



---

Tibullus and Ovid: The Authorship of the Sulpicia and Cornutus Elegies in the Tibullan Corpus

Author(s): R. S. Radford

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 44, No. 1 (1923), pp. 1-26

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/289641>

Accessed: 12/06/2014 10:27

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLIV, 1

WHOLE No. 173

## I.—TIBULLUS AND OVID:

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE SULPICIA AND CORNUTUS ELEGIES  
IN THE TIBULLAN CORPUS.

### PART I.

#### I. *Introduction.*

In two articles published in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*,<sup>1</sup> I have sought to show that the whole Tibullan Appendix—including also the second, third and fifth elegies of Book II—as well as the whole Vergilian Appendix, including the great *Priapea*, are the youthful productions of Ovid, composed by him in the period extending from 27 to 8 B. C. These conclusions are based partly upon a study of the schemata and the metrical development, and partly upon the use of Burman's long neglected Index to Ovid, and they agree entirely with the results gained by Gruppe,<sup>2</sup> Kleemann<sup>3</sup> and Némethy;<sup>4</sup> they are also the only rational interpretation of the facts which have been set forth in elaborate dissertations by Ehrengruber<sup>5</sup> and Holschmidt.<sup>6</sup> It is now established beyond

<sup>1</sup> LI (1920), 146-171, "The Juvenile Works of Ovid and the Spondaic Period of his Metrical Art," and LII (1921), 148-177, "The *Priapea* and the Vergilian Appendix."

<sup>2</sup> *Röm. Elegie*, Leipzig, 1838, 105-143.

<sup>3</sup> *De libri III carminibus quae Tibulli nom. circumferuntur*, Strassburg, 1876.

<sup>4</sup> *De Ovidio elegiae in Messallam auctore*, Budapest, 1909.

<sup>5</sup> *De panegyrico Messallae pseudo-Tib.*, partes I-X, Kremsmünster, 1889-92, 1894-99.

<sup>6</sup> *De Culicis Sermone*, Marburg, 1913. A brief recent discussion, I

question that Ovid—like Catullus, like Propertius and like Tibullus in his first book—composed originally in spondees, and that the marvellously light and graceful dactylic verse which we now find in his received works was not a miraculous endowment of his youth, but the result of full twenty years of unremitting labor and study. In particular, the first edition of the *Amores*, consisting of five books, which was published *after* 15 B. C. and probably as late as 13-11 B. C., did not greatly exceed 48.5% of dactyls in the distich.<sup>7</sup>

The present article,—omitting only the *Panegyric* which has been so fully and elaborately treated by Ehrenguber—examines minutely the language and schemata of Book IV of the Tibullan corpus and of the second or Cornutus elegy of Book II.<sup>8</sup> It

may add, showing in a striking manner the close connection between the Lygdamus poems, the *Culex*, the *Ciris* and Ovid, is that of H. Wagenvoort, *Mnemosyne* XLV (1917), 107-113. As to the *Moretum*, K. v. Reichenbach, *Die Echtheit des Mor.*, Znaim 1883, pp. 5, 9-10, shows clearly, but briefly, its Ovidian language. Plessis also (*Poésie Lat.* 277, n. 3) mentions with approval a "manuscript work by M. Lachèze" (a summary of which is given in the *Positions des mémoires présentés à la Fac. des Lettres de Paris*, 1907), which reaches the same conclusions, and expressly attributes the *Moretum* to Ovid. As to the *Ciris*, see below, n. 37.

<sup>7</sup> Eight elegies of the present *Amores* (382 vss. in all), which have been only partially revised, show the spondees actually predominant in the hexameter lines as follows: I 15, 57.1%; II 4 and III 10, 53.1%; III 8, 53%; II 8, 51.8%; I 13, 51.2%; I 2, 51.0%; II 11, 50.9%. The youthful *Halieutica* shows 57.2% of spondees, v. further *op. cit.* (1920), 169.

<sup>8</sup> II 2 must be joined to the Sulpicia elegies (IV 2-6), of which it is the natural and expected conclusion, and after marriage the lover 'Cerinthus' is given his true name of Cornutus; v. Gruppe, *op. cit.* 64, 68, 93; Zingerle, *Kl. philol. Abh.* I 22 f.; Ribbeck, *Röm. Dicht.* II 196; Knappe, *De Tibulli lib. IV elegiis*, Duderstadt, 1880, pp. 6 f., 19; Némethy, *Tib.* 49, 328-330; K. F. Smith, *Tib.* 86; Teuffel, *Studien u. Charakteristiken*, Leipzig 1871, p. 368; Plessis, *Poésie Lat.* 377 f.; Belling, *Albius Tibullus*, Berlin 1897, pp. 295 ff. Belling even argues (p. 298) that the 'editor' of the whole Corpus inserted a note to the effect that Cornutus is = Cerinthus, and that the archetype gave 'Cerinthe' at II 2, 9 and 3, 1 as a marginal or interlinear reading. The agreement in phraseology between II 2 and IV 2 has often been noted, e. g. by Némethy, 329, 334; Belling, 296; Bürger, *Hermes*, XL 329. The agreement of II 2 in length with the Sulpicia elegies is also very striking. The relation of II 2 to these elegies is also discussed

thus fulfills the promise of presenting overwhelming proof of the Ovidian authorship, which was made in my former articles, and gives—just as the Ehrengruber and Holtschmidt dissertations give—an example of what may be expected from the detailed treatment of the language of [Tib.] II 5 and 3, and also of the *Ciris*, *Aetna*, *Catalepton*, *Priapea*, etc.; *ab uno disce omnes*. The principal poems which we shall examine are the Sulpicia Elegies and Letters; these have already been discussed by well-known critics with some very valuable results, but before I speak of these results in detail, I wish to mention briefly certain questions which relate to the whole Appendix.

## II. *The 'Imitations' or 'Playful Forgeries' Contained in Books IV and II.*

The third and fourth books (if we may be allowed, for purposes of convenience, to retain the erroneous modern division) are far from being the only works of Ovid contained in the Tibullan corpus. The desperate condition of the second or posthumous book has long been well known, and for nearly a century a multitude of scholars have clearly recognized that the whole of this book cannot possibly be the genuine production of Tibullus. Gruppe, who discussed the problem—after Scaliger and Heyne—with even more than his usual acumen (*op. cit.* 69-101), proposed to remedy the most serious difficulties which present themselves (1) by transferring the elegy II 2 to Book IV, where it clearly belongs, and (2) by assuming that enormous interpolations—namely II 3, 35-58 and II 5, 23-38 and 66-78—were introduced into the two elegies, II 3 and II 5, after the death of Tibullus. Gruppe's view of II 2 has been very generally approved; many of the best Tibullan scholars, such as Baehrens, Korn, and Bubendey, have also substantially accepted his second solution (v. Baehrens, *Tib.*

at length by Ullrich, "De libri secundi Tibull. statu integro," *Fleckeis. Jahrb. Supplementbd.* XVII [1890], 448-460, but very unsuccessfully, since his whole thesis relating to the publication of the second book during the lifetime of Tibullus is a mistaken one and is rejected by most Tibullan scholars, e. g. Magnus, *Berl. philol. Wochen-schr.* 1890, col. 600, and Hiller, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 1890, col. 1087; other scholars holding the same view are named in the references of Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.*, Paris 1906, p. 568.

*Blätter* 24), but W. Wisser in an elaborate program, which is devoted entirely to the arrangement and composition of the great Messalinus or national elegy,<sup>9</sup> reached the following correct conclusions respecting II 5: (1) That the development of the thought in this poem is wholly foreign to Tibullus; (2) that, in a certain technical sense, the composition throughout is immature and even bad; (3) that, in spite of the free employment of the names of Tibullus and Nemesis, the poem is wholly spurious and no part of it proceeds from Tibullus.<sup>10</sup> The elegy II 3 has been discussed especially by Gruppe, Francken, Wilhelm and Belling; like II 2, it is addressed to Cornutus (Cerinthus) and therefore also "stands in a definite relation to the Sulpicia elegies" (cf. Zingerle, *Abh.* I 23). Belling's discussion (*Albius Tibullus*, pp. 79-81, 268-291) of this "rhetorical elegy," as he well terms it, deserves the highest praise and is more acute and searching than that of any of his predecessors; he recognizes clearly the closest kind of connection as existing between II 3 and II 2, on the one hand, and the Sulpicia elegies, on the other, and correctly assumes (pp. 291-303) the appearance in the Cornutus and Sulpicia poems of "a new phase of the poet's composition, a Cornutus-Sulpicia period"; to this group he joins also (p. 383) IV 13 and 14. The evidence of the language is conclusive, I may add, respecting the actual Ovidian origin of II 3. We possess four effective criteria for distinguishing the genuine poems and the playful 'forgeries.'<sup>11</sup> These are (1) the composition and the development of the thought, (2) the metre, (3) the language, and (4) the character of the mythology. Three of the elegies of the second book, namely 1, 4, and 6, exhibit the matured dactylic art of Tibullus and are apparently genuine; for they attain a marvellous virtuosity in

<sup>9</sup> 'Ueber Tibull. II 5,' Eutin 1874. A very inadequate summary of Wisser's program is given by Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 258.

