



Tibullus and Ovid: Part III

Author(s): Robert S. Radford

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (1923), pp. 293-318

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/289253>

Accessed: 12/06/2014 10:29

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLIV, 4

WHOLE No. 176

I.—TIBULLUS AND OVID.

(Concluded.)

PART III.

VI. *Evidence of the Schemata.*

With respect to the origin of the fourth book, it remains to consider the proof which may be drawn from the schemata, i. e. the combinations of dactyls and spondees occurring in the verse. In my judgment, we scarcely need the metrical evidence of these poems to establish conclusively their Ovidian authorship; the testimony of the phraseology alone is most ample and of a sufficiently convincing character, yet it is also clearly a matter of the greatest interest to determine whether the metre confirms the clear indications of the style and the language. One objection, however, of some plausibility, which can be urged against the whole method of metrical study, may fairly be faced at the outset. Some well-known scholars—for example, even Ehrengruber and Cartault—have written long treatises upon the schemata of Latin verse with almost excessive detail and with no definite goal to be attained; it is not too much to say that they have brought the metrical form of evidence, to a certain extent, into disrepute, and it is by no means entirely without reason that Belling writes: “Summa summarum: die ganz statistische Rechnerei hat nur das—wie mir scheint, doch nicht ganz unergiebig—Ergebnis, dass sie ergebnislos ist.”^{81a} Bel-

^{81a} *Albius Tibullus*, p. 26. Ganzenmüller also, *Beiträge zur Ciris*, p. 635, underestimates the value of the schemata: “Die Drobisch’sche Methode scheint mir zu sehr äusserlich, rein mechanisch, zu sehr auf Zufälligkeiten begründet und in ihrem praktischen Wert zweifelhaft.”

ling's indictment is too hasty and too sweeping. Ehrengruber and Cartault have not labored wholly in vain; it is possible that they have fallen at times into extremely grave mistakes, but their work is substantial and their material is permanently valuable. Ehrengruber, for example, is certainly right when he holds that the preferred or favorite schemata of a poet belong to his essential personality and cannot easily be modified,^{81b} but he is wholly mistaken in thinking that a youthful and developing artist can not change these forms for a purpose and within certain limits. For, just as conceivably other supports might be substituted for the Doric columns of the Parthenon, so too the schemata, the mighty pillars that support the "stately temple of song,"⁸² can be changed in a sufficient time and for an adequate cause. Yet, as a rule, the changes must, after all, fall within narrow limits. Thus I shall not assume nor allow the sudden and violent transitions for which Cartault, when attributing IV 2-6 and IV 13-14 to Tibullus, is constantly forced to find excuses, and which contravene and destroy the fundamental principles of the poet's art. I conclude then that the schemata, when properly studied, afford a most valuable test of authorship, and, although they have sometimes been misused, they can also be employed legitimately, and with undoubted effectiveness.

In discussing the development of the Ovidian schemata in the Lygdamus and Sulpicia elegies, I shall refer constantly to Cartault's important work which has already been frequently quoted, namely *Le Distique élégiaque chez Tibullus, Sulpicia, Lygdamus* (Paris, 1911), and it therefore seems desirable to speak of the general character of the treatise and of the nature of some of its conclusions. The merits of so comprehensive and, in many respects, so masterly a work need no encomium from me. By his rich and orderly collection of material Cartault has laid all present and future students of Tibullus and the Tibullan corpus under lasting obligations, and on my own account I am only too glad to acknowledge my deep indebtedness to his labors. Yet the sense of obligation must not prevent me from pointing

^{81b} *De Panegyrico*, X, p. 13.

⁸² See the famous allegory in Verg. *Georg.* 3, 13 ff., where the noble poem is described under the form of a temple erected in the plain of Mantua.

out certain serious defects in the plan of his work which prevent many of the conclusions from being either reasonable or just. There is reason first to regret the complete neglect of the work of his predecessors; thus, in the chapter on elision (pp. 181-199), all the facts are given with the utmost completeness and the utmost accuracy, but in a complex question, such as that of elision, where the interpretation is almost, if not quite, as important as the facts, it is disappointing that Cartault nowhere refers to the views of previous writers such as Hörschelmann, Paroli and Kleemann.⁸³ A still more serious fault lies, however, in the fact that the plan of the work is, after all, far too narrow to gain trustworthy results in the difficult questions of disputed authorship. Cartault's earlier book on the *Corpus Tibullianum*⁸⁴ shows an insufficient study of its authorship and no study whatever of its language. In his metrical work, therefore, he places himself in a very difficult position and, so far as the question of authenticity is concerned, he undertakes an impossible task. For it is not very likely that the metre which is contained within the small volume of Tibullus can itself alone give a solution. We have already seen that in a larger field Hultgren was much alarmed by the low proportions of the *Medicamen Faciei*, but was unable to interpret them correctly; similarly Cartault, pointing out (*op. cit.*, p. 25) that DSSD is the predominant schema of IV 13-14, is greatly perturbed, but seeks only specious excuses for the remarkable "anomaly" which he frankly admits. Having then no additional resources to steady and to fortify his judgment, in his eagerness to retain Tibullan authorship, he is finally driven to the point of sacrificing and abandoning in succession nearly all the principles of Tibullan art. Thus the evidence is everywhere massed by the accomplished metrician and the indefatigable scholar, but the conclusions are drawn by the special

⁸³ See the review by J. Tolkiehn (*Berl. Philol. Wochenschr.* XXXII [1912], col. 525), who says: "The neglect of the performances of other scholars, which is characteristic of Cartault's works in general, reaches its height in this book; he has not quoted a single one of the four principal treatises relating to the subject."—While making Cartault's treatise the basis of my own study, I have recognized its serious limitations at certain points and have added references to authoritative previous discussions, such as those of Eichner, Knappe and Hörschelmann.

⁸⁴ *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris, 1909.

pleader, who, for the moment, sets aside the rules and the usage of Tibullus. Cartault vacillates also greatly with reference to the time of production of the fourth book, usually holding that it follows closely upon the first book, but at other times associating it closely with the second.⁸⁵ Before we examine, however, the schemata which form the central theme of our study, I wish to give a striking example from another field which will serve to illustrate Cartault's too great readiness, in dealing with authorship, to set aside the well-known rules of Tibullan art.

It is a well-known fact that Tibullus, unlike Ovid, seeks carefully to differentiate the two halves of the pentameter and therefore scarcely ever allows the first half to end with an iambic word (cf. Eichner, *De poet. Lat. usque ad Aug. distichis*, Bresl. 1868, p. 81; Knappe, *De Tib. l. IV elegiis*, p. 32). Two exceptions to the rule occur in which it is usually said that he intentionally seeks "parallelism between the two hemistichs":⁸⁶ 1, 4, 4 non tibi barba nitet, non tibi culta coma est; 1, 5, 64 subicietque manus efficietque viam. Cartault also holds (p. 139) that we have "no negligence here, but clearly a literary effect." A single case occurs in which the first member is terminated by a dissyllable and the second member by a trisyllable: 2, 6, 32 et madefacta meis serta feram lacrimis. Since the two members are already differentiated, this case should be excluded entirely from our count. Two genuine exceptions occur, however, in the Ovidian elegies of the second book: 2, 2, 22 ludat et ante tuos turba novella pedes; 2, 5, 18 vatis et ipse, *precor*, quid canat illa, doce. In any case the distinctive rule of Tibullan art holds good. Even if all five cases in 616 pentameters were Tibullan and all were unexcused (which is scarcely the case), the percentage of exceptions would be only 0.8; if two cases are counted in 503

⁸⁵ In point of fact it bears no direct relation to either book, but its author naturally came far more closely under the influence of the first book, and at the same time pursued his own independent development which at times led somewhat in the direction of the second book.

⁸⁶ See Eichner, *op. cit.*, 88 f. and B. O. Foster, *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* XL (1909), p. 56. Eichner (*Bemerkungen über den metr. Bau in den Distichen des Cat., Tib., Prop. u. Ov.*, Gnesen 1875, p. 22) also points out that a distich, in which both hex. and pent. have iambic words standing at the caesura, is found not at all in Tib., 3 times in Lyg. (2, 15 f.; 5, 19 f.; 6, 47 f.), 38 times in Ov.

genuine pentameters (omitting II 2, 3 and 5), it is only 0.4. On the other hand in IV 2-6 we have four cases⁸⁷ in 57 pentameters in which the first hemistich is terminated by an iambic word, constituting 7.0%. Cartault's assumption that this percentage can be reconciled with distinctive Tibullan art is wholly inadmissible and prepares us for similar disregard of the evidence of the schemata. The usage of IV 2-6 at this point is wholly similar to that of Lygdamus who has ten cases in 145 pentameters, or 6.9% (Cartault, p. 151), and wholly similar to that of Ovid, who, in the first 56 pentameters of *Amores I*, has four cases, or 7.1%. It is clear therefore that in this rule Tibullus carefully observed a refinement which Ovid never fully adopted.⁸⁸

Many other less important indications of difference of usage between the fourth book and the two 'authentic' books may be mentioned. Thus in both IV 2-6, IV 7-12 and IV 13-14 the elisions in the pentameter are much more frequent than those in the hexameter (Cartault, pp. 184, 307, 309). This is contrary to Tibullus' usage in the second book (1. 4. 6) and contrary to his usage in half the elegies of the first book, but it is in complete accord with the usage of Lygdamus, who, like Catullus, has the larger number of elisions in the pentameter.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ IV, 4, 16; 5, 14; 6, 4; 6, 12; see Cartault, pp. 147, 308.

