still quarrelling over the will, however, underlines how little control in the end public administrators held over private interests.

University of Memphis CHERYL ANNE COX
cacox@memphis.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000717

GALLIAMBICS BY CALLIMACHUS

Two lines in the galliambic metre, quoted anonymously by the second century metrician Hephaestion (p. 39.1–2 Consbruch), have been tentatively ascribed to Callimachus (= fr.761 inc. auct. Pf) on the strength of a passage in the Byzantine grammarian George Choeroboscus (p. 246.4–5 C). Both the integrity of the text of Hephaestion, and the ascription to Callimachus, have been impugned by David Mulroy,[1] and his arguments have been accepted by E. Courtney and D. F. S. Thomson[2] (and perhaps others). The arguments for so doing are quite ill-founded, but in order to demonstrate this it will be necessary to set forth the evidence in detail. In so doing I hope to prove Hephaestion's text to be for the most part sound, and make a stronger case for the ascription of the two galliambic lines to Callimachus.

Hephaestion p. 38.6–39.2 Consbruch discusses the galliambic metre, in the context of its derivation from the ionic *a minore*:

Τῶν δὲ ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ μεγεθῶν τὸ μὲν ἐπισημότατόν ἐστι τὸ τετράμετρον καταληκτικόν, οἷόν ἐστι τὸ Φρυνίχου τοῦ τραγικοῦ τουτί (fr.14 *TGrF*)

τό γε μὴν ξείνια δούσαις, λόγος ὥσπερ λέγεται,
ὀλέσαι, κἀποτεμεῖν ὀξέι χαλκῷ κεφαλάν

καὶ παρὰ Φρυνίχῳ τῷ κωμικῷ (fr.76 *PCG*)

ἆ δ' ἀνάγκα' σθ' ἱερεῦσιν καθαρεύειν φράσομεν·

τοῦτο μέντοι καὶ γαλλιαμβικὸν καὶ μητρῳακὸν [καὶ ἀνακλώμενον] καλεῖται — ὕστερον δὲ <καὶ> ἀνακλώμενον ἐκλήθη — διὰ τὸ πολλὰ τοὺς νεωτέρους εἰς τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν γράψαι τούτῳ τῷ μέτρῳ (ἐν οἷς καὶ τὰ τοὺς τρίτους παιῶνας ἔχοντα καὶ παλιμβάκχειον καὶ τὰς τροχαικὰς ἀδιαφόρως παραλαμβάνουσι πρὸς τὰ καθαρά), ὡς καὶ τὰ πολυθρύλητα ταῦτα παραδείγματα δηλοῖ (Call. fr.761 inc. auct. Pf.)

Γάλλαι μητρὸς ὀρείης φιλόθυρσοι δρομάδες
αἷς ἔντεα παταγεῖται καὶ χάλκεα κρόταλα

Of the line-lengths in the (ionic a minore) metre, the most notable is the catalectic tetrameter, such as this one by the tragic poet Phrynichus:

˘ ˘ – – ˘˘ – – ˘ ˘ – – ˘˘ –
τό γε μὴν ξείνια δούσαις, λόγος ὥσπερ λέγεται,

˘ ˘ – – ˘ ˘ – – ˘˘ – – ˘ ˘ –
ὀλέσαι, κἀποτεμεῖν ὀξέι χαλκῷ κεφαλάν

and in the comic poet Phrynichus:

˘ ˘ – – ˘˘ – – ˘ ˘ – – ˘ ˘ –
ἆ δ' ἀνάγκα' σθ' ἱερεῦσιν καθαρεῦειν φράσομεν·

[1] D. Mulroy, 'Hephaestion and Catullus 63', *Phoenix* 30 (1976), 61–72.
[2] E. Courtney, 'Three poems by Catullus' *BICS* 32 (1985), 90–1; D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus: Edited with a Textual and Interpretive Commentary* (Toronto, 1997), 375.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now this is called both galliambic and metroiac—and later it was called anaclomenon <as well>—because later poets wrote many (poems) to the mother of the gods in this metre (in which in addition to the pure (ionic *a minore* metra) they also use the (ionic *a minore* metra) containing third paeons and the palimbaccheus and the trochaic (syzygies) indifferently), as these often repeated examples too make plain:

Γάλλαι μητρὸς ὀρείης φιλόθυρσοι δρομάδες
αἷς ἔντεα παταγεῖται καὶ χάλκεα κρόταλα.

The difficulty in interpreting the Hephaestion passage, which has been subject to several attempts at emendation, is this: the lines quoted by Hephaestion do not seem (so it is claimed) to be a very good illustration of the type of metre he has just been discussing. Before proceeding, brief mention of his terminology is needed. In the parenthesis above he characterises the galliambic as follows: 'This metre is called galliambic . . . in which they use the third paeon (⏑⏑ – ⏑) and palimbaccheus (– – ⏑) and the trochaic (syzygy) (– ⏑ – –) indifferently in addition to the pure [ionic *a minore*] (⏑⏑ – –).'[3] On the face of it indeed looks as if these two lines are poorly chosen; neither of them seems to provide us with a third paeon, palimbaccheus, or trochaic syzygy. The scholia (p.148 Consbruch) suggest that in the second line we have two molossi through synizesis in *ἔντεα* and *χάλκεα*, thus giving the first half of the second line a similar metrical shape to the first, i.e. – – – ⏑ ⏑ – –| – – – ⏑ ⏑ –.[4] There is nothing whatsoever to recommend this guess. Likewise the statement of van Ophuijsen[5] that both syllables might be scanned as one short syllable with synizesis is highly unlikely (the result would give us a palimbaccheus, but we are still left with much that wants clarification).

The answer is in fact ready to hand, and seems not to have been noticed because nobody has bothered to pay particular attention to the beginning of Hephaestion's chapter on ionics *a minore* (of which he regards the galliambic to be a type).[6] The relevant passage needs to be quoted in full (p. 37.10–21 Consbruch):

τὸ δὲ ἀπ' ἐλάσσονος ἰωνικὸν συντίθεται μὲν καὶ καθαρόν, συντίθεται δὲ καὶ ἐπίμικτον πρὸς τὰς τροχαικὰς [διποδίας] οὕτως, ὥστε τὴν πρὸ τῆς τροχαικῆς ἀεὶ γίνεσθαι πεντάσημον, τουτέστι τρίτην παιωνικήν, καὶ τὴν τροχαικήν, ὁπόταν προτάττοιτο τῆς ἰωνικῆς, γίνεσθαι ἑπτάσημον [τροχαικήν], τὸν καλούμενον δεύτερον ἐπίτριτον· ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ ἡ μὲν τρίτη παιωνικὴ συναιρεῖται εἰς παλιμβάκχειον, τῆς δὲ ἐπιφερομένης τροχαικῆς ὁ πρότερος λύεται εἰς τρίβραχυν· ἐμπίπτουσι δὲ καὶ οἱ μολοττοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν περιττῶν χωρῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀπ' ἐλάσσονος ἰωνικοῖς, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ μείζονος ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρτίων.

The ionic *a minore* is composed both pure (i.e. ⏑ ⏑ – –), and admixed to the trochaic (a trochaic syzygy – ⏑ – –) in such a way that the (ionic syzygy) before the trochaic (syzygy) always becomes a (syzygy) of five time units,[7] a so-called third paeon (⏑ ⏑ – ⏑), and that the trochaic (syzygy), whenever it is placed before the ionic (syzygy), becomes a (syzygy) of seven time units, the so-called second epitrite (– ⏑ – –). But sometimes the third paeon is contracted into a palimbaccheus (– – ⏑) and the first foot of the trochaic (syzygy) following it (– ⏑) is resolved into

[3] I deal with *ἀνακλώμενον* below.

[4] *τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ὁμοίως τῷ πρώτῳ μολοττόν, κατὰ συνίζησις τῶν δύο βραχειῶν, τῶν μετὰ τὰς δύο μακράς, εἰς μίαν λαμβανομένων· αἷς ἔντεα, αἷς ἔντη· ὁμοίως καὶ ἐν τῷ χάλκεα χάλκη.* Mulroy (n. 1), 67, who 'tacitly' accepts the scholiast's statement, falls into great confusion at this point.

[5] *Hephaestion on Metre* (Leiden, 1987), 113. Elsewhere in this article translations of Hephaestion are adapted from him.

[6] So in West's modern handbook (*Greek Metre* [Oxford, 1983], 145) the discussion of galliambics follows that of ionics *a minore*.

[7] One short = one time unit, one long = two time units.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a tribrach (˘ ˘ ˘); also the molossi (– – –) fall in at the odd-numbered places in the ionic *a minore*, just as they do at the even numbered in the *a maiore*.

