ἀναγής, ἐφύμνιον
TWO LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES*

PÄR SANDIN

Abstract Two unrelated words are examined with the aid of the electronic Thesaurus (*TLG*). Full corpora of the words and their derivates are given in an Appendix. We find that the evidence for the sense of ἀναγής is less certain than has been commonly believed: the supposed instance in Herod. 2.70 is actually ἐναγής; other alleged instances are due to editorial mistakes or interpolations. The original sense is likely to have been 'pure' (so Hsch. α 4227). ἐφύμνιον originally meant 'eulogy', 'invocation', being a verbal noun to ἐφυμνεῖν: so, e.g., Call. *Ap.* 98, fr. 384.39, A.R. 2.713, Ath. 15.701c, Ph. 1.535. Due to the common use of invocations as refrains to hymns and similar, the noun took on this sense in scholarly discourse, a semantic process explained by Hephaèstion in a passage that has been insufficiently understood (*Poëm.* 7.1).

The need for a major revision of LSJ remains great – even after the 1996 *Supplement* – as David Bain has argued recently, and before him John Chadwick, in this journal and elsewhere.[1] Most of the articles in the old lexicon would probably benefit from a revision with the aids of the material and search facilities now available through electronic media. In the present notes I am concerned with two unrelated Greek words with fairly limited occurrences.[2] The studies are based on the entire corpus of instances obtained through searches on the *TLG* disc 'E', and the additional material on the *TLG* website, with some

1 David Bain, 'Some Addenda and Corrigenda to the Revised Supplement to Liddell and Scott', *Glotta* 75 (1999 [2001]) 121-33; John Chadwick, 'The Case for Replacing Liddell and Scott', *BICS* 39 (1994) 1-11; John Chadwick, *Lexicographica Graeca: Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek* (Oxford 1996) 6-8, *passim*.

2 I have had reason to study these words in connection with work on a commentary on Aeschylus' *Supplices*, the first part of which hopefully is to be published in the winter of 2003-04.

further material gathered from lexicons.[3] Full lists of instances of the words are given in the second Appendix.

The nature of the subject demands that I cite several ancient works which are not listed in LSJ. Abbreviations of these works are explained in the first Appendix. As to the titles and the manner of reference (editions, numbers of chapters and pages, etc.), I usually follow the standard of the *TLG*. In cases where the *TLG* title and/or manner of reference to a particular work is different from that given in LSJ or Lampe (*A Patristic Greek Lexicon*), I give the latter within parentheses. Abbreviations of the cited editions are supplied with some references for clarity: these editions are listed in Appendix 1.

ἀναγής

The oldest alleged instance is likely to be no instance at all. Herodas 2.70 has the crasis ὠναγής, meaning 'the foul'.[4] Scholars have assumed that this is a crasis of ὁ ἀναγής, which would be regular in the Ionic dialect of Herodas. It is highly probable, however, that ὁ ἐναγής is actually intended. From the mouth of Herodas' procurer, whose style and vocabulary is a parody of Attic legal rhetoric (although in East Ionic dialect),[5] we would expect the common Attic ἐναγής before the extremely rare ἀναγής, which is not attested elsewhere before the first century AD, and not with any certainty outside lexicographical works before medieval times (see below). Cf. also the wealth of parallels with ἐναγής gathered by Headlam (n. 5) ad loc. The crasis ὠναγής < ὁ ἐναγής is possible: Herodas' practice of contraction and crasis is inconsistent, and does not always agree with the rules of authentic Ionic.[6] Since we have no certain example of a crasis or a contraction in Herodas of ο + ε > ου (the regular Attic, and occasional East Ionic, contraction) it is by no means certain that he would have written οὐναγής.[7]

Herodas regularly exhibits the Doric crasis κή- < καὶ + ε, and ὠναγής would likewise be a regular Doric crasis of ὁ ἐναγής.[8] More importantly, Herodas did not write genuine Ionic but an Ionic *Kunstsprache* with several hyper-Ionicisms, and ὠναγής is likely to be referred

3 *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, disc. 'E' (Irvine 2000) [CD-ROM]. The *TLG* website is currently available online at <http://www.tlg.uci.edu/> and includes, for non-licensed users, a full version of the *TLG Canon* (cf. n. 18 below).

4 The sense must be 'foul', *pace* Bücheler (*Herondae mimiambi*, ed. Franciscus Buecheler (Bonn 1892)) and Cunningham (Herodas, *Mimiambi*, ed. I. C. Cunningham (Oxford 1971)) *ad loc.*, who argue for an ironic use of ἀναγής in the sense of 'pure'. This would be inconsistent with the hypocritically grave and indignant rhetoric of Herodas' pander. Hermann Krakert's observation (*Herodas in mimiambis quatenus comoediam Graecam respexisse videatur* (Leipzig 1902) 26, n. 1), that the pander is describing his opponent with an adjective usually applied to himself (*impurus leno*), is attractive.