⁸⁸ According to Eichert, *op. cit.*, 81, Ovid admits 4% of exceptions in the *Amores* and *Fasti*, 8% in the *Maeenas*.

⁸⁹ According to Paroli, *De Tib. arte metr. cum Lygd. comparata*, Brescia, 1899, p. 39, the average number of elisions in Lygdamus per hundred hexameters is 10.34, per hundred pentameters 13.10. According to Cartault, p. 185, all the elegies of Lygdamus, except III 3, show more elisions in the pent. than in the hex. Note also that the percentage of elisions in the 57 pent. of IV 2-6 is 17.5%, in the 20 pent. of IV 7-12 it is 15%, in the 14 pent. of IV 13-14 it is 21.4%,—higher, in the latter case, says Cartault (p. 184), than in "any piece of the two authentic books." The genuine Tibullus, on the other hand, never exceeds 10.6% in the pent., except in the two early elegies I 7 and 9, which show 15.6% and 16.7 respectively.—On elision in the Tibullan corpus in general, see the detailed study of W. Hörschelmann, *Philologus* LVI (1897), pp. 354-371. While the differences between the two poets cannot be discussed fully here, I may note briefly that the harsher cases of elision of a long vowel before a short are always more numerous in Ovid than in Tibullus (cf. also Hörschelmann, *op. cit.* 361), because Ovid developed the dactyl in the first foot even more

Furthermore, both in IV 13-14, IV 2-6 and IV 7-12, the end of the first dactylic foot coincides, in the hexameter, with the end of a word in the majority of cases (Cartault, pp. 62, 64, 70, 306, 308), and this predominance of coincidence accords with the usage of Lygdamus (Cartault, p. 78) and is at variance with the usage of Tibullus' second book (Cartault, p. 44), though not with that of his first. The predominance in IV 13-14 of the dactylic word (the better form) over the trochaic word in the fifth foot of the hexameter, and the practical equality of the two in IV 2-6 (Cartault, pp. 132, 306, 308) agrees with the usage of Lygdamus (p. 134) and is opposed to that of Tibullus (pp. 128 ff.). The cases in which the two parts composing the distich, that is, the hexameter and the pentameter, do not encroach upon each other, prevail over the cases of encroachment to only a moderate extent in Tibullus (60.0% as against 40.%), but they prevail overwhelmingly in Lygdamus (79.1%) and in IV 13-14 (85.7%); IV 2-6 also (70.7%) stands here nearer to Lygdamus than to Tibullus (Cartault, pp. 271-277, 307, 309). Also, quite contrary to the usage of Tibullus, in IV 2-6 the distich containing four propositions is practically equal in number of cases to the distich containing two propositions (Cartault, pp. 268, 309), and in IV 13-14 it actually predominates, that is, it is relatively twice as frequent as in the two 'authentic' books (pp. 267, 307). Finally, in IV 2-6 and IV 7-12 we find that

completely than Tibullus and used the license of the first foot much more freely in allowing such elisions as *vi²di ego*, *e²rgo ego*, *e²rgo ubi*, *e²rgo amor*, &c. While adopting the Tibullan principle of avoiding elision, he therefore always remained bolder and freer at certain points than his predecessor. It is true that L. Müller (*R. M.*² 333 ff., 343, 360) seeks to account for this Ovidian freedom as wholly due to the 'familiar phrase' or the 'formula,' but this explanation seems a mere subterfuge and a begging of the question; see my "Licensed Feet in Latin Verse," *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield*, 251-272.—I have already discussed in a previous section (p. 237) the elision of a trochaic word ending in -*ā* before a short vowel, which occurs three times in the Sulpicia elegies, but is unknown to Tibullus. On the other hand, the extraordinary aversion which—owing, doubtless, to the nasalization of the preceding vowel—both the youthful Ovid (in *Sulpicia*, *Lygdamus*, *Panegyric*, *Culex*, *Dirae*) and also the mature Ovid exhibit to the synaloepha of syllables in *m*, appears to be shared with Tibullus; see Plésent, *Le Culex, Étude*, Paris 1910, p. 424.

in the beginning of the second member of the pentameter the dactylic word predominates over the trochaic word in the proportions of Lygdamus, i. e. the dactylic word is twice as frequent as the trochaic, not three times as frequent, as is the case in Tibullus (Cartault, pp. 147-148).

With the exception of the iambic word at the diaeresis of the pentameter in IV 2-6 and of the immense preponderance of the distichs without the encroachment of the two members in IV 13-14, these differences of usage are mostly trivial and unimportant in comparison with the weighty and decisive testimony of the schemata appearing in Book IV. It may be worth while first to remind the reader that, of the sixteen possible schemata, the favorites for the literature in the stichic measure are these: DSSS, 15% ; DSDS, 11.8% : DDSS, 11% ; SDSS, 10% (Hultgren, *Neue Jahrb.*, cvii, 1873, p. 747; Drobisch, *Ber. sächs. Ges.*, 1866, p. 125). Before I exhibit the full details, I may summarize briefly the most important facts relating to Book IV as follows: In IV 13-14, DSSD, the great schema of Ovid, which distinguishes him from all the other elegiac poets,⁹⁰ and which holds the first place in the *Heroides*, the *Tristia* and the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, is notably predominant (35.7%). The beautiful elegy IV 13 therefore contains its author's signature written across its face in the largest and clearest letters. *For it is not in fact the dactylic virtuosity, as scholars have erroneously fancied, but rather the usually high ratio of DSSD and of DDS D, which is as a rule the true distinguishing mark of Ovid's works, mature and juvenile alike.*⁹¹ On the other hand, DSSD is weak

⁹⁰ DSSD, which throws the dactyl into the usually spondaic fourth foot, is unimportant in Catullus and in the first three books of Propertius (about 7% and 6.7% respectively). Propertius, however, raises it to the fifth place in Bk. IV (9.1%) and gives it the third place in his last book (12.2%). These figures are taken from Hultgren, *Observ. metr.* 22, who follows the five-book division of Propertius.

⁹¹ DSSD is already strong in *Catalept. IX* and in the *Panegyric*, and sinks chiefly in the juvenile works in which Ovid is preoccupied with the dissyllabic close; see below, p. 312. In the mature Ovid it is the second schema (14.2%) in the elegiac hex. It has strongly attracted Ovid because of the perfection of its symmetry,—for reasons which are well analyzed by Plésent (*op. cit.* 433): “DSSD, the system of the framing of the feet (*l'encadrement des pieds*)—in the first member (the first four feet)—is also greatly appreciated by the author of the

in Tibullus, holding only the fifth rank in the first book and the sixth in the second (all six elegies, v. below p. 312), and it occupies, for example, only the eighth place in Virgil's *Aeneid* and the seventh place in Lucretius; its place in the stichic measure for the whole literature, according to Drobisch (*Ber. sächs. Ges.*, 1866, p. 125) is sixth (6.5%). Again in IV 2-6, SDSS, the schema which holds the second rank in Lygdamus (the youthful Ovid) and only the eighth rank in both books of Tibullus, is predominant (17.5%). Conversely, in IV 13-14, the great Tibullan schema, DSDD, which is one of the favorites of the literature and which does not fall below the second place in either book of Tibullus,⁹² but which is abnormally weak in

Culex. . . This schema is artistically balanced, since it groups in the middle of the verse, two by two, the homogeneous elements, and frames them at the extremities by the heterogeneous elements: DSSDD." It is with good reason therefore that, after giving a table of the five most frequent schemata of the *Culex*, Plésent concludes (p. 434): "C'est, a peu de chose près, la facture d'Ovide."—On the whole question of the dactyl in the fourth foot, Drobisch well says (*Ber. sächs. Gesellsch.* 1873, pp. 13, 16): "With the exception of Ovid and Aratus,—[the latter, however, in a very slight degree]—all the remaining Roman and Greek poets prefer (for the third and fourth feet) the hexameter of the form (. . ds) to that of the form (. . sd). . . . The Roman poets demand most decidedly a spondee for the fourth foot, through which of course the regular dactyl of the fifth foot is given especial prominence. Only in Ovid is this demand met in a surprisingly slight degree." On the other hand, the prevailing usage of the Latin poets is well described by Papillon and Haigh (*Bucolics and Georgics of Virgil*, p. 15): "In Virgil the rapid movement of the hexameter—in those verses in which the dactyls predominate—is almost always checked and the rhythm, as it were, collected and steadied by a spondaic fourth foot—e. g. Aen. I 45. 'Turbine corripuit scopuloque infixit acuto.' The spondaic fourth foot is indeed specially characteristic of Virgil's rhythm in the *Aeneid*." On the many schemata of the *Panegyric* which carry the dactyl into the fourth foot and which are therefore widely at variance with the usage of Tib., see the fine discussion of Ehrengruber (X 7 f.). Ovid's preference for the dactyl in this foot is well shown also in the dactylic percentages given by Hultgren (*Neue Jahrb.* CVII, 1873, p. 751) for the first four feet of the hexameters of the *Fasti*, namely 1: 89.1%—2: 43.9%—3: 36.8%—4: 46.3%,—where, however, the dactylic percentage of the second foot is unusually low.

