

REFRAINS IN ANCIENT GREEK POETRY

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of Cornell University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Simon Peter Burris

May 2004

© 2004 Simon Peter Burris

## REFRAINS IN ANCIENT GREEK POETRY

Simon Peter Burris, Ph.D.

Cornell University 2004

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 ἐφύμνιον. 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.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Simon Peter Burris was born in Nacogdoches, Texas on March 4, 1970. He entered the University of Texas at Austin in 1988 and was awarded a B.A. in Classics in 1992. In 1993 Mr. Burris married Miss Lori Ann Dutschmann of Waco and moved to Iowa City to attend the University of Iowa Writers' Workshop. In 1995 he was admitted as a graduate student in Classics at Cornell University, and began work on his dissertation in 1999. In 2001, Mr. Burris accepted a temporary teaching position at Luther College in Decorah, Iowa, where a son, Owen Hugh, was born in 2002.

To Lori.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many others contributed to the success of this dissertation. First I must express my gratitude to Hayden Pelliccia for his help throughout my association with Cornell University's Department of Classics. His careful criticism of my work has led me to make many improvements and to avoid many pitfalls. Many thanks to the other members of my committee: Kevin Clinton, Judith Ginsburg and Jeffrey Rusten. Without their help this dissertation would not have been possible. Thanks also to Joseph Reed, in whose class the earliest incarnation of this dissertation made its appearance; to Alan Nussbaum; to Pietro Pucci; to Danuta Shanzer; to Frederick Ahl; to David Mankin; and to the Lane Cooper Foundation for its support in the form of a fellowship for the year 1999-2000. Special thanks to Charles Britain for his generous comments and encouragement; to Nancy Sokol and the other administrative staff for their invaluable help; and to my colleagues and students at Luther College for their friendship and support. Finally, I thank my wife, Lori, for her constant patience.

All mistakes are my own.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Biographical Sketch</i>	page iii
<i>Dedication</i>	iv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	v
1 INTRODUCTION	i
2 ANCIENT SCHOLARLY TREATMENT OF REFRAINS	14
3 PERFORMANCE OF REFRAINS	43
4 EXTERNAL ASSOCIATIONS	54
5 REFRAINS IN NON-DRAMATIC LYRIC	63
6 REFRAINS IN DRAMATIC LYRIC	124
7 REFRAINS IN BUCOLIC	165
<i>Appendix: Refrain in Dithyramb</i>	183
<i>Bibliography</i>	192

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

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.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 astrophic and stichic verse, such as we find in the continuous hexameters of bucolic?<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 responson” 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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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,

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Camps (1980) 46-49.

<sup>4</sup> See Kirk (1962) 59ff for a readable overview of formulaic method in Homeric poetry.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Kirk (1976) 4ff.

<sup>6</sup> 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.”<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> This is a compositional style not common, it seems, to the poems with which we will be dealing.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> 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 ἔν μὲν...ἔτευξε; 490 (=573, 587) ἔν δὲ...ποίησε; 541 (=550, 561, 607) ἔν δ’ ἐτίθει; 590 ἔν δὲ...ποίηκε.

<sup>8</sup> Stanley (1993) 7.

<sup>9</sup> 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. *παίαν* or *ἄξιε ταῦρε* 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 Ἠλείων γυναῖκες ὑμνοῦσαι παρακαλοῦσι “βοέω ποδὶ”  
 παραγίνεσθαι πρὸς αὐτάς; ἔχει δ’ οὕτως ὁ ὕμνος·

ἐλθεῖν ἦρω Διόνυσε  
 Ἄλείων ἐς ναὸν  
 ἀγνὸν σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν  
 ἐς ναὸν  
 τῷ βοέω ποδὶ θύων,

εἶτα δις ἐπάδουσιν

ἄξιε ταῦρε,  
 ἄξιε ταῦρε.

The similarities between this example of appended cry and many examples of refrain are potentially misleading.<sup>10</sup> The doubling of the cry *ἄξιε ταῦρε* resembles

<sup>10</sup> Campbell translates Plutarch’s *δις ἐπάδουσιν* “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 *ἄξιε ταῦρε*, *ἄξιε ταῦρε* 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 Ἠλείων γυναῖκες ὑμνοῦσαι*. 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.<sup>11</sup> 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

*Persae* 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 Paeon* 2 (Käppel Pai. 36b)  
*Erythraean Paeon* (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

*Paeon 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

<sup>11</sup> E.g. Pindar, *Paeon* 2.35f; Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 121; *Persae* 1057. For repeated cry as a distinct and independent formal type, and its use in refrain, see my discussion in CHAPTER 4.

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

Euripides

*Bacchae* 877-881=897-901  
*Bacchae* 992-996=1011-1016  
*Ion* 125ff.=141ff.

Macedonius

*Paean in Apollinem et Aesculapium* (Käppel Pai. 41)

[Moschus]

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

Philodamus Scarpheus

*Paean in Dionysum*

Pindar

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

Sappho

fr. III 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

§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”.<sup>12</sup> As we shall see, the placement

<sup>12</sup> 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

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”.<sup>13</sup> This is when the refrain follows its stanza, as in Aristonous, *Paeon to Apollo* 1-4 (Käppel):

Πυθίαν ἱερόκτιτον  
ναίων Δελφίδ’ ἀμφὶ πέτραν  
ἀεὶ θεσπιόμαντιν ἔ-  
δραν, ἰὴ ἰὲ Παιάν

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

ἰήϊε Δάλι’ Ἀπολλων  
Λατόος ἔνθα με παῖδες  
εὐμενεὶ δέξασθε νόω θεράποντα  
ὑμέτερον κελαδεννᾶ  
σὺν μελιγάρυϊ παι-  
ᾶνος ἀγακλέος ὀμφᾶ.

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:

ἴφροι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον,  
ὑμήναον,  
ἀέρρετε, τέκτονες ἄνδρες·  
ὑμήναον.  
γάμβρος †εἰσέρχεται ἴσος† Ἀρευι,  
ἄνδρος μεγάλω πόλυ μέζων.

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.<sup>14</sup> More commonly, a complex refrain consists of a

---

example, the refrain of Aristonous’ *Paeon* is included in its strophe; it is excluded from its corresponding stanza.

<sup>13</sup> The terms “terminal refrain”, “initial refrain” and “medial refrain” are taken from Magnus (1989) 47ff.

<sup>14</sup> 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, *Paeon to*

*Dionysus* 1-13 (Käppel):

[δεῦρ' ἄνα] Διθύραμβε, Βάκχ',  
 εἴυιε, Ταῦρ κ|ισσοχαί-  
 τα, Βρόμι', ἤριναίς ἰκοῦ  
 ταῖσδ' ἰεραῖς ἐν ὤραις·  
ἐνὸι ὦ ἰὸ [Βάκχ', ὦ ἰὲ Παιά]ν·  
 ὄν Θήβαις ποτ' ἐν εὐίαις  
 Ζη[νὶ] γείνατ[ο] καλλίπαις Θυόνα  
 πάντες δ' [ἀθά]νατοι [χ]όρευ-  
 σαν, πάντες δὲ βροτοὶ χ[ά]ρευ-  
 σαῖς, ὦ Β[ά]χχιε, γένναις.  
ἰὲ Παιάν, ἴτι σωτή]ρ,  
εὐφρων τάνδε] πόλιω φύλασσ'  
εὐαίωσι σὺν [ὄλβωι].

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 *Paeon* 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):

ἴλαοι δὲ καὶ εὐθύφρονες γὰι  
 δεῦρ' ἴτε σεμναὶ ( ) πυριδάπτωι  
 λαμπάδι τερπόμεναι καθ' ὀδόν.  
ὀλολύξατε νῦν ἐπὶ μολπαῖς.

σπονδαὶ δ' ἴες τὸ πᾶν ἔνδαιδες οἴκων†  
 Παλλάδος ἀστοῖς· Ζεὺς παντόπτας  
 οὕτω Μοῖρά τε συγκατέβα.  
ὀλολύξατε νῦν ἐπὶ μολπαῖς.

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

ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' αἰοιδᾶς.  
 Θύρσις ὄδ' ὡς Αἴτνας, καὶ Θύρσιδος ἀδέα φωνά.

πᾶ ποκ' ἄρ' ἦσθ', ὅκα Δάφνις ἐτάκετο, πᾶ ποκα, Νύμφαι;  
 ἦ κατὰ Πηνειῶ καλὰ πέμπεα, ἦ κατὰ Πίνδω;  
 οὐ γὰρ δὴ ποταμοῖο μέγαν ῥόον εἶχετ' Ἀνάπω,  
 οὐδ' Αἴτνας σκοπιάν, οὐδ' Ἄκιδος ἱερὸν ὕδωρ.  
ἄρχετ' ἐ βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς.  
 τῆνον μὰν θῶες, τῆνον λύκοι ὠρύσαντο,  
 τῆνον χῶκ δρυμοῖο λέων ἔκλαυσε θανόντα.  
ἄρχετ' ἐ βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς.

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, *Paean 2* (71f) 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<sup>15</sup>, 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.<sup>16</sup> 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

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Moritz (1979), Rutherford (2001).

<sup>16</sup> 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 *ἐφύμνιον*. 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 there 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-literary song cultures, but it has not yet been tested. Since refrains containing “ritual cries” (e.g. *ὦ παιάν*) are most typically offered as examples of the influence of sub-literary 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 *ἐφύμνιον*, which I will argue is the standard term for the refrain form. I will also have occasion to contrast the usage of *ἐφύμνιον* with that of other terms, most especially *ἐπίφθεγμα*.

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 ἐφύμνιον, 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 ἐπι- 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: ἐφύμνιον· τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ ὕμνῳ ᾄσμα. This analysis is less explicit, but is still clearly implied in Hephaestion *περὶ Ποιημάτων* 7.1 (p. 70 Consbruch): ταύτης τῆς προσηγορίας τετύχηκεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐφύμνιον τι εἰώθασιν ἐπάγειν οἱ ποιηταὶ ταῖς στροφαῖς. Likewise Origen, *Selecta in psalmos* v.12, p.1656.14 τὸ δὲ ὅτι “εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ” ἐφύμνίας 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.<sup>1</sup> The term ἐφύμνιον 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 ὕμνος”. If this analysis is correct, then from the time of its coining the term ἐφύμνιον referred to the formal relationship between certain lines and the poems to which they were attached.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Schwyzer *bd.* I, 436. This phenomenon is known as hypostasis. Cf. ἔκτοπος, -ιος; ἔνυπνος, -ιος; ἐπιχθόνιος. My thanks to Prof. Alan Nussbaum for his help on this point.

<sup>2</sup> ἐφύμνέω should not be taken as the corresponding verb to the noun ἐφύμνιον. Whereas the prefix ἐπι- of ἐφύμνιον describes the relationship between refrain and song, the prefix ἐπι- of ἐφύμνέω 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.<sup>3</sup> π. Π. 7.1 (p.70 Consbruch) opens with a definition of the term *ἐφύμνιον*:

ἔστι δέ τινα ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι καὶ τὰ καλούμενα ἐφύμνια, ἅπερ ταύτης τῆς προσηγορίας τετύχηκεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐφύμνιον τι εἰώθασιν ἐπάγειν οἱ ποιηταὶ ταῖς στροφαῖς, οἷά ἐστι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα “ἰήϊε παιᾶν” καὶ “ὦ διθύραμβε.”

(There are certain things in poems called “*ἐφύμνια*”, which have received this designation because the poets are in the habit of appending some sort of “refrain” to their strophes.<sup>4</sup> And of this sort are such things as “*Ieïe*

---

This meaning is most obvious when a dative object is supplied: Aesch. *Eum.* 902 τὸ οὖν μ’ ἄνωγας τῆδ’ ἐφύμνησαι χθονί. (Cf. X. *Mem.* 2.6.11 ἂ μὲν αἱ Σειρήνες ἐπήδον τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ.) It is also found where the dative object is implied: Soph. *OT* 1275 τοιαῦτ’ ἐφύμνων [implied dative object Jocasta]. *ἐφύμνέω* 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 οὐ γὰρ ὡς φυγῆ παιᾶν’ ἐφύμνον. The accusative object of *ἐφύμνέω* typically refers to the entirety of the reported singing, as seen in the examples above and at Pl. *Leg.* 947c τὸ πατριον μέλος ἐφύμνειν. Rutherford (2001) 71 is probably correct to conclude that the frequent use of verbs with the prefix *ἐπι-* in connection with paeon may reflect a sub-literary practice whereby a paeon 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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 *ἐφύμνιον* 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.

<sup>4</sup> Of the examples of refrain (both *ἐφύμνιον* and *ἐπιφθεγματικόν*) 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.<sup>5</sup> 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 ἐφύμνιον:

ὅταν δὲ τὸ ἐφύμνιον μὴ μετὰ στροφὴν ἀλλὰ μετὰ στίχον κέηται  
περιλαμβανόμενον ἄλλω στίχῳ, μεσύμνιον καλεῖται [τὸ ποίημα], οἷόν ἐστι τὸ  
παρὰ Σαπφοῦ  
“Ἴψροι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον ἀείρετε τέκτονες ἄνδρες,  
ὑμήναον,  
γαμβρὸς ἔρχεται ἴσος” Ἀρενι.”<sup>6</sup>

(But when the ἐφύμνιον lies not after a strophe but rather after a line and is enclosed by another line, it is called a μεσύμνιον. 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” (ἰηῖε παιάν, ὑμήναον) 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.<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> Hephaestion’s use of ἐπάγειν with ἐφύμνιον probably indicates that he analyzes the latter form’s prefix ἐπι- to mean “after”.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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 paeon genre.

We also note that while only *μεσύμνιον* is illustrated by means of an example quoted in its formal context, nevertheless a lot of formal information is implied about *ἐφύμνια* through this action. Since *μεσύμνια* are distinguished from *ἐφύμνια* in that they do not occur after a strophe, it follows that the writer assumes the natural place for an *ἐφύμνιον* 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.<sup>8</sup> 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 *μεσύμνιον* form is less common than normal terminal refrain. While Hephaestion does use two terms (*ἐφύμνιον*, *μεσύμνιον*) 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 *ἐφύμνιον* is the original, general term that, broadly speaking, applies to all such refrains regardless of their location relative to the strophe. The term *μεσύμνιον*, then, merely identifies a particular sub-category within the larger category *ἐφύμνιον*.

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

ἔστι δέ τινα καὶ τὰ καλούμενα ἐπιφθεγματικά, ἃ διαφέρει ταύτη τῶν ἐφύμνιων, ὅτι τὰ μὲν [ἐφύμνια] καὶ πρὸς νοῦν συντελεῖ τι, τὰ δὲ [ἐπιφθεγματικά] ἐκ περιττοῦ ὡς πρὸς τὸ λεγόμενον τῇ στροφῇ πρόσκειται· οἷον τὸ Βακχυλίδου “ἦ καλὸς Θεόκριτος, οὐ μόνος ἀνθρώπων ὄρας”, καὶ “σὺ δὲ σὺν χιτῶνι μούμφω παρὰ τῆς φίλην γυναικα φεύγεις.”<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> There is, in fact, so surviving example of a dithyramb with a refrain containing the cry ὦ 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.

<sup>9</sup> The sense of the passage and its context militates against the received reading of τὰ μὲν ἐφύμνια... τὰ 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 ἐφύμνια given above (ἰήιε παιάν, κτλ), not to

(There are certain things called ἐπιφθεγματικά, which differ from ἐφύμνια 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 ἐφύμνιον, we are most likely meant to understand that, like μεσόμενιον, ἐπιφθεγματικόν is a sub-category of ἐφύμνιον, in this case distinctive for its content rather than its form.<sup>10</sup> Formally speaking, ἐπιφθεγματικόν is identical to ἐφύμνιον, both of them being attached to strophes. The definition for ἐφύμνιον given by Hephaestion at 7.1 would describe ἐπιφθεγματικόν just as well.

Hephaestion's distinction between ἐφύμνια 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 ἐφύμνιον.<sup>11</sup> 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 ἐφύμνια 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.

<sup>10</sup> Hephaestion's term ἐπιφθεγματικόν appears to be derived from ἐπίφθεγμα. Cf. my discussion of the latter term below in this chapter.

<sup>11</sup> Hephaestion appears to represent a common practice among metrical handbooks in the way he begins with ἐφύμνιον, 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. grammatian 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 ἐφύμνιον 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 ἐφύμνιον to identify the refrain form. Likewise, whenever the scholia use the term ἐφύμνιον 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.<sup>12</sup> Despite the scantiness of the examples, they are sufficient to indicate a pattern of use for the term ἐφύμνιον 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 *Ag.* 311-1066 and 1160-1673.<sup>13</sup> As we shall see, the examples drawn from **M** point not only to the common use of the

<sup>12</sup> 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 ἐφύμνιον.

<sup>13</sup> For a description of **M** see O. L. Smith, *Scholia in Aeschylum*, Leipzig 1976, v.1, pp. viif. I use Smith's text throughout for scholia to Aeschylus.

term *ἐφύμνιον* 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 of refrain in the *Septem* (975-7=986-8, occurring near the high point of Antigone and Ismene’s lament):

Χο. ἰὼ Μοῖρα βαρυδότειρα μογερά,  
 πότνιά τ’ Οἰδίπου σκιά·  
 μέλαιν’ Ἐρινύς, ἧ μεγασθενής τις εἶ.

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

Σ **M** *Sept.* 975-7a ἐφύμνιον.

Σ **M** *Sept.* 986-8a τὸ ἐφύμνιον. ταῦτα δὲ λέγει ὡς βαρέως φέρων.

We note that the use by the scholiast here of the term *ἐφύμνιον* is not quite identical to that suggested by Hephaestion above: while the placement of the refrain qualifies it as an *ἐφύμνιον* (π. Π. 7.1), its length and fully developed sense would seem to recommend it as an *ἐπιφθεγματικόν* (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 *ἐφύμνιον*; 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 *ἐφύμνιον* 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.<sup>14</sup> In this case, the repeated identification of the refrain as an ἐφύμνιον 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:

ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ τεθυμένῳ  
τόδε μέλος, παρακοπά,  
παραφορὰ φρενοδαλῆς,  
ῥυμνος ἐξ Ἑρινώων,  
δέσμιος φρενῶν, ἀφόρ-  
μικτος, ἀνοῖα βροτοῖς.

The corresponding scholion:

Σ **M** *Eum.* 341 ἐφυμνίῳ 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 ἐφύμνιον.<sup>15</sup> 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

<sup>14</sup> But cf. Σ **I**<sup>1</sup> *Sept.* 986-8a ταῦτα λέγει ὡς βαρέως φέρων. Smith, v.2, pp. viif dates **I** (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 **I** of any notice of an ἐφύμνιον is consistent with the hypothesis that ταῦτα, κτλ arose as a comment on the content, not the form, of the lines in question.

<sup>15</sup> We find the same distinction made at Σ *Ar. Ra.* 209.1 with a very similar phrase: κέχρηται δὲ αὐτῷ ὡς ἐφυμνίῳ ὁ 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 *ἐφύμνιον*. 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.<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> The decision made by the scholiast (or his source) to identify these lines as an *ἐφύμνιον* 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 *ἐφύμνιον* 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.<sup>18</sup> 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

<sup>16</sup> 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 *ἐφύμν.* 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.

<sup>17</sup> 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 τοῦτο λέγεται ἐπωδὸς καὶ πρόασμα καὶ ἐπιμελώδημα. But *ἐφύμνιον* is more frequently used by far than any alternate term.

<sup>18</sup> 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 ἐφύμνιον 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 ὕμνον ᾄδει πεποιημένον εἰς τὸν θεόν, ἢ καινὸν αὐτὸς πεποιηκὼς ἢ ἀρχαῖόν τινα τῶν πάλαι ποιητῶν -- μέτρα γὰρ καὶ μέλη καταλελοίπασι πολλὰ ἐπῶν τριμέτρων, προσοδίων ὕμνων, παρασπονδείων, παραβωμίων, στασίμων χορικῶν στροφαῖς πολυστρόφοις εὐδιαμετρημένων --, μεθ’ ὧν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι κατὰ τάξεις ἐν κόσμῳ προσήκουσι, πάντων κατὰ πολλὴν ἡσυχίαν ἀκρωμένων, πλὴν ὅποτε τὰ ἀκροτελεύτια καὶ ἐφύμνια ᾄδειν δεῖσι· τότε γὰρ ἐξηχοῦσι πάντες τε καὶ πᾶσαι.

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 ἐφύμνιον is very likely to reflect their use of the term.<sup>19</sup> The second reason is that most likely Philo is here applying the term ἐφύμνιον to Hebrew poetry.<sup>20</sup> His use of the term in this non-Greek context indicates that ἐφύμνιον 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 ἐφύμνιον here to accord more or less with what he understood to be the normal formal analysis applied to Greek poetry.<sup>21</sup>

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.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> 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.

<sup>20</sup> This seems most likely in view of the fact that the songs sung at the banquet include those "of the old poets" (ἀρχαῖόν τινα τῶν πάλαι 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.)

<sup>21</sup> 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. προσοδίων ὕμνων, παρασπονδείων, etc.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. R. J. Schork, *Sacred Song from the Byzantine Pulpit: Romanus the Melodist*, 1995: 18f. Cf. also Maas-Trypanis (1963) xiif.

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 ἐφύμνιον 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 ἐφύμνιον in Alexandrian scholarship*

Now I turn to the use of the term ἐφύμνιον 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 ἐφύμνιον, 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  
 φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπία,  
 καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος κεχλαδῶς  
 ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ’ ὄχθον ἀγεμονεῦσαι  
 κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστῳ σὺν ἑταίροις

The scholiasts seek as a rule to accomplish three things with regard to this passage. First, they seek to identify the specific Ἄρχιλόχου 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,  
αὐτός τε καϊόλαος, αἰχμητὰ δύω.<sup>23</sup>

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 κιθαρῳδοῦ τούτῳ τῷ κόμματι ἐχρῶντο, τρὶς αὐτὸ 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 τριπλός. It is at this point we meet our first example of an Alexandrian scholar applying the term ἐφύμνιον 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 τριπλός by Pindar “not because it is composed of three strophes, but because the καλλίνικε is thrice refrained.” (τριπλόου δὲ οὐ διὰ τὸ ἐκ τριῶν στροφῶν συγκεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ τρὶς ἐφυμνιάζεσθαι τὸ καλλίνικε.) The verb ἐφυμνιάζω is

<sup>23</sup> I use West’s text. For the purposes of this study I am not interested in the question whether the song Pindar calls Ἄρχιλόχου μέλος is really by Archilochus.

clearly a denominative form derived from ἐφύμνιον, cf. the Hellenistic συμποσιάζω < συμπόσιον.<sup>24</sup> While it is impossible to be certain that Eratosthenes himself used the verb ἐφυμνιάζειν 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 χρῆσθαι ἐφυμνίῳ or similar for the same meaning.<sup>25</sup> Even if ἐφυμνιάζεσθαι 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 τριπλόος is not the only one reported in the scholia. At Σ O.9.3g the scholiast says that the song is τριπλόος “having a triple refrain (τρὶς ἐπαδόμενος<sup>26</sup>) or being composed of three strophes according to Aristarchus (ἢ τριστροφος ὡν κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον).” 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.<sup>27</sup> 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 Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος still enjoyed a

<sup>24</sup> Schwyzer bd. I, p. 735.