5 Herodas, *The Mimes and Fragments*, with notes by Walter Headlam, ed. A. D. Knox (Cambridge 1922) xxxvii.

6 Cunningham (n. 4) 212 writes: 'P [*PLit. Lond.* 96, the major papyrus of Herodas] is inconsistent in the representation of the collision of vowels, but may reproduce, however imperfectly, the practice of Hds., as similar inconsistencies are found in Hippon. and Call.'

7 It is uncertain whether Herodas would have thought of 3.12 προύνεικοι as a case of crasis or contraction.

8 See, e.g., Volkmar Schmidt, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 1 (Berlin 1968) 20-27; Herbert Weir Smyth, *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects: Ionic* (Oxford 1894) 242, 628. The Doric ω appears not to be found elsewhere in crasis, only in contractions (e.g., Sophr. fr. 13 PCG τυρῶντα; Ar. *Lys.* 1260 ἐλάσσως; *Tab.Heracl.* 1.184 λωτήριον). It has been argued, with little foundation as far as I can see, that ω in some cases is a regular Ionic contraction or crasis of ο + ε: cf. Smyth (op.cit.) 265.

to this category.[9] Crasis of ο + ε is rare in the surviving Ionic authors, and contraction is far from standard: uncontracted οε might be said to be the norm in verse (so at Herod. 6.72 εὐνοέστερον), while the prose usage is inconsistent.[10] A crasis ο + ε > ου of article + nominal, very common in Attic,[11] appears, as far as I can tell, only in οὕτερος and τοὕτερον, six times, in the most famous Ionic writer, Herodotus.[12] Crases on ω (ο, οι, ου, ω + α) on the other hand are conspicuously Ionic (un-Attic) and also very common in Herodotus, for instance in ὠνήρ, ὦλλοι, ὡυτός, ὤνθρωπος. Also conspicuously Ionic is the contraction ο + η > ω in νῶσαι (νοέω) and βῶσαι (βοάω), and Herodas has the latter verb, contracted thus, in 3.23, 4.41 and 4.45. Herodas also has several unusual crases on ω: ο + οι in 4.75 (ᾦ < ὄ οἱ), οι + ο in 6.102 (ὠρν[ι]ϑο[κ]λέ[π]ται), ω + ει in 5.15 (ἐγᾦμι), ω + η in 1.3 (ἐγῶδε < ἐγὼ ἤδε), and κὤ- < καὶ ὁ Ἀ- in 2.97 and 4.3. It thus seems likely that Herodas, interpolating from the common East Ionic crases and contractions on ω, of which he apparently is fond, would think that ὠναγής < ὁ ἐναγής is 'purer' Ionic than the Attic ου-crasis. We may conclude that ἐναγής is more likely to be intended here than ἀναγής.

The second oldest instance of ἀναγής is in Harp. 30.1, from whom the entries in Photius, pseudo-Zonaras and the *Suda* derive: ἀναγεῖς· Αἰσχίνης κατὰ Κτησιφῶντος. διὰ μὲν τοῦ α τοὺς ἀνάγνους· ἐὰν δὲ ἐναγεῖς, τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἄγει, τουτέστιν ἐν τῷ μιάσματι. But ἀναγής is not to be found in our mss. of Aeschines: an indubitable ἐναγής, with the sense 'polluted', appears in 108, 110, 117, 121, 122, and twice in 129, of the third speech (*In Ctesiphontem*). Harpocration apparently based his entry on a corruption in his text of Aeschines (although he seems to have been aware also of the correct reading ἐναγής).

Hesychius has two instances of the word. We find it first at α 4222, (mis-)placed between ἀνάγειν and ἀνάγεσθαι and glossed ὁ ἐναγής, ἢ βέβηλος. In the other entry (α 4227) he takes the word in the opposite meaning: καθαρός. Here Schrevel supplied <ὁ μὴ> and is followed by Latte.[13] It is a fact, however, that a large number of glosses from the Greek orators were interpolated into Hesychius from Atticistic handbooks of the second century AD.[14] We see that one such lexicon, Harpocration's, has ἀναγής in the same sense as the former of Hesychius' entries, taken from a corrupt text of Aeschines. For what it is worth, the entry follows after ἀνάγειν in Harpocration as well as in Hesychius. The different wording suggests that Hesychius' entry is not dependent on Harpocration: however, mss. of Aeschines in the first century obviously exhibited the corruption ἀναγής for ἐναγής, and the word might have found its way into other Atticistic lexicons as well as to Harpocration, and then into Hesychius. Latte (n. 13) I, xiv observes that 'Atticistarum glossae iusto saepius ordinem turbant in eis operis partibus, quae alioquin intactae videntur', which is obviously the case of the first, but not the second, instance of ἀναγής in Hesychius. This is of course not the only possibility of interpolation (cf. ibid. xv-xvi), but circumstantial evidence rather points

9 See Cunningham (n. 4) on 2.80, 3.35, 4.21, 4.42, 4.54, 4.89, 5.44, 6.11, 6.90, 7.34, 7.88; V. Schmidt (n. 8) 26-27, 30-31, 35-36, 39-40.

10 Cf. Friedrich Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte*, 3 vols (Berlin 1921-24), III (1924), 61; Smyth (n. 8) 263-66.

