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What do refrains contribute to ancient Greek poetry? Modern scholarship has usually limited its treatment of ancient Greek refrains to considerations of their external associations. The tendency has been to explain refrains, both individually and as a formal type, by reference to assumed origins for the refrain form and its use in primitive song, for which we have little or no evidence. By contrast, I have attempted to explain the refrain form as an established feature within the ancient Greek poetic tradition. I am interested in two questions. First, what do individual refrains contribute to the individual poems in which they appear? Second, what literary refrain tradition is indicated by the surviving examples? Obviously the answering of one question involves the answering of the other.

Before an examination can be made of individual refrains in context, there are some general questions that must be asked. In CHAPTER 2, I examine the treatment of refrains by ancient Greek scholarship. This involves examining the scholarly terminology associated with refrains, especially the term ἐπιφάνεια. In CHAPTER 3 I test the commonly held hypothesis that refrains are sung by a chorus in response to stanzas provided by a soloist. In CHAPTER 4 I address the question of the often assumed relationship between sub-literary song and the refrains in surviving Greek poetry. I do this by investigating ritual cries and their use both within and outside the context of formal refrains.
Once these general questions have been addressed, we may consider individual refrains in context. Since, as I shall argue, refrains find their most natural “home” in the monostrophic and triadic structures of non-dramatic lyric, I begin there in CHAPTER 5. Then I examine refrains in the antistrophic context of dramatic lyric in CHAPTER 6. I conclude my examination with the refrains of bucolic hexameters in CHAPTER 7. As it happens, this order coincides (very broadly speaking) with chronological order and thus reflects what I shall argue is the development of a continuous refrain tradition in ancient Greek poetry.
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In his book on repetitive forms in modern poetry, Laury Magnus almost despairs at offering a definition for the term “refrain”:

So self-evident a device as the refrain turns out to be difficult to define... The obvious definition that might describe the refrain simply as the set of a poem’s repeated lines or parts of lines neglects important semantic characteristics of the device. The most compelling of these is that of intrusion: the refrain disrupts or retards the development of the poem. Such intrusion results from the refrain’s segmentation of the poem, from the way in which it “slices through” poetic utterance while maintaining its own distinct identity — a consistency of personality which renders it distinct from the stanza or strophe and which, despite possible material alterations, does not essentially change.1

Magnus’ point is that refrains are identified and classified as such because of the impression made upon the sense of the audience, rather than because of any particular formal characteristic. The refrain is “self-evident”; it “[maintains] its own distinct identity”; it has a “consistency of personality”. True, this effect is brought about by means of repetition, but the repetition may not be strictly verbatim: there may be “material alterations” from one instance to the next. The unit of verse to which the refrain is attached is not necessarily fixed: it may be either “stanza or strophe”. To what degree do these units of non-refrain verse have an independent existence? “Strophe” would imply (at least in the context of Greek lyric poetry) a unit of verse with a life of its own, one to which any refrain could justly be considered additive; “stanza” has no such connotation, and conceivably could apply to any group of lines “[resulting] from the refrain’s segmentation of the poem”. We have, then, two obstacles to any attempt to define the term “refrain”: the apparent ability for refrains to depart from strictly

1 Magnus (1989) 46.
verbatim repetition, and the variety of metrical contexts in which they may be found.

Magnus is interested, of course, in the refrains of modern poetry, which are often much more variable in content and more sophisticated in formal and thematic functionality than the refrains of ancient Greek poetry. But his basic complaint is applicable to our subject. Greek refrains tend not to exhibit variation within individual poems, but there are several such cases with which we shall have to deal. More important is the difficulty of metrical context. One cannot, for example, offer a definition for Greek refrains such as “lines or parts of lines repeated within each strophe”. What would be done with the refrains of Pindar Paean 2 and 4, both of which are repeated with each triad? What of the refrains of antistrophic lyric in drama? And what of the refrains of astroplastic and stichic verse, such as we find in the continuous hexameters of bucolic? That these are refrains is, as Magnus says of refrains in general, self-evident, and any definition of “refrain” for the purposes of this study must include them.

§1 Definition and corpus

I propose the following as a working definition of “refrain” for ancient Greek poetry. “Refrains” are lines or portions of lines that are repeated regularly in a poem, and which are separated by and distinct from intervening material.

At this point it is desirable to distinguish what we are calling “refrains” from two other formal types: Homeric repetitions and what I shall call “appended

\footnote{Wilamowitz (1925) 265 denies the name “refrain” for Thyrsis’ song in Theocritus 1, but his reasons for so doing seem to be (1) the dissimilarity between Thyrsis’ refrain and those of German and Roman folk song, and (2) the lack of a strophic structure for the song. This second reason stems, no doubt, from Wilamowitz’ earlier efforts to correct a 19th century fad of looking for “strophic responsion” in Greek bucolic and using this as a basis for textual criticism. Cf. Wilamowitz (1906) 137.}
cries”. Besides limiting the corpus to be examined for this study, the distinction will occasion some useful discussion concerning the qualities of the refrain form.

Repeated phrases and lines are common enough in Homer that they may be regarded as a distinctive aspect of his style. Indeed, if we are correct in taking the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as products (ultimately) of an oral poetic tradition, repetition would seem to have been indispensable to their composition and performance. The evident adaptation of inherited oral compositional methods, including formulaic repetition, to what would otherwise be called high literary ends, stands as a singular achievement of the Homeric poems. Thus we may say with confidence that repetitions of phrase and line are essential to Homeric poetry.

This is not the case with the refrains of lyric and bucolic, in whose composition formulaic methods do not seem to have played a part. Whereas we cannot imagine an *Iliad* or an *Odyssey* without frequent repetitions of whole lines, we can point to the overwhelming majority of lyric and bucolic poems that do not feature refrains. All this does not of itself prove that Homeric repetitions — no matter their determination by the requirements of composition — are never meant to produce an effect similar to that produced by the refrains of lyric and bucolic. But their infrequency (in terms of occurrences per line) relative to refrains in lyric and bucolic; their placement according to the needs of narrative rather than to a set scheme; their syntactic continuity with their context,

---

4 See Kirk (1962) 59ff for a readable overview of formulaic method in Homeric poetry.
6 Fehling (1969) 101 points out that the use of formal repetition is relatively infrequent in melic and dramatic lyric. The several occurrences of repetition in the fragments of Sappho suggest to him that repetition may have been characteristic of the wedding song genre. My own discussion of hymeneus in CHAPTER 5 will deal with the use of the refrain form specifically rather than of repetition in general.
contrasting with the typical discontinuity of syntax associated with refrains —
these qualities suggest that the intended effect of repetitions in Homer is not the
same as the intended effect of refrains in lyric and bucolic.

But what of the “refrain-composition” identified in Homer by Keith Stanley?
According to him, this sub-category of ring-composition is the use of “fixed or
similar phrases [to] emphasize the serial relationship between the elements of a
catalogue or description”, and “the poet may also organize ordinary narrative in
this way.”7 While this “serial organization” functionality may be present in
bucolic passages with refrains (one thinks immediately of Theocritus 1 and 2, and
ps.-Moschus Epitaph of Bion), it does not seem to be an important function for the
refrains of lyric. This makes sense, given the commonality of continuous
hexameter verse in Homer and bucolic: without the repetitions, there would be
no self-evident demarcations of theme between successive segments of
hexameters. But even here, the parallel is not too strong, at least in Theocritus 1
and 2, where the number, closeness and regularity (especially in Theocritus 2) of
refrains repeated verbatim produce an effect incomparable to that of the relatively
infrequent and verbally variable repetitions of sense in Homer which Stanley is
describing. In the end, this kind of repetition is best understood with reference
to the “origin in an accretive parataxis” of ring-composition in general.8 This is a
compositional style not common, it seems, to the poems with which we will be
dealing.9

7 Stanley (1993) 8. Stanley is following van Otterlo (1944) 195f, who found evidence
of “Ritournellkomposition” in the description of the construction of Achilles’
shield in Iliad 18: 483 ἐν µὲν...ἐτευκεῖ; 490 (=573, 587) ἐν δὲ...ποιήσε; 541 (=550, 561,
607) ἐν δὲ...ἐτίθεις; 590 ἐν δὲ...ποικιλλαι.
9 The clear use of refrains in Greek epic is found, though far removed from the
compositional context of Homer, at Nonnus 15.309ff. The distinction between
Nonnus’ use of the refrain form and his use of other kinds of repetition is made
(though briefly) by Schmiel (1998) 326.
Refrains should also be distinguished from cries that are appended to songs but are not periodically repeated. These cries are often associated with cult, e.g. παιάν or ἀξίες ταύρε below, and their appearance even in obviously literary contexts seems to point to sub-literary performances. I will discuss in CHAPTER 4 what I see as the relationship between this type of cry and the refrain form; here I am interested only in making a formal distinction. An example of the appended cry is found in the cult song to Dionysus sung by the women of Elis, reported by Plutarch at Quaest. Graec. 36:

διὰ τί τὸν Διόνυσον αἱ τῶν Ἡλείων γυναίκες υμνοῦσαι παρακαλοῦσιν “Βοέω ποδὶ” παραγίνεσθαι πρὸς αὐτὰς: ἐχεὶ δ’ οὕτως ὁ υἱὸς

ἐλθέων ἐρω Διόνυσε
’Ηλείων ἐς ναὸν
ἀγνών σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν
ἐς ναὸν
τῷ Βοέω ποδὶ θύων,

ἐίτα διὸς ἐπάθουσιν

ἀξίες ταύρε,
ἀξίες ταύρε.

The similarities between this example of appended cry and many examples of refrain are potentially misleading. The doubling of the cry ἀξίες ταύρε resembles

10 Campbell translates Plutarch’s διὸς ἐπάθουσιν “they add the double refrain.” Similarly, van der Weiden (1991) 11: “the form [of the song] makes it plausible to assume that the last two lines were a refrain sung by a chorus, while the first lines were sung by a soloist.” It is not clear whether Campbell and van der Weiden believe that the song continues beyond Plutarch’s quotation with ἀξίες ταύρε, ἀξίες ταύρε repeated as a true refrain; they may simply be using the term “refrain” in the imprecise manner often used by scholars (cf. my discussion above). In any event, van der Weiden’s hypothesis of a performance divided between soloist and chorus is at odds with the context provided by Plutarch, who describes “the women of the Eleans”, not a soloist, as hymning Dionysus: τὸν Διόνυσον αἱ τῶν Ἡλείων γυναίκες υμνοῦσαι. The natural reading of the passage is that the Elean women sing both the song and its accompanying cries. Van der Weiden’s hypothesis reflects a common assumption among modern scholars concerning the default performance mode of what they call “refrains” (cf. my discussion of performance of refrains in CHAPTER 3).
the close repetitions that frequently occur in refrains. The doubled cry follows, and is distinct from, the rest of the song; this may remind us of a terminal refrain following its stanza. Nevertheless, there is no indication in Plutarch’s context that the song continues beyond the quotation and that the doubled cry is repeated as a refrain.

When we apply our definition of “refrain” to surviving ancient Greek poetry up through the first century A.D., we arrive at the following corpus:

**Aeschylus**
- *Persæ* 1057-1064
- *Septem* 975-977=986-989
- *Suppliants* 117-122=128-133
- *Suppliants* 141-143=151-153
- *Suppliants* 889-892=899-902
- *Agamemnon* 121=138=159
- *Agamemnon* 1072-1073=1076-1077
- *Agamemnon* 1081f=1085f
- *Agamemnon* 1489-1496=1513-1520
- *Eumenides* 328-333=341-346
- *Eumenides* 778-792=808-822
- *Eumenides* 1043=1047

**Anonymous**
- *Frag. Erythraean Paean* 2 (Käppel Pai. 36b)
- *Erythraean Paean* (Käppel Pai. 37)
- *Hymnus Curetum* (CA 160) 1-6=11-16=21-26=31-36=41-46=51-56=61-66
- Campbell 931L (SLG 460, 461, 462, 465)

**Aristonous**
- *Paean in Apollinem* (Käppel Pai. 42)

**Aristophanes**
- *Peace* 1332=1335=1336=1344=1345=1349=1350=1355=1356
- *Birds* 1736=1742=1754
- *Frogs* 404=410=416
- *Ecclesiazousae* 952=960
- *Ecclesiazousae* 958f=967f
- *Ecclesiazousae* 971f=974f

**Bacchylides**

---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{11}}\] E.g. Pindar, *Paean* 2.35ff; Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 121; *Persæ* 1057. For repeated cry as a distinct and independent formal type, and its use in refrain, see my discussion in \textit{CHAPTER 4}.
§2 Some useful terms and the variety of Greek refrains

It will be convenient at this point to introduce some terms descriptive of the formal relationship between refrains and the poems in which they appear. This will also serve to introduce some important points concerning the variety of metrical structures in which refrains appear. The segments of intervening material between refrains we may call “stanzas”.\footnote{I occasionally use the terms “stanza” and “strophe” with reference to the same passage, depending on whether my focus is on distinguishing the refrain from its context (“stanza”), or on speaking of a periodic unit of strophic lyric as such. For} As we shall see, the placement

fr.*18 S-M:
fr. *19. 1-2=8-9:

Euripides
\textit{Bacchae} 877-881=897-901
\textit{Bacchae} 992-996=1011-1016
\textit{Ion} 125ff.=141ff.

Macedonius
\textit{Paean in Apollinem et Aesclulapium} (Käppel Pai. 41)

[Moschus]
3.8=13=19=25=36=45=50=57=64=69a=85=98=108=113

Philodamus Scarpheus
\textit{Paean in Dionysum}

Pindar
\textit{Paean} 2. 35-36=71-72=107-108
\textit{Paean} 4. 31=62
\textit{Paean} 5. 1-19=37=43
\textit{Paean} 21
\textit{Threnus} 5 (fr. 128e) (a)2-4=(b)6-8

Sappho
fr. 111 Voigt/LP

Theocritus
1.64=70=73=76=79=84=89
1.94=99=104=108=111=114=119=122
1.127=131=137=142
2.17=22=27=32=37=42=47=52=57=63
2.87=93=99=105=111=117=123=129=135
of refrains with respect to their stanzas is quite varied in Greek poetry. This
arrangement we call “scheme”. The most common scheme for refrain in Greek
poetry is the “terminal refrain”.13 This is when the refrain follows its stanza, as in
Aristonous, *Paeon to Apollo* 1-4 (Käppel):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Πολιαν ἵεροκτιτον } \\
\text{παϊῶν Δελφὴν ἀμφὶ πέτραν } \\
\text{ἄεὶ θεσπιώματιν ἐ-} \\
\text{δραῖν, ἦ ἐ Παιὰν }
\end{align*}
\]

We call “initial refrains” those which come at the beginning of their stanza,
e.g. Pindar, *Paeon* 5.43-48 (Snell-Maehler):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ὑμὲν Δάλι' Ἀπόλλων' } \\
\text{Λατόσις ἔνθα μὲ παιδείς } \\
\text{εὐμετεῖ δέξασθε νώῳ θεράποντα } \\
\text{ὑμέτερον κελαδευνά } \\
\text{σὺν μελιγάρφῳ παι-} \\
\text{άνος ἀγακλέος ὀμφά. }
\end{align*}
\]

Another scheme has the refrain occur within the body of the stanza; these we
may call “medial refrains”. Sappho fr. 111 (Lobel-Page) will serve as an example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἡψι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον, } \\
\text{yrıμπναιοι, } \\
\text{ἀέρρετε, τέκτονες ἄνδρες· } \\
\text{溇ψιμχοι, } \\
\text{γάμβρος τεισέρχεται ἵσος τ̣ Ἀρευ, } \\
\text{ἀνδρός μεγάλῳ πόλυν μέζων. }
\end{align*}
\]

When refrains occur more than once for a single stanza, we call it a “complex
refrain”. The Sappho fragment above is an example of this in that it features two
medial refrains in one stanza.14 More commonly, a complex refrain consists of a

---

13 The terms “terminal refrain”, “initial refrain” and “medial refrain” are taken
from Magnus (1989) 47ff.
14 This depends, of course, on one’s text. Page in his *Sappho and Alcaeus* (1955) 124
offers a text in which the fragment is construed as two short strophes, each with a
single medial refrain. This arrangement into two strophes is at odds with all other
editions of the fragment with which I am familiar, including Page’s own in *LGS*
(1968). See my discussion of this fragment’s text in CHAPTER 5.
combination of a medial refrain and a terminal refrain, as in Philodamus, *Paean to Dionysus* 1-13 (Käppel):

[deir' ána] Διώφραμβε, Βάκχ',
εἴ, Ταύρ κλισσοχαί-
tα, Βρόμ', ἦρμανις ικών
ταίσθ', ιεραις ἐν ὀραίς
εἰσοί ω ἵδι [Βάκχ', ὦ ἰε Παίαν'
δὲ Θήβαις ποτ' ἐν ἑυίαις
Ζη[νι] γεινατ' ηλλυνήνα
πάντες δ' ἱδήναι οἰκό
πάντες δ' ἐστι βροτοὶ χάρεν
σαῖς, ὦ Βάρχνη, γένναιοι.
ἵε Παίαν, ἵπτε σκηλπ.

Besides the variety of schemes, there is a variety in the kinds of larger metrical structures in which refrains may be found in Greek poetry. So far we have looked at examples of refrain taken from monostrophic lyric. Refrains also occur in triadic structures, as in Pindar's *Paean* 2 and 4, where the refrain occurs at the close of each triad. (In our terms, these triads are stanzas with terminal refrains.) We frequently find refrains in the antistrophic lyric structures of Athenian drama, as at Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 1040-1047 (Page):

ὅλαι δὲ καὶ εὐθύφρονες γάϊ
δειρ' ἵτε σεμναὶ ( κ' ) πυριδάςπτων
λαμπὰς τερπόμεναι καθ' ὤοιν.
ἄλολοξατε νῦν ἐπὶ μολπαῖς.

σπονδαὶ ὅ' τές τὸ πάν ἐνθαίδες οὐκὼν'
Παλλάδος ἀπόστασις. Ζεὺς παιστόπτας
οὔτω Μοῖρα τε συγκατέβα.
ἄλολοξατε νῦν ἐπί μολπαῖς.

We sometimes find refrains in metrical contexts that are not strophic at all, as in Theocritus 1.64-73:

ἀρχετε θυμολικάς. Μοίσαι φίλαι, ἀρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς.
Θύρσις ὦ' ω ᾿Αἴτνας, καὶ Θύρσιδος ἀδέα φωνά.
In this situation, the refrain lends to continuous verse a sense of structure which it would lack otherwise, whereas in strophic lyric the refrain serves to reinforce a structure that is already there. In this context it is difficult to say whether the refrain goes with what follows or what goes before, and so terms like “initial refrain” and “terminal refrain” are usually not useful.

§3 Questions and method

Once we have an idea of what refrains look like and where they occur, we come to the basic question of this study. What do refrains contribute to ancient Greek poetry? More precisely, we are interested in two questions. First, what do individual refrains contribute to the individual poems in which they appear? Second, what literary refrain tradition is indicated by the surviving examples? Obviously the answering of one question involves the answering of the other. A reasonably complete interpretation of an individual refrain in context cannot be made in a vacuum, while an appreciation of any refrain tradition relies on the study of specific examples. In this study I will necessarily be continually negotiating between these two aspects of the basic question, though my main concern in the early chapters must be with general issues more than with specific poems.

There is another way of dividing our basic question, a way that will shape the remainder of this section and much of this study as a whole. On the one hand, we
may speak of external associations that refrains bring with them to surviving Greek poetry, either by the nature of the refrain form per se, or by the content of individual refrains. On the other hand, we may speak of the formal and thematic functionality of refrains within their poems. As the questions of individual refrain contribution and of refrain tradition are inseparable, so are the issues of external associations and internal functionality. For example, the interpretation of the second occurrence of the refrain in Pindar, *Paeon* 2 (71ff) as “quasi-dramatic” relies upon the recognition of the external military associations brought by the paean cry featured in that refrain.

While attention has been paid on occasion to how refrains function thematically and formally in context\(^\text{15}\), modern scholarship has usually limited its treatment of ancient Greek refrains to considerations of their external associations. The tendency has been to explain refrains, both individually and as a formal type, by reference to assumed origins for the refrain form and its use in primitive song, for which we have little or no evidence. Generally speaking, we may say that scholarship has suffered from the lack of a comprehensive view of refrains as they are used throughout surviving Greek poetry.\(^\text{16}\) Nevertheless, the external associations assumed by modern scholars suggest important questions. In addressing them, however, it will be necessary to avoid becoming too entangled in unanswerable questions concerning the origins and primitive use of refrains. In this study, the purpose of examining possible external associations is not to


\(^{16}\) To date no comprehensive study has been made. The title of Peiper’s series of articles (1863-1865), *Der Refrain bei griechischen und lateinischen Dichtern*, is misleading: of the Greeks only the bucolics are treated. Perhaps the best attempt at a survey (if not a comprehensive treatment) of the distribution of refrains in ancient Greek poetry is given by Cannatà Fera (1990) 124ff.
reconstruct the pre-history of the Greek refrain; it is to inform our understanding of surviving Greek poetry.

Before an examination can be made of individual refrains in context, there are some general questions that must be asked.

To what extent does our definition of “refrain” correspond to ancient understanding? Did ancient Greek poets and their audience recognize a formal category apart from individual examples and apart from generic types, e.g. the refrains of hymenaeus? In general, did they distinguish between the content of refrains and the refrain form per se? To answer these questions, I propose to examine the treatment of refrains by ancient Greek scholarship. This will involve examining the scholarly terminology associated with refrains, especially the term ἐφύμων. This will be the matter of CHAPTER 2.

How were refrains performed? If an answer should be arrived at, it would have very important implications for the interpretation of individual refrains in context. Scholars have almost universally assumed a default performance model whereby refrains are sung by a chorus in response to stanzas provided by a soloist. An investigation of the performance of refrains must begin with the testing of this hypothesis. This will be the matter of CHAPTER 3.

What external associations do refrains bring to their poems? In a way, this question cannot be separated from consideration of refrain functionality in context, since a generic association, which is external to any particular poem, is created by the sum of other examples within the genre. Consideration of such an association is not really preliminary to consideration of specific refrain texts, and must wait till more general questions have been considered. But their remains the general question of the often assumed relationship between sub-literary song and the refrains in surviving Greek poetry. This is not an unreasonable assumption
given the near ubiquity of refrains in documented (non-Greek) sub-literate song cultures, but it has not yet been tested. Since refrains containing “ritual cries” (e.g. ἵη παϊάν) are most typically offered as examples of the influence of sub-literate song upon the refrains of surviving Greek poetry, it seems best to begin with an investigation of these cries and their use both within and outside the context of formal refrains. This will be the matter of CHAPTER 4.

Once these general questions have been addressed, we may consider individual refrains in context. Given that the formal functionality of refrains depends so much upon their metrical context, it makes sense to organize our examination along metrical lines. Since, as I shall argue, refrains find their most natural “home” in the monostrophic and triadic structures of non-dramatic lyric, I will begin there in CHAPTER 5. Then I will examine refrains in the antistrophic context of dramatic lyric in CHAPTER 6. I conclude my examination with the refrains of bucolic hexameters in CHAPTER 7. As it happens, this order coincides (very broadly speaking) with chronological order and thus reflects what I shall argue is the development of a continuous refrain tradition in ancient Greek poetry.
CHAPTER 2
ANCIENT SCHOLARSHIP ON THE REFRAIN FORM

In this chapter I intend to evaluate how well the definition of “refrain” offered in CHAPTER 1 matches ancient understanding. Two questions must be asked. First, was the refrain form distinguished from the content of individual refrains? Second, was the refrain form conceived separately from its appearance in individual examples and in certain genres? I am also interested to see how well the corpus of refrain texts offered in CHAPTER 1 conforms to the generic associations indicated in ancient scholarship. My selected method is to examine the terminology applied to the refrain form in ancient scholarship. Practically speaking, this consists mainly of examining the usage of ἐφύμυνον, which I will argue is the standard term for the refrain form. I will also have occasion to contrast the usage of ἐφύμυνον with that of other terms, most especially ἐπίφρεγμα.

Our sources for the ancient scholarly treatment of the refrain form fall into two main groups. The first of these consists of the surviving works of the Hellenistic scholars themselves, both their scholarship and their poetry. The second group of sources consists of later sources of the post-Hellenistic period, such as metrical handbooks, scholia to archaic and classical poetry, and lexicographers. I shall argue that these owe their treatment of the refrain form to the work of scholars of the Hellenistic period. Because the evidence from the later period is more abundant, and often clearer in its formal treatment of refrains, it is there that I will begin my study. I proceed under the assumption that, unless indicated otherwise, the later sources are derivative of Hellenistic scholarship proper, and thus can be used to reconstruct that scholarship. I believe the following pages will justify that assumption.
In the case of each of these groups I will be interested in the usage of the relevant scholarly terminology, i.e. the working definition of terms applied to the refrain form. I will also be interested in the application of that terminology by ancient scholarship to specific poems and genres.

Before I turn to the primary evidence, I will briefly consider the ancient etymology of the term ἐφύμιων, and what this and modern linguistics can tell us about the original context for the term’s use. The form of the word itself offers us a clue as to its earliest use. Certainly later writers analyzed the term so that the prefix ἐπί- referred to the formal relationship of the refrain to the strophe, or more generally to the song, to which it was attached. This analysis is made explicitly in, for example, the Suda: ἐφύμιων τὸ ἐπί τῷ ὑμνῷ ἁτέμα. This analysis is less explicit, but is still clearly implied in Hephaestion περὶ Ποιημάτων 7.1 (p. 70 Consbruch): ταύτης τῆς προσηγορίας τετύχθηκεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐφύμιων τί εἰσόδασιν ἐπάγειν οἱ ποιηταὶ ταῖς στροφαῖς. Likewise Origen, Selecta in psalmos v.12, p.1656.14 τὸ δὲ ὅτι “ἐἰς τὸν αἰώνα τὸ ἐλεος αὐτοῦ” ἐφύμιας τρόπῳ ἐπιλέγεται. This ancient etymology would seem to be more or less correct. Prepositions are frequently joined to substantives in Greek, resulting in adjectival forms ending in -ος or -ιος.1 The term ἐφύμιων seems then to be a neuter substantive derived from a standard adjectival form, with an original meaning of “the thing upon or in addition to the ὑμνος”. If this analysis is correct, then from the time of its coining the term ἐφύμιων referred to the formal relationship between certain lines and the poems to which they were attached.2

1 Schwyzer bd. 1, 436. This phenomenon is known as hypostasis. Cf. ἔκτοπος, -ος; ἐνυππος, -ιος; ἐπιχόδιος. My thanks to Prof. Alan Nussbaum for his help on this point.
2 ἐφυμενεω should not be taken as the corresponding verb to the noun ἐφύμιων. Whereas the prefix ἐπι- of ἐφύμιων describes the relationship between refrain and song, the prefix ἐπι- of ἐφυμενεω describes the relationship between the singer and the person or thing over which or in response to which the singing is directed.
In order to establish the precise nature of this formal relationship, I turn now to the primary evidence.

§1.1 Hephaestion

Our fullest ancient source for the critical terminology of refrains is found in the work περὶ Ποιημάτων (hereafter π. Π.) appended to the metrical handbook commonly ascribed to 2nd century A.D. metrist Hephaestion.3 π. Π. 7.1 (p. 70 Consbruch) opens with a definition of the term ἑφόμιον:

ἐστι δὲ των ἐν τοῖσ σοιήμασι καὶ τὰ καλούμενα ἑφόμια, ἀπερ ταύτης τῆς προσήγορίας τετυχήκεν. ἑπειδὴ καὶ ἑφόμιαν τι εἰσόδασαν ἐπάγεων οἱ ποιηταὶ ταῖς στροφαῖς, οὐά ἐστι καὶ τὰ τουαίτα “ἱηέ παιάν” καὶ “ὡ διδυράμβε.”

(There are certain things in poems called “ἑφόμια”, which have received this designation because the poets are in the habit of appending some sort of “refrain” to their strophes.4 And of this sort are such things as “Ieīe

This meaning is most obvious when a dative object is supplied: Aesch. Eum. 902 τι συν μ’ ἄνωγας τῇ ἐφόμιον χόθοι. (Cf. X. Mem. 2.6.11 ἀ μὲν αἱ Σειρήνες εἰπέδον τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ.) It is also found where the dative object is implied: Soph. OT 1275 κοινάτ’ ἑφόμιον [implied dative object Jocasta]. ἑφόμια is also used to describe singing in response to events, as when the Athenians reacted to the Persians’ apparent loss of heart during the battle of Salamis: Aesch. Pers. 393 ὅ γάρ ὡς φυγή παιάν ἑφόμιον. The accusative object of ἑφόμια typically refers to the entirety of the reported singing, as seen in the examples above and at Pl. Leg. 947 εἰς τὸ πάτριον μέλος ἑφόμιει. Rutherford (2001) 71 is probably correct to conclude that the frequent use of verbs with the prefix ἐπι- in connection with paean may reflect a sub-literary practice whereby a paean cry “[followed] a ritual event or speech as an endorsement (rather like ‘Amen’), but the use of such a verb to describe a performance does not, as Rutherford seems to imply, require us to assume the presence of a formal refrain.

While it is commonly agreed that the main part of the handbook is in fact an abridgement taken directly from a 48 book treatise of the same name by Hephaestion himself, it is not clear whether or not the π.Π. derives from Hephaestion’s own work. Nevertheless, this document is important in that the definitions it gives for ἑφόμιον and related terms has provided the terminology used by later scholars in discussing refrains in ancient Greek poetry. Moreover, comparison of these definitions in the π. Π. with the usage of the same terms in scholia will show a great affinity between the two, and therefore suggests that in its essentials the π. Π provides a good picture of refrain terminology in antiquity.

4 Of the examples of refrain (both ἑφόμιον and ἐπιφθεγματικοῦ) given by π.Π., we have the stanzaic contexts for two: the refrains of Sappho fr. 111 L-P (the stanzaic
paian” and “O dithyramb”.)

For Hephaestion the normal placement of the refrain is after the strophe. This is made clear by what follows in the π.Π. The writer goes on to introduce another refrain term, this one being used to describe a particular subcategory within the broader category of ἐφύμιον:

(But when the ἐφύμιον lies not after a strophe but rather after a line and is enclosed by another line, it is called a μεσύμιον. And of this sort is the passage from Sappho: “Raise high the roof, ye builders, hymenaon, The bridegroom, equal to Ares, is coming.”)

A few general remarks are in order at this point. Two of the three examples given by Hephaestion to illustrate “refrain” (ἵππες παιάν, ψιχήραι) belong to genres that not only frequently feature refrains, but that also seem to have taken their names from the cry commonly used within a formal refrain in those genres. Indeed, as we shall see, Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes both offer etymologies for the paean cry that clearly suggest that the genre took its name from the cry. It is only reasonable to expect that this kind of etymology made sense because of the high expectation of the presence of the cry (and perhaps of

context is provided by π.Π.) and of Bacch. fr. *19 (the stanzaic context is provided in part in POxy 23, 2361). Both these refrains occur in monostrophic contexts, and it may be that the author of π.Π. specifically has monostrophic lyric in mind when he speaks of refrains in relationship to a στροφή.

5 Hephaestion’s use of ἐπάγεων with ἐφύμιον probably indicates that he analyzes the latter form’s prefix ἐπί- to mean “after”.

6 I provide Consbruch’s text for the purposes of discussing the refrain terminology of the π.Π. I shall argue for a different text for the Sappho fragment when discussing the function of its refrain in context in CHAPTER 5.

7 For ὑμήν and related cries being the source for both the name of the song and the name of the later deity, see Paul Maas, “ὑμήν ὑμήν”, Philologus 66 (1907) 594.
the refrain as well) in the paean genre.

We also note that while only μεσόμνιον is illustrated by means of an example quoted in its formal context, nevertheless a lot of formal information is implied about ἑφύμνα through this action. Since μεσόμνια are distinguished from ἑφύμνα in that they do not occur after a strophe, it follows that the writer assumes the natural place for an ἑφύμνον is after a strophe. Moreover there is implied a familiarity with the form of paeans and dithyrambs that makes it unnecessary to illustrate the scheme of those genres’ refrains by actually quoting them in context.\(^8\) It may be that the writer of π. Π. assumed that hymenaeus refrains were less familiar to his readers. A simpler explanation is that Sappho’s refrain is quoted in context because the μεσόμνιον form is less common than normal terminal refrain. While Hephaestion does use two terms (ἑφύμον, μεσόμνιον) to describe refrains according to whether they fall after or within the body of the strophe to which they are attached, it seems clear that ἑφύμον is the original, general term that, broadly speaking, applies to all such refrains regardless of their location relative to the strophe. The term μεσόμνιον, then, merely identifies a particular sub-category within the larger category ἑφύμον.

π. Π. offers a third category of refrain form in section 7.3 (p. 71f., Consbruch):

\[
\text{"\begin{quote}
\text{στι δὲ τινα καὶ τά καλούμενα ἐπιφθεγματικά, ἃ διαφέρει ταύτη τῶν ἑφυμίων, ὅτι τά μὲν ἑφύμνια καὶ πρὸς νοῦν συντελεῖ τι, τὰ δὲ ἐπιφθεγματικὰ ἐκ περιττοῦ ώς πρὸς τὸ λεγόμενον τῇ στροφῇ πρόσκειται· οὖν τὸ Βακχυλίδου ἢ καλὸς Θεόκριτος, οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώπων ὀρᾶς, καὶ "σὺ δὲ σὺν χιτώνι μοῦνον παρὰ τὴν φίλην γυναῖκα φεύγεις."\"}
\end{quote}\]

\(^8\) There is, in fact, so surviving example of a dithyramb with a refrain containing the cry ὡ διθύραμβε, and no clear examples of dithyramb that feature a refrain of any kind. Nevertheless we must conclude that the writer of π. Π. thought such cries, set in the form of refrains, were common in dithyramb. Cf. APPENDIX I.

\(^9\) The sense of the passage and its context militates against the received reading of τά μὲν ἑφύμνια... τά δὲ ἐπιφθεγματικά. Of the editors of π.Π., Westphal (1866) ad loc. first and most explicitly made the case against the received text: ἐκ περιττοῦ... πρόσκειται applies to the examples of ἑφύμνον given above (ἐίπε παιάν, κτλ.), not to
(There are certain things called ἐπιφθεγματικά, which differ from ἐφύμινα in this way, that the former contribute something to the sense, while the latter is superfluously attached to the strophe as far as concerns what is being said.)

Although Hephaestion literally treats ἐπιφθεγματικόν as completely separate from ἐφύμινα, we are most likely meant to understand that, like μεσύμινα, ἐπιφθεγματικόν is a sub-category of ἐφύμινα, in this case distinctive for its content rather than its form.10 Formally speaking, ἐπιφθεγματικόν is identical to ἐφύμινα, both of them being attached to strophes. The definition for ἐφύμινα given by Hephaestion at 7.1 would describe ἐπιφθεγματικόν just as well.

Hephaestion’s distinction between ἐφύμινα and ἐπιφθεγματικά reflects a recognition by him that the refrain form was particularly associated with certain genres. Nevertheless, π. Π. 7.1-3 stands as evidence that the basic refrain form was seen as a legitimate feature in a wide variety of lyric genres.

Finally, the multiplicity of terms used by Hephaestion for “refrain” is explained by the fact that his is a prescriptive metrical handbook, and that he is interested in separating and classifying all the sub-categories that elsewhere fall under the single heading of ἐφύμινα.11 As we shall see, the Alexandrian scholars

the fragment of Bacchylides provided; and to this fragment πρὸς νοῦν συντελεῖ τι clearly applies. A correction is clearly warranted, though it is difficult to choose between Westphal’s solution of transposing καὶ πρὸς νοῦν συντελεῖ and ἐκ περιττοῦ ὡς πρὸς τὸ λεγόμενον τῇ στροφῇ πρόσκειται, and Caesar’s simpler omission of ἐφύμινα after τὰ μὲν and ἐπιφθεγματικά after τὰ δὲ. I have followed the latter course in my own translation. Cf. n.11 below in this chapter.

10 Hephaestion’s term ἐπιφθεγματικόν appears to be derived from ἐπίφθεγμα. Cf. my discussion of the latter term below in this chapter.

11 Hephaestion appears to represent a common practice among metrical handbooks in the way he begins with ἐφύμινα, the general term for "refrain", and then sub-divides that into specific sub-categories on the basis of location relative to the strophe. Cf. the 4th century A. D. grammatarian Marcus Victorinus in his Artes Grammaticae I, p. 59 Keil; cf. my Appendix 1: Refrains in Dithyramb. Hephaestion’s use of the term ἐπιφθεγματικόν and his corresponding distinction made between refrains based on their relative semantic value is never picked up by other commentators. this explains, in part, the misunderstanding that led to the apparent textual error at π.Π. 7.3 discussed above.
and the scholiasts who took up their terminology had different interests when it came to identifying instances of the refrain form, interests that did not require them to make the kinds of distinctions made by Hephaestion. Nevertheless, Hephaestion’s use of the term \( \epsilon \phi \mu \mu \nu \nu \) as the general term for “refrain” most likely derives from Hellenistic scholarly practice.

§1.2 Aeschylean scholia

Another source of evidence for the post-Hellenistic terminology relating to refrains is the earlier poetic scholia. Scholia that comment on instances of refrains, when they do treat the form of these refrains as opposed to treating only their content, usually use the term \( \epsilon \phi \mu \mu \nu \nu \) to identify the refrain form. Likewise, whenever the scholia use the term \( \epsilon \phi \mu \mu \nu \nu \) in the absence of any actual refrain form in the text being commented upon, the term is applied to content that we have good reason to believe was often cast in the form of a refrain. Before I begin I must acknowledge that the number of examples I shall present is small. One explanation for this is the fact that I have excluded from my investigation all scholia not identified as “vetera” by editors.\(^\text{12}\) Despite the scantiness of the examples, they are sufficient to indicate a pattern of use for the term \( \epsilon \phi \mu \mu \nu \nu \) by scholiasts in antiquity.

The examples I deal with are drawn from a single manuscript, the venerable M (Mediceus Laurentianus 32, 9) dated to the tenth century and containing all seven of the surviving plays of Aeschylus save for \textit{Ag.} 311-1066 and 1160-1673.\(^\text{13}\) As we shall see, the examples drawn from M point not only to the common use of the

\(^\text{12}\) It should be noted that later scholia by and large follow the practice of the scholia vetera when it comes to the use of the term \( \epsilon \phi \mu \mu \nu \nu \).

term ἐφύμινον in late antiquity, but also to the likely original context in which “refrain criticism” of the Aeschylean corpus came into being.

There is a single instance of refrain the Septem (975-7=986-8, occurring near the high point of Antigone and Ismene's lament):

Χο. ἰὸν Μοῖρα βαρυσθέτειρα μογερά, πότινα τ’ Οἰδίπου σκιά: μέλαιαν Ἑρμύς, ἡ μεγασθενής τις εἶ.

The lines are identified as a refrain in the corresponding scholia:

Σ Μ Sept. 975-7a ἐφύμινον.

Σ Μ Sept. 986-8a τὸ ἐφύμινον. ταῦτα δὲ λέγει ὡς βαρέως φέρων.

We note that the use by the scholiast here of the term ἐφύμινον is not quite identical to that suggested by Hephaestion above: while the placement of the refrain qualifies it as an ἐφύμινον (π. Π. 7.1), its length and fully developed sense would seem to recommend it as an ἐπιφθεγματικὸν (π. Π. 7.3). Already we begin to see that the scholia do not usually make the kind of detailed formal distinctions regarding refrains that are made by Hephaestion. Another point of interest is the fact that each of the two instances of the refrain in the text is identified as an ἐφύμινον; this is, so far as I can tell, the only place in scholia to Greek poetry where the scholiast felt compelled to point out more than one instance of a given refrain. His motive may be revealed in the extended comment that follows the second use of ἐφύμινον in the scholion to 986-8a. Here the scholiast says, “[The poet] says these things as if heavily burdened.” Now, this comment could be understood simply as trying to explain the content of the passage in the text, but in that case we might have expected the comment to have been made at the first instance of the refrain at 975ff. An alternate explanation is that the scholiast reserves his extended comment for the second instance of the refrain precisely because it is the form of the refrain that he is attempting to explain, i.e. it is the
very repetition of the refrain that has suggested the notion “heavily burdened” to the scholiast.\(^{14}\) In this case, the repeated identification of the refrain as an ἐφύμινον emphasizes the scholiast’s interest in the use of the refrain form per se.

There are three places where refrains are used in the *Eumenides*, but only one of these (328-33=341-6) is identified as a refrain in the M scholia. Aeschylus’ text is as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἐπὶ δὲ τῶ γενομένῳ} \\
\text{τόδε μέλος, παρακοπά,} \\
\text{παραφορὰ φρευδαλῆς,} \\
\text{ὕμνος ἐξ Ἐρινών,} \\
\text{δέσμιος φρευνώ, ἀφόρ-μικτος, αὐσονα βρωτοῖς.}
\end{align*}\]

The corresponding scholion:

Σ M Eum. 341 ἐφυμινω αὐτῷ χρήται. λέγεται δὲ καὶ μεσόφθεγμα.

Three points are of interest here. First, the scholiast is not content merely to identify the refrain; he emphasizes that the content of lines 341ff. is being “used as a refrain”. This indicates a clear division within the mind of the scholiast (or of his source) between the content of the refrain and its form, and it is the latter that is identified as an ἐφύμινον.\(^{15}\) Second, the scholiast has identified only the second instance of the refrain, which again would seem to indicate a special interest in explaining the repetition found in the passage being commented upon. This emphasis on the form of the refrain is explained by the third point of interest in

\(^{14}\) But cf. Σ Ι’ Sept. 986-8α ταῦτα λέγει ὡς βαρέως φέρον. Smith, v.2, pp. viif dates Ι (Athous Iberorum codex 209) to the end of the 13th century and stresses the importance of its scholia (in this he follows Turyn and Dawe), since the MS provides a good witness to the same ancient recension of scholia for which M had long been believed the only witness. While not conclusive, it must be admitted that the omission by the primary hand of Ι of any notice of an ἐφύμινον is consistent with the hypothesis that ταῦτα, κτλ arose as a comment on the content, not the form, of the lines in question.

\(^{15}\) We find the same distinction made at Σ Ar. Ra. 209.1 with a very similar phrase: κέχρηται δὲ αὐτῷ ὡς ἐφυμινω τῶν βατράχων χορός. Cf. my discussion of the term ἐπίφθεγμα later in this chapter.
the scholion, namely the offer of an alternate term μεσόφθεγμα for the form of the passage in question. A brief consideration of the context in the text will preclude our understanding μεσόφθεγμα to have been offered as an equivalent of ἐφύμινον. The song (321-96) of which our refrain is a part contains four strophic pairs. Only the first of these features a refrain; the second and third feature non-repeating mesodes between strophe and antistrophe; the fourth strophe and antistrophe stand alone. The term μεσόφθεγμα is more appropriate to the mesodes of the second and third strophic pairs than to the refrain of the first, and so it seems that its appearance at Σ M 341 may imply an alternate tradition for the Aeschylean text in which lines 341-5 do not occur at all. The decision made by the scholiast (or his source) to identify these lines as an ἐφύμινον may, therefore, be motivated by a desire to justify the repetition of these lines in the text.

