

NICOLÒ CAMPODONICO

*Pisa*

*nicolo.campodonico@sns.it*

## IN THE NAME OF TIBULLUS

[TIB.] 3, 19 AND HORACE \*

### 1. *A controversial elegy*

The penultimate poem of the so-called *Appendix Tibulliana* is the short but much debated elegy [Tib.] 3, 19.<sup>1</sup> I quote here the text according to Luck's edition:<sup>2</sup>

Nulla tuum nobis subducet femina lectum:  
Hoc primum iuncta est foedere nostra Venus.  
Tu mihi sola places, nec iam te praeter in urbe  
Formosa est oculis ulla puella meis.  
Atque utinam possis uni mihi bella uideri, 5  
Displiceas aliis: sic ego tutus ero.

\* I would like to thank Gianpiero Rosati, Alessandro Schiesaro, and Mirko Donninelli for their valuable advice during the writing of this work.

<sup>1</sup> On the *Appendix Tibulliana*, which coincides with book 3 of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, see the introductions by Dettmer 1984, Skoie 2012, and Knox 2018 and the commentaries by Tränkle 1990, Fulkerson 2017, and Maltby 2021a. Regarding the structure, I follow the interpretation by Maltby 2010, 338, according to whom the *Appendix Tibulliana* gathers «different groups of poems [...] written at different times by different authors». Maltby 2021a and 2021b, on the other hand, embraces the hypothesis by Holzberg 1998 that the entire book 3 is the work of a single poet who takes on different names and *personae*; on this point I share the doubts of Hubbard 2004, 180-181 and Heyworth 2021, 152, since the alleged traces of authorial unity within the *Appendix Tibulliana* do not seem so compelling to me.

<sup>2</sup> The *Appendix Tibulliana* is split into two books in the Italian branch of the manuscript tradition, which causes some fluctuation in the numbering of the poems (4, 1-14 = 3, 7-20). Although Luck 1998<sup>2</sup> adopts this division of the *Corpus* into four books, I maintain the earlier division into three books, according to which our poem is 3, 19 and not 4, 13. On the transmission of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, see Rouse - Reeve 1983.

*Giornale Italiano di Filologia*, ed. by G. ROSATI, Turnhout, 2024 (*GIF*, 76), pp. 181-199  
© BREPOLS PUBLISHERS 10.1484/J.GIF.5.142412

Nil opus inuidia est, procul absit gloria uulgi:  
 Qui sapit, in tacito gaudeat ipse sinu.  
 Sic<sup>3</sup> ego secretis possum bene uiuere siluis,  
 Qua nulla humano sit uia trita pede. 10  
 Tu mihi curarum requies, tu nocte uel atra  
 Lumen, et in solis tu mihi turba locis.  
 Nunc licet e caelo mittatur amica Tibullo,  
 Mittetur frustra, deficietque Venus.  
 Per tibi sancta tuae Iunonis numina iuro, 15  
 Quae sola ante alios est mihi magna deos.  
 Quid facio demens? cheu, mea pignora cedo.  
 Iurauī stulte: proderat iste timor.  
 Nunc tu fortis eris, nunc tu me audacius ures:  
 Hoc perperit misero garrula lingua malum. 20  
 Iam, facias quodcumque uoles, tuus usque manebo,  
 Nec fugiam notae seruitium dominae,  
 Sed Veneris sanctae considam uinctus ad aras:  
 Haec notat iniustos supplicibusque fauet.

In this rather short elegy, a male poet describes his tormented love for a mistress, following the characteristics of this literary genre. He declares to the unnamed woman that he loves no other girl and even hopes, for his own safety, that no other man likes her (1-6). Likewise, he does not intend to boast about his love, but to enjoy it in his innermost self: he would be ready to live even in uninhabited woodlands with his lover (7-10). She is for him the source of all joy and he would prefer her to any *amica* sent from heaven: he guarantees this with an oath to Juno (11-16). The poet then acknowledges that, with this act, he has shown subjection and given strength to his *domina*: he will be forever at her service and only hopes for Venus' favour (17-24).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> I accept *sic*, transmitted by manuscripts A, G, V and printed by Lenz - Galinsky 1971<sup>3</sup> and Tränkle 1990, against Markland's *tecum* accepted by Luck 1998<sup>2</sup>. Even though the conjecture better indicates that the girl will accompany 'Tibullus' into the wood, as stated in v. 12, it is easy to understand *sic* as a sort of protasis *si tecum esse liceat*, as Maltby 2021a, 543-544 points out (following Heyne 1817<sup>4</sup>, 401); he also notes that *sic ego* (also in v. 6) is used as a line-opening by Tibullus (1, 10, 43) and other elegiac poets: among the many occurrences, see the thematically similar Ov. *am.* 3, 11, 39 *Sic ego nec sine te nec tecum uiuere possum*.

<sup>4</sup> On the structure of the poem, see Maltby 2021a, 538-539, who notes that it is «clear and simple [...] with its six groups of four lines».

The author of the elegy names himself as Tibullus in v. 13, which makes it unquestionable that this elegy concerns his authorial *persona*. For this reason, many scholars have attempted to establish whether it is indeed a work by Tibullus or a pseudo-Tibullan poem. In this paper, I will first reassess this debate and highlight the elements suggesting that this poem is an impersonation of Tibullus; secondly, I will analyse this text in relation to the representation of Tibullus in two poems by Horace and argue that the author of [Tib.] 3, 19 elaborates on them to construct a refined embodiment of the famous elegiac poet.

## 2. *The Tibullan author of [Tib.] 3, 19*

The origin of this elegy has greatly troubled scholars. Due to the name given in v. 13 and to certain stylistic features, many have assumed that the poem is an authentic work by Tibullus, possibly written in his youth.<sup>5</sup> However, since the end of the nineteenth century, other scholars have argued against Tibullus' authorship of this poem: as it presents typical Tibullan themes, but also apparently Propertian and Ovidian influences, they have concluded that the elegy is the work of a forger.<sup>6</sup> Recently, Heyworth has returned to the hypothesis that the poem was written by Tibullus; however, it would not be a juvenile work, but a fragment of elegy from the shorter and possibly incomplete book 2, together with the epigram [Tib.] 3, 20.<sup>7</sup> This shift in chronology

<sup>5</sup> Heyne 1817<sup>4</sup>, 599 found the elegy a «carmen vere Albianum». He was followed, among others, by Cartault 1909, 24-26; Smith 1913, 87; Ponchont 1924, 187; Lenz 1932; Ciaffi 1944, 179-184; Alfonsi 1946, 21-24; Pepe 1948, 91-95; Herrmann 1956; Riposati 1967<sup>2</sup>, 40-42 and 78-70; and Eisenhut 1977.

