THE PHENOMENON OF *SPERRUNG* IN TIBULLUS' ELEGIES[1]

BIRGITTA WOHL

California State University, Northridge

A few years ago an American scholar opened a major article with the following statement:

> Any reader of Latin elegiac poetry cannot have failed to notice the recurrence of a particular pattern of word-order in such frequency as to be predictable and monotonous. I am referring to the placement of an adjective before the caesura of either hexameter or pentameter of the elegiac couplet and the noun modified by that adjective at the end of the line.[2]

Conrad's article deals in detail with the phenomenon of *Sperrung* of adjectives and nouns, not in elegy, however, but in dactylic hexameter, tracing the history of such patterns from Homer to Vergil. I will outline briefly the salient points of his argument as a background for the investigation in this study.

According to Conrad, the guiding principles for separation of adjective and noun are the following: (1) the function of the caesura as a boundary immediately before or after which one of the separated elements appears; (2) the phenomenon of *framing*, by the separated elements, either of whole lines or of rhetorical cola (i.e., sense-units). Both factors have the effect of emphasizing one or both of the separated elements. On the controversial question of the role of the caesura

and on the clash between ictus and accent in Latin hexameter Conrad takes a conservative stand and concludes after presenting much evidence from both sides that the traditional view still offers a more satisfactory explanation of the fact that Latin poetry extended and exploited the use of those Greek caesurae which created conflict between ictus and accent.[3]   Already from Ennius on, Latin hexameter shows a preference for the B1 caesura, and while harmony between ictus and accent was usually sought in the first, fifth, and sixth feet, the remaining feet were less favorable to it; if B1 has no conflict, that was usually compensated for by conflict at the A4 caesura and/or at the C1 caesura.   Conrad therefore assumes that both ictus and accent were pronounced with vocalic stress, the ictus, however, being clearly subordinated to the accent, i.e., just barely heard.[4]   The present work adheres to this view. The question of accent-ictus clash is, however, not a factor in all the patterns of separation, but plays an important role in many of them.

Conrad, moreover, traces the fully developed, refined colometric structure of Vergil back to its origins in the formulaic diction of Homer, and then follows the development and crystallization of types of adjective-noun separations through a number of intermediate stages. His work shows in detail what substantial changes were made and what preferences emerged in the Hellenistic period, from which the Latin poets derived their main influence.   While Homer and Apollonius both frequently use the same separation-patterns,[5] there is, however, one significant difference between them: Apollonius shifts the position of the words so that the adjective overwhelmingly *precedes* the noun; this becomes the dominant trend from then on.

Not only is the frequency of *Sperrung* increased and certain types

---

[3] I.e., the trihemimeral, the penthemimeral, and the hephthemimeral caesurae. The sigla for the caesurae used by Conrad are the convenient abbreviations introduced by H. Fränkel in his chapter "Der Homerische und der Kallimacheische Hexameter," in *Wege und Formen frügriechischen Denkens* (Munich 1955) 110 f. They are:

$$- \mid \smile \mid \smile \parallel - \mid \smile \smile \parallel - \mid \smile \mid \smile \parallel - \mid \smile \smile \parallel - \smile \smile \parallel - \overset{\smile}{\smile}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & & 1 & 2 & & 1 & 2 \\ & & A & & & & B & & & C \end{array}$$

[4] Conrad, *dissertation* 147.

[5]   B   C   B
              1. ——— | ——— X | ——— X   2. ——— X | ——— X

Conrad, *dissertation* 79 f.

preferred in the Hellenistic period, but interlocked word-order, of which there is no genuine example in Homer, is common in Apollonius and used effectively as well. Separation in enjambment, in Homer mainly used for apposition, is quite complex in Apollonius. These rhetorical refinements of Alexandrian sense-division in poetry had a strong influence on all Latin poets. Although the Ennian fragments tell us very little beyond the one-line unit, they show definite familiarity with Alexandrian patterns of separation and colometry. Naturally this is even more so the case with subsequent Latin poets, and the patterns find their most stylized form in the elegists.

Turning to elegy, we find that not much work has been done on this type of *Sperrung*;[6] at least, there has been no serious attempt to go beyond mere statistics, as Conrad has done for the hexameter. J. Heyken's work[7] deals with the placement of adjectives and nouns in general, not just with separation, and it gives statistical tables for all Roman elegists,[8] but the discussion remains superficial due to the vastness of the material collected. What is immediately striking in his results is the relatively great absence of substantial differences between the investigated authors. Naturally this is largely due to the general conformity dictated by poetic standards and hardening conventions in the Augustan period. But investigations of individual poets are now necessary in order to discover the peculiar position of each in this matter. This is what I propose to do for Tibullus in this study.

In the interest of clarity the divisions and categories of the present study differ from those of Heyken in several respects, most importantly by separating the patterns of the hexameter from those of the pentameter.

This brings us to the debated question of the origin and historical

---

[6] In A. Cartault's work, *Le distich élégiaque chez Tibulle, Sulpicia, Lygdamus* (Paris 1911), there is a chapter on "Distribution symétrique du qualificatif et du qualifié dans l'hexamètre et dans le pentamètre" (200–62). It deals, however, not only with separated adjectives and nouns; also, it provides no statistics but has more general, often interesting, observations in the analyses of the individual examples. No mention is made of the history of the patterns of separation and the influence among the Alexandrian poets and their influence on Catullus, see J. Van Sickle, *TAPA* 99 (1968) 487–508.

[7] *Über die Stellung der Epitheta bei den römischen Elegikern* (Diss. Kiel 1916).

[8] Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Lygdamus, Sulpicia (Tib. 4.7–12), de Sulpicia (Tib. 4.2–6) and Ovid. The Ovidian material, however, includes only *Heroides* and *Fasti*. For a list of earlier works on related topics, see Conrad, *article* 254.

development of the pentameter patterns themselves, and also the question of possible differences between the patterns of separation in the epic hexameter and in the elegiac hexameter. In talking about the rhetorical influence on the symmetry of a pentameter pattern such as
—— X ‖ —— X Heyken suggested that the transference of this
$$B_1$$
pattern to the hexameter (i.e., —— X | —— X) was a specifically Roman contribution.[9] That this pattern originated in the pentameter is argued also by Patzer[10] who attempts to prove that the neoterics were responsible for transferring this basically elegiac pattern to the epyllion hexameter, which he sees as something very different from the epic hexameter, a "lyric" hexameter, closer to elegy in spirit. Conrad objects to the suggestion of the elegiac origin of the pattern on the basis of his own work, which shows that the form is prevalent already in Homer, and on the Latin side from Ennius on. That the pattern subsequently happened to become more frequent in the pentameter because of the central caesura is a different matter from the question of its origin.

More work is, however, needed on the development of the elegiac patterns of separation in the Hellenistic period. It is not inconceivable that we should assume a slightly different tradition for elegy, and perhaps a mutual influence between the two genres at times, even if the hexameter is the originator of most patterns. A full treatment of this must, however, fall outside the scope of the present study.[11]

For the moment I therefore proceed on the assumption that the development of the patterns of *Sperrung* in epic and in elegiac hexameters was rather parallel, i.e., that there appeared refinements, changed frequencies and new combinations of patterns, characteristic of each age.

E. H. Sturtevant has dealt with the question of accent and ictus in Latin elegiac distichs, and his conclusions throw some light on the question of the difference between the epic and elegiac hexameter.[12]

[9] *Op. cit.* (above, note 7) 22.
[10] "Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters," *MH* 12 (1955) 77 ff.
[11] See the further discussion of this matter below, pp. 401 ff.
[12] "Accent and Ictus in the Latin Elegiac Distich," *TAPA* 55 (1924) 73–89; the main bulk of his many articles on metrical matters deals with epic hexameters and caesurae; they are conveniently listed in Conrad, *article* 255.

Although his work falls partly outside our immediate concern, some of his results have direct importance. He asserts that the notion of caesura is a "philological ghost," that word-ends were not perceivable to the ear within a phrase, but that the clash between ictus and accent was, and that it constituted a most important factor in Latin poetic art, the development of which he traces. His conclusions for the hexameter are well known, but what concerns us directly is his investigation of the preferred position for harmony and clash in the Latin pentameter; first, 89% of the lines show harmony in the two full feet following the central caesura, while the two first feet of the line reach only 41%; secondly, the elegiac hexameter differs from the epic hexameter only in a slightly higher percentage of clash in the second, third, and fourth feet. We may, therefore, with due allowance for the difference in approach, derive some corroboration from Sturtevant for our working assumption of a fairly similar situation in the epic and elegiac hexameter.

PATTERNS OF *SPERRUNG* IN THE HEXAMETER

Table I shows the numerical occurrences in Tibullus of adjective-noun *Sperrung*, the amount of non-separations, and their respective percentages.[13]

---

[13] Since in almost any table of a given phenomenon there seems to be some variation in the numbers of instances counted due to different individual procedure, I will at this point clarify my own methods. I have tried to follow the practice used by Conrad to include not only adjectives (both in attributive and predicative position), but also genitive attributes; the justification for this lies in the practice of the poets themselves, who often place a genitive attribute and its noun in the same pattern of separation as an adjective and a noun.

By a separation I mean a break constituted by at least one intervening word or a break between lines (i.e., also enjambment from the last word of the hexameter to the first word of the pentameter), all within one single clause, either main or subordinate. Examples which include any ambiguity as to their qualification have been excluded rather than included, e.g., cases of uncertain MS reading, such as Tib. 1.2.7.

A line like Tib. 1.1.22 deserves comment: *Nunc agna exigui est / hostia parva soli.* I have chosen to include *exigui-soli* in spite of the elision (the examples of this type are very few); also, when a line has two cases of separation, one of genitive and noun and another of adjective and noun (as here), *sharing one word (soli)*, only one separation is recorded, i.e., in this case —— a ‖ —— A (*exigui/soli*) and *not* —— ‖ A — a (*hostia/soli*). Concerning the non-separations Heyken (above, note 7) 62 concludes that there is a certain definable reason behind them and gives a long list of various possibilities. I cannot agree totally—the categories he divides the material into are too many, and many non-separations must be seen as a necessity from another perspective, i.e., some ‘other’ word or

TABLE I.   SEPARATED AND UNSEPARATED ADJECTIVES

Total		Tibullus I	Tibullus II
905	Separated	593 66%	312 66%
472	Unseparated	304 34%	168 34%

A few additional statistics must be presented before we go into a more detailed discussion.   The adjective (or genitive) normally precedes the noun, a change which, as mentioned, took place in the Hellenistic period.   The number of separations with *reversal* of this order is in general quite low, as shown in Table II.   *Sperrung* in enjambment is entered separately, with the total amount of separation shown in parentheses.

TABLE II.   REVERSALS OF THE ADJECTIVAL POSITION

Book I			Book II		
Hex.	Pent.	Enj.	Hex.	Pent.	Enj.
29 (225)	29 (309)	13 (59)	25 (126)	18 (165)	7
Total: 71 (593): 12%			Total: 50 (312): 16%		

We see that in terms of percentage, reversal is highest in enjambment, next in hexameter, and generally in Book II.   The number of genitive attributes in the patterns of separation may also be of interest.

