

The Dochmiac in Ancient Metrical Scholarship*

Almut FRIES

It is well known among metricians today that the dochmiac ($\bar{\cup} \bar{\cup} \bar{\cup} \bar{\cup}$) was not fully understood as a metrical unit before the early 19th century when August Seidler published his seminal study *De versibus dochmiacis tragicorum Graecorum* (Leipzig 1811–12).¹ Late-antique and Byzantine scholars interested in rhythm and metre, above all Demetrius Triclinius (ca. 1280–1335), were familiar with the basic form ($\cup - \cup -$), but following the extant writings of Hephaestion and his successors, they usually identified it as a ‘hypercatalectic antispast’ ($\cup - - \cup + -$). By ancient doctrine this analysis allowed for considerable variation in the first two elements (cf. pp. 22–4). However, with the exception of the shape $- - - \cup -$, which was recognised by a scholiast on Hephaestion and repeatedly by Triclinius (p. 23 with n. 9, p. 24 with n. 13), all knowledge of this had been lost, and there was evidently no awareness either of the many variations caused by resolution and ‘drag’ in the second half of the dochmiac.²

* For helpful comments on successive drafts of this paper I am much indebted to James Diggle, Patrick Finglass, Laetitia Parker, Nigel Wilson and the late Martin West. I also profited greatly from the criticism of various anonymous referees.

¹ Seidler identified thirty-two forms of dochmiac as theoretically possible (of which the most frequent is actually $\cup \bar{\cup} - \cup -$), but some are very rare, and others never occur. See CONOMIS 1964: 23–8, WEST 1982a: 109 and PARKER 1997: 65. On dochmiacs with $\bar{\cup} \bar{\cup}$ in place of one of the single shorts see n. 11.

² Following West, I use ‘drag’ and ‘dragged’ for dochmiacs with long first and/or fourth position. Yet it should be noted that the term (coined by A. M. Dale) is not really appropriate for the first element, which is far more often long than the fourth and seems to have become equivalent to an anceps (cf. DALE ²1968: 105, WEST 1982b: 289 = 2013: 274–5). PARKER 1997: 65–6 regards both positions as true anceps. In any case there is no reason why the dochmiac, which is of unclear origin and only came into its own in fifth-century drama, should fall under West’s prehistoric ‘rules of contrast’ (if they ever operated), according to the first of which ‘each princeps must have a short adjacent to it’ (1982a: 19; cf. 1982b: 287 = 2013: 271).

The extreme formalism that characterises much of ancient metrical scholarship did nothing to increase its reputation with modern students of the subject. Seidler certainly expected no help from that quarter – and with good reason, given the limited scope and varying quality of the material at his disposal (cf. his *Prooemium*, VI, X).³ There is, however, evidence for wide-ranging, if not complete, understanding of the dochmiac among ancient metricians, including perhaps Hephaestion, after it had fallen out of use in post-classical times,⁴ and it seems worthwhile to present it in context and attempt to trace the origin of our more explicit sources. In doing so I have, as far as possible, arranged the material according to the types of metrical variation that are recognised. This occasionally groups together approaches based on different theoretical principles (especially metrical as opposed to rhythmic analysis), but it has the advantage of avoiding much repetition and giving the reader an instant sense of the respective levels of expertise. I largely disregard irregular forms of the dochmiac (e.g. ◡ – – –), which are not universally accepted by ancient and modern scholars, and also the ‘ethos’ of the metre, which both agree was one of urgency and strong emotion.

ANCIENT DOCUMENTS (RE-)CONSIDERED

(1) Hephaestion and his School

Hephaestion’s laconic classification of the dochmiac as a variety of the ‘antispastic metre’ (p. 32.5–6 Consbruch) has proved as influential as potentially misleading to his successors:

καὶ ἔστιν ἐπίσημα ἐν αὐτῷ (sc. τῷ ἀντισπαστικῷ) τάδε· πενθεμιμερὲς μὲν τὸ καλούμενον δοχμιακόν, οἷον ‘κλύειν μαίεται / τὸν ἐγγώριον’ (*TrGF* II FF 184, 185).

³ It is worth remembering that scholars of Seidler’s time were even more hampered than we are by the editorial neglect ancillary texts tend to suffer. For this reason, I presume, KÜHNE 1863 largely omitted the dramatic scholia from consideration, with the result that the picture he drew remains one-sided. A complete list of ancient and medieval sources on the dochmiac (divided into rhythmicians and metricians) can be found in TESSIER 2006 and ANDREATTA 2014: 10–19, 27–31 (~ 2009–10: 1–14, 23–8). But neither asks how many and which forms were actually identified.

⁴ The peculiar *Fragmentum Grenfellianum*, a sort of concert aria that mixes dochmiacs of various shapes (basic, resolved and ‘dragged’) with cretics, iambics and anapaests, is the latest extant specimen of the metre (*CA* 177–80, re-edited recently by ESPOSITO 2005). ‘The papyrus has been dated to the second century B.C., but the poem may well be older’ (PARKER 2001: 32).

“(Metra) worth mentioning in it [the antispastic metre] are the following: the penthemimer called dochmiac, as (*TrGF* II FF 184, 185) ‘κλύειν μαίεται / τὸν ἐγχώριον (υ – – υ – | υ – – υ –)’.”⁵

