THE GLYCONIC IN TRAGEDY[1]

Glyconic is one of the commonest verse-forms in tragic odes. Examples are abundant enough for its nature to be statistically understood. The purpose of this paper is to examine the characteristics of tragic glyconic a little more thoroughly than current handbooks,[2] paying special attention to antistrophic responsion. The following topics are studied here: (1) aeolic base; (2) dragged close; (3) resolution; (4) compounds.

Glyconic is described as ⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–. It starts with two elements, 'aeolic base' (⏑⏑),[3] which can be filled not only with ––, –⏑ or ⏑–, but with ⏑⏑⏑ or –⏑⏑ in later, mainly Euripidean, tragedies. There is a special tendency for particular shapes to correspond antistrophically with each other, as will be shown below. The following six elements, –⏑⏑–⏑–, are indivisible, though it is sometimes convenient to call –⏑⏑– 'choriambic nucleus' for purely descriptive purposes. The double short of the 'nucleus' cannot be contracted into a long, unlike double short in dactyls (– – = –⏑⏑) or anapaests (– – = ⏑⏑– = –⏑⏑).[4] Glyconic can in general be in antistrophic responsion with wilamowitzian (⏑⏑–×–⏑⏑–).[5]

The penultimate element of glyconic is occasionally occupied by a long ('dragged glyconic' ⏑⏑–⏑⏑–––). Whether this element can be filled by two shorts (⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–) is highly questionable. But resolution of some long elements is permitted in tragedy, unlike Lesbian lyric. The sixth and the eighth elements can be occupied by double-short (⏑⏑–⏑⏑⏜⏑– or ⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑⏜). Tribrach opening (⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–) should be treated separately from resolution for reasons to be explained later, though it is usually treated as if one of the two elements of the base were resolved (but which of the two suffers resolution?). The 'compounds' such

[1] This paper is based upon a section of Part I of my Ph.D. thesis 'Euripidean Lyric Metres: a Classification' (Part I, Aeolic Metres; Part II, Prosodiac – Enoplian; see note 16) submitted to the University of St Andrews in 1982. I am deeply grateful to Mrs E. M. Craik, Mrs L. P. E. Edwards (= Parker) and Dr C. Carey for saving me from many errors. Mrs Craik and Mrs Edwards kindly also examined the draft of this paper, improved my English, and gave me useful suggestions. My debt to them is immeasurable.

[2] e.g. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin, 1921, repr. Darmstadt, 1962), O. Schroeder, *Aeschyli cantica* (Leipzig, 1916²), *Sophoclis cantica* (Leipzig, 1923²), *Euripidis cantica* (Leipzig, 1928²), P. Maas, *Greek Metre* (transl. by H. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford, 1962), B. Snell, *Griechische Metrik* (Göttingen, 1962³), A. Dain, *Traité de métrique grecque* (Paris, 1965), A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* (Cambridge, 1968²), D. S. Raven, *Greek Metre: an Introduction* (London, 1968²), D. Korzeniewski, *Griechische Metrik* (Darmstadt, 1968). Though I am indebted to these scholars, I do not refer to them nor to the differences between their interpretations except in some special cases.

[3] Maas describes the (Lesbian) glyconic as ××–⏑⏑–⏑–. He uses the symbol ⏑⏑ to note anaclasis. Therefore, when the form ⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– is given to the glyconic in tragedy, ⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– is excluded by definition. Snell, however, uses the symbol ⏑⏑ a little more loosely. It stands for '2 ancipitia, wo selten Doppelkürze erscheint'. When I employ the symbol ⏑⏑ for 'aeolic base' in this paper, it covers –×, ×– (and ⏑⏑⏑ and –⏑⏑ for convenience) but not ⏑⏑. However, I hesitate to take it as anaclasis. For the question whether 'aeolic base' should be of the same nature as other cases of anaclasis cited by Maas, see p. 80 below.

[4] Dale takes E. *IT* 1126/1141, ⏑⏑–––––, as an example of contraction of glyconic (or wilamowitzian; for this nomenclature, see n. 5 below). But both 1126 and 1141 are easily changed into normal wilamowitzian by transposing κάλαμος and πτέρυγας to the end of the verse (as Diggle does in the new OCT).

[5] So-called 'choriambic dimeter'. I tried to show the inappropriateness of this name in *CQ* n.s. 32 (1982), 59–74. 'Wilamowitzianus' is Maas's nomenclature, here anglicized.

as gl+ba (= phalaecian, ○○–⏑⏑–⏑–⏑––) or ia+gl (×–⏑–○○–⏑⏑–⏑–) are here regarded as suffixed or prefixed forms of glyconic, not as different verses. Pherecratean (○○–⏑⏑––) and wilamowitzian (○○–×–⏑⏑–), both of which have a close kinship with glyconic and a considerable number of examples in tragic odes, will be referred to only when the comparison with glyconic is useful. As a rule the texts of Page (Aeschylus, OCT), Dawe (Sophocles, BT) and Murray (Euripides, OCT) are followed, but the colometry is mine.

Aeolic base

In the Lesbian metres with the characteristic of rigid isosyllabism, the aeolic base is composed literally of two ancipitia (××).[6] In Attic tragedy, however, the first two elements are not as free as the notation ×× would suggest. Though the colon ⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– is actually used in tragedy, it should not be taken as glyconic because (i) ⏑⏑ never corresponds antistrophically with ––, –⏑ or ⏑–[7] but always with ⏑⏑ itself, and (ii) it is attested, though rarely, by antistrophic responsion that ⏑⏑⏑ and –⏑⏑ are possible shapes of the aeolic base of glyconic.[8]

Another restriction pertinent to tragic glyconics is found in the possible combinations of antistrophic responsion. This has often been overlooked, or at least not fully stated in standard handbooks, in spite of being, I believe, equally important. There are 312 pairs of glyconics in strophic odes (A(eschylus) 27, S(ophocles) 92, E(uripides) 193) and, further, 23 glyconics (S4, E19)[9] corresponding with wilamowitzian (apart from the form starting with –⏑⏑ and its antistrophic counterpart, which will be discussed separately (p. 71)). The frequency of each combination of two corresponding forms of aeolic bases is:

	––	–⏑	⏑–	⏑⏑⏑
––	150	69	19	4
	(A6, S43, E101)	(A5, S21, E43)	(A1, S12, E6)	(S1, E3)
–⏑		32	3	1
		(A11, S9, E12)	(S1, E2)	(E1)
⏑–			28	0
			(A4, S7, E17)	
⏑⏑⏑				29
				(S2, E27)

The detail of the figures would be different according to different texts, colometry and prosody (especially the treatment of syllables followed by *muta cum liquida*); but the following result would hardly be affected.

Antistrophic responsion is normally found

[6] But ⏑⏑ is extremely rare even in Lesbian metres. As to glyconics, ⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– is found only at Sappho 94 LP 22, ?96. 4, 98(a)8, ?(b)9. Also, as Maas notices (§33. 3), ⏑– is much rarer than is imagined. Cf. D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 80–1.

[7] In MSS readings, ⏑⏑ corresponds with ⏑– at E. *Ba.* 404/419 and 406/421. They can easily be emended as in Murray's text: 404 *ἵνα* : *ἵν' οἱ* Heath, 421 *ἴσα* : *ἴσαν* l(= Triclinius (?)).

[8] If there were an example of antistrophic responsion between ⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– and ––⏑⏑–⏑– with unambiguous demonstration of colon-beginning, this colon would be identified beyond doubt as a different colon from glyconic. Dale mentions E. *Hyps.* fr 1 ii 23/iii 26 (*LM*² 134 n. 1), but the colometry represented in the papyrus is not reliable. See p. 69 below.

[9] S. *Aj.* 1190/1197 and *Ant.* 106/123 are included. Once the responsion between gl and wil is accepted in pre-Euripidean work, *ἄν* (Wilamowitz) and *ἀπ' Ἀργόθεν* (Erfurdt) seem to me the easiest solution. However, lines with textual corruption in the part occupying aeolic base are, as a rule, excluded from my figures.

(i) between identical forms (– –/– –, –∪/–∪, ∪–/∪–, ∪∪∪/∪∪∪)

(ii) between those forms which have a long at the same position (– –/–∪ and – –/∪–).

