MISCELLANEA

THE METRICAL SCHEMES OF THE HEXAMETER

The aim of this paper is a modest one. A new proposal is offered for the notation of caesurae in the early Greek hexameter.[1]) Before doing so, it is necessary to briefly review a number of previous proposals, since there is to date no generally accepted notation. Let us start with the metrical scheme. The hexameter is traditionally divided into six metra or feet, each consisting of a princeps, i.e. "a position in the verse that calls for a long syllable" (West 1982: 199), and (with the exception of the last foot) a biceps, i.e. "a pair of short positions admitting of contraction" (West 1982: 192):[2])

^{1}–⏖^{2}–⏖^{3}–⏖^{4}–⏖^{5}–⏖^{6}––

Structurally the hexameter can be regarded as consisting of two or more cola ('members') separated by one or more caesurae ('breaks'). In the metrical doctrine prior to the third century AD four caesurae were recognized (Bassett 1919: 351): after the princeps of the third foot, after the third trochee, after the princeps of the fourth foot, and after the biceps of the fourth foot. The common Greek terms were (τομή) πενθημιμερής, κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον, ἑφθημιμερής and βουκολική (Bassett 1919: 353), which have in turn produced the English terms penthemimeral, trochaic, hephthemimeral and bucolic caesura.[3]) The corresponding symbols—P, T, H and B, introduced by White (1912: 152)—are still current in modern metrical studies such as Sicking (1993: 75). The revised metrical scheme, incorporating the traditional caesurae, can be represented as follows:

^{1}–⏑⏑^{2}–⏑⏑^{3}–|$_P$⏑|$_T$⏑^{4}–|$_H$⏑⏑|$_B$^{5}–⏑⏑^{6}––

A number of influential modern metricians assume one and only one caesura located near the middle of the verse. For instance, West (1997: 222) claims that "Every verse without exception has a caesura (word-end) at one of three places: (1) after the first syllable in the third foot ('masculine' or penthemimeral caesura); (2) between the two shorts in the third foot ('feminine' or κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον caesura); or (3) after the first syllable in the fourth foot (hephthemimeral caesura)." Sicking (1993: 77) goes so far as to claim that verses without a P or T caesura are without a caesura (*zäsurlos*).

Whether we are prepared to accept this conclusion depends to no small extent on the question of what is understood by the terms caesura and its corollary, colon.[4]) Bassett (1919: 345) distinguishes three different meanings of the term caesura: (1) word-end, (2) rhythmical break, and (3) sense-pause. A proponent of the first view is West (1982: 6), who defines

Also available online – www.brill.nl

caesura as "regular word-end" dividing the verse into two cola or "metrical phrases" (*ibid.*, 5). Sicking (1993: 54), on the other hand, defines caesura as rhythmically relevant word-end (*rhythmisch relevante Wortgrenze*) which, he adds (1993: 52), has a perceptive function (*perzeptive Funktion*) and divides the verse into two rhythmical cola (*rhythmische Kola*).

In an epoch-making article originally published in 1926, Hermann Fraenkel set out to demonstrate that in the Greek hexameter the articulation of the sense (*Sinnesgliederung*) and the succession of long and short syllables are geared for one another (*aufeinander abgestimmt*) (^{2}1960: 103). He explicitly defines caesurae as sense-pauses (*Sinnesfugen*) that are used for the internal articulation (*Binnengliederung*) of the verse (^{2}1960: 111). He further assumes that each verse consists of four cola separated by caesurae at the following three positions (^{2}1960: 104, 111): (1) after the princeps of the first foot, after the first trochee, after the biceps of the the first foot or after the princeps of the second foot (the so-called A-caesurae), (2) after the princeps of the third foot or after the third trochee (the so-called B-caesurae, corresponding with the traditional P and T caesurae), and (3) after the princeps of the fourth foot or after the biceps of the fourth foot (the so-called C-caesurae, corresponding with the traditional H and B caesurae). In addition to these 'canonical' caesurae, Fraenkel (^{2}1960: 106 ff.) also finds instances of 'displaced caesura' (*Verschiebung eines Einschnitts* or *verspätete Einschnitt*) after the second trochee or after the biceps of the second foot (displaced A-caesurae, marked with an exclamation mark); or after the princeps of the fifth foot or after the fifth trochee (displaced C-caesurae, again marked with an exclamation mark).[5]) This gives the following metrical scheme (adapted from Fraenkel ^{2}1960: 104, 111):

$$^{1}- \mid_{A_1} \smile \mid_{A_2} \smile \mid_{A_3} {}^{2}- \mid_{A_4} \smile \text{¦}_{A!} \smile \text{¦}_{A!} {}^{3}- \mid_{B_1} \smile \mid_{B_2} \smile {}^{4}- \mid_{C_1} \smile\smile \mid_{C_2} {}^{5}- \text{¦}_{C!} \smile \text{¦}_{C!} \smile {}^{6}- -$$

Fraenkel's notation is used especially in German metrical publications—for instance Korzeniewski (1968: 31) and Nünlist (2000: 111)—but has not gained wide acceptance, probably because of the lack of correspondence in numeration between the caesurae at A_1/B_1 versus A_4 (after the princeps) or A_2 and B_2 (after the trochee) versus C_2 (after the biceps). Moreover, the A-caesurae are used to refer to two feet, the B-caesurae to a single foot, and the C-caesurae again to two feet if the displaced caesurae are taken into account. Finally, as Higbie (1990: 15) correctly points out, Fraenkel's system fails to include all the places in the verse where a clause or sentence can end (assuming that either of these may coincide with a colon).

The problems connected with Fraenkel's notation were bypassed by Eugene O'Neill in an equally epoch-making article published in 1942. Assuming that caesurae are not restricted to the traditional P, T, H and B, nor to Fraenkel's A, B and C positions, O'Neill (1942: 113) devised an alternative notation which has since gained fairly wide acceptance. Using whole numbers to refer to positions after either the princeps or the biceps and half numbers to refer to positions after the trochee, O'Neill's notation can be represented as follows:

$$ {}^{1}-_{1}\smile_{1.5}\smile_{2}{}^{2}-_{3}\smile_{3.5}\smile_{4}{}^{3}-_{5}\smile_{5.5}\smile_{6}{}^{4}-_{7}\smile_{7.5}\smile_{8}{}^{5}-_{9}\smile_{9.5}\smile_{10}{}^{6}-_{11}-_{12} $$

A variant of O'Neill's notation can be found in Sicking (1993: 69) (probably after van Raalte 1986: xix):

$$ {}^{1}-_{1}\smile_{2a}\smile_{2b}{}^{2}-_{3}\smile_{4a}\smile_{4b}{}^{3}-_{5}\smile_{6a}\smile_{6b}{}^{4}-_{7}\smile_{8a}\smile_{8b}{}^{5}-_{9}\smile_{10a}\smile_{10b}{}^{6}-_{11}-_{12} $$

Hagel (1994-95: 78) proposes yet another numerical notation, but his numbers refer to moraic, not syllabic, positions:

$$ {}^{1}-_{2}\smile_{3}\smile_{4}{}^{2}-_{6}\smile_{7}\smile_{8}{}^{3}-_{10}\smile_{11}\smile_{12}{}^{4}-_{14}\smile_{15}\smile_{16}{}^{5}-_{18}\smile_{19}\smile_{20}{}^{6}-_{22}-_{24} $$

The demerit of both Hagel's and O'Neill's system is again the relative opacity, as there is no correspondence between the numeration and the traditional division into six feet. The trochaic positions, especially, cannot be easily deciphered if one is not using the notation frequently—the same being true of the odd numbers.

O'Neill's system is sometimes used in conjunction with other notations. Porter (1951: 16), for instance, assuming a variant of Fraenkel's theory, superimposes the A, B and C symbols over O'Neill's positions 2/3, 5/5.5, and 8/9 respectively, but with a numerical value different from Fraenkel's, thus adding to the confusion as noted by Higbie (1990: 15):

$$ {}^{1}-_{1}\smile_{1.5}\smile\overset{A_2}{|}_{2}{}^{2}-\overset{A_1}{|}_{3}\smile_{3.5}\smile_{4}{}^{3}-\overset{B_2}{|}_{5}\smile\overset{B_1}{|}_{5.5}\smile_{6}{}^{4}-_{7}\smile_{7.5}\smile\overset{C_2}{|}_{8}{}^{5}-\overset{C_1}{|}_{9}\smile_{9.5}\smile_{10}{}^{6}-_{11}-_{12} $$

Beekes (1972: 2), on the other hand—assuming that caesurae are rhythmical breaks restricted to the traditional P and T positions (1972: 3)—superimposes White's symbols over O'Neill's positions 5 and 5.5:

$$ {}^{1}-_{1}\smile_{1.5}\smile_{2}{}^{2}-_{3}\smile_{3.5}\smile_{4}{}^{3}-\overset{P}{|}_{5}\smile\overset{T}{|}_{5.5}\smile_{6}{}^{4}-_{7}\smile_{7.5}\smile_{8}{}^{5}-_{9}\smile_{9.5}\smile_{10}{}^{6}-_{11}-_{12} $$

Finally, mention should be made of the notation used by Kirk (1985: 18) in the first volume of the Cambridge commentary to the *Iliad*. While adopting traditional symbols for the canonical P and T caesurae (using M for 'masculine' and F for 'feminine'), Kirk accepts Porter's A-caesurae (which he marks as 'secondary'—as opposed to the 'main' or 'central' M and F caesurae—together with the traditional B and H caesurae, the latter designated as R by Kirk 1985: 20), but with the numerical values reversed (Kirk's A_1 corresponding to Porter's A_2 and Fraenkel's A_3):

$$ {}^{1}-\smile\smile\vdots_{A1}{}^{2}-\vdots_{A2}\smile\smile{}^{3}-|_{M}\smile|_{F}\smile{}^{4}-\vdots_{R}\smile\smile\vdots_{B}{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}-- $$

It is not necessary for our present purpose to engage in the controversy over the nature of the caesura and the colon.[6]) Suffice it to record that there is indeed a controversy and that there is need for a system *à la*

O'Neill which can accommodate every potential caesura position, but with more transparency as regards the position of the caesura vis-à-vis the foot. The proposed notation is in fact so obvious that it is hard to believe that no one has thought of it before. The numeration is based on the traditional division of the hexameter into six feet, the symbols 'a', 'b' and 'c' referring to the positions after the princeps, after the trochee, and after the biceps respectively (Janse 1998: 138):

$$^{1}-_{1a}\smile_{1b}\smile_{1c}{}^{2}-_{2a}\smile_{2b}\smile_{2c}{}^{3}-_{3a}\smile_{3b}\smile_{3c}{}^{4}-_{4a}\smile_{4b}\smile_{4c}{}^{5}-_{5a}\smile_{5b}\smile_{5c}{}^{6}-_{6a}-_{6c}$$

As the use of the traditional names for the 'canonical' caesurae is so well established, it may be found useful to append the corresponding symbols to the new numeration:

$$^{1}-_{1a}\smile_{1b}\smile_{1c}{}^{2}-_{2a}\smile_{2b}\smile_{2c}{}^{3}-_{3aP}\smile_{3bT}\smile_{3c}{}^{4}-_{4aH}\smile_{4b}\smile_{4cB}{}^{5}-_{5a}\smile_{5b}\smile_{5c}{}^{6}-_{6a}-_{6c}$$

To illustrate the applicability of the new notation, let us consider the fragment from the *Iliad* (1.43-52) as analyzed by Fraenkel (²1960: 112). For our present purpose Fraenkel's interpretation will be taken for granted without further discussion:[7])

ὣς ἔφατ᾽ | εὐχόμενος | τοῦ δ᾽ ἔκλυε | Φοῖβος ᾽Απόλλων 1c 3a 4c
$^{1}-\smile\smile_{1c}{}^{2}-\smile\smile{}^{3}-_{3a}-{}^{4}-\smile\smile_{4c}{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}--$