11 Schwyzer, *Gr.Gramm.* I, 402.

12 οὕτερος 1.34, 1.134 *bis*, 3.78, τοὕτερον 1.32, 1.186.

13 Ἡσυχίου λεξικόν, accurante Cornelio Schrevelio (Leyden 1668); *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, ed. Kurt Latte, 2 vols (Copenhagen 1953-66).

14 Latte (n. 13) I, xiii-xiv.

to the first Hesychian entry being interpolated. Schmidt's deletion of the first entry of ἀναγής is therefore attractive,[15] whereas Schrevel's (n. 13) <ὁ μὴ> in α 4227 has little substantial foundation.

The extant evidence for ἀναγής = ἐναγής is mostly of a later date. There are a few instances, all of which have gone unnoticed or ignored by LSJ. Lampe records two occurrences in the Christian Fathers, the first of which is Thdt. *Is.* 5.29 (13.3). Here, however, ἐναγούς is the correct reading. Theodoretus writes: τὸ ἀνάθημα καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄγαν ἁγίου καὶ ἀφιερωμένου τῷ θεῷ τίθησι τὰ θεῖα λόγια καὶ μέντοι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄγαν ἐναγούς καὶ βεβήλου. The phrase ἐναγὴς καὶ βέβηλος (being, apart from the conjunction, identical to the gloss in the first Hesychian entry of ἀναγής) occurs often enough elsewhere in the Christian authors of the fourth century to imply that this is also the correct reading here.[16] The preceding word ἄγαν suggests that we are looking at a dittography-type corruption, but probably not in the mss., but in the older editions: the modern ones indeed have ἐναγούς, presented not as a conjecture, but as the reading of the mss.[17]

Lampe's other example is [Meth.] *Sym. et Ann.* 18.353b MPG, and there is also one instance in Basil of Caesarea that has gone unnoticed: *Exorc.* 31.1681b MPG. The former is presumably a Byzantine work; the latter is of doubtful authenticity:[18] in neither case can we safely assume that the word is not a corruption for ἐναγής, but we also cannot take corruption for granted.[19] However, insofar as the instances are sound, it is not certain that

---

15 *Hesychii Alexandrini lexikon*, ed. Mauricius Schmidt, 2nd edn (Jena 1867).

16 E.g., Eus. *V.C.* 3.26.3; Chrys. *Virg.* 6.15, *Jud.* 48.851.16, 48.912.27 MPG, *Hom. in Mt.* 58.732.32 (etc.) MPG; Cyr.Al. *Ex.anim.* (*Hom.div* 14) 77.1084.21 MPG.

17 The single extant ms. for the complete work, Μετόχιον τοῦ Παναγίου τάφου 17 from Constantinople (K), is illegible at the relevant place; the text has to be supplied from a secondary source, the Isaiah-catena 'N', which cites chapters 1-16 almost in their entirety. Older editions of Theodoretus' Isaiah-commentary rely on the citations from the catenae alone, K being virtually unknown before 1899. The old standard edition, Τοῦ μακαρίου Θεοδωρήτου ... ἄπαντα: *B. Theodoreti ... opera omnia*, ed. Ioann. Ludov. Schultze, 8 vols (Halle 1769-74), II (1770), 165-403, reprinted in MPG 81.216-493, is however not based on fresh collations of the catenae-mss but follows (cf. viii-x) the authority of the edition of Jacques Sirmond, Μακαρίου Θεοδωρήτου ... ἄπαντα: *Beati Theodoreti ... opera omnia*, cura & studio Iacobi Sirmondi, 5 vols (Paris 1642-84), II (1642), which apparently exhibits ἀναγούς here: so, at least, do Schultze and Migne. ἐναγούς is printed in the modern editions, however: Theodoret von Kyros, *Kommentar zu Jesaia*, ed. August Möhle, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 5 (Berlin 1932) and Théodoret de Cyr, *Commentaire sur Isaïe*, ed. Jean-Noël Guinot, Sources chrétiennes 276, 295, 315, 3 vols (Paris 1980-84), II (1982). Lampe's claim (s.v. ἀναγής) that ἐναγούς is a conjecture of Möhle's appears to be mistaken: Möhle does not present it as such in his apparatus. Neither he nor Guinot suggests that ἐναγούς is anything else than the reading of the mss. of the Isaiah-catena 'N'.

18 The *Sermo de Symeone et Anna* is dated to the ninth century by Otto Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 5 vols (Freiburg im Breisgau 1913-32), II (2nd edn, 1914), 350-51, who suggests that the author might be Methodius the Confessor, Patriarch of Constantinople 842-46. I have not been able to find an assessment of the origin and date of the *Exorcismi*: the work is however marked as spurious on the *TLG* disc and in Luci Berkowitz and Karl A. Squitier, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Canon of Greek Authors and Works*, 3rd edn (New York 1990), and as of doubtful authenticity by Lampe. The relevant part of it is attributed to Gregorius Thaumaturgus in one ms. according to the editor Jacques Goar (*Εὐχολόγιον sive rituale Graecorum*, opera R. P. Jacobi Goar, 2nd edn (Venice 1730; repr. Graz 1960) 584).