In judging this statement it is important to remember that Hephaestion’s *Encheiridion* is the epitome of an epitome of a treatise in 48 books, in other words, that it is the result of extreme abbreviation. Interestingly, he does not describe the dochmiac as ‘an antispast plus a syllable’ (i.e. a hypercatalectic antispast), like his 8th- or 9th-century commentator Choeroboscus (*in Heph.* p. 239.13–15 Consbruch) and others before and after,⁶ but calls it a ‘penthemimer’ (a metron of two feet and a half), which may betray ‘a glimmering awareness that the licenses of resolution and contraction can change the number of syllables but not the demarcation of the foot or of the half-foot – in modern terminology, that the number of the *elements* is constant’.⁷ In any case, Hephaestion is likely to have applied to the dochmiac one of his general principles relating to antispastic metre, namely that the first foot (υ –) of the first metron or ‘syzygy’ (the ‘coupling’ of two feet, υ – + – υ) can take any of the four forms of a two-syllable foot (υ –, – υ, – –, υ υ).⁸ This would have covered the dochmiac with long first position (– – – υ –),⁹ the hypodochmiac (– υ – υ –), which some modern metricians have regarded as an anaclastic version of the standard dochmiac,¹⁰ and also the shapes – υ υ – υ – and υ υ – – υ –, if we can believe Choeroboscus that the first foot could be resolved into a ‘dactyl’ or an ‘anapaest’ (*in Heph.* p. 238.13–20 Consbruch).¹¹

⁵ Translation VAN OPHUIJSEN 1987: 96. Apart from the dochmiac, Hephaestion’s ‘antispastic’ category includes a variety of Aeolic metres, all assumed to be based on the unit υ – – υ.

⁶ E.g. Ap(h)thionius *ap. Mar. Vict. GL* VI 88.23–5 Keil, Trichas p. 389.1–9 Consbruch and Σ^{Tricl.} *S. Ai.* 879a (p. 18.2–3 Tessier).

⁷ VAN OPHUIJSEN 1987: 100.

⁸ *Heph.* p. 31.16–18 Consbruch, followed by Aristides Quintilianus (1.26 = p. 49.20–3 Winnington-Ingram), who expresses preference for a spondaic opening.

⁹ Cf. Σ (A) *Heph.* p. 142.14–17 Consbruch, who wrongly regards the first syllable of κλύειν in Hephaestion’s sample as long and so analyses the penthemimer as beginning with a ‘fourth epitrite’ (– – – υ). On the dochmiac and the ‘epitrite’ see below, p. 24 with n. 13.

¹⁰ Especially WILAMOWITZ 1921: 405–6. The length – υ – υ – is not uncommon among dochmiacs (CONOMIS 1964: 31–4), but it also occurs elsewhere, and it is impossible to tell whether it was perceived differently depending on the metrical context (cf. n. 28 on the ambiguity of – υ υ – υ – as a dochmiac or a dodrans A). Contrary to WEST 1982a: 110–11 and PARKER 1997: 66, there is no certain example of responsion between a hypodochmiac and a normal dochmiac. [A.] *PV* 577 ~ 595 and E. *Hipp.* 832 ~ 850 are easily emended (cf. CONOMIS 1964: 31–2), and at E. *Med.* 1252 ~ 1262 a papyrus has yielded a better version of 1262 (anticipated by Musgrave).

¹¹ The form υ υ – – υ – (~δ) is occasionally attested in manuscripts, but always in passages that are either easily emended or irretrievably corrupt (CONOMIS 1964: 35–8). Many mod-

If, moreover, Hephaestion's statement that 'sometimes also the first foot is resolved into a tribrach' (p. 32.3–4 Consbruch ἔστι δὲ ὅτε καὶ λύεται ὁ πρότερος πούς εἰς τρίβραχυν) referred to antispasts in general, and not only to those 'mixed up with iambics' (pp. 31.20–32.3 Consbruch εἰς ἀναμίσγεται ταῖς ἰαμβικαῖς ...),¹² dochmiacs of the form $\cup \cup - \cup -$ would also be included.

However, nothing of this is specified in Hephaestion's surviving work, nor do we get any help from Aristides Quintilianus, who treated the dochmiac in his chapters on rhythm (1.13–19) and consequently followed a different analytical system (cf. pp. 26–7). There is no evidence either that Hephaestion allowed variation in the fourth element of the basic antispast, which Lomiento deduced from the fact that the scholia to Greek drama occasionally label cola beginning $\cup - - -$ as ἀντισπαστικόν and/or associate the metre with the 'epitrite' (i.e. $\cup - - -$, $- \cup - -$, $- - \cup -$ or $- - - \cup$).¹³ It is improbable, therefore, that Hephaestion, in his theoretical framework, recognised dochmiacs with long fourth position, never mind 'double-drag' forms. For clear indications that the former, and much else of what we now label 'dochmiac', was understood in antiquity we have to look elsewhere in the old scholia to Aeschylus, Aristophanes and Euripides. In some places their testimony is supplemented by ancient manuscript colometries or musical annotation.

ern scholars are therefore reluctant to accept any kind of dochmiac with 'irrational anceps' (see FRIES 2014: 292), but ancient metricians may have recognised them. Choeroboscus twice claims familiarity with Hephaestion's longer epitome in eleven books (*in Heph.* pp. 229.16–20, 246.15–17 Consbruch), which perhaps detailed the point about resolution. On the other hand, it may just as well have been Choeroboscus' own inference, especially since Aristides Quintilianus (n. 8) says nothing about it.

¹² The latter is the interpretation of VAN OPHUIJSEN 1987: 96, but the entire introduction to antispastic metre is so elliptical (as van Ophuijsen himself admits) that the first view is by no means excluded.

¹³ GALVANI – LOMIENTO 2014: 116 with n. 5, 119. None of the examples she cites (116 n. 5) uses the terms δόχμιος or δοχμιακόν, unlike Triclinius who repeatedly identifies dochmiacs of the form $- - - \cup -$ as ἀντισπαστικόν μονόμετρον ὑπερκατάληκτον δοχμιακόν (*sic*) ἐξ ἐπιτρίτου δ' (ΣΣ S. *Ai.* 621, 900) or simply ἀντισπαστικόν μονόμετρον ὑπερκατάληκτον δοχμιακόν (Σ *Ant.* 100); cf. TESSIER 2000: 202–3. Some sources attest δόχμιος as an alternative name for the the first one or two 'epitrites' (Σ (B) *Heph.* p. 303.26–8 Consbruch, Choerob. *in Heph.* p. 219.13–18 Consbruch, Anon. Ambros. p. 229 Studemund) or even all four (P.Oxy. 5159 → fr. 1.5–2.10), probably by analogy with early analyses of the Triclinian kind (cf. Σ (A) *Heph.* p. 142.14–17 Consbruch, paraphrased in n. 9). The existence of an ancient metrical theory that regarded the dochmiac as a 'hypercatalectic epitrite' (BENAÏSSA 2012: 109–10) is unlikely. More traces of it should survive, and as Benaïssa himself admits, it does not account for the standard form $\cup - - \cup -$.

