

Nina Almazova

ALEXANDER POLYHISTOR AND GLAUCUS
OF RHEGIUM AS SOURCES OF PSEUDO-
PLUTARCH'S TREATISE *DE MUSICA*
III–IV

To the memory of Andrew Barker

I have argued in *Hyperboreus* 27: 2 (2021) 266–290 that the main sources of the first part of Ps.-Plutarchus' *Περὶ μουσικῆς* (ch. 3–10) are both Heraclides of Pontus and Alexander Polyhistor and that in ch. 5 and 7 the compiler quotes Glaucus of Rhegium from Alexander's (and not Heraclides') text. Defending my point of view requires facing two more problems. Firstly, I have to demonstrate that Ps.-Plutarch knew Glaucus indirectly¹ rather than first hand. Secondly, I must address two quotations from Glaucus not yet considered (ch. 10) and try to establish whether their source was Heraclides or Alexander.

III

There is no clear solution to the first question, since the information at our disposal is insufficient. Of most significance is the use of the indefinite pronoun, as the compiler introduces the book of Glaucus for the first time: ἐν συγγράμματι **τινι** τῷ² Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν τε καὶ

¹ Contrary to Volkmann 1856, XII, this is the opinion of Westphal 1865, 69; Weil–Reinach 1900, XI–XII; Jacoby 1941, 100 n. 1; Gostoli 2011, 39; Pöhlmann 2011, 16; 24; Barker 2014, 36–40. All these scholars believe that the quotations from Glaucus found their way into the book of Ps.-Plutarch through Heraclides. It has been hypothesized (Presta 1965, 84; Barker 2009, 279) that, since the data of Glaucus were used by Heraclides and by Aristoteles (in *Περὶ ποιητῶν*), his treatise was eventually supplanted by these popular works. However, it was still known at least in the 2nd cent. BC: he was cited by Apollodorus, *FGrHist* 244 F 32 (see Gostoli 2015, 129; ead. 2020, 141).

² As observed by Wyttenbach 1800 (see the apparatus by Ziegler–Pohlenz 1959, 4 ad loc.), τινι together with τῷ is suspect. Perhaps τινι duplicated the original τῷ: see Weil–Reinach 1900, 20–21 § 47.

μουσικῶν (1132 E). This looks like a referral to a book he has never held in his hands. I also think important that the phrase ἐζηλωκέναι δὲ τὸν Τέρπανδρον Ὀμήρου μὲν τὰ ἔπη, Ὀρφέως δὲ τὰ μέλη (1132 F), which I consider a quotation from Glaucus, is governed by Ἀλέξανδρος ... ἔφη: it would have made no sense to quote Glaucus second hand if the compiler possessed his book.

Aside from that, one can only draw conclusions by examining Ps.-Plutarch's abilities as a compiler and analyzing the ways in which he worked with his sources. This author traditionally has a bad name among modern scholars, and an appreciation recently attempted by A. Barker led to the same results: he is considered an unoriginal and unintelligent writer, who is only capable of copying his sources mechanically, rather than re-considering them and reorganizing them into content.³ Nevertheless, let us pose again the question which is of primary importance for this paper: is Ps.-Plutarch capable of taking a critical and analytical approach to his predecessors?

The principle of composition is one and the same in ch. 3 to 10, regardless of their possible sources. It is based on lists of artists famous in a certain field in a certain period: legendary poets-musicians up to the Trojan war; the first authors of poetic nomes (citharodic and aulodic); the founders of auletics; citharodes who followed Terpander; and representatives of the "second phase of musical organization". Thus the "historical" section of the treatise is mainly a catalogue of *πρῶτοι εὑρεταί*.⁴ That is how the author twice (at the beginning and at the end of Lysias' speech) formulates his scope.⁵ Most likely, this was not Ps.-Plutarch's own choice – he accepted this principle from his sources. Cataloging inventors is typical of Greek historians of art and science.⁶ In fact, we find elements of such lists in Heraclides (ch. 3), in Polyhistor (ch. 5), and in Glaucus.

³ E.g. Weil-Reinach 1900, IV–V; XXIII; Henderson 1957, 379; Ziegler-Pohlenz 1959, XI ("compiler stultissimus"); Rosenmeyer 1968, 222 ("a mine of ill-considered and jumbled information"); Barker 2014, 29; 103–104; Lucarini 2020, 71 ("keine ausgeprägte Denkfähigkeit"); Gostoli 2020, 142.

⁴ As noted e.g. by Kleingünther 1933, 138–139; Lanata 1963, 273–274; Gostoli 2011, 36.

⁵ 1131 E: *τίς πρῶτος ἐχρήσατο μουσικῇ, ἀναμνήσατε τοὺς ἐταίρους, καὶ τί εὔρε πρὸς αὐξήσιν ταύτης ὁ χρόνος, καὶ τίνες γεγόνασιν εὐδόκιμοι τῶν τὴν μουσικὴν ἐπιστήμην μεταχειρισσαμένων*; 1135 D: *εἰρηκῶς κατὰ δύναμιν περὶ τε τῆς πρώτης μουσικῆς καὶ τῶν πρῶτον εὐρόντων αὐτήν, καὶ ὑπὸ τίνων κατὰ χρόνους ταῖς προσεξευρέσεσιν ἠῴζηται*.

⁶ See e.g. Kleingünther 1933, 135–143; Zhmud 2006, 23–44; Barker 2014, 42.

From time to time, alternative versions are adduced in the treatise; sometimes they are left without comments,⁷ while in other cases the variant thought to be true is indicated.⁸

Besides, the author alternates between chronicling the inventors and reasoning on certain problems: on epic metre of the first nomes; on nomes as musical laws; on corruption of music in the time of Phrynis and Timotheus; on the part played by Lesbian citharodes in Sparta; on elegy as a musical genre; on the genres in which the poets of the second phase of musical organization composed.

Now, can we think that the author of *Περὶ μουσικῆς* fulfils his own research work, namely, (1) compares different versions and (2) selects facts that support his argument in favour of the postulates that were dear to him?