19 Corruption appears to be certain in another previously ignored example of ἀναγής, Lex.Seg. *Gloss.rhet.* 212.32 (*AB* 1.212.32). The variant reading πavαγεῖς is found in the otherwise identical entries in Phot. α 244, Lex.Seg. *Coll.verb.util.* α 15.3 (*An.Bachm.* 1.15.3) and *Suda* α 314.

they are independent of the lexicographical tradition from Harpocration: three Byzantine lexicons copy his entry of ἀναγής almost word by word.

The semantic evidence for ἀναγής thus fades into even more uncomfortable uncertainty than before. We retain one lexicographical entry in Harpocration, based on a corruption in a ms. of Aeschines, but received in Byzantine lexicographical tradition; one probable interpolation in Hesychius, possibly stemming ultimately from the same source; and two uncertain instances in ?Basil and pseudo-Methodius. On the other hand, we have one, *prima facie* sound, entry in Hesychius, where the adjective is glossed καθαρός. This may well be the correct classical sense of the word, being in accordance with several opposing pairs of adjectives on ἐν- and ἀ(ν)-, e.g., -αυλος, -δηλος, -δοξος, -οργος, -τελής, -τριβής, -υδρος. We also find ἀναγέα conjectured, attractively in my opinion, by Boissonade in A. *Supp.* 123, where the sense 'unpolluted', 'pure' is perfectly appropriate.[20] (Unfortunately this sense of ἀναγής is not supported by Sanskrit *an-āgás*, which appears to be unrelated, *pace* Schwyzer, *Gr.Gramm.* I, 512 and Cunningham (n. 4) on Herod. 2.70.[21])

ἐφύμνιον (-ία, -ιάζω, -ιος)

Lampe records the meaning 'eulogy' in Jo.D. *Hom.* 10.1 (*III Dorm.* 1.4 Kotter = 96.753a MPG), also listing an adjective ἐφύμνιος, 'of praise, in praise', occurring in the same author and in his (eighth-century) contemporary Andreas Cretensis. The general meaning of the term in earlier literature, patristic as well as secular, seems in several cases not to be different. In fact, it appears that ἐφύμνιον originally meant 'sung invocation', 'eulogy', being a verbal noun to ἐφυμνεῖν, and that the word keeps this general meaning alongside the more technical sense 'refrain' (which is the only meaning given by LSJ) throughout its history.

First, the sense 'refrain' is redundant and irrelevant in the three oldest instances of the word, Call. *Ap.* 98, fr. 384.39, and A.R. 2.713, all of which passages concern themselves with invocations and eulogies, not the structure of songs (cited in order):

          ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῆον ἀκούομεν, οὕνεκα τοῦτο
          Δελφός τοι πρώτιστον ἐφύμνιον εὕρετο λαός,
          ἦμος ἐκηβολίην χρυσέων ἐπεδείκνυσο τόξων.
100   Πυθώ τοι κατιόντι συνήντετο δαιμόνιος θήρ,
          αἰνὸς ὄφις. τὸν μὲν σὺ κατήναρες ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ
          βάλλων ὠκὺν ὀϊστόν, ἐπηΰτησε δὲ λαός·
          ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῆον, ἵει βέλος, εὐθύ σε μήτηρ
          γείνατ' ἀοσσητῆρα· τὸ δ' ἐξέτι κεῖθεν ἀείδη.

20 Αἰσχύλος: *Aeschylus*, curante Jo. Fr. Boissonade (Paris 1825) 272. With his emendation read θεοῖς δ' ἀναγέα τέλεα πελομένων καλῶς | ἐπίδρομ' ὁπότι θάνατος ἀπῇ. The Danaids are promising 'for the gods *untainted* offerings, if things turn out well, streaming in where *death be absent*'. Aeschylus ironically foreshadows the bloody outcome of the myth: what the gods will actually get (as the audience knows) is mass-pollution through the slaughter of 49 newly-wed husbands. Such foreshadowing occurs elsewhere in the drama: see Aeschylus, *The Suppliants*, ed. H. Friis Johansen and Edward W. Whittle, 3 vols (Copenhagen 1980), I, 37.

21 See Pierre Chantraine and Olivier Masson. 'Sur quelques termes du vocabulaire religieux des Grecs: la valeur du mot ἄγος et de ses dérivés', in *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung: Festschrift Albert Debrunner* (Bern 1954) 85-107 (105-06).

ἄνδρας ὅτ' οὐ δείσαντες ἐδώκαμεν ἡδὺ βοῆσαι
νηὸν ἔπι Γλαυκῆς κῶμον ἄγοντι χορῷ
Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον.

πολλὰ δὲ Κωρύκιαι νύμφαι, Πλειστοῖο θύγατρες,
θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσιν, ἰὴ ἴε κεκληγυῖαι·
ἔνθεν δὴ τόδε καλὸν ἐφύμνιον ἔπλετο Φοίβῳ.

The same is true for Ath. 15.62 (15.701c), where the dining sophists are discussing whether the expression ἰὴ παιών (see above) is a παροιμία, an ἐφύμνιον, or something else. The exact meaning of παροιμία in the context is not entirely clear,[22] but the distinction will not make sense if ἐφύμνιον is to denote the structural role of the phrase in a song, a 'refrain'; the origin and meaning of the ἰὴ παιών is the subject of the discussion, not whether it is sung as verse or refrain. It is, by the way, already clear to the Deipnosophists that the utterance is commonly used as a refrain, an ἐπίφθεγμα: see 15.52 (15.696f-697a).

In fact, the distinction between ἐφύμνιον and παροιμία in Athenaeus seems to be that between a vocative and a non-vocative utterance, i.e., between a call to the god and a 'proverb' or 'saying' in the third person. The discussion that follows does consider these two alternatives: the ἰὴ παιών is said either to stem from ἵε παῖ, being the admonition of Leto to her son to shoot the monster Python (cf. Call. *Ap.* 97-104, cited above), *or* to be a παροιμία (and not ἵε παῖ, but ἰὴ παιών). No further information about the latter alternative is given, but apparently it differs from the former in not being a vocative expression.

An attempt at a definition of ἐφύμνιον as a term of poetics, which seems to have been of great importance for the later scholarly usage of the word, is found in Heph. *Poëm.* 70 (7.1): ἔστι δέ τινα ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι καὶ τὰ καλούμενα ἐφύμνια, ἅπερ ταύτης τῆς προσηγορίας τετύχηκεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐφύμνιόν τι εἰώθασιν ἐπάγειν οἱ ποιηταὶ ταῖς στροφαῖς, οἷά ἐστι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα· ''Ἰήϊε παιάν' καὶ 'ὦ διθύραμβε'.

Not the most stringent of definitions, it may seem at first, *ephymnia* being thus named 'since the poets usually add as it were an *ephymnion* to the strophes'. Observe, however, that the two examples of ἐφύμνιόν τι in the definiens are *invocations*, of the same kind we find in the authors mentioned above. Hephaestion is thus probably saying that 'the technical term *ephymnion* is called thus, since the poets are in the habit of adding an *invocational phrase* (ἐφύμνιόν τι) to the strophes'. Accordingly, the latter ἐφύμνιον may not be a noun, but an adjective, with the sense 'invocational', 'eulogic', as ἐφύμνιος in Lampe. Hephaestion's explanation may indeed be right, and the etymology of Photius ε 44.24, τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ ὕμνῳ ᾀσμα, accordingly mistaken: the preposition ἐφ- does not signify an 'addition to' a hymn or an 'additional' hymn, but comes from the verb ἐφυμνεῖν, 'sing *to* someone'.[23] Due to the common practice of using invocations as refrains, however, ἐφύμνιον comes to mean

---

22 Gulick compares English 'slogan' (Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists*, trans. Charles Burton Gulick, Loeb Classical Library, 7 vols (London 1928-57), VII (1941), 269); Schweighäuser despairs (Iohannes Schweighaeuser, *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, 9 vols (Strassburg 1801-07), VIII (1807), 367).

23 Photius' etymology is apparently accepted by Ian Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford 2001) 71, who argues that 'in descriptions of παιάν-cries their utterance tends to be expressed with verbs bearing the prefix ἐπι-, which implies that the utterance follows something else as an endorsement'. But a simpler way of interpreting the prefix is that the παιάν is usually sung either *to*, *in praise of* someone (Apollo), or *over*, *at* something/someone, as a blessing or encouragement (e.g., A. fr. 350).

'refrain' in scholarly literature. This is the case of most of the instances in the *scholia vetera* in Aeschylus, Pindar, and Aristophanes. Two instances do however preserve the original sense of 'eulogy': the scholia in Ar. *Av.* 1764 and Ar. *Pax* 453a. The former provides an instructive illustration of the development of the semantics of the word. It treats the so-called 'ἐφύμνιον of Archilochus' (mentioned above in Call. fr. 384.39): τὸ τήνελλα μίμησίς ἐστι φωνῆς κρούματος αὐλοῦ ποιᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐφυμνίου οὗ εἶπεν Ἀρχίλοχος εἰς τὸν Ἡρακλέα μετὰ τὸν ἆθλον Αὐγέου· 'τήνελλα καλλίνικε, χαῖρε ἄναξ Ἡράκλεις αὐτός τε καὶόλαος, αἰχμητὰ δύω' ([Archil.] fr. 324 IEG).

While ἐφύμνιον here and in Callimachus refers to these words (or to the entire ode) in their capacity as a sung invocation or eulogy, the same term in the Pindaric scholia apparently describes the τήνελλα καλλίνικε in its capacity as a *refrain*. Thus sch. Pi. *O.* 9.1i, 9.3*l* and, with the hapax verb ἐφυμνιάζω, possibly used by the grammarian Eratosthenes, sch. Pi. *O.* 9.1k. The first and the last instance read τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος, ὃ τοῖς νικῶσι τὰ Ὀλύμπια ἐπήδετο, ἦν τρίστροφον [...]. ἐφυμνίῳ δὲ κατεχρῶντο τούτῳ· τήνελλα καλλίνικε and Ἐρατοσθένης δέ (*Ant.com.* p. 226 Bernhardy) φησι μὴ ἐπινίκιον εἶναι τὸ Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος, ἀλλ' ὕμνον εἰς Ἡρακλέα· τριπλόον δὲ οὐ διὰ τὸ ἐκ τριῶν στροφῶν συγκεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ τρὶς ἐφυμνιάζεσθαι τὸ καλλίνικε.

