

HEPHAESTION AND CATULLUS 63

DAVID MULROY

THE IDEA HAS LONG BEEN IN THE AIR that Catullus 63 (Attis) is a translation or imitation of a lost Hellenistic poem.¹ The best known defense of the view is that of Wilamowitz in "Die Galliamben des Kallimachos und Catullus," *Hermes* 14 (1879) 194-199, and—with some revision—in *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* 2 (1924) 291-295. In recent decades, criticism has remained divided on Wilamowitz's view, but the details of his argument have been mostly ignored. Reasons given for the acceptance or rejection of the "Greek model" theory have typically been broad and subjective.²

In my view, c. 63 is uniquely Catullan; as much so as (say) the Lesbia poems. Yet it is not the purpose of this essay to vindicate that view entirely. Rather I propose to take only the first step in demonstrating the originality of the poem, viz., to reexamine Wilamowitz's argument in detail. The conclusions of my reexamination are antithetical. On the one hand, given Wilamowitz's basic evidence, his argument is quite compelling; it cannot be summarily dismissed. On the other hand, the evidence itself is far from trustworthy. Wilamowitz's superstructure—one might say—is sound, but his foundation is illusory.

Wilamowitz's argument is based on two pieces of evidence. It will prove convenient to set them forth at the outset. They are a passage from Hephaestion's *Enchiridion* (a second-century synopsis of metrical theory) and a gloss thereto attributed to a sixth-century Byzantine scholar, Georgius Choeroboscus. Hephaestion is discussing lines composed of lesser ionics: ~ ~ ~. As we will see, all modern editors agree that the passage needs some emendation.

¹I am indebted to one of *Phoenix*' anonymous referees for the information that the view that Catullus' poem was *totum e graeco quodam scriptore translatum* is mentioned in Doering's 1820 edition of Catullus; it is ascribed to *insigne illud Angliae decus, War-tonus*.

²For support of Wilamowitz's conclusion on general grounds, cf. Fordyce, *Catullus* (Oxford 1961), *ad loc.*: "Its spirit is so Greek . . . that it seems certain that Catullus was translating or adapting a Greek original." For the reverse, Quinn, *Catullus: the Poems* (London 1970), *ad loc.*: "Wilamowitz's thesis of a Greek model . . . is now generally discredited. *Sellar* 369-70 well remarked a hundred years ago, 'There is nothing at all like the spirit of this poem in extant Greek literature.'" A similar dismissal of Wilamowitz's view occurs in J. P. Elder's well-known article, "Catullus' Attis" *AJP* 68 (1947) 394-403. Though there are many different nuances in the positions taken by critics hostile to the "Greek model" theory, I know of no thorough, critical analysis of the evidence and logic behind it.

(12.3) Τῶν δὲ τῷ μέτρῳ μεγεθῶν τὸ μὲν ἐπισημότατόν ἐστι τὸ τετράμετρον καταληκτικόν, οἷόν ἐστι τὸ Φρυνίχου τοῦ τραγικοῦ τουτί,

τό γε μὴν ξείνια δούσαις, λόγος ὥσπερ λέγεται

ὀλέσαι, κάποτε μὲν ὅξέϊ χαλκῷ κεφαλάν,

καὶ παρὰ Φρυνίχῳ τῷ κωμικῷ,

ἃ δ' ἀνάγκα 'σθ' ἱερεῦσιν καθαρεύειν φράσμεν.

τοῦτο μέντοι καὶ γαλλιαμβικόν καὶ μητρφακόν καὶ ἀνακλώμενον καλεῖται. ὕστερον δὲ 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 τροχαϊκὰς ἀδιαφόρως παραλαμβάνουσι πρὸς τὰ καθαρὰ, ὥς καὶ τὰ πολυθρύλητα ταῦτα παραδείγματα δηλοῖ,

Γαλλαὶ μητρὸς ὀρείης φιλόθυρσοι δρομάδες

αἷς ἔντεα παταγείται καὶ χάλκεα κρόταλα.

Of standard lengths in the meter, the best known is the tetrameter catalectic; for example, this from the tragedian Phrynichus:

---/---/---/---
---/---/---/---.

And in Phrynichus the comic poet:

---/---/---/---.

Now this is also called galliambic and matroic and anacastic. Later it was named anacastic on account of more recent poets having written many poems to the mother of the gods in that meter, in which they freely juxtapose to the pure ionics third paeons (---) and palimbacchic (--) and trochaic dipodies (---), as also these famous *exempla* illustrate:

---/---/---/---
---/---/---/---.

(Choeroboscus' Commentary, Cap. 12) 'Ιστέον ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ ἀπ' ἐλάσσονος ἰωνικὸν λέγεται ἀνακλώμενον καὶ μητρφακόν καὶ γαλλιαμβικόν ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς Γάλλους, ὃ ἐστι τοὺς κιναιδούς, ἱαμβίζειν καὶ ὑμνεῖν τὴν Ῥέαν κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν: διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ μητρφακόν. ἴσως δὲ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀνακλώμενον διὰ τὴν κλάσιν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶν καὶ ἀπαλότητα. ᾧ καὶ Καλλιμάχος κέχρηται. ἔστι δὲ ἀταξία πολλή ἐν τῇ ποιήσει (Wilamowitz; χρήσει, codd.) ᾧν παραφέρει χρήσεων καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ποσὶ.

Note that this lesser ionic meter is called anacastic, matroic, and galliambic from the Galli, i.e., the effeminate, lampooning³ and singing hymns to Rhea in the agora. On account of that too it is called matroic. And possibly for that reason it is called anacastic, on account of the sound of the voices of the Galli and their delicacy. A meter which Callimachus also uses. There is great disorder in the composition of the *exempla* that Hephaestion adduces, especially in the initial feet.

In order to evaluate these texts, it is first necessary to understand the metrical term, *anaklomenon*, which I have translated "anacastic." The term is attributive; the related noun is *anaklasis*. An anacastic verse is one that suffers *anaklasis*.

³"Lampooning" rather than "using iambs" since, as Choeroboscus presents the situation, the Galli used lesser ionics, not iambs. Therefore, he must have the secondary sense of *ιαμβίζω* in mind.

Anaklasis itself is a metrical license, which ancient metrists mention only in connection with lesser ionic meters.⁴ The earliest systematic discussion of the term in the extant literature belongs to the fourth-century metrist, Marius Victorinus. His explanation of *anaklasis* is based on the assumption that a long syllable takes precisely twice as much time to pronounce as a short syllable. The time used in pronouncing a short syllable represents the basic unit of time in any meter. A metrical foot is worth as many time units as it would have short syllables if all of its long syllables were resolved into two short syllables apiece. Thus the lesser ionic foot is worth six time units (~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~); it is *hexachronos* or *hexasemos* ("hexachronic").

Anaklasis denotes compensating deviations from hexachronicity (to coin a term) in successive ionic feet. In practice, it always involves a prior foot made pentachronic by the substitution of a third paeon (~ ~ ~) or equivalent bacchic (~ ~ ~) for the ionic. The pentachronic foot is then followed by a heptachronic foot. The heptachronic foot is usually a second epitrite (~ ~ ~ ~ ~), which is also referred to as a trochaic dipody. Sometimes the initial trochee is resolved into a tribrach (~ ~ ~ ~ ~).⁵

That Hephaestion understood *anaklasis* in the manner described above emerges in part from 12.1, where he describes an identical phenomenon without, however, employing the term *anaklasis*. He refers instead to a type of "mixed" line that occurs in lesser ionic meters.⁶ Later, in 14, he uses *anaklomenon* to describe lesser ionic "mixed" in precisely the way that he has described in 12.1 and that Victorinus defines as representing *anaklasis*. Specifically, Hephaestion is discussing epionic trimeter acatalectic, a combination of two iambs and two lesser ionic (~ / ~ / ~ ~ ~ / ~ ~ ~). In 14.7, he notes an exceptional form of the line:

⁴There is no ancient authority for the modern extension of the term *anaklasis* to include similar license in other meters; see U. Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin 1921) 235.