<sup>25</sup> See above.

<sup>26</sup> This is one of the very few places where ἐπαείδω 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.9.1i τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος, ὃ τοῖς νικῶσι τὰ Ὀλύμπια ἐπήδετο.

<sup>27</sup> For example, Fuhrer (1992) 187.

widespread use as a victory song in the Hellenistic period.<sup>28</sup> 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 *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 *τριπλόος*, 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 *ἐφύμνιον* 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 *Z O.*9.11: τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος, ὃ τοῖς νικῶσι τὰ Ὀλύμπια ἐπήδετο, ἦν τρίστροφον... ἐφυμνίῳ δὲ κατεχρῶντο τούτῳ· τήνελλα καλλίνικε. It follows that West's suggestion that *τήνελλα 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.<sup>29</sup>

Two important points can be made concerning Eratosthenes' use of *ἐφύμνιον*. First, while his use of the term does not strictly correspond to that found in the *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

<sup>28</sup> This much is assured by the appearance of Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον in Callimachus fr. 384.39 in reference to Sosibius' victory at the Panathenaea in the early 3rd century B.C. See below.

<sup>29</sup> West (1974) 138. There is nothing in the terms *κόμμα* or *τρὶς ἐπιφωνοῦντες* that requires us to understand the *τήνελλα* 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 Σif itself: *τήνελλα* appears at the beginning of the first strophe, and presumably in the second and third.

the π. Π. is but a part.<sup>30</sup> Second, we see that the application of the term ἐφύμνιον 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 comment directed at Pindar's use of the adjective τριπλόος at *O.*9.3. This follows the pattern suggested by the usage of ἐφύμνιον 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 question.

### §2.2 *Callimachus fr.* 384.39

Another place where a scholar of Alexandria uses the term ἐφύμνιον 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 ἦνται  
 κάλπιδες, οὐ κόσμου σύμβολον, ἀλλὰ πάλης—  
 ἄνδρας ὅτ' οὐ δείσαντες ἐδώκαμεν ἠδὲ βοῆσαι  
 νηὸν ἐπι Γλαυκῆς κῶμον ἄγοντι χορῶ  
 Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον

It has been pointed out by Fuhrer that Callimachus in this passage is making two separate allusions to passages in Pindar.<sup>31</sup> 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 ἐλαίας / ἔμολεν Ἥρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν ἐν

<sup>30</sup> 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 κιθάρας ἐν μέσῳ τῶ χορῶ ἔλεγε, τὸ τήνελλα, ὃ δὲ χορὸς τὰ ἐπίλοιπα.

<sup>31</sup> Fuhrer (1992) 186ff.

ἀγγ(έω)ν ἔρκεσιν παμπουκίλοις. The second allusion is, of course, Ἄρχιλόχου νικαίου ἐφύμνιον, 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.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> 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 ἐφύμνιον 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

---

<sup>32</sup> Fuhrer (1992) 184f.

<sup>33</sup> Fuhrer (1992) 187f.

speaking, identifying ἐφύμνιον with the Archilochus song as a whole<sup>34</sup>; this is rather an instance of synecdoche.

### §2.3 Callimachus Hymn to Apollo

We find another instance of ἐφύμνιον 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 paeon cry (in this case ἰῆ ἰῆ παιῆον) and, as I shall argue, for the refrain form frequently used in the paeon genre.

ἰῆ ἰῆ παιῆον ἀκούομεν, οὔνεκα τοῦτο  
 Δελφός τοι πρότιστον ἐφύμνιον εὔρετο λαός,  
 ἦμος ἐκηβολίην χρυσέων ἐπεδείκνυσο τόξων.  
 Πυθώ τοι κατιόντι συνήντετο δαιμόνιος θήρ,  
 αἰνὸς ὄφις. τὸν μὲν σὺ κατήναρες ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλω  
 βάλλων ὠκὺν οἴστον, ἐπηύτησε δὲ λαός·  
 ἰῆ ἰῆ παιῆον, ἴει βέλος. εὐθύ σε μήτηρ  
 γείνατ' ἀοσσητήρα. τὸ δ' ἐξέτι κείθεν αἰείδη.

That the cry ἰῆ ἰῆ is meant to be taken as the equivalent of the imperative ἴει ἴει, and that Callimachus is suggesting this as an etymology for the cry, has long been recognised.<sup>35</sup> What has not been recognised thus far is that Callimachus is not merely offering an etymology of the typical content of the paeon refrain, i.e. the paeon 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' ἄλλω / βάλλων ὠκὺν οἴστον, 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

<sup>34</sup> 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 ἐφύμνιον to be the only element of the song surviving in his day.

<sup>35</sup> 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 paeon 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 *βαλόν*). The phrase *ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλω... ὄϊστόν* 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 *κατήναρες*. What we have here is an example of the “factive” aorist as described by Schwyzer.<sup>36</sup>

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 *κατήναρες* 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 *κατήναρες*: 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?<sup>37</sup>

<sup>36</sup> 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. *ἀλγέ' ἔθηκε... ψυχὰς* “Αἰδι προΐαψεν, Schwyzer vol. 2, 261. (Schwyzer’s example, Van Thiel’s text.) This use of the aorist is called “complexive” at Smyth §1927.

<sup>37</sup> 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 *ἀοσσητήρα*:

If I am correct in taking ἐπηύτησε 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 paeon refrain. According to this aetiology, the Delphians “discovered” (εὔρετο) the refrain form (ἐφύμνιον) by shouting out their prototypical paeon cry (ὠὴ ὠὴ παιῶν) in response to each arrow shot by Apollo. Each of these shots corresponds to a stanza (strophe or triad) in a lyric paeon, just as each instance of the Delphians’ cry corresponds to the refrain of a lyric paeon. The correspondence of shout in the narrative of the aetiology and refrain in lyric paeon is underscored by the use of the prefix ἐπ- in both ἐπηύτησε and ἐφύμνιον. As we shall see, Callimachus’ treatment in this aetiology of the paeon refrain as a reaction to events in the narrative is in keeping with a similar practice found in literary paeon (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.<sup>38</sup>

Callimachus would seem, then, to offer us an account of the origins of the paeon 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”: τοῦτο / Δελφός τοι πρώτιστον ἐφύμνιον εὔρετο λαός (97f).<sup>39</sup> 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 paeon is but the first. While we cannot assume that Callimachus’ basic assertion

---

either would work just as well as a shout of encouragement (or as the refrain of an actual paeon). I myself take the quote to stop after βέλως: the asyndeton that immediately follows seems to indicate a change in speaker, and the second person (σε) at line 103 seems parallel with that at line 101 (κατήναρες).

<sup>38</sup> See CHAPTER 5, especially my discussion of Sappho fr. 111 and Philodamus *Paeon in Dionysum*.

<sup>39</sup> If Callimachus had meant merely that the Delphians were the first to discover the paeon refrain, and not that this refrain was the first refrain ever discovered, we would expect πρώτιστος, predicate to λαός.

that the refrain form originates in the paean genre is correct<sup>40</sup>, 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 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 *Hymn to Apollo* for which his aetiology of the ἐφύμνιον has important implications. I am referring to the use by Callimachus throughout the *Hymn* of what we may call “quasi-refrains.”<sup>41</sup> These consist of the repeated cries of ἰὴ ἰή that appear at the beginning of lines 25 (ἰὴ ἰὴ φθέγγεσθε), 80 (ἰὴ ἰὴ Καρνεῖε πολύλλιτε) and, of course,

---

<sup>40</sup> I will argue in CHAPTER 5 that the refrain form enters Greek poetry through the iambic-aeolic lyric tradition rather than through any particular genre.

<sup>41</sup> I borrow the term “quasi-refrain” from Reed (1997) 47, who uses it to describe αἰάζω τὸν Ἀδωνιν, ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις et sim. that periodically recur throughout Bion *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 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 *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 (*ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῶνον ἀκούομεν*). 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.<sup>42</sup> 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* 6.120f offers what has been called a “quasi-refrain” (*ἰὴ ἰὴ τε νῦν, μέτρα παιηό[ν]ων ἰὴ τε 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.<sup>43</sup>

#### §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):

*ἄμφι δὲ δαιομένοις εὐρὺν χορὸν ἐστήσαντο,  
καλὸν Ἰηπαιῶνον Ἰηπαιῶνοα Φοῖβον  
μελπόμενοι.*

<sup>42</sup> The same can be said for the repeated *ἰὴ παιῶνον ἰὴ παιῶνον* at line 21. Another instance of the cry may be hinted at by *ἰητροί* at the beginning line 46, which seems to point to an alternative etymology for *ἰή*. See Rutherford (1991) 1, n.2 on ancient etymologies of *ἰή* from *ἰατρός*.

<sup>43</sup> 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 *Δελφύνη*, 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*:

πολλὰ δὲ Κωρύκῃαι Νύμφαι Πλειστοῖο θύγατρῃς  
 θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσι, («ἴη ἴε») κεκληγυῖαι·  
 ἔνθεν δὲ τόδε καλὸν ἐφύμνιον ἔπλετο Φοῖβω.

The basic scenario is the same here as in the Callimachus passage discussed above: arrows shot by Apollo alternate with the shouts of encouragement offered by the spectators. In this case the repetitious nature of those shouts is made explicit by *πολλὰ* (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 *ἐφύμνιον* (it is merely *καλόν*, 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 (*σὺν δὲ σφιν... ἦρχεν*, 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 *χορείῃ μέλψαν ἀοιδῇ* (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.<sup>44</sup> 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*.<sup>45</sup> I suggest that it is possible that the treatments of the paeon 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 paeon was identified as an ἐφύμνιον, 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 ἐφύμνιον in Archilochus fr. 324 we find in Callimachus fr. 384 and the scholia to Pi. O. 9.iff, discussed above.

### §3 ἐπίφθεγμα

Our understanding of ancient refrain scholarship will be significantly enhanced by consideration of the term ἐπίφθεγμα and its use as contrasted with that of the term ἐφύμνιον. ἐπίφθεγμα 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 ἐπιφθεγματικόν, a term which, as we have seen, is used in π.Π. to refer to a type of formal refrain.<sup>46</sup>

In ancient scholarly contexts ἐπίφθεγμα has the basic meaning “expression”. This is most clearly seen in contexts apart from refrains. One particularly

<sup>44</sup> Williams (1978) 82.

<sup>45</sup> Pfeiffer ad Callimachus fr. 88 = schol. Ap. Rh. *Arg.* 2.705-11b, where Callimachus is said to have called the serpent Δελφύνη.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Rutherford (2001) 71 with n. 10.

unmusical example is found at Σ Aesch. *Suppl.* 827C1 *λόφ· ἔστι ἀποπτυσμοῦ μίμημα· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀποπτύειν ἐπίφθεγμα ἐποίησεν.*<sup>47</sup> 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 *βρεκεκεκεκεξ κοὰξ κοὰξ* at Ar. *Ra.* 209ff, the scholiast writes *ἐπίφθεγμα δὲ ποιὸν τοῦτο· κέχρηται δὲ αὐτῷ ὡς ἐφυμνίῳ ὁ τῶν βατράχων χορός.* Clearly a distinction is being made between content and form, and *ἐπίφθεγμα* is applied to the former.<sup>48</sup>

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 τὴν ᾠδὴν Ἀρίσταρχ(ος) [διθ]υραμβικὴν εἶναί φησιν διὰ τὸ παρειλή[φθαι ἐν α]ὐτῇ τὰ περὶ Κασ[σανδρας,] ἐπιγράφει δ' αὐτὴν [Κασσ]άνδραν, πλανη[θέντα δ' α]ὐτὴν κατατάξαι [ἐν τοῖς Π]αιᾶσι Καλλιμάχον [διὰ τὸ ἰή,] οὐ συνέντα ὅτι [τὸ ἐπίφθ]ε[γ]μα κοινόν ἐ[στι] καὶ διθυράμβου.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Herodian *Περὶ Παθῶν* 3.2, p.182 Lentz τὸ ψό ἐν Ποιμέσι Σοφοκλέους· ἐπιφθεγμα γάρ; *De prosodia catholica* 3.1, p.506 Lentz ἄρρυ ἐπίφθεγμα τῶν ἐρετῶν; Origen *In canticum canticorum (fragmenta)* p.141 Baehrens τὸ πολυθρύλητον δὲ παρ' Ἑλλησι ἐπίφθεγμα προείληπται παραδοθέν τῷ σοφῷ Σολομῶνι, τὸ “γνώθι σαυτόν”; Σ Ar. *Av.* 1303.1 ἄγε· ἐπίφθεγμα παρακελευστικόν.

<sup>48</sup> It is in this light that we are to understand Σ Aesch. *PV* 877a ἐλελελελελεῦ· ἐπίφθεγμα θρηνώδες and Σ *Pers.* 1057.5 ἄπριγδα· τοῦτο ἐπιφώνημα καὶ ἐπίφθεγμα ἐπὶ τῶν μετὰ σφοδρότητος τιλλόντων 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.

<sup>49</sup> 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 ἰή 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 [ἐπιφθ]ε[γ]μα does not rely upon the restoration of τὸ ἰή. Luppe's specific objection, given by him at (1987) 10 and repeated at (1989) 26, that the papyrologically impossible restoration of [τοῦτο τὸ ἐπιφθε]γγμα, with its added demonstrative, would be necessary for the sense desired by Lobel, cannot stand. In the context of a discussion of the paeon genre, there cannot have been any ambiguity as to what kind of expression τὸ ἐπίφθεγμα 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 ἐπίφθεγμα (τὸ ἰή in Lobel’s restored text) was common to dithyramb as well as paean (14-19). ἐπίφθεγμα 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.<sup>50</sup> 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 ἐπίφθεγμα 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 “ἰή” or the like.<sup>51</sup> 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 ἐπίρρημα. 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

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Rutherford (2001) 97.

<sup>51</sup> Luppe (1989) 23 is right to follow Lobel ad loc. in doubting that Callimachus would have relied upon the presence of ἰή 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 παιᾶν ἐπίφθεγμα. That the terms ἐπίρρημα and ἐπίφθεγμα are here used as synonyms is clear;<sup>52</sup> just as clear is the fact that they do not mean “refrain”.<sup>53</sup> To begin with, there is the usage of ἐπιφθεγμα 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 παιᾶν 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.

---

<sup>52</sup> Lobel ad loc. is too cautious when he treats “the absence of the παιανικὸν ἐπίρρημα” and “the presence of the παιανικὸν ἐπίφθεγμα” as separate criteria used by Democritus for a poem’s exclusion or inclusion.

<sup>53</sup> Pace Rutherford (2001) 94 and 71, n.10; also Gulick, who translates ἐπίφθεγμα as “refrain” in his Loeb edition.

#### §4 Conclusion

The consistent usage of ἐφύμνιον, especially as it is contrasted with that of other terms such as ἐπίφθεγμα, 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 ἐφύμνιον 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 paeon 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 I, in which paeans play an important part.

Seeing as our definition and corpus appear satisfactory, we may procede.

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> More usually the hypothesis is simply applied in passing and without argument to refrains in genres seen as derived from sub-literary models.<sup>3</sup> The most common version of the hypothesis involves the verb ἐξάρχω and the related nouns ἐξάρχων and ἔξαρχος. Its most famous exponent is Pickard-Cambridge, who applies it to Archilochus fr. 120 West:

ὡς Διωνύσου ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος  
οἶδα διθύραμβον οἴνω συγκεραυνωθείς 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.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Jebb (1905) 43. For Hephaestion’s use of the fragment, see CHAPTER 2.

<sup>2</sup> Maehler (1982) 1. Maehler is followed, though less determinedly, by Davies (1988) 62f, who briefly suggests divided performance in his “Appendix 1: The Spirit of Compromise”. Davies also cites Jebb.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> Pickard-Cambridge (1962) 9. For refrain in dithyramb, see APPENDIX 1.

The specific model he has in mind is one whereby an ἐξάρχων improvises the stanzas of a song and is answered by a chorus' refrain; this or something like it has been the common interpretation.<sup>5</sup>

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. *Ecc1.* 952ff; Ion's solo paeon with refrain at Eur. *Ion* 112ff; and Simaetha's refrains in Theocritus 2.<sup>6</sup> 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 ἐξάρχων 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.<sup>7</sup>

### §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”

<sup>5</sup> 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 paeon” (*PMG* 856) “represent part of the section sung by the ἐξάρχων, and that they were followed by a communal παιάν-cry sung by the army as a whole, which is not represented in the text.”

<sup>6</sup> Radermacher (1921) 199f.

<sup>7</sup> Radermacher (1921) 200.

involved was the reading of the poem from a book<sup>8</sup>; 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 in a cultic context, e.g. the *Dictaeon 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 ὑμῶν ὑμέναι’ ὦ appears to have been sung mostly by the chorus and may have been sung

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Hunter (1996) 3ff, especially 7ff where he uses a comparison of the Grenfell Fragment with Theocritus’ “mimes” (including *Idyll* 2) to argue that the latter “suggest rather the centrality of the written text.”

at one point at least (1334f) by Trygaeus.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> Under this heading also comes the attribution for the refrains of the “love duet” at Ar. *Eccl.* 952ff.<sup>11</sup>

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<sup>12</sup>; solo stanzas, choral refrains, 3 cases<sup>13</sup>; choral stanzas, solo

<sup>9</sup> Olson (1998) 315: “This is a profoundly troubled section of the text.” Olson 319 assigns the first instance of the refrain to the chorus rather than to Trygaeus on the basis that “a variant of the refrain ὑμῆν ὑμέναι’ ὦ 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.

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

<sup>11</sup> 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 ἄνοιξον (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 ἄνοιξον 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.

<sup>12</sup> In odes: Aesch. *Pers.* 664ff; *Suppl.* 117ff and 141ff; *Ag.* 121ff; *Eum.* 328ff; Eur. *Ba.* 877ff and 992ff. In comic parabasis: Ar. *Ra.* 404ff. In song with protagonist’s recitative: Ar. *Av.* 1736ff.

<sup>13</sup> In epirrhematic passages: Aesch. *Suppl.* 889ff; *Ag.* 1489; *Eum.* 778ff.

refrains, 2 cases<sup>14</sup>; solo stanzas and refrains, 1 case<sup>15</sup>; “mixed” performance, 1 case<sup>16</sup>. 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.

### §2 *ἐξάρχοι* 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 *ἐπίφθεγμα* was not borne out by the ancient usage of the term. Here I am concerned with *ἐξάρχω* and related terms, since they have been assumed to indicate a specific performance mode for refrain poetry. It does seem that *ἐξάρχω* commonly refers to the performance relationship between a chorus or similar musical body and its

<sup>14</sup> In “reversed” epirrhematic passage: Aesch. *Ag.* 1072ff and 1081ff.

<sup>15</sup> In solo ode prior to entrance of chorus: Eur. *Ion* 125ff.

<sup>16</sup> Chorus and protagonist exchange refrain: Ar. *Ra.* 209ff.

leader.<sup>17</sup> But how well does the literature bear out the specific scenario of an ἑξάρχος 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.<sup>18</sup>

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 δειπνον ἄδουσί τε καὶ ψάλλουσιν αἱ παλλακαὶ αὐτῷ, καὶ μία μὲν ἑξάρχει, αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι ἀθρόως ἄδουσι. 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 ἑξάρχος is doing. We are told that the

---

<sup>17</sup>For examples, see Zimmermann (1992) 19, n.3. Zimmermann draws a distinction between ἑξάρχω + accusative and ἑξάρχω + 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 ἑξάρχω + genitive used of singing that involves responsorial singing at ps.-Hesiod *Scutum* 201ff:

ἐν δ' ἦν ἀθανάτων ἱερὸς χορός· ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσω  
 ἰμερόεν κιθάριζε Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς υἱὸς  
 χρυσείῃ φόρμιγγι· [θεῶν δ' ἔδος ἄγνός Ὀλυμπος·  
 ἐν δ' ἀγορῇ, περὶ δ' ὄλβος ἀπείριτος ἐστεφάνωτο  
 ἀθανάτων ἐν ἀγῶνι·] θεαὶ δ' ἑξήρχον ἀοιδῆς  
 Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες, λιγὴν μελπομένης εἰκυῖαι.

And at *Odyssey* 6.100ff:

σφαίρη τὰ δ' ἄρ' ἔπαιζον, ἀπὸ κρήδεμνα βαλοῦσαι·  
 τῆσι δὲ Ναυσικάα λευκώλενος ἤρχετο μολπῆς.

The distinction seems to be not between group singing and solo singing, but rather between the relationship of group leader to group in the case of ἑξάρχω + accusative, and the relationship of singer to song in the case of ἑξάρχω + genitive. In both cases the subject of ἑξάρχω is an ἑξάρχων or ἑξάρχος. And so, while ἑξάρχω may be used in the context of both solo and group singing, those two performance modes do not correspond to the use of the genitive and accusative case after the verb.

<sup>18</sup>Examples such as the κυβιστητῆρε... μολπῆς ἑξάρχοντες at *Il.* 18.605f are not relevant, since they do not clearly represent performances of *singing* leaders and *singing* choruses. Examples such as Ναυσικάα ἤρχετο 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 *ἑξάρχος* who is playing. It would seem that the role of the *ἑξάρχος* 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 *ἑξάρχος* who does not seem to follow Pickard-Cambridge's model in *h.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:

ἡγείται χαρίεντα περὶ χροῖ κόσμον ἔχουσα,  
 ἑξάρχουσα χορούς· αἱ δ' ἀμβροσίην ὄπ' ἰεῖσαι  
 ὕμνεῦσιν Λητῶ καλλίσφυρον ὡς τέκε παῖδας  
 ἀθανάτων βουλή τε καὶ ἔργμασιν ἕξοχ' 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 *h.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 *ἡγείται*, 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.<sup>19</sup>

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

---

<sup>19</sup>Cf. the description of Nausicaä 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.

