VIRGIL AND TIBULLUS 1.1

MICHAEL C. J. PUTNAM

THE OPENING OF TIBULLUS' first elegy has a strong element of daring to it (1–6):

Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro
et teneat culti iugera magna soli,
quem labor assiduus vicino terreat hoste,
martii cui somnos classica pulsa fugent:
me mea paupertas vitae traducat inerti
dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus.[1]

Let some other heap up wealth for himself with tawny gold and possess great acreage of tilled land, someone whom continual trouble frightens because the enemy is near, whose sleep War's trumpet-blasts rout: may my poverty transfer me to a spiritless life so long as my hearth glows with continual flame.

We might expect an apostrophe, or at least a reference, to patron or beloved, such as we encounter, for instance, in the initial line of Propertius 1.1.[2] These addresses do come, but only after the poem has run more than half its course. What we find, instead of an appeal for, or acknowledgement of, support or inspiration, is a brisk request for differentiation between the speaker and someone else (*alius*), a differentiation centered on the amassing of riches (*divitias*), the poem's striking first word. The full bravura of this initial act of distinction will only become apparent as the poem progresses.

Reiteration of *divitias* at line 41 asks us to attend to the first figure from whom the speaker prominently dissociates himself, namely a wealthy ancestor (41–42):

non ego divitias patrum fructusque requiro
quos tulit antiquo condita messis avo.[3]

This essay was delivered on February 6, 2004, as the fifteenth annual George B. Walsh Memorial Lecture at the University of Chicago. I am grateful to Shadi Bartsch and her esteemed colleagues for making my stay so very pleasant.

1. A powerful reading of these lines and of their ramifications for the poetry of Tibullus as a whole is offered by Miller 1999, 191–96. For a comprehensive survey of work on Tibullus' first elegy, see Maltby 2002, 508–9.

2. On the relative chronology of the early work of the two elegists, see Lyne 1998, 519–44.

3. Tibullus is not specific, nor can we be, about how many generations the use of *avus* may denote. On the limitation that the pastoral mode puts on the pursuit of worldly goods, see Poggioli 1975, 1–41.

Classical Philology 100 (2005): 123–41
 0009-837X/05/10002-0002$10.00

I myself do not ask for the riches of my ancestors and the yield which the harvest that he had stored brought to my forefather of old.

As we shall see when we return to the word *antiquus,* which Tibullus had carefully used three lines previously of the rustic inventor of earthenware, not everything in the past deserves scorn, but the monies that his family once possessed are not now apparently essential to the speaker's well-being. However, when some dozen lines later we turn to wealth acquired in the present, we find the speaker audaciously confronting none other than his patron himself, Messalla Corvinus (53–56):

te bellare decet terra, Messalla, marique
ut domus hostiles praeferat exuvias:
me retinent vinctum formosae vincla puellae
et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores.[4]

It is proper for you, Messalla, to make war on land and sea, that your house might sport the enemy's spoils. The chains of a beautiful girl hold me in bondage and I sit as guard before her unyielding doors.

The life of poverty, which is the speaker's prayer for his life's lot in the poem's opening lines, now takes a personal turn as he describes his status as thrall to the as-yet-unnamed Delia. But with more boldness still on the speaker's part, the generalized warrior, who amasses wealth while suffering war's trials, becomes specified as a patron called upon not in a gesture of anticipation or gratitude but as an exemplar for a style of life from which Tibullus would stand apart.

There remains a further act of daring in that the preceding lines suggest that the speaker, too, shares in the proclivities of the initial *alius* from whom the poem's first distichs pray for distance (49–52):

. . . sit dives iure furorem
qui maris et tristes ferre potest pluvias.
o quantum est auri pereat potiusque smaragdi
quam fleat ob nostras ulla puella vias!

. . . let him who can withstand the fury of the sea and rain's grimness be duly rich. O may what there is of gold and emeralds perish rather than any girl weep on account of our travels.

We do not need the presumed biographical facts that poems such as 1.3 and 1.7 supply to draw from these lines, which immediately precede the address to Messalla, the conclusion that the speaker's distasteful involvement with military goals, the voyaging necessary for their implementation, and the concomitant monetary aggrandizement that results from their pursuit, link the poet's mouthpiece and his patron together, grudgingly, at least here, on Tibullus' part. The crafter of these three couplets fosters this complementarity by a powerful example of enmeshed rhyming through the concluding

4. For a detailed survey of the career of Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus (64 B.C.E.–8 C.E.), see Syme 1986, 200–216.

words of each pentameter, which take us from *pluvias* to *vias* to *exuvias*. Just as Dante regularly creates metaphor through the sonic frictions that arise naturally from the use of *terza rima,* so Tibullus, by linking rain first with travel, then with the spoils of war, connects the people for whom these words stand as metonyms—he who would grow rich by enduring the climatic horrors of seafaring, he who would make his girl weep by journeying in search of gold and jewels, and he who would decorate his mansion with the plunder of war fought on land and sea. The impersonal *alius* of the elegy's start thus becomes not just Messalla but the speaker as well, who shares in his patron's ambitions. One of the poem's richest ironies lies in the fact that Tibullus must not only pray for separation from his patron but also from a self that has adhered to that patron and his dubious goals, and as a result has brought hurt upon himself and those dear to him. The poem begins, and continues, as an extended prayer for separation from "another" who happens also to be both "self" and sustainer of self.

The life that he would lead has its own ironies, as Tibullus defines it. Three times he links the adjective *iners* with the existence he hopes to be his. We find it first at line 5, where poverty may transfer him from devotion to military matters to a *vitae inerti,* a life presumably without the motions and commotions that warring brings. The third usage occurs at line 71, where the noun *inertia* is now associated with the passionless lethargy of senescence. In between we find it prominent in the self-definition of the speaker's first apostrophe to Delia, where the language has something in common with that of the poem's initial distichs (57–58):

> non ego laudari curo, mea Delia; tecum
> dummodo sim, quaeso segnis inersque vocer.
>
> I do not care to gain glory, my Delia. If only I am with you, I ask that I be labeled lazy and useless.

Once again the *laudes* engendered by military prowess, tangible evidence of which is to be seen in the *exuviae* that Messalla's home displays, is not to be his. But there are to be provisos. He can stand poverty, as long as his hearth gleams, and accept the labels slothful and ineffectual as long as he possesses Delia.

But the fact that we are reading a powerful poem by a powerful poet adds another, ironic level to the meaning here of *iners*. *Iners* is associated with lack of *ars* as early as Lucilius, who offers a brisk definition (frag. 446 Krenkel): . . . *ut perhibetur iners, ars in quo non erit ulla*[5] (". . . just as a man is styled artless in whom no art will be found"). In the next century Cicero can speak of "arts which those who lacked them were called artless by our ancestors" (*artes quibus qui carebant inertes a maioribus nominabantur, Fin.* 2.115). So the speaker's *inertia,* on what we might call the biographical level, proposes a slothful life that contrasts with military activism. When

5. The fragment comes from Lucilius' thirteenth book. The line is quoted twice by Servius (on *Aen.* 5.158 and *G.* 4.25); for further details and examples see Maltby 1991, s.v. *iners.*

looking at the poet's creative enterprise, we find ourselves face to face with an apparently modest maker whose artlessness hides art.[6]

The juxtaposition of *segnis* with *iners* at 58 supports and supplements the irony. Servius, in his comment on Virgil's use of the word *ardentes* at *Aeneid* 1.423, speaks of those who understand the word as meaning *ingeniosi,* which is to say "burning with intelligence." He goes on:

> nam per contrarium segnem, id est sine igni, ingenio carentem dicimus: unde et a Graeco venit catus, id est ingeniosus ἀπὸ τοῦ καίεσθαι.[7]
>
> For by contrast we call *segnis*—which is to say *sine igni* [without fire]—one who lacks *ingenium* [the spark of talent]. Whence also the word *catus* [clever], that is *ingeniosus* [sparkling with talent], comes from Greek, ἀπὸ τοῦ καίεσθαι [from the word to catch on fire].

The speaker who lacks art is also *segnis,* which is to say missing the "fire" that is the mark of the inborn talent complementing creative intelligence. The combination of *segnis* and *iners* therefore makes the surface claim that the speaker lacks the combination of *ars* and *ingenium,* of craftsmanship and imagination, necessary for the production of great poetry. Once again Tibullus asks us to confront the paradox of his own "simplicity," the pretense that, for him at least, lifestyle and poetic style are nearly parallel and complementary, and that the simplicity of country existence finds its imaginative outlet in a poetic style that is artless and restrained, and that lacks complexity.[8]

But the poet himself has already complicated this literal and figurative self-portrait. We learn from the poem's last distich that the speaker's lifestyle, his vaunted *paupertas,* by no means implies destitution (77–78):

> . . . ego composito securus acervo
> dites despiciam despiciamque famem.
>
> . . . free from care, my treasure amassed, I will despise the rich, and I will despise hunger.

Catullus more than once links hunger with cold,[9] and one of his signposts for abject poverty is lack of fire (*ignis,* 23.2). Tibullus, however, in the lines that precede his rich etymological play on *segnis,* has twice over asked his reader to accept fire as a crucial ingredient of the existence he imagines for himself. We have seen its appearance in his opening definition of a poverty sustainable "as long as my hearth glows with continual flame" (*dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus*). And we learn shortly later that one of the pleasures of a quiet country life is (47–48):

6. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.93; see Elder 1962, passim.

7. See Maltby 1991, s.v. *segnis*.

8. For the combination of *ars* and *ingenium* as the touchstone for creative genius, see Hor. *Ars P.* 295 and 408–10. For details see Rudd 1989, on *Ars P.* 408–9, quoting Ovid on Ennius (*Tr.* 2.424) and Callimachus (*Am.* 1.15.14), as well as Cicero's comment to his brother (*Q Fr.* 2.9.3) on the quality of the poetry of Lucretius; for a more general discussion, see Brink 1971, 394–400 (on *Ars P.* 408–18).

On programmatic aspects, or lack thereof, of Tib. 1.1, see, among others, Ross 1975, 159; Wimmel 1976, 80; Leach 1978, 81, 99; Leach 1980, 84–87; Boyd 1984, 273–74; Mutschler 1985, p. 28 and n. 92; Wray 2003, 23–24.

9. Cf. 23.14 (*frigore et esuritione*), 28.5 (*frigoraque famem*).

. . . gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit Auster,
securum somnos igne iuvante sequi.[10]

. . . free from care, to pursue sleep with the help of a fire, what time the South wind of winter has poured down its chilling rain.

The presence of fire helps define an existence poised between luxury and want. But it also punningly gives the lie to the speaker's protestations of *segnitia*. However deeply the poet's wordplay may serve as camouflage, there is *ignis* doubly in his world, in the fire that distinguishes the *mediocritas* of his temporal situation and in the *ignis* that, in spite of his self-characterization to the contrary, fosters an *ingenium* of consequence.[11]

How much Tibullus' initial elegy is concerned metapoetically with the crafting of verse is made clear from another motif that runs through the poem centered on variations of *facio* and *facilis,* and therefore on the poet as "maker" of a literal world that is also of the mind.[12] We first find it in line 8, where the protagonist prays himself into the role of rural man, planting vines in timely fashion and robust fruit trees "with easy hand" (*facili manu*). The notion is developed and expanded later in another prayer (37–40):

adsitis, divi, neu vos e paupere mensa
dona nec e puris spernite fictilibus:
fictilia antiquus primum sibi fecit agrestis,
pocula de facili composuitque luto.

Gods, be at my side, and do not scorn gifts from a poor man's table and from earthenware that's clean: a rustic of old first fashioned earthenware for himself, and shaped cups of pliant mud.

By clear contrast to his *antiquo avo,* named, as we have seen, in the next distich, the speaker links himself with the ancient who invented the manufacture of earthenware. He makes clever use of assonance and alliteration to connect an adjective-become-noun, *fictilibus/fictilia,* derived from *fingo,* with *fecit* and its adjective, *facilis,* so as to merge one type of fashioning with another. In other words, Tibullus associates himself with a rustic inventor who, Prometheus-like, made use of mud not to fashion humankind from a basic elemental merger of earth and water but rather the goblets that "simple," primitive man might use.[13]

10. The passage both looks back to lines 1–6 and anticipates 77–78.

11. Of the many passages in Roman poetry that deal with the interplay and complementarity of life and art, one of the most striking, as well as one of the most Tibullan, is to be found at Hor. *Carm.* 2.16. The restricted but comfortable life described in 13–16—*vivitur parvo bene, cui paternum / splendet in mensa tenui salinum / nec levis somnos timor aut cupido / sordidus aufert* ("He lives well, on a small amount, whose ancestral saltcellar gleams on a slender dining table, nor does fear or base greed take away gentle sleep")—finds its counterpart in the speaker's life of the mind (37–40): . . . *mihi parva rura et / spiritum Graiae tenuem Camenae / parca non mendax dedit et malignum / spernere volgus* ("The Fate who does not lie has granted me small acreage and the slender breath of the Greek Muse and scorn for the spiteful crowd").

12. My debt here to David Wray's excellent essay (2003) grows deeper still.

13. Prometheus' man, modeled from mud, is a figure for humility as well as simplicity; see Otto [1890] 1964, p. 202, s.v. *lutum,* no. 4. Among other treatments of the subject, we might mention Cic. *Pis.* 59; Hor. *Carm.* 1.16.14; Prop. 3.5.7 (*fingenti . . . Prometheo*); Ov. *Met.* 1.83 ([Prometheus] *finxit*); Phaedrus 4.16.3 (*Prometheus, auctor vulgi fictilis . . .*); Mart. 9.45.8 ([Prometheus] *humanum merito finxerat ille genus*)

Again the metapoetical is just beneath the surface of the poet's description, and it proposes a further paradox. For a poet of Tibullus' deeply Callimachean persuasions to link himself with stylistic purity is hardly unexpected.[14] Undefiled waters must be the source of poetry that is equally untainted stylistically. Mud, by contrast, is a thoroughly un-Callimachean symbol, linked by the Alexandrian poet with the λύματα γῆς that the wide stream of over-expansive poetry sweeps in its course (*Hymn* 2.109), and notoriously by Horace, whose Lucilius is *lutulentus* in his spate of verse, by contrast to the *puris versis* that a poet should take as his start.[15] *Purus,* therefore, here means, on the literal level, ritually pure and unsullied, Callimachus' καθαρή (*Hymn* 2.111), such that the early rustic inventor could use for proper worship.

In the context of *fictilia de facili luto,* of plain artifacts made by a primitive artisan, the word complements the three uses of *iners* that we have traced, and means something like the eighth definition in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary:* "devoid of embellishment, addition, or elaboration." Early earthenware cups, in other words, typify art at its most essential, which is to say basic and unadorned, with no aesthetic pretensions and niceties beyond simplicity of design. Thirdly, if we touch a further but kindred level of metapoetics, we find Tibullus associating himself and the inventiveness of his poetry with that which is stylistically untainted and, in the last analysis, original. He who seemed *tersus atque elegans* in his poetry would not take amiss a parallel with someone who "composed" *pura fictilia* from *facili luto*.[16] No excess, wasted words came from the stylus of Tibullus, and those that he used were chosen with care and precision by a poet bent on the perfection of refinement.

Tibullus' last use of *facio* comes in close conjunction with the appearance of *iners* at 58, which serves as a marker to prepare the reader for further words about words. The speaker, who has just addressed Delia for the first time in the poem, imagines himself on his deathbed (59–60):

---

and 10.39.4 ([Lesbia] *ficta Prometheo . . . luto*); Juv. 14.35 (*meliore luto finxit praecordia Titan*). At 6.13 Juvenal speaks of men as *compositi . . . luto,* perhaps an echo of Tib. 1.1.40 (*composuit . . . luto*).

The use of *componere* again at 77 (*composito acervo*) suggests the several parallels between poetic composition and lifestyle that dot the poem. There may also be a punning as well as paradoxical connection between *lutum,* the soluble compound that knits together, *luo* and *componere*. On *luo* and λύειν, see Paulus-Festus 107. 6–7 Lindsay, s.v. *lues*.

14. On Tibullus and Alexandrian poetry, see Wimmel 1960, 262–65, which deals primarily with Tib. 2.5; Luck 1969, 83–99; Bulloch 1973, 71–89; Cairns 1979, passim.

15. Hor. *Sat*. 1.4.11 and 54; cf. 1.10.50.

16. On *purus* and its ramifications in this context, cf. Wray 2001, p. 171, n. 29, with citations and bibliography. See, among many references, Prop. 3.1.3 (*puro de fonte*) and Fedeli 1985, ad loc., citing Quint. 10.1.78; Pers. 5.28; Quint. 4.2.118, 5.14.33, 8.3.14, 10.1.94 (on *purus* Horace vis-à-vis *lutulentus* Lucilius); Tac. *Dial*. 2.2. We remember also Caesar's judgment on Terence as *puri sermonis amator* (Courtney, *FLP*, frag. 1, from Suet. *Terence* 7). Cicero (*Verr.* 2.4.49) speaks of the difference between *argentum purum* and *duo pocula . . . cum emblemate,* a distinction of value for my subsequent discussion of *Ecl.* 3.

It is a witty irony for Tibullus to combine *lutum* and *purus* in his imagined world of agricultural-artistic beginnings. Mud does not here defile the flow of over-expansive poetic waters, but is utilized as the crucial material to be fashioned into a shape at once practical and aesthetic. In the context of Tibullus' call for a return to "simplicity," mud is better than gold, the non-ambitions of the "unsophisticated" country-dweller poet more worthy than the danger-fraught aspirations of war-minded patrons.

te spectem suprema mihi cum venerit hora,
te teneam moriens deficiente manu.

May I gaze upon you when my last hour has come; as I die, may I hold you, with my grasp giving way.

If a *facilis manus* typifies the speaker as the rustic going about his work of planting, he of whom Tibullus' crafting hand tells at the start of his poem, so it is with failing hand, a hand no longer capable of "making," that Tibullus describes his protagonist's elegiac love-death in the arms of his mistress, as his poem begins its denouement.

The phrase caught the attention of a slightly younger master of the Latin language, Ovid, who reiterates a version of it in his *epicedion* for his great predecessor, *Amores* 3.9.[17] We come in on Delia lamenting at the poet's funeral pyre (57–58):

cui Nemesis "quid" ait "tibi sunt mea damna dolori?
me tenuit moriens deficiente manu."

To whom Nemesis says: "Why is my loss a cause of grief for you? As he was dying it was me that he held, with his grasp giving way."

Such an extraordinary cooptation, where a later poet quotes nearly a complete pentameter from a predecessor he is in the course of honoring, has a series of resonances. First, it takes us directly back to the immediate circumstances of the original utterance. Just as the use of apostrophe brings an individual and his or her setting directly before us, so Ovid's echo of Tibullus' language, especially when direct address is also part of the figuration, draws the reader doubly back into the "narrative" of Tibullus' first elegy, to admire how his follower treats it. And what he does is nothing short of extraordinary, since he uses Tibullus as a clear sign to show that he is changing the latter's biography as well. We move from Tibullus' words spoken to Delia, describing his future death and her consequent mourning, to Nemesis' transformation of her poet-lover's words as she speaks to Delia about his recent demise.

In other words, Ovid replaces Tibullus' Delia with Nemesis, who reechoes the poet's earlier words, as future time turns to past and prediction is both adjusted and realized. Ovid thus "corrects" Tibullus' *vita* by confirming—in Tibullus' own language—what the reader of his second book of elegies already knows, namely, that Nemesis succeeded Delia as the poet's amour. Ovid brings truth, we could say, as well as finality to the Tibullan opus, through a brilliant example of an *epicedion* that both mourns the departure of the deceased but also, since in this case the object of attention is a poet of major importance, brings a career to completion as well. The start of a *vita poetica,* as described in Tibullus' first elegy where his death is anticipated, is brought to posthumous fulfillment at the hands of a later master

17. On *Am.* 3.9 see Perkins 1993; Boyd 1997, 179–89; Reed 1997; Ball 2002.

Commentators duly note the Ovidian parallel here as well as a possible source in *Anth. Pal.* 7.735; Smith ([1913] 1964) notes the imitation by Voltaire, and Sobrino (1971) adds Bécquer to the list.

who at once rounds out biographical *vita* and poetic life. Ovid in fact lends a sense of pattern and order to the Tibullan corpus that many of Tibullus' readers find absent in the concluding elegy of his second book, the poem that should fill that role.

The start of a poetic career, in which the author's death is anticipated, is brought to a posthumous completion at the hands of a successor poet. Just as Nemesis co-opts for herself Tibullus' language addressed to his earlier love, so Ovid, successor to Tibullus and heir to the tradition of elegy, also arrogates to himself the words of his poetic forebear, *culte Tibulle* (*Am.* 3.9.66). He, as it were, absorbs Tibullus into his own poetic destiny while at the same time placing him in the tradition of Calvus, Catullus, and Gallus (61–64). The narrative of two books of elegies is assimilated into the plot of literary history, as the immortalizing power of poetry and a poet's accomplishment triumph in the midst of a song that mourns his passing. In sum, through Ovid's ostentatious act of assimilation, the literal *vita* of Tibullus is brought to completion, his *oeuvre* gains a form of closure with Tibullus' first elegy rounded off not by his own last poem but by the genius of *Amores* 3.9, and the course of elegy, from Calvus to Ovid, is accounted for, as the novelistic history of one poet is embedded by his heir into a larger survey of one of Latin poetry's most important genres.

These last two passages also provide examples of Tibullus' indebtedness to, and dialogue with, the first two of Virgil's masterpieces, the *Eclogues,* probably published in 37, and the *Georgics,* probably published in 30–29.[18] To explore this interplay is the purpose of the remainder of this essay.[19] Let us begin with lines 37–40. An ancient reader of these lines, when coming upon generalized *pocula de facili luto,* would recall the two *pocula fagina* of Virgil's third *Eclogue,* "the chiseled work of divine Alcimedon" (*caelatum divini opus Alcimedontis, Ecl.* 3.37), that the shepherd Menalcas presents as wager to his colleague Damoetas, and a second pair, presumably also carved of beech wood, that the latter offers on his part. Merely to repeat Virgil's description is to point up the basic differences that Tibullus would set up between himself and his great contemporary as he stakes out his own metapoetic turf. Tibullus' cups, of course, are made of "easy mud." On Menalcas' we have "a supple vine added by easy lathe" (*lenta . . . torno facili super-*

18. On various aspects of the relation of Tibullus with Virgil, see Lee 1974, 100–101; Wimmel 1976, 44–46; Bright 1978, 4; Leach 1978, passim; Murgatroyd [1980] 1991, 49–50 (introduction to commentary on *Elegy* 1.1); Ball 1983, 34; Johnson 1990, 97–99; Maltby 2002, 19–20, and commentary on 1.1.1 and 1.1.77–78; Wray 2003, p. 228 and n. 40 (with bibliography).

19. We took note at the start of this essay of the daring manner in which Tibullus opens his initial elegy. It is well also to observe the element of bravado, as well as homage, in Tibullus' first book as a whole. A ten-poem collection, for all its originality in the elegist's chosen genre, would seem to claim direct comparison for itself with both Horace's first collection of *Satires* and the *Eclogues* (see below, n. 28). As far as the latter book is concerned, their own author speaks of himself as *audax . . . iuventa* (*G.* 4.565) when he undertook their composition (the near quotation of *Ecl.* 1.1 that forms the last line of the *Georgics* stands not only for the first poem but for the group as a whole). Tibullus would have recognized Virgil's own brilliant novelties in *Eclogue* 1, both in his originality vis-à-vis Theocritus and in his portrait, as virtuoso as it is intrepid, of the two sides of Rome that would inform his whole career.

addita vitis, Ecl. 3.38). In its midst we have two astronomers, Conon and probably Eudoxus, while in the center of Damoetas' we find Orpheus charming the trees.

Tibullus, therefore, would have us carefully take a step backward in the development of human artistry. Instead of wood Tibullus' rustic uses mud, and his hands—the mud is, after all, "makeable"—are implicitly his tools, not the lathe or chisel that is the vehicle for expressing Alcimedon's genius. Nor does Tibullus offer goblets incised with decorated scenes on his cups, only a brief *aition* of origination outlining the start of craftsmanship, not one of its later developments. In other words, in Tibullus' distichs we look at what is aesthetically primal, essential, natural, basic. Urbane is replaced by crude, refined by primitive and rustic, the highly wrought, elaborate, and artificial by the plain and elemental. In contrast to Virgil, then, Tibullus is setting up a model for his own original stylistics that is in fact true to himself, with a simplicity that deceives and with the aesthetically complex masquerading in the guise of the unsophisticated.

There may also be an effort here on Tibullus' part to cut through, in however gentle a fashion, aspects of Virgilian pastoral that, by contrast with the elegiac poet's straightforwardness, border the pretentious on the part of the earlier poet's characters. Nowhere in Tibullus' version of pastoral do we find presumably rustic shepherds describing with obvious appreciation *objets de vertu* of a highly civilized nature. Tibullus, however, also shows full awareness in his first elegy of Virgil's own efforts at defining decorum and restraint in pastoral poetry, especially those to be found in the seventh of his *Eclogues*. Let me offer two examples. At line 6, we remember, Tibullus' speaker puts a condition on his acceptance of a life of poverty: . . . *dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus*. The poet behind these words is thinking back to lines 49–50 of Virgil's poem:

> hic focus et taedae pingues, hic plurimus ignis
> semper, et assiduo postes fuligine nigri.
>
> Here is a hearth and sticky pinewood, here there is always plentiful fire, and doorposts ever black with soot.

The words are spoken by Thyrsis, the "goad" who loses in his amoebaean contest with Corydon, the "lark." One of the reasons for his defeat is a clear lack of grace and felicity in the verses with which he attempts to cap those of Corydon, who in this instance had spoken of mossy fountains and soft sleep as antidotes to summer heat. Tibullus "corrects" Thyrsis not so much by a contrast in subject matter that points up the beautiful rather than the ugly as by keeping the same subject but altering it into something more appropriate, specifically in this case by the facile change of *fuligine nigro* to *luceat,* from black grime to brightness and gleam. He has at once absorbed Virgil's words, and their metapoetic lesson in good taste, and altered their context to suit elegantly both his "biography" and his role as heir to Virgilian pastoral.

My second example follows shortly on the first. At 17–20 Tibullus' speaker asks that a Priapus, along with Ceres, stand watch over his gardens and that the Lares, too, serve as guardians:

. . . pomosisque ruber custos ponatur in hortis
terreat ut saeva falce Priapus aves.
vos quoque, felicis quondam, nunc pauperis agri
custodes, fertis munera vestra, Lares.

And let a red Priapus be placed as guardian in my orchard gardens to frighten the birds with his fierce sickle. You, too, Lares, receive your gifts, guardians of land once prosperous, now poor.

We will return to these lines shortly when dealing with their reminiscence of a verse from the first *Eclogue*.[20] Here we should take note of another source, *Eclogue* 7.33–36:

sinum lactis et haec te liba, Priape, quotannis
expectare sat est: custos es pauperis horti.
nunc te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus; at tu,
si fetura gregem suppleverit, aureus esto.

It is enough, Priapus, for you to accept a bowl of milk and these cakes each year. You preside over a poor garden. Now, for the time being, we have made you of marble, but, if offspring fill out the flock, be you of gold.

Once more Thyrsis' verses form a negative contrast with those of Corydon that precede. The latter addresses Diana and, combining suitability with flair, envisions a statue of her made of smooth marble with her likeness wearing crimson buskins. Thyrsis, by contrast, imagines, with hyperbole that emphasizes what is already unseemly, the scarecrow god Priapus, ordinarily made of wood, as first marble and then gold—this from the possessor of a poor garden! Once more Tibullus absorbs Virgil's context and modifies it, by reversing Thyrsis' blatant ineptness. The elegist's Lares in their humble garden have as colleague a red (presumably wooden) Priapus, appropriately bright and no doubt scary to winged creatures, not made of marble, which is possible though unusual, or, more incongruous, golden, but simple, as befits the speaker's limited land holdings—and his creator's fastidious style.[21]

Let us return now to Virgil's role in helping shape the final appearance of a form of *facio* in *Elegy* 1 at 59–60: *te spectem suprema mihi cum venerit hora, / te teneam moriens deficiente manu.* Tibullus would have us remember the first appearance of the Orphic voice in *Georgic* 4 where the poet, in

20. On the present echo see Lee 1974, 101, and Maltby 2002, 129.

21. *Eclogue* 7 also plays a more expansive, quasi-programmatic role for Tibullus' poetry as a whole. The apostrophes to Delia and Priapus, at *Ecl.* 7.29 and 33, suggest the alternation between heterosexual and homosexual elements that distinguishes the elegies of Tibullus from those of Propertius and Ovid. The disquisition of Priapus in 1.4 opens out the homosexual theme that is elaborated in the Marathus poems (1.8 and 9; Marathus is also mentioned at 1.4.8). The only other mention of Priapus in the poetry of Tibullus is at 1.1.18, and Virgil's Delian Diana easily mutates into Tibullus' Delia. This aspect of Tibullus' *oeuvre* is pointedly ignored by Ovid in *Am.* 3.9. See further Maltby 2002, 43 and 215.

third-person narrative, brilliantly draws us into the song of the bereaved poet, apostrophizing his lost wife (465–66):

> . . . te, dulcis coniunx, te solo in litore secum,
> te veniente die, te decedente canebat.
>
> . . . you, sweet wife, he mourned, you, to himself on the lonely shore, you as day comes, you as it withdraws.

The failing hand of the elegy's speaker calls attention to the poet's creativity, paradoxically, by an extraordinary rewriting of one of Virgil's most beautiful sequences of hexameters.

Tibullus fancies himself the prototypical poet, Orpheus, who as death nears can not only gaze upon his Eurydice but hold her as well, and find comfort. Delia becomes a surviving Eurydice, beloved mistress replacing cherished wife, yet now, as the use of anaphora that begins with *te . . . te* continues on to permeate the next ten lines, the imagined future mourner (*flebis . . . flebis,* 61–63).[22] Virgilian lament is easily attuned to, and therefore readily assimilated by, elegy, but the poet's imagined *Liebestod* has little in common with the final rending of the body of Orpheus, torn apart by lovesick, infuriate Maenads. The craft of Tibullus' final *manus* is beholden to Virgil, but its tone, as it were, literally and figuratively domesticates the sweep of the older poet's powerful, intense evocation of the passionate poet at work. Mythic modulates into immediate, personal experience, as the grand, mesmeric civilizer gives way to the specific sufferer, to the private lover, dying in the arms of his mistress.

The relentless, eternal forces of nature against which Orpheus mourns, whose continuity is reflected in his continuous mourning, are transformed into Tibullus' singular dying and its synecdochical reflection in his failing hand. Nature's continuous, inexorable cyclicity becomes one person's *suprema hora,* the singular moment of human finality, the artist's ultimate, ironic act of *inertia.* Tibullus turns away from Orpheus' bout of lamentation that, for awhile, is coextensive with nature's eternity, to a last hour that slips away like Catullus' "brief light" in comparison to the suns that set and rise with regularity. The elegist accomplishes his own riff on the challenge death brings to the human poet but that the Orphic artist's creative, immortalizing hand surmounts. It is no wonder that Ovid chose to quote these lines in his own poetic act of homage that at once mourns a poet's passing and eternalizes him through his own words at their most beholden and most inventive.

But the *Georgics* are a powerful intellectual influence on Tibullus from the start of the poem. The use of *alius* in line 1, the "other" whom we saw to be at once Messalla, the speaker's rich ancestor, and his own past acquisitive self, is drawn in part from the *alii* and *alius* who figure prominently in Virgil's extraordinary diatribe on modern society at the end of *Georgic* 2—

22. Note also *parce . . . parce* at 67–68 and *iam . . . iam,* at 70–71. The syllable *-te* permeates Tibullus' text as it does Virgil's.

those others who trouble the seas in search of economic gain or hoard the wealth that they have amassed.[23] The *classica,* the trumpet blasts that in Virgil typify the present, martial age of Jupiter and were not heard in the georgic world under Saturn's dispensation (*G.* 2.539), are what waken Tibullus' initial "other" who, in his ambitions, suffers the horrors of war (1.1.4). That Virgil's world of Jupiter existed in Tibullus' speaker's past, one that, either by choice or of necessity, he must now forego, is clear from lines 21–22:

tunc vitula innumeros lustrabat caesa iuvencos;
nunc agna exigui est hostia parva soli.

Then a slaughtered heifer purified numberless steers; now a lamb is the meager offering for a tiny plot.

The eating of "slaughtered steers" (*caesis iuvencis, G.* 2.537) is another Virgilian emblem of the contemporary Jovian era.[24] To embrace poverty is to do without the *classica* that typify the life of the Messallas of Rome. It also means that a lamb replaces a heifer in our protagonist's rite of purification, so as to typify his own diminished resources and changed circumstances—morally for the better—from those of his forefathers. But mitigating factors exist. Wine abounds in Tibullus' imagined, incipient realm, as does fruit.[25] For Virgil's early farmer "the year overflows with fruit" (*pomis exuberet annus, G.* 2.516). In the setting that Tibullus imagines (13–14):

. . . quodcumque mihi pomum novus educat annus
libatum agricolae ponitur ante deo.

. . . whatever fruit the new year raises for me is placed as an offering before the farmer god.

One further allusion to the *Georgics* in these opening lines, this time to the poem's third book, may help clarify the poet's intent. We have seen how Tibullus' line 6 (*dum meus assiduo luceat igne focus*) looked back to *Eclogue* 7.49–50. It also recalls *Georgic* 3.376–78, where Virgil is detailing life among the Scythians:

ipsi in defossis specubus secura sub alta
otia agunt terra, congestaque robora totasque
advolvere focis ulmos ignique dedere.

They themselves live in leisure undisturbed, in caves dug deep beneath the earth, rolling heaped-up logs and whole elms toward the hearth and placing them on the fire.

23. *G.* 2.503 and 507. Maltby 2002, on 1.1–2 and 77–78, suggests that allusions to this passage from *G.* 2 serve as defining signposts for Tibullus' first elegy, with line 1 referring to *G.* 2.507, and with the poem's final line (78)—*dites despiciam despiciamque famem*—making a bow to *G.* 2.498–99, which tell of the Roman *agricola* of once-upon-a-time: . . . *neque ille / aut doluit miserans inopem aut invidit habenti* (". . . nor did he grieve in pity for the poor or envy the rich").

24. The phrase is also used at *G.* 3.23 and 4.284 as well as *Aen.* 3.369, 5.329, and 8.719, passages in which the tonality of the context is often ambiguous.

