

Literary reflections on the dithyrambic genre

Hadjimichael, Theodora

DOI:

[10.1353/ajp.2022.0006](https://doi.org/10.1353/ajp.2022.0006)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Hadjimichael, T 2022, 'Literary reflections on the dithyrambic genre', *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 143, no. 1, pp. 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ajp.2022.0006>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the accepted manuscript for an article first published in *American Journal of Philology*. The final version of record is available at: <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/855058>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Literary Reflections on the Dithyrambic Genre

Theodora A. Hadjimichael

Department of Classics, Ancient History and Archaeology

School of History and Cultures

University of Birmingham

Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK

t.hadjimichael@bham.ac.uk

Literary Reflections on the Dithyrambic Genre

Abstract: This article addresses the question of how the dithyramb was classified in antiquity, examining in detail two fragmentary papyri (*P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a–b; *P.Berol.* 9671 verso) alongside other testimonia which comment on the nature and development of the dithyrambic genre. While the majority of these testimonia expect the dithyramb to be associated with Dionysus, some show that this Dionysiac link was not exclusively followed as the defining criterion for the poems' classification, even after the Alexandrian taxonomy of lyric genres had been established. This article demonstrates that throughout antiquity generic identification of dithyramps was a process that was always in the making.

Literary Reflections on the Dithyrambic Genre

In memoriam Andrew Barker

The dithyramb has attracted much attention in recent years, and scholarly enquiry has focused on the contextualization of dithyrambic poems in their performative, ritual, and political context, on the understanding of the dithyramb's generic features by looking at the characteristics of extant dithyrambic poems, and on the evolution of the dithyrambic genre in antiquity and its reception in fifth- and fourth-century sources.¹ Furthermore, modern scholars have emphasized the distinction between the cultic and generic label *dithyrambos* and the performance term *kyklios khoros* in an attempt to clarify that dithyrambic performances were only one kind of circular choral performance in the fifth century B.C.E.² The vital issue lurking behind all the above discussions is the generic identification of poems and by extension the criteria by which poems were classified in the Alexandrian Library.

Much has been written on genre and on the classification of Greek lyric poetry, and many important studies have attempted to tackle the question of generic identification and classification. A. E. Harvey (1955) suggested that the Alexandrian classification did not reflect the original principles of lyric compositions and that the Hellenistic scholars superimposed to a certain degree posterior principles and their own artificial schematisms. Two decades later, L. E. Rossi (1971) created an artificial formulation and periodization by distinguishing between "non-written rules to be followed" in the archaic era, "written rules to be respected" in the classical era, and "written rules not to be followed" by poets but to serve as principles of taxonomy in the Hellenistic period. Harvey and Rossi created a contrast between Hellenistic classification and the original performative aim and context of lyric song, and crucially linked lyric poetry to its occasion of

performance,³ which was taken as a central consideration in later studies: Bruno Gentili (1988, 3) emphasized the links between Greek poetry and a community's social and political life, Claude Calame (1974; 1996, 478–80; 1998) approached the question of poetic genre through structuralism and semiolinguistics, making associations with audience expectations at the occasion of performance, and Gregory Nagy (1994) identified genre as speech-act, and foregrounded the importance of the social and performative context of poetry, by concluding that “the occasion *is* the genre” (Nagy 1994, 13).⁴ To be sure, the Alexandrians could not have been aware first-hand of the original social and ritual context within which lyric poems were performed and which defined in part their generic character.⁵ Nevertheless, in this article I argue that the Hellenistic scholars did not operate single-handedly: generic identification and classification was in all probability based either on generic markers and hints to the occasion found in the lyric poems themselves, or on pre-Hellenistic sources where song-types were discussed and commented upon. Such reflections and observations on lyric genres carried great weight, when generic markers or self-reflective comments are not found in the lyric poems; they had potentially provided the Hellenistic scholars with principles or theories upon which they would have based their attempts to understand lyric genres.⁶

In this article I focus once more on the dithyramb and on its defining features, insofar as they were understood in various testimonia that were reacting to the genre. I discuss specifically two fragmentary papyri that contain extensive comments on the dithyrambic genre and demonstrate that a connection with Dionysus was anticipated in dithyrambic songs (*P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a–b and *P.Berol.* 9671 verso). It becomes obvious from the two papyri that generic questions were posed already in the fourth and third centuries B.C.E. and that the generic identity of poems might still have been a matter of discussion even after the poems'

Hellenistic classification. As the analysis will demonstrate, comments on the nature of the dithyrambic genre concentrate both on the genre's Dionysiac character and on its narrative content, in an attempt to reveal and reconstruct the poems' initial purpose and performative occasion. Emphasis falls on the expected links of the dithyramb with Dionysus, while long narratives whose content was unrelated to Dionysus and which were included in poems of the late classical period are criticized negatively in the aforementioned papyri. The overall analysis brings to the surface questions related to generic expectations and to the criteria used for identifying certain poems as dithyrambs.⁷

What is appropriate to Dionysus and the Dithyramb: *P.Graec.Vindob. 19996a–b*

A much neglected papyrus, *P.Graec.Vindob. 19996a–b* (= Test. 220 Ieranò), focuses on dithyrambic poems of the late fifth and early fourth centuries B.C.E. The text preserves several poetic quotations, some of which are indicated by *paragraphoi*, and also includes musical (a I, cols. 1–6), linguistic (a II, col. 4), literary (a III), metrical (b II, col. 2), and aesthetic (b IV) comments on the quoted extracts, as well as information on poetic content (b III).⁸ The names Melanippides (a I, col. 4 Μελανιππί[δην]) and presumably Philoxenus (a II, col. 4 [Φιλόξ]ενος) can also be read on the papyrus, identifying two of the major representatives of the late classical lyric poetry—Melanippides of Melos and Philoxenus of Cythera.⁹ The date of the papyrus and the type of the preserved text have been debated among scholars. In the *editio princeps* Oellacher (1932, 136 and 144–5) dates the papyrus to the first century B.C.E. or first century C.E., and proposes that it preserves a commentary on two poems of the same author, with each roll (*a* and *b*) containing one poem. Maas, on the other hand, suggests that the work is a *syggramma* on the dithyrambographers of the fourth century B.C.E., compiled at the end of the third century

B.C.E.,¹⁰ and Körte (1935, 246) assumes that the papyrus is a *Peri tou deina* treatise, composed at the time of the Peripatos. Furthermore, several scholars have dated the papyrus differently: Page (1970, 390) *c.*100 B.C.E. and Campbell (1993, 321) *c.*200 B.C.E., who, however, dates the dithyrambic fragments *c.*400 B.C.E. Fongoni (2006, 97–8) follows Maas and dates the preserved text, which she identifies as originating in the Peripatetic milieu, to the fourth / third century B.C.E., while she notes that the papyrus is to be dated to the first century B.C.E. or first century C.E. More recently, Battezzato (2013, 100) dates the papyrus to the first century C.E., and summarizes the views expressed on the nature of the text: the papyrus-text “appears to be a commentary on one or more dithyrambic poems, or a treatise on dithyramb with extensive poetical quotations.” I will focus on four parts of the papyrus from fragments a I–II and b II–IV that foreground some of the features of the poems that are discussed in the papyrus, and will allow us to draw conclusions on what was considered as conventional and expected in a dithyrambic poem and what as unexpected or innovative.¹¹

All scholars who have made the suggestion that the text belongs to a treatise of the Peripatetic tradition draw attention to the first part of the papyrus (a 1, cols. 1–3). The discussion in the specific columns centres on the musical harmony that would be appropriate for the dithyrambic genre and for the god Dionysus, and, while commenting on a specific poem, the commentator claims that a middle ground between two harmonies should have been applied or perhaps was indeed applied to the poem under discussion.

(a I, col. 1)

] . . . [τὸ
 μὲν] πάθος οὐκ ἀγνο-

ῶν], ὅτι θρηῆνόν τινα
ἀπα[ι]τεῖν δόξειεν ἄ(ν),
τὸν δὲ διθύραμβον
εἰδώς, ὅτι πάντα μᾶλ-
[λον ἢ θρηῆνον δέχεται]

(a I, col. 2)

[
νησε .[. .].ω .ος α[λ]λό-
τριον ἢ[γ]ούμενος εἰ-
ναι τῶι πάθει, τὸ δὲ
τῆς Δωρι[σ]τὶ τῶι Διονύ-
σῳι. τὸ μέσον ἀμφο[τέρων] . .

“(col.1) ... since he did not ignore that one could think that the emotion (*pathos*) required some sort of lamentation (*threnos*), and since he knew that the dithyramb [could encompass] all sorts of things rather than [lamentation] . . .

(col.2) . . . since he thought that it [the dithyrambic genre?] was inappropriate (*allotrios*) to this emotion (*pathos*), and that the presence of the Dorian harmony was inappropriate to Dionysus. The middle course between the two (?) . . .”¹²

We have no indication in the papyrus-text of the harmony that is meant to be seen in opposition to the aforementioned Dorian mode, but, as scholars have recognized, the discussion follows

Aristotle's observations in book 8 of his *Politics*, allowing us to assume that the comparison is made between the Dorian and the Phrygian *harmoniae*.¹³ In the final sections of his *Politics* Aristotle turns to the educational role of *mousike*, and builds on the distinction that Socrates makes in Plato's *Republic* with reference to musical modes (*harmoniae*) to support his argument that only the Dorian mode is morally appropriate (*Pol.* 1342a29–30 τοῖς ἠθικοῖς). His discussion on how the ethical character of musical modes corresponds to the state of the human soul (*Pol.* 1342a22–8) addresses the appropriateness of specific modes to certain poetic genres and certain musical instruments (*Pol.* 1342a22–b16). Aristotle focuses specifically on the *aulos* and the dithyramb as examples of musical instruments and poetic genres that require the Phrygian harmony. In the course of this discussion on the *prepon* with reference to musical modes and to their coupling with certain musical instruments, Aristotle refers to the emotional and orgiastic effect of the *aulos* and of the Phrygian mode, both of which are considered to be inseparable in Bacchic poetry and movement (*Pol.* 1342b4–6). In order to exemplify his claim, Aristotle comments on Philoxenus' failed attempt to compose his dithyramb *Mysoi* in the Dorian harmony (*Pol.* 1342b8–12). As we read in the text, because of the nature of the specific harmony Philoxenus had to fall back on the Phrygian mode; the dithyramb is the Phrygian poetic genre par excellence, after all, and the noble character of the Dorian mode is deemed to be inappropriate (*Pol.* 1342b8). Without naming Philoxenus, ps-Plutarch also uses *Mysoi* in his *De musica* (1142f) as an example of experimentation with all the musical modes in a single poem—Hypodorian at the beginning, Mixolydian and Dorian at the end, Hypophrygian and Phrygian in the middle—in order to demonstrate the technical skills and the musical knowledge that a poet needs to possess in order to make such an attempt.

Obviously, Philoxenus' games with the musical modes are typical examples of the broader character of the poetic culture in the late fifth and early fourth centuries B.C.E.,¹⁴ an observation that is also supported by fragment a I, columns 4 and 6 of the papyrus.