<sup>6</sup> This idea was first developed by Postgate 1880, followed by Knoche 1956; Lee 1963; Wimmel 1968, 257-259; Tränkle 1990, 323-325; Gaertner 2002; Maltby 2010, 336-337; Maltby 2021a, 537-538; Maltby 2021b. Fulkerson 2017, 43-44 and 294-295 remains more open about the authorship of this elegy.

<sup>7</sup> Heyworth 2021, 155 suggests that the second book of elegies by Tibullus, written roughly between 26 and 19 BC, was originally longer and that some poems were lost in transmission. I remain more convinced that it is shorter because it was left unfinished when Tibullus died in 19 BC, since contemporaries apparently suggest that his death was quite premature (see Dom. Mars. fr. 180, 1 Hollis and Ov. *am.* 3, 9, 35-36). However, any assumptions on this point can only remain speculative.

would also justify some of the Propertian echoes in the poem.<sup>8</sup> Heyworth shows that it is not impossible for [Tib.] 3, 19 to precede and interact with other Augustan elegiac poets; his analysis effectively illustrates how arguments based on *Prioritätskritik*, which attempt to establish the relative chronology of two works and assess which imitates and which is being imitated, are sometimes biased and can be overturned.<sup>9</sup>

In stating that [Tib.] 3, 19 is a fragment and not a complete elegy, Heyworth first notes its brevity (24 lines), although he himself acknowledges that there are shorter poems by Tibullus himself (2, 2 is 22 lines long) and no lack of examples from other poets.<sup>10</sup> He also considers this elegy to be incomplete, since «no situation is set out at the beginning, no individual is addressed, and there are no closural markers at the end».<sup>11</sup> However, the poem shows a sort of internal structure in the references to the evolution of the poet's condition: the initial declaration of exclusive love for the woman (1-14) is followed by the oath (15-16), which constitutes a turning point towards the ending, when the poet acknowledges his *seruitium* to her (17-24). And the individual addressed in the elegy is the woman herself, whom the poet invokes in different ways and instances (see e.g. *tu* in vv. 3, 11, 19). Finally, the poem shows signs that can indeed be considered closural: the poet declares that, in the future, he will sit suppliant at the altar of Venus, addressing her with greater awe than at the beginning. In the very *incipit* the poet had recalled – through a reference to Venus, albeit in the translated meaning of love – the *foedus* by which his love with the woman was

<sup>8</sup> Heyworth 2021. Among the most evident parallels with other elegiac poets, one can quote *tu mihi sola places* in [Tib.] 3, 19, 3; Prop. 2, 7, 19; Ov. *ars* 1, 42; see also [Tib.] 3, 19, 1 and Prop. 1, 8, 45 and the more general similarities between [Tib.] 3, 19 and Ov. *ars* 1, 41-49; 3, 485-490 and *rem.* 579-587.

<sup>9</sup> Of course, one cannot entirely deny the value of these methods, which were formulated and admirably applied by Axelson 1960 on Ovid and Lygdamus, but they suffer from certain limitations (on which see Peirano 2012, 80-81 and Dell'Aversano *et al.* 2015), especially when topical elements of a literary genre are involved.

<sup>10</sup> For instance, Prop. 1, 12 (20 lines); 14 (24 lines); 21 and 22 (10); 2, 2 (16); 4 (22); 7 (20); 12 (24) and Ov. *am.* 2, 3 (18); 3, 15 (20); see also Wimmel 1968, 258, who rightly notes that Tibullus' elegies are usually rather long.

<sup>11</sup> Heyworth 2021, 155.

sanctioned (v. 2 *hoc primum iuncta est foedere nostra Venus*).<sup>12</sup> The author also refers to Venus, in the sense of sexual intercourse, toward the middle of the elegy (v. 14 *deficietque Venus*), to emphasise his exclusive love for no other woman than his *puella* and just before his solemn oath of love to her. In this way, Venus is evoked at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the elegy, thus serving as a meaningful and effective *trait d'union* of the poem. It thus seems unlikely that [Tib.] 3, 19 is a fragment and can be easily read as a short but consistent elegy.

As far as authorship is concerned, there is one element that, in my opinion, decisively argues against the Tibullan authenticity of the poem. As I said, the poet of [Tib.] 3, 19 calls himself Tibullus in vv. 13-14 (*nunc licet e caelo mittatur amica Tibullo/mittetur frustra deficietque Venus*).<sup>13</sup> It has long been noted that Tibullus gives his name only twice in the two surely authentic books of elegies:<sup>14</sup> in 1, 3, 55-56 (*Hic iacet immitti consumptus morte Tibullus/Messallam terra dum sequiturque mari*) he imagines his death following Messalla and his own epitaph; and in 1, 9, 83-84 (*Hanc tibi fallaci resolutus amore Tibullus/Dedicat et grata sis, dea, mente rogat*) he imagines the inscription of a vow he will offer to Venus.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, Tibullus names himself only in 'epigraphic fantasies': he never does so in purely elegiac contexts or in cases, as in [Tib.] 3, 19, 13, where the proper name (*Tibullo*) is a simple synonym for *mihi*, as often occurs, for instance, in Catullus.

On this point, Heyworth observes that «two examples are hardly enough to establish an unbreakable norm».<sup>16</sup> However,

<sup>12</sup> See Maltby 2021a, 540: «The mention of Venus here in the first couplet is picked up in the final couplet (24) by *Veneris ... aras*, suggesting poem 19 is a complete poem with intentional ring-structure [...] her mention at the beginning, middle and end of the poem is a good choice for a poet acting as a *Tibullus personatus*». Tränkle 1990, 334 also notes that Tibullus often ends his elegies with references to Venus (see Tib. 1, 2, 99-100; 6, 83-84; 9, 81-82).

<sup>13</sup> Commentators have noted that this phrase appears to rework Tib. 1, 3, 90 *uidear caelo missus adesse tibi* and Ov. *ars* 1, 43 *haec tibi non tenues ueniet delapsa per auras*.

<sup>14</sup> See Postgate 1880, 280-281 and Knoche 1956, 188-190.

<sup>15</sup> On the literary meaning of these inscriptions see Perrelli 2002, 110 and 285; on their Hellenistic origin, see Maltby 2002, 201.