βῆ δὲ | κατ᾽ Οὐλύμποιο | καρήνων | χωόμενος κῆρ 1b 3b 4c
$^{1}-\smile_{1b}\smile{}^{2}--{}^{3}-\smile_{3b}\smile{}^{4}--_{4c}{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}--$

τόξ᾽ |ὤμοισιν ἔχων | ἀμφηρεφέα τε | φαρέτρην 1a 3a 5b
$^{1}-_{1a}-{}^{2}-\smile\smile{}^{3}-_{3a}-{}^{4}-\smile\smile{}^{5}-\smile_{5b}\smile{}^{6}--$

ἔκλαγξαν δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ | ὀϊστοὶ | ἐπ᾽ ὤμων | χωομένοιο 2b 3b 4c
$^{1}--{}^{2}-\smile_{2b}\smile{}^{3}-\smile_{3b}\smile{}^{4}--_{4c}{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}--$

αὐτοῦ | κινηθέντος | ὁ δ᾽ ἤϊε | νυκτὶ ἐοικώς 1c 3b 4c
$^{1}--_{1c}{}^{2}--{}^{3}-\smile_{3b}\smile{}^{4}-\smile\smile_{4c}{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}--$

ἕζετ᾽ ἔπειτ᾽ | ἀπάνευθε | νεῶν | μετὰ δ᾽ ἰὸν ἕηκε 2a 3b 4a
$^{1}-\smile\smile{}^{2}-_{2a}\smile\smile{}^{3}-\smile_{3b}\smile{}^{4}-_{4a}\smile\smile{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}--$

δεινὴ δὲ | κλαγγὴ | γένετ᾽ ἀργυρέοιο | βιοῖο 2a 3a 5b
$^{1}--{}^{2}-_{2a}-{}^{3}-_{3a}\smile\smile{}^{4}-\smile\smile{}^{5}-\smile_{5b}\smile{}^{6}--$

οὐρῆας μὲν | πρῶτον | ἐπῴχετο | καὶ κύνας ἀργούς 2c 3b 4c
$^{1}--{}^{2}--_{2c}{}^{3}-\smile_{3b}\smile{}^{4}-\smile\smile_{4c}{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}--$

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ᾽ | αὐτοῖσι | βέλος | ἐχεπευκὲς ἐφιείς 2a 3b 4a
$^{1}-\smile\smile{}^{2}-_{2a}-{}^{3}-\smile_{3b}\smile{}^{4}-_{4a}\smile\smile{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}--$

βάλλ᾽ | αἰεὶ δὲ πυραὶ | νεκύων | καίοντο θαμειαί 1a 3a 4a
$^{1}-_{1a}-{}^{2}-\smile\smile{}^{3}-_{3a}\smile\smile{}^{4}-_{4a}-{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}--$

It should be obvious that the new notation is far more transparent than previous ones. Compare, for instance, the notation of the first verse in the various systems:

Fraenkel	Porter	Kirk	O'Neill	Sicking	Hagel	Janse
A_3-B_1-C_2	A_2-B_2-C_2	A_1-M-B	2-5-8	2b-5-8b	4-10-16	1c-3a-4c

Finally, it may be noted that the 'sense-pauses' identified by West (1982: 36) are identical with Fraenkel's canonical caesurae—following the new notation:

$$^{1}-_{1a}\smile_{1b}\smile_{1c}{}^{2}-_{2a}\smile\smile{}^{3}-_{3a}\smile_{3b}\smile{}^{4}-_{4a}\smile\smile_{4c}{}^{5}-\smile\smile{}^{6}--$$

It is the hope of the present writer that the new notation will facilitate discussion and comparison *in rebus hexametricis*.

Universiteit Gent/Universiteit van Amsterdam — Mark Janse
mark.janse@rug.ac.be

1) The present notation, though specifically devised for the early Greek hexameter, can be (and has already been) applied to other hexametric poetry.
2) The following metrical symbols are used: – = long, ⌣ = short, ⏖ = contractable biceps, | = caesura, ¦ = displaced caesura.
3) The penthemimeral and trochaic caesurae are sometimes called 'masculine' and 'feminine' respectively, but the origin of the sexual metaphor is obscure (West 1982: 195). On the use of the term bucolic 'caesura' instead of 'diaeresis' see West (1982: 192) and Sicking (1993: 54).
4) Bassett (1919: 349) has shown that the Greek term τομή originally meant 'segment' rather than 'end of a segment'.
5) On the notion of displaced caesura see West (1997: 223).
6) A preliminary discussion of the author's position can be found in Janse (1998: 135 ff.). A revised and extended English version of that chapter is in preparation.
7) For a critical appraisal of Fraenkel's theory see Janse (1998: 140 ff.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

S.E. Bassett, *The Theory of the Homeric Caesura According to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine*, AJP 40 (1919), 343-72.
R.S.P. Beekes, *On the Structure of the Greek Hexameter*, Glotta 50 (1972), 1-10.
H. Fraenkel, *Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter*, in: *Wegen und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, 100-56 (München ²1960).
S. Hagel, *Zu den Konstituenten des griechischen Hexameters*, WienStud 107-8 (1994-5), 77-108.
C. Higbie, *Measure and Music. Enjambement and Sentence Structure in the* Iliad (Oxford 1990).

M. Janse, *Homerische metriek. Orale poëzie in de praktijk*, Didactica Classica Gandensia 38 (1998), 125-51.
G.S. Kirk, *The Structural Elements of Homeric Verse*, in: *The Iliad. A Commentary*. Vol. I: *Books 1-4*, 17-37 (Cambridge 1985).
D. Korzeniewski, *Griechische Metrik* (Darmstadt 1968).
R. Nünlist, *Homerische Metrik*, in: J. Latacz (ed.), *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*, 109-14 (München 2000).
E.G. O'Neill Jr., *The Localization of Metrical Wordtypes in the Greek Hexameter*, YCS 8 (1942), 105-78.
H.N. Porter, *The Early Greek Hexameter*, YCS 12 (1951), 3-63.
C.J. Ruijgh, *D'Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique. Analyse dialectologique du langage homérique, avec un excursus sur la création de l'alphabet grec*, in: J.P. Crielaard (ed.), *Homeric Questions. Essays in Philology, Ancient History and Archaeology*, 1-96 (Amsterdam 1995).
C.J.M. Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre* (München 1993).
M. van Raalte, *Rhythm and Metre. Towards a Systematic Description of Greek Stichic Verse* (Assen 1986).
M.L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982).
——, *Homer's Meter*, in: I. Morris & B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, 218-37 (Leiden 1997).
J.W. White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy* (London 1912).

TIMEO SIMULACRA DEORUM (OVID, *HEROIDES* 10.95)

Deserted by Theseus on a lonely island, the Ariadne of Ovid's *Heroides* 10 is terrified at the many possible threats to her life (79-98). In addition to fearing such animals as wolves (84), lions (85), tigers (86), and seals (87), she is afraid of being either killed (88) or enslaved (89-92) by other human beings. As she herself sums up the situation, *si mare, si terras porrectaque litora uidi, / multa mihi terrae, multa minantur aquae* (93 f.).[1]) However, land and sea are not the only scary venues: Ariadne adds briefly, *caelum restabat—timeo simulacra deorum!* (95), before returning once more to the dangers posed by beasts (96) and men (97 f.).

This passage has attracted a certain amount of scholarly discussion on account of textual and grammatical problems, as well as the perceived absurdity of its content. Various remedies, such as expunging a number of verses or positing a lacuna, have been suggested.[2]) In what follows, I shall be concerned with just one of the many issues surrounding these lines, the one that is, perhaps, the most intriguing: Ariadne's fear of the gods. The line *caelum restabat—timeo simulacra deorum!* raises three main questions: (1) How does this verse connect to what precedes and, especially, to what follows?; (2) Why is Ariadne afraid of the gods?; and (3) What are we to understand by *simulacra deorum*?

As for (1), the mention of the gods arises out of Ariadne's astonishingly