

**The author of [Tibullus] 3.19 and 3.20: anonymous or Tibullus?**

Book 3 of the *Corpus Tibullianum* consists of four parts: (A) 3.1–6 (145 elegiac couplets): a series of poems that are unified in describing one love, for a beloved, Neaera, who is named in five out of the six; the ‘I’ figure is identified as Lygdamus at 3.2.29, in an imaginary epitaph, and the name is conveniently used for the poet. (B) 3.7 (211 hexameters): the *Panegyricus Messallae*, the one poem not in elegiac couplets. (C) 3.8–18 (77 elegiac couplets): 11 poems bound together by the name *Cerinthus* that appears in five, by the concentration on female desire (after the initial poem on female beauty), and by the name *Sulpicia*, which starts the cycle and recurs in 3.16. (D) 3.19–20: a group of twelve couplets followed by a group of two; the first names the ‘I’ figure as Tibullus. This analysis omits the double transmission of 3.18, after 3.17, but also between 3.6 and 3.7. However, this oddity should serve as a reminder that transmission is not stable and predictable: in the case of so miscellaneous a book there is implausibility to any account that assumes everything is carefully ordered.<sup>1</sup>

Of the earlier sections, B and C are linked to Tibullus by the presence of Messalla, addressed in 1.1, 1.3, 1.7, 2.1, and also named in 1.5 and 2.5. The *Panegyricus* begins *Te, Messalla, canam*; and Sulpicia addresses him as a *propinquus* in 3.14. There is no particular reason for associating Lygdamus with Tibullus; rather he links to Propertius, who uses the name Lygdamus of a slave in 3.6, 4.7–8. However, there are poetic connexions between the Lygdamus poems and Sulpicia: both sequences begin on the Matronalia (3.1, 3.8), and both knowingly disrupt elegiac conventions. Poems 3.1–6 are written from the point of view of a man who wishes to be married, unlike Propertius (explicitly), Tibullus and Ovid (though Ovid makes his own disruption when he casually reveals that he is in fact married: *Amores* 3.13.1); and female desire is the dominant force in the Sulpicia cycle: hers is the authorial voice in 3.9, 11, 13–18 (and perhaps 3.10, 3.12). It looks as though three interconnected poems or cycles of poems, each too short to make a book on their own, have been gathered together as an addition to the books of Tibullus, to whom two of them can clearly be linked.

Three of the sections have poems that identify their author (3.2 Lygdamus, 3.16 Sulpicia, 3.19 Tibullus). But each of these raises issues. Lygdamus presents himself as a member of the Roman elite, the kind of youth who swims in the Tiber or at Baiae (3.5.1–4) or drinks Falernian (3.6.5–6), yet he uses a slave’s name, presumably an adopted poetic identity, which renders him anonymous now, and perhaps always did. Sulpicia, by contrast, presents a real Roman identity, linking herself to the Servii Sulpicii (3.16.4) as well as to Messalla; but this creates questions about whether a *puella* could write herself as an elegiac lover,

<sup>1</sup> For a fuller account of current views, see Knox 2018. Very different is Robert Maltby’s contribution to this volume. His analysis follows others’ in splitting C into two parts, 8–12 and 13–18; but he now follows the theory of Holzberg 1998, and thinks the whole book is due to a single author (though writing in the Flavian period, whereas Holzberg is content with Tiberius or later). This seems most improbable, given the conditions of publication in the ancient world: how was so miscellaneous a collection expected to survive, or to be read, as a single work? Further fundamental objections of this kind were raised already by Hubbard 2004: 180–1. Wiser was Maltby’s previous account (2010), which saw the sections as written in the sequence C<sup>2</sup>, C<sup>1</sup>, A, B, D. However, even this piece starts from the conviction that ‘most of the poems in Book 3 are heavily influenced by Ovid’ and gives no consideration to the possibility that the influence may run the other way (a flaw shared with most such analyses: Lee 1963 is the most explicit in trying to avoid it); the same applies to the attempt to show that Lygdamus is later than Martial and other Flavian poets. Thus the account Maltby gives there of A to C seems to me at best possible, certainly not necessary.



No woman will remove your bed from us: our affair was first joined with this solemn agreement. I love only you, nor beside you is any girl in the city now beautiful to my eyes. Would that you might seem pretty to me alone! I pray that you not attract others: that way I shall be safe. There is no need to incur envy: let the boasting of the populace be kept far distant; the man who is wise rejoices to himself in his silent breast. (8) Thus I can live well in the secluded woods where no path is trodden by human foot. You are my rest from cares, you my light even on a dark night, and you a crowd to me in empty places. Though a girlfriend now be sent for Tibullus from heaven, she shall be sent in vain, and Venus will depart. This I swear to you by the holy godhead of your Juno, who is alone mighty to me before other gods. (16) What am I doing in my madness? Alas, I am giving up my security. I have sworn stupidly: fear on your part was of advantage. Now you will be powerful, now you will burn me more boldly: my chattering tongue has produced this misfortune. In future you may do whatever you wish: I shall remain yours for ever and not flee the servitude of a familiar [*or* notorious] mistress. But I shall sit bound by the altars of holy Venus: she marks down the unjust and favours suppliants.

Notable here is the attribution of the poem to Tibullus (13). The poem is either genuinely by Tibullus<sup>4</sup> or by a poet masquerading as Tibullus.<sup>5</sup> The use of the name heightens the issues involved; it means that we must ask not only ‘is it plausible that this was written by Tibullus?’, but also ‘is it plausible that this was written by someone who was not Tibullus but was pretending to be Tibullus?’

The observation (e.g. Wimmel 1968: 258; Tränkle 1990: 324) that 3.19 is shorter than genuine Tibullian poems is undone not only by 2.2 (two lines shorter, at 22), but also by the possibility that the 24 lines are a fragment, not a complete poem. This is an important point that has had little consideration. To my mind this is not a complete poem: no situation is set out at the beginning, no individual is addressed, and there are no closural markers at the end;<sup>6</sup> at any rate if verse 24 is the end of an elegy, it is hard to see verse 1 and what follows as that poem’s start. Maltby (2010: 337) finds suspicious that there is only one non-disyllabic pentameter ending (22); but this is badly misleading in what it implies about Tibullus’ metrical practice – the first pentameter in 1.1 to have a non-disyllabic ending is verse 36, and there are only four in 39 pentameters; the first in 1.2 is in verse 44, and there are three in 49 pentameters. Likewise in Tibullus 2 there are plenty of sequences of more than 12 couplets for which the same is true (e.g. in the last 21 couplets of poem 2.5, there is only *eripiet*, 92; in the first 15 of 2.6 only *melius*, 20). Knoche (1956: 174–5) was troubled by the diction and by the simple structure, in particular the composition in quatrains; however, this is not a necessary analysis of the sequence – for example it is not clear to me that there are stronger breaks in thought between 4 and 5 or 8 and 9 than between 6 and 7. As for diction, *praeter* in 3 is not used by Tibullus elsewhere; but it is used only once in Ovid’s *Amores*, and the similar anastrophe *te propter* is found four times in books 1 and 2. Nor is *amica* found in Tibullus 1

<sup>4</sup> This view was held by e.g. Heyne 1798: *Observationes* 254; Baehrens 1876: 46–7; Smith 1913: 516–19; Lenz 1932; Herrmann 1957; Eisenhut 1977.

<sup>5</sup> So Postgate 1880, 1903: 191–9; Knoche 1956; Lee 1963; Wimmel 1968; Tränkle 1990: 323–5; Maltby 2010: 336–7.

<sup>6</sup> Fulkerson 2017: 295 sees a closural marker in the enclosure of the poem between *Venus* (2) and *Veneris* (23); but such repetitions occur within poems (thus 1.1 is enclosed by *Diuitias*, 1, and *dites*, 78; but not by the *diuitias* that appears in 41). The lack of a proper beginning is what shows 3.19 to be a fragment.

or 2;<sup>7</sup> however, there is no reason why he should not have expanded his vocabulary under the influence of Propertius,<sup>8</sup> as he does in the case of *seruitium*, which is all but absent from book 1,<sup>9</sup> but becomes an important concept in book 2.<sup>10</sup> Postgate (1880: 281–2) points out that Tibullus only uses his name in imaginary inscriptions (1.3.53, 1.9.83); this is true of the extant material in books 1 and 2; but two examples are hardly enough to establish an unbreakable norm. Moreover, the line ending *amica Tibullo* shares with 1.9.83 *amore Tibullus* the unusual combination of weak caesurae in the fifth and the sixth foot, an effect that Ovid reproduces in *Tristia* 4.10.51–2 *nec auara Tibullo | tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae* (where he combines it with the echo of Tib. 1.4.36 *formae non ullam fata dedere moram*).<sup>11</sup> Gaertner (2002: 346) sees the piece as a ‘Cento’;<sup>12</sup> this is a clever description, but not I think borne out by the intertexts: only one half-line is found in another elegist (*tu mihi sola places*), and the passages that are close to models rather rework the phrasing, often in interesting ways – just what I expect from a Tibullus.

At the beginning of the poem, Knoche (1956: 181 n. 1) and Lee (1963: 6–7) find 3.19.1 *nulla tuum nobis subducat femina lectum* to be a slightly nonsensical version of Propertius 1.8.45 *nec mihi riualis certos subducat amores* (affected by 3.20.21 *non certo uincitur foedere lectus*): to their minds ‘bed’ is an inept replacement for ‘love’ – though *tuus amor* can mean ‘love of you’, *tuus lectus* cannot function similarly. However, this is to ignore the generous extension of the objective genitive in Latin.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, *lectus* is an evocative symbol of marriages and affairs:<sup>14</sup> compare for example Propertius 3.20.2 *uidisti a lecto quem dare uela tuo* (‘the man whom you have seen set sail from your bed’) and 4.11.85 *seu ... aduersum mutarit ianua lectum* (‘or if the door changes the bed opposite’), and the Greek equivalent in the important parallel adduced already by Statius (1567: 269) – Sophocles, *Electra* 114 τὸς εὐνὰς ὑποκλεπτομένουσ (‘those secretly stealing away the marriage bed’). *tuum lectum* means ‘the place where I sleep with you’, but effectively ‘(quasi-)marriage with you’ (so Heyne 1798: 219). As Lee acknowledges, this case proves nothing about the poem’s authenticity, even if he were right, for Propertius 1.8 was certainly available to Tibullus, and there is no reason to think that Propertius 3.20 postdates Tibullus’ death. I suspect too that there is more going on here.

<sup>7</sup> Knoche 1956: 180. Also absent from the main corpus are *uulgus* (assuming the conjecture *Valgi* is correct at 1.10.11), *secretus*, *humanus* (Postgate 1903: 172), *subducere*, *sapere*, *pignora*, *considerare* (Knoche 1956: 181).

<sup>8</sup> Eisenhut 1977: 212–13 reasonably argues that *amica* fits admirably here, carrying a force different from *domina*; moreover, it can be seen to echo Propertius 2.6.41 *nos uxor numquam, numquam diducet amica*, a possible model for 3.19.1 (as Lenz 1932: 129 saw), and perceived by Scaliger (followed by Luck, Sandbach and others) to be originally part of the same poem as Propertius’ *tu mihi sola places* (2.7.20).

<sup>9</sup> The one counter-example concerns servitude to the goddess Venus, not the beloved: 1.2.99 *Venus, semper tibi dedita seruit*.

<sup>10</sup> Especially 2.4.1 *Sic mihi seruitium uideo dominamque paratam* and the following lines; see also 2.3.5–30.

<sup>11</sup> See Platnauer 1951: 10 on the rarity. Of course, a pretender may have spotted the same distinctive rhythm as Ovid, but the need to multiply such marks of artistry makes the hypothesis seem less plausible (cf. Lenz 1932: 139–40).

<sup>12</sup> Perhaps the fullest list of Tibullian phrases is that in Knoche 1956: 182–3; of the seven phrases none is more than two words, and it includes nugatory items such as *e caelo* (1.10.60) and *procul ... absis* (1.9.51).

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. Woodcock 1959 §76; a Tibullian example is given by Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 66: 1.3.50 *leti uiae*. Such genitives are frequent with words for marriage (e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 3.475, Prop. 4.11.11 *quid mihi coniugium Paulli*, Ov. *Am.* 2.7.21 *Veneris famulae conubia*).

<sup>14</sup> So *TLL* 7(2).1097.42–3 ‘uergit apud poetas hic illic ad notionem q.e. [...] matrimonium, concubitus’.

Bruno Currie has suggested<sup>15</sup> that there may be a reworking of the climactic moment of the *Odyssey*, where Penelope instructs Eurycleia to bring the bedstead out of her bedroom for the stranger to sleep on (23.177–80) – and thus enables the stranger to confirm that he is indeed Odysseus, as he knows the bed was built as part of the house and cannot be moved; note in particular his response at 203–5:

οὐδέ τι οἶδα,  
ἦ μοι ἔτ' ἔμπεδόν ἐστι, γύναι, λέχος, ἧέ τις ἦδη  
ἀνδρῶν ἄλλοσε θῆκε, ταμῶν ὑπο πυθμέν' ἐλαίης.

I do not know whether my bed is still fixed, woman, or whether some man has now cut through the trunk of the tree below and put it elsewhere.

The emphasis on gender is something 3.19 preserves; and the word *lectus* echoes the Greek form λέχος. The return of Odysseus is a theme with which Tibullus himself has made great play in 1.3: he is stranded, ill, on Phaeacia, and fantasises about Delia running straight to him on his unannounced return (1.3.92), as Penelope does eventually to Odysseus (23.208), and about her feeling that he has been sent from heaven (*sed uidear caelo missus adesse tibi*, 1.3.90), a concept that is revisited at 3.19.13. We may wonder whether ‘Tibullus’ is playing the Odysseus role or that of Penelope here.

*lectus* also nods towards Propertius 3.20.21, as Lee saw; and it looks as though the passage is responding to Propertius’ discussion of an opening *foedus* that will establish the conditions on which the affair proceeds (3.20.15–24: n.b. *primum* in 3.19.2, *pignora* in 3.19.17):<sup>16</sup>

**foedera** sunt ponenda prius signandaque iura  
et scribenda mihi lex in amore nouo.  
haec Amor ipse suo constringet **pignora** signo,  
testis sidereae torta corona deae.  
namque ubi non certo uincitur **foedere lectus**,  
non habet ultores nox uigilata deos,  
et quibus imposuit soluit mox uincla libido:  
contineant nobis omina **prima** fidem.

First, **treaties** must be settled and agreements signed and laws written for my new love. Love will confirm these **pledges** with his own signet ring, and the twisted crown of the starry goddess will serve as witness. For when a **bed** is not bound by a fixed **agreement**, the wakeful night finds no avenging gods, and lust soon loosens the bonds from those on whom it has placed them: let the **first** omens secure our fidelity.

