alacri animo et erecto, unde se redituras numquam arbitrarentur. Powell (ad loc.) parallels this with *Tusc.* 1.101 *legiones scribit Cato saepe alacres in eum locum profectas unde redituras se non arbitrarentur*, whose similar phrasing may indeed suggest a Catonian original; but the language is more 'historiographical' than specifically Catonian, and the similarity to (e.g.) Catullus 3.11 *illuc unde negant redire quemquam*, which can itself be paralleled from Greek literature (Fordyce, ad loc.), suggests that we have here a shorthand evocation of a stock scene (note the *saepe* in both Cicero passages). For this, as for the narrative of the tribune's deed itself, stylistic and linguistic considerations would bring greater understanding of historiographical technique, and hence of what is and what is not a bit of genuine Cato. Similar problems subsist in Volume II, e.g. with *FRH* 14 F12 (= 12P), the story 'quoted' by Gellius as coming from 'libri annales', where B. & W. do not really address the question of its authenticity (but see S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X. Volume II: Books VII and VIII* [Oxford, 1998], p. 231 n. 2 with bibliography)—again, many of the cogent arguments against Claudian authorship are based on stylistic considerations. Finally, it is nice to see the shaggy dogs from the *Paradoxographus Palatinus* make their way into one of these collections (*FRH* 3 F2,8a; to be F75 in the new text edited by the Cornell *équipe*), and B. & W. have a decent note, but one which just scratches the surface of the relationship between paradoxography and history and Cato's apparent predilection for *thaumata*, merely pointing (I: 152) to the 'ethnographically inspired' history of this part of the *Origines*. But the issue is much deeper, as brought out, for example, by E. Gabba in *JRS* 91 (1981), 50–62, and by A. J. Woodman in *Tacitus Reviewed* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 168–89.

It is hard to know for whom this collection is intended: it seems to this reviewer that it falls between stools, neither providing the desiderated revision/rethinking of Peter nor really meeting the need for greater accessibility of these texts on more than a superficial level. (*Non omnia possumus omnes*: it is a pleasure to thank Dr Horsfall and Prof. Woodman for learned help in preparing this review.)

Yale University CHRISTINA S. KRAUS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni280

CATULLUS

M. B. Skinner: *Catullus in Verona. A Reading of the Elegiac* Libellus*, Poems 65–116*. Pp. xl + 256. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2003. Cased, US$59.95 (CD-ROM, US$9.95). ISBN: 0-8142-0937-8 (0-8142-9023-X CD-ROM).

C. Nappa: *Aspects of Catullus' Social Fiction*. (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 125.) Pp. 180. Frankfurt, etc.: Peter Lang, 2001. Paper, £24. ISBN: 3-631-37808-4 (US ISBN: 0-8204-5387-0).

If the earlier part of the twentieth century saw Catullus as—above all—a poet of passionate and anguished love, and the middle decades of the century as a refined Callimachean artist (a view enshrined in Kenneth Quinn's famous, or infamous, doctrine of 'levels of intent', which relegated the invective poems to the margins of the poet's *oeuvre*), the pendulum has—it seems—now definitively swung in the other direction. Recent studies (notably the monographs by Brian Krostenko and David

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wray,[1] both of which deal in different ways with performative aspects of Catullus' poetry) have tended to make the invective poems their central focus, and to view Catullus as primarily a social commentator.

Nappa and Skinner—though employing rather different theoretical frameworks—both share this tendency to interpret Catullus' poetry as social commentary; yet each of the two studies ultimately offers a quite distinctive 'take' on the stance and characterization of the poems' speaker, and are in this sense suggestively complementary. A joint review of the two books seems appropriate, too, in so far as N. is clearly heavily influenced by S.'s articles on Catullus (seven of which are cited in the bibliography, along with her earlier monograph, *Catullus' Passer: The Arrangement of the Book of Polymetric Poems* [New York, 1981]); S.—whose apparently effortless mastery of the vast bibliography on this poet is an impressive feature of her work—returns the compliment by citing N. on several occasions. Under the circumstances, comparisons are perhaps invidious; nevertheless, it may not be unfair to either scholar to suggest that, while S.'s approach is more adventurous and challenging, N.'s more conventional reading is ultimately the more convincing of the two.