When we consider these examples drawn from the M scholia, a pattern emerges. To begin with, the term ἐφύμινον is never applied to short refrains but only to those consisting of more than one line. This may in part be explained by a familiarity with short refrains on the part of scholiasts (or their sources), and thus a reduced need to remark upon the appearance of short refrains in the text. Excluding, then, what we may call “short” refrains, all remaining refrains in the surviving Aeschylean corpus are identified as such in the M scholia by means of

See West (1982) 79 for the term “mesode”. Sommerstein (1989) ad loc., calls the refrains of the first strophic pair as well as the mesodes of the second and third pairs “ephymnia”. In doing this he follows a not uncommon practice of modern editors (cf. West’s own marginal labeling of these mesodes as ἐφυμnThe, in his edition), a practice to be avoided on two grounds: it neither reflects ancient usage, nor does it make the useful formal distinction between refrain and mesode. This is not to suggest that alternate terms were never used for the refrain form. We find them, for example, at schol. vet. Theocritus 1.64b ἄρχετε τούτο λέγεται ἐπωδὸς καὶ πρόσαρμα καὶ ἐπιμελέσθημα. But ἐφύμινον is more frequently used by far than any alternate term.

That a basic familiarity with short refrain types associated with certain genres or individually famous songs was, indeed, expected is apparent from π.Π. 7.1.
the term ἐφύμινον except for those occurring in two places. The first of these consists of those portions of the Agamemnon already noted above to be missing from M; about their corresponding scholia we may say nothing. The second place where “long” refrains in Aeschylus occur and yet are not identified in the M scholia is the Supplices. This omission should surprise us, since there are at least three separate “long” refrains found in that play (117ff, 162ff, 890ff), more than in any other surviving tragedy. Explanations for this omission must, of course, remain tentative, but try to explain it we must. One possible explanation is that identification of the occurrence of the refrain form may have been made only in those places where ancient commentators used such identifications to defend a particular reading for the text. A more likely explanation is that “refrain criticism” was to be found only in some of the Hellenistic commentaries on Aeschylus’ tragedies, and that these commentaries were not among those used in the compilation of the M scholia to the Supplices.

§1.2 Philo of Alexandria

Before we move from post-Hellenistic sources on to the Alexandrian scholars themselves, there is one intermediary source whose special nature demands a brief look. Philo of Alexandria, writing in the early 1st century A.D., describes in his De vita contemplativa a banquet as held by the Therapeutae, a Jewish mystical sect located in Egypt. Singing was a part of such a banquet, and some of their songs would seem to have contained refrains (80.7):

καὶ ἔπειτα ὁ μὲν ἀναστὰς ὑμῶν ἄδει πεποιημένων εἰς τὸν θεόν, ἡ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν πεποιημένων ἄρχαι τῶν πάλαι ποιητῶν -- μέτρα γὰρ καὶ μέλη καταλείπομεν πολλὰ ἐπῶν τριμέτρων, προσοδίων ὑμῶν, παραποιημένων, παραβομένων, στασίμων χορευτικῶν στροφάς πολυστρόφους εἰς διαμετρημένων --, μεθ’ ὦν καὶ ὁ άλλοι κατὰ τάξεις εἰς κόσμῳ προσήκοιτι, πάσης κατὰ πολλῆς ἱστοικίας ἀκρωμένων, πλὴν ὡστε τὰ ἀκροτελεύτατα καὶ ἐφύμινον ἄδειν θέου· τότε γὰρ ἐξεχόσει πάντες τε καὶ πάσαι.
Philo's description is of special interest for two reasons. First is his close proximity both geographically and chronologically to the Alexandrian scholars: his use of ἐφώμιον is very likely to reflect their use of the term.¹⁹ The second reason is that most likely Philo is here applying the term ἐφώμιον to Hebrew poetry.²⁰ His use of the term in this non-Greek context indicates that ἐφώμιον was appropriate even at this early date for refrains in a relatively broad range of poetry, and that the term was not associated solely with refrains typical of certain specified Greek lyric genres. Philo’s interest, attested elsewhere, in analyzing Hebrew poetry in terms of Greek quantitative metrics argues for taking his use of ἐφώμιον here to accord more or less with what he understood to be the normal formal analysis applied to Greek poetry.²¹

We may note here that the refrain form and performance mode found in Hebrew song (particularly psalmody) as described by Philo, and not any native Greek refrain tradition, is the ultimate source for the refrains found in later Byzantine Christian song such as the kontakion.²²

---

¹⁹ The term ἀκροτελεύτιον would seem to refer to verse endings, other than refrains, that are meant for responsive singing. The term has a general meaning of “cap” or “line ending”; cf. LSJ s.v.

²⁰ This seems most likely in view of the fact that the songs sung at the banquet include those “of the old poets” (ἀρχαῖα τινα τῶν παλαι ποιητῶν). Even if these had been translated into Greek, we can expect their basic form to have been determined by the original Hebrew versions. This seems especially likely in the case of the refrain form, which is not uncommon in Hebrew poetry. (See S. E. Gillingham, The Poems and Psalms of the Hebrew Bible, Oxford 1994, pp. 195f. for a resumé of refrains found in the Psalms. See M. O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structures, Winona Lake 1997, pp. 466ff. for a treatment of refrain-like repetitions found in biblical Hebrew poetry outside the Psalms.)

²¹ See Donald R. Vance, The Question of Meter in Biblical Hebrew Poetry, Lewiston-Queenston-Lampeter 2001, pp. 47-9. Philo pushed his quantitative approach to Hebrew poetry to the extent that he imputed quantitative metrical training to Moses in his De vita Mosis 1.23. It is in this light that we should view Philo’s use of Greek generic terms in De vita contemplativa 80, e.g. προσοδίην ὑμων, παραστόπον, etc.

All this, taken together with what we have already seen in the π.Π. and Greek poetic scholia, suggests that later antiquity inherited a common tradition in which the term ἔφωμυνον was used to mean “refrain” in a wide variety of contexts, and in a broad formal sense that more or less corresponds to the formal definition offered in Chapter 1. It now remains to be seen to what degree the same may be said of how the Alexandrian scholars treated the refrain form themselves.

§2 Use of ἔφωμυνον in Alexandrian scholarship

Now I turn to the use of the term ἔφωμυνον by the Alexandrian scholars of the Hellenistic period themselves. Rather than attempt a history of the usage of the term in Hellenistic Alexandria, my aim is simply to arrive at a synchronic view of Hellenistic usage. It will be shown that their use of the term, and their treatment of the refrain form as shown by the use of ἔφωμυνον, is consistent with the use of the term by the later writers already discussed above. In this section I deal with four texts that serve as witnesses for the practice of three scholars: Σ Pi. O.9.1k; Call. fr. 384.39; Call. b.Ap. 98; Apoll. Rh. Arg. 2.713.

§2.1 Eratosthenes and schol. vet. Pi. O.9.1k

Our first text is a comment attributed to Eratosthenes, reported at Σ Pindar O.9.1k. This scholium, along with most of the scholia to the first three lines of O.9, seeks to explain a reference in those lines to what has come to be known as “the Archilochus song”. O.9.1-4 (S-M):

τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος
φωναὶ Ὑλυμπία,
καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλός κεχλαδός
ἄρ ἔρεις Κρόνιου παρ᾽ ὁχῦν ἀγεμονεύσαι
κομώσως φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστῳ σὺν ἑταῖροι
The scholiasts seek as a rule to accomplish three things with regard to this passage. First, they seek to identify the specific Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος Pindar is referring to, and to quote enough of it or describe it to the extent that the reader will have a notion what Pindar is talking about. This is what is going on in, for example, schol. 1a-c. From these quotations we get Archilochus fr. 324:

τήνελλα καλλίνικε
χαίρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεισ,
αὐτὸς τε καϊλαος, αἰχμητὰ δύνω. 23

The second thing the scholiasts are keen to accomplish is to explain the form of the Archilochus song, specifically to account for the cry τήνελλα with which it opens. They do this by means of a story (Σ 1f) according to which Archilochus wished to lead a chorus in singing his song, but found himself short a lyre player. To compensate, he imitated the sound of a lyre being strummed (τήνελλα) and thus began the performance. “From that time on, those lacking a citharode used this phrase, voicing it three times.” (τὸ λοιπὸν οἱ ἀποροῦντες κιθαροῦ τούτῳ τῷ κόμματι ἔχωντο, τρὶς αὐτῷ ἐπιφωνοῦντες. Dr. v.1, p. 267.9-12)

The third thing the scholiasts seek to accomplish with regard to the Pindar passage is to explain why Archilochus’ song is called τριπλῶς. It is at this point we meet our first example of an Alexandrian scholar applying the term ἐφύμιον in the sense of “formal refrain”, i.e. the sense in which it is used by critics of late antiquity. The scholiast at O.9.1k reports that Eratosthenes, besides identifying the Archilochus song as a hymn to Heracles and not an epinician, says that it is called τριπλῶς by Pindar “not because it is composed of three strophes, but because the καλλίνικε is thriced refrained.” (τριπλῶς δὲ οὐ διὰ τὸ ἐκ τριῶν στροφῶν συγκεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ τρῖς ἐφύμιαξεσθαι τὸ καλλίνικε.) The verb ἐφύμιαξε is

---

23 I use West’s text. For the purposes of this study I am not interested in the question whether the song Pindar calls Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος is really by Archilochus.
clearly a denominative form derived from ἐφύμνιον, cf. the Hellenistic συμποσιάζω < συμπόσιον. While it is impossible to be certain that Eratosthenes himself used the verb ἐφυμνάζειν in the original context from which the scholiast draws, this does seem likely, since this is a unique occurrence of the verb, and the scholia elsewhere regularly use χρῆσαι ἐφυμνίω or similar for the same meaning. Even if ἐφυμνάζεσθαι is here the scholiast’s own coinage, we cannot doubt but that it is a paraphrase of Eratosthenes’ use of ἐφύμνιον in the original context.

Eratosthenes’ explanation for Pindar’s characterization of the Archilochus song as τριπλός is not the only one reported in the scholia. At Σ O.9.3g the scholiast says that the song is τριπλός “having a triple refrain (τρῖς ἐπαθόμενος)” or being composed of three strophes according to Aristarchus (ἡ τρίστροφος ὃν κατὰ ’Αρισταρχον).” Aristarchus’ explanation as reported here has caused some confusion in modern scholars, who have taken the controversy between the “Eratosthenis doctrina” and the “Aristarchi doctrina” to be that the former believes the Archilochus song has three refrains and but not three strophes, while the latter believes it has three strophes but not three refrains. Given this view, one might almost believe that Eratosthenes and Aristarchus are not in fact speaking of the same song, or that one or both are ignorant of the song’s most basic formal aspects. Both these explanations for the dispute are highly unlikely, however, in light of the fact that the famous Ἄρχιλόχου μέλος still enjoyed a

24 Schwyzer bd. 1, p. 735.
25 See above.
26 This is one of the very few places where ἐπαινῶ and related forms are used to describe a formal refrain. It is more usually used to describe “singing over” something or someone, e.g. a victor. Cf. schol. O.9.11 τὸ μὲν Ἄρχιλόχου μέλος, ὁ τῶν νικῶν τὰ Ολύμπια ἐπήδεστο.
27 For example, Fuhrer (1992) 187.
widespread use as a victory song in the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{28} It must be concluded that both Eratosthenes and Aristarchus had accurate knowledge of the form of the Archilochus song, i.e. that they had the text of it at hand, and that the dispute recorded in the scholia to \textit{O}.9.1-3 is not over the form of the Archilochus song. The dispute recorded in the scholia is limited to the question why Pindar chose to call the Archilochus song \textit{τρίπλόος}, an adjective which obviously can reasonably be taken to refer to either of two distinct, but not mutually exclusive formal characteristics of the song in question. Indeed, if Eratosthenes has applied \textit{ἐφύμιον} to the Archilochus song in a way consistent with the usage of later commentators — and we have no reason to doubt that this is the case — then it is implied that he recognizes that the Archilochus song is made up of three strophes, to each of which is appended a refrain. We see an explicit form of this analysis at \textit{Z}.9.1i: \textit{τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος, ὅ τοῖς νικῶσι τὰ Ὄλυμπια ἐπήδετο, ἣν τρίστροφον... ἐφυμίω ὃ ἑκατερῶντο τοῦτω τῆνελλα καλλίνικε.} It follows that West’s suggestion that \textit{τῆνελλα καλλίνικε} are formally separate from the song itself, and shouted out three times together in much the same way as the English “hip-hip: hooray”, must be ruled out.\textsuperscript{29}

Two important points can be made concerning Eratosthenes’ use of \textit{ἐφύμιον}. First, while his use of the term does not strictly correspond to that found in the \textit{π. Π}. (the refrain of the Archilochus song comes at the beginning, not the end, of the strophe), it is consistent with the broad usage found in later writers, of which

\textsuperscript{28} This much is assured by the appearance of \textit{Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμιον} in Callimachus fr. 384.39 in reference to Sosibius’ victory at the Panathenaea in the early 3rd century B.C. See below.

\textsuperscript{29} West (1974) 138. There is nothing in the terms \textit{κόμμα} or \textit{τρίς ἐπιφωνοῦντες} that requires us to understand the \textit{τῆνελλα} to be sung three times together and apart from the rest of the song. Indeed, the “hip-hip: hooray” hypothesis is at odds with the account of \textit{Σφ} itself: \textit{τῆνελλα} appears at the beginning of the first strophe, and presumably in the second and third.
the π. Π. is but a part. Second, we see that the application of the term ἐφύμων by Eratosthenes to the refrain of the Archilochus song arose not in a comment directed primarily to the Archilochus song itself, but rather in a commen directed at Pindar’s use of the adjective τριπλόας at O.9.3. This follows the pattern suggested by the usage of ἐφύμων in later writers examined above, namely that the term is not routinely used merely to identify the refrain form, but to make such identification when it bears upon a larger textual or interpretational quesiton.

§2.2 Callimachus fr. 384.39

Another place where a scholar of Alexandria uses the term ἐφύμων in reference to the refrain of the Archilochus song may be found in the elegiac epinician written by Callimachus for Sosibius. The relevant lines come at the beginning of the third of the surviving fragments of the poem. They introduce the theme of a prior victory by Sosibius at the Panathenaea, and are generally taken to be spoken in the person of the laudandus himself:

—καὶ παρ’ Ἀθηναίοις γὰρ ἐπὶ στέγος ἱερὸν ὑμναί
cάλπιδες, οὐ κόσμου σύμβολον, ἀλλὰ πάλης—
ἀνήρας ἤτ’ οὐ δείσατες ἐδώκαμεν ἤδε βοήσαι
ιηὴν ἐπὶ Γλαυκῆς κώμον ἀγνοτὶ χορὸν
‘Ἀρχιλόχου νυκαίον ἐφύμων’

It has been pointed out by Fuhrer that Callimachus in this passage is making two separate allusions to passages in Pindar. The first is the oil jars (κάλπιδες, 35) dedicated to the temple of Athena, which allude to the prize of oil described at Pi. N.10.35-6: γαῖα δὲ καυθείσα πυρὶ καρπὸς ἐλαῖας / ἐμολευ "Ἡρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν ἐν

30 Σ O.1.f ἐν μέσῳ means “in the middle of the chorus”, not “in the middle of the strophe”. Cf. Σ 1c αὐτὸς μὲν τὸ μέλος τῆς κυθάρας ἐν μέσῳ τῷ χορῷ ἐλεγε, τὸ τήνελλα, ὥ δὲ χορὸς τὰ ἐπίλοιπα.
The second allusion is, of course, Αρχιλόχου νικαίον ἐφύμμιον, which points to Pi. O.9.1-3, discussed above. In describing the dedication of the oil jars and the performance of the Archilochus song, Callimachus is following normal epinician practice: an artful way is found to mention prior victories of the laudandus, which would otherwise be a very prosaic theme. Fuhrer rightly sees these allusions by Callimachus to be a product not only of his careful reading of Pindar as a poetic model, but also of his formal study of Pi. O.9. I will have more to say concerning the likely context of that study later in this section. Finally, we may note that we can go farther with our analysis of Callimachus’ allusion to Pi. O.9. Callimachus here not only borrows from Pindar the performance of the Archilochus song as a symbol representing a prior victory; he also follows Pindar by making the Archilochus song an implicit foil for his own song. The fact that it is Sosibius, the laudandus, who is speaking when mention is made of the Archilochus song only makes that much stronger the implicit contrast between the Archilochus song, sung to Sosibius in his youth, and Callimachus’ more artful poem, composed for Sosibius in his maturity.

We may assume that Callimachus is using the term ἐφύμμιον in the same sense in which Eratosthenes uses it, i.e. to mean “formal refrain”. There is nothing in fr. 384 to suggest otherwise. What is more, we have independent knowledge that the Archilochus song did feature a refrain, probably one which occurred once at the beginning of each of three strophes, and therefore it makes sense to assume that it is this refrain form to which Callimachus is referring. Callimachus is not, strictly

---

32 Fuhrer (1992) 184f.
speaking, identifying ἐφύμινον with the Archilochus song as a whole\(^{34}\); this is rather an instance of synecdoche.

§2.3 Callimachus Hymn to Apollo

We find another instance of ἐφύμινον being used by Callimachus to describe a formal refrain in his *Hymn to Apollo*. In lines 97-104 of that poem we are offered an aetiology for the paean cry (in this case ἵη ἵη παιήνοι) and, as I shall argue, for the refrain form frequently used in the paean genre.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἵη ἵη παιήνοι ἄκούσωμεν, οὐ̂ νεκα τοῦτο} \\
\text{Δελφὸς τοι πρώτηστοι ἐφύμινον εύρετο λαός.} \\
\text{ἡμὸς ἐκηβολίη προσέων ἐπεθεικυνυστο τὸξων.} \\
\text{Ποῦ δὲ τοι κατιώτις συνήτετο δαμόσους κήρ.} \\
\text{αιῶν ὁφίς. τὸν μὲν σὺ κατήναρες ἄλλον ἐπ’ ἄλλῳ} \\
\text{βάλλων ὡκύν ὀιστόν, ἐπηύτησε δὲ λαός.} \\
\text{ἵη ἵη παιήνοι, ἵη βέλος. εἴδυν σε μήτηρ} \\
\text{γεινατ’ ἀσσηθήρα. τὸ δ’ ἐξέτι κείθεν ἀείδη.}
\end{align*}
\]

That the cry ἵη ἵη is meant to be taken as the equivalent of the imperative ἵη ἵη, and that Callimachus is suggesting this as an etymology for the cry, has long been recognised.\(^{35}\) What has not been recognised thus far is that Callimachus is not merely offering an etymology of the typical content of the paean refrain, i.e. the paean cry; he is also offering an account of the origins of the refrain form itself. To see how this is so, we will need to turn our attention to the sentence occupying lines 101f.: τὸν μὲν σὺ κατήναρες ἄλλον ἐπ’ ἄλλῳ / βάλλων ὡκύν ὀιστόν, ἐπηύτησε δὲ λαός. First I wish to focus on the μὲν clause, which relates the actions of Apollo. The tense of the verb κατήναρες (“you killed”) is aorist, and thus at first

---

34 Fuhrer (1992) 187. The fact that portions of the Archilochus song besides the refrain are preserved in the scholia to Pindar and Aristophanes, and the reports in the Pindar scholia of Eratosthenes’ and Aristarchus’ commentary on the song, suggest that it is unlikely that Callimachus would consider the ἐφύμινον to be the only element of the song surviving in his day.

35 See, for example, Radermacher, *Philologus* 60 (1901) 500f. See Rutherford, *ZPE* 88 (1991) 1, n.2 for a resumé of various ancient etymologies for the paean cry.
glance would seem to refer to the moment at which Apollo achieved the death of the serpent, Python. The accompanying participle βάλλων, however, is in the present tense and thus clearly speaks to a repeated action rather than a single, momentary act (as we would have with the aorist participle βαλω). The phrase ἄλλων ἐπὶ ἄλλῳ... ὁστὼν renders the meaning inescapable: Apollo is repeatedly shooting Python with arrows, and it is this repeated action that, when taken as a whole, is covered by the aorist finite verb κατάναρας. What we have here is an example of the “factive” aorist as described by Schwyzer.36

Now I turn to the second clause of the sentence. Here again we find an aorist finite verb: “the people shouted in response (ἐπηύτησε).” This verb, like κατάναρας above, I also take as an example of the “factive” aorist, i.e. I understand it to refer not to one shout voiced by the Delphians, but many. My reasons are as follows. To begin with, the verb ἐπηύτησε occurs in the δέ clause that is coordinate with the μέν clause that contains κατάναρας: it makes sense that, if the μέν clause is describing a repeated action — and it clearly does — the δέ clause does also. To this we may add that the ἐπ- prefix of ἐπηύτησε indicates that the action of the verb is in reaction to what precedes (hence my translation, “shouted in response”); since what precedes is the many shots made by Apollo, we expect many shouts in reaction. Finally, we may point out that, if indeed ἐπηύτησε referred to a single shout by the Delphians made in response to the completed act of Apollo’s killing the serpent, then the content of that shout would make no sense: why shout out, “shoot an arrow,” if Python is already dead?37

36 This is a use of the aorist “der nicht so sehr den Moment des Abschlusses betont als den Vollzug einer Handlung oder eines Geschehnisses schlechthin.” Cf. Iliad 1.2f. ἄλγε εἴθηκε... ὑψάς Ἀιδί προσάψας, Schwyzer vol. 2, 261. (Schwyzer’s example, Van Thiel’s text.) This use of the aorist is called “complexive” at Smyth §1927.

37 It makes no difference to my point whether we take the quotation of the Delphians’ shout to stop after βέλος (Williams), or to continue on to ἀποστηρα:
If I am correct in taking ἐπηθήσεσε at line 102 to refer to repeated shouts, then what we have here is a quite ingenious aetiology that Callimachus has devised for the form of the paean refrain. According to this aetiology, the Delphians “discovered” (ἐὑρετο) the refrain form (ἐφύμιοι) by shouting out their prototypical paean cry (ἵνα ἴη πατόν) in response to each arrow shot by Apollo. Each of these shots corresponds to a stanza (strophe or triad) in a lyric paean, just as each instance of the Delphians’ cry corresponds to the refrain of a lyric paean. The correspondence of shout in the narrative of the aetiology and refrain in lyric paean is underscored by the use of the prefix ἐ‐ in both ἐπηθήσεσε and ἐφύμιοι. As we shall see, Callimachus’ treatment in this aetiology of the paean refrain as a reaction to events in the narrative is in keeping with a similar practice found in literary paean (as well as in other genres) by which individual instances of refrain are presented as spontaneous reactions to events narrated in the non-refrain context.38

Callimachus would seem, then, to offer us an account of the origins of the paean refrain, both its content and its form. But we may go further, for he says that the refrain found by the Delphians is the “first”: τούτῳ / Δέλφῳ τοι πρῶτωσιν ἐφύμιοι εὑρετο λαός (97f).39 We must understand that Callimachus is not offering us the beginnings of the refrain for one genre; his aetiology is an account of the origin of the refrain form itself, a form that may be found in many genres of which paean is but the first. While we cannot assume that Callimachus’ basic assertion

---

38 See CHAPTER 5, especially my discussion of Sappho fr. 111 and Philodamus Paean in Dionysum.

39 If Callimachus had meant merely that the Delphians were the first to discover the paean refrain, and not that this refrain was the first refrain ever discovered, we would expect πρῶτωσιν, predicate to λαός.
that the refrain form originates in the paean genre is correct\textsuperscript{40}, this assertion does point to two conclusions. First, Callimachus must have seen the link between the refrain form and the paean genre as especially, perhaps uniquely, strong. Since he was dealing with what for him would have been literary pre-history, a second conclusion follows: he must have acquired this impression for the simple reason that, among all the poetry he had available to him, the refrain form was especially well represented in poems he judged to be paeans. This tends to confirm the predominance of the paean genre among the non-dramatic portion of my refrain corpus laid out in \textsc{chapter 1}.

Before we turn to the last example of ancient scholarly treatment of the refrain form, I wish to draw attention to an aspect of Callimachus \textit{Hymn to Apollo} for which his aetiology of the $\epsilon\phi\mu\mu\eta\nu$ has important implications. I am referring to the use by Callimachus throughout the \textit{Hymn} of what we may call “quasi-refrains.”\textsuperscript{41} These consist of the repeated cries of $i\bar{\eta} \ i\bar{\eta}$ that appear at the beginning of lines 25 ($i\bar{\eta} \ i\bar{\eta} \ \phi\delta\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\sigma\theta\varepsilon$), 80 ($i\bar{\eta} \ i\bar{\eta} \ \kappa\alpha\nu\eta\varepsilon \ \pi\omega\lambda\lambda\lambda\iota\tau\varepsilon$) and, of course,

\textsuperscript{40} I will argue in \textsc{chapter 5} that the refrain form enters Greek poetry through the iambic-aeolic lyric tradition rather than through any particular genre.

\textsuperscript{41} I borrow the term “quasi-refrain” from Reed (1997) 47, who uses it to describe $\alpha\iota\alpha\varsigma \ \tau\omicron \ \Lambda\delta\omicron\nu\iota\nu$, $\alpha\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron \ \kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma \ \Lambda\delta\omicron\nu\iota\nu$ et sim. that periodically recur throughout Bion \textit{Adonis}. This usage must be distinguished from that of Rutherford (1991) 4 and (2001) 70f, who applies “quasi-refrain” to any “refrain-like expression that does not occur regularly in [a] song”, e.g. a singleton paean-cry. Rutherford sees these non-recurring cries as a secondary development from formal refrains, at least in the genre of paean; in \textsc{chapter 4} I will argue for a different understanding of the relationship between formal refrains and appended ritual cries. Reed also uses “quasi-refrain” to refer to what he sees as a secondary development of the refrain form; but unlike Rutherford he applies the term to repetitive forms that resemble refrains in their very repetition. (I will argue in chapter 7 that these repetitions in Bion \textit{Adonis} resemble true refrains in other ways as well.) To put it another way, Rutherford’s interest is in the similarity in content between his “quasi-refrains” and true refrains; Reed’s interest is in similarity with respect to form, and it is with this interest that I use the term here. It is unfortunate that the same term should be used by both scholars to refer to separate phenomena; it does not appear that either was aware of the other’s coining of the term.
line 97 (ἵη ἵη παιήνον ἄκονομει). These are clearly meant to call to mind the paean cry etymologized at lines 97ff, and their repetition likewise calls to mind the refrain form commonly used in paean.42 Given the strong association made between the refrain form and the paean genre in the aetiology in lines 97ff, we must conclude that Callimachus is characterising his Hymn, or at least a part of it, as a sort of paean. We may compare this “extra-generic” use of the refrain form to the refrains found in Theocritus 1 and the quasi-refrains of Bion Adonis.

Finally, it may be that, in making this “formal allusion” to the typical lyric paean and its refrain, Callimachus is following Pindar. That poet’s Paean 6.120ff offers what has been called a “quasi-refrain” (ἵη ἵη ἐνυν ἐντρα παιήνον ἐνυν ἵη νέοι) that occurs at the end of a triad, i.e. exactly where we find refrains in those paeans by Pindar that do feature refrains.43

§2.4 Apollonius Rhodius Argonautica 2.701-13

One final example of Alexandrian scholarly treatment of the refrain form is found at Apollonius Rhod. Arg. 2.701-13. After landing on the isle of Thynias, the argonauts see a vision of Apollo (2.674ff.). Orpheus declares that the island will be dedicated to the god and that sacrifices are to be made immediately (685ff.). As the offerings burn, the Argonauts form a chorus and sing the paean cry (2.701ff.):

άμφι δέ δαιμόνειος εὐρύν χορόν ἐστησάντω,
καλὸν Ἡπαιήνον Ἡπαιήνον Φοῖβον
μελπόμενοι.

42 The same can be said for the repeated ἵη παιήνον ἵη παιήνον at line 21. Another instance of the cry may be hinted at by ἵητροι at the beginning line 46, which seems to point to an alternative etymology for ἵη. See Rutherford (1991) 1, n.2 on ancient etymologies of ἵη from ιατρός.

43 Rutherford (1991) 4. Rutherford’s point concerning the paean-cry here is more convincing than his general point that non-repeating paean-cries function as “quasi-refrains”. This is because the paean-cry falls precisely where we find a true refrain in Pae 2 and 4. Cf. n. 42 above.
While the Argonauts sing the paean cry, Orpheus sings a narrative of the slaying of the serpent, here named Δελφώνη, by Apollo at Pythia. The narrative ends with an aetiology for the paean cry which is very similar to that offered by Callimachus in his Hymn to Apollo:

\[
\text{πολλά δὲ Κωρίκας Νύμφαι Πλειστὸδ θύγατρες} \\
\text{θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσαν, ((浠 ζε)) κεκληγνήαι;} \\
\text{ἐ νθεν δὲ τόδε καλὸν ἐφύμιον ἐπλετοῦ Φοίβῳ.}
\]

The basic scenario is the same here as in the Callimachus passage discussed above: arrows shot by Apollo alternate with the shouts of encourage offered by the spectators. In this case the repetitious nature of those shouts is made explicit by πολλά (711) and the iterative θαρσύνεσκον (712). It seems, therefore, that Apollonius is, like Callimachus, offering an account of the origins of the refrain form in the paean genre. Unlike Callimachus, Apollonius does not make use of the refrain form itself in his own poem — no formal allusions here — and he makes no claim that the paean refrain is the first ἐφύμιον (it is merely καλὸν, 713).

One way in which Apollonius goes further than Callimachus in his treatment of the refrain form is his representation of a refrain performance outside the aetiology. The performance represented by Apollonius is “divided”: the chorus of Argonauts sing a refrain consisting of the paean cry (701ff.), while the soloist, Orpheus, “leads” the performance “with” them (καὶ δὲ σφᾶν... ἔρχεν, 703f.). We can be sure that the singing of the Argonauts and the singing of Orpheus constitute a single performance because, once the singing is done, Apollonius refers to the whole by the single phrase χορεῖν μέλψαι ἔοικο (714). Apollonius treats the mythological episode as a triple aetiology accounting for (1) the etymology of the paean cry, (2) the refrain form in which that cry is typically set within the paean genre, and (3) a certain mode of performance for paeans.
Given the strong similarities between this passage in the *Argonautica* and the Callimachus passage discussed above, it is natural to ask how they are related. It is impossible to be certain which passage is drawing upon the other; most likely the relationship between the two is more complex than mere imitation.\textsuperscript{44} Pfeiffer, for example, has suggested that Apollonius is here drawing upon an alternate version of the Pythian myth related by Callimachus in Book 4 of his *Aetia*.\textsuperscript{45} I suggest that it is possible that the treatments of the paean refrain by Callimachus in his *Hymn to Apollo* and by Apollonius in *Arg.* 2 arise from an original scholarly context in which a refrain appearing in a paean was identified as an \textit{̓efʰümινον}, etymologised, and perhaps given an account for its repetitive form. To this we may compare the likely original scholarly context that gave rise to the treatments of the \textit{̓efʰümινον} in Archilochus fr. 324 we find in Callimachus fr. 384 and the scholia to Pi. O. 9.1ff, discussed above.

\textsection 3 \textit{ἐπιφθεγμα}

Our understanding of ancient refrain scholarship will be significantly enhanced by consideration of the term \textit{ἐπιφθεγμα} and its use as contrasted with that of the term \textit{̓efʰümινον}. \textit{ἐπιφθεγμα} has been taken to refer to the refrain form, or at least to instances of formal refrains, as such. This understanding has been encouraged by the resemblance of the term to \textit{ἐπιφθεγματικόν}, a term which, as we have seen, is used in \pi.Π. to refer to a type of formal refrain.\textsuperscript{46}

In ancient scholarly contexts \textit{ἐπιφθεγμα} has the basic meaning “expression”. This is most clearly seen in contexts apart from refrains. One particularly

\textsuperscript{44} Williams (1978) 82.
\textsuperscript{45} Pfeiffer ad Callimachus fr. 88 = schol. Ap. Rh. *Arg.* 2.705-11b, where Callimachus is said to have called the serpent Δελφύνη.
\textsuperscript{46} Cf. Rutherford (2001) 71 with n. 10.
unmusical example is found at Σ Aesch. *Suppl.* 827c1 ἵψις ἕστι ἀποπτυσμένῳ μίμημα· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀποπτύειν ἐπίφθεγμα ἐποίησεν. The term is used, to be sure, in the context of refrains; but it there refers to the content of the refrain, not to the refrain form itself. To explain the chorus’ repeated, refrain-like cry of βρεκεκεκέκεκε κοαξ κοαξ at Ar. *Ra.* 209ff, the scholiast writes ἐπίφθεγμα δὲ ποιῶν τούτῳ· κέχρηται δὲ αὐτῶ ὡς ἐφιμινῷ ὁ τῶν βατράχων χορός. Clearly a distinction is being made between content and form, and ἐπίφθεγμα is applied to the former.

With this in mind, we may clear up a potential misunderstanding concerning the Hellenistic criteria for the classification of paeans. Let us consider the commentary to Bacchylides 23 preserved, in part, in *POxy* 2368:

ταύτην τ᾿ ὑδην Ἀρίσταρχος ὁδισπυραμβικῆν εἶναι φησὶν διὰ τὸ παρειλήφθαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ περὶ Καστιγνάρας, ἐπιγράφει ὃ αὐτὴν Κασσίανδραν, πλασμένην δ᾽ αὐτὴν κατατάξας ἐν τοῖς Πλαίσι Καλλιμάχον ὅδι τὸ ἱ, ὁν συνέντα ὅτι τὸ ἐπίφθεγμα γιον κωνὸν ἔστι καὶ διθυράμβου.

47 Cf. Herodian Περὶ Παθῶν 3.2, p.182 Lentz τὸ ψό εἰν Ποιμέσι Σοφοκλέους ἐπίφθεγμα γὰρ; De prosodia catholica 3.1, p.506 Lentz ἄρρη ἐπίφθεγμα τῶν ἑρετῶν; Origen In canticum canticorum (fragmenta) p.141 Bachrens τὸ πολυθρύλητον δὲ παρ’ Ἑλλησι ἐπίφθεγμα προειληφθαὶ παραθοῦν πό σοφῶ Σολωμών, τὸ “γνώσι σαυτών”; Σ Ar. Αν. 1303.1 ἄγει ἐπίφθεγμα παρακελευστικῶν.

48 It is in this light that we are to understand Σ Aesch. *PV* 877a ἀλλελελελελεῦ ἐπίφθεγμα θηπηθότες and *Σ Pers.* 1057.5 ἀπριγάν τούτῳ ἐπιφώνημα καὶ ἐπίφθεγμα ἐπὶ τῶν μετὰ σφοδρότητος τιλλούτων τὰς τρίχας. (Cf. Σ Ar. *Ra.* 1073.1 for this synonymous use of ἐπιφώνημα and ἐπίφθεγμα.) the use of ἐπίφθεγμα by the scholiasts is occasioned by their interest in the meaning of individual expressions, not in the formal structure in which they occur.

49 I present Lobel’s text, with his suggested restorations. Käppel and Kannicht (1988) offer very convincing answers to the objections of Luppe (1987) made against Lobel’s text on papyrological grounds. Luppe’s emphasis on the conjectural nature of Lobel’s restoration of τὸ ἵ, is appropriate, but the restoration is certainly plausible in the context, and it was reasonable for Lobel to suggest the restoration, as he did, in his commentary. In any event, the restoration and interpretation of ἐπιφώνημα does not rely upon the restoration of τὸ ἵ. Luppe’s specific objection, given by him at (1987) 10 and repeated at (1989) 26, that the papyrologically impossible restoration of τούτῳ τὸ ἐπιφώνημα, with its added demonstrative, would be necessary for the sense desired by Lobel, cannot stand. In the context of a discussion of the paean genre, there cannot have been any ambiguity as to what kind of expression τὸ ἐπίθεγμα would refer.
The commentator reports that Aristarchus classifies the poem as a dithyramb on the basis that a narrative of Cassandra is dealt with therein (9-13); that he gives the title “Cassandra” to the poem (13f); and that he says that Callimachus mistakenly classifies the song among the paeans because he did not understand that the ἑπίφθεγμα (τὸ ἱη in Lobel’s restored text) was common to dithyramb as well as paean (14-19). ἑπίφθεγμα here has been taken, as it has been elsewhere, to mean “refrain”. Consequently it has been thought that the criterion by which Callimachus is said by Aristarchus to have classified poems as paeans is the presence of a formal refrain.50 This interpretation is on its face difficult to accept. The surviving examples of paeans with no formal refrain are too numerous to allow that any ancient editor may have been supposed to use this as a necessary criterion for inclusion in the genre. It is here that our study of the usage of the term ἑπίφθεγμα by ancient scholarship proves its worth. The criterion for paeanic classification being spoken of in the commentary is the presence of some form of the paean-cry, i.e. the expression “ἱη” or the like.51 The formal arrangement of the cry, in or out of a refrain, is of no concern in the commentary.

We find a similar case at Athenaeus 696e-697a. In this passage, Democritus rejects the classification as paean of the Hermias song by Aristotle: it does not have τὸ παιανικὸν ἑπίρρημα. To prove that such a thing is a required feature of paeans, he catalogues a series of poems which he does admit as paeans. He

51 Luppe (1989) 23 is right to follow Lobel ad loc. in doubting that Callimachus would have relied upon the presence of ἱη as the criterion for classifying a poem as a paean. As Lobel points out, the presence of the cry outside the genre is simply too common. But Luppe does not seem to allow for the possibility that Aristarchus is simply mistaken in imputing this criterion to Callimachus. While it is doubtful that Callimachus would automatically classify any poem as a paean based on the presence of the paean-cry, there remains the possibility that his criteria may have varied from author to author or period to period: the presence of the cry in the work of a known choral lyricist may have been sufficient for him to make a default classification of that work as paean.
specifies that the Corinthian paean sung in honor of Agemon has τὸ παιανικὸν ἐπίφθεγμα. In the case of the Rhodian paean sung in honor of Ptolemy I he even quotes what he is talking about: τὸ ἰὴ παιῶν ἐπίφθεγμα. That the terms ἐπίφθημα and ἐπίφθεγμα are here used as synonyms is clear; just as clear is the fact that they do not mean “refrain”. To begin with, there is the usage of ἐπίφθεγμα to refer to the content, not the form, of refrain established above for ancient scholarship elsewhere. But consideration of the context is sufficient. Democritus’ proof that the Rhodian song is a genuine paean involves no demonstration of the recurrence of a refrain; he does not allude to form at all. His only concern is with the presence of some version of the paean-cry, and to demonstrate that presence he need only quote the version of the cry used in the song. True, the ἰὴ παιῶν quoted by Democritus may, in fact, have been used in a formal refrain in the Rhodian song; but this is not Democritus’ point, and it cannot be deduced from the passage.

This examination of the term ἐπίφθεγμα should caution us against being too quick to find evidence for refrains in secondary descriptions of poetry: the presence of an ἐπι- compound is not enough. It should also serve to emphasize that ancient scholarship had available to it a terminology suitable for distinguishing between individual instances of refrain, the content of refrains, and the refrain form abstracted from individual examples.

52 Lobel ad loc. is too cautious when he treats “the absence of the παιανικὸν ἐπίφθημα” and “the presence of the παιανικὸν ἐπίφθεγμα” as separate criteria used by Democritus for a poem’s exclusion or inclusion.
§4 Conclusion

The consistent usage of ἐφύμνον, especially as it is contrasted with that of other terms such as ἐπίφρογμα, demonstrates clearly that ancient Greek scholarship did recognize a distinct formal type “refrain”. It is also clear that the conception of the refrain form was sufficiently abstracted from its individual examples so that it was not exclusively identified with any particular genre. This is indicated, for example, by the use of the term ἐφύμνον by Hellenistic scholars in the context of the Archilochus song as well as of paeans. Nevertheless, a strong association between the refrain form and the paean genre is implied in the works of Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes. This in turn corresponds reasonably well to the corpus arrived at in CHAPTER 1, in which paeans play an important part.

Seeing as our definition and corpus appear satisfactory, we may proceed.
CHAPTER 3

THE PERFORMANCE OF REFRAINS

A commonly accepted hypothesis holds that the default performance mode for ancient Greek poetry with refrains is as follows: a soloist sings the stanzas of the poem, while the refrain is provided by a chorus. Jebb relies on this hypothesis when he suggests a divided performance for Bacchylides fr. 18 — this when nothing but the poem’s refrain has survived, quoted with no context at π.Π. 7.3.  

It is even used by Maehler (who cites Jebb) to disprove any ancient distinction between poets who composed monody and those who composed choral lyric.  

More usually the hypothesis is simply applied in passing and without argument to refrains in genres seen as derived from sub-literary models.  

The most common version of the hypothesis involves the verb ἔξαρχω and the related nouns ἔξαρχον and ἔξαρχος.  Its most famous exponent is Pickard-Cambridge, who applies it to Archilochus fr. 120 West:  

...ὡς Διονύσιον ἀνακτῶν καλὸν ἔξαρξαι μέλος  
οἴδα διόμερον οἴων συγκεραυνώθεις φρένας.  

Besides being our earliest attestation of a song called “dithyramb”, Pickard-Cambridge sees the fragment as our earliest witness of a refrain in dithyramb.  

---

1 Jebb (1905) 43. For Hephaestion’s use of the fragment, see CHAPTER 2.  
3 E.g., Wilamowitz (1925) 309, who assumes a solo-chorus division, corresponding to stanza and refrain, for the singing that accompanied the yearly procession from Athens to Eleusis. This he relates to the song of the initiates at Ar. Ra. 395ff. the presence of refrains is sometimes interpreted in light of the hypothesis even when contrary to what is otherwise believed of a genre’s performance mode. Rutherford (2001) 66 sees the refrains in some of Pindar’s Paeans as perhaps indicating a “special form of choral performance”, although he considers unison singing by the chorus to be the default for paeans.  
4 Pickard-Cambridge (1962) 9. For refrain in dithyramb, see APPENDIX 1.
The specific model he has in mind is one whereby an εξάρχων improvises the stanzas of a song and is answered by a chorus’ refrain; this or something like it has been the common interpretation.\(^5\)

As early as 1921 Radermacher had warned against assuming that refrains in Greek poetry are sung in response to soloists who sing stanzas. In doing so he cited three examples of refrain poetry where the common performance hypothesis clearly do not apply: the “love duet” of Ar. Eccl. 952ff; Ion’s solo paean with refrain at Eur. Ion 112ff; and Simaetha’s refrains in Theocritus 2.\(^6\) It will be the first task of this chapter to bring more primary evidence to bear in the testing of the received performance hypothesis. The second task will be to extend Radermacher’s caution to the interpretation of secondary descriptions of performance, specifically those which feature εξάρχων and related terms. The scantiness of the evidence requires that our examination of refrain performance be brief, but even this brief treatment will be sufficient to vindicate Radermacher’s judgment that our determination of the performance mode for refrains must be made on a case by case basis.\(^7\)

§1 Primary evidence for the performance of refrain poetry

Our knowledge of the performance mode of surviving refrain poems is mixed. In the case of bucolic, it seems safe to assume that the only “performance”

---

\(^5\) E.g., Hauvette (1905) 168; Dornseiff (1921) 6; Garvie (1969) 100; Van der Weiden (1991) 11. Cf. also Rutherford (2001) 45, who modifies Pickard-Cambridge’s model by supposing that the surviving lines of the Spartan “marching paean” (PMG 856) “represent part of the section sung by the εξάρχων, and that they were followed by a communal παιάων-cry sung by the army as a whole, which is not represented in the text.”

\(^6\) Radermacher (1921) 199f.

\(^7\) Radermacher (1921) 200.
involved was the reading of the poem from a book; discussion of refrain performance in this case must be restricted to the use of the secondary descriptions of performances found in the poems. Surviving refrains in drama come to us, in most cases, with sufficient context to ascertain performance mode; it is with these that the bulk of this section will deal. By contrast, our evidence for the performance mode of lyric refrain poems outside drama is scanty, to say the least. Even in those cases where a refrain poem survives in an inscription placed it a cultic context, e.g. the Dictaean Hymn, we are not given information concerning how the songs were to be sung. What we would like are songs with accompanying instructions for performance, such as those that introduce Erythraean Paean fr. 1: “paeanize first around Apollo’s altar the following paean three times.” What we have, however, are general assumptions concerning the performance of whole lyric genres, or assumptions deduced from the form of the poems themselves. It is these very assumptions that we are attempting to test in this chapter; consequently our examination must be limited to the surviving refrains of drama.

Survival in the context of a play does not, of course, guarantee that the determining of a refrain’s performance mode will never be problematic. A particularly difficult case is the refrain found beginning at line 1334 in Aristophanes Peace. The textual problems of the end of the play, where the chorus and Trygaeus share a final hymenaeus song, are so great that sure attribution of the refrain is impossible. All that can be said is that the refrain ὑμεῖν ὑμἐναι ὁ appears to have been sung mostly by the chorus and may have been sung

---

8 Cf. Hunter (1996) 3ff, especially 7ff where he uses a comparison of the Grenfell Fragment with Theocritus’ “mimes” (including Idyl 2) to argue that the latter “suggest rather the centrality of the written text.”
at one point at least (1334f) by Trygaeus. There are also cases where the attribution of the refrain is admittedly only probable, as in the refrains of Aesch. Pers. 1057 ff and Sept. 975ff, both of which occur in kommoi and seem to be performed by the chorus in response to the soloist. Under this heading also comes the attribution for the refrains of the “love duet” at Ar. Eccl. 952ff.

Fortunately most of the extant refrains of drama (16 out of 21) occur in formal and dramatic contexts which make attribution almost certain. If we limit our examination to these examples, we arrive at the following results: choral stanzas and refrains, 9 cases; solo stanzas, choral refrains, 3 cases; choral stanzas, solo

---

9 Olson (1998) 315: “This is a profoundly troubled section of the text.” Olson assigns the first instance of the refrain to the chorus rather than to Trygaeus on the basis that “a variant of the refrain ἰμᾶν ἰμέναι ο’ was sung by the wedding party and other onlookers as the groom escorted the bride home.” Oddly, Olson cites as one of his examples Cassandra’s solo refrain at Eur. Tro. 310ff. Clearly Olson is operating in accordance with the divided performance hypothesis for refrain. It does not help that he uses “refrain” to refer to cries not in a formal refrain, e.g. his citation of Eur. Phaeth. 227 and Theoc. 18.58 as “refrains”. In any event, the association of the hymenaeus cry or even formal refrains with choral performances would not warrant the disqualification of its solo performance here.

10 For Pers. 1057ff, see Broadhead ad loc. For Sept. 975ff, see my discussion of the passage in CHAPTER 6.

11 Vetta (2000) ad loc. rejects an alternating performance whereby each of the two strophes is assigned to the girl and each of the antistrophes to the youth. Following Wilamowitz (1927) 216, he finds it too incredible, even given the reversal of normal roles throughout the play, that the girl should take up the “masculine theme” of ἀναξιοὺ (971). He goes on to reject the idea that we are dealing here with a “love duet”, because that would assume a “real model” for the song, as suggested by Bowra (1970) 155; but this cannot apply here because of the unreal situation obtaining between the youth and the girl. Besides being self-defeating (a girl’s use of ἀναξιοὺ is too unrealistic for the play, but the unrealism of the play rules out Aristophanes’ use of a real folk model for the song), Vetta’s second objection fails to take into account that this is, after all, a play. As Parker (1997) 546 points out, “Women’s love-songs and male-female duets, whether literary or traditional, are forms of musical drama.” Vetta cannot, therefore, dismiss a duet performance here on the basis that it is not true to life, just as Bowra cannot count on this duet’s representing actual courting procedure.

12 In odes: Aesch. Pers. 864ff; Suppl. 117ff and 141ff; Ag. 121ff; Eum. 328ff; Eur. Ba. 877ff and 902ff. In comic parabasis: Ar. Ra. 404ff. In song with protagonist’s recitativo: Ar. Av. 1736ff.

13 In epirrhematic passages: Aesch. Suppl. 889ff; Ag. 1489; Eum. 778ff.
refrains, 2 cases\textsuperscript{14}; solo stanzas and refrains, 1 case\textsuperscript{15}; “mixed” performance, 1 case\textsuperscript{16}. This clearly does not support the common “divided performance” hypothesis; if anything, it indicates that by far the most common performance mode for refrain poetry is one in which stanza and refrain are performed by the same speaker. But we should hesitate before applying the result of our examination to refrain poetry outside of drama. It is the nature of the case that questions of attribution will be greatest in those passages where more than one speaker share a song, and consequently choral odes sung in unison must make up the majority of refrains with clear attribution. Nevertheless, the weight of the numbers makes it clear that the “divided performance” hypothesis must be rejected as the default performance mode for refrains in Greek poetry. We may go further by saying that our examination indicates that, at least in the case of drama, that the performance mode of a refrain tends to be determined by the formal requirements of the genre, not the mere presence of a refrain in a passage.

\section*{§2 $\acute{e}\acute{E}a\rho\chi\omega$ in secondary descriptions of performance}

I have already pointed out in Chapter 2 that caution is necessary when dealing with secondary descriptions of performance. There I demonstrated that the meaning of “refrain” often assumed by modern scholars for $\acute{e}\pi\acute{a}\phi\theta\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$ was not borne out by the ancient usage of the term. Here I am concerned with $\acute{e}\acute{E}a\rho\chi\omega$ and related terms, since they have been assumed to indicate a specific performance mode for refrain poetry. It does seem that $\acute{e}\acute{E}a\rho\chi\omega$ commonly refers to the performance relationship between a chorus or similar musical body and its

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{14}] In “reversed” epirrhythmic passage: Aesch. \textit{Ag.} 1072ff and 1081ff.
\item[\textsuperscript{15}] In solo ode prior to entrance of chorus: Eur. \textit{Ion} 125ff.
\item[\textsuperscript{16}] Chorus and protagonist exchange refrain: Ar. \textit{Ra.} 209ff.
\end{itemize}
leader. But how well does the literature bear out the specific scenario of an ἔξαρχος who leads off a song with non-refrain material and a chorus that answers with a refrain? Relevant passages are those which give some indication of the content sung by both parties of the performance, chorus and leader.

What at first glance could be seen as a support for Pickard-Cambridge’s model may be found in the description of the Persian king’s dinner, according to Heracleides of Cumae, as given at Athenaeus 4.145d: καὶ παρὰ τὸ δείπνον ἄδουσί τε καὶ ψάλλουσιν αἱ παλλακαὶ αὐτῷ, καὶ μία μὲν ἔξαρχει, αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι ἄδρῶς ἄδουσί. But it is difficult to say whether the main body of concubines (αἱ ἄλλαι) are singing something like a refrain, or are simply singing the song in its entirety. It comes down to the question of just what the ἔξαρχος is doing. We are told that the

---

17For examples, see Zimmermann (1992) 19, n.3. Zimmermann draws a distinction between ἔξαρχος + accusative and ἔξαρχος + genitive, which he insists can be used of solo singing. The examples he gives for this solo singing, namely the individual and extended lamentations sung by Andromache, Hecuba and Helen at Iliad 24.722ff, 746ff and 761ff, are not particularly convincing, since these are sung in a context that clearly includes responsorial singing. We find examples of ἔξαρχος + genitive used of singing that involves responsorial singing at ps.-Hesiod Scutum 201ff:

---

18Examples such as the κυβιστητήρε... μολπῆς ἔξαρχουτες at II. 18.605f are not relevant, since they do not clearly represent performances of singing leaders and singing choruses. Examples such as Nausicaä ἢρχετο μολπῆς at Od. 6.101 do not give any indication of who is singing what.
concubines both sing and play on stringed instruments, but when the division of labor is laid out only the main body of concubines is said to be singing: perhaps, then, it is only the ἵκαρχος who is playing. It would seem that the role of the ἵκαρχος here is to initiate and regulate the singing of the chorus, and not to provide the lion’s share of singing.

We find another example of an ἵκαρχος who does not seem to follow Pickard-Cambridge’s model in *b.Hom.* 27 to Artemis. The goddess arrives at Delphi and sets up a chorus of Muses and Graces (15), then hangs up her bow and leads them in song, 17ff:

> ἤγείται χαρίεντα περὶ χρῷ κόσμων ἤχουσα,  
> ἵκαρχουσα χοροῦν· αἱ δὲ ἀμβροσίην ὑπ’ ἰείσαι  
> ἱμεύσιν Λητῶ καλλίσφυρον ὡς τέκε παιδας  
> ἀδανάτων βουλή τε καὶ ἐργασιν ἤξοχ’ ἀρίστους.

In this case it is made clear that the chorus sings not a refrain but instead a mythical narrative concerning the birth of Leto’s children (apparently something like the first half of *b.Ap.*). Artemis may be sharing in this narrative singing, but it is just as likely that she is not. The physical distance between her and the chorus implied by ἤγείται, along with the emphasis placed upon her physical beauty, may indicate that she is dancing in a way distinct from that of the chorus, in which case her singing may be distinctive as well.19

We have examples of ἵκαρχοι who themselves supply refrains during performance. The first is Σ Π. *O.9.1k*, discussed in *CHAPTER 2*. Our interest there was with the use of the term ἐφύμιον in connection with τήνελλα καλλίνκε, the refrain of the “Archilochus Song”. Here we are interested with the performance mode described in the scholion:

---

19Cf. the description of Nausicaā as she leads the musical ball game at *Od. 6.101ff*, where she is compared to Artemis, again with an emphasis upon her physical distinctiveness.
According to this account, the cry τίνελα originated as an improvised imitation of instrumental accompaniment. Here we have a clear example of an ἔξαρχος who sings at least part of a refrain in order to regulate the performance of a chorus. Although Eratosthenes’ theory (which we need not accept) concerning the origin of τίνελα presumes that an unusual performance situation gave rise to the cry in the first place, nevertheless it seems most likely that this theory is inspired by the existing performance situation, which certainly featured a τίνελα and almost certainly one sung by the ἔξαρχος. In other words, Eratosthenes is explaining not only the word τίνελα, but also the typical performance model for the song in his own time. No indication is given that the singing of the remainder of the song is divided between leader and chorus. So far as this song is concerned, therefore, the distinctive function of the ἔξαρχος would seem to be to provide a portion of the refrain.

Another example of an ἔξαρχος whose function is clearly not in keeping with Pickard-Cambridge’s model is found at Demosthenes 18 (De corona) 260, where Aeschines is accused of a ridiculous brand of religious enthusiasm:

εν δε ταῖς ἡμέραις τοὺς καλοὺς διάσοντος ἄγων διὰ τῶν ὁδών, τοὺς ἑστεφανωμένους τῷ μαραθῶ καὶ τῇ λεύκῃ, τοὺς ὠφεις τοὺς παρεῖς βλήβων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς αἰώρων, καὶ βοών (εὐοὶ σαβοῖ) καὶ ἐπορχούμενος (ὑῆς ἄττης ἄττης ύῆς,)
ἔξαρχος καὶ προηγημένω καὶ κιστοφόρος καὶ λικνοφόρος καὶ τοιαύθ’ ὑπὸ τῶν γραδῶν προσαγορευόμενος.

Here we have an ἔξαρχος whose singing is limited to ritual cries (εὐοὶ σαβοί). He also dances to other cries (ὑῆς ἄττης ἄττης ύῆς) which may or may not be sung.

20 Cf. Σ 1f ὁ Ἀρχίλοχος... ἀπορήσας κιθαριστῇ διά τῶν λέξεων μιμήσασθαι τῶν ῥυθμῶν καὶ τῶν ἰχθύν τῆς κιθάρας ἐπεικής.
by another party. Either set of cries may have been cast in refrain form; there is no way of telling.

From these examples it is clear that it cannot be assumed that, if indeed there is a refrain associated with the dithyramb mentioned in Archilochus fr. 120, it is the chorus and not the speaker himself who sings it. Indeed, in the two examples above where the content sung by εξαρχοι is clearly established (Σ Pi. O.9.1k, Dem. 18.260), that content cannot be construed as stanzas to be answered by the refrains of a chorus. Most importantly, the mere presence of an εξαρχοσ does not itself require us to understand there to be a refrain involved at all.

This does not, of course, rule out the possibility that εξαρχοι may provide stanzas and be accompanied by a chorus’ refrains. One possible example is the lamentation over Hector by Andromache, Hecuba and Helen in Iliad 24.723-76; it is this passage that Pickard Cambridge cites as his first parallel to justify his understanding of εξαρχοι in Archil. fr. 120. He is followed by Alexiou, who in her book on Greek lament characterizes the passage as a single piece arranged in “the simple strophic pattern AxAxAx”, in which the improvised contribution of each woman is followed by “a refrain wailed by the whole company of women in unison.” It is important here to distinguish between the form of Homer’s description of the laments, and the likely form of the performance being described. The passage in Homer does not, in fact, present us with a refrain. Each of the lines that follow the individual gōoi are different, having in common only a formula indicating the conclusion of a speech: ὁς ἐφατο κλαίουσα (746, 760);

---

22 Alexiou (1974) 131f. This is a pattern that she identifies as traditional, and which she sees to survive “in popular hymns, such as the Hymn of the Kouretes and the Elian Hymn to Dionysus”. In doing so, she is obviously drawing upon the received “divided performance” hypothesis, as well as disregarding the formal difference between a refrain and appended cries.
or ὤς ἔφατο κλαίουσ’ (776). These lines are, then, no more “refrains” than any succession of formulaic lines or half-lines that introduce or follow a speech.

That being said, it remains to be seen whether these lines, while not refrains themselves, might not represent the performance of refrains in the narrative. After all, the second half of each line describes wailing emitted in response to the individual gooi: ἐπὶ... στενάχωντο (745); γόνω... ὤρινε (760); ἐπὶ... ἐστενε (776). But if this is a refrain poem being described, it is a very unusual one indeed, for it features a different speaker for each “stanza” and a change of speaker for the “refrains” as well. “The women” are explicitly said to supply the wailing only at 24.746, after Andromache’s lament. No explicit subject is given for ὤρινε at 24.760, after Hecuba’s contribution, though it is natural to assume that the women there, too, are the ones raising the γόνω ἀλίαστον. At 24.776, after Helen’s contribution, however, it is the “boundless host” (δῆμος ἄπείρων) that are said to answer her with their wailing. Rather than a set form of 3 “stanzas” that are divided by regular “refrains”, what is being described is more likely a series of discrete performances, each of which is answered by an ever-increasing volume of cries. We must keep in mind, however, that the pattern of lament, cries, lament and so on in this passage may be a product of Homer’s necessarily linear presentation. In his dissertation on the improvised laments in the Iliad, Tsagalis has argued (following the interpretation offered by Σ 24.746) that what Homer is describing is responsive wailing simultaneous with each individual goos, rather than following it.\(^23\) Tsagalis’ point anticipates to some degree my discussion in CHAPTER 3 concerning the relationship between ritual cries and the refrain form.

---

\(^{23}\) Tsagalis (1998) 95ff.
What may we conclude? First, a default performance model whereby solo stanzas are answered by choral refrains cannot be assumed for Greek poetry with refrains. Second, the performance mode for individual refrain poems seems determined by the requirements of the containing poem or its genre, not by the refrain form per se. Third, even if an association between a particular performance mode for refrain and a genre can be established, the variety of performance modes for refrain observed in drama suggests that we cannot assume that there is a default performance mode for refrain in any genre.
The comparative evidence suggests that the refrain form is almost universal in terms of both geography and the register of poetry in which it appears. It is reasonable to suppose that it is a very old form indeed, and that it is likely to have played a larger role in ancient Greek song than is indicated in surviving Greek poetry. Scholars have identified the refrain form as especially typical of popular song in general; more often it is identified with specific sub-literary genres including magic, laments and other ritual song. This hypothesis of a popular association for the refrain form in Greek poetry is difficult to test, since so little survives of sub-literary ancient Greek song. Occasionally we may point to surviving refrain poems as likely examples of a popular form: the Dictaean Hymn to Zeus and the hymenaeus song concluding Aristophanes Peace come to mind. But it is impossible to be sure to what extent the form of the hymenaeus in the Peace is determined by the needs of its containing genre, i.e. drama. In the case of the Dictaean Hymn, even though it is firmly established in a cultic context, we cannot rule out the possibility of its form being influenced by literary poetry. The majority of refrain poems in our corpus are significantly earlier than the date of 300 B.C. proposed for the Hymn. If we turn to that section of the PMG entitled “Carmina Popularia”, we find no refrains. It is to be admitted that this is hardly

---

3 Deubner (1919) 400; Hutchinson (1985) ad Sept. 965ff.; Schwartz (1897) 6; Reiner (1938) 32; Wilamowitz (1926) 92.
4 Cf. my argument in chapter 3 that the performance mode of refrains in drama is usually determined by the needs of drama rather than by a default performance mode associated with the refrain form per se.
an adequate sample upon which to base firm conclusions — we are speaking of only 37 songs and fragments — but the point should be clear: the hypothesis that the refrain form is especially typical of popular Greek song is not supported by surviving examples.

Still, the hypothesis should not be dismissed out of hand. The distribution of our refrain corpus seems, on the whole, to be consistent with the idea that refrains played a role in Greek popular song. We find refrains represented in several literary genres for which it is natural to suppose sub-literary antecedents: paean, hymenaeus and lament. Perhaps the refrains used in these genres do reflect the use of refrains in those antecedents. A popular origin for the “love duet” at Aristophanes Eccl. 952ff has been supposed; its refrain, taken together with the refrains of Bacchylides frr. *18 and *19 (both of which are classified as “erotica” by Maehler), may point to a popular form of love poetry that featured refrains. The refrain in the Song of the Initiates at Aristophanes Ra. 397ff may reflect the presence of a refrain in the Iacchus song performed during the yearly procession from Athens to Eleusis. But the difficulties of this line of reasoning are apparent. We cannot take it for granted that the distribution of refrains in surviving poems is representative of their use in Greek poetry, either with regard to the original distribution among genres, or to the proportion of refrain use within each genre.

---

5 Ussher (1973) 208 assumes that the very presence of the refrain “indicates a popular basis for the song”. Radermacher (1921) 199 also suggests a popular antecedent, but does not make the presence of the refrain the basis for his judgment.
6 Cf. Radermacher (1921) 199, Wilamowitz (1925) 309.
7 See CHAPTER 5 for a discussion concerning the predominance of paeans in our corpus.
How are we to evaluate the relationship between sub-literary form and the refrains of surviving Greek poetry? Rather than attempt to account for sub-literary form as a whole, I propose to examine two specific types, both of which have been suggested as being especially associated with refrains: magic and the ritual cries associated with paean and hymenaeus.

§1 Refrains and magic

The refrain form has long been held by critics to have played an important role in ancient Greek magic, and they have pointed to this as a likely source for the refrains of Greek poetry. Some critics suggest that all poetic refrains originated in a sub-literary context where magic and religious ritual were inseparable; others limit themselves to the narrower claim that the refrains of certain literary passages, e.g. Aesch. Pers. 663ff. and Theocritus 2, derive from refrains as used in genuine magical spells. While it is impossible to prove or disprove these theories, it is possible to ask to what extent refrains are found in real magical spells. My examination of Audollent’s Defixionum Tabellae, Preisendanz’ Papyri Graecae Magicae and Daniel and Maltomini’s Supplementum Magicum has not yielded any examples of refrain. Gow seems to have been correct when, while addressing the question whether the refrain of Theocritus 2 might reflect the use of refrains in genuine magic, he stated that, “though refrains are found in the magic of other countries there is little trace of them in Greece.”

---

8 Deubner (1919) 400; Fraenkel (1950) ad Ag. 121.
9 Moritz (1979) 187.
10 Kranz (1933) 130.
11 Audollent (1904) liv notes the contrast between the regular refrain of Virgil Ec. 8 and the formulae used in defixiones, which do not recur unchanged from the beginning of the text.
Notwithstanding the absence of formal refrains in surviving magical texts, repetition is clearly an important feature of many of them, as is made clear in the middle of a hymn to Apollo at PGM I.307-314:

\[
\text{όρκιζω κεφαλήν τε θεού, ὑπὲρ ἐστὶν Ὁλυμπος,}
\text{όρκιζω σφραγίζα θεού, ὑπὲρ ἐστὶν ὄρασις,}
\text{όρκιζω χέρα δεξιετήρη ἣν κόσμῳ ἐπέσχες,}
\text{όρκιζω κρητήρα θεού πλούτων κατέχουτα,}
\text{όρκιζω θεοῖν ἀιώνιον Ἀιώνα τε πάντων,}
\text{όρκιζω Φύσιν αὐτοφυή, κράτιστοιν Ἀδωνίαν,}
\text{όρκιζω δύναστα καὶ ἀντέλλουν Ἁλωαίων,}
\text{όρκιζω τὰ ἁγία καὶ θεία ὄνοματα ταῦτα, ὅσως}
\text{ἄν περιψωσί μοι τὸ θεόν πνεύμα καὶ τελέσῃ,}
\text{ὁ ἔχω κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν.}
\]

Here the most obvious repetitive element is the anaphora of όρκιζω, whose repetition seems both to emphasize the demands of the speaker and to introduce a catalogue of items associated with the god.\(^\text{13}\)

The most common form that magical repetition takes, besides the doubling of words\(^\text{14}\), is the simple repetition of a whole passage within a spell. These repetitions may be more or less verbatim\(^\text{15}\), but more often the repetition is of thoughts rather than of words. For example, a third century A.D. spell of unknown provenance (Suppl. Mag. I.39):

\[
\text{διαικόνησον μοι εἰς Ἀπλωνούν, ἤ ἔτεκεν Ἀρσινό, καὶ ἀγριανθήτω ἡ ψυχή αὐτῆς}
\text{εἰς τὸ παραλλαγήν τὴν ψυχήν αὐτῆς καὶ κλίθησαι εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν, ἵνα με}
\text{φιλῆ καὶ ὃ ἐὰν αὐτὴν αἰτῶν ἐπήκοον μοί ἢν, ἐμοὶ Πτολεμαίῳ, ὅ ἐτεκεν Ἐστείου. (2-7)}
\]

\[
\text{ποίησον Ἀπλωνούν, ἤ ἔτεκεν Ἀρσινό, φιλεῖν με, ἐμὲ τὸν Πτολεμαίον, ὅ ἐτεκεν}
\text{Θασείς, εἰς τὸν ἀπαντὰ χρόνον, ἥνα με φιλῆ καὶ ὃ ἐὰν αὐτὴν εἰσὶν δοῦ μοι καὶ μή}
\text{ἐπεχέντῳ μιὰν ώραν, ἔως ἐλθῇ πρὸς ἐμὲ τὸν Πτολεμαίον, ὅ ἐτεκεν Θασείς, εἰς τὸν}
\text{ἀπαντὰ χρόνον. (11-17)}
\]

\(^\text{13}\) Cf. anaphora of ἔγω εἰμι ὁ “I am he who...” at PGM IV.185ff; ἐν ἦ at IV.2259ff.
\(^\text{14}\) Daniel and Maltomini, i, p.37.
\(^\text{15}\) Cf. Suppl. Mag. 1, #13.
“Serve me in regard to Aplonous, whom Arsinoe bore, and let her soul be roused so that her soul be deranged and incline towards my soul, so that she love me and so that whatever I demand of her, she obey me, me Ptolemaios, whom Thaseis bore.” (2-7)

“Make Aplonous, whom Arsinoe bore, love me, me Ptolemaios, whom Thaseis bore, for all time, so that she love me and so that whatever I tell her, she give it to me, and not let her delay for a single hour until she comes to me Ptolemaios, whom Thaseis bore, for all time.”16 (11-17)

Besides the way that near-equivalent thoughts are rendered with varying phrases (ὁ ἐὰν αὐτήν αἰτῶ ἐπήκοος μοι ἐν — ὁ ἐὰν αὐτήν εἶπὼ δοὶ μοι), we note that even those phrases which are repeated verbatim do not appear in the same order in each of the two iterations of the prayer. Two points can be inferred concerning how repetition operates in this spell: first, verbatim repetition is not necessary so long as there is repetition of thought; second, while repetition is itself essential, it is not necessary that repeated thoughts or phrases be set within any sort of strict formal structure such as a refrain. This approach to repetition, while it may on occasion happen to resemble refrain, lacks the formality of refrain as practiced in poetry. At the same time, the poetic refrain does seem eminently suitable for representing in poetry the repetitiveness of genuine magical spells, and we must acknowledge that such a representation is probably intended in Theocritus 2.

§2 Refrains and ritual cries of paean and hymenaeus

We find a common sub-literary formal treatment of the paean cry in three examples, taken from drama, of brief prayers concluded by a single instance of the paean cry. At Aristophanes Vesp. 869 the chorus prays to Apollo that he favor Bdelycleon’s sacrifice, then they add the cry ἰῃε παιάν. Likewise Hermes at Pax

16 Translation Daniel and Maltomini.
453 concludes his brief prayer for good fortune with ἵνα παι옹ν, ἵνα. In both these cases the paean cry is not linked syntactically to the prayer it follows, and this may indicate that these cries are not meant, strictly speaking, as addresses to a god, Paean.17 A third example of a single paean cry occurring at the end of a brief prayer is found at Soph. Phil. 827ff. Philoctetes is in anguish and prays to Sleep to come and relieve his pain. In this case, the paean cry παι翁ν is probably the subject of ἵνα and acting as an epithet for Sleep in this particular aspect. We may note that there is marked repetition of key words in this prayer ("Ὑπνος, εὐαίων, ἵνα"18), which may be explained either by Philoctetes' high emotion or a tendency for repetition in prayer; but with all this repetition there is no refrain. If, then, there is a special religious force to repetition, that force is not dependent upon the manifestation of that repetition within a formal refrain.

We also see secondary evidence for the category of prayers followed by a separate paean cry. Two examples from Xenophon will suffice: An. 3.2.9 ἠξαντο καὶ ἐπαιόνισαν; An. 4.8.16 εὐξάμενοι δὲ καὶ παιόνισαντες. We find a similar practice reported in Xenophon whereby a sacrifice (not a prayer) is followed by the paean cry: An. 4.3.19 ἐπεὶ δὲ καλὰ ἢν τὰ σφάγια, ἐπαιόνιζον πάντες οἱ στρατιώται καὶ ἀνηλάλαξον, συνωλοῦκον δὲ καὶ αἱ γυναίκες ἀπασαι. From the context it is clear that these paeans are shouts, not entire songs.19

We see another sub-literary formal treatment in Eryth. Pae. to Apollo fr. 1, which opens with a triple repetition of a doubled paean cry:

ิน παι翁ν ὡ ἵνα παι翁ν

17Thus Trygaeus' nervous pun, taking παιόν as a form of παι翁, to strike).
18Cf. the repetition of εὐαίων within the refrain at Eur. Ion 125ff.
19 These paean shouts must be distinguished from the paean songs sung immediately prior to battle. The battle paeans are led off by the general, taken up by the soldiers, and finished off with a separate cry to Enyalus: X. Hell. 2.4.17, An. 1.8.17-8, An. 5.2.14, Cyr. 7.1.25.
Following the one line of prayer to Apollo is a break in the stone; it is likely
that the inscription does not continue far beyond the break on this side of the
stone. We find this same treatment of the paean-cry at Aristoph. *Thesm.* 295-311.
Here one of the women calls for the holy silence and then begins a formal prayer
to Demeter, Kore and other gods that they make the women’s congress a good
one, and that the woman “who does and counsels best concerning the demos of
the Athenians and that of the women” prevail. The prayer is then rounded off
with a triple paean cry: ἵη παιόν, ἵη παιόν, ἵη παιόν. Here again, we note the
specific formal treatment of the paean cry by means of a triple repetition located
outside the body of the prayer. This must be seen as a formal type in its own
right, distinct from the equally specialized form of the refrain. These two forms,
refrain and triple cry, share the basic characteristic of repetition, but that is only
one aspect of each form.\(^{20}\) Indeed, the multiplication of cries is a common
occurrence within the refrain form itself.

Ritual cries may also serve as the sole content of an individual song.\(^{21}\) We find
an example of this at Plautus *Casina* 800ff. Here Olympio clearly intends that his
extended hymenaeus cry *hymen hymenaeo hymen* to be taken as the complete text of

\(^{20}\) We note that the trebling of a cry of invocation may be found outside the
context of religious song: cf. the jingle sung by Dionysus at *Frogs* 184, χαίρ ὄ
χάρων, χαίρ ὄ χάρων, χαίρ ὄ χάρων. This particular example, with its obvious
pun, may indicate that such close repetitions in ancient Greek had by nature a
certain sing-song quality. This quality seems to be at work behind the repeated
cries elsewhere in the play: βρεκεκεκεκεκέκεκέκεκέκέκεκέκε
his hymenaeus song (*hymenaeo meo*, 799). We may compare this potentially endless song of repeated cries with the closely repeated paean cries at the beginning of *Eryth. Pae. to Apollo* fr. 1; the two songs are also similar in their expansion of the basic cries (*ἡ παῖϊν, hymen*) by means of multiplication as well as the addition of *π.ο.22* These similarities, along with that of the triple paean cry closing the prayer at *Thesm. 295ff.*, suggest that the simple and continuous repetition of ritual cries was probably common in sub-literary ritual performance. There may have been a special religious force of the number three.23

We have seen that ritual cries outside of the context of refrain may receive varied formal treatment in sub-literary song. This corresponds to the variable treatment of cries within refrains, for there too we find single cries, multiple cries and, in the case of some refrains in paean, cries attached to a brief prayer. The relationship between the refrain form and the ritual cries associated with paean and hymenaeus seems to be as follows. Whereas the ritual cries are essential to the genres which they mark with their presence, refrains are but one of several formal treatments that are commonly applied to them. It is clear that these cries were often repeated in sub-literary performances, and thus it is only natural that this should be represented in developed literary examples by the use of certain repetitive forms — of which refrain is one.24 Thus may be explained the relatively frequent occurrence of refrains in hymenaeus and paean.

---

23 Rutherford (2001) 262, n.7
24 Cf. Wilamowitz (1913) 248, who compares the poetic adaptation of the paean cry by means of the refrain form to a similar adaptation of “halleluja” and “kyrie eleison” in Christian music.
In this chapter I have argued that the most satisfying and sustainable explanation for the relationship between the refrains of ancient Greek poetry and sub-literary forms is one given in terms of the poetic function of the refrain form, rather than in terms of a pre-supposed origin of the refrain form in sub-literary ritual. To disprove such an origin is, of course, impossible. But I must add that, even if we could establish that refrains were important for the popular antecedents of the various literary genres, this would still not account for the use of refrains in surviving poems. Refrains are used in some poems and not in others: why? The answer that suggests itself is that refrains were used in specific poems for specific, poetic reasons. External associations, such as with popular song, may have had a role to play in these poetic choices, but they cannot fully account for those choices. Consequently, the interpretation of specific refrains in context must not end with the observation that they are typical of popular song.
CHAPTER 5

REFRAINS IN NON-DRAMATIC LYRIC

My aim in this chapter is to analyze how individual refrains in lyric contribute to the poems in which they appear, and describe the general character, if any, common to all refrains in lyric. I shall begin with a general examination of the form of refrains throughout my corpus of lyric refrain texts, focusing on meter and placement with respect to the strophe (section 1). With this examination, I hope to establish the dominant (and likely original) form of the non-dramatic lyric refrain. I shall then proceed to (section 2) an examination of how my primary texts function within their contexts. My primary texts fall into three categories:

Category A consists of Sappho fr.111, which I treat as a special case for three reasons. First, this fragment serves as an admirable illustration of the problems involved in determining the text of refrains. Second, the relationship between the refrain form, “primitive” song, and performance scenario — a question that almost always attends consideration of lyric refrains — is especially vital for our understanding of this poem. Third, this poem is our earliest example of the aeolic metrical tradition which, I shall argue, is the most likely original “home” for the Greek lyric refrain form.

Category B consists of Pindar, Paeans 2, 4, 5, 21; the anonymous Erythraean Paean to Asclepius; Philodamus, Paean to Dionysus; Aristonous, Paean to Apollo; Macedonicus, Paean to Apollo and Asclepius; and the anonymous Hymnus Curetum. All these poems come to us directly from ancient sources: Pindar’s paeans from papyri, the remaining poems through inscriptions. All survive intact enough that we may with confidence discuss the formal and thematic relationship between refrain and non-refrain context.
Category C consists of Archilochus, fr. 324; Pindar, fr. 128e (a+b); Campbell 931L; and Bacchylides frr. *18, *19. Discussion of these poems is greatly restricted by their fragmentary character.

Finally, I shall conclude the chapter with (section 3) a general consideration of the main functions of the lyric refrain.

1. The form of the refrains in non-dramatic lyric.

   Meter. When speaking of the meter of the lyric refrain, we are concerned with three things: the metrical character of the context in which the refrain appears; the metrical character of the refrain itself; and the relationship between the two.

   Of our fifteen primary non-dramatic lyric refrain texts, there are twelve whose non-refrain metrical contexts can with any certainty be ascertained.1 Of these, eight have metrical contexts that are aeolic or iambic-aeolic: Sappho fr. 111; Archil. fr. 324; Campbell 931L; Pi. Pae. 2, 4, 21; Aristonous Paean; Philodamus Paean in Dionysum. Three have contexts that are dactylic or dactylo-epitrite: Eryth. Pae. Asclep.; Pi. Pae. 5; Macedonicus Paean. The Hymnus Curetum alone has a non-refrain metrical context that is ionic; but the refrain of this poem is so long, and so much longer than the poem’s stanzas, that it should probably be seen as a special case within non-dramatic lyric. The most common metrical context in which non-dramatic lyric refrains are found is, then, aeolic or iambic-aeolic. We may relate this to the association of the aeolic tradition with monostrophic structure, which we shall see is the dominant structural scheme associated with non-dramatic lyric refrains.

   Most lyric refrains are comprised of meters that are iambic (Sappho fr. 111;  

   1 The other three are Pi. fr. 128e and Bacch. frr. *18 and *19.
Archil. fr. 324; Bacch. fr. *18; Campbell 931L), aeolic (Pi. Pae. 2; Aristonous) or iambic-aeolic (Pi. Pae. 4, Pae. 21; Hymn. Cur.). Of these nine, only the refrain of Hymn. Cur. is joined with strophes that are not aeolic, iambic or iambic-aeolic. We may say, then, that there is in the other eight cases a metrical affinity between refrain and non-refrain context where that context may be ascertained. Besides the nine iambic-aeolic refrains, we find two that are noticeably ionic: Bacch. fr. *19 is made up of anaclastic ionic dimeters; Philodamus Paean in Dionysum features an ionic medial refrain and an ionic-aeolic terminal refrain. We may note that, while it may be possible to explain the ionic measures of Philodamus as being characteristic of ritual verse, particularly Dionysiac verse\(^2\), no such explanation is forthcoming for Bacch. fr. *19, since it presents no obvious religious character. To these we may add a final three refrains that are dactylic (Eryth. Pae.; Macedonicus) or dactylo-epitrite (Pi. Pae. 5), all of which occur in dactylic or dactylo-epitrite contexts.\(^3\) But even here we find a possible sign of iambic-aeolic influence: while the non-refrain dactylo-epitrite context of Pi. Pae. 5 suggests an analysis of that poem’s refrain as \(D –\), it is also possible to analyze it as \(r^de\), a form of enoplian.\(^4\)

Another measure we have for how closely a refrain is metrically bound to its context is the degree to which that refrain can reasonably be analyzed as a separate metrical entity, or must instead be taken as metrically continuous with its context. Three of our texts fall into the latter category: Aristonous, Eryth. Pae., Macedonicus. It is interesting to note that the paeans of Aristonous and Macedonicus are the only two of our primary lyric texts that feature a refrain that is altered through the course of the poem. The medial refrain of the Eryth. Pae.

---

\(^3\) The remains of the refrain of Pi. fr. 128e are compatible with dactylo-epitrite.
\(^4\) Cf. Sappho 111.3, 7. See West (1982) 195 for the wide range of this term’s application by ancients and moderns.
also varies, but only between the two versions, E and P, in which it is carried. It may be significant as well that Macedonicus alone of our texts does not display a regular strophic arrangement. In all three poems the variations in the refrain seem motivated by a desire to accommodate non-refrain material that is itself variable in length.

Looking at the metrical evidence, we can make two main points. First, the non-dramatic lyric refrain is typically treated as metrically distinct within its context. This distinctiveness is usually achieved not by a sharp contrast between the meter of the refrain and that of the non-refrain context, but instead by treating the refrain as a separate period within the overall metrical structure. This suggests that a basic function of the refrain form is to emphasize its content, but to do so in such a way as not to divorce that content completely from its context. This tendency for metrical integration is taken to the extreme in those cases where the refrain is fully incorporated within the surrounding metrical structures, at which point it is liable to be treated as a variable space filler, as seen in the paean of Macedonicus and the variation of the refrain between the E and P texts of the *Eryth. Pae*. Within this larger context, a refrain such as the medial refrain of Philodamus stands out as particularly abrupt, since it is clearly of a metrical type different from the surrounding strophe.

The second major point to be made from the metrical evidence is that the dominant tradition within our corpus of lyric refrains is iambic-aeolic. The importance of this tradition is seen not only in the sheer number of examples: it is clear as well from their breadth, both with respect to time (Sappho to Pindar to the 4th century inscription of Aristonous *Paean*) and to genre (hymenaeus to paean to hymns to the “erotica” of Bacch. fr. *18). The refrain would seem, therefore, to be a formal feature established early on in iambic-aeolic,
independent from any single variety of song. Bacch. fr. *19, especially if we assign it to Anacreon⁵, may suggest a similar, independent tradition within ionic.

Scheme. Of the twelve poems whose strophic pattern can be established⁶ nine are monostrophic. Two are triadic (Pi. Pae. 2 and 4) but their refrains occur only once per triad, at the end, functioning effectively as a monostrophic refrain.⁷ Macedonicus Paean is astrophic, but the placement of the refrains seems designed to suggest strophic divisions: this is especially the case with the extended version of the refrain (ἰε ὁ ἰε παιαν), which divides the poem into rough thirds. Of all our poems only two present us with positive evidence of refrains that are irregular in their placement. The first is Campbell 931L, where the refrain is lacking at the end of the first strophe, but occurs after each of the following three surviving strophes; but the first strophe may, in fact, function as a separate introduction for the dramatically inset song (characterized as birdsong, and containing the refrain) that follows.⁸ The second instance of an irregularly placed refrain is found in Macedonicus, but again this seems a result of its astrophic structure. The very fact that a refrain is used in this poem to provide a semblance of monostrophic structure argues for taking the poem as an exception that proves the rule. We may, therefore, say with confidence that the usual arrangement for a refrain in non-dramatic lyric is regular and within a monostrophic structure.

We have thirteen lyric texts where the relative position of the refrain(s) can be ascertained.⁹ Of these, six have refrains that occur at the end of strophes (Pi. Pae.

⁶ Pi. fr. 128c and Bacch. frr. *18 and *19 are too fragmentary for the strophic pattern to be established.
⁷ Cf. Ag. 121ff. for an example of a refrain that occurs after strophe, antistrophe and epode.
⁸ See my discussion below.
⁹ Pi. fr. 128c is too fragmentary for our purposes here. The case of Bacch. fr. *18 is a bit more complex. This fragment is quoted at Heph. π. Π. §7.3 (Consbruch p. 71) as an example of ἐπιφθεγματικόν, which is contrasted with ἐφόμενον purely on
2, 4, 21; Aristonous *Paean*; Bacch. fr. *19*; Campbell 931L), two have refrains that occur at the beginning of strophes (Archil. fr. 324; Pi. *Pae. 5*), and three have more than one instance of refrain for each strophe. Within this third group, which we can call poems with “complex refrains”, we find two (Eryth. *Pae*.; Philodamus) featuring both a medial and a terminal refrain; the third poem of the group, Sappho fr. n, features two medial refrains. To this class of “complex refrain” poems we may add Macedonicus *Paean*. As noted above, this is an astrophic poem, but in so far as we understand it to be divided into three sections meant to resemble strophes, each of these “strophes” contains within its body a number of medial refrains (ἐπαινόν or ἔν τι παιάν) that are distinct from the longer refrain (ἐπαινόν ἐπαινόν) that ends each “strophe”. The poem’s basic refrain structure resembles, therefore, that of Eryth. *Pae*. and Philodamus *Paean*. Our thirteenth poem, *Hymn. Cur.*, once again proves a special case. Its six-line refrain occurs at the beginning of the poem, in between each of the following four-line ionic strophes, and again at poem’s end.11

While the wide variety of our examples testifies to the flexibility of the basic refrain form, the most represented type is the terminal refrain. The initial-refrain

---

10 This according to my text, which I argue for below. Lobel-Page take the fragment to comprise two full stanzas, each one containing a single medial refrain. 11 This arrangement stands as a distinct scheme for refrains. We find it also in Theocritus 1, where it is not necessary to classify as Gow (1950) 16 does, the refrain as initial or terminal, with one extra instance thrown in at the end or beginning of Thyrsis’ song.
should probably be viewed as simply a variation of the terminal refrain: both
appear at the boundaries of their strophes and thereby serve to emphasize, on the
one hand, the integrity of each individual strophe and, on the other hand, the
continuity of the poem’s overall structure. Medial refrains, by contrast, disrupt
the continuity of the strophes in which they appear. This, along with the fact that
in three of the four lyric poems in which medial refrains occur they are
accompanied by terminal refrains, points to a functional difference between the
two refrain types.12 A clue to the medial refrain’s function may be suggested by
the fact that in all four poems the medial refrains are comprised solely of what are
taken to be ritual cries. I suggest the medial refrain form was adopted in order to
lend a spontaneous air to poems as a whole by handling ritual cries in such a way
as to present them, within the dramatic frame of the poems, as eruptions of
uncontrollable enthusiasm.

§2. The functions of lyric refrains in their contexts.

§2.1 Sappho fr. 111

I have provided the text of Voigt, who follows Bergk in inserting additional

12 We cannot be sure the strophe begun in Sappho fr. 111 was not completed by an
terminal refrain, since the context of Heph. π. Π. §7.1 (Consbruch p. 70) (the
formal contrast of medial and terminal refrains) would motivate exclusion of a
terminal refrain.
instances of the refrain ἰμήναον at lines 6 and 8; I will use Voigt's numeration throughout my discussion of this fragment. This is the most “liberal” text of the fragment with respect to refrains. We have three sources for the fragment which may be divided into two groups. The first group consists of Hephaestion π. Π. §7.1 (p.70.21-23 Consbruch) and Arsenius 51.83 (p.460 Walz) = Apostolus 17.76a (2, 705 Leutsch-Schneidewin), which preserve lines 1-5. The second group consists of Demetrius περὶ Ἑμηνείας 148, which preserves lines 1-5 and 7. Where they overlap, all three texts give an almost identical reading of the fragment except in one aspect: while Hephaestion and Arsenius read ἰμήναον at lines 2 and 4, Demetrius reads no refrain at all. It is in large part because of this discrepancy that the status of the refrain has received variable treatment at the hands of modern editors. For example, in his edition of Hephaestion, Consbruch allows that the codices have an ἰμήναον at line 2, but omits it from his text, giving the explanation, “deest ap. Demetr. de eloc. 148.”

What explains this discrepancy? The omission of the refrain by Demetrius could, of course, be ascribed to a genuine error of memory, but it seems hardly likely that Demetrius, when quoting from the very famous ἰμέναοι of Sappho, would simply forget about the existence of the refrains which are typical of that genre as a whole. More likely the answer lies in the contexts in which the

13 Nevertheless, although Demetrius gives no instance of the refrain at all in his version, Consbruch does include the second ἰμήναον given by the codices, that one after ἄνδρες. It would seem obvious that, if Demetrius is a valid witness for or against the instance of the refrain at line 2, it is a valid witness for the instance at line 4. Most likely, Consbruch’s decision to omit the refrain at line 2 is based on two principles: first, that a strophe can have only one μεσόμιον; second, that since the first μεσόμιον in the MSS interrupts the syntax of the stanza, it is more suspect than the first attested μεσόμιον. The former assumption is not required by Hephaestion’s definition; the latter is contradicted by the multiple medial refrains observed in dramatic lyric.

