Within love-poetry as a whole ‘παιδικός ἐρως’ forms a distinct sub-division, and the figure of the ‘puer delicatus’, although often treated similarly to the mistress, is none the less obviously different from her by reason of his sex, extreme youth and, to a lesser extent, circumstances (for instance, in the case of the boy we do not find all the paraphernalia connected with the girl’s ‘coniunx’ or ‘vir’). Accordingly, a separate study of paederastic poetry seems justifiable, and the relatively small number of poems on this topic means that such a study can be of manageable proportions. It is the purpose of this article to concentrate on boy-love in Tibullus, but there will be a preliminary discussion of the topic in pre-Augustan poetry and other Augustan poets to establish the literary background. Particular attention will be paid to the physical attributes and character of the ‘puer delicatus’ himself, the situations depicted in the poems and the tone and approach of the poet.

With regard to the physical features of the boy obviously the fundamental requisite was youthfulness. So Maximus of Tyre (24.9) tells us that Anacreon’s poems were full of the youth of Bathyllus, and Theognis (1305) speaks of ‘ταῦτα ἐρωτάτων ἄνθροπος’. So Pindar in his eulogy on Theoxenus (fr. 108.6ff. Bowra) admits:

'ἄλλα ἐγὼ τάσον ἐκατεί κηρός ὡς δαχθεῖς ἔλα
ιράν μελισσάν τάκομαι, εὕτ' ἰν τῖω
παιδών νεόγυιον ἐς ἦμαν'

Exact age in the ‘puer delicatus’ is hard to pin down and is seldom specified. Rather than a pedantic reckoning of years, the poets were more concerned with the absence of hair on the face and elsewhere on the body as a sign of youth. As early as Theognis (1327f.) there is mention of the smooth cheek in this connection:

'ἀν παῖ, ἐως ἄν ἔχεις λείαν γέννυ, οὕποτε σαῖνον
παῖδομαι, σοῦ εί μοι μόροιμον ἔστι θανεῖν.'

1. This article was read as a paper to the Conference of the Classical Association of South Africa at Port Elizabeth in January 1977.

2. Meleager (A.P.12.125) mentions an eighteen year old boy, but later for Seythinus (A.P.12.22) sixteen is the fatal age, while Strato (A.P.12.4) considers that a boy’s attractions increase from the twelfth to the seventeenth year.
So the advent of hairs terminated both the youth and the attractions of the 'puer delicatus', as Alcaeus points out at A.P. 12.30:

\['η κνήμη, Νίκανδρε, δασύνεται ἄλλα φύλαξει \\
μὴ ॰ καὶ ἕ πυγή ταὐτό παθοῦσα λάθη \\
καὶ γυνώθη φιλέωτος δοῦσα σπάνις. ἄλλα' ἐτι καὶ νῦν \\
tῆς ἄμετακλήτου φρόντισαν ἡλικίης.\]

Another basic requirement was handsomeness, an attribute so common that the boy who is only 'καλῶ μὲν μετρίως' at Theoc. Id. 30.3 is the exception that proves the rule. But perhaps prettiness would be a better term, as delicacy and effeminacy were marked characteristics of the 'puer delicatus'. Anacreon, for instance, at 2D is in love with a boy who has a girlish glance. Meleager at A.P. 12.109 speaks of 'ὁ τροφερός Διόδωρος' and Horace at Epod. 11.23 f. says of his love:

'nunc gloriantis quamlibet mulierculam \\
vincere mollitia amor Lycisci me tenet.'

So the boy was often smooth- or tender-skinned, and gracefulness was considered becoming. As for specific points of beauty, the eyes and the hair are most frequently singled out, although here, of course, tastes vary.

Apart from the above recurring details other attractions less often mentioned include the colouring and complexion, sweetness of smile (Theoc. Id. 30.5) or of speech (Meleager A.P. 12.94.2, 122.3), soft lips (Theoc. Id. 29.25), soft anus and honeyed thighs (Dioscorides A.P. 12.37) and lovely loins (Meleager A.P. 12.94.2).

In view of the youth and effeminacy of the boy one might expect to find a degree of tenderness in his character, but the reverse is almost invariably the case. The 'puer delicatus' is generally cruel, unfaithful and greedy, and this character is reflected in the situations found in paederastic poetry. Theognis (1299 ff.) is the first to complain openly of a boy's cruelty, and this complaint is often echoed by others. One manifestation of this cruelty was the way in which the boy