⁵Marius Victorinus in Keil, *Grammatici Latini* 6.93: *plerumque recipit in principio versum baccium a longis incipientem (---) et paeonem tertium (---) quorum uterque quinque temporum spatio extenditur . . . huic, cum esse sena tempora in singulis coniugationibus, utpote ionicorum, oporteat, necessario trochaeus aut eius basis adnectetur (---) ea contemplatione imminuta, ut dipodiae superioris tempora ex subditis compleantur . . . huius modi autem inter se suzugias passionem sive communionem musici anaklasin vocant et metra, siqua forte adverterint talia, anaklomena appellant, quod retrorsum inclinentur, ut in quibusdam saltationum gesticulis nostra corpora pone pandantur.*

⁶Hephaestion 12.1 (Consbruch's Teubner Text): Τὸ δὲ ἅπ' ἐλάσσονος ἰωνικὸν συντίθεται μὲν καὶ καθαρὸν, συντίθεται δὲ καὶ ἐπιμίκτον πρὸς τὰς τροχαϊκὰς (διποδίας) οὕτως, ὥστε τὴν πρὸ τῆς τροχαϊκῆς αἰὲν γίνεσθαι πεντάσημον, τουτέστι τρίτην παιωνικήν, καὶ τὴν τροχαϊκὴν, ὁπόταν προτάττοιτο τῆς ἰωνικῆς, γίνεσθαι ἐπτάσημον (τροχαϊκὴν), τὸν καλούμενον δεύτερον ἐπίτριτον: ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ ἡ μὲν τρίτη παιωνικὴ συναιρεῖται εἰς παλιμβάκχειον, τῆς δὲ ἐπιφερομένης τροχαϊκῆς ὁ πρότερος λύεται εἰς τριβραχυν.

Καθαροῦ μὲν ὄντος τοῦ ἰωνικοῦ τοῦτο: ἀνακλωμένου δὲ ὄντος αὐτοῦ, προταχθεῖσα
 ἱαμβικὴ ἐξάσημος ἢ ἐπτάσημος ποιεῖ τὸ τοιοῦτον, οἷον παρὰ Σαπφοῖ,
 ἔχει μὲν Ἀνδρομέδα καλὰν ἀμοιβάν
 Ψάπφοι τί τὰν πολύολβον Ἀφροδίταν.

The previous *exemplum* is characterized by a pure ionic component. When the ionic part is anaclastic, a hexachronic or heptachronic iambic dipody prefixed to it yields the following, as in Sappho:

---/---/---
 ---/---/---

We can now summarize Wilamowitz's argument. It appears from Hephaestion 12.3 that there *was* once a large number of Alexandrian poems to or about Cybele; for Hephaestion elsewhere uses the term *neoteroi* to designate Alexandrian poets, cf. 15.6–8. With respect to versification, the hallmark of such poems was the use of anaclastic lesser ionic tetrameter catalectic. Unfortunately, none of the poems survives, and so we know little else about them. Still, Catullus was demonstrably influenced by the Alexandrians. C. 63 concerns Cybele, and its verse is anaclastic lesser ionic tetrameter catalectic. Fully two thirds of the poem scan, like the first line, as follows:

~ ~ - ~ / - ~ - - / ~ ~ - ~ / ~ ~ ~
super alta vectus Attis celeri rate maria

The first foot is a pentachronic third paeon; the second, a compensating heptachronic second epitrite or trochaic dipody; the third, another third paeon; the fourth, an incomplete trochaic dipody with the first trochee resolved into a tribrach.

As long as Wilamowitz's evidence is accepted at face value, there are adequate grounds to infer that c. 63 is an extension of an Alexandrian tradition: one more poem to Cybele in anaclastic ionics. The degree to which it is derivative, of course, remains in doubt. On one extreme, it is possible to suppose that particular incidents and details were invented by Catullus and that only the generic qualities of the poem, the general subject, versification, form, and tone are derivative. On the other extreme, one might feel that c. 63 is a translation of one of its Greek predecessors. In any event, it seems unreasonable to deny that Hephaestion 12.3 creates a link between Catullus 63 and a putative genre of Alexandrian poetry—that c. 63 is basically imitative.

It is true that Wilamowitz attempted to prove the latter extreme. He did so with several secondary arguments all designed to suggest that the *Gallai* lines in Hephaestion represented the beginning of a poem by Callimachus and that that poem was Catullus' closely followed model. The first connection was provided by the use of the feminine form, *Gallai*, apparently to designate Cybele's male, though castrated, priests.

Catullus also uses the feminine for Attis' followers and even for Attis himself. Again the lines from the Greek poem were well-known (πολυθρόλητα) and in a meter, which—according to Choeroboscus—Callimachus used. The hypothesis lay close to the surface, then, that the famous Alexandrian poem was by the most famous Alexandrian poet.⁷ If so, it was even easier to believe that Catullus had translated it, just as he had translated "Berenice's Lock." Moreover, Attis is portrayed as a Greek youth. Left to his own devices, Catullus would have been more likely to create a Roman youth.

Obviously, none of these secondary arguments has great force by itself. The use of the feminine form, *Gallai*, may have been a widespread affectation in Alexandrian poetry. If limited to Hephaestion's *exemplum*, it may have been the only feature of the poem that Catullus imitated. Indeed, the reference in Hephaestion's *exemplum* may for all that is known about it have referred to priestesses of Cybele. That would be the accepted interpretation of the lines, if it were not for the survival of Catullus' poem. The Choeroboscus gloss does not say that Callimachus wrote the *Gallai exemplum* or any songs to "The Mother," but only that he also used the meter. (In fact, the gloss would be a strange one to append to the citation of a famous Callimachean poem—as if one were to follow the citation of the opening of the *Iliad* with the remark that Homer *too* used dactylic hexameter.) That a poem was famous and possibly Callimachean would not, in any event, prove that Catullus had translated it. And finally, it is possible that a Latin poet created a Greek youth in a poem that is not an imitation. Yet the essential strength of Wilamowitz's position does not depend on those arguments, but rather on the inference from Hephaestion 12.3 that there once existed a group of Alexandrian Cybele poems written in anaclastic ionics.

The only legitimate grounds for rejecting Wilamowitz's basic position would be the discovery that his crucial piece of evidence, Hephaestion 12.3, is untrustworthy. As it happens, "untrustworthy" is a mild characterization. In my opinion, at least, given an understanding of *anaklasis*, as defined by ancient metrists, and some familiarity with the rest of Hephaestion's work, it is impossible to believe that Hephaestion or any well informed metrist wrote 12.3 in its present form.

Since Hephaestion's work is not well known, some description of its general nature is in order. That is particularly true since modern handbooks, e.g., OCD, perpetuate the tradition that Hephaestion's *Enchiridion*

⁷In his earlier treatment, the *Hermes* article, Wilamowitz asserted that Callimachus' authorship of the *Gallai* lines was a certainty. In *Hellenistische Dichtung*, he described it as merely conjectural. The essential question, however, concerns Catullus' alleged debt not to Callimachus, but rather to a popular Alexandrian genre. Wilamowitz never expressed uncertainty on that second question.

is the “product of successive abridgements.” The phrase invites readers to imagine that scholars of several generations and uneven competence eliminated passages that did not interest them and invented transitional passages wherever necessary to cover the gaps, and that the resulting text must be full of inconcinnity and contradiction. In fact, the theory that Hephaestion’s work was an abridgement of a 48-volume original into one volume is based on two bold textual emendations and must be considered tentative at best.⁸ The point that is relevant, however, is that even if the theory should be true, it holds that Hephaestion himself was the abridger. It was his ambition to reduce the essence of metrics into one volume. Whether or not he first published a longer version, the extant *Enchiridion* is a work of admirable conciseness and lucidity. For example, Hephaestion’s definition of long and short syllables (1.1) is still repeated almost verbatim in modern introductions to Greek and Latin prosody. Gevaert called the *Enchiridion* the best work in the whole range of ancient metrical literature. The judgement is debatable, but it is at least true that in general Hephaestion’s text makes perfectly good sense.

That is not the case, however, with 12.3. The most obvious defect is the double introduction of the term *anaklomenon*. While in conversation statements of the same form (“X is called A, B, and C, and—oh yes—it was named C relatively late,” instead of “X has also been named A, B, and later C.”) are unremarkable, their obvious lack of economy make them anomalous in terse expository prose. Aesthetics aside, the sequence of thought does not make sense without determined and imaginative paraphrase, since the reasons given for the later use of the term *anaclastic* also explain the propriety of the allegedly earlier terms. One must assume that what Hephaestion meant to say was roughly: “It was later called *anaclastic* because later poets wrote hymns to the mother in this meter (as had earlier poets, whence the terms ‘matroic’ and ‘galliambic’) in which they (unlike the earlier poets) freely substituted third paeons etc. (i.e., used *anacclasis*).” It is not typical of Hephaestion, however, to require so much reading between the lines. Moreover, even the single introduction of “*anaclastic*” as a synonym for “*galliambic*” and “*matroic*” is inconsistent with Hephaestion’s usage elsewhere. As 14.7 shows, Hephaestion does not use *anaklomenon* as a proper name for a meter in the same way that he might have used “*galliambic*” or “*matroic*.” Rather, like *καθαρόν*, *anaklomenon* denotes the quality of some lesser ionic lines in any lesser ionic system.

It is also puzzling that Hephaestion provides a definition of *anaklasis* again in 12.3, when he had already given its definition in 12.1. The mere existence of the theory that Hephaestion’s single volume represents the

⁸The theory was propounded by A. Rossbach, *De libris Hephaestionis* (Vratislava 1875).

condensation of an original 48 proves that he is not given to otiose repetition. It is even more puzzling that his discussion of *anакlasis* in 12.3 is inconsistent with that in 12.1; for 12.3 as it now stands states that *anакlasis* refers to the *free* (ἀδιαφόρως) substitutions of third paeons, etc., for lesser ionics. It clearly comes from a writer who was unaware of the balance of pentachronic and heptachronic lines that is an integral part of the proper definition of the term.

It is also worth mentioning that the words used to connect the *Gallai exemplum* with the discussion of *anакlasis* are not typical of Hephaestion. Most of his handbook consists of brief abstract descriptions of meter followed by *exempla*. His normal method of introducing exempla is to use one of a few terse formulae, οἷον ("e.g.") and ὡς παρά ("as in") being by far the most frequent. There is no other instance of anything remotely resembling "as even those well known paradigms clarify" in the rest of the handbook. Other exempla are virtually never characterized as famous or obscure or in any other way than with reference to their metrical quality. The term "paradigm" is itself quite rare, though not unexampled. *Touto* and *tauta* are regularly used in their precise meaning to designate what has gone before, not what follows. Finally, 12.3 contains the only instance of δηλοῖ or its cognates in such a connection in the handbook.

The most telling point against the authenticity of the passage, however, turns on the metrical quality of the *Gallai exemplum*. In my translation of 12.3 above, I have scanned the lines as follows: ---/ ~---/ ~---/ ~---/ /---/ ~---/---/ ~~~. In so doing, I have tacitly accepted the suggestion in the A scholiast of allowing synizesis in ἐντεα and χάλκεα in line 2. It seems certain that that is what Hephaestion had in mind, if he chose the *Gallai exemplum* to discuss in chapter 12. With synizesis, the lines become virtually identical metrically. They both illustrate lesser ionic tetrameter catalectic with the permissible use (noted by Hephaestion in 12.1) of the hexachronic molossos (---) in odd-numbered feet, and are thus relevant to the chapter. Without synizesis, the second line would in Hephaestion's terms represent a form of which he makes no mention: the alternation of greater and lesser ionics. The difficulty is that neither with synizesis nor without it does the *Gallai exemplum* illustrate *anакlasis* either in the precise definition of 12.1 or in the amateurish definition of 12.3.

Wilamowitz attempted to pass over this difficulty. In his *Hermes* article, he wrote that everything was in order; that it was only necessary to read one chapter of Hephaestion to discover that he often quotes only the initial lines of well-known poems. That, of course, evades the issue. Whenever it was possible, Hephaestion apparently used the first line or two of a poem—regardless of its fame—to exemplify the meter or metrical license under discussion. (Most of Hephaestion's *exempla* do not survive in any other form; it is therefore impossible to be certain that

they are preponderantly initial lines. Yet vocative clauses are frequent, and they and many other *exempla sound* like initial lines. Moreover, citations of extant works are of initial lines whenever they provide apt *exempla*.) There is, however, no instance of the practice that Wilamowitz implied to be common: the use of initial lines to “clarify” the nature of a metrical practice that only occurs later in the poem.

Accordingly, it seems certain that the inherited text of 12.3 differs from Hephaestion’s original: something has either been added to or subtracted from it, or there have been both additions and subtractions. To go further than that necessarily requires some conjecture. Yet I believe it possible to do so with a reasonable degree of certainty, and important to try, since 12.3 is involved in an important way with our assessment of Catullus’ originality.

In the first place, it is unlikely that much, if anything, has been omitted from the original text. In 12.3 Hephaestion has already given a full exposition (by his standards) of lesser ionic tetrameter catalectic, when he goes on to exemplify a sub-species of poetry in that meter, the galliambic or matroic song. In merely quantitative terms, the treatment is fuller than normal. Besides, doubt about the authenticity of the passage arises from dubious extras—e.g., the otiose and inaccurate definition of *anaklasis*—rather than missing essentials.

Westphal believed that two or more lines (*exempla*) had been omitted from the text after the *Gallai exemplum* and that those missing did exemplify the different kinds of *anaklasis* mentioned in 12.3. In fact, the hypothesis is not likely. Out of 112 *exempla* in the chapters (5–13) devoted to the discussion of individual meters, 103 (by my count) consist of only one or two lines (71 of one line; 32 of two). Of the remainder (six of three lines; three of four), two are explained by Hephaestion’s desire to show that the meter in question was used in stichic compositions (Alcman in 7.4; Cratinus in 8.6). The remaining “long *exempla*” are almost all in relatively short meters (dactylic tetrameter in 7.6 and 7.7; choriambic dimeter in 9.1; and antispastic dimeter in 10.2 twice). Thus in the whole large set of *exempla* only two (three Priapean lines in 10.5 and three Aristophanic paeonics in 13.3) offer any support for the idea that the *Gallai exemplum* may originally have gone on for even one additional line. By Hephaestion’s standards, it is unusually long as it stands.

All three of Hephaestion’s modern editors—Gaisford, Westphal, and Consbruch—concur in the belief that something extraneous has been added to 12.3. Their suspicions, however, seem to stem exclusively from the obvious inconcinnity involved in the words *καὶ ἀνακλόμενον καλεῖται ὕστερον δὲ ἀνακλόμενον ἐκλήθη*. Gaisford and Consbruch bracket *καὶ ἀνακλόμενον*; Westphal, everything from *ὕστερον* to *μέτρῳ*.

If the only trouble with the passage were the double introduction of the term “anaclastic” then the Gaisford-Consbruch emendation would be preferable. The idea would be that a copyist who knew something about meter added *καὶ ἀνακλόμενον* because it was a synonym in some writers for galliambic and because he had seen the term in the corner of his eye. He had probably realized his error in copying the immediate sequel, but had neglected to correct it. That explanation, however, virtually necessitates accepting everything from *ὑστερον* to *δηλοῦ*—that portion being one sentence syntactically and consisting of closely interwoven assertions—and we have seen that there are weighty objections to so doing. On the other hand, Westphal’s view that *καὶ ἀνακλόμενον* belongs to the original text provides no explanation at all of why a glossator would have written that later the verse was called anaclastic. In a gloss, “later” would mean “after the author’s times” and would be nonsense if Hephaestion himself had written *καὶ ἀνακλόμενον*.

Since previous attempts at emendation have left much doubt about the text, I propose considering a drastic solution. Specifically, it seems to me that Hephaestion’s original sentence probably read simply: *τοῦτο μέντοι καὶ γαλλιαμβικὸν καὶ μετρωτὸν καλεῖται ὥς: Γάλλαι* etc. Possibly, the *ὥς* phrase was somewhat longer originally: “when used in songs like.”

The major advantage of such a sweeping deletion is that it alone provides a context in which the *Gallai exemplum* seems well chosen rather than extraordinarily inappropriate. Two circumstances lead to that characterization of the alternatives. The first is that apparently galliambics were always pervasively anaclastic (in Hephaestion’s terminology). The second is that the classification of galliambics as a species of lesser ionic was at least as controversial in Hephaestion’s day as it is in ours. Both of these points are established by the only extant discussion of galliambics that antedates Hephaestion’s, that preserved in the fragments of Caesius Bassus (ca A.D. 79), in Keil, *G.L.* 6.261:

De galliambo. Ex hoc (8-syllable iambic beginning with an anapaest: *˘˘-/-˘-/-˘-/-*) *nascitur galliambus repetito hoc metro, sed una syllaba detracta, ut habeat semipedem clausulam, quale est hoc.*

˘˘ -/-˘- / ˘ -/-
mea Vatiēna amabo

ut faciat,

˘˘ - /-˘- / ˘ - /-// ˘˘ - /-˘- / ˘ -
mea Vatiēna amabo, mea Vatiēna ama.

