have included οὐερεδάριος (*P.Oxy*. LIV 3758.120); contrast, for example, the lemmata βικεννάλιον or βικήσιμον, whose examples include forms in οὐι-. βελόκιον: Delete the example in *CPR* XIV 31 (very uncertainly read). βηξιλλιφόρος: The reading of the word in *O.Bodl*. II 1676 is extremely uncertain (and infringes 'Youtie's law'). βουλγαρικός: The discussion of the word offers no proof that it corresponds to Lat. *vulgaris*; and there is no way that in *SPP* VIII 1124 = XX 133 we are dealing with an alias. δεφήνσωρ: This official is probably not identical with the *defensor civitatis* (Greek ἔκδικος), cf. D. Hagedorn *apud* B. Kramer, *Pap.Flor.* XIX, p. 308 n. 12, and now *P.Thomas* 24. δομεστικός: To the literature on *comites domesticorum* add R. Delmaire, *Byzantion* 54 (1984), 148–53, 175. On *P.Oxy*. XVI 1942 see now *ZPE* 132 (2000), 180. δούξ: Further examples in *P.Berol.inv.* 25009r.l (ed. *GRBS* 17 [1976], 198), *SEG* VIII 355, XXIV 1223–4, and now *CPR* XXII 1. There are two doublets: BM Or. 8903 = *MPER* NS XXIII (elsewhere cited as KSB) 241, and *SB* I 1840 = *I.Syringes* 788. Delete *PSI* VII 800 and *P.Amh*. II 151, where the word is restored. *SB* IV 7475 (= *I.Theb*. 196) and V 8704 have been republished by J. Gascou, *T&MByz* 12 (1994), 339 ff. *P.Lugd.Bat.* XIII 10 dates to 399/400, cf. J. R. Rea, *ZPE* 56 (1984), 79–88; *SPP* III 271b dates to mid-VII, cf. J. Gascou and K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 49 (1982), 89–90, as also does *SB* XVI 12884, see *CPR* XXII 1 intro.; *BGU* III 750 is post-conquest, but does not date to 750. To the bibliography add now C. Zuckerman, *AnTard* 6 (1998), 137–47; J.-M. Carrié, *AnTard* 6, 105–21. The old dating of the texts in *P.Apoll*. to 703–15 (cf. pp. 137, 153, 155) should be condemned to oblivion, and replaced by 'later VII', cf. *BL* VIII 10 (referred to on pp. 183, 204, 258). Last, in a lexicon pertaining to the Greek documentary texts *Ägyptens*, examples from *P.Ness*. or *PPG* should have been set apart from the Egyptian material.

Wolfson College, Oxford N. GONIS

CATULLAN MACHISMO

D. Wray: *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*. Pp. xi + 246. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-521-66127-7.

The declared aim of this monograph is to 'make Catullus new'—that is, to offer fresh perspectives on the author, inducing readers to see the corpus, particularly the short poems, in a different light. It is, accordingly, a refreshingly iconoclastic study. W. begins by challenging the use of the term 'lyric' (however it may be defined) to characterize Catullan poetics, arguing that it subsumes craftsmanship and intellectual play beneath a modernist concept of the poet as earnest 'maker of meaning' at a time of cultural crisis. While conceding the possibility that Catullus may indeed bear witness to a collapse of values in Roman society, W. contends that the prevailing 'axiomatic, central and complete' view of him as 'crisis poet' needs interrogation. As a long-time advocate of that view, I would say 'fair enough'.

Next W. presents the case for reading a 'postmodern Catullus' by aligning his art with that of contemporary poets who eschew meditative lyric in favor of encyclopedic collage. Louis Zukofsky, already notorious among Catullan scholars for his idiosyncratic translation of the entire corpus, serves as the illustrative example. Zukofsky's use of allusive punning in a threnodic context is cited to illuminate the aesthetics behind what might seem inappropriately frivolous intertextuality in a classical author. Point well made, but W.'s Catullan instances—the echo of the *Odyssey*

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.94 Published online by Cambridge University Press

proem in the opening distich of 101 and the 'correction' of Calvus' hesitant language at 96.6—do not constitute jarring breaches of decorum. The kind of alleged aesthetic lapse he has in mind—epitomized by Virgil's witty adaptation of a line from the 'Lock of Berenice' at *Aen*. 6.460—does not, to my recollection, occur in Catullus. On the other hand, startling juxtapositions of poems within the extant collection have unquestionably scandalized critics, so much so as to give rise to the hypothesis of a posthumous editor. W. adduces the postmodern 'long poem' with its jumble of discursive styles and speech registers in order to plead that '"whole" need not mean "organic" ': assemblages such as Zukofsky's '*A*' and William Carlos Williams' *Paterson* reflect a ludic sensibility comparable to that exhibited by the arrangement of the Catullan corpus. This is a very attractive notion; subsequent discussions of the 'Catullan problem' might well bear it in mind.

The central thesis of W.'s book is that Catullus' short poems can be construed as a 'performance of manhood'—a self-consciously competitive staging of gestures and stances defined in Roman gender ideology as quintessentially masculine. In successive chapters, W. presents close readings of certain 'Lesbia poems' and poems of invective to bolster that contention. Verses in which the speaker self-righteously professes devotion to an undeserving mistress and lambastes rivals are man-to-man utterances claiming excellence as a lover; verbal aggression strives to demonstrate mastery of the aesthetics of ridicule, to be duly commended as *urbanitas* by male peers. In the final chapter, W. describes two 'code models' of earlier authors through which Catullus enacts manhood: the 'Archilochian' mode of fierce hypermasculine invective and the 'Callimachean' mode of erudite, Hellenized, and 'feminized' sophistication.

W. is careful to present his thesis as an heuristic tool, a means of 'triangulating' between blind dismissal of the brutality of Catullan polemic and its condemnation on moral grounds. Still, I am afraid I cannot accept his position entirely. Granted, it involves some obvious truths: in the Lesbia poems, the speaker certainly justifies his conduct according to élite male values, thereby inscribing a male third-party audience, and in such *diffamationes* as 17, 33, and 67 (not to mention 97, the most obscene of the lot), slanderous content is lovingly accentuated by stylishness of delivery. Furthermore, several of W.'s insights into particular poems are brilliant, like his identification of the speaker of poem 37 as a personification of the *miles gloriosus* (pp. 80–7) and his placement of poem 30 among the group of poetic challenges represented by 38 and 50 (pp. 101–3). That said, though, W.'s take on the invective poems is uncomfortably grim and literal (e.g. poem 33, the attack on the Vibennii, displays not only 'bad taste' but 'ethical vileness', p. 125). Where is the tongue-in-cheek quality other readers have frequently sensed in such verses, an element that enhances their comic appeal even as it tempers suspicion of actual intent to injure? Again, W. elides the distinction between performance as 'social display of self' (e.g. Judith Butler's 'performance of gender') and performance as theatrical art. When he speaks of upper-class Roman males' scrutiny of each other in respect to dress, comportment, and speech, and when he brings in anthropological descriptions of Cretan village men staking out reputations through outrageous braggadocio, he assumes that audiences are to regard the projected self as a seamless extension of the 'inner self'. Proper reception of theatrical performance, however, requires the acknowledgement of disjunction between the two, even when the actor is playing someone bearing his own name. W. does not take account of a growing body of recent scholarship examining Catullus' texts as scripts for performance in the latter sense. Hence this approach to Catullan poetics, while to some degree quite helpful, ought not to be imposed monolithically upon the shorter poems. Nor, it is clear, does W. intend to do that.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.94 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This is a provocative first book by a talented and sensitive commentator, one that set me thinking hard about my own (ethical) relation to Catullus. I have not been dissuaded from viewing the poet as a principled critic of his cultural and political milieu, but I will nuance my statements more judiciously from now on.

University of Arizona MARILYN B. SKINNER

LUCRETIUS' LEGACY

A. L. GIESECKE: *Atoms, Ataraxy and Allusion. Cross-generic Imitation of the* De Rerum Natura *in Early Augustan Poetry*. (Spudasmata 76.) Pp. 202. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2000. Paper, DM 54. ISBN: 3-487-11105-5.

This book deals with the imitation of Lucretius in the poems of Catullus, Virgil, and Horace. The didactic *Georgics* are excluded, and that accounts for the term 'cross-generic' in the subtitle—G. probably found the original title of her doctoral dissertation (*The Influence of Lucretius on the Bucolic, Heroic Epic, Satires, and Lyric Poetry of the Early Augustan Period*, Harvard, 1992) uninviting for publishers or readers. The structure of the thesis is clear: there is a preface that expounds the aim and scope of the work, followed by five chapters dealing with the imitation of Lucretius in the poems mentioned, and a conclusion. The book closes with a catalogue of correspondences (very useful, of course, and for some readers the first thing to look into) and an *index locorum* that one has to consult to find the discussion of a correspondence in the book—it would have been more user-friendly to add the page numbers already in the 'catalogue'.

G. is operating with a broad conception of 'allusion' and dismisses the scholarly debate on imitation, allusion, authorial intention, etc., quite briefly (p. 8 n. 13 is the shortest research report on intertextuality I have ever come across, balanced by an equally laconic list of recent studies on Lucretius, p. 156 n. 185). She declares that in her work she will follow a variety of theories, assuming authorial intention to be at work as well as 'subconscious imitation'. She thereby seems to adhere to the community (a diminishing one: cf. R. F. Thomas, *Reading Vergil and his Texts* [Ann Arbor, 1999], p. 2) that avoids—subconsciously or intentionally—the term 'intertextual(ity)'.

The chapter on Catullus is a curious start, since, as G. admits, it is by no means certain that Catullus is imitating Lucretius. But her discussions of the relevant passages are mostly convincing. The example of Catull. 64.205–6 shows quite well G.'s way of argumentation (pp. 16–17): 'quo motu tellus atque horrida contremuerunt/ aequora concussitque micantia sidera mundus' resembles the Lucretian 'omnia cum belli trepido concussa tumultu/ horrida contremuere sub altis aetheris oris . . .' (*DRN* 3.834–5). Both instances recall Ennius (*ann*. 309 Skutsch 'Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu'); Ennius and Lucretius use their lines in a context that is related to the Punic wars, Catullus not. And there are similarities between the Catullan and the Lucretian lines that cannot be explained by the Ennian model. Therefore (and also for other reasons omitted here), the line of imitation is Ennius–Lucretius–Catullus.

In each of the next four chapters, G. follows the same strategy: she notes parallels between Lucretius and the later poet, and then examines the intellectual relation between the two authors, namely the attitude of the later author towards Epicureanism. If his work can be connected with Epicurean thinking, the imitation

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.94 Published online by Cambridge University Press