



## EMENDATIONES TIBULLIANAE I\*

### ABSTRACT

*Conjectures are made on the text of three passages in Tibullus, Books 1–2: 1.4.26 hastam ... suam for crines ... suos, 2.1.56 membra for bache, 2.4.60 alii rebus for alias herbas.*

**Keywords:** Tibullus; Latin; elegy; textual criticism; conjecture

‘His MSS are almost the worst in the world’; ‘few classical texts are quite so badly transmitted as the *Corpus Tibullianum*’; ‘the Tibullan corpus has abominable manuscripts and editions to match’.<sup>1</sup> Critics have never held the manuscripts of Tibullus in high respect, and it is not difficult to see why. The oldest copy of the complete text, cod. Ambros. R. 26 sup. (A), dates only so far back as 1374/5; many of the medieval florilegia, though older by a couple of centuries, are much interpolated; and the only other witness demonstrably independent of A, the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum* (F), is almost entirely lost to sight.<sup>2</sup> This is not the sort of evidence on which an editor should like to establish the text of one of Rome’s canonical love poets. Nevertheless, modern editors have been able to derive from this tradition what is—despite all faults—still a fairly readable paradosis, even if many dubious lections continue to stick in their place. The purpose of this paper is to reconsider three of these doubtful readings afresh, and in each case to propose an emendation.

\* I am indebted to David Butterfield for supervising the undergraduate thesis and the M.Phil. essay in which these notes first appeared. Thanks also are due to Jonathan Nathan for helpful comments on an early draft, as well as to *CQ*’s reader and to the Editor for their constructive remarks.

<sup>1</sup> A.E. Housman, ‘Ovid’s *Heroides*’, *CR* 11 (1897), 286–90, at 289 = F.R.D. Goodyear and J. Diggle (edd.), *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1972), 1.409; D. Fowler, ‘Roman literature’, *G&R* 36 (1989), 100–9, at 102, paraphrasing H.D. Jocelyn, ‘*Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres* ed. Fridericus Waltharius Lenz’, *Gnomon* 38 (1966), 35–40, at 35; E. Courtney, ‘Problems in Tibullus and Lygdamus’, *Maia* 29 (1987), 29–32, at 29. Reference will be made to the following editions and commentaries: R. Maltby, *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction, and Commentary* (*ARCA, Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers, and Monographs* 41) (Cambridge, 2002); R. Perrelli, *Commento a Tibullo: Elegie, libro I* (Soveria Mannelli, 2002); G. Luck, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carmina* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1998<sup>2</sup>); P. Murgatroyd, *Tibullus Elegies II* (Oxford, 1994); G. Lee, *Tibullus: Elegies* (Leeds, 1990<sup>3</sup>); F. Della Corte, *Tibullo: Le Elegie* (Milan, 1990<sup>3</sup>); P. Murgatroyd, *Tibullus I* (Pietrmaritzburg, 1980); J. André, *Albii Tibulli elegiarum liber primus* (Paris, 1965); K.F. Smith, *The Elegies of Tibullus* (New York, 1913); G. Némethy, *Albii Tibulli carmina. Accedunt Sulpiciae elegidia* (Budapest, 1906); L. Dissen, *Albii Tibulli carmina ex recensione Car. Lachmanni passim mutata*, 2 vols. (Göttingen, 1835); J.G. Huschke, *Albii Tibulli carmina*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1819); C. Bach, *Albii Tibulli carmina* (Berlin, 1819); J.H. Voss, *Albii Tibullus und Lygdamus* (Heidelberg, 1811); C.G. Heyne and E.K.F. Wunderlich, *Albii Tibulli carmina, libri tres cum quarto Sulpiciae et aliorum*, 2 parts (Leipzig, 1817<sup>4</sup>); J.A. Vulpius, *Albii Tibullus eques Romanus et in eum Jo. Antonii Vulpii novus commentarius* (Padua, 1749); J. Broukhusius, *Albii Tibulli equitis Rom. quae exstant, ad fidem veterum membranarum sedulo castigata* (Amsterdam, 1708); A. Staius, *Tibullus cum commentario Achillis Statii Lusitani* (Venice, 1567).

