

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

“Old” and “New” Music: The Ideology of *Mousikē*

Armand D'Angour

I don't sing (*ouk acidō*) the old songs
for my new (*kaina āma*) songs are superior.
Young (*neos*) is the Zeus who reigns—
in olden times was Kronos in charge.
Away with you, ancient Muse!

(Timotheus *PMG* 796)

This fragment of lyrics from a song composed by Timotheus of Miletus, the best-known representative of the “New Musicians” of the late fifth century BC, presents a bold, self-referential assertion of musical progress. In claiming that what he sings is not just new but better, Timotheus makes a declaration of aesthetic superiority that encompasses the words of his song and the music to which they are set. His verbal novelties may be taken to include idiosyncratic forms and expressions, such as perhaps are found here in the uncontracted *acidō* for “sing” and the archaic-sounding *āma* for “my.”¹ His musical improvements may be taken to include the rhythms, melodies, harmonic structures, the use of instruments, and other features of performance that will have constituted, both in this instance and more generally, *mousikē*. While most of the latter elements are unrecoverable, the rhythms of the song inscribed in the metre of the words show that the last three lines of this fragment are a series of ionics (UU — —, short-short-long-long; see Lynch in this volume). This is a metre that draws attention to its exotic foreign provenance, in this case also reminding us that Timotheus' native Ionia lent its name to one of the musical modes and was considered a source of Greek musical innovation.²

The lyric fragment describes the progression from old to new in terms of a political metaphor, relating to the succession of the rulers of Olympus. The former supreme deity Cronus

A Companion to Ancient Greek and Roman Music, First Edition.

Edited by Tosca A.C. Lynch and Eleonora Rocconi.

© 2020 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2020 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

(*Kronos*) has been supplanted by his son, the young (*neos*) Zeus, now sovereign of the Greek pantheon. *Neos* picks up on the earlier *kainos*, suggesting that Zeus is also both a “new” and a “modern” ruler, in the way that the music of Timotheus is both new and avant-garde.³ Just as the older god has yielded power to the younger deity, the “ancient Muse,” a personification of earlier musical styles and sounds that Timotheus claims to be superseding, may bluntly be told to make herself scarce.

Timotheus’ metaphor (even his use of *archōn* recalls the contemporary political institution) suggests the promotion of an explicit musical “ideology.” The suggestion was subject to a literal construal by Plato in *Republic* Book 4, where he has Socrates quote Damon of Oa, the musical theorist active in the 440s and 430s as adviser to Athens’ leading statesman Pericles, as having declared to Socrates’ approval that “styles of music are never changed without bringing about alterations in the most fundamental sociopolitical institutions (*nomoi*).”⁴ The rapturous public reception of the progressive styles of music that Plato encountered in his youth century evidently struck the philosopher with a deep sense of alarm. He dwells in *Republic* and *Laws* on the social and ideological implications of musical change, and proposes that constraints should be imposed on the kind of music allowed in his ideal state. Parallels in later historical periods from the Renaissance to the Jazz Age demonstrate that music of emotional extremes, set to words that imply subversion and resonating socially progressive viewpoints, are often construed by conservatives as an impetus for political instability.

The New Music

Timotheus’ lyrics constitute one of many reflections by ancient musicians, philosophers, and commentators, on the impact of “the New Music,” the term used for developments in musical styles and techniques in Athens during the fifth century BC. To many, the sounds and practices associated with the New Music signalled a dramatic change in the very nature of musical expression; as Timotheus’ allusion to the displacement by Zeus of Cronus proposes, they were felt to herald a revolution.⁵ Although they attracted the censure of traditionalists, New Musicians such as Melanippides, Phrynīs, Kinesias, Krexos, Philoxenus, and Telestes enjoyed great popularity.⁶ They were particularly associated with dithyrambs, which by the fifth century were annual large-scale circular dances staged in the theater and involving a large proportion of citizen participants.⁷ Music unaccompanied by words lacked the cultural prestige of sung music, but would have been heard in formal and informal contexts. In symposia, for instance, pipe-playing female slaves provided traditional musical entertainment (see De Simone in this volume); while elite competitive contexts such as the Pythian Games featured expert pipers vying to win the prize for innovative sounds, as heard in performances of *nomoi* (musical set pieces) such the Pythian Air and Athena-*nomos* for solo *aulos* (see Power in this volume).⁸