If ἐφυμνιάζεσθαι is the *ipsissimum verbum* of Eratosthenes, and if it was indeed intended to mean 'sing a refrain', this sense of ἐφύμνιον will be contemporary with Callimachus and Apollonius. The sense of the noun is then divided throughout its known history. Later the two senses may be found even within the usage of the same author. There are two examples of ἐφύμνιον in Philo Judaeus, of which the first, *Congr.erudit.* 115 (1.535), contains no implications of a 'refrain' (*pace* LSJ), and is indeed translated 'hymn of triumph' by Colson.[24] The latter instance, however, *Vit.contempl.* 80 (2.485), does mean 'refrain'. The instance in Nil. *Narr.* 3.3 appears to mean 'hymn':[25] οὔπω τῆς ᾠδῆς παυσαμένου τοῦ πλήθους, ἔτι δὲ ἐπὶ γλώσσης τὸ ἀκροτελεύτιον τοῦ ἐφυμνίου φέροντος, where the last phrase probably means 'the refrain of the hymn' (to the sun). In ?Or. *Sel. in Ps.* 12.1656a MPG (where the term used is ἐφυμνία) and Didym. *fr.Ps.* 1195.3, of which the former appears to depend on the latter or both depend on a common source,[26] the noun takes the sense 'refrain', *pace* Lampe s.v. ἐφυμνία. So possibly also the instances in Didym. *Zacch.* 3.269 and *fr.Ps.* 929.43, although there are no internal clues to this sense: the verse (Exodus 15.1, 15.21) mentioned by Didymus in these passages as an ἐφύμνιον is however referred to by Philo in a similar passage (*Agricult.* 82 = 1.312) as an ἐπῳδός to a hymn.

ἐφύμνιον occurs four times in Hesychius, of which instances only one (ε 5117) appears to refer to a 'refrain'. In τ 794 and 795 the sense is rather 'invocation', whereas in ε 7552 the noun (in the plural) is simply glossed ᾠδαί. 'Eulogy' is also the sense of the noun and the

---

24 *Philo*, trans. F. H. Colson (G. H. Whitaker, Ralph Marcus), Loeb Classical Library, 10 vols, 2 supplements (London (etc.) 1929-62), IV (1932), 517.

25 The authenticity of this work of Nilus, commonly denied (e.g. by Bardenhewer (n. 18) IV (2nd ed., 1924), 162-63, followed by Lampe), is asserted by its latest editor, Fabrizio Conca (Nilus Ancyranus, *Narratio*, ed. Fabricius Conca (Leipzig 1983)): see his refs. at v, n. 1.

26 Origen: τὸ δέ, "Ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, ἐφυμνίας τρόπῳ ἐπιλέγεται. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἀεὶ ἐλεεῖ, εἰκότως οἱ ἐφυμνοῦντες λέγουσιν, Ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. Didymus: διὸ καὶ ἐφ' ἑκάστου στίχου τρόπῳ ἐφυμνίου ἐπιλέγεται Ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ. ἐπεὶ γὰρ οὐ ποτὲ μὲν ἐλεεῖ, ποτὲ δὲ οὔ, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ ἐλεεῖ, εἰκότως οἱ ἐφυμνοῦντες λέγουσιν Ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.

adjective in all instances in John of Damascus and Andreas Cretensis, and also of the instance in *Hymn.hagiolog.* 10.13.4 Kalamakis (possibly tenth century).[27] The double sense continues into the later Middle Ages, where, interestingly, the extant instances in literature (Nicetas David, Nicephorus Basilaces) mean 'eulogy', whereas the ones in scholarship (Photius, *Suda*, Triclinius' and Tzetzes' scholia on Aeschylus and Aristophanes) mean 'refrain'.[28]

The original sense of the noun is 'sung invocation', 'eulogy'. The sense 'refrain' is extant from at least the first century BC, possibly inferable from the third, but it is derivative, owing to the common usage of invocational phrases as refrains of hymns, in combination with a misunderstood etymology (as demonstrated by the entry in Photius, cited above). A lexical article following the pattern of LSJ might look something like this:

ἐφυμνία, ἡ = ἐφύμνιον II, ?Or. *Sel. in Ps.* 12.1656a MPG. -ιάζω, *sing as the refrain*, Eratosth. ap. sch. Pi. *O.* 9.1k (Pass.) -ιον, τό, *sung invocation, eulogy*, to a god, A.R. 2.713, Call. *Ap.* 98, Ph. *Congr.erudit.* 115 (1.535), Ath. 15.62 (15.701c); to Heracles or to a victorious athlete, Call. fr. 384.39, Hsch. τ 794-95, sch. Ar. *Av.* 1764, sch. Ar. *Pax* 453a. **II**. *refrain*, of a eulogy or a hymn, Ph. *Vit.contempl.* 80 (2.485), Didym. *fr.Ps.* 1195.3; in literary terminology, Heph. *Poëm.* 69.12, 69.19 (5.1, 5.4), 70.12 (7.1), etc., Hsch. ε 5117, sch. Pi. *O.* 9.1, sch. A. *Eu.* 341, etc., sch. Ar. *Ran.* 209, etc. -ιος *invocational*, Heph. *Poëm.* 70.13 (7.1) ἐφύμνιόν τι ἐπάγειν ταῖς στροφαῖς add an *invocational* phrase to the strophes.

