

VERSE TRANSPOSITIONS IN TIBULLUS

After having been for some while the butt of conservative critics, verse transpositions in Propertius have, mainly thanks to the work of G. P. Goold,¹ again become respectable among scholars. In his edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius J. J. Scaliger (first edition: Paris 1577, ²Antwerp 1582, several times reprinted), the great archeget of the method, had subjected the other great elegist of Propertius' generation to the same treatment,² and in fact one of Scaliger's transpositions is supported by external evidence: 1.5.71–6 belong after 6.32; this is confirmed by Ovid's imitation in *Trist.* 2.447ff.³ *Trist.* 2. 459–60 (*scit, cui latretur, cum solus obambulet, ipse cui totiens clausas excreet ante fores*) echo Tib. 1.6.31f. (*ille ego sum, nec me iam dicere uera pudebit, instabat tota cui tua nocte canis*) and 5.73 (*et simulat transire domum, mox deinde recurrit solus et ante ipsas excreat usque fores*). That Ovid should have brought together in one distich verses from two different Tibullan poems may not seem wholly impossible, but much less likely than that the lines in Tibullus were also consecutive, in particular because the distich immediately preceding 459f. clearly refers to the situation of Tib. 1.6.⁴

Although the Ovidian parallel is well known,⁵ no modern commentator or critic, so far as I can see, deems Scaliger's transposition worthy of discussion. The lines may not be wholly impossible at the end of 1.5, yet the advantages of transposing them to 1.6 are so overwhelming that together with Ovid's testimony I believe they render Scaliger's text certain. Verses 1.5.69f. have the typical ring of closure⁶ and conclude the poem much more effectively than the appendix 71–6. After 1.6.32 the lines at first sight may seem to introduce quite abruptly the rivalling lover and to duplicate ineptly the persons spending the night before the poet's lady's door. But on closer reflection one

¹ 'Noctes Propertianae', *HSCP* 71 (1966), 59–106; 'On Editing Propertius', *Papers in Honour of Otto Skutsch*, *BICS* Suppl. 51 (1987), 27–38; 'Problems in Editing Propertius', in J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York, 1989); 'Paralipomena Propertiana', *HSCP* 95 (1992), 287–320; and the new Loeb Propertius (Cambridge, MA, 1992).

² It is perhaps worth pointing out that Scaliger's major rearrangements of Propertian elegies appear to be influenced by his appreciation of the complex structure of Tibullan poems. Where Scaliger proposed major transpositions in Propertius he normally united two or more elegies separated in the ms. tradition (for a survey of Scaliger's major rearrangements, cf. W. R. Smyth, *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum* [*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 12; Leiden, 1970]). In Propertius Scaliger often found himself confronted with textual units such as 2.18 which, in their transmitted form, could not stand as a single poem. On the other hand, sometimes two or three separately transmitted poems formed a thematic unity, as certainly is the case with 2.20/21, 2.22–4 and 3.4/5. Thus he tried to integrate several seemingly disintegrating blocks into one larger poem, presumably on the model of the large disparate units he encountered in Tibullus. To suspect that some disconnected smaller units in the second book of Propertius may be accommodated more convincingly in larger, less concise structures on the Tibullan model is a reasonable supposition, and it is perfectly correct that, in sharp contrast to the short almost epigrammatic poems of book 1, Propertius' second book includes poems (like 2.34) which in their complicated intertwined structure appear to come quite close to Tibullus.

³ A. Grafton in his monograph on Scaliger (*Joseph Scaliger* [Oxford, 1983], pp. 178f.) has rightly pointed out that the Ovidian parallel furnished Scaliger with some documentary evidence for his theory of major dislocations in Tibullus and Propertius.

⁴ *denique ab incauto nimium petit ille marito, se quoque uti seruet, peccet ut illa minus* (*Trist.* 2.457f.).

⁵ Smyth in his commentary (New York, 1913) prints the complete Ovidian passage.

⁶ Cf. 1.2.97f., 7.63f., 8.77f., 9.81ff., 10.67f.

may feel that the poet's rival—so important for the poet's argument in the first part of 1.6—deserves a more prominent appearance than the brief reference in line 5f. (*iam Delia furtim/ nescio quem tacita callida nocte fouet*), and the poet's renewed insistence to be entrusted with Delia's custody in 37 fits much better after an explicit reference to the dangers posed by another lover than after the poet's admission of and excuses for his own love affair with the married lady.

