a.d.) in his Scholia. In the former passage Horace tells Albius to moderate his grief at the cruelty of Glycera, nor to descant in piteous elegies on her broken faith and the victory of a younger rival. It is clear that Glycera cannot be Nemesis ; for it is a pseudonym, as the context shows, and Horace would, of course, have used the same pseudonym as Tibullus. If, on the other hand, Nemesis were a real name, Horace had no occasion to use a pseudonym. It is possible that Tibullus had another mistress, Glycera, of whom we know nothing further, and that the miserabiles elegi have perished ; but this is a mere supposition. The Albius of the epistle has an estate at Pedum, where Horace conjectures he may be musing or writing. He is handsome, rich, and knows how to enjoy life. He is wise and has the gift of speech, popularity, reputation, and good health abunde,—an enviable list of attributes, but certainly one which does not agree very well with what we know from elsewhere of Tibullus. The theory, then, that these passages refer to Albius Tibullus must be pronounced, with Baehrens, unproven ; and the forma of Horace’s Albius must not be used, as Schulze uses it, to subvert the credit of the insignis forma of the Life.—Ovid, Brisk, iv. 10, 53 sq., “successor fuit hic [Tibullus] tibi, Galle, Propertius ilii, quartus ab his serie temporis ipse fui.” In the preceding couplet he had said, “ Vergilium vidi tantum nec amara Tibullo tempus amicitiæ fata dedere meæ.” Ovid, who was born in 43, would be only twenty-four at Tibullus’s death if it occurred in 19.—The loss of Tibullus’s landed property is attested by himself (i. 1, 19 sq.), “Vos quoque felicis quondam, nunc pauperis agri custodes, fertis munera vestra, Lares. Tunc vitula innumeros lustrabat cæsa iuvencos ; nunc agna exigui est hostia parva soli” (comp. 41, 42). Its cause is only an inference, though a very probable one. That he was allowed to retain a portion of his estate with the family mansion is clear from ii. 4, 53, “Quin etiam sedes iubeat si vendere avitas, ite sub imperium sub titulum- que, Lares.” Compare the passages quoted above and i. 1, 77, 78.— Messala composed epigrams (Plin., Ep., v. 3) and bucolic poems (comp. the pseudo-Virgilian Catalepton, ii.) ; but he was more con­spicuous as a patron than as a poet. On his circle and that of Mæcenas, see Teuffel, Gesch. der römischen Literatur, 4th ed., p. 431 (vol. i. p. 389 of the Eng. transl.). Other members of the circle were Messala’s brother, Pedius Publicola, Æmilius Macer (probably the Macer addressed in ii. 6), Valgius Rufus, Lygdamus, Sulpicia, and others, and even Ovid to a certain extent (Ov., Pont., i. 7, 28 sq. ; Trist., iv. 4, 27 sq. ). Tibullus was Messala’s contubernalis in the Aquitanian war (Vita Tib. and Tib., i. 7, 9 sq., a poem com­posed for Messala’s triumph). It should be stated that the date of the Aquitanian campaign is still undetermined. It has been assigned to 30, 29, and 28. He received militaria dona ( Vita) ; Baehrens unkindly suggests it was for purely poetical services (Tib. Bl., p. 15). Tibullus’s dislike of war is always coming to the surface (e.g., i. 3 ; i. 10), and so also his love of quiet and retirement (i. 1 ; ii. 1 ; 3, 1 sq.).—Apuleius (Apol., 10), “accusent Tibullum . . . quod ei sit Plania in animo, Delia in versu ” ; this is the most probable form of the name, Delia (δηλos) being a translation of Plania. As regards her station, it should be noticed that she was not entitled to wear the stola, the dress of Roman matrons (i. 6, 68). Her husband is mentioned as absent (i. 2, 67 sq.). She eludes the custodes placed over her (i. 2, 15, and 6, 7). Tibullus’s suit was favoured by Delia’s mother, of whom he speaks in very affectionate terms (i. 6, 57 sq.). For Tibullus’s illness at Corcyra, see i. 3, 1 sq., 55 sq. The fifth elegy was written during estrangement (discidium) and the sixth after the return of the husband and during Delia’s double infidelity. On the difficulty of “harmonizing” the Delia elegies, see F. Leo (in Kiessling and Wilamowitz-Möllendorf's Philol. Unters., ii. pp. 19-23), who is, however, too sceptical. Any other attachments that Tibullus formed (such as the supposed one for Glycera) must have fallen between the end of the Delia and the beginning of the Nemesis connexion.