Tibullus and the Language of Latin Elegy

R. MALTBY

Summary. Ovid shares with Tibullus a number of the features generally attributed to Tibullan elegantia. It is Propertius whose verbal exuberance and mythological complexity mark him out from the others. These differences are perhaps to be attributed in some degree to the influence of Messalla on Tibullus and Ovid, and of Gallus on Propertius. Finally the concept of Tibullan elegantia needs to be redefined. His style is not consistently restrained but is capable on occasion of considerable elaboration and variety, which are all the more effective in contrast with his overall linguistic purity.

I. INTRODUCTION

Richard Burger (1911: 371–94) argued that Tibullus was an analogist, showing preference for one form of word or synonym over another, and avoiding all lexical peculiarities, be it excessive colloquialism or high-style phraseology. He pointed out that Tibullus prefers seu over sive, neu for neve and atque for ac; he uses fessus for the colloquial lassus, ventus not aura, gaudium not laetitia. He avoids diminutives, Greek loan-words and the intimate erotic vocabulary used by Catullus and Propertius of their mistresses, e.g. lux, vita, deliciae. Burger was justly criticized by Axelson (1945: 114–33) for attributing these features of Tibullus' style to the influence of Caesar and the analogists. Axelson claimed that Tibullus' choice of one word or form over another was often metrically motivated and in line with the practice of the other Roman elegists. The fact that Tibullus did not avoid the alternative forms of the perfect ērunt, erunt, -ere and the syncopated form of -erunt, and that he used the doublets senecta
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and senectus, deorum and deum, quibus and quis, caeruleus and caerulus, vinculum and vinclum did much to discredit Bürger’s analogist theory. Murgatroyd (1980: 16) added to Axelson’s objections that Tibullus made use of the synonyms anguis and serpens, umens and umidus, porto and veho, and coma, capillus and crinis without apparent distinction. In fact Tibullus makes an even wider use of synonyms than that shown by Murgatroyd.1 Despite these criticisms, Bürger nevertheless provided a sound basis for later studies of the elegantia and cultivated style for which Tibullus was praised in antiquity.2 The features of this style, which were derived ultimately from the λεπτότης of Callimachus and his followers including, amongst the Romans, Virgil in the Eclogues and Horace in the Odes, are best summed up by J. P. Elder (1962: 68) as ‘purity of... diction, straightforwardness of... syntax, and directness of... comparisons’.

Bürger and subsequent students of the style of Tibullus, including Axelson, rarely provide accurate comparative statistics from the other two elegists, Propertius and Ovid. This leaves their conclusions open to an objection. It could be said that emphasis, ancient and modern, on Tibullan elegantia has obscured the fact that in essence Tibullus’ style is little different from that of Ovid in the Amores, so Lee (1975: 9), whereas Propertius’ verbal exuberance, reminiscent of his Hellenistic literary forebears and probably also of Gallus, sets him apart from the others. My aim is to answer this potential objection by taking some features of Tibullan style and comparing them directly with Propertius and Ovid. Usually Tibullus emerges as the most restrained of the three, but in almost all cases Ovid is closer to Tibullus than to Propertius.

The stylistic similarities between Tibullus and Ovid and their differences from Propertius are, I shall argue, to some extent explicable by the tastes of their patrons. A further conclusion is that one of the advantages of Tibullan stylistic purity was that, when he did use a colourful, daring or out of the way expression, its effect would be all the more telling by contrast with his normal style.


2 Ovid, Amores 1.15.28 donec erunt ignes arcusque Cupidinis arma / discretur numeri, culte Tibulle, tui; 3.9.66 auxisti numeros, culte Tibulle, pios; Quintilian Inst. 10.1.93 elegia quoque Graecos provocamus, cuius mihi tersus atque elegans maxime videtur auctor Tibullus, sunt qui Propertium malint. Ovidius utroque lascivor, sicut durior Gallus; Velleius Paterculus 2.36.3 Tibullus... et Naso, perfectissimi in forma operis sui.
II. GREEK LOAN-WORDS

Horace informs us that Tibullus’ patron, M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, had strong views on foreign loan-words. In his speeches he was careful to use pure Latin only.\(^4\) Porphyrion ad loc. states that Messalla went so far as to invent *funambulus*, as a Latin equivalent for the Greek *συνοπλάτης*.\(^5\) Messalla’s views on the avoidance of Greek in official speeches were no doubt widespread.\(^6\) Whether they would apply to verse might be doubted by some, but the context in which Horace cites him, namely an attack on the heavily Graecizing nature of Lucilius’ verse, only makes sense if Messalla’s views extended to poetry also. Appendix A lists the Greek loan-words which I have found in the three elegists. The Tibullan examples not in Bürger’s list (1911: 387) are asterisked — a warning, if needed, about the unreliability of material collected before proper word-indexes were available.

Greek loan-words as a group are not uniform in their associations. They enter the Latin language at different periods and belong to different registers. No doubt the elegists’ audience would have recognized most as Greek, but a word such as *sandyx*, (‘red dye’ or cloth of that colour), recently introduced by Virgil in his *Eclogues*, would presumably have sounded more foreign and exotic than *coma* (‘hair’), which had been at home in Latin poetic diction since Pacuvius’ day.\(^7\) Similarly, scientific and technical terms like *hippomanes* (again recently introduced by Virgil in his *Georgics*) would have learned or didactic associations absent from the names of common utensils such as *cadus* or *crater*. A gradation of ‘Greekness’ can be established, starting at the least Greek end of the scale with words where early vowel weakening, e.g. *canistrum*, or the addition of a Latin suffix, e.g. *gypsatus, euhans*, displays a high degree of integration, through words well-established in the ordinary language, e.g. *poeta* or in technical vocabularies *podagra*, to rare or unusual Greek borrowings, e.g. *catasta*, or *antrum*, often restricted to verse, and ending with words which retain their Greek terminations, e.g. *cometen* (Tib. 2.5.71), *beryllon* (Prop.