To be sure, the complex structure of Tibullan elegy will never cease to cause perplexity but modern research (inaugurated by Leo's fundamental study⁷) has certainly shown that in spite of the poor transmission of the text⁸ major interventions are, on the whole, not called for. There are no textual problems in Tibullus equalling the notorious difficulties in Propertius. None the less, I think that, beside the transposition already mentioned, at least two further cases exist where a major transference should be seriously considered.

Richter's⁹ transposition of 1.1.25–32 after 6 has been adopted by Murgatroyd in his commentary on book I (Pietermaritzburg, 1980). I have little to add to his arguments.¹⁰ I shall merely point out that this transposition is also recommended by the repetitions of *lustrare* in 21/35 and of *pauper* in 19/37.¹¹ Similar repetitions in close vicinity are typical of Tibullus, and of this elegy in particular.¹¹

1.4 seems to be among Tibullus' most straightforward poems. In contrast to most of his other compositions it exhibits an obvious thematic unity and cohesion.¹³ Nevertheless discontent about the transmitted verse order has been voiced by many critics in the past,¹⁴ and despite strenuous attempts to explain the text¹⁵ the transmitted sequence seems highly improbable to me.

Let us consider the structure of the whole poem in its transmitted form. The macrostructure of the poem appears to be tripartite:

- 1–6: The poet asks Priapus for the reasons of his success with beautiful boys.
- 7–72: Priapus' answer (with introduction of the speaker in 7f.).
- 73–84: The poet as failed lover and 'magister amoris'.

⁷ Zu augusteischen Dichtern in *Philologische Untersuchungen* 2 (Berlin, 1881); still important on the structure of Tibullan elegy is M. Schuster, *Tibull-Studien: Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik Tibulls und des Corpus Tibullianum* (Wien–Leipzig, 1930); among more recent studies I mention only F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 111ff. and W. Wimmel's detailed analysis of 1.1 and 1.2 in his *Tibull und Delia I* (Wiesbaden, 1976), II (Wiesbaden, 1983).

⁸ See my 'Tibullus ludens' in *Eikasmos* 5 (1994), at p. 251, n. 1.

⁹ See R. Richter, *De Albii Tibulli tribus primis carminibus disputatio* (Zwickau, 1873), pp. 3ff.

¹⁰ See his appendix pp. 298f.

¹¹ Murgatroyd himself rightly points to *exiguol exigui* (33/22).

¹² Cf. *adsiduus* (3/6), *pomum* (8/13; *pomosis* 17), *ponere* (14/17). *pomum–ponitur* in 13f. may be a pseudo-etymological word-play; for this feature of Tibullus' poetic technique, cf. my paper in *Eikasmos* (n. 8), 251ff.

¹³ Ch. Neumeister, *Tibull* (Heidelberg, 1986), pp. 75f. even takes 1.4 as a prime example of lucid composition in contrast to Tibullus' normal technique and states: 'Daß Tibull sehr wohl fähig war, einen Gedankengang in dieser Weise (i.e. in methodischen Schritten) zu organisieren, beweist im großen der Lehrvortrag über die Ars amandi, den er I, 4 dem Priap in den Mund legt.'

¹⁴ I mention here only Ritschl's contribution in *Ber. d. phil. hist. Cl. d. Kön. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.* 18 (1866), 56–74 (= *Opuscula philologica* iii [Leipzig, 1877], 616–36); other proposals are collected and discussed by Hübner in *Hermes* 14 (1879), 307ff. and Karsten in *Mnemosyne* 15 (1887), 230ff.

¹⁵ Still important is Vahlen's treatment in: *Monatsberichte d. Berliner Akademie* 1878, 343–56 (= *Gesammelte Philologische Schriften* ii [Leipzig–Berlin, 1923], 32–45); see also Hübner *loc. cit.*; modern commentators and critics normally skip over the difficulties.

As it stands, the long middle section (after the couplet of introduction [7f.]) could be divided into the following subsections:¹⁶

- A (9–14): The various attractions of boys.
- B (15–20): The need for patience.
- C (21–26): Lovers' oaths.
- D (27–38): The shortness of youth.
- E (39–56): The services of a lover and a patient lover's reward.
- F (57–72): Poor artists and greedy boys.

