THE GENRE AND UNITY OF TIBULLUS 2.6

P. MURGATROYD

THE FIRST CRITIC TO COMMENT on the genre of 2.6 was Francis Cairns,[1] who pronounced it a paraclausithyron, declaring simply that line 12 is a clear komastic announcement and referring to a few commonplaces and one variation on a commonplace of the genre evident in the elegy. Cairns' classification is basically correct, but if it is to be established firmly needs fuller argumentation. This I will endeavour to provide, by demonstrating that the poem is actually aimed at Nemesis, reasoning that the *mise en scène* is Nemesis' door, and pointing to numerous additional komastic topoi and twists to komastic topoi as well as general features of the paraclausithyron. Such a generic investigation provides a sharper focus and a better perspective. It enables one to picture the scene and savour its dramatic elements, to follow the poem's main drift and perceive its coherence, to realize that it operates on two levels (with intellectual as well as emotional appeals), and to assess this literary piece in its literary tradition, appreciating properly its subtlety, ingenuity, and originality.

A discussion of the unity of the elegy is essential for determination of its genre, and the first thing that needs to be settled is that, as must be the case if this is a locked-out lover's serenade, the piece is in fact directed at the beloved. This vital point, which also involves important considerations like the major thrust of the whole poem and Tibullus' techniques of persuasion, has been largely neglected by scholars. Many have neglected it entirely, others seem to imply that they take 2.6 to be a loosely drifting monologue. Some, such as Ponchont,[2] Bright (233 f.), and Mutschler (275 f.), do remark rather vaguely that the poet plays on tenderness, fear, and pity, and in some passages there is threat and admonishment, and L. Dissen[3] does perceive a broader attack extending over most of 2.6. But a close reading reveals

[1] F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979) 183 ff. (hereafter cited as Cairns). See also J. Veremans, "Tibullus II,6: forme et fond," *Latomus* 46 (1987) 68–86, at 81, who simply accepts Cairns' view.

The following works will be cited by authors' names alone: R. J. Ball, *Tibullus the Elegist: A Critical Survey* (Göttingen 1983); D. F. Bright, Haec mihi fingebam: *Tibullus in his World* (Leiden 1978); F. O. Copley, Exclusus amator: *A Study in Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore 1956); F.-H. Mutschler, *Die poetische Kunst Tibulls* (Frankfurt am Main 1985).

[2] M. Ponchont, *Tibulle et les auteurs du* Corpus Tibullianum (Paris 1968), in the final paragraph of his introduction to 2.6.

[3] L. Dissen, *Albii Tibulli carmina* (Göttingen 1835), in his introduction to this elegy.

PHOENIX, VOL. 43 (1989) 2.

that Nemesis is in Tibullus' sights in every single section and the entire poem consists of a series of attempts to make her relent. These are drastic attempts, in keeping with his drastic straits: with a *lena* and rival or rivals (45 f., 51 f.) in the background, for some considerable period of time (13, 47, 49) the elegist has been helplessly in love with Nemesis but rejected (12–14, 27) and so in agony. In short, amid a general gloom, and with a particularly dispirited conclusion, 2.6 depicts a man at the end of his tether trying increasingly harsh methods on his obdurate mistress, until he finally runs out of ideas.[4]

In 1–10[5] the sequence of thought appears to be as follows: the poet's friend Macer[6] is off to camp, and, presumably because Love is his constant

[4]The text used is that of Guy Lee, *Tibullus: Elegies* (Liverpool 1982) with one alteration. In 45 in place of A's *vetat* I accept ψ's *necat*, which gives good sense (for the figurative use of the verb cf., e.g., Ovid *Her.* 10.115), could easily have been corrupted to *vetat*, and seems preferable to the latter for several reasons: it is a stronger word, and so more plaintive (for the benefit of his girl), in keeping with the emotional extremes in this elegy (cf. esp. 51) and fitting with the motif of death; it makes for a smoother transition from the previous section (*lena necat* echoes closely *lena nocet* in 44, and *necat* recalls the sister's death at 29 ff. which dominates that section); *necat* contributes to the ring-composition in the final section, being picked up by *morior* and *perdita* in 51 and *vivas* in 53; it is also possible that Tibullus here has in mind and is trying (with a more powerful verb) to improve on Hor. *Epod.* 14.15 f. *me libertina, nec uno / contenta, Phryne macerat.*

