The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Music of the *Orestes*

Cecil Torr

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 09 / November 1894, pp 397 - 398

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188894, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188894

How to cite this article:

Cecil Torr (1894). The Music of the *Orestes*. The Classical Review, 8, pp 397-398
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188894

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ἁρμονία AND ΤΟΝΟΣ IN GREEK MUSIC.

IN the interesting and instructive volume on the *Modes of Ancient Greek Music*, lately published by the Clarendon Press, the Provost of Oriel maintains that there was no such distinction as that which Westphal and others have drawn between ancient Greek 'modes' (ἁρμονίαι) and 'keys' (τόνοι or τρόποι). Among the reasons which Mr. Monro adduces in support of their identity is the fact that Plutarch was apparently not aware of any difference of meaning between τόνος and ἁρμονία (*l.c.*, p. 26). This is inferred from a comparison of three passages in his

treatise *De Musica*, cc. 15-17, cc. 6 and 8, and c. 19. May I be permitted to point out that it appears to be (if possible) still more clearly proved by another passage in the same author? In the tract *De E apud Delphos*, c. 10, p. 389 e, Plutarch incidentally mentions πέντε τοὺς πρώτους, εἶτε τόνους ἢ τρόπους εἶθ' ἁρμονίας χρηθεῖν, ὧν ἐπιτάσσει καὶ ὑφέσει τρεπομένων κατὰ τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον αἱ λουπαὶ βαρυτήτες εἰσι καὶ δξύτητες. Here Plutarch obviously regards the 'modes' as synonymous with the 'keys.'

J. E. SANDYS.

THE MUSIC OF THE ORESTES.

IN his article on the Orestes papyrus in the last number of this *Review*, pp. 313-317, Mr. Abdy Williams has been following Dr. Wessely with rather too much confidence. The transcript will not bear examination.

1. He says that the notes for the accompaniment are mingled with the text. That would be unprecedented. In the nine fragments from Delphi with notes for instruments the notes are written above the text; and so also in the Kircher and Marcello MSS. He says that the notes here are ζ, γ, and Ζ. Whenever the so-called Ζ occurs in the text, it comes between the last word of one verse and the first word of the next verse; so this must be a species of κορωνίς for marking off the verses. The ζ and γ occur, with other fragments of letters, in the interval between κατέκλυσεν and ὡς πόντου, where δεινῶν πόνων should be read; so they are blunders of the scribe. Obviously, the scribe was puzzled by the half-verse ἀνὰ δὲ λαῖφος ὦς, and completed it with the half-verse τις ἀκάτου θοᾶς, beginning the next verse at τινάξας and adding the Ζ above the line. And then he made this muddle of the text, beginning a fresh verse at ὡς πόντου with the Ζ again above the line.

2. Mr. Abdy Williams says that the ictus dot is placed above the musical sign, or alongside it, according to exigencies of space. It is always above the punctuating Ζ, and alongside the musical sign that follows the Ζ. Thus, Ζ̣ and Ρ̣ in lines 1, 2; Ζ̣ and Ι̣

in 3, 4, and again in 5, 6, and 11; and Ζ̣ and Φ̣ in 7. Thus the plain dot marks the first note in a verse, while the combined dot and dash mark the first note in the fourth foot. The dot and dash occur in lines 5, 7, 9, as printed in the transcript; and a photograph shows traces of them above the first Π in line 1. They are required above the first Ζ in line 3, but here the photograph shows hardly any traces of the Ζ itself.

3. In determining the values of the notes, he treats the μα in ματέρος as a short syllable; the χεν in ἀναβακχεύει, the δαι in δαίμων, and the πον in πόντου, as two short syllables each; the word ὦς as two long syllables; and the ρων in δεινῶν as a short and a long. No doubt the ὦς is split, for this is written as ὦως: but if the other syllables were split, they would be written accordingly. Moreover, a long syllable always splits into two shorts, as may be seen from the Delphic hymns.

4. As regards the notes for voices, he follows the usual system in giving e for γ, g for φ, a for C, d for Ι, and e for Ζ. But he gives f for Ε, whereas Ε was the lower of the two notes that came between e and f; and in line 11 he treats the punctuating Ζ as a note for voices. He also gives ḅ for Π and makes P a quarter-tone between ḅ and a. This involves the enharmonic scale with intervals of a quarter of a tone apiece; but the notation will also suit the chromatic scales with intervals of three-

eighths or a third of a tone apiece, besides other chromatic and enharmonic scales with more complicated intervals.

5. As regards the alleged notes for instruments, he follows the usual system in giving *g* for Ζ. But he gives *f* for Γ, whereas Γ was a note between *e* and *f*; and he also gives *b* for Δ, thereby involving the enharmonic scale with intervals of a quarter of a tone apiece.

6. He transcribes the music into the no-

tation that is now in use; and this is associated with an octave of twelve equal intervals. But in Greek music the intervals were not the same; so the notes are not exactly in their places.

The comparisons with modern music appear to be illusory. They are not founded on the ancient music as it stands, but on a transcript which twists it into modern shape.

CECIL TORR.

NOTE ON THE HOMERIC HYMN TO HERMES V. 33.

In the current *Hermathena*, in a review of Goodwin's *Homeric Hymns* among other conjectures I have put forward one (on *Hermes* v. 33) which has been fortunate enough to command the assent of many of my friends. I avail myself here of the courtesy of the Editor of the *Classical Review* to make a slight improvement on it. The note ran thus:—

In v. 33 there is, as it seems to us, room for a certain conjecture, though, strange to say, the needfulness of a correction has not struck any of the editors. *Hermes*, addressing the tortoise out of whose shell he afterwards fashioned the lyre, exclaims:—

πόθεν τόδε, καλὸν ἄθυρμα,
αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἔσσι, χέλυσ ὄρεσι ζώουσα;

But 'how came it that thou art a shell?' is unmeaning. Read *ἔσσο* for *ἔσσι*. The tortoise was not the shell much more than a man is his great-coat. One is reminded of the joke ascribed to Mr. Gilbert when in reply to 'You wear a great-coat?' he said, 'No, I never was.' But 'thou art clothed with this shell' at once recalls the *λάϊνον ἔσσο χιτῶνα* of Γ 57.

The punctuation given above, which is that of most editions, compels us to give to *πόθεν* the sense of *qui fit ut*? not of *unde*? Now this sense of *πόθεν* is posthomeric.

This is not a serious objection, for every reader of the hymns knows that they abound in posthomeric usages. But a slight change of punctuation improves the construction; read:—

πόθεν τόδε καλὸν ἄθυρμα;
αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἔσσο χέλυσ ὄρεσι ζώουσα.

'Whence this pretty plaything? Curiously wrought (or, sheeny,) is the shell wherewith thou art clothed upon, thou tortoise of the field.' The punctuation which I now recommend is, I find, that of Gemoll's edition.

It would be quite impossible with the ordinary punctuation to take *πόθεν ἔσσι* together = *unde es*? To this *τόδε* is fatal; *τοῦτο* would be awkward, but *τόδε* would not be Greek, unless we could write *πόθεν ὅδε σοφὸς Εὐριπίδης* (or *ὅδε σοφὸς Εὐριπίδης*) *εἶ*; Besides, the coupling together in apposition of *ἄθυρμα, ὄστρακον, χέλυσ*, would be ungraceful to the point of unintelligibility. The words *αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἔσσι* would of necessity supply the predicate.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

THE MODERN GREEK WORD *νερό*.

In a note in the *Classical Review* of March (p. 100) Mr. A. N. Jannaris says that the modern Greek word *νερό* has no connexion with the ancient *νηρό*, *Νηρεὺς*, but is nothing but a phonetic modification of *νεαρόν* 'fresh,' *sc.* *ἔδωρ*. I should like to point out that Prof. Krumbacher at Munich, three years ago, proposed the same etymo-

logy. In the edition of the *Colloquium Pseudo-Dositheanum Monacense* inserted by Krumbacher in the *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, W. von Christ dargebracht (München, 1891), p. 362 *seqq.* (in a note to 'πίωμεν νερόν ἐκ τοῦ βανκιδίου bibamus recentem de gillone'), we find the explanation of *νερόν* from *νεαρόν*