On the other hand responsion is never or hardly ever found between –∪/∪–, ∪∪∪/– –, ∪∪∪/–∪ and ∪∪∪/∪–. In other words, the tragic glyconic can be classified into three schemes between which antistrophic responsion is extremely unusual: –×–∪∪–∪–, ×– –∪∪–∪– and ∪∪∪–∪∪–∪–.

The same tendency is observed unmistakably in wilamowitzians and pherecrateans too.

Wilamowitzians (except those corresponding with glyconics)

	– –	–∪	∪–	∪∪∪
– –	72	17	7	1
	(S16, E56)	(S5, E12)	(E7)	(E1)
–∪		8	0	1
		(S3, E5)	(s. below)	(E1)
∪–			13	1
			(S3, E10)	(E1)
∪∪∪				26
				(S2, E24)

Pherecrateans

	– –	–∪	∪–	∪∪∪
– –	84	30	5	1
	(A16, S11, E57)	(A13, S2, E15)	(A1, S1, E3)	(E1)
–∪		23	3	0
		(A13, E10)	(A2, S1)	
∪–			10	0
			(E10)	
∪∪∪				10
				(A1, E9)

The following irregular cases are worthy of mention:

A. *Th.* 298–9/315–16 (⁻˘pher/˘⁻pher+˘⁻pher/⁻˘pher)

τοὶ δ' ἐπ' ἀμφιβόλοισιν ἰάπτουσι πολίταις ~ καταρρίψοπλον ἄταν ἐμβαλόντες ἄροισθε

S. *Phil.* 1125–6/1148–9 (˘⁻pher/⁻˘pher+⁻˘gl/˘⁻gl)

γελᾷ μου χερὶ πάλλων τὰν ἐμὰν μελέου τροφάν ~ χῶρος οὐρεσιβώτας φυγᾷ μηκέτ' ἀπ' αὐλίων

It is interesting that –∪/∪– (∪–/–∪) is immediately followed by ∪–/–∪ (–∪/∪–) in the two cases above.

E. *Hec.* 446/457 (⁻˘gl/˘⁻gl; phalaecian is taken as gl+ba: see p. 79 below)

(κομί-)ζεις θοὰς ἀκάτους ἐπ' οἶδ(-μα λίμνας) ~ (τάλαι-)ναν οἰκτρὰν βιοτὰν ἔχου(-σαν οἴκους)

E. *IT* 1096/1113 (˘⁻wil/⁻˘gl)

ποθοῦσ' Ἑλλάνων ἀγόρους ~ ἔνθα τᾶς ἐλαφοκτόνου

S. *Trach.* 845/856 (˘˘˘gl/⁻⁻gl)

(γνώμας μολόντ') ὀλεθρίαισι συναλλαγαῖς ~ (ἰὼ κελαι-)νὰ λόγχα προμάχου δορός

E. *Hel.* 1493–4/1510–11 (⏑⏑⏑gl/– –gl + ⏑⏑⏑pher/– –pher)

Μενέλεως ὅτι Δαρδάνου ~ *οὐκ ἐλθοῦσά ⟨ποτ'⟩ Ἰλίου*
πόλιν ἑλὼν δόμον ἥξει ~ *Φοιβείους ἐπὶ πύργους*

E. *Hyps.* fr. 1 ii 23/iii 26 (⏑⏑⏑gl/– –gl)

(*χρυσεόμαλ-*)*λον ἱερὸν δέρος ὃ περὶ δρυὸς*
~ (*ἀρότοι-*)*σιν τρισσοῖς ἔλιπεν κράτος*

The colometry found in the papyrus is: 24 pher‖ B, 25 ⏓ – ⏑⏑ ⏓ ⏑ ⏓, 26 pher (metrical numeration of Bond). It is not impossible for 24 to be a single period (note *brevis in longo*), but *τὸ χρυσεόμαλλον ἱερὸν δέρος* and *ἀρότοισιν τρίσσοις* will be better arranged in the same period by supposing overlap (synartesis; dodr B + gl). The avoidance of overlapping is one of the principles of Alexandrian colometry.

E. *El.* 146/163 + 148/165 (⏑⏑⏑gl/– ⏑wil + ⏑⏑⏑gl/– –wil)

διέπομαι, κατὰ μὲν φίλαν ~ *δέξατ' οὐδ' ἐπὶ στεφάνοις*
χέρα τε κρᾶτ' ἐπὶ κούριμον ~ *Αἰγίσθου λώβαν θεμένα*

Whether 140–9 and 157–66 are in responsion is not proved by stating simply that the responsion between gl and wil is normal. Consider other uncertainties entangled textually and metrically at every line of 142–5/159–62.

E. *Ion* 117/133 (⏑⏑⏑wil/– –wil)

ἵνα δρόσοι τέγγουσ' ἱεραί ~ *οὐ θνατοῖς, ἀλλ' ἀθανάτοις*

E. *Hel.* 1490/1507 (– ⏑wil/⏑⏑⏑wil)

Ὡρίωνά τ' ἐννύχιον ~ *βάλετε βαρβάρων λεχέων*

Reading *Ὡαρίωνα* would produce the correspondence – ⏑⏑/⏑⏑⏑, which is easier to parallel (see below p. 72 and n. 17). For the form *Ὡαρίων* in tragedy, cf. Eur. *Hec.* 1103 (where, however, *Ὡρίων* is offered by some MSS, and may be preferable).

E. *IT* 1130/1145 (⏑ – wil/⏑⏑⏑wil)

ἀείδων ἄξει λιπαρὰν ~ *παρὰ πόδ' εἰλίσσουσα φίλας*

There are some other examples of irregular responsion which I do not count in the table above:

A. *Cho.* 610/621

ξύμμετρόν τε διαὶ βίου ~ *πνέονθ' ἃ κυνόφρων ὕπνῳ·*

The choice depends on the scansion of the second syllable of *ξύμμετρον*.

S. *El.* 480/496

(*ὕπεστί μοι*) *θάρσος ἀδυπνόων κλύου(-σαν)*
~ (*πρὸ τῶνδέ τοι*) †*μ' ἔχει μήποτε μήποθ' ἡ(-μὶν)*†

480 *θάρσος*] *θράσος* L^{ac} and others. 496 *μ' ἔχει*] *μ' ἔχει θάρσος* PGR. In some other MSS, *θάρσος* is found as a gloss. *μήποτε* om. LGRZc (for fuller report of MSS, see Dawe).

From a metrical point of view, *θάρσος* (both 480 and 496) with expelled *μ' ἔχει* (496) would be easier to accept. This conjecture was proposed by Wilamowitz (according to Pearson; cf. *GV* 512) or by Wunder (according to Dawe; but Wunder's suggestion is different according to Jebb). The colometry of 479–80/495–6 taken by Wilamowitz, Pearson and Dale (*LM*² 84) is, however, not ia + gl followed by 2 ia, but ia + sp‖ B ch + ba‖ B lecyth.

E. *Hipp.* 147/157

(ἀνίε-)ρος ἀθύτων πελανῶν τρύχη ~ τὸν εὐξεινότατον ναύταις

I am now inclined to accept ia + ch + sp in the midst of aeolic cola by beginning a colon with ἀνίερος ~ λιμένα (colometry of Schroeder and Barrett).

E. *Hel.* 1116/1131

Ἀχαιῶν ὑπὸ λόγχαις ~ δόλιον ἀστέρα λάμψας

This is the MS word-order, which Kannicht accepts. The preceding cola are tel + hipp in synartesis (unusual combination), and hipp ends with *brevis in longo*. Murray adopts Hermann's transposition δόλιον ἀκταῖς and divides 1115–16/1130–1 as gl ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ + pher. This colometry is much smoother.

E. *Supp.* 998/1021

ἐπύργωσε καὶ γαμέτα ~ χρῶτα χρωτὶ πέλας θεμένα

For the verse – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –, see p. 76 below.

E. *Supp.* 1000/1023

πρός σ' ἔβαν δρομὰς ἐξ ἐμῶν ~ σὲ τὸν θανόντ' οὔποτ' ἐμᾷ

E. *Or.* 813/825

(ἀρ-)νὸς ἦλυθε⟨ν⟩ Ταναλίδαις ~ (παράνοι-)α· θανάτου γὰρ ἀμφὶ φόβῳ

The colon ⏑ – ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏑ – is not wilamowitzian but iambo-choriambic. Responsion with gl (– ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ –) or wil (⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –) in the two cases above is highly suspicious: *CQ* n.s. 32 (1982), 59–84.

