Critics have long examined Tibullus Book 1 for evidence of an external ordering — a subject which has initiated a variety of interesting proposals for nearly a century. Early modern scholars' offered radical approaches to the whole question of Tibullus's structural strategy: Scaliger transposed numerous passages within almost all the poems in order to rectify the dislocation which he presumed had occurred during transmission; Dissen prefigured with his tripartite formulas the nineteenth-century classicists who claimed that the elegies obeyed rigid mathematical proportions. Certain recent scholars have followed in the footsteps of these mathematically-oriented classicists by applying an approach once used for analyzing the internal structure of a poem to an analysis of the external arrangement of the elegies — a methodology resulting almost always in the pairing or linking of structurally inharmonious pieces. Wimmel seems to have followed in the footsteps of Scaliger, not by rearranging passages within elegies but by rearranging the elegies themselves (except for 2.2) into five trilogies which in his opinion demonstrate the original ordering of the poems: I (1.4, 1.8, 1.9); II (1.10, 1.3, 1.1); III (1.2, 1.5, 1.6); IV (1.7, 2.1, 2.5); V (2.3, 2.4, 2.6) — an unfortunate distortion of a transmitted corpus. While these particular theories do not help solve the problem of the external ordering, the mystery does become more soluble when one considers all the other proposals which have appeared — proposals which this paper will analyze, evaluate, and synthesize in an attempt to gain deeper insight into the external arrangement of the first ten elegies.

Some detect a structural principle based wholly or partly on the alternation of the names of the people addressed or mentioned by Tibullus. Schulze observes the following sequence of names: 1.1 (Messalla and Delia) — 1.2 (Delia), 1.3 (Messalla and Delia), 1.4 (Marathus), 1.5 (Messalla and Delia).
Delia), 1.6 (Delia), 1.7 (Messalla), 1.8 and 1.9 (Marathus) — 1.10 (no addressee). This theory has its drawbacks, for Tibullus addresses more people (and deities as well) within an individual elegy than revealed in the above sequence — as for example in 1.2, where the poet addresses a cup-companion (1-6), Delia’s door (7-14), Delia herself (15-80), Venus by implication (81-88), his cup-companion (89-98), and Venus directly (99-100). Yet the theory does call attention to the existence of a frame in 1.1 and 1.10 and to the pairing of Messalla and Delia, who get pushed closer and closer together as the elegies unfold. Martin actually detects two poetic sequences (1.2-1.4 and 1.5-1.9): first Tibullus addresses Delia (1.2), Messalla (1.3), and Marathus (1.4) over a span of three poems; then he addresses Delia (1.5 and 1.6), Messalla (1.7), and Marathus (1.8 and 1.9) over a span of five poems. This proposal too has its limitations in that it not only overlooks to an even greater degree the large number of addressees within the elegies but also appears to equate a complex of three poems with a complex of five poems. Still, the proposal does enable one to observe how smoothly and how regularly Tibullus moves from one addressee to another — from his mistress, to his patron, to his boy. Michelfeit combines name and theme in three sequences which he considers möglichst symmetrische: 1.1 (war and peace), 1.2 (Delia), 1.3 (war and peace) — 1.4 (Marathus), 1.5 (Delia), 1.6 (Delia), 1.7 (war and peace) — 1.8 (Marathus), 1.9 (Marathus), 1.10 (war and peace). This suggestion too suffers because like its predecessors, it overlooks many other addressees, fails to demonstrate any meaningful symmetrical design, and links poems on the basis of disparate concepts (name and theme). Even so, this particular suggestion does take into account the strong punctuation occurring before the fourth and after the seventh elegies. Although these scholars follow an approach riddled with flaws, they do make certain observations which prove helpful in a consideration of the subject under discussion.

Several5 perceive a structural connection between Vergil’s Bucolics and Tibullus Book 1 (in Marx’s words, je zehn Gedichte enthaltenden). While they stop short of drawing any detailed parallels between the two works, they imply that Tibullus models his book after Vergil’s — each containing ten poems, bucolic in nature. Krause6 first recognized the sophisticated organizational principle employed by Vergil in the Bucolics — the chiastic pairing of poems around Buc. 5 (hymn to Daphnis), all capped by Buc. 10 (song about Gallus): Buc. 1 and 9 (dialogues about country); Buc. 2 and 8