It is clear that Caesius views the line *˘˘˘˘˘˘-/-˘˘˘˘˘˘* as the *regular* form of the galliambic. It follows that that form was, at least, quite frequent in the galliambic poems with which he was familiar. Indeed, other extant galliambics (Varro’s, Catullus’, and Maecenas’) suggest that what Hephaestion calls mixed lines were used virtually to the ex-

clusion of "pure" lines in most galliambic songs. Caesius' discussion also shows that the classification of galliambics as lesser ionics was likely to stir disagreement among informed readers.

Now all of the proposed emendations of 12.3 leave the clear implication that Hephaestion's *Gallai exemplum* was chosen to illustrate why galliambic songs were sometimes called anaclastics. Yet all the relevant evidence suggests that, if that had been his desire, it would have been easy for him to find a galliambic song that was in fact anaclastic in its initial lines. Indeed, it may have cost him considerable labour to find one that was not. Thus previous emendations have Hephaestion going out of his way in order, as it were, to fail to prove his point. Moreover, they suggest that the point that Hephaestion set out to prove, however ineptly, was precisely the point that was not in question. An informed reader would not have doubted that typical galliambic songs consisted of what Hephaestion chose to call impure ionics, but he would have questioned whether such songs were not better described—as their very name suggested—as a species of iambic verse.

By way of contrast, if the entire discussion of *anaklasis* is removed from the text, there is considerable rationality in the residue. Hephaestion's pursuit of brevity leads him to introduce the phenomenon of *anaklasis* once and for all in his initial general discussion of lesser ionics. Then in 12.3, having come to the specific topic of the galliambic, Hephaestion's desire is to vindicate their inclusion in the lesser ionic family. Consequently, he finds a galliambic beginning atypically with pure ionics (with the substitution of molossoi in odd-numbered feet, a license distinct from *anaklasis* and also covered in 12.1). The term galliambic suggests a subject matter as well as a meter. The *Gallai exemplum* leaves no doubt as to the subject of the poem from which it is taken. Indeed, the first two words give an implicit explanation of the names galliambic and matroic. Nothing could be more concise or to the point.

We have then to account for the alleged interpolations. Hephaestion is traditionally identified with the tutor of the emperor Verus before his accession. Thus he flourished and probably published the *Enchiridion* around A.D. 150. According to Consbruch, there are only three manuscripts of the *Enchiridion* and its scholia of independent authority, A, D, and I. Of those, A may belong to the thirteenth century; D and I belong to the fifteenth. Common lacunae show that they all descend from the same archetype. Apparently, then, the archetype itself was late Byzantine and subject to interpolation.

It may be argued, however, that the alleged interpolations must have been included in an ancestor of the archetype long before the late Byzantine period. Specifically, 12.3 must have had its present form at the time that Choeroboscus' commentary was written because the commentary refers to the term *anaklomenon* as in Hephaestion's text. Choeroboscus

