The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Lafaye on Catullus *Catulle et ses modèles*, par Georges Lafaye, Maître de Conférences à la Faculté des lettres de Paris. Hachette. 1894.

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / February 1895, pp 39 - 42

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201029, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201029

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 39-42 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201029

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

(5) Passages where the original reading is ignored or wrongly given :—

Schenkl.	MS.
Cap. i. § 3.— <i>ότε</i> .	<i>οτι</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>οτε</i>).
§ 30.— <i>ελθε</i> .	<i>ελθ(ων?)</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>ελθε</i>).
Cap. vii. § 25.— <i>συγκαθήσει S</i> .	<i>συγκαθήσεις S</i> .
Cap. xii. § 26.— <i>οισθα</i> .	<i>οισθας</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>-θα</i>).
Cap. xii. § 30.— <i>ἔχων...ἀγνοῇ*</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>-εἰς</i>).	<i>ἔχεις...ἀγνοῶν</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>ἔχων...ἀγνοεῖς</i>).
Cap. xvii. § 11.— <i>μὼν ὥς</i> .	<i>μόνως</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>μὼν ὥς</i>).
Cap. xxv. § 14.— <i>οὐ</i> .	<i>οὐ</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>οὐ</i>).
Cap. xxviii. § 18.— <i>ἡ δ'</i> .	<i>ὁ δ'</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>ἡ δ'</i>).
Cap. xxix. § 21.— <i>τοσοῦτον</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>τοσοῦτων</i>).	<i>τοσοῦτων</i> (<i>corr.</i> <i>τοσοῦτον</i>).
	W. M. LINDSAY.

LAFAYE ON CATULLUS.

Catulle et ses modèles, par GEORGES LAFAYE, Maître de Conférences à la Faculté des lettres de Paris. Hachette. 1894.

THIS essay is an *ouvrage couronné* by the Academy of Inscriptions, and is an attempt to answer the question, How much is Catullus indebted to the Alexandrian poets, how much to the older Greek lyrists? Such a subject is on the face full of difficulties. The Greek lyric poets, except Pindar, exist only in fragments; an ode as nearly complete as Sappho's *Ode to Aphrodite*, is rare and exceptional. Thus the very basis of a really adequate judgment is wanting: for no one can appraise a poet fairly unless he has at least some one complete work before him. From this point of view then the comparison is unequal: for the Alexandrian poets are well preserved, and have come down to us not in fragments, but entire. The *Idylls* of Theocritus, the *Argonautics* of Apollonius of Rhodes, the *Alexandra* of Lycophron, the *Hymns* of Callimachus, the astronomical poem of Aratus, have come to us in a form more or less complete: we can see perfectly the aim of each poet and the amount of success with which he worked it out. We can understand why it was that the Alexandrian poets so greatly influenced the Romans. Whereas from the short fragments of the lyric poets we can only arrive at the most imperfect apprehension of their distinct form; and when the question—how much they affected any given Roman poet—is raised, can give little more than an approximate answer.

There is another difficulty which besets the question: the *absolute* loss of so much literature which may have contributed to

mould a writer, Catullus or whoever it may be. Any one who reads M. Lafaye's account of the hendecasyllable before Catullus will feel how difficult his task has been simply from want of materials. The hendecasyllable is Catullus' most successful experiment: we are curious to learn who had used it before him, what poems of any considerable length had been composed in this metre, and what kind of subject had been treated in it. But the actual specimens of pre-Catullian hendecasyllables are few, isolated, and insignificant; if there was nothing more than we have, Catullus may almost claim to be the inventor of this metre, so perfectly new is the development he has given it, and so various the tones which it assumes in his hands. But it is more than probable that specimens of Greek hendecasyllables were familiar to him which have perished entirely: and that these were known also to Catullus' older contemporary, Furius Bibaculus.