<sup>10</sup> Hartung also, *De Panegyrico*, pp. 31, 44, &c., always refers to II 5 as the 'suspected elegy'; cf. also Ehr. I 29, 35; II 34. I may add that the writer of II 5 clearly had before him the complete *Aeneid* and very possibly also Propertius' fourth book; wholly unlike the genuine Tibullus, he also possessed all the recondite learning of Alexandria and of later Greece.

<sup>11</sup> "The reader must not, however, feel all the moral indignation that the term forgery is likely now to produce."—Fay on the forged Elogium Duilianum, *Class. Phil.* XV (1920), 176.

the distich, which ranges from 55 to 57%,<sup>12</sup> and which Ovid himself was able to achieve only in the works published after 8 B. C., that is, in the *Heroides*, the *Ars* and the second *Amores*. One elegy, II 5, is so heavily spondaic—showing only 46.7% of dactyls—that this feature alone subjects it to the gravest suspicion; <sup>13</sup> two elegies exhibit an equal ratio (50%), and may, so far as regards the application of this one test, possibly be genuine, but the evidence of the language and the mythology easily shows that both are spurious.

As is well known, our extant manuscripts of Tibullus, which are all of late date (saec. XIV or XV), divide the Tibullan corpus into three books; the usual or traditional division into four books, which is due to the Italian scholars of the fifteenth century, is entirely without authority in the text tradition and is retained only for the sake of convenience. It is doubtful, however, whether even the three-book division is correct. For Ullrich, who has carefully discussed this whole question (*Studia Tib.: De libri II. editione*, Berlin, 1889, pp. 58-74), reaches the conclusion that, in all probability, there were originally only 'two books of Tibullus.' Thus the *Excerpta Parisina* (saec. XI or XII), which are considerably older and better than our extant manuscripts, after quoting verses found in the *Nemesis* book as "*in secundo*," cite, no less than fifteen times, verses of the *Lygdamus* poems as "*in eodem (sc. in secundo)*." Also a library catalogue of the ninth century published by M. Haupt (*Opusc.* III, 2, 426) enumerates only 'two books of Tibullus' ("*Albi Tibulli lib. II*"). In Ullrich's view then (p. 69), just as we owe the four-book division to the Italian scholars, so at the close of the middle ages the fourteenth-century copyists have introduced into our manuscripts, for the sake of convenience, the division into three books.<sup>14</sup> A similar conclusion is reached by Leonhard, *De codicibus Tibull.*, Monachii 1882, p. 53.

<sup>12</sup> II 1 shows 55.2% of dactyls in the distich, II 4 55.0%, II 6 56.8%.

<sup>13</sup> The high percentage of spondees in the first foot also indicates that both II 5 and II 3 are spurious.

<sup>14</sup> Ullrich's exact view (pp. 68 f.) is that there was a first edition of Tibullus consisting of two books, both of them published in the poet's lifetime, but that we now possess a second edition prepared by a late editor, whom he (erroneously) supposes to have lived after the period of Martial. This editor, he holds, has not added a third book to the collection, but has affixed a 'formless appendix' to the second book,

Lucian Müller (*Praef. Tib.* VI), on the other hand, assumes that the older manuscripts have omitted by mistake the marks of division before the Lygdamus poems. Cartault also (*Tibulle* 69) argues that the Excerpta Parisina, in citing the first two extracts from Book III, namely 1, 7 and 2, 6, have forgotten to add "*in tertio*," and when, beginning with the third extract (3, 11), they have "*in eodem*," they are really referring to this omitted subscription. He further holds (*Corpus Tibull.* 223, 352) that the ninth-century catalogue is either inaccurate in its figures or relates to an incomplete manuscript. In any case, believing 'Lygdamus' to be the editor of our present Corpus, Cartault fully admits (*Tibulle* 89) the "possibility that the second book has appeared only with the complete edition," which, in his view, contained the third book as an appendix. A similar conclusion is reached by Hiller (*Hermes* XVIII [1883], 352 f.), who maintains that all the apparent deviations from the three-book division of our extant manuscripts can be explained through the carelessness and error of the medieval copyists. The matter does not admit of final determination,<sup>15</sup> but I myself incline to the three-book division as more fully attested, and am disposed to believe that the editor of our Corpus (Ovid) has probably devoted one book to the poems of Tibullus alone, a second to a mixed collection, and a third exclusively to his own productions. In order to constitute the second book, Ovid was compelled to add three elegies of his own, comprising 224 verses; even with this addition, the posthumous book, with only 428 lines in all, "has a strikingly small size in comparison with all the books of Roman poets that can justly

thus making the latter consist in all of 1111 verses. The view of Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, Berlin 1882, pp. 426 ff., whom Ullrich has closely followed, is essentially the same, except that Ullrich makes the 'appendix' begin with the Lygdamus poems, while Birt, finding the present second book of 428 verses unduly and abnormally short, adds to it the 290 verses of the Lygdamus poems and so makes the 'appendix' begin with the *Panegyricus Messallae*, whose separate title is guaranteed by the Excerpta Parisina.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Schanz, *Röm. Litt.* § 278, p. 221, who speaks of the editor as "having added all that he found as a third roll to the two already known Tibullan books," yet adds: "It would also be conceivable that he united all with the short second book, and certain excerpts . . . seem to point to such a book-division."

be cited" (Hiller, *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* 1890, col. 1087), and bears convincing testimony to the existence of peculiar and unusual circumstances.<sup>16</sup>

It is quite impossible to say whether we possess in our extant corpus all the works of Tibullus or not. It is well known that the first book was published *after* the triumph of Messalla in September, 27 B. C.; we ourselves hold with Baehrens (*Tib. Blätter* 24) that the actual date of publication, however, was nearer 25 or 24 B. C.<sup>17</sup> In 23 B. C. Horace (*C. I* 33) speaks of our poet as "addressing mournful elegies to Glycera"; these may either be the Delia elegies of the first book, or they may very possibly be, as many scholars maintain (cf. Ullrich, p. 46), poems which have been lost and which were not included by the editor in our present corpus; we have no possible means of determining the question definitely.<sup>18</sup> Nor yet can we determine

<sup>16</sup> The well-known fact that Ovid's Sappho Epistle, which entirely lacks any ascription to an author, is usually found in Tibullus manuscripts (e. g. in the Guelferbytanus, but not in A and V), I regard at present of course as wholly accidental, but I have had no opportunity to examine more carefully into the matter, as I should have wished to do.

<sup>17</sup> According to Cartault, *Tibulle* 89, it was in 26/25.

