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I

n the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, the newborn god has just been caught. When Apollo sees the skins of his cows hanging in Hermes’ cave—sure signs of his little brother’s audacity—he tries to bind Hermes and vent his anger (403–416). But Hermes takes out an instrument of his own invention, the kithara, and plays so pleasantly (ἐρατὸν κιθαρίζων 423) and so orderly (κατὰ κόσμον 433) that Apollo relents and pledges eternal friendship for knowledge of the instrument (436–462). Yet it is not only the verbal descriptions of the kithara’s “lovely sound” (ἐρατὴ … ἰωή 421) and soporific effect (ἥδυμον ὕπνον ἑλέσθαι 448–449) that should alert us to the quality of Hermes’ song. From when Her­mes starts to play, well into Apollo’s response (409b–441), nearly every metrical shape is in place. Every dactyl (‒ ⏑ ⏑, as in μήτερα, “mother” [430]), spondee (‒ ‒, such as υἱόν, “son” [430], and the appositive group ἣ γάρ, “for she” [430]), pyrrhus (⏑ ⏑, λάχε, “obtain” [428]), choriamb (‒ ⏑ ⏑ ‒, ἀθανάτους, “immortals” [431]), almost every shape is in a more expected, or what O’Neill calls “localized,” metrical position.[[1]](#footnote-2) It is as if Hermes “soothed” (ἐπρήϋνεν 417) Apollo with familiar rhythms, a lullaby (449), each shape placed *kata kosmon* (433).[[2]](#footnote-3) Here, at least, the meaning of the story can be felt through the rhythm of the poetry.

This article is a preliminary investigation into the expectancy of metrical shapes in the rhythm of Greek epic (seventh century BCE to fifth century CE). It argues that a new measure of metrical regularity according to expectancy enables readers to compare the distri­bution of metrical shapes and locate passages within texts with unusual metrical tendencies, such as Hermes’ song above. Its source data are the metrical shapes, positions, and basic statistics of the roughly half-million words and ap­positive groups (for example a preposition and its object) from Homer’s *Iliad* to Non­nus’ *Dionysiaca*.[[3]](#footnote-4) From these, it provides new stylistic information about the distribution of metrical shapes, especially when they occur at unexpected positions, in texts, authors, and characters, and how they may affect the experience of the poetry. This in­vestigation opens possibilities for future research into the ways in which rhythm engages expectations, including the style of authors, mimesis of generic models, rhetoric of speakers, and the *kosmos* of poetry.

Rhythm is an essential characteristic of epic poetry.[[4]](#footnote-5) The “omnipresent,” “immutable pattern of sound” gives epic a distinct identity and pleasure of “immersion.”[[5]](#footnote-6) Epic rhythm comes out of a long tradition of oral performance, where rhythmic units emerged from phrasal patterns and converged into the “special language” of verbal art.[[6]](#footnote-7) Comparative studies in oral poetics suggest that rhythmic patterns can serve literary functions, such as to characterize dramatic passages.[[7]](#footnote-8) And con­temporary theorists of transhistorical poetics have explored how the rhythms of metrical verse “afford an organizing of temporal experience … in the moment of reading,” co­ordi­nating aesthetic and social regularity.[[8]](#footnote-9)

Metrical shapes contribute to the rhythm of epic in what is known as the “inner metric” of hexameter.[[9]](#footnote-10) As O’Neill has shown, metrical shapes frequent or “localize in” only a few of all possible metrical positions.[[10]](#footnote-11) Porter argues that this regularity generates “patterns of expectancy” that poets can “distort” to create “tension between what is expected and what is actually spoken.”[[11]](#footnote-12) In other words, each word or word group has a combination of long and short syllables, that is, a quantitative “shape”; the regular occurrence of these shapes in positions of the hexameter line forms a verbal rhythm that becomes ex­pected by an audience and offers poets rhythmic material to manipulate.[[12]](#footnote-13) Musicologists such as David Huron have found similar tension in musical rhythms, where rhythmic patterns imprint on a listener’s mind through “statistical learning” and guide aspects of their attention:

the evidence strongly suggests a form of statistical learning in which listeners perceive the world in a manner that corresponds to their past listening experience … Listeners appear to be sensi­tive to the frequency of occurrence of various rhythmic patterns, and their cognitive processing of rhythmic information is disposed to interpret stimuli in terms of familiar preexisting rhythms.[[13]](#footnote-14)

