

ENCLITIC RHYTHMS IN THE VERGILIAN HEXAMETER

PETER L. SMITH

A PERSISTENTLY TROUBLESOME QUESTION IN LATIN PHONOLOGY has been the accentuation of enclitic composites.¹ One consequence of this problem is the uncertainty it may cause in the pronunciation of classical dactylic hexameter, where the separable enclitics (*-que*, *-ve*, and *-ne*) are to be found in abundance. The present study attempts to review and clarify the areas of phonetic controversy through a metrical analysis of all enclitic rhythms in the poetry of Vergil. Particular attention will be given to the putative regression of accent that may occur when an enclitic is followed by elision.

Since late antiquity, there has always been some theoretical confusion about the precise nature of the Latin accent shift caused by the addition of these common enclitic particles. Most modern scholars readily agree that, in the classical period at least, all final heavy syllables must have received a syntactical accent before the enclitic, regardless of the isolate accentuation of the base-word: *multúmque*, *multiósque*, *multaéque*, *imperiúmque*, *imperióque*, etc.² This principle could be inferred from the metrical evidence of Augustan Latin literature even if it were not confirmed by Roman grammatical theorists.³ The elements of uncertainty occur in three main areas: (1) the accentuation of enclitic composites in which the base-word ends in a light syllable (*multiáque*, *limĩnáque*, *armentáque*, *Sāturniáque*, etc.); (2) the potential tendency for elision to cause a regression of accent within the enclitic composite; and (3) the possible dynamic effect of the verse-ictus upon the accent of the composite.

The first problem of the trochaic and dactylic base-words has arisen because of conflict between the testimony of some imperial Roman grammarians, who appear to have advocated the accentuation *multiáque/*

¹The subject is reviewed with precision and clarity by W. Sidney Allen in *Accent and Rhythm* (Cambridge 1973) 158–161; see also Allen's summary comments in *Vox Latina* (Cambridge 1965) 87–88. Important linguistic issues are considered by R. Whitney Tucker, "Accentuation Before Enclitics in Latin," *TAPA* 96 (1965) 449–461. These works will be cited in a shortened form. I am prepared to challenge Tucker's overstated conclusion, "that in the second century B.C. at least, the place of the word-accent was unaffected by the addition of an enclitic" (460); but he does offer persuasive evidence that substantial phonetic development must have occurred in the centuries between Plautus and Seneca.

²This application of the term "syntactical" is taken from W. S. Allen, *Accent and Rhythm* 158; the terminology will remind us that, in actual Latin usage, enclitic composites were accented only within a phrase or sentence (cf. Allen 25).

³For the most comprehensive collection and analysis of ancient theories on Latin accent, see Friedrich Schoell, *De accentu linguae latinae veterum grammaticorum testimonia* (*Acta societatis philologiae Lipsiensis* 6; Leipzig 1876).

līmĩñäque,⁴ and the evidence of classical Latin poetry, which seems to support the accentuation *múltäque/līmĩñäque*. This puzzle has attracted its share of scholarly attention. The early years of the twentieth century witnessed a flurry of activity, following a trail-blazing article by Carl Wagener.⁵ A most noteworthy contribution was made by the American F. W. Shipley, who approached the question from the evidence of Republican Latin prose clausulae.⁶ Shipley's arguments point clearly and logically to the conclusion that Cicero accented enclitic composites by the normal principles of the penultimate law (i.e., *multúmque*, *multósque*, *multaéque*; but *múltäque*, rather than *multäque*). He made the further important discovery that Cicero normally excluded dactylic composites such as *crīmĩñäque* or *testimōññäque* unless an accent shift could be avoided by one of three phonetic expedients: elision (*crīmĩñäqu[e]*), synizesis (*ómñjäquě*, *testimōññjäquě*), or syncope (*cēt[e]räquě*, *períc[u]läquě*). No subsequent researcher has successfully challenged these conclusions.⁷

Accordingly, English-speaking classicists of the last half-century have been generally prepared to discount the testimony of the late Roman grammarians on this aspect of the problem. The modern linguistic treatises in English offer basically consistent guidance, despite some areas of uncertainty (e.g., Kent favours *līmínaque*, whereas Allen admits the possibility of *līmínaque*);⁸ and accentuations such as *mágnäque* have been advocated by influential literary scholars.⁹ This is not to say that the mists of confusion have been entirely dispelled. The revised principle has

⁴On this question, the ancient grammarians' testimony is neither clear nor consistent; cf. Tucker 451.

⁵"Betonung der mit que, ve, ne zusammengesetzten Wörter im Lateinischen," *Neue Philologische Rundschau* 1 (1904) 505–511. See also H. J. Edmiston, "The Question of the Coincidence of Word-accent and Verse-ictus in the Latin Hexameter," *CR* 17 (1903) 458–460; Charles B. Newcomer, "The Effect of Enclitics on the Accent of Words in Latin," *TAPA* 37 (1906) xxvii–xxviii.

⁶Shipley published several studies on this subject between 1909 and 1913; his research culminated in "Preferred and avoided combinations of the enclitic *que* in Cicero (considered in relation to questions of accent and prose rhythm)," *CP* 8 (1913) 23–47.

⁷Years later, Shipley's work was admired and accepted by Ernst Kalinka, in his definitive survey of metrical scholarship for *Bursians Jahresbericht* 256 (1937) 87: "Ich gestehe, dass diese Ausführungen Shipleys mich überzeugt haben." It is interesting to note that most recent computer analyses of hexameter rhythm have accented all enclitic composites by the inflexible application of the penultimate law, ignoring the possible effect of elision. This is the method followed by Wilhelm Ott in his excellent series, *Materialen zu Metrik und Stilistik* (Tübingen 1973–). The principle is sensibly defended by Nathan A. Greenberg in "Metrical Shape, Initial Stress, and Crosstabulation," *Revue* [International Organization for Ancient Languages Analysis by Computer] (1978, No. 3) 10–11.

⁸Roland G. Kent, *The Sounds of Latin*³ (Baltimore 1945) 68; W. S. Allen, *Vox Latina* 87–88, *Accent and Rhythm* 159.

⁹For example, L. P. Wilkinson, "The Augustan Rules for Dactylic Verse," *CQ* 34 (1940) 30, n. 3.

had only partial acceptance in France, where there has always been resistance to English and German theories of Latin accent.¹⁰ Elsewhere on the European continent, the time-honoured conservative doctrine is still at times proclaimed, perhaps under the continuing authority of the old German handbooks.¹¹

The second problem is the possible effect of elision (*synaloephe*) on Latin word-accent. In addition to Shipley's articles, a number of studies have pointed to elision as a factor that may control or modify enclitic accent and usage.¹² In a wider context, an important school of modern scholarship, typified by Eduard Fraenkel,¹³ revived the old theory that *all* elided words will undergo a regression of word-accent through the loss of the final syllable. The weight of recent research has effectively discredited this once-popular doctrine, as can be seen from the work of Jean Soubiran and W. S. Allen.¹⁴ Nonetheless, even the most sceptical of modern scholars appear prepared to concede that *enclitic* elision may cause a regression from the syntactical accent of the composite (*colōrémque*) to the isolate accent of the base-word (*colōremqu[e]*).

The third and interrelated problem involves the question of verse-ictus, a topic that has always bristled with controversy.¹⁵ If the Latin hexameter

¹⁰The conservative position is upheld by Max Niedermann, *Précis de phonétique historique du latin*³ (Paris 1953) 14–15. Reference is made below (note 35) to Jean Soubiran's examination of trochaic composites. Some French-speaking scholars seem more inclined to doubt the ancient grammarians on this subject; see J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le monosyllabe dans l'hexamètre latin* (Paris 1964) 266 and n. 1; E. Liénard, "Réflexions sur l'accent latin," *Hommages à Marcel Renard* (Collection Latomus 101; Brussels 1969) 554 and n. 3.

¹¹For example, G. Bernardi Perini, *L'accento latino*² (Bologna 1967) 38–43. Even after modern revision, the standard German handbooks still defer to the imperial grammarians; e.g., Brugmann-Delbrück, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*² (Berlin-Leipzig 1967 [1930]) 1.975–976; Sommer-Pfister, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*⁴ (Heidelberg 1977) 1.217–218; with some reservations, Manu Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*⁶ (*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* 2.2.1; Munich 1977) 240.

¹²G. Eskuche, "Die Elisionen in den 2 letzten Füßen des lateinischen Hexameters, von Ennius bis Walahfridus Strabo," *RhM* 45 (1890) 236–264, 385–418; W. M. Lindsay, "The Saturnian Metre. II," *AJP* 14 (1893) 313; W. M. Lindsay, *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford 1922) 34–35; E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*⁴ (Stuttgart 1957), Anhang XI.9, 456; R. D. Williams, "The Effect of elided -que on Word Accent in the Hexameter," *PACA* 47 (1950) 31; Nils-Ola Nilsson, "Enclitica nach zwei kurzen Silben im Latein," *Eranos* 52 (1954) 195–216. See also L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge 1963) 233, 235, 236, and D. S. Raven, *Latin Metre* (London 1965) 32.

¹³*Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers* (Berlin 1928) 268–269.

¹⁴Jean Soubiran, *L'Elision dans la poésie latine* (Paris 1966) 457–480; W. S. Allen, *Accent and Rhythm* 159–161.

¹⁵The scope of this paper does not permit me to review the fundamental controversy over Latin accent and ictus, which has extended from the time of Bentley to the present day. Suffice it to say that I find myself in close agreement with the position of W. S.

has an audible pulse-beat, as many believe, can that aural expectation influence the accentuation of enclitic composites? May it possibly be the actual cause of accent regression before enclitic elision? The question assumes particular relevance in any enquiry on fourth-foot harmony, a circumstance overlooked by W. F. Jackson Knight in his pioneer study of Vergilian homodyne.¹⁶ A strong case can be made for fourth-foot coincidence of ictus and accent in such Vergilian verses as these (which are marked to show homodyne¹⁷):

Cōnticuēre ōmnes intēntique ōra tenēbant Aen. 2.1
īncute uīm uēntīs submērsasque ōbrue pūppis Aen. 1.69

In an attempt to resolve these uncertainties, insofar as they pertain to Augustan hexameter, I have undertaken a metrical classification of all enclitic rhythms in the entire Vergilian corpus, excluding the *Appendix Vergiliana*. Though I acknowledge the hazards of reaching objective conclusions on enclitic accent from the evidence of hexameter poetry, I stop short of accepting R. Whitney Tucker's gloomy pronouncement: "Little, if anything, can be learned on this subject from the formal verse of the Golden Age."¹⁸ It is obviously true, as Tucker insists, that we cannot rely on our own phonetic intuition in this area: it is hardly adequate to state that a poet uses such-and-such an accentuation because "it sounds right to me." Moreover, those who try to prove accentual theories from the evidence of classical Latin hexameter must always remember that the Augustan poets were constrained by factors of metre, syntax, and style

Allen, as summarized in *Vox Latina* 83–94, and developed further in *Accent and Rhythm, passim*. See also L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (above, n.12) 118–132 and 221–236. I have not yet had access to the 1980 University of Toronto Ph.D. thesis by S. Traverse, entitled *Ictus Metricus: Phonological, Historical and Comparative Studies in Greek and Latin Metrics*.

¹⁶*Accentual Symmetry in Vergil* (Oxford 1939). Knight's lack of precision in defining his own rules for word-accent and the problem of elided enclitics are both noted by Nathan A. Greenberg in "Vergil and the Computer: Fourth foot texture in Aeneid 1," *Revue* [International Organization for Ancient Languages Analysis by Computer] (1967, No. 1) 1–16. See also E. D. Kollmann, "Remarks on the Structure of the Latin Hexameter," *Glotta* 46 (1968) 301–302.

¹⁷I use the convention of marking the hexameter ictus by a subscript dot, the main word-accent by an acute, and the putative secondary accent by a grave; cf. L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (above, n. 12). Avery Woodward, one of the earliest students of fourth-foot texture, described the cadence *intēntique ōra tenebant* as "a threefold blow" (referring explicitly to ictus-accent harmony); see "The Fourth Foot in Vergil," *PQ* 15 (1936) 129. Though writing in full awareness and approval of Miss Woodward's paper, Knight could actually quote *submērsasque ōbrue pūppis* as an instance of deliberate heterodyne (fourth-foot clash), *Accentual Symmetry in Vergil* (previous note) 24.

¹⁸Tucker 456.

that had greater influence on word-placement than any considerations of stress accent.¹⁹ Still, there is much that we can learn about accent from the hexameters of Vergil and Ovid, if we focus our attention first on those verse-positions where there is a preponderant tendency for ictus-accent harmony. Then, by inference, we may be justified in making some cautious hypotheses about accentual rhythms in other sections of the hexameter line.

My methodology, therefore, involved correlating and tabulating the enclitic composites as distinct metrical patterns, by verse-positions.²⁰ My classification was limited to occurrences in the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* of the three standard light enclitics *-que*, *-ve*, and *-ne*, which have common phonetic properties. I excluded monosyllabic and pyrrhic base-words (chiefly forms like *mēque* or *mēāque* and the conjunctions *atque*, *namque* and *neque*), since it was obvious that they could not enter into the question of accent regression.²¹ My only other exclusions were fixed compounds such as *denique* and *undique*. In the tables that summarize each group of patterns, the figure in parentheses is the total number of Vergilian occurrences.²²

I present my conclusions in the form of hypotheses, rather than established proofs. These conjectures may be summarized as follows:

1. In Vergilian hexameter, enclitic composites are typically deployed so as to exploit the natural coincidence of verse-ictus and word-accent that must occur when the enclitic is not elided. Despite some opinion to the contrary, the principle is probably not violated by composites with a trochaic base-word (such as *armaque*).

2. For the frequent patterns of Vergilian enclitic elision *in thesi* within the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th feet (and the rare cases within the 5th foot), the principle of harmony is maintained by the combined phonetic effect of the hexameter ictus and the natural syntactical word-accent. There is no clear evidence to sustain a theory of accent regression in these situations.

¹⁹See, for example, E. G. O'Neill, Jr., "Word-Accents and Final Syllables in Latin Verse," *TAPA* 71 (1940) 335-359. Though I disagree with several of O'Neill's arguments, I do accept his principle that we must not "put the accentual cart before the metrical horse" (358).

²⁰Such tasks of classification are now substantially less onerous since the publication of Wilhelm Ott's metrically coded Reverse-Index, *Rückläufiger Wortindex zu Vergil* (Tübingen 1974), to which I acknowledge my indebtedness. Like Ott, I use the text of R. A. B. Mynors, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford 1969).

²¹The monosyllabic type must produce harmony if the enclitic is unelided or if it is elided *in thesi*, and it will produce clash if the enclitic is elided *in arsi*. The pyrrhic type, of which there are merely nine examples in all of Vergil, can be accommodated only by enclitic elision *in arsi*, which causes accentual conflict in the preceding foot.

