The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On the Study of Greek Lyric Metre

W. R. Hardie

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 06 / June 1892, pp 244 - 249

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00185853, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185853

How to cite this article:

W. R. Hardie (1892). On the Study of Greek Lyric Metre. The Classical Review, 6, pp 244-249 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185853

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

'half as much again as,' 'four-thirds of,' etc., and this is the construction here; as is shown by another sentence a little later on the same page, where Nicomachus goes on to remark that these ratios are given in terms which increase progressively. Thus, he says, *πρῶτος μὲν πρῶτον πυθμένα πολλὰ πλάσιον ἔξει, δεύτερος δὲ δευτέρου δεύτερον ἀπὸ πυθμένος ἡμιόλιον, τρίτος δὲ τρίτου τρίτον ἀπὸ πυθμένος ἐπίτριτον, κ.τ.λ.* That is to say, 6 : 4 is the second *ἡμιόλιος λόγος* from the *πυθμὴν* (3 : 2), 12 : 9 is the third *ἐπίτριτος λόγος* from the *πυθμὴν* (4 : 3), and so on.

5. The meaning of *πεμπάδι συζυγείς* will be best considered when we are agreed about *ἐπίτριτος πυθμὴν*. I may say that I merely noticed, as one of several weak points, the want of evidence that *συζυγείς* could imply multiplication. The strength of my argument here lies in the aptness of the words *ἐπίτριτος πυθμὴν πεμπάδι συζυγείς* as a description of the triangle whose sides are 4 and 3 and hypotenuse 5.

6. Similarly with *ἀποστάσεις*—I do not say that it could not mean distance from a point to another, but only that in the two other mathematical passages in Plato where it occurs it denotes the ratio between two magnitudes. The discrepancy between fig. vi. and fig. ix. seems to me to be more than an apparent one, and to involve giving up Mr. Adam's explanation of the three *ἀποστάσεις* and four *ὄροι*. On the view represented by fig. vi. the *ἀποστάσεις* lay along a line. Mr. Adam

bade us take them up tenderly and lift them with care, when they would arrange themselves in the Pythagorean triangle (fig. vii.). He now makes them all start from the same point (fig. ix.). Under this rough usage the Pythagorean triangle becomes impossible here, and the case is proportionately strengthened for finding it in the next part of the passage.

7. Whether the Nuptial Number is a good joke or not, I would press this point. Plato does not merely warn us that it is a joke. He distinctly seems to imply that the point of the joke lies in the use of high-sounding scientific language which is nevertheless without meaning. The Muses do not give us serious mathematics in a playful manner—smiling at their Babylonian numbers, as Mr. Adam puts it. Their language is lofty and serious (*ὡς δὴ σπουδῇ λεγούσας ὑψηλολογουμένας*), but they are really jesting and trifling with us (*ὡς πρὸς παῖδας ἡμᾶς παίζουσας καὶ ἐρεσχλούσας*). I agree (as I have already said) that Plato is probably half-serious. But if he had had a clear and consistent mathematical sense to convey, he would have been wholly serious, as he is in other mathematical passages. Mr. Adam has done something to illustrate the serious side, and would probably have done more if he had not attempted to explain everything: *πλέον ἡμισυ παντός*. The significance of the Platonic Number is not dependent on the completeness of its solution.

D. B. M.

ON THE STUDY OF GREEK LYRIC METRE

THE study of Greek metre has hitherto been grievously and unreasonably neglected in this country and, for want of a better advocate, I wish to say a few words in its defence: practically, to show that a great deal of metrical knowledge might be taught with advantage even in schools, a large part of the subject being both easy and simple and likely to help the learner to a better appreciation of ancient poetry; and theoretically, to call attention to some principles which seem to me to render the study less nebulous, baseless and generally unsatisfactory than it has appeared to be in the lucubrations of some of its exponents. I take the practical question first, namely, what parts of metrical science are easily taught and worth knowing—worth knowing,

that is, for people who are neither technical musicians nor scholars by profession, but for whom classical literature is part of an ordinary liberal education.

It is, I believe, the practice in schools to ignore altogether the metre of the choric parts in Greek tragedy. Only in a few schools, and there only in the highest form, is the subject touched at all. No one can deny that there are passages and even large tracts of choric verse which are metrically very difficult, and where the difficulties are complicated by textual and grammatical questions—the whole being quite beyond the capacities of schoolboys. But is that a good reason for neglecting the metre of all? There are also large tracts and whole odes which without being hard to

construe are as easy metrically as many English lyrics, in which knowledge of the metre—or at all events appreciation of the general metrical or rhythmical effect—would be insisted upon by any reasonable teacher. Who would tolerate the unmetrical reading of these lines, as if they were so much florid prose?—

Since the songs of Greece fell silent, none
like ours have risen;
Since the sails of Greece fell slack, no
ships have sailed like ours:
How should we lament not, if her spirit sit
in prison?
How should we rejoice not, if her wreaths
renew their flowers?

