

D. MULROY: *The Complete Poetry of Catullus*. Pp. xlv + 114. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2002. Paper. ISBN: 0-299-17774-2.

With the exception of Virgil, Catullus is probably the Roman poet most widely read by both students of classical studies/classical civilization and non-specialists; Mulroy's new translation is therefore a welcome addition to the several versions already available.

This nicely produced volume includes a thirty-page introduction and minimal explanatory notes (scarcely a 'commentary', as the title-page claims) on each poem. The translation itself reads well, and generally follows the Latin closely; M. does not attempt, however, to imitate the verbal structures of the original as closely as (for example) Guy Lee (Oxford, 1990). This makes for less stylized English than the sometimes mannered language of Lee's (otherwise excellent) version, and students will no doubt find M. more accessible. M. effectively conveys something of the excitement and (apparent) immediacy of Catullus' poetry. The studied, formal elegance so characteristic of the elegiacs, in particular, is perhaps harder to convey in translation, though M.'s intermittent use of rhyme works well as a counterpoint to his colloquial diction; the metrical schemes employed (explained in detail on pp. xxiv–ix of the introduction) are also more strictly adhered to than is often the case in modern translations. The opening of poem 16, for example, is neatly rendered: 'I'm going to rape you, front and back, / you queer and you nymphomaniac'; and the epigrammatic conciseness of poem 70 is nicely captured in M.'s version: 'My woman says that she would prefer none other / to me, though Jupiter sought her. / She says, but a woman's words to her lover belong / on wind and rapid water.' Occasionally, M. strays over the fine line that separates the colloquial from the prosaic ('I feel it occur' for *feri sentio* in 85.2, for instance, struck the reviewer as a false note); generally, however, the stylistic level is nicely pitched, and M. does not fight shy of obscene language where appropriate.

The introduction is, on the whole, less satisfactory. This reads very much as a historian's—rather than a literary scholar's—take on the context and character of Catullus' poetry. It may be none the worse for that, and it is certainly useful to have the invective poems located within the framework of contemporary factional politics; but M.'s speculative comments on what Catullus 'must' have felt about particular events verge at times on crude biographical criticism of the kind from which the author seeks to distance himself on p. xvi. M. makes an effective case (pp. xii–xvi) for the identification of Lesbia with Clodia Metelli, though his attempts to date specific poems (pp. xvi–xvii) rely, inevitably, on circular arguments; nor does he take sufficient account of recent work on the representation of Roman women, which might incline us (like, for example, Suzanne Dixon, *Reading Roman Women* [London, 2001], pp. 133–56) to attribute apparent similarities between Lesbia and Clodia to the exploitation by both Catullus and Cicero of a common stereotype, rather than identify the two women. This part of the introduction concludes (pp. xxv–vii) with some curiously romanticized conjectures about the poet's ultimate fate (M. implies that Julius Caesar may have had him assassinated): the romantic 'novel' of the young poet dying of love is replaced here by the equally romantic image of Catullus the fearless political activist. Still more naïve is the section (pp. xxvii–xxxii) dealing with 'Catullus' Sincerity': M. finds it 'difficult to resist thinking that [Catullus] really was smitten' (p. xxix), but does not seem to have stopped to ask himself why this should matter (or, indeed, how Catullus creates this effect of apparent sincerity).

M.'s translation is, in short, readable and often felicitous; colleagues employing this volume in their teaching, however, would be well advised to issue a health warning to students against uncritical reading of the introduction.

*Trinity College Dublin*

MONICA R. GALE

G. GIARDINA: *Contributi di critica testuale. Da Catullo alla Historia Augusta*. Pp. xi + 186. Rome: Herder Editrice, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 88-85876-79-X.

Giardina here reprints and indexes thirty-two sets of critical notes, of which thirty appeared from 1970 to 2000 in *Museum Criticum*, one in *Paideia* 52 (1997), and one in *Studi Gagliardi* (2001). Nine concern Petronius, whom he has edited with Rita Cuccioli Melloni (1995); six Propertius, whose second book he has edited (1977); four Catullus; three Horace; another three

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

Seneca's tragedies, which he has edited (1966); and one each Virgil, Ovid, Varro, Seneca *N. Q.*, Apuleius, the *Historia Augusta*, and Porphyrio (oddly, this last consists of seven unconnected notes on pp. 368–73 of Holder's edition). He adds only a laboured expansion of his note on Catullus 55.9 and some remarks on Goold's Loeb of Propertius. The volume will not perform much of a service, therefore, except to readers who have no access to *Museum Criticum*. One cross-reference (p. 61 n. 5) works only in the original version, which is where Marzullo's dutifully reported brainwaves should have stayed.

G.'s conjectures seldom alter more than one word, and they are a mixed bag. Many are reasonable without being cogent; he rightly places sense and idiom above the shapes of letters, but a conjecture like *manavit* at Prop. 2.32.23 (for *me laedit*), which no reader would ever find fault with if it were transmitted (any more than with the fifteenth-century conjecture *pervenit*), runs the risk of looking more like an evasion than a solution. He can bring one up with a salutary jolt, as when he argues that *O funde* at Cat. 44.1 is a corrupt name (though one of his suggestions, Ofonius, would be unmetrical in the vocative), or that at Hor. *Ep.* 1.11.26 not *locus* but *Notus* was *effusi late maris arbiter*, or that at 118.5 Petronius credited Horace with *curiosa facilitas* and not, despite the better rhythm, *felicitas*. His objections to transmitted readings or previous conjectures, for instance Prop. 1.2.9 *non fossa*, are often just, but it is hard to see why his own *consternet* at Prop. 1.4.23 or *pulpa voretur* at 2.20.31 escapes.

Bibliographical annotation is light, and sometimes his argument cuts corners. At Cat. 3.17 his *vestra* for *tua* presupposes what many consider an unacceptable text in 16. In Cat. 44 he neglects to reinterpret ll. 2–4. At *Aen.* 9.172 his parallels for *quis* include one with the complement in the dative and none with it in the accusative. At Prop. 2.32.47 he needed parallels not for generalizing plurals but for a mixture of generalizing and ordinary plurals. At Prop. 2.5.28 *lingua levis* (H. Richards), not mentioned, surely has more in its favour than *verbilevis* (Scaliger, with *formipotens*). At Prop. 4.11.53 he should have explained the relevance, which eludes me, of Lucr. 1.656. Going back to *HSCP* 71 (1966), 76–7 would have saved him from wondering how Goold took *motis decor artubus* at Prop. 1.4.13.

At Catullus 97.3 his appeal to the authority of G rests on two false statements, one specific and the other general; and what makes a conjecture 'autorevole' (pp. 10, 66)? On his *soporem* at Hor. *Od.* 3.1.19 see now F. Cairns, *Coll. Latomus* 266 (2002), 84–5. He quotes Ausonius *Mos.* 324–6 in a baffling form by omitting words and making two mistakes, one of them an unmetrical *mari* for *amni* (p. 27). Also unmetrical is his *arcus dant* at Petronius 119.11. Sen. *N. Q.* 6.1.13 *infamis ruinis* (Tyre *aliquando*) is surely protected against his *informis* by *Ep.* 14.8 *ab illa regione verticibus infami* (the Straits of Messina), 6.21.1 *vexerit* against his *evexerit* by rhythm.

G.'s editions of Seneca's tragedies (1966) and of Cicero's speeches *Pro Rabirio Postumo* (1967) and *Pro Balbo* (1971) were the best available at the time. Together with these notes, they have shown him to be a sober and thoughtful critic of both poetry and prose. So retrospective a volume is therefore a disappointment.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

MICHAEL D. REEVE

M. LIPKA: *Language in Vergil's Eclogues*. (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 60.) Pp. xii + 224. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 3-11-016936-3.

'The work is designed to provide scholars with *material*' (p. xi, author's emphasis). It is hard to believe, however, that any scholar will be content with the bare statement on p. 13 that *agellus* in *Ecl.* 9.3 means 'beloved homeland', rather than 'little farm' or 'smallholding'. Similarly, on p. 91 there is a faulty paraphrase of 2.12 *uestigia lustru* as 'follows in Alexis' footsteps'. The phrase really means 'go round in search of', or simply 'track'. Thus the scholar for whom the book is designed might well repudiate the proposed debt to Callimachus, canvassed at that point, as illusory. Or consider this: on p. 34 we are told that, in *Ecl.* 2.22 'lac mihi non aestate nouum, non frigore defit', *non aestate . . . non frigore* is 'a simple hendiadys . . . (= *nunquam*)'. Has L. never encountered the term 'polar expression' or, as E. L. Bundy used to call it, 'universalizing doublet'? L. has another heterodox 'take' on hendiadys on p. 153, where he regards the double *atque* in 5.23 as an example; again, no explanation supports the claim. I doubt the notion on p. 41, that in 3.58 'incipit, Damoeta; tu deinde sequere, Menalca', *sequere* is an imperative, will count as 'material' in a scholar's armoury. Surprising too is the claim on p. 158 that *cycnus* is the common word for 'swan' in classical Latin. 'Common' to whom? As a loanword, it was part of

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved