

informed, and imaginative; a process of interpretation which will never be completed with respect to a text ever open to new readers. As Mueller states in his examination of "The life of the *Iliad*", "the completion of a text is the beginning of a life that is sustained through the ages as long as there are readers to construe the meaning of the words" (177).

This is not, then, a restatement of the text's autonomy but an emphasis upon the necessary importance of the efforts of its readers. These responses have differed, and will differ considerably, in a history of reading which must also be a reading of (its) history. Kirk writes of Homeric scholarship: "The critical literature is enormous, and has passed through historical phases some of which are best forgotten" (xv). But one can sense gathering within Homeric studies literary criticism of a sophistication which may well mark another new and significant stage. It remains to be seen whether it can be sustained, or, indeed, survive.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

MICHAEL LYNN-GEORGE

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
LIBRARY
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
1987

TIBULLUS: A REVIEW ARTICLE

In this article it is my intention to provide not a full bibliography or a review of all recent scholarship on Tibullus¹ but a selective account of secondary literature which is meant to prove interesting and genuinely helpful to those teaching the poet in schools or universities for the first time or after a lapse of several years. Such an account seems necessary because in the resurgence of interest in this author during the last two decades significant advances in Tibullan criticism have been made, but Tibullus has also acquired some unfortunate champions, and much has been written on him that is vapid, fatuous, pretentious and over-subtle. The more substantial and influential contributions that fall into this latter category do require comment, but I will simply pass over many lesser works of this type, so as not to bog down my readers, and to spare them the irritation and frustration I often experienced in preparing this review. Confining myself to those poems which were definitely composed by our poet (i.e. books 1 and 2),² and taking into consideration all material that reached me by the end of 1985, I will concentrate on books and articles in English and French which are still in print and/or available in most university libraries, although well-known and useful items in other languages will also be treated more briefly.

1. TEXT

For detailed and scholarly accounts of the transmission and textual tradition of the *Corpus Tibullianum* see R.H. Rouse and M.D.

¹References for fuller bibliographical information are given below in section 6.

²Some scholars maintain that several of the poems in the rest of the *Corpus Tibullianum* were also produced by Tibullus, but these claims are disputed and remain open to doubt, and the later elegies are generally much inferior to those in books 1 and 2.

Reeve in *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford 1983) 420ff. (ed. L.D. Reynolds) and J.M. Fisher *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II.30.3 (Berlin 1983) 1953ff.

True to its series, the Oxford Classical Text by J.P. Postgate (*Tibulli Alorumque Carminum Libri Tres* [Oxford 1915] second ed.) is a generally sound and reliable edition which handles textual criticism economically. It contains a condensed *apparatus criticus* with brief comments (in Latin), alerting readers to most of the important problems and avoiding the clutter of trivia. Although at times one feels that Postgate should have supplied more information (for instance, with regard to 1.4.9, 1.4.43f., and 1.7.4), most teachers and lecturers interested in the textual side will find that this work adequately suits their purposes.

Three other books should also be used by those wishing to engage in more detailed study of the text. F.W. Lenz and C.C. Galinsky *Albi Tibullus: A Commentary Libri Tres* (Leiden 1971) offer the most extensive *apparatus criticus*, together with references for parallel lines and passages and some critical discussion (in Latin). Although their *apparatus* is very comprehensive and is constantly illuminating over the various types of mistakes made by scribes, its inclusion of so many obvious inanities and slips makes it bulky and heavy-going, and it actually excludes some noteworthy emendations (for example, Lambinus' *fit* and *donatur* at 1.1.15 and 17, and Livineius' *pertusisque* at 1.10.37). So too in their discussions many works that give little or no help are cited, but some relevant scholarship is omitted (e.g. for 1.5.49 Postgate on the subjunctive of *edo* in *Classical Review* XVI [1902] 111f.), and several significant difficulties are inadequately handled or totally ignored (as in the case of 1.4.9 and 2.5.110). In addition, the book itself is not free from typographical errors (read on p.54 "Cl.R. n.s. 16 [1966] 188", on p.57 "Burs. LI 347", on p.60 "Manil. IV 469", on p.99 "Ovid Amor. III 13, 16"). Rather less inflated are A. Cartault *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum* (Paris 1909) and L. Pichard *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum* (Paris 1924). Cartault's concise remarks on the text are in the main valid enough over lesser points, and he can be perceptive in the case of more serious issues (for instance, on *modo* at 1.3.4), but his arguments are also often faulty (so he maintains that *dites* should come first in 1.1.78 as *divitias* does in line 1 of that poem, but *divitias* and *dives* are not first words

in lines 41 and 49), and he neglects or glosses over some major problems (for example, 2.2.21). Helpfully Pichard does not merely list parallel phrases etc. but actually quotes the majority of them, and in this connection he is fuller than Lenz and Galinsky (if at times over-enthusiastic in seeing similarities to Tibullus' phraseology). Unfortunately there are many glaring omissions in his *apparatus criticus*, and his textual criticism is frequently simplistic and superficial (e.g. over the complexities of 1.1.48 and 2.5.67ff.), and he is too prone to have recourse to Havet's critical method and to accept Havet's emendations.

My own *Tibullus* I (see section 2 below) contains a critical appendix which covers all points which I believe substantially affect the interpretation of the poems in book 1; and, last but by no means least, in his *Tibullus: Elegies* (see section 3 below) Lee has produced what many scholars consider to be the best text of the elegies in books 1 and 2 and has brief textual notes.³

2. COMMENTARIES

Of the three commentaries suitable for use in schools or with beginners at university⁴ the best is W.M. Wilson's *Select Elegies of Tibullus* (London 1967), if one makes allowances for the need he obviously felt to protect the morals of British schoolchildren. His selection is fairly representative (1.1,3,5,7,10, 2.1,3,5,6), although the absence of homosexual poetry makes for an incomplete and distorted view of Tibullus. Wilson uses Postgate's Loeb text (see section 3), interlacing it with *résumés* in English and "omitting a few unsuitable lines" (i.e. 2.1.75-78, 2.3.14a-16, 33f., 75f.). As well as notes he offers a brief introduction, a full vocabulary and an index of proper names. The notes, which eschew literary criticism and concentrate instead on elucidating grammar, references and meaning

³ André (see Section 2) and Ponchont and Luck (see section 3) also provide brief information on the text, while Schuster (see section 4) has a lengthy and noteworthy section on various textual problems in Tibullus (p.115ff.).

⁴ Also well worth looking at (if available) is J.P. Postgate's *Selections from Tibullus and Others* (London 1903), but unfortunately this edition has long been out of print.

(many phrases and lines are translated into English), are admirably lucid, concise and to the point (if anything rather too generous in the amount and nature of the help given).

