

✓ LATIN SCRIPT AND LETTERS

A.D. 400-900

*Festschrift presented to Ludwig Bieler
on the occasion of his 70th birthday*

EDITED BY

Forwards
JOHN J. O'MEARA

AND

BERND NAUMANN



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN
1976

77/781

LUPUS OF FERRIERES ON THE METRES OF BOETHIUS

VIRGINIA BROWN

Famous for his activities as scribe and textual critic, Lupus of Ferrières is credited with a work on the metres of Boethius which is often referred to but has yet to be examined. Brief though this treatise is — it comprises pp. xxv-xxix of R. Peiper's edition (Leipzig, 1871) of the *Consolatio philosophiae* — it is nevertheless of some interest for the picture it gives of Lupus as metrician.

Then, too, the treatise's preoccupation with metre may make it something of a rarity as well as an authority on the subject so far as medieval commentaries on the *Consolatio* are concerned. Granted, of course, that much if not most of this vast material remains at present unstudied or inaccessible, yet, to judge from those glosses or commentaries which have been examined and published, Lupus' observations did indeed circulate to some extent. They appear, for example, in excerpted form in the anonymous commentary of Einsiedeln MS. 179 (s. IX) and in the commentary of Remi of Auxerre (s. X), and further sifting of the notes amassed on the *Consolatio* by medieval scholars will doubtless reveal other occurrences. Hand in hand with their use by commentators goes the survival of Lupus' remarks in not a few manuscripts. In addition to the eight codices mentioned by Peiper (p. xxiv), there are the six listed by E. T. Silk and the Heiligenkreuz copy noted by N. M. Haring; since the "anonymous" treatise on the Boethian metres of Balliol College MS. 10 noted by R. A. B. Mynors is actually that of Lupus (to line 132), this brings to at least sixteen the number of codices which contain the work.¹

¹ P. Courcelle, *La consolation de philosophie dans la tradition littéraire* (Paris, 1967), p. 12 nn. 1-6 lists medieval commentaries on the *Consolatio* that have been studied and at least partially edited; to these should be added N. M. Haring, "Four Commentaries on the *De consolatione philosophiae* in MS Heiligenkreuz 130", *Mediaeval Studies* 31 (1969) 287-316. For the Oxford manuscript see R. A. B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford* (Oxford, 1963), p. 8. I have to thank Mr. John F. R. Coughlan for calling my attention to this witness and for examining Parisinus lat. 15090 which contains Remi's commentary. As in Einsiedeln 179 and the first commentary (ff. 6-76) of Heiligenkreuz 130, the metrical glosses of

For all these reasons, and not merely because it was compiled by one of the most outstanding ninth-century humanists, does the commentary of Lupus deserve study, and I propose here to give an analysis and consideration of its contents.

By way of a prefatory statement, it would be well to note that the treatise does not signify a hitherto unsuspected interest on Lupus' part in either metre or related matters. Witness the passages in *Letters* 5, 8, 9, and 21 in which he discusses questions of pronunciation and declares that he has consulted the "poets" for his evidence. *Letters* 5 and 8 offer, perhaps, the clearest indication that he continued to ponder such problems until he found a satisfactory solution. In the former (dated to May 836 by L. Levillain in his edition of the *Letters*), Lupus admits to Einhard that he is uncertain, in the case of words like *aratrum* and *salubris*, as to whether the penult is pronounced long (since it is long by nature) or short (since the vowel in the penultimate syllable is followed by a mute plus a liquid). However, by April 837 (Levillain's date) Lupus had decided that the penult in such instances was to have the accent, for in *Letter* 8 he writes to Alcuin that "*salubris, aratrum* et similia accentu paenultimo indubitanter moderanda". Whoever the "docti et studiosissimi viri" were who assisted Lupus in reaching this conclusion, one result of their joint deliberation is obvious: while working on the metres of Boethius, he was to insist on the precedence of nature over position in penultimate syllables composed of a mute and a liquid, and his scansion of these words does not reflect the teaching of Donatus whose dictum had puzzled him in *Letter* 5.

To turn now to the commentary itself. It consists of a short introduction wherein Lupus asserts that his task required a great deal of diligence ("non mediocri diligentia"), and then there follows a listing (in the numerical order of the poems) of the 27 metres according to which Lupus has classified all *carmina* in the *Consolatio*, together with a brief explanation of each metre and citation of the first or the first two line(s) from each poem.² As Peiper has pointed out (p. xxiv),

Parisinus lat. 15090 are not attributed to Lupus, and they appear at the head of each poem, occasionally spilling over into the margin.