<sup>18</sup> They certainly were not, as Schanz (§ 279, p. 221) and Ullman (*A. J. P.* XXXIII 152) think, the Nemesis elegies, since these latter show imitation of Propertius' third book and were therefore composed after 22 B. C. (Némethy, *Tib.*, p. 338; Belling, *op. cit.* 363 f.). They may well, however, have been different from the Delia elegies, for Hörschelmann's studies upon elision in Tib. (*Philologus*, 1897, pp. 354-371) imply, as he correctly concludes, a considerable difference between books I and II, or as Postgate (*Selections*, p. xxxiii) well phrases it, 'an appreciable interval of time between their composition.' The development of the dactylic virtuosity is a still more striking proof of this interval. Unlike the works of Propertius, the thirteen genuine elegies which we possess from Tibullus all show the unity of the distich and almost invariable dissyllabic closes in the pentameter. The earlier productions of Tibullus could not possibly have exhibited this finished form, and the poems therefore (such as I 10, 4, 8 &c.) which have come down to us from his more youthful period reach us doubtless only in a revision or a second edition. The principal purpose of Ovid was certainly not to publish the complete works of Tibullus, but to offer to the cultivated Roman public an artistic 'Tibullan volume' with elegant dissyllabic closes. If therefore he found among the papers of his predecessor any elegies with polysyllabic endings which Tib.



certainly whether the ancients, as is implied in Charisius' citation (I 87 Keil: 'implicuitque femur femini'), knew certain poems of Tibullus which we no longer possess (cf. Wisser, *Quaest. Tib.*, p. 18; Hiller, *Hermes* XVIII 353, n. 1; Schanz § 279, p. 221; Marx, Pauly-Wissowa, I 1327, s. v. Albius, and also the various references given by Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 569). In any case it is clear that Tibullus composed but little, and we need not be surprised that, upon his sudden death in 19 B. C., Ovid, when he was appointed literary executor by Messalla, could find among his papers only three elegies of 204 verses suitable for publication, namely II 1, 4 and 6. These were too few in number to constitute a poetical book, which, as Birt (*op. cit.* 291 ff.) has shown, should contain at least 500 verses.<sup>19</sup>

We come now to the publication of the three genuine elegies and of the whole Appendix. So far as relates to the 'Messalla Collection' alone, it has already been correctly perceived by Teuffel (*Stud. u. Charakt.* 1871, p. 382), by Postgate (*op. cit.* L), and by Cartault (edition, p. 89) that 'Lygdamus' (Ovid) was the actual editor. Since Ovid's poems occupy one-half of the second book (II 2, 3 and 5) and the remainder of the corpus, and since he expressly tells us (*Pont.* II 3, 75) that Messalla first induced him to "venture to commit his works to fame," we cannot doubt that it was with Messalla's express approval that he edited the three posthumous elegies and added his own early poems,—many of them devoted to the praise of his patron and his patron's family. We therefore regard as highly improbable the view prevalent since the time of Lachmann (cf. Schanz, *op. cit.* § 278, p. 220), that the Appendix was not issued until Messalla's death, because it unites the poems of Tibullus with

had not revised and which he himself found no time to correct, we may be sure that he unhesitatingly suppressed them. Ayrmann, in his once famous biography of Tibullus (*Vitebergae* 1719, p. 148), which is quoted by Cartault (*Corpus Tibull.* 37, n. 2), is by no means wholly wrong in his judgment at this point: "Non male colligas . . . eam, quam nunc habemus editionem, sive a Tibullo non longe ante ipsius obitum, sive, quod mihi probabilius videtur, post illum a Critico quodam curatam esse: in qua scilicet multae, quae puncta acutorum iudicium non tulerant, Elegiae omissae, aliae seorsum editae insertae, et integri forsan lib. III et IV primum adiecti fuerint."

<sup>19</sup> *Monobibla*, or works without book-division, do not have this limitation, cf. Birt, p. 297.

foreign material. Publication, however, certainly did not occur at once, but was deferred until a favorable opportunity offered; for it was necessary that Ovid should first compose the choice and exquisite poems which give him the clearest right to take his place, in the circle of Messalla, beside the revered master and even to share in the elegant and harmonious 'Tibullan volume.'<sup>20</sup> The elegies IV 2-14 and II 2, 3 and 5 were therefore composed for an express purpose, and all alike are made truly 'Tibullan,' that is, they are made to conform to all (or nearly all) the principal rules of Tibullan art, such as the unity of the distich, the preference for dactyls, the limitation of elision, the figures produced by placing adj. and subst. in correlation, and,—in very large measure also,—to the simplicity and naturalness of Tibullan speech,<sup>21</sup> without, however, its vagueness, its monotony, and its mechanical repetition. Especially noticeable is it that the extremely difficult refinement which requires the elegant dissyllable in the pentameter close, and which, because of its extreme difficulty, many of the best Roman poets (such as Martial and Ausonius) never fully adopted,<sup>22</sup> is here taken up and carried to a degree of perfection exceeding that of Tibullus himself. Several striking facts cannot fail to arrest our attention here. The *Copa* in the 'Vergilian Appendix,' which, like the Sulpicia elegies (IV 2-6), imitates the fourth book of Propertius,<sup>23</sup> and like them, shows the early Ovidian schema SDSS predominant, does not observe the Tibullan rule of the dissyllable; it was not intended therefore for the 'Tibullan volume,' although it was composed about the same time as the Sulpicia elegies,—most probably, of course, shortly before them. It is evident then that it was very slowly and, we may add, in some respects, very reluctantly that the youthful Ovid abandoned the greater freedom and vigor of Catullus, Gallus and Proper-

<sup>20</sup> A certain apparent metrical uniformity, at least, pervades the whole volume, v. L. Müller, *praef. Tib.*, p. xxviii, and Zingerle, *Abh.* II 75.

<sup>21</sup> Bürger, *Charites* 371-394; Knappe, *op. cit.* 12; K. F. Smith, 68.

<sup>22</sup> Plessis, *Traité de métrique* §§ 134 f. and *Poésie Lat.* 275, n. 3, rightly maintains that the extent to which this refinement was actually adopted has been greatly exaggerated. Besides Tibullus, Ovid, and—in his latest elegies—Propertius, very few have ever conformed to this severe rule.

<sup>23</sup> This question is treated more fully below, see p. 20.

tius, in order to attain the uniform smoothness and the artistic precision of Tibullus.<sup>24</sup> Consequently his art long remained in an experimental stage, and the complete attainment of the Tibullan dissyllable, which is evident first in the *Consolatio* and the *Maecenas* (9 and 8 B. C.), was—just as the full achievement of the dactylic virtuosity—the work of many years. On the other hand, the heavy spondaic preponderance which appears in the Lygdamus elegies (III 1-6) shows clearly that they are a very early work, and the sequel of Neaera's divorce from the poet is actually given later in the poems of the 'Vergilian Appendix' (Catal. VI, XII, XIII)—a collection which completely disregards both the dissyllable and the unity of the distich.<sup>25</sup> It is evident therefore that the Lygdamus elegies, which were at first written quite independently, must originally have had polysyllabic and pre-Tibullan endings, but that they have been carefully revised in this respect with the purpose of fitting them to the Tibullan corpus.<sup>26</sup> The scrupulous artist

<sup>24</sup> Ovid possessed by nature great narrative and descriptive powers; therefore in early youth he dearly loved and long retained the simpler and more perspicuous word-orders; cf. *TAPA*, 1920, p. 151; Krafft, *De artibus quas Tib. et Lyg. in versibus, &c.*, pp. 10, 24. We cannot doubt then that he shed 'tears, idle tears' (*lacrimas inanes*) as he slowly turned away from nature to art and to the choice and elegant, though artificial, collocations and arrangements of words which, in the last analysis, the learning and genius of Ennius had imposed upon Rome; see my "Licensed Feet in Latin Verse," *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield* (New Haven, 1920), pp. 253 f. It is not surprising therefore that the conjunction *et*, which is postponed 36 times in Tib., suffers displacement only 20 times in the Tib. App.; see Streifinger, *De syntaxi Tib.*, Wirceburgi 1881, p. 40; Lierse, *Ueber die Unechtheit des dritten Tib. Buches* 27. Naeke (*Valerius Cato*, pp. 284-95) has noted this retention of the simple and normal order as characteristic also of the juvenile pieces of the Verg. App.

<sup>25</sup> The elegiac poems in the Verg. App. belong to the period of the Athenian journey and often have Greek originals; it is not surprising that they should retain Greek freedom and Greek flexibility in the treatment of the pentameter. Of later date seems to be the influence of Tibullus upon Ovid as upon "one born out of due time."