As the text stands, the logical connection between the various sections seems to be rather loose, to say the least; what is, however, clear at first sight is that A and F must form the beginning and end of Priapus' speech. As regards the beginning there can also hardly be much doubt that B must follow directly on A, although one has found difficulty in understanding how precisely the two sections relate to each other. Priapus begins his speech with a warning (*o fuge te tenerae puerorum credere turbae, / nam causam iusti semper amoris habent* [9f.]) which leads to a brief enumeration of various types of manly beauties in 10ff. With 15ff. (*sed ne te capiant, primo si forte negabit, / taedia . . .*) he inverts his initial warning: 'Keep away from boys', he had said, 'they will too easily make you fall in love.' He then continues: 'But don't let them fool you, if they won't submit easily. With patience you will achieve your goal.' At first sight one may find *sed* difficult; yet it corresponds to the implicit opposition: it would be better to keep away from the dangers posed by attractive young boys, but at least their initial reluctance need not worry anyone unduly.¹⁷ After this turnaround Priapus can go on to give advice on how to *conquer* a boy and thus respond to the initial request of the poet. B must follow immediately on A at the beginning of Priapus' instructions.

As regards the concluding section (F), line 57 (*heu male nunc artes miseras*¹⁸ *haec saecula tractant*) marks the start of a new theme not touched upon elsewhere by Priapus;¹⁹ F clearly introduces a new topic at the conclusion of the speech which need not necessarily cohere very closely with what precedes. One notes, however, that after E the transition to 57ff. is particularly abrupt.²⁰ The complaint about bad times for artists and greedy boys in 57ff. must strike one rather odd after 39–56 have ended on an optimistic note with the *puer* surrendering to the faithful services of the lover (*tum tibi mitis erit, rapias tum cara licebit! oscula, etc.* [53ff.]).

More serious perplexities lurk in the sequence of the middle sections between B and F. They present a muddled train of thought and awkward breaks between B/C and C/D. The transitions from 20 to 21 may not be impossible but at least with the

¹⁶ The following division corresponds to that indicated in the edition and translation of G. Lee ('Liverpool, 1982), pp. 40ff., *mutatis mutandis* also to that of Cairns, *Tibullus*, p. 207; cf. also Jacoby, *RhM* 65 (1910), 56; Schuster, *Tibull-Studien*, pp. 29f.

¹⁷ The text appears to have been understood correctly by F. Della Corte in his commentary (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1980) who writes on pp. 15–16: 'parerebbe in contraddizione col precetto iniziale (v. 9: *O fuge . . .*), col quale si consigliava di diffidare dei *pueri*.' I fail to see the point of Murgatroyd's objection against *o fuge* in l. 9 (see his critical appendix, p. 306); he then opts for *ne fuge*, already found in the so-called *excerpta Perrei* (cf. the preface of Luck's [Stuttgart, 1988] edition, p. XVIII) and also accepted by Cartault (Paris, 1909); but surely the questioner of 1ff. is not in need of any further encouragement not to shun the company of lovely boys.

¹⁸ To interpret *artes* as anything other than 'the arts, poetry', as does W. Stroh, *Die römische Liebeslegie als werbende Dichtung* (Amsterdam 1971), p. 113 with n. 10, is plainly absurd.

¹⁹ As regards Ritschl's objection that 57ff. do not fit in the mouth of Priapus see below (n. 33).

²⁰ Even Schuster, *Tibull-Studien*, p. 30 speaks of 'ein weniger glatter Übergang'.

introduction by *nec* the invitation to the lover not to spare with oaths (*nec iurare time* . . . [21]) looks rather as if this advice should be integrated into a series of precepts for lovers on how to deal with the beloved. It is strange that it should arrive out of the blue; in particular, as the text stands, one fails to see how the swearing of false oaths relates to the need to be patient. C is strangely isolated between the affirmation that patience will be rewarded in B and a complaint about the quick passing away of youth in D.