“σύ τ’ ὄ διογε(νέζ) (υ – υ υ υ –): ... These too are dochmiacs and of equal proportion if one scans them as of eight time-units. I correctly said ‘scans’, for they are rhythms. Rhythms are scanned, while metres are divided off, not scanned.”

It is in fact not certain whether the first note refers to A. *Sept.* 101–2 πέπλων καὶ στεφείων πότε εἰ μὴ νῦν / ἀμφὶ λιτὰν ἔξομεν (as the manuscripts have it), which can only be analysed as *ba kd* | *2cr*. Ercoles suggested that it really belongs to the dochmiacs at *Sept.* 92–4 τίς ἄρα ῥύσεται, τίς ἄρ’ ἐπαρκέσει / θεῶν ἢ θεᾶν (υ υ υ – υ – υ υ υ – υ – | υ – – υ –),¹⁷ following the passage where M correctly divided the lines against word-end (above). On the other hand, the text at *Sept.* 101–2 is very probably faulty. On the basis of Σ A. *Sept.* 101a Smith πότε στέφη ῥίψομεν καὶ πέπλους ἐπὶ γῆς ἢ νῦν, τραπέισαι ἐπὶ λιτανείαν τὴν περὶ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς πόλεως, West (²1998) printed πέπλων καὶ στεφείων <πότε> ποτ’ εἰ μὴ νῦν / ἀμφὶ λιταν<ᾶ βαλεῖν χρεῖαν> ἔξομεν, thereby restoring pure dochmiacs.¹⁸ Since we cannot establish the date of the presumed corruption (haplography in 101, slip from -αν to -αν in 102), West’s statement that ‘[t]he scholia preserve the knowledge that these are dochmiacs (101e, codd. MIV al.)’ carries some weight.

In any event, both scholia correctly describe the basic dochmiac as a rhythm of eight time-units (ὀκτάσημος) and recognise it, in Aeschylus and the quotations from Euripides and Aristophanes, in forms with resolved second and third position, i.e. υ υ υ – υ – (A. *Sept.* 92/3 (?), Ar. *Av.* 1189–90, E. *Phoen.* 344–5) and υ – υ υ υ – (A. *Sept.* 128). This goes beyond Hephaestion, as we have him, and Aristides Quintilianus (1.17 = p. 37.13–15 Winnington-Ingram), whose equally rhythmic-based division of the dochmiac into an iamb (υ –) and a paeon (– υ –) leaves it open whether he envisaged the possibility of resolution in the longa of either foot:

Μιγνυμένων δὴ τῶν γενῶν τούτων εἶδη ῥυθμῶν γίνεται πλείονα: δύο μὲν δοχμιακά, ὧν τὸ μὲν συντίθεται ἐξ ἰάμβου καὶ παιῶνος διαγυίου, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἐξ ἰάμβου καὶ δακτύλου καὶ παιῶνος.

“Several species of rhythm are generated by mixtures of these genera. There are two dochmiacs, of which the first is composed of an iambus and a *paiōn* *diaguios* [– υ –], the second of an iambus, a dactyl and a paeon.”¹⁹

¹⁷ ERCOLES 2015: 320–5.

¹⁸ Cf. WEST 1990: 101–2.

¹⁹ Translation BARKER 1989: 441. Cf. Mart. Cap. 9.990 (adapting Aristides). The *paiōn diaguios* (two-limbed?) is so called because the durational ratio between its arsis and

We cannot tell either whether the author of the Aeschylus scholia, or his source, recognised the dochmiacs with long first (or fourth) position in the lines that follow the ones he commented on (*Sept.* 102 (?), 130–8), unless the conditional clause ... ἐάν τις αὐτὰ ὀκτασήμως βαίνει (Σ A. *Sept.* 128a Smith) can be interpreted to that effect (i.e. octaseme, as opposed to ennea- or even decaseme in the case of double ‘drag’).²⁰ Clearer evidence for their recognition comes from the ancient commentators on Aristophanes and Euripides.

(3) Heliodorus on Aristophanes

In the corpus of Attic drama, the plays of Aristophanes are the only ones which were undoubtedly equipped with a full ancient metrical commentary. From the extant scholia we can infer that its author was Heliodorus, a distinguished metrician who also wrote a handbook (ἐγχειρίδιον) on metre one or two centuries before Hephaestion.²¹ Like his later colleague, Heliodorus subscribed to the doctrine of the *metra prototypa* as basic components of all Greek verse,²² although a comment in Choeroboscus suggests that he combined this with a less schematic conception of metre (*in Heph.* p. 247.11–14 Consbruch):

Ἡλιόδωρος δέ φησι κοσμίαν εἶναι τῶν παιωνικῶν τὴν κατὰ πόδα τομήν, ὅπως ἢ ἀνάπαυσις ἐπιδιδούσα χρόνον ἕξασήμους ποιῆ τὰς βάσεις καὶ ἰσομερεῖς ὡς τὰς ἄλλας, οἷον ‘οὐδὲ τῷ Κνακάλω οὐδὲ τῷ Νυρσύλα’ (Alcm. fr. 173 *PMGF*).

thesis is a proportionally unequal 2 : 3 (Arist. Quint. 1.16 = p. 37.5–7 Winnington-Ingram; cf. BARKER 1989: 441 nn. 119, 200 and below, n. 23 and p. 32 with n. 36). Aristides’ ‘second dochmiac’ is in fact a glyconic.

²⁰ Within the rhythmical division of the octaseme dochmiac into groups of three and five shorts, these ‘irrational’ longs ‘must have been accommodated by a kind of rubato’ (WEST 1982a: 115). Cf. WEST 1992: 142–3.