—Ovid, writing at the time of Tibullus’s death {Am., iii. 9, 31), says—“ Sic Nemesis longum, sic Delia, nomen habe­bunt, altera cura recens, altera primus amor.” Nemesis is the sub­ject of book ii. 3, 4, 6. The mention of a lena (ii. 6) settles her position. The connexion had lasted a year when ii. 5 was written (see ver. 109). It is worth noticing that Martial selects Nemesis as the source of Tibullus’s reputation, “fama est arguti Nemesis lasciva Tibulli” {Epigr., viii. 73, 7); compare xiv. 193, “ussit amatorem Nemesis lasciva Tibullum, in tota iuvit quem nihil esse domo,” where, however, the second line is taken from one of the Delia elegies. Ovid, Amores, iii. 9, 58, “me tenuit moriens deficiente manu.” The point of this can only be seen by reference to Tib., i. 1, 60, where Delia is addressed, “ te teneam moriens deficiente manu.” —The epigram of Domitius Marsus on his death is as follows : “ Te quoque, Vergilio comitem, non æqua, Tibulle, Mors iuvenem campos misit ad Elysios, ne foret aut elegis molles qui fleret amores aut caneret forti regia bella pede.”—Tibullus condemns the rough handling which the inamorata often suffered from her Roman lover, e.g., i. 10, 59-60—“A ! lapis est ferrumque, suam quicumque puellam verberat; e caelo deripit ille deos. ” The tenderness of the passage paraphrased above (ii. 6,41) is perhaps unmatched in ancient poetry : “desino, ne dominæ luctus renoventur acerbi. Non ego sum tanti ploret ut illa semel. ”—His love for a rustic life and rustic worship appears throughout whole poems, as in i. 1 and ii. 1, 2. Of his poetry he says (ii. 4, 19), “Ad dominam faciles aditus per carmina quæro ; ite procul, Musæ, si nihil ista valent.”—Specimens of Tibullus at his best may be found in i. 1, 3, 89-94 ; 5, 19-36 ; 9, 45-68; ii. 6. Quintilian says (Inst., x. 1, 93), “Elegia quoque Græcos provocamus, cuius mihi tersus atque elegans maxime videtur auctor Tibullus ; sunt qui Propertium malint ; Ovidius utroque las­civior sicut durior Gallus.”—Ovid {Am., l.c.) well calls him cultus, Martial argutus, “ fine-toned. ” A short but not inadequate account of Tibullus’s prosody is given by L. Mueller in his introduction to Tibullus {Catullus, Tibullus, und Propertius, Leipsic, 1880). Catullus and Tibullus lengthen a short vowel before sp and fr ; Propertius always keeps it short in similar conjunctions, even where s is followed by two consonants, as in striges. Catullus, and in three cases Tibullus, allow a trisyllabic verb to close the pentameter. Propertius never permits himself this liberty, al­though in his earlier poems he has as many trisyllabic endings as Tibullus. —The chronology of the first book is discussed amongst others by Baehrens {Tib. Bl., pp. 12-24). But the data do not admit in all cases of his precise determinations. Baehrens and Hiller {Hermes, xviii. 353) agree that the second book was post­humous. If it had been known to Ovid when he wrote his elegy on the poet’s death, it seems certain that he would have quoted from it. Hiller assigns 2 B.c. as an inferior limit, by which time Ov., Ars Am., iii. 3, 535 sq., must have been written. Amongst the “disarranged poems” are i. 1, 4, 6 and ii. 3, 5. Proposed re­arrangements of them may be found in Hiller’s Tibullus (1885). Charisius (pp. 66 and 105) quotes part of a hexameter which is not found in the extant poems of Tibullus.

The Tibullian authorship of book iii. has long ago been sur­rendered by scholars. Its latest defenders have been Fuss {Be Elegg. Libro quem Lygdami esse putant, Münster, 1867) and the English translator, J. Cranstoun. It has been suggested that Lygdamus (λύγδoς, white marble) is a Grecizing of Albius, some relation of Tibullus (compare Hiller, Hermes, xviii. 353, n. 2) ; and this is possible. Gruppe’s long-exploded theory that Ovid was the author has been recently revived by J. Kleeman {Be Libri III. Carminibus quæ Tibulli Nomine circumferuntur, Strasburg, 1876). Considerable difficulty is caused by iii. 5, 15-20, which contains agreements with three passages of Ovid, Ars Am., ii. 669 sq. ; Tr., iv. 10, 6: “cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari” (Lygdamus and Ovid using word for word the same expression for the year of their birth, the consulship of Hirtius and Pansa) ; and Am., xi. 14, 23 sq., which are much too close to be accidental, and in which the theory that Ovid was the imitator is excluded by the fact that the lines are much more appropriate to their surroundings in Ovid than in Lygdamus. In consequence Baehrens ( Tib. Bl., 40) regards the poem as written after 13 a.d., the date of the Tristia, while Hiller (l.c., p. 359) regards the lines as a later addi­tion by Lygdamus himself. In either case it would be published after 13. The line quoted above may have obtained proverbial currency before either of the passages was written, as the death of both consuls in one year would have impressed the Roman imagina­tion as powerfully as the coincident deaths of Adams and Jefferson did the American. In that case no part of book iii. need be later than the Christian era. For Lygdamus’s imitations of Tibullus, see Gruppe, Die römische Elegie, i. 112 sq. There are resemblances between the pseudo-Tibullus and the Catalepton (Baehr., op. cit., p. 52).—The view of Baehrens (Tib. Blätt., 49) and others that iii. and iv. originally formed one book may now be considered estab­lished, in spite of Birt’s objections (Das antike Buchwesen, 426 sq.) ; and Hiller in his edition prints them as one. They were published some time after book ii., probably after the death of Messala (Baeh­rens, op. cit., 48, adds, “and of his son Messalinus ’). Further determination of the date is impossible. We do not know when they were added to the genuine poems of Tibullus ; but it was prob­ably before the Life was written.—Most scholars since Lachmann (Kl. Schr., ii. 149) have condemned the “Panegyric on Messala.” It is an inflated and at the same time tasteless declamation, entirely devoid of poetical merit. The language is often absurdly exagger­ated, e.g., 190 sq. The author himself seems to be conscious of his own deficiencies (1 sq., 177 sq.). All that we know about him is that he, like so many of his contemporaries, had been reduced to poverty by the loss of his estates (181 sq.). The date is fixed by 121 sq.—Sulpicia was the daughter of Servius Sulpicius (iv. 10, 4), and she seems to have been under the tutelage of Messala (cf. 14, 5-8), her uncle by marriage (Haupt, Hermes, iv. 33 sq.). Cerin­thus is a real name. He was probably a Greek (Baehr., p. 41 and note). He is not to be identified with the Cornutus addressed in Tib., ii. 2, 3. Gruppe (op. cit., 27) and Teuffel (Studien, 367) attri­bute iv. 2-6 to Tibullus himself ; but the style is different, and it is best to answer the question as Baehrens does (p. 46) with a non liquet. For Sulpicia’s style and its feminine Latinity, compare Gruppe (op. cit., i. 49 sq.).—The direct ascription of iv. 13 (verse 13—“ nunc licet e caelo mittatur amica Tibullo ”) to Tibullus prob­ably led to its being included in the collection. Later on, it and