praeterire. Conclusion: "Der geographische Befund aus dem Wortbestand von c. 11 ist so eindeutig wie möglich" (ibid.). It is, according to Stoessl, the first poem from Catullus’ third period, it is followed by political invectiva, provoked by the unbearable situation at Verona.

Next, a more difficult problem, 14b. The poet calls his poems ineptiae, hence is not sure about their quality, he must be rather young. Metre (the phalaeceus), and words like manus and forte point to the early Lesbia-period (II, 1). The poem was not completed (!) and replaced by c. 1, which is Roman, because libellus, pumex, expolire and explicare are typically Roman. Avidus is not—it is Veronese—but is "aus Verona mit nach Rom genommen" (p. 91)! There are moreover eight hapax legomena in ten lines, which give a "Verhältniszahl 0.8". Of course in a libellus like that of Catullus there are many hapax legomena in each poem, but why it is worth reporting such a "Verhältniszahl" remains unclear.

Stoessl’s book sometimes looks like a parody of studies working with statistics, but I am afraid it is not meant as such. I fear it is intended as a new impulse to the Catullforschung. Heaven forbid that others follow this example!
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1) T. P. Wiseman, Catullus: His Life and Times, JRS 69 (1979), 161 (from 161-168).


The author of this study examines the question how the relationship between the poet and his immediate environment takes shape in Tibullus’ work. In his treatment of the elegies bearing on this relationship Bright strongly emphasizes the interrelationship between the poems which belong to one and the same series and are concentrated around one of the central characters in the life of the poeta-cliens and poeta-amator. Thus the discussion of El. 1, 7, an elegy devoted to the glorification of the achievements of Tibullus’ patron Messalla, gives rise to a detailed account of the role which Messalla plays in other elegies, both in book I and in book II. In particular, Bright clearly shows how certain elements in El. 1, 7 return in El. 2, 1 (pp. 38 ff.). After discussing El. 1, 7 (which constitutes the core of the chapter entitled ‘Messalla meus’), Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXV, Fasc. 3-4 (1982)
Bright gives much attention to the thematically related festive poem for Messalla's son Messalinus: *El. 2, 5*, the longest elegy in Tibullus' entire oeuvre. In his analysis of this poem Bright especially emphasizes its unity of composition, while at the same time revealing the unmistakable parallels with Vergilius' writings (pp. 66 ff.).

The greater part of Bright's book, however, is taken up by reflections on Delia, Nemesis and Marathus, as was to be expected in view of the important place they have in Tibullus' poetry. In chapter five, on 'the nature of Delia and Nemesis' (pp. 99-124), one finds a number of illuminating and very valuable observations on Delia and Nemesis as "purely literary creations" and as two contrary manifestations of one being, comparable to Diana, who represents a combination of the functions of *dea lucis* and *dea noctis*. Starting from this view on the meaning of the names given by Tibullus to the *puella amata*, Bright in his analysis of the poems belonging to "the Delia-series" (I, 1; I, 3; I, 5; I, 6; pp. 125-183) and "the Nemesis-series" (2, 4; 2, 6; pp. 184-227) accentuates the unmistakable deterioration which can subsequently be detected in the various poems and in the two successive series, from a situation of unruffled happiness in the relationship between the poet and his beloved to the ever-increasing crumbling of the dream and the advancing decay of the relationship, ending in "total loss of mistress".

After these two series "the Marathus-series" (I, 4; I, 8; I, 9) is dealt with and Bright does not only point out the differences between these poems and the Delia- and Nemesis-poems, but he also shows how the relationship between Marathus and Pholoe is repeatedly used by Tibullus to reflect his own experiences as an *amator* (pp. 228-259), which fits in admirably with an important aspect of Tibullus' poetry which is rightly emphasized by Bright, that is with its pre-eminently subjective character. In illustration of this characteristic feature Bright does not only point out the above-mentioned function of the description of the amorous relationship between Marathus and Pholoe, but also the scarcity of mythological exempla in Tibullus' poems (cf. pp. 1 ff.: 'The limits of Tibullan myth'). In this connection Bright also discusses the complete absence of explicit references to the works of other poets. Subsequently he uses an analysis of *El. 1, 3* as a further illustration of this subjectivity which is so characteristic of Tibullus' work and which is much more apparent in his than in Propertius' and Ovid's poems. Bright convincingly shows that in *El. 1, 3* Tibullus uses elements from Homer's *Odyssey* in order to be able to identify himself with Odysseus and thereby to characterize him-