Mr. Lafaye's book is open then to a criticism which is, at starting, inevitable: it is obliged to be tentative, conjectural, and in not a few cases unconvincing. Of this the author is himself perfectly conscious: in discussing the two poems on the Sparrow, which have many forerunners in Greek literature, but are essentially an original inspiration of Catullus, he cites Meleager's well-known elegiacs to a locust, and even Archias' epigram on a cicada killed by ants, and then after justly contrasting the effect produced by Catullus' *Passer* with these light and somewhat frivolous effusions, concludes that it is impossible to say to what extent Catullus was consciously imitating either these or any other Greek model: 'il

n'a point sous les yeux un livre choisi entre beaucoup d'autres dans sa bibliothèque et ouvert à une page déterminée. Il a modelé sur les ouvrages des maîtres, non pas son poème, mais son esprit.' Elsewhere he is more positive and, as I think, less satisfactory. For my own part I should not venture to say that the fragments of Callimachus' *iambi* are sufficient to give us an adequate idea of their general effect, or of the temper in which they were written: nor would it seem possible to me to elicit from a comparison of these with the fragments of Archilochus which of the two Catullus imitated. And is it not trifling to attempt, in the tenuity and fragmentary state of our knowledge, to suggest *four* various modes in which Catullus may have imitated Archilochus (p. 12)?

These are the weaknesses of a work which has many recommendations of style and treatment. The questions raised by M. Lafaye are very generally those which recur most to a student of Catullus, in other words, those which from a literary point of view are the most interesting. Such are the following. Had C. any predecessor in the pure iambic poems *Phaselus ille* and *Quis hoc potest uidere?* Considering the frequency with which the pure iambic senarius occurs in Greek tragedy, it is remarkable that so few entire poems thus composed are extant. Again, in what sense was it true that Horace, not Catullus, was the first to introduce to Latium the iambi of Archilochus? The question is thus answered by M. Lafaye. Horace borrowed from Archilochus the metrical form of his *Epodes*, and little besides. Catullus took from him his vehement and choleric tone, his subjects, and much of his diction; little or nothing of his metre. The answer is plausible and may be true; but as no one entire poem of the Parian is preserved, the explanation must remain a conjecture for want of sufficient materials. It is not even impossible that Archilochus wrote some pure iambic poems (see *fr.* 41, 44), and that these were directly copied by Catullus in *Quis hoc potest uidere?* while Horace, a thorough Caesarian and somewhat a contemner of Catullus, purposely overlooked this Archilochian inspiration as hateful to the Caesars and a thing which they would gladly forget or ignore.

One of the most interesting sections of M. Lafaye's work is the chapter on Catullus' hendecasyllables. Here, if anywhere, the poet is most original, and the fatiguing effort of tracing the source of his inspira-

tions is little required and only rarely successful. But, to make up for this, M. Lafaye gives us a lively and very well written account of the growth of the Roman hendecasyllable, with an abstract, generally more or less full, of each of the finer Catullian specimens. He accentuates the two conflicting tendencies under which the poet wrote them; on the one side the literary aspiration to reproduce for his countrymen the free *abandon* of Greek life, its absolute indifference to politics, its happy absorption in the trifling business of the moment whether love or little incidents of life and society; on the other the old ethos of Republican Rome, which centred everything in the state and thought it unworthy of true Romans to obtrude upon the public notice any exhibition of private, especially erotic, feeling. It is of course the Greek that prevailed: but the Roman was also deep in Catullus, and displays itself in such confessions as xvi. 3

Qui me ex uersiculis meis putastis
Quod sunt molliculi parum pudicum

and 13

male me marem putatis

and such excuses as the famous and, since Catullus, again and again repeated

Nam castum esse decet pium poetam
Ipsum, uersiculos nihil necessest.

It is this plain-spoken Roman feeling which accounts for and to some extent justifies the coarse language which Catullus habitually allows himself—the *pedicabo ego uos et irrumabo*, the *pathice et cinaede*, &c., which defy translation and almost transcend the licence of Plautus and the Comic writers. It is impossible, here, not to think of Lucilius, and the loss of that first Latian Satire in which we should no doubt have found things far more shocking than anything in the poet of Verona. But the conflict of Greek and Roman tendencies which Catullus knew how to adjust, took in Lucilius the unfortunate line of mixing Greek and Roman words in a hodge-podge which has proved fatal to the preservation of his satires: we cannot compare him with Catullus in point of nude coarseness—the only one in which any comparison was possible—because the extant Lucilian remains are too short to justify it.

M. Lafaye, in the course of this section, contrasts Catullus' hendecasyllabic *Minister*

uetuli puer Fulerni with Horace's *Persicos odi, puer, apparatus*. Each is very short, of seven and eight lines respectively: each addressed to a young slave. But in delicacy Horace's ode has a decided advantage: Catullus does not shrink from the 'hardiesses de l'expression'; Postumia is *ebriosa acina ebriosior*: water is called *uini perniciēs*. Teetotalers may rejoice to think that this, the single poem in which Catullus makes wine his subject, is by no means one of the most felicitous of his attempts. How far more graceful is the six-line hendecasyllabic to Juventius, *Mellitos oculos tuos, Iuuenti!* None, indeed, of Catullus' poems exceed in tenderness the cycle of those addressed to young friends of his own sex. M. Lafaye well says, in contrasting Cat. ix. (to Veranius just come back from Spain) with Hor. C. i. 36 (to Plotius Numida), ii. 7 (to Pompeius Varus), the first 'n'est qu'un cri de joie et de tendresse,' while Horace scatters flowers to strew the path of his friends, recalls the memories which endear them, and dwells complacently on the festal preparations which await their arrival. I suspect that two recent articles in *Philologus* by the veteran Duntzer, in which the claims of Horace as a lyrist against Catullus are strongly and even violently asserted, are much influenced by this and similar considerations. Certainly Horace is a much nearer approach to the modern ethical standard, while Catullus represents the old Greek, more purely pagan, and sensuous feeling. This question—Horace or Catullus the greater lyrist?—discussed by Munro in a well-known chapter of his *Elucidations*, is very well treated by Lafaye, pp. 133 *sqq.* He finds the difference to lie much in the formal character of either poet's lyrics. Catullus has no idea of a set ode, with its learned digressions and harmonious balance of parts. Each hendecasyllabic is the expression more or less spontaneous of the feeling of the moment: its Greek prototype is oftener an epigram than a lyric. This point, which is only slightly worked out, is likely to receive new attention from the increasing interest in Greek epigram evinced by the newly-published edition of the *Anthologia Palatina* by Stadtmüller, as well as by Reitzenstein's *Epigramm und Skolion*.

The chapter on the *Nuptials of Peleus and Thetis* (lxiv.), which M. Lafaye justly calls a misnomer, is to me less interesting. To my judgment it is unnecessarily long. On the main question which it raises—How are we to account for the disproportionate extent

of the episode of Ariadne betrayed by Theseus?—a great deal of Alexandrian literature is cited, and it is no doubt here, if anywhere, that Catullus kept close to Alexandrian prototypes. But it is very disappointing to find no allusion to the newly-discovered fragments of Callimachus' *Hecale*, which throw a flood of light on the Callimachean conception of an Epyllion, and which would have supplied M. Lafaye with a still unransacked mine of quite new materials. As it is, there is little in the four sections into which he has divided his discussion (*Le Conte épique*) which has not been said before: and the comparison of betrayed love as depicted by Euripides, Apollonius Rhodius and Catullus, though just, is needlessly minute and even somewhat tiresome. It would have been more to the point to have dwelt at greater length on more special details of Catullus' Epyllion—e.g. the inartistic repetition of particular words like *mens, animus, pectus*; the recurrence of the same rhythmic type in the composition of the hexameter, so far removed from the variety of structure in the hexameters of Catullus' Greek models, and specially from the *Hecale*, a priceless addition to our knowledge of Callimachus and full of promise for future researchers and wiser editors than Otto Schneider; or again to have compared it with the extant *Culex* and *Ciris*, the latter of which is probably the best surviving specimen of Roman Epyllia, and exhibits some strange points of agreement with the earlier and of course far simpler work of Catullus. Perhaps too we might complain that the chronology of lxiv., I mean the date of its composition, is not even touched upon.