² His quoting of the first line(s) might suggest that he scanned only this portion of the poem, and see below p. 75 f. where he appears to have examined only the opening lines. However, it seems to me that, for the most part, this is an undeniably handy way of indicating which poem is under discussion, and I base this inference on metres nos. 1, 4, 15, 22, 25, 27 where the citation is preceded by "quorum initia haec sunt" or "cuius initium hoc est".

his source is the *De centum metris* of Servius and, in fact, Lupus himself mentions this work (metre no. 18). It is probable that Servius was his principal and perhaps his only authority. Even though other metrical grammarians occasionally put forward similar statements, Lupus never refers to them (either in the commentary or in the *Letters*), nor does he include any portion peculiar to any of them. This is not true when it comes to Servius, for he generally quotes him verbatim (and several times at some length) besides giving definitions that are unique to the latter.³

In order to demonstrate this evident dependence and also to provide an abbreviated version of Lupus' commentary for convenience of discussion, I give below the parallel passages for both texts. The Servius sections are from H. Keil, *Grammatici latini* IV (reprint Hildesheim, 1961) 456-467 and, for Lupus, I have used Peiper's edition. An asterisk preceding the number of a poem designates an instance of an erroneous judgment by Lupus or mistake in terminology or other notabilia having some bearing on his method and metrical ability.

<i>Boethius</i>	<i>Lupus</i>	<i>Servius</i>
I. 1	Primum itaque genus car-	(465. 19-20) elegiacum
V. 1	minis elegiacum est quod constat primo uersu heroico, secundo prima pentemimere heroica, secunda dactilica. pentemimeris autem est post duos pedes sillaba de verbo remanens.	constat de penthemimeri prima heroica, secunda dactylica... (457. 9-10) penthemimeren esse, cum duos pedes sequitur syl- laba quae partem termi- nat orationis...
*I. 2	Secundum dactilicum tetra-	
*IV. 5	metrum quod constat spon- deo dactilo catalecto item dactilo spondeo...	
I. 3	Tertium quod constat pri- mo heroico secundo alcma- nio dactilico tetrametro aca-	(457. 15-16) acatalec- tum... qui legitimo fine concluditur... (460. 11-

³ For definitions given correctly in the commentary, I have been able to locate similar passages in the *De centum metris* in every case except for the "heroic hexameter" (metre no. 21). The explanation which he gives, however, is not found in the grammarians to whom he refers in the *Letters*, namely Caper, Donatus, Priscian, and Servius, commentary on the *Aeneid*.

talecto id est quattuor pedibus dactilicis nulla remanente sillaba. acatalectus enim uersus est qui legitimo fine clauditur. Metra autem dactilica principaliter dactili constant, recipiunt tamen spondeum et non numquam in fine trocheum.

*I. 4 Quantum ponit falleutium
*III. 10 constans spondeo dactilo
tribus trocheis.

I. 5 Quintum anapesticum pin-
III. 2 daricum constans dimetro
acatalecto. metra uero ana-
pestica principaliter constant anapesto, recipiunt tamen frequenter spondeum, raro proceleumaticum apud comicos autem etiam dactilum saepiusque ultima cum superest syllaba in duas soluitur breues.

I. 6 Sextum gliconium quod
II. 8 constat spondeo choriambo
*III. 12 pyrrichio...

*IV. 3

*V. 4

I. 7 Septimum dactilicum dime-
trum catalecticum cui est
nomen adonio. catalecticus
autem uersus dicitur cui
una syllaba deest.

II. 1 Octavum genus iambicum
III. 11 est hyponactium constans
trimetro acatalecto claudo.
iambica uero metra impari-
bus quidem locis possunt
recipere iambum tribra-

12) Metra dactylica prin-
cipaliter constant dactylo, recipiunt tamen et spondeum et interdum ultimo loco trochaicum.

(465. 31) phalaecium constat spondio, dactylo, tribus trocheis...

(462. 8) pindaricum constat dimetro acatalecto...

(461. 27-29) Metra anapaestica principaliter constant anapaesto; recipiunt tamen frequenter spondeum, raro proceleumaticum, apud comicos autem etiam dactylum, saepiusque ultima cum superest syllaba, in duas soluitur breues.