---

4 Horace, *Satires* 1.10.27ff. Latine / cum Pedius causas exsudet Publicola atque / Corvinus, patriis intermiscere petita / verba foris malis, Canusini more bilinguis?
5 Porphyrion ad 1.10.28 Pedius Publicola et Messalla adeo curasse dicitur ne Graeca Latinis verbis inmiscerent, ut Messalla primus funambulum dixerit, ne συνοπλάτην diceret.
6 Cf. the anecdote in Suetonius, *Tiberius* 71 about Tiberius’ avoidance of Greek in the senate and his rejection of the word *εξηλημα* from a senatorial decree; see further Kaimio (1979: 106).
7 The commonly occurring *coma* and *poeta* are excluded from the list on the grounds that their Greek origin was no longer strongly felt.
4.7.9). This last type, inflected in Greek, is a rare category in all three elegists (Tib. 3 per cent, Prop. 6 per cent, Ov. 5 per cent). Quintilian 1.5.58ff. suggests they should be avoided by orators and gives as an example (1.5.61) Messalla’s use of the Latinized form of the nominative *Euthia* for *Euthias*, probably in his *oratio Hyperidis pro Phryne in lat. versa*. From the practice of the elegists it would seem that such reticence about the use of Greek terminations in Latin also extended to verse.

To clarify the distribution of these types amongst the elegists Appendix A gives the author of first attestation for each loan-word and shows the main categories to which each poet’s Greek borrowings belong.

The frequency of different Greek words in Tibullus (one in 40 lines) is slightly greater than in Ovid (one in 45 lines). Even Propertius, with one in 36 lines, is not markedly out of step. In occurrences, however, Tibullus is more sparing (one in 32 lines), as opposed to Ovid (one in 23) and Propertius (one in 16).8

Of course the author of first attestation can only give a rough guide to when a word actually entered the language, but, with this proviso in mind, all three elegists use in similar proportions Greek words borrowed early (Plautus or before) and Greek borrowings from the time of Cicero and the neoterics (Tib. early 46.5 per cent, time of Cic. 46 per cent; Prop. early 37 per cent, time of Cic. 41 per cent; Ov. early 38 per cent, time of Cic. 36 per cent) with near contemporary borrowings (from Horace on) forming the smallest category (Tib. 13.5 per cent; Prop. 22 per cent; Ov. 26 per cent). Tibullus, however, is noticeably more restricted in his recent borrowings, showing a marked preference for Greek loan-words established before the Augustan period. Propertius (23 per cent) has a much greater proportion of rare or unusual words or words restricted to verse than Tibullus (17 per cent) or Ovid (14 per cent); he also has more words with Greek terminations (Prop. 6 per cent, Tib. 3 per cent, Ov. 5 per cent). Propertius (14 per cent) makes greater use of Greek words with Latin suffixes than Tibullus (7 per cent) and Ovid (4 per cent).

As for the lexical categories of Greek loan-words, the most frequent type in all three authors are words connected with poetry and music. Only in Propertius is the traditionally productive category of words connected with the life of luxury equally important. Propertius also differs in making much greater use of technical terms from the lower registers connected with sport, shipping and, in particular, household equipment and utensils.

---

8 Joan Booth reminds me that Tib.’s avoidance of Greek does not extend to proper names, where his *noms parlants* Pholoe and Nemesis are Greek. To these I would add Marathus (on which see Murgatroyd 1980: 9) and Delia. In fact the use of meaningful Greek names is well established in Latin literature of all genres, especially comedy, lyric and pastoral.
It is striking that this last category is completely absent from Ovid. Clearly Propertius was willing to go further than Tibullus and Ovid in extending the lexical range of elegy to include terms more at home in the lower genres of comedy and satire.

As the figures for the frequency of Greek borrowings over Propertius' four books show, this stylistic feature becomes more marked in his later books. There is a contrast here with his use of diminutives, which, as shown below, become less frequent in Books 3 and 4. As Norden (1910: 507) points out, Propertius has more Greek loan-words than Virgil, Horace and Tibullus put together. This feature may be intended to parallel in Latin poetry the varied use of lexical registers and Greek dialect forms in his Hellenistic forerunners. The increase in his later books may be due to his movement away from personal love elegy towards experiments with more consciously Hellenistic themes. What is certain is that this is not an area where Tibullan influence led him progressively to restrict his usage.

Greek loan-words in Tibullus are clearly concentrated in poems where Hellenistic influence is particularly noticeable. These are: 1.7, a birthday poem for Messalla which also praises his patron for his military victories abroad — a combination of a genethliakon and an epinikion, with clear echoes from Callimachus frs. 383 and 384 Pf., which were probably epinikia; 2.5 an invocatory hymn to Apollo (κληρικός ἐμοῖς) on the occasion of the appointment of Messalla’s son Messalinus as one of the Quindecimviri Sacris Faciundis, a poem displaying much antiquarian and literary doctrina, and again containing echoes from Callimachus, especially Hymn 2 (to Apollo). Apart from these two poems Greek loan-words are very rare indeed in Tibullus. Of course, this rarity makes their effect all the more striking, especially if they are concentrated in a single passage. A particularly good example is:

\[
\text{vota loquor: regnum ipse tenet quem saepe coegit}
\]
\[
\text{barbara gypsatos ferre catasta pedes. (2.3.59–60)}
\]

Here three words of Greek origin in a single pentameter serve to emphasize the barbaric character of Tibullus’ rival for Nemesis, a foreign exslave. The word barbarus on its own would perhaps by this date be scarcely recognizable as Greek, but here it gains significance through its occurrence in a cluster of Greek loan-words. The rare catasta, which occurs first here or at Livy 28.21.2 and then not in verse again until Persius (6.77), refers to a revolving platform on which slaves were exhibited for sale. When on the

---

9 Concentrations of Greek words in Tibullus: 1.3.59 chorea, 61 casia, 66 myrteus; 1.7.12 lympha, 15 aetherius, 28 barbarus, 44 choris, 45 corymbus, 48 cista, 49 chorea; 2.5.2 cithara, 3 chorda, 17 charta, 32 calamus, 48 barbarus, 71 cometes, 98 calix.
catasta, foreign slaves were distinguished from *vernae* by having their feet smeared with gypsum. The verb *gypso*, derived ultimately from the Greek *γυψός*, occurs before here only at Cicero, *Epistulae ad Familiares* 7.6.1. The verb is retained by Ovid in his imitation of this line at *Amores* 1.8.64:

```latex
nec tu, siquis erit capitis mercede redemptus,
despice; gypsati crimen inane pedis.
```

But in Propertius 4.5.51–2:

```latex
aut quorum titulus per barbara colla pependit,
cretati medio cum saluere foro
```

where the epithet *barbara* in 51 suggests an echo of Tibullus, the Greek *gypsatus* is replaced by the Latin *cretatus*. Finally the application of *barbarus*, the Greek for ‘foreigner’, to a Greek is an ironic reversal of the common Plautine joke by which the word is used in the mouths of Greeks to refer to Romans.10

To sum up: it is Propertius who stands out from Tibullus and Ovid both in his greater frequency of Greek loan-words and in his wider lexical range. It is perhaps worth recalling that Messalla, the aristocratic defender of pure Latinity, in addition to being Tibullus’ patron also encouraged Ovid’s first attempts at verse.11

### III. ‘VERSUS ECHOICI’

If Tibullus is somewhat restricted in his use of Greek loan-words, this is not the case with his introduction into Latin verse of a number of Hellenistic Greek rhetorical figures. The device of repeating the beginning of the hexameter at the end of the pentameter, a feature of Hellenistic epigram, as exemplified from Callimachus and Meleager12, is attested for the first time in Latin poetry in Tibullus 1.4.61–2:


11 For Messalla as the patron of Ovid’s early work, see Ovid *Pont.* 2.3.75ff. (to Messalla’s son, Cotta Maximus): *me tuus ille pater . . . / primus ut auderem commitere carmina famae / impulit: ingenii dux fuit ille mei*, and cf. *Trist.* 4.4.27ff., *Pont.* 1.7.27ff., 2.2.97ff.

12 *versus echoici*, cf. Martial 2.86.3 *nusquam Graecula quod recantat echo*; *AP* 7.518.1–2 (Callimachus)

```
'Aστακίδης τὸν Κρήτην τὸν αἰπόλον ἤρπασε Νέμφη
ex ὤρεω, καὶ νῦν ἱερὸς Αστακίδης,
```

*AP* 5.176.1–2 (Meleager)

```
'δεινὸς Ἑρως, δεινὸς· τί δὲ τὸ πλέον ἢ πάλιν εἶπο
καὶ πάλιν οἰμώζων παλλάκι, 'δεινὸς Ἑρως';
```
It is significant that this occurs in a lecture on the art of homosexual love, delivered by a statue of the god Priapus — an elegy, which, like 1.7 and 2.5, displays a considerable degree of Alexandrian influence. There is no example of such a *versus echoicus* in Propertius, but it becomes a favourite trick of Ovid's style, with perhaps the best known example occurring at *Amores* 1.9.1–2

militat omnis amans, et habet sua castra Cupido; Attice, crede mihi, militat omnis amans.

It is then used rather excessively by later Latin poets, see Munari (1971: 350, n. 10).

Another version of this is where the opening of the second half of the pentameter repeats the opening of the first half. This becomes something of a characteristic hallmark of Tibullan style, often giving emphasis to the end of an elegy:

1.1.78 despiciam dites despiciamque famem
1.4.82 deficiunt artes deficiuntque doli
1.7.64 candidior semper candidiorque veni
2.5.100 caespitibus mensas caespitibusque tonum

In all the Latin examples *-que* is attached to the echoed word, which is always in penultimate position in the line. Three of the poems in which it occurs are characterized by marked Hellenistic influence: 1.4, 1.7 and 2.5. It is not found in Propertius, but is used occasionally by Ovid. Its Greek origin is emphasized by its combination with Greek proper names in *Heroides* 4.112 *Pirithoum Phaedrae Pirithoumque tibi*, while *Amores* 2.11.10 *et gelidum Borean egelidumque Notum* is a humorous variation on the type. According to Seneca (*Contr. 2.2.12*) this last line was judged by Ovid's friends to be one of his three worst and by Ovid himself to be one of his three best.

In their use of *versus echoici* Tibullus and Ovid again resemble each other, but differ from Propertius. Tibullus appears to have been the innovator, although given the loss of Gallus and of so much neoteric poetry certainty on this point is impossible. His techniques were then taken up and developed further by Ovid. Again a connection with the circle of

---

14 For Greek pentameter echoes, cf. *AP* 5.159.4 (Simonides) καὶ πόθεν αἱ ζώαι καὶ πόθεν οἱ πώνακες; *AP* 6.13.6 (Leonidas) τῷ δὲ διὸ δρυμῶι, τῷ δὲ δι’ ἕλιον.
Messalla suggests itself. If, as seems likely, the pseudo-Virgilian *Catalepton* 9.13ff.\(^\text{15}\) refers to Messalla, then he composed pastoral and erotic verse in Greek. It is possible that Tibullus and other members of the circle, such as the young Ovid, could have been influenced by the Hellenistic techniques displayed in these poems and encouraged to adapt them to Latin verse. Tibullus could, of course, have taken them directly from Hellenistic poetry, but it is strange that these particular types are not also to be found in Propertius, who in other areas shows a mastery of Hellenistic verse technique.

**IV. POSTPONED PARTICLES**

The postponement of the particles *et*, *at*, *atque*, *aut*, *nam*, and *namque* develops in neoteric verse in imitation of a Hellenistic Greek poetic mannerism.\(^\text{16}\) Examples of postponed *kai* in Hellenistic poetry are given in Haupt (1875: 136–7) and Norden (1957: 402 n. 4). It is possible that the postponement of *nam* and *namque* could have been based on the analogy of *enim*, see Janson (1979: 95–6), but if so, it is strange that no clear example of postponed *nam* is found until Catullus 23.7\(^\text{17}\) and of *namque* until Catullus 64.384. Platnauer’s figures (1951: 93–6) for postponed particles in elegy suggest that this is more frequent in Tibullus and Propertius than in Ovid’s *Amores*. To test this hypothesis all the examples of postponed *et* in Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid’s *Amores* were counted.\(^\text{18}\) Tibullus is the most frequent user (one in 32 lines). Again poems 1.4 and

\(^\text{15}\) [Virg.] *Catalepton* 9.13ff.

```latex
pauca tua in nostras venerunt carmina chartas,
carmina cum lingua, tum sale Cecropio.

...\[
molitter hic viridi patulæ sub tegmine quercus
Moeris pastores et Meliboeus erant.

...\[
felicem ante alias o te scriptore puellam
altera non fama dixerit esse prior.
```


\(^\text{17}\) At Plautus *Mil.* 1379, *Pers.* 379 and *Pseud.* 521 the text is unsound. The conjecture of *nam* for *non* in Valerius Aedituus fr. 2.3 (Buecheler) should be rejected.