TABLE III.   GENITIVE ATTRIBUTES

Book I		Book II	
Gen./Noun	Noun/Gen.	Gen./Noun	Noun/Gen.
16	8	11	3
Total: 24: 4%		Total: 14: 4.4%	

Next let us turn to the frequency of separation in the hexameter lines in comparison to that of the pentameter lines.[14]

expression may deserve the most emphatic position; for examples of this, see Cartault (above, note 6) 202 f.

[14] This includes all one-line occurrences, both single separations and interlocked word-order with two (rarely three) sets of adjectives and nouns; the separations in enjambment are naturally excluded.

TABLE IV. "SPERRUNG" IN HEXAMETER VERSUS
PENTAMETER

	Book I		Book II	
Hex.	225	42%	126	43.4%
Pent.	309	58%	165	56.6%
Total	534		291	

The interesting fact about this distribution is the strikingly higher frequency in the pentameter.   Underlying the last table is furthermore a wealth of variations of patterns, slightly higher in the hexameter, as shown below:[15]

TABLE V.   BASIC TYPES OF "SPERRUNG" AND THEIR VARIATIONS

	Hex. I	Pent. I	Hex. II	Pent. II
Basic Types	12	9	10	10
Individual Variations	40	19	26	16

Not only are there somewhat fewer types, and much less variation per type in the pentameter, which could after all be expected due to the central caesura, but the distribution of the variations over the existing patterns is also much more uneven.[16]   The pentameter exhibits a heavy concentration of one or two types, in spite of several other possibilities.   Both these factors contribute to give the separation-patterns of the pentameter a "predictable and monotonous" character, which then has been attributed to the elegiac patterns in general. Such a statement can, however, not be made about the hexameters of Tibullus, as we will see.

It is convenient to divide the patterns into three different categories:

(1) one set of separated adjective (genitive) and noun in one single line, (which also includes some examples of two sets in one line, *not interlocked*, e.g., a——A b——B);

(2) two or more sets in one single line in interlocked word-order, e.g., AbaB;

(3) separations in enjambment.

[15] This requires some explanation: both *types* and *variations* are patterns in terms of relationship to the standard caesurae, A_{1-4}, B_{1-2}, C_{1-2}; as a basic *type* I regard, e.g.,

$$\overset{A_4}{\text{—— a | —— A}}, \text{ and individual variations of it are } \overset{A_3}{\text{—— a | —— A}} \text{ or } \overset{A_4}{\underset{A_3}{\text{—— a | —— A ——}}}.$$

[16] See below, pp. 410 ff.

The six most frequent patterns in the hexameter category are set forth in Table VI. Some of them occur in interlockings as well, which are tabulated in a separate column.[17]

TABLE VI. THE MOST FREQUENT HEXAMETER PATTERNS IN TIBULLUS

		Book I			Book II		
	Patterns	Single	Inter.	Sum	Single	Inter.	Sum
1.	B_1 / A / a ‖ — a/A	41	13	54	24	12	36
2a.	B_1 ‖ C_1 A/a ‖ — a/A	24	5	29	9	1	10
2b.	C_1 A/a ‖ — a/A	8	2	10		1	1
3.	B_1 A/a — a/A	6	5	11	5	3	8
4a.	B_1 A/a ‖ C_2 a/A —	5	5	10	3		3
4b.	B_1 A/a ‖ C_1 a/A —	3	2	5	3	2	5
5.	A_4 A/a — a/A C_1 —	12		12	1	1	2
6.	C_1 A/a — a/A	4		4	6		6

PATTERN 1

This is by far the most frequent in Tibullus as well as in Catullus 64[18] and Cicero's *Aratea*. The pattern seems to be one which the neoterics exploited in particular.[19]

---

[17] In this table are described the *pure* patterns, i.e., without such variations as are described above in Table V. The amounts do not include minor variations of the presented patterns; what is given in the table accounts for 55.5% of the total hexameter occurrences; separations in enjambment are excluded.

[18] Patzer's percentages for Catullus are not based on the total amount of separations, but on the total amount of lines of the poem.

[19] It is identical with Homer's and Apollonius' second pattern: Conrad, *dissertation* 189 f. and *article* 207 f. In Catullus this pattern covers 27.8% of all examples in poem 64, which comes close to Tibullus' use: 24% in Book 1, 28.5% in Book 2; see Table VII and the discussion there.

Heyken is of the opinion that the further apart the two elements are, the more emphasis they get, especially the first element.   It is, however, not quite as simple as that.   Certainly the basic idea underlying separation is emphasis, but many other factors can also contribute to give the element added highlight.   Examples can be found where a short separation, for instance our pattern 6, can be much more effective than a framing, such as pattern 5.   One must rather judge the success of each individual occurrence.

> Ipse seram *teneras* maturo tempore *vitas*[20]   1.1.7

Here the adjective is thrown into relief by a number of factors: it precedes its noun, thereby creating suspense that lingers until the phrase is closed by the addition of the noun; in the meantime, however, the adjective has come to stand out both by its clash between ictus and accent and by means of the juxtaposition of the following word *maturo*, in which lies an antithetic concept.   Conrad states that the key to the effectiveness of interlocked word-order is juxtaposition.   As we see here, juxtaposition plays a very important role in a single separation as well, granted that the possibilities for effective usage are larger in interlocked constructions.

> Tunc vitula *innumeros* lustrabat caesa *iuvencos*,
>   Nunc agna *exigui* est hostia parva *soli*.   1.1.21–22

Here we have to include the whole distich to get the full effect; *innumeros* is stressed not only by its relation to the caesura (clash), but also by the nature of the word itself: due to its length it occupies such a large segment of the line that it graphically describes its own meaning. Furthermore it derives emphasis from the contrasting word *exigui* in the comparable position of the pentameter.   The structural parallelism of these two lines is carried quite far, but enlivened by contrast: *tunc* / *nunc*, *vitula* / *agna* (both elided), *innumeros* / *exigui* (both with clash), and *iuvencos* and *soli* are postponed till the end of the line, where they each conclude a sentence, satisfying the anticipation created by the earlier presented adjective.[21]

> Illa docet *molli* furtim derepere *lecto*,   1.2.19

---

[20] The text is that of F. W. Lenz, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres* (Leyden 1964).

[21] For a similar couplet see 1.4.5 f.

Both *molli* and *furtim* have conflict between ictus and accent; the sensuousness of *molli* is heightened by *furtim* which tells us immediately what kind of relationship we are dealing with.   Here the juxtaposition has cumulative affect.

Iam tenet *infernas* magico stridore *catervas*,   1.2.49

The fact that the poet developed the standard procedure of placing the adjective *before* the noun has been accredited to the adjective's power to depict, to evoke moods, a feature which became a particularly strong poetic concern in the Alexandrian period.   This naturally has greater relevance in those genres which attempt to appeal mainly to the senses, to convey an atmosphere, a feeling rather than a fact, i.e., lyric and elegy.   The frequency of adjectives seems furthermore to be a characteristic of Roman elegy, while both classical and Alexandrian elegy are more restrained in this respect.[22]

The line just quoted is very much a case of flavor and mood conjured up by the adjectives: both end in conflict; *magico* adds an uncanny quality to the already threatening *infernas*, the power of which lingers much longer both because of its antecedent position and because it makes the second foot into a spondee.   Had it been possible to place both *catervas* and *infernas* at the end, the effect would have been greatly weakened.[23]

PATTERN 2

Most of the general observations made under pattern 1 naturally hold for all the separation patterns.   The main reason for separating pattern 2 into *a* and *b* is that in *a* the word before the C1 caesura is particularly emphasized by not only ending in an ictus-accent conflict, but also by following one.   In the table the greater frequency of *a* points to its greater effectiveness.   The fact that pattern 3 exists and is quite common, also in its pentameter equivalent, pattern 6, may

[22] See Patzer (above, note 10) 86 f.

[23] I should like to mention one more feature about the last example, since it will not be dealt with separately. From *infernas* to the end we have in fact a kind of concentric arrangement, abBA; in the separations of the hexameter type ——— a | ——— A or the pentameter type ——— a ‖ ——— A it is quite common to fill the intervening space with a noun and its adjective, unseparated (cf. also 1.1.7).

justify this twofold division of pattern 2.   In the discussion *a* and *b* will be dealt with together, unless otherwise indicated.

This is the epic pattern par excellence, the most common in Homer, Apollonius, Ennius, and Vergil.[24]

> Adde merum vinoque *novos* conpesce *dolores*,   1.2.1

The more important word of the two is emphasized: the pain is *recent*. Also in this pattern, as we see, the tension created by the clash is relieved by the harmony of the noun at the end.

> At mihi contingat *patrios* celebrare *Penates*   1.3.33

Tibullus' respect for old Roman rites is frequently attested in this poem; the two separated elements are here bound together by alliteration.

> At tibi, quae pretio *victos* excludis *amantes*,   2.4.39

The most important feature about the lovers is their defeat (*victos*); but in a most effective juxtaposition, the word on each side of the participle explains and adds to the disgrace (*pretio, excludis*).

The normal order is, as we have stated, adjective-noun, since in most cases the primary notion to be conveyed is embodied in the adjective. In the following example the noun is made to precede in order to carry more weight:

> Et simulacra deum *lacrimas* fudisse *tepentes*   2.5.77

The reversal is expressive and made for a particular purpose.   For the effect is in fact that both adjective and noun become emphatic, just as both words contain an amazing piece of information; the noun is stressed by its unusual position and its clash between ictus and accent, the adjective by being the final word of the line and thus the lasting impression you take away from it.[25]

---

[24] Conrad, *dissertation* 183–88, *article* 203–07; in Catullus 64 I have found twenty-three examples at C1 and thirty-four at C2, which together make up the second most frequent pattern.

[25] Conrad argues (*dissertation* and *article passim*) that when the usual word-order is reversed, i.e., when the separated adjective *follows* the noun, the effect of the adjective in most cases is even more emphatic.   This I have not in general found to be the case in Tibullus.

An interesting feature appears as we look over the examples of this pattern. The space following the C1 caesura is often occupied by a verb.[26] This situation is frequent also in Homer, where this arrangement forms part of the oral formulaic diction. The overwhelming number of examples of pattern 2 does, like the last example, enclose a verb between the two separated elements.[27]

PATTERN 3

This type is similar to pattern 2b, by having the beginning of the first element after the B1 caesura; but it does not have clash of ictus and accent in the first element itself, which therefore must derive its additional stress, if any, from other factors.

The fact that this group is so relatively small in comparison with 2a and b, confirms the greater attraction of ending an adjective at C1, rather than of starting one after B1, i.e., the desirable effect of an ictus-accent conflict. Patterns 3 and 6 are in fact the only patterns in the table without this conflict of the first element.

> Vota cadunt: utinam *strepitantibus* advolet *alis* ... (Amor),   2.2.17

In this example the sheer length of the word contributes to the sensation of overwhelming noise, as does also the onomatopoetic quality of the word.