More important for Lee’s argument is the relationship with *Ars* 1.41ff. (sic), which he finds to be a passage from which the ‘Tibullus’ poet has ineptly taken Ovidian material and thus revealed himself as an impostor. The core of the similarity lies in *Ars* 1.41–4:

<sup>15</sup> In the class Laurel Fulkerson and I organised on [Tibullus] 3 in Trinity Term 2015 at Oxford.

<sup>16</sup> It would not matter for my thesis as a whole if Propertius is the imitator in 3.20.

dum licet, et loris passim potes ire solutis,  
 elige cui dicas ‘**tu mihi sola places**’.  
 haec tibi non tenues ueniet *delapsa per auras*:  
 quaerenda est **oculis** apta **puella** tuis.

While it is possible and you can proceed everywhere with untightened reins, choose to whom you will say ‘I love only you’. She will not come to you slipping down through the insubstantial air: a suitable girl must be sought by your eyes.

This obviously has a genetic relationship with verses 3–4 of 3.19:

**tu mihi sola places**, nec iam te praeter in urbe  
 formosa est **oculis** ulla **puella** meis.

It would be perfectly apt for Ovid to allude further to one of the places where his elegiac predecessors had used the phrase *tu mihi sola places* (the other being Propertius 2.7.19);<sup>17</sup> thus in addition to the repetition of *oculis ... puella tuis/meis*, in 43 *ueniet delapsa per auras* matches the substance of *e caelo mittatur amica* in 3.19.13. Lee, however, suggests that *in urbe* is drawn from *Ars* 1.60 *mater in Aeneae constitit urbe sui*: in Ovid’s passage the talk of the city is entirely relevant, but here the phrase adds little to the couplet. Of course it might have had more point in a larger context from which it has been separated. However, though the textual criticism of fragments needs special care, I suspect the problem is due to textual corruption: the lover says ‘you are the most beautiful girl in the world’, not ‘in the city’;<sup>18</sup> scribal corruption between *orbis* and *urbs* is frequent and easy (see e.g. Verg. *Georg.* 1.505, Ov. *Met.* 13.294, *Fasti* 2.130). As for *tu mihi sola places*, when Ovid uses it in *Ars* 1 to typify the classic lover’s utterance, it will be all the more effective if it has been used by two earlier elegists. Postgate (1903: 197) finds the Propertian play with the phrase poetic and individual: ‘you alone please me; may I alone please you, Cynthia’ (2.7.19 *tu mihi sola places; placeam tibi, Cynthia, solus*). ‘Tibullus’ reinforces the sentence with a negative equivalent (as elegy does so often) in the rest of the couplet, and then adds a new twist in the following hexameter (3.19.5–6):

atque utinam posses uni mihi bella uideri!  
 displiceas aliis: sic ego tutus ero.

Instead of hoping that the girl find only him attractive, he wishes that he alone find her attractive – a thought we find elsewhere (Propertius 1.2, for example; the second couplet of Callimachus, *Epigram* 29 Pf.<sup>19</sup> [= *AP* 12.51]; Ausonius XIII.88), but nicely brought into contact with the cliché *tu mihi sola places*: Postgate’s ‘a step too far’ seems hypercritical. We

<sup>17</sup> I am attracted by the notion that all three have a model in mind, perhaps Gallus: this would make even more pleasing the paradox by which an assertion of uniqueness is actually a commonplace.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Knoche 1956: 187: ‘denn dem Verliebten wird doch die Liebste nicht bloss als das schönste Mädchen von Rom erscheinen, sondern als das schönste Mädchen schlechthin’. *orbe* appears in various quotations and reworkings of the line, including verse 9 of Sannazaro’s dedication of his works to Pope Clement VII (*quippe mihi toto nullus te praeter in orbe / triste salutifera leniet arte malum*), and Pricaeus’ citation in his note on Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 3.23.2 (Pricaeus 1650: 174). I have not found it registered as a conjecture.

<sup>19</sup> Also Callimachean are the rejection of *inuidia* and the *uulgus* in 7, of the *uia trita* in 9.



**est opus:**<sup>20</sup> auxilio **turba** futura tibi est.  
 tristis eris, si solus eris, dominaeque relictæ  
 ante oculos facies stabit, ut ipsa, tuos.  
 tristior idcirco nox est quam tempora Phoebi:                   585  
 quae releuet luctus **turba** sodalis abest.<sup>21</sup>

Any lover is harmed by empty places: beware empty places. Where are you running off to? You can be safer amid people. You have no need of seclusion, as seclusion amplifies passion: the crowd is going to assist you. You will be sad if you are alone, and the image of your abandoned mistress will stand before your eyes, as if she did herself. For this reason night brings more sadness than the period of the Sun: a crowd of companions is not present to relieve grief.