<sup>16</sup> Heyworth 2021, 156.

this argument can easily be reversed. Since Tibullus mentions his own name only twice and in the same precise context, it would be an exceptional (and therefore suspect) coincidence to find Tibullus' name within the 24 lines of 3, 19 (and in a different context), if we assume that it was written by Tibullus himself. Moreover, later Augustan elegiac poets have a quite different treatment of their own names: Propertius names himself eight times just from the second book onwards (two of which are still in fictitious inscriptions, while many others are allocutions by Cynthia),<sup>17</sup> while Ovid calls himself Naso almost fifty times, in a variety of contexts.<sup>18</sup> Such a difference in the act of naming oneself suggests that our elegy is not by Tibullus at all, and that it was written after his death and was possibly influenced by a habit of later elegiac poets.<sup>19</sup>

Naming oneself is undoubtedly a significant act within a text and it may have a precise aim, since it constitutes a sort of seal guaranteeing the authenticity of the work. For this very reason, the author of [Tib.] 3, 19, if not Tibullus himself, is clearly impersonating Tibullus. In this sense, the elegy can be likened to some texts of the *Appendix Vergiliana*, such as *Culex*, *Catalepton* and *Ciris*, which are apparently written as Virgil's juvenile poems by assuming his voice, not (only) to deceive, but to engage the audience in a sophisticated literary game.<sup>20</sup> I think that the case of [Tib.] 3, 19 may fall into precisely this type of texts and that this *Tibullus personatus* is not the work of a modest forger, as some scholar have in the past believed, but rather of a skilful reader and writer.<sup>21</sup> The poems of the *Appendix Vergiliana* come to fill

<sup>17</sup> Prop. 2, 14, 27 is an inscription; 2, 24, 35 and 4, 7, 49 are allocutions from Cynthia; 3, 3, 17 and 4, 1, 71 allocutions from Phoebus; 2, 8, 17 and 3, 10, 15 allocutions from himself; 2, 34, 9 is within a poetological context.

<sup>18</sup> Some of these are still epigraphic, such as Ov. *am.* 1, 11, 27; 2, 13, 25; *ars* 2, 744 and 3, 812; *trist.* 3, 3, 74 and 76.

<sup>19</sup> Maltby 2002, 339 had already noted this: «unlike Propertius and Ovid who frequently mention themselves by name, Tibullus restricts such references to the inscriptions here [at 1, 9, 83] and at 1.3.55».

<sup>20</sup> See especially Peirano 2012, 59-73, who also discusses Tibullan impersonations in reference to the *Panegyricus Messallae* [Tib.] 3, 7 in 132-148, and Stachon 2014, 13-51. It should be noted, however, that Virgil's name is never mentioned in the poems of the *Appendix Vergiliana*, as is the case in [Tib.] 3, 19.

<sup>21</sup> Postgate 1880, 285 calls [Tib.] 3, 19 a «cento of a versifier»; Gaertner 2002 has picked up and expanded this definition, which seems to me quite un-

the curiosity of Virgil's early production in the form of 'creative supplements';<sup>22</sup> likewise, the literary construction of our elegy stems not only from the works by Tibullus and other elegiac poets, as has been observed, but also from Horace and the characterisation he offers of Tibullus, as I intend to demonstrate.

### 3. *Tibullus in the wood: [Tib.] 3, 19 and Hor. epist. 1, 4*

Our 'Tibullus' states that he does not want to expose his love to the gossipy life of the city (5-8) and that he is rather willing to take his girl on a romantic getaway in the most uninhabited woods (9-10 *sic ego secretis possum bene uiuere siluis/qua nulla humano sit uia trita pede*). A connection between the poet Tibullus and the forests is thus established. The expression *secretae siluae* has been linked to a passage from Ovid's *Remedia amoris* (579-591), where deserted places are said to be harmful to unhappy lovers (579 *loca sola nocent*; 581-582 *non tibi secretis .../est opus*), since they force them to continually rethink their love, as was the case with Phyllis in the woods (591 *quid nisi secretae laeserunt Phyllida siluae?*).<sup>23</sup> It is possible that the 'Tibullus' of 3, 19 takes up the Ovidian expression precisely to subvert it, highlighting that his love can develop even in such places as the woods, which are considered unsuitable for love.

Tibullus is commonly considered to be the most country-loving of the Roman elegiac poets.<sup>24</sup> This is why, regarding the reference to *secretae siluae* in [Tib.] 3, 19, 9, Eisenhut stated: «das ist so Tibullisch wie nur möglich».<sup>25</sup> In fact, the very association between Tibullus and the woods should be somewhat

generous. Knoche 1956, 180 and 190 calls the author of the elegy a «rhetorically educated poet epigone», but he rightly compares it with the poems from the *Appendix Vergiliana*. I agree, instead, with Lee 1963, 10, who rightly recognises «the skill of this forger».

<sup>22</sup> This definition of Latin poetic *pseudepigrapha* has been given by Peirano 2012, 13-24.

<sup>23</sup> See Lee 1963, 8 and Tränkle 1990, 329-330 for a rich analysis of the parallels among the two texts.

<sup>24</sup> See, among many possible examples, Tib. 1, 1; 1, 3; 2, 3, 1-10 and, among many studies, Riposati 1967<sup>2</sup>, 105-119 and Cairns 1979, 132-134 and 145-146.

<sup>25</sup> Eisenhut 1977, 223. Alfonsi 1946, 24 also sees in the reference to the *secretae siluae* «il sigillo del migliore Tibullo».



surprising. In his two authentic books of elegies, he makes no reference at all to woodland environments: the term *silua* never appears, and the adjective *siluestris* is used only once as a common epithet for Pan.<sup>26</sup> The term *nemus* is not found either, and there are only two occurrences of *lucus*: in one case, a drunken peasant brings his family home from there, and in the other evil omens of war are heard there.<sup>27</sup> Of course, there are references to *arbores*, but these are quite generic, or to fruit trees.<sup>28</sup> There are, therefore, no woodland *rêveries* in the authentic poems by Tibullus.

As has been suggested, this idea of Tibullus in the woods comes from Horace.<sup>29</sup> *Epist.* 1, 4 is addressed to Albius, who is praised for being a frank judge of Horace's satires (1 *Albi nostrorum sermonum candide iudex*): this Albius is identified, both in the titles of the poem in the manuscripts and in the ancient commentary by pseudo-Acron, with the poet Albius Tibullus.<sup>30</sup> This identification has been accepted by many scholars, but questioned by others, who consider it an invention of ancient Horatian exegesis.<sup>31</sup> Since in *carm.* 1, 33 Horace addresses an elegiac poet named Albius, who is also identified by manuscripts and by ancient (and modern) commentators with Tibullus,<sup>32</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Tib. 2, 5, 30 *garrula siluestri fistula sacra deo*, within the description of the place where Roma would have arisen. See Heyworth 2021, 164.

<sup>27</sup> Tib. 1, 10, 51-52 *rusticus e luco reuehit, male sobrius ipse, / uxorem plastro progeniemque domum* and 2, 5, 73-74 *ferunt ... / ... lucos praecinuisse fugam*.

<sup>28</sup> Fruit trees appear in Tib. 1, 5, 32 and 1, 7, 32; other (single) *arbores* are mentioned in 1, 1, 28; 2, 5, 29; 2, 5, 96.

<sup>29</sup> This has already been noted by Heyne 1817<sup>4</sup>, 401 and discussed by later commentators; see especially Lee 1963, 10. An overview of the actual relationship between Horace and Tibullus is provided by Della Corte 1996.

<sup>30</sup> Ps. Acro *ad epist.* 1, 4, 1: *hac epistola Albius Tibullum elegorum scriptorem alloquitur, qui uidebatur libros eius sermonum multum laudare*; the following references (*Albius iste criticus fuit, poeta et scriptor philosophiae*) appear to be derived from the content of *epist.* 1, 4 itself. According to the apparatus in Klingner 1959<sup>3</sup>, 248 *ad Albius Tibullum* is the title of the epistle in manuscripts C, γ and R. The identification of the Albius of Hor. *epist.* 1, 4 with Tibullus is accepted by Fedeli 1997, 1056-1058 and Cucchiarelli 2019, 254. Brugnoli 1994, 354 also suggests that *Albi ... candide* echoes the *candida ... Alba* mentioned in Tib. 1, 7, 58.

<sup>31</sup> See especially Postgate 1912 and Mayer 1994, 133.

<sup>32</sup> See Hor. *carm.* 1, 33, 1-3 and Ps. Acro *ad loc.* *Albius Tibullum alloquitur, elegorum poetam*; Porph. *ad loc.*: *Albius Tibullum adloquitur elegiorum poetam*. See also the grammarian Diom. 3, 484 *Horatius ... ad Albius Tibullum elegiarum auctorem scribens* and the inscription of *carm.* 1, 33 in manuscript families E



it is highly probable that the Albius of *epist.* 1, 4 is also Tibullus. In any case, the mere fact that the addressee of this epistle (and the ode) was already believed to be Tibullus in antiquity is sufficient for my argument.

In the *epistle*, Horace wonders what Albius is doing, whether he is writing (v. 3) or walking through salubrious forests, silently pondering great thoughts (4-5 *an tacitum siluas inter reptare salubres/curantem quidquid dignum sapiente bonoque est?*). If this Albius was (or was believed to be) Tibullus, his connection with the *secretae siluae* in [Tib.] 3, 19 could easily derive from here, in addition to the passage from Ovid's *Remedia*. The language of this passage of the elegy reveals some links with Horace, as has already been noted.<sup>33</sup> Given the affinity between *siluae salubres* and *secretae siluae*, the same phrase *bene uiuere* ([Tib.] 3, 19, 9) often has a philosophical meaning and recurs several times in Horace's *Epistles*:<sup>34</sup> it can thus summarise v. 5 of the letter to Albius, which deals with what is worthy of a sage man (*curantem quidquid dignum sapiente*). The parallel reading of the two texts thus suggests a possible narrative: 'Tibullus' (in [Tib.] 3, 19) wished to live well with his girlfriend in the woods but must instead live well philosophically (in Hor. *epist.* 1, 4), perhaps to overcome his love pains. Moreover, the previous reference to walking along an untrodden path ([Tib.] 3, 19, 10 *qua nulla humano sit uia trita pede*) clearly recalls a famous Callimachean

and Ψ (Klingner 1959<sup>3</sup>, 34). The identification with Tibullus is firmly accepted by Nisbet - Hubbard 1970, 368 and Quinn 1985, 184. Mayer 2012, 201-202 denies that Albius is Tibullus and points out that Tibullus' *praenomen* is known only from manuscripts of his works and the *Vita* appended thereto, which may have been influenced by the exegetical identification of Horace's Albi with Tibullus. However, it cannot be entirely ruled out that the *Vita* comes from an independent tradition (possibly Suetonius), especially since it reports the datum – not elsewhere attested – that Tibullus was an *eques Romanus*; see Stachon 2021, 460-468, who nevertheless does not accept the identification of Tibullus with the Horatian Albius.

<sup>33</sup> Lee 1963, 10 notes the links between Hor. *epist.* 1, 4, 4-5 *tacitum, siluas*, and *sapiente* and [Tib.] 3, 19, 8-10 *tacito ... sinu, siluis*, and *qui sapit*; Heyworth 2021, 164-165 compares also *curantem* and *curarum*. See also Lenz 1932, 137. The connections between Hor. *epist.* 1, 4 and the *Corpus Tibullianum* are emphasised by Brugnoli 1994, who believes, however, that [Tib.] 3, 19 predates Horace.

<sup>34</sup> See Hor. *epist.* 1, 6, 56; 1, 11, 29 and 1, 15, 45; the phrase appears also in Tib. 1, 3, 35 *quam bene Saturno uiuebant rege*.

image, especially through its reworking by Lucretius.<sup>35</sup> This would be perfectly consistent with an elegy that is strongly allusive and rich in explicit quotations from other poets.<sup>36</sup> In particular, the *siluae* may reveal the metaliterary meaning of the passage, corroborated by the metaphor of *silua*/ῥῆμα as poetic matter:<sup>37</sup> this would be a precise recall of the Horatian text, of which [Tib.] 3, 19 stands as a sort a ‘fake precedent’.