(a I, col. 4)

...].Μελανιπί-
δην] καὶ κατατάτ-
τ]ειν ἑκάστην ἐπὶ
τ]ὸ πρέπον αὐτῶν.
δηλοῖ δὲ ταῦτα τε[
.....

(a I, col. 6)

σθένος· ἔντα[ῦθα
φανερὸς] ἔστι τά[ς] τε [?]
ἀρμονίας ἐπὶ τὸ πρέ-
πον ἑκάστας διανέ-
μων καὶ δύο μὲν Δωρι[στί

“(col. 4) ... and that Melanippides also arranged every (harmony) according to what was appropriate (*prepon*) to them. This is demonstrated by *te*[...]”

.....

(col. 6) ‘force’. Here it is clear that he divided each of the two harmonies in a way that was appropriate (*prepon*) and [composed?] two [sections? strophes?] in the Dorian harmony ...”¹⁵

It is uncertain whether the papyrus-text in fragment a I, cols. 1–6 discusses Philoxenus’ *Mysoi* with Aristotle’s comments in mind, but contrary to Aristotle the commentator suggests that a middle ground between the Dorian and Phrygian mode would be appropriate to the dithyramb (a I, col. 2 *to meson*), not exclusively the Phrygian mode. If all columns in fragment a I comment on the same poem, the commentator might be referring to a specific poem by Melanippides throughout,¹⁶ or Melanippides’ oeuvre might be used as example of how different sections or strophes of the same poem could accommodate musical harmonies suitable for certain emotions (*pathos*) and by extension suitable for certain poetic genres (*threnos*, dithyramb).¹⁷

Undoubtedly, all fragments in *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a focus on performative features of a certain dithyrambic poem composed either by Philoxenus or by Melanippides as well as on characteristics that are presented obliquely as expected of the dithyrambic genre in general. The commentator makes implicit comparisons between dithyrambic traits that were considered traditional and those that are evident in the poem under discussion but are unconventional: in fr. a I, col. 2 the combination of the Dorian with the Phrygian harmony is presented as being suitable for the dithyramb in comparison to the exclusive application of the Dorian mode that would cause an inappropriate emotion; in fr. a II, col. 3 the phrase βακχεῦον[. ?ε]ῖς καὶ νόν, placed between two poetic quotations, marks newly introduced metrical or musical features that did not conform to what was customary;¹⁸ in fr. a II, col. 4.3–6 ἐπικρατῶ[ν τῆς] λέξε| ὡς κατὰ τ[ὴν ἐπί]νοι|αν (following the *editor princeps*) emphasizes the predominance of words over content, and points to the dominance of style over meaning.¹⁹ The implicit criticism of how the dithyramb

had changed by the time the papyrus-text was written implies that this kind of dithyramb was different from the version that was considered traditional, and was therefore unexpected. What is more, the comments on appropriateness focus on elements that are of vital importance at an actual poetic performance—musical mode, emotional effect, metrical innovations, and the eloquent combination of words that creates a stylistic spectacle.

If all fragments and columns focus on a specific poem, then the comments provide strong evidence to suggest that the poem in question is a cultic dithyramb, which was (expected to be) performed at a festival. The comments in fr. a I, cols. 1–2 with reference to the appropriate mode and its emotional effects are associated explicitly with the dithyramb as genre (fr. a I, col. 1.5 τὸν δὲ διθύραμβον) and also with the god Dionysus (fr. a I, col. 2.4–5 τῶι Διονύσῳ). The poetic quotation in fragment a II, col. 2 positions the said poem explicitly within the context of a Dionysiac festival:

ἀναβόασον αὐτῶι. Δι-
όνυσσον ἀ[εῖ]σομεν ἱεραῖς
ἐν ἀμέρα[ι]ς δώδεκα
μῆνας ἀπόντα. πάρα
δῶρα, πάντα δ' ἄνθη

“Shout aloud to him! Let us sing of Dionysus in the days of holy worship, after his twelve-month long absence; present are his gifts, all is abloom” (trans. Henrichs 1978)²⁰

The fragment, taken from a cult-song of Dionysus, reflects in its diction both the time and the season when it was sung; Dionysus has been absent for twelve months, and its annual return is

celebrated with the specific song at the time of flower-blossoming. Two festivals celebrating the spring return of Dionysus come to mind: the Anthesteria that took place from the eleventh to the thirteenth of the month Anthesterion (January / February), and the Great Dionysia, a five-day festival in the month of Elaphebolion (mid to late March). The specific reference to the blooming of all the flowers is strong evidence in favour of the Great Dionysia as the performance occasion for the poem. Fragment a II, col. 2 allows us to conclude that the entire poem from which the quotation was taken was composed in order to be performed in honour of the god Dionysus. The poem's explicit association with the performance occasion of an annual festival and its cultic context connects by extension the genre of the dithyramb with the worship of Dionysus. Taken together, all poetic quotations and the comments on all columns of fragment a II offer information on the cultic character of a dithyramb of either Philoxenus or Melanippides, something that is also implied by the dispute over the musical modes that should also have been appropriate for Dionysus (a I, col.2.4–5 τῶι Διονύσῳ). Moreover, roll *a* of the papyrus reveals certain performative features that were perceived as typical of the dithyramb and, in all probability, were still expected to be found at a dithyrambic performance.

The question of what is appropriate for the dithyrambic genre remains the main focus of discussion also in *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996b. The comments in the two fragments that follow the extensive poetic quotations in fr. b I cols.1–2, II cols.1–2 focus once again on what is expected or allowed in the genre of the dithyramb, but is not found in the poem under discussion.

(b III)

Ποσειδ]ῶνα ἐν[ταῦθα

.....]..πι ἔρωτι..[

ἔρ]ημα ὁ Κύκλωψ τι[νὰ τῶν

τ]οῦ Νηρέως θυγατέρ[ων

μελιζόμενος καὶ πα[ίζων

(b IV)

]ε]ν]

..... α]ιρούμενος η]ν?

.....]παιδιᾶς γε καὶ

.... γέλ]ωτος ἀπηρημέ-

.....]οῦδὲ τὸν διθύραμ[βον]

(b III) Poseidon there ... (from? / because of?) love the Cyclops, singing and dancing in solitude (for) one of the daughters of Nereus

(b IV) indeed partaking in amusement and . . . laughter, removing himself (?) / being separated (?).
. . but not the dithyramb²¹

It is unclear whether the comments in fragments b, III–IV apply specifically to the poem from which the preceding quotations were taken, or whether they are inserted as *comparanda* and refer to a different poem. The commentator focuses on the representation of a Cyclops (b III), who, according to Fongoni (2006, 100–2), is the Cyclops who is depicted as being in love with the nymph Galateia in the *Cyclōps* of Philoxenus of Cythera. The comments centre on the portrayal of a love-struck and joyful Cyclops who sings, laughs, and enjoys himself. The few testimonia and fragments from Philoxenus' *Cyclōps* offer information on the content and the sound effects of the

poem, and recreate the image depicted in the papyrus-commentary: a two-line song through which the Cyclops praises Galateia's beauty was part of his repertoire to her (*PMG* 821), and the musical and poetic role of the courting Cyclops (κιθαρίζοντα) is also mentioned in the scholia to Ar. *Plut.* 290–301 (*PMG* 819). Fongoni (2006, 101–2) suggests that the parody in Aristophanes and the paraphrasis of Philoxenus' poem by the scholiast point specifically at the poem's mimetic character. The word θρεττανελό in Aristophanes is introduced by the slave and the chorus as a word used by Philoxenus' Cyclops, and the commentator interprets the specific neologism as the way through which the poet imitates in his poem the sound of the *kithara*. The unusual word taken from the *Cyclōps* inserts in the comic scene the same sound effects that it would have created in the original poem. The slave Carion does not simply repeat the word in *Plutus*, however: he also recreates the dancing and stamping moves of the Cyclops' feet (Ar. *Plut.* 290–2), recalling the commentator's παίζων in *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996b IV.

There is indeed a high probability that the author of *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996b focuses on the mimetic character of the poem he discusses, plausibly Philoxenus' *Cyclōps*. The participles used to describe his behaviour—μελιζόμενος καὶ παίζων—and the emphasis on the pleasurable effects—παιδιά, γέλως—create a vivid image where we can visualize the Cyclops singing and dancing in a way that probably resembles the lively recreation of his performance in Aristophanes' *Plutus*. The growing mimetic character of dithyrambic poems is presented as part of the development of the genre in the ps-Aristotelian *Problems* (Arist. [*Pr.*] 918b13–20), where we read about structural, melodic, and performative changes that turned the late dithyramb into a genre whose performance imitates and recreates its narrative content. The two papyrus fragments might also, if not exclusively, point at the narrative character and narrative content of the poem in

question and more specifically at its lack of Dionysiac associations. If the discussion in roll *b* reflects or builds on the discussion in roll *a*, then the commentator's worry is presumably the unsuitability of the Cyclops story for the dithyrambic genre (b, IV.5 οὐδὲ τὸν διθύραμ[βον]); after all, it had nothing to do with Dionysus. Indirectly, and if seen in association with the references to the expected performative details of a traditional dithyramb, as those are outlined in *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a, the commentary on the two fragments (b III–IV) might also underscore the lack of connections of the specific poem with the cultic and ritual context of the dithyrambic genre.

Overall, the emphasis on both rolls falls on what is not customary, but rather new or innovative for the dithyrambic genre, and the discussion concentrates on features that are found in specific poems and that, according to the author of the papyrus-text, are unsuitable for the dithyrambic genre. All in all, the comments in *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a–b allow us to conclude that the dithyramb is understood as a poem for Dionysus, and was meant to be performed within the context of a Dionysiac festival, expectations that were presumably not fulfilled by all the poems that were identified as dithyramps at the time.

The Dithyramb and its Distinctive Feature(s): *P.Berol.* 9571 verso

Another discussion on the dithyramb, most probably a *syggramma* or a *peri*-treatise on a lyric genre (presumably the dithyramb), is found on a fragmentary papyrus (*P.Berol.* 9671 verso = Ieranò Test. 219) dated to the beginning of the third century C.E.²² The text compiles information on the practicalities of dithyrambic competitions (Col. I.1–25), briefly analyses in Aristotelian terms the evolution of tragedy from the dithyramb through the dithyramb's transition to satyr drama (Col. II.33–41), and offers a stylistic analysis of acoustic features and of the effects of

61 π[αιᾶνες Schubart 62 οὐδὲ] Schubart

63 [εἴ μὴ τις Schubart 64 ἔκχυσις dub. Schubart | καλεῖται Schubart | τῶι διθυ-] Schubart

65 ἐν ἀρ[χομένῳι vel ἐν ἀρ[χῆι τοῦνομα Schubart

66 [τις] Schubart οὔ[τε ἐν τέλει vel ὄν[ομα ἐν τέλει Schubart²⁶

Those (poets? / paeans?) will have nothing dithyrambic . . . (nor? / when? / but?) dithyrambic words
... (is called?). At any rate, in his dithyramb neither at . . . of the god . . . did (one?) find (nor?) . . .

P.Berol. 9571 v. Col. II.61–6²⁷

The passage makes a comparison with certain types of poems that are not or should not be identified as dithyramps, and the main criterion for this characterization is their poetic diction. The future ἔξουσι (Col. II.65) gives the impression that this alteration is presented as a development of the dithyrambic genre that occurred after the time of Pindar, whose fr. 70b.8–18 Sn–M is quoted in column II as exemplary of the dithyrambic genre. Schubart's supplement εἴ μὴ τις . . . | . . . καλεῖται (Col. II.63–4) would turn ἔξουσι into the apodosis of a conditional clause. If we accept the supplement as the conditional's protasis, the lack or the respective presence of a specific feature would be presented in the papyrus-text as the condition that determines the poem's generic identity, in this case its identity as a dithyramb.²⁸ It is unclear what words the author of this comment considers to be dithyrambic (Col. II.63), and the papyrus breaks where the second term of comparison is introduced. Schubart (1941, 28–9) assumes that the comparison is made between dithyramps and paeans (perhaps Pindar's paeans?), supplementing the gap in Col. II.63 with π[αιᾶνες. The presence of γοῦν (Col. II.64), however, makes it unlikely that the comparison in

the specific lines is made between two different poetic genres;²⁹ it is more likely that the discussion still concerns the dithyramb, but a kind of dithyramb that lacks some of its expected features, or more so one specific feature. As a matter of fact, the commentator refers to a certain dithyrambic poem (Col. II.64–6) where the god, presumably Dionysus, given his prominence in the papyrus-text, is presumably not mentioned in any of its parts, and this suggests that Dionysiac connections or references to Dionysus were expected in all poems identified as dithyrambs.³⁰

The three lines at the end of the papyrus-text reflect three lines from the biological narrative on the development of tragedy from the dithyrambic genre at the beginning of column II (Col. II.36–41). I give the text of Del Corno and the supplements of Schubart in the apparatus criticus:

ρι.[. . .]χῆι τοῦ ποιήμ[ατος

ἢ κ(αὶ) [. . .]λει, ὅθεν κ(αὶ) τοπ[

Διόνυσόν φη(σι) κ(αὶ) τὴν τρα[γωιδίαν 38

ἐκ τοῦ διθυράμβου διὰ κ[

αὐτοῦ μετήγαγεν ἐπὶ τῆ[ν 40

σατυρογο[α]φίαν

36 ἦ [ἐν ἀρχῆι Schubart **37** [ἐν τέ]λει Schubart | τὸ π[ρὸς τὸν Schubart

. . . of the poem or even . . . , and for this reason he says . . . Dionysus, and also that tragedy (developed / was born?) out of the dithyramb because of / on account of . . . this (the poet?) changed direction towards the composition of satyr drama . . .

P.Berol. 9571 v. Col. II.36–41³¹

The phrase τοῦ ποιήματος (Col. II.36) might be used generally for any dithyrambic poem or might refer specifically to the poem whose narrative is paraphrased in lines 32–4 of the papyrus: a dithyramb that includes the story of Orion’s blinding on Chios, which also involved satyrs.³² Pindar’s fr. 72–3 Sn–M, the most likely candidate for the poem mentioned in the papyrus, are paraphrased in the context of this brief discussion of the evolution of poetic genres—dithyramb, satyr drama, tragedy—presumably because the poem made some sort of association between Dionysus and satyrs.³³ We read in the Pindaric scholia to *Olympian* 13 (Σ Pi. *Ol.* 13.25c Drachmann = Pi. fr. 71 Sn–M) that in the poem that opened the collection of Pindar’s Dithyrambs, the very dithyramb with the narrative on Orion, Pindar claimed that the dithyramb was invented in Thebes.³⁴ The specific Pindaric poem, therefore, included a reference to the dithyramb’s birthplace, if not to its *aetion*, which it localised in Thebes, and its narrative offered a Dionysiac aetiology of the dithyramb.³⁵

The keyword for the purpose of this discussion is ὅθεν (v.37) that is associated with Dionysus; “for this reason, from which”, we read in the papyrus-text, he says that it has something to do with Dionysus. The ὅθεν might refer to Pindar’s dithyramb, and specifically to the presence of satyrs in its poetic narrative or to references to Dionysus in the poem. The same comment, however, might be applied to any poem with a certain characteristic. The generalizing tone of the causal and explanatory secondary clause makes it more likely that the author of the text refers to a widespread rule and that Pindar’s fr. 72–3 Sn–M are mentioned to support a general statement. After all, the dithyramb and its characteristic features become the text’s exclusive focal point from Col. II.41 onwards, and the literary genealogy along with the paraphrase of the Pindaric dithyramb and the focus on Dionysus preface the new section.³⁶ Taking the two passages together (Col. II.36–41, 61–6), the feature that the papyrus-author gives emphasis to is, most probably, a reference to

the god Dionysus or a story associated with Dionysus, which, if we accept Schubart's supplements in Col. II.36–7, is expected to be found either in the proem or in the closing lines of a dithyrambic poem. This detail does not necessarily contextualize the performance of such poems within a Dionysiac festival; it exclusively points to the poems' association with Dionysus through their diction, which alludes to the ritual origins of dithyrambic song and genre only in retrospect.

Franco Longoni (1976) suggests that the comparison in Col. II.36–8 and Col. II.61–6 is made between the dithyrombs of Pindar and those of Bacchylides, and proposes that the pronoun $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in Col. II.65 refers to Bacchylides. According to Longoni (1976, 306), Pindar's dithyrombs, especially those quoted and paraphrased in the papyrus-text (frr. 70b and 72-4 Sn–M), are presented as examples of compositions that are bound to the cult of Dionysus and are in compliance with the ritual origins of the song. On the contrary, Bacchylides' dithyrombs, argues Longoni, are recalled as representative cases of a second type of dithyramb that does not contain the name of the god and evokes neither Dionysiac elements nor the Bacchic atmosphere.

It has indeed been recognized by modern scholars that Bacchylides' dithyrombs are different from those of Pindar and that they generally have a unique place within the dithyrambic genre of the fifth century B.C.E.: the majority of them lacks any associations with Dionysus.³⁷ Based on Longoni's hypothesis, the papyrus-text creates a distinction within the dithyrambic genre between a ceremonial / religious and a literary / competitive song.³⁸ Longoni's proposition is not illogical, especially if we assume, as the *editor princeps* does, that Simonides might have been named in the missing part in Col. I.17 and perhaps also in Col. II.53.³⁹ If all the three main representatives of the dithyrambic genre in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. are named in the papyrus-text, the commentator then creates a narrative with the main features of their dithyrambic compositions, which he supports with paraphrases and quotations of their poems. However, if we

are to assume that both αὐτοῦ and the last three lines of the preserved column II refer to Bacchylides and his dithyrambs, Bacchylides' name would have had to be mentioned earlier in the papyrus. Unless he is named in the missing part of the papyrus, it is difficult to argue that Bacchylides was named in Col. II.51–61. The name of a poet must have been included in the missing part of Col. II.53, and Schubart suggests Σιμωνί(δης) and Lobel Ἀμμ]ώνι(ος) (Schubart 1941, 28); it could indeed be the case that αὐτοῦ in Col. II.65 refers back to that poet.⁴⁰

At any rate, the closing and opening sections of column II of the papyrus allow us to conclude confidently that the identification of the dithyrambic genre is made on the basis of diction and narrative content, and perhaps also structural features if Schubart's supplements are accepted. That in the view of the papyrus-author references to Dionysus were expected to be found in all those poems that were dithyrambs is evident in the numerous times that Dionysus is named in connection with prizes, performances, and poems that the commentator considers to be dithyrambs. This close link between poem and divine honorand, more specifically diction and Dionysus, as presented in the papyrus-text, suggests that to the mind of the papyrus-author dithyrambic poems were identified exclusively as cultic hymns in honour of Dionysus and that the dithyrambic genre was expected to be associated with the god Dionysus. We can draw another conclusion from the preserved text. Despite the expected Dionysiac link that dithyrambs were meant to have in order to be identified as dithyrambic poems, there was a point in time in the development of the genre when the poems became detached from their cultic and religious frame. Irrespective of whether that Dionysiac detachment mentioned at the end of column II is associated with Bacchylides or with poets of the post-classical era, the commentator presents it as something innovative and different from the traditional dithyrambic norm of Pindar and of the classical era. Along with the possible lack of references to Dionysus, in all probability, the absence of

dithyrambic words is given as the reason why some poems lacked dithyrambic character, and these ὀνόματα διθυραμβικά might implicitly refer to the lack of Dionysiac content, as well as to the song's dissociation from a Dionysiac (ritual) context.⁴¹

Dionysiac Features and Heroic Narratives

In both *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a–b and *P.Berol.* 9571 verso we find passages with obvious Dionysiac features and comments on the diction and narrative of poetic extracts which focus specifically on their association with the dithyrambic genre. The author of *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a–b is interested in the musical mode and harmony (a 1, cols. 1–2) and the narrative (b III–IV) that would be appropriate to a dithyrambic poem and at a dithyrambic performance, while the commentator in *P.Berol.* 9571 verso associates explicitly dithyrambic poems with Dionysus; the naming of Dionysus and the inclusion of Dionysiac diction become the distinctive features of the dithyramb. The author of *P.Berol.* 9571 verso lays out the one characteristic that identifies the dithyramb—the presence of the god Dionysus either through invocation and naming or through a Dionysiac narrative—within the context of a treatise that deals generally with the dithyrambic genre, and the discussion is supported with fragments where Dionysus is explicitly named and with poetic extracts that recreate the Bacchic atmosphere at a dithyrambic performance. Whereas *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a–b concentrates on compositions and representatives of the New Music of the late classical period, the majority of the poetic quotations found in *P.Berol.* 9571 verso are taken from fifth-century dithyrambs, specifically Pindar. The closing section of the extant part of column II of *P.Berol.* 9571 verso points at compositions that are no longer associated with Dionysus and also at the moment when the dithyrambic genre diverts from its cultic and Dionysiac roots. It is possible to argue, therefore, that the missing part of the papyrus presumably contained

a discussion or even criticism of the post-classical dithyrambic poems, similar to what we find in *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a–b.

The expectations that the dithyramb should be associated with Dionysus and the subsequent detachment of the genre from its Dionysiac context inevitably alludes to the famous saying Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον.⁴² Allegedly, there was a point in the development of the dithyrambic genre when Dionysus was no longer the narrative focus of the performed poems.

Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον: ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ μὴ προσήκοντα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις λεγόντων ἢ παροιμία εἴρηται. Ἐπειδὴ τῶν χορῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰθισμένων διθύραμβον ἄδειν εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον, οἱ ποιηταὶ ὕστερον ἐκβάντες τὴν συνήθειαν ταύτην, Αἴαντας καὶ Κενταύρους γράφειν ἐπεχείρουν. Ὅθεν οἱ θεώμενοι σκώπτοντες ἔλεγον Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον.

Nothing to do with Dionysus: the proverb is said in respect of those who talk about the things that do not belong to what is established. For from the very beginning, it was customary for the choruses to sing in honour of Dionysus. Afterwards the poets departed from this habit and attempted to write *Aiantas* and *Kentaurs*. For this reason, the spectators were mocking saying, ‘nothing to do with Dionysus’.

Zenob. V 40.10-16 = Ieranò Test. 65⁴³

It is impossible to draw any precise chronological conclusions on when the change at dithyrambic performances occurred, but the ἐξ ἀρχῆς and ὕστερον create a temporal division between “a time before” and “a time after” that is clearly defined by a change in poetic content. We read that

dithyrambic choruses sang in honour of Dionysus from the very first dithyrambic performances and that the dithyramb's association with Dionysus became an expected feature of the genre; Zenobius even calls it a habit.⁴⁴ The audience's reproach to the detachment of dithyrambic performances from their religious context recalls the comments in the two papyri analysed above, where we find a distinction between the conventional Dionysiac and the innovative non-Dionysiac. When Archilochus introduces the word dithyramb for the first time he defines it as the song of Dionysus (fr. 120 W²), and Pindar's extant dithyrambs confirm the Dionysiac character of dithyrambic song; invocations of Dionysus, mythological narratives related to Dionysiac mythology, and Dionysiac diction contextualize indeed the majority of Pindaric dithyrambs within Dionysiac cultic and ritual frames.⁴⁵ Furthermore, a good number of sources recall the self-reflective generic comments found in lyric poems, and connect, in their turn, the dithyramb with Dionysus: we read in a fragment of Aeschylus how Dionysus should be honoured with a dithyramb that would be performed by a shouting *kōmos* (*TrGF* 355); the chorus in Euripides' *Bacchae* dance and sing in honour of Dionysus, whom they call *Dithyrambos* (*Bac.* 526-7); and in Pindar's *Olympian* 13 the ox-driving dithyramb is turned into the vehicle of Dionysus' celebration (*Ol.* 13.18–19). Based on our extant sources the dithyramb was understood as the poem for Dionysus down to the Byzantine era.⁴⁶

According to Zenobius, however, there was a point in time when dithyrambs were no longer the song of Dionysus, and the poets chose to introduce narratives that had nothing to do with the god, a statement that recalls the concluding lines of *P.Berol.* 9571 verso (Col. II.61–4). Zenobius, of course, derives his information from intermediate sources,⁴⁷ and in my view the passage combines the two Platonic perceptions of the dithyramb. In a famous passage from Plato's *Laws* (*Lg.* 700a–b) the dithyramb is introduced within a nostalgic narrative of generic and musical

purity, and is associated explicitly with Dionysus (*Lg.* 700a7–e4), while in the course of an incomplete and problematic typology of modes of narratives in the *Republic* (*R.* 392d1–7, 394b8–c5) Socrates, famously, associates the dithyramb with the lack of mimetic mode (*R.* 392d5; *R.* 394c2-3).⁴⁸ In all probability, Plato reproduces in the *Republic* a general remark on the dithyramb, expressed by Glaucus of Rhegium.⁴⁹ As we read in the *De Musica*, Xenocritus’ compositions contained mythological narratives, and, consequently, it was unclear whether they were paeans. The existence of these (mythological) narratives in Xenocritus’ poems was for Glaucus of Rhegium the determining criterion for classifying them as dithyramps.⁵⁰

περὶ δὲ Ξενοκρίτου, ὃς ἦν τὸ γένος ἐκ Λοκρῶν τῶν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ,
ἀμφισβητεῖται εἰ παιάνων ποιητῆς γέγονεν· ἡρωϊκῶν γὰρ ὑποθέσεων
πράγματα ἔχουσῶν ποιητὴν γεγονέναι φασὶν αὐτόν· διὸ καὶ τινὰς
διθυράμβους καλεῖν αὐτοῦ τὰς ὑποθέσεις . . .

“As to Xenocritus, a native of Locri in Italy, it is uncertain whether he was a composer of paeans: it is said that he composed on heroic subjects involving actions, which is why some people call his pieces dithyramps . . .” (trans. Barker 1984)

Ps-Plut. *De Mus.* 1134e5–10

Ps-Plutarch refers to a group of unnamed individuals who considered the presence of mythological narratives in a poem to be a dithyrambic trait,⁵¹ which suggests that in the fourth century B.C.E. the connection between a heroic narrative and the dithyramb was, plausibly, a general principle.⁵² Thus, Plato could possibly have interpreted Glaucus’ “heroic subjects involving actions” as long

narrative stretches or pure narrative mode, and his remark in the *Republic* might express a general perception in the classical period that the dithyramb was the narrative genre par excellence.⁵³

Admittedly, neither Zenobius nor Plato nor, as a matter of fact, Glaucus of Rhegium offer a detailed literary theory with regards to the dithyrambic genre; Glaucus and Plato rather reflect and react to current understandings and interpretations of the dithyrambic genre, and Zenobius describes and explains a change in dithyrambic performances, as that was presumably reported in the sources to which he had access. Nevertheless, that the presence of an extended narrative was also a criterion for classifying poems as dithyrambs in the Alexandrian Library is evident in *P.Oxy.* 23.2368.

ταύτην τή]ν ᾠδὴν Ἀρίσταρχ(ός)
γε μὲν διθυραμβικὴν εἶ- 10
ναί φησι]ν διὰ τὸ παρειλῆ-
φθαι ἐν α]ὐτῇ τὰ περὶ Κασ-
σάνδρας,] ἐπιγράφει δ' αὐτὴν
... Κασσ]άνδραν

14 καὶ Luppe 1987, Maehler 2003, Rutherford 1991 : Ἰλιον ἢ Luppe 1989 : (οὐ)τω Gallavotti
1957 : οὐν Ucciardello 1996-1997 : διὸ D'Alessio 1997, 37 n. 90

Aristarchus says that this ode is dithyrambic because what concerns Cassandra has been included in it, and he entitles it ... *Kassandra*.

For Aristarchus the mythological narrative about Cassandra was the defining feature for the poem's generic identity as dithyramb. The poem *Kassandra* has been identified as one of Bacchylides' dithyramb, and rightly so; with the exception of Ode 19 (ΙΩ), the sole dithyramb explicitly associated with the god Dionysus, the poems that are included in the book of Bacchylides' Dithyramb are characterized by pure mythological narrative, and they lack explicit deictic references to their cultic contexts, as well as internal pointers that associate them with Dionysus.⁵⁵ As a matter of fact, all the dithyramb of Bacchylides carry titles, which reflect their narrative content or the main mythological figure of the story, and we also have evidence for dithyramb with titles composed by Simonides and Pindar: Simonides' Μέμνων (539 *PMG* / 351 Poltera) and Pindar's *Dithyramb* 2 Ἡρακλῆς ἢ Κέρβερος Θηβαίοις (fr. 75 Sn–M).⁵⁶ The commentator in *P.Oxy.* 23.2368 clarifies that it is a narrative about Cassandra that gave the said poem the title *Kassandra*, and it is at this point that the fragmentary commentary converges with Zenobius. That which replaced the Dionysiac references in the dithyramb is not explained; Zenobius only gives us heroic names that are, presumably, titles of dithyrambic poems: Αἴαντας καὶ Κενταύρους. We know that Lasus composed a dithyramb entitled *Kentauroi* (*PMG* 704), Telestes a dithyramb with the title *Hymenaios* (*PMG* 808), and Kleomenes wrote the dithyramb *Meleagros* (*PMG* 838). Philoxenus' *Hymenaios* (*PMG* 828) might also have been a dithyramb. In fact, various testimonia on poems of the post-classical era use titles to identify them. To mention only a few, Timotheus composed a *Cyclōps* (*PMG* 780), a *Skylla* (*PMG* 793), an *Artemis* (*PMG* 778), an *Elpēnōr* (*PMG* 779), the *Persai* (*PMG* 788), and a poem with the title *Aias emmanēs* (*PMG* 777); Melanippides composed a *Marsyas* (*PMG* 758) and a *Persephonē* (*PMG* 759);

Telestes a poem entitled *Argō* (PMG 805), another with the title *Asklēpios* (PMG 806-7); Kinesias also wrote an *Asklēpios* (PMG 774); Philoxenus composed his famous *Cyclōps* or *Galateia* (PMG 815-24), his *Deipnon* (PMG 836), and the *Mysoi* (PMG 826).

Zenobius uses the titles to denote a change in dithyrambic poetics and content. The fragmentary state of the poems of the New Music makes it impossible for us to argue with certainty that none of these entitled compositions was associated with Dionysiac poetics and that none reflected the religious context within which it was expected to be performed.⁵⁷ Nonetheless, one may only look at the titles included above and those assigned by the Alexandrians to fifth-century dithyramps and paeans to understand what they were trying to encapsulate. In a recent overview of the titles of poems of Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides, Enrico Prodi points out that titles, as we have them, were based on Alexandrian systematization, and were given to poems with the aim of orienting the reader's understanding of the piece in question and offering information about the poem's context: honorands, dedicatees, performers, and commissioners.⁵⁸ Whereas in the case of paeans titles include the worshipped divinity (Apollo) and often the commissioning community, in the case of dithyramps titles reflect the narrative content of the song rather than the ritual occasion; "a dithyramb is, first and foremost, a story".⁵⁹ The difference between the habits of entitling paeans and dithyramps is important. Although they were both cultic songs, in the case of the dithyramb it was the internal narrative content of the poem that somehow had to be encapsulated by the title rather than the cultic and external occasion of its performance. The emphasis on the narrative story included in the poem points back to Glaucus' understanding of the dithyramb as containing mythological stories and to Plato's view of the dithyramb as the narrative genre par excellence. It also reflects the criticism of the commentator in *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996b that the love-story of Cyclops was unsuitable for the dithyramb and thus for Dionysus.

As the discussion of the fragmentary papyri has demonstrated, the dithyramb was conventionally considered to be a cultic song in honour of Dionysus. The song's expected association with Dionysus is also often confirmed by hints at the poems' Dionysiac contextualization and by other testimonia on the Dionysiac nature of dithyrambic songs. Sources that comment on or criticize the narrative and non-Dionysiac nature of dithyrambic poems complement these cultic and Dionysiac characteristics that are expected to be found in dithyrambic poems. The ancient commentary preserved in *P.Oxy.* 23.2368, the features of the majority of poems from Bacchylides' book of Dithyrambs, Glaucus' observation on Xenocritus' dithyrambs, and Plato's double interpretation of the dithyramb suggest that the ritual and religious view of the dithyramb as the song of Dionysus and the formalistic view of the dithyramb as a poem with (long) narrative sections were both understood in antiquity as characteristics of the dithyrambic genre.

A scholion on the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax is strong enough evidence to suggest that these two views of the dithyramb prevailed in the understanding of the genre, at least in later years.⁶⁰

Διθύραμβός ἐστι ποίημα πρὸς Διόνυσον ἀδόμενον ἢ πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνα,
παραπλοκάς ἱστοριῶν οἰκειῶν <περιέχον>.

The dithyramb is a poem that is sung in honour of Dionysus or in honour of Apollo, and it includes entanglements of suitable stories.

Σ Lond. Dion. Thrax, *Art. Gramm.* 314c.21–2 (p.451 Hilgard = Test. 33 Ieranò)

Seemingly, the scholiast tries to combine two principles in his definition of the dithyramb—the ritual and the formalistic—and the scholion suggests that had a poem not included markers to ritual

contextualization or Dionysiac references the existence of a number of interconnected (mythological) stories would have been a helpful generic feature. Obviously, remarks on lyric genres in various sources and self-reflective comments in the poems themselves were used as literary grammar in later classifications and understandings of lyric poems. For the classification of the *Kassandra* as a dithyramb Aristarchus might indeed have looked for instructive comments in sources other than the lyric poems. The Alexandrians were familiar with Plato and his work, which they grouped together and upon which they commented, and they might in all probability have been influenced by his view of lyric genres (e.g. the dithyramb) and by his own lyric literary history.⁶¹ It is, though, also significant to recognize that the Hellenistic scholars had in their possession much more material than what has survived down to the modern era; they might even have possessed Glaucus' work or other treatises which we know only by title and indirect references. The Alexandrians were most likely aware of early poetic taxonomies and classificatory observations through the texts that survived in the Library. Be it through Glaucus' work, through other treatises and texts that did not survive extant to the modern era, or through Plato's comment on the narrative nature of the dithyramb, Aristarchus' *ta peri Kassandras* that was applied as a dithyrambic criterion for the classification of the poem was not invented in the Alexandrian Library. It rather reflects a long literary history, of which we are aware only fragmentarily.

Conclusions

The surviving authorities that discuss the dithyramb from the classical period down to the Byzantine era recall the ritual and Dionysiac performative context of dithyrambic poems, which suggests that the dithyramb was meant to have a cultic function and to be connected with Dionysus. The text preserved in *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a–b and *P.Berol.* 9671 verso and the comments made on the conventional and the innovative in the genre of the dithyramb, and specifically on the

presence or absence of Dionysiac diction in dithyrambic poems, are strong enough evidence to suggest that, despite the Dionysiac expectations, poems that were unrelated to Dionysus were often still classified or understood as dithyrambos. The authors of the two papyrus-texts point at certain poetic features that could be seen as criteria for identifying song-types and poetic genres. One could even argue that the text in *P.Berol. 9671 verso*, in particular, contains references to some of the criteria that the Alexandrians might have used to catalogue and classify poems.⁶² Despite the emphasis in both papyri on the ritual character of the dithyramb, interpreting lyric genres exclusively within their ritual context had proven problematic as early as the fifth century B.C.E.; Glaucus of Rhegium and other contemporary musicographers recognized the presence of heroic (mythological) narratives in lyric poems as a classificatory criterion for Xenocritus' dithyrambos, which, in all likelihood, showed neither Dionysiac connections nor ritual associations with Dionysus. This observation might be echoed in the *Republic* and Plato's comment on the mode of enunciation of the dithyrambic genre, which is also reflected in Aristarchus' classification of the poem *Kassandra* as a dithyramb (*P.Oxy. 23.2368*). Despite the evident oscillation in our sources between the religious and the formalistic view of the dithyramb, the evidence provided by the two fragmentary papyri suggests that the dithyramb was originally understood as a Dionysiac song, and its Dionysiac roots were usually presented as a desideratum.

Going one step further, the above discussion reveals that genre generally and generic identification of lyric song-types specifically were debated and conceptualized already in fifth- and fourth-century B.C.E. discussions, and might have continued being debated as well as conceptualized even after their classification by the Alexandrians. The sources that elaborate on the nature of the dithyramb reveal that genres were not unproblematic, and that song-types were living entities that always evolved in their performative context, constructing and unfolding their

genre progressively.⁶³ Evidently, the authors of the two papyri attempt to recreate through the existing text of the dithyrambic poems the occasion and purpose of the song's composition and performance, imposing on the poems their own ritual, communicative, and aesthetic expectations, all of which were created by poets, audiences, or other critics.⁶⁴ Based on the sources that formed the basis for the above discussion one can conclude that commentators, critics, and scholars in antiquity did not take into account only one parameter in their understanding of genre. They rather considered various factors—occasion, form, and content—and one or all three factors became dominant each time.⁶⁵ Song-types that were identified as dithyrambos were made to fit within ancient scholars' expectations, which reveals that genres were crystallized retrospectively and continuously at their various receptions.⁶⁶ Every era wrestled with the classificatory parameters of the dithyramb, and debate about what marked the dithyrambic genre continued throughout antiquity. The Alexandrians, then, did not have the final say on the matter.⁶⁷

¹ See in particular Pickard-Cambridge 1962, ch.1; Schmidt 1990; van der Weiden 1991; Zimmermann 1992 and 1993; Hose 1995; D'Angour 1997; Lavecchia 2000; Wilson 2003; Pritchard 2004; the volume edited by Kowalzig and Wilson 2013.

² The term *kyklios khoros* can also be applied to choral performances that did not necessarily have Dionysiac associations, on which Fearn 2007, 163–80; D'Alessio 2013; especially important is Ceccarrelli 2013; cf. Pickard-Cambridge 1962, 32: “The name ‘circular chorus’, which always means dithyramb, was probably derived from the dancers arranged in in a circle, instead of in a rectangular formation as dramatic choruses were.” In a scholion to Aristophanes' *Aves* (schol. Ar. Av. 1403) Dicaearchus along with Hellanicus of Lesbos (*FGrH A4 Hoi Karneonikai* F85) are named as the authorities who ascribed the invention of the *kyklios khoros* to Arion (*Peri Dionysiakōn Agōnōn* fr.75 Wehrli²), who is mentioned in Herodotus as the first to have composed and named a dithyramb (Hdt.1.23). According to Proclus, a similar association of Arion with both the dithyramb and the *kyklios khoros* is made by

Aristotle (Phot. *Bibl.* 239, 320a, p.160.30–3 Henry = Test. 49 Ieranò). The references to Dicaearchus and Aristotle suggest that the identification of the dithyramb with the *kyklios khoros* originated in the Peripatos. On the figure of Arion and its association with the dithyramb and the *kyklios khoros*, D’Alessio 2013, 114–8.

³ Cf. the observation made by Dover 1964, 188–90.

⁴ Emphasis in the original. Also, Rösler 1980 on the contextualization of Alcaeus’ poetry within the political context of Lesbos, where his *hetairoi* become its primary recipients. The anthropological, performance- and occasion-oriented model in our understanding of genre has been pushed back in recent years; see the volume edited by Budelmann and Phillips 2018 and that by Foster, Kurke, and Weiss 2020.

⁵ See more recently Cingano 2003, 22; Ford 2002, 10; Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 22–6; Carey 2009.

⁶ Carey 2009, 22 points out that the formulation of an explicit grammar of genres postdates the performance culture of archaic and early classical Greece.

⁷ Where it is not stated, translations are mine.

⁸ Fragments a I, col. 3.2–6, a II, cols. 2–3, 5 + b I, cols. 1–2 + b II, cols. 1–2 = *PMG* 929. Oellacher 1932 detects *paragraphoi* at fragments a I, col. 2.6, col. 3.1 and 5, col. 5.4, col.6.1; a II, col. 3.3, col. 4.6; a III, col. 1.2; b I, col. 2.5; b II, col. 2.3, and identifies poetic quotations in fragments a I, col. 3.5–6; a I, col. 5.2–3; a II, col. 2; a II, col. 3.3–6; a II, col. 5; b I, col. 1; b I, col. 2; b II, col. 1; b II, col. 2.1–3. The *paragraphoi* at line beginning, however, indicate the possible existence of more quotations, including a I col.2, a II col.4, and a I, col. 5.2–4 discussed in Battezzato 2013, 100 n.44, 101–2.

⁹ Maas’ supplement in a I, col.4.5 Τελ[έστης is adopted in the text of Ieranò, but omitted by Battezzato 2013, 100, n.44 as doubtful, an objection already raised by Körte 1935, 246–7.

¹⁰ Mass’ opinion is registered in Oellacher 1932, 144 and Körte 1935, 246.

¹¹ The similarities between Aristoxenus’ fragments and the papyrus-text have led scholars to assume that the papyrus contains a peripatetic treatise. Indeed, what survives from Aristoxenus’ *Peri mousikēs*, *Mousikē akroasis*, and *Peri melopoiias* reveals that Aristoxenus commented on the ethical qualities of certain musical harmonies and on their appropriateness to certain poetic genres: e.g. Aristoxenus fr.80 Wehrli² on Plato rejecting the Lydian harmony for its lamenting character; fr.81 Wehrli² on the appropriateness of the mixolydian harmony to tragedy; fr.82 Wehrli² on the noble character of the Dorian harmony. In none of the surviving fragments from the three treatises, however, does Aristoxenus draw on examples from the late classical dithyramb and in none does he comment on extracts from the

poems of the New Music. Indeed, the Peripatetics showed interest in musical harmonies, their ethical character, and the way in which they were used by poets and perceived by philosophers (e.g. Aristoxenus fr.74–5, 81–4 Wehrli², Heracleides Ponticus fr.163 Wehrli²). Wherever poetic extracts are quoted, however, the Peripatetic author does not comment specifically on the content of the quotation; he rather incorporates it in his discussion to support his argument; on the Peripatetic method on the lyric treatises, see in more detail Hadjimichael 2019a, ch.4, and 2019b; on Chamaeleon’s method specifically, Bouchard 2019. This precise difference and the existence of *lēm̄mata* followed by explanatory comments (e.g. fr. a I, col. 6) are strong pieces of evidence in favour of the suggestion of the *editor princeps* that the papyrus contains a commentary on different poems, which are meant to be or are recognized to be dithyrambs.

¹² Text and translation by Battezzato 2013, 100 with n.44 on his reproduction of the text.

¹³ Oellacher 1932, 141; Battezzato 2013, 100–1.

¹⁴ On the musical innovations of the late classical dithyramb, see Zimmermann 1992, 122–6, Csapo 2004, 212–29 and 2011, 72–89; LeVen 2013. On the *aulos* revolution in particular, Wilson 1999; Martin 2003; Wallace 2003, and the lyre Wilson 2004.

¹⁵ Text and translation Battezzato 2013, 100, who in col. 4 translates “Melanippides and arranged”.

¹⁶ Battezzato 2013, 102 tentatively suggests that Melanippides is the focus of the discussion in fr. a I, and points out that the commentator might be referring to *PMG 759*, a dithyramb of Melanippides’ with the title *Persephonē*, which also presumably had threnodic connotations. See also p.102, n.54, where he entertains the possibility that the commentator might be discussing Philoxenus, in the course of which discussion he quotes Melanippides.

