Two More New Verses of Hipponax (and a Spurium of Philoxenus)?

ROBERT L. FOWLER

Hipponax Test. 21 Degani:

21 Choerob. ad Hephaest. 3 (Π. ποδών), 1. 214. 8–20 Consbr.
"Ιαμβος... εἰρηται ἣτοι ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τῆς Κέλεου θεραπάντης, ἡτίς τὴν Δήμητρα λυπομένην ἤνάγκασε γελάσαι γέλαιον τι εἰπούσα, τῷ ρυθμῷ τούτῳ τοῦ ποιῶς αὐτόματος χρησιμένη, ἢ ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τινός ἔτερας, γραφές, ἢ Ἰππόναξ ὁ Ιαμβοποιός παρὰ θάλασσαν ἑρία πληνούσῃ συντυχών ἦκουσε τῆς σκάφης ἐφαγόμενος, ἐφ’ ἢς ἔπλυνεν ἢ γραφές, "ἀνθρωπ”, ἀπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις.” καὶ συλλαβῶν τὸ ῥηθὲν οὔτως ἀνόμασα τὸ μέτρον. ἄλλοι δὲ περὶ τοῦ χωλιάμβου τὴν ἰστορίαν ταύτην ἀναφέρουσι, γράφοντες τὸ τέλος τοῦ στίχου "τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέψεις.”

21a Choerob. ad Hephaest. 5 (Π. ιαμβικοῦ), 4. 229. 10–15 Consbr.
"Ἰππόνακτος δὲ ἔλεγον αὐτὸ εἶναι κατὰ τὴν εἰρημένην ἀνάστρω χρησίν τῆς γραφῆς καὶ σκάφης τοῦ ἀνθρωποῦ, ἀπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις.” τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τῆς γραφῆς λέγεται εἶναι τῆς ἄνω εἰρημένης.

"Ιαμβος... ἐκλήθη... ἢ ἀπὸ γραφῆς τινός Ἰάμβης καλομένης, ἢ πληνοῦσῃ συντυχών ὁ Ἰππόναξ καὶ ἀνάμενος τῆς σκάφης, ἐφ’ ἢς ἔπλυνεν ἢ γραφῆς τὰ ἔρια, ἦκουσε λεγομένης "ἀνθρωπ", ἀπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις.”

21c Tricha, Lib. de novem metris 1 (Π. ιαμβικοῦ) 370. 11–16 Consbr.
"τῇ γὰρ ἄνωθεν ῥηθείση ἐντυχῶν, φασί, γραφή, ἢτίς Ἰάμβη ἐκαλεῖτο, ἐρία ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ πληνούσῃ, τῇ σκάφῃ τε πλησιάσας ἦκουσε παρ’ αὐτῆς "ἀνθρωπ", ἀπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις.” τὸν δὲ ἀκούσαντα τοῦτο ἐκ τούτου τὸν χωλὸν ἐπιτηδεύσασθαί Ιαμβον.
In two recent articles, Christopher G. Brown and Ralph M. Rosen have independently suggested that the verse quoted anonymously in the above testimonia to Hipponax actually comes from the poet himself. The suggestion, which was first made by Koster, but subsequently ignored, is highly attractive. As Rosen in particular has demonstrated, the context raises many more questions than the verse answers; the hypothesis that both verse and context were invented by some metrician to explain the origin of the iambic verse will not bear scrutiny. The line, therefore, comes from some poem; whether it comes from a poem by Hipponax may still be doubted. Both scholars suggest that the line and the story may have come from a poetic initiation scene, paralleling those in Hesiod and Archilochus; but the Hellenistic interest in such scenes is well known, and the possibility that the verse comes, as Brown puts it, “from a lost comedy or poem about Hipponax” (n. 8) cannot be dismissed. Brown finds the supposition of an intermediary source less economical, but it is only so if the story originally stood in Hipponax (so that a Hellenistic writer would be intermediary): which is the point under contention.

Both scholars refer briefly to the extra material found in the fourteenth-century codex Vaticanus Palatinus Graecus 356. This manuscript is quoted by Conbruch in his apparatus to Choeroboscus p. 214, in the chapter of Choeroboscus’ commentary entitled περὶ ποδῶν (test. 21 above), although

---


2 W. J. W. Koster, Tractatus Graeci de re metrica inediti (Paris 1922) 60 f.: “Versum in Hipponactis choliambis extitisse propter argumentum scurrile pro certo habeo; historiam addiderunt hariolantes grammatici.” The verse must have had some context, however, and there is no need to assume that the one given by the grammarians is anything but the original. Koster was anticipated by Heinrich zur Jacobsmuehln in his edition of pseudo-Hephaestio De metris (Dissertationes Philologicae Argentoratenses 10. 4 [Strassbourg 1886], hereafter “zur Jacobsmuenhl” or “ps.-Heph.”) §19, who put a discreet “(Hippon.)” in the margin beside the verse.

3 It arouses suspicion that in the metrical handbook underlying all these testimonia and forming the subject of this paper the story of Hipponax was followed by another explanation for the name of the genre—παρὰ τὸ τὸν βάςειν—in which Callimachus fr. 380 Pfeiffer is quoted, a couplet that plays on the aition (see below p. 18 and notes 32, 46, 47). If the author of this handbook culled one explanation of the origin of iambos from a Hellenistic poet, why not the other one he quotes in the same breath?
as will be seen the manuscript is not in fact a copy of Choeroboscus. Consbruch quotes from “folio 163v”: [the iambos was named after] ἰόμβης τινός, ἥτις κατὰ τύχην ἐν Ἑλενσίνι πρῶτη τὸ τοῦ [sic vel etiam τὸ τούδο] cod.; lege tōto, sc. το μέτρον; error per compendium oritus est] εξ αὐτομάτου ἐξέφερε τὸν διώθοιντα πλύνουσαν αὐτὴν καταμωκησαμένη οὕτως εἰπούσα: ἀνθρωπ', ἀπελευ, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις. ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀκαταθύμιος φαίνη, ἔργον δὲ μωρὸν ἐκτελεῖς σκάφην τρέπων. In his version of the story, Choerobocus seems to distinguish the washerwoman Lambe from the well-known Eleusinian one; he first tells the Eleusinian story, then introduces the washerwoman by saying ἤ (ἐφήσατι) ἀπὸ ἰόμβης τινός ἐτέρας, after a different iamb. This need mean no more than that the story comes from a different source; she could still be the Eleusinian Lambe as the Palatine codex claims, and as Rosen offers some slight reasons for believing. On the whole, however, Brown is probably right to state (n. 3) that the two words ἐν Ἑλεσίνι in the Palatine version are simply a mistake. The rest of what the Palatine MS offers is not, however, to be ignored. Rosen (n. 10) wonders if it merely offers “a clumsy conflation of the details found in Choerobocus, or whether it represents a more accurate report of an actual passage in Hipponax.” He continues, “I would like to think that the participle καταμωκησαμένη (‘mocking’) and the gloss ἐμοί... τρέπων indicate that the commentator is explaining a passage of Hipponax that he has in front of him, but I realize that these details could merely be an attempt to explain an unclear account such as we find in Choerobocus.” That is a nicely judged evaluation, but for one overlooked fact: the “gloss” scans.

We are dealing, in fact, not with one putative verse of Hipponax, but with three:

ἀνθρωπ', ἀπελευ τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις.
ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀκαταθύμιος φαίνη, ἔργον δὲ μωρὸν ἐκτελεῖς σκάφην τρέπων.

1. ἀνατρέπεις ν.1. in Choer., utpote aition choliambi metri originis praebens. τὴν ἀνατρέπεις: μὴ τάραττε τὴν σκάφην f. 1. apud ps.-Heph. Σ1b necon nostrum codicum fol. 161v (vide infra) et Isaacum Monachum ed. Bachmann A nec. Gr. 2. 175. 8, 187. 11.

