference to ten fingers and one tongue. The poet bids the audience to approve with their cheer and applaud with their hands; but he does not mention the stamping of the feet.²⁷

Alan Sommerstein follows this interpretation, translates “with all your eleven oars,” and suggests, most convincingly in my opinion, that “the likeliest interpretation of this obscure phrase is that the eleven oars are the fingers and the tongue, so that the phrase means ‘with applause and cheers.’”²⁸ Thomas Hubbard, however, contests Sommerstein’s interpretation on the grounds that “[i]f Aristophanes had meant ‘with hands and mouth’ (itself already a metonymy for clapping and cheers), he would have found a less opaque way of saying it.”²⁹ Even aside from the fact that Hubbard’s remark here hardly does justice to Aristophanes’ poetic imagination and elaborate uses of language, the idea expressed in Timotheus’ “eleven strikes” is less obscure than the expression in the *Knights*, since the κρούματα of ἑνδεκακρουμάτοις are a more direct echo of the expression κρούω χεῖρας (clap the hands, LSJ, s.v. κρούω [2]) than in the synecdochic κόπαις.³⁰

Moreover, this indirect way of referring to clapping and cheering is certainly not out of place in Timotheus’ narrative, brimming with compounds that function as periphrasis and whose meanings rely on the interpretation of synecdoches, metonymies, and metaphors. One typical feature of Timotheus’ language indeed is the poet’s fondness for developing the logic of both everyday and inherited poetic language, especially in compounds. This is the case, for example, with ἀβακχίωτος ὄμβρος (*PMG* 791.61–62), “unbacchic rain,” in context a periphrasis for seawater. The image relies on two expres-

26. Σ *Eq.* 546: <ἐφ’ ἑνδεκα κόπαις> κέλευσμα ναυτικόν λέγεται ἐφ’ ἑνδεκα κωπηλασίας ῥέκτεινομένην. Also *Suda*, s.vv. ἀποπέμψατ’ ἐφ’ ἑνδεκα κόπαις (α 3470 Adler): ἀπὸ τῶν ναυτικῶν. LSJ (s.v. κόπη) also gives πομπίμοις κόπαις ἐρέσσων (Soph. *Trach.* 561). This last phrase (“rowing with escorting oars”) and a comparable expression in Aeschylus (*Sept.* 862: ἐρέσσετε πόμπιμον χερσὶν πύτυλον, “ply with your hands an escorting sweep of oars”) lead me to believe that ἐφ’ ἑνδεκα κόπαις was indeed a nautical expression, from which the Sophoclean phrase is derived, rather than an ad hoc explanation provided by the scholiast and *Suda* to make sense of the expression ἐφ’ ἑνδεκα κόπαις in the *Knights*.

27. Naber 1895, 240. Merry (1895, ad loc.) explains: “perhaps the word κόπαι, properly meaning oarhandles, passes into the meaning of the spectators, which they clap together to applaud a favourite.” Coulon (1937, 38–40) and Taillardat (1962, 436) support the same interpretation. For the gesture and noisy audience participation, see also Pickard-Cambridge, Gould, and Lewis 1968, 272–73.

28. Sommerstein 1981, ad loc. To support this interpretation, Sommerstein refers to the metaphorical use of body parts for describing nautical elements and vice versa, including, *inter alia*, the image of the oars as hands in Timotheus (*PMG* 791.5–6: χεῖρας παρέσυρον ἐλατίνας). The most useful parallels are the comparison of a (middle) finger with a (mid-ship?) oar, ὥσπερ κώπη μεσόνεως (Arist. *Part. an.* 687b18), and the image of the tongue as an oar in Dionysus Chalcus (frag. 4.3–5 West = Ath. 669a): τὸν τε σὸν ἀρχαῖον τηλεδᾶπὸν τε φίλον / εἰρεσίην γλώσσης ἀποπέμψομεν εἰς μέγαν αἶνον / τοῦδ’ ἐπὶ συμποσίου (“With the oarage of the tongue we will send off your old faraway friend onto a great praise at this symposium”).

29. Hubbard 1989, 115.

30. Also s.v. κρότος “κ. χερῶν: clapping of hands, applause” (and reference to Ar. *Ran.* 157).

sions: the Homeric οἶνοπα πόντον (wine-dark sea) and the expression οἶνος ἄκρητος (unmixed wine, i.e., wine without water). The Timothean phrase activates the image contained in the (unexpressed) Homeric formula: the sea *is* associated with wine, although in a negative form, ἀβακχίωτος. But it is also an inversion of the other (common) expression, οἶνος ἄκρητος, as it refers to unmixed *water*.³¹ A similar kind of linguistic process, I suggest, is at play in the compound ἐνδεκακρουμάτοις: the compound semantically plays on an (unstated) expression ἐφ' ἐνδεκα κώπαις ("on eleven oars," to signify cheer and applause) and condensates it in a compound morphologically reminiscent of lyric epithets used to describe instruments (ἐπτακτύπου, ἐπτάγλωσσον, ἐπτάτονον, etc.).³²

So, if the compound "eleven-struck" plays with the image of applauding hands and cheering tongue, what does the expression μέτροις / ῥυθμοῖς τ' ἐνδεκακρουμάτοις / κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει mean as a whole? I propose to understand the lines as "making the art of the kithara spring up again, with eleven-struck meters and rhythms," that is, with meters and rhythms that bring cheers of approval. The meters and rhythms are one of the major innovations of the New Musicians' compositions, but the very use of the meters in the *sphragis* illustrates the play between provocative innovation and concern for legitimization that we have already observed at work elsewhere in the *sphragis*:³³ although polymetry is illustrated throughout the poem, the *sphragis* itself only relies on traditional Aeolic meters familiar from hymnic poetry, while drawing attention to the poet's use of "eleven-struck" meters and rhythms in his awakening of the art of the kithara.³⁴

This interpretation of ἐνδεκακρουμάτοις thus sheds light on the rhetoric, and the stylistics, of the passage: if "eleven-struck" develops the logic of a nautical expression to refer to fingers and tongue, and metonymically to cheer and applause, the very compound that seems to refer to a controversial musical reality (a hyperchordic kithara) also signifies the approbation that the poet

31. On the image, see Gargiulo 1996.

32. In offering this nontechnical reading, I am emboldened by Barker's (1998) interpretation of a similarly puzzling periphrasis in a fragment of Timotheus, Telestes of Selinous: πενταρράβδῳ χορδῶν ἄρθμῳ (PMG 808.3). Barker (p. 77) proposes that "there is another possible interpretation which . . . is attractively simple, and has the great advantage of offering a sense which an audience could be expected to recognize. Scholars (from Athenaeus on) have missed it, I think, because their dedication to the quest for serious organological information in Telestes' words has diverted them from the possibility that there simply is none there. I suggest that once we put that assumption behind us, the natural reference of the word 'five-rodde' becomes rather obvious. The 'five-rodde' is the human hand. It would be extraordinary if anything else were intended." Both Barker's argument and my interpretation find added weight in the fact that Timotheus' and Telestes' riddling compounds both refer to the same object: the human hand(s) of the string player. This kind of creative one-upmanship among competitive New Music composers, finding innovative ways to engage with the same idea or the same myth, is illustrated in other New Music passages (see, e.g., PMG 758 and 805, on Athena and Marsyas, or 759 and 770, on the evocative etymology of Acheron).

33. On the metrical innovations of New Music, see [Plut.] *De mus.* 1132e, 1135c–d; Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 19, Heph. *Poem.* 3.3. On the *Persians*, composed in a mix of hexameters and iambo-trochaic and Aeolic meters, see Wilamowitz 1903, 29–38; and Korzeniewski 1974, whose position is discredited in Hordern 2002, 55–60.