Istituto svedese di studi classici a Roma / University of Gothenburg

---

27 This instance is the only one recorded in Erich Trapp, *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität* (Wien 1994-), fasc. 3 (1999). As for the date, see Kalamakis (ref. in Appendix 1) 430-31.

28 The entry of the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, ἐφύμνια· οἱ ὕμνοι οἱ μετ' ὀργάνων καὶ τέχνης ᾀδόμενοι, is eccentric and probably irrelevant.

APPENDIX 1: *ancient works not abbreviated in LSJ*

0123.004	*TLG* number
0123.004p	In the printed *TLG Canon* (n. 18), but not on the *TLG* 'E' CD or presently on the website (n. 3)
0123.004e	On the *TLG* 'E' CD and the website, but (a) not in the printed *Canon*, or (b) with an updated *TLG* number in the electronic version of the *Canon*
0123.004w	On the *TLG* website, but not in the printed *Canon* or the *TLG* 'E' CD
—	Not presently in the *TLG* corpus or *Canon*

Andr.Cr.	Andreas Cretensis
Or.	*Orationes* (—)
Ath.	Athenaeus
Deipn.epitom.	*Deipnosophistarum epitome* (0008.003)
Bas.Caes.	Basilius Caesariensis
Exorc.	*Exorcismi* (2040.064)
Chrys.	Joannes Chrysostomus
Virg.	*De virginitate* (2062.009)
Jud.	*Adversus Judaeos* (2062.021)
Hom. in Mt.	*Homiliae in Matthaeum* (2062.152)
Cyr.Al.	Cyrillus Alexandrinus
Ex.anim.	*De exitu animi* (4090.119)
Didym.	Didymus Caecus
fr.Ps.	*fragmenta in Psalmos* (2102.021)
Zacch.	*Commentarii in Zacchariam* (2102.010)
Eratosth.	Eratosthenes et Eratosthenica
Ant.com.	*De antiqua comoedia* (0222.007p)
Eus.	Eusebius Caesariensis
VC	*Vita Constantini* (2018.020)
Hymn.hagiolog.	ἀγιολογικοὶ ὕμνοι ἐπωνύμων ποιητῶν (—)
Jo.D.	Joannes Damascenus
Carm.	*Carmina* (*canones*) (2934.074p)
III Dorm.	*Homilia III in Dormitionem Mariae* (2934.025w, cf. 2934.025, 029p)
Lex.Seg.	Lexica Segueriana
Coll.verb.util.	*Collectio verborum utilium e differentibus rhetoribus et sapientibus multis* (4289.005e)
Gloss.rhet.	*Glossae rhetoricae* (4289.004e)
Meth.	Methodius Olympius
Sym. et Ann.	*Sermo de Simeone et Anna* (2959.012p)
Niceph.Bas.	Nicephorus Basilaces
Or.	*Orationes* (3087.002w)
Monod.	*Monodiae* (3087.005w)
Nicet.Dav.	Nicetas David (Nicetas Paphlago)
Hom.	*Homiliae* (2705.004w)

Nil.   Nilus Ancyranus
  Narr.   *Narrationes* (4118.001w)
Or.   Origenes
  Sel. in Ps.   *Selecta in Psalmos* (2042.058)
Ph.   Philo Judaeus
  Agricult.   *De agricultura* (0018.009)
  Congr.erudit.   *De congressu eruditionis gratia* (0018.016)
  Vit.contempl.   *De vita contemplativa* (0018.028)
sch.Tricl.   scholia Triclinii (in Aeschylum) (5010.003)
sch.Tz.   scholia Tzetzae (in Aristophanem) (see under Tzetzes below)
sch.vet.   scholia vetera
Thdt.   Theodoretus Cyrrhensis
  Is.   *Commentaria in Isaiam* (4089.008)
Tz.   Joannes Tzetzes
  Comm. in Ar. Av.   *Commentarium in Aristophanis Aves* (5014.020)
  Comm. in Ar. Ran.   *Commentarium in Aristophanis Ranas* (5014.023)

Explicitly cited editions:

AGC   *Anthologia Graeca carminum Christianorum*, ed. W. Christ and M. Paranikas (Leipzig 1871)

Bernhardy   *Eratosthenica,* ed. Godofredus Bernhardy (Berlin 1822, repr. Osnabrück 1968)

Garzya   *Nicephori Basilacae orationes et epistolae*, ed. Antonius Garzya (Leipzig 1984)