Having pointed to the similarities as suggesting conscious or unconscious reminiscence by one poet of the other, Lee finds *turba* awkward in 3.19.12 (again following Knoche 1956: 185): it means ‘crowd’, not ‘company’, and often has ‘associations of confusion and disturbance’; but he then cites Deucalion’s affectionate words to Pyrrha at *Metamorphoses* 1.355 *nos duo turba sumus* – this is what humanity has been reduced to by the flood. In Tibullus’ works, however, the word is repeatedly used in positive contexts, with no negative connotation: 2.1.16 (of the group following the sacred procession round the farm) *uinctaque post olea candida turba comas* (‘and behind a crowd wearing white, their hair bound with olive leaves’); similarly 2.1.23 *turbaque uernarum, saturi bona signa coloni* (‘and the crowd of home-born slaves, prosperous signs of a satisfied farmer’); and the offspring desired at 2.2.22 *ludat ut ante tuos turba nouella pedes* (‘that a new little crowd may play before your feet’). This points to what is going on here: elite Romans were regularly accompanied, by slaves, friends and other members of the *familia* – but ‘Tibullus’ will not feel alone, as long as his mistress is with him.

Verses 11–12 develop the structure of Propertius 1.11.23–4, moving further from the Iliadic model on which they are based (Andromache calls Hector father, mother, brother and husband at *Iliad* 6.429–30):<sup>22</sup>

**tu mihi sola domus, tu, Cynthia, sola parentes,**  
 omni **tu** nostrae tempore deliciae.

You alone are my family, you, Cynthia, alone my parents, you are at every moment my delight.

To my mind the individual metaphors are apt and effective. *lumen*, unlike *lux* (Prop. 2.14.29, 2.28.59, 2.29.1; Ov. *Am.* 1.4.25, *Ars* 3.524; [Tib.] 3.9.15, 3.18.1), is not applied directly to the elegiac mistress, but ‘light’ well expresses the lover’s sense of delight and relief in the

<sup>20</sup> Lee misses this phrase, shared with 3.19.7 *nil opus inuidia est*.

<sup>21</sup> Note also *Rem.* 591 *quid nisi secretæ laeserunt Phyllida siluae?* This works very effectively as an inversion of 3.19.9. Tränkle 1990: 329–30 (on 3.19.11–12) also considers the relationship of the passages, but without adding anything cogent.

<sup>22</sup> Commentators add Ter. *Ph.* 496 *tu mihi cognatus, tu parens, tu amicus*, Ov. *Ep.* 3.52 *tu dominus, tu uir, tu mihi frater eras*.

presence of the beloved, and the addition of *nocte uel atra* revivifies the metaphor. *tu mihi curarum requies* is like two Ovidian passages: *Tristia* 4.10.118 (of the Muse) *tu curae requies*; *Pont.* 3.3.7 *publica me requies curarum somnus habebat* ('I was in the arms of sleep, the public rest from cares'). I can see no obstruction to our imagining that those descend from 3.19.11: the expression *curae/curarum requies* is then first used of a girlfriend, before getting reapplied by the mature and exiled Ovid to the Muse and sleep. More similar, in being applied to a loved wife, is *Consolatio ad Liuiam* 306 *tu requies fesso grata laboris eras* ('you [i.e. Antonia] were a delightful rest from labour when he was tired'), with *laboris* replacing *curarum* (perhaps under the influence of Verg. *Aen.* 3.393 *is locus urbis erit, requies ea certa laborum*, 'this will be the place for the city, this a certain rest from labours'). If the *Consolatio* is to be dated to the year or so after Drusus' death,<sup>23</sup> this too would come before the Ovidian examples, and provide a model for *Metamorphoses* 7.812 *requies erat illa labori*. As Lenz (1932: 138) noticed, this comes in another Ovidian passage that shares details with 3.19: *Met.* 7.812–13, 816–19 (Cephalus telling of his delight in the refreshing breeze, *aura*):

**requies** erat illa labori.  
 'aura' (recordor enim) 'uenias' cantare solebam  
 ...  
 forsitan addiderim (sic me mea fata trahebant),  
 blanditias plures et 'tu mihi magna uoluptas'  
 dicere sim solitus, 'tu me reficisque fouesque,  
 tu facis ut siluas, ut amem loca sola. ...'

She was rest after labour. I used to sing (as I recall): 'Aura, please come'. ... Perhaps I added further loving expressions (so my fates were dragging me to ruin) and regularly said: 'You are my great delight, your touch restores me, you make me love the woods and lonely places'.

It is perhaps possible that the author of 3.19 has combined allusion to this with allusion to the *Remedia* passage; but a far simpler theory is that Ovid knows well and has twice alluded to the same Tibullian verses, once when the *Remedia* inverts a passage of love elegy, and once in a narrative of the *Metamorphoses* that carefully reworks elegiac motifs.

The final passage adduced by Lee (1963: 8–9) is Ovid, *Ars* 3.485–90:

ancillae puerique manu perarate tabellas,  
**pignora** nec iuueni credite uestra nouo.  
 perfidus ille quidem, qui talia **pignora** seruat,  
 sed tamen Aetnaei fulminis instar habent:  
 uidi ego pallentes **isto terrore** puellas  
**seruitium** miseris tempus in omne pati.

Score your writing tablets with the hand of a slave girl or boy, and do not entrust your pledges to a new lover. Admittedly he is a traitor who preserves such pledges, but

<sup>23</sup> As I believe: see Heyworth 2020.

they have the power of a thunderbolt forged in Etna: I have seen girls growing pale with fright over this and enduring unhappy servitude for all time.

*miser* and *seruitium* occur in 3.19.20 and 22, but these are standard elegiac language, and no case can be based on their presence. Lee gives more weight to the connexions with 17–18:

quid facio demens? heu heu mea **pignora** cedo.  
iuravi stulte: proderat **iste** timor.

*pignus* is absent from Tibullus books 1 and 2, and thought by Lee to be drawn from the *Ars* 3 passage. He describes the whole phrase *mea pignora cedo* as ‘forced’; and claims that this transitive use of *cedo* is ‘probably unparalleled’. But Tibullus himself offers an instance of transitive *cedere* (1.4.39–40 *tu puero quodcumque tuo temptare libebit | cedas*, ‘you should yield whatever it pleases your boy to try’), if not quite in this sense; and the whole phrase works as an innovation: ‘I give up my assurances, my pledges of success, the things I rely on for future happiness’. *TLL* defines looser senses of *pignus* with ‘quod fiduciam alicuius rei confirmat, vel rem quandam tutam facit’ (10(1).2123.36–7; cf. also the initial definition at 2121.6–7), and gives various examples of ‘pledges’ of love (e.g. among the passages cited at 2123.55–2124.6; in Sen. *Suas.* 5.1 *prior ... metus futuri pignus est*, fear is the *pignus*, as here). Lee is misled by his insistence on a genetic relationship with the Ovidian passage; there is no need for a concrete sense (as Tränkle also assumes).

On the other hand, *heu heu* is Tibullian (1.4.81, 1.6.10, 2.3.2, 2.3.49, 2.5.108), and sometimes used (as here) to mark a change of direction; so is *stulte*: cf. Tibullus 1.9.45 *tum miser interii, stulte confisus amari* (‘that was when I perished, poor wretch, foolishly trusting that I was loved’). And in the phrase *proderat iste timor* (‘fear on your part was of advantage to me’), *iste* is actually more focussed than it is in the supposed Ovidian model. Moreover, verses 17–18, as Gregory Hutchinson has suggested to me,<sup>24</sup> seem to contain a reworking of material from Callimachus, *Aetia* fr. 74.2 Harder λῦρὸς ἐγώ, τί δέ σοι τόνδ’ ἐπέθηκα φόβον; (‘I am shameless – why have I imposed this fear on you?’). Acontius having made Cydippe swear to marry him has caused Artemis to threaten her life when she does not; ‘Tibullus’ likewise reproaches himself over a misguided oath, but in his case he has removed the threat rather than imposing it. Though the shared phrasing may seem slight, we have barely more than this line from this portion of the Callimachus passage; in Aristaenetus’ version (*Aetia* fr. 75b.62–8 Harder) there follow reflections on divine attention to oaths, and *iurare* is a key term in Ovid’s Acontius and Cydippe letters (16 instances, with special emphasis in *Ep.* 21.133–44). For such allusive play with Callimachus in Tibullus, see for example the material gathered together in Bulloch 1973.

If 3.19 is by a pseudo-Tibullus, the failure to mention either Delia or Nemesis is strikingly sophisticated<sup>25</sup> – we are invited to enjoy the fact that we do not know which mistress is in play; but if this is a Tibullian fragment, the lack of a name is less surprising; and, as well as recalling the *assueto ... amore* of Propertius 1.1.36, *notae seruitium dominae* (22) will be a reference to the familiarity of the now known mistress. Trisyllabic endings to the pentameter are rare in Tibullus, but not entirely unknown (twenty, according to Platnauer

<sup>24</sup> Again thanks to the Oxford reading class in Trinity Term 2015.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Ovid’s play on *nomen* at *Amores* 1.3.21, 26 (before Corinna is named in 1.5), and on *nomen* and *noscere* when celebrating the names of elegiac mistresses at *Ars* 3.536–7.



lumen, et in solis tu mihi turba locis.

But which text alludes to the other?<sup>28</sup> For Lee the Tibullian impostor has incorporated echoes of *Epistles* 1.4.4–5 designed to give plausibility to his fabrication. But like the whole of this fabrication the subtlety is surprising; and it raises the question as to why Horace put Tibullus in the woods at all, if he nowhere mentioned them. Rather we can see the Tibullus 3.19 passage as the base for a typical bit of Horatian teasing: whereas Tibullus has fantasised about being in an erotic pair in the woods with his mistress, Horace renders him speechless (*tacitum*) and makes him a philosopher: the *Epistles* are much concerned with *bene uiuere* (1.6.56, 11.29, 15.45), and thus Tibullus' *cura* is not here erotic, but concerns the worthy behaviour for a wise and good man.

Generally in this paper my point has not been to argue that a particular sequence must have been historically true, but rather to show that the intertextual order is perfectly plausible if 3.19 is actually a Tibullian poem. In the absence of any serious counter-evidence, the interaction with *Epistles* 1.4 is crucial, and makes it almost certain that the presence of Tibullus' name is valid. But how do we account for the transmission of the piece at the end of [Tibullus] 3? Of those scholars who have thought it authentic, most have suggested that it is unpublished juvenilia;<sup>29</sup> but the links with Propertius 2 and 3 and with *Epistles* 1.4 make that unlikely. My theory is rather different: 3.19 is a fragment from the lost end of book 2. Reeve 1984 showed that 2.6, the final poem of the extant book 2, does not end with a proper closure:<sup>30</sup> this explains why the length of the book is so much less than the norm for Latin poetic productions. He concentrated on the notion that Tibullus simply died, as we are told by the epigram he did, in the same year as Vergil, and the work was left, and published, unfinished. But given he lived through the 20s, even if we suppose book 1 published in 27, say, there is plenty of time for him to have finished a second book. So it is at least as plausible that a portion of the book has been lost by accident, either at the time when it was copied into a codex, or subsequently.<sup>31</sup> A reader then found a fragment (perhaps an extended quotation) from the lost portion of book 2, and able to identify it as Tibullian, because of the use of the poet's name, appended it to his collection of Tibullus and other writings. In my view, we can remove the brackets round Tibullus when talking about 3.19 (though editors might confuse people and renumber it as book 2, fragment 1, or the like). One nice consequence is that in the closing account of Venus *haec notat iniustos* (24) looks strikingly like what one might say of Nemesis<sup>32</sup> – the name Tibullus has given to the mistress of book 2; another is that Nemesis is now granted by Tibullus the epithet given her by Martial (8.73.7 *fama est arguti Nemesis*

<sup>28</sup> This question could not be decisive for authenticity, however, as parts of *Ep.* 1 almost certainly antedate Tibullus' death in 19.

<sup>29</sup> The substance of Propertius 3.20 undermines the belief (see e.g. Hanslik 1952: 32–3, Alfonsi 1946: 22) that the similar Tib. 3.19 must be an early poem; and the element of reminiscence shows that the reference to a *foedus* does not initiate an affair.

<sup>30</sup> Murgatroyd 1994 rejects the case, but fails to deal with either the lack of a sense of plot in the closing stages or the sense of ongoing continuity created by the particular anaphora in 47–53.

<sup>31</sup> Books are sometimes truncated in works that continue, as this in a sense does, with the Messalla-related addendum that we know as book 3. Losses of such a kind occur in Vergil (V lacks the end of *Georg.* 4 and *Aen.* 9, but begins again with *Aen.* 1.1 and 10.1 respectively; F lacks the end of *Aen.* 2 and 3 before beginning again with 3.1 and 4.1), Ovid's *Fasti* (U lacks 2.853–64), Seneca's *Medea* (the A tradition lacks 1009–27).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.406 *adsensit precibus Rhamnusia iustis*, Tr. 5.8.9.

*formosa Tibulli*);<sup>33</sup> a third is that *iam* (3) has proper force – the girl addressed here is not the first to catch his eye.

### 3.20

What then of the four-verse 3.20?

rumor ait crebro nostram peccare puellam:  
nunc ego me surdis auribus esse uelim.  
crimina non haec sunt nostro sine facta<sup>34</sup> dolore:  
quid miserum torques, rumor acerbe? tace.<sup>35</sup>

Rumour says our girl is frequently going astray: now I would wish I had deaf ears. These charges are not made without causing me pain: why do you torture me in my misery, bitter rumour? Be silent.

*Rumor* does not appear elsewhere in Tibullus, but compare Propertius 2.32.23–4 *nuper enim de te nostras manauit ad aures / rumor* ('recently a rumour about you trickled into my ears'). *peccare* is frequent in elegy for 'being unfaithful', but the same Propertian poem also provides the closest parallel for *nostram peccare puellam*: *tu prius et fluctus poteris siccare marinos ... quam facere, ut nostrae nolint peccare puellae* (2.32.49–51: 'you will be able to dry up the waters of the sea ... before you could make our girls unwilling to stray'). *surdus* does not otherwise feature in Tibullus, and again Propertius provides the closest models: verse 2 combines the phrasing of 2.16.36 *turpis amor surdis auribus esse solet* ('a base love often has deaf ears') with the sentiment of 2.20.13 *de te quodcumque, ad surdas mihi dicitur aures* ('whatever is said to me about you is said to deaf ears').<sup>36</sup>

However, *quid miserum torques* is Tibullian phrasing, and so is the conversation with a divine abstraction, cf. 2.6.15–18:

acer Amor, fractas utinam, tua tela, sagittas,  
si licet, extinctas aspiciamque faces.  
tu **miserum torques**, tu me mihi dira precari  
cogis et insana mente nefanda loqui.

Violent Love, if I may, I would wish to see the arrows, your weapons, broken and your torches extinguished. You torture me with unhappiness, you force me to make prayers disastrous for myself and insanely to utter things unspeakable.

Like 3.20 these four lines are concerned with speech and silence. They are also like 3.20 in that they could constitute an epigram in themselves; and there are plenty of other short

<sup>33</sup> Lenz 1932: 134. The commentary section of his essay (133–45) has many good observations.

<sup>34</sup> *iacta* Pontanus: *ficta* Muretus, one or other of which may be right: cf. Prop. 2.23.13–14 *an tu / non bona de nobis crimina ficta iacis?*

<sup>35</sup> The break before the final iambus is not unTibullian, though it is not a common feature in elegy: cf. Tib. 2.2.10 *en age – quid cessas? adnuat ille – roga*. Platnauer 1951: 27 also adduces Ovidian examples, e.g. *Am.* 3.7.47–8 and *Ep.* 5.129–30.

<sup>36</sup> The topic is central also to Ovid, *Amores* 3.14.

sequences in Tibullus 2 (and other elegiac books) of which this is true: 2.1.1–4, 2.3.1–4, 2.4.15–20, 2.5.105–8. It is thus entirely possible that 3.20 is not a complete poem, but a quatrain quoted separate from its context, and found relevant to the Tibullian corpus by a later reader. The cause of the association might have been the elegance of the expression and the erotic content; but there is a fair chance that the lines were placed here because they were attributed to Tibullus. In responding to Propertius and in theme they would not be out of place in the lost final section of book 2; and the juxtaposition with 3.19 carries some weight.<sup>37</sup>

### Bibliography

- Alfonsi, L. (1946) *Albio Tibullo e gli autori del Corpus Tibullianum*, Milan.
- Baehrens, E. (1876) *Tibullische Blätter*, Jena.
- Bullock, A. W. (1973) ‘Tibullus and the Alexandrians’, *PCPS* 19: 71–89.
- Eisenhut, W. (1977) ‘Die Autorschaft der Elegie 3, 19 im Corpus Tibullianum’, *Hermes* 105: 209–23.
- Fulkerson, L. (2017) *A literary commentary on the elegies of the Appendix Tibulliana*, Oxford.
- Gaertner, J. F. (2002) ‘Zur Deutung von [Tib.] 3, 19’, *Mnemosyne* 55: 346–9.
- Hanslik, R. (1952) ‘Der Dichterkreis des Messalla’, *AAWW* 3: 22–38.
- Hartmann, J. J. (1911) ‘De Tibullo poeta’, *Mnemosyne* 39: 369–411.
- Herrmann, L. (1957) ‘Corpus Tibullianum, III, 19 et 20’, *Latomus* 16: 462–4.
- Heyne, C. G. (1798) *Albii Tibulli carmina*, 3rd edn, Leipzig.
- Heyworth, S. J. (2020) ‘The *Consolatio ad Liuiam* and literary history’, forthcoming in T. E. Franklinos and L. Fulkerson (eds), *Constructing authors and readers in the Appendices Vergilianae, Tibullianae, and Ovidianae*, Oxford.
- Hofmann, J. B., and A. Szantyr (1965) *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Munich.
- Holzberg, N. (1998) ‘Four poets and a poetess or portrait of the poet as a young man? Thoughts on Book 3 of the *Corpus Tibullianum*’, *CJ* 94: 169–91.
- Hubbard, T. K. (2004) ‘The invention of Sulpicia’, *CJ* 100: 177–94.
- Kilpatrick, R. S. (1986) *The poetry of friendship: Horace Epistles I*, Edmonton.
- Knoche, U. (1956) ‘Tibulls früheste Liebeselegie? (Tibull III 19)’, in *Navicula Chiloniensis: studia philologica Felici Jacoby professori Chilonensi emerito octogenario oblata* (Leiden) 153–70.
- Knox, P. (2018) ‘The Corpus Tibullianum’, in H.-C. Günther (ed.), *A short companion to Tibullus and the Corpus Tibullianum* (Nordhausen) 135–60.
- Lee, A. G. (1963) ‘On [Tibullus] III, 19 (IV, 13)’, *PCPS* 9: 4–10.
- Lenz, F. W. (1932) ‘Ein Liebesgedicht Tibulls (4, 13)’, *SIFC* 10: 125–45.
- Maltby, R. (2002) *Tibullus, Elegies: text, introduction and commentary*, Cambridge.
- Maltby, R. (2010) ‘The unity of *Corpus Tibullianum* Book 3: some stylistic and metrical considerations’, *PLLS* 14: 319–40.
- Murgatroyd, P. (1994) *Tibullus: Elegies II*, Oxford.
- Platnauer, M. (1951) *Latin elegiac verse*, Cambridge.
- Postgate, J. P. (1880) ‘On the genuineness of Tibullus IV.13’, *Journal of Philology* 9: 280–5.
- Postgate, J. P. (1903) *Selections from Tibullus and others*, London.
- Reeve, M. D. (1984) ‘Tibullus 2.6’, *Phoenix* 38: 235–9.

<sup>37</sup> Thus Hartmann 1911: 408 saw no reason to separate 3.20 from its predecessor.

- Smith, K. F. (1913) *The elegies of Albius Tibullus*, New York.
- Tränkle, H. (1990) *Appendix Tibulliana*, Berlin.
- Wimmel, W. (1968) 'Zur Frage der Elegie 3, 19 des Corpus Tibullianum', in id., *Der früher Tibull* (Munich) 257–9.
- Woodcock, E. C. (1959) *A new Latin syntax*, London.