Horace and the poetology of Tibullus' Elegy 2.1

Autor(en): **Tzounakas, Spyridon**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica**

Band (Jahr): **70 (2013)**

Heft 1

PDF erstellt am: **27.04.2024**

Persistenter Link: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-327727

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.
Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.
Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Ein Dienst der *ETH-Bibliothek*
ETH Zürich, Rämistrasse 101, 8092 Zürich, Schweiz, www.library.ethz.ch

http://www.e-periodica.ch

Horace and the Poetology of Tibullus' *Elegy* 2.1

By Spyridon Tzounakas, Nicosia (Cyprus)

Abstract: In his *elegy* 2.1, where he appears as a *uates* in a rustic festival, Tibullus reveals many aspects of his poetic programme and justifies his poetic predilection for the theme of *rura* in his *elegies*. By entering here into an intertextual dialogue with Horace's *Satires*, the elegiac poet implicitly comments upon Horace's views on the evolution of the satiric genre. He takes a more favourable stance towards Lucilius and earlier kinds of satire, and reminds his readers of the rustic origin of this genre, thus highlighting its similarity with his own poetry and defending his own poetic choice of composing elegies with strong rustic elements. Horace's *Epist*. 1.4, addressed to Tibullus, seems to respond to these comments in a humorous way, while at the same time implying his generic opposition to elegy.

Tibullus' *elegy* 2.1 has not yet received the same attention by scholars as the introductory one of the first book, although it reveals many aspects of his *ars poetica*. The subject-matter of this poem is a religious rustic festival, usually identified with the *lustratio agri*, where the poet appears as a priest in this ceremony and prays for the fertility of the crops and herds.[1] However, as I shall attempt to demonstrate in this article, this rural festival becomes the appropriate setting which enables Tibullus not only to express his poetic predilection for the theme of *rura* (2.1.37: *rura cano rurisque deos*), but also to comment upon theoretical matters concerning Roman poetry in an indirect and allusive manner. In this way, he enters into a discussion with both his ancestors and his contemporaries, and suggests his stance regarding some of their literary views. Moreover, his role as *uates*, given the dominant position of the particular concept in Augustan poetics[2], makes the possibility of poetological remarks here even more probable. Additionally, this possibility is further enhanced by the placement of the poem in the opening of a book, a place that is appropriate for programmatic statements.

1 For the festival presented here, the work of P. Pöstgens, *Tibulls Ambarvalgedicht (II.1)* (Würzburg-Aumühle 1940) remains valuable. On Tibullus' intentional vagueness about the details of this festival and its identification with the *lustratio agri*, see e.g. H. Musurillo, S.J., "A Festival on Messalla's Estate: Tibullus II. 1 Reconsidered", in P.T. Brannan, S.J. (ed.), *Classica et Iberica: A Festschrift in Honor of the Reverent Joseph M.-F. Marique* (Worcester, Mass., 1975) 107–117, esp. 107–109, 116; P. Murgatroyd, *Tibullus, Elegies II. Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford 1994) 17–19; R. Maltby, *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge 2002) 359.

2 See especially J.K. Newman, *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry* (Brussels 1967). For the shadow of Callimachus in the image of the poet as the priest of the Muses in Augustan poetry, see R. Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome* (Cambridge 2006) 7–16.

Museum Helveticum 70 (2013) 16–32

Already in the first couplet of his elegy Tibullus states that in the religious festival he is following the traditional ritual, as it was handed down to him from his ancient ancestors:

> *Quisquis adest, faueat: fruges lustramus et agros,*
> *Ritus ut a prisco traditus extat auo.*

The poet's statement concerning his dedication to the tradition of his ancestors could be taken not only to mean the performance of religious ceremonies, but also to imply a clear poetic choice. Tibullus wishes to connect his poetry not only with the simplicity and morality associated with the past, but also with the long-standing Roman literary tradition, a fact which cannot but have an impact on his stylistic choices. Thus, within this context, the renowned purity of Tibullan style[3], which constitutes one of the main characteristics of his poetry, is aptly implied in lines 2.1.13–14:

> *Casta placent superis:* ***pura*** *cum ueste uenite*
> *Et manibus* ***puris*** *sumite fontis aquam.*

The possibility of a poetological reading of the adjective *purus*[4] in this couplet is further reinforced by the fact that the passage is filled with terms usually defined as markers of poetology (*uestis*, *manus*, *aqua* and *fons*). In Augustan poetics the spring (*fons*) and the water (*aqua*) are conspicuous symbols of poetic inspiration originated in Greek poetry.[5] Additionally, *uestis* is frequently connected in Roman elegy with the poetic form[6], while *manus* metapoetically could denote the poet's

3 For the stylistic purity of Tibullus, see e.g. S. Tzounakas, "*Rusticitas* versus *Urbanitas* in the Literary Programmes of Tibullus and Persius", *Mnemosyne*[4] 59 (2006) 114 with relevant bibliography.

4 This adjective corresponds to the Greek καθαρός, for which cf. e.g. Callim. *Hymn* 2.110–112, where his famous poetological metaphor of the clear spring is presented. For the possible stylistic implications of the adjective *purus*, cf. also J.C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire: A Study in Form and Imagery* (Cambridge 1974) 9 with n. 3, who comments on the phrase *uoce … pura* at Pers. 5.28: "*pura* introduces the ideas of *Latinitas*, terseness, and lack of corruption: but not necessarily the notion of simplicity".

5 Cf. e.g. A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik: Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius* (Heidelberg 1965) passim; F. Quadlbauer, "*Fons purus.* Zu seiner stilkritischen Verwendung bei Quintilian und Martial", in D. Ableitinger/H. Gugel (eds), *Festschrift Karl Vretska. Zum 70. Geburtstag am 18. Oktober 1970 überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern* (Heidelberg 1970) 181–194; N.B. Crowther, "Water and Wine as Symbols of Inspiration", *Mnemosyne*[4] 32 (1979) 1–11; F.M. Dunn, "Horace's Sacred Spring (*Ode*, I.1)", *Latomus* 48 (1989) 97–109; A. Suter, "Ovid, from Image to Narrative: *Amores* 1.8 and 3.6", *ClW* 83 (1989–1990) 15–20, esp. 17–20.

6 For a characteristic example, cf. the famous personifications of Elegy and Tragedy in Ovid's *Amores* 3.1, and especially the line Ov. *Am.* 3.1.9: *forma decens,* ***uestis tenuissima****, uultus amantis* and see, for instance, M. Wyke, *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations* (Oxford 2002) esp. 122–124; C.A. Perkins, "The Figure of Elegy in *Amores* 3.1: Elegy as *Puella*, Elegy as *Poeta*, *Puella* as *Poeta*", *ClW* 104 (2010–2011) 313–331, esp. 314.

personal writing[7]. Consequently, in an allegorical way, Tibullus is at this instance implying his preference for a poetic inspiration that shall take a pure form and shall be composed by a pure poetic hand.

A poem with poetological implications is expected to include comments upon, or allusions to, the poetic programme of other poets. It is a known fact that Tibullus was an exception in not following the trend of the poets of his day to boast about their poetic models and to be expressly associated with them[8]. This, of course, does not mean to say that his text is void of literary influences of earlier and contemporary poets[9]. Until now the influence on Tibullus' *elegy* 2.1 has mainly been restricted to the Alexandrian poets and Vergil, or even Lucretius.[10] We should not, however, underestimate the role of Horace[11] in this poem, since,

7 A characteristic example in Tibullus is that of the phrase *facili ... manu* in line 1.1.6, for which see D. Wray, "What Poets Do: Tibullus on 'Easy' Hands", *ClPh* 98 (2003) 217–250.

8 See Tzounakas (n. 3) 115 with n. 20.

9 For a brief and general overview of Tibullus' relation with the literary tradition and his contemporaries, see J.M. Fisher, "The Life and Work of Tibullus", *ANRW* II.30.3 (1983) 1941–1951; H. Dettmer, "The 'Corpus Tibullianum' (1974–1980)", *ANRW* II.30.3 (1983) 1967–1970.

10 See, e.g., Pöstgens (n.1) 53–84; A. Dubla, "Tibullo 2, 1: Struttura, stile, influssi ellenistici", *BStudLat* 8 (1978) 32–42, esp. 38–42; F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979) esp. 126–135; R.J. Ball, *Tibullus the Elegist: A Critical Survey* (Göttingen 1983) 161–162; Murgatroyd (n. 1) 20–21; M. Wifstrand Schiebe, *Das ideale Dasein bei Tibull und die Goldzeitkonzeption Vergils* (Uppsala 1981) 70–73; F.-H. Mutschler, *Die poetische Kunst Tibulls. Struktur und Bedeutung der Bücher 1 und 2 des Corpus Tibullianum* (Frankfurt a. Main/Bern/New York/Nancy 1985) 213–215; A. Foulon, "Les *laudes ruris* de Tibulle II, 1, 37–80: Une influence possible de Lucrèce sur Tibulle", *REL* 65 (1987) 115–131; J. Fabre-Serris, "Deux réponses de Tibulle à Virgile: Les élégies II, 1 et II, 5", *REL* 79 (2001) 140–151, esp. 140–147, 150–151. For epic elements in the particular elegy, see D.N. Levin, "Reflections of the Epic Tradition in the Elegies of Tibullus", *ANRW* II.30.3 (1983) 2067–2072.

11 The article of U. Schmitzer, "Satiren zur Ehre Messallas: die literarkritische Bedeutung von Tibulls Elegie 2,1", *WSt* 106 (1993) 111–132 is a significant step in this direction. The work of G. D'Anna, "Qualche considerazione sui rapporti di Tibullo con Virgilio e Orazio", in *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi su Albio Tibullo (Roma – Palestrina, 10–13 maggio 1984)* (Rome 1986) 29–45 is restricted to some passages from elegies 1.1 and 2.5. More generally, for the relation between the two poets, see also, among others, J.P. Postgate, *Selections from Tibullus and Others* (London 1903) 179–184; B.L. Ullman, "Horace and Tibullus", *AJPh* 33 (1912) 149–167, with the reply by J.P. Postgate, "Albius and Tibullus", *AJPh* 33 (1912) 450–455 and the reply in turn by B.L. Ullman, "Rejoinder to Mr. Postgate", *AJPh* 33 (1912) 456–460; C. Pascal, "Orazio e Tibullo", *Athenaeum* 6 (1918) 237–246; H.J. Izaac, "Tibulle est-il L'Albius d'Horace?", *REL* 4 (1926) 110–115; L. Herrmann, "Horace adversaire de Properce", *REA* 35 (1933) 287–292; A. Brouwers, "Horace et Albius", in *Études Horatiennes. Recueil publié en l'honneur du bimillénaire d'Horace* (Brussels 1937) 53–64; J. De Decker, "Horace et Tibulle", *RevPhil* 11 (1937) 30–44; B. Otis, "Horace and the Elegists", *TAPA* 76 (1945) 177–190, esp. 186–188; L. Pepe, *Tibullo minore* (Naples 1948) 63–95; W. Willige, "Horaz und Tibull", *Gymnasium* 54 (1957) 98–100; E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 323–327; B. Riposati, *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo* (2nd ed., Milan 1968) 242–245; M.C.J. Putnam, "Horace and Tibullus", in id. (ed.), *Essays on Latin Lyric, Elegy, and Epic* (Princeton 1982) 152–159 [= *ClPh* 67 (1972) 81–88]; D. Gagliardi, "Orazio e Tibullo (Per la ricostruzione di un rapporto 'trasversale')", *A&R* n.s. 37 (1992) 75–87; R.J. Ball, "*Albi, ne doleas*: Horace and Tibullus", *ClW* 87 (1993–1994) 409–414; G. Giangrande, "Horace, Tibullus and Cassius Parmensis", *Veleia* 22 (2005) 259–261; R. Perrelli, "Orazio e Tibullo

as we shall see, some of the views Tibullus adopts here could be regarded as responses to him.

The *Satires* of Horace were published in the 30s of the first century B.C.[12]; thus this work predates the elegies of Tibullus[13], who in all probability had taken it into account. In the poems 1.4, 1.10 and 2.1 of his collection the satiric poet criticizes Lucilius[14], his predecessor in the particular genre, and expresses his views regarding the direction of his satiric poetry. One matter for which Lucilius is criticized is his tendency to mix Greek and Latin words, a tendency which is praised by Horace's interlocutor, who compares the aesthetic result to the *suauitas*[15] that transpires from the combination of Falernian and Chian wine: *at sermo lingua concinnus utraque | suauior, ut Chio nota si conmixta Falerni est* (*Sat.* 1.10.23–24). In the framework of the rustic festival described in his poem, Tibullus employs a similar image, since he asks for Falernian and Chian wine: *nunc mihi fumosos ueteris proferte Falernos | consulis et Chio soluite uincla cado* (2.1.27–28). Wine is frequently used as a symbol of inspiration and a metaphor for poetry[16] and, given Horace's precedent, on a metapoetic level Tibullus could mean here that he seeks his poetic inspiration both in the austere, traditional[17] Roman poetry, as well as in the light and sweet Greek poetry, symbolized respectively by Falernian and Chian wine. Consequently, the elegiac poet appears to be using Horace's allegorical image and to be acknowledging the use of both Roman and Greek poetry as sources of poetic inspiration.

a confronto in *Carm.* 1,33: il dialogo con un elegiaco 'moderato'", *Paideia* 60 (2005) 239–253. Most of these studies mainly focus on Horace's references to *Albius* at *Carm.* 1.33 and *Epist.* 1.4, who is usually identified with Albius Tibullus.

12 For the dating of the work, see e.g. P.M. Brown, *Horace: Satires I, with an Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary* (Warminster 1993, repr. 1995) 3. According to him, the first book appeared c. 35 B.C. and the second in 30 B.C.

13 The publication of Tibullus' second book is dated in around 19 B.C.; see Maltby (n. 1) 39–40.

14 On Horace's criticism of Lucilius, see especially N. Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* (2nd ed., Berkeley and Los Angeles/Bristol 1982) 86–131; C.J. Classen, "Die Kritik des Horaz an Lucilius in den Satiren I 4 and I 5", *Hermes* 109 (1981) 339–360; R. Scodel, "Horace, Lucilius, and Callimachean Polemic", *HarvSt* 91 (1987) 199–215; G. Harrison, "The Confessions of Lucilius (Horace *Sat.* 2.1.30–34): A Defense of Autobiographical Satire?", *ClAnt* 6 (1987) 38–52; K. Freudenburg, *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal* (Cambridge 2001) 15–124 passim; D.J. Coffta, *The Influence of Callimachean Aesthetics on the Satires and Odes of Horace* (Lewiston 2001) esp. 23–43; C. Schlegel, *Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace's* Satires, *Book 1* (Madison/London 2005) esp. 38–51, 127–143; S.J. Harrison, *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (Oxford 2007) 76–79.

15 For *suauitas* as a stylistic principle in neoteric aesthetics, see Rudd (n. 14) 119; Brown (n. 12) 186.

16 See, e.g., S. Commager, "The Function of Wine in Horace's *Odes*", *TAPA* 88 (1957) 75–76; Crowther (n. 5) 1–11; Bramble (n. 4) 48–50; S. Tzounakas, "The Reference to Archaic Roman Tragedy in Persius' First Satire", *AntCl* 77 (2008) 99–100.

17 For the suggestions of age in Tibullus' reference to Falernian wine, see e.g. K.F. Smith, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus: The Corpus Tibullianum Edited with Introduction and Notes on Books I, II, and IV, 2–14*, (New York 1913, repr. Darmstadt 1971) 398–399.

This obviously does not mean that he is theoretically placing himself totally alongside the poetic approach and aesthetic views of the *Lucili fautores*. Tibullus does not mention the mixing of the two wines which could be interpreted as a preference for a blend of Latin and Greek vocabulary. In fact, that would be in total contrast to the principle of stylistic purity so prevalent in his work in general and in *elegy* 2.1 in particular, as well as to his overall tendency to avoid the use of Greek words[18]. What he is revealing here rather is his interest in an inspiration springing from both Roman and Greek poetic models. His intentions, however, seem to go even further. Horace's objection to Lucilius' linguistic impurity[19] points to Callimachus' *Iamb* 13, where the latter defends his use of mixed dialect and his πολυείδεα and where the image of wine-mixing is also present.[20] By employing a similar imagery, Tibullus implicitly qualifies Horace's thought. In his view, the opposition to linguistic impurity should not lead to the elimination of Greek poetry as a source of poetic inspiration, which could work well together with the traditional Roman elements, and thus he suggests a certain adherence to Callimachean aesthetics. Besides, it is no coincidence that Alexandrian elements are prevalent in his second book, where his poetry is closer to the poetic practice of Propertius and Ovid,[21] while in the description of the ritual he employs both traditional Roman as well as Greek elements[22].

The next lines come to reinforce the intertextual dialogue with the satiric Horace; the elegiac poet claims that on a festive day it is not shameful for someone to be inebriated and unsteady on his legs:

Vina diem celebrent: non festa luce madere
Est rubor, errantes et male ferre pedes.
(Tib. .29–302).1

18 For Tibullus' avoidance of Greek words, see R. Maltby, "Tibullus and the Language of Latin Elegy", in J.N. Adams/R.G. Mayer (eds), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (Oxford/New York 1999) 379–382, 391–396 (Appendix A). He attributes the rarity of Greek loan-words in Tibullus' elegies to the literary views of his patron, M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, who was a defender of pure Latinity.

19 Horace's criticism of Lucilius' impurity is mainly expressed through the characterization of the latter as *lutulentus* at *Sat.* 1.4.11 and 10.50. Consequently, stylistic purity is a desideratum for both Horace and Tibullus.

20 Scodel (n. 14) 206–207, 210 rightly connects the particular Lucilian practice, as described by Horace, with the latter's intention to underline an association between the satires of Lucilius and the *Iambs* of Callimachus.

21 Cf. R. Maltby, "The Wheel of Fortune, Nemesis and the Central Poems of Tibullus I and II", in S. Kyriakidis/F. De Martino (eds), *Middles in Latin Poetry* (Bari 2004) 114–115.

22 See J.G. López, "Ritus patrius y ritus graecus en Tibulo II 1", in *Simposio Tibuliano. Commemoración del Bimilenario de la muerte de Tibulo* (Murcia 1985) 263–273; cf. G. Luck, *The Latin Love Elegy* (2nd ed., London 1969) 75.

These lines also recall the same Horatian satire, which begins with a criticism of Lucilius' versification and his *inconpositus pes*:

> *Nempe inconposito dixi pede currere uersus*
> *Lucili. quis tam Lucili fautor inepte est,*
> *ut non hoc fateatur?*
> (Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.1–3)

Tibullus' phrase *errantes et male ferre pedes*[23] points to Horace's phrase *inconposito ... pede currere uersus* | *Lucili*[24] and, given the frequent use of *pedes* as a metrical technical term, it could be interpreted as a poetological statement from Tibullus regarding the need for understanding and leniency in the presence of certain weaknesses of verse. This statement seems to move in two directions. On the one hand, Tibullus appears to be taking a positive stance concerning Lucilius and to be searching for alleviating elements, refusing to adopt Horace's severe criticism. It is possible that the choice of the word *luce*, instead of *die*[25], for the description of the day reinforces this interpretation even more, given the alliterative association of ***luce*** – ***Luc****ilius*. In fact, the motif of "πρῶτος εὑρετής", which is highlighted in this poem[26], is in accordance with the portrayal of Lucilius as *inuentor* of the satiric genre[27]. On the other hand, Tibullus' reference to *errantes et male ferre pedes* could suggest the elegiac metre he chooses, which due to the pentameter points to an inability to walk normally[28], a notion often found in elegiac poetry, as for example in the famous personification of Elegy at Ov. *Am.* 3.1.7–10.

Tibullus' reference to *uina* and inebriation here seems to be another comment on Horace's stance towards Lucilius. Based on passages Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.86–90 and *Sat.* 2.1.68–74, Anderson has convincingly argued that in Horace's picture of

23 Cf. also 2.1.90: *incerto … pede*, which recalls the phrase *certo … pede* some lines earlier (2.1.52); for the echo of *errantes … pedes* in *incerto … pede* as well as for other parallels between lines 2.1.27–36 and 2.1.81–90, see C. Rambaux, *Tibulle ou la répétition* (Brussels 1997) 63.

24 Cf. also Horace's reference to Lucilius at *Sat.* 1.4.10: *stans pede in uno*.

25 Cf. also 2.1.5: ***Luce*** *sacra requiescat humus, requiescat arator*. According to M. Grondona, "Struttura e stile dell'elegia II 1 di Tibullo", *Maia* 23 (1971) 237, the choice of *luce* twice in this elegy aims at elegance.

26 This motif is especially evident in lines 37–66, with a remarkable repetition of *primum*; cf. Dubla (n. 10) 34–35, 37; Schmitzer (n. 11) 121, who highlights Tibullus' comments on *agricola* as the πρῶτος εὑρετής of poetry.

27 Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.48; 2.1.62–63.

28 For the pun in *pes* "foot of body / metrical foot" in Latin poetry, see e.g. M.J. Mordine, "*Sine Me, Liber, Ibis*: The Poet, the Book and the Reader in *Tristia* 1.1", *ClQu* n.s. 60 (2010) 535, n. 33, with relevant bibliography. For this pun in Tibullus, cf. B.H. Fineberg, "From a Sure Foot to Faltering Meters: The Dark Ladies of Tibullan Elegy", in M. DeForest (ed.), *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King* (Wauconda IL 1993) 249–256; J. Henkel, "Foot Puns and the Elegiac Meter in Tibullus and Other Augustan Poets", Abstract of paper delivered at the meeting of the American Philological Association (1/9/2009).

Lucilius and the latter's *libertas* there is an implication of drunkenness[29]. Thus, once again, the elegiac poet distances himself from Horace's criticism and appears to regard Lucilius with a more favourable eye.

This intertextual dialogue with the satiric Horace has been adroitly prepared with relevant echoes and allusions in the proceeding lines:

> *Tunc nitidus plenis confisus rusticus agris*
> *Ingeret ardenti grandia ligna foco,*
> *Turbaque uernarum, saturi bona signa coloni,*
> *Ludet et ex uirgis exstruet ante casas.*
> *Euentura precor: uiden ut felicibus extis*
> *Significet placidos nuntia fibra deos?*
> (Tib. .21–26).1

In the same *satire* 1.10, in order to reinforce his criticism of Lucilius for the latter's frequent use of Greek words, Horace mentions that when he was composing poetry in Greek, Quirinus appeared in a dream and told him that such an exercise was as pointless as bringing timber to a forest:

> *in siluam non ligna feras insanius ac si*
> *magnas Graecorum malis inplere cateruas.*
> (Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.34–35)

It appears that this Horatian remark, in combination with the lines

> *dissolue frigus ligna super foco*
> *large reponens atque benignius*
> *deprome quadrimum Sabina,*
> *o Thaliarche, merum diota.*
> (Hor. *Carm.* 1.9.5–8)

was taken into account by Tibullus, when he mentions:

> *Tunc nitidus plenis confisus rusticus agris*
> *Ingeret ardenti grandia ligna foco*
> (Tib. 2.1.21–22)

Tibullus hopes that the successful outcome of the ritual he is staging will result in a *nitidus rusticus* bringing timber to the burning hearth. The phrase *nitidus rusticus* could recall the persona of the poet[30] himself, who already in the first

29 W.S. Anderson, "The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satires", in id. (ed.), *Essays on Roman Satire* (Princeton 1982) 16–17, 32–33; cf. also Harrison (n. 14) 42–43, n. 24; Freudenburg (n. 14) 47–48; Schlegel (n. 14) 47 and 151 n. 11.

30 See G. Brugnoli, "*Tibullus nitidus Agricola*", *RCCM* 36 (1994) 355. For a different view, see Murgatroyd (n. 1) 19.

programmatic elegy of the first book calls himself *rusticus*[31] (1.1.7–8: ***ipse*** *seram teneras maturo tempore uites* | ***rusticus*** *et facili grandia poma manu*), while the adjective *nitidus* recalls his frequent practice to use words denoting the white colour or brightness, in order to allude to his name *Albius* (<*albus*) as well as to his style[32]. It is a well known fact that in poetry wood often points to ὕλη/ *materia* and by implication to the poetic material[33]. Consequently, it would be justifiable if one were to give these lines a poetological interpretation. Thus, within the context of the dialogue between the two poets, Tibullus appears to be employing a similar allegorical image to the one found in Horace's satire, claiming that his poetic material is not moving in the direction of the forest, but in that of the burning hearth. Fire is a frequent and conventional metaphor for love[34] and by his statement the poet intimates his intention to offer material for love poetry[35], symbolized by the phrase *ardenti … foco*. Furthermore, in this last phrase we could identify an additional stylistic proclamation. In ancient literary criticism, 'frigidity' is a frequent term to describe stylistic vices. According to the Greek critics, τὸ ψυχρὸν is the result of excess or extravagance and is neighbour to elevated style, while the Latin *frigidum* is related to flatness and insipidity of style and characterizes deficiency in fire or spirit.[36] By highlighting the lack of frigidity as regards his poetic material, Tibullus suggests the qualities of his own poetry. At the same time, it could be assumed that the adjective *grandia*, with which the poet refers to the timber he hopes a *nitidus rusticus* will gather at the site of the hearth, should the ritual be carried out successfully, implies a sense of poetic confidence on the part of Tibullus as to the greatness of his future poetic material and the overall value of his poetry. This confidence is in total agreement with his role as *uates*, as this concept usually points to more elevated poetry[37]. The phrase *plenis confisus … agris* (2.1.21), with which the *nitidus rusticus* is portrayed to have confidence in the plentiful yield of the fields,

31 For the connotations of this characterization, see Tzounakas (n. 3) 111–128.

32 For this practice, see e.g. S. Tzounakas, "*Populus alta* or *alba*? A Note on Tibullus 1.4.30", *Hermes* 136 (2008) 210, n. 31, with relevant bibliography.

33 An indicative example in Tibullus is that in lines 1.10.7–8: *diuitis hoc uitium est auri, nec bella fuerunt,* | *faginus adstabat cum scyphus ante dapes*, for which see Wray (n. 7) 236–237. For the frequency of this poetological metaphor in Latin literature, see recently S. Tzounakas, "Further Programmatic Implications of Valerius Flaccus' Description of the Construction of the Argo (1.121–9)", *SOslo* 86 (2012) 163–164.

34 OLD, s.v. *ignis*, 9.

35 For fire as a symbol of elegiac love poetry, cf. Ov. *Trist.* 4.10.45: *saepe suos solitus recitare Propertius* ***ignes***, where the elegies of Propertius are called *ignes*.

36 See especially L. Van Hook, "Ψυχρότης ἢ τὸ Ψυχρόν", *ClPh* 12 (1917) 68–76; cf. also A.M. Keith, "Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory", *Mnemosyne*[4] 52 (1999) 60, with n. 57, who cites K. Freudenburg, *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton 1993) 191–192.

37 For a characteristic example in Tibullus, cf. F. Solmsen, "Tibullus as an Augustan Poet", *Hermes* 90 (1962) 314–316, who notes cases of elevated style in elegy 1.2, where the poet appears as a *uates* or *sacerdos Veneris*. For the *uates*-concept in Tibullus, see especially Newman (n. 2) 96–99.

is also of considerable metapoetic interest and again implies Tibullus' poetic confidence. Since agriculture is a frequently used critical metaphor for literature, the implication of a plentiful literary production here is very likely. Furthermore, this phrase may be an allusive reference to the etymology of *satura* that further facilitates Tibullus' intentions to associate his poetry with satire[38]. In this way the elegiac poet seems to imply that the example of Roman satire, and that of Horace in particular, gives him confidence that his own poetry will be successful as well.

The phrase *saturi bona signa coloni* in line 2.1.23 seems to be another example of this intertextual dialogue with Horace, since it recalls the latter's self-presentation as *colonus* in his *satire* 2.1, another poem related to Horace's stance towards Lucilius, and especially the line Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.35: *nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus*. The qualification of the word *coloni* with the adjective *saturi*, given its etymological connection with *satura*,[39] serves as an intentional marker which makes the possibility of a poetic allusion to the satiric poet even more likely. This allusion to Horace is further reinforced in many other indirect ways. The choice of *ludet* (2.1.24) paves the way for the *ludite* at 2.1.87 and brings to mind the frequent use of the verb with erotic connotations in Roman elegy[40], but at the same time it also recalls Horace's definition of his satiric poetry as *ludus*[41], thus highlighting the similarity between the two genres once again. The *turba uernarum* (2.1.23) could also point to Horatian satire, since slaves quite often appear in his work[42]. The phrase *ex uirgis exstruet ante casas* (2.1.24), which recalls Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.247: *aedificare casas*,[43] could also be added to the various verbal similarities.

38 For similarities between Tibullus' poetry and satire, cf. J.P. Elder, "Tibullus: *tersus atque elegans*", in J.P. Sullivan (ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric* (London 1962) 81 and 105, n. 25; A. Sauvage, "Tibulle et son temps", *Latomus* 28 (1969) 875–893; A. Foulon, "L'art poétique de Tibulle", *REL* 68 (1990) 74; Tzounakas (n. 3) 125.

39 As has already been mentioned above, this has efficiently been prepared by the phrase *plenis … agris* in line 2.1.21.

40 Cf. e.g. P. Lee-Stecum, "Poet/Reader, Authority Deferred: Re-Reading Tibullan Elegy", *Arethusa* 33 (2000) 187; H.C. Gotoff, "Tibullus: *Nunc levis est tractanda Venus*", *HarvSt* 78 (1974) 234.

41 Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.138–139; 10.37. This is a term that is used in a similar way by Lucilius (cf. Lucil. 1039 W = 1039 M), while it is applied to Persius' composition by Cornutus at Pers. 5.15–16; see S. Tzounakas, "Persius on his Predecessors: A Re-examination", *ClQu* n.s. 55 (2005) 566.

42 Cf. e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.65–67: *o noctes cenaeque deum, quibus ipse meique | ante Larem proprium uescor* ***uernasque*** *procacis | pasco libatis dapibus*, in a poem in which Horace praises rustic life. It is worth noting that in his portrayal of Horace Persius characterizes him with the word *uafer* (1.116), for which see Tzounakas (n. 41) 564–565. For the general sense in Tibullus' phrase, Postgate (n. 11) 106 cites Hor. *Epod.* 2.65–66: *uernas ditis examen domus | circum renidentis Lares*. He also notes that *uerna* "appears to be a Sabine word". It is possible that the choice of a Sabine word could also be associated with Horace's famous estate in the territory of the Sabines, which "figure[s] prominently in Horace's poetic landscape", as K. Dang, "Rome and the Sabine 'Farm': Aestheticism, Topography, and the Landscape of Production", *Phoenix* 64 (2010) 102–127, has recently demonstrated.

43 For the verbal similarity here, see Maltby (n. 1) 366; cf. also M.C.J. Putnam, *Tibullus: A Commentary* (Norman 1973) 155; Ball (n. 10) 152.

An allusion to the satiric genre can also be detected in lines 2.1.51–54, where Tibullus comments upon the invention of the rustic songs:

> *Agricola adsiduo primum* ***satiatus*** *aratro*
> *Cantauit certo rustica uerba pede*
> *Et* ***satur*** *arenti primum est modulatus auena*
> *Carmen, ut ornatos diceret ante deos.*

The words *satiatus* and *satur* could be interpreted as etymological references to the origin of the word *satura*[44] and the poet seems to follow the theory which connects the origins of satire with uncouth rustic songs in praise of Bacchus[45]. This is the theory of the so-called 'dramatic *satura*' which connects satire with primitive dramatic or quasi-dramatic works. According to this theory, the dramatic *satura* is one of the earliest stages of Roman drama, which is derived from rustic festivities. It appears explicitly in Livy (7.2.4–13) and Valerius Maximus (2.4.4), it is implied, apart from Tibullus, by Vergil (*Georg.* 2.380–396) and Horace (*Epist.* 2.1.139–176), while Varro, Accius or Aelius Stilo are regarded as the most likely immediate source.[46] Tibullus' adoption of this theory is continued in the next few lines (2.1.55–58), where the poet refers to the fact that dance was invented by farmers and thus indirectly suggests the rustic origins of tragedy:

> *Agricola et minio subfusus, Bacche, rubenti*
> *Primus inexperta duxit ab arte choros.*
> *Huic datus a pleno, memorabile munus, ouili*
> *Dux pecoris hircus: duxerat hircus oues.*

Tibullus is etymologizing once more here. As Maltby has noted, in line 2.1.55 Tibullus underlines tragedy's connection with Bacchus and "may be alluding to an etymology of *tragoedia* from τρύγες, red wine lees, with which the original actors of tragedy were supposed to have smeared their faces" (374), while the word *hircus* in line 2.1.58 points to the Greek word τράγος and thus alludes to another etymology of tragedy from the Greek words τράγος and ᾠδή.[47] He also remarks that the phrase *duxit … choros* in line 2.1.56 is "a reference to the Aristotelian theory that tragedy originated in the dithyramb (*Poet.* 1449a)"[48]. Through all these etymological references the rustic origin of tragedy is

44 See G. Lee, *Tibullus: Elegies. Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes* (3rd ed., revised in collaboration with R. Maltby, Leeds 1990) 147; Maltby (n. 1) 373–374.