²¹ Subscr. (a) ΣΣ^{VN} Ar. *Nub.* (I.3.1 250 Holwerda) ~ Subscr. ΣΣ^V Ar. *Pax* (II.2 182 Holwerda) κεκώλισται ἐκ τῶν (πρὸς τὰ) Ἡλιοδώρου ... and ΣΣ^{vet.} Ar. *Vesp.* 1283e Koster, *Pax* 1353 (?) Holwerda. Heliodorus’ ἐγχειρίδιον was criticised as too elementary by Hephaestion (Long. *Proll.Heph.* p. 86.1–5 Consbruch). For the problem of dating him between the first century BC and the first century AD see PARKER 1997: 95–6 with n. 8.

²² Various eight (Heliodorus), nine (Hephaestion) or ten in number: iamb, trochee, dactyl, anapaest, choriamb, antispast, ionic *a maiore*, ionic *a minore* (paeon, proceleusmatic). Our earliest exponent of this model is the grammarian Philoxenus of the first century BC (fr. 286 Theodoridis = Ap(h)thionius *ap. Mar. Vict. GL VI* 98.17–26 Keil), but it is probably somewhat older. Its ancient rival was the ‘derivation’ theory, which only allowed feet of two or three syllables and traced all verse forms back to the iambic trimeter and the dactylic hexameter. See LEONHARDT 1989, a revision of LEO 1889.

“Heliodorus says that in paeonics (i.e. – ∪ –, – ∪ ∪, ∪ ∪ –) it is a mark of good order for word-end to coincide with foot-end so that the pause, by adding one time-unit, makes the metres hexaseme and of equal proportion, like the others, as for example (Alcm. fr. 173 *PMGF*) οὐδὲ τῷ Κνακάλω οὐδὲ τῷ Νυρσύλα (– ∪ – | – ∪ – | – ∪ – | – ∪ –).”²³

In view of such rhythmical concerns, whether based on objective criteria or not, we should not be surprised to find Heliodorean scholia on Aristophanes which implicitly or explicitly recognise a variety of dochmiacs, including some with long first element.²⁴

The most significant series of annotations relates to *Acharnians*, a play especially rich in dochmiac lyrics owing to the agitated nature of the chorus. Thus Ar. *Ach.* 358–63 (~ 385–90) is correctly analysed as a sequence of seven dochmiacs (arranged in two ‘dimeters’ and three ‘monometers’ – modern editors prefer a ‘trimeter’ and two ‘dimeters’), and the commentator does not seem to have been perturbed by the presence of various resolved forms (∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪, ∪ ∪ – ∪ –, ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪) in addition to the standard one:

Σ^{vet.} Ar. *Ach.* 358a Wilson

διπλῆ καὶ εἴσθεσις εἰς περίοδον τοῦ χοροῦ πεντάκωλον δοχμίαν, ὄντων διπλῶν μὲν τῶν δύο πρώτων, ἀπλῶν δὲ τῶν τριῶν τὸ λοιπόν.

“A *diplē* and indentation to mark a choral period of five dochmiac cola, with the first two being dimeters, the remaining three monometers.”

²³ Cf. PARKER 1997: 96–7, who does not paraphrase the end of the statement. By ‘of equal proportion’ (ἰσομερεῖς) Heliodorus meant the durational ratio between thesis and arsis, which in paeonics is normally 2 : 3 (or 3 : 2 according to some rhythmicians), but in the hexaseme form would become 1 : 1 as, for example, in dactyls and anapaests (see WEST 1992: 140–3 and below, p. 32). It is important not to confuse these paeonics with the ‘cretics’ produced by syncopation of iambic and trochaic metra, which presumably have a triseme in place of their initial or final long.

²⁴ Most notes that go back to Heliodorus can easily be identified by the technical terminology he employed. The backbone of his colometry was a system by which longer verses (relative to the preceding one) began further to the left (ἐν ἐκθέσει) and shorter ones further to the right (ἐν εἰσθέσει). By extension ἔκθεσις and εἴσθεσις could then be applied to entire metrical systems so positioned, and the same is true in lyrics of the critical sign used to indicate change of metre (παράγραφος διπλῆ or simply διπλῆ). See WHITE 1912: 384–95 and PARKER 1997: 96.

Similarly, $\Sigma^{\text{vet.}}$ Ar. *Ach.* 490 and 566a Wilson describe their respective astrographic stanzas (490–5, 566–71) as dochmiac, but this time these also contain the ‘dragged’ shapes $---\cup-$ (490, 494)²⁵ and $-\cup-\cup-$ (567, 569, 571).

The latter form is further recognised in $\Sigma^{\text{vet.}}$ Ar. *Ach.* 1219a Wilson καὶ σκοτοδινιῶ ($-\cup-\cup-$)] τῆς δευτέρας συζυγίας δόχμιον †ῶδε† (cf. 1221 καὶ σκοτοβινιῶ) and $\Sigma^{\text{vet.}}$ Ar. *Nub.* 1164 Holwerda ὄν κάλεσον τρέχων / ἔνδοθεν ὡς ἐμέ ($-\cup-\cup-$ | $-\cup-\cup-$)] τὸ ιβ' καὶ ιγ' δόχμιος συζυγία. These brief notes are significant for two reasons. First, the use of the term ‘dochmiac syzygy’, at least in the one on *Nub.* 1164,²⁶ suggests that Heliodorus, although an adherent of the *metra prototypa* theory, was also familiar with the rhythmical interpretation of the dochmiac as a combination of two different feet (i.e. $\cup-+-\cup-$).²⁷ This accords with his treatment of the paeonics reported by Choeroboscus (above) and explains his ability to cope with variations in the dochmiac scheme beyond the first ‘foot’, which was covered by the antispastic theory (cf. pp. 22–4).

Secondly, the two comments testify to Heliodorus’ ability to recognise the dochmiac in alien surroundings. Ar. *Ach.* 1219 stands in a predominantly iambic context, which could not have guided him.²⁸ Ar. *Nub.* 1164, on the other hand, is preceded by a metrically identical line (1163 λυσανίας πατρώων μεγάλων κακῶν) and followed by three single dochmiacs of the form $\cup-\cup-$ (1166, 1168, 1170), but as far as our scholia go, it is isolated because only 1163 carries a note which wrongly identifies πατρώων ... κακῶν as a glyconic ($\Sigma^{\text{vet.}}$ Ar. *Nub.* 1163e Holwerda). Whatever that says about the limits

²⁵ In Ar. *Ach.* 494 ἀνήρ οὐ τρέμει τὸ πρᾶγμα’ ... the initial long was restored by Elmsley (ἀνήρ codd.). Since the context requires the article, it is likely that the ancients too read ANHP accordingly and in some papyri perhaps added a rough breathing and/or a length mark for clarification.

²⁶ Since the partly corrupt scholium on Ar. *Ach.* 1219 belongs together with $\Sigma^{\text{vet.}}$ Ar. *Ach.* 1214a Wilson ... διπλῆ καὶ δυάδες τρεῖς, δικώλους ἔχουσαι τὰς περιόδους, ἐξ ἰάμβου τριμέτρου ἀκαταλήκτου ἐκκειμένου <καὶ κώλων διαφόρων>. τῆς μὲν οὖν πρώτης δυάδος τὸ δευτερόν ἐστι παιωνικὸν δίρρυθμον ... and $\Sigma^{\text{vet.}}$ Ar. *Ach.* 1223a Wilson ... τῆς τρίτης δυάδος ἰαμβικὸν ἐφθήμερες, WHITE 1912: 403 deleted συζυγίας (leaving δευτέρας, sc. δυάδος) and wrote ἀπλοῦν for ῶδε. For the ‘dochmiac syzygy’ see also the Heliodorean scholia in n. 29 and cf. HOLWERDA 1967: 251 and TESSIER 2000: 200–1.

²⁷ For the antithesis between ‘metricians’ and ‘rhythmicians’ cf. Choerob. in *Heph.* p. 239.13–17 Consbruch ἰστέον γάρ, ὅτι τὸ δοχμιακὸν σύγκειται ἐξ ἀντισπάστου καὶ συλλαβῆς, ὡς πρὸς τὸν μετρικὸν χαρακτῆρα. οἱ μέντοι ῥυθμικοὶ τὸ πᾶν μέτρον ὡς μίαν συζυγίαν λαμβάνοντες δοχμιακὸν ὀνομάζουσι ... See further ERCOLES 2015: 321 and my section (5) below.

²⁸ It is not even clear whether Aristophanes intended *Ach.* 1219 and 1221 to be dochmiacs. PARKER 1997: 154–7 wavers between that and an aeolo-choriambic dodrans A, although in her introduction (67) she seems to favour the dochmiac interpretation.

of Heliodorus' expertise (the mistake was easy given the clash between metron- and word-end in the verse), he knew enough about the dochmiac and at least some of its possible variations to recognise them even in places where the surrounding metres would not have led him to expect them.²⁹

(4) Euripidea

Heliodorus and the anonymous source of the scholia on *A. Sept.* 101 (92–4?) and 128 were not the only ancient metricians and/or rhythmicians who demonstrably understood something of the variable nature of the dochmiac. Among the old scholia on Euripides' *Orestes* there is a brief note on the opening line of the remarkable 'tiptoeing' parodos (*Or.* 140–207):

Σ^{MTAB} *E. Or.* 140 Schwartz

πρόσφορος τῷ πάθει ἢ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ ἀγωγή δοχμιάζουσα.

“The dochmiac rhythm and tempo are appropriate to the sentiment (of the passage).”

It would be natural to apply the comment to at least the entire first strophic pair (140–52 ~ 153–65), which is almost pure dochmiac, and to conclude that it goes back to someone who knew that this metre could take 'irrational' longs (142, 146, 154, 160) and be resolved to the point of becoming a series of eight shorts (149–50 ~ 163–4).³⁰

The preservation of such a note on *Orestes* is in line with the other musical documents we have of this most popular ancient play, above all the Vienna papyrus (P. Vindob. G 2315 = Rainer inv. 8029) of ca. 200 BC, which contains parts of lines 338–44 of the again mainly dochmiac first stasimon (316–31 ~ 332–47) with musical notation.³¹ Interestingly, the papyrus

²⁹ Cf. also Σ^{vet.} *Ar. Nub.* 1206a Holwerda διπλῆ καὶ εἰσθεσις εἰς μέλος τοῦ ὑποκριτοῦ ὀκτάκωλον, ὃν τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ... τὸ ζ' ἐξ ἰαμβικοῦ πενθημιμεροῦς καὶ δοχμίου συζυγίας, which presupposes a wrong division of 1210–11 (actually 2ia + 2ia_n) caused by the common error of running on to word-end, and Σ^{vet.} *Ar. Eq.* 303a Jones (a single dochmiac among cretics), which is based on a corrupt text of 303 (PARKER 1997: 162–3). Despite GENTILI 1998, Σ^{vet.} *Ar. Ach.* 284a Wilson ... πρῶτος τοίνυν ἐστὶ <στίχος> ἐν ἐκθέσει †κατὰ τὸ ἴσον τοῖς χορικοῖς ἃ ποιεῖ δοχμὸν συζυγίαν καὶ παίωνα τρεῖς καὶ διαίρεσιν† ... is beyond restoration.

³⁰ The second strophic pair (166–86 ~ 187–207) is also mainly dochmiac (heavy in resolution), but with iambo-trochaic and enoplian cola interspersed.

