

TIMOTHY RENNER

The Aesthetics of Hexameter Verses: A New Fragment on Metre in the Michigan Collection

Under a single inventory number, 6766a, in the University of Michigan collection in Ann Arbor are housed three papyrus fragments of unknown provenance which were acquired by purchase during the earlier twentieth century. On their verso sides, characterized in the library’s inventory as “grammatical treatise”, the fragments display passages written in bookhand. The practiced informality of this verso writing, which may be assigned to the second century C.E.¹, might first suggest that all three pieces come from the same roll. Fr. 3 seems to stand apart distinctly, however, when one studies the three with care. Although the visual dissimilarities are particularly accentuated by the use of a thicker pen and by more liberal, even sloppy use of ink in Fr. 3 (especially from line 11 on), there are differences in the formation of letters in Fr. 3 that seem significant, particularly with respect to β, δ, ι, λ, υ, each of which in Fr. 3 is wholly, or often, written with greater pretensions to ornamentation by means of such features as serifs.

The verso of Fr. 1 preserves parts of 10 lines in which enclitics and accents are discussed, and the verso of Fr. 2 contains portions of 14 lines concerning *διαστολή*, *συνάφεια*, and compound adjectives. Fr. 3, with no surviving margins or head or foot of column but containing portions of 21 lines, focuses on metre rather than prosody or grammar in the strict sense. In particular, the writer discusses different configurations of the hexameter line with special consideration given to the coincidence, or lack of coincidence, of word endings with ends of feet. In all three fragments of 6766a, Homeric verses or phrases are cited. While these quotations enable us to calculate the column width of Frs. 1 and 2 as approximately 38 letters, we arrive at a figure of some 29–34 letters for Fr. 3. Lastly, the scanty remains of writing on the recto side of the fragments², the more extensive surface wear on the recto of Fr. 3, and especially what appears to be the slightly greater thickness of the papyrus fabric in Fr. 3 by comparison with the other two, confirm our conclusion that Fr. 3 comes from a different roll than that of the other two pieces.

Elsewhere I plan to present an edition of Frs. 1 and 2 together with more comprehensive remarks on all three fragments. Since the verso of Fr. 3 adds especially to our picture of the study of Greek metrics in Roman Egypt, I would like to explore it in a little more detail here.

Aside from common minor spelling variations, few mistakes or orthographical peculiarities are present in the text: Note the omission of the second π in *πεμπ*’ in line 12 and the mistaken writing of the masculine form for the participle *ἔχουσαι* in a Homeric quotation in line 14 (the latter was corrected immediately by the writer, it appears, but he seems to have left the same error unaltered in line 16). No accents are visible. Iota-adsript is not written. Spaces are used to separate sentences.

P. Mich. Inv. 6766a, Fr. 3

Verso, recto: literary or documentary text

II century C.E.

7.9 (ht.) × 5.4 (w.) cm

1] . [ca. 6] . [

2] . α . . . [. . .] ει . . . [

3 [ca. 10] ποδας οϊ [] λειτα [

¹ The informal yet “literary” nature of the writing is very much in keeping with the general character of many verso literary and subliterated texts. For hands showing a range of features closely comparable to the Michigan papyrus and dated to the second century, see the very formal script of the Berlin Theaetetus Commentary, Seider, *Paläographie* II, no. 40, and a more informally written fragment of Menander, *Epitrepontes*, Turner, *GMAW*² no. 86.

² This recto writing consists of bits of documentary texts in Frs. 1 and 2 and of badly rubbed, largely illegible remains of 5–6 lines in Fr. 3; the latter text looks more like a bookhand than cursive, but whether the text was documentary or literary cannot be established.

