

THREE TOPICS IN GREEK METRE

I. CATALEXIS

Catalexis was the subject of an important recent article by L. P. E. Parker.¹ There is one particular aspect of it that she does not touch, and that ought not to be left out of account: its presumable Indo-European origins. Consideration of this aspect leads to the drawing of distinctions which otherwise tend to escape notice.

In all the main categories of Greek metre it is possible to distinguish catalectic and acatalectic cola, so related that the last two positions in the acatalectic colon correspond to a single position in the catalectic:²

	acatalectic	catalectic
aeolic	...υυ-υ-	...υυ--
iambic	...-υ-υ-	...-υ--
trochaic	...-υ-×	...-υ-
cretic	...-υ--υ-	...-υ---
dactylic	...-υυ-υυ	...-υυ--
anapaestic	...υυ-υυ-	...υυ--
ionic	...υυ--	...υυ-
dochmiac	υ--υ-	υ---

In many cases the catalectic forms are associated with period- or strophe-end; in trochaics, dactyls and anapaests the association is so regular that one may almost say that the acatalectic forms cannot end a period.³ Catalectic cola are thus 'catalectic' in a double sense: they end before the measure of the full colon is reached, and they tend to end a larger metrical sequence.

The commonest verses in the Vedas are a twelve-syllable line ending ...υ-υ-, an eleven-syllable line ending ...υ-, and an eight-syllable line ending ...υ-υ-; there is also a heptasyllable ending ...υ-. The seven- and eleven-syllable lines are obviously 'catalectic' in relation to the eight- and twelve-syllable ones in the Greek sense, and students of Indian metre have long applied the term to them. The hendecasyllable is actually used to end certain songs composed in dodecasyllables, as well as in independent stanzas, so that there is a parallel with the clausular function of Greek catalectic cola. In other Indo-European poetries the original quantitative patterns have largely been obscured by accentual developments. I have argued, however, that the catalectic/acatalectic contrast has left recognizable traces in Slavic, Old Irish, Germanic, and early Latin verse-forms, the last three all showing some evidence of a tendency for the longer verse to precede the shorter.⁴

It seems reasonable to assume on the strength of the Indian evidence, whatever one thinks of the rest, that *one* of the Greek types of catalexis, namely ...υ-υ-/...υ-- , was inherited, both as a formal phenomenon and in its potentially clausular role. Catalexis in iambic and aeolic verse is, I suggest, to be understood in the light of this.

¹ *CQ* n.s. 26 (1976), 14–28.

² I use the term 'position', which ought to be self-explanatory, for what Maas and others after him call 'element'. 'Elements' suggests *στοιχεῖα*, components of language or of particular verses.

³ 'Almost', because there are a handful of difficult cases.

⁴ *Glotta* 51 (1973), 161–187.

Cola of acatalectic form (e.g. the iambic dimeter, the glyconic, or the telesilleian) and those of catalectic form (pherecratean, reizianum, aristophanean, etc.) are both alike viable as independent verses. A poem or strophe may be constructed from either, or from a combination of both; if from both, the normal pattern will be a catalectic close contrasting with antecedent acatalectic verses or cola. The basic cola themselves are developments from inherited prototypes.⁵

When we turn to dactyls we find a different situation. Dactylic metre seems to be a specifically Greek development in which the inherited cola can no longer be recognized. A dactylic period, if it is fully dactylic, must end either ...υυ--|| or ...υυ=||. (I say 'if it is fully dactylic' because of course there are endings such as οὐδεμίαν κατάκοιτος ὦραν, where the period reveals itself as in essence a greatly expanded aeolic verse.) In Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* the ending ...υυ=|| differentiates the close of the strophe from that of the other periods within the strophe, which end ...υυ--||. It would be possible to call the latter acatalectic and the former the catalectic equivalent.⁶ Ancient metricians, however, classified them both as catalectic, εἰς συλλαβὴν or εἰς δισύλλαβον (Heph. *Ench.* 7. 1), reserving 'acatalectic' for verses in which the last 'foot' has the same form as the preceding ones, with the proviso that the final syllable is always anceps. An acatalectic dactylic tetrameter, therefore, according to them, has the form

$$-uu-uu-uu-u \times,$$

and they are able to find it, preceded by a disyllabic foot of any kind, in the metre of Sappho's second book (Heph. 7. 5-7). It is very doubtful, however, whether it can be found in anything that we would accept as dactylic.⁷ The newest piece of evidence is provided by P. Oxy. 3213, published in 1977. Combined with P. Oxy. 2443 fr. 1, it gives a fragment of Alcman in which a strophe begins

ταὶ δ' ὅτε δὴ ποταμῶϊ καλλιρρόωι
ἀράσαντ' ἔρατὸν τελέσαι γάμον
καὶ τὰ παθῆν ἄ γυναιξὶ καὶ ἀνδρά[σι(ν)
λατα κωριδίας τ' εὐνᾶς [τυ]χῆν.

The second and fourth lines have the scheme $-\infty-\infty-|\infty-\infty-$. The first and third may be the same, if period-end is assumed at *καλλιρρόωι*, or they may be $-\infty-\infty-\infty-\infty-|\infty-\infty-$ in synapheia. In any case we would appear to have firm examples of the elusive entity $-\infty-\infty-\infty-\infty-\infty \times$; and another can be seen in Alc. 57,

οἶα Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἔρσα τράφει
καὶ Σελάνας.

However, I have argued elsewhere that these verses are not to be considered as tetrameters, like the very common $[-\text{uu}-\text{uu}-\text{uu}-\text{uu}]$, but as $D|\text{uu}e$.⁸ That is not something that has a catalectic equivalent. I maintain that there is no such thing as an acatalectic tetrameter $-\text{uu}-\text{uu}-\text{uu}-\text{u} \times$ corresponding to the ‘catalectic’

⁵ See *Glotta* l.c., 165–70, and *CQ* n.s. 23 (1973), 184 f.

⁶ A. Dain and D. S. Raven have followed this course.

⁷ See A. M. Dale, *Wien. Stud.* 77 (1964), 15–36 = *Collected Papers* (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 185–209; Parker 18 f. At Ibycus 282 (= S151), 24–5 the emendation of mine that Page cites in his apparatus in *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* was presented in *Philologus* 110 (1966), 152 f. I discuss Archil. 190 in my *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, p. 135. Miss Parker seems to be suggesting that the dactylic tetrameter and the ithyphallic which make up that fragment might really have been separate verses, since the Cologne fragment has shown that another of Archilochus' so-called asynarteta, D|2ia, was in fact D||2ia. But that has no bearing on the viability of 4da as an independent verse.

⁸ See *ZPE* 26 (1977), 39.