By happy chance we have an example which allows us to review the way Ps.-Plutarch worked with his sources. In ch. 5 (1133 A) we read:

γεγονέναι δὲ καὶ Πολύμνηστον ποιητὴν, Μέλητος τοῦ Κολοφωνίου υἱόν,
ὃν [Πολύμνηστόν] *** τε καὶ Πολυμνήστην νόμους ποιῆσαι. περὶ δὲ
Κλονᾶ ὅτι τὸν Ἀπόθετον νόμον καὶ Σχοινίωνα πεποιηκῶς εἶη μνημο-
νεύουσιν οἱ ἀναγεγραφότες.

This phrase is perplexing, since the existence of Polymnestus of Colophon has been already stated above (ch. 3, 1132 C), and which is more, not two, but seven or eight aulodic nomes ascribed to the first inventors have been enumerated (ch. 4, 1132 D):

Οἱ δὲ νόμοι οἱ κατὰ τούτους, ἀγαθὲ Ὀνησίκρατες, αὐλωδικοὶ ἦσαν·
Ἀπόθετος, Ἑλεγχοί, Κωμάρχιος, Σχοινίων, Κηπίων τε καὶ † Δεῖος καὶ
Τριμερής· ὑστέρῳ δὲ χρόνῳ καὶ τὰ Πολυμνήστεια καλούμενα ἐξευρέθη.

If one takes the words of Ps.-Plutarch literally, the following understanding suggests itself: in the time of Clonas and Polymnestus (indicated by κατὰ τούτους in 1132 D) there were seven nomes just mentioned (it is not yet clear whether some of them were composed by Clonas and

⁷ 1132 A: Clonas comes from Tegea, according to the Arcadians, or from Thebes, according to the Boeotians. *Ibid.*: there is a version that Ardalos of Troezen – rather than Clonas – was the first aulode. 1133 B: it is said that Philammon from Delphi invented some of the citharodic nomes ascribed to Terpander. 1134 A–B: some people ascribe the Tripartite nome to Sacadas, while the Sicyonian chronicle ascribes it to Clonas.

⁸ 1133 C–D: those who think Hipponax contemporary to Terpander are wrong. Cf. the discussion on the genre of Xenodamus in ch. 9, 1134 C–D.

the other by Polymnestus, or both authors created all the seven types), whereas the so-called Polymnestian nomes do not really belong to Polymnestus, for they were composed later. In this case, below in ch. 5 a definition is offered (with a reference to οἱ ἀναγεγραφότες): it turns out that Clonas was the author of two nomes out of seven, Ἀπόθετος and Σχοινίων. The reader concludes that the remaining five were by Polymnestus. However, of Polymnestus it had just been said that his nomes bore his name (that much is clear in spite of text corruption)! Besides, the question of who composed the Polymnestian nomes, if not Polymnestus himself, remains without answer in the treatise. Lucarini postulates an alternative version here, which disputes the data of ch. 4.⁹

Yet we cannot believe for long that the impact of Clonas was limited to two nomes, since at the end of ch. 8 (1134 B) we face a new affirmation:

ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀναγραφῇ τῇ περὶ τῶν ποιητῶν Κλονᾶς εὐρετῆς ἀναγράφεται τοῦ Τριμεροῦς νόμου.

It now becomes clear that in all three cases we deal with the list of seven aulodic nomes which Heraclides found in the Sicyonian chronicle, where the authorship of Clonas was indicated for all of them. In ch. 8 the new reference to this list comes in a polemical context: someone ascribed νόμος Τριμερῆς to Sacadas, rather than to Clonas. Ps.-Plutarch does not comment on which attribution of the Tripartite nome must be right.

The true meaning of addressing the nomes Ἀπόθετος and Σχοινίων in ch. 5 becomes evident if one compares it with two parallel passages in Pollux.

Poll. 4. 65: σφάλλονται δὲ οἱ καὶ Ἀπόθετον προστιθέντες αὐτῷ (sc. Τερπάνδρῳ) καὶ Σχοινίωνα· οὗτοι γὰρ αὐλητικοί.¹⁰

Poll. 4. 79: καὶ Κλονᾶ δὲ νόμοι αὐλητικοὶ Ἀπόθετός τε καὶ Σχοινίων.

It is stated that Pollux used Heraclides (though probably at second hand),¹¹ so the unique matching information on Ἀπόθετος and Σχοινίων in two Roman era authors surely originated in his work. From Pollux it

⁹ Lucarini 2020, 76.

¹⁰ Pollux does not use the word αὐλωδικός, but replaces it by αὐλητικός in a broad sense “dealing with aulos-playing” (Almazova 2008, 22).

¹¹ This is proved by setting forth Heraclides’ ideas on ἀρμονία (Athen. 14. 624 D = Heraclid. fr. 163 Wehrli) in Poll. 4. 65 (Rohde 1870, 69–70; Weil–Reinach 1900, VII–VIII; Wehrli 1969, 116).

becomes clear that the *Συναγωγή* of the Pontic scholar contained polemics against those who erroneously ascribed these two nomes to Terpander.

As for the work of Heraclides, this proves that he juxtaposed alternative versions from various sources (which is exactly what the genre of *συναγωγή* implies¹²) and, when possible, upheld the variant he believed to be true. In particular, this case clearly shows that Heraclides considered the testimony of the Sicyonian inscription authoritative enough to be used as an argument in his discussion.

As for Ps.-Plutarch, this analysis proves that he mechanically copied out information on the characters mentioned, did not mind repetitions arising in his summary and paid no attention to the fact that removing polemical context would deprive his reader of the possibility of following Heraclides' thought, or that his wording could be misleading. Clumsy usage of pronouns must be especially noted: unhelpfully putting *κατὰ τούτους* at the beginning (1132 D), he failed to make clear that some of the aulodic nomes – that of Clonas – belonged to the first generation, and the other – that of Polymnestus – to the second.

Observations concerning the structure of various parts of *Περὶ μουσικῆς* can be added. Some sections are conspicuous for their lack of order in expounding evidence: the author skips from one musician to another and repeatedly comes back to those already mentioned, instead of describing them one after another.¹³ The structure of ch. 4–5 – one of the most unskillful sections (1132 E – 1133 B) – can serve as an example:¹⁴

Terpander [1]

Archilochus [1] (confronted with Terpander and Clonas)

Olympus [1]

Idaeon Dactyls

Hyagnis

Marsyas

Olympus [2]

Terpander [2]

¹² See Barker 2014, 31–32; Gostoli 2020, 135.

¹³ The attempt of Westphal 1865, 69 to trace a strict order in the chapters on the nomes of Terpander, Clonas and Polymnestus is unconvincing – it is impossible to distinguish his sections by contents: (1) Die Componisten der Nomoi (p. 3, 26–4, 8); (2) Die einzelnen Nomoi (p. 4, 9–22); (3) Persönlichkeit und Zeitalter der Componisten (p. 4, 22–5, 19); (4) Nachträgliches (p. 5, 10–25). E.g., the demonstration that the first nomic composers used epic metre is present both in the first and the second section, and the names of the nomes and chronological data occur in the fourth section instead of the second and the third respectively. See also Hiller 1886, 422–423.

¹⁴ Italics indicate the names which I think taken from the book of Polyhistor.

Orpheus

Clonas [1]

Archilochus [2] (confronted with Terpander and Clonas)

Clonas [2] (confronted with Ardalus)

Polymnestus [1]

Clonas [3]

Polymnestus [2]

Terpander [3] (confronted with Philammon)

It appears that the compiler simply wrote out his information as he came across it, made no attempt to organize it and did not even notice the repetitions.

The same is the structure of ch. 7, notwithstanding the fact that here the names of the *nomes* feature as ‘rubricators’:

Olympus the elder [1]*Olympus the younger* [1]*Olympus the elder* [2] (confronted with Marsyas)*Crates**Olympus the younger* [2]*Olympus the elder* [3]*Marsyas* (confronted with Hyagnis)*Olympus* (the elder?) [4]

It is in the same style of incoherent rough drafts that the end of ch. 6 (following the discussion of the *nomes*), ch. 8 and ch. 9–10 (the part following the list of genres) is composed; the only difference is that the author does not return to the same character several times.

Since in ch. 5 and 7 evidence of different sources is represented in the same disarray, it seems obvious that the compiler is to blame. The books he addressed must have contained a more detailed and connective exposition.¹⁵ Ps.-Plutarch produces a most unskillful summarizing with numerous gaps. One reason why the examined sections are distinguished by particular confusion can be postulated: this must have happened each time as the compiler did not follow the train of thought of just one author, but rather chose his material selectively, or else had to interpret different points of view. In ch. 7, I believe that Ps.-Plutarch tried to switch the order from ‘by musicians’ to ‘by *nomes*’. As for the information on Terpander, Clonas and Polymnestus (ch. 4–5), one can imagine that Heraclides, whose book the compiler used, alternated extractions on a certain subject

¹⁵ Westphal 1865, 69.

from various and sometimes contradicting sources, among which we know the Sicyonian chronicle, Glaucus and the poets – Pindar and Alcman. Any reappraisal of this information in *Περὶ μουσικῆς* in order to create an integral picture out of it is out of the question. As was repeatedly noted, Ps.-Plutarch makes no conclusions, he is only capable of “copy-and-pasting”.¹⁶ Moreover, his unsuitable abridgement of his sources’ considerations and inappropriate wording cause misunderstanding: it is enough to recollect the incomprehensible expression φησὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν δεύτερον γενέσθαι μετὰ τοὺς πρώτους ποιήσαντας αὐλωδίαν (1132 E, p. 5, 1–2) analyzed in part I.¹⁷

Thereafter, each time we see that a quotation (e.g. from Glaucus) is logically inserted into the argument, we should remember that Ps.-Plutarch simply was not capable of this.

IV

Now let us analyze the structure of the section containing two last references to the Rhegian scholar.

Glaucus is identified four times in *Περὶ μουσικῆς* (ch. 4, 1132 E; ch. 7, 1133 F; ch. 10, 1134 D and E), and two more quotations can be postulated¹⁸ in ch. 5 (1132 F and 1133 A).¹⁹ According to the conclusions made above, he was referred to by both Heraclides and Alexander: probably Glaucus’ work on ancient poets and musicians made such a valuable contribution to the history of arts that later writers on the same subject could not do without it. It seems that quotations concerning Olympus’ impact are taken from the book of Alexander (1132 F and 1133 F), whereas Heraclides had no grounds to adduce them, for he displayed no interest in instrumental aulos music. Now, two more fragments remain (ch. 10, 1134 D–E, p. 9, 4–11 and 15–16): in the first, Glaucus postulates the influence of Archilochus and Olympus on Thaletas (and places Thaletas after Archilochus), and in the second, he affirms that Thaletas is older than Xenocritus. So, we have to control whether these references can be integrated into the general scheme: is it possible to assume that the fragment of Glaucus about Olympus in ch. 10 is taken from Polyhistor, like the other quotations on

¹⁶ Weil–Reinach 1900, IV–V; Barker 2014, 29; 37; Gostoli 2015, 130.

¹⁷ Almazova 2021b, 276–279.

¹⁸ See Almazova 2021b, 274–275; 279.

¹⁹ Attempts have been made to ascribe still more material to Glaucus, but these suggestions, at best, cannot be verified: Zieliński 1885, 303 – ch. 28 (which is in fact from Aristoxenus, see Meriani 2003, 77–79); Franklin 2010–2011, 744 – ch. 6; 759–760 – the reference to Terpander’s Pythian victories in ch. 4, p. 4, 24.

the same subject? Of course, the need to conclude that Glaucus' statement of Olympus' influence in ch. 7 (on Stesichorus) is taken from Alexander, and an identical statement in ch. 10 (on Thaletas) is not, would inevitably make my reconstruction less probable.

No doubt, the entirety of the information adduced in ch. 9–10 could not belong to a composition dedicated to Phrygia: the birthplaces of musicians mentioned there are Crete, Cythera, Locri, Colophon and Argos, and the region of their activity is Peloponnesus (Lacedaemon, Arcadia and Argos). However, we must see whether only the quotation from Glaucus could be borrowed from Polyhistor.

In ch. 9 yet another group of musicians is listed²⁰ – this time those who took part in the “second phase of musical organization”.²¹ The following section (ch. 9–10, p. 8, 18 – 9, 16) is dedicated to the debate over what the genres were in which they composed. Ps.-Plutarch – as usually – causes confusion. At first, he cites the thesis of one party, not considering it necessary to warn that this is not the universally accepted point of view: Thaletas, Xenodamus and Xenocritus composed paeans; Polymnestus, “the so-called Orthians” (τῶν Ὀρθίων καλουμένων: this statement puzzles the reader, since above, 1132 C and 1133 A, Polymnestus was represented as the author of aulodic nomes and processional hymns); and Sacadas, elegies. Immediately below, four points of this claim (all but that on Sacadas) are called in question, not all together, but one by one, yet in a different order (Xenodamus – Polymnestus – Thaletas – Xenocritus). A natural, it would seem, attempt to link the discussion about generic attributes of paeon in three poets²² and to separate it from the examination of the Orthian nome is never made.

