

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

ROBERT L. FOWLER

Hipponax Test. 21 Degani:

21 Choerob. ad Hephaest. 3 (Π. ποδῶν), 1. 214. 8–20 Consbr.

Ἰαμβος . . . εἶρηται ἤτοι ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τῆς Κελεοῦ
θεραπαίνης, ἥτις τὴν Δήμητρα λυπούμενην ἠνάγκασε γελάσαι
γέλοιόν τι εἰποῦσα, τῷ ρυθμῷ τούτου τοῦ ποδὸς αὐτομάτως
χρησαμένη, ἢ ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τινὸς ἑτέρας, γραῶς, ἢ Ἰπῶναξ ὁ
ιαμβοποιὸς παρὰ θάλασσαν ἔρια πλυνούση συντυχῶν ἤκουσε
τῆς σκάφης ἐψάμενος, ἐφ' ἧς ἔπλυνεν ἢ γραῦς, "ἄνθρωπ',
ἄπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέψεις." καὶ συλλαβῶν τὸ ρηθὲν
οὕτως ὠνόμασε τὸ μέτρον. ἄλλοι δὲ περὶ τοῦ χωλιάμβου τὴν
ἱστορίαν ταύτην ἀναφέρουσι, γράφοντες τὸ τέλος τοῦ στίχου
"τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέψεις."

21a Choerob. ad Hephaest. 5 (Π. ιαμβικοῦ), 4. 229. 10–15
Consbr.

Ἰπῶνακτος δ' ἔλεγον αὐτὸ εἶναι κατὰ τὴν εἰρημένην
ἀνωτέρω χρῆσιν τῆς γραῶς καὶ σκάφης· "ἄνθρωπ', ἄπελθε, τὴν
σκάφην ἀνατρέψεις." τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τῆς γραῶς λέγεται εἶναι τῆς
ἄνω εἰρημένης.

21b Schol. [B] Hephaest. 20 (Π. ποδῶν), 4. 299. 17–300. 3
Consbr. = Arsen. 8. 99 b (CPG 2. 461. 8–17 L.–Schw.)

Ἰαμβος . . . ἐκλήθη . . . ἢ ἀπὸ γραῶς τινος Ἰάμβης
καλουμένης, ἢ πλυνούση συντυχῶν ὁ Ἰπῶναξ καὶ ἀψάμενος
τῆς σκάφης, ἐφ' ἧς ἔπλυνεν ἢ γραῦς τὰ ἔρια, ἤκουσε λεγούσης
"ἄνθρωπ', ἄπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέψεις."

21c Tricha, Lib. de novem metris 1 (Π. ιαμβικοῦ) 370. 11–16
Consbr.

τῇ γὰρ ἄνωθεν ῥηθείση ἐντυχῶν, φασί, γραί, ἥτις Ἰάμβη
ἐκαλεῖτο, ἔρια ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ πλυνούση, τῇ σκάφῃ τε
πλησιάσας ἤκουσε παρ' αὐτῆς "ἄνθρωπ', ἄπελθε, τὴν σκάφην
ἀνατρέψεις." τὸν δὲ ἀκούσαντα τοῦτο ἐκ τούτου τὸν χωλὸν
ἐπιτηδεύσασθαι ἴαμβον.

21d Gramm. Ambros. Π. τῆς τῶν ποδῶν ὀνομασίας 255. 14–20 Keil–Nauck (pone Lex. Vindob.)

ἰάμβους δὲ τὰς ὕβρεις ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰάπτειν, ὃ ἔστι βλάπτειν· οἷς καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος κέχρηται ὕβριστῆς ὄν. ἄλλοι δὲ καλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἰάμβον καὶ λέγουσι κληθῆναι ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τινὸς οὕτω καλουμένης γραφῆς, ἥτινί ποτε ὁ Ἰππῶναξ ὑπήντησε καὶ ἀκουσίως τῆς σκάφης ἀψάμενος, ἐφ' ἧς τὰ ἔρια ἔπλυνεν, ἤκουσε λεγούσης αὐτῆς “ἄνθρωπ’, ἀπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέψεις.”

In two recent articles, Christopher G. Brown and Ralph M. Rosen have independently suggested that the verse quoted anonymously in the above testimonium to Hipponax actually comes from the poet himself.¹ The suggestion, which was first made by Koster,² 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.³

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

¹ Christopher G. Brown, “Hipponax and Iambe,” *Hermes* 116 (1988) 478–81; Ralph M. Rosen, “A Poetic Initiation Scene in Hipponax?,” *AJP* 109 (1988) 174–79.

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 Jacobsmuehlen in his edition of pseudo-Hephaestio *De metris* (Dissertationes Philologicae Argentoratenses 10. 4 [Strasbourg 1886], hereafter “zur Jacobsmuehlen” or “ps.-Heph.”) §1^b, 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 ἰὸν βάζειν—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.⁴ Consbruch quotes from "folio 163^v": [the iambos was named after] Ἰάμβης τινός, ἥτις κατὰ τύχην ἐν Ἐλευσίῃ πρώτη τὸ τοῦ [sic vel etiam τὸ τοῦ cod.; lege τοῦτο, sc. τὸ μέτρον; error per compendium ortus est] ἐξ αὐτομάτου ἐξέφερε τὸν διωθοῦντα πλύνουσαν αὐτὴν καταμωκησαμένη οὕτως εἰποῦσα· ἄνθρωπ', ἄπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις. ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀκαταθύμιος φαίνη, ἔργον δὲ μωρὸν ἐκτελεῖς σκάφην τρέπων. In his version of the story, Choeroboscus seems to distinguish the washerwoman Iambe from the well-known Eleusinian one; he first tells the Eleusinian story, then introduces the washerwoman by saying ἡ (εἴρηται) ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τινὸς ἑτέρας, after a different Iambe. This need mean no more than that the story comes from a different source; she could still be the Eleusinian Iambe 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 Ἐλευσίῃ 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 Choeroboscus, 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 ἐμοὶ . . . 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 Choeroboscus." 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:

ἄνθρωπ', ἄπελθε· τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις.
ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀκαταθύμιος φαίνη,
ἔργον δὲ μωρὸν ἐκτελεῖς σκάφην τρέπων.

1. ἀνατρέπεις v.l. in Choer., utpote aition choliambi metri originis praebens. τὴν – ἀνατρέπεις; μὴ τάραττε τὴν σκάφην f. 1. apud ps.-Heph. §1^b necnon nostrum codicem fol. 161^v (vide infra) et Isaacum Monachum ed. Bachmann Anec. 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.