— — — — —. There is only the pure — — — — —, and it exists only as a proclitic colon, so to speak: it cannot end a period,⁹ it is merely the standard length in which dactyls are measured out in the course of a *πνίγος*. Iambics, trochaics and anapaests likewise tend to be dispensed in tetrapodies when they occur in long runs. It is convenient and conventional to distinguish ... — — — — and ... — — — —| as 'acatalectic' and 'catalectic', and it is also appropriate inasmuch as one is a non-stopping and the other a stopping rhythm. But the relationship is not the same as between acatalectic and catalectic iambic or aeolic cola. There is no contrast here of longer and shorter closing rhythms; that only exists between ... — — — —|| and ... — — — —||.¹⁰

The case is similar with anapaests. What we call the catalectic cadence, ... — — — —||, is in fact the only way of ending a period in normal circumstances.¹¹ ... — — — —| is non-final, and there is no question of such a cadence as ... — — — —||. I presume that in the earliest Greek poetry, moulded by the Indo-European tradition, all verses ended either in — —|| or in — —||. Those in — —|| were capable of dactylic expansion, giving such verses as *ῥάμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν* "Ατθι πάλαι ποτά οἱ ῥι μὲν 'αῖ τε Κυδώνιαι, but these remained associated with aeolic verse and did not develop as a separate genus. What we know as dactylic and anapaestic developed from verses in — —||, acquiring a distinctive character from their uniformity of rhythm. Their endings in — —|| are thus catalectic endings in a historical as well as a functional sense, whereas 'acatalectic' dactylic and anapaestic measures are acatalectic only in the functional sense.

We now turn to trochaic. Acatalectic dimeters and trimeters appear as independent verses among aeolic and dactylic cola in Alcman (1 str. 9–12, 3 str. 3), and in dactylo-epitrites from Stesichorus on. In verse of regular trochaic or iambo-trochaic movement, however, acatalectic trochaic period-end can scarcely be found. There are plenty of ithyphallic endings, and a few of the type — — — —| — — — —||.¹² But apart from one or two doubtful cases in Aristophanes,¹³ acatalectic trochaic measures are proclitic and require something different to close the period, most often a lekythion. The pattern represented by the tetrameter,

— — × — — × | — — × — — ||,

⁹ There is occasionally hiatus after it (Ar. *Pax* 116, S. *Ph.* 1205, E. *Or.* 1303, *Phaeth.* 111 (before exclamation ⚡), cf. *Supp.* 277 (hexameter), *Or.* 1302 (— — — — —)), but like the hiatus sometimes found at the bucolic caesura in Homer, it cannot be interpreted as closing a period. Cf. E. Fraenkel, *Kl. Beitr.* i. 190; D. Korzeniewski, *Gr. Metrik*, p. 74. Hephaestion says that Alcman composed entire strophes in acatalectic tetrameters, but the fragment he quotes (27) is presumably only part of a strophe (despite Syrianus, *Comm. in Hermog.* i. 61 R.); I assume with Wilamowitz (quoted by Fraenkel 189) that it must have ended — — — —.

¹⁰ Parker 19 regards the final position in ... — — — —|| as a biceps with compulsory contraction. This does not seem to me meaningful. If double short is precluded, it is not a biceps. Besides, contraction (— for —) must be a secondary phenomenon, whereas — — as a close must be original. Anyway it may be more correct to write the pendant close as — × than as — —. This point will be discussed presently.

¹¹ Occasionally, and especially in emotionally charged contexts, we do find ... — — — —| with hiatus or brevis in longo (but not a short open vowel): *Alc.* 78, *Med.* 1396, *Ant.* 932, 936, *Nub.* 892, *Av.* 212, *O.C.* 139, 143, 170, 188, 1757.

¹² *Sim.* 541. 13?, *Pind. Ol.* 2 str. 1, ep. 2, 5?, *Bacchyl.* 17 ep. 7?; S. *Ant.* 364 ~ 374; E. *Supp.* 368 ~ 372, 376 ~ 380, *Or.* 966 f. ~ 977 f.

¹³ *Vesp.* 407 *ἐντέτατ' ὀξύ* (with irregular double short and unelidable vowel in hiatus); 1064 f. *οἴχεται, κύκνου τε πολιώτεραι δὴ || αἰδ' ἐπανθοῦσιν τρίχες ||* (but the lekythion is unlikely to be a separate period; MacDowell takes *δὴ* to be in corruption, which would be highly abnormal); *Eccl.* 899 (where *ὡπερ ξυνείην ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἕτερον ἂν πέτοίτο* may be an addition; cf. Wilamowitz, *Gr. Verskunst*, p. 476).

appears in more extended form in a song such as Anacreon's πῶλε Θρηκίη (2tr|2tr|2tr|lek||) and often in comedy, for example in the πνίγη which sometimes follow tetrameter passages. In tragic lyric, trochaic cola emerge as segments within strophes that begin and end with blunt cola, strophes that seen as a whole are iambic and are capable of analysis into iambic metra throughout if a series of trochaic word-divisions is disregarded. *Helen* 168–78, with its trochaic πνίγος ending in a lekythion, is the outstanding example. The lekythion in this category of lyric should not be considered as a catalectic trochaic dimeter. It is one of the basic constituents of all iambic verse, whether or not trochaic segmentation is present, and its acatalectic status is shown by its relationship to the ithyphallic, which functions as its catalectic counterpart. For example in *Cho.* 631–8, κακῶν δὲ πρεσβεύεται τὸ Λήμνιον κτλ., the scheme of the strophe is: ia lek|ia 2lek|ia lek|ia \wedge ia|ia lek|ia lek|ia \wedge ith||. Lekythion and ithyphallic are clearly an acatalectic/catalectic pair of the inherited type. But all so-called catalectic trochaic verses end with a lekythion or lekythion + iambic metron. What goes by the name of catalectic trochaic, therefore, is from a historical point of view acatalectic. As for what we call acatalectic trochaic, we should perhaps distinguish between the autonomous verses in the Dorian poets and the proclitic cola that occur in iambic and iambo-trochaic. The latter seem to be on a par with 'acatalectic' dactylic tetrameters, that is, they are extension-pieces. The word-divisions that mark them out help us to keep time as the rhythm flows on uninterrupted, and make it clear that there is to be no pause just yet. The former, on the other hand, can perhaps be derived from an Indo-European prototype, as they have an analogue in an octosyllabic verse of the form $\times \times \times \times - \cup - -$ used in a few early Vedic hymns. The cadence of this verse would suggest that it belongs to the catalectic category; but it has no acatalectic counterpart one syllable longer, and it may possibly represent a hypercatalectic type. A hypothetical Indo-European opposition between hypercatalectic $\dots - \cup - -$ and acatalectic $\dots - \cup -$ would provide a prototype for the opposition between 'acatalectic' and 'catalectic' trochaics in Greek.¹⁴

The Greek metre that has the greatest chance of being of foreign origin is the cretic. From at least the fifth century B.C. it was considered to be characteristic of Crete, and the earliest poet known to have used it is Thaletas of Gortyn.¹⁵ It is not easily related to other Greek metres, and is unique in having hemiolic rhythm. A Minoan legacy preserved in cultic dance? The catalectic close appears in Alcman's cretic hexameters (58) and in *PMG* 967

Κρησίοις ἐν ῥυθμοῖς παῖδα μέλψωμεν ||,

whereas in drama (and the late Delphic Paeans) cretic periods and strophes end acatalectic. We cannot document an alternation of the two endings in any context. Formally they resemble the aeolic and iambic alternatives $\times - \cup - / \cup - -$, but it is hard to say whether the cretic catalexis represents a congener of the Helladic type, an innovation under Helladic influence, or an independent growth.