25. With 1.1.10, cf. *G.* 2.6–7.

The Scythians experience their own somewhat macabre version of the *secura quies* and *otia* that is the happy lot of the idealized early farmer.[26] One ingredient of this leisure—the continuous, plentiful fire—Tibullus would claim for himself. But the element of hyperbole that lurks in the barbarians' "heaped-up logs and whole elms" the poet deflects from his speaker onto the ambitious *alius* of the opening line by moving *congesta* to *congerat*. The poet's alter ego may wish for the Scythians' continuous fire, but it is in terms that we might expect, of restraint rather than of exaggeration, with the latter duly coupled not with "poor" Tibullus but with the heaps of gold that reward the soldier's competitive, trial-ridden efforts.

The world of modern Rome, as Virgil sees it in the final hundred lines of *Georgic* 2, is riddled with immorality. Among its ingredients are pride, corrupting wealth, the pernicious uses of power, internal and external war, and self-exile in the pursuit of negative ambition. Tibullus would eliminate the aspects of his patron, of his immediate ancestors, and of his covetous former self that complement this unflattering portrait. But he would also return us, in our thoughts, certainly, and maybe also in what he expects to be a new reality for himself, to Virgil's georgic world in time past. To give up the role of *alius,* of physically and ethically following Messalla and his dubious military and political goals, is to give up the Jovian present (which includes Octavianus Caesar thundering on the Euphrates) and pray into being for himself a postwar status that has also much in common with Virgil's imagined ur-Rome, which is to say with a time before Romulus killed Remus and set a pattern for civil war.

Tibullus is thus reimagining, for himself at least, a georgic world that combines in a quasi-realistic vision aspects of both Saturn and Jupiter, of *labor* in all its senses but also of the productivity that comes with it and the concomitant stretches of enjoyment. The defunct existence of Virgil's robust but happy farmer, living in creative accord with nature, can in fact be recaptured, Tibullus might seem to suggest, with appropriate alterations to suit the perspective of elegy. Such a situation can only arise, however, when the various negative *alii* of *Georgic* 2 and *Elegy* 1.1 have been eliminated from the speaker's own realm, and especially when the state can turn away from war (which in the case of Tibullus means Messalla's post-Actian military activity on behalf of Rome and Augustus in both east and west, campaigning in which Tibullus apparently shared) and allow the poet's dream some partial sanction in fact.[27]

26. *G.* 2.467–68; see Thomas 1988, 2:112 (on *G.* 3.376–77).

At *Carm.* 1.9.5–8—*dissolve frigus ligna super foco / large reponens atque benignius / deprome quadrimum Sabina / o Thaliarche, merum diota* ("Melt the chill, piling the wood generously on the hearth and lavishly fetch forth wine four winters old in a two-handled Sabine jug")—Horace may be thinking of both *G.* 3.378 and Tib. 1.1.6. He brilliantly suppresses the word *ignis* while absorbing it sonically into *ligna* and *benignius* (the phrase *lignis focum* also occurs at *Epod.* 2.43).

27. Messalla celebrated his triumph over the Aquitanians on September 25 of 27 B.C.E. Octavian was offered the title Augustus sometime in mid-January of the same year (see commentators on Ov. *Fast.* 1.589–90).

But the greatest single influence of Virgil on Tibullus 1.1 is, as we might expect, his opening *Eclogue,* many of whose programmatic aspects are adopted, and adapted, by the elegist in his own initial poem, likewise the first of a collection of ten, as he absorbs the force of Virgil's pastoral vision into his own unique amalgam of genres.[28] We might begin by looking at the allusion most often pointed out by critics.[29] When Tibullus writes of the newly reduced circumstances of his household gods—*vos quoque, felicis quondam, nunc pauperis agri / custodes, fertis munera vestra, Lares* (19–20)—he would have us recall the ironic command of the shepherd Meliboeus to his flock at *Eclogue* 1.74: *ite meae, felix quondam pecus, ite capellae* ("make your way, my goats, once happy flock, make your way"). The reiteration of *ite* Virgil puts twice elsewhere into the mouth of a shepherd ordering his flock to make its way home.[30] In the mouth of Meliboeus, as he prepares to depart for exile, the exhortation has about it a double bitterness. First, it is an imperative with no authority behind it. His flock is no longer his, and he would be powerless to offer it proper direction in any case. Second, given the shepherd's harsh, desperate circumstances, *ite* also means something slightly mocking, such as "away with you," "be off elsewhere, since you are no longer in my charge," or even "farewell, because we, who were once inseparable, must now go different ways, you homeward [because night is falling], me to parts remote," into a real world far beyond the bounds of pastoral.

In co-opting the phrase *felix quondam* applied to Meliboeus' unfortunate flock for use with his speaker's land, once blessed now poor, Tibullus performs a careful act of reversal. Virgil's shepherd must abandon his unhappy goats because of his disturbed situation caused by Roman civil war and by the soldier, both *impius* and *barbarus,* emanating from Rome who carries out her mandates. Tibullus, by contrast, can lay claim to his possessions, however reduced they may be in value. War and expropriation have done their damage but, at least in the postbellum world into which Tibullus' farmer-to-be imagines himself, his location is not at some distant point of the globe but on his own property. In this regard, the progress from *Eclogue* 1 to Tibullus 1 is from war's incursions, experienced now, at first hand, to a postwar moment when the poet's speaker can reclaim his land, and his creator invent an amalgam of pastoral and georgic combined, which at least partially restores their integrity, as Virgil imagines one in the figure of Tityrus and the other in the *agricola* of *Georgic* 2. To a certain degree, Tibullus' vision is similar to that which Virgil imputes to Tityrus, save that the former imagines his character having passed through a period of warring and now returning to a pastoral-georgic existence more than a little touched by the realities of history.

Poverty is part of that design. At line 68 of *Eclogue* 1, Meliboeus can lament "the poor hut" (*pauperis tuguri*) that he must leave behind and pos-

28. On collections of ten in Augustan poetry books, see Leach 1978, passim.
29. See, e.g., Lee 1974, 101; Wimmel 1976, 18–19.
30. See also *Ecl.* 7.44 and 10.77; each of these last two lines begins *ite domum* ("go home . . .").

sibly never see again. The protagonist of Tibullus 1 has reclaimed possession of what is now his "poor land" (*pauperis agri*). But the poem as a whole urges us to accept this turn of events positively and to believe that such an outcome is doubly for the good. Not only is the speaker's property restored to him, it can also stand as symbol of the *paupertas* (5) that he is now morally bidden to embrace, parallel to the "poor table" (*paupere mensa,* 37) and its earthenware that he must use. It thus serves as contrast to the *divitias* (1) that come to those who make war (and dispossess shepherds and expropriate the property of others) and that had once belonged to his fathers (41). Likewise its owner is distinguished from the *dives* (49), who withstands the madness of sea travel to pursue his search for wealth, and the *dites,* who serve as opposites to the destitute in the poem's last line. Our speaker would distance himself from both.

Other parallels recapitulate many of the same points and much the same tonality. One example has no lexical overlap, though Tibullus' bow to Virgil is clear. At *Eclogue* 1.13–15 Meliboeus speaks to his colleague Tityrus of a she-goat whose unnatural instincts reflect the violated landscape in which they live:

> . . . hanc etiam vix, Tityre, duco.
> hic inter densas corylos modo namque gemellos,
> spem gregis, a! silice in nuda conixa reliquit.
>
> This [goat], Tityrus, I scarcely even lead. For here, just now, among the thick hazels she bore twins, the hope of the flock, and abandoned them on the naked flint.

The complementary event in Tibullus' new world takes a more positive turn. The poet prays (31–32):

> non agnamve sinu pigeat fetumve capellae
> desertum oblita matre referre domum.
>
> Nor would I be ashamed to carry home in my arms a lamb or she-goat's offspring, abandoned by its forgetful mother.

There are still she-goats who desert their young in this new arrangement of pastoral, but menace in the landscape, taking the form of bare flint, is absent, and we have at hand a nascent, bucolic zoophile who can accomplish what seems forbidden to the hapless Meliboeus, and can save the future of his flock.[31]

The same irony that we traced in line 74 pervades the preceding hexameter (73): *insere nunc, Meliboee, piros, pone ordine vitis* ("Graft now your pears, Meliboeus, place your vines in a row"). Meliboeus' self-injunction is a parody of line 45 where the young god in Rome addresses the community of shepherds as if life were all normality: "*pascite ut ante boves, pueri; summittite tauros*" ("'Pasture your cattle as before, young people; breed your bulls'"). As in line 74, the exiled shepherd's posture of power is

31. See Wimmel 1976, 28–29. We may also be meant to find a parallel between the *agnus* (*Ecl.* 1.8) that Tityrus offers his *deus* and the *agna* that "Tibullus" sacrifices for his land (1.1.22).

actually a bitter revelation of his helplessness. The balance is redressed in the presumably restored pastoral-georgic existence that Tibullus' speaker prays will be his. We have seen one of its important phrases before (7–8):

ipse seram teneres maturo tempore vites
rusticus et facili grandia poma manu . . .

May I myself, a rustic now, plant tender vines, when the time is ripe, and robust fruit trees with easy hand . . .

There will be vines in Tibullus' vision of rural felicity and they are his to dispose with the hand of an artisan.[32]

Aspects of the pastoral eden preserved for Tityrus also spill over into Tibullus' wished-for world. For instance, there is Tityrus' description of his arrival in Rome (42–43):

hic illum vidi iuvenem, Meliboee, quotannis
bis senos cui nostra dies altaria fumant.

Here, Meliboeus, I saw that youth for whom our altars smoke twelve days each year.

Tibullus' echo also looks to a moment of ritual (35–36):

hic ego pastoremque meum lustrare quotannis
et placidam soleo spargere lacte Palem.

Here I am used to purifying my shepherd and to sprinkling a kindly Pales with milk.

The difference between the two passages lies in the fact that a life that is idealized in the context of *Eclogue* 1, where the realm of leisurely shepherding and song, preserved for Tityrus and taken away from Meliboeus by different aspects of the same entity, is imagined as feasible. Our Tibullan figure wills away the negative aspects of Roman power and its ambitions as a thing of the past in his own life. He seems to pray for a renewal of major aspects of Tityran pastoral, but independent of Rome and its ambiguities.

Ambiguity permeates another resonance between the two poems. At the start of the concluding lines of *Eclogue* 1 (79–80), Tityrus makes the departing Meliboeus a last offer:

hic tamen hanc mecum poteras requiescere noctem
fronde super viridi: sunt nobis mitia poma . . .

Nevertheless you might rest here with me tonight upon fresh foliage. I have ripe apples . . .

Tibullus adapts line 79 in his protestations that the shrunken condition of his property, in comparison to that of his ancestors, is adequate to his needs (43–44):

parva seges satis est, satis est requiescere lecto
si licet et solito membra levare toro.[33]

32. The phrase *tempore vitis* echoes *tempore finis,* ending line 67.

33. Tibullus is also clearly thinking of Catullus 31.10 (*acquiescimus lecto*), where the speaker, returned to Sirmio from a political assignment in Bithynia, sees his peninsular home in erotic terms. With Tibullus' *labor adsiduus* (3), cf. Cat. 31.9 (*labore*) and 11 (*laboribus*); see also Lee 1974, 104.

A small crop is enough; it is enough if one can rest on a bed and refresh one's limbs on the accustomed couch.

The one last night that might be, or might have been, Meliboeus' (Virgil's language is purposefully vague), according to Tityrus, has changed into a critical ingredient in what will be "Tibullus'" reduced circumstances. What ends for Meliboeus, as he heads finally into exile, remains an ongoing part of what the poet's protagonist imagines to be his future present.

Finally, there is one area of differentiation between Tityrus' blissful preserve and the soldier's troubled career, as described in 1.1.3–4, to which I would like to call attention. It centers on the notion of sound. We remember that Tibullus' man of ambition is someone *quem labor assiduus vicino terreat hoste, / Martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent.* In the soldier's career the disruptive sound of trumpet blasts puts sleep to flight (*somnos fugent*) because of his need to respond to an enemy nearby (*vicino hoste*).[34] This noise, which afflicts the soldier, replaces the music of Tityrus' hedge (*Ecl.* 1.53–55):

hinc tibi, quae semper, vicino ab limite saepes
Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti
saepe levi somnum suadebit inire susurro . . .

From here, as always, the hedge on the neighboring bound, whose willow flower is grazed by bees of Hybla, will often persuade you to fall asleep with its gentle buzzing.

And these sounds are soon complemented by the singing of the pruner and by the cooing and moaning of pigeons and turtledoves. Trumpet calls, in military life, and loss of sleep from the enemy's proximity, are the antitheses of sleep secured for the dweller in the pastoral landscape by the sound emanating from its denizens, human or otherwise. Sleep is only restored in the life of Tibullus' make-believe self by acceptance of certain larger values of Virgilian pastoral. But Tibullus offers a variation on the theme by changing the setting of the scene from exterior to interior, and from a moment of fertility in the countryside (after all, the bees are at work, and Tityrus can offer his departing guest not only apples but chestnuts and cheese) to a winter scene when it is the speaker's pleasure (48) . . . *securum somnos igne iuvante sequi!* (". . . free from care, to pursue sleep with the help of a fire!"). However different the scenarios, Tibullus' career metamorphosis involves the abandonment of a life where sleep is routed like a hostile force for one where it is a requisite part of the shepherd-farmer's habitual regimen.[35]

In the majority of these intertextual references to the first *Eclogue,* we find Tibullus drawing significant aspects of Virgil's context into his own but deviating from them in crucial ways that follow one general pattern. As we saw also in the case of the *Georgics,* we are in a post-*Eclogue* setting.

34. The military imagery is continued in the metaphoric use of *pulsa,* where the reader expects some form of a verb like *inflo*.