3. Cf. also A.P. 12.31.3 (Phanias), 33 (Meleager), 36 (Asclepiades of Adramyttium), Hor.C.4.10.
4. Cf. e.g. Theogn.1341, Aristoph.fr.218K, Meleager A.P.12.94.3,125.3,133.1.
5. Cf. Theogn.1319, Polystratus (A.P.12.91.3), Rhianus (A.P.12.93.6,121), Theoc.Id. 30.5.
6. Cf. Max.Tyr.24.9. Eyes may be black (Hor.C.1.32.11f.), flashing (Pind.fr.108 Bowra, Meleager A.P.12.72,110,127,144, Rhianus A.P.12.93.9), prattling (Meleager A.P.12.122.4) or honeyed (Catull.48.1); hair may be black (Hor.C.1.32.11f.), golden (Aristoph.fr.218K) or luxurious (Meleager A.P.12.164).
7. Again tastes vary here: dark (Callimachus A.P.12.230.1), fair (Virg.Ecl.2.16), honeyed (Dioscorides A.P.12.170.3), blushing (Theoc.Id.30.8).
8. E.g. Theoc.Id.7.118ff.,29.31,30.16ff., Catull.99.5ff., Virg.Ecl.2.6, Hor.C.4.1,49.4.10.1.
tended to neglect or refuse the poet,⁹ another was his habit of being unfaithful to him and taking up with other men.¹⁰ Such behaviour means that frequently the poet is possessive and jealous of rivals,¹¹ and either warns the boy of the danger of nemesis or prays that he suffer punishment, as Theognis (1331ff.) does:

\[\text{αἰδεό μὲν καὶ [καλὲ], διδοῦν χάριν, ἦν εἶ ποτε καὶ σὺ}
\]
\[\text{ηὔεις Κυπρογενοῦς δῶρον ἱστεφάνου}
\]
\[\text{χειάζων, καὶ ἐπ' ἀλλοι ἐλεύθερει, ἀλλά σε δαίμων}
\]
\[\text{δοίη τῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιτυχεῖν ἐπέμων."¹²}
\]

Again the 'puer delicatus' tends to have a mercenary streak: at Aristophanes Aves705f. mention is made of the practice of giving boys birds to overcome their obstinacy, but by the time of Glaucus (A.P. 12.44) such presents are scorned and tastes are more expensive:

\[\text{ὣς ὦτε παῖδας ἐπιείθη πάλαι ποτέ δῶρα φιλεύντας}
\]
\[\text{ὄρτυξ, καὶ ῥαπτή σφαῖρα καὶ ᾄστράγαλοι}
\]
\[\text{νῦν δὲ λοπός καὶ κέρμα τά παίγνια δ' ὀδὴν ἐκεῖνα}
\]
\[\text{ἰαχύνει ἐητεῖτ' ἄλλο τι, παιδοφίλαι.}
\]

The theme of gifts also occurs in Discorides (A.P.12.42), Callimachus (A.P.12.148) and Virgil (Ecl.2.40ff.).

Such, then, is the character of the 'puer delicatus' and such the conventional situations found in connection with 'παιδίκος ἐρως.' The course of boy-love seldom ran smooth; in the whole of paederastic poetry up to and including the Augustans there is only one clear instance of a happy affair, between Menalcas and Amyntas at Virgil Ecl.3.66ff., although even here Menalcas complains of his boy's behaviour at 74ff. and criticizes his musical skill at Ecl.5.16ff.¹³

In the above discussion of the figure of the 'puer delicatus' and the situations of paederastic poetry it has been expedient to combine the Augustans and their predecessors, but when considering the tone and approach of the poet a distinction between the two is necessary. In poets before the Augustan period the tone is almost invariably serious and one of involvement. Most often the lover is depicted as infatuated with his present boy or, at any rate, a keen paederast in general. So Theognis (1343ff.) says:

---

⁹. Anac.2, 4D, Theogn.1299ff.,1311ff.,1329ff., Virg.Ecl.2, Hor.C.4.1.37ff. So the lover is locked out at A.P.5.145 (Asclepiades), 12.118 (Callimachus), Theoc.Id.7.118ff.
¹⁰. Theogn.1257ff.,1259ff., Callimachus A.P.12.43, Theoc.Id.29, Catull.24.81. In this connection the boy is not above perjury (Dioscorides A.P.2.170).
¹³. There may also be a happy affair at A.P.12.105 (Asclepiades), but the meaning of the epigram is far from clear: see Gow and Page The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams, vol. II. 130.
Pindar (quoted above) describes himself as wasting away when he looks on the youthful limbs of boys. Rhianus at A.P. 12.93 claims 'οἱ παῖδες λαβώρυνθος ἀνέξοδος' and goes on to list in somewhat obsessive detail a variety of attractions. So too Meleager at A.P. 12.95 indulges in a sexual fantasy involving the simultaneous attentions of a number of boys to Philocles, while at 12.158 he depicts himself as entirely abject to Theocles and ends with the appeal:

'Ὅλοθ' ἀναξ, ἵλθι: σὲ γὰρ θεῶν ὦρισε Δαίμων
ἐν σοί μοι ᾠωθὴ πείρατα καὶ θανάτου.' (7f.)

In Theocritus Id.23 the lover who is scorned by a boy actually commits suicide. Even when not professing his infatuation, the paederast usually appears to be in earnest, whether hoping for success, complaining of the boy’s behaviour, warning him of nemesis or attacking rivals.

