

Glaukos of Rhegion

George Huxley

GLAUKOS OF RHEGION is one of the earliest literary historians of Hellas. He was born or active at about the same time as Demokritos, whom he reported to have been the pupil of a Pythagorean: Diogenes Laertios (9.38) on Demokritos remarks, τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν τινος ἀκοῦσαί φησιν αὐτὸν Γλαῦκος ὁ Ῥηγίνος κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους αὐτῷ γεγονώς.¹ As vital evidence for early Greek lyric poetry and music the fragments of Glaukos well repay enquiry; besides, the collection in Müller (FHG 2.23–24) can be increased. So no apology is needed for renewed study of this interesting but obscure western Greek scholar.

The book of Glaukos is variously named *On Ancient Poets and Musicians*, or *A Register (ἀναγραφὴ) of Ancient Poets*² or simply *On Poets*.³ It would be a mistake to regard any of the titles as original; Glaukos mentioned a poet who was by no means “old” in his time—Empedokles⁴—and it is not quite certain that the work was exclusively concerned with music and poetry rather than with literature in general. The mention of Demokritos suggests a wider scope than poetry and music, though it is worth noting that the Abderite wrote on topics known to have interested Glaukos—*Περὶ ῥυθμῶν καὶ ἁρμονίης* and *Περὶ ποιήσιος*, as Jacoby pointed out.⁵ Glaukos may well have travelled away from home; the *De Musica* (4.1132E), which calls him ὁ ἐξ Ἰταλίας perhaps implies that he did so, but the late fifth century dedication to Hermes by a *Glaukias* of Rhegion which Pausanias⁶ saw at Olympia can hardly be his. There is no proof that he visited Athens.⁷ *The Lives of the Ten Orators*, it is true, states that the book by Glaukos on poets

¹ See also E. Frank, *Plato und die sogenannte Pythagoreer* (Halle 1923) 335–56 for the Pythagorean ties of Demokritos.

² [Plut.] *De Musica* 4 and 7 (1132E and 1133F).

³ [Plut.] *Mor.* 833CD.

⁴ Diog. Laert. 8.52.

⁵ RE 7 (1912) 1418 s.v. GLAUKOS 36.

⁶ Paus. 5.27.8; cf. E. Loewy, *Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer* (Leipzig 1885) no. 33.

⁷ F. Jacoby suggested that he did so, in “The Date of Archilochos,” *CQ* 35 (1941) 100 n.1.

was ascribed to Antiphon the orator (*Mor.* 833CD), but that hardly shows Glaukos to have been in Athens or even to have written in the Attic dialect. The *Lives* is very confused here; its source may well have ascribed the *Περὶ ποιητῶν* of Glaukos to Antiphon *the sophist*.⁸

The merit of Glaukos' poetical history was apparent to the great Apollodoros of Athens, who made good use of it and mentioned the western scholar in his trimeters:⁹

ἦν μὲν Μέτωνος υἱός, εἰς δὲ Θουρίου
αὐτὸν νεωστὶ παντελῶς ἐκτισμένους
〈ό〉 Γλαῦκος ἐλθεῖν φησιν.

The allusion is to the *akmē* of Empedokles, which Apollodoros almost certainly synchronised with the founding of Thourioi; that is, he would have placed the philosopher's birth forty years before 444/3 B.C.¹⁰ Glaukos gave the age of Demokritos (*Diog.Laert.* 9.38), but perhaps only because they were coevals; we do not know that Apollodoros took his dating of Empedokles from Glaukos, who seems to have been more interested in the relative ages of poets and in the order of their musical discoveries than in absolute chronology. Glaukos may well have studied Empedokles not only as a poet but also because they shared an interest in musical theory; Empedokles seems at least to have thought about the structure and functioning of ears.¹¹

The principal fragments of Glaukos' treatise are to be found in the Plutarchan *De Musica*, which reveals some of its contents, at least in outline. The author of the *De Musica* also made use of the musical writings of Aristoxenos and Herakleides Pontikos, but statements made by Glaukos can be separated from theirs.