The author of our elegy may have picked up on certain metaliterary invitations in Horace’s text that paved the way for the creation of a new scenario: Horace’s questions about what Albius is currently doing, which also refer to the action of writing, leave the answer open to a supplement;<sup>38</sup> Horace’s depiction of Albius as *tacitus* also makes readers curious about what Tibullus would have to tell.<sup>39</sup> This intertextual and biographical entanglement is comparable, again, with the Virgilian *pseudepigrapha*, which deliberately elaborate unknown moments of the great poet’s life and career.<sup>40</sup> The author of [Tib.] 3, 19 has poetically constructed a situation in which Tibullus would have professed his desire to go into the woods, apparently later realised in the Horatian epistle. But there is also an ironic reversal of context between the two poems: the Tibullus of [Tib.] 3, 19 wants to flee into the woods with his beloved, whereas the Albius of Hor. *epist.* 1, 4 is there alone, and has swapped elegiac yearning for philosophical reflection (v. 5), perhaps because his mistress has abandoned him.

<sup>35</sup> See Lucr. 1, 926-927 (= 4, 1-2) *Avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante/ trita solo* and Call. *aet.* 1 fr. 125-128 Pf.; see Fulkerson 2017, 297-298 and Maltby 2021a, 545. On the metaliterary value of *silua*, see Hinds 1998, 11-14.

<sup>36</sup> See again n. 8.

<sup>37</sup> Fulkerson 2017, 297 also compares Acontius carving the name of Cydippe into the trees in Call. *aet.* 3 fr. 1, 72-73 Pf.

<sup>38</sup> Hor. *epist.* 1, 4, 2-3 *Quid nunc te dicam facere in regione Pedana?/Scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula uincat*. Cassius Parmensis was one of Caesar’s killers and later a supporter of Antony; ancient *scholia* to Horace’s *epist.* 1, 4 say that he was Epicurean and an author of tragedies, elegies, and epigrams, but they appear to be overall unreliable (see Fedeli 1997, 1058). In any case, the comparison between Albius and Cassius Parmensis is probably ironic; see Cucchiarelli 2019, 256. It is less likely that Horace is here alluding to an alleged republican nostalgia of Tibullus as a member of Messalla’s circle, as Della Corte 1996 suggests.

<sup>39</sup> On the metaliterary overtones of Hor. *epist.* 1, 4, see Keith 1999, 47-51.

<sup>40</sup> See again Peirano 2012, 74-79 and Stachon 2014, 52-112.

4. *Tibullus' cry of love between [Tib.] 3, 19  
and Hor. carm. 1, 33*

If the location of Tibullus in the woods in [Tib.] 3, 19 seems to refer to his portrayal in Horace's *epist.* 1, 4, it is legitimate to wonder whether the author of our elegy might have been influenced, especially in terms of content, by Horace's other poem that is likely addressed to Tibullus: *carm.* 1, 33.<sup>41</sup> In this ode, Horace comforts Albius, who suffers from his love for the cruel Glycera and writes plaintive elegies, because she has betrayed him for a younger man.<sup>42</sup> Precisely because of the identification of Albius with Tibullus, it has been assumed in the past that [Tib.] 3, 19 belonged to an early poetic cycle that Tibullus devoted to the Glycera mentioned by Horace.<sup>43</sup> However, in my opinion, the terms of the correlation between Horace's ode and [Tib.] 3, 19 should be reversed.

Horace advises his friend not to grieve excessively (1 *ne doleas plus nimio*) and calls his poems *miserabiles ... elegos* (2-3); Albius is then reminded that everyone, including Horace himself, has been the victim of unhappy and upsetting loves by the will of Venus (5-16). Horace is clearly developing a subtle polemic against the turmoils of elegiac love, which he contrasts with the approach to eros proper to a lyric poet: to the elegiac dedication to a single woman, Horace opposes the plurality of partners (here *Myrtale*, v. 14) and recognises the mutability of Venus.<sup>44</sup> It has been rightly noted that the poet of [Tib.] 3, 19 is extremely prone to self-pity and exhibits powerlessness in relation to his mistress:<sup>45</sup> he swears love and fidelity to her, but immediately regrets it

<sup>41</sup> On the ancient identification of Albius in Hor. *carm.* 1, 33 with Tibullus, see again n. 32.

<sup>42</sup> Hor. *carm.* 1, 33, 1-4 *Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor/Immitis Glycerae, neu miserabilis/Decantes elegos, cur tibi iunior/Laesa praeniteat fide*.

<sup>43</sup> The identification of the mistress of [Tib.] 3, 19 with the Glycera of *carm.* 1, 33 is supported, for instance, by Dissen 1835, 459; Cartault 1909, 24-26 and Ripsati 1967<sup>2</sup>, 40-41 and 78-79. Gruppe 1838, 223 also speculated on the existence of a youthful book of poems that Tibullus dedicated to her; this hypothesis has been rightly disproved by Bright 1978, 106.

<sup>44</sup> See Mayer 2012, 202-204 and Nisbet - Hubbard 1970, 370.

<sup>45</sup> See Fulkerson 2017, 294: «he [i.e. the elegiac *amator*] is here even more abject than usual: he flaunts his powerlessness in a way that is artful [...] he also succumbs to erotic servitude».

(v. 17 *quid facio demens?* and 18 *iuravi stulte*) because it will make her stronger (29 *nunc tu fortis eris*), yet he is also pleased to feel subject to her will, now that she will impose a *seruitium* on him (v. 23 *nec fugiam notae seruitium dominae*). These are, of course, common elements of such a highly typified genre as Latin erotic elegy, but this particular emphasis, in [Tib.] 3, 19, on elegiac self-commiseration perfectly fits Horace's definition of *miserabiles elegi*.<sup>46</sup> It is therefore plausible that Horace's *carm.* 1, 33 has provided the author of [Tib.] 3, 19 with a guideline for the invention of a new situation concerning Tibullus.

In *carm.* 1, 33 Albius suffers from Glycera's betrayal with a younger man (3-4 *tibi iunior/laesa praeniteat fide*), just as in [Tib.] 3, 19 'Tibullus' hopes to have no rival for his woman and thus be safe (5-6 *atque utinam possis uni mihi bella uideri, / displiceas aliis: sic ego tutus ero*). Horace's reference to broken faithfulness (*laesa fide*) also corresponds to the *foedus* that 'Tibullus' claims to have established with his mistress at the beginning of [Tib.] 3, 19, 2 *hoc primum iuncta est foedere nostra Venus*. Moreover, the *domina* of [Tib.] 3, 19 manifests all her power over the poet (v. 19 *nunc tu fortis eris, nunc tu me audacius ures*) and thus corresponds to the Horatian definition of Glycera as *immitis*. The poet then emphasises his consequent wretchedness (v. 20 *hoc peperit misero garrula lingua malum*), just as Albius' *elegi* were *miserabiles* in Hor. *carm.* 1, 33, 2. Our elegy thus represents a situation prior to that of *carm.* 1, 33, to which it may also appear as a 'prequel' (as also seen with Hor. *epist.* 1.4): the harshness of Tibullus' mistress has not changed, but fidelity has been broken in *carm.* 1, 33 by the arrival of the rival feared in [Tib.] 3, 19, 6. In this sense, the very idea of *nec fugiam ... seruitium* in v. 22 seems to prefigure the composition of other love elegies, such as those mentioned by Horace, and Tibullus' poetic production overall.

