

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

**VOL. XLVIII**

HELSINKI 2014

## INDEX

NEIL ADKIN	<i>Some Recent "Improvements" to the Text of Jerome's Letter 52, "On Sacerdotal Lifestyle"</i>	11
NECİP FİKİRİ ALİCAN	<i>Rethought Forms: How Do They Work?</i>	25
LUIGI ARATA	<i>Usi medici dell'Anagyris foetida nella medicina greca</i>	57
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>True Patriots? The Public Activities of the *Augustales of Roman Ostia and the summa honoraria</i>	67
GIUSEPPE CAMODECA	<i>Un nuovo consularis Byzacenae di tardo IV secolo e i Tannonii di Puteoli</i>	93
ANTONIO CORSO	<i>Retrieving the Style of Cephisodotus the Younger</i>	109
LEE FRATANTUONO	<i>Saevit medio in certamine: Mars in the Aeneid</i>	137
SEPPO HEIKKINEN	<i>Copy-paste Metrics? Lupus of Ferrières on Boethius</i>	165
PANU HYPPÖNEN	<i>4π = 12.5? – The Problems in the Vitruvian Hodometer</i>	185
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Two Greek Documents on Bronze (IG XIV 954; IG XIV 955 = IGUR 4)</i>	205
TUA KORHONEN	<i>Some Steps Towards Plato's Ecopolitics in the Laws</i>	211
ANTTI LAMPINEN	<i>Fragments from the 'Middle Ground' – Posidonius' Northern Ethnography</i>	229
JARI PAKKANEN	<i>A Reappraisal of the First Publication of Stirrup Jar Inscriptions from Tiryns by Johannes Sundwall: Photographs, Lost Sherds and the 'a-nu-to/no-di-zo Workshop'</i>	261
GIORGOS C. PARASKEVIOTIS	<i>Verg. ecl. 6,13–30. Mimic Humour in Silenus' Scene</i>	279
ELINA PYY	<i>In Search of Peer Support: Changing Perspectives on Sisterhood in Roman Imperial Epic</i>	295
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Some Published, But Not Very Well Known Latin Inscriptions</i>	319

HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCXCII– CCCI</i>	347
PIETRO VERZINA	<i>L'esordio ἦν ὅτε (Cypria fr. 1,1 Bernabé) e le sue connotazioni narrative</i>	415
VILLE VUOLANTO	<i>Children in the Roman World: Cultural and Social Perspectives. A Review Article</i>	435
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	451
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	575
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	581
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	587

## COPY-PASTE METRICS? LUPUS OF FERRIÈRES ON BOETHIUS

SEPPO HEIKKINEN

Boethius's sixth-century *De consolazione philosophiae* is the most celebrated example of a *prosimetrum*, or a work that mixes prose and verse, composed in Late Antiquity. The author interspersed the prose chapters of his epoch-making work with short poems in an astonishingly wide range of different metres. In the medieval reception of Boethius, his verse was regarded as an essential part of the whole, reflected in the wide range of studies to which it was subjected since the *Consolatio*'s rediscovery by Alcuin in 790. Although Boethius's elaborate and often eccentric way of combining widely different metrical units did not, as such, inspire many followers,<sup>1</sup> his use of metre was nevertheless widely studied: in some manuscripts the poems have been supplied with scansion markings, and ultimately many of them were set to music.<sup>2</sup> The first effort to describe and codify Boethian metres undertaken by Lupus of Ferrières (c. 805 – c. 862),<sup>3</sup> the *Consolatio*'s first acknowledged medieval editor, ultimately joined this tradition of metrical glossing: Lupus's brief treatise has been transmitted in several manuscripts, sometimes as a complete commentary, sometimes as marginal glosses appended

---

<sup>1</sup> D. Norberg cites some evidence of Boethian metrics in early medieval verse including the stichic use of the Sapphic strophe in *cons. 2 carm. 6*, a poem in anapaestic dimeters obviously modelled after *cons. 1 carm. 5* and the adoption of the metre of *cons. 1 carm. 2* by a number of poets. These are, however, among the least complex of Boethius's metres and not exclusive to his verse. – D. Norberg, *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale* (Acta universitatis Stockholmiensis: Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 5), Stockholm 1958, 78, 81 and 84.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., M. T. Gibson – M. Lapidge – C. Page, "Neumed Boethian Metra from Canterbury: A Newly Recovered Leaf of Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 5.35 (the 'Cambridge Songs' manuscript)", *Anglo-Saxon England* 12 (1983) 141–52.

<sup>3</sup> R. Peiper (ed.), *Philosophiae consolationis libri V*, Leipzig 1871, xxiv–xxix.

to poems in the pertinent metres.<sup>4</sup> The text's wide circulation affirms its central role in the medieval study of Boethius: his treatise, in complete form or as excerpts, is testified in at least sixteen medieval codices and it is cited, among others, in the commentary of Remigius of Auxerre (saec. X).<sup>5</sup> Lupus's commentary remained, more or less, the sole authority on its subject until the Renaissance.<sup>6</sup>

Lupus of Ferrières's pioneering exposition of Boethian metres became an indispensable aid for the subsequent commentaries on Boethius's poetry largely because the metrical treatises of late antiquity provided no practical tools for its proper analysis: some of Boethius's metres and their combinations are – as far as we can ascertain – unique to the author and therefore not presented as such in the standard works on metre which were in circulation in the Early Middle Ages. Nevertheless, as Virginia Brown has demonstrated in her comprehensive study of the text,<sup>7</sup> Lupus was either unwilling or unable to undertake a fully independent study of the structure of Boethius's metres: instead, he chose to cobble his commentary from bits and pieces of Marius Servius's fourth-century *De centum metris*,<sup>8</sup> which he often cites verbatim.<sup>9</sup> The obvious shortcomings of Lupus's presentation largely owe to his reliance on secondary sources which were not ideally suited to his subject: as the *Consolatio* had emerged at the very end of antiquity, it had not become the focus of a scholarly tradition in the way that the works

<sup>4</sup> R. C. Love, "The Latin Commentaries on Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae* from the 9th to the 11th Centuries" in: N. H. Kaylor, Jr. – P. E. Phillips (eds.), *A Companion to Boethius in the Middle Ages*, Leiden – Boston 2012, 75–133, at pp. 103–4.