> Et tu, Bacche tener, *iucundae* consitor *uvae*,   2.3.63

Here the separated adjective is drawn closer to Bacchus, to whom the *sense* of the word could also fit.

PATTERN 4

The examples of 4b are generally unobtrusive, but can at times display a subtle grace, as for instance,

> Ac iuvenum *series teneris inmixta puellis* (Ludit),   1.3.63

which is an example of interlocked word-order as well.

> Bacchus et *adflictis* requiem *mortalibus* adfert,   1.7.41

Here *requiem*, inserted between the two separated words, radiates its effect on both and is effectively juxtaposed to *adflictis*.

---

[26] Conrad, *dissertation* 183 and *article* 203.

[27] Additional examples are 2.2.11, 3.9, 5.47 and 5.117. In the last examples anaphora plays a part in the reversed arrangement of noun and adjective.

Pattern 4a involves some standard procedures of the Latin epic hexameter. "The overwhelming tendency of Latin poets is to seek conflict of ictus and accent in the second, third and fourth feet of the hexameter and coincidence of ictus and accent in the last two feet. The consequence of this is the rarity of a word ending in the arsis of the fifth foot.   Since the fifth foot is regularly a dactyl, it is particularily well suited to third declension singular ablative forms, such as *parte*, *sorte*, *mole*, *arte*, *lumine*, *corpore*, *nomine* and the like."[28] Part of this standard technique is also to place a verb between B1 and C2.   In many of the examples of this pattern when a verb does not fill the whole space between the B1 and the C2 caesurae, the separating element is a verb and a preposition.   Since the fifth foot of a line is so favorable for nouns in the ablative, and since the position between the C1 and C2 caesura is suitable for a long monosyllable, it is understandable that monosyllabic prepositions and the noun they govern should regularly fill these two places.[29]

The examples are not in abundance, but Tibullus uses them with greater effectiveness than the previous variant.

> Annus in *apricis* maturat *collibus* uvas,   1.4.19

The basic structure of the sentence: *annus-maturat-uvas* is broken up by two words which add color and life to the scene; the juxtaposition of *apricis* and *maturat* makes us feel the power of the hot sun.   The fifth foot is indeed filled by a dactylic word, and the space between B1 and C2 by a verb.

> Rure puer *verno* primum de *flore* coronam (Fecit . . .)   2.1.59

Here the freshness is underscored by the cumulative power of *verno*, *primum* and *flore*; and a preposition before C2 governs the word following.

The overall picture of pattern 4a shows that Tibullus' elegies agree with the procedure of the Latin epic hexameter: the fifth foot is

---

[28] Conrad, *article* 215 f.

[29] Conrad, *ibid.*; in his *dissertation* 198 ff. it is also pointed out that this pattern is naturally a good choice when separation is desired and the second element is dactylic and therefore cannot stand at the end. The frequency of this pattern in Catullus and Cicero is explained as depending upon their striving to stay within a one-line sense-unit and avoid enjambment. Cicero's role in this poetic context is in general puzzling and the closeness of his *Aratea* to Catullus 64 is remarkable in view of his opinion of the neoterics.

dominated by a third declension ablative noun, while a finite verb or a particle occupies the place between B1 and C2 in about half the cases.

PATTERN 5

This corresponds to Homer's pattern 3 according to Conrad. Catullus and Cicero use it less frequently than Vergil.[30]

Now we must briefly introduce a phenomenon about which more will be said later, i.e., the rhetorical colon or sense-pause.[31]   Naturally one hexameter line cannot always contain one sentence, and there appears to be a fair consensus on the interrelationship between sense-pause and the various caesurae in the hexameter line.   One scholar, de Groot, has defined the caesura as a boundary for rhetorical cola;[32] i.e., the sense-units tend to fall into certain patterns with regard to their relationship to the caesurae.   Ultimately this phenomenon, as most others we have dealt with here, has its origin in Homer, in the epic formulae.

$$\text{A4} \qquad \text{C1}$$

The pattern presently under discussion, —— a | —— A | ——, does indeed coincide with the pattern of one of the more common cola in Homer, as defined by Parry, i.e., from the beginning of the line to the C1 caesura.[33]   In general three cola are often distributed over two lines: from the beginning of the first line to C1, from C1 to A4 of the following line, from A4 to the end of the second line.   Within the first of these cola our type appears as a frequent pattern of separation in Vergil.[34]   Catullus' and Cicero's sparing use has been commented on.[35]   Tibullus with 14 examples in 621 lines (the hexameters only), i.e., 2.2%, comes close to Vergil's 17 examples in 731 lines of Book 8,

---

[30] Conrad, *dissertation* 200 f., 208 f., *article* 218 f., 222 ff.; Catullus and Cicero, with their predilection for a one-line sense-unit, apparently preferred to have the separated elements as far apart as possible.   Vergil, who feels freer to use enjambment, has more variations available to him. The actual ratio of one-line sense-units is *c.* 50% of Catullus 64, while only *c.* 11% of Vergil, *Aen.* 8.

[31] See below, pp. 419 ff.

[32] A. W. de Groot, "Wesen und Gesetze der Caesur," *Mnemosyne* 2 (1935) 81–154, esp. 90 f.

[33] *L'Epithète traditionelle dans Homère* (Paris 1928) 11.

[34] On the use of this colon in Vergil, see Conrad, *dissertation*, Ch. II, on the word-order of Vergil's *Ecl.* 4.

[35] See above note 30; Catullus never employs our particular variant, i.e., no. 5.

i.e., 2.3%.   Let us look at some of the examples and their implications
for the colometric structure.

> Sanguineas edat illa dapes atque ore cruento (. . . bibat)   1.5.49

The horror of the meal is underscored by the prominent position of the
words describing it; the adjective is especially placed so as to make a
strong imprint on our memory, and again deliberately reinforced by
the last word of the line, *cruento*.   The rhetorical colon ending in C1
is actually also framed by the two separated elements, a marked feature
of the Vergilian technique.[36]

> Nec saevo sis casta metu, sed mente fideli   1.6.75

Saevo is brought into prominence by the clash at A4, and also by the
alliteration with *sis*.   Mainly, however, it is *metu* that catches our
attention; this is the essential word and as such occupies the central
position of the line, emphasized by conflict; its position close to *mente*
skilfully brings the two antithetic moods together, and the link is
stressed by the alliteration of *m*.   The whole line displays a chiastic
pattern of aABb, although the last two words are not separated.

Looking back over the examples, we can find that 11 out of the
total 14 separations end a rhetorical colon at the C1 caesura, and 9 out
of the total 14 hexameter lines have enjambment with the subsequent
pentameter.   Even granting the inherent closeness of the two parts
of the distich, Tibullus in his use of this particular pattern surely stands
closer to Vergil's practice of enjambment than to the preference for a
one-line sense-unit which Catullus 64 displays.[37]

PATTERN 6

The relative rarity of this pattern is no doubt due to the limitations
imposed by the shortness of space. Pronouns are therefore very
frequently found here; of the ten examples four have a pronominal
form for the adjectival part, three for the substantival part.   None of
the examples is very conspicuous due both to the short space allotted
and to the frequent absence of conflict.

---

[36] Conrad, *dissertation*, Ch. II and *passim*, *article* 201 f.
[37] See below, pp. 416 ff., on enjambment and 419 ff. on colometry.

Nunc ad bella trahor, et iam *quis* forsitan *hostis*
Haesura in *nostro* tela gerit *latere*.   1.10.13–14

Hinc fletus rixaeque sonant, *haec* denique *causa*
Fecit ut . . .   2.4.37

Vsque cano Nemesim, sine qua *versus* mihi *nullos*
Verba potest *iustos* aut reperire *pedes*.   2.5.111–12

The last example is the most emphatic, because of the use of a spondaic word immediately following the C1 caesura, thus creating conflict between ictus and accent of the first element.

A marked feature has already become apparent: the frequent enjambment with the pentameter, which is not surprising when the centre of gravity is pushed so far towards the end of the hexameter line.   Of the ten existing examples of this type of separation it is only in *one* that a clause is concluded at the end of the hexameter line.[38] Enjambment is closely connected with patterns of colometry, and we find in fact that in most cases our type of separation is contained within a colon which itself reaches over into the pentameter but starts within the hexameter: in three cases from C1, in five from B1 and in one from A4—a further support for the theory of de Groot.[39]

Before turning to the pentameter, let us sum up the general impressions of the hexameter patterns of separation in Tibullus.   We have found that they closely resemble those of the epic hexameter.   All the six most frequent types are dependent on caesurae, and exploit them for emphasis: four by having the first element before a masculine caesura, two (3 and 6) by letting the first element follow immediately upon a masculine caesura.   Of the four patterns mentioned, three relieve the tension created by the conflict of ictus and accent in the first element by means of the harmony of the second.   There is as a rule no one caesura which has a greater power than any other when used in separation patterns, provided it causes clash.   It all comes down to the effectiveness of the individual example, accompanied by juxtaposition, antithesis, alliteration etc.   I cannot therefore agree with Heyken's statement that if the adjective does not stand either first in the line or

---

[38] 2.3.31; even in that case it is a subordinate clause with its main clause following in the pentameter.
[39] Above p. 398 and note 32.

before B1 (or before the central caesura of the pentameter), the whole expression loses its emphasis.[40]

B

I have already mentioned Patzer's suggestion that —— a | —— A in the neoteric hexameter originates in the equivalent pattern of the pentameter, —— a || —— A, and also Conrad's objection to that theory.[41] In the same article Patzer argues that the exploitation of separation of adjectives and nouns is a specifically Roman feature introduced by the neoterics. He then pulls together the three patterns he finds most frequent in Catullus 64, holding them up as neoteric hallmarks par excellence, and discusses their historical origin. Catullus' patterns are worth looking into for a moment as a background for the patterns of Tibullus, but I prefer not to use Patzer's categories, since they seem too elastic and imprecise: a symbol like —— | a — A does not tell very much at all. I will therefore put next to them my own calculations of Catullus 64, which are based on adherence to distinct caesurae. Without that notion we cannot take the ictus-accent clash into consideration, nor can ultimately any useful comparative study be made.[42] See Table VII.