\(^\text{18}\) Postponed *et*: Tibullus 1.1:3, 1.2:3, 1.3:1, 1.4:5, 1.5:2, 1.6:1, 1.7:6, 1.8:0, 1.9:1, 1.10:4, 2.1:3, 2.2:2, 2.3:5, 2.4:0, 2.5:2, 2.6:1 39 occurrences = 1 in 32 lines. Propertius, Book 1, 23 = 1 in 30 lines; Book 2, 31 = 1 in 45 lines; Book 3, 19 = 1 in 52 lines; Book 4, 23 = 1 in 44 lines; Propertius 96 occurrences = 1 in 42 lines.

Ovid, *Amores* 1.3:10, 1.9:22, 1.15:34, 2.1:32, 2.6:35, 2.9:10, 2.10:36, 3.8:21, 3.12:18, 9 occurrences = 1 in 273 lines.
1.7, where Hellenistic influence is strong, have the most examples (5 and 6 respectively); though 2.5 has a surprisingly low total of two. Propertius is next in frequency (one in 42 lines). In the first book, however, it is more frequent (one in 30 lines) than in Tibullus, perhaps because of strong Catullan influence on the *Monobiblos*.

In this case it is Ovid who stands out as making very infrequent use of the device, with only 9 instances in the whole of the *Amores* (one in 273 lines). How are these figures to be explained? Unlike the *versus echoici*, which occur for the first time in Tibullus, the postponing of these particles had been introduced into Latin poetry by Catullus and his neoteric contemporaries, poets who, according to Tränkle (1960: 22–9) were particularly influential on Propertius, especially in his first book. Now as Norden (1957: 402) argues the reason why this Hellenistic device commended itself to both Greek and Latin writers was mainly metrical convenience and the need to keep unimportant words from taking up the emphatic first position in the line. It could be that Ovid, with his greater metrical facility and fastidiousness, simply found other, less artificial ways of overcoming these problems.

However, Ovid does follow Tibullus in his extension of this Hellenistic device to the postponement of enclitic *-que* to follow four-syllable verbs in the second half of the pentameter.19 As Schünke (1906: 114–5) shows, Tibullus was the first to make use of this figure with *-que*, of which he lists ten examples in Books 1 and 2. Propertius has only one example, in his second book, while Ovid uses it five times in the *Amores* and more frequently in his later works, so McKeown (1987: 83). Ovid’s greater use of this figure in comparison with Propertius is perhaps to be explained on the grounds that Ovid is complimenting its inventor Tibullus, an author whose style as a fellow member of Messalla’s circle he greatly admired. Tibullus and Propertius, on the other hand, were to some extent rivals, working in their own contrasting styles, and although undoubtedly they may echo one another’s verse, and although Tibullus’ first book may have influenced to some extent the style and particularly the metrics of Propertius’ later work, so Murgatroyd (1980: 13–15), conscious imitation, of the type we can see in Ovid, particularly, for example in *Amores* 3.9 on Tibullus’ death, is rare.

19 e.g. Tibullus 1.1.25 *pocula, de facili composuitque luto;* 2.5.90 *accendet, flammas transilietque sacras*; also at 1.3.14, 1.3.38, 1.6.54, 1.6.72, 1.7.62, 2.3.54, 2.5.70, 2.5.72. Propertius 2.20.12 *ferratam Danaes transiliamque domum.* Ovid *Amores* 1.8.112, 3.7.10, 3.10.12, 3.13.30, 3.14.12.
It would be all too easy in a study of this kind to be guilty of selectivity in choosing features to back up the thesis that Ovid shares many of the characteristics of Tibullus’ *elegantia*, and that it is Propertius whose linguistic exuberance sets him apart from the other two. In the interests of a balanced view an attempt was made to find an aspect of Tibullan *elegantia* that did not conform to this pattern. The only one to emerge was his avoidance of compound adjectives (see Appendix B). As with Greek loan-words, compound adjectives are a very diverse category. Some of them, e.g. *agricola*, *benignus*, *magnificus*, are well established in all registers and are not restricted to poetic language; others, particularly those based on the suffixes *-ger* and *-fer*, came to be regarded as characteristic of high-style epic and tragic diction. Ennius is credited with increasing Latin’s native stock of compound adjectives by attaching standard suffixes, and occasionally prefixes, to a wide variety of nouns on the analogy of Greek poetic practice. In Catullus these compounds occur most frequently in the long poems, see Ross (1969: 17–22). Tibullus’ use is particularly restricted, with only eight occurrences of six words (one in 155 lines). None of the six was invented by Tibullus, and only *imbrifer*, which occurs for the first time at Virgil, *Georg.* 1.313, and *lanificus*, which is used adjectivally for the first time in Tibullus, are at all rare. Earlier, from Lucilius on, *lanificus* occurs only as a feminine noun *lanifca* ‘woman spinner’ or ‘weaver’. There is a parallel here with *agricola*, which occurs as a noun from Plautus on, but is used adjectivally first in Tibullus. The only other point of note is the use of *naufragus* in the active sense of ‘shipwrecking’, a sense also attested in Horace, *Carm.* 1.16.10, cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 3.553.

Propertius, with 28 occurrences of 21 words (one in 144 lines), is not notably freer in his use than Tibullus. What does mark him out from Tibullus is his willingness to invent new compounds. No fewer than eight of his 21 compounds are attested for the first time in Propertius. Furthermore, by far the majority of Propertius’ compounds are rare or poetic, with only three, *agricola*, *artifex* and *sacrilégus*, occuring regularly in prose. There is a marked increase in these compounds in Propertius’ later books, especially Book 3. Again, as with Greek loan-words, this corresponds with

---

20 On compounds in general in Latin see Bader (1962).
21 But not as restricted as Ross (1979: 19 n.8) suggests, where he finds only two.
22 For other examples of the use of adjectives in such an active sense in Tibullus see Cairns (1979: 109).
a move away from more subjective elegy towards more general themes where Hellenistic influence is more noticeable.

Ovid is much less restricted than Tibullus and even than Propertius, with 28 occurrences of 26 words (one in 98 lines). Of these no fewer than ten are attested for the first time in Ovid. Only four occur commonly in prose, benignus, carnifex, magnificus and munificus. Such compounds were to become more common in the Metamorphoses. But already in the Amores, as Booth has shown (1981: 2696–7), they could be used to add a touch of high-flown poeticism, as with the reference to the river Po at 2.17.32 as populifer, or a note of mock solemnity as when the epithet Martigenae is used at 3.4.39 for Romulus and Remus, the result of an extra-marital affaire. This is a case then where Ovid’s inventiveness and wit lead him beyond the bounds observed by the other elegists.

VI. DIMINUTIVES

Tibullus' elegantia involved avoiding not only words such as compound adjectives whose tone was too elevated for elegy, but also colloquial features such as certain diminutives, whose tone could have been too conversational. This is one of the few features for which Axelson (1945: 41–3) gives full figures from all the elegists. An analysis of his findings is set out in Appendix C. Diminutives are again a diverse class, used in a wide variety of contexts, not all of which are colloquial23. Of the three elegists Tibullus is the least frequent user (one in 177 lines) and none of his six examples is especially colloquial. He is careful to avoid ‘affective’ diminutives of the type ocellus, used frequently in erotic contexts by both Propertius (ocellus 18: oculus 18) and Ovid (ocellus 11: oculus 25). Of the diminutives he does use, capella is the regular word for ‘she-goat’ in Augustan poetry; it appears to have been the base-form capra that was the everyday word from which most Romance reflexes are derived (Axelson 1945: 44–5). fabella is used in its specialized sense of a story told to children (cf. Cic. de Fin. 5.42 (parvi) . . . fabellarum auditione ducuntur) and adds an air of innocence to the story-telling scene at 1.3.85. fiscella ‘cheese basket’ is an item of technical vocabulary, with no diminutive force (cf. Virg. Ecl. 10.71). novellus is perhaps the most unusual of Tibullus’ diminutives. It refers normally to the young of animals (e.g. Varro, Rust. 1.20.2 novellos . . . iuvencos) and in its context at 2.2.22 ludat et ante tuas turba novella pedes perhaps likens the crowd of young children playing at their father’s feet in an affectionate way to a litter of young animals.

Tibullus' two remaining diminutives, *tabella*, once of a writing tablet (2.6.45) and once of a picture in a temple (1.3.38), and *tigillum* (2.1.39) of a small rafter used in the construction of a primitive house, are technical words with no particular affective or colloquial tone. Propertius has more diminutives (one in 75 lines) than either Tibullus or Ovid. In contrast with Tibullus he is not averse to using affective diminutives of the type *auricula*, *labellum*, *lectulus*, *ocellus*, *parvulus* and *vocula*. These are much more frequent in the first two books, where again Catullan influence could have been important. Propertius' use of *auricula* in Book 1 is the only occurrence of this diminutive in elegy. The context is a shut-out lover's complaint:

Prop. 1.16.27–8 o utinam triecta cava mea vocula rima percussas dominae vertat in auriculas.

As Fedeli points out (1980: 389), the presence of the rare *vocula* (27) and *ocellus* (31) in the same context argues for an affective use of the diminutive here. Tibullus and Ovid in the *Amores* use only *auris* (Tib. 1; Ov. *Am.* 5). The distribution of *ocellus* in Propertius is instructive here. Whereas in Book 1 it is the only word for 'eye', it disappears completely in Books 3 and 4 (Book 1 *ocellus* 10 — *oculus* 0; Book 2 *ocellus* 8 — *oculus* 5; Book 3 *ocellus* 0 — *oculus* 5; Book 4 *ocellus* 0 — *oculus* 8 — see Axelson (1945: 41–2)). This drastic reduction in diminutives in Books 3 and 4 may to some extent be a result of the change in tone and subject matter of the last two books, referred to above, but it is also possible that the restraint displayed by Tibullus in his first book may have influenced Propertius' later practice. Ovid is more restrained than Propertius in his use of diminutives (one in 98 lines), but unlike Tibullus he does not avoid the affective use of *labellum* and *ocellus*. His other diminutives are not particularly colloquial in tone and in general his usage is closer to that of Tibullus.

To summarize the findings so far, it is clear that except in the case of compound adjectives the purity of diction displayed by Tibullus is also a characteristic of Ovid's style in the *Amores*. The main contrast is between these two, both protégés of Messalla, and Propertius, a poet much influenced in his early career by Gallus, who could actually have been his first patron.

---

24 On Catullus' use of diminutives see Fordyce (1961: 95–6).
VII. ETYMOLOGICAL WORD PLAY

A detailed investigation of this topic in elegy would go beyond the scope of this chapter. One point, however, does seem relevant to the present investigation. Such interest in the origins of words is well attested in Tibullus and in Ovid, and although it is not entirely absent from Propertius, particularly when the word play involves proper names, it does not appear to be characteristic of his style. This is another area where the interests of Tibullus and Ovid coincide and contrast with those of Propertius. Again it would be tempting to see in this difference the influence of Messalla on Tibullus and Ovid. Seneca’s comment at Contr. 2.4.8 that Messalla was a Latini . . . sermonis observator diligentissimus suggests at least that Messalla was particularly careful in his own choice of language.

