
Rosetta

Pappas, V. (2016); 'Variety in Tibullus 1.2'

Rosetta **18**: 48 – 64

<http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/issue18/Pappas.pdf>

Variety in Tibullus 1.2

Vasileios Pappas

Abstract

This paper researches Tibullus 1.2, a *paraclausithyron* poem. It looks at the poet's technique of generic deception, the poem's setting, the identity of the person whom Tibullus asks to pour wine, and it analyses the similarities between this elegy and Tibullus 1.5, Propertius 4.9. and Ovid *Amores* 1.6. Furthermore, it underlines the role of women in Tibullus 1.2 (especially the persona of Venus). Finally, it deals with the hidden discourse about poetics at the end of the elegy.

Introduction

Tibullus 1.2 is an elegy full of thematic diversities and similarities which exist in the poem itself and in comparison with other elegies of Tibullus and of other elegiac poets. The main purpose of this paper is to reveal and interpret this poetic game of Tibullus, namely the element of variety in this elegy.

It is commonly accepted that Tibullus 1.2 is Tibullus' first variation of the *paraclausithyron* theme (or *komos*, according to Cairns),¹ namely the song of the *exclusus amator* in front of his mistress' door.² His second *paraclausithyron* is the elegy 1.5,³ and according to some scholars, his third elegy with the same theme is 2.6.⁴ All the features of this genre are present here: much wine,⁵ the

¹ Cairns 2007²: 8.

² For the *paraclausithyron* as a literary theme, see Mirmont 1909: 573-576; Canter 1920: 355-368; Burck 1932: 186-200; Copley 1956; Cummings 1996. For specific *paraclausithyra*, see Hardy 1923: 263-264; Copley 1939: 335-349, 1942: 96-107; Vretska 1955: 20-46; Anderson 1964: 1-12; Yardley 1978: 19-34; Lateiner 1978: 188-196; Watson 1982: 92-102; Yardley 1987: 179-189; Greene 1994: 344-350; Lee-Stecum 1998: 72-100; Laigneau 2000: 317-326; Vaiopoulos 2009: 77-128, 2010: 153-172; Frangoulidis 2013: 267-281.

³ For this poem, see Copley 1956: 107-112; Vretska 1963: 295-321.

⁴ See Cairns 1979: 183-85; Veremans 1987: 68-86; Murgatroyd 1989: 134-142.

⁵ Tib. 1.2.1: *merum vinoque*, 3: *multo...baccho*.

custos,⁶ the door,⁷ other obstacles of love,⁸ *furtivus amor*,⁹ the rich rival-husband of the elegiac *puella*,¹⁰ the poor and rustic poet-lover¹¹ and the garlands.¹²

The poet begins his narration *in medias res*. But, as Maltby noted, there is a connection between 1.1 and 1.2: 'the theme of *militia amoris* with which the first poem ended'.¹³ Tibullus is drunk and refers to a drinking companion, to a cupbearer or to himself in the imperative. He is either at a symposium or outside Delia's door. (1-4).¹⁴ Verses 4-5 demonstrate that we are dealing with a *paraclausithyron*, which begins from verse 5 and ends at verse 80. In this section, the protagonists of the poem are Venus – the deity who helps the secret lovers – and a *saga*, who can help Tibullus conceal his *furtivus amor* towards Delia via magic. Tibullus states in the *paraclausithyron* his condemnation of Delia's rich lover or husband, and his classical preference for a rustic life with his mistress.¹⁵ In the next part of the poem (81-88), Tibullus declares that he is now before Venus' temple acting like an *exclusus amator* to her door. The poem ends (89-100) in a ring composition form as Tibullus addresses a friend or his drinking companion, again in the imperative. Simultaneously, in the last couplet (99-100), Tibullus begs Venus to feel sorry for him and to remember that he has always been dedicated to her. Thus, he reminds the reader of her presence and her important role as the main character of the poem, who in the first instance is the great ally of the poet, but afterwards acts like a *dura domina*.

⁶ Tib. 1.2.5: *custodia*, 15: *custodes*.

⁷ Tib. 1.2.6: *dura ianua*, 7, 9: *ianua*, 17: *limina*, 18: *fores*, 86: *liminibus*.