[5]My division into sections is based partly on the movement of thought and partly on the fact that in each case ring-structure clearly marks off the groups of lines. On 1–10 see Cairns 208. In 11–18 *me* and *mihi* (17) echo *mihi* (11), and the final two words of the passage take up the opening two, with a pointed progression; 19–28 are framed by Tibullus' difficulties in love and Hope's promise that they will improve, with *Spes . . . spondet* in 27 parallel to *Spes . . . ait* in 20 (note also *sed* in 27 and 19, and with *negat* in 27 cf. *ait* in 20). Allusion to the poet's unhappy affair appears at the very end (*lena nocet nobis*) as it does at the very start (*parce*) of 29–44, and note also *ego* in 42 (cf. *mihi*, 31), *illa* in 42 (cf. *illa* and *illius*, 31), *lacrimis* in 43 (cf. *lacrimis*, 32), and *bona* in 44 (cf. *bene*, 30). The initial three words of 45–54 are recalled at the section's end: *lena* recurs in 53, for *necat* compare *morior* and *perdita* in 51 (and the contrasting *vivas* in 53), and *miserum* is picked up by *anxia* in 53.

[6]From 2.6.1–6 one can conclude with certainty only that Tibullus' Macer is supposed until the time of composition to have been closely connected with Amor and to have served in his camp (i.e., to have been a dedicated lover), and not, as is sometimes claimed, that he was also an elegist/love poet (at 1 ff. there is no mention or even hint of anything written by Macer) and was at that time a young man (as though an older man could not have had affairs or joined the Roman army in some capacity or other, e.g., as a legionary—see G. Forni, *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano* [Milan and Rome 1953] 27 and Appendix A—or a member of a *cohors praetoria*). There are several candidates for the Macer of 2.6.1 ff. Scholars tend to favour two Augustan poets: Aemilius Macer and Pompeius Macer. Aemilius Macer, who came from Verona and was a friend of Virgil, died in Asia in 16 B.C.; he wrote didactic poetry on birds, snakes, and plants, and is mentioned by Ovid along with Propertius, Horace, Virgil, and Tibullus as one of the older Augustan poets whom he reverenced in his youth (Ovid *Tr.* 4.10.43 f.,

companion (i.e., Macer is always in love), Tibullus wonders if Amor might accompany him; this seems improbable, so 5–6 suggest instead that Cupid should recall and punish Macer; then, unexpectedly, the poet comes up with a third possibility—Amor might spare soldiers like Macer (let them get free from love)—and, still more unexpectedly, he offers to join up himself if this is the case; by 9–10 his eagerness to escape love has led him to assume that this is the case and he announces that he is off to camp himself and bids farewell to Venus and girls. As yet this passage's real relevance and function have not been explained. Nor are they readily discernible on an initial perusal—not surprisingly, since here Tibullus is misleading his general audience.[7] Readers must now bear with me briefly and take on trust something which will be shortly clarified—the elegy's primary or ostensible purpose. To fit with that lines 1–10 should, like the rest, be intended for Nemesis; if they are not, this section is hopelessly divorced from the remainder of 2.6. A re-reading with this in mind shows that the poet here may well be trying to perplex and scare his girl.

Lines 1–4 constitute an ingenious and diverting start. In 2, where Amor must be carrying Roman weapons,[8] perhaps the idea is that he might enlist too and be Macer's companion-in-arms; but the notion of his bearing Macer's weapons as his servant[9] is more piquant and amusing. The comic incongruity of Cupid carrying Roman arms and accompanying Macer on his arduous travels is brought out by *tenero* in 1 (= "young," "sensitive," and "weak")[10] and *fortiter* in 2 (of the stout effort needed by little Amor), and there is also the paradox of Love involved in real soldiering. As to the