45 Cf. Maltby (n. 1) 373–374.

46 On the particular theory the relevant bibliography is extensive; see e.g. B.L. Ullman, "Dramatic *Satura*", *ClPh* 9 (1914) 1–23; M. Coffey, *Roman Satire* (2nd ed., Bristol 1989) 18–23, 211–214, 274; S.P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*, Vol. II: *Books VII–VIII* (Oxford 1998) 40–72.

47 Maltby (n. 1) 374–376, with relevant ancient testimonies and bibliography; cf. Smith (n. 17) 402–403; Putnam (n. 43) 158–159; Dubla (n. 10) 40.

48 Maltby (n. 1) 374–375. On the theories alluded to here, see also Murgatroyd (n. 1) 50–51; cf. Schmitzer (n. 11) 120–128.

highlighted even more. At the same time, the word *pleno* in line 2.1.57 could be regarded as an allusion to the etymology of the word *satura* that enables the poet to underline the association of the two genres and their common derivation from rustic festivities.

Tibullus' intention is evident: by highlighting the fact that satire and tragedy stem from rustic songs, the elegiac poet attempts to justify his own poetic choice to sing of the countryside and its gods, as he states in line 2.1.37: *rura cano rurisque deos*.[49] However, they are not the only genres to which Tibullus' elegies bear similarities. The multiple allusions to Hellenistic epigram, Vergil's *Eclogues*, Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* and Vergil's *Georgics* in this elegy as well as the reference to stock themes of comedy in lines 2.1.73–74[50] move in the same direction, since they associate Tibullus' elegiac poetry with epigram, bucolic poetry, didactic epos and comedy. In this way he places himself in a broader context of literary tradition and at the same time implies the correctness, suitability and value of the poetic direction he has chosen. One of his primary arguments for the particular selection of poetry is that love[51], which constitutes a focal point of his work, was born in the fields:

> *Ipse quoque inter agros interque armenta Cupido*
> *Natus et indomitas dicitur inter equas.*
> *Illic indocto primum se exercuit arcu:*
> *Ei mihi, quam doctas nunc habet ille manus!*
> (Tib. .67–702).1

As Tibullus implies, since love was born in the countryside, then it is logical to praise rustic life, while rustic themes should be expected to enjoy a privileged place in the work of a poet who deals with the theme of love. Furthermore, Tibullus' comment concerning the change that has come over *Cupido* with the passage of time is also worth noting: whereas in the fields the deity was an inexpert archer (***indocto*** … *arcu*), his hands are now very skilled (*quam* ***doctas*** *nunc habet ille* ***manus!***), a fact that seems to frighten the poet, who exclaims *ei mihi*. In parallel with the other poetic intentions of the passage[52], the likelihood

49 It is possible that here Tibullus feels the need to defend his poetic choices against criticism such as that professed by Propertius, for which see especially F. Solmsen, "Propertius and his Literary Relations with Tibullus and Vergil", *Philologus* 105 (1961) 273–277; R.O.A.M. Lyne, "Propertius and Tibullus: Early Exchanges", *ClQu* n.s. 48 (1998) 533–535; Tzounakas (n. 3) 111–128, with relevant bibliography.

50 For the themes alluded to here, see Smith (n. 17) 407; Murgatroyd (n. 1) 59; Maltby (n. 1) 379.

51 For a treatment of the theme of *amor* in elegy 2.1, see e.g. H. Geiger, *Interpretationen zur Gestalt Amors bei Tibull* (Zurich 1978) 33–46; A. Novara, "Un hymne Tibullien au dieu Amour (a propos de Eleg. II, 1, v. 67–90)", *VL* 116 (1989) 2–10; R. Simons, "Cupidos Bogen: Zu Tibull 2, 1, 67–72 und Ovid *Met.* 1, 454–465", *Philologus* 152 (2008) 270–281.

52 As Maltby (n. 1) 378–379 rightly notes, this passage has a significant programmatic role, since it hints at the poet's own suffering in the next poems of book II. For the exclamation *ei mihi* as suggestive of "the poet's own painful experience of *amor*", see also Lee-Stecum (n. 40) 186.

of poetological intimations in these lines should not be ruled out. As has already been mentioned, the term *manus* metapoetically could denote a poet's personal writing, while the terms *doctus* and *indoctus* are frequently found in Roman literary criticism and relate to *doctrina* or lack of it. Thus Tibullus seems to imply here that in his day erotic poetry has changed its initial form and demands very skillful writing that points to exhibition of *doctrina* in a way that appertains to Hellenistic techniques. The poet appears concerned about this change and implies his longing for the past and, by extension, for the poetic choices this entails.

This broader context allows for a more comprehensive interpretation of the role and expediency of Tibullus' allusions to Horace's work. The elegiac poet's intention to defend his own poetic choice to compose love poetry with strong rustic elements leads him to adopt a more positive stance towards the earlier poetry with rustic origins. So he engages in a dialogue with a representative of Roman satire, and in particular with poems of the latter that deal with the development of the particular genre, reminding the reader of the rustic origins of satire and, by extension, its similarity with his own poetry. It is for this reason that Tibullus expresses himself more favourably for older types of satire, which bearing a greater proximity to the genre's rustic origins could be considered to be closer in character to his own poetry. In this way he is trying to highlight the notion of nostalgia for an easier and pleasanter past compared to a present full of trials, which, as is known, constitutes one of the main axes of his poetry, as well as to highlight his anxiety concerning the high literary demands of love poetry in his day. Consequently, his stance should be interpreted more as a poetic strategy and less as a proposal to return to the poetry of the archaic period (besides, archaisms are not a stylistic trait of his poetry) or a real disagreement with Horace's poetry.

The possibility that Tibullus might be alluding to Horace's *Satires* is supported by Horace himself. There is strong reason to believe that Horace took Tibullus' *elegy* 2.1 as an implicit criticism for his satires and that he responded to it with *epistle* 1.4.