By disrupting learned patterns of rhythm and sound, un­expected sounds can trigger a variety of affective states in the listener, such as increased attention, or surprise and its physical manifestations in gasps of awe, chills of frisson, and automatic laughter.[[14]](#footnote-15) For readers of epic, awareness of the rhythmic char­acter of a passage can provide not only insight into the potential cognitive/attentive experience of an early audience but also new ways to approach affect in and of texts, such as Apollo’s unusual laugh in response to the “startling” sound of Hermes’ kithara (*Hom. Hymn Hermes* 420–421).[[15]](#footnote-16)

But O’Neill’s breakthrough, while fundamental to our knowl­edge of regularity in *epos*, has been limited in its usefulness for reading texts. One problem is its measurement. Even with counts and percentages for a given metrical shape, it is often unclear what metrical positions are in fact unexpected for it, since shapes may localize in various positions to various degrees; percentages alone prove insufficient for comparison. Another is the difficulty of its application. Although looking up the statistics in the published charts for one metrical shape is easy enough, it soon becomes laborious to apply the information from printed tables of statistics to every word in a line, let alone all words in a passage, poem, or poetic corpus. Both problems have made it difficult to tell whether shapes, either expected or unexpected, are characteristic of books, speakers, or of epic as a genre, and to compare the expectancy of shapes of a passage *in situ*. Previous efforts to integrate this metrical information into commentary and interpretation have thus been limited, and there is much that remains unknown about the basic rhythm of metrical shapes in passages of poetry.[[16]](#footnote-17)

In what follows, we attempt to increase the utility of metrical shapes for reading passages by analyzing their stylistics in three respects. After (§1) updating previous methodologies, we provide (§2) new stylometric information about the density of un­expected shapes in particular authors, poems, and books and (§3) a brief case study of the expectancy of shapes in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* before (§4) concluding. It is now possible to pro­duce statistical analysis of the rhythm of metrical shapes in epic, compare them meaningfully, and see in vivid detail passages where metrical shapes localize or occur against expectation.

1. Metrical shapes beyond O’Neill and Hagel

The present study focuses on metrical shapes as quantitative rhythmic units. As such, it completes O’Neill’s study of “word-types,” i.e. metrical shapes such as ‒ ⏑ ⏑, which was based on a limited sample of a few texts and omitted appositive groups.[[17]](#footnote-18) Our study diverges, however, from a more recent analysis of localization, that of Hagel’s “word shapes.”[[18]](#footnote-19) Hagel measures the localization of phonetic-metrical compounds and appositive groups with variable quantities, breaking metrical shapes into smaller categories of “word shapes.” For example, Hagel com­bines O’Neill’s two shapes ‒ ‒ ⏑ and ‒ ‒ ‒ into one “metrical shape” ‒ ‒ ⏒, whose final syllable is an anceps (may be either long or short); then subdivides that into ten “word shapes” ac­cording to their initial and final vowels or consonants (or double consonants) and final quantities: for example C‒ ‒ ⏒V̆C as found in the word κοίλῃσιν (“hollow” *Il*. 1.26).[[19]](#footnote-20) Hagel shows that word shapes, like O’Neill’s metrical shapes, also localize and provide valuable information on the metrical tendencies of word forms. In contrast, the present study addresses the rhythmic expecta­tions generated by metrical shapes alone, which localize and generate patterns of expectancy through statistical learning in ways that may affect the stylometry of the text.