VIII. TIBULLUS 1.4 AND THE MOCK DIDACTIC STYLE

The linguistic peculiarities of Tibullus 1.4. are adduced here as a final illustration of the effect of Tibullus’ occasional departures from his stylistic norm. As argued earlier, this imaginary dialogue between the poet and a statue of Priapus is one in which Hellenistic influence is particularly marked. Priapus’ art of homosexual love is commonplace in its precepts, but they are delivered in an amusingly pompous, mock didactic style, tricked out with numerous linguistic peculiarities and literary allusions.

The contrast with the Tibullan norm is noticeable and effective. Priapus’ speech is introduced and concluded by the mock-epic phrases sic ego: tum Bacchi respondit rustica proles (7) and haec mihi . . . deus edidit ore (73).

For the first, cf. Virg. Aen. 1.325 sic Venus: et Veneris contra sic filius orsus, and for the mock-heroic effect of proles, see Norden on Aen. 6.784. For edidit ore, cf. Virg. Aen. 7.194 haec . . . placido prior edidit ore (of Latinus). Priapus’ speech begins, significantly, with a syntactical Graecism, credere, modelled on the Greek φευγεω inf. (cf. Herod. 4.76, Plato, Apol. 26A) and occurring for the first time in Latin in Lucretius 1.1052

---

29 To the mock-didactic elements listed in my discussion Professor David West suggests the following additions: 5–6 nudus . . . nudus, cf. Virg. Georg. 1.299 nudus ara, sere nudus; 31–2 the ageing horse, cf. Lucr. 5.886–7; 55 echoes the famous Sapphic tag 1.21, cf. Hor. Carm. 2.5.13, 2.12.27–8; the undermining of Tibullus’ position at the end of the poem is a standard feature of Horatian mock-didactic, e.g. Epod. 1.2.
30 Professor David West points out that the verb retains an element of its literal sense viz. fuge turbam.
fuge credere, Memmi. This is the first of a number of echoes of Lucretius' didactic style. The pentameter has a mock-legal solemnity; causam habere and iusta causa are frequent in legal texts, and there is irony in iusti... amoris with reference to homosexual love. The legal humour here, and the play on technical terms, is very reminiscent of Ovid. More Lucretian echoes follow in 18-21: for the proverbial wearing away of stone by water, longa dies molli saxa peredit aqua (18), cf. Lucr. 1.326 vesco sale saxa peresa, with lucida signa (20), cf. Lucr. 5.518, and with Veneris... venti (21), cf. the etymological play on Venus and ventus at Lucr. 1.22-4, alma Venus... te, dea, te fugiunt venti. At 27 Tibullus uses the form transiet. This is the only example of this form of the future (for transibit) of any compound of eo in the whole of classical verse. In literary Latin generally it is extremely rare and does not occur again until Seneca. However, its occurrence in early Bible translations and in a highly colloquial letter from Vindolanda suggests that it may have been current in colloquial speech. Priapus is fond of unusual forms: atteruisse at 48 is the only surviving example of this form of the perfect of terto or its compounds apart from Apuleius and the Itala (see Neue–Wagener 3.394). As Murgatroyd (1980: 148) points out, the form is vouched for by Charisius 323.9 (B) and Velleius Longus GLK VII 74.5, who describes it as archaic. At 28 remeatque, the disjunctive -que has caused difficulties and has been changed to -ve in later MSS, but again it becomes a feature of poetic language from Lucretius on (see Bailey on Lucr. 2.825) and is another example of Priapus' intentionally didactic and recherché style. colores (29) for flowers is a metonymy of Lucretian origin (5.740), which recurs at Virgil, Georg. 4.306 and Propertius 1.2.9 in a similar didactic context. In 33 vidi, with its emphasis on autopsy and its appeal to personal experience, though not exclusively didactic, is characteristic of the didactic attitude, see Smith (1913: 275) and cf. Lucr. 4.577–9, 6.1044–55. Ovid makes frequent use of it in his mock-didactic Ars Amatoria (2.169, 493, 547, 3.43, 487, 598) and Remedia Amoris (1, 227, 311, 499, 555, 609, 621, 663). In 36 is a reference to the snake preserving its youth by sloughing off its skin; again the only other occurrence of exuit in this context is Lucretius 4.61. At 44 the rare compound imbrifer occurs earlier only in a didactic context at Virgil, Georg. 1.313.

31 Futures of this type are restricted mainly to the compounds of eo, and occur most frequently in Christian Latin and Bible translations. See Neue–Wagener (1892–1905) 3.327f. Outside that sphere the only examples of transiet are Sen. N.Q. 3.10.4 and Apul. Ascl. 28 p. 314 (Hildebrand). Examples with other compounds in the classical period are as follows: inietur Cic. Leg. Agr. 2.25.67, redies Apul. Met. 6.19, iniet Sen. Ben. 2.1.2, exiet Sen. Epist. 17.9, exient Iulius Modestus ap. Charis. Gramm. 1.125K.

32 Professor Jim Adams informs me that the form rediemus occurs at Vindolanda Inv. no. 93.1544 (see Bowman and Thomas (1996)).
The use of the future indicatives temptabis and dabis in 51–2 as directives, though not exclusively a didactic feature, is found in contexts where the authority of the speaker gives him confidence that the addressee will comply with his request, see Risselada (1993: 169). The high frequency of this construction in Cicero's letters (Risselada (1993: 174–8)) suggests it may have been a feature of conversational Latin. At 9 Venerem vendere looks like another etymological play on Venus' name (cf. Ovid, Amores 1.10.29–34). The typically Hellenistic structure of the couplet 61–2, which Tibullus reproduces here for the first time in Latin, was discussed in section 3 above. The speech ends with an accumulation of short mythological references: 63–4 Nisus and Pelops, 68 Ops and the rites of the Phrygian Mother Goddess Cybele. Finally the rather odd use of expleat in 69 deserves some explanation. What does expleat urbes mean? expleo is normally used of completing a circuit, as in Aeneid 12.763. Tibullus could be thinking of completing a circuit of cities. But given Priapus' penchant for learned etymologizing seen elsewhere in this passage, it could be that the ancient derivation of urbs from orbis (Maltby (1991: 655)) lies at the root of the expression here. Priapus is using a verb expleo with urbs which would be more appropriate with the word from which urbs is derived, namely orbis. The aim is to hint at the etymology urbs < orbis. At the end of the poem, when Tibullus himself takes up the stance of teacher of love, this change of role is reflected in his adoption of Priapus' didactic style with the proverbial gloriu cuique sua est in 77, and the epic tempus erit cum in 79 recalling the Homeric ἐσσεται ἡμαρ.

APPENDIX A

Greek Words

Greek Words in Tibullus

aetherius (αἰθέριος, Cic.) 1, *barbarus (βάβαρος, Naev.) 3, *cadus (κάδος, Plaut.) 1, *calamus (καλαμός, Plaut.) 1, calix (κόλιξ, Plaut.) 1, *canistrum (κανιστρά, Cic.) 1, *casia (κασία, Plaut.) 1, *catasta (κατάστασις, Tib./Liv.) 1, charta (χάρτης, Cic.) 1, chorda (χορδή, Cic.) 1, chorea (χορεία, Lucr.) 2, chorus (χορός, Naev.) 3, cista (κίστης, Cic.) 1, cithara (κιθάρα, Var.) 2, cometes (κομήτης, Cic.) 1, concha (κόχυτης, Plaut.) 1, *corymbus (κόρυμβος, Virg. Ecl.) 1, *elegi (ἐλεγοί, Tib./Hor. Carm.) 1, *fucus (φοκός, Plaut.) 1, gypsatus (γύψος, Cic. Epist.) 1, hippomane (ἵππωμανής, Virg. Georg.) 1, *lympha (νύμφη, Pacuv.) 2, *myrteus (μύρτος, Cato) 1, *myrtus (μύρτος, Cato) 1, nardum (νάρδος, Lucr.) 1, *palma (παλάμη, Plaut.) 1, podagra (ποδάγρα,
Cic.) 1, scyphus (σκόφος, Plaut.) 1, stola (στολή, Enn.) 1, zmaragdus (σμαραγδός, Var. Men.) 2.
* words not in Bürger’s list (1911: 387)

On the possibility that canistrum was derived from the form κάνυστρον and that both fucus and φοκος derived independently from a Semitic root see Biville (1990: 148, 195–6).

30 words = 1 in 40 lines
39 occurrences = 1 in 32 lines
Tibullus 1 and 2 = 1240 lines

Early borrowings: 14 = 46.5 per cent
Ciceronian period: 12 = 46 per cent
Near contemporary: 4 = 13.5 per cent
First in Tibullus: catasta?, elegi? 2 = 7 per cent
Latin suffixes: gypsatus, myrteus 2 = 7 per cent
Rare or unusual: catasta, chorea, elegi, lymph, hippomanes 5 = 17 per cent
Greek terminations: cometen 2.5.71, 1 = 3 per cent

Lexical categories

1 scientific/technical 6 = 20 per cent
2 poetry/music/dance 7 = 23 per cent
3 plants/trees 5 = 17 per cent
4 luxury items 4 = 13 per cent
5 utensils 3 = 10 per cent
6 religion 2 = 7 per cent
7 clothing 1 = 3 per cent
8 other

Greek Words in Propertius

acanthus (άκανθος, Virg. Ecl.) 1 (Book 3), adamantinus (άδαμαντίνος, 1 Lucr.) 1(3), adamas (άδαμας, Virg. Aen.) 1(4), aer (άερ, Cato) 4 (Books 2234), aetherius 1(2), amphora (άμφορεύς, Naev.) 1(4), antrum (άντρον, Virg. Ecl.) 14(11223333444444), astrum (αστρον, Cic.) 7(233444), barbarus 6 (233444), baris (βάρις, Prop.) 1(3), beryllus (βηρυλλός, Maecenas) 1(4), bombyx (βομβύς, Prop.) 1(2), cadus 2(44), calamus 6(233444), calathus (κάλαθος, Virg. Ecl.) 2(23), calix 1(2), canistrum 2(34), carbasus (κάρφασος, Enn.) 2(4), cataphractus (κατάφρακτος, Sall.) 1(4), cathedra (καθεδρα, Hor.)
Book 2 60 occurrences in 1396 lines = 1 in 23
Book 3 89 occurrences in 990 lines = 1 in 11
Book 4 78 occurrences in 952 lines = 1 in 12

Early borrowings: 41 = 37 per cent
Ciceronian period: 46 = 41 per cent
Near contemporary: 24 = 22 per cent
First in Propertius: *baris, bombyx, cerastes, chrysolithus, crotalista*, *clulas, mitratus, rhombus, terebinthus, thyius* 10 = 9 per cent
Latin suffixes: *adamantinus, euthans, mitratus, murreus* 4 = 4 per cent
Rare or unusual: *adamas, antrum, calathus, carbasus, cataphractus, cerastes, chalybs, chorea, chrysolithus, cithara, clatria, crotalista*, *cyclus, elegi, hippomanes, lympha, nympha, orgia, pancratium, pontus, rhombus, sandyx, thalamus, thyius, thyrsus, trochoe* 26 = 23 per cent
Greek terminations: *barida 3.11.44, beryllon 4.7.9, heroidas 2.28.1.29, heroas 3.11.27, isthmos 3.22.2, lotos 3.12.27, paeana 3.15.42, 7 = 6 per cent*

Lexical categories:

1 scientific/technical 17 = 15 per cent

2 poetry/music/dance 18 = 16 per cent

3 plants/trees 10 = 9 per cent

4 luxury items 18 = 16 per cent

5 utensils/household equipment 10 = 9 per cent

6 religion 3 = 3 per cent
7 clothing 6 = 5 per cent
8 ships/sea 6 = 5 per cent
9 sport 6 = 5 per cent
10 other 17 = 15 per cent

carbasus, cyclas, mitra, mitratus, petasus, zona
baris, contus, isthmus, phaselus, pelagus, pontus
discus, gymnasion, gyrus, palaestra, pancratium, trochus

antrum, barbarus, ephemeris, epistula, herois, heros, herous, lympha, moecha, nympha, parma, pompa, pharetra, sceptrum, thalamus, tropaeum, tyrannus

