Malta
Classics
Association

Melita Classica

Vol. 9

2023

Journal of the
Malta Classics Association

Melita Classica

Vol. 9
2023

Journal of the
Malta Classics Association

Melita Classica
Vol. 9, 2023

ISBN: 978-9918-21-249-1

Malta Classics Association,

The Department of Classics and Archaeology,
Archaeology Farmhouse, Car park 6,
University of Malta, Msida

info@classicsmalta.org

www.classicsmalta.org

CONTENTS

The Malta Classics Association Committee 2023

Hon. President	Prof. Anthony Frendo
Executive President	Mr Samuel Azzopardi
Vice President	Mr Steve De Marco
General Secretary	Ms Claire Bugeja
Treasurer	Mr Nico Muscat
Members	Raina el-Masri
	James Farrugia
	Kayleigh Frostick
	Karl Hallett
	Nikolai Zammit

Melita Classica Editorial Board 2023

Editor	Mr Samuel Azzopardi
Members	Prof. Michael Zammit
	Dr Carmel Serracino
	Mr Steve De Marco

Editorial

The finished product is not always indicative of all the work that goes into its production, and academic journals such as this *Melita Classica* are no different. The papers contained within this year's volume are, no different to others in previous editions of the *Melita Classica* and those in other works and publications, the product of hours of research, study and hard work by authors dedicated to producing a work representative of their broader dedication to their subject and craft, through which they hope to introduce a broader public to an area of study they have found to be interesting and of value.

To this work by the authors is added the commitment and work of my colleagues on the Editorial Board, our blind reviewers (whom I thank especially for their selfless service since they must remain nameless and unrecognised) and all those who have contributed in small or great ways to the publication of this work, including our returning and generous sponsors, the Farsons Foundation.

The *Melita Classica* remains the most tangible proof of the MCA's commitment to fostering and promoting the study of Classics in Malta and abroad, and of making it as widely accessible to as many people as possible.

This ninth volume of the *Melita Classica* is once again representative of the broad scope of Classics as a field of study. The papers contained within are concerned with the study of history, literary study and criticism, translation and transmission of texts, and reception. We hope that you will find them intriguing and informative.Our hope is that reading through these pages may quicken your own passion for Classics and set your mind alight with inspiration, ideas, and insights.

Samuel Azzopardi

Editor

How to Become a Soldier of Love: the Transformation of *militia* and the Poetic Program of Tibullus' 1.1

Clemens Wurzinger[1]

1. Introduction

After a difficult initial phase of research,[2] the elegies of Albius Tibullus have received more attention in recent years.[3] Even though research is increasing, many themes of his elegies still seem to be unaddressed. This paper aims to contribute to the understanding of Tibullus' poetic program by looking at the whole of Elegy 1.1 and thus to join the recently growing research on Tibullus' poetry. In particular the change of the poetic narrator's *militia* in connection with its meaning regarding the poetic program will be the focus of the present paper.[4] Elegy 1.1 is admittedly one of the few elegies of Tibullus that has definitely undergone intensive research

1 Clemens Wurzinger is a PhD candidate of the University of Graz and the Max-Weber-Kolleg Erfurt in the International Graduate School (IGS) "Resonant Self-World Relations in Ancient and Modern Socio-Religious Practices" (funded by FWF and DFG).

2 In particular, the many rearrangements of verses in the elegies have shaped this phase. Compare the famous phrase *Quot editores, tot Propertii* by John Swinnerton Phillimore (Phillimore (1901) Praefatio V), which could be edited – perhaps even more appropriately and in the spirit of the early editors – to *tot Tibulli*. The early phase of the 20th century is certainly marked by Jacoby (1909 and 1910) and Van Wagenigen (1913), who found the combination of many different themes in the elegies with Tibullus' very associative writing style problematic. Neither, however, attempted to explain these elements as central traits. These first negative observations, however, also immediately faced headwinds, especially Reitzenstein (1912).

3 Schuster should be mentioned as a pioneer in 1930, Bright (1978) later as a central work on the world(s) and characters inside these worlds. For more structural considerations of both the first and the second book of elegies, see Mutschler (1985), which is still very much worth reading today. For an overall view of the first book of the elegies from the perspective of power ("powerplay", as he calls it), see Lee-Stecum (1998). Maltby's achievements in the study of Tibullus' elegies should be mentioned. Too much has been published on various Elegies by Maltby to mention it all here; most important – in my estimation – is his commentary (2002), in which he maps and discusses all the major problems of research in a broad way, such as the structure of the elegies and the function of the characters and topics.

4 To highlight the important difference between the real author and the poetic 'I', the term 'poetic narrator' will be used throughout the analysis.

from the beginning, especially with regard to the poet's poetic program.[5] Elegy 1.1 will be discussed in terms of the reading flow, focusing on the interplay of land, love, soldiering, the ritual burial and its function for the poetic program at the end of the elegy, which seems to be a still untouched topic.[6] First, the opening part of elegy 1.1 (verses 1-40) and the concept of the rejected *militia* and the new counter-concept shown in it will be discussed. Hereupon, the 'transitional passage' (verses 41-44) will be discussed mainly in its function as an introduction of the theme of love and the first glimpse of change of the *militia*. In the third part of the discussion, the second part (verses 45-78) of the elegy will be considered in terms of the new connection between love and soldiering regarding the change of the nature of the poetic narrator in and after the ritual. The findings will be summarized in a short résumé and this redefinition of *militia* will be interpreted in its relation to the poetic program of the author.