<sup>2</sup> On the mysterious fate of MS F, see H. Dixon, ‘The discovery and disappearance of the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum* of Tibullus’, *RHT* 1 (2006), 37–72.

For passages discussed I give the text of Luck's second edition (with his obeli), including his sigla and apparatus criticus, to which I append some forgotten conjectures.

## I

Jupiter allows lovers to break their oaths with impunity (1.4.21–6):

'nec iurare time: Veneris periuria uenti  
 irrita per terras et freta summa ferunt.  
 gratia magna Ioui: uetuit pater ipse ualere,  
 iurasset cupide quicquid ineptus amor:  
 perque suas impune sinit Dictynna sagittas  
 affirmes †crines† perque Minerua suos.' 25

24 crines Z+ : clipeos Santen : cristas Mitscherlich : gryphes uel gryphas Rigler

'Great thanks be to Jupiter: the father himself annuls whatever foolish love should rashly aver. Diana allows you to swear by her arrows with impunity, Minerva by her hair.' Suspicion is justly cast on *crines*, for it is not easy to see why a lover, least of all a perjurious lover, should wish to aver his affection by invoking as a witness—of all things—the 'hair' of Minerva. That Minerva was fond of her hair is not in doubt: her turning the locks of Medusa, who had preferred her own to the goddess', into snakes is testament enough to that.<sup>3</sup> But whether it was the sort of attribute whereby a lover could swear, whether it stood in the same relation to Minerva as the bow and arrow to Diana, is very far from certain. Commentators are at a loss for a parallel.<sup>4</sup> 'Iuratur per id quod utrique deae carissimum,' says Dissen, 'quo contemto maxime irascitur quaeque; sitne ea corporis pars an telum, quid refert? poena ut eo ipso sumatur, per quod peieratum, non opus est.'<sup>5</sup> This is a perfectly reasonable inference, but it does not square neatly with the actual practice of oath-swearing in elegy. Lovers in this genre usually swear by (one of) two things: by something they are willing to lose if they perjure themselves, and by something to ensure that they lose it in such an event.<sup>6</sup> A lover swears by his own hair,<sup>7</sup> and expects to lose it if the oath is broken; he does not swear by the hair of a divine witness. This conception of the lover's oath is most fully worked out by Ovid in *Amores* 3.3, where it is parodied extensively. There his mistress, having first sworn an oath by all of her most attractive qualities (3–4 long hair, 5–6 rosy cheeks, 7–8 dainty feet, 9–10 sparkling eyes) and then broken it, is permitted—contrary to expectation—

<sup>3</sup> Commentators (n. 1) have tended to adduce Servius Danielis on Verg. *Aen.* 6.289 to substantiate this point, but cf. also Ov. *Met.* 4.793–803.

<sup>4</sup> Murgatroyd (n. 1), 140 compares oaths sworn by Zeus's head and Caesar's head, the rays of the sun, and the song of the Fates, but 'can find no exact parallel for an oath by her [Minerva's] hair'. Heyne (n. 1), 49 offers up Prop. 2.28.11–12, yet there the girl is not swearing by Minerva's eyes but rather denying their beauty, which is 'a different kind of offence from that mentioned in verse 8 [quidquid iurarunt, uentus et unda rapit]', according to S.J. Heyworth, *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius* (Oxford, 2007), 232.

<sup>5</sup> Dissen (n. 1), 94.