TABLE VII. THE MOST FREQUENT HEXAMETER PATTERNS IN CATULLUS 64

Patzer	No. of Examples	Present Study	No. of Examples
		B1	
1. —— a | —— A	94	1. —— a | ———— A	104
		B1 C1	
2. —— | a —— A	70	2a. —— | a | —— A	23
		B1 C2	
3. a ———— A	25	2b. —— | a | —— A	34 } 59
		B1	
		2c. —— | a —— A	2
		B1 C2	
		3. —— a | — | A —	33
		4. a ———— A	25

[40] Op. cit. (above, note 7) 26.
[41] Above, p. 388.
[42] Except for the framing pattern (Patzer no. 3) there seems no possibility of reaching the same amounts in our calculations. In the case of pattern 1 Patzer counts the refrain (from line 327 on) only once. His principles are, however, not always clear to me, e.g., if he indeed allowed himself the leeway described in his article, pp. 81 ff., concerning

First, all the separations in the right-hand column occur in Tibullus'

$$\text{——} a \mid \overset{\text{B\scriptsize I}}{\text{——}} A$$

hexameters. Then we see that —— a | —— A ranks number 1 in Poem 64 as well as in Tibullus' hexameters. We can infer that this pattern probably was a favorite with the neoterics in general. Catullus did in any case prefer this pattern to that which was the favorite of the

$$\text{——} a \mid \overset{\text{C\scriptsize I}}{\text{——}} A$$

epic hexameter, —— a | —— A, the top ranking type of Homer, Apollonius, Ennius and Vergil. Patzer suggests that this was done out of a desire to differentiate the epyllion from the genuine epic hexameter of the Homeric tradition. This may very well be so, but in that case Catullus made no distinction between the separation patterns of his epyllion and his elegies. The most frequent patterns of his elegies (65–68) are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII.   THE MOST FREQUENT HEXAMETER
PATTERNS IN CATULLUS 65–68

	Patterns	No. of Examples
1.	——— a │ —————— A Bɪ	38
2a.	——— │ a │ ——— A Bɪ Cɪ	11 ⎫
2b.	——— │ a │ ——— A Bɪ C2	4 ⎬ 19
2c.	——— │ a ——— A Bɪ	4 ⎭
3.	——— a │—│ A ——— Bɪ C2	13
4.	a ——————— A	8

These are exactly the same four patterns that we find in Catullus 64 and occurring in the same order and frequency as there. If we regard Catullus' pattern 2a and b as the epic pattern par excellence, it is

the variation of his three types, then his amounts ought to be higher. Furthermore, it appears to me that the classification of his variations is misleading; e.g., line 15, *aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes*, is given as a variant of no. 3, whereas in fact it has clear and
$$\text{A4 \quad Bɪ}$$
different relationships to available caesurae, a | —— | A ——; in general he seems only to acknowledge "Der Zäsur," i.e., Bɪ.

interesting to note that the percentage of this is lower in the elegies than in Poem 64: 8.5% versus 15.1% in 64, and this in spite of a slightly higher ratio of separations per line in the elegiac hexameter.

But even so, one is struck by the remarkable homogeneity and lack of distinction between the small epic hexameters and the elegiac hexameters. The neoteric effort, as seen through Catullus 64–68,

puts up a joint front against epic taste.[43]   The fact that —— a | —— A is a clear preference in Catullus' elegies certainly must have been decisive for the Augustan elegists. It is clearly mirrored in Tibullus' hexameter patterns, as we know. The next question is of course how this Catullan usage related to Alexandrian practices. The fragmentary state of preservation of several important Alexandrian poets has not encouraged many studies and our information about patterns of *Sperrung* is spotty. J. Van Sickle[44] has provided much valuable information concerning the use of some of the patterns.

First, it appears that Alexandrian elegy in general is richer in examples of *Sperrung* than the Alexandrian hexameter.[45]   It has also been established that in Alexandrian elegy the separation pattern —— a ‖

—— A of the pentameter far outnumbers the use of —— a | —— A in the elegiac hexameter.[46]   This is also the case in Catullus, who not only applies the Alexandrian hexameter pattern to Latin elegy, but also increases the frequency of the use of the equivalent hexameter pattern, i.e., our pattern 1; the general tendency in Catullus is to aim

[43] The few remains we have of Cinna's poetry agree with Catullus' usage; see Morel, FPL, 87 f., esp. numbers 1, 6, and 11; see also the comments on Cinna by J. B. Van Sickle (above, note 6) 498.

[44] Above, note 6.

[45] Patzer (above, note 10) 87 f. and Van Sickle (above, note 6) 490 f.

[46] See also below, pp. 409 ff., in the discussion of the pentameter patterns. Van Sickle (above, note 6) 490 note 10 supplies the following statistics: "For example, Call. *Epig.* (274 verses), hexameter 0, pentameter 21, of which 7 place the subst. first; *Hymn* 5, hexameter 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." The texts for the passages mentioned are found in R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* I–II (Oxford 1949–53). Other Hellenistic epigrammatists are also reported using the pattern, as well as Hermesianax in his *Leontion* fragment.

for a more even distribution of this pattern in the pentameter and the hexameter than do his Alexandrian models. This more balanced usage is followed by most Latin poets. Tibullus' practices do not, however, agree with that of the other Latin elegists.[47]

B1

Since the pattern ——— a | ——— A is relatively uncommon in Alexandrian hexameters and very common in Latin elegiac hexameters, Patzer and Van Sickle both argue that the origin of the Latin hexameter separation of this particular type lies in the equivalent pentameter separation, i.e., ——— a ‖ ——— A.   Conrad's work shows, however, that the origin lies in the Homeric hexameter. Our knowledge of Alexandrian patterns indicates on the other hand that Hellenistic poets made the Homeric precedents into regular patterns, which in turn the neoterics developed further and increased in frequency. Our

B1 C2

third Catullan hexameter pattern, ——— a | — | A ———, does not need much comment.[48]   The caesurae involved are the two by far most important for Catullus in general, and they occur in a large number of combinations.   The frequent use of C2 as word-endings may perhaps be interpreted as a Grecism in Catullus, since Latin poetry in general was much more fond of those caesurae which created conflict between ictus and accent.   In Tibullus this is certainly the case.[49]

The fourth Catullan pattern is based on the framing principle.   This may indeed be a neoteric feature, but Tibullus uses it very sparingly. In the hexameters I find only three examples in Book I and two in Book II,[50] while it is somewhat more common in his pentameters, where it constitutes pattern 6.

A recent work on Catullus by D. Ross[51] investigates the differences between the three main groups of poems: the polymetrics, the longer poems 61–68, and the epigrams, assuming that Catullus is himself responsible for the arrangement of the poems.   He shows convincingly

---

[47] See below, pp. 410 ff.
[48] Cf. 64.86, 133, 230, 303, 335; cf. the elegies: 66.17 and 79; 67.33; 68.7 and 107.
[49] See above, Table VI.
[50] 1.1.17, 7.29, (10.51); 2.1.67, 5.69.
[51] *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1966).

that the two former groups are the more neoteric ones; the epigram, Ross argues, was by Catullus' time already sufficiently incorporated into a Roman tradition to be less open to novelty and experimentation. He bases this opinion mainly on the use of vocabulary, but a minor study of word-order and *Sperrung* confirms his views. Thus the epigrams use *Sperrung* much more sparingly and certain patterns of separation which are shown to be neoteric innovations or exploitations are very rare indeed in the epigrams, while quite frequent in the elegies. Among these neoteric hallmarks he counts the framing pattern of separation, pattern 4 and also the preceding pattern 3.[52]   Ross further finds that 1 and 2 of our Catullan patterns were relatively common in Latin pre-neoteric epic, and he does not therefore regard them as particularly neoteric, in spite of the many occurrences in Catullus 64. The neoterics should therefore be regarded as responsible for the frequency, but not for the introduction of these patterns into Latin hexameter.

In summing up the discussion about the hexameter patterns we can then conclude that the neoterics followed and further developed— especially in frequency—the usage of the Alexandrian elegists, and that Tibullus generally follows the anti-epic standards set by the neoterics for the separations of adjectives and nouns.   What, however, is most striking about Tibullus' separation patterns in the hexameter is a remarkable striving for variety; this tendency will become even more evident when we study the pentameter patterns, where so great a variety is not found.

Above (p. 391) we already noted that both types and individual variations of types, not surprisingly, were more numerous in the hexameter.   Naturally the situation varies somewhat among the individual elegies.   I will give a few examples to illustrate the point. The figures account only for one set of separation in a single hexameter line.

Ordinarily there is, as one might expect, an equivalent situation in the pentameter, i.e., when the hexameter is rich in variations, so is the pentameter and vice versa.   In some cases the relative plainness of single hexameter patterns indicated above is compensated for by a

---

[52] See especially the section on word-order, pp. 132–37 and his tables p. 134.

rather large number of examples of interlocked word-order and/or separations in enjambment. Such is, for example, the case with 1.6 or 1.9. But in 2.4 simplicity prevails in all categories of separation. In 2.5 there are a great number of variations of single separations; in

TABLE IX. REPETITION AND DISTRIBUTION OF PATTERNS OF "SPERRUNG"

Poem	Individual Types of Separation	Amount of Repetitions among these Types	Distributions of Repetitions over Different Types
1.1	14	6	3 types
1.4	11	11	8 ex. of pattern 1, 3 of pattern 2
1.5	9	1	
1.6	9	None	
1.7	6	10	9 ex. of pattern 1, 1 of pattern 2
1.10	11	5	4 types
2.5	16	8	4 ex. of pattern 1, rest distributed
2.6	13	3	All of pattern 1
2.4	7	3	3 types

2.6 there are slightly fewer and in these cases of many single separations there is naturally less room for interlockings, although there are also exceptions to this condition, i.e., poems which in fact are rich in both single separations and interlockings, as Poem 1.4.

Generally speaking, there is a larger concentration of separations and accompanying intricacies in poems which also for other reasons can be regarded as more formal, i.e., as exhibiting more salient Alexandrian or neoteric features, such as 1.4 and 1.7. But such a concentration is also found in 1.3 and 2.1, a fact which will receive more comment below.

There is then an interesting and noticeable difference between the individual poems with regard to the distribution and combinations of separations. The reason for this differing degree of experimentation is not always possible to establish; we will analyze some of the effects of this varying treatment in longer passages at the end of this study.

Now let us turn to an investigation of the usage of *Sperrung* in the pentameter, in interlocked word-order and in enjambment.

PATTERNS OF *SPERRUNG* IN THE PENTAMETER

TABLE X.[53] THE MOST FREQUENT PENTAMETER PATTERNS IN TIBULLUS

		Book I			Book II		
	Patterns	Single	Inter.	Sum	Single	Inter.	Sum
1.	———$\frac{A}{a}$‖———$\frac{a}{A}$	149	34	183	73	23	96
2.	——— a ‖ —∪∪| A ———	13	13	26	5	5	10
3a.	$\overset{A4}{———\ a\ \|}$ ——— A	14	6	20	3		3
3b.	$\overset{A3}{———\ a\ \|}$ ——— A	5	1	6	4	1	5
4.	$\frac{A}{a}$——— ‖$\frac{a}{A}$———	4	6	10	4	8	12
5.	$\frac{A}{a}$——— ‖—∪∪|$\frac{a}{A}$ ———	3	9	12	3	4	7
6.	$\frac{A}{a}$——— $\frac{a}{A}$	9	2	11	7	1	8

PATTERN 1

The overwhelming preference for pattern 1 has already been referred to, as well as its possible relation to the equivalent pattern in the hexameter.[54]   Ross concludes that —— a ‖ —— A is an especially neoteric feature on the basis that in the Catullan distichs it is twice as frequent in the elegies as in the epigrams.[55]

The diaeresis makes our pattern 1 natural and the phenomenon develops into something quite formalistic and at times monotonous.[56] Therefore the examples are not always as charged from an interpretative point of view as the equivalent pattern 1 of the hexameter; and this is the case in spite of the fact that both elements in the pentameter separation have conflict of ictus and accent.   In other words: the amount of repetition blunts the potential effect.

[53] The material in this table accounts for 52.3% of all pentameter separations; those in enjambment are excluded. Let us for our convenience set up a series of names for the relevant caesurae:

$$- \smile \smile \mid - \mid \smile \smile - \parallel - \smile \smile - \downarrow \smile \smile \mid -$$

A3 A4   central

(bucolic diaeresis
of the pentameter)

[54] See above pp. 401 f. and 403 f.
[55] Ross (above, note 51) 136 f.
[56] See above pp. 403 f. on the frequency of this pattern in the Hellenistic elegiac pentameter.

Generally the last word of the pentameter is considered more emphatic than the last word of the hexameter, not only because of the clash, but also because of the finality derived from being the concluding word of the whole distich.

<div align="center">Ignoscas: <i>capiti</i> sint precor illa <i>meo.</i>   1.2.12</div>

In this line the colon is framed by the two separated words, which makes them both quite noticeable. This phenomenon, which we will return to below,[57] is frequent in the pentameter, most probably because it is one of the means available to the artist for counterbalancing the repetitive effect of the central caesura.

<div align="center">Neu prope <i>fulgenti</i> lumina ferte <i>face.</i>   1.2.38</div>

Here the separated parts are connected by alliteration; <i>fulgenti</i> is emphasized both by its clash of ictus and accent and by the additional force derived from the juxtaposed <i>lumina.</i>

At times, as we have seen, it is only one juxtaposed word which helps to highlight one or the other of the separated elements. In the following three examples practically every word in the line as well as its specific position adds a particular shade to the whole, so that a very effective impression is created of delay and questioning anxiety, fragrant flower-beds and scorching heat, respectively.

<div align="center">Quaerebam <i>tardas</i> anxius usque <i>moras.</i>   1.3.16</div>

<div align="center">Floret <i>odoratis</i> terra benigna <i>rosis</i>;   1.3.62</div>

<div align="center">Et Canis <i>arenti</i> torreat arva <i>siti,</i>   1.4.42</div>

The force of the juxtaposition is sometimes additive, sometimes antithetical, as we have seen. The latter is naturally more dramatic and these examples are also in fact more numerous.

<div align="center">Neu timeat <i>celeres</i> tardior agna <i>lupos.</i>   2.1.20</div>

I should like to present one more example of juxtaposition where it seems to me that a rather sly suggestion is implied. Talking about the perversity of the inspired followers of Magna Mater, Tibullus says:

<div align="center">Et secet ad <i>Phrygios</i> vilia membra <i>modos.</i>   1.4.70</div>

[57] Pp. 420 ff.

Is not the baseness of *vilia* extended to everything Phrygian by the closeness of the two words flanking the central caesura?

PATTERN 2

Pattern 2 could be called a variation of pattern 1, to be used when the second element is a trochaic word.[58]   Its most effective use is in interlocking with other patterns of separation which will be dealt with later.   Here are a few specimens of a single set separation:

> Versatur *celeri* Fors levis *orbe* rotae.   1.5.70
> Cum tibi non *solita* corpus ab *arte* movet.   1.9.66

In these examples the adjectives, in which the essence of the expression lies, are accordingly emphasized by their position.

PATTERN 3

This type is close to pattern 6, the framing of a line, but our main version, i.e., 3a, differs from pattern 6 by having clash between ictus and accent of the first separated element.   Pattern 3 is primarily used in single separations for obvious reasons.

> Hic *placidam* niveo pectore pellit *aquam*,   1.4.12

Are the alliterations of *p* intended to suggest the splashing sound of water?

> Et *durum* terrae rusticus urget *opus*,   1.9.8

The spondees of the first hemistich underscore the heaviness of the labor.

In the table I have also included a close but less emphatic variant for separations, i.e., 3b, where the first element consists of a pyrrhic word, while in the main variant the first element must end in a long syllable. Words ending at A3 accordingly do not have conflict of ictus and accent.

> Cum *mea* ridebunt *vana* magisteria.   1.4.84

PATTERN 4

Pattern 4 is less emphatic than the previous ones; neither word has a clash of ictus and accent, and it is the last word of the line which carries weight, due to its position at the end of the distich, as we said above.

---

[58] Dactylic words are rare here, because of the tendency to avoid a final monosyllable. See E. H. Sturtevant (above, note 12) 80 f.

This pattern is thus more frequent in interlockings than in single separations.

The following example is among the most interesting:

>   *Illius* est nobis *lege* colendus Amor.   2.4.52

PATTERN 5

In the next pattern the elements are more widely separated, and we meet it most frequently in interlockings.[59]

>   *Crura* licet dura compede *pulsa* sonent.   1.7.42

>   (Nec taedebit . . .) *Balba*que cum puere dicere *verba* senem.   2.5.94

PATTERN 6

The principle of framing is, as mentioned earlier, one of the main factors operating in this kind of *Sperrung*. In the epic hexameter it is common from Homer on. It is frequent in Ennius and Lucretius and seems generally to be more a Latin than a Greek favorite. In elegy, however, it is, as mentioned above,[60] more common in the pentameter than in the hexameter and Tibullus is no exception.[61]

>   (Nondum caeruleas pinus contempserat undas,)
>   *Effusum* ventis praebueratque *sinum*,   1.3.38

The spread of the sail extends in front of our eyes as the expression extends to comprise the whole line.

>   *Ipse* dedit cupidis fallere posse *deus*.   1.8.56

In the first part of this study we were able to conclude that Tibullus in his hexameter patterns had achieved the impression of great variety. That this was a conscious effort dictated by personal choice on his part was shown for instance by a table in Heyken which indicates a much heavier concentration on our hexameter pattern 1 in both Propertius I and II and in Ovid's *Heroides*.[62]

[59] See below pp. 412 ff.

[60] See above p. 404.

[61] I have found 19 examples in Tibullus' pentameters: 1.3.20, 38, 78; 1.4.8, 44, 68; 1.6.76; 1.7.20; 1.8.56, 66; 1.9.20; 2.1.10, 40; 2.3.14c, 72; 2.4.50; 2.5.10, 72; 2.6.46. For the use in the hexameter, see above p. 404 and note 49.

[62] J. Heyken, (above, note 7), second table p. 17; in 100 lines of text the following percentile use of hexameter pattern 1 occurs: Tib.1:27.5, Tib.2:23.7, Prop.1:44.9, Prop.2:56.1, Ovid, *Her.*: 38.9.

The same cannot be said about the pentameter patterns.   There is in Tibullus' poems an overwhelming frequency of pattern 1: 59% and 57.8% of all pentameter separations, respectively, in the two books. In this respect he far surpasses Propertius I and II and Ovid's *Heroides*.[63] The tendency towards this type of separation has its origin far back and is inherent in the pentameter structure.   The fact that Tibullus shows this heavy dominance of pattern 1 in the pentameter over the use of the equivalent pattern in the hexameter puts him closer to Hellenistic elegiac practices than the other Latin elegists including Catullus, where a more even distribution is at hand.[64]

The desire for parallel construction in the two halves of the pentameter is well known and the *Sperrung* is one form in which this tendency is expressed.   In many cases it creates a kind of syntactical rhyme or homeoteleuton,[65] although it is impossible to tell to what extent this was in fact an intended effect or often simply produced by the nature of Latin declensions.[66]   The phenomenon naturally becomes more frequent with the growing taste for separations of epithet and noun in the Alexandrian period.   Tibullus' treatment of the pentameter separations clearly displays the formalization of the distich by the concentration on pattern 1 and this is something that he learned from the Alexandrians[67] and from Catullus who employs pentameter pattern 1 to a very high degree, while the other elegists have a more even distribution of pattern 1 in hexameter and pentameter. In Catullus, 66% of his pentameter separations follow this pattern,

---

[63] Heyken (above, note 7) second table p. 17: in 100 lines of text the following percentile use of pentameter pattern 1 occurs: Tib.1:72.5, Tib.2:76.3, Prop.1:55.1, Prop. 2:43.9, Ovid, *Her.*: 61.1.

[64] See above pp. 402 f.

[65] See I. N. Herescu, *La Poésie Latine* (Paris 1960) 135 ff., for his precise definitions of these concepts. There is indeed a widespread inconsistency in the usage of the terms among scholars. What we are dealing with now in the Tibullan pentameter is homeoteleuton, i.e., similar sounds of the *last syllable* of two words. He never directly comments on the pattern under discussion, —— a ‖ —— A, in the pentameter. For a survey of the history of rhyme, see E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig 1898, repr. Darmstadt 1958) 810–908; for a briefer treatment, see L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge 1963) 25–34.

[66] 21% of Tibullus' pentameters show homeoteleuton between one element before the central caesura and the other at the end of the line; 22% of Catullus' pentameters have the same, but 27% of Propertius 1.

[67] See the discussion above pp. 403 ff.

which is less than Tibullus in relation to total pentameter lines, since fewer pentameter separations are found per number of lines in Catullus than in Tibullus. The impression of monotony derived from the pentameter also depends on the fact that the frequency of separation in the Tibullan pentameter *in general* is higher than in the hexameter (the reverse is true of Catullus). In addition, the central caesura and the avoidance of enjambment from the hexameter to the pentameter limit severely the possibility for variation. There is then a discrepancy in Tibullus' handling of the hexameter and the pentameter separations. We may perceive the heavy use of pentameter pattern 1 as monotonous formalism that he could—or would—not liberate himself from. But being an accomplished artist, Tibullus is likely to have taken a different view. The Alexandrians had already firmly set the pattern, and this tradition Tibullus follows more closely than the other Latin elegists, as seen above. We may marvel at the fact that this feature did indeed have the artistic sanction it had, but we must accept that our sensitivity is perhaps different.

When we compare, then, the effectiveness of the individual patterns, it is again the hexameter that ranks higher. No single hexameter type was a priori superior to another. But as can be seen in the examples discussed, the usage of the pentameter types is frequently less striking, less skillful in suggesting that other dimension, that psychological undercurrent or colorful allusion which was to be found in many hexameter separations. Apart from pattern 1 and 6 not many interesting examples appear in the pentameter. Especially in 3 and 5, where the elements are widely separated, the impression is often one of flatness.[68] A tighter construction seems to give a more successful result.

INTERLOCKED WORD-ORDER

When the elements of two sets of nouns and adjectives are separated in ancient verse they frequently appear in interlocked word-order.[69] Homer has no genuine example of this phenomenon, but Apollonius

---

[68] In addition to some of the examples quoted above pp. 409 ff. see, e.g., 1.1.6, 12; 1.8.16; 1.10.8; 2.6.8 of patterns 3a and b and 1.6.80 of pattern 5.