It may appear (and indeed it has appeared) problematic that Horace expressly calls Tibullus' mistress Glycera, who does not coincide with any of his *dominae* (Delia and Nemesis), and that in [Tib.] 3, 19 the *puella* remains nameless. It is well established, however, that in Horace's ode Glycera is a meaningful name in

<sup>46</sup> This had already been observed by Cartault 1909, 25.

several respects. Firstly, it is a speaking name, connected to the Greek γλυκύς, «sweet», which Horace cleverly juxtaposes with *immitis*.<sup>47</sup> But most importantly, the name Glycera was used at other times by Horace for some of his own lovers.<sup>48</sup> In *carm.* 1, 19, 5-8 he says he is tormented by the love for a splendid Glycera, characterised by a *grata proteruitas* (v. 7), which has some parallels with Albius' mistress in *carm.* 1, 33 and with the woman in [Tib.] 3, 19.<sup>49</sup> In *carm.* 1, 30, 5 Venus is invited to visit Glycera's house: she is thus closely associated with the goddess of love, so much so that many commentators have thought she was a courtesan.<sup>50</sup> Later, in *carm.* 3, 19, 28 Horace says he still burns with love for Glycera.<sup>51</sup>

To return to the ode to Albius, it is safe to assume that Horace did not intend, with the name Glycera, to allude to a specific mistress of Tibullus, nor, absurdly, to a love rivalry between them.<sup>52</sup> Rather, Glycera may represent a specific type of woman, who shares some aspects with the bold *domina* characteristic of love elegy.<sup>53</sup> The very fact that Glycera is the name of a girl loved by both Horace and Albius may be part of Horace's polemic with the elegiac genre: he shows that passion, even for the same fierce woman, can be experienced in a more measured way, as in *carm.* 1, 19, rather than Albius' whining manner in *carm.* 1, 33. Here, even the characterisation of Albius as being *Glyceræ memor*,

<sup>47</sup> See Nisbet - Hubbard 1970, 371, who emphasise the nature of this «quasi-biographical reference» and criticise the attempts to identify Glycera with one of Tibullus' known or unknown mistresses; see also Romano 1991, 610-611.

<sup>48</sup> On Horace's Glycera(e), see Mazzoli 1996.

<sup>49</sup> Hor. *carm.* 1, 19, 5-8 *urit me Glyceræ nitor/splendentis Pario marmore purius,urit grata proteruitas/et uultus nimium lubricus aspici*; compare the *immitis Glyceræ* in Hor. *carm.* 1, 33, 2 and *nunc tu me audacius ures* in [Tib.] 3, 19, 19. On the characterisation of Glycera, see Nisbet - Hubbard 1970, 238 and Romano 1991, 560-562.

<sup>50</sup> Hor. *carm.* 1, 30, 1-4 *O Venus, regina Cnidi Paphique,/sperne dilectam Cypron et uocantis/ture te multo Glyceræ decoram/transfer in aedem*. See Nisbet - Hubbard 1970, 346 and 240 for Glycera (and Glycerium) as common names among *heteræ*; see also Quinn 1985, 180-181; Romano 1991, 601-603; Mazzoli 1996, and Mayer 2012, 194.

<sup>51</sup> Hor. *carm.* 3, 19, 28 *Me lentus Glyceræ torret amor meae*, where *torret* echoes *urit* in *carm.* 1, 19, 5 and 7. See the note by Woodman 2022, 282.

<sup>52</sup> Similar dynamics were hypothesised in the past: see the critical overview provided by Mazzoli 1996.

<sup>53</sup> This had already been suggested by Smith 1913, 56.

i.e. still in love with her, can be read with a further metaliterary meaning: Horace invites Albius to not grieve excessively (*ne doleas plus nimio*) by literally reminding him (*memor*) of the charming Glycera in *carm.* 1, 19 and how Horace himself behaved with her in an earlier poem within the same book of *Odes*.<sup>54</sup>

This symbolic value of the name Glycera in Hor. *carm.* 1, 33 may have discouraged the author of [Tib.] 3, 19 from believing that Tibullus had a mistress by this name. Instead, the author of [Tib.] 3, 19 develops some insights into his elegiac affair offered by Hor. *carm.* 1, 33 in a more sophisticated way. In v. 22 ‘Tibullus’ states that he can no longer escape the *seruitium notae dominae*. This expression may refer, in a literal sense, to the past *liaison* with the woman, whose tyrannical character he has already experienced.<sup>55</sup> Nevertheless, *nota domina* is amusing and surprising, both because her name is not given in the elegy, and because Tibullus did in fact have two *dominae*.<sup>56</sup> However, if one also accepts the hypothesis that the author of [Tib.] 3, 19 kept in mind what Horace wrote about Tibullus and Glycera in *carm.* 1, 33, the phrase *nota domina* will allude precisely to her fame, both because she is literally known through Horace, and because she is an emblematic figure of an elegiac *domina*.

### 5. *Embodying Tibullus*

In conclusion, [Tib.] 3, 19 appears in many respects not to be an authentic work by Tibullus, but rather a pseudepigraphic elegy. It is not merely a text ‘falsely’ circulating under his name, but a poem written as an actual impersonation of Tibullus. One should remember that in the 1st century AD he was considered the greatest Roman elegiac poet and his fame could easily inspire the production of *pseudepigrapha*.<sup>57</sup> It is not easy to say with cer-

<sup>54</sup> This point had already been observed, with a different aim, by Ciaffi 1944, 184.

<sup>55</sup> So, for instance, Tränkle 1990, 333.

<sup>56</sup> See Fulkerson 2017, 301, who also rightly notes that *nota* may have a negative connotation as «notorious» (as in Quint. *decl. min.* 363, 2).