<sup>6</sup> Smith (n. 1), 271–2; F.V. Hickson, *Roman Prayer Language: Livy and the Aeneid of Vergil* (Stuttgart, 1993), 107. In elegy one's own eyes are the commonest thing to swear by; cf. Prop. 1.15.33–6; Ov. *Am.* 2.16.43–4, 3.11.48; [Tib.] 3.6.47. But other non-divine entities may be invoked in place of a god: cf. Prop. 2.20.15–17; Ov. *Her.* 2.37–8, 13.159–60; and see I.C. Torrance, 'Of cabbages and kings: the *Eideshort* phenomenon', in A.H. Sommerstein and I.C. Torrance (edd.), *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece* (Berlin and Boston, 2014), 111–31.

<sup>7</sup> Or by the hair of one dear to him, as in e.g. Apul. *Met.* 3.23.

not to lose but to keep them, whereas Ovid, because she swore by his eyes also, feels the hurt in his own. When in *Am.* 3.3.13–14 he writes *perque suos illam nuper iurasse recordeo | perque meos oculos: en doluere mei!*, he is parodying such lines as Prop. 1.15.35–6 *hos [sc. ocellos] tu iurabas, si quid mentita fuisses, | ut tibi suppositis exciderent manibus*.<sup>8</sup> And when he proceeds to satirize the calling of gods to witness, he concentrates not on their hair but, like Tibullus in 1.4.25, on their weapons (*Am.* 3.3.27–30):

nobis fatifero Mauors accingitur ense;  
 nos petit inuicta Palladis hasta manu.  
 nobis flexibiles curuantur Apollinis arcus;  
 in nos alta Iouis dextera fulmen habet.

This passage would seem to controvert Dissen's earlier assertion: in elegy the gods very much do exact punishments using the weapons on which elegiac lovers swear. Such instruments include the bow of Cupid (*Ov. Am.* 2.7.27–8; *Her.* 7.157), the torches of Venus (*Her.* 3.39–40), the arrows of Diana (*Fast.* 2.157), and, in a different context, the thunderbolt of Jupiter (*Verg. Aen.* 12.200; *Stat. Silu.* 3.1.186) and bow of Apollo (*Anth. Lat.* 199.11 R). Minerva's hair is not only unparalleled as an attribute on which to swear an oath; it is not even of the same class as those attributes which are actually sworn upon.<sup>9</sup> Hence Merli, the only modern scholar besides Luck who seems to acknowledge the oddness of *crines*, is moved to regard it as intentionally humorous.<sup>10</sup> Swearing by the hair of Minerva—upon this theory—is a behaviour illustrative of the 'foolish love' of lines 23–4: the lover in his eagerness swears upon whatever first comes to mind (24 *iurasset cupide quicquid ineptus amor*), and the first thing that here comes to mind, after the arrows of Dictynna, is the hair of Minerva. But with Merli's explanation come two problems. First, if Minerva's hair is acknowledged to be a ridiculous attribute to swear by, then the oath by which it is sworn ought to be accounted as weak or worthless (cf. *Ov. Rem. am.* 783–4). But if a lover's oath were weak or worthless because he had picked a ridiculous attribute for a witness, Jupiter would have no reason to intervene, and the special exception he makes for lovers (23–4) would not be in request. In truth, the 'foolishness' of love consists, as commentators have long remarked, in choosing to swear by two goddesses who by reason of their own *castitas uirginalis* would be least disposed to forgive the breaking of a lover's oath—not in swearing by an abnormal attribute of one of those two goddesses.<sup>11</sup> Second, if it were Tibullus' intention to index some of the strange attributes on which heedless lovers swear, one wonders why he did not assign an equally irreverent item to Diana (her *crura*, for example).

*crines* has been explained in other ways. Acknowledging that a parallel to *sagittas* is required to give force to *impune* in line 25, Huschke wondered if *crines* might be a metonym for the plume of Minerva's helmet.<sup>12</sup> This is quite impossible. *crinis* by itself sometimes signifies the material from which a plume is made but never the crest of the

<sup>8</sup> J.T. Davies, 'Revisit Amor: literary burlesque in Ovid's *Amores*', *ANRW* 2.31.4 (1981), 2460–506, at 2503.

<sup>9</sup> Prayers, unlike oaths, do sometimes admit of non-weapons: e.g. Isis' *sistra* in *Ov. Am.* 2.13.11.

<sup>10</sup> E. Merli, 'Per la chioma di Minerva: nota a Tibullo 1, 4, 23–26', *RFIC* 145 (2017), 400–4.

<sup>11</sup> Dissen (n. 1), 94; Smith (n. 1), 271; Murgatroyd (n. 1), 140; Della Corte (n. 1), 167–8; Maltby (n. 1), 223. In other words, the 'inappropriateness' of *ineptus* (on which, see Perrelli [n. 1], 136) refers to the choice of goddess, not of attribute.

<sup>12</sup> Huschke (n. 1), 118–19. The anonymous reader wonders if *crines* could refer to the hair of the Gorgon on Minerva's aegis (cf. *Luc.* 7.149). I think this interpretation is blocked by *suos*, which suggests Minerva's 'own' hair, not that of the Gorgon. Substituting *Medusa* for *Minerua* (another

helmet itself (cf. E. Lommatzsch, *TLL* 4.1202.78–1203.2). Moreover, this special use of *crinis* is usually clarified by context, as in Sil. *Pun.* 5.133–4 *cui uertice surgens | triplex crista iubas effundit crine Sueuo*, where the hair clearly belongs to a plumed helmet. Finally, it is not easy to see how a plume might be put to the use of punishing a liar. This last objection holds for Mitscherlich's *cristas* and for all other conjectures so far made upon this passage.<sup>13</sup>

The fact is that, if Tibullus wished to specify a genuinely threatening attribute of Minerva, he would have written *hastam ... suam*.<sup>14</sup> That he did is entirely possible. Not only is Minerva's spear a weapon like Diana's arrows; it is also the only attribute of hers which I have found persons in Latin poetry to swear by (cf. Juv. 13.82), and, if read here, would enable line 26 to constitute the line parodied at Ov. *Am.* 3.3.28.<sup>15</sup> The distance travelled by *crines* from the letters of *hastam* is contrasted by its closeness to those of the tail-end of *affirmes*. If a copyist committed an error of dittography, writing, say, *affirmes firmes* for *affirmes hastam*, a later scribe could well have changed this into *affirmes crines* ( $m = n$ ), writing *suos* for *suam* as a matter of course. Such errors are not uncommon in Tibullus' manuscripts: cf. 1.1.50 *terre ferre* (cod. Parisinus lat. 8233) in error for *tristes ferre* (Z+), 1.4.42 *arenti torren̄ti torreat* (V) in error for *arenti torreat* (AGX+), 1.5.11 *sulpure puro* (Z+) in error for *sulpure uiuo* (Heinsius, Broukhusius), 1.10.14 *telit gerit* (H) for *tela gerit* (Z+).<sup>16</sup> The anonymous reader suggests, alternatively, that *hastam* was first corrupted to *castam*, owing to the frequent collocation of this adjective with Minerva (cf. Prop. 3.20.7; Ov. *Am.* 1.7.18; *Ilias Latina* 78, 333, 532, 894), and then deliberately emended by a scribe to *crines*.

## II

Tibullus explains the origins of a festival (2.1.51–6):

agricola assiduo primum satiatus aratro  
 cantauit certo rustica uerba pede  
 et satur arenti primum est modulatus auena  
 carmen, ut ornatos diceret ante deos,  
 agricola et minio suffusus, Bacche, rubenti  
 primus inexperta duxit ab arte choros. 55

proposal) is discountenanced by the regular collocation of Diana and Minerva in poetry (e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 2.243).

