

REPLY TO REVIEW

G. Mader's review of my commentary on book I of Tibullus appeared recently in *Acta Classica* 24 (1981) 175–177. I am in agreement with some of his remarks (most notably his kind praise of various aspects of my work); and I am indebted to his meticulous scrutiny for some helpful observations, in connection with the misplaced line and the few typographical errors. However, the review contains a number of inaccuracies and misapprehensions and incorporates several criticisms and suggestions to which I would like to respond in the interest of Tibullan scholarship. Disregarding minor matters, I will address myself to more substantial points in the order in which they occur in the review.

Firstly, the reviewer accuses me of not taking into account some important work on Tibullus which appeared between the publication of Harrauer's bibliography (in 1971) and my own commentary. In fact, I took into account all relevant scholarship that was available to me until February 1978 (as the date at the end of the first part of my Preface implies), after which the book was in the publisher's hands. I am most definitely not so unscholarly as simply to neglect or ignore articles and books in the manner suggested; and my failure to cite many academic works from the last decade was perfectly deliberate, since (for the reasons given on page vii on my Preface) I was of the considered opinion that they did not merit citation.

Wimmel's *Tibull und Delia*, which the reviewer regards so highly, was just one of those deliberate omissions. I honestly did not feel that I needed any more help on the structure of 1.1, but, had I done so, I certainly would not have turned for it to Wimmel's muddled and clumsy structural interpretation. In particular, Wimmel did not show me that in 1.1 the transposition of lines 25–32 to follow line 6 is not essential. Over this matter I can only refer the reviewer back again to my various arguments in the Critical Appendix (most of which he does not mention and Wimmel says nothing to refute), and I would add that I am also unimpressed by the reviewer's own brief attempt to support the order of lines in the mss.: 'ipse' in 7 might pick up 'me' in 5 (I fail to see how it develops 'me' significantly), but it picks up 'pudeat' in 29 and 'pigeat' in 31 better; and it is all very well to talk of foils and (quite vaguely) of negative-positive thought progression, but elsewhere in Tibullus they do not entail any loss of coherence, and if a poet in one couplet wishes for a life of 'inertia' but in the next immediately speaks of the work that he will perform then (only to drop that topic promptly for another twenty lines), that deserves to be described not as a progression in thought but as an illogical jerk.

So too in the case of the variant readings 'igne' and 'imbre' at 1.1.48 Wimmel did not convince me of the superiority of the latter. Nor does the reviewer, who seems to misinterpret both the line in question and my discussion in the Critical Appendix, if I understand correctly the implications of his rather elliptical remarks. Thus, contrary to the reviewer's apparent inference, I did not and would not suggest that 'igne' denotes a 'hypocauston' and that Tibullus' country home was equipped with such a heating-device. Clearly, when I said that "Enk . . . provides a parallel for a Roman heating his bedroom (Pliny *Epist.* 2.17.23)", I meant simply that the passage in Pliny is one that conveniently proves that Romans did heat their bedrooms, and I went on to add that Enk "makes the valid observation that there is no reason at all why a Roman should not *light a fire* there on a cold night". Given our ignorance of the nature of Tibullus' house in the country as a result of his reticence on the subject,¹ it seemed to me perfectly possible that the poet might light a fire in the room in which he slept, and that assumption is hardly invalidated by Julian *Misopogon* 341D (cited by the reviewer), which refers to steam produced from walls that had been allowed to become thoroughly damp. In addition, it would appear that the reviewer, for reasons best known to himself, chooses to conclude that 'somnos . . . sequi' in

line 48 means not that Tibullus is pursuing sleep (i.e. trying to sleep) but that he is already sleeping (a meaning which the phrase patently cannot bear there, particularly in view of 'iuvante') and imagines that a man already asleep can be somehow helped by a downpour of rain. Again several of my arguments in the Critical Appendix here remain unanswered.