14 “The author of the π. ἐρμ. is often loose in his quotations, relying as he appears to do on his memory.” Roberts (1902) 213.
fragment appears. It will be remembered that Hephaestion quotes the fragment specifically in order to illustrate the use of μεσόμμια (refrains occurring within, not between, strophes). Demetrius, on the other hand, is interested only in a certain stylistic tendency of Sappho by which she pretends to change her mind: ἐστὶ δὲ τις ἰδίως χάρις Σαπφικῆ ἐκ μεταβολῆς, ὅταν τι εἰποῦσα μεταβάλλεται καὶ ὥσπερ μετανοήσῃ, οἷον ὑψον δή, φησί, τὸ μέλαθρον... μείζων, ὥσπερ ἐπιλαμβανομένη ἐαυτῆς, ὅτι ἀδυνάτῳ ἐχρήσατο ύπερβολῆ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῷ Ἀρητί ἵσος ἐστίν. As Perotta has pointed out, “egli [Demetrius] può aver tralasciato il ritornello tra un verso e l’altro, inutile ai suoi fini.” If Perotta is correct, then Demetrius’ testimony concerning the refrain is of no value, and does not weigh against the insertion of a refrain after line 5 by Bergk and Diehl.

Another line of approach is metrical. Some editors have questioned the status of lines 2 and 4 on the basis of a relationship they perceive between line 5 and line 7 (preserved in Demetrius); the issues are most clearly laid out by Perrotta: “Poichè il v.1 è un ferecrateo e il v.3 un enoplio, e un enoplio è anche il v.6 [line 7 in Voigt], quasi certamente il v.5, corrotto, doveva essere un ferecrateo. La strofa di Saffo avrà avuto lo schema abab (il ritornello, che si ripete ad ogni verso, non conta).” Page in his Sappho and Alcaeus understands the same scheme of two short strophes, but takes the further step of omitting the refrain of line 4, appealing to the context in Hephaestion. His reasoning seems to be that, since lines 3 and 5 mark the end and the beginning of two separate strophes, and since Hephaestion has been speaking of μεσόμμια which μὴ μετὰ στροφῆν ἄλλα μετὰ στίχων κέπται, there can be no refrain at line 4 between the two strophes. (By the

---

15 Cf. my discussion in CHAPTER 2.
16 Perotta (1948) 53.
17 Perrotta (1948) 53.
18 Page (1955) 124. Page (following Lobel) also appeals to Demetrius for this omission, citing Lobel’s “suggestion that the context in Hephaestion indicates
same reasoning there would be no refrain at line 8 Voigt.)

Gallavotti has rejected outright the possibility of reducing line 5 to a pherecratean in order to obtain the pattern \textit{abab}. “Il v.3 [line 5 Voigt] è citato nella identica forma... da Demetrio e da Efestione, l’uno retore a l’altro metricista, dall’uno per il concetto e dall’altro per il metro; non si può dunque pensare a dipendenza; ognuno dei due rappresenta per noi distintamente un determinato stadio della tradizione di Saffo, che rispecchia lo stato del testo delle edizioni alessandrine.” In place of the two short strophes of Page (\textit{Sappho and Alcaeus}) and Perrotta, he suggests a single strophe that incorporates both instances of the refrain preserved in Hephaestion (but not inserting the additional instances suggested by Bergk).\footnote{Gallavotti (1950) 113-114.} There are several advantages to Gallavotti’s reading. First, it preserves the refrain text as it is given in our recension. Second, it keeps the instance of the refrain at line 4 within the strict terms of Hephaestion’s definition of a \textit{μεσύμμιοι, i.e. μὴ μετὰ στροφήν ἀλλὰ μετὰ στίχων κέιται}. A third advantage of Gallavotti’s reading becomes apparent after one considers Hephaestion’s aims in the relevant passage. Why quote one strophe and part of the next (according to the structure suggested by Page in his \textit{Sappho and Alcaeus} and Perrotta) in order to illustrate a type of refrain that occurs only within strophes and not in between them? This would be confusing at best, while there would be no such difficulty with the quotation of a strophe or a portion of one strophe in order to illustrate a refrain that occurs between individual lines. This depends, of course, on understanding Hephaestion’s definition of \textit{μεσύμμιοι} in a strict sense (i.e. a
cannot occur between strophes), and it is possible he never meant it to be taken so strictly. But if that were true, then Lobel-Page’s argument from context disappears as well. In any event, the refrains in lines 2 and 4 must stand, as they do in most modern texts. As for Bergk’s suggested additional instances of ὑμήναον at lines 6 and 8, since Demetrius must be excluded as evidence for the refrain text and since Hephaestion and Arsenius both end their quotation with line 5, so long as there is no convincing argument that the fragment represents two strophes that must be balanced (in meter and in instances of the refrain) there remains no positive basis for inserting further instances of the refrain. My text, so far as the refrain is concerned (the text of the non-refrain lines is not at issue), will therefore follow that of all major modern editions except Voigt and Page in *Sappho and Alcaeus*:

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi\nu\iota & \ \delta\etta \ \tau\omicron \ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta\rho\omicron, \\
\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\omicron, \\
\alpha\epsilon\pi\rho\varepsilon\tau\omicron, \ \tau\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \acute{\iota}\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron \\
\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\omicron, \\
\gamma\acute{\alpha} \mu\beta\rho\omicron \ \iota\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron \dot{\epsilon}\omicron \rho\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron \dot{\omicron} \omicron \omicron \ \acute{i}\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \omicrontext/\text{endtext}}}
dependent upon the fragment’s content is Maas’s assertion that the poem was performed before the ὀλαμος.22 For Page, the flatness and heaviness of humor in the fragment serves as evidence for its use at a real wedding.23 The refrain has been seen as a “traditional” or even “cultic” element, and its very presence has been taken as evidence that fr. 111 is taken from a choral song.24 This view of the refrain as an especially traditional element of the ὀμείναιος is understandable given the common view that the genre evolved, gradually but directly, from performances of the repeated hymenaeus cry alone to the expanded literary form, which retained the cries in the form of a refrain.25 According to this view Sappho’s refrain is a sign not only that fr. 111 was performed chorally at a real wedding, but also that it is closely related to the primitive ὀμείναιος.

There are problems with this explanation. I have already argued that there is not a necessary (or even common) link between refrains in ancient Greek poetry and any particular performance model.26 In light of this, it would seem that the view that we are dealing with a poem performed by a chorus during a real wedding ultimately depends on the thematic content of fr. 111. A more credible approach is that suggested by Wheeler, who sees the direct address to the τέκτωνες in fr. 111 (along with the direct addresses to groom and bride in fr. 112 and the dialogue of fr. 114) as “quasi-dramatic.” These he relates to similar representations in Callimachus and Theocritus, who are commonly given credit for the method’s invention.27 An even clearer example of Sappho’s use of the quasi-dramatic

22 Maas (1916) 132.
23 Page (1955) 119-20. It is curious that the parallels Page gives for this sort of wedding humor are drawn from three literary examples (Aristoph. Peace, Theoc. 18, Catullus 61), two of which we may be confident were not performed at real weddings.
26 Cf. CHAPTER 3.
27 Wheeler (1930) 218.
technique is the speech of Aphrodite in poem 1.28 We cannot, then, take references in Sappho’s wedding songs to outside events as sure evidence for either occasion or performance situation. Given what we know of her use of dramatization in what we assume to be a monody (Sappho 1) we have no reason not to assume that her wedding poems are monodic as well. (We cannot, of course, rule out the possibility that Sappho composed choral poetry.29) In the end, it is impossible to be sure of the performance situation and occasion of Sappho’s wedding poetry. Even if we did know these things, they would not in themselves account for the use of the refrain in fr. 111, since we have sufficient examples of Sappho’s wedding poetry to suggest that refrains, at least refrains like that of fr. 111, are not a constant feature.30

Whatever we are to make of the refrain in Sappho fr. 111, we must make our judgment on the basis of the text itself, and that judgment must concern the literary character of the refrain. The single most conspicuous characteristic of this refrain, apart from its content, is its intrusiveness. There is no syntactic link between the refrain and its context, and in its first instance (line 2) it interrupts the sentence constituting lines 1 and 3. This intrusiveness may be explained in one

---

28 We may compare to these examples fr. 114, also classified under epithalamia, and the critical attention it has received. Fr. 114 contains what appears to be a dialogue between a girl (a bride?) and the personified Maidenhood (παρθενία). The girl asks Maidenhood where she is going; the latter replies she will no longer have to do with the girl: παρθενία, παρθενία, ποι με λίπουσα τοῦχη; τούκέτι ἡξω πρός σέ, οὐκέτι ἡξω†. Page (1955) 122 has concluded from the plurality of speakers in this poem that it must be “designed for recitation by choirs” and must have accompanied some stage of the wedding ceremony. Usener (1913) v.4, 309 has gone so far as to suggest a scenario by which one of the bridal chorus steps forward, assumes the role of Maidenhood, and engages the bride in a ritual dialogue that formally breaks her ties to girlhood. Usener’s scenario must, of course, be relegated to the category of scholarly fantasy, but it is only the most extreme example of a tendency in modern critics to insist on a perfect, literal correspondence between text and performance situation.


30 Fr. 104a, 105a&e, 110a, 112, and 115 are all as long or longer than fr. 111, and none of them feature anything resembling a refrain.
of two ways. The first possibility is that the refrain represents a spontaneous exclamation on the part of the speaker. This would be a sign of an irrepressible exuberance that is appropriate to the matrimonial setting and to the jolly hyperbole of the strophe’s theme. The second possible explanation for the refrain’s intrusiveness in this fragment is that it is meant to be taken as an utterance by someone other than the primary speaker of the poem. In either case, the refrain in fr. 111 is apparently meant to convey a sense of heightened emotion and to mark the poem as a hymenaeus. All this does not, of course, prove that the refrain form was not simply a standard feature of literary hymenaeus at the time Sappho composed the poem of which fr. 111 is a part; what evidence we have suggests it was not.

§2.2 Pindar, Paean 2

Text. Our text for Pi. Pae. 2, 4 and 5 depends upon P.Oxy. v, 841 (= Maehler’s Π Shiv), published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1908. Pae. 2 is taken from coll. 1-8, 4 from coll. 15-19, and 5 from coll. 19-22. The second instance of the refrain of Pae. 5 is partially preserved in fr. 112 of the same papyrus.

Scheme. The refrain occupies the final two lines of the epode of each triad. There are three triads and the refrain is at least partially preserved in each case.

Meter. The refrain may be analyzed as three "ph. Rutherford has suggested the triple use of the metrical element " - " - " may be significant in view of the tendency for the παιάν cry to be uttered three times.” We have already noted the general tendency to multiply ritual cries both within and outside formal

---

31 Kirk (1963) 51ff. suggests this hyperbole may be sexual.
32 D’Alessio (1992) 82.
refrains.\textsuperscript{34}

The metrical context is aeolic, \(pb\) and \(\hat{p}b\) appearing frequently throughout. These end periods two out of ten confirmed times, including in the epode immediately prior to the refrain. The refrain may, therefore, serve metrically to reinforce the closing catalectic cadence; but it is not the sole provider of that cadence. The \(\hat{p}b \hat{p}b \hat{p}b\) figure is unique to the refrain, but we do find an instance of \(\hat{p}b \hat{p}b \hat{p}b\) elsewhere in the poem: strophe 4 \(\parallel \hat{p}b \hat{p}b \hat{p}b \parallel\). The refrain clearly has a closing force that picks up on the frequent \(pb\) in the triad.\textsuperscript{35}

\textit{Syntax.} The \(\delta\epsilon\) justifies the copyist’s punctuation after the second \(\iota\eta\ \iota\epsilon\).\textsuperscript{36} The second \(\pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\) is therefore to be taken with the clause that follows: it is the subject of \(\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\iota\). This drawing of the \(\pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\) away from \(\iota\eta\ \iota\epsilon\) is marked, since the two are usually treated as a single unit. In this case, the second \(\iota\eta\ \iota\epsilon\) is left dangling with respect to syntax. There is probably a continuing sense that \(\iota\eta\ \iota\epsilon\) and \(\pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\) are to be taken together. The syntax is also notable in that we have here the only case of \(\pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\) treated unambiguously as the subject of a verb within a refrain.\textsuperscript{37} The unexpected syntactic shift is probably a conscious attempt to manipulate and extend the given cry \(\iota\eta\ \iota\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\). The result is a more thematically developed refrain as well as a more emphatic cadence. This conscious manipulation implies an expectation of regularity in the form of the paean cry, perhaps especially in the context of the usually predictable refrain form.

\textit{Theme.} The second part of the refrain is a self-standing prayer that “Paean

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{34} Cf. \textit{CHAPTER 4, §2}.
\textsuperscript{35} Thus is refuted the judgment of Wilamowitz (1913) 247 n.1 that the refrain is to be taken as outside the scheme of the poem because “it arose out of the intrinsically unrhythmic cry.”
\textsuperscript{36} The use of the “high dot” here accords with its use throughout the papyrus. Cf. Grenfell and Hunt (1908) 14.
\textsuperscript{37} But cf. the possible use of \(\pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\) as an appositional vocative at Philodamus \textit{Pae. ad Dion.} 11 \(\iota\iota\ \pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\), \(\dot{\iota}\iota\ \sigma\omega\tau\hnu\rho\) and its probable use in the vocative at \textit{Eur. Ion} 125ff \(\omega\ \Pi\alpha\iota\nu\ \omega\ \Pi\alpha\iota\nu\), \(\epsilon\nu\ai\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ai\nu\)/ \(\epsilon\iota\eta\), \(\omega\ \Lambda\alpha\tau\iota\nu\ \pi\ai\).\end{footnotesize}
never leave me.” We may compare this to the terminal refrain of Philodamus Paean (יוו ות��, בקףש תמאג פולסאש’ וקיאוונ סינ ظלCow) and to the paean refrain at Eur. Ion 125ff. (וקיאוונ קיה). These should be distinguished from refrains containing prayers related to the performance of the song at hand, which are best considered together with other refrains containing “performance language”. Outside the context of the refrain form, we compare these “non-musical prayer” paean refrains to the brief, independent paean prayer at Soph. Phil. 832 (יוו mở, פאיוינ). We distinguish these from other prayers where there is an accompanying paean cry that is not involved in the syntax of the prayer:

Aristoph. Pax 453 (יוו ב’ יגאדח עגונינ’. וקיאוונ קיה), Eryth. Pae. fr. 1 (יוו פ’aiוונ |ו| analyzer אפולוונ, ה”וديدא קוירונ, ה”וديدא). The refrain of Pi. Pae. 2 seems, then, to function as a genuine prayer to Paean in its own right. A problem arises, however, in that the poem ends with a prayer (104-106) that the hero, Abderus, “step forward”, presumably to the battle that is anticipated. This is immediately followed by the third and final appearance of the refrain, with its own prayer that “Paean never leave me”. The proximity of the two prayers, both of which are in the optative, would seem to clash were it not for the fact that the emphasis is upon the specific and immediate appeal to Abderus more than upon the merely

---

38 Cf. also το δ’ ευ νικατω at Aesch. Ag. 121ff.
39 E.g., Ar. Ra. 404 “Iακχε φιλοχορευτα συμπροσεμπε’ με.
40 Cf. also the ending prayer at Isyllus Paean 58-61.
41 Wilamowitz (1913) 248 takes it specifically to be a prayer for the continued success of the city, occasioned by the warning example of Athen’s fate at the hands of the Persians. See Rutherford (2001) 268 for the debate on the identity of “my mother’s mother” in lines 28f and the consequent dating of the poem.
42 Radt (1958) 81 suggests δανή rather than δ’ at line 104: the prayer for victory in the upcoming war would then be directed to Apollo. If Radt is correct, then the refrain with its prayer is easily taken as directed to Apollo as well, and there is no longer any conflict between the two prayers for primacy. But Rutherford (2001) 264, n.8 has argued against Radt’s suggested reading, pointing out that δανή is a term both rare and late, and disputing Radt’s claim that δ’ is too short to fill up the space to the left of the break in the line in the papyrus.
general force of the paean prayer in the refrain. This priority of Abderus over Paean may be reflected in the fact that the former is prayed to in the second person, the latter in the third person.\(^{43}\) This in turn suggests that the hero is thought of as a specific figure in a way that Paean is not. Indeed, for the purposes of this poem, “Paean” could mean nothing more than “good fortune”.

Since each triad begins with a new thought, the refrain seems to emphasize the thematic outline of the poem as it underscores its basic structural divisions.\(^{44}\) The poem’s refrain is especially suited for this use at the end of large, discrete units of sense, since the paean cry is used elsewhere as a sort of “amen”\(^{45}\) Now, with regard to the thematic structure of the poem, the refrain in each of its three instances occurs just after what could be considered a moment of climax. The first follows a gnomic climax having to do with the fruits of stubborn resistance (31-34); the second follows a reference to an earlier victory at Mount Melamphyllon (68-70); the third follows the concluding prayer to Abderus (98-106).\(^{46}\) Special attention should be given to the second and third instances of the refrain: since each comes “at the climax of a description of military action,” It has been suggested that the second (coming after the mention of the battle of Mount Melamphyllon) could be taken as a victory paean, while the third (following the prayer to Abderus for future victory) could be taken as a pre-battle paean.\(^{47}\) These

---

\(^{43}\) Rutherford (2001) 274 suggests that the “refrain follows as if an expansion of the prayer.” Could Abderus be construed as the subject of \(λεπτολ\) in the refrain? We may have a parallel for Pindar’s shifting from second to third person at \(N. 5.43-5\), if Pfeijffer (1999) 172f is correct; but cf. Carey (1989) 291. This shift from Du-stil to Er-stil in the context of prayer would, however, seem to reverse the apparently normal order seen elsewhere, e.g. Hesiod \(Op. 3-9\). Cf. Meyer (1933) 39 and 62f. (Norden (1913) 163ff discusses only shifts from third to second person.)

\(^{44}\) Rutherford (2001) 263.

\(^{45}\) E.g., Aristoph. \(Thesm. 316\) and the use of a concluding paean cry at the end of \(Pi. Pae. 1\). Cf. also discussion at Rutherford (2001) 315f. concerning the placement of \(\iota\iota\iota\) \(κτλ\) at the end of a triad.

\(^{46}\) Radt (1958) 16 sees the refrain in each of these cases to refer to the coming war.

\(^{47}\) Rutherford (2001) 264, 274.
instances of the refrain would, then, be dramatic in that their motivation is found
within the narrative of the poem rather than the occasion of its performance.48

§2.3 Pi. Pae. 4

Scheme. The refrain is the ninth and last line of the epode of each of the two
surviving triads.

Meter. Rutherford analyses the refrain as \( iα dοd \), within an aeolic-choriambic
context which tends in the strophe from \( iα \) to \( da \), in the epode from \( da \) back to \( iα \).
The refrain’s figure is very similar to the \( iα dοd \) that occurs frequently in the poem
(strophe 2; epode 1, 2, 8), always ending period, and which has been labeled “Q” by
Rutherford.49 Thus the refrain’s catalectic cadence seems particularly well suited
for the triad ending. The refrain is immediately preceded by \( Q iα dοd \), the
acatalectic com form, so a period end is clearly established before the refrain caps
it off with a more emphatic ending.

Theme. A “self-conscious inversion”50 of the established pattern of
disadvantage (foil) followed by advantage (cap) is found in 25-27, where it is first
said that Ceos produces good vintage and then that it is not good pasturage
(\( άνυππος, βουνομίας, ἀδαίστερος \).51 This inversion seems best explained as a
(negative) foil for the (positive) emphatic cap of Melampus at line 28. (Also,
Melampus is a named, specific cap to the preceding general description of
advantages and disadvantages of Ceos.) The first instance of the refrain occurs
therefore at a moment of climax. The specific yet mythic example of Melampus

48 Radt (1958) 16 points out what he sees as the artful manner in which Pindar has
related the refrain to the martial themes of the poem. He limits himself, however,
to characterizing the refrains as “allusions” to the war theme, while I, along with
Rutherford, see them as quasi-dramatic.
51 Käppel (1992) 105f.
has a gnomic effect in that it attempts to illustrate or explain the Ceans’ satisfaction with what they have got; perhaps, then, we may take the paean cry as acting as a sort of “amen” to this sentiment. Or perhaps the paean cry is an exuberant exclamation of thanksgiving for the good things mentioned above. In any case, the refrain marks the ending climax of a move within the first triad from the general (a description of islands in general rather than of Ceos specifically⁵²) to the specific (an assessment of Ceos). This first refrain does not mark a strong change of thought: we are taken from the Melampus myth to a gnome “preferring the near to the far.”⁵³

The speech of Euxantius may continue to the end of the second triad, and therefore it is conceivable that the second refrain is spoken by him.⁵⁴

§2.4 Pi. Pae. 5

Scheme. The refrain begins each five line strophe in this monostrophic poem. The refrain is not repeated at the end of the poem.

Meter. The refrain itself is analyzed as D–, and stands in a very simple dactylo-epitrite metrical context (s2: D–; s3: e–D–; s4: D–; s5: DD–). The refrain is simply the base D– with an initial breve expansion.⁵⁵

We should note the resemblance of the figure of this refrain to those of other metrical contexts. It shares the basic adonic cadence with the aeolic ᾨpher of Pi. Pae. 2 and the aeolic-choriambic ia dod of Pae. 4. In both these cases the final spondee is occupied by παιάν; here παιάν is supplanted by the name of Apollo.

---

⁵⁴ Cf. line 3 of Eryth. Pae. ad Asclep., where medial refrain is almost certainly meant to be understood as a quotation of the κοίροι. See my discussion in this chapter below.
⁵⁵ Cf. iambic expansion at S3, dactylic expansion at S5.
The entire adonic figure, which is comprised of the exclamatory shout (ιγ or ω) + ʰ ῳ + παιάν in Pae. 2 and Pae. 4, is here occupied by the full naming with epithet of Delian Apollo. The shape of the preceding shout is maintained, however, with the result that the figure D- in s5 looks to be a simple expansion, executed in order to accommodate the naming of Delian Apollo, of the common adonic of Pae. 2 and Pae. 4. The refrain of Pae. 5, therefore, closely fits both the dactyloepitrite context of the poem as well as the essentially aeolic context of Pindar’s paean refrains taken as a whole.

The form of the paean cry in Pae. 5, or something very like it, may have been commonly used in addresses to Apollo as Paean. We find a similar line at Soph. OT 154: ἤτε Δάλιε Παιάν. Sophocles’ version of the cry occurs in the parodos in a dactylic context, with which we may easily compare the context of the refrain in Pae. 5. This fact, taken together with the monostrophic structure of Pae. 5 and its “comparatively unemphatic ending”, has led Rutherford to suggest that the poem may have been meant for a procession.6 If Rutherford is right, this may help account for the refrain’s placement at the beginning of the strophe and not at the end, where it would tend (at least in the case of the last strophe) to emphasize closure. This initial refrain scheme, while unique among Pindar’s paeans, need not give us too much surprise. Eryth. Pae. ad Ap. fr. 1 attests to the use of the paean cry (if not the paean refrain proper) to begin a paean-prayer, and we may compare this to the cries initiating the Iacchus song in Frogs 316ff. Likewise, the refrain of Archil. fr. 324 is initial.

Theme. Given that we have only two complete strophes out of an original eight, it is difficult to assess how the refrain interacts thematically with its context. Both of the last two instances of the refrain follow descriptions of the

---

settlement of islands. The lines immediately preceding the penultimate refrain at line 37 could well be taken as a climax, perhaps even calling for a victory paean.\footnote{Cf. discussion of Pi. Pae. 2 above.}

But the very close frequency of the refrain in this poem prevents pressing this point too hard. On the other hand, it is this very frequency that serves, along with the appearance of “Delos” at line 40 and the likely appearance of “Delos” or “Delian” at line 17, emphatically to identify the addressee of the song.

\textit{§2.5 Pi. Pae. 21}

\textit{Text.} The largest fragment of the poem (lines 1-24) is found in P.Oxy. xxvi, 2442 (published by Lobel in 1961, = Maehler’s \textit{P}²⁶), fr. 32, col. 2.\footnote{This papyrus overlaps with the more famous and extensive P.Oxy. 841. (Both papyri contribute to \textit{Pae.} 7, 7a, 8 and 8a.)} The refrain of this poem also appears in P.Oxy. xv, 1792 (published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1922; published again in 1961 by Lobel in vol. xxvi, = Maehler’s \textit{P}²⁷) frr. 24, 55, 83 and 84. Fr. 24 preserves part of a third line after the refrain, but it is impossible to determine its position relative to the bulk of our remaining poem; the meager content of the third line (\textit{δαρδαμ}) rebuffs comment. In fr. 84 the refrain is followed by an asterisk, and thus probably can be placed at the end of the poem. In that case the terminal refrain scheme would seem to be constant throughout the poem.

\textit{Scheme.} The poor state of our text before the first instance of the refrain at 3f and after the third instance at 19f makes the structure of the song less than perfectly clear. We can, however, be confident that at 5-12 and 13-20 we are presented with two strophes of an equal number of lines, each marked by following paragraphoi. These strophes, while they are not metrically identical, nevertheless can be understood to correspond metrically to each other if we
follow Lobel’s suggestion and assume an aeolic character for both. 59 This assumption is supported by the iambic-aeolic meter of the refrain, taken together with the observation that refrains in lyric tend to resemble their stanzas with respect to meter. 60 There are two possible structures for this song: monostrophic or triadic. According to the latter, our fragment would begin with the end of an epode, followed in the papyrus by a coronis, the usual sign used to indicate the end of a triad. Then would follow strophe (5-12), antistrophe (13-20) and the beginning of another epode (21ff) before the break. But there is nothing in the meter that requires a triadic arrangement. For example, the apparent “metrical dissimilarity” between lines 13 and 21, which according to the triadic hypothesis would be taken from strophe and epode respectively, is no less explicable by reference to an assumed Aeolic base, than is the dissimilarity between lines 6 and 14, which must be taken as corresponding to each other whether one hypothesizes a triadic or a monostrophic structure. 61 Nor does the presence of the coronis after line 4 require that we take this song as triadic. Special graphical treatment of one instance of refrain, and not of others, is seen elsewhere in a papyrus roughly contemporary with this one. 62 Thus, given Pindar’s practice observed elsewhere of placing refrains at the borders of equally sized units of verse, i.e. either individual strophes of a monostrophic song (Pae. 5) or whole triads (Pae. 2 and Pae. 4), and given that a triad with refrain following strophe, antistrophe and epode

59 Lobel ad loc.: “There is nothing not explicable by the indeterminateness of the Aeolic ‘basis’.”
60 See §1 above.
62 See CHAPTER 7. Rutherford (2001) 403 presents a false dilemma when he implies that the coronis forces us to choose between a triadic structure for the song or an editor’s division of the song into segments of three strophes each.
would be highly unusual\textsuperscript{63}, a monostrophic structure is by far the more likely for this song.

\textit{Meter}. It is difficult to assess the metrical context, since the right side of the column is missing; but what we have is consistent with aeolic. The refrain itself is iambic-aeolic, $ia \, gl \, tl^\circ$.

\textit{Syntax}. While it is possible that the refrain ends in a verb, now lost, which could take $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ as its direct object\textsuperscript{64}, it is not necessary to invoke such a verb in order to account for the accusative case. Elsewhere the content of refrains is sometimes cast into the accusative in the absence of any obvious governing syntax: \textit{Eryth. Pae. ad Asclep.} $i\eta \, p\alpha\iota\alpha\nu \, \Lambda\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\pi\iota\omicron \omicron$, / $\delta\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\omicron\alpha \, k\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\tau\alpha\omicron\omicron$, / $i\epsilon \, p\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$; Sappho fr. 111 $\psi\mu\nu\mu\alpha\omicron\nu$. The question becomes, then, how are we to explain this use of the accusative? One possibility is that there is an understood verb of speaking, an implicit command to perform comparable to those explicitly given in some other refrains, e.g. Pi. fr. 128e $\delta\iota\rho\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron \, \iota\alpha\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\omicron \omicron / \kappa\epsilon\lambda\alpha\delta\omicron\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha \omicron$.\textsuperscript{65} Aesch. \textit{Ag.} $a\iota\lambda\iota\iota\omicron \, a\iota\lambda\iota\iota\omicron \, e\iota\pi\epsilon \omicron$.\textsuperscript{65} The fact that a common theme treated in refrain form throughout Greek poetry is exhortation to perform may support this possibility. Another possibility is that we are simply dealing with an independent refrain type, the accusative refrain, just as vocative refrains of invocation are a type. In any event, there is no need to suppose that the cry $i\eta \, i\epsilon$ is acting as a verb.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{63} Unusual, but not unheard of. Rutherford’s claim, (2001) 403, that there is no known example of a refrain occuring at the end of strophe, antistrophe and epode is incorrect: this is precisely the scheme found at Aesch. \textit{Ag.} 121ff.

\textsuperscript{64} Rutherford (2001) 403.

\textsuperscript{65} Cf. Rutherford (2001) 317 and n.50. Regardless of our grammatical explanations for such constructions, the constructions themselves must be acknowledged as an existing type. The judgment of Denniston and Page (1957) 174 that the use of the accusative in ritual cries “should not be used as evidence of grammatical usage” may be, strictly speaking, correct. But this does not mean that such usage of the accusative in ritual cries might not be analyzed by ancient authors and applied by them in new contexts which superficially resemble ritual cries.

\textsuperscript{66} The use of $i\eta \, i\epsilon \, \mu\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha \, \tau\alpha\omicron\eta\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\nu$ at Pi. \textit{Pae.} 6.121-122 is not a parallel. There the cry $i\eta$ is altered to resemble a plural imperative verb which would seem to take
Theme. The mention of “queen of the Olympians” (βασίλειαν Ὀλυμπίων), whether it refers to Hera or some other wife of Zeus, suggests that this song is probably not a paean, despite the appearance of ἱερ ιε.67 There may nevertheless be an Apolline association for the song, since the future tense of ἔσσεται (13) and of σχίσει (17) suggests that we may be dealing here with direct speech containing a prophecy.68 If we do have direct speech at 13ff, it must have been introduced by a verb of speaking prior to the appearance of the refrain at lines 11f; that instance of the refrain would, therefore, be understood either as part of the direct speech or as interrupting it. If we entertain the first of these two possibilities, we must ask how the content of the refrain might be construed as appropriate to prophetic speech. The appearance of ἱερ ιε may be a clue, since it brings a clear paeanic association to the refrain, and we have a description of what seems to be a prophetic utterance accompanied (or at least followed) by a paean or paean cry in Aesch. fr. 350. In this fragment of dialogue, Thetis gives an account of how at her wedding Apollo himself sang of her future blessings, and concludes (3f):

ξύμπαντα τ’ εἴπὼν θεοφαίεις ἐμὰς τόχας
παιών ἐπηνοήμησεν ἐνδομών ἐμὲ.

Given the fragmentary state of the papyrus, it is difficult to assess how the refrain interacts with the rest of the poem thematically. The appearance of the refrain at 11f does, however, come immediately after what could be a climax, the

---

67 Rutherford (2001) 404f guesses that the song’s occasion may have been the ritual bathing of a cult statue.
naming of the holy headwaters of Achelous at 9-10, reinforced with a
demonstrative: ἀλλὰν Ἀχελωίου / κρανίον τούτο ἐκθέλον. This would be in keeping
with Pindar’s use of refrains in conjunction with moments of climax in Pae. 2 and
4.

Rutherford has suggested that this poem is probably not a paean, basing his
argument upon the fact that the deity invoked in the refrain is not one normally
associated with the genre. If this is so, then it follows that Pindar chose to use a
refrain in this case for some reason other than generic necessity. This goes against
Schroeder’s suggestion that the refrain is a formal feature with which Pindar (and
with him Bacchylides) was impatient. Far from being an unwelcome restraint, a
stale holdover from tradition which was to be jettisoned at the first opportunity,
the paean refrain is a form whose literary benefits would seem to have
recommended it for use even in other genres.

§2.6 Erythraean Paean to Apollo

Text. I provide the text of PMG 934, which is based on E (see below) save for
two major corrections made on the basis of PDA: Αἰγλα for Ἄγλαία at 13, and
dοκίμουν for δόκιμων at 23. The apparatus is for the text of the refrains only.

[Παιάνα κλητό]μητιν ἀείσάτε
[κούροι Λατοίδαν Ἡκτατον,
'ιε Παίαν,
ὅς μέγα γάρ[μα βεροῦσιν ἐγείνατο
μιχθεῖσιν ἐμ. φιλότητι Κορ]ωνίδι
ἐν γοι ταί Φλεγενείαιν.
[η] Παιάν, Ἀσκληπίων
δαιμόνα κλεινόθατὼν,
'ιε Παιάν.

[to]δ ἐκ καὶ ἐξεγένοντο Μακάων 10

---

This is, as Käppel points out, the only example of the paean genre for which we have multiple witnesses. The poem comes to us preserved in three inscriptions and the fragments of a fourth. The oldest of the inscriptions (E) is found on a stele in the Asclepion of the Ionian city of Erythrae. The obverse of this stone contains a lex sacra including explicit instructions for the performance of the paean to Apollo that follows (CA p. 140; PMG 933; K 36a); the reverse contains a fragmentary paean to Apollo (K 36b), then our paean to Asclepius, then the beginning of a song in honor of Seleucus (CA p. 140). The content of this last song dates it to 280/1 B.C.; the previous inscriptions were dated by Wilamowitz

72 Cf. Wilamowitz (1909) 37ff.
73 Wilamowitz (1909) 48; Powell ad loc.
to 380-360 B.C., and this date has been generally accepted.⁷⁴ Our paean is also represented in an inscription from Ptolemais in Egypt (P) datable to the end of the 1st century A.D.; an inscription from Macedonian Dion (D) datable to the 2nd century A.D.; and fragments of an inscription in Athens (A) datable to the 1st or 2nd century A.D.⁷⁵ Each of these witnesses offers a different text, though the remains of A are almost completely consistent with P. The problem of how to relate these witnesses is difficult, but requires some discussion here, since we will be interested in evaluating how the various versions of the poem’s refrain text function in context.

Most scholars have assumed that P, A and D, while they are not attempts slavishly to copy its text, nevertheless are derived from E.⁷⁶ According to this view, the differences between later versions and E are explained as accommodations to the needs of local cult practice and myth. For example, the omission of ἐν γῇ at line 6 of P and D (A does not preserve enough of the line to be of use here) has been explained as a suppression of the myth naming Thessaly as Asclepius’ birthplace; this suppression is the product of an assumed “Athenian recension” and was made in furtherance of the mythological claims of the nearby cult site of Epidaurus.⁷⁷ It should be noted that this account of the relationships between the poem’s versions is not inconsistent with the hypothesis that E itself represents an Erythraean alteration of an existing poem. Indeed, it is the very adaptability of this poem to the needs of diverse cultic contexts that probably

---

⁷⁴ Wilamowitz (1909) 37; Furley and Bremer (2001) 212f; Bülow (1929) 38.
⁷⁷ Bülow (1929) 36 and 44f dates the change to the 4th century. But see Furley and Bremer (2001) 213f for a skeptical view of this theory.
accounts for its evident popularity.\textsuperscript{78}

Not all scholars have accepted E as the source for the other versions. Powell has assumed that all the surviving versions are derived from an exemplar (now missing) “doubtless of Thessalian origin and dialect”\textsuperscript{79}; these versions are simply so altered that the Thessalian forms have vanished. There are different causes for the alterations in each case: some changes were made to clarify syntax (e.g., D τῇ Φλεγήναι); some were made in favor of more familiar forms (e.g., Π ἐνανγεῖ); some to create a more metrically consistent strophe (E passim).\textsuperscript{80} Of all the surviving versions of the poem, it is E that receives the harshest treatment from Powell: its writer added ἐν γὰ at line 6 because he could not understand τὰ Φλεγήναι alone and because he wished to create a closer responsion between the strophes; similarly, he omitted Ἀκεσὼ τε πολύλιτες for metrical reasons; he could not comprehend Αἰγλα so he wrote Ἀγλαία instead. Finally, Powell rejects E’s φάος... δόκιμον at 22f as a nonsensical corruption of ἤματο... δοκίμους. While they may not have joined Powell in so strong a condemnation of E, editors have often not accepted E’s text.\textsuperscript{81}

It is difficult to accept Powell’s assessment of E. It relies upon an assumption that is neither compelling in itself nor necessary to explain the case, i.e. that since the poem’s subject matter is (in part) Thessalian, so must be its origin. Furthermore, Powell’s arguments from sense are weak. For example, if the adjective Φλεγήναι as applied to Asclepius’ mother made no sense to the writer of

\textsuperscript{78} Cf. CA p. 138; Käppel (1992) 198. But Käppel’s characterization of the poem as “automatisiert” is not called for. The adaptability of the poem speaks to its achievement as an individual composition. In any case, genres do not compose poems; people compose poems.
\textsuperscript{79} CA p. 138.
\textsuperscript{80} CA p. 136.
\textsuperscript{81} E.g., preference for Π, D Αἰγλα in PMG, Käppel (1992), Furley and Bremer. But Powell does not join PMG’s approval of D Φλεγήναι at 6.
E, why should it make any more sense applied to an interpolated (according to Powell) γα? For the reference to Phlegyas would be the same in both cases. Finally, it simply more likely that the regular metrical structure of E (or something like E) should be altered so as to accommodate local themes, than that the poem should have begun life with the oddly infrequent metrical irregularities assumed by Powell.\footnote{Cf. Keyßner (1934) 990.} Therefore, while Powell and other editors are probably correct not to rely too heavily on E as an authority for the original text of the poem, we must accept Bülow’s judgment that E stands as our best witness for the poem’s original form.\footnote{Bülow (1929) 36.} It is on this assumption that I base my discussion of the refrain’s function in context, especially with regard to its use in the adaptation of local themes.

**Scheme.** E is quite regular, with three equal stanzas of 9 lines each, of which line 3 is a medial refrain and lines 7-9 serve as a terminal refrain. All these refrains are invariable throughout the poem. PAD is less regular in its scheme. An additional stanza is appended to P which is metrically dissimilar to the first three and which has neither medial nor terminal refrain. Both the refrains found in E do appear in the first three stanzas of PAD, but their forms are in several instances slightly different from those in E, and they are not perfectly consistent. The medial refrain varies between \(\text{ίε ο ἵε παῖαν}^{84}\) and \(\text{ο ἵε παῖαν}^{85}\); the terminal refrain varies both in the case of Asclepius and his epithet (accusative or vocative) and in the choice between the adjectives κλεινότατον (-e) and σεμποτατε.

**Meter.** Again, only version E shows real regularity. The stanza is comprised of a string of dactyl feet interrupted once by an expanded hemiepes and medial refrain, then is finished off, just prior to the terminal refrain, by catalexis: 4\text{da} | D\text{2}

\footnote{P3 and 21; D3 (but \(\text{ίε ο ἵε παῖαν D21}\); perhaps A21.} \footnote{PD 12; perhaps A12.}
(It may be that line 6 of the stanza is meant to lend an aeolic air, since it can be analyzed as \textit{ph}. ) The terminal refrain starts off iambic, but then takes on the dactylic character of the rest of the stanza, before being finished off by the paean cry: \texttt{2\textbar d | D \parallel \textit{i\textsand\textsh}	extit{p\textit{ai\textit{an}}}. 

The question of meter and scheme is more complicated in the case of PAD. It is true that the alterations introduced do lead to a breakdown in the strophic responsion that would otherwise have been inherited from E\textsuperscript{86}, but the producers of PAD show themselves not inattentive to meter, at least in the way they handle the refrains. We begin by asking why the paean cry that comprises the medial refrain in PAD should be variable. The instance of the medial refrain in the second stanza is key. Immediately before this refrain, PAD has added to E’s \textit{kai Ποδαλείριος ἃδω Ἰασώ} the new material ‘\textit{Ἀσκεσώ τε πολύλλιτος}.\textsuperscript{87} This addition alters the original shape of the line from D\textsuperscript{2} to \textit{5da}, assuming the same period end between lines 11 and 12. In order to maintain the dactylic rhythm of the line, however, two further alterations have been made. First, the pause at the end of line 11 is removed, leaving \textit{6da}. Second, since the original paean cry of \textit{i\textsand\textsh}	extit{p\textit{ai\textit{an}}} would leave a string of four breve syllables, that cry is augmented by an \textit{\textatilde}$. The result is an easily comprehensible \texttt{8\textbar da} for lines 11-12.

Two points can be made of this. First, a refrain which had been more or less metrically independent from its context in E (as shown by its treatment as a separate period) has become in PAD an integral part of itsmetrical context. Second, for PAD the medial refrain functions as a place holder, which he may adjust according to themetrical needs of the stanza. This is a clear indication that the medial refrain is at the service of its context and not the other way around.

\textsuperscript{86} West (1982) 141.
\textsuperscript{87} Only \textit{πολύλλιτος} confirmed in Α.
We may reconstruct the process by which the medial refrain of PAD was altered thus. It seems clear that, once \( \omega \) had been added to line 12, it became desirable to add it to the remaining two instances of the medial refrain, perhaps for the sake of symmetry. 88 This addition would, however, have consequences for how these other two medial refrains fit their metrical contexts. Once again, in order to maintain the basic dactylic rhythm the crafty producer of P made an addition, this time of two breve syllables \( \text{i} \text{ê} \). In this case the period end between line 2 of the stanza and the medial refrain was kept. To sum up, P inherited the use of the paean cry \( \text{i} \text{ê} \text{παιάν} \) in this song from E, but this cry was altered in one instance of the medial refrain for the metrical accommodation of new material in the previous line. Once the medial refrain was altered in one instance, the remaining instances must be adjusted as well, but again with an eye toward the immediate metrical context.

Besides the alterations to the medial refrain, PAD features an interesting variation in how the name of Asclepius and epithet are handled in the terminal refrain. In E, Asclepius is called “most famous divinity”, the name and epithet being cast in the accusative case \( \text{Ασκλαπιόν}, \text{δαιμόνα κλεμώτατον} \) in all three instances of the terminal refrain. The use of the accusative case here has been explained by Käppel as determined by the function of Asclepius as the direct object of \( \text{γενατο} \) in line 4; the accusative is kept in the other three instances of the terminal refrain simply out of a desire for consistency. 89 But as I have shown above, the accusative is commonly used for the content of refrains in lyric, and so we may conclude that the author of E plays upon this convention by taking

88 Cf. Keyßner (1934) 992, who hypothesizes an intermediary Athenian source for PAD that achieved complete strophic symmetry.
89 Käppel (1992) 194f. Wilamowitz (1909) 45 suggests the accusative is retained “as if it were an interjection like \( \omega \).”
advantage of the case of 'Ασκλαπιών in one of its instances. The alteration of case in PAD could be explained by a simple desire for variation (cf. the replacement of κλεινότατε by σεμνότατε in the third stanza) but it is more likely due to the judgment that the accusative treatment of Asclepius made sense only where he functioned as a direct object.90

Theme. The refrains often serve to articulate the poem into segments. The medial refrain at line 3 separates the initial address to Apollo and the κούροι from the following relative clause (in the style of hymns), which introduces the topic of Asclepius. Asclepius is named in the accusative case within the terminal refrain, begin syntactically linked with what goes before, and thus the refrain is not a superficial addition to the strophe, but its climax.91 The second strophe is wholly composed of another hymnic relative clause (this time with Asclepius as the antecedent), and the terminal refrain marks it off as a discrete unit. In the third strophe, the medial refrain divides the general prayer for the city from the more personal prayer for the singers (δος δ’ ήμας, κτλ).

There are two points at which the refrains interact with the non-refrain context thematically. The first is at the first instance of the medial refrain at line 3. Here the refrain should almost certainly be understood as a quotation of the paean cry that the youths are enjoined to sing in lines 1-2 παιάνα κλωτόμητιν ἄείσατε / κούροι. The second point of interaction is the use of the terminal refrain in its first instance, already noted above, as a direct object of ἐγείνατο at line 4. It is difficult to speak of either refrain as being consistently used at points of climax, since the intervals between their appearances are so short. As we shall see, this is but one example of a tendency to provide “motivation” for refrains early on in the

90 We may note also that D “over corrects” the first instance of the terminal refrain to ἵππαιάνα 'Ασκληπιών.
poems in which they appear.

§2.7 Macedonicus Paean (=IG II 4473 + SEG xxiii (1968) 126; CA 138; K 41; FB 7.5)
Makedonikós 'Αμφιπολείτης
ἐποίησεν τὸν θεού προστάξαντ[ος].

"The poem is from an inscription (IG II/III² 4473 + SEG xxiii (1968) 126) found in the Athenian Asclepion, and is dated to the first century B.C. or A.D. 92 I present the text Furley and Bremer, who follow the arrangement of lines found in the inscription.

Scheme. In this poem we find three versions of the refrain, all of them based on the paean cry: ἐς παιάν (lines 2, 4, [10], [11], 19), ἐς ἐς παιάν (6, 13, 15, 18), ἐς ἐς ἐς παιάν (8, 16, 20). The scheme by which these refrains are arranged is not regular, but the placement of the longest refrain version would seem to divide the poem

92 Kirchner judged that the letter-forms could not be from later than the end of the 1st century B.C. Pordomingo Pardo (1984) 108f, based on the distribution of similar names in -ικός (and of the Latin cognomen “Macedonicus”), concludes that nothing prevents placing our author in the first century B.C. or A.D.
into three basic divisions, for each of which it would serve as an terminal refrain.

**Meter.** Apart from the refrains themselves, there is no discernable metrical pattern for the poem, which is an astrophic string of dactylic feet and the occasional hemiepes. There is a tendency to end lines, especially immediately before refrains, in a spondee; no instance of refrain is ever preceded by a dactyl. In those cases where the non-refrain portion of a line ends in what seems to be a hemiepes (11, 16, 19, 20), the following refrain is always one that begins ἰ Ἧ, ensuring a continuation of the dactylic rhythm and providing at last a spondaic ending.\(^93\) The refrain version ἰ Ἥ παιάν, then, always follows a spondee.

**Theme.** The first instance of the refrain (line 2) seems to be meant as a quotation of what the κοῦροι are enjoined to sing in line 1 (ἰμνεῖτ'). In general, the refrains in this poem seem to represent spontaneous, intrusive cries. Out of the twelve instances of refrain, six interrupt sentences (lines 6-7, 8-9, 10-11, 11-12, 13-14, 16-17). The variation of the refrain serves not only the meter and overall structure of the poem; it also serves to represent dramatically the natural variation of spontaneous, informal ritual cries outside the context of song.

I have suggested that the long version of the refrain divides the poem into three parts resembling strophes. One potential problem for this point of view is the fact that the first and second instances of this long refrain interrupt units of sense: it separates κοῦροι and the relative τῶν at 8-9, and the epithet κλεινότατε and its noun Ἄσκληπις at 16-17. If, then, we are to speak of strophe like divisions in the poem, these divisions do not seem to correspond to units of sense. But the appearance of the long refrain version does seem to mark moments of climax: it follows the first appearance of Asclepius’ name at line 8; interrupts κλεινότατε ... Ἄσκληπις at 16-17, again giving emphasis to the divine name; and the final instance

---

\(^93\) Cf. Pordomingo Pardo (1984) 125. She also sees a possible ρή in ἰ ἰ ἰ ἱ παιάν.
follows the concluding prayer and *makatrantos*. In each of these cases, the extended length of the refrain reflects a heightened sense of enthusiasm in reaction to climactic moments in the poem.

The similarities between this poem and the *Erythraean Paean to Asclepius*, along with the fact that both appear in the Athenian Asclepion, has naturally led scholars to assume an influence. Wilamowitz called Macedonicus’ poem a “revision” of the earlier paean, while Bülow characterized Macedonicus as an “imitator”.94 Besides the observed similarities with respect to the gods named in both poems95 and their overall structure96, there are two points concerning the refrains that, to my knowledge, have not thus far been observed. First is Macedonicus’ use of the epithets $\delta\alpha\imath\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha\varsigma\sigma\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\omicron\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ (11) and $\delta\alpha\imath\omicron\omicron\nu\kappa\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon$ (16) immediately before refrains; these should remind us of the variation of the terminal refrain found in *Eryth. Pae.* PAD. $\delta\alpha\imath\omicron\omicron\nu\kappa\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon$ is especially noteworthy, since it is in the same case as is used at PAD 21. The second more general point is that Macedonicus’ variation of his refrain between $\iota\epsilon$ (or $\iota\eta$) $\pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$ and $\iota\epsilon$ $\iota\epsilon$ $\pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$ greatly resembles the variation between the paean cry in the medial and terminal refrains of *Eryth. Pae.* PAD.

§2.8 Philodamus, *Paean in Dionysum* (F-B 2.5; K 39; CA p.165-171)

---

94 Wilamowitz (1909) 42f; Bülow (1929) 39 n.1. If Wilamowitz is correct, and Macedonicus has written for the Athenian Asclepius cult a revision of a paean already existing in the Asclepion, one must ask what occasioned that revision. One possibility is that a need was perceived for a version of the older paean, presumably *Eryth. Pae.* A or something very similar, that would be even more specifically linked to local cult practice. (Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) i.267, who see Macedonicus’ mention of “suppliant bough” and “youths of the Athenians” at lines 3f as references to an actual ceremony for which the song was intended.) Given the formal differences between the two poems, Bülow’s characterization of Macedonicus as an “imitator” (“Nachahmer”) seems a bit extreme.

95 Furley and Bremer (2001) ii.232.

The poem is taken from an inscription found at Delphi and dated to 340/339 B.C. by a subscription naming Etymondas as archon. Since the subscription records honors given to Philodamus of Scarpheia and his brothers for having composed the paean, we may suppose it was composed not long before it was inscribed. I use Furley and Bremer's text, which is based on Weil's of 1895.

`Διϑόραμβε, Βάκχ',
elīte, taīrē, klīssoxai-
ta, Βρόμι', ἡπωνάις ἱκών
ταῖσθ' ἱεραῖς ἐν ὑραις,
– Εὖοι ὦ ὦ |Βάκχ', ὦ ἤ Παιάν –
ἲν Θήβαις ποτ' ἐν εὐναις
Ζηνὶ| γείναι|ο| καλλίσταις Θύωνα
πάντες δ' ἱδὼν πάντων χόρευ-
σαν, πάντες δ' ὑποτο τξάρεν
σαίς, ὦ Βάκχε, γείναις.
'ἔ Παιάν, ἵθι σωτῆρ,
ἐὑθρων τάνδε] πόλιν φύλασσ'
εὐαιων σὺν θλβωι.|
[Νυκτίφαες δὲ χερὶ πάλ-λων σὲλας εὐθείας [. . . . . .]]

tροίς ἐμολεῖς μυχοῖσιν Ἡλευ-

σίνος ἀν’ ἄνθρωποις,

ὡ Ἕνοι ὦ ὦ Βακχ’, ὦ ὦ ὦ Παιάν ὦ

[ἐθνὸς ἐν’] ἀπαν Ἡλλάδος

γὰς ἀλμυρ’ εὐναέταις [φίλους] ἐπίπτταις

ὅργιών ὀστῶν Ἰαλ-

χόν [κλειεὶς] ἀν’ βροτοῖς πόνων

ὡς [οἱ] ὁρμοὶ [ἀμοχθῶν.]

Ἰε Παιάν, ὦ καὶ σωτῆρ,

εὐκρῶν] τάνδε [πόλιν φύλασσ’

ἐναῖων] σὺν ὀλβωι.

ομιτ Ω

[᾿Ενθέθεν ἂπ’ ὀλβίας χθονὸς

Θεσσαλίας] ἐκελὼς ἀσ-

η τεμενίως τ’ Ὀλυμπίων

Πιερίας τ’ κλειτᾶν

ὡ Ἕνοι ὦ ὦ Βακχ’, ὦ ὦ ὦ Παιάν ὦ

Μοῦναί δ’ αὐτίκα παρθένοι

κλεσσέων] στεφάμεναι κύκλων σε πάσαι

μέλησεν] ἀθάνατον ἐς ἄει

Παιάν’ εὐκλέα τ’ ὧ πτι κλέον-

σαί, Ἰκατάρξε δ’ Ἀπόλλων.

Ἰε Παιάν, ὦ καὶ σωτῆρ.

[εὐκρῶν] τάνδε πόλιν φύλασσ’

ἐναῖων] σὺν ὀλβωι.

ομιτ Ω, ΩΙ, ΩΙΙ

Ἐκτελέσαι δὲ πρᾶξιν Ὄμι-

φεκτόνας [θεοὶ] κελεύ-

ει τάχος, ὥς Ἡκάμβολος

μῆνις el. [. . .] κατάσχης.

ὡ Ἕνοι ὦ ὦ Βακχ’, ὦ ὦ ὦ Παιάν ὦ

[ἐθνὸς] δ’ ἐγ ξενίων ἐτέι-

νιός θεῶν ἱερῶν γείτει συναίμω

τόνδ’ ύμων, θυσίαν τε φαῖ-

νεος σὺν Ἡλλάδος ὀλβίας

παλαιόμοις ἐκτελεῖαν.

ὡ ὦ ὦ ὦ Παιάν, ὦ καὶ σωτῆρ.

εὐκρῶν] τάνδε πόλιν φύλασσ’

ἐναῖων] σὺν ὀλβωι.
'Ω μάκαρ ὀλβία τε κεί-
nων γελειά| βροτών, ἀγή-
ρων ἀμίαντων ἀ κτίσηι
ναὸν ἄναλγῳ| Φοῖβωι,
ὡ Εὐνῶ ὕ ὦ Ἡ Ἡ βαχ' οὐ ἡ Παιάν| ὡ
χρυσέων χρυσέως τύποις
παλ. . . . . . . . . . ἐν θειὶ γκουκλούνται
[. . . . . . . . . ὁθογ. κόμαν
125
δ' ἀργάνουτ᾽ ἐλέφαντιναν
ἐν] δ' αὐτόχθων κόσμωι.
'ἡ Παιάν, ἢθι [σωτήρ.]
ἐνφρων τάνδε πόλιν φύλασσ'
eναίωσι] σύν ὀλβώι.
130

Πυθιάσω δὲ πενθετή-
ροις [πτῆτὼν] ἐτάζε Βάκ-
χου θυσίαν χορών τε προ-
λῶν] κυκλίαν ἀμίλλων
ὡ Εὐνὼ ὕ ὦ Ἡ βαχ', ὦ ὦ Παιάν ὡ
τεύχεων, ἄλλοφεγγέων
δ' ἀλτὸναίσ] ἵσον ἀβρών ἀγαλμα Βάκχου
ἐν [κεύει] χρυσέως λεόν-
tων στῆσαι, ἁθέωι τε πτεὺ-ι
ἐκι θεῶι πρέπον ἀντρον.
135
'ἡ Παιάν, ἡθι [σωτήρ.,
ἐνφρων τάνδε πόλιν φύλασσ'
eναίωσι] σύν ὀλβώι.

'Ἀλλὰ δέχεσθε Βακχιά-
tαν Διόνυσον, ἐν δ' ἀγώ-
αῖς ἀμά σύν [χοροίσι κι-
κλήσκετε] κυστοχλαίασι
ὡ Εὐνὼ ὕ ὦ Ἡ βαχ', ὦ ὦ Παιάν ὡ
πᾶσαν [Ἐλλάδ' ἀν'] ὀλβίλαμ
παν...ετε...πολ...υ...ςτα..νας..ρεπι.
140
ἀν...ν...ο...κυκλα]
Χαίρ', ἀναξ ψυχείας.
'ἡ Παιάν, ἡθι [σωτήρ.,
ἐνφρων] τάνδε πόλιν φύλασσ'
[ἐναίωσι] σύν ὀλβώι.
145

Scheme. The poem is monostrophic with 12 strophes of 13 lines each.98 It

98 If strophe 10 is an insertion (cf. Sokolowski (1936) 138f) then the refrain
obviously served to integrate it formally with the existing poem.
features a medial refrain, comprising a succession of various cries, at strophe line 5, and an terminal refrain, made up of a paean cry and a brief prayer, at strophe lines 11-13. The medial refrain is treated as especially distinct in the inscription, being set off from the non-refrain text by double points.\textsuperscript{99}

\textit{Meter.} My analysis of Philodamus’ strophe follows closely Rainer’s:\textsuperscript{100}

\begin{verbatim}
1 - - - - - ch ia
2 - - - - - ch ia
3 - - - - - ch ia
4 - - - - || ch ia^
5 - - - - - - - - || 3 io } medial refrain
6 - x - - - gl
7 - x - - - - - - || gl ia^ 
8 - x - - - gl
9 - x - - - gl
10 - x - - - || pb
11 - - - - - || 2 io } 
12 - - - - - gl } terminal refrain 
13 - - - - - || pb }
\end{verbatim}

Both portions of the strophe, i.e. before and after the medial refrain at strophe line 5, display a sense of rhythmic completion through the use of catalectic measures corresponding to the immediately preceding acatalectic context (1-4: \textit{ch ia / ch ia / ch ia / ch ia^}; 6-10: \textit{gl / gl ia^ / gl / gl / pb}). This, taken together with the hiatus observed at lines 108 (\textit{κατάσκην ἐν χείρι}) and 121 (\textit{Ποιήσων ἐν χείρι}), justifies analyzing the medial refrain certainly, and the terminal refrain probably, as separate periods.\textsuperscript{101} The meter of the medial refrain is potentially ambiguous, but Rainer argues that the unambiguous ionic dimer of the first line of the terminal refrain confirms Weil’s original analysis of the medial refrain as an ionic

\textsuperscript{99} Cf. graphical treatment of refrains in Macedonicus Paean. 
\textsuperscript{100} Rainer (1975) 180f. Rainer himself admits that his identification of lines 1-3 of the strophe as choriambic dimeters, following Wilamowitz (1921) 242f, is but a matter of convenience. 
\textsuperscript{101} Rainer (1975) 181f.
trimeter whose initial two shorts have been replaced with a long.¹⁰² Rainer sees this metrical ambiguity of the medial refrain to contribute to a metrical continuity throughout the strophe, which together with the catalectic force of the final pherecratean, speaks to the refrains' full metrical integration with the stanza.¹⁰³

The longer terminal refrain is metrically interesting in that it differs from the medial refrain not only in its relative complexity, but also in the way that it recalls the meters that precede it in the strophe. Its pattern of ionic, glyconic and pherecratean cola would seem to encapsulate the ionics of the medial refrain and the following glyconics and pherecratean of the second half of the non-refrain portion of the strophe. In this way, the terminal refrain reflects within its own structure the relationship between refrain and stanza displayed in the preceding context. We may note that this metrical encapsulation in the terminal refrain is reinforced by the thematic pattern of its content. Its ionic cola contain the brief, undeveloped sentiment we expect in a paean refrain; most particularly it echoes the ritual cries of the medial refrain. The latter part of the terminal refrain resembles thematically the latter half of the stanza in that it contains a more developed theme, corresponding to what we would expect in the stanza portion of a paean. Indeed, this terminal refrain could stand alone as a fully developed, if brief, example of a strophe (with refrain) of a literary paean.

Theme. My thematic analysis of Philodamus' refrains falls under three headings: the character of the refrains themselves, the function of the refrains within Philodamus' overall project, and the ways in which these refrains are typical examples of lyric refrain functionality.

¹⁰² Rainer (1975) 184; Weil (1895) 411. Cf. Wilamowitz (1921) 242f on the metrical ambiguity of the medial refrain.
¹⁰³ Rainer (1975) 184 with n.360. This in contrast to Maas' judgment (RE 19.2.2443) that the poem's refrains are superficially appended.
We may compare Philodamus’ terminal refrain to the brief paean prayers discussed earlier that consist of a paean cry tied closely to a brief sentence of prayer\textsuperscript{104}, e.g. Sophocles \textit{Philoctetes} 827ff:

```
Τύμ ν ὄνωσα ἄναγγελς, "Τύμ ν ἀλγέων,
εὐαές ἡμῖν
ἐλθοι, ἐναίων ἐναίων, ὀνάξ.
ἀμμασι δ᾽ ἀντίσχοις
τάνδε ἀγγαίων, ἅ τέταται τανῦν.
"ιδι ἵδι μοι παιών.
```

Käppel has said of Philodamus’ terminal refrain that it has “perfectly concentrated the principle of construction of the paean genre into the minimal space of three verses.” While we may not go so far as Käppel (whose judgment is based on his functional reconstruction of “paean”), Philodamus’ terminal refrain is striking in its apparent completeness as an independent prayer.\textsuperscript{105} Rainer has related the length of the terminal refrain to that of certain refrains found in dramatic lyric, and suggests the possibility that this may, along with similarities of vocabulary and phraseology, point to a particular dependence of Philodamus upon Euripides.\textsuperscript{106}

Also noted by Rainer is the word order within the terminal refrain. The balancing of ἰδι παιῶν and ἵδι σωτὴρ in the first line, and the bracketing of τάνδε πόλων and σῶν in the second and third lines, reinforce the “syntactical symmetry”

\textsuperscript{104} Cf. \textit{CHAPTER 4}, \textsection 2.

\textsuperscript{105} Käppel (1992) 231. This “principle of construction” (“Konstructionsprinzip”) is simply an accumulation of the various ingredients considered by Käppel to be essential to the paean genre: the paean cry (ἰδι παιῶν); the naming of the aspect (σωτὴρ) in which the god is addressed; the mood of the address (indicated by εὐφρων); the imperative prayer (φύλασσε); the naming of the intended recipient of health (τάνδε πόλων); and the description of the condition accompanying health (ἐναίων σῶν ἀλβω). See Käppel (1992) 62-65 for a summary of his functional view, and 72-74 for a summary of its concommitent formal elements.

\textsuperscript{106} Rainer (1975) 187f and 211f. But cf. 255f, where he admits that, in the case of Philodamus’ use of the refrain form, “cult poetry may be the determining factor.”
which he sees as characteristic of the poem as a whole. The terminal refrain also participates in the mixing of dialects found throughout the poem: “Doricized” τάνδε, “epic-ionic” φυλασσε. This close relationship between refrain and the poem as a whole is also apparent in the progression in each strophe from the juxtaposed cries of the medial refrain to the paean cry of the terminal refrain. This progression reflects the overall project of the poem to introduce the worship of Dionysus within an Apolline context.

Concerning the two cries used in the medial refrain, it is important to note their parallel use: Ἰό Βάκχε is associated with Dionysus as ἴε Παιάν is associated with Apollo; Ἰό Βάκχε bears a superficial resemblance to ἴε Παιάν with its initial exclamatory particle, and is also metrically equivalent; both cries are similarly resistant to etymology, and probably capable of sustaining a variety of denotations; and both cries, in one form or another, have a literary pedigree that includes use in refrains. In as much as Dionysus can be said to have a “paean cry” of his own, it is the iobacchus cry. Käppel may be correct in his suggestion that the use of the cry in this poem is the result of a conscious attempt to bridge the two genres of paean and dithyramb: I argue elsewhere that the refrain form may have been a common feature of “old style” literary dithyramb.

107 Rainer (1975) 203f; cf. 197ff.
108 Rainer (1975) 210f.
109 Käppel (1992) 232 sees a similar progression at work, at least in the first strophe; but, as I make clear below, I do not agree with him that the progression is one of generic surprise and disappointment.
110 Cf. Käppel (1992) 225 with n.80. But it is unnecessary to guess with Käppel that later attested forms like ἴοβακχος depend upon the use of the “shortened form” of Ἰό in this poem. For that matter, it is unnecessary to speak of Ἰό as a “shortening of Ἰώω” or ἴε as a shortened form of ἱή: we are simply dealing with paris of alternative forms.
111 Both Παιάν and ἴοβακχος are used as genre names as well, cf. Heph. π. Π. 15.9. It is likely that the ἴοβακχος was distinguished by the presence of the cry Ἰό Βάκχε or something similar, if not the use of this cry in a refrain specifically.
113 Cf. APPENDIX 1.
Now we turn to consider the refrains’ contribution to Philodamus’ overall project: to introduce the worship of Dionysus within an Apolline context.\(^{114}\) Besides its identification of Dionysus as “Paean”, the poem is surprising in that it appears to be meant for performance at the theoxenia festival. We are told in lines 110-112 that Apollo commands the Amphictyones to “set forth this song (τὸν τὸν ὄμνον) at the yearly banquet of hospitality (ἐγείρετο ητείος) for the holy, kindred race of the gods (θεών ιερῶν γένει συναίμων).”\(^{115}\) The theoxenia was held during the month of Theoxenios (March/April); thus the reference to spring at line 3f (ἡμεῖς ἐν ἀφραῖ).\(^{116}\) This placement of the song in spring is striking, given the usual practice whereby the worship of Dionysus at Delphi was assigned to winter, while worship of Apollo occupied the balance of the year.\(^{117}\) It is important to note that the Paean does not present itself as a prayer that Dionysus remain at Delphi oast the end of winter; it is an invitation for the god to come to Delphi from elsewhere, and thus the song does not “extend the Dionysiac cult from winter into spring.”\(^{118}\) Instead, it seems to be an attempt to identify the worship of Dionysus with that of Apollo. To this we may compare the identification of the two gods themselves evident in a statue from the west pediment of the sixth temple of Apollo, i.e. the temple whose construction is referred to in our present poem. This statue presents Dionysus dressed and posed in such a way as strongly to resemble Apollo as cithai rode.\(^{119}\)

---

\(^{114}\) Obviously I disagree with position of Rainer (1975) 172 that “the portrayal of Dionysus was a secondary consideration, subordinate to the primary purpose of the paean which was to impress upon the people of Greece the necessity of completing the construction of Apollo’s sanctuary.” Cf. Käppel (1992) 217f.

\(^{115}\) Furley and Bremer (2001) i.122 in their English translation seem to construe (as does Käppel (1992) 221) συναίμων as an independent substantive “brother”; but this interpretation is explicitly rejected in their note to the Greek text at ii.77.

\(^{116}\) Käppel (1992) 209f; Furley and Bremer (2001) ii.60.

\(^{117}\) Furley and Bremer (2001) i.126f.

\(^{118}\) Pace Furley and Bremer (2001) i.127.

In this context of religious syncretism, it is not surprising to find instances in Philodamus’ *Paean* where generic ambiguities are exploited. Still, it is possible for the issue of generic ambiguity to be over-emphasized. Furley and Bremer, in their comment on the first appearance (line 5) of the medial refrain with its cry Ὠ ἰε παῖν, note that, “from the first lines [of the poem] on the audience had expected this song to be a dithyramb, now it turns out to be a paean.” Though they do not make it clear, they are probably thinking of of the initial address to Dionysus in line 1 as Διόνυσος and the other distinctly Dionysian epithets found in the first three lines: Βάκχει, κλισοχαῖτα, Βρόμι. That, at least, is the reasoning offered by Käppel, who also judges that, after the poem’s first few lines, the audience must have expected to hear a dithyramb. In fact, Käppel sees a specific progression within Strophe I by which an expectation for the dithyrambic genre is established in the audience (lines 1-4); that expectation is confused by the paeanic elements of the medial refrain (line 5); and the original generic expectations are ultimately disappointed by the inescapably paeanic terminal refrain. This progression of generic perceptions in Strophe I is important for Käppel because it is the first stage in a corresponding religious progression whereby Dionysus comes to be genuinely identified as “Paean” by poem’s end.

But it seems very unlikely that the audience would actually be confused or disappointed concerning the poem’s genre. The composition of the chorus, their manner of dancing, the instrumental accompaniment and the music itself would be manifest from (at least) the first line of the poem. The fact that the poem was composed at the command of an oracle, and that Philodamus and his brothers

---

120 Furley and Bremer (2001) i.61.
121 Also εὐλεία and ἑράρε if Weil and Vollgraff happen to be correct in their supplements.
122 Käppel (1992) 224f.
were honored by the Delphians for providing them the means by which to satisfy
the oracle’s demands, make it rather incredible to suppose that the audience was
in the dark concerning what kind of song they were about to hear. In fact, if
Pomtow’s supplements to the prose subscription are anywhere near correct124, it
seems that the oracle specified the genre of the poem as well as its addressee: ēπει
Φιλόδαμος καὶ τοὶ ἀδελφοί τὸν παιὰν τὸν ἐς τὸν Διόνυσου ἐποίησαν...ʔ...κατὰ τὰν
μαντείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπαγγείλατο.

All this is not to say that generic ambiguity between dithyramb and paean is
never exploited in the poem. The most striking example of this is found in
Strophe V, where Philodamus takes the “quasi-dramatic” function commonly
found in lyric refrains and adapts it to his overall project of situating the worship
of Dionysus within a previously Apolline context. In this strophe, Dionysus has
arrived at Pieria beneath Mount Olympus and is received by the Muses, who sing
and dance in his honor under the leadership of Apollo.125 Scholars have long

124 SIG3 270. Furley and Bremer (2001) ii.57, n.8 note parallel examples of Delphic
honors for poets in SIG3 447-452.
125 My reading of the passage depends in part upon the supplement ἥπειρ’ at line 53.
This is the reading of Vollgraf (followed by Furley and Bremer), who rejects the
supplement εἵπειρ’ of Weil’s editio princeps of 1895. (This reading of Weil’s is
actually found not in the main body of his article in BCH, but in the
appended notes on page 548 of the same volume.) Vollgraf’s argument is twofold:
first, he points out the difficulties of taking κέλλων with ἥπειρ’ in the sense
desired by Weil (“you arrived at the blessed land, Thessaly”); second, he disputes
the appropriateness of ὀλβίας χθονός as applied to Thessaly. Käppel (1992) 243, n.
149 attempts to defend Weil’s supplement by simply having ἥπειρ’ take the
accusative object ἀστη at 54f, but he does not address Vollgraf’s second point. In
light of Furley and Bremer’s suggestion ad loc. that ὀλβίας χθονός would be very
appropriate for Eleusis, and their observations concerning the likely itinerary for
Dionysus in the poem, Vollgraf’s suggestion seems superior.

A separate question is that of the reference of τέμευός τε Ὁλύμπιον at line 55.
That it simply referred to the region of Mount Olympus was suggested by
Fairbanks (1900) 39, 146 and followed by, among others, Powell CQ 8 (1914) 288
and Käppel (1992) 244, n. 151. Vollgraf’s elaborate suggestion (1924, 192ff) that
the reference is to Olympia at Dion in Macedonia, and that it is an homage to
Macedonia and Alexander, is unnecessary given the Olympian association of the
Muses.
recognized the pivotal importance of Strophe V as a parallel for Philodamus’ own poem. Fairbanks and Vollgraf have limited themselves to the observation that the Muses, like Philodamus, desire to identify Dionysus as “Paean”; both inset song and frame share the same poetic and religious project.\textsuperscript{126}

Many instances of the refrains in this poem seem to be dramatically motivated by their immediate contexts. In several cases the refrains seem to be used as “quotations” of the singing or shouting described in the non-refrain context: the second instance of the medial refrain (line 18) would seem to be identical to that which is shouted (βαχχίας) by Thebes and Euboea in the second strophe (15-17); again in strophe 12, the medial refrain seems to be the content of the singing enjoined (σὺγγερον κηκλήσκετε) at 146f\textsuperscript{27}; and when we are told in strophe 5 that the Muses, under Apollo’s direction, sing a paean (58-62), the immediately following instance of the terminal refrain seems to stand in for their song.\textsuperscript{128} In other places the refrains, while not explicitly referred to in the immediate context, do nevertheless appear motivated or justified by the description of a musical performance. Such is the case in strophe 11, where the medial refrain interrupts a sentence describing the establishment of circular (dithyrambic?) choruses at the Pythia (129-136)\textsuperscript{129}; also the terminal refrain in strophe 1 closely follows πάντες δ’

\textsuperscript{126} This is implicit in Fairbanks (1900) 146: “We are not to forget that the present hymn is a paean at a festival of Apollo, but performed in honor of Dionysus.” Vollgraf (1924) 198 is more explicit in drawing the parallel, though he probably goes too far when he suggests that the Muses’ address of Dionysus as “Paean” reflects the poet’s desire to identify Dionysus with Apollo. Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) ii, 72f with reference to Strophe V: “There is no reason to talk of syncretism, as Apollo retains his identity and his prerogatives.”

\textsuperscript{127} Käppel is incorrect when he states that this injunction to sing is unique within paean: cf. ἵητε at Pi. Pae. 6.121.

\textsuperscript{128} It may also be possible to take τόνδε ὤμυνον at 112 to refer to one or both of the refrains.

\textsuperscript{129} This interruption cannot be called, as Käppel (1992, 254, n. 185) calls it, “die Einbindung des Methymnions in der Satz.” The effect is one of overflowing enthusiasm, not of reconciliation of cry with narrative.
In at least one instance, a refrain is used to emphasize a moment of emotional climax. As Marcovich has pointed out, in strophe 9 Apollo orders the Amphictyones to rebuild his temple at Delphi quickly “that the Far-shooter keep his anger far away” ωἷς Ἐκαβόλως / μὴν ἦττα ἐκαστασχη (107f). There immediately follows an instance of the medial refrain, and then the commands of the god resume. This interruption of Apollo’s commands by the medial refrain, along with the ecstatic character of the refrain (especially the exclamation ἐνόη), suggests that the refrain is serving a dramatic function here as well. Specifically, it expresses relief or hope that the god’s anger will be kept distant.

It is impossible to tell whether one ritual cry present in the medial refrain is influencing the precise form of another. Most likely the ὧ could be appended to any number of such cries, perhaps simply for metrical purposes (as I have demonstrated above for its use in the P version of Eryth. Pae.). Käppel is correct to point out that in using a form of the iacchus cry in the medial refrain, Philodamus is following established literary tradition rather than any cult practice at Delphi that identified Iacchus with Dionysus. If the content of Philodamus’ medial refrain is determined by literary rather than subliterary practice, it is likely that the use of the refrain form itself is also taken from literary tradition. If the use of the refrain form in this poem were a conservative reflection of similar forms used in Delphic cult song, we would not expect Philodamus to place his

---

130 This would go against Käppel (1992, 248f.), who suggests the end refrain is not related to its non-refrain context until strophe 5. Another instance could be indicated in the admittedly quite fragmentary strophe 6. There the medial refrain occurs in close proximity to ἰαχάω in line 69. I do not agree with Käppel (1992, 251) that ἰαχάω must refer to ἱη specifically.
131 Marcovich (1975) 168.
132 Käppel (1992, 225) sees the use of ὧ in conjunction with the iobacchus cry as an analog to its use with the paean cry.
133 Käppel (1992) 239.
Iacchus/Dionysus identification here, where we should expect instead that which is most traditional.

The appearance of the cry ἀίδηλός is best explained not by Dionysus’ role as “rescuer” at Eleusis\textsuperscript{134}, but instead by the way it appears to have been used in a manner parallel with the use of the paean cry:

Käppel bases his argument that Philodamus’ poem is a paean, not a dithyramb, on the assumptions that the refrain form is special the paean genre and that there are no refrains in dithyramb. As we have seen, these are false assumptions. It follows that Käppel’s other point, that the original audience must be disappointed on a formal level, since they were expecting a dithyramb without refrain, is false as well.

\section*{§2.9 Aristonous, Paean}

\textit{Scheme}. The scheme is straightforward. There are twelve strophes of four lines, each with the refrain in its concluding line. While all strophes are metrically equivalent (though not identical: γλ“ replaces γλ at line 2; there is resolution at 37\textsuperscript{135}) there is an alternation in the version of the refrain used. ἰὴ ἰὲ παιάν is used in all odd numbered strophes, ὅ ἰὲ παιάν in all even numbered strophes. We may relate this very regular variation in the terminal refrain to the compound refrains we see in \textit{Eryth. Pae.} and Philodamus.

\textit{Meter}. Both versions of the refrain occupy all but the first one or two syllables of the pherecratean that concludes each strophe. The two refrain versions are not interchangeable, since they each have a slightly different metrical shape: ἰὴ ἰὲ παιάν

\textsuperscript{134} Käppel believes it is this role as “rescuer” that qualifies Dionysus for inclusion within a paean. This is in line with his functional, rather than formal, approach to the question of genre.

\textsuperscript{135} Cf. West (1982) 141.
The refrain shows itself, therefore, to be doubly integrated within its metrical context: first, in that it does not constitute a separate period; second, in that it is metrically flexible. Within the context of the largely glyconic strophe, the refrain serves as a catalectic conclusion.

**Theme.** The first instance of the refrain interrupts the first sentence of the poem, emphasizing the naming of Apollo, which immediately follows. In the remaining instances, the refrain comes in between what are more or less complete units of sense. At no point is it necessary to take the refrain as motivated dramatically by its context. Such a motivation could, however, be operating after the mention of the sounds of the lyre at 15f., as well as after the brief mention of Apollo being sent to Python at 19f., where it is conceivable that the common etymology of the paean cry from ἀιμμνίομ, which we know from elsewhere, is being alluded to.136

§2.10 Archilochus fr. 324

**Scheme.** We have only one instance of the refrain; this stands as the first line of a 3-line strophe. The context, however, makes it clear that the refrain τὴνελλα καλλίνικε is to be repeated three times in the course of the song, each time in conjunction with a strophe.137

**Meter.** West analyzes the strophe, including the refrain, 2ia' | quasi-itb || 3ia \||.138 The refrain would seem, then, at least somewhat integrated within its metrical context.

---

136 Call. b. Ap. 103f. Cf. Rutherford ZPE 88 (1991) 1-10, who argues that “this Pythoconia-aetiology of the paean-cry is probably at least as old as the 5th century.”

137 See my discussion in Chapter 2 of Eratosthenes’ comment on this song as reported in schol. vet. Pi. O.9.1ff.

138 He notes the “distinct affinity with the refrain of the Dictaean Hymn”, which he analyzes 2ia' | itb | 4tr' || bi | itb ||, p.148.
**Theme.** The cry τῆνελλα is, as we saw in Chapter 2, explained in the scholia to Pi. O.9.1ff. as a vocalization adopted by Archilochus to imitate the rhythm and tone of a cithara, the occasion being the absence of an accompanist. The story concerning Archilochus seems an obvious invention, but the scholiast may be right in his identification of the cry as an imitation of a musical instrument. Whether we take τῆνελλα as a musical imitation or simply as a meaningless cry, its place alongside καλλίνικε in this refrain is assured by *Birds* 1762, and its purpose would seem to be to express excitement and joy. If we do accept that the cry is a musical imitation, this would serve as another example (along with Campbell 931L) of sound imitation in a refrain, and of the more general tendency to use refrain as a means of injecting into a poem a dramatic reference to musical performance.

§2.11 *Pindar* fr. 128e (=Threnus 5) (a) + (b)

The remains are extremely fragmentary, but there survive on separate papyrus scraps what appear to be two instances of the same refrain comprising at least three papyrus lines. It is impossible to ascertain the meter, though what remains is compatible with dactylo-epitrite. All that can be said concerning scheme is that one instance of the refrain is followed by six lines of papyrus, and so if the refrain comes at the end of strophes or triads this would be the minimum distance between instances.

Despite the fragmentary nature of the poem, the gist of the refrain is clear. It contains a command (to the chorus?) to shout out a shrill cry of woe (ὀρθίων ιάλεμον...κελαδήσατε). We may compare this to the exhortation to the chorus of

---

139 We may compare this to the similar, yet apparently independently arrived at, explanation for the same cry offered by the scholiast to Aristophanes *Birds* 1762, who says the cry is an imitation of “some kind of voice of a note on a pipe” (φουής κρούματος αύλου ποιάς).
Campbell 931L to “go”, and to the general tendency to use the refrain to present thematic material relating to performance. As in the case of the paean and hymenaeus, the refrain here seems to be used to incorporate sub-literary (perhaps even unmusical) material, a cry of mourning, within a literary poem.

§2.12 Bacchylides fr. *18

We are given no context for this refrain, which is quoted at Heph. π. Π. §7.3 (Consbruch p.71) as an example of ἐπιφύτευματικόν along with the refrain of Bacchylides fr. *19. We note that this is very unlike most of our surviving lyric refrains in that it contains a theme developed over 2 sentences. Probably this refrain is one of a very few in extant ancient Greek lyric that provide the basic theme for the poem in which it appears.140

The meter is iambic. It is impossible to guess at the scheme.

The asyndeton between the two sentences of the refrain may indicate a dramatic pause, perhaps even a change of speaker. Also notable is the lack of a connective in the first sentence, which may (assuming it is not due to an alteration of the original quotation) indicate that the refrain as a whole is not linked syntactically to its non-refrain context.

Smyth assumes that the refrain “was delivered by the chorus after the strophe had been sung by a single voice.”141 This theory for the original performance mode, though it is common enough among modern scholars, cannot be supported from the text at hand. The only possible indication of a change of speaker in the refrain as we have it is the asyndeton already mentioned above. It seems, then,

---

140 Cf. the refrain ἰδεὶς, ἰδεὶς μανήναι at Anacreonta 9.3,9.19 (West), which serves as the basic theme of the poem, upon which are based the detailed elaborations found in the intervening lines.
141 Smyth (1900) cxi.
that if there was an actual change of speaker during the performance of the poem, the division of labor between performers was much more complicated than Smyth (and the other scholars who have suggested a divided performance model for refrains in general) have imagined. In the absence of any positive external evidence for such a divided performance, it seems best to assume a single performer that is capable of representing a multiplicity of dramatic voices.

§2.13 Bacchylides fr. *19

Scheme. The refrain, which consists of an extended sentence, stands as the sixth and seventh lines of a 7-line strophe. The refrain’s position at the end of the strophe is assured by the presence of paragraphoi.

Meter. Maehler analyses the refrain of this poem as anac | anac | ba. It is impossible to ascertain the metrical context, though there are preserved a few snatches that are consistent with ionic meter.

Syntax. This refrain is unique among all our primary non-dramatic lyric refrain texts in that it is connected to its context syntactically by the particle δὲ. This is in part explained by the fact that this refrain serves as narrative consequent to action in the preceding strophe.

Theme. Whereas the refrain of Bacchylides fr. *18 seems to be a general proposition that we can imagine is illustrated in its non-refrain context, this refrain does not look like an overriding theme. Here the general theme is developed in the non-refrain context, as shown by the string of insults apparently directed to the addressee in the preceding context: he is called “deceiver and whisperer... perjured” (ἀπαρχης καὶ ψιθυρος... ἐπίλορκος, 6f.) in the single surviving, fragmentary strophe. These direct characterizations are then illustrated by the narrative detail that follows in the refrain: “You, with your one tunic, flee to your
dear woman.” It may be that the refrain in its first instance simply relates the outcome of an embarrassing situation described in the first (missing) strophe. In that case, its repetition throughout the remainder of the poem, juxtaposed to new material not immediately related to the refrain’s narrative theme, would have an increasingly humorous effect.

§2.14 Hymnus Curetum

This poem appears in an inscription found at Palaikastro, in the old Minoan town, at the temple of Dictaean Zeus.\textsuperscript{142} Though the stone on which it appears is only about half preserved, the odd fact that the same poem has been inscribed on both sides of the same stone (it appears that the second copy was made due to the poor quality of the first) has allowed an almost full restoration of the text.\textsuperscript{143} While the stone itself seems to have been inscribed in the third century A.D., the orthography confirms a date for the poem’s composition in the fourth or third century B.C.\textsuperscript{144} I use West’s text; all line numbers are for his edited text.

We find that, once again, the refrain has been graphically treated in the inscription.\textsuperscript{145} In the fair copy on the “face” of the stone, a space (about three letters’ worth) is inserted after each surviving instance of the refrain (lines 6, 16, 46). A mark of punctuation (∞) precedes the second instance of the refrain (line 11). The state of the stone does not allow us to observe the beginnings of the remaining instances of the refrain, but it seems likely that a similar mark preceded each of them. There is no such mark preceding the first instance of the refrain; one presumes this is so because it opens the poem and thus does not need to be

\textsuperscript{142} Bosanquet (1908-9) 339.
\textsuperscript{143} Bosanquet (1908-9) 340f.
\textsuperscript{144} West (1965) 151.
\textsuperscript{145} My observations are taken from the photographs at ABSA 15 (1908-9) plate XX.
set off from any preceding non-refrain text. The graphical treatment is less elaborate on the “back” of the stone. Here, there is no evidence of a mark preceding any instance of the refrain. The refrain text is, however, clearly distinguished from the non-refrain text of the poem: “The engraver of the Back set out his copy so as to cover the whole surface, beginning a fresh line for each stanza and each repetition of the refrain.”

Scheme. Here we have the sole example among our primary non-dramatic lyric texts of a refrain that is larger than the stanzas in its poem. Indeed, it resembles nothing so much as a complete song repeated over and over, each repetition being separated by inserted material.

Syntax. Very notable is the fact that, in at least one place, the non-refrain portion of the song is syntactically dependent upon the refrain. μολπῷ, the last word of the refrain at line 6, serves as the antecedent of the relative pronoun τὰν in line 7.

Meter. The refrain is iambic-aeolic, analyzed by West as 2\text{i}a \text{\textbar} \text{i}th \text{\textbar} 4\text{tr} \text{\textbar} \text{hi} \text{\textbar} \text{i}th. West compares this to the meter of the hymn to Heracles preserved in Archilochus fr. 324 and suggests that, “the Cretan poet has evidently incorporated something of a traditional cult acclamation.” At the same time, the stanza of our poem may also show signs of great antiquity, being composed of ionic dimeters, a measure that has been linked to cultic song. The close repetitions

---

146 Bosanquet (1908-9) 346.
148 West (1982) 124, 142. While most of the stanzas are based on iones a maiore (— — — ), the last stanza changes to a minore ( — — — ). Farley and Bremer (2001) ii, 3 suggest that this swith “will have been intentional and expressive, to underline the importance of the last stanza.” They also point out that “in Greek poetry of the fifth c. B.C. iones a minore were associated with processional songs.” One may add that the coincidence of a processional meter in the last stanza with its theme of vigorous motion (όρε, etc.) would be suggestive of some kind of mobile performance, were it not for the line 9f: στάντες ἀειδομέν τεόν ἄμφι βωμόν.
of ὥρε in lines 57–60, being set in ionic meter, may thus represent a very old charm or prayer. 149

Theme. As noted above, the refrain of the Hymn resembles a more or less complete hymn in itself 150: Zeus is named Kouros (line 1), named once with reference to his father (Κρόνειε, 2) 151; his function as leader of the gods is mentioned in what seems to be a standard hymnic relative clause (γὰν ὅς βέβακες, κτλ., 3ff.) 152; and we may compare χαίρε μοι... γέγαθε μολπά to a similar link between greeting and prayer involving the present song expressed in the Homeric Hymns. 153

There is at least one place in non-refrain portion of the Hymn where the speakers (the Curetes) describe their own musical performance:

τάν τοι κρέκομεν πακτίστι
μείζατες ἀμ', αἰγλούσιν
καὶ στάτες ἀείδομεν τεόν
ἀμφὶ βασιγὸν εὐερκή.