The idea that Polymnestus has something to do with the Orthian nome is ascribed to the “harmonians” (1134 D, p. 8, 28 – 9, 2):

²⁰ Two of them have been mentioned above: Polymnestus in ch. 3–5 and 8, Sacadas in ch. 8.

²¹ Contrary to a popular view (e.g. Westphal 1863, 298; Weil–Reinach 1900, III; Riemann 1923, 68; Fileni 1987, 13; 16–17; Ercoles 2009, 157; 161; 167; Power 2010, 238; Ercoles 2013, 24; 380–381; 499; Barker 2014, 24; Gostoli 2015, 126; ead. 2020, 137; 138; Lucarini 2020, 72 and others), the modifier of place ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ (p. 8, 10) in fact refers only to the first phase of musical organization – that of Terpander – for the musicians named below were active not only in Sparta, but at least also in Arcadia and Argos.

²² Monotony with which Ps.-Plutarch introduces first the data on Thaletas (καὶ περὶ Θαλήτα δὲ ... εἰ παιάνων γεγένηται ποιητῆς ἀμφισβητεῖται), then on Xenocritus (περὶ δὲ Ξενοκρίτου ... ἀμφισβητεῖται εἰ παιάνων ποιητῆς γέγονεν), makes one suppose that he repeats twice the phrase which featured only once and integrated examination of several poets at once in his source.

Καὶ Πολύμνηστος δ' αὐλωδικοὺς νόμους ἐποίη-
 σεν· εἰ δὲ τῷ Ὀρθίῳ νόμῳ <ἐν> τῇ μελοποιίᾳ κέχρηται,
 καθάπερ οἱ ἁρμονικοὶ φασιν, οὐκ ἔχομεν [δ'] ἀκριβῶς
 εἰπεῖν· οὐ γὰρ εἰρήκασιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι τι περὶ τούτου.

εἰ Petavius : ἐν codd. | ἐν add. Volkmann (ἐν δὲ τῷ Ὀρθίῳ νόμῳ τῇ
 <ἐναρμονίῳ> μελοποιίᾳ Westphal) | δ' del. Volkmann

Perhaps the same harmonians declared the compositions of the authors representing the “second phase” to be paeans, but we do not know for sure.

Three (rather than two) parties can be traced in the discussion: the author in whose work Ps.-Plutarch found this argument was not the first to object to the definition of genres proposed at the beginning. While he may have added something new to the discussion, he certainly reproduced the doubts and counter-evidence of other critics as well. Thus Pratinas, who thought Xenodamus’ works to be hyporchemes, is identified as a critic of the paeon theory, and he is clearly one of many (ἄλλοι ... καθάπερ Πρατίνας, p. 8, 20–22); the author agrees and supports this view by observations on Pindar (p. 8, 25–27). A “two-layered” reference to reported speech, which argues that Xenocritus composed dithyrambs, is also significant: φασιν ... τινας διθυράμβους καλεῖν αὐτοῦ τὰς ὑποθέσεις (p. 9, 14–15). Apparently, various interpreters did not simply propose definitions of genres independently of each other, but engaged in polemics with one another, and the source of Ps.-Plutarch summarized and reconsidered this polemics, while also adding new arguments. As I believe, such activity is beyond the capacity of Ps.-Plutarch.

The most likely candidate to have been his source is Heraclides. General considerations are in favour of him: his genre of συναγωγή presupposed bringing together various evidence²³ (the συναγωγή by Polyhistor does not fit our case, for most information in this section has nothing to do with Phrygia). Besides, Heraclides is known²⁴ for his disposition to back up his arguments with references to the poets (e.g. to Pindar and Alcman in ch. 5, 1133 B, cf. ch. 9, 1134 D). To my mind, the most important proof is provided by the assertion: Καὶ Πολύμνηστος δ' αὐλωδικοὺς νόμους ἐποίησεν (ch. 10, p. 8, 28–29), which echoes “Heraclidean” ch. 3–5 and

²³ Certain differences of approach compared with the preceding chapters (e.g., the problem of genres was never considered above; elegy is a metre of Clonas and Polymnestus in ch. 3, but a genre of Sacadas in ch. 9), can be plausibly explained by assuming that it was Heraclides himself (rather than Ps.-Plutarch) who changed his source when reviewing a new period.

²⁴ Barker 2014, 33–34.

most probably goes back to the Sicyonian chronicle. There is an analogous reference to the Sicyonian inscription in ch. 8 (which contains common characters with ch. 9–10 – Sacadas and Polymnestus, and thus probably forms the same section with the following chapters): concerning the Tripartite nome the authorship of Sacadas is contested by the authorship of Clonas, which has been stated above by Heraclides.

It is often assumed that Glaucus took part in the discussion on genres²⁵ and opposed the statements adduced at the beginning, but this is not evident from the text. There seem to be three possible ways of interpreting the quotation(s): (1) Glaucus himself gave his view on genres; (2) someone else (Heraclides?) aptly adopted his discourse dedicated to other matters as an argument; (3) his data are irrelevant to the discussion and are adduced (by Ps.-Plutarch?) for no apparent reason.

- p. 9, 2 καὶ
περὶ Θαλήτα δὲ τοῦ Κρητὸς εἰ παιάνων γεγένηται ποι-
ητῆς ἀμφισβητεῖται. Γλαῦκος γὰρ μετ'
5 Ἀρχιλόχον φάσκων γεγενῆσθαι Θαλήταν, μεμιμῆσθαι μὲν
αὐτόν φησι τὰ Ἀρχιλόχου μέλη, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ μακρότερον
ἐκτεῖναι, καὶ Παίωνα καὶ Κρητικὸν ῥυθμὸν εἰς τὴν μελο- 1134E
ποιίαν ἐνθεῖναι· οἷς Ἀρχιλόχον μὴ κεχρησθαι, ἀλλ' οὐδ'
Ὀρφέα οὐδὲ Τέρπανδρον· ἐκ γὰρ τῆς Ὀλύμπου αὐλήσεως
10 Θαλήταν φασὶν ἐξειργάσθαι ταῦτα καὶ δόξαι ποιητὴν
ἀγαθὸν γεγονέναι.

6 τὰ : τοῦ ΑγNI : τὰ τοῦ Pet. 7 Παίωνα Ritschl : μάρωνα codd. : < τὸν ἐπιβατόν> Παίωνα Westph. 10 φασὶν : φησὶν dub. W.–R.²⁶

Judging from the way that the reference to Glaucus is introduced (γάρ should be explanatory²⁷), his words must refute the theory that Thaletas composed paeans. However, no genre is explicitly disclaimed or ascribed to the Cretan poet in the quotation, so one has to guess in what way the data of Glaucus are relevant to the discussion.²⁸

²⁵ Weil–Reinach 1900, 37; Privitera 1957, 100; Fileni 1987, 22; Barker 2009, 296–297; Gostoli 2011, 39.

²⁶ φασὶν, if correct, must either refer to Glaucus himself (due to the compiler's awkwardness) or imply that Glaucus on this point relied on the words of others rather than on personal analysis.

²⁷ See Denniston 1954, 60: “γάρ gives the motive for saying that which has just been said: I say this because...”.

²⁸ Cf. Hiller 1886, 414 n. 9: “Dieses wenig passende γάρ dient nur dazu, um an die Bemerkung περὶ Θαλήτα δὲ τοῦ Κρητὸς εἰ παιάνων γεγένηται ποιητῆς ἀμφισβητεῖται einiges speciellere über Thaletas anzuknüpfen”.

Anyway, there are reasons to doubt that Glaucus was expressing his opinion on all the musicians under review in this section. He is first referred to concerning Thaletas, i.e. after discussing the genres of Xenodamus and Polymnestus. Xenodamus is never mentioned in his fragments at all, and on Xenocritus we only have a chronological calculation placing him after Thaletas (p. 9, 15–16).²⁹

The case of Polymnestus looks more promising, since a fragment of Glaucus cited in ch. 7 (1133 E–F) also mentions the Orthian nome:

- p. 7, 10 ὅτι δ' ἐστὶν Ὀλύμπου ὁ Ἀρμάτειος νό-
 mos, ἐκ τῆς Γλαύκου συγγραφῆς τῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρχαίων 1133 F
 ποιητῶν μάθοι ἂν τις, καὶ ἔτι γνοίῃ ὅτι
 Στησίχορος ὁ Ἱμεραῖος οὐτ' Ὀρφέα οὔτε Τέρπανδρον
 οὐτ' Ἀρχίλοχον οὔτε Θαλήταν ἐμμήσατο, ἀλλ' Ὀλυμπον,
 15 χρησάμενος τῷ Ἀρματείῳ νόμῳ καὶ τῷ κατὰ δάκτυλον
 εἶδει, ὃ τινες ἐξ Ὀρθίου νόμου φασὶν εἶναι.

In ch. 10 the reference to the Orthian nome does not belong to the quotation from Glaucus, but his quotation which follows immediately below evidently bears a close similarity to the one adduced in ch. 7. They both deal with the same characters – not only Olympus, but also the sequence Orpheus – Terpander – Archilochus – Thaletas. Moreover, in both cases Glaucus singles out remarkable rhythmical elements, which offer evidence on the poets' mutual influences: he claims that Stesichorus (ch. 7) and Thaletas (ch. 10) borrowed certain rhythms from Olympus. Thus, it is almost certain that these two fragments from Glaucus belonged together in his treatise. Since in ch. 10 his analysis is inserted into a discussion on paeans, one could imagine that detecting such rhythmical peculiarities was applicable for judging not only the influences, but also the genres. These observations make it possible to assume that the passage on Polymnestus (1134 D, p. 8, 28 – 9, 2) also formed part of the same discussion: in ch. 10 it was Glaucus who opposed the harmonians concerning Polymnestus, and in ch. 7 his opponents who claimed that Stesichorus borrowed the dactylic rhythm from the Orthian nome were the same harmonians.³⁰

²⁹ Barker 2009, 280; 297 attributes the argument that Xenocritus composed dithyrambs rather than paeans (p. 9, 13–15) to Glaucus on the only grounds that it is placed between two quotations from him. He notes himself that this argument requires no musical analysis and is supplied with a reference to still other people's claim – in other words, demonstrates nothing typical of Glaucus. To my mind, the position between two references to Glaucus actually suggests that the intermediate text does not belong to him.

³⁰ Weil–Reinach 1900, XIII with n. 2; Almazova 2021a, 362–365.

However, this cannot be taken for granted. Firstly, in ch. 7 – just as in ch. 10 – the discussion in which Glaucus participated evidently concerned the sources of borrowings, but there are no signs that any party raised a problem of genre definition: Glaucus’ opponents seem not to argue that Stesichorus composed Orthian nomes, proving this by his use of a rhythm typical to them (a claim “this rhythm in Stesichorus’ works is borrowed from the Orthian nome” implies that there were no Orthian nomes among Stesichorus’ works).

Secondly, not only is there no proof that the addressing of the Orthian nome in ch. 10 has anything to do with Glaucus, but the argument reveals a purely Heraclidean approach: the affirmation that Polymnestus composed aulodic nomes refers to the data of ch. 4 and 5 (Sicyonian chronicle?), and the tendency to rely on the statements of οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, rather than empirical analysis, is typical of Heraclides, and not Glaucus. Remarkably, it is only on this point (of four) that we find no explicit refutation of the postulated genre definition (no “ἀμφισβητεῖται”, which could have been referring to Glaucus) – only moderate doubt of the harmonians’ claim,³¹ which could have occurred to Heraclides independently of any predecessors, while comparing their information with that of the Sicyonian chronicle.

Therefore, if our conclusions are to be based on what can actually be read in the text, rather than on speculation, it is safer to assume that (1) among the musicians discussed in ch. 9–10 Glaucus’ argument concerned only the works of Thaletas, and (2) the Rhegian scholar was not himself interested in the problem of genre definition and did not take part in the polemics on paeans. If the author who summarized and developed this polemics (Heraclides) adduced Glaucus’ data as helpful for the discussion, then we must try to restore his train of thought.

The context (as formulated by Ps.-Plutarch) must imply that the peculiarities indicated by Glaucus contradict the possibility of including Thaletas’ works among paeans. One might suppose that the argument against paeans consisted in using cretics (– ∪ –) and paeons (that is, apparently, resolved cretics – ∪ ∪ and ∪ ∪ ∪ –). Indeed, there is evidence that cretic rhythms were typical of hyporchemes (the genre alternative to paeans which is assumed above for Xenodamus, 1134 C).³²

³¹ This can signify that the “use of the Orthian nome” and the composing of aulodic nomes is not incompatible.

³² Anon. Ambros. *De re metrica* p. 225 l. 29 Studemund = Keil 1848, 7 l. 18–22: Ἀμφίμακρος ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ τῆς θέσεως, ὥς ἔχων ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν μερῶν τὰς μακράς. Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς καλεῖται καὶ Κρητικός, ὥς τῶν Κρητῶν ἐπινοησάντων τὸ εἶδος τοῦ τοιοῦτου ῥυθμοῦ, οἷς καὶ ὑπόρχημα ἀναφέρεται· φιλεῖ δὲ τὰ ὑπορχήματα τούτῳ τῷ ποδὶ καταμετρεῖσθαι. Choeroboscus (*Schol. in Heph. B* 218, 14 and 303, 20 Consbruch) calls the 4th paeon (∪ ∪ ∪ –) ὑπορχηματικός καὶ κρητικός.

This is corroborated by surviving fragments of hyporchemes (Bacch. fr. 15–16 Snell), whereas there are no cretics or paeons κατὰ μέτρον in existing examples of paeans of the classical time.³³

However, there are reasons to doubt this. To begin with, even if the connection of paeans with the dancing five-beat rhythm was not deeply rooted,³⁴ it still looks improbable that the use of cretics and paeons would be *excluded* for paeans. Fragments at our disposal reveal too much rhythmical variety³⁵ to consider the metre as one of the generic features of a paean. The very etymology of the metrical term παίων³⁶ could not but suggest a relationship with paeans. Perhaps it is exactly this etymological tie between a paeon (= cretic) and a paean that provoked speculation about the Cretan origin of paeans and its mythological justification.³⁷ It appears from Ephorus' evidence that Thaletas applied the "Cretan rhythms" to paeans and other songs.³⁸ Limenius, a poet of the Hellenistic times, used cretics κατὰ μέτρον in his paean of 128/7 BC.³⁹

Still more importantly, Heraclides would hardly have needed a reference to Glaucus' authority in order simply to prove the occurrence of cretics or paeons in Thaletas' compositions. Any competent reader or listener could easily realize them without assistance. Glaucus' significant discovery could only be the statement of Thaletas' borrowings from Archilochus and from Olympus. In this case, depending on details that are not known to us, the argument might be e.g. as follows:

³³ Rutherford 2001, 78.

³⁴ Rutherford 2001, 79 considers a possibility (first admitted by Deubner 1919, 395–396; 406) that cretics and paeons were typical of the more ancient form of a paean, perhaps related only to Crete or Delphi. This form might have been echoed/ imitated in Hellenistic Delphic paeans (see below n. 39).

³⁵ Rutherford 2001, 78–79: Pindar uses mostly aeolic rhythms with iambic and dactylic insertions and dactyls; there are also dactylo-epitrites and paroemiacs. As for cretic, paeon and bacchius, they are not more numerous than in Pindar's epinicia. Similarly, paeans of later times mostly demonstrate dactylo-epitrites, dactyls and ionics.

³⁶ On etymology s. Christ 1879, 384–385; Deubner 1919, 395. The rhythmical term is first attested in Aristot. *Rhet.* 1409 a 2–21, in the form παϊάν; later the form παίων prevails (with the variant παίων reconstructed in the passage of Ps.-Plutarch: the accent fluctuates, s. LSJ s.v. παϊάν III).

³⁷ Furley–Bremer 2001, I, 91.

³⁸ Ephor. *FGrHist* 70 F 149 = Strab. 10. 4. 16: τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς Κρητικοῖς χρῆσθαι ... οὓς Θάλητα ἀνευρεῖν, ᾧ καὶ τοὺς παιᾶνας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τὰς ἐπιχωρίους ᾠδὰς ἀνατιθέασι.

³⁹ Pöhlmann–West 2001 (= *DAGM*), no. 21; Furley–Bremer 2001, II, 92–94. Analogous is the rhythm of *DAGM* no. 20 (Furley–Bremer 2001, II, 85–86), which is probably also a paean, although the definition of genre is not preserved in its title.

a) *Archilochus composed paeans, but Thaletas diverged from his model, introducing the rhythms not typical of paeans, or of citharody more generally, which he borrowed from Olympus' aulos music.* (This is implausible, since we never hear that paeans were ascribed to Archilochus,⁴⁰ and – as argued above – it is hard to assume that someone thought paeans and cretics quite inappropriate for paeans.)

b) *Although Thaletas used rhythms suitable for paeans, this is not enough – in fact his work is the same as Archilochus' songs, which are not paeans,⁴¹ and furthermore, cretics and paeons occur not only in paeans, but even in the aulos music of Olympus.*

Unfortunately, faced with a lack of evidence (concerning both attributes of paeans compared with other genres and the artistic heritage of Olympus, Archilochus and Thaletas) we are not in a position to establish either what kind of solution to the genre problem one might receive from Glaucus' argument, or whether it was apt for such a solution. Perhaps the extent of our exegetical problems is best explained if we suppose that the quotation from Glaucus did not form an organic part of the original discussion. Remarkably, in the case of Thaletas (the only one of four) we are not even told which alternative genre was ascribed to him. At any rate, Heraclides must have said explicitly that it was up to debate as to whether Thaletas composed paeans, since the compiler could hardly have claimed this on his own part. Yet, whatever use could be made of analyzing elements borrowed by Thaletas, at least additional information that he borrowed his rhythms from no one but Olympus and the borrowing did him good still seems completely irrelevant for any judgments of his genre. On the other hand, this data would perfectly match Polyhistor's book on Phrygia, and the close affinity of Glaucus' passages cited in ch. 7 and ch. 10 makes one assume that Ps.-Plutarch found them quoted together – most probably in Alexander's treatise.

