ABOUT FORM AND FEELING
IN CATULLUS 65

JOHN B. VAN SICKLE

Humanities Center of the Johns Hopkins University

Twenty-three verses survive from the poetic preface that Catullus wrote for his translation of *The Lock of Berenice*. In nineteen of them, an attribute is separated from the word it qualifies by an intervening word or phrase. The separated elements occur regularly at the same positions in the line, forming a set of patterns which predominate in the structure of the poem. In the most frequent pattern, an attribute appears at the end of the first half-line, before the principal (penthemimeral) cesura, and a substantive at the end of the line:

> etsi me *assiduo* confectum cura *dolore*. (1)

In a second pattern, regularly recurring but by no means as frequent, the attribute stands at the beginning of the line and the substantive at the end:

> *Troia* Rhoeteo quem subter litore *tellus*. (7)

The use of patterns in the preface is unique; but it has partial precedents, possibly a significance for the history of elegy, and a coherence in itself, all of which will concern us here.

Similar patterns are common in both the hexameter and the pentameter of Propertius and Ovid, so much so that their frequency has been called "predictable and monotonous."[1] They were also this frequent, but in the pentameter, in Hellenistic epigram, while in the oldest elegy they had been only sporadic, hardly yet amounting to a pattern. Heyken thought that Propertius and Ovid were the first elegiac poets to extend separative patterning to the hexameter in their

---

[1] C. Conrad, "Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil," *HSCP* 69 (1965) 195.

couplets.[2] Catullus, however, anticipated them in the translation of Callimachus (c. 66) and especially in its Preface and in poem 68. The Preface forms a link between the other two, attached to poem 66 and anticipating the later themes of Troy and a brother's death. The three poems together thus comprise a distinct group within Catullus' elegiac works, marked on the one hand by affinity to Callimachus and on the other by the theme of death at Troy, the use of myth to represent personal experience, and all three showing a tendency to extend the use of separative patterning in the hexameter in a way that other elegiac verse, including that of Catullus, had not done. Among the three, poem 65 employs patterning in the most bold, pronounced manner. Catullus exploits a formative potential of the couplet under the spur of recent death and burial—*nuper* (5)—in a place rich with myths. Troy, which will be the key to a mythological treatment of love and death in poem 68,[3] here stands at the climax (7) of a series of separative patterns that grows from the first verse (1–8). Innovation in form coincides with innovation in theme and feeling.

Catullus' use of separative patterning in the Preface is especially striking in view of the apparent origins of the technique. He elaborates it under circumstances of painful, distracting grief; but, in some of his own other poems and in a fragment of Cinna as well as in Hellenistic manifestations, patterning represents a primarily literary sentiment, form sought out for the sake of a highly skillful, consciously artificial poetry without the burden or inspiration of anxiety overtly expressed. The Catullan Preface thus takes on further importance as a possible link between Hellenistic formal practices and what will be characteristically Roman in the feeling and technique of elegy.[4] The function of the Preface in Catullus' own work, between poems 66 and 68, may well also be crucial in the history of elegy. The fragmentary state of

[2] J. Heyken, *Über die Stellung der Epitheta bei den römischen Elegikern* (Diss. Kiel 1916) 17–23.
[3] On the relationship of 65 and 68, see W. Kroll, *Catullus*[4] (Leipzig 1960) 196; or H. A. J. Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations* (New York 1905) 154; or G. Lieberg, "L'ordinamento ed i reciproci rapporti dei carmi maggiori di Catullo," *RFIC* 37 (1958) 44, "68 si mostra un chiaro pendant e uno sviluppo del 65;" and, generically, D. O. Ross, "Catullus' Poetic Vocabulary and the Roman Poetic Traditions," *HSCP* 71 (Summary of Dissertation, 1966) 344–46.
[4] Ross (above, note 3) 345–46.

the evidence and the critical uncertainty as to what constitutes origin in poetry preclude final judgments about the origin of Latin elegy; but surely the new form and feeling of the Preface must figure in our tentative views.

I

The earliest Greek poetry, both stichic hexameter and elegiac couplet, had contained divers separations of attribute from substantive, including those which were to predominate in Latin elegy. But separation of any sort occurred sporadically and with varying treatment. Often the substantive would come first, inducing no expectation of a modifier to follow, or the words intervening between separated elements would be other attributes, giving more of a cumulative than separative effect.[5] A recent writer's view of Homeric practice would also describe the early elegists: they established not so much regular patterns of separation as "precedents for positions of separated elements."[6]

Hellenistic poets made the treatment of separations more regular, both in stichic hexameter and in couplets, tending to restrict the substantive to second position, at the verse-end. The attribute would stand first, either within the second half-line, or before the cesura (penthemimeral, B[1]), or perhaps at the beginning of the verse, in any event emphasized and acquiring import through placement before some intervening phrase or word.[7]

[5] On placement of attribute first and on the importance of the cesura, see Conrad (above, note 1) 197, and Heyken (above, note 2) 11, 19. On earlier elegy, Heyken, p. 9. Incidence of his type 1 in elegy: Mimnermus, 9 examples in 74 verses; Tyrtaeus, 8 in 147; Solon, 7 in 109 (sample); Theognis, 12 in 254 (sample); cf. Callinus 1.13; Xenophanes 1.2, 14; 3.2, 5. Yet verses formally comparable to later patterns are rare: see Tyrt. 8.36; Mimn. 11.4, 6; Solon 3.20; Xenophan. 1.2 and Theog. 18, 76, 78, 140–42 and 180–82 (each with 2 forms of χαλεπός), 244, 253. For hexameter, see below, note 7.

[6] Conrad (above, note 1) 201.

[7] On placement and order, see Heyken (above, note 2) 20. A sampling of hexameter: Homer, Od. 6.1–200, total 14 examples, of which 7, however, are cases of adjective accumulation more than separation, and none is the entire equivalent of the later pattern (but cf. Od. 6.24), in all 7%; Ap. Rh. 4.1–205, total 18 examples, 8.8%, of which only 2 place the subst. first, in contrast to the 5 in the Homeric sample; Theoc. Id. 22.1–224, total 15 examples, 6.7%, of which 4 place the subst. first; Arat. Phaen. 1.1–200, total 17 examples, 8.5%, of which 2 place subst. first; Mosch. Eur. 1–166, total 13 examples, 7.8%, of which 1 places subst. first; Call. H. 1.1–95, total 2; cf. Conrad (above, note 1)

The regular patterns of the new poetry came into being without a significant increase in the frequency of attribute-substantive separation in stichic hexameters.[8] Separative patterns in hexameter appear as part of a general process that codified and refined artistic means. By contrast, in elegiac couplets the development of separative patterning was more marked. Patterns became quite frequent in the pentameter though not yet the hexameter of the couplet, particularly patterns of the type *assiduo| . . . dolore‖* (65.1), *doctis| . . . virginibus‖* (65.2), that place the attribute before the cesura and the substantive at the verse-end and that were to be the most frequent also in Latin elegy. Separative patterning has been called a law of the verse form in Callimachus.[9] In his surviving works, as in those of other Hellenistic poets, the law operates through the pentameter as if founding a new principal of structural unity on the inevitable divisiveness of the pentameter cesura.