[69] Tibullus has, however, a few examples where this is not the case, e.g., aAbB, as in 1.1.13, 1.6.33, 1.7.1, 2.1.62, 2.6.31.

uses it often and his most common sequence is abAB.[70]   Interlocked word-order also appears in Lucretius, Cicero and Catullus, but is only sparingly found in Ennius.[71]   In Latin epic another sequence-pattern besides abAB is also popular: a concentric arrangement, abBA.[72]   The particular distribution of these elements, which (at least by later literary critics) was considered the ideal, involves placing the two adjectives before the B caesura and the two nouns after the C caesura and inserting the verb in the intervening space.[73]   Heyken also has a section discussing the distribution of two nouns and two adjectives over the line and their most common sequences.[74]   But since he here deals not only with *separated* adjectives and nouns, but with placements of such words in general, a great part of his intricate tables is irrelevant to us.   His conclusions are—as in other types of separations—based on the too limited assumption that in all cases the most stressed positions in a line are the initial and the one before the B caesura.

Table XI shows the number of lines where interlocked word-order

TABLE XI. FREQUENCY OF INTERLOCKED WORD-ORDER

| Hexameter I | 22 | Pentameter I | 33 | Book I | 55 |
| Hexameter II | 16 | Pentameter II | 22 | Book II | 38 |

occurs in Tibullus, i.e., Book I has one example every 14.8 lines, while Book II has one every 11.2 lines.

These interlockings are—just as are the single separations—more frequent in the pentameter and are distributed over the following sequences.

We see that the clear favorite is abAB, a type common already in Alexandrian hexameters; the concentric pattern is much more sparingly used, and occurs preferably in the pentameter, where there are ten examples, while there is only one in the hexameter.   It seems natural

[70] Conrad (above, note 2) *dissertation* 86–91.

[71] Conrad (above, note 2) *article* 234 f. states that both the pattern abAB and abBA are absent in Ennius.

[72] I have chosen to include both the concentric patterns and the interlocked ones in the same category, since many of the same artistic intentions and effects are found operating in both. Table III shows the number of concentric examples as such.

[73] Conrad, *dissertation* 224 ff., *article* 234 ff.

[74] *Op. cit.* (above, note 7) 77–99.

TABLE XII. TYPES OF INTERLOCKED WORD-ORDER

Hexameter I		Pentameter I		Hexameter II		Pentameter II	
Pattern	No. of Examples	Pattern	No. of Examples	Pattern	No. of Examples	Pattern	No. of Examples
abAB	15	abAB	16	abAB	11	abAB	18
AbaB	5	abBA	7	AbaB	2	abBA	2
(aBcAbC	1)[75]	Abab	7	abBA	1	ABab	1
aBAb	1	aBAb	2	aBAb	1	AbaB	1
	—	aBbA	1	ABab	1		—
	22		—		—		22
			33		16		

enough that the pentameter structure favored this arrangement around the central caesura, but possibly this might be a development of Tibullus' own desire for symmetry, or part of the standardization of the early Augustan period. For insofar as Catullus 65–68 give a representative picture of neoteric practice, the concentric arrangement was not so distributed then. It occurs eight times in Catullus' elegies: five times in the hexameter, three in the pentameter.[76] Tibullus' use of interlockings is in general much more sparing than Catullus', who shows one example every 6.2 lines, compared to Tibullus' one example every 14.8 and 11.2 lines, respectively, in Books I and II. According to Ross both abAB and abBA are neoteric hallmarks and absent in the epigrams.[77]

The possibilities for effective juxtaposition are naturally increased in interlocked word-order and the poet has achieved many interesting results. At times the cumulative force of suggestive words strung one after the other is striking, as in

Tunc *nitidus* plenis *confisus rusticus* agris (Ingeret) 2.1.21
      X   X   ab(a)AB

[75] Only in one case in Tibullus are three nouns and adjectives involved: 1.6.83 (aBcAbC): *Hanc Venus ex alto flentem sublimis Olympo / Spectat . . .*

[76] 65.7 and 21; 67.33; 68.67 and 115; 65.6; 68.142 and 144.

[77] *Op. Cit.* (above, note 51) 134 f. Norden (*Aeneid* VI³, 394 f.) claims both abAB and abBA are particularly neoteric due to their relative scarcity in Hellenistic poetry. Patzer, "Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters," *MH* 12 (1955) 85 f. disagrees and emphasizes their occurrence among the younger Alexandrians.

in which line the three adjectives all underline the farmer's contentment, and in

> Non mihi *pigra* nocent hibernae *frigora* noctis,[78] 1.2.31
> $\qquad\qquad$ X $\qquad\qquad$ X $\quad$ abAB

where each word specifies the discomfort of winter.

> *Ipsa* bipenne suos caedit *violenta* lacertos $\quad$ 1.6.47
> $\qquad$ X $\qquad\qquad\qquad$ X $\quad$ AbaB

This sentence is a very skillful construction aimed at suspense; *ipsa* and *suos* are both stressed due to their positions and thus add to the gruesome aspects, but not until the last word of the line do we find out how much harm she has in fact done to herself.

> Atque *aliquis senior* veteres *veneratus* amores $\quad$ 2.4.47
> $\qquad\quad$ X $\qquad\qquad$ X $\quad$ (a)AbaB

This last example combines several of the features noted above; cumulative effect of each added word as well as alliteration; the *a*'s frame the line and the two juxtaposed *v*'s tie together two words whose meanings are meant to be related.

In most cases of interlocked word-order we are dealing with combinations of those single patterns of separation we have already met, for instance in 2.4.47 (quoted above) hexameter patterns 4a and 2a are combined; in 2.3.72 (quoted above) pentameter patterns 6 and 2. 2.1.21 (quoted above) combines hexameter pattern 1 and a type that was

not frequent enough to get into our table, i.e., $\overline{\quad}$ a $|$ $\overset{A4}{\overline{\quad}}$ $|$ $\overset{C2}{A}$ $\overline{\quad}$.

Basically it is the same procedure as the one operating in interlockings in the epic hexameter, except for greater or lesser frequency of certain patterns.[79]

---

[78] Conrad, *article* 235 f. discusses this particular distribution where the first adjective is followed by a verb and the three remaining words come after the main caesura. It is said to be a common type in Latin epic hexameters; in Tibullus, however, it is rather rare.   If any type prevails at all, it is the so-called "ideal" (cf. above pp. 412 f.).

[79] In the examples on pp. 414 f. only some types of interlockings are represented. References to other types given in Table XII are:

Hexameter:	aBcAbC	1.6.83
	aBAb	1.10.17
	abBA	2.1.3
	aBAb	2.4.41
	(a)ABab	2.5.57

SEPARATION IN ENJAMBMENT

In Homer, where the noun normally precedes the adjective, the examples of "deferred" adjectives are mostly appositional. With Apollonius the situation changes, however, both in single line separations and in separation in enjambment, and the adjective becomes the first element in the majority of cases.

The two most common patterns of enjambment in the *Argonautica* are, according to Conrad, the following:

         B   C

1. —— | x | (xxx)

    x —— | ——

i.e., the second element at the beginning of the second line, and the first element somewhere after the B caesura.

2. ———— x

   A   B   C

   x | (x) | (x) | ——

i.e., the first element at the end of the first line and the second element before either A, B or C caesura of the following line. These two types account for the great majority of separations in enjambment in the Latin epic hexameter.[80]

In Tibullus, however, this is not quite the case. Of course we are dealing with a different meter, but, *mutatis mutandis*, the basic situation is fairly similar. The total number of examples amounts to 79;[81] thirteen of these are separated not by another word, but merely by the ends and beginnings of lines, as in

      Flava Ceres, tibi sit nostro de rure *corona*
         Spicea, . . .   1.1.15

Pentameter:	abAB	2.5.16
	AbaB	1.6.22
	aBAb	1.7.26
	aBbA	1.3.4
	ABab	2.5.50

[80] Conrad (above, note 2) *dissertation* 241–53 and *article* 235–48.

[81] 1.1.15 f., 19 f., 27 f., 39 f., 49 f., 67 f.; 1.2.13 f., 33 f., 59 f.; 1.3.19 f., 39 f., 43 f., 59 f., 67 f., 73 f., 77 f., 83 f., 87 f., 91 f., 93 f., (bis); 1.4.21 f., 33 f., 43 f., 53 f., 59 f., 71 f., 79 f.; 1.5.5 f., 13 f., 25 f., 45 f., 67 f.; 1.6.5 f., 37 f., 45 f., 63 f., 67 f., 73 f., 85 f.; 1.7.1 f., 15 f., 17 f., 27 f., 35 f., 39 f.; 1.8.25 f., 31 f., 37 f., 57 f.; 1.9.9 f., 11 f., 31 f., 37 f., 59 f.; 1.10.11 f., 35 f., 49 f. (bis); 2.1.7 f., 27 f., 55 f., 61 f., 79 f., 87 f., 89 f.; 2.2.13 f.; 2.3.45 f., 73 f.; 2.4.17 f., 29 f.; 2.5.7 f., 43 f., 67 f., 97 f., 99 f.; 2.6.19 f., 31 f., 47 f.;

Of the remaining 66 examples, half are accounted for by the two patterns described, but with a very uneven distribution: 27 for pattern 1, and 6 for pattern 2.   The other half consists of individual patterns.

Let us first look at pattern 1: the latter element comes at the beginning of the second line and there is a choice of three possibilities for the placement of the first.   The Tibullan distribution is fairly similar to the one in Latin epic hexameters, as presented by Conrad.   There the most frequent placement is to have the first element after the C caesura;[82] placements before the C or B caesurae are equal in number.

Before studying the effect of these patterns in the actual text, we must point out that in all Tibullan cases we are dealing with enjambment only from hexameter to pentameter.[83]

> Te meminisse decet, quae plurima *voce* peregi
>   *Supplice,* . . .   1.2.13–14

In this case the adjective is made prominent by its isolation; it stands both first in the line and last in a clause which is the central of three rhetorical cola distributed over two lines.

> At *scelerata* iacet *sedes* in nocte profunda
>   *Abdita,*   1.3.67–68

The noun has two adjectives and the later one, *abdita*, is prominently placed at the beginning of the line; *abdita* and *sedes* are separated by a prepositional phrase, intimately connected with both words.   These examples also remind us of the fact that the reversal of adjective and noun is most common in enjambment.[84]   Naturally Tibullus' use of pattern 1 is closer to the practice of the epic hexameter than is his use of pattern 2, where the poet has to deal more extensively with the pentameter and its different caesurae.

We have already noticed that pattern 2 is not strikingly frequent in Tibullus' elegies in comparison with pattern 1.   There is also a difference in the placing of the second element in pattern 2 in relation to the caesura; in the Latin epic hexameter the position before the B caesura

---

[82] In Tibullus preferably after C2, e.g., 1.5.13 f., 67 f., 1.8.31 f., 57 f.; 2.4.29 f., 2.6.19 f.

[83] See below pp. 419 f. and 427 f.

[84] See above, Table II.

is most common, then before the C caesura, lastly before the A caesura.[85] In Tibullus the order goes B, A, C.

> At tu casta precor maneas, sanctique *pudoris*
> Adsideat *custos* sedula semper anus. 1.3.83–84

Both the separated elements are key-words in the distich, and the poet has made sure that they are stressed, the first by its final position, the second by its placement before the central caesura with clash of ictus and accent.