Thus, I believe that in 1134 D–E the compiler interrupted the exposition of Heraclides to insert one more extract from the book of Polyhistor. In doing so he reacted mechanically to the name of Thaletas – just like he did at the beginning of ch. 5, as he came across the name of Terpander and wrote out a passage on Phrygian auletes which was alien to the rest of the section. Perhaps Heraclides did say something on the appropriateness

⁴⁰ The fragment Athen. 5. 180 C = Archiloch. fr. 121 W. (αὐτὸς ἐξάρχων πρὸς αὐλὸν Λέσβιον παιήονα) is by no means a valid proof that this poet had ever composed paeans – one is not even sure that he speaks of himself.

⁴¹ This way of reconstruction is proposed by Barker 2009, 296: the songs of Archilochus “had nothing in common with the solemn or celebratory paean, and were in fact best known for their delight in ribaldry and abuse”.

of Thaletas' cretics to paeans (or hyporchemes), which reminded Ps.-Plutarch of what he read in Polyhistor (who quoted Glaucus) on a similar matter. Thus, he acted in his usual way and inserted information he found on Thaletas without caring if it was relevant for the current discussion. It seems that his clumsy insertion supplanted Heraclides' words and deprived the readers of the possibility to learn what the argument was against defining Thaletas' work as paeans.

A. Barker⁴² drew attention to what he thought was an incongruity in Heraclides' approach. On Polymnestus, Ps.-Plutarch's source hesitated to accept the harmonians' claim because οἱ ἀρχαῖοι said nothing about this issue. This implies that (a) the harmonians based their opinion not on literary evidence, but on something else (presumably on listening and analyzing the music), and (b) the author who summarized the discussion considered conclusions reached by their methods insufficient if they were not supported by archaic written texts. Now, as for Thaletas, Glaucus must have used much the same methods as the harmonians; however, no doubt is expressed on his account. Barker, who believes that all the quotations from Glaucus in Ps.-Plutarch come from the work of Heraclides,⁴³ wonders why he found the Rhegian scholar trustworthy on this point and supposes that he had some additional reasons unknown to us. This incongruity disappears if we assume that Glaucus' argument on Thaletas was never considered in Heraclides' book.

As for the last quotation from Glaucus (1134 E, p. 9, 15–16), it only deals with the relevant dating of Thaletas and Xenocritus and so could occur in either Heraclides or Alexander. Still its proximity to the previous quotation, the comparison to Thaletas (who must have featured in the book on Phrygia due to his supposed dependence on Olympus) and the lack of connection with the argument on genres make me believe that it was taken from the same source as 1133 E–F and 1134 D–E – that is, from Polyhistor. In this case Xenocritus was perhaps yet another musician to whom Glaucus ascribed some borrowings from Olympus. Once again, the compiler mechanically inserted an additional note (irrelevant to the current discussion) concerning a person just mentioned.

To sum up, I ascribe to Alexander Polyhistor the following passages in Ps.-Plutarch: ch. 5, p. 5, 3–11; ch. 7, p. 6, 21 – 7, 18; ch. 10, p. 9, 4–11 and 15–16. In describing Phrygian influence on Greek music Alexander was much obliged to Glaucus of Rhegium, so it was he who transmitted to Ps.-Plutarch all Glaucus' considerations dealing with Olympus. Heraclides,

⁴² Barker 2009, 296–297.

⁴³ Barker 2009, 279–280.

in his turn, was also acquainted with Glaucus' famous work and used it at least for chronological matters. I suppose that in ch. 4, p. 4, 25 – 5, 2 = ch. 5, p. 5, 14–15 Ps.-Plutarch borrowed Glaucus' calculations from Heraclides.⁴⁴

Nina Almazova
Saint Petersburg State University
n.almazova@spbu.ru

Bibliography

- N. Almazova, “On the meaning of ἀλωδία, ἀλωδός”, *Hyperboreus* 14: 2 (2008) 5–34.
- N. Almazova, “Artistic Heritage of Polymnestus of Colophon”, *Mnemosyne* 74: 3 (2021a) 357–370.
- N. Almazova, “Alexander Polyhistor and Glaucus of Rhegium as Sources of Pseudo-Plutarchus' Treatise *De musica*. I–II”, *Hyperboreus* 27: 2 (2021b) 266–290.
- A. Barker, “Heraclides and Musical History”, in: W. W. Fortenbaugh, E. Pender (eds.), *Heraclides of Pontus. Discussion*, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 15 (New Brunswick – London 2009) 273–298.
- A. Barker, *Ancient Greek Writers on their Musical Past. Studies in Greek Musical Historiography* (Pisa–Roma 2014).
- W. Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig 1879).
- J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954).
- L. Deubner, “Paian”, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik* 22 (1919) 385–406.
- M. Ercoles, “La musica che non c'è più... La poesia greca arcaica nel *De musica* pseudo-plutarcho”, in: D. Castaldo, D. Restani, C. Tassi (eds.), *Il sapere musicale e i suoi contesti da Teofrasto a Claudio Tolomeo* (Ravenna 2009) 145–169.
- M. Ercoles, *Stesicoro. Le testimonianze antiche* (Bologna 2013).
- M. G. Fileni, *Senocrito di Locri e Pindaro* (Roma 1987).
- J. C. Franklin, “The Lesbian Singers: Towards a Reconstruction of Hellanicus' *Karneian Victors*”, *Rudiae* 22–23 (2010–2011) 719–763.
- W. D. Furley, J. M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns I–II* (Tübingen 2001).
- A. Gostoli, “Da Demodoco a Timoteo: una storia della lirica greca nel *De musica* attribuito a Plutarco”, *QUCC* 99 (2011) 31–42.
- A. Gostoli, “Glaucio di Reggio musicista e storico della poesia greca nel V secolo a. C.”, *QUCC* 110 (2015) 125–142.
- A. Gostoli, “Le fonti storiografiche del *De musica* attribuito a Plutarco”, in: *Il potere della parola. Studi di letteratura greca per Maria Cannatà Fera*, a cura

⁴⁴ I am grateful to those of my students who helped me to understand the problems an inexperienced person like Ps.-Plutarch can face when summarizing scholarly works.