2. ἀκαταθύμιος et metro repugnat et orationem solutam (ne dicam tardam) redolet.

It is easy to overlook the fact that these words scan, because Consbruch, in accordance with his usual practice, prints them as prose (compare for example the elegiac couplet quoted in the apparatus to p. 331). There can be little doubt that we have here a continuation of the first verse.

The third verse is a perfect trimeter, and provides an idiomatic progression from compound to simple form of the same verb (אֵבָטֶפָא - τρέπων). Two lexical iamb-shaped words filling up the final metron violate Knox’s bridge, but the law does not hold good for Hipponax.

The second verse poses obvious difficulties. Without the sequel (I readily admit) there would be no reason to think that these words constituted a verse, and an editor might prefer to print them in smaller type between the other verses on the assumption that the whole line is a paraphrase. I would not quarrel with such a decision; what I have printed here assumes that אַקַּתַּטְהָמִי, a late and proxy word, has ousted the original words from the middle of the verse. But on either view a verse lies behind the words. The δέ of verse 3 does not follow well on verse 1. The μέν of verse 2 gives it its raison d’être. But what exactly is the μέν... δέ contrast here? “You seem unpleasant to me, but you do a foolish thing in upsetting my tub” will not do; “you seem pleasant enough, but...” would. Perhaps the gloss אַקַּתַּטְהָמִי is a mistake per contrarium. Or perhaps we have an example of a non-adversative μέν... δέ, equivalent roughly to “the first thing I want to say is X, the second thing is Y,” where no very strict relation exists between X and Y other than that of being consecutive. In this construction the first μέν is almost solitariurn, with the force “whatever else you may say, you may say this” (as H. Lloyd-Jones once put it in a seminar); if one does then think of something else to say, the particle δέ is available to rescue you. The old woman says, in effect, “You’re a pest, you are. And (I might add) an oaf.”

This additional information does not, unfortunately, shed much light on the question of authorship. The third verse has the ring of archaic simplicity to it, but that could be affected just as well by a later author. The content is unremarkable, except that it justifies the commentator’s καταμικησαμένη; mockery by lambe is exactly what we want in a poetic

---

5 See R. Renehan, Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader (Cambridge, MA 1969) 77-85; Studies in Greek Texts, Hypomnemata 43 (1976) 11-22. It is perhaps possible that the compound belongs to one speaker (the author of the first verse) and the simplex to another (a putative forger), but on the whole this reflex of idiom seems more likely to proceed from a single connected utterance.


7 All words beginning אַקַּתַּטְהָ in LSI (and there are many) are quoted only from prose, except for one occurrence of אַקַּתַּטְהָ at Ar. Nub. 1229; אַקַּתַּטְהָמִי is quoted from no author before Artemidorus. The corruption prevents us from knowing whether this verse was a choliamb or not (ϕαίνῃ need not be the last word). Iambic lines appear amid the choliamb at frs. 29a. 1, 30. 1, 32. 1, 36. 4, etc. The variant אֵבָטֶפָא is presumably the emendation of someone who thought the story should explain the origin of the choliamb; it could have arisen at any time and has no bearing on the question of authenticity.

8 J. D. Denniston, Greek Particles (Oxford 1954) 370 writes: “The strength of the antithesis varies within wide limits. Sometimes μέν... δέ conveys little more than τε... καὶ.”
initiation scene describing how Hipponax became an “iambic” poet. But another possibility, which readers will have raised already, presents itself: a grammarian, expecting just this kind of content, and missing it in the story as found in Choeroboscus, might have supplied it for himself. The relative inanity of the verses might seem to some scholars an indication of forgery rather than authenticity. One argument against this view is that a forger might at least be expected to have got the number of syllables right in his second verse. But to dispel any doubts we must investigate the MS.

Since Consbruch reports its reading in the apparatus to Choeroboscus, one easily assumes that Palatinus 356 contains a copy of that author, and is merely dependent on him. At a quick glance the same might be said of testimonia 21b–d. The truth is, however, more complex than this. Testimonium 21b is from the fifth book of the B–scholia to Choeroboscus; this book in its turn represents one recension of a popular Byzantine metrical manual whose fortunes were investigated a century ago by W. Hoerschelmann and W. Studemund.9 The book got attached to the scholia to Hephaestion, but its connection with him is only that of the general subject matter; it is not dependent on Choeroboscus, but on Choeroboscus’ sources. Testimonium 21d is a representative of another recension of the same book, and is likewise not dependent on Choeroboscus; testimonium 21c is harder to decide, since Trichas shows the influence both of this metrical handbook and of Choeroboscus in various parts of his work. This passage could come from either. Consbruch printed the B–scholia from a judicious selection of manuscripts but, as he points out in the preface (xxiv; cf. xxvii), Book 5 is found in many more manuscripts. It is in the nature of these grammatical reference books that each copy offers many minor variations (the authors were often schoolmasters culling from here and there what they needed for their lectures, with many additions and alterations), and an edition that gave an account of all these differences would be pointless. Nonetheless, one must be vigilant, for any one schoolmaster could have had at his disposal a superior copy of the original, or happened to have been the only one who took the trouble to copy out a particularly choice passage. So the solution is to report occasional readings of interest from other manuscripts in the apparatus, as Consbruch does. Palatinus 356 is one of these MSS, but Consbruch reported it in connection with Choeroboscus rather than the B–scholia to Hephaestio where it belongs (pp. 281, 300).

The MS is a miscellany of grammar, rhetoric, history, and theology;

the author is (fortunately for me) no great scholar, but a humble teacher dutifully assembling his material (and making mistakes in the process). He is not the man to ask the kind of question that would have inspired the forger, much less the man to find an answer. He is most certainly not John Tzetzes (who was not a great scholar, but thought he was); Rosen is correct to state that folio 163° of this MS contains Tzetzes' prolegomena to Lycophron, but Consbruch was incorrect to state that our material is on folio 163°. It is on folio 163°, as Professor Herwig Görgemanns of Heidelberg, through whose kind offices I obtained a microfilm of this part of the MS, immediately noticed. It might be objected by a determined skeptic that although the scribe of this MS cannot have been the forger, his authority could have been. This is to violate Ockham's razor; there is no reason to deny this witness to the book the same authority as any other, many of which contain unique material. That a fragment is preserved by a single manuscript is of course no impediment to its authenticity; such a criterion would reverse scholarly opinion of the authenticity of many fragments, not to mention more complete works like the Choephoroi of Aeschylus. In the present case there is certainly nothing remarkable about supposing that one MS in a thoroughly "open" tradition has preserved authentic material, especially when the source is preserved complete in no MS. Most of p. 310. 8-20 Consbruch is preserved only in Vindobonensis theolog. gr. 287 (see Consbruch's preface, p. xxii), as it happens, a section immediately preceding the one under discussion here. It should be pointed out too that many metrical MSS remain unread; Consbruch reports that the copies of this book are "practically innumerable."¹⁰ Were they properly investigated, our extra verses would very likely turn up in other MSS— together with new details about their context.

Provided, then, that my (and Consbruch's) evaluation of the MS as an independent witness to the tradition of this handbook is correct (the detailed evidence is laid out below), these three verses must henceforth be read together by anyone considering the question of authenticity. We have either three new verses of Hipponax or no new verses.

In what follows I will first briefly relate the facts about this metrical handbook and then provide a transcript of the readings in Palatinus 536. Most of what I say on the first score derives from Hoerschelmann, one of that numerous class of industrious nineteenth-century Germans who devoted their lives to the dirty spadework of philology, unfashionable now, but still largely undone. (Where would we be today without that buckster Dindorf?)