<sup>26</sup> This statement does not apply to the sixth poem, which did not form part of the booklet sent as a New Year's present to Neaera (Gruppe, *op. cit.* 119-123; Cartault, *Tibulle*, p. 70), but was written later and expressly for the Tibullan volume. Hence it shows a large dactylic percentage in the distich (46.4%), and Ehrenguber (*op. cit.*

who apologized for composing the epistle of Sappho, the lyric poetess, in elegiac verse (*Her.* 15, 5) and also for writing the invectives of the *Ibis* (*Ib.* 45) and the loftier themes of the *Fasti* (*Fast.* II 3 ff.; VI 2) in the same metre, and who, in II 5, purposely introduced one or two minor Tibullan refinements into his own metrical schemes,<sup>27</sup> was not likely to overlook propriety and consistency in the pentameter closes which strike even the eye. We know that, in a wholly similar way, the first *Amores* were later revised both with respect to pentameter closes and to dactylic virtuosity. We conclude therefore that the second and third books of our extant codices were probably published by Ovid at the authorization of Messalla subsequent to the fourth book of Propertius and to the *Copa*, i. e. about 14-13 B. C.<sup>28</sup> The whole Appendix was therefore completed when Ovid was twenty-nine or thirty, and it contains some of his most exquisite work, which he never afterwards surpassed. It affords us also a glimpse into the family circle of Messalla and presents us with a picture of the youthful poet more attractive than we possessed before or than we should form from the *Amores* alone.<sup>29</sup>

X 5) correctly says that it is the only poem of Lygdamus (except the very short No. 2) which does not contravene Tibullan art in this respect.

<sup>27</sup> Namely, the avoidance of SD and the very free use of postponed *que*,—the latter a device, however, which at a later period is immensely common in the works published under his own name.

<sup>28</sup> Provided we assume the correctness of our present division of 'Tibullus' into three books, another theory would be possible perhaps, though extremely improbable. Baehrens (*Tib. Blätter* 53) who, like Plessis (*Poésie lat.* 369), so clearly perceived the close relation existing between the Tibullan and Vergilian Appendices, held that some grammarian of the age of Claudius had found by chance certain poems in the house of Messalla and united them into two different collections, putting into one those which reminded him of the style of Tibullus, and into the other those which were written more in Vergil's manner; "the public received favorably the matters presented under such favorite names and exercised no criticism." I hold, on the other hand, that Ovid himself published both the three posthumous elegies of Tibullus and the Tibullan Appendix; also that he prepared for publication, but suppressed, the other Appendix, a copy of which was later found in Cotta's house and published as Vergilian, see *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1921, p. 165.

<sup>29</sup> As stated above, the first edition of the *Amores* is probably not earlier than 13-11 B. C. Riese, in the fine Preface (p. vi) to his text

The Ovidian poems, whose inclusion in the volume was approved by Messalla, make as a rule no claim whatever to Tibullan authorship and are legitimately added to the volume as the work of a youthful admirer and disciple of the lamented Tibullus. A special case, however, is presented by the two poems already mentioned, namely II 5 and 3, and by IV 13. These latter are artistic 'imitations' or 'impersonations,' which assume the right to use freely the names of Tibullus and of Nemesis, and which therefore at first appear to have been actually written by Tibullus. They are in a certain sense 'forgeries' of a playful and innocent kind; their real authorship was doubtless well known within the small Messalla circle, but could not possibly have been known outside. We may properly direct our attention in the present paper chiefly to IV 13, the exquisite 'imitation' of Tibullus which has itself been imitated and admired by so many English poets.<sup>30</sup> The Tibullan authorship of this poem

of Ovid (Leipzig 1871), correctly holds, I think, that even the first Amores do not belong among the poet's early works; for after quoting the well-known passage upon "Corinna first awakening his genius" (*Trist.* 4, 10, 57 ff.), he aptly adds: "Ex quibus verbis cave ne hoc efficias, Amorum libros primos ab eo compositos esse; cum illud tantum dicere velit, gloriam se per eos primum sibi parasse." The view of Pohlenz (*De Ov. carm. amat.*, Göttingen 1913) that the first Amores appeared shortly after 19 B. C., seems to me wholly erroneous. However, if a first Amores is assumed more heavily weighed down with spondees and polysyllabic endings than I have hitherto contended for, the conjectural date may be made just as early as one pleases, except that the elegy I 14 referring to the Sygambri (B. C. 15) is shown by the 50% of spondees in its hexameters to belong to the first edition; note especially the spondaic vss. 45-49, which contain the reference!—In my former article (*Trans.* 1920, p. 147), it is possible that, in assuming the age of sixteen, I have given too early a date to the "first shaving of the beard" (*Trist.* 4, 10, 57), but in any case no one will question that Ovid was both a member of the circle of Messalla and was composing verse very freely at the age of twenty; cf. *Pont.* 2, 3, 71 f., and see Plessis, *Poésie Lat.* 422 f.; Hennig, *De Ovidii sodalibus*, Berlin 1883, p. 29.

<sup>30</sup> E. g., by Walsh, Cowley and Thomas Moore, perhaps also by Shakspere; v. Smith on IV 13, 9-12 and in *A. J. P.* XXXVII (1916), 155. Wilhelm (*Rhein. Mus.* LIX [1904] 291) also thinks that Shakspere owes to this poem the fine lines of the duke of Suffolk in Henry VI, Part II. III 2, v. 360 ff. Verses 11-12 are paraphrased by Cowley: "Thou from all shades the darkness canst exclude, | And from a desert

has been rejected in our own times by many critics, but the most weighty arguments against its authenticity have been advanced by Postgate,<sup>31</sup> who here turns aside from the purely subjective and dilettant methods which characterize his criticism of the Lygdamus poems and, employing effectively all modern helps, shows himself one of the most acute and trustworthy of Tibullan scholars. It seems worth while, however, to point out that Postgate was not the first to perceive the 'forgery'; the learned English translator, James Grainger, brought forward, in his poetical version of 1757, serious objections against the ascription of the poem to Tibullus and even proposed Ovid as the author.<sup>32</sup> The language of this piece is fully studied below and its Ovidian character shown.

banish solitude." They are also well translated by Williams: "Thou art my balm of care, in dark my day, | In wildest waste, society complete." V. 12 (. . . in solis tu mihi turba locis) is quoted CIL. 10, 378 (I. Inscr. R. N. n. 6374). Postgate's harsh judgment upon the merits of this elegy (as also in part that of Voss, Ehrengreber, and Némethy upon the *Lygdamus*, *Panegyric* and *Ciris*) is to be explained by the principle enunciated by Ellis with respect to the Elegies of Maximianus (*A. J. P.* V 6): "It has always been and it is at the present day the fashion of scholars, when denouncing a forgery, to heap abuse and ridicule on the work with which the forger has been busied." Smith (p. 517) well says: "There are beautiful lines in this poem, lines, I may add, which appear to have had a longer and more vivid tradition in English poetry than anything else in the entire Corpus Tibullianum"; cf. also Schanz § 278, p. 220 and § 281, p. 229; Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 323; Gruppe, *op. cit.* 268; Belling, *Albius Tibullus* 383. Wilhelm, *op. cit.*, speaks of them as "versus suavissimi, qui poetam in arte perfectum ostentare videntur"; Martinon also (*Tibulle*, Paris 1895, XLVII), says: "Cette pièce est peut-être le chef-d'oeuvre du poète"; cf. Hennig, *Untersuchungen zu Tib.* 16.

<sup>31</sup> *Journal of Philology* IX (1880), 280-285; *Selections*, pp. 191-199. Ehrengreber likewise, *op. cit.* IX 61, argues that the poem contains too many elisions to be genuine; on the character of these elisions, see also Hörschelmann, *Philologus* 1897, pp. 358 f.

<sup>32</sup> *Poetical Translations* II, p. 814: "Though the critics unanimously ascribed this elegy to Tibullus, yet did the translator think, that the thoughts had not that simplicity, which constitutes one of the characteristic beauties of our poet. And though Tibullus is mentioned in the poem, no argument can thence be drawn of its being the work of our poet, as in after-times, those who excelled in elegy affected to style themselves Tibullus."—P. 816: "Therefore, if Tibullus is the author, he either in this piece imitated Ovid, or the piece itself was

The six little Letters (IV 7-12) of Sulpicia, kinswoman of Messalla,<sup>33</sup> in which the lady undertakes the part of wooing the shy youth, Cerinthus, are also, as the language unmistakably shows, composed by Ovid himself,<sup>34</sup> though doubtless with the approval or consent of Sulpicia, who was naturally not averse to so obliging and so accomplished a secretary. These condensed

written by some body else, who was so fond of Tibullus, &c." Cf. also Postgate, *Selections*, p. 198: "Some member of the circle of Tibullus, an admirer both of him and of Propertius, wrote it to amuse himself or his friends, &c."

<sup>33</sup> The Greek pastorals which Messalla himself wrote upon a certain maiden or 'heroine' (*Catal.* 9, 13 f.) may possibly have suggested to Ovid the praise of Sulpicia in verse, cf. Bachrens, *Tib. Blätter* 46.

<sup>34</sup> As Gruppe (*Röm. El.* 27-64) so well pointed out, the love story of Sulpicia and Cerinthus is told in two versions, one version consisting of short letters (IV 8-12), the other of longer monologues (2-6). Many scholars in Gruppe's day wished to reject as spurious all the Sulpicia poems without exception, but Gruppe found a *via media*, generously giving up to Sulpicia the short letters, but retaining for Tibullus the longer elegies. Yet why, one may ask, should not one poet have composed both versions? (There are many 'doublets,' for example, in the Verg. App., and many in the *Metamorphoses*; cf. Schanz, § 304, p. 317.) Gruppe does not answer this question, and, with respect to one poem at least (IV 7), scholars have never been able to decide to which group it belongs! Upon this whole question, however, it will be sufficient to refer the reader to the long and ineffectual polemic of Belling (*Albius Tibullus*, 1-26) against Hennig; cf. also Hiller, *Hermes* XVIII 355. It is indeed the irony of fate that most critics should have indignantly repudiated the brilliant Lygdamus discovery of Gruppe, and have meekly accepted his erroneous Sulpicia solution. Knappe, however, (*op. cit.* 41) earnestly objects to Gruppe's ascription of these 'little letters' to Sulpicia, on the very good grounds, (1) that the amatory epistle written in verse (instead of prose) is always a literary device, (2) that Sulpicia, a modest maiden, could not possibly have used in IV 10 such obscene words as *scortum*, *toga*, &c.—The correspondences with the Sulpicia elegies which the Letters exhibited are well shown by Belling, *op. cit.*, 31-34. The judgment expressed by Heyne in his second edition (1777) upon their authorship, as reported by Cartault (*Corpus Tibull.* 69 f.), is so near the truth that it is worth quoting: "Heyne n'est pas sûr que celles même qui paraissent être de Sulpicia soient d'elle en réalité; elles peuvent avoir été faites par un poète parlant en son nom." Cartault himself, who does not like Gruppe especially well, calls Gruppe's supposed discovery "the great novelty of his book" (*op. cit.* 164, 549), and although he scarcely does full justice elsewhere to the gifted and brilliant author of the "*Römische Elegie*," he here becomes unduly favorable to him.

epigrams—necessarily a little difficult and obscure in view of their extreme brevity—are a wonderfully clever imitation of feminine psychology and foretoken the rare gift of impersonation shown in the *Heroides* and other later works. Unlike the *Heroides*, however, but wholly like the epistle of Arethusa in Propertius (IV 3), the situations and characters are not drawn from the mythical past, but from the immediate present and from real life.

From the time of Gruppe (*op. cit.* 49), of Teuffel (*Stud. u. Charakt.*, 1871, p. 366), and of Baehrens (*op. cit.* 42) these letters have been used to illustrate the theme of ‘Feminine Latinity.’<sup>35</sup> Postgate, however (*Selections*, XLI), shrewdly speaks of this whole allegation as an unfounded ‘calumny,’ and Cartault (*Corp. Tibull.* 164, 179) declares the phrase ‘Feminine Latin’ (instead of ‘colloquial Latin’) to be unjust and misleading, in spite of the great popularity which it has achieved, while Smith (*Tib.* 81) discusses the ‘feminine psychology’ of the letters at length and pays a well-deserved tribute to the cleverness of their author when he writes: “In this respect nothing in all literature could be more characteristically feminine than these elegies. Their charming author is beyond all doubt a very woman. . . . She is feminine in what she says and in the way she says it.”<sup>36</sup>

A brief word may be said in conclusion respecting the special character of the ‘imitations’ of Tibullus and Vergil which have been composed by Ovid. Famous examples of pseudonymous and anonymous publication abound in literature,—we need only mention the finding in the temple of the book of the law (Deuteronomy) ascribed to Moses 621 B. C., or the recitation of the *Hymn to Apollo* by the Homeric rhapsode who impersonated Homer and introduced into his poem certain pretended reminiscences of Homer’s life,<sup>37</sup> and, in modern times, the

<sup>35</sup> Cf. also Schanz § 284, p. 239, and Marx, Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. ‘*Albius*,’ col. 1326.

<sup>36</sup> According to Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* § 46. 12, p. 169, Hertzberg, in his review of Gruppe, at once called into question the pretended discovery of “Feminine Latinity”; see also Belling, pp. 70-72.

<sup>37</sup> This is the usual view of Homeric scholars, cf. Gilbert Murray, *Greek Lit.*, pp. 6, 53. On the whole subject of ancient “Pseudepigrapha,” see the treatment of Birt in his *Kritik u. Hermeneutik*, pp.



Rowley poems in which, by a species of dramatic masquerade, Chatterton reproduced the rich pageantry and all the curious learning of the Middle Ages. Ovid, who was almost from the first a devoted disciple of Tibullus and of Vergil, and who, according to his own account (*Trist.* IV 10, 42), worshipped these poets as superior beings, composed, for the Tibullan volume which he edited, several poems of considerable length in the name of Tibullus and, at an earlier date, three or four very short pieces in which he playfully impersonated Vergil (*Catal.* VIII and XIV; cf. I and VII).<sup>38</sup> I may call especial attention, however, to a few extenuating circumstances connected with these imitations or, as some may prefer to call them, these playful forgeries: (1) The Tibullan pieces are apparently deliberate and intentional impersonations, but emphatically not harmful

222-242 (Müller's Handbuch I, 3, München 1913), which is very excellent in spite of occasional lapses and errors, such as the total misunderstanding (p. 231) of the *Halieutica*, which belongs to Ovid's early and formative period (*Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1920, p. 163), and the genuineness of which has been so fully vindicated by Zingerle (*Abh.* II 1). Respecting the *Ciris* he speaks almost like a prophet (p. 240): Ich glaube wie Ganzenmüller, dass die *Ciris* . . . unter Ovidischem Einfluss steht"; he then goes on to cite striking Ovidianisms, such as *quid enim* (vss. 71, 190, 334, 437, 513), *illa ego sum* (409, 411, 414), &c. (Very admirable also is his discussion of the *Culex* [pp. 232 ff.]). Birt is here wholly right in his praise of Ganzenmüller's great study upon the *Ciris* ("Beiträge zur *Ciris*," *Fleckeis. Jahrb. Supplementbd.* XX [1894], pp. 553-657), which shows most clearly the close relation in which this poem stands to Ovid; yet although Ganzenmüller's facts are indisputable, his conclusions—like those of Ehrenguber and Holt-schmidt—are sometimes technically erroneous. With a view to supplementing Ganzenmüller's splendid performance, Mr. R. F. Thomason, a graduate student of the University of Tennessee, has undertaken to examine the language and phraseology of the *Ciris* in detail. His dissertation is almost completed and will be published at an early date. I myself have in preparation brief articles upon the Lygdamus elegies and the *Panegyric* which are designed to supplement the dissertations of Kleemann and of Ehrenguber.

<sup>38</sup> So far as regards Tibullus, it would be difficult to prove, I think, that Ovid has really taken greater liberties with him than Plato took with Socrates or the unknown author of the Fourth Gospel took with the "beloved disciple reclining on the Master's bosom."—The Vergilian impersonations, we have a right to assume, were composed at about the same time as the metrical arguments to the books of the *Georgics* and of the *Aeneid* (*Anth. Lat.* 1. 2 Riese), cf. *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1921, p. 153.

ones, in any sense of the word. Ovid's attitude towards Tibullus especially was generous in the extreme. (2) In these imitations we can also see that Ovid was interested in writing for the joy of writing, and cared little for the splendor of fame or wealth which the performance might bring him. Niebuhr thought him "the only Roman who attained complete facility of versification," and in no case has it ever been more true than in his that "the poet does but speak because he must; he sings but as the linnets sing." Literature was the master-passion of his life. Even Tomi could not quell his buoyant and genial spirit,<sup>39</sup> and he poured forth his copious and melodious verse to the very end.<sup>40</sup> (3) There are very many forms of literary artifice and of dramatic masquerade to be seen in his works. Thus the *Amores* profess to deal with personal experience and to celebrate an actual mistress, Corinna, but in point of fact they are almost entirely the creation of poetic fancy and of literary study.<sup>41</sup> The *Panegyric* professes (v. 122) to have been composed in 31 B. C. or very shortly afterwards, but this is a mere literary device; actually it was written many years later (cf. *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1920, p. 160). The elegy upon Messalla (*Catal.* IX) was probably written in 27 B. C. (cf. *Pont.* II 3, 79 f.), yet even of this we cannot be certain.<sup>42</sup> The *Copa* and the second part of the *Maecenas* (v. 145 ff.) are also essentially dramatic impersonations, but in their case a brief

<sup>39</sup> *Stat. Silv.* I 2, 254 nec tristis in ipsis Naso Tomis.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *Trist.* V 12, 59 nec tamen, ut verum fatear tibi, nostra teneri | A componendo carmine Musa potest. | Scribimus et scriptos absumimus igne libellos: | Exitus est studii parva favilla mei.