- di G. B. D'Alessio, L. Lomiento, C. Meliadó, G. Ucciardello (Alessandria 2020) 133–145.
- I. Henderson, “Ancient Greek Music”, *The New Oxford History of Music* I (London 1957) 336–403.
- E. Hiller, “Die Fragmente des Glaukos von Rhegion”, *RhM* 41 (1886) 398–436.
- F. Jacoby, “The Date of Archilochos”, *CQ* 35 (1941) 97–109.
- H. Keil, *Analecta Grammatica*, Nachricht über das Königliche Pädagogium zu Halle 13 (Leipzig 1848).
- A. Kleingünther, “ΠΙΠΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung”, *Philologus Supplbd.* 26, Heft 1 (Leipzig 1933).
- G. Lanata (ed., tr., comm.), *Poetica pre-platonica. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Firenze 1963).
- C. M. Lucarini, “Herakleides Pontikos und die ps.-plutarchische Schrift *Περὶ μουσικῆς*”, *Hyperboreus* 26: 1 (2020) 71–87.
- A. Meriani, “Tracce Aristosseniche nel *De musica pseudoplutarcheo*”, in: id., *Sulla musica greca antica. Studi e ricerche* (Salerno 2003) 49–81.
- E. Pöhlmann, “Ps. Plutarch, *De musica*. A History of Oral Tradition of Ancient Greek Music”, *QUCC* 99 (2011) 11–30.
- E. Pöhlmann, M. West (eds.), *Documents of Ancient Greek Music. The Extant Melodies and Fragments* (Oxford 2001).
- T. Power, *The Culture of Kitharōidia* (Cambridge, Ma. – London 2010).
- A. Presta, “Glauco di Reggio”, *Almanacco calabrese* 15 (1965) 87–95.
- G. A. Privitera, “Arciloco e il ditirambo letterario pre-simonideo”, *MAIA* 9 (1957) 95–110.
- H. Riemann, *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte* I, 1: *Die Musik der Altertums* (Leipzig 1923).
- E. Rohde, *De Julii Pollucis in apparatu scaenico enarrando fontibus* (Lipsiae 1870).
- T. G. Rosenmeyer, “Elegiac and Elegos”, *Calif. St. in Class. Ant.* 1 (1968) 217–231.
- I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford 2001).
- R. Volkmann (ed.), *Plutarchi De musica* (Leipzig 1856).
- F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*. VII. *Herakleides Pontikos* (Basel–Stuttgart 1969).
- H. Weil, Th. Reinach (eds.), *Plutarque. De la Musique*. Édition critique et explicative (Paris 1900).
- R. Westphal, *Harmonik und Melopöie der Griechen*, Metrik der griechischen Dramatiker und Lyriker II. 1 (Leipzig 1863).
- R. Westphal (Hrsg.), *Πλουτάρχου Περὶ μουσικῆς. Plutarch über die Musik* (Breslau 1865).
- D. Wytenbach, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia, id est opera, exceptis Vitis, reliqua* V (Oxonii 1800).
- L. Zhmud, *The Origin of the History of Science in Classical Antiquity* (Berlin – New York 2006).
- K. Ziegler, M. Pohlenz (eds.), *Plutarchus. Moralia* VI, 3 (Lipsiae 1959).
- Th. Zieliński, *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie* (Leipzig 1885).

Further arguments are adduced in support of the thesis (see *Hyperboreus* 27: 2 [2021] 266–290) that Ps.-Plutarch extensively used the “Collection of Information about Phrygia” by Alexander Polyhistor for his history of music in *De mus.* ch. 3–10, and it is in Polyhistor’s work that he found all the quotations from Glaucus of Rhegium concerning the impact of Olympus.

The acquaintance of Ps.-Plutarch with the work of Glaucus at first hand is dismissed on the following grounds: (a) the way of introducing his quotations such as using the indefinite pronoun *τινι* (p. 4, 27 Ziegler 1959) and making Glaucus’ statement governed by Ἀλέξανδρος ... ἔφη (p. 5, 3–4), and (b) Ps.-Plutarch’s total inability to insert extant data logically into the argument (as seen throughout the first section of his treatise), whereas some references to Glaucus do form an organic part of the discussion.

Glaucus’ statement of Olympus’ influence on Thaletas in ch. 10 is so similar to that of his influence on Stesichorus in ch. 7 that they must have belonged together in the original work and were probably adduced together in Ps.-Plutarch’s source. Although on the whole the matters discussed in ch. 9–10 are unlikely to have been taken from a treatise about Phrygia, Glaucus’ quotations concerning Thaletas and Xenocritus seem to make no contribution to the current discussion on genres. Thus, the compiler might simply have been inspired by coming across the same names, leading him to insert the information from Alexander’s work mechanically (the same was the case with the reference to Terpander that prompted a rather irrelevant insertion of Polyhistor’s data in ch. 5).

Автор приводит новые аргументы в защиту предположения (см. *Hyperboreus* 27: 2 [2021] 266–290), что Псевдо-Плутарх в разделе своего трактата, посвященном истории музыки (*De mus.* гл. 3–10), активно использовал “Свод данных о Фригии” Александра Полигистора и именно оттуда почерпнул все фрагменты Главка из Регия, посвященные влиянию Олимпа.

Непосредственное знакомство Псевдо-Плутарха с книгой Главка отрицается на следующих основаниях: (а) форма введения цитат – употребление местоимения *τινι* (p. 4, 27 Ziegler 1959) и оформление цитаты из Главка как косвенной речи, зависящей от Ἀλέξανδρος ... ἔφη (p. 5, 3–4); (б) неспособность самого Псевдо-Плутарха (которую он многократно демонстрирует в начальном разделе трактата) развивать аргументацию своих источников, подкрепляя ее уместными цитатами из других авторов, между тем как некоторые – но не все – ссылки на Главка органично встроены в ход рассуждения.

Тезисы Главка о влиянии Олимпа на Фалета (гл. 10) и на Стесихора (гл. 7) настолько схожи между собой, что, скорее всего, они относились к одному пассажиру в его труде и, возможно, были приведены вместе в источнике Псевдо-Плутарха. В целом материал гл. 9–10 едва ли может восходить к трактату о Фригии. Но цитаты из Главка, посвященные Фалету и Ксенокриту, как кажется, не имеют отношения к дискуссии о жанрах, которая излагается в этих главах. Очевидно, встретив в книге Александра те же имена музыкантов, что у Гераклида, компилятор механически включил данные Главка о них в свой текст (таким же образом сведения из Полигистора о Терпандре, не связанные с темой рассуждений Гераклида, появились в гл. 5).