Small divergences are observed between the three poets as to which combination of aeolic bases is most frequently used. Responsion between – – / ⏑ – is relatively rare in Aeschylean and Euripidean plays, while Sophocles uses it rather freely (but it should be noted that the number of occurrences of ⏑ – is absolutely smaller than of – –). Sophocles and Euripides use – – / – ⏑ more often than – ⏑ / – ⏑, while the latter is the commonest of Aeschylean combinations, even commoner than – – / – –, which is used by Sophocles and Euripides extremely frequently. ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ is peculiar (but not restricted) to later Euripidean plays, both in antistrophic and astrophic odes. However, it should be stressed that there is no difference among the three poets concerning the fundamental tendency.

It is interesting that ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ / – ⏑ and ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ / ⏑ –, which are theoretically possible forms of responsion if ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ is created by resolving the long element of ○○, are actually extraordinary phenomena. And, as we shall see later, the responsion – ⏑ ⏑ / – – has no example, while – ⏑ ⏑ / ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ is found. Tribrach opening should be differently interpreted from the responsion of ⏑ ⏑ with – at the sixth and the eighth element of glyconics (and, of course, from the resolution found in e.g. iambics; for resolution of glyconic, see p. 77 below). It is inappropriate to describe two shorts of ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ occupying aeolic base as 'resolved long'. Rather, the tribrach seems to be substituted for ○○ as a whole.

A peculiarity of glyconics beginning with ⏑ – and ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ is observable in the avoidance of synartesis with the preceding colon. There is only one ⏑ ⁻ gl (*Hec.* 457)[10] and two ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ gl (*IA* 186, *Hyps.* 1 ii 23) that are overlapped and one ⏑ ⁻ gl preceded by elision (δ'; S. *Phil.* 1168). On the contrary, there are many examples that are in synartesis

[10] – ⏑ – ⏔ ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – (cr + gl), at *Med.* 155f./180f., is not included. For this compound, see p. 79 below.

(106 lines of $^{-}{}^{-}$gl and 56 lines of $^{-}{}^{\cup}$gl),[11] among glyconics beginning with a long. Word-overlapping by one element is the most frequent, but other types of synartesis (elision, division of word-group, overlapping by two or more elements) are also found. Even if the high frequency of $^{-}{}^{\times}$gl overall is taken into account, different tendencies in the matter of synartesis are not negligible. This tendency is confirmed in wilamowitzians and pherecrateans too. There are two $^{\cup}{}^{\cup}{}^{\cup}$wil (*Or.* 825, 827) in synartesis with the preceding colon, and no example for $^{\cup}{}^{-}$wil, $^{\cup}{}^{-}$pher or $^{\cup}{}^{\cup}{}^{\cup}$pher.

As has been observed above, antistrophic responsion between $-\cup$ and $\cup-$ is extremely rare. We do not know why, but certainly $-\cup$ must have given a harsh effect in correspondence with $\cup-$ more distinctly than $--$ did. Incompatibility between $-\cup$ and $\cup-$ may be suspected in the usage of the priapean too. In order to simplify the argument, every combination of gl + pher is counted here as a priapean except when period-end is obviously marked after gl.

There are 170 examples of priapean dicola (strophic verses are counted separately). Of these the combination of $^{\cup}{}^{-}$gl + $^{-}{}^{\cup}$pher is found three times (A. *Cho.* 621f., E. *Tro.* 323f./339f.), and $^{-}{}^{\cup}$gl + $^{\cup}{}^{-}$pher, never. Moreover, in antistrophic verses, the successive use of $-\times+\times-$ and of $\times-+-\times$ is not found in priapeans, even if $-\cup$ is not directly adjacent to $\cup-$. For example, such combinations are not found: $^{\cup}{}^{-}$gl + $^{-}{}^{-}$pher corresponding with $^{-}{}^{-}$gl + $^{-}{}^{\cup}$pher, or $^{-}{}^{\cup}$gl + $^{-}{}^{-}$pher corresponding with $^{-}{}^{-}$gl + $^{\cup}{}^{-}$pher. Even if the relative scarceness of $^{\cup}{}^{-}$gl and $^{\cup}{}^{-}$pher is taken into account, the avoidance of successive use of $-\times+\times-$ (and $\times-+-\times$) is impressive. Furthermore, though it is a chicken-and-egg argument, it is theoretically possible to suppose that this avoidance in priapean dicola is itself one of the causes of the paucity of $\cup-$ in aeolic base.

Whether the avoidance is found generally in other consecutive aeolic cola such as gl + gl, gl + hipp, has not been investigated yet. Two facts are certain: (1) the combination of $-\times+\times-$ is noticeably rare, while $\times-+-\times$ is less rare; (2) but these combinations are not totally avoided. What must be checked is whether they are much rarer than would be expected statistically. I do not discuss this problem further here. Interestingly, priapeans of $^{\cup}{}^{\cup}{}^{\cup}$gl + $^{-}{}^{-}$pher and $^{-}{}^{\times}$gl + $^{\cup}{}^{\cup}{}^{\cup}$pher are found rather frequently (14 times and 8 times respectively; all in Euripidean plays). This, too, has to be considered in a wider perspective.

So far I have not discussed the glyconic starting with $-\cup\cup$. This colon ($-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$) is difficult to identify when it is found in an astrophic ode or, in a strophic ode, in correspondence with the identical form, because there is a colon, 'ibycean', which is of the same form. Strictly speaking, 'ibycean' should be given the form $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\times-$ in tragedy since its penultimate element is occupied by long quite frequently[12] (for the

[11] The figure will be different to some extent according to which definition is given to synaphea, especially to 'word-group'. This question is important, but it is dispensable for our current purpose.

[12] Tragic 'ibycean' is used after 'enoplian' or 'hemiepes pendant':
$\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup|-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$ E. *Andr.* 827, *HF* 1030;
$\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup|-\cup\cup-\cup\cup---$ E. *HF* 1033, *Or.* 1257/1277;
$\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup|-\cup\cup-\cup\cup---$ E. *Hec.* 1069 (*ἀκέσαι' ἀκέσαιο τυφλόν,|Ἄλιε, φέγγος ἐπαλλάξας*).
$\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\!\!\uparrow\!\!-/\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup|-\cup\cup-\cup\cup---$ E. *El.* 701/715;
$-\cup\cup-\cup\cup--\!\!\uparrow\!\!-/\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\!\!\uparrow\!\!-/\cup\cup-\cup\cup---$ E. *Tro.* 258.
Other examples are: A. *Th.* 222/229 (this is the unique case of antistrophic responsion of $\cup$ with $-$ at the penultimate element), E. *Alc.* 244/248 ($-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$); S. *OC* 239, 1245, E. *Or.* 1381 ($-\cup\cup-\cup\cup---$). For A. *Cho.* 315/332, E. *El.* 151, 155, see below. ?*Tro.* 248 (*ἔννεπε τλάμονα Κασάνδραν*) ?*Tro.* 269 (*ἆρά μοι ἀέλιον λεύσσοι*) ?*HF* 1205 ((*πέπλον ἀπόδι-*)*κε, ῥέθος ἀελίῳ δεῖξον*). Also cf. $--\cup\cup-\cup\cup-|\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$ E. *Andr.* 831 (?/827 above), $\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-|\cup-\cup-\cup\cup---$ E. *Tro.* 267; $\times-\cup-\times-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$ E. *Ion* 685/704, $\times-\cup-\times-\cup\cup-\cup\cup---$ E. *Hec.* 647, 649, *HF.* 1184, 1186, 1188, *Ion* 717, 1487, *Pho.* 121.

penultimate element of glyconic, see p. 75 below). I recognize a parallel structure between $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\times-$, $\times-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\times-$,[13] $\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\times-$,[14] $\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-\times-$,[15] and interpret the penultimate elements of these cola as equivalent to 'link anceps' that 'connects' $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-$, $\times-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-$, $\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-$ and $\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$ with $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-$, $-\cup-\cup--$, $-\cup---$, $-\cup--$, $-\cup-$, $--$ etc.[16] Unlike glyconic, the true 'ibycean' and its related forms are associated quite commonly with dochmiacs in tragedy. I believe, against Dale, that 'ibycean' and various 'prosodiac-enoplians' are not aeolic, but this argument must be developed separately. What concerns us now is whether a particular passage of the shape $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$ can or should be classified as glyconic.

The form is certainly used as a glyconic since its existence is guaranteed by responsion with $\cup\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$: E. *IT* 1144/1129 *παρθένος εὐδοκίμων γάμων* ~ *κέλαδον ἑπτατόνου λύρας* and with $\cup\cup\cup---\cup\cup-$ ($^{\cup\cup\cup}$wil): E. *IT* 1092/1109 *εὐξύνετον ξυνετοῖς βοάν* ~ *ὀλομένων ἐν ναυσὶν ἔβαν* (E. *IA* 169/190 can be taken as either $^{\cup\cup\cup}$gl/$^{-\cup\cup}$gl or $^{-\cup\cup}$gl/$^{-\cup\cup}$gl according to the scansion of *ὁπλοφόρους*). The responsion between $^{\cup\cup\cup}$wil and $^{-\cup\cup}$wil ($\cup\cup\cup-\times-\cup\cup-$ or $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup-\cup\cup-$) can be taken as another proof of the freer responsion of aeolic base between $\cup\cup\cup$ and $-\cup\cup$.[17] There is no example of $^{-\cup\cup}$pher corresponding with $^{\cup\cup\cup}$pher (and, if $^{-\cup\cup}$pher actually existed, it would be of the same form as 'hemiepes pendant'). Remarkably, $-\cup\cup$ in aeolic base corresponds only with $\cup\cup\cup$ (and of course with $-\cup\cup$), so it would be natural to suppose that $-\cup\cup$ is a variation of $\cup\cup\cup$. The lack of examples of $-\cup\cup/--$ obviates the possible explanation that $-\cup\cup$ is created by resolution of $--$.[18]

$^{-\cup\cup}$gl could reasonably be expected to exist even without antistrophic attestation, because (i) responsion of aeolic bases tends to occur between identical forms generally, and (ii) in the case of the wilamowitzian, $^{-\cup\cup}$wil is the most plausible explanation for the particular forms such as $-\cup\cup\cup\cup-\cup\cup-$, even without antistrophic responsion with more familiar forms. For the identification of examples of $^{-\cup\cup}$gl, we depend on metrical context, but this criterion is not absolutely reliable.[19] E. *El.* 151–6 (astrophic) is composed of a sequence of six cola that are quite similar to each other:

(1) $-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$
(2) $\cup\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup-$
(3) $\cup\cup\cup-\cup-\cup-\|_{H}$

[13] S. *OC* 1564/1575, E. *Alc.* 594/602, *Andr.* 841.

[14] E. *Andr.* 296/304, 298/306, *Hel.* 640, *Hyps.* fr 64 77, 81.

[15] E. *El.* 586, 588, *Ion* 1448, 1479, 1482, 1484, 1486, *HF* 1196, *Hel.* 657, 680, 681, *Rh.* 459/825, *Phaeth.* 276, *Hyps.* fr 64 94, S. *Tra.* 647/655.

[16] My interpretation of these verses is new. A full treatment of so-called 'prosodiac-enoplian' is given in Part II of my thesis (see n. 1). I am preparing to publish this part. Here, however, without exact definition of 'ibycean', the current argument about distinction of glyconic with the base $-\cup\cup$ from 'ibycean' is valid.

[17] *Ba.* 410/425 *Πιερία μούσειος ἕδρα* ~ *κατὰ φάος νύκτας τε φίλας IA* 553/568 *ὦ Κύπρι καλλίστα θαλάμων* ~ *μέγα τι θηρεύειν ἀρετάν* (*ὦ Κύπρι* should be preferred to *Κύπρι* L^2P^2 even metrically because the responsion between $-\cup$ and $\cup\cup\cup$ is far more irregular), *IA* 764/753 *Τρῶες, ὅταν χάλκασπις Ἄρης* ~ *ἄγυρις Ἑλλάνων στρατίας*, *IA* 765/754 *πόντιος εὐπρῴροιο πλάτας* ~ *ἀνά τε ναυσὶν καὶ σὺν ὅπλοις*, *Hel.* 1347/1363 *τύμπανά τ' ἔλαβε βυρσοτενῆ* ~ *κύκλιος ἔνοσις αἰθερία* (*τύμπανα* need not be emended into *τύπανα* as far as this passage is concerned; if *κύκλιος* is scanned as $-\cup\cup$, $-\cup\cup/-\cup\cup$ is obtained).

[18] I take this opportunity to correct an error in my previous article *CQ* n.s. 32 (1982), 64. E. *Suppl.* 999 *χαλκεοτευχοῦς τοῦ Καπανέως* should be scanned as $-\cup\cup---\cup\cup-$, which corresponds with the identical form.

[19] *IT* 1098/1115, *IA* 169/190, 759/770 are discerned as glyconics comparatively easily. *Hel.* 525 (*παντοδαπᾶς ἐπὶ γᾶς πόδα*) and *Or.* 831 may be glyconics.

(4) ⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–
(5) –⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–
(6) ⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–‖

Since we know that –⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– and ⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– can stand in antistrophic responsion, it may be a reasonable supposition that cola 1 and 5 are also glyconic as well as 2, 4, 6. But a question arises: is the difference of 1 from 2 essentially smaller than that of 3 from 2? In other words, is it meaningful to call 1 (and 5) and 2 (and 4, 6) glyconic, while giving a different name, lecythion, to 3? It is not sufficient simply to describe cola 2, 4, 6 as glyconics. What is important is that they all start with ⏑⏑⏑ and so does 3. There is no ordinary glyconic nor wilamowitzian nor pherecratean. If we consider that the lecythion is juxtaposed here because of its similarity with glyconic, it will also be possible to suppose that 'ibycean' is juxtaposed for the same reason. Juxtaposition may not prove anything about the *genera* to which each of the shapes belongs.

Juxtaposition of 'ibycean' with glyconic is already found at A. *Cho.* 315–22/332–9, which is composed of four dicola:

(1) –⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–|⏑⏑⏑–⏑––
(2) ⏑––⏑⏑–⏑–|–⏑⏑–⏑––
(3) ⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–|–/⏑⏑–⏑––
(4) ⏑––⏑⏑–⏑–|–⏑⏑–⏑––(= 2)

I hesitate more to call the first dicolon gl+ithyph than the previous Euripidean case. As Aeschylus hardly uses the aeolic base ⏑⏑⏑ (*Ag.* 698/716, ⏑⏑⏑pher, is the unique case), it is much less probable for –⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– to be a variant of gl here. In this ode, too, the transition from one metre to another is subtler than the names given to each metre suggest. Notice the similarity between ⏑⏑⏑–⏑–– and –⏑⏑–⏑––, or ⏑––⏑⏑–⏑– and ⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–.

Similarly when hemiepe are closely juxtaposed with glyconics, as in A. *Ag.* 717–26/727–36 (gl, gl, pher‖ –⏑⏑–⏑⏑––|–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑|–⏑⏑–⏑⏑––‖ ⏑⏑⏑lecyth, ⏑⏑⏑lecyth‖ gl, pher‖‖), it is misleading to state that hemiepes is meant to be a variation of pherecratean, though it is undeniable that hemiepes can be associated with aeolics. Perhaps there may not be so substantial a difference between –⏑⏑–⏑⏑–– (hem) and ⏓⏓–⏑⏑–– (pher) as their names indicate, and sometimes it seems nonsense to argue whether or not a particular colon is pherecratean (e.g. A. *Pe.* 568ff./576ff.:

–⏑⏑–⏑⏑––‖–––⏑⏑––‖–––⏑⏑––‖–––⏑⏑–⏑–↑–⏑⏑–⏑––‖

(hem, 2 pher, gl, ch+ba *or* 3 hem, gl, ch+ba).

But in so far as you accept traditional classification and continue to use traditional terminology, the extension of what each term signifies must not be over-widened, or the word 'variation' will open the way to putting together in the same class verses which vary enormously. This is, I think, the most significant deficiency of the *Hebung*-theory of Wilamowitz or Schroeder.

To return to the lecythion, or whatever it may be called, at E. *El.* 153, a parallel is found at E. *Hipp.* 67 ἃ *μέγαν κατ' οὐρανὸν*. This is also found in sequence with glyconics. Nobody would deny the similarity of glyconic and lecythion in these contexts. The single short occupying the fourth element changed into double short, lecythion becomes glyconic. Therefore, Wilamowitz (*GV* 247f.) and Barrett (*ad loc.*) take these two lecythia as a variant of glyconic. But it is far fetched, and much more so than in the case of –⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–, to say that –⏑–⏑–⏑– (⏑⏑⏑–⏑–⏑–) is glyconic. There is no absolute criterion except for antistrophic responsion to enable us to decide whether –⏑–⏑–⏑– is glyconic; and we have no example of such responsion.

The relation of lecythion with glyconic is more delicate outside tragedy. Let me digress. Bacchylides 18 is composed of cola so similar to tragic glyconics and iambics that it is unnecessary to separate categorically this ode (and odes 2 and 3, and to a lesser extent, ode 19) from tragic odes, by grouping it with so-called Pindaric 'non-dactylo-epitrite' (logaoedic) odes.[20] The third period runs thus:

⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–
–⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–
–⏒–⏑–⏑–
– – –⏑⏑–⏑– ‖

In the first colon aeolic base takes three forms: – – (35, 50), –⏑ (5), and ⏑⏑⏑ (20). Once (50) the colon is in synartesis with the following colon. In the second colon, the base takes the forms – – (21, 36) and –⏑ (6, 51). The colon is in synartesis with the following colon throughout. The third colon takes the form – – –⏑–⏑– only once (22). Period-end is shown by *brevis in longo* at the end of the fourth colon at 38.

The third colon –×–⏑–⏑– is interesting. It looks like a hybrid of lecythion and glyconic ('aeolicized lecythion' (?) if such a nomenclature is meaningful). At least a colon – – –⏑–⏑– which corresponds with –⏑–⏑–⏑– resembles glyconics more than lecythion usually does in this context. I am tempted to compare this with the second colon of the eupolidean dicolon (Hephaestion, *Ench.* ch. 16, 5. Cf. Ar. *Nub.* 518–62: ⏑⏑–×–⏑⏑– ⏑⏑–×–⏑–)[21]. Bacchylides 18 will be mentioned again later.

The famous metrical joke, if it actually is so, Ar. *Ran.* 1322 *περίβαλλ' ὦ τέκνον, ὠλένας* has no certain parallel in the Euripidean corpus. Nor is there any certain example of the aeolic base occupied by ⏑⏑– elsewhere in tragedy. E. *Hyps.* fr. 1 iii 7 *(παρ-)θένος Αἴγιν' ἐτέκνωσε Πη(-λεα)* is of the shape ⏑⏑– –⏑⏑–⏑– according to the colometry given by modern editors, and is accepted as glyconic.[22] But there are too many irregularities in the supposed antistrophic responsion between fr 1 ii 1–14/iii 1–17,[23] and, even if ⏑⏑– –⏑⏑–⏑– were established here as glyconic, synartesis involving ⏑⏑– would be highly questionable. Dale writes 'Euripides has two or three instances of ⏑⏑–' (*LM*² 134). It is not clear which passages she has in mind, but *HF* 640/659 *ἐπὶ κρατὶ κεῖται· βλέφαρων ~ φανερὸν χαρακτῆρ' ἀρετᾶς* ⏑⏑–⏑– – ⏑⏑– is taken as one example (*LM*² 152). However, it is extremely doubtful whether 639–42 should be arranged as aeolic.[24] E. *IT* 1120 *μεταβάλλει δυσδαιμονία* (/1103 – – – – – ⏑⏑–) may be another, but is textually uncertain. At S. *Aj.* 1190 *ἀνὰ τὰν εὐρώδη Τροίαν* the sense is quite clear. But it is hard to imagine that Sophocles admitted the responsion between ⏑⏑– – – – ⏑⏑– ~ –⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– as ⏑⏑–wil/–⏑gl, though I think the responsion between wil and gl is possible in the 'earlier' plays of Sophocles too. Outside tragedy, the first colon of Bacchylides 18 is ⏑⏑– –⏑⏑–⏑– and the metrical context favours a glyconic interpretation. But it should be noticed that here ⏑⏑– unfailingly corresponds with ⏑⏑– itself. As noticed above, at the fifth colon (metrical numeration) glyconic is found to take – –, –⏑, and ⏑⏑⏑ at aeolic base. The

[20] Dale stresses that different branches of Greek lyric odes should not be mingled in analysis ('The Metrical Units of Greek Lyric Verse, I', *CQ* 44, 1950, 138 ff. = *Collected Papers*, pp. 41 ff.). I agree with her in principle.

[21] The colon – – –⏑–⏑– is used also as the second colon of another dicolon by Eupolis (Heph. *Ench.* ch. 15, 22): –⏑⏑–×–×– – – –⏑–⏑– (or, with Hermann's conjecture, –⏑⏑–×–⏑– – – –⏑–⏑–).

[22] Grenfell and Hunt (following Wilamowitz), H. v. Arnim, O. Schroeder, D. Page and G. Bond.

[23] Overlapping pherecratean (4, Bond's metrical numeration), free responsion between –⏑⏑–⏑– – ~ –×–⏑⏑– – (4 and 5), two emendations *metri causa* (*κορτάλων* str. 9, *ποταμοῖο* ant. 6), lacuna (str. 10).

[24] It should be remembered that Alexandrian colometry is rather indifferent to dividing –⏑⏑–|⏑⏑–. Cf. Pindar fr. 169a 13 Sn, or Stesichorus *Geryoneis*.

responsion of ⏑⏑⏑ with – – or –⏑ is unusual in tragic odes. It cannot be decided, however, from these two small facts whether Bacchylides had a less rigid notion about the aeolic base of glyconics, or whether Bacchylidean metre was of a different nature from tragic metres.

Dragged close

To give a strict definition to the term 'drag', a thorough examination of all the relevant metres is still required;[25] I provisionally use the appellation 'dragged glyconic' to denote the glyconic which has a long, instead of the normal short, at the penultimate element as an occasional licence. The colon ⏑⏑–⏑⏑––– is identified as glyconic because of antistrophic responsion between ordinary and 'dragged' glyconic. But this responsion is surprisingly rare. It is found fairly certainly in three passages at most: S. *OT* 1187/1197 *ὡς ὑμᾶς ἴσα καὶ τὸ μη(-δέν)* ~ *τοξεύσας ἐκράτησας τοῦ* (but *ἐκράτησε...ἀνέστα* (1201) makes 1197 ordinary glyconic: see Jebb *ad loc.*) S. *Phil.* 1128/1151 *ὦ τόξον φίλον, ὦ φίλων* ~ *τὰν πρόσθεν βελέων ἀλκὰν* E. *Ba.* 867/887 (*ἐμπαί-*)*ζουσα λείμακος ἡδοναῖς* ~ (*αὔξον-*)*τας σὺν μαινομένᾳ δόξᾳ*. These examples are supported by the same type of responsion in telesilleans at E. *El.* 730/740 *χρυσωπὸν ἔδραν ἀλλά(-ξαντα)* ~ *λευκόν τε πρόσωπον ἀ(-οῦς)*. Two other cases are too weak to cite as likely examples. E. *Hipp.* 741/751 precariously depends upon the traditional reading of *θεοῖς*, which is easily changed to *θεοῖσιν*. At *Ion* 206, L has *τείχεσι*. *τείχεσσι* restores 'dragged' glyconic corresponding with ordinary glyconic, but since 221 is defective and since the combination gl – (dragged) gl – 'chor enopl B' (⏑–⏑–⏑⏑––) is an unusual one in the Euripidean corpus, *Ion* 206/220 is not useful for confirmation of the responsion. At *IA* 1056/1078, Murray admits the responsion. But without the transposition of *γάμους Νηρέως* (1056 Fritzsche), the metre makes sense (drag gl – reiz (⏑–⏑⏑––, *Πηλέως* scanned as disyllabic). Hermann rejected the possibility of the responsion totally[26] and left proposals of emendation to 'restore' the exact responsion for each case (they are still registered in apparatuses). Perhaps he was right, but since there is no positive ground to deny antistrophic responsion between 'dragged' and ordinary glyconics categorically, we had better keep traditional readings.

Most examples of 'dragged' glyconics correspond antistrophically with 'dragged' glyconics. And the usage is sometimes concentrated in a particular ode or period: E. *Hipp.* 141/151, 143/153, 150/160 and ?147/157; *IT* 1123/1138, 1127/1142; *Ba.* 865–7/885–7. These two characteristics suggest that tragic poets were conscious of the difference between 'dragged' and ordinary glyconics.

'Dragged' glyconics do not always mark period-end. This tells against the presupposition that they produce a form of *rallentando*. Some even overlap into the following cola (*Hipp.* 143/153, *Ba.* (865)/885, 866/886, ?*Ion* 206, cf. E. *El.* 730 (telesillean, above)). But it must be admitted that colometry is sometimes a matter of taste. If we start from the presupposition that 'dragged' glyconic cannot be in synartesis, *Hipp.* 143f./153f. can be arranged as ⏑⏑⏑–⏑–⏑–/⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑–– (dodr B+hypercat. wil). For *Ba.* 865ff./885ff., ––⏑⏑⏑–|⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–|⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–

[25] The term 'unreiner Schluß' was used by Wilamowitz and it is translated into English 'impure ending'. Dale means by 'drag' the phenomenon that a short between two longs has occasional licence to lengthen. Her usage is not necessarily restricted to the endings. Even limited to endings, it is still questionable whether dochmiacs (e.g. ⏑––––), ibyceans (–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–––), glyconics (Dale rightly rejects the idea of 'iambic with impure ending' which Denniston applies to ⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑––– or ⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑––– ('Lyric Iambics in Greek Drama' in *Greek Poetry and Life*, Oxford, 1936, pp. 141–2)) should be called by the same name.

[26] Cited by A. C. Pearson, *CQ* 23 (1929), 173.

(dodr B+wil+chor decasyll (wil+⏑–)) may be imagined. I prefer the idea of overlapping 'dragged' glyconic to introducing such unfamiliar cola as hypercat wil or wil+⏑–. At the same time, more examples of overlapping 'dragged' glyconic could be acquired in the following cases:

S. *Ant.* 104/121 –⏑–⏑⏑–|––⌒–⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–⏑

Pearson and Dawe divide into drag gl+hipp,

S. *Ant.* 813/830 –––⏑⏑––|–⌒–⏑–⏑⏑–

Pearson and Dawe divide into pher+ ∧ wil,

E. *Hec.* 473/482 –––⏑⏑–|–⌒––––⏑⏑–

Murray and Daitz divide into drag gl+dodr B,

E. *HF* 674/688 –––⏑⏑––|––⌒––⏑⏑–

Murray divides into pher+ ∧ wil. According to this division, 688 (pher) ends with τὸν. An emendation from which a different metrical interpretation ensues is suggested by Diggle in the new OCT.

E. *Ion* 1080/1096 ⏑––⏑⏑––|–⌒–––⏑⏑–

Murray and Biehl divide into pher+ ∧ wil. When the first colon is made into drag gl, both str and antistr end with καὶ.

But I should prefer to interpret all these passages as dodr B+wil+ba (S. *Ant.* 104f./121f.) or dodr B+wil (the other four cases) uniformly. The combination of dodr B+wil is found at E. *Hel.* 1303/1321, *Ba.* 874/894 and possibly at E. *Supp.* 960/968.

As 'dragged' glyconic is an exceptional form of glyconic, while poets are totally indifferent to the value of the second element of –×–⏑⏑–⏑– (but ⏑––⏑⏑–⏑– must have been felt separately), it is wrong to give a notation such as ⏓⏓–⏑⏑–×– or ⏓⏓–⏑⏑–⏓⏓. The latter is related to the supposition that the choriamb is fixed at the middle four elements of a free eight-syllable verse.[27] It is questionable even to call the penultimate element anceps in the sense that the fourth element of the wilamowitzian, which is analysed as aeolic base+–×–⏑⏑–, is anceps. Dragged glyconic is too unusual to constitute a case for giving the notation ⏓⏓–⏑⏑–×– or –×–⏑⏑–×– to glyconic (as does Barrett).

Finally, it remains to be considered whether two shorts are ever substituted for single short in the penultimate position in glyconic, producing a colon of the form ⏓⏓–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–.

E. *Supp.* 1021

χρῶτα χρωτὶ πέλας θεμῷγα

(~ 998 ἐπύργωσε καὶ γαμέτα).

Note the responsion ⏑–/–⏑ in aeolic base. The text of Evadne's aria suffers from considerable corruption, though 998/1021 has clear sense. I doubt whether this verse can correspond with a normal wilamowitzian. At any rate it is too dangerous to cite this line as an example of the responsion of (i) ⏑⏑/⏑ at the fourth element of wilamowitzian *or* (ii) the special glyconic (⏓⏓–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–) with wilamowitzian.

[27] The scheme ⏓⏓–××–⏓⏓ is found, for example, in M. Platnauer, *Iphigenia in Tauris* (Oxford, 1938), p. 184, or K. Rupprecht, *Einführung in die griechische Metrik* (München, 1950³), p. 52. The idea of 'choriambic nucleus' shifting its position seems to me still dominant; but I cannot accept it. The hypothetical colon 'choriambic dimeter' ⏓⏓⏓⏓–⏑⏑– is actually to be divided into two different cola, namely wilamowitzian (⏓⏓–×–⏑⏑–) and iambo-choriambic dimeter (×–⏑–––⏑⏑– and –⏑⏑––⏑⏑–). Cf. n. 5 above.

E. *El.* 439/449

κοῦφον ἅλμα ποδῶν Ἀχιλῆ ~ ἱππότας τρέφεν Ἑλλάδι φῶς

Ἀχιλῆ Heath: -λλῆ L. τρέφεν Tr²: ἔτρ- ⟨L⟩ P (Diggle's apparatus is cited.)

The corrections are reasonable, and this case is to be taken more positively. It is so completely accommodated in an aeolic context that it may be naturally supposed that the verse is either glyconic or wilamowitzian. And there seems to be no other explanation open. But is – ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – actually a *variant* of either gl or wil?

E. *Hipp.* 749 (χέον-)ται Ζηνὸς μελάθρων παρὰ κοί(-ταις)
(~ 739 (σταλάσ-)σουσιν ἐς οἶδμα πατρὸς τάλαι(-ναι) – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ –)

Wilamowitz (*GV* 247) and Schroeder (*Cantica*) accept this traditional reading and explain the extraordinary responsion by their *Hebung*-theory.[28] It would be more natural to suppose some textual corruption.

As for – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ –, there is no example that prevents us from taking it as dactyls (in a wider sense). The form ∪ – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – is found at S. *Aj.* 231/255, but glyconic interpretation is there questionable. ∪ ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – is used at E. *Ba.* 112/127, 115/130 and *IA* 1093, but the metrical context is not perfectly clear in either passage.

E. *El.* 439/449 is unique. It opens up the methodological question of whether any special form must be explained as a variation of an extant metre, even if it results in loosening the definition of the metre, or whether some apparently anomalous examples should be regarded as capricious without any more precise analysis.

Resolution of long elements

The tragic glyconic occasionally has two shorts at some positions instead of one long. This phenomenon is regarded as resolution. Lesbian isosyllabism never allows resolution and this restriction is generally observed by Aeschylus and Sophocles too. The resolution of the long in glyconic is a typical Euripidean innovation, especially common in his later plays.

Apart from the tribrach occupying aeolic base, resolution is found, except in a few cases (see below, p. 78), at the sixth element (the 'right' side of the 'choriambic nucleus') and the last element. There are twenty-five glyconics (2 Soph., 23 Eur.) of which the sixth element is resolved (⏑⏑ – ∪ ∪ ⏜ ∪ –). Twelve cola correspond with glyconics which are not resolved, and one (E. *Hel.* 1459), with a wilamowitzian (1473, ∪ ∪ ∪ – – – ∪ ∪ –, emended). Resolution corresponds antistrophically in only four pairs. The remaining four cola are astrophic.

There seems to be a certain relation between resolution and tribrach opening. Eight cola, about one-third of the examples, start with a tribrach (∪ ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ ⏜ ∪ –), and one with a dactyl (– ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ ⏜ ∪ –; *Or.* 831, this colon may not in fact be glyconic but dactylic with the scansion δᾱ́κρυα). Considering the low frequency of tribrach opening, the coincidence seems significant. In all except three cola (E. *Heracl.* 777, *El.* 458, *IA* 1047) a new word starts with the resolved element (⏑⏑ – ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ –). This localization of a word supports the idea that the colon in question is not wilamowitzian (⏑⏑ – ∪ ⏜ ∪ ∪ –) but glyconic. Usually the latter part of the colon (∪ ∪ ∪ –) is filled with one word or a word-group connected closely, but overlap into the following colon

[28] Strictly speaking, Wilamowitz supposes that the penultimate element of glyconic, as well as the second element, is treated as *Senkung* by Euripides, while Schroeder takes both – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ and – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – as a kind of *Vierheber* (enoplia) in his sense, a different verse from glyconic.

by one syllable (⏑⏑⏑–⏉–/) is not rare (E. *El.* 445, *Hel.* 1301, 1319, 1459, *Pho.* 237, *IA* 771, 1038). The most striking example is *Pho.* 234 (⏑⏑⏑|–⏉– –/ *νιφόβολόν τ' ὄρος ἱερόν, εἰ-λίσσων*).

Twenty-two glyconics (1 Soph., 21 Eur.) have resolved last element (⏓⏓–⏑⏑–⏑⏔). Strict responsion is not the rule here, either. Eight cola (four pairs) are in strophic responsion while six correspond with normal glyconics. The others are astrophic. Thirteen cola have a tribrach word which occupies the last three brevia (⏓⏓–⏑⏑–|⏑⏑⏑). Overlap into the following colon is generally avoided, but is found in three lines (*Hel.* 1348/1364, *Pho.* 208). As in the case of resolution of the sixth element, there is a tendency to coincide with tribrach opening. ⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑⏔ (12 lines) outnumbers –×–⏑⏑–⏑⏔ (10 lines; no example of ⏑– –⏑⏑–⏑⏔) in spite of the far less frequent occurrence of ⏑⏑⏑ than of –× at the aeolic base.

Unlike the tribrach occupying the aeolic base, resolution of the sixth and the eighth elements corresponds quite often with normal long. Perhaps resolution of these elements is felt as an occasional licence by Euripides rather than as a device to create a special rhythmical effect (whatever that might be). But on the other hand frequent coincidence with tribrach opening (⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑⏔⏑– and ⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑⏔, one (*Hyps.* 1 ii 23) is of the form ⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑⏔⏑⏔; such an extraordinary form could not be identified as glyconic if it were not for strophic responsion) may make the opposite interpretation possible.

Whether the third element of glyconic (the 'left' side of the 'choriambic nucleus') is resolved as often as other cases is not certain, for the form $\left.\begin{matrix}– –\\ ⏑–\\ ⏑⏑⏑\end{matrix}\right\}$⏑⏑⏑⏑–⏑– cannot be distinguished from an iambic dimeter: $\left.\begin{matrix}– –⏑⏑\\ ⏑–⏑⏑\\ ⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑\end{matrix}\right\}$⏑–⏑–. Theoretically, there is no reason to reject the possibility of the resolution of this element. The form –⏑⏔⏑⏑–⏑– is found only at *IA* 781, a passage often taken as spurious. – –⏔⏑⏑–– –, *Ba.* 865, is attested by strophic responsion with – – –⏑⏑–– – (dragged gl). Of the forms which cannot be distinguished from iambic dimeters, some examples of ⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑–⏑– may be judged glyconic from the metrical context (S. *OC* 186/205, E. *Med.* 211, *Suppl.* 978, *Ion* 497, *El.* 126). Possibly kinship with ⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑– in similar metrical context (e.g. S. *Ant.* 108/125) may be observed (but no example of strophic responsion is found between ⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑–⏑– and ⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑–). However, since pherecratean is associable with iambics, and since metrical context is not necessarily a reliable criterion, such a delicate classification would be meaningless.

Compounds

Dale is meticulous in not using nomenclature bringing the concept of 'metron' into aeolic cola. She avoids the appellation 'glyconic+spondee' for the colon ⏓⏓–⏑⏑–⏑– – –. According to her classification this colon is aeolo-choriambic decasyllable with dragged ending. Similarly, Barrett's diagram showing the normal aeolic colon as a length taken from the sequence ...×–×–×–×–⏑⏑–×–×–×–×...[29] presupposes that the penultimate element of this colon is not true long but anceps. But this supposition is not free from objection.

First, the penultimate element cannot be attested as anceps by actual examples, for there is no example of the antistrophic responsion of long with short at this position. Nor is there found even a single colon of the shape ⏓⏓–⏑⏑–⏑–⏑–. What we have

[29] *Euripides, Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964), appendix I.

is ○○–◡◡–◡––– only, and the number of occurrences of this colon (23) cumulatively favours spondaic interpretation.

Secondly, no example continues into the following colon in synartesis but many have an obvious, strong sense-break after them, so that we may safely suppose that this colon marks period-end. This characteristic agrees with the notion of the spondee in iambic contexts: the two longs are real longs which are the equivalent of the two longs of a doubly syncopated iambic metron (∧ – ∧ – or ʟʟ). On the contrary, 'dragged' glyconics sometimes overlap into the following colon.

Thirdly, we have examples of –––×–◡◡––– which can be regarded as 'wilamowitzian + spondee', but its hypothetical corollary, of which the penultimate element is filled with short, ○○–×–◡◡–◡–, is not found either.[30] The exact coincidence of the first eight elements of ○○–◡◡–◡––– and ○○–×–◡◡––– with gl and wil as to structure and metrical context, and also the parallelism between gl and wil, suggest that the longer cola were created by adding a spondee to two cola already in existence, namely glyconic and wilamowitzian.

Similarly, the phalaecian (○○–◡◡–◡–◡––) is reasonably analysed as glyconic + bacchiac. It has its wilamowitzian counterpart ○○–×–◡◡–◡––, which is used by Sophocles and Euripides. Here, too, the first eight elements of the two cola are identical with glyconic and wilamowitzian in structure and metrical context. After bacchiac, period-end can be supposed in all the examples.[31] At *Or.* 833 hiatus explicitly denotes it. There is no obstacle to taking the last element of the 'bacchiac' of these cola as true long, equal to that of the iambic bacchiac (◡– ∧ – or ◡–ʟ), not as anceps (◡–×).

There are twenty-three occurrences (11 antistrophic pairs + 1 astrophic) of gl + sp. As Dale observes (*LM*² 154), longer words of the shape ––– or ◡––– tend to occupy the spondaic part. But I do not think this tendency is useful either to prove or to reject the spondaic interpretation. Diaeresis is found at S. *Ant.* 865 and E. *IT* 1094 (elision at E. *Ion* 1073; for wil + sp, E. *El.* 174/197, 444). In the thirty-two examples of gl + ba, no special tendency is detected about localization of words.

Other types of suffix are rare: gl + mol, E. *Ion* 1237; gl + ch, S. *Aj.* 605/618 and E. *Hipp.* 740/750 (another colometry is possible), gl + ia, ?S. *Aj.* 194.

Of the prefixed forms, ia + gl is found at S. *Aj.* 600/612, †601/615†, 624/635, 625/636, 1188/1195, *Tra.* 845/856, E. *El.* 169 (/192 ia + wil; iambic metron is totally resolved into ◡◡◡◡◡◡) and, probably, at S. *El.* 479/495 (see p. 69 above). The iambic metron and glyconic are linked by synartesis in all the examples listed except for *Tra.* 845, where there is word-end with elision, and S. *El.* 479/495. This colon may have come down from Lesbian metres since the tendency to synartesis is observed in Alcaeus 70 LP, where ia + gl is used alternately with lesser asclepiad. For the affinity of 'iambic metron' with glyconic, 3 ia followed by gl in synartesis at A. *Cho.* 324f./354f. and ch + ia followed by gl in synartesis at S. *Ant.* 332f./342f. and E. *Heracl.* 910f./919f. are to be compared, although in these passages the 'iambic metron' belongs to a different colon from the glyconic.

Another type of prefixed form is cr + gl. This is used at E. *Med.* 155f./180f., *Heracl.* 898f./907f., *IA* 783f. (and cr + wil, at S. *Phil.* 137f./152f.). Diaeresis after cretic is observed except at *Med.* 180 and *Heracl.* 907. In Sapphic metre, cr + gl

[30] *Ba.* 867/887 turns to ––◡–◡◡–◡– if overlapping is rejected at 865–6/885–6 (p. 75 above).

[31] I include S. *Aj.* 697 in the examples of gl + ba provisionally. This line has ⏑̃ at the end. This is avoided by adopting another colometry (Schroeder, Dale *LM*² 151) which follows rhetorical division better, but needs to admit an unfamiliar colon ◡–––◡◡–◡– repeated twice. Perhaps this colon is analysable as ba + dodr A; cf. Sophoclean examples of ba + gl, p. 80.

appears in 96 LP (cr+gl, gl, gl+ba; all in synaphea) and perhaps in 98 LP (gl, gl, cr+gl, is proposed by Page). In 96 LP diaeresis is generally avoided, and frequent appearance of ⏑– at the aeolic base is significant. Of the tragic examples, only *Med.* 155f./180f. starts with ⏑–.

Sophocles seems to use ba+gl. This is found at *Aj.* 1205/1217, *OC* 120/152 (supposing the colon begins with ὁ πάντων ~ δυσαίων of the preceding colon of Dawe's colometry), *OC* 123f./155f., and perhaps at *OC* 131/162 too (starting with ἀδέρκτως ~ φύλαξαι from the preceding colon). Diaeresis is generally observed (but *Aj.* 1205 has elided δ' there), so it is possible to separate the bacchiac from the following glyconic.

Conclusions

I summarize conclusions to serve as a basis for a further investigation about the nature of glyconic. The glyconic in tragedy is better described as ○○–⏑⏑–⏑– than by any other notation, but whether aeolic base (○○) can be taken as anaclasis should be examined. Maas uses ○○ as the symbol of anaclasis, defined as 'the sequences ×– and –× responding with each other' (§33.4). This is purely descriptive.[32] Aeolic base is occupied by ––, –⏑, ⏑–, ⏑⏑⏑ and –⏑⏑ in tragedy. Taking account of antistrophic responsion, these forms can be classified into three: –×, ×–, and ⏒⏑⏑. The last is obviously a late development and can be put aside. Certainly –× and ×– correspond here, but it should not be forgotten that examples of –⏑/⏑– are hardly ever found: 2 gl/gl, 1 gl/wil, 3 pher/pher among some hundred cases. Responsion is observed between –⏑–⏑⏑–⏑– and ⏑––⏑⏑–⏑– far less frequently than between –×–⏑⏑–⏑– and –×–×–⏑⏑–.

Anaclasis is not a very common phenomenon in general. For example, –⏑⏑–/⏑–⏑– has only a handful of examples as far as I know. Note that Maas does not say anything about the general relation between the choriamb and the iambic. And ⏑⏑––⏑⏑––/⏑⏑–⏒–⏑–– (note that the fourth element of 'anacreontic' is not always short) is attested only in internal responsion in Anacreon, and it is quite exceptional in antistrophic responsion in tragedy. The relation between aeolic base and these phenomena is still open to question.

I do not understand why Maas employs the notion of anaclasis to explain the antistrophic responsion between glyconic and wilamowitzian. When this responsion is described in a figure, $\left\{\begin{matrix}⏑⏑⏑\\ ○○\end{matrix}\right\}–\left\{\begin{matrix}⏑⏑–\\ ×–⏑\end{matrix}\right\}⏑–$ is the only scheme that represents the responsion exactly, as Maas himself recognizes. Nevertheless, he gives ○○–⏑○○⏑–. The tribrach opening may be neglected by expansion of the definition of the symbol ○○, but the responsion between ⏑⏑– ~ ×–⏑ cannot be simplified any more. Neither ○○–⏑○○⏑– nor ○○–×○○⏑– is perfect. The former excludes ○○–––⏑⏑–, which is used more frequently than ○○–⏑–⏑⏑–.[33] The latter includes ○○––⏑–⏑–, which does not exist at all. Then is there any profit in ○○–$\left\{\begin{matrix}⏑⏑–\\ ×–⏑\end{matrix}\right\}$⏑–? It is inorganic and meaningless to take out ⏑⏑– (×–⏑) from glyconic (wilamowitzian).

[32] Maas does not describe anaclasis as the inversion of the positions of two elements. He may have been cautious so as to avoid any implication about the origin or the historical process of evolution of the cola, which are identical except for the two elements in question.

[33] Of 24 examples of wilamowitzian corresponding with glyconic (including ⏑⏑⏑wil/–⏑⏑gl), 20 are ○○–––⏑⏑– and 4 are ○○–⏑–⏑⏑–. The fourth element of wilamowitzian in general is occupied by long more frequently than by short.

The penultimate element of glyconic must be described as a short, not as an anceps. The number of 'dragged' glyconics is very small, and responsion with normal glyconic is found in only three cases. The symbol of anceps (×) should be given to the element where a long and a short appear with equal frequency (of course, here 'equal' means 'roughly or relatively equal'). If I am right to take tragic 'ibycean' not as – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – but as – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – × –, the penultimate element will be another distinction between 'ibycean' and its kindred and glyconic.

When people believed in 'logaoedic', the responsion between glyconic and wilamowitzian was explained as e.g. – – – ⏑⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –.[34] Thanks to the 'cyclic dactyl', the responsion between ∪ ∪ and ∪ (or more exactly, between – ∪ ∪ and – ∪) created by this scheme was admitted without any trouble. 'Logaoedic' was rightly abandoned and superseded by the theory which supposed a free eight-syllable verse. But if the scheme ○○○○ – ∪ ∪ – : ○○ – ∪ ∪ – ○○ : – ∪ ∪ – ○○○○ is baseless (see n. 26), the theory itself must be questioned.

If the colon – ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – (E. *El.* 439/449) is accepted as a *variant* of glyconic or wilamowitzian, it means that an anceps or a short can be resolved (or in a milder expression, a double-short can be substituted for an anceps or a short). For some people this acceptance may entail a sort of *Hebung*-theory. Suppose someone were to establish a hypothetical scheme ○○ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – to cover glyconic, wilamowitzian, lecythion, ○○ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ –, – × – ∪ – ∪ – (Bacch. 18. 7), and dubious responsion such as – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ~ – – – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – (E. *Hipp.* 739/749) or – – – ∪ – ∪ – ~ – – – – – ∪ ∪ – (S. *Ant.* 106/123). The ultimate proof of its irrelevance is found in the absence of antistrophic responsion. If this scheme were right, we should have more examples of ○○ – ∪ – ∪ – and ○○ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – corresponding with gl or wil.

The term 'resolution' should be used only when, a long being the norm, antistrophic responsion between the long and the substituted double-short is observed not uncommonly. In this sense 'resolved glyconic' is an appropriate name only for ○○ – ∪ ∪ ⏑ ∪ – and for ○○ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ ⏑.

Hephaestion is evidently wrong to dissect the glyconic into two metra, antispast and iambic.[35] Moreover the analysis of all aeolic cola into 'metra' in an even looser manner, such as taking the whole glyconic as equivalent to a dimeter, has some difficulties, for example, in the interpretation of the hipponactean (○○ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – –). But, on the other hand, cola ○○ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – – – and ○○ – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – – can be reasonably analysed into glyconic + spondee/bacchiac. The spondee and the bacchiac are to be taken as equal to those of iambic cola.

These cola, and the glyconic itself too, should not be regarded as a length taken from the sequence . . . × – × – × – ∪ ∪ – × – × – × . . . Barrett's diagrammatic formula of the commoner aeolic cola, I think, covers too much. This problem goes beyond our current scope, but some of the weak points of the formula are mentioned here. (1) Not every length taken from the sequence of alternating long with one double-short and several single-short (or anceps) is actually found. (2) It cannot explain why some particular cola are employed so frequently. (3) Even the idea of alternating anceps is based on *a priori* judgement. For example, the penultimate element of

[34] Jebb, at S. *Phil.* 1082/1102.

[35] *Ench.* ch. 10. Notice that he analyses the telesillean × – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – as 'major ionic hephthemimer' (ch. 11.2; this analysis is also found in Heliodorus. See his scholia on Ar. *Pax* 1329ff. (White, p. 440)) or as anapaestic (ch. 4.4) too.

⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–––– is true long. (4) Aeolic base has a peculiar nature and should not be equated with other long+anceps.[36]

Seijo University, Tokyo KIICHIRO ITSUMI

[36] Dale adds a note to Barrett's scheme that –× may be inverted in the 'left' of 'choriambic nucleus' (*LM*² 153). Most likely this idea has its origin in the notion of anaclasis. But the tendency above observed about aeolic base and the fact that the third element of wilamowitzian is always long are not well explained.