³¹ See especially WEST 1992: 277–8, 284–5 and PÖHLMANN – WEST 2001: 12–15 (both with further literature).

indicates, by its use of the *stigmē*, that in the dochmiac the arses were on the first and third positions, meaning that the theses fell onto the second and fourth + fifth (i.e. $\cup - ' - \cup ' -$).³² This probably reflects a general truth about dochmiac *rhythm*, whether or not the notation represents Euripides' own music (which I consider unlikely). The irregularity of the theses, in that they last two and three χρόνοι respectively, probably contributed to the sense of urgency the dochmiac conveyed, and it would explain why later rhythmicians divided it into an iamb and a cretic, for the 'beats' of which ($\cup - '$ and $- \cup ' -$) we have evidence going back to the fifth century BC (cf. pp. 26–7 with n. 19 and p. 32 with n. 36).

The beginning of the *Orestes* parodos (140–2), moreover, was chosen by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Comp.* 63–4) to illustrate the non-agreement of melody and word-accent, and another scholium comments on the vocal delivery of this song:

Σ^B E. *Or.* 176 Schwartz

τοῦτο τὸ μέλος ἐπὶ ταῖς λεγομέναις νήταις ᾄδεται καὶ ἐστὶν ὀξύτατον ... ἀλλὰ κέχρηται μὲν (*sc.* ἡ Ἡλέκτρα) τῷ ὀξεῖ ἀναγκαίως, οἰκειὸν γὰρ τῶν θρηνοῦντων, λεπτότατα δὲ ὡς ἐνὶ μάλιστα.

“This song is sung on the so-called *nētai* (the top-notes), and is very high ... but she [Electra] has to use the high register because it is typical of people lamenting, and she does so as softly as possible.”³³

Both this note and the comment by Dionysius of Halicarnassus are no doubt based on a living performance culture (although the musical scores would hardly have been authentic),³⁴ and the same must be true of the scholium to E. *Or.* 140 with its reference to tempo (ἀγωγή) as well as rhythm (cf. below). Such practice probably also contributed to the wider appreciation of the dochmiac by metricians certainly up to the age of Heliodorus.

³² The text of only one dochmiac in the sequence is complete enough to cover both arses in the musical notation (E. *Or.* 342b ... κατέκλυσεν δ[εινῶν]), but the distribution of the *stigmai* in the rest is entirely consistent with that, irrespective of the shape which the dochmiacs take ($\cup - - \cup -$, $\cup \cup \cup - \cup -$, $\cup - \cup \cup \cup -$, $\cup - - - -$, $\cup \cup \cup - - - -$ and $- \cup \cup - \cup -$ are found).

³³ Translation by PÖHLMANN – WEST 2001: 10 (adapted); cf. WEST 1992: 277. Instead of *λεπτότατα* (Schwartz), West reads *λεπτότατον* for the transmitted *λεπτότερον*, with a full stop after τῶν θρηνοῦντων: ‘And it (the song) is as light as it can possibly be’.

³⁴ See BUDELMANN 2001: 222 and PARKER 2001: 36–8 (where read ‘the end of the fifth century’ instead of ‘... fourth ...’ on p. 36, five lines from the bottom of the main text).

(5) Rhythmical Theory

It remains to explain in greater detail the theoretical basis of the scholia to A. *Sept.* 101 (92–4?), 128 and E. *Or.* 140, which will also shed further light on Heliodorus' conception of the dochmiac. Their technical terminology depends on the tradition of rhythmical analysis, which began with Democritus, Hippias of Elis and Damon in the second half of the fifth century BC and reached an early peak in Aristotle's student Aristoxenus, whose treatise on rhythm (Ῥυθμικὰ στοιχεῖα or *Elementa Rhythmica*) survives in one fragment from the second book (preserved in three manuscripts) and later adaptations, especially by Aristides Quintilianus and Michael Psellus.³⁵

In Damon (*ap.* Pl. *Rep.* 400a–c) we first see the classification of rhythmical units (βάσεις) according to the durational ratio between their arsis and thesis, resulting in three categories (εἶδη or *genera*): 1 : 1 = 'dactylic' (υ υ | –' or υ υ | –); 1 : 2 or 2 : 1 = 'iambic' (υ | –' or –' | υ) and 2 : 3 or 3 : 2 = 'paeonic' (– | υ' – or – υ' | –).³⁶ He also displayed some interest in musical tempo (*ap.* Pl. *Rep.* 400c1–3 καὶ τούτων τιςὶν οἴμαι τὰς ἀγωγὰς τοῦ ποδὸς αὐτὸν οὐχ ἥττον ψέγειν τε καὶ ἐπαινεῖν ἢ τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς αὐτοῦς), which shows that rhythmical theory was rooted in performance culture.³⁷

Following on from this, Aristoxenus introduced the measurement of rhythm in time-lengths (χρόνοι), with the smallest intelligible feet being triseme (*Rhythm.* 2.31 Pearson). Unfortunately, the fragment of his *Elementa Rhythmica* breaks off just after the beginning of the section on octaseme rhythms (2.36 Pearson):

ὥστε πέμπτοι ἂν εἶησαν οἱ ἐν ὀκτασήμῳ μεγέθει. ἔσονται δ' οὗτοι δακτυλικοὶ τῷ γένει, ἐπειδήπερ ***.

"[Fifth] in order, therefore, will be the feet of eight-signal length, and these will be of the dactylic kind because ..."³⁸

³⁵ A concise account of ancient rhythmical theory is provided by WEST 1992: 242–5. See also PEARSON 1990: xxiii–liv, BUDELMANN 2001 (with strong emphasis on the performance aspect embodied in ῥυθμός) and ERCOLES 2014: 431–3.

³⁶ Cf. e.g. Arist. *Rhet.* 1409a2–6, Aristox. *Rhythm.* 2.30–6, Aristid. *Quint.* 1.14 = pp. 33.29–34.18 Winnington-Ingram. The names of the εἶδη are generic and thus, in the case of 'dactylic' and 'iambic', cover anapaests and trochees as well. Some rhythmicians also allowed an arsis / thesis ratio of 4 : 3 = 'epitrite' (– | υ' –). See WEST 1982a: 22–3, 1992: 131 with n. 7, 243–4 and ERCOLES 2014: 432.

³⁷ ERCOLES 2014: 432. Cf. BUDELMANN 2001: 214–15.