K.P. Harrington's *The Roman Elegiac Poets* (1914, reprinted Norman 1968) also excludes the paederastic elegies and contains one less piece from Tibullus 1 and 2 (1.1,3,7,10, 2.1,2,5,6). However, it does have several elegies from the rest of the *Corpus Tibullianum* and many poems by Catullus, Propertius and Ovid. There is no vocabulary or index of names, but there is a long introduction (although much of this now requires revision) and, usefully, text and commentary appear on the same page. In the latter, literary appreciation is again avoided and the emphasis is on basic comprehension, but Harrington is more diffuse than Wilson (often his remarks and parallels [some of which are taken from the Bible] will prove of little relevance or interest to students at this level); nor does he provide as much elementary assistance as Wilson does (and many of his glosses are themselves in Latin); he also employs grammatical terms and refers to publications which are now long out of date.

R. Maltby's *Latin Love Elegy* (Bristol 1980), in addition to selections from Catullus, Propertius and Ovid, includes Tibullus 1.1,3,7, 2.4. These four elegies on their own do not, of course, give an adequate idea of our poet, which is a pity, because, although there is no vocabulary, the introduction is workmanlike and modern, and the notes briefly and clearly aid understanding of the Latin and also comment sensitively on literary qualities of the poems. This book is certainly worth consulting, and I would especially recommend it to those teaching a course on Roman elegy in general. (In the section on Tibullus there are two misprints: on p.117 for "Chronos" read "Cronos", and on p.128 the note on line 55 is misplaced.)

M.C.J. Putnam in his *Tibullus: A Commentary* (Norman 1973) claims that his notes (on books 1 and 2) "focus on the needs of the student approaching Latin elegy for the first time" (p.ix), but I for one must disagree. His commentary handles too cursorily or even passes over entirely many questions of syntax, reference and sense which need to be explained for a beginner; and it is often baffling, misleading or positively erroneous (for instance, on p.151 he says "There are no temples in Tibullus' rustic world" [cf.1.1.16], and on p.157 *plaustrum* at 2.1.42 is taken to mean "plow"). With regard to

critical appreciation, although he is occasionally thought-provoking and perceptive (e.g. on the order of words in 1.8.30), he seems to me to be generally over-subtle, undisciplined and fanciful. But I must admit to a personal distaste for this whole school of criticism (which others do find stimulating and satisfying). Perhaps I should allow readers to make up their own minds on this, and help them by quoting just two representative comments by Putnam *re* the very first poem: on p.50 (of *alius* in 1.1.1) he says "the singular rouses the suspicion that a special instance, perhaps even himself, is in the poet's mind"; and on p.58, in connection with *ut domus hostiles proferat exuvias* (1.1.54), he states "the house 'sports' the booty in front of itself, as if it were leading the triumphal procession". I find that there is much in this work that depresses, but perhaps most depressing of all is the announcement on the final page that the paper on which the book is printed has an effective life of at least three hundred years.

Of the four commentaries aimed at a higher level which deserve mention that by K.F. Smith is in some respects quite a help but in others a decided hindrance. *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (1913, repr. Darmstadt 1971) consists of introduction, text (of the whole *Corpus* plus *testimonia antiqua*) and commentary (for some reason on books 1,2 and 4.2-14 only). The introduction, which is over ninety pages long, is in the main prolix and at times dull, although his section on imitation of Tibullus is quite interesting and his assessment of the elegies is perceptive in some places, if outmoded in others (e.g. p.68 lines 11ff.). His text is based on Hiller's (Berlin, Tauchnitz 1909), except for a few variants (listed on p.527f.). Textual matters receive minimal attention (something which has a bearing on his pronouncements on Tibullan usage), and the discussion that he does offer is mostly short, feeble and misguided (so on p.527 he opines that *Mors nigra* does not appear in Latin poetry, but see Statius *Theb.* 9.851). His notes, which fill nearly 350 pages, tend to be rather dry and dusty, and are clogged with much material that has no place in a commentary (such as citations and quotations of European literature supposedly based on Tibullus and bizarre forays into the Italian for "playing gooseberry", the floral symbol of *compositum caput* for Arab lovers and so on). Some people, admittedly, enjoy rambling in such academic byways and find them quaintly charming; I find them irritating and distracting. Smith here

has little in the way of literary criticism (but he can be perceptive: see 1.4.9-56n.) and devotes most of his labours to exegesis and philology. In these spheres he is usually sane and can be enlightening, and he is very full on grammar, metre, language and style, with numerous notes and lengthy series of parallels. However, sometimes he is unclear (e.g. 1.9.71-4n. and 4.13.5n.) or over-simplifies (for example, over the situation at 1.9.43f.) or has no note where one would like to see a note (in connection with *militia amoris*, for instance); he frequently includes irrelevant comment (2.4.8-10n. etc.); and the reader must always be on his guard and should constantly check Smith's lists and assertions (so on p.200 he maintains that internal rhyme between nouns in the hexameter does not occur in our poet, but see 1.2.69 and 1.5.43; and none of the passages adduced in connection with 1.6.70 concerns attacks on the eyes).

Superior to Smith in various ways is one of the early nineteenth century commentaries which has been re-issued recently and so should be easily accessible. Although over a hundred and fifty years old, L. Disсен's *Tibulli Carmina* (1835, repr. Hildesheim 1969) is still an important work of Tibullan scholarship. It covers all the *Corpus Tibullianum* and is almost wholly written in Latin (but plain, simple Latin). Subsequent advances in knowledge and technique have naturally rendered some of what Disсен says outdated, and he is not without his faults (he does tend to be rather rigid and dogmatic about structure, and he makes [largely futile] attempts to date individual pieces). Nevertheless Disсен was an acute critic and alive to the poetry. His businesslike introductions to the elegies give résumés, cover background-situation and structure, and proffer (generally sensitive) overall appreciations. The notes are comprehensive but concise, avoiding the type of listing found in Smith, giving references that are almost always to the point, and containing a useful store of material taken over from earlier scholars (and judiciously examined). Interpretation and explication are mainly sound, and in the lively admixture of literary criticism he shows himself especially good at illuminating the point of Tibullus' choice of expression and his inclusion of a particular word, phrase or couplet (to take just one example from many, Disсен discerned in the mention of the Danaïds at 1.3.79f. a passing hint and covert warning for Delia, should she prove unfaithful to the elegist).

J. André's *Tibulle Elegiarum Liber Primus* (Paris 1965) is a much slighter work but one that also deserves attention. The introduction and notes are brief but helpful as far as they go. Although his statements on the chronological ordering of the poems are somewhat trying and some of his comment is puzzling (as when on 1.9.1-2 and 13-17 he implies that the early part of 1.4 constitutes advice to Marathus), yet his edition is valuable for its perceptiveness and originality (e.g. on the onomatopoeia at 1.2.37f., the sense of *inculto* at 1.2.76, the arrangement of words at 1.3.52, and the irony at 1.6.24).

