I am still learning new things after several readings. However, although he writes elegantly and lucidly, he makes few concessions for the hard of thinking (like me).

National University of Ireland, Maynooth GORDON CAMPBELL

CATULLAN CONCATENATIONS

P. CLAES: *Concatenatio Catulliana: A New Reading of the Carmina*. (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 9.) Pp. 165. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 2002. Cased, €50. ISBN: 90-5063-288-2.

Linear readings of Roman poetry books are—happily—gaining statistically on the type of approach that uses hypothetical poem dates to reconstruct the story of the *liber*'s composition, and C., who follows this trend, has produced a valuable contribution to our interpretation of such *libri*. In Catullus' case, the poem-by-poem strategy unearths powerful evidence to support the theory that this author set out the collected poems himself. C.'s findings are not quite as 'brand-new' as he maintains (p. 5). He was actually able to pick up where a number of studies devoted to thematic and lexical concatenation within various groups of *carmina* have left off, and has also drawn on linear readings of Augustan poetry books (e.g. M. S. Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's* Odes [Chapel Hill, 1986]). T. P. Wiseman, moreover, has shown more than once that Catullus very probably divided his poems into three books, these corresponding to *c*. 1–60, 61–4, and 65–116 in modern editions. However, C. not only now underpins this theory with numerous new observations—the implicit metapoetical content of the poems that frame each of the three divisions, and the previously unnoticed associations linking these texts (pp. 14–17), for example—but also illustrates his specific concern, that is, the interpretation of Catullus' collection in terms of thematic and formal coherence, with an unprecedented wealth of material. C. argues most persuasively in the section (by far his longest) where he reads all of the *carmina* in succession as links in a 'chain' (pp. 57–111). His lists recording repetition of words, synonyms, antonyms, and etymological cognates tell us, by contrast, little; indeed, his fifteen-page 'Inventory of Lexical Concatenation' (pp. 35–49)—starting '1/2 *Cui/cui, dono/[dare], solebas/solet* . . .' as it means to go on—could kill what incipient sympathy for the overall method conservative Catullus students may develop.

C.'s forte in the hunt for lexical and thematic links between *carmina* is evident: the obscene innuendo. Recent work on Roman sexualities will see itself corroborated as C. demonstrates that not merely pairs, but whole series of poems are interwoven with ambiguous expressions which signal that the texts—between the lines, at least—somehow have to do with the erotic *lusus* typical of Catullus. The 'oral motif', for instance, links *carmina* 39, 40, 42–5, 47–51, 53–5, and 57–60 in such a way that, probably even when they came to the famous poem addressing Cicero *disertissimus* (49), ancient readers could not but think of the motif *os impurum* (p. 75). The puns C. discovers in this area will greatly stimulate modern readings, given that the existing commentaries, including Thomson (Toronto, 1997), usually dodge the issue. In the allusions-to-contemporaries department, however, he tends to go overboard. C. himself stresses at the outset that Catullus' poems 'should not be interpreted as biographical documents' (p. 18), and yet later, discussing, for example, *c*. 46 and its links to *c*. 45, he writes: 'The juxtaposition suggests that the poet left Italy because he was disappointed in love' (p. 78). Reeks of the old 'Catullus Romance', doesn't it? The

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.354 Published online by Cambridge University Press

same must be said of C.'s reading of the Lesbia-poems, where he does his best to uncover hidden allusions to Clodia, her brother, and their (allegedly incontrovertible) goings-on, although more and more scholars now challenge the notion that Catullus' *puella* can be identified with any historical Roman female (cf. *PCPS* 46 [2000], 28–44). And when, in this same context, C. for instance calls *c*. 104 and 107 'Clodia-poems', he once again risks having readers greet his entire approach with scepticism.

C.'s argumentation is weakened somewhat by the fact that his method has apparently been influenced simultaneously by post-modern semiotics and old-style philological analysis. He rounds off his running commentaries with brilliant observations on *c*. 116 and its sense of an ending (p. 111) and then proceeds to offer us some rather dated, 1960s/70s-style schematic representations in illustration of 'concentric composition', backing these up at the end of his book with conjectures, poems carved up, and verses rearranged. Perhaps C. should have confined himself to commentaries on each poem, investigating the *concatenatio* possibilities in greater depth—and dispensing with the lists and diagrams would have given him the necessary space. But, even in the form it has taken, this section of his book will be essential reading for future interpretations of Catullus.

University of Munich NIKLAS HOLZBERG

POETS AS LITERARY HISTORIANS

E. S. SCHMIDT (ed.): *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine*. (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 47.) Pp. xviii + 406. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 2-600-00747-4.

Ancient poets appeal to the immortal Muses or gods for direct access to material for their undying poems; at the same time, they are as aware as any poet writing out of a more secularist poetics of their position within a purely human tradition. Roman poets are made even more self-conscious of their place within a literary history by their dependence on their Greek predecessors, a dependence which recent work by Denis Feeney and others has converted from a passive admission of secondariness to an active resource of cultural and poetic self-definition. The topics of the present collection of essays have come into the spotlight in recent years above all as a result of an intense focus on genre and allusion. Genre is an inherently historical category, being the hypostatization of the features shared by a line of poets writing in conscious imitation of their predecessors. Allusion, whether reinforcing generic membership or not, writes an earlier into a later text and invites the reader to reflect on the temporal relationship between the two texts, reflections central to Stephen Hinds's *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge, 1998), above all in his Chapter 3, 'Diachrony: Literary History and its Narratives'.

A subject very much of the moment, then, and also one of very wide scope, as is clear from the variety of texts and approaches on offer in the volume, whose contents are arranged roughly chronologically, from Ennius to Flavian epic. A curious side effect is that the chapters are also grouped by language: first three in German, then one in French, two in English, and finally two in Italian. I hope that this is not in fact the principle of organization, given the slightly heated spat in the discussion after Hinds's paper about the supposed blindness to one another of Latinist traditions in the anglophone and non-anglophone scholarly communities (pp. 263–5). In fact, there are

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.354 Published online by Cambridge University Press