greek Words in Ovid, Amores
adamas 1, aelinos (αἰλων, Ov.) 1, aer 2, aetherius 1, barbaria (βαρβαρος, Plaut.) 1, barbarus 2, cedrus (κεδρος, Virg. Georg.) 1, chorda 1, concha 1, corona 3, cothurnatus (κοθυρνος, Ov.) 1, cothurnus 6, croceus (κροκος, Virg. Ecl.) 1, crocus, 1 electrum 1, elegi 2, ephemeris 1, graphium (γραφιον, Ov.) 1, gypsatus 1, gyrus 1, herois 1, heros 2, herous 1, historia 1, historicus 1, lilium 1, lyra 8, magus (μαγος, Cic.) 1, marmoreus (μαρμαρος, Cic.) 2, myrteus 1, myrtus 3, nympha 2, palma 4, pelagus 2, peltatus (πελτας, Liv.) 1, pharetra 3, pharetratus (Virg. Georg.) 2, phaselus 1, phoenix (φοινιξ, Ov.) 1, poeniceus 1, pompa (πομπα) 8, pontus 2, psittacus (πιθακος, Ov.) 4, rhombus 1, sceptrum 4, sistrum (σειτρον, Ov.) 2, stomachus (στομαχος) 1, thalamus 3, theatrum 3, thyrsus 2, tigris 1, toxicum 1, tragoedia (τραγωδια) 1, tyrannus 1, zmaragdus 1, zona 1.

55 words = 1 in 45 lines
105 occurrences = 1 in 23 lines
Ovid, Amores 2460 lines

Early borrowings: 21 = 38 per cent
Ciceronian period: 20 = 36 per cent
Near contemporary: 14 = 26 per cent
First in Ovid, Amores: aelinos, cothurnatus, graphium, phoenix, psittacus, sistrum 6 = 11 per cent
Latin suffixes: cothurnatus, gypsatus, historicus, marmoreus, myrteus, peltatus, pharetratus, poeniceus 8 = 14 per cent
Rare or unusual: elegi, graphium, nympha, pontus, rhombus, sistrum, thalamus, thyrsus 8 = 14 per cent
Greek terminations: adamanta 3.7.57, aelinon 3.9.23, heroidas 2.4.33, 3 = 5 per cent
Lexical categories

1 scientific/technical 9 = 16 per cent
2 poetry/music/dance 11 = 20 per cent
3 plants/trees 7 = 13 per cent
4 luxury items 3 = 5 per cent
5 utensils/household equipment 0
6 religion 1 = 2 per cent
7 clothing 1 = 2 per cent
8 ships/sea 3 = 5 per cent
9 sport 1 = 2 per cent
10 other 19 = 35 per cent

APPENDIX B

Compound Adjectives

Compound Adjectives in Tibullus

agricola (adj. Tib., noun Plaut.) 1.1.14, 2.1.36; imbrifer (Virg. Georg.) 1.4.44; lanificus (adj. Tib., lanifica noun Lucil.) 2.1.10; magnificus (Cic.) 1.5.6, 2.6.11 adv.; naufragus (active, as here, first in Hor. Carm. 1.16.10, passive in Cic.) 2.4.10; sacrilegus (Plaut.) 2.4.26.

6 words = 1 in 206 lines
8 occurrences = 1 in 155 lines

First in Tibullus: adjectival uses of agricola and lanificus.
Compound Adjectives in Propertius


21 words = 1 in 193 lines
28 occurrences = 1 in 144 lines

Book 1: 0
Book 2: 6 (1 in 232 lines)
Book 3: 15 (1 in 66)
Book 4: 7 (1 in 136)

First in Propertius: gemmifer, lauriger, longaevus, octipes, odorifer, palmifer, turriger, velifer.

Compound Adjectives in Ovid Amores

armifer (Ov.), aurifer (Cic.), bacifer (Ov), benignus (Plaut.), biformis (Virg. Aen.), bilustris (Ov.), carnifex (Naev.), centimanus (Hor. carm.), corniger 2, fatifer (Virg. Aen.), lanificus, legifer (Virg. Aen.), liniger (Ov.), magnificus (2), Martigena (Ov.), munificus (Cato), naufragus, palmifer, pomifer (Ov.), populifer (Ov.), quadriiugus (Enn.), ruricola (Ov.), semiadapertus (Ov.), semisupinus (Ov.), septemplex (Virg. Aen.), signifer (Cic.).

26 words = 1 in 95 lines
28 occurrences = 1 in 88 lines

First in Ovid: armifer, bacifer, bilustris, liniger, Martigena, pomifer, populifer, ruricola, semiadapertus, semisupinus.

APPENDIX C

Diminutives

Diminutives in Tibullus

capella (1.1.31), fabella (1.3.85), fiscella (2.3.15), novellus (2.2.22), tabella (1.3.28, 2.6.45), tígillum (2.1.39).
6 words, 7 occurrences
1 word per 207 lines, 1 occurrence per 177 lines

**Diminutives in Propertius**

asellus 2(44), auricula 1(1), corolla 4(1122), facula 1(2), flabellum 1(2), labellum 1(2), lapillus 3(113), lectulus 2(24), libellus 7(1122333), masculus 1(2), ocellus 18 (1: 10, 2: 8), parvulus 2(12), quasillus 1(4), sacellum 2(24), sirpiculus 1(4), tabella 5(223344), vocula 1(1).

17 words, 54 occurrences
1 word per 238 lines, 1 occurrence per 75 lines

Book 1: 20 (1 in 35 lines)
Book 2: 21 (1 in 66 lines)
Book 3: 6 (1 in 232 lines)
Book 4: 7 (1 in 136 lines)

**Diminutives in Ovid, Amores**

asellus, capella, labellum (3), lapillus, libellus (5), ocellus 11, quantulus-cumque, tabella (12).

8 words, 25 occurrences
1 word per 307 lines, 1 occurrence per 98 lines

See B. Axelson (1945: 41–3).

*Note.* I would like to express my thanks to Dr Joan Booth and Professors Francis Cairns, David West and Jim Adams for their detailed and helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

*Addendum to note 28.* On etymologising in general in Propertuis see now A. Michalopoulos PLLS 10 (1998) forthcoming, which will show it to be more frequent than originally thought.
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