2. The Transformation of the *militia*

2.1. Creating a perfect world – 'The first part' of the Elegy (V. 1-40)[7]

Elegy 1.1 begins with a priamel in which an *alius* is brought onto the imagined stage; he is supposed to acquire wealth (*Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro*, v. 1) and land ownership (*et teneat culti iugera magna soli*, v. 2), things that can only be achieved through constant toil with the enemy (*quem labor adsiduus*

5 For recent, very readable and thoughtful considerations of this elegy from various angles, see Miller (1999) ("Dream Text"), Wray (2003) (poetics of "easy hands"), Putnam (2005) (Virgil and Tibullus), Dengler (2017) 157-169 (poetic narrator/poetic 'I'), Kennedy (2017) (Delia's name and various possible interpretations of it), and most recently Harrison (2020) (*paupertas* and "poetic ideology") and La Babera (2021a and b) (*Spes* and Intertextuality). Thus, of course, there have already been considerations of Tibullus' poetic program, though this has been held in the previous papers primarily in terms of individual concepts, but not in terms of the transformation of the *persona* of the poetic *I* that runs throughout.

6 For the connection of the themes of *amor*, *rura* and *militia* in Elegy 1.1 see Gaisser (1983) 58-67. Gaisser discusses many interesting points regarding the contrasting of these elements, but not the transformation of the narrator and the interpretation with regard to the poetic program of the entirety of this elegy.

Since the term 'reading flow' has been used, it seems important to say a few words about whether the elegy is being analyzed here in its concrete performance or as a text for reading. Since too little is known about the recitation of Tibullus' elegies in particular and about recitation in Augustan Roman antiquity in general to be able to make precise statements in individual cases, the elegies are understood for the present analysis as 'reading elegies', which they certainly became after their publication. For a contemporary summary of the discussion around 'reading' in antiquity see Busch (2002) and Heilmann (2021) 41-55.

7 In the following, the text edition of Luck (1998) will be used as a basis; in case of deviations, this will be marked in the footnotes.

vicino terreat hoste, v. 3) and sleepless nights in the sound of trumpets (*martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent*, v. 4).[8] In verses 5-6, the poetic narrator is introduced, but as the object of the sentence, just as the *alius* seemed to be the object of warlike actions before.[9] He wants to put up with poverty (*Me mea paupertas vitae traducat inerti*,/*dum meus adsiduo luceat igne focus*, v. 5-6), if only he will then be spared from such warlike actions. This *vita iners* is discussed in the next verses as the life of a countryman who tends to his field as well as for the gods and goddesses. The opening verses of this passage (v. 7-8) show this picture through the stressed position of *ipse* and *rusticus* each at the beginning of the verse (***Ipse*** *seram teneras maturo tempore vites/**rusticus** et facili grandia poma manu*). This is followed by a list of deities important to the poetic narrator and his life, an unnamed god of agriculture (*libatum agricolae ponitur ante deo*, v. 14), Ceres (*Flava Ceres*, v. 15), Priapus (*terreat ut saeva falce, Priapus, aves*, v. 18), and the Lares (*custodes, fertis munera vestra, Lares*, v. 20). The invocation of these deities adds a religious level to the acts of land cultivation, which is of great importance for the further elegies in general, but in particular regarding the ritual later in this elegy, as we will see especially in the second part.

In these first verses a clear contrast is opened by the priamel. On the one hand there is the image of the soldier who can acquire riches and possessions, but in return has to experience alienating things in terrible wars; on the other hand, we see the poetic narrator of the elegy, who gladly renounces possessions and riches if he is allowed to live a quiet life in poverty and religiosity in return. Harrison and Wray have already shown in convincing essays that this is by no means a reflection on the real living conditions of the author, but rather an allegory for the poetry of Tibullus: Wray pointed out here, on the one hand, especially based on *facili… manu*, that the image of the farmer and farm labour is to be seen as an image of Tibullus' poetry; in Wray's wording "And a poet's hand, dextrous and tender, is fit for plucking lyre strings and writing poems, but not for stretching itself out to enclose and pluck ripe crops too big for its grasp, as the a-b-B-A arrangement of the words in the verse iconically shows it doing: *facili grandia poma manu*."[10]

---

8 Here, in the sense of *lectio difficilior*, contrary to the version of Luck (1998) the *magna* (v. 2) handed down in A G V X is used instead of *multa* (handed down in the *Excerpta Frisingensia*). See for a detailed discussion of the main arguments for the reading of *multa* Chrysostomou (2009) 2-5. The unusual expression must be defended rather than edited; this is especially noteworthy when we think of the middle section of the elegy, where *parva* is shaped as a clear counter-term to *magna* at this point.

9 These lines of connection have already been observed many times, among others Fisher (1970) 767. Lee-Stecum (1998) 30 additionally emphasizes that verses 1-4 and 5-6 are in reverse order; thus, in 1-4 the effect is first, then the reason, while in verses 5-6 the reason is first, then the effect.

10 Wray (2013) 233. In his essay, Wray analyses the opposition of the terms *labor* and *vita iners* used by Tibullus, but in particular also Tibullus' play with the term *facilis*, here derived from *facere*. The

Harrison, on the other hand, stressed the importance of *paupertas* and reads this word as a reference to the poetry of Callimachus and thus to the tradition of "slender" poetry as opposed to the poetry of the pre-Hellenistic period.[11] Harrison in particular stressed the importance of the rejection of Roman *militia* in terms of intertextuality with Horace and Virgil or "pirating pastoral poverty", as he calls it.[12] I would like to strongly emphasize this rejection in particular: a clear positioning against the constructed image of a Roman *militia*, which seeks wealth and glory, is sketched here; an idle life is preferred to one full of glory and wealth, but also the hardships of a soldier. This contrast is even reinforced in the next verses; from verse 6 on, the poetic narrator creates a picture of a counter-world in which it wants to find itself, namely in the everyday life of a simple *rusticus*. This contrast about the creation of a rural life is extremely noteworthy for the topic of *militia*, if we think of ancient Roman values and the old connection between soldiering and farm work.[13] The unravelling of these elements – namely soldiering and rurality as an old ideal – and the redefinition of a new and opposing lifestyle seem to be the main elements of these first verses.

After a first conclusion of these verses in a short sacrificial scene in the context of the village cult community (*Agna cadet vobis, quam circum rustica pubes/clamet 'io messes et bona vina date'*, v. 23-24) we come to an interesting statement of the poetic narrator in verses 25-26. The reading of these verses is problematic, but must fundamentally express a wish for a life without war (*Iam modo iam possim contentus vivere parvo/nec semper longae deditus esse viae*).[14]

---

hands of the peasant are inscribed as 'producing', namely as 'producing' a poem, Wray (2003) 232.

11 See for the use of the term "slender" Harrison (2020) 115. The importance of the Hellenistic poetry on Tibullus has already been aptly reviewed by Cairns in 1979, as Harrison (2020) 127 (footnote 3) correctly points out.

12 See for the connections with Horace and Vergil Harrison (2020) 118-121 and 123-124.

13 Consider – as the earliest example of Roman prose – the last part of Cato's Praefatio (4) in his work *de agri cultura*: "*At ex agricolis et viri fortissimi et milites strenuissimi gignuntur, maximeque pius quaestus stabilissimusque consequitur minimeque invidiosus, minimeque male cogitantes sunt qui in eo studio occupati sunt.*" This connection is perhaps best illustrated by the well-known story of Cincinnatus in the version of the Livy (Liv. 3, 26-29), which seemed to experience a new renaissance at the time of Tibullus and Livy. See for a discussion of the life data of Tibullus Maltby (2002) 39-40. In a situation of supreme crisis of the Roman state, the senate asked Cincinnatus to assume sole rule and leave his field behind. He immediately accepted the task and defeated the opponents within a few days. He returned to his field after leaving the dictatorship without discussion; he thus became the ideal type of Roman nobleman. This story shows us an ideal of a Roman nobleman associated with the early Roman period, namely soldiering and farm work.

14 Contrary to the version of Luck (1998), *iam modo iam possim* (handed down in the *Excerpta Frisingensia*, r) is used here instead of *iam mihi iam possim* (conjecture of Schneidewin), since the text handed down in Z+ (*iam modo non possum*) is problematic in terms of content and grammar. The version surviving in *Florilegium Gallicum* (*quippe ego iam possum*, f) is rejected here, since a wish of the poetic I is more likely in terms of content. For a more detailed discussion see Maltby (2002) 130 and

Even though it was clear to the recipients from the beginning, through the many subjunctive forms, that the poetic narrator only wishes for such a life and is not yet living it, we nevertheless meet here a first clear glimpse of the narrator's life as a soldier. He is himself part of the form of life he rejects; however, he wants to leave behind the rejected form of *militia* and his life in general, as these verses and the next ones with a *locus amoenus* prove (*sed Canis aestivos ortus vitare sub umbra/ arboris ad rivos praetereuntis aquae*, v. 27-28).

After the first 'ritual' part of these opening verses, we come back to sacred tasks of the peasant. The poetic narrator is not ashamed to work with a hoe (*Nec tamen interdum pudeat tenuisse bidentem*, v. 29), to take care of his cattle (e.g. *non agnamve sinu pigeat fetumve capellae/desertum oblita matre referre domum*, v. 31-32) and commands robbers and wolves to help themselves to a fatter herd (*At vos exiguo pecori, furesque lupique,/parcite: de magno est praeda petenda grege*, vv. 33-34). These sacred tasks are again enriched – as in the opening verses – by socio-religious actions, thus a purification of the shepherd of the poetic narrator and an appeal to Pales (*Hinc ego pastoremque meum lustrare quotannis/et placidam soleo spargere lacte Palem*, v. 35-36), a renewed call to the deities (*Adsitis, divi*, v. 37) and the reference to the production of ritual objects from clay at the time of the 'old countryman' (*Fictilia antiquus primum sibi fecit agrestis/pocula de facili conposuitque luto*, v. 39-40). These verses have also been correctly interpreted by previous commentators as imagery for poetry as such: Wray connects the terms *fictilia* and *facili* with *facili… manu* (v. 8) and thus also the interpretation regarding the poetics of Tibullus; in connection with references to Virgil and Theocritus, these verses stand for the creation of a poem itself.[15] Putnam read these verses similarly, additionally emphasizing the importance of mud as an image for Tibullus' poetry as "aesthetically primal, essential, natural, fundamental". The "Urbane is replaced by crude, refined by primitive and rustic, the highly wrought, elaborate, and artificial by the plain and elemental. In contrast to Virgil, then, Tibullus is setting up a model for his own original stylistics […]".[16] I would like to expand this interpretation to include the entirety of the previously mentioned tasks of the poetic narrator. Directly following the wish in verses 25-26 to leave this form of life, these verses of land-work are put, which are again drawn as a counter-image to the soldier's life and thus – in view of Wray's and Putnam's interpretation of the passage 39-40 – could stand for the poet's creation of a poem as well.

---

especially Döpp (2005) 459-460. For a counter opinion and general discussion of the difficult textual criticism of Tibullus' first elegy see Chrysostomou (2009).

15 Wray (2003) 234-238. For the references to Virgil's eclogues that seem to shape this passage and the elegy as a whole, see Putnam (2005).

16 For both quotes see Putnam (2005) 131.

In summary, the separation of the depicted elements of the Roman *militia*, in particular the separation of the old connection of land cultivation from soldiering, seems to be the central moment of this first part, accompanied by the definition of the 'rustic' as the poetic oeuvre of Tibullus and the tasks as 'creating a poem'. There is a strong focus on the religious duties of the peasant; this area seems particularly important for the creation of the ideal life world, which will be our focus later.

2.2. The introduction of love – 'the middle part' of the Elegy

Let us now look at the passage known as the 'transitional part' (verses 41-44). This part refers to the first four verses of the elegy and thus forms, together with these first verses, a first small ring composition within the elegy.

Verses 1-4	**Verses 41-44**
Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro **et teneat culti iugera magna soli**, quem **labor assiduus** vicino terreat hoste, **Martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent**.	**Non ego divitias** patrum fructusque require, **quos tulit antiquo condita messis avo**: **parva** seges satis, satis est **requiescere lecto**, si licet, **et solito membra levare tor**o.

The elements that refer to the beginning are marked here in bold. First, the renewed mention of the term *divitias*, which lexically emphasizes the reference to the beginning. However, the arrangement of the verse is different, *divitias* is no longer at the beginning of the verse, but *non ego*, which can be traced back to *alius* in the first verse. *Ego* is now mentioned in rejection, not *alius*, which moves the focus away from passivity to a more active level of the poetic narrator; the poetic narrator does not speak indirectly about its rejection, but rather emphasizes it, greatly elevating the initial passage and reopening the main topic. In step with verse 1, in which wealth is more precisely defined by an ablative, we get an addition in verse 41, namely the grain of the fathers. This rejection seems surprising after this first part but can be explained by the theme of rejection of wealth and the word *patrum*: Land cultivation is not fundamentally rejected, but there is an attempt to reject and redefine the connection between war and land cultivation of ancient times, if we recall Livy's version of the myth around Cincinnatus, for example. Just as we find the separation of farm labor and soldiering in the opening passage of the elegy, this is taken up again here and summarized by the 'grain of old'. The great land of verse 2 (*magna*, v. 2) becomes the small piece of land (*parva*, v. 43); the steady labor of the soldier (*labor assiduus*, v. 3) becomes the rest and sleep of the countryman (*requiescere*, v. 43). The war trumpets that rob the soldier of sleep in verse 4 (***c**lassic**a** **p**uls**a** fu**g**ent*, v. 4) are no longer seen or heard; rather,

the theme of rest and sleep is presented with tonally gentle consonants as an antithesis (*so**l**i**t**o **m**e**mb**ra le**v**are **t**oro*, v. 44).

The priamel, which was set up at the beginning of the poem, seems to be eliminated, farm work – which has been set up as 'poetic work' – separated from that of the duties of a soldier. However, a new theme is emerging – again implicitly – namely the theme of love. This is indicated by the mention of the bed (*lecto* and *toro*, vv. 43 and 44). Both *lectus* and *torus*, in addition to the more general meaning of 'resting bed', also have within them the erotic connotation of 'marriage/love bed', thus preparing the introduction of the love theme in the next verses. But both *torus* and *lectus* also carry the meaning bier, which already points to the burial scene of the poetic narrator – and thus not only to the conclusion of the verse but also of the life of the poetic narrator – later in the elegy.[17] The theme of the initial verses is resumed, but implicitly expanded by a new theme, a theme that is to define the rest of the elegy and the rest of Tibullus' work, namely love.

If we turn here for the first time to the question of *militia* regarding the first four verses, two things are particularly noteworthy. First, wealth is again repulsed, but this time directly the connection of land cultivation and the 'old time', namely the time of the ancestors (*Non ego divitias patrum*, v. 41). The direct connection of the 'old' way of thinking of wealth, namely war and land cultivation, is very personally repulsed by the poetic narrator – in contrast to the more impersonal repudiation by the priamel at the beginning of the elegy. Not only war and the signs of the very same are denied, but rather the combination of the classical elements of the 'old' way of life. If we try to interpret this regarding the poetics of this poem, the creation of the 'old' is rejected; a new *militia* and a new path of poetry is to be taken, namely the path of *militia amoris* and thus of love elegy.[18] Secondly, the land cultivation – already separated from the classical soldiering in the first part and in the middle part – is enriched by another theme, the theme of love. This happens artfully through the repetition of *satis* in one verse, when first the small seed, then the quiet sleeping is enough (*parva seges satis, satis est requiescere lecto*, v. 43). If we take these two levels together, in these central verses of the elegy – looking back at the first four verses – love poetry is set forth as a poetic program. Not only is an ideal lifeworld of the poetic narrator created, but the concept of his *milita* is redefined. The ring composition to the opening verses seems to be completed, the new theme of love can enter the main stage.

17 OLD s.v. *lectus* and *torus*.

18 Such a interpretation is likely due to a comparison with other opening poems of the Augustan period. In many cases, the importance of the first poem for statements about the work of a poet and for the understanding of the rest of the poems has been shown. For examples see Horace (Lefèvre (1995)) and for Vergil (Georgica: Volk (2002)).

2.3. The death of the soldier – 'the second part' of the Elegy

At the beginning of the second part of the elegy we find the image of 'love as calm in the storm'; hostile winds (*immites ventos*, v. 45) are not a problem if only one can keep the beloved inside the house (*dominam tenero continuisse sinu*, v. 46). The image of the storm is reinforced when we encounter the wintry oyster in verses 47 and 48 (*gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit oyster*, v. 47), which is in strong contrast to the pleasant fire within the house (*igne iuvante*, v. 48).[19] These verses are interesting with regard to the beginning of the poem, as the theme of peaceful sleep – in contrast to the soldier's sleeplessness in the first verses – is taken up together with the theme of fire, and thus not only is the image itself presented, but through the metaphor of fire as love this new topic is brought in. This can be seen above all through the strong contrast of the two images; while the image of the storm is one of the most terrifying images of antiquity, since it probably recalls above all the image of the storm at sea, the image of the fire is to be understood as the exact opposite.[20] The fire is no longer to be understood only as a 'minimum of wealth and security' as in verse 6, but also as a symbol of love, thus invoking the theme of love elegy and therefore showing a first glimpse of the transformation of the poetic narrator. The new goal in life seems to come into focus, but at the same time the new form of *militia*, as can be seen in the term *domina*: the poetic narrator no longer has a *dux* or *dominus*, but a *domina*.[21]

Similarly as we read in verse 5 a wish for a life according to the ideas of the poetic narrator, we meet a wish at the beginning of the 'second part' (*hoc mihi contingat*, v. 49);[22] this is followed – exactly mirroring the first verses, in which the rejection first occurred – by the rejection of the existence of a man who wants to acquire riches, but in return leaves his beloved in tears (*o quantum est auri pereat potiusque smaragdi,/quam fleat ob nostras ulla puella vias*, v. 51-52). The *alius* is represented by vivid imagery; once again, the image of seafaring is

19 Contrary to the version of Luck (1998), here instead of *imbre* (surviving in manuscript G and in *Florilegium Gallicum*) *igne* (surviving in Z+, consensus codd. A G V X cum multis) is used. For a convincing discussion of this passage, see Schuster (1930/1968) 121 and Portuese (2017). For a dissenting voice, see Chrysostomou (2009) 16-19.

20 The image of the terrible sea voyage has been used as a deterrent image since the beginning of Greek and also Roman literature. See as an example the long passage about seafaring from Hesiod's Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι (vv. 618-694) at the beginning of Greek literature. See for more examples and an overall view on seamanship Casson (1986).

21 Since we do not know to what extent Gallus already used the term *domina* as a central concept of the love elegy, statements about its importance here are difficult. For a discussion of the term *domina* and the basic constellation of Roman love elegy, see Hoffmann (1976).

22 The parallel structuring of the verses should be emphasized here – in verse 5 we meet a wish; if we see verse 45 as the beginning of the second part, a wish is found here as it is in the fifth verse of the second part.

linked to classical soldiering, thus marking it as a form of life to be rejected. The rhetorical elaboration in the form of a polyptoton (*qui*… *quantum*… *quam*) further emphasizes the image. Once again, this form of wealth is conceded without hesitation to a person who does such things; the personal rejection of the poetic narrator is thus emphasized.

The patron of Tibullus, Messalla, is held up as a prime example of such a life of this 'classical' form of *militia*.[23] This mention caused surprise, especially in older research, since a dedicatory poem or at least a more flattering mention was probably expected.[24] But the preceding verses provide a way for the poetic narrator to introduce Messalla without direct criticism; the life the poetic narrator desires is not one marked by glory and wealth (*te bellare decet*… *ut domus hostiles praeferat exuvias*, vv. 53-54), but a life of tranquility with his beloved. The booty that Messalla captures on his war campaigns is directly compared to the poetic narrator, who as *ianitor* (v. 56) sits almost as booty himself at the door of his beloved, but at the same time protects the beloved like booty.[25] Messalla's military service is thus to be understood as a prime example of soldiering, which the poetic narrator rejects, but in which he seems to still find itself. At the same time, a first new duty of the poetic narrator is presented here, namely the protection of the beloved as *ianitor*; in contrast to Messalla, aspects of the new *militia* of the poetic narrator are presented. Again, while rejection is seen in the narrators words, at the same time there is no direct criticism; the emphasis is on the 'otherness' of the way of life. The poetic narrator rejects all glory and is not bothered by negative terms that would be terrible for a *representative* of classical *militia*; rather, he affirms them (*dum modo sim, quaeso segnis inersque vocer*, v. 58).[26] Step by step, the poetic narrator leaves behind his old soldiering and reveals himself as a new soldier – namely as a soldier of love.

---

23 Messalla is introduced as a prime example of the Roman nobleman, especially regarding the areas of foreign war – at least in the representation in Tibullus' elegies. Messalla, however, does not appear at all as a negative personality, but rather simply as the opposite to the way of life that the I has determined for himself.

24 Horace can be cited here as another example, who likewise introduces and thus honors his patron Maecenas in the form of a comparison of life forms (Hor.*c.*1.1). With regard to Elegy 1.7, which probably celebrates the patron's birthday, however, it is by no means problematic, since, first, this dedication in the form of a 'comparison of lives' was used by other poets, and, second, a real honor poem can be found in Book 1.

25 As Putnam (1973) 58 and Lee-Stecum (1998) 48 have already seen.

26 If one wants to emphasize the interpretation regarding the poetic program here, one could also ask oneself for which literary form Messalla stands. Messalla seemed to be known – besides his military career and his patronage – mainly as orator and historian, which can be summarized 'political writings'. The poetic narrator could thus subtly claim another task as poet for himself here as well. See for historical information on Messalla Eck (2006).

Of particular interest for the creation of a new *militia* is the burial of the poetic narrator that now follows. The importance of this ritual for the elegy and especially for the transformation of the poetic narrator has not been seen in previous essays and commentaries. It does not only refer to the world previously built around religiosity and rurality, but also serves as a central moment in the poetic narrators ideal of life. Introduced by double address to Delia (*te* in verses 59 and 60), we see the – at least desired – close connection of Delia and the poetic narrator. In addition, we should refer to the religious, prayer-like form of these verses, which clearly recalls the religious sphere built up especially in the first part of the elegy. This beginning is emphasized by the alliterations at the beginning of the verses (*spectem suprema*, v. 59 and *te teneam* (*moriens*… *manu*), v. 60). Furthermore, the contrast with the martial ideal, which the poetic narrator rejects, is indicated by *te spectem*. In the words of Maltby, who sums it up here: "It was the height of military glory to die facing the enemy […]. T. rejects this in favour of an inglorious death facing Delia".[27] This effect is intensified by the strong emotionality of a double wish or exclamation, in the last moments the poetic narrator only wants to hold Delia in his arms.

In verses 61-64, there is another double address to Delia. This is, as in the two opening verses of this passage, connected with physicality and emotionality, since body and tears are in focus. The body of the poetic narrator is placed on a bier that will soon burn, and to this body Delia will give kisses and tears. These kisses and tears seem almost "sacralized" in the sense of a personally lived religion, they become the offerings to the gods of love.[28] The physicality is also visible by the design of the verses: firstly, *positum me* stands directly next to *Delia*, whereby the closeness of the two is also reflected in the verses. Secondly, *arsuro*… *lecto* surround the lovers and encircle them in the written image. In addition, the image of fire is to be interpreted as a love metaphor: the poetic narrator of this elegy can end his life in love, namely burnt by flames of love, this seems to be the ideal conclusion of an ideal life. In verses 65-68 we experience a real theater in the text. The cult community and village youth are apparently present at this funeral and cannot return home dry-eyed; this further detail of the theater scene enlarges the stage and 'image in the mind' for the recipient, but above all creates the effect of a ritual community. This is further reinforced by the aesthetic design of verses 67-68. Not only the repetition of *parce* with homoioteleuta at the end should be

27 For the quotation see Maltby (2002) 143, who argues mainly about the contrasts with Tyrtaios (11.19-20 and 12.25-26 West). Murgatroyd (1980) 65-66 argues in a similar way.

28 For sacralization see Rüpke (2021) 75-78, especially "temporary sacralization" of page 76. It is important to emphasize here that it is not the 'emotionality' of the offerings that sacralizes the kisses and tears, but rather the ritual setting and thus the connection to the deities, Rüpke (2021) 87. Compare Putnam (1973) 59: "The vivid moment of burning becomes real, though future. The attributes of love (lectum, oscula) are transferred to the instant of cremation."

mentioned, but also the emphatic position of *meos* in the middle of verse 67.[29] The scene, as well as the verses, revolve around the poetic narrator, creating an image of the ritual scene.

Sacralized objects play a strong role in ancient literary cremations, especially if we think of Homeric and generally epic heroic burials.[30] Let us briefly consider the structure of such an epic hero's funeral in Homer: first, the corpse is washed and anointed, then placed on a bier; during this prothesis, relatives and friends commit the funeral lament. Second, the bier is carried to the funeral pyre, where the corpse is again lamented and strands of its hair are consecrated. Third, the corpse is burned, often with offerings for the dead and parts of personal possessions; in the heroic context, these are usually swords and/or horses or other personal possessions that signify wealth and fame.[31] The comparison of the burial in Homer and the poetic narrator here is worthwhile, as it again presents elements of the new *militia*: one could also speak of a short prothesis in Tibullus, where Delia and the cult community are present and mourn the dying poetic narrator; the narrator is given – instead of the expected weapons and general possessions of a soldier – the sacralized tears and kisses of Delia to take with him into the next life; the strands of hair, which play a role in the burial of the heroes, is rejected by the poetic narrator at the end of the ritual scene, as is the lamentation itself (*sed parce solutis/crinibus et teneris, Delia, parce genis*, vv. 67-68). This rejection already shows that the poetic narrator will not really find its end here; the resurrection as a new *persona* is already being prepared. All these differences present the poetic narrator at the end of his life to the ancient recipients precisely not as an epic hero of a classical *militia*, but as a lover in the context of the ideal life he himself has set up.

This ritual seems to have several functions for the text. On the one hand, it represents the transformation of the poetic narrator by living through a death experience, even though it is only imagined. The death scene thus truly brings an end to this ideal and simultaneously transforms the poetic narrator towards the next scene.[32] If we link this scene to the theme of *militia amoris*, death can be seen

29 As Putnam (2005) 133 points out.

30 Homer seems an ideal point of comparison here, as his portrayal was to shape subsequent depictions of hero and soldier in all following literature. Homer's importance for Tibullus' elegies can be seen above all in Elegy 1,3, which makes the comparison of the kinds of burial here even more relevant. Of course, the comparison can also be drawn with the general burial practice of the time, see for this Hauser/Kierdorf (2006) and Hope (2009) 80-81.

31 Hauser/Kierdorf (2006). For a prime example of such a burial see that of Hector at the end of the 24th canto of the Iliad, Il. 24, 695-804.

32 The ritual exhibits lines of connection to so-called 'rites de passage'. In Turner's terms, one could speak of real "liminality" here, since through this ritual the poetic I loses its previous social characteristics – namely, those of a *miles* –, enters an "intermediate phase" during the ritual and

as ideal here as well. The death of the soldier for his family and the fatherland is one of the classical motifs of antiquity;[33] the poetic narrator dies here, however, not in battle and for the city, but in the context of rural life and after a perfect life without battle and war in poverty and love. The perfect end of an epic soldier becomes that of a love soldier. Likewise, the poetic narrator does not fall here in the face of the enemy, but in the face of the beloved and in a ritual context that once again reflects the connection to the level of the deities. This thus fulfills the requirements of *militia amoris* and in a sense transforms the poetic narrator toward its ideal of life; the old *persona* at war is left behind for a life of war service to love. All the important elements of the elegy – nature, religiosity, and love – seem completed.[34]

In verses 69-72, the elements of death used so far are brought in and transformed into a call for the enjoyment of love in youth. This 'burial in the mind' was just imagined, the transformation to a soldier of love and thus to a poet of love is completed. The scene shows the recipients the newly won ritual *communitas*, as *iungamus amores* is of course meant as a call to Delia, but also addressed to the intratextual cult community.[35] The poetic narrator takes his new role as love soldier/poet 'within' society and drops his role as a *miles Romanus*.

The transformation of the poetic narrator into a *miles amoris* and the transformation of the *milita* as such after this ritual can now be seen especially in the last verses of this elegy (v. 73-78). In verse 73 we encounter a renewed call to love, even to 'light' love (*Nunc levis est tractanda Venus*, v. 73). This 'light Venus' can be explained by the idealized form presented in this elegy: the military tasks of battle, which the poetic narrator probably had to and still has to experience itself, are transformed into tasks of *militia amoris*, breaking the doorposts (*dum frangere postes*/*non pudet*, vv. 73-74) and starting quarrels (*et rixas inseruisse iuvat*, v. 74). In the ritual, the poetic narrator became a soldier of love, which he confidently and almost as a manifesto throws at the recipients in the last verses (*hic ego dux milesque bonus*, v. 75); war signs and trumpets, which we experienced

becomes a person with new social characteristics during "reaggregation". See Turner (1977) 94-130. For the classification of funerary rituals as 'rites of passage', see van Gennep (1960) 87-96. For the notion of liminality or threshold state, see Turner (2003) 251-261. The issue of rites of passage was briefly addressed in another context regarding Tibullus at Wittchow (2009) 261-273, who, however, observed this more on the relationship of *senex* and *iuvenis* in Elegy 1,4 and 1,6.

33 As early examples from many shall serve the battle pareneses of Kallinos (1 West) and Tyrtaios (10 West).

34 One could compare Lee-Stecum (1998) 33, on elegy 1.1 in general: "This, then, might be one way in which to read this elegy (or collection): as part of a discussion about how to live".

35 If we want to go further in the interpretation here, we could even claim that this passage involves the recipients; not only Delia and the poetic I, not only the cult community, but also the recipients are to enjoy a life of love (poetry).

at the beginning of the elegy as negative symbols of war life, are to stay away from the poetic narrator and his life, they are to concern only the greedy (*vos, signa tubaeque*,/*ite procul, cupidis vulnera ferte viris*, v – 75-76). The rejection of wealth and war, rejected in the first verses by the priamel, is emphatically rejected in the last two verses by the poetic poetic narrator (*ferte et opes: ego composito securus acervo*/*dites despiciam despiciamque famem*, vv. 77-78), represented by the emphasized position of *ego* and the double mention of *despiciam*. With *acervo*, the ring composition to the first verses is clarified once again (*semper acervos*, v. 9). The word *famem* concludes the elegy, giving the recipients the main points of rejection at the beginning and of the elegy.

As a final point, the verb forms of verses 69-78 should be mentioned. The entire poem is mostly characterized by the subjunctive, which on the one hand have a function of dismissing the wealth of war, and on the other hand have a desiring function in relation to the newly created ideal life. This seems to change in the last verses of the elegy, where we find more forms of the present and future tense on the one hand, and hortative and jussive subjunctive on the other, which seem like self-commands.[36] The transformation of the poetic narrator thus seems to be reflected in the verses not only in terms of content, but also grammatically.

3. Summary and Outlook: A new poetic narrator? – The transformation of the *militia*

First, let us return to the beginning of the elegy and follow the structures and tactics in its progression. In the first verses of the elegy, we find a priamel that has a very impersonal tone of voice; an 'other' is in an alienating war situation that is depicted as a horror image for the poetic narrator. The ancient recipients, as well as the modern ones, follow the poetic narrator in creating its ideal of life, which in the 'first part' tries to unravel soldiering and country life as a given connection; one could speak of a redefinition of Roman *militia*. Within this journey, however, the recipients also realize that the poetic narrator is not in this ideal of life, rather he is closer to the life of the 'other'. The recipients experience this only in brief moments of the elegy in which the poetic narrator directly addresses his lifeworld. After a renewed rejection of the classical soldier's life in the 'transitional' section of the elegy and the subtle introduction of love, we meet the narrator's lover,

36 The frequent occurrence of these grammatical phenomena – though they exist earlier – after this transformation are interesting. Verses 69-78: Interea, dum fata sinunt, **iungamus** amores:/iam **veniet** tenebris Mors adoperta caput,/Iam **subrepet** iners aetas, nec amare **decebit**,/Dicere nec cano blanditias capite./Nunc levis **est tractanda** Venus, dum frangere postes/Non **pudet** et rixas inseruisse **iuvat**./Hic ego dux milesque bonus [**sum/ero!**]: vos, signa tubaeque,/**Ite** procul, cupidis vulnera **ferte** viris,/**Ferte** et opes: ego conposito securus acervo/**Despiciam** dites **despiciamque** famem.

Delia. Love promises liberation from his war-torn life; only in the arms of the beloved can the world change. This is precisely what is ultimately to happen: in a funeral ritual, the poetic narrator undergoes a death experience, is able to leave behind his previous life as a soldier and turn to a new soldiering, away from a classical *militia* and toward *militia amoris*. This is marked in the verses in and after the ritual by the change from the jussive conjunctive (it shall/it may) to a hortative subjunctive, future tense, present tense, and imperative. The poetic narrator is thus a new person in the final verses of the elegy; he is still a soldier, even a leader, but not one of a Roman *militia*, but of a *militia amoris*.

What does this transformation of militia mean for Tibullus' poetic program? Through this transformation of *militia*, the genre of love elegy as such seems to be initiated; the narrator's choice of life is also to be understood on the poetic level as a choice of love elegy and to be interpreted looking at the poetic program of Tibullus. Like Ovidius later has a verse foot stolen from him at the beginning of his work, thus almost forcing him to write love elegies, Tibullus strongly defines his creative work in this programmatic opening poem in contrast to the ideal Roman *militia* and thus emblematic of the literary creation that seems to be associated with this classical image. This transformation happens throughout the poem in Elegy 1.1, but in particular in the ritual scene: the poetic narrator transforms himself to a *miles amoris*, but also transforms his task as a poet away from his predecessors – one may think of classically political genres such as the epic and the court speech, possibly embodied by Messalla – to love elegy. The old self in the form of a classical *miles* dies; however, through the special form of burial the self awakens as a new person in a new *militia*, the *militia amoris*. This interpretation can be argued especially with the positioning of the poem as the first in the collection: Elegy 1.1 stands at the beginning of Tibullus' work and art, which is defined and simultaneously presented by this change of *militia*. Tibullus here plays quite decisively with the expectations of the recipients, since through the theme of land cultivation, the rejection of war, and only the gradual emergence of the love theme, we as recipients travel together with the poetic narrator on the path from Roman *militia* to *militia amoris*, as metaphor thus to the love elegy as such. The poetic narrator of the elegy, and thus the *persona* with whom the ancient recipients engage in further reading, creates his new life in Elegy 1.1, but also his new task as a poet. Here the poetic narrator seems to be not only a good soldier, but also a good poet; to put it in the words of Elegy 1.1, *Hic ego dux milesque bonus*!

Bibliography

Ball R.J. (1983) *Tibullus the elegist. A critical survey* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupre).

Bright D.F. (1978) *Haec mihi fingebam. Tibullus in his world* (Leiden: E. J. Brill).

Busch S. (2002) 'Lautes und leises Lesen in der Antike', *RhM* 145/1, 1-45.

Cairns, F. (1979) *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Casson, L. (1986) *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Chrysostomou T. (2009) 'Textprobleme in Tibull 1.1', *MH* 66, 1-22.

Dengler F. (2017) *Non sum ego qui fueram: Funktionen des Ich in der römischen Elegie* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag).

Döpp S. (2005) 'Iam modo, iam possim contentus uiuere paruo! Die Struktur von Tibulls Elegie 1,1', *Hermes* 133, 458-474.

Eck, W. (2006) 'Valerius', in Cancik H., Schneide H. and Landfester M. (eds.) *Der Neue Pauly*. Consulted online on 30 May 2022 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574–9347_dnp_e1227180]. First published online: 2006.

Fisher J.M. (1970) 'The Structure of Tibullus' First Elegy', *Latomus* 29/3, 765-773.

Gaisser J.H. (1983) '"Amor, rura" and "militia" in Three Elegies of Tibullus: 1.1, 1.5 and 1.10', *Latomus* 42/1, 58-72.

Harrison S. (2020) 'Pirating pastoral poverty: Poetics in Tibullus 1.1', in Evans R. and De Marre M. (eds.) *Piracy, pillage, and plunder in antiquity: appropriation and the ancient world* (London/New York: Routledge) 115-128.

Hauser S. und Kierdorf W. (2006) 'Bestattung', in Cancik H., Schneide H. and Landfester M. (eds.) *Der Neue Pauly*. Consulted online on 30 May 2022 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574–9347_dnp_e215970]. First published online: 2006.

Heilmann J. (2021) *Lesen in Antike und frühem Christentum. Kulturgeschichte, philologische Sowie kognitionswissenschaftliche Perspektiven und deren Bedeutung für die neutestamentliche Exegese* (Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto).

Hoffmann J. (1976) *Poeta und Puella: zur Grundkonstellation der römischen Liebeselegie*. PhD Dissertation. (University of Erlangen).

Hope V.M. (2009) *Roman Death: The Dying and the Dead in Ancient Rome* (London: Bloomsbury).

Jacoby F. (1909) 'Tibulls erste Elegie. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der tibullischen Kunst', *RhM* 64, 601-622.

Jacoby F. (1910) 'Tibulls erste Elegie', *RhM* 65, 22-87.

Kennedy D.F. (2017) 'What's in a Name? Delia in Tibullus 1.1', *CQ* 67/1, 193–198.

La Babera S. (2021a) 'Hopeful Poetry: Tibullus's Spes and Her Literary Lineage', *AEVUM ANTIQUUM* 21, 35-56.

La Babera S. (2021b) 'Tibullus Beyond Elegy: Poetic Interference Across Generic Boundaries', *AEVUM ANTIQUUM* 21, 3-13.

Lee-Stecum P. (1998) *Powerplay in Tibullus. Reading Elegies Book One* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Lefèvre E. (1995) 'Die Komposition von Horaz' erstem Oden-Buch', in Belloni L., Milanese G.F. and Porro A. (eds.) *Studia classica Johanni Tarditi oblata I* (Milano: Vita e pensiero) 507-521.

Luck G. (1998) *Albii Tibulli aliorumque: Carmina* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner).

Maltby R. (2002) *Tibullus: Elegies: text, introduction and commentary* (Cambridge: Francis Cairns).

Miller P.A. (1999) 'The Tibullan Dream Text', *TAPA* 129, 181-224.

Murgatroyd P. (1980) *Tibullus I. A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press).

Mutschler F.-H. (1985) *Die poetische Kunst Tibulls: Struktur und Bedeutung der Bücher 1 und 2 des Corpus Tibullianum* (= Studien zur klassischen Philologie 18, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang).

Prien C. (1867) *Die Symmetrie und Responsion der römischen Elegie* (Lübeck: Heinrich Schmidt).

Phillimore J.S. (1901) *Sexti Properti Carmina* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Portuese O. (2017) 'Tibull. 1,1,48: tracce di deperditi in semionciale?', *GFA* 20, 127-133.

Putnam M.C.J. (1973) *Tibullus. A Commentary* (= American Philological Association Series of Classical Texts 3, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press).

Putnam M.C.J. (2005) 'Virgil and Tibullus 1.1', *Class. Philol.* 100/2, 123-141.

Reitzenstein R. (1912) 'Noch einmal Tibulls erste Elegie', *Hermes* 47, 60-116.

Rüpke J. (2021) *Ritual als Resonanzerfahrung* (=Religionswissenschaft heute 15, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Scaliger J.J. (1577) *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii noua editio et Castigationes in Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium* (Paris: Mamertus Patissonius).

Schuster M. (1930/68) *Tibull-Studien: Beiträge zur Erklärung u. Kritik Tibulls u. des Corpus Tibullianum* (Wien 1930: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky/Hildesheim 1968: Olms).

Turner V.W. (1977) *The ritual process. Structure and Anti-Structure* (Ithaka/New York: Cornell University Press).

Turner V.W. (2003) 'Liminalität und Communitas', in: Krieger D.J. and Belliger A. (eds.) *Ritualtheorien. Ein einführendes Handbuch* (Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag).

Van Gennep A. (1960) *The rites of passage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Van Wageningen J. (1913) 'Tibulls sogenannte Träumereien', *NJA* 31, 350-355.

Volk K. (2002) *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Wittchow, F. (2009) *Ars Romana: List und Improvisation in der augusteischen Literatur* (Heidelberg: Winter).

Wray D. (2003) 'What Poets Do: Tibullus on "Easy" Hands', *CP* 98/3, 217-250.

Contents

Malta Classics Association
classicsmalta.org

THE FARSONS FOUNDATION

ISBN: 978-9918-21-249-1