Separative patterning of the type *assiduo| . . . dolore‖* predominates in the pentameters of two fair-sized poems, the Leontion fragment of Hermesianax and the fifth Hymn, *Bath of Pallas*, by Callimachus. Elsewhere it is also frequent, if not so obviously the rule, in the pentameter of epigrammatists of the first and succeeding Hellenistic generations, for example Anyte, Perses, Asclepiades, Simias, and other and later poets. Its use in Callimachus' own epigrams seems sparing by comparison with the fifth Hymn; in Catullus too it will be a characteristic of the longer poems.[10]   In the Greek epigrammatists, its formal importance may be inferred not so much from absolute frequency as

256, note 32. Euphorion is too fragmented to permit comparisons. However, there is no instance of separation in fr. 51 (Powell) with its 15 consecutive lines. It seems difficult to assign him any particular importance for the history of these patterns, contrary to H. Patzer, "Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters," *MH* 12 (1955) 86–87; cf. note 20, on emphatic force of placement.

   [8] See note 7 for figures.

   [9] Conrad (above, note 1) 254, note 2, reports that Meineke considered separation a *lex* of elegiac composition; cf. Heyken (above, note 2) 9–10, 17, 75.

   [10] For example, Call. *Epig.* (274 verses), hexameter 0, pentameter 21, of which 7 place the subst. first; *Hymn* 5, hex. 6, of which 3 have the subst. first, pent. 30, of which 3 have subst. first; *Aetia*, revised introduction (36 verses accountable), hex. 0, pent. 7, of which 3 with subst. first; *Berenice's Lock* (22 verses), hex. 1, pent. 7, none with subst. first; cf. note 26. Patzer (above, note 7) 87–88, does not take sufficient account of the shift in order of the separated elements. On the difference between longer and shorter works of Catullus, cf. remarks by Ross (above, note 3) 345.

from the much larger proportion of instances in pentameter than in hexameter in any given poet's work. Separation of attribute from substantive did not enter poetic practice in the hexameter, but it first becomes a pattern and pre-eminent technical principle through the medium of the pentameter.[11]

Anyte has 17 separations of the type *assiduo| . . . dolore‖* in pentameter, 2 in hexameter. Perses has 9 in the pentameter, none in hexameter. Asclepiades has 20 in pentameter, 4 in hexameter. Simias has 5, in the pentameter alone. Hedylus has 8 in pentameter and, in the hexameter, 3, of which two come in a single poem (Gow-Page 1831–36).

Hermesianax used the pattern in more than half the pentameters of his long fragment: 27 in pentameter, but only 4 in hexameter in a piece of 98 lines.

Callimachus in the fifth Hymn, which has 142 lines, uses the same pattern in 30 pentameters and 6 hexameters. In other long poems, the proportion for hexameter would appear to have been lower still, e.g. the introduction to the *Aitia*, revised, and *Berenice's Lock*; but fragments are too scant to permit any firm conclusions. Such continuous, coherent pieces as do survive have numerous separations in pentameter.[12] If the *Lock* actually resembled the fifth Hymn in this practice, it must have provided a distinctive formal challenge and potential for its translator, Catullus.

The epigrams of Callimachus have 21 separations like *assiduo| . . . dolore‖* in pentameter, none in hexameter. Theocritus has 7, in pentameter only. Alcaeus (epigrammatist) has 33 in the pentameter, 6 in hexameters; Leonidas of Tarentum has 85 in pentameters and 9 in hexameters. Antipater of Sidon, who shows artistic consciousness of patterning in order to represent a representation of the Meander, has 69 in pentameter to 9 in hexameter.[13] Meleager has 53 in pentameter and 8 in the hexameter.

---

[11] S. K. Langer, *Feeling and Form* (New York 1953) 283, "One may view the evolution of every literary genre as the exploitation of some pre-eminent technical principle and its influence—positive or negative—on other available practices and materials."

[12] Cf. above, note 10.

[13] Antipater introduces patterning to represent the Meander in a variation on Leonidas. In A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *Hellenistic Epigram* (Cambridge 1965) 2.76, Gow comments on the variation: "whereas Leonidas' lines are lucid enough, A.'s are not," or again, p. 77, "In short A. would seem not to have envisaged the object he professes

Such, in brief, is the treatment of separative pattern that preceded Catullus among the Hellenistic Greeks. A comparable emphasis on the form of the pentameter appears in two of Catullus' own poems. Poem 99 has 6 patterns of this type in pentameter, 1 in hexameter, out of 16 lines; poem 67, the Loquacious Door, has 10 in pentameter, 2 in hexameter, out of 48 verses. The emphasis is much less marked in the epigrams at large—i.e. some 49 poems or fragments having 12 lines or less, but including *si qua ricordanti* ... (c. 76).[14] Here there are 33 patterns in pentameter, 13 in hexameter, out of 303 verses; as opposed to the epigrams of Callimachus which have 21 in pentameter, none in hexameter, in 274 verses (58 short poems).

The translation, Preface, and long elegy of Troy (c. 66, 65, 68) move further from the Hellenistic practice. The translation has 15 separative patterns of the type *assiduo| ... dolore‖* in pentameter, 11 in hexameter out of 94 verses. Then the Preface has 6 in pentameter, 5 in hexameter out of 23 verses. The longer elegy has 28 in pentameter, 17 in hexameter out of 159 verses. To recall the most directly commensurate Hellenistic poems, Hermesianax in the Leontion fragment had 27 of these patterns in pentameter, 4 in hexameter out of 98 verses; and Callimachus in the fifth Hymn had 30 in pentameter and 6 in hexameter out of 142 verses. In terms of frequency, Catullus' long elegies (c. 66, 68) thus use separative patterning in about the same percentage of all verses as did Callimachus and Hermesianax;[15] but in terms of

to describe." In effect, A. envisaged the Meander, not the peplos, to represent its pattern more than to describe or speak about an object. In Leonidas, names take prominent positions (2207–2212 G.–P.) and there is a suggestion of interlocking word order in the invocation—*AbAB*, though *A* modifies *A* which modifies *b*. But separation and patterning have become everything in the imitation (516–523). Thus *a* before the cesura (516), then *a ... |A* in the pentameter; then another demonstrative before the hexameter cesura (518) with the pattern *a|avA*, followed in the pentameter (519) by *aBAb*, a pattern of words to give the semblance of the Meander's famous pattern. Leonidas made no attempt to provide such a poetic analogue; in fact it is not certain that he meant the river instead of the design named for it (see Gow, p. 349, *ad* 2210). For other instances of interlocking separations used to represent the Meander, see Prop. 2.32.35–36, and Ovid, *Met.* 8.162.