¹⁷ In his comments on fragment a I, col. 6 Oellacher (1932, 138) points out that an empty space wider than 5 cm is detectable on the right side of the specific column, which implies that the following columns were shorter by one line or that col. 6 was followed by a title. According to Körte (1935, 246 n.1) the wider space is a sign that fragment a I, col. 6 marks the end of the script, and he, therefore, proposes changing the order of the fragments and having fragments a II and III moved before fragment a I. Cf. Oellacher 1932, 137 “Nach der letzten Kolumne von a I ist ein breiter freier Raum. Vielleicht war hier das Ende der Rolle. Die Anfangsspuren einer zweiten Kolumne von III erweisen, daß eine Anordnung von III unmittelbar vor II nicht vorgenommen werden kann.” Fragments a II, columns 2, 3, and 5 include poetic quotations, and were we to accept Körte’s suggestion and reverse the order we would have had the three passages that are presumably taken from the dithyramb under discussion placed before the comments on the musical

harmonia that is thought to be appropriate to a poem for Dionysus. Körte's proposal would place sections of the poem before the commentary, and the quoted passages would specify the poem that the commentator identifies as a dithyramb. In such a reconstruction, the poem under discussion would have been a poem of Philoxenus, whose name was, in all probability, included at the end of a II, col. 4. Within the context of that discussion, therefore, Melanippides would be mentioned and quoted (a I, cols. 1–4) as the poet who managed to combine various musical modes in one of his poems, presumably *PMG 759*, as already suggested by Battezzato 2013, 101–2. In this case, the commentator would be following Aristotle's criticism of the wrong musical character of Philoxenus' work (possibly quoting his *Mysoi*?), referring briefly to Melanippides as the poet who, unlike Philoxenus, blended musical *harmoniae* successfully. The construction *accusativus cum infinitive* (I a, col. 4), especially in comparison to the nominative used for Philoxenus (a II, col.4.6), implies that the commentator is following the authority of another source, whose view on Melanippides is mentioned in the text. If one decides to take up Körte's suggestion in rearranging fragments a I–III, then the entire discussion in *P.Graec.Vindob.* 19996a would centre exclusively on a poem of Philoxenus, in the course of which Melanippides is quoted as a *comparandum*; cf. Battezzato 2013, 102 n.54.

¹⁸ Oellacher 1932, 142. The *kainon* might be referring to the lyric dactyls in which the three lines in fr. a II, col. 3.3–6 were composed.

¹⁹ Generally, the dithyramb is singled out in our sources for its extravagant style and bold language, on which see Ieranò Test.165–88b, 195b–203, and the New Dithyramb in particular was known and also criticized in comedy for its exuberant and elevated diction, implausible metaphors, accumulated epithets and bold compounds, and also exaggerated periphrases, on which see Ford 2013 and LeVen 2014, ch.4. Also, Csapo 2004, 222–9 and 2011, 82–9 on the linguistic and syntactical features of the New Music that prioritized sound over sense.

²⁰ The text is that of Oellacher 1932, reproduced also in Ieranò 1997, Test. 220. The *editor princeps* reads $\acute{\pi}\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ in fr. a II, col. 2.4–5, but Powell 1932, 263, col. 2 points out that $\acute{\pi}\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \delta'\ \acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ is preferable, and since then either of the two readings have been adopted in different editions and discussions of the papyrus fragment— $\acute{\pi}\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \delta'\ \acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$: Körte 1935, 248; Page 1962, *PMG* 929b and 1970, 392; Campbell 1993, 320. $\acute{\pi}\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$: Slater 1976, 65; Henrichs 1978, 146; Ieranò 1997, 132. The term $\acute{\pi}\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$, if we keep the acute as given by Oellacher, would be a technical term, equivalent to $\acute{\pi}\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$, and used in epiphanies, on which Pfister 1924, col. 311 s.v. *Epiphanie*. Oellacher 1932, 142 mentions Maas' objections against $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$ in line 4, who suggests that $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ might also be possible. He also notes

that although in line 2 ἀ[ί]σομεν would fill in the gap better, it would not suit the context, and Maas suggests ἀ[ύ]σομεν, which is adopted by Page and Campbell. Page 1970, 390, however, notes that ἀ[εῖ]σομεν is more probable, though the form is strange.

²¹ The text is that Oellacher 1932, reproduced also in Ieranò 1997, Test. 220. The translation of b IV that I offer takes the first participle with the nouns in the genitive. If we assume that the Cyclops is holding a *kithara* while singing and dancing, on which cf. *PMG* 819 (2), an alternative translation could be the following: taking for himself (a *kithara*?) . . . and (partaking?) in amusement and . . . laughter, removing himself (?) / being separated (?) . . . but not the dithyramb.

²² Schubart 1941, 25; Del Corno 1974, 100. The date given in the BerlPap Papyrus Datenbank is between the second and third century C.E.

²³ A four-line quotation remains unidentified (*P.Berol.* 9671 v. Col. II.58–61). The *editor princeps* (Schubart 1941, 28) thinks that the name of a poet is mentioned in Col. II.53; Schubart suggests Simonides, and Lobel Ammonios. Another quotation is presumably found in Col. I.25, but remains unidentified. Janko 2011, 500 proposes that Archilochus' fr. 120 W² is quoted in Col. II.25–6.

²⁴ Schubart supplements Col. I.19 with ταύρ]ουζ in order to explain the two-line quotation from Pindar's *Ol.* 13; cf. 'Simonides' 27 *FGE* (= 79 D.). On the specific quotation and the length of the lines, Dal Corno 1971, 103 with pp.105–6 for a discussion of the prizes mentioned in the papyrus in connection with literary evidence. According to Schubart (1941, 27), Simonides might also be mentioned in this section (Col. I.17–18), and Lobel, whose view is mentioned in Schubart's comments and apparatus criticus, suggests Στ]μῶν(ῖ)(ου) ἐπί|γραμμα along with Ἀδεϊμάν]του in Col. I.13, which would identify the archon and point to *FGE* 28 (= 77 D.) that is ascribed to Simonides.

²⁵ Schubart 1941, 29, suggests that due to the long Pindaric quotations the text might be a commentary on Pindar. The specific quotations, though, are not *lēmata*, as Del Corno 1974, 104 points out, but are cited ἐν ἐκθέσει, and are included as evidence and examples for the claims made in the papyrus-text. Dal Corno 100, n.3 points out that the *paragraphos* that Schubart identifies in his text under Col. II.58 seems to be the horizontal line of the τ in Col. II.59, and suggests that the text could be a section from a longer *peri*-treatise on a more general theme like Dicaearchus' *Peri Dionysiakōn agōnōn* or Didymos' *Peri Lyrikōn Poiētōn* (pp.109–10). Janko 2011, 500 points out that the erudition of the treatise is suggestive of Didymos.

²⁶ Schubart 1941, 28 points out that the supplement we choose for v.66 affects that of v.65. Thus, if we accept ὄν[ομα (v.66), then ἐν ἀρχῆι τοῦνομα (v.65) would be dispensable, and the two lines would be ἐν ἀρχομένωι | τοῦ θεοῦ [. . .] εὔρε ὄν[ομα ἐν τέλει (vv.65–6).

²⁷ The text is that of Del Corno 1971, reproduced in Ieranò 1997. They are both cautious, and mention in their apparatus criticus only Schubart’s supplement in Col. II.65 ἐν ἀρχῆι. The width of the columns would affect the kind of supplements that would be acceptable, or the position thereof, and the two editors offer different suggestions, on which Schubart 1941, 26–7; Del Corno 1971, 103–4; also Janko 2011, 500.

²⁸ Schubart 1941, 29 clarifies that the future ἔξουσι is conditional: “sie werden haben (wenn wir zu dieser Stelle kommen).”

²⁹ According to Smyth 1984, ad 2830 “γοῦν commonly confirms a previous general assertion by giving a special instance of its truth . . . γοῦν is thus used in bringing forward a reason, which, while not absolutely conclusive, is the most probable explanation of a previous statement.”

³⁰ Cf. Janko 2011, 500–1. The presence of οὔτε in Col. II.65 creates the expectation of a second οὔτε, perhaps in v.66, whose construction would correspond to that of v.65.

³¹ *P.Berol.* 9571 v. Col. II.35–44 = *F37d in Janko 2011, who supplements v.37 with τὸ π[αρομιιάζειν οὐδὲν π(ρὸς) τὸν and v.40 with τῆ]ν περὶ τοῦ Διονύσου in an attempt to connect the verses with the proverb “nothing to do with Dionysus”, on which see below. These supplements notionally depend on the verb ἐξένευον (v.35), which signals some sort of avoidance—stories about Dionysus, based on Janko’s translation, or introduction of satyrs, as Schubart 1941, 27 proposes tentatively—and his supplement ἤρξαντο (cf. v.35 Schubart suggests ἤρξατο), which indicates some sort of change and the start of a new habit. If we accept Janko’s supplements Col. II.35–8 would read “began to avoid (plots about Dionysus) and began (to sing) about (Dionysus) either at the start of the poem or even at its end. Hence the (proverb arose ‘nothing to do with) Dionysus’ ” (trans. Janko 2011). I find it difficult to follow the train of thought in the specific lines, as they have been supplemented by Janko, especially as the invocation to the god Dionysus, alluded to here in “sing”, is in all probability presented at the end of column II as a distinctive dithyrambic feature, as already discussed above, and something that had to do with Dionysus. Though this point does not affect

my argument, I am inclined to think that Col. II.37–8 still refer to how dithyramps were associated with Dionysus; cf. Schubart 1941, 27–8.

³² We read in Serv. ad Verg. *Aen.* 10.763 that Dionysus appeared with the satyrs to assist Oenopion. On the relationship between the dithyramb and the satyr play, as presented in the papyrus, Del Corno 1974, 107–9.

³³ Cf. Lavecchia 2000, 20, 64, 273–4.

³⁴ The quotation of Pi. fr. 72 Sn–M in the *Etym. Magn.* Θώραξ (= p. 460, 35) is also prefaced by Πίνδαρος διθυράμβῳ πρώτῳ and creates an obvious association with Pi. fr. 71 Sn–M. Also, Lavecchia 2000, 274–6.

³⁵ Del Corno 1974 108–9 with nn. 23–4; Fearn 2007, 198–9.

³⁶ As Del Corno 1974, 107 notes, the second half Col. II.41 introduces a new argument, which is marked by the empty space on the papyrus as well as by ὁ μ(ὲν) οὖν.

³⁷ On Bacchylides' dithyramps and their peculiar position within the dithyrambic genre, see Harvey 1955, 174; Jebb 1906, 38–40; Longoni 1976, 305; Privitera 1977, 33–4; Zimmermann 1992, 64–103; Käppel 2000; Fearn 2007, ch.3; Calame 2013, 341–52; Hadjimichael 2014a.

³⁸ Longoni 1976, 306–7, who follows Severyns 1938, 134–5; cf. Harvey 1955, 172–3 who distinguishes three subtypes of the dithyramb: that sung at feasts, the ceremonial / religious, and the literary / competitive. Romero 2000, 54–7 analyses structurally two of Pindar's fragmentary dithyramps and two dithyramps of Bacchylides to detect religious and Dionysiac features, and concludes that in both cases the poems are characterized by religious content, even if it is more profound in Pindar.

³⁹ See the apparatus criticus and comments in Schubart 1941 and De Corno 1974.

⁴⁰ Also De Corno 1971, 102 n.5.

⁴¹ *Contra* Janko 2011, 500–1, who argues that the new topic introduced at the closing lines of the papyrus relates to a class of dithyramps with dithyrambic vocabulary but with no invocations or references to Dionysus.

⁴² Cf. Longoni 1976, 307 and D'Alessio 2013, 119 on the association between the proverb and the οὐδὲν ἔξουσι διθυραμβικόν in *P.Berol.* 9571 verso.