The other half of the separations in enjambment is made up of single variations, some very closely related to those discussed, and some rather complex with, for instance, several adjectives and one noun, or several nouns and one adjective. And just as single patterns of separation could be combined in interlocked word-order, so there is interlocked word-order combined with separation in enjambment. It is in fact very frequent, occurring in one third of the total number.

> *Fictilia* antiquus primum sibi fecit agrestis
>   *Pocula,* de facili conposuitque luto. 1.1.39–40
>   X   X

> *Talis* ad Haemonium *Nereis* Pelea quondam
>   Vecta est frenato *caerula* pisce *Thetis.* 1.5.45–46
>   X   X

The last example is very rich and interesting. Thetis dominates the distich: *talis–Thetis* is the beginning and the end, and in addition she makes her appearance known once more in each line. The two other separations of the couplet are very skillfully worked in: *Haemonium–Pelea* surround the epithet for his bride as if embracing her; *caerula*, the standard epithet for the sea, is flanked by *frenato–pisce*, which add concrete detail to the more general nature of the adjective flanked.

A favorite pattern of Tibullus is the following:

> Hunc cecinere diem Parcae *fatalia* nentes
>   *Stamina,* non ulli *dissoluenda* deo, 1.7.1–2
>   X   X

i.e.,
$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C}_1 \\
\text{——} \mid \text{X ——} \\
\text{X ——} \parallel \text{X ——}
\end{array}
$$

[85] Conrad, Table in *article* (above, note 2) 245.

This particular placement of three combined factors, *fatalia-stamina-dissoluenda*, recurs three more times in the same poem (1.7.17 f., 35 f., 39 f.).   It is mainly by juxtaposition that these three words are given added relief: the ominous overtone of *fatalia* is driven home by *Parcae-nentes*: and the same point is being made from a slightly different angle by the finality of *dissoluenda* flanked by *non ulli-deo*.   Tibullus thus skillfully uses the *Sperrung* also in enjambment, adapting the placements of elements as closely as the meter allows to the practices established by the epic hexameter.

At several points we have had the occasion to touch upon the related topic of colometry.[86]   The distribution of sense-units over the line has its ultimate origin in the Homeric formulae, and is in general also in later poetry closely related to the caesurae.   The following section is not intended to be a complete study of Tibullus' rhythms of rhetorical cola, but merely to provide a few general observations.[87]

Conrad's study of Vergil's colometry showed that Vergil and Horace shared the same methods of refinements, although working in different meters.[88]   The elegiac distich imposes even greater rigidity for sense-distribution.   But nevertheless I think we can conclude that Tibullus attempted, as far as possible, to mold his verse in accordance with the same artistic demands of sophisticated variety as his two contemporary fellow poets.

Naturally the distich is a basic unit for sense-division.   This is crystallized in the so-called law of the distich, that is, the hexameter and the pentameter together make up a sense unit with one sentence in each line:

> Num Veneris Magnae violavi numina verbo,
> Et mea nunc poenas inpia lingua luit?   1.2.81–82

Occasionally a sentence comprises two or more distichs,[89] and in such a framework much variation can be found.   The law of the distich is furthermore not altogether dominant but appears, as far as the chosen material indicates, to be less frequent in Book II.[90]   This

[86] See above, pp. 397–400.
[87] They are based on the study of 1.1,2,3 and 2.1,2,3.
[88] *Dissertation* (above, note 2), ch. II on the word-order of Vergil, *Ecl.* 4.
[89] E.g., 1.1.1–4.
[90] In 1.1,2 and 3 the law of the distich exists in *c.* 25–30% of all distichs, in 2.1,2 and 3 in *c.* 20%.

law is mixed with a large number of other types of cola, and great care is thus taken as in the case of the patterns of *Sperrung*, to avoid monotony by repetition of the same arrangement in several consecutive lines. The following brief section illustrates this striving for variety:

> Ipse seram teneras maturo tempore vites
>   Rusticus et facili grandia poma manu;
> Nec spes destituat, sed frugum semper acervos
>   Praebeat et pleno pinguia musta lacu.
> Nam veneror, seu stipes habet desertus in agris
>   Seu vetus in trivio florida serta lapis,
> Et quodcumque mihi pomum novos educat annus,
>   Libatum agricolae ponitur ante deo.
> Flava Ceres, tibi sit nostro de rure corona
>   Spicea, quae templi pendeat ante fores,
> Pomosisque ruber custos ponatur in hortis,
>   Terreat ut saeva falce Priapus aves.   1.1.7–18

Lines 7–8 consist of one sentence, the two parts of which share subject and verb; the first part contains all of the hexameter and up to the A3 caesura of the pentameter. Lines 9–10 have two sentences, one from the beginning of the hexameter to the B1 caesura, the other covering the rest of the distich; the last sentence has two parts of the same nature as in the previous distich and with the intervening break at the same place, the A3 caesura. The next sentence includes lines 11–12 and contains three clauses, the first of which ends at the A4 caesura, the two latter compressed into sharing verb and direct object and bound together by anaphora (*seu*), which is a quite common phenomenon; this method of balancing two shorter cola in one line with a longer in the following is frequently found, also with breaks at the B1 and the C1 caesurae;[91] lines 13–14 have one clause to each line— an example of the law of the distich; 15–16 include two clauses, the first of which ends at the A3 caesura of the pentameter; lines 17–18 are another example of the law of the distich.

We can already begin to draw some conclusions. The boundaries for the rhetorical cola fall exclusively at regular caesurae.[92] In addition

---

[91] E.g., 1.3.89 f. and 2.1.5 f.

[92] Sense-pauses occur almost always in Homer and always in Callimachus at A1–4, B1–2, C1–2; see Conrad, *dissertation* (above, note 2) 46 and *article* 197; cf. the opinion of A. W. de Groot (above, note 32) 17 ff. and note 32.

to the A4 and B1 caesurae appearing in the quoted passage, the C1 and C2 caesurae are also frequently so used, as in

> Haec cantu finditque solum Manesque sepulchris
>   Elicit et tepido devocat ossa rogo;   1.2.47–48
> Siquis et inprudens adspexerit, occulat ille
>   Perque deos omnes se meminisse neget: 1.2.39–40

A colometric division at the central caesura of the pentameter is on the other hand rare.   The only example in Book 1.1–3 is in the concluding distich of 1.1:

> Ferte et opes; ego conposito securus acervo
>   Despiciam dites despiciamque famem.

Here the caesura of the pentameter is used to emphasize the antithesis the poet is setting up.

Lines 1.2.47 f. also bring up another phenomenon, which is a noteworthy part of colometry, and that is framing of a colon by the two elements in *Sperrung*: (*et*) *tepido . . . rogo*; other examples of this are 1.1.34, 1.1.40, 1.3.65, and 1.2.12.   It appears to be particularly frequent in the pentameter (see above pp. 408 f.).   The lines can thus exhibit an intricate pattern, where the varying rhythm of colometry is woven together with the differing patterns of separation.

An additional way of marking the various cola is by anaphora, as mentioned.   It is used to combine cola with a distich, as in

> Tum victus abiere feri, tum consita pomus,
>   Tum bibit inriguas fertilis hortus aquas,   2.1.43–44

where all three cola are introduced by the same word.[93]   Or anaphora can be used to form a chiastic pattern, as in

> Parva seges satis est, satis est requiescere lecto   1.1.43–44

At times whole consecutive distichs are marked by anaphora for purpose of emphasis, as in 1.1.17–22.

We have so far in this study analyzed only smaller sections from which the whole poem is ultimately constituted.   Now that we have acquired some familiarity with the individual pebbles of the mosaic, it is time to look at a few longer passages to get an impression of the poet's art of composition at large.

---

[93] The similarity to (and influence from?) the cadence of such a passage as Vergil, *Aen.* 8.3 is striking: *utque acris concussit equos utque impulit arma.*

It has been mentioned earlier in this study[94] that the various poems differ considerably among themselves with regard to *Sperrung*. Mainly there is a variation of frequency of separations and of complexity of the patterns used. No reader familiar with Tibullus will probably be surprised to find out that for example poems 1.4 and 1.7 or 2.1 have a high frequency of separations and interlockings. The Alexandrian—perhaps showpiece—quality of 1.4 is commonly acknowledged.[95] Poem 1.7 is an almost official tribute to Messalla's triumph and a certain degree of formality could be expected in it, as well as in 2.1, the opening poem of the later collection.

But the poem that stands out very clearly above all others in this respect is none of those, but rather 1.3. It is extremely rich in highly intricate interlockings, both in a single line and in enjambment. This could be used as an effective argument against the assumed casual circumstances of the composition, if today anyone still thinks that Tibullus actually wrote this poem while sick on Corcyra. It is a very polished piece indeed, almost experimental in its singular exploitation of these artistic means.[96]

Let us examine the last section of 1.3, the description of Tartarus, lines 67–94.

> At scelerata iacet sedes in nocte profunda
>   Abdita, quam circum flumina nigra sonant:
> Tisiphoneque inpexa feros pro crinibus angues
>   Saevit, et huc illuc inpia turba fugit.   70
> Tum niger in porta serpentum Cerberus ore
>   Stridet et aeratas excubat ante fores.
> Illic Iunonem temptare Ixionis ausi
>   Versantur celeri noxia membra rota,
> Porrectusque novem Tityos per iugera terrae   75
>   Adsiduas atro viscere pascit aves.

[94] See above, pp. 405 f.

[95] See, e.g., G. Luck, *Latin Love Elegy* (London 1969[2]) ch. 5.

[96] I have found a total of 86 separations in the space of 94 lines: 19 single separations in the hexameters: 1, 7, 11, 21, 23, 33, 35, 37, 39, 45, 49, 53, 57, 61, 65, 69, 79, 81, 91; 29 in the pentameters: 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 46, 54, 58, 60, 62, 66, 72, 74, 76, 82, 84, 86, 92, 94; 7 interlockings in single hexameter lines: 3, 29, 41, 55, 63, 71, 75; 6 in pentameter lines: 4, 24, 28, 48, 52, 80; 12 separations in enjambment: 19 f., 39 f., 43 f., 59 f., 67 f., 73 f., 77 f., 83 f., 87 f., 91 f., 93 f. (bis).

> Tantalus est illic, et circum stagna, sed acrem
>   Iam iam poturi deserit unda sitim,
> Et Danai proles, Veneris quod numina laesit,
>   In cava Lethaeas dolia portat aquas.   80
> Illic sit, quicumque meos violavit amores,
>   Optavit lentas et mihi militias.
> At tu casta precor maneas, sanctique pudoris
>   Adsideat custos sedula semper anus.
> Haec tibi fabellas referat positaque lucerna   85
>   Deducat plena stamina longa colu,
> At circa gravibus pensis adfixa puella
>   Paulatim somno fessa remittat opus.
> Tum veniam subito, nec quisquam nuntiet ante,
>   Sed videar caelo missus adesse tibi.   90
> Tunc mihi, qualis eris, longos turbata capillos,
>   Obvia nudato, Delia, curre pede.
> Hoc precor, hunc illum nobis Aurora nitentem
>   Luciferum roseis candida portet equis.