¹⁰ P. xxiv, cf. apparatus to p. 309; Hoerschelmann, Lehrbuch 18. Studemund AV 153 n. 2 reports that Par. 2561 is another witness along with many others he cites only as "etc. etc." On p. 242 he draws attention to a "codex Hilferdingii apud Nauckium in 'Mélanges gréco-romains' tom. II pag. 510." This journal was published by the Academia nauk S. S. R., Leningrad (St. Petersburg); non vidi. On Mutitensis II F 4, see below n. 40; on Vat. gr. 97, below n. 41.
The book’s sources probably include Longinus and Orus, who gives a terminus post quem of the fifth century A.D. This accords well enough with the fact that the Armenian translation of Dionysius Thrax, made in the fifth century, appears to lack the version of the book that became attached to Dionysius’ treatise. A terminus ante is provided by Choeroboscus’ use of the work, whose career is placed “between the middle of the eighth century and the beginning of the ninth.”

The three recensions are as follows. (1) That of Book 5 of the B-scholia to Hephaestio (pp. 280 ff. Consbruch), dubbed “Appendix Hephaestionea” (App. Heph.). It is edited from three Parisini (2756, s. xv; 2757, s. xvi; 2847, s. xvi) and a MS in the British Museum, Arundel 517 (s. xv). In his edition of Hephaestio Gaisford also used three Barocci in the Bodleian which Hoerschelmann in his edition of the B-scholia rejected; Consbruch followed Hoerschelmann. This recension contains additional material, often of good quality. (2) The second version is closer to the original book. It formed an appendix to the Ars grammatica of Dionysius Thrax, and so was called the “Appendix Dionysiana” (App. Dion.) by Hoerschelmann. It is found in two versions, one of them printed by Uhlig in his edition of Dionysius (pp. 117–24), the other by Consbruch (pp. 307 ff.). The principal manuscripts are Monacensis gr. 310 (ante s. xi); Leidensis Voss. gr. in quarto 76 (non post s. xi: Uhlig xxi); a Saibantianus in the Bodleian, Auct. T IV 9 (s. xv–xvi; Consbruch’s main authority); and Paris. gr. 2881 (s. xv; cf. AV 169). Uhlig also reports some readings from Vat. Pal. gr. 23, and Consbruch from several more: Ven Marc. 483 (s. xiv), Laur. LVI 16 (cf. AV 167), Barb. I 4 (cf. AV 168), Ambr. Q 5 sup.

11 Hoerschelmann, Lehrbuch 65 ff. A work περὶ ὀνομάτων is cited at p. 294. 22 Consbr. With the beginning of this section (p. 294. 7) compare the A-scholia, p. 109. 9–11, where Longinus is cited; with the whole of ch. XX compare Choeroboscus ch. III, at the end of which Orus and Longinus are cited. Galen and perhaps Philoxenus may figure as well (below p. 13).

12 Consbruch, p. xx, states that the book was written “non ante Georgium Pisidam” (s. vii), but this author is quoted only by Helias AV 170 f., who may therefore have been responsible for the addition. A similar explanation applies to the quotations of Constantine of Sicily (s. ix–x) in Isaac p. 192. 7, of John of Damascus (s. vii–viii) in the section περὶ ἔλεγχον in Ven. Marc. 483 (AV 195 f.), Tract. Urb. App. §7 p. 84, ps.–Heph. §75, and our codex, and of Sophronius (s. vii–vii) in the section ἔτερος περὶ τῶν Ἀνακρουντέων (p. 317 Consbruch, al.), although the latter would be a quite early accretion.

13 G. Uhlig, Grammatici Graeci I. 1 (Leipzig 1883; hereafter “Uhlig”) lii; Hoerschelmann, Lehrbuch 17.

14 N. G. Wilson, Scholars of Byzantium (London 1983) 70. It is theoretically possible that Choeroboscus used the book’s sources rather than the book itself. If so, a terminus ante can be provided by the tenth-century date of Parisinus gr. 1983, which contains the so-called “rhetorical” recension of the work. If Hardt’s date of the ninth century is right for Monacensis græcus 310, in which the “Dionysian” recension appears (I. Hardt, Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae regiae bavaricae. Codices graeci III [Munich 1806]), we have an even earlier terminus; Uhlig xiii dates it more cautiously to “before the eleventh century.”

15 A collection of metrical texts including Hephaestio, Choeroboscus, works by the Tzetzes brothers, Helias Charax, and Trichas, which served as Triclinius’ personal manual (there are
(s. xv; cf. AV 152 sqq.) and "P ii II 47 in bibl. Alexandrino-Vatic(ana)," a library whose subsequent fortunes are unknown to (cf. AV 162 n.). (3) This version is dubbed "Appendix Rhetorica" (App. Rhet.) on analogy with the others, but it is not actually found as an appendix to any work. It is known from Parisinus gr. 1983, an important witness to Hermogenes and other rhetoricians. Its readings were partly reported by Cramer in *Anecdota Parisiensia I* (Paris 1839) 393 ff.; Consbruch prints it at pp. 337–43.

This book was a basic treatise in Byzantine times, providing indeed together with some other parts of the B–scholia the sole basis of all later Byzantine metrical writings except Trichas, Tzetzes, and the old scholia to the poets.\(^1^6\) Trichas (Consbruch, pp. 363 ff.; date uncertain) certainly used it, along with Hephaestio and his A– and B–scholia and Choeroboscus. The Tzetzes brothers used it too; John's poem *De metris* shows its influence in the section on iambics,\(^1^7\) and it may be significant that the Vindobonensis referred to above (p. 6) offers *App. Dion.* as a work of Tzetzes (no forename given; see Consbruch, p. xxii). The poems on metre of John Botaniates and Michael Psellos\(^1^8\) rely on the book, and Consbruch's apparatus (e. g. p. 322) gives several instances of borrowings in Eustathius. Among lesser known authorities and anonymous writers\(^1^9\) who used this book were Helias Charax,\(^2^0\) Isaac Monachus,\(^2^1\) pseudo-Hephaestio,\(^2^2\) pseudo-Herodian on hexameters,\(^2^3\) pseudo-Plutarch on the same subject,\(^2^4\) the Anonymous Ambrosianus in Ambr. gr. C 222 inf. (s. xiii),\(^2^5\) the Tractatus Harleianus in MS British Museum Harl. 5635, which may be by Triclinius and is at least based on him,\(^2^6\) the Tractatus Urbinas edited by Koster,\(^2^7\) an anonymous treatise in a Chisianus in Rome, misc. R IV 11,\(^2^8\) another in

\(^1^6\) So K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur*\(^2^\) 1 (1897) 595.


\(^1^8\) AV 198–204.


\(^2^0\) Ed. Studemund, AV 170–98; see also L. Voltz, *De Helia Monacho, Isaaco Monacho, Pseudo-Dracone*, Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae 11 (Strassbourg 1886).


\(^2^2\) Ed. zur Jacobsmuhlen (above, note 2); see also Consbruch, pp. 348–49, 352–54.

\(^2^3\) AV 185–88; Consbruch, pp. 326–28 (part of the *App. Dion.*).


\(^2^5\) Hipponax test. 21d Degani; see AV 211–47; part of this treatise was printed by H. Keil, *Analecta grammatica* (Halle 1848) 3 ff. and then by A. Nauck in *Lexicon Vindobonense* (Petersburg 1867; repr. Hildesheim 1965) 253 ff., a more readily available book than AV.


\(^2^7\) See above, note 2.

\(^2^8\) Selected readings in G. Mangelsdorff, *Progr. Gymn.* (Karlsruhe 1876). Studemund, AV 205–09 gives the first section of this "Anecdota Chisianum" complete, and notes that its first few pages are excerpted from the Anonymous Ambrosianus.
Vat. gr. 14,29 yet another in Vat. gr. 1405 (s. xv), dubbed “Anonymous Romanus” by zur Jacobsmuehlen and appended to his edition of pseudo-Hephaestio (pp. 101 ff.), two more in Parisini 2881 and 2676 printed by Consbruch, pp. 349 and 351, and one entitled perì μέτρον going under the name of Moschopoulos.30 Among later users are Michael Apostolius and his son Arsenius in their collection of proverbs (referred to by Degani at test. 21b) and pseudo-Dracon,31 who bring us into the sixteenth century.32

To turn then to the actual readings of the MS. Folios 157\textsuperscript{r} ff. contain §1 of pseudo-Hephaestio or his source (this MS is older than any of those containing pseudo-Hephaestio; the latter’s editor33 thinks that the common source of pseudo-Hephaestio, pseudo-Dracon and Isaac Monachus was a tract written in the fourteenth century, which is to say the century in which our MS was written). On fol. 161\textsuperscript{r} will be found the variant of the Hipponactean verse found in §1\textsuperscript{b} of pseudo-Hephaestio and Isaac, pp. 175. 8, 187. 11, ἀνθρωπ’, ἀπέλθε, μή τάραττε τὴν σκάφην. The variant presumably arises from quoting from memory. This section of pseudo-Hephaestio is an independent composition of his source which, although drawing on very familiar material, is not directly in the tradition of the handbook that concerns us here, so that I do not report variant readings. On fol. 161\textsuperscript{v} (line 9) our material begins:\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{29} Studemund, AV 97 ff.; cf. Consbruch 355 ff., reporting readings also from Marc. gr. 483.

\textsuperscript{30} Ed. N. Titze, Manuels Moschopuli Cretensis opuscula grammatica (Leipzig 1822) 43–50.

\textsuperscript{31} Ed. G. Herrmann (Leipzig 1812).

\textsuperscript{32} Parts appear also in the treatise perhaps falsely attributed to Nicetas of Serrae (also of Herakleia), edited from Par. Suppl. gr. 164 (s. xv–xvi) by Koster at the end of his edition of the Tractatus Urbanus (cf. Hunger [above, note 19]). The part of the book entitled Διονυσίου περὶ ποδῶν (Consbr. pp. 331 ff.) is found in a clutch of manuscripts enumerated by Studemund, AV 162 n., including Par. gr. 1773, one of the copies of the book to preserve Callimachus fr. 380 (cf. T. Bergk, Kleine philologische Schriften II [Halle 1886] 285 f.).

\textsuperscript{33} Zur Jacobsmuehlen, p. 21.

\textsuperscript{34} I follow normal conventions and do not report orthographica such as Byzantine accents on enclitics, nu-movable, etc.
Illinois Classical Studies, XV.1

This section, which our scribe calls peri metron hieroikou, deals with the so-called diaphora of the hexameter (App. Heph. p. 293; App. Rhet. p. 340; Anon. Paris. in cod. Par. 2676, Consbruch p. 351; ps.-Heph. §§5, 13, 29; Tract. Harl. §19d; Tract. Urb. Appendix §3 p. 64; etc.). Unlike App. Heph. and App. Rhet., but like the anonymi in Par. 2676 and the Tract. Harl., ps.-Heph., and others related to him (Isaac, p. 183. 29, pseudo-Draco, p. 140. 16), our author provides an eighth diaphorad; but whereas the Anon. Par. and others call this eighth type klimakoston, our man calls it probothymion (Diomedes, GL 1. 499. 15–17, quoting the same example, calls such verses "fistulares"). Tract. Harl. has both terms, but our author gives a differently-worded explanation and adds the material about cases, so that he is not dependent on this source. In this section, then, the independence of our MS is already well attested.

§2. ἢξει δὲ καὶ πάθη ἦξι· τὰ 36 μὲν κατὰ πλεονασμὸν οἱ προκέφαλος, προκοιλίος ὁ καὶ προγάστωρ, καὶ δολιχόουρος (ἤ) καὶ μακροσκελής; τὰ δὲ κατὰ ἑλλειψιν οἱ ἀκέφαλος, μεσόκλατος ὁ καὶ λαγάρος, καὶ μύωρος· προκέφαλος ἦστιν ὁ ἔχων κατ' ἀρχήν περισσὴν συλλαβήν, ὡς "θάρσης, ὦ ἦξειν δηών ἀμφὶ στήθεσιν" [Β 544; ἤξει δηώ ἀμφὶ στήθεσφι καὶ ἑξέσπερον; immo est hic versus prokoiilio; vide App. Heph. p. 289. 19, Anon. Par. p. 350. 5 Consbr.]. προκοιλίος δὲ ὁ καὶ προγάστωρ λέγεται [λέγεται ὁ καὶ π. cod.] ὁ ἔχων κατὰ τὸ μέσον περισσὴν συλλαβήν, ὡς τὸ "[ἐκεῖνη πολλὰ] [haec fortasse ex altero exemplo hexametri quod dicitur acephali p. 350. 17 Consbr. in verbo ἐπειδῆ incipienti, quamvis apud nostrum desit] υφετει τι ποιον ταλασσα τε [καὶ τάλασσα] τε ἑξήσσα." [A 157; immo est hic versus prokefsalo uti patet ex huiusmodi versuum ratione]. δολιχόουρος δὲ ὁ καὶ μακροσκελῆς ὁ κατὰ τὸ τέλος ἔχων περισσὴν συλλαβήν, ὡς τὸ "Κύκλως, τῇ πιὲ οἶνον, ἐπὶ φάγει ἀνδρόμει κρέατα [1 347]. τὰ δὲ κατ' ἑλλειψιν ἐσι ταύτα· ἀκέφαλος ἦστιν ὁ μὴ ἔχων [κατὰ

35 On the diaphora see Hoerischelmann, "Zur Geschichte der antiken Metrik," Philol. 47 (1889) 112.

36 The scribe has a peculiar way of writing this ligature so that some might read it as τρίο, but cf. τίνοντα on line 1 of fol. 162\*; metà ibid. line 2, etc.
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This section discusses the πάθη of the hexameter (App. Heph. p. 288; App. Dion. pp. 322, 325, 327 [=ps.-Herodian]; App. Rhet. 341. 19; Athen. 14. 632c [p. 347 Consbruch]; ps.-Heph. §§11b, 17 [pp. 348 f. Consbruch]; Anon. Par. in cod. Par. 2881, Consbr. p. 349; Tract. Urb. Appendix §4 p. 68; ps.-Plut. §5; etc.). Our author (who will treat the subject again at §10 below) is here closest to the Anon. Par., but has some differences which again attest his independence. Most noteworthy is his alternative name for the type of verse called προκοίλιος, προγάστωρ; no one else gives this information, but in view of the remark at Tract. Harl. 19c ("the προκοίλιος verse has an extra syllable in the middle which gives it a roundness like that of pot-bellied persons [προγάστωρ]") it is a perfectly plausible variant. Since our scribe shows himself elsewhere to have been essentially a copyist, he should not be thought to have invented it. There are other variances: Although his πάθη are listed in the same order as the Anon. Par. and with similar definitions, his examples sometimes differ, as for example for the προκέφαλος verse (one supposedly having an extra syllable at the beginning), where our scribe quotes (under the wrong head, to be sure) II. 1. 157 and Anon. Par. quotes II. 1. 193. For the δολιχόσωρος (a verse supposedly having an extra syllable at the end) Anon. Par. quotes II. 3. 237 and Od. 9. 347; our author quotes only the second of these examples. In the original, it seems, there were often several examples; apographs tend to copy only one or two. They do not as a rule find new examples. In the case of the προκέφαλος these two witnesses have each chosen entirely different examples, and are thus independent of each other. Our author also has the choice variant μύσωρος for μεσέωρος (cf. Eust. 900. 7). But he also makes mistakes, particularly in copying verses. His statement that the λαγχαρός is identical with the μεσόκλαστος might be regarded as a mistake if the distinction drawn by Anon. Par. p. 350. 18 ff. is correct (although the name λαγχαρός is missing there, it is possible to suppose that his two verses, of which one is deficient in the quantity of a syllable in mid-line and the other is altogether lacking a syllable, could have been designated as μεσόκλαστος and λαγχαρός in the original, since Anon. Par. is the only one to make such a distinction and yet shares with our author alone the quotation of II. 3. 249); but it is as likely, and more economical, to suppose that the distinction is an autoschedism.
This series of definitions represents the actual beginning of the handbook that underlies this whole investigation. The two sections so far reported come from a later part of it. This is only one small example of how fluid the transmission of these things is, so that sorting them out is not so much a matter of finding tracks through a jungle as of separating blended liquids. Our author entitles the section perì daktulon kai Ætêroû méteron, and begins with the definition of a dactyl, to proceed with the anapaest, the amphimakros, etc., down to the molossus in the order found in App. Rhet. pp. 337. 17–338. 10 and many other places. His definitions of the baccheus and palimbaccheus are inverted, and he has mistakenly identified the molossus and the choréus; he has also omitted the disyllabic feet altogether, although he inserts the definition of a trochée after the amphibrach at p. 338. 4. These inadequacies will shortly be made up by a repetition of the whole section. But first we are briefly told what kinds of feet (dactylos or spondees) are permissible in each of the six feet of the hexameter. I am unable to find that this is taken from anywhere in particular, but it is of course perfectly unremarkable (and could be inferred for example from Hephaestio 7. 1 p. 20 Consbruch, or for that matter from the section below perì toû Êrōikou). Then, as mentioned, our author begins again with the basic definitions, this time from the top (p. 337 Consbruch).