⁹² It holds the second place in the first book, and in the second book divides the supremacy with DDSS, v. below, p. 312.

the youthful Ovid and shows strength almost for the first time in IV 2-6 and in the *Panegyric*, reaches only 7.1% instead of the 15.1%, which is its ratio in the two books of Tibullus.⁹³ In the Sulpicia letters, IV 7-12, although DDSS is dominant, the second schema (15%) is SSSS, which stands so close to SDSS, and which, according to Hultgren, is the third schema of Lygdamus (11.0%),⁹⁴ and is still strong in the *Panegyric* and the early *Amores*. Finally, to turn to the pentameter, in both IV 2-6 and IV 13-14, the form SD, which, in a most peculiar and characteristic manner, is the pet aversion of Tibullus and has in his 'two books' a ratio of only 3.9%,⁹⁵ appears with the normal Ovidian percentage of 14.1. Extended comment upon these facts is unnecessary, since the metre—like the language—fairly shouts and cries aloud the name of its author. Similarly careful study has shown me that, in the case of II 3 and 5, the metrical evidence alone—inclusive of course of the spondaic preponderance—is fully sufficient clearly and definitely to separate these elegies from Tibullus;⁹⁶ the lan-

⁹³ Or 15.4%, if we exclude II 2, 3 and 5.

⁹⁴ Kleemann, using a different text, gives it 10.3% and makes it divide the third place with DDSS.

⁹⁵ Or 4.2%, if we exclude II 2, 3 and 5.

⁹⁶ From more than a score of evidences I will cite only two: The flagrant double violation of the "autonomy of the distich" in II 5 would alone be almost sufficient to condemn this elegy; cf. here II 5, 109 and 117 with *Lyg.* 1, 27 and *Catal.* 8, 5; 4, 3 and 7, and v. Cartault, *Distique ÉL.* 278 f. (For examples of occasional disregard of this unity of the distich in the mature Ovid, see L. Müller, *Res. Metr.*² 267.) Again his marked predilection for the heptemimeral caesura—usually accompanied by the 'feminine' caesura of the third foot (Ehr. IX 71 f.; Cartault 172)—is one of the best-known characteristics of the genuine Tibullus, and the average percentage in all the elegies of the first book except the very earliest (I 4. 9. 8. 7) is 36.8 according to Krafft (28.7 according to Cartault). But as Krafft has well noted (*De artibus quas Tib. et Lygd. in versibus, &c.*, p. 18), the ratio of this caesura is very low in the two "imperfect" and "insufficiently polished" elegies II 3 and 5,—only 18.6% as compared with 30.4% in the "more perfect" poems of Book II (1. 4. 6), which show Tibullus' mature art and his perfected norm. While this low ratio is by no means conclusive on the question of spuriousness, it yet constitutes a very important ground of suspicion; cf. here also Cartault, *Distique ÉL.* 157 ff., who, however, is much inferior at this point in his perceptions and conclusions to Krafft. *Note especially that this low ratio is also true of*

guage, however, and the mythology are equally convincing, and their evidence can be much more quickly grasped. This summary statement gives the main facts, but I must now present the complete details in order to exhibit in an orderly manner the development of the Ovidian metric from the *Catalepton* on.

There are important differences between the schemata preferred by Tibullus and those preferred by Ovid, which should be carefully noted. The three Tibullan favorites are DSSS, with 17.7% in the 'two books,' DSDS with 15.1% and DDSS, with 13.6%. The fourth schema of Tibullus is DDDS, with 8.4%.⁹⁷ The favorite schemata of the mature Ovid, on the other hand, are DSSS, DSSD and DDSS; next in importance are DDSD and DSDS, which stand very closely together. The exact ratios for these five schemata in all the elegiac works of the mature Ovid (excepting only the *Sappho*, the *Consolatio* and the *Nux*) are 14.6%, 14.2%, 12.2%, 11.8%, and 11.2% respectively. The ratios in Ovid's stichic hexameters are only slightly different.⁹⁸ The foregoing statement means that, in the

the elegies of Book IV. Thus according to Cartault (*l. c.* 159 f.), in IV 2-6 it is only 21%, in IV 7-12 only 25%, and in IV 13-14 only 7.1%. *For the whole book it is only 19.8%*. See also below, p. 305, n. 105. Note also that there is just one case in Book IV of the hephthemimeral without the regular feminine caesura of the third foot, namely 4, 13: *interdum vovet, interdum. . .* Cartault aptly remarks (pp. 179, 173): "The two authentic books have only one example identical with this verse; it is II 3, 41: *praedator cupit immensos. . .*" Both these verses, it will be noted, are examples of the schema SDSS, which is very rare in Tib. Furthermore this use of the *molossic* word before the hephthemimeral caesura, which thus occurs twice in the Appendix, but never in the genuine Tib., is found four times in the *Panegyric*, as v. 44, 64, 91, 93: *inque vicem modo directo. . .* Hence Ehrengruber (IX 82) observes most acutely: "Tibullus, si mittimus II 3, 41, *qui addabitabitur*, et IV 4, 13: "Interdum vovet, interdum . . .," ubi figura anaphorae mitigatur, nusquam *molossica* verba ante caes. hephth. posuit, sed numerum dactylicum etiam in III. pede adamans longiorem vocem choriambicam ante caes. conlocavit, e. g. I 1, 77; 5, 1; II 6, 11." —Cartault (p. 179) wishes to recognize also a similar exceptional hephthemimeral in IV 3, 17: *tunc veniat licet ad casses | . . .* (rather than *ad | casses*).

⁹⁷ Compare here Cartault, *op. cit.*, pp. 19 f. If we omit II 2, 3 and 5, the ratios for the two books, according to Cartault's figures, are 17.9, 15.3, 13.9 and 8.5 respectively.

⁹⁸ The elegiac percentages have been carefully calculated by me from

effort to advance from DSSS, the simplest and easiest of the dactylic schemata, and to decrease the number of spondees in the hexameter, Tibullus proceeds mainly by way of DSDS and DDSS, Ovid mainly by way of DSSD, DDSS and DDS D. With the notable exception of DSDS, the five schemata named above are those which Ovid really preferred from the beginning and which are most frequent in *Catalepton* IX, written at the age of seventeen. Even in this early poem, however, he gave the fifth place (9.3%) to SSSS, and showed himself also favorable to SDSS (2 cases); the first form, he well knew, was a favorite with his great exemplar, Catullus,⁹⁹ the second with his intimate friend, Propertius. Partly for this reason, and partly in the effort to habituate himself to the dissyllabic closes of the distich, he was content for many years to give a great place to these two forms, both of which are so important in the stichic measure; hence SDSS is prominent in IV 2-6 and in the *Copa*, SSSS in the *Panegyric* (Ehr. IX 90), and both in the Lygdamus

Hultgren's complete tables for the separate elegiac works (*Observationes metr. in poetas elegiacos*, Leipzig 1871, pp. 26 f.); they include of course the so-called "spurious Epistles." For the stichic hexameter, Drobisch (*Ber. sächs. Ges.* 1873, p. 23) gives the following percentages computed for the first three books of the *Metamorphoses*: DSSS, 13.4%; DDSS, 13.4%; DSSD, 12.0%; DDS D, 11.3%; DSDS, 11.2%. (Note that DDS D, the fourth schema of Ovid, both stichic and elegiac, in the general stichic ratio stands only ninth,—5%, according to Drobisch; it is unimportant also in the elegy of Catullus and Propertius, and in the genuine Tib., who favors it slightly, it reaches only 6.5% in 504 hex.) The figures given by Plessis (*Métrique*, p. 50, § 61) and Plésent (*Le Culex*, p. 434, n. 2) are somewhat misleading, namely DSSD, 13.9%; DSSS, 13.6%; DSDS, 11.2%; DDSS, 10.7%. I owe to the kindness and painstaking accuracy of Professor C. W. E. Miller, the editor of this Journal—who has most generously supplied me with numerous other valuable data and references relating to the metric—the information that these percentages are taken from Drobisch's earlier article (*Ber. sächs. Ges.* 1866, p. 105) and are based only upon the first 560 normal verses of Ovid's *Metam.* I. According to the figures which Plessis (*l. c.* 52, § 64) has compiled by his own methods, the favorite schemata of the elegiac distich for the literature are DSSS, 15.7%; DDSS, 11%; DSDS, 10.8%; DSSD, 10.2%. The fact that DSSD holds the fourth place in these figures is evidently due to the great rôle which it plays in Ovid.