6. E. Krause, Quibus temporibus quoque ordine Vergilius Eclogas scripsit (Diss., Berlin, 1884) 6.
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(songs about love); Buc. 3 and 7 (contests in song); Buc. 4 and 6 (visions of worlds). This particular observation not only contributed a great deal to our knowledge of the technique which an Augustan could use to arrange poems within a book but also inspired a number of later scholars to examine Tibullus's first ten elegies for a similar kind of ordering, one based not upon alternation of names but upon similarity of themes. Port observes in Tibullus Book 1 five pairs of poems — one outer pair framing four interlocking pairs: 1.1 and 1.10 (elegies on simple life); 1.2 and 1.6 (Delia's preference for another); 1.3 and 1.7 (Messalla's exploits on campaign); 1.4 and 1.8 (Marathus's entanglements in love); 1.5 and 1.9 (influence of rival lover). Two of the interlocking pairings seem rather questionable, for they depend too heavily on the references to rival lovers, characters who appear in only small parts of the elegies under consideration: 1.2.65-70 (the soldier who leaves Delia for the wars); 1.5.69-76 (the rival who receives Delia's affection); 1.6.15-38 (the husband who keeps Delia from Tibullus); 1.9.53-74 (the rival who keeps Marathus from Tibullus). Yet the other two interlocking pairings seem very legitimate: 1.3 and 1.7 deal with heroic exploits (and not just Messalla's) — the former, Tibullus's odyssey through life and death, the latter, Messalla's journey around the Mediterranean; 1.4 and 1.8 deal with professorial lectures to immature students — the former, Priapus's lecture to Tibullus on the handling of Marathus, the latter, Tibullus's lecture to Pholecte on the handling of Marathus. By focusing on theme rather than name as the principle underlying the ordering of the elegies, Port brings the problem of arrangement one step closer to a solution.

The thematic approach reaches its fruition in the proposals of three scholars, all of whom suggest the same formula for the external ordering. While they differ in the descriptive tags which they assign to the various elegies, they all detect an arrangement which involves three pairs of poems framed by two program-poems and separated by two genre-poems: 1.1 (philosophy of life) — 1.2 and 1.3 (love for Delia); 1.4 (poem about Priapus); 1.5 and 1.6 (anguish over Delia); 1.7 (poem about Messalla); 1.8 and 1.9 (warning to Marathus) — 1.10 (philosophy of life). Littlewood alone provides arguments to justify the above scheme — arguments which warrant consideration if only to illuminate the artistry inherent in the
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arrangement. She sees 1.1 and 1.10 as introductory and concluding poems, deep and reflective — a fair statement, for in each of these elegies Tibullus extols the simple life: in the first, scorn for avarice and preference for poverty; in the last, hatred for war and praise of peace. She views 1.2 and 1.3 as poems of separation, sincere pieces dealing with the early stages of happy love — also a legitimate pairing, since the poet strives within each of these elegies to overcome an obstacle keeping him from Delia: in the former, his mistress's door; in the latter, his own illness. She regards 1.5 and 1.6 as poems about Delia's infidelity, troubled pieces concerned with the later stages of unhappy love — again a justifiable coupling, where Tibullus begs Delia to return to him: in one poem, after a quarrel; in the other, at the end of the affair. She considers 1.8 and 1.9 poems about Marathus's infidelity, light pieces dealing with boy-girl love — another artistic juxtaposition, in that within each of these elegies the poet criticizes Marathus for his other affairs: in the former, with Pholoe; in the latter, with a rival. She maintains that 1.4 and 1.7 function as poems which afford a contrast to the pairs of elegies preceding and following them, as they certainly appear to do: on the one hand, the monologue of Priapus, a relief from the deteriorating relationship with Delia; on the other hand, the glorification of Messalla, a respite from the entire subject of love. Thus, Littlewood develops a proposal which surpasses all earlier studies on the subject and which provides the best solution yet to the problem of ordering.

Powell9 provides a novel and stimulating approach to the question of external arrangement — one which deserves the most serious consideration. Like earlier scholars, Powell regards 1.1 and 1.10 as program-poems which frame the entire book, but unlike his predecessors, he observes therein a subtle attempt to convey a notion of development, almost that of a story in the area of the book's principal themes. In Powell's opinion, the following sequence emerges: 1.1 = love for Delia, a mutual love, with Delia pictured as weeping at Tibullus's funeral; 1.2 = love for Delia, coupled with suspicion, as Delia learns that the witch's charm will fool her husband only if she remains faithful to Tibullus; 1.3 = love for Delia, further aggravated by separation during a campaign but kept alive by prayer for her chastity; 1.4 = love for Marathus, beginning of a homosexual relationship with a young boy, occurring during an apparent estrangement from Delia; 1.5 = estrangement from Delia, now made explicit, where Tibullus refers to an actual quarrel and appeals to Delia for reconciliation; 1.6 = indictment of Delia, filled with bitterness over her infidelity — the climax of a tortured relationship; 1.7 = glorification of Messalla, the least amatory poem, as Tibullus momentarily turns from an unhappy affair to his victorious patron; 1.8 = love for Marathus, resumed with distrust, as Tibullus

observes Marathus's infatuation with Pholoe; 1.9 = indictment of Marathus, filled with bitterness over his infidelity — the climax of another tortured relationship; 1.10 = hatred for war, coupled with a prayer for peace, but avoiding any personal reference to the subject of love. Anticipating possible criticism, Powell takes care to point out that he is not attempting to say that the poet Tibullus, a certain Delia, and a certain Marathus actually experienced everything suggested by the above narrative but that Tibullus may well have arranged the elegies in the sequence in which they appear in order to give them an interesting artistic unity — a qualification which enables this particular scholar to make his proposal all the more attractive and convincing. Thus, Powell too provides a difficult problem with an excellent solution — one which complements the interesting proposal developed by Littlewood and one which warrants an important place in the scholarship on this subject.

I would like to suggest still another way of approaching the question of external arrangement, but again as a means of complementing and not superseding the most recent studies. In so doing, I would like to expand and elaborate on a statement which I made in a recent article on the subject of Tibullus’s structural strategy, where I mentioned that the poet may be converting organizational devices used to compose elegies into organizational devices which connect elegies. In that article I stressed that Tibullus shows a fondness for three such organizational techniques: 1) ring-composition (the framing of a passage or poem with similar phrases or ideas); 2) transitional units (passages which connect larger sections of an elegy); 3) dramatic unity (an unexpressed dramatic idea occurring during an unexpressed time-lapse). Yet one may find ring-composition not only within the framework of an individual poem but also in the very frame formed by the program-poems: Tibullus begins the book by addressing Delia and closes it by ignoring her (Tib. 1.1 and 1.10) — a technique which Catullus may have used in his own ordering of the Lesbia-poems, a book possibly framed by the two Sapphic lyrics marking the dawn and dusk of the love-affair (Cat. 51 and 11). Furthermore, one may see transitional units not only as short passages which connect longer sections of elegies but as entire elegies which afford smooth transitions between pairs of elegies: 1.4 deals with Tibullus’s instruction in sodomy — a transition from 1.3, separation from Delia, to 1.5, frustration with Delia; 1.7 deals with the poet’s glorification of Messalla — a transition from 1.6, dismissal of Delia, to 1.8, involvement with Marathus. Finally, one may find dramatic unity operative not only between the sections of a particular elegy but between the elegies

themselves, where there surface a host of unexpressed dramatic ideas: between 1.1 and 1.2, separation from Delia; between 1.3 and 1.4, argument with Delia; between 1.4 and 1.5, contact with Delia; between 1.6 and 1.7, break with Delia; between 1.7 and 1.8, reunion with Marathus; between 1.9 and 1.10, break with Marathus. As the above illustrations demonstrate, the external arrangement clearly involves a conversion of organizational techniques employed in constructing individual elegies into organizational techniques which actually connect different elegies.

The external ordering reveals the hand of the poet Tibullus — not a literary executor — for within it emerge not only the techniques employed throughout Augustan poetry but also the strategies peculiar to Tibullus himself. One finds the solution to the arrangement not in the theory of any single scholar but in a combination of all the relevant proposals — those which I have already attempted to analyze and which I shall now attempt to synthesize by means of the following chart:

![Diagram of elegies]

The above outline reveals a truly sophisticated symmetry — one involving a combination of separated and interlocking pairs of poems, the development of a narrative about heterosexual and homosexual love, and the application of organizational devices employed within elegies to the arrangement of the elegies in relation to one another. Possibly attempting to emulate the beautiful design of Vergil’s *Bucolics*, Tibullus produces a book of internally coherent and externally harmonious compositions.*

* I wish to thank Professor Barry B. Powell for evaluating an earlier version of this paper, one which I presented at the November 1977 convention of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast.