risulta apprezzabile e dovrà essere tenuto in considerazione dalle studiose e dagli studiosi di Lucrezio[2].

Leonardo Galli
Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna
leonardo.galli3@unibo.it

Silvia Condorelli, *Tra Gallia e Italia sulle tracce di Catullo. Echi del Veronese nella poesia del VI secolo*, Cesena: Stilgraf Editrice, Quaderni di *Paideia*, 25, 2022, 218 pp., ISBN 979-12-80150-29-5.[*]

It has been the received opinion that the poems of Catullus ceased to be read around the fall of the Roman Empire, or a little earlier: "[a]fter the eclipse of Roman culture in the 5th century there follow eight centuries of darkness before the dramatic rediscovery of Catullus around AD 1300."[2] This book shows that we have been wrong: if practically no traces of Catullus have been found in the literature of late antiquity, that is simply because we have not searched hard enough. But Silvia Condorelli has now unearthed convincing textual echoes of Catullus in works written in Italy and Gaul in the sixth century. She examines each echo in detail, in order to verify whether it really has a Catullan subtext; hence her book is also an in-depth study of the different ways in which these late antique poets integrated Catullan elements into their own verse. Her book makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of two subjects: the transmission of the poems of Catullus as well as the literature of late antiquity and its attitude towards the pagan classics.

[2] Tra i refusi, abbiamo notato *inter* per *iter*, p. 129 (v. 1124); «res novae moliri» per *res nouas moliri*, p. 161; «*artista*» per *arista*, p. 255; «*arma nectimus arma noua*» per *armis nectimus arma noua* (Prop. 3.5.12), p. 298; «syntetical» per *syntactical* (l'onomatopea di D. West), p. 377; *pholosophus* per *philosophus*, p. 452.

[*] This review was written within the research group LITTERA at the Universitat de Barcelona (reference: 2021-SGR-00074). The author gratefully acknowledges a Ramón y Cajal Grant (RYC2018-024411-I) awarded by the Ministery of Universities of Spain, and partly funded by the European Social Fund.

[2] D. Kiss, "The Protohistory of the Text of Catullus", in J. Velaza (ed.), *From the Protohistory to the History of the Text*, Frankfurt am Main 2016, 125-40, at 131. Thus also id., "Introduction: A Sketch of the Textual Transmission", in id. (ed.), *What Catullus Wrote: Problems in Textual Criticism, Editing and the Manuscript Tradition*, Swansea 2015, xiii-xxx, at xiii; and J. L. Butrica, "History and Transmission of the Text", in M. B. Skinner (ed.), *A Companion to Catullus*, Malden Ma. 2007, 13-34, at 24.

The book starts with a thoughtful introduction ("Introduzione", pp. 9-33), which discusses the idea of classical literature both in general and what it specifically meant to late antique writers, and this section sets out our current knowledge of the transmission of Catullus in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages. Chapter 1 ("Catullo in Gallia all'inizio del VI secolo", pp. 35-69) focuses on the reception of Catullus in Gaul. A short introductory section presents the echoes of Catullus that have been unearthed in past publications by Condorelli and others in Ausonius and Sidonius Apollinaris, who wrote in the fourth and the fifth centuries, respectively, before the chapter proceeds to study the echoes of Catullus in the writings of a Christian poet from the turn of the sixth century, Alcimus Avitus, Bishop of Vienne. Chapter 2 ("Catullo nell'Italia ostrogota", pp. 71-117) shifts the focus to Italy, setting out clear echoes of Catullus in the writings of Ennodius and Arator, and discussing the case of Boethius, for whom it is not entirely clear whether he knew Catullus directly or through the mediation of Pliny the Elder or Caesius Bassus. Condorelli argues convincingly that it appears more likely that Boethius had read Catullus (or his poem 52 at any rate). Chapter 3 ("Catullus alle soglie del Medioevo: Venanzio Fortunato", pp. 119-57) sets out a list of convincing echoes of Catullus in the poems of Venantius Fortunatus, who was born in northern Italy but emigrated to Merovingian Gaul.[3] The concise Conclusions ("Conclusioni", pp. 159-61) pull the threads together: Condorelli notes that Catullus continued to be read in this period, with the long poems 61, 64, 66 and 68 receiving the greatest attention. She also compares the ways in which the different authors treat Catullus. There are differences not only in quantity but also in quality. Avitus is the exception in that he treats the pagan author as an adversary, subverting Catullus' meaning and putting his words to new use in a Christian context. The book closes with a long bibliography (pp. 163-206), which attests to the broad reading of the author, and with a useful *Index locorum* (pp. 209-215).