belonged to the early sixth century. His commentary, however, has probably been expanded by later writers.⁹ Therefore its reference does not prove that 12.3 had achieved its present form by around A.D. 500. In any event, it is not impossible that the glosses were written and interpolated in the three and a half centuries that unquestionably do separate Hephaestion's original from Choeroboscus' commentary. Indeed, it would be during those centuries that such glosses would most likely have been written anyway; for the first evidence (outside of Hephaestion 12.3 itself) for the use of *anaklomenon* as a synonym for galliambic occurs in the writings of Atilius Fortunatianus, ca A.D. 300 (Keil, *G.L.* 6.290). In other words, it would not be unlikely for a glossator ("glossator 1") of the fourth century to add the words *καὶ ἀνακλόμενον* in the margin of Hephaestion's text. The gloss neglected Hephaestion's terminology, in which anaclastic refers to a particular type of mixed line in any lesser ionic system, but was accurate and innocent enough. The confusion began in earnest, however, when a second glossator attempted to explain Hephaestion's potentially puzzling omission of the term anaclastic as a synonym for galliambic: "It was later (i.e., after Hephaestion, before glossator 1) named anaclastic on account of more recent (i.e., post-Hephaestionic) poets having written many songs to the mother of the gods in which they freely juxtapose verses with third paeons and a palimbacchic and trochees." On this construction of events, it remains uncertain whether the second glossator meant that the *Gallai exemplum* illustrated *anaklasis*. If he did, he was mistaken; and since his definition of *anaklasis* is inaccurate that would not be surprising. Yet it is possible to suppose that he only wrote *πολυθρύλητα παραδείγματα* (i.e., anyone who cares to can think of examples for himself) and that *τὰ . . . ταῦτα* was only added at the time that the gloss was interpolated into the text, or shortly thereafter, to create the appearance of continuity. (It is also possible that *καὶ ἀνακλόμενον* originated as a scribal error after the interpolation of *ὑστερον ἀνακλόμενον* etc. in the way that Gaisford and Consbruch apparently thought it did; its previous existence is not necessary to account for the *ὑστερον ἀνακλόμενον* gloss.)

The importance of the foregoing is simply that, supposing that both *καὶ ἀνακλόμενον* and *ὑστερον ἀνακλόμενον* etc. are interpolations, it follows that *ὑστερον* and *νωτέρους* refer not to Alexandrian times and poets respectively (as they probably would if they were Hephaestion's words), but rather that they refer to developments after Hephaestion's times. They are intended to account for Hephaestion's omission of *anaklomenon* as a synonym for galliambic. And it must be added at once that the value of the concomitant assertion for the history of Greek literature is nil. As we have seen, Caesius Bassus' treatment of galliambics shows that they were pervasively "anaclastic" before Hephaestion's time. Indeed, the term

⁹V. B. Z. Muller, *Hermes* 53 (1918) 345 ff.

may have been *applied* to galliambics only after Hephaestion had classified them as ionics. But whenever the term was first applied to galliambics, the assertion that its applicability resulted from relatively late changes in typical galliambic versification is entirely implausible. More likely, putative glossator 2 did not base his statement on knowledge of literary history but rather inferred it from two facts that lay at hand: Hephaestion did not call galliambics "anaclastics;" he and his contemporaries did.

If the origin and significance of ὕστερον and νεωτέρους in Hephaestion 12.3 are what I have argued that they are, then Wilamowitz's case for the imitative nature of Catullus 63 can no longer be considered persuasive. As has been mentioned, Wilamowitz's case rests fundamentally on the inference from Hephaestion's unemended text that there *was* once a large number of Alexandrian galliambics. That inference combined with the facts that Catullus sometimes imitated and even translated Alexandrian poetry and that 63 is in the meter and on the subject of a galliambic song created an overwhelming presumption that the work was basically derivative. Since all the representatives of the putative collection of Alexandrian galliambics had vanished, it was necessary to base one's more detailed idea of what they were like on Catullus' alleged imitation of them. The procedure was far from ideal but not unparalleled in classical studies. If, however, Hephaestion 12.3 is emended along the lines that I have suggested, there remains precious little evidence that the galliambic was a favourite Alexandrian form.

One remaining piece of evidence may be dealt with briefly here. It is Choeroboscus' statement concerning Callimachus. Choeroboscus' ludicrous speculation about the origin of the term *anaklomenon* shows that he was unaware of the metrical difference between pure lesser ionic compositions and anaclastics or galliambics. He says, in effect, that the lesser ionic meter was used by the Galli, whence its alternate names, and also used by Callimachus. He does not say or even imply that Callimachus used the lesser ionic meter in the same fashion as did the Galli. The only reason for us to assume that he did would be the belief that I have attempted to discredit in the foregoing pages: that the galliambic hymn was a favourite Alexandrian genre.

To conclude, my examination of Hephaestion 12.3 and the gloss from Choeroboscus' commentary has led me to believe that they do not provide any genuine support for the hypothesis that matroic hymns similar to Catullus 63 represented a standard type of Alexandrian poetry. I am aware that other pieces of evidence and lines of argument might be brought to bear on the question. The purpose of this essay, however, has been simply to set forth the reasons for skepticism concerning those best known pieces of evidence.