⁴³ The text is that of Leutsch and Schneidewin 1839. The quoted extract from Zenobius' entry is followed by a sentence where we read that because of the audience's dissatisfaction the dithyrambic poets had decided at a later stage (ὕστερον) to introduce satyrs to their poems so as not to give the impression that they had forgotten the god. This

sentence creates a further association with *P.Berol.* 9571 v, 32–41, where the author associates Pindar’s fr. 72–3 Sn–M and the presumed presence of satyrs with Dionysus and the dithyrambic genre. This is not the place to dwell on this, but if we trust Zenobius the introduction of the satyrs in the non-Dionysiac narratives of the dithyramps is presented as an additional innovation, which would pose questions with reference to the chronology of Pindar’s dithyramb. Would the poets have introduced in their poems a pre-existing dithyrambic feature or would they have innovated?

⁴⁴ The ἐξ ἀρχῆς possibly alludes to the time of the establishment of dithyrambic performances in a competitive context. We know that dithyrambic competitions were established in Athens by c.509 B.C.E.; the first dithyrambic victory at the Dionysia is recorded on the *Marmor Parium* in 510/09 or 509/08 B.C.E. (*FGrHist* IIB 239 A46).

⁴⁵ E.g. Pi. *Dith.* 1.11 (= fr. 70a Sn–M); *Dith.* 2.2, 6, 19–21, 31 (= fr. 70b Sn–M); *Dith.* 3.7 (= fr. 70c Sn–M); fr. 75.9–10 Sn–M with Lavecchia 2000, 11–13. On the Dionysiac poetics of the dithyramb, Ford 2013, 322–5; on the connection of the dithyramb with Dionysiac mysteries, Prauscello 2013 and Lavecchia 2013 with further bibliography.

⁴⁶ e.g. *Suda* s.v. διθύραμβος (= δ 1030 Adler); Photius s.v. διθύραμβος (δ 575 Theodoridis); Proclus *ap.* Phot. Bibl. V 160. See also Ic Ierandò (=Test. 25–33), and Test. 210, 215a.

⁴⁷ According to the *Suda* (= ζ 73 Adler), Zenobius created a three-book epitome of the collections of Didymus of Alexandria and Lucillus of Tarrha in Crete. Works on proverbs, however, are also attributed to Aristotle, Clearchus of Soli, Chrysippus, and collections of proverbs were already made in the Hellenistic period by Demon and Aristophanes of Byzantium.

⁴⁸ The complications created by the division of literature into imitative and non-imitative (discursive) genres in the specific passage from the *Republic* have been discussed by a number of scholars; see especially Rosenmeyer 2006, Halliwell 2009, and Peponi 2013. The word *dithyrambos* appears in the *Republic* for the first and sole time in this passage, presumably with the exclusive aim of supporting Plato’s theory of poetic discourse. Cf. the scholia vetera, where the scholiast compiles information on the dithyramb’s performative context, and emphasizes its religious character and association with Dionysus (Σ Pl. R. 394c).

⁴⁹ D’Alessio 2013, 120.

⁵⁰ Barker 2014, ch.2 examined the method with which the author of the *De Musica* compiled his text from the works of Heracleides Ponticus and Glaucus’ *On the Ancient Poets and Musicians*, and concluded that Glaucus “must have

reached his conclusions either on the basis of his own study of music that he actually heard, or on analyses which he took from the work of contemporary *harmonikoi*” (p.35); also D’Alessio 2013, 120.

⁵¹ If we trust the *Suda*, Lasus of Hermione produced a work *On Music*. Glaucus of Rhegium wrote a book entitled *On the Ancient Poets and Musicians* (*FHG* 1–6), which survived through Harpocration, the *De Musica*, and Diogenes Laertius. Hellanicus of Lesbos, presumably a contemporary of Glaucus, produced the first musical historiography with chronographical expositions—*FGrH* A4 F20, *Hoi Karneonikai* F85–6, on whom Franklin 2010, 25–31 and 2012; Barker 2014, 46–51. Ephorus included in his historical writing material relevant to music, on whom Barker 2014, 52–5. Damon of Oa was a music theorist at the time, on whom Wallace 2015, who argues that Damon left no writings, with further bibliography. Lastly, Aristoxenus refers to groups of *harmonikoi* who centred around Epigonus of Sicyon, Pythagoras of Zacynthus, and Agenor of Mytiline, all of whom left no writings of their own (*Harm.* 7, 46 Wehrli²). On early musicological historiography, Franklin 2010.

⁵² D’Alessio 2013, 121.

⁵³ D’Alessio 2013, 121. Adam 1962 *ad loc* takes Plato’s verdict about the dithyramb at face value, and interprets this statement on the dithyramb’s pure narrative nature as evidence of the genre’s decline at Plato’s time.

⁵⁴ The text is that of Maehler 2006 in *CLGP* I.4, 294, but I do not include his supplement before *Κασσ]άνδραν* (v.14).

⁵⁵ Maehler 1997, 241 emphasizes how Ode 19 is undoubtedly a dithyramb, as its mythological narrative centres on the birth of Dionysus, confirming to the letter the Athenian’s comment in the *Laws* that the mythological content of a dithyrambic narrative sings of the birth of Dionysus (*Lg.* 700b4 *Διονύσου γένεσις*).

⁵⁶ Titles of Bacchylides’ dithyrambs, on which Hadjimichael 2014b, 84–8: Ode 15 *Ἀντηνορίδαι ἢ Ἐλένης ἀπαίτησις*; the left side margin of the column of Ode 16 is lost, and thus a title has been added by modern editors [*Ἡρακλῆς* (vel *Δηϊάνειρα*)]; Ode 17 has the titles *Ἡϊθεοί* and *Θησεύς*, which might have been a single title connected with a lost *καί*, or *Θησεύς* might have been a secondary title and the two would have been connected by *ἢ*; Ode 18 *Θησεύς*; Ode 19 *Ἴώ Ἀθηναίοις*, and Ode 20 *Ἰδακ Λακεδαίμονίοις*. Simonides’ *Εὐρώπη* (*PMG* 562 / 353 Poltera) might also have been a dithyramb.

⁵⁷ Some of the fragments of the representatives of the New Music have language and images that are associated with Dionysus, on which Zimmermann 1992, 129–32, Csapo 1999–2000 and 2003.

⁵⁸ Prodi 2019, 486.

⁵⁹ Prodi 2019, 488.

⁶⁰ The text of Ieranò 1997 has περιέχων. The scholion is echoed in a passage from *Anecdota Oxoniensa* IV, p.314 Cramer.

⁶¹ According to Diogenes Laertius (3.61), Aristophanes of Byzantium had organized Plato’s work into trilogies, the first of which opened with the *Republic*. Diogenes Laertius (3.65) also informs us that the Platonic text became the object of exegetical activity. See Schironi 2005 on the Hellenistic edition of and commentary on Plato, as well as on evidence in favour of her conclusion that Aristarchus produced a *hypomnēma* on Plato’s *Republic*.

⁶² Cf. Longoni 1976, 305.

⁶³ Ford 2019, 59, 80–1 who introduces the term “generification” for the process through which the text produces its genre.

⁶⁴ Cf. Ford 2019, 57 and his analysis of the Linus-song at pp.73–80.

⁶⁵ Ford 2019, 64–7 where he elaborates with examples.

⁶⁶ Cf. Foster, Kurke, and Weiss 2019, 13–18.

⁶⁷ I thank the two anonymous readers for their suggestions and criticisms, which much improved this article, as well as Zoe Stamatopoulou and David Lewis for reading and commenting on an earlier draft. I bear sole responsibility for any errors or misjudgements. Parts of this article were presented at the international conference *Plato as Literary Critic* (July 2014, Munich Germany), which I organised at the Center for Advanced Studies at LMU München (CAS^{LMU}), and at the 112th CAMWS meeting (March 2016, Williamsburgh VA), and I thank both audiences. The conference in Munich was organised with the financial support of LMUexcellent and the CAS^{LMU}. Research for the preparation of the two conference papers was conducted while I held a post-doctoral fellowship at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München that was funded by the DFG Exzellenzinitiative and during a research stay at UC Berkeley in spring 2016 that was funded with a postdoctoral fellowship awarded by LMU München within the framework of the program “LMU–UCB Research in the Humanities”. The financial support of my research during these periods is gratefully acknowledged.

Bibliography

- Adam, J. 1962. *The Republic of Plato*. With Critical Notes, Comm. and Appendices. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barker, Andrew. 2014. *Ancient Greek Writers on Their Musical Past: Studies in Greek Musical Historiography*. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra.
- Bastianini, G. et al. 2006. ed. *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris Reperta, Pars I. Commentaria et Lexica in Auctores, Vol.1. Aeschines-Bacchylides, Fasc.4 Aristophanes-Bacchylides (CLGP I.4)*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter.
- Battezzato, Luigi. 2013. “Dithyramb and Greek Tragedy.” In *Dithyramb in Context*, ed. Barbara Kowalzig and Peter Wilson, 93–110. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bouchard, Elsa. 2019. “The Self-Revealing Poet: Lyric Poetry and Cultural History in the Peripatetic School.” In *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry 600 BC–400 AD: Transmission, Canonization, and Paratext*, ed. Currie, Bruno and Rutherford, Ian, 182–202. Leiden: Brill.
- Budermann, Felix and Phillips, Tom. ed. 2018. *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calame, Claude. 1974. “Réflexions sur les genres littéraires en Grèce archaïque.” *QUCC* 17:113–28.
- Calame, Claude. 1996. “Feste, riti e forme poetiche.” In *I Greci: storia, cultura, arte, società*, vol. II.1, ed. Salvatore Settis, 471–96. Turin: G. Einaudi.
- Calame, Claude. 1998. “La Poésie Lyrique Grecque, un Genre Inexistant?.” *Littérature* 111:87–110.
- Calame, Claude. 2013. “The Dithyramb, a Dionysiac Poetic Form: Genre Rules and Cultic Contexts.” In *Dithyramb in Context*, ed. Barbara Kowalzig and Peter Wilson, 332–52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, D. A. ed. 1993. *Greek Lyric V. The New School of Poetry and Anonymous Songs and Hymns*. Loeb Classical Library 144. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carey, Chris. 2009. “Genre, Occasion and Performance.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, ed. Felix Budermann, 21–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ceccarelli, Paola. 2013. “Circular Choruses and the Dithyramb in the Classical and Hellenistic Period: A Problem of Definition.” In *Dithyramb in Context*, ed. Barbara, Kowalzig and Peter, Wilson, 153–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Cingano, Ettore. 2003. "Entre skolion et enkomion: Réflexions sur le 'genre' et la performance de la lyrique chorale grecque." In *Colloque la poésie grecque antique: actes*, ed. J. Jouanna and J. Leclant, 17–45. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard. Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres.
- Csapo, Eric. 1999–2000. "Later Euripidean Music." In *Euripides and Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century*. Illinois Classical Studies 24–25, ed. Martin, Cropp, Kevin, Lee and David, Sansone, 399–426. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Csapo, Eric. 2003. "The Dolphins of Dionysus." In *Poetry, Theory, Praxis: The Social Life of Myth, Word and Image in Ancient Greece. Essays in Honour of William J. Slater*, ed. Eric, Csapo and M. C. Miller, 69–98. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Csapo, Eric. 2004. "The Politics of the New Music." In *Music and the Muses: The Culture of "Mousikê" in the Classical Athenian City*, ed. Penelope, Murray and Peter, Wilson, 207–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Csapo, Eric. 2011. "The Economics, Poetics, Politics, Metaphysics, and Ethics of the 'New Music'." In *Music and Cultural Politics in Greek and Chinese Societies, Vol. I: Antiquity*, 65–131. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- D' Alessio, G. B. 1997. "Pindar's *Prosodia* and the Classification of Pindaric Papyrus Fragments, *ZPE* 118:23–60
- D' Alessio, Giambattista. 2013. " 'The Name of the Dithyramb': Diachronic and Diatopic Variations." In *Dithyramb in Context*, ed. Barbara Kowalzig and Peter Wilson, 113–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- D' Angour, Armand. 1997. "How the Dithyramb got its Shape." *CQ* 47:331–51.
- Del Corno, D. ed. 1974. "P.Berol.9571 verso über den Dithyrambos. Pindar und die Poetik des Aristoteles." *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Antiker Rechtsgeschichte* 66:99–110.
- Dover, K. J. 1964. "The Poetry of Archilochus." In *Archiloque: Sept Exposés et Discussions Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 10, 181–212. Vandoeuvres-Geneva. Fondation Hardt.
- Fantuzzi, Marco and Hunter, Richard. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fearn, David. 2007. *Bacchylides. Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fongoni, Adelaide. 2006. "P.Graec. Vindob. 19996 B III: Un' esegesi del Ciclope di Filosseno?", *AION (filol)* 28:97–102.

- Ford Andrew. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ford, Andrew. 2013. "The Poetics of Dithyramb." In *Dithyramb in Context*, ed. Barbara Kowalzig and Peter Wilson, 313–31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ford, Andrew. 2020. "Linus: The Rise and Fall of Lyric Genres." In *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greece: Theories and Models*. Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, Vol.4, ed. Foster, Margaret, Kurke, Leslie and Weiss, Naomi, 57–81. Leiden: Brill.
- Foster, Margaret, Kurke, Leslie and Weiss, Naomi. 2020. "Introduction." In *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greece: Theories and Models*. Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, Vol.4. ed. Foster, Margaret, Kurke, Leslie and Weiss, Naomi, 1–28. Leiden: Brill.
- Franklin, J.C. 2010. "Remembering Music in Early Greece." In *The Historiography of Music in Global Perspective*, ed. Sam Mirelman, 9–50. Piscataway NJ.
- Franklin, J. C. 2012. "The Lesbian Singers: Towards a Reconstruction of Hellanicus' *Carnean Victors*." In *Poesia, musica e agoni della Grecia antica*, ed. Daniela Castaldo, Francesco Giannachi and Alessandra Manieri, 720–764. Galatina: Gorgias Press.
- Galavotti. C. 1957. "Review of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 23*," *Gnomon* 29.6:419–25.
- Gentili, Bruno. 1988. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*. English trans. A. T. Cole. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Hadjimichael, Th. A. 2014a. "Aristophanes' Bacchylides: Reading *Birds* 1373–1409", *GRMS* 2: 184–210
- Hadjimichael, Th. A. 2014b. "Bacchylides Fr. 60 M. and the *Kassandra*", *BASP* 51:77–100
- Hadjimichael, Th. A. 2019a. *The Emergence of the Lyric Canon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hadjimichael, Th. A. 2019b. "The Peripatetics and the Transmission of Lyric." In *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry 600 BC–400 AD: Transmission, Canonization, and Paratext*, ed. Currie, Bruno and Rutherford, Ian, 151–81. Leiden: Brill.
- Halliwell, Stephen. 2009. "The Theory and Practice of Narrative in Plato." In *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, ed. Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos, 15–41. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter.
- Harvey, A. E. 1955. "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry." *CQ* 5.48:157–75.
- Henrichs, Albert. 1978. "Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina." *HSCP* 82:121–60.
- Hose, Martin. 1995. "Bacchylides, Carmen 17: Dithyrambos oder Paian ?" *RhM* 138:47–54.

- Ieranò, Giorgio. 1997. *Il ditirambo di Dioniso: Le testimonianze antiche*. Pisa: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali.
- Janko, Richard. 2011. *Philodemus On Poems: Books Three and Four. With the Fragments of Aristotle On Poets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jebb, R.C.S. ed. 1906. *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kowalzig, Barbara. and Wilson, Peter. ed. 2013. *Dithyramb in Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Käppel, Lutz. 2000. "Bakchylides und das System der chorlyrischen Gattungen im 5. Jh. v.Chr." In *Bakchylides. 100 Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung*, ed. Andrea Bagordo and Bernhard Zimmermann 11–27. Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Körte, Alfred. 1935. "799. Exegetische Schrift zum jüngeren Dithyrambos." *Arch. für Papyr.* 11:246–8.
- Lavecchia, Salvatore. 2000. *Pindaro: I Ditirambi. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo.
- Lavecchia, Salvatore. 2013. "Becoming like Dionysos: Dithyramb and Dionysian Initiation." In *Dithyramb in Context*, ed. Barbara Kowalzig and Peter Wilson, 59–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leutsch, E. L. and Schneidewin, F. G. ed. 1839. *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum. Tomus I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht.
- Leven, P. A. 2013. "The Colors of Sound: Poikilia and its Aesthetic Contexts." *GRMS* 1:229–42
- Leven, P. A. 2014. *The Many-Headed Muse: Tradition and Innovation in Late Lyric Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Longoni, Franco 1976. "Nota sulla storia del ditirambo (Ancora a proposito di P.Berol. 9751 verso). *Acme* 29:305–8.
- Luppe, Wolfgang. 1987. "Dithyrambos oder Paian? - zu Bakchylides carm. 23 Sn./M." *ZPE* 69:9–12.
- Luppe, Wolfgang. 1989. "Nochmals zu Kallimachos' Gattungzuordnung bakchylideischer Lieder." *Analecta Papyrologica* 1:23–9.
- Maehler, Herwig. ed. 1997. *Die Lieder des Bakchylides. Zweiter Teil. Die Dithyramben und Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

- Maehler, Herwig. ed. 2003. *Bacchylidis Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Martin, Richard. 2003. "The Pipes are Brawling: Conceptualizing Musical Performance in Athens." In *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. ed. Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, 153–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagy, Gregory. 1994. "Genre and Occasion." *METIS* 9:11–25.
- Oellacher, Hans. ed. 1932. "XXII. Eine exegetische Schrift zum späteren Dithyrambos." In *Griechische Literarische Papyri I. Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer) Neue Serien*, ed. Hans Gerstinger, Hans Oellacher and Kurt Vogel, 136–45. Vienna.
- Page, D. L. ed. 1970. *Select Papyri, Vol. III: Poetry*. Loeb Classical Library 360. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Peponi, Anastasia-Erasmia. 2013. "Dithyramb in Greek Thought: The Problem of Choral Mimesis." In *Dithyramb in Context*, ed. Barbara Kowalzig and Peter Wilson, 353–67. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pfister, F. 1924. "Epiphanie". In *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Supplementband IV, ed. Georg Wisowa and Wilhelm Kroll, col. 277–323. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. 1962. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, 2nd ed. rev. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Powell, J.U. 1932. "More Rainer Papyri." *CR* 46.6:262–3.
- Prauscello, Lucia. 2013. "Demeter and Dionysos in the Sixth-Century Argolid: Lasos of Hermione, the Cult of Demeter Chthonia, and the Origins of Dithyramb." In *Dithyramb in Context*, ed. Barbara Kowalzig and Peter Wilson, 76–92. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pritchard, David. 2004. "Kleisthenes, Participation, and the Dithyrambic Contests of Late and Classical Athens." *Phoenix* 58:208–22.
- Privitera, G.A. 1977. "Il Dittirambo da cando culturale a spettacolo musicale." In *Rito e Poesia Corale in Grecia. Guida storica e critica*, ed. Claude Calame, 25–37. Rome: Laterza.
- Prodi, E. E. 2019. "Poem-Titles in Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides". In *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization and Paratext*. Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, Vol.5, ed. Bruno Currie and Ian Rutherford, 461–515. Leiden: Brill.

- Romero, F. G. 2000. "The Dithyrambs of Bacchylides: Their Position in the Evolution of the Genre." In *Bacchylides. 100 Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung*, ed. Andreas Bagordo and Bernhard Zimmermann, 47–58. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck.
- Rosenmeyer, Th. G. 2006. "Ancient Literary Genres. A Mirage?." In *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism*, ed. Andrew Laird, 421–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rösler, Wolfgang. 1980. *Dichter und Gruppe: eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*. Munich: W. Fink.
- Rossi, L. E. 1974. "I Generi Letterari e le Loro Leggi Scritte e non Scritte nelle Letterature Classiche." *BICS* 18.1:69–94.
- Rutherford, Ian. 1991. "Pindar 'Paeon' VIIIa, the 'Cassandra' of Bacchylides and the Anonymous 'Cassandra' in P.Oxy. 2368: an Exploration in Lyric Structure." *Eos* 79:5–12.
- Schironi, Francesca. 2005. "Plato at Alexandria: Aristophanes, Aristarchus, and the 'Philological Tradition' of a Philosopher." *CQ* 55.2:423–34.
- Schmidt, D. A. 1990. "Bacchylides 17 – Paeon or dithyramb." *Hermes* 118:18–31.
- Schübart, W. ed. 1941. "Über den Dithyrambos." *APF*:24–9.
- Severyns, A. 1938. *Recherches sur la Chrestomatie de Proclus*. Paris : E. Droz.
- Slater, W. J. 1976. "Symposium at Sea." *HSCPh* 80:161–1
- Smyth, H. W. 1984. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ucciardello, Giuseppe. 1996-1997. "Riesame di P.Oxy.2368: Alcuni Problemi di Lettura e di Interpretazione." *Analecta Papyrologica* 8-9:61–88.
- Van der Weiden, M. 1991. *The Dithyrambs of Pindar: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Amsterdam: J. C. Kiesen.
- Wallace, R. W. 2003. "An Early Fifth-Century Athenian Revolution in *Aulos* Music." *HSPH* 101:73–92.
- Wallace, R. W. 2015. *Reconstructing Damon. Music, Wisdom Teaching, and Politics in Perikles' Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Peter. 1999. "The *Aulos* in Athens." In *Performance, Culture, and Athenian Democracy*, ed. Simon, Goldhill and Robin, Osborne, 58–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Peter. 2003. "The Politics of Dance: Dithyrambic Contest and Social Order in Ancient Greece." In *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*, ed. David, Phillips and David, Pritchard, 163–96. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

Wilson, Peter. 2004. "Athenian Strings." *In Music and the Muses: The Culture of "Mousikê" in the Classical Athenian City*, ed. Penelope Murray and Peter Wilson, 269–306. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Zimmermann, Bernhard. 1992. *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Zimmermann, Bernhard. 1993. "Das Lied der Polis: Zur Geschichte des Dithyrambos." In *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis. Papers from the Greek Drama Conference, Nottingham, 18–20 July 1990*, ed. Alan Sommerstein, Stephen Halliwell, Jeffrey Henderson and Bernhard Zimmermann, 39–54. Bari: Levante.