   14 For example, 69.2, 3, 4; 72.3–4; 88.3–4; 96.1, 4; 101.2, 9. See also remarks by Ross (above, note 3) 346 on c. 76.
   15 Call. *H.* 5 has 36 separations in 142 lines (25.4%); Hermes. *Leont.*, 31 in 98 (31.6%); Cat. 66, 26 in 94 (27.7%); c. 65, 11 in 23 (48%); c. 68, 45 in 159 (28.2%); c. 67, 12 in 48 (25%); and c. 76 has 3 in 26 lines (11.5%), but cf. 76.1, 2, 18, 21, 25.

distribution between pentameter and hexameter, Catullus shows a marked shift toward what will be the practice of Latin elegists.   In this process, the Preface (c. 65) is unique yet suggestive, showing greater frequency and more balanced distribution than do the associated poems, in short a moment of heightened feeling and of the audacity associated with newness in form.[16]   Fully one third of its couplets thus have separation in both pentameter and hexameter, a mannerism equaled only later, as in Propertius' first elegy.[17]

II

Up to this point, we have said little about reasons or conditions for change, preferring rather to give what evidence there is for formal change itself.   Any account of the conditions for change among the Greek poets might include, for example, those "precedents for positions of separated elements" or the inevitable strong division of the pentameter mentioned above, and probably it ought to include some reference to the changed position of the poets in their society and with respect to a tradition of verse that they might begin to think of as a canon, over against their own practice.   The extension of separation into pattern accompanied loss of old audiences and matter and the tendency for poetry to speak a more closed language, "bibliothecal," as Wendell Clausen aptly put it, suiting language to its object.[18]   To the good, pattern bespoke a new skill and self-consciousness in the poet,

[16] C. 65 has 11 separations, no subst. placed first; c. 66 has 26 with 4 subst. first; c. 68 has 45 with 1 subst. first; c. 67 has 12 with 2 subst. first; shorter epigrams have 46 with 2 subst. first; Hermesianax has 31 with 3 subst. first; and for Callimachus, see above, note 10.

[17] In the Leontion, only one couplet of 49 has identical patterns in both hexameter and pentameter: 51–52, but cf. 9–10; Call. *H.* 5 has three such couplets out of 71: 1–2, 21–22 (20–23), 71–72; instances in Hellenistic epigram are scattered, with none in Callimachus' own short poems.   Cat. 66 has 5 such couplets out of 47, c. 65 has 4 out of 12, c. 68 has 14 out of 79 couplets, and c. 67 has one out of 24.   Thus c. 66 has 6 separations in hexameters that lack a corresponding pattern in the pentameter of the same couplet; c. 65 has none; c. 68 has only 3 in hexameters that lack the parallel in the pentameter.   Prop. 1.1 has 6 couplets with separation in both verses, and 3 other separations in hexameter, 4 others in pentameter, out of 19 couplets, 38 verses.

[18] W. Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *GRBS* 5 (1964) 183, with a paronomastic, telling sketch of Callimachus: "Theirs was a bibliothecal poetry, poetry about poetry, self-conscious and hermetic;" or again, "umbratile poets. . . . their manner excelled their matter."

but it also represented his restriction to matters of form and language, a precious content and something of an end in itself. Out of such precedents then, with understandable difficulty, Catullus will attempt to elaborate a poetic medium that can take the abruptly, overtly personal without losing touch with previous artful, erotic play. He gives evidence of the difficulty in the Preface, with its internal contrasts between distracted silence and then its juxtaposed, contradictory yet similar symbols for the poet (65.13–14, violated singer; 65.18, 20, *meo animo, casto gremio*, both female figures); and in the long elegy, when he returns seeking to reconcile the contradictions in an audacious structure, he makes explicit reference to the limitations of his undertaking: *quod potui* (68.149). He was working with poetic means generated under quite other circumstances and meant for lighter work.

The Roman elegists looked back to Callimachus and Philetas of Cos for their tradition (e.g. Prop. 3.1.1., Ov. *Rem. am.* 759), and beyond them stood the half-legendary finder-founder, Mimnermus (cf. the ironical remark of Horace, *Epist.* 2.2.100–1). Callimachus himself, in articulating his own poetics, refers to Philetas and Mimnermus (*Ait.* fr. 1.9–12 Pf.). We have scant means to judge the forms of Philetas, but his pupil Hermesianax, born probably around 300 B.C., has left one of the two remaining pieces of some length in which separative patterning predominates. Hermesianax has been called a "tolerable metrist despite his monotonous habit of ending the first half of a pentameter with an adjective and the second with the substantive which it qualifies."[19] Yet his "monotonous habit" appears also in Callimachus and might well be interpreted by a more sympathetic, poetical observer as a technical innovation or perfecting of form. Certainly Roman elegists took up and extended its use, nor would Catullus' translation of the *Lock* be the only possible channel of stylistic influence. Hermesianax also wrote the story of Attis, apparently in elegiacs (Paus. 7.17.9, Fordyce on c. 63). Catullus' own treatment of the Attis story uses frequent, bold separative patterning, though it shifts to galliambics, a meter that Callimachus also is said to have

---

[19] E. A. Barber, *OCD* (Oxford 1949) 418 s.v.: "He possessed, to judge by what remains of his poetry, a very mediocre brain." So much for his matter (cf. above, note 18). And his manner?

used and which is unlikely to have been used for any other subject (cf. Fordyce, p. 261, note 1). We have already seen that separation did not constitute a pattern in Mimnermus and the early elegists, though it occurred occasionally, enough for a precedent; and of course Mimnermus' longer poems are lost. But when Hermesianax talks about Mimnermus as the discoverer of the pentameter, separation plays a crucial part in the art of the couplet. What appears monotonous from one viewpoint proves highly skillful and pointed on closer examination. In the context of the present study, we cannot take time to examine the entire Leontion fragment or the fifth Hymn of Callimachus, but we shall go into Hermesianax' treatment of Mimnermus and Hesiod in detail, to suggest the way in which separation works in a couplet and a group of couplets. The Leontion posits love as the mover of all formed speech, poetry, and philosophy, inventing passion if need be where none was recorded, and this paradoxical singleness of theme has its counterpart in the apparent monotony of form. But where artifice is so apparent it must be deliberate, or a very bad job indeed: the whole business stands or falls on the skill with which detail, the audacity with which the larger strokes come off: not matter so much as manner is the issue. The stories of erotic passion in the older poets become transparent, symbolic of Hermesianax' own passion for poetry itself.

In his treatment of Mimnermus, Hermesianax says that the old elegist discovered the sweetly echoing sprite of the tender pentameter after laboring mightily in the toils of love (7.35–36 Powell):

> Μίμνερμος δέ, τὸν ἡδὺν ὃς εὕρετο πολλὸν ἀνατλὰς
> ἦχον καὶ μαλακοῦ πνεῦμα τὸ πενταμέτρου.

In both separations, the attribute is placed first, conforming to the new but not to any older convention. Words that characterize not the poet but the invented form take important positions: thus ἡδύν before the hexameter cesura and the substantive, ἦχον, at the beginning of the pentameter, and then a pattern of the most frequent type closing the pentameter. Both treatment of the patterns and their combination are Hellenistic, not archaic.

In Hermesianax' language, references to content and form merge. The pentameter is a sweet echo both by position and by the nature of

Mimnermus' sweet, erotic matter. Thus too the "breath" of "tender pentameter" implies both erotic tenderness and poetic inspiration and skill.[20] In the pentameter, separated words frame πνεῦμα and all three words together form a local pattern of alliteration, μ, π, π . . . μ. These initial letters in turn echo the initials of Mimnermus, beginning the hexameter, and of his productive striving toward its end—πολλόν. Generic references to Mimnermus' form and content thus also have their immediate, specific points of referral in Hermesianax' art. Words like "sweet" and "tender," of the conventional language of passion, thus tend to acquire significance as values in rhetoric and poetics. Talk about invention becomes symbolic, making oblique reference to the inventiveness manifest in itself. Separation emerges as a subtle, consciously exploited poetic instrument.

Separation has comparable importance in a longer passage, too, where it serves in unifying several couplets and putting emphasis again on key terms, again with obvious self-consciousness and self-symbolization on the poet's part (7.21–26 Powell):[21]

> φημὶ δὲ καὶ βοιωτὸν ἀπορρολιπόντα μέλαθρον
>   Ἡσίοδον πάσης ἤρανον ἱστορίης
> Ἀσκραίων ἐσικέσθαι ἐρωνθ᾽ Ἑλικωνίδα κώμην
>   ἔνθεν ὅ γ᾽ Ἡοίην μνώμενος Ἀσκραϊκὴν
> πόλλ᾽ ἔπαθεν, πάσας δὲ λόγων ἀνεγράψατο βίβλους
>   ὑμνῶν, ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἀνερχόμενος.

Separation occurs in two successive pentameters, then in the following hexameter, where an attribute, πάσας, before the strong cesura echoes πάσης from the first pattern. In the pentameter, πρώτης before the

---

[20] On the use of separation for framing, see Conrad (above, note 1) 201. For the phrase "tender breath," see also line 15, the breath that Orpheus won for Argiope by singing. Its connotations, technical, vital, and spiritual, make it suitably ambivalent in both contexts. The name, Argiope or Agriope, is etymological and unique; cf. O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Berlin 1922) 18.61.

[21] Cf. the opening of Hesiod's *Shield*, where the action of leaving home has a verbal echo here. Patzer (above, note 7) 89, analyzes the present passage, noting separation in vv. 24, 25, but passing over the parallels 22/25, 25/26, and the structure of 23–24. He sees evidence that elegiac hexameter is *gestaltet* on pentameter, and says that the same structures recur in remaining verses. In fact, however, only 4 such separations occur in hexameters, to 27 in pentameters, while there are fundamental objections to his idea that the hexameter is modeled on the pentameter. Conrad (above, note 1) 195–96, has shown that such patterns are indigenous to the epic hexameter. We have seen that they are also indigenous to both pentameter and hexameter in early elegy (above, note 5).

cesura continues the alliterative series; placement gives it proleptic force.   In the central pattern, the key word, 'Ηοίην, stands parallel to the repeated "all" in a couplet bounded by versions of the name of Hesiod's town.   Echo, position, pattern, all imply that the master of *all* history was nonetheless constrained by love to put a *girl's* name at the *top* of *all* his sheets: one thinks of Vergil's *praescripsit pagina nomen (E.* 6.12).[22]   In particular, patterning accentuates the conceit by which Hesiod's fondness for the formula ἢ οἵη, "Or such as (she) ... ," which punctuated successive tales of heroines in love, is transformed into a sign of fondness for a girl.   The notion of a poet in love with a verbal figment reflects on Hermesianax' own poetic passion, while at the same time the emphasis in the fable on travel and erotic frenzy and on paronomastic nomenclature raises a question, whether Hermesianax is not contriving a paronomastic etymology of Hesiod's name, implying by means of the story that the elements of the name mean something like "one who takes a sweet or frenzied, i.e. an erotic trip": ἡσι-ὁδός, ἧσις, ἡσιεπής.

From the self-reflecting art of the couplet on Mimnermus and the section of three couplets on Hesiod, we might go on to reconstruct the modes and elements of ingenuity and unity in the whole piece and to value this poetry both on its own terms and as part of the literary environment in which Callimachus also worked and which provided precedents for Catullus and his contemporaries.   Comparable developments of pattern, in a couplet or small grouping of couplets, appear also in the poetry of Callimachus and other epigrammatists,[23] though only Callimachus' fifth Hymn now affords an example of commensurate length.

In Latin, the elegiac couplet was used before the time of Catullus for short poems in the tradition of the epigram, so that their lack

---

[22] The erotic topos is also familiar from contemporary peripatetic biographers: Barber (above, note 19).

[23] See instances of clustering, Call. *H.* 5.1–12, 20–26, 70–72, and, in the other epigrammatists (examples cited from Gow and Page, above, note 13): Alcaeus x (8 verses) 1, 2, 4, 5, 6; see also XI; Antipater XXXIII (8 verses) 1, 2, 3, 4; Dioscorides XIV (4 verses) 1, 2, 4; Hedylus II (6 verses) 3, 4, 5; Leonidas XLII (8 verses) 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; and XLVII (6 verses) 2, 3, 4, 6; Mnasalces XI (4 verses) 1, 2, 4; Polystratus I (8 verses) 3, 4, 6, 8; anonymous XLII (10 verses) 4, 6, 8, 10; and XLVIII (6 verses) 3, 4, 6; and Meleager CXXVI (6 verses) 2, 4, 6.

of concern with the separative patterns that are so pronounced in longer Hellenistic works is perhaps less surprising; but Catullus' friend Cinna made striking use of patterns in an epigram interesting for its associations with Callimachus as well as with Catullus.[24]   In matter it recalls the Callimachean epigram it echoes, or the literary interests of Hermesianax; in form it is closer to the Preface than to them.

Among Catullus' own works in elegiacs, we have mentioned two, apart from the longer poems of Callimachus and Troy, that employ separative patterning in a marked way, closer to Hellenistic practice than to the Preface.   A rueful promise not to steal another kiss from Iuventius, c. 99, has one separation in hexameter, six in pentameter, out of 16 verses.   Five staccato periods are disposed symmetrically, with bold parallels in form, reversals in sense, around an expression of disgust on which the poem turns.   *Surripui* and *dulci* at the beginning have their analogues in form, opposites in sense, at the end: *tristi, numquam . . . surripiam.*[25]   The use of patterning is different in c. 67,

---

[24] For Valerius Aedituus, Q. Lutatius Catulus, and Porcius Licinus, see W. Morel, *FPL* (Stuttgart 1961) 42, 43, 46, and for Cinna, p. 89, fr. 11:

> haec tibi Arateis multum invigilata lucernis
> carmina, quis ignis novimus aetherios,
> levis in aridulo malvae descripta libello
> Prusiaca vexi munera navicula.