²²In his *Index Verborum Vergilianus* (New Haven 1930), M. N. Wetmore lists 4350 light enclitics (*-que* 4168, *-ve* 102, *-ne* 80), including their occurrences in the poems of the *Appendix*. The total of my tabulated enclitics for the three major poems, after the exclusions as noted, is 3809.

3. In Vergil's infrequent use of elision *in arsi* after the 5th foot of the hexameter, a coincidence of ictus and accent is still apparent. The Vergilian evidence does not allow us to say whether or not this phenomenon should be described as accent regression.

4. When a Vergilian enclitic is elided *in arsi* at the end of the 1st or 4th feet of the hexameter, or hypermetrically after the 6th foot, the influence of the metrical pulse-beat establishes a harmony of ictus and accent in the 1st, 4th, and 6th feet respectively. For spondaic feet at least, this conjecture requires the hypothesis of a regression from the syntactical to the isolate word-accent. Though he was not the first Latin poet to experiment with the fourth-foot enclitic rhythm, Vergil developed it into a distinctive stylistic pattern, found no fewer than 74 times in his mature work (and imitated by Ovid and later poets).

5. The self-conscious artifice of the *-quē/-quē* coordination (with the first *-que* prolonged *in arsi*), to be found 17 times in Vergil and 12 times in Ovid, has a rhythmical kinship to parallel patterns of accent regression. Though this is a literary device that bends the normal rules of Latin prosody and phonology, it too was designed to be read with a harmony of ictus and accent.

In the following examination of Vergilian enclitic rhythms, I have arranged the evidence by the metrical shape and position of the various base-words. The five sections of my analysis are not designed to correspond numerically with the hypotheses presented above, though my rationale for these hypotheses will become apparent.

I

Table I presents a substantial majority (69.9%) of all 3809 Vergilian enclitic rhythms tabulated—2663 composites with a spondaic, anapestic, or iambic base, of which 689 (25.9% of 2663) show elision *in thesi*.

If we accept the orthodox theory of enclitic accent, it is evident that all the unelided patterns (group A) will receive a syntactical accent on the penult of the composite, that this penult must inevitably coincide with a metrical arsis, and that the composite must therefore produce a harmony of ictus and accent within the constraints of dactylic hexameter. Vergil's sensitivity to this natural harmony may be inferred from the large number of enclitic composites that are placed so as to end at the fifth trochee: when we add the unelided fifth-foot figures from Table I to those shown below in Table II, we find that Vergil has a total of 1251 such patterns (32.8% of all rhythms tabulated). Expressing the statistical data another way, we can state that roughly one Vergilian verse in ten, on average, has an unelided enclitic at the fifth trochee.²³ Now there were surely other considerations of metre and syntax that influenced this feature of Vergil's

²³The 1251 cases represent 9.69% of the 12,913 verses in Mynors's OCT.

TABLE I

ENCLITIC RHYTHMS IN VERGIL: BASE-WORD IS A SPONDEE, ANAPEST, OR IAMB (2663)

A. Without Elision (1974):

1. <i>caelumque</i>	(1262)	- 2 - √ (18)	- 3 - √ (295)	- 4 - √ (102)	- 5 - √ (847)
		- - √			
2. <i>sociosque</i>	(544)	√ √ 2 - √ (13)	√ √ 3 - √ (152)	√ √ 4 - √ (61)	√ √ 5 - √ (312) √ √ 6 - √ (6)
		√ √ - √			
3. <i>uirumque</i>	(168)	√ 2 - √ (29)	√ 3 - √ (7)	√ 5 - √ (30)	√ 6 - √ (102)
		√ - √			

B. With Elision *in thesi* (689):

1. <i>caelumqu(e)</i>	(423)	- 2 - t (1)	- 3 - t (145)	- 4 - t (269)	- 5 - t (8)
		- - t			
2. <i>sociosqu(e)</i>	(238)		√ √ 3 - t (91)	√ √ 4 - t (144)	√ √ 5 - t (3)
		√ √ - t			
3. <i>uirumqu(e)</i>	(28)	√ 2 - t (8)	√ 3 - t (9)	√ 4 - t (11)	
		√ - t			

style; but there can be little doubt that he found the strong syntactical accent of the enclitic composite one pleasing way in which to reinforce the characteristic rhythm of the hexameter cadence, where fifth-foot harmony has been shown to approximate 99%.²⁴

We should notice, too, the significant number of Vergilian hexameters (102) that end with an enclitic composite of three syllables; here again there is an opportunity to create an emphatic coincidence of ictus and accent at a verse-position where Vergilian harmony approaches 100%. The rhythmical effect is even more strongly marked in the 60 of these 102 verses where the final word is paired with a preceding enclitic in a polysyndetic coordination such as *caelumque diemque* (*Aen.* 1.88) or *hominumque deumque* (*Aen.* 1.229)—a stylistic practice that has often been noted by commentators as an epic mannerism imitative of Homer and Ennius.²⁵ The six examples of four-syllable enclitic verse-endings in group A.2

²⁴Statistics on fifth-foot harmony will vary in accordance with the researcher's stand on accentual controversies. The combined figure for Vergil's 5th and 6th feet is given as 99.5% by E. H. Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*² (Philadelphia 1940) 184. Ott (above, n. 7) shows 99.47% for fifth-foot harmony in *Aeneid* 1, and 99.11% for *Aeneid* 6.

²⁵See Norden on *Aen.* 6.336, R. G. Austin on *Aen.* 4.83. All of these 60 pairs extend from the hephthemimeral caesura to the end of the verse; 43 begin with a spondaic base-word and 17 with an anapestic; 57 are *-que/-que*, 2 are *-ne/-ne* (*Aen.* 1.308, 12.321), and 1 is *-ve/-ve* (*Aen.* 9.211). These patterns of polysyndeton were analyzed by H. Christensen, "Que -que bei den römischen Hexametrikern (bis etwa 500 n. Chr.)," *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 15 (1908) 165-211. Christensen (169) shows 67 Vergilian *-que/-que* pairs in this position, but his count includes the hypermetric patterns that I consider under Table IV below. He also shows that Ovid far exceeded Vergil in his use of this mannerism, with 246 cases of *-que/-que* after the hephthemimeral caesura.

(*Aen.* 5.300, 6.11, 9.344, 9.574, 9.767, 10.505) are anomalous patterns used for special effect. They do maintain a rhythmical harmony in the sixth foot, but they violate the regular inner-metrical principles of the hexameter cadence by requiring an awkward elision in order to establish a preceding fifth-foot harmony (*mentem animumque*, *Aen.* 6.11); without this elision, they can be expected to cause an extraordinary fifth-foot clash (. . . *at socii multo gemitu lacrimisque*, *Aen.* 10.505).²⁶

This awkward elision just mentioned explains the low number of fifth-foot examples in Table I.B. In contrast to 1189 fifth-foot occurrences of unelided composites of the types *caelumque*, *sociosque*, or *uirumque*, we find here only 11 instances of these types with fifth-foot elision. Vergil's general distaste for elision in the fifth-foot thesis of his dactylic hexameter was not a phenomenon of word-accent, but a principle of inner metric (see O'Neill, n. 19 above). Enclitic elision at this point in the line will produce an exotic pattern such as *pactosque hymenaeos* (*Aen.* 4.99) or *pictique Agathyrsi* (*Aen.* 4.146). The same metrical principle limits the use of the longer elided composites listed below in Table II (B. 3 and note), each found once only: *inconcossosque hymenaeos*, *Aen.* 1.651; *Lacedaemoniosque hymenaeos*, *Aen.* 3.328; and *Lycaoniumque Erichaeten*, *Aen.* 10.749. Of the 14 examples of this enclitic elision in total, 8 involve some form of the word *hymenaei* (*Aen.* 1.651, 3.328, 4.99, 6.623, 7.344, 7.358, 11.217, 11.355), 4 a Greek proper name (*Aen.* 4.146, 6.445, 9.344, 10.749), and 2 a Greek noun (*elephanto*, *Geo.* 3.26; *orichalco*, *Aen.* 12.87). There is still accentual harmony, it should be noted;²⁷ but the metrical pattern is a clear departure from the accepted Augustan norm, and it is thus used only in formulaic Greek expressions.²⁸

The main lesson to be learned from the final two feet is that Vergil's ear was well attuned to the natural syntactical accent of enclitic composites. Beyond question, therefore, he must have sensed a similarly marked rhythm elsewhere in the verse. Indeed, in 23 verses he joined coordinate pairs of unelided enclitics in the 4th and 5th feet, just as he employed the *caelumque diemque* type in the final cadence.

