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Introduction

Demetrius Triclinius, who was active in Thessalonica in the first third of the fourteenth century, is well known as the most accomplished Byzantine metricalian 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. In addition, Triclinius used the old metrical scholia on Pindar and Aristophanes, of which the latter largely go back to another distinguished ancient metricalian, 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.

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* (London 1996) 249–256.


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, 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 responson 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 ([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 responson; and also G. Pace, “Sul valore di προῳδικός/ἐπῳδικός/ποσῳδικός 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 responson 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 (῾ and ἵ) to the more archaic angular one (⊢ 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.


\(^6\) 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 Aristophanes 12 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

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 responsion, 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.

**Responsion 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ar.</td>
<td>284–301 ~ 335–346; 358–365 ~ 385–392; 1008–1017 ~ 1037–1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pax</td>
<td>534–548 ~ 590–604; 895–904 ~ 992–1003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Tragedy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag.</td>
<td>1407–1411 ~ 1426–1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eum.</td>
<td>837–847 ~ 870–880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...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 responsion in Orestes can be interpreted either way (see below).
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 response 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):

εἰόθεσι τοῖς αὐτοῖς δραµατοποιοῖς ἑαυτῶν γράφειν ἐτέρῳ μέτρῳ ὁποσασσοῦσιν στροφὰς· εἴτε πάλιν περάναντες δὲ στροφεῖ ἡ προκείµεναι κατὰ διέχειαν ἀνταποδίδοναι τὰς στροφὰς. ἐφ’ ἑκάστης μὲν οὖν στροφῆς τίθεται παράγραφος.

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

Triclinius’ failure is evident from his quotation of the passage in his scholium on Ar. *Eq.* 997b (1.2 225.8–15 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 responsion 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 responsion, 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 iambic-triostichic choral stanzas) reads as follows:

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

εἴσθεσις διπλῆς καθόλου ἁμοιβαίας περιόδους ἔχουσα καὶ μονοστρόφους ἔπτα. οἱ δὲ στίχοι εἰσὶν ἴαμβικοὶ τρίμετροι ἀκατάληκτοι· τὰ δὲ καθ’ ἐκάστην περιόδον τοῦ χοροῦ κώλα εἰσὶν ἀντισπαστικά·

A passage consisting entirely of seven corresponding sections and single strophes. The stichic verses are catalectic 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 κώλα ἐτέρω ἐδέστη ἐκεῖ καὶ ἀντίστροφον τὰ κώλα τὰ ἐξῆς τοῦ χοροῦ ...

16 ‘Antispastic metre’ (based on ῥ — — ῥ) 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).
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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 ἐ` ἵσομετρα τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν· ἔοικε δὲ εἶναι
tαύτα ἀντιστροφῆ 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

Tricliniius’ 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


18 Cf. schol. τ Ag. 1407, 1426, Eum. 837, 870 Smith. Curiously, Tricliniius 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.


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, Euripides 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. 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, with vertical strokes marking Triclinius’ alterations:


Χο. ἄιες ὣς ἐκείνες ὥς,

ἀνήκουστα τāς

τυράννου | πάθεια μέλεα θρευμένας;

όλοιμαι ἐγγέρ πρὶν σάν. | φίλα.

κατανύσαι φρενιν. ἵο μοι, φεῦ φεῦ;

ὁ τάλαινα τάνδ’ ἀλγέων |

ὁ πόνοι τρέφοι βροτοῦ |

οἴδας, εξέφρασαι εἰς φάς κακά.

τίς σε παναιμέρος οὐδε χρόνος μένει;

τελευτάσαι τι καινὸν δόμοις;

ἀσίμα δ’ οὐκέτ’ ἐστίν οἱ φθινει πύρη

Κύπριδος, | ὃ τάλαινα παῖ Κρησία.