Finally there is my *Tibullus I: A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (Pietermaritzburg 1980). The (20 page) introduction treats of Tibullus' life, the characters of book 1, the chronology of the book and the arrangement of the poems in it, the relative dating of Tibullus I and Propertius I, and Tibullus and the Analogistic Grammatical Theory. The commentary is full, running to 250 pages and combining explanation and appreciation (with the former predominating). For each elegy there is an introductory essay which considers points such as background-situation, structure, unity, genre, main themes, models and tone, and in the notes that follow I address myself to syntax, sense and reference and also remark on aspects like language, metre, motifs, progression of thought and transitions. There is also a critical appendix (referred to in section 1 above) amounting to 30 pages. I cannot speak too highly of my own work.

3. TRANSLATIONS

One translation stands head and shoulders above the rest - Guy Lee's *Tibullus: Elegies* (Liverpool 1982, second ed.). The book consists of introduction, text and facing translation (of the first two books, Marsus' epitaph and the *vita Tibulli*), notes, chronological guide and select bibliography. The introduction of thirteen pages, as well as handling sensibly the poet's life and the characters in Tibullus 1 and 2 (except for Marathus), is a perceptive and stimulating essay, especially in connection with topics such as the Ovidian tone, feeling and sincerity in Tibullus, the overall structuring of book 1, the poet's attitude to love, and religion and moralizing. The notes (over fifty pages, covering content, textual, linguistic and stylistic points, and literary and historical matters) are

constantly helpful and illuminating: for instance, in his remarks on 1.3.77 Lee solved a distinct problem over the list of sinners in Tartarus by finding an amatory crime for Tantalus. Lee is an astute and sensitive textual critic, and so his text is superior to that used by any other translator. The translation (in free verse) is poetry in its own right. Consistently accurate, it contains many felicities and catches well various aspects such as tone (for example, the mock-solemnity in 1.4), connotations of language (e.g. military terms in 1.1) and the general polish of the poetry (so 2.3.9f. is rendered: "with never a complaint when the sun scorched my thin arms/or broken blisters made my soft hands sore"). In addition Lee offers many penetrating interpretations, bringing to the fore points which had escaped earlier critics ("untimely" for *immiti* in 1.3.55, "kept desire on edge" for 1.8.74, and so on).

Although readable, in comparison with Lee, P. Dunlop's Penguin translation (of the whole *Corpus*) in *The Poems of Tibullus* (Harmondsworth 1972) seems somewhat flat and dull. His mixture of heroic couplets and free verse is misleading, as is his rather cavalier attitude to lacunae (see his p.57, and note also that 1.8.53f. is overlooked). The need to find a rhyme causes Dunlop some problems, at times he is positively incorrect over the meaning (e.g. for 1.3.69 and 2.4.35), and his version of 2.1.4 is unfortunate to say the least ("Ceres, bind your forehead with ears"). He also includes a long introduction, which is not free from questionable statements ("Tibullus hardly ever plays with the language" [on p.47] is one of them) and a glossary of proper names (but the Fates from the start of 1.7 are missing).

M. Ponchont in *Tibulle et les Auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum* (Paris 1968, second ed.) proffers a (conservative) text for all the poems in the *Corpus* and a facing translation into French prose (with a few footnotes). His version is generally workmanlike, but it is explicative, which means that it tends to be pedestrian, introduces material not found in the Latin and incorporates Ponchont's own explanations of the point, which at times strike me as improbable (e.g. on 1.3.12 and 2.6.53). In addition to an introduction Ponchont has interesting essays on each of the elegies of 1 and 2 (they give the situation, have much to say on structure and development of themes and offer [sane] overall appreciation, although they are

marred by his dubious attempts to order individual poems chronologically).

Three other translations may be disposed of more briefly. Postgate's Loeb version (the complete *Corpus Tibullianum* in prose) in *Catullus, Tibullus and the Pervigilium Veneris* by F.W. Cornish, J.P. Postgate and J.W. Mackail (London and Cambridge 1962, revised ed.) has occasional misprints (such as *reprens* for *repetens* in 1.3.39) and mistranslations (such as "flocks" at 1.1.33), and generally it is now hopelessly archaic and stilted (it dates from 1913 originally). C. Carrier in *The Poems of Tibullus* (Bloomington and London 1968) did the whole *Corpus* into verse (with various kinds of rhyme). This work was well received in some quarters when it first came out, but, despite some felicities, for my taste the translation is far too free, often bearing little relationship to the Latin and introducing all kinds of extraneous details, and even containing serious inaccuracies (for example, "Spain" in 1.7.11 and "Taurus" in 1.7.16). At times it almost seems as if it is based on Postgate's Loeb translation rather than on his Latin text: so her version of 2.6.45f. ("With hidden poisons I know she plots my death") seems closer to Postgate's "stealthily she passes to and fro with tablets hidden in her bosom" than to Tibullus' *furtimque tabellas/occulto portans itique reditque sinu*. Finally there is G. Luck's *Properz und Tibull Liebeselegien* (Zurich and Stuttgart 1964), which contains a faithful rendering of Tibullus 1 and 2 into straightforward German prose, with a short introduction and notes (particularly concerned with parallels for themes).

4. WORKS OF GENERAL SCHOLARSHIP ON TIBULLUS

G. Luck's *The Latin Love Elegy* first came out in 1959, and the much improved second edition (London and New Jersey 1969) provides a clear and enjoyable general introduction to Roman elegy, with the fourth and fifth chapters (out of a total of ten) devoted specifically to Tibullus. Luck's life of the poet is brief but sound enough, although the identification of Horace's Albius (mentioned in *Odes* 1.33 and *Epistles* 1.4) with Tibullus needs more discussion, and Luck does not even allow for the possibility that the Glycera of *Odes* 1.33 was merely imaginary. After a brief summary of the poems (at times too brief to give much of an idea of them) there is a survey of the poet's milieu and art which is especially interesting for its observations on

Tibullus' diction and "slender style".⁵ The fifth chapter (on Alexandrian themes in Tibullus, as evident in 1.7 and 1.4) highlighted an aspect which had not received much attention up to then and which is still of importance today, although it has been treated more fully by subsequent scholars (see below). Here, despite a few reservations,⁶ I find Luck's discussion sensible and perceptive; particularly praiseworthy is the way in which he does not simply list Hellenistic sources but explains how the elegist incorporates and adapts them.