After the general reflections of 17ff. (*longa dies homini docuit parere leones, / longa dies molli saxa peredit aqua, / annus in apricis maturat collibus uvas, / annus agit certa lucida signa uice*) we expect an application of these maxims to the relationship between the *puer* and his lover, not some particular advice to the lover which as such has nothing to do with patience and its rewards. Precisely this application of 16–20 to the situation of the wooing lover we get in 39f. (*tu, puero quodcumque tuo temptare libebit, cedas*); the couplet introduces a series of various precepts on behaviour towards the beloved, which—in contrast to C—very well illustrate the general maxims of B. One feels a vague suspicion that B and E belong somehow together.

This suspicion can again be corroborated by an Ovidian parallel: *A.A.* 2.177–232 recall motifs from Tibullus 1.1.17–20 and 39ff.;²¹ even more than in the case of 1.5.71–6 the fact that Ovid recalls the passage need not mean necessarily that 17–20 and 39ff. could not have been divided in the Tibullan model, but Ovid's imitation is much more straightforward if 17–20 and 39ff. form one continuous passage as I shall suggest below.

Beside the isolation of C the most serious—and I think insuperable—problem of the transmitted verse order is posed by D. Already at first sight one may wonder how the warning not to take too much time in love affairs in 27 (*at si tardueris, errabis*²²) and the following complaint about the quick passing of time goes together with the advice to be patient in B. One would expect that the connection between the two contrasting concepts is somehow made explicit. As the text stands D is sandwiched between AB, C and E; and E, in particular, appears to refer back to the advice to patience in B. D has no connection whatsoever with what precedes or what follows, and, what is even more disturbing, is the address in 27.

Understandably scholars have been divided as to who is addressed by the second person in 27. There are those (1) like Wilhelm²³ who think that Priapus' *monita* are

²¹ *A.A.* 2.179–183 recall Tib. 1.4.17–19; in particular 183 (*obsequium tigrisque domat Numidasque leones*) is close to 17 and 179–82 (*flectitur obsequio curuatus ab arbore ramus; / . . . / obsequio tranantur aquae, nec uincere possis! flumina, si contra quam rapit unda nates*) recall the imagery of 18f. *A.A.* 2.189 (*saepe tulit iusso fallacia retia collo*) and 193f. (*non te Maenalias armatum scandere siluas! nec iubeo collo retia ferre tuo*) may be compared to Tib. 1.4.49f. (*nec, uelit insidiis altas si claudere ualles, / dum placeas umeri retia ferre negent*), *A.A.* 2.203–206 (*seu ludet numerosque manu iactabit eburnos, / tu male iactato, tu male iacta dato; / seu iacies talos, uictam ne poena sequatur, / damnosi facito stent tibi saepe canes*) to 51f. (*si uolet arma, leui temptabis ludere dextra; / saepe dabis nudum, uincat ut ille, latus*). The passage immediately preceding *A.A.* 2.181 also shows distinct affinities to Tibullus's poem (*A.A.* 2.161ff. Ovidius presents himself as a *praeceptor amandi* for the poor; 177f. echo Tib. 1.4.55f.). The use of the anaphora or epanalepsis is common to Tibullus and Ovid (cf. also *obsequio* in Tib. 1.4.40). *A.A.* 2.193f. could be seen as an ironic reference to the Tibullan passage.

²² Lachmann's *tardueris* for the transmitted *tardus eris* is too easy for me to renounce this remedy. For the lengthening of future perfect endings (or shortening of perfect subjunctive endings) in classical Latin see F. Sommer, *Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg, 1914), p. 583; M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (München, 1963), p. 340; cf. also M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge, 1951), p. 56.

²³ *Satura Vidrina* (Breslau, 1896), p. 49 with the approval of Stroh (*Die römische Liebeselegie*) with further references in p. 113, n. 9.

addressed to the reluctant boy. Others (2) like Murgatroyd (*ad loc.*) and F.-H. Mutschler²⁴ take them as a warning for the lover that he will soon be too old for love himself. The first opinion is, of course, prompted by the fact that traditionally the motif of old age is used in similar contexts to warn the lover's young prey,²⁵ that if he (or she) does not concede it will soon be too late for him (her) to arouse erotic interest; and 33ff. in particular (*uidi ego iuuenem, premeret cum serior aetas, / maerentem stultos praeteriisse dies. / crudeles diui! serpens nouus exuit annos, / formae non ullam fata dedere moram*, etc.) appear to fit, at first sight, much better as a warning for the young beloved than as a *monitum* to the lover himself.²⁶ However, I cannot see how the second person in 27 can refer to anybody but the addressee of Priapus' speech, i.e. the lover, after the second person referring to him in 25f. (*perque suas impune sinist Dictynna sagittas / adfirmes crines perque Minerua suos*). The first alternative may be the obvious interpretation if the passage is considered in isolation. If we have to choose between the two alternatives in the given context and as the text stands in the transmitted verse order, the address can only refer to the lover.

To be sure, it will be almost impossible to find any place in Priapus' speech where a second person could address any other person but the lover, and in any case the normal use of the motif by no means excludes that Tibullus should have given it a new twist. On the contrary, one could see in Tibullus' transference of the warning of the quick passing of youth from the young object of love to the lover an ironic adaptation by the poet. And even though the lover surely is addressed in 27f. the warning about the passing of youth need not necessarily refer to the ageing of the lover alone. Priapus's words could mean: conquering a boy obviously needs some patience, but do not take too much time, soon the object of your desire may not be worth it any more.²⁷ This appears to me to be the only possible line of interpretation if we try to save 27–38 where they stand. Yet in its transmitted position the function of the passage must remain extremely obscure, precisely because the contrast between the two competing concepts, patience and haste—so important for the irony—is not made explicit. Even in this reading reasons for suspecting that D is dislocated are strong.

But if we then look around for another place for D it seems to be rather difficult to place D in a position where it stands in pointed contrast to the advice to be patient. If we simply tried to remove C we would hardly gain much; D would only stand strangely isolated between the two closely connected sections B and E; and the purpose of D's insistence on haste would still be unclear. But what if we remove CD (21–38) together and exchange it with E (39–56)?

First of all, this order takes account of the close coherence of B and E; it restores 39ff. to its natural place after 20. Moreover the complaint at the beginning of F does not follow any longer upon the 'happy end' of love affairs in E. The warning about the quick passing of time, even though it is put in an ironic manner, referring superficially

²⁴ *Die poetische Kunst Tibulls, Studien zur klassischen Philologie* 18 (Frankfurt, 1985), 79; similarly also Schuster, *Tibull-Studien*, p. 30.

²⁵ On this motif in homoerotic epigram see S.L. Tarán, *JHS* 105 (1985), 90–107; cf. also Kiessling and Heinze (*Berlin*, 1930) on Hor. C. 4.10; Nisbet and Hubbard (Oxford, 1970) on Hor. C. 1.25 (p. 289ff.); C. Macleod, in D. A. West and A. Woodman (edd.), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 94ff. = *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 250ff.

²⁶ But see also below p. 506.

²⁷ Correctly understood, as it seems, by Della Corte who paraphrases (*ad loc.*): 'Chi agisce con lentezza, sbaglia: sfiorisce presto l'età del ragazzo.'

²⁸ Cf. H. Oppermann in *Festschrift F. Altheim* (Berlin, 1969), pp. 1.459ff. (= H. Oppermann [ed.], *Wege zu Horaz* [Darmstadt, 1972], pp. 349ff.); R. Ancona, *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes* (Durham, NC, 1994), cf. in particular pp. 31–6 on C. 2.5.

to the quick passing of youth for the beloved boy, implicitly refers too—and much more so—to the ageing lover himself. A man like him may be pleased to find his haste in love affairs being justified by Priapus pointing to the brief space of time his young beloved is attractive, he may use it even as a persuasive trick towards his victim, yet deep down he knows that he himself has much less time to lose than his younger partner.

In 1.4.27ff. Tibullus applies the traditional motif in a very subtle manner which is distinctly reminiscent of the way Horace handles it in his erotic poetry. It has often been observed that Horace's love poetry is predominantly concerned with the love of the ageing man or woman; the shortness of life, exposure to death—one of the prevalent themes of his poetry—is very much present in his erotic poems as well, and in most of them one strongly feels the incumbent shadow of 'Vergänglichkeit'.²⁸ One of Horace's seemingly most straightforward adaptations of the traditional theme of the elderly lover wooing a girl who is still too young for love is 2.5. Yet, on closer inspection, Horace handles it with much originality. In this poem the quick passing of time does not function as a warning to the reluctant girl or an exhortation to *carpe diem*, but as a consolation to the wooer: with some patience on his part the time will soon come when the girl will be mature for love. But in spite of all the ostentatious nonchalance with which Horace speaks,²⁹ whatever optimistic outlook the elderly man may try to persuade himself to adopt, he knows: it is not he who has time to be patient, it is rather his young beloved (2.5.13–5):

... currit enim ferox
aetas et illi quos tibi dempserit
adponet annos . . .