Glaukos took his enquiries far back in time to the heroic age, for he discussed Mousaios;¹² but he was specially interested in the lyric and melic poets of the seventh century B.C., with whom most of the fragments in the *De Musica* are concerned. Terpander, the *De Musica* remarks, was distinguished in the kitharode's art. Four successive victories at the Pythia are ascribed to him, and indeed he lived at a very ancient epoch. "At least Glaukos from Italy shows him to have

⁸ Antiphon Soph. 87 A 6, in H. Diels / W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*¹¹ II (Zurich 1964) p.337.

⁹ *Diog.Laert.* 8.52 = Apollodoros, *FGrHist* 244 F 32.

¹⁰ F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin 1902) 272–3.

¹¹ Diels, *Vorsokr.* 31 B 99 (= Theophr. *De Sens.* 9): κώδων. σάρκινος ὄζος.

¹² Harpokration s.v. Μουσαῖος. . . . εἰρήκασι δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἄλλοι τε καὶ Γλαῦκος.

been earlier than Archilochos in a treatise of his concerning ancient poets and musicians; for he states that he followed upon those who were the first to sing to the flute” (properly *αὐλός*, ‘clarinet’ or ‘oboe’): *πρεσβύτερον γοῦν αὐτὸν Ἀρχιλόχου ἀποφαίνει Γλαῦκος ὁ ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἐν συγγράμματι τιμῇ τῷ περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν τε καὶ μουσικῶν. φησὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν δεύτερον γενέσθαι μετὰ τοὺς πρώτους ποιήσαντας αὐλωδίαν* [*De Mus.* 4.1132E]. R. G. Bury proposed to change the last word to *κιθαρωδίαν*,¹³ but that alteration is not needed. Glaukos is not arguing for the high antiquity of Terpander, but for the even higher priority of reed music over *κιθαρωδία*. Westphal¹⁴ proposed to alter *αὐλωδίαν* to *αὐλητικὴν* here, since earlier in the *De Musica* (1132c) and in the next excerpt from Glaukos it is implied that Klonas, a successor of Terpander, introduced *αὐλωδίαν*—though, continues the *De Musica*, other writers assert that a forerunner of Klonas, Ardalos of Troizen, was the first to have established the aulodic Muse. The second excerpt from Glaukos continues with Terpander and his relationship in time to Klonas: *ἐξηλωκέναι δὲ τὸν Τέρπανδρον Ὀμήρου μὲν τὰ ἔπη, Ὀρφείως δὲ τὰ μέλη. ὁ δ’ Ὀρφεὺς οὐδένα φαίνεται μεμιμημένος· οὐδεὶς γὰρ πω γεγένητο, εἰ μὴ οἱ τῶν αὐλωδικῶν (αὐλητικῶν Westphal) ποιηταί· τούτοις δὲ κατ’ οὐθὲν τὸ Ὀρφικὸν ἔργον ἔοικε. Κλονᾶς δ’ ὁ τῶν αὐλωδικῶν νόμων ποιητής, ὁ ὀλίγω ὕστερον Τέρπανδρου γενόμενος, ὡς μὲν Ἀρκάδες λέγουσι, Τεγεάτης ἦν, ὡς δὲ Βοιωτοί, Θηβαῖος. μετὰ δὲ Τέρπανδρον καὶ Κλονᾶν Ἀρχίλοχος παραδίδεται γενέσθαι. ἄλλοι δὲ τινες τῶν συγγραφέων . . .* [*De Mus.* 1132F–1133A]. Westphal’s changes from *αὐλωδίαν/αὐλωδικῶν* to *αὐλητικὴν/αὐλητικῶν* are attractive. They entail that according to Glaukos, *aulodia* was introduced later than Terpander, by Klonas, but that simple reed playing (auletic) was practised in very early times. In the scheme of Glaukos the archetypal *αὐλός*-player was Olympos the Phrygian (*De Mus.* 10.1134E). Between the excerpts from Glaukos quoted above, the *De Musica* inserts a passage from Alexander Polyhistor (*FGrHist* 273 F 77), who in his treatise on Phrygia stated that Olympos was the first to bring *κρούματα* to the Greeks. In the context *κρούματα* would seem to be Phrygian double-reed tunes.¹⁵ Alexander gave the succession of *αὐλός*-players (1) Hyagnis, (2) his son Marsyas and (3) Olympos, but there is no sign

¹³ See the Teubner *Moralia* VI.3³, edd. Ziegler and Pohlenz (1964) p.4.

¹⁴ *Plutarch, Über die Musik* (Breslau 1865) 68, approved by Jacoby, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 1419–20.

¹⁵ Cf. *OCD s.v. Music*, p.589.

that Glaukos in his book went back beyond Olympos in his treatment of Phrygian music.

The emphasis upon Olympos was strong in Glaukos' scheme. In *De Musica* (1133^{EF}) we are told that according to Glaukos, Olympos invented the *ἀρμάτιος νόμος*. The historian insisted also that Stesichoros copied Olympos (not Orpheus or Terpander or Archilochos or Thaletas) when he employed the *ἀρμάτιος νόμος* and τὸ κατὰ δάκτυλον εἶδος, "which some say arose from the treble nome" (*ὄρθιος νόμος*). Thaletas the Cretan, too, was indebted to Olympos (*De Mus.* 1134^{DE}) for his use of the paion and cretic rhythm, which, claimed Glaukos, Archilochos, Terpander and Orpheus did not employ. But Thaletas did, he asserted, imitate the μέλη of Archilochos and enlarge them. So it is clear that the book of Glaukos put (1) Terpander, (2) Archilochos and (3) Thaletas in that chronological order. Earlier than Terpander were Homer, whose ἔπη, and Orpheus, whose μέλη, he attempted to match (so Glaukos in *De Mus.* 1132^F). The position of Olympos in this order is not immediately apparent, but Glaukos clearly regarded him as earlier than Klonas, and, so as to emphasise the antiquity of ἀυλός-playing, would have placed him earlier than Terpander too. The strong interest in ἀυλός-playing suggests that Glaukos may have been a player himself; Jacoby's assertion that he was one is very attractive.¹⁶ In this connexion we may suggest that τὸ κατὰ δάκτυλον εἶδος of Olympos may have referred originally to the fingering of the ἀυλός, rather than to the metre of songs accompanied by it. The *harmatios nomos* was perhaps composed for a parade of Phrygian chariotry. As for the paions and cretics said by Glaukos to have been adopted from the music of Olympos by Thaletas, we would expect cretics to be at home in Crete from pre-Hellenic times; but the paian or paion is a closely related metre, being in effect a resolved cretic (υυυ— or —υυυ or υ—υυ or υυ—υυ for —υ—); and the cretic itself was sometimes classed as a form of paion, παιῶν διάγυιος. The linking of paions with Olympos at least suggests the possibility that the metre was of Anatolian origin; but the matter is obscure, and besides, as early as the Homeric Hymn to the Pythian Apollo (518), the paion is associated with Crete, Κρητῶν παιήονες. So much for the views of Glaukos on early musical history; other passages in the *De Musica*—for example on Krexos the pupil of Olympos, on Polymnestos the famous

¹⁶ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7).

Kolophonian poet, or on Xenokritos of Lokroi—may be excerpts from the book of Glaukos, but we cannot prove that they were.

One passage can, however, be added to the evidence about Glaukos. In Plato's *Phaedo* (108D) Sokrates alludes to ἡ Γλαύκου τέχνη. From the context the Glaukos and his craft are not identifiable—conceivably the Chian inventor of welding is meant. However, a scholiast *in loco*,¹⁷ who draws on Aristoxenos through Lucillus Tarrhaeus,¹⁸ has a story about a Glaukos and a musical experiment by Hippiasos the Pythagorean. The musico-philosophical context and the link with Aristoxenos entail that the Glaukos can hardly be other than our man of Rhegion, whose interest in two other philosophers, Empedokles and Demokritos, we have already noted. In the story a Hippiasos is said to have fashioned four bronze discs in such a way that their diameters were equal, but their thicknesses were in the proportions: $\frac{4}{3}$ to 1 (discs 1 and 2); $\frac{3}{2}$ to 1 (discs 1 and 3); 2 to 1 (discs 1 and 4). So their relative thicknesses were 12(1), 9(2), 8(3), 6(4). When the discs were struck they produced a kind of harmony (*συμφωνίαν τινά*). Glaukos, having noticed the varying pitches produced by the discs, attempted to compose (*χειρουργεῖν*) with them, and from the experiment there came the saying *Γλαύκου τέχνη*. The scholiast adds that the story is found in the books *Περὶ μουσικῆς ἀκροάσεως* of Aristoxenos and *Περὶ θεωρίας* of Nikokles; it therefore goes back to a genuine Pythagorean tradition and is properly included in the evidence for Hippiasos of Metapontion by Diels and Kranz.¹⁹ Hippiasos flourished some time after Pythagoras, but, it seems, not later than *ca.* 450 B.C.; so he was older than Glaukos but could still have overlapped him in time. The story however does not require that Hippiasos (whose enquiry is analogous to early Pythagorean experiments with strings of varying length) personally demonstrated his discs to the musical historian of Rhegion. The experiment suggests that Glaukos' book may well have included some musical theory together with literary and musical history. Other passages excerpted from a Glaukos or Glaukon were discussed by E. Hiller of Halle;²⁰ none of them can be proved to come from the man of Rhegion, but the statement ascribed to a Glaukos that Aeschylus adapted the *Persae* from the *Phoenissae* of

¹⁷ Ven. T, quoted by J. Burnet, *Plato's Phaedo* (Oxford 1911) App. II.

¹⁸ See Burnet, *op.cit.*, who refers to L. Cohn, *Quellen der Platoscholien* (*JClassPhil*, Supplbd. 13 [1883]) 836ff.

¹⁹ *Vorsokr.* 18 [8] 12 (I, p.109).

²⁰ "Die Fragmente des Glaukos von Rhegion," *RhM* N.F. 41 (1886) 398–436.

Phrynichos would not have been out of place in the historian's remarks *περὶ ποιητῶν*.²¹ According to a scholium on Euripides *Hecuba* 41, Polyxena, having died of wounds inflicted by Odysseus and Diomedes in the sack of Troy, was buried by Neoptolemos. This statement is said to come from the *Kypriaka* (or *Kypria*?), "as Glaukos writes," and would also be in place in a book *Περὶ ποιητῶν*, but we cannot confidently claim it for the man of Rhegion.

We can now reconstruct the chronological order worked out by Glaukos. It is not certain that he assigned absolute dates, but the relative order was evidently argued in detail.²²

1. Introduction of Auletic. Olympos composer of *harmatios nomos*.
2. Introduction of Kitharodic. *Melē* of Orpheus. (? Earlier introduction of Kitharistic by Amphion or Apollo).
3. *Epē* of Homer (? Mousaios mentioned as forerunner in epic poetry).
4. Terpander, who drew on Orpheus and Homer (*De Mus.* 1132F).
5. Introduction of Aulodic. Klonas, a little later than Terpander (1133A).
6. Archilochos, later than Terpander and Klonas (1133A).
7. Thaletas, who drew on both Olympos and Archilochos (1134DE).
8. Stesichoros, who was later than Thaletas but did not imitate him (1133F).

Glaukos may well have made use of the book on Homer by his fellow townsman Theagenes of Rhegion, who is alleged to have lived or to have been born in the time of Kambyses²³ and to have been the first to write *περὶ Ὁμήρου*.²⁴ The Glaukon who is mentioned by Plato (*Ion* 530CD) as a Homeric critic, together with Metrodoros of Lampsakos and Stesimbrotos of Thasos (*FGrHist* 107 T 3), could well be our Glaukos.²⁵

In his contribution to *Archiloque*²⁶ K. J. Dover draws attention to

²¹ See G. Lanata, *Poetica pre-platonica: Testimonianze e frammenti* (Bibl.Stud.Sup. 43, Firenze 1964) pp.278f on Glaukos fr.7.

²² See also Jacoby, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 1420.

²³ Tatian, *Adv. Graecos* 31.

²⁴ Schol. B on *Il.* 22.67.

²⁵ *Γλαύκων* codd., *Γλαῦκος* Sydenham. See further G. Lanata, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.21) 279–281.

²⁶ *Entretiens Hardt* 10 (Geneva 1964) 193.

Ionisms in Tyrtaios and argues that the elegiac distich was an Ionian poetic form brought into Peloponnese by, or in the time of, that poet. He therefore suggests that the statement by Herakleides Pontikos²⁷ that elegiac poetry was composed by Klonas should be rejected; he rejects too the opinion, which was held by Glaukos, that Klonas was earlier than Archilochos. Dover believes that no poem of Tyrtaios need be dated earlier than 640 B.C.;²⁸ but if Tyrtaios was already active in a Messenian war *ca.* 665, as I have suggested,²⁹ then Klonas, Tyrtaios and the introduction of the Ionian elegiac distich to Peloponnese may all be earlier than Archilochos, who flourished about the middle of the seventh century B.C.³⁰ Glaukos may well have regarded Klonas and Tyrtaios as slightly earlier than the Parian poet, placing them a little later than Terpander, who, according to Hellenikos,³¹ was a victor at the Spartan Karneia in 676. Dover makes a strong case for Tyrtaios having followed an Ionian model; that model need not have been Kallinos or Archilochos, whom we do not know to have been the earliest Ionian elegists. I suggest, therefore, that the order (1) Terpander, (2) Klonas, (3) Archilochos, given by Glaukos was a likely one, but that all three poets were so close together that they may have overlapped in time. Tyrtaios could properly be placed between Klonas and Archilochos, but such chronological refinements mean little within a remote period of less than half a century.

Since Glaukos insisted on the priority of *αὐλός* music he had to place Olympos as early as possible. Others, less committed, could date him relatively late. We find an echo of the disagreement in the Suda, whose entries *s.v.* "Ὀλυμπος include a Mysian *αὐλός*-player who lived before the Trojan war and a second Olympos, a Phrygian, who was a contemporary of Midas son of Gordios. The real Olympos may well have been active in the time of the great Midas king of Phrygia *ca.* 700 B.C., when Anatolian influences on Hellenic civilization were strong. Olympos would thus be a contemporary or an elder contemporary of Terpander, who himself is said to have flourished *κατὰ Μίδαν*.³² His prehistoric forerunner of the same name is a figment, but

²⁷ *De Mus.* 1132c: Heraclid.Pont. fr.157 Wehrli.

²⁸ Dover, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.26) 194 n.

²⁹ *Early Sparta* (London 1962) 57.

³⁰ For the date see esp. Jacoby, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 97-109.

³¹ *FGrHist* 4 F 85.

³² See also Schmid/Stählin, *Gesch.griech.Lit.* I (Munich 1929) 330. Cf. D. A. Campbell, "Flutes and Elegiac Couplets," *JHS* 84 (1964) 68.

a figment invented perhaps quite early; for it is alleged that Pratinas, who flourished *ca.* 480 B.C., distinguished the two Olympoi.³³ If that is true, Glaukos cannot have invented the doublet; instead he would have claimed that there was but one Olympos, the Phrygian auletic innovator, who lived before—perhaps long before—Terpander.

There is no reason to think that Glaukos wrote his book in verse in the didactic Empedoklean manner. Long ago J. N. Forkel, it is true, assumed that he was a poet, but there is no evidence for the assertion.³⁴ He may well have written in the scientific medium of his day, in literary Ionic, just as a near contemporary of his in the West seems to have done, Antiochos the Syracusan historian.³⁵

THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST
December, 1967

³³ Fr.6 Page. See also F. Lasserre, *Plutarque, de la Musique* (Olten and Lausanne 1954) 45 n.3.

³⁴ *Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik* I (Leipzig 1788) 264.

³⁵ I am grateful to Dr John Barron, who kindly read the manuscript of this paper.