<sup>57</sup> For Tibullus’ primacy among elegiac poets, see Vell. 2, 36, 3 *Tibullusque et Naso, perfectissimi in forma operis sui*, Quint. *inst.* 10, 1, 92 *elegia quoque Graecos prouocamus, cuius mihi tersus atque elegans maxime uidetur auctor Tibullus*



tainty when this impersonation might have been composed, although I would be tempted to think of the literary *milieu* of the Tiberian age, to which some texts of this sort seem to date.<sup>58</sup> Within this kind of literary production, there was much room for the elaboration of biographical and literary scenarios, which creatively filled the gaps that open up around the figure of a poet, connected by a sort of biographical intertextuality, as happens in Virgilian *pseudepigrapha*.

In our case, the representation of Tibullus has been based not only on Tibullus himself,<sup>59</sup> but also on two Horatian poems, *carm.* 1, 33 and *epist.* 1, 4, which allude to an Albius as the writer of elegies, already identified in antiquity with Tibullus. From the references to Tibullus' tormented love and *miserabiles elegi* for an unfaithful mistress in the ode, the author of [Tib.] 3, 19 has drawn the details of the erotic affair and the very invitation to compose such verses. The image of Tibullus' retreat to the *silvae*, which is absent from his authentic elegies, goes back to the Horatian *epistula*, but in [Tib.] 3, 19 it is depicted in a romantic, and not yet philosophical, light. In this sense, our elegy foretells the situations described in the two Horatian texts, from which it in fact derives.<sup>60</sup> The author of [Tib.] 3, 19, while certainly not Tibullus, is no pedestrian forger, as some scholars have claimed: in the poem, they prove to be a careful reader of both Tibullus' and Horace's poetry and construct an original and quite fascinating picture of the former. This impersonation offers a subtle

and the *Vita Tibulli* 2 *hic multorum iudicio principem inter elegiographos obtinet locum*; see Stachon 2021, 464-465. The refined rewriting of Tibullan themes in Ov. *am.* 3, 9 may have offered further inspiration to the author of [Tib.] 3, 19.

<sup>58</sup> Tibullus famously belonged to the circle of Messalla Corvinus, whose sons Messalinus and Cotta were important literary patrons under Tiberius: they may have favoured this highly elaborate kind of pseudepigraphic compositions, as I have suggested for *Ciris* and *Catalepton* 9 in Campodonico 2020.

<sup>59</sup> See again Knoche 1956, Lee 1963 and Gaertner 2002.

<sup>60</sup> Concerning the epigram [Tib.] 3, 20, little can be said with certainty. The explicit reference to the woman's betrayal (v. 1 *nostram peccare puellam*) seems to recover the jealousy against other men expressed in 3, 19, 6, which is found realised in Hor. *carm.* 1, 33, 3-4. However, nothing in the epigram suggests that it is a Tibullan impersonation like the elegy and they could be by different authors. Finally, it cannot be ruled out that the epigram was later added to the *Corpus Tibullianum* due to misattribution or accidents of tradition, in a case of 'secondary' pseudepigraphy (on which see Stachon 2014, 13-19).

literary game, with the complicity of learned readers: the explicit reveal of Tibullus' mask in v. 13, which is not consistent with his authentic practice of self-naming, may appear exceptional compared to other poetic *pseudepigrapha*, but is instead proof that this is more a refined reworking than a deceptive forgery. The *persona* of the greatest poet becomes the tool for handling both literary history and a deeply codified genre such as Latin love elegy.<sup>61</sup>

### Bibliography

- Alfonsi 1946 = L. Alfonsi, *Albio Tibullo e gli autori del Corpus Tibullianum*, Milano 1946.
- Axelsson 1960 = B. Axelsson, *Lygdamus und Ovid: zur Methodik der literarischen Prioritätsbestimmung*, *Eranos* 58, 1960, 92-111.
- Bright 1978 = D. F. Bright, *Haec mihi fingebam: Tibullus in His World*, Leiden 1978.
- Brugnoli 1994 = G. Brugnoli, *Tibullus nitidus agricola*, *RCCM* 36, 1994, 353-357.
- Cairns 1979 = F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge 1979.
- Campodonico 2020 = N. Campodonico, *Virgilio nel circolo di Messalla. Ciris, Catalepton 9 e la letteratura di età tiberiana*, *Maia* 73, 2020, 657-670.
- Cartault 1909 = A. Cartault, *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris 1909.
- Ciaffi 1944 = V. Ciaffi, *Lettura di Tibullo*, Torino 1944.
- Cucchiarelli 2019 = A. Cucchiarelli (a cura di), *Orazio. Epistole I*, Pisa 2019.
- Della Corte 1996 = F. Della Corte, *Albius 2 (Albius Tibullus)*, in *Enciclopedia Oraziana* 1, 1996, 625.
- Dell'Aversano et al. 2015 = C. Dell'Aversano - A. Grilli - M. Nervi, *La 'legge di Axelsson'. Filologia, estetica, transtestualità*, *Maia* 67, 2015, 603-640.
- Dettmer 1984 = H. Dettmer, *The Corpus Tibullianum (1974-1980)*, in *ANRW* II, 30, 3, 1984, 1962-1975.

<sup>61</sup> The existence of pseudepigraphic elegies is confirmed by Suet. *vita Hor.* 12, where Suetonius mentions elegies circulating under Horace's name that he considers false.