The reviewer also comments on my discussion of imitation of Propertius 1 in Tibullus' first book, claiming that my treatment of the subject is inadequate and coming up with two further instances of such imitation. Firstly, he remarks that Tibullus 1.9.21 might recall Propertius 1.1.27 ('flamma . . . ferro': ferrum . . . ignes'). I had in fact considered this possibility but quickly rejected it: the two lines contain significant differences in situation and reference² and strictly have only one (quite normal) word in common ('ferrum'), and it seemed to me far more likely that Tibullus' 'flamma . . . ferro' recalled the frequent combinations of those two same words elsewhere³ than Propertius' 'ferrum . . . ignes'. Secondly, the reviewer says that Tibullus 1.8.9–12 and 15–16 contain in his opinion a likely echo of Propertius 1.2.1–14 "(with the key words 'capillus', 'cultus', 'nitere', 'artifex' and 'indocilis'; cf. also Propertius 1,15,5–8)". Naturally, in view of the thematic similarity, I had explored the possibility of imitation here too, but again I rejected the idea for various reasons. The topic of the beloved dressing up and the idea that natural beauty is superior to the artificial were common enough,⁴ and the Propertian and Tibullan passages show distinct differences in tone, circumstances and details (hair-care alone is common to both), while verbal correspondences seemed to me negligible. The reviewer suggests five instances of coincidence in diction, but two of these are not so close ('cultu'—'coluisse' and 'nitere'—'nitidum') and one is most improbable ('indocilis' is presumably supposed to be recalled by Tibullus' 'inculto', but these are two different words with quite different senses). The fact that four words (out of eighty-four) in a Propertian passage, and words that are hardly unusual or remarkable, bear some similarity to four words (out of thirty-four) in some lines of Tibullus provides extremely weak grounds for claiming Propertian influence. (Propertius 1.15.5–8 is still more unlikely as a source here, if that is the reviewer's suggestion.) I had hoped that my commentary⁵ would incidentally discourage such lack of strictness and rigour in the suggestion of models, a failing which has bedevilled criticism of Tibullus (and other poets) for far too long.

To move on to the reviewer's discussion of my references on page 48 for the condemnation of war, I must admit to being at something of a disadvantage here, in that I am mystified by his distinction between hostility to militarism as a response to a *particular* war in Aristophanes and as a *generic* demand in Roman elegy, not least because I find it hard to follow this differentiation between "particular" and "generic" and to see how opposition to warfare can be described as a "demand" in Roman elegy.⁶ At any rate I still consider the cited plays of Aristophanes to be perfectly pertinent parallels, especially since, like them, Tibullus 1.1 is presented as a personal response to a particular campaign⁷ containing condemnation of war in general.

In connection with my notes on sounds causing fear at 1.2.35–36 and on bad dreams at 1.5.13–14, the reviewer seems to object both to my inclusion of as many as six or seven references in each case and to my exclusion of still more references. A mere two or three lines of comment hardly indicate that I regard these as "vital literary motifs", as he implies. Actually, I simply selected a few widespread parallels from the many that came to mind and were recorded in Smith, to show that these were not startlingly original themes and were common enough throughout Greek and Latin literature. The reviewer suggests four more references; I could easily have added a further half dozen or so, but I believed that my points had already been adequately made.

With regard to my use of the term "ring-structure" in my notes on 1.1.11–44 and 1.2.15–24, I generally, in the interests of economy, refrained in my commentary from pointing out

what I considered to be self-evident and from repeating myself. Thus on 1.1.11–44 I deemed it unnecessary to specify that at 41ff. the theme of ‘paupertas’ is present in ‘non ego . . . parva seges satis est’, that of religion in his requests there to the gods in return for the ‘dona’ of 38 (cf. my note on 1.1.41–44) and that of relaxation in ‘requiescere lecto’ and ‘membra levare toro’. Similarly on 1.2.15–24 it seemed sufficient justification of my reference to ring-structure within these lines to mention shortly afterwards that 15–16 state the poet’s main point that Venus aids the brave and 23–24 restate that opening idea.

Finally, I beg to differ in the matter of my very occasional (supposedly unwarranted) jibes at Smith’s display of non-classical erudition.⁸ Whether or not this practice was common among scholars of his generation is completely beside the point. Such a display is only one aspect of the extensive irrelevance that helps to mar Smith’s commentary,⁹ and all such irrelevance, because it wastes the reader’s time, puts a strain on his patience and concentration, and is often frustrating and positively misleading, constitutes a serious fault and deserves to be roundly condemned.

NOTES

1. Incidentally, I do not see why the reviewer should be so certain that the building is a mere “cottage”, especially in the light of 19ff.
2. Almost certainly in Tibullus the reference is to ‘servitium amoris’ (see my commentary on 1.9.21–22), while in Propertius the reference is to surgery and cautery (see e.g. Postgate, Enk, Rothstein, Luck (Artemis ed.), Hodge and Buttimore, Richardson *ad loc.*).
3. See Smith on Tibullus 1.9.21.
4. See Smith and myself on the Tibullan passage.
5. See e.g. my introductory essays to 1.4 and 1.7.
6. For instance, there is no anti-militarism in Tibullus 1.7.
7. See my introductory essay to 1.1.
8. My remark on page 216, by the way, is hardly an example of such a jibe.
9. Especially evident in the frequent inclusion of inapposite material in his lists of references, which (although this appears to have escaped the reviewer) I had to sift carefully, cutting and expanding where necessary.

P. MURGATROYD

University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg

ACTA CLASSICA



Acta Classica is published annually by the Classical Association of South Africa. The journal has been in production since 1958. It is listed on both the ISI and the SAPSE list of approved publications.

Published by
The Classical Association of
South Africa

For further information go to:
http://www.casa-kvsa.org.za/acta_classica.htm