⁸ For the dangers of the night, see Tib. 1.2.24: *obscura nocte, tenebris*, 30: *insidias*. For the bad weather which terrifies the lover, see Tib. 1.2.31: *hibernae frigora noctis*, 32: *multa...imber aqua*.

⁹ Tib. 1.2.10: *furtim*, 19: *furtim*, 36: *furta*.

¹⁰ Tib. 1.2.67-72 and 77-80.

¹¹ Tib. 1.2.73-76.

¹² Tib. 1.2.14: *florida sarta*, 84: *sartaque*.

¹³ Maltby 2002: 153. For the continuity between Tib. 1.1 and 1.2, see also Bright 1978: 134-135.

¹⁴ There is much discussion among scholars about the identity of the person to whom Tibullus refers, and about this elegy's setting. See Putnam 1973: 61-62; Bright 1978: 137; Murgatroyd 1980: 71-74; Ball 1983: 37; Lee-Stecum 1998: 72-73; Maltby 2002: 152.

¹⁵ Tzounakas 2006: 111-128.

Tibullus 1.2 and 1.5

It is true that the resemblance between Tib. 1.2 and 1.5 is very striking.¹⁶ Firstly, characters derived from Comedy exist in these two elegies: the *saga* of 1.2¹⁷ who corresponds to the old witch,¹⁸ the *dives amator*¹⁹ and the *custos* of 1.2 identify perfectly with the *lena* of 1.5.²⁰ The purifying process is almost the same.²¹ Wine is necessary for the poet-lover in both cases,²² and Venus plays an important role in both poems.²³ The door dominates in both elegies²⁴ as well as the feature of *furtivus amor*.²⁵ The first verses of both elegies are marked by military language.²⁶ Tibullus often appears as a *praeceptor amoris* in his elegies.²⁷ In 1.2 and 1.5 the poet-lover also has this dimension, as shown by the advice that he offers to his *domina* and the *dives amator* respectively.²⁸ Furthermore, scholars have pointed out the common form of ring composition in these two elegies.²⁹

It seems that Tibullus' purpose is to make a thematic link between his two *paraclausithyra*. The poet wishes to underline the similarities that exist in these two elegies and, simultaneously, to make his reader reveal their hidden diversities. Thus, Tibullus highlights the important feature of variety among these two elegies.

¹⁶ Copley 1956: 111-112.

¹⁷ Cf. Tib. 1.2.43-44.

¹⁸ Cf. Tib. 1.5.12.

¹⁹ Cf. Tib. 1.2.67-80, and 1.5.47.

²⁰ Cf. 1.2.5: 1.2.15, and 1.5.48.

²¹ Cf. Tib. 1.2.63-64, and 1.5.11-12.

²² Cf. Tib. 1.2.1-4, and 1.5.37-38.

²³ Cf. Tib. 1.2.16, 1.2.99, 1.5.40, and 1.5.58.

²⁴ Cf. Tib. 1.2.5-10, 1.5.67-68, and 1.5.74.

²⁵ Cf. 1.2.9-10, 1.2.191, and 1.5.7, 1.5.65, 1.5.75.

²⁶ Cf. Tib. 1.2.1-6, and 1.5.1-2. For these passages see Bright 1978: 154-155, and 135-136 respectively; Lee-Stecum 1998: 156-157 and 74-75 respectively.

²⁷ Bright 1978: 135; Maltby 2009: 280-81.

²⁸ Tib. 1.2.15-16 – 59-60, and Tib. 1.5.69-76.

²⁹ Ball 1983: 89; Shea 1998: 18.

Tibullus 1.2, Propertius 4.9 and Ovid *Amores* 1.6

There are also many similarities between this poem and two other *paraclausithyra*, namely Prop. 4.9 and Ov. *Am.* 1.6. Many critics have noted that Propertius' aetiological poem would be considered as a *paraclausithyron*, where Hercules becomes an *exclusus amator* before the door of the *Bona Dea*.³⁰ This reading considers humour and political or religious parody to be main purposes of the poet. In elegy 1.2 Tibullus is suddenly located at Venus' temple (81-88), he is afraid that he violated its sanctity and acts like a genuine *exclusus amator* (87-88).³¹ Tibullus and Hercules sing their *paraclausithyra* towards two female deities (Venus and *Bona Dea* respectively) with many doses of irony and parody of the character of *exclusus amator* itself. However, Tibullus' lover acts like Venus' suppliant, but Hercules destroys *Bona Dea's* temple.

Also, it is commonly accepted that Ovid's *paraclausithyron* (*Am.* 1.6) owes much to Tibullus 1.2.³² The doors and the masters of these two elegies are cruel.³³ Jupiter with his thunderbolt is present in both poems.³⁴ The role of erotic deities, namely Venus and her son, Cupid (in *Am.* 1.6), is of great importance too: these two gods can transform the frightened poets to fearless lovers, who defy the unfriendly weather or the dangers of the night.³⁵ In both poems (and at Prop. 1.16.36-44), the poet-lover reminds his *impedimenta amoris* of the previous favours he offered to them.³⁶

Also, I believe that Tibullus here seeks to parody the hymns towards deities (*Gebetsparodie*). For that reason he uses the second person of the personal pronoun (*Du Stil*) for the apostrophe to the door and the anaphoric *ille* when he

³⁰ Anderson 1964: 1-12; McParland 1970: 349-355; Holleman 1977: 79-92; Pinotti 1977: 50-71; Warden 1982: 228-242; Anderson 1992: 96-103; Cairns 1992: 65-95; Kennedy 1993: 18-21; Janan 1998: 65-77; Lindheim 1998: 43-66; Fox 1999: 157-76; McDonough 1999: 464-477; Spencer 2001: 259-284.

³¹ Cf. Tib. 1.2.87-88.

³² On the effect of Tibullus in Ovid's poem, see Copley 1956: 131 and n. 14; Bright 1978: 138.

³³ Cf. Tib. 1.2.7, and 1.6.2.

³⁴ Cf. Tib. 1.2.8, and Ov. *Am.* 1.6.16.

³⁵ Cf. Tib. 1.2.16-16-42, 81-88, and Ov. *Am.* 1.6.9-14.

³⁶ Cf. Tib. 1.2. 13-14, and Ov. *Am.* 1.6.19-20.

refers to Venus.³⁷ Ovid imitates Tibullus' technique in referring to the *ianitor* of *Am.* 1.6 like a god; many scholars have noted that Ovid's specific poem might be interpreted as a parody of a hymn.³⁸

Deceptive diversities: two *paraclausithyra* in one symposiac poem

Cairns and Musurillo have long since detected Tibullus' trend to surprise and deceive his reader.³⁹ This Hellenistic technique, mostly of generic deception, takes place in our poem also, as it starts like a symposiac poem (1-4), but at the next couplet (5-6) we understand that it is a *paraclausithyron*. Tibullus innovates further; he combines the address to both the door (7-14) and his mistress (15-16). It is true that the direct address to his *domina* is unusual (15-16) for this kind of song.⁴⁰ In 1.2 Tibullus applies another narrative practice; like 1.5, he places 'similar images in different contexts and in different perspectives'.⁴¹ Thus, on one hand, Venus is the patroness of lovers and especially Tibullus' (16-34). However, if her secrets are betrayed,⁴² she becomes a punisher (35-42), who requires supplications in order to forgive the insults made against her (81-88). Along with this deity, a dark figure exists: a *saga*, which, by means of magic, can upset the natural order of the world (43-58). This *persona* helps our poet-lover, as she may make Delia's husband (or companion) not believe his eyes, even if he sees Tibullus in bed with his sweetheart (57-58). Thus, we deduce that while for Venus a basic elegiac ingredient (the *furtivus amor*) is a prerequisite for all the erotic relationships (36, 81-88), for *saga* is the absolute privilege for our poet-lover. Consequently, this dark figure (present in other elegies as well)⁴³ offers to Tibullus the main feature

³⁷ For this technique see Norden 1913: 143-166. See Tib. 1.2.7, 8, 11, 13-14, 17, 19, 20, 21.

³⁸ Yardley 1978: 31-34; Watson 1982: 92-102; Laigneau 2000: 321.

³⁹ Musurillo 1970: 398; Cairns 1979: 166-191.