(465. 10) glyconium constat spondio choriambo pyrrichio...

(460. 14) adonium constat dimetro catalectico ... (457. 13-14) catalecticum versum dici, cui syllaba una deest...

(458. 22) hipponactium constat trimetro acatalecto claudo... (457. 25-458. 3) Metra iambica locis imparibus quinque recipere possunt pedes,

chum spondeum dactilum anapestum. In paribus iam-bum tantum uel tribrachin et frequenter apud comicos anapestum ita tamen ut multarum breuium iunctura uitetur.

iambum tribrachum spondeum dactylum ana-paestum, locis autem pa-ribus tantum iambum vel tribrachum, et apud co-micos frequenter ana-paestum, ita tamen ut multarum brevium iunc-tura vitetur.

*II. 2 Nonum est asclepiadeum quod fit spondeo duobus co-riambis pyrrichio siue iam-bo cui et ferecratium subie-cit constans spondeo dac-tilo spondeo.

(465. 13-14) asclepiadium constat spondio, duobus choriambis, pyrrichio...

(465. 7) pherecratium constat spondio dactylo spondio...

*II. 3 Decimum est sapphicum quod constat trocheo spon-deo dactilo duobus trocheis. miscuit autem huic secun-dum semper uersum glico-nium de quo superius dic-tum (*cf. sup. I. 6*).

(466. 2-3) sapphicum con-stat trochaeo, spondio, dactylo, duobus trocha-eis...

II. 4 Vndecimum genus iambi-cum anacreontium est quod constat dimetro catalectico cuius secundum uersum supposuit ferecratium quod paulo ante memoraui (*cf. sup. II. 2*)...

(458. 10) anacreontium constat dimetro catalec-tico...

II. 5 Duodecimum anapesticum
III. 5 parhemiaticum est quod con-stat dimetro catalectico.

(462. 6) paroemiaticum constat dimetro catalec-tico...

II. 6 Tertium decimum sapphicum
IV. 7 continuatum...quamuis id (*sc. IV. 7. 35*) dimetro ado-nio terminauit ita: Sidera donat.

II. 7 Quartum decimum iambi-cum archilochium quod constat trimetro acatalecto

(458. 20) archilochium constat trimetro acata-lecto... (458. 12) archilo-

- habetque subiectum iambicum archilochium constans dimetro acatalecto...
- II. 8 *cf. sup.* I. 6
- III. 1 Quintum decimum faliscum constans tribus dactylis et pyrrichio...
- III. 2 *cf. sup.* I. 5
- III. 3 Sextum decimum iambicum archilochium quod constat, ut supra memoraui (*cf. sup.* II. 7), trimetro acatalecto cui mixtum est elegiacum ita ut supra exposui (*cf. sup.* I. 1) constans.
- *III. 4 Septimum decimum et faleucium posuit subiecitque illi dactilicum archilochium tetrametrum catalecticum In quo tamen pro spondeo siue dactilo imparibus locis trocheum reperies.
- III. 5 *cf. sup.* II. 5
- *III. 6 Duodeuicesimum dactilicum alcmanium constans trimetro ypercatalecto. ypercatalectus uero est uersus cui una syllaba superest habetque subiectum sibi ferecratium quod, ut supra memoraui (*cf. sup.* II. 2), spondeo constat et dactilo et spondeo. Sed in hoc loco pro primo spondeo est ubi anapestum contra regulam in *centimetro* traditam inuenimus.
- *III. 7 Vndeicesimum iambicum anacreontium constans dimetro catalectico...
- chium constat dimetro acatalecto...
- cf. sup.* I. 6
- (465. 5) faliscum constat tribus dactylis et pyrrichio...
- cf. sup.* I. 5
- cf. sup.* II. 7, I. 1
- (460. 27) archilochium constat tetrametro catalectico...
- cf. sup.* II. 5
- (460. 25) alcmanium constat trimetro hypercatalecto... (457. 14-15) hypercatalectum, cui una (sc. syllaba) superest... (465. 7) pherecratium constat spondio dactylo spondio...
- (458. 10) anacreontium constat dimetro catalectico...

- III. 8 Vicesimum asclepiadeum (458. 12) archilochium cuius supra regulam posui constat dimetro acatalecto...
(*cf. sup. II. 2*) habetque subiunctum sibi iambicum archilochium dimetrum acatalectum.
- III. 9 Primum et uicesimum est heroicum exametrum qui locis omnibus aliis dactilum siue spondeum, quinto solum modo dactilum recipit, sexto spondeum siue trocheum.
- *III. 10 *cf. sup. I. 4* *cf. sup. I. 4*
- III. 11 *cf. sup. II. 1* *cf. sup. II. 1*
- *III. 12 *cf. sup. I. 6* *cf. sup. I. 6*
- IV. 1 Secundum et uicesimum (460. 30) alcmantium constat tetrametro acatalecto subpositumque sibi habet iambicum archilochium de quo paulo ante dixi (*cf. sup. II. 7*).
- *IV. 2 Tertium et uicesimum trochaicum alcmantium constat dimetro acatalecto. (459. 5-7) Metra trochaica Sane metra trochaica locis imparibus hos recipiunt pedes, trochaicum tribrachin et nonnumquam dactilum paribus uero cum supradictos, tum etiam spondeum et anapestum recipiunt. huic autem generi subdidit Boetius de quo supra dictum est (*cf. sup. II. 2*) ferecratium quod pro spondeo interdum recipiunt anapestum.
- *IV. 3 *cf. sup. I. 6* *cf. sup. I. 6*
- IV. 4 Quartum et uicesimum fal-

- leutium habens subiectum
elegiacum...
- *IV. 5 *cf. sup. I. 2*
- *IV. 6 Quintum et uicesimum ge-
nus est mixtum uariis pedi-
bus quod incertum quo po-
tissimum debeat censi
uocabulo. Aut enim dactili-
cum adonium erit quod pro
dactilo siue pro spondeo
anapestum recipiat aut dac-
tilicum archilochium tetra-
metrum quod idem pro
spondeo siue dactilo anapes-
tum indifferenter admittat.
Nam anapesticum sentire
ratio dissuadet quando
spondeo uel dactilo quam
anapesto compositum sit.
- IV. 7 *cf. sup. II. 6*
- V. 1 *cf. sup. I. 1*
- V. 2 Sextum et uicesimum dac-
tilicum archilochium quod
constat tetrametro catalec-
tico... *cf. sup. I. 1*
(460. 27) archilochium
constat tetrametro cata-
lectico...
- *V. 3 *cf. sup. IV. 6*
- *V. 4 *cf. sup. I. 6*
- V. 5 Septimum et uicesimum ar-
chilochium constans tetra-
metro bucolico et tribus
trocheis. tetrametrum uero
bucolicum est, cum quartus
pes dactilus est qui partem
finiat orationis... *cf. sup. I. 6*
(466. 23-24) archilochi-
um constat tetrametro
bucolico et tribus tro-
chaeis... (461. 12-13) bu-
colicum constat hexame-
tro catalectico, ita ut
quartus dactylus partem
determinet orationis...

Obviously Lupus' purpose was simply the identification of the metre of each poem; there is nothing whatever on such points as the Boethian use of the caesura, his predilection for the number of syllables with which to end the hexameter, or the metrical practice

of other poets for purposes of comparison. Lupus' own observations relieve the stark simplicity of the commentary only three times, namely when he notes that IV. 7. 35 consists of an adonic (no. 13) and comments on metrical peculiarities in III. 4 (no. 17), IV. 6 (no. 25) and V. 3 (no. 25). We shall probably never know precisely why Lupus settled on the design of his treatise as we now have it, but speculation on his reasons for doing so may include the following suggestions: first, there is the fact that Servius in the *De centum metris* does no more than give the skeletal framework of each metre and Lupus may have followed the pattern of this and other metrical works; next, since Lupus himself wrote little poetry (and this only in hexameters and elegiacs), he may have been interested in the metres of the *Consolatio* for strictly antiquarian and grammatical motives instead of their use as possible models for his own compositions.⁴ The apparent sparseness of his commentary may be a disappointment, but it is hardly fair and certainly useless to censure him for what he did not do, especially as he does not appear to have been concerned with any feature pertaining to the oral recitation of verse.

It is perhaps also unfair that most of the discussion of the commentary will be concerned with Lupus' erroneous identifications, for this will tend to give a onesided picture of his abilities. The overall figures, however, will serve to dispel any impression of incompetence. Of the nearly 60 occurrences of various metres (either singly or in combination) in the *Consolatio*, Lupus was actually *wrong* in 9 instances; add to these another 6 instances where he "slipped" rather than erred, and the result is that Lupus achieves almost a 75 per cent record for correctness. To give him just due, we must further concede that some of the trouble could be owing to a faulty manuscript of Boethius. I think, nevertheless, that the kinds of errors to be enumerated will indicate that inaccuracies which can be blamed on a badly transcribed codex, or one with variant readings, are few and far between.