35. All together there are five words (*quotannis,* together with forms of *iners, umbra, ager,* and *capella*) that end hexameters in *Ecl.* 1 and Tib. 1.1, and two instances where words forming dactyls in the fifth foot are repeated (*tempore, requiescere*). There is also a remarkable overlap in vocabulary other than the instances noted here or in the text (some sixteen examples).

The division between a happy Tityrus and an exiled Meliboeus, caused by a Janus-like Rome, is a thing of the historical, and poetic, past. Yet we read "Tibullus' " embrace of what is now a postwar pastoral, as he abandons the martial or economic ambitions of Rome and its elite, through the eyes of Virgil. The elegist's fictive self, crafty like the crafter of *fictilia,* imagines himself as versions of both Tityrus and Meliboeus, at once *redivivi* and novel. Tibullus-Meliboeus has returned from a form of self-inflicted relegation, as he followed the vagaries of Messalla, and reembraced, at least in his mind's eye, the universe that had remained whole for Tityrus. But there is also one notable difference, a difference that also arose in connection with our earlier discussion of Tibullus' reference to Virgil's treatment of the Orpheus myth. In *Eclogue* 1 we are dealing, in however effective a fashion, with two shepherds with exotic Greek names who spring from a Hellenistic poetic tradition. In Tibullus' first elegy, on the other hand, however complex its poetic sources, the fact that the poem is narrated by a speaking "I" gives it an immediacy that emphasizes the personal presence and therefore the humanity of its protagonist.

The layerings and overlappings in this poem are one of its features. Sometimes these are purely verbal, as *labor assiduus* is contrasted with *assiduo igne* in the poem's opening distiches, or the *antiquus agrestis* with *antiquo avo* in lines 39–42. Sometimes lexical parallels take on a generic tinge as elements of pastoral and elegy merge. The phrase *ante fores,* for instance, is used at both lines 16 and 56, of the shepherd-farmer's worship of Ceres and of the lover's posture as *ianitor* before his mistress's door. The lap (*sinus*) in which the landholder transports a lamb (31) becomes the lap of the speaker's girl (46), and the carrying home of the forgotten animal slides into the "wet eyes" that the young will carry home (*referre domum,* 32 and 66) from the lover's funeral. It is no shame for the farmer to clutch a hoe (*pudeat*) or for the enamored speaker to break down his mistress's door (*pudet*).[36] This overlap of pastoral with elegy is, of course, one of the trademarks of Tibullus' poetry. It has been the purpose of this essay to illustrate the strong role that Virgil plays, especially through the initial poem of his first *magnum opus,* in spurring the imagination of Tibullus as he in turn creates the elegy that opens his own masterpiece.

Brown University

36. There is also a careful correspondence between the literal warring of the Roman, Messallan sphere and the figurative battling of the elegiac *miles amoris*. (War, provided it is metaphoric, is a necessary fixture of the elegist's existence.) For example, the soldier's lost sleep (*somnos*, 4) slides into the lover's quiet rest (*somnos,* 48). The *tristes pluvias* (50) that the ambitious militarist must endure contrast with the *tristibus lacrimis* (62) that Delia will offer to her dead lover, just as Messalla's house and its spoils of war stand against the dwelling of the speaker's mistress before whose entrance he sits enthralled.

LITERATURE CITED

Ball, R. J. 1983. *Tibullus the Elegist: A Critical Survey.* Hypomnemata, 77. Göttingen.
_____. 2002. *Legiturque Tibullus et placet:* Ovid's Tribute to a Role Model. *Latomus* 266:48–53.
Boyd, B. W. 1984. *Parva seges satis est:* The Landscape of Tibullan Elegy in 1.1 and 1.10. *TAPA* 114:273–80.
_____. 1997. *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the "Amores."* Ann Arbor, Mich.
Bright, D. 1978. Haec mihi fingebam: *Tibullus in his World.* Cincinnati Classical Studies, 3. Leiden.
Brink, C. O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry.* Vol. 2, *The "Ars Poetica."* Cambridge.
Bulloch, A. W. 1973. Tibullus and the Alexandrians. *PCPS* 19:71–89.
Cairns, F. 1979. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge.
Elder, J. P. 1962. Tibullus: *Tersus atque elegans*. In *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric,* ed. J. P. Sullivan, 65–105. London.
Fedeli, P. 1985. *Properzio: Il libro terzo delle "Elegie."* Bari.
Johnson, W. R. 1990. Messalla's Birthday: The Politics of Pastoral. *Arethusa* 23:95–113.
Leach, E. W. 1978. Vergil, Horace, Tibullus: Three Collections of Ten. *Ramus* 7:79–105.
_____. 1980. Poetics and Poetic Design in Tibullus' First Elegiac Book. *Arethusa* 13:79–96.
Lee, G. 1974. *Otium cum indignitate:* Tibullus I.I. In *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry,* ed. T. Woodman and D. West, 94–114. Cambridge.
Littlewood, R. J. 1970. The Symbolic Structure of Tibullus Book I. *Latomus* 29:661–69.
Luck, G. 1969. *The Latin Love Elegy.* New York.
Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1998. Propertius and Tibullus: Early Exchanges. *CQ* 48:519–44.
Maltby, R. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Arca, 25. Leeds.
_____. 2002. *Tibullus: "Elegies": Text, Introduction and Commentary.* Arca, 41. Cambridge.
Martin, J. 1947. Tibulls erste Elegie. *WJh* 2:361–68.
Miller, P. A. 1999. The Tibullan Dream Text. *TAPA* 129:181–224.
Murgatroyd, P. [1980] 1991. *Tibullus I: A Commentary on the First Book of the "Elegies" of Albius Tibullus.* Reprint, Bristol.
Mutschler, F.-H. 1985. *Die poetische Kunst Tibulls: Struktur und Bedeutung der Bücher 1 und 2 des Corpus Tibullianum.* Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 18. Frankfurt.
Otto, A. [1890] 1964. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer.* Reprint, Hildesheim.
Perkins, C. A. 1993. Love's Arrows Lost: Tibullan Parody in *Amores* 3.9. *CW* 86:459–66.
Poggioli, R. 1975. *The Oaten Flute*. Cambridge.
Reed, J. 1997. Ovid's Elegy on Tibullus and Its Models. *CP* 92:260–69.
Ross, D. O., Jr. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge.
Rudd, N. 1989. *Horace: "Epistles" Book II and "Epistle to the Pisones" ("Ars Poetica").* Cambridge.
Smith, K. F. [1913] 1964. *The "Elegies" of Albius Tibullus.* Reprint, Darmstadt.
Sobrino, E. O. 1971. *"Deficiente manu," CFC* 2:223–26.
Syme, R. 1986. *The Augustan Aristocracy.* Oxford.
Thomas, R. 1988. *Virgil: "Georgics."* 2 vols. Cambridge.
Wimmel, W. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom*. Hermes Einzelschrift, 16. Wiesbaden.
_____. 1976. *Tibull und Delia.* Vol. 1, *Tibulls "Elegie" 1, 1.* Hermes Einzelschrift, 37. Wiesbaden.
Wray, D. 2001. *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood.* Cambridge.
_____. 2003. What Poets Do: Tibullus on "Easy" Hands. *CP* 98:217–50.