Imprecisions are few, and they mostly involve omissions of a kind that is inevitable in a quickly evolving field such as Catullan scholarship. In places, one could argue for an alternative view, or add more recent bibliography. Cicero's well-known references to the *poetae novi* (*Orat.* 161) and the "neoterics" (*Ad Att.* 7.2.1) have often been seen as swipes at the circle of poets of which Catullus was part; this is how Condorelli takes them (at p. 22 n. 40); but in fact these references are not so straightforward.[4] Condorelli mentions (at p. 27) my discovery of a reference in Isaac Vossius' commentary of 1864 to a reading from Catullus' poem 11, apparently in the lost final part of the famous ninth-century florilegium known as the *Codex Thuaneus* (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, latin 8071); but after I made that discovery, Michael Reeve helped me track down Vossius'

[3] This chapter is an expanded version of S. Condorelli, "Sulle tracce del liber catulliano tra età tardoantica e alto Medioevo: Venanzio Fortunato", *Paideia* 75, 2020, 527-64.

[4] See E. Courtney (ed.), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford 1993, at 189.

collation of Catullus, which attributes the reading to another manuscript; if Vossius attributes it to the *Thuaneus*, it is because he has confused his notes.[5] It is well known that the *Thuaneus* is closely related to a florilegium now in part in Vienna (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 277, part 3); the *Thuaneus* contains Catullus' *carmen* 62, which does not appear on the surviving fragments of the Vienna florilegium. Condorelli notes (at p. 27) that Carlo Vecce has found traces of a third copy of the same florilegium in the marginalia of Aulo Giano Parrasio on Catullus 62 (now in Aberdeen, University Library, Inc. 165).[6] However, Michael Reeve has shown that there was no third copy; the readings quoted by Parrasio must stem from the *Thuaneus*.[7] Condorelli (p. 30 n. 79) also refers to evidence for the knowledge of Catullus in a reading of a manuscript of Priscian from the eleventh century.[8] Elena Spangenberg Yanes has now demonstrated that the same reading appears in a family of manuscripts of Priscian that emerges in ninth-century France.[9]

The book has been corrected meticulously. Slips and mistakes are mercifully rare.[10] Typographical errors are few, and they mostly affect citations in foreign languages and bibliographic references.[11]

I will end this review by suggesting two ways in which we could build on the results of this book. First, we should reflect on the methods used by Condorelli to detect allusions. She has been notably conservative: she has demanded strong evidence and has only accepted echoes that involve significant lexical similarities (which cannot be due to the influence of a third author), the use of the Catullan passage as a hypotext, or ideally both. This caution is exemplary, and it yields results of a very high quality, as doubtful echoes are not taken into consideration. But it is in the nature of literary imitation that it is not always obvious; some

[5] D. Kiss, "Isaac Vossius, Catullus and the Codex Thuaneus", *CQ* 65, 2015, 44-54, against which now see D. Kiss, "Editions and Commentaries", in I. Du Quesnay, T. Woodman (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Catullus*, Cambridge 2021, 291-317, at 304 with n. 57.

[6] C. Vecce, *Iacopo Sannazaro in Francia. Scoperte di codici all'inizio del XVI secolo*, Padua 1988, at 114-15; cf. Kiss, "Introduction: A Sketch", xiii-xiv.

[7] M. D. Reeve, "Two Manuscripts of 'Ovid' and Grattius", *Hermes* 144, 2016, 194-202.

[8] Cf. Kiss, "Introduction: A Sketch", xv.

[9] E. Spangenberg Yanes, "*Cuniculosae*/*Celtiberosae*: novità sulla tradizione di Prisciano e Catullo", *MD* 83, 2019, 187-196.

[10] At p. 19 n. 32, the start of the preface of Gregory of Tours' *Historiae ecclesiasticae Francorum libri decem* is quoted with two mistakes, at *cum nonnullae res gererentur vel rectae vel inprobae* (for *vel recte vel inprobe*) and at *vel ditarentur a devotis vel nudarentur a perfides* (for *perfidis*). The text appears online several times with these same mistakes. For the correct readings see the authoritative edition by J. Guadet and N. R. Taranne, Paris 1836-1838, *ad loc*. — The Oxford Classical Text of Catullus of R. A. B. Mynors (1958) is not the "[edizione] teubneriana" (p. 33).

[11] P. 11 n. 5 "celui don't l'étude" for "dont" (here the autocorrector of my word processor also tried to insert the English form). — H. Akbar Khan is quoted in the bibliography and elsewhere (p. 22 n. 41) as "Akbar Kahn"; likewise W. Olszaniec as "Olszaniek" (p. 26 n. 64) and R. L. Hunter as "Hunther" (p. 37 n. 7). — For "Giustiano" (p. 71 n. 1) read "Giustiniano". — At p. 76 below, the word order of Ennodius *Carm.* 1.1.30 *nec uisu facilis* has been regularized to *nec facilis uisu*. — "Risale al 1931 la scoperta di un manoscritto venanziano (Parisinus 13048)" (p. 121) should read "1831".

echoes are likely to have slipped through Condorelli's net. On occasion one may want to use more generous criteria. Consider this passage about the construction of Noah's ark from the fourth book (entitled *De diluvio mundi*) of Avitus' *De historiae spiritalis gestis*:[12]

Quis tantus capiat sensus, quis denique sermo
explicet,[13] advectis fuerit quae copia lignis?
Nudati colles, spoliatae robore silvae;
mons ut quisque fuit, famulo placuere paratu.
Pelion immensas committit[14] vertice quercus,
insuper exponit multa virtute recisum
Ossa nemus Pindoque abies subducitur alta.
Atlans ipse novas ictu resonante secures
sensit et annosas dedit ad navalia pinus.
Invictum tunc surgit opus, contexta levatur
porrectis trabibus praecelsi culminis aedes.