To teach a boy to read these lines with some sense of their rhythm is neither more nor less difficult, one would think, than to teach him the structure or general effect of trochaic tetrameters. And yet fairly intelligent boys who have spent years over Greek poetry scarcely know a trochee from an anapaest when they see it! Trochaic systems for the chorus are often quite as simple as tetrameters: but of course they know nothing whatever about their construction. To begin at the beginning, they are not taught to recognize in Greek lyrics a thing which they must know in modern singing or music, if they have any training in these at all.

This is the not very obscure or recondite phenomenon which the Greeks called *τομή*, the contraction of a foot into one syllable or the prolongation of a single syllable to the duration of a complete foot or bar. A great deal of choric poetry becomes at once comparatively graceful and intelligible by the revelation of this simple fact—a fact which no teacher who knew it could have the slightest difficulty in making audible to his scholars. Any one who knows a long syllable from a short can be easily made to understand what a still longer syllable is, $\sqcup$ or $\bullet$, $\sqcup$ or $\bullet$. Perhaps the best plan for beginners would be to have texts in which *σλλαβαὶ τρίσημοι* and *τετράσημοι* were followed by a hyphen, a notation adopted by Reiter (*Dissert. Vindob.* 1887):

ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπεμ-νησάμην ἀμειλίχων,
ἐπεὶ δ' ἀναγ-κας ἔδν λέπαδνον
αἰωρ-ήσ-ασα τοῦμὸν ὄμμα.

It is the more irrational to ignore *τομή* because it occurs in modern English verse. Mr. George Meredith has written some lyrics, in the versification of which *τομή* is conspicuous:—

Water, first of singers, o'er rocky mount
and mead,
First of earthly singers, the sun-loved rill
Sang of him.

—(*Poems and Lyrics*, 1883, p. 73,
'Phoebus with Admetus.')

It occurs more irregularly in 'Love in the Valley' (*ib.* p. 87 f.):

Lovely are the curves of the white owl
sweeping
Wavy in the dusk lit by one large star

* * * *

Thicker crowd the shades while the grave
East deepens
Glowing, and with crimson a long cloud
swells.¹

A few passages like these dictated and read in English would make the effect obvious.² When *τομή* has been made clear to the learner, and when the equally easy conception of an anacrusis has been explained to him, he is in a position to construe metrically a large number of choric passages, especially in Aeschylus. The beginning of metrical teaching should be this explanation of *τομή* and its application to simple trochaics. Even an obtuse pupil would be encouraged to persist by the vague feeling that he had gained something worth having, and that what seemed turgid and eccentric prose had become something much more artistic and pleasing to the ear—he might still be a long way from thorough appreciation of the

¹ This, by the way, is a passage which an editor of Statius would do well to quote on *Thebais* i. 342—

sed nec puniceo rediturum nubila caelo
promisere iubar, nec resescentibus umbris
longa repercusso nituere crepuscula Phoebos.

² In an accentual language like English *τομή* is less clearly marked, and it is a more difficult effect for a poet to handle successfully, than in the quantitative verse of Greece. There, it can generally be detected with certainty and precision. In English an interpretation is sometimes possible which avoids it or places it differently. Thus the line,

'Thicker crowd the shades while the grave East deepens,'
may be either

or

$\sqcup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \sqcup \sqcup \sqcup$
 $\sqcup \cup \cup \sqcup \cup \cup \sqcup \sqcup \sqcup$

But 'while the grave East' is unsatisfactory, and the intention of the poet was no doubt the other. In other places in the same poem I take it that Mr. Meredith meant the line to begin with double *τομή*:

$\sqcup \sqcup$ Wild cloud mountains that drag the hills along.

This is common in Greek poetry, though there an anacrusis usually occurs (as in the last of the three Greek passages just quoted).

that the trochee is sometimes resolved $\cup \cup$
(e.g. in the last line of the strophe in
Pyth. IV.).

(c) 'Periodometry' — the separation of subordinate groups of $\kappa\omega\lambda\alpha$ within a strophe — is at first sight a thorny, recondite, and unpractical subject. I propose to state very briefly one or two principles which seem to place it upon a firmer basis, theoretically: and this having been done, it will appear that a part of the study might with advantage be taught, perhaps even in schools.