J.P. Elder's chapter on Tibullus at p.65ff. of *Critical Essays on Roman Literature I Elegy and Lyric* (London 1962, edited by J.P. Sullivan) owes much to Luck and goes over much the same ground as he does, but some additional elements are covered, and it was a good idea to include analysis of a complete elegy (1.5). Elder here proffers a mostly sane and fairly broad introduction (although he has little to say about Marathus), and he astutely criticizes the "myth" about the elegist (i.e. the stock evaluation of his poetry as simple, delicate, winsome, unruffled, unruffling etc.), and also has some stimulating comments to make on 1.5 (especially in connection with the variety of moods and repetition of words to draw the poem together). However, in fairness to my readers I must point out that some of what Elder says is puzzling and questionable - for instance, his statements on pp.85 and 103 about the contrast between the clarity of the poet's manner of writing and the obscurity of what he really wanted for himself, his interpretation (91) of the significance of Delia's absence from 1.10, and his remarks on pp.76 and 78 about the limited suggestiveness of Tibullan imagery.⁷ Furthermore, there are some definite errors. Most of these are minor, as when he implies on p.71 that Ovid was a friend of Tibullus, despite Ovid's own denial of this at *Tristia* 4.10.51f. More serious is his employment in his discussion of the countryside in Tibullus (79ff.) of terms such as

⁵ See also (for scattered observations on various stylistic devices in Tibullus) M. Gronzona *Latomus* 36 (1977), 3ff. (in Italian).

⁶ See my *Tibullus I* pp.131 and 211.

⁷ Contrast my own suggestions about the imagery in *Tibullus I* pp.162, 175.

"idylls", "Arcadia", "bucolic" and "pastoral", which are inappropriate and misleading: the Tibullan countryside is not a half-mythical Arcadia of vague position such as is found in Theocritus' *Idylls* or Virgil's *Eclagues*; the elegist clearly writes about real Italian farmland (albeit at times idealized) and includes real details like tools, bathwater, blisters and sun-burn.⁸

In my opinion D.F. Bright's *Haec Mihi Fingebam: Tibullus in his World* (Leiden 1978) contains so many subjective and fanciful notions that the Latin part of the book's title is singularly appropriate. In-between an introductory chapter on mythology in Tibullus and the supposedly hazy presentation of his world and a concluding chapter on the overall structuring of books 1 and 2, there are seven chapters discussing the elegies themselves (usually at length, but 1.10, 2.1 and 2.2 receive cursory treatment). On the positive side let me say that Bright does show how valuable it can be to group poems together for study (e.g. those concerned with Delia or Nemesis), he is interesting on the way in which later elegies in the books echo earlier ones, and he does have a few other insights (see section 5 below). Unfortunately, however, this is a very uneven work. It is also, I feel, far too long (some 280 pages) and frequently vapid and vague (e.g. on p.130 "Delia...is in many ways an angel of death for Tibullus, providing the enclosed, secure, tomblike setting for which he had longed earlier" and on p.262 "Delia occupies our attention through 1.3, and then the break away to Marathus in 1.4 creates a sense of separation, a pause in time and implicitly the poet's removal in faraway places"). I do concede that some may find attractive theories which I find far-fetched (that the poet himself is the *garrulus...verna* of 1.5.26 [114], that 1.9.53-78 recall various Catullan pieces [255] and so on). Yet I do feel that I am above reproach in criticizing Bright for lack of meticulousness and rigour, as exemplified by the misquote of 1.1.73 on p.135; the contradiction between the final lines on p.127 and "we find in 43-44 more direct observations on her beauty than anywhere else in Tibullus" (161f.); the claim on p.230 that Virgil *Eclague* 2 was a substantial model for

⁸ On the realism of the countryside in Tibullus cf. also F. Solmsen *Hermes* 90 (1962) 303f., Lee *Tibullus: Elegies* 17f. and Lyne *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace* (Oxford 1980) 151f.

Tibullus' homosexual poetry, when the sole attempt at corroboration is the tentative, and doubtful, suggestion on p.258 that 1.9.79f. is a reflection of *Eclogue* 2.73; and the way in which Bright glibly talks of a "Marathus series" (consisting of 1.4,8 and 9) while offering only minimal argument (on p.249) that the unnamed boy of 1.9 is supposed to be Marathus. I would recommend that anybody consulting Bright's book do so with caution.

F. Cairns' *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979) is the most important general work on Tibullus for nearly fifty years, one which nobody teaching the elegist can afford to ignore, and which merits a lengthy and detailed critique.

Cairns states in his preface that "this book seeks to relate Tibullus to the Hellenistic literary tradition in which he worked and to examine aspects of his craftsmanship which derive from it". His first chapter discusses ancient and modern assessments of the poet, the characteristics of Hellenistic (or Alexandrian) poetry, and the characteristic and non-Hellenistic features in 1.1. The next three chapters consider Tibullus mainly as a *doctus poeta*: chapter 2 is concerned with his Alexandrian *doctrina* in the form of Hellenistic themes and Hellenistic historical and mythological allusion; 3 treats of the elegist's Romanizing of Alexandrian themes and genre; 4 describes his diction and interest in etymology and semantics as reflected in his diction. The following four chapters deal with the style that makes him a *cultus poeta*: in 5 there is an account of the characteristics of Hellenistic narrative technique, dramatic poetry and personal monologue, and Tibullus' employment of them; in 6 Cairns handles the poet's slow revelation of information about the scenario, and in 7 the way in which Tibullus deceives readers about such information; in 8 he writes about the elegist's ordering of his material (ring-structure, parallel composition etc.). The final chapter offers a new view of the origins of Latin love elegy and briefly studies our poet's place in its development. All Greek quotations (and many Latin ones) are translated throughout.

This is a considerable work of scholarship, learned, original, penetrating and full (230 pages of main text). It puts forward a strong case for a substantial revision of critics' estimates of Tibullus and a recognition of him as even more cultured, literate and craftsmanlike than most had imagined. Cairns has greatly increased our knowledge not only of Alexandrian influence on Tibullus but also

of many other aspects of his poetry, constantly shedding illumination on shorter passages (such as 1.3.73ff. on p.54ff.), entire poems (see section 5 below) and whole techniques (the slow revelation, and so on). Particularly valuable are p.100ff. (on semantics) and chapters 6-8 (where Cairns's remarks on the elegist's arrangement of material and development of themes must surely have put an end to the view that the elegies are loosely written and proceed from one idea to another without much overall organization).

Nevertheless, despite my admiration for *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, I have to warn readers that they should use it in a critical spirit and exercise care and attention.