The element of humour in this period is occasional and confined to a few poets. Anacreon puns on the name of his boy (2D):

'Κλεοβούλως δ’ ἀγαθὸς γένεο
σύμβουλος.'

Dioscorides (A.P.12.37) claims that Eros in fun formed Sosarchus' anus tender as marrow, to annoy Zeus, because his thighs are far more honeyed than those of Ganymede. Meleager is slightly more inclined to humour: at A.P.12.144 there is the amusing fantasy of Eros getting some of his own medicine, being burned by the eyes of Myciscus: at 12.95.5 he applies the epithet 'ἐδόστοχος' ('well-aimed, that hits its target well') to the penis of Philocles; there is mockery in the military imagery of 12.33.1f.:

'Ἡν καλὸς 'Ηράκλειτος, οὕτ’ ἥν ποτὲ νῦν δὲ παρ’ ἡβην
κηρύσσει πόλεμον δέρρως ὀπισθαβάταις.'

and in the contempt of 12.41.3f.:

'στέργονθ’ θῆλυν ἔρωτα· δασυτρώγλων δὲ πίεσμα
λασταύρων μελέτω ποιμέσιν αἰσγοβάτας.'

It will be observed that on the few occasions when the tone is humorous the joke tends to be quite coarse and is not directed against the poet himself.

In the poet’s approach to the theme of ‘παιδικός ἔρως’ one has to take into account far more his individuality and the period in which he was writing. So
Anacreon's paederastic poems are generally light and witty, and at A.P.5.78 there is the pleasant conceit of Plato's soul on his lips as he was kissing Agathon, hoping to cross over to him, whereas a heavier treatment is found in Theognis and Pindar. In general the Hellenistic authors and Catullus are characterized by a greater degree of ingenuity and cleverness. I have already mentioned Meleager's use of military terms at A.P.12.33. Also worthy of note are A.P.12.121, where Rhianus wonders if the Graces met Cleonicus and embraced him, that he has become such a Grace himself, and A.P.12.109, where Meleager remarks of delicate Diodorus being captivated by Timarion's wanton eyes:

'Ἡ τόδε καινόν
θάμβος ἡρώ· φλέγεται πῦρ πυρί καυσμενον.'

So too the elements of learning and imagery become more common and more developed. For instance, Callimachus (A.P.12.230), Alcaeus (A.P.12.64), Dioscorides (A.P.12.37) and Meleager (A.P.12.65,68,70,133) make apposite, if obvious, play with Ganymede, while at Theocritus Id.29.37f. there is an allusion to the labours of Hercules, and Catullus at 24.4ff. pointedly says:

'mallem divitias Midae dedisses
isti, cui neque servus est neque arca,
quam sic te sineres ab illo amari'

where the impoverished rival could certainly do with the wealth of Midas. Among the images and conceits employed most popular are the idea of rays emanating from the boy's eyes, his eyes captivating by some other method and the boy burning the lover. One final element deserving of mention is the occasional presence of details of a more physical and coarse nature.

To sum up, then, before the Augustans paederastic poetry is generally serious in tone, and, while approaches differ from poet to poet, although we do find lightness of touch and a degree of learning, it would be fair to say that the

---

14. Cf. e.g. the pun in 2D mentioned above and the clever polyptoton in 3D.
15. Cf. also Meleager's puns at A.P.12.157,165. The boy as Eros occurs at A.P.12.54, 56,76,78 (Meleager), 75 (Asclepiades) and 77 (Asclepiades/Posidippus). Callimachus in A.P.12.43 seems to be aiming at word-play, but there are difficulties in the final couplet (see Gow and Page op. cit., vol. ii, 156f.).
16. Ganymede in this connection first occurs at Theogn.1345ff. (he also mentions Atalanta at 1283f.)
17. First in Pindar fr.108.2 Bowra; cf. also Rhianus (A.P.12.93) and Meleager (A.P.12.72,110,127,144).
19. E.g. A.P.12.121 (Rhianus), 122 (Meleager). Note also militia amoris at A.P.12.23 (Meleager) and servitium amoris at A.P.12.81.5 (Meleager), 169 (Dioscorides).
learning is seldom particularly recondite and the imagery fairly restricted in
compass.

To move on to the Augustans excluding Tibullus, although poems on the
subject of ‘παιδικός ἔρως’ are few in number, they show a general contrast to
and improvement on their predecessors. Seriousness of tone is still found, for
instance in Virgil Ec.2, in which Corydon sings a complaint directed at the boy
Alexis, at Ec.3.66ff., the rare instance of the happy affair mentioned above, and
at Horace C.4.10, in which Ligurinus receives a solemn warning of the rapid
passing of youth and beauty. However, amusement and humour are more in
evidence. Horace in Epod.11 professes that he has no heart for poetry now that
he is ‘amore percussum gravi’ (2), and after describing the depth of his former
passion for Inachia he closes with his present love (23ff.):

‘nunc gloriantis quamlibet mulierculam
   vinceere mollitia amor Lycisci me tenet;
   unde expedire non amicorum queant
   libera consilia nec contumeliae graves,
   sed alius ar dor aut puellae candidae
   aut teretis pueri, longam renodantis comam.’