περὶ δὲ τοῦ “τήνελλα” Ἐρατοσθένους φησὶν ὅτι ὅτε ὁ ἀυλιτῆς ἢ ὁ κιθαριστῆς μὴ παρήν, ὁ ἔξαρχος αὐτὸ [τὸ τήνελλα] μεταλαβὼν ἔλεγεν ἕξω τοῦ μέλους, ὁ δὲ τῶν κωμαστῶν χορὸς ἐπέβαλλε τὸ “καλλίνικε”, καὶ οὕτω συνειρόμενον γέγονε τὸ “τηνέλλα καλλίνικε”.

According to this account, the cry *τήνελλα* originated as an improvised imitation of instrumental accompaniment.<sup>20</sup> 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 *τήνελλα* 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 *τήνελλα* and almost certainly one sung by the *ἔξαρχος*. In other words, Eratosthenes is explaining not only the word *τήνελλα*, 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:

ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις τοὺς καλοὺς θιάσους ἄγων διὰ τῶν ὁδῶν, τοὺς ἐστεφανωμένους τῷ μαράθῳ καὶ τῇ λεύκῃ, τοὺς ὄφεις τοὺς παρείας θλίβων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς αἰωρῶν, καὶ βοῶν («εὐοὶ σαβοῖ») καὶ ἐπορχούμενος («ὕης ἄττης ἄττης ὕης») ἔξαρχος καὶ προηγημῶν καὶ κιττοφόρος καὶ λικνοφόρος καὶ τοιαῦθ’ ὑπὸ τῶν γραδίων προσαγορευόμενος.

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

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Σ If ὁ Ἀρχίλοχος... ἀπορήσας κιθαρωδοῦ διὰ τινος λέξεως μιμήσασθαι τὸν ῥυθμὸν καὶ τὸν ἦχον τῆς κιθάρας ἐπειχῆρσε.

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 ἑξάρχουι is clearly established (Σ Pi. O.9.1κ, 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 ἑξάρχουος 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 ἑξάρχουι 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 ἑξάρξαι in Archil. fr. 120.<sup>21</sup> 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 *Ax Ax Ax*”, in which the improvised contribution of each woman is followed by “a refrain wailed by the whole company of women in unison.”<sup>22</sup> 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: ὡς ἔφατο κλαίουσα (746, 760);

<sup>21</sup> Pickard-Cambridge (1962) 9.

<sup>22</sup> 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 *ὡς 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... στενάχοντο* (745); *γόον... ὄρινε* (760); *ἐπὶ... ἔστεινε* (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 *ὄρινε* at 24.760, after Hecuba’s contribution, though it is natural to assume that the women there, too, are the ones raising the *γόον ἀλίστων*. At 24.776, after Helen’s contribution, however, it is the “boundless host” (*δῆμος ἀπείρων*) 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.<sup>23</sup> Tsagalis’ point anticipates to some degree my discussion in CHAPTER 3 concerning the relationship between ritual cries and the refrain form.

---

<sup>23</sup> 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.

CHAPTER 4  
REFRAINS AND SUB-LITERARY FORM

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.<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup>; more often it is identified with specific sub-literary genres including magic, laments and other ritual song.<sup>3</sup> 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 *Dictaeon 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.<sup>4</sup> In the case of the *Dictaeon 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Bowra (1962) 42ff ; Gudewill (1998) coll. 122ff.

<sup>2</sup> Dover (1971) xlix-l; Hunter (1999) 61.

<sup>3</sup> Deubner (1919) 400; Hutchinson (1985) ad *Sept.* 965ff.; Schwartz (1897) 6; Reiner (1938) 32; Wilamowitz (1926) 92.

<sup>4</sup> 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: paeon, 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<sup>5</sup>; its refrain, taken together with the refrains of Bacchylides frs. \*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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Radermacher (1921) 199, Wilamowitz (1925) 309.

<sup>7</sup> 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 paeon 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<sup>8</sup>; others limit themselves to the narrower claim that the refrains of certain literary passages, e.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 663ff.<sup>9</sup> and Theocritus 2<sup>10</sup>, 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.<sup>11</sup> 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."<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Deubner (1919) 400; Fraenkel (1950) ad *Ag.* 121.

<sup>9</sup> Moritz (1979) 187.

<sup>10</sup> Kranz (1933) 130.

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> Gow (1950) v. 2, p. 39, n. 1.

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:

ὀρκίζω κεφαλὴν τε θεοῦ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν Ὀλυμπος,  
 ὀρκίζω σφραγίδα θεοῦ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὄρασις,  
 ὀρκίζω χεῖρα δεξιτερῆν, ἣν κόσμῳ ἐπέσχεις,  
 ὀρκίζω κρητῆρα θεοῦ πλοῦτον κατέχοντα,  
 ὀρκίζω θεὸν αἰώνιον Αἰῶνά τε πάντων,  
 ὀρκίζω Φύσιν αὐτοφυῆ, κράτιστον Ἀδωναίου,  
 ὀρκίζω δύνοντα καὶ ἀντέλλοντα Ἐλῳαίου,  
 ὀρκίζω τὰ ἅγια καὶ θεῖα ὀνόματα ταῦτα, ὅπως  
 ἀν πέμψωσί μοι τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα καὶ τελέση,  
 ἃ ἔχω κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν.

Here the most obvious repetitive element is the anaphora of *ὀρκίζω*, whose repetition seems both to emphasize the demands of the speaker and to introduce a catalogue of items associated with the god.<sup>13</sup>

The most common form that magical repetition takes, besides the doubling of words<sup>14</sup>, is the simple repetition of a whole passage within a spell. These repetitions may be more or less verbatim<sup>15</sup>, 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):

δαικόνησόν μοι εἰς Ἀπλωνοῦν, ἣ ἔτεκεν Ἀρσιωή, καὶ ἀγριανθήτω ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῆς  
 εἰς τὸ παραλλαγῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῆς καὶ κλιθῆναι εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν, ἵνα με  
 φιλήῃ καὶ ὃ ἐὰν αὐτὴν αἰτῶ ἐπήκοός μοι ᾗν, ἐμοὶ Πτολεμαίῳ, ᾧ ἔτεκεν Θασεῖς. (2-  
 7)

ποίησον Ἀπλωνοῦν, ἣ ἔτεκεν Ἀρσιωή, φιλεῖν με, ἐμὲ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, ὃν ἔτεκεν  
 Θασεῖς, εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον, ἵνα με φιλήῃ καὶ ὃ ἐὰν αὐτῇ εἴπω δοῖ μοι καὶ μὴ  
 ἐπεχέτω μίαν ὥραν, ἕως ἔλθῃ πρὸς ἐμὲ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, ὃν ἔτεκεν Θασεῖς, εἰς τὸν  
 ἅπαντα χρόνον. (11-17)

<sup>13</sup> Cf. anaphora of *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ* “I am he who...” at *PGM* IV.185ff; *ἐν ἧ* at IV.2259ff.

<sup>14</sup> Daniel and Maltomini, i, p.37.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Suppl. Mag.* I, #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.”<sup>16</sup> (11-17)

Besides the way that near-equivalent thoughts are rendered with varying phrases (ὁ ἐὰν αὐτὴν αἰτῶ ἐπήκοός μοι ᾗν — ὁ ἐὰν αὐτῇ εἴπω δοῦ 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 paeon and hymenaeus

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

<sup>16</sup> Translation Daniel and Maltomini.

453 concludes his brief prayer for good fortune with ἰὴ παιών, ἰή. 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.<sup>17</sup> 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 παιών is probably the subject of ἴθι 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 ("Ἔπνε, εὐαίων, ἴθι<sup>18</sup>), 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 ἠΰξαντο καὶ ἐπαιάνισαν; *An.* 4.8.16 εὐξάμενοι δὲ καὶ παιανίσαντες. 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 ἦν τὰ σφάγια, ἐπαιάνιζον πάντες οἱ στρατιῶται καὶ ἀνηλάλαζον, συνωλόλυζον δὲ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ἅπασαι. From the context it is clear that these paeans are shouts, not entire songs.<sup>19</sup>

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:

ἰὴ παιών· ὦ ἰὴ παιών·

<sup>17</sup>Thus Trygaeus' nervous pun, taking παιάν as a form of παίω, to strike).

<sup>18</sup>Cf. the repetition of εὐαίων within the refrain at Eur. *Ion* 125ff.

<sup>19</sup>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 Enyalios: X. *Hell.* 2.4.17, *An.* 1.8.17-8, *An.* 5.2.14, *Cyr.* 7.1.25.

ἰὴ παιών· ὦ ἰὴ παιών·  
 ἰὴ παιών· ὦ ἰὴ παιών·  
 [ὦ] ἄναξ ἸΑπολλων, φείδεο κούρων, φείδε[ο]

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: ἰὴ παιών, ἰὴ παιών, ἰὴ παιών. 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.<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup> 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

<sup>20</sup>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' ὦ Χάρων, χαίρ' ὦ Χάρων, χαίρ' ὦ 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: βρεκεκεκεκέξ, which is imitative of the croaking of frogs; ἰὴ κόπον, κτλ and τοφλαττοθρατ, κτλ, which are both used to emphasize monotony in verse.

<sup>21</sup>This use must be distinguished from the use of a ritual cry outside the context of both song and prayer, as at Aristoph. *Lys.* 1291ff. and *Av* 1763ff., where ἰὴ παιών is used simply as an exclamation of joy in conjunction with other cries such as ἀλαλαί and ἰαί.

his hymenaeus song (*hymenaeo meo*, 799). We may compare this potentially endless song of repeated cries with the closely repeated paeon cries at the beginning of *Eryth. Pae. to Apollo* fr. 1; the two songs are also similar in their expansion of the basic cries (*ἰὴ παιών*, *hymen*) by means of multiplication as well as the addition of *ὦ/ὸ*.<sup>22</sup> These similarities, along with that of the triple paeon 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.<sup>23</sup>

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 paeon, cries attached to a brief prayer. The relationship between the refrain form and the ritual cries associated with paeon 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.<sup>24</sup> Thus may be explained the relatively frequent occurrence of refrains in hymenaeus and paeon.

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Rutherford (2001) 69f.

<sup>23</sup> Rutherford (2001) 262, n.7

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Wilamowitz (1913) 248, who compares the poetic adaptation of the paeon 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.III, 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 fr. \*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.<sup>1</sup> 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;

---

<sup>1</sup> The other three are Pi. fr. 128e and Bacch. fr. \*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 *Paeon 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<sup>2</sup>, 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.<sup>3</sup> 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  $\bar{D} -$ , it is also possible to analyze it as  $r^{da}$ , a form of enoplian.<sup>4</sup>

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.*

---

<sup>2</sup> West (1982) 124, 142.

<sup>3</sup> The remains of the refrain of Pi. fr. 128e are compatible with dactylo-epitrite.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Sappho III.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 Anacreon<sup>5</sup>, may suggest a similar, independent tradition within ionic.

*Scheme.* Of the twelve poems whose strophic pattern can be established<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> Macedonicus *Paeon* 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 (*ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ παιάν*), 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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> Of these, six have refrains that occur at the end of strophes (Pi. *Pae.*

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Lloyd-Jones, H., *CR* (1958) 17.

<sup>6</sup> Pi. fr. 128e and Bacch. fr. \*18 and \*19 are too fragmentary for the strophic pattern to be established.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Ag.* 121ff. for an example of a refrain that occurs after strophe, antistrophe and epode.

<sup>8</sup> See my discussion below.

<sup>9</sup> Pi. fr. 128e 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 ἐφύμνιον purely on

2, 4, 21; Aristonous *Paeon*; 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. 111, features two medial refrains.<sup>10</sup> To this class of “complex refrain” poems we may add Macedonicus *Paeon*. 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 (ἰὲ παιάν or ἰὴ παιάν) that are distinct from the longer refrain (ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ παιάν) that ends each “strophe”. The poem’s basic refrain structure resembles, therefore, that of *Eryth. Pae.* and Philodamus *Paeon*. 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.<sup>11</sup>

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

---

the basis of sense: the former contains a real sentence, the latter does not. Assuming that the two are similar in all other aspects, we would be able to say that, like the ἐφύμνιον, the ἐπιφθεγματικόν occurs at the end of its strophe, and therefore any example given for ἐπιφθεγματικόν must be an terminal refrain. This assumption is not safe, however, because the focus of the passage in Hephaestion is on sense and not form. Consequently, we must admit the possibility that π. Π. uses ἐπιφθεγματικόν as a general term covering all refrains contributing to sense (πρὸς νοῦν συντελεῖ τι), regardless of their scheme. Cf. Hephaestion’s use (§71., p.70 Consbruch) of ἐφύμνιον both as a general term covering all refrains and as a term specifically applied to terminal refrains.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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. III*

ἴψοι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον,  
 ὑμῆναον,  
 ἀέρρετε, τέκτονες ἄνδρες·  
 ὑμῆναον.  
 γάμβρος †(εἰσ)έρχεται ἴσος ᾿Αρεσι†,  
 (ὑμῆναον,)  
 ἄνδρος μεγάλῳ πόλῳ μέσδων.  
 (ὑμῆναον,)

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

<sup>12</sup> We cannot be sure the strophe begun in Sappho fr. III 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 *ὕμνησιν* 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 Ἑρμηνείας 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 *ὕμνησιν* 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 *ὕμνησιν* at line 2, but omits it from his text, giving the explanation, "deest ap. Demetr. de eloc. 148."<sup>13</sup>

What explains this discrepancy? The omission of the refrain by Demetrius could, of course, be ascribed to a genuine error of memory<sup>14</sup>, but it seems hardly likely that Demetrius, when quoting from the very famous *ὕμναι* 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

---

<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, although Demetrius gives no instance of the refrain at all in his version, Consbruch does include the second *ὕμνησιν* 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 *μεσὺμνιον*; second, that since the first *μεσὺμνιον* in the MSS interrupts the syntax of the stanza, it is more suspect than the first attested *μεσὺμνιον*. The former assumption is not required by Hephaestion's definition; the latter is contradicted by the multiple medial refrains observed in dramatic lyric.

<sup>14</sup> "The author of the π. ἑρμ. 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 *μεσύμνια* (refrains occurring within, not between, strophes).<sup>15</sup> Demetrius, on the other hand, is interested only in a certain stylistic tendency of Sappho by which she pretends to change her mind: ἔστι δέ τις ἰδίως χάρις Σαπφικῆ ἐκ μεταβολῆς, ὅταν τι εἰποῦσα μεταβάλληται καὶ ὥσπερ μετανοήσῃ, οἶον ὕψου δῆ, φησί, τὸ μέλαθρον. . . μείζων, ὥσπερ ἐπιλαμβανομένη ἑαυτῆς, ὅτι ἀδυνάτω ἐχρήσατο ὑπερβολῇ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν Ἀρηϊ ἴσος 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.<sup>16</sup>

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).”<sup>17</sup> 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 *μεσύμνια* which μὴ μετὰ στροφὴν ἀλλὰ μετὰ στίχον κέηται, there can be no refrain at line 4 between the two strophes.<sup>18</sup> (By the

<sup>15</sup> Cf. my discussion in CHAPTER 2.

<sup>16</sup> Perotta (1948) 53.

<sup>17</sup> Perrotta (1948) 53.

<sup>18</sup> 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 *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 (*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).<sup>19</sup> 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 *μεσύμνιον*, i.e. *μὴ μετὰ στροφὴν ἀλλὰ μετὰ στίχον κέηται*. 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 *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 *μεσύμνιον* in a strict sense (i.e. a

---

that cod. P of Demetrius is correct in omitting the refrain *ὑμῆραον* after *τέκτονες ἄνδρες*.” It follows from what I have argued above that codex P is not “correct” in its omission but rather reflects Demetrius’ own lack of interest in the refrain altogether. For similar, cf ap. crit. *PLF* ad loc.: “4 om. (ii) cod. P et fort. omiss. postulant Heph. rationes”.

<sup>19</sup> Gallavotti (1950) 113-114.

μεσύμνιον 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 Hephæstion 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:*

ἴψοι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον,  
 ὑμήναον,  
 ἀέρρετε, τέκτονες ἄνδρες·  
 ὑμήναον.  
 γάμβρος †(εἰσ)έρχεται ἴσος ᾿Αρηνι†,  
 ἄνδρος μεγάλω πόλυ μέσδων.

*Theme.* Comment on the refrain in this fragment, besides that on the form ὑμήναον, has been limited to attempts to relate its appearance to the poem's original mode of performance and occasion. The poem is generally taken to have been performed by a chorus as part of a real wedding ceremony.<sup>20</sup> Page is very specific in placing the poem in its performance context: "[it is] a song presumably recited by the assembly which went in procession from the bride's house to the bridegroom's after the ceremonial banquet."<sup>21</sup> This precise placement is arrived at, one presumes, from the thematic content of the fragment itself. Likewise

<sup>20</sup> Kirkwood (1974) 139, Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 91, Page (1955) 119-22, Maas (1916) 131f.

<sup>21</sup> Page (1955) 120.

dependent upon the fragment's content is Maas's assertion that the poem was performed before the *θάλαμος*.<sup>22</sup> For Page, the flatness and heaviness of humor in the fragment serves as evidence for its use at a real wedding.<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> This view of the refrain as an especially traditional element of the *ὑμέναιος* 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.<sup>25</sup> 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 *ὑμέναιος*.

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.<sup>26</sup> 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 *τέκτονες* 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.<sup>27</sup> An even clearer example of Sappho's use of the quasi-dramatic

---

<sup>22</sup> Maas (1916) 132.

<sup>23</sup> 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.

<sup>24</sup> Kirkwood (1974) 140, Contiades-Tsitsoni (1990) 93.

<sup>25</sup> Maas (1916) 131f., Muth (1954) 7f. Cf. CHAPTER 4.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. CHAPTER 3.

<sup>27</sup> Wheeler (1930) 218.

technique is the speech of Aphrodite in poem 1.<sup>28</sup> 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.<sup>29</sup>) 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.<sup>30</sup>

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

<sup>28</sup> 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, ποί με λίπουσα ἴοιχην; τοῦκέτι ἤξω πρὸς σέ, οὐκέτι ἤξω†*. 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.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Davies (1988) 52-64.

<sup>30</sup> Frr. 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.<sup>31</sup> 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, *Paeon 2*

*Text.* Our text for Pi. *Pae.* 2, 4 and 5 depends upon P.Oxy. v, 841 (= Maehler's Π<sup>4</sup>), 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.<sup>32</sup>

*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  $\hat{p}b$ . Rutherford has suggested the triple use of the metrical element  $\sim \sim \sim$  – “may be significant in view of the tendency for the *παύων* cry to be uttered three times.”<sup>33</sup> We have already noted the general tendency to multiply ritual cries both within and outside formal

<sup>31</sup> Kirk (1963) 51f. suggests this hyperbole may be sexual.

<sup>32</sup> D'Alessio (1992) 82.

<sup>33</sup> Rutherford (2001) 264, n.7.

refrains.<sup>34</sup>

The metrical context is aeolic, *pb* and *^pb* 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 *^pb ^pb ^pb* figure is unique to the refrain, but we do find an instance of *^pb ^pb* elsewhere in the poem: strophe 4 || *^pb ^pb* ~ ||. The refrain clearly has a closing force that picks up on the frequent *pb* in the triad.<sup>35</sup>

*Syntax.* The *δέ* justifies the copyist's punctuation after the second *ιη ιέ*.<sup>36</sup> The second *παιάν* is therefore to be taken with the clause that follows: it is the subject of *λείποι*. This drawing of the *παιάν* away from *ιη ιέ* is marked, since the two are usually treated as a single unit. In this case, the second *ιη ιέ* is left dangling with respect to syntax. There is probably a continuing sense that *ιη ιέ* and *παιάν* are to be taken together. The syntax is also notable in that we have here the only case of *παιάν* treated unambiguously as the subject of a verb within a refrain.<sup>37</sup> The unexpected syntactic shift is probably a conscious attempt to manipulate and extend the given cry *ιη ιέ παιάν*. 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.

*Theme.* The second part of the refrain is a self-standing prayer that "Paean

<sup>34</sup> Cf. CHAPTER 4, §2.

<sup>35</sup> 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."

<sup>36</sup> The use of the "high dot" here accords with its use throughout the papyrus. Cf. Grenfell and Hunt (1908) 14.

<sup>37</sup> But cf. the possible use of *παιάν* as an appositional vocative at Philodamus *Pae. ad Dion.* 11 *ιέ παιάν, ιθι σωτήρ* and its probable use in the vocative at Eur. *Ion* 125ff *ὦ Παιάν ὦ Παιάν, / εὐαίων εὐαίων / εἴης, ὦ Λατοῦς παλ.*

never leave me.” We may compare this to the terminal refrain of Philodamus *Paeon* (ἴθι σωτήρ, εὐφρων τάνδε πόλιν φύλασσο' εὐαίωσι σὺν ὄλβωσι) and to the paeon refrain at Eur. *Ion* 125ff. (εὐαίωσι εἴης).<sup>38</sup> 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”.<sup>39</sup> Outside the context of the refrain form, we compare these “non-musical prayer” paeon refrains to the brief, independent paeon prayer at Soph. *Phil.* 832 (ἴθι μοι, Παιών).<sup>40</sup> We distinguish these from other prayers where there is an accompanying paeon cry that is not involved in the syntax of the prayer: Aristoph. *Pax* 453 (ἡμῖν δ' ἀγαθὰ γένοιτ'. ἰὴ παιών ἰή), *Eryth. Pae. fr. 1* (ἰὴ παιών· [ὦ] ἄναξ Ἄπολλον, φεῖδεο κούρων, φεῖδε[εο]). The refrain of Pi. *Pae. 2* seems, then, to function as a genuine prayer to Paeon in its own right.<sup>41</sup> 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.<sup>42</sup> This is immediately followed by the third and final appearance of the refrain, with its own prayer that “Paeon 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

<sup>38</sup> Cf. also τὸ δ' εὐ νικάτω at Aesch. *Ag.* 121ff.

<sup>39</sup> E.g., Ar. *Ra.* 404 Ἰακχε φιλοχορευτὰ συμπρόπεμπέ με.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. also the ending prayer at Isyllus *Paeon* 58-61.

<sup>41</sup> 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.

<sup>42</sup> Radt (1958) 81 suggests δαφνηρέ instead of Ἄβδηρε 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 δαφνηρός is a term both rare and late, and disputing Radt's claim that Ἄβδ- 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.<sup>43</sup> 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.<sup>44</sup> 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”<sup>45</sup> 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).<sup>46</sup> 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.<sup>47</sup> These

---

<sup>43</sup> Rutherford (2001) 274 suggests that the “refrain follows as if an expansion of the prayer.” Could Abderus be construed as the subject of *λείπῳ* 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.)

