

## INTERLINEAR HIATUS IN TRIMETERS

In *CQ* 55 (1941), 22–5, E. Harrison noticed that hiatus between verses in the trimeters of dialogue was much less frequent in tragedy when the sense ran on from one verse to the next, than when there was a pause in sense at verse-end. He observed (i) that Aeschylus' *Prometheus* differed from the other plays of Aeschylus in this respect, the proportion of run-over hiatus to end-stopped hiatus being much higher, and more like that of comedy; (ii) that Sophocles had remarkably few verses with run-over hiatus in the *Trachiniae* (8) and *Antigone* (12), much less than Aeschylus in proportion to the number of non-stop trimeters in the play, though *Oedipus Tyrannus* had much the largest number in Sophocles (48), and no continuous chronological development was discernible; (iii) that in Euripides there was a general progression from relative strictness to relative freedom in the run-over hiatus allowed, though individual plays did not conform closely to this pattern; (iv) that in general comedy was freer than tragedy. Harrison tabulated his findings for Euripides as shown in Table I.

TABLE I

	B.C.	I	II	III	IV
Alc.	438	806	239	17	14
Med.	431	1049	312	14	22
Her.		897	322	29	11
Hip.	428	1012	311	17	18
And.		951	356	19	19
Hec.		932	301	23	13
Tro.	415	798	296	34	9
Hel.	412	1267	390	58	7
Or.	408	1170	291	32	9

I = all trimeters. II = non-stop trimeters. III = non-stop hiatus in trimeters. IV = II divided by III.

He noted that the *Heraclidae* in particular failed to conform to any linear development, since though it belonged presumably to the early 420s it had relatively many trimeters with run-over hiatus.

In 1970, in order to check Harrison's findings about the relation between the *Prometheus Vinculus* and other drama, C.J. Herington, assisted by S.B. Carleton, compiled a table for all Aeschylus (Carleton) and the first five plays of Aristophanes (Herington), as shown in Table II.<sup>1</sup>

Herington concluded that Harrison was in the main right. In Table II, while the proportion of hiatus to all trimeters (col. III) varies only within narrow limits, the proportion of non-stop hiatus to all hiatus (col. IV) shows a variation for *P. V.* so large that it must be significant. Sophocles' *Trachiniae* is markedly stricter than any play of Aeschylus, and the *P. V.* is markedly freer than any tragedy, being closer in this respect to Aristophanes, particularly the *Knights*. Herington observed that the *Acharnians* was markedly stricter than other early Aristophanes, and suggested that this might be due to the extent of tragic parody in the play.

<sup>1</sup> C.J. Herington, *The Author of the 'Prometheus Bound'* (1970), p. 39.

TABLE II

I. Number of trimeters	II. Instances of interlinear hiatus (all kinds)	III. Instances of nonstop hiatus
A E S C H Y L U S		
<i>Pr</i> 429	78 (18% of I)	19 (24·5% of II)
<i>Se</i> 515	84 (16·5%)	15 (18%)
<i>Su</i> 400	62 (15·5%)	12 (19·5%)
<i>Ag</i> 843	142 (17%)	31 (23%)
<i>Ch</i> 621	104 (16·5%)	17 (16·5%)
<i>Eu</i> 641	120 (18·5%)	24 (20%)
<i>PV</i> 773	129 (16·5%)	53 (41%)
A R I S T O P H A N E S		
<i>Acharnians</i> 817	133 (16% of I)	26 (19·5% of II)
<i>Knights</i> 688	111 (16%)	47 (42·5%)
<i>Wasps</i> 758	144 (19%)	46 (32%)
<i>Clouds</i> 757	134 (17·5%)	42 (31·5%)
<i>Peace</i> 700	117 (16·5%)	42 (36%)

I do not in general wish to challenge Herington's conclusions, but it seems to me that the right answers have been reached for not entirely the right reasons; and, more importantly, that if the methods used in both these inquiries are modified, and other factors taken into consideration, more significant results emerge for both Aeschylus and Sophocles; and that, contrary to Harrison's findings, some sort of chronological development is discernible in Sophocles, as well as in Euripides.

The modifications are as follows. (1) The concept of pause (grammatical, syntactical, semantic, or what you will) needs clearer definition than Harrison, followed by Herington, gave it. (2) Verses followed by change of speaker, where run-over is *ipso facto* impossible, save in a handful of cases, distort the picture and should be excluded from the count. (3) Pause in hiatus should be treated as a function of pause at verse-end in general. This means that, as Harrison saw, a count must be made of all non-stop verses in trimeters, not merely of non-stop hiatus, and that for each play the proportion of non-stop hiatus to end-stopped hiatus should be measured against the proportion of non-stop to end-stopped trimeters in general.<sup>2</sup> I will deal with each of these in turn.

(1) Harrison, after pointing out the obvious fact that modern editors differ in their punctuation and that this is not a sufficient guide, notes some syntactical categories where common sense demands a pause, though modern convention would not normally punctuate. He instances subordinate clauses and participial clauses. He allows that there will be room for differences in the judgement of individuals, but maintains that such differences will not be so great as to invalidate his conclusions. Herington says much the same. But for this kind of inquiry a more sensitive instrument is needed. Such an instrument is largely provided by the studies of E. Fraenkel<sup>3</sup>, who uses various criteria to establish categories of

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Mark Griffith, in a dissertation on 'The Authenticity of the Prometheus Vinculus', to be published shortly, makes the same point in his criticism of Herington's treatment.

<sup>3</sup> E. Fraenkel, 'Kolon und Satz', *NGG* (1932), 197-213, *ibid.* (1933), 319-54 = *Kl.*

*Beitr.* i (1964), 73-130; 'Nachträge zu "Kolon und Satz, ii"', *Kl. Beitr.* i. 131-9; 'Noch einmal Kolon und Satz', *SB München*, 2 (1965). Further material of the same kind may be found in *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos* (1968), esp. pp. 201-3, 208-12.

pause within the sentence, notably the position of *ἄν*. The importance of Fraenkel's work for the relation of sense-pause to verse-end was seen by S. Lauer in his study of enjambment in Pindar,<sup>4</sup> though his extension and application of Fraenkel's categories was somewhat arbitrary. A full treatment of pause, drawing not only on Fraenkel's work but on ancient theory and practice in sentence-articulation, punctuation, etc., and various analytical arguments,<sup>5</sup> is a lengthy business and unnecessary for the present purpose. It will be sufficient here to list and illustrate Fraenkel's main categories, and such extensions of them as will be readily acceptable without discussion. These are as follows:

Infinitive clauses (excluding simple prolativ infinitive).

Participial clauses: (1) *participium coniunctum*, (2) genitive absolute. (The part. must have verbal force; attributive participles to not count.) The subject may belong to the main or to the participial clause. Some adjectives have verbal force (e.g. *ποτανοί* at *Hel.* 1478, *παλινόρτος* at *Ag.* 153).

Apposition. This includes 'extraposition' (Jespersen's term as used by Lauer), e.g. *ὁ δέ* followed at an interval by a name; sometimes a descriptive phrase with article followed by a name.

Series. This covers series of phrases in conjunction, disjunction, and asyndeton. A series of e.g. simple epithets in conjunction or asyndeton would not normally qualify, unless there is some special emphasis or contrast. There may then be pause in more than one place, e.g. *E. Hel.* 229–31 *φεῦ φεῦ, τίς ἦ Φρυγῶν | ἦ τίς Ἑλλαντίας ἀπὸ χθονός | ἔτεμε τῶν . . . πεύκαν;*

New idea added to an already completed sense. (This usually falls under apposition or series.)

Phrase having the force of a clause, e.g. *Ag.* 748 *πομπῇ Διὸς ξενίου*. (In lyric verse the idea of *rhetorical weight* is relevant here: a long phrase which fills the verse can more easily discharge the function of a clause than a short one.) The structure of the sentence must be taken into account.

Vocative. A criterion to be used with caution, since sometimes a vocative goes closely with what precedes (*ἀλλ' ὕμεις, ὦ ἄνδρες*), sometimes with what follows—it may even, though rarely, be followed by an enclitic.

Linking phrase, e.g. *Ag.* 158 *τοῖσδ' ὁμόφωνον | αἰλῶν αἰλῶν εἰπέ*.

A few other connections, such as similes or complements to comparatives, depending on the structure of the sentence.

There could be disagreement about the application of these criteria in particular places, but such places will be few, and provided the criteria are consistently applied the margin of error will not be very large. (For a more detailed definition of sense-pause, see 'Pause and Period', pp. 27–36 of this volume.)

(2) That verses followed by a change of speaker should be excluded from the count is tolerably obvious. A dramatist's avoidance or otherwise of non-stop

<sup>4</sup> S. Lauer, *Zur Wortstellung bei Pindar* (1959).

<sup>5</sup> See pp. 27–36 of this volume. The language of lyrics had the special characteristic that individual words have more semantic weight than in prose or in trimeters

(above, p. 35 n.25), so that pause may occasionally be omitted on grounds that do not hold for trimeters. In applying the categories to trimeters I have tried to observe this difference consistently; in any case it affects relatively few places.

hiatus in trimeters can only be judged by comparing the incidence of non-stop hiatus with end-stopped hiatus *where non-stop hiatus would be possible*, which is normally not so at change of speaker. Thus a play which abounds, say, in stichomythia will exhibit a deceptively high proportion of end-stopped hiatus, which must falsify its relation to other plays in this respect.

(3) The practice of a dramatist in the avoidance or otherwise of non-stop hiatus in trimeters must also be judged by his avoidance or otherwise of non-stop trimeters in general. The latter might, of course, be significant in itself, though I have not found it to be so; but the special significance of the former can only be discerned if it is expressed as a function of the latter.

Table III takes account of (2) and (3). The significant figures for my purpose are those in col. 13, which express the proportion of non-stop to end-stopped hiatus as a function of the proportion of non-stop to end-stopped trimeters in general.<sup>6</sup> They seem to justify the following conclusions:

(1) The plays of Aeschylus whose date is known (*Persae*, *Septem*, *Oresteia*) exhibit a relatively small variation, but such variation as there is shows them to be progressively freer in the admission of non-stop hiatus. The *Supplices*, probably to be dated to 463 and in any case between the *Septem* and *Oresteia*, is out of line with this tendency but by a fairly small margin, perhaps too small to be significant. The *Prometheus* is much freer than the other plays, and, as Herington has remarked, nearer in this respect to Aristophanes than to any other tragedy. If it is Aeschylus' last play, the difference may show that the same kind of exaggeration of a tendency already discernible in previous plays as is to be found in other criteria, as Herington, after Yorke and others, has observed. Dr. Mark Griffiths, however, would regard so marked a variation within so short a time as making *prima facie* against Aeschylean authorship. I incline to Herington's view, but the variation is certainly remarkable.

(2) The plays of Sophocles whose dates are known, or whose approximate dates or order of composition are generally agreed (that is, all except the *Trachiniae*), in general show the same tendency as Aeschylus towards an increasing freedom in the admission of non-stop hiatus. The *Philoctetes* is out of line, but again the variation is probably too small to be significant. There is virtually no difference between *Ajax* and *Antigone*, both usually assigned to the late 440s; nor is there any significant difference between *O.T.*<sup>7</sup> and *Electra*, though the latter is likely to be the later by some ten or even fifteen years. The *Trachiniae* is by this criterion the earliest of Sophocles' plays, in accord with the view of Reinhardt and several recent scholars;<sup>8</sup> perhaps much the earliest, as Schwinge and Kamerbeek have suggested.

<sup>6</sup> This is the essential difference between my procedure and those of Harrison and Herington. Harrison's final column gives the proportion of non-stop hiatus to non-stop trimeters, but takes no account of the proportion of non-stop hiatus to all hiatus. Herington, on the other hand, takes no account of the proportion of non-stop trimeters to all trimeters. (N.B. Harrison's figures in Table I, col. 1, differ from mine in Table III, col. 1, because he counts some trimeters in lyric scenes which I do not.)

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the brief survey of views about Sophoclean chronology given by E.R. Schwinge, *Die Stellung der Trachinierinnen im Werk des Sophokles* (1962), pp. 70-3. Harrison's method makes *O.T.* the least strict of all the plays, and the *Electra* almost as strict as the *Trachiniae*.

<sup>8</sup> K. Reinhardt, *Sophokles*<sup>3</sup>, (1947), ch. i; J.C. Kamerbeek, *The Plays of Sophocles, I: The Trachiniae* (1959), p. 27-9; E.R. Schwinge, *op. cit.*

TABLE III

## AESCHYLUS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<i>Pers.</i>	429	80	18·6	390	73	18·7	146	34·0	37·4	17	21·2	23·3	62·3
<i>Sept.</i>	475	80	16·7	401	69	17·2	107	22·3	26·7	13	16·2	18·8	70·0
<i>Ag.</i>	844	140	16·6	718	109	15·2	226	25·7	31·8	28	20·8	25·7	80·8
<i>Cho.</i>	620	98	15·8	442	66	14·9	107	17·3	24·3	13	13·1	19·7	81·9
<i>Eum.</i>	640	120	18·8	500	89	17·8	139	20·8	27·8	17	14·2	19·1	68·7
<i>Suppl.</i>	473	75	15·9	331	49	14·9	109	23·0	32·4	13	17·3	26·5	81·2
<i>P.V.</i>	713	129	16·5	611	74	15	251	31·7	41·1	38	29·5	51·3	125·0

} 77·4

## SOPHOCLES

<i>Trach.</i>	967	137	14	792	86	11	291	30·1	36·7	7	5·1	8·1	22·1
<i>Ant.</i>	910	143	15·7	672	90	13·4	244	25·7	36·4	11	7·6	12·2	33·5
<i>Aj.</i>	1123	159	14·2	771	107	13·9	237	30·8	31·1	11	7·5	10·5	33·8
<i>O.T.</i>	1187	222	18·6	801	131	16·4	371	31·3	46·4	24	10·8	18·3	39·4
<i>El.</i>	1136	207	18·2	822	121	14·7	318	28·0	38·7	19	9·2	15·7	40·6
<i>O.C.</i>	1372	231	16·9	1066	149	13·9	386	28·2	36·1	29	12·6	19·4	53·7
<i>Phil.</i>	1077	203	18·4	775	117	15·2	275	25·5	35·5	24	13	20·5	57·7

## EURIPIDES

<i>Med.</i>	1033	148	14·3	842	115	13·6	206	20·0	24·5	7	4·7	6·1	24·9
<i>Hcl.</i>	893	140	15·7	707	98	13·6	230	25·7	32·5	13	9·5	13·3	40·9
<i>Andr.</i>	935	132	14·2	789	99	12·6	238	25·4	30·4	7	5·3	7·1	23·3
<i>Ion.</i>	1030	143	14·0	632	107	16·9	250	24·3	39·5	16	11·2	14·9	37·7
<i>Hel.</i>	1248	223	17·9	599	143	23·8	219	17·5	36·5	36	16·1	25·9	70·1

## ARISTOPHANES

<i>Eq.</i>	685	182	26·6	425	107	25·2	98	14·3	23·1	31	17·0	29	125·6
<i>Ach.</i>	815	179	22·0	574	136	23·9	85	10·4	14·8	16	8·0	11·8	79·7
<i>Nub.</i>	756	189	25·0	448	144	31·7	99	13·1	22·5	27	14·2	19·0	84·4

## Note:

Col. 1 = all trimeters.

2 = all hiatus in trimeters.

3 = all hiatus in trimeters expressed as percentage of all trimeters.

4 = all trimeters less change of speaker.

5 = all hiatus in trimeters less change of speaker.

6 = col. 5 as percentage of col. 4.

Col. 7 = all non-stop trimeters.

8 = col. 7 as percentage of col. 1.

9 = col. 7 as percentage of col. 4.

10 = non-stop hiatus.

11 = col. 10 as percentage of col. 2.

12 = col. 10 as percentage of col. 5.

13 = col. 12 as percentage of col. 9.

No clear pattern emerges for Euripides or Aristophanes from the small samples I have taken, which are intended mainly as a control. Harrison seems to be right in saying that the *Heraclidae* is unusually free in the admission of non-stop hiatus, and that Euripides in general became much freer in his later plays, particularly the *Helen*, though it hardly approaches the *P.V.* as he asserts. Herington is evidently right to say that the *Acharnians* is much stricter than the *Knights*, but his explanation, that the *Acharnians* abounds in tragic parody, does not seem to hold for the *Clouds*, for which the figure is comparable and perhaps not significantly different. But the meagre evidence I have offered is not enough to warrant any very positive conclusion: the practice of both authors needs a thorough investigation.

Even the complete figures for Aeschylus and Sophocles must however be used with caution. It is reasonable to assume that the poets did not vary their practice

in this respect to suit any particular dramatic requirement, since non-stop hiatus has no very obvious emotional effect which it would not share with enjambment in general. This criterion would not therefore be vulnerable to the same objection as other formal criteria suggested for the dating of Sophocles' plays (resolved feet, antilabe, etc.) on which Kitto justly poured scorn.<sup>9</sup> But it is remarkable that six of the twenty-four trimeters with non-stop hiatus in *O. T.* occur in Oedipus' impassioned speech at 1369–1415, while the proportion of non-stop trimeters in general there is much lower than usual (the corresponding figure in col. 13 for this speech alone is 111·1). There might therefore be some dramatic reason for the high incidence of non-stop hiatus in *Phil.* and *O.C.* But the high incidence in Oedipus' speech may be an accident (I have not noticed any such concentration elsewhere), and in the absence of some plausible correlation we may tentatively use this criterion as evidence for chronological development, and see in it an additional ground for regarding the *Trachiniae* as the earliest of Sophocles' extant plays.

Wadham College, Oxford

T. C. W. STINTON

<sup>9</sup> H.D.F. Kitto, 'Sophocles, statistics and the *Trachiniae*', *AJP* 60 (1939), 178–93.