⁹⁹ In some of the elegies of the first book (5, 7, 8) Tibullus also gives the fifth or sixth place to SSSS.

poems. DSDS, which is the second schema of Tibullus and of the literature in general, *but which does not carry the dactyl into the fourth foot*, appealed to him in no wise at first; it does not occur at all in *Catal.* IX, shows only two cases in the *Catalepton* as a whole, and is barely present in IV 13-14, IV 7-12 and four of the Lygdamus poems. It is the second form, however,—no doubt by accident—in the short pieces, Lygd. 3 and 5, and is second, doubtless by natural development, in IV 2-6, in the *Halieutica*, and in the *Panegyric*; it is first in II 3, third in the *Ciris*, and fourth or fifth in the *Culex*. It never became, however, one of his three most frequent forms.¹⁰⁰ DSSD, on the other hand, the most characteristic of all his schemata, which is predominant in so many of his works and of his single poems, attracted him from the first, and in conjunction with his other favorite, DDS D, enabled him even in his youth to carry the dactyl to an extraordinary extent into the usually spondaic fourth foot.¹⁰¹ I may mention here also the substantial grounds on which Ribbeck (*App. Verg.* 12) and Birt (*Symbola ad hex. Lat.* 46) have identified Lygdamus with the author of *Catalepton* IX,¹⁰² viz. the ‘playful mannerism of the style’ in both cases, with a marked fondness for striking

¹⁰⁰ It is one of the symmetrical schemata. Plésent (*Le Culex*, p. 433) well calls it “the system of the *interlacing of the feet* (*Ventre-lacement des pieds*), not only in the first member, but in the whole verse: DSDSDS.” Note that it contains the same number of dactyls as DSSD, the arrangement which Ovid usually prefers.

¹⁰¹ Tibullus loved to begin the verse with a dactyl and, like the other Latin poets, to place a *spondee* in the fourth foot; see Christ, *Metrik*², p. 165. Ehrenguber, X 7, correctly notes that the usage of the *Panegyric* is very different.

¹⁰² See also Braum, *De monosyllabis ante caes.*, Marburg, 1906, pp. 28, 63. On the other hand, against the almost unanimous judgment of scholars, and by means of the most improbable hypotheses, Frank (*Class. Philol.* XV 34 ff.; 103 ff.) wishes to attribute both *Catal.* IX and the *Ciris* to Virgil. He is not likely to gain many adherents for this view, but he is quite right in ascribing both poems to the same author (p. 103) and is fully justified also in the neat tribute which he pays to the real merits of the *Ciris* as a youthful production of great promise (p. 105). The *Ciris* in truth is a very pretty poem of its kind. With the help of a prodigious memory, the innumerable borrowings and imitations which it shows are handled with extraordinary cleverness (cf. Drachmann, *Hermes* XLIII, 1908, p. 408, on vv. 369 ff.), while their excessive accumulation—sometimes extending to whole

forms of repetition, and the extraordinary strictness which both poems exhibit in treating the caesura. Thus, in 145 hexameters, Lygdamus has the penthemimeral caesura in all except four cases (Krafft, *op. cit.*, p. 18; Cartault, p. 169). Similarly, in 32 hexameters, *Catalepton IX* always shows the penthemimeral, which is here invariably accompanied by at least one of the two secondary masculine caesurae.¹⁰³ Upon this masterly¹⁰⁴ treatment of the caesura in youth is based the notable predilection of the mature Ovid for the favorite Roman penthemimeral, in the use of which he is the great adept and the supreme artist (Müller, *R. M.*², pp. 222, 79).¹⁰⁵ To return from this digression to the

groups of verses—clearly betokens the immaturity and the levity of youth; cf. *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1921, p. 154, notes 13, 14. As Leo has well shown ("Vergil und die Ciris," *Hermes* XXXVII [1902], p. 54), such flagrant and immoderate plagiarism (*furtum*) was expressly condemned by the best Augustan critics (see Hor. *Ep.* 1, 3, 15 ff.), and Ovid himself fully recognizes (*Trist.* 4, 10, 64) that the poem is a 'faulty' one. Hence it no doubt provoked unfavorable criticism, and was wisely suppressed by its author. It is largely owing to such restraint that he was able to write later (*Trist.* 4, 10, 123): nec qui detrectat praesentia, Livor iniquo | Ullum de nostris dente momordit opus.

¹⁰³ These grounds alone could not lead us to a certain conclusion except for the common relation to Messala and the complete agreement of vocabulary. We may note that the *Copa* also, in 19 hex., always has the penthemimeral caesura—a usage infinitely at variance with that of Virgil. Similarly the first 47 verses of the *Lydia* show only the penthemimeral, which is almost invariable also in the great *Priapea*, etc.

¹⁰⁴ Paroli, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 52.

¹⁰⁵ The youthful Ovid afterwards greatly relaxed the strictness of his rules at this point, and although he never equalled the usage of Tibullus (see above, p. 301, n. 96), yet both in the *Panegyric* and in the *Sulpicia* elegies he allowed the hephthemimeral rather freely, if accompanied by one of the three secondary caesurae; thus 13 cases (18.3%) occur in IV 2—6 and 13—14. In the *Culex* also the hephthemimeral reaches, according to the figures of Plésent (*l. c.* 440), 16%, but according to those of Eldridge (*Num Culex et Ciris ab eodem poeta, &c.*, Giessen 1914, p. 31) 22.6%. Ehrenguber (IX 71) thinks that the hephthemimeral is the principal caesura in 25.1% of the verses of the *Panegyric*, but this is doubtless much too high an estimate. Yet Ovid's mature works show very clearly the effects of his early training, and he gives to the penthemimeral, which is far the best of all Roman caesurae, a ratio of more than six to one instead of Vergil's ratio of three or four to one. Thus in the first book of the *Ars* the penthemimeral reaches 86%, the hephthemimeral only 14%.

various schemata, the following table will serve to show their frequency in the juvenile works, omitting for the present the *Aetna*, *Dirae*, etc., but including the *Culex*, *Ciris*, *Copa*, *Rosetum* and five of the early *Amores*:

Forms.	Catalept. IX.	Halieut.		Lygdamus, All six elegies.		Lygdamus, Elegy 4.		Subp. Letters, IV 7-12.		IV 2-6.		IV 13-14.		Paneg.		
	32 hex.	130 hex.		145 hex.		48 hex.		20 hex.		57 hex.		14 hex.		211 hex.		
DSSS	7 ¹⁰⁶ 21.9	8	6.2	27 ¹⁰⁸	18.6	11 ¹⁰⁹	22.9	21 ¹⁰	10.0	6	10.5	3	21.4	37 ¹¹¹ 17.5		
DSDS	0	0	19	14.6	9	6.2	1	2.1	1	5.0	9	15.8	1	7.1	29	13.7
DSSD	4	12.5	8	6.2	8	5.5	1	2.1	1	5.0	3	5.3	5	35.7	18	8.5
DSDD	1	3.1	1	.8	4	2.8	0	0	2	10.0	3	5.3	1	7.1	9	4.3
DDSS	5 ¹⁰⁷	15.6	11	8.5	15	10.3	3	6.3	4	20.0	9	15.8	2	14.2	22	10.4
DDDS	1	3.1	5	3.8	9	6.2	5	10.4	1	5.0	5	8.8	1	7.1	16	7.5
DDSD	4	12.5	6	4.6	7	4.8	2	4.1	1	5.0	2	3.5	0	0	6	2.9
DDDD	0	0	4	3.1	2	1.4	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	0	0	6	2.9
SDSS	2	6.2	21	16.2	17	11.8	9	18.8	2	10.0	10	17.5	1	7.1	7	3.3
SDDS	0	0	9	6.9	11	7.6	3	6.3	0	0	2	3.5	0	0	12	5.7
SDSD	2	6.2	7	5.4	7	4.8	4	8.3	1	5.0	1	1.7	0	0	10	4.7
SDDD	0	0	3	2.3	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2.4
SSSS	3	9.3	9	6.9	15	10.3	3	6.3	3	15.0	0	0	0	0	15	7.1
SSDS	1	3.1	9	6.9	8	5.5	3	6.3	1	5.0	2	3.5	0	0	7	3.3
SSSD	0	0	5	3.8	4	2.8	2	4.1	0	0	3	5.3	0	0	10	4.7
SSDD	1	3.1	5	3.8	1	0.7	1	2.1	1	5.0	1	1.7	0	0	2	1.0