In the mid-fifth century, advanced kinds of *aulos* playing were associated with professional non-Athenian musicians such as the renowned Pronomos of Thebes who, writes Pausanias, “thrilled audiences with his facial expressions and the movement of his body” (9.12.6). The popular response to the auletic virtuosity evident in New Musical performances was not shared by elite commentators, who disparaged “theatocratic” tendencies.⁹ An anecdote about the aristocratic Alcibiades, who cast away his *aulos* because it distorted his features, implies that considerations of social class were involved; a gentleman might play the lyre but could not be expected to be a competent aulete (Plut. *Alc.* 2.5–7). Philosophical critics disapproved of the instrument’s multivalent capacities, railing at its volubility and indeterminacy: unlike a plucked

lyre-string, the pitch of an *aulos* note is easily varied. The fact that auletes must use their mouth to emit nonverbal sounds also made the *aulos* ideologically suspect, as if it were antipathetic to *logos*,¹⁰ and the way performers blew their cheeks in and out, frog-like, to perform circular breathing made playing the instrument a visibly indecorous activity.¹¹ The conflict between new and old music is baldly represented in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* as one between *aulos* and *kithara*, the latter strummed by stuffy old-school performers, the former associated with the inventive “music-loving race” of frogs (*Ran.* 240: *philōidon genos*).¹²

The New Musicians proclaimed their ideology, like Timotheus, in the words of their songs. A modern listener will not expect to find remarks about musical practice in the libretto of an opera, but classical Greek poetry is notoriously self-referential. “Hear me lead off the lovely song of Lord Dionysus, the dithyramb,” declaims Archilochus, engaging a responsorial chorus in the archaic dithyramb (fr. 120, with D’Angour 2013, 200–1). “Take down my Dorian lyre from its peg,” sings Pindar’s troupe (*Ol.* 1.17–19), apparently signaling the Dorian *harmonia*.¹³ Euripides’ *Trojan Women* (514–16) has the chorus bid the Muse “Sing a funeral dirge about Troy in novel strains beset with tears, for now I will wail my song for Troy” (Sansone 2009). The “novel strains” would in practice have been distinguishable from the sounds used in traditional tellings of the tale of Troy, such as those sung by kitharodes, professional singer-players who accompanied their songs with the *kithara*. Such performances, we may infer from Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, were associated with melodically repetitive singing interspersed with the strummed *toplattotbrat* (*Ar. Ran.* 1284–97; Power 2010, 120).

Given the dominance of sung music in Greek musical culture, audiences were guided to think about the music by the very words of the lyrics, which drew attention to their use of novel elements and styles. The tradition of poets promoting novelty had Homer himself as a model. The earliest comment on music in the literary record comes when, in Book I of the *Odyssey*, Telemachus takes issue with Penelope’s instruction to the bard Phemius to “stop singing this distressing song” (1.340–1). As Odysseus is still absent from Ithaca and possibly dead, Phemius’s song about the return of heroes has upset Penelope; but Telemachus intervenes to declare that the bard should sing as he pleases, since “the newest song attracts the greatest applause” (*Od.* 1.352; D’Angour 2011, 184–9). Thus sanctioned by the words of the divine bard, novelty in music was to become an ideological imperative for composer-performers; it is invoked by Greek poets across the centuries (D’Angour 2011, 190–5). Wherein the novelty may be presumed to lie, however, is impossible to determine with certainty from the texts. It might be verbal, rhythmical, melodic, or instrumental, or a combination of these; but the expectation persisted that true poet-musicians should aim to create something new. In what follows I consider some of the specific forms in which that vaunted newness will have been present, first in the context of the New Music and then in the “old” music that preceded it.

Elements of the New Music

Scholars of ancient music have detailed the social, political, verbal, and technical dimensions of the New Music (see in particular Csapo 2004; Csapo and Wilson 2009; LeVen 2014). Technical changes included additions to instrumental capacities, a broadening of melodic effects, a new mixing of styles and harmonic structures, increased employment of verbal and musical mimeticism, and dramatic approaches to performance. The New Musicians’ promotion of novelty in all these areas was both explicit and implicit. As well as drawing attention to the superiority of his “new songs,” Timotheus proclaims their novelty in the unruly rhythms to which his lyrics

are set. By contrast to the standardly repetitive forms of earlier epic, elegiac, and most lyric compositions, the meters of Timotheus and his fellow New Musicians, who include the dramatists Euripides and Agathon as well as performers such as Philoxenus, Kinesias, and Telestes, tend to be variegated, unpredictable, and hard to systematize. Their metrical irregularity is associated with the extravagant verbiage, neologistic compound words, and unusual expressions that were thought to characterize dithyrambs in particular (Csapo 2004, 212–16; Franklin 2013, 231–6).

This metrical variegatedness (*poikilia*) was accompanied by increased melodic and harmonic changeability (LeVen 2013). Particularly notable was the use of modulation, the movement of a melody from using a set of notes comprising a particular *harmonia* (e.g., Phrygian or Lydian) into a different modal system such as Hypophrygian or Mixolydian. Modulation was encouraged by changes in instrumental capacities. We learn of the extension of the number of strings on the *kithara* to as many as twelve, and of the invention by Pronomos of Thebes of a sliding collar to cover or open pipe-holes, allowing for changes during performance of the pitches available on the pipes (see Terzēs in this volume). Bold modulations were considered a typical aspect of the New Musicians' oeuvre.¹⁴

Part of the ideological self-presentation of the New Musicians was the defiant stance toward tradition marks Timotheus' lyrics—"Away with you, ancient Muse!" It contrasts with the rueful, even apologetic attitude that can be found in the words of Choerilus of Samos, a composer of epic working around the beginning of the fourth century, who laments that "there is nowhere for the poet, search as he may, to steer his freshly yoked chariot" (Choerilus fr. 2.4–5 PEG). The New Musicians revelled in the idea that they were breaking new ground in overturning canons of traditional musical style. Plato labels their musical adventurousness *paranoia*, "law-breaking;" but they themselves rejected their critics' extreme accusations, accusing others of being "violators of music."¹⁵ While insisting that they were doing something new, the New Musicians often couch their claims in traditional terms. These include appeals to the Muses (see Murray in this volume) or to renowned musical figures such as Orpheus. Thus while the *Persians* speaks of a "newly constructed (*neoteuchēs*) Muse," the coda finishes with the word *eunomia*, "lawfulness;" and in describing Orpheus as "musically variegated" (*poikilomousos*) (LeVen 2014, 97–101), Timotheus invokes the legendary bard as a forerunner of the new style.

These implicit claims to be innovating within a tradition chimed with popular perceptions. In a fragment of Pherecrates' comedy *Chiron* quoted by pseudo-Plutarch, the character of the Muse speaks, using imagery that is explicitly sexual, of being mistreated by a series of musicians beginning with Melanippides of Melos and culminating with Timotheus. Each musician ends up becoming "acceptable" to her, apart from her latest assailant, Timotheus himself. The implication is, however, that he too will eventually be accommodated by the Muse—that is, his transgressive style of music will in due course become, as indeed it did, no less mainstream than that of his predecessors (D'Angour 2006, 269). In coining the epithet *poikilomousos* Timotheus raises the notion of *poikilia*, variety and colour, which was already a feature of metamusical discourse from the early fifth century when Pindar uses it to give a positive characterisation of his own poetry (LeVen 2014, 101–5). The earlier use of the term suggests that composers had long sought to enliven their songs with varied rhythmical and melodic effects. A testimony regarding Pindar's alleged teacher Lasus of Hermione, who was active at the end of the sixth century, speaks of his introducing into the dithyramb "a greater multiplicity of notes and range of tempi (*agōgē*)" (Ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 29.1141c). The notion of a fifth-century "revolution" in music may be suspected of being more a matter of rhetoric than reality.¹⁶

However, the New Musicians sought to exaggerate and amplify existing musico-poetic practices. Mimetic effects, for example, were used by earlier composers such as Simonides, in whose poetry we find the syllabic length of words extended for mimetic purposes: the lengthening of “*py-yr*” (PMG 587), fire, suggests a flickering flame, while *kno-ōssōn* (PMG 543.9), “snoring,” imitates the rise and fall of the snorer’s breathing (West 1992, 200–1). An increasing penchant for such effects is suggested by the competition in *Frogs*, in which Aristophanes has Aeschylus parody Euripidean lyrics by extending the enunciation “twist” or “wind,” *heilissō*, represented by the repeated diphthong *ei* as in *heieielissete* (Ar. *Ran.* 1314, 1348). The dramatist was evidently notorious for setting this word (often found in his tragic lyrics) to an appropriately winding, melismatic sequence of pitches.¹⁷

Analysis of the Orestes papyrus (see below) suggests that Euripides sought to imitate words’ meanings by clothing them with mimetic music, though in more sophisticated ways than suggested by Aristophanes’ parody. This mimetic impulse is of a piece with the naturalistic depiction that was the goal and ideological direction of contemporary visual artists. Pliny recounts a story about the foremost painters active in Athens, Parrhasius and Zeuxis:

Zeuxis had painted a bunch of grapes with such skill that a flock of birds flew down and tried to eat the grapes. Zeuxis was delighted to claim that his skill had fooled the birds. Some time later, however, he was invited to visit the studio of a rival, Parrhasius. Parrhasius who pointed to the curtain drawn across the studio, and invited Zeuxis to draw it aside to reveal his own latest effort. Zeuxis stepped forward and stretched out his arm to take hold of the curtain. Only then did he realize that what he thought was the curtain was, in fact, only the painting of a curtain. He admitted defeat saying “I fooled the birds, but Parrhasius fooled me.” (Plin. *NH* 45.34–5)

In this regard, the New Musicians were following a broader artistic tendency in the period toward mimetic representationalism (D’Angour 2011, 151–6). Their discourse shows that they were seeking to be not just artistically fresh (*neos*) but defiantly innovative (*kainos*); though even this discourse was not wholly new, since it is attested in a dithyramb of Bacchylides composed “for the Athenians” in the earlier part of the century (10.9: “weave something *kainon* for Athens”; D’Angour 2011, 71–2).

In addition to drawing attention to the extravagant mimesis of the New Music, the lyric parodies in *Frogs* (1309–22 mimics Euripides’ choral songs and 1331–64 his monodies) are notable for their wildly astrophic metrical form. Rather than creating a regular metrical pattern of words, with respension in successive verses or stanzas, the words flow and tumble without a repeated structure; comic poets derided the music that accompanied this style of composition, using terms such as “wrigglings” and “ant-runs.”¹⁸ Freedom from traditional metrical restraints allowed the New Musicians’ songs to be more dramatic. These qualities would have been enhanced by changeable harmonic settings and melodic variation. Although we cannot extract from the texts any certain indication of melodic shape or harmonic structure, a late source provides useful testimony to how Euripidean music diverged from that of earlier tragedians (see Ercoles in this volume):

The music (*melopoiia*) of early tragedy uses the unmixed enharmonic genus and a genus that mixes enharmonic and diatonic; but none of the tragedians until Euripides appears to have made use of the chromatic genus, which has a soft character. Ancient tragedy mainly uses the Dorian and Mixolydian scales (*tonoi*), the former because it is suited to solemnity, the latter because it is associated with mourning; it also used what were then called relaxed or loose modes (*harmoniai*), the

Ionian and the free Lydian. (...) Euripides first used a large range of notes (*polychordia*) in a melodic style called “gapped” by early musicians. Overall, Euripides uses many more genera and exhibits much more variegatedness than his predecessors. (Pseudo-Psallus *On Tragedy* 5.39–53)

Modes (*harmoniai*) were structures of notes from which tuning systems such as scales (*tonoi*) could be derived, and different structures were felt to generate distinct ethical effects; genera modified these systems by creating different patterns of internal intervals within the scales. The enharmonic made use of fine pitch-differences (e.g., quartertones and one-third tones), producing what toward the end of the fifth century was thought an old-fashioned, perhaps nostalgic, effect; whereas the diatonic genus comprised whole tones and semitones, as do modern Western scales (on ancient scales see Barker in this volume). Euripides was associated with both chromatic melodies and mixed genera. Reference to his “gapped” style may refer to his use of wide intervals between successive notes of melody as opposed to a succession of smaller intervals.

The parodic texts in *Frogs* use deliberately excessive jumps of sense and syntax; and in addition to wide interval leaps in melody, New Musical melodies probably featured bold shifts in modes and registers. Modulation between different modes was considered a striking feature of the New Music.¹⁹ Traditional songs will generally have been sung to a single mode, though modulation of some kind, at least between sections of a performance, was a familiar practice; however, the manner in which it was employed within a single performance by musicians of the later fifth century, aided by technical developments, was heard as considerably more unrestrained.²⁰ To audiences the effect will have been instantly recognizable: the innovative melodic qualities of Euripidean choruses, which were associated with the sounds of the New Music, made them uniquely memorable and exciting.²¹

The New Musicians also used sounds and movements on stage to enhance their performances and create dramatic realizations of their narratives. Timotheus was said to have imitated the sounds of a storm in his dithyramb *Nauplius*, spinning around on the stage when performing it, while in his *Semele* he imitated both in song and on the *aulos* the screams of a woman in childbirth (Csapo 2004, 213–14). Conventional rhythmical and melodic-harmonic order was abandoned in favor of immediacy and representationalism. Ironically, extreme naturalism of this kind was something that philosophical critics were apt to designate as “unnatural,” in that they meant a departure from conventional generic expectations. A commentator from the school of Aristotle observes: “We enjoy rhythm because it is divided up in a distinctive and regular way, and moves us in an orderly manner. Orderly movement is more closely akin to us than disorderly, so is more natural” (Ps.-Arist. *Pr.* 19.38). The New Musicians went out of their way to disrupt such orderliness and regularity, relishing the effect of artful disarray in the service of novelty and professional virtuosity.

Pseudo-Aristotle also draws attention to the way the expert performers of the New Music used techniques that were beyond the capacities of amateur musicians trained to sing in traditional dramatic choruses. “Why were *nomoi* (solo set pieces) not composed with responsion, while choral songs were?” he asks. The answer is that “*nomoi* were performed by professional musicians who could act and sing at the same time. This made it possible for the pieces they sang to be long and multiform” (Ps.-Arist. *Pr.* 19.15). He goes on to argue that this is also why “dramatic arias are not responsional, while choral arias are; in fact, the actor is a professional performer and imitator, whereas the chorus is not required to act to the same extent.” The New Musicians were not only composers and instrumentalists, but stage performers who took their cue for their dramatic performances from the star singer-actors of the theater (Csapo and Wilson 2009, 287–8).

While their musical and histrionic virtuosity set the professional New Musicians apart from citizen performers, it was also part of the New Musical ideology to represent itself as a non-elite and “democratic” genre (see Csapo and Wilson in this volume). Such a notion cannot refer to the complex compositional features and performance requirements of their music, but only to the non-elite provenance of its practitioners as well as to the music’s widespread popularity and notoriously free stylistic range (Csapo and Wilson 2009, 290–2). In *Frogs*, “Aeschylus” appears to pun on *melē*, songs, and *meli*, honey, in characterizing his modernist rival’s music as positively promiscuous:

This fellow takes his honey (*meli*) from all over the place: brothel-house songs, drinking songs by Meletus, Carian pipe tunes, dirges, and dances. (Ar. *Ran.* 1301–3, with Palmer’s reading *meli* for *men* in MSS)

The corollary is that, by contrast, the older style of music represented by “Aeschylus” was sober, uniform, and respectable. While this characterization makes for an undue ethical and auditory polarization of old and new styles, it leads us to ask which elements or characteristics of the older music might be identified as distinguishing it in style and effect from the New Music that allegedly displaced and succeeded it.

“Old” Music

While the evidence shows that musicians shared an ideological disposition towards “novelty” from the earliest times, the ways in which such earlier music was heard to sound by contemporary and later audiences are far less well articulated than that of its successor. Plato was insistent that good music should, unlike the excesses of the New Musicians, “follow *logos*,” a phrase that may suggest among other things that melody should allow the natural quantities and tonal inflections of words to be observed (Pl. *Resp.* 3.398d, with D’Angour 2006, 280). Some specific instances of the older style of music that attracted rare comment are likely to have fallen into this category. In a passage of Plato’s *Ion*, Socrates argues that good song-composers (*melopoioi*) are divinely possessed when they compose their beautiful melodies, adducing the composer Tynnichus of Chalcis, “who never composed a single poem that one would think worth mention other than the paean which everyone sings, virtually the finest of all songs” (*Ion* 534d4–e1). Similarly the tragedian Phrynichus, a contemporary of Aeschylus, was remembered for his particularly “sweet” music, as several comments in Aristophanic comedy show. “Like a honey-bee,” we read, “Phrynichus was always sipping on the nectar of ambrosial melodies (*melē*) to produce sweet song.”²²

One may infer that this style of music was, relatively speaking, harmonically uniform and melodically simple from a passage of Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, where the character of Euripides scorns Aeschylus as being a “worthless song-composer who always repeats the same thing time and again” (1249–50). The Aeschylean verses that he cites to illustrate this inadequacy are rhythmically identical, and may also have been sung to identical melodies.²³ The clear aim is to suggest to the audience that the older style of music was repetitive to the point of monotony.²⁴ By contrast, one of the novelties of the New Music was its deliberate violation of both rhythmic and melodic conventions. Indeed, the flouting of the notion of following the natural rhythm and melody embedded in Greek words in any predictable fashion might have been a spur to the development of vocal notation during the fifth century BC (suggested in D’Angour 2006, 283).

In relation to these developments, immediately after describing some “modernist” features of a chorus of Euripides’ *Orestes*, Dionysius of Halicarnassus comments:

Prose diction does not violate or exchange the quantities of any word or verb, but keeps the long and short syllables just as they are naturally transmitted. But music and rhythm alter them, making them shorter or longer, so that they often turn into their opposites. Music and rhythm do not take their time-values from the syllables of words, but adjust syllables to time-values. (Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 64).

This statement has been felt to pose an alarming challenge to scholarly assumptions about syllabic length; West (1992, 132–3) hastens to offer reassurance that Dionysius was probably referring only to the way that a limited number of compositions from a late period violated metrical structures by their melodic settings. But the context indicates that Dionysius is speaking of the kind of melodic setting he found in a Euripidean score; and we may reasonably conclude that this was precisely one aspect of the New Musical *paranomia* that marked its departure from older styles.

Just as there is a sense, however, in which the harmonic and rhythmical elements of, say, classical music and jazz arise within a shared context of musical sound—distinct as these genres are in respect of style, context, and modes of performance—so also a closer analysis of ancient Greek musicians’ typical sound world may help to show how the New Music both drew on and diverged from earlier styles. However, it should be acknowledged that the descriptions of ancient critics or enthusiasts, as well as the tiny remains of musically notated evidence, mainly represent publicly performed and elite music of the kind heard in such venues as the theater, the temple, and the Odeion, Athens’ purpose-built concert hall (see Perrot in this volume). These will be representative of only a tiny part of the full range of ancient musical expression; a great deal of music would have been performed and enjoyed in less formal settings including symposia, work contexts, and nonceremonial occasions of celebration or recreation. Therefore, it would be hazardous to posit a simple linear development from the old style to the new, since myriad different kinds of musical sound, mostly lost to us, will have continued to be performed and heard.

Without assuming a monolithic musical style, it may be possible to undertake investigations into the sounds notated in the ancient musical fragments and reach a tentative understanding of prevailing rhythmical and harmonic idioms, as well as melodic and instrumental practices, which would have spanned (albeit with considerable differences in form and emphasis) both old and new styles of music. By noting these fundamental aspects of Greek musical idiom, we may be in a better position to understand how their alterations and modifications are reflected in the terms used by performers and critics to describe the developments of the New Music. A helpful guide to considering this common idiom is the earliest substantial example of musically notated documents, the papyrus fragment containing part of a choral passage of Euripides’ *Orestes* (see Ercoles in this volume, Figure 10.1). This is likely to record the musical setting of the words composed by the dramatist himself, who was known as a foremost exponent of the New Musical style. Given that it is composed for choral performance, however, it is likely to have incorporated features familiar to traditional choral performers as well as elements of Euripidean modernism. The off-beat, irregular, meter in which it is composed, dochmiacs, invariably suggests agitated expression (Dale 1969, 254–5); but here as elsewhere the meter falls into conventionally responding stanzas. The note structure identifies the ode as sung in the Phrygian or possibly Dorian mode, and no modulation into any other mode is detectable. The genus is likely to be the traditional enharmonic, which uses microtonal intervals (*pykna*);

but the recurrent tonal foci a fourth apart around which the microtones cluster seem to indicate that these were largely heard in this instance as passing-notes within an essentially diatonic structure.²⁵

All these aspects seem to suggest a fairly traditional approach to composition. However, key New Musical techniques may be detected in the music, both on the papyrus as preserved and as reconstructed for performance (detailed examination in D’Angour 2018, 58–64). These include the mimetic use of melody to represent the meaning of the text: for example, the falling melodic cadence of the last three syllables of *katolophyromai* (“I lament,” 341) suit the dejected connotation of the word, and upward melodic leaps may be found on references to “leap up in frenzy” (*anabaccheuei*, 339) and (on the reasonable assumption that the same melodic shape applied in the strophe) to “jump up” (*ampallesth*, 322). An ancient commentator indicates that a declaimed interjection (similar to modern *Sprechstimme*) interrupts the melodic line at an emotive juncture (*deinōn ponōn*, “terrible labors,” 343), creating a powerfully dramatic effect.²⁶ Despite these striking features, the notation of the papyrus indicates a moderate conformity to word-pitch—to a perhaps surprising degree, given the constraints of strophic respension. In some places where pitch-accent profiles are defiantly violated, sophisticated New Musical explanations suggest themselves.²⁷

This almost-unique notated testimony to classical musical composition thus offers some understanding both of the prevailing musical idiom and of the stylistic departures that marked the work of the New Musicians. The result is to reinforce our assumption that the strident claims of the latter were more representative of ideological impulses than of technical changes in musical style. While there would undoubtedly have been instances of musical exuberance and excess, both melodic and rhythmical, and of unfamiliar expressions and effects that will have struck the ears of conservative listeners as unpalatable, the fundamental modal and rhythmical character of the New Music was certainly a natural development of earlier musical styles rather than a wholesale departure from them. The aim of the musicians to be seen as radical and revolutionary was part of the dramatic self-presentation that made them exciting and popular; but notwithstanding their ideologically driven assertions, the sounds they produced were a logical outgrowth of their musical experimentation and were quickly absorbed into mainstream musical expression. They laid the basis for a musical sound world that, as scholarship can now propose to demonstrate, connects both the old and new sounds of ancient Greek music to those of subsequent European musical traditions.

NOTES

- 1 On the diction and style of New Musicians, see Csapo and Wilson 2009, 287–90; LeVen 2014, 150–88.
- 2 On the associations of ionics see Dale 1969, 256–7; Hordern (2002, 55–60) analyses Timotheus’s favored meters, and cites suggestions (252–3) that the first two lines of this fragment were also ionics in some form.
- 3 For associations of *neos* and *kainos*, see D’Angour 2011, 66–73, 85–90. *Kronos* was associated not just with the old but with the old-fashioned, and his festival the *Kronia* was perceived to be a byword for antiquated rituals: *Kroniōn ozōn* (Ar. *Nub.* 398, literally “smelling of the *Kronia*”) connotes “stale and musty.”
- 4 Pl. *Resp.* 4.424c. On Damon see Lynch 2013; Wallace 2015. Lynch argues that Plato simply used Damon’s observations as a basis for expounding his own philosophical position on

- music. Wallace suggests, more controversially (74) that Damon's was not just a neutral observation about the power of music but that he proposed exploiting musical change to encourage radical political change; however, it would be strange if Plato cited Damon's own words to argue the opposite position.
- 5 A later anecdote about Timotheus' reception in Sparta (Plut. *Mor.* 238c–d) relates to political opposition from conservative official bodies: see LeVen 2014, 120–1. In *Persians* Timotheus speaks of “Spartan” critics (*PMG* 791.206–20), but Csapo and Wilson (2009, 285–6) suggest that this may refer to “an ideological construction ... which invokes Sparta as a bastion of traditional music.”
 - 6 “All the considerable criticism directed against Timotheus and the other ‘New Musicians’ from the comic stage and the scholar's study is predicated on a high degree of achieved agonistic success. It is, in fact, largely motivated by that success” (Csapo and Wilson 2009, 280).
 - 7 On the transformation of the dithyramb into its fifth-century form, see D'Angour 1997.
 - 8 On the Pythian Air see West 1992, 212–14; Rocconi 2016. On the Athena *nomos* see Phillips 2013, who suggests that some of its elements were imitated in the music of Pindar's twelfth *Pythian Ode*.
 - 9 Plato deplored *theatrokratia* “power of the spectator mob”: *Leg.* 3.701a, *Grg.* 501a–502c.
 - 10 Arist. *Pol.* 8.1341a22–5; on the rejection of the *aulos*, see Wilson 1999, 63–9, 87–95.
 - 11 Wilson (1999, 70–2) discusses the possible functions, aesthetic and practical, of the cheek-strap (*phorbeia*).
 - 12 Strangely, the unmistakable genesis of Aristophanes' title and theme of *Frogs* has eluded commentators, including Dover 1993.
 - 13 Pindar's references to ethnic terms used for modes do not seem always to have signaled a musical mode: West 1992, 346–7.
 - 14 A short-lived invention by Pythagoras of Zacynthus, the Tripod, placed lyres in different tunings around a rotating base so that each lyre set in a different mode might be played in quick succession, but simpler ways of playing modulating music (such as the addition of extra strings on *kithara* and collars on *auloi*) were available (D'Angour 2006).
 - 15 Timotheus *PMG* 791.216–18; see LeVen 95–6.
 - 16 D'Angour 2006, 276; on earlier “revolutions” see LeVen 2014, 81–3.
 - 17 The tradition that Timotheus collaborated with Euripides in the composition of his music may have arisen out of their perceived similarities in the use of techniques of this kind: D'Angour 2017, 434–5.
 - 18 Philoxenus, a composer known for his dithyrambs, was nicknamed “the Ant” (*Suda* Φ 393): LeVen 2014, 12.
 - 19 The term for “modulation” (*metabolē*) may have contributed a sense of “revolutionary” change: D'Angour 2006, 267.
 - 20 Lynch (2018) gives a technical interpretation of the Pherocrates fragment as indicating that the use of a rotating tuning peg (*strobilos*) extended the modal capacities of the *kithara*.
 - 21 Plutarch recounts (*Nicias* 29) how Athenians who returned to Athens after the ill-fated Sicilian expedition of 415–413 BC thanked Euripides for their release from captivity, which they obtained after teaching the Syracusans what they could remember of his songs.
 - 22 *Ar. Av.* 748–51; cf. *Wasps* 220. “Sweet” (*glykys*) here assimilates the pleasure of hearing to that of taste, a metaphor suggested by the near-homophony of *melē* and *meli*: D'Angour 2015, 189.

- 23 The pitch accents on the words used in the different verses fall in very similar places: Danielewicz 1990; D’Angour 2007, 296–7.
- 24 See Dover 1993 on *Ran.* 1264–7.
- 25 Essentially diatonic: see Aristox. fr. 83 Wehrli; Hagel 2010, 398–405. West (1992, 285) notes these foci without further comment, but in this respect, the melody may seem to conform to the statement by Pseudo-Psallus quoted above regarding the music of tragedy using “a mixture of the enharmonic and diatonic.” The microtonal notes have been analyzed as relating to natural pitch changes associated with the enunciation of different vowels (D’Angour 2016).
- 26 The scholiast on line 343 indicates that these words “are shouted out” (*anapephōnētai*); while the corresponding location in the strophe would be *phoitaleou*, Tosca Lynch has felicitously suggested that the correspondingly declaimed words are likely to have been the immediately following exclamation *phēu mochthōn* (327, “alas for his labours”).
- 27 E.g. “stretching out” (*ore-echtheis*, 328) in the strophe, assuming melodic respension to the antistrophe, is set to a “stretched-out” melodic figure, while the rise on the second syllable creates an aural expectation that the singers are about to address Orestes by name (*Orēsta*, which rises tonally on the second syllable, might be substituted for *orechtheis*): D’Angour 2018, 62.

REFERENCES

- Csapo, Eric. 2004. “The Politics of the New Music.” In *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City*, edited by Penelope Murray and Peter Wilson, 207–48. Oxford: OUP.
- Csapo, Eric and Peter Wilson. 2009. “Timotheus the New Musician.” In *Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, edited by Felix Budelmann, 277–93. Cambridge: CUP.
- D’Angour, Armand. 1997. “How the Dithyramb Got Its Shape.” *CQ*, 47.2: 331–51.
- D’Angour, Armand. 2006. “The New Music: So What’s New?” In *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece*, edited by Simon Goldhill and Robin Osborne, 264–83. Cambridge: CUP.
- D’Angour, Armand. 2007. “The Sound of *Mousikē*: Reflections on Aural Change in Ancient Greece.” In *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution*, edited by Robin Osborne, 288–300. Cambridge: CUP.
- D’Angour, Armand. 2011. *The Greeks and the New*. Cambridge: CUP.
- D’Angour, Armand. 2013. “Music and Movement in the Dithyramb.” In Kowalzig and Wilson, eds. 198–210.
- D’Angour, Armand. 2015. “Sense and Sensation in Music.” In *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics*, edited by Pierre Destrée and Penelope Murray, 199–203. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- D’Angour, Armand. 2016. “Vocables and Microtones in Ancient Greek Music.” *GRMS*, 4.2: 273–85. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/22129758-12341279>.
- D’Angour, Armand. 2017. “Euripides and the Sound of Music.” In *A Companion to Euripides*, edited by Laura K. McClure, 428–44. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- D’Angour, Armand. 2018. “The Musical Setting of Ancient Greek Texts.” In *Music, Text, and Culture in Ancient Greece*, edited by Tom Phillips and Armand D’Angour, 47–72. Oxford: OUP.
- D’Angour, Armand. Forthcoming. “A Musical Reconstruction of the *Orestes*’ Papyrus.”

- Dale, Amy M. 1969. *Collected Papers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Danielewicz, Jerzy. 1990. "Il *nomos* nella parodia di Aristofane (*Ran.* 1264 sgg.)." *AION*, 12: 131–42.
- Dover, Kenneth. 1993. *Aristophanes: Frogs*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Franklin, John C. 2013. "'Songbenders of Circular Choruses': Dithyramb and the 'Demise of Music.'" In Kowalzig and Wilson, eds. 213–36.
- Kowalzig, Barbara, and Peter Wilson, eds. 2013. *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford: OUP.
- LeVen, Pauline. 2013. "The Colours of Sound: *Poikilia* and its Aesthetic Context." *GRMS*, 1: 229–42. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/22129758-12341244>.
- LeVen, Pauline. 2014. *The Many-Headed Muse*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lynch, Tosca. 2013. "A Sophist 'in Disguise': A Reconstruction of Damon of Oa and his Role in Plato's Dialogues." *EPlat* 10. DOI: <http://etudesplatoniciennes.revues.org/378>.
- Lynch, Tosca. 2018. "'Without Timotheus, Much of our *Melopoia* Would not Exist; But without Phrynis, There Wouldn't Have Been Timotheus': Pherecrates' Twelve Strings, the *Strobilos* and the Harmonic *Paranomia* of the New Music." *GRMS*, 6.2: 290–327. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/22129758-12341324>.
- Phillips, Tom. 2013. "Epinician Variations: Music and Text in Pindar, *Pythians* 2 and 12." *CQ*, 63.1: 37–56.
- Power, Timothy. 2010. *The Culture of Kitharodia*. Washington, DC: Hellenic Studies.
- Rocconi, Eleonora. 2016. "The Music of the *Laws* and the Laws of Music: *Nomoi* in Music and Legislation." *GRMS* 4.1: 71–89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/22129758-12341268>.
- Sansone, David. 2009. "Euripides' New Song: The First Stasimon of *Trojan Women*." In *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp*, edited by J. Robert C. Cousland and James R. Hume: 193–203. Leiden: Brill.
- Wallace, Robert W. 2015. *Reconstructing Damon. Music, Wisdom Teaching, and Politics in Perikles' Athens*. Oxford: OUP.
- West, Martin L. 1992. *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wilson, Peter. 1999. "The *Aulos* in Athens." In *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, edited by Simon Goldhill and Robin Osborne, 58–85. Cambridge: CUP.