Naturally, in view of the bias of his book, Cairns devotes himself to Tibullan imitation of Alexandrian writers, so it may be as well to mention here that one should always bear in mind that Tibullus was influenced to a significant degree by other Greeks, and by Romans as well.⁹

More importantly, I (and many other scholars) find that frequently Cairns overstates his case and sounds too confident (despite the reservations on p.42, 63 etc.) when postulating Hellenistic sources. The fragmentary nature of the evidence is problematical. Cairns argues (42f.) that because much Alexandrian poetry has been lost and much of what survives consists of bits and pieces, when it comes to discerning Hellenistic influence, one should relax the rules of evidence and not be as strict as in better documented areas. Yet a great amount of poetry by other Greeks and by various Latin predecessors of Tibullus has also been lost or survives only in fragments, so that one could equally well argue that where there is no unmistakably clear and direct imitation by our poet of an Alexandrian author one should be wary of asserting that Tibullus is definitely indebted to a Hellenistic model. Cairns tends to assume that anything that occurs several times in Alexandrian poetry is a specifically Alexandrian characteristic (which, of course, it need

⁹ See e.g. the index in *Tibullus* / s.v. imitation and D.N. Levin *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II.30.3 (Berlin 1983) 2000ff., who lists helpfully and discusses rather uncertainly various reminiscences of epic and Lucretius in Tibullus proposed by Levin himself and other scholars.

not be), and that any feature which is found in Tibullus and also in Hellenistic authors is an instance of conscious Hellenistic imitation by our poet (but many of the features in question appear in non-Hellenistic writers too, and some of them surely must have been generally poetic or generally literary features). Often, when Cairns tries to establish reliance on Alexandrian precedents, his arguments fail to convince me: so at p.187ff. he maintains that Tibullus' deception of his audience was derived from Hellenistic techniques, but such deception was a widespread phenomenon in ancient poetry (one found in pre-Hellenistic writing), and he offers little detailed evidence for his claim (only on pp.189f. and 191). Cairns can even fail to produce any corroboration at all for such assertions: nowhere in chapter 8 does he establish why ring-composition should be classed as an especially Alexandrian device, and he actually admits himself (194ff.) that it was common in poetry and prose from Homer.

This Hellenistic slant to the book also has a most unfortunate side-effect: it tends to reduce Tibullus' poetry to a series of Hellenistic allusions, themes, devices etc., a combination of formulae and variations, a sort of literary mime. The relationship between literature and real life is, of course, very complex,¹⁰ but it is surely dangerous to neglect one at the expense of the other. Cairns only occasionally allows that the poet may be writing about his actual circumstances, his own beliefs and emotions, and, although one must accept that he was a very civilized and skilful author, because of Cairns' preoccupations he comes over as so obsessed with literary minutiae, scholarship and technique that there seems little room for anything else, such as genuine sensitivity or feeling.¹¹

I should add that the reader would be well advised to take a close look at other aspects of Cairns's book too. Cairns is still ready to slot poems or parts of poems into various generic classifications, but not all would agree with his views on the genres of the elegies (for example, unlike Cairns [167], I would describe 1.3 as a blend of

¹⁰On sincerity in elegy see A.W. Allen in *Critical Essays on Roman Literature I: Elegy and Lyric* p.107ff. and J. Griffin *Journal of Roman Studies* 66 (1976) 87ff. and 71 (1981) 39ff.

¹¹Contrast the attitudes of Lee in the introduction to his *Tibullus: Elegies and Lyne* (below).

conventional propempticon and reversed propempticon); and in any case this whole procedure is not without its difficulties and drawbacks.¹² So too, although chapter 4 (on verbal learning) contains much that is of interest, I feel that much of it is also dubious: for instance, with regard to Cairns's remarks on etymologizing (92ff.), even if one grants that the positioning in close proximity of words which were or were thought to be connected by derivation may indicate an etymological interest on the poet's part, yet *spes* in 1.1.9 and *spiceo* in 1.1.16 (cited on p.94) are surely too far apart for one to claim that such interest is in evidence (and I do not see why 1.1.9-16 should be classed together as a "verse paragraph"); and in 2.2.18f. and 2.4.4 (cited on p.95) Tibullus has *vinc(u)la* and *Amor* (not *Venus*) so that I cannot see there any play on a link between *Venus* and *vincire*.

But it would be churlish to continue in this vein. I have been critical of parts of Cairns's book only because he writes at such length and with such assurance and erudition that some readers might well be awed into accepting it all uncritically. I do not want to end on a negative note, so let me stress once more that *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* is overall an impressive and indeed vital work.

I would also strongly recommend R.O.A.M. Lyne's *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace* (Oxford 1980), which has three chapters (3,4 and 6) on Tibullus and his love poetry. Lyne's style is engaging, his observations are suggestive and often acute, and his emphasis on the emotions in the elegies and on the characteristics of Tibullus as he comes across in his poetry is illuminating and a welcome change from the dry pedantry of much scholarship on the poet. Lyne has taken a fresh look at Tibullus and has really thought about him, and he makes users of his book do so too.

After brief remarks on the elegist's life and the relative dating of Tibullus I and Propertius I in chapter 3, Lyne moves on to what he entitles "the life of love" (65ff.), i.e. the expression by Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius of an unconventional preference for a dishonourable life of inactivity given over to love in place of conventionally proper and honourable pursuits such as military

¹²See the second article by Griffin cited above, n.10.

service and the acquisition of wealth and esteem. Here he does highlight an important aspect which gives much Latin elegy a provocative flavour, but for me he makes too much of it, depicting the poets as spokesmen with a carefully thought out manifesto aggressively advocating an alternative social creed for the unconventional to rally to. So too Lyne overestimates the novelty and impact of *militia amoris* and *servitium amoris* as they appear in Roman elegy: for instance, it is simply not true to state that "military imagery of love had been sparingly used in Greek (Hellenistic) poetry...it is not...Catullan" (p.71); in fact both were established figures before the elegists, and since so much earlier Latin and Greek literature has not survived both may have been even more popular than appears from the remains.¹³

Chapter 6 opens with a short preface on the rarity of myth in Tibullus (Lyne here is somewhat misleading, since he fails to mention the Golden Age, Elysium and Tartarus in 1.3, Osiris in 1.7 and early Rome 2.5, which are all lengthy and significant examples). Lyne then proceeds to discuss Delia, Némésis and Marathus, firstly concentrating on the elegist's ideal of a life in the country with Delia (life in the country *per se* is attainable, but not with Delia there with him); secondly stressing the thesis that Némésis makes our poet renounce this dream; and lastly assuming that Marathus is the boy of 1.9 and considering him mainly as he appears there. These three sections are in my view Lyne's best: they contain much that is sensible and perceptive, and they are full of original ideas; I found particularly interesting his discussion of Tibullus' representation of the farmer's life as dishonourable *otium* in 1.1 and his suggestions about levity in 1.1 and 2.3. My one regret is that Lyne did not have the space to tell us what he thinks of 1.3, 4, 6, 8, 2.4 and 6; and my one major criticism is that he neglects the poet's literary predecessors, a serious omission (so one cannot appreciate 1.9 fully and properly unless one realizes that it is a variation on the separation-poem generally and Horace *Epode* 15 especially). Next comes a section on structure and technique in the love poems, based

¹³See my articles on the figures in *Latomus* 34 (1975) 59ff. and 40 (1981) 589ff.

on analyses of two poems (1.5 and 1.2). Some of what he says on these topics is certainly valid, but I must disagree with him over the supposed implausibility and inappropriateness of much of 1.5 and over the *mise-en-scène* of 1.2 (a major problem, which he skates over). Finally he rounds off the chapter with some thoughtful and stimulating conclusions about the character of Tibullus as evident in his elegies, and here his comments on humour and his final judgement (189) are well worth pondering.