Condorelli (pp. 55-59) notes that line 299 *Pelion immensas committit vertice quercus* echoes the first line of Catullus' poem 64, *Peliaco quondam prognatae vertice pinus*. But there is more, as the atmosphere, the imagery and the vocabulary of this passage evokes several sections of Catullus 64: the reference to the construction of the Argo (lines 1-2), the description of the Thessalian countryside emptying of people (lines 31-37), the simile of the oak felled by a gust of wind (lines 105-109) and to a lesser extent the trees that are carried by the river Penios as wedding-gifts (lines 285-293). In particular, Avitus' line 297 *Nudati colles, spoliatae robore silvae* recalls the movement of Catullus 64.35 *Deseritur Cieros, linquunt Pthiotica Tempe*, while the use of *robur* for trees in this verse is paralleled at Catullus 64.107 *indomitus turbo contorquens flamine robur*. And Avitus' line 299 *Pelion immensas committat vertice quercus* is paralleled by Catullus 64.105-6 *Nam velut in summo quatientem brachia Tauro* / *quercum*. These parallels are less striking than the one that has been highlighted by Condorelli, but they add up to a sensitive evocation of the atmosphere of this poem of Catullus'.

Second, if we are trying to track down the transmission of a text, positive evidence is significant, but the absence of evidence may not mean anything. If an author clearly echoes the poems of Catullus, and the echo cannot have been mediated through an intermediate source, then she (or he) must have read his

[12] I follow N. Hecquet-Noti (ed.), *Avit de Vienne: Histoire Spirituelle* tome II (Chants IV-V), Paris 2005. The punctuation is mine; I indicate other divergences. Out of her four manuscripts *LNGR*, I have had access to digital images of *R* (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reginensis lat. 2078) and *G* (St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 197).

[13] Hecquet-Noti writes the ungrammatical *explicat* without comment, but this is surely a misprint. *GR* read *explicet*.

[14] *committit G* : *-at* R, while Condorelli (p. 56) prints *cum mittat*, but *cum* may not be needed before *insuper exponit* in the following verse.

poems at least in part. But if she does not echo Catullus, that does not mean that she has not read him. An absence of echoes, or indeed an absence of evidence, does not always indicate that an author was not known in a given period. That is a lesson to be drawn from Condorelli's book: most Catullan scholars thought that our poet was not read in the sixth century, since there was practically no evidence, but now Condorelli has demonstrated the contrary. Her book should have lasting influence on our field.

Dániel Kiss
Universitat de Barcelona
kiss@ub.edu

Malte Helfberend, *Ciceros Rede "Pro L. Cornelio Balbo", Einleitung und Kommentar*, Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft. Beihefte N.F. 13, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2022, 239 pp., 99.95€, ISBN 978-3-11-079560-8.

The speeches of Cicero delivered during the year after his return from exile exhibit a clear development, from the often bombastic and proud rhetoric of the first two, in which he offered his thanks before the senate and people of Rome, to the self-conscious reticence that he employed, particularly after the meeting at Luca in April 56, to avoid offending the power trio of Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus. In part on account of these rhetorical maneuvers–however necessary they may have been in context–and because of lingering if long-dispelled doubts about the authenticity of the first four, these orations have largely suffered from decades, even centuries, of neglect, with scholars mining the texts for legal and historical information rather than treating them as unified and coherent works of persuasion.[1] In recent years this lack has been addressed by a series of detailed commentaries.[2] In the case of *Pro Balbo* several editions of the text exist, some with minimal notes, but commentaries on the speech are scarce.[3] The most substantial of these include Reid's edition of 1878 in English and Rubio's of 1954 in Spanish, both of which cover grammatical, legal, and textual matters, but in

[1] For a concise history of the authenticity debate regarding *Post reditum in senatu*, *Post reditum ad Quirites, De domo sua,* and *De haruspicum responsis,* see R.G. Nisbet, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De domo sua ad pontifices oratio*, Oxford 1939, xxix-xxxiv.

[2] *Pro Caelio* offers the significant exception to this general neglect, as does Nisbet's commentary on *De Domo Sua* (see previous note). As with Nisbet, the following works have appeared with Oxford University Press: R.A. Kaster, *Cicero: Speech on behalf of Publius Sestius*, 2006; L. Grillo, *Cicero's "De Provinciis Consularibus Oratio"*, 2015; G. Manuwald, *Cicero: "Post Reditum" Speeches. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, 2021; A. Corbeill, *Cicero, "De haruspicum responsis": Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, 2023. See too T. Boll, *Ciceros Rede "Cum senatui gratias egit". Ein Kommentar*, Berlin 2019.

[3] For critical editions without substantial commentary see Helfberend 226-7.