³⁸ Translation PEARSON 1990: 19 (who wrongly printed 'seventh' instead of 'fifth').

We have no way of knowing whether Aristoxenus also discussed dochmiacs, although this seems likely. In that case, one wonders how he would have reconciled their 3 : 5 division, which rendered them proportionately unequal by definition (δόχμιος = ‘slanting’), with the notion that octaseme rhythms belong to the ‘dactylic’ genre, meaning that they go by the ratio 1 : 1. Perhaps Aristoxenus assigned the dochmiac to a special subcategory or, more probably, treated it as a ‘composite foot’ (cf. *Rhythm.* 2.22, 26 Pearson). He may well be the origin of the analysis as iamb + cretic, which we find most clearly expounded in Aristides Quintilianus, followed by the statement that dochmiacs ‘were called “slanting” on account of their complexity, their unevenness and because they are not analysed by the rules of straight rhythm’ (1.17 = p. 37.13–18 Winnington-Ingram ... δόχμιοι δὲ ἐκαλοῦντο διὰ τὸ ποικίλον καὶ ἀνόμοιον καὶ μὴ καθ’ εὐθὺ θεωρεῖσθαι τῆς ῥυθμοποιίας).³⁹

Returning to our scholia, the one on *E. Or.* 140 evidently goes back to a text which, in the tradition of Damon, had some sort of performance in mind. Those on *A. Sept.* 101 (92–4) and 128 present a less clear picture. The last note (p. 26) shows that the scholiast, like his source, was alert to the theoretical distinction between ‘rhythm’ and ‘metre’, of which the former is ‘scanned’ (βαίνη; cf. Damon’s βάσεις), the latter ‘divided off’ (διαρεῖται). This distinction is again attested as early as the fifth century BC (*Ar. Nub.* 638) and connected with performance insofar as ‘metre’ came to be restricted to the syllabic pattern of words, whereas ‘rhythm’ always retained a sense of flexibility in the actual duration of the longs and shorts. Note Longinus in his commentary on Hephaestion (p. 83.10–16 Consbruch):

Ἔτι τοίνυν διαφέρει ῥυθμοῦ τὸ μέτρον, ἧ τὸ μὲν μέτρον πεπηγότας ἔχει τοὺς χρόνους, μακρόν τε καὶ βραχὺν καὶ τὸν μεταξὺ τούτων τὸν κοινὸν καλούμενον, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς πάντως μακρὸς ἐστὶν ἢ βραχὺς· ὁ δὲ ῥυθμὸς ὡς βούλεται ἔλκει τοὺς χρόνους. πολλάκις γοῦν καὶ τὸν βραχὺν χρόνον ποιεῖ μακρόν.

“‘Rhythm’ and ‘metre’ differ also in the following point: ‘metre’ has fixed time-lengths, long and short and between them the so-called common one, which itself is either fully long or short, too. ‘Rhythm’ manipulates

³⁹ Cf. pp. 26–7. Choeroboscus reports a more systematic explanation of the name. According to him (*in Heph.* pp. 239.15–240.6 Consbruch), ‘the rhythmicians’ (οἱ ῥυθμικοί) called the metre δοχμιακόν because its arsis / thesis ratio is $n : n + 2$, while that of the other ‘unequal’ *genera* (‘iambic’, ‘paeonic’, ‘epitrite’) is $n : n + 1$.

time-lengths as it pleases. Often at least it makes even the short time-length long.⁴⁰

If the Aeschylus commentator, and his source, were familiar with this concept, it would be a further argument – in addition to the puzzling conditional clause in Σ A. *Sept.* 128a Smith (... $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ τις αὐτὰ ὀκτασήμως βαίνῃ) – for the assumption that behind the short notes lies a wider appreciation of the dochmiac, and the scholiast was simply not interested in forms other than octaseme. There would then have been a third ancient metrician who, like Heliodorus and apparently the source of the scholium on E. *Or.* 140, understood at least ‘single-drag’ dochmiacs from a rhythmical perspective. But, as often, our remains do not permit a firm conclusion.⁴¹

CONCLUSION

This exposition should leave no doubt that the ancients knew considerably more about the dochmiac than they have commonly been credited with. Yet we must not get too optimistic. If we observe a greater success rate in the identification of dochmiacs with variation in the first two positions, this is probably because these forms were proportionately the most frequent.⁴² Conversely, the lack of any evidence, analytical or from colometry,⁴³ for the recognition of dochmiacs with long first *and* fourth position may be due to their comparative rarity or an accident of transmission, or both. There also remains the contrast between the largely indirect testimony of the dramatic

⁴⁰ Translation BUDELMANN 2001: 224 (adapted). See also BARKER 1989: 393–4, 450 n. 237 and ERCOLES 2015: 325–6 (with reference to Σ A. *Sept.* 128a Smith).

⁴¹ The metrical competence of the commentator is hard to judge. Σ^M [A.] *PV* 128a Herington, the only other extended metrical scholium in the corpus, correctly identifies the line (~ *PV* 144) as ‘Anacreontic’ (pe | 2io⁺), but then illustrates it with Anacr. fr. 412 *PMG*, which does not show anaclasis in the ionic part. It is possible that he thought of the anaclastic and non-anaclastic as substitute forms, or else his knowledge was erratic. Otherwise the note displays the same interest in the ‘ethos’ of the rhythm as those on *Sept.* 101 (92–4) and 128 (cf. ERCOLES 2015: 326–9).

⁴² See the figures in CONOMIS 1964: 23. Since we know neither how many, if any, ‘non-standard’ dochmiacs Hephaestion recognised on the basis of first-foot variation in the ‘antispastic metre’ (pp. 23–5) nor how old the ‘antispastic’ analysis of the dochmiac actually is, it would be dangerous to claim that it had anything to do with the phenomenon. And it does not apply to Heliodorus and the pure rhythmicians.