IEG   *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, ed. M. L. West, 2 vols, 2nd edn (Oxford 1989-92), I: *Archilochus Hipponax Theognidea* (1989)

Kalamakis   Διονυσίου Χ. Καλαμάκη 'ἁγιολογικοὶ ὕμνοι ἐπωνύμων ποιητῶν', Παρνασσός 36 (1994) 421-93

Kotter   *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, ed. P. Bonifatius Kotter, Patristische Texte und Studien 7, 12, 17, 22, 29, 5 vols (Berlin (etc.) 1969-88), V: *Opera homiletica et hagiographica* (1988)

Lebrun   Nicétas le Paphlagonien, *Sept homélies inédites,* ed. F. Lebrun (Leuven 1997)

MPG   *Patrologiae cursus completus ... series Graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne, 161 vols (Paris 1857-94)

PCG   *Poetae comici Graeci*, ed. R. Kassel and C. Austin, 8 vols (Berlin (etc.) 1983-), I: *Comoedia Dorica Mimi Phlyaces* (2001)

Pignani   Niceforo Basilace, *Progimnasmi e monodie*, ed. Adriana Pignani, Byzantina et Neo-Hellenica Neapolitana 10 (Naples 1983)

APPENDIX 2: *corpus verborum*

<   Derived from
=   Identical to
†   The relevant word is corrupt or interpolated.
l.c.   *loco citato*

ἀναγής Harp. 30.1; Thdt. †*Is.* 5.29 (13.3); [Meth.] *Sym. et Ann.* 18.353b MPG; ?Bas.Caes. *Exorc.* 31.1681b MPG; Hsch. †α 4222, α 4227; Phot. α 1418 (< Harp. l.c.); *Suda* α 1823 (< Harp. l.c.); [Zonar.] α 167 (< Harp. l.c.); †Lex.Seg. *Gloss.rhet.* 212.32 (*AB* 1.212.32)

ἐφυμνία, ἡ ?Or. *Sel. in Ps.* 12.1656a MPG

ἐφυμνιάζω ?Eratosth. *Ant.com.* p. 226 Bernhardy (ap. sch. Pi. *O.* 9.1k)

ἐφύμνιον, τό Call. *Ap.* 98, fr. 384.39; A.R. 2.713; Ph. *Congr.erudit.* 115 (1.535), *Vit.contempl.* 80 (2.485); Ath. 15.62 (15.701c), *Deipn.epitom.* 2.2.162 (< Ath. l.c.); Heph. *Poëm.* 69.12 (5.1), 69.19 (5.4), 70.12 (7.1), 70.18 (7.1), 71.17 (7.3), †71.17 (7.3); Didym. *Zacch.* 3.269, *fr.Ps.* 929.43, 1195.3; Hsch. ε 5117, 7552, τ 794, 795; ?Nil. *Narr.* 3.3; Jo.D. *Carm.* 1 ἀκρ. 1, p. 205 AGC (*Carm.theog.* ἀκρ. 1, 96.817d MPG), *III Dorm.* 1.4 Kotter (*Hom.* 10.1, 96.753a MPG); Nicet.Dav. *Hom.* 2, p. 197.2 Lebrun, *Hom.* 4, p. 267.3 Lebrun; Phot. ε 44.24; *Hymn.hagiolog.* 10.13.4 Kalamakis; *Suda* β 530, ε 3975 (< Phot. l.c.), ι 217; *Et.Gud.* ε 572; Niceph.Bas. *Or.* B3 *bis*, pp. 50.8, 72.11 Garzya, *Or.* B4, p. 76.29 Garzya, *Monod.* 1, p. 281 Pignani; *EM* 35.2, 469.43 (= A.R. l.c.), 469.45; [Zonar.] β 410.16, ε 932.26 (< Phot. l.c.); Lex.Seg. *Coll.verb.util.* ε 245.10 (*An.Bachm.* 1.245.10) (< Phot. l.c.); sch.vet. A. *Eu.* 341, sch.vet. A. *Th.* 975-77a, c, d *bis* (< Heph. *Poëm.* 70.12), 986-88a, c, d *ter*; sch. Tricl. A. *Ag.* 104b, 121a, sch. Tricl. A. *Eu.* 490b, 511; sch. A.R. 183.5 (2.712-13); sch.vet. Ar. *Pax* 453a, sch.vet. Ar. *Av.* 1764, sch.vet. Ar. *Ran.* 209, 216, 1275, 1285, Tz. *Comm. in Ar. Av.* 1764 (sch.Tz. Ar. *Av.* 1764 < sch.vet. Ar. *Av.* 1764), *Comm. in Ar. Ran.* 1265 (sch.Tz. Ar. *Ran.* 1265); sch. Pi. *O.* 9.1i, 9.3*l*

ἐφύμνιος Heph. *Poëm.* 70.13 (7.1); Andr.Cr. *Or.* 12 *bis*: 97.1064c, 97.1068a MPG, *Or.* 16: 97.1153b MPG; Jo.D. *Carm.* 1.43, p. 206 AGC (*Carm.theog.* 43, 96.821a MPG); *Et.Gud.* ε 572 *bis*