- 4 [ca. 10] ούλομέν[η]ν ἢ μυρ[ί' ca. 8]
 5 [ca. 8] . δε ἐστίν σενηρ[ca. 8]
 6 [ca. 9] ποδαστ . ν . κιν [ca. 8]
 7 [ca. 8] λιόθεν με φέρων ἄνε[μος Κικόνεσ-]
 8 [σι πέλασσε] . [.] . ιδεομουτηπολ[ca. 8]
 9 [ca. 9] ἰν ἀπαρτίζοντες επ . [ca. 8]
 10 [ca. 9] ὕβριος εἴνεκα τῆσδε [σὺ δ' ἴσχεο]
 11 [πείθεο δ' ἤ]μειν καὶ οἱ κατὰ διποδ[ίαν ca. 4]
 12 [τῶ δ' ἄρα πέ]μπτω πέμ' ἀπὸ νήσου δεῖα [Καλυ]-
 13 [ψώ καὶ ἔσ]πετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμ[πια]
 14 [δώματ' ἔχ]ο[[ντε]] ὕσαι σχημάτων δὲ ε[ca. 3]
 15 [ca. 7] ὄν μέτρον ὁ μὲν γὰρ δώ[ματ']
 16 [ἔχοντε]ς καὶ ἐπτὰ καὶ δέκα συλλ[αβ- . .]
 17 [ca. 7] . οἰεῖσιν ἐκάτερος γὰρ αὐτῶ[ν ca. 3]
 18 [ca. 7] . ς χώρας δυσυλλάβους μο[ca. 4]
 19 [ca. 10] ς πόδας ἔχει ὀδὶ τρισϰ[αίδεκα]
 20 [ca. 10] στίχος καὶ ἑκκαίδεκα
 21 [ca. 10] τεσ . η ν . [

2]εἰτῶ[? 3 space after ποδασ? ται[? 6 see comm. 8 λ[could be δ; see comm. 9 space after ἀπαρτίζοντες 10 ὕβριος pap. 11 ἤμειν: a space follows 12 δεῖα, πέμ(π)' 14 space after ἔχ]ο[[ντε]] ὕσαι; see comm. 15 space after μέτρον 17] . π or τ space after εἰσιν 18 see comm. 19 space after ἔχει

4. *Il.* 1.2 7–8: *Od.* 9.39 10–11: *Il.* 1.214 12–13: *Od.* 5.263 13–14: *Il.* 2.484



P.Mich. inv. 6766a, Fr. 3

4–5. That the Homeric verse (see the discussion below) was quoted in its entirety cannot be verified; if it was, the end of the verse should have fallen immediately, or nearly, prior to δε in 5.

5. *E. g.* ἐν ἡρ[ωϊκῶ μέτρῳ].

6. Perhaps πόδας, τὴν δὲ κιν[. Following κιν the surface appears to be blank for a distance of about 1½ letters before the papyrus breaks off; presumably a letter or letters have completely rubbed off here. κίνησις, κίνημα, and κινέω may be used to refer to the inflecting of words, but how a mention of this would fit into the context is not clear to me.

7–8. Whether the whole verse was quoted, as I have assumed in printing the text, or precisely how it was split between the two lines, cannot be established; if it was completely quoted, its final part would have filled, or nearly filled, the lacuna at the beginning of 8. See the discussion below.

8. What appears on the photograph to be part of a supralinear horizontal stroke above the small lacuna represented by [], just below οθ in line 7, is not ink but a small hole. Second half of line: *E. g.* ὁμοῦ τῆ πολ[υ-, referring to a characteristic of the verse just cited.

9. ἀπαρτίζοντες: See the discussion below.

Possibly ἐπτ[ά.

13. On the Homeric verse see the discussion below.

14. It seems that the writer must have cancelled ντε immediately, before proceeding any further in the line. If that is what he did, however, it is interesting that he wrote υ above the cancelled letters and then continued with σαι following them. For evidence that he later wrote the masculine form again, see 16; as far as we can tell, he did not make the correction there.

16. [ἔχοντε]ς: See on 14.

συλλ[αβάς]?

17. εἰσίν?

18. χ survives only as small amounts of ink from its two right extremities. A χώρα is the space in a verse occupied by one foot.

Although a number of problems in understanding the Greek text remain to be solved, the nature and the main sequence of topics discussed can, I think, be followed quite well on the basis of discussions of hexameter verse preserved in various manuscripts and published as appendices to M. Consruch's 1906 Teubner edition of Hephaestion's *Encheiridion*, as well as by reference to the treatise *Περὶ Μέτρων* that is associated with the works of Plutarch. Let us examine four of the most important pieces of this background evidence. The first, from Codex Parisinus 2676 (J), is printed by Consruch on pp. 351–352 of the “Mantissa” section of his edition under the heading *Commentarii de Hexametro, C: ΠΕΡΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΩΝ*:

Διαφοραὶ στίχων εἰσὶν ἑννέα·

1. κατενόπλιον τὸ ἔχον ἐν τῷ στίχῳ δύο δακτύλους καὶ σπονδεῖον ὡς ἐπὶ τούτου (A 1)
μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος.
2. περιοδικόν τὸ ἔχον ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ στίχῳ ἕνα δάκτυλον καὶ ἕνα σπονδεῖον (A 2)
οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ Ἄχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκεν.
3. σαπφικόν τὸ ἔχον ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῷ τέλει σπονδεῖους, τοὺς δὲ μέσους δακτύλους (A 9)
Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός· ὁ γὰρ βασιλῆι χολωθεῖς.
4. βουκολικόν τὸ μὴ ἐν τῷ μετρεῖσθαι λῆγον εἰς μέρος λόγου (K 475)
ἔξ ἐπιδιφριάδος πυμάτης ἱμάσι δέδεντο.
5. ὑπόρρυθμον δὲ τὸ λῆγον εἰς μέρος λόγου ἐν τῷ μετρεῖσθαι, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἔστιν ἰδεῖν (A 214)
ὔβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε, σὺ δ' ἴσχεο, πείθεο δ' ἡμῖν.
6. τέλειον τὸ ἔχον ὅλα τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου (X 59)
πρὸς δέ με τὸν δύστηνον ἔτι φρονέοντ' ἐλέαιρε.
7. πολιτικόν τὸ δημῶδες κατὰ τὴν φράσιν (Λ 680)
ἵππους δὲ ξανθὰς ἑκατὸν καὶ πενήκοντα.
8. κλιμακωτόν, ἐν ᾧ προῖων αὖξει τὰς συλλαβάς, οἶον (Γ 182)
ὦ μάκαρ Ἀτρεΐδῃ μοιρηγενὲς ὀλβιόδαιμον.
9. ἐμπερίβολον τὸ ἔχον τινὰ τῶν δέκα κατηγοριῶν καὶ τῶν ἔξ περιστατικῶν ὡς τὸ (A 3)
πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄτιδι προΐαμεν·
ἔχει γὰρ οὗτος ὁ στίχος ποσόν, ποιόν, (οὐσίαν), τόπον, χρόνον.

It may be seen that this summary list of “types” of hexameter line, together with single Homeric verses cited to exemplify each, uses varying criteria as the basis of its definitions and is somewhat miscellaneous. Indeed, the list reads like a compilation of leftovers preserved by scholars and students and falling short in both scope and depth by comparison with what we imagine must have been originally a much larger and more comprehensive body of critical discussion of this kind about various aspects of the heroic hexameter.

Some of the bases of classification may seem to us pedantic or trivial, such as the defining of a type as a line containing all of the parts of speech (no. 6) or as comprised of words of ever-increasing length (no. 8) or as including words that answer a certain number of questions about the action described (no. 9). One type (no. 7) is based on choice of diction and is thus the most subjectively defined of the group. Several types are defined on the basis of sequence or location of dactyls and spondees or in relation to the coincidences of feet with words. For our purposes, however, we may especially take note of those types which involve certain relationships between boundaries of metrical feet and boundaries of words:

— The *περιοδικόν* type (no. 2), in which the sequence of feet is dactyl-spondee-dactyl-spondee-dactyl-spondee. An accompanying characteristic, at least in the case of the Homeric verse cited here, is that word end falls at the end of feet 2 and 4.

— The type called here *βουκολικόν* (no. 4), in which boundaries between feet never coincide with word ending.

— The *ὑπόρρυθμον* type (no. 5), objectionable because boundaries between feet always coincide with word end — i. e. the “opposite” of no. 4 in respect to hexameter aesthetics³.

In the discussion that follows we shall refer, for the sake of convenience, to Types 2, 4, and 5 as we examine parallels to these *διαφοραί* in other manuscript passages and in the papyrus.

We turn next to two additional passages, of Late Antique or medieval origin in their present form, which are printed in the “Mantissa” of Consruch’s edition under the heading ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΜΩΝ, sections 2 and 3, and which are attributed to Pseudo-Hephaestion:

Ps.-Heph. 27 (Consruch, p. 353):

Χαίρει δὲ μάλιστα τὸ αὐτὸ μέτρον τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῶν ποδῶν, ὅταν κατὰ πόδα μηδένα εἰς μέρος λόγου ἀπαρτίζη, ἀλλὰ συνδεδεμένοι πῶς εἰσιν ἀλλήλοις, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἰλιόθεν (με) φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσε (ι 39).

Παρατεῖται δὲ τὴν κατὰ πόδα τομήν, ὡς ἐν τῷ ὕβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε, σὺ δ’ ἴσχεο, πείθεο δ’ ἡμῖν (A 214).

καθ’ ἐκάστην γὰρ πόδα κατὰ μέρος λόγου ἀπήρτισται.

(There follows a discussion of a other undesirable type of hexameter line which are less relevant for us here.)

Ps.-Heph. 19 (Consruch, pp. 353–354):

Κακόμετρον ἐστίν, ὃ κατὰ πόδα ἢ διποδίαν ἢ κατὰ περίοδον ἀπαρτίζει τοῖς μέρεσι τοῦ λόγου· τὸ γὰρ καθαρὸν ἠρωϊκὸν ἐπικόπτειν θέλει τὴν λέξιν ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τῶν χωρῶν ἄνευ τῶν τομῶν. ἔστιν οὖν τὰ κατὰ πόδα κακόμετρα (A 214)

ὕβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε, σὺ δ’ ἴσχεο, πείθεο δ’ ἡμῖν

κατὰ διποδίαν δὲ (B 484 alibi)

ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι, Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσαι·

(Further discussion of other varieties of τὸ κακόμετρον, including spondee in the fifth foot, follows.)

Pseudo-Hephaestion 27 speaks first of essentially what we have termed Type 4. The term *βουκολικόν* is not used as in the ΠΕΡΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΩΝ passage, and in fact the type is simply described according to its special characteristics, which entail a “binding together” of the feet — the idea is stated once and then rephrased, as if for special emphasis — because no word boundaries coincide with foot boundaries. Then, by way of contrast and disapproval, the writer refers briefly to our Type 5, the “opposite” of Type 4 in which there is a *τομή*, a word break, at the end of each foot. The author’s descriptive language varies somewhat from that of the ΠΕΡΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΩΝ account that we first encountered, but the principles, and even the Homeric verse cited, are the same.

Pseudo-Hephaestion 19 offers a discussion of our Type 5, which is here called *κακόμετρον* in place of *ὑπόρρυθμον*, and presents two Homeric examples including Iliad 1. 214, which was cited for this purpose also by the ΠΕΡΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΩΝ and by Pseudo-Hephaestion 27. The second Homeric citation, Iliad 2. 484, is

³ Seven of the nine *διαφοραί* discussed in this list appear in essentially the same form in two passages of the Scholia to Hephaestion: See Consruch pp. 293–294 (from his Liber IV, believed by him to derive from marginal notes to a version of the *Encheiridion*) and 340–341 (from his Liber V, characterized by him as Byzantine in origin).

said to exemplify the quality of κακόμετρον in a different, but related manner: The bad effect of the τομαί or word breaks occurs not because they fall at the end of every foot as in our basic definition of Type 5, but because they still break up the line κατὰ διποδίαν. Embedded in this entry is the general remark that “pure hexameter” (καθαρόν ἠρωϊκόν) is characterized by word breaks that occur within the χῶραι, or feet, and without τομαί. For ease of reference, we will refer henceforth to the κατὰ διποδίαν variety of κακόμετρον as Type 5-Dip.

Finally, part II of the brief work Περὶ Μέτρων included in the corpus of Plutarch’s works discusses Διαφοραὶ τοῦ ἠρωϊκοῦ μέτρου in a similar vein to the above texts. In particular, this passage includes entries on the Type 2 (περιοδικόν) and Type 5 (ὑπόρρυθμον/κακόμετρον) patterns with which we are familiar (Plutarchus, ed. G. N. Bernardakis, vol. VII, Leipzig 1896, p. 467, lines 8–9 and 16–18)⁴:

περιοδικόν ἐστι δάκτυλος καὶ σπονδαῖος, οἶον
οὐλομένην, ἢ μυρί’ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε’ ἔθηκεν. (*Iliad* 1. 2)

ὑπόρρυθμόν ἐστι τὸ καθ’ ἕκαστον πόδα ἀπαρτίζον εἰς μέρος λόγου, οἶον
ὔβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε, σὺ δ’ ἴσχεο, πείθεο δ’ ἡμῖν. (*Iliad* 1. 214)

The dry, summary quality of this type of analysis as it has come down to us in the various sources is especially evident in this spare account, in each of whose entries a single Homeric line — in both instances, one of the “standard” lines used in our other sources — serves as the example.

As noted above, in Fragment 3 the author of our Michigan papyrus discusses different word and foot arrangements of the hexameter line. Let us return to the text of this fragment. The first kind of arrangement that the author addresses probably concerns what we have called Type 2, the περιοδικόν. The discussion then proceeds to those arrangements of verses which are more, or most, desirable because the boundaries of their feet do not coincide with word boundaries. The author continues on to consider kinds of arrangement that are undesirable because in them word boundaries repeatedly coincide with beginnings and ends of feet or with beginnings and ends of διποδίαι. Thus, the fragment covers (possibly) what we have called Type 2 and (definitely) what we have designated Types 4, 5, and 5-Dip.

To examine the papyrus in more detail, we may identify three successive stages in the discussion quite precisely, with the last few lines remaining problematic. First, following a probable mention of feet in line 3, *Iliad* 1. 2 (οὐλομένην κτλ.) is quoted in line 4, with continuation into line 5 if (as is probable unless it had already been referred to) the entire verse was cited. The damage to the papyrus makes it hard to be sure whether the author discussed the verse before or after the quotation or in both places, or what he said about it. In any case, the passages from the ΠΕΡΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΩΝ and from the Plutarchean Περὶ μέτρων which we examined earlier make it likely that the verse is being cited as an example of the περιοδικόν arrangement, consisting of the pattern dactyl/spondee/dactyl/spondee/dactyl/spondee. In the extant metrical literature, in fact, the citations of this particular Homeric verse occur *only* in order to exemplify this particular type of line defined according to the above criteria⁵.

In the second identifiable stage of the discussion, in lines 7–8 of the fragment, *Odyssey* 10. 39 (Ἰλιόθεν με κτλ.) is quoted to exemplify our Type 4 arrangement, the most praiseworthy kind because foot boundaries never coincide with word boundaries⁶. Although in lines 8–9, once again, understanding

⁴ Several other types, some of which correspond, either in name or in actuality, to types named in the ΠΕΡΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΩΝ passage from Parisinus 2676 discussed above, are also included.

⁵ In spite of the coincidence of boundaries of διποδίαι with word boundaries in this verse, our extant sources do not actually find fault with the “periodic” arrangement — they merely describe it as a type. Of course, since *Iliad* 1. 2 is composed in such a way that each διποδία ends with a word (οὐλομένην, ἢ / μυρί’ Ἀχαιοῖς / ἄλγε’ ἔθηκε) it could also be taken by us as an example of Type 5-Dip.

⁶ Type 4, as I have called it, does not seem to have a consistently applied label in the material of the manuscript tradition. In the ΠΕΡΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΩΝ it is referred to as βουκολικόν, and indeed there a citation, *Iliad* 10. 475, is given which is not used elsewhere to illustrate. In the other manuscript passages, the type is normally just described according to its characteristics (for an additional passage see Eust. II. 2. 672, which shares descriptive language with Pseudo-Hephaestion 27 and also discourses on Type 5, and cf. Diomedes, *Ars Grammatica* Book III, Grammatici Latini I. 495. 27–30 and 496. 7–9).

in detail and supplementing the lacunose Greek and filling it out present a considerable challenge, we may note that a form of the very verb that is often used by writers about metre to refer to coincidences (or lack thereof) between word and foot boundaries concludes the sentence in 9: ἀπαρτίζοντες (this word could, of course, be referring to the treatment of Type 5 which is about to begin near the end of the same line).

In the third stage of our author's discussion, in lines 9–14, we are presented with three quoted Homeric verses — all, I would argue, to exemplify a “bad” type of foot and word arrangement in hexameter, or rather two related subtypes of such arrangement, those that we designated as Types 5 and 5-Dip. As we saw earlier, the ΠΕΡΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΩΝ, both Pseudo-Hephaestion passages, and the Περὶ μέτρων all cite Iliad 1. 214 as their example of Type 5, ὑπόρρυθμον or κακόμετρον. The verse is cited in this context in similar discussions in other sources in the manuscript tradition⁷. Following the quotation of this verse in lines 10–11, the author of the papyrus extends his (presumably censoring) discussion of Type 5 by referring to “also those (verses) κατὰ διποδ[ίαν]”. This provides a transition to the citation of verses exemplifying Type 5-Dip in lines 12–14.

Especially in view of the character of the discussion in the fragment, which is clearly more extended than much of what we have in the sources preserved in manuscript, it is interesting that the author of our papyrus gives not just one, but two examples to illustrate Type 5-Dip. Of the two, the Iliadic verse, ἔσπετε νῦν μοι κτλ. (2. 484), appears in the metrical literature as one of the standard examples of this kind of fault, but the Odyssean τῶ δ' ἄρα πέμπτῳ κτλ. (5. 263) seems to be an example the use of which, on the available evidence, is peculiar to our writer alone.

To conclude our detailed look at the fragment, the sense of lines 14ff. is less easy to penetrate, but the discussion involves numbers of syllables in verses and feet. The opening word of this section, σχημάτων, suggests the focus here may also be on the configuration of verses according to the number and position of dactyls and spondees in them⁸. The text appears to refer to at least two epic verses. These include, in 15–16, the recently cited Iliad 2. 484, which is partially quoted again and which is said to have 17 syllables (this is the case if one counts the elided alpha at the end of δώματ'). The next sentence, in lines 17–19, includes the remark that “each one of them” (perhaps Odyssey 5. 263 and Iliad 2. 484) has certain characteristics, which include χώρας δισυλλάβους. If the writer is here referring to the two verses just cited, we would like to better understand the point that is being made about what they have in common, as the first has three disyllabic feet (feet 2, 4, and 6) and the second two (feet 2 and 6). The verse to which οἱ δὲ beginning the next sentence (line 19) refers is uncertain. The significance of τρισκ[αίδεκα] (referring to syllables, presumably) in 19 is also rather elusive⁹. Lastly, ἑκκαίδεκα in line 20 could refer to the total number of syllables in Iliad 2. 484 if we do not count the elided syllable referred to above.

To date only 13 Greek papyri containing explanations or analyses of metre, or said to discuss metre, have been published. Within this group, which includes a school book and a metrical exercise that probably comes from a school context, the variety of metres discussed as well as the manner and depth of treatment vary enormously¹⁰. The texts range from three treatises from Roman Oxyrhynchus which preserve up to several columns and provide in-depth discussion of lyric metres, together with quoted examples and

⁷ For an apparent trace of this type of analysis as early as the first century B.C.E., cf. Trypho Grammaticus Fr. 23.1, our only fragment of the author's Περὶ μέτρων and very similar in wording to the discussion of κακόμετρον in Pseudo-Hephaestion 19.

⁸ For this use of the term cf. Consbruch pp. 263–265, a section of the scholia to Hephaestion which he designates Liber II.

⁹ 13 is actually the number of syllables in Iliad 2. 484 counting up to the end of δώματ' and ignoring the elided syllable.

¹⁰ In Pack² see, in addition to the principal group composed of nos. 2170–2176, the metrical-rhythmical treatise no. 166 (now supplemented by P.Oxy. XXXIV 2687; cf. L. E. Rossi, *Aristoxenica, Menandrea, Fragmenta Philosophica*, ed. A. Brancacci et al., Firenze 1988, 11–30), the metrical exercise no. 430 (cf. M. Haslam, ZPE 20 [1976] 55–57; R. Criboire, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Atlanta 1996, 216, no. 182), the metrical definitions (?) no. 2171, the possible treatise on the lengthening and shortening of syllables no. 2301, the school notebook no. 2644 (metrical definitions on page III verso–page IV verso), and the possible dialogue on metrics no. 2812. The chronological spread of these texts is wide, with three papyri from the Ptolemaic period, six from the first through third centuries C.E., and four from the sixth and seventh centuries.

metrical schemes written in notation, to scanty scraps which derive from various other kinds of treatises or which contain brief, very basic definitions of common types of feet. This is a group of papyri that is difficult to assess comprehensively. Certainly these miscellaneous papyri appear to contain no trace of the type of analysis of hexameter verses that is represented in the manuscript passages we have examined or in the Michigan papyrus. In fact, as chance would have it none of the 13 contains extended discussion of the hexameter line.

We have seen that it is possible to make rather specific correlations between the fragmentary discussion contained in the papyrus on the one hand and comments about the aesthetics of hexameters which are provided by several sources from the manuscript tradition on the other. Although the specific types of hexameter lines discussed in the papyrus, together with the ways in which most of the Homeric lines are quoted as examples, bear strong similarities to the material from the manuscripts, it is most striking that the Michigan treatise appears to have addressed the various topics in a more extended fashion than summary definition or brief comment. Further, the fragment that we possess focuses on one specific aspect of hexameters, the relationships between word boundaries and the boundaries of feet or *διποδίαι*, and it seems to do so in a more organized and concentrated way than the brief, rather arid nature of the *διαφοραί* which were current during the Byzantine period and perhaps in earlier centuries. The existing text of Hephaestion's *Encheiridion* proper — according to the Suda a distillation by its author of a work on metre that originally comprised 48 books — does not mention the *διαφοραί* or the particular definitions of verse types associated with them. The papyrus enables us to document that at least one significant category of this material was already being discussed, and apparently being discussed in a more detailed way, in the second century.

This time of the papyrus is the very age of Hephaestion. It is even possible that we have in the Michigan fragment part of a longer version of his work. But whoever the author was, the papyrus has opened a fascinating window for us. This window offers us a brief, contemporary glimpse into what must have been a well established tradition — very likely carried on extensively by grammarians and incorporated into education by various means since Hellenistic times — of classifying and critiquing in such specific ways the hexameters of Homer, the author who remained the most potent symbol of Greek *παιδεία* in the Roman world.