149 Cf. West (1965) 157ff., where ὥρε is taken to refer to the “springing up” of plant life, which the command hopes to achieve in this, a rite of fertility. Cf. also Harrison (1908-9) 337, who remarks that this use of ὥρε “lands us straight in the heart of primitive magic.”
150 Cf. the similar appearance of the longer of the surviving paean refrains, e.g. those of Pi. Pae. 2 and Philodamus Paean ad Dionysum.
151 But he is never named directly in the poem, and this stands out from the usual practice of traditional Greek hymnody. Cf. Furley and Breemer (2001) ii, 5.
152 Cf. West (1965) 151, on his emendation of γὰν ὅς for γάνος at line 3: “I avoid the difficult noun, supply the essential qualification of βέβακες, and restore the whole ephymnion to normal invocation structure with its typical relative clause following the vocative.” Furley and Bremer’s suggestion (2001, ii, 8f) that the inscription’s παγκρατές γάνος be read παγκρατές γάνος (“almighty splendour”) is no more satisfying in terms of grammar than West’s reading. Furthermore, while they may be correct in pointing out difficulties in West’s assumption that the upsilon in the inscription’s γάνος is the result of a misread breathing mark in the cutter’s hand copy, Furley and Bremer provide no account of their own for the letter’s appearance.
We may conclude that the substance of this performance is the content of the refrain of the *Hymn*. Once again, the material set within the refrain form is treated dramatically as a quotation. This dramatic treatment of the refrain text early in the *Hymn* suggests a desire to provide motivation for the continuance of the refrain throughout the rest of the poem.\(^{154}\)

If δαιμόνιον at line 4 includes the Curetes themselves\(^{155}\) then the term ἀγώμενος may refer to (among other things) Zeus’ role as the honorary chorus leader for the present poem.

\section*{Structure}

The refrain stands at the end of all the four surviving strophes of P.Oxy 2625 fr. 1(b) save the first. The first strophe may serve as an introduction for what follows, while the following strophes comprise the song of the nightingale mentioned at line 1.\(^{156}\)

**Meter.** The colometry of the strophe is not certain, but in general terms we are dealing with iambic-aecolic.\(^{157}\) The refrain itself is iambic. Assuming the first strophe follows the pattern revealed in the other three, ἰτω ἰτω χορός would metrically correspond to non-refrain material in line 3. Thus the refrain is closely tied to its metrical context.\(^{158}\)

**Theme.** Rutherford is almost certainly correct in his explanation of the content of the refrain in terms of birdsong as represented elsewhere in Greek

---

\(^{154}\) Cf. the similar dramatic treatment of the refrains in the first strophes of the *Erythraean Paean* (E text) and Philodamus *Paean in Dionysum*.

\(^{155}\) Cf. Bosanquet (1908–9) 351f. and West (1965) 156.

\(^{156}\) Rutherford (1995) 41. The refrain also appears three times in P.Oxy. 2625 fr. 2, and up to three times in frs. 3 and 6.


\(^{158}\) Cf. the integration of the μεσόμενον with the strophe in *Eryth. Paean* (version P, Α, D) above.
poetry.\textsuperscript{159} Again, the refrain is seen to play a dramatic role: this time, instead of presenting a ritual cry as an inset quotation, the refrain serves immediately to characterize the speaker by means of a typical noise. In this way, the refrain of this poem shows an affinity with the characterizing refrains of drama.\textsuperscript{160}

Rutherford points out that this is the only refrain in surviving lyric poetry that features a command to the chorus to “go”.\textsuperscript{161} But it should be recognized that the theme of this refrain is an appeal for the performance of the present song, and that this theme is commonly associated with refrains throughout Greek poetry.\textsuperscript{162}

§3. The functions of refrains in lyric

The main functions performed by lyric refrains can be divided into two broad categories: (1) intrinsic functions, i.e. those that rely on the essential qualities that attend all refrains regardless of context; and (2) extrinsic functions, i.e. those that rely upon an interaction between the refrain and its context.

The single great intrinsic function of the lyric refrain is that of emphasis. This is achieved by means of the essential qualities of any refrain: verbatim repetition of content and the distinction from non-refrain context that comes with this repetition. We can imagine that in the case of lyric, this emphasis would be especially strong, since a phrase of music would have been repeated along with the words repeated in the refrain. Surely words and music would have reinforced each other in the mind of the listener. Any number of themes could theoretically be selected for the special, emphatic treatment offered by the lyric refrain. Any and

\textsuperscript{159} Rutherford (1995) 42f.
\textsuperscript{160} See CHAPTER 6. One thinks immediately of $\beta\theta\epsilon\varepsilon\kappa\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\varepsilon\kappa$, κτλ at Frogs 209ff.
\textsuperscript{161} Rutherford (1995) 41.
\textsuperscript{162} Cf. the direct command in the refrain of Pi. fr. 128e, as well as the close conjunction of refrain with similar appeals in the non-refrain contexts of Eryth. Paean 1-3, Macedonicus Paean 1-2.
every poem could use the refrain to, for example, emphasize the overall theme particular to that poem. This seems to be exactly what is going on in Bacchylides fr. *18. But what is interesting is that the extant refrains of Greek lyric are, in fact, dominated by a very few themes.

One of the themes commonly treated in lyric refrains (and, as we shall see, in Greek refrains as a whole) is that of performance, specifically the performance of the poem containing the refrain itself. In the refrain of Pi. fr. 128e, the chorus is commanded to shout out a shrill cry of woe (ὄρθιον ἴάλεμον...κελαδήσατε). In Campbell fr. 931L, the chorus is enjoined to “go” (ἰτω ἵτω χορός), which probably refers to the performance of the poem at hand, especially if we take ἵτω here to be imitative of bird-song.163 Gods can likewise be enjoined to assist in the performance of a poem, even if only to serve as an audience: in the refrain of Hymn. Cur. the speaker bids Zeus to come and “rejoice in the music” (γέγαθε μολπᾶ). We may also put under this heading the refrain of Archil. fr. 324, which, if Schol. Pi. O.9.1ff. is right and this is a vocal imitation of a cithara, is another reference to performance. Finally, it could be that instances of the accusative case in refrains not otherwise explained by syntax, e.g. ἵμαν ἵμαν in Sappho fr. 111, may imply a verb of speaking, and this again would be a reference to the performance of the song at hand.

Another theme that commonly receives emphasis in lyric refrains is the naming of gods. Examples would include all refrains containing forms of the paean and hymnæus cries, assuming these are divine names.164 Even discounting ritual cries that may or may not name deities, there are several clear case of gods

---

164 Whether or not these cries originated from the names of divinities is controversial. For the view that they are, cf. Weil (1889) 325 ff.; Diggle (1970) 151, 155-8. For different interpretations, cf. Lamer (1932) 381; Schwyzer (1939) i, 522 n.5; Frisk (1970) s.v. “2. ἵμαν”; Chantraine (1933) 174.

No matter how we take ritual cries such as παιαν and ἵμαινα — whether as divine names or as lexically meaningless exclamations — their accommodation stands as a major function in extant lyric refrains. As I have argued above, this accommodation is an example of the artistic incorporation of subliterary material within literary poetry. This is especially apparent in Pi. *Pae.* 2 and Philod. *Scarph. Pae. Dion.* , where the refrain contains the larger form of the extended paean prayer. It is clear that this placement of subliterary material in the emphatic form of refrain is at least in part motivated by a desire to relate literary paean and hymenaeus to an existing subliterary context, and to borrow authority from that context.

To this extent, then, the refrains of paean and hymenaeus in Greek lyric poetry function to emphasize generic identity. A separate question is whether the authors of literary paean and hymenaeus made an identification of these genres with the refrain form *per se*. The refrain is without a doubt very common in literary paean; likewise it seems to have been common in hymenaeus, if one takes into account examples of that genre in drama (*Ar. Av.* 1720-54, *Pax* 1331-66). Another fact that would seem to support an identification of literary paean with the refrain form would be the disproportionately high number of refrains occurring in paean compared to those occurring in other genres: paeans account for 8 of the 14 texts in our lyric refrain corpus.

But we should not be too quick to make the identification. We have to acknowledge that the domination of our lyric refrain corpus by paean is at least in

\(^ {165} \) Rutherford (2001) 403f.
part explained by two factors that have nothing to do with the refrain form itself. First, it is only by accident that we have the four paean refrain texts by Pindar that make up a full half of the extant paean refrains of lyric. The loss of a single papyrus, P. Oxy. 5, 841, would certainly have had an important impact on our understanding of paean refrains. Not only would our lyric refrain corpus have been reduced by three (Pi. Pae. 2, 4 and 5); we would have no example of a paean by Pindar whose refrain contained the word παιάν, nor any absolutely clear example of a lyric refrain (of any genre) used in a triadic context, nor any usable evidence for how Pindar related refrains to their non-refrain contexts. The second factor that has influenced the distribution by genre of our lyric refrain corpus is the fact that the four lyric paean refrains not by Pindar are all from monumental inscriptions. We may presume that this high rate of inscriptional representation has to do with the special religious character of the paean, its ties to specific cults and the obvious motivations for communities to have had paeans publicly displayed. No such motivation existed for the inscription of, for example, hymenaeus. The dominance of our lyric refrain corpus by paeans cannot itself prove an identification of the paean genre with the refrain form per se.

The most important reason not to make such an identification is, of course, that there are so many examples of paean and hymenaeus that simply do not feature refrains. On the other hand, the sheer number of examples from these two genres that do feature refrains forces us to admit that the use of the form was very common in those genres. And as we shall see in Chapter 4, our earliest attested applications of the ancient Greek term for “refrain” (ἐφόμνον) are in connection with paean. It seems, therefore, safe to conclude that, while it is too

166 I add this last point because so little of the non-refrain context survives in Pi. Pae. 21.
much to say that the mere appearance of the refrain form indicated genre, or that
it was obligatory for any genre, nevertheless a close association existed between
the refrain form and the genres of paean and hymenaeus. If we cannot explain
this association in genetic terms (derivation from subliterary refrain) or in terms
of strict generic identification, we can explain it by pointing out, as I have
endeavored in this chapter to do, that the refrain form served admirably to treat
the ritual cries special to hymenaeus and paean.
As we turn to refrains found in drama, our first question is, as before, how do these refrains contribute to the poems in which they appear? In the case of drama, we may be more precise by asking how these refrains contribute to their immediate context within the larger context of a play, that immediate context usually being a particular lyric passage. The second question before us is, to what extent is the use of refrain in drama informed by its use in non-dramatic lyric as discussed in Chapter 5? This question is vital, since I have argued that non-dramatic lyric, specifically monostrophic lyric, is the formal “home” of the refrain form in Greek poetry. We shall see in this chapter that dramatic refrains as a rule follow the lead set by non-dramatic lyric refrains, both in the way they serve to incorporate independent lyric genres within the dramatic lyric context, and in the way they build upon and expand the functionality of non-dramatic lyric refrains.

I begin with (§1) a preliminary discussion of some features of the refrain form peculiar to drama. Then I shall proceed to outline the main functions of dramatic refrain, beginning with (§2) the use of refrains to mark lyric passages as belonging to independent lyric genres. Following this, I shall offer (§3) an extended discussion of what I call “emotive” refrains, which I see as the most important example of the extension of lyric refrain functionality within tragedy. In this discussion I will focus on the refrains of Aeschylus Persae, Septem, and Supplïces. The second important functional development will be dealt with an (§4) a discussion of the use by Euripides of what I call “characterizing” refrains in Ion, Electra and Troades. In all these cases, I shall be concerned with establishing the
links between the functionality of refrains in drama with that of refrains in non-dramatic lyric.

§1. Features of the refrain form peculiar to drama

Antistrophic structure and refrains. The basic structure of non-dramatic lyric is monostrophic, triadic or astrophic. As we saw in CHAPTER 5, non-dramatic lyric refrains are found in all three of these structural contexts, although the form is most frequently used in monostrophic poems, and it seems to have developed out of the monostrophic structure. Dramatic lyric, on the other hand, is based on a quite different structure, one in which strophe is paired with corresponding antistrophe, and songs are composed of a succession of strophic pairs, each pair unique with respect to length and metrical character. This basic difference in strophic structure has several implications for how refrains are used in drama, and for our study of them. First, the refrains in drama are rarely repeated more than once. (Exceptions are almost all found in comedy, in monostrophic or astrophic contexts. The single exception in tragedy, Aesch. Ag. 121ff, will be discussed below.) Consequently, we often see dramatic songs in which a refrain appears in only one part of the song. Songs which feature refrains throughout are either composed of one strophic pair (Aesch. Sept. 966ff; Eur. Ba. 862ff, 977ff), or offer a series of strophic pairs, each of which is attended by a different repeated refrain (Aesch. Ag. 1072ff). Finally, the fact that the refrain in the antistrophic context is

---

1 West(1982) 78f.
2 These are not the only schemes that are conceivable in an antistrophic context. Dramatic poets could have treated the strophic pair itself as a unit to which a refrain could be appended, much as Pindar in Pae. 2 and 4 appends an instance of the refrain to each triad rather than to the triad's constituent parts. Such a scheme would, as in Pindar's paeans, successfully imitate in drama a monostrophic structure, where a continually repeated refrain seems most at home. No example of this is found in extant drama.
repeated only once necessarily makes it more difficult to establish the texts of refrains.\(^3\)

**Balanced cries versus refrains.** Our view of refrains in drama is complicated by what I call “balanced cries”. These are lexically meaningless exclamations, usually quite short (\(\text{êê, aïaï} \)) but sometimes consisting of several syllables (\(\text{êëêëêë} \)), that occur in corresponding positions in both strophe and antistrophe. We find an example of these balanced cries in the second strophic pair of the second stasimon of the *Persae*, ll. 568-583:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τοὶ δὲ ἄρα πρωτομόροιο} \\
\text{φεῦ} \\
\text{ληφθέντες πρὸς ἀναγκας} \\
\text{ηὲ} \\
\text{ἀκτὰς ἀμφὶ Κυρείας} \\
\text{όα} \\
\text{ἐρρανταῖ στένε καὶ δακιὰζου, βαρὺ δὲ ἀμβώσασον} \\
\text{οὐράνι’ ἁχη,} \\
\text{όα,} \\
\text{τεῖνε δὲ δυσβάνκτον βοῶτιν τάλαναν αὐδᾶιν} \\
\text{γυαπτόμενοι δὲ ἀλὰ δειναὶ} \\
\text{φεῦ} \\
\text{σκύλλουται πρὸς ἀναιῶν} \\
\text{ηὲ} \\
\text{παιῶν τὰς ἀμαίντου,} \\
\text{όα,} \\
\text{πεἰθεὶ δὲ ἀνθρα δόμος στερηθεὶς, τοκέες δὲ ἀπαῖδες} \\
\text{δαιμόνι’ ἁχη,} \\
\text{όα,} \\
\text{δυρόμενοι γέροντες τε πάν ὃ ἦ κλύουσιν ἄλγος.}
\end{align*}
\]

While these cries do, strictly speaking, fit the definition of “refrain” given in **CHAPTER 1**, it is clear that they are far removed from the refrains we have discussed so far, and I will not be dealing with them directly in this study. The reasons for this are many: they are so brief and disruptive that it seems most

\(^3\) See West (1982) 98f on the general difficulty of textual criticism in antistrophic contexts.
reasonable to treat them *extra metrum*; they seem not so much musical stylizations of exclamations as genuine exclamations that have no real place in the music of the ode, and which it is difficult to imagine could have any kind of independent musical existence; unlike the cries associated with paean and hymenaeus (e.g. ἵνα ἀιωνίων ἀνεργίαν), these dramatic cries serve no discernable function, such as generic identification, beyond mere expression of emotion; the sheer numbers in which they may be employed (the above example is, it must be admitted, an extreme case) suggests that we are not dealing with multiple instances of a form such a refrain, but rather with a larger, more complex form that emphasizes the balance of strophe with antistrophe; furthermore, this complex form appears only in drama, and only in relation to strophic pairs, which suggests that we are dealing with a special form specific to drama, and not merely a complex version of the refrain form. Finally, we note that this form is employed pretty evenly throughout tragedy and is used by Sophocles, whose extant plays do not provide us with any example of refrain proper. Despite these differences, both balanced cries and refrains do share a major function in drama in that they both indicate a state of high emotion on the part of the speaker. (In the example above, the Chorus has just heard the Messenger’s speech.) As we shall see, balanced cries are not infrequently used in close conjunction with refrains to achieve this end. Finally, the fact that these balanced cries share some aspects of functionality and form

---

4The following list is meant to illustrate, and should not be taken as complete: Aeschylus, *Persae* 117/122, 268/274, 568ff/576ff, 652/657, 1043/1051, 1053/1061; *Septem* 150/158, 327/339, 966/978; *Agamemnon* 1072/1076, 1136/1146. Sophocles, *Ajax* 348/356, 393/412, 694, 706; *Electra* 830/842; *Antigone* 1261ff/1284ff; *Trachiniae* 1003/1014. Euripides, *Alcestis* 215/228, 872ff/889ff; *Suppliants* <77>/85, 806/819, 1127/1133; *Electra* 114/129; *Troades* 1287/1294, 1302ff/1317ff; *Ion* 153/170; *Orestes* 1352/1357; *Rhesus* 454/820. Aristophanes, *Wasps* <302>/315; *Peace* 459ff/486ff; *Birds* 737ff/770ff.
with refrains, and the fact that they often occur in the body of strophes, may account for the rarity with which we find medial refrains in drama.

One of the questions we must address in relation to refrains in drama is how to reconcile their formal function within a lyric ode with their dramatic function, i.e. the way they represent speech dramatically set outside the musical context of the ode. This same question can be applied to balanced cries. By considering how these two roles intersect in two passages of the *Septem*, we will gain some perspective for addressing the same issue with respect to refrains elsewhere.

With battle imminent, the Chorus of the *Septem* embark on a series of prayers and expressions of their anxiety. They pray to a succession of gods: all the gods (109-15), Zeus (116-26), Athena (127-30), Poseidon (130-4), Ares (135-9), Aphrodite (140-4) Lyceian Apollo (145-9), and Artemis (149-50). At this point the Chorus' song passes into its second pair of strophes at 151, and is interrupted by the first instance of the balanced cry ß ß ß ¶. The immediate cause for this interruption of the Chorus' song of prayer is explained in the following line: the Chorus are distracted by the sound of chariots circling the city (ἀρμάτων ἀμφὶ πόλιν κλώ, 152). The Chorus then resume their prayer, this time addressing Hera. This prayer in turn peters out into rapid, brief questions asking what shall be the city’s fate? (156f) Again, the Chorus emit the cry ̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄ (157), this time in alarm at the stones being thrown by the besiegers (ἀκροβόλων ἐπάλξεις λιθῶς ἐρχέται, 158). Within the drama, then, both instances of the cry ̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄ are spontaneous reactions to events beyond the control of the Chorus. The cry’s identical position with respect to strophe and antistrophe would seem motivated by a desire to emphasize its emotive effect rather than to represent any independent lyric form, e.g. the use of regular cries in prayer.
At 166 the prayer resumes, this time directed at all the gods and set within the third and final strophic pair of the ode. Each strophe begins with the particle ἰὼ followed by a direct address to the gods: ἰὼ, παναλκεῖς θεοί (166), ἰὼ φίλοι δαίμονες (174). ἰὼ is an exclamation frequently used when invoking aid (Sept. 96; Soph. Phil. 736, ἰὼ ἰὼ παιάν Trach. 222; ἰὼ Βάκχαι Eur. Ba. 578); here it clearly is also used to express grief (cf. ἰὼ μοι μοι Soph. OC 199). Again, the use of ἰὼ at the beginning of both strophe and antistrophe is meant to emphasize the pathetic cries of the Chorus by means of distinctive repetition. Finally, we may note that the use of balanced cries in the second and third (but not the first) strophic pairs of this ode follows a trend we shall see elsewhere: lyric ephymnia in dramatic odes tend to occur later rather than sooner within those odes. This we may explain by the tendency for ephymnia to be used to represent a rising of emotion throughout the course of an ode.

We find a similar use of balanced cries to mark moments of particular grief or despair at lines 327/339 of the same play. In this case the Chorus are describing the evils that befall any conquered city. When they come to a subject with which they are intimately concerned, i.e. the fate of the conquered women, they interrupt their description with a cry: τὰς δὲ κεχειρωμένας ἄγεσθαι / ἐ̣ ἐ̣, νέας τε καὶ παλαιᾶς (326f). Again in the antistrophe, the women are overcome with emotion when, in order to speak of the many misfortunes that attend a fallen city, they must utter the terrifying hypothetical clause that is now not so hypothetical: πολλὰ γὰρ, εὖτε πτόλεις δαμασθῆ, / ἐ̣ ἐ̣, δυστυχῇ τε πράσσει (338f).5 Once again, the

---

5 Hutchinson (1985) ad loc. suggests that, whereas ἐ̣ ἐ̣ at 327 accompanies a clause dealing with women, at 339 “it marks the beginning of the wider theme” of the fate of fallen cities. While it is true that the Chorus go on at this point to speak of aspects of defeat not pertaining exclusively to themselves, I argue that it is their sudden identification with the hypothetical city of line 338 that motivates the second instance of their cry.
insertion of the cry marks the moment at which the Chorus realize that they are speaking of their own situation. As in the case of the balanced cries at 150/158 above, these cries of ὑπό are represented as spontaneous expressions of distress despite their formal role within the context of the strophic pair.

*The length of dramatic refrains.* Perhaps balanced cries occupy a niche that would otherwise be filled by short (one line) refrains. In any event, short refrains are the exception rather than the rule in drama, and tend either to be associated with genres independent of drama (Linus song at Aesch. *Ag.* 121ff, Iacchus and Hymenaeus in Aristophanes); or they fulfill the exclamatory function normally taken on by balanced cries, either by describing such cries (ἄπρεγδα ἄπρεγδα μάλα γοηδνά at *Persae* 1057) or by calling for such cries (δολολύζατε ἐν ἐπὶ μολπαῖς at *Eum.* 1043). We find refrains that are often quite long — up to 15 lines long, as at *Eum.* 778ff — to the point that we may hesitate to call them “refrains” at all: perhaps “repeated stanzas” would make more sense in these cases.6 This is especially true in cases (as in the *Eum.* passage just cited) when the “refrain” constitutes the entire lyric portion of an epirrhetic structure. But there are reasons to consider even these long repetitions to be refrains. To begin with, it is difficult to find a meaningful cut-off point at which we stop calling repetitions “refrains”. Second, we have evidence that such long repetitions were considered along with shorter ones to be refrains in antiquity. The scholium to the repeated portion of the Erinyes’ “binding song” uses the term ἐφύμινον with reference to the passage: Schol. Vet. *Eum.* 328ff ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ἐφύμινῳ αὐτῷ χρήται. This is the standard term used by scholiasts for “refrain” of any size, and probably reflects Alexandrian scholarly usage.7

---

6 See my discussion of the *Hymnus Curetum* in Chapter 5.
7 See Chapter 2.
The meter of tragic refrains. The great length of many tragic ephymnia allows for a more complex metrical character than we see in the typically shorter refrains of lyric outside drama. Moreover, the heterogeneity of meter that we find throughout tragedy is represented even in shorter tragic refrains. Nevertheless, there is a certain degree of continuity between the meter of tragic lyric refrains and that of non-dramatic lyric refrains. In Chapter 5 I pointed out the prevalence of aeolic and iambic meters in the refrains of non-dramatic lyric, and I suggested that this prevalence indicates a strong link between the refrain form and the aeolic-iambic metrical tradition. To a great extent, this relationship is carried over into tragedy. Of 17 separate instances of refrain in tragedy, 12 exhibit a metrical character that is at least in part iambic, aeolic or both: Pers. 663, 1057; Sept. 975ff; Suppl. 117ff, 141ff, 889ff; Ag. 1072f, 1081f; Eum. 328ff, 778ff, 837ff; Bacch. 877ff, 991ff. Also, as in non-dramatic lyric, we occasionally see refrains used in dactylic contexts: Ag. 121; Eum. 1043. Tragic lyric seems, then, to be following the lead of lyric in general so far as refrain meter is concerned. There is, however, one area in which the refrain form breaks new metrical ground in tragedy: tragic refrains frequently consist of, and frequently are found in contexts consisting of, dochmaics: Pers. 663; Sept. 975ff; Suppl. 117ff, 889ff; Ag. 1081f; Eum. 778ff, 837ff; Bacch. 991ff. This meter is, as has been pointed out before, associated with drama in general and tragedy in particular, and always coincides with moments of emotional intensity. The association of dochmaics with a full half of the instances of tragic refrain reinforces the point I make below that one of the prime functions of the refrain in drama is as an indicator of heightened emotions on the part of the speaker. There is also one case (Ag. 1489ff) where the similarly excited anapaestic meter is used to express heightened emotion. A final note: the

---

common use of tragic refrains featuring iambic coincides with Aeschylus’ favoring of iambic lyrics, and this may explain in part why we find so many refrains in Aeschylus.\(^9\)

**Scheme.** Almost all examples of refrain in tragedy occur at the end of strophes. (I have already raised the possibility above that the tendency of balanced cries to fall within the boundaries of the strophe may account for the scarcity of medial refrains in tragedy.) There are two exceptions. The first of these is *Pers.* 1057=1064, which is a medial refrain; but its similarity in content to the exclamations we find in balanced cries probably accounts for its use in the middle of the strophe. The second exception is the Linus refrain of *Ag.* 121ff, which occurs at the end of strophe, antistrophe and epode; this scheme is probably meant to imitate that of a monostrophic poem with a refrain after each strophe. While tragedy is a bit less free in how it deploys the refrain with respect to the strophe, it continues the tendency seen in non-dramatic lyric to favor the use of end refrains.

*Distribution of refrains in drama.* Aeschylus has been noted before now for his relatively frequent use of refrains.\(^{10}\) How are we to account for this? Critics who have sought to answer this question have tended to offer one of two explanations. The first of these is that Aeschylus consciously employed formal elements, including refrain, taken from ritual in order to serve his own dramatic purposes.\(^{11}\) A second, separate explanation is that the refrain form is a feature of primitive tragedy, and it is only to be expected that we find it most in the earliest playwright for which we have surviving plays.\(^{12}\) The first of these explanations

---


\(^{10}\) Stanford (1942) 85; Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) ad 117-22=128-33.


\(^{12}\) Horneffer (1914) 15, n.3; Reiner (1938) 32; Faenkel (1950) ad *Ag.* 121.
rests upon the assumption that the refrain form is a standard feature of sub-literary song; I have already argued against this assumption in CHAPTER 4, and I will take up the issue again as I go through individual refrain texts below. I will attempt to answer the second explanation here.

While it is impossible either to prove or disprove the theory that tragic refrains are derived from a primitive precursor to tragedy, it is permitted to ask how well it fits the given facts. It is true that the overwhelming majority of surviving tragic refrains occur in Aeschylus: of the 17 total instances of tragic refrain, 14 appear among his seven extant plays. We may compare this to zero instances of refrain in Sophocles’ seven extant plays, and three instances in the 19 surviving plays of Euripides. If the tragic refrain form is a feature of primitive tragedy, we might expect it to decline in frequency at a more or less steady rate; what we see instead is an abrupt halt in its use, and then what seems to be a slight resurgence late in the fifth century. The notion that the few instances of refrain in Euripides are symptomatic of the archaizing tendency late in his career only begs the question, why this form now? (And can we discount the fact that Aristophanes uses refrains at ten places in four of his eleven extant plays?) Our consternation only grows when we consider the distribution of refrains within Aeschylus’ surviving work. Of the seven extant plays attributed to him, five contain at least one instance of refrain; of these five, three (Suppl., Ag., Eum.) contain at least three instances of refrain each. Most of Aeschylus’ refrains occur, therefore, in his later, rather than his earlier, surviving plays: this is a trend that does not support a theory by which the refrain form is a primitive element. The absence of any refrains in Sophocles’ extant work is all the more striking when we remember that most of Aeschylus’ refrains occur in plays that were produced at a time when we know Sophocles was
writing. It seems we must simply accept that Aeschylus favored the refrain form for his own reasons as an individual author. What these reasons were can only become apparent when we study the refrains themselves in context.

§2. Use of refrains to represent independent lyric genres

The function of the refrain in drama most obviously connected to non-dramatic lyric is its use in the representation within drama of independent lyric genres. We find this as Eur. Ion 112-43 (paean) and Tr. 308-40 (hymenaeus); Ar. Pax 1329-59 (hymenaeus), Av. 1731-54 (hymenaeus) and Ra. 398-413 (iacchus, possibly dithyramb). We may also wish to include in this list Aesch. Ag. 104-59; this passage presents special problems and will be dealt with separately. All the passages in Euripides and Aristophanes (and perhaps Aesch. Ag. 104-59) are presented as song within their dramatic contexts, and it is certain that the use of the refrain form, in conjunction with paean-, hymenaeus- and iacchus-cries is meant to emphasize the identity of these passages as lyric song independent of dramatic lyric itself. We should note, however, that independent lyric — including genres commonly featuring the refrain form in non-dramatic examples — is often represented in drama without refrains. The use of the refrain to mark independent lyric is, therefore, especially emphatic. We saw in CHAPTER 5 that non-dramatic lyric refrains tend to emphasize their content in relation to the rest of the poem; in drama, the emphatic function of the refrain is broadened to emphasize whole lyric passages with respect to the larger context of the play. We see this not only in the use of refrain to represent independent lyric genres, but

13 Aeschylus won first prize over Sophocles with a tetralogy including Supplices according to P. Oxy. 2256.
14 See appendix on refrain in dithyramb.
also in their use to mark moments of particularly intense emotion, as we shall see in the following section. It is possible, of course, that dramatists highlighted independent lyric genres in an attempt to arouse emotions specifically associated with particular lyric genres.16

In taking on the refrain from non-dramatic lyric, dramatic lyric often translates what in normal circumstances would be a monostrophic structure into antistrophic structure. This we see in Eur. *Ion* (112-43), *Tr.* 308-40, and Ar. *Av.* 1731-54: in each case the lyric passage in question is composed of a single strophic pair with matching refrains. But comedy seems to have been readier to accept the monostrophic structure of non-dramatic lyric with little or no alterations. We find what appears to be a true monostrophic structure in the three strophes, each with initial-refrain, at Ar. *Ra.* 398-413. Ar. *Pax* 1329-59 stands as a song of irregular strophic structure in the MS. Attempts have been made to regularize it into a comprehensible monostrophic arrangement; in any case it is clearly not a strictly antistrophic song.

A very unusual example of how what was probably a monostrophic refrain form is adapted to dramatic lyric is found at Aesch. *Ag.* 104-59. The scheme by which this refrain is deployed is unique in tragedy; indeed it is unparalleled in Greek poetry. As we have seen, the usual practice is to place refrains after (or within) both strophe and antistrophe of a matching strophic pair. Here the one-line refrain is placed after each term (strophe, antistrophe, epode) of a singleton triad. This attachment of a refrain to uneven stanzas is seen nowhere else in strophic Greek poetry. Refrains are used with triads in non-dramatic lyric, as we saw in Pindar’s paeans discussed in *CHAPTER 5*; but in Pindar’s case the refrains

16 Cf. Haldane (1965) 33f. in regard to Aeschylus’ use of independent lyric forms to this end.
occur only once per triad, after the triad. Each of Pindar’s triads is, therefore, functionally equivalent to a single stanza with respect to the refrain, and it seems clear that Pindar is following the custom of monostrophic lyric, which attaches the refrain to succeeding stanzas — in that case strophes — of equal length and metrical shape. Here, in the parodos of the *Agamemnon*, the “stanzas” to which the refrain is attached are uneven, but again the intent seems to be to recall the practice of monostrophic lyric. I will argue below that this portion of the parodos is imitative of non-dramatic monostrophic lyric. In view of the normal practice of Aeschylus (and drama as a whole) to incorporate refrains into an antistrophic structure, it seems likely that *Ag*. 104-59 stands as an isolated experiment in form, one never followed up in later drama.

At this point it is convenient to consider just what the refrain at Aesch. *Ag*. 121ff. is doing. Fraenkel identifies *aiλυνον* here as an instance of an old element of “liturgical song”, and accepts the theory, as put forth by Deubner, that such refrains come from magical repetitions in cult, and represent an early stage in poetic development.\(^1\) He does not specify how this section of the parodos is characterized by the use of the refrain; he does, however, detect a magical quality in it, though he does not offer a motivation for the Chorus to use magic at this point. Instead, the magical quality of the refrain “serves to heighten the effect of a ‘promise of destiny’.” Owen goes further by insisting that the Chorus of the *Agamemnon* are functioning as a chorus within the drama. In this parodos they sing something “like an incantation”, and their very singing influences the action of the play.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Fraenkel (1950) ad 121; Deubner (1919) 400.

\(^2\) Owen (1952) 65, 67.
Other critics identify the refrain as coming from the Linus song, a type of song first mentioned at Il. 18.570. This use of the Linus song has been explained in very general terms: the Linus song is sad, and Ag. 104ff. is meant to be sad as well. Moritz has suggested a more specific and interesting explanation. The refrain of Ag. 121ff. is itself a mixture of both sorrow (αιλιον) and hope (τό θέ αυτό μικάτω), which corresponds to a similar ambiguity in each of the three elements of the triads of the passage. Furthermore, the mythical Linus, whom Moritz relates to the “problematic sacrificial aspect of harvest”, parallels the figure of Iphigenia in the Agamemnon.

Another possible avenue for arriving at an understanding of the associations which the refrain at Ag. 121ff. might bring to its context is the consideration of the meter of the passage. The triad is dactylic throughout and, like many other Aeschylean dactylic strophes, it contains scattered iambic cola. Well in line with this context, the refrain is analysed as 5 da, with a caesura after D that separates the αἰλιον cry of distress from the spondaic prayer for a good outcome that follows in the second half of the line.

The dactylic character of the triad is of special interest because it seems it may derive from citharodic nomoi. At Aristophanes Frogs 1264ff, Euripides offers a slew of choice lines by Aeschylus in order to show the metrical repetitiousness of

---

19 It is not critical to my argument whether λίνοι... καλῶν at Il. 18.570 refers to the linus song genre or to Linus, the subject of the song at hand. The prevalence of song about Linus, along with its associations with citharody, as we shall see when discussing Hesiod fr. 305, amounts to a genre for all practical purposes. Origins are not relevant here; what is relevant is the emotional and formal associations with song about Linus, i.e. “linus song”, and how these might have been used by Aeschylus for effect. See Haüßler (1974) for an argument that the mythological figure Linus pre-dates the genre of linus song.

20 Haldane (1965) 38, who speaks of a “Linus dirge”.


22 Parker (2001) 39 suggests the dactylic character of the passage was meant, in conjunction with the theme of the Trojan War, to call to mind epic verse.
that poet’s lyrics. These lines are by and large dactylic, and Euripides emphasizes their monotony and predictability by interspersing between them a repeated dactylic line ιη κόπον οὐ πελάθεισ ἐπ’ ἀρωγάν. When Dionysus declares that he will be made ill if subjected to more of these repetitious lines (βουβωνιῶ, 1280), Euripides tells him to control himself until he “shall hear another song set worked up from the citharodic nomoi” (στάσιν μελῶν / ἐκ τῶν κιθαρῳδικῶν νόμων εἰργασμένην, 1281f). The fact that Euripides identifies the preceding (and following) Aeschylean lines as citharodic in character, and the fact that they are all metrically similar as is emphasized by the use of the repeated ιη κόπον, κτλ, points to an association between dactylic lyric and citharody. Among these sample Aeschylean lines is the first line of the triad before us, κύριος εἴμι θροεῖν ὄδιον κράτος αἰσιον ἀνδρῶν (Ar. Ra. 1276). It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that this portion of the parodos is metrically inspired by, perhaps even consciously imitative of, citharodic song.23

If, as I have suggested, Ag. 104-59 is a rare example of citharodic style song in tragedy, then there may be more grounds for identifying the refrain as one associated with linus song. At Il. 18.569f. the boy singing the linus song “citharizes on a shrill phorminx” (φόρμιχγγι λυγείη / ἱμερίνεν κιθάριζε). And the scholium to 18.570 reports some lines of Hesiod that support the association of linus song and citharody (fr. 305, M-W):

δυ δή [Linus]. ὃσοι βροτοί εἴσιν ἀοίδοι καὶ κιθαρισταί,
πάντες μὲν θρηνεύσιν ἐν εἰλάπτιναις τε χοροῖς τε,
ἀρχόμενοι δὲ Λίνον καὶ λόγοις καλέονσιν.

It seems possible, therefore, that the refrain of Ag. 104-59 is meant to represent that passage as a genuine example of Linus song, or at least to suggest to the audience the sadness normally associated with that genre. What is not clear is

whether we are to understand the Chorus to be represented as performing a linus song within the drama. The association of that genre with citharody suggests not. Much more likely is the explanation that the sad associations of citharodic linus song reinforce the sadness of the narrative being related by the Chorus at this point in the play. The refrains emphasize this sadness not only through their connection to linus song, but also by illustrating the recurring, centripetal thoughts of the Chorus as it goes over an unpleasant story with which it has long been familiar. This we may relate to the “emotive” function of dramatic refrain to be discussed in the next section. Finally, the apparent interruption of Calchas’ direct-speech prophecy by the refrain at 139 is an example in drama of the “quasi-dramatic” function of non-dramatic lyric refrains as seen in CHAPTER 5.24 Here, of course, there is already an explicit dramatic context for the Chorus’ song; but the refrain at 139 shares with non-dramatic refrains their tendency to represent the emotional reaction of the speaker to narrative in the non-refrain context. In any case, the refrain at Ag. 121ff. is clearly drawing upon the non-dramatic lyric refrain tradition.

§3. “Emotive” function of refrains in tragedy

In this section I deal with a function of dramatic refrains especially important for tragic lyric. This is the “emotive” function, by which I mean the use of the refrain form to indicate a state of intense emotion, usually on the part of the speaker.25 This is a function obviously derived from the non-dramatic lyric

---

24 The first refrain at 121 may also be in reaction to what has just been narrated. Cf. Thiel (1993) 52.
25 Repetition is frequently a sogn of intense emotion in tragedy. Cf. Stanford (1983) 93ff, especially 95-97. Broadhead (1960) ad Pers. 928-30: “Repetitions... are esp. common in emotional scenes... Eur. is very fond of the device, which is comparatively rare in Aesch.”
practice of using the refrain form to contain ecstatic cries. It is also related to the non-dramatic lyric “quasi-dramatic” refrain function, whereby the refrain is used to emphasize the subjective reaction of the speaker to events described in the non-refrain context. Here I will focus on five passages from Aeschylus that serve as good illustrations of this function of dramatic refrain.

**Persae 663-671**

In the second stasimon, the Chorus sing an incantation to draw up the spirit of Darius. The refrain appears after the third strophe and antistrophe.

$$\text{Πράξεις 663-671}$$

In the second stasimon, the Chorus sing an incantation to draw up the spirit of Darius. The refrain appears after the third strophe and antistrophe.
ἔσκειν, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν εὖ ποδοῦχει. ἥε.

βαλλήν, ἀρχαῖος  ἱστ. ᾱ.κ.τ.  ἔβλο' ἐπ' ἀκρον κόρυμβον ὄχθου, 660
κροκόβαπτον ποδὸς εὐμαρεὶν ἀείρων,  βασιλείου τύρας
φάλαρον πυφαινκων.  βάσκε πάτερ ἄκακε Δαριάν, οἱ.

ὁπώς αἰαίη  ἱστ. ᾱ.κτ.  665
κλύση νέα τ’ ἄχη,  δέσποτα δεσποτῶν φάνηθα.
Στυγία γάρ τις ἐπ’ ἀχλῶν πεπόταται.
669  νεολαία γάρ ἡθη
670  κατὰ πᾶσ’ ὅλωλεν.
βάσκε πάτερ ἄκακε Δαριάν, οἱ.

673  αἰαὶ αἰαὶ’  ἱστ. ἐπωδός.
ο’ πολύκλαυτε φίλοισι βανῶν,
675  τί τάδε, δυνάστα, δυνάστα, ὁ’
περίσσα δέδομα δι’ γοεν’ ἀμάρτια;
πάσαι γά τάδ’
ἐξεφύτων τρίτοκαλμοι
680  νάες ἀνας ἀναις.

**Meter.** Broadhead analyzes the refrain as an iambic dimeter (highly resolved) with οἱ being understood as an exclamation extra metrum; this seems reasonable given that the third strophic pair is composed mainly of choriambics, often paired with iambics or syncopated iambics (cretic, baccheus). This choriambic element, along with the dochmaics that begin the strophe, as well as the ionics elsewhere in the stasimon, probably lend an air of excitement and fear. More pertinent to our interest than a precise metrical classification of this refrain, however, is its

---

26 Broadhead (1960) 290f.
long chain of short syllables. Nothing in the rest of the ode prepares us for this, and so it may be a metrical expression of the high pitch of the Chorus’ upset. This conclusion is somewhat supported by the fact that Aeschylus tends not to resolve his lyric iambics.\textsuperscript{27} As we shall see, he often places runs of short syllables within refrains (though these are usually analyzed as dochmaics); most of these case fall, as does this one, at moments of great emotion.

\textit{Theme}. It has been assumed that the use of the refrain form in this song conjuring Darius from the dead is determined by “a precedent in non-dramatic ritual”, i.e. a refrain form used in magic.\textsuperscript{28} One might ask why, if the refrain form is so inextricably linked to necromancy, it is employed only in the third and final strophic pair of the ode, the whole of which is clearly represented as a magical incantation? I shall argue that the refrain form is used in this ode as one of several elements that signal the rising level of the Chorus’ emotions.

The ode begins with introductory anapests in which the Chorus accede to Atossa’s commands and begin to address the chthonian gods, including Earth and Hermes, in a general sort of way (623-632). At this point the antistrophic portion of the song begins. In Strophe 1, the Chorus are distracted from their project and wonder aloud whether their cries can be heard by those below the ground (634-9); but in the following antistrophe they resume their spell, again addressing Earth and the other chthonian gods (639-46). Strophe and Antistrophe 2 mark a shift to a more specific and more fervent appeal: Darius is named for the first time in the ode (651) and the Chorus cite his excellence as a king. An increased level of emotion is signaled by the repetition of terms (\textit{Aidpves} at 649, 650; \textit{thetai}στωρ at 654, 655) that is enhanced by their correspondence within strophe and

\textsuperscript{27} West (1982) 100.
\textsuperscript{28} Moritz (1979) 187. See Broadhead (1960) 302 for an attempt to link the use of refrain in this ode to comparative evidence from Australian aborigines.
antistrophe. Likewise the Chorus emit their first nonsensical cry of the ode, ἂ, at the end of strophe and antistrophe.

At this point we reach an even greater level of excitement in the third strophic pair. We may imagine that the charm is showing signs of working: this may account for the details of Darius’ dress given by the Chorus (659-62). The tendency towards repetition shown in the previous strophic pair is now growing stronger as repetitions become closer: βαλλήν, ἄρχαιος / βαλλήν (657f); δέσποτα δέσποτου (666). It is here that the Chorus are at the height of anticipation, and so it is here that their bare command to Darius that he appear is given emphasis by means of the refrain form. When the moment of climax is reached, i.e. when Darius’ shade is fully materialized above his tomb, the emotional tension is such that it can be expressed only by the inarticulate ἄαι ἄαι that begins the concluding epode (672).

Here we see that the use of the refrain can be satisfactorily explained by its contribution to the representation of the Chorus’ increasingly high emotions. The refrain itself is but the final and most marked instance of the repetitiveness that Aeschylus uses as an index for the Chorus’ mental state in this ode. This accords completely with a reading in which this particular refrain also “suggests, allusively, the important themes of the stasimon and of the whole tragedy.”