Cf. Callimachus, *Epigram* 27.4 Pf., and, on the piece in general, F. Skutsch, s.v. "Helvius (12)," *RE* 1.8 (1912) 227; cf. Cat. 1.1–2 for implied identification of a book's content and its manufacture; cf. Cat. 10.30 for the Bithynian journey that Catullus and Cinna shared.   Cinna *sibi paravit* a book as well as eight straight men.   And one might compare the literary activity of another cohort in the provinces, Hor. *Epist.* 1.3.   Also, A. Ronconi, *Studi Catulliani* (Bari, first publ. 1939–40) 146, sees in Cinna *il riscontro* of

> laneaque aridulis haerebant morsa labellis
> quae prius in levi fuerant extantia filo. (Cat. 64.316–17)

Cf. also Cinna's own recollection of Callimachus' *Hecale* (so Skutsch),

> te matutinus flentem conspexit Eous
> et flentem paulo vidit post Hesperus idem,

in relation to Cat. 64.269, 62.35 (Schrader); *paulo post* was avoided in a certain class of poetic language: so B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter* (Lund 1945) 95.   Cinna's fragment makes play of initial letters, patterns, and names of distant places in a way that recalls the opening of Cat. 64.1–21 and c. 65.1–8.

[25] Cf. Cat. 99.1, 2, 10, 14, 16.   Here we find neither the incremental periodic structure nor the full-line patterning and framing of c. 65.

where patterns are clustered in the long periods of the speeches, unifying
them in ways comparable to the construction of the tale of Eoie or of
certain sections of the fifth Hymn.[26]   Talk—the loquacity and veracity
of the Door, tonality and tendentiousness in speech—is the poem's
subject, just as art was the real subject of Hermesianax.   In the Door's
case, moreover, Catullus contrives a paradox of base matter in elegant
forms, as in the poem's last line (67.48):

<p align="center">falsum mendaci ventre puerperium.</p>

Ostensibly, another loquacious female object is the subject of c. 66
as well.   We do not know if the petulant indiscretion of the Lock
(66.15–32) about the queen's physical longing for her absent spouse,
which caused the Lock's own separation from the queen through a
vow for his safe return, was so pronounced in the Greek as in the Latin.
Callimachus' Lock refers to itself as πλόκαμος (*Ait.* fr. 110.47, 63 Pf.),
masculine, though its sister locks are feminine (fr. 110.51); Catullus'
Latin is not only less common about gender, but seems to make a
great deal of the gossipy, somewhat tempestuous (feminine) character
of the speaker (cf. 66.21–33, 39–40, 75–76, though this last has its parallel
in the Greek).   It is significant that the translation comes to a climax
with a prayer about matters of great importance to Catullus in other
poems as well, in ten lines that correspond to a ten-line gap in the
Greek.   We cannot say whether Callimachus gave as much impor-
tance to ὁμόνοια in marriage; for him elsewhere it was a political ideal
(*H.* 6.134).   But for Catullus *concordia* (66.87) was associated with
strong, mutual love in marriage, with a faithful bond (*foedus*) in love
that he had sought in vain for himself but that he enshrined in a brilliant,
bold treatment of the Argonautic myth in his Peleus and Thetis (64.
334–36, the most emphatic of the utterances of the Parcae).[27]   That

[26] Separations in c. 67: (21–22, 24, 28), 30, (32, 34, 36) as well as in 13, 2, 6, 8.

[27] Even the "longer mythological and Alexandrian pieces . . . (as has been noticed
by several critics) offer a continuation and refinement of the basic personal concerns
we find in his poems about Lesbia": R. Bagg, "Some Versions of Lyric Impasse in
Shakespeare and Catullus," *Arion* 4 (1965) 78, cf. 84; cf. also M. C. J. Putnam, "The
Art of Catullus 64," *HSCP* 65 (1961) 167, 172.   S. Commager, "Notes on Some Poems
of Catullus," *HSCP* 70 (1965) 104, has directed gentle irony at those who in spite of
c. 68 would view the "other poems as only impersonal exercises."   For other connec-
tions between c. 66 and c. 64, see below, note 45: n.b. *optato*, 64.31, 66.79; cf. 64.328,
372.

Wedding is unique among Greek and Latin hexameter poems for the frequency with which it employs separative patterning, as we shall see in a moment; and it shares a dark view of Troy with the long elegy. In both form, then, and theme the Lock and Preface have associations with it.　In particular, the Lock opens with three separations of the type *assiduo| ... dolore‖* in the first six lines, and parallel construction and emphatic use of position characterize the whole section, as if patterning were fit to give a semblance of Conon's well-disposed sky. Three separative patterns then close the first period, a grouping of seven couplets; and, beyond this, separations figure in four other clusters.[28]　In one couplet, two separations counterpose the chaste and unchaste in a patterned antithesis at once commonplace and yet a recurrent concern of Catullus in poems more obviously personal (66.83–84), while *concordia*, in the following lines, is the poem's climactic theme, together with *amor| ... assiduus‖* in marriage (cf. 61.227).

The Preface forms a single period that begins with the separation *assiduo| ... dolore‖* (65.1), repeated then in each of the next three lines.[29] Separative structure continues, but the span of the separated elements grows so that one attribute and substantive enclose another (65.5), then frame an entire pentameter (65.6), then hexameter (65.7),[30] with the outer alliterative pairs enclosing each a second pair.[31]　The section

[28] E.g. 66.19–23, 55–60, 65–68, 80–84; cf. above, note 26, for poem 67.

[29] For punctuation as a single period, see C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus* (Oxford 1961) 325; Kroll (above, note 3); contrast the punctuation of R. A. B. Mynors, *Catulli Carmina* (Oxford 1958).

[30] On the importance of full-line framing, Heyken (above, note 2) 12 ff.; such framing occurs in 1 of 15 verses in Cat. 64, 1/34 in Cic. *Arat.*, 1/225 in Lucr., according to T. E. V. Pearce, "The Enclosing Word Order in the Latin Hexameter," *CQ* 16 (1966) 162–66. Hermesianax, *Leontion*, has it twice, both gen.-noun, vv. 23, 48; Ap. Rh. 4.1–205, 42, 97; Mosch. *Eur.* 3; and cf. Antipater, 305 (G-P), 357, 423, 461, 525, 528; Leonidas, 2236; Perses, 2866; Theocritus, 3.2 (3385), 16.5 (3450), 21.4 (3495), 22.4 (3501); Meleager, 1.34 (3959), 58 (3983); and 4581, 4643, 4645.　Conrad's table for this type of separation (above, note 1) 225, yields figures at variance with Pearce: frequency of 1/17 in Cat. 64, 1/23 in Cic. *Arat.*, 1/91 in Lucr. 3.　Direct comparison between these figures and Heyken's is also impossible because he treats lines with one and two separations separately (above, note 2) 8, 70.

[31] On a second pair within the fundamental pattern, Heyken (above, note 2) 74–75. Full-line framing and other separations are frequent in Catullus' c. 63 and in the short lyrics, e.g. *meas ... nugas* (1.4); cf. 11.10, 2b.3, and remarks by Ross (above, note 3) 346 on the close connection between polymetrics and the longer elegies.　On the connotations of *Lethaeo gurgite*, Fordyce (above, note 29) *ad loc.*, and cf. c. 68.91, *nostro letum*

closes with a return to the original form.   In the group of four couplets, the word *Troia* assumes the most prominence (65.1–8).

The form of the opening establishes itself as a pattern and returns as a kind of formal motif throughout the rest of the poem.   It closes the poet's words to his brother with a poetic symbol, a mythological reflection on this new poetic form of grief (65.13–14).[32]   It recurs again as he reflects on reasons for sending the translation (65.17–18). And it follows again at once, as the very thought of a literary gift and of the working of poetic mind occasions a further Callimachean gift; the simile of the poet's spirit, which closes the poem, is in all likelihood a translation or version of Callimachus.[33]   From the patterns of a

miserabile fratri.   For references to the harbor, stream, and shore of the underworld, see Antipater (G-P) 287, 525, 547; Anyte, 683; and Leonidas, 2340, 2384, 2441.

[32] *Tegam*, the reading of the archetype, fits as well as *canam*, of the mid-15th century, into the local alliterative patterns.   Although the mss. are contradictory at other important points, notably on *Troia*, and in other cases no intelligible tradition was preserved, there is no a priori reason to reject a difficult *tegam* for a redundant *canam* (-*te te-* does not constitute a bar; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 4.24, 38).   If *tegam* stands, then *qualia* must have the force of *qualiter* and *carmina* some of the old verbal force of -*men*: "I'll always love, always I'll shade the songs I'm singing tearfully because of your death, just as it was under thick shadows of boughs that the bird sang, she of Daulis the shaded town, lamenting . . . ." By position *carmina* is emphatic, framed by the controlling pattern *tua| . . . morte.* It must be construed concretely—the continuing, unquestioned fact of poetry that Catullus will be making—and it must be taken closely together with *tegam*, while *concinit* in turn is read together with *sub densis|ramorum . . . umbris‖.*   *Qualia* compares the two kinds of song by the two entire phrases.   The details of shadow assume a particular relevance with *tegam* that they otherwise lack, though they fit the general scene.   Kroll (above, note 3) dismisses *tegam* in something like this sense with a referral to Bursian 183, 5.   But in the entire phrase it becomes a term for the particular kind of poetry that Catullus will make in analogy with the nightingale.   *Qualia* may be read adverbially with *canam*, too, though part of the tension and the explicitly metaphorical poetics are lost.   Cf. an adverbial use of *qualis*, Verg. *G.* 4.511, likening Orpheus' singing to that of the nightingale, where *maerens* and *umbra* remind us of Cat. 65, though they are words natural enough to the matter; and cf. *Aen.* 3.679, 4.143.   Catullus makes a great point, and uses his dominant pattern for the shade in which Philomel sang, even to the etymology of Daulias itself, as Fordyce (above, note 29) observes.   L. Alfonsi, "Catullo elegiaco," *Gedenkschrift G. Rohde* (Tübingen 1961) 13, sees *l'amore e la morte* in c. 65, but Catullus' own paronomasia, 65.12–13, associates *morte* with *ramorum*, the shade of song, prompting as an alternate translation, "I shall always shade my songs with death as under shade sang . . .": "I will always shade my songs with your death so that they are mournful (proleptic, *maesta*). . . ."   On the nightingale as symbol of the poet and also of poetry, R. Pfeiffer, note to Call. *Ait.* fr. 1.16 (Oxford 1965) vol. 1, p. 4.

[33] On the apple as a Callimachean reminiscence, L. W. Daly, "Callimachus and Catullus," *CP* 47 (1952) 97–99; note that the pattern of 65.19 resembles 65.5, but this begins a different kind of parenthesis; cf. 65.21; cf. also T. B. L. Webster, *Hellenistic*

delicate, literary consideration, the mind of the poet continues into the
self-reflecting simile. *Vagis|...ventis‖* and *(ex) meo|...animo‖* (65.17–18)
give rise to *ut missum...| ... malum‖* and *casto| ... e gremio‖* (65.19–20),
then also to *quod ... | ... locatum‖* and finally, in the closing cadence,
prono| ... decursu‖, followed in the pentameter by *tristi| ... ore* which
intertwines with *|conscius ... rubor‖*, perhaps some semblance of the
complexity of feeling in a discovered girl, a perfect fit of matter and
form.

The simile is "charmingly vivid and unexpected,"[34] a scene repre-
sented in an ensemble of fine touches. The course of the apple across
the floor takes "a distinctive rhythm, with spondees in all feet except
the fourth, ... clearly meant to echo the sense,"[35] though the apple is
praeceps and spondees slow (65.23). Perhaps both the spondees and
the alliteration are merely kinetic, suggesting motion, so that they
represent the apple but by a kind of antiphrasis. On the other hand,
agitur seems all the quicker by contrast with the rest of the line. In
the line before, *excutitur* gives a semblance of a sudden forcing out
with the abruptness of two verbs, asyndetic, splitting the second half
of a pentameter (65.22).

The charm of the simile is so patent and its art so suited, that it
invites a romantic stock response. Like some of its Homeric predeces-
sors, the simile does not follow in fact, whatever its formal sequence
with earlier patterns or its internal attractions in itself. The poet
sets out to compare a request for poems to a lover's gift, and he com-
pares then, too, his own mind to the secretive lap of an amorous girl:
(ex) meo animo likened to *casto e gremio* (65.18, 20). But the friend's
request did not slip from the poet's mind while the apple did escape the
girl. Once the simile has begun, Catullus follows the story itself,
the probably Callimachean scene, out to its conclusion, leaving behind
the original terms of the simile: *dicta ... ut ... malum*. Consequently,
like the apple it describes, the simile presents itself vivid and unexpected.
It completes its own full course, *decursu*, responsive to the logic of its

Poetry and Art (London 1964) 306. If the simile is a translation, Catullus literally does
send *carmina*, c. 66 and part of c. 65. The plural, which has troubled some readers,
would thus be literal and exact. One of the most striking verbal parallels between
c. 66 and c. 65 is the pattern *casto| ... gremio‖* (66.56).

[34] Fordyce (above, note 29) 325.
[35] Fordyce (above, note 29) 325.

own (literary) form and feeling and it makes its own (symbolic) revelation. Because it detaches itself from one order, it invites consideration of another, much as Hermesianax called attention to his own art through paradox. In effect, the simile reveals Catullus' still fresh literary experience and devotion to Callimachean form and sentiment. The Callimachean poetic range is artfully, fondly recollected in the face of new personal concerns and new poetry in the patterns of Troy (65.1–8) with their new poetics of love and death in the self-reflecting, violent simile of the nightingale (65.11–14). The return is momentary, remarkably inward, conditioned (*ne . . . forte putes*, 65.17–18), a matter of sense in form and touching ineffably, too, on the poetry of death. Not only do the forms, patterns that themselves have become motifs, recall Catullus' movement toward a mythological dimension in *Troia . . . tellus*, but the spreading blush on the girl's cheek—*huic manat* (65.24)—echoes an imagined movement of the wave of the rivers of the underworld; in his monumental elaboration of the circumstances of death and burial, Catullus also evoked, poignantly specific, the touch of water lapping the pale foot (65.6), while he closes with a specific, particularly delicate touch that in the context, as diverted simile and echo, becomes a symbol of his own complicity in art: [36]

> Etsi me assiduo confectum cura dolore
>   sevocat a doctis, Ortale, virginibus,
> nec potis est dulcis Musarum expromere fetus
>   mens animi, tantis fluctuat ipsa malis—
> 5 namque mei nuper Lethaeo gurgite fratris
>   pallidulum manans alluit unda pedem,
> Troia Rhoeteo quem subter litore tellus
>   ereptum nostris obterit ex oculis:

. . . .

[36] The Association's anonymous referee speaks of "the most significant relationship in the whole, the contrast between the wave welling up from Lethe and the blush spreading over the girl's cheek." One might also note a contrast between the tempest of the poet's mind, *mens animi . . . fluctuat* (65.4), in contrast with the capacity to retain, recall a matter of literary friendship, *ne . . . / effluxisse meo forte putes animo* (65.18), where *forte* becomes a crucial word. In the larger context, one relates the wave lapping the foot to the surf playing with Ariadne's garments fallen before her feet (64.67): *alluit . . . pedem, ante pedes . . . adludebant.*

10   numquam ego te, vita frater amabilior,
            aspiciam posthac? at certe semper amabo,
                semper maesta tua carmina morte tegam,
            qualia sub densis ramorum concinit umbris
                Daulias, absumpti fata gemens Ityli—
15   sed tamen in tantis maeroribus, Ortale, mitto
                haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae,
            ne tua dicta vagis nequiquam credita ventis
                effluxisse meo forte putes animo,
            ut missum sponsi furtivo munere malum
20   procurrit casto virginis e gremio,
            quod miserae oblitae molli sub veste locatum,
                dum adventu matris prosilit, excutitur,
            atque illud prono praeceps agitur decursu,
                huic manat tristi conscius ore rubor.

In the course of the Preface, patterning takes on the function of motif, and, at the juncture of the second simile of the poet's mind (19–24), it posits unity in form and poetic process over against a more prosaic disjunction. Form is even more absolute, positive, and articulated in unifying disparate matters, in the longer elegy of Troy. The great plan of the poem is too well known to need description,[37] constructed as it is on the form that recalls one of the golden lines of the Preface or of the Marriage of Peleus and Thetis (abvBA):[38]

            pallidulum manans alluit unda pedem (65.6)

                dominam (68.68)
                    molli candida diva pede (70)
                        abrupto coniugio (84)
                            Troia (89): letum (91)
                        amoris aestus (107–8)
                    tum . . . lux mea (131–32)
                domina (156)

[37] See for example Fordyce (above, note 29) 343–44.
[38] On abvBA patterning in Latin hexameter, Conrad (above, note 1) 234 ff., and especially 239–40. The less arresting patterns are more frequent, e.g. 65.1, 12, 24, or Cinna, fr. 11.1, 3; in epigram, note Alcaeus, 95 (P-G); Antipater, 304/5, 459, 519 (cf. above, note 13), 548/49, 605, 64.4 (611) and 8 and 20, and 638/39; Anyte, 683, cf. 735; Aristodicus, 775; Artemon, 809; Dioscorides, 1688, 1712; Leonidas, 2265; or Meleager, 4701. Needless to say, such patterns are a hallmark of Catullus 64 and Latin elegy.

As if the fact itself were not sufficient testimony, Catullus calls attention
to the nature of the central section, referring to it as *hoc . . . confectum
carmine munus* (68.149), not merely, if unexpectedly, one of the *munera*
that had been requested (68.10), but representing perhaps both more and
less (*quod potui*, 68.149).[39]   Within the ambitious structure, junctures
and coincidences are sometimes forced, while a number of phrases are
shared with other poems, so that at least those from the translation
and Preface give substance to one possible sense of *confectum*.[40]   This
is the poet's own word for his work.   It has to be weighed, interpreted
in terms of the entire construction.

Separative patterning is sparse in the introductory section (68.1–40);
it is frequent in the second, obviously structured part of the poem.
At one point it gives form to what is one of the most characteristic
movements, if not actually the generative idea and feeling of the work.
A climactic run of attributes stands before the principal cesuras as
Catullus recaptures a specific, vivid sensation from his own past:
communes, molli, trito, arguta (68.69–72).   The poet's attention moves
from general recollection, gradually coming to focus on the particular
telling detail in a way that recalls the particularity too in the Preface
of his allusion to another foot and to the blush (65.6, 24).   Then,
from the specific token of his own love recalled, he moves to initiate
a mythological reflection on it.   Following the progression of qualities,
quondam appears next before the cesura, as in other contexts (8.3, 64.1,
and cf. 64.382) when Catullus enlarges or recalls feeling; and then
Protesilaeam| . . . domum|| introduces the specific mythological correla-
tive (68.73–74).   In all, the *confectum carmine munus* includes an 8-line
section with 6 separations, a 17-line section with 10 separations, and a
16-line section with 12 separations, in addition to other, smaller
groupings.[41]

Elements that tend to distinguish the translation, Preface, and long
elegy of Troy from Catullus' other elegiac work afford at the same
time points of contact with the Marriage of Peleus and Thetis (c. 64), in
stichic hexameters.   Direct parallelism between pentameter and hexam-
eter appears to be a formal principle in the three elegies, especially

---

[39] On *quod potui*, Fordyce (above, note 29) 343.

[40] See below, notes 42–46, on the relationships between Cat. 64 and 68.

[41] 68.54–62, 69–86, 100–4, 121–36; and 21–22, 91–92, 111–12.

65 and 68, in effect extending the practice of separation as a hexameter convention.[42]   The Wedding for its part uses patterns like *assiduo|* ... *dolore‖* more frequently than any other extant Greek or Latin hexameter poem, setting a precedent that Vergil acknowledged and implicitly criticized in the elaborate style and universal scheme of peaceful heroism in the fourth Pastoral (*E.* 4.46–47).[43]   Again, the elegies deploy separations in clusters, and so does the Wedding.[44]   All four poems

[42] Cf. above, note 17.

[43] For Greek hexameter, see above, note 7. (a) The pattern became dominant in Hellenistic pentameter (cf. above, notes 5, 9), where it turns on the strong cesura, yet the prevailing contemporary tendency was to reduce the importance of the strong (B^1) cesura in hexameter; hence there was less likelihood of direct parallelism or effect of the pentameter's development on the hexameter, even for a poet like Callimachus, who wrote in both genres. Homer had word endings at B^1 in 50% of the verses, at B^2 (trochaic) in about 60% (for the terms B^1, B^2, see Conrad [above, note 1] 197–98); Callimachus raises B^2 to 74%, lowers B^1 to about 42%; Apollonius did roughly the same: figures given for Homer and for Callimachus (B^2) by H. N. Porter, "The Early Greek Hexameter," *YCS* 12 (1951) 11; for Callimachus (B^1) and Apollonius, calculated from material in the tables of E. G. O'Neil, Jr., "Localization of Metrical Word Types in the Greek Hexameter," *YCS* 8 (1942) 105 ff.