A full review by me of R.J. Ball's *Tibullus The Elegist: A Critical Survey* (Cöttingen 1983) has already appeared in *Classical Views* new series 4, 3 (1985) 490-491. Suffice it here to say that this is generally a rather dull and disappointing work, most useful as a bibliographical aid. There is an opening chapter on approaches to Tibullus (especially Ball's own approach) and a final one on the overall arrangement of the elegies in books 1 and 2 (this has an interesting survey of theories, but does not investigate the second book deeply enough). In-between there are sixteen chapters which discuss individually the sixteen poems by Tibullus. Here the emphasis is on structure, and, although Ball does provide some insights, he ignores several important aspects (such as transitions and the repetition of key-words), and I personally find his schemata in the main unconvincing and oversimple. Despite sundry additions to the structural material,¹⁴ Ball only presents an overview that does not really come to grips with the elegies or their problems, and he is especially cursory on 1.10, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.6.

By way of contrast J.M. Fisher in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 11.30.3 (Berlin 1983) 1924ff. has an interesting and valuable discussion of several areas, namely the authorship of the poems in the *Corpus Tibullianum*, Tibullus' life and circumstances, the chronology of books 1 and 2 and of the individual elegies, the influence on him of the elegist's predecessors, the relationship between the poet and contemporary literature, his impact on later authors and their estimates of him, and the transmission and textual tradition of the *Corpus*. There are a few gaps: for instance,

¹⁴In these he is prone to accept uncritically fanciful suggestions by previous scholars.

Tibullus' family and the status of Delia; and Nemesis and Marathus might have been covered in more detail. I would also take issue with Fisher over some points: e.g. on p.1934 when handling the dates of the elegist's birth and death he incorrectly claims that *adolescens/iuvenis* denotes somebody up to the age of 40 (actually *iuvenis* is used of people as old as 45; see my *Tibullus I* p.4); and on p.1941 Fisher maintains that the only poet alluded to by Tibullus is Pompeius Macer, but this identification is not certain, and Fisher leaves out of account the possibility that the Titius of 1.4.73f. is the poet mentioned by Horace at *Epistles* 1.3.9ff. However, these are relatively minor matters. In general Fisher's monograph is admirably careful, balanced and sane, and it includes many original observations as well as examining judiciously the theories of earlier critics (in fact this shrewd appraisal and the fulness of his bibliographical references have allowed me to shorten this article quite considerably). Although at times perhaps over-cautious, Fisher's scholarly and objective approach makes a welcome change from the lax and subjective effusions of so many who have written on Tibullus.

The material cited so far has been favourable towards our poet. However, since an attempt to face honestly and, if possible, refute unfavourable criticism can be an enlightening exercise, I would also recommend a perusal of the views put forward by G. Williams in *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968) p.495ff., 535ff. Williams is often negative, although he does allow the elegist some good points (such as the unified combination in one piece of a large number of themes, skill at transitions, the ability to give a new turn to an old phrase or idea, and economy of language).

Finally I will mention some books in German. M. Schuster's *Tibull-Studien* (1930, repr. Hildesheim 1968) was a milestone in Tibullan criticism when it came out and still repays study today. *Tibull-Studien* is divided into four parts which deal successively with structure of and train of thought in individual poems, some common Tibullan themes (countryside, war, religion, magic, *paupertas* and love), textual criticism, and Nachleben (Tibullus' influence on German verse). Although the final section is unlikely to prove of much relevance to readers, the discussion in the third part of over 30 textual problems in books 1 and 2 is interesting, and the second section, if at times marred by some dubious speculation, contains much common sense (for example, concerning the poet's *paupertas* and

the paederastic pieces). But most noteworthy is his treatment of structure, in which he gives an account of earlier approaches and a full elucidation of his own views on the subject. An examination of all of this should make readers more informed and thoughtful over this still contentious issue, even if they disagree with Schuster's own method and conclusions. (Briefly, he contends that almost all of the elegies have a "Keimzelle", a concept, feeling or event which gets the poem started, and from which Tibullus moves on smoothly from subject to subject and image to image; but Schuster overlooks the very precise, disciplined and orderly arrangement of several Tibullan pieces [most notably 1.1];¹⁵ in addition he is surely wrong in rejecting verbal repetition as a binding device.) More recently W. Wimmel has produced three tomes on Tibullus - *Der Frühe Tibull* (Munich 1968) on 1.3, 4, 8, 9 and 10; *Tibull und Delia Erster Teil* (Wiesbaden 1976) on 1.1; and *Tibull und Delia Zweiter Teil* (Wiesbaden 1983) on 1.2. Readers with a good command of German and a great amount of patience will glean some rewards from Wimmel's minute analyses, especially those who are concerned less with the poetry than with schematism, cycles, types, forms, themes, sequences, categories etc. But Wimmel does have noteworthy remarks on the technique of slow revelation of circumstances and on Tibullus' relationship to contemporary authors.

5. SCHOLARSHIP ON INDIVIDUAL ELEGIES

In addition to the books already mentioned in sections 2 and 3, the following works and parts of works should be of help for the interpretation and appreciation of individual poems.

1.1: Guy Lee's discerning essay on this elegy (94ff. in *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry* ed. A. Woodman and D. West, Cambridge 1974) is especially good on Tibullus' imitation of and subtle variation on Virgil, structural elements and the military connotations of the language. J.M. Fisher *Latomus* 29 (1970) 765ff. is well worth consulting on the structure and contrasts with the soldier's way of life, as is Lyne (see section 4 above) 155ff. on the provocative flavour of the poet's depiction of the farmer's existence as

¹⁵See also Cairns chapters 6-8 (mentioned above in this section).

dishonourable inactivity, on humour and on the pathos in the notion of Delia taking part in this simple rural ideal. Cairns (see section 4) p.11ff. has much to say on Hellenistic aspects of 1.1, but some caveats are necessary: for instance, he classifies love and the country as Hellenistic themes, but they are found in many non-Hellenistic authors as well, there do not seem to be in this piece any direct reminiscences of Alexandrian writers (whereas Tibullus here is clearly imitating Horace, Virgil and Propertius,¹⁶ and imitating passages of theirs which do not appear to be specifically indebted to Hellenistic predecessors), and to write off Tibullus' remarks here as Alexandrian topoi is to ignore the distinct possibility of some sort of basis in the elegist's beliefs and experiences.