<sup>13</sup> C.W. Mitscherlich, *Tentamen criticum in aliquot Tibulli loca* (Göttingen, 1800), 4–5. *clipeos*, suggested by L. van Santen, 'Albius Tibullus ex ed. Heynii', *Bibl. Crit.* 1.3 (1779), 53–88, at 74, is unaccountably plural; had Tibullus intended to signify Minerva's 'aegis', he would have written *clipeum ... suum. gryphes* or *gryphas*, proposed by F.A. Rigler, *Annotationes ad Tibullum*, 3 vols. (Potsdam, 1839–1844), 1.14–15, could, I suppose, be put to the use of enforcing an oath, but *angues/-is* (or *hydras* or *colubros*, as the referee suggests) would be more emblematic of the goddess (cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.802–3; Stat. *Theb.* 2.597, 8.517–18; Claud. *Carm.* 8.162–4).

<sup>14</sup> Having arrived at this conclusion I discover that Heyne (n. 1), 2.88 had unfairly rejected it: 'manet alterum, post *sagittas* Dianae expectari posse simile quid ex armis Minervae; de quibus si circumpexeris, habes *hastam, galeam, scutum*, unde coniecturae duci possunt ... magis tamen per lusum ingeniosum quam ex re et veritate.'

<sup>15</sup> For Minerva's spear in Latin verse, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 10.474; *Priapea* 9.6, 20.2; Mart. 14.179; Sen. *Ag.* 528–30; Sil. *Pun.* 9.456; Claud. *Rapt.* 2.21–5, *Carm. min.* 53.91–3.

<sup>16</sup> Other manuscript traditions are privy to this type of error: thus at Ov. *Ib.* 640 *inmemores ne nos* we find in one manuscript (y) *inmemores nemore* (see the apparatus criticus of A. La Penna, *Publi Ovidi Nasonis Ibis* [Florence, 1957], 171).

'The farmer, wearied by constant ploughing, was first to chant rustic words in regular metre, first to play on the oaten pipe a song to sing before decorated gods. And the farmer, drenched with ruddy cinnabar, Bacchus, first led the dance with inexpert skill.' To what speaker should be attributed the sudden exclamation of *Bacche* in line 55? To the farmer? But there is no *ait* or *inquit* to mark the attribution. Then to Tibullus? Cries of (*euho*) *Bacche* are the sort of thing one expects to hear from a Dionysian reveller, and a Dionysian revel is indeed what many believe to be here under discussion.<sup>17</sup> But Tibullus does not pose as a participant of this festival; he poses as its narrator, and it is not in the style of a narrator to make strange and wild ejaculations of this kind. True, Bacchus is invoked along with Ceres at the beginning of this elegy. But there his presence is welcomed by a second-person pronoun and imperative (3–4):

Bacche, ueni, dulcisque tuis e cornibus uua  
pendeat, et spicis tempora cinge, Ceres.

Here he gets no such fanfare. *Bacche* is part of no prayer, no earnest exhortation. When Hartman enquires 'cur vocativus ille *Bacche* inseritur?', I do not know how to answer him.<sup>18</sup>

Whenever Tibullus pronounces a name in the vocative case, he always follows it with a verb or a pronoun of the first or second person.<sup>19</sup> The spontaneous apostrophe of Bacchus in line 55 differs from every other address in Tibullus in this particular. No first- or second-person verbs or pronouns are present to bring him into conversation either with Tibullus or with the dancing farmer (for example 'Bacchus, the farmer leads *your* dance'), nor is any effect gained by their absence. 'Intempestiue', says Statius, 'Bacchum videtur appellare. Mihi aut aliquid deesse, aut vitio scriptum videbatur.'<sup>20</sup> If *bacche* (thus MSS AV) is corrupt, the number of possible parts of speech which it could have supplanted is not great. It may hide an adverb qualifying *rubentem*, such as *suaue* or, what is much closer to the letters, *dulce*.<sup>21</sup> But take *bacche* out of the text entirely, and the one thing that appears most to be missing from this sentence is a part of the body in respect of which the farmer has smeared himself with cinnabar. An accusative of respect is so used with *suffusus* in Ov. *Met.* 11.368 and [Ov.] *Hal.* 123; cf. also *Ciris* 505–6 *minioque infecta rubenti | crura*. So, where upon their bodies did the holidaying Romans of antiquity apply the tincture of cinnabar? Pliny the Elder (*HN* 33.111), citing Verrius Flaccus, reports that in old times the Romans used *minium* to colour the 'face of a statue of Jupiter' (*Iouis ipsius simulacri faciem diebus festis*

<sup>17</sup> Murgatroyd (n. 1), 50; Maltby (n. 1), 374–5.

<sup>18</sup> J.J. Hartman, 'Ad Tibulli elegiam libri secondi primam', *Mnemosyne* 42 (1914), 193–7, at 195.

<sup>19</sup> Verses in which the vocative (not only of a name) is used with a second-person verb or pronoun are 1.1.15, 19–20, 33–4, 37, 53, 57, 61, 68, 75; 1.2.7, 9, 15, 73, 99; 1.3.1, 4, 5, 23, 27, 51, 92; 1.4.1, 61, 83; 1.6.2–3, 15–16, 55, 63; 1.7.7, 13, 23, 43, 53, 63; 1.8.50, 67; 1.9.5, 65, 84; 1.10.15, 25, 67; 2.1.3–4, 17–18, 33–5, 81; 2.2.9, 21; 2.3.27, 61, 63–4, 66; 2.4.2, 6, 15, 20; 2.5.1, 17, 39–41, 51, 55, 57, 65, 79, 88, 105–6, 114, 121; 2.6.5, 15, 28, 53. Those in which it is used with the first-person are 1.6.85–6, 1.8.69 and 2.3.1. At 1.10.11 some editors read *Valgi* for *uulgi*, but the true correction assuredly is *dulcis*: see J.J. O'Hara, 'War and the sweet life: the Gallus fragment and the text of Tibullus 1.10.11', *CQ* 55 (2005), 317–19.

<sup>20</sup> Statius (n. 1), 149. In reply Broukhusius (n. 1), 219–20 and Vulpius (n. 1), 150–1 give some valid reasons why Bacchus might receive mention in this context (e.g. 'a Tibullo attingi principia Tragoediae'), but not why he should be directly addressed in the vocative, which is the matter at issue.

<sup>21</sup> For *suaue rubenti*, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 3.63, 4.43–4; [Verg.] *Ciris* 96; and *Copae* 19. For *dulce rubenti*, cf. Stat. *Silu.* 2.1.133–4 *dulce rubenti | murice*, *Theb.* 4.274 *dulce rubens* [*sc.* the face of Parthenopaeus]; Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.45 and 48 *dulce rubens hyacinthus*. In minuscule scripts *b* and *a* are as easily confused with *d* and *u* as the ascender of *h* with *l*.