<sup>44</sup> Rutherford (2001) 263.

<sup>45</sup> E.g., Aristoph. *Thesm.* 310f 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 *(ὠῆ) ἠῆτε, κτλ* at the end of a triad.

<sup>46</sup> Radt (1958) 16 sees the refrain in each of these cases to refer to the coming war.

<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup>

### §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 *ia dod*<sup>ˆ</sup>, within an aeolic-choriambic context which tends in the strophe from *ia* to *da*, in the epode from *da* back to *ia*. The refrain's figure is very similar to the *ia dod* that occurs frequently in the poem (strophe 2; epode 1, 2, 8), always ending period, and which has been labeled "Q" by Rutherford.<sup>49</sup> Thus the refrain's catalectic cadence seems particularly well suited for the triad ending. The refrain is immediately preceded by Q *ia dod*, 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"<sup>50</sup> 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 (*ἀνιππος, βουνομίας, ἀδαέστερος*).<sup>51</sup> 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

<sup>48</sup> 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.

<sup>49</sup> Rutherford (2001) 452.

<sup>50</sup> Rutherford (2001) 286f.

<sup>51</sup> 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 descriptions of islands in general rather than of Ceos specifically<sup>52</sup>) 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."<sup>53</sup>

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.<sup>54</sup>

#### §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.<sup>55</sup>

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 *phē* of *Pi. Pae. 2* and the aeolic-choriambic *ia dod* of *Pae. 4*. In both these cases the final spondee is occupied by *παίαν*; here *παίαν* is supplanted by the name of Apollo.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Käppel (1992) 103f.

<sup>53</sup> Rutherford (2001) 288.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. line 3 of *Eryth. Pae. ad Asclep.*, where medial refrain is almost certainly meant to be understood as a quotation of the *κοῦροι*. See my discussion in this chapter below.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. iambic expansion at S3, dactylic expansion at S5.

The entire adonic figure, which is comprised of the exclamatory shout ( $\hat{\iota}\eta$  or  $\hat{\omega}$ ) +  $\hat{\iota}\epsilon$  +  $\pi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$  in *Pae.* 2 and *Pae.* 4. is here occupied by the full naming with epithet of Delian Apollo. The shape of the preceding shout  $\sim\sim$  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 dactylo-epitrite context of the poem as well as the essentially aeolic context of Pindar's paeon refrains taken as a whole.

The form of the paeon cry in *Pae.* 5, or something very like it, may have been commonly used in addresses to Apollo as Paeon. We find a similar line at Soph. *OT* 154:  $\hat{\iota}\eta\iota\epsilon$   $\Delta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\epsilon$   $\Pi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$ . 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.<sup>56</sup> 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 paeon cry (if not the paeon refrain proper) to begin a paeon-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

---

<sup>56</sup> Rutherford (2001) 294ff.

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.<sup>57</sup> 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.

### §2.5 *Pi. Pae. 21*

*Text.* The largest fragment of the poem (lines 1-24) is found in P.Oxy. xxvi, 2442 (published by Lobel in 1961, = Maehler’s Π<sup>26</sup>), fr. 32, col. 2.<sup>58</sup> 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 Π<sup>7</sup>) fr. 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 (λατοδαμ) 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.

*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

<sup>57</sup> Cf. discussion of *Pi. Pae. 2* above.

<sup>58</sup> This papyrus overlaps with the more famous and extensive P.Oxy. 841. (Both papyri contribute to *Pae. 7, 7a, 8* and 8a.)

follow Lobel's suggestion and assume an aeolic character for both.<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup> 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.<sup>62</sup> 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

---

<sup>59</sup> Lobel ad loc.: "There is nothing not explicable by the indeterminateness of the Aeolic 'basis'."

<sup>60</sup> See §1 above.

<sup>61</sup> *Pace* Rutherford (2001) 403.

<sup>62</sup> 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<sup>63</sup>, a monostrophic structure is by far the more likely for this song.

*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°*.

*Syntax.* While it is possible that the refrain ends in a verb, now lost, which could take *βασίλειαν* as its direct object<sup>64</sup>, 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: *Eryth. Pae. ad Asclep.* ἰὴ παιάν Ἀσκληπιόν, / δαίμονα κλεινότατον, / ἰὲ παιάν.; Sappho fr. III ὑμῆναον. 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 ὄρθιον ἰάλεμλον / |κελαδήσατ. |; Aesch. *Ag.* αἴλινον αἴλινον εἰπέ.<sup>65</sup> 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 ἰὴ ἰέ is acting as a verb.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>63</sup> Unusual, but not unheard of. Rutherford's claim, (2001) 403, that there is no known example of a refrain occurring at the end of strophe, antistrophe and epode is incorrect: this is precisely the scheme found at Aesch. *Ag.* 121ff.

<sup>64</sup> Rutherford (2001) 403.

<sup>65</sup> 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.

<sup>66</sup> The use of (ἰὴ) ἰήτε μέτρα παιηό[ν]ων at Pi. *Pae.* 6.121-122 is not a parallel. There the cry ἰή 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 *ὠὴ ἰέ*.<sup>67</sup> There may nevertheless be an Apolline association for the song, since the future tense of *ἔσσεται* (13) and of *σχήσει* (17) suggests that we may be dealing here with direct speech containing a prophecy.<sup>68</sup> 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 *ὠὴ ἰέ* 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):

*ξύμπαντά τ' εἰπὼν θεοφιλεῖς ἐμὰς τύχας  
παιῶν' ἐπηρυφήμησεν εὐθυμῶν ἐμέ.*

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

---

the internal accusative *μέτρα παιηόλων*. (Cf. Wackernagel (1953-79) ii, 883.) The passage fails as a parallel for the accusative refrain of *Pae.* 21 on three grounds. First, there is no alteration of the cry in *Pae.* 21 which would cause us to take it as having a special verbal force. Second, *βασίλειαν, κτλ* can in no way be taken as an internal object. Third, while the subject of *ὠήτε* in *Pae.* 6 is clearly a chorus, probably the chorus performing the poem, there is no obvious corresponding singular subject for a verb *ὠὴ ἰέ* in *Pae.* 21, which we expect to have been performed by a chorus as well.

<sup>67</sup> Rutherford (2001) 404f guesses that the song's occasion may have been the ritual bathing of a cult statue.

<sup>68</sup> Rutherford (2001) 404 and n.8.

naming of the holy headwaters of Achelous at 9-10, reinforced with a demonstrative: ἀλλὰν Ἀχελωΐου / κρανίου τοῦτο ζᾶθε[ον]. 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.<sup>69</sup> 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.<sup>70</sup> 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*: Ἀγλα for Ἀγλαία at 13, and δοκίμους for δόκιμον at 23. The apparatus is for the text of the refrains only.

[Παιᾶνα κλυτό]μητιν αἰείσατε  
 [κοῦροι Λατοΐδαν Ἔκ]ατον,  
 ἰὲ Παιάν,  
 ὃς μέγα χάρ[μα βροτοῖσ]ιν ἐγείνατο  
 μιχθεῖς ἐμ φι[λότητι Κορ]ωνίδι 5  
 ἐν γαί τᾶι Φλεγυεῖαι,  
 [ἰὲ Παι]άν, Ἀσκληπιὸν  
 δαίμονα κλεινό[τατ]ον,  
 ἰὲ Παιάν,

[το]ῦ δὲ καὶ ἐξεγένοντο Μαχάων 10

<sup>69</sup> Rutherford (2001) 406.

<sup>70</sup> Schroeder (1999) 69.

καὶ Πο[δα]λείριος ἦδ' Ἴασώ,  
 ἰὲ Παιάν,  
 Αἴγλα [τ'] εὐώπις Πανάκειά τε  
 Ἴηπιόνας παῖδες σὺν ἀγακλυτῶι  
 εὐαγέϊ Ἰγυίαι· 15  
 ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἴασκληπιὸν  
 δαίμονα κλεινότατον,  
 ἰὲ Παιάν.

χαίρέ μοι, Ἴλαος δ' ἐπινίσσο  
 τὰν ἀμὰν πόλιω εὐρύχορον, 20  
 ἰὲ Παιάν,  
 δὸς δ' ἡμᾶς χαίροντας ὄρᾶν φάος  
 ἀελίου δοκίμους σὺν ἀγακλυτῶι  
 εὐαγέϊ Ἰγυίαι·  
 ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἴασκληπιὸν 25  
 δαίμονα κλεινότατον,  
 ἰὲ Παιάν.

3 ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν PD  
 7 ἰὴ παιᾶνα Ἴασκληπιόν D  
 12 ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν PD; ]ῶ[ A  
 16-18 ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἴασκληπιέ, δαῖμον κλεινότατε, ἰὲ Παιάν PD; ]ἰὴ Παιάν[  
 ]κλεινότατε, ἰὲ[ A  
 21 ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν P; ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν D; ]ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ[ A  
 25-28 ἰὴ Παιάν, Ἴασκληπιέ, δαῖμον σεμνότατε, ἰὲ Παιάν PD; ]σεμν[ A

This is, as Käppel points out, the only example of the paeon genre for which we have multiple witnesses.<sup>71</sup> 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.<sup>72</sup> The obverse of this stone contains a *lex sacra* including explicit instructions for the performance of the paeon to Apollo that follows (*CA* p. 140; *PMG* 933; K 36a); the reverse contains a fragmentary paeon to Apollo (K 36b), then our paeon 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.<sup>73</sup>; the previous inscriptions were dated by Wilamowitz

<sup>71</sup> Käppel (1992) 193.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Wilamowitz (1909) 37ff.

<sup>73</sup> Wilamowitz (1909) 48; Powell ad loc.

to 380-360 B.C., and this date has been generally accepted.<sup>74</sup> 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.<sup>75</sup> 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.<sup>76</sup> 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 γῆ* 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.<sup>77</sup> 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

---

<sup>74</sup> Wilamowitz (1909) 37; Furley and Bremer (2001) 212f; Bülow (1929) 38.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) 213.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Bülow (1929) 37; Käppel (1992) 372; Furley and Bremer (2001) 213; Rutherford (2001) 69 n.6.

<sup>77</sup> 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.<sup>78</sup>

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”<sup>79</sup>; 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 τῆ Φλεγύαο); some were made in favor of more familiar forms (e.g., P εὐαγγελί); some to create a more metrically consistent strophe (E *passim*).<sup>80</sup> Of all the surviving versions of the poem, it is E that receives the harshest treatment from Powell: its writer added ἐν γὰρ at line 6 because he could not understand τῆ Φλεγυεῖα alone and because he wished to create a closer responsion between the strophes; similarly, he omitted Ἄκεσώ τε πολύλλιτος for metrical reasons; he could not comprehend Ἀῖγλα so he wrote Ἀγλαία instead. Finally, Powell rejects E’s φάος... δόκιμον at 22f as a nonsensical corruption of ἡμάς... δοκίμους. While they may not have joined Powell in so strong a condemnation of E, editors have often not accepted E’s text.<sup>81</sup>

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 Φλεγυεῖα as applied to Asclepius’ mother made no sense to the writer of

<sup>78</sup> Cf. *CA* p. 138; Käppel (1992) 198. But Käppel’s characterization of the poem as “automasiert” 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.

<sup>79</sup> *CA* p. 138.

<sup>80</sup> *CA* p. 136.

<sup>81</sup> E.g., preference for P, D Ἀῖγλα in *PMG*, Käppel (1992), Furley and Bremer. But Powell does not join *PMG*’s approval of D Φλεγύαο at 6.

E, why should it make any more sense applied to an interpolated (according to Powell) γᾶ? For the reference to Phlegyas would be the same in both cases. Finally, it is 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.<sup>82</sup> 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.<sup>83</sup> 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 ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ παιάν<sup>84</sup> and ὦ ἰὲ παιάν<sup>85</sup>; the terminal refrain varies both in the case of Asclepius and his epithet (accusative or vocative) and in the choice between the adjectives κλειώτατον (-ε) and σεμνότατε.

*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: 4da | D<sup>2</sup>

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Keyßner (1934) 990.

<sup>83</sup> Bülow (1929) 36.

<sup>84</sup> P<sub>3</sub> and 21; D<sub>3</sub> (but ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν D<sub>21</sub>); perhaps A<sub>21</sub>.

<sup>85</sup> PD 12; perhaps A12.

|| *ιὲ παιάων* || *4da* | *4da* | *3da*<sup>^</sup>. (It may be that line 6 of the stanza is meant to lend an aeolic air, since it can be analyzed as *pb*.) 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: *zia* | D || *ιὲ παιάων*.

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 responson that would otherwise have been inherited from E<sup>86</sup>, 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 *καὶ Ποδαλείριος ἦδ' Ἰασώ* the new material *Ἄσκεσώ τε πολύλλιτος*.<sup>87</sup> This addition alters the original shape of the line from D<sup>2</sup> to *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 6 *da*. Second, since the original paean cry of *ιὲ παιάων* would leave a string of four breve syllables, that cry is augmented by an *ω*. The result is an easily comprehensible 8 *da*<sup>^</sup> 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 its metrical context. Second, for PAD the medial refrain functions as a place holder, which he may adjust according to the metrical 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.

<sup>86</sup> West (1982) 141.

<sup>87</sup> Only *π*]ολύλλιτος confirmed in A.

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.<sup>88</sup> 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  $\acute{\iota}\acute{\epsilon}$ . 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  $\acute{\iota}\acute{\epsilon}$   $\pi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$  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  $\text{Ἄσκληπιόν, δαίμονα κλεινότατον}$  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  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\omicron$  in line 4; the accusative is kept in the other three instances of the terminal refrain simply out of a desire for consistency.<sup>89</sup> 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

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Keyßner (1934) 992, who hypothesizes an intermediary Athenian source for PAD that achieved complete strophic symmetry.

<sup>89</sup> Käppel (1992) 194f. Wilamowitz (1909) 45 suggests the accusative is retained “as if it were an interjection like  $\omega$ .”

advantage of the case of Ἄσκληπιόν 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.<sup>90</sup>

*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 κοῦροι 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.<sup>91</sup> 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 (δὸς δ' ἡμᾶς, 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 paeon cry that the youths are enjoined to sing in lines 1-2 παιᾶνα κλυτόμητιν ἀείσατε / κοῦροι. The second point of interaction is the use of the terminal refrain in its first instance, already noted above, as a direct object of ἐγένετο 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

<sup>90</sup> We may note also that D “over corrects” the first instance of the terminal refrain to ἰηπαιᾶνα Ἄσκληπιόν.

<sup>91</sup> Käppel (1992) 194.

poems in which they appear.

§2.7 *Macedonicus Paeon* (=IG II2 4473 + SEG xxiii (1968) 126; CA 138; K 41; FB 7.5)

Μακεδονικὸς Ἀμφιπολείτης  
ἐποίησεν τοῦ θεοῦ προστάξαν[τος].

Δήλιον εὐφάρετραν Ζηνὸς γόνον ὕμνειτ' ἀργυρότ[οξον]  
εὐφρονη θυμῶι εὐφῆμωι γλώσση ἰὲ Παιάν  
ἰκτῆρα κλάδον ἐν παλάμῃ θέτε καλὸν ἐλαΐνεον κ[αὶ δάφνης]  
ἀγλαὸν ἔρνος, κούροι Ἀθηναίων ἰὲ Παιάν  
[κο]ῦροι, ἄμε[μπ]τος ὕμνος ἀεῖδοι Λητοῖδην ἑκατον, Μ[ουσῶν] 5  
κλυτὸν ἠγ[ε]μ[ον]ῆα ἰὲ Παιάν  
ἐπιτάρροθον ὅς ποτιε γείνατο νούσων καὶ βροτέας [ἀλκτῆρα]  
δύης Ἀσκληπιὸν εὐφ[ρο]να κούρον· [ἰ]ὲ ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν  
τὸν δ' ἀνὰ Πηλιάδας κορυφὰς ἐδίδαξε [τ]έχνην πᾶ[σαν κρυ]-  
φίαν Κένταυρος ἀλεξίπουν μερόπεσσι· [ἰ]ὲ Παιάν 10  
παῖδα Κορωνίδος, ἠπιὸν ἀνδράσι δαίμονα σεμνότα[τον ἰ]ὲ Παιάν.]  
τοῦ δ' ἐγένοντο κόροι Ποδαλείριος ἠδὲ Μαχάων Ἑλλη[σι]ν κοσμήτορ[ε]  
λόγχης ἰὲ Παιάν  
ἠδ' Ἰασὼ Ἀκεσῶ τε καὶ Αἴγλη καὶ Πανάκεια, ἠπιόνης παῖδες σὺν  
ἀριπρέπτω Ἰγυίαι· ἰὲ Παιάν 15  
χαῖρε, βροτοῖς μέγ' ὄνειαρ, δαῖμον κλεινότατε, [ἰ]ὲ ὦ [ἰ]ὲ Παιάν]  
Ἀσκληπιέ, σῆν δὲ δίδου σοφίαν ὕμνουδτας ἐς αἰ[εῖ] θ[ά]λλειν]  
ἐν βιοτῆι σὺν τερπνοτάτῃ Ἰγυίαι· ἰὲ Παιάν]  
σώϊζοις δ' Ἀτθίδα Κεκροπίαν πόλιν αἰὲν ἐπερχόμε[ν]ος ἰὲ Παιάν.  
ἠπιος ἔσσο, μάκαρ, στυγεράς δ' ἀπερύκε νούσου[ς] ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν. 20

*Text.* The poem is from an inscription (IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 4473 + SEG xxiii (1968) 126) found in the Athenian Asclepion, and is dated to the first century B.C. or A.D.<sup>92</sup> 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 paeon cry: ἰὲ παιάν (lines 2, 4, [10], [11], 19), ἰὲ Παιάν (6, 13, 15, 18), ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ 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

<sup>92</sup> 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 astroptic 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 *ἰε̂*, ensuring a continuation of the dactylic rhythm and providing at last a spondaic ending.<sup>93</sup> The refrain version *ἰῆ παιάων*, 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 (*ὕμνεϊτ'*). 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 *κοῦρον* and the relative *τὸν* at 8-9, and the epithet *κλεινότατε* and its noun *Ἄσκληπιέ* 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* ... *Ἄσκληπιέ* at 16-17, again giving emphasis to the divine name; and the final instance

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Pordomingo Pardo (1984) 125. She also sees a possible *pb* in *ἰε̂ ὦ ἰε̂ παιάων*.

follows the concluding prayer and *makairismos*. 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".<sup>94</sup> Besides the observed similarities with respect to the gods named in both poems<sup>95</sup> and their overall structure<sup>96</sup>, there are two points concerning the refrains that, to my knowledge, have not thus far been observed. First is Macedonicus' use of the epithets *δαίμονα σεμνότατον* (II) and *δαίμον κλεινότατε* (I6) immediately before refrains; these should remind us of the variation of the terminal refrain found in *Eryth. Pae. PAD. δαίμον κλεινότατε* 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 *ἰὲ* (or *ἰῆ*) *παιάν* and *ἰὲ ὦ ἰὲ παιάν* 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)

<sup>94</sup> 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.

<sup>95</sup> Furley and Bremer (2001) ii.232.

<sup>96</sup> Pordomingo Pardo (1984) 126.

The poem is taken from an inscription found at Delphi and dated to 340/339 B.C. by a subscription naming Etymondas as archon.<sup>97</sup> Since the subscription records honors given to Philodamus of Scarpheia and his brothers for having composed the paeon, 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.

[. . . . .] Διθύραμβε, Βάκχ',  
 εἴυιε, ταῦρε, κλισσοχαί-  
 τα, Βρόμι', ἠριναῖς ἰκοῦ  
 ταῖσδ' ἱεραῖς ἐν ὥραις,  
 – Εὐοῖ ὦ ἰὸ Βάκχ', ὦ ἰὲ Παιά|ν –           5  
 ὄν Θήβαις ποτ' ἐν εὐίαις  
 Ζη|νι| γείνατ|ο| καλλίπαις Θυώνα  
 πάντες δ' ἀθά|νατοι χόρευ-  
 σαν, πάντες δὲ βροτοὶ χ|άρευ  
 σαῖς, ὦ Β|άκχιε, γένναις.                           10  
 Ἴε Παιάν, ἴθι σωτή|ρ,  
 εὐφρων τάνδε| πόλιw φύλασσ'  
 εὐαίωvι σὺν ὄλβωι.]

Ἄν τότε βακχίαζε μὲν  
 χθῶ|ν . . . . .] τε Κάδ-           15  
 μου Μινυᾶν τε κόλπ|ος Εὐ-  
 βο|ιά τε καλλίκαρπος,  
 ὦ Εὐοῖ ὦ ἰὸ Β|άκχ', ὦ ἰὲ Παιά|ν ὦ  
 πᾶσα δ' ὑμνοβρυῆς χόρευ-  
 εw [Δελφῶ|ν ἱερά μάκαιρα χώρα·           20  
 αὐτὸς δ' ἀστερόεν δέμας  
 φαίνων Δελφίσι σὺν κόραι|ς  
 Παρv|ασσοῦ πτύχας ἔστας.  
 Ἴε Παιάν, ἴθι σω|τή|ρ,  
 εὐφρων [τάνδε| πόλιw φύλασσ'           25  
 εὐαίωvι σὺν ὄλβωι.]

<sup>97</sup> The crucial dating of Etymondas' archonship has been established in three stages. First, Vatin (1964) limited the possible years to two available gaps (as then understood) in the Delphi archon list for 344/3 and 339/8. Second, Marchetti (1977) eliminated the gap for 344/3 and moved the remaining sequence of archons back by one year up through 337/6, with the result that the gap previously assigned to 339/8 was now reassigned to 340/39. This gap required an archon's name in the genitive case 8 letters long. Our third stage in the process of dating Etymondas came when Stewart (1982, p.224, n.49) suggested the genitive ΕΤΥΜΟΝΔΑ to fill in the remaining gap for 340/39. (For a fuller but still brief account of this process, see Käppel (1992) 209. For some reason, Furley and Bremer (2001) 124f do not record Stewart's critical contribution.)

[Νυκτι]φαῆς δὲ χειρὶ πάλ-  
λων σ[έλ]λας ἐνθέοις [. . . . .]  
τροῖς ἔμολες μυχοῦς [Ἐλε]υ-  
σίνοσ ἀν' ἀνθεμῶ]δεις, 30  
ὦ Εὐοῖ ὦ ἰὸ Βακχ', ὦ ἰὲ Παιά]ν ὦ  
[ἔθνος ἔνθ' ἅπαν Ἑλλάδος  
γᾶς ἀ]μφ' ἐ]νναέταις [φίλοις] ἐπ[όπ]ταις  
ὀργίων ὀσί]ων Ἰακ-  
χον [κλείει σ]τε βροτοῖς πόνων 35  
ὦ]ξ[ιας ὄρ]μον [ἄμοχθον.]  
Ἰὲ Παιάν, ἴθι σωτήρ,  
εὐ]φρων τάνδε [πόλι]ν φύλα]σσο  
εὐαί]ωνι σὺν ὄλβωι.

ομιτ ΙΩ

[Ἐ]ν]θεν ἀ]π' ὀλβίας χθονὸς 53  
Θεσ[σαλίας] ἔκελσας ἄσ-  
τη τέμενός τ' Ὀλύμπ]ιον 55  
Πιερ]ίαν τε κλειτάν  
ὦ Εὐοῖ ὦ ἰὸ Βακχ', [ὦ ἰὲ Παι]άν ὦ  
Μοῦσαι δ' αὐτίκα παρθένοι  
κ[ισσῶι] στεψάμεναι κύκλωι σε πᾶσαι  
μ[έλψαν] ἀθάνα[το]ν ἐς αἰ 60  
Παιάν' εὐκλέα τ' ὀπὶ κλέο]υ-  
σαι, [κα]τάρξε δ' Ἀπόλλων.  
Ἰὲ Παιά]ν, ἴθι σ]ωτήρ,  
[εὐ]φρων τάνδε πόλι]ν φύλ]ασσο  
εὐαί]ωνι σὺν ὄλβωι. 65

ομιτ ΩΙ, ΩΙΙ, ΩΙΙΙ

Ἐκτελέσαι δὲ πρᾶξιν Ἀμ- 105  
φικτύονας θ[εὸς] κελεύ-  
ει τάχος, ὥ]ς Ἐ]κάβολος  
μῆνιν ε[λ. .] κατάσχη,  
ὦ Εὐοῖ ὦ [ἰὸ Β]ακχ', ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν ὦ  
δε]ίξαι δ' ἐγ ξενίοις ἐτεί- 110  
οις θεῶν ἱερῶι γένει συναίμωι  
τόνδ' ὕμνον, θυσίαν τε φαί-  
νειν σὺν Ἑλλάδος ὀλβίας  
πα]νδ[η]μοῖς ἰκετεΐαις.  
ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν, ἴθι σωτήρ, 115  
εὐ]φρων τάνδε πόλι]ν φύλα]σσο  
εὐαί]ωνι σὺν ὄλβωι.

ὦ μάκαρ ὀλβία τε κεί-  
 νων γε[νεὰ] βροτῶν, ἀγή-  
 ρων ἀμίαντον ἄ κτίσηι 120  
 ναὸν ἄ[ρακ[τι] Φοίβωι,  
 ὦ Εὐοῖ ὦ ἰὸ Βακχ', ὦ ἰὲ Παιάν] ὦ  
 χρύσειον χρυσεῖσι τύποις  
 πα[. . . . .]ν θεαὶ ἔγκυκλοῦνται  
 [. . . . .]δογ, κόμαν 125  
 δ' ἀργαίνοντ' ἐλέφαντι[ναν  
 ἐν] δ' αὐτόχθονι κόσμωι.  
 Ἴὲ Παιάν, ἴθι [σωτήρ,]  
 εὐφρων τάνδε πόλιw φύλασσ'  
 εὐα[ίωσι] σὺν ὀλβωι. 130

Πυθιάσιw δὲ πευθετή-  
 ροις [π]ροπό[λοισ] ἔταξε Βάκ-  
 χου θυσίαν χορῶν τε π[ο]λ-  
 λῶν] κυκλίαν ἀμιλλαν  
 ὦ Εὐοῖ ὦ ἰὸ Βακχ', [ὦ ἰὲ] Παιάν] ὦ 135  
 τεύχειw, ἀλιοφεγγέσιw  
 δ' ἀ[ντ]ο[λαῖς] ἴσον ἀβρὸν ἄγαλμα Βάκχου  
 ἐν [ζεύγει] χρυσεῶν λεόν-  
 των στῆσαι, ζαθέωι τε τ[εῦ-]  
 ξαι θεῶι πρέπον ἄντρον. 140  
 Ἴὲ Παιά[ν], ἴθι σω[τήρ],  
 εὐφρων τάνδε πόλιw φύλασσ'  
 εὐα[ίωσι] σὺν ὀλβωι.

Ἄλλὰ δέχεσθε Βακχ[ι]άσ-  
 ταν Διόνυσ[ου], ἐν δ' ἀγνι-] 145  
 αῖς ἅμα σὺν [χορ]οῖσι κλι-  
 κλήσκετε] κισσο[χ]αίταις  
 ὦ Ε[ὐο]ῖ ὦ ἰὸ Βακχ', ὦ ἰὲ [Παιάν] ὦ  
 πᾶσαν [Ἐλ]λάδ' ἀν' ὀλβίαμ  
 παν....ετε..πολ..υ...στα..νας..ρεπι. 150  
 λω.....ν...ιο.ε...κυκλι|  
 Χαῖρ', ἄ]ναξ ὑγείας. 153  
 Ἴὲ Παιάν, ἴθι σωτήρ,  
 εὐφρων] τάνδε πόλιw φύλασσ' 155  
 [εὐαίωσι σὺν ὀλβωι.]

*Scheme.* The poem is monostrophic with 12 strophes of 13 lines each.<sup>98</sup> It

<sup>98</sup> 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.<sup>99</sup>

*Meter.* My analysis of Philodamus' strophe follows closely Rainer's:<sup>100</sup>

1	- ~ - ~ -	<i>cb ia</i>	
2	- ~ - ~ -	<i>cb ia</i>	
3	- ~ - ~ -	<i>cb ia</i>	
4	- ~ - ~ -	<i>cb ia</i> <sup>^</sup>	
5	- - - ~ - - -	3 <i>io</i>	} medial refrain
6	- x - ~ - ~ -	<i>gl</i>	
7	- x - ~ - ~ -	<i>gl ia</i> <sup>^</sup>	
8	- x - ~ - ~ -	<i>gl</i>	
9	- x - ~ - ~ -	<i>gl</i>	
10	- x - ~ - -	<i>pb</i>	
11	~ - - ~ - -	2 <i>io</i>	} terminal refrain
12	- - - ~ - ~ -	<i>gl</i>	
13	- - - ~ - -	<i>pb</i>	}

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: *cb ia* / *cb ia* / *cb ia* / *cb ia*<sup>^</sup>; 6-10: *gl* / *gl ia*<sup>^</sup> / *gl* / *gl* / *pb*). This, taken together with the hiatus observed at lines 108 (κατάσχη· εὐοῖ) and 121 (Φοίβωι· εὐοῖ), justifies analyzing the medial refrain certainly, and the terminal refrain probably, as separate periods.<sup>101</sup> The meter of the medial refrain is potentially ambiguous, but Rainer argues that the unambiguous ionic dimeter of the first line of the terminal refrain confirms Weil's original analysis of the medial refrain as an ionic

<sup>99</sup> Cf. graphical treatment of refrains in Macedonicus *Paeon*.

<sup>100</sup> 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.

<sup>101</sup> Rainer (1975) 181f.

trimeter whose initial two shorts have been replaced with a long.<sup>102</sup> 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.<sup>103</sup>

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.

---

<sup>102</sup> Rainer (1975) 184; Weil (1895) 411. Cf. Wilamowitz (1921) 242f on the metrical ambiguity of the medial refrain.

<sup>103</sup> 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 paeon prayers discussed earlier that consist of a paeon cry tied closely to a brief sentence of prayer<sup>104</sup>, e.g. Sophocles *Philoctetes* 827ff:

“Ἦπν’ ὀδύνας ἀδαής, Ἦπνε δ’ ἀλγέων,  
 εὐαῆς ἡμῶν  
 ἔλθοις, εὐαίῳν εὐαίῳν, ὦναξ·  
 ὄμμασι δ’ ἀντίσχοις  
 τάνδ’ αἴγλαν, ἃ τέταται ταυῶν.  
 ἴθι ἴθι μοι παιῶν.

Käppel has said of Philodamus' terminal refrain that it has “perfectly concentrated the principle of construction of the paeon 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 “paeon”), Philodamus' terminal refrain is striking in its apparent completeness as an independent prayer.<sup>105</sup> 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.<sup>106</sup>

Also noted by Rainer is the word order within the terminal refrain. The balancing of *ἰὲ παιῶν* and *ἴθι σωτήρ* in the first line, and the bracketing of *τάνδε πόλις* and *σύν* in the second and third lines, reinforce the “syntactical symmetry”

<sup>104</sup> Cf. CHAPTER 4, §2.

<sup>105</sup> Käppel (1992) 231. This “principle of construction” (“Konstruktionsprinzip”) is simply an accumulation of the various ingredients considered by Käppel to be essential to the paeon genre: the paeon cry (*ἰὲ παιῶν*); the naming of the aspect (*σωτήρ*) 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 πόλις*); and the description of the condition accompanying health (*εὐαίῳνι σύν ὄλβωι*). See Käppel (1992) 62-65 for a summary of his functional view, and 72-74 for a summary of its concomittent formal elements.

<sup>106</sup> 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.<sup>107</sup> The terminal refrain also participates in the mixing of dialects found throughout the poem: “Doricized” τάνδε, “epic-ionic” φύλασσε.<sup>108</sup> 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.<sup>109</sup>

Concerning the two cries used in the medial refrain, it is important to note their parallel use<sup>110</sup>: ἰὸ Βάκχε is associated with Dionysus as ἰὲ παιάν is associated with Apollo; ἰὸ Βάκχε bears a superficial resemblance to ἰὲ 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.<sup>111</sup> 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<sup>112</sup>: I argue elsewhere that the refrain form may have been a common feature of “old style” literary dithyramb.<sup>113</sup>

<sup>107</sup> Rainer (1975) 203f; cf. 197ff.

<sup>108</sup> Rainer (1975) 210f.

<sup>109</sup> 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.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Käppel (1992) 225 with n.80. But it is unnecessary to guess with Käppel that later attested forms like ἰοβάκχος depend upon the use of the “shortened form” of ἰὸ in this poem. For that matter, it is unnecessary to speak of ἰὸ as a “shortening of ἰὼ) or ἰέ as a shortened form of ἰή: we are simply dealing with pairs of alternative forms.

<sup>111</sup> Both παιάν and ἰόβακχος are used as genre names as well, cf. Heph. π. Π. 15.9. It is likely that the ἰόβακχος was distinguished by the presence of the cry ἰὸ Βάκχε or something similar, if not the use of this cry in a refrain specifically.

<sup>112</sup> Käppel (1992) 243.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. APPENDIX I.

Now we turn to consider the refrains' contribution to Philodamus' overall project: to introduce the worship of Dionysus within an Apolline context.<sup>114</sup> Besides its identification of Dionysus as "Paeon", 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 (τόνδε ὕμνον) at the yearly banquet of hospitality (ἐγ ξενίοις ἐτείοις) for the holy, kindred race of the gods (θεῶν ἱερῶν γένει συναίμωι)."<sup>115</sup> The theoxenia was held during the month of Theoxenios (March/April); thus the reference to spring at line 3f (ἡρνωαῖς ἐν ὥραις).<sup>116</sup> 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.<sup>117</sup> It is important to note that the *Paeon* 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."<sup>118</sup> 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 cithairode.<sup>119</sup>

<sup>114</sup> 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 paeon which was to impress upon the people of Greece the necessity of completing the construction of Apollo's sanctuary." Cf. Käppel (1992) 217f.

<sup>115</sup> Furley and Bremer (2001) i.122 in their English translation seem to construe (as does Käppel (1992) 221) *συναίμωι* as an independent substantive "brother"; but this interpretation is explicitly rejected in their note to the Greek text at ii.77.

<sup>116</sup> Käppel (1992) 209f; Furley and Bremer (2001) ii.60.

<sup>117</sup> Furley and Bremer (2001) i.126f.

<sup>118</sup> *Pace* Furley and Bremer (2001) i.127.

<sup>119</sup> Stewart (1982) 209.

In this context of religious syncretism, it is not surprising to find instances in Philodamus *Paeon* 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  $\hat{\omega} \hat{\iota} \hat{\epsilon} \pi α ι ά ν$ , 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 paeon.”<sup>120</sup> Though they do not make it clear, they are probably thinking of the initial address to Dionysus in line 1 as  $\Delta ι θ ύ ρ α μ β ε$  and the other distinctly Dionysian epithets found in the first three lines:  $Β ά κ χ ’, κ λ ι σ σ ο χ α ί τ α, Β ρ ό μ ι ’$ .<sup>121</sup> 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.<sup>122</sup> 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 “Paeon” by poem’s end.<sup>123</sup>

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

<sup>120</sup> Furley and Bremer (2001) i.61.

<sup>121</sup> Also  $\epsilon \lambda \upsilon \nu \epsilon$  and  $[τ α \upsilon \rho \epsilon]$  if Weil and Vollgraff happen to be correct in their supplements.

<sup>122</sup> Käppel (1992) 224f.

<sup>123</sup> Käppel (1992) 232.

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 correct<sup>124</sup>, it seems that the oracle specified the genre of the poem as well as its addressee: [ἐπει Φιλόδαμος καὶ τοὶ ἀδελφοὶ τὸμ παιᾶνα τὸν ἐς τὸν Διόνυσον ἐποίησαν...? ...κατὰ τὰ]ν μαντεῖαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπαγγείλατ[ο].

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.<sup>125</sup> Scholars have long

<sup>124</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 270. Furley and Bremer (2001) ii.57, n.8 note parallel examples of Delphic honors for poets in *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 447-452.

<sup>125</sup> My reading of the passage depends in part upon the supplement ἀ|π' at line 53. This is the reading of Vollgraf (followed by Furley and Bremer), who rejects the supplement ἐ|π' 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 κέλλω with ἐπί + genitive 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 ἐ|π' take the accusative object ἄστη 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 supplement seems superior.

A separate question is that of the reference of τέμενός τε Ὀλύμπιον 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 "Paeon"; both inset song and frame share the same poetic and religious project.<sup>126</sup>

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 (*βαχχίαζε*) 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 (*σὺ γὰρ χοροῖσιν κικλήσκου*) at 146f<sup>127</sup>; and when we are told in strophe 5 that the Muses, under Apollo's direction, sing a paeon (58-62), the immediately following instance of the terminal refrain seems to stand in for their song.<sup>128</sup> 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)<sup>129</sup>; also the terminal refrain in strophe 1 closely follows *πάντες δ'*

<sup>126</sup> This is implicit in Fairbanks (1900) 146: "We are not to forget that the present hymn is a paeon 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 "Paeon" 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."

<sup>127</sup> Käppel is incorrect when he states that this injunction to sing is unique within paeon: cf. *ἰήτε* at Pi. *Pae.* 6.121.

<sup>128</sup> It may also be possible to take *τόνδ' ὕμνον* at 112 to refer to one or both of the refrains.

<sup>129</sup> 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.

[ἀθά]νατοι [χ]όρευσαν (8f.).<sup>130</sup>

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” ὦ[s Ἐ]καβόλος / μῆνιν ἐ[κὰς] κατάσχη (107f).<sup>131</sup> 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 εὐοῖ), 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.<sup>132</sup> Most likely the ὦ 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.<sup>133</sup> 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

<sup>130</sup> 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 *ἰαχὰν* in line 69. I do not agree with Käppel (1992, 251) that *ἰαχὰν* must refer to *ἰῆ* specifically.

<sup>131</sup> Marcovich (1975) 168.

<sup>132</sup> Käppel (1992, 225) sees the use of ὦ in conjunction with the iobacchus cry as an analog to its use with the paean cry.

<sup>133</sup> Käppel (1992) 239.

Iacchus/Dionysus identification here, where we should expect instead that which is most traditional.

The appearance of the cry ἰὸ Βάκχ' is best explained not by Dionysus' role as "rescuer" at Eleusis<sup>134</sup>, 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.

### §2.9 *Aristonous, Paean*

*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: *gl'* replaces *gl* at line 2; there is resolution at 37<sup>135</sup>) there is an alternation in the version of the refrain used. ἰῆ ἰὲ παιάν is used in all odd numbered strophes, ὦ 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 *Eryth. Pae.* and Philodamus.

*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: ἰῆ ἰὲ παιάν

<sup>134</sup> 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.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. West (1982) 141.

— vs. ὦ λέ παῖάν —. 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 paeon cry from ἴημι, which we know from elsewhere, is being alluded to.<sup>136</sup>

#### §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 τήνελλα καλλίνικε is to be repeated three times in the course of the song, each time in conjunction with a strophe.<sup>137</sup>

*Meter.* West analyzes the strophe, including the refrain,  $2ia^{\wedge} | \text{quasi-}ith \parallel 3ia \parallel$ .<sup>138</sup> The refrain would seem, then, at least somewhat integrated within its metrical context.

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

<sup>137</sup> See my discussion in CHAPTER 2 of Eratosthenes’ comment on this song as reported in schol. vet. Pi. O.9.1ff.

<sup>138</sup> He notes the “distinct affinity with the refrain of the Dictaeon Hymn”, which he analyzes  $2ia^{\wedge} | ith | 4tr^{\wedge} \parallel hi | ith \parallel$ , p.148.

*Theme.* The cry τήνελλα 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.<sup>139</sup> Whether we take τήνελλα 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 (ὄρθιον ἰάλεμον...κελαδήσατε). We may compare this to the exhortation to the chorus of

<sup>139</sup> 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” (φωνῆς κρούματος ἀυλοῦ ποιᾶς).

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 paeon 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 ἐπιφθεγματικόν 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.<sup>140</sup>

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.”<sup>141</sup> 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,

---

<sup>140</sup> Cf. the refrain θέλω, θέλω μανῆναι at *Anacreontea* 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.

<sup>141</sup> 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 *paraphoroi*.

*Meter.* Maehler analyses the refrain of this poem as *anac̄l | anac̄l' 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 *δέ*. 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... perjurer” (*ἀπατη[η]ς καὶ ψιθυ[ρο]ς... ἐπι[λο]ρκος*, 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 Dictaeon Zeus.<sup>142</sup> 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.<sup>143</sup>

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.<sup>144</sup> 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.<sup>145</sup> 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

<sup>142</sup> Bosanquet (1908-9) 339.

<sup>143</sup> Bosanquet (1908-9) 340f.

<sup>144</sup> West (1965) 151.

<sup>145</sup> 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.”<sup>146</sup>

*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.  $\mu\omicron\lambda\pi\hat{\alpha}$ , the last word of the refrain at line 6, serves as the antecedent of the relative pronoun  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  in line 7.

*Meter.* The refrain is iambic-aeolic, analyzed by West as  $z\acute{i}\hat{a} \mid i\hat{t}h \mid \grave{a}tr \parallel h\acute{i} \mid i\hat{t}h \parallel$ . 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.”<sup>147</sup> 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.<sup>148</sup> The close repetitions

<sup>146</sup> Bosanquet (1908-9) 346.

<sup>147</sup> West (1982) 148.

<sup>148</sup> West (1982) 124, 142. While most of the stanzas are based on ionics *a maiore* (— — ~), the last stanza changes to *a minore* (~ — —). Farley and Bremer (2001) ii, 3 suggest that this switch “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. *ionici 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 ( $\theta\acute{o}\rho\epsilon$ , etc.) would be suggestive of some kind of mobile performance, were it not for the line 9f:  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu \tau\epsilon\acute{o}\nu \acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{\iota} \beta\omega\mu\acute{o}\nu$ .

of *θόρε* in lines 57–60, being set in ionic meter, may thus represent a very old charm or prayer.<sup>149</sup>

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

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 πακτίσι  
μείξαντες ἄμ' ἀυλοῖσι  
καὶ στάντες ἀείδομεν τεὸν  
ἄμφι βωμὸν εὐερκῆ.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. West (1965) 157f., where *θόρε* 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 *θόρε* “lands us straight in the heart of primitive magic.”

<sup>150</sup> Cf. the similar appearance of the longer of the surviving paean refrains, e.g. those of Pi. *Pae.* 2 and Philodamus *Paeon ad Dionysum*.

<sup>151</sup> But he is never named directly in the poem, and this stands out from the usual practice of traditional Greek hymnody. Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) ii, 5.

<sup>152</sup> Cf. West (1965) 151, on his emendation of γᾶν ὄς 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 παγκρατὲς γάνους be read παγκρατὲς 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 γάνους 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.

<sup>153</sup> Cf. *b. Hom.* 13.3 χαίρε θεὰ καὶ τήνδε σάου πόλι, ἄρχε δ’ αἰοιδῆς; *b. Hom.* 14.6 καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαίρε θεαί θ’ ἅμα πᾶσαι αἰοιδῆ; *b. Hom.* 16.5 καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαίρε ἄναξ· λίτομαι δέ σ’ αἰοιδῆ; *b. Hom.* 19.48 = *b. Hom.* 21.5 καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαίρε ἄναξ, ἴλαμαι δέ σ’ αἰοιδῆ. Also cf. Furley and Bremer (2001) ii, 5.

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.<sup>154</sup>

If δαιμόνων at line 4 includes the Curetes themselves<sup>155</sup> then the term ἀγώμενος may refer to (among other things) Zeus' role as the honorary chorus leader for the present poem.

§2.15 Campbell 931L = SLG S460-462, S465 = P. Oxy. 2625 fr. 1(b), 2, 3, 6

*Scheme.* 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.<sup>156</sup>

*Meter.* The colometry of the strophe is not certain, but in general terms we are dealing with iambic-aeolic.<sup>157</sup> The refrain itself is iambic. Assuming the first strophe follows the pattern revealed in the other three, ἴτω ἴτω χορός would metrically correspond to non-refrain material in line 3. Thus the refrain is closely tied to its metrical context.<sup>158</sup>

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

<sup>154</sup> Cf. the similar dramatic treatment of the refrains in the first strophes of the *Erythraean Paeon* (E text) and Philodamus *Paeon in Dionysum*.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. Bosanquet (1908-9) 351f. and West (1965) 156.

<sup>156</sup> Rutherford (1995) 41. The refrain also appears three times in P.Oxy. 2625 fr. 2, and up to three times in fr. 3 and 6.