⁴⁰ Bright 1978: 138.

⁴¹ Shea 1998: 48.

⁴² This is a hint with mythological allusions. As Lee-Stecum 1998: 84, declares: 'The reference to Venus' desire for secrecy suggests the mythologically renowned anger of a goddess when mortals see (or know) what they should not'.

⁴³ Cf. Prop. 1.1, Ov. *Am.* 1.8, and 1.14.

of elegiac love, the secret love. With her help our poet may be a genuine elegiac poet-lover.

As indicated above, scholars disagree on the identity of the person whom Tibullus asks to pour wine and on the setting of this elegy.⁴⁴ Ball briefly summarises the main critical theories about this subject: the second person whom Tibullus is addressing might be a cup-boy, a fellow drinker, or even himself. By his argumentation, which is based on parallel texts of Catullus, Horace and Tibullus himself; he concludes that this person must be Tibullus' fellow drinker and that the setting of the elegy is probably a drinking-party.⁴⁵ Perhaps Ball's theory is justified by Tibullus' technique to combine the poetic genres and to deceive the reader.⁴⁶

In Tib. 1.2 we are located at a symposium, as it is indicated by the ring composition form of this elegy (with the apostrophes to Tibullus' drinking fellow in 1-4 and 89-98). However, this symposiac poem is actually a frame which includes – by the technique of the boxed narrative – not only one *paraclausithyron*, but two: one towards Delia (15-80), and one towards Venus (81-88). Delia's *paraclausithyron* includes various themes: the praise of Venus (17-32); the appeal not to disclose Venus' secrets (35-42); the extensive reference to the *saga* and her magic power (43-66); the condemnation of the *dives amator* (67-72 and 77-80), which concludes Tibullus' desire to live in his Arcadia with Delia (73-76). The second *paraclausithyron* has Venus as its recipient and many features of the genre: lover's fear for the *dura domina*, his pleas, the door, the kisses on it and the garlands. The vocabulary is that which is used to the song of the *exclusus amator*: *serta* (84), *oscula liminibus* (86), *supplex* (87), *miserum* (88).

Therefore, Tibullus' 1.2 concludes two *paraclausithyra* and many different themes. However, there are many linguistic indicators in the text serving as junctions in this *variatio* and contributing to the poem's unity. Tibullus presents

⁴⁴ See p. 2 and n. 14 of this paper.

⁴⁵ Ball 1983: 36-38. However, Murgatroyd 1980: 71, believes that 'the most obvious and natural setting is before the door'.

⁴⁶ Cairns 1979: 166-168.

himself like a suppliant to both *paraclausithyra*: to Delia's door (14: '*supplice*') and to Venus' temple (87: '*supplex*'). Venus' name itself is referred to six times, from the beginning to the end of the poem (16, 36, 42, 81, 92, and 99), a fact that shows that she is the main protagonist of the elegy. On the contrary, Delia's name is referred to only three times (15, 33, and 73: 'Delia'); that proves that Tibullus' sweetheart plays a more insignificant role in comparison with the deity. If we suppose that '*ille fereus*' of 67 is Delia's husband (or companion), then he is referred to two times (43: '*coniunx tuus*', and 67-72, 77-80). It seems that there is a connection between *saga*'s (43-66) and *dives amator*'s discourses (67-72 and 77-80). However, Miller has suggested another two solutions for the *persona* of 67-72 and 77-80: the other man might be another rival, a *dives amator* or Tibullus himself, as we know that he was a wealthy equestrian who followed his patron Messalla on campaign.⁴⁷ Finally, the declaration of Tibullus in Delia's *paraclausithyron* that a babbling man (41: '*quicumque loquax*') must be afraid of Venus' vengeance, coincides with his fear expressed in Venus' *paraclausithyron* that his impious tone might insult the deity and bring him punishment (82: '*et mea nunc poenas in pia lingua luit?*').

In our elegy, the poet mixes the types of the symposiac poem and the *exclusus amator*'s song to provide the reader with two *paraclausithyra*. Consequently, he combines two different genres and creates one poem with unity.

Women in Tibullus 1.2

Tibullus' 1.2 is a poem dedicated to women and their powers: Delia (by the power of her door), Venus, *saga*, *Medea* (53) and *Hecate* (54). Men are marginalised (54: '*custodia*', 43: '*coniunx*', and the *dives amator* in 67-72 and 77-80). Venus is the recipient of the second *paraclausithyron* and simultaneously the protagonist of the whole poem. She can be a faithful helper but, if betrayed, she would be a tremendous avenger like a mortal woman. Delia is a pathetic figure: she must listen to Tibullus' advice, but at the same time she may be unfaithful to him. Thus, he feels the need to convince her that, if she has other lovers except our poet, her husband will be well informed about her

⁴⁷ Miller 2002: 64.

infidelities (59-60). *Saga*, who is a master in black magic and the secrets of dark deities and mythological figures such as *Medea* and *Hecate*, works as Venus' assistant in case of the revelation of the goddess' secret plans (43-44). With her spells, she can bring together the two lovers without any fear, but simultaneously (by magic again) she can make Tibullus stop loving Delia. In this elegy, Tibullus presents women as powerful creatures, who can be transformed into helpers or punishers. After all, it was an established concept in Latin literature that women were fickle.⁴⁸

Tibullus presents himself as a powerless human being who is controlled by powerful women. He presents himself as a scared man, who adopts moody and controversial behaviour; at one moment, he threatens the door (7-8), but immediately after that he apologises for his behaviour (11-12). Moreover, he appears to be a daring lover, inasmuch as he has Venus' help (25-32), while he expresses his fear for the possible punishment of Venus (81-88, 99-100). He needs the help of a powerful *saga*, who is 'the very antithesis of the bright and serene goddess Venus'.⁴⁹ He advises his sweetheart as an original *praeceptor amoris*, but he simultaneously admits that he depends on a sign of her finger (34). Tibullus looks like he cannot adopt one stable behaviour and, as Lee-Stecum declares: 'the text suggests that the poet/lover is powerless to control the course of the poem'.⁵⁰

Feminist scholars interpreted elegists' attitude to women as a trend to identify their mistress with a specific social class of emancipated and powerful women in contemporary Roman society.⁵¹ Hallett expressed the view that 'by having women control them, [Tibullus and Propertius] are sharply reversing social reality'.⁵² Wyke declared that: 'it is not the concern of elegiac poetry to upgrade the political position of women, only to portray the male narrator as alienated from positions of power and to differentiate him from other, socially responsible

⁴⁸ Cf. the unsettled behavior of Lesbia towards Catullus, and the '*versuta Corinna*' of *Ov. Am.* 2.19.9.

⁴⁹ Shea 1998: 18.

⁵⁰ Lee-Stecum 1998: 78.

⁵¹ See, for example, Lilja 1965: 37-41.

⁵² Hallett 1973: 113.

male types'.⁵³ Also, Tibullus' attitude towards women in this elegy can be interpreted as a reaction to warfare (against other nations or civil), as his aversion to war and politics in general is evident – an attitude common in other elegies as well.⁵⁴

I do not believe that in this elegy Tibullus is concerned with politics or the social status of male and female genders. I think that he represents women sometimes as tender, other times as powerful, evil and fickle creatures, as he has a dual purpose: a) to cause humour and parody, by telling his reader that a *paraclausithyron* song needs a little divine help and magic to succeed and b) to reinforce his narrative technique of surprise and deception. After all, the poet is the powerful author, who controls his poetic *personae* and he represents them as he wishes.⁵⁵ In 1.2 he acts like that because he intends to make a complex poem characterised by the feature of *variatio*, an element that penetrates in the whole poem and, finally, it contributes to its unity.

Tibullus' self-contradiction

Thus, we could say that Tibullus' 1.2 is a poem characterised by variety: in the context of a symposiac poem we have two *paraclausithyra* dedicated to different recipients, variant feminine *personae* who dominate the whole poem (Delia, *saga* and especially Venus) and three shadowy masculine characters (*custos*, *coniunx* and Tibullus' fellow drinker at the beginning and at the end of the poem). But above all, the powerful narrator dominates. His voice (the lyrical *ego*) is everywhere in the poem: he (as a *praeceptor amoris*) describes the stance of Venus towards lovers and especially him; he deals with *saga*'s qualities and help to himself; he condemns *dives amator*'s attitude towards his sweetheart; he addresses his friend. Although at the first sight he gives the impression that he cannot control his poem's course, he is actually an omniscient narrator.

⁵³ Wyke 1989: 42.

⁵⁴ Cf. Tib. 1.1 and 1.10.

⁵⁵ For the representation in literature, see Weitz 1969: 213-224; Lamarque – Haugom 1994.

Tibullus also contradicts himself. He declares that a babbling man who will reveal Venus's secrets will be punished by the goddess. But since this published poem is accessible to a broader readership (Messalla's circle), the poet becomes a *loquax* man himself. By this method, the poet reveals to the reader the elegiac 'game' and his poetic self-consciousness.⁵⁶

Variety does not exist only into this elegy; Tibullus expresses a different opinion about *inertia* in 1.2 in comparison with that he expressed in elegy 1.1, which is programmatic.⁵⁷ There, he declares that his wish is to live a quiet life, a life of inaction and to just be a *miles amoris*. He condemns the urban way of life, wealth, and campaigns. He wants to live an Epicurean life as a farmer together with his Delia.⁵⁸ In our poem, Tibullus says that Venus helps only the adventurous and active lovers. In 1.1 the political or military *inertia* (or *otium*), which 'is stigmatized because it symbolizes the opposite of the virtues possessed by the ideal Roman farmer-soldier',⁵⁹ is something desirable. In 1.2 the characteristic of *negotium* is necessary for a successful lover. Thus, Tibullus sets on an amatory context a traditional Roman political belief and now he adopts it – although in the previous poem he rejected it. In this way he combines two concepts that were incompatible for the Romans – politics and love – and he parodies the politics of his era.⁶⁰

Poetics in Tibullus 1.2

Finally, I believe that a short reference to *saga*'s part of the poem is actually a hidden discourse of poetics. In verses 61-64, Tibullus says that this witch can make him stop loving Delia (61-62: '*dixit amores...solvere posse meos*'). We know that '*amores*' could be interpreted as love poems. After all, *Amores* was the title of the elegiac collections of Gallus and Ovid. It is my opinion that here Tibullus reveals again the elegiac code to his reader; he presents an imaginary *persona* of his poem in order to make him stop writing erotic verses for his

⁵⁶ Lee-Stecum 1998: 85-86.

⁵⁷ Cairns 1979: 11-13; Lee-Stecum 1998: 67-71; Maltby 2002: 116.

⁵⁸ Tib. 1.1.5, 57-58, and 71-72:

⁵⁹ Miller 2002: 62.

⁶⁰ Lee-Stecum 1998: 81-82; Maltby 2002: 161; Miller 2002: 62; Wray 2003: 224-227;.

scripta puella,⁶¹ consequently to stop writing erotic poetry in general. Simultaneously, he reveals himself as a powerful director of this poem and of elegiac genre in general.

As I have stated, the setting of this elegy is probably a drinking party, where Tibullus addresses one of his fellow drinkers (89-98). The poet ends this poem with advice to the same or to another friend who is present at this symposium. He warns him not to laugh at his suffering, because Venus might be cruel to him too. As an *exemplum* to avoid, he talks about an old man who fell in love and started to care about his appearance and to beg his sweetheart's maid to mediate with her for him. In these verses we could detect a hidden poetology as well as an attack on one of Tibullus' poetic rivals, who started his career by writing 'serious' genres (*epos* or historiography) and in old age undertook to write love poetry. There are linguistic indicators for that: the old man who at first mocked the juvenile '*amores*' (91), now himself writes sweet words (93: '*blanditias*') that is elegiac erotic poems, which he pronounces with a trembling voice (93: '*tremula...voce*'). In his poems he uses a typical *persona* of the elegiac genre that is the *ancilla*, in order to convince her *domina* to love him back (96). He, who perhaps in the past wrote for heroes and brave military deeds, using for that purpose a suitable vocabulary (92: '*vinculis subdere colla*'), is now a captive of Venus (that is erotic poetry) and wanders for his love to the traditional setting of the Roman political life (96: '*foro*').

In contradiction to this ridiculous figure, Tibullus closes his poem with a last appeal to Venus (99-110) to spare him, who was always a devote servant of her (99-100),⁶² and not her late follower, like the old man. She must not burn his love, 'a crop which she herself has sown'.⁶³ In other words, Tibullus closes this elegy with a wish: to not stop writing elegiac poetry.

⁶¹ Wyke 1987: 47-61.

⁶² Tib. 1.2.99-100:.

⁶³ Shea 1998: 18.

Conclusions

Consequently, I believe that Tib. 1.2 is an elegy which is full of variety; this poem has a lot in common with other elegiac poems, such as Tib. 1.5, Prop. 4.9 and Ov. *Am.* 1.6. Simultaneously, it has many contradictions in itself and with the former poem (1.1) of Tibullus' elegiac collection. The poet harmoniously combines in one poem divergent genres to produce two *paraclausithyra* in a symposiac context. Also, he describes different dimensions of the same characters (women) deceiving his readership. Finally, he makes a hidden discourse about poetics, revealing some elements of the elegiac game.

Bibliography

- Anderson, W.S. 1992. 'The Limits of Genre', in K. Galinsky (ed.) *The Interpretation of Roman Poetry: Empiricism or Hermeneutics?*. Frankfurt-am-Main, Bern, New York, Paris: Peter Lang, 96-103.
- Ball, R.J. 1983. *Tibullus the Elegist. A Critical Survey*. (Hypomnemata, 77). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bright, D.F. 1978. *Haec mihi fingebam: Tibullus in his world*. Leiden: Brill.
- Burck, E. 1932. 'Das Paraklausithyron', *Hum. Gymnasium* 43, 186-200.
- Cairns, Fr. 1979. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cairns, Fr. 1992. 'Propertius 4.9: 'Hercules Exclusus' and the Dimensions of Genre', in K. Galinsky (ed.) *The Interpretation of Roman Poetry: Empiricism or Hermeneutics?*. Frankfurt-am-Main, Bern, New York, Paris: Peter Lang, 65-95.
- Cairns, Fr. 2007². *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Michigan Classical Press.
- Canter H.V. 1920. 'The Paraclausithyron as a Literary Theme', *AJPh* 41, 355-368.
- Copley, F.O. 1939. 'A Paraclausithyron from Pompeii', *AJPh* 60, 335-349.
- Copley, F.O. 1956. *Exclusus amator. A study in Latin Love Poetry*. (Amer. Phil. Assoc. Philol. Monogr. 17). Madison.
- Cummings M.S. 1996. *Observations on the Development and Code of the Pre-elegiac Paraclausithyron* (Ph.D. dissertation). University of Ottawa).
- Fox, M. 1999. 'Propertius 4.9 and the Toils of Historicism', *MD* 43, 157-176.

- Frangoulidis, St. 2013. 'Transformations of Paraclausithyron in Plautus' Curculio', in Th.D. Papanghelis, St.J. Harrison and St. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature, Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes 20*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 267-281.
- Greene, E. 1994. 'Sexual Politics in Ovid' s *Amores* 3.4, 3.8 and 3.12', *CPh* 89, 344-350.
- Hallett, J. 1973. 'The Role of Women in Roman Elegy', *Arethusa* 6, 103-124.
- Hardy, W.G. 1923. 'On Ovid *Am.* 2.19 and 3.4', *CPh* 18, 263-264.
- Holleman, A.W.J. 1977. 'Propertius IV.9: An Augustan View of Roman Religion', *RBPh* 55.1, 79-92.
- Janan, M. 1998. 'Refashioning Hercules: Propertius 4.9', *Helios* 25 (1998), 65-77.
- Kennedy, D. 1993. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laigneau, S. 2000. 'Ovide, *Amores* 1.6: un paraclausithyron très ovidien', *Latomus* 59, 317-326.
- Lamarque P. - Haugom O. 1994. *Truth, Fiction, and Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lateiner, D. 1978. 'Ovid's homage to Callimachus and Alexandrian poetic theory (*Am.* ii 19)', *Hermes* 106, 188-196.
- Lee-Stecum, P. 1998. *Powerplay in Tibullus: reading Elegies Book One*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lilja, S. 1965. *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women*. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennicae.

- Lindheim, S. 1998. 'Hercules Cross-Dressed, Hercules Undressed: Unmasking the Construction of the Propertian *Amator* in Elegy 4.9', *AJP* 119, 43-66.
- Maltby, R. 2002. *Tibullus: Elegies Text, introduction and commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maltby, R. 2009. 'Tibullus and Ovid', in P.E. Knox (ed.), *A Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough, Chr. 1999. 'Forbidden to Enter the Ara Maxima: Dogs and Flies or Dogflies?', *Mnemosyne* 52, 464-477.
- McParland, E. 1970. 'Propertius 4.9', *TAPA* 101 (1970), 349-355.
- Miller, P.A. 2002. 'Tibullus', in B.K. Gold (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. Maiden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 60-67.
- Mirmont De La Ville. 1909. 'Le παρακλαυσίθυρον dans la littérature latine', in *Philologie et Linguistique. Mélanges Offerts à Louis Havet*. Paris, 573-576.
- Murgatroyd, P. 1980. *Tibullus I: A commentary on the first book of the elegies of Albius Tibullus*. Pietermaritz: University of Natal Press.
- Murgatroyd, P. 1989. 'The Genre and Unity of Tibullus 2.6', *Phoenix* 43.2, 134-142.
- Musurillo, H. 1970. "The structure of Tibullus 1.5", *TAPhA* 101, 387-399.
- Norden, E. 1913. *Agnostos theos. Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Pinotti, P. 1977. "Properzio IV.9: Alessandrinismo e arte allusiva", *GIF* 8, 50-71.
- Putnam, M.C.L. 1973. *Tibullus: A commentary*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Shea, G.W. 1998. *Delia and Nemesis: The Elegies of Albius Tibullus*. Lanham-New York-Oxford: University Press of America.
- Spencer, D. 2001. 'Propertius, Hercules, and the Dynamics of Roman Mythic Space in Elegy 4.9', *Arethusa* 34, 259-284.
- Tzounakas, Sp. 2006. ' 'Rusticitas' versus 'urbanitas' in the Literary Programmes of Tibullus and Persius', *Mnemosyne* 59.1, 111-128.
- Vaiopoulos, V. 2009. "Léandre dans Ov. *Her.* 18: conformation avec les stéréotypes et dépassement de l'identité élégiaque", *Ágora. Estudos Clássicos em Debate* 11 , 77-128.
- Vaiopoulos, V. 2010. "Exclusus amator dans Ovide, Epist. 18 et 19. *Traits du paraclausithyron*", *Athenaum* 90, 153-172.
- Veremans J. 1987. 'Tibullus II,6: forme et fond', *Latomus* 46, 68-86.
- Vretska, K. 1955. 'Tibulls Paraclausithyron (1,2)', *WS* 68, 20-46
- Vretska, K. 1963. 'Albius Tibullus: Elegie 1.5 Interpretation', *Das altsprachliche Unterricht* 6, reprinted in W. Eisenhut (ed.) *Antike Lyrik* (Darmstadt), 295-321.
- Warden, J. 1982. 'Epic into Elegy: Propertius 4.9.70f.', *Hermes* 110, 228-242.
- Watson, L.C. 1982. 'Ovid *Amores* 1.6: A parody of a hymn?', *Mnemosyne* 35, 92-102.
- Weitz, M. 1969. 'Truth in Literature', *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 9 (1955): 116-129, reprinted in J. Hospers (ed.), *Introductory Readings in Aesthetics*. New York: Free Press, 213-224.
- Wray, D. 2003. 'What Poets do: Tibullus on 'Easy' Hands', *CPh* 98.3, 224-227.
- Wyke, M. 1987. "Written Women: Propertius' *Scripta Puella*", *JRS* 77, 47-6.

- Wyke, M. 1989. 'Mistress and Metaphor in Augustan Elegy', *Helios* 16.1, 25-47.
- Yardley, J.C. 1978. 'The Elegiac Paraclausithyron', *Eranos* 76, 19-34.
- Yardley, J.C. 1987. 'Propertius's 4.5, Ovid *Amores* 1.6 and Roman Comedy', *PCPhS* 213, 179-89.