Our study makes use of a statistical formula we call *expectancy*.[[20]](#footnote-21) The intuition is that the distribution of metrical shapes over *sedes* creates an expectation for an average or “typical” number of occurrences of a shape at any *sedes*, and for how much the counts vary across *sedes*. Expectancy, denoted by the variable *z*, is the amount by which an observed count *x* differs from the mean, in units of standard deviations.[[21]](#footnote-22) Two appendices report ex­pectancy *x* and *z* data for the metrical shapes of words and appositive groups in major poems of the hexameter corpus.[[22]](#footnote-23) The [Appendix](https://grbs.library.duke.edu/index.php/grbs/article/view/17015/7581) linked to this paper is a synopsis of the distri­bution of metrical shapes in epic, while the second appendix (online) provides the diachronic distribution of each shape by text.[[23]](#footnote-24) Expectancy allows for valid and meaningful comparisons of shapes between texts, authors, and eras, more than localization scores or percentages alone. Take for example the distribution of the anapaest (⏑ ⏑ –) over *sedes*, shaded for expectancy (Table 1):[[24]](#footnote-25)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Work** | **1** | **2** | **2.5** | **3** | **4** | **4.5** | **5** | **6** | **6.5** | **7** | **8** | **8.5** | **9** | **10** | **10.5** | **11** | **12** | **Total (Σ*x*)** |
| *Iliad* | ✖ | 478  (11.8%)  −1.514 |  |  | 1,205  (29.9%)  −0.253 |  |  | 1,891  (46.9%)  +0.936 |  |  | 440 (10.9%)  −1.580 |  |  | 20 (0.5%)  −2.308 |  |  | ✖ | 4,034 |
| *Odyssey* | ✖ | 322  (10.9%)  −1.516 |  |  | 816  (27.6%)  −0.561 |  |  | 1,563  (52.9%)  +0.883 |  |  | 240  (8.1%)  −1.675 |  |  | 15 (0.5%)  −2.110 |  |  | ✖ | 2,956 |
| *Hom. Hymns* | ✖ | 49  (9.9%)  −1.904 |  |  | 177  (35.9%)  +0.176 |  |  | 213  (43.2%)  +0.761 |  |  | 53  (10.8%)  −1.839 |  |  | 1  (0.2%)  −2.684 |  |  | ✖ | 493 |
| *Theog.* | ✖ | 24  (10.0%)  −1.616 |  |  | 68  (28.2%)  −0.403 |  |  | 117  (48.5%)  +0.947 |  |  | 32  (13.3%)  −1.395 |  |  | 0  (0.0%)  −2.277 |  |  | ✖ | 241 |
| *WD* | ✖ | 26  (10.8%)  −1.401 |  |  | 58  (24.1%)  −0.695 |  |  | 130  (53.9%)  +0.894 |  |  | 25  (10.4%)  −1.423 |  |  | 2  (0.8%)  −1.931 |  |  | ✖ | 241 |
| *Shield* | ✖ | 18  (12.7%)  −1.470 |  |  | 43  (30.3%)  −0.124 |  |  | 63  (44.4%)  +0.953 |  |  | 17  (12.0%)  −1.524 |  |  | 1  (0.7%)  −2.386 |  |  | ✖ | 142 |
| *Argon.* | ✖ | 133  (12.0%)  −1.902 |  |  | 389  (35.1%)  −0.224 |  |  | 546  (49.3%)  +0.805 |  |  | 37  (3.3%)  −2.532 |  |  | 2  (0.2%)  −2.761 |  |  | ✖ | 1,107 |
| Callim. *Hymns* | ✖ | 28  (17.6%)  −1.254 |  |  | 30  (18.9%)  −1.195 |  |  | 98  (61.6%)  +0.785 |  |  | 3  (1.9%)  −1.982 |  |  | 0  (0.0%)  −2.069 |  |  | ✖ | 159 |
| *Phaen.* | ✖ | 21  (6.0%)  −2.328 |  |  | 130  (37.0%)  +0.120 |  |  | 157  (44.7%)  +0.726 |  |  | 42  (12.0%)  −1.856 |  |  | 1  (0.3%)  −2.777 |  |  | ✖ | 351 |
| Theoc. | ✖ | 59  (12.0%)  −1.771 |  |  | 199  (40.4%)  +0.599 |  |  | 189  (38.3%)  +0.430 |  |  | 43  (8.7%)  −2.042 |  |  | 3  (0.6%)  −2.719 |  |  | ✖ | 493 |
| Quint. Smyrn. | ✖ | 184  (17.0%)  −1.054 |  |  | 262  (24.2%)  −0.416 |  |  | 452  (41.7%)  +1.137 |  |  | 180 (16.6%)  −1.087 |  |  | 6  (0.6%)  −2.509 |  |  | ✖ | 1,084 |
| *Dion.* | ✖ | 349  (13.5%)  −1.826 |  |  | 927  (35.8%)  −0.073 |  |  | 1,212 (46.9%)  +0.791 |  |  | 97  (3.8%)  −2.590 |  |  | 1  (0.0%)  −2.881 |  |  | ✖ | 2,586 |
| TOTAL | ✖ | 1,691  (12.2%)  −1.549 |  |  | 4,304 (31.0%)  −0.252 |  |  | 6,631 (47.7%)  +0.903 |  |  | 1,209 (8.7%)  −1.788 |  |  | 52 (0.4%)  −2.362 |  |  | ✖ | 13,887 |

Table 1:

⏑ ⏑ – by count (*x*), percentage, and expectancy *z*-score

(darker shades are more unexpected)