The modern edition of Boethius which I have used is that of Professor Bieler, published in volume 94 of the *Corpus Christianorum*, Series latina (Turnhout, 1957).

⁴ J. Szövérfy, *Weltliche Dichtungen des lateinischen Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1970), p. 598 gives a list of Lupus' poems and observes "als Dichter ist er anscheinend ziemlich unbedeutend."

Alcaics

Only once does Boethius use this type of Aeolic verse, namely in III. 4 where the alcaic decasyllabic (— ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — | ∪ — ∪) occurs in even lines. Lupus correctly identified the phalaecian hendecasyllabic as the metre of the odd lines but mistook the alcaic form for the *dactilicum archilochium* (tetrameter catalectic). Since he understood the latter to consist of 4 feet, of which the last was a spondee (cf. V. 2: — ∪ — ∪ — | — ∪ ∪ — ∪), his dactylic tetrameter catalectic (without spondaic substitutions in the first two feet) would indeed resemble the alcaic in nearly every particular. The exception is the third foot where the alcaic demands a trochee, and Lupus, to his credit, pointed out this anomaly in the alleged dactylic metre. Although it was certainly not unknown to the Middle Ages, the alcaic was not commonly employed by medieval poets, and it is possible that, apart from III. 4, Lupus had never, or very seldom, encountered this type.⁵

Anapestic metres

Used in II. 5 and III. 5, the anapestic dimeter catalectic presented no difficulty to Lupus. As for the anapestic dimeter acatalectic, he identified it correctly at I. 5 and III. 2 but wavered when grappling with IV. 6 and V. 3, finally concluding on the basis of the large number of spondees and dactyls contained therein that the metre of the latter instances was not anapestic. If he hesitated to classify the metrical scheme of IV. 6 and V. 3 as anapestic dimeter acatalectic (which it actually is) because of an apparent scarcity of anapests, then his reluctance is all the harder to understand, for a comparison of these poems with I. 5 and III. 2 shows throughout a consistent pattern regarding the occurrence of anapests. For example, I. 5 and IV. 6 both consist of 48 lines, with the total number of anapests

⁵ There are few examples of alcaics in the MGH, *Poetae aevi Carolini*; the index to vol. III places this metre among the "metra rariora" (p. 816). A number of hymns composed in the alcaic hendecasyllabic are mentioned by D. Norberg, *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale* (Stockholm, 1958), p. 83. With regard to III. 4, P. Klopsch points out that Lupus' erroneous identification may have prompted his pupil Heiric of Auxerre to combine the phalaecian with the dactylic tetrameter catalectic in the preface to the *Vita Germani*; see Klopsch's *Einführung in die mittellateinische Verslehre* (Darmstadt, 1972), pp. 96-97. It should be noted, however, that Heiric's tetrameter follows the usual rules of prosody and does not admit a trochee in uneven feet.

amounting to 42 and 45 respectively. They are distributed among the four feet that make up the two metra as follows: (I. 5) 13, 16, 6, 7; (IV. 6) 14, 24, 4, 3. III. 2 (38 lines) and V. 3 (31 lines) have respectively a total of 37 and 21 anapests which are allocated thus: (III. 2) 12, 13, 7, 5; (V. 3) 5, 8, 3, 5. Two of the conclusions which can be drawn from these statistics are directly relevant to the problem at hand: IV. 6 and V. 3 are in no way deficient in anapests since the former contains more than I. 5 does, and the latter, though 7 lines shorter than III. 2, still contains a goodly number; both IV. 6 and V. 3 display the greatest frequency of anapests in the second foot of the first metron, agreeing in this feature with I. 5 and III. 2. In dealing with the metre of I. 5 and III. 2, Lupus himself had already pointed out that the anapestic dimeter acatalectic allows the substitution of spondees and dactyls, and it is puzzling that he should adopt such a cautious approach to IV. 6 and V. 3.