<sup>41</sup> The line between legitimate literary artifice and forgery is often hard to draw; cf. Chatterton's famous reply to Horace Walpole: "Thou mayst call me Cheat. | Say, didst thou ne'er indulge in such Deceit? | Who wrote Otranto?"

<sup>42</sup> Paul, the great disciple who in a certain sense exploited Jesus, never knew him "after the flesh," nor did he greatly care to learn the actual facts of his life. Ovid's case is somewhat similar. Although he enjoyed the intimate companionship of Propertius, Ponticus and Bassus, there is no evidence to show that he ever knew the modest and retiring Tibullus during his lifetime; cf. *Trist.* IV 10, 51 Vergilium vidi tantum; nec amara Tibullo | Tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae, "Unkind fate refused the time which might have made us friends." Cf. also Martinon, *Tibulle* XLVIII: "Il faut considérer qu' Ovide n'a guère connu Tibulle que par ses oeuvres"; similar is the view of Postgate, *Selections*, XVII.

explanatory introduction is provided. Many of the *Priapea* also are monologues spoken by Priapus. (4) It is universally recognized that the feigned *Epistles of the Heroines* have been developed from the exercises of the rhetorical schools; for we know that in the schools rhetorical speeches were constantly placed in the mouth of mythological and historical personages.<sup>43</sup> Hence the *Heroides* have sometimes been described as “erotic *suasoriae*, based on the declamations of the schools” (Cruwell, *Rom. Lit.* 306). Similarly the short imitation of Tibullus (IV 13) and the two short impersonations of Vergil (*Catal.* VII and XIV) may well be viewed as versified speeches and rhetorical exercises such as, in a prose form, were certainly common in the schools; for strict accuracy they need only the caption ‘*Tibullus (Vergilius) loquitur.*’ Sommer (*Catal.*, p. 68) has rightly conjectured that *Catal.* XIV was composed by an admirer of Vergil, who, “in the scholastic manner (*scholastico more*), assumed to speak in his name,” and Ribbeck (*Röm. Dicht.* II 240) thinks it possible that Ovid first treated some of the themes of the *Heroides* as prescribed exercises while he was still a pupil of the schools.<sup>44</sup> When we believe that the Sulpicia Letters and the Vergilian ‘Trifles’ are genuine, we pay a great tribute to the dramatic and artistic ability of the true author; we have in the *Latin Anthology* also fifteen epitaphs of Vergil written in the first person (II 51 ff., 59 ff. Riese), but few, I suppose, will defend their authenticity.

### III. *Previous Studies of the Sulpicia Elegies.*

In Gruppe’s day many scholars were disposed to reject as spurious all the Sulpicia poems of the fourth book without exception,<sup>45</sup> but after Gruppe came forward with his ingenious com-

<sup>43</sup> Ribbeck, *Röm. Dicht.* II 239; Schanz, *Röm. Lit.* § 297; Zingerle, *Ovid u. s. Vorgänger* I 119; K. F. Smith, *Martial and Other Essays*, 59, 72.

<sup>44</sup> Partly because of this close relation to the rhetorical schools, Riese regarded the *Heroides* as the first work of Ovid, and in his edition (Leipzig 1871) gave them their old position before the *Amores*; see his preface, p. ix. Some of them were no doubt spondaic in their earliest publication, but as a rule they have been carefully revised; they still retain, however, a few polysyllabic endings (L. Müller, *R. M.*<sup>2</sup> 29, 259), — a clear indication of their early composition.

<sup>45</sup> Heyne, in his three editions (1755, 1777, 1798), had found these

promise, retaining the 'elegies' for Tibullus and giving up, in a chivalrous and romantic way, the 'little letters' to Sulpicia herself, the defenders of the 'elegies' gained fresh courage and naturally sought to bring forward as many surface resemblances as they could find between these poems and the genuine works of Tibullus.<sup>46</sup> Acute critics, however, have not failed to note also many points of difference and of sharp divergence. Thus Ribbeck (*Röm. Dicht.* II 196), after observing that these poems "breathe the atmosphere of the city and show a sense of the elegance of the high society of Rome," adds that they are wholly "foreign to the Tibullan manner." Marx (Pauly-Wissowa, *s. v. Albius*, col. 1322) speaks briefly of "the unknown author of these elegies, who in some turns reminds us of Tibullus." Postgate (*Selections*, XXXIX) aptly remarks: "The treatment of his themes (which the poet of these elegies presents) is somewhat freer and lighter than Tibullus'; it is more impersonal, and, I had almost said, more professional. . . . We observe but very little which we might call distinctive of Tibullus." Baehrens (*Tib. Blätter* 46) attributes "these most charming pearls of Roman poetry" to a poet of the first rank and adds: "The representation is too quiet, too objective and too strictly limited to the subject in hand to be attributed to Tibullus, who is constantly subjective, constantly rambling and tossed hither and thither by conflicting feelings. . . . In the circle of Messalla there moved not merely such dilettanti as Lygdamus, the author of the *Culex*, (*Ciris*) &c., but also true poets like Ovid and others."<sup>47</sup> Sellar (*Elegiac Poets* 256)

elegies very charming, but wholly different in character from those of Tibullus, and had therefore unhesitatingly rejected Tibullan authorship; see Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 60, 69, and cf. Zingerle, *Abh.* I 22.

<sup>46</sup> See Knappe, *op. cit.*; Zingerle, *Kl. philol. Abh.* II (Innsbruck 1877), 45-90. The latter offers many statistics and minute observations, which are usually more curious than valuable.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. K. F. Smith, *Tib.* 79, on the authorship of the Sulpicia cycle: "Messalla's circle was, to say the least, exceptionally favoured, if it possessed a second elegiac poet so like Tib. in his poetical temperament and so nearly his equal in genius." With a strange forgetfulness of the facts of literary history, Crusius says (Pauly-Wissowa V 2297, *s. v. "Elegie"*): "It is not very probable that a second poet of such high and original powers has lived in the entourage of Messalla. If the verses belong to Tibullus, we should have to recognize in them a later phase of his development."

observes respecting the Sulpicia cycle: "The art is not like that of Tibullus; . . . it is the art of a poet dealing objectively and somewhat playfully with a love with which he sympathises as a spectator." References to other scholars also, such as Martinon, Fabricius, &c., who have rejected the ascription to Tibullus, may be found in Cartault, *Corpus Tibull.* 564.

An especially valuable contribution to the study of these elegies has been made by Bürger (*Hermes* XL [1905], 329 ff.), who has discussed the relation in which they stand to Propertius. In his view the elegy IV 2 shows clear imitation of the fourth book of Propertius in the three following passages: v. 14 *Vertumnus* . . . mille habet ornatus, mille *decenter* habet; cf. Prop. IV 2, 45 (*Vertumnus* speaks) nec flos ullus hiat pratis, quin ille *decenter* | impositus fronti langueat ante meae:<sup>48</sup> v. 20 proximus *Eois* colligit *Indus aquis*; cf. Prop. IV 3, 10 ustus et *Eoa* discolor *Indus aqua*:<sup>49</sup> v. 22 et *testudinea Phoebe* superbe *lyra*; cf. Prop. IV 6, 32 non ille (*Phoebus*) attulerat . . . | et *testudineae* carmen inerme *lyrae*.<sup>50</sup> Hence Bürger concludes that the composition of the Sulpicia elegies falls after Prop. IV and consequently after 15 B. C.; he says expressly (p. 332): "These poems are not by Tibullus and have first arisen after his death."<sup>51</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Ovid greatly admired this charming elegy upon *Vertumnus*, and has imitated it twice in the *Copa* (vss. 18, 22) as well as in *Met.* XIV 643 ff.

<sup>49</sup> Twice elsewhere *Ov.* imitates this same Propertian verse without the *Eoa*, but with *discolor* or the like, namely A. A. 3, 130 quos legit in viridi decolor *Indus aqua*; T. 5, 3, 24 et quascumque bibit discolor *Indus aquas*. We do not need to assume with Zingerle (*Abh.* II 84) that Prop. first imitated the Tibullan verse, and *Ov.* afterwards imitated the Propertian.

<sup>50</sup> *Testudinea lyra* occurs only in these two passages.—As Bürger fully notes, Olsen had already very carefully and methodically pointed out this relation to the fourth book of Propertius in his *Propertius und Tibull.* *Comment. Gryphiswald.*, Berlin 1887, pp. 27-32, and correctly maintained that, wherever relations exist between Propertius and Tib. IV, Propertius is the original. Belling, *op. cit.* 304 and 372, accepts the proofs of Olsen as wholly convincing, and assumes that both Prop. IV 2 and 4 became known in some way to Tibullus before their publication in book form.—Bürger is of course mistaken (p. 329) in holding that Tib. IV 2 shows 'imitation' of II 2 and was written after it; the true relation is just the opposite.

<sup>51</sup> In spite, however, of Bürger's protest (p. 328), Belling is right in

It is noteworthy also that several scholars have shown remarkable acuteness with respect to single poems of the cycle. Thus R. Richter (*De quarti libri Tib. elegiis*, Dresden 1875), though accepting the other elegies, rejects the Tibullan authorship of IV 5, on the ground of the many evident imitations of the genuine Tibullus which this piece betrays, and Hailer (*Blätter für das Gymnasial-schulwesen* XXX [1894], pp. 265-267), noticing in a very brief manner the occurrence of certain bold constructions both in the *Panegyric* and in IV 6, correctly assumed their common authorship and their dependence upon Propertius. The close relation which still another elegy, IV 3, bears to the Adonis myth, has been pointed out by Wilhelm, *Rhein. Mus.* LXI [1906], 95 ff.; cf. also Maass, *Hermes* XXIV [1889], 520 ff. Although Wilhelm does not recognize the fact, this Alexandrine trait is an evidence of spuriousness.

It is not unlikely that the Sulpicia elegies also show one or two imitations of Vergil's *Aeneid* (19 B. C.) and perhaps one of Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* (17 B. C.); see below, Part II. Postgate (*Class. Review* IX [1895], 77) unhesitatingly rejects the Tibullan authorship of the whole Sulpicia cycle; he has also justly noted (*Selections* 196) several very striking borrowings from Propertius in IV 13 (vss. 3, 4, 8). One of these likewise relates to the fourth book: v. 4 *nec formosa est oculis ulla puella meis*; cf. Prop. IV 4, 32 *et formosa oculis arma Sabina meis*.<sup>52</sup> Ovid's imitation, I may add, wholly disposes of the reading *famosa* which has been adopted here by a few editors (Phillimore, Rothstein).—Belling (*op. cit.* 29, n. 2) also points out briefly, but admirably, some of the close parallels between Lyg. 1 and IV 2; cf. also Schanz, *Röm. Litt.* § 284, p. 239.

#### IV. *The True Relation of Ovid to Tibullus.*

Since we are about to separate accurately for the first time the works of Tibullus and of Ovid, we may estimate briefly the relation in which the two poets stand to each other. Tibullus

the parallels to Tib. IV which he quotes (*op. cit.* 374, n. 1) from Ovid himself. For A. A. 3, 386 certainly echoes Tib. IV 4, 8, not Tib. 1, 4, 66, and Am. 2, 13, 15 goes back much more nearly to Tib. IV 4, 19. 20 than to Prop. 2, 28 b, 41. 42.

<sup>52</sup>Belling (*op. cit.* 373) takes the same view as Postgate, and compares also Tib. IV 14, 1 (*rumor ait*) with Prop. IV 4, 47 (*ut rumor ait*).

was scarcely a professional man of letters at all<sup>53</sup> and he had little sense (for that age) of the continuity of literature.<sup>54</sup> He did not possess the gift of rapid facility, and as Sellar (*Elegiac Poets* 236) has well observed, could be "roused to write only when under the influence of some strong attachment." He therefore composed but little, and has left only the ten elegies of the first book and the three genuine elegies of the second,—thirteen poems in all.<sup>55</sup> He cared nothing for literary fame and had certainly made no provision for his own unpublished poems. It was therefore indeed a fortunate circumstance that a thoroughly vigorous and masterful poet arose in the same circle, who collected and preserved the three unpublished elegies, generously added to them his own brilliant, though at times immature, productions, and published the whole resulting collection in permanent form. For, wholly unlike Tibullus, Ovid from earliest infancy had dreamed of literary immortality, and no poet has ever lived who had a livelier sense of the unbroken continuity of the literary tradition, or who understood better the meaning of 'pure Castalia' and of 'lovely Helicon.'<sup>56</sup> Ovid

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Jacoby, *Rhein. Mus.* LXV [1910], 72: "Er war doch schliesslich nur . . . ein Dilettant höherer Ordnung . . . Tibull ist kein Literat geworden, wie Catull, Properz, Ovid; sowenig wie er je ein Stadtmensch geworden ist, ein Grossstädter vom Typ dieser drei Dichter . . . Tibull ist mehr zufällig zu dichterischer Produktion gekommen."

<sup>54</sup> Thus when it is said (Zingerle, *Ovid u. s. Vorgänger*, I 132) that Tib. represents the genuinely Roman or nationalistic development in Roman elegy as opposed to the Grecizing tendency of Catullus, Propertius and Ovid, all that is meant—all that can be meant—is that he was solitary and unworldly, in a word, that he stood apart from the literary movement and the learned Alexandrinism of his day. He certainly cannot be the representative of a nationalistic *group* or *school*, as Hendrickson (*Class. Phil.* XII [1917], 350) and perhaps Gruppe (*op. cit.* 265) appear to think, for no such group ever existed at Rome, so far as relates at least to the treatment of the elegy or the ode. Surely Nageotte (*Litt. lat.* 376) is more nearly correct, when he speaks of Tib. as being "sans parti pris d'école et d'érudition," "without definite choice of school or learning."

<sup>55</sup> Tibullus, however, died very young. Harrington (*Proceedings Am. Phil. Ass.* 1901, p. 137) and Cartault (*Tibulle* 5) may possibly be right in placing his birth in 48 B. C. instead of the usually assumed 54 B. C. Gruppe thinks that he was born between 54 and 49, Postgate between 55 and 50.

<sup>56</sup> "Ovid," says de la Ville de Mirmont (*Jeunesse d'Ovide* 4), "is, in

again has abundant variety and a rich fancy, while Tibullus is limited to his own personal experience as the lover of simple country life, the singer of Delia and of Nemesis, the loyal friend of Messalla. He attempts no lofty flights, and his verse, though sincere and sweet, is not without a certain monotony and narrowness of range.<sup>57</sup>

Tibullus, it is true, was much admired by his own contemporaries, and the elegies which he addressed to Delia, though few in number, rank among the most perfect productions of ancient poetry. Yet we may well doubt whether his slender volume would ever have survived the ravages of time and have come down to our modern era, if Ovid had not added bulk to the collection and incorporated in it many of his own choicest works. Certain it is that the Tibullus of later literary tradition is not strictly the historical poet of the thirteen genuine elegies, but rather the double-star, Tibullus-Ovidius, that shines partly with borrowed light. Plessis (*Poésie Lat.* 376) has finely said that "Tibullus owes a part of his reputation for tenderness and sincerity to the verses of Lygdamus which long centuries have attributed to him." There can be no doubt also that a large part of Tibullus' fame is due to the charming and graceful elegies of the Sulpicia cycle,—elegies, I may add, which Ovid, in all his later work, never surpassed and seldom equalled.<sup>58</sup> The great Messalinus hymn (II 5) has even given to the pacifist poet of the age of Augustus a touch of genuine nationalism, a suggestion even of militarism and flamboyant jingoism. Not only then has Ovid in the Lygdamus elegies added to the volume of the simple-minded and unworldly Latin Rousseau a good share of this world's pomp and splendor, but the Sulpicia poems

point of time, the first of the 'men of letters.'" Cf. also Nageotte, *Litt. lat.* 380: "Mais qualités et défauts, tout est bien d'un homme qui a mordu le laurier," and Schanz § 291, p. 265: "Seine Augen waren auf den dichterischen Lorbeer gerichtet." Hence Ovid often expresses Shakspeare's thought, "much is the force of heaven-bred poesy"; cf. *A. A.* 3, 549 f.; *P.* 3, 4, 93.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. the elder Scaliger's terse characterization (*Poet.* VI 7): *uniformis ille paene totus est . . . Audis enim casas, focos, rura, nemora, praela, spicas, sacra tum saepe tum multum.*

<sup>58</sup> In praise of these elegies, see Gruppe, *op. cit.* 27, 267, and the judgments assembled by Zingerle, *Abh.* II 90.



also, as we have seen, introduce us in a romantic way to the distinguished and high-bred society of Rome.<sup>59</sup> It is true that Quintilian (10, 1, 93) pronounces Tibullus "the most finished and elegant author of Roman elegy,"<sup>60</sup> but the only actual reminiscence of 'Tibullus' in his works is drawn from one of the gay and sparkling pieces of Ovid.<sup>61</sup> It is perfectly evident then that Quintilian bestows the palm of excellence not upon the poet of the thirteen elegies (one and a half books), but upon the much more brilliant and varied Tibullus-Ovidius, whose works, in the modern codex form, comprise four books.<sup>62</sup> Similarly it is incontestable that the lines of the collection which have passed most fully into English quotation and poetry are not the lines of Tibullus at all, but those of Ovid.<sup>63</sup> It is difficult to tear apart what the long centuries have closely joined. Severe critics,—to whom alone this study is addressed,—will be able to separate Tibullus and Ovid, but the great body of general readers and casual students will doubtless always unite the two Augustan brother-poets, much as they will always associate and fuse together Socrates and Plato, Paul and Jesus, Giorgione and Titian, Raphael and Raphael's disciples.

<sup>59</sup> For love of splendor and luxury here, see esp. IV 2, 15-20; II 3, 45-52. Note also that the admirable description of Sulpicia's rich dress and of her personal charms (IV 2, 3-12) is not at all in the manner of Tibullus, who follows rather Homer's usage with respect to Helen of Troy, and never actually pictures the beauty of Delia in words, but gives only the effects produced by her beauty; cf. Smith, p. 48: "Unlike Prop., he does not revel in her beauty, he does not enumerate her single charms."

<sup>60</sup> (Elegiae) . . . tersus atque elegans maxime auctor.

<sup>61</sup> IV 2, 8 *illam* . . . componit *furtim subsequiturque decor*; cf. Quint. 1, 11, 19 unde nos non id agentes *furtim decor* ille centibus traditus *prosequatur*.

<sup>62</sup> Ullrich, *Stud. Tib.* 68, n. 2, states just the opposite of the actual facts here. Nor am I wholly sure that when Seneca (*N. Q.* 4, 2, 2) quotes the verse Tib. 1, 7, 26 and attributes it to Ovid, the wrong ascription is entirely due to accident. Seneca may still have known that a large part of the collection was the work of Ovid, though he makes the mistake of attributing to him a verse which is found in the first book.

<sup>63</sup> Thus Shakspeare's "At lovers' perjuries, | They say, Jove laughs" = Lyg. 6, 49; often quoted is 'traitress, but though traitress, still beloved' (Lyg. 6, 56 'perfida sed, quamvis perfida, cara tamen'), cf. K. F. Smith, *A. J. P.* XXXVII 151; the famous verses IV 13, 9-12 have already been mentioned above (p. 12, n. 30).

Taking it by and large Ovid was scarcely more the disciple of Tibullus than he was of Catullus, Calvus, Cinna, Valgius Rufus, Vergil, Lucretius, Propertius, Eratosthenes, Callimachus and a score of other Roman and Alexandrian poets, each one of whom he sincerely worshipped.<sup>64</sup> For in truth, with the sensuous temperament of a Correggio, but the imitative genius of a Raphael, he holds out his hands in eager, generous admiration towards all that was great and fine in the poetic art both of Rome and of Alexandria.<sup>65</sup> Yet it is evident both from the epicedion (*Am.* 3, 9) and from other poems that he regarded himself as a follower in some special sense of the 'refined Tibullus,' and recognized in him the supreme artist who first brought Roman elegy to perfection.<sup>66</sup> For just as Raphael, the assimilator of so many styles, the 'sedulous ape' of so many great painters, derived the lovely type of the Umbrian Madonna from Perugino, the teacher of his youth, so it is undoubtedly true that Ovid took from Tibullus as his master certain precious refinements of his art, which in their origin are partly Roman

<sup>64</sup> *T.* 4, 10, 41 temporis illius colui fovique poetas, | quotque aderant vates, rebar adesse deos; 5, 3, 55. See S. G. Owen's eloquent tribute, *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., s. v. "Ovid," XX p. 388: "He heartily admires everything in literature, Greek or Roman, that had any merit. . . . It is by him, not by Vergil or Horace, that Lucretius is first named and his sublimity is first acknowledged. The image of Catullus that most haunts the imagination is that of the poet who died so early, 'hedera juvenalia cinctus Tempora,' &c." Mackail also (*Lat. Lit.* 136) speaks of "his genuine love of literature and admiration for genius, unmingled in his case with the slightest traces of literary jealousy."

<sup>65</sup> Zingerle (*Ovid* I 133) describes him as "a poetic eclectic to a certain extent," and speaks both of his original qualities and of his "correct feeling (*Takt*) in his imitations" (I 135). He sums up (II 113): "Ovid has thoroughly well understood how to appropriate from all his predecessors and to make his own that which suited the character of his own poetry"; cf. Ganzenmüller, *Philologus* LXX 276. Nageotte, who devoted much study to Ovid and is one of the best critics of his works, gives a favorable but just estimate at this point (*Litt. lat.* 380): "Même en imitant il est déjà lui-même, il a sa marque. . . . Il a beau emprunter de Propertius des tournures, des formes de style, des sujets d'élegie; il a beau savoir Tibulle presque par coeur, sa Muse est comme Iris qui dans sa course aérienne se nuance des mille reflets de la lumière sans cesser d'être belle et déesse."

<sup>66</sup> Tibullus is the perfecter of Roman elegy (Zingerle, *Ovid* I 54); Tibullus and Ovid are the principal stages of the elegy (Gruppe I 387).

and partly Greek, namely, the requirement of the dactyl in the first foot, the dissyllabic close, the unity of the distich, the avoidance of elision, the light and rapid movement of the dactylic virtuosity. This obligation he has more than repaid and has done all for Tibullus that the most devoted and most self-abnegating follower could do. Thus he tells us that, like the Penelope of Homer, the Nemesis of Tibullus shall possess undying fame (*Am.* 3, 9, 31), but with rare self-effacement he does not tell us that he has himself composed a full half of the Nemesis book. If we consider then only the beautiful and touching epicedion (*Am.* 3, 9) and the gift of the two wonderfully brilliant elegies, II 5 and IV 13,—neither of them wholly free from minor faults, it is true, yet both of them, in many features of power and interest, far surpassing much of the work of Tibullus himself—we must freely admit that they constitute one of the noblest and most generous tributes that a grateful poet has ever paid to the memory of an admired and honored predecessor. In the happy Elysian valley, where, with pure draughts of Lethean water, the ‘etherial sense’ is cleansed from every earthly stain and where the brother-poets, Calvus and Catullus, Cinna and Valgius, sweet ‘singers of Euphorion,’ ivy-wreathed and laurel-crowned immortals, wander hand in hand together,<sup>67</sup> there surely Tibullus also, the perfecter of the elegy, and Ovid, the disciple who was greater than his master, will meet in congenial fellowship, and, amid the strains of Orphean music and ‘words that are few but tuneful sweet,’<sup>68</sup> will calm and assuage the poet’s unsatisfied and infinite longing, which even the fairest symbols of earth can but feebly and dimly express,—iure suas requiescere Musas | Et leviter blandum poterunt deponere amorem.<sup>69</sup>

R. S. RADFORD.

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. *Am.* 3, 9, 62.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Dante, *Inferno*, IV 114 (Of the dwellers in the ‘Castle of Fame’) ‘parlavan rado con voci soavi.’

<sup>69</sup> Cp. *Ciris* 11.