N. offers close analysis of a selection of poems, rather than an interpretation of the collection as a whole. He begins with a laudably clear and explicit statement of the theoretical principles on which his reading is based. The version of *persona*-theory on offer here—according to which the poems' speaker is a fictional creation, manipulated by the controlling hand of the author—may seem a little dated, though N. makes a valiant attempt (pp. 18–26) to justify his intentionalist approach; in view of his own reading of Poem 42 as thematizing the *reader's* rôle in the creation of meaning (pp. 146–7), however, one might reasonably have expected more reflection on this issue. For N., tensions between the stances adopted by the speaker in different poems are to be interpreted as a deliberate strategy on the part of the author, whose *persona* is self-consciously designed to be 'both resistant to and collusive with the society in which he lives' (p. 23); the poet subjects Roman values and social protocols to scrutiny by representing himself as 'more or less exactly the sort of figure so memorably castigated by authors such as Cicero, castigated at times even by Catullus himself' (p. 27). The adoption of this 'dissolute' *persona* allows Catullus to explore 'moral gray areas': speaking from the perspective of an effeminate adulterer, while vigorously attacking others for sexual immorality, unmanliness, and moral corruption, the poet compels his reader to reflect on traditional Roman notions of morally appropriate behaviour.

This approach works better for some poems than others. Stimulating discussions of Poems 16, 37, and 39 in the first two chapters include some striking *obiter dicta*—for example, the observation that Catullus tends to present his *persona* through the eyes of others, so that 'the Catullan self is constructed from a nexus of other people' (p. 57). Chapter 3, while heavily indebted to S.'s well-known article on Catullus' political imagery (*Ramus* 8 [1979], 137–52), again offers some helpful analysis, characterizing Poems 10, 28, and 47 as monologues whose speaker is inescapably complicit in the very system which he attacks. (I remain unconvinced, however, by the argument that the speaker does not express hatred or outrage towards Memmius and Piso, and represents himself as submitting *voluntarily* to *irrumatio* by the former.) Less successful is N.'s attempt in Chapter 4 to read Poems 12 and 13 as the 'voice of the

[1]B. A. Krostenko, *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance* (Chicago and London, 2001); D. Wray, *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood* (Cambridge, 2001).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

individual triumphing over his [shallow and mundane] environment' (p. 117). Two final chapters, devoted to 'symbolic' objects and representations of the poetry book as physical entity in Catullus' poetry, add little to N.'s central thesis: both read like somewhat awkwardly attached appendices, and the discussion here is more laboured and less securely founded in theoretical terms than the first four chapters. Some interesting points are, nevertheless, raised in this closing section of the volume, particularly with reference to Poems 22 and 42, in both of which—according to N.—the separate physical existence of the poetry-book symbolizes its openness to interpretation (or misinterpretation) by readers.

Unlike N., S. lays emphasis on the sequential arrangement of the poems, and her book—while occasionally jumping between related poems in different parts of the collection—offers a running commentary on the 'elegiac *libellus*' as a whole (thus complementing her earlier study of the polymetrics). S.'s technique of sequential reading has considerable merits, and is deployed in much more nuanced and subtle ways than the alleged structural patterns which are more often advanced by scholars arguing for authorial arrangement of the collection. S.'s exploration of significant juxtapositions, 'cycles' within the elegiac sequence, and interlocking groups of poems on similar themes, throws up some striking results, most notably a very suggestive discussion (pp. 50–7) of thematic links between Poems 67 and 68 (a and b). Arguably less successful (or at least less convincing to the reviewer) is her attempt to situate both speaker and 'reader-addressee' (Conte's terminology, cited at p. xxiv) within a—rather narrowly defined—socio-political context. Many of the interpretations of individual poems advanced, especially in Chapters 3 and 4, are reliant on uncertain prosopographical hypotheses: if interpretation of these poems depends to the extent that S. implies on intimate knowledge of contemporary events and personalities, then we might as well admit for once and for all that a full understanding is irretrievably lost to us. Nor does S. fully explain or justify a peculiar feature of many of the readings advanced in this part of the book, her tendency, that is, to regard the political level as primary even where poems appear to be concerned with not obviously political themes (particularly incest and sexual morality in general). It is, of course, true that accusations of sexual misdemeanours are commonly deployed in the political discourse of the late Republic, and that such accusations may have a symbolic dimension; but it is not at all clear to me why S. is so determined to find political subtexts even in such poems as 99 (Iuventius' reaction to the poet's theft of a kiss is, it seems, a figure for the *os impurum*, representing in turn the 'impure' perversion of language and values in the public discourse of the late Republic; hence, the poem demonstrates how 'the erstwhile "purity" of Catullus' neoteric pronouncements has been contaminated by the filthiness of the surrounding public discourse [represented by Poems 97 and 98]', p. 123).

The combination of the metapoetic and the political in S.'s reading of Poem 99 is representative of her overarching thesis. The elegiac *libellus* as a whole, she argues, is concerned above all with the problem of false and deceptive language. A very stimulating discussion in Chapter 3 of Lesbia's deceptive use of language ramifies in two directions, back to S.'s thought-provoking if not wholly persuasive treatment (Chapters 1–2) of the Callimachean programmatics of 65 and 116, and forward to her heavily politicized reading of the epigrams (Chapters 3–4). Poem 65 is, for S., a version of the 'Cretan liar' paradox, in which the poet artfully eschews artistry and gives what he purports to withhold (i.e. elaborate and highly wrought poetry); the poem's transfiguration of the pain of loss into art (suggested especially by the nightingale simile) is a kind of falsification. The issue of falsification becomes more

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

acute in Poem 68, where Allius is extravagantly praised for—in effect—playing the morally indefensible rôle of pimp or go-between. Similarly, the romanticized images of Lesbia as 'goddess' in the first part of 68b are undermined by the more 'realistic' estimation of her character in the latter part of the poem. Finally, Poem 116 suggests a renunciation of 'frivolous neoteric aesthetics' in the light of the political and ideological corruption represented by Gellius' sexual escapades, attacked in the preceding invective sequence.

For S., then, the 'message' of the elegiac *libellus* as a whole is that language has become—in the mouths of power-hungry politicians—irredeemably corrupt. But the language of poetry is correspondingly dishonest, and under such circumstances, 'the only recourse . . . is silence' (p. 123). Paradoxically, this is poetry about *not* (any longer) writing poetry. The climax of S.'s study is a rich and challenging—but, for this reviewer, ultimately unconvincing—reading of Poems 68a and b (for S., separate but closely interrelated poems). S. stresses the themes of the *domus* and children/childlessness reflected especially in the Protesilaus/Laodamia and Hercules *exempla*, and reads the pair of poems as a diptych centring on the conflict between 'the aesthetic dedication required of the serious writer' and familial obligations. The tension is left unresolved at the end of 68b; but the combined effect of the two 'halves' of the diptych (of which 68a must be read as later in chronological sequence) is to suggest—like 116, in S.'s reading—a repudiation of art in favour of duty to the family. Is this really the case, however? We need not, as S. would have us do, equate the speaker's protestations of temporary incapacity with complete renunciation; and the extravagant praises of Allius in 68b need only be read as self-consciously false if the reader refuses the invitation to question traditional canons of morality which the poem arguably offers. The rôle of the reader is perhaps not quite so clearly prescribed by the rhetoric of the text as S. would have us believe.

A brief summary like this cannot do justice to the subtleties of S.'s argument, nor to the many striking and suggestive readings of individual poems offered *en route*. S. is always challenging and thought-provoking, even when she ultimately fails to convince. Despite its idiosyncrasies, this is a book which I would urge all serious students of Catullus' poetry to read and engage with.

Trinity College, Dublin MONICA R. GALE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni281

CICERO'S *TOPICA*

T. REINHARDT (ed.): *Marcus Tullius Cicero:* Topica. Edited with a Translation, Introduction, and Commentary. Pp. xvi + 435. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £74. ISBN: 0-19-926346-9.

We can be grateful to Tobias Reinhardt for his book, which constitutes a highly significant contribution to our understanding of one of the most intriguing of Cicero's works. In his introduction (pp. 3–72) R. first analyses the rhetorical background to Cicero's interest in the strategies of argumentation called τόποι or *loci*. He then sketches a history of them and finally deals with theoretical questions linked to the origin of Cicero's source and the legal context of the treatise. A philologically impressive chapter on the transmission of the *Topica* (pp. 73–112) introduces the text, which is accompanied by an elegant translation (pp. 115–75). The commentary (pp. 177–370) is based on a remarkably detailed integration of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni281 Published online by Cambridge University Press