In any case, his allegations in no. 25 are false, namely that the adonean permits an anapest to take the place of a dactyl or spondee and the dactylic tetrameter admits an anapest for a spondee or dactyl. These are probably Lupus' own deductions since similar statements are not put forth by Servius or other metricians, and they represent doubtless an attempt to explain the facts as he found them. He has reversed the relationship between the adonean and the anapestic dimeter acatalectic as the adonean may be one variant of the anapestic metron, but not vice versa. And while grammarians have noted the similarity of the anapestic to the dactylic metre, provided that the first syllable of the first dactylic foot is removed, nowhere do they affirm that the dactylic metre can receive an anapest for a dactyl or spondee.

Dactylic metres

These are the metres most frequently used in the *Consolatio*. Their number varies, depending on the method of classification, but they encompass approximately ten different forms of which Lupus recognized correctly the following: adonean (I. 7), alcmnian (I. 3, IV. 1, V. 5), hexameter (I. 1, I. 3, III. 9, V. 1), elegiac pentameter (I. 1, III. 3, IV. 4, V. 1), tetrameter catalectic (III. 6, V. 2), and trimeter acatalectic (III. 1).⁶ On the debit side are his erroneous sug-

⁶ Lupus refers to III. 6 and V. 5 as the dactylic trimeter hypercatalectic and bucolic tetrameter respectively; I am following Peiper's terminology in the *Index metricus* (pp. 220, 221) to his edition of the *Consolatio*.

gestion that the metres (anapestic dimeter acatalectic) in IV. 6 and V. 3 were either the adonean or archilochian, the identification of the alcaic (III. 4) as a dactylic tetrameter catalectic, and his belief that the metre of I. 2 and IV. 5 was the dactylic tetrameter. The metrical scheme of IV. 5 will be discussed below under *Iambic and Trochaic metres*, and it is convenient to treat here the question of I. 2.

Lupus defined the "dactylic tetrameter" in which this poem is supposedly written as consisting of a "spondee, dactyl catalectic, likewise a dactyl, spondee". The metre, however, is actually the dactylic trimeter catalectic coupled with the adonean, thus forming the pattern $- \text{---} - \text{---} - | - \text{---} - \text{---}$. I think that it is possible to follow his reasoning if we look at this scheme from another angle and understand the "spondee, dactyl catalectic" to refer to the dactylic trimeter catalectic and the "dactyl, spondee" to refer to the adonean. The difficulty, of course, with Lupus' statement is that it would be an odd dactylic tetrameter indeed which allows a catalectic foot in the middle of the line. This, then, is an example similar to II. 4, III. 6, IV. 2, IV. 6 and V. 3 of his introducing an anomaly to explain the metrical facts. Finally, because he writes "*spondee*, dactyl catalectic", it may not be too wide of the mark to infer that he was aware of the predominantly spondaic bases (lines 1, 4, 6, 8-12, 15-19, 21-23, 25, 26) of I. 2.

Glyconics

The sixth metre treated in the commentary is the glyconic, and under this heading Lupus rightly groups I. 6, II. 8, III. 12, IV. 3, and V. 4, explaining that the metrical scheme is composed of a spondee, choriamb, and pyrrhic. The even lines of II. 3 (the tenth metre) are also in the glyconic, and Lupus notes here that he has spoken previously of this metre, thus affirming, it would seem, his earlier definition. Consequently, since he has stated so clearly his notion of the components of the glyconic, it is rather surprising that he did not point out such irregularities as the iambic base in II. 3. 16 (*bonis*), III. 12. 29 (*stupet*), V. 4. 11 (*nihil*), V. 4. 13, 38 (*notis*, from *nota*, -ae) and the trochaic base for the whole of IV. 3 (with the exception of the last line).

Perhaps these aberrations on the part of Boethius failed to catch Lupus' attention or perhaps, given the summary nature of the treatise, he felt there was no need to expatiate on anomalies. It

seems unlikely, however, that in the case of two of the iambic bases he could have obtained a spondaic first foot unless he was deliberately inconsistent, for he apparently scanned as short the first syllables of *bon-* and *not-* elsewhere in the *Consolatio. nihil* and *stup-* figure in other erroneous identifications, and Lupus may have had some doubt regarding their vowel quantities. For *stup-* see *Iambic and Trochaic metres*; as for *nihil*, he would have had to scan a long first syllable at IV. 3. 25 since he included the poem among those glyconics beginning with a spondee.

This brings us to the question of why Lupus considered the bases in IV. 3 to be spondaic when, in fact, 38 of the 39 lines have a trochaic first foot. Further metrical analysis shows that lines 1, 3-7, 9, 11-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22, 24, 26-28, 31-34, 36-37 begin with a word of two syllables or more, and that the rules of position do not allow the second syllable to be scanned as long. The base in lines 2, 4, 8, 10, 13, 17, 21, 23, 25, 29-30, 35 comprises a monosyllabic word plus the opening syllable of another word; except for *aper* at IV. 3. 10 (whose first syllable is also long at IV. 4. 5), the quantity of the first syllable of the second word is always short elsewhere in the work. Clearly Lupus could have obtained a spondee in the first foot of IV. 3 only by contravening the rules of prosody which he had already successfully applied. Did his recognition of the metre as glyconic derive from the choriambic and pyrrhic elements in the line?

Iambic and Trochaic metres

Lupus correctly identified eight of the nine occurrences of iambic verse, namely the dimeter acatalectic (II. 7, III. 8, IV. 1), dimeter catalectic (II. 4),⁷ trimeter acatalectic (II. 7, III. 3), and limping trimeter acatalectic (II. 1, III. 11). With regard to trochaic types, he was right in designating IV. 2 as the dimeter acatalectic, and he described the ithyphallic of V. 5 simply as "three trochees". His score would have been perfect except for a slip at IV. 5. The metre is a trochaic tripod catalectic followed by an adonean (odd lines) alternating with an iambic tripod catalectic plus adonean (even lines),⁸ but Lupus classified it as a dactylic tetrameter and, curiously

⁷ In his "La metrica di Boezio", *Giornale italiano di filologia* 7 (1954), L. Pepe shows (pp. 238, 239 n. 38) that the metre of II. 4 is iambic rather than ionic (Peiper, p. 222).

⁸ I follow Pepe (p. 238) here rather than Peiper who considers (p. 219) the

enough, grouped the poem with I. 2 (dactylic trimeter catalectic with adonean).

As with I. 2, if considered in a certain way, the metrical scheme of IV. 5 (— ◡ — ◡◡ ◡ | — ◡◡ — ◡ and ◡ — ◡ ◡◡ ◡ | — ◡◡ — ◡) does resemble an odd kind of dactylic tetrameter, but one encounters even more problems in trying to force the latter into this mould. For example, in the trochaic tripody (usually five syllables), the second syllable is always short and the third always long; Lupus needs a long second syllable for an opening spondee or a short third syllable (if the pattern is dactyl, spondee). However, none of the rules of position would have permitted him to make the necessary adjustments, nor, in comparison with occurrences of similar forms in the rest of the *Consolatio*, are there changes in the quantity of vowels which would account for such a scansion. Besides, even if circumstances did allow him to scan two successive spondees and a long syllable (which would generally be the case since two shorts for the long fourth syllable are found only in line 5), this would hardly explain why he thought the metre to be composed of a "spondee, dactyl catalectic".

The matter of the iambic tripody catalectic is equally as complicated. A long first syllable occurs in every instance except in lines 2 (*prōpinqua*) and 20 (*stūpetque*). If Lupus were here to scan the first syllable as long, he would be inconsistent in the case of *propinqu-* at least, for he has scanned it as short in III. 10. 9 and IV. 4. 3. It might be possible to argue that he regarded the first syllable of *stupetque* as long since in III. 12. 29 *stupet* must, according to his definition, comprise the spondaic base of a glyconic line. On the other hand, *stūpebit* occurs in line 6 of IV. 5 where it constitutes the third syllable of the tripody and fits perfectly into the scheme. Lupus is also in trouble in various other ways: he needs the second syllable short (which is always long) to scan an opening dactyl; and he needs the third syllable long (which is always short) to scan a second spondee (or dactyl in the case of line 20 with the tribrach *subitis*).

The adonean at the end of every line in IV. 5 seems to be the "dactyl, spondee" referred to in his treatment of the metre, and its occurrence in a similar position in I. 2, together with approximately the same number of syllables in the first half of the line, may have

metre to consist of a trochaic penthemim (first part of the sapphic) and iambic penthemim (first part of the alcaic hendecasyllabic) combined with the adonean.

prompted Lupus to associate the two poems metrically. But even with the greatest good will, the task is hopeless for any one who tries to scan either poem as any kind of "dactylic tetrameter".

Ionics

If a "minor ionic" dimeter opens with a long syllable rather than two shorts, it would be a simple matter to mistake the pattern ($\overline{\cup} - - \cup \cup - -$) for a pherecratic ($- - - \cup \cup - -$). This is what Lupus has done for III. 6 and IV. 2 where an apparent spondaic first foot occurs in lines 2, 5-8 and 2, 4, 7-9 respectively. The metre, however, is the ionic since genuine pherecratics do not normally display an anapestic base (Peiper, p. 222); this irregularity in his "pherecratic" was noted by Lupus for both poems. It should be mentioned, too, that he identified correctly the dactylic tetrameter catalectic (= his dactylic trimeter hypercatalectic) and the trochaic dimeter acatalectic as the respective metres combined with the "minor ionic" in III. 6 and IV. 2. The ionic anacreontic of III. 7 he took to be the iambic anacreontic.

Phalaecean hendecasyllabics

At I. 4, III. 4, III. 10 and IV. 4 Lupus has properly identified the metre and explained that the phalaecean consists of a spondee, dactyl, and three trochees. What he has not told us is that Boethius substituted an iambus, dactyl, and spondee for the first trochee in I. 4. 2, 6, 11 respectively. Nor did he let us know that, in III. 10, lines 1-3 are phalaecean but thereafter this metre (odd lines) alternates with the sapphic (even lines). His assumption that the poem is composed entirely in phalaeceans was to be expected if he scanned merely the first two lines, for in III. 10 we have the only instance where Boethius did not introduce the alternating metre in the second line.

Pherecratics

A similar situation exists in his treatment of this metre. Lupus observed that even lines in II. 2 and II. 4 are in pherecratics consisting of a spondee, dactyl, spondee. Curiously enough, he did not point out that the bases in II. 2. 14 (*alios*), II. 2. 18 (*sitis ar(descit)*) and II. 4. 8 (*bibulas*) are anapestic although he remarked on a similar

phenomenon in III. 6 and IV. 2 (see above under *Ionics*) which he also considered to be in "pherecratics". Some manuscripts offer the reading *altos* for *alios*; this variant would constitute the spondaic base of the pherecratic and could, of course, have appeared in Lupus' own copy of the *Consolatio*.

Sapphics

II. 3, II. 6, III. 10 and IV. 7 are written in the sapphic hendecasyllabic. The metrical irregularities evident in the phalaecian are not present in this type of aeolic verse, and there is nothing for which Lupus may be called to task apart from his failure to notice that from line 4 on the even lines in III. 10 are in sapphics (see above under *Phalaecian hendecasyllabics*). His remark that IV. 7. 35 consists of an adonean is correct.

* * *

To sum up. Although Lupus did not compile a detailed commentary on the metres of the *Consolatio*, nevertheless his little treatise is sufficiently full to allow us to form an opinion regarding his abilities as metrician.

The overall impression must, I think, be distinctly favourable. As noted on p. 71, Lupus has a score for accuracy of nearly 75 per cent. The metres which caused him the most trouble were the alcaic (III. 4), anapestic dimeter acatalectic (IV. 6, V. 3), dactylic trimeter catalectic with adonean (I. 2), iambic tripody catalectic with adonean (IV. 5, even lines), "minor ionic" dimeter (III. 6, IV. 2), sapphic (III. 10), and trochaic tripody catalectic with adonean (IV. 5, odd lines), for he was unable to identify properly their metrical arrangement. On several other occasions Lupus correctly identified the metre but failed to report certain irregularities which would have invalidated his definition of the metre; such aberrations occur in Boethius' employment of the glyconic (II. 3, III. 12, V. 4), phalaecian (I. 4), and pherecratic (II. 2, II. 4).

How to explain Lupus' errors? Since there appears to be only one instance (II. 2. 14) where a textual variant may be adduced as an explanation, we must look to his methodology. It seems to me that the faulty identifications can be described as "intelligent" mistakes, and that they originate in his attempt to force the metre into ano-

ther scheme which it resembles closely, but is not identical with (as he often notes) in every particular. As for those individual lines where he would have been wrong according to the rigid Servian formula, it may be that he based his conclusions on the general metrical scheme, being constrained simply to overlook Boethian peculiarities.

If these suggestions are anywhere near the truth, then it is necessary to assume that the changing quantity of vowels in the medieval period had little to do with the matter. And, indeed, we have evidence that only *stup-*, *nihil*, and *aper* may have been a problem. Until more substantial proof of Lupus' own poetic practices is discovered, there seems to be little chance of showing that the phenomenon of vowel changes lay behind his metrical blunders in the commentary.