The first distich, lines 67 f., is the general introduction to the section through line 82; *scelerata-sedes-abdita* are distributed over two lines, and both adjectives are at the beginning of their respective lines, the last one, *abdita*, further thrown into relief by being the last word in the clause. In the next distich, 69 f., the distribution of the rhetorical cola over the lines is the same: the first clause ends with a verb at the beginning of the pentameter line. The separated elements *feros-angues* are here for the sake of variation, however, placed in the latter half of the line; the adjective *feros* is underscored both by the clash of ictus and accent before the C1 caesura and by its juxtaposition to *inpexa*. The couplet is a small masterpiece in evoking a mood: all the *s*'s of the hexameter are highly suggestive of the hissing of the serpents, while the dark vowels (*u*'s) of the pentameter undoubtedly are meant to evoke the darkness and the terror of the Underworld. The two verbs standing guard on each side of the pentameter drive home the essential points to be made: the relentless fierceness of the pursuers and the hopeless flight of the pursued. The following distich, lines 71 f., presents again a different pattern of separation (although the distribution of rhetorical cola over the lines is the same). It is most

simply described with the symbols: —— a | —— | b | AB.   The
A3   B1 C2

pentameter presents the most common form of separation, —— a ‖
—— A.

Lines 73 f. have a very complex pattern of separation in enjambment
with its weight towards its end—as did 69 f., and we can now begin to
feel a certain smooth rhythm guided by a strong desire for variation,
skillfully operating with all available possibilities. *Ixionis-membra*
belong together but both words are equipped with their own un-
separated adjective and the last pair, *noxia membra*, fills out the space
between the separated elements of *celeri-rota*, indeed an intricate form
of interlocking. The distich consists of a single sentence. In the
next lines, 75 f., the weight of the separated elements is more sym-
metrically distributed, in both the hexameter and the pentameter.
The hexameter has interlocked word-order (abAB) and the pentameter
is framed. It is quite common in dealing with the hexameter pattern
     B1
—— a | —— A to find a similar or equivalent arrangement in the
pentameter, in other words, when the separated adjective of the hexam-
eter is pulled forward to the beginning of the line, so is the separated
adjective of the pentameter.[97]   Also, this distich consists of a single
sentence, but lines 77 f. have a different arrangement: three clauses, the
first one ending at B1, the last one starting before the end of the hex-
ameter; *acrem-sitim* are separated and stand at the end of their respective
lines. Lines 79 f. present a variant distribution of clauses again; of the
two clauses the subordinate one is inserted into the main clause.
Veneris-numina are separated in the hexameter.[98]   The pentameter
has interlocked word-order (abAB), one constituent of which is
pattern 1.

Both the patterns of the following lines, 81 f., are fairly common:
hexameter pattern 2b and pentameter pattern 1; the distich ends the
section which describes Tartarus in detail by a more general reference
to whoever else might be there, and thus corresponds to lines 65 f.,
which do the same—in similar words—for the description of the
Meadows of the Blessed from lines 59 f. In lines 81 f., however, the
mention of military service functions as a link to the next trend of

[97] Cf. 1.3.45 f., 1.5.49 f., 1.10.7 f.,
[98] See above, pp. 397 f., on the suitability and frequency of dactylic words starting at
C2.

thought, the next section describing Delia faithfully waiting for the poet by her loom.   And as she appears to us in ideal simplicity, so the lines describing her are very plain and simple with regard to our patterns.   This plainness lasts until the two concluding distichs, which are quite elaborately wrought again; the last two lines of the poem look like this in symbols:

$$\text{B1}$$
$$\text{—— aa } | \text{ —— Ba.}$$
$$\text{—— AC } \| \text{ b —— C}$$

It is as if the poet wanted to leave this complexity as the lasting, final impression of the poem as a whole.   But lines 93 f. are remarkable for another poetic intention as well: that of leaving the reader with an overwhelming glitter of light, as a contrast to the darkness of Hades. No less than five words in a row suggest light: *Aurora nitentem | Luciferum roseis candida . . .*[99]

What are the conclusions to be drawn from these analyses and from this study in general?   It is clear that Tibullus is highly conscious of the artistic means of poetic refinement which we have discussed and also most skillful in using them for his own purposes.   His control over the tools of his trade is evident, first, from the degree of variety with which these patterns are worked into the individual poems.   This selectivity is even more firmly proven in our analyses of the longer passages.   There we find not only little well-carved gems consisting of a couplet or two, but the principle of *variatio* is consistently carried on to the composition at large, where the self-conscious mastery is betrayed in the overall careful attempts to avoid repetition of the same patterns in consecutive or nearly consecutive lines.   The striving for variation creates a rhythm, and I think that perhaps the old simile of waves or wave-like movements applied to Tibullus' poetry could more aptly be used in this context of concrete patterns, and the general smoothness of their combinations.[100]

[99] Another passage which is interesting from a colometric point of view is 2.1.37–50, where Tibullus dwells on his favorite subject, the happiness of rustic life, and which displays an equal degree of *variatio* as the passage just analyzed.

[100] See J. Vahlen, "Über drei Elegien des Tibullus," *Ges. Phil. Schr.* II (Leipzig-Berlin 1923) 41. F. Leo has a somewhat similar interpretation of Tibullus' compositional technique: the image he uses to describe it is that of tone-waves: *Zu augusteischen Dichtern* (Berlin 1881) 44.

The poet is clearly part of a specific poetic tradition, but exactly what is his position in it? The question cannot be fully answered at the moment, mainly because of the gaps in our knowledge of Alexandrian elegy. A thorough study of the practices and possible development in Propertian patterns would also be helpful. Let us, however, try to sum up whatever information has been obtained in the course of this study.

Sperrung of noun and adjective goes back to Homer, but it was the Alexandrians who strongly developed this tendency and established several norms which were to become more and more firmly adhered to by the Romans. The neoterics took up this poetic device and exploited it far more elaborately than their Alexandrian models did. It was, however, known to Roman poets before the neoterics, mainly to Ennius, but seems not to have had any significant influence until later, possibly during the period of Parthenius.[101] In this as well as in other respects, the neoterics laid the foundation for the Augustan poets. But the differences between the neoterics and the Augustans are very noticeable, and this type of separation not surprisingly falls neatly into line with Latin poetic development in general. For in Tibullus we can clearly perceive the normalizing standards of the Augustans in general; the flexibility and freedom still prevailing in Catullus are not present any more. The wealth of the neoteric experimentation has now been poured into moulds: one example of this is the sanction and frequency of pentameter pattern 1; from these moulds the freedom returns polished and tamed, not unpleasantly so by any means— refinement is rarely unpleasant; but no doubt in the process something adventurous and forceful was lost. And I think this can be said in spite of the danger of interpreting literary development at large through specific literary personalities, such as Catullus and Tibullus.

Let us look at some of these Augustan features in Tibullus within our immediate sphere of interest, apart from the crystallization and recurrence of certain separation-patterns.

First, Tibullus adheres in general to the so-called law of the distich, a rule which naturally is related to the development of the patterns themselves. We have stated that the separation-patterns of Catullus

[101] See Patzer (above, note 10) and W. Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *GRBS* 5 (1964) 181–96.

64 show a preference for the one-line unit. This principle is much less noticeable in the elegies of Catullus.[102]   He makes in that respect a marked and interesting distinction between the genres: the elegies abound in bold enjambments, not just from hexameter to pentameter, which is common enough and only reinforces the isolation of the distich; but there are also several enjambments from pentameter to hexameter,[103] as well as long strings of loosely connected sentences of a type not present later, when a firmer grid was pressed upon the elegy.   A few sample passages can illustrate the difference better than anything else.[104]

> abiunctae paulo ante comae mea fata sorores
>   lugebant, cum se Memnonis Aethiopis
> unigena impellens nutantibus aera pennis
>   obtulit Arsinoes Locridos ales equos,   Cat. 66.51–54

> quo mea se molli candida diua pede
> intulit et trito fulgentem in limine plantam
>   innixa arguta constituit solea,
> coniugis ut quondam flagrans aduenit amore
>   Protesilaeam Laudamia domum
> inceptam frustra, nondum cum sanguine sacro
>   hostia caelestis pacificasset eros.   Cat. 68.70–76

> Castra Macer sequitur: tenero quid fiet Amori?
>   Sit comes et collo fortiter arma gerat?
> Et seu longa virum terrae via seu vaga ducent
>   Aequora, cum telis ad latus ire volet?
> Vre, puer, quaeso, tua qui ferus otia liquit,
>   Atque iterum erronem sub tua signa voca.
> Quod si militibus parces, erit hic quoque miles,
>   Ipse levem galea qui sibi portet aquam.   Tib. 2.6.1–8

[102] The percentage of one-line sense-units in Catullus 65–68 is c. 34%, while in Poem 64 it is c. 50%. T. E. V. Pearce, "The Enclosing Word Order in the Latin Hexameter," *CQ* 16 (1966) 140–71 and 298–320 discusses framing in Catullus and touches upon the one-line sense-unit. He is, however, mainly interested in *Sperrung* as a phenomenon of *colometry*, and does not want to make statements about the *effects* of *Sperrung* for emphasis of the separated elements. He finds Catullus one of the first Latin poets to make framing of a syntactical unit a practice, especially in Poem 64.

[103] I use the term enjambment in a very strict sense: only when elements of the same clause are divided between two lines.

[104] The text used is by R. A. B. Mynors, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford 1958).

The comparison needs very little comment at this point.[105]   The looseness and at the same time complexity of the Catullan passages contrast sharply with the orderly simplicity and perspicuity of those by Tibullus.   Catullus is in no way checked by the law of the distich and his colon-distribution is free and diversified.

Another Augustan development in Tibullus is the treatment of the pentameter in general.   We noticed that in Catullus (and probably in the earlier tradition insofar as he is representative of it) the frequency of *Sperrung* is less in the pentameter than in the hexameter.   In Catullus the separations in the pentameter make up only 33.8% of the total separations, while the situation is reversed in Tibullus: the emphasis is on the pentameter with 58% and 56.6% respectively in the two books of the total separations.[106]   The "predictable and monotonous character" of separations in Latin elegy should thus probably be applied only to the pentameter, as far as Tibullus is concerned.   That the pentameter received special attention is also shown by the fact that practically all the concentric arrangements in interlocked word-order are limited to the pentameter in the Tibullan poems,[107] which was not the case in Catullus.

As long as we lack detailed studies of the patterns in Propertius and Ovid, Tibullus receives the role of a representative for Augustan elegy. Our own knowledge of him in other respects and the general information that exists on the other two elegists allow us, however, to deduce something about the essence of his individual position in these questions.   His art is marked by a general restraint in the use of complex constructions (with the relatively few exceptions indicated), by a careful selectivity and a light-handed touch, that in the majority of his poems—such as the passage just quoted above—creates that characteristic perspicuity and easy-flowing naturalness of language; a deceptive naturalness to be sure, for Tibullus is a master of the careful art which conceals art.

[105] Two other passages to compare for the same purpose are Tib. 1.7.23–32 and Cat. 66.7–14.

[106] See above, Table IV.

[107] See above p. 411.