Forms.	Culex.		Ciris.		Copa.	Am. I 2.		Am. I 13.		Am. I 15.		Am. III 8		Am. III 10.		
	410 hex.		527 hex.		19 hex.	26 hex.		21 hex.		21 hex.		33 hex.		24 hex.		
DSSS	54	13.2	97	18.4	3	15.8	4	15.4	3	14.3	3	14.3	8	24.2	6	25.0
DSDS	35	8.5	56	10.6	2	10.5	4	15.4	3	14.3	1	4.8	2	6.1	1	4.2
DSSD	38	9.3	31	5.9	1	5.2	6	23.1	0	0	5	23.8	4	12.1	3	12.5
DSDD	12	2.9	8	1.5			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.0	1	4.2
DDSS	64	15.6	73	13.9	1	5.2	2	7.7	2	9.5	2	9.5	4	12.1	3	12.5
DDDS	35	8.5	45	8.5	1	5.2	1	3.8	1	4.8	2	9.5	2	6.1	1	4.2
DDSD	27	6.6	30	5.7	3	15.8	3	11.5	2	9.5	9	0	1	3.0	5	20.8
DDDD	10	2.4	12	2.3	1	5.2	1	3.8	3	14.3	0	0	1	3.0	0	0
SDSS	32	8.1	49	9.3	4	21.1	0	0	2	9.5	1	4.8	1	3.0	2	8.3
SDDS	29	7.1	23	4.4			1	3.8	0	0	1	4.8	2	6.1	0	0
SDSD	17	4.2	13	2.5	2	10.5	0	0	2	9.5	2	9.5	3	9.1	0	0
SDDD	10	2.4	7	1.3			1	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SSSS	18	4.4	30	5.7	1	5.2	1	3.8	2	9.5	1	4.8	0	0	0	0
SSDS	13	3.2	26	4.9			1	3.8	1	4.8	1	4.8	1	3.0	0	0
SSSD	7	1.7	20	3.8			1	3.8	0	0	1	4.8	1	3.0	1	4.2
SSDD	8	1.9	7	1.3			0	0	0	0	1	4.8	2	6.1	1	4.2

¹⁰⁶ Or 8 (25.0%), if v. 43, with uncertain reading, belongs here.

¹⁰⁷ Or 6 (18.8%), if v. 43 belongs here.

¹⁰⁸ Kleemann's figures are followed, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

¹⁰⁹ Cartault is followed, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

The relative frequency of the various schemata may be shown much more clearly to the eye by means of a different arrangement. For the sake of both brevity and perspicuity, I select in the presentation the eight *schemata* which seem most important for the formative period, and omit the rest:

<i>Catalepton IX, 32 hex.</i>		<i>Halieutica, 130 hex.¹¹²</i>	
DSSS	... 7[8] cases, 21.9[25.0]%	SDSS 21 cases, 16.2%
DDSS	... 5[6] " 15.6[18.8]%	DSDS 19 " 14.6%
DSSD	... 4 " 12.5%	DDSS 11 " 8.5%
DDSD	... 4 " 12.5%	SSSS 9 " 6.9%
SSSS	... 3 " 9.3%	DSSS 8 " 6.2%
SDSS	... 2 " 6.2%	DSSD 8 " 6.2%
DDDS	... 1 " 3.1%	DDSD 6 " 4.6%
DSDS	... 0 " 0 %	DDDS 5 " 3.8%
<i>Lygdamus, 145 hex.</i>		<i>Lygdamus 4, 48 hex.</i>	
DSSS 27 cases, 18.6%	DSSS 11 cases, 22.9%
SDSS 17 " 11.8%	SDSS 9 " 18.8%
DDSS 15 " 10.3%	DDDS 5 " 10.4%
SSSS 15 " 10.3%	DDSS 3 " 6.3%
DDDS 9 " 6.2%	SSSS 3 " 6.3%
DSDS 9 " 6.2%	DDSD 2 " 4.1%
DSSD 8 " 5.5%	DSSD 1 " 2.1%
DDSD 7 " 4.8%	DSDS 1 " 2.1%

¹¹⁰ Here, and also in IV 2-6, IV 13-14, Cartault is followed.

¹¹¹ Ehrengreuber is followed here; Lederer is followed in the *Culex* and *Ciris*.

¹¹² Not recognizing the fact that the *Halieutica* is a juvenile work, Birt (*Kritik u. Hermeneutik*, Müller's *Handbuch* I, 3, Munich 1913, p. 23) attacks its authenticity on the ground that, contrary to the rule of metrical elegance, it admits a spondaic word in the first foot of the hex. once in every seventeen verses, while in the last book of the *Ex Ponto* this happens only once in every forty verses. The *Hal.*, however, is similar enough at this point to the *Lygdamus* and the Sulpicia Letters (IV 7-12), which show the spondaic word in the first foot once in every ten hexameters, or to the early elegy *Am.* 1, 15, which shows the spondaic word once in every seven verses! For, as I have said elsewhere, it was with reluctance that Ovid, the wonderfully gifted narrator, turned away from the 'inimitable spontaneity' of Catullus, who—for example—in the 24 pentameters of c. 67 comes very near having a spondaic word in the first foot once in every three verses. Birt also assails the *Hal.* because it employs some words which Ovid afterwards avoided, but of the words in Birt's list, we may note that *properare* with the acc. occurs Paneg. 205, *viridare* Cu. 50, *denuntiare* Lygd. 5, 5, *Ætn.* 235, &

Sulpicia Letters (IV 7-12), 20 hex.			Sulpicia Elegies (IV 2-6), 57 hex.		
DDSS	4 cases,	20.0%	SDSS	10 cases,	17.5%
SSSS	3 "	15.0%	DDSS	9 "	15.8%
DSSS	2 "	10.0%	DSDS	9 "	15.8%
SDSS	2 "	10.0%	DSSS	6 "	10.5%
DSSD	1 "	5.0%	DDDS	5 "	8.8%
DDSD	1 "	5.0%	DSSD	3 "	5.3%
DDDS	1 "	5.0%	DDSD	2 "	3.5%
DSDS	1 "	5.0%	SSSS	0 "	0 %

IV 13-14, 14 hex.

DSSD	5 cases,	35.7%
DSSS	3 "	21.4%
DDSS	2 "	14.2%
DDDS	1 "	7.1%
SDSS	1 "	7.1%
DSDS	1 "	7.1%
DDSD	0 "	0 %
SSSS	0 "	0 %

Panegyric, 211 hex.

DSSS	37 cases,	17.5%
DSDS	29 "	13.7%
DDSS	22 "	10.4%
DSSD	18 "	8.5%
DDDS	16 "	7.5%
SSSS	15 "	7.1%
SDSS	7 "	3.3%
DDSD	6 "	2.9%

Culex, 410 hex.

DDSS	64 cases	15.6%
DSSS	54 "	13.2%
DSSD	38 "	9.3%
DSDS	35 "	8.5%
DDDS	35 "	8.5%
SDSS	33 "	8.1%
DDSD	27 "	6.6%
SSSS	18 "	4.4%

Ciris, 527 hex.¹¹³

DSSS	97 cases,	18.4%
DDSS	73 "	13.9%
DSDS	56 "	10.6%
SDSS	49 "	9.3%
DDDS	45 "	8.5%
DSSD	31 "	5.9%
DDSD	30 "	5.7%
SSSS	30 "	5.7%

¹¹³ Ganzenmüller's discussion (*Beitr. z. Ciris*, 626 ff.) of the metrical features of the *Ciris* deserves much praise. Thus he points out—after Viertel—that Ovid and the *Ciris* have practically the same proportion of Greek words at the close of spondaic lines (66%, against Vergil's 55% only), and still more strikingly that Ovid (5 times) and the *Ciris* (once) stand alone in not always placing before the closing quadrisyllable a word of pyrrhic, dactylic or ionic *a maiore* scansion, but in allowing also a word of the measurement $\cup\cup\cup\cup$, as Ci. 73 coniungum castae *violaverat Amphitrites* (cf. also Kreunen, *Proleg. in Cirin*, Utrecht 1882, pp. 43 ff.) He shows also (p. 633)—after Bieling—that the author of the *Ciris* loves peculiarly Ovidian examples of hiatus which are absent both from Catullus and from Vergil, e. g. Ci. 424 O¹ ego crudelis; 287 O¹ iterum. Thus O¹ ego occurs 3 times in the *Met.* (2,520; 8, 51; 9, 487) and twice in the elegies (P. 1, 4, 149; *Nux* 159); add Pseudo-Tib. II 3, 5 (cf. Ganzenmüller, *Die Elegie Nux*, p. 28), as well as Tib. II 4, 7 and Hor. *Epod.* 12, 25; cf. also Lygd. 4, 82 and [Tib.] IV 11, 3 (a¹ ego).

