

## I

## LYRICAL CLAUSULAE IN SOPHOCLES

The close of a lyric stanza, which is left echoing on the ear and so has an important part to play in keeping the impression of the rhythmic whole distinct and intelligible, is treated by the Greek dramatic poets as a problem with a great variety of solutions. A comparative study of their technique is profitable only within certain limits. Thus, for instance, the relatively high degree of uniformity in the metres of most of the choral lyrics of comedy restricts the choice of clausula and the intricacy of its relation to the rest of the stanza. Again, Aeschylus, especially in his earlier plays, composes many systems which are a series of short periods in responsion—not stanzas so much as the elements of stanzas—and some of these periods simply stop; it would be arbitrary to isolate the last colon here and call it a clausula. Nor would a formal classification of clausular rhythms in the drama be likely to lead to any very enlightening conclusions as to the practice of an individual poet; the multiplicity of phenomena is too great, especially in Sophocles and Euripides. Nevertheless, in the relation between the final clausula and those phrases earlier in the stanza where a metrical period comes to a close, it seems possible to formulate a distinctively Sophoclean technique; and the examination of this throws some light on the division into cola, and in one or two cases perhaps even on the text itself.

Here obviously great caution is necessary. Clausulae, like the rest of the metrical elements in a lyric, are often welded into preceding cola so that it is difficult to say precisely where they begin; and again division is sometimes merely an academic question, and there is nothing to be gained or inferred by adding syllables here and taking them off there. But it often happens that the clausula is easier to isolate than other phrases, and the responsion of strophe and antistrophe is here a valuable guide. It is the assumption of this article that, for all our ignorance of the sound of Greek lyric and its

## 2 *The Collected Papers of A. M. Dale*

relation to music and dance, rhythm is more likely to have been used, at any rate by Sophocles, to bring out the meaning of a passage than as a superimposed system of scansion related perhaps to the music but overriding the natural rhetorical effect. Clearly this is not a principle of detail, such as can be applied indiscriminately to each sentence of a lyric; but if, for instance, both strophe and antistrophe show a clear grammatical pause at the same place, particularly when this cuts off one phrase at the end, a division into metrical units which coincides with this pause is *a priori* more probable than one which ignores it. Conversely, the absence of diaeresis before what is normally a separable metrical unit may mean that here the clausula proper is of greater extent, as for instance in Aesch. *Ag.* 452–5 = 471–4, where the correct formula is not 2 pherecrateans, glyconic, pherecratean, but 2 pherecrateans+priapean.<sup>1</sup> This may be as important a principle as the absence of regular diaeresis in the paroemiac close of anapaests. And though it is sometimes impossible to determine whether a particular phrase is trochaic or iambic, choriambic or ionic, it is still important to try to establish such distinctions by correct division wherever there appears to be reasonable ground to go upon, since there is good evidence that the rhythmical movement of these feet was in fact different.

Where textual questions are involved, metrical criteria, outside certain well-established limits, are notoriously unsafe, since the range of phenomena is often too narrow to warrant general conclusions, and the interpretation of them is controversial. Admittedly, arguments based on metrical analogy would be valueless if they conflicted with a well-authenticated text, but where counsels have been divided and certainty is unattainable it is of interest to consider the metrical argument along with the rest and see which line of emendation is supported by all parallel cases among Sophoclean clausulae.

If we consider the clausula in relation to the rest of the stanza, one characteristic that emerges as peculiar to Sophocles is his extreme care to avoid any monotony of repetitive effect. There are very few cases where the final clausula repeats an earlier period-close within

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Wilamowitz, *Griech. Vers.* p. 457.

### *Lyrical Clausulae in Sophocles*

3

the stanza, nor are final clausulae repeated from one pair of strophes to the next. This is in marked contrast to the practice of Euripides. To take first of all glyconic systems, which are among the most homogeneous in both authors and are usually restricted to the simplest kinds of catalectic clausula: in Soph. *Phil.* 169 ff. the clausula, a pherecratean, repeats the fourth phrase, and this is the only case of repetition in this metre in the extant plays. In *Phil.* 1081–1100, a passage with an unusually uniform movement, the changes are rung on all the regular glyconic clausulae, — — — ∪ ∪ — (pher.), — — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — — (hipponactean), ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — — (iamb. dim. cat.) and at the end — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — — (chor. dim. cat.). *O.C.* 192–206 has similar variations. A fair case for comparison would be Eur. *Phoen.* 202 ff., which has roughly the same degree of uniformity in general movement; the pherecratean clausula is a precise echo of two earlier period-closes in strophe and antistrophe and again in the epode; nine repetitions in all within the compass of forty-eight lines.<sup>1</sup> There are passages in Euripides where this metre is prolonged over a series of strophes and refrains of a special hieratic character; here the pherecratean returns again and again, as ordinary metrical unit, as period-close, and as final clausula. Such are the famous cult-hymn celebrating the exploits of Heracles,<sup>2</sup> and the hymn of the Bacchae,<sup>3</sup> which resembles the ἐφύμνις of the *Agamemnon*<sup>4</sup> and may well be a reminiscence of the Aeschylean *Lycurgeia*. This type of lyric nowhere occurs in the extant plays of Sophocles, so that there is no proper basis for comparison; but it is worth noting that of the long κομποί in the two *Electras* the Euripidean<sup>5</sup> achieves its plangent effect by an extraordinary metrical monotony largely due to the continually recurring pherecratean catalexis, whereas Sophocles in a lyric<sup>6</sup> of very varied movement returns indeed several times to an iambic form of close, but only once repeats, in a final clausula, l. 172,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. in the same metre Eur. *Andr.* 501 ff., *Supp.* 990 ff., *I.A.* 164 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *H.F.* 348–441.

<sup>3</sup> *Bacch.* 862–911.

<sup>4</sup> In the chorus beginning l. 355, cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 625 ff.

<sup>5</sup> ll. 112–212.

<sup>6</sup> ll. 121–250.

#### 4 *The Collected Papers of A. M. Dale*

a form of trimeter  $\cup - - - \cup - \cup - -$  which occurs as a mid-verse close in the previous pair of strophes, l. 127.<sup>1</sup>

The same difference is noticeable in their use of other common types of clausula. The ithyphallic<sup>2</sup> close of Eur. *Andr.* 125 is repeated from three earlier phrases in the strophe and appears again at the close of the next pair: it recurs over and over again in *Phoen.* 1018–66. It is common enough in Sophocles in simple and in elaborate systems, but nowhere does a clausula of this form repeat an earlier phrase from the stanza nor is it ever used to end successive strophes in the same chorus. The same applies to his use of the various forms of reizianum, one of which Euripides repeats twelve times, including the three clausulae, in *Ion* 453–509. Again, just as in dimeters  $\cup - \cup - \cup - -$  and  $- \cup \cup - \cup - -$  are used as minor variations on the equivalent pherecratean, so a trimetric clausula

θυμοῦ τ' Ἀτρείδαις μεγάλων τε νεϊκέων<sup>3</sup>  
 $- - \cup - - \cup \cup - \cup - -$

picks up without repeating the equivalent phalaecean five lines back

θοᾶν ὠκυάλων νεῶν, ὅτ' Αἴας  
 $\cup - - \cup \cup - \cup - \cup - -$

There is no parallel in Sophocles to the repetitive effect of Eur. *Supp.* 1123 ff., where the similar clausula

εὐδοκίμων δήποτ' ἐν Μυκῆναις  
 $- \cup \cup - - \cup - \cup - -$

has its exact counterpart in the middle of the verse and again at the close of the next pair, each time following a full iambic trimeter.

The extent of Aeschylean lyric available for comparison is

<sup>1</sup> ll. 249–50 should probably be taken as a tetrameter (so Bruhn and Schroeder) rather than as reiz. + trim.

<sup>2</sup> The name is used as a convenient label for the phrase  $- \cup - \cup - -$  without prejudice to the question whether in any particular instance it is iambic or trochaic.

<sup>3</sup> *Aj.* 718.

## *Lyrical Clausulae in Sophocles*

5

limited,<sup>1</sup> and the form which his repetitions more often take is that the same rhythm closes successive stanzas: in *Ag.* 681 ff. a pherecratean (or priapean) ends three pairs running and appears also in mid-verse, and *Supp.* 524 ff. has — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — at the close of four pairs besides containing several trimeters ending in the same phrase.<sup>2</sup> But this is rather a symptom of the more homogeneous character of many of Aeschylus' metrical systems than significant for his use of clausular rhythm in particular. The point which is noteworthy for the Sophoclean lyric is that in no stanza does the final clausula repeat more than one earlier 'close',<sup>3</sup> and that the repetition of even one is exceptional, while epodes and consecutive pairs of strophes within the same system always vary their clausulae.

The exceptions are worth noting. But first it should be made clear that there are a few lyrics which cannot be said to have a clausula properly speaking at all—some of those, for instance, which consist largely of dochmiacs or dochmiacs mixed with iambic trimeters. Neither the acatalectic trimeter nor the dochmiac pair which so often ends such a series is here a detachable clausular rhythm; it is significant that there is the same freedom of responsion in such final dochmiacs as in any others. Again, *O.T.* 158 is hardly so much an 'adonean' clausula as the end of a dactylic πνίγος, just as *O.T.* 511 (not a repetition) is the end of an ionic πνίγος.<sup>4</sup> Of clausulae proper the exceptions are, besides *Phil.* 179 already mentioned: *Aj.* 232, where βοτῆρας ἱππωνώμας echoes the iambic dimeter 224 ἄτλατον οὐδὲ φευκτάν; two cases of a repeated iambic trimeter catalectic (*Ant.* 976 and *O.T.* 202) and one of an acatalectic trimeter (*El.* 1390); *Ant.* 614, perhaps the most striking,<sup>5</sup> where an ionic trimeter *a maiore* — — ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — — is repeated from the third phrase of the

<sup>1</sup> See p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Instances are frequent in Eur., cf. *Hipp.* 1110 and 1130 (iamb. dim. cat.), *Suppl.* 606 and 625 (ithyph.).

<sup>3</sup> Unless *O.T.* 151 ff. be taken as containing a series of adoneans, but see below.

<sup>4</sup> The 'twin' clausulae discussed below (p. 7) are a separate phenomenon.

<sup>5</sup> *El.* 1069 would be no less so, if it were admitted as an alcaic decasyll. But see below, p. 17.

## 6 *The Collected Papers of A. M. Dale*

strophe; and *El.* 515, an interesting case, in that πολύπονος αικεία repeats πολύπονος ἱππεία of l. 505, the special intention being unmistakable.<sup>1</sup>

This limited scale of exception is so remarkable, as compared with the proportion of repeated phrases in Euripides, that it seems reasonable, where the text is disputed, to be suspicious of a conjecture which is *markedly* at variance with this characteristic technique. In *Aj.* 1199 ff. the strophe begins in LA ἐκείνος οὔτε στεφάνων and the antistrophe καὶ πρὶν μὲν ἐννυχίου. The Byzantine scholar's insertion of οὖν before ἐννυχίου, though in itself perfectly sound Greek, is an obvious effort to supply the missing syllable; G. Wolf substituted αἰὲν νυχίου, which has been adopted by Jebb, Pearson, and Radermacher, presumably from a conviction that the metre is choriambic, since otherwise Hermann's emendation of the strophe, οὐ for οὔτε, is simpler and more probable.<sup>2</sup> Now if the metre is choriambic the first period closes 1201 with the adonean τέρψιν ὀμιλεῖν, from which the next period follows on (is the awkward first syllable a sort of anacrusis?) with two more choriambic dimeters ending in τέρψιν ἰαύειν. After a connecting bacchiac (so L's κωλισμός) the rhythm continues in glyconics and choriambics to the third and final adonean μνήματα Τροίας. It looks temptingly neat, till we realise that precisely this symmetry is un-Sophoclean. For the adonean metra among choriambics are real clausular rhythms (of the so-called 'hypercatalectic' relation), not segments of dactyls as in *O.T.* 151 ff. If, on the other hand, Hermann's emendation is adopted the whole rhythmical movement is changed.<sup>3</sup> The first period is ionic *a minore*, starting from an iambic metrum, and ending on -ψιν ὀμιλεῖν. The second is ionic *a maiore*, ending in a common catalexis -αύειν. ἐρώτων δ' makes the transition to glyconics, which duly end

<sup>1</sup> The metre ◡◡◡◡— — is a resolved version of ◡—◡—|— —, a 'brachycatalectic' iambic dimeter like δπου μακραῶνι *Aj.* 193. This curious epode is a series of variations on the same short theme, and in such a case of course each modification must count as a real variant.

<sup>2</sup> The combination οὐ...οὔτε is characteristic of Sophocles, and easily leads to corruption, cf. *O.C.* 702. See Wilamowitz, *Berl. Klass.* v. 2. v. 65 n.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Wilamowitz, *G.V.* p. 511.

## *Lyrical Clausulae in Sophocles*

7

in the clausula μνήματα Τροίας, the first and only adonean of the stanza.

The κομμός of nurse and chorus in *Tr.* 879 ff. is not in antistrophical structure, and the metrical composition of such passages has a technique of its own. But in these too the disposition to end with a clausula which avoids repeating the effect of an earlier period-close is equally persistent. The last sentence of this passage runs in the MSS<sup>1</sup> ἔτεκεν ἔτεκεν μεγάλαν ἃ νέορτος ἄδε νύμφα δόμοισι τοῖσδ' Ἑρινύν, clearly three dimeters of some kind. As the double ἔτεκεν defies metrical analysis, most editors follow the *recentiores libri* which read ἔτεκε for the second. The first dimeter, the equivalent of two cretics, must then end with μεγάλαν, and we are left with a trochaic dimeter ἃ νέορτος ἄδε νύμφα followed by a clausula in which Jebb, Radermacher, and Wilamowitz<sup>2</sup> follow Nauck in reading δόμοις for δόμοισι solely in order to make it correspond exactly to the double bacchiacs of 890 and 892. In the first place it is now clear that this triple parallel is not in Sophocles' manner and should not be gratuitously forced upon the text. But further, a division into cola which makes an iambic metrum (whether ∪ – ∪ – or ∪ – –) follow upon an acatalectic trochaic – ∪ – –, without even a grammatical pause, is surely an intolerable violation of the 'principle of alternation'.<sup>3</sup> Schroeder's conjecture<sup>4</sup> ἔτεκ' ἔτεκε is a simple emendation, and brings ἃ into the first dimeter, so that the last two are identical forms of the iambic dimeter catalectic:

νέορτος ἄδε νύμφα  
 δόμοισι τοῖσδ' Ἑρινύν.

There are two other instances in Sophocles of such 'twin' clausulae: *Tr.* 223–4 again in this metre, and *Aj.* 199–200

γλώσσαις βαρυάλγητα·  
 ἔμοι δ' ἄχος ἔστακεν,

<sup>1</sup> Taking the universally accepted reading of the scholia ἃ νέορτος.

<sup>2</sup> *G.V.* p. 609.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. P. Maas, *Gr. Met.* p. 35.

<sup>4</sup> Adopted by Pearson in the Oxford text.

## 8 *The Collected Papers of A. M. Dale*

which might be analysed as a telesilleian with spondaic close, analogous to the glyconic and asclepiad with the same peculiarity. Euripides seems hardly to have used the 'twin' form:<sup>1</sup> Aeschylus has one clear example, *Pers.* 556–7 = 566–7 (two pherecrateans); *Cho.* 469–70 has two hipponacteans, but the strophe is too short for this to be taken as the clausular period; it is simply part of the internal structure of the five-line stanza *abbcc*. The particular interest of the Sophoclean examples is that all three occur in non-antistrophic lyrics, as though such passages were felt to require an extra degree of internal responson.

A further illustration of Sophocles' care to avoid too monotonous an assimilation of the clausula to the rest of the verse is his manipulation of heavy closes. Both he and Euripides have a liking for the *rallentando* of three or more consecutive long syllables at the end of a period or of the strophe. It is not always possible to analyse such a phrase with certainty: the effect appears sometimes to be achieved by adding a long syllable or a spondee to a recognised colon, sometimes by lengthening a penultimate syllable which is normally short. It is common for such a trisyllabic 'drag' to occur more than once in the context, in order to diminish the abruptness of a departure from normal rhythm:<sup>2</sup> thus the clausula *O.T.* 872 ends in γῆραςκεῖ after the penultimate phrase λάθα κατακοῖμασῆ, and in *Aj.* 400 the spondee added to the iambic dimeter gives the close ἀνθρώπων,<sup>3</sup> supported three phrases later by the heavy dochmiac ὀλέθρι' αἰκίζει.<sup>4</sup> But Sophocles shows characteristic scrupulousness in avoiding too much repetition of the same effect. It would be idle, of course, to look for any parallel among his lyrics to the long series of spondaic anapaests in Eur. *Tro.* or *I.T.*, but Eur. *Hipp.* 141 ff. is an ordinary choral strophe which makes play with spondaic closes, and

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps *Hec.* 905 ff. ends in two hipponacteans.    <sup>2</sup> See below, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Aj.* 596 ff. where the pauses in strophe and antistrophe indicate that 597 and 604 should be shown as identical cola, both of this type, glyc. + sp., giving εὐδαίμων and εὐνώμαι.

<sup>4</sup> Dindorf's correction is much the most satisfactory here. εὐφρονες Ἀργείοις 420 is a recognised variation in dochmiac responson, — ∪ ∪ — — — with ∪ ∪ ∪ — — —.



## *Lyrical Clausulae in Sophocles*

9

here the clausula is the fifth phrase of the type, while the preceding pair of strophes also ended in one. The most spondaic of Sophocles' lyrics is probably the ode to Sleep, *Phil.* 827 ff., but here the clausula breaks the series of heavy closes and the epode has none. It is again significant that the only clausulae of this type which echo more than one earlier — — — occur in epodes, *Aj.* 192 ff., *El.* 504 ff., *O.C.* 1239 ff.,<sup>1</sup> in all of which the degree of repetition is in marked contrast to Sophocles' antistrophic technique.