If Vergil and his Roman readers were accustomed to a strong rhythmical harmony for the unelided patterns in group A, would they have been

²⁶That the unusual cadence *mentem animumque* is an echo of Ennius and Lucretius is shown by Norden on *Aen.* 6.11 (cf. Anhang IX.2, 439). The anomalous rhythm of *Aen.* 10.505 is noted by R. D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books 7-12* (London 1973) 354.

²⁷In the fifth-century Vergilian papyrus from Oxyrhynchus, published in *Papiri Greci e Latini* 1 (1912) 47 and plate 12, a superscript macron (here an accent mark?) suggests fifth-foot harmony in *Aen.* 4.99: *pactōs[que] hymenaeos*; an acute accent appears on the unelided composite in *Aen.* 4.68: *totāque v[aga]tur*. See Clifford H. Moore, "Latin Exercises from a Greek Schoolroom," *CP* 19 (1924) 322-325.

²⁸See Norden, *Aeneis VI*, Anhang IX.1, 438; cf. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (above, n. 12) 225-226.

likely to give a different accentuation to the corresponding elided composites in group B? Enclitic elision *in thesi*, it is crucial to note, occurs invariably under metrical conditions where the ictus must counter any tendency for accent regression.

In a brief summary article published in 1950 (above, n. 12), R. D. Williams made a tentative proposal for accent regression whenever enclitic elision occurs in the third thesis—he called it “elision over the caesura”—in such a line as *imminet aduersasque aspectat desuper arces*, *Aen.* 1.420 (an example from Table I is *scuta uirum galeasque et fortia corpora uoluit*, *Aen.* 1.101). Williams argued that we should accentuate *aduērsasque* (or *gāleasque*), because the rhythm *aduērsāsque* (or *galeāsque*) “would give coincidence of accent and ictus in both the third and fourth feet, which the caesura normally prevents.”

It is doubtful that the question can be proven one way or the other. However, some flaws in Williams’s proposal can be revealed by an examination of all third-foot elisions in *Aeneid*, Book 1.

In *Aeneid* 1, there are 35 elisions at the 3rd thesis, 24 on the second long beat of a spondaic 3rd foot and 11 on the first short beat of a dactyl. Of the 35, 21 are enclitic composites (14 elided on the second long, 7 on the first short). Of these 21 elided composites, 8 could produce the consecutive harmonies in the 3rd and 4th feet that Williams wished to avoid. These harmonies occur under two circumstances: (a) the enclitic is followed by a monosyllable—*molēmque et mōntis*, *Aen.* 1.61 (a natural coordination; cf. *Aen.* 1.101, 119, 458, 550, 556); or (b) it is followed by a molossus—in addition to Williams’s example (*Aen.* 1.420), we find *largōque umēctat* in line 465. In the remaining 13 cases of enclitic elision at the 3rd thesis (62% of the total in *Aeneid* 1), an anapestic or spondaic word follows to the hephthemimeral caesura, producing fourth-foot conflict: *saeuītque animīs* (149), *onerāntque aūrō* (363); see also *Aen.* 1.11, 57, 98, 165, 476, 495, 506, 512, 514, 733, and 744. Are we likely to read the following elided composites with accent regression?

<i>impūlerit. tantaēne animīs caelēstibus īrae?</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 1.11
<i>scēptra tēnens mollītque animōs et tēperat īras</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 1.57
<i>fērtur ēquīs currūque haeret resupīnus ināni</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 1.476
<i>Arctūrūm pluuiāsque Hýadas geminōsque Triōnes</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 1.744

In the larger group of 13 elisions, therefore, Williams’s argument does not apply; and even within the group of 8, the third-foot ictus makes accent regression difficult and artificial:

hōc mētuen̄s mōlēmque et mōntis īnsuper āltos *Aen.* 1.61

Williams’s hypothesis is further weakened by the evidence of verses that begin with paired words in enclisis, where the rhythmic harmonies of the

first word create an expectation of harmony in the second:

laëtitiâque metûque; âuidi coniûngere dextrâs Aen. 1.514

uirutêsque uirôsque aut tânti incêndia bêlli Aen. 1.566

Though it is not a typical Vergilian rhythm, the last verse must, I believe, show total coincidence of ictus and accent.

My conviction that all the patterns in Table I maintain the usual syntactical accent is strengthened by the evidence of the fourth-foot composites, where elision is actually the norm (424/587 occurrences = 72.2%). Here we see a characteristic rhythm in which accent regression, in defiance of ictus, seems highly unlikely.²⁹ For syntactical and stylistic reasons, Vergil is partial to enclitic elision at this point in the hexameter; *Aeneid* 6 alone shows 36 cases. From *Aeneid* 6, I quote three representative verses of this type, which can be given a natural reading only if one maintains the normal syntactical accent:

Sic fâtur lâcrimâns, classîque immîttit habênas Aen. 6.1

erîpui hîs ûmerîs mediôque ex hôste recêpi Aen. 6.111

uôce uôcans Hécateñ caelôque Erebôque potêntem Aen. 6.247

II

Vergil makes regular use of enclitic rhythms in which the base is a word of longer shape—a molossus, choriamb, or disponde (the last found only after the penthemimeral caesura). Table II displays a total of 697 such rhythms, of which 173 (24.8%) show elision *in thesi*.

It will be apparent that the constraints of the hexameter must produce at least one ictus-accent harmony in the case of all the unelided patterns (group A). For the reasons given above, I doubt that this syntactical accent will ever shift under the influence of elision *in thesi* (group B).

A difficult and important question, which can be only tentatively addressed on Vergilian evidence alone, is the possible existence of a secondary word-accent upon the enclitic composites of Table II.³⁰ There are clues that suggest its presence; but a decision on the matter must involve some arbitrary judgement.

²⁹The Ennian cadence *Latiumque augescere uultis* (Warmington 472 = Vahlen 466) was apparently quoted by Varro (*De Lingua Latina*, Goetz and Schoell Frag. 86, 218.8–10) to illustrate the syntactical accent *Latiûmque*, even though the word is elided in the 4th thesis. This citation is seen as a clinching argument against all accent regression by Bertil Axelson, "Der Mechanismus des ovidischen Pentameterschlusses," *Ovidiana*, ed. N. I. Herescu (Paris 1958) 130, n. 2; but Axelson appears to overlook the fact that Ennius' verse shows a coincidence of ictus and syntactical accent.

³⁰Though the theory of a Latin secondary word-accent was challenged by William Beare, *Latin Verse and European Song* (London 1957) 175, the majority of recent scholars uphold the existence of a secondary stress: see Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (above, n. 12) 121 ff.; Liénard (above, n. 10) 559; Allen, *Accent and Rhythm* 190–191.

TABLE II.

ENCLITIC RHYTHMS IN VERGIL: BASE-WORD IS A MOLOSSUS, CHORIAMB, OR DISPONDEE (697)*

A. Without Elision (524):

1. *aeternumque* (343) 1--2-~ (273) 2--3-~ (46) 4--5-~ (24)
 |--|~
 2. *auxilioque* (164) 1-~~2-~ (122) 2-~~3-~ (20) 4-~~5-~ (13) 5-~~6-~ (9)
 |-~~|~
 3. *tempestatumque* (17) -4--5-~ (17)
 -|--|~

B. With Elision *in thesi* (173):

1. *aeternumqu(e)* (121) 1--2-t (84) 2--3-t (36) 3--4-t (1)
 |--|t
 2. *auxilioqu(e)* (51) 1-~~2-t (33) 2-~~3-t (16) 3-~~4-t (2)
 |-~~|t
 3. *tempestatumqu(e)* (1) -4--5-t (1)
 -|--|t

*Not included in Table II are 12 occurrences of three less typical polysyllabic rhythms: *Agamemnoniaque*, ~4-~~5-~ (4 occurrences unelided, *Geo.* 3.550, *Aen.* 6.489, *Aen.* 6.838, *Aen.* 10.123; once elided at *Aen.* 3.328); *gubernatorque*, ~2--3-~ (twice unelided, *Geo.* 3.345 and *Aen.* 1.426) and ~4--5-~ (once unelided at *Aen.* 3.269); and *soporiferumque*, ~4-~~5-~ (3 occurrences unelided, *Aen.* 4.486, *Aen.* 7.711, *Aen.* 8.725; once elided at *Aen.* 10.749).

Limited support for a secondary accent may be provided by the nine verses in which Vergil introduces the type *auxilioque* at the end of the hexameter line (5-~~6-~). These patterns are stylistic anomalies, of course, but there is no reason to believe that they were rhythmically offensive in violating the established cadence. Five of the nine are quasi-Greek hexameters, which convey the sing-song effect of a chanted catalogue:³¹

Drýmoqué Xanthóque Ligéaque Phýllodocéque *Geo.* 4.336
Nýsaée Spióque Thaláque Cýmodocéque *Aen.* 5.826
ingémui, Glaucúmque Medóntaque Thèrsilochúmque *Aen.* 6.483
híc máctat Ladóna Pherétaque Dèmodocúmque *Aen.* 10.413
Chlóreaque Sybarímque Darétaque Thèrsilochúmque *Aen.* 12.363

The exotic and un-Latin quality of these lines is underscored by their exaggerated rhythmic harmonies, in contrast to the subtle interplay of clash and harmony at which Vergil normally aimed. However, the very fact that they are exotic must greatly reduce their value as clear phonetic

³¹We may note that these five verses account for all occurrences of the rhythmical pattern *cruentaque* (Table III.A.4) in the fourth foot of the hexameter.

evidence; and the other four cadences of this type (*Aen.* 5.589, 6.393, 6.601, and 8.416) include only one Latin word.³²

A somewhat stronger argument in support of secondary word-accent is the fact that Vergil can begin 395 hexameters (on average, 30.6/1000 verses) with enclitic composites that have a molossus (273) or choriamb (122) as the base-word. In view of his established preference for first-foot harmony—probably in excess of 70%³³—I think it likely that we are intended to hear a strong rhythmical coincidence in these common patterns of the type *aeternumque* or *auxilioque*. The presumed accent shift caused by enclisis can be illustrated by these contrasting pairs of verses:

<i>aetérnum látraŋs exsánguis térreat úmbras</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 6.401
<i>aètérnúmqe lócus Palinúri nómen habébít</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 6.381
<i>auxíliq tútos dímittam opibúsque iuuábo</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 1.571
<i>aùxilióque uocáre déos et téndere pálmas</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 5.686

The rhythmic importance of pattern A.1 is apparent from its use in the two majestic lines that form the climax of the *Aeneid's* epic statement:

<i>ínferrétíque déos Látiq; génuš únde Latínus</i>
<i>Álbaníque pátrēs atque áltae móēnia Rómae.</i>

Aen. 1.6–7

If these composites are to receive a secondary accent when they begin a verse, we must surely give them a similar intonation when they begin at the second or fourth arsis, or (in the case of group A.3) at the penthemimeral caesura. This assumption is strengthened when we find patterns A.1 and A.3 linked effectively in four verses of identical texture:

<i>òbscenaéque cánēs impòrtunaéque uolúces</i>	<i>Geo.</i> 1.470
<i>nìmborúmque fáciš tempèstatúmque poténtem</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 1.80 ³⁴
<i>ìmplorántique déos obtèstantúrque Latínus</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 7.576
<i>dìsiectíque dúces desòlatíque manípli</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 11.870

One reason for the much lower frequency of types A.1 and A.2 at the second arsis may be the fact that this arrangement almost invariably produces three successive harmonies in the first three feet:

<i>lília uèrbenásque prémēs uescúmque papáuer</i>	<i>Geo.</i> 4.131
<i>rèstitit, Eùrydicénque súam iámi lúce sub ípsa</i>	<i>Geo.</i> 4.490

³²The one Latin word used in this position (*ancipitemque*) occurs in *Aen.* 5.589, where the labyrinth image is thought to account for the metrical anomaly; cf. R. D. Williams *ad loc.* It is significant that Horace concluded three sapphic stanzas with one-word adonic verses that seem to confirm the secondary accent: *Fàbriciúmque* (*C.* 1.12.40), *Mèrcuriúsque* (*C.* 1.30.8), and *mìlitiaéque* (*C.* 2.6.8).

³³Cf. n. 24 above. Ott's statistics for first-foot harmony in *Aeneid* 1 and 6 are 68.53% and 70.97%; the inclusion of secondary accents would raise these figures by about 6%. Greenberg (above, n. 7) 33 shows first-foot harmonies of 82.0%, 70.2%, and 66.2% for the *Eclogues*, *Aeneid* 4, and *Aeneid* 12 respectively.

³⁴Cf. *Geo.* 1.27, *Aen.* 1.53, 1.255, 3.528.

TABLE III

ENCLITIC RHYTHMS IN VERGIL: BASE-WORD IS A TROCHEE OR HAS A TROCHAIC ENDING (250):

A. Without Elision (237):

1. <i>armaque</i>	- ~ (102)	1 - ~ (69)	5 - ~ (33)
2. <i>armentaque</i>	- - ~ (94)	- 4 - ~ (34)	- 5 - ~ (60)
3. <i>Tiberinaque</i>	~ - ~ (34)	~ 4 - ~ (14)	~ 5 - ~ (20)
4. <i>cruentaque</i>	~ - ~ (7)	~ 4 - ~ (5)	~ 5 - ~ (2)

B. With Elision *in thesi* (13):

1. <i>armaqu(e)</i>	- ~ t (11)	1 - ~ t (8)	5 - ~ t (3)
2. <i>armentaqu(e)</i>	- - ~ t (2)	- 4 - ~ t (1)	- 5 - ~ t (1)

III

Table III displays the group of 250 composites in which the enclitic is attached to a trochee or a word ending in a trochee. The question of their accentuation has been a matter of continuing controversy. In two provocative studies published in the late 1960's, Jean Soubiran rallied to the defence of the imperial grammarians, backed by careful scholarship and impressive ingenuity.³⁵ Only the accentuations *armâque* and *armentâque*, he argued, could explain the relative infrequency of these types in the fifth foot of Latin hexameters. I remain unconvinced, and my scepticism is apparently shared by Liénard and Allen.³⁶ Combined factors of syntax and style—admirably analyzed by Soubiran himself—seem far more compelling than the alleged clash of ictus and accent. A fifth-foot rhythm that occurs as often as 115 times (8.9/1000 verses) can hardly be described as a striking anomaly, and it seems unlikely that Vergil would have been so ready to violate his normal hexameter cadence. In any event, elision of these patterns is very unusual (13/250 = 5.2%), and the question of accent regression is not an issue.

IV

Table IV displays all cases of Vergilian enclitic elision *in arsi*, exclusive of composites with monosyllabic and pyrrhic base-words. It is only for these eight rhythmic patterns that a theory of enclitic accent regression becomes phonetically plausible.

Elision permitted the introduction into hexameter poetry of enclitic composites with a dactylic base. To be sure, there were other phonetic expedients available: like Cicero, Vergil could resort to synizesis (*Lauinjaque uenit*, *Aen.* 1.2) or syncope (*suppostaque furto*, *Aen.* 6.24; *exposta-*

³⁵"Sur les mots de type *armaque* dans l'hexamètre latin," *Pallas* 14 (1967) 39–58, and "Sur les mots de type *armentaque* dans l'hexamètre latin," *Pallas* 15 (1968) 57–101.

³⁶Liénard (above, n. 10) 554; Allen, *Accent and Rhythm* 159.

TABLE IV

ENCLITIC RHYTHMS IN VERGIL: ALL OCCURRENCES OF ELISION *in arsi* (170)
(excluding monosyllabic and pyrrhic base-words)

A. Dactylic Feet (65):				
1. <i>corporaqu(e)</i>	(46)	1 - ∞ a (41) (1)*	5 - ∞ a (4)	
- ∞ a				
2. <i>Saturniaqu(e)</i>	(13)	- 4 - ∞ a (7)	- 5 - ∞ a (6)	
- - ∞ a				
3. <i>Cerealiaqu(e)</i>	(4)	∞ 4 - ∞ a (1)	∞ 5 - ∞ a (3)	
∞ - ∞ a				
4. <i>exsultantiaqu(e)</i>	(2)	4 - - 5 - ∞ a (2)		
- - - ∞ a				
B. Spondaic Feet (105):				
1. <i>caelumqu(e)</i>	(24)	1 - - a (19) (1)§	6 - - h (4)	
- - a				
2. <i>aeternumqu(e)</i>	(58)	- 4 - - a (58)		
- - - a				
3. <i>coloremqu(e)</i>	(16)	∞ 4 - - a (1)	∞ 6 - - h (15)	
∞ - - a				
4. <i>perituraequ(e)</i>	(7)	∞ 4 - - a (7)		
∞ - - a				
TOTALS: (170)	(60) (2)*§	(74)	(15)	(19)

*2 - ∞ | a (one occurrence only: *Aen.* 11.634)

§2 - - | a (one occurrence only: *Aen.* 1.78)

que ponto, *Aen.* 10.694); but these experiments were rare indeed.³⁷ Less extraordinary are the verses in which Vergil used elision at the sixth arsis to accommodate a dactylic composite in the fifth foot. There are 15 examples in all (A.1 through 4), usually identified by the representative pattern *Saturniaque arua* (*Aen.* 1.569).³⁸ Because they have been well analyzed by Eskuche, Norden, and Soubiran, there is no need to discuss them at length. For our purposes, the important point to notice is that they seem beyond reasonable doubt to maintain the accustomed harmony of ictus and accent in the fifth foot; viz., *ágminaque ármāt* (*Aen.* 7.648), *Tiúðniaque ástra* (*Aen.* 6.725), *Cereðliaque áрма* (*Aen.* 1.177), and *èxsuliántiaque haúrit* (*Geo.* 3.105 and *Aen.* 5.137). Whether we regard the word-accent as a regression or as the normal syntactical pronunciation of the composite will depend on our attitude towards the *liminaque/liminaque* alternatives mentioned above (note 8). If it is a regression, it is surely caused by the combined effect of elision and verse-ictus.

When we turn to the beginning of the line, we see that the composite type *corporaqu(e)* acquires a frequency (41 instances) that may allow us

³⁷For Cicero, cf. Shipley (above, n. 6); see also Norden on *Aen.* 6.24.

³⁸See Eskuche (above, n. 12) 386; Norden, *Aeneis VI*, Anhang XI.1.9, 456 (to Norden's list of 14, add *Geo.* 2.464); Soubiran (above, n. 14) 464-466.

to consider it as unexceptional. Again, I would conjecture, there must be a harmony of ictus and accent, regression or no regression. This first-foot rhythmic pattern has attracted less scholarly attention than its counterpart in the fifth foot. Stylistically, it can be seen to have particular value in self-contained "golden" lines or otherwise symmetrical verses, because it allows the placement of a neuter plural adjective or noun in the first position:³⁹

impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem Geo. 1.468
grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulcris Geo. 1.497
corporeaque agresti nudant praedura palaestra Geo. 2.531

Because such verses are rarer in the *Aeneid* than in the *Georgics*, the enclitic pattern is proportionately less common; the statistics are *Eclogues*, 1 (3.46); *Georgics*, 19; and *Aeneid*, 21. In his use of the pattern, Vergil was probably influenced by Catullus, who is notoriously fond of such symmetries:⁴⁰ five balanced verses in Catullus 64 (235, 264, 316, 345, 351) begin with a composite of this shape. The elided first-foot dactyl is found also in Propertius and Ovid.⁴¹

It is not characteristic of Vergil to elide dactylic composites at the third arsis. There is one example only (*Aen.* 11.634), a unique Vergilian rhythm that probably shows total coincidence of ictus and accent:⁴²

armaque corporeaque et permixti caede uirorum
semianimes uoluntur equi . . .

The phenomenon of accent regression has been shown above to be a possible but not inevitable explanation for the dactylic composites in elision. When we consider Vergil's use of spondaic and bacchiac composites like *caelumqu(e)* and *coloremqu(e)* (groups B.1 and B.3), this phonetic principle assumes paramount importance.

As one might expect, the topic of enclitic accent regression has been discussed primarily—almost exclusively, in fact—in the context of hypermetric verses, where the hexameter cadence virtually forces a regressive shift. There is basic agreement on the question. Even Soubiran, who presents an eloquent case against regression as a general consequence of

³⁹The feminine singular adjective or noun is an obvious alternative; for other examples, see *Geo.* 1.9, 1.222, 2.157, 2.396, 3.366, 4.24, 4.470; *Aen.* 3.280, 7.615.

⁴⁰See Kenneth Quinn on 64.7 in *Catullus, The Poems*² (London 1973) 301.

⁴¹Propertius begins 9 hexameters with elided dactylic composites: 1.3.25, 1.6.17, 2.1.77, 2.13.29, 2.15.33, 3.6.17, 3.10.25, 3.11.3, and 4.1.19. Ovid has 6 examples in *Metamorphoses* 1: 39, 62, 501, 528, 598, 742.

⁴²The accentuation of monosyllabic conjunctions like *et* and *aut* is always problematic; see E. D. Kollmann, "'Et' in arsi after elidable syllables in the Vergilian Hexameter," *Studii Clasice* 14 (1972) 67–84. Statius *Theb.* 10.275 is cited as a parallel rhythm to *Aen.* 11.634 by R. D. Williams (above, n. 26) 421.

elision, seems grudgingly prepared to admit that the hypermetric hexameters may be legitimate exceptions.⁴³ Vergil has 19 such verses that end in *-que*, with 4 spondaic base-words and 15 bacchiac.⁴⁴ The two patterns of hypermetric rhythm can be illustrated as follows:

B. 1 *sternitur infelix alieno uulnere, caelumque
aspicit et dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos.* *Aen.* 10.781–782

B. 3 *omnia Mercurio similis, uocemque coloremque
et crinis flauos et membra decora iuuenta.* *Aen.* 4.558–559

In reading these verses, why do we feel a natural inclination to change the accent of the elided composites? The phonetic explanation is quite simple: we are merely shifting from the syntactical accent of the composite to the customary isolate accent of the base-word, under the dynamic influence of the verse-ictus. The enclitic becomes virtually a detached phoneme, linked by synaphea to the following verse.

If the sixth-foot accentuation of 6 – – |h is *caelumque* (or possibly *caelumque*), should not a similar rhythm be heard when such words occur in the first foot, with elision at the second arsis? Table IV. B. 1 shows that there are 19 patterns of this type in Vergil:⁴⁵

<i>sēptemque ūna sibi mūrō circūddedit ārces</i>	<i>Geo.</i> 2.535 (cf. <i>Aen.</i> 6.783)
<i>īgnemque hōrribilēmque fēram fluuiūmq̄ liquēntem</i>	<i>Geo.</i> 4.442
<i>pāllamque ēt pīctūm crōceq̄ uelāmen acāntho</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 1.711
<i>hāstamque ēt clipeī non ēnarrābile tēxtum</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 8.625

Although this proposal can be nothing more than conjecture, I believe that the ictus and isolate accent again combine to produce a first-foot harmony, parallel to that of the *corporaqu(e)* type in A.1.⁴⁶

⁴³Soubiran (above, n. 14) 466–468; see also Alice H. Carpenter, "Hypermetric Lines and Interlinear Hiatus in Latin Hexameter Verse," *PQ* 9 (1930) 351–362. Carpenter subscribes to the German compromise theory of a "hovering" accent (*schwebende Betonung*) on both syllables of the hypermetric sixth foot (*caelumque*); this position had been developed earlier by Albert Granger Harkness in "The Word-Group Accent in Latin Hexameter," *CP* 3 (1908) 42. For other references, see A. S. Pease on *Aen.* 4.558.

⁴⁴Spondaic base-words: *Geo.* 3.377, *Aen.* 1.448, 8.228, 10.781; bacchiac: *Geo.* 2.344, 2.443, 3.242, *Aen.* 1.332, 2.745, 3.684, 4.558, 4.629, 5.422, 5.753, 6.602, 7.470, 9.650, 10.895, 11.609. Soubiran, who lists only 17, presumably follows a different textual reading in *Geo.* 2.344 and *Aen.* 3.684, where Mynors adopts hypermetrical variants.

⁴⁵The list of 19: *Geo.* 1.279, 1.406, 2.535, 3.451, 4.341, 4.442; *Aen.* 1.711, 3.445, 5.371, 6.280 (*ferreique* with synizesis), 6.650, 6.783, 6.839, 7.326, 8.291, 8.625, 9.344, 11.255, 12.336. Three of these are words in *-cumque* (*Geo.* 1.406, *Aen.* 3.445, 11.255); because they have no isolate accent (i.e., there is no base-word such as **quodcum* or **quaecum*), these indefinite compounds may be special cases. The unique example of a spondaic composite elided at the third arsis is *quodcumque* in *Aen.* 1.78.

⁴⁶A similar conjecture for 20 cases in Lucretius was made by William A. Merrill, "Lucubrations Lucretianae," *CPCP* 7 (1924) 239.

We are left only with the very interesting group of fourth-foot patterns in Table IV. Is it not reasonable to surmise that enclitic elision at the fifth arsis produces ictus-accent harmony in the preceding foot? As in the case of the hypermetric verses, the pulse of the ictus coincides with the isolate accent of the base-word, so as to cause the reader to shift naturally and unconsciously to that familiar isolate accent. This would be a logical explanation for enclitic accent regression. Of all patterns of Vergilian enclitic elision, none but the rhythms in Table IV meet these necessary metrical conditions.

In the corpus of extant Latin poetry, Lucretius is the only one of Vergil's predecessors to have made significant use of this fourth-foot rhythm, and his 16 examples lack subtlety or variety.⁴⁷ Vergil, in contrast, developed the pattern into an artistic rhythmical device, used 74 times in total: though it is absent from the *Eclogues*, it is found in every book of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, occurring on average once in 163 lines (6.1 times/1000 verses) within these two poems. Vergil's enclitic conjunction is *-que* in every case except *Aen.* 11.457 (*piscosove amne Padusae*), unless one also reads *-ve* in *Aen.* 2.37 (*subiectisque urere flammis*).

The eight examples of the rhythm in dactylic fourth feet (A. 2 and A. 3) may or may not involve accent regression, as we have seen with other dactylic rhythms above. They are illustrated by these two verses:

A. 2 *rēs Āgamēmnoniās uictrīciaque ārma secūtus* *Aen.* 3.54⁴⁸

A. 3 *Cūrētum sōnitus crepitāntiaque aēra secūtae* *Geo.* 4.151

The 66 remaining examples must show accent regression, if our hypothesis is valid; in all these cases, a spondaic fourth foot is followed by enclitic elision at the 5th arsis:

B. 2 *ān mēmōrēm pōrtus Lucrīnoque āddita clāustra* *Geo.* 2.161⁴⁹

dīsiecītque rātes euērtitque aēquora uētis *Aen.* 1.43

cōnspexēre, sīlent arrēctisque aūrībūs āstant *Aen.* 1.152

B. 3 *antīquī Laurētis opācaque īlice tēctum* *Aen.* 11.851

B. 4 *cōrticībūsque cāuīs uitiōsaeque īlicis ālūo* *Geo.* 2.453⁵⁰

ēt sēdet hōc ānimō peritūraeque āddere Trōiāe *Aen.* 2.660

⁴⁷Lucretius 1.431, 501, 677, 681, 686; 2.47, 149, 246; 3.780; 4.347, 555, 951, 1187; 5.448; 6.20, 686. The earliest use of the rhythm is an elegant example in Ennius (*Sat.* 3-4): *contemplor/ inde loci liquidas pilatasque aetheris oras*. There is no example in the poems of Cicero or in Catullus 64.

⁴⁸The other six verses of the type A.2 are *Aen.* 3.174, 6.490, 8.535, 11.6, 11.729, 11.909.

⁴⁹There are 58 verses of the type B.2, 14 in the *Georgics* and 44 in the *Aeneid*: *Geo.* 1.240, 2.33, 2.161, 2.507, 3.27, 3.35, 3.57, 3.369, 3.423, 3.513, 4.4, 4.44, 4.296, 4.521; *Aen.* 1.43, 1.69, 1.152, 2.1, 2.37, 2.80, 2.195, 2.301, 2.681, 3.227, 3.386, 3.579, 4.579, 5.47, 5.53, 5.210, 5.490, 5.584, 5.865, 6.260, 7.127, 7.386, 7.575, 8.304, 8.448, 8.520, 8.627, 10.142, 10.207, 10.645, 10.776, 10.801, 10.896, 11.186, 11.398, 11.457, 11.826, 11.835, 12.158, 12.551, 12.618, 12.700, 12.830, 12.848.

⁵⁰The other five verses of the type B.4 are *Aen.* 8.669, 9.24, 9.113, 11.190, 11.887.

If one examines the group of 74 verses as a whole, several stylistic features become immediately apparent. There is a strong tendency for the rhythm to create a self-contained syntactical unit between the penthemimeral caesura and the end of the line; though many of these hexameters may not show final punctuation, only seldom does the syntax impose a necessary enjambement with the following verse. In 50 of the 74 cases, the introductory base-word is an adjective or participle, usually balanced with a noun at the end of the verse (32/50) or less commonly in the 5th foot (14/50). (Of the remaining 24 base-words, 18 are substantives, 4 are verbs, and 2 are adverbs.) The Vergilian patterns are rich in assonance, a quality that may be enhanced by the accent regression:

claréscunt sónitus armórumque ingruit hórror *Aen.* 2.301
námque mánuş ínter maestórumque óra paréntum *Aen.* 2.681
exclúsi ánte óculos lacrimántumque óra paréntum *Aen.* 11.887

The harmonic cadence can provide a powerful release to heavy, spondaic verses:

haúd uátum ignárus uentúrique ínscius aéui *Aen.* 8.627
ínlúsus múris hostílique ággere saéptus *Aen.* 11.398

All 74 examples are memorable verses, showing consistent artistry and patterned sonority. That the rhythmic pattern impressed Vergil's Roman readers may be judged by its common appearance in Ovid and later poets.⁵¹

v

This enquiry has suggested that accent regression is likely to occur only when an enclitic is elided at the end of a metrical foot, under the circumstances defined in Table IV. As we see from Table V, however, there is one special situation where Vergil could impose regression even without elision. In 17 verses, we find the device of the *-que/-que* coordination in which the first *-que* is prolonged *in arsi* (a type of diastole). Vergil was clearly attracted to this rhythmical licence, as his poems account for exactly half of the examples to be found in extant Latin hexameters.⁵² Though the technique was a Homeric imitation that departed from the

⁵¹The rhythm occurs in every book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* for a total of 50 cases, all *-que* (on average, once in 240 lines or 4.2 times/1000 verses). All 50 examples begin at the penthemimeral caesura, with 22 dactylic fourth feet and 28 spondaic. Of the 50 introductory base-words, 47 are adjectives or participles, with 44 nouns in balance (19 in the 5th foot and 25 at the end of the line). See, for example, *Met.* 1.476, 538, 730; 2.81, 273, 324, 679. Book 1 of Statius' *Thebaid* has two examples: lines 6 and 535.

⁵²There are 34 extant examples; in addition to Vergil's 17 and Ovid's 12, the device is found also in Accius *Annales* 1 (= Festus 130.15), Grattius *Cynegeticon* 130, Germanicus *Aratea* 1.262, *Ilias Latina* 168, and Silius Italicus *Punica* 7.618.

TABLE V

ENCLITIC RHYTHMS IN VERGIL: SPECIAL PATTERN: ENCLITIC PROLONGED *in arsi* (17)

1. <i>liminaque</i>	- ~ - (4)	1 - ~ 2 - (4)
2. <i>terrasque</i>	- - - (12)	1 - - 2 - (12)
3. <i>Noemonaque</i>	~ - ~ - (1)	~ 4 - ~ 5 - (1)

1. *liminaque* (4)

<i>tribulaque trahaque et iniquo pondere rāstri</i>	<i>Geo.</i> 1.164
<i>liminaque laurusque dei, totisque moueri</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 3.91
<i>spiculaque clipeique erēptaque rostra carinis</i>	7.186
<i>Chloreaque Sybarismque Darētaque Thersilochumque</i>	12.363

2. *terrasque* (12)

<i>terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum</i>	<i>Ecl.</i> 4.51
<i>lappaque tribolique, interque nitētia cūlta</i>	<i>Geo.</i> 1.153
<i>aestusque pluuiisque et agentis frīgora uentos</i>	1.352
<i>Eūrique Zephyrique tōnat dōmus, omnia plēnis</i>	1.371
<i>lappaque tribolique absint; fūge pābula laeta</i>	3.385
<i>terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum</i>	4.222
<i>Drymoque Xanthoque Ligēaque Phyllodocēque</i>	4.336
<i>Crētesque Dryopēque frēmunt piclique Agathyrsi</i>	<i>Aen.</i> 4.146
<i>Brōntesque Steropēque et nūdus mēmbra Pyrāgmon</i>	8.425
<i>ensemque clipeumque et rūbrae cōrnua cristae</i>	12.89
<i>fontisque fluuiisque uocq, quaeque aetheris alti</i>	12.181
<i>Antheusque Mnestheusque rūunt, omnisque relictis</i>	12.443

3. *Noemonaque* (1)

Alcandrumque Haliūque Noēmonaque Prytanimque *Aen.* 9.767 (cf. *Iliad* 5.678)

Ovid *Metamorphoses*. Type 1 (5): 5.484, 7.265, 10.262, 10.308, 11.36

Type 2 (5): 1.193, 3.530, 4.10, 8.527, 11.290

Type 3 (2): 13.257, 13.258 (cf. *Iliad* 5.677-678)

normal rules of Latin prosody, it was used only under carefully controlled phonetic and metrical restrictions.⁵³

In the context of the present study, it is important to observe that the device is limited to the 2nd or 5th arsis of the hexameter, thus affecting the accentuation of base-words that occupy the 1st or 4th foot respectively—the same verse-positions commonly affected by accent regression

⁵³For analyses of these restrictions, see Norden, *Aeneis VI*, Anhang X, 450-452; S. E. Winbolt, *Latin Hexameter Verse* (London 1903) 200-201; J. P. Postgate, *Prosodia Latina* (Oxford 1923) 32-34; A. E. Housman, "Prosody and Method," *CQ* 21 (1927) 12; Hugo Pipping, "Ein Beitrag zur römischen Metrik," *Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 13.1 (1942) 1-12; R. G. Austin on *Aen.* 4.146; N. E. Collinge, *Collectanea Linguistica* (*Janua Linguarum* 21; The Hague 1970) 200.

before elision in Table IV. One can easily see the rhythmical kinship between the following patterns:

- V. 2 *Crêtesque Dryopésque frémunt pictique Agathýrsi* *Aen.* 4.146
 IV. B. 1 *Coëumque Iapetúmque créat saeuúmque Typhóea* *Geo.* 1.279⁵⁴

Vergil's five examples of dactylic composites (Table V.1 and 3) can be interpreted as support for the normal unelided accentuation *liminaque* or *liminaquè*.⁵⁵ The evidence is not conclusive, however, for the rhythm can be equally well explained as an accent regression caused by the verse-ictus, like the 65 cases in Table IV.A. There is good reason to believe that Vergil's twelve examples of spondaic composites in Table V.2 show the same pattern of accent regression that we have conjectured for their elided counterparts.

Once again, therefore, we can note the effect of the hexameter's rhythmic pulse-beat on the accentuation of enclitic composites. Here, I submit, is further evidence that the ictus may be the dynamic cause of accent regression.

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

⁵⁴The similarity caused Christensen (above, n. 25, 182) to explain *Geo.* 1.279 as a case of lengthened *-que*. This was an understandable error; but *Iapetus* is always scanned with a vocalic *I* in Latin poetry (cf. Horace *C.* 1.3.27, Ovid *Met.* 1.82, etc.).

⁵⁵Cf. n. 8 above, and see Wagener (above, n. 5) 509–511.