Each row of Table 1 shows expectancy computed within a single text. Since the distribution of the shape ⏑ ⏑ – is different in each text, the same percentage may represent different *z*‑scores in different texts. For example, anapestically-shaped words occur at around the same frequency near the beginning of the line (i.e. *sedes* 2) in both the *Homeric Hymns* and the *Theogony*, around 10%. But despite this similarity in frequency, measuring by standard distribution shows that the shape is more un­expected in the *Hymns* (−1.904 vs. −1.616), which results in a darker shading in the visualization. The same is true of different metrical shapes at the same *sedes*. As shown in the Appendix (in which expectancy is computed over the full corpus), although spondees (– –) appear with less frequency than anapaests (⏑ ⏑ –) at *sedes* 10 (0.0% [6/40,131] vs. 0.4% [52/13,887]), they have a greater expectancy in that position (*z* = −1.697 vs. −2.362), be­cause the distribution of spondaically-shaped words over other *sedes* is generally more variable. The definition of ex­pectancy in terms of standard deviations shows how counts differ from what is “typical” in a way that plain percentages do not. In addition to tables, computed expectancies may also be visualized in the text itself by shading each word according to the ex­pectancy of its metrical shape, for instance in *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 13 (as above, darker shades indicate lower *z*-scores):[[25]](#footnote-26)

**καὶ τότ’ ἐγείνατο παῖδα πολύτροπον**, **αἱμυλομήτην**

and then she (Maia) bore a child, many-wayed, plotting-twists.

While most shapes are expected in their given positions (within a range of *z* = −0.52 to +0.61), the shape of ἐγείνατο (⏑ ‒ ⏑ ⏑) is very unexpected (*z* = −5.40) at *sedes* 2.5; it is much more com­mon, for example, at *sedes* 6.5.

Similar to the analysis of lemmata (or all morphological forms of a word) in prior studies, the above method provides basic infor­mation about when and where metrical shapes are ex­pected.[[26]](#footnote-27) Such information is beneficial to future metrical and linguistic study of hexameter, but also, as will be demonstrated below, to readers of epic who are interested in the potential stylistic effects of meter. We suggest that regularity of metrical shapes charac­terizes a passage, speech, text, or author in ag­gre­gate. A general impression or affective state may arise from ex­treme rhythmic regularity, such as the impression of som­nolence or “sweetness” in the *Hymn to Hermes* passage discussed above; or unexpected irregularity, such as general increase in attention or other affective states found in psychological studies of musical rhythm. The potential for the latter increases in certain texts or individual books or poems that contain a higher density of ir­regular shapes, a topic that is the focus of the follow­ing section.

2. Density of unexpected metrical shapes

For the purpose of analysis, we will call a shape/*sedes* com­bination “unexpected” when it has an expectancy *z*-score less than or equal to −2.0; that is, the number of occurrences of the shape at that *sedes* is at least 2 standard deviations lower than the weighted mean number of occurrences at any *sedes*. The specific threshold is arbitrary and is only for the convenience of con­verting the continuous quantity of expectancy into a yes/no binary. By this definition, 3.30% (13,160/399,327) of words or appositive groups in the epic corpus have a metrical shape that is unexpected at the *sedes* at which it appears.

Unexpected shapes are unevenly distributed. For example, 4.00% (3,551/88,796) of shapes in the *Iliad* are unexpected (an average of 147.96 per book, which themselves average roughly 3,700 shapes), with Book 10 having the least proportion of unexpected shapes at 3.27% (108/3,303) and Book 2 having the greatest at 4.68% (227/4,850). Below, we show the overall per­centage of unexpected shapes in particular texts, as well as the book or poem with the lowest and highest rates of unexpected shapes (Table 2).[[27]](#footnote-28)

We may note a general diachronic trend toward fewer un­expected shapes. Apollonius of Rhodes, Callimachus, and Non­nus put shapes in expected places more often than other poets.[[28]](#footnote-29)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Work** | **Overall rate of unexpected metrical shapes** | **Book with lowest rate of unexpected metrical shapes** | **Book with highest rate of unexpected metrical shapes** |
| *Iliad* | 4.00% (3,551/88,796) | 3.27% (108/3,303) Bk. 10 | 4.68% (227/4,850) Bk. 2 |
| *Odyssey* | 3.91% (2,667/68,293) | 2.70% (87/3,222) Bk. 10 | 4.62% (159/3,444) Bk.17 |
| *Homeric Hymns* | 3.91% (508/12,994)  3.95% (423/10,704) [*Hymns* 2–5] | 0.00% (0/88) *Hymn* 8  0.00% (0/24) *Hymn* 12  0.00% (0/18) *Hymn* 13  0.00% (0/29) *Hymn* 16  0.00% (0/26) *Hymn* 17  0.00% (0/31) *Hymn* 21  0.00% (0/20) *Hymn* 23 | 10.53% (8/76) *Hymn* 29 |
| *Theogony* | 3.55% (201/5,663) | - | - |
| *Works and Days* | 3.38% (158/4,669) | - | - |
| *Shield of Heracles* | 3.88% (104/2,683) | - | - |
| Ap. Rh. *Argon.* | 2.09% (668/32,027) | 1.83% (179/9,761) Bk. 4 | 2.55% (180/7,064) Bk. 2 |
| Callim. *Hymns* | 1.52% (79/5,200) | 0.97% (6/619) *Hymn* 2 | 1.77% (10/564) *Hymn* 1 |
| Aratus *Phaen.* | 3.27% (201/6,149) | - | - |
| Theocr. *Idylls* | 3.12% (445/14,273) | 1.17% (3/256) *Idyll* 20 | 6.35% (53/835) *Idyll* 15 |
| Quintus Smyrn. *Fall of Troy* | 3.74% (1,836/49,063) | 3.35% (123/3,677) Bk. 14 | 4.46% (165/3,701) Bk. 6 |
| Nonnus *Dion.* | 2.50% (2,742/109,517) | 1.79% (33/1,840) Bk. 34 | 3.54% (69/1,951) Bk. 46 |

Table 2:

Density of Unexpected Metrical Shapes by Work and Book

Aratus and Theocritus, however, interrupt this tendency and have only slightly fewer unexpected shapes than Archaic poets; Quintus of Smyrna has nearly the same average as the *Iliad*. But despite Theocritus’ closeness to Archaic figures, the density of unexpected shapes in his poetry ranges far more widely than to Homer; in contrast to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, whose difference is only about 1.4% to 1.9% between the highest and lowest fre­quencies, the difference in Theocritus’ range is 5.2%. The rhythm of Theocri­tus’ metrical shapes varies far more in his oeuvre than does Homer’s.

Some individual books or poems have a surprisingly large number of unexpected shapes, which may tell us more about their rhythmic character. Theocritus *Idyll* 15, which depicts women attending a festival of Adonis, has over twice as many unexpected shapes as we would expect based on his corpus (6.35% [53/835] compared to average 3.12%); this difference exceeds those of other Hellenistic authors, e.g. Callimachus (highest 1.77% to average 1.52%), and Homer, too (4.68% to 3.96%).[[29]](#footnote-30) From these figures, *Idyll* 15 appears to be rhythmically distinct, at least in its density of unexpected metrical shapes. A better understanding of the poem’s distinctive rhythm could intervene in current scholarship, which debates its Homeric character and its indebtedness to rhythmic prose mime, such as that of Sophron.[[30]](#footnote-31) Theocritus adopts the hexameter, but his rhythm, at least of metrical shapes, is un-Homeric. Perhaps like other metrical features, the positioning of shapes also contributes to what Miles has described as “the audial impact of (Theocri­tus’) works and the implications of tones and resonances with past poetry.”[[31]](#footnote-32)

The expectancy of shapes allows for future inquiry of this sort not only into the style of different authors, but also how rhythm relates to the possible style of individual books and poems. And like books, shorter passages may also deviate from typical metri­cal distributions. In what follows, we return to the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* to briefly examine the literary contexts of both un­expected and overly regular rhythm of metrical shapes within the hymn.

3. Rhythm, expectancy, and kosmos in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes

The rhythm of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* has been the subject of some debate. In its larger structure, West claims that “(the hymn has) no command of the even tempo appropriate to epic storytelling.”[[32]](#footnote-33) But Thomas demonstrates how the poem “makes use of complex internal patterning at every level” (39), where corresponding passages develop themes such as *charis* (“divine favor” 36) and *kosmos* (“intricate, pleasing structure” 39).[[33]](#footnote-34) When Apollo prosecutes Hermes for stealing his cattle, he deploys “an arsenal of rhetorical strategies” that include “rhythm, al­literation, syntactic curtness, understatement and perhaps sar­casm.”[[34]](#footnote-35) Hermes responds to this rhetorical onslaught with rhythmic stylings of his own, ending 11 out of 17 lines with the pattern [⏑ – –]verb with six preceded by [– ⏑] (261–277).[[35]](#footnote-36) Thus far, then, rhythm has been suggested to work on both a large and a small scale in the organization of the poem: as thematic responsion between longer intratextual passages, and as a rhe­torical feature of interpersonal dispute.