⁴ M. Consbruch, *Hephaestionis enchiridion* (Leipzig 1906), hereafter "Consbruch." The MS once belonged to Arsenius (test. 21 b): H. Stevenson, *Codices manuscriptorum Palatini Graeci bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome 1885) 203.

The third verse is a perfect trimeter, and provides an idiomatic progression from compound to simple form of the same verb (ἀνατρέπεις – τρέπων).⁵ Two lexical iamb-shaped words filling up the final metron violate Knox's bridge, but the law does not hold good for Hipponax.⁶

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 ἀκαταθύμιος, a late and prosy word,⁷ 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 μὲν of verse 2 gives it its *raison d'être*. But what exactly is the μὲν . . . 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 ἀκαταθύμιος is a mistake *per contrarium*. Or perhaps we have an example of a non-adversative μὲν . . . 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 μὲν is almost *solitarium*, 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."⁸

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 καταμωκησαμένη; 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.

⁶ A. M. Devine and L. D. Stephens, *Language and Metre. Resolution, Porson's Bridge, and their Prosodic Basis*, American Classical Studies 12 (Chico, CA 1984) 7. Exceptions occur for example at fr. 32. 2 and 36. 1 West.

⁷ All words beginning ἀκατα- in *LSJ* (and there are many) are quoted only from prose, except for one occurrence of ἀκατάβλητος at *Ar. Nub.* 1229; ἀκαταθύμιος is quoted from no author before Artemidorus. The corruption prevents us from knowing whether this verse was a choliamb or not (φαίνη need not be the last word). Iambic lines appear amid the choliambic at fr. 29a. 1, 30. 1, 32. 1, 36. 4, etc. The variant ἀνατρέψεις 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*² (Oxford 1954) 370 writes: "The strength of the antithesis varies within wide limits. Sometimes μὲν . . . δέ conveys little more than τε . . . καί."

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 Hephaestio, 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;

⁹ W. Hoerschelmann, "Die Composition der Hephaestio-Scholien," *RhMus* 36 (1881) 260-301; *Scholia Hephaestionea altera integra* (Dorpat 1882); *Ein griechisches Lehrbuch der Metrik* (Dorpat 1888), hereafter "Hoerschelmann, *Lehrbuch*"; "Zur Geschichte der antiken Metrik," *Philol.* 47 (1889) 1-12; R. Schoell and W. Studemund, *Anecdota varia Graeca et Latina I: Anecdota varia Graeca musica metrica grammatica*, ed. W. Studemund (Berlin 1886), hereafter "AV." Cf. also M. Consbruch, *De veterum περὶ ποιήματος doctrina*, Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen 5. 3 (Breslau 1890) and L. Voltz, "Die εἶδη des daktylischen Hexameters," *Philol.* 52 (1894) 385-94.

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 forgery, 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^v of this MS contains Tzetzes' prolegomena to Lycophron, but Consbruch was incorrect to state that our material is on folio 163^v. It is on folio 163^r, 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 theol. 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 356. 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 huckster 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 Akademiia 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,¹¹ who gives a *terminus post quem* of the fifth century A.D.¹² 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.¹³ 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."¹⁴

The three recensions are as follows. (1) That of Book 5 of the B-scholalia 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 Barocciani in the Bodleian which Hoerschelmann in his edition of the B-scholalia 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),¹⁵ 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-scholalia, 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 ἐλεγεῖων* in Ven. Marc. 483 (AV 195 f.), Tract. Urb. App. §7 p. 84, ps.-Heph. §7^c, and our codex, and of Sophronius (s. vi-vii) in the section *ἐτέρως περὶ τῶν Ἀνακρεοντείων* (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 graecus 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 me (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.¹⁶ Trichas (Consbruch, pp. 363 ff.; date uncertain) certainly used it, along with Hephæstio 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 iambs,¹⁷ 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 Psellos¹⁸ 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 writers¹⁹ who used this book were Helias Charax,²⁰ Isaac Monachus,²¹ pseudo-Hephæstio,²² pseudo-Herodian on hexameters,²³ pseudo-Plutarch on the same subject,²⁴ the Anonymous Ambrosianus in Ambr. gr. C 222 inf. (s. xiii),²⁵ the Tractatus Harleianus in MS British Museum Harl. 5635, which may be by Triclinius and is at least based on him,²⁶ the Tractatus Urbinas edited by Koster,²⁷ an anonymous treatise in a Chisianus in Rome, misc. R IV 11,²⁸ another in

notes in his hand): N. G. Wilson (previous note) 253; Studemund, *AV* 165–98.

¹⁶ So K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur*² I (1897) 595.

¹⁷ J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota Oxoniensia* III (Oxford 1836) 308 ff.

¹⁸ *AV* 198–204.

¹⁹ Cf. Krumbacher (above, note 16) 596 f.; H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* II (Munich 1978) 50 ff.

²⁰ Ed. Studemund, *AV* 170–98; see also L. Voltz, *De Helia Monacho, Isaaco Monacho, Pseudo-Dracone*, Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae 11 (Strasbourg 1886).

²¹ Ed. L. Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca* II (Leipzig 1828; repr. Hildesheim 1965) 167–96.

²² Ed. zur Jacobsmuehlen (above, note 2); see also Consbruch, pp. 348–49, 352–54.

²³ *AV* 185–88; Consbruch, pp. 326–28 (part of the *App. Dion.*).

²⁴ Ed. Studemund, *Philol.* 46 (1888) 27–34.

²⁵ Hipponax testi. 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*.

²⁶ Ed. T. Gaisford in the second edition of his Hephæstio (Oxford 1855) I 317–34, and again by Studemund, *Index lectionum* (Breslau 1887).

²⁷ See above, note 2.

²⁸ Selected readings in G. Mangelsdorf, *Progr. Gymn.* (Karlsruhe 1876). Studemund, *AV* 205–09 gives the first section of this “Anecdotum Chisianum” complete, and notes that its first few pages are excerpted from the Anonymus Ambrosianus.

Vat. gr. 14,²⁹ yet another in Vat. gr. 1405 (s. xv), dubbed "Anonymus 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 *περὶ μέτρων* 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-Draco,³¹ who bring us into the sixteenth century.³²

To turn then to the actual readings of the MS. Folios 157^v 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-Draco 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^v will be found the variant of the Hipponactean verse found in §1^b of pseudo-Hephaestio and Isaac, pp. 175. 8, 187. 11, ἄνθρωπ', ἄπελθε, μὴ 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^v (line 9) our material begins:³⁴

§1. Περὶ μέτρον ἠρωϊκοῦ. τὸ μέτρον τὸ ἠρωϊκὸν ἐστὶν ἐξάμετρον, ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἐπτά τινὰς διαφορὰς αἰτινὲς εἰσὶν αὐταὶ· κατενόπλιον, περιοδικόν, Σαπφικόν [σαμφικόν cod.], βουκολικόν, ὑπόρρυθμον, τέλειον καὶ πολιτικόν. κατενόπλιον μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ ἔχον δύο δακτύλους καὶ σπονδεῖον καὶ πάλιν δύο δακτύλους καὶ σπονδεῖον, ὡς τὸ "ὡς φατο δάκρυ χέων, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε πότνια μήτηρ" [A 357]. περιοδικόν δὲ ἐστὶ, τὸ ἔχον δάκτυλον καὶ σπονδεῖον καὶ πάλιν δάκτυλον καὶ σπονδεῖον, ὡς τὸ "οὐλομένην ἢ μυρὶ 'Αχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε" [A 2]. Σαπφικόν δὲ ἐστὶ, τὸ ἀρχό(μενο)ν ἀπὸ σπονδείου καὶ λῆγον εἰς σπονδεῖον, ὡς τὸ "ἄλλοι μὲν ῥα θεοὶ τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἱποκορυσταί" [B 1]. βουκολικόν δὲ ἐστὶ, τὸ μετὰ τρεῖς πόδας [ad haec vide Consbr.; verum invenies apud eius ed. p. 351. 21] ἀπαρτίζον εἰς μέρος [ἀπαρτίζειν εἰς μέτρον cod.] λόγου, ὡς τὸ "ἐξ ἐπιδιφριάδος πυμάτης [πημάτοις cod.] ἱμάσι δέδεντο" [K 475].

²⁹ Studemund, *AV* 97 ff.; cf. Consbruch 355 f., reporting readings also from Marc. gr. 483.

³⁰ Ed. N. Titzze, *Manuelis Moschopuli Cretensis opuscula grammatica* (Leipzig 1822) 43–50.

³¹ Ed. G. Hermann (Leipzig 1812).

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 Urbinas* (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.).

³³ Zur Jacobsmuehlen, p. 21.

³⁴ I follow normal conventions and do not report orthographica such as Byzantine accents on enclitics, nu-movable, etc.

ὑπόρρυθμον δέ ἐστι, τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον πόδα ἀπαρτίζον (εἰς) μέρος λόγου, οἷον "ὑβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε, σὺ δ' ἴσχεο, πείθεο δ' ἡμῖν" [A 214]. τέλειον δέ ἐστι, τὸ ἔχον ὅλα τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου, ὡς τὸ "πρὸς δέ με τὸν δύστηνον ἔτι φρονέοντ' ἐλέαιρε" [X 59]. πολιτικὸν δέ ἐστι, τὸ ἀνευ πάθους ἢ τρόπου γιγνόμενον, οἷον "ἵππους δὲ ξανθὰς ἑκατὸν καὶ πεντήκοντα" [Λ 680]. τινὲς δὲ καὶ ὄγδοον προστιθέασι τὸ προβάθμιον, ὅπερ ἀρετὴ ἂν εἴη ἢ καλλίστη ἐν μέτρῳ· ὃ ἀπὸ μιᾶς συλλαβῆς ἀρχόμενον μίαν μέχρι τέλους προστιθήσι συλλαβὴν [κεφαλὴν cod.], ὡς τὸ "ὦ μάκαρ Ἀτρείδη μοιρηγενὲς ὀλβιόδαιμον" [Γ 182]. ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἀρετὴν οὗτος ὁ στίχος ὅλος ὢν κλητικὴ, ὡσπερ τὸ "ἦρωσ Ἀτρείδης εὐρυκρείων Ἀγαμέμνων" [A 102] ὅλος ὢν εὐθεία.

This section, which our scribe calls *περὶ μέτρου ἠρωϊκοῦ*, deals with the so-called *διαφοραὶ* 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. §19^d; Tract. Urb. Appendix §3 p. 64; etc.).³⁵ 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 *διαφορὰ*; but whereas the *Anon. Par.* and others call this eighth type *κλιμακωτόν*, our man calls it *προβάθμιον* (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. ἔχει δὲ καὶ πάθη ἕξ· τὰ³⁶ μὲν κατὰ πλεονασμὸν οἷον προκέφαλος, προκοίλιος ὃ καὶ προγᾶστωρ, καὶ δολιχόουρος (ὃ) καὶ μακροσκελῆς· τὰ δὲ κατὰ ἔλλειψιν οἷον ἀκέφαλος, μεσόκλαστος ὃ καὶ λαγαρός, καὶ μούρος· προκέφαλός ἐστιν ὃ ἔχων κατ' ἀρχὴν περισσὴν συλλαβὴν, ὡς "θώρηκας ῥήξειν δηῖων ἀμφὶ στήθεσσι" [B 544; ῥήξε δηῖω ἀμφὶ στήθεσφι cod.; immo est hic versus προκοίλιος, vide *App. Heph.* p. 289. 19, *Anon. Par.* p. 350. 5 Consbr.]. προκοίλιος δὲ ὃ καὶ προγᾶστωρ λέγεται [λέγεται ὃ καὶ π. cod.] ὃ ἔχων κατὰ τὸ μέσον περισσὴν συλλαβὴν, ὡς τὸ "(ἐπειὴ πολλὰ) [haec fortasse ex altero exemplo hexametri quod dicitur acephali p. 350. 17 Consbr. in verbo ἐπειδὴ incipienti, quamvis apud nostrum desit] οὐρεὰ τε σκιοέντα θάλασσα τε [καὶ θάλασσα cod.] ἠχῆεσσα" [A 157; immo est hic versus προκέφαλος uti patet ex huiusmodi versuum ratione]. δολιχόουρος δὲ ὃ καὶ μακροσκελῆς ὃ κατὰ τὸ τέλος ἔχων περισσὴν συλλαβὴν, ὡς τὸ "Κύκλωψ, τῇ πίε οἶνον, ἐπεὶ φάγες ἀνδρόμεια κρέα" [ι 347]. τὰ δὲ κατ' ἔλλειψιν εἰσι ταῦτα· ἀκέφαλός ἐστιν ὃ μὴ ἔχων [κατὰ

³⁵ On the *διαφοραὶ* see Hoerschelmann, "Zur Geschichte der antiken Metrik," *Philol.* 47 (1889) 1–12.

³⁶ The scribe has a peculiar way of writing this ligature so that some might read it as *τρία*; but cf. *πίνοντα* on line 1 of fol. 162^v, *μετὰ ibid.* line 2, etc.