The Sophoclean clausula, so carefully differentiated from its context, is nevertheless in clearly audible relation to it, and where a sequence of quantitative syllables admits of more than one metrical interpretation the most reasonable analysis is that which sets it most clearly in such a relation. In *Ant.* 353 ff., for instance, the movement of the last four lines makes it clear that the final *συμπέφραστοι* is an abbreviated variant of the lecythion 362 *φεῦξιν οὐκ ἐπάξεται*:<sup>2</sup> *O.T.* 1096–7 is a variation on the familiar 'Archilochian dicolon' (enoplious+ithyphallic) with the second member syncopated to — ◡ — — — in order to avoid exact repetition of the ithyphallic *τοῖς ἔμοις τυράννοις* which closes the dactylo-epitrites just before: *El.* 486–7, which has just the same variant, both avoids repeating the ithyphallic *ἔσιν ἃ πρόμουντις* and picks up in acephalic form the rarer ◡ — ◡ — — — (sync. iamb. dim.) *ὑπεστί μοι θάρσος* 479. The same picking up of an earlier phrase in slightly modified form is seen in *O.T.* 1196, where the 'reizianum' *οὐδὲν μακαρίζω* is really a catalectic version of the telesilleian *τίς γάρ, τίς ἀνὴρ πλέων* 1189, appearing instead of the expected pherecratean because that has occurred twice already as a period-close. *O.T.* 910 *ἔρρει δὲ τὰ θεῖα* has the same sequence of syllables, but is here in 'brachycatalectic' relation to the enoplii — — ◡ ◡ — ◡ — — 900 and 902. *Aj.* 181 should be taken as an indivisible logaedic unit — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ ◡ — — set at the end of

<sup>1</sup> Wilamowitz's analysis of the last four lines (*G.V.* p. 256) destroys the natural coincidence of rhythm and sense, and is much less probable than the division adopted by Radermacher, Schroeder, and Pearson. I take the final ο of *ἀπό* to be lengthened by the initial ρ, however, so that the clausula is not a paroemiac but — — ◡ ◡ — ◡ — — —, exactly the same as *Aj.* 1191.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 20.

10 *The Collected Papers of A. M. Dale*

the smoothly running dactylo-epitrites because it combines both trochaic and dactylic elements.<sup>1</sup>

Wilamowitz<sup>2</sup> conjectures that the 'refrain' is an historical antecedent of the clausula. Whatever may be the truth of this general hypothesis, I shall endeavour to show that metrical analysis suggests the possibility of a more precise and direct connection between the refrain and one particular type of clausula, in which a metrical and rhetorical unit is detachable from the end of the verse. Sometimes, of course, such a unit is nothing more than a normal closing rhythm with a pause in the sense before it, and this may be an actual refrain: Aeschylus' αἴλιον refrain,<sup>3</sup> for instance, is a dactylic close following upon an iambic dimeter; so too Euripides<sup>4</sup> ends a little ἐφύμνιον with ὁ τι καλὸν φίλον αἶψά, a pherecratean following a choriambic dimeter. The penultimate phrase in each case required some metrical close, and the detachment of the last phrase has no particular *metrical* significance. But there are cases where the detachable phrase is appended as a kind of extra clausula to a stanza which appears, metrically speaking, to have already reached an end; and in several of these, though the actual words are not repeated, there is verbal reminiscence from strophe to antistrophe, an echo of a ritual cry of appeal or lamentation, repetition of a key-word at the same place in the line, a general similarity of meaning, or a parallelism in the form and syllabic length of the words. In Aesch. *P.V.* 588 the clausula of the strophe is a line consisting of dochmiac+two cretics:

κλύεις φθέγμα τᾶς βούκερω παρθένου;

<sup>1</sup> Wilamowitz, *G.V.* p. 403 takes the clausula here as a reizianum ἐτείσσας το λώβαν, with μαχαναῖς ending the dactylo-epitrites, but the cretic attached without linking syllable to the last hemiepes — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — is impossibly harsh. The whole phrase is merely a variant of the 'alcaic decasyllable'; such logaoedic lengths have as a matter of fact no rigidly fixed number of short syllables: cf. another form, *Aj.* 701 — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪ — — repeated *O.C.* 129 καὶ παραμειβόμεσθ' ἄδερκτως. Soph. *Tereus*, frag. 532 ἐξοχος ἄλλος ἐβλασπεν ἄλλου has the normal form of the decasyllable, again as a clausula to dactylo-epitrites.

<sup>2</sup> *G.V.* p. 445.

<sup>3</sup> *Ag.* 121.

<sup>4</sup> *Bacch.* 881, cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 165.