§3. (fol. 162') Perì daktulon kai Ætêroû méteron. daktulos èk makrâs kai duó braxheîn. Æánasaiastos èk duó braxheîn kai makrâs. Æmfímakros èk makrâs braxheîas kai makrâs. Æmfíbrachus èk braxheîas makrâs kai braxheîas. trochâs èk makrâs kai braxheîs. braxheîs èk duó makrôn kai braxheîs. palimbákheîos èk braxheîas kai duó makrôn· molossôs kai xorôs èk trîwv braxheîn. ãi pròstî yphra toû Êrōikou méteron deketai spôndêios kai daktulon· èi kai Æntéwra õmôwos kai ãi trîtê kai ãi têtaîrî kai ãi pêmûpê. ãi dé èkth troxhân ãi kai spôndêios· tà δ' Ællâ pânta [sc. Æmfíbrachus, palimbákheîos, etc.; vide infra partem de hexameter] Ælên toû Íâmbu [haec transposui; antè tà δ' Ællâ cod.] deketai ãi Êrōikôs stîchos.
Robert L. Fowler

The introductory definition of “foot” is preceded by one of “metron”; our author also has some additional material at p. 337. 7. The original at this point obviously gave the total number of πόδες σύνθετοι, followed by the sub-totals of 4-, 5-, and 6-syllable feet. (There is a lacuna, in other words, after ἀκτιό in line 7 and similarly in App. Dion. p. 307. 7. Cf. also ps.-Heph. §§2, 20.) Our author does indeed have this material, but he has mistakenly repeated the total of “twelve” from the ἀπλοῖ. He gives the totals for 4-, 5-, and 6-syllable feet respectively as 16, 32, and 64, agreeing therefore with ps.-Heph. (note, however, that he has the remarks at p. 338. 11-14, as ps.-Heph. does not). The total for σύνθετοι should therefore be 112. (Our author has also managed to omit the total of 3-syllable feet in its rightful place and adds it after the 6-syllable ones.) But for all this there are distant echoes of learning here too; compare the full account of 5- and 6-syllable feet in the Anonymus Ambrosianus AV 232 ff., with Studemund’s notes. The source is there given, unexpectedly, as Galen ἐν τῷ περὶ συνθέσεως τεχνῶν, a lost work which Galen himself calls περὶ τῆς τῶν τεχνῶν συστάσεως in περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων, vol. XIX 44 Kuchn (cf. XVIII A 209. 6, I 227. 4). Galen, in his turn, may be copying Philoxenus (pseudo-Draco, p. 133. 2, if that is not an invented citation, as seems likely). 37 The longer feet are not enumerated by our author, however; he stops (as does the Anec. Chis. AV 209) after the trisyllables at p. 338. 14 with an explanation somewhat like that of lines 11-14. In the enumeration of feet he omits (as he did the first time round) the sigla and the temporal length of each foot. In his examples he substitutes κῆπος for Ζηθός at line

37 “Pseudo-Draco” is in reality Jacob Diassorinos, who also forged a lexicon of Philemon; his friend Constantine Palaiokappa forged the Eudocias Victorium. The material would be germane in Philoxenus’ περὶ μετρον, frs. 285-87 in the edition of C. Theodoridis (Berlin 1976), who appears to have missed this citation.
§5. ἔτι περὶ μέτρου ἡρωίκου. ποὺὸν ἔστι τὸ ἡρωίκὸν μέτρον; ὃ [οὗ cod.] καὶ ὁμηρὸς ἑχρῆσατο καὶ ὁ Ἡσίοδος καὶ ὁ περιηγητής καὶ ὁ Ἀρατός καὶ ὁ Κίλις Ὀπισθαίνος καὶ οἱ παλαιτέροι τούτων Ὀρφεὺς καὶ Λίνος. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ ἡρωίκον ἔξαπον ἐστίν. ἕξ γὰρ ἔχει πᾶδας, ἐκ δακτύλου καὶ σπονδείου τοὺς πέντε συγκειμένους, τὴν δὲ ἐκτὴν ἡ διὰ σπονδείου ἡ διὰ τροχαίου ἀποπληρῶν· ὡς γὰρ ἐκτὴ πάντος μέτρου ἀδιάφορον ἔχει τὴν τελευταίαν συλλαβήν. ἐνίστε δὲ καὶ παλιμβάχειον καὶ ἀμφιμακρὸν δέχεται τὸ ἡρωίκον μέτρον, καθαροὺς μέντοι [μὲν cod.] καὶ ἐν τάξει δακτυλικοῦ κείμενους καθαροῖ δὲ εἰσίν ὅταν ἀπαρτίζοισιν εἰς μέρος λόγου καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς ἔχουσι λέξειν ἀπὸ φωνῆντος ἄρχομενον. καὶ παλιμβάχειον μὲν, ὡς τὸ "πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ιερὸν πολιτέυθρον ἔπες[εν]" [ο 2]. [ἀμφιμακρὸν δὲ, ὡς τὸ "οὗ τι μοι (αἰτή) ἔσοι, θεοὶ νῦ μοι αἰτιοὶ εἰσίν" [Γ 164]. δέχεται καὶ χορείον τὸν καὶ τρίβραχον, καθαρὸν μέντοι καὶ αὐτὸν· (fol. 162v) ὡς τὸ "Νέστορα δ' οὐκ ἔλαβεν ιαχή [ἡ ἀχή cod.] πίνοντα περ ἔμπης" [Ε 1]. διὰ τί λέγεται ἡρωίκον; ἐπεὶ οἱ πρῶτοι πρῶτῳ ἐμέμφειρο ἥρων πράξεις ὑπεθεντο· καὶ ὁμηρὸς μετὰ Λίνον καὶ Ὀρφέα τοιούτῳ μέτρῳ ἑχρῆσατο ἡρώων τὰς ἐπὶ Τροίας [τῆς ἔ. Τ. τὰς cod.] πράξεις διεξόν.

We continue duly with the section that seems to have stood next in the original book (App. Dion. p. 312, App. Rhet. p. 339). Perhaps on his own initiative our author gives at the outset a list of poets who have used the hexameter; the material of App. Rhet. pp. 339. 19–40. 11 is then given with some minor variations in order and with the omission of p. 340. 5–9, but with the additional information, obviously coming from the original, that the chore or tribrach can also be found in the hexameter; II. 14. 1 is quoted as an instance. Compare ps.-Draco, pp. 149, 153, and the Anonymus Romanus §3 (ed. zur Jacobsmuhlen ps.-Heph. p. 102).

§6. Περὶ ἐλεγειοῦ. τὸ ἐλεγειόν μέτρον πεντάμετρον ἔστησεν γὰρ ἔχει χώρας. τὰς μὲν ὅν δύο συγκειμένας ἐκ τε δακτύλου καὶ σπονδείου· ἐνίστε δὲ καὶ ἀμφιμακρὸν καὶ παλιμβάχειον ἐπιδέχεται ἡ πρώτη καὶ ἡ δευτέρα μόνον, καθαροῖς μέντοι καὶ ἐν τάξει δακτυλικοῦ κείμενους· καθαροὶ δὲ εἰσίν ὅταν ἀπαρτίζονται εἰς μέρος λόγου καὶ (εἰς) φωνῆν ἐς συλλαβήν καθαράν λήξαε καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς ἔχουσιν ἀπὸ φωνῆντος ἄρχομενον. [οὖν] ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀμφιμακροῦ, ὡς τὸ "οὗ τι μοι αἰτή ἔσοι" [Γ 164]. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ παλιμβάχειου, ὡς τὸ "πλάγχθη [πλάχθη cod.], ἐπὶ Τροίης" [α 2]. ἡ δὲ τρίτη χώρα σπονδείον
This section perί ελεγείου can be found in almost identical form at App. Dion. pp. 315 f. The words supplemented by Conibruch at 315. 26 from ps.-Heph., the A nec. Chis. and others are found also in this MS. But after p. 316. 5 we are given material on the origin of elegy not found in any of the three recensions as printed by Conibruch, yet plainly germane at this point, as the similar progression on the τάμβος in App. H eph. shows (pp. 280 f., cf. below on anacreon tics). Further confirmation of this supposition comes from the branch of the tradition to which ps.-Heph. belongs, where this extra material recurs verbatim (§7; cf. Helias 3. 1, ps.-Mosch. p. 48, Isaac 186. 22, ps.-Draco 161. 28, Tract. Urb. App. §7 p. 82).38 With this account compare the shorter version at Σ Dion. Thr. 476. 4–6 Hilgard:

38 Our author is not, however, dependent on ps.-Hephaestio (at least as represented by surviving MSS); in zur Jacobsmuehlen’s apparatus sufficient separative errors are quoted from all the MSS he used. Tract. Urb. does not have everything that our MS does, and Tract. Harl. and ps.-Draco have markedly different wording.
ιστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ ἔ ἐ εἰ μὲν διὰ τοῦ ἔ ψιλοῦ γράφεται, θεωμαστικὸν ἐπίρρημα ἔστιν, εἰ δὲ διὰ τῆς ἀι διωθόγγου, σχετιαστικὸν. Τhis is another example of the close relation of these two traditions on metrical points.39 Our author then continues with ἐτι ποίος μετρᾶται κτλ.; these remarks are lacunose and jejune, and add nothing to what has already been said. The citation of a Byzantine poet of the eighth century adds to the impression that this material is intrusive. It is not, however, unique to our author (who is, therefore, once again simply copying what he sees), for quite similar remarks and a quotation of the same pentameter are found in Ven. Marc. gr. 483 (AV 195).40 It is worth noting too that our author has the obviously correct ἀγράντοισὶ(θ) whereas the manuscript printed by Migne has ἀγράντοι.

§7. Περὶ Ἀνακρεόντειον. τὰ Ἀνακρεόντεια· ἐπιδέχονται μὲν αὐτῶν οἱ οἶκοι ἀνάπαιστον καὶ δύο ἱάμβους καὶ μίαν περιττὴν συλλαβήν, οἷον “ἀπό τοῦ λίθου τὸ βέθρον.” τὸ δὲ τούτων κοινοῦλλον δέχεται τοὺς ἐξ ἐλάττονος καὶ μείζωνος, εἶτον πυρρήχιον καὶ σπονδεῖον, οἷον “ἀρετῆς εὐσεβέσιν ἀνδρα ἀρεταῖς.” ὡς ὡς ἐστὶν ὁ στίχος τοῦ Ἀνακρέοντος· ἡ πρώτη χώρα ἐξ ἀνάπαιστον· ἡ β´ καὶ γ´ ἐξ ἱάμβου· ἡ δ´ μονοσύλλαβος καὶ ἀδιάφορος· οἷον “ἀπὸ τῆς φίλης ἔριμον” (Sophronii 5.1 ed. Gigante). τοῦ δὲ κοινοῦλλον αὐτοῦ ἡ α´ καὶ γ´ καὶ ε´ χώρα ἐκ πυρρήχιον, ἡ β´ καὶ τετάρτη ἐκ σπονδείου· ἡ δ´ ἐκτή καὶ αὐτή ἡ ἐκ σπονδείου ἢ ἐκ τροχαίον, οἷον “Σαχαρίου μεγάλου πάγκλυτε κοῦρε” (Sophronii 5.17). Ιστεόν ὅτι ἕκα τὰ ἀναπαυστά ἑν τὸ κόλον εἰς τέλειον πόδα, ἀκατάληκτον λέγεται· εἰ δ´ ἐλλείπει, καταληκτικὸν ὄνομάζεται. διὰ τι καλεῖται Ἀνακρέοντειον; ὅτι Ἀνακρέον τις πρώτος τούτῳ ἐχρήσατο.

For this section on anacreonics compare App. Dion. pp. 316. 20–17. 11 (and note the extra comment, trivial but quite possibly from the original, as similar remarks about final syllables in other sections show, about the possibility of a “trochee” in the sixth foot). A brief description of catalectic and cataleatic versions follows, which is good old learning but found in none of the three regular recensions. The definition of catalexis and catalexis does, however, recur in ps.-Heph. §9, where the editor reports Studemund’s opinion that it is taken from the rhetor Castor; but as Krumbacher notes, the ascription of that treatise to Castor is false, and it is.

39 In the Dionysian scholia these words follow on another explanation of the origin of elegy, the one about the daughter of Kleio who died just before her wedding. Hilgard attributed this explanation to Heliodorus, the scholiast of Dionysius (otherwise unknown, and not to be confused with the metrical writer). His criteria for attribution, which are cogent, are laid out on pp. xiv ff. of his edition (Grammatici Graeci I 3 [Leipzig 1901]); for his not so cogent argument that Heliodorus merely summarized Choeroboscus see N. G. Wilson (above, note 14) 71 f.

40 It recurs also in Mutienesis II F 4 (s. xv–xvi), which also contains ps.-Hephaestio (cod. Z); but from what zur Jacobsmuenhle reports of this MS’s readings (p. 11) it seems clear that it is a copy of our MS.
really an anonymous work of perhaps the tenth century (so that the borrowing is the other way around). The explanation of the name’s origin is also in ps.-Heph. (§8*, which is to say before the definition of catalexis rather than after as in our codex; ps.-Heph. has presumably got the order right, since the definition of catalexis reads like a general remark about all metres so far discussed—note the absence of δέ in our MS, which could be expected were this an additional comment on the anacreontic), and in others related to him (Isaac, p. 191. 25, ps.-Draco, p. 167. 12, Anon. Rom. §5 p. 105).

§8. Περὶ ιαμβικοῦ. τὸ ιαμβικὸν μέτρον ἐξά/μετρον (fol. 163') καὶ τρίμετρον καλεῖται· τρίμετρον μὲν κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς οἰῖτινες κατὰ τετρασυλλάβους καὶ πεντασυλλάβους καὶ ἕξασυλλάβους πόδας μετροῦσι· διὰ τί καλεῖται ἐξάμετρον· ὅτι χώρας ἔξ ἔχει· εἰς πόσους διαιρεῖται τὸ ιαμβικὸν μέτρον· εἰς δύο· εἰς τὸ καλοῦμενον κωμίκον τε καὶ τραγικόν· ὥς καὶ τὸν παλαιὸν οἱ πολλοὶ κατεχρήσαντο· καὶ εἰς τὸ καλοῦμενον καθαρὸν τε καὶ τρίμετρον. ποιόν ἦστι τὸ τραγικὸν τε καὶ κωμίκον· δ δέχεται ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ τρίτῃ καὶ πέμπτῃ χώρα (ἤτοι) πόδας πέντε· δάκτυλον, (σπονδεῖον), χορεῖον, ἀνάπαιστον, καὶ τὸν ὁμόωνομον ιαμβον, ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ τετάρτῃ τους ἀπὸ βραχείας ἀρχιμένους τουτέστι χορεῖον, ἀνάπαιστον, ιαμβον, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐκτῇ, ιαμβον ἢ πυρρίχιον· δει γὰρ πάντως αὐτὴν εἶναι δισυλλάβως καὶ τὴν πρὸ τέλους ἔχειν βραχεῖαν. ποιόν ἦστι τὸ καθαρὸν καὶ τρίμετρον, ὅπερ ἐν μὲν ὀλίγαις ταῖς βάσεσιν ἤγουν ταῖς χώραις (ἡγουν) τῷ ιαμβῷ χρῆται· ἡ ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ τρίτῃ καὶ πέμπτῃ ιαμβον ἢ σπονδεῖον ἐπιδέχεται, ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ τῇ τετάρτῃ μόνον τὸν ιαμβον, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐκτῇ ἢ ιαμβον ἢ πυρρίχιον. πόθεν ὀνομάσθη τὸ μέτρον τοῦτο ιαμβικὸν· ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τινὸς, ἦτες κατὰ τὰ χήν ἐν Ἐλευσίνι πρώτῃ τούτῳ [τὸ τοῦ νεὶ τὸν cod.] ἐξ αὐτομάτου ἔξερε οἱ διωθοῦντα πλοῦνοιν αὐτὴν καταμικησαμένην ὑπὸς εἰποῦσα· “ἀνθρωπε”, ἀπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέψεις. ἔμοι μὲν ἀκαταθύμιο φαίνῃ, ἔργον δὲ μωρὸν ἐκτελεῖς σκάφην τρέπον.” ἀλλαξ· ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τινὸς γυναικὸς υβριστρίας, ἦτες αἰσχρῶς υβρισθείσα ἁγχον ἢ [ἀνί cod.] τὸν βιόν κατέλυσε, ὡς τὸ Ἀρχιλόχου δὴλοι ποίημα ὅπερ Λυκαμβίδες καλεῖται. λέγουσι

41 Castor: C. Walz, Rheitores Graeci III (1834) 713. 10–12; Krumbacher (above, note 16) 451. Du Cange, Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis (Lyons 1688; repr. Graz 1958) col. 727, s. v. κουκουλλίον, writes out this section on anacreontics from “an anonymous MS.” P. Matanga, Anecdota Graeca I (Rome 1850; repr. Hildesheim 1971) prae. 30 n. 1 quotes du Cange and adds variant readings from Vat. gr. 97, which may therefore be another copy of our book.
We come at last to the section that most concerns us here. The beginning of these remarks περί τοῦ ἱάμβου corresponds most closely to App. Heph. pp. 280–81. 17, except for a reference at the outset to the ancients’ practice of analysing by metra rather than feet; this remark, which is a remnant of good old learning, is found in no other copy of this section except the Anonymus Romanus §6 who, however, omits much else. Our MS also shares with the Anonymus Romanus the unique, if easily inferred, detail that the lambe who hanged herself αἰσχρῶς ὑβρισθείσα was also an ὑβριστρία; more interestingly, our MS is the only source to state that Archilochus’ poem was actually called Λυκαμβίδες. In view of the unswerving consistency of all other sources in saying simply ὅπερ καὶ άι Λυκαμβίδες ἐπί τοῖς Ἀρχιλόχου ποιήματι, this detail may be regarded as a mistake like ἐν Ἑλευσίνι; but it is a rather odd mistake. Perhaps it arises from misreading the source as something like άι Λυκαμβίδες τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου.

The different explanations of the genre’s name are excerpted differently by the various copyists. For ease of reference I shall designate them as follows:

A. The name comes from the Eleusinian Lambe.
B. People wanting to "insult" (ἱάμβιζεν) others used this metre.
C. From the Lambe who abused Hipponax.
D. The name come from τὸν βαζεῖν (quotation of Callimachus).
E. From the Lambe who was so disgraced that she hanged herself, like the Lykambids in Archilochus’ poem.
F. Lambs are made up of a short and a long because ὑβρις tends to start from trivial causes and grow ever larger (quotation of Homer).

The following chart will show the fluidity of the tradition. Any of these witnesses not provably derivative must be given equal weight to the others. It is apparent at a glance that Choerobuscus is not the source of the rest. By "preamble" I mean the part of the section preceding the etymology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preamble</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choerobuscus p. 214</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x²²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Pal. 356</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. Heph. p. 280</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. Heph. p. 299</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x³³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²² B is conflated with D and cited after C.
³³ Cited in order A, E (without mention of Archilochus), C, B, D.
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App. Dion. p. 310

"Dionysius" περὶ ποδόν
(App. Dion. p. 333,
AV 160)

App. Rhet. p. 342

Ambros. Q 5 sup.
(AV 153)

Helias (AV 170)

Marc. gr. 483
(AV 196)

Anec. Chis. (AV 206)

Anec. Chis. (AV 208)

Anon. Ambros. (AV 223;
Nauck, Lex. Vind. 255)

ps.-Heph. §1b

ps.-Heph. §6

ps.-Heph. §40

ps.-Heph. §37

Anon. Rom. §6

(PS.-Heph. p. 105)

Isaac, pp. 187–89

Trichas, p. 366

Tract. Harl. §17

Tract. Harl. §18

Tract. Urb. App. §2, p. 60

Tract. Urb. App. §6, p. 79

Tract. Urb. App. §8, p. 84

"Nicetas" De metris

(Tract. Urb. p. 107)

Id. p. 111

x x x x x

x

x x x x

x

x x x

x

x x x

x

x

x x x

x

x x x

x

x

x


44 This author also has the explanation (which is no explanation at all) ὅτι ἐν διπλασίῳ (ἐν ὑπεράφως: em. Consbruch) ὁ λόγος, "because the ratio (of long to short) is 2 : 1." Cf. Anec. Chis. AV 207.

45 Without mention of Archilochus.

46 Cited in order C, D (with quotation of Callimachus), B. The reader is reminded that Anec. Chis. is an apograph of Anon. Ambros. in this section (above, note 28).

47 Cited in order A (with detailed account of the story), B (deriving the name, however, from ἱπτείν), C, E, D (with quotation of Callimachus), B more briefly (this time reporting the equation ιομβίζειν = λοίδορεῖν).

48 Without mention of Archilochus.

49 Without mention of Archilochus.

50 Cited in order C (without mentioning Hipponax; this aition was also given at p. 175. 5), preamble (more profusely), B conflated with E (without mention of Archilochus), F (without quotation of Homer). Ps.-Draco, pp. 127, 162 ff. copies Isaac, pp. 175, 187–89.