This is among the most explicit expressions Horace has given to the mood which underlies much of his erotic poetry; but even here he does not dwell on the thought but rather inserts it *en passant*. Elsewhere he lets us feel only—without any explicit reference to the situation of the seemingly dispassionate onlooker observing how time goes by and transforms a young and attractive object of love—that it is rather the speaker, it is the ageing lover himself to whom the sinister reflections apply.³⁰ This reticence, this indirectness is characteristic of Horace when he speaks of the central concerns of his poetry.

The affinity of Tibullus' handling of the motif in 1.4.27ff. with Horace, in particular with C. 2.5 are obvious, and Tibullus shares with Horace even the subtle combination of irony and melancholy. One need not think of direct influence of any particular Horatian poem on Tibullus. It rather appears as if Tibullus had created his version of the traditional topic under the influence of a characteristic stratum of the erotic poetry of his elder friend. Old age figures prominently in Tibullus' poetry: he speaks of the loneliness of the old woman who failed to appreciate faithful love when she was young (1.6.77ff.; cf. also 1.2.91ff. and 1.8, passages which are distinctly reminiscent of poems like Horace's C. 1.25 or 4.13); on the other hand he dreams of the happy 'Zweisamkeit' of the faithful lovers in old age (1.6.85f.). The motive of old age is rare in Propertius,³¹ and one may also note that Propertius—for all his obsession

²⁸ It has often been doubted that the person addressed in 2.5 is the speaker himself; Nisbet and Hubbard (in their introduction to the poem) seem to me to have shown definitely that the poem is a monologue.

³⁰ Cf. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 414ff. (on 4.10 and 13).

³¹ It appears prominently in 3.24/25 (cf. also 2.18.19f.; as I have tried to show in *SBAW* 1997, 2 the poem is profoundly influenced by Horace's Odes; for books 1 and 2 see W. Herz,

with death—makes even little use of the *carpe diem* maxim (cf. 1.19.25f., 2.15.23f.; for Tibullus cf. 1.1.69ff., 8.47f.).³²

However this may be, if we return to our argument about the verse order in Tibullus' elegy 1.4, the arrangement (ABECDF) proposed above answers both the objections against the transition from B to C and those against the transition from E to F, and above all it does away with the problem of the isolation of D. The melancholy outlook implicit in D very well serves as a bridge to the complaints about the difficulties for poor artists in love with greedy youngsters in F, and after the warning for difficult boys implicit in D the invitation to the *pueri* to honour the Muses comes naturally.³³ The main body of Priapus' speech dwelled on advice for the lover who must be patient and endure every labour in order to achieve his goal. But in the end he may console himself: boys who make him wait too long only do damage to themselves. And surely, uttered from the lips of this venerable divine authority, the final exhortation to pay due honours to poets cannot fail to impress its addressees.

These considerations also remove the main problem with D in its transmitted place: the lack of co-ordination between the two conflicting precepts, patience (BE) and haste (D). If D is placed after E the need to bring it in pointed contrast to B no longer exists. The advice to be patient announced in B and developed in E refers to the period of wooing. With the end of E (53–56) we enter the phase where a relationship is already established (*tum tibi mitis erit, rapias tum cara licebit! oscula: pugnabit, sed tibi rapta dabit. I rapta dabit primo, post adferet ipse roganti, I post etiam collo se implicuisse uelit* [53–56]). Now the lover is advised to use his luck ruthlessly, swearing the notorious false oaths of love, and, of course, after having waited so long, now he has no time to lose and must do everything to keep things going.

The only objection which I still can see against the proposed arrangement regards the transition from E to C. To be sure, the oath of the lover is very much in place in the initial stage of the love affair proper which is marked by the conclusion of E. It is the right place for the *foedus amoris*;³⁴ Tibullus speaks of it in 1.6.69ff. Yet even though C,

Vergänglichkeit und Tod in der römischen Elegie (Diss. Freiburg, 1955), p. 130, who rightly observes that the motif is rather unimportant in Propertius; cf. also R. Müller, *Motivkatalog der römischen Elegie* (Diss. Zürich, 1952), p. 46.

Modern research has not made much of the affinities between Tibullus and Horace in their stance towards death and old age; the contrast between Tibullus and Propertius was observed by R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 66f., who rightly calls Tib. 1.1.69ff. 'Horatian lines'; cf. also Wimmel's treatment of the topic in 1.1 and 10 (*Tibull und Delia* I, pp. 62ff.), which he concludes with the remark: 'Das letzte Bild der Elegie (i.e. 1.10) zeigt Tibulls *ego* noch einmal unmittelbar, aber in einer Haltung, die ebenso gut auch vom befreundeten Horaz formuliert sein könnte. Sehr wahrscheinlich waren es die jüngsten horazischen Dichtungen, die Tibull auf die Fruchtbarkeit des daseinskritischen Themas haben aufmerksam werden lassen.' For the death-motif in Propertius we possess an excellent modern treatment by T. D. Papanghelis, *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (Cambridge, 1987).

³² Cf. Müller, *Motivkatalog der römischen Elegie*, p. 45.

³³ Ritschl, *art. cit.*, (= 621) was right when he noted that the passage is difficult in the mouth of Priapus, and he wanted to transpose 57–70 to the end of the poem (i.e. after 84). Vahlen has rightly pointed out that this transposition deprives 81–4 of much of their effect; moreover the final *ἀπροσδόκητον* is a deliberate imitation of the end of Call. *Iamb.* 9 (see Dawson, *AJPh* 67 [1946], 12f.: cf. also Jacoby, *art. cit.*, 57ff.) and Lefèvre (*RhM* 91 [1968], 182f.) may well be right in detecting an echo of the Tibullan passage in Hor. C. 4.1.33ff. The coherence of 71f. with the preceding has been well explained by Murgatroyd *ad loc.* Still, Ritschl has made a valid point; the transmitted text is awkward. The transposition advocated by me provides a bridge for this appendix of Priapus' speech. Ritschl's treatment also shows implicitly that spoken by Priapus the passage can only be understood with a slight touch of humour.

³⁴ One only needs to think of Prop. 3.20.

as regards its contents, follows very well upon E, I still feel that, as the text stands, the transition is somewhat abrupt. I therefore suggest to transpose, in addition, 71f. (*blanditis uolt esse locum Venus ipsa: querelis supplicibus, miseris fletibus illa fauet*) after 56, between E and C in order to bridge the gap.

Verses 71f. are not impossible where they stand. However, they are not only an unnecessary appendix after 67–70, the couplet is even slightly awkward. If 71f. were to follow upon 67–70 one would have to interpret *blanditiis* in pointed contrast to *uendit amorem* in 67: curse upon him who sells his love for money; Venus wants not money but *blanditiae* to succeed. However, if the primary emphasis should fall upon the unmarked *blanditis* then the emphasis given to *Venus* by *ipsa* is awkward.³⁵ On the other hand, after 56 the couplet fits perfectly and provides an excellent bridge from C to D. Once the affair has begun the lover may be sure that his wishes will be satisfied: Venus himself guarantees the success of his *blanditiae*, *querelae*, and *fletus*. He need not even worry about swearing false oaths because they are easily forgiven. *blanditiis, querelis . . . fletibus* aptly continue and enhance *roganti* in 55f., and with the *periuria* of 21ff. the series reaches its peak. For the sequence *blanditiae*–*periuria* one may compare again Ovid: *A.A.* 2.619ff.; after the advice *blanditis animum furtim deprendere nunc sit* in 619, which is developed in detail in the following lines, Ovid goes on in 631–4:

*nec timide promitte: trahunt promissa puellas;
pollicito testes quoslibet adde deos.
Iuppiter ex alto periuria ridet amantum
et iubet Aeolios inrita ferre Notos.*

One may even see the juxtaposition of 71f. and E confirmed by the fact that Ovid speaks again of *blanditiae* in the context of the rules of conduct he lays down in *A.A.* 2.179ff., the *passus* which, as we have seen,³⁶ echoes sections B and E of Tibullus' poem. *A.A.* 2.177f.³⁷ (*si nec blanda satis nec erit tibi comis amanti, perfer et obdura: postmodo mitis erit*) is clearly modelled on Tibullus 1.4.55f. and the reminiscence would even be closer if it referred to 1.4.55f., 71f. in this sequence.

Moreover the repetition *Venus* (71)–*Veneris* (21) surely supports the sequence 71f.–21ff., as *uelit*–*uolt* supports the sequence 55f.–71f.; in fact it continues the series *uolet* (45)–*uelit* (49)–*uolet* (51).³⁸ The whole sequence 55f.–71f.–21f. is further supported by a series of sound effects: 71f. continues the *l*-sounds of 56; 71f. prepares the *erlfe(r)/ve(r)*-sounds in 21f.:³⁹

*post etiam collo se implicuisse uelit.
blanditiis uolt esse locum Venus ipsa: querelis
supplicibus, miseris fletibus illa fauet.
nec iurare time: ueneris periuria uenti
inrita per terras et freta summa ferunt.*

³⁵ This was seen by Heyne who emended *ipsa* to *illa*; even after 56 one may consider *illa* (*ipse* in 55 would explain the slip); but after 56 *ipsa* in 71 is possible, and after a passage marked by anaphora and epanalepsis (53ff.) the repetition *ipse* (55)/*lipsa* (71) with different reference may be intentional.

³⁶ See above p. 504.

³⁷ Cf. also *A.A.* 2.159f. (*blanditias molles auremque iuuantia uerbal adfer . . .*).

³⁸ For verbal echoes in Tibullus, see above n. 22; for this elegy in particular, see Murgatroyd in his introduction to 1.4 (p. 129).

³⁹ One may note in particular that the central word *Venus* is flanked by alliterating words in vicinity like *uelit . . . uolt . . . fauet . . . uenti*; for sound effects in Tibullus, see e.g. Wimmel's remarks in his *Tibull und Delia* II, pp. 86ff., cf. also Della Corte in the appendix of his commentary (pp. 309ff.) and my contribution in *Eikasmos* cited above (n. 8), p. 261, n. 48.

If then the transposition of 71f. and 21–38 (in this order) after 56 does restore a satisfactory text one will still ask for a plausible explanation of the dislocation. One may observe that the two passages, CD (21–38) and E (39–56), which change place count 18 lines each; thus one could think of an inverted leaf in the ancestor of our tradition. This does not, however, take account of the dislocation of 71f. and I cannot see a convincing explanation either for the dislocation of a sequence of 20 lines, i.e. 71f. + 21–38, nor why the continuous sequence should have been split into 71f. and 21–38. It is indeed rather awkward that in order to arrive at a convincing solution for the textual problems in 1.4 we have to resort to a double transposition which presupposes a process of corruption which appears to be too complicated to be reconstructed. On the other hand no plausible reason for the dislocation can be detected even as regards the less radical transpositions in 1.1 and 1.5/6 which I have mentioned at the beginning.⁴⁰ The considerable length of the dislocated passages surely points to mechanical reasons such as physical damage to the archetype. The transmission of Tibullus⁴¹ shows marked similarities to that of Propertius; it has been plausibly suggested that both poets were transmitted from late antiquity in a single codex.⁴² In any case, as regards Propertius, in my opinion, heavy mechanical damage of the archetype has led to considerable text losses and dislocations.⁴³ Could the archetype of Tibullus have been affected by something similar on a much smaller scale? Minor text losses, i.e. of single distichs, are relatively numerous. In addition, Reeve has argued convincingly that the end of the second book is lost.⁴⁴ That is, I suppose, as far as we can get. We must admit that the concrete reasons for the major dislocations in Tibullus elude us, but the general condition of the text is such that we need not hesitate to accept major transpositions if the result will be found convincing.

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

H.-C. GÜNTHER

⁴⁰ See p. 501.

⁴¹ For the most recent survey see Reeve and Rouse in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford 1983), pp. 421ff.

⁴² See J. L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius* (Toronto, 1984), p. 30.

⁴³ I have dealt with the problem extensively in my recent monograph *Quaestiones Propertianae* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 169; Leiden, 1997).

⁴⁴ See M. O. Reeve in *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi su Albio Tibullo* (Rome, 1986), pp. 62ff. and in *Phoenix* 38 (1984), 235–9.