- Dissen 1835 = G. L. Dissen (ed.), *Albii Tibulli Carmina*, Göttingen 1835.
- Eisenhut 1977 = W. Eisenhut, *Die Autorschaft der Elegie 3, 19 im Corpus Tibullianum*, *Hermes* 105, 1977, 209-223.
- Fedeli 1997 = P. Fedeli (a cura di), *Q. Orazio Flacco. Le opere 2, 4. Le Epistole, l'Arte poetica*, Roma 1997.
- Fulkerson 2017 = L. Fulkerson (ed.), *A Literary Commentary on the Elegies of the Appendix Tibulliana*, Oxford 2017.
- Gaertner 2002 = J. F. Gaertner, *Zur Deutung von [Tib.] 3, 19*, *Mnemosyne* 55, 2002, 346-349.
- Gruppe 1838 = O. Gruppe, *Die römische Liebeselegie. Band I*, Leipzig 1838.
- Herrmann 1956 = L. Herrmann, *Corpus Tibullianum III, 19 et 20*, *Latomus* 16, 1957, 462-464.
- Heyne 1817<sup>4</sup> = C. G. Heyne (ed.), *Albii Tibulli carmina*, Leipzig 1817<sup>4</sup> [1777<sup>1</sup>].
- Heyworth 2021 = S. J. Heyworth, *The author of [Tibullus] 3.19 and 3.20: anonymous or Tibullus?*, in B. Kayachev (ed.), *Poems without Poets. Approaches to Anonymous Ancient Poetry*, Cambridge 2021, 152-169.
- Hinds 1998 = S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge 1998.
- Holzberg 1998 = N. Holzberg, *Four Poets and a Poetess or a Portrait of the Poet as a Young Man? Thoughts on Book 3 of the Corpus Tibullianum*, *CJ* 94, 1998, 169-191.
- Hubbard 2004 = T. K. Hubbard, *The Invention of Sulpicia*, *CJ* 100, 2004, 177-194.
- Keith 1999 = A. M. Keith, *Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory*, *Mnemosyne* 52, 1999, 41-62.
- Klingner 1959<sup>3</sup> = F. Klingner (ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Opera*, Leipzig 1959<sup>3</sup> [1939<sup>1</sup>].
- Knoche 1956 = U. Knoche, *Tibulls früheste Liebeselegie? (Tibull III 19)*, in *Navicula Chiloniensis: studia philologica Felici Jacoby professori Chilonensi emerito octogenario oblata*, Leiden 1956, 173-190.
- Knox 2018 = P. Knox, *The Corpus Tibullianum*, in H.-C. Günther (ed.), *A Short Companion to Tibullus and the Corpus Tibullianum*, Nordhausen 2018, 135-160.
- Lee 1963 = A. G. Lee, *On [Tibullus] III, 19 (IV, 13)*, *PCPhS* 9, 1963, 4-10.

- Lenz 1932 = F. W. Lenz, *Ein Liebesgedicht Tibulls (4, 13)*, SIFC 10, 1932, 125-145.
- Lenz - Galinsky 1971<sup>3</sup> = F. W. Lenz - G. C. Galinski (eds), *Albii Tibulli aliorumque Carminum libri tres*, Leiden 1971<sup>3</sup> [Leipzig 1939<sup>1</sup>].
- Luck 1998<sup>2</sup> = G. Luck (ed.), *Albius Tibullus. Carmina*, Stuttgart 1998<sup>2</sup> [1988<sup>1</sup>].
- Maltby 2002 = R. Maltby (ed.), *Tibullus. Elegies. Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Cambridge 2002.
- Maltby 2010 = R. Maltby, *The unity of Corpus Tibullianum book 3: some stylistic and metrical considerations*, PLLS 14, 2010, 319-340.
- Maltby 2021a = R. Maltby, *Book Three of the Corpus Tibullianum*, Cambridge 2021.
- Maltby 2021b = R. Maltby, *Authorial intent and the structure of book 3 of the Corpus Tibullianum*, in B. Kayachev (ed.), *Poems without Poets. Approaches to Anonymous Ancient Poetry*, Cambridge 2021, 49-66.
- Mayer 1994 = R. Mayer (ed.), *Horace. Epistles. Book I*, Cambridge 1994.
- Mayer 2012 = R. Mayer (ed.), *Horace. Odes. Book I*, Cambridge 2012.
- Mazzoli 1996 = G. Mazzoli, *Glicera*, in *Enciclopedia Oraziana* 1, 1996, 755-756.
- Nisbet - Hubbard 1970 = R. G. M. Nisbet - M. Hubbard (eds), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I*, Oxford 1970.
- Peirano 2012 = I. Peirano, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake. Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context*, Cambridge 2012.
- Pepe 1948 = L. Pepe, *Tibullo Minore*, Napoli 1948.
- Perrelli 2002 = R. Perrelli, *Commento a Tibullo. Elegie, libro 1*, Soveria Mannelli 2002.
- Ponchont 1924 = M. Ponchont, *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris 1924.
- Postgate 1880 = J. P. Postgate, *On the Genuineness of Tibullus IV.13*, JPh 9, 1880, 280-285.
- Postgate 1912 = J. P. Postgate, *Albius and Tibullus*, AJPh, 33, 1912, 450-455.
- Quinn 1985 = K. Quinn (ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. The Odes*, London 1985.
- Riposati 1967<sup>2</sup> = B. Riposati, *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo*, Milano 1967<sup>2</sup> [1945<sup>1</sup>].

- Romano 1991 = E. Romano (a cura di), *Q. Orazio Flacco. Le opere 1, 2. Le Odi, il Carme secolare, gli Epodi*, Roma 1991.
- Rouse - Reeve 1983 = R. H. Rouse - M. D. Reeve, *Tibullus*, in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, 421-425.
- Skoie 2012 = M. Skoie, *Corpus Tibullianum, book 3*, in B. K. Gold (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*, Malden-Oxford 2012, 86-100.
- Smith 1913 = K. F. Smith (ed.), *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, New York 1913.
- Stachon 2014 = M. Stachon, *Tractavi monumentum aere perennius. Untersuchungen zu vergilischen und ovidischen Pseudepigraphen*, Trier 2014.
- Stachon 2021 = M. Stachon (Hrsg.), *Sueton. De Poetis. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den erhaltenen Viten nebst begründeten Mutmaßungen zu den verlorenen Kapiteln*, Heidelberg 2021.
- Tränkle 1990 = H. Tränkle (Hrsg.), *Appendix Tibulliana*, Berlin 1990.
- Wimmel 1968 = W. Wimmel, *Der frühe Tibull*, Munich 1968.
- Woodman 2022 = A. J. Woodman (ed.), *Horace. Odes book III*, Cambridge 2022.

### Abstract

Elegy 3, 19 of the *Corpus Tibullianum* depicts the passionate and typically elegiac love for an unnamed woman by a poet who identifies himself with Tibullus (in v. 13). For this reason, several scholars have accepted, even recently, that the elegy is his work. However, several elements contradict this hypothesis, such as the fact that the authentic Tibullus only names himself in imagined inscriptions. It is more likely that [Tib.] 3, 19 is a pseudepigraphic impersonation of Tibullus: it appears to be constructed from the references to him found in Hor. *epist.* 1, 4 (his retreat into the *silvae salubres*) and *carm.* 1, 33 (his painful love for a bold and unfaithful woman). The author of [Tib.] 3, 19 thus creates an elegy that anticipates what Horace says in his texts addressed to Tibullus and assumes his authorial mask in an allusive literary game.

*Keywords:* Tibullus, Horace, pseudepigraphy, impersonation, elegy, *Appendix Tibulliana*, *Corpus Tibullianum*