Persae 1057=1064

After Xerxes’ entrance and the Chorus’ initial reaction (906-30), both parties embark on a kommos that will last to the end of the play (931-1076). The refrain,

30 Moritz (1979) 195.
sung by the Chorus, occurs medially in the seventh and last strophe and antistrophe.

\begin{center}
\begin{verbatim}
Ξε. καὶ στέρν᾽ ἄρασθε κάπισθα τὸ Μύσιον. \hspace{1cm} [στρ. η.
1055
Χο. ἀνία, ἀνία.
Ξε. καὶ μοι γενείον πέρθε λευκὴρ θρίχα.
Χο. ἀπριγδ᾽ ἀπριγδα μάλα γοενά.
Ξε. ἀὕτει δ᾽ ὄξυ.
Χο. καὶ τάδ᾽ ἐρξω.
\end{verbatim}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{verbatim}
1060
Ξε. πέπλον δ᾽ ἑρείκε κολπίαν ἀκμῇ χερῶν. \hspace{1cm} [ἀντ. η.
Χο. ἀνία, ἀνία.
Ξε. καὶ ἐλάλλ᾽ ἔθειραν καὶ κατοίκτισαί στρατόν.
Χο. ἀπριγδ᾽ ἀπριγδα μάλα γοενά.
Ξε. διαίνου δ᾽ ὄσσε.
1065
Χο. τέγγομαι τοι.
\end{verbatim}
\end{center}

**Meter.** The refrain itself may be analyzed 2 \textit{ia x} (with one instance of resolution) and is at home in a strophe dominated by iambics and the baccheus. The entire latter half of the kommos (1002-76) is similarly iambic with syncopations.\textsuperscript{31}

**Theme.** This refrain would seem to function as little more than a longer and more sensical version of the exclamatory balanced cries that run throughout the kommos. As such it plays a role within this system of balanced cries not unlike that played by the refrain at 663-671, that is it marks the latter stage of an escalation of emotion signaled by the increasing use of repetition throughout the kommos, as well as a tendency to divide succeeding strophes into ever more numerous (and shorter) lexical units. Each strophe and antistrophe of the first three strophic pairs of the kommos (931-1001) are divided into two parts, one sung by Xerxes and a second sung by the Chorus. At first both parties are relatively restrained in their use of repetition: we find anaphora at 950f (\textit{τῶν}) and 956f

\textsuperscript{31} Broadhead (1960) 296.
(ποῦ), and one instance of balanced cry at 955/966 (οίοιοί). The third strophe seems to be the turning point, for here we have our first close repetitions, some of which are balanced by similar repetitions in the antistrophe: ἔ ἔ / βοιά βοιά (977/991); μυρία μυρία (980); ἔλιπες ἔλιπες / ἔταφον ἔταφον (985/1000); ἀλαστα (990). After this, the pace picks up. From the fourth strophe to the end of the play, each part is given usually only one line at a time. As sentences become shorter, their content resembles more and more the exclamations of the balanced cries: Χο. παπαὶ παπαὶ. Χε. καὶ πλέον ἡ παπαὶ μὲν οὖν (1031f); Χο. δόσιν κακὰν κακῶν κακοῖς. (1041). The refrain at 1057=1064 is a sort of amalgam of sentence and exclamation: like a sentence, it has lexical sense; but that sense is nothing more than a declarative expression of what would otherwise be expressed as exclamation. Here, then, we have a case at the very border between refrains, as I have been treating them, and balanced cries.

**Septem 975-7=986-9**

The bodies of Eteocles and Polynices are laid out and grieved over in a kommos; just who is grieving and singing which lines is an object of dispute, as will be seen below. The refrain follows both the strophe and antistrophe that, along with a concluding epode, finish the penultimate section of the play (822-1004).

Ἀν. ἥ. Ἰς. ἥ. |στρ. α.
Ἀν. μαίνεται γόουσι φρῆν. Ἰς. ἐν γάρ δὲ καρδία στένει.
Ἀν. ἰωὶ πανδάκρυτε σὺ. 970
Ἰς. σὺ δ’ αὐτε καὶ πανάθλε. Ἀν. πρὸς φίλου ἐφύσο. Ἰς. καὶ φίλον ἑκτάνες.
Ἀν. ὄπλοι λέγειν. Ἰς. ὄπλοι δ’ ὀρῶν. Ἀν. ἀγέων τοῖν τάδ’ ἐγγύθεν.
Ἰς. πέλας δ’ αἴδ’ ἀδελφαί ἀδελφεῖν. †
Meter. The refrain occurs in a context of short iambic lines delivered in alternation by two parties (Antigone and Ismene in the text provided), which Lloyd-Jones has called “lyric stichomythia”. In places these lines are broken down, each speaker reduced to delivering individual, constituent iambic feet. In such a metrical environment, the 3-line refrain seems positively long and placid, and certainly distinguished from its context. Even so, the refrain shares an iambic character with the strophe, being analyzable as 2 doch / cri / 3 ia. The dochmaics of its first line are, perhaps, a nod to the upset expressed in the strophe.

Theme. Not all refrains in drama are used to indicate heightened emotion. Here we have one that serves instead as an almost placid contrast to the highly emotional strophe to which it is appended, and gives to that emotion a wider

---

32 Lloyd-Jones (1959) 104.
33 The refrain’s first line could also be analyzed as ba ia, with split resolution, which Hutchinson (1985) ad loc. feels is not characteristic of Aeschylus.
meaning. In order to show how this works, I must first briefly address the problem regarding the assignment of this section of the kommos to speakers. Unfortunately, the MSS are not very helpful, nor consistent, in their assignment to specific characters and their use of the paragraphos in this section of the poem (822-1004). Consequently, there has been some dispute as to who says what, when. The interpretation I offer here for how the refrain operates in this context does not rely upon the assignment of the “lyric stichomythia” to the sisters, Antigone and Ismene, or to the leaders of two hemichoruses. Both views accept that the “lyric stichomythia”, including the strophe and antistrophe of our passage, are performed by soloists of one sort or other, and that the refrain is performed by the chorus. My interpretation, which relies upon a contrast between the individual performances of the soloists (whoever they may be) and that of the chorus in the refrain, is thus served by both points of view.

I will offer one note, however, regarding one of Hutchinson’s arguments for the hemichorus leader theory, since it is relevant to my interpretation of the refrain. Hutchinson argues that the language of the “lyric stichomythia” is markedly emotionally restrained, and therefore unlikely to have been delivered by truly interested parties; there is, for example, no instance of the anadiplosis we so often see elsewhere in tragic laments, and the exclamations used are neither “personal” (like οἶμοι) nor “abandoned” (like ὄτοτοτο). Now, even if we grant that the doubled ἦς that opens both strophe and antistrophe is more restrained than other sorts of cries of woe — though I do not see how we can be sure of this point — there are sufficient other indications that the “lyric stichomythia” are meant to be taken as highly emotional utterances. The brevity of each soloist’s lines,

34 See Lloyd-Jones (1959) 105-8 for an argument for the sisters, Hutchinson (1985) 181 and ad loc. for one for the leaders of the hemichoruses.
35 Hutchinson (1985)181.
especially in view of the relatively long and calm refrain, are a clear sign of emotional excitement: we may relate this directly to the tendency I noted above in respect to the *Persae* that shortened lines correspond to increased emotion. Furthermore, the rhyming quality of these “lyric stichomythia”, e.g. δορὶ δ᾽ ἐκανες / δορὶ δ᾽ ἔθανες / μελεοπόνος / μελεοπαθῆς (963f), shows the same obsessive emotionalism as anadiplosis elsewhere. These soloists, whoever they are, are certainly caught up in the moment and lost in their own emotional reactions to the fate of Eteocles and Polynices.

It is generally accepted that the Chorus sings the refrain after the strophe and antistrophe of “lyric stichomythia”. The question is, what is the refrain doing here? One commonly offered explanation is that the refrain form used here reflects the refrain form as used in actual ritual laments.\(^{36}\) I have already discussed in *CHAPTER 4* the difficulties of calling upon an absent ritual formal tradition to explain refrains in literary poetry, but it is certainly possible that Aeschylus is here drawing upon ritual form in order to characterize this song as genuine ritual. (We may note, incidentally, that the more we assert that the present passage is meant to be a realistic ritual lament, the less we can accept Hutchinson’s position that those who perform the lament are not truly interested parties to it.) In any case, we may at least ask whether the refrain contributes something in addition to any possible external associations it may have with an independent genre, ritual or otherwise.

I have already discussed the differences between the strophe and antistrophe on the one hand, and the refrain on the other hand, with respect to form: the “lyric stichomythia” is excited and broken, the refrain placid and continuous. now

\(^{36}\) Lupas-Petre (1981) 275. Hutchinson (1985) ad 181, relates the appearance of the refrain here to its appearance in Pi. fr. 128c, and infers that both draw upon ritual form.
I turn to differences in the themes contained in these two forms. First let us consider the soloists and what they sing. Their attention is narrowly focused on the two dead brothers as well as their own emotions. Their language with respect to the brothers themselves is strikingly visual. The very pains the soloists feel (or that they impute to Eteocles and Polynices) is described as “hard to look at” (δυσθέσατα πίματα, 978), and grief must be twice expressed because the disaster is presented as a double spectacle (διπλά λέγειν / διπλά δ’ όραν, 972). The eyes of the soloists seem drawn to certain visual details as well, including the brothers’ spears (962) and the position of their bodies (965, 971). The soloists are also absorbed in their own state of mind, which is completely overcome with the misery of the moment: “The mind is mad with groaning. And the heart wails within.” (μαίνεται γόοις φρήν / ἐντὸς δὲ καρδία στένει, 967f). If the soloists pause at this point to think of anything beyond the bare fact of the dead brothers and their own emotional reaction to that fact, it is only to consider the immediate relationship between the two brothers and the ironic symmetry involved in the situation.

The refrain presents quite a different picture. Here there is no dwelling upon the speaker’s emotional state, nor even any direct reference to Eteocles or Polynices. Whereas the soloists of the “lyric stichomythia” are enthralled by the immediate disaster, the Chorus in the refrain treat this disaster as but an individual instance of the greater disaster that has fallen on the house of Laius. Their interest is not in this particular event, but in the controlling power of Fate and the Erinys of Oedipus’ curse. On one level, then, the refrain balances the extreme, near-sighted emotionalism of its context; the refrain’s objective recognition of the force behind the brothers’ deaths serves to reinforce the soloists’ subjective response to those deaths. We may go further. It has been suggested that a major theme of the Septem as a whole is that of the lot, i.e. the lot
that should have facilitated the peaceful division of Eteocles and Polynices' inheritance, but which instead has left them only a share in ruination. If this is so, then the refrain in our passage gives strong emphasis to this important theme, first by an emphatic quality achieved by its marked repetitiveness, second by the way in which the refrain, with its broader and more objective view, is juxtaposed to the narrowly focused but emotionally intense “lyric stichomythia” of the kommos.

A final note. The difference in outlook I have laid out between the “lyric stichomythia” and the refrain is consistent with Lloyd-Jones’ assignment of the former to Antigone and Ismene. We would expect the sisters to be focused on their subjective experience, just as we would expect the (slightly) less interested Chorus to be able to present a broader, more objective view of the situation.

Suppl. 117ff

τοιαῦτα πάθεα μέλεα θρεμένα λέγω
λυγέα βαρέα δακρυστή, ἵη ἵη.
115
ἰθλέμουσιν ἐμπρεπής
ζώσα γόος με τιμῶ.

ἵλεώμας μὲν Ἄπιοι βούνοι,
καρβάνα δ’ αὖθαίν εὖ, γὰ, κοιμεῖς.
120-121
πολλάκι δ’ ἐμπίπτων λακίδι σῶν λυνσώνει
122
Σιδόνια καλύπτρα.

θεώς δ’ ἑναγέα τέλεα πελομένων καλῶς
ἐπιδορμ’, ὑπόθι βάνατος ἀπη.
125
ἰω ῥεῖ,
ἰω δυσάγκριτοι πόνοι.

ποί τόθι κύμ' ἀπάξει:

ιλεώμαι μὲν Ἀπίαν βούν.  ἔφυμ. α. 

καρβάνα δ' αὐθάν εὖ. γά., κοννεῖς. 

πολλάκι δ' ἐμπίπτων λακίδι σὺν λυφοσίνει 

Σιδονία καλύπτρα.

πλάτα μὲν οὐν  ἔφυμ. β.

λιωρραφής τε δόμως ἄλα στέγων δορὸς 

ἀχείματον μ' ἐπεμπε σὺν 

πνεαίς' οὔθε μεμφομαι' 

πνεαίς' οὔθε μεμφομαι' 

tελευτάς δ' ἐν χρόνῳ 

πατήρ ὁ παντόπτα 

πρεμενεῖς κτύσειεν.

σπέρμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός, εἴνας 

ἁνθήνων, ἐ' ἦ, 

ἀγαμου ἀδαματον ἑκφυγεῖν.

βέλουσα δ' αὖ  ἀντ. η.

βέλουσαν ἄγνα μ' ἐπιδέτω Διὸς κόρα, 

ἕχουσα σέμων εἴνωτ' ἀ- 

σφαλέα. παιντὶ δὲ σδένει 

Τιωγιούσι δ' ἀσφαλέας 

ἀδρήτος ἀδρήτα 

ῥύσιος γενέσθω.

σπέρμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός, εἴνας 

ἁνθήνων, ἐ' ἦ, 

ἀγαμου ἀδαματον ἑκφυγεῖν.

εἰ δὲ μὴ, μελανθέ 

ηλιόκτυπου γέινοι 

τοῦ γάλου, 

τοῦ πολυξενώτατον, 

Ζήνα τῶν κεκμηκῶτων 

ἐξομένθα σὺν κλάδοις 

ἀρτάναις θαυμόσαι, 

μὴ τυχρούσαι θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων.
These three refrains occur toward the end of the parodos as the Chorus of fleeing Danaids arrive at the Argive sanctuary singing of their predicament and praying for asylum.

Scheme. The MSS preserve refrains after strophe and antistrophe of the sixth and seventh of the eight strophic pairs of the parodos. The mesode (162-7) transmitted by the MSS after the strophe of the eight strophic pair is commonly inserted again after the final antistrophe by modern editors. It may be that “a scribe’s omission of the last of a number of ephymnia is particularly easy to
explain psychologically\textsuperscript{38}, but the fact that this scenario is possible is not proof that it is true. To begin with, such an omission would constitute a gross and unusual instance of haplography: gross, because of the sheer number of words omitted; unusual, because we would expect a quite different sort of error here than the one supposed by editors. What we would expect is that the erring scribe, returning his eye to the original in order to acquire the first instance of the ephymnium, i.e. that after the strophe, would instead let his eye fall upon the second instance, i.e. that after the antistrophe. In this case the scribe would omit both the first instance of the ephymnium and the antistrophe, leaving us with the strophe and one instance of the ephymnium. Editors who postulate an original second instance of an ephymnium require us to accept that the scribe’s eye simply passed over these few lines. The fact that these lines happen to be identical to those appearing only a little above, therefore, plays no part in this scenario. In other words, the insertion proposed by editors has no more transcriptional probability than any random lines one could care to suggest as having been omitted. As for the intrinsic probability of the insertion, to insist on the insertion is effectively to rule out the possibility that Aeschylus could ever intend or admit the use of ephymnia and mesodes in the same ode\textsuperscript{39} All this is not to disprove that lines 162-7 are not, in fact, the first of two instances of an ephymnium: it is only to stress that our treatment of these lines as such is based on purely subjective grounds, and to that extent my comments on these lines qua refrain must be qualified.

\textit{Meter}. Strophes 6-8 may all be analyzed as iambic (though Strophe 8 could easily be analyzed as trochaic), and the refrains themselves somewhat reflect this.

\textsuperscript{38} Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) ad. loc.
\textsuperscript{39} Cf. Hall (1913) 151, 189-90.
A few trends may be noted. First, Strophe 6 begins with a suddenly high degree of resolution — the first two periods \(3\text{ia} / 2\text{ia}\) are almost completely resolved — which tapers off in Strophe 7 (one instance at 135/145) and is absent in Strophe 8. This trend away from resolution is balanced by a trend to increased syncopation in the Strophes 7 and 8. The ephymnia follow the first of these two trends set by the stanzas in that we find runs of short syllables in the first and second refrains but not in the third. This sudden increase in short syllables beginning in Strophe 6 and tapering off at the end of the parodos corresponds to the quick shift in focus from Zeus and his power (through Strophe 5) to the immediate problem facing the Danaids (Antistrophe 5, Strophe 6), which in turn gives way to the sinister yet calm resolution of the Chorus to commit suicide (Strophe/Antistrophe 8).

Within the refrains themselves we see a tendency to go from long syllables to short. This is most pronounced in the first refrain, where the almost uninterrupted string of long syllables in the first two lines \((mol\ i\ a\ sp / i\ a\ mol\ sp)\) is contrasted by the string of short syllables making up the irregular dochmaic in the third line. This shift from long to short in all three refrains corresponds to a shift in thematic focus on the part of the Chorus in the first and second refrains. In both cases the opening line of solemn prayer with its many long syllables \((\text{λεώμαι μὲν \'Απίαν βούλων\ 129, σπέρμα σεμνὰς μέγα ματρός, εὖνάς / ἀνήρων})\) gives way to a concentration on the immediate situation of the Danaids and short syllables \((\text{πολλάκι} \ δ' \ ἐμπίτω \ λακιδὶ σὺν λυσσωνεὶ \ 131, ἁγαμον ἀδάματον ἐκφυγεῖν}).\) For the most part, then, these refrains follow the lead of the stanzas in terms of how they use meter to reflect the changing mental state of the Chorus.

Theme. Again, we find that the refrain is used to indicate the mental state of the speaker. As has been pointed out already, the refrains begin at that point in
the parodos when the Danaids turn from the general topic of Zeus to their own predicament. Also we see a return to direct prayer for acceptance as suppliants (ἰλεώμαι, 117). The placement of the refrains in this case fits the general pattern whereby refrains in drama tend to occur toward the end of lyric passages, indicating an overall escalation of emotion.

When we turn to the content of these refrains we see that they, like many other dramatic refrains, characterize the emotional state of the speaker. Most obvious is the use of balanced cries in the second and third refrains (ἐέ 142/152, ἦ 162/176). In both these instances the cry seems motivated by what immediately precedes it. The cry ἐέ occurs immediately after the phrase εὐνὰς ἀνδρῶν, indicating that the mere thought of sexual relations with men is repulsive to the Danaids. Likewise the cry ἦ immediately follows the name of Io, the ancestor of the Danaids whose misfortunes they relate to so closely. In this case, the very form of the cry seems to play upon the name Io as if to imply an etymology or to suggest that the Chorus’ current expression of distress imitative of Io’s own distress. In addition to these cries, emotion is expressed by other sound effects such as the alliteration and assonance found especially in the first and second refrains: πολλάκι ὁ ἐμπίπτων λακίδι σὺν λινοσινεί; σπέρμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός, εὐνάς: ἄγαμον ἄδαματον.

The content of the refrains in this passage helps to characterize the ethnicity of the Danaids. Direct characterization is achieved when the Chorus call their own voice “barbarian” (καρβάνα, 119-130) and when they describe their clothes, which they rend in mourning, as linen and of foreign make (λινοσινεί Σιδονία καλύπτρα, 120f=131f). A less direct characterization of their ethnicity is achieved

41 Cf. the use of balanced cries in the example from the Septem discussed above.
42 One is tempted to suggest that the cry is imitative of a cow’s lowing.
by their emphasis on their descent from Io in the second and third refrains as well as the strong identification with Io expressed in the third refrain, where the Chorus’ emission of the cry \textit{ió} is in reaction to, and almost imitative of, the sad history of their ancestor. The language used in the refrain also seems to characterize the Chorus as foreign: both \textit{kounveis/kounw} (119=130, 165=175c) and \textit{karbána} (119=130) are unusual forms that may contribute an exotic air. We may compare this to the apparent attempts to represent Egyptian language later on in the play (825ff).\textsuperscript{43} Finally, it may be that the heavy use of alliteration and assonance noted above is itself meant to characterize the Chorus’ speech as exotic.

\textit{Suppl. 889ff=899ff}

This refrain occurs after the third strophe and antistrophe of the amoibean passage between the Danaids and the Herald who has come to lead them to the waiting ship that will take them back to Egypt.

\begin{verbatim}
Khryse
iúze kai lákaê kai kálei theous.
Aniguptian gar pàr ev ón ùperdorhê.
[iúze kai]
875
† bóa, píkróter, áxéos oiêzos ànomi ékhou. 

(Δadh.) oioi oioi | ánt. β.
lúmas, á sín prò gás úláskwv
† perihamptá bravnêis'
oi épwa ðí', ó mégas
880
Néilos, úbriçontá σ' ápòtré-
ψeiñ àistov úbriw.
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Kàr. bainew kelenw pàr w eis ãmphiástron
ôsun táxista' muhê tis scholaxêwv.
ôlik ãw aúth plókaumou ouðam' àxetai.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{43} Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) ad loc.
885
Δαδ. οἶοι, πάτερ, βρέτεωσ ἄρος | ἱστ. γ.
άτα μ᾽ ἀλαδί ἄγει.
ἀραχνός ὡς, βάδην.
ἐναρ ὃναρ μέλαν.
ότοτοτοτούι,
890
μᾶ Γὰ μᾶ Γὰ, βοάν
φοβερὸν ἀπότρεπε.
ὁ βὰ Γὰς παῖ Ζεῦ.

Κη. οὕτως φοβοῦμαι δαίμονας τούς ἐπιθάδε.
οὐ γάρ μ᾽ ἐθρέψαν, οὐδ᾽ ἐγήρασαν τροφή.

895
Δαδ. μαμᾶ πέλας δίπους ὄψις.
ἐχών δ᾽ ὡς με (φῶνιος ἡ)
τὸ πότε ὦν καλῶν
δάκος; ἀχ.. ὃν
ότοτοτοτοι,
900
μᾶ Γὰ μᾶ Γὰ βοὰν
φοβερὸν ἀπότρεπε.
ὁ βὰ Γὰς παῖ Ζεῦ.

Κη. εἰ μῆ τις ἐς ναῦν εἰσὶν αἰνέσας τάδε,
 λακίς χίτωνος ἑργόν οὐ κατοικτεῖ.
905
Χο. ἱὸ πάλεως ἅγιοι πρόμοι, δάμναμαι.

**Meter.** Because of the many textual problems that attend this part of the play, it is difficult to establish the meter for the first part of this amoebean passage (through 865). The first strophic pair would seem to be composed of dochmic, dactylic and iambic cola, with long runs of short syllables occurring at 843/854 and 850/862. The second pair is largely made up of ionic cola. The third pair, to which is appended the refrain, is iambic and dochmic in character, thus fitting the pattern of Aeschylus’ typical use of refrains in iambic contexts. This third strophic pair, both stanzas and refrain, feature numerous resolutions in both the iambic and the dochmic portions. The agitated character of the strophic pair is
also shown by that fact that there is no period that extends over more than one metrical colon. The refrain itself displays a violent alternation between the short syllables of the resolved iambics and dochmaics of the first and third lines, respectively, and the almost unbroken longs of the second and fourth lines. Again, this emphasizes the agitated state of mind of the Chorus who sing these lines. After much agitation, the Chorus can only follow up with what appears to be the shortest stanza extant in Greek tragedy (905/908).

Theme. As in the case of the refrain at Persae 663=671, discussed above, this refrain occurs near the end of a sustained crescendo of rising emotion on the part of the Chorus. As the threats of the Egyptian Herald mount, so do the vocal protestations made by the Chorus, until the appearance of the Argive king (991). The refrain, when it comes, is but the last in a series of repetitions that mark the increasing anxiety of the Danaids: the cries aài aïaï and oïoï oïoï appear in response at the beginning of the second strophe and antistrophe (866/876); alliteration and assonance occur with great frequency (δι’ ἀλίμπρυτον ἀλς, 868; Ἕρειαστὶς αὐραῖς, 881; βαίνειν... βαρίν, 882; ἐνε καὶ λάκαζε καὶ κάλει θεοῦ, 872). The effect grows even stronger in the third strophe (ἀρος ἀτἀ μ’ ἀλαδί ἁγει, ἀραχνὸς, 885ff) until we arrive at pure repetition in both stanza (ἄναρ ὄναρ, 887) and refrain (μᾶ Γὰ μᾶ Γὰ, 890=900).

The content of the refrain itself also marks it as a climax of emotion for the Chorus. It has the quality of noise as much as of speech, with its opening cry of distress (ὅτοτοτοῖ , 889=899) and the strings of single syllable words in the second and fourth lines (μᾶ Γὰ μᾶ Γὰ; ὥ βᾶ Γᾶς παι Ζεῦ). Corresponding to this reduction in lexical sophistication is a similar reduction in theological sophistication: here at

---

the height of their terror, the Chorus can only pray to Earth Mother and her child, Zeus. This breaking-up of language into its constituent elements is continued, though to a slightly lesser degree, in lines 905/908, where the iambic line is divided by diaeresis between each metron.\textsuperscript{46}

\textit{§4. “Character” refrains}

Another major function of refrain in drama is to introduce characters. These refrains are sung by actors upon their initial entry onstage or shortly thereafter, and provide important information concerning the character’s motivation or state of mind both to the audience as well as to other characters onstage. In most cases, the speaker is singing a song within the drama of the play, and quite often the refrain helps identify that song as belonging to a particular independent lyric genre (paean at \textit{Ion} 112ff.; hymenaeus at \textit{Tr.} 308ff.; iacchus at \textit{Ra.} 316ff.).

The first clear case of a “character” refrain is found at \textit{Ag.} 1072ff. and rewards close study.

\begin{verbatim}
Ka. ὀτοτοτοτοὶ πότοι δὰ. ὀπολλοὶ ὀπολλοὶ.
χο. τι ταῦτ’ ἀνοιγτύνξας ἀμφὶ Λοξίου;
1075
οὐ γάρ τοιώντος ὡστε θρηνητοῦ τυχεῖν.

Ka. ὀτοτοτοτοὶ πότοι δὰ. ὀπολλοὶ ὀπολλοὶ.
χο. ἥδι αὐτὲ δυσφημοῦσα τῶν θεῶν καλεῖ
οὖνεν προσήκουν ἐν γόοις παραστατεῖν.
1080

Ka. Ὁ Απολλων. Ὅ Απολλων
ἀγνιατ’, ἀπόλλων ἐμὸς.
ἀπόλλεος γάρ οὗ μόλις τὸ δεύτερον.
χο. χρήσειν οἰκεῖκεν ἄμφὶ τῶν αὐτῆς κακῶν.
μείει τὸ θείου δουλία περ ἐν φρενί.
1085
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{46} Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) iii, 362.
In each of these four strophes, Cassandra sings in a meter usually analyzed as a mix of bacchic and iambic metra\(^47\), and is answered each time by the Chorus, who speak in iambic trimeters. This is an example of epirrhematic composition, the first in which is reversed the more usual arrangement whereby the Chorus sings and is answered by an actor speaking trimeters. This unusual quality of the passage is emphasized not only by the appearance of refrains, but also by the content of those refrains. The Chorus are surprised by Cassandra’s use of a cry of mourning (\'\'\'\'\'\'\'\') in conjunction with the naming of Apollo: “Why do you raise these cries about Loxias? For he is not such a one as to come by a mourner.” (1074f.)\(^48\) The strange content of Cassandra’s refrain makes perfect sense, of course, within the dramatic context. The odd epirrhematic structure, the use of the emphatic refrain, the appearance of bacchic and dochmaic metra, and the wailing content of the refrain all illustrate Cassandra’s state of distress. Likewise her repeated naming of Apollo, even in the unwholesome context of mourning, emphasizes her relationship with that god and her status as a prophetess. This last point is not lost on the Chorus (\'\'\'\'\'\'\'\'), though they are prevented from fully comprehending Cassandra’s prophecy.

\(^{47}\) 1072f.=1076f. are read as bacchic tetrameter by Wilamowitz. Fraenkel (1950) says each line “may be regarded as roughly equivalent to a catalectic iambic metron”. Deniston-Page analyzes the lines \(cr \, ba / ia \, sp\), and 108-3 as \(ia \, sp / ba \, dochm / 3 \, ia\).

\(^{48}\) We may note here that this passage in no way requires us to take the refrain form \textit{per se} as identified with threnody. The concern of the Chorus is with the content, not the form of the refrain: \(\tau i \, \tau a u \tau i \, \\\alpha \omega \omega \tau o \tau u \chi \alpha s\) (“Why did you raise these cries of \(\dot{o}\tau o\tau o\tau o\)?”). Also, the Chorus’ identification of Cassandra’s song as threnody is made before they have heard the repetition of the refrain.
The characterizing function of refrains is highly favored by Euripides, appearing in three separate plays: *Ion* 112ff., *El.* 112ff. and *Tr.* 308ff. We may relate this to his frequent use of monodic prologues.49 In *Ion* 112ff., Ion has just finished his opening anapaests (82-111), usually sung by the Chorus elsewhere, when he begins to sing what seems to be a very convincing example of paean featuring the refrain:\(^\text{50}\)

\[
\text{ἔδιαϊών ἐδιαϊών,}
\]

\[
	ext{ἐός, ὁ Λατοῦς παί.}
\]

We note especially the use of molossi in the refrain, which we relate to *Eryth.* Pae. fr. 1 and other hymns.\(^\text{51}\) The characterizing effect of Ion’s refrain is clear.\(^\text{52}\) It emphasizes the generic identity of his monody as paean\(^\text{53}\), and this in turn illustrates his contentment as a servant of Apollo’s shrine and his expression of that contentment in the apparent invention of an otherwise unknown lay service.\(^\text{54}\) All this establishes the background for the upsetting of his contentment later in the play.

A very similar use of refrain is found in *El.* 112ff. Here Electra is being “introduced” not to the audience — she has been onstage at least since line 54 — but to Orestes, who sees her again for the first time as she draws water at the well and sings her monody, in which she bemoans her sad condition. Her song is a work song of sorts, easily compared to Ion’s paean, which he sings as he sweeps; her jug resembles Ion’s broom.\(^\text{55}\) Electra’s attitude towards her work is, of course, quite different from that of Ion towards his; but the way in which both characters

\(^{49}\) Imhof (1966) 19.
\(^{50}\) Cf. Rutherford (2001) 111: “The only true παιάν-refrain in extant tragedy.”
\(^{53}\) Imhof (1966) 19.
\(^{54}\) Imhof (1966) 20; Burnett (1970) ad 129; Furley/Bremer (2001) 83.
\(^{55}\) Knox (1979) 259.
are depicted at work, including the emphasis given to the repetitiousness of that work by means of the refrain, is emblematic of their respective situations as well as their respective states of mind. In both cases, the songs serve as ironic illustrations of the status quo; ironic, because both characters’ situations will soon radically change upon the arrival of unexpected visitors.

A third instance of the “character” refrain in Euripides is found at Tr. 308ff. Here the mourning of Hecuba and the Chorus is interrupted by the entrance of Cassandra, who sings a hymeneus song marked by several instances of repetition, including a refrain at lines 314 and 331.

"Ἀνέχει πάρεχε.
φῶς φέρει σέβω φλέγω --ιδού ιδού --
λαμπάσι τού ιερόν.
ο Ἐκείναι ἀναξ;
μακάος ο γαμέτας;
μακαρία δ' εγώ βασιλικοῖς λέκτροις
κατ' Ἀργος ἀ γαμουμένα.
Ἐκείνων ᾁ Ἐκείναι ἀναξ.
ἐπεὶ σύ, μάτηρ, ἐπὶ δάκρυσι καὶ
γόουσι τὸν θανόντα πατέρα πατρίδα τε
φίλαιν καταστένοντος ἐχεις.
ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ γάμους ἔμοις
ἀναφλέγω πυρὸς φῶς
ἐς αὐγάν, ἐς αὐγάναν,
διδοῦσ', ὧς Ἐκείναις, σοί,
διδοῦσ', ὅ Ἐκάτα, φάος,
παρῆσαν ἐπί λέκτροις
ἀ νόμος ἐχει.

πάλλε πόδα.
αἰδέριον ἀναγε χορόν' εὐάν, εὖν'
ὡς ἐπὶ πατρός ἐμοῦ
μακαρωτάτατοι
τύχαις' ὁ χορός ὅσιος,
ἀγε σὺ, Φοῖβε, νῦν' κατὰ σὸν ἐν δάφναις
ἀνάκτορον θυμισῶ.
Ἐκείνων ᾃ Ἐκείναις Ἐκείνων.
χόρευε, μάτηρ, ἀναγέλασον

Like Ion with his broom and Electra with her jug, Cassandra has her torch.\(^\text{57}\) And like the monodies of Ion and Electra, Cassandra’s song is ironic. In her case the irony does not lie in any lack of foresight — she knows all too well what is coming — but in the quality of the hymenaeus, which “has some of the natural exhuberance a girl might feel at her wedding”, but which is horribly inappropriate to the situation.\(^\text{58}\) The terrible, parodic character of the song is strengthened by the address to Hecate\(^\text{59}\), and the refrains, along with the other repetitions, illustrate Cassandra’s obsessive madness.\(^\text{60}\) Finally, we note that, whereas the refrains of the monodies of Ion and Electra are very regular within their respective antistrophic pairs, Cassandra’s hymenaeus is somewhat disordered in its structure. The two instances of refrain are slightly different from each other (‘\(\text{Τ} \mu \eta \nu \ \omega \ \text{Τ} \mu \eta \nu \ \text{να α}\)\(\text{νεναι} 314 \ / \text{Τ} \mu \eta \nu \ \omega \ \text{Τ} \mu \eta \nu \ \text{να α}\)\(\text{νεναι} \ \text{Τ} \mu \eta \nu \ 331\)), and there seem to be three other “near-refrains” scattered throughout the song: \(\omega \ \text{Τ} \mu \eta \nu \ \text{να α}\)\(\text{νεναι} 310; \text{διδουσ}’, \ \omega \ \text{Τ} \mu \eta \nu \ \text{ναιε}, \ \sigma \omega 322; \\text{βοσαθ’ Τ} \mu \eta \nu \ \text{ναιου, ω 335}\). It seems likely that these irregularities of form are meant to help illustrate Cassandra’s disordered state of mind.

There are several possible ways of relating the characterizing function of these refrains to other functions of dramatic refrains as well as to non-dramatic lyric refrain functionality. The function can be seen as an extension of the practice of

\(^{57}\) Cf. Barlow (1986b) 47f.
\(^{58}\) Barlow (1986a) 173.
\(^{60}\) Barlow (1986a) 174.
using refrains to represent in drama examples of independent lyric genres: half of our “character” refrains (Ion 122ff., Tr. 308ff.) certainly fall into that category. What distinguishes this particular use of independent genre refrains is that, while elsewhere an independent genre is represented simply to suggest a general occasion (weddings at the end of Av. and Pax) or emotion (sorrow and disquiet at Ag. 104ff.), in these cases the representation of independent genre serves to characterize specific characters, with respect to motivation and state of mind, at a specific moment in the action of the plays.

Another way to understand how the characterizing function arose in dramatic refrains is to see it as an extension of the “emotive” refrain function, which also serves to illustrate the state of mind of the speaker, though not with such specificity. Or, one could point to the general tendency of refrains, established even in early lyric examples, to emphasize the subjective experience of the speaker. In a way, even the function of generic emphasis as found in non-dramatic lyric is a form of self-characterization. In that case, the point is to locate the speaker within a song tradition; in the “character” refrains of drama, the point is to locate the speaker within the action of the play.
CHAPTER 7
REFRAINS IN BUCOLIC HEXAMETER POETRY

Three main questions face us as we consider what the refrains in these poems are doing. The first is, what structural, thematic and dramatic functions are performed by the refrains within the poems in which they appear? Second we ask, what external associations do these refrains bring to the poems? Third and last, how closely do the refrains follow the traditions of the lyric refrain? To answer these questions, I will approach the refrain as it is used in Greek bucolic in three sections dealing with (§1) the structural aspects of the bucolic refrain, (§2) likely external associations, and (§3) non-structural functionality. In each of these sections I will relate the practice of bucolic refrain to the lyric refrain tradition. I hope to show in this chapter that these refrains are best understood with reference to the existing lyric refrain tradition.

§1. Structural aspects and functions of the refrain in bucolic poetry.

Before analyzing the structural functions of the refrains in specific poems, it is desirable to discuss briefly the related issues common to all instances of refrain in Greek bucolic poetry. Of all the functions that can be performed by the refrain form in bucolic, none is so immediately apparent as that of imparting structure. The bucolic refrain, normally consisting of a single hexameter line¹, breaks up by means of its conspicuous repetitions what would otherwise be a continuous succession of hexameter lines — a succession usually subject to no formal unit larger than the hexameter itself. This aspect of the refrain is, of course, made

¹ The exception to this rule is the variable “refrain” of Ε.Α., but even in that poem the usual length of individual instances of the “refrain” is one full hexameter line.
especially striking in most modern printed editions, in which each instance of refrain is either indented, or set apart from the surrounding context by means of extra spacing above and below the line, or both. It should be noted that such graphic treatment of the refrain was not unknown in antiquity.²

It is perhaps strange that critics have not more often remarked on the strangeness of the mere fact that refrains should appear in what would otherwise be continuous hexameter poetry. Something of this strangeness is reflected in one critic’s suggestion that the introduction by Theocritus of the refrain form to hexameter poetry “may have been felt to be a daring innovation which gives to the poem something of a stanzaic structure, wholly alien to the even flow of the narrative hexameter.”³ While we may dispute whether the bucolic refrain indicates a true “stanzaic structure”, it is certain that it does demand some explanation, and only natural that we should look outside bucolic itself for at least some points of that explanation. But this anticipates the next section’s topic.

Beyond remarking on the novelty of the refrain in hexameter poetry, we may ask, what are the intrinsic formal implications of its appearance? The answers to this question will touch in turn upon an issue with a long history, namely the question whether bucolic hexameter exhibits evidence of a real strophic or stanzaic structure. I will only briefly cover the matter. Scholars of the nineteenth century often took the presence of refrains in bucolic as evidence for a real strophic structure in contexts where those refrains appear. This strophic structure was thought to include, among other features, real “strophic responsion”

---

² Oxy. P. 3545 preserves lines 68-74 and 78-95 of Theocritus *Idyll 1*. The refrain ἔρχετε, κτλ at line 79 is marked off by paragraphi both above and below; no such marks are found at 73 and 89, the two other instances of refrain where the left margin is preserved. Oxy. P. 3546 preserves Theocritus 2.30-2 and 43-9, and here both instances of the refrain Ῥυγξ, κτλ at 32 and 47 are marked off by paragraphi both above and below. Both papyri are dated to the second century A.D.
between elements of different “strophes”. Since, as we shall see, the surviving MSS do not give us perfectly regular instances of refrain in most of the relevant bucolic poems, the text of these poems was frequently emended in order to produce the required regularity.4 This approach was condemned long ago by Bergk and by Wilamowitz, who pointed out that the refrains in bucolic were meant only to be suggestive of strophic song in hexameter.5 Despite the occasional references to “stanzas” and “pastoral lyric”6 critics on the whole have come to accept Wilamowitz’s position as correct.

Assuming that refrains, where they do appear in bucolic hexameter, do not indicate genuine strophes or stanzas, it follows that their appearance is strange not only because they have not been seen in hexameter before, but also because they appear in a formal context so different from their natural home. As I have argued in Chapter 3, the refrain in Greek lyric seems to have arisen in a monostrophic environment. Within this environment, the unit of the strophe served both as a measure of frequency for the refrain (e.g., one refrain per strophe) and as a location within which the refrain could be placed (i.e., at the beginning, at the end or in the middle of each strophe). By contrast, the hexameter environment of bucolic offers no such formal home for the refrain. Rather than coming at the beginning or end of strophes, the bucolic refrain can only come between individual lines of verse, or more broadly between (not before, not after) stretches of continuous hexameters.7 Critics who seek to determine whether

4 See Gow (1950) v.2, p.16, n.2 for a partial bibliography of studies attempting to find “strophic responson” in bucolic. To his list we may add Peiper, R. (1863-1865).
5 Bergk, Philol. 14.182; Wilamowitz, (1906) 137.
6 Rosenmeyer (1969) 95.
7 We note that the papyrological evidence for the formal relationship of bucolic refrains to their context, though scant, conforms to this understanding. If the writer of Oxy. P. 3546 had thought of the refrain ἵππες, κτλ as coming after a “strophe”, we would expect the paragraphus to have been placed only below the
instances of refrain in bucolic “belong to” the lines preceding or to those following would seem still to be laboring under the misconception that the appearance of refrains indicates intent on the part of the poet to reproduce, as opposed to represent, strophic lyric in hexameter verse.\(^8\)

There is only one example in bucolic where the formal implications for the refrain in hexameter are to some degree nullified, or at least subverted. This is the “refrain” of Bion \(E\lambda\), and it is unique in bucolic poetry. The “refrain” is established in the first two lines of the poem:

\[
\text{aiážw tón "Aðωνιν, "ἀπώλετο καλὸς "Aðωνις":}
\]

\[
\text{"وليκτο καλὸς "Aðωνις", ἔπαιαέζουσι των Ερώτες.}
\]

Both lines are divided at the heththimemeral caesura into two segments, which I label 1a, 1b and 2a, 2b. These initial two lines are not repeated together for the remainder of the poem; the first line is repeated entire only once, at line 67. What makes the “refrain” so striking, despite the lack of the usual repetition of whole lines, is the way in which the half-line segments of lines 1-2 are repeated throughout the poem in different combinations. A combination of 1a and 2b adds a new segment attached to 2b at line 28 (aiáί τὰν Κυθέρειαν, ἐπαίαζονσι των Ερώτες) and this combination is repeated at 86. At lines 37 and 63 we find the new segment combined with 1b (aiáί τὰν Κυθέρειαν, ἀπώλετο καλὸς "Aðωνις). Clearly the poet means to play with these segments in as many ways as he can. (The combination of 2a and 1b is avoided as they are essentially synonymous.)

---

\(^8\) Gow (1950) 16.
It has been doubted whether these repetitions constitute a true refrain\(^9\); strictly speaking, they do not. Nevertheless, their manner of arrangement, as well as their content, strongly suggest an interest on the part of Bion in the refrain form as it is more usually used in bucolic and elsewhere. Also, we shall see that these repetitions function within their context in much the same way as true refrains. They are useful evidence for Bion’s reception of the refrain form and therefore deserve our attention.

Now I shall turn to a consideration of the specific structural functions performed by the refrain in bucolic. Because these functions depend, as I have argued above, upon the formal implications specific to refrains in hexameter verse, I will not have many occasions for comparison with lyric refrains, as I will have when discussing other kinds of functionality later on.

**Song marker.** The most basic structural function performed by bucolic refrains is the distinction of those parts of poems that do contain refrains from those that do not. The two examples of this are in Theocritus 1 and 2, which feature inset pieces that are performed within the dramatic frame of each poem. In *Idyll* 1 this function is especially clear, since we can be sure that the first line of refrain (\(\alpha \beta \chi \varepsilon \tau \epsilon \varepsilon\), \(\kappa \tau \lambda\)) at 64 is also the first line of Thyrsis’ song; this is confirmed by the clear change of speaker after 63.\(^{10}\) Here the initial instance of refrain, along with its frequent recurrences, marks lines 64-142 decisively as different in kind from their context: they are “song” while the remainder of the poem is “speech”. The end of Thyrsis’ song is not so definitely marked by the last instance of refrain at 142. True, Thyrsis at 143 turns to the goatherd and asks for the goat he was promised, and this would seem to be separate from the preceding song; but

\(^9\) Gow (1950) ii, 16; Reed (1997) 96f.
\(^{10}\) The fact that the refrain is the first line of Thyrsis’ song does not require us to take it as the first line of a “strophe”.

Thyris then immediately proceeds to a concluding salutation to the Muses, which is best taken as the final theme of his song.\textsuperscript{11} But again, we are aided by a change of speaker at 146. The changes of speaker at 64 and 146 serve, therefore, as the definite beginning and end of Thyris’ “song”, but it is the refrain that marks it as “song” formally.

The refrain of \textit{Idyll} 2 is similarly used to mark off an inset performance within the poem. There are, however, important differences between \textit{Idylls} 2 and 1 that must be taken into account. To begin, \textit{Idyll} 2 is a dramatic monologue, and therefore there are no changes of speaker to help mark off the inset performances. The initial instance of the poem’s first refrain (\textit{ũγ̣ξ, κτλ}) at 17 marks the beginning of Simaetha’s spell proper.\textsuperscript{12} The cessation of the second refrain (\textit{φράζεο, κτλ}) after 135 seems intended to convey Simaetha’s changing state of mind, of which more will be said later.

It should be noted that the refrain form is not the only device used in bucolic to mark off inset performances formally. A similar function is performed by the introduction of elegiac couplets at \textit{Idyll} 8.33-60, which mark off the first stage of the singing contest depicted in that poem.

Theocritus’ use of the refrain form to mark off a section of a poem is rare in lyric. The single possible example is Campbell fr. 931L, lines 8ff. In that poem, the last line of the first strophe is replaced by a refrain that is repeated in each of the following strophes. As has been pointed out before\textsuperscript{13}, this may indicate that the first strophe was intended as an introduction to an inset performance that followed. If this is the case, then the fragment very closely parallels \textit{Idylls} 1 and 2 in this respect. But the late date of the fragment, along with its metrical

\textsuperscript{11} Pace Gow (1950) ad loc., who sees 144f. as separate from the song.

\textsuperscript{12} Gow (1950) ad loc.

\textsuperscript{13} Rutherford (1995) 41.
irregularities, militate against our assuming that Theocritus had before him any lyric examples of refrains used to mark off inset performances.\footnote{Lobel, \textit{Oxy. P.} 32 (1967) 114, dates the papyrus to the second century on the basis of the hand.}

\textit{Articulation.} Just as the refrain form serves to mark an inset “song” formally as separate from its context, it also serves to separate from each other the blocks of verse within that “song”. This function we may call “articulation” since the refrains link together as well as separate these blocks of verse. This is a role that, of course, is to some extent played by lyric refrains; in bucolic it is a critical function, since there is no natural formal unit in hexameter that can (as the strophe in lyric) serve the function itself. Within this category of function, there are two subcategories. The first is that simple articulation provided by any refrain that divides its poem into discrete and meaningful units of sense. The second is that more complicated articulation achieved by a refrain whose content changes as the poem progresses. Both these functions may (as in the case of Theoc. 1 and 2) appear in the same poem.

\textit{Simple articulation.} It is only natural that refrains in bucolic should usually fall between sentences,\footnote{Bucolic refrains do on occasion interrupt sentences, but I shall deal with that phenomenon later when discussing the “lyric functions” of bucolic refrains.} but we can go further and show that they also mark off larger units of sense grouped by theme. This is most apparent in Theocritus \textit{Idylls} 1 and 2 and \textit{EB}. The “refrains” of \textit{EA} operate in a slightly different way structurally, and I shall reserve comment on them for the following section on “complex articulation”.

The clearest example of a bucolic refrain that is used to mark off distinct thematic units is probably that of \textit{EB}. This poem’s refrain occurs at intervals that are significantly longer and more irregular in length (from four to fourteen lines)
than those in Theocritus 1 and 2. Given this, we should not be surprised that each
separated block of verse is thematically discrete.\footnote{The refrains break the poem into thirteen clear thematic blocks: 1-7, reaction of
inanimate nature to Bion’s death; 9-12, of nightingales; 14-8, of Strymonian swans;
20-4, an imagined scene of Bion in Hades; 26-35, reaction of immortals to Bion’s
death; 37-44, a list of famously bereaved characters; 46-9, nightingales and
swallows; 51-6, a consideration of Bion’s now inactive pipe; 58-63, the reaction of
Galatea; 65-9, more consequences of Bion’s death among the immortals; 70-84, a
comparison of Bion to Homer; 86-97, the reaction to Bion’s death on the part of
the listed hometowns of other famous poets; 99-107, a comparison of Bion to
dying vegetation; 109-12, an allegation that Bion was poisoned; 114-end, a parting
farewell in the voice of the poet himself.

Other divisions of \textit{EB} by theme are, of course, possible. Manakidou (1996) 43-
57 suggests, for example, 5 divisions by theme. But the fact that the poem’s refrain
“is extremely unhelpful in this division” (Manakidou, 43, n.48) does not prove that
it “has no real function” (Manakidou, 32, n.25) in the poem.\footnote{Cf. Kegel-Brinkgreve (1990) 56; Mumprecht (1964) 33; Porro (1988) 213.}

It should be noted that the
sections created by the refrain in this poem contain lists linked not only by theme,
but also by sound. I am speaking of lines 37-44, where we are told that Bion is
lamented more than the dearly departed of a slew of distinguished mourners. Six
of these eight lines feature (usually initially) the phrase \textit{οὐ τόσον} (37, 41), \textit{οὐ τόσον}
(40) or \textit{οὐδὲ τόσον} (38-9, 42). My point is that the poet of \textit{EB} has used the refrain
not only to mark off units of sense, but also, in one case, of sound.

By using the refrain to mark off discrete thematic units, the poet of \textit{EB} seems
to have followed the practice of Theocritus in \textit{Idyll} 1. This should be no surprise,
given \textit{EB}’s obvious dependence upon that poem.\footnote{Cf. Kegel-Brinkgreve (1990) 56; Mumprecht (1964) 33; Porro (1988) 213.} The refrains of Theocritus 1,
however, come much more frequently than those of \textit{EB}, resulting in much shorter
blocks of verse. These range in length from two to five lines, the most common
length being four lines. It follows that longer themes must be treated in sections
longer than single blocks of verse marked off by refrain. Nevertheless, these
blocks frequently do correspond to discrete thematic units, and even the themes
treated more at length generally occupy two or more intact blocks of verse. In
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but also by sound. I am speaking of lines 37-44, where we are told that Bion is
lamented more than the dearly departed of a slew of distinguished mourners. Six
of these eight lines feature (usually initially) the phrase \textit{οὐ τόσον} (37, 41), \textit{οὐ τόσον}
(40) or \textit{οὐδὲ τόσον} (38-9, 42). My point is that the poet of \textit{EB} has used the refrain
not only to mark off units of sense, but also, in one case, of sound.

By using the refrain to mark off discrete thematic units, the poet of \textit{EB} seems
to have followed the practice of Theocritus in \textit{Idyll} 1. This should be no surprise,
given \textit{EB}’s obvious dependence upon that poem.\footnote{Cf. Kegel-Brinkgreve (1990) 56; Mumprecht (1964) 33; Porro (1988) 213.} The refrains of Theocritus 1,
however, come much more frequently than those of \textit{EB}, resulting in much shorter
blocks of verse. These range in length from two to five lines, the most common
length being four lines. It follows that longer themes must be treated in sections
longer than single blocks of verse marked off by refrain. Nevertheless, these
blocks frequently do correspond to discrete thematic units, and even the themes
treated more at length generally occupy two or more intact blocks of verse. In
other words, while not every instance of refrain in Thyrsis’ song marks a change of theme, almost every change of theme is marked by an instance of refrain. 18

An especially interesting example of a refrain used to mark off discrete thematic units is found in the first of Simaetha’s two performances in Theocritus 2, namely that portion of the poem featuring the refrain ἵυγξ, κτλ. This is an exceptionally regular refrain compared to most others in bucolic (only the second refrain of Theocritus 2 is so regular), marking out nine blocks of verse of four lines each. This high degree of regularity serves to emphasize all the more the articulation between each block of verse and its corresponding theme. What makes this case so interesting is that, as Gow has pointed out, almost each block corresponds either to a specific physical act performed as part of the dramatized magical spell, or to a specific prayer belonging to that spell, or both. To this rule there are two exceptions only: in the fourth block (38-41) there is no physical act nor prayer, while in the fifth block there are two pairs of act and prayer. Gow explains the absence of magic in block four is made up by its superabundance in block five. 19

Complex articulation. A more complex form of articulation is produced when a refrain changes over the course of a poem. We may compare this function to the song marker function. In that case, the presence of refrain in one part of a poem marks it off from the rest of the poem; here, the changing refrain within a poem, 18 These themes fall out as follows: 65-9, the poet asks, where were the nymphs?; 71-2, wild animals (jackals, wolves, lion) mourn Daphnis; 74-5, domesticated cattle mourn; 77-8, Hermes arrives; 80-4, herdsmen arrive, and with them Priapus, who occupies 85-8 and 90-4 as well; 95-8, Cypris comes and questions Daphnis; 100-3, Daphnis answers Daphnis; 105-7, Daphnis dismisses Cypris; 109-10, Daphnis speaks of Adonis; 112-3, Daphnis again dismisses Cypris; 115-8, Daphnis bids farewell to wild animals and their haunts; 120-1, Daphnis identifies himself as a herdsman; 123-6 and 128-30, Daphnis calls to Pan; 132-6, Daphnis calls on nature to mourn him; 138-41, Daphnis goes to the stream.
19 Gow (1950) ii, 39f.
or within one part of a poem, marks off separate sections within a poem or inset “song”. We see this function quite clearly at work in Theocritus 2, where the refrain ἔναγξ, κτλ is replaced by the refrain φράζεο, κτλ at line 69. This change in the content of Simaetha's refrain marks the shift from her performance of a magical spell to her new performance, addressed to the Moon. This new performance is, within the dramatic context, a plaintive soliloquy expressing Simaetha's anguish as well as her blame of Delphis²⁰; it also serves the poet’s purpose of providing the narrative background for the dramatic action of the poem. This division between the two parts of the poem is further emphasized by the change in the frequency with which the refrain appears, from every fifth line to every sixth. This aspect of the refrain’s functionality is made possible by the unusual regularity (for bucolic) of the two refrains throughout the poem. It is important to note as well that the changes in the refrain do not destroy the formal continuity created by the presence of the refrain throughout the majority of the poem.²¹ Indeed, the refrain, even as it changes, illustrates the basic continuity of Simaetha’s emotional state;²² a state that is characterized by compulsive, recurring thoughts of her situation, until at line 135 it reaches a pitch at which it can no longer be contained within the regular form of refrain.²³

This brings us to another aspect of the complex articulation of refrain function: the use of the point of change in a refrain’s content to mark a specific theme within the non-re refrain context. In Theocritus 1, for example, the change of Thyrsis’ refrain at line 94 from its first version (ἀρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοίσαι φίλαι, ἀρχετε᾽ ἀοιδᾶς) to its second version (ἀρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοίσαι, πάλιν ἀρχετε᾽ ἀοιδᾶς)

²⁰ Griffiths 85; Andrews (1996) 27, n.3.
²² Parry 47; Gutzwiller (1991) 103.
²³ Griffiths 85.
has been explained as marking the arrival of Cypris to the scene immediately thereafter. But we cannot press this point too hard: the MSS are far from unanimous in locating this first change in the refrain, and in his edition Gow places the change at 94 because he sees that as “a suitable position for a change of refrain.” The change to Thyrsis’ third refrain (λήγετε βουκολικάς, Μοίσαι, ἵτε λήγετ’ ἀοιδᾶς), on the other hand, is well established in the MSS for line 127, and so it is reasonable to suggest that this change marks Daphnis’ call to Pan, which begins in the “stanza” just prior.

§2. Possible external associations for the refrain form in bucolic poetry.

Given the apparent innovation represented by Theocritus’ introduction of the refrain form to hexameter verse, we are obliged to relate its use in bucolic to its use elsewhere. Critics have commonly connected it with popular or primitive forms, sometimes without reference to a specific genre, but more often to specific sub-literary genres. Some have seen the refrain in bucolic poetry as a feature inherited “from actual herdsmen’s songs.” It is impossible to prove or disprove that ancient Sicilian herdsmen’s songs did, in fact, feature refrains; but if recent criticism disputing bucolic’s descent from “primitive rural cults, religious festivals, or other aspects of folk culture” is correct, then we may say it is

---

24 Hunter (1999) ad loc., comparing this passage to V. Ec. 8.61, where “Muses are called upon to end the song just as Daphnis abandons his syrinx.”
25 As Hunter (1999) acknowledges ad 1.64.
26 Gow (1950) ii, 17.
27 Gow (1950) ii, 16.
28 Dover (1971) xlix-l.
29 Walker (1980) 131; see also Mumprecht ad EB 8. Similarly Hunter ad Theoc. 1.64 relates the refrain of that poem to “popular βουκολικάς”. Walker 127 opines, “It is difficult to account for [Theocritus’] stylistic use of repetition, refrain, and amoebean exchange in any other way.”
unlikely that bucolic refrain has such an origin. A second, even more commonly suggested source for the refrain form in bucolic is the ritual lament.\footnote{Manakidou (1996) 32f.; Hunter (1999) ad Th. 1.67; Gutzwiller (1991) 103; Estevez (1981) 35. It is noteworthy that recent criticism in this direction habitually cites Alexiou as an authority on the refrain form in ritual lament. (Cf. CHAPTER 3, §2.) We may compare this to the unquestioning acceptance of Kranz and Deubner by earlier critics who, here and elsewhere, related the refrain form to magic.}

I have already in Chapter 1 dealt with the problems concerning the attempts to explain the refrains of Greek poetry with relation to sub-literary forms in general and the sub-literary in particular. I will repeat here only that we lack the positive evidence necessary to claim these associations. Fortunately we do have some evidence for possible external associations brought by the refrain form to bucolic poetry. To begin with, we may look to the nearly three centuries of poetic practice previous to bucolic as represented in our refrain text corpus. As we have seen, this corpus reveals a refrain tradition that is rooted in monostrophic lyric song, yet is diversified to the extent that refrains are featured in examples of disparate genres and strophic structures. We also have before us the evidence, discussed in Chapter 4, for the treatment of the refrain form by Hellenistic scholarship, scholarship that is roughly contemporaneous with, and therefore a likely context for, the composition of bucolic refrain poetry. As we have seen, Hellenistic scholarship saw the refrain as a formal feature of strophic lyric, and recognized its presence in a variety of generic contexts. The most important association, therefore, that the refrain form is likely to have brought to bucolic poetry is its association with lyric. Certain aspects of that association are not normally played out in bucolic; I have already discussed the implications of the lack of a strophic structure for the refrain form in continuous hexameter.
§3. Lyric refrain functionality in the refrains of bucolic poetry.

Adaptation of external sub-literary material. Bucolic refrains not only carry
associations with lyric song in general; they also make use of many of the
functions, both intrinsic and extrinsic, established already for lyric refrains. The
first of these is the use of the refrain form’s intrinsic emphatic force to adapt
independent sub-literary material to poetry. This is most clear in the refrain of
EA, which contains a version of the independent Adonis cry (ἀπώλετο καλὸς
Ἀδωνις).\textsuperscript{32} This we may easily relate to the use of independent cries such as παιάν
in lyric refrains. Another interesting example of Theocritus’ use of refrains to
incorporate and emphasize an independent outside element is the first refrain of
Idyll 2. In this refrain (ὑψξ, ἐλκε τῇ τῆς ἐκατον ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἀνδρα) the outside
element is an action: the turning of the wryneck on a wheel as part of the
performance of the magical spell.

Dramatization. Beyond the mere introduction of an independent external sub-
literary element to the poem, the first refrain of Idyll 2 also serves an extrinsic
dramatic function by linking the text of the poem to action represented as
happening in the moment. This dramatic function of the refrain parallels the
dramatic effect achieved through the use of the mute character, Thestylis.\textsuperscript{33}

These two dramatic elements work closely together, especially at lines 18-21.

\textsuperscript{32} Shorter and simpler versions seem to have been more common. Cf. Sappho fr.
168 ὁ τὸν Ἀδωνις; Theoc. 15.136, 143 ὁ φίλο Ἀδωνις. See Reed (1997) 20, 195, 251 for
the possibility that Bion’s version of the Adonis cry may fit a theme (“[name of
god] is dead”) with Near Eastern associations.

Here Simaetha berates Thestyris for botching the spell and must give additional instructions for how to through the meal onto the fire, all within the confines of the “stanza” defined by the refrains at 17 and 22. Simaetha’s dutiful observance of the regular refrain, despite the interruption, highlights the irregularity of the ritual at this point in the spell, and the effect is clearly meant to be humorous.

Simaetha’s dramatizing first refrain is an innovative extension of the “quasi-dramatic” refrain function frequently found in lyric. Most examples of dramatizing refrains in bucolic are rather closer in operation to their lyric predecessors. As we saw in Chapter 2, one of the important dramatic functions of lyric refrains is to serve on occasion as “quotations” of performances described in the non-refrain context. We find an exact parallel in EA. In this poem the Adonis cry portion of the “refrain” (ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνίς) is passed from speaker to speaker, sometimes within the refrain itself: the speaker of the poem (αιάζω τῶν Ἀδωνίων) and the “Loves” (ἐπαιάζουσιν Ἑρωτεῖς) are alternately assigned the Adonis cry as segments 1a and 2b of the variable refrain appear and reappear throughout the poem. At 35ff. we find the most striking instance of dramatization in the refrain of the EA. Here it is Cythera who emits the refrain, lamenting both herself and Adonis: ἀ δὲ Κυθήρα... ἀείδει (‘αιά τὰν Κυθέρειαν ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνίς.’) Then, in a twist probably meant as a humorous comment on the repetitiousness of the refrain form itself, Echo takes up the cry immediately following at line 38: ᾿Αχὼ δ’ ἀντεβόασεν (‘ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνίς.’) This example is extreme, but definitely follows the lead established by prior lyric practice, especially in paeans.

---

Less extreme, but just as surely influenced by lyric practice, are those bucolic refrains that interrupt sentences at moments of climax, and thus present the speaker to be emitting a spontaneous emotional reaction to narrative in the non-refrain context. An example of this occurs at Theoc. 2.103ff., where, in her soliloquy to the Moon, Simaetha describes her reaction to the first time Delphis came to her house:

\[
\text{§g∆ d° nin \( \omega \) \( \varepsilon \) \( \nu \) \( \eta \eta \) \( \sigma \) / \( \tilde{\alpha} \text{rti} \ \tilde{\theta} \text{urar} \ \tilde{u} \text{p} \text{er} \ \sigma \text{ud} \text{on} \ \tilde{\alpha} \text{mei} \tilde{b} \text{om} \text{en} \ \pi \text{lo} \ \kappa \text{ou} \text{phi} \ / \ - \ \phi \text{ra} \text{xe} \text{o} \ \mu \text{eu} \ \tau \text{on} \ \tilde{e} \text{ro} \text{w} \tilde{h} \ \tilde{o} \text{be} \ \tilde{i} \text{ke} \text{to}, \ \pi \text{ot} \text{ina} \ \text{Ze} \text{l} \text{a} \text{n} \text{a} - / \ \pi \text{a} \text{sa} \ \mu \text{e} \nu \ \tilde{e} \text{psi} \text{uch} \eta \nu \ \chi \text{i} \text{no} \text{s} \ \pi \text{l} \text{e} \text{o} \text{n}, \ \kappa \text{t} \text{l} . \ \text{Dover recognizes a dramatic effect here and likens it to Idyll 1.85,}^{35} \ \text{where we find the refrain emphasizing the enjambment of} \ \zeta \text{ateio} \ \text{.}^{36} \ \text{But the effect at 1.85 is probably not “dramatic”, since there is no particular reason to expect that the speaker (Thyrsis) would become suddenly emotional over the search by the nameless} \ \kappa \text{öra} \ \text{of line 82 for Daphnis. Moreover, Thyris} \text{s’ refrain does not contain anything that could be considered expressive of strong emotion. By contrast, the refrain of 2.105 occurs at a spot where we do expect Simaetha to be emotional, and the substance of her refrain is emotionally appropriate in that it speaks of the origin of her love, which is clearly the moment being described at 2.103ff. Likewise we may speak of EB 44ff. as an example of this dramatic use of the interrupting refrain. There the refrain interrupts a sentence describing the mourning of Bion by nightingales and doves, and occurs immediately after the naming of Bion: "οςσυν \( \alpha \text{ποφιμ} \text{ένοιο} \ \kappa \text{ατωδύραντο} \ \text{B} \\text{\iota} \\text{ω} \text{νος} / - \ \alpha \text{ρ} \text{χ} \text{e} \text{τe} \ \text{Σικελίκαι}, \ \tau \text{ω} \ \pi \text{έντες} \ \alpha \text{ρ} \text{χ} \text{e} \text{τe}, \ \text{Μοίσαi} - / \ \alpha \text{δονίδες} \ \pi \text{ασ} \text{α} \ \tau \text{e} \ \chi \text{ελιδόνες}, \ \nu \nu \ \text{s} \ \text{ποκ} \ \text{é} \text{τερπεν}. \ \text{The interruption comes at a moment we would expect an emotional outburst on the part of the speaker, and the substance of the refrain is appropriate to such an outburst, containing as it does a reference to grief.}

^{35} \text{Dover (1971) ad loc.}
^{36} \text{Cf. Gow (1950) and Hunter (1999) ad 1.85.}
Invocation, performance language and generic identification. Another function commonly taken on by the refrain in bucolic is the treatment, by means of the refrain form’s intrinsic emphatic force, of themes of invocation. This is clearly related to the treatment of divine names in lyric refrains, though the personages invoked in bucolic refrains are not always divine, e.g. the wryneck in the first refrain of Theoc. 2. Bucolic refrains also follow the lead of lyric refrains in that they commonly treat themes of performance. Usually the performance referred to is that of the song at hand; in EA we see an example where the performance being described (the emissions of the Adonis cry et sim.) is probably external to the poem itself.

Most commonly these two themes, invocation and performance, are combined in the refrains of bucolic. In the second refrain of Theoc. 2, Simaetha invokes Selene and asks her to “tell whence came my love”; in other words, Simaetha is asking Selene to assist her in the performance of her song, a theme commonly treated in lyric refrains.37 The clearest examples of this type of bucolic refrain are, of course, the refrains of Theoc. 1 and EB, both of which are addressed to the Muses and ask them to “begin” (ἐρχετε) and, in the case of Theoc. 1, to “lay aside” (ληγετε) the songs at hand.

This brings us to the matter of the generic function of the refrain in bucolic. Halperin has pointed out that, “Bucolic poetry... was created and sustained by a brief series of poets whose consciousness of working in a common literary territory is attested by an unusual frequency of references and allusions to earlier members of the tradition by later ones.”38 The use of the refrain stands as an important example of this generic self-consciousness on the part of bucolic poets,

37 Cf. the refrain of Hymn. Cur. and the refrain (Ἰακχε φιλοχορευτά, συμπρόπεμπτε με) of the Initiate’s song, Frogs 403ff.
a convenient means by which these poets place themselves within a distinctive bucolic tradition. This bucolic refrain tradition begins, of course, with Theocritus. It has already been pointed out that *Idyll* 1 self-consciously presents itself as belonging to a “bucolic” tradition, and that the content of that poem’s refrains, e.g. ἀργυρές, emphasizes its “foundational” aspect. But what has not been stressed before is the significance of Theocritus’ use of the refrain form *per se* for this foundational function.

We have already seen in Chapter 2 how the refrain form was used in lyric to emphasize generic identity. It could be seen that Theocritus’ adoption of the refrain form to treat programmatic and generic themes in *Idyll* 1 parallels the generic identification function established for lyric refrains. Like lyric poets before him, one would argue, Theocritus would have seen the repetitiousness of the refrain form as a convenient means to emphasize important thematic material, in his case the theme of a “bucolic” tradition. But in view of the many aspects of refrain functionality that Theocritus borrows from previous lyric practice, it seems more likely that his adoption of the refrain form for use in his self-conscious generic program is dependent upon, rather than parallel to, the similar function of refrains in lyric. It will be remembered from Chapter 2 that the refrain form, since it was frequently selected as a means to emphasize certain generic themes (e.g. the paean cry) in lyric poetry, eventually became associated with specific genres. This we have already seen evidenced in the Hellenistic scholarly treatment of refrains, which begins, so far as we can tell, with allusions by Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes to the refrain form commonly used in paean. Theocritus seems to have noticed this same association between the

---

40 Hunter (1999) ad 1.64. Fantuzzi (1998) points out that Thyrsis is the only “living” shepherd in Theocritus to invoke the Muses.
refrain form and certain genres of lyric, and to have deduced that generic identification was an important function of lyric refrain. The point here is that, rather than using the refrain form to identify his poetry as belonging to any specific genre of existing Greek lyric, Theocritus is taking up what he sees as an established function of the lyric refrain: the identification of genre. That Theocritus uses the refrain form specifically to identify the inset song of *Idyll 1* as an example of “bucolic” is beyond doubt. The appeal to the Muses in that refrain is for a genre (βουκολικᾶ... ἀοιδᾶς) of which Thyrsis is said to be a master at line 20: καὶ τὰς βουκολικὰς ἐπὶ τὸ πλέον ἱκεο Μοίσας. Similarly, *Idyll 2*’s first refrain functions to identify the first inset performance within that poem as a spell; this it does not by any strict formal similarity to real spells, but by the emphasis given to the obviously magical character of the refrain’s content.

Once Theocritus had established this function for the refrain in bucolic, it persisted for the duration of that poetic tradition. What is interesting is the way in which the refrain form *per se* was identified with the bucolic genre by later bucolic poets and used as a means of placing their poems within that tradition. In the case of *EA*, the refrain form is even treated as a theme in its own right, manipulated in such a way not only to emphasize (as we have seen) the dramatic function of the refrain form, but also to comment upon and demonstrate mastery over a formal device strongly associated with the bucolic tradition itself.
APPENDIX

REFRAINS IN DITHYRAMB

§1 The existence of a refrain in dithyramb

Our two best sources of evidence for a refrain in Greek dithyramb are relatively late: the seventh section of π.π. which, if it is correctly attributed to Hephaestion, dates from the 2nd century A.D.; and the first book of the Ars Grammatica of Marius Victorinus, rhetorician of the 4th century A.D.¹ The texts are:

Hephaestion Περὶ ποιημάτων §7 (p.70 Consbruch):
ἐστὶ δὲ των ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι καὶ τὰ καλούμενα ἐφήμια, ἀπερ ταύτης τῆς προσηγορίας τετυχηκέν, ἐπειδή καὶ ἐφήμιον τι εἰσώσασιν ἐπάγειν οἱ ποιηταὶ ταῖς στροφαῖς, οία ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ((ἰηὲ παιάν)) καὶ ((ὁ διθύραμβος)).

Mar. Victorinus G.L. VI 59, 24-29 Keil:
Hoc loco non superserim dicere esse brevia cola, quae post strophon et antistrophon supercini moris est, quae iam non epodae, sed ἐφήμια dicentur, ut est in ἱη παιάν. Haec enim vel hymnis vel dithyrambis supercini moris est, quae [de epodicis carminibus] si quando praeponuntur προοίμια, si autem post antistrophon collocentur, μεθώμια nuncupabuntur.

These texts are to some extent complementary. Hephaestion quotes a refrain ὁ διθύραμβος which he does not explicitly associate with the genre of dithyramb; Victorinus states that refrains are usually “sung over” (supercini) dithyrambs, but does not give an example of these particular refrains. We should not doubt, however, that Hephaestion meant his readership to

¹Neither Hephaestion nor Victorinus are commonly considered in modern discussions of the form of dithyramb. Pickard-Cambridge (1962, 9), who assumes a refrain performance is described in Archilochus fr. 120 (and Van der Weiden (11), who follows him) makes no mention of either passage. Ieranò, Giorgio. Il ditirambo di Dioniso : le testimonianze antiche, Lyricorum Graecorum quae existant ; 12. Pisa: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 1997. collects both passages in his testimonia section, but does not go any further than to mention that a refrain is attested in Hephaestion in his commentary section. While Crusius had mentioned Hephaestion in relation to a refrain for dithyramb in his 1905 RE article (col. 1204), no such mention is made of H. or of the refrain in the New Pauly.
understand ò διθύραμβε as being a refrain of dithyramb, as can be seen by his parallel quotation of the refrain associated with the paean. We may note that Victorinus also sees no need to state explicitly that ἴῃ παιάν is taken from the paean.

Hephaestion and Victorinus know of a refrain (or refrains) in dithyramb. The question remains, which stage of dithyramb are they talking about? That they are speaking of literary, and not “folk”, dithyramb is almost certain, since both writers’ interests are rooted in established literary forms which they illuminate with examples taken from well known literary sources. Furthermore, it is unlikely that examples of “folk” dithyramb would have survived so late, especially in the case of Victorinus.

The context in which Hephaestion and Victorinus mention these refrains provides a clue as to which stage of literary dithyramb they belong. Both writers are speaking of ἐφύμνια (as well as the related forms μεσύμνια, μεθύμνια and προύμνια), which are appended to strophes: Hephaestion, ἐπάγεον... ταῖς στροφαῖς; Victorinus, post strophen et antistrophen supercini. This implies a strophic context for the refrains of dithyramb, at least as known by these two writers. As it

\[\text{This is quite clear in the case of Hephaestion, whose sources are clearly literary and well known, and probably based on Alexandrian editions, cf. τὸ δεύτερον Σαπφοῦς (p.63), τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον Σαπφοῦς (p.63), [ἡν πρῶτην φωνὴν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Ἀλκαῖου καὶ τὴν δεύτερην (p.66)], τὸ πρῶτον Ἄνακρέωντος ἄριστα (p.68). Authors cited are Sappho (4x), Callimachus, Menander, Homer (2x), Timotheus, Simonides (2x), Alcaeus (3x), Hermeius, Anacreon (3x), Pindar, Simias Rhodius, Bacchylides (2x), and Eupolis; other ascriptions include αἱ τραγῳδίαι καὶ αἱ παλαιὰ κοιμωδίαι (p.63) and ἐν ταῖς κοιμωδίαις (p.72). All passages quoted are ascribed with two exceptions: (1) the very instances of the paeanic and dithyrambic refrains under discussion; (2) two fragments of Archilochus (94, 104) on p.71, the first of which was probably thought by the writer to be immediately recognizable as Archilochus’ because it includes an address to Lycambe. Hephaestion’s dependence upon written sources is emphasized by his habitual use of the verb γράφω when describing the relative location of metrical features within a line or stanza, as well as his assumption of a generic ποιήσις who produces these metrical phenomena in writing.}\]
happens, one of the few things we know about the music of the dithyramb is that, some time near the end of the 5th century B.C.\(^3\), there appeared a new form of dithyramb that featured the astrophic \(\acute{\text{a}ναβολή}\), an innovation apparently introduced by Melanippides.\(^4\) This structural change seems to be linked to the introduction of more dramatic material to the genre.\(^5\) It follows that a refrain such as is described by Hephaestion and Victorinus could not occur within the new astrophic dithyramb, and therefore they must be describing refrains found in examples of the older, antistrophic form of the literary genre. It would seem, therefore, that Pickard-Cambridge’s intuition about a refrain in early dithyramb is more or less correct. But it is impossible to restrict the refrain to an early stage, since the examples of the antistrophic dithyramb available to Hephaestion and Victorinus could be not only dithyrambs written before the introduction of the new astrophic form around the end of the 5th century; they could just as well be examples of an old-style antistrophic form that coexisted with the new dithyramb well after the introduction of the latter. Such a survival of the old form may be indicated by Philodamus Scarpheus’ “Paean to Dionysus” discussed below.

§2 The form of the refrain in dithyramb

There are two aspects of the question of form: (1) the content of the refrain itself; (2) how the refrain is deployed with respect to the non-refrain portion of the song.

\(^3\)Pickard-Cambridge, pp. 38ff.


\(^5\)Ps. Aristotle *Probl.* XIX 15 918b: διὸ καὶ οἱ διθύραμβοι, ἔπειτα μημητικοὶ ἐγένετο, οὐκέτι ἔχουσιν ἀντιστρόφους, πρότερον δὲ εἶχον.
Content of the refrain of dithyramb. Hephaestion’s π.π. is once again our clearest source of evidence, since it alone gives us content explicitly set in the formal context of a refrain. The single ὤ διθύραμβε appears to be an address to a person, Dithyramb, to be identified with Dionysus. This and similar forms should be considered “normal” for the refrain in dithyramb, if only because of its coincidence with the name of the genre. But as we shall see, there appears to be a variability in the content of the refrain associated with the dithyramb that goes beyond even the variability we saw in the examples of the ύμή-refrain.

Pindar (fr. 85) is credited for using a form other than the “normal” one at Et.M. s.v. διθύραμβος: Πίνδαρος δέ φησιν λυθύραμβου καὶ γὰρ Ζεὺς τικτομένου αὐτοῦ ἔπεβολ (λυθί ράμμα, λυθί ράμμα), ἱν’ ἡ λυθύραμμος καὶ διθύραμβος κατὰ τροπήν καὶ πλεονασμόν. This form, λυθύραμβος, may or may not have been used as a proper refrain. If it was used in a refrain, a single instance of it may have made up the whole of that refrain’s content, much as with ὤ διθύραμβε given in the π.π. above. But the fact that the etymology given for the form has Zeus shout λυθί ράμμα twice may indicate that the cry was doubled (at least) in performance. In this case the entry in the Et.M. would serve not only as an etymology for the word form, but also as an aetiology for the performance mode. There is a question, of course, as to whether the etymology is Pindar’s own, but we may treat it as evidence for the refrain either way: if it is Pindar’s etymology, then Pindar was explaining the refrain as known to himself and to his audience; if it is a later writer’s etymology, then that writer was attempting to explain the form as found

---

6 Cf. Ieranò test. 2-23, pp. 18-23, for examples of διθύραμβος used as divine name. 7 We may compare the aetologies for the paean refrain given by Callimachus, Hymn 2.103-104: ((ἡ ἡ παιήν, ἢι βέλος, εὐθὺ σε μήτηρ / γείνατι ἀοσπητήρα)) τὸ δ’ ἐξέτει κείθεν αἰείθε., and Ap. Rh., 2.712f: θαρσύνεσκον ἐπέσσειν, ( 묘 ἡ) κεκληγυίαν / ἐνθεν δὲ τὸ διόμενον ἐφόμενον ἐπλετο Φοῖβῳ.
in Pindar. In either case the doubling of the shout within the etymology implies that the composer of the etymology was faced with a doubled (at least) instance of the word form, and the most likely context for that double instance is a refrain.

Another bit of evidence for a “doubled” refrain in dithyramb may be found at Pratinas, fr.1 Page (PMG 708) 12f:

\[ \nu \nu \quad \nu \nu \quad \nu \nu \quad \nu \nu \]

The doubled or compound form \( \text{θριαμβοθύαραμβε} \), here used as an epithet of Dionysus, to whom the speaker is appealing in his diatribe against the new music with its overly aggressive flute accompaniment, may be taken from an extended refrain form, perhaps Crusius’ reconstructed \( \text{θρίαμβε διθύραμβε} \).

Already it would seem there was more than one form of the refrain in dithyramb, variable not only in number but in word-form: \( \text{διθύραμβος} \), \( \lambda ν \nu \) \( \text{θριαμβοθύαραμβος} \) (or \( \text{θριαμβε διθύραμβε} \), as reconstructed by Crusius), and by implication \( \text{θρίαμβος} \). All of these forms share an obvious similarity, especially in their -\( \text{αμβως} \) endings, but there is evidence for even more radical variation.

8 Cf. Julian, Or. VII 15, 220 b-c, II pp. 63-5 Rochefort: ‘Ερμή καλείσσας ὁ Ζεὺς ἀρπάσαι τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τεμών (τῶν αὐτῶν μηρῶν ἐν) ἀρπάττει: εἶτα ἐκείδει, ἡνίκα ἐτελεσφορὴν τὸ βρέφος, ὠδίνων ὁ Ζεὺς ἐπὶ τὰς τύμφας ἔρχεται: τὸ (Ἀλῆθι μάμμα) δὲ αὐτὴ τῶν μηρῶν προσπαθέοι (τῶν διθύραμβον ἡμῶν) εἰς φῶς προήγαγον. The performers of the cry are different in this version of the etymology. An even stronger suggestion of performance situation is present in the participle \( \text{προσπαθέοι} \) and the resemblance of the nymphs to a chorus.

9 Also, the etymology does not identify \( \lambda ν \nu \) \( \text{θριαμβοθύαραμβος} \) as an address to Dionysus, though it is easy to imagine that a form originally used as an address could later be construed as having its origins elsewhere in the dionysiac narrative material. But this does call into question whether even a refrain containing the form \( \text{διθύραμβος} \) would always be understood as a direct address to a person, Dithyramb.

10 Op. cit. col. 1204. Cf. also the extended form \( \text{υμηνυμένανος} \), used as a name for the wedding song at Oppian, C.1.341, and which is clearly derived from the commonly extended, or “doubled” form of the \( \text{υμήν}-\text{refrain} \).
At Aristophanes’ *Frogs* 316f, the chorus of Initiates makes its entrance while singing the refrain ἴακχε ὃ ἴακχε / ἴακχε ὃ ἴακχε. Xanthias reacts by saying (318ff):

τούτ’ ἔστι ἐκεῖν’, ὃ δέσποτ’ οἱ μεμνημένοι / ἐνταῦθα ποῦ παίζοντι, οὐς [Heracles]

έφραζε νῦν. ἀδουσί γοὺν τὸν ἴακχον ὑπερ Διαγόρας. The scholium to 320 explains Xanthias' reference to “the iacchos, the very one Diagoras [sings]” in the following manner. Schol. V in Aristoph. *Ra.* 320, p.284 Dübner: διψηραμβοποίως ὁ Διαγόρας ποιητής, συνεχῶς ἴακχε ἴακχε ἄδων. ἡ κωμικὸς διψηραμβικὰ, τουτέστι Διονυσιακὰ δράματα ποιῶν. Now, for our purposes it is not critical whether the text of Aristophanes should read Διαγόρας as I have given it, following the mss., or διέ ἄγορᾶς as given by Coulon and Dover; nor is it critical whether or not the scholiast is correct in his identification of the Diagonas of Aristophanes’ text with a dithyrambic poet, Diagoras. What is important is that the scholiast has made the connection between the refrain ἴακχε ὃ ἴακχε in the text of the play with what he knows about the dithyramb. This suggests an association of the refrain with the genre of dithyramb, and the survival of that association in sufficient examples that it would suggest itself to a later commentator. This association may be confirmed by PMG 1027d, taken from Dion. Hal.’s discussion of brachysyllabic meters: ἴακχε θρίαμβε. σὺ τῶν θυραγέ.

Further variability in the refrain of dithyramb, and an apparent ease with which dithyramb could incorporate paeanic material into its own refrain, may be indicated by Philodamus Scarpheus’ paean to Dionysus, Coll.Hell. pp.165ff, which opens with the line ἴδε ώρ’ ἄνα Διδύραμβε Βακχ’ and which features a mesymnion at the fifth line of each stanza εὖοὶ ὃ ἱόβακχοι ὃ ἰὲ παιάν. Also, there is

---

11Dover’s argument, ad loc., that mention of the famously impious Diagoras in this context would be too poor a joke for Aristophanes, is very weak.

12It does not follow that the refrain ἴακχε ὃ ἴακχε is associated exclusively with dithyramb, and therefore there is no immediate need to classify the song sung by Aristophanes’ Initiates as a dithyramb.
Aristarchus’ classification of Bacchylides 23 as a dithyramb despite the presence of what we would normally think of as a paeanic refrain, i.e. ἱή.

We may have evidence for the use of ἄλαλά as a refrain of dithyramb in Pindar’s description of a divine performance of dithyramb in fr. 70b, listed as Dithyramb 2 by Maehler:

πρὶν μὲν ἔρπε σχοινοτένεια τ’ ἀοιδὰ
διὸ υφάμβων...
οἷάν Βρομίου [τελε]τάν
καὶ παρὰ σκάλπτον Δίὸς Οὐρανίδαι
ἐν μεγάροις ἵ σταμτο. σεμιὰ μὲν κατάρχει
Ματέρι παρ μ εγιάλα ρόμβου τυπάνων,
ἐν δὲ κέχλαδεν κρόταλ’ αἰθομένα τε
δαίν ὑπὸ ξαν θαλίμυ πεικάις
ἐν δὲ Νάθων ἐρέγουμοι στοιαχαί
μανιαὶ τ’ ἄλαλ αἱ τ’ ὀρίνεται ριψαίχεις
ςών κλώνῳ.

It is clear, then, that among the various appropriate cries that could accompany early (and divinely sanctioned) dithyramb as imagined by Pindar was the cry ἄλαλά. If Pindar includes this cry in his description of primitive, pure dithyramb, it is likely that he understood the cry to be appropriate to contemporary, proper dithyramb as well. The role of ἄλαλά in contemporary, literary dithyramb that would correspond most closely to its role as a spontaneous cry accompanying the imagined primordial dithyramb is that of a regular refrain. To this we may compare Pindar fr. 78: κλόθ’ Ἀλαλά, πολέμου θύγατερ. / ἐγχέων προοίμιον, ἄθυται / ἄνδρες ὑπὲρ πόλιος τῶν ιρόθυτου βάνατον,

which is said in the scholium to Aesch. Pers. 49 to have come from a dithyramb. Although Pindar’s interest in fr. 78 is in the use of ἄλαλά as a war cry, it may be that he was providing an elaborate treatment (an etymology?) of the word in order to explain its appearance in dithyramb. Again, the implied importance of the word suggests its repeated use, most likely as a refrain.
It may be possible to link this extreme variability of refrain content with the generic “mixing” bemoaned at Plato, *Laws* 700. But the fact that Pindar is credited for an “unusual” form (λυθίραμβος) argues against an extreme version of this position. Clearly there was a small set of forms and near variants that were associated with the earlier refrains of dithyramb. These probably included διθύραμβος, θρίαμβος, λυθίραμβος; and not ἴαχος or ἴη, which both speak to a broadening of religious identifications for Dionysus.

Arrangement of refrains in dithyramb. Obviously, since we have no surviving example of a dithyrambic refrain in context, what we can say concerning how these refrains were deployed within individual dithyrambs is limited to speculation. If it were possible to say with certainty what performance role is implied by ἔξαρχοι in Archilochus fr. 120, we would know whether the dithyramb mentioned there featured (in Victorinus’ terms) a προφύσμων sung by the ἔξαρχος, or a μεθύμμων sung by the chorus in response to non-refrain material provided by the ἔξαρχος. Certainty is impossible given the scant amount of evidence available, but in as much as the examples of ἔξαρχοι given in §1 above indicate anything at all, they tend to favor προφύσμων sung by ἔξαρχοι for the purpose of initiating and regulating the performance of the chorus. Although we have no evidence for an ἔξαρχος leading off the ἴαχος at *Frogs* 316ff, and we cannot classify the song as a dithyramb, still the fact that a refrain associated with dithyramb is apparently used as a προφύσμων in the song of the Initiates may indicate the common use of refrains as προφύσμων in proper dithyrambs.13

---

13 On more tenuous grounds, the etymologies offered by Pindar and Julian may indicate placement after the strophe, since in both cases the cry λόθι ράμμα is uttered in response to the birth of Dionysus. The very forms used (ἐπεβόα, προσεπάδουναι) emphasise that the cry is reactive.
end, however, it seems most likely that refrains could be used in any number of positions in dithyramb as in other “refrain genres”. Victorinus does not limit the dithyrambic refrain to any specific location with respect to the strophe, while Hephaestion’s placement of it after the strophe cannot be taken as definitive or even exclusive in the context of Hephaestion’s own discussion of refrains.¹⁴

¹⁴E.g., Hephaestion offers Sappho’s ἵμηναον as an example of a μεσήμμιον (not ἑφήμμιον) event though he must have been aware of the many (and perhaps overwhelming) examples of ἵμην-refrains used elsewhere after the strophe
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