So after preparing us for the idea of a grande passion by the strong expression in
line 2, the details of the affair with Inachia, for whom his passion has now
actually been superseded and, one imagines, surpassed, and the claim that
neither friends’ frank advice nor stern reproaches could extricate him from his
present love, Horace at the very end tells us that simply love for another—girl
or boy, no matter—will end this affair. Here there is a gentle mocking by the
poet of his own tendency to fall deeply in love with one and then just as deeply
with another. A similar technique is evident in C.4.1. After thirty-two lines in
which he claims that he is no longer suited to love, that Venus would be more
profitably employed in the house of Paulus Maximus and that neither woman
nor boy can now delight the poet, the final two stanzas form an unexpected and
amusing contradiction, in which he confesses his present love for Ligurinus.
Again we see the laugh directed at the poet himself.

At C.2.9 I believe that Horace is teasing a friend. It seems likely that the
circumstances are that Valgius (probably an elegiac poet) has lost his boy
Mystes to another lover and is extravagant and enduring in his grief. In the ode
Horace mocks his friend’s excessive laments for his love and finally exhorts him
to celebrate contemporary military events instead, thereby wittily inverting the
rejection of the subject of feats of arms in favour of love that is common in
elegy.21 Finally, in Propertius 1.20 there is another instance of the clever and
none-too-serious approach. The poet’s friend, Gallus, has a handsome

21. For this interpretation of the ode see Quinn Latin Explorations, 160ff. and my
boyfriend called Hylas, who seems to be in danger of being taken from Gallus by some girl. The learned Propertius seizes on the mythological parallel of Hercules and Hylas, equating Italian women with Nymphs (11,12,52), and relates the story of the rape of Hylas by way of a warning. 22

This brief discussion of ‘παιδικὸς ἔρως’ in the Augustan poets other than Tibullus has shown their general tendency towards a lighter and more bantering tone. It has also illustrated their greater adroitness of technique and cleverness in the handling of the topic. ‘Doctrina’ is again in evidence, 23 although their use of imagery is neither extensive nor particularly inventive. 24 The coarser elements occasionally present in their predecessors are absent. In general, then, the paederastic poetry of Tibullus’ contemporaries can be seen as an advance in sophistication and refinement. It remains to consider Tibullus himself.

Marathus, Tibullus’ boyfriend, appears at the end of 1.4, in 1.8 and probably in 1.9. The boy in 1.9 is not named but is likely to be Marathus because of a number of considerations. Apart from the fact that one would expect a different boy to be named to distinguish him from Marathus, the ‘puer delicatus’ of 1.9 and Marathus are alike physically (see below), both employ the trick of crying (1.8.67ff., 1.9.37ff.) and both are in love with a girl, significant not only because this is a rare occurrence for the ‘puer delicatus’ (see below) but also because in 1.8 the girl is fickle, which is exactly the way in which Tibullus wishes the boy’s girlfriend in 1.9 to behave (1.9.39ff.).

Physically Marathus mainly conforms to type, although Tibullus does not give a very clear picture of him. Certainly he is young, probably aged about fifteen or sixteen, and beardless. 25 Marathus is also handsome (1.9.6, 13, 51). The punishment for him mentioned at 1.9.13ff.

\[\textit{pulvisque decorem detrahet et ventis horrida facta coma; uretur facies, urentur sole capilli}\]

distributes that he had beautiful hair and a fair complexion. Other conventional

22. Ovid, incidentally, disclaims personal interest in paederasty (A.A.2.683ff.), and the nearest he comes to the subject in his poetry are the legendary figures of Cyparissus, Ganymede and Hyacinthus (Mort.10.106ff., 155ff., 162ff.).

23. Prop.1.20 has already been mentioned. Cf. also Virg. Ecl.2.24 (Amphion), 32 (Pan as ‘εὔπερτος’), 61 (Paris), 3.67 (possibly a ref. to Diana), Hor.C.2.9.13ff. (Antilochus and Troilus).

24. Interestingly enough, like the Hellenistic poets, they favour the fire of love (Virg. Ecl.2.1.68, 3.66, Hor. Epod.11.4, 27). As the topic is rare in elegy apart from Tibullus, the paucity of imagery is not so surprising.

25. ‘Puer’ is applied to him at 1.4.83, 1.8.27, 49, 1.9.11, 53, 75. At 1.8.31 he is described as a ‘juvenis’. Technically ‘puer’ was used of someone up to the age of fourteen or fifteen (Varro ap. Cens. cap. 14, Isid. Orig.11.2.4), while ‘juvenis’ was applied to someone as young as sixteen (Hor. Ars Poet.1.61 and Brink ad loc.). The absence of the beard (1.8.31ff.) suggests that Marathus was more ‘puer’ than ‘juvenis’, but of an intermediate age, so that the latter term can also be used of him (presumably to bring out the sexual maturity and appeal of Marathus for Photoe’s benefit).
attributes of the ‘puer delicatus’, such as gracefulness, smooth skin and lovely eyes, are not mentioned in connection with Marathus. However, he was undoubtedly effeminate, a point which Tibullus brings out with rather more subtlety than others by the application to him of ‘tener’ (1.8.51, 1.9.30) and ‘invalidus’ (1.9.16), and by listing at 1.8.9ff. his fastidious attentions to his hair, nails, clothes and footwear and his use of cosmetics.

In character too Marathus generally conforms to the conventional figure of the boy, but with some interesting variations. Marathus is cruel, tormenting, neglecting and refusing his lovers (1.4.81, 1.8.7ff.). 26 1.9 concerns his faithlessness, greed and perjury, while in both 1.8 and 1.9 the idea of punishment for his misdemeanours occurs. As usual, the affair is not a happy one, and in 1.9 Tibullus represents himself as driven to contemplating a termination of it. Yet Marathus’ character is more deeply drawn than this. He comes over as spoilt and precocious: apart from his foppish attention to his personal appearance mentioned above (a new detail in this connection), he also claims a quite advanced level of erotic expertise at 1.8.57ff.:

‘nota venus furtiva mihi est, ut lenis agatur
spiritus, ut nec dent oscula rapta sonum;
et possum media quamvis obrepere nocte
et strepitu nullo clam reserare fores’.

In 1.9 this skill has been enough to take in Tibullus. Yet, after all he is seen to be only a young boy, and when he himself falls in love27 and is similarly maltreated he is reduced to childish complaints and tearful bewilderment.

To assess Tibullus’ tone and approach to ‘παιδικός ἔρως’ the easiest method is to give a detailed criticism of each of the elegies in turn and then to draw conclusions. 1.4 takes the form of an imaginary dialogue between the poet and a statue of Priapus on the subject of paederasty. In the opening eight lines Tibullus asks the god what his technique is for catching pretty boys, presuming that there is some technique, since Priapus is hardly attractive. Priapus is here described with realism as a weatherbeaten statue, ugly, naked and rustic, the bantering tone helped by various poetic devices (especially alliteration, anaphora and balance) and the mock-solemnity of the fourth couplet introducing the god’s reply.28 Thus

26. His cruelty may be reflected in the name ‘Marathus’, which, although a real name (cf. Suet.Aug.79,94), is probably a pseudonym chosen for special point, like ‘Delia’ and ‘Pholoe’. The name has been linked with ‘μαραθω’ ‘to wear out, waste away’ (see K. F. Smith on 1.4.81–4), and may also be connected with fennel (‘marathrum, μάραθρον, μάραθος’), which might suggest pain, since fennel was used as a cane (see Mayor on Juv.1.15).


28. I.e. the rather grandiose ‘proles’ in 7 (see Norden on Virg. Aen.6.784) and the military language in 8.
in effect the lines warn against taking too seriously Priapus' pose as 'praecceptor amoris'.

The second section (9–72) contains the 'praecpta': the god begins with a general recommendation of boy-love (9–14), then states that patience is required (15–20), perjury is permissible (21–26), swiftness of action is necessary (27–38), obsequious conduct will effect success (39–56) and obsequious poetry, rather than gifts of money, should be sent to the boy (57–72). This section of the elegy is highly ironical: the subject is a humble one and Priapus' remarks on it are commonplace, but they are presented with the pose of a dignified, dogmatic and learned professor. So the recommendation of boy-love is in the manner of the openings of didactic works where complimentary remarks about the subject under discussion are made. This attitude is also to be seen in the orders and prohibitions, the lists of examples and full discussion which he gives to each precept with parallels from nature and personal experience. Even when he abandons temporarily this calm and logical attitude at 57ff., he gives an emotional and highly poetic attack on gifts and defence of poetry. The extraneous material that he introduces is seldom new but seems intended to enhance his own and the subject's dignity. So the language is generally poetic and elevated with a number of new or unusual forms and words, and stylistically the elegy seems overdone.

In the final section of the elegy (73–84) there are a number of unexpected turns. So far Tibullus has tried to mislead the reader as to the identity of the person for whom Priapus' advice is intended. Lines 1–56 suggested that the poet wanted general information, but the theme of poetry versus money at 57–72 suggested that he may have asked for his own use. Line 73 attempts to allay this suspicion: Tibullus says that the advice was really asked on behalf of Titius, another poet. In 74 comes another turn: this poet cannot use the advice because of his wife. Therefore at 75–78 Tibullus says that he will pass it on to other lovers, implying that he still wanted general information only. At this point Tibullus takes over Priapus' pose as 'praecceptor' and shows similar earnestness and self-importance:

'gloria cuique sua est: me, qui spernentur, amantes
consultent: cunctis ianua nostra patet.'

29. Reading 'ne fuge te' (exc. Perrei) in 9.
30. Cf. e.g. Cic. De Or. 1.30ff., Nat. D. 1.7ff.
31. E.g. the refs. to time's universal laws at 15ff. and 27ff., the claim of divine support at 21ff. and the elaboration of the theme of immortality conveyed by poetry at 61ff.
32. E.g. 'fuge' for 'noli' (9), 'angustus' active (11), 'stat . . . ante' (14), 'transiet' (27), 'insuetus' used absolutely and 'atteruisse' (48), 'tercentenus' and 'expleo' (69).
33. E.g. the frequent use of anaphora, the structural neatness and precision, the contrasts, correspondences, climax, word-play and artistic arrangement of words.
34. There are problems over the identity of Titius (see K. F. Smith ad loc.). Briefly, for Tibullus to pretend that Priapus' advice was more fitting for someone else and thus allay the suspicions raised at 57ff., he must choose a reasonably well-known poet for that person. Possibly the poet Titius mentioned by Horace (Epist. 1.3.9ff.) is referred to here.
tempus erit, cum me Veneris praecepta ferentem
deduccat iuvenum sedula turba senem.' (77–80)

However, at 81ff. comes the unexpected climax, in which Tibullus shows that he did need the god's advice for himself and that it proves useless in the case of Marathus:

'cheu quam Marathus lento me torquet amore!
deficiunt artes, deficiuntque doli.
pierce, puer, quaeso, ne turpis fabula fiam,
cum mea ridebunt vana magisteria.'

Thus in 1.4 there are two sets of contrasts, the second mirroring the first: Priapus appears initially as the usual undignified figure, but then adopts a serious and learned pose; so Tibullus appears next in the same dignified role, but is finally reduced to a laughing-stock.

The extensive irony and humour in the elegy—at the expense of both the god and the poet himself—is obvious. Even when Marathus is introduced and the poet appears as the infatuated and maltreated lover the effect is comic. Structure and technique are polished and sophisticated. This is also a learned poem: apart from the amatory 'praecepta'—incidentally, this is the longest and most detailed treatment of the 'praeceptor amoris' theme until Ovid—there is mythological 'doctrina'35 and, on the literary side, the influence of the Alexandrians is particularly evident.36

In 1.8 Tibullus has discovered that some sort of an affair is going on between Marathus and young girl called Pholoe, in which the boy is infatuated but unsuccessful. Tibullus assumes again his pose as 'praeceptor amoris' and advices the girl to mend her ways. The gradual revelation of circumstances present in 1.4 is again evident here. Lines 1–26 act as a general but vague introduction to the poem. The first four couplets inform us that the poet has discovered the existence of an affair despite efforts at concealment; Tibullus immediately establishes himself in his role as amatory expert by claiming that Venus herself taught him (5f.) and aptly quoting an old amatory precept (7f.). In the next four couplets he defines the part of the lover and gives some idea of the main characters: here already we see the amusement at the situation that characterizes the whole elegy, as Tibullus devotes three whole couplets to the excessive but unavailing pains taken by the lover over his appearance and a single contrasting couplet on the girl's success despite her lack of attention:

35. Esp. the whole mythological fantasy on which the poem is based. Note also the refs. to Priapus' parentage (7), the seduction of Io (23f.), Nisus and Pelops (63f.) and Cybele (67f.).
36. See Luck The Latin Love Elegy, 92ff.
The final five couplets decide the cause of infatuation, and here the humour is heightened as Tibullus ironically wonders if the lover's odd behaviour may have been caused by magic, citing with apparent seriousness the power of witchcraft in other fields, only to conclude with anticlimactic realism that sexual attraction is the real cause. The neat dissection into three groups of lines dealing with various aspects of the affair fits in well with Tibullus' pose of expertise.

In lines 27–66 the poet turns to address the girl. After a brief transition at 27f. he first attacks her venality (29–48), putting forward the idea of the superiority of youth and beauty to old age and wealth. Lines 29–38, appealing to her sensuality, point out that the lover's youth and beauty are preferable to the old age of another man, even if he does have money, and advise the girl to enjoy herself with the lover. Lines 39–48, appealing to the girl's vanity, point out that her own youth and beauty are preferable to the old age that she may herself suffer, even if she does have money, and advise her to enjoy her youth while she can. Thus the attack is comprehensive and balanced, with two symmetrical ten-line groups. A few more details about the main characters are revealed (she is mercenary, and both the lover and the girl are young), and humour is still in evidence.37 The second part of the address to the girl consists of an attack on her cruelty (49–66). Again the theme of youth is present, but here the emphasis is on the boy's childishness and the appeal is to the girl's pity. The first three couplets are a request to spare the boy because of the effect she is having on him. The poet's amusement is again to the fore, notably in the application to this trivial situation of a variant on an old technical phrase from Roman law38 and the description of the lover's excesses of grief at 53f.:  

vel miser absenti maestas quam saepe querellas conicit et lacrimis omnia plena madent!

The next six couplets quote the boy's own complaint that, although he knows how to conduct a secret affair, the girl still scorns him. Here there is a neat balance between three couplets on his claims of expertise and three on his lack of success, while the sight of the boy formerly so sure of his sophistication but now reduced to childish tears suggests Tibullus' amusement. During these lines it is revealed that the boy is none other than Marathus.

The final section (67–78) consists of threats. After a transitional couplet
telling Marathus to stop crying, since she is unmoved, two couplets threatening punishment for the girl's arrogance (69–70, 77–78) enclose an admonitory example of punishment for a similar crime. Tibullus saves a few revelations and surprises for the end of the poem. At last he tells us the girl's name—Pholoe. He also gives the particular reason for his amusement at the situation. The example of punishment cited is Marathus:

'hic Marathus quondam miserōs ludebat amantes' (71)

He used to behave exactly as Pholoe is now doing39 and his present maltreatment at the hands of Pholoe is his punishment: that the poet would include himself among the wretched lovers that the boy made mock of and so feel pleasure at his discomfiture is suggested by 1.4.81ff., 1.9.1 and 45f. However, this correspondence between Pholoe's present cruelty to Marathus and the cruelty which he himself showed to his lovers also suggests that, just as the crimes are the same, so Pholoe's punishment will be the same and like Marathus she too will be scorned. This suggestion is confirmed in the final couplet. At 39–42 Tibullus had said to the girl:

'non lapis hanc gemmaeque iuvant, quae frigore sola
dormiat et nulli sit cupienda viro.
heu sero revocatur amor seroque iuventas
cum vetus infecit cana senecta caput.'

Being scorned by lovers in old age was a detail commonly mentioned in connection with the punishment of the cruel mistress,40 and, in view of the warning to the girl of nemesis at 28 ('persequitur poenis tristia facta Venus'), it seems likely that at 39–42 Tibullus was hinting that such scorn will be the girl's punishment if she does not change her ways. Corroboration in the form of verbal clues is provided when he closes the elegy with this threat of nemesis:

'at te poena manet, ni desinis esse superba.
quam cupies votis hunc revocare diem!' (77–8)

The threat is not specific but contains clear echoes of 'poenis' (28) in 'poena' (77) and 'revocatur' (41) in 'revocare' (78). More follows. If Pholoe is also to be scorned, then a clever and novel complexity has been added to the conventional situation: normally we find only the scorrer scorned, but here Tibullus implies that Pholoe, the scorrer of the scorrer scorned (Marathus), will herself be scorned in turn. So the elegy ends with a subtle and humorous final twist.

39. At 71 'miserōs ludebat amantes' echoes 61 (cf. also 'miser' at 23, 53); 73 cf. 67f.; 74 cf. Pholoe's excuse at 35f. and 55ff.
40. E.g. Callimachus (A.P.5.23), Tibullus 1.6.77ff., Ovid A.A.3.69ff., Rufinus (A.P.5.27, 28.)
Again, then, Tibullus adopts a bantering tone and a mocking, ironical stance. Note too the superior, detached pose of the expert, which is rare for the lover of boys. Again structural neatness is evident and the technique of slow revelation means that he keeps our interest and makes surprising disclosures and twists. Certainly 1.8 is a clever poem, but the element of learning lies not so much in mythological 'doctrina' as in the subtle handling of the literary theme of nemesis and the whole pose as 'praeceptor amoris'.

1.9 is occasioned by Marathus' seduction by the money of another man. The first sixteen lines act as a general introduction to the main themes of the elegy: after two couplets on the boy's perjury and its inevitable punishment the poet prays that Marathus be spared serious divine wrath, and predicts less grave, but apt, punishments. Lines 17–52 consists of complaints to the boy: Tibullus begins by quoting his advice to the boy on the evil of being seduced by money and the inevitability of detection, and states his shame at the entreaties that accompanied this advice; next he recalls the boy's answering oaths not to let himself be seduced and his own stupidity in believing him; anger at this deception leads to a sudden remembrance of Marathus' affair with a girl (which incidentally suggests another apt punishment for him) and the way in which he used the poet in this liaison; Tibullus then moves on to his shame at the poetry which he composed in praise of the boy, and in a climactic final couplet he curily dismisses him. At 53–74 he turns to attack Marathus' seducer. The point of the curse in 53–64 is that the seducer's wife is to prefer other men to him, just as Marathus preferred him to Tibullus: the first three couplets describe her future infidelity with a number of lovers and the seducer's ignorance of it, while the next three extend the insults by describing the lustfulness and drunkenness of the seducer's sister and praying that his wife will surpass her. At 65–74 the poet returns to the present and shows that this process is already under way, reserving the supreme insult for the final couplet, in which he fully exculpates the wife on the grounds of the seducer's physical repulsiveness. In the conclusion of the elegy (75–84) Tibullus returns to Marathus, expressing dismay that the boy could have slept with such a creature and closing with yet another threat of punishment, his intention to leave him and take up with another boy.

Again there is a slow revelation of circumstances, which gives the end of the poem maximum impact. We are told early on that the boy has been unfaithful (I f.) and seduced by gifts (II), but the identity of the seducer is not revealed until later (at 53 we learn that he is married and at 73f. that he is old and diseased) nor the exact nature of the relationship ('accubuit' at 75), while only at 79ff. does Tibullus make it clear that he is definitely contemplating a separation from Marathus.

41. But there may be a reference to the love of Venus and Adonis at 35ff.: see Lee *Tibullus: Elegies*, Cambridge, 1975, 110.
On the face of it 1.9 is a more serious and powerful poem than 1.4 and 1.8, although with less attention than usual paid to structure and learning. Yet there is more to it than this. The elegy gains much in subtle humour by its position immediately after 1.8. Instead of the poet’s detachment and amusement in 1.8, we find involvement, shame and anger. So too Tibullus in 1.9 has been duped by Marathus, although at 1.8.1f. he maintained that he could not be taken in and at 55ff. betrayed some mirth at the boy’s claims of expertise. In addition, the poet himself being deceived in 1.9 represents an entertaining rebound of 1.8.35ff., where he recommends such deception (to the girl). Similarly Marathus has here been seduced by the gifts of an old man, a rebound of the poet’s advice to the girl at 1.8.29ff.:

‘det munera canus amator,
   ut foveat molli frigida membra sinu.’

So the old man’s success in 1.9 neatly contradicts Tibullus’ claim of the sexual frustration of old age at 1.8.39ff. But the most diverting contrast is that between the poet’s pose as an expert ‘praeceptor amoris’ in 1.8 and his complete naïveté in 1.9. Tibullus freely admits his lack of sophistication at 37 (‘non ego fallere doctus’) and 45 (‘stulte confusus amari’), and by wondering why Marathus swore to be faithful if he intended to break his word and expressing dismay at Marathus demeaning himself by sleeping with the seducer he shows similar simple-mindedness. So at 3f. he maintains that perjury is punished, despite the well-known proverb that the gods laugh at lovers’ perjuries (1.4.21ff.), at 23ff. he claims that furtive affairs are revealed by god, whereas at 1.8.35ff. he claims that Venus assists them, and at 37f. he falls for the trick of crying, although at 1.8.67ff. he is aware of this ploy.

This contrast between the detached ‘praeceptor’ in 1.8 and the naïve and involved lover in 1.9 is indicative of considerable ingenuity of the part of Tibullus, as it seems certain that the poet himself was responsible for the arrangement of the elegies in book I.42 We must also consider as deliberate the neatness of the overall structure of his paederastic elegies, whereby, as in 1.4 itself, so in the conjunction of 1.8 and 1.9 we see the amusing contrast between uninvolved precepts and the reality of personal involvement.

It remains to give an overall assessment of Tibullus’ elegies on ‘παπαδίκος ερως’. He has a number of points in common with the other Augustans, but in him we find a definite progression from and improvement on his contemporaries.43 His poems on this topic are characterized by elegance and polish and

---

42. Book I was published in the poet’s lifetime, in 27 or 26 B.C. (cf. Ov. Tr.2.463f.). For some interesting observations on the careful arrangement of Tibullus’ elegies see Lee op. cit., 13.
43. It should also be remembered that the Odes are, of course, later than Tibullus.
are unmarred by any real vulgarity. In his handling of the figure of the 'puer delicatus' and in the situations depicted in the three elegies there is a significant degree of variation and innovation. Tibullus surpasses all others in the length of the poems, which means that he gives a more detailed treatment of the theme and has greater scope for ingenuity. The tone of humour and amusement, often at the poet's own expense, is more extensive and more developed than in his predecessors and contemporaries. The skill in technique and structure and the breadth of the imagery employed are also remarkable. Added interest is achieved by the introduction of characters other than the boy and the poet himself (Priapus, Pholoe and the seducer) and by the concentration on presentation from a didactic angle and the consequent detachment in approach. Finally, subtlety, as seen in the twist to the theme of the scorner scorned, the contrast between 1.9 and 1.8 and the overall structural pattern of the three elegies, is in my opinion the distinguishing feature and the most notable quality of Tibullus' paederastic poetry.

44. With reference to 'παιδικὸς ἥπας' the most explicit remarks occur at 1.4.12 (white breast), 53ff. (kisses and embrace), 1.9.75f. ('accumbo' of sexual connection), 77f. (blandishments and kisses).

45. E.g. militia amoris (1.4.40), servitium amoris (1.9.21f., 41f., 79), the beloved as a ruler (1.9.80), the yoke of love (1.4.16), the palm of victory (1.9.81f.), 'intereo' (1.9.45), hunting imagery (1.9.46).
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