<sup>5</sup> P. Courcelle, *La consolation de la philosophie dans la tradition littéraire*, Paris 1967, 12; N. M. Haring, "Four Codices on the *De consolatione philosophiae* in MS Heiligenkreuz 130", *Medieval Studies* 31 (1969) 287–316; V. Brown, "Lupus of Ferrières on the Meters of Boethius", in: J. J. O'Meara – B. Naumann (eds.), *Latin Script and Letters A.D. 400–900. Festschrift Presented to Ludwig Bieler on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, Leiden 1978, 63–79, at p. 63.

<sup>6</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxiv; J. Leonhardt, *Dimensio syllabarum: Studien zur lateinischen Prosodie- und Verslehre von der Spätantike bis zur frühen Renaissance* (Hypomnemata 92), Göttingen 1989, 161. – Niccolò Perotti's *De Horatii et Boethii metris* (c. 1480) constitutes the first serious effort at improving Lupus's presentation while it, too, is highly dependent on it.

<sup>7</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 63–79.

<sup>8</sup> *Gramm.* IV,456–67.

<sup>9</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 64–5. Lupus's reliance on Servius was already demonstrated by Peiper in his edition of the text; see Peiper (above n. 2), xxiv. Once, Lupus actually cites Servius as a source, and his term "pindaric" for the anapaestic dimeter of *cons.* 1 *carm.* 5 and *cons.* 3 *carm.* 2 has only been attested in Servius (*gramm.* IV,468,8).

of Vergil and Horace had. Although, in some cases, Lupus recognised Boethius's departures from the usage prescribed by Servius, there is much that he ignored, and here we may have to look beyond Servius to account for his occasional lapses of judgement. This paper argues that Servius is not Lupus's only source and that, for better or worse, Lupus relied implicitly on Bede's *De arte metrica*, a work that, on the surface, would appear particularly ill-suited for a study of Boethius's metres, as Bede's presentation of lyric metres is extremely scant and limited to poetic lengths commonly encountered in Christian hymnody. Lupus's failed description of two Boethian metres (*cons. 1 carm. 2* and *cons. 4 carm. 5*) would, in fact, appear to be based on the description of a not quite identical metre in Bede's *De arte metrica*. It will also be apparent that Lupus's arguably misplaced trust in Bede's authority indirectly affected his at times idiosyncratic use of metrical nomenclature. As Lupus's presentation remained largely unchallenged for several centuries, even his mistakes may have had wider repercussions on Boethian scholarship than has generally been assumed. At the same time they testify for Bede's unquestioned authority on metrical issues in the Early Middle Ages.

Boethius's use of different metrical forms is wide, and, although he often used common Graeco-Latin metres such as the dactylic hexameter, the elegiac couplet and the iambic trimeter, together with simpler lyric lengths, he frequently combined these metres in less usual ways.<sup>10</sup> It is obvious that Boethius did not find the traditional four-line strophes of aeolic verse suited to his sustained narrative, but opted, instead, to use e.g. glyconics (*cons. 1 carm. 6*; *cons. 2 carm. 8*; *cons. 3 carm. 12*; *cons. 4 carm. 3* and *cons. 5 carm. 4*), adonics (*cons. 1 carm. 7*) and sapphics (*cons. 2 carm. 6* and *cons. 4 carm. 7*) in a stichic form. In *cons. 4 carm. 7*, he rounds off his poem in consecutive sapphics with a single adonic line in a gentle but surprising allusion to the more usual form of the metre. He also uses different line types as distichs; often the two lines have a shared pedigree, as in the aeolic couplets consisting of the sapphic with the glyconic (*cons. 2 carm. 3*), the hendecasyllable with the alcaic decasyllable (*cons. 3 carm. 4*) or the hendecasyllable with the sapphic line, in almost, but not quite, regular alternation in *cons. 3 carm. 10*. Yet more complex are some of his poems where the halves of a single line are combined from metrically disparate parts in the manner of the archilochean metres used by Horace. The most original of these – and this turned out to be a major stumbling block for Lupus<sup>11</sup> – is *cons. 4 carm. 5*, where a line

<sup>10</sup> For a comprehensive discussion, see L. Pepe, "La metrica de Boezio", *GIF* 7 (1954) 227–43.

<sup>11</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 76.

that consists of a *trochaic* tripod catalectic (– u – x / x) followed by an adonic (– uu – –):

*si quis Arcturi sidera nescit*  
– u – – – / – uu – –

alternates with an *iambic* tripod catalectic (x – u – / x) followed by an adonic:

*propinqua summo cardine labi*  
u – u – – / – uu – –

This metre is not attested anywhere else in ancient literature.<sup>12</sup>

It is obvious that Boethius was extremely well-read and perfectly at ease among the maddeningly complex wealth of metrical structures of the Graeco-Latin heritage. We cannot ascertain to what degree his more original metrical structures are his own creation, as we no longer have access to all the literature that he obviously was acquainted with. But, even on a more mundane level, his use of poetic metre manifests a profound knowledge of literary tradition and independence from the metrical handbooks of the late antique grammarians.<sup>13</sup> When it comes to aeolic metres, Boethius departs from the grammarians' stock descriptions of the glyconic (– – / – uu – / u –), which generally prescribe a spondee for the beginning, or "aeolic base" of the line, freely substituting it with a trochee (– u) or an iamb (u –). This variation is consistent with the Greek usage of these metres, and still occurs in Catullus, the spondee having become compulsory only with the Augustans.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Pepe (above n. 10), 238. Peiper (above n. 3, 225) has suggested corrupt readings of Seneca's *Oedipus* or the anonymous *Agamemnon* as a possible model.

<sup>13</sup> E.g., Diomedes, *Ars grammatica*, book III (*gramm.* I,473–529); Marius Servius, *De centum metris* and *De metris Horatii* (*gramm.* IV,456–472); Aphthonius in Marius Victorinus's *Ars grammatica* (*gramm.* VI,31–184); Palaemon (attributed to Victorinus), *De metrica institutione* (*gramm.* VI,206–215); Maximus Victorinus, *De ratione metrorum* (*gramm.* VI,216–228) and Mallius Theodorus, *De metris* (*gramm.* VI,585–610).

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., D. S. Raven, *Latin Metre*, London 1965, 134; M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982, xi; L. Morgan, *Musa Pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*, Oxford 2010, 50. – The glyconic line was regularised already in Horace, as was the fourth element of the sapphic line (– u – – / – uu – / u – –), which is still variable in Catullus (– u – x / – uu – / u – –). Boethius's use of the sapphic line and the hendecasyllable, where a similar standardisation took place, is

Lupus's efforts to understand Boethius's metrical complexity and sophistication inevitably ran into a number of snags: although Lupus was arguably the metrically most erudite author of his age, his knowledge of metre and prosody had been laboriously gleaned from books. His analyses of Boethius's metres were adapted, second-hand, from what he could find in the metrical treatises of Late Antiquity, and although his efforts to rework his material often show considerable perspicuity, it is understandable that his narrow frame of reference sometimes led him astray. Although Lupus's own poetic output is relatively narrow and arguably insignificant,<sup>15</sup> his interest in metre and prosody is well-documented by his letters, where he discusses prosodic issues with a thoroughness that borders on the obsessive.<sup>16</sup> He frequently offers his reading of the "poets" as evidence, even departing from, or contradicting, grammatical authority.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, in his letter 6, he rejects the classical scansion *blasphēmus* he had encountered in Prudentius for the Byzantine Greek *blásphēmus*, relying on oral evidence from an actual living Greek whom he had personally encountered – and apparently pumped for information on Greek prosody.<sup>18</sup> Lupus's correspondence demonstrates an empirical approach unusual for his day and age, as well as an ability to draw on an exceptionally wide range of sources when trying to solve the mysteries of Latin prosody and poetic scansion.

---

consistent with post-classical practice.

<sup>15</sup> J. Szövérfy, *Weltliche Dichtungen des lateinischen Mittelalters*, Berlin 1970, 598; Brown (above n. 5) 71. Lupus's scant verse has been published in B. Bischoff, "Anecdota Carolina", in: W. Stach – H. Walther (ed.), *Studien zur lateinischen Dichtung des Mittelalters: Ehrengabe für Karl Strecker zum 4. September 1931* (Schriftenreihe zur Historischen Vierteljahrschrift 1), Dresden 1931, 1–11, at p. 4; K. Strecker (ed.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Poetae Latini aevi Carolini 4*, Berlin 1923, 1032, 1052, 1059; K. Strecker (ed.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Poetae Latini medii aevi 6: Nachträge zu den Poetae aevi Carolini*; Weimar 1951, 153.

<sup>16</sup> E. Perels (ed.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae 6: Epistolae Karolini aevi 4*, Berlin 1925, 1–126.

<sup>17</sup> In his letter 5, Lupus wondered whether a plosive and liquid could have the power of *shortening* the preceding syllable in cases where it was long by nature (as in *arātrum*), and, happily enough, suspected that it could not, despite Donatus's confusing discussion (*gramm.* IV,371,20) which Lupus had, admittedly, misinterpreted. – Perels (above n. 16), 15.

<sup>18</sup> Perels (above n. 16), 27: *Itaque Graecus quidam Graecos "blasphemus" dicere correpta paenultima mihi constanter asseruit.*



Lupus's brief commentary on Boethius begins with a short introduction of no more than two sentences,<sup>19</sup> where the author acknowledges that the poems are difficult even for educated readers (*etiam inter doctos*) and characterises his treatise as having been compiled *non mediocri diligentia*. This is followed by a list of poetic metres in the order in which they appear in Boethius's work, illustrated with either the first line or the first two lines of each poem. Lupus's wording follows that of Servius to an amazing degree. Servius's treatise itself is little more than a list of poetic metres and the metrical feet of which they consist, with a negligible amount of cited material – Brown characterises Servius's presentation as "skeletal"<sup>20</sup> – and Lupus's discussion is equally sparse, being solely preoccupied with combinations of feet and syllables and neglecting such issues as caesurae and word division, let alone broader stylistic issues. It is apparent that the treatise was primarily intended as an aid to scansion. Notably, *De centum metris* also appears to have been one of the sources which Bede had at his disposal when composing his *De arte metrica*, the standard guide to metre in the Early Middle Ages.<sup>21</sup> Almost at the very end of his treatise, Bede adds that those who are interested will find many more metres *in centimetrorum libris* but that, as they are pagan, he had been "unwilling to touch them" (*quae, quia pagana erant, nos tangere non libuit*).<sup>22</sup> Bede's probably unfair casting of the work as pagan reflects the fact that it largely describes metres that had not been employed by Christian authors: Bede's own treatise is deliberately limited in its discussion of lyric metres, being a guide to what he considered proper Christian versification.<sup>23</sup> In referring his reader to Servius's work, he nevertheless did a great service to his latter-day readers, and Lupus seems to have followed his injunction to the letter.

<sup>19</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxv, 1–6.

<sup>20</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 71.

<sup>21</sup> On the circulation and influence of Bede's treatise, see e.g. M. L. W. Laistner – H. H. King, *A Hand-list of Bede Manuscripts*, Ithaca (NY), 88–9; C. B. Kendall (ed.), "De arte metrica et de schematibus et tropis", in C. W. Jones (ed.), *Bedae Venerabilis opera: Opera didascalica I* (Corpus Christianorum, Ser. Latina 123A), Turnhout 1975 59–171 at pp. 60–72 and 72–4; M. Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature 600 – 899*, London – Rio Grande (OH) 1996, 313; Brown, *A Companion to Bede* (Anglo-Saxon Studies 12), Woodbridge 2009, 22; J. A. Westgard, "Bede and the Continent in the Carolingian Age and Beyond", in: S. DeGregorio (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Bede*, Cambridge 2010, 201–15, esp. at 210.

<sup>22</sup> Kendall (above n. 21), 138.

<sup>23</sup> In addition to the hexameter and the elegiac couplet, Bede only discusses the hendecasyllable, the sapphic strophe, the "terentianean" metre, the iambic dimeter, the iambic trimeter, the anacreontic and the trochaic septenarius, all of which are illustrated with Christian examples.

Lupus's descriptions of metres are generally artfully combined from what he had found in Servius. To accommodate the nature of his commentary, Lupus has often inverted the order of Servius's presentation, as in his discussion of the anapaestic dimeter (in his, as in Servius's nomenclature "pindaric"):<sup>24</sup> a short characterisation of the metre (*quintum anapaesticum Pindaricum constans dimetro acatalecto*), quoted from Servius at *gramm.* IV,462,8, is followed by a lengthier exposition of anapaestic metres, taken from an earlier passage (*gramm.* IV,461,27–29). Similarly, Boethius's combinations of different metres have been assembled from the descriptions of the respective metres in Servius. Lupus has left out Servius's introduction to metrical terminology, which touches on the role of the two-foot metron or dipody as the building-block of iambic, trochaic and anapaestic metres. Servius appears to have regarded the concept of the metron as redundant: he neither mentions it nor explains its structure, being merely content to say that iambo-trochaic and anapaestic metres take their names from the number of "pairs of feet".<sup>25</sup> It is obvious that Lupus expects his readers to be acquainted with this information, as he does not specify what such terms as "dimeter" and "trimeter" (based on the number of metra rather than individual "feet") mean. His discussion of the structure of iambic metres is limited to a description of the differences between "odd and even feet" (*loci impares/loci pares*), borrowed from Servius's introduction to iambic verse,<sup>26</sup> which he has appended to his discussion of the iambic scazon (x – u – / x – u – / x – – –), in his, as in Servius's terminology, "hipponactic":

*Octavum genus iambicum est hyponactium constans trimetro acatalecto claudo. Iambica vero metra imparibus quidem locis possunt recipere iambum tribrachium spondeum dactylum anapestum. In paribus iambum tantum vel tribrachin et frequenter apud comicos anapestum ita tamen ut multarum brevium iunctura vitetur.*<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Peiper (above n. 3) xxv–xxvi. The use of the term is exclusive to Servius and Lupus.

<sup>25</sup> *Gramm.* IV,457,16–18: *monometrum vel dimetrum vel trimetrum in iambicis trochaicis anapesticis metris per pedes duplices computari, in ceteris per simplices.*

<sup>26</sup> *Gramm.* IV,457,25–458,3.

<sup>27</sup> Peiper (above n. 3) xxvi. Lupus, as Servius before him, fails to specify what "limping" (*claudus*) means in this context, apparently expecting a remarkable knowledge of metrics from his readers. The suggestion that even feet may take the anapaest in comic verse is ostensibly a half-hearted effort on Servius's part to address the archaic forms of iambic verse employed in early Roman comedy.

[The eighth metre is the iambic hipponactic, which consists of a limping trimeter acatalectic. Iambic metres can take an iamb, a tribrach, a spondee, a dactyl or an anapest in the uneven feet, in the even ones only the iamb or tribrach, or frequently, in comic verse, the anapaest, in such a way, however, that a conjunction of many short syllables is avoided.]

Mallius Theodorus (saec. IV–V) had jettisoned the concept of the iambo-trochaic metron to the extent of altering his metrical nomenclature, casting e.g. the iambic dimeter as the "iambic tetrameter" and the iambic trimeter as the "iambic hexameter" on the strength of the number of individual feet in the line,<sup>28</sup> a solution followed by Bede in his *De arte metrica*.<sup>29</sup> Although it is probable that the classical concept of the metron was highly irrelevant to Lupus – and in this he is not alone among the authors of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages – he nevertheless followed the more traditional terminology of Servius while keeping technical discussion to a minimum.

In her exhaustive analysis of Lupus's treatise, Virginia Brown has concluded that the author reached a 75 per cent accuracy in his description of Boethius's huge variety of metres.<sup>30</sup> When it comes to dactylic and iambo-trochaic metres, Lupus is generally faultless, even when discussing such less usual lengths as the alcmnian trochaic tetrameter, the iambic scazon and even the meiuric ("mouse-tailed") dactylic tetrameter (labelled *faliscus* by both Lupus and Servius). His errors lie mainly in his sometimes mistaken analyses of aeolic, iambic and anapaestic lengths. In the case of aeolic metres, Lupus is inconsistent in his observation of some of the liberties which Boethius had taken in his use of this verse type.

In his discussion of the hendecasyllable, Lupus makes no mention of Boethius's idiosyncratic treatment of the middle of the line. Although the standard scheme of the metre, in its post-classical form, is (– – / – uu – / u – u – –), in *cons. 1 carm. 4* we encounter lines where the "third trochee" formed by the sixth and seventh elements has been substituted with an iamb (line 2), a dactyl (line 6) and a spondee (line 11):<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup> *Gramm.* VI,593,6–9 and 21–23.

<sup>29</sup> Kendall (above n. 21) 135.

<sup>30</sup> Brown (above n. 5) 75. Brown notes generously that some of Lupus's mistakes may be due to faults in the manuscript at his disposal.

<sup>31</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 78.

*fatum sub pedibus egit superbum*  
 -- / - uu u / -- u --  
*versum funditus exagitantis aestum*  
 -- / - uu - / uu - u --  
*quid tantum miseri saevos tyrannos*  
 (-- / - uu - / -- u --)

This is an understandable oversight on Lupus's part, as such liberties are restricted to three lines in all of Boethius's hendecasyllables and are not described by late antique authorities on metre. Lupus also makes the mistake of analysing *cons. 3 carm. 10* as having been composed in hendecasyllables, whereas in reality the hendecasyllable alternates with the sapphic line. The apparent stumbling block seems to have been the opening of the poem, which consists of three consecutive hendecasyllables, and Lupus apparently did not proceed further in his analysis.

When it comes to the glyconic line (- - / - uu- / u -), Lupus ignored the fact that Boethius had used a pre-classical form of the line where the initial spondee can be substituted with an iamb or a trochee. This is understandable, as the poems where he used the metre (*cons. 1 carm. 6*; *cons. 2 carm. 8*; *cons. 3 carm. 12*; *cons. 4 carm. 3* and *cons. 5 carm. 4*) are generally consistent with classical practice; pre-classical liberties only occur in isolated cases (five lines altogether in *cons. 2 carm. 3*, *cons. 3 carm. 12* and *cons. 5 carm. 4* have an iambic base) apart from *cons. 4 carm. 3*, where all the lines open with a trochee with the exception of the final one.<sup>32</sup> Brown has been unwilling to attribute Lupus's lapse to any deficiencies in his understanding of syllable prosody, and she is probably correct: it is highly unlikely that a scholar of Lupus's calibre would have given an erroneous scansion to 38 consecutive lines in *cons. 4 carm. 3*. It is more likely that, having once correctly identified the metre, Lupus was unwilling to modify its description without support from the grammatical authorities, whose presentation of the glyconic metre is narrowly post-classical, or more simply neglected to scan the remaining poems composed in the metre.

When it comes to the metres which Lupus had actually misunderstood, his general tendency seems to have been to opt for a more familiar interpretation when dealing with less usual metres, and then introduce additional metrical "liberties" to make his description plausible. This is particularly the case in *cons. 3 carm. 6* and *cons. 4 carm. 2*, where the minor ionic dimeter (uu - - / uu - -) is combined, respectively, with the dactylic tetrameter catalec-

<sup>32</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 74–5.

tic and the trochaic dimeter. Here Lupus has, on both occasions, mistakenly interpreted the ionic dimeter as a pherecratic, or a catalectic form of the glyconic line (– – / – uu – / –). Indeed, the ionic dimeter can manifest itself as a pherecratic if the two initial short syllables are fused (– – – / uu – –), but not the other way around, as Lupus sees it: he assumes that the metre is a pherecratic with an occasional *resolution* of the initial long syllable and actually supplements Servius's description of the pherecratic with this observation.<sup>33</sup> We can surmise that the origin of this mistake lies not only in Lupus's relative unfamiliarity with ionic verse: namely, elsewhere in the *Consolatio*, Boethius does use the pherecratic proper with an anapaestic base twice (*cons. 2 carm. 2,14* and *18, cons. 2 carm. 4,8*). Although, in his discussion of these poems, Lupus makes no note of this idiosyncratic solution, it may have prompted him to apply it elsewhere and impeded his ability to recognise the minor ionic for what it really is.

Lupus's observation of anapaestic metres is deficient in a similar way: rather than recognising them consistently for what they are, he often suggests a dactylic interpretation – with the addendum that the poet has occasionally substituted anapaests for dactyls. Lupus's discussion of anapaestic metres is inconsistent in this respect: he has correctly recognised the anapaestic dimeter catalectic (uu – uu – / uu – –) of *cons. 2 carm. 5* and *cons. 3 carm. 5*.<sup>34</sup> When it comes to the anapaestic dimeter acatalectic (uu – uu – / uu – uu –), he wavers, analysing it correctly in *cons. 1 carm. 5* and *3,2*<sup>35</sup> but suggesting at *cons. 4 carm. 6* and *cons. 5 carm. 3* that the metre is dactylic, being either the "archilochean dactylic tetrameter catalectic" (– uu / – uu / – uu / – –) or a combination of two adonics (– uu – –) with occasional substitution of anapaests for dactyls.<sup>36</sup> He defends his interpretation by asserting that he views the metre as dactylic because the lines have "more spondees and dactyls than anapaests" (*nam anapesticum sentire ratio dissuadet quando spondeo vel dactilo quam anapesto compositum sit*). Here Lupus is obviously wrong, as dactyls are commonly substituted for anapaests in anapaestic verse but the anapaest is never employed in dactylic metres. His statement is not corroborated by any of the grammarians, nor does it hold water

<sup>33</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxvii: *Sed in hoc loco pro primo spondeo est ubi anapestum contra regulam in Servio traditam invenimus.*

<sup>34</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxvii.

<sup>35</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxv–xxvi.

<sup>36</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxviii.

statistically, as Brown has observed.<sup>37</sup> It is hard to see Lupus's motives for his presentation of the metres at *cons. 4 carm. 6* and *cons. 5 carm. 3*, apart from the fact that he obviously found dactylic metres more familiar and tractable than anapaestic ones; one must also note that already the ancient grammarians have a general tendency to give a dactylic or an iambo-trochaic interpretation to lyric metres of various metrical origins.<sup>38</sup> In medieval metrics, the tendency to derive all lyric metres from the hexameter became even more pronounced, and Lupus's conflation of dactylic and anapaestic metres is echoed in several later treatises.<sup>39</sup> Lupus's dactylic reinterpretation of the anapaestic dimeter acatalectic is, of course, faultless as a description of its prosodic structure as he found it, although his use of metrical nomenclature is misguided and has forced him to tie himself into knots to explain the metrical irregularities his definition appeared to suggest.

Another stumbling block for Lupus was the alcaic decasyllable (– uu – uu – / u – –), which Boethius used as a couplet with the hendecasyllable in *cons. 3 carm. 4*. Although the metre is described by Servius,<sup>40</sup> Lupus has apparently overlooked his presentation. Brown has assumed that he may not have encountered the line elsewhere, which is obviously unwarranted, as Lupus most certainly was acquainted with Horace's *Odes*.<sup>41</sup> However, in Horace, the alcaic decasyllable always forms the fourth line of the alcaic stanza, and its use as the second line of a couplet undeniably makes it here extremely difficult to recognise. Lupus has, once again, resorted to a simpler dactylic interpretation: he presents the line as a variant of the archilochean dactylic tetrameter (– uu / – uu / – uu / – –) with a voluntary "substitution of a trochee for the third dactyl in uneven feet" (*in quo tamen pro spondeo et dactilo imparibus locis etiam trochaeum reperies*).<sup>42</sup> Lupus's description is not precise, as what he calls the trochee appears constantly in what he terms the third foot of the line, but never in its beginning. Lupus has apparently drawn an analogy from the different roles of even and uneven feet in iambo-trochaic verse that obviously does not describe the poem accurately.

<sup>37</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 73.

<sup>38</sup> For the theoretical background of this thinking, see J. Leonhardt 1989, "Die beiden metrischen Systeme des Altertums", *Hermes* 117 (1989) 43–62.

<sup>39</sup> See P. Klopsch, *Einführung in die mittelalterliche Verslehre*, Darmstadt 1972, 97–8.

<sup>40</sup> *Gramm.* IV,466,20–22.

<sup>41</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 72. Lupus's own teacher Hrabanus Maurus himself emulated Horace's *Odes* in several of his hymns, see E. Dümmler (ed.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Poetae Latini aevi Carolini* 2, Berlin 1884, esp. at 249–51.

<sup>42</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxvii.

Brown cites as one further "mistake" by Lupus his description of the ionic anacreontic (uu – u / – u – –), in *cons. 3 carm. 7* as an "iambic anacreontic",<sup>43</sup> but this is something he shares with Servius who groups the metre together with iambic metres.<sup>44</sup> Modern metrical literature sees the anacreontic as an anaclastic variant of the minor ionic dimeter (uu – – / uu – –), i.e. a form where the final element of the first foot and the first element of the second foot have switched places, but it was commonly presented as an iambic metre by grammarians who saw it as simply an iambic dimeter catalectic (x – u – / x – –), with resolution of the first element.<sup>45</sup> Lupus's use of the term is perfectly consistent with the late antique practice of conflating the anacreontic with the iambic dimeter catalectic, and the latter is precisely what both Servius and Lupus describe. Lupus has probably prefixed the name of the metre with "iambic" simply to avoid confusion: Servius elsewhere also uses the term "anacreontic" for the minor ionic dimeter and trimeter.<sup>46</sup> It is unfortunate that, in this instance, Lupus did not resort to the description of the metre given in Bede's *De arte metrica*, which is that of the anacreontic proper and would correspond perfectly with the metre as adopted by Boethius.<sup>47</sup>

As we can see, in most cases Lupus's inaccuracies are minor. Sometimes he has overlooked metrical liberties that Boethius had taken contrary to the descriptions of poetic metre in the grammarians; in other cases, he has started out with a mistaken classification of a metre and then tried to postulate additional metrical rules to make it fit. In most cases, however, the result is satisfactory as far as actual poetic scansion is concerned.

Virginia Brown has, with some justice, recognised Lupus's presentation of the unusual metre of *cons. 1 carm. 2* as particularly unhappy, as far as both metrical structure and nomenclature are concerned, and been unable to attribute it to Servius or any other source. The poem has been composed in a combination

<sup>43</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxviii.

<sup>44</sup> *Gramm.* IV,458,10.

<sup>45</sup> E.g., Mallius Theodorus, *gramm.* IV,593,24–27. Mallius uses the term "anacreontic" simply as a name for the iambic dimeter catalectic, although he also presents the anacreontic metre in a stricter sense as its aesthetically superior variant.

<sup>46</sup> *Gramm.* IV,464,17–20.

<sup>47</sup> Kendall (above n. 21), 136–7. Although Bede, too, classifies the metre as iambic, paraphrasing Mallius Theodorus at *gramm.* IV,464,17–20, he gives the structure of the metre as uu – u / – u – –: *recipit anapestum, duos iambos, et semipedem.* – See S. Heikkinen, *The Christianisation of Latin Metre: a Study of Bede's De arte metrica*, Helsinki 2012, 158–64.

of a hemiepes (– uu / – uu / –) and an adonic (– uu / – –). The first two feet can manifest themselves as any combination of dactyls and spondees, quite like the first half of a dactylic pentameter. So, in Boethius's poem, we encounter four line-types altogether:

1. spondee+dactyl:

*heu quam praecipiti / mersa profundo* (line 1)

– – / – uu / – // – uu / – –

2. dactyl+dactyl

*mens hebet et propria / luce relicta* (line 2)

– uu / – uu / – // – uu / – –

3. dactyl+spondee

*tendit et externas / ire tenebras* (line 3)

– uu / – – / – // – uu / – –

4. spondee+spondee

*hic quondam caelo / liber aperto* (line 6)

– – / – – / – // – uu / – –

In the poem, the first type, with an initial combination of spondee+dactyl predominates, appearing in seventeen of the poem's twenty-seven lines. This also corresponds with Lupus's description of the metre, which prescribes a spondee and dactyl for the beginning of the line: *Secundum dactilicum tetrametrum quod constat spondeo dactilo catalecto item dactilo spondeo* ("The second metre, the dactylic tetrameter, consists of a spondee, a dactyl, a catalecton, followed by a dactyl and a spondee").<sup>48</sup> What is remarkable is that Lupus ignores the other line-types, which occur no less than ten times in the poem, and characterises the line as a "dactylic tetrameter", which seems hugely inappropriate and likely to cause confusion. As Brown notes, "it would be an odd dactylic tetrameter indeed which allows a catalectic foot in the middle of the line."<sup>49</sup> Brown has not recognised the obvious source of Lupus's presentation: it is to be found in Bede's *De arte metrica*, where Bede describes the metre of two anonymous hymns which correspond entirely with the line type most common in Boethius, having always an initial spondee followed by a dactyl:<sup>50</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxv.

<sup>49</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 74.

<sup>50</sup> Bede has falsely attributed the hymns to Ambrose. For a discussion of Bede's mistake, see D. Norberg, *Au seuil du Moyen âge. II: Études linguistiques, métriques et littéraires 1975–95*



*Metrum dactylicum tetrametrum catalecticum constat ex spondeo, dactylo, catalecto, dactylo, spondeo. Quo usus est sanctus Ambrosius in precatone pluviae, cuius exordium hoc est: Squalent arva soli pulvere multo...*<sup>51</sup>

[The dactylic tetrameter catalectic consists of a spondee, a dactyl, a catalecton, a dactyl and a spondee. Saint Ambrose used this metre in a prayer for rain, of which this is the beginning: The fields lie deep in dust...]<sup>52</sup>

For the metre, Bede has used the equally perplexing term "dactylic tetrameter catalectic", which makes metrically even less sense than Lupus's "dactylic tetrameter", as, far from being catalectic, the line is actually *longer* than four feet. Bede's term may be based on analogy: it is possible that he viewed the line as a dactylic pentameter which lacked the two final syllables.<sup>53</sup> Bede's influence on Lupus's nomenclature is nevertheless apparent.

The metre, as Bede presents it, is in modern scholarship known as the "terentianean verse" because it first appears in Terentianus Maurus's second-century *De litteris, de syllabis, de metris*.<sup>54</sup> It was later used, among others, by Martianus Capella before becoming hugely popular with hymnodists of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.<sup>55</sup> The origins of the metre are obscure, and it would be tempting to view it as an aeolic form.<sup>56</sup> Terentianus himself is ambiguous on the matter: although he calls the metre by the name *hendecasyllabus alter*, he has interpreted the metre as dactylic, which is probably a back-formation. He also demonstrates its structure by stating that it can be formed from the begin-

---

(Filologiskt arkiv 40), Uppsala 1998, 256–7.

<sup>51</sup> Kendall (above n. 21), 134.

<sup>52</sup> Trans. C. B. Kendall, *Bede. Libri II De arte metrica et de schematibus et tropis: The art of Poetry and Rhetoric* (Bibliotheca Germanica: Ser. nova 2), Saarbrücken 1991, 149.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid. The dactylic pentameter itself is, of course, inappropriately named. In the words of M. L. West, it does not "contain five of anything." – West (above n. 14), 44.

<sup>54</sup> Ter. Maur. 1939–1956.

<sup>55</sup> Norberg (above n. 1), 79–80.

<sup>56</sup> The most practical solution is to see the terentianean metre as a catalectic form of the minor asclepiad (– – / – uu – / – uu – / u –), as W. Meyer has done in his *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rythmik 2*, Berlin 1905, 225. For a more detailed discussion of the various definitions of the terentianean metre, see Norberg (above n. 50), 257–8.

ning and the end of a hexameter line<sup>57</sup> and then presents several lines that have been assembled from bits and pieces of the *Aeneid*, starting with *postquam res Asiae primus ab oris*.<sup>58</sup> Although all of Terentianus's lines correspond to the type presented by Bede, his dactylic interpretation of the length may ultimately be behind Boethius's free use of dactyls and spondees for either of the first two feet: Boethius simply took Terentianus's "dactylising" approach one step further by subjecting the metre to the same rules as the dactylic hexameter and pentameter.<sup>59</sup>

It is difficult to see why Lupus used Bede's definition of the terentianean metre without any further adjustments that would describe all the verse types in *cons. 1 carm. 2*. Possibly he went no further than the first line in his scansion of the poem and was relieved to have discovered something familiar. Alternatively, it could be that he expected his readers to understand implicitly that dactyls and spondees are widely interchangeable in dactylic verse – obviously his target audience were the *docti* whom he mentions in his introduction. As the metre was highly popular in early medieval hymnody, it was certainly easy enough to recognise for his readers. It is equally obvious that Lupus and his readers alike were thoroughly acquainted with Bede's *De arte metrica*, and it is understandable that it was Lupus's final resort in the absence of a more comprehensive scholarly description of the metre.

Lupus's choice of the term "dactylic tetrameter" is one that could lead to terminological confusion, as Boethius also used metres that actually fit the term, but Lupus has solved the problem by resorting to the older terminology found in Servius. This has, however, led to an inconsistent terminological jumble: in the case of the dactylic tetrameter acatalectic (– uu / – uu / – uu / – uu), Lupus is careful to refer to it in *cons. 1 carm. 3* and *cons. 4 carm. 1* as an "alcmanian dactylic tetrameter acatalectic" (*dactilicum alcamanium tetrametrum acatalecticum*), also explaining thoroughly what the term "acatalectic" means,<sup>60</sup> but calls the same length the "bucolic tetrameter" in *cons. 5 carm. 5*.<sup>61</sup> This inconsistency

<sup>57</sup> Ter. Maur. 1940–1944.

<sup>58</sup> Ter. Maur. 1949.

<sup>59</sup> Pepe (above n. 10), 235.

<sup>60</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxv.

<sup>61</sup> Peiper (above n. 3), xxviii; Brown (above n. 5), 73. Brown also appears to suggest that Lupus calls the dactylic tetrameter catalectic by two different names at *cons. 3 carm. 6* and *cons. 5 carm. 2*, but these are, in fact, different metres, the former (– uu / – uu / – uu / –) being, in his nomenclature, the "alcmanian trimeter hypercatalectic" and the latter (– uu / – uu / – uu / –), the "archilochean tetrameter catalectic".

is something that Lupus inherited from Servius and reflects earlier usage, but the fact that Lupus was unable to revise his terminology demonstrates his dependence on Servius's treatise.

Unfortunately, Lupus did not stop here: he claims that the "dactylic tetrameter" of *cons. 1 carm. 2* is shared by *cons. 4 carm. 5*, where, as we have noted, trochaic or iambic elements are combined with the adonic. The openings of the lines in *cons. 4 carm. 5* are obviously not dactylic in any sense, and if Lupus had taken the trouble of scanning them properly, he would certainly have discovered this. The metre of *cons. 4 carm. 5* is, of course, the most original of all the metres in the *Consolatio*, and it would appear that, in this case, Lupus simply gave up. Focusing on the adonic at the end of each line, he concluded that the presentation he had given for *cons. 1 carm. 2* was close enough for comfort.

Another probable sign of Bede's influence can be found in Lupus's definition of the dactylic hexameter, which Boethius used a number of times in combination with other metres, but only once on its own at *cons. 3 carm. 9*. As Brown has noted, the definition given in Lupus does not follow the one in Servius,<sup>62</sup> or, indeed, any of the sources which he cites in his letters when discussing metrics and prosody.<sup>63</sup> The hexameter according to Lupus is as follows:

*Primum et vicesimum est heroicum exametrum qui locis omnibus aliis dactilum sive spondeum, quinto solum modo dactilum recipit, sexto spondeum sive trocheum.*<sup>64</sup>

[The twenty-first metre is the heroic hexameter which takes the dactyl or the spondee in all other feet but only the dactyl in the fifth and a spondee or a trochee in the sixth.]

In other words, Lupus departs from traditional definitions of the hexameter in ruling out the use of spondees in the fifth foot, a construction known as a spondaic line. Spondaic lines are, admittedly, highly unusual in Latin hexameter verse, and there are none at all in Boethius,<sup>65</sup> making Lupus's description factually correct, although as a definition of the hexameter it is unusual and departs from the defini-

<sup>62</sup> *Gramm.* IV,461,10–11.

<sup>63</sup> Brown (above n. 5), 65. Brown mentions Caper, Donatus, Priscian and Servius's commentary on the *Aeneid* as sources to which Lupus refers.

<sup>64</sup> Peiper (above n. 5), xxviii.

<sup>65</sup> Pepe (above n. 10), 233.

tions given in the majority of grammarians. The major exception is Bede, who in his *De arte metrica* presents the first definition of the hexameter which rules out spondaic lines altogether:

*Constat autem ex dactylo et spondeo vel trocheo, ita ut recipiat spondeum locis omnibus praeter quintum, dactylum praeter ultimum, trocheum vero loco tantum ultimo; vel, ut quidam definiunt, spondeum ultimo loco semper et omnibus praeter quintum...*<sup>66</sup>

[It is formed from the dactyl, the spondee, and the trochee in such a way that it takes the spondee in every foot except the fifth, the dactyl in every foot except the last, and the trochee only in the final foot. Or, as some prosodists explain it, it takes the spondee in the last foot and in all feet except the fifth ...]<sup>67</sup>

Bede's redefinition of the hexameter reflects the declining popularity of spondaic lines in Latin verse and the disdain they had met with in earlier grammatical literature.<sup>68</sup> For Bede, spondaic lines constituted a severe prosodic flaw, symptomatic of what he considered "pagan" metrics,<sup>69</sup> and his views are reflected by the practices of Carolingian hexameter verse, which generally avoids spondaic lines altogether – Lupus's own verse being, to my observation, no exception.<sup>70</sup> We cannot be certain to what extent Lupus shared Bede's ferocious opposition to spondaic lines but his correspondence shows that in matters of prosody he was nothing if not meticulous. Lupus's paraphrase of Bede in his discussion of the most central quantitative metre in the Graeco-Roman heritage nevertheless indicates that he viewed Bede's revised definition of the hexameter as standard and that it required no further discussion.

<sup>66</sup> Kendall (above n. 21) 108–9.

<sup>67</sup> Trans. Kendall (above n. 52), 97.

<sup>68</sup> For a more extensive discussion, see S. Heikkinen, "*Quae non habet intellectum*: The Disappearance of Spondaic Fifth Feet from Dactylic Hexameter Verse", in: A. Hall – O. Timofeeva – Á. Kiricsi – B. Fox (eds.), *Interfaces between Language and Culture in Medieval England: A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö* (The Northern World 48), Leiden – Boston 2008, 81–98.

<sup>69</sup> Kendall (above n. 21), 129–30; S. Heikkinen, "Vergilian Quotations in Bede's *De arte metrica*", *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 17 (2007) 101–9, at p. 107.

<sup>70</sup> Norberg (above n. 1), 64–5; Heikkinen (above n. 68), 95–6.

The impact of Lupus's treatise on later studies of Boethius's metre has been subjected to some study. However, it also seems to have indirectly influenced the composition of medieval verse. Paul Klopsch has plausibly attributed the metre of a poem by Lupus's pupil Heiric of Auxerre<sup>71</sup> to Lupus's erroneous description of *cons. 3 carm. 4*. In the poem, the hendecasyllable alternates with the archilochean dactylic tetrameter in emulation of what Lupus *thought* was Boethius's metre, although Boethius in reality used the alcaic hendecasyllable.<sup>72</sup> In the case of the terentianean metre, at least Sedulius Scottus seems to have composed poetry that follows Lupus's (or Bede's) "hypercorrect" description of the length even when he is otherwise Boethian in his diction,<sup>73</sup> although many medieval authors freely adopted the metrical innovations of Boethius in their use of the metre.<sup>74</sup>

Lupus of Ferrières was essentially right in his conclusion that, although many of the metres of Boethius seemed alien on the surface, they could ultimately be traced to more familiar lengths, and, in his presentation, resorted to the most exhaustive compendium of poetical metres accessible to him. Given the sparseness of Servius's presentation and his inconsistent use of metrical nomenclature – he often gives disparate metres the same name – we can but guess at the amount of work that went into the compilation of Lupus's short treatise. His shortcomings lie mainly in his neglect of such liberties in Boethius as are not found in late antique treatises on metre, and his occasional misidentification of individual metrical structures, although he usually tries to make amends for his failed analyses by suggesting additional metrical liberties that would make them plausible. Lupus's choices demonstrate that the nature of, above all, ionic, and, to a lesser extent, anapaestic metres was largely alien to scholars of his generation.

Virginia Brown's discussion of Lupus's treatise has charted admirably his use of Servius's *De centum metris* as well as pointing out the pitfalls in his adaptation of a work not always ideally suited to the task. I have ventured to suggest some probable reasons for some of Lupus's failings: Lupus largely continued a scholarly tradition that sought to derive all metres from dactylic and iambo-trochaic units, which, among others, had led to his superficially unwarranted "dactylisation" of anapaestic metres. Lupus was obviously largely unacquainted with,

<sup>71</sup> L. Traube (ed.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Poetae Latini aevi Carolini* 3, Berlin 1896, 436.

<sup>72</sup> Klopsch (above n. 39), 96–6.

<sup>73</sup> Note the opening line of Sedulius's *Tamquam praecipitans turbo regentes* with its allusion to *cons. 1 carm. 2,1* (*Heu quam praecipiti mersa profundo*). – Traube (above n. 71), 158.

<sup>74</sup> Norberg (above n. 1), 80; Norberg (above n. 50), 258–9.

and incapable of recognising, ionic metres, and the archaising liberties which Boethius took with the glyconic line escaped his attention, possibly for want of support from metrical theory. However, we must bear in mind that Lupus's treatise was mainly intended to be an aid to poetic scansion. As such, most of his definitions, even when theoretically mistaken, were perfectly adequate for this purpose, at least when taken together with the additional metrical rules and exceptions which Lupus was forced to postulate.

I have also ventured to give a plausible source for some of Lupus's presentations that are not traceable to Servius, and that source is none other than Bede's *De arte metrica*. It is telling that the presentation of the metre in *cons. 1 carm. 2* – and, less appropriately, that of *cons. 4 carm. 5* – is borrowed almost verbatim from the presentation of the terentianean metre in Bede, although the structure of the poem shows metrical liberties that Lupus does not discuss. Though possibly alien to modern classicists, for Lupus's audience the terentianean metre was one of the most familiar lengths in Boethius's *Consolatio*, although Boethius's usage departed from the traditional form of the metre described by Bede. Tellingly, in Cruindmel's ninth-century *Ars metrica*, which is largely an embellished version of Bede's treatise, the terentianean metre is, together with the iambic dimeter, the only lyric length the author discusses.<sup>75</sup> Indubitably, the erroneous attribution of the metre to Ambrose, together with its use by medieval hymnodists, had lent it increased authority.<sup>76</sup> As for the dactylic hexameter, Lupus's presentation is superficially his own, but the content, with its implied proscription of spondaic lines, is consistent with Bede's regularised definition of the metre. It is reasonable to assume that, in his treatise, Lupus gives the hexameter the same description he would have used in a classroom and that, by the ninth century, this reformed presentation had become standard.

To summarise: although, when dealing with the bulk of the *Consolatio* and its almost impenetrable metrical variety, Lupus resorted to Servius's *De centum metris* as the most wide-ranging compilation of poetic metres in existence, it is apparent that he relied on the tried and true when discussing those metres which he and his audience found to be the most familiar. It is equally apparent that, in these choices, his faith in Bede was implicit.

*University of Helsinki*

<sup>75</sup> J. Huemer (ed.), *Cruindmeli sive Fulcharii Ars metrica: Beitrag zur Geschichte der karolingischen Gelehrsamkeit*, Wien 1883, 47–9.

<sup>76</sup> Norberg (above n. 50), 256–7.