<sup>157</sup> Rutherford (1995) follows Führer's analysis, *do ph<sup>da</sup> — — •• ph<sup>2da</sup>*; Page and Campbell do not.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. the integration of the μεθύμνιον with the strophe in *Eryth. Paeon* (version P, A, D) above.

poetry.<sup>159</sup> 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.<sup>160</sup>

Rutherford points out that this is the only refrain in surviving lyric poetry that features a command to the chorus to “go”.<sup>161</sup> 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.<sup>162</sup>

### §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

---

<sup>159</sup> Rutherford (1995) 42f.

<sup>160</sup> See CHAPTER 6. One thinks immediately of  $\beta\rho\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ , κτλ at *Frogs* 209ff.

<sup>161</sup> Rutherford (1995) 41.

<sup>162</sup> 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. Paeon* 1-3, *Macedonicus Paeon* 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 ἰάλεμον...κελαδήσατε). In Campbell fr. 931L, the chorus is enjoined to “go” (ἴτω ἴτω χορός), which probably refers to the performance of the poem at hand, especially if we take ἴτω here to be imitative of bird-song.<sup>163</sup> 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” (γέγαθι μολπαῖ). 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. ὑμῆναον 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 hymenaeus cries, assuming these are divine names.<sup>164</sup> Even discounting ritual cries that may or may not name deities, there are several clear case of gods

<sup>163</sup> Rutherford (1995) 42f.

<sup>164</sup> 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; Schwyzler (1939) i, 522 n.5; Frisk (1970) s.v. “2. ὑμῆν”; Chantraine (1933) 174.

named in lyric refrains: Delian Apollo in Pi. *Pae.* 5; “queen of Olympians” (probably Hera)<sup>165</sup> in Pi. *Pae.* 21; Asclepius in *Eryht. Pae.*; Zeus “Kouros” in *Hymn. Cur.*; the epithet *καλλίνικε* for Heracles in Archil. fr. 324.

No matter how we take ritual cries such as *παιάν* and *ὕμνησον* — 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 subliterate 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 subliterate 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 subliterate 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

---

<sup>165</sup> 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 *παίαν*, 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.<sup>166</sup> 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.<sup>167</sup> 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” (*ἐφύμνιον*) are in connection with paean. It seems, therefore, safe to conclude that, while it is too

<sup>166</sup> I add this last point because so little of the non-refrain context survives in Pi. *Pae.* 21.

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Rutherford (2001) 144.

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 subliterate 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.

CHAPTER 6  
REFRAINS IN DRAMATIC LYRIC

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 *Supplices*. The second important functional development will be dealt with in (§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.<sup>1</sup> 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).<sup>2</sup> Finally, the fact that the refrain in the antistrophic context is

---

<sup>1</sup> West(1982) 78f.

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

*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 (ἔέ, αἰαῖ) but sometimes consisting of several syllables (ὀτοτοτοτοῖ), 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:

τοῖ δ' ἄρα πρωτομόροιο  
 φεῦ  
 ληφθέντες πρὸς ἀναγκας  
 ἦέ  
 ἀκτὰς ἀμφὶ Κυχρείας  
 ὄα  
 ἔρραυται· στένε καὶ δακνάζου, βαρὺ δ' ἀμβόασον  
 οὐράνι' ἄχη,  
 ὄα,  
 τεῖνε δὲ δυσβάνκτον βοᾶτιν τάλαιναν αὐδάν·

γναπτόμενοι δ' ἀλὶ δεινῶι  
 φεῦ  
 σκύλλονται πρὸς ἀναύδων  
 ἦέ  
 παίδων τᾶς ἀμιάντου,  
 ὄα,  
 πευθεῖ δ' ἄνδρα δόμος στερηθεῖς, τοκέες δ' ἄπαιδες  
 δαιμόνι' ἄχη,  
 ὄα,  
 δυρόμενοι γέροντές τε πᾶν δὴ κλύουσιν ἄλγος.

While these cries do, strictly speaking, fit the definition of “refrain” given in CHAPTER I, 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

<sup>3</sup> 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. ἰὴ παιᾶν, ὦ ὑμέναι' ὦ), 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.<sup>4</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup>The 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, 1055/1061; *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, 1302f/1317f; *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, ie. 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 ἔ ἔ ἔ ἔ. 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 κλύω, 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 ἔ ἔ ἔ ἔ (157), this time in alarm at the stones being thrown by the besiegers (ἀκροβόλων ἐπάλλξεις λιθὰς ἔρχεται, 158). Within the drama, then, both instances of the cry ἔ ἔ ἔ ἔ 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 *ὦ* followed by a direct address to the gods: *ὦ, παναλκείς θεοί* (166), *ὦ φίλοι δαίμονες* (174). *ὦ* is an exclamation frequently used when invoking aid (*Sept.* 96; *Soph. Phil.* 736, *ὦ ὦ παιάν Trach.* 222; *ὦ Βάκχαι Eur. Ba.* 578); here it clearly is also used to express grief (cf. *ὦ μοί μοι Soph. OC* 199). Again, the use of *ὦ* 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 / ἔ᾽, νέας τε καὶ παλαιάς* (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 γάρ, εὐτε πτόλις δαμασθῆι, / ἔ᾽, δυστυχῆ τε πράσσει* (338f).<sup>5</sup> Once again, the

---

<sup>5</sup> Hutchinson (1985) ad loc. suggests that, whereas *ἔ᾽* 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 ἔ᾽ ἔ 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 (ἄπριγδ' ἄπριγδα μάλα γοεδυά at *Persae* 1057) or by calling for such cries (ὀλολύξατε νῦν 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.<sup>6</sup> This is especially true in cases (as in the *Eum.* passage just cited) when the “refrain” constitutes the entire lyric portion of an epirrhematic 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 ἐφύμνιον with reference to the passage: Schol. Vet. *Eum.* 328ff ἐπὶ δὲ τῶ] ἐφύμνιῳ αὐτῶ χρηταί. This is the standard term used by scholiasts for “refrain” of any size, and probably reflects Alexandrian scholarly usage.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> See my discussion of the *Hymnus Curetum* in CHAPTER 5.

<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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

---

<sup>8</sup> West (1982) 108.

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.<sup>9</sup>

*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.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> The first of these explanations

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. West (1982) 99.

<sup>10</sup> Stanford (1942) 85; Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) ad 117-22=128-33.

<sup>11</sup> Else (1977) 74f, 79, 83; Moritz (1979) 187, 191, 209; Hutchinson (1985) ad *Sept.* 965ff; Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) ad 117-22=128-33.

<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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).<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> 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

---

<sup>13</sup> Aeschylus won first prize over Sophocles with a tetralogy including *Supplices* according to *P. Oxy.* 2256.

<sup>14</sup> See appendix on refrain in dithyramb.

<sup>15</sup> Dramatic hymenaeus without refrain: Eur. *Phaethon* 227-44. Dramatic paean without refrain: Soph. *OT* 151ff, *Phil.* 827ff.

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.<sup>16</sup>

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

---

<sup>16</sup> 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 *ἀλλυον* 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.<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Fraenkel (1950) ad 121; Deubner (1919) 400.

<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> Moritz has suggested a more specific and interesting explanation. The refrain of *Ag.* 121ff. is itself a mixture of both sorrow (*ἀλλιον*) and hope (*τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω*), 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*.<cite>

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.<sup>21</sup> Well in line with this context, the refrain is analysed as 5 *da*, with a caesura after *D* that separates the *ἀλλιον* 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.<sup>22</sup> At Aristophanes *Frogs* 1264ff, Euripides offers a slew of choice lines by Aeschylus in order to show the metrical repetitiousness of

---

<sup>19</sup> It is not critical to my argument whether *λίνον... καλόν* 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.

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

<sup>21</sup> West (1982) 128.

<sup>22</sup> 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 *ἰὴ 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 *ἰὴ 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, *κύριός εἰμι θροεῖν ὄδιον κράτος αἴσιον 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.<sup>23</sup>

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*" (*φόρμιγγι λιγείη / ἰμερόεν 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):

*ὄν δῆ [Linus], ὅσοι βροτοὶ εἰσιν αἰδοὶ καὶ κιθαρισταί,  
πάντες μὲν θρηνεύουσιν ἐν εἰλαπίνας τε χοροῖς τε,  
ἀρχόμενοι δὲ Λίνου καὶ λήγοντες καλέουσιν.*

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

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Wilamowitz (1889) ii, 116; Fraenkel (1950) ii, 58.

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.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> This is a function obviously derived from the non-dramatic lyric

<sup>24</sup> The first refrain at 121 may also be in reaction to what has just been narrated. Cf. Thiel (1993) 52.

<sup>25</sup> Repetition is frequently a sign 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.”



ἔσκειν, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν εὖ ποδοῦχει. ἦέ.

βαλλήν, ἀρχαῖος [στρ. γ.  
 βαλλήν, ἴθι, ἰκοῦ·  
 ἔλθ' ἐπ' ἄκρον κόρυμβον ὄχθου,  
 660  
 κροκόβαπτου ποδὸς εὖμαριν ἀείρων,  
 βασιλείου τιήρας  
 φάλαρον πιφάυσκων.  
 βάσκει πάτερ ἄκακε Δαριάν, οἷ.

ὅπως αἰανῆ [αντ. γ.  
 665  
 κλύης νέα τ' ἄχη,  
 δέσποτα δεσποτῶν φάνηθι.  
 Στυγία γάρ τις ἐπ' ἀχλὺς πεπόταται·  
 669  
 νεολαία γὰρ ἦδη  
 670  
 κατὰ πᾶσ' ὄλωλεν.  
 βάσκει πάτερ ἄκακε Δαριάν, οἷ.

673  
 αἰαῖ αἰαῖ· [ἐπφδός.  
 ὦ πολύκλαυτε φίλοισι θανῶν,  
 675  
 τί τάδε, δυνάστα, δυνάστα, ὕι  
 περισσὰ δίδυμα δις γοέδν' ἀμάρτια;  
 πᾶσαι γὰ τᾶδ'  
 ἐξέφθινται τρίσκαλμοι  
 680  
 νᾶες ἄναες ἄναες.

*Meter.* Broadhead analyzes the refrain as an iambic dimeter (highly resolved) with οἷ 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.<sup>26</sup> More pertinent to our interest than a precise metrical classification of this refrain, however, is its

<sup>26</sup> Broadhead (1960) 29of.

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 iambs.<sup>27</sup> 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.

*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.<sup>28</sup> 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 (Ἰδωνεύς at 649, 650; θεομήτωρ at 654, 655) that is enhanced by their correspondence within strophe and

---

<sup>27</sup> West (1982) 100.

<sup>28</sup> 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, ἦέ, 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).<sup>29</sup> The tendency towards repetition shown in the previous strophic pair is now growing stronger as repetitions become closer: βαλλήν, ἀρχαῖος / βαλλήν (657f); δέσποτα δεσπότου (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 αἰαῖ αἰαῖ 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."<sup>30</sup>

#### *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,

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Moritz (1979) 190.

<sup>30</sup> Moritz (1979) 195.

sung by the Chorus, occurs medially in the seventh and last strophe and antistrophe.

Ξε. καὶ στέρν' ἄρασσε κάπιβόα τὸ Μύσιον. [στρ. η.

1055

Χο. ἀνία, ἀνία.

Ξε. καὶ μοι γενείου πέρθε λευκήρη τρίχα.

Χο. ἄπριγδ' ἄπριγδα μάλα γοεδνά.

Ξε. αὐτεὶ δ' ὄξυ.

Χο. καὶ τάδ' ἔρξω.

1060

Ξε. πέπλον δ' ἔρεικε κολπίαν ἀκμῆ χερῶν. [ἀντ. η.

Χο. ἀνία, ἀνία.

Ξε. καὶ ψάλλ' ἔθειραν καὶ κατοίκτισαι στρατόν.

Χο. ἄπριγδ' ἄπριγδα μάλα γοεδνά.

Ξε. διαίνου δ' ὄσσε.

1065

Χο. τέγγομαί τοι.

*Meter.* The refrain itself may be analyzed *2 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.<sup>31</sup>

*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 (ἰάων) and 956f

<sup>31</sup> Broadhead (1960) 296.

(ποῦ), and one instance of balanced cry at 955/966 (οἰοιοῖ). 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: ἐὲ ἐὲ / βοᾶι βοᾶι (977/991); μυρία μυρία (980); ἔλιπες ἔλιπες / ἔταφον ἔταφον (985/1000); (ἄλαστ' ἄλαστα (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. παπαῖ παπαῖ. Χε. καὶ πλέον ἢ παπαῖ 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).

<i>Αν.</i> ἡέ. <i>Ισ.</i> ἡέ.	<i>[στρ. α.</i>
<i>Αν.</i> μαίνεται γόοισι φρήν.	
<i>Ισ.</i> ἐντὸς δὲ καρδία στένει.	
<i>Αν.</i> ἰωὼ πανδάκρυτε σύ.	
970	
<i>Ισ.</i> σὺ δ' αὖτε καὶ πανάθλιε.	
<i>Αν.</i> πρὸς φίλου ἔφθισο. <i>Ισ.</i> καὶ φίλον ἔκτανες.	
<i>Αν.</i> διπλόα λέγειν. <i>Ισ.</i> διπλόα δ' ὀράν.	
<i>Αν.</i> † ἀχέων τοίων τάδ' ἐγγύθειν.	
<i>Ισ.</i> πέλας δ' αἰδ' ἀδελφαὶ ἀδελφεῶν. †	



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 *paragaphos* 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*.<sup>34</sup> 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 *οἱμοι*) nor “abandoned” (like *ὄτοτοτοῶ*).<sup>35</sup> Now, even if we grant that the doubled *ἦέ* 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,

---

<sup>34</sup> 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*.

<sup>35</sup> 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’ ἔκαυες / δορὶ δ’ ἔθανες / μελεσπόνος / μελεσπαθής* (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.<sup>36</sup> 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

---

<sup>36</sup> 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” (*δυσθέατα πῆματα*, 978), and grief must be twice expressed because the disaster is presented as a double spectacle (*διπλᾶ λέγειν / διπλᾶ δ' ὀρᾶν*, 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 γόοισι 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 Erinyes 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



ποιὶ τόδε κῦμ' ἀπάξει;

ἰλεῶμαι μὲν Ἀπίαν βοῶνιν, [έφυμν. α.

130

καρβᾶνα δ' αὐδὰν εὖ, γὰ, κουνεῖς.  
πολλάκι δ' ἐμπίτνω λακίδι σὺν λινοσινεῖ

133

Σιδονία καλύπτρα.

πλάτα μὲν οὖν [στρ. η.

135

λινορραφῆς τε δόμος ἄλα στέγων δορὸς  
ἀχείματόν μ' ἔπεμπε σὺν  
πνοαῖς· οὐδὲ μέμφομαι·  
πνοαῖς· οὐδὲ μέμφομαι·  
τελευτὰς δ' ἐν χρόνῳ  
πατῆρ ὁ παντόπτας

140

πρευμενεῖς κτίσειεν.

σπέρμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός, εὐνὰς [έφυμν. β.

ἀνδρῶν, ἔ ἔ,  
ἄγαμον ἀδάματον ἐκφυγεῖν.

θέλουσα δ' αὖ [ἀντ. η.

145

θέλουσαν ἀγνά μ' ἐπιδέτω Διὸς κόρα,  
ἔχουσα σέμν' ἐνώπι' ἀ-  
σφαλέα, παντὶ δὲ σθένει  
ἴδιωγμοῖσι δ' ἀσφαλέας  
ἀδμήτος ἀδμήτα  
ῥύσιος γενέσθω.

σπέρμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός, εὐνὰς

ἀνδρῶν, ἔ ἔ,  
ἄγαμον ἀδάματον ἐκφυγεῖν.

εἰ δὲ μή, μελανθῆς [στρ. θ.

155

ἠλιόκτυπον γένος  
τὸν γάιον,  
τὸν πολυξενώτατον,  
Ζῆνα τῶν κεκμηκότων  
ἰξόμεσθα σὺν κλάδοις

160

ἀρτάναις θανοῦσαι,  
μὴ τυχοῦσαι θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων.

ἅ Ζήν, Ἰοῦς ἰὼ μῆνις  
 μάστειρ' ἐκ θεῶν  
 κουνῶ δ' ἄταν

λέφυμν. γ.

165

γαμετᾶν οὐρανοῖκων.  
 χαλεποῦ γὰρ ἐκ  
 πνεύματος εἰσι χειμῶν.

καὶ τότε' οὐ δίκαιοις  
 Ζεὺς ἐνέξεται ψόγοις,

ἀντ. θ.

170

τὸν τὰς βοῶς  
 παῖδ' ἀτιμάσας, τὸν αὐ-  
 τός ποτ' ἔκτισεν γόνω,  
 νῦν ἔχων παλίντροπον  
 ὄψιν ἐν λιταῖσιν;

175

ὑψόθεν δ' εὖ κλύοι καλούμενος.

175α

ἅ Ζήν, Ἰοῦς ἰὼ μῆνις

λέφυμν. γ.

175β

μάστειρ' ἐκ θεῶν

175ψ

κουνῶ δ' ἄταν

175δ

γαμετᾶν οὐρανοῖκων.

175ε

χαλεποῦ γὰρ ἐκ

175φ

πνεύματος εἰσι χειμῶν.)

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”<sup>38</sup>, 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<sup>39</sup>. 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.

*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.

---

<sup>38</sup> Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) ad. loc.

<sup>39</sup> 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 *zia / zia* 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 ia sp / ia 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 (*ἰλεῶμαι μὲν Ἀπίαν βοῦνιν 129, σπέρμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός, εὐνὰς / ἀνδρῶν*) gives way to a concentration on the immediate situation of the Danaids and short syllables (*πολλάκι δ' ἐμπίτνω λακίδι σὺν λινοσινεῖ 131, ἄγαμον 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 (ἰλεῶμαι, 117).<sup>40</sup> 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, ἰώ 162/176). In both these instances the cry seems motivated by what immediately precedes it.<sup>41</sup> 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 ἰώ 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.<sup>42</sup> 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 δ' ἐμπίτνω λακίδι σὺν λινοσινεῖ,; σπέρμα σεμνᾶς μέγα ματρός, εὐνὰς; ἄγαμον ἀδάματον.

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" (καρβᾶνα, 119=130) and when they describe their clothes, which they rend in mourning, as linen and of foreign make (λινοσινεῖ Σιδονία καλύπτρα, 120f=131f). A less direct characterization of their ethnicity is achieved

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Conacher (1996) 84.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. the use of balanced cries in the example from the *Septem* discussed above.

<sup>42</sup> 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 *ιὼ* 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 *κοννεῖς/κοννῶ* (119=130, 165=175c) and *καρβᾶνα* (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).<sup>43</sup> Finally, it may be that the heavy use of alliteration and assonance noted above is itself meant to characterize the Chorus' speech as exotic.

*Suppl.* 889ff=899ff

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

ΚΗΡΥΞ

ἴνξε καὶ λάκαξε καὶ κάλει θεούς.  
 Αἰγυπτίαν γὰρ βᾶριν οὐχ ὑπερβορῆ.  
 [ἴνξε καὶ]  
 875  
 † βόα, πικρότερ' ἀχέων οἰζύος ὄνομ' ἔχων. †

(Δαδ.) οἰοῖ οἰοῖ [ἀντ. β.

λύμας, ᾗ σὺ πρὸ γᾶς ὑλάσκων

† περιχαμπτὰ βρυάζεις·

ὄς ἐπωπᾶ δ', ὁ μέγας

880

Νεῖλος, ὑβρίζοντά σ' ἀποτρέ-

ψειεν ἄιστον ὕβριν.

Κη. βαίνειω κελεύω βᾶριν εἰς ἀμφίστροφον

ὅσον τάχιστα· μηδέ τις σχολαζέτω.

ὄλκῃ γὰρ αὕτη πλόκαμον οὐδάμ' ἄζεται.

<sup>43</sup> Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) ad loc.

885  
 Δαδ. οἰοί, πάτερ, βρέτεος ἄρος [στρ. γ.  
 ἀτᾶ μ'· ἄλαδ' ἄγει,  
 ἄραχνος ὡς, βάδην.  
 ὄναρ ὄναρ μέλαν,  
 ὀτοτοτοτοί,

890  
 μᾶ Γᾶ μᾶ Γᾶ, βοᾶν  
 φοβερὸν ἀπότρεπε·  
 ὦ βᾶ Γᾶς παῖ Ζεῦ.

Κη. οὔτοι φοβοῦμαι δαίμονας τοὺς ἐνθάδε·  
 οὐ γάρ μ' ἔθρεψαν, οὐδ' ἐγήρασαν τροφῆ.

895  
 Δαδ. μαιμᾶ πέλας δίπους ὄφισ· [ἀντ. γ.  
 ἔχιδνα δ' ὡς με (φόνιος ἦ)  
 τί ποτέ ν(ω καλῶ)  
 δάκος; ἀχ... ὕι  
 ὀτοτοτοτοί,

900  
 μᾶ Γᾶ μᾶ Γᾶ βοᾶν  
 φοβερὸν ἀπότρεπε,  
 ὦ βᾶ Γᾶς παῖ Ζεῦ.

Κη. εἰ μή τις ἐς ναῦν εἴσω αἰνέσας τάδε,  
 λακὶς χιτῶνος ἔργον οὐ κατοικτιεῖ.

905  
 Χο. ἰὼ πόλεως ἀγοὶ 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 amoebian passage (through 865). The first strophic pair would seem to be composed of dochmaic, 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 dochmaic 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 dochmaic 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.<sup>44</sup> The refrain itself displays a violent alternation between the short syllables of the resolved iambs 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).<sup>45</sup>

*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 *αἰὲ αἰαὲ* and *οἰοὶ οἰοὶ* appear in responsion at the beginning of the second strophe and antistrophe (866/876); alliteration and assonance occur with great frequency (*δι' ἀλίρρυτον ἄλσος*, 868; *Εὐρείαισιν αὔραις*, 881; *βαίνειν... βᾶριν*, 882; *ἴνξε καὶ λάκαξε καὶ κάλει θεούς*, 872). The effect grows even stronger in the third strophe (*ἄρος ἀτᾶ μ'· ἄλαδ' ἄγει, ἄραχνος*, 885ff) until we arrive at pure repetition in both stanza (*ὄναρ ὄναρ*, 887) and refrain (*μᾶ Γᾶ μᾶ Γᾶ*, 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 (*ὀτοτοτοτοῖ*, 889=899) and the strings of single syllable words in the second and fourth lines (*μᾶ Γᾶ μᾶ Γᾶ; ὦ βᾶ Γᾶς παῖ Ζεῦ*). Corresponding to this reduction in lexical sophistication is a similar reduction in theological sophistication: here at

<sup>44</sup> Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) iii, 362.