34. I am very grateful to one of the journal's anonymous referees for suggesting an additional way of reading the compound, one that might "squeeze in something musically significant." If we follow Sommerstein's interpretation of the "eleven oars" of Aristophanes' expression as referring to the human ten fingers and tongue, Timotheus' revival of the *kitharis* with "eleven-struck rhythms and measures" could very well be a riddling way to describe his sophisticated use of his own ten fingers and tongue (or mouth)—in his role as a virtuoso *kitharoidos*, using his two hands to play and his tongue to sing.

will get in the reception of his metrical innovations. This interpretation has not been proposed before, in part because of critics' determination to give the phrase a musical or organological meaning in an overall metapoetic passage. Despite its necessarily tentative nature, this interpretation suggests new ways to do justice to a text once derided as a "vapid and silly [libretto],"³⁵ and invites us, if nothing else, to pay closer attention to the logic of Timotheus' poetic language.

PAULINE LEVEN
Yale University

35. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 51.

LITERATURE CITED

- Barker, A. 1984. *Ancient Musical Writing*. Vol. 1, *The Musician and His Art*. Cambridge.
- . 1998. Telestes and the "Five-Rodded Joining of Strings." *CQ* 48: 75–81.
- Borthwick, E. K. 1967. Some Problems in Musical Terminology. *CQ* 17: 145–57.
- . 1968. Notes on the Plutarch *De musica* and the *Cheiron* of Pherecrates. *Hermes* 96: 60–73.
- Comotti, G. 1972. L'endecacordo di Ione di Chio. *QUCC* 13: 54–61.
- Coulon, V. 1937. Observations philologiques sur divers passages d'Aristophane. *REG* 50: 14–51.
- Csapo, E. 2004. The Politics of the New Music. In *Music and the Muses: The Culture of "Mousike" in the Classical Athenian City*, ed. P. Murray and P. Wilson, 207–48. Oxford.
- Csapo, E., and P. Wilson. 2009. Timotheus the New Musician. In *Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, ed. F. Budelmann, 277–93. Cambridge.
- d'Angour, A. 2006. The New Music—So What's New? In *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece*, ed. S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, 264–83. Cambridge.
- Dobrov, G., and E. W. Urios-Aparisi. 1995. The Maculate Music: Gender, Genre, and the *Chiron* of Pherecrates. In *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*, ed. G. Dobrov, 139–74. Atlanta.
- Düring, I. 1945. Studies in Musical Terminology in Fifth-Century Literature. *Eranos* 43: 176–97.
- Gargiulo, T. 1996. Mare e vino nei *Persiani*: Una congettura a Timoteo, fr. 791, 61–62 Page. *QUCC* 54: 73–81.
- Henderson, J., ed. and trans. 1998. *Aristophanes—"Acharnians," "Knights."* Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Hordern, J. 2002. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford.
- Hubbard, T. 1989. The *Knights'* Eleven Oars (Aristophanes, *Equites* 546–547). *CJ* 85: 115–18.
- Janssen, T. H. 1984. *Timotheus "Persae."* Amsterdam.
- Korzeniewski, D. 1974. Die Binnenresponson in den "Persern" des Timotheus. *Philologus* 118: 22–39.
- Levin, F. 1961. The Hendecachord of Ion of Chios. *TAPA* 92: 295–307.
- Maas, M. 1992. *Polychordia* and the Fourth-Century Greek Lyre. *Journal of Musicology* 10: 74–88.
- Maas, M., and J. McIntosh Snyder. 1989. *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece*. New Haven, Conn.
- Merry, W. 1895. *Aristophanes, "The Knights."* Oxford.
- Naber, S. 1895. *Nautica. Mnemosyne* 23: 234–69.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. 1990. *Die Attische mittlere Komödie: Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte*. Berlin.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1962. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*². Oxford.

- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W., J. Gould, and D. M. Lewis. 1968. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*². London.
- Power, T. 2001. Legitimizing the *Nomos*: Timotheus' *Persae* in Athens. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University.
- . 2007. Ion of Chios and the Politics of Polychordia. In *The World of Ion of Chios*, ed. V. Jennings and A. Katsaros, 179–205. Leiden.
- Prauscello, L. 2009. Wandering Poetry, Travelling Music: Timotheus' Muse and Some Case-Studies of Shifting Cultural Identities. In *Wandering Poets in the Ancient Greek Culture*, ed. I. C. Rutherford and R. Hunter, 167–94. Cambridge.
- Reinach, T. 1901. Un fragment d'Ion de Chios. *REG* 14: 8–19.
- Restani, D. 1983. Il *Chirone* di Ferecrate e la "nuova" musica greca. *Rivista italiana di musicologia* 18: 139–92.
- Rocconi, E. 2003. *Le parole delle Muse: La formazione del lessico tecnico musicale nella Grecia classica*. Rome.
- Sarti, S. 1992. Gli strumenti musicali di Apollo. *AION*(archeol) 14: 95–104.
- . 2003. La kithara greca nei documenti archeologici. *RBPH* 81: 47–68.
- Sommerstein, A. 1981. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: "Knights."* Warminster.
- Taillardat, J. 1962. *Les images d'Aristophane*. Paris.
- Visconti, A. 1999. *Aristosseno di Taranto: Biografia e formazione spirituale*. Naples.
- West, M. L. 1992a. *Analecta Musica*. *ZPE* 92: 1–54.
- . 1992b. *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1903. *Timotheos: "Die Perser"—Aus einem Papyrus von Abusir im Auftrage der deutschen Orientgesellschaft*. Leipzig.
- Wilson, P. 2004. Athenian Strings. In *Music and the Muses: The Culture of "Mousike" in the Classical Athenian City*, ed. P. Murray and P. Wilson, 269–306. Oxford.
- Zimmermann, B. 1993. Comedy's Criticism of Music. In *Intertextualität in der griechisch-römischen Komödie*, ed. N. Slater and B. Zimmermann, 39–50. Stuttgart.

CATULLUS' FURIUS

While there is probably no *communis opinio* on the identity of the Furius mentioned in Catullus 11, 16, 23, 26, and by implication 24, by far the most widely favored identification, especially after the study of W. A. Heidel, is M. Furius Bibaculus.¹ Bibaculus was a contemporary of Catullus and a fellow neoteric poet, and he is mentioned alongside Catullus as a lampooner of the Caesars and a writer of iambus.² Like Catullus he was from Cisalpine Gaul

1. Heidel 1901. This identification has been accepted and/or argued for by, e.g., Hendrickson (1917, 88 n. 1); Spaeth (1936, 550); Neudling (1955, 71); Frank (1928, 85, 284 n. 7); Green (1940, 348–56); Loomis (1969), who points out metrical and stylistic similarities between the two poets; Fordyce (1961, 124, 156); Granarolo (1973, 306); Lyne (1978, 171 n. 13); Arkins (1982, 107); Nisbet (1995, 393–95); Beck (1996, 168, 277); and Hollis (2007, 127). This view is not universally shared: Quinn (1973, 160, 169) and Thomson (1997, 236) are noncommittal; Courtney (1993, 200) is hesitant; Syndikus (1984, 140 n. 3) finds the identification very unlikely, but his statement that *nothing* indicates the Furius in question was the literary figure Bibaculus seems to breezily dismiss a century's worth of scholarship arguing otherwise.

2. Tac. *Ann.* 4.34 (*carmina Bibaculi et Catulli referta contumeliis Caesarum leguntur*) may indicate that Catullus attacked Julius Caesar and Bibaculus attacked Octavian/Augustus. Courtney (1993, 199) and Hollis (2007, 127–28) incline to this view, but Neudling (1955, 71–72) and Nisbet (1995, 394) consider it probable that Bibaculus disparaged both men. Neudling explains Furius' *Annales*, his epic on Caesar's campaigns in