In ionics we find several different forms that have a claim to be called catalectic, though they do not occur in the earliest evidence, the ionics of Alcman and the Lesbian poets.¹⁶ In Anacreon too ionics are normally of equal length. But Hephaestion quotes

¹⁴ On hypercatalexis in Greek see Parker 16. She points out that it functions in the same way as catalexis in that it produces a contrast between blunt and pendant clausulae.

¹⁵ Cratinus 222, *PMG* 967, *al.*; Glaucus of Rhegium *ap. ps.-Plut. De Musica* 1134de; Ephorus 70F 149 §16.

¹⁶ Unless Lesb. inc. 23 χρυσοφάην θεράπειαν Ἀφροδίτας represents the end of a catalectic followed by an anacletic ionic.

from him the catalectic verse *Διονύσου σαῦλαι Βασσαρίδες* (411 b); and 346. 1 shows us a strophe with hypermetric beginning and hypercatalectic end:

$$\begin{array}{c} -\cup\cup-\cup\cup--| \\ \cup\cup-\cup\cup--| \\ \cup\cup--\cup\cup-\cup\cup--|| \end{array}$$

The third verse is paralleled in A. *Supp.* 867 (~ 877) *αἶ γὰρ δυσπαλάμωσ ὄλοιο* || (in form like a hipponactean, but in the context ionic), P.V. 130 ~ 146, Ba. 536 ~ 555, Corinna 654, and it has an anaclastic equivalent in Anacr. 413-4 (stichic trimeters) $\cup\cup--\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup--$ and Bacchyl. fr. 19. 1-2 (refrain)

*σὺ δὲ σὺν χιτῶνι μούνωι
παρὰ τὴν φίλην γυναῖκα φεύγεις.*

The reduced metron $\cup\cup-$ is quite common in drama; it sometimes serves as period-end, but it also occurs freely at the beginning of the verse or within it. The anaclastic dimeter $\cup\cup-\cup\cup--$ gives rise to catalectic clausulae as follows:

$\cup\cup-\cup\cup--$ *Cycl.* 502 ~ 510, Ba. 71 (taken up in 72 ff.).
 $\cup\cup-\cup\cup\cup\cup-$ in galliambics (Catull. 63, etc.; D.L. 8. 91); cf. *Pers.* 107 ~ 113.
 $\cup\cup-\cup\cup--$ P.V. 134 ~ 151, *Vesp.* 302 ~ 316, Ba. 385 ~ 401, 536 ~ 555.

Mention may also be made of the metrically unique Dictaeon hymn with its ionics *a maiore* $-\cup\cup\cup-\cup\cup\cup|$ and catalectic $-\cup\cup\cup--||$.

Part of the anaclastic series corresponds closely to part of the iambo-trochaic series, differing only in the initial syllable:

$\cup\cup-\cup\cup--$	$-\cup-\times-\cup\cup--$	(2tr)
$\cup\cup-\cup\cup\cup\cup-$	$-\cup-\cup\cup\cup-$	(lek)
$\cup\cup-\cup\cup--$	$-\cup-\cup\cup--$	(ith)

As we have seen, these may represent Indo-European hypercatalectic, acatalectic and catalectic respectively. If so, there has been a displacement of functions in the ionic genus, the first type becoming the standard and the others alternative catalectics to it. But we are hampered by not knowing whether $\cup\cup-\cup\cup\cup\cup-$ and $\cup\cup--\cup\cup--$ are of separate origin, and if not, which was primary.

The alternation $...\cup\cup--/...\cup\cup-$ is one that we met, but did not account for, in dactylic, where $...--$ seemed to be an original catalectic. The shorter clausula may have arisen by generalization of the principle of blunt/pendant contrast. Again a displacement would be involved. Originally the pendant close was the catalectic, but where it became the dominant form in a particular genus a vacancy might be created for a new catalectic, a shorter blunt form, to contrast with it. In ionics the alternation of $\cup\cup-$ and $\cup\cup--$ within the verse (however *that* originated) provided especially favourable conditions.

In the dochmiac genus, a catalectic counterpart of the basic form $\cup--\cup-$ may perhaps be recognized in the colon $\cup---$, which is an elusive entity but does seem to occur occasionally. N. C. Conomis in his valuable study of dochmiacs in *Hermes*, 92 (1964), 23-50, discusses it on p. 34. From dochmiac contexts he cites only H. F. 1024 (*λυσσάδι συγκατεριγάσω μοίραι* ||), and several examples of *ἰώ μοί μοι*, to which he is rightly reluctant to ascribe metrical status. I would add A. *Supp.* 117 (*ἰλέομαι μὲν ᾿Απίαν βοῦνιν*; *Hypsip.* p. 48 B. line 103 *δι' Αἰγαίου*; *Rhes.* 832 (*ζῶντα πόρευσον οὐ*) *παραιτούμαι* || (~ †466); possibly *Hipp.* 814 *αἰαὶ τόλμας*; *Tro.* 260

(τίδ' ὁ νεοχμὸν = *cr*, ἀπ' ἐμέθεν ἐλάβετε = *δ*) τέκος, ποῦ μοι; ||. I leave out of account a number of examples of |---|, which can always be interpreted as an anapaestic metron. Resolved forms ◡◡◡-- can be adduced from Aeschylus: *Sept.* 152 ὦ πότνι' Ἥρα || ~ 160 ὦ φίλ' Ἀπολλων ||; *Cho.* 962 ψάλιον οἴκων.¹⁷ The colon does not seem strongly associated with a clausular role, though it does end the strophe in *Rhesus*, a section of a strophe in *H.F.*, and a period in several places.

The genesis of the dochmiac is obscure, but formally the opposition ...◡◡-/...-- fits the inherited model. The corresponding hypercatalectic will be ◡--◡◡-, and this actually occurs in A. fr. 343 M., 37 πυρὸς ἀκάματον αὐγάν || ~ 46 [τε καὶ] σπεισίδωρ[ος] ||, where the resolutions in 37 preclude description as two bacchei. Possibly this measure should be recognized in some other places where alternative analyses are available, e.g. *Ag.* 1103 (~ 1110) ἄφερτον φίλοισιν, |δυσίατον· ἀλὰ δ' (ἐκὰς ἀποστατεῖ ||); 1123 (~ 1134) (ξυνανύτει = *cr*) βίου δύντος αὐγαῖς; 1136 (~ 1146) ἰὼ ἰὼ ταλαίνας. Aeschylus several times closes a dochmiac strophe with an aristophanean, --◡◡◡--◡-, and although he does the same in his iambic lyrics, it is worth pointing out that --◡◡◡--◡- is one of his favourite forms of dochmiac, and the aristophanean is hypercatalectic in relation to it. In *Sept.* 692-4, for example, the relationship is clearly felt:

ὠμοδακῆς σ' ἄγαν ἱμερος ἐξοτρύ-
νει πικρόκαρπον ἀνδροκτασίαν τελεῖν
αἵματος οὐ θεμιστοῦ.

II. ANCEPS

I am not concerned with anceps syllables (as in Ἄρης, πικρός) but with anceps positions. They have always been with us, yet there is no unanimity among metricians about their classification and notation. There are certainly different sorts of anceps to be distinguished. However, I will venture a general proposition that embraces them all:

Greek metre is based on the ordered contrast of long and short. Those positions are anceps which are not required to be long or short in order to make the chosen pattern clear.

Indo-European verse can be seen as essentially syllable-counting, with an opposition of long and short syllables in the cadence: more precisely, with a long syllable in the antepenultimate or penultimate position, set in relief by a short preceding it and (when antepenultimate) following it.¹⁸ The scheme of the acatalectic octosyllable, for example, was

× × × ◡◡◡ × ||

Such quantitative regulation as there was served to emphasize a single point in the delivery of the verse, near the end. The final syllable was apparently not involved. In Vedic verse, as in Greek, the quantity of the final syllable is indifferent.

As Greek verse evolved, it became subject to more extensive regulation of quantities. The principle was established that there should be fixed long positions – I call them (*loci principes*) – not only in the cadence but in the earlier part of the verse too, and that they should be spaced, neither adjacent to one another nor separated by more

¹⁷ And perhaps E. *Cycl.* 661 (τόρνεν' ἔλκε μή) σ' ἐξοδυνηθεῖς. Among iambs: *Andr.* 467 ἔριδας οἴκων ~ 475 ἄχθος ἐπ' ἄχθει; *O.C.* 1079 Ζεὺς τι κατ' ἄμαρ ~ 1090 Παλλὰς Ἀθήνα.

¹⁸ See above, pp. 281 f. For simplicity I here omit the hypercatalectic type in which there are two longs with a short between.

than two other positions. For the pattern of these longs to be recognizable, it was necessary for *some* of the other positions to be kept short. Two rules sufficed; I shall call them the rules of contrast.

1. Each long (princeps) position must have a short adjacent to it.

2. No short syllable might be adjacent to a long syllable *not* in a princeps position, as this would create ambiguity as to which long syllable was occupying the princeps.

From these rules it follows that if successive principles are separated by two positions, these must both be short;¹⁹ if only by one it may be anceps, provided that the principles have an adjacent short on their other side. If a verse begins with a

princeps, therefore, it must continue either $\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}\left\{\begin{smallmatrix} \times \text{---} \\ \text{---}\text{---} \end{smallmatrix}\right.$ or $\text{---}\text{---}\left\{\begin{smallmatrix} \times \text{---} \\ \text{---}\text{---} \end{smallmatrix}\right.$

In Ionic and Doric poetry these principles do operate from the beginning of the verse, but in the Aeolic tradition relics of the original freedom of the pre-cadential part of the verse survive in the glyconic $\times \times \text{---}\text{---}\text{---}$ (with its congeners and derivatives) and in the verses $\text{oo--}\times \text{---}\text{---}$ ²⁰ and $\times \times \text{---}\text{---}(\text{---})$.²¹ The peculiarity of these forms is that, while they obey the principle of having a princeps in every second or third position, the first princeps is not supported by the two rules of contrast.

Where the principles were regularly spaced on every second position, giving the iambo-trochaic pattern $\text{---}\text{---}\times \text{---}$, it was natural to carry the rhythm through to the end of the verse, so that $\times \text{---}\text{---}\times \parallel$ (for example) came to be understood as $\times \text{---}\times \text{---}\parallel$. In practice the quantity of the final syllable remained free, but a short syllable there came to be felt as standing for a notional long. Even in asymmetrical cola of the acatalectic type, such as the glyconic $\times \times \text{---}\text{---}\times \parallel$, the sense of recurrent longs in every second or third position was enough to confer the status of a theoretical long on the final anceps. Wherever a glyconic occurs in synapheia with a following colon in archaic or classical lyric, its eighth position is long and (in those poets who admit resolution in aeolic cola) resolvable. This does not happen with 'pendant' cola such as $\times \times \text{---}\text{---}\times$ or $\times \times \text{---}\text{---}\times$; their final syllable is usually long in synapheia, but not invariably, and it is not resolvable.²²

The ancient metricians teach that the final syllable in any metre is indifferent, *ἀδιάφορος*.²³ Some of them explain that a short syllable in that place is made equivalent to a long by the addition of the pause:

Quintil. 9. 4. 93 neque enim ignoro in fine pro longá accipi breuem, quia uidetur aliquid uacantis temporis ex eo quod insequitur accedere.

Aphthon. ('Mar. Vict.') vi. 62. 29 Keil nihil enim metri interest utrum illa longa sit an breuis, eá uidelicet ratione quia distinctionis mora breue tempus extendit. Cf. 71. 20.

Anon. vi. 636. 17 K. nihil interest longá an breui syllabá uersus finiatur, cum finiti uersús mora, etiam si breuem sortita est syllabam, adiectione uacui temporis faciat illam longae parem.

¹⁹ The contraction of such a double short into a long (biceps) is generally agreed to be a secondary development. It often results in long syllables in the principles having no short syllables next to them. We may still say that there are two short *positions*.

²⁰ Attested in the Lesbians only in the form $\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}$, but perhaps in principle $\times \times \text{---}\text{---}$.

²¹ Not attested in the Lesbians.

²² Not all cola ending --- are pendant in this sense: in bacchiacs and ionics both long positions behave as principles. In tragic ionics either is resolvable (in synapheia), and in bacchiacs at least the second (the first being presumably a triseme).

²³ A collection of passages is quoted by L. E. Rossi, *Riv. Fil.* 91 (1963), 61–3. Add Arist. Quint. p. 44. 7 W.-I.

Choerob. in Heph. p. 225. 8C. ἰστέον ὅτι ἡ βραχεΐα ἀντὶ μακρᾶς εὐρίσκεται εὐλόγως κατὰ τὸ τέλος· βοηθεῖται γὰρ ὑπὸ τῆς σιωπῆς. They are not saying that all short finals stand in lieu of a long, since they also believe in long finals standing in lieu of a short,²⁴ but they certainly consider that a long would be the rational quantity in many metres. From the time of Boeckh the concept of a 'short instead of a long' has been orthodox doctrine, formulated by Maas as '(syllaba) brevis in (elemento) longo'.²⁵ Maas argued that 'inner responsion' very often requires a long in the final position and practically never a short; he meant that in an iambic line, for instance, the rhythm leads us to expect that the sequence will be repeated in the last metron. L. E. Rossi rejects this as too theoretical, 'un resto, tenace a morire, dell' intellettualismo hermanniano'. In his view the scheme of the verse requires nothing more nor less than an indifferent element in final place; the quantity of the syllable is rendered indifferent by the pause.²⁶ A. M. Dale distinguishes between metres in which the pattern does point to a final long (all those in which the penultimate is short, and bacchiacs or ionics in series) and metres in which it does not (aeolics, paroemiacs, dactyls, with pendant close ... ◡ - ×).²⁷

There is logic in all these standpoints. The final position can be notated as long in all cases inasmuch as it can always accommodate a long syllable, and when it is occupied by a short syllable its length can always be regarded as being made up by the pause. But if we want our notation to express the nature of the syllables which actually occur in a given position, we should mark the final as an anceps, since in the rest of the metrical scheme a long-mark signifies that a position requires a long syllable. If on the other hand we want it to express our perception of the colon's φύσις, it is perfectly reasonable to distinguish between cola which, when not closing the period, end in a (resolvable) princeps – glyconics, ionics, acatalectic iambic cola, etc. – and those which do not, and to show the final as long or anceps accordingly. It might be a worthwhile subject of research to determine how far poets do in fact admit short final syllables in period-endings of the two categories.²⁸

We have now accounted for the three common types of anceps: (i) anceps preceding the initial princeps, including the double anceps of the Aeolic base; (ii) mid-verse anceps in the sequence ◡ - × ◡ -; (iii) final anceps. Now for the rarer type for which Miss Dale uses the name 'drag'. In *CQ* n.s. 1 (1951), 23 (= *Collected Papers*, 67) she describes it as 'a short between two longs which has occasional licence to lengthen'. This is a regrettably loose definition, and her examples are not homogeneous.

²⁴ See Aphthonius and Choeroboscus 11.cc.

²⁵ *Gr. Metrik*, 2nd ed. (1929), p. 35; *Greek Metre* (1961), pp. 29, 33.

²⁶ Art. cit. 63. He approves Maas's suggestion of a special symbol ◡ to denote the final element, noting that in music this indicates the prolongation of a final note *ad libitum* (art. cit. 71).

²⁷ *Collected Papers*, p. 188, cf. *Gnomon* 28 (1956), 193, *Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 2nd ed., p. 26. Miss Parker in *CQ* n.s. 26 (1976), 27 criticizes Miss Dale for inconsistency, on the ground that she uses the criterion of internal responsion for the first group but not for the second, there being no internal responsion pointing to final anceps. This seems unfair. Miss Dale is surely entitled to regard the final as anceps in the absence of internal responsion or other factors calling for it to be long.

²⁸ Only a syllable ending in a short open vowel should be counted as short. Mr W. S. Barrett has recently discovered that Pindar shows a marked aversion to such syllables in all final positions: in the Epinicians their frequency is one in 20 where the period ends - ◡ - ||, one in 120 with other rhythms, whereas in Homer and the Lesbian poets they occur once every four or five verses. I have been unable to find any definite example of a final short in ionics ending ◡ - ◡ - ||; at Ar. *Vesp.* 314 ἀγαλμα may be elided into ἐέ, which is usually printed *extra metrum* but has no counterpart in the strophe. I suspect that ἐέ in dramatic texts represents sobbing.

In ionics $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ at *Cycl.* 499 (~ 507, 515) must be counted as drag if the text is sound. More common in drama (with perhaps an earlier instance in Anacreon 346 fr. 4. 3) is $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$. But this does not fall within my definition of drag; $\cup\cup \times \cup\cup\cup$ is the form to be expected, according to the rules of princeps-spacing and contrast, for an octosyllable beginning $\cup\cup$ and ending $\cup \times$. The general preference for short anceps may be of aesthetic origin. In a strict musical rhythm it allows exact equivalence with $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$, with which the so-called anaclastic form is associated in Anacreon and may occasionally respond in drama. In general we see preferences for long or short anceps being exercised much more in sung than in spoken verse. In lyric iambs, for example, Aeschylus has a strong preference for short anceps, whereas Sophocles sometimes has a series of long ones (as in *El.* 482 ff. ~ 498 ff., *Ichn.* 243 ff. ~ 290 ff.).

(i) One kind arises when an acatalectic dactylic colon (usually a tetrameter) is followed by an iambic or enoplian colon, as in *OT* 171 f. ~ 182 f.

$$-uu-uu-uu-uu \mid x-uu-uu-uu-x \parallel.$$

(ii) The strophe of Alcman's Louvre Partheneion sometimes ends $\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}$, sometimes $\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}$. The scheme could therefore be represented as $\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}$, $\text{---}\times\text{---}$. But considering $\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}\text{---}$ on its own, we would certainly take the long

³⁰ In *P.V.* 576/595 $\cup\cup\cup\cup$ actually occurs in responsion with $\cup\cup\cup\cup$. (Page emends.)

³¹ Also 'Therperander' *PMG* 697, *E. Alc.* 464 f. ~ 474 f., *El.* 456 ~ 468, 459 ~ 471, *I.T.* 395 ~ 410?, *Phoen.* 1581, *Or.* 1101, *I.A.* 1332, *Ar. Nub.* 289 f. ~ 312 f., *Tim. Pers.* 130 f., 139 f.

the notional principles need to be realized by long syllables. Briefly and temporarily [$\times \cup \cup$] [$\times \cup \cup$], with the help of word division, may pass for dactyls, [$\cup \cup \times$] [$\cup \cup \times$] for anapaests. In the Aristophanic passages it seems to be a matter of (a) retaining only one effective princeps in each trochaic, iambic or ionic metron, letting the other be anceps so long as the adjacent syllables remain short (normal $\cup \cup \times$: free style $\cup \cup \times \cup$, not $\cup \cup \times \times$), and (b) relaxing the second rule of contrast as regards the consecutive non-princeps positions of the ionic and anapaest, so that the normal $\cup \cup -$ becomes $\times \cup -$.³⁷

Lastly I want to consider the question of 'resolvable anceps'. Maas, *Greek Metre* pp. 27 f., applies this term, together with 'resolvable breve', to the admission of the sequence $\cup \cup -$ as an alternative to the normal $\times -$ or $\cup -$ in iambo-trochaic metre, to the reiziana and telesilleans of two subliterate poems (*PMG* 848, 935) which allow $\times -$ and $\cup \cup -$ as alternative beginnings, and to resolution in the Aeolic base, i.e. the responsion $\cup \cup \cup \sim - \times \sim \cup -$ (for which he cites only Aristonoos and Corinna, though in drama too $\cup \cup \cup$ may respond either with $\cup \cup$ or with $\cup -$, and $\cup -$ with $\cup -$). Recently we have learned that Stesichorus used $\times D \sim e -$ and $D \sim D -$.³⁸ This too has been called resolvable anceps.

'Resolution' implies division into constituent parts. The normal application of the term is to the splitting of a long position into two shorts. Fair enough: let the two shorts coalesce, and you have a long again. But what happens in ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τὸ χρέμα τῶν νυκτῶν ὄσον? Is the short position in the first metron divided into half-shorts? That would be splitting the atom: a short is the smallest unit on the scale, it is not like a semiquaver that can be divided into demisemiquavers. I prefer to say that the metrical scheme is relaxed. A double short is substituted for a single. The essential contrast of short and long is preserved, and provided that the frequency of such substitutions is kept within bounds the overall rhythm is not overborne. As for the telesilleans and reiziana with initial double short, such forms are quite common in Pindar and drama, only never, I think, in responsion with $\times - \cup \cup - (\cup) -$. They occur in the Lesbian poets too, but there they function as glyconics and pherecrateans, the double short being still an accepted form of the base. I suggest that this is their origin. Because of their light-headedness, so to speak, they came to be dissociated from $\times \bar{\times} - \cup \cup \dots$ and treated as a variant of $\times - \cup \cup \dots$. At the same time the base, now always containing at least one long, came to be treated as resolvable. We can always say that it is a long that is being resolved, even though the location of the long in the base is variable.

In the case of Stesichorus it seems eccentric to call $\cup \cup \cup \cup - \cup \cup \cup - \dots$ a resolution. It differs from an ordinary biceps only in that it alternates with a single short as well as with a long. It seems best to say that Stesichorus (like Alcman fluctuating between the endings $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup -$ and $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \times$) fluctuates between a biceps and an anceps at certain points of juncture between cola, and to speak in such instances not of a resolvable anceps but of a biceps/anceps. Let us hold fast to the principle that only a long can resolve.

³⁷ Though irregular in Greek terms, this pattern of contrast has an analogy in the standard Lydian rhyming dodecasyllable, which seems to approximate to the scheme $\times \cup \cup \times \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$, though we are ignorant about many details of prosody and the part played by stress. See *Kadmos* 11 (1972), 165–75 and 13 (1975), 133–6.

³⁸ P. Lille 76, best studied with P. J. Parsons, *ZPE* 26 (1977), 7–36.

III. CAESURA

The distinction made in nearly all modern metrical handbooks between caesura, which falls within a metron, and diaeresis, which falls between metra, has a precarious foundation in ancient doctrine. Aristides Quintilianus, listing the *εὐπρεπεῖς τομαί* of the hexameter, says *τετάρτη κατ' ἐνίου τέσσαρες δάκτυλοι, ἧ ὅπερ ἄμεινον τέταρτος τροχαῖος· ἧ γὰρ εἰς ὅμοια μέρη διαίρεσις μᾶλλον ἢ τομὴ καλεῖται* (I. 24, p. 47. 21 W.-I.). But it is the equality of segments – he is thinking of a division into three dimeters –, not the coincidence of word-end with metron-end, that prompts the word *διαίρεσις*. It would not have been applied to the caesura in the trochaic tetrameter catalectic,

- - - x - - - x | - - - x - - -.

Aristides' point is made clearer by comparison of ps.-Hephaestion p. 353. 6 ff. C.:

παραίτεται δὲ (the hexameter) τὴν κατὰ πόδα τομήν, ὥς ἐν τῷ
ὕβριος | εἵνεκα | τῆσδε, σὺ | δ' ἴσχειο, | πείθεο | δ' ἡμῖν
(Il. 1. 214) ... καὶ τὴν δίχα τομήν, ὥς
ἐνθ' οὗτ' Ἰδομενεὺς πλῆ | μίμνειν οὗτ' Ἀγαμέμνων
(Il. 8. 78) ... καὶ τὴν εἰς τριχῇ διαίρεσιν δέ, ὥς ἐν τῷ
ἦρως, μὴ μοι | τούνεκ' ἀμύμονα | νείκεε κούρην
(Od. 7. 303). ῥυθμικὰ γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα <μᾶλλον> ἢ μετρικά.

All these word divisions are *τομαί*; *διαίρεσις* (εἰς ὅμοια μέρη) is the undesirable rhythmical effect they produce. To speak of the 'bucolic diaeresis', as modern writers now do almost invariably, is not only a pedantry unknown to the ancients, who said *βουκολικὴ τομή*, *caesura* or *incisio bucolica*,³⁹ but a misunderstanding of their use of *διαίρεσις*.

It was Boeckh who was responsible for the extension of the term:

Talem divisionem, si in aequalia versus dissecabatur membra, veteres grammatici vocabant διαίρεσιν: sed tantundem est, aequalia sint an inaequalia: communis enim huius divisionis in utrisque, et aequalibus et inaequalibus, est natura: quapropter totum hoc sectionis genus distinctionem sive diaeresin appellabimus.

(*De metris Pindari* [*Pindari Opera* i. ii], 97.)

Subsequent writers perpetuated this usage but attributed it to the ancients, which Boeckh did not do.

Wilhelm Christ was exceptional in rejecting the distinction drawn between diaeresis and caesura, though he repeated the error of asserting that it was the ancient doctrine:

Wir haben diese Scheidung von διαίρεσις und τομή als unwesentlich und verwirrend aufgegeben und nennen jeden einen Vers in Kola theilenden Wortschluss Cäsur.

(*Metrik der Griechen und Römer*, 2nd ed., 1879, 123.)

Christ's practice is in line with that of ancient metricians. But is it a practice to be followed, or does Boeckh's signify a genuine advance over it? Is there some distinction to be drawn between different categories of *τομή*, or should we simply be content to note that word-end occurs at certain places in the verse, and to call it caesura in all cases?

I have so far spoken only of the hexameter. Let us now consider it in conjunction

³⁹ Append. Dionys. p. 330. 11 Consbruch, ps.-Heph. p. 352. 21; [Sergius] iv. 523. 14 K., Aphthon. vi. 65. 31, 114. 18, cf. 240. 8; Frag. Bobiense, vi. 623. 15.

with its most obvious parallel, the iambic trimeter. Every hexameter has a caesura in one of these three places:

- - - - - | - - - - - x

Every iambic trimeter in the iambographers, and nearly every one in tragedy, has a caesura in one of these two places:

x - - - x | - - - x - - -

The explanations usually offered for these facts insult common sense. Otto Schroeder, for example, says that the caesura was required as a pause for breath, which enabled the reciter to avoid disturbing the flow of the verse by breathing at the ends of metra.⁴⁰ If one were to recite Homer on the summit of Mt. Everest I daresay it might be necessary to gasp for breath after every hemistich, but it is not necessary for a healthy man anywhere in Europe, and if Schroeder had ever tried it out he would have discovered that it sounds ridiculous. He does not say why a breath at the end of the second or third metron should be more disturbing to the flow of the verse than one at the end of the fourth, where a caesura is quite common. Another explanation quite often advanced is that the caesura was necessary to prevent the verse from falling into two equal halves. This point of view has some support in the ancient observations about *διαίρεσις*, but it is open to at least three objections: (i) Word-end after the third foot is not avoided; it is not hard to find verses such as *ἐννῆμαρ μὲν ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὦλχeto κῆλα θεοῖο* (*Il.* 1. 53), or *ὅς δ' ἔστι παῖς μοι μόνος, ὑπεκπέμπω λάθραι* (*Andr.* 47). (ii) Avoidance of medial division does not in any case entail caesura in an *adjacent* place. Why do we never find such a verse as *καὶ παρὰ θῖνα πολυφλοίσβοιο νέοντο θαλάσσης*? (iii) If division into equal parts is offensive in these metres, why is it sought in others, for instance in the elegiac pentameter and in anapaests?

The true answer is simply stated by Aphthonius:

Incisiones etiam uersuum, quas Graeci *τομάς* uocant, ante omnia in hexametro heroico necessario obseruandae sunt: omnis enim uersus in duo cola fórmandus est. (vi. 64. 31 K.)

The units *D* (- - - - -), *D* x, x *D* x, are common as independent cola in lyric from Archilochus and Alcman on. The elegiac pentameter consists simply of two *D* cola. The hexameter with which it associates is in essence a combination of a 'falling' colon *D*(-) with a 'rising' one ∞ *D*-; they are so matched that the rhythm at the join is smooth.⁴¹ These, not dactylic feet, were the metrical units which meant most to the poet, in conformity with which he arranged his words, and to which most of his inherited language was already adapted: *τὸν δ' ἡμέιβετ' ἔπειτα - πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς*. The normal caesura, whether penthemimeral or trochaic, is simply the place where the two cola meet. The secondary analysis of the verse into six feet or metra is irrelevant to it, as we see from the parallel of the ineptly-named pentameter, where the caesura cannot be said either to cut into a foot or to coincide with the end of one. (Consequently metricians since Boeckh have never made up their minds whether to call it a caesura or a diaeresis.)

Similarly in the iambic trimeter. By the time of Sophocles and Euripides there were those who analysed it as three metra (Hdt. 1. 12. 2, 174. 5), but x - - - x and

⁴⁰ *Gr. Singverse* (1924), p. 8; *Nomenclator Metricus* (1929), p. 20; similarly K. Rupprecht, *Einführung in die gr. Metrik*, 3rd ed. (1950), pp. 13 f.

⁴¹ There are a few cases in Homer where it is not, and I assume that in earlier times unequalized verses, especially of the form *D*|∞*D* x ||, were more freely admitted. See *CQ* n.s. 23 (1973), 188; *Il.* 4. 202 may be added to the examples, but 4. 517 and 9. 506 should be subtracted from them.

— ◡ — × — ◡ — were surely the metrical units in the tragedians' minds, and in Archilochus', as they composed. The verse did not necessarily *originate* as a compound of these two cola (see below), but that is what it *was* in historical times. The less common hephthemimeral caesura, both in the trimeter and the hexameter, represents a displacement of the normal caesura. The two parts of the verse retain as nearly as possible their outer shape, though the first becomes longer and the second shorter: in

— ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — | ◡ — ◡ — ×

the contrast is preserved between a first colon beginning on the princeps and a second beginning off it, and in

× — ◡ — × — ◡ — | × — ◡ —

vice versa. The relation of the caesura to the 'foot' is significant only to this extent.

The bucolic caesura in the hexameter has an altogether different status. It is merely a place at which word-end is quite common: a regular caesura is necessary as well. I suspect that it is a by-product of the main caesura. The poets aimed to fit their words into the frame — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — × ||. For words and word-groups of the shape ◡ — ◡ — ◡ or ◡ — ◡ — ◡, of which there were many, the most convenient place was after the main caesura. That is where they are usually put, and that gives you a bucolic caesura.

In archaic lyric and the lyrics of drama, wherever standard cola (glyconics, dochmii, iambic dimeters, etc.) can be recognized, there is frequent correspondence of colon-end and word-end within the period. This is caesura of the same kind as that in the hexameter or pentameter, caesura which simply reflects the organization of the phrasing in close accord with the colon structure. Hephaestion, incidentally, uses *τομή* of the colon-division in Archilochus' 'asynartete' verse × D × | *ith*, 'Ερασμονίδη Χαρίλαε, χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον (p. 47. 12C.). Something similar – perhaps not quite the same – can be seen where the composition is by metra rather than cola. For example long dactylic runs are commonly divided into tetrameters by word division. The acatalectic dactylic tetrameter is, as we have seen (p. 283), not an autonomous colon. Marching anapaests are divided after every metron except the last before the catalexis.⁴² In long iambo-trochaic periods word division is used to mark out trochaic dimeters (see p. 284), indeed often single metra and single 'feet':

φόρμιγγας, | αἰλίνουσ<ι> |
τοῖς ἐμοῖσι | σύνοχα | δάκρυα, |
πάθει | πάθεα, | μέλεσι | μέλεα |
μουσεῖα | θρηγῆμασι ξυνωιδὰ |
πέμπει | Φερσέφασσα |
φόνια, | χάριτας | ἔν' ἐπὶ | δάκρυσι | ... (Hel. 171–6.)

So sometimes with cretics, as in *Hec.* 1081 ναῦς ὅπως | ποντίοις | πείσμασιν | λινό-
κροκον... 1100 f. ἀμπτάμενος | οὐράνιον | ὑψιπετὲς | ἐς μέλαθρον |; with ionics, *Cho.* 790–3, 827–30. We can call all these caesurae if we like, but they are something a little different from the caesura in the hexameter.

The antithesis of the caesura is the bridge. In general, bridges within the colon may be accounted for by a single basic principle of versification that I have never seen formulated:

Polysyllabic words which are of the right shape for the beginning or end of the colon

⁴² Occasionally the division is postponed by one short syllable. This is perhaps analogous to the alternation of D|∞D– with D◡|◡D– in the hexameter; it cannot be compared with the postponement represented by the hephthemimeral caesura.

tend to be placed there rather than in other possible positions. The tendency is stronger as regards colon-end. This gives rise to bridges because there are certain points in the verse at which word-end would only occur as a result of an abnormal word-placing. Thus in the hexameter words scanning $| \text{---} \cup$ are most often placed at the end of the first colon, and those scanning $| (\cup) \text{---} \cup$ at the end of either the first or the second. Hermann's Bridge is a way of expressing the fact that they are seldom placed at the beginning of the second colon. In the trochaic tetrameter, composing within the frame

$$\text{---} \cup \times \text{---} \cup \times | \text{---} \cup \times \text{---} \cup ||,$$

the poet will instinctively use a sequence $\cup \text{---} |$ to occupy the place against the caesura, and the more habitually he does that, the less his ears accept the patterns $\text{---} \cup \text{---} | \text{---} \cup \times | \text{---} \cup \times \text{---} \cup ||$ and $\text{---} \cup \times \text{---} \cup \times | \text{---} \cup \text{---} | \text{---} \cup ||$. Hence the bridges named after Havet and Porson.⁴³

Where there is a bridge between cola – that is, where there is systematic and not just casual absence of word-end – we usually find caesura one position later. In other words there is an overlap of one syllable beyond the notional colon-end. This is the phenomenon which Maas aptly calls dovetailing, from the dovetail joint in carpentry (*Greek Metre*, p. 44). There are examples in archaic lyric, and it is quite common in tragedy, especially with aeolic cola. Sometimes cola are separated by caesura in the strophe and dovetailed in the antistrophe, or vice versa. This is not just a matter of alternative places for a caesura. The caesura has a different status in the two cases. Between cola it is a significant division, a boundary; but in the case of dovetailing what is significant is not the fact that there is a division in the second colon after the first syllable, but the fact that the first colon overruns. It is not so much a caesura displaced as a caesura replaced by an overlap-syllable. Instead of separation there is juncture. This is a different distinction from the conventional one between caesura and diaeresis, and a more useful one.

The occasional medial caesura in the tragic trimeter, where the word preceding the caesura is not an elided one (as it usually is), may possibly be considered as arising by overlap of the usual penthemimeral caesura. It is also possible, as G. Nagy has argued, that the penthemimeral caesura itself originated by the dovetailing of an iambic metron with a dimeter. The Vedic dodecasyllable mentioned on p. 281 has a fluctuating caesura, after the fourth or fifth syllable. The common forms are

$$\begin{array}{l} \times \cup \times \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup \text{---} \cup \text{---} \\ \times \text{---} \cup \text{---} \cup | \cup \cup \cup \cup \text{---} \end{array}$$

and

The part following the caesura in the first type resembles the octosyllable ($\times \times \times \times \cup \text{---} \cup \text{---}$) which is one of the other commonest Vedic verses. The octosyllable sometimes has an iambic metron ($| \cup \text{---} \cup \text{---}$) appended to it; the dodecasyllable may be accounted for from the prefixing of a similar tetrasyllabic unit (only less definite in form) to the same octosyllabic verse.⁴⁴ The caesura after the fourth syllable then marks the original point of juncture, and that after the fifth gives a dovetail effect. The line is not quite an iambic trimeter, but there is no difficulty about deriving the basic octosyllable and the Greek iambic dimeter (among other Greek octosyllabic cola) from a common prototype. Perhaps, then, the penthemimeral caesura in the Greek trimeter began as a dovetailing alternative, which later became standard and understood as

⁴³ Both in fact discovered by Porson, as pointed out by G. Torresin in *Riv. Fil.* 94 (1966), 184.

⁴⁴ *Glotta* 51 (1973), 163.

a colon-dividing caesura.⁴⁵ Something similar happens in Lesbian verse, where an iambic metron is sometimes prefixed to an aeolic colon but word-end is preferred after the fifth syllable. We see this in the Alcaic hendecasyllable $\times - \cup - \times : - \cup - \cup - \cup - ||$ (= iambus + telesilleian), and in Alc. 70. 2 ff., 117. 26 ff., 354?, 384, 386, Lesb. inc. 21. 2 Voigt = 17 L.-P.⁴⁶ In tragedy we find an iambic metron prefixed to dactylic cola, and again dovetailed:

- $\times - \cup - \cup - | \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup -$ (A. *Ag.* 109 ~ 126, 116 ~ 135, fr. 198, 212B; S. *O.T.* 175 ~ 186; E. *Hipp.* 1105 ~ 1113)
 $\times - \cup - \cup - | \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup -$ (A. fr. 408)
 $\times - \cup - \cup - | \cup - \cup - \cup -$ (S. *Tr.* 94 ~ 103; E. fr. 303. 4)

Cf. Dale, *Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 2nd ed., p. 45.

I have spoken hitherto of word-end without defining what constitutes word-end. The two complications are elision and appositives. In both matters Greek poets seem to want to have their cake and eat it. An elided vowel may always be disregarded and a valid caesura obtained between the remainder of the word and the following initial vowel. On the other hand the great majority of tragic trimeters showing medial caesura (49 out of 69 in Aeschylus, 76 out of 87 in Sophocles, 163 out of 170 in Euripides) have elision there, as if the situation were legitimized by the fact that the unelided word would have reached the hephthemimeral caesura position.⁴⁷ And in three or four cases apparent breaches of Porson's Bridge seem to be excused by elision.⁴⁸ As regards appositives, they can always be treated as forming one word with the word which they precede (in the case of prepositives) or follow (in the case of postpositives); but both Homer and the tragedians occasionally treat them as separate words for purposes of caesura.⁴⁹ Presumably the poet while versifying may hear a word in isolation from other words (and unelided, if its unelided form is metrical), and place it in the verse on that basis, or he may hear it already embedded in a phrase. But this is not a complete explanation of the inconsistencies. We may say that a line like A. *Supp.* 931,

καὶ γὰρ πρέπει κήρυκ' ἀπαγγέλλειν τορῶς,

arises because the poet placed κήρυκα in an appropriate place for the unelided form, which would have given a normal caesura, and then allowed ἀπαγγέλλειν to supervene. Then to explain why he never by the same process produces a line such as

λόγον δ' ἅπαντ' ἀπαγγελεῖν μέλλω τορῶς,

⁴⁵ G. Nagy, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Cambridge, Mass. 1974), pp. 280 ff. I was perhaps too sceptical in my review (*Phoenix* 28 (1974), 458).

⁴⁶ cf. J. Irigoin, *L'Ant. Cl.* 25 (1956), 5-19.

⁴⁷ The penthemimeral caesura, however, is never anticipated in this way; in other words there is no verse in which the only caesura to be found is one at the end of the first metron with elision.

⁴⁸ S. *Aj.* 1101, *Ph.* 22; E. *Hclld.* 529, perhaps *Ion* 1 (though see Page, *P.C.P.S.* 1961, 81).

⁴⁹ There are limits to the licence. Homer never has caesura after a monosyllabic preposition, καί, or ἀλλά, or before δέ, μέν, γάρ, κεν, ἄν. The tragedians do not have it after a single monosyllabic prepositive (though they do after a pair, e.g. πρὸς τὴν |), except in *P.V.* 589 πῶς δ' οὐ κλύω τῆς | οἰστροδινήτου κόρης; In this instance it is possible that there is felt to be a quasi-caesura between the elements of the compound, οἰστρο | δινήτου. Such a licence would also account for the one trimeter with apparently no caesura at all in the second metron, *Pers.* 501 στρατὸς περαι | κρυσταλλοπήγα διὰ πόρον. Cf. the famous division of Aristogeiton's name between hexameter and pentameter in 'Sim.' epigr. 1 Page and the later imitations of it.

A. M. Devine and L. Stephens, *C. Ph.* 73 (1978), 314-28, account for the inconsistency with which appositives are treated as a reflection of 'phonostylistic' differences, that is, of tempo variations associated with different stylistic levels. See also W. S. Allen, *Accent and Rhythm*, pp. 25 f.

we have to add the rider that the cancellation of the potential caesura at *ἄπαντα* demands the provision of an alternative one, *ἄπαντ'* × - ∪ |, whereas in the case of *κήρυκα* there is no such requirement because there is no further possibility of a caesura, unless after a short monosyllable. To look at it another way, where there is no penthemimeral caesura the poet exercises himself only to the extent of selecting a word shaped ... × - ∪ | to lie across the third foot, not to the extent of ensuring that there is an actual word-break before the fourth princeps.

In a line such as *Cho.* 914,

οὔτοι σ' ἀπέρριψ(α) εἰς δόμους δορυξένους,

the word before the caesura could not be part of a trimeter if it were not elided or else its final syllable lengthened by position; the first alternative is the easier. So Aeschylus thinks of it as a word-shape ∪ - - | and places it accordingly. How is it, then, that in *Hcld.* 529,

καὶ στεμματοῦτε καὶ κατάρχεσθ' εἰ δοκεῖ,

the elided *κατάρχεσθ'* can be placed where an unelided word shaped | ∪ - - | could not? Why should *Ἀτλας ὁ χαλκίοισι νώτοις οὐρανόν*, if that is what Euripides wrote in *Ion* 1, be more acceptable than *νώτοις οὐρανόν*, which must have sounded identical? I suppose because *κατάρχεσθε* and *νώτοισι(ν)* might have stood unshortened at that place in the verse with suitable consonants following.

Bedford College, London

M. L. WEST