1.2: Setting and genre are major problems here. For discussion of these considerations see the introductory essay to this poem in my commentary and also J.C. Yardley *Eranos* 76 (1978) 28f., Lyne 179ff., Ball 47f. and Bright 136ff. (for details of these two latter works see section 4). In addition F. Solmsen *Hermes* 90 (1962) 314ff. points out the elevation of tone and style in part of this elegy.

1.3: H. Eisenberger *Hermes* 88 (1960) 188ff. (in German), Bright 17ff. and Ball 50ff. comment on similarities here between Tibullus and Odysseus, but in my opinion they overstate their case (particularly Bright and Ball) and mistakenly see an extended parallel throughout.¹⁷ C. Campbell *Yale Classical Studies* 23 (1973) 147ff. sheds some light on the progression of thought and organization of material in 1.3.

1.4: For a perceptive account of tone and overall interpretation see F. Solmsen *Hermes* 90 (1962) 320ff. Although in need of some refinement, the scheme of Ball (66) shows the ring-composition. On Alexandrian influence here see Luck 92ff. (section 4 above), C.M. Dawson *American Journal of Philology* 67 (1946) 1ff. and A.W. Bulloch *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* new series 19 (1973) 75f., but be cautious over their suggestions about the models for secondary material in 1.4.

¹⁶ See my commentary p.49ff.

¹⁷ Cf. my *Tibullus* I p.100.

1.5: Bright (154ff.) lists some affinities with the previous Delia-poem (1.3). Elder (see section 4) p.99ff. is reliable on the range of mood and themes, the repetition of words to draw the elegy together,¹⁸ and the purpose of some of the sections. Cairns illuminates the structure on p.212ff., and also (176ff.) has some engaging pages on Tibullus' distortion of the chronological sequence of events (however, it is not obvious from the poem whether the rich lover arrived on the scene before or after the poet's separation from Delia; and I personally do not believe that the *quidam* of 71ff. is Tibullus himself).

1.6: Ball (pp.95, 99, 100f., 102f.) passes on some insights into structural aspects noted by Rhorer. On this subject see also J.H. Gaisser *American Journal of Philology* 92 (1971) 202ff.; Gaisser is also thought-provoking over irony in 1.6, although in my view she rather overdoes the cynicism.

1.7: A crucial and complex question here is the genre: in addition to my *Tibullus* I p.208ff. cf. Cairns 171f. (who still does not convince me). On Hellenistic imitation here see Luck 84ff. and Bulloch (in the article cited under 1.4) pp.73, 76f., 80, who are I feel a little too enthusiastic.¹⁹ Gaisser *Classical Philology* 66 (1971) 221ff. clarifies the purpose of the literary *doctrina* and the links between Messalla and Osiris. Those with German should benefit from reading Schuster (see section 4) 17ff. on the development of the thought. Ball (107) shows how neatly 1.7 is structured (but note that the address to Messalla starts in line 7, not in 9 as Ball would have it).

1.8: To the observations in my commentary on the slow revelation of circumstances here should be added Bright 240ff. (who makes some good points on the tease in the opening section) and Cairns 147ff. (on the technique of delayed information throughout the piece).

¹⁸ On this device in 1.5 see also (if available) D.M. Kriel *Akroterion* 22,2 (1977) 1ff. (although several of the echoes he sees seem to me insignificant). Kriel's article is partially summarized by Ball (pp.85, 86, 88, 89).

¹⁹ Cf. *Tibullus* I p.211f.

1.9: Bright (250f.) mentions some noteworthy thematic links between 1.8 and 1.9 (venality is another major theme of the latter elegy, and it also occurs at 1.8.29ff.). Lyne (173ff.) is acute on the piquancy of the sacrifice of dignity and freedom for a boy. Ball (p.135) is quite illuminating about features such as the recurring address to the boy (but note that the first apostrophe ends at line 4). On the structure see also Cairns 208f. Earlier (on p.152f.) he makes the suggestion that the seducer and his wife in 1.9 are the *canus amator* and Pholoe of 1.8 and that the *iuvenis* of 1.9.55 and 71 is Marathus; this is an intriguing idea but one would like to see more discussion (e.g. to square 1.8.15f. with 1.9.69f. and 74, and to square 1.8.55ff. with 1.9.57f.).

1.10: I regret to say that there is nothing on 1.10 that I can really recommend.

2.1: M. Grondona *Maia* 23 (1971) 236ff., A. Dubia *Bollettino di Studi Latini* 8 (1978) 32ff. (both in Italian) and H. Musurillo *A Festschrift in Honour of J.M.F. Marique* (ed. P.T. Brannan, Worcester 1975) 107ff. should be consulted (and scrutinized) on style, structure, Hellenistic sources and the identity of the festival referred to in this poem.

2.2: See Cairns 204 on the elaborate ring-composition.

2.3: Lyne 164ff. has something to say on the humour here (cf. also the suggestive remarks of Lee [see section 3 above] 140f., R.J. Littlewood *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 11.30.3 [Berlin 1983] 2142ff. and J.K. Newman *Augustus and the New Poetry* [Brussels 1967] 388ff.). Lyne also notes how the elegist in 2.3 comes out with a different view about the countryside and wealth, and Lyne ascribes this change to Nemesis (but I feel that he should also take into consideration simple thematic variation: cf. Newman loc. cit.). A. Foulon *Revue des Etudes Latines* 58 (1980) 252ff. is interesting on the Apollo *exemplum* (at lines 11ff.) and its Alexandrian aspects (although several of his proposals in connection with the latter are rather nebulous), and so is M.W. Schiebe (in German) on the influence of Propertius 2.5 on this piece (in ch.4 of *Das ideale Dasein bei Tibull*, Uppsala 1981). Cairns comments shrewdly at p.153ff. on the slow revelation and at p.209ff. on the structure of this elegy and its similarity to that of the next (but I do not find his schema for 2.4 entirely convincing: for instance, his explanation of 2.4.45-51 appears forced).

2.4: To refine one's response to this poem, it helps to study Lee p.143 (who finds it mainly credible) along with Bright 205ff. (who feels it is unconvincing). Lyne 168f. again points out how Tibullus here reverses cherished values and again Lyne holds Nemesis to blame (see above on 2.3).

