

Demetrius Triclinius and Responsion between Non-consecutive Strophes in Greek Drama

Almut Fries

Introduction

Demetrius Triclinius, who was active in Thessalonica in the first third of the fourteenth century,¹ is well known as the most accomplished Byzantine metrician and the first scholar since the end of antiquity to understand the principle of strophic responsion in Pindar and the lyrics of Greek drama. Armed with this knowledge, he emended and annotated the texts of the tragedians, Aristophanes, and Pindar in a series of editions, some of which became the vulgate for several centuries.

The principal source of Triclinius' metrical expertise was Hephaestion's *Encheiridion* (II A.D.), equipped with scholia as well as the commentaries of Longinus and Choeroboscus. His personal copy of these and other works on metre survives as the codex *Marc.gr.* 483.² In addition, Triclinius used the old metrical scholia on Pindar and Aristophanes, of which the latter largely go back to another distinguished ancient metrician, Heliodorus, who certainly preceded Hephaestion (who quotes him) and has variously been dated to the first century B.C. or, more often, the first century A.D.³

¹ Very little is known about his life, not even the years of his birth and/or death, although from the dates of his scholarly output (see below), ca. 1280 to 1335 is a reasonable guess. For a concise account of Triclinius' career see N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*² (London 1996) 249–256.

² Described in E. Mioni, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum. Codices Graeci Manuscripti II Thesaurus Antiquus. Codices 300–625* (Rome 1985) 289–291.

³ See briefly L. P. E. Parker, *The Songs of Aristophanes* (Oxford 1997) 95–96, with further literature, especially O. Hense, *Heliodoreische Untersuchungen*

Present-day appreciation of Triclinius' abilities is mixed. While the pioneering status of much of his work is recognised, one cannot fail to notice that his understanding of rhythm and colometry was limited (by ancient as well as modern standards) and many of his analyses and textual interventions are therefore flawed. Nevertheless, his successive recensions of the Greek dramatists show that he improved as a metrician,⁴ and further proof of this lies in his treatment of non-consecutive responding stanzas in tragedy and Aristophanes. Here we can see a clear difference between Triclinius' early work and the mature editions of his later years and explain how and when the development took place. It appears that Triclinius learnt about separated responsion from the old metrical scholia on Aristophanes (which often comment on the phenomenon) when he studied them more deeply in preparation for his monumental final Aristophanes edition of the mid- to late 1320s.

In the absence of external evidence, Triclinius' scholarly career has to be reconstructed from the dates, exact or approximate, of his extant autographs and internal criteria relating to his script and cross-references between his commentaries. Two manuscripts written by him in full are signed and dated, a copy of Aphthonius and Hermogenes (*Oxford, New College* 258) to August 1308, and his edition of Hesiod (*Marc.gr.* 464) to both

(Leipzig 1870) and "Heliodorus," *RE* 8 (1912) 28–40. Add M. W. Haslam, "The Homer Lexicon of Apollonius Sophista I. Composition and Constituents," *CP* 89 (1994) 1–45, at 26–27, who revived the theory that Heliodorus is to be identified with the homonymous author of the *Odyssey* commentary used by Apollonius Sophista (I A.D.).

⁴ See especially O. L. Smith, *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius* (Leiden 1975), ch. 2–4, on Triclinius' use of ancient metrical terminology and his growing awareness of strophic responsion; and also G. Pace, "Sul valore di προφδικός/ἐφδικός/μεσφδικός in Demetrio Triclinio," *Lexis* 32 (2014) 376–392. I do not agree with Pace's conclusion about the relative chronology of Triclinius' final editions (i.e. Aristophanes preceding all three tragedians), but my findings regarding his treatment of divided responsion would be compatible with it. On the difficulty of establishing such an order see also n.14 below.

20 August 1316 and 16 November 1319. A third complete autograph, his final recension of Aeschylus (*Neap.* II F. 31), can be dated to about 1330 by the watermarks in the paper and is generally accepted as his last production.⁵

A significant discovery of Turyn was that between 1316 and 1319 (that is between the subscriptions in the Hesiod codex) Triclinius changed his way of writing breathings from the usual rounded form (ˆ and ˙) to the more archaic angular one (ˆ and ˙).⁶ This provides at least a rough criterion for dating the other relevant autographs. The three stages of Triclinian annotation in the famous codex *Laur.* 32.2 (which alone preserves the ‘alphabetic’ plays of Euripides) and the early scholia on the Byzantine triad of Aristophanes (*Wealth, Clouds, Frogs*) in *Paris. suppl.gr.* 463 must be earlier than ca. 1317 because they exhibit only round breathings.⁷ The same is true of the first set of notes on the Euripidean triad (*Hecuba, Phoenissae, Orestes*) in the codex *Angelicus gr.* 14, whereas the second and third stage (the latter distinguishable by a different colour of ink) have angular breathings and so very probably postdate the Hesiod.⁸ Finally, by means of the breathings we can confirm that Triclinius studied Hephaestion and other metrical treatises before he began to work on the dramatists and Pindar. His copy (*Marc.gr.*

⁵ See A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York 1943) 102–108, and Smith, *Studies* 34–40.

⁶ A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1957) 26–28, and *Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Italy I* (Urbana 1972) 124–125; he was partially anticipated by E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon I* (Oxford 1950) 3 n.3.

⁷ See Turyn, *Euripides* 257–258 (on *Laur.* 32.2) and Smith, *Studies* 44 (on *Paris.suppl.gr.* 463).

⁸ Cf. H.-C. Günther, *The Manuscripts and the Transmission of the Paleologan Scholia on the Euripidean Triad* (Stuttgart 1995) 36–38 (with previous literature). Günther observes that the paper of certain pages replaced by Triclinius in *Angel.gr.* 14 seems to be identical to that of *Marc.gr.* 464, which makes it “tempting to imagine” that he used “some spare paper from his Hesiod” (37). Considering also the *ductus* of Triclinius’ script, he dates the finished edition to the early 1320s. The matter is disputed (see n.14 below).

483) is almost entirely annotated in script with round breathings.⁹

The remaining Triclinian manuscripts of the Attic dramatists are copies of lost autographs. Triclinius' preliminary work on Aeschylus is represented by the codices *Marc.gr.* 616 (G), *Laur.* 31.8 (F), and *Salm.Bibl.Univ.* 233 (E), of which the first was certainly produced in his lifetime, as early as 1321 or 1322. Very few Triclinian annotations are found in the Sophoclean part of *Laur.* 32.2,¹⁰ but his later recension of all seven tragedies is reliably preserved in the mid-14th-century *Paris.gr.* 2711 and the 15th-century *Marc.gr.* 470.¹¹ Finally, of Triclinius' edition of eight of the eleven surviving plays of Aristophanes¹² an almost complete copy exists in Oxford, *Bodl. Holkham gr.* 88 (early 15th cent.), and a partial one in its 14th-century twin, *Vat.gr.* 1294.¹³

Between the Euripidean triad of, arguably, the early 1320s and the Naples Aeschylus of ca. 1330, Triclinius' second Sophocles and Aristophanes can be placed in that order on the basis of cross-references in the respective commentaries.¹⁴ In

⁹ See O. L. Smith, "The Development of Demetrius Triclinius' Script Style: Remarks on Some Criteria," *ClMed* 45 (1994) 239–250, at 248–249.

¹⁰ For other traces of early Triclinian work on Sophocles see O. L. Smith, "Tricliniana I," *ClMed* 33 (1981/2) 239–262, at 244–250, and "Tricliniana II," *ClMed* 43 (1992) 187–229, at 189–197.

¹¹ Descriptions in A. Turyn, *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles* (Urbana 1952) 74–76, and, more recently, Mioni, *Codices Graeci* II 259–260 (*Marc.gr.* 470).

¹² Triclinius omitted *Lysistrata*, *Thesmophoriazusae*, and *Ecclesiazusae*, none of which was commonly read in Byzantium. *Thesmophoriazusae* survives only in the codex *Ravennas* 429 (R).

¹³ On *Holkham gr.* 88, which has lost *Pax* 1227–1359 (1228–1268 were added from the Aldine) see N. G. Wilson, "The Triclinian Edition of Aristophanes," *CQ* N.S. 12 (1962) 32–47. *Vat.gr.* 1294 contains the triad and *Eq.* 1–270. Its precise dating, based on watermarks, is contested (Smith, *Studies* 97–98 n.78).

¹⁴ See Turyn, *Euripides* 34–36, and Smith, *Studies* 41–43, who considers it possible that Sophocles preceded the final Euripides. Günther's observations (*Manuscripts* 36–38) do not rule this out, but Smith's argument from the

practice, however, Triclinius is likely to have worked on more than one text at any given time and applied the fruits of his research across the board. Thus he was able to apply his knowledge about separated respension, which *ex hypothesi* he gained from renewed study of the old metrical scholia on Aristophanes, to the Sophoclean instances of the phenomenon. Aeschylus provides no fully relevant cases (see below); for Euripides the new insight came too late.

Respension between non-consecutive strophes in Greek drama

It is fairly common in Old Comedy, much less so in tragedy, for two corresponding stanzas to be separated from each other by a section of dialogue, lyric, or a combination of the two. The instances in plays treated by Triclinius are these:

(a) Comedy

Ar. *Ach.* 284–301 ~ 335–346; 358–365 ~ 385–392; 1008–1017 ~ 1037–1046

Eq. 303–313 ~ 382–390 / 322–334 ~ 397–408; 616–623 ~ 683–690; 756–760 ~ 836–840

Nub. 700–706 ~ 804–813; 949–958 ~ 1024–1033; 1345–1350 ~ 1391–1396

Vesp. 334–345 ~ 365–378; 526–545 ~ 631–647; 729–735 ~ 743–749; 868–874 ~ 885–890

Pax 346–360 ~ 385–399 ~ 582–600; 463–472 ~ 490–499; 856–867 ~ 909–921; 939–955 ~ 1023–1038

Av. 327–335 ~ 343–351; 451–459 ~ 539–547; 851–858 ~ 895–902; 1188–1195 ~ 1262–1268; 1553–1564 ~ 1694–1705

Ran. 534–548 ~ 590–604; 895–904 ~ 992–1003

(b) Tragedy

Aesch. *Sept.* 417–421 ~ 452–456; 481–485 ~ 521–525; 563–567 ~ 626–630

Ag. 1407–1411 ~ 1426–1430

Eum. 837–847 ~ 870–880

absence of references to the Euripides scholia in the notes on Sophocles is likewise inconclusive, as he himself admits. The question cannot be answered on the present evidence. Triclinius' failure to recognise separated respension in *Orestes* can be interpreted either way (see below).

Soph. *Phil.* 391–402 ~ 507–518

OC 833–843 ~ 876–886

Eur. *Hipp.* 362–372 ~ 669–679

Or. 1353–1365 ~ 1537–1548

[Eur.] *Rhes.* 131–136 ~ 195–200; 454–466 ~ 820–832

My discussion will follow the relative chronology of the Triclinian editions sketched above, but group authors together as far as possible. For Aristophanes I will largely restrict myself to the Byzantine triad, where we are able to compare two successive recensions.

Triclinius at work

1. Hephaestion and Aeschylus

Triclinius could have learnt about separated strophic respension relatively early in his career from Hephaestion and the old metrical scholia on Aristophanes, but there is no evidence that he did. Indeed he never understood the relevant portion of Hephaestion's *Περὶ σημείων*—or whoever else wrote that short treatise on diacritical marks relating to metre which has been appended to the *Encheiridion* ('Heph.' *De signis* p.76.3–7 Consbruch):

εἰώθασι τοίνυν αὐτοὶ οἱ δραματοποιοὶ μεταξὺ ἰαμβείων τινῶν γράφειν ἑτέρῳ μέτρῳ ὅποσασοῦν στροφάς· εἶτα πάλιν περᾶναντες δι' ἰαμβείων τὸ προκείμενον κατὰ διέχειαν ἀνταποδιδόναι τὰς στροφάς. ἐφ' ἑκάστης μὲν οὖν στροφῆς τίθεται παράγραφος·

Now the dramatists themselves tend to insert in between iambs any number of strophes in a different metre. Then, after continuing what goes before in iambs, they give the corresponding strophes at an interval. At each strophe a paragraphos is placed.¹⁵

Triclinius' failure is evident from his quotation of the passage in his scholium on Ar. *Eq.* 997b (I.2 225.8–15 Jones-Wilson),

¹⁵ I understand this section to mean that more than one divided strophic pair may occur in any one drama, not that multiple strophes precede their respective antistrophes, of which the only extant example is Ar. *Eq.* 303–313 ~ 382–390 / 322–334 ~ 397–408. It is possible that the text became less clear by abbreviation.

which belongs to his final Aristophanes edition. In this scene no lyric strophe interrupts the spoken iambics, with an antistrophe being given “at an interval” (κατὰ διέχειαν); instead recitations of mock oracles in dactylic hexameters and a few other lines in that metre are interspersed with the regular dialogue verse.

Among Triclinius’ early recensions or working copies of the dramatic texts only one shows some awareness of respension between non-consecutive stanzas. The metrical scholia on Aeschylus in GEF, which go back to a lost Triclinian autograph (τ), consist of both longer introductory notes and short comments on each individual lyric section. The long scholia make no mention at all of respension, but the shorter ones—evidently composed at a later stage—do, though often still in a manner that betrays doubt. Thus the introductory scholium on Aesch. *Sept.* 375–685 (the seven paired speeches of the Scout and Eteocles, punctuated by short iambo-dochmiac choral stanzas) reads as follows:

Schol. τ *Sept.* 375–416a (II.2 179.14–17 Smith)

εἴσθεσις διπλῆς καθόλου ἀμοιβαίας περιόδου ἔχουσα καὶ
μονοστροφῶν ἑπτὰ. οἱ δὲ στίχοι εἰσὶν ἰαμβικοὶ τρίμετροι
ἀκατάληκτοι· τὰ δὲ καθ’ ἑκάστην περίοδον τοῦ χοροῦ κῶλα
εἰσὶν ἀντισπαστικά·

A passage consisting entirely of seven corresponding sections and single strophes. The stichic verses are acatalectic iambic trimeters, while the cola of each choral section are antispastic.¹⁶

However, the notes which accompany the lyrics cautiously recognise them as three strophic pairs:

Schol. τ *Sept.* 417–421a (II.2 195.27–31 Smith)

ἀντισπαστικά κῶλα ε’ ... ἔοικε δὲ στροφῆ· ἔχει γὰρ καὶ
ἀντίστροφον τὰ κῶλα τὰ ἐξῆς τοῦ χοροῦ ...

¹⁶ ‘Antispastic metre’ (based on ∪ – – ∪) is the category in which Hephaestion (p.32.5–8 Consbruch) had included the dochmiac, which subsequently was not recognised as a metrical unit until August Seidler rediscovered it in the early 19th century: *De versibus dochmiacis tragicorum Graecorum* (Leipzig 1811–1812).

Five antispastic cola ... The passage seems to be a strophe, for it has an antistrophe in the following choral cola.

Schol. τ *Sept.* 452–456b (II.2 208.7–8 Smith)

ἀντισπαστικὰ κῶλα ε' ἰσόμετρα τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν· ἔοικε δὲ εἶναι ταῦτα ἀντιστροφή τῆς προτέρας στροφῆς.

Five antispastic cola of equal measure to the previous. They seem to be the antistrophe to the preceding strophe.¹⁷

The regular epirrhematic structure of the scene will have helped Triclinius, as was probably also the case with his antistrophic recognition of Aesch. *Ag.* 1407–1411 ~ 1426–1430 and *Eum.* 837–847 ~ 870–880.¹⁸ We know from his first set of scholia on Aristophanes in *Paris.gr.* 463 that he had understood Hephaestion on the epirrhematic syzygy in comedy early on.¹⁹

2. Euripides

Triclinius' work on Euripides is divided between the Byzantine triad (*Hecuba*, *Phoenissae*, *Orestes*) and the rest of the surviving plays. Of the former he produced the edition with full metrical commentary which is now the codex *Angelicus gr.* 14 (T); for the latter we have to be content with his textual and colometric changes and/or the short marginal notes in *Laur.* 32.2 (L).²⁰ Three of the four instances of widely separated

¹⁷ Likewise schol. τ *Sept.* 481–485b, 521–525c, 563–67a, 626–630b Smith (all with the formula ἔοικε δέ). Cf. Smith, *Studies* 63–67.

¹⁸ Cf. schol. τ *Ag.* 1407, 1426, *Eum.* 837, 870 Smith. Curiously, Triclinius never identified *Eum.* 778–793 ~ 808–823, although it belongs to the same epirrhematic system and, as in 837–847 ~ 870–880, strophe and antistrophe are verbally identical. In both his early and final Aeschylus editions he analyses *Eum.* 808–823 as a single strophe, with no note on 778–793.

¹⁹ 'Heph.' *Poem.* pp.72.10–73.10, *De signis* pp.75.19–76.2 Consbruch. Cf. schol.^{Tr1} *Ar. Nub.* 563b/c, 595a–c Koster and *Ran.* 674–737α, 706–717a Chantry.

²⁰ Reports of L are taken from the digital images available on the website of the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (<http://opac.bmlonline.it>, via 'Manoscritti'), occasionally supplemented from the facsimile of J. A. Spranger, *Euripidis quae inveniuntur in codice Laurentiano Pl. XXXII*, 2 (Florence 1920). For T (and related manuscripts) I have mainly relied on the colometrical ap-

responson in the Euripidean corpus come from non-triadic plays, *Hipp.* 362–372 ~ 669–679, *Rhes.* 131–136 ~ 195–200, and *Rhes.* 454–466 ~ 820–832. They show varying degrees of Triclinian activity, but no indication that he was able yet to see that the respective stanzas belong together.

This lack of expertise is most obvious in *Hipp.* 362–372 ~ 669–679, where L (like the other medieval manuscripts) preserves almost intact the ancient verse division.²¹ In particular, it is not always apparent what Triclinius meant to achieve with his colometric changes, which he effected by erasing or crossing out a word and adding it to the preceding or following line. I print Diggle's text,²² with vertical strokes marking Triclinius' alterations:

Eur. *Hipp.* 362–372 ~ 669–679 (iambo-dochmiac)

<p>Χο. αἴες ὦ, ἔκλυες ὦ, ἀνήκουστα τᾶς τυράννου πάθεα μέλεα θρεομένας; ὀλοίμαν ἐγῶγε πρὶν σάν, φίλα, κατανύσαι φρενῶν. ἰὼ μοι, φεῦ φεῦ· 365 ὦ τάλαινα τῶνδ' ἀλγέων· ὦ πόνοι τρέφοντες βροτούς. ὄλωλας, ἐξέφηνας ἐς φάος κακά. τίς σε παναμέριος ὕδε χρόνος μένει; τελευτάσεται τι καινὸν δόμοις· 370 ἄσημα δ' οὐκέτ' ἐστὶν οἱ φθίνει τύχα Κύπριδος, ὦ τάλαινα παῖ Κρησία.</p>	<p>Φα. τάλανεσ ὦ κακοτυχεῖς γυναικῶν πότμοι· τίν' ἢ νῦν τέχνην ἔχομεν ἢ λόγον 670 σφαλεῖσαι κάθαρμα λύειν λόγου; ἐτύχομεν δίκας. ἰὼ γὰρ καὶ φῶς· πᾶ ποτ' ἐξαλύξω τύχας; πῶς δὲ πῆμα κρύψω, φίλαι; τίς ἂν θεῶν ἀρωγὸς ἢ τίς ἂν βροτῶν 675 πάρεδρος ἢ ξυνεργὸς ἀδίκων ἔργων φανεῖη; τὸ γὰρ παρ' ἡμῖν πάθος πέραν δυσεκπέρατον ἔρχεται βίου. κακοτυχεστάτα γυναικῶν ἐγώ.</p>
--	--

pendix in L. De Faveri, *Die metrischen Tricliniusscholien zur Byzantinischen Trias des Euripides* (Stuttgart/Weimar 2002). Donald Mastronarde kindly helped to verify some doubtful points from images of T.

²¹ Part of the strophe (*Hipp.* 362–366, 372) survives in *P.Oxy.* XLIV 3152 fr.2 (II A.D.). It differs from the standard colometry only in that 365 is divided into two single dochmiacs, which is also the arrangement in the papyrus fragment P.Berol. 5005 (VI–VII A.D.). Given the corresponding syntactical break in 672, this may be the division of Aristophanes of Byzantium (cf. M. W. Haslam, *P.Oxy.* XLIV pp.33–34), although the exclamatory nature of 365b may have prompted scribes to put it on a separate line. No ancient witness gives us the antistrophe.

²² J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae* (Oxford 1981–1994).

362–372 nota metrica τροχαϊκά **366– 669–679 nota metrica** τροχαϊκά **679**
367 ὦ τάλαινα τῶνδ' ἀλγέων ὦ πόνοι | ἐγὼ erasum in L (Tr?)
 τρέφοντες βροτούς L: corr. Tr **370**
 δόμοις erasum in L (Tr?)

Only at 366–367 did Triclinius restore the correct division by moving ὦ πόνοι to the next verse—if for entirely the wrong reason. He seems to have thought that the two cola, which actually consist of a cretic and a dochmiac each, would produce better trochaics that way, which was his mistaken overall analysis of the stanzas (cf. the repeated marginal note τροχαϊκά). His other colometric revisions in strophe (363, 364, 372) and antistrophe (671, 677), as well as the possible deletion of δόμοις (370) and ἐγὼ (679), destroyed what had so far survived intact.

