

“A Song to Match my Song”: Lyric Doubling in Euripides’ *Helen*

Andrew L. Ford
Princeton University

Friedrich Solmsen opened new paths into the *Helen* in 1934 when he showed that certain details of the play’s language, notably the antithesis between *onoma* and *pragma*, reflected major intellectual debates of the day. While Solmsen focused on problems of cognition and perception that were being discussed by the sophists, subsequent studies have expanded the scope of issues addressed, finding references to Gorgianic skepticism about language and communication¹ and Anaxagorean thinking about *eidōla*.² From this more recent criticism new thematic concerns of the play have come into view, notably the nature of art, as in the repeated oppositions of copy to original, of *mimēsis* to reality.³ In this line, I propose that, alongside its metaphysical doubles (such as between seeming and being or name and thing) and metapoetic doubles (reality and illusion, truth and art), *Helen* puts in play a set of oppositions that center on *mousikē*. Poetry and song were, after all, also subjects of speculation and research in the fifth century, as in Herodotus’ inquiries into the history of song types or Democritus’ thesis that primitive man learned to sing by imitating the swan and nightingale.⁴ The purpose of this paper is to show how these issues surface in the lyric passages of Euripides’ play.⁵ I will focus on the parodos, since it is not much studied and in my view is often not well understood. I will also point more

1 Notably Downing (1990), Meltzer (1994), and Wright (2005) ch. 4, for whom the play is effectively a dramatization of *On Not Being*.

2 Cf. Pippin Burnett (1960); Segal (1971b) 561, 608.

3 As Zeitlin (1981) 203 observes, *Helen* remains in this play “the figure upon whom can be focused the poetic problems of imitation itself”. Cf. Pippin Burnett (1960) and Segal (1971b) esp. 612.

4 See Ford (2002) 133–52 on Herodotus and 145–146, with n. 57 and (forthcoming) on Democritus (154 DK).

5 Pucci (1997) 70–74, Barker (2007) and Murnaghan (forthcoming) have penetrating remarks on the lyric dynamics in the play.

briefly to subsequent lyrics that raise the anthropological question of the origin of song and the related question of whether song originates in nature or in art. My argument will be that Euripides explores this topic by taking women's lament as a prototypical lyric form and suggests that musical art arose when solo expressions of grief were echoed or "doubled" in various ways.⁶

A paradigmatic case of musical doubling is the *parodos*. It begins with an extraordinary invocation in which Helen prays to the Sirens to provide musical accompaniment to her lament, "a song to match my song" (173). As Paley long ago observed, "the wish of Helen, that the Sirens might come to her aid in singing is in a manner realized by the approach of the chorus who respond antithetically to her monody".⁷ In providing, metrically and presumably musically, the "matching" (*sunokha*, 172)⁸ song Helen had called for, the chorus gives us the first of many lyric doubles in the play. This implication is underscored by the formal structure of the *parodos*, which is unique in extant Euripides: Euripides often composed *parodoi* to be sung *di' amoibaion*, but *Helen* is the only example in which the lyrics are neatly divided between a strophe sung by the protagonist and an antistrophe by the chorus, a division that is reiterated in a second strophic pair (191–210 = 211–228).⁹ In its language and themes as well, the *parodos* explores how solo song can be augmented by being repeated or doubled by other voices, a theme that recurs in later lyrics. The first stasimon begins by invoking the nightingale to lead a lament, thus offering a natural prototype for Helen as leader of a mourning chorus; the great ode to the Mountain Mother gives a compatible image in the scene in which the grieving goddess is comforted by a divine chorus.

6 Downing (1990) 3 notes the appropriateness that, in this play about Helen as a double object, "the poet repeatedly delights in doubling of his language". My reading brings out the musical aspects of what he identifies as an "almost obsessive 'germination' which dominates both its structure and its theme". LeVen (n.d.) also explores how "la multiplication verbale fait en effet écho au problème de la multiplication de la nature d'Hélène".

7 Paley (1874³) ad 129. Cf. Barker (1984) 68 n. 37 and Pucci (1997) 53, 59, noting that the substitution of women for Sirens invites the audience to be aware of tragic conventions.

8 *sunokha* at 172 suggests both "congruent with" and "rhythmically accompanying": Willink (1990) 89, citing *Bacch.* 160 ff.

9 *Parodoi* are shared between chorus and actors in [Aesch.] *PV*, *Soph. El.*, *Phil.*, *OC*; Euripides did so eight times (not counting *Rhes.*), beginning with *Medea*. Cf. Hose (1990) vol. 1, 96–100, vol. 2, 236–237; Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 59–60; pertinent remarks in Dale (1967) 75; Taplin (1977) 246–247, 473; Willink (1990) 77 n. 3; Burian (2007) 200.

Taken together, the songs of *Helen* intimate a genealogy that traces song to the inarticulate grieving of abandoned women. Solitary cries of pain are converted into musical art when others come to share the mourner's burden: a chorus gives articulation and shape to a soloist's lament and creates the possibility of future repetitions, formal and controlled, in which ceremonial choirs of women elaborate that first cry into an art which can be repeated at regular intervals to please the gods. In referring to these modes of repetition as “doubling,” I acknowledge Pietro Pucci's reading of *Helen* that insists that the conceptual oppositions in the play be deconstructed like Derridean supplements, uncanny doubles of which each is the source of the other. Pucci's reading puts the integrity of any postulated “original” in doubt and so, having sought to bring out the musical discourse on the origins of song in *Helen*, I will return at the end to consider how his observations destabilize Euripides' picture.

Parodos: Proode and Strophe A (164–178)

The dramatic pretext for the parodos is Helen's need to lament an unprecedented mass of troubles. Euripides starts the theme in the prologue by having her “recount the ills I have suffered” (22–23), including a husband compelled to go to war, many dead on her account, and an unjust reputation as an adulteress and the cause of war (41–55). These are added to in the first episode when Teucer informs her that her husband is rumored dead, her mother has hung herself in shame, and her brothers have died at their own hands. When Teucer departs, he leaves Helen alone on stage to give expression to her grief. Now that the deaths of kin are in view, lamentation requires a higher musical register than her earlier trimeters; but Helen's sorrows are so vast that she does not know where to begin (164–166):

ὦ μεγάλων ἀχέων καταβαλλομένα μέγαν οἴκτον	164
ποῖον ἀμιλλαθῶ γόνον ἢ τίνα μοῦσαν ἐπέλθω	
[δάκρυσιν ἢ θρήνοις ἢ πένθεσιν; αἰαί.]	166a

Oh to lay the foundation of a lament as great as my griefs are great
 what sort of lament can I muster, what Muse approach?
 [in tears or dirges or gestures of grief? Alas.]¹⁰

10 I follow Willink (1990) 79–80 in bracketing 166, a plausible pentameter but difficult to interpret; as he points out (79), “the appended disjunction is inconsistent with the commitment to threnody enunciated at 164–165”. The interpolation is a common topos, dubitation among alternative modes of grieving:

ah ah!

The brief dactylic *proode* opens with a shapely hexameter announcing the theme of the forthcoming parodos: exceptional sufferings call for an exceptional lament. The need for proportion between the two is underscored in the paregmenon of *meγas*, the first of numerous figures of repetition we will notice.¹¹ The verb *kataballesthai* sitting in the middle of the line intimates, through its long history in lyric *prooimnia*, that Helen is “laying the foundation” for a song.¹² The implication is mildly provocative since Helen is alone and no musician is at hand.¹³ More specifically, the metaphor and the dactylic rhythm assimilate her cry to the kitharodic proem, considered one of the oldest forms of lyric in the fifth century.¹⁴ The effect of evoking it here is, as Willink (1990, 78) says, to add “a flavour of solemn ‘song-inception’ to the opening hexameter”. It also focuses attention on Helen’s forthcoming song, for the proem was an attention-getting moment in the kitharode’s art.¹⁵ Helen then begins the parodos proper with an elaborate lyric invocation; it is one of the most ornamented, complex, and paradoxical variations on the form.

cf. Hypsipyle’s *thrēnos* in *Hyps.* fr. 1.4.5-9 Bond (= 752h.5-9 TrGF) with Bond 1963: 78-9 and Antigone’s monody in *Phoen.* 1498-1503. On *Hel.* 166a, see Willink (1990) 79 n. 13.

- 11 See Breitenbach (1934) 221 and 221-6 on *paregmenon* and *polyptoton* generally.
- 12 Cf. Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 65 pointing to Homeric (ἀνα)βάλλεσθαι (ἀναβολή) for beginning a song (e.g. *Od.* 8.266-7) and Pindar’s metaphorical use of the verbs in connection with “laying foundations” of song (e.g. *Pyth.* 1.3-4, *Pyth.* 7.1-3; cf. *Pyth.* 4.138). Allusion to old forms is blended with novelty: see Willink (1990) 78 n. 9 who suggests the prefix in Euripides’ *kataballesthai* may be a neologism, influenced by κατάρχεσθαι. Cf. Dale (1967) *ad loc.*
- 13 Helen’s isolation is ironically underscored by *hamillathō* (165), which Dale (1967) 76 glosses, “as it were, ‘enter as my contribution to the contest’ ... from the notion of outdoing rival performances”. Burnett (1971) 77 rightly notes that Helen “begin[s] with a stylized *prooimion*”, though epinician is not the genre suggested.
- 14 Not to epic recitative: non-epic touches in Helen’s language are the “Doric” καταβαλλομένα and ἀρχέων pronounced without synizesis. On “laying foundations” as a kitharodic metaphor, see Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 60 who compares Timotheos 788 *PMG*.
- 15 On the prominence of the *prooimion* in kitharody, cf. [Plut.] *Mus.* 4.1132d-e and the comic verb *amphianaktizein* (“Begin with the lord”) for composing preludes (Cratinus 72 K-A; Aristoph. fr. 62 K-A), derived from the opening words of Terpander’s Orthian *prooimion* (697 *PMG*).

The parodos is beset with deep problems of interpretation and re-spon-sion that I do not pretend to treat fully.¹⁶ It will be enough if we can follow what the stanza as a whole is saying; the only textual choice that my reading depends on is following the manuscript (L) and reading *pempseie* in the third person at verse 174b (“may she [Persephone] send”). With this exception (and with less major differences in 170 and 175), the text that follows is based on Allan (2008), with a minimal apparatus to signal some of the less certain spots:

πτεροφόροι νεάνιδες,
 παρθένοι Χθονὸς κόραι,
 Σειρήνες, εἶθ' ἔμοῖς
 μόλοιτ' ἔχουσα 170
 Λίβυν λωτὸν ἢ σύ-
 ριγγας αἰλίνοις κακοῖς·
 τοῖς <δ'> ἔμοῖσι σύνοχα δάκρυα,
 πάθεσι πάθεα, μέλεσι μέλεα,
 μουσεῖα θρηγήμα-
 σι ξυνωιδᾶ πέμψειε
 Φερσέφασσα φόνια, χάριτας 175
 ἴν' ἐπὶ δάκρυσι παρ' ἔμέθεν ὑπὸ
 μέλαθρα νύχια παιᾶνα
 νέκυσιν ὀλομένοις λάβηι.

169 ἔμοῖς Aldina: ἔμοῖς γόοις L 170 ὀμιλοῖτ' Willink 171a-b ἢ
 σύριγγας Tr³: ἢ σύριγγας ἢ φόρμιγγας L 172 <δ'> Willink 174b
 πέμψαιτε Bothe, alii 175 φόνια φόνια Tr³: φόνιον ἄχαριν Willink

Winged girls,
 maiden daughters of Earth,
 Sirens, would that
 you would come, bringing 170
 the Libyan lotus-flute or pan-pipes to my wails of woe;
 and would that tears to match [my tears],
 sufferings matching sufferings, songs matching songs,
 a deadly concert hall resounding with dirges,
 Persephone might send, so that she may have a thank-offering 175
 and in the halls of Night receive from me in tears
 a paean for those dead and gone.

16 Willink's (1990) indispensable discussion finds the tradition “already seriously corrupt in antiquity” (81). I am indebted to Justina Gregory for discussing some of the textual problems in the parodos.

Helen resolves her *aporia* by invoking divine aid, but her theme requires underworld divinities rather than Muses.¹⁷ The invocation begins as a cletic hymn: the Sirens are asked to “come” (*moloit*, 170)¹⁸ to Egypt from the underworld, no doubt on their wings (167). They are to bring pipes instead of the lyres they usually bear in iconography, for lyres often accompanied happy song.¹⁹ This, the first lyric in Euripides’ “new” Helen (Ar. *Thesm.* 850), is to be a new kind of song to match a new extremity of suffering.²⁰

Helen returns to the theme of the *proode* at verse 172 (where Willink’s insertion of *de* marks the change of focus). She wants the Sirens to copy her words and gestures exactly, stressing the closeness with which they are to match her actions in a very rare double *paregmenon*: *pathesi pathea, melesi melea* (173).²¹ The Sirens’ “song to match her song” will thus be a kind of double of Helen’s expression of grief and is presented as such in the rest of the strophe.

There follows in 174 a difficult phrase, *mouseia thrēnēmasi xunōida*, which is both semantically and syntactically ambiguous. I have translated it as a fourth appositive to the tears, gestures, and songs (172–173) the Sirens are to bring; it proleptically characterizes their joint performance as a “concert hall resounding with dirges”. This reading gives *mouseia* its usual local meaning, a *place* for activities connected with the Muses, which is the sense the word has in a later lyric in the play (1108). The

17 In the literary tradition, Homer’s Sirens already figure as “infernal counterparts to the Muses”: see Ford (1992) 53–54 and Barker (2007) 9–11. Willink (1990) 79 is right that 165 may read either *Mousa* (“what Muse should I approach”) or *mousa* (“to what musical mode should I have recourse”; cf. *IT.* 181–182 and Bond 1963: 77). However, *pace* Allan, the relevance to what follows is lost if we rule out any reference to Muses. Cf. Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 66.

18 Willink (1990) 87 with nn. 47–8 proposes *homiloit*’ (partly to respond to 182, a troubled passage itself, and partly to anchor the datives better). I disagree with his setting the Sirens’ performance in the Underworld (see below), but if *homiloite* be preferred, the sense of “coming” is still present in *ekhousai*, “bringing” or “carrying”. For a protagonist summoning a chorus to share in her lament, cf. *Tro.* 142–152 and *IT* 138–142.

19 Triclinius’ deletion of “or of lyres” in 171 on metrical grounds gives the sentence more point: Willink (1990) 1990: 87, with n. 49; *pace* Dale (1967) 78, *ad* 172 (who documents the Sirens’ association with tombs and lyres); cf. Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 67.

20 Cf. LeVen (n.d.) “Dans cette ode, l’interrogation sur la manière de faire un thrène, l’invocation des Sirènes et la réflexion sur le statut de la répétition verbale sont les voix qu’utilisent Hélène et le chœur pour penser la proper identité d’Hélène”.

21 Breitenbach (1934) 225; on the text, Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 116.

paradoxical metaphor brings out the thought that Helen's emotional outburst, when matched with the Sirens' accompaniment, will resemble a formal musical presentation, the kind of thing that at Athens could have been presented in the Periclean Odeion. The metaphor caps a progression in the appositives in 172–174 that begin with mute, bodily expressions of grief—bursting out in tears, dumb self-defiling gestures—and rise to musical speech before ending in the image of a concert hall, a social institution for elaborating sound into art. At this point, what Helen had referred to as her cries of woe (*ailinois*, 171b) and perhaps laments (if L's *goois* in 169 is not a gloss) is called a *thrēnos*, a formal dirge (174).²²

I shall return to the opposition between natural and artistic expressions of sorrow, but first must note that a number of editors radically change the picture here by adopting the old emendation *pempsaite* (“may you [Sirens] emit”).²³ The Sirens remain the subject and are asked to “send” or emit their song in the underworld for Persephone's pleasure. On this reading, *mouseia* (174) is taken in predicative apposition to the Sirens and interpreted metonymically as “you singers”. Willink so argues, observing that “halls of songs” cannot be “sent”. He paraphrases: “and (I wish) that (as) *mouseia* in concert with my lamentation / (you) might emit/transmit *dakrua*, *pathea*, *melea* congruent with mine, / so that (*also*, where) Persephone ... may tearfully receive from me / a paean to the dead in the halls of Night”.²⁴ The chief defect with this scenario is that it ignores the theme of reciprocal exchange (*kharis*), which is strongly marked by the sequence *pempseie* (174)—*kharitas* (175)—*labēi* (178).²⁵ With *pempsaite* and the Sirens performing in Hades, it is hard to see what reciprocity is due Persephone, and we are required to take *kharitas* weakly as “pleasure”. If on the other hand we retain *pempseie*, the theme of reciprocity fits well, as Dale explains: “‘where shall I go for Musical inspiration?’ and the answer is: The Sirens with their musical

22 On the opposition in lamentation between the *goos*, the emotional and uncontrolled wailing of female kin, and the *thrēnos*, which implies musically skilled *aidoi*, see Barker (2007) 12–13 and Segal (1993a), analyzing *Iliad* 24, with Martin (2003).

23 E.g. Willink (1990) 89, followed by Kovacs in his Loeb edition (2002), Allan (2008).

24 Willink (1990) 89 n. 56; paraphrase on 85. Allan (2008) 171 also understands that the Sirens' “corresponding music and song, performed in the underworld, will, she hopes, enable Persephone to hear her lament”.

25 Against emendations of *kharitas* such as Willink's (1990) 90 *phonion akharin*, see Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, *ad* 176–8 and *ad* 173–6 defending *φόνια* as an epithet to *mouseia*.

instruments could give it; if Persephone would send them I could make her the gift of a paean for the acceptance of the dead in her chambers of night".²⁶

Getting the direction of the song right is important because it allows us to appreciate the strong final conceit of the strophe, that in the underworld Helen's dirge (*thrēnēmasi*, 174) will undergo a change in genre and become a paean (177).²⁷ The term is deliberately paradoxical, for paeans proverbially had no place in Hades. No one would direct a song of triumph or thanksgiving to Hades, nor even a paean praying for deliverance, for paeans were only sung in situations admitting of salvation or remedy; for death, a *thrēnos* is the only response.²⁸ Precisely because paeans were antithetical to dirges, troping a lament as an infernal paean is common in tragedy.²⁹ Still, we may ask why the trope is used here. What kind of song does Helen envision, and for whom is it intended? To answer these questions we must take a detour and examine a very similar song from Aristophanes' *Birds*, a short monody by Tereus that is also the first song in its play. This high-style stanza has been identified as influencing a later lyric in *Helen*,³⁰ but it also casts a direct light on the first strophe of the parodos, for it is an invocation as well, and one that

26 Dale (1967) 76 *ad* 165. Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 70 *ad* 176-8 speaks of a *quid pro quo* payment to Persephone. Willink (1990) 89 holds it in favor of *pempsaite* that the two verbs introduced by *eithe* are both second-person; but the change of subject in *pempsaie* is prepared for by Willink's *d'* in 171, and the resulting chiasmus of subject and verb is appropriate (chiasmus being a form of reciprocity): the *Sirens* are to *come*, they are to be *sent* by *Persephone*.

27 The closest Euripidean parallel to *Helen's* parodos is thus the exchange of astrophic songs between Iphigenia and the chorus in *IT* 123-235; note esp. 179-185 in which the chorus answers Iphigenia's astrophic lament with the promise to shout out (ἐξουδάσω, 181) "antiphonal songs" (ἀντιψάλλουσιν ὠτιδὰς ὕμνων, 179); they declare that this is the form of music that the dead cultivate and Hades performs, quite a different song from paeans (183-185: τὰν ἐν θρήνοισιν μοῦσαν / νέκυσσι μελομένην, τὰν ἐν μολπαῖς / Ἄδης ὕμνεϊ δίχρα παιάνων).

28 Käppel (1992) 47; cf. Ford (2007) with further literature. Cf. Eur. *IT* 184-185: "the song that Hades sings, far from paeans" (τὰν ἐν μολπαῖς / Ἄδης ὕμνεϊ δίχρα παιάνων) and Aesch. *TrGF* fr. 161 with Fraenkel (1950a) on *Ag.* 645 and Bond (1981) on *HF* 348.

29 Rutherford (2001) 115-126 finds such "ambiguity" typical of representations of the paean in tragedy; see esp. 48-50, and 118-120 for its paradoxical linkages with the chthonic sphere.

30 Fraenkel (1950b) 175-177 sees *Hel.* 1107-1113 as derived from *Birds* 209-215, so too Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 281 n. 8; others allow for a possible common source: Silk (1980) 101, Pucci (1997) 71 n. 62. On Tereus' monody, see Zimmermann (1985) vol. 1, 70-74, Barker (2004) 191-195 (arguing that it represents 'New music'); Corbel-Morana (2004) is a valuably full study.

pictures spontaneous lament finding a divine accompaniment. In addition, the Aristophanic lament also seems to change its genre as it enters another realm, thus anticipating Euripides' theme of the transformation of grief by art.

The Hoopoe's Song (*Birds* 209–222)

As in *Helen* 167–178, the function of the first monody in *Birds* is to convene a chorus. Tereus, metamorphosed into a hoopoe, bids his mate, Procne, now a nightingale, to sing and summon the other birds (209–222):

Ἄγε σύννομέ μοι, παῦσαι μὲν ὕπνου, λύσον δὲ νόμους ἱερῶν ὕμνων, οὓς διὰ θείου στόματος θρηνηῖς τὸν ἔμὸν καὶ σὸν πολὺδακρυον Ἴτυν, ἐλελιζομένη διεροῖς μέλεσιν γένυος ξουθῆς. Καθαρὰ χωρεῖ διὰ φυλλοκόμου μίλακος ἤχῳ	210
πρὸς Διὸς ἔδρας, ἴν' ὁ χρυσοκόμας Φοῖβος ἀκούων τοῖς σοῖς ἐλέγοις ἀντιψάλλων ἐλεφαντόδετον φόρμιγγα θεῶν ἴστησι χορούς· διὰ δ' ἄθανάτων στομάτων χωρεῖ ξύμφωνος ὁμοῦ θεία μακάρων ὀλολυγή.	215 220

Come, my musical nest-mate, leave off sleep,
and loose the strains of sacred song,
lamenting through your godlike lips
my son and yours, Itus many-teared,
your trilling mouth aquiver
in liquid song. Pure, its echo proceeds
through leaf-tressed briony
to the seat of Zeus, where golden-tressed
Phoebus hears, and for your elegy
provides accompaniment, plucking his lyre, ivory-inlaid,
and setting up a chorus: through
their immortal lips proceeds
in perfect harmony
the godlike cry (*ololugē*) of the blessed ones.

As a bird, Tereus calls not on a Muse but on his nest-mate, the nightingale. The substitution of animal for (divine) singer makes sense as part of a series of oppositions between nature and *tekhnē* in the lyric, a theme

signaled by the punning first epithet *sun-nomos* (209). The nightingale is an animal that shares a *nomós*, a natural habitat, with her fellow bird; but Procne is also a singer who commands a musical mode, a *nómos* of sacred song (cf. *nómous* in 210).³¹ This nightingale embodies spontaneous, natural song; the fact that Procne was a mortal before metamorphosing into an animal (like Tereus, 75, 98, 114 ff.) may be thought to complicate the image, and will be considered in my conclusion. Here at any rate, her singing is presented as an instinctive act: she no sooner rises than sings, and every time she sings it is the same sad theme, “Itus of many a tear”. The trills from the bird’s throat are a “fluid”, inarticulate song (*dierois melesin*, 213);³² this is not human speech, but a ceaseless, almost compulsive repetition of syllables.

Procne’s repetitive calling of her son’s name then undergoes an extraordinary sublimation to become a joyful choral celebration accompanied by Apollo’s lyre. In three distinct stages (each marked by a *dia*) the cry of sorrow from her “godlike mouth” (211) is transformed until it is echoed by “immortal mouths” on Olympus (220–221).³³ (1) the bird’s throat is set aquiver like a plucked lyre-string (*elelizomenē*);³⁴ (2) its echo, perhaps called “pure” because detached from its agonizing source, rises up through the leaves of its natural place (its *nomós*) and reaches heaven; (3a) there it is heard by Apollo as a *nómos*, a kind of song, the mournful *elegos*;³⁵ (3b) Apollo adds musical accompaniment (*anti-psallón*), and the song, artfully elaborated on an instrument that is itself a work of art (*elephanto-deton*), evokes a response from a divine chorus which shouts out

31 The same word-play underlies *sunnomos* used of the poet at *Birds* 678; cf. 736–781 and *Thesm.* 947, 983.

32 Cf. Lucretius’ “liquid” calls of birds (*liquidas avium voces*) that were imitated in the first songs (*DRN* 5.1380).

33 Procne’s song “proceeds” (*khorei dia phullokomou*, 215) as Apollo’s song proceeds (*dia ... khorei*, 221). Pace the dismissive discussion by Silk (1980) 102, who treats such repetition as deplorable “prolixity”.

34 Corbel-Morana (2004) 228, 234–235, cites *Pyth.* 1.3–4: the lyre “when set quivering furnishes the up-beat for *proemia* that lead choruses” (ἀγρησιχόρων ὀπίσταν προοιμίων / ἀμβολὰς τεύχης ἐλελιζομένα). There may be in *elelizomenē* (213) a hint of *elissein*, “set astir”, and the cry *eleleu*, “alas, alas”; cf. Mastronarde (1994) on *Phoen.* 1514 and Corbel-Morana (2004) 236.

35 In 185 *elegon* is Triclinius’ replacement for *thrēnon*; cf. *alurois elegois* at *IT* 146. *elegos* does not yet have a connection with the elegiac meter: see E. Bowie, “Elegy” in *Brills New Pauly Online* (2009). There is possibly also a reference to the repetitive nature of the *elegos* from its folk derivation from *e e legein*, “say, woe woe”.

ololugē.³⁶ The strophe ends by quoting the Olympian refrain, which may ring ambiguously: an *ololugē* is a climactic cry, often a ritual women's shout to express joy or, less often, distress.³⁷ Pain of course is absent from “the blessed ones” (222), and so we must imagine that whatever sense of loss inhered in the original cry has been cancelled from the “harmonious” and “godlike” *ololugē* that comes from their immortal lips.

Two years later, the opening strophe of *Helen* exhibits a similar plot. With the difference that the tragic monodist directs her song downward to Hades, both songs show a solitary outpouring of sorrow being sublimated into a fundamentally different kind of song: the Sirens' accompaniment is to transform Helen's cries of woe (*ailinois*, 172b) into a formal dirge (*thrēnos*, 174), which then can enter another world and be changed again into a song greeted by a shout of joy (177). We can now return to the question of why Helen's invocation ends with this provocative *paean*.

Some commentators suggest that Helen's song is offered to those who have died because of her as an act of restitution (*kharis* 176).³⁸ But it is Persephone who is named as the recipient of the song (*labēi*, 178), not the dead. Focalisation is at issue here, and I think the dead are interested in the *paean* as a song that Persephone will sing to them as she entertains them in the halls of her father Night (as Willink well interprets *nukhia*).³⁹ Helen imagines underworld symposia that mirror, and reverse, the earthly rite: if on earth one accompanied libations with *paean*s to “the heroes” and the chthonic deities, underworld heroes may use songs from above at their parties, and no song is more characteristic of the upper world than the dirge, that quintessential song of mortality.⁴⁰

36 With the divine *ololugē*, Bremer (1993) 158 n. 68 aptly compares the swan-song at 770-784: this rises to produce *thambos* on Olympus, where the Graces and Muses “add a shout of joy” (ἐπωλόλυξαν, 783).

37 On *ololugē*, see Deubner (1941) 10-12 (a cry of admiration or triumphant jubilation) and Dunbar (1995) *ad loc.*

38 Segal (1993a) 60 speaks of Helen's “song of thanksgiving” for the dead, but gratitude is not on her mind. Similarly, I do not agree with Käppel (1992) 48-49 that Helen feels so guilty that she wishes to make the Trojan warriors undead through a “*paean* for the dead”. Willink (1990) 82 notes that at Aesch. *Cho.* 320-322 survivors' laments (*goos*) are said to give *kharis* to the dead (χάριτες δ' ὁμοίως / κέκληνται γόος εὐκλεῆς / † προσθοδόμοις Ἀτρείδαις), but rightly observes “gratifications for the dead” is obscure.

39 Willink (1990) 90; cf. 91 where Willink construes the dative *nekusin olomenois* as “for”, “offered to” (citing K-G 1.428).

40 See Rutherford (2001) 50-52 for the sympotic *paean* (sources at his n. 60). The *kommos* of *Choephoroi* expresses a transformation from dirge to sympotic *paean*, though only as a wish: “instead of *thrēnoi* by the tomb may the *paian* in the

Helen thus invokes the Sirens' accompaniment to magnify the reach of her song, and in the process to change her lament into an entertainment for the noble dead, who will add their ambiguous "Paean!"⁴¹

Parodos Antistrophe A: Echo and Responion (179-190)

As mentioned, Helen's impossible prayer for accompaniment to her lament succeeds after a fashion when the Trojan women arrive and sing an antistrophe. The chorus' bright, new-dithyrambic song (Kannicht *ad* 179-180) strikes a sharply different note from Helen's, but they advert to their role as antiphonists in two ways. The first is their explanation that they have come from doing the laundry, waiting for the sun to dry "purple" garments (181). This detail is not much illuminated by referring to *Hippolytus*, in which a women's chorus also arrives from washing (121-130). A more resonant parallel is a scene from *Od.* 6.85 ff. in which Nausicaa and her maids wash royal robes by the sea: while the laundry dries, the girls begin to sport (ἔπαιζον, 6.100) and Nausicaa leads them in a song and dance (τῆσι δὲ Ναυσικᾶα λευκώλενος ἤρχετο μολπῆς, 6.101). The princess becomes an impromptu *choragus* for her maids, as the poet makes clear by comparing her to Artemis leading joyful maidens' choirs (*Od.* 6.102-9; cf. *Hom. Hymn to Artemis* 27.11-20).⁴² In a similar way, Helen's wish for musical accompaniment leads to an improvised "choeur de jeunes filles," with the sorrowing queen as its leader.⁴³

The chorus refer to the accompaniment they provide a second time in their insistence that the melancholy cry that drew them was only an indecipherable noise: a din (*homados*, 184), a scream (*elaken*, 185), wailing (*aiagmasi*, 186), groaning (*stenousa*, 186), a shout (*anaboa*, 190).

royal halls usher in the newly mixed bowl of wine" (342-344: ἀντὶ δὲ θρήνων ἐπιτυμβιδίων / παιῶν μελάθροισ ἐν βασιλείοις / νεοκράττα φίλον κομίσειεν, trans. Rutherford 2001: 119 n. 7).

- 41 In *nekusin olomenois* (178, "the dead and departed"), the epithet is not pleonastic (cf. *nekun olomenon* in *Phoen.* 1295) but connotes (via *Il.* 1.2) the "heroic dead" of the Trojan war; the verb is associated with the Trojan war casualties at *Helen* 384-385 (in *anadiplosis*); cf. 232.
- 42 Cf. Burian (2007) 202 *ad* 179-90 and Ford (1992) 118-9 on the Nausicaa scene and its metapoetic aspects for the *Odyssey*.
- 43 The Sirens invoked by Helen also had a role as paradigms in maiden songs, see Calame (1977) vol. 2, 79 ff., esp. 81 n. 67. With Helen's "winged young women, maidens..." (*pterophoroi neanides / parthenoi*, 167-8), cf. Stesichorus' "gold-winged maiden" in his second palinode (*khrusoptere parthene*, 193 PMG), which may have been addressed to a Siren.

Thoughtful and subtle as we have seen the first strophe to be, the chorus has heard it as an artless, impulsive outburst; it was an *aluros elegos* (185), “a song of grief not meet for the lyre”.⁴⁴ The implication is that, without their intervention, Helen’s impulsive expression of emotion would remain purely artless.⁴⁵ The choral subtext comes out in the antistrophe’s final image, comparing Helen’s cries to the screams of a nymph fleeing a sexual assault of Pan (186–190 Allan):

αἰάγμα-
 σι στένουσα νύμφα τις,
 οἷα Ναΐς ὄρεσι φύγδα
 νόμον ἰεῖσα γοερὸν, ὑπὸ δὲ
 πέτρινα γύαλα κλαγγαῖσι
 Πανὸς ἀναβοᾶι γάμους. 190

187 φύγδα Herwerden: φυγάδα L 188 νόμον Matthiae: γάμων L 189
 γύαλα Dindorf: μύαλα γ- L κλαγγαῖσι Murray: -ὰς L

some Nymph crying woe,
 such as a Naiad in flight sends out to the mountains,
 a mournful strain, and in accompaniment
 to the screams the rocky recesses
 shout aloud the marriage of Pan. 190

Isolated and far from help, the Naiad yet produces a kind of music, a mournful “strain” (*nómon*, on a probable emendation of the awkward *gamōn* in 188). My translation of what then happens (188–190) again ventures to differ from the prevalent view (Kannicht, Kovacs, Burian), according to which the Naiad shouts within (*hupo*) mountain caves. Reverting to an older reading (Reiske, Paley, Allen-Italie), I read a change of subject in v. 188, so that the rocky hollows (*guala* or *mukhala*) shout out in accompaniment to (taking *hupo* in tmesis with *anaboa*) the nymph’s cries; that is, they echo her.⁴⁶ The unnamed nymph fleeing Pan may make us think of Echo, though it must be noted that she is an Oread rather than a Naiad in *Hecuba* (1110) and the story of Echo and

44 Translation by Dale. For *aluros elegos* (repeated at *IT* 146), cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 990–992, *Eum.* 330–332, Soph. *OC* 1222, Eur. *Alc.* 447 (*Phoen.* 1028 is unclear).

45 Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 58: “Das Parodos-amoibaion ist zunächst elementarer Ausbruch vehementer Klage und fassungslose Vergegenwärtigung des Ausmasses dieser *sumphorai* in der Form unreflektiert klagender Herzählung”.

46 See Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 73–4. For tmesis of *hupo*- in verbs of musical accompaniment, cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.570, *Od.* 21.411, *H. Hom. Herm.* 502; *aneboa* is apt for resonating sounds, it is used of cymbals at *Hel.* 1309.

Pan is not attested before the Hellenistic age.⁴⁷ The music of Pan is in any case appropriately characterized as a plangent mountain echo: in the *Hom. Hymn to Pan* the mountain peaks “groan” an “echo” when he sings and dances with the nymphs.⁴⁸ The antistrophe that “echoes” Helen’s strophe thus closes on an allusion to a cry of distress that finds an echo. The repetition that the rocks provide makes them into a kind of chorus in the wild, suggesting again a naturalized version of formal antiphony. We may see further a generic transformation in the scene: when the nymph’s cries of “Rape!” are echoed, they are heard (by us) as “the marriage of Pan” (90), as it were the refrain of an inartful, indeed an uncivilized *humenaïos*.

In its diction, themes, and staging, then, the first strophic pair of *Helen* shows the heroine transformed from solitary mourner into the leader of a maiden’s choir.⁴⁹ When Helen began, as far as the audience knew, she had embarked on a solo aria, for Euripides was quite accustomed to inserting astrophic monodies before the parodos.⁵⁰ But as her cries reverberate, like the Nightingale’s from its tree, they find a response from an unexpected quarter, like the Naiad crying to the mountain wastes. From these sonic doubles let us turn to verbal repetitions in the lyrics.

47 *Andromeda*, produced with *Helen* in 412, exploited echo for dramaturgical effect in the first scene in which Andromeda chants her distress in lyric antiphony with an echo from a cave (fr. 118 Kannicht, mocked in Ar. *Thesmo.* 1059 ff.). See Zeitlin (1996) 397.

48 *Hymn.* 19.14–21, esp. 16: κορυφήν δὲ περιστένει οὖρεος ἠχώ, with which cf. στένουσα (“groaning”) in *Hel.* 186. At v. 18, Pan is compared to a nightingale that “gushes out a dirge in a gush” (θρῆνον ἐπιπροχέουσα χέει), where West’s Loeb retains the transmitted verbal echo, though for Halliday, Allen and Sikes “the repetition ἐπιπροχέουσα χέει is hardly tolerable”. On Pan here, see Borgeaud (1988) ch. 4 (“sexuality and music”) esp. 76–88, Pucci (1997), 54–55.

49 Foley (1992) 146, citing Calame (1977) vol. 1, 92, 127 and *passim*. Segal (1993b) 233, referring to *Alcestitis*, *Hippolytus* and *Hecuba* aptly observes: “Euripides’ tragedies are in a sense songs of sorrow. ... also songs of the sorrows that would otherwise be hidden away, uncommemorated because they are endured in the privacy of a secret world where the larger part of Athenian women’s lives unfold”.

50 Euripides sets a monody before the chorus’ entry in *Andromache*, *Hecuba*, *El.*, *Tro.*, *Andromeda*, and *Hyps.* (1.iv = 752f–h.9), on which see Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004) 229–231.

Anadiplosis and Doubled Speech

In the second strophic pair Helen teaches the chorus to sing her new song. As Dale (1967, 80) puts it, “Helen summarizes Teucer’s information, and the chorus then repeats it back to her with sympathy”. Beyond this doubling of content, the chorus learns doubling of diction. The heroine begins the second strophe with a sort of echo, *iô iô* (191), and her song is strongly marked by figures of repetition, including paremenon (*dakrua dakrusi*, 195), anadiplosis (*emolen, emole*, 195; *aphanes aphanes*, 207), and a Gorgianic multiplication of like-sounding epithets (δι’ ἐμὲ τὰν πολυκτόνον, / δι’ ἐμὸν ὄνομα πολύπτονον, 197–198). When the chorus begins the second antistrophe, they seem to have learned to echo Helen’s style (211–214): αἰαῖ δαίμονος πολυστόνου / μοίρας τε σᾶς, γύναϊ. / αἰὼν δυσαίων τις / ἔλαχεν ἔλαχεν κτλ. Their opening cry, *aiai* (211), is a redoubled syllable like Helen’s *iô iô* (191); the epithet they give to describe her fate (*daimonos polustonou*, 211) seems inspired by Helen’s *polu-* compounds in 198–199 (and will be repeated again in Helen’s *poluktonos Kupris*, 238). Like Helen, they generate speech through repetitions of syllables and words: *aiōn dusaiōn* (213), *elakhen elakhen* (214).

What is the reason for this doubling? Helen implied in her invocation that the Sirens’ accompaniment would enable her lament to reach the underworld. This is repetition as echo, as augmenting the reach of sound. But repetition is also appropriate as the characteristic mode of lament. Hence when Helen refers to her “wails of woe”, the use of *ailinois* in the plural (172b) suggests the typically repeated refrains of mourning songs, as in the Aeschylean call for the Linus lament, “say ‘alas for Linus, for Linus,’” (αἴλινον αἴλινον εἰπέ, *Ag.* 121), a repeated refrain that is itself repeated (at 139 and 159).⁵¹ Euripides evokes a poetic idea that lament is at root a repeated cry of the lost one’s name. Pindar supplies its aetiology in what seems to be a *thrēnos* when he traces dirgesinging to a number of Muses mourning their early dead sons; one goddess “sang the resounding Linus, alas for Linus” (ἄχέταν Λίνον αἴλινον ὕμναι, fr. 128c.6 S–M).⁵² The implication is that proper names, repeated over time, evolved into the refrains marking genres of lament such as “the Linus song”. The proper name in mourning becomes a refrain by dint of repetition, and further repetitions smooth the refrain into a

51 Cf. *Soph. Aj.* 627, *Eur. Orest.* 1395. See Fraenkel (1950a) *ad Aesch. Ag.* 121 and Bond (1981) 150 (*ad HF* 348).

52 Ford (2002) 15–16.

common noun, no longer the name of a dead individual but a word that can (mis)name the genre of laments sung over other women's sons.

The same poetic logic underlies many representations of the song of the nightingale as an endless iteration of "Itus, Itus", and may lie behind the epithet "Itus of many a tear" in *Birds* (212). To say *Itus* or *ai Linon* one time is to express *pothos* for what naming cannot bring back; but to say *Itus Itus* or *ailinon ailinon* can be to inaugurate a rite of recuperation, to try to extend the power of speech by doubling its stuff. The mourning nightingale herself appears in the next song of *Helen*. The first stasimon begins with another remarkable invocation as the chorus, in Helen's absence, call on the nightingale to be their accompanist (*sunergos*, 1113) in a dirge (1107–1116):

σὲ τὰν ἐναύλοισ ὑπὸ δενδροκόμοις μουσεῖα καὶ θάκουσ ἐνίζουσαν ἀναβοάσσω, τὰν ἀοιδοτάταν ὄρνιθα μελωιδὸν ἀηδόνα δακρυόεσσαν,	1109b–1110
ἔλθ' ὦ διὰ ξουθᾶν γενύων ἐλελιζομένα θρήνων ἔμοι ξυνεργός, Ἑλένας μελέους πόνους τὸν Ἰλιάδων τ' ἄει- δούσαι δακρυόεντα πόνον	1115
Ἀχαιῶν ὑπὸ λόγχαις	
1115 πότμον Badham	

To you I call, who in tree-tressed bowers sit in your concert hall (<i>mouseia</i>) enthroned, you, most songful melodious bird, tearful nightingale,	1110
come, trilling through your tawny mouth as the fellow-worker of my dirge (<i>thrēnōn</i>), while I sing the painful travails of Helen and the tearful travail of Troy's women	1115
beneath Achaean spears ...	

As in *Birds*, the nightingale's song takes part both of nature and of art, an ambivalence expressed through calling its haunts its "halls of melody" (so Burian 258 translates *mouseia kai thakous*, 1108); the metaphor recalls both the ambiguity of Aristophanes' *sunnomos* and the artful figure of *mouseia* in *Helen's* parodos.

This nightingale is prescribed a double theme by the chorus: the travails of Helen (*Helēnas meleas ponous*, 1113) and the Trojan women's travail (*Iliadōn ponon*, 1115). Editors have found such repetition "scarcely

tolerable” (Dale),⁵³ but it is unnecessary to correct repetitions in an ode that contains several others, especially when it prescribes a theme for mourning. The chorus begins its narrative with an anadiplosis, *emolen, emole* (1118), that echoes Helen’s earlier *emolen, emole* (195) and ends the stasimon by summing up Helen’s fate as “woes upon woes, and grievous *ailinoi* on top of disasters” (ἐπὶ δὲ πάθεα πάθεσι φέρεις †ἀθλίους συμφοραῖς αἰλίνοις†, 1163–1164), another expression they seem to have learned from Helen herself (πάθεσι πάθεα, μέλεσι μέλεα, 173).

It was suggested above that Euripides’ description of the nightingale “quivering in her tawny mouth” (1111) hearkens back to the Aristophanic Procne with “her tawny mouth set aquiver” (*Birds* 213–214). But of course Euripides also engages with a long history of the nightingale as a figure of mourning.⁵⁴ In this tradition, tragic poets emphasize the repetitiveness of her song in figurative language. In Aeschylus a chorus compares the indecipherable cries of Cassandra to the “tuneless-tune” (*nomon anomon*) of the nightingale, insatiable of crying “as she groans Itus Itus” (Ἴτυν Ἴτυν στένουσ’, *Ag.* 1144),⁵⁵ and Euripides spoke of the nightingale in *Phaethon* as “wailing sleeplessly in lamentation, Itus, Itus much-lamented” (fr. 773.25–26 *TrGF*: ὀρθρευομένα γόοις / Ἴτυν Ἴτυν πολύθρηνον). Sophocles varied the game in his “grief-stricken nightingale, wailing for Itus, always Itus” (*El.* 148–149: ἄ Ἴτυν αἰὲν Ἴτυν ὀλοφύρεται, / ὄρνις ἄτυζομένα); he momentarily suspends the iteration, but the interposed word, as Loraux noted, sounds an echo of the refrain *aiai*, “Alas, alas”.⁵⁶ In the nightingale stasimon of *Helen*, it is notable that the word “singing” is broken up metrically (*aei-dousa*, 1114–1115) in such a way as to suggest the endlessness (“ever,” *aei*) of her song.

Paregmenon and *anadiplosis* are widely used in late Euripidean lyric (a mannerism for which he was mocked in *Frogs* 1335–1336, 1352–1354).⁵⁷ In *Helen* these figures are used to suggest lament reduced to its essentials. One could list other examples in *Helen*, along with other allusions to maidens’ choirs to show its persistent interest in ritual women’s cho-

53 Badham’s *potmon* is adopted by Kannicht, Diggle, Kovacs, and Allan; not by Dale. Cf. *ponon* / *aponon* in 1320–1.

54 Cf. *Od.* 19.517–523, *Aesch. Ag.* 1140–1149, *Suppl.* 58–67, *Soph. El.* 103–109, 140–152, 1074–1081, fr. 585. See Pucci (1997) 70–71.

55 Fraenkel (1950a) on *Ag.* 1144f. (vol. 3, 522 n.1, “duplication as a characteristic means of reproducing the sound of the voices of birds”).

56 Loraux (1990) 93. The second *Itun* scans as an iamb, as in *Birds* 213.

57 Breitenbach (1934) 214–221.

ruses.⁵⁸ Space permits only one final reference, in the hymn to the Mountain Mother that constitutes the second stasimon. This song celebrates a chorus (1345) composed of the Graces, the Muses, and Aphrodite to comfort Demeter. Theirs is clearly a primordial song and involves a number of musical aetiologies: Aphrodite “for the first time takes up the tambourines stretched with hide” (1346–1349), and Deo takes in her hands, presumably for the first time, the “deep rumbling” *aulos* (1349–1351).⁵⁹ As in the *parodos* of *Bacchae* (120–134), an *aition* for the use of exotic instruments is appropriate in cult song.⁶⁰ The ode has been read as itself an aetiology of song.⁶¹ All we hear about what was sung by this divine chorus is that they dispelled the sorrow of Deo with their cry *alala* (*lupan allaxait' alalai*, 1344). Their song is again a repetition, and is received as such by the goddess: *gelasen de thea ... terphtheis' al-al-agmōi* (1349–1352).

Looking again at the *parodos*, we see that its musical form, diction, and themes combine to stage it as a primal mortal song of consolation. Accidentally and as if for the first time, the players enact the archetypal form of women's lament.⁶² It is not logical of course that the *parodos* of *Helen*, unprecedented though her sorrows are, should be the first occasion of women's lament. The *Iliad* had shown her at Troy “leading the lament” (*exērkhē gooio*, 24.761, etc.) for Trojan women who groan in response (*epi de stenakhonto gunaikēs*, *Il.* 24.746); Pindar had shown goddesses inventing lament songs. Nonetheless, setting *Helen* in Egypt lends

58 Foley (1992), esp. 144–147 draws out the theme, as in the reference to Callisto and the daughter of Merops driven from Artemis' chorus (381) and in picturing Helen's return as her leading once again the girls' choruses in Sparta (1465–1478). Foley notes the role cult dances play in proper transition to marriage, as when Persephone herself was snatched from a choir (1311–1312, on which Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 341 notes how, “with Alexandrian attention to detail”, the poet justifies replacing the flower-gathering motif with a ring-dance, because *paizein* is used in the flower-gathering scene in *H. Hom. Dem.* 5, 425). See also Murnaghan (forthcoming).

59 For the aetiologies, Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 330 with n. 12 and *ad* 1308–1309. The Mother had her characteristic castanets already in 1308–1310.

60 Comparing the enigmatic mode of expression in *tumpāna bursotenē* (*Helen* 1347) with *bursotonon kuklōma* (*Bacchae* 124) suggests that the instrument had not yet been given a name so soon after its invention. Similar is *khalkou audan khthonian* (*Hel.* 1346) for bronze castanets; cf. schol. Pind. *Isth.* 7.1–3 for *ēkheia*, echoing bronze instruments, in rites of Demeter.

61 Pippin Burnet (1960) 115–6 for comedy; Downing (1990) 12 for “choral celebration”.

62 Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 59 (the chorus “wird deshalb zwanglos zum Partner der Klage”).

her first song a primordial air: nearby grows the lotus (183), from which Athena invented the *aulos*, the *Libun lōton* (170).⁶³ One remembers that Egypt was thought to be the land of the oldest songs, indeed the place where all song originated, and originated in a dirge.⁶⁴ In Egypt, there are no male *oidoi*, the epic Muse is not invoked, and song arises by chance. *In extremis*, Helen goes back to the roots of song.

The Egyptian songs of *Helen* thus suggest a genealogy of lament: isolated and stripped to its essentials, human lament arose from the solitary, inarticulate wailing of abandoned women grieving. These cries are brought into order by finding accompaniment—an echo in nature, a matching cry by women friends, response in a choral ode. In the parodos, a woman's cries are integrated into a community when others come to echo them, and a form of musical art is discovered that can generate new laments, as in the first stasimon. In the first stasimon, the nightingale's endless iterations are proposed as the natural paradigm for lament, as the second stasimon nominates Demeter's chorus its divine model. Between them, humans forge songs to cope with loss, as Democritus held, and as Lucretius put it, “to imitate the liquid notes of birds / with mouth and lips came long before men learnt / to charm the ears by singing tuneful songs” (*De rerum natura*, 5.1379–81, tr. R. Melville). Helen weeping in Egypt is one evolutionary step beyond the nightingale in her tree. In nature the mechanism of repetition is the echo, in art it is the responding chorus, but both forms of doubling have the power to allow sounds of woe to reach another realm.

In honoring Pietro Pucci, we cannot leave Euripides' fantasy of music's origins, built out of poetic imagination and current anthropology, without turning it upside down and seeing how it looks. Deconstruction is always suspicious of the relation of cause and effect, and in this case makes us ask if singing one's sorrow is natural, like the nightingale's instinctive outpouring of grief. Or do we think birds “sing” sad songs only because we do? For Pucci, such doubles operate so that the “original” is “determined in its attributes by the other, namely the copy or appear-

63 So Kannicht (1969) vol. 2, 68, noting that Athena Tritogeneia was honored around the Libyan *Tritonis limēn* (Hdt. 4.188–189). In Pindar (*Pyth.* 12.19–21) Athena helps Perseus kill the Gorgo (in Libya, *Hel.* 766–769) and imitates its shocking cry (*eriklangkton goon*) on her instrument (*sun entesi*). For Libyan lotus as a good material for flutes: Theoph. *Hist. Plant* 4.3.3–4. Duris of Samos (apud Athen. 618b–c) explains why the *aulos* is called Libyan by tracing the art to a Libyan nomad, Seirites, who is also credited with inventing *aulos* songs to the mother of the gods (*mētrōa*). On the *aulos* (usually associated with Phrygia) here, see Barker (1984) 224 n. 128, (2007) 18–20.

64 Hdt. 2.79; cf. Pl. *Laws* 657b; see Ford (2002) 151–152.

ance”; the origin exists as a deferred effect of the copy, the *eidōlon* (1997, 46). If the invocation of the nightingale “represents music as a natural phenomenon, and the human song as repetition (copy?) of the natural one”, this picture comes to us itself as a song (1107–1015).⁶⁵ It is the artifice of human song that allows birdsong to be natural.

I find Pucci’s version of deconstruction valuable for its balance: it is not purely skeptical, not content to dispel metaphysical postulates, but follows the logic of its position to note that, if it is the copy that allows the original to be what it is (1997, 44) the original nonetheless remains available in some sense for contemplation. Pucci sees through illusions but doesn’t look past them. Still, he warns that such pairs can at best generate the effect of a true origin, and argues that Euripides is aware that doubling a lamenting voice is not the same as restoring a missing presence. As Pucci observes of the hymn to the great Mother, even if Deo is pleased with the new music, she nevertheless does not get back her daughter; Euripidean lament offers not a recovery of loss but art’s diverting power of replacement.⁶⁶ Pucci is also right to say that repetitions that bring no gain threaten to become “a merely formalistic and musical connotation, a mere verbal, musical icon”.⁶⁷ The futile iterations Euripides sees at the root of lyric seem to acknowledge this, but I have added that such doubling can create a transformative echo. Helen did not get her Sirens, but her song of sorrow has been transformed. It did not reach Hades, or heaven, but it did resound beyond Egypt for we hear it in an Attic *mouseion*. If we follow the otherworldly logic of her audacious invocation, Helen’s lament has passed on to become a tragic ode in an Athenian play.

65 Pucci (1997) 71.

66 Pucci (1980b) 218: “Aphrodite’s music *replaces* the finding of Persephone, for the great Mother receives the flute, not her daughter, in her arms (1350 ff.) and laughs. This point seems to me the clearest allusion to the diverting power of art and to its structure as replacement or compensation.” Cf. Pucci (1997) 72–74, against redemptive readings, such as Zuntz (1960) 226–227.

67 Pucci (1997) 71, graciously referring in n. 63 to an early presentation of the present study; it is a pleasure to bring it out now as a token of thanks for Pietro’s teaching, collegueship, and friendship.