2.5: See Bright 66ff. and (still fuller) Ball 185ff. for useful summary of scholarly criticism on the various complex issues in 2.5, particularly claims of Virgilian echoes (many of which seem to me improbable),²⁰ arguments concerning the absence of overt mention of Augustus, and structural questions (including numerous emendations, transpositions and excisions). On the structure see also H. Merklin *Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von K. Büchner* (ed. W. Wimmel, Wiesbaden 1970) 301ff. (in German), Cairns 65ff., 204ff. and A. Foulon *Revue des Etudes Latines* 61 (1983) 173ff. R.J. Littlewood on humorous elements in 2.5 (in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 11.30.3 [Berlin 1983] 2139ff.) is worth pondering, although I personally would class some of the passages he cites as lighter touches rather than examples of actual humour.

2.6: An attempt to answer the assertion of M.D. Reeve (*Phoenix* 38 [1984] 235ff.) that 2.6 is incomplete sharpens one's appreciation of the elegy. Cairns 185ff. is perceptive on Tibullus' technique of deceiving and surprising the reader here.

6. MISCELLANEOUS

The concordance which I find clearest and easiest to use is E.N. O'Neil's *A Critical Concordance of the Tibullan Corpus* (Ithaca 1963), which is based on Lenz's 1959 (Leiden) edition, but also includes many conjectures and variant readings omitted by Lenz. I have noted only a few errors in O'Neil: on p.129 the entries under *fluctus* and *fluito* should be reversed; *memores* in 1.3.2 must be classed under *memor* on p.191, not under *memoro* on p.192; on p.234 delete the heading *perfrango* and include the entry there under *perfringo* immediately below. For concordances see also A. Della Casa *Le Concordanze del Corpus Tibullianum* (Univ. di Genova 1964) and S.

²⁰On epic reminiscences in 2.5 see also D.N. Levin *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 11.30.3 (Berlin 1983) 2085ff.

Govaerts *Le Corpus Tibullianum. Index verborum et relevés statistiques* (Univ. de Liège 1966).

R. Pichon's *Index Verborum Amatoriorum* (1902, reprinted Hildesheim 1966) contains a helpful list of amatory terms used by Catullus and the elegists with explanations (in Latin) and copious references. Note, however, that his list, although full, is not exhaustive, and his explanations are not always precise enough.

On questions of metrical usage in Tibullus (and Propertius and Ovid) see M. Platnauer's *Latin Elegiac Verse* (1951, reprinted Connecticut 1971).

Those requiring full bibliographical information on Tibullus should consult A. Cartault *A propos du Corpus Tibullianum: un siècle de philologie latine classique* (Paris 1906), H. Harrauer *A Bibliography to the Corpus Tibullianum* (Hildesheim 1971), R.J. Ball *Erano's* 73 (1975) 62ff., the bibliography (232-240) in Ball's *Tibullus The Elegist* and, of course, *L'Année Philologique*.

UNIVERSITY OF NATAL,
PIETERMARITZBURG

P. MURCATROYD

LES CIRQUES ROMAINS

John H. Humphrey. *Roman Circuses: Arenas for Chariot Racing*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1986. Pp. xiv + 703. 303 illustrations, 4 indices. Relié, E.-U. \$60.00. ISBN 0-520-04921-7.

"Il più grande edificio di spettacolo di tutti i tempi...". C'est ainsi que F. Coarelli¹ commence sa description du *Circus Maximus* dans son excellent guide archéologique de Rome. Et de fait, même si l'on s'en tient à une capacité de 150.000 personnes environ - c'est l'estimation, basse, que retient d'ailleurs finalement John Humphrey (126)² - on dépasse encore largement les grands stades modernes de 100.000 spectateurs: et encore la construction de tels stades ne va-t-elle pas sans poser de problèmes, puisqu'un pays occidental développé comme la France n'en possède toujours pas, et la "crise" n'a rien fait évidemment pour arranger les choses. Malgré cette importance du *Circus Maximus* - ou plutôt en raison de celle-ci, nous allons le voir - il n'existait pas jusqu'à présent de publication satisfaisante de cet édifice, pour ne pas parler de l'immense majorité des autres cirques du monde romain: c'est dire que, s'agissant d'édifices dont le rôle fut essentiel dans la civilisation romaine, le livre, impressionnant, de John Humphrey est le bienvenu.

On ne peut pas ne pas rapprocher la réflexion de l'auteur "the study of Roman circuses is in its infancy" (x), de celle de P. Aupert à propos de stades grecs: "L'archéologie des stades en est en effet à ses balbutiements."³ Même s'il existe des raisons spécifiques, sur

¹ *Guida archeologica di Roma* 1 (Verone 1974) 292.

² Pour le cirque du début du III^e siècle de notre ère, lorsqu'il a acquis son aspect définitif. Les dimensions extérieures sont les suivantes: 620 m. de longueur pour 140 m. de largeur; l'arène fait 580 m. de long pour 79 m. de large, la barrière ("spina") 335 m.; et il y a 175-180 m. entre les stalles de départ et la première meta.

³ "Athletica 1: Epigraphie archaïque et morphologie des stades anciens," *BCH* 104 (1980) 309.



ILL record updated to IN PROCESS
Record 20 of 20

ILL pe

Record 20 of 20

CAN YOU SUPPLY ? YES NO COND FUTUREDATE

:ILL: 983213 :Borrower: VZS :ReqDate: 20010920 :NeedBefore: 20011020
:Status: IN PROCESS 20010920 :RecDate: :RenewalReq:
:OCLC: 4771780 :Source: OCLCILL :DueDate: :NewDueDate:
:Lender: *BMC,DHU,TXH,MBB,SUC

:CALLNO:

:TITLE: Echos du monde classique. Classical views.

:IMPRINT: [s.l.] Classical Association of Canada.

:ARTICLE: Murgatroyd, P.; Tibullus. A review article

:VOL: 31 :NO: :DATE: 1987 :PAGES: 69-92

:VERIFIED: OCLC ISSN: 0012-9356

:PATRON: Curley, D DEPT: classics STATUS:fac

DE

*1
E 3*

:SHIP TO: ILL

Skidmore College Library
815 No. Broadway
Saratoga Springs
NY
12866

:BILL TO: Same

:SHIP VIA: Fastest at no chg. :MAXCOST: \$0 IFM :COPYRT COMPLIANCE: CCL

:FAX: (518)580-5540 *** ARIEL ADDRESS 141.222.170.254

:E-MAIL: ILLDESK@skidmore.edu

:BORROWING NOTES: SUNY/OCLC Deposit Account# w/ UMI:D#800108 Oberlin Grp.

Mem/CANNOT PAY INVOICE WITHOUT COPY OF REQUEST We do not charge for ILL services. Please reciprocate.

:AFFILIATION: SUNY/OCLC, Oberlin Grp., LVIS

:LENDING CHARGES: :SHIPPED: :SHIP INSURANCE:

:LENDING RESTRICTIONS:

:LENDING NOTES:

:RETURN TO:

:RETURN VIA: