DOI: 10.14232/suc.2024.5.171-188

Clemens Wurzinger
University of Graz

How to Feel Again: Tibullus 1.5 and the Emotionalisation of Recipients

As early as 1979, Cairns described one of the most important characteristics of elegies of Tibullus: they play with the recipients' expectations, as they only pass on information to the recipients in a gradual manner. This essay attempts to apply this concept not only to Tibullus' elegy 1.5, but above all to the transition from Elegy 1.4 to 1.5. The focus will be on the 'confusing' and religious structures of the text, as these are clearly used to influence the emotional state of the recipients. A brief insight into the field of Emotion Studies together with Cairns' concept of "delayed information" will help to focus on the first 36 verses of the elegy and their attempts to create a 'confusing relationship' with the recipients.

Keywords: Roman Poetry, Tibullus, Elegy 1.5, Emotion Studies, "delayed information", ritual scenes

Introduction

In his book 'Tibullus. A Hellenistic Poet in Rome', Cairns points to a central aspect of Tibullus' poetry: Tibullus often only gradually grants his recipients access to key information about the situation of the speaking 'I' and the central characters of the respective elegy; Cairns describes this as „delayed information" and uses this characterisation to analyse Elegies 1.1 and 1.8 in particular. Among other important findings, this analysis seems to do justice to the artistry and structure of the elegies,

which focus directly on one of the great strengths of Tibullus' poetry, which still seems to be an untouched topic: its ability to evoke responses, especially emotional ones, from its recipients.[1] The present paper will analyse one elegy of the collection that is literally at the centre of Tibullus' first book, namely Elegy 1.5, but in addition to the 'confusing structures' of this elegy, the use of ritual and religious themes as 'emotional catalysts' to convey certain emotions and moods will also be considered. After this introduction, Cairns's concept is given more theoretical support by linking it to the broad field of emotion studies; in a third chapter, the transition from Elegy 1.4 to 1.5 and the opening passages of the elegy will be looked at in order to explain the beginning of this elegy through the marker of „delayed information"; a final chapter gives an outlook on the rest of the verses and summarises the findings.

Cairns' "delayed information" and Emotion Studies

In addition to the important finding that Tibullus was indeed influenced by Hellenistic literature, Cairns provides an important clue to the analysis of the elegies, namely that the poetic I of the elegies often provides little information about the situation and *personae* of the piece, and that additional information is revealed only gradually and slowly. Cairns thus analyses central elegies in Tibullus's works and is able to bring about a new approach to the elegies and their evaluation. More than 40 years after the book's publication, its ideas are still relevant today, but one level of analysis seems to have been forgotten: how does a text of a certain structure and content affect the recipients of a certain period? Cairns seems to be raising an important point, which I would like to

[1] In what follows, we speak of an implicit offer of emotionalisation. This means that the text makes an offer to the recipients – but whether they accept it is again in the hands of the subject and is determined by their subjective and socio-cultural disposition.

incorporate into the larger field of Emotion Studies, to which at least parts of his analyses ultimately belong. The history of Emotion Studies is already long and too detailed to cover all the important works. The following considerations will focus on Simone Winko (2003), who has offered easy-to-use grids and important considerations for the analysis of poetry; however, her approach is too comprehensive to be applied to all the elements discussed here. We will therefore focus on three elements in particular: the role of ritual/religious scenes, the 'confusing structures', and the juxtaposition of positive and negative elements of certain scenes of the 'life of the I', focusing on the implicit 'offers' of the structures on their recipients. Such a selection must seem arbitrary; however, a focus on these three elements can be justified by their relevance to previous analyses of the elegy, together with the novelty of the focus on the religious/ritual themes and the method.

Before we begin to analyse the elegy, we need to clarify whether and how language or literature can 'encode' certain emotions, and whether we can therefore speak scientifically about the generation of emotions through texts.[2] One might say that emotions and feelings are always in the subject and therefore cannot be analysed; Winko counters critics who claim that any research into the generation of emotions can only fail because it is defined purely by the reading subject by pointing to empirical research which shows that the spectrum of possible effects is not as wide and differentiated as one might think, but the analysis has to remain at the level of the object and its structures.[3] I would add that language is a means of communication between people within a given society and culture, which (also) aims to convey our ways of thinking and our desires.[4] In the course of this discussion, it seems to be extreme-

[2] Winko speaks of "coding", see e.g. Winko (2003: 109).
[3] Winko (2003: 14).
[4] For a discussion of the connection between emotion, society and culture, see Winko (2003: 81–90).

ly fruitful to deal with the explicit and, above all, implicit structures that generate emotions and to introduce a new level of discourse into the 'rationalised' analysis of literature.[5] When we read texts, the recipients must enter into a process of interaction with the literature in order to understand and 'assimilate' it. Language and, above all, literature can therefore - within certain cultures and societies that understand certain social and societal 'codes' - actualise certain moments in the recipients and thus also generate or at least 'trigger' emotions. Winko distinguishes two areas here, namely 'thematisation' and 'presentation'; while 'thematisation' deals with the explicit statements about emotions, 'presentation' is concerned with the implicit way in which emotions are presented, which includes both content-related and formal criteria.[6] Certain elements of literature are thus capable of 'actualising' emotions in the recipients - especially with regard to the previous treatment of the theory of the „act of reading"; emotion-generating structures can thus be included to some extent in Iser's large area of „blanks",[7] especially in the area of 'presentation', since here we are dealing with implicitly emotion-generating structures that can only be actualised by certain persons belonging to a certain group. As discussed above, the religious/ritual themes, the 'confusing structures' and the striking juxtapositions of lifestyles and realities are analysed here, which are not just important topics for ancient texts as a whole but especially for Tibullus' elegies.

[5] See Schwarz-Friesel (2013: 22–23).

[6] Winko (2003: for 'Thematisation' 111–114; for 'Presentation' 114–119). It is not possible to present all of Winko's thoughts here; on pages 132–150, however, Winko discusses explicitly lexically presented emotions, implicitly lexically presented emotions and the decisive cultural contextualisation.

[7] In Iser's theories on the concepts of reception aesthetics (implicit reader and act of reading), the 'blanks' („Leerstellen") are central elements that enable interaction between text and recipient. These empty spaces must be filled by the recipients in order to activate the full potential of the text in the act of reading; see Iser (1994: 59).

Who is it, that I love? Elegy 1.5, emotions, and a confused reader

The end of elegy 1.4[8]

In Elegy 1.4, the I presents what appears to be the beginning of a dialogue with the god Priapus; the I addresses him and asks for advice and help in winning over boys (v. 3). Priapus then delivers a speech of 64 verses in four blocks, a rather comical, didactic speech on the subject of winning over boys. At the end of the elegy, however, we learn that the dialogue was fictional and that Priapus' speech was a quotation from the poetic I (*Haec mihi, quae canerem Titio, deus edidit ore*, v. 73). The I gave this speech to a certain Titius, who will play no further role except in this poem; he nevertheless remained with his beloved (v. 75a), whereupon the I wishes to be celebrated as a teacher in the things of love (v. 75b). However, the importance of this activity as a teacher of love is strongly deconstructed at the end of the elegy, when the I tells us that he himself is enslaved by a boy (v. 81), and he himself admits in the last two verses that - if Marathus does not take pity on the I - he will probably be ridiculed as a teacher.

The elegy is noteworthy for two reasons: first, Elegy 1.4 as a whole seems to play with the recipients' expectations, especially in terms of form; at the beginning of the elegy, the recipients think that a kind of dialogue between the I and Priapus is being presented, but in the end they find an elegy in monologue form, just like all the others before it. Secondly, the content of this elegy revolves around the theme of love for young boys, which has not yet been addressed in Tibullus' elegies; the elegy thus also plays with the recipients' expectations in terms of

[8] The excellent studies on the structure of the first book (Littlewood [1970] and Mutschler [1985]) have shown that book 1 was probably structured following a logic; whether the book was already known in this form in antiquity cannot be proven, but the clear structure and the separation of books 1 and 2 (Delia and Nemesis; Ov. Am. 3, 9, 31–32: *sic Nemesis longum, sic Delia nomen habebunt, / altera cura recens, altera primus amor*) suggest an ancient arrangement of the book.

content. These two points seem to be central to the transition to Elegy 1.5 and should be considered below with regard to the generation of emotions in the recipients.

Prologue (vv. 1-8)

Elegy 1.5 begins – in the style of elegy 1.3 – with a dramatic introduction to the situation. The poetic I thought that it could survive the separation (*Asper eram et bene discidium me ferre loquebar*, v. 1), which – indicated by the imperfect tense[9] – has probably been attempted for some time; however, the reality and the present time depict the I as desperate and 'without glory' (*at mihi nunc longe gloria fortis abest*, v. 2).[10] It is striking that the I uses military language to describe his situation; just as the I presented his emotional state in elegy 1.3 by presenting itself as a classical *miles* and the alienation that this creates, it does the same here – *gloria fortis*, a classical military phrase, is used to describe the situation.[11] Elegy 1.5 without the previously read elegy 1.4 seems to offer us a desperate situation of the Roman love elegy and of Tibullus in particular, but with elegy 1.4 in the background, some questions arise: did not the I at the end of the elegy present itself as a teacher of love in order to acquire fame (*gloria cuique sua est*, 1.4,77), which now seems far away?[12] And who exactly is meant by this separation, Delia or Marathus, who is introduced in elegy 1.4?[13] In addition, it should be mentioned that we cannot find any 'evidence'

[9] See also Vretska (1970: 301).
[10] The Latin text is from Postgate (1905/15).
[11] For *gloria fortis* as a term of 'military language' see Murgartroyd (1980: 162) and Maltby (2002: 242).
[12] Even though he describes his teachings as *vana magisteria* (v. 84), we find a certain pride in the last verses; if Marathus spared him, the I would not be ridiculed.
[13] This question has also been raised by Putnam (1973: 100), Mutschler (1985: 86) and Maltby (2002: 241), especially with regard to the terms *puer* and *gloria*. In addition, the possible damage of the Marathus episode to the relationship of the I with Delia should be mentioned; this may play a role in this situation. See Bright (1971: 158 and Mutschler (1985: 87).

for the I's relationship with Delia – or with any person for that matter;[14] apart from elegy 1.3, there is no evidence of a 'real' relationship between Delia and the I. The I is depicted as completely alienated in its relationship with its beloved; the opening verses set up not only a confusing and question-raising picture, but also a desperate situation.

This confusion and despair is now presented to us in verses 3-4 in the form of a simile, when the I compares itself to a spinning top that is skilfully „beaten" by a boy, which could show lines of connection with the punishment of slaves and thus with the *servitium amoris* (*Namque agor ut per plana citus sola verbere turben, / quem celer adsueta versat ab arte puer*, v. 3-4).[15] At first sight, this is a parable, the fate of the I seems to be presented through an image. The state of confusion and despair is thus reinforced, while at the same time a new question arises – could the *puer* of the parable perhaps be Marathus, known from elegy 1.4, or the god Cupid?[16] So the first four verses not only create an emotionally charged picture of the situation, but could also create tension and confusion in the recipient: Who and what is this about? From whom is the I being separated?[17]

The situation does not seem to improve in the following verses of this opening. We find a male object - again it is not clear who is being addressed here - who is to be 'burnt' and 'tormented' (v.5) so that he cannot say anything arrogant (vv.5-6); terrible words are to hold the person

[14] See Lee-Stecum (1998: 158).

[15] Murgatryod (1980: 162) emphasises the word *verbere*, which carries the connotation of punishment. Lee-Stecum (1998: 158) emphasises the "lack of control". Many scholars – e.g. Smith (1913/64: 290–291), Bulloch (1973: 76), Putnam (1973: 100), Bright (1978: 155), Ball (1983: 82), and Maltby (2002: 242) – have drawn connecting lines to Kallimachos (*Epigr*. 1.9–10 Pf. /54, 9-10 Asper) and Virgil (*Aen*. 7, 378–384), which may reinforce the effect of this opening passage; the gyration seems to be an image of an extreme movement in general or of a strong love mania.

[16] See Lee-Stecum (1998: 159). Contrary to the opinion of Lee (1982: 127, „one can hardly help thinking of Cupid here"), the text clearly plays with the previous poem and the term *puer*.

[17] Initial reflections on the important connection between these first 4 verses and the previous poem were briefly considered by Mutschler (1985: 86).

back. These verses could now be addressed to the *puer*, but they could also - more likely - be a form of self-address: the I, as we saw in elegy 1.4, has probably been a little too haughty and is admonishing himself to exercise restraint.[18] Looking at the situation of the I, these 'punishments' are classic slave punishments, which confirms the *servitium amoris*.[19] Verse 6 continues in a similar vein; an imperative addressing the lover is used to ask to be spared; he/she should do this in memory of the past nights of love (vv. 7-8). The last verses thus refer to the secret and already lived love relationship of the I with the beloved; at the same time, they take up the uncertainty of the previous verses - the poetic I's nights with other people don't seem clear anymore.[20] The first verses depict the I's desperate situation in various artistic ways: first, exclamations and a pictorial narrative style that draw the recipient into the situation; second, emotional text structures such as desperate love and separation; third, an exciting game with the expectations of the recipient, who is probably deliberately left in the dark at the beginning about the exact situation and the *personae* involved, which could reinforce the emotional structures from earlier.[21] If we compare this opening passage with the structure of the elegy as a whole, we notice at least a hint of a temporal division; in verses 1-2 we seem to find the 'past' influencing the 'now' (vv. 3-4); in verses 5-8 we find entreaties and imperatives to the future. Elegy 1.5 thus also seems to play with different temporal structures from the outset and to use them as emotional reinforcements:

[18] Maltby (2002: 243) suggests here that the loss of 'language' is also a form of punishment for slaves. In addition, it should be mentioned that at the end of the elegy the I spoke quite haughtily about his existence as a teacher of love; compare Mutschler's formulation "self-confident announcement of being a teacher of love" (my English, Mutschler [1985: 86]) in relation to elegy 1.4.
[19] Smith (1913/64: 291), Putnam (1973: 100), Murgatroyd (1980: 162–163), Lee (1982: 127) and Maltby (2002: 243).
[20] Compare Lee-Stecum (1998: 160).
[21] See Mutschler (1985: 96–98).

the 'now' is provided with a backstory, this 'now' is simultaneously used as a terrible starting point for the appeals to the future.

The ritual: the healing of a girl (vv. 9-18)

Beginning in verse 9, the recipients receive some answers to their questions. The I mentions that a woman has been cured of a serious illness through his efforts (vv. 9-10: *Ille ego, cum tristi morbo defessa iaceres*, / *te dicor votis eripuisse meis*), which seems to answer at least one question: the elegy is about a female lover, not Marathus, but the name is still not mentioned; the suspense is likely to be maintained by this gradual revelation of information. The beginning emphasises the personal action of the I, *dicor* in conjunction with *eripuisse* takes the recipients back to the past and at the same time, like *dicitur* in Elegy 1.3, expresses an uncertainty for the recipient - is this really the truth?[22] Or is the I inventing a story in order to emotionalise the situation for itself and the recipients?[23] The I – with the help of an old woman, probably a form of priestess or witch – has purified Delia with an atonement and sulphur (vv. 11-12).[24] A ritual seems to be used to create a certain emotional setting, here past attachment, fidelity and devotion are to be depicted; however, if one includes the doubtfulness through the *dicor*, this scene could also be a narrative created by the I itself in order to create precisely this emotional state in the recipients. Here we can again refer to the temporal structure of the elegy; Vrestka showed the actual story in comparison to the plot

[22] See Murgatroyd (1980: 164), Lee (1982: 127), Lee-Stecum (1998: 161) and Maltby (2002: 244).

[23] The emphasis on the action of the I in this scene has already been recognised by many researchers; see, for example, Maltby (2002: 245). The purification ritual described here (*lustratio*) seems to be associated with the help of a witch; she seems to be the one who supports the I, but the I performs the ritual itself – at least in the self-narrative. For *lustratio*, see Smith (1913/64: 293), Della Corte (1980: 178), Murgatroyd (1980: 164–165), Maltby (2002: 245) and Perrelli (2002: 167).

[24] For the function of the *anus* in such rituals, see Murgatroyd (1980: 164–165) and Maltby (2002: 244–245).

presented: the I helps the woman, then comes the *lena* and the lover, followed by a separation, the attempt to overcome the separation, and finally the resumption of the courtship of the beloved.[25] As in elegy 1.3, a 'back story' of ritual actions is told or perhaps even invented in order to reinforce the emotions conveyed by the I's current situation and to give the characters more depth.[26] This flashback is dominated by rituals: the I cured or freed the lover from bad dreams with salted sacrificial shot (vv. 13-14), even sacrificing to Hecate in a hidden and veiled way in an attempt to redeem her (vv. 15-16).[27] Not only are the scenes once again very vividly depicted (the lens is focused on the I in the action; clear depiction of a scene [healing]; exclamatory character of the verses [*ipse ... ipse ... ipse*]), but the devotion to the beloved reaches its climax through the sacrificial acts; the I tries everything to cure her illness. These rituals, their parts and the associated attempt to communicate with the gods are deeply rooted in Roman culture, reinforce the current emotional mood of the text ('emotional catalysts') and are therefore likely to provide a potential for identification for the recipients.[28]

In the last verses of this retrospective passage, the I tells us that, despite the devotion, someone else now enjoys the woman's love; this person now uses the I's prayers in the same way (vv. 17-18: *Omnia persolvi: fruitur nunc alter amore, / et precibus felix utitur ille meis*).[29] This break

[25] Vretska (1970: 317–318); see Musurillo (1967 and 1970).
[26] Contrary to Kriel (1977: 1), who sees this scene as 'reality' in contrast to the dream in the countryside.
[27] *Filum* normally means thread; in religious/ritual contexts, however, the term is also used to refer to the headband of priests, usually that of the *flamines* or *fetiales*. The tunica must be open during such ritual acts. For this and further information, see Smith (1913/64: 294–295), Della Corte (1980: 178), Murgatroyd (1980: 166) and Perrelli (2002: 168).
[28] The turning to the deity Hecate can be interpreted here as an extreme – the I tries everything and seeks help from every deity, even from a dark witch goddess like Hecate. In addition, the possible function of Hecate as 'guardian of the liminal' can be emphasised here, see Johnston (2006); the beloved Delia should not die and thus cross this threshold.
[29] Murgatroyd (1980: 166) and Maltby (2002: 244, 246), emphasise that the asyndeton

is highly significant in terms of emotion studies. Firstly, the emotional sphere established in the opening verses is now reinforced: despite the loving and pious actions of the I, she has abandoned it. Worse still, she already has another lover, which reinforces the drastic nature of the initial situation. In the first eight verses, the I finds itself in an estranged relationship with its beloved, with love in general and with all the relationships it has built up in its life; the general form together with looks into the past and future life of the I allows the recipients to experience the emotional moments and thus to give an offer of an emotional response through this affective moment. At the same time, there is an uncertainty about the situation and the 'truthfulness' of the narrative, so that the recipients seem to receive an overall 'emotional cocktail'.

Just a Dream (vv. 19-36)

This situation is followed by a break from verse 19 onwards. Here, the I presents us with his wish, namely a happy life, if only his beloved were healthy – but a deity would not allow this (vv. 19-20: *At mihi felicem vitam, si salva fuisses, / fingebam demens, sed renuente deo*). *Fingebam demens* now seems to emphasise this part as imagination and the previous part as 'reality', although the recipients still cannot be sure of the 'reality' presented.[30] What's crucial for our purposes is that again a god seems to confront the desires of the I, emphasising the alienation of the previous verses in relation to the sphere of the gods, through the contrast between *felicem vitam* and *renuente deo*. Scioli points out that the revelation about the new lover in the verses before means that the wish of the I must be classified as completely unrealistic, and the scene is therefore

and the contrast between *ipse ego* and *alter* make the desperate situation evident in the design of the verses.

[30] The meaning of *fingebam* has already been recognised by many, see for example Maltby (2002: 247) and Scioli (2015: 67). For a metapoetic reading of the verb, see Scioli (2015: 68–73).

emotionally charged for the recipients – the despair of the I is clearly evident in this imagination.[31]

As in the previous elegies, rural life is now presented to us as the counter-world or ideal world of the I; the scene is introduced by *rura colam* in verse 21, where we finally learn the name of the woman of whom the I has been speaking all along: it is Delia, the beloved we know from elegy 1.3. Of course, love is not absent, and Delia enters the scene immediately after the vision of this dream in the countryside (v. 21: *mea Delia custos*), with a change from the second to the third person. The fact that Delia's name is revealed in precisely this context does not seem to be a coincidence: it is here – in this fiction of an ideal life on the countryside – that Delia appears, she is the guardian and head of the house. This time, however, the I's ideal of life is transformed; it is not the I who works in the country (as in elegy 1.1), but Delia who is the active person in this rural dream. The I is only a spectator in this dream; the recipients see this scene almost through the eyes of the I, emphasising the emotional immersion into the character.[32] She enters the scene and takes care of grain and wine (vv. 22-24). This is followed by other tasks, such as counting the cattle (v. 25), playing with a slave boy (v. 26), offering grapes, ears of corn and a sacrificial meal to a peasant god (v. 27-28). Exactly which rural god this is has been the subject of much scholarly debate, but for our purposes and the creation of a rural setting, however, this question is unimportant – it is a rural god who fits into the setting of this rural dream perfectly.[33] The ritual creates a religious setting, which we already know from elegy 1.1, and thus increases the emotional power on

[31] Scioli (2015: 60). Maltby (2002: 247) refers to elegy 1,3 and in particular *prohibente deo* (1,3,21).
[32] Scioli (2015: 63).
[33] See for a discussion of which god it could be: Silvanus (Murgatroyd [1980: 169] and Maltby [2002: 248]), Bacchus, Ceres and Pales (Della Corte [1990: 180]) are brought into the discussion.

the I and the recipients of the elegy. The aforementioned passivity of the I is emphasised once again in the last two verses of this passage about Delia's rural tasks; the I isn't just passive, this is done entirely according to the I's wishes (v. 30: *at iuvet in tota me nihil esse domo*).[34] The recipients see small scenes of Delia and the I in the countryside, the images focus on simple movements and on 'key features'.[35] If we think back to the desired ideal of life in elegy 1.1, we could speak here of the fulfilment of a *vita iners* that the I has wished for. These verses could therefore convey a positive emotional situation for the recipients through their rural and desirable ambience, looking back to the wishes of the I in elegy 1.1, especially in contrast to the I's desperate situation in the first verses.

Two elements seem particularly noteworthy here: first the comparison with the I in elegy 1.1, and second the contrast represented by the rituals. The tasks that Delia undertakes in this passage are almost identical to those in elegy 1.1, where we also find the harvesting of grain and the making of wine from grapes (v. 6), the preparation of must in bulk (v. 10), work with livestock (v. 29-32) and sacrifices to rural deities (Ceres, Priapus and Lares, verses 15, 18 and 20).[36] The ideal life is thus embodied by Delia in perfect harmony with the actions of the I in elegy 1.1, which further emphasises their close connection: the I and Delia want a similar life, namely one in the countryside and in piety. Secondly, the contrast between the emotions and feelings to be evoked is attached to the description of the rituals. This second sacrificial ritual of Delia to a rural god creates a calm, happy and gentle mood, especially in view of elegy 1.1, and serves as a conclusion to this portrayal of work in the country; Delia is also depicted as particularly pious by the verb *sciet*, as she is very

[34] Compare Mutschler (1985: 88–89) and also Lee-Stecum (1998: 166), who emphasises the power structure; the I becomes the dominant through passivity, although we have so far seen the exact opposite of this.
[35] Compare Scioli (2015: 63).
[36] For a comparison, see also Mutschler (1985: 89, n. 9).

adept at performing these tasks. This is in stark contrast to the cleansing ritual of the opening passage, which is not just about saving someone from fatal illness and does not address any rural gods, which would be the ideal gods of the poetic I, but the deity of witches and generally an underworld goddess, namely Hecate. As in Tibullus' earlier elegies, the ritual scenes act as 'mood catalysers', either generating or at least intensifying the feelings, emotions and ultimately moods themselves.

Messalla now enters this ideal life of the two of them; Delia takes care of Messalla, who not only appears as if in an epiphany, but is also entertained by Delia like a deity (vv. 31-32: *Huc veniet Messalla meus, cui dulcia poma | Delia selectis detrahat arboribus*). Vretska is right to emphasise the 'breaking in' of the future tense; future fantasy becomes „Zukunftsgewissheit".[37] Although we have already found future forms before and therefore should not speak of a 'breaking in' of the future tense, the appearance of Messalla is intensified by the future tense; Delia actually worships Messalla and prepares a sacrificial feast for him as a 'servant' (vv. 33-34: *Et, tantum venerata virum, hunc sedula curet, | huic paret atque epulas ipsa ministra gerat*). The language now has clear religious connotations (*venerata ... curet ... paret ... epulas ... ipsa ministra*), Messalla actually enters this dream as a god-like figure; we continue to view this scene through the eyes of the I and experience the epiphany first-hand.[38] Just as in elegy 1.1, Delia and the I wish for rurality and religiosity as a breeding ground for love, here we find this dream portrayed again as a stark contrast to the unhappy scene at the beginning.[39] In addition to the general descriptive factors that contrast the mood of the scenes, the socio-religious action should again be mentioned as an emotional cat-

[37] Vretska (1970: 306–307).
[38] See Scioli (2015: 65).
[39] Scioli (2015: 62) mentions here that this rural ideal is divided into 3 parts of 4 verses each (verses 21–24, 25–28, 31–34), which creates a certain "snapshot" aesthetic of the individual scenes.

alyst; the darkness of the beginning contrasts here with the light/green of the dream; the illness or purification ritual of the active self contrasts with the joyful sacrificial ritual and feast with Delia in the active role, the 'witch' Hecate of the beginning contrasts with the rural deity and Messalla. The general conception of Messalla also seems worth noting again here: whereas in elegy 1.1 and 1.3 Messalla was a prime example of the rich Roman *miles* whose way of life was to be rejected, here the I has him appear as a true friend and almost as a god.[40]

At the end, all this is presented to us as recipients once again as a dream; the I has only dreamed about this (vv. 35-36), the winds carry these wishes away. *Nunc* now breaks into the scene in a deictic manner and thus ends the imagination abruptly; *fingebam* recalls the *fingebam* of verse 19 and thus ends this section.[41] The concept of *vota* deserves additional emphasis here; the *vota* previously uttered in ritual acts are thus resumed and once again precisely demonstrate the impossible realisation of the fiction of the I. Despite the rituals (purification ritual, offerings to Hecate) and the turning of the I in general, the relationship between Delia and the I can no longer be healed. This passage can thus be interpreted as a futile 'prayer', which on the one hand shows the focus on the attempt to 'heal' the situation of the I, and on the other hand seems to increase the emotional value for the recipients.[42]

Conclusion and outlook

Unfortunately, there is not enough space here to analyse the elegy in its entirety in terms of the themes discussed; the analyses are therefore intended to provide a new approach to interpreting the structures of

[40] See Mossbrucker (1983: 67) and Mutschler (1985: 90).
[41] Murgatroyd (1980: 171), Mutschler (1985: 90) and Maltby (2002: 249).
[42] Scioli (2015: 61–62) interprets this scene as a prayer spoken aloud at the door of the beloved.

the elegy's effect in terms of the relationship between recipient and text, rather than a new overall interpretation.

After the serene excursion to Priapus in elegy 1.4, elegy 1.5 brings the recipients back to the sad realms of elegy 1.3 and Delia. Right at the beginning, the I laments the separation from a loved one, which already sets the recipients' confusion in motion: what separation? And the separation from which person, Marathus or Delia? This feeling of confusion is immediately presented to the recipients with the simile of a playing *puer*. Could this *puer* be referring to Marathus? Or rather the god Cupid? After accusations against herself, a look back at a healing ritual, that further emotionalises the separation even more, a female form finally makes it clear who this separation is about, namely Delia. The flashback leads to a dreamlike fantasy in which the terrifying image of the sick Delia is reversed. She takes care of everything in the house and in the fields, the I only watches; the gloomy healing ritual is contrasted with the bright image of sacrifices in the countryside, as in the ideal of the I in elegy 1.1. After the passages we have discussed, however, we return to the sad beginning of the elegy: all of this is only fiction, the I still has strong love pains and tries to banish them with wine and other lovers (vv. 37-46). Now another antagonist to the 'tragedy' of the I is introduced, a *lena*. She is cursed by the I; the curse again seems to serve as an emotional catalyst for the I's desperate situation, while at the same time the recipients nearly curse the *lena* themselves through their reading in the sense of a performative act (vv. 47-58). After this curse, the I shows itself in his *servitium amoris*, represented by the advantages of a poor man (vv. 59-74). The last two verses show us that the I is in a state of complete uncertainty.

Elegy 1.5 and the other elegies seem to play with the feelings of the recipients: the I stands before us as the main character, whose emotional state is centred in front of the eyes of the recipients; however, it often

only allows the recipients to slowly gain central knowledge about the situation of the I, the *personae* involved – especially who the lover in this elegy is – and the story itself. This 'game' of riddles and the resulting offers of emotions are reinforced and intensified by the use of ritual scenes that implicitly contain certain emotions and moods ('emotional catalysers'), as well as the depiction of desires in contrast to the reality of the I. Tibullus' elegies are thus not just skillful plays on various intertexts with other texts, but emotionally evocative texts that make the recipient experience the emotional state of the I and attempt to transfer it to the recipient.

Bibliography

Ball 1983	R.J. Ball: *Tibullus the elegist. A critical survey*. Göttingen 1983.
Bright 1971	D.F. Bright: *A Tibullan Odyssey*. Arethusa 4/2 (1971) 197–214.
Bright 1978	D.F. Bright: *Haec mihi fingebam. Tibullus in his world*. Leiden 1978.
Bulloch 1973	A.W. Bulloch: *Tibullus and the Alexandrians*. PCPS 19 (1973) 71–89.
Cairns 1979	F. Cairns: *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge 1979.
Della Corte 1980	F. Della Corte: *Tibullo giambeggiante*. MD 5 (1980) 145–160.
Della Corte 1990	F. Della Corte: *Tibullo, le Elegie*. Milano 1990.
Iser 1994	W. Iser: *Der implizite Leser. Kommunikationsformen des Romans von Bunyan bis Beckett*. München 1994.
Johnston 2006	S.I. Johnston: *Hekate*. In: H. Cancik, H. Schneide und M. Landfester (eds.): DNP. Accessed online on 13 February 2023. First published online in 2006. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_dnp_e505900
Kriel 1977	D.M. Kriel: *Structural Parallels in Tibullus* 1,5. Akrotetion 22/2 (1977) 1–9.
Lee 1982	G. Lee: *Tibullus: Elegies. Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes*. Cambridge 1982.
Lee-Stecum 1998	P. Lee-Stecum: *Powerplay in Tibullus. Reading Elegies Book One*. Cambridge 1998.
Littlewood 1970	R.J. Littlewood: *The Symbolic Structure of Tibullus Book I*. Latomus 29 (1970) 661–669.
Maltby 2002	R. Maltby: *Tibullus: Elegies: text, introduction and commentary*. Cambridge 2002.

Mossbrucker 1983 B. Mossbrucker: *Tibull und Messalla. Eine Untersuchung zum Selbstverständnis des Dichters Tibull*. Bonn 1983 (Habelts Dissertationsdrucke. Reihe Klassische Philologie 34).

Murgatroyd 1980 P. Murgatroyd: *Tibullus I. A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus*. Pietermaritzburg 1980.

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

Musurillo 1970 H. Musurillo: *Furtivus Amor: The Structure of Tibullus* 1.5. TAPhA 101 (1970) 387–399.

Musurillo 1967 H. Musurillo: *The Theme of Time as a Poetic Device in the Elegies of Tibullus*. TAPhA 98 (1967) 253–68.

Perrelli 2002 R. Perrelli: *Commento a Tibullo: Elegie, libro I*. Soveria Mannelli 2002.

Powell 1974 B.B. Powell.: *The Ordering of Tibullus Book 1*. CP 69 (1974) 107–112.

Postgate 1905/15 J.P. Postgate: *Tibvlli aliorvmqve carminvm libi tres*. Oxford 1905/1915.

Putnam 1973 M.C.J. Putnam: *Tibullus. A Commentary*. Oklahoma 1973.

Schwarz-Friesel 2013 M. Schwarz-Friesel: *Sprache und Emotion*. Tübingen 2013.

Scioli 2015 E. Scioli: *Dream, Fantasy, and Visual Art in Roman Elegy*. Wisconsin 2015.

Smith 1913/64 K.F. Smith: *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus. The Corpus Tibullianum ed. with Introduction and Notes on Books I,II, and IV*. New York 1913/Darmstadt 1964.

Vretska 1970 K. Vretska: *Tibullus Elegie I.5*. In W. Eisenhut (Ed.): Antike Lyrik. Darmstadt 1970, 295–320.

Winko 2003 S. Winko: *Kodierte Gefühle. Zu einer Poetik der Emotionen in lyrischen und poetologischen Texten um 1900*. Berlin 2003.