<sup>45</sup> Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) iii, 362.

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.<sup>46</sup>

#### §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 *Ion* 112ff.; hymenaeus at *Tr.* 308ff.; iacchus at *Ra.* 316ff.).

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

Κα. ὀτοτοτοτοῖ πόποι δᾶ. ὦπολλον ὦπολλον. Χο. τί ταῦτ’ ἀνωτότυξας ἀμφὶ Λοξίου; 1075 οὐ γὰρ τοιοῦτος ὥστε θρηνητοῦ τυχεῖν.	[στρ. α.
---	----------

Κα. ὀτοτοτοτοῖ πόποι δᾶ. ὦπολλον ὦπολλον. Χο. ἦδ’ αὐτε δυσφημοῦσα τὸν θεὸν καλεῖ οὐδὲν προσήκουτ’ ἐν γόοις παραστατεῖν.	[ἀντ. α.
--	----------

1080 Κα. ᾿Απολλον· ᾿Απολλον· ἀγνιᾶτ’, ἀπόλλων ἐμός. ἀπώλεσας γὰρ οὐ μόλις τὸ δεύτερον. Χο. χρήσειν ἔοικεν ἀμφὶ τῶν αὐτῆς κακῶν. μένει τὸ θεῖον δουλία περ ἐν φρενί. 1085	[στρ. β.
--	----------

<sup>46</sup> Friis-Johansen/Whittle (1980) iii, 362.



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.<sup>49</sup> 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:<sup>50</sup>

ὦ Παιᾶν ὦ Παιᾶν,  
εὐαίων εὐαίων  
εἴης, ὦ Λατοῦς παῖ.

We note especially the use of molossi in the refrain, which we relate to *Eryth. Pae.* fr. 1 and other hymns.<sup>51</sup> The characterizing effect of Ion's refrain is clear.<sup>52</sup> It emphasizes the generic identity of his monody as paean<sup>53</sup>, 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.<sup>54</sup> 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.<sup>55</sup> Electra's attitude towards her work is, of course, quite different from that of Ion towards his; but the way in which both characters

<sup>49</sup> Imhof (1966) 19.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Rutherford (2001) 111: "The only true *παιᾶν*-refrain in extant tragedy."

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Owen (1939) ad loc.; Burnett (1970) ad loc.; Wilamowitz (1926) 92.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Lee (1996) 88.

<sup>53</sup> Imhof (1966) 19.

<sup>54</sup> Imhof (1966) 20; Burnett (1970) ad 129; Furley/Bremer (2001) 83.

<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup> 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 hymenaeus song marked by several instances of repetition, including a refrain at lines 314 and 331.

Ἦνεχε· πάρεχε.  
 φῶς φέρε· σέβω· φλέγω --ιδού· ιδού --  
 λαμπάσι τόδ' ἱερόν.  
 ὦ Ἕμναι' ἄναξ·  
 μακάριος ὁ γαμέτας·  
 μακαρία δ' ἐγὼ βασιλικοῖς λέκτροις  
 κατ' Ἄργος ἄγαμουμένα.  
 Ἕμνην ὦ Ἕμναι' ἄναξ.  
 ἐπεὶ σύ, μήτηρ, ἐπὶ δάκρυσσι καὶ  
 γόοισι τὸν θανόντα πατέρα πατρίδα τε  
 φίλαν καταστένουσ' ἔχεις,  
 ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ γάμοις ἐμοῖς  
 ἀναφλέγω πυρὸς φῶς  
 ἐς αὐγάν, ἐς αἴγλαν,  
 διδοῦσ', ὦ Ἕμναιε, σοί,  
 διδοῦσ', ὦ Ἕκάτα, φάος,  
 παρθένων ἐπὶ λέκτροις  
 ἅ νόμος ἔχει.

πάλλε πόδα.  
 αἰθέριον ἄναγε χορόν· εὐᾶν, εὐοῖ·  
 ὡς ἐπὶ πατρὸς ἐμοῦ  
 μακαριωτάταις  
 τύχαις· ὁ χορὸς ὄσιος.  
 ἄγε σὺ, Φοῖβέ, νιν· κατὰ σὸν ἐν δάφναις  
 ἀνάκτορον θυηπολῶ,  
 Ἕμνην ὦ Ἕμναι' Ἕμνην.  
 χόρευε, μήτηρ, ἀναγέλασον·

<sup>56</sup> Lee (1996) 88.

ἔλισσε τᾶδ' ἐκέισε μετ' ἐμέθεν ποδῶν  
 φέρουσα φιλτάταν βάσιιν.  
 βόασαθ' Ὑμέναιον, ὦ,  
 μακαρίαις αἰοδαῖς  
 ἰαχαῖς τε νύμφαν.  
 ἴτ', ὦ καλλίπεπλοι Φρυγῶν  
 κόραι, μέλπετ' ἐμῶν γάμων  
 τὸν πεπρωμένον εὐνᾶ  
 πόσιιν ἐμέθεν.

Like Ion with his broom and Electra with her jug, Cassandra has her torch.<sup>57</sup> 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 exuberance a girl might feel at her wedding”, but which is horribly inappropriate to the situation.<sup>58</sup> The terrible, parodic character of the song is strengthened by the address to Hecate<sup>59</sup>, and the refrains, along with the other repetitions, illustrate Cassandra's obsessive madness.<sup>60</sup> 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 (Ὑμῆν ὦ Ὑμέναι' ἄναξ 314 / Ὑμῆν ὦ Ὑμέναι' Ὑμῆν 331), and there seem to be three other “near-refrains” scattered throughout the song: ὦ Ὑμέναι' ἄναξ 310; διδοῦσ', ὦ Ὑμέναιε, σοί 322; βόασαθ' Ὑμέναιον, ὦ 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

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Barlow (1986b) 47f.

<sup>58</sup> Barlow (1986a) 173.

<sup>59</sup> Mueller-Goldingen (1996) 35.

<sup>60</sup> 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.

## 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 line<sup>1</sup>, 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The exception to this rule is the variable “refrain” of *EA*, 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.<sup>2</sup>

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."<sup>3</sup> 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 responson"

---

<sup>2</sup> Oxy. P. 3545 preserves lines 68-74 and 78-95 of Theocritus *Idyll* 1. The refrain ἄρχετε, 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 ἰυγξ, κτλ at 32 and 47 are marked off by paragraphi both above and below. Both papyri are dated to the second century A.D.

<sup>3</sup> Kegel-Brinkgreve (1990) 9.

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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> Despite the occasional references to “stanzas” and “pastoral ‘lyric’”<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> Critics who seek to determine whether

---

<sup>4</sup> See Gow (1950) v.2, p.16, n.2 for a partial bibliography of studies attempting to find “strophic respension” in bucolic. To his list we may add Peiper, R. (1863-1865).

<sup>5</sup> Bergk, *Philol.* 14.182; Wilamowitz, (1906) 137.

<sup>6</sup> Rosenmeyer (1969) 95.

<sup>7</sup> 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 ἰυγξ, 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.<sup>8</sup>

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 *EA*, and it is unique in bucolic poetry. The “refrain” is established in the first two lines of the poem:

*αἰιάζω τὸν Ἄδωνιν, ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις*.  
*ᾠλέτο καλὸς Ἄδωνις, ἐπαιιάζουσι Ἐρωτες.*

Both lines are divided at the hephthimemeral 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 (*αἰιάζω τὸν Ἄδωνιν, ἐπαιιάζουσι Ἐρωτες*) sees two iterations, at 6 and 15. A new segment is attached to 2b at line 28 (*αἰαὶ τὰν Κυθέρειαν, ἐπαιιάζουσι Ἐρωτες*) and this combination is repeated at 86. At lines 37 and 63 we find the new segment combined with 1b (*αἰαὶ τὰν Κυθέρειαν, ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις*). 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.)

---

refrain, not both above and below as it is in the papyrus. By contrast, the refrains of strophic lyric are graphically treated as integral to the strophes or triads with which they are associated. E.g., in Oxy. P. 5, 841, the coronis marking the end of each triad occurs only below the refrain that completes each epode of each triad; no marking distinguishes the refrain from what comes above.

<sup>8</sup> Gow (1950) 16.

It has been doubted whether these repetitions constitute a true refrain<sup>9</sup>; 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 (ἄρχετε, κτλ) at 64 is also the first line of Thyrsis' song; this is confirmed by the clear change of speaker after 63.<sup>10</sup> 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

<sup>9</sup> Gow (1950) ii, 16; Reed (1997) 96f.

<sup>10</sup> 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".

Thyrsis then immediately proceeds to a concluding salutation to the Muses, which is best taken as the final theme of his song.<sup>11</sup> 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 Thyrsis' "song", but it is the refrain that *marks* it as "song" formally.

The refrain of *Idyll* 2 is similarly used to mark off an inset performance within the poem. There are, however, important differences between *Idylls* 2 and 1 that must be taken into account. To begin, *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 (ἰυγξ, κτλ) at 17 marks the beginning of Simaetha's spell proper.<sup>12</sup> The cessation of the second refrain (φράζειο, 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 *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<sup>13</sup>, 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 *Idylls* 1 and 2 in this respect. But the late date of the fragment, along with its metrical

<sup>11</sup> Pace Gow (1950) ad loc., who sees 144f. as separate from the song.

<sup>12</sup> Gow (1950) ad loc.

<sup>13</sup> Rutherford (1995) 41.

irregularities, militate against our assuming that Theocritus had before him any lyric examples of refrains used to mark off inset performances.<sup>14</sup>

*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.

*Simple articulation.* It is only natural that refrains in bucolic should usually fall between sentences,<sup>15</sup> 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 *Idylls* 1 and 2 and *EB*. The “refrains” of *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 *EB*. This poem’s refrain occurs at intervals that are significantly longer and more irregular in length (from four to fourteen lines)

---

<sup>14</sup> Lobel, *Oxy. P.* 32 (1967) 114, dates the papyrus to the second century on the basis of the hand.

<sup>15</sup> Bucolic refrains do on occasion interrupt sentences, but I shall deal with that phenomenon later when discussing the “lyric functions” of bucolic refrains.

than those in Theocritus 1 and 2. Given this, we should not be surprised that each separated block of verse is thematically discrete.<sup>16</sup> 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 *οὐ τόσον* (37, 41), *οὐ τόσσον* (40) or *οὐδὲ τόσον* (38-9, 42). My point is that the poet of *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 *EB* seems to have followed the practice of Theocritus in *Idyll* 1. This should be no surprise, given *EB*'s obvious dependence upon that poem.<sup>17</sup> The refrains of Theocritus 1, however, come much more frequently than those of *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

---

<sup>16</sup> 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 *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.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Kegel-Brinkgreve (1990) 56; Mumprecht (1964) 33; Porro (1988) 213.

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.<sup>18</sup>

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  $\hat{\iota}\nu\gamma\xi, \kappa\tau\lambda$ . 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.<sup>19</sup>

*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,

---

<sup>18</sup> 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.

<sup>19</sup> 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 *ἴνυξ, 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 Delphis<sup>20</sup>; 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 create by the presence of the refrain throughout the majority of the poem.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, the refrain, even as it changes, illustrates the basic continuity of Simaetha’s emotional state;<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

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

<sup>20</sup> Griffiths 85; Andrews (1996) 27, n.3.

<sup>21</sup> Parry 47; Andrews (1996) 26f.

<sup>22</sup> Parry 47; Gutzwiller (1991) 103.

<sup>23</sup> Griffiths 85.

has been explained as marking the arrival of Cypris to the scene immediately thereafter.<sup>24</sup> But we cannot press this point too hard: the MSS are far from unanimous in locating this first change in the refrain<sup>25</sup>, and in his edition Gow places the change at 94 because he sees that as “a suitable position for a change of refrain.”<sup>26</sup> The change to Thyrsis’ third refrain (λήγετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι, ἵτε λήγετ’ ἀοιδᾶς), on the other hand, is well established in the MSS for line 127<sup>27</sup>, 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,<sup>28</sup> 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.”<sup>29</sup> 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,<sup>30</sup> then we may say it is

<sup>24</sup> 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.”

<sup>25</sup> As Hunter (1999) acknowledges ad 1.64.

<sup>26</sup> Gow (1950) ii, 17.

<sup>27</sup> Gow (1950) ii, 16.

<sup>28</sup> Dover (1971) xlix-l.

<sup>29</sup> Walker (1980) 131; see also Mumprecht ad *EB* 8. Similarly Hunter ad Theoc. 1.64 relates the refrain of that poem to “popular βουκολιασμός”. Walker 127 opines, “It is difficult to account for [Theocritus’] stylistic use of repetition, refrain, and amoebean exchange in any other way.”

<sup>30</sup> Halperin (1983) 83; also Gutzwiller (1991) 4-7.

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.<sup>31</sup>

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.

---

<sup>31</sup> 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.

§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 Ἴδωνις).<sup>32</sup> This we may easily relate to the use of independent cries such as παιᾶν 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 (Ἰνγξ, ἔλκε τὸ τῆνον ἔμον ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα) 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.<sup>33</sup> These two dramatic elements work closely together, especially at lines 18-21.

Ἰνγξ, ἔλκε τὸ τῆνον ἔμον ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα.  
 ἄλφिताί τοι πρᾶτον πυρὶ τάκεται. ἀλλ' ἐπίπασσε,  
 Θεστυλί. δειλαία, πᾶ τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπότασαι;  
 ἦ ῥά γέ θην, μυσάρα, καὶ τὴν ἐπίχαρμα τέτυγμαι;  
 πᾶσσ' ἅμα καὶ λέγε ταῦτα· «τὰ Δέλφιδος ὀστία πᾶσσω».  
 Ἰνγξ, ἔλκε τὸ τῆνον ἔμον ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα

<sup>32</sup> Shorter and simpler versions seem to have been more common. Cf. Sappho fr. 168 ὦ τὸν Ἴδωνιν; Theoc. 15.136, 143 ὦ φίλ' Ἴδωνι. 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.

<sup>33</sup> Stanzel (1998) 157; Hommel (1986) 92.

Here Simaetha berates Thestylis 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 Ἰδωνίς) is passed from speaker to speaker,<sup>34</sup> sometimes within the refrain itself: the speaker of the poem (αἰάζω τὸν Ἰδωνίω) and the “Loves” (ἐπαιάζουσιν Ἐρωτες) 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... αἰίδει << αἰαὶ τὰν Κυθήρειαν ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἰδωνίς.>> 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: Ἄχὼ δ’ ἀντεβόασεν << ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἰδωνίς.>> This example is extreme, but definitely follows the lead established by prior lyric practice, especially in paeans.

---

<sup>34</sup> Estevez (1981) 36.

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: ἐγὼ δέ νιν ὡς ἐνόησα / ἄρτι θύρας ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἀμειβόμενον ποδὶ κούφῳ / — φράζέο μιν τὸν ἔρωθ' ὅθεν ἵκετο, πότνα Ζελάνα — / πᾶσα μὲν ἐψύχθην χιόνος πλέον, κτλ. Dover recognizes a dramatic effect here and likens it to *Idyll* 1.85,<sup>35</sup> where we find the refrain emphasizing the enjambment of ζῆταισ'.<sup>36</sup> 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 κώρα of line 82 for Daphnis. Moreover, Thyrsis’ 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: ὅσσον ἀποφθιμένοιο κατωδύραντο Βίωνος / — ἄρχετε Σικελικαί, τῷ πέντεος ἄρχετε, Μοῖσαι — / ἀδονίδες πᾶσαι τε χελιδόνες, ἄς ποκ' ἔτερπεν. 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.

<sup>35</sup> Dover (1971) ad loc.

<sup>36</sup> 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.<sup>37</sup> 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” (ἀρχετε) and, in the case of Theoc. 1, to “lay aside” (λήγετε) 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.”<sup>38</sup> The use of the refrain stands as an important example of this generic self-consciousness on the part of bucolic poets,

<sup>37</sup> Cf. the refrain of *Hymn. Cur.* and the refrain (Ἰακχε φιλοχορευτά, συμπρόπεμπέ μιν) of the Initiate's song, *Frogs* 403ff.

<sup>38</sup> Halperin (1983) 75f.

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<sup>39</sup>, and that the content of that poem’s refrains, e.g. ἄρχετρε, emphasizes its “foundational” aspect.<sup>40</sup> 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 paeon 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 paeon. Theocritus seems to have noticed this same association between the

---

<sup>39</sup> Hunter (1999) 60f.; Halperin (1983) 83; Van Sickle (1976) 22.

<sup>40</sup> 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 (βουκολικᾶς... ἀοιδᾶς) of which Thyrsis is said to be a master at line 20: καὶ τὰς βουκολικᾶς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν ἔκειο 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

§I *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.<sup>1</sup> The texts are:

Hephaestion *Περὶ ποιημάτων* §7 (p.70 Consbruch):

ἔστι δέ τινα ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι καὶ τὰ καλούμενα ἐφύμνια, ἅπερ ταύτης τῆς προσηγορίας τετύχηκεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐφύμνιον τι εἰώθασιν ἐπάγειν οἱ ποιηταὶ ταῖς στροφαῖς, οἷά ἐστι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα <<ἰῆε παιάν>> καὶ <<ὦ διθύραμβε.>>

Mar. Victorinus *G.L.* VI 59, 24-29 Keil:

Hoc loco non supersederim dicere esse brevia cola, quae post strophē et antistrophon supercini moris est, quae iam non epodae, sed ἐφύμνια dicentur, ut est in ἰῆ παιάν. Haec enim vel hymnis vel dithyrambis supercini moris est, quae [de epodicis carminibus] si quando praeponuntur προύμνια, si autem post antistrophon collocentur, μεθύμνια nuncupabuntur.

These texts are to some extent complementary. Hephaestion quotes a refrain ὦ διθύραμβε 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Neither 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 exstant*; 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 ὦ 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 ἰὴ 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.<sup>2</sup> 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, ἐπάγειν... ταῖς στροφαῖς; Victorinus, *post strophēn et antistrophēn supercini*. This implies a strophic context for the refrains of dithyramb, at least as known by these two writers. As it

---

<sup>2</sup>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), [τὴν πρώτην ᾠδὴν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Ἀλκαίου καὶ τὴν δευτέρην (p.66)], τὸ πρῶτον Ἀνακρέοντος ᾠσμα (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 τραγωδίαὶ καὶ αἱ παλαιαὶ κωμωδίαὶ (p.63) and ἐν ταῖς κωμωδίαῖς (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 Lycambes. 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 ποιήτης 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.<sup>3</sup>, there appeared a new form of dithyramb that featured the astrophic ἀναβολή, an innovation apparently introduced by Melanippides.<sup>4</sup> This structural change seems to be linked to the introduction of more dramatic material to the genre.<sup>5</sup> 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 dithyramps 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.

<sup>3</sup>Pickard-Cambridge, pp. 38ff.

<sup>4</sup>Aristotle *Rhet.* 3.9.1409b 24ff. (ed. Kassel): ὥστε γίνεται ὃ ἔσκωψε Δημόκριτος ὁ Χίος εἰς Μελανιππίδην ποιήσαντα ἀντὶ τῶν ἀντιστρόφων ἀναβολάς.

<sup>5</sup>Ps. Aristotle *Probl.* XIX 15 918b: διὸ καὶ οἱ διθύραμβοι, ἐπειδὴ μιμητικοὶ 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 ὦ διθύραμβε appears to be an address to a person, Dithyramb, to be identified with Dionysus.<sup>6</sup> 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 ὑμῆν-*refrain*.

Pindar (fr. 85) is credited for using a form other than the “normal” one at *Et.M.* s.v. διθύραμβος: Πίνδαρος δέ φησι λυθίραμβον· καὶ γὰρ Ζεὺς τικτομένου αὐτοῦ ἐπεβόα «(λῦθι ῥάμμα, λῦθι ῥάμμα)», ἔν' ἣ λυθίραμμος καὶ διθύραμβος κατὰ τροπήν καὶ πλεονασμόν. This form, λυθίραμβος, 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 ὦ διθύραμβε given in the π. π. above. But the fact that the etymology given for the form has Zeus shout λῦθι ῥάμμα 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.<sup>7</sup> 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

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Ieranò test. 2-23, pp. 18-23, for examples of διθύραμβος used as divine name.

<sup>7</sup>We may compare the aetiologies for the paean refrain given by Callimachus, Hymn 2.103-104: «(ἰῆ ἰῆ παιῆον, ἴει βέλος, εὐθύ σε μήτηρ / γείνατ' ἀοσητήρα)· τὸ δ' ἐξέτι κείθεν ἀείδη., and Ap. Rh., 2.712f: θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσω, «(ἰῆ ἰε)» κεκληγυῖαι / ἔνθεν δὲ τὸδε καλὸν ἐφύμνιον ἔπλετο Φοίβῳ.

in Pindar.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

Another bit of evidence for a “doubled” refrain in dithyramb may be found at Pratinas, fr.1 Page (PMG 708) 12f: ἦν ἰδοῦ· ἄδε σοι δεξιὰ καὶ ποδὸς διαρριφά, θριαμβοδιθύραμβε, / κισσόχαιτ’ ἄναξ, ἄκουε τὰν ἐμὰν Δώριον χορείαν. The doubled or compound form θριαμβοδιθύραμβε, 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 θρίαμβε διθύραμβε<sup>10</sup>

Already it would seem there was more than one form of the refrain in dithyramb, variable not only in number but in word-form: διθύραμβος, λυθίραμβος, θριαμβοδιθύραμβος (or θρίαμβε διθύραμβε, as reconstructed by Crusius), and by implication θρίαμβος. All of these forms share an obvious similarity, especially in their -αμβος endings, but there is evidence for even more radical variation.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Julian, *Or.* VII 15, 220 b-c, II pp. 63-5 Rochefort: Ἐρμῆ κελεύσας ὁ Ζεὺς ἀρπάσαι τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τεμῶν (τὸν αὐτοῦ μηρὸν ἐν)ράπτει· εἶτα ἐκέλευεν, ἠνίκα ἐτελεσφορήθη τὸ βρέφος, ὠδίνων ὁ Ζεὺς ἐπὶ τὰς νύμφας ἔρχεται· τὸ «(λῦθι ράμμα)» δὲ αὐταὶ τῷ μηρῷ προσεπάδουσαι (τὸν διθύραμβον ἡμῖν) 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 προσεπάδουσαι and the resemblance of the nymphs to a chorus.

<sup>9</sup>Also, the etymology does not identify λυθίραμβος 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 διθύραμβος would always be understood as a direct address to a person, Dithyramb.

<sup>10</sup>Op. cit. col. 1204. Cf. also the extended form ὑμνησμέναιος, 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 ὑμῆν-*refrain*.