The section on the Elegies is slighter, but more interesting. It touches the question whether Catullus translated closely in his *Coma Berenices*; M. Lafaye's remarks here should be compared with his previous criticisms (much against me) of the poet's translation (li.) of Sappho's ode *Φαίβερά μοι κῆρος ἴσος θεοῖσι*. I am obliged to confess that his reasonings on this much-debated point and his animated defence of Catullus' deviations from Sappho, as well as of the integrity, as it stands, of the seemingly unconnected strophe *Otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est*, have not convinced me. As to the *Coma*, there is great reason for suspecting that the Latin version is not very close to the original: would not Callimachus have thought it very inferior to his doubtless elaborately finished original? In the discussion on lxviii. the adaptation of lyric

forms to elegy is treated at some length: the question of Alexandrianisms is here very prominent and, though the absence of any extant Callimachean model gives to the diatribes of a long series of scholars on lxviii. an inevitable fluctuation and uncertainty, the really salient characteristics of the poem—distinguishing it from every other existing Roman elegy—are well brought out.

The *conclusion* emphasizes the difference between the first division of Catullus' poems (i.—lx.) and the rest. The Alexandrian influence is far more perceptible in this

latter and much larger portion than in the more purely lyrical. Little weight however can be attached to Bährens' theory that Catullus began with imitating Sappho and the Aeolian school and only later at the suggestion of Calvus (why not Cinna?) came to Alexandrian models: equally problematic is the counter view that lxv., lxvi., lxviii. preceded the lyrics. Few, I think, can doubt that the *candida diva* of lxviii. is Lesbia; and if so, it must have been written late.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

TYRRELL AND PURSER'S *LETTERS OF CICERO*, VOL. IV.

The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero.
Edited by R. Y. TYRRELL, Litt. D., Regius Professor of Greek, Trinity College, Dublin; and L. C. PURSER, Litt. D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. Vol. IV. Dublin University Press. 1894.

THE great work of Professor Tyrrell and Dr. Purser proceeds at a sufficient pace, if we allow its scope and dignity. The first volume appeared in 1879, and was re-edited in 1885; the second in 1886; the third in 1890. The present volume brings us down to Letter 544 (*Fam.* xiii. 16), the last before the death of Tullia. As there are only about 320 letters remaining, covering a period of just two years and a half—letters for the most part of no great length or difficulty—and as the need for excursions and long introductions diminishes with the advance of the work, we may perhaps fairly expect that the whole will be completed in one more volume, to appear about 1898. The editors themselves must be very glad to be getting at last in sight of land.

I have already, on more than one occasion, been permitted to express the general appreciation of this work in the *Classical Review*; I need, therefore, now only deal with a few special features of the present volume, and note some selected passages.

In the critical department a change has been made in accordance with the suggestions of Mendelssohn in his edition of the *Epp. ad Fam.* published last year, and very meekly accepted by the editors (*benigne admoniti*, p. 445). This consists chiefly in the substitution of P, a codex in the Paris

Library, which was very slightly treated in vol. i., ed. 2. p. 82, for T, a codex in the Library of Tours, described in detail, *ib.* p. 78. In vol. ii. p. lx. it was maintained with much emphasis that T was not descended from P, but the editors have now very frankly withdrawn from their position, convinced by Mendelssohn's arguments. The other changes are the discarding with contempt of a Harleian MS. used formerly, and the citation throughout of a Palatine MS. (598), which had been already described, vol. ii. p. lxxxiii. but is now treated as a more important authority (p. c.).

It is most unfortunate that the text and notes seem to have been finally printed off and dismissed before the introductory part was written at all. On p. lxxxv. the editors warmly express their obligations to O. E. Schmidt's work (1893), and say: 'if we had had the advantage of his guidance when originally arranging the order of the letters, that arrangement would have been much improved.' Accordingly the order and dates of the letters in the text are often adversely commented on, sometimes in Part I. (e.g. p. liv.), sometimes in Part III. of the Introduction—a most perplexing and irritating arrangement, which is made worse by not being specially pointed out anywhere.

The same explanation seems necessary for the absence of notes where they are greatly needed. For example, on Letter 304 (*Att.* vii. 11), any one might well be astonished to find no note on *tota haec Campana*, which necessitates either a forced meaning to be given to *haec*, or the theory that *Campana* (the Med. reading for *Campania*) was used of the Roman *Campagna* before the Augustan