Now the first line of Call. fr.761 does not present too many difficulties: in the first foot the initial double short of the ionic *a minore* is contracted, giving us a molossus in an odd-numbered place in the line. The second line is a bit more complex: Hephaestion says (p. 38.16–18) that not only do we find galliambics composed from 'pure' ionics *a minore*, but that we find lines where a second epitrite is preceded by a third paeon,[8] which would look like ˘ ˘ – ˘ | – ˘ – –. But he has previously told us (p. 37.10–21) that sometimes the third paeon is contracted into a palimbaccheus, and that the first foot of the trochaic syzygy following it is resolved into a tribrach, which would look like this: – – ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ – –. And this is exactly the shape of line two of the passage he quotes. And furthermore in the passage introducing these two lines, so often tinkered with by editors,[9] he makes this clear, but only in the light of the opening remarks of the chapter. We have a palimbaccheus which was formed from the contraction of a third paeon, and following it we have that form of trochaic syzygy which he earlier called the second epitrite, with the initial foot resolved creating a tribrach following the palimbaccheus. Furthermore, the resulting line is indeed anaclastic (*ἀνακλώμενον*) in the sense that ancient metricians use the term,[10] because the resulting palimbaccheus (– – ˘) is pentachronic, as where a foot of 'pure' ionics *a minore* is hexachronic, and the compensating trochaic syzygy that follows (whether the first foot is resolved into a tribrach or not) is heptachronic.[11] There is no discord with the metre he describes and the example he quotes.[12] Furthermore, it is evident that Hephaestion regards the galliambic as a form of catalectic tetrameters,[13] since his discussion of the metre follows directly from that of catalectic tetrameters. Indeed it is obvious that he regards the examples he had just quoted as a form of ('pure') galliambics, since immediately following the quotation of Phryn. Com. (76 *PCG*) he says *τοῦτο μέντοι καὶ γαλλιαμβικὸν κτλ.*, which obviously looks back to the passages just quoted and not forward to the next passage (Call. fr.761).[14]

This solves one problem, but leaves us with another, because it has been argued by Mulroy, and accepted by Thomson and Courtney, that the two galliambic lines quoted by Hephaestion are not by Callimachus. The lines are anonymous in Hephaestion, and the ascription to Callimachus rests on the following passage from Choeroboscus (p. 245.26–246.7 Consbruch):

[8] For these and other terms see Hephaestion ch. 3 *περὶ ποδῶν* (p.10–12 C) with van Ophuijsen (n. 5), 53–4.

[9] Or deleted wholesale, as Mulroy wished to do.

[10] In ancient metrical scholarship the term *ἀνακλώμενον* is used exclusively of ionics *a minore*. Cf. Marius Victorinus *GLK* 6.93–6. 7.

[11] That the lines are not anaclastic (*ἀνακλώμενον*) is one of Mulroy's main arguments for deleting the passage. It must be said that even Wilamowitz did not recognize that line two was anaclastic in the ancient sense ('Die Galliamben des Kallimachos und Catullus', *Hermes* 14 [1879], 196).

[12] Note that in Catullus 63.1 we have, following Hephaestion's terminology, a third paeon followed by a second epitrite, and as the paeon is not contracted into a palimbaccheus, the first foot of the epitrite (trochaic syzygy) is not resolved into a tribrach. In 63.5 on the other hand, the line starts with a palimbaccheus, and just as we should expect, the following trochaic syzygy has its first foot resolved into a tribrach. Hephaestion's description is as suited to Catullus as it is to the two lines he quotes.

[13] Cf. the classification of galliambics by West (n. 6 , 145) as a dimeter and catalectic dimeter.

[14] Further suggested by the lack of connective particle after *τοῦτο*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ἰστέον ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ ἀπ᾽ ἐλάσσονος ἰωνικὸν λέγεται ἀνακλώμενον καὶ μητρῳακὸν καὶ γαλλιαμβικὸν ἀπὸ τοὺς Γάλλους, ὅ ἐστι τοὺς κιναίδους, ἰαμβίζειν καὶ ὑμνεῖν τὴν Ῥέαν κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ μητρῳακόν. ἴσως δὲ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀνακλώμενον διὰ τὴν κλάσιν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶν καὶ ἁπαλότητα. ᾧ καὶ Καλλίμαχος κέχρηται. ἔστι δὲ ἀταξία πολλὴ ἐν τῇ χρήσει [ποιήσει Wilamowitz] *ὧν παραφέρει χρήσεων καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ποσί.*

Note that this ionic *a minore* is called anaclomenon, metroiac, and galliambic from the Galli, that is the pathics, lampooning and singing hymns for Rhea in the Agora; for this reason it is also called metroiac. And perhaps for this reason it is called anaclomenon, on account of the sound of their voices and their effeminacy; and Callimachus uses the metre. There is much disorder in the composition of the examples he (Hephaestion) adduces, particularly in the first feet.

Schneider in his edition of Callimachus suggested the possibility that the lines are by Callimachus, but it was Wilamowitz who first argued it fully,[15] and though later modifying his views somewhat, he maintained the good chance of Callimachean authorship.[16] Pfeiffer did not commit himself on the question; Martin West seems to be in favour of an ascription to Callimachus.[17] Mulroy however maintains that a phrase in Choeroboscus indicates that Callimachus cannot be the author. The phrase is *ᾧ καὶ Καλλίμαχος κέχρηται*, which has been interpreted as meaning that Callimachus uses the metre *as well* (that is, in addition to the passage cited). The first question to ask is where would Choeroboscus have got such information? Obviously from a text of Hephaestion, and from nowhere else. Choeroboscus, who had long been placed in the sixth century for want of better evidence, can now firmly be placed in the late eighth/early ninth century.[18] He can thus be seen as a lesser figure in that cultural awakening that is associated with men such as Photius and Arethas. It also means that he would not have had that many books. Certainly he had access to texts that have not come down to us (though thanks to papyri we have much that was not available to him). What would be extraordinary is if he had access to lyric poetry, and particularly a collection that contained lyric poetry by Callimachus in any form. That he did not should be suggested by the fact that in the few places in his lengthy commentary where he does cite or betray knowledge of a text that is not preserved either in Hephaestion as we have him, or in the scholia to Hephaestion—and indeed the fragments found solely in the scholia to Hephaestion are surely derived from a fuller version of his handbook—in these few places the texts he quotes almost certainly derive from Hephaestion or the scholia. A few examples will suffice. At p. 179.6 Consbruch Choeroboscus cites line 638 of Ar. *Nub*; now this is not to be found in Hephaestion, but is quoted by 'Longinus' (third century A.D.) in his prologue to Hephaestion's handbook (p. 83.21 Consbruch). Most probably this line was taken from a fuller version of Hephaestion.[19] There is evidence elsewhere that the scholia that have come down to us with Hephaestion were in some instances based on a fuller

[15] Wilamowitz (n. 11), 194–201.

[16] 'Neues von Kallimachos', *SB Berl. Akad.* (1912), 542; *Hellenische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* (Berlin, 1924), 2.295.

[17] West (n. 6), 145, n. 20.

[18] C. Theodoridis, 'Der Hymnograph Klemens terminus post quem fur Choiroboskos', *BZ* 73 (1980), 341–5; cf. A. Dyck *Epimerismi Homerici* (Berlin–New York, 1983), 1.5–7; F. Montanari's article in *Der neue Pauly* s.v. Choiroboskos; N. G. Wilson *Scholars of Byzantium* (London, 1983), 69–74.

[19] By fuller version I mean either an unabridged (or not so fully abridged) version of the handbook we have, or a copy of the handbook as we have it but with fuller quotations (for lemmata cited by metricians were much more susceptible to corruption and omission than the text). See further Postscript.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

version of his text than is preserved in our MSS. For example, at p. 68.19 the treatise περὶ ποιήματων quotes lines 1–3 of Anacreon fr. 348 *PMG*, and following the quotation we find the words καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. The scholia to this passage however give us a full eight lines; it seems obvious that either these extra lines were omitted in the *Encheiridion* by the author himself in an abridgement, or were left out by a scribe who then wrote καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. That they are preserved by ΣA indicates that the scholiast had access to a fuller version of Hephaestion. A particularly good example is Alcaeus fr. 308 LP: Hephaestion (p. 44.6 Cons.) gives us only line 1, as do ΣA (p. 170.2 Cons.). Choeroboscus however gives lines 1–4, that is an entire Sapphic stanza. There is little doubt that the whole stanza once stood in Hephaestion, and that this is what Choeroboscus found in his text.

This is all to illustrate two points, first, that it would be highly surprising for Choeroboscus to tell us anything of value that he did not derive directly from his texts of Hephaestion or their scholia, and second, that even in the early ninth century he had access to texts of Hephaestion and their scholia that were in some instances a good deal fuller than our MSS.[20]

Now to return to the disputed passage in Choeroboscus, it might have been a problem if Choeroboscus had quoted the two lines in question and then said ᾧ καὶ Καλλίμαχος κέχρηται. But this he does not do; he describes the metre, a description derived entirely from Hephaestion, and then says 'and Callimachus uses the metre'. He then goes on to say that in the examples Hephaestion adduces there is great disorder (ἀταξία). The obvious inference from this is not that the lines were corrupt in his exemplar (the lines are in fact remarkably uncorrupt in our MSS), but that he simply didn't understand the metrical structure of the lines.[21] He therefore did not quote the lines (indeed he often doesn't quote lemmata to illustrate the metre under discussion), but simply gave the name of a poet who composed in the metre, a name that he found in his text.[22] So why is the name not in our texts? To answer this we need to look at Hephaestion again. The anonymous lines are introduced with the words ὡς καὶ τὸ πολυθρύλητα ταῦτα παραδείγματα δηλοῖ. This is an odd way for Hephaestion to introduce a lemma, and here Mulroy was right to suspect that something might be amiss. Both πολυθρύλητα and παραδείγματα rarely turn up in Hephaestion, though the latter is quite common in Choeroboscus (cf. p. 224.4, 19 C) and the B Scholia (e.g. p. 275.5 C) when introducing lemmata. Both words however occur in the next chapter of Hephaestion (p. 40.17–18), which might well have been lower on the same folio or opposite it on the next of an exemplar. In this later passage in Hephaestion they are however not used in apposition, but πολυθρύλητα is used of a paeonic tetrameter, and clearly means that the metre is 'often cited' and not that the specific example is famous, while παραδείγματα introduces a lemma from Aristophanes. I expect that παραδείγματα in 38.19–20 is most likely an intrusion, perhaps from the next section of Hephaestion, though its use by later writers would explain how a scribe came to add it. What probably happened is that an original ascription παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ was abbreviated to παρὰ Καλλ. (as often happened), and that παραδείγματα was later written either as a 'correction' of some reading like παρακαλλ, or through parablepsy with παραδείγματα a bit later on. Perhaps πολυθρύλητα as well is an intrusion, and the original text read simply ὡς καὶ παρὰ

[20] See Postscript, and Wilson (n. 18), 73.

[21] Elsewhere Choeroboscus betrays a less than perfect understanding of metre.

[22] καί is a standard way of introducing an author's name or anonymous example in both Hephaestion and Choeroboscus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Καλλιμάχῳ. Whatever the exact form of the sentence, Choeroboscus certainly read *παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ* or *παρὰ Καλλ.* in his text. This is much more likely than Choeroboscus being able to provide independent attestation for the use of galliambics by an author who was at the time mainly known as the author of a few epigrams and hexameter hymns (if even that).

POSTSCRIPT

It would be worthwhile to mention here a few points about Choeroboscus' work on Hephaestion,[23] as there is little written on it, and what little there is seems often to be unknown to those who discuss him. His date was mentioned above, along with the implications of this date for access to poetic texts. What type of work was this? It is often referred to as a Commentary, or even as scholia. Both these terms are misleading; it is designated in the MSS as *σχόλια σὺν θεῷ τῶν μέτρων ἀπὸ φωνῆς κτλ*. Likewise his commentary on the *Canones* of Theodosius is designated in the MSS as *ἀπὸ φωνῆς*. The meaning of this phrase, at least at the time of Choeroboscus' activity, has been shown[24] to mean that a work so headed was copied down, not to the express dictation of someone, but in a course of lectures or classes.[25] Perhaps (as Wilson suggests) we are to imagine that every word of Choeroboscus was diligently taken down by a pupil or pupils and subsequently transcribed into MSS containing Hephaestion. Or perhaps the work that goes under his name is more of an amalgam, where his lecture notes form the base of the text, with a reasonable amount of augmentation by his pupils (this might account for the differences in the lemmata from Hephaestion contained in different MSS).[26] Whatever the exact process that brought Choeroboscus' words to parchment, we must bear in mind that he did not diligently write a commentary, such as, for example, Eustathius did on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, or annotate a text of Hephaestion with extensive marginal scholia.

To return to the sources used by Choeroboscus, and particularly his copies of Hephaestion, it was noted above that in most cases where he preserves fragments of poetry not to be found in either Hephaestion or the other scholia to the *Enchiridion*, these quotations were most likely taken from a fuller version of Hephaestion. Mulroy has cast aspersions on the statement that the work we have by Hephaestion is an abridgement or epitome of a much fuller version, saying that this conclusion has only been arrived at by emendation.[27] The relevant passage is Choeroboscus p.181. 10 C:

Ἰστέον δ' ὅτι [οὗτος ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος] πρῶτον ἐποίησε περὶ μέτρων μη' βιβλία, εἶθ' ὕστερον ἐπέτεμεν αὐτὰ εἰς ἕνδεκα, εἶτα πάλιν εἰς τρία, εἶτα πλέον εἰς ἕν, τοῦτο τὸ ἐγχειρίδιον.

Note that first he composed a work on metre in forty-eight books, and later he abridged it to eleven books, then again to three, and further to one, which is the *Enchiridion*.

The only emendation worthy of note is Rossbach's deletion of the words *οὗτος ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος*, which is obviously an interpolation. As for the size of Hephaestion's original work, one might indeed question the number forty-eight, as there is no other independent evidence to corroborate it. However, that Choeroboscus had access to an

[23] See the judicious account by Wilson (n. 18), 72–3.
[24] M. Richard, '*ἀπὸ φωνῆς*', *Byzantion* 20 (1950), 202–4.
[25] Cf. Wilson (n. 18), 70–1.
[26] Compare the guide to syntax by Michael Syncellus, discussed by Wilson (n. 18), 76–7. Admittedly the MSS of Choeroboscus do not show the same degree of variation as do Syncellus'.
[27] 'Bold textual emendations' are the words of Mulroy (n. 1), 66.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

eleven-book version of Hephaestion seems highly likely. Elsewhere he makes explicit reference to it, at p. 246.15 C: *ὡς ἐν τοῖς κατὰ πλάτος εἰρημένοις αὐτοῦ ἕνδεκα βιβλίοις φησί*.[28] This obviously refers to a fuller version of the same work, a version that he had access to and which doubtless contained most if not all of the poetic texts that Choeroboscus uniquely preserves.[29]

In the period when Choeroboscus was working there is very little evidence of poetic texts being read. Though in one place Choeroboscus seems to indicate that students at the time were reading Homer and other poetry, there is no direct evidence for what this other poetry might be. However, we should expect that lyric was not an area he would expect his students to turn to—at best a bit of Homer, tragedy, and comedy.[30] Indeed Choeroboscus explicitly states that the value of studying Hephaestion is for those interested in verse composition.[31] And it is unlikely that the forays made into verse composition at this point extended beyond hexameters, elegiacs, iambics and the occasional Anacreontic.[32] Indeed Choeroboscus, for all his familiarity with Hephaestion, is capable of making bad mistakes, such as in his discussion of the choliambic (p. 193.12–14), and of synizesis (p. 210.13). Thus it is quite probable that had Choeroboscus had access to other verse texts (even such fragments as are preserved in Theodosius' *Canones*) he might well have been unable to identify their metre in any case beyond the few metres that were still practised in the middle Byzantine period.[33]

Keble College, Oxford ALEXANDER DALE
alexander.dale@keble.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000729

[28] Cf. Wilson (n. 18), 73.

[29] A modification of the suggestion mentioned above regarding the corruption of an ascription to Callimachus is that in the *Enchiridion* available to Choeroboscus the text already stood as we have it, but that the ascription to Callimachus was explicit in the eleven-book edition he had access to.

[30] For the texts read at this time see Wilson (n. 18), 61–78. We remember that Photius did not include any classical poetry in the *Bibliotheca*.

[31] P. 180.16 C; cf. Wilson (n. 18), 72–3.

[32] The case of Ignatius the deacon mentioned by Wilson (n. 18), 73, who claims to have been introduced to 'trimeters, tetrameters, trochees, and anapaests' by his master the patriarch Tarasius (d. 806), should not be regarded as evidence for a general milieu in which verse texts were studied and imitated, but as an example of an otherwise rare appetite for an aspect of classical civilization that was for the most part forgotten at this point in history. We should remember that the last man who seems to have been capable of writing iambics that observe the rules of classical prosody, George of Pisidia, had been dead for some hundred years. For Anacreontics at this period see West (n. 6), 169.

[33] I would like to thank Dr Armand D'Angour for reading and commenting on a draft of this note.

VIRGIL AND THE *ASTYANAX* OF ACCIUS

The influence of Greek and Roman tragedy on the *Aeneid* has been largely recognized throughout the twentieth century.[1] Scholars took interest mainly, on the one

[1] The only thorough (but as yet incomplete) work is A. König, *Die Aeneis und die griechische Tragödie. Studien zur imitatio-Technik Vergils* (Diss., Berlin, 1970). Cf. at least, among the others:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000729 Published online by Cambridge University Press