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/53.1.96 Published online by Cambridge University Press

supports the 'ideological' purpose of the text. If there is no Epicurean message possible (as, for example, is the case with *Aeneid* 6, being about a journey to the underworld), the Lucretian 'references' are not an evocation of Epicurean philosophy, but something more complex, called by G. 'oppositio in imitando' (n. 49)—a term she borrows from G. Giangrande (*CQ* 17 [1967], 84). The range of the imitations G. assembles includes close parallels, but also very loose ones (the latter often introduced with phrases like 'may owe something' or 'may have been suggested by'). She certainly could have provided the reader with a more systematic typology of references (as does e.g. R. F. Thomas, op. cit., p. 117). Sometimes G. decides to mention only briefly instances that are worth more discussion, e.g. (pp. 79–80) the imitation of *DRN* 2.144 in *Aen*. 9.459 ('prima novo spargebat lumine terras . . . aurora'): one could certainly have a closer look at Lucretius' and Virgil's usage of 'novus' and 'primus' (see Servius, Wakefield and Munro, ad locc.). But on the whole, her treatment of passages in Virgil is good—note, for instance, the discussion of Venus and Mars in *DRN* and in the *Aeneid* (pp. 74–5). The parts that deal with Horace are somewhat more difficult to judge. There are, of course, well known parallels, e.g. between *DRN* and *Odes* 2.16 and 3.1 (where G. finds herself following in the footsteps of, among others, V. Pöschl and H. P. Syndikus). But there are not as many close imitations of Lucretius in Horace as there are in Virgil. G. compensates for this deficiency with more or less self-contained discourses that describe the relation between the genre of satire and didactic epic (pp. 101–15) and the 'philosophy' of Horace (pp. 122–31). Those parts are neither fish nor flesh: they are not exhaustive, but at the same time too extensive to be a mere introduction to the discussion of the actual imitations.

Despite this criticism, the book is useful, and readers of one of the poems G. deals with who want to know more about a possible reference to Lucretius should consult not only the relevant commentaries, but also G.'s dissertation. The book is well produced, with only few misprints and occasional errors (the text she reads in *Ecl*. 6.33 varies between 'ex omnia' on p. 33 and 'exordia' on p. 183, and there is a superfluous 'sic' in n. 23).

University of the Saarland CHRISTOPH CATREIN

ASPECT IN CAESAR

F. OLDSJÖ: *Tense and Aspect in Caesar's Narrative*. (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 26.) Pp. 544. Uppsala: Uppsala University Library, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 91554-5076-8.

This is a published thesis. It is a superior thesis, but its virtues—care in surveying prior scholarship, clarity and fullness in explaining terminology and method, warning the reader what it proposes to do, doing it, and then telling the reader what has been done, striving for completeness—make it, for most Latinists, a tedious book, especially in its first 175 pages, where the groundwork is laid. The ratio of words to conclusions is large, and the reader is given few enticements to make him think that his labor will be worth the effort. I recommend that the reader go directly to pp. 489–93 (Part 5), where the conclusions are summarized. I quote from three paragraphs from that summary, which will give an idea of the book's aims and style.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.96 Published online by Cambridge University Press