Metrical shapes play a role in both the macro- and micro-rhythms of the hymn. From a more distant vantage point, we see that passages vary in the number of unexpected shapes (*z* ≤ −2.0). We can view this variation as a graph of unexpected shapes in the poem ( *fig.* 1):[[36]](#footnote-37)
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*Figure* 1: Number of unexpected metrical shapes in windows of 181 shapes in *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, with pips indicating their location

There are peaks, where passages have more unexpected shapes (max = 15), and troughs, with few to no unexpected shapes. Such a graph thus identifies runs of lines that we could consider arrhythmic (peaks) or, conversely, overly rhythmic (troughs) ac­cording to the expectancy of metrical shapes. Both types—arrhythmic and overly rhythmic passages—may tell us some­thing about the style and meaning of their respective places in the narrative. We suggest that this is the case for the hymn and will consider a few of the outstanding sections.

Surprisingly, thematically related passages at times cor­respond rhythmically as well. This correlation is especially apparent for the theme of song. Hermes sings two songs in the hymn. As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, Hermes’ theogonic song that pacifies Apollo near the poem’s end is overly rhythmic in its metrical shapes (409b–441). From the moment Hermes breaks from Apollo’s bonds (δέσμα 408) well into Apollo’s enamored response to Hermes’ song (δῶρον 442), there is only one unexpected shape out of 181 shapes over 32 lines (– ⏑ ⏑ – –, Μνημοσύνην μέν 429). For context, in the Archaic corpus only 0.72% of passages of this length have 1 or less unexpected shapes.[[37]](#footnote-38) But this is not the first section with overly expected rhythm. The first is, in fact, Hermes’ other song, sung immediately after he invents the lyre at the poem’s beginning (52–67). From when Hermes “improvises” on the “lovely play­thing … in scales” (ἐξ αὐτοσχεδίης 55; τεῦξε, φέρων, ἐρατεινὸν ἄθυρμα … κατὰ μέρος 52–53) singing of his birth in the cave (61), to his first thoughts of something to eat (χρειῶν ἐρατίζων … δείπουσι 67), there are no unexpected shapes (0/78).[[38]](#footnote-39) Scholars have previously noted how the two songs are intricately related and reflect Hermes’ social transition from the domestic sphere of the first song to the social hierarchies of the gods in the second.[[39]](#footnote-40) We can now see that the songs share overly expected rhythm of metrical shapes as well.

Hermes’ second song also responds to themes and rhythm of the ‘sacrifice’ of Apollo’s cows that follows their theft (120–154). After Hermes butchers two of the cows, he cooks them on spits. From when he begins to cut the meat (ταμὼν κρέα 120) to when he burns the carcasses, tosses his sandals into the Alpheios (139), and crawls back into his crib cradling his lyre (χέλυν ἐρατὴν ἐπ’ ἀριστερὰ χειρὸς ἐέργων 153), there are only two unexpected shapes out of 189 (only 2.13% of windows of this length have two or less shapes in the Archaic corpus). A rhythmic pattern emerges between this scene and his previous activity of crafting and playing the lyre. Hermes crafts the lyre out of the turtle (33–52a, somewhat rhythmically unexpected [8/104, 5.2%, of win­dows have that many or more unexpected shapes]) then plays the lyre (52b–67a, overly rhythmic [0/78, 4.18%]); Hermes craftily (δολίης … τέχνης 76) steals Apollo’s cattle (105–120a, rhythmically unexpected [8/90, 2.43%, with 8 or more un­expected shapes]), then carefully cooks two in proper fashion (120b–154a, overly rhythmic [2/189, 2.13%]). The final song of Hermes recalls these two passages of cultural performance (music, food preparation) in its themes and diction.[[40]](#footnote-41) In addition to these shared themes and language, the passages are likewise marked by overly expected rhythm.

Even more striking is the correlation between the expectancy of metrical shapes and claims to *kosmos* (“orderliness”). This correlation plays out in two passages. We have mentioned the overly expected rhythm of Hermes’ second song and the narrator’s accompanying commentary on its *kosmos*: “(Hermes) pronounced all things *in order*, playing the lyre under his arm” (πάντ᾿ ἐνέπων κατὰ κόσμον, ὑπωλένιον κιθαρίζων 433).[[41]](#footnote-42) Long before this, though, Apollo demands that Hermes reveal the whereabouts of his cows; this demand is accompanied by threats to commit acts “*not* according to order” (οὐ κατὰ κόσμον 255), such as throwing Hermes into Tartaros (256). Thomas has noted how Apollo begins his threats with “alliteration of μ-, the mono­syllables creating a pronounced sixth-foot caesura, the curt syntax … (and) explosive enjambement.”[[42]](#footnote-43) We can also see that Apollo’s opening lines contain an arresting amount of un­expected metrical shapes:

**ὦ παῖ**, **ὃς ἐν λίκνῳ κατάκειαι, μήνυέ μοι βοῦς**

**θᾶσσον**· **ἐπεὶ τάχα νῶϊ διοισόμεθ’ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον**. 255

**Child**, **who lies in a crib**, **confess to me about the cows**

**quickly**· **since soon we shall disagree *not in good order***.

Three shapes, 6[⏑ ⏑ – ⏑] (κατάκειαι), 9[– ⏑ ⏑ –] (μήνυέ μοι), and 2.5[⏑ – ⏑ ⏑] (ἐπεὶ τάχα), are unexpected (only 0.025% of windows of 5 shapes have 3 unexpected shapes in the Archaic corpus), while the passage as a whole (from Λητοΐδης 253 to μητρός 267 [78 shapes]) has 7 out of 78 (3.11% of windows of 78 shapes have 7 or more unexpected shapes in the corpus).[[43]](#footnote-44) The hymnist con­centrates unexpected shapes in Apollo’s speech at the same time that Apollo threatens to act οὐ κατὰ κόσμον. In other words, Apollo performs the breach of *kosmos* in the irregular rhythm of his speech.

This is not the only correspondence between notions of *kosmos* and metrical rhythm in Greek literature. Later, in the early Hellenistic period (4th/3rd cent. BCE), the poet Simias of Rhodes makes the association explicit in his so-called *technopaegnion* or “picture-poem” shaped like an egg (fr.26.7–10 Powell):

Τὸ μὲν θεῶν ἐριβόας Ἑρμᾶς ἔκιξε κᾶρυξ

φῦλ’ ἐς βροτῶν, ὑπὸ φίλας ἑλὼν πτέροισι ματρός,

ἄνωγε δ’ ἐκ μέτρου μονοβάμονος μέγαν πάροιθ’ ἀέξειν

ἀριθμὸν εἰς ἄκραν δεκάδ’ ἰχνίων, κόσμον νέμοντα ῥυθμῶν, 10

Hermes, loud-voiced herald of the gods, took it (the egg) from under its dear mother’s wings and gave it to the world, command­ing me to increase gradually the number of feet from the original one foot to ten at the end, *while maintaining proper order in the rhythm*,[[44]](#footnote-45)

Plato, too, associates *kosmos* with *rhythmos*, perhaps indebted to the earlier musicological work of Damon (*Resp.* 400a):

βίου ῥυθμοὺς ἰδεῖν κοσμίου τε καὶ ἀνδρείου τίνες εἰσίν· οὓς ἰδόντα τὸν πόδα τῷ τοῦ τοιούτου λόγῳ ἀναγκάζειν ἕπεσθαι καὶ τὸ μέλος, ἀλλὰ μὴ λόγον ποδί τε καὶ μέλει.

(We must) see which are the *rhythms* of an *orderly* and manly life. In view of this the metrical foot and the melody must follow the verbal expression and not the expression follow the meter and the melody.[[45]](#footnote-46)

Thomas suggests that the poet of the Homeric hymn may have been aware of similar associations and metaphors of ἴχνος (“tracks, feet”) as related to sense (cf. Plato *Parm*. 128c) and rhythm (Simias fr.26) and fashioned the order of words in the meter to reflect the meaning of the poetry, such as when Hermes drives the cattle backward, “the front to the back and the back to the front” (τὰς προσθεν ὄπισθεν, / τὰς δ᾽ ὄπιθεν πρόσθεν 77–78).[[46]](#footnote-47) We could add to this example the unexpected position of 3ἴχνια (“tracks, footsteps”) by Apollo in 351 when describing Hermes’ deceitfulness (δολοφροσύνην 361), a word that is out of place both according to its metrical shape (dactylic words are rarely in this position either in the Archaic or overall corpus, cf. Appendix) as well as its word form (*z* = −2.11, 1/9, in the Archaic corpus) and lemma (*z* = −2.74, 3/10, in the Archaic corpus). While it is be­yond the purview of this article to argue for direct knowl­edge of such semantics of *kosmos* or related terms by the hymnic poet, never­theless we now know something new. In the hymn, there is a positive correlation between *kosmos* and the expectancy of metrical shapes.

More thematic associations emerge from exceptionally rhythmic and arrhythmic passages. Hermes’ overly rhythmic performances are associated with desire (ἐρατεινόν 52, ἐρατήν 153, ἐρατή 421, ἵμερος 422, ἐρατόν 423, ἐρατή 426, ἔρος 434), gifts (γέρας 60, 122, 129, 429, 432, cf. 291, 573), sleepiness (449), sweetness (γλυκύς 422), and laughter (Ζεὺς δὲ μέγ᾿ ἐξεγέλασσεν 389, γέλασσε δὲ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων 420). But we find more negative associations in arrhythmic passages. When Apollo threatens Hermes οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, his future deeds emphasize darkness (λαβὼν ἐς Τάρταρον, ἐς ζόφον, οὐδέ … ἐς φάος, ὑπὸ γαίῃ 256–258, cf. ἐς φάος 402) and helplessness (ἀμήχανον 257). Later, Apollo describes the theft to Zeus in perhaps the most arrhythmic pas­sage in the hymn (343–363, 12/107 unexpected shapes [0.035% of such windows in Archaic epic]), again emphasizing darkness (κόνις … μέλαινα 345, μελαίνηι νυκτὶ ἐοικώς 358, κατὰ ζόφον 359) and helplessness (ἀμήχανος 346; cf. ἀμήχανος 434 and μηχανῶτα 436, with Thomas *ad loc*.), as well as monstrosity (πέλωρα 342 and πέλωρ᾿ 349) and quick, skilled movement (διαπυρπαλάμησεν … τὸ μὲν ἔνθα, τὸ δ᾿ ἔνθα 357). This is not to say that these themes are intrinsically or even pervasively associated with rhythmicity in epic elsewhere, only that they are so in the hymn.

The above survey of the expectancy of metrical shapes in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* proceeded on two levels. A macro-scale analysis of unexpected shapes identified passages with noticeably few or exceptionally concentrated amounts of unexpected shapes. Closer inspection of these passages revealed un­antici­pated correlations. Both of Hermes’ songs, as well as his cooking of the cows, occur in overly rhythmic passages with few un­expected shapes. Conversely, the most arrhythmic passages occur in speeches by Apollo and at times accompanied threats and other formal irregularities such as alliteration and atypical caesurae.[[47]](#footnote-48) But most surprising of the findings are the asso­ciations between rhythm and notions of *kosmos*. Descriptions of “orderly” (κατὰ κόσμον) performance had the fewest unexpected shapes, while threats of “unseemly” (οὐ κατὰ κόσμον) conflict had a concentration of unexpected shapes. Granted, there are limits to the current data and methodology. The edition of texts is paramount, and the text of *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* is rather thorny, for instance in the corruption of line 346 and resulting difference in words, word order, metrical shapes, and rhythmic data.[[48]](#footnote-49) Hagel’s list of appositive groups, which is the basis of the current analysis, also needs labor-intensive refining and ex­pansion.[[49]](#footnote-50) Future phonological analysis could and should have the option to incorporate larger groups, such as minor phrases and formulas, major phrases and cola; such reanalysis would provide new statistics relevant under different phonological con­ditions.[[50]](#footnote-51) That said, this paper advances the state of the art in important ways, both in methodology and in analysis, and un­covers new potential for future investigation.

4. Conclusion: the rhythm of metrical shapes

The above analysis defines and defends a central claim: when metrical shapes are measured by expectancy, we can better identify the rhythm of authors, poems, characters, and passages in ways that can inform their style and interpretation. It does so by incorporating the metrical shapes of words and appositive groups and by extending previous analysis of metrical shapes with a measure of expectancy. Such a measure allows for the more accurate and useful comparison of distribution by standard deviations, such as in locating passages that are rhythmically unusual by their density of unexpected shapes. We see its utility especially in extreme cases, such as in the uncommon density of unexpected shapes in the urban mime of Theocritus *Idyll* 15.

But it is the unforeseen correlations between themes and the rhythm of shapes in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* that suggest that the method and data have a more pervasive application to the study of Greek epic. By mapping rhythmic analysis to narrative, this case study reveals associations between song, *kosmos*, and other themes with the expectancy of metrical shapes. Such a meth­odology that combines computational exploration and closer reading could open new avenues of inquiry. Do themes have rhythmic expectations? To what extent do social, rhetori­cal, or affective goals condition the articulation of hexameter’s inner metric? While this study is preliminary, the goal of this article is to make the method and data available for future adap­tation and exploration and provide brief proofs of concept for the stylistic importance of metrical shapes. Such importance becomes visible through exploration of the data within the text in a process that brings readers closer to recon­structing the potential experience of the poems by audiences attuned to the rhythms of Greek epic.[[51]](#footnote-52)
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