(b) Latin shifts toward predominance of B^1: Ennius, *Ann.* (Vahl.²) fr. 35, 77, 110, 187, 194, 234, 268 (77 verses), 21% at B^2 and 70% at B^1; Lucr. 1.1–100, has 8 B^2 and 86 B^1, with 5 no cesura; Cat. 64 (Peleus) 1–100, has 7 B^2 to 92 B^1, with no cesura in one: cf. L. Nougaret, *Traité de métrique latine classique* (Paris 1948) 30, sec. 71.

(c) Although both Lucr. and Cat. 64 show similar prevalence of word endings at B^1, Lucr. has separations of the type under consideration in only 5.1% of the verses of Book 4 (1287 verses), and 12 of the 66 of these place the substantive first. Catullus has this type in 22.6% of the verses of the Peleus (407 verses in Mynors, above, note 29); only 4 of 90 (102 including the refrains) place substantive first, about 4% in contrast to Lucr., where 18% are with substantive first.

(d) Separation in other hexameters: Cic. *Arat.*, fr. 34 (Traglia), 480 verses, has this pattern in 13.5%; but 21% have the substantive first, unlike Catullus 65, 68, and 64, where substantive is first in 0, 2%, 4% (n.b. Cat. 66, 15.4%). The pattern is sporadic in Ennius; Vergil: *Ecl.* 4 has it in 20.6% of the verses, no subst. first; *Ecl.* 6 has it in 21%, most of which have subst. first, as if reflecting its Lucretianizing manner; *Ecl.* 9 has it in 19.4%, of which almost half have the subst. first, all in Lycidas' talk or in recollected fragments, except 9.54, but cf. 9.13, 15; *Ecl.* 10 has it in 19.5%, no subst. first. Altogether, the *Ecl.* have this pattern in 16% of the verses, with subst. first in 7 of the 133 cases; *Georg.* 1 has it in 19.6%, with subst. first in 4 of 101 cases; *Aen.* 5 has it in 14.6%, highest in the *Aeneid*, with 11% of the subst. first. Both *Ecl.* and *Georgics* follow Catullus' restriction on the substantive and approach his frequency in use. On other points of contact between Cat. 64 and *Ecl.* 4, see E. K. Rand, "Catullus and the Augustans," *HSCP* 17 (1906) 21 ff., and J. B. Van Sickle, "The Unnamed Child, A Reading of Virgil's Messianic Eclogue," *HSCP* 71 (Summary of Dissertation, 1966) 350–51.

[44] For patterns in clusters, see above, notes 21, 23, 26, 27, and cf. Prop. 1.1.1–6, 7–8, 9–10, 19–22, *et passim*, to which Conrad in a general way calls attention (above, note 1)

also echo one another in many particular phrases and motifs,[45] as well as in the larger representations of feminine passion, and concern with truth, loss, and passion realized through concordant marriage.[46] Obviously, too, the Preface, elegy, and Wedding share the theme of Troy; and all three also restrict the substantive to second position more rigorously than the Lock does.[47]   The elegies respond to Callimachus in their fashion, while the wedding reinterprets the Argonautic material that was so important for Callimachus, Apollonius, and Theocritus, contriving an erotic *aition* (64.16–21, Mynors) for the holocaust at Troy, thus unifying the action of the heroic age.

The poetics of death—*maesta tua carmina morte* (65.12)—and simile of the poet as a singer like Philomel (65.13–14) at the center of the preface mark a new poetic consciousness in Catullus, both in form and in feeling, that bears also on the elegy of Troy and through it perhaps also

195. Separations in Alexandrian hexameter (cf. above, note 7) occur occasionally in successive or neighboring verses, but without regular clustering and pairing. Again (cf. above, note 6) we might speak of precedent set rather than regular patterns, e.g. clustering and pairing in Ap. Rh. 4.1–205 at 35, 37, 40–41 and 126, 128; Mosch. *Eur.* 5–7, 55, 57; and see above, note 25.   In Latin, such nuclei are more frequent, e.g. Cic. *Arat.*, fr. 34 (Traglia), has 8 pairs, one triad (145–47), and 10 clusters, with separations in close proximity.   Cat. 64 has even more pairings, 11, in fewer lines (407, to the 480 of Cic. fr. 34), 4 triads, and 17 clusters, tending to greater length than Cicero's.   Verg. *Georg.* 1 (514 vv.) has 12 pairs, 5 triads, and 14 clusters.   Boundaries of individual clusters vary, reflecting periodic structure.

[45] Most conspicuous (in part gathered by Putnam [above, note 28] 177 ff.; for others perhaps less striking see his article): *tantis fluctuat*, 64.62 / 65.4; *mente expromere*, 64.223 / 65.3–4; *assiduo*, 64.242 / 65.1 / 68.55; *tempestate, auctus*, 64.25, 73 / 66.11; *optato* . . . *lumine*, 64.31 / 66.79; *discerpent*, 64.142 / 66.73; *levia* . . . *brachia*, 64.332 / 66.10 (cf. also words, *progenies*, 64.85 / 66.26; *magnanimum*, 64.23 / 66.44); *somnum* . . . *desertum*, 64.56–57 / 68.5–6; *quandoquidem fortuna*, 64.218 / 101.5; *priscum, parens*, 64.159 / 101.7; *abstulit, frater, adempte*, 101.6 / 68.20, 92; *casto* . . . *gremio*, 65.20 / 66.56; also *prosilit*, 65.22 / 68.58; *prono praeceps*, 65.23 / 68.59.   G. Lieberg (above, note 3) 38, compares 65.17 / 64.59, noting their common themes of vanity of words.   The benediction, *quid pro quo*, that the Royal Lock pronounces on chaste brides corresponds to the terms of the praise of Peleus' and Thetis' marriage: *amor, concordia*, 66.87–88, 64.334–36. And the poet insists on the truth at 64.306, 322, as does the Lock: *namque ego non ullo vera timore tegam* (66.72).

[46] Robert Bagg (above, note 28) 77 ff., gives a thoughtful account of Catullus' use of feminine figures.   In this he goes beyond Putnam (above, note 28) 194, 195, who pointed to c. 11 and to Polyxena in c. 64, as well as to Laodameia in c. 68, among others. Cf. also c. 2b, the feelings of Atalanta when the golden apple freed her, and the contrasting figures of Philomel and the girl in c. 65.

[47] See above, note 43 (d) and notes 16, 17.

on the course of elegy at Rome.[48]   The poetry of the Peleus and
Thetis in its turn, whether a preparation or a harvest of the gains and
losses, certainly a companion of the longer elegies, bears on the poetry
of Vergilian pastoral, especially of *Eclogues* 4 and 6, and, through
pastoral, on the Vergilian formation of hexameter and the sensibility
that conceives of Dido in reminiscence of Medea and Ariadne scorned.[49]

[48] Alfonsi (above, note 32) 12, calls c. 65 "la prima vera e propria elegia in Roma,"
and says that Catullus created this genre "che fonde l'amore e la morte" (p. 13); it
would be more accurate to reserve judgment on the question of an historical first even
while recognizing the qualities of the poem that lend themselves to such a view.   Oddly,
Alfonsi seems to take the placement of c. 65 before c. 66 as evidence for order of compo-
sition, "prima egli ha creato," p. 14.