51 C is given at greater length at p. 370. 11.

52 Cited in order B, E, A.

53 Omits quotation of Homer.

54 Cited in order A, preamble, B, D, E, F.
§9. ἢτι περὶ τοῦ δακτυλικοῦ μέτρου. τὸ δακτυλικὸν μέτρον ἐπιδείχεται πόθας β', τὸν δάκτυλον καὶ τὴν συναίτεσιν τοῦ δακτύλου. λέγω δὴ τὸν σπονδείον. δοκεί δὲ ἐπὶ τέλει τὸν τροχαιόν ἐπιδείχεσθαι: τὸ δὲ οὖχ οὕτως ἔχει, ἀλλ' ἔστιν οἱ τροχαιὸς δάκτυλος ἔλλειπον μιὰ συλλαβὴ τῇ τελευταίᾳ.

These remarks recur in this form at ps.-Heph. §11a, but nowhere else in this whole tradition (although similar material is found at ps.-Heph. §25, cf. Hephaestio 7. 1); yet, once again, they may confidently be believed to have come from the source. Although several points of contact have emerged between ps.-Heph. and our MS (and others will emerge below), we have seen repeatedly that they are independent in details, and so need not be regarded as interdependent in this section. Independence of these two books is also proved in a more general way by the completely different arrangement of their contents. Another argument based on the dates of the manuscripts was advanced earlier (p. 9).

§10. πάθη δ' αὐτοῦ γίνεται τρία μὲν κατὰ τὸ μέγεθος, τρία δὲ κατ' ἐλλειψιν: κατὰ μέγεθος τὸ λεγόμενον μακροκέφαλον καὶ τὸ προκοίλιον καὶ τὸ μακροσκέλες. καὶ μακροκέφαλον μὲν, όταν πλεονάζῃ συλλαβῇ κατ' ἀρχήν καὶ συναίτεσις γίνεται [γίνεται cod.] δύο συλλαβῶν εἰς μίαν, ώς ἐν τῷ "χρυσεῷ ἀνὰ σκήπτηρ" [A 15, 374]. προκοίλιον, όταν τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο κατὰ τὸ μέσον πάθη, ώς ἐν τῷ "οἱ 'Αχιλέων, Πηλέως υἱόι" [Π 21, alibi]. μακροσκέλες δὲ, όταν συλλαβῇ κατὰ τὸ τέλος πλεονάζῃ, ώς ἐν τῷ "ἀλλ' ὅτε Σοῦνιον ἵρον ἀφικόμεθ' ἄκρον 'Αθηνέων" [γ 278; ἱερὸν et 'Αθηναίων cod.]. τὰ δὲ κατ' ἐλλειψιν, ώς τὸ λεγόμενον ἀκέφαλον (τὸ τε) λαγαρὸν καὶ τὸ μείουρον. ἀκέφαλον μὲν, τὸ ἐλλείπον χρόνῳ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχήν, ώς ἐν τοῦτῳ "ἐπειδὴ νήσας τε καὶ Ἐλλησποντον ἱκόντο" [Ψ 2]. λαγαρὸν δὲ τὸ ἐλλείπον χρόνῳ κατὰ τὸ μέσον, ώς ἐν τῷ "βὴν εἰς [βινεῖς cod. (!)] Αἰώνος κλυτὰ δόματα [δόματα cod.]" [κ 60]. τὸ γὰρ ὁ οὐ δύναται μακρὰν ποιεῖν συλλαβῆν, ἐπειδὴ μὴ ἀπήρτισται εἰς μέρος λόγου. τὸ δὲ ἐλλείπον χρόνῳ κατὰ τὸ τέλος μείουρον λέγεται, ώς ἐν τῷ "Τρώες δ' ἐρρίθησαν, ὅπως ἵδον αἰώλον δφίν" [Μ 208].

For the πάθη of the hexameter see above on §2. This second treatment of the subject recurs word for word in ps.-Heph. §11b (pp. 348 f. Consbruch).

§11. (fol. 163v) τομαί εἰσὶ τέσσαρες [debuit pénnte], πενθήμερης, ἐφθημερῆς [-ές bis cod.], τρίτη τροχαίκη, καὶ τετάρτη, καὶ βουκολική. πενθήμερης ἐστιν, όταν μετὰ δύο πώδας εὐρεθῇ συλλαβῇ ἀπαρτίζουσα εἰς μέρος λόγου, οἷον "μὴν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηλημίαδε 'Αχιλής" [A 1]. ἐφθημερῆς δὲ ἐστιν, όταν μετὰ τρεῖς πώδας εὐρεθῇ συλλαβῇ ἀπαρτίζουσα εἰς μέρος λόγου, οἷον "τὸν δ' ἀπατείδομον προσέφη πώδας ὡς ς 'Αχιλλεύς" [A 84, alibi]. τρίτη τροχαίκη ἐστιν, όταν ο δεύτερος ποὺς εὐρεθῇ τροχαίος καὶ ἀπαρτίζῃ [-ει cod.] εἰς μέρος λόγου
This section on the τομαι of the hexameter recurs in §10 of pseudo-Hephaestio (compare further App. Dion. pp. 328 ff., Helias AV 172, ps.-Heph. §§15, 30, Anec. Chis. §8, ps.-Draco, pp. 126, 137, ps.-Plut. §3 = ps.-Heph. §15, Tract. Harl. §8, and Isaac, p. 186. 1). The confusion over the number of caesurae is older than this handbook (see Terentianus Maurus 1695 [GL 6. 376], Diomedes GL 1. 498. 4 and Marius Victorinus GL 6. 65. 23). Originally there were only four (the pentaemeral, the heptameral, the trochaic or “third trochaic” because it occurs after the third trochee, and the bucolic); when someone added a fourth caesura after the second trochee, this became the “third trochaic,” i. e. τρίτη (τομή) τροχαίκη, and the “third trochaic” became the “fourth trochaic.” The difficulty caused by the intruder is apparent from the persistence of the number “four” in the MSS and the ineptitude of the example given for the τρίτη τροχαίκη. (The Latin grammarians have the luxury of keeping the third trochee in the third foot and the fourth in the fourth; in Greek this would violate Hermann’s bridge.) This section adds nothing to what we so far know of the MS.

There follows wholly new material of a rhetorical nature (definitions of φράσις, ἐκφράσις, ἀντίφρασις, μετάφρασις, παράφρασις and περίφρασις), and then the prolegomena to Lycophron.

The general conclusion of this examination does not need to be repeated. To close on a rather different note, the great difficulty I encountered even in identifying, let alone locating, all the sources necessary to evaluate the material offered by this manuscript, highlights the need for a corpus metricorum. The need was clearly identified a century ago, and the work begun, but like so many other projects of our industrious forebears the laborers to complete it have not yet been found. It is to be hoped that someone more ambitious than myself (who can plead involvement

55 On the doctrine of caesurae see Voltz (above, note 20) 48 ff.
with another, equally deserving corpus, viz. the mythographers) will take on the task.\footnote{56}

University of Waterloo

\footnote{56}{I am grateful to Professor Dr. Herwig Görgemanns for useful comments and assistance. He takes less offence than I do at ἀραθοῦμος in line 2 (citing formations such as ἀπαράμυθος in PV 185 and ἀσυνέτημα in Alcaeus fr. 208a 1 Voigt). If it is sound, a lacuna \( < \times > \) may be supposed after \( μέν \) to fill out the line. With respect to the \( μέν \ldots δὲ \) contrast he suggests that the opposition lies mainly between the two persons who are the conceptual subjects (respectively first and second) and may have been clear from a context in which (for instance) Hipponax first approached the woman with some banter and then nearly upset her tub by leaning on it; she first tells him what she (\( μέν \)) thinks of his approaches, and then what he (\( δὲ \)) is about to do through his clumsiness.}