---

Quint. 10.1.56, Servius on *Ecl.* 5.1, Jerome *Chron.* 2001). Pompeius Macer, who was a friend of Ovid and still alive during his exile, wrote epic poetry on the Trojan War (Ovid *Am.* 2.18, *Pont.* 2.10, 4.16.6, Suet. *Iul.* 56.7). It may be relevant that Ovid comments on the love-interest in this poetry (Paris, Helen, and Laodamia) and remarks *si bene te novi, non bella libentius istis / dicis, et a vestris in mea castra venis* (*Am.* 2.18.39 f.). But this by no means exhausts the possibilities for our Macer. He could be some other Macer (it was a common enough name). Note also that *macer* means "lean" and the lover was traditionally lean (cf., e.g., Ovid *Am.* 1.6.5, *AA* 1.733 and see Mutschler 272, n. 10), so that Macer could be an appropriate pseudonym for a real person or name for an invented character.

[7]Cf. Cairns 181 ff. on this intentional obfuscation.

[8]Since bows and quivers were borne on the shoulder rather than slung from the neck: cf., e.g., Homer *Il.* 1.45 f., Prop. 2.12.10, Virg. *Aen.* 1.500 f., Ovid *Met.* 1.457.

[9]Cf. Plaut. *Trin.* 595 f. *sed id si alienatur, actumst de collo meo, / gestandust peregre clupeus, galea, sarcina*, and for *comes* applied to a slave see, e.g., Ter. *Haut.* 455, Juv. 6.119, Ulp. *Dig.* 47, 10, 15, 16. This idea would also be more in keeping with Amor's tender years (note *tenero* in 1 and *puer* in 5), and such a menial task would give more point to *volet* (= "be willing, consent") in 4.

[10]For these two latter meanings see *OLD* s.v. 6 and 7, and for Love so depicted cf., e.g., Plato *Symp.* 195c ff., 203c; *AP* 5.212.6 (Meleager), 12.150 (Callimachus); Prop. 1.9.12; Ovid *Her.* 15.179, *Rem.* 24, 198.

impact on Nemesis, such pawkiness (at the expense of Cupid in particular) is hardly the reaction of a lover who is passionately committed and downcast over his lack of success. But then at 5–6 he appears to become more serious, disapproving of Macer's disregard of Amor—in effect: "this is all very entertaining, but it really must stop." *ure* and *voca* are emphatically positioned; and *quaeso* in 5 (for which see *OLD* s.v. 3) may be to give insistence to those imperatives, or to soften commands to a god. It now seems unlikely that Tibullus himself would so slight Cupid, and this increases the shock-value of 7 ff., where he of all people (he says) is prepared to serve again, as a common soldier (8 denotes one of the rank and file who has no servant),[11] and is prepared to endure discomfort (in or near arid terrain and so carrying water in his helmet),[12] if he might thus be rid of love. Then in the perkily dactylic 9–10 he avers that he is actually off to camp, leaving behind *Venus* and *puellae*. If one accepts that here as elsewhere Nemesis is in view, then 1–10 intimate that Tibullus' ardour has greatly cooled, that he is keen to escape love totally, and, more, that he is renouncing love completely, i.e., ending the affair. As a further item of congruence, in a poem characterized by extremes and desperation, this would be an extreme measure and, given his continued attachment to her hitherto despite her maltreatment (see 13–14), a desperate ploy.[13]

[11]For soldiers' servants fetching and carrying water cf. Non. p. 48.17, 62.6.

[12]For this use of the helmet cf. Lucan 9.498 ff., Plut. *Ant.* 47.

[13]I should also briefly refute a recent interpretation of 1–10 according to which Tibullus there is not speaking of love and war but is referring metaphorically to love poetry and epic verse/military themes (see E. N. O'Neil, "Tibullus 2.6: A New Interpretation," *CP* 62 [1967] 163–168, Bright 217–219, Ball 222 f.). The theory can be summarized as follows: (1) only two men are possible candidates for Tibullus' Macer, namely Aemilius Macer and Pompeius Macer; (2) of these two the latter must be the one mentioned by Tibullus; (3) this Macer, who subsequently appears in Ovid *Am.* 2.18 as an epic poet, is here obviously forsaking erotic verse for epic; (4) similarities (unspecified) between 2.6.1 ff. and Propertius 1.7 and Ovid *Am.* 2.18, and familiar phrases from elegiac and martial contexts, such as *tenero . . . Amori, longa . . . via, ure* and *ferus*, also show that Tibullus is alluding here to amatory and epic poetry; (5) since at 1 ff. he is stating metaphorically that Macer has left elegy for epic, in that passage Tibullus is also saying in the same terms that he too once attempted loftier themes (Bright maintains that he had tried elegy on martial themes, i.e., 2.5, in which he sang in particular of war, only to be driven back to love as a subject in 2.6). The theory fails in all five arguments: neither (1) nor (2) is justified (see above, n. 6); (3) it is not obvious to me, nor was it obvious to any critic before O'Neil, that at 1 ff. Macer is changing genres, and in fact there is no proof that Pompeius Macer was ever an elegist or love poet (Ovid *Am.* 2.18, *Pont.* 2.10, 4.16.6, cited by Ball, show only that he composed epic); (4) I see no definite similarities between 2.6.1 ff. and Propertius 1.7 or Ovid *Am.* 2.18, nor do I see how *tenero . . . Amori* etc. demonstrate that there is allusion to poetry at 1 ff.; no evidence is cited for the figurative application to an epic author of the language at 1 ff., and it seems most improbable that lines 3 f. and 8 in particular could designate such an author; in addition, Amor does not fit easily into such a metaphor (with this interpretation at

The purport of 11–18 is more immediately apparent. The poet is trying to assure his girl that his big talk (i.e., the boast that he was giving up love) is empty, flatter her by implying that he could not finish with her because of his uncontrollable passion (in 14 he returns out of love, of course), and show the pain she has long caused him (*quotiens*, 13) and still causes him, to move or shame her. Also he openly turns on Amor as the cause of his problems rather than Nemesis herself (and the vehemence at 15–18 in the extensive alliteration, the position and rare application of *acer*,[14] and the anaphora and strong terms in 17 f. is eloquent of misery).

Lines 19–28, where she is actually addressed (28), offer still better support for Nemesis as Tibullus' target. Manifestly for her benefit are: his near-suicide (because of her); the affirmation that it is only the hope that things will improve (i.e., that she will soften) which keeps him alive (= an appeal to her to be *facilis* [cf. 27 f.] and an implicit threat that if she is not he might kill himself); *ei mihi* and the brief complaint of *dura puella* in 28. Lines 21–26 have been explained as a digression, but are also apposite to Nemesis and lead directly into 27 f. The elegist takes a full three distichs to build up the impressiveness of Spes as an influential goddess who operates not only in the amatory sphere but also in various other areas of human life, keeping alive and consoling many others, powerful enough to reassure even the most abject of mortals. The natural inference (taken up in 28) is that Nemesis, a mere human (note the collocation *puella deam*), should respect such a deity and not thwart her will, as expressed in 27.[15]

At 29–44 the poet increases the pressure with a concerted attack based on the death of Nemesis' beloved sister. She is used in a straight entreaty for mercy and as a way for Tibullus to ingratiate himself by professing affection for her (note the juxtaposition *illa mihi* in 31, and the anaphora of *illa* at 31 ff., which suggests her importance to him). The mention of her demise (with many affecting details) seems intended to arouse tenderness, pity, and love in Nemesis and get her in a softened mood, all of which could make her amenable to his pleas (and so he simultaneously alludes to his own wretchedness). The sister is also envisaged as disapproving of Nemesis' conduct and

---

2–4 Tibullus would presumably have in mind the god too penning epic verses); as for (5), if the figurative explanation of 1–4 was acceptable, 7–10 would have to mean that Tibullus *intends* to compose epic, not that he has written on generally lofty themes or has produced elegy on war in particular (and 2.5 is not primarily martial anyway).

[14]Elsewhere Amor is described specifically as *acer* only at *Corp. Tib.* 4.2.6 (in a different sense, without vituperative force), and Prop. 2.30.9 *excubat ille acer custos*, where the primary meaning is "alert," although "hostile, bitter, fierce," (the word's sense here in Tibullus) is probably also present; cf. also Ovid *Her.* 4.70 *acer in extremis ossibus haesit amor*. There is also stress in the contrast with *tenero ... Amori* (1).

[15]Other interpretations (for which see Dissen [above, n. 3] and M. C. J. Putnam, *Tibullus. A Commentary* [Norman, Oklahoma 1973] *ad loc.*, Bright 220 ff., Ball 220) do not give 21–26 such point or integrate them as well.

made the mouthpiece of an order to desist, while 37 ff. utilize the *soror* to frighten Nemesis, with various horrific touches. Then, having had his use out of the sister, he will say no more about her for Nemesis' sake—41 ff. combine a show of concern, humility, and love with compliments. Williams[16] and Bright (222 f.) criticize the reference to the *soror* as selfish and unfeeling. This is to miss the point: that the normally gentle and sensitive poet exploits his girlfriend's sister, a dead little girl, in this calculated way is surely supposed to be an indication that Nemesis has been stubbornly unresponsive to other (more moderate) pleas, so that he is now driven to even this expedient. Similarly in 44 he is desperate enough to play up to a quality which is scarcely perceptible in this elegy or any other—Nemesis' basic goodness—and to employ the old ruse of shifting the blame elsewhere, on to the *lena* (a scapegoat at least as old as Plautus),[17] weakly repeating a stratagem already used at 11 ff. (where Amor was the root all his evils).

At 45–54, with his mistress still in view, the poet continues with the *lena*'s responsibility for his troubles, and attempts to win pity once more (by citing instances of Phryne's repeated cruelty and accentuating with *necat* [45], *morior* and *perdita* [51] the anguish it frequently causes him), and he again inserts flattery and intimations of love (most notably *dulces* in 47 and the jealousy in 51–52). Evidently he can find no new lines of approach here. I discern *aporia* too in his effort at attaching responsibility to the procuress. *Pace* Cairns (186) the slightest probing beneath the surface raises questions: the poet does not try to explain how the actions at 45–50 could take place without at least complicity on Nemesis' part, and one is left doubting that they could, especially in view of *dura puella* in 28 and her character elsewhere in Book 2; and Tibullus' apparent failure to force an entry (contrast 1.1.73 f.) when faced with Phryne's patent lies and vague pretexts at 47–50 looks like a tacit admission that Nemesis herself is involved in the deception. So this attempt to represent the *lena* as the guilty party seems tired and unconvincing. Concomitantly, there is gloom in this passage, deepened by imagery of death, and a sense of isolation, in the elegist's separation from Nemesis, and his neglect by the gods at 53 f. (where they have plainly not been moved by his *vota*). There we see too his impotence in the face of Phryne's behaviour, as all he can do in reply is mouth useless curses. The result of all this is an increasingly pervasive aura of desperation, despondency, and futility, which will also be aimed at his girl, and which (in contradistinction to the inventiveness and humour of the opening) produces a bleakly effective close to the poem generally.[18]

[16]Gordon Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968) 538.

[17]Cf. Plaut. *As.* 146 ff.; see also Tib. 1.5.47 f. and Copley 39 f.

[18]In defence of my explication of individual passages and the thrust of the whole poem I must address the article by M. D. Reeve, "Tibullus 2.6," *Phoenix* 38 (1984) 235–239.

This necessarily protracted discussion has demonstrated that Nemesis is Tibullus' target throughout and as a result 2.6 is a unified whole. Not only is this piece directed at Nemesis, but it may also be supposed to be delivered in front of her door for various reasons. To expand on Cairns' statement that line 12 is a komastic announcement, although *loqui* is employed of

---

To him 2.6 does not appear to be complete for the following reasons. (1) "What it lacks above all is a decision on the dilemma of lines 7–12, whether to go soldiering like Macer or to persevere in unrequited passion for Nemesis." (2) "Another form of the same dilemma arises in 27, namely whether or not he is to go on hoping." (3) "It is hard to believe that Tibullus meant to end the poem with an account of how a *lena* often treats him and he her. At the very least one expects a reaction here and now to the difficulty caused by the *lena*." (4) "A point of style contributes to the expectation that the poem will continue .... No poem but 2.6 ends with consecutive couplets that begin with the same word ... [this] stylistic feature of 47–54 suits the middle of a poem." (5) "Surely the *lena* is not an important or respectable enough character to end the poem." None of these arguments is convincing. (1) There is no dilemma in 7–12: one can hardly infer from 7 ff. that Tibullus genuinely contemplates joining up (as a common soldier); the remarks there are surely a pretence, to convince Nemesis that he is ending his affair with her (and to mislead his general audience), and at 11 ff. he goes on to admit that he could not leave for camp and finish with her because of his love for her. (2) Nor is there any dilemma in 27: that the poet at this stage does still hope to some extent is stated at 19 f. and clearly demonstrated by the whole poem with its multifarious appeals designed to win his mistress' complaisance; his subsequent attitude would depend on Nemesis' response to those appeals, his own interpretation of it, mental state, etc., and is therefore beyond the immediate ambit of this elegy, which attempts to make his girlfriend relent now; even if he knew what it would be, I do not see that Tibullus had to spell out his future position, and to do so could well have been imprudent: to state that he would continue to hope if rejected might easily have undermined the whole piece, while to say that he would lose hope (and so abandon Nemesis) could have been taken as a direct ultimatum. (3) The end of 2.6 is not simply an account of how a *lena* treats him and he her but has an obvious ulterior motive and real point, as I have shown; and 44 ff. leave one in no doubt of the feelings Tibullus might be supposed to entertain at present concerning the bawd and in fact render actual enunciation of them somewhat superfluous. (4) To base expectations on a *corpus* consisting of only 16 poems is questionable, and there is no particular reason why the elegist should not here end a poem with consecutive couplets that begin with exactly the same word (presumably Reeve is thinking of identical words since he disallows 1.6.81 ff.), especially since in general repetition does occur at the close of Tibullan pieces (*ferte* and *despiciam* at 1.1.76 ff., *candidior* at 1.7.64 and *sic, tibi,* and *sint/sit* at 2.5.121 f.), and in particular the conclusion with consecutive distichs which start with identical words is found elsewhere in elegy (Ovid *Tr.* 4.7.23 ff.; cf. also *Her.* 8.117 ff.). (5) The *lena* is represented by Tibullus as being not without importance, and minor, even anonymous, figures appear at the climaxes of Prop. 1.1, 3.6, Ovid *Am.* 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 2.10, etc.; I am unaware of any rule concerning the social standing of characters who end elegies, and regardless of her lack of respectability the procuress had entire elegies devoted to her by Propertius (4.5) and Ovid (*Am.* 1.8). Finally, I have argued that 45–54 do in fact provide an effective conclusion to 2.6, and it is not easy to see where the poet could go from there or what he could usefully add to the various drastic measures already employed, and the final passage actually suggests that he is at a loss himself.

writers, it is far more frequently applied to speakers, so at 11–12 it seems most natural and obvious to assume that Tibullus has actually spoken the words of 1–10 (with *magna* referring to his boast about giving up love) and has done so at Nemesis' closed door. Reinforcing this, 13–14 would again place him on the doorstep and immediately clarify why he is there despite his eagerness to break with her (7 ff.)—this time, as before, his great love has forced him to return. It has been suggested to me that instead 11 f. mean that Tibullus is given to big talk and refer to a series of rebuffs which he has suffered. However, if that was his point he could have made it clearer by saying *magna loqui soleo* or something similar; such an interpretation produces a disjointed effect (the transition and progression of thought at 11–14 are now not as smooth, and 1–10 are not tied in so closely to the rest of the poem); and this explanation makes Tibullus into rather a ridiculous figure and one at variance with his *persona* elsewhere (a chronic boaster incapable even now of learning his lesson despite being repeatedly deflated by the shut door). Line 41 provides another substantial argument in favour of my *mise en scène*: if speaking, the poet could reasonably pretend to cut himself off after getting carried away about the sister and claim he was desisting to spare Nemesis' feelings; but if 2.6 was a poem sent to her (the only logical alternative explanation of a piece aimed at her so consistently and pointedly), he could easily have cut down the passage on the *soror* before sending it, so *desino*, etc., then would be transparent and unconvincing to a degree. Note further that in his elegies he favours an actual dramatic situation in a definite location. That Tibullus apostrophizes Phryne as well as Nemesis (both beyond the *clausae fores*) also fits with his standing at the door. Nor is there anything in 2.6 that invalidates this generic classification.

Numerous komastic features also indicate clearly the genre of the elegy. 2.6 contains all the characteristics of the paraclausithyron noted by Copley (1)—it combines pleas to the girl to relent, a warning to her (37 ff.), a protestation against her cruelty (28), a picture of the serenader's sufferings, and (at 19 ff.) the occasional threat of suicide. The addresses to Amor and the mistress are established elements of the genre.[19] Many of its themes figure too: Cairns (184) remarks on the deceiving of the lover, the lover as a slave, the unsuccessful attempt to leave the beloved, the harshness of the beloved, and the attack on Amor; to those may be added the shut door, the personification of the door (in 12), and the lover helpless, weeping, in pain, driven mad, and abusing his mistress.[20] As for twists to komastic motifs, there are so many possible instances of these that many if not all must be intentional. Cairns (184 f.) says that in lieu of the threat of suicide or

[19]See the introductory essay to 1.2 in my *Tibullus I* (Pietermaritzburg 1980).
[20]For references see Copley 19, 28 ff., 33 f., 45, 49, 63, 72 ff.

actual suicide of the komast Tibullus declares "I would have killed myself, had not ... "; as has been argued above, there is in fact a threat at 19 ff., but it is implicit rather than explicit (as is usually the case). In addition, at 5 Tibullus tells Love to burn Macer, something the serenader regularly suffered (see Copley 19, n. 37); in 16 there are torches, but they belong to Cupid, not the *exclusus amator*;[21] and instead of burning him, the torches are to be quenched; at 31 ff. a complex of details frequently associated with the locked-out lover (gifts, garlands, supplication, complaint, and his tears)[22] are utilized instead in connection with Tibullus' offerings and entreaties to the sister; in 41 ff. we find the girlfriend's grief and tears in place with the komast's; and at 45 ff. it is the bawd who is cruel and deceitful rather than the beloved.[23]

In line with Tibullus' fondness for generic variation and innovation[24] the above items make for originality, and there are other original aspects as well. 2.6 is more dismal (with its frequent allusion to and imagery from death) and more radical (in the kinds of appeal employed) than any surviving paraclausithyron apart from Theocritus(?) *Idyll* 23.[25] Entirely new in the genre are: the apostrophe to the *lena* (at 53 f.),[26] the poet's friend and the poet himself joining the army (1 ff.), the destruction of Amor's arrows and extinguishing of his torches (15 f.), Hope and her effects (19 ff.), and the use of and death of a relative of the beloved (29 ff.). 2.6 is not only a paraclausithyron but a paraclausithyron with novel facets and individual colouring.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
MCMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONT. L8S 4M2

[21]For the latter's torches cf., e.g., Prop. 1.16.8, Ovid *Am.* 1.6.58, Strato *AP* 12.252.1.

[22]For gifts cf. Theoc. *Id.* 3.10 f., 34, 23.20 f., Tib. 1.2.14, Prop. 1.16.36, 44. For garlands and supplication see my commentary on Tib. 1.2.13–14; and for complaint see on Tib. 1.2.9–10. For tears consult Copley 19, nn. 38 and 41, 33, nn. 22 and 23.

[23]For such conduct by the beloved see Copley 19, n. 43, 33, n. 25.

[24]See in particular (for his locked-out lover's serenades) my introductory essays to 1.2 and 1.5 (above, n. 19).

[25]Death figures prominently in *Id.* 3 also, but that poem has a comic flavour, as Gow observes in his introduction to it.

[26]Cf. the address to the similarly obstructive *ianitor* in Ovid *Am.* 1.6.