Φα. τάλαινες ὃ κακοτυχεῖς

γυναικῶν στόμιον:

τίν’ ἡ γυνί τέρταν ἔχομεν ἡ λάγον 670

σφαλέσαι | κάθαμα λέειν λάγον;

ἐτύχομεν δίκας. ἵο γά τοι φοῖς;

πά ποτ’ ἐξαλάξον τύχας;

πόδε δὲ πήμα κρύσῳ, φίλαι;

τίς ἄν θεῶν ἐργοῦς ἢ τίς ἄν βροτῶν 675

πάρεδρος ἢ ξυνεργὸς αἰτίων ἔργον

φανεῖν; | τὸ γάρ παρ’ ἡμῖν πάθος

πέραν δυσεκπέρατον ἔρχεται βίοι.

κακοτυχεστάτα γυναικῶν ἐγὼ.

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 parchment 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.

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 δόµος (370) and ἐγώ (679), destroyed what had so far survived intact.

In the iambic-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 responson.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.


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

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 anaepastic dimer (without diaeresis) after the form in which he inherited 823b (ἀμφί (περί;?) ναοὶ τοῦ τάῤῥειν Ἀργείων στρατὸν) had suggested anaepasts to him (cf. his metrical note ἀναπαιστικά καὶ τροχαῖκα καὶ ἑιμβικά). Similar objectives lie behind his other textual interventions in the antistrophe.26

---

26 The Triclinian version of Rhes. 826b–827a (πηγὰς: μή μοι κότον ὦ ναὸς θῆς) also gives an ‘anaepastic dimer’, and 831 (κοτα γάς με ζωντα πήρεον) 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 (iambic-docho-miac-enhopian) 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 assign-ments 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 respon-sion, 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


28 Schol.* 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 responsion. 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. In the first pair (iambic-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). However, Triclinius made no comment in Ps (cf. schol. Tr1 Nub. 700a, 804a Koster) or L Vat (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 responsion 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 (Raven nas 429) has been collated from the facsimile of L van Leeuwen and A. W. Sijthoff, Aristophanis Comœdiae undecim cum scholiis. Codex Raven nas 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 1966) 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)

Χο. νῦν δείξετον τὸ πιστύνω

κίνδυνος ἐπίκενων πότερος

λόγοι καὶ φρόντις καὶ
gνωστοσεκερὶς μερίμναις,

legate ἀμείων πότερος

φανήσεται. νῦν γὰρ ἐπίκενων

ἔνθαδε κίνδυνος ἀνείται σοφίας,

ὅς περὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς φίλοις

ἐστὶν ἔγον μέγιστος.

953–954a λέγων ἀμείων πότερος

Bergk: ὀπότερος κατότι λέγον | ἀμείων φανήσεται codd.: ὀπότερος

<γ> LVat 954b–955 νῦν γὰρ ...

κίνδυνος | ἀνείται σοφίας RPdLVat

Χο. ὁ καλλιτύργιον σοφίαν

κλεινοτάτην ἐπίσκοπον,

ὡς ἠδύ σου τοῖς λόγοις

σώφρον ἐπεστιν ἀνθέος.

eυδαιμονές γ’ ἠσαν ἄρ’ οἱ

ζωντεῖς τὸν εἶ τῶν προτέρων,

πρὸς τάδε σ’, ὅς κομψοπρέπη μοῦσαν ἔχων,

δεῖ σε λέγειν τι καινόν, ὡς

νυκτόκιμηκεν ἀνήρ.

954b–957 νῦν γὰρ ...

ἔνθαδε κίνδυνος ἀνείται σοφίας,

ὅς περὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς φίλοις

ἔχων καλλιτύργιον σοφίαν πρὸς τάδε σ’, ὅς

κομψοπρέπη μοῦσαν ἔχων,

δεῖ σε λέγειν τι καινόν, ὡς

νυκτόκιμηκεν ἀνήρ.

Schol. vet. Ar. Nub. 949a (L.3.1 183.3–6 Holwerda)

ἐν ἐπεκθέσει περίοδον τοῦ χοροῦ ἔκουσα μὲν ἀντίστροφοι, ἐν
dιεχεῖα δὲ, διαφοράς κεκωλίσμενην· θῆσα δὲ ὡς φέρεται νῦν. ἦ

μὲν προτέρα "νῦν δείξετον τὸ πιστύνω," ἦ δὲ δευτέρα "ὁ καλλι-

τύργιον σοφίαν" ἐνὶ τοῦ "εὐδοκίμηκεν <ἀνήρ>.”

In further positioning to the left a choral section which has an
antistrope, but at an interval, differently colometrised; I will set
it out as currently transmitted. The first [begins] νῦν δείξετον τὸ
πιστύνω, the second is ὁ καλλιτύργιον 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
eyear stage. However, in his later edition he correctly divided
the first four cola of the antistrope on the basis of the strophe


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 ἔνθαδε, which looks like the fairly
common error of stopping short before the end of a colon (Parker, Songs
100–101, 202).
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and, less felicitously, tried to restore responsion in the partially corrupt lines that follow. His accompanying notes comment on the insertion of γ’ in 954 (which he read as ὑπότερος αὐτοῦν λέγων) and the textual and colometric rearrangement of 1028–1030 with the aim of making the lines equivalent to their respective counterparts: schol.\textsuperscript{Tv2} Nub. 949b, 1029 (I 3.2 134.6–7, 148.5–6 Koster). Writing πρὸς τάδε δ’ for πρὸς οὖν τάδ’ (Ps et codd. vett.) in 1030 was “a move in the right direction metrically,”\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{verbatim}
Ar. Nub. 1345–1350 ~ 1391–1396 (iambo-choriambic)
Χο. σὸν ἔργον, ὦ πρεσβῦτα, φροντίζειν ὅπῃ τὸν ἄνδρα κρατήσῃς, ὡς πρὸς τοῖς ‘πεποίθειν, οὐκ ἂν ἦν οὕτως ἀκόλουθος. ἀλλ’ ἐσθ’ ὅτι συστάνεται δήλον γε <τοῖ> τὸ λήμα τὸ τάνδρος.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{33} Parker, Songs 203.

\textsuperscript{34} Cf. schol.\textsuperscript{Tv2} Nub. 1345c, 1391b–c Koster.
mistake. The remedies Triclinius applied to Nub. 1049–1050—
colometric change and the addition of γε—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. Regiae
Suecorum 147 = Rs). A longer ancient note on Nub. 1345
analyses the strophe as a miniature triadic system.\footnote{ Cf.
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.\textsuperscript{V} T\textsuperscript{II} Ran. 592b Chantry). It is un-
clear again whether he had read the ancient scholia preserved in Rs and E
(Modena, Bibl. Estense \textalpha.U.5.10).}

Whatever the truth in the last case (and at Ran. 534–548 ~
590–604), Triclinius was capable of recognising separated re-
sponsion 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 as-
sumption 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).\footnote{ See Parker, \textit{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
corruption also goes together with ancient failure to recognise responsion
(Triclinius made no progress either).}

He did not, however, change the in-
herited colometry, and it is worth noting the cautious formu-
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.¹⁷ Ar. *Vesp.* 365a (II.1 62.1–3 Koster)

η ἁμοίβασις αὐτή στροφῆ ἐσοκεν εἶναι ἀντιστροφῆ τῆς ἀνω ῥεθετίσες ὁμοίας στροφῆς, ἄλλ׳ ἐστιν ἐλλιπής· στίχων γάρ ἐστιν καὶ κόλων ν´… 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.¹¹ Ar. *Vesp.* 334a (II.1 58.5 Koster) στροφῆ κάλων καὶ στίχων ιβ´ and 365b (62.10 Koster) στροφῆ ἐτέρα κάλων καὶ στίχων η´.

³⁸ Ta changes allegiance to a non-Triclinian source (*Marc.* gr. 468 = V) on f. 246v, 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* (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 Σωφο-
Soph. Phil. 391–402 ~ 507–518 (iambo-dochmiac)

Χο. οἰκτείρ', ἀναξ' πολλὰν ἔλε-  
ξεν δυσφιστῶν πάνων  
οθλ', σία μηδείς τὸν ἐμὸν τύχοι φίλων.  
ἐι δὲ πικροὺς, ἀναξ' ἐξθεῖς Ἀτρείδας,  
ἐγὼ μὲν, τὸ κείνον  
κακὸν τὸ δένε κέρδος  
μέγα τιθέμενο, ἐν|θη|περ ἐπιμέμονεν,  
ἐπ' εὐστόλου ταχείας | νεώς  
πορεύσατιμ' ἐν ἐς | δόμους, τὰς θέους  
νέμεσιν ἐκφυγών.

510
515

ἐπιμέμονεν cdd.: ἐπεὶ μέμονεν cdd. pler.:  
ἐπιμέμονεν T: ἐπεὶ μέμονεν G  
517 post τὰν add. ἐκ cdd.: del. Hermann

Schol. Soph. Phil. 391.0a Janz

ἡ παρούσα στροφὴ κόλων ἐστὶ τῇ', ἔχει δὲ ἀντιστροφὴν τὴν  
μετὰ τοὺς προκειμένους στίχους, ἥς ἡ ἀρχή· "οἴκτειρ' ἀναξ',"  
tοσούτως καὶ αὐτὴν κόλων ...

The present strophe consists of thirteen cola and has as an an-
tistrophe the one following the preceding stichic verses, which  
begins with οἴκτειρ' ἀναξ' [507], and consists of as many cola ...  

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 'vetere', 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. According to this the dochmiac


507–518 (iambo-dochmiac)

Χο. οἰκτείρ', ἀναξ' πολλὰν ἔλε-
ξεν δυσφιστῶν πάνων
οθλ', σία μηδείς τὸν ἐμὸν τύχοι φίλων.
ἐι δὲ πικροὺς, ἀναξ' ἐξθεῖς Ἀτρείδας,
ἐγὼ μὲν, τὸ κείνον
κακὸν τὸ δένε κέρδος
μέγα τιθέμενο, ἐν|θη|περ ἐπιμέμονεν,
ἐπ' εὐστόλου ταχείας | νεώς
πορεύσατιμ' ἐν ἐς | δόμους, τὰς θέους
νέμεσιν ἐκφυγών.

510
515

ἐπιμέμονεν cdd.: ἐπεὶ μέμονεν cdd. pler.:  
ἐπιμέμονεν T: ἐπεὶ μέμονεν G  
517 post τὰν add. ἐκ cdd.: del. Hermann

Schol. Soph. Phil. 391.0a Janz

ἡ παρούσα στροφὴ κόλων ἐστὶ τῇ', ἔχει δὲ ἀντιστροφὴν τὴν
μετὰ τοὺς προκειμένους στίχους, ἥς ἡ ἀρχή· "οἴκτειρ' ἀναξ',"
tοσούτως καὶ αὐτὴν κόλων ...

The present strophe consists of thirteen cola and has as an an-
tistrophe the one following the preceding stichic verses, which
begins with οἴκτειρ' ἀναξ' [507], and consists of as many cola ...

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 'vetere', 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. According to this the dochmiac

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

40 Cf. schol. Soph. Phil. 507.0a (+ 403.0, 519.0) Janz and the short notes schol. Soph. Phil. 391.0b (στροφὴ κόλων τῇ') and 507.0b (ἀντιστροφὴ κόλων τῇ').
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.

---
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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 iaA | ia Aia | 2do iaA Aia | do).\(^{42}\) In the strophe, however, Zg differs from LK in that 391–392 (2ia | 2Aia), 394/395, 396–397 (2iaA | 2Aia) 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, ἐξηυδώμαν in 395 was evidently designed to create a further longum in ‘responision’ with 510/511, whereas with ἐπιμέτηνεν in 514/515 he at least produced a verb beginning with ἐπ-. It is not impossible that Triclinius was aware of the reading ἐπεὶ μέτηνεν from a codex other than G (\textit{Laur. Conv. Soppr.} 152), which was written in Apulia in 1282 and so could hardly have been available to him.\(^{43}\)

With \textit{OC} 833–843 ~ 876–886 Triclinius presumably had less trouble because the colometry in \textit{T}(\textit{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 ἔς 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. \textit{OC} 833–843 ~ 876–886 is even more crammed on the page (cf. n.45 below).

\(^{43}\) In principle ἐξηυδώμαν could also have come from a manuscript now lost (as my anonymous referee points out). But the inconsistency between creating ‘perfect’ responision and admitting the ‘imperfect’ within four lines of each other remains. We must not expect too much of Triclinius.
Soph. OC 833–843 ~ 876–886 (iambo-dochmiac)

835


Triclinius’ most notable achievement in dealing with this strophic pair is his discovery that the iambic trimeter in 882 lacks its first half: schol.55 Soph. OC 876 (p.111 Turnebus) ἐλλιπῆς δὲ ἐστιν ὁ εἰς τῶν ἵμμβων. 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. Suppr. 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 ... δοκό (Zo) according to the speaker assignments, while 876–877 ἕω τάλας ... εὶ and 833–834 ἕω πόλις ... ἕς (Zo) are run together. L has 833–834/835 ~ 876–877/878 as in ΔΤ (TTa), 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).
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supplement here, but he restored responsion, 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 προβάθ᾽ ὡδὲ βάτε for προβάθ᾽ ὡδ᾽ ἐμβάτε (essentially a word-division error), but then inserted a syntactically ruinous τε after γάς in 884 to make the verse end metrically equivalent to that of the wrong paradosis in the strophe (ἔντοποι codd.: ἔντοποι Brunck). Similarly, in 843 ~ 886 he realised that the lines as he had them did not correspond. His emendations produced an iambic penthemimer (~ − ~ − ⏑), 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 Hephæestion and beginning to work on the dramatic texts.

Conclusion

Demetrius Triclinius has justly been described as the first modern editor and textual critic. 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. Ar. Rhamn. 592b Chantry (see n.35) and schol. Ar. Rhamn. 592b Massa Positano, o τῆς ἄντιστροφῆς ὡδὸς πέμπτος στίχος ἐλλιπῆς ἦν πρὸς τὸν τῆς στροφῆς· διό καὶ ἀναπληρώθη παρ᾽ ἑμοῦ, καὶ οὐκέτι ὡς καλῶς. In his text Triclinius expanded Pers. 1065 βόα νῦν ἄντιδουπά μοι to an iambic trimeter by adding μέλος θείες because he erroneously thought that the verse ought to respond with Pers. 1060 (3ia). Cf. L. Massa Positano, Demetri Triclinius in Aeschyli Persas scholia (Naples 1963) 71, 148.

to his fellow Byzantines his work seemed little short of a miracle,\textsuperscript{48} and some of his conjectures (such as the one in Soph. \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{50}
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\textsuperscript{48} In a note transmitted at the end of the metrical scholia to Pi, \textit{Ol}. 1 Triclinius’ students reverently speak of him as their \textit{µυσταγωγός}; E. Abel, \textit{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, \textit{An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides} (Cambridge 1965) 28–29; Smith, \textit{Studies} 4, 40.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Scholia} I 43). Cf. Zuntz, \textit{Inquiry} 28.

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{GRBS}. Timothy Janz kindly gave me permission to quote his unpublished Oxford dissertation.