At Aristophanes' *Frogs* 316f, the chorus of Initiates makes its entrance while singing the refrain ἰακχ' ὦ ἰακχε / ἰακχ' ὦ ἰακχε. Xanthias reacts by saying (318ff):  
 τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖν', ὦ δέσποθ'· οἱ μεμνημένοι / ἐνταῦθά που παίζουσιν, οὗς [Heracles]  
 ἔφραξε νῶν. ἄδουσι γοῶν τὸν ἰακχον ἔνπερ 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: διθυραμβοποιὸς ὁ Διαγόρας ποιητῆς, συνεχῶς ἰακχε ἰακχε ἄδων. ἢ κωμικὸς διθυραμβικὰ, τουτέστι Διονυσιακὰ δρᾶματα 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 δι' ἀγορᾶς as given by Coulon and Dover<sup>11</sup>; nor is it critical whether or not the scholiast is correct in his identification of the Diagoras of Aristophanes' text with a dithyrambic poet, Diagoras. What is important is that the scholiast has made the connection between the refrain ἰακχ' ὦ ἰακχε 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.<sup>12</sup> This association may be confirmed by PMG 1027d, taken from Dion. Hal.'s discussion of brachysyllabic meters: ἰακχε θρίαμβε, σὺ τῶνδε χοραγέ.

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' paeon to Dionysus, Coll.Hell. pp.165ff, which opens with the line [δεῦρ' ἄνα Δ]ιθύραμβε Βακχ' and which features a mesymnion at the fifth line of each stanza εἶσοι ὦ ἰόβακχ' ὦ ἰὲ παιάν. Also, there is

<sup>11</sup>Dover'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.

<sup>12</sup>It does not follow that the refrain ἰακχ' ὦ ἰακχε 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. ἰή.

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

π ρὶν μὲν ἔρπε σχοινοτένειά τ' ἀοιδὰ  
 διθ' υράμβων...  
 οἴαν Βρομίου [τελε]τάν  
 καὶ παρὰ σκά[πτ]ον Διὸς Οὐρανίδαι  
 ἐν μεγάροις ἴσταιντι. σεμνᾶ μὲν κατάρχει  
 Ματέρι παρ μ εγιάλα ρόμβοι τυπάνων,  
 ἐν δὲ κέχλαδ[εν] κρόταλ' αἰθομένα τε  
     δαῖς ὑπὸ ξαν θαιῖσι πεύκαις·  
 ἐν δὲ Ναῖδων ξίργδουποι στοναχαί  
 μανίαι τ' ἀλαλ αἴ τ' ὀρίνεται ρίψαύχεωι  
 σὺν κλόνῳ.

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 ἀλαλά. 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 ἀλαλά 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: κλυθ' Ἀλαλά, πολέμου θύγατερ, / ἐγγέων προοίμιον, ᾗ θύεται / ἄνδρες ὑπὲρ πόλιος τὸν ἰρόθυτον θάνατον, 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 ἀλαλά 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, *Laos* 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 ἰακχε or ἰή, 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 dithyramps is limited to speculation. If it were possible to say with certainty what performance role is implied by ἐξάρξαι in Archilochus fr. 120, we would know whether the dithyramb mentioned there featured (in Victorinus’ terms) a πρὸς μνιον sung by the ἑξάρχος, or a μεθύμνιον sung by the chorus in response to non-refrain material provided by the ἑξάρχος. Certainty is impossible given the scant amount of evidence available, but in as much as the examples of ἑξάρχοι given in §1 above indicate anything at all, they tend to favor πρὸς μνια sung by ἑξάρχοι for the purpose of initiating and regulating the performance of the chorus. Although we have no evidence for an ἑξάρχος leading off the ἰακχος 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 πρὸς μνιον in the song of the Initiates may indicate the common use of refrains as πρὸς μνια in proper dithyramps.<sup>13</sup> In the

<sup>13</sup>On more tenuous grounds, the etymologies offered by Pindar and Julian may indicate placement after the strophe, since in both cases the cry λῶθι ῥάμμα is uttered in response to the birth of Dionysus. The very forms used (ἐπεβόα, προσεπάδουσαι) 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.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>E.g., Hephaestion offers Sappho’s *ὑμῆναον* as an example of a *μεσὺμνιον* (not *ἐφ’ὑμνιον*) event though he must have been aware of the many (and perhaps overwhelming) examples of *ὑμῆν*-refrains used elsewhere after the strophe

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexiou, M., *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, London, 1974.
- Andrews, N. E., "Narrative and Allusion in Theocritus, *Idyll 2*" in *Hellenistica Groningana: Proceedings of the Groningen Workshops on Hellenistic Poetry. Theocritus*, ed. Groningen, 1996.
- Audollent, A., ed., *Defixionum tabellae quotquot innotuerunt tam in graecis orientis quam in totius occidentis partibus praeter atticas in Corpore Inscriptionum Atticarum editas*, Paris, 1904.
- Barlow, S., *Euripides: Trojan Women*, Warminster, 1986a.
- Barlow, S., *The Imagery of Euripides: A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Language*, Bristol, 1986b.
- Bosanquet, R. C., "The palaikastro Hymn of the Kouretes", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 15 (1908-9), 339-56.
- Bowra, C. M., *Primitive Song*, Cleveland, 1962.
- Bowra, C. M., *On Greek Margins*, Oxford, 1970.
- Broadhead, H. D., *Aeschylus: Persae*, Cambridge, 1960.
- Burnett, A. P., *Ion by Euripides: a translation with commentary*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970.
- Bülow, P., "Ein vielgesungener Asklepiospaian" in *Xenia Bonnensia: Festschrift zum fünfundsiebzigjährigen Bestehen des philologischen Vereins und bonner Kreises*, ed. Bonn, 1929.
- Campbell, D. A., *Greek Lyric*, Cambridge, 1990.
- Camps, W. A., *An Introduction to Homer*, Oxford, 1980.
- Cannatà Fera, M., *Pindarus: Threnorum Fragmenta*, Rome, 1990.
- Carey, C., "Two transitions in Pindar", *Classical Quarterly* 39 (1989), 287-295.

- Chantraine, P., *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris, 1933.
- Conacher, D. J., *Aeschylus: The Earlier Plays and Related Studies*, Toronto, 1996.
- Consbruch, M., *Hephaestionis Enchiridion*, Leipzig, 1906.
- Contiades-Tsitsoni, E., *Hymenaios und Epithalamion : das Hochzeitslied in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*, Stuttgart, 1990.
- D'Alessio, G. B., "Due note su P.Oxy. 841 (Pindaro, Peani)", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* (1992),
- Daniel, R. W. and F. Maltomini, ed., *Supplementum Magicum*, Opladen, 1990.
- Davies, M., "Monody, Choral Lyric and the Tyranny of the Handbook", *Classical Quarterly* 38 (1988), 52-64.
- Denniston, J. D. and D. L. Page, ed., *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, Oxford, 1957.
- Deubner, L., "Paian", *Neue Jahrb. f. d. klass. Alt.* 22 (1919), 385-406.
- Diggle, J., ed., *Euripides. Phaethon, edited with prolegomena and commentary*, Cambridge, 1970.
- Dornseiff, F., *Pindars Stil*, Berlin, 1921.
- Dover, K. J., *Theocritus: Select Poems*, Glasgow, 1971.
- Estevez, V. A., "Ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις: A Description of Bion's Refrain", *Maia* 33 (1981), 35-42.
- Fairbanks, A., *A study of the Greek pæan : with appendixes containing the hymns found at Delphi, and the other extant fragments of pæans*, New York, 1900.
- Fantuzzi, M., "Textual Misadventures of Daphnis: The pseudo-Theocritean *Id.* 8 and the Origins of the Bucolic 'Manner'" in *Hellenistica Groningana III: Proceedings of the Groningen Workshops on Hellenistic Poetry. Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, ed. M. A. Harder and e. al, Groningen, 1998.
- Fehling, D., *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin,, 1969.

- Fraenkel, E., *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, Oxford, 1950.
- Friis-Johansen, K. and E. W. Whittle, *Aeschylus: The Suppliants*, Copenhagen, 1980.
- Frisk, H., *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1970.
- Fuhrer, T., *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos*, Basel and Kassel, 1992.
- Furley, W. D. and J. M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns*, Tübingen, 2001.
- Gallavotti, C., "Studi sulla lirica graeca", *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* n.s.28 (1950), 97-116.
- Garvie, A. F., *Aeschylus' Supplikes: Play and Trilogy*, Cambridge, 1969.
- Gillingham, S. E., *The Poems and Psalms of the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford, 1994.
- Gow, A. S. F., *Theocritus, edited with a translation and commentary*, Cambridge, 1950.
- Grenfell, B. P. and A. S. Hunt, ed., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 1908.
- Griffiths, "Poetry as *Pharmakon* in Theocritus' *Idyll 2*" in *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. G. W. Bowerstock, W. Burkert and M. C. J. Putnam, Berlin, 1979.
- Gudewill, K., "Refrain" in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik begründet von Friedrich Blume*, ed. L. Finscher, Kassel, 1998.
- Gulick, C. B., ed., *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists*, Cambridge, 1941.
- Gutzwiller, K. J., *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*, Madison, 1991.
- Haldane, J. A., "A Paean in the *Philoctetes*", *CQ* 57 (1963), 53-56.
- Hall, F. W., *A Companion to Classical Texts*, Oxford, 1913.
- Halperin, D. M., *Before pastoral, Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*, New Haven, 1983.

- Harrison, J., "The Kouretes and Zeus Kouros", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 15 (1908-9),
- Hauvette, A., *Archiloque. Sa vie et ses poésies*, Paris, 1905.
- Haüßler, R., "λίvos ante Λίvon", *RbM* n.s. 107 (1974), 1-14.
- Hommel, H., "Bemerkungen zu Theokrits Pharmakeutria" in *Theokrit und die griechische Bukolik*, ed. E. Bernd, Darmstadt, 1986.
- Horneffer, *De strophica sententiarum in canticis tragicorum responsione*, diss. Bonn, 1914.
- Hunter, R. L., *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, New York, 1996.
- Hunter, R. L., *Theocritus: A Selection*, Cambridge, 1999.
- Hutchinson, G. O., *Aeschylus: Septem contra Thebas*, Oxford, 1985.
- Imhof, M., *Euripides' Ion: eine literarische Studie*, Bern, 1966.
- Jebb, R. C., ed., *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments*, Cambridge, 1905.
- Käppel, L. and R. Kannicht, "Noch einmal zur Frage «Dithyrambos oder Paian» in Bakchylideskommentar P. Oxy. 23.2368", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 73 (1988), 19-24.
- Käppel, L., *Paian : Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*, Berlin ; New York, 1992.
- Kegel-Brinkgreve, E., *The Echoing Woods: Bucolic and Pastoral from Theocritus to Wordsworth*, Amsterdam, 1990.
- Keil, H., ed., *Scriptores Artis Metricae*, Leipzig, 1874.
- Keyßner, K., "Zum Asklepios hymnus von Erythrai", *Philologische Wochenschrift* 54 (1934), 990-992.
- Kirk, G. S., *The Songs of Homer*, Cambridge, 1962.
- Kirk, G. S., "A fragment of Sappho reinterpreted", *CQ* 57 (1963), 51-52.
- Kirk, G. S., *Homer and the Oral Tradition*, Cambridge, 1976.
- Kirkwood, G., *Early Greek Monody*, Ithaca, 1974.

- Knox, B. M. W., *Word and Action: Essays on the Ancient Theater*, Baltimore, 1979.
- Kranz, W., *Stasimon, Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie*, Berlin, 1933.
- Lamer, H., "Hymen(aios)", *Philologische Wochenschrift* 52 (1932), 381.
- Lee, "Shifts of Mood and Concepts of Time in Euripides' *Ion*" in *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond*, ed. Silk, Oxford, 1996.
- Liddell, H. G. a. R. S., *A Greek-English Lexicon: A New (9th) Edition by Sir H. Stuart Jones*, Oxford, 1940.
- Lloyd-Jones, H., "The End of the *Seven Against Thebes*", *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 9 (1959), 80-115.
- Lobel, E. a. D. P., ed., *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, Oxford, 1955.
- Lobel, E., ed., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. xxiii*, London, 1956.
- Lupas, L. and Z. Petre, *Commentaire aux «Sept contre Thèbes» d'Eschyle*, Paris, 1981.
- Luppe, W., "Dithyrambos oder Paian? Zu Bakchylides Carm. 23 Sn./M.", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 69 (1987), 9-12.
- Luppe, W., "Nochmals zu Kallimachos' Gattungszuordnung Bakchylideischer Lieder", *Analecta Papyrologica* 1 (1989), 23-29.
- Maas, P., "ὕμην ὑμήν", *Philologus* 66 (1907), 590-596.
- Maas, P., "Hymenaios", *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9 (1916), 130-134.
- Maas, P. and C. A. Trypanis, ed., *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Genuina*, Oxford, 1963.
- Maehler, H., ed., *Die Lieder des Bakchylides I. Die Siegeslieder I*, Leiden, 1982.
- Maehler, H., ed., *Pindarus, ii. Fragmenta, Indices*, Leipzig, 1989.
- Magnus, L., *The Track of the Repetend: Syntactic and Lexical Repetition in Modern Poetry*, New York, 1989.

- Manakidou, F. P., "ΕΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ ΑΔΩΝΙΔΟΣ and ΕΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ ΒΙΟΝΟΣ: Remarks on their Generic Form and Content", *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici* 37 (1996), 27-58.
- Marchetti, P., "À propos de l'archonte delphien de 344/3" in *Études delphiques: BCH Suppl. IV*, ed. Paris, 1977.
- Marcovich, "Philodamus' Delphic Hymn to Dionysus", *ZPE* 18 (1975), 167-168.
- Meyer, H., *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Würzburg, 1933.
- Moritz, H., "Refrain in Aeschylus: Literary Adaptation of Traditional Form", *Classical Philology* 74 (1979), 187-213.
- Mueller-Goldingen, C., "Die Kassandraszene in Euripides' *Troades* (308-461)" in *ΑΗΝΑΙΚΑ. Festschrift für Carl Werner Müller zum 65. Geburtstag am 28. Januar 1996*, ed. C. Mueller-Goldingen and K. Sier, Stuttgart, 1996.
- Mumprecht, V., *Epitaphius Bionos*, Zurich, 1964.
- Muth, R., "'Hymenaios' und 'Epithalamion'", *Wiener Studien* 67 (1954), 5-45.
- Norden, E., *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*, Leipzig, 1913.
- Olson, S. D., ed., *Aristophanes: Peace, edited with introduction and commentary by S. Douglas Olson*, Oxford, 1998.
- Owen, A. S., *Euripides: Ion*, Oxford, 1939.
- Owen, E. T., *The Harmony of Aeschylus*, Toronto, 1952.
- Page, D., *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*, Oxford, 1955.
- Page, D. L., ed., *Lyrical Graeca Selecta*, Oxford, 1968.
- Page, D., ed., *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoediae*, Oxford, 1972.
- Parker, L. P. E., *The Songs of Aristophanes*, Oxford, 1997.
- Parry, H., "Magic and Songstress: Theocritus *Idyll* 2", *Illinois Classical Studies* 13

- (1988), 43-55.
- Peiper, R., "Der Refrain bei griechischen und lateinischen Dichtern", *Jahrb. für klass. Philol.* 87, 89, 91 (1863-1865), 87.617-623, 762-766; 89.449-460; 91.333-355.
- Perrotta, G., "Il frammento 123 Diehl di Saffo", *Maia* 1 (1948), 52-61.
- Pfeiffer, R., ed., *Callimachus*, Oxford, 1949.
- Pfeijffer, I. L., *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, & Pythian VIII*, Leiden, 1999.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W., *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy. 2nd Edition rev. by T.B.L. Webster*, Oxford, 1962.
- Pordomingo Pardo, F., "El pean de Macedonico a Apolo y a Asclepio, un nuevo hallazgo epigrafico", *Corolla Londiniensis* 4 (1984), 101-129.
- Porro, A., "L' *Adonidis Epitaphium* di Bione e il modelo teocriteo", *Aevum Antiquum* 1 (1988), 211-221.
- Powell, J. U., ed., *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford, 1925.
- Radermacher, L., "Griechischer Sprachbrauch", *Philologus* 60 (1901), 491-501.
- Radermacher, L., ed., *Aristophanes' Frösche. Einleitung, text und Kommentar*, Vienna, 1921.
- Radt, S. L., *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian: Text, Scholien und Kommentar*, Amsterdam, 1958.
- Rainer, B. L., *Philodamus' Paeon to Dionysus: a Literary Expression of Delphic Propaganda*  
*Le Paian: Hymns For Asklepios (Greece, Paeans)*, diss. Illinois, 1975.
- Reed, J. D., *Bion of Smyrna: The Fragments and the Adonis*, New York, 1997.
- Reed, J. D., *Bion of Smyrna: The Fragments and the Adonis*, New York, 1997.
- Reiner, E., *Die rituelle Totenklage der Griechen*, Stuttgart, 1938.
- Roberts, W. R., ed., *Demetrius on Style. The Greek text of Demetrius De Elocutione*

- edited after the Paris manuscript*, Cambridge, 1902.
- Rosenmeyer, T. G., *The Green Cabinet; Theocritus and the European Pastoral lyric*, Berkeley, 1969.
- Rutherford, I., "Neoptolemus and the Paeon-cry: an Echo of a Sacred Aetiology in Pindar", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 88 (1991), 1-10.
- Rutherford, I., "The Nightingale's Refrain: P.Oxy. 2625 = SLG 460", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 107 (1995), 39-43.
- Rutherford, I., *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*, Oxford, 2001.
- Schmiel, R., "Repetition in Nonnos' Dionysiaca", *Philologus* 142 (1998), 326-334.
- Schork, R. J., *Sacred Song from the Byzantine Pulpit: Romanus the Melodist*, Gainesville, 1995.
- Schröder, S., *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian*, Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1999.
- Schwarz, P., *De ephymniorum apud Aeschylum usu*, diss. Halle, 1897.
- Schwyzler, E., *Griechische Grammatik*, Munich, 1939.
- Smith, O. L., ed., *Scholia in Aeschylum*, Leipzig, 1976-82.
- Smyth, H. W., *Greek Melic Poets*, London, 1900.
- Smyth, H. W., *Greek Grammar, Revised by Gordon M. Messing*, Cambridge, Mass., 1956.
- Snell, B. a. H. M., ed., *Pindarus, i. Epinicia*, Leipzig, 1987.
- Sokolowski, F., "Sur le péan de Philodamos", *BCH* 60 (1936), 135-143.
- Sommerstein, A. H., ed., *Aeschylus: Eumenides*, Cambridge, 1989.
- Stanford, W. B., *Aeschylus in his Style: A Study in Language and Personality*, Dublin, 1942.
- Stanford, W. B., *Greek Tragedy and the Emotions: An Introductory Study*, London, 1983.

- Stanley, K., *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad*, Princeton, 1993.
- Stanzel, K.-H., "Mimen, Mimepen und Mimiamben — Theokrit, Herodas und die Kreuzung der Gattungen" in *Hellenistica Groningana III: Proceedings of the Groningen Workshops on Hellenistic Poetry. Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, ed. M. A. Harder and e. al, Groningen, 1998.
- Stewart, A., "Dionysus at Delphi: The pediments of the Sixth Temple of Apollo and Religious Reform in the Age of Alexander" in *Studies in the History of Art, Volume 10, Symposium Series I: Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, ed. B. Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, Washington, 1982.
- Thalman, W. G., *Dramatic Art in Aeschylus' Seven Against Thebes*, New Haven, 1978.
- Thiel, R., *Chor und tragische Handlung im 'Agamemnon' des Aischylos*, Stuttgart, 1993.
- Tsagalis, C., *The Improvised Laments in the Iliad*, diss. Cornell, 1998.
- Usener, H., *Kleine Schriften*, Leipzig, 1913.
- Ussher, R. G., ed., *Aristophanes: Ecclesiazusae*, Oxford, 1973.
- Van der Weiden, M. J. H., *The Dithyrambs of Pindar : Introduction, Text, and Commentary*, Amsterdam, 1991.
- Van Otterlo, W. A. A., "Eine merkwürdige Kompositionsform der älteren griechischen Literatur", *Mnemosyne* 12 (3rd ser.) (1944), 192-207.
- Van Sickle, J., "Theocritus and the Conception of Bucolic Genre", *Ramus* 5 (1976), 18-44.
- Van Thiel, H., ed., *Homeri Ilias*, Hildesheim, Zürich and New York, 1996.
- Vance, D. R., *The Question of Meter in Biblical Hebrew Poetry*, Lewiston, Queenston and Lampeter, 2001.
- Vatin, C., "Pharsaliens à Delphes", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 88 (1964), 446-454.

- Vetta, M., ed., *Le donne all' assembla*, Milan, 2000.
- Vollgraff, W., "Le péan delphique à Dionysos", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 48-51 (1924-1927), 97-208, 140-142, 263-394, 423-468.
- Wackernagel, J., *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen, 1953-79.
- Walker, S. F., *Theocritus*, 1980.
- Weil, H., "Observations sur les fragments d'Euripide", *Revue des Études grecques* 2 (1889), 322-342.
- Weil, H., "Un pean delphique a Dionysos", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 19 (1895), 393-418.
- West, M. L., "The Dictaeon Hymn to the Kouros", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 85 (1965), 149-59.
- West, M. L., *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin ; New York, 1974.
- West, M. L., *Greek Metre*, Oxford, 1982.
- West, M. L., *Carmina Anacreontea*, Leipzig, 1984.
- West, M. L., *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, Oxford, 1989.
- Westphal, R., ed., *Scriptores Metrici Graeci*, Leipzig, 1866.
- Wheeler, A. L., "Tradition in the epithalamium", *American Journal of Philology* 51 (1930), 205-223.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., ed., *Euripides Herakles*, Berlin, 1889.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker*, Berlin, 1906.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., "Nordionische Steine", *Abhandlungen der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Classe* (1909), Abh. 2.1-71.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., *Sappho und Simonides. Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker*, Berlin, 1913.

- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin, 1921.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., *Reden und Vortraege*, Berlin, 1925.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., ed., *Euripides Ion*, Berlin, 1926.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., ed., *Aristophanes. Lysistrate*, Berlin, 1927.
- Williams, F. J., *Callimachus : Hymn to Apollo, a Commentary*, Oxford and New York, 1978.
- Zimmermann, B., *Dithyrambos : Geschichte einer Gattung*, Göttingen, 1992.