*minio inlini solitam*) and the ‘bodies’ of persons going in triumphal procession (*triumphantiumque corpora*).<sup>22</sup> Though he claims to be unable to see the origin of this custom (112 *cuius rei causam equidem miror*), possibly it bears some relation to that practice of painting red the faces of agricultural gods, a custom alluded to not only by Tibullus in line 54 (*ornatos ... deos*) but also by Virgil in *Ecl.* 6.21–2 *Aegle, Naiadum pulcherrima, | iamque uidenti sanguineis frontem moris et tempora pingit* and 10.26–7 *Pan deus Arcadiae uenit, quem uidimus ipsi | sanguineis ebuli bacis minioque rubentem*. Servius and Servius Danielis’s comments on these passages are also redolent of Verrius’ dictionary: Verg. *Ecl.* 6.22 *multi ob hoc dictum putant* (cf. Plin. *HN* 33.111 *enumerat auctores Verrius*), *quod robeus color deorum sit: unde et triumphantes facie miniata, et in Capitolio Iuppiter in quadrigis miniatus; 10.27 facie rubra pingitur Pan propter aetheris similitudinem: aether autem est Iuppiter. unde etiam triumphantes ... faciem quoque de rubrica inlinunt instar coloris aetherii*. So, red faces and red bodies. Since neither *ora* nor *corpora* will scan, the best lection according to this line of reasoning would surely be *membra*. Mention of the farmer’s ‘limbs’ (or ‘limbs as comprising the whole body’, *OLD* s.v. 2) leads neatly into the description of dancing in line 56, *membra mouere* being a common synonym of this (cf. Tib. 1.7.38; Lucr. 4.980; Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.24–5; Ov. *Fast.* 6.677–8). The manuscripts’ *membra* may have been banalized first to *brachia*, then corrected to *bache* for metre’s sake;<sup>23</sup> else it was abbreviated first to *m̄bra*, and then expanded by a generous hand into *bache*, perhaps owing to a scribe’s familiarity with Verg. *Ecl.* 10.27 *bacis minioque rubentem*, or under the influence of *ab arte* in the line below (for example *suffusus membra rubenti* → *suffusus ab arte rubenti* → *suffusus bache rubenti*). For *membra* + *perfusus* + ablative there is a parallel in Luc. 8.735 *perfusus sanguine membra*.<sup>24</sup>

### III

Tibullus agrees to drink a concoction of magic herbs and drugs, if Nemesis will look kindly on him (2.4.55–60):

quicquid habet Circe, quicquid Medea ueneni,	55
quicquid et herbarum Thessala terra gerit,	
et quod, ubi indomitis gregibus Venus afflat amores,	
Hippomanes cupidae stillat ab inguine euae,	
si modo me placido uideat Nemesis mea uultu,	
mille alias herbas misceat illa, bibam.	60

60 alias herbas Z+ : aliis philtris *Sprengel* : malas herbas *Valckenaer* : malos succos *Heyne*

<sup>22</sup> This passage is brought into connection with Tib. 2.1.55–6 by Broukhusius (n. 1), 220 n., Bach (n. 1), 123 n. and Némethy (n. 1), 207.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Ov. *Ib.* 366 *brachia membraque* T; Stat. *Theb.* 9.435 *Baccheaque*] *bracchiaque* P.

<sup>24</sup> As the commoner word for ‘pouring’ a liquid upon one’s body is *perfusus* (cf. N. Holmes, *TLL* 10.1.1418–1419.71), *suffusus* being reserved for things wholly permeated (hence the prefix, *sub-*) rather than poured on top of (as Dissen [n. 1], 220 says: ‘[v]erbum *suffusus* proprium de iis quae sub cute conspiciuntur’), one wonders why Tibullus did not write it here. Perhaps he did. For the error, cf. Maximianus, *Carm.* 5.99 *perfusa*] *suffusa* FGM (in the apparatus criticus of R. Webster, *The Elegies of Maximianus* [Princeton, 1900], 57). A scribe’s reminiscence of Ov. *Am.* 3.3.5 *suffusa rubore* and Lucr. 6.1146 *suffusa luce rubentes* may have caused the corruption here.

When a list of particulars is closed by a noun qualified by *mille alii*, these words always specify the class to which the items on said list belong, never further items from that class: Sen. *Contr.* 3.16 *laqueus, gladius, praeceps locus, uenenum, naufragium, mille aliae mortes*; Celsus, *Med.* 1.pr.41 *metu, dolore, inedia, cruditate, lassitudine, mille aliis mediocribus adfectibus*, 3.21.2 *famem, sitim, et mille alia taedia*; Sen. *Dial.* 9.5.3 *petulantiam, inuidiam, mille alia inertia uitia*. We should therefore cast a second glance at *herbas* in line 60, since it appears to violate this pattern by failing to constitute a class able to comprehend all the items on its list; for *uenenum* (55) and *hippomanes* (57–8) are not ‘herbs’ with which a thousand ‘others’ (*alias*) may be mixed.<sup>25</sup> A second reason to suspect the text of this passage is its ambiguous syntax. Murgatroyd remarks that *quicquid ... ueneni* (55), *quicquid ... herbarum* (56) and *Hippomanes* (57–8) can be taken as objects either of *misceat* (along with *mille alias herbas* in asyndeton) or of *bibam* (*mille alias herbas misceat illa* standing in parenthesis).<sup>26</sup> The grammar could be disambiguated by making *mille alias herbas* into an ablative or dative noun phrase, *mille aliis herbis*, and thus tying the ingredients of lines 55–8 only to *misceat*: ‘let her mix poison, herbs and hippomanes with a thousand other herbs: provided my Nemesis looks on me kindly, I shall drink.’ But merely changing the case will not solve our first problem: a more generic noun than *herbas/-is* is required to comprehend all the ingredients of lines 55–8. Sprengel was the first to see that an ablative was needed here; he was also one of the first to notice the need for a noun other than *herbis*.<sup>27</sup> His *philtris* however will not do the job: *uenenum, herba* and *hippomanes* are related to *philtrum* not as species to genus (as in the four examples of *mille alii* given at the start of this note) but as simples to a compound. A philtre is what Nemesis is making; one does not brew a philtre out of ‘poison, herbs, hippomanes and a thousand other philtres’. Changing *alias* to a different adjective, such as Valckenaer’s *malas herbas* (or *malis herbis*), is a solution still less attractive, since it would leave intact the unimaginative repetition of *herbas* after *herbarum* in line 56 at the expense of removing an interesting and well-established idiom in *mille alias/-is*.<sup>28</sup> Heyne’s *malos succos* (or *aliis succis*) is better, but strays further from the paradox than one would like, and it may be doubted whether ‘juice’ is sufficiently generic to comprehend the Thessalian herbs of line 56.<sup>29</sup> All these emendations are in any case vitiated by the un-Tibullian homoeoteleuton in *-īs, -ās* or *-ōs*.<sup>30</sup> Since the true

<sup>25</sup> To provide *alias* in 2.4.60 with an additive meaning (‘[a thousand herbs] as well’; cf. O. Hey, *TLL* 1.1625.75–1626.7; K.–St. 2.1.651 n. 17; H.–Sz. 208) would not be idiomatic according to the pattern of usage established above (one can hardly translate Sen. *Contr.* 3.16 *mille aliae mortes* as ‘and a thousand deaths as well’); and *herbas* would still remain repetitious after *herbarum* in line 56 (‘Thessalian herbs ... and a thousand herbs as well’).

<sup>26</sup> Murgatroyd (n. 1), 162. The ambiguity is thought to be suggestive of mental disturbance by Voss (n. 1), 312 and Bach (n. 1), 152.

<sup>27</sup> C.K. Sprengel, *Neue Kritik der klassischen römischen Dichter in Anmerkungen zum Ovid, Virgil, und Tibull* (Berlin, 1815), 138.

<sup>28</sup> L.C. Valckenaer, *Animadversionum ad Ammonium grammaticum libri tres* (Leiden, 1739), 222. *malas herbas* was favoured by P. Burman, *Sex. Aureli Propertii elegiarum libri IV* (Utrecht, 1780), 51, to whom it is wrongly attributed by later editors.

<sup>29</sup> Heyne’s conjecture, proposed in Heyne and Wunderlich (n. 1), 2.239, was made to remove the unfigured repetition of *herbarum* from line 56.

<sup>30</sup> *alias herbas* (at 2.4.60) is the only instance of a type- $\alpha^2$  ‘hom.’, viz. the homoeoteleuton of a noun with a ‘numeral’ adjective in agreement, and one of only two type- $\alpha$  ‘homs.’ in Tib. 1–2, according to D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Homoeoteleuton in Latin Dactylic Verse* (Stuttgart, 1994), 96–7.