The key to the arrangement of *περίοδοι* lies, in a great many cases, in careful examination of the *κῶλον* or cadence with which a strophe closes. The point at which a strophe ends is known with certainty, and if we find certain types of verse occurring with great frequency in this place, there is a presumption that these types were felt to be appropriate and effective at the close of any group, whether a strophe or a shorter whole. But certain forms do constantly recur in this place. $\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$ is one (*τὰν δυσάλωτον ἔλη τις ἀρχάν*, virginibus puerisque canto). $\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$ is another (*πατρῶν δ' ἐκτίνεις τιν' ἀθλον*). $\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$ is a third (*καὶ δόξαν' ἀποκλίνει*). The first step in an inductive enquiry will therefore be to take various strophæ, and, observing the cadence into which they close, to look for that cadence in them elsewhere. If we find it two or three times in the course of

logaedic as any ode ever was. There is not even the justification of appropriateness in *ῥῶς*, for the song expresses lively excitement and curiosity. Some lines, it is true, in the middle of the strophe, approximate in form to *ἐπισύβητα*, but at most this would lead us to classify the whole as partly logaedic, partly *ἐπισύμβητον*. A change of time being assumed to be unlikely in a strophe, Schmidt's belief that *ἐπισύβητα* must be in $\frac{3}{4}$ time prevents him from recognizing any such fusion of forms or hybrid strophæ. (See Prof. Jebb's 'Metrical Analyses,' Intr. to *O. T.* p. lxxxv., *O. C.* lxxii.)

Trach. 496 f. μέγα τι σθένος ἃ Κύπρις is taken by Schmidt to be logaoedic (*v.* Prof. Jebb's Introduction, p. lix.), but it is quite clearly ἐπισύνθετον. It runs thus:—

μέγα τι σθένος ἂ Κύπρις ἐκφέρεται νίκας ἀεί

καὶ τὰ μὲν θεῶν

παρέβαν καὶ ὅπως Κρονίδαν ἀπάτασεν οὐ λέγω

οὐδὲ τὸν ἐγγυχόν ᾿Αϊδαν

$\overline{\eta}$ $\overline{\text{Ποσειδά}\overline{\omega}\text{να}}$ $\overline{\text{τινά}\overline{\kappa}\text{τορα}}$ $\overline{\gamma\alpha\iota\alpha\varsigma}, \&c.$

Κρονιδᾶν ἀπάταον οὐ λέγω does, it is true, look like logaodic verse. But the illusion does not last when one remembers that in Pindar the last foot of the dactylic κῶλον in ἐπισύνθετα is quite frequently a trochee. These lines run $\Delta(4) \in \Delta(4) \in \Delta \in \Delta$, &c.

the strophe, we may assume provisionally that *περίοδοι* ended at these points, and proceed to look about for further evidence. To a certain extent, the first line of a strophe as well as the last has a character of its own, that is, has recurrent forms which seem to have been preferred. If the lines which follow the closing cadences show any such characteristics, the division of the strophe at these points will be confirmed.

But there is also a non-metrical criterion. Grammar or syntax helps a little. In Greek poetry the sense is often independent of strophic limits—a sentence is carried over the iunctura of two strophæ. There is much of this in Pindar, and a little of it in the lyrics of tragedy. Now where it does occur there is a distinct tendency to make the transition by means of a relative pronoun. For example, in *O.T.* 1195, the antistrophe begins ‘ὄστις καθ’ ὑπερβολάν’ κ.τ.λ.: *Bacchæ*, 87, ‘ὅν ποτ’ ἔχουσ’ ἐν ὠδίνων λοχίαις ἀνάγκαις’ κ.τ.λ. This then, we are tempted to think, was felt to be a neat and happy connecting link, just as in Latin prose the relative was frequently adopted for attaching a period to its predecessor. Thus there is a presumption that it will be found rather frequently at the beginning of a new *περίοδος*, within the strophe. Premising that, syntactically, the participial clause is very like a relative clause in effect, we now proceed to examine a choric passage on these principles, looking for (a) a closing cadence, (b) occurrence of either relative pronoun or participle at the beginning of a *περίοδος*. Take *O.T.* 1186:—

ἰὼ γενεαὶ βροτῶν,
 ὥς ὑμᾶς ἴσα καὶ τὸ μη-
 δὲν ζώσας ἐναριθμῶ.

1190 τίς γάρ, τίς ἀνὴρ πλέον
τᾶς εὐδαιμονίας φέρει
ἢ τοσοῦτον ὅσον δοκεῖν
καὶ δόξαντ' ἀποκλίνει ;
τὸν σὸν τοι παράδειγμ' ἔχων,
τὸν σὸν δαίμονα, τὸν σὸν, ὦ
τλάμων Οἰδιπόδα, βροτῶν
οὔδεν μακαρίζω.

ant. 1195 ὅστις καθ' ὑπερβολὰν
τοξεύσας ἐκράτησε τοῦ
πάντ' εὐδαίμονος ὄλβου,
ὦ Ζεῦ, κατὰ μὲν φθίσας
τὰν γαμψώνυχα παρθένου
χρησμοφδόν, θανάτων δ' ἐμᾶ
1200 χώρα πύργους ἀνέστα,
ἐξ οὗ καὶ βασιλεὺς καλεῖ
ἐμὸς καὶ τὰ μέγιστ' ἐτι-
μᾶθης ταῖς μεγαλυσιν ἐν
Θήβαιον ἀνάσσω.

with the measure through Anacreon's visit to the court of Pisistratus,

/ / /
μεταμανθάνουσα δ' ὕμνον
or

/ / /
νοτίους ἔτεγξα παγαῖς,

connecting with this, in the next place, the normal Ionic which Anacreon has as a 'clausula'—

ἄγε δῆυτε μηκέθ' οὔτω
πατάγῃ τε κάλαλητῷ
Σκυθικὴν πόσιν παρ' οἴνῳ
μελετώμεν, ἀλλὰ καλοῖς
ὑποπίνοντες ἐν ὕμνοις

and which in the *Persae* is continuous—

πεπέρακεν μὲν ὁ περσέπολις ἤδη κ.τ.λ.,

and finally pointing out, with the help of the surviving Greek line

Γαλλὰι μητρὸς ὀρείης φιλόθυρσοι δρομάδες,
that what Catullus has is a combination of the broken and the normal Ionic—

/ / / / / / / /
super alta | vectus Atys | celeri rate maria.¹

This is only one example out of many. Most lyric measures could be treated in the same way, and the real effect of Catullus' or Horace's forms would be much better understood by contrast with what had preceded them in Greece—how, for instance, Horace imparted Roman 'gravitas' to the Alcaic stanza by two changes, making the spondee or heavy trochee regular in the

¹ For the *ῥθος* of the measure, it is in its general effect a trochaic dipody unhinged or thrown out of balance by a strong stress on one half of it: therefore adapted to express mental disturbance: and hence constantly associated with the ecstatic worship of Cybele and Dionysus—being, for example, the metre of most of the lyrics in the *Bacchae*.

second place (— : — — —)—a form perhaps suggested by the Pindaric 'epitritus'—and having 'diaeresis' in the middle of the verse where Alcaeus had none,

χειμῶνι μοχθεῖντες μεγάλῳ μάλα,

this effect being somewhat akin to the juxtaposition of two κῶλα in the elegiac 'pentameter'; while in Sapphic verse he introduced an effect akin to the hexametric linking of two groups by 'caesura' (... 'nivis atque dirae,' a word beginning in the middle of the dactyl, — — — — —, — — — — —).

All these are very familiar facts, of which, as facts, no scholar or teacher requires to be reminded. What it is perhaps not altogether superfluous to insist upon, is the selection or discrimination of those facts which might be taught easily and with advantage. Perhaps it is sanguine to expect that a new impulse would be given to the study of Greek poetry, and a new attraction added to it. But the experiment might at least be tried.

At present metrical matters are often spoken of as a very recondite and special study, more so even than palaeography. It is difficult to see any justification for this. Palaeography may be taken on trust by the ordinary student. For the constitution of the text, he may, reasonably and without material loss, rely upon some editor who is known to be sound and careful. But he cannot read a line of poetry with any approximation to the effect originally intended by the poet unless he knows something of metre. True, the most advanced metrician probably falls short of being able to reproduce or reconstruct the exact scheme which Aeschylus or Pindar intended. But it is at least certain that Greek lyrics were not pronounced as if they were English prose.

W. R. HARDIE.

NOTES ON EARLY ATHENIAN HISTORY.

I.—THE COUNCIL: ἐφέται AND ναύκαρποι.

ALL students of Greek history are aware that much ingenuity has been expended on attempts to reconstruct the pre-Solonian constitution of Athens. One of the most important points debated has been the question what was the nature of the Council which undoubtedly always existed, and what

were its relations to the later Council of the Areopagus. Several elaborate theories as to this have been constructed: the most brilliant and most popular is that of Lange: it has been adopted wholly or in part by nearly all later writers.

He maintains¹ that the ἐφέται mentioned

¹ *Abh. d. k. Sachs. Gesellschaft a. Wissenschaften* 17. Leipzig. 1879.