



---

Meter, Colon, and Rhythm: Simonides (PMG 542) and Pindar between Archaic and Classical

Author(s): Joel B. Lidov

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 105, No. 1 (January 2010), pp. 25-53

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/651251>

Accessed: 02/04/2012 07:18

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

# METER, COLON, AND RHYTHM: SIMONIDES (*PMG* 542) AND PINDAR BETWEEN ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL

JOEL B. LIDOV

IT IS COMMONLY SAID that the meter of Simonides *PMG* 542, the *Ode to Scopas*, like that of the other “aeolic” poems of Simonides, is similar to the aeolic poems of Pindar and Bacchylides.<sup>1</sup> Given the difficulties these latter pose, the comparison is not very helpful. The grounds for the comparison are that in all these poems we can use internal evidence to divide them into segments, that is, into cola or periods, that contain both single- and double- shorts and that these segments are not similar to dactylo-epitrite and not like the short or regularly repeating verses of Alcman, Anacreon, Alcaeus, or Sappho. I will propose that there is another way to understand the rhythms of Simonides’ poem that reveals a very simple underlying pattern in its construction. Recognition of this pattern will not only make it easier to appreciate Simonides’ poem, it will also clarify some basic problems of metrical theory and perhaps suggest a way in which some of the notorious complexity of later choral lyric came about. I will examine the structure of Simonides’ *Ode to Scopas*, discuss the problems it raises, and then illustrate a similar process of composition in two stanzas by Pindar: the epode of *Pythian* 2 and the strophe of *Pythian* 10.

## THE METER OF THE *ODE TO SCOPAS*

Plato’s discontinuous quotation and paraphrase of Simonides’ ode pose difficulties for reconstructing its text, but there is much less doubt about the scansion of its repeating stanza. In the generally accepted modern

1. See the discussion and schemes in West 1982a, 66; Hutchinson 2001, 293; Maas 1962, §70, p. 50 (“Their [sc. the stanzas of Simonides 542] internal structure reveals all the licenses permitted in the later lyric poets”); and Raven 1968, 104. Dale (1969a) remarks that the ode is composed in the “free periodic style” like Pindar’s compositions, but does not supply an analysis. There are also analyses in Wilamowitz 1913, 182–83; Merkelbach 1997, 70; Gentili 1964, 297–98; and Cole 1988, 159. There are no analyses in the handbooks of Snell (1962 [preferred, see Sicking 1986] or 1982); Korzeniewski (1968); or Sicking (1993). The above works of West, Hutchinson, Maas, and Cole will be referred to by their authors’ names; three other works of West (1982b, 1987, and 1992) will be referenced by date. In addition, Dale MU (Dale 1969a) and Dale *LMGD* (Dale 1968) will distinguish Dale’s two theoretical systems. The text of Pindar and Snell’s analyses are cited from Snell-Maehler (Maehler 1987), Sappho and Alcaeus from Voigt 1971, and other lyric from Page 1962 (*PMG*). I have tried to restrict terminology to generally familiar terms, including the forms “glyconic,” “adonic,” and “pherecratean”; as far as possible, I will use “long” and “short” instead of “heavy” and “light,” (*syllaba*) *longa* and *brevis*, or (*elementum*) *longum* and *breve*.



s1	- ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ - -	τοῦνεκεν οὐ ποτ' ἐγὼ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι
s2	∪ ∪ - - - ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ -	δυνατὸν   διζήμενος κενεῶν ἐς ἄ-
s3	- ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ - - ≡ - ∪ -	πράκτον ἐλπίδα μοῖραν αἰῶνος βαλέω,  .
s4	∪ ∪ - ∪ - - ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ -	πανάμωμον ἄνθρωπον, εὐρυεδέξους ὅσοι
s5	- ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ - -	καρπὸν αἰνύμεθα χθονός·  .
s6	∪ ∪ - ∪ - - ∪ - ∪ ∪ - -	ἐπὶ δ' ὑμῖν εὐρὼν ἀπαγγελέω,  .
s7	- - ∪ - - ∪ - ∪ ∪ -	πάντας δ' ἐπαίνημι καὶ φιλέω,  .
s8	∪ - - ∪ - -	ἐκὼν ὅστις ἔρδηι
s9	- ∪ - ∪ ∪ - -	μηδὲν αἰσχρόν· ἀνάγκαι δ'
s10	- ∪ - ∪ - -	οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται.   .

FIG. 1. Scansion of Simonides 542 as printed in *PMG*

cratean and one ithyphallic. The only principle here is the persistence of the unnamed sequence ∪∪-∪-, which he appears to associate with both iambic and glyconic.<sup>4</sup>

Hutchinson's explanation shies away from this method of isolating components. He describes the cola in terms of a general explanation of aeolic rhythms and draws attention to specific recurrent patterns. He ends the first colon on γενέσθαι and thinks it stands somewhat apart, given its unique successive double-shorts and the pendant ending. He then recognizes three pairs of cola (s2–s3, s4–s5, s6–s7) in which all the cola follow the general pattern of “single-short sequence, choriambic or ‘dactylic’ core, followed by single short” (p. 293), with the peripheral elements omissible, and with a double-short allowed to stand for an initial single-short. This description reflects the strategy for analyzing aeolic rhythms popularized by D. S. Raven's handbook: he presents them as sequences of indeterminate length that contain a double-short and show great freedom in the elements preceding it.<sup>5</sup> But Hutchinson does give a shape to Simonides' stanza as a whole when he describes the symmetries and repetitions, especially the three initial double-short openings of the three pairs of cola, and the repeated -∪-∪-∪-, which he does not call glyconic (I presume lest that obscure its relation to sequences slightly longer or shorter). He combines the final three cola into two:

∪ - - ∪ - - - ∪ - ∪ ∪ -    ἐκὼν ὅστις ἔρδηι μηδὲν αἰσχρόν· ἀνάγ-  
- - ∪ - - - -                    και δ' οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται.

4. His diagram, with n. 80, is obscure. Cf. p. 62, where he identifies the unnamed sequence as a variation of an iamb in aeolic contexts, rather than as a relative of the glyconic. West presents this analysis to demonstrate Snell's principle of explaining the aeolic odes as “progressive development, each verse derivable from the one preceding or the one before that, with only occasional back-references to the beginning,” but he does not actually illustrate such a development. His analysis is identical to Maas's (§70, p. 50), except that the latter does not label the dodrantes; Maas, however, provides no explanation. For the relation of “anacastic” to other aeolic forms in West's system, see p. 43 below.

5. Raven 1968, 84–85, 104 (Hutchinson, unlike Raven, does not call the double-short element part of a choriamb). See Barrett 1964, 421–23 for a similar approach to aeolic in drama, along with Dale's note (*LMGD* 153–56).

This serves to eliminate the pendant clausulae in s8 and s9 and to produce in ἐκὼν . . . ἀναγ- something more like the single short running to - - - - - that occurs in the previous two cola (s6 and s7). But despite the sense of order and reason these repeated patterns give to the sequence of cola in the stanza, he remarks that “we are far from the short and easily grasped stanzas of the Mytilenean poets” (p. 293).

#### THE RHYTHM OF THE *ODE TO SCOPAS*

We are far, but not quite so far as it appears. The problem is that the poet has very clearly imposed on us some major divisions—those effected by responding word-ends, especially when marked with punctuation—and these divisions do not yield “easily grasped” segments. Our normal procedures require us to accommodate them when possible, especially if they are widely separated (so only one or the other of adjacent divisions . . . | δυνάτον | . . .), and to fall back on the internal patterning as a guide to further divisions (as in the subdivision of s2–s3 and s4–s5) only when they are too far apart. But what if we start by taking the patterning as a guide? The scheme presented in figure 2 shows that if we disregard the responding word-ends—or, as it turns out, all of them except the one certain period-end near the middle of the stanza—a pattern appears that is fairly easy to grasp (the nonsyllabic symbol “+” will be explained below).

Set out in this way, the metrical pattern hardly seems to belong to the same ode, but it is too simple and repetitive to be accidental: after what I will call the opening fanfare (I will return to it), six instances of the eight-syllable sequence - - - - - (lines *c*, *d*, *e*, *f*, *g*, *j*), and three seven-syllable sequences ending . . . - - - - - (*b*, *i*, *k*) make up the structure of the ode. Two of these are connected by an anaceps, and the final three alternate with a series of increasing iambo-trochaic lengths; the final aeolic and iambo-trochaic pair (line *k*) look like familiar clausular phrases. (These would have been more obvious if the demarcations marked ! at the end of *j* and in *k* did in fact appear in all stanzas.) The only interruption to this is at the one certain period-division (end of *g* = s5; this is also the only point of metrically serious textual uncertainty); a shorter, five-syllable sequence there with the same close - - - - - as the eight-syllable sequences appears to highlight the structural break.

For obvious reasons, I will refer to these sequences as “glyconic” and “pherecratean”—but with the scare quotes, since those terms have become associated with a different kind of analysis: the kind, like West’s, that emphasizes labeling “a common stock of metrical figures” (p. 63) within the demarcations and that we usually call colometric analysis. Such analyses have long noted the importance of the glyconic in this ode. The recognition of glyconics accounts for the division of s2–s3 and s4–s5 (fig. 1) into two cola; Wilamowitz was the first to analyze each of these long sequences as a single period subdivided into two cola at the juncture of two successive glyconics (corresponding to the division of *c*–*d* and *f*–*g* in fig. 2).<sup>6</sup> Reinhold

6. Wilamowitz 1913, 182–83. Page’s (1962) text and colon divisions largely follow Wilamowitz’s. Hutchinson’s analysis assumes this division into cola without acknowledging the reason for it. Wilamowitz

a	- - - - -	τοῦνεκεν οὐ ποτ' ἐγὼ τὸ μὴ
b	- - - - -	γενέσθαι   δυνατόν   δι-
c	- - - - - +	ζήμενος κενεάν ἐς ἅ-
d	- - - - - ≅	πρακτον ἐλπίδα μοῖραν αἰ- ὦν-
e	- - - - - +	ος βαλέω,  . πανάμομον ἄν-
f	- - - - - +	θρωπον, εὐρυεδέρος ὅσοι
g	- - - - -	καρπὸν αἰνύμεθα χθονός·   .
h	- - - - - +	ἐπὶ δ' ὅμιν εὐ-
i	- - - - - - - - +	ρὼν ἀπαγγέλω.  . πάν- τας δ' ἐπαί-
j	- - - - - + - - -	νημι καὶ φιλέω,  . ἐκὼν ὅστις ἔρδῃ
k	- - - - - - - - -	μηδὲν αἰσχρόν· ἀνάγκαι δ'   οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται.    .

FIG. 2. Rhythmical patterns in Simonides 542

Merkelbach, over forty years ago, reformatted Wilamowitz's analysis and identified the glyconic as the measure on which the ode was based; his analysis isolated a glyconic in lines s2, s3, s4, and s5, two curtailed glyconics (— — — — = *maec* = West's *dod*) in lines s6 and s7, and the penultimate pherecratean. He even suggested that — — — — at the start of lines s4 and s6 could be either iambic or foreshortened glyconic, that the opening colon was a glyconic variation with a double-short as the second element of the basis, and that the final ithyphallic was here a variant of the pherecratean. As we have seen, glyconics also figure in West's and Hutchinson's explications. Thomas Cole's method of analysis, which is less rigidly bound to colometric divisions than most, observes a consistent pattern of — — — — (Dale's A segment) alternating with ××, which is equivalent to continuous glyconics, with or without iambo-trochaic supplements. But in his analysis the necessity of coordinating that pattern to demarcations determined by Simonides' regular word-ends requires the frequent omission of one or two elements, and the result is still a blend of partial and whole sequences. So in all these earlier analyses, the principle that one must pay attention to the demarcations in the text obscured the pervasiveness of the "glyconic" sequence, and as a result not all the "glyconics" were recognized, and parts of others were interpreted as other metra.<sup>7</sup>

regarded the poem as sympotic and saw the stanza as a development of the metrical forms seen in the scolia and in the sympotic poetry of Alcaeus and Anacreon. He explained the first line as an ionic trimeter differing from the usual form of phalaecean—a typical starting measure of the scolon—only in having a choriamb in the first position. (In reprinting his 1898 analysis he added a note [182 n. 3] that he would make minor changes, but he does not say where.) Gentili's scheme for the poem (1964, 297–98) follows Wilamowitz's, at least for the second and third stanzas (which he identifies as strophe and antistrophe); he calls the first line an encomiologus—that is, a dactylic colon combined with an iambo-trochaic—but he keeps an "ionic" as the opening of the second line and offers for the rest an analysis that would be amenable to tetrasyllabic scansion. Diehl (1924) prefixed a fully tetrasyllabic scansion to his edition (= Simon. 4).

7. Merkelbach's scheme (1997, 70) illustrates a method by which an analysis is deemed satisfactory when each colon is described in terms of known units in combinations for which there are parallels elsewhere; the choice among alternatives and the explanation of variations is made by reference to the general rhythmic

Although the scheme I have presented reveals a simpler and more consistent structure than other presentations of the meter, it should not be thought of as an alternative colometry (e.g., a kind of dovetailing [also called overlap or colon-caesura]—this is not dovetailing as we know it, which involves only one or two syllables), and it is not intended as an exclusive analysis. For the demarcations, reinforced by punctuation (i.e., syntactic breaks), will not go away. Rather, I propose, Simonides has superimposed one kind of structure on another. The one I am discussing—described in figure 2, lines *a–k*—I will call, for want of a better term, the rhythmic structure.

“Rhythm” has many meanings; here I mean any form of readily recognizable patterning that makes possible the perception—or creates the illusion—of a sustained repetition or of continuity, the quality that distinguishes verse from prose. The perception of rhythm in so general a sense may be created by familiar patternings that are recognizable even when we cannot say precisely where one instance begins and another ends. We find this uncertainty in much of Stesichorus (West, 50); in noncolometric descriptions of dactylo-epitrite using Paul Maas’s D (---) and e (--) sequences in combination with the ambivalent *anceps interpositum*; or in composite Lesbian verses, such as those of the sapphic stanza. In the case of these last, there are half a dozen theories about their precise divisions into segments, but no one would say that the difficulty of the analysis makes it hard to perceive them as rhythmical. Looking only at the rhythm here, we see that the “glyconic” as a whole is functioning as a repeatable unit, much like the D-sequence in other rhythms.<sup>8</sup> For a glyconic series, the immediate antecedents are Anacreon’s poems (or poem) 3 = *PMG* 348 and 12 = *PMG* 357, in which glyconics alternate with pherecrateans at intervals of three and five lines. But with the iambo-trochaic expansions in the last lines, we can see that Simonides is evolving an aeolic form along lines similar to Stesichorean or Ibycean dactylo-epitrite, in which movement is predominantly dactylic but the repetitions are modified slightly by intervening ancipites or iambo-

---

context. Line 1 = *gly var.* + *ba*, 3 = *gly* + *ia*, 4 = *ia var.* + *gly*, 5 = *gly*, 6 = *ia var.* + *maec*, etc. Only --- before *gly* in 2 is not explained as a form of either *gly* or *ia*; he ignores but does not replace Wilamowitz’s labeling of it as ionic. (The resolution of the second syllable of the basis, which he suggests for line 1, is outside Archaic practice [see West, p. 61]; West’s *dod*<sup>d</sup> brings it into the aeolic orbit.) Since there is no evidence that would lead us to expect a late Archaic audience to recognize as a colon an ad hoc adaptation of an iambic metron combined with the first half of an asclepiad (line 6), this mix of units is hard to fit into a history of metrics except in terms of Wilamowitz’s theory of *Kurzverse* as basic forms. Nonetheless, it is not clear to me why West substituted his complicated diagram for Merkelbach’s straightforward one. (I owe to David Sider the initial observation that an analysis like Merkelbach’s for s1–s5 could be transformed into nearly continuous glyconics by joining the lines printed separately; the similarity of the resulting pattern to Cole’s analysis suggested to me the possibility of considering the rhythm of the whole apart from the demarcations.)

For many scholars the colometric analysis is just a stand-in for a supposed determinative rhythm that is expressed musically, and its only purpose is to show that the string of syllables could be made to conform to one or another musical rhythm. My assumption here is that the metrical and rhythmic analysis should make sense on its own, whether or not the perception of it was aided by the musical performance (see Dale *LMGD*, 1–4).

8. The possibility that the portion of a glyconic after the basis, ---, could function as a unit equivalent to Maas’s D-sequence was raised by Dale (*LMGD*, 179 n. 1) and taken up by Sicking (1993, 137); cf. Cole’s treatment of aeolic, discussed above.

trochaic sequences. In all the examples of those forms, however, the demarcations by word-end patterning, when they do occur, either reinforce or, at least, do not contravene, the perception of the rhythmical units.

The most notable antecedent for a form without any reinforcement is Sappho 96 V, LP, which is composed in stanzas consisting of a cretic, three glyconics, and a bacchiac metron:

— — x — — — —	ἄ δ' <ἐ>έρ-σα κάλα κέχυται τεθά-
x — — — —	λαιοι δὲ βρόδα κᾶπαλ' ἄν-
x — — — — — —	θρυσκα καὶ μελίλωτος ἄν-θεμώδης

Sappho provides no consistent word-end patterning to make this (or any alternative) structure clear (word-end seems to be avoided between the first two glyconics and is perhaps preferred between the second two). The aeolic basis is regularly — — but that is not an absolute rule, and once a choriambic dimeter does duty for a glyconic. The stanza is only thirty syllables long, certainly within the normal limits for a period. Sappho assumes that her audience will be able to grasp the whole and its repeated glyconics without further guidance from the text.<sup>9</sup>

In developing a “glyconic” phrase as the predominant rhythmic sequence of a longer stanza structure, therefore, Simonides is working with familiar materials in a familiar way. But Simonides’ strophe, in addition to being longer than Sappho’s and more varied, requires the audience to hear the “glyconic” phrases against the cuts—not just in the absence of cuts—and this requires that the basis of the rhythm be very familiar indeed. It is unlikely that any structure other than glyconic (together with pherecratean, discussed below) could have served his purpose. Anacreon is witness to its role as one of the basic aeolic forms—perhaps *primus inter pares*—and it retains its predominance after him.<sup>10</sup> At the turn from the Archaic to the Classical age, it is hard to think that any other aeolic forms would be so familiar.

Nonetheless, Simonides has also provided some guidance to the form, so that the glyconic-shaped sequences emerge more clearly. Usually in Archaic poetry, apart from the aeolic basis and choriambic expansion, rhythmic synaphy in the form of continuous alternation (the simplest type of sustained repetition) is maintained within the units of composition (i.e., successive fixed long positions—*princeps* syllables, in West’s terminology—are separated by one short or one anceps syllable or by two short syllables), although alternation is often broken between units.<sup>11</sup> In this poem, the strict

9. West (p. 33) and Cole (p. 159) group Sappho 96 with Alc. 140 V = 357 LP, which appears to be composed of two glyconics plus an iamb, as instances of a compound (undemarcated) period. Alcaeus’ twenty-syllable distich is inherently simpler to grasp than Sappho 96, and, moreover, it mostly has word-end between the glyconics (the enjambment of ἀνδρῶν in line 6 is probably emphatic). Metrically, it is a less ambitious—or perhaps I should say a less lyric—form. But it is notable that both poems assume ready recognition of the glyconic as a rhythmic unit.

10. Itsumi (1984, 67–68) reports 312 pairs of glyconics in tragedy, 146 pairs of choriambic dimeters, and 23 mixed; Aeschylus has only glyconics. I will discuss the choriambic dimeter further below (pp. 41–44).

11. In a previous article (Lidov 1989), I emphasize the alternation of comparatively fixed and variable elements in Archaic poetry. West’s elaborate description of the “rules of contrast” (pp. 18–19) achieves the same result without making alternation itself a rhythmic principle; he reserves “rhythm” for the ratio of



maintenance of  $\sim\sim$  as the base (after γενέσθαι) also maintains alternation within the glyconic sequence. But four of the six “glyconic” sequences (and one “pherecratean”) are preceded by a break in alternation, and five are followed by one (including the cadence in *h*). These breaks are indicated by the + symbol in figure 2 (p. 29 above). Unbroken alternation after the glyconic sequence occurs only in  $s_2 = d$ , within αἰῶνος, and after  $s_5 = g$  χθονός (but that is also period-end).

Before I return to the beginning of the stanza, the role of the “pherecratean” deserves more attention. The sequences of this shape in lines *i* and *k* do not by themselves create rhythmic uniformity in the stanza; rather, they adapt the sequence of “glyconic” phrases to their interchange with iambo-trochaic phrases at the end. The “glyconic” has a characteristic cadence—double-short followed by single-short—that strongly suggests the presence of an aeolic sequence, and the eight-syllable dimeter length can claim to be familiar and traditional. The “pherecratean” pattern is not so distinctive. If the basis has two longs, the sequence will adapt to a variety of rhythms, and the final, pendant close does not mark it as belonging to any specific type. The description of the closing syllable raises problems that I will discuss later in this essay; here it is enough to observe that the sequences . . .  $\sim\sim$ — $\sim\sim$  . . . in *i* and *k* could also be read as . . .  $\sim\sim$ — $\times$ — $\sim$  . . . and, taken by themselves, the lines could be described as abbreviated (brachycatalectic) “glyconic” phrases followed by an anceps that starts an iambo-trochaic rhythm, rather than as “pherecrateans” that make a seamless transition into (and, in *k*, out of) iambo-trochaic. Such a reading would be consistent with my overall argument, but I think the context makes it simpler to assume that the audience perceives “pherecrateans.” For although the association of pherecratean and glyconic does not appear in the Lesbians (with the possible exception of Alc. 322 V), it was apparently well established by this time. Anacreon joins pherecrateans to glyconics (e.g., *PMG* 348 and 357 [mentioned p. 30 above], 358, 373), and Aeschylus, whose use of aeolic was extremely limited and presumably conservative, ends several different strophic pairs with the tercet *pher* || *pher* || *gly pher*. In Simonides’ poem a number of features guide the audience to hear the familiar pattern of the “pherecratean” in  $\sim\sim\sim\sim$ —: glyconic cadences immediately precede, the basis used is consistently  $\sim\sim$ , and there is an actual long syllable in all the positions that provide the second long syllable of  $\sim\sim$ — (those responding with πάν-τας and ἀνάγ-και), so that it has the same form as a pendant close. Taken this way, the transitions in lines *i* and *k* can be assimilated to the rhythmic uniformity of the stanza without supposing that the audience recognizes phrases equivalent to undemarcated and unfamiliar variants of the glyconic colon.

The beginning of the stanza does not exhibit the same rhythmic clarity. Rhythmic analysis only confirms what both simple scanning and the variety

---

time values. In the revised presentation of rhythm in the *Introduction to Greek Metre*, he allows that “the recurrence of princeps-longs at every second or third position in most metres gives a clear sense of rhythm” (1987, 7). I find it difficult to distinguish his conception of a princeps syllable (he has no name for the nonprinceps syllables) from the notion of a strong beat; nonetheless, the term is convenient and has become familiar.

of unsatisfactory colometric analyses imply: the opening is different from the rest. The successive double-shorts are unique, and the sequence — — — — — occurs nowhere else in the poem, however one divides it. If cuts that occur in three out of three stanzas mean anything for a colometric analysis, and it is the consensus that they should, the cuts on either side of δυνατόν are confusing. If the initial colon ends on δυνατόν, the poem might appear to begin D~ed<sup>1</sup> in the style of dactylo-epitrite: so Merkelbach interprets it, but to achieve uniformity he then reinterprets the colon without δυνατόν as a variant of glyconic. West, as we have seen, prefers his expanded and anaclastic dodrantes. Hutchinson, ending the colon on γενέσθαι, calls it an “expanded version of the ‘ibycean’ . . . , which in this context may be considered aeolic” (p. 293). But whichever fashion one prefers of characterizing the opening as conforming (or not) to the aeolic that appears later, it is not self-evidently aeolic and bears little resemblance to what follows. The audience, upon first hearing, in the actual first stanza, the ringing double-shorts of the poem’s opening words—ἄνδρ’ ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως (~ τοῦνεκεν οὐ ποτ’ ἐγὼ τὸ μῆ)—would have had no trouble recognizing the words as rhythmical, but they would not have immediately understood which rhythm to expect, and the continuation—γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν (~ γενέσθαι δυνατόν)—gives no guidance. Indeed, in terms of colometry, the impression of dactylo-epitrite (or, in traditional colometry, an encomiologus) could even be recast as an initial D (s1 — — — — — = τοῦνεκεν οὐ ποτ’ ἐγὼ) followed by an iambo-choriambic phrase (s1–s2 — — — — — = τὸ μῆ γενέσθαι δυνατόν, itself followed by another iambic metron that overlays the start of a glyconic); one could compare the D that begins Alcman *PMG* 89 and is followed by iambo-trochaic cola (as scanned by West, 52).<sup>12</sup>

Concentrating on the rhythm rather than the colometry, we see that after the movement changes from alternation with double-short to alternation with single-short in s1, it is followed by what could be a pendant ending (γενέσθαι). Although in figure 2 I presented these syllables in line *b* as the opening of a “pherecratean” (it would have the only basis in the poem of the form ~ —), that is a retrospective analysis; only as the poem continues does the underlying glyconic movement actually become clear. Even after the second “glyconic” (line *d*) Simonides chose to add an anceps that creates continuity of alternation rather than to emphasize the clarity of definition that a break helps to provide. I think we should understand, therefore, that he in fact intends

12. Given that the poem’s opening has no context (but see below), the absence of basis syllables would obscure the perception of the initial phrase as aeolic. As I noted above, — — — — — would not be a self-evident basis to an audience brought up on Archaic poetry. The dodrans is of course the essentially aeolic cadence, but without a context—and shorn of West’s theory of rhythmic reversal (which I will discuss below)—an expanded dodrans at the start of a poem is no more justified than Merkelbach’s glyconic. For the pairing of normal and “anaclastic” dodrans, see Dale *LMGD*, 139; she finds a possible example of dodrans A and B (the same sequence, without the expansion) in Ar. *Nub.* 566, but the context there is iambo-choriambic, as well as much later. For the ibycean, Hutchinson compares Ibyc. *PMG* 286.1–3 and Simon. *PMG* 275.1. The former makes clear that the ibycean context is fundamentally closer to dactylic than to glyconic. The latter is a dubious parallel, since synzeysis in δολυμήδεος would render the line dactylo-epitritic, and without synzeysis it suggests that expansion of an ibycean would take the form of expansion of the double-short elements, not the single-short.

the rhythm to become clear only as the poem progresses: it is χαλεπὸν to recognize it at first.

One hears the opening for the first time only once, however, and for that reason there is value in Merkelbach's observation of the similarity of the opening to a glyconic with a basis of  $-\cup\cup$ . With each repetition of the stanza its overall dominant "glyconic" movement is likely to appear with greater and greater clarity. And in all the stanzas except the first, the opening lines will be heard in the context provided by the close of the preceding stanza:

<i>j</i>	$-\cup-\cup-\cup-$	+	$-\cup-\cup-$
<i>k</i>	$-\cup-\cup-\cup-$		$-\cup-\cup-\cup-\text{   }$
<i>a</i>	$-\cup\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-$		
<i>b</i>	$\cup-\cup-\cup-\cup-$		

So context and familiarity could impose a perception of the "glyconic" pattern on the more recalcitrant material of lines *a*–*b*, but, even if they do, there will always be some tension. This tension and the unusual bases of both lines will mark the beginning of the new stanza. At the same time, the brief, single-short sequence spanning the end of *a* through the start of *b* will provide a transition away from the mixed aeolic and iambo-trochaic rhythms to the pure aeolic of lines *c*–*h*.

From what we can read of the poem, it appears that each stanza begins by describing what must be negated and ends with what can be confirmed, but in the poem as a whole Simonides gradually changes the emphasis from asserting the impossibility of the perfection represented in the opening to celebrating the praiseworthiness of the goodness that is possible and sufficient. As the audience's perception of the limited good became more prominent, the rhythmical pattern in which the conception of goodness was represented at the start would be increasingly perceived in conformity with the rest of the stanza, so that the ideal of perfection could be seen as an introduction to the topic of human goodness rather than in contrast or opposition to it.

#### COLON AND FRAME

We return to the question of the metrical structure of the poem. On top of the repetitive, rhythmic pattern based on the "glyconic" and varied by segments of iambo-trochaic, Simonides has imposed a separate pattern of wording and syntax. There is a problem of nomenclature here. "Colon" has been used for each of the longer rhythmic sequences into which a whole poem is divided—in effect, for each printed line; in this sense, all the demarcations end cola, but the sequences s2–s3 | δυνατόν . . . βαλέω |, and s4–s5, | πανάμωμον . . . χθονός |, are each divided into two "cola." This is how Hutchinson uses the word. He does not give a particular name to any sequences—even the obvious glyconics—within these, since he apparently regards them as characterizing their colon but not constituting it.<sup>13</sup> "Colon" is also commonly used for "a

13. Unfortunately, Hutchinson is not clear about how he defines cola. His analysis of s2–s3 and s4–s5 could be read as offering an alternative justification for Wilamowitz's divisions, that their repetition of internal features—patterning, pendant endings—are what mark out these sequences as cola, but his discussion

rhythmical sequence accredited by frequent use,” one or more of which constitute the longer units, the sections between the demarcations. West, who uses colon with this meaning, marks a period-end at most of the demarcations in Simonides’ poem (s3, s5, s7, s8), but appears to call all the separate longer units “verses.”<sup>14</sup> To avoid ambiguity, I will use the term “frame” for the sequences that are demarcated by responding word-end and so control the presentation of language and thought. Frames may have a rhythmic character, but that is not part of their definition, and they are not necessarily the rhythmic constituents of longer sequences.<sup>15</sup> We are accustomed to the contrast between analysis by rhythm and by frame in stichic verse.<sup>16</sup> We need not confront it visually in stichic texts, however, because rhythmic sequence and frame coincide at regular intervals; we do not have to choose between printing

υ - υ -            θεοὺς μὲν αἰτ-  
- - υ -            ὦ τῶνδ’ ἀπαλ-  
υ - υ -            λαγῆν πόνων

or

υ - υ - -            θεοὺς μὲν αἰτῶ  
- - υ - υ - -    τῶνδ’ ἀπαλλαγῆν πόνων

But in lyric verse, where both the patterns and the frames are less familiar or self-evident and the points of coincidence too far apart, we print a song analyzed sometimes by frames (unless they are too wide for the page), sometimes by rhythmic sequences.

Periods, which occur in both stichic and lyric verse, are a special case of frames, in which the verbal demarcation is supplemented by something that can also bring about prosodic changes (which we call *brevis in longo* and terminal hiatus). Period-end, or *pausa*, can be characterized by rhythmically significant features (e.g., by a shift between regular and catalectic forms), but

---

seems to take the existence of the separate cola a priori. Note that those who use “colon” in this sense use it without regard for whether or not there is demarcation by word-end (as here) and also use it for lengths that could be, but are not necessarily, periods.

14. Sicking (1986, 428) notes the two uses of “colon.” West (p. 4, also 1987, 3) equates verses with periods, but here they seem to correspond to what Hutchinson calls cola. Since the analysis into metrical units presupposes that they end at what he marks as periods, there should be a separate basis for this marking, but none is given.

15. I am adapting “frame” from the work of Lotz, who uses it as the general term for all syntactically defined units (including the word) within which phonetic material is regulated (1972, 4, 10; 1966, 139), but in Lotz’s use frames are normative, and he supposes that the frame contains the rhythmic sequence; see the similar use by Nagy (2004, 150–55). In Nagy’s analyses of the aeolic meters (1996, esp. 76) many of the familiar cola appear (synchronically) to be the consequence of overlapping or dovetailing, a one-syllable displacement of the verbal frame in a series (a consequence diachronically of the employment of cola a syllable longer and shorter). From the point of view of the analysis of late Archaic or early Classical stanzas here, I would regard dovetailing as a special case of coincidence of frame and rhythmic unit, not as a separation of them.

16. Compare the contrasts between “inner” and “outer” metric in O’Neill (1940, 336 n. 3), and between “metrical” and “rhythmical” cola in Sicking (1993, 52–57, with epodic verse as the example), or Parker’s distinction between “metrical” and “rhetorical” articulation, both “rhythmically significant,” throughout Greek verse (1970, 51). Dale’s discussion of the effects of word division in Aeschylus’ lyric iambs also illustrates the contrast (*LMGD*, 81–83).

it need not impose a rhythmical terminus. I stress this because the frequency with which *pausa* coincides with the end of a rhythmical segment creates the impression that the two are necessarily associated. But only if we still believe that long and short syllables must be equated to crotchets and quavers and that *pausa* must be assigned the value of a rest will it be necessary for period-end to have rhythmic significance. In this context, it is worth remembering that we do not know what the phonetic realizations of either cuts or, more important, *pausae* really were.

Although *pausa* is often understood as a physical pause and not just a stopping point, there are other ways in which terminus, or juncture, can be indicated: variations in tempo or in intonation, for example.<sup>17</sup> That rhythmical sequences can continue over other kinds of breaks is clear enough from the caesura of the hexameter and trimeter, and, more extremely, *antilabe*, as well as from the numerous syntactic breaks within rhythmic sequences that are not at caesurae. Similarly, it is not necessary that the prosodic effects that characterize *brevis in longo* and terminal hiatus be rhythmic effects. Conversely, when *pausa* does coincide with a rhythmic and syntactic break, it is possible that it was accompanied by an “empty beat” or by an overlong pronunciation of a final syllable, which might maintain a musical or notional rhythmic continuity that contrasted with the speech rhythm (e.g., at the end of the trochaic tetrameter catalectic). *Pausa* as a framing phenomenon neither requires nor denies a particular rhythmic realization in performance. The important point is that a syllable at period-end always participates in the rhythm as a long syllable, whether it already has this value or acquires it from its position.<sup>18</sup>

17. Juncture is “[a] term used in phonology to refer to the phonetic boundary features which may demarcate grammatical units such as morpheme, word, or clause. The most obvious junctural feature is silence, but in connected speech this feature is not as common as the use of various modifications to the beginnings and endings of grammatical units” (Crystal 1991, 188). Recent discussion in Classical metrics focuses on the stichic forms, where there is a coincidence of rhythm and frame; see, e.g., Nagy 2004, 148–49. The strong association of *pausa* and grammatical termini suggest some analogy in their realization, but even in mid-sentence, or perhaps especially in mid-sentence, the point remains that the realization of *pausa* can take various forms and perhaps even be optional. The four-syllable period of Pind. *Ol.* 7s3 could be enhanced rhetorically by pauses on either side in many strophes, but I doubt that in performance the internal junctures of 22–23, ll Ἡρακλῆος || εὐρυσθενεῖ γέννῃ, where period-end guarantees that -ος is long, differed very much from those of *Pythian* 10.3, ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλῆος βασιλεύει. Cf. the discussion of sense-pauses by Stinton (1990, 310–14 = 1977, 27–30).

18. In the context of a diachronic description of verse forms, Nagy defines *brevis in longo* as “neutralization, in prepausal position (that is, in the last syllable of a metrical unit), of the distinction between long and short in favor of long” (1996, 65). The recognition of this as true indifference (neutralization) may be critical to the explanation of the development of different (especially expanded) meters, but the strict definition of “pause” as it operates in Greek poetry (established by Boeckh for Pindar), since it involves the possibility of hiatus as well as neutralization at the end of a frame, requires a distinction between prepausal neutralization in favor of long and other types (e.g., the initial or final syllables of iambic or trochaic metra, respectively) and allows the assumption that prepausal syllables are always perceived, for rhythmic purposes, as long. Conversely, the glyconics in Anacreon’s stanzas are always demarcated by word-end, but never are followed by hiatus or have a final syllable that would not be long in synaphy with the next metrical unit. Rather than saying that the (synchronic) expectation of a final long, shown by these, is neutralized if a glyconic is followed by a pause, it is easier to assume that a short in a prepausal position always registers as an actual long (more precisely, an otherwise light syllable is realized as a heavy one). I assume, therefore, that there is some kind of phonetic expression of this (see also Devine and Stephens 1994, 79–84, 146). With this assumption, the common rule that there is “no *anceps iuxta breve* except at period-end” can be simplified to mean that there is no true *anceps* at period-end.

When studying the interaction of poetic structure with sense or rhetoric, it is valuable to note when there is or is not a coincidence of major grammatical unit, rhythmic sequence, and frame. The significance of each type of agreement or disagreement may, however, vary with the type of composition or with the style of the poet (enjambment, for example, is probably more noteworthy in Homer and Alcaeus, less in Sappho, Sophocles, and Pindar). What we have seen in Simonides' poem is a regular disagreement of frame and rhythmic sequence.

The series of frames in the *Ode to Scopas*, much more than the repetition of the "glyconic" rhythmic sequence, makes it a distinctive composition. The frames provide the structure that the poet can use to modulate the emphases in his sentences, to bring ideas to prominence, and to create parallelism and contrast—what we generally think of as the subtle effects of well-formed poetry. Judging from the remains we have, after the opening proposition in the first frame of each stanza (s1), we hear two long frames expanding the initial idea (s2–s3, s4–s5). Hutchinson has well described how their rhythms are parallel; both alternate double-short with a short sequence of single-short and end on single-short. A period-end divides the stanza (s5); the end of the frame coincides here with the end of a rhythmic unit. A progression of shorter frames follows; there is also near parallelism in s6–s7, following the period-end:

s6    ~ – ~ – – ~ – ~ – –  
s7    – – ~ – – ~ – ~ – –

Now we hear the poet's assertion in response to the idea expounded in the first part. In the second stanza s6–s7 turn from the initial contrast of man and god to the role of circumstance in man's contingent goodness; in the third, s6–s7 introduce the poet's actions with the parallel ἀπαγγελέω and φιλέω. In s9–s10 the synonymous μηδὲν αἰσχρόν in the third stanza and καλὰ in the fourth are each followed by the initial dative of a phrase defining their limits.

Frames may be superimposed on a rhythmic pattern, but we need not assume that the imposition always produces arbitrary and unfamiliar partial sequences. The initial ~ – ~ – – that begins two frames (s4 and s6) can recall, for example, a sequence (not a colon) found in at least one type of Lesbian aeolic, the part of the sapphic hendecasyllable after its most common caesura. The familiarity of short segments may be important in understanding what happens after the period-end at χθονός.<sup>19</sup> Coming immediately after a significant break, the series of syllables ~ – ~ – echoes the immediately preceding glyconic cadence as well as the start of the previous frame. These echoes help signal a kind of transition here, the end of one development and

19. Any discussion of the following six syllables is limited by uncertainty over the text, for this is the one spot where the manuscripts offer a different scansion for each stanza. Page's text is modeled on ὕγις ἀνὴρ in the fourth stanza, following Bergk in deleting ἄν after ὄν in the second, and, least convincingly, emending ἔπειθ' to ἐπὶ ὄ' in the third. Wilamowitz, suspecting that ὕγις ἀνὴρ is misplaced, hesitantly interpreted the tradition as ~ – ~ – – = dochmiac (1913, 164 n. 2, 165 n. 3, 182–83); most subsequent editors rightly find this even more unlikely.

the beginning of the next: the glyconic series is broken by a familiar fraction of itself. The rhythmic series then resumes in a new form, in which the aeolic sequences are each followed by short iambo-trochaic sequences. In terms of frames (metrically), this section introduces sequences of a different kind, ones in which the double-short is the penultimate element ( $\sim\sim-$ ); these are equivalent to what West calls anacastic, and Dale B-type aeolic cola, which were very uncommon in the earlier lyric known to us (as will be discussed below). If Simonides' practice here is not a one-off performance, but the application of one technique used by late Archaic poets to introduce flexibility to repetitive patterns, it could be significant for the way we incorporate cola of that type into our analyses of late Archaic or early Classical verse. If the technique was widespread, it could have had the consequence of accustoming audiences to fractional cola and alternative patterns as rhythmic entities—introducing, that is, more varied cola, which in time would become by themselves a basis for different rhythms.

#### RHYTHM AND FRAME IN PINDAR

The prevalence of such a technique is hinted at by Bruno Snell. Toward the end of the "Metrorum Conspectus" appended to his edition of Pindar, Snell notes, perhaps ruefully: *in aeolicis aliquando cola inter se cohaerentia "pausa" dirimi videntur, sed cum in aeolicis metris explicandis omnia incertiora sint, hanc rem hic movere nolo*; he gives only two examples, from *Paeanes* 6.<sup>20</sup> But let us look at the epode of *Pythian* 2. In the scheme in figure 3 I arrange the epode according to the rhythm; the superscript numbers correlate with the lineation in Snell's text (e1–e8), and "(+)" represents the interpretation of a rhythmic discontinuity as part of a pendant sequence (e.g.,  $\sim\sim\sim (+) \sim$  rather than  $\sim\sim + \sim\sim$ ).

Lines *a–g* form a series of "glyconic" phrases in two lengths; lines *h–k* begin with a pendant "pherecratean," the familiar sequel to the blunt "glyconic," and alternate pendant "glyconic" lengths with iambo-trochaic; the stanza ends with a series of "glyconic" phrases. We can contrast this with a colometric analysis. Snell follows the normal procedure of starting with the demarcated lengths, printed as the separate lines (= e1–e8, the frames). His analysis makes use of a group of cola ending  $\sim\sim-$ . He calls the full, eight-syllable version in this group a choriambic dimeter and also recognizes acephalous versions of seven syllables (= "*^chodim*") and of six (= "*^chodim*"). In his text of Pindar (but not in the "Conspectus"), Snell analyzes each of the first three lines (*pausa* only after e1b and e2) as a combination of a glyconic (with bases of  $\sim-$ ) and one of the acephalous choriambic dimeters; lines e3–e5 are made up of regular glyconic forms (including a pherecratean) and syncopated iambs; each of lines e6, e7, and

20. Snell 1989, 189 (= p. 172 in Snell 1964; the section has been reprinted unaltered in subsequent Teubner editions). In both examples the period-end separates two choriambic in expanded cola, so that the terminal sequence of the first segment is the same as ἀγγελέω here. Snell also cites five examples from the dactylo-epitrites (1989, 183 = 1964, 167).

a	∞ ∞ - ∞ ∞ - ∞ - +	
b	- ∞ - ∞ ∞ -1b∞ - +	
c	- ∞ ∞ - ∞ ∞ - +	
d	- ∞ - ∞ ∞ -2∞ - +	
e	- ∞ ∞ - ∞ ∞ - +	
f	∞ ∞ - ∞ ∞ -3∞ - +	
g	- ∞ ∞ - ∞ ∞ - +	
h	∞ ∞ - ∞ ∞ - - +	(+) ∞ - ∞ - +
i	4∞∞ - ∞ ∞ - ∞ - -	(+) ∞ -5x - ∞ - +
j	- x - ∞ ∞ - ∞ - -	(+) ∞ -6∞ - +
k	- ∞ ∞ - -	(+) ∞ -7-
l	- ∞ - ∞ ∞ -8∞ - +	
m	- ∞ - ∞ ∞ - ∞ - +	
n	- ∞ - ∞ ∞ - ∞ - -	

FIG. 3. Rhythmical patterns in Pindar *Pythian* 2, epode

e8 begins with a different length of a *cho dim*. There is typically a break in alternating rhythm between these units and within the basis, but never over line-end (or period-end). Thus Snell's scheme yields a colometry whose outstanding characteristic is that, within and between periods, various types of *gly* alternate with various types of *cho dim*—that is, cola ending ∞--- or ∞-∞- contrast with those ending ∞∞-.<sup>21</sup> This contrast makes it somewhat similar to Simonides' ode, but, just as there, we can see here that the changes and apparent variety of rhythm within the frames determined by word-end (including, in this case, period-end) are overlaying a simpler and more uniform rhythmic sequence.

Again, I stress that lines a–n do not represent an alternative colometry; rather, they present the rhythm as something separate from the frames that have been used as the starting points for a traditional colometry. And although the pattern of the rhythm is less simple than that of the *Ode to Scopas*, the rhythmic scheme reveals a greater regularity and architectural clarity than can be detected by dividing as Snell did and deriving the rhythm from the framing structure.<sup>22</sup> Since it is the pattern of rhythmic movements that is important, and not their division into lines or units (which is just a visual

21. Turyn ([1948] 1952) brings more apparent uniformity to the analysis in his edition by treating ∞-∞-∞- as a *maecenas* rather than a *choriambic dimeter*, but the name does not alter the fact that these are sequences ending in a double-short movement; for present purposes, the distinctions among the various nomenclatures for (xx)-∞-∞-∞-, although theoretically important, are not germane. In the "Conspectus" Snell redivides "*gly* (*chodim*)" as "*hipp (ia)*" by grouping the tenth syllable (underlined) with those to its left instead of to its right: ∞-∞-∞-∞-∞-∞-∞-∞-∞-.

22. The kinds of patterns presented in the central section of this scheme—pendant endings followed by iambic elements—are excluded by Snell (1962, 37) as possible forms of external expansion in the formation of a period in the Lesbian poets and Horace; however, *gly pher ia* is his own analysis of e3 in this ode (I will discuss such sequences below). In my analysis, of course, there is no intention of describing a period. It is only because of the layout I have used that the iambo-trochaic segments are to the right of the aeolic. One could separate the segments differently, and replace each instance of -- (+) ∞ with - + --;



aid), I adopted a layout in figure 3 that demonstrates the role of the extended iambo-trochaic sequences in *h–k* as the distinguishing feature of the middle section of the strophe. In figure 4, I present a different layout for the second half of the stanza, redistributing lines *h–l* to show how the rhythmic analysis is aligned with the framing.

Now each of the various “glyconic” sequences is both preceded and followed by iambo-trochaic alternation and forms the core of one frame. The final rhythmic series, lines *e7–e8 = l'–n*, can be seen to resemble closely Sappho’s glyconic stanza. The audience, of course, did not hear the poem as a column; they heard repeating aeolic sequences with or without separating lengths of iambo-trochaic and with irregularly recurrent period-ends.

The rhythm reveals three sections to the stanza, or two sections and a coda. The change from the first to the second becomes noticeable in the middle of line *h*, and the end of that line also corresponds with the end of a frame, *e3*. Not unexpectedly, the shift from a uniform series of rhythmic patterns to a new set of patterns leaves its mark in a colometric analysis as well. In Snell’s analysis *e1*, *e1b*, and *e2* all end in double-short, and *e3* would also, save for its extension by an iambic metron; *e4*, *e5*, and *e6* end in single-short. But the rhythmic analysis makes clear both the unity of each section and the underlying continuity of rhythmic pattern throughout the stanza; more striking, however, is that the analysis that separates rhythm and framing marks the division between the first and second sections more clearly by showing that the end of a frame and of a rhythmic phrase do coincide at the end of *h = e3* (we saw a similar coincidence, involving period-end, in Simonides’ ode). While the stanza stands on its own as a structured rhythmic (and perhaps also musical and choreographic) composition, there is a reflection in the verbal content of the separation into two parts. In the third triad *χαῖρε*, enjambling *g–h*, signals that one poetic section is coming to an end. In the other triads a pronominal form at the start of line *i* introduces a change of focus: in *A' τεάν* reintroduces Hieron between the positive example of the grateful maiden and the negative example of Ixion; in *B' τόν* begins a new stage of the story; and in *Δ' ὅσα* defines what is hoped for by poet and victor but lost by the negative exemplar of the previous lines.

I doubt that this kind of analysis would yield anything so uniform in the strophe of this ode. It is more likely that, whatever the principle of the strophe of *Pythian 2* (its rhythm appears to be built up from extended runs of single- and double-short, held together by appearances of the glyconic cadence; it is somewhat similar to Simonides 543, the *Danaë Ode*), Pindar has reverted to what I take to be one of the older methods of construction in the epode, in order to provide a contrasting stanza of rhythmic evenness and clarity.

---

but it seems reasonable to me that, just as in Simonides’ poem, the interpretation that gives the rhythm a more regular character would be the one most readily recognized. Here that would be the appearance, after a series of “glyconics,” first of a “pherecratean” and then of similar sequences, just when the aeolic phrases begin to alternate with iambo-trochaic sequences. Note also that, unlike Snell, I have treated all tribrachs uniformly as  $-\cup$ .

<i>h'</i>				∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	(+)	∞	∞
<i>i'</i>				∞	∞	+ <sup>4</sup> ∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	(+)	∞	∞
<i>j'</i>	<sup>5</sup> x	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	(+)	∞	∞
<i>k'</i>																(+)	∞	∞
<i>l'</i>																	+	
<i>m</i>																	+	
<i>n</i>																		

FIG. 4. Partial alternate representation of Pindar *Pythian* 2, epode

## THE VARIETIES OF AEOLIC COLA

I have suggested that this compositional technique made use of the audience's familiarity with fractional segments of the already familiar rhythmic sequences and at the same time could make some new divisions of familiar sequences come to appear as satisfactory rhythmic units by themselves.<sup>23</sup> In the epode of *Pythian* 2 (see fig. 3, p. 39 above), we see three instances of what is usually called a dodrans, lines *c*, *e*, and *g*; and perhaps one of an adonic (= catalectic dodrans), line *k*; these are the final and characteristic segments of the glyconic and pherecratean. There is little evidence that either of these is an independent colon in early Archaic verse. The adonic, however, provides an excellent example of how persistent framing patterns, in this case one isolating a phrase of that shape at the end of the hexameter and another isolating it at the end of the sapphic stanza, make a sequence familiar and potentially susceptible to other uses.<sup>24</sup> In *Pythian* 2e, the "dodrans" and "adonic" do not function fully independently; rather, each instance is in a context created by the longer, well-established patterns, and the rhythmic character of the shorter segments is reinforced by those, so that the poet can take advantage of their familiarity and use them as rhythmic sequences. Uses such as this, however, would also reinforce the likelihood of their being perceived independently.

On the other hand, this rhythmic analysis of *Pythian* 2e completely dispenses with sequences matching Snell's various "choriambic dimeters" as compositional units, just as the analysis of Simonides removed the appearance of West's anacletic dodrans (= Snell's "(<sup>^</sup>*cho dim*)"). A number of issues

23. Something like this may already be apparent in the third line of the common form of Attic scolia, where two easily recognizable phalaeceans are followed by a line beginning ∞∞∞∞ . . . and ending with a choriamb. Nothing is gained by calling this an iamb rather than an aeolic segment.

24. Nagy remarks about the traditional fourth line of sapphic stanza, "To posit an adonic . . . is to invoke a segmentation for which I know of no diachronic explanation" (1996, 78 n. 65). I would argue that in the sapphic stanza the adonic really has become separate from the previous "line," but it is purely contextual in origin: it owes its existence to its effect as a clausular, catalectic echo created out of the previous sequences (as West says, the last "period" is a "distended form of the first and second" [p. 33]; Nagy locates the adonic in a catalectic telesillean dovetailed with a preceding telesillean). Voigt's description of the meters of the Lesbians uses the adonic only for Sappho 158 (relying on a report of a report of an adonic dimeter by Marius Victorinus, it seems an unlikely analysis), and she has no recourse to the dodrans. West has a very unusual analysis of the hendecasyllable of the alcaic stanza into a penthemimer and a dodrans (p. 33) and otherwise finds the dodrans only in late Classical verse. West's use of the dodrans as a colon differs *toto caelo* from Dale's (MU 93) and Sicking's (1993, 137) use of the equivalent sequence **ds** as a metrical "unit," along with **d** and **s** (described below), in the composition of Lesbian aeolic.

come together here, and it will be useful to review the role of this colon as a basic pattern.


The forms whose eight-syllable standard is known, under various theoretical regimes, as choriambic dimeter (Wilamowitz), wilamowitzianus (Maas), aeolic dimeter B (Dale), or anaclastic glyconic (West) constitute one of the most disputed areas in the modern study of Greek metrics. Some of the difficulty reflects the difference between a focus on their use and a focus on their origin. Wilamowitz originally isolated the pattern by comparing various cola, including the glyconic, to the ur-Germanic four-stress verse or *Vierheber* (so one sometimes finds “glyconic” as the name for all the forms). That particular comparison has long been discredited, but the historical and comparative perspective has been put on much firmer ground in Indo-European studies, which derive the form, just like the glyconic, from an Indo-European octosyllable having six unspecified initial syllables and ending  $\sim -$ . When the last four syllables become fixed as a choriamb, the expressions of the choriambic dimeter (including iambo-choriambic) are different realizations of the freedom of the first half. Choriambic dimeter forms retain much of the variability of the first half in the fifth century, contrary to the general tendency of the other Greek verse types derived from this octosyllable to differentiate themselves more fully as fixed forms—this variety is in fact what makes their history visible.<sup>25</sup> From this perspective, rhythmical simplification would not need to rely on the glyconic; for example, the epode of *Pythian* 2 could be understood to open this way:

a		$\sim - \sim - \sim -$
b		$\sim - \sim - \sim - \sim -$
c	1b	$\sim - \sim - \sim -$
d		$\sim - \sim - \sim - \sim -$
e	2	$\sim - \sim - \sim -$

But the immediate history of the use of these verse forms in the Archaic and Classical periods discourages this description. Fifth-century practice supports a distinction between the iambo-choriambic forms ( $\times - \sim - \sim - \sim -$ ) with a short third (or sixth from last) syllable and all the other types with a final choriamb; Dale (*LMGD*, 131–32) treats the former as built of metra (and not really aeolic), the latter as cola to be taken whole. The interchange of iambic and choriambic metra can be found in some tetrameters of Anacreon (*PMG* 388) and iambo-choriambic forms continue to be found in iambic or choriambic contexts. But the octosyllabic choriambic dimeter as a colon exists in Archaic verse, and even in Corinna (if one wishes to include her), only as an alternative to the glyconic; that is, it is found only when there are repetitive sequences including the glyconic and in forms where syllable count is regulated. In the fifth century it is absent from Aeschylus and only becomes common in Euripides and comedy. The acephalous seven- (and six-) syllable forms have no basis for being recognized except as variants of

25. The diachronic development of the Greek forms from Indo-European prototypes is summarized by Nagy (1996, 71–74), with references to his own earlier work and that of Watkins.

the longer form.<sup>26</sup> The history of use thus offers no evidence that the forms of choriambic dimeter enjoyed the familiarity that would make them recognizable as patterns without the reinforcement of demarcation, even if the analysis of their origin shows that they are akin to the glyconic.

West's analysis avoids the problem of the conflict between these conclusions, because it is based on a theory of rhythm according to which all sequences that can be analyzed as choriambic are in fact anacastic iambic (or trochaic). The double-short is not a single rhythmic element, but two, and anacastis may be compared to musical syncopation in which "an accented short note [is] followed by a longer one." Aeolic, and any verse type in which one can locate both iambic and choriambic forms of the four-syllable metron, is characterized by "snappy syncopations and wrong-footing changes of bar length"; it becomes a kind of iambic with special effects and "the glyconic variants in which  occupy the first or second half of the verse instead of the centre appear quite natural from this point of view." Since it is the presence of a musical (strong) beat that shapes the measures, differences in exact sequence are of little consequence, and we are free anywhere to assume the presence of any of the "natural" forms that might result. (Without this theory, the analyses would appear to be motivated primarily by a desire to be economical with the nomenclature.) If we proceed on the more common assumption that Greek meter is appreciated in terms of patterns of long and short (with the two shorts constituting a single rhythmic element even if they count as two syllables), the question of when it is appropriate to recognize the choriambic dimeter remains open.<sup>27</sup>

One way to reconcile the two results discussed above is to assume that the choriambic dimeter forms had long been in use in popular poetry lost to us (the comic eupolidean—two *cho dim* ending with a blunt catalexis—would, perhaps, be a late witness) and were adopted into the formal lyric poetry of festival and other public occasions well after other types. Or it could be argued that the process that generates the choriambic dimeter forms—the contrast between free opening and rigid closing segments—was always in some way immanent in the language, whether as an inherited feature or as a feature typical of many language systems (the interchangeability of iambic and choriambic metra within Anacreon's tetrameters would be a consequence of the process). That same conclusion is reached without recourse to diachronic or comparative metrics in Cole's theory of the rhythmic cycles within the *langue* of Greek. He calculates the eight-syllable patterns possible within the

26. Dale, *LMGD* 131–36. Itsumi (1982) includes a discussion of early uses. He cites three exceptional passages in Pindar as obvious *cho dim* sequences (71 n. 43; he prefers the label *wil*). In *Ol.* 9s6, a *cho dim* is substituted in a series of glyconics; on *Nem.* 4, see p. 44 below; *Isthm.* 8 apparently repeats short sequences ending ~~~~ set off by caesurae, period-ends, or breaks in rhythmic synaphy, but that poem also features some anomalies that complicate the scansion and analysis.

27. The presentation of aeolic in *Greek Metre* depends on West's theory of the musical beat, but it is not spelled out there. Users of that volume should consult as well West 1987, 7–8, and 1992, 139, 148–50 (the quotations above are from 1992, 139 and 148–49). The singleness of the double-short as an element is an observation both of its equivalence to single-short and anceps in the alternating rhythms of poetry and of its role in speech rhythm (Devine and Stephens 1994, 127–28), not a deduction from the phenomenon of contraction (or *biceps*). In this respect, aeolic does not differ from dactylo-epitrite.

constraints of the underlying rules for long-short contrast; there are seven, and three of these include what we are calling iambo-choriambic, glyconic, and choriambic dimeter (p. 8); all of these would be available to the *parole*.

Any of these possible solutions will explain why the choriambic dimeter was acceptable without requiring a *protos heuretes*, but none directly addresses the fact that the sequences ending in a choriamb appear late on the scene in the formal poetry we know and only gradually free themselves from the glyconic context. The analyses I propose, in which frames are superimposed on rhythmic sequences resembling the glyconic, draw our attention to how the two types overlap, with change of basis:

— — — — — — — — is also . . . — — — — — — — — — — — . . .

In the acephalous versions the overlap is even more exact:

x — — — — — x — — — — — is also . . . x — — — — — — — x — — — — — — . . .

This is what creates the possibility of different analyses. But the goal of this method of composition, apparently, is not to disguise one form as the other but rather to make use of the rhythmic familiarity of the “glyconic” in its various lengths. For the underlying rhythmic clarity of undemarcated “glyconics” permits demarcations that mark out other sequences, ones that are not intrinsically or necessarily foreign to the rhythms of Greek but that are, it seems, less familiar.

It is also possible for choriambic dimeter forms, if they are unambiguously demarcated and presented, to supply by themselves a readily apparent motif; this happens in the strophe of *Nemean* 4:

x — x — — — —	Ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα
— — — — —	πόνων κεκριμένων
x — x — — — —	ἱατρός· αἱ δὲ σοφαί

We could realign these lines to bring out “glyconic” sequences (breaking after πόνων and ἱα-), but there is no call for that; nothing would be gained and it would lead only to more irregularity later on in the stanza. But this example is very different from the intermixture of various choriambic forms and glyconic forms required by the attempt to account for the rhythm of *Pythian* 2e in terms of traditional cola as established units within periods. So I do not mean to eliminate sequences ending with a double-short from the analyses of rhythm in Pindar, but to suggest that we look again at strophes that do intermix the various lengths of *cho dim* and glyconic. In such cases the identification of such cola with rhythm may have led us to overlook an actual rhythmic construction that is much simpler and creates a better context for perception.

#### RHYTHMS AND PATTERNS

In discussing the *Ode to Scopas* and *Pythian* 2e I stressed the ease of recognizing a “glyconic.” It not only appears to have been a well-established form, it also has a distinctive cadence that makes the exact demarcation less

important; in addition, repetition and, usually, continuity of alternation reinforced the sense of rhythm, and discontinuities often clarified the patterning. Other forms were recognizable in the context established by “glyconic” rhythm. My goal, however, was not to find “glyconics” wherever possible but to discover a simple, underlying basis for the rhythmic scheme. I referred to the opening of *Nemean* 4 to indicate that clear demarcations and regular repetition might allow a less familiar form to serve the same purpose; the repetition itself would encourage the audience to recognize the poem as rhythmical. In a final analysis I will take the argument a step further, to explore whether the rhythm can be based on a phrase that is less self-evident and less regularly repeated than in the previous examples.

The example I will use is the strophe of *Pythian* 10. It opens with a ringing verbal phrase (a nominal sentence):

Ὀλβία Λακεδαίμων, — — — — —

There is word-end in all eight responsions, and the final syllable is short in line 43. Some editors demarcate the line as a period; all describe it as a single pherecratean colon. Although I noted earlier that the pherecratean as a colon is not as obvious as the glyconic, the opening of the strophe of *Pythian* 10 sets it out unmistakably. The previous instances I have discussed were set up by preceding glyconics. This kind of initial use recalls the role of the pherecratean as an independently inherited form (rather than as a shortened glyconic):<sup>28</sup> the opening cry of Sappho 111, ἴψοι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον, and, in its acephalous form, the opening lines of the “Swallow Song,” ἦλθε ἥλιθε χελιδὼν (*PMG* 848, assuming it is or imitates an early popular song), or Aeschylus’ repeated tercet, which I cited before for its *gly* + *pher* final line, but which begins *pher* || *pher* || (see too *Sept.* 295–300).

I believe the rhythm of the strophes of *Pythian* 10 can best be understood by taking this opening as the declaration of a distinctive pattern: that is, the pherecratean colon becomes a “pherecratean” pattern that provides the sense of rhythm in this strophe, and what is most distinctive about the pattern is not its exact shape but the aeolic context it creates and the cadence, . . . — — — —, which incorporates a break in alternation. Before I propose a scheme that illustrates that, however, I need to return to the question of how best to describe the last syllable of a pherecratean or other pendant colon.

Pherecrateans have usually been discussed as freestanding or clausal cola that are followed by obligatory word-end; the last syllable can be long or short. In the case of forms that end blunt, . . . ~|, we take any final short syllable to be *brevis in longo* and assume period-end; but in those that end pendant, . . . ~ — |, as the pherecratean does, no internal patterning makes that necessary. Dale, accordingly, asserts that the final syllable of a pendant colon, apart from ionic and syncopated iambic, always occupies a position for an “anceps syllable,” so that if it is long it is a “long anceps” and contrasts with the preceding “true long.” But that is an axiom, not an observation

28. See Nagy 1996, 75.

or deduction.<sup>29</sup> Nothing, in fact, prevents us from taking the final position as a place for a long syllable, just as in the case of a blunt ending. Since the pherecratean in particular can function as a catalectic variant (in which the penultimate short appears to be repressed, just as in catalectic iambic), and since an actual long final syllable is more common than a short, it is an easy assumption that the final position is, in fact, the long expected at period-end, and that a final long is a characteristic of the form, not just an apparent consequence when it occupies a terminal position. This is how Snell treats it. He will even locate a pherecratean ending with two longs in the middle of a period in a position in which a final anceps would contravene the general rule forbidding an anceps position adjacent to another anceps or short without intervening obligatory word-end and, presumably, period-end (*Ol.* 1s6, *^pher ia; Nem.* 3e3, *pher ^pher*).<sup>30</sup>

We can also consider the question apart from theory in terms of the continuing rhythmic context of individual instances. Three longs in a row are most easily interpreted as  $\times -$ , and that remains true even if there is word-end after the second, as long as there is no instance of hiatus to necessitate the assumption of period-end.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, the sequence  $\dots \sim \text{---} \sim \dots$  (or  $\dots \sim \text{---} \times$ ), contains a break in alternation, and the second long, like the first, is not an anceps but a fixed long (West's *princeps*). A sequence that scans  $\dots \sim \text{---} \sim \sim$ , as *Pythian* 10s1–s2 does, is no different. The apparent juxtaposition of anceps and breve, which never occurs without obligatory word-end, indicates that there is period-end here, so that the variable syllable is the long always found at period-end; the one short, in line 43, is a *brevis in longo*, and the two longs are not rhythmically different from each other.<sup>32</sup> The context here, therefore, dictates that what the audience perceives at the start of the stanza is  $\dots \sim \sim \sim \text{---} (+)$ , and this agrees with theories of the pherecratean that do not posit final anceps as a rhythmic entity.

29. *LMGD* 26; more fully Dale 1969b, 185–90. Her argument is rejected by Parker (1976, 25–27). Dale's argument is consistent with, and reinforces her conception of, long anceps as a quantity shorter than "true long" in performance; this is highly unlikely, given the probability of terminal lengthening in Greek (Devine and Stephens 1994, 146–52).

30. Wilamowitz ([1921] 1962, 92, 396–99) presents the pherecratean as a catalectic dimeter (*Vierheber*) ending in two longs and distinguishes it from a *Kurzvers* such as the reizianum that does end with an anceps. Maas (§34, p. 29) originally advocated assuming that all final elements were *longa* but added the afterthought that they could be marked as an *elementum finale*; this has no further place in his system. Discussions are further complicated in some writers who adopt an ancient distinction between the *adiaphoros* (indifferent) at verse-end and the anceps elsewhere. I have not found any place where Snell explains his rationale; Turyn's analysis ([1948] 1952) for both passages separates the successive longs.

31. For example, the first two lines of the sapphic stanza are conventionally set out with pendant endings on the assumption that there is period-end (there are no firm examples of hiatus); some editors, more cautiously, show anceps (note especially Voigt, who also marks *finis coli* not period-end in her edition [1971, 15, 21]). The ambiguities of anceps, *brevis in longo*, and pendant ending are discussed by Stinton (1990, 324–25, 328–29, 358–61 = 1977, 38, 41–42, 64–66), in connection with the problem of dividing cola in tragedy. See also West 1982b, 286–88.

32. As I argued above (n. 18), the concept of a final (period-ending) anceps is not meaningful. The restriction on *anceps iuxta breve* is described by Maas (§35, pp. 29–30); there are, of course, exceptions, most notably, in the aeolic basis  $\times \times$  (in cases of  $\times \times$  the possibility of overlap may confuse an analysis). Turyn ([1948] 1952) for some reason does not mark either *Pyth.* 10s1 or the parallel case of *Ol.* 1s1 as periods, even though he treats them as separate verses and explicitly says (p. XI) that *anceps iuxta breve* (and presumably *iuxta anceps*) at an obligatory cut is a sign of period-end.

<i>a</i>		- x - ∪ ∪ - -	(+)
<i>b</i>	<sup>2</sup> ∪	- x - ∪ ∪ - ∪ -	+
<i>c</i>		- ∪ ∪ - -	(+)
<i>d</i>	∪	- <sup>3</sup> ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - x	
<i>e</i>		- ∪ ∪ - -	(+)
<i>f</i>	<sup>4</sup> ∪	- - ∪ ∪ - x	
<i>g</i>		- ∪ ∪ - -	(+)
<i>h</i>	∪	- ∪ ∪ - -	(+)
<i>i</i>		∪ - ∪ - <sup>5</sup> ∪ ∪ - - ∪	
<i>j</i>		- ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ -	+
<i>k</i>		- <sup>6</sup> ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - ∪ -	x - x - ∪ -

FIG. 5. Rhythmical patterns in Pindar *Pythian* 10, strophe

For the remainder of Pindar's stanza, Snell's analysis mixes five *cho dims* of various lengths together with six cola from the glyconic family and one iamb and one cretic. In figure 5 I present a rhythmical analysis that takes the pherecratean colon as an intentional cue or motif and present the poem divided into a series of aeolic segments (superscript numbers correspond to Snell's periods s2–s6); toward and at the end of the strophe, there are two iambo-trochaic sequences (we can compare both the tendency in dactylo-epitrite for single-syllable alternation to characterize the ending, and the structure of the *Ode to Scopas*).

Note that every instance of the pattern ∪∪-- after the first line (in *c*, *e*, *g*, and *h*) is followed by a single short syllable, reproducing its context; all of these instances are in shorter sequences (three resemble the sequence "adonic"). Since each of the short syllables that follow the two longs could be heard as part of the start of the following aeolic sequence, as if it belonged to the basis or to a single-short series preceding the next double-short, I have put them all to the left of the sequences in the scheme rather than to the right (except in line *i*, where the typical, eight-syllable dimeter length suggests a degree of self-sufficiency, despite the internal break in alternation, before the sequence in *j* that matches a normal "glyconic").

The "glyconic" sequences in lines *b* and *j* are unremarkable in the context of "pherecrateans"; the former is quickly followed by a reassertion of the motif of the opening, and the latter appears to introduce rhythmic variation for the coda. Line *d* is more notable. The anapest at the end falls between two princeps-syllables and alternation is unbroken (in addition to the fact that word-end is avoided after long anapests); so in terms of rhythm the sequence ∪∪-x is different from the close of the first frame.<sup>33</sup> Pindar has not made it stand out as a disruption, however, because the actual pattern of quantities (rather than rhythm) does mostly match the opening: the anapest

33. It is implicit in both Snell's analysis and mine that the sequence . . . ∪∪-{x}-∪∪ . . . would not be heard as part of a single phrase in aeolic rhythm (after the basis); see also Dale's observation on the absence of ∪∪∪∪∪∪ (LMGD 159 n. 1).



is long seven times out of eight (the eighth time it is being adapted to an exceptional effect; note the sequence of falling word-shapes in the gnome [line 28],  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\epsilon\rho\varsigma$  /  $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\eta\varsigma$  /  $\omicron\breve$   $\pi\omicron\tau'$  /  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ). Similarly, the two double-shorts in *d* are rhythmically concordant and probably familiar—the rhythm of Sappho 110 is *pher*<sup>d</sup>, and in Sappho 111 <sup>^</sup>*pher*<sup>d</sup> follows the opening *pher* after the refrain—but it is, nonetheless, different. Line *d* thus varies from its predecessors; it extends the rhythm internally and, although it may raise the expectation of a clear, consistent close, it does not provide one but continues the rhythmic alternation into a new sequence. (Analysis by frames is indeterminate here, since this same section of the strophe also lacks demarcations.) The new sequence, line *e*, takes the shape of an “adonic” and firmly reasserts the norm, breaking the continuity of alternation, and also ending a period. We can see (and hear) that lines *a–e* constitute the first section of the stanza.

The second section begins, in line *f*, with a repetition of the uncertainty of movement; the apparent basis is uniquely  $\sim-$ , and the anceps at the end turns out to be a true anceps (5  $\sim$ , 3  $-$ ). But the typical aeolic seven-syllable length and the preceding “adonic” suggest the possibility of hearing it, like line *d*, as a variation from the “pherecratean” motif, and that pattern is immediately reinforced in lines *g* and *h*. This section ends with a turn to iambotrochaic in line *i*, and, as I already noted, the strophe’s coda (lines *j–k*) is marked by the acatalectic “glyconic” followed by an expanded acatalectic sequence (“dodrans<sup>d</sup>”) and another segment of single-short alternation. The two double-shorts in the final aeolic sequence *k* echo the sequence that closed the first section.<sup>34</sup> The movement from the second section to the coda is a transition rather than a break, so that the structure of the stanza is not A, B, C but A, B + C. The transition takes place within or at the end of line *i*; in the poem we find word-break at the period-end after  $\sim-\sim-$ , but also, six times out of eight, after the following  $\sim---\sim$ .

The framing is formed by periods (after s1) that each contain at least two rhythmic sequences, so that the thought progresses through long verbal movements. But the rhythmic analysis helps us see the three-part structure that Pindar has given to himself as an outline for composition and to the audience as a guide to the comprehension of the strophe as a whole.<sup>35</sup> These larger rhythmical sections are separated both by the variations in rhythmic design at the transitions between them and by their interaction with the framing structure; to appreciate them we have to overcome our habit of reading for framed

34. I think this better describes the effect these would make here than calling it a “glyconic” with a variant basis in  $\sim\sim$ , though that is also possible, given the preceding “glyconic.” One could also extend both of these by one syllable to emphasize the possibility of pendant closes, but the stanza has offered no reason not to prefer the familiarity of the “glyconic” cadence.

35. This ode is clearly articulated, and the threefold structure could be inferred from the regular punctuation at the end of s3 and the greater length of the fourth period; such structures were a formal part of the metrical presentation in the days when the use of J. H. H. Schmidt’s elaboration of mid-nineteenth-century theories provided the basis for forcing symmetries onto the patterns of forced equal measures, and in this instance it even recognized the same division (see the scheme in Gildersleeve’s edition [1890] 1965, 114). But the reader of Snell’s or Turyn’s metrical analyses by standard cola will find no hint of the presence of sectional divisions within the stanza.

units (cola and period lengths), while giving more emphasis to the points at which rhythmic sequences do close on demarcations (especially, in this case, the end of *e* = s3). In *Pythian* 10s this structure is also a guide to the organization of thought. For example, in the first strophe, lines *a*–*d* present the introductory foils (I have added macrons where necessary to mark prepausal long syllables),

<i>a</i>	- x - - - -	(+)	Ὀλβία Λακεδαιμόνων,
<i>b</i>	<sup>2</sup> - - x - - - - -	+	μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία. πατὴρ δ'
<i>c</i>	- - - - -	(+)	ἄμφοτέραις ἐξ
<i>d</i>	- - <sup>3</sup> - - - - - x		ἐνδὲς ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρα-
<i>e</i>	- - - - -	(+)	κλέος βασιλεύει.

lines *f*–*i* change the focus to a series of (pronominal and proper) name caps that give the ode a specific origin and locale,

<i>f</i>	<sup>4</sup> - - - - - x		τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν;
<i>g</i>	- - - - -	(+)	ἀλλὰ με Πυθώ
<i>h</i>	- - - - -	(+)	τε καὶ τὸ Πελοποννησί-
<i>i</i>	- - - - - <sup>5</sup> - - - -		ὄν ἀπύει Ἀλεῦα τε

and lines *j*–*k* announce the reasons for the performance: the sponsors' motive, and the victor's.

<i>j</i>	- - - - -	+	παῖδες, Ἴπποκλέα θέλον-
<i>k</i>	- <sup>6</sup> - - - - - x - x - -		τεῖς ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν
			ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὄπα.

In the antistrophe lines *a*–*e* present the victory; *f*–*i* (ending this time at the period-end) address the god; and *j*–*k* present, as a balanced pair, the reasons for success: divine help and family. Such patterning does not impose a necessary and rigid logical structure, but a set of possibilities, which the poet uses with varying degrees of explicitness. There is a striking enjambment in line 21, θεὸς εἶη / ἀπήμων κέαρ, between the first and second section; the strophe of Γ' is divided between music, festivity, and freedom from suffering, but the progression of the narrative makes no use of articulations in the antistrophe of Γ'.

Some of the sequences here, with the varying lengths of single-short alternation before the double-short, are not easy to label as the rhythmic equivalents of named cola, but they remain recognizably aeolic, because the context was set by the initial phrases, which are familiar as sixth-century aeolic forms. The varying aeolics of the later Classical tradition, which we now treat as individual colon-lengths in tragic lyric (and which are the basis of Hutchinson's description of the colometry of Simonides 542) may have their origin in the use of rhythmic patterns in the lyric technique we see exemplified here.

## CONCLUSIONS

The method that I have adopted here for describing the rhythm of these three lyric strophes has similarities to two methods elaborated in the last twenty years. The common element is the separation of rhythm from the analysis of verbal frames, although the other two methods are much more

reductive and neither fully divorces rhythm from verbal demarcation. On one side, there is the severely atomic approach that C. M. J. Sicking developed and that produces analyses similar to those in Dale's essay on the "periodic style" of composition: they use  $d = \text{---}\cup\text{---}$  and  $s = \text{---}\cup$  to provide the most efficient expression of the sequences possible in Greek verse. Analysis begins with the isolation of these units and the ancipitia that may or may not adjoin them. The method has the advantage of closely connecting poetic rhythm to its basis in the syllabic contrast in Greek prosody. Dale and Sicking look for groupings within each period that might give a verse its generic character, but the level of analysis is so close to the actual pattern of longs and shorts that it deprives us of the ability to notice the formative role of familiar sequences.<sup>36</sup> On the other side are the broad generalizations of Cole's method (which looks more to performance than to composition). Cole argues that the audience had a knowledge of cyclically repeating rhythmic sequences and that the verses are, in effect, composed of line segments taken from these. While this unifies a wide range of possible verse types and takes into account the possibility of alternative demarcations for the same rhythm, both theory and analysis acquire a level of complexity beyond what the relatively straightforward schemes here seem to call for. As an approach to rhythm, then, I have taken a middle road that calls on the mediating factor of the audience's experience with the regularities of the earlier Archaic lyric to isolate what is familiar and recognizable. The analyses proposed are compatible with what can be learned from descriptions of actual practice, with the derivation of Greek meters from Indo-European syllabic forms, and with the Greek tradition's tendency to regular alternation in poetic speech; since they rely on patterns of speech, they are independent of—or indifferent to—the ways they could be realized in musical performance.

The fundamental principle of these analyses is that the "colon" or "period," conceived as an independent or delimited unit, is not synonymous with rhythmic structure—we have to work with two phenomena, rhythm and framing, not one. There is some confirmation in the opening of the epode of *Pythian* 10 that Pindar expected the audience to recognize the familiar sequences as patterns. Snell analyzes its first two periods into three cola, as framed by frequent word-ends:

$x - \cup \cup - - : x - \cup \cup - - \cup - ||^2 - \cup \cup - - ||$

He labels this  $\wedge pher$ ,  $\wedge gly$ , and  $(\wedge pher)$ , another instance of his willingness to define a pherecratean as a colon ending in two longs.<sup>37</sup> The description based on frames here closely resembles the patterns used at the beginning of the strophe, as I presented them above, with the first two sequences foreshortened:

36. See Sicking 1993 and Dale MU. Compare Dale's analysis of *Pythian* 10 (MU 69). Sicking (1993, 60) is aware of the difficulty but treats it only as a problem of descriptive vocabulary; it does not affect his analyses. He does, however, draw attention to the distinction between "a rhythmical and a metrical level" (1986, 42; 1993, 52, 57, *passim*), although my use of those terms is nearly the reverse of his.

37. Turyn ([1948] 1952), following a theory that recognizes *Kurzverse*, calls these a reizianum, a telesilleian, and an adonic. Dale, who uses this ode to exemplify the deficiencies of the colometric method for nondramatic choral lyric in comparison to her proposed "metrical units," reproaches the first of these, since a reizianum is traditionally  $x - \cup \cup - x$ , and that creates two adjacent ancipitia without intervening period-end (MU 70).

strophe:	- x - ∪ ∪ - -	epode:	x - ∪ ∪ - -
	∪ - x - ∪ ∪ - -		x - ∪ ∪ - -
	- ∪ ∪ - -		- ∪ ∪ - -

But Snell's colometric description of this sequence in the strophe—*pher*, then a seven-syllable *^chodim* and a six-syllable (*^chodim*)—fails to make visible how Pindar chose to reflect the opening rhythm of the strophe in a different construction in the opening of the epode. Yet neither the similarity in the patterns nor the difference is likely to be a coincidence.

I do not mean to suggest that the analysis of rhythm independent of demarcation is the solution to all problems of understanding early choral lyric. Certainly in early Greek lyric poetry and in much Classical poetry it was normal to have recognizably rhythmic sequences coincide with verbal frames, just as they do in this example of the opening of the epode of *Pythian* 10. When they do, "colometric analysis" serves well as a guide to discovering the rhythm, identifying either units of composition or basic structures of variation. In other cases the interaction of framing and rhythm may be more complex. For example, the strophe of Pindar's first *Olympian* moves from primarily aeolic, to aeolic interchanging with lengths of iambo-trochaic, to pure iambo-trochaic. In s1–s5 the frames clarify the different rhythmic segments, but in s6 and s7 the extent and character of each type of rhythmic pattern must be appreciated separately from the frames. In s8–s11 the framing produces four lines similar to Aeschylean lyric iambic, but these overlie other repetitive patterns.<sup>38</sup>

By the end of the sixth century, when the professional and itinerant poets had the chance to learn many local styles, there were a number of rhythmical models and compositional techniques available to them as they sought to expand the possibilities of lyric composition. In the development from Archaic to early Classical, we can see that one technique was to separate the rhythmic patterns that the earlier tradition had made familiar from the demarcations that had originally defined them. Simonides was "a poet intensely aware of traditions, and one ready to combine them in novel ways and to extend them in adventurous innovation" (Hutchinson, 289). We cannot say whether the separation of frame and rhythm is an innovation by Simonides or a fashion of his time, but a study of his technique in the *Ode to Scopas* does show him using extremely traditional, and simple, materials in a new expressive mode, and his poem and these odes of Pindar suggest how this mode might have produced artistically satisfying poetic structures that also led to later styles in aeolic composition.<sup>39</sup>

*Queens College and the Graduate School  
City University of New York*

38. The opening sequences of s6 and s7 echo the previous lekythia, and there are two "pherecrateans" not defined by word-end. The full trimeter isolated as s8 is part of an iambic sequence that begins at the end of s7; in s9–s11 the breaks in alternation reveal three repetitions of one phrase (–∪–∪–) and one more "lekythion."

39. I am grateful to Hayden Pelliccia, David Sider, and Jacob Stern, who offered corrections and comments at various stages; I am particularly indebted to Thomas Cole for his generous comments on an earlier draft. I remain responsible for the remaining errors and advice not taken. The work on this project was funded (in part) by grants from the City University of New York PSC-CUNY Research Program.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Barrett, W. S., ed. 1964. *Euripides, "Hippolytus."* With introduction and commentary. Oxford.
- Cole, T. 1988. *Epiplode: Rhythmical Continuity and Poetic Structure in Greek Lyric*. Loeb Classical Monographs. Cambridge, Mass.
- Crystal, D. 1991. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*<sup>3</sup>. Oxford.
- Dale, A. M. 1968. *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*<sup>2</sup>. Cambridge.
- . 1969a. The Metrical Units of Greek Lyric Verse, I, II, III. In *Collected Papers*, 41–97. Cambridge. Originally published in *CQ* 44 (1950): 138–48; *CQ*, n.s., 1 (1951): 20–30, 119–29.
- . 1969b. Observations on Dactylic. In *Collected Papers*, 185–209. Cambridge. Originally published in *WS* 77 (1964): 15–36.
- Devine, A. M., and L. D. Stephens. 1994. *The Prosody of Greek Speech*. New York.
- Diehl, E., ed. 1924. *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*. Vol. 2.1. *Poeti melici: chori*. Leipzig.
- Gentili, B. 1964. Studi su Simonide II: Simonide e Platone. *Maia* 16: 278–306.
- Gildersleeve, B. L. [1890] 1965. *Pindar: "The Olympian and Pythian Odes."* Reprint. Amsterdam.
- Hutchinson, G. O. 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces; Alcman, Stesichorus, Sappho, Alceaus, Ibycus, Anacreon, Simonides, Bacchylides, Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides*. Oxford.
- Itsumi, K. 1982. The "Choriambic Dimeter" of Euripides. *CQ* 32: 59–74.
- . 1984. The Glyconic in Tragedy. *CQ* 34: 66–82.
- Korzeniewski, D. 1968. *Griechische Metrik*. Die Altertumswissenschaft. Darmstadt.
- Lidov, J. B. 1989. Alternating Rhythm in Archaic Greek Poetry. *TAPA* 119: 63–85.
- Lotz, J. 1966. Metric Typology. In *Style in Language*, ed. T. Sebeok, 135–48. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1972. Elements of Versification. In *Versification: Major Language Types*, ed. W. K. Wimsatt, 1–21. New York.
- Maas, P. 1962. *Greek Metre*. Trans. H. Lloyd-Jones. Oxford.
- Maehler, H., ed. (post B. Snell). 1987. *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*<sup>8</sup>. Part 1, *Epinicia*. Leipzig.
- Merkelbach, R. 1997. Zwei metrische Beiträge. In *Philologica: Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, ed. W. Blümel et al., 68–70. Stuttgart. Originally published in *Maia* 15 (1963): 165–67.
- Nagy, G. 1996. Metrical Convergences and Divergences in Early Greek Poetry and Song. In *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*, vol. 2, ed. M. Fantuzzi and R. Pretagostini, 63–110. Studi di metrica classica 10. Rome. Revised version of appendix to G. Nagy, *Pindar's Homer* (Baltimore, 1990).
- . 2004. *Homer's Text and Language*. Urbana, Ill.
- O'Neill, E. G., Jr. 1940. Word-Accents and Final Syllables in Latin Verse. *TAPA* 71: 335–59.
- Page, D., ed. 1962. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford.
- Parker, L. P. E. 1970. Greek Metric, 1957–1970. *Lustrum* 15: 37–98.
- . 1976. Catalexis. *CQ*, n.s., 26: 14–28.
- Poltera, O. 1997. *Le langage de Simonide: Étude sur la tradition poétique et son renouvellement*. Sapheneia. Bern.
- Raven, D. S. 1968. *Greek Metre: An Introduction*<sup>2</sup>. London.
- Sicking, C. M. J. 1986. Review of *Greek Metre* by M. L. West and *Griechische Metrik*<sup>4</sup> by B. Snell. *Mnemosyne* 39: 423–32.
- . 1993. *Griechische Verslehre*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Munich.
- Smyth, H. 1904. *Greek Melic Poets*. London.
- Snell, B. 1962. *Griechische Metrik*<sup>3</sup>. Erweiterte Auflage. Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft. Göttingen.
- , ed. 1964. *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*. Part 2, *Fragmenta, indices*<sup>3</sup>. Leipzig.
- . 1982. *Griechische Metrik*<sup>4</sup>. Neubearbeitete Auflage. Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft. Göttingen.

- . 1989. *Metrorum conspectus*. In *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Part 2, ed. H. Maehler, 178–88. Leipzig. Originally published in Snell 1964.
- Stinton, T. C. W. 1990. Pause and Period in the Lyrics of Greek Tragedy. In *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*, 310–61. Oxford. Originally published in *CQ*, n.s., 27 (1977): 27–72.
- Turyn, A., ed. [1948] 1952. *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Reprint. Oxford.
- Voigt (Hamm), E.-M., ed. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta*. Amsterdam.
- West, M. L. 1982a. *Greek Metre*. Oxford.
- . 1982b. Three Topics in Greek Metre. *CQ*, n.s., 32: 281–97.
- . 1987. *Introduction to Greek Metre*. Oxford.
- . 1992. *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1913. *Sappho und Simonides*. Berlin.
- . [1921] 1962. *Griechische Verskunst*. Reprint. Bad Homburg.