Albius, the addressee of the epistle, is identified with Albius Tibullus by the majority of scholars[53]. I think that the similarities of the epistle with Tibullus' *elegy* 2.1 constitute an additional argument in this direction. The phrase *nostrorum sermonum candide iudex* in the first line of the epistle proves that Tibullus indeed judged Horace's satires, as I have argued above. The presence of the adjective *candidus*, apart from its stylistic overtones, also possibly serves as a wordplay for the name of Albius[54], something that is in accordance with Tibullus' tendency to make frequent references to the colour white so as to imply his name. At the same time, the choice of the particular adjective could also point to Tibullus' role

53 See e.g. Maltby (n. 1) 40, with n. 4.

54 See e.g. R. Mayer, *Horace, Epistles Book I* (Cambridge 1994) 133; Putnam (n. 11) 156; Keith (n. 36) 47–48.

as *uates* in his *elegy* 2.1, since the celebrants in the religious festival were dressed in white, as stated in the phrase *candida turba* (2.1.16)[55]. Finally, one is tempted to suspect that Horace's choice of the adjective *candidus* and his emphasis on brightness could be another wordplay and correspond to Tibullus' positive stance towards Lucilius, as the latter's name derives from *lux*[56].

The question *quid nunc te dicam facere in regione Pedana?* which follows (Hor. *Epist*. 1.4.2) could further reinforce the idea of an intertextual dialogue between the two poets. As has already been mentioned, for the rustic festival Tibullus requests Falernian and Chian wine, which could be taken as a comment against Horace's criticism of Lucilius' poetry, when the *Lucili fautores* supported the mixing of Latin and Greek words arguing that it led to *suauitas*, just like the mixing of the two wines. Horace then attempted to refute their argument by reminding them just how inappropriate the combination of the two languages would be in the case of a serious trial against eminent orators who were renowned for their adherence to pure *Latinitas*:

> *cum uersus facias, te ipsum percontor, an et cum*
> *dura tibi peragenda rei sit causa Petilli?*
> *scilicet oblitus patriaeque patrisque Latini,*
> *cum Pedius causas exsudet Poplicola atque*
> *Coruinus, patriis intermiscere petita*
> *uerba foris malis, Canusini more bilinguis.*
> (Hor. *Sat*. 1.10.25–30)

As the first of the orators mentioned is **Pedius**, one could assume that Horace's question *quid nunc te dicam facere in regione* ***Pedana?*** is an allusive way for him to hint at Tibullus' intervention. The choice of area justifiably recalls the name of the orator and, by means of this association, Horace appears to be defending his earlier poetic choices. He thus reminds Tibullus that his opposition was limited to instances where the use of both languages is totally inappropriate and that he was not referring to the general use of Roman and Greek inspiration. Indeed, Horace never supported the avoidance of Greek inspiration[57], something which is evident in his poetry, especially in his lyric works. In other words, he indicates to Tibullus that he misinterpreted his opinion when the latter took one of his views pertaining to the use of the two languages in unsuitable areas, such as the court, and applied it to a broader context, such as the usefulness of Greek models.

55 For the phrase *candida turba* here, see Maltby (n. 1) 364, who also notes that "*candida* has associations of ritual purity", citing McKeown on Ov. *Am*. 2.13.23–24, "but also of good fortune", and Murgatroyd (n. 1) 29; cf. Putnam (n. 43) 154.

56 Cf. also the word *diluxisse* in line 13 of Horace's epistle: *omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum.*

57 On the contrary, there are a number of occasions where Horace clearly suggests the imitation of Greek models; cf. e.g. Hor. *Ars* 268–269: *uos exemplaria Graeca | nocturna uersate manu, uersate diurna.*

Horace answers his question by suggesting two possibilities: either Tibullus is attempting to overcome the *opuscula* of Cassius Parmensis, obviously implying that he is composing elegies, or he has withdrawn to the forest and is quietly contemplating what is appropriate for the wise and good man. As the phrase *curantem quidquid dignum sapiente bonoque est* (Hor. *Epist.* 1.4.5) brings to mind an interest in moral philosophical subjects and thus is in accordance with the moralistic tone of the satire, the question could be interpreted as an examination of Tibullus' poetic interest, that is, whether Tibullus is treating elegy or the moral speculations that are characteristic of satire. Thus, Horace indirectly appears to be commenting on the shift in Tibullus' interest from matters pertaining to the elegy to those pertaining to the satire. The phrase *tacitum siluas inter reptare salubris* (Hor. *Epist.* 1.4.4) is also of particular interest. The reference to the forest[58] is reminiscent of the rustic setting of Tibullus' elegy, while the word *tacitum* further reinforces the possibility of an allusion to *elegy* 2.1. Tibullus' poem begins with a request for silence (2.1.1: *Quisquis adest, faueat*), as is appropriate for a religious ceremony[59], while the image of silence[60] returns at the close of the poem with the appearance of Night[61] and the very presence of the word *tacitus*:

> *Ludite: iam Nox iungit equos, currumque sequuntur*
> *Matris lasciuo sidera fulua choro,*
> *Postque uenit* ***tacitus*** *furuis circumdatus alis*
> *Somnus et incerto Somnia nigra pede.*
> (Tib. .87–902).1

58 For the possible critical resonance of the words *siluas* and *salubris* here, see Keith (n. 36) 48.

59 Even here, however, Horace's influence must not be ruled out, as Tibullus' phrase justifiably brings to mind Horace's lines *Odi profanum uolgus et arceo.* | *fauete linguis: carmina non prius* | *audita Musarum sacerdos* | *uirginibus puerisque canto* (Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.1–4); cf. Schmitzer (n. 11) 113; Levin (n. 10) 2067–2068. It is worth noting that in both poems the poets are portrayed as priests.

60 As Putnam (n. 43) 163 notes, "Tibullus is fond of dark, silent, usually ominous approaches (e.g., 1.1.70; 1.9.4; 1.10.34). Hence the strangely melancholy impression here". On the significant presence of silence in Tibullus' work, see further C. Bermejo Jiménez, "El silencio en Tibulo", in *Simposio Tibuliano. Commemoración del Bimilenario de la muerte de Tibulo* (Murcia 1985) 217–225.

61 While the elegy opens with images of brightness and light (cf. e.g. 2.1.5: ***Luce*** *sacra requiescat humus, requiescat arator*), it closes with the approach of Night and darkness. On the contrast between light and darkness in this elegy, see G.W. Shea, *Delia and Nemesis: The Elegies of Albius Tibullus. Introduction, Translation and Literary Commentary* (Lanham/New York/Oxford 1998) 92, 97–99; cf. also Ball (n. 10) 160–161; J. Bouquet, "La Nuit, le Sommeil et le Songe chez les élégiaques latins", *REL* 74 (1996) 192. On the significant role of the concepts of light and dark (with emphasis on the adjective *candidus* and its synonyms) in Tibullus' poetry in general, see J. Booth/R. Maltby, "Light and Dark: Play on *Candidus* and Related Concepts in the Elegies of Tibullus", *Mnemosyne*[4] 58 (2005) 124–132, with special reference to elegy 2.1 (128–130).

This image of the night[62] seems to have been the cause of one more comment on the part of Horace. Having mentioned Tibullus' blessings in lines *Epist.* 1.4.6–11, in lines *Epist.* 1.4.12–14 Horace calls on the elegiac poet to make good use of his blessings and to consider every passing day as pleasant and treat it as though it were his last: *inter spem curamque, timores inter et iras | omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum: | grata superueniet quae non sperabitur hora.* This image, and especially the choice of the phrase *diem … diluxisse*, points to dawn[63] and is in direct contrast with the image of the night that is dominant in the closing lines of Tibullus' poem. In this way Horace indirectly advises the elegiac poet to abandon grief and to adopt a 'brighter' and more optimistic attitude towards his problems, which defined by the terms *spes*, *cura*, *timores* and *irae* seem to be pointing to the essence and themes of elegiac poetry[64]. This interpretation is further reinforced by Horace's other reference to Tibullus in his ode 1.33, and especially his lines Hor. *Carm.* 1.33.1–4.

The indications of an intertextual dialogue between the two poets reach a climax at the close of the epistle with Horace's humorous self-portrait: *me pinguem et nitidum bene curata cute uises, | cum ridere uoles, Epicuri de grege porcum* (Hor. *Epist.* 1.4.15–16). The presence of *ridere* may recall Horace's *Satires*, where laughter is presented as the primary means by which truth is expressed (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.24: *ridentem dicere uerum*)[65]; thus, just as at the beginning of the poem, Tibullus' interest in the particular work of Horace is once again implied, an interest that appears to have constituted one of the motivations behind the composition of the particular epistle. The rustic imagery and Horace's comparison to a pig from Epicurus' herd is in accordance with the emphasis given by Tibullus to the praise of rustic life and his rustic interests, thus reinforcing the likelihood of allusion to his work. Last but not least, it is worth noting the choice of the words *pinguem et nitidum*, which seem to be influenced by Tibullus' lines 2.1.21–24[66]:

> *Tunc* ***nitidus*** *plenis confisus rusticus agris*
> *Ingeret ardenti grandia ligna foco,*
> *Turbaque uernarum,* ***saturi*** *bona signa coloni,*
> *Ludet et ex uirgis exstruet ante casas.*

62 For Tibullus' reference to the personified *Nox* at the close of *elegy* 2.1 as an implicit way to hint at the predominant role of Nemesis (who bears the same name as the daughter of Night, according to Greek mythology) in book II, see D.F. Bright, Haec mihi fingebam. *Tibullus in his World* (Leiden 1978) 118–119; Murgatroyd (n. 1) xvii–xviii; Rambaux (n. 23) 65–66; Maltby (n. 1) 360; for the choice of the name *Nemesis*, see also Maltby (n. 21) 103–121, esp. 112–121; A. Arena, "Per una interpretazione della Nemesi tibulliana", in P. Defosse (ed.), *Hommages à Carl Deroux*, I: *Poésie* (Brussels 2002) 29–35; E. Stafford, "Tibullus' Nemesis: Divine Retribution and the Poet", in J. Booth/R. Maltby (eds), *What's in a Name? The Significance of Proper Names in Classical Latin Literature* (Swansea 2006) 33–48.

63 See Mayer (n. 54) 135.

64 For Horace using here the technical language of elegy, see Ullman (n. 11) 158–159; cf. also Ball (n. 11) 413; R.S. Kilpatrick, *The Poetry of Friendship: Horace, Epistles I* (Edmonton 1986) 60.

65 See Mayer (n. 54) 136.

66 Cf. Brugnoli (n. 30) 355–357.

Since, as has already been mentioned, the phrase *saturi … coloni* could be interpreted as an allusion to the satiric Horace, the latter does not hesitate to point humorously to his weight referring to himself as *pinguem* and comparing himself to a pig[67], an animal that, in evoking images of corpulence, further intensifies the meaning of *pinguem*. Thus he seems to make fun of the word *saturi*, acknowledging the allusion to his person and responding to that in a manner which points to a playful and light-hearted mood, which is in accordance with the overall attitude he is calling on Tibullus to adopt. The word *nitidum* brings to mind Tibullus' *nitidus rusticus* in the same passage, further reinforcing the possibility of an intentional allusion to the particular elegy. By means of this allusion, Horace makes it apparent that he intends to continue his humorous approach concerning Tibullus' words even further, portraying himself not only as *nitidus rusticus* but as *nitidus porcus*. At the same time, the choice of the adjective *nitidus* could be linked to an earlier occurrence of the word in Horace's *Satires*, bringing the relevant passage to the mind of the reader:

> *quid? cum est Lucilius ausus*
> *primus in hunc operis conponere carmina morem*
> *detrahere et pellem,* ***nitidus*** *qua quisque per ora*
> *cederet, introrsum turpis.*
>
> (Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.62–65)

It is worth noting that in this passage Horace refers to Lucilius and to the latter's practice of criticizing eminent citizens, who though bright on the surface, were contemptible in essence. By recalling the particular passage with the phrase *nitidum bene curata cute*, where apart from the adjective *nitidus* the similarity is also reinforced by the analogy of the words *cute* and *pellem*, Horace appears to be remarking on Tibullus' stance towards Lucilius' poetry and to be adopting in a humorous tone a characterization which he had himself earlier given to the victims of Lucilius' criticism.

We must not, of course, think that the scope of Horace's *epistle* 1.4 is restricted to poetological matters. In all probability, Horace identified certain allusions to his *Satires* made by Tibullus in *elegy* 2.1 and on the basis of those very allusions he composed an epistle highly humorous in tone, where the emphasis is not given to literary matters, but, by means of apposite jokes, to the need to adopt a more optimistic view of life. In this way he succeeds in portraying an image of superiority, as he appears reluctant to become embroiled in literary arguments and focuses more on philosophical matters, stressing the value of *ridere* to the addressee of the epistle. Even in this instance, however, literary polemics are not absent, as one of the marked characteristics of elegy which is placed in Horace's target is its plaintive mood. It is true that Horace never did

67 For the implication of Epicurean hedonism in Horace's assimilation to a *porcus* here, see Mayer (n. 54) 136.

particularly appreciate elegiac poetry and he never fails to voice his opposition to it[68]. Tibullus' gesture to present his own poetic choices by commenting on Horace's literary views, allowed the latter one more opportunity to imply his stance concerning the literary genre in question yet again by highlighting not only a different outlook, but also a different poetic approach to similar themes.

Correspondence:
Spyridon Tzounakas
Department of Classics and Philosophy
Faculty of Letters
University of Cyprus
P.O. Box 20537
CY-1678 Nicosia (Cyprus)
stzoun@ucy.ac.cy

68 See especially Otis (n. 11) 177–190; K. Quinn, *Latin Explorations: Critical Studies in Roman Literature* (London 1963) 154–162; cf. also Kilpatrick (n. 64) 137, n. 8.