τ]ην [aquae damnium] ἀρχὴν κεφαλὴν, τουτέστι μακρὰν συλλαβὴν, οἶον "ὄς ἦδη [hoc supra lin. cod.; ἦδει in lin.] τὰ τ' ἐόντ[α] τὰ τ' ἐσσόμενα [haec tria ante τὰ τ' ἐόντα cod.] πρὸ τ' ἐόντα" [A 70]. μεσόκλαστος δέ ἐστιν, ὁ ἔχων μέσον κλάσμα, ὡς τὸ "ῶτρυνέ μιν [ῶτρυνε δὲ Anon. Par., quae ambo exempla versus huiusmodi satis illustrant; Homerus vero ῶτρυνεν (vel ὄτρ-) δὲ scripsit, sc. versum ἀπαθῆ] γέροντα παρισταμένη [sic etiam Anon. Par.; -ος Hom.] ἐπέεσσι" [Γ 249]. μύουρος δέ /// [tasura] ὁ ἔχων κατὰ τὸ τέλος βραχεῖαν τὴν λέξιν, ὡς τὸ "Τρῶες δ' ἐρρίγησαν ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἰόλον ὄφιν" [M 208].

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. §§11^b, 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. 19^c ("the *προκοίλιος* verse has an extra syllable in the middle which gives it a roundness like that of pot-bellied persons [*προγαστ(ό)ρων*"]) 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) *Il.* 1. 157 and Anon. Par. quotes *Il.* 1. 193. For the *δολιχόουρος* (a verse supposedly having an extra syllable at the end) Anon. Par. quotes *Il.* 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 *μύουρος* for *μείουρος* (cf. Eust. 900. 7). But he also makes mistakes, particularly in copying verses. His statement that the *λαγαρός* 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 *λαγαρός* 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 *λαγαρός* 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 *Il.* 3. 249); but it is as likely, and more economical, to suppose that the distinction is an autoschediasm.

§3. (fol. 162^r) Περὶ δακτύλου καὶ ἐτέρων μέτρων. δάκτυλος ἐκ μακρᾶς καὶ δύο βραχειῶν· ἀνάπαιστος ἐκ δύο βραχειῶν καὶ μακρᾶς· ἀμφίμακρος ἐκ μακρᾶς βραχείας καὶ μακρᾶς· ἀμφίβραχυς ἐκ βραχείας μακρᾶς καὶ βραχείας· τροχαῖος ἐκ μακρᾶς καὶ βραχείας· βακχείος ἐκ δύο μακρῶν καὶ βραχείας· παλιμβάκχειος ἐκ βραχείας καὶ δύο μακρῶν· μολοσσὸς καὶ χορείος ἐκ τριῶν βραχειῶν. ἡ πρώτη χώρα τοῦ ἠρωϊκοῦ μέτρου δέχεται σπονδεῖον καὶ δάκτυλον· καὶ ἡ δευτέρα ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ τρίτη καὶ ἡ τετάρτη καὶ ἡ πέμπτη· ἡ δὲ ἕκτη τροχαῖον ἢ καὶ σπονδεῖον· τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα [sc. ἀμφίμακρον, παλιμβάκχειον, etc.; vide infra partem de hexametro] πλὴν τοῦ ἰάμβου [haec transposui; ante τὰ δ' ἄλλα cod.] δέχεται ὁ ἠρωϊκὸς στίχος.

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 περὶ δακτύλου καὶ ἐτέρων μέτρων, 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 choreus; he has also omitted the disyllabic feet altogether, although he inserts the definition of a trochee 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 (dactyls 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 περὶ τοῦ ἠρωϊκοῦ). Then, as mentioned, our author begins again with the basic definitions, this time from the top (p. 337 Consbruch).

§4. Περὶ μέτρου ποδός. τί ἐστι μέτρον; ποδῶν συνθήκη· καὶ τί ἐστι πούς; μετρικὸν σύστημα συλλαβῶν· ποσαχῶς ὁ πούς; διχῶς· ὁ μὲν ἐστὶν ἀπλοῦς, ὁ δὲ σύνθετος· ἀπλοῦς μὲν, ὁ ἐκ δύο ἢ καὶ τριῶν συλλαβῶν· σύνθετος δέ, ὁ ἀπὸ τεσσάρων [τετάρ(των) cod.] μέχρι καὶ ἕξ· πόσοι πόδες ἀπλοῖ; ιβ'· πόσοι τούτων δισύλλαβοι; δ'· καὶ πόσοι τρισύλλαβοι; η'· πόσοι πόδες σύνθετοι; ιβ'· πόσοι τούτων τετρασύλλαβοι; ι'· πόσοι πεντασύλλαβοι; λβ'· πόσοι ἑξασύλλαβοι; ξδ'· καὶ πόσοι τρισύλλαβοι; ὀκτώ· ποιοί εἰσιν οἱ δισύλλαβοι; ὁ σπονδεῖος, ὁ πυρρήχιος, ὁ τροχαῖος, καὶ ὁ ἰαμβος· ποῖός ἐστιν ὁ σπονδεῖος καὶ ποῖος ὁ πυρρήχιος καὶ ποῖος ὁ τροχαῖος καὶ ποῖος ὁ ἰαμβος; σπονδεῖος μὲν ὁ ἐκ δύο μακρῶν, οἷον ἦρω· πυρρήχιος δὲ ὁ ἐκ δύο βραχειῶν, οἷον λόγος· τροχαῖος δὲ ὁ ἐκ μακρᾶς καὶ

βραχείας, οἷον κῆπος· ἴαμβος δὲ ἐκ βραχείας καὶ μακρᾶς, οἷον Σόλων [σίλων cod.]. ποιοὶ εἰσὶν οἱ τρισύλλαβοι; δάκτυλος, ἀνάπαιστος, ἀμφίμακρος, ἀμφίβραχυς, βακχεῖος, παλιμβάκχειος, χορεῖος, καὶ μολοσσός. ὁ δάκτυλος ἐκ μακρᾶς καὶ δύο βραχειῶν, οἷον Ἥλιος· ὁ ἀνάπαιστος ἐκ δύο βραχειῶν καὶ μακρᾶς, οἷον Πολέμων· ὁ ἀμφίμακρος ἐκ μακρᾶς καὶ μέσης βραχείας καὶ πάλιν μακρᾶς, οἷον Ἥγεμών· ὁ ἀμφίβραχυς ἐκ βραχείας καὶ μέσης μακρᾶς καὶ πάλιν βραχείας, οἷον βοηθός· ὁ βακχεῖος ἐκ βραχείας καὶ δύο μακρῶν, οἷον Νοήμων· ὁ παλιμβάκχειος ἐκ δύο μακρῶν καὶ βραχείας, οἷον Ἥφαιστος· ὁ χορεῖος ἐκ τριῶν βραχειῶν, οἷον Δόλιος· ὁ μολοσσός ἐκ τριῶν μακρῶν, οἷον Ἡρώδης. σημειῶσαι ὅτι καὶ οἱ τετρασύλλαβοι (καὶ οἱ πεντασύλλαβοι) καὶ οἱ ἐξασύλλαβοι πόδες ἔχουσιν ἴδια ὀνόματα· ἐπεὶ μὴ χρῶνται τούτοις οἱ νῦν γράφοντες μετρικῶς, οὐδὲ χρεῖα τούτων· ἐμπράκτως νῦν ζητεῖται ἦθη ταῦτα [sc. minus quam τετρασύλλαβοι], ἵνα μὴ περιττοσυλλαβοῦντες ἡμεῖς νομιζώμεθα.

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 ὀκτώ 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 Kuehn (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 Ζῆθος at line

³⁷ "Pseudo-Draco" is in reality Jacob Diassorinos, who also forged a lexicon of Philemon; his friend Constantine Palaiokappa forged the *Eudociae Violarium*. The material would be germane in Philoxenus' περὶ μέτρων, fr. 285-87 in the edition of C. Theodoridis (Berlin 1976), who appears to have missed this citation.

13 (*App. Dion.* p. 307. 13 has δῆμος here); at p. 338. 4 he has (like Isaac, p. 178. 19) βοηθός for Ὀμηρος (*Anec. Chis.* also has Ὀμηρος; *App. Dion.* p. 308. 6 has Σερήνος, except for Marc. Ven. 483, which also has βοηθός). In this section, then, our author emerges once more as a man who has got hold of good old material independently of other known witnesses, but who has copied it with little thought.

§5. ἔτι περὶ μέτρου ἠρωϊκοῦ. ποιόν ἐστι τὸ ἠρωϊκὸν μέτρον; ᾧ [οὗ cod.] καὶ Ὀμηρος ἐχρήσατο καὶ ὁ Ἡσίοδος καὶ ὁ περιηγητὴς καὶ ὁ Ἄρατος καὶ ὁ Κίλιξ Ὀππιανὸς καὶ οἱ παλαιότεροι τούτων Ὀρφεὺς καὶ Λίνος. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ ἠρωϊκὸν ἐξάπουν ἐστίν· ἕξ γὰρ ἔχει πόδας, ἐκ δακτύλου καὶ σπονδείου τοὺς πέντε συγκειμένους, τὴν δὲ ἕκτην ἢ διὰ σπονδείου ἢ διὰ τροχαιοῦ ἀποπληροῖ· ἢ γὰρ ἕκτη ἐπὶ παντὸς μέτρου ἀδιάφορον ἔχει τὴν τελευταίαν συλλαβὴν. ἐνίστε δὲ καὶ παλιμβάκχειον καὶ ἀμφίμακρον δέχεται τὸ ἠρωϊκὸν μέτρον, καθαρὸς μέντοι [μὲν cod.] καὶ ἐν τάξει δακτυλικοῦ κειμένους· καθα[ροὶ δ]έ εἰσιν ὅταν ἀπαρτίζωσιν εἰς μέρος λόγου καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς ἔχουσι λέξιν ἀπὸ φωνήεν[τος ἀρχο]μένην. καὶ παλιμβάκχειον μὲν, ὡς τὸ “πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσ[εν]” [α 2]· [ἀμ]φιμακρον δέ, ὡς τὸ “οὐ τί μοι (αἰτίη) ἐσσί, θεοὶ νύ μοι αἰτιοὶ εἰσιν” [Γ 164]. δέχεται καὶ χορεῖον τὸν καὶ τρίβραχυν, καθαρὸν μέντοι καὶ αὐτόν· (fol. 162^v) ὡς τὸ “Νέστορα δ’ οὐκ ἔλαθεν ἰαχὴ [ἢ ἀχῆ cod.] πίνοντά περ ἔμψης” [Ξ 1]. διὰ τὴν λέγεται ἠρωϊκόν; ἐπεὶ οἱ πρῶτοι πρῶτῳ ἐμμέτρῳ χρησάμενοι ἠρώων πράξεις ὑπέθεντο· καὶ Ὀμηρος μετὰ Λίνου καὶ Ὀρφέα τοιοῦτῳ μέτρῳ ἐχρήσατο ἠρώων τὰς ἐπὶ Τροίας [τῆς ἐ. Τ. τὰς cod.] πράξεις διεξιῶν.

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 choree or tribrach can also be found in the hexameter; *Il.* 14. 1 is quoted as an instance. Compare ps.-Draco, pp. 149, 153, and the Anonymus Romanus §3 (ed. zur Jacobsmuehlen ps.-Heph. p. 102).

§6. Περὶ ἐλεγείου. τὸ ἐλεγεῖον μέτρον πεντάμετρον ἐστίν· πέντε γὰρ ἔχει χώρας. τὰς μὲν οὖν δύο συγκειμένας ἕκ τε δακτύλου καὶ σπονδείου· ἐνίστε δὲ καὶ ἀμφίμακρον καὶ παλιμβάκχειον ἐπιδέχεται ἢ πρῶτη καὶ ἢ δευτέρα μόνον, καθαρὸς μέντοι καὶ ἐν τάξει δακτύλου κειμένους. καθαροὶ δὲ εἰσιν ὅταν ἀπαρτίζωνται εἰς μέρος λόγου καὶ (εἰς) φωνήεν ἢ εἰς συλλαβὴν καθαρὰν λήξωσι καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς ἔχωσιν ἀπὸ φωνήεντος ἀρχομένην, [οἶον] ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀμφιμάκρου, ὡς τὸ “οὐ τί μοι αἰτίη ἐσσί” [Γ 164]· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ παλιμβάκχειου, ὡς τὸ “πλάγχθη [πλάγχθη cod.], ἐπεὶ Τροίης” [α 2]. ἢ δὲ τρίτη χώρα σπονδείου

μόνον δέχεται, ἡ δὲ τετάρτη μόνον ἀνάπαιστον, ἡ δὲ πέμπτη ἀνάπαιστον ἢ καὶ χορείον μόνον· ἐπὶ παντὸς γὰρ μέτρου ἀδιάφορός ἐστιν ἡ τελευταία τοῦ στίχου συλλαβή. ἔστι δὲ καὶ οὕτω μετρήσαι· τὸν πρῶτον καὶ τὸν δεύτερον πόδα χρῆ δακτύλον ἢ σπονδεῖον ἐπιζητεῖν ἢ, καθὼς προεῖρηται, ἀμφίμακρον ἢ παλιμβάκκειον θεραπευόμενον καὶ καθαρῶς ἐν τάξει δακτύλου κείμενον· καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἀπαρτισμὸν τῶν δύο τούτων ποδῶν χρῆ συλλαβὴν μακρὰν ἐπιζητεῖν ἀπαρτιζομένην εἰς μέρος λόγου· καὶ μετὰ τὴν συλλαβὴν ἄλλους δύο πόδας ἀπὸ δακτύλου μόνου κειμένους καὶ μετὰ τούτους τοὺς δύο πόδας χρεῶν αὐθις ἐπιζητεῖν συλλαβὴν εἰς τὸ πέρασ τοῦ ἐλεγειακοῦ στίχου [στοιχείου cod.] ἢ μακρὰν ἢ βραχεῖαν, ἐπειδήπερ, καθὼς προεῖρηται, ἐπὶ παντὸς μέτρου ἀδιάφορός ἐστιν ἡ τελευταία τοῦ στίχου συλλαβή. διὰ τί λέγεται ἐλεγείον; διότι ἔλεγχοι ἐλέγοντο οἱ θρηνοὶ οἱ παρὰ τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς [περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς cod.]·

συντίθεται δὲ ἡ λέξις παρὰ [περὶ cod.] τοῦ ε̄, ὃ σημαίνει τὸν ἀνεκφώνητον στεναγμὸν, καὶ τὸ [τοῦ hic vel τὸ altero loco possis legere; in ceteris exemplis similiter haec confunduntur] λέγω· οἱ γὰρ θρηνεῖν ἀρχόμενοι πρῶτον ἀφασίᾳ κατεχόμενοι στεναγμοῖς καταχρῶνται. σημείωσαι ὅτι τὸ ε̄ ψιλὸν δηλωτικόν ἐστι, τὸ δὲ αἰ δίφθογγον τοῦ στεναγμοῦ τοῦ ἐκπεφωνημένου· καὶ διεστάλη ἡ γραφή ἵνα διδαχθῇ δι' αὐτῆς ἡ τούτων διαφορά. ἔτι ποίους μετρᾶται ὁ ἐλεγείος, καὶ πόσαις χώραις περαίνεται; ποσὶ μὲν τῷ δακτύλῳ καὶ τῷ σπονδείῳ, δυσὶ δὲ χώραις καὶ μιᾷ συλλαβῇ· κρεῖττον δὲ εἴ τις ἠρώφ στίχῳ συμπλέκει [hic δ(ιὰ) τ s.l. u.v., unde v.l. διαπλέκει τοὺς deprehendi potest] τοὺς ἐλεγείους, ὡς τὸ “χρῆ πενήνην φεύγοντα καὶ ἐς μεγακῆτεα πόντον ῥίπτειν καὶ πετρῶν Κύρνε κατ' ἠλιβάτων” [Theognidis 175 f.] καὶ τὸ “σήμερον ἀχράντοις(ι) βαλὼν θεοφθεγγεῖ [-φθογγεῖ cod.] πυρσῷ πνεύματος ἐνθάπτει νάμασι ἀμπλακίην” [Joh. Damasc. PG 3. 825].

This section περὶ ἐλεγείου can be found in almost identical form at *App. Dion.* pp. 315 f. The words supplemented by Consbruch at 315. 26 from ps.-Heph., the *Anec. 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 Consbruch, yet plainly germane at this point, as the similar progression on the ἴαμβος in *App. Heph.* shows (pp. 280 f., cf. below on anacreontics). Further confirmation of this supposition comes from the branch of the tradition to which ps.-Heph. belongs, where this extra material recurs verbatim (§7^a; 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 ἔξ ἔει μὲν διὰ τοῦ ἑψιλῶ γράφεται, θαυμαστικὸν ἐπίρρημά ἐστιν, εἰ δὲ διὰ τῆς αἰ̄ διφθόγγου, σχετλιαστικόν. This is another example of the close relation of these two traditions on metrical points.³⁹ Our author then continues with ἔτι ποίους μετρῶται 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 ἀχράντοις(ι) whereas the manuscript printed by Migne has ἀχράντοιο.

§7. Περὶ Ἀνακρεοντείου. τὰ Ἀνακρεόντεια ἐπιδέχονται μὲν αὐτῶν οἱ οἴκοι ἀναπαίστου καὶ δύο ἰάμβους καὶ μίαν περιττὴν συλλαβὴν, οἷον “ἀπὸ τοῦ λίθου τὸ ῥεῖθρον.” τὸ δὲ τούτων κουκουλλίον δέχεται τοὺς ἐξ ἑλάττονος καὶ μείζονος, εἴτουν πυρρίχιον καὶ σπονδεῖον, οἷον “ἀρετῆς εὐστεφάνου ἀνθεα δρέψας.” οὕτω ἐστὶν ὁ στίχος τοῦ Ἀνακρέοντος· ἡ πρώτη χώρα ἐξ ἀναπαίστου· ἡ β' καὶ γ' ἐξ ἰάμβου· ἡ δ' μονοσύλλαβος καὶ ἀδιάφορος· οἷον “ἀπὸ τῆς φίλης ἐρήμου” (Sophronii 5. 1 ed. Gigante). τοῦ δὲ κουκουλλίου αὐτοῦ ἡ α' καὶ γ' καὶ ε' χώρα ἐκ πυρρίχιου, ἡ β' καὶ τετάρτη ἐκ σπονδείου· ἡ δὲ ἕκτη καὶ αὐτὴ ἢ ἐκ σπονδείου ἢ ἐκ τροχαίου, οἷον “Ζαχαρίου μεγάλου πάγκλυτε κοῦρε” (Sophronii 5. 17). ἰστέον ὅτι ἐὰν ἀναπαύηται τὸ κῶλον εἰς τέλειον πόδα, ἀκατάληκτον λέγεται· εἰ δ' ἑλλείπει, καταληκτικὸν ὀνομάζεται. διὰ τί καλεῖται Ἀνακρεόντειον; ὅτι Ἀνακρέων τις πρῶτος τούτῳ ἐχρήσατο.

For this section on anacreontics 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 acatalectic versions follows, which is good old learning but found in none of the three regular recensions. The definition of catalexis and acatalexis 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 Mutitensis II F 4 (s. xv–xvi), which also contains ps.-Hephaestio (cod. Z); but from what zur Jacobsmuehlen 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).⁴¹ The explanation of the name's origin is also in ps.-Heph. (§8^a, 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 ἰαμβικοῦ. τὸ ἰαμβικὸν μέτρον ἐξά/μετρον (fol. 163^r) καὶ τρίμετρον καλεῖται· τρίμετρον μὲν κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς οἵτινες κατὰ τετρασυλλάβους καὶ πεντασυλλάβους καὶ ἐξασυλλάβους πόδας μετροῦσι· διὰ τί καλεῖται ἐξάμετρον; ὅτι χώρας ἕξ ἔχει· εἰς πόσους διαιρεῖται τὸ ἰαμβικὸν μέτρον; εἰς δύο, εἰς τὸ καλούμενον κωμικὸν τε καὶ τραγικόν, ᾧ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν οἱ πολλοὶ κατεχρήσαντο· καὶ εἰς τὸ καλούμενον καθαρὸν τε καὶ τρίμετρον. ποῖόν ἐστὶ τὸ τραγικόν τε καὶ κωμικόν, ὃ δέχεται ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ τρίτῃ καὶ πέμπτῃ χώρα {ἦτοι} πόδας πέντε· δάκτυλον, (σπονδεῖον), χορεῖον, ἀνάπαιστον, καὶ τὸν ὁμώνυμον ἴαμβον, ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ τετάρτῃ τοὺς ἀπὸ βραχείας ἀρχομένους τουτέστι χορεῖον, ἀνάπαιστον, ἴαμβον, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἕκτῃ, ἴαμβον ἢ πυρρήχιον· δεῖ γὰρ πάντως αὐτὴν εἶναι δυσύλλαβον καὶ τὴν πρὸ τέλους ἔχειν βραχείαν. ποῖόν ἐστὶ τὸ καθαρὸν καὶ τρίμετρον, ὅπερ ἐν μὲν ὅλαις ταῖς βάσεσιν ἤγουν ταῖς χώραις (ἤγουν) τῷ ἰάμβῳ χρῆται, ἢ ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ τρίτῃ καὶ πέμπτῃ ἴαμβον ἢ σπονδεῖον ἐπιδέχεται, ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ τῇ τετάρτῃ μόνον τὸν ἴαμβον, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἕκτῃ ἢ ἴαμβον ἢ πυρρήχιον. πόθεν ὠνομάσθη τὸ μέτρον τοῦτο ἰαμβικόν; ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τινός, ἥτις κατὰ τύχην ἐν Ἐλευσίνῃ πρώτη τοῦτο [τὸ τοῦ vel τὸ τοοῦ cod.] ἐξ αὐτομάτου ἐξέφερε τὸν διωθοῦντα πλύνουσαν αὐτὴν καταμωκησαμένη οὕτως εἰποῦσα· “ἄνθρωπ', ἄπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις. ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀκαταθύμιος φαίνῃ, ἔργον δὲ μωρὸν ἐκτελεῖς σκάφην τρέπων.” ἄλλως· ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τινὸς γυναικὸς ὕβριστριάς, ἥτις αἰσχροῦς ὕβρισθεῖσα ἀγχόνῃ [-ώνη cod.] τὸν βίον κατέλυσε, ὡς τὸ Ἀρχιλόχου δηλοῖ ποίημα ὅπερ Λυκαμβίδες καλεῖται. λέγουσι

⁴¹ Castor: C. Walz, *Rhetores 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. κουκούλλιον, writes out this section on anacreontics from “an anonymous MS.” P. Matranga, *Anecdota Graeca* I (Rome 1850; repr. Hildesheim 1971) praef. 30 n. 1 quotes du Cange and adds variant readings from Vat. gr. 97, which may therefore be another copy of our book.

καὶ διὰ τοῦτο συντεθῆναι τὸν ἱάμβον ἀπὸ βραχείας καὶ μακρῶς, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν ὕβριν ἀπὸ βραχείας ἄρχεσθαι τῆς αἰτίας, εἰς μέγα δὲ καταλήγει(ν) κακόν, ὡς καὶ "Ὀμηρὸς φησι περὶ αὐτῆς· "ἦτ' ὀλίγη μὲν πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε [-ιζε cod.] κάρη καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει" [Δ 442-43].

We come at last to the section that most concerns us here. The beginning of these remarks περὶ 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 Iambe who hanged herself αἰσχρῶς ὕβρισθεῖσα was also an ὕβριστρία; 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 αἱ Λυκαμβίδες ἐπὶ τοῖς Ἀρχιλόχου ποιήμασι, this detail may be regarded as a mistake like ἐν Ἐλευσίνι; but it is a rather odd mistake. Perhaps it arises from misreading the source as something like αἱ 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 Iambe.
- B. People wanting to "insult" (ιαμβίζειν) others used this metre.
- C. From the Iambe who abused Hipponax.
- D. The name come from ἰὸν βάζειν (quotation of Callimachus).
- E. From the Iambe who was so disgraced that she hanged herself, like the Lykambids in Archilochus' poem.
- F. Iambs are made up of a short and a long because *hybris* 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 Choeroboscus is not the source of the rest. By "preamble" I mean the part of the section preceding the etymology.

	preamble	A	B	C	D	E	F
Choeroboscus p. 214		x	x	x ⁴²			
MS Pal. 356	x			x		x	x
<i>App. Heph.</i> p. 280	x		x		x	x	x
<i>App. Heph.</i> p. 299		x	x	x	x	x ⁴³	

⁴² B is conflated with D and cited after C.

⁴³ Cited in order A, E (without mention of Archilochus), C, B, D.

<i>App. Dion.</i> p. 310	x	x	x	x	x
"Dionysius" <i>περὶ ποδῶν</i> (<i>App. Dion.</i> p. 333, <i>AV</i> 160)	x ⁴⁴				
<i>App. Rhet.</i> p. 342	x				
Ambros. Q 5 sup. (<i>AV</i> 153)		x	x	x	x
Helias (<i>AV</i> 170)	x	x	x	x	x
Marc. gr. 483 (<i>AV</i> 196)	x	x	x	x ⁴⁵	
Anec. Chis. (<i>AV</i> 206)		x	x	x ⁴⁶	
Anec. Chis. (<i>AV</i> 208)		x	x		
Anon. Ambros. (<i>AV</i> 223; Nauck, <i>Lex. Vind.</i> 255)		x	x	x	x ⁴⁷
ps.-Heph. §1 ^b				x	
ps.-Heph. §6	x				
ps.-Heph. §40	x				
ps.-Heph. §37	x	x		x ⁴⁸	
Anon. Rom. §6 (ps.-Heph. p. 105)	x			x ⁴⁹	x
Isaac, pp. 187-89	x	x	x	x	x ⁵⁰
Trichas, p. 366	x		x	x	x ⁵¹
Tract. Harl. §17		x	x	x ⁵²	
Tract. Harl. §18	x				
Tract. Urb. App. §2, p. 60		x	x	x	x ⁵³
Tract. Urb. App. §6, p. 79	x				
Tract. Urb. App. §8, p. 84	x				
"Nicetas" <i>De metris</i> (Tract. Urb. p. 107)	x	x		x	
Id. p. 111	x	x	x	x	x ⁵⁴

⁴⁴ This author also has the explanation (which is no explanation at all) ὅτι ἐν διπλασίονι (ἐνδιπλασίονος; 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 *ἰάπτειν*), C, E, D (with quotation of Callimachus), B more briefly (this time reporting the equation *ἰαμβίζειν* = *λοιδορεῖν*).

⁴⁸ Without mention of Archilochus.

⁴⁹ Without mention of Archilochus.

⁵⁰ Cited in order C (without mentioning Hipponax; this citation 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. ἔτι περὶ τοῦ δακτυλικοῦ μέτρον. τὸ δακτυλικὸν μέτρον ἐπιδέχεται πόδας β', τὸν δάκτυλον καὶ τὴν συναίρεσιν τοῦ δακτύλου· λέγω δὴ τὸν σπονδεῖον. δοκεῖ δὲ ἐπὶ τέλει τὸν τροχαιὸν ἐπιδέχεσθαι· τὸ δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἔχει, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ τροχαιὸς δάκτυλος ἑλλείπων μιᾷ συλλαβῇ τῇ τελευταίᾳ.

These remarks recur in this form at ps.-Heph. §11^a, 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' ἑλλειψιν· κατὰ μέγεθος τὸ λεγόμενον μακροκέφαλον καὶ τὸ προκοίλιον καὶ τὸ μακροσκελές. καὶ μακροκέφαλον μὲν, ὅταν πλεονάζῃ συλλαβὴ κατ' ἀρχὴν καὶ συναίρεσις γίνηται [γίνεται cod.] δύο συλλαβῶν εἰς μίαν, ὡς ἐν τῷ "χρυσέφ' ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ" [A 15, 374]. προκοίλιον, ὅταν τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο κατὰ τὸ μέσον πάθη, ὡς ἐν τῷ "ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ, Πηλέως υἱέ" [Π 21, alibi]. μακροσκελές δέ, ὅταν συλλαβὴ κατὰ τὸ τέλος πλεονάζῃ, ὡς ἐν τῷ "ἀλλ' ὅτε Σούνιον ἱρὸν ἀφικόμεθ' ἄκρον Ἀθηνέων" [γ 278; ἱερὸν εἰ Ἀθηναίων cod.]. τὰ δὲ κατ' ἑλλειψιν, ὡς τὸ λεγόμενον ἀκέφαλον (τό τε) λαγαρὸν καὶ τὸ μείουρον. ἀκέφαλον μὲν, τὸ ἑλλείπον χρόνῳ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν, ὡς ἐν τούτῳ "ἐπειδὴ νῆάς τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἵκοντο" [Ψ 2]. λαγαρὸν δὲ τὸ ἑλλείπον χρόνῳ κατὰ τὸ μέσον, ὡς ἐν τῷ "βῆν εἰς [βινεῖς cod. (!)] Αἰόλου κλυτὰ δώματα [δόμενα cod.]" [κ 60]. τὸ γὰρ ὁ οὐ δύναται μακρὰν ποιεῖν συλλαβὴν, ἐπειδὴ μὴ ἀπήρτισται εἰς μέρος λόγου. τὸ δὲ ἑλλείπον χρόνῳ κατὰ τὸ τέλος μείουρον λέγεται, ὡς ἐν τῷ "Τρῶες δ' ἐρρίγησαν, ὅπως ἴδον αἰόλον ὄφιν" [M 208].

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

§11. (fol. 163^v) τομαί εἰσι τέσσαρες [debut pέντε], πενθιμιμερής, ἐφθιμιμερής [-ές bis cod.], τρίτη τροχαική, καὶ τετάρτη, καὶ βουκολική. πενθιμιμερές ἐστίν, ὅταν μετὰ δύο πόδας εὐρεθῇ συλλαβὴ ἀπαρτίζουσα εἰς μέρος λόγου, οἷον "μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος" [A 1]. ἐφθιμιμερές δὲ ἐστίν, ὅταν μετὰ τρεῖς πόδας εὐρεθῇ συλλαβὴ ἀπαρτίζουσα εἰς μέρος λόγου, οἷον "τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς" [A 84, alibi]. τρίτη τροχαική ἐστίν, ὅταν ὁ δεῦτερος πούς εὐρεθῇ τροχαιὸς καὶ ἀπαρτίζῃ [-ει cod.] εἰς μέρος λόγου

τέλειον, οἷον "πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς "Αἶδι προΐαψεν" [A 3]. τετάρτη τροχαϊκή, ὅταν ὁ γ' πὸς εὐρεθῆ τροχαῖος εἰς τέλειον μέρος λόγου ἀπαρτίζων, οἷον "Τρώων ῥῆξε [ἔρρηξε cod.] φάλαγγα, φῶς δ' ἐτάροισιν ἔθηκεν" [Z 6]. βουκολική δέ, ὅταν μετὰ τέσσαρας πόδας εὐρεθῆ συλλαβὴ ἀπαρτίζουσα εἰς μέρος λόγου τέλειον, οἷον "Ζεὺς μὲν που τό γε οἶδε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι" [Γ 308]. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἕτερα βουκολική, ἣ τὰ βουκολικὰ συνεγράψαν.

This section on the *τομαί* 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).⁵⁵ 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 penthemimeral, the hepthemimeral, 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) τροχαϊκή, 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 τροχαϊκή. (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, ἔκφρασις, 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.⁵⁶

University of Waterloo

⁵⁶ I am grateful to Professor Dr. Herwig Görgemanns for useful comments and assistance. He takes less offence than I do at ἀκαταθύμιος in line 2 (citing formations such as ἀπαράμυθος in PV 185 and ἀσυννέτημι in Alcaeus fr. 208a 1 Voigt). If it is sound, a lacuna < x > may be supposed after μὲν to fill out the line. With respect to the μὲν . . . δέ 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 (μὲν) thinks of his approaches, and then what he (δέ) is about to do through his clumsiness.