I may add that, quite in the manner of the mature Ovid, we find

<i>Copa</i> , 19 hex.			<i>Roŕetum</i> , 25 hex.		
SDSS	4 cases,	21.1%	DSSD	5 cases,	20%
DSSS	3 “	15.8%	DSDS	3 “	12%
DDSD	3 “	15.8%	DDSD	2 “	8%
DDSS	2 “	10.5%	DDSS	2 “	8%
DDSS	1 “	5.2%	(DSDD)	2 “	8%
DSSD	1 “	5.2%	DSSS	1 “	4%
SSSS	1 “	5.2%	DDSS	0 “	0%
DDDS	1 “	5.2%	SDSS	0 “	0%
			SSSS	0 “	0%

(I follow here the reading of Riese, *Anth. Lat.* 646, for v. 1: mordentia frigora sensu; Peiper, in his edition of Ausonius, reads mordenti a frigore sensu [DSSS].)

<i>Am.</i> I 2, 26 hex.			<i>Am.</i> I 13, 21 hex.		
DSSD	6 cases,	23.1%	DSSS	3 cases,	14.3%
DSSS	4 “	15.4%	DSDS	3 “	14.3%
DSDS	4 “	15.4%	DDSS	2 “	9.5%
DDSD	3 “	11.5%	SDSS	2 “	9.5%
DDSS	2 “	7.7%	SSSS	2 “	9.5%
SSSS	1 “	3.8%	DDSD	2 “	9.5%
DDDS	1 “	3.8%	DDDS	1 “	4.8%
SDSS	0 “	0 %	DSSD	0 “	0 %

<i>Am.</i> I 15, 21 hex.			<i>Am.</i> III 8, 33 hex.		
DSSD	5 cases,	23.8%	DSSS	8 cases,	24.2%
DSSS	3 “	14.3%	DDSS	4 “	12.1%
DDSS	2 “	9.5%	DSSD	4 “	12.1%
DDDS	2 “	9.5%	DDDS	2 “	6.1%
SDSS	1 “	4.8%	SDSS	1 “	3.0%
SSSS	1 “	4.8%	DDSD	1 “	3.0%
DSDS	1 “	4.8%	SSSS	0 “	0 %
DDSD	0 “	0 %			

already in the prooemium both of the *Culex* and of the *Ciris*—at least in an experimental way—the artistic heaping up of dactyls, in order to indicate the gay and light character of the verse (*versus mollis* or *gracilis*), as Cu. 1 lusimus, Octavi, gracili modulante Thalia; 35 f. mollia sub tenui decurrere carmina versu | Viribus acta suis Phoebo duce ludere gaudent; Ci. 19 f. interdum ludere nobis | Et gracilem molli liceat pede claudere versum. See here the excellent discussion and remarks of G. May, *De stilo epylliorum Romanorum*, Kiliae 1910, pp. 100 ff.: “Poeta tenuitatem et molliorem carminis sui gracilibus dactylicis praenuntiat his in versibus. . . . Consulto poeta *Ciris* his dactylis utitur, &.”—Similar examples occur in other parts of the *Ciris*, cf. May, p. 101. Plésent (*op. cit.* 431, 435 f.) has also discussed very admirably the expressive and picturesque use of dactyls which is so characteristic a feature of the *Culex*.

Am. III 10, 24 hex.

DSSS	6 cases,	25.0%
DDSD	5 “	20.8%
DDSS	3 “	12.5%
DSSD	3 “	12.5%
SDSS	2 “	8.3%
DDDS	1 “	4.2%
DSDS	1 “	4.2%
SSSS	0 “	0 %

I may now discuss in somewhat fuller detail the use of the three forms SDSS, DSSD and DSDD by the elegiac poets:

SDSS.—This is the second form in Lygdamus (11.8%), with SSSS holding the third place (11.0% according to Hultgren); it is the first form in IV 2-6 (17.5%) and the second form in II 3 (15.0%);¹¹⁴ it is the first form in the *Halieutica* (16.2%), with SSSS at 6.9%, and also the first form in the *Copa*, reaching 21.1%, with SSSS at 5.2%. These remarkable facts have by no means escaped the notice of Cartault, but unfortunately he allows his metric to remain wholly in the clouds and never brings it to earth. Thus he says frankly (p. 31): “Lygdamus differs very sharply from Tibullus in the fact that, in the hexameter, the form SDSS holds the second rank in his pieces as a whole, while in the two books of Tibullus it occupies only the eighth rank. It is remarkable that the same form occupies the first rank in the pieces IV 2-6, which this peculiarity, however, is insufficient to lead us to attribute to Lygdamus.” Again he writes respecting IV 2-6 (pp. 27, 307): “The predominance of SDSS is contrary to the usage of Tibullus, since this form never prevails in any authentic piece and reaches only the eighth rank in Books I and II; there is an anomaly here.” In fact, in the ‘two books’ of Tibullus (including II 2, 3 and 5) SDSS has an average of only 5.0%;¹¹⁵ it is entirely absent from four poems, and its highest rank in the authentic elegies is fourth in I 1 (10.5%), and fourth or fifth in I 4 (9.5%) and in II 4

¹¹⁴ Note that II 3 has, for the distich, only 50.0% of dactyls and only 76.8% of dactylic beginnings. The proportion in this case of these latter is close to that of II 5 (77.8%) and considerably above that of IV 2-6, 13-14 (69.7%), v. *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1920, p. 163.

¹¹⁵ Omitting II 2, 3 and 5, it has an average, according to Cartault's figures, of only 4.6%.

(10.0%). On the other hand, it is a favorite with Propertius, and throughout his first four books it is the second schema, reaching 14.9% in Book I and 13.1% in Book II, but it is rare in other elegiac poets.¹¹⁶ It has only 6.2% in *Catalept.* IX, but SSSS has 9.3%;¹¹⁷ again it has only 3.3% in the *Panegyric*, but here again SSSS has 7.1%. It has 7.1% in IV 13-14 (14 hex.); in IV 7-12 it has 10.0% and SSSS has 15.0%. It is the fourth form in the *Ciris* (9.3%), with SSSS at 5.7%. In the early *Medicamen Fac.* it still shows strength (10.0%), though ranking only as the fifth schema. Since it involves a spondaic beginning, it has been revised out of the *Amores* as a rule (only 4.5%), but *Am.* III 3 still shows 12.5% (3 cases), III 14 12% (3 cases), with SSSS in each case at 4%, while I 13 has 9.5% (2 cases), with SSSS also at 9.5%; etc. In the *Consolatio* it still stands at 6.3%.

DSSD.—This is the predominant form in IV 13-14 (35.7%); it is the third or fourth scheme in *Catalepton* IX (12.5%) and in the whole *Catalepton* the third (10.4%),—the third also in the great *Priapea* (12.6%); it is the fourth scheme in the *Panegyric* (8.5%), with DDSD at 9%, and it divides the second place with DDSS in II 5 (11.5%); in the *Ciris* it is the sixth form (5.9%), with DDSD at 5.7%, in the *Culex* the third form (9.2%), with DDSD at 6.6%; in the beautiful and exquisite *Rosetum* (*Anth. Lat.*, Riese, 646), it is the first form (20%), with DDSD and DSDD each at 8%. It often holds the first place also in Ovid's mature works, just as in IV 13-14 and in the *Rosetum*. In the 'two books' of Tibullus, however, it has an average of only 7.0% or, if we omit II 2, 3 and 5, of only 6.0%. Its most favorable position in the genuine elegies of Tibullus is in I 2 (12.0%) and I 6 (11.9%), where it is outranked by two forms (DDSS and DSSS, or DDDS), and divides the third place with two or three others (DSDS, DSSS, DDSD, SSDS).¹¹⁸ It reaches the fourth or fifth place also in I 8 (10.3%) and II 6 (11.5%). Cartault himself well says

¹¹⁶ Hultgren, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

¹¹⁷ In the whole *Catal.* it has 9%, with SSSS at 6%; in the great *Priapea* it has 7.5%, with SSSS at 3.2%.

¹¹⁸ That DSSD, with 7 cases, should divide the second place with DDSS in II 5, attaining 11.5%, is an evidence of spuriousness.

(p. 25): "The form DSSD does not predominate in any of the pieces of the two authentic books; in the first book as a whole it reaches only the fifth rank, in the second only the sixth rank." Again he says (p. 306): "The predominance of the form DSSD is astonishing; this form never predominates in Tibullus." Further he expressly writes (p. 21) respecting DSSD and DDSD, the two schemes of which Ovid is so fond, as follows: "As a general rule Tibullus avoids these forms and they insinuate themselves only into pieces of some length." Yet against the clear metrical evidence he seeks to ascribe IV 13-14 to Tibullus (pp. 25, 306)!

In the poems, however, which show preoccupation with the dissyllabic close, DSSD sinks greatly; thus in Lygdamus it reaches only 5.5% (with DDSD at 4.8% and DSDD at 2.8%); in IV 2-6 it has only 5.3% (with DDSD at 3.5% and DSDD at 5.3%), and it shows only 5.0% in IV 7-12 (with DDSD at 5.0% and DSDD at 10.0%). Later it becomes one of the three chief schemata of Ovid; thus it holds the third rank in *Am.* I. (11.5%) and the second in the *Fasti* (15.0%). In the *Heroides* (first series) it ranks as the first schema (15.0%), and it is easily first also throughout the five books of the *Tristia* (17.9%), rising in *Trist.* III. to 17.8%, in *Trist.* I. to 18.9%, etc. To give examples of single poems, it shows 23.1% (6 cases) in *Am.* I 2, and 23.8% (5 cases) in *Am.* I 15; in both of these it is the predominant schema. As has already been stated, it is unimportant in Propertius except in his fifth book, where it is the third schema (12.2%).

DSSD.—This form is weak in IV 13-14 (only 7.1%); it is preceded by three forms and equalled by three others. In Tibullus on the other hand, it is the second schema of Book I., and in Book II. (six elegies) it divides the first place with DDSD; its proportion for these two books is 15.1, or if we exclude II 2, 3 and 5, it is 15.3. Of the fourteen genuine elegies of Tibullus, there are only three in which DSSD falls below 11.9%, viz. I 7 (6.2%), I 9 (7.3%) and II 6 (wholly lacking), and in these elegies the first place is then filled by the Tibullan favorites, DSSS and DDSD, not by a form like DSSD, to which Tibullus is averse.¹¹⁹ Hence Cartault justly

¹¹⁹ The second place also in these elegies is filled by the favorites

writes here (p. 25) : " There is reason to remark upon the rarity of DSDS." If, however, we examine with care the usage of the youthful Ovid, we shall have little cause for surprise at the weakness which this form exhibits in IV 13-14. It is wholly lacking in *Catalepton* IX; it holds only the sixth or seventh place (6.2%) in the Lygdamus poems as a whole, though in the short pieces, Lygd. 3 and 5, it is the second form (15.8%, 18.7%), and it reaches only 5% in IV 7-12. It first shows real strength in the Sulpicia elegies (IV 2-6), where it is the second or third form (15.8%), in II 3, where it is the first form (20%), in the *Halieutica*, where it is the second (14.6%), in the *Panegyric*, where it is also the second (13.7%), in the *Ciris*, where it is the third (10.6%), and in the *Culex*, where it is one of the two standing forth. Though the second form in some single elegies of the *Amores*, it ranks only as the fifth form (about 10%) in the three books as a whole.

The close relations which exist between the Lygdamus elegies and the Sulpicia letters (IV 7-12) may be seen at a glance both from the table given above (p. 306) and from a comparison of the schemata presented in Cartault (pp. 27-31); note especially the proportions of SSSS, SDSS, DSDS DSSD and SD. It is not my purpose, however, to discuss these relations in detail in the present paper.

The schemata of the Pentameter may next be given :

Forms.	Lygda-		Lygd., Sulp.		Am.		Am.		Am.		Am.	
	Catalept. IX.	mus, All six elegies.	Elegy 4.	Letters, IV 7-12.	IV 2-6.	IV 13-14.	I 2.	I 13.	I 15.	III 8.	III 10.	III 10.
	32 pent.	145 pent.	48 pent.	20 pent.	57 pent.	14 pent.	26 pent.	21 pent.	21 pent.	33 pent.	24 pent.	
DS	16 50.0	62 42.7	16 33.3	8 40.0	30 52.6	5 35.7	16 61.6	12 57.1	6 28.6	22 66.7	11 45.8	
DD	7 21.9	23 15.9	5 10.4	0 0	10 17.5	3 21.4	4 15.4	4 19.0	8 38.0	4 12.1	5 20.8	
SD	3 9.3	22 15.2	9 18.8	4 20.0	8 14.0	2 14.3	3 11.5	2 9.5	4 19.0	2 6.1	4 16.7	
SS	6 18.8	38 26.2	17 35.4	8 40.0	9 15.8	4 28.5	3 11.5	3 14.3	3 14.3	5 15.1	4 16.7	

SD.—It will be observed that SD occurs 8 times in the 57 pentameters of IV 2-6 and twice in the 14 pentameters of IV 13-14, reaching 14.0% and 14.3% respectively, and almost attaining equality with SS. This high ratio is entirely contrary

DSSS, DDSS and DSDD, the last becoming a favorite in the second book and holding the fourth rank in this book (8.9%).

to the usage of Tibullus, whose marked aversion to SD is one of the most striking characteristics of his entire versification. Cartault states this fact clearly (p. 24): "The form SD is extremely rare and is always at the end of the lists in Tibullus, except in I 7, where it prevails over SS by a unit, which is accidental." In fact, SD occurs only 24 times in the 616 pentameters of Tibullus (two books), reaching only 3.9%, or if we exclude II 2, 3 and 5, it occurs only 21 times in 503 pentameters, reaching only 4.2%.¹²⁰ Its highest percentages are 7.3 in I 4 and 7.7 in I 1. Cartault comments correctly enough on IV 2-6 (p. 27): "The relative frequency of SD is astonishing, while II 5, in 61 pentameters, offers only one case; ¹²¹ there is here another anomaly (in addition to the predominance of SDSS)." Again in IV 13-14 he notes (p. 25): "SD is relatively frequent. . . . The remainder conforms to Tibullan usage." This frequency of SD, which is so contrary to the manner of Tibullus, is, however, quite in accordance with the usage of Ovid, who throughout his mature works treats SD and SS almost alike and usually gives to each a proportion of about 10.0%, falling, however, sometimes as low as 8.7% (*Am. II.*) and rising as high as 13.3% (*Am. II.*) or even 16.0% (*Medic. Fac.*).¹²² In the six Lygdamus elegies, however, SS was considerably more frequent and stood at 26.2% (Kleemann), while SD stood at 15.2%. Here again Cartault, who is so unfortunate in his conclusions (pp. 306-310), states the bare facts correctly (p. 32): "SD reaches in Lygd. 1-4 and 5 equality with

¹²⁰ See Eichner, *op. cit.*, Table foll. p. 92, and p. 66, where he speaks of "the authors of Book IV." as differing widely from Tib. in this usage. The facts are also correctly stated by Knappe, *op. cit.* 28 f., who seeks in vain to explain them away by ingenious special pleading.

¹²¹ This striking phenomenon is possibly the result of accident, just as it is doubtless accidental that DD is entirely absent from the Sulpicia letters (IV 7-12, 20 pent.), while SS, which stood at about the same ratio as DD in the Lygdamus elegies and in IV 2-6 and 13-14, holds its own with 8 cases (SS in II 5, with 11 cases [18%] is strongly represented). More probably, however, in the case of so scrupulous an artist as Ovid, it is the result of express imitation applied to elegies that were to be mingled so closely with those of Tib.; thus also II 2 in 11 pent. has no case of SD, and II 3 in 41 pent. has only 2 cases (4.9%).

¹²² Hultgren, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

DD, while in Tibullus, with the insignificant exception of I 7, SD remains in the lowest rank and, in the two authentic books, with the lowest figures."

SS.—It is noticeable that SS occupies the second rank (28.5%) in IV 13-14 and approaches very closely to equality with DD in IV 2-6 (9 cases against 10, or 15.8% against 17.5%). This is much nearer to the usage of Lygdamus (above, p. 313; Cartault, p. 31) than to that of Tibullus.¹²³ Cartault says correctly (p. 24): "DD predominates always over SS in Tibullus, except in I 3 and II 5, and it reaches equality in I 4." Note finally, as is so often the case in Catullus, that SS is actually equal to DS (40.0%) in IV 7-12.

DD.—A brief word may be said respecting the early elegy *Am.* I 15, which is so remarkable in showing only 42.9% of dactyls in the hexameter, but 61.9% in the pentameter. The high percentage in the pentameter is clearly due to the thorough-going character of the revision. For the elegy actually shows a predominance of the schema DD (8 cases with 28.0%) over the great basic schema DS (6 cases with 28.6%), such as is possible only for the later Ovid. Thus the youthful Ovid, in IV 2-6 and 13-14, gives to DS 49.3%, to DD 18.3%; similarly in the four early elegies (*Am.* I 2. 13; III 8. 10), DS shows 58.6% (61 cases), DD 16.3% (17 cases). In Book II of the revised *Amores*, however, DS stands at 47.5%, while DD rises to 27.0% and is predominant in II 6 (32.3% against 29.0%) and nearly equal in II 16 (38.5% against 46.2%), etc.

We have seen that Ovid himself preferred certain types of verse from the first; we have seen also that in his formative years the favorite verse-forms of Catullus and Propertius attracted him greatly. Especially does the influence of the well-loved Catullus—'doctus'¹²⁴ Catullus—stand out sharply in Lygd.

¹²³ Eichner (*op. cit.* 65) correctly notes that "the proportion of SS in Catullus is above $\frac{1}{3}$, in the two books of Tibullus about $\frac{1}{4}$, in Lygd. about $\frac{1}{4}$, in Book IV nearly $\frac{1}{4}$." (Actually in the genuine 503 pentameters of Tib. the ratio is 12.5%, in Lygd. 26.2%, in II 5 18.0%, in IV 2-7 17.7%, in IV 13-14 28.5%, in Book IV as a whole 23.1%.) Knappe (*op. cit.* 28) and Zingerle (*Abh.* II 76) seek to break the force of these facts somewhat by Gruppe's hypothesis of the entire separateness of IV 2-6 (or 2-7).

¹²⁴ Lygd. 6. 41; *Am.* 3, 9, 62.

4-5, in IV 7-12 and in the *Ciris*.¹²⁵ After a long apprenticeship to the great masters, however, Ovid finally achieved an independent and distinctive art of his own; in many cases, by means of art and acquired mastery, he was even able to return to nature and the choices of his earliest youth. The stately and elegant fabric of artistic verse which we now possess in the received *corpus* did not suddenly spring by magical means out of airy nothingness; rather it was the result of the labors and studies of full twenty years (27 B. C.—8 B. C.). *Tantae molis erat Nasonis condere carmen*. When, we may ask, was the poet's work at last complete, and to what date shall we assign the *Heroides* in their present form? Evidently they were not composed *before* the year 10 B. C., when Ovid was already thirty-three. If we seek a more precise date, we are confronted with a new problem, viz. the authorship of the *Consolatio ad Liviam* on the death of Drusus and of the *Elegia Maecenatis*.¹²⁶ These two epicedia¹²⁷ were composed in B. C. 9 and 8 respectively, and do not yet exhibit, at least in their hexameters, the full virtuosity. It is quite clear that they are the last of the 'juvenile works' of Ovid and that they will fit neatly into the general scheme of his apprenticeship. Only extremely careful tests applied both to the language and the metre can solve the various problems which they offer and perhaps fix more nearly the date of the *Heroides*.¹²⁸

¹²⁵ See above, pp. 307 ff.

¹²⁶ It is well known that both of these have the same author.

¹²⁷ Like Statius, Ovid was immensely fond of writing epicedia. The one upon Tibullus (*Am.* III 9) is still preserved; those upon Messalla and Augustus have been lost.

¹²⁸ On the basis of the schemata, Ehrenguber (X, 18) correctly pronounces the *Consolatio* Ovidian; I may add that, in all the lengthy disquisitions which have been written upon this poem—including that of Skutsch in Pauly-Wissowa—I have never yet been able to find a single really serious or weighty reason advanced for doubting its authenticity. For Baehrens' favorable judgment upon the merits of the *Maecenas*, see *P. L. M.* I 123 f.—Since writing the above reference to the date of the *Heroides*, I have made further studies, and am now able to announce that, so far at least as concerns the Epistles of Paris and of Helena (*Her.* XVI and XVII), I have discovered the explanation of the metrical anomalies which have attracted the attention of scholars since the editio Veneta (1484) and since Scaliger, and am able to

A brief final word may be added respecting the text of Tibullus. Beyond question the Elegies II 1, 4 and 6—as the metrical schemata alone sufficiently demonstrate—are substantially his own, yet no construction occurring in these poems can be regarded as certainly Tibullan, unless it be confirmed by the testimony of the first book, since it will always be possible to suppose that a few single lines contain the interpolations or the corrections of Ovid. For Ovid comes between us and the historic Tibullus, very much as Paul comes between us and the historic Jesus. Jesus is eclipsed by Paul, Tibullus is merged in Ovid. It is possible fully to restore neither the one nor the other. The more complex and more forceful personalities have obscured the more ideal, the simpler and the more naïve originals. The great disciples—summoned to their task by manifest destiny, and both alike “by Death’s unequal hand controll’d”—have shaped and moulded the plastically incomplete and unfinished work of their lamented and glorified mas-

establish the comparatively early date of these two Epistles. For they belong most clearly, not to the time either of the *Metamorphoses* or of the *Tristia*, as many have supposed, but to the close of the formative period when Ovid was still engaged with “metrical experiments.” A single proof of this fact may be mentioned here. These two Epistles are entirely similar to *Catal. IX, Lygdamus, Arguments to the Aeneid, Lydia, Copa* and *Priapea* in experimentation with the caesura (see above, p. 305), that is, in 322 hex. they exhibit the Roman penthemimeral in all except 4 cases (Birt, *Rhein. Mus.* XXXII (1877), p. 390; Clark, *H. S. C. P.* XIX 134)! The poems of the Vergilian Appendix also may all without exception be justly termed “metrical experiments.” At first the remarkable vacillation or “wobbling” which they show with regard to certain metrical elegancies is infinitely perplexing to the investigator, but after much study and reflection the true explanation becomes evident. The youthful artist seeks in the end to perfect himself in very many difficult refinements of form—there are at least ten or twelve principal ones,—but in each poem or series of poems he purposely devotes himself to only seven or eight of the entire number and concentrates his attention almost entirely upon these. Therefore in one series of pieces we find him relaxing his rigor especially with respect to elision, in a second series with respect to monosyllables before the caesura, in a third with respect to the avoidance of the fourth trochee, in a fourth with reference to the dissyllabic close of the pentameter, etc. Thus he moves slowly but steadily forward to the great consummation,—the supreme achievement seen in the *Ars*, the

ters. In all this there is nothing surprising. For just as in the completed canon of the New Testament the writings of Paul, the legal specialist and the versatile eclectic, overweigh upon the whole the original gospel of the simple and sublime Nazarene, so in the finished Tibullan volume—which is dedicated with a single purpose to the glory of Messalla's house—the effusions of the brilliant Ovid, the professional man of letters and the practiced rhetorician, largely supersede the genuine works of the gentle and sincere Tibullus, who was Nature's unspoiled and unsophisticated child and a spirit truly akin to Shelley or to Keats,—England's sweet singers who were nurtured in a far distant clime and lent lustre to another golden age.¹²⁹

ROBERT S. RADFORD.

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND.

perfected *Heroides* (I-XV) and the second *Amores*, in which all the preciousities are evenly blended and tempered, and the unquestioned zenith of classical art is attained to the wonder and delight of all his Roman successors (cf. L. Müller, *Res Metrica*², pp. 79, 96, 144, 522). The vulgar assumption that our poet's consummate art was a purely miraculous endowment and was in evidence from the first, is of course an utter fallacy, but the whole subject of the "metrical experiments" requires a separate treatment, which I now have in preparation. *It is worth while, however, to emphasize here once more the fact that the received Ovidian corpus breaks up at at least four points: (1) the *Halieutica*; (2) the early *Amores*; (3) the early double *Epistles*; (4) the *Medicamen Faciei*. The view of Jacoby (*Rh. Mus.* 1905, p. 71) as to the chronology of Ovid's received works is essentially correct; Riese's conjecture mentioned by me above (*A. J. P.* XLIV 12, n. 29 and 18, n. 44) as to the early date of the *Heroides* is wholly erroneous, except as it may apply in a modified form to the six double *Epistles* (XVI-XXI).*

¹²⁹ I have allowed the statement contained in the text to stand, although in both the cases cited it doubtless expresses only a half truth. From another point of view the form in which the untiring energy and the practical genius of Paul cast the Christian religion is the only one which was suited to the current thought and learning of the Graeco-Roman world. Similarly it cannot be denied that Ovid greatly improved upon the labors of Catullus, Virgil and Tibullus, and, in consequence of his more detailed aesthetic studies and his fuller mastery of the laws of the Roman language, gave to the chief Latin verse-forms the only complete development which was possible in the elegant and courtly imperial age.