In the iambo-dochmiac pair *Rhes.* 131–136 ~ 195–200 Triclinius just accepted the divergent colometry and partially faulty text he received in strophe and antistrophe, which would have given him little chance anyway to recognise responsion.²³ Dochmiacs, however regular, were beyond his metrical understanding, although he had some ‘success’ with observation and syllable counting when the correspondence was exact (see below on Sophocles).

Rhes. 454–466 ~ 820–832 are more interesting. Both text and colometry are severely corrupt in the paradosis, and it was Gottfried Hermann who discovered that the stanzas ought to respond.²⁴ The following text is my own, with a select apparatus.²⁵ Vertical strokes indicate the verse divisions in L.

²³ The strophe is faithfully transmitted, except that 197–198 (3do) is wrongly divided before the final longum of the first dochmiac. In the antistrophe several minor corruptions impair the metre.

²⁴ G. Hermann, “De Rheso Tragoedia dissertatio,” in *Godofredi Hermanni Opuscula* III (Leipzig 1828) 262–310, at 304, 308–309.

²⁵ A. Fries, *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus. Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Berlin/Boston 2014). For greater clarity I have here kept the deletion in the main body of the antistrophe.

Rhes. 454–466 ~ 820–832 (iambo-dochmiac and dactylo-epitrite)

<p>Χο. ἰὼ ἰώ. φίλα θροεῖς, φίλος Διόθεν εἶ· μόνον φθόνον ἄμαχον ὑπατος Ζεὺς θέλοι ἀμφὶ σοῖς λόγοι- σιν εἶργειν. τὸ δὲ νάϊον Ἀργόθεν δόρυ οὔτε πρὶν τιν' οὔτε νῦν ἀνδρῶν ἐπόρευσε σέθεν κρείσσω. πῶς μοι τὸ σὸν ἔγχος Ἀχιλλεὺς ἄν δύναίτο, πῶς δ' Αἴας ὑπομείναι; εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε γ' ἦμαρ εἰσίδοιμ', ἄναξ, ὅτ' πολυφόνου χειρὸς ἄποιν' ἄροιο σῶ λόγχα. </p>	<p>455</p> <p>460</p> <p>465</p>	<p>Χο. ἰὼ ἰώ, ἄμέγας ἐμοὶ μέγας ᾧτ' πολίοχον κράτος τότε ἄρ' ἔμολον ὅτε σοι ἄγγελος ἦλθον ἀμφὶ ναῦς πύρ' αἶθειν [Ἀργείων στρατόν]· ἐπεὶ ἄγρυπνον ὄμμ' ἐν εὐφρόνῃ οὔτ' ἐκοίμισ' οὔτ' ἔβριξ', οὐ τὰς Σιμοεντιάδας παγᾶς· μή μοι κότον, ᾧ ἄνα, θῆς· ἀναίτιος γὰρ ἔγωγε πάντων†. εἰ δὲ χρόνῳ παρὰ καιρὸν ἔργον ἢ λόγον πύθη, κατὰ με γᾶς ζῶντα πόρευσον· οὐ παραιτοῦμαι. </p>	<p>820</p> <p>825</p> <p>830</p>
<p>454–466 nota metrica χοριαμβικά ἰαμβικά τροχαϊκά 459 τιν' οὔτε νῦν Nauck: οὔτε νῦν τιν' Ω 460 ἐπόρευσεν L 461–462 τὸ σὸν ἔγχος Ἀχιλλεὺς Wilamowitz: Ἀχιλλεὺς (-λ- V) τὸ σὸν ἔγχος Ω 464 τόδε γ' Hermann: τόδ' Ω 466 ἄποιν' ἄροιο σῶ Diggle: ἀποινάσαιο Δ: ἀπονάσαιο fere Λ (-όνα- Q, ≠ Q^{1c})</p>	<p>820–832 nota metrica ἀναπαιστικὰ καὶ τροχαϊκὰ καὶ ἰαμβικά 822 ἔμολον V<L²>Q et Tr^{1s}: ἔμολ' Tr¹ 823 ἀμφὶ V<L²>Q; περὶ P et aut Tr¹ aut L (rescr. Tr²) ναῦς Badham: ναυσὶ Ω ἀργείων στρατόν del. Badham, Kirchhoff (στρατόν iam del. Tr¹) 827 ᾧ ἄνα VQ; ᾧ ἄναξ <L>P; ᾧ ἄναξ Tr^{2/3} 828 ἔγωγε V<L>Q; ἐγὼ Tr¹ 830 με γᾶς Barnes: με γα(ι) V<L²>Q; γᾶς με Tr¹ 831–832 οὐ γὰρ Tr¹</p>		

Given the state of the paradosis, it is doubtful whether Triclinius would have perceived the responsion at any point in his career. Yet he heavily interfered with the antistrophe on more than one occasion (sigla Tr¹-Tr³), if only to 'improve' the cola as he understood them at the time. Most notably, his partial erasure of the intrusive Ἀργείων στρατόν in 823 (στρατόν del. Tr¹) seems to have been intended to produce an anapaestic dimeter (without diaeresis) after the form in which he inherited 823b (ἀμφὶ (περὶ?) ναυσὶ πυραίθειν Ἀργείων στρατόν) had suggested anapaests to him (cf. his metrical note ἀναπαιστικὰ καὶ τροχαϊκὰ καὶ ἰαμβικά). Similar objectives lie behind his other textual interventions in the antistrophe.²⁶ The

²⁶ The Triclinian version of *Rhes.* 826b–827a (πηγάς· μή μοι κότον ᾧ ἄναξ θῆς) also gives an 'anapaestic dimeter', and 831 (κατὰ γᾶς με ζῶντα πόρευσον) a 'paroemiac'. In 827b–828 (ἀναίτιος γὰρ ἐγὼ πάντων) he seems

strophe, which is considerably better preserved, evidently posed no problems to him.

With *Or.* 1353–1365 ~ 1537–1548, the choral lyrics that frame the Phrygian's aria and ensuing dialogue with Orestes (1368–1502 and 1503–1536), we come to Triclinius' final recension of the Euripidean triad in the codex *Angelicus gr.* 14 (T). Our text of the strophic pair (iambo-dochmiac-enhoplion) differs considerably from what Triclinius will have found in T and other manuscripts in the tradition of Thomas Magister. Their level of corruption, widely divergent colometry, and haphazard speaker assignments in and around the stanzas apparently confused him so much that he did not even discern roughly equivalent systems.²⁷ Instead he analysed *Or.* 1311–1360 as a run of iambic trimeters (attributed to Electra from 1349), followed by a choral astrophon of nine cola (i.e. 1361–1368), whereas the antistrophe became a sequence of three short stanzas (1537–1538, 1541–1542, 1545–1548) and two pairs of iambic trimeters (1539–1540, 1543–1544), which after 1537–1538 were divided between semi-choruses.²⁸ For the question of when Triclinius learnt about separated responsion, therefore, *Orestes* is of no use. But if Günther is right to date the completed manuscript to shortly after 1320 (see n.8 above), he probably did not yet know of the principle. On the less likely assumption that it postdates the final Sophocles (n.14), Triclinius' failure to see the relationship between *Or.* 1353–1365

to have envisaged ia + an, while 832 (οὐ <γὰρ> παραιτοῦμαι) gives ia + sp (λιαλ). I am not sure about 820–823a.

²⁷ See De Faveri, *Tricliniuscholien* 178–179, 190–192, and for the text alone also J. Diggle, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Orestes* (Oxford 1991) 93–99, and the critical apparatus in his OCT.

²⁸ Schol.^T *Or.* 1311–1360, 1361–1368a, 1537–1538a, 1539–1540, 1541–1542a, 1543–1544, 1545–1548a De Faveri. With the exception of 1543, all Triclinian speaker assignments are also found in other manuscripts. Since he rewrote the relevant pages in T (as for almost all the lyrics) and the other 'Thoman' manuscripts vary considerably, one cannot be certain either which colometric alterations are due to him. There is no sign that Triclinius worked on this strophic pair in L.

and 1537–1548 testifies to the unchanging limitations of his expertise.

3. *Aristophanes*

Triclinius' strengths and weaknesses are most clearly perceived in *Aristophanes*, where his achievements range from complete misunderstanding of the ancient scholia to independent restoration of strophic responion. A comparison of his notes on a triad play, of which we have both the earlier version in his working copy *Paris.suppl.gr.* 463 (Ps) and the later one in *Bodl. Holkham gr.* 88 (L) and *Vat.gr.* 1294 (Vat), will be instructive.

Aristophanes' *Clouds* contains three strophic pairs responding at an interval wide enough to make them important to our enquiry: 700–706 ~ 804–813, 949–958 ~ 1024–1033, 1345–1350 ~ 1391–1396.²⁹ In the first pair (iambo-choriambic) the strophe lacks the final three lines. The loss goes back to antiquity because the old metrical scholia remark on it (schol.^{vet.} *Nub.* 700c, 804a Holwerda).³⁰ However, Triclinius made no comment in Ps (cf. schol.^{Tr1} *Nub.* 700a, 804a Koster) or LVat (cf. schol.^{Tr2} *Nub.* 700b, 804b/c Koster). Presumably he never understood the ancient commentator here.

The other two pairs show a difference in recognition of separated responion between the first and second set of Triclinian annotations. In the case of 949–958 ~ 1024–1033 especially this is not difficult to understand from the available evidence:

²⁹ I give the text of N. G. Wilson, *Aristophanis Fabulae* (Oxford 2007), with an abridged and adapted apparatus. For Triclinius' colometry I have consulted Ps and Vat on microfilm and L in the original. As a control R (*Ravennas* 429) has been collated from the facsimile of L. van Leeuwen and A. W. Sijthoff, *Aristophanis Comoediae undecim cum scholiis. Codex Ravennas 137.4.A* (Leiden 1904).

³⁰ Apart from accidental omission, it is possible that *Aristophanes* himself removed the lines when revising the play, but never composed a replacement: K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes. Clouds* (Oxford 1968) 187; cf. Parker, *Songs* 198–201. Both scholars rightly discount the notion of an intentional metrical joke, which in this form would be unparalleled.

Ar. *Nub.* 949–958 ~ 1024–1033 (iambo-choriambic)

<p>Χο. νῦν δείξεται τὸ πισύνω τοῖς περιδεξίοισιν λόγοισι καὶ φροντίσι καὶ γνωμοτύποις μερίμναις, λέγων ἀμείνων πότερος φανήσεται. νῦν γὰρ ἅπας ἐνθάδε κίνδυνος ἀνείται σοφίας, ἧς πέρι τοῖς ἐμοῖς φίλοις ἔστιν ἀγὼν μέγιστος.</p>	<p>950</p> <p>955</p>	<p>Χο. ὦ καλλίπυργον σοφίαν κλεινοτάτην ἐπασκῶν, ὡς ἡδύ σου τοῖσι λόγοις σῶφρον ἔπεστιν ἄνθος. εὐδαίμονές γ' ἦσαν ἄρ' οἱ ζῶντες τότε ἐπὶ τῶν προτέρων· πρὸς τάδε σ', ὦ κομποπρεπῆ μοῦσαν ἔχων, δεῖ σε λέγειν τι καινόν, ὡς ἠὺδοκίμηκεν ἀνήρ.</p>	<p>1025</p> <p>1030</p>
<p>953–954a λέγων ἀμείνων πότερος Bergk: ὀπότερος αὐτοῖν λέγων ἀμείνων φανήσεται codd.: ὀπότερος <γ'> LVat 954b–955 νῦν γὰρ ... κίνδυνος ἀνείται σοφίας RPsLVat</p>	<p>1024–1027 ὦ καλλίπυργον ... ἐπασκῶν ὡς ἡδύ σου ... ἄνθος RPs: corr. Tr² (LVat) 1028 γ' Blaydes: δ' codd. ἦσαν post ἄρ' transp. codd. pler. (ἄρ' οἱ ἦσαν Ps) 1029a τότε ζῶντες LVat post haec habent ἠνίκ' ἦς LVat 1029b–1030 ἐπὶ τῶν προτέρων· ... κομπο- πρεπῆ ... ἔχων LVat πρὸς τάδε σ' Hall & Geldart: πρὸς τάδε δ' LVat: πρὸς οὖν τάδ' Ps et codd. vett.</p>		

Schol.^{vet.} Ar. *Nub.* 949a (I.3.1 183.3–6 Holwerda)

ἐν ἐπεκθέσει περίοδος τοῦ χοροῦ ἔχουσα μὲν ἀντίστροφον, ἐν
διεχειρίᾳ δέ, διαφόρως κεκωλισμένην· θήσω δὲ ὡς φέρεται νῦν. ἡ
μὲν προτέρα “νῦν δείξεται τὸ πισύνω,” ἡ δὲ δευτέρα “ὦ καλ-
λίπυργον σοφίαν” ἕως τοῦ “εὐδοκίμηκεν <ἀνήρ>.”

In further positioning to the left a choral section which has an
antistrophe, but at an interval, differently colometrised; I will set
it out as currently transmitted. The first [begins] νῦν δείξεται τὸ
πισύνω, the second is ὦ καλλίπυργον σοφίαν up to εὐδοκίμηκεν
<ἀνήρ>.³¹

Triclinius found an equally distorted colometry in Ps—
whether it was the same as the ancient one we cannot tell³²—
and, as in *Rhesus* and *Orestes*, was unable to deal with it at an
early stage. However, in his later edition he correctly divided
the first four cola of the antistrophe on the basis of the strophe

³¹ Cf. schol.^{vet.} *Nub.* 949b–d, 1024a Holwerda.

³² Only one relevant papyrus has come to light so far. P.Berol. 13219 (= *BKT* V.2 no. 219) of the fifth or sixth century A.D. includes fragments of *Nub.* 955–957 with verse division after ἐνθάδε, which looks like the fairly common error of stopping short before the end of a colon (Parker, *Songs* 100–101, 202).

and, less felicitously, tried to restore responion in the partially corrupt lines that follow. His accompanying notes comment on the insertion of γ' in 954 (which he read as ὀπότερος αὐτοῖν λέγων) and the textual and colometric rearrangement of 1028–1030 with the aim of making the lines equivalent to their respective counterparts: schol.^{Tr2} *Nub.* 949b, 1029 (I 3.2 134.6–7, 148.5–6 Koster). Writing πρὸς τὰδε δ' for πρὸς οὖν τὰδ' (Ps et codd. vett.) in 1030 was “a move in the right direction metrically,”³³ but on the whole the confusion in both strophe and antistrophe defied Triclinius' abilities. Nevertheless he deserves credit for acting on the cue of an ancient scholium which probably gave him as few details as it does us today.

Likewise in the last divided choral lyric of *Clouds* the older Triclinius succeeded where the younger one had failed:

Ar. *Nub.* 1345–1350 ~ 1391–1396 (iambo-choriambic)

Χο. σὸν ἔργον, ὃ πρεσβύτα, φροντίζειν ὅπη τὸν ἄνδρα κρατήσεις, 1346	Χο. οἶμαί γε τῶν νεωτέρων τὰς καρδίας πηδᾶν ὅτι λέξει.
ὡς οὗτος, εἰ μὴ τῷ 'πεποιθῆεν, οὐκ ἂν ἦν οὕτως ἀκόλαστος.	εἰ γὰρ τοιαῦτά γ' οὗτος ἐξεργασμένος λαλῶν ἀναπέσει,
ἀλλ' ἔσθ' ὅτῳ θρασύνεται· δῆλόν γε <τοι> τὸ λῆμα τὸ τάνδρός. 1350	τὸ δέρμα τῶν γεραιτέρων λάβοιμεν ἂν 1395 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐρεβίνθου.

1349–1350 ἀλλ' ἔσθ' ὅτῳ θρασύνεται· |
δῆλον τὸ λῆμ' ἐστὶ τάνθρώπου RPs: ἀλλ'
ἔσθ' ὅτῳ θρασύνεται· δῆλόν γε τὸ | λῆμ'
ἐστὶ τάνθρώπου LVat **1349** <τοι> suppl.
Hermann **1350** τὸ λῆμα τὸ τάνδρός
Hermann

Schol.^{Tr2} *Nub.* 1345b (I 3.2 183.1–2 Koster)

εἴσθεσις χοροῦ στροφῆς μὲν λόγον ἔχουσα διὰ τὸ ἔχειν καὶ ἀντί-
στροφον τὸ “οἶμαί γε τῶν νεωτέρων” ...

A choral passage, which has the function of a strophe because it
also has an antistrophe in οἶμαί γε τῶν νεωτέρων ...³⁴

Textual corruption in the last two lines of the strophe impairs
the otherwise perfect preservation of the ancient colometry.
However, LVat testify to at least a first step towards healing the

³³ Parker, *Songs* 203.

³⁴ Cf. schol.^{Tr2} *Nub.* 1345c, 1391b–c Koster.

mistake. The remedies Triclinius applied to *Nub.* 1049–1050—colometric change and the addition of $\gamma\epsilon$ —are familiar from *Nub.* 949–958 ~ 1024–1033 and were among his regular favourites, but he simply had not seen the correspondence before (no comment is made in Ps). The sparse old scholia on *Nub.* 1350 and 1391 were easy to overlook and may not even have been available to Triclinius, for they survive in only one manuscript of the early- to mid-14th century (*Vat.gr. Reginae Suecorum* 147 = Rs). A longer ancient note on *Nub.* 1345 analyses the strophe as a miniature triadic system.³⁵

Whatever the truth in the last case (and at *Ran.* 534–548 ~ 590–604), Triclinius was capable of recognising separated responsion in Aristophanes without external guidance. In *Vesp.* 334–345 ~ 365–378, where we have only L as a witness to his work, the transmitted colometry again did not invite the assumption that the stanzas belong together. Yet the fairly simple metre (nearly all trochaics) will have helped Triclinius to draw the right conclusion, either independently or contrary to old scholia now lost (with verse divisions as divergent as in our paradosis the ancient commentators would not have seen the correspondence either).³⁶ He did not, however, change the inherited colometry, and it is worth noting the cautious formu-

³⁵ Cf. Parker, *Songs* 98, 212–213. At *Ran.* 534–548 ~ 590–604 (trochaic) we also find no sense of a strophic relationship in Ps, while in his second edition Triclinius made ample comments to that effect, emended the text (543, 596), and even noticed the lacuna in 592 (2tr), which he filled with a rhythmically correct supplement (cf. schol.^{Tr2} *Ran.* 592b Chantry). It is unclear again whether he had read the ancient scholia preserved in Rs and E (*Modena, Bibl. Estense* α .U.5.10).

³⁶ See Parker, *Songs* 228–229, who reasonably traces the colometries shared by RV and L to antiquity because (a) they appear to be deliberate rather than the result of scribal errors, and (b) elsewhere the old scholia “generally accord with the colon-division preserved more or less imperfectly by RV” (229). At e.g. *Eq.* 303–313 ~ 382–390 / 322–334 ~ 397–408, *Pax* 346–360 ~ 385–399 ~ 582–600, and *Ran.* 895–904 ~ 992–1003, serious corruption also goes together with ancient failure to recognise responsion (Triclinius made no progress either).

lation in his long scholium on *Vesp.* 365—reminiscent of his early work on Aeschylus—and the observation that, as it stands, the antistrophe is four lines short:

Schol.^{Tr} Ar. *Vesp.* 365a (II.1 62.1–3 Koster)

ἡ ἀμοιβαία αὕτη στροφή ἔοικεν εἶναι ἀντιστροφή τῆς ἄνω ῥηθείσης ὁμοίας στροφῆς, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἐλλιπής· στίχων γάρ ἐστιν καὶ κώλων ἧ' ... L

This dialogic strophe seems to be the antistrophe to the above-mentioned strophe of the same kind, but it is deficient, for it consists of eight verses and cola ...³⁷

This still leaves something to be desired by modern standards, but is a big improvement on Triclinius' treatment of e.g. *Hipp.* 362–372 ~ 669–679.

4. *Sophocles*

For Sophocles, as for the other tragedians, Triclinius had no predecessors in metrical analysis when he worked towards his final edition of the plays, best represented by the codices *Paris. gr.* 2711 (T) and *Marc. gr.* 470 (Ta).³⁸ Yet he did well by the two separated strophic pairs in *Philoctetes* and *Oedipus Coloneus*, despite the general sparseness of his commentary on these less popular plays. Alerted by his study of the ancient scholia on Aristophanes, I infer, he identified both *Phil.* 391–402 ~ 507–518 and *OC* 833–843 ~ 876–886, of which the first required some ingenuity, given the different colometries he found in strophe and antistrophe (see below):³⁹

³⁷ Contrast the simple analysis in schol.^{Tr} Ar. *Vesp.* 334a (II.1 58.5 Koster) στροφή κώλων καὶ στίχων ἰβ' and 365b (62.10 Koster) στροφή ἑτέρα κώλων καὶ στίχων ἧ'.

³⁸ Ta changes allegiance to a non-Triclinian source (*Marc. gr.* 468 = V) on f. 246^v, from *Phil.* 472 to the end of the play, which stands last in the manuscript. See Turyn, *Sophocles* 76, and T. J. Janz, *The Scholia to Sophocles' Philoctetes* (diss. Oxford 2004) 84–86.

³⁹ Sophocles is quoted from H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophocles Fabulae*² (Oxford 1992), while the text of the Triclinian scholia on *Philoctetes* comes from Janz. For the notes on *Oedipus Coloneus* (and *Trachiniae*) we still need to refer to A. Turnebus, *Δημητρίου τοῦ Τρικλινίου εἰς τὰ τοῦ Σοφο-*

Soph. *Phil.* 391–402 ~ 507–518 (iambo-dochmiac)

<p>Χο. ὄρεστέρα παμβῶτι Γᾶ, μᾶτερ αὐτοῦ Διός, ἃ τὸν μέγαν Πακτωλὸν εὐχρυσον νέμεις, σὲ κάκει, μᾶτερ πό τνι', ἐπηιδώμαν, 395 ὅτ' ἐς τόνδ' Ἀτρειδᾶν ὕβρις πᾶσ' ἐχώρει, ὅτε τὰ πάτρια τεύ χεα παρεδίδοσαν, ἰὼ μάκαιρα ταυροκτόνων 400 λεόντων ἔφε δρε, τῷ Λαρτίου, σέβας ὑπέρτατον.</p> <p>395 ἐπηιδώμαν codd. pler.: ἐξηυ- T Ta</p>	<p>Χο. οἴκτηρ', ἄναξ· πολλῶν ἔλε- ξεν δυσοίστων πόνων ἄθλ', οἷα μηδεὶς τῶν ἐμῶν τύχοι φίλων. εἰ δὲ πικρούς, ἄναξ, ἔχθεις Ἀτρείδας, 510 ἐγὼ μὲν, τὸ κείνων κακὸν τῷδε κέρδος μέγα τιθέμενος, ἔν θαπερ ἐπιμέμονεν, 515 ἐπ' εὐστόλου ταχείας νεῶς πορεύεσάμ' ἂν ἐς δόμους, τὰν θεῶν νέμεσιν ἐκφυγῶν.</p> <p>515 ἐπιμέμονεν edd.: ἐπεὶ μέμονεν codd. pler.: ἐπιμέμηεν T: ἐπεὶ μέμηεν G 517 post τὰν add. ἐκ codd.: del. Hermann</p>
---	--

Schol.^{Tr} Soph. *Phil.* 391.0a Janz

ἡ παροῦσα στροφή κῶλων ἐστὶ γ', ἔχει δὲ ἀντιστροφήν τὴν μετὰ τοὺς προκειμένους στίχους, ἧς ἡ ἀρχή· “οἴκτηρ' ἄναξ,” τοσοῦτων καὶ αὐτὴν κῶλων ...

The present strophe consists of thirteen cola and has as an antistrophe the one following the preceding stichic verses, which begins with οἴκτηρ' ἄναξ [507], and consists of as many cola ...⁴⁰

The vertical strokes indicate the (additional) verse divisions in T(Ta). In the antistrophe they agree with what must be the ancient colometry, to judge by the joint testimony of the earlier ‘Thomano-Triclinian’ codex *Laur.* 32.2 (Zg)—the invaluable L of Euripides—and three notable ‘veteres’, *Laur.* 32.9 (L) of the 10th century (our oldest complete manuscript of Sophocles), *Laur.* 31.10 (K) of ca. 1160 and, belonging to a different family, *Paris.gr.* 2712 (A) of ca. 1300.⁴¹ According to this the dochmiac

κλέους ἑπτὰ δράματα: Περὶ μέτρων οἷς ἐχρήσατο Σοφοκλῆς, περὶ σχημάτων, καὶ σχόλια (Paris 1553), which largely reproduces T.

⁴⁰ Cf. schol.^{Tr} *Phil.* 507.0a (+ 403.0, 519.0) Janz and the short notes schol.^{Tr} *Phil.* 391.0b (στροφή κῶλων γ') and 507.0b (ἀντιστροφή κῶλων γ').

⁴¹ I have consulted digital images of L and K on the website of the Laurentian Library (n.20 above) and a microfilm of A. On the dating of K see N. G. Wilson, “A Mysterious Byzantine Scriptorium: Ioannikios and his Colleagues,” *Scrittura e Civiltà* 7 (1983) 161–176, and Fries, *Rhesus* 49.

pairs in 394/395 ~ 510/511 and 398/399 ~ 514/515 are divided in two and 400–402 ~ 516–518 (ia do | 2do | do) wrongly arranged as ia ia_λ | ia λia | 2do (ia_λ λia | do).⁴² In the strophe, however, Zg differs from LK in that 391–392 (2ia | 2λia), 394/395, 396–397 (2ia_λ | 2ia_λ) and 398/399 are run together, with the result that on the page the text is four lines shorter than that of the antistrophe. To match the stanzas Triclinius had to notice the rhythmical correspondence and divide the strophe on the basis of the antistrophe, which he did quite successfully, probably by a combination of applying his metrical knowledge (in the iambics) and counting syllables (in the dochmiacs). Only at 394/395 ~ 510/511, where the dochmiacs do not respond exactly, did he go wrong by one position. The divisions in the middle of a word there and in 398/399 and 401 (the latter avoiding the run-over mistake of Zg and others) are indeed strong indications that Triclinius worked independently. Of his two textual changes, ἐξηυδῶμιν in 395 was evidently designed to create a further longum in ‘respon- sion’ with 510/511, whereas with ἐπιμέμηνεν in 514/515 he at least produced a verb beginning with ἐπι-. It is not impossible that Triclinius was aware of the reading ἐπεὶ μέμηνεν from a codex other than G (*Laur. Conv. Soppr.* 152), which was written in Apulia in 1282 and so could hardly have been available to him.⁴³

With OC 833–843 ~ 876–886 Triclinius presumably had less trouble because the colometry in T(Ta) all but conforms to the traditional (and largely correct) one, best preserved among the

⁴² L, K, and Zg divide after ἔφεδρε in 401, a specimen of the the common scribal error of running on to the end of a word. Conversely, in 517, K stops short before the prosodic unit ἐξ δόμους. K also has 401b–402 on one line without spacing, but the scribe (Ioannikios) was eager to save writing material, as is obvious from a glance at any of his products. OC 833–843 ~ 876–886 is even more crammed on the page (cf. n.45 below).

⁴³ In principle ἐξηυδῶμιν could also have come from a manuscript now lost (as my anonymous referee points out). But the inconsistency between creating ‘perfect’ respon- sion and admitting the ‘imperfect’ within four lines of each other remains. We must not expect too much of Triclinius.

witnesses I consulted in A (*Paris.gr.* 2712) and—in place of Zg, which is not available for *Oedipus Coloneus*—the ‘Thoman’ Zo (*Pal.gr.* 287).⁴⁴ Vertical strokes again mark its deviations from the modern text.⁴⁵

Soph. *OC* 833–843 ~ 876–886 (iambo-dochmiac)

Οι. ἰὼ πόλις.	Οι. ἰὼ τάλας.	876
Χο. τί δρῶς, ὦ ξέν'; οὐκ ἀφήσεις; τάχ' ἐς	Χο. ὅσον λῆμ' ἔχων ἀφίκου, ξέν', εἰ	
βάσανον εἰ χερῶν.	τάδε δοκεῖς τελεῖν.	835
Κρ. εἴργου. Χο. σοῦ μὲν οὐ,	Κρ. δοκῶ. Χο. τάνδ' ἄρ' οὐκ-	
τάδε γε μωμένου.	ἔτι νέμω πόλιν.	
Κρ. πόλει μαχῆ γάρ, εἴ τι πημανεῖς ἐμέ.	Κρ. τοῖς τοι δικαίοις χά βραχὺς νικᾷ μέγαν.	
Οι. οὐκ ἠγόρευον ταῦτ' ἐγώ; Χο. μέθεξ	Οι. ἀκούεθ' οἶα φθέγγεται; Χο. τά γ' οὐ	
χεροῖν	τελεῖ,	
τὴν παῖδα θάσσον. Κρ. μὴ 'πίτασσο' ἄ μὴ	<Ζεὺς μοι ξυνίστω.> Κρ. Ζεὺς γ' ἂν εἰδείη,	
κρατεῖς.	σὺ δ' οὔ.	
Χο. χαλᾶν λέγω σοι. Κρ. σοὶ δ' ἔγωγ'	Χο. ἄρ' οὐχ ὕβρις τάδ'; Κρ. ὕβρις; ἀλλ'	
ὀδοιπορεῖν.	ἀνεκτέα.	840
Χο. προβάθ' ὦδε, βᾶτε βᾶτ', ἔντοποι.	Χο. ἰὼ πᾶς λεώς, ἰὼ γὰς πρόμοι,	
πόλις ἐναίρεται, πόλις ἐμά, σθένει.	μόλετε σὺν τάχει, μόλετ'· ἐπεὶ πέραν	
προβάθ' ὦδέ μοι.	περῶσ' <οἶδε> δῆ.	883

841 ὦδε βᾶτε TTa: ὦδ' ἐμβᾶτε cett. ἔντοποι **882** <Ζεὺς μοι ξυνίστω.> suppl. Jebb, alii Brunck: ἐντόπιοι codd. **843** προβάθ' ὦδέ μοι codd. pler.: προβάτε μ' ὦδε TTa alia: lacunam ind. Tricl. γ' Hartung: ταῦτ' codd. **884** γὰς τε TTa **886** <οἶδε> suppl. Elmsley: περῶσι δῆτα TTa

Triclinius' most notable achievement in dealing with this strophic pair is his discovery that the iambic trimeter in 882 lacks its first half: schol.^{Tr} Soph. *OC* 876 (p.111 Turnebus) ἔλλιπῆς δέ ἐστιν ὁ εἰς τῶν ἰάμβων. He did not venture any

⁴⁴ Collated from photocopies of images which Roger Dawe deposited in the Classics Faculty Library, Cambridge (courtesy of James Diggle). Together with *Laur.Conv.Soppr.* 172 this manuscript is better known as the codex P of Euripides, which in the 'alphabetic' plays (and *Rhesus*) was copied from L (*Laur.* 32.2) after Triclinius had applied his first set of corrections.

⁴⁵ AZo divide 839–840, 881, and 877/878 τάδε ... δοκῶ (Zo) according to the speaker assignments, while 876–877 ἰὼ τάλας ... εἰ and 833–834 ἰὼ πόλις ... ἐς (Zo) are run together. L has 833–834/835 ~ 876–877/878 as in AT(Ta), but otherwise gives a line to each speaker; K retains traces of the old colometry among the attempts to squeeze as much text as possible into one line (cf. n.42).

supplement here,⁴⁶ but he restored responion, if not the correct metre (dochmiac), in 841–843 ~ 884–886, where the transmitted text is corrupt in both strophe and antistrophe. In 841 he improved metre and language by writing προβᾶθ' ὦδε βᾶτε for $\text{προβᾶθ' ὦδ' ἐμβᾶτε}$ (essentially a word-division error), but then inserted a syntactically ruinous τε after γᾶς in 884 to make the verse end metrically equivalent to that of the wrong paradosis in the strophe (ἐντόπιοι codd.: ἐντοποι Brunck). Similarly, in 843 ~ 886 he realised that the lines as he had them did not correspond. His emendations produced an iambic penthemimer ($\text{υ} - \text{υ} - \text{υ}$), not entirely absurd, but inappropriate here as a clausular rhythm. It was left to Elmsley to propose a simple supplement in 886.

With the different challenges that they posed to an early metrician, the two separated strophic pairs in Sophocles give an excellent picture of what Triclinius could accomplish at his most advanced, and without the help of ancient material. It ranks with his best results in undivided choral lyrics and shows beyond doubt the progress he made since first reading Hephæstion and beginning to work on the dramatic texts.

Conclusion

Demetrius Triclinius has justly been described as the first modern editor and textual critic.⁴⁷ His often violent interventions, based on varying degrees of metrical understanding, have not endeared him to his 20th- and 21st-century colleagues, but

⁴⁶ Contrast schol.Tr² Ar. *Ran.* 592b Chantry (see n.35) and schol.Tr² Aesch. *Pers.* 1065 Massa Positano ὁ τῆς ἀντιστροφῆς οὐτος πέμπτος στίχος ἐλλιπὴς ἦν πρὸς τὸν τῆς στροφῆς· διὸ καὶ ἀναπληρώθη παρ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ οἶμαι ὡς καλῶς. In his text Triclinius expanded *Pers.* 1066 βόα νυν ἀντίδουπά μοι to an iambic trimeter by adding μέλος τιθείς because he erroneously thought that the verse ought to respond with *Pers.* 1060 (3ia). Cf. L. Massa Positano, *Demetrii Triclinii in Aeschylī Persas scholia*² (Naples 1963) 71, 148.

⁴⁷ E.g. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin 1889) 194–195; Smith, *Studies* 3–4; P. J. Finglass, “The Textual Transmission of Sophocles’ Dramas,” in K. Ormand (ed.), *A Companion to Sophocles* (Malden 2012) 9–24, at 15.

to his fellow Byzantines his work seemed little short of a miracle,⁴⁸ and some of his conjectures (such as the one in Soph. *OC* 841) have never been improved on. Most importantly, however, Triclinius realised that Greek lyric poetry cannot be fully appreciated without knowledge of its metrical structure, and he persevered in the study of these rhythms to make the fruits of his research available to perceptive readers of his and future times.⁴⁹ In his treatment of non-consecutive responding stanzas we not only can see a general increase in metrical comprehension, but can also identify its source (the old Aristophanes scholia), and we have proof that Triclinius was able to transfer his knowledge (to Sophocles). It is an interesting addition to what we otherwise know about his scholarly development and the chronology of his work and one point among many where both should matter to us.⁵⁰

January, 2015

The Queen's College
Oxford OX1 4AW
United Kingdom
almut.fries@classics.ox.ac.uk

⁴⁸ In a note transmitted at the end of the metrical scholia to Pi. *Ol.* 1 Triclinius' students reverently speak of him as their *μυσταγωγός*: E. Abel, *Scholia recentiora in Pindari Epinicia I Scholia in Olympia et Pythia* (Budapest/Berlin 1891) 49. This is also the only contemporary reference to Triclinius' activities. Cf. G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge 1965) 28–29; Smith, *Studies* 4, 48.

⁴⁹ A very personal statement to that effect can be found in the last paragraph of the preface with which Triclinius equipped all his final editions (best consulted in Abel, *Scholia* I 43). Cf. Zuntz, *Inquiry* 28.

⁵⁰ Versions of this paper have been presented in Oxford and New Orleans, at the 146th meeting of the Society for Classical Studies (formerly American Philological Association), 8–11 January 2015. I am grateful to all audience members who asked illuminating questions and to the following individuals for commenting on successive drafts and/or otherwise facilitating my research: Christopher Collard, James Diggle, Patrick Finglass, Donald Mastronarde, Douglas Olson, Martin West, Nigel Wilson, and the anonymous referee for *GRBS*. Timothy Janz kindly gave me permission to quote his unpublished Oxford dissertation.