⁴³ I.e. correct division against word-end (p. 25). In all seven attested passages where ‘double-drag’ dochmiacs run over word-boundaries (A. *Sept.* 705, E. *Her.* 917, 1026–7, *Ion* 796–8, 1487, *Phoen.* 346, *Fr. Grenf.* 37) the manuscripts and papyri are inconclusive or wrong.

scholia, especially the Heliodorean ones on Aristophanes, and the mechanical analyses of the theorists, which culminated in the lasting notion of the ‘hypercatalectic antispast’ extracted from Hephaestion (and perhaps the rival idea of a ‘hypercatalectic epitrite’, which did not catch on). More than two hundred years on and in the light of extensive research applied to ancient metrical scholarship Seidler’s decision to base his investigation of the dochmiac on the poetic texts alone has lost nothing of its merit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I do not list editions of ancient texts which are simply quoted for their content.

- ANDREATTA, L.: *Docmi κατὰ σχέσιν in Eschilo*. Diss. Trento 2009–10 (accessible online at <http://eprintsphd.biblio.unitn.it/585/>).
- *Il verso dochmiaco. Fonti e interpretazioni*. Rome 2014.
- BARKER, A.: *Greek Musical Writings II. Harmonic and Acoustic Theory*. Cambridge 1989.
- BENAISSA, A.: *P.Oxy. 5159. Chapter on Tetrasyllabic Feet*. In: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXXVIII*. R.-L. Chang *et al.* (eds.). London 2012, 101–10.
- BUDELMANN, F.: *Sound and Text. The Rhythm and Metre of Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry in Ancient and Byzantine Scholarship*. In: *Homer, Tragedy and Beyond. Essays in Honour of P. E. Easterling*. F. Budelmann – P. Michelakis (eds.). London 2001, 209–40.
- CONOMIS, N. C.: *The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama*. *Hermes* 92, 1964, 23–50.
- DALE, A. M.: *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*. Cambridge²1968.
- DIGGLE, J.: *The Textual Tradition of Euripides’ Orestes*. Oxford 1991.
- ERCOLES, M.: *Metrics (métron), Ancient Theories of*. In: *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics II*. G. K. Giannakis (ed.). Leiden 2014, 431–6.
- *Alcuni scholî ‘metrici’ pre-tricliniani a Eschilo e la loro possibile fonte*. *Eikasmos* 26, 2015, 319–32.
- ESPOSITO, E.: *Il Fragmentum Grenfellianum (P.Dryton 50). Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. Bologna 2005.
- FRIES, A.: *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Berlin – Boston 2014.
- GALVANI, G. – LOMIENTO, L.: *Note al P.Oxy. 515*. *QUCC* n.s. 107.2, 2014, 101–22.
- GENTILI, B.: *Il commento di Eliodoro ad Aristofane, Ach. 285 ~ 336*. *QUCC* 58, 1998, 7–10.
- HOLWERDA, D.: *De Heliodori commentario metrico in Aristophanem II*. *Mnemosyne* IV 20, 1967, 247–72.
- KÜHNE, W.: *De dochmio quid tradiderint veteres*. Diss. Halle 1863.
- LEO, F.: *Die beiden metrischen Systeme des Altertums*. *Hermes* 24, 1889, 280–301.
- LEONHARDT, J.: *Die beiden metrischen Systeme des Altertums*. *Hermes* 117, 1989, 43–62.
- PARKER, L. P. E.: *The Songs of Aristophanes*. Oxford 1997.
- *Consilium et Ratio? Papyrus A of Bacchylides and Alexandrian Metrical Scholarship*. *CQ* n.s. 51, 2001, 23–52.
- PEARSON L. I. C. (ed.): *Aristoxenus. Elementa Rhythmica*. Oxford 1990.
- PÖHLMANN, E. – WEST, M. L.: *Documents of Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford 2001.
- TESSIER, A.: *Docmi in epoca paleologa? Medioevo Greco* 0, 2000, 197–205.

- *δοχμιος* (*δοχμικός, δοχμιακός, δοχμιακός*) / *dochmius* (*dochmios, dochmiacum*). In: *Nomenclator metricus Graecus et Latinus I (α–δ)*. G. Morelli (ed.). Hildesheim 2006, 500–2.
- VAN OPHUIJSEN, J. M.: *Hephaestion on Metre. A Translation and Commentary*. Leiden et al. 1987.
- WEST, M. L.: *Greek Metre*. Oxford 1982 (= West 1982a).
- *Three Topics in Greek Metre*. *CQ* n.s. 32, 1982, 281–97 (= West 1982b).
- *Studies in Aeschylus*. Stuttgart 1990.
- *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford 1992.
- *Aeschyli tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheus*. Ed. M. L. West. Stuttgart – Leipzig²1998.
- *Hellenica III. Philosophy, Music and Metre, Literary Byways, Varia*. Oxford 2013.
- WHITE, J. W.: *The Verse of Greek Comedy*. London 1912.
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON: *Griechische Verskunst*. Berlin 1921.

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

Résumé

Dochmijský verš v antickej odbornej spisbe

Almut FRIES

Článok skúma pozostatky antickej (a byzantskej) odbornej spisby zaoberajúcej sa dochmijským veršom jednak po teoretickej stránke, jednak z pohľadu praxe, ako ju dokumentujú scholiá ku gréckym dramatickým textom. Autorka poukazuje na to, že antickí metrici a rytmici na základe svojho odlišného analytického prístupu rozumeli tomuto veľmi premenlivému veršu omnoho lepšie, než sa im pripisuje. Okrem základnej formy (∪ – – ∪ –) sa často rozoznáva variácia na prvých dvoch pozíciách, menej často tiež rezolúcia a predĺženie na zvyšných troch pozíciách. Pozornosti autorov zrejme ušli iba pomerne zriedkavé dochmije s dlhou slabikou na prvej a štvrtej pozícii („dvojité predĺženie“). Keďže však žiadna antická teória nevysvetľuje všetky možné tvary, bolo rozhodnutie moderných metrikov založiť svoje analýzy iba na básnických textoch rozhodne správne.