Play on the Proper Names of Individuals in the Catullan Corpus: Wordplay, the Iambic Tradition, and the Late Republican Culture of Public Abuse*

JENNIFER INGLEHEART

ABSTRACT

The paper explores the significance of names and naming in Catullus. Catullus' use of proper names, and in particular his play on the connotations of the names of individuals who are attacked within his poems, has not been fully explored to date, and the paper identifies several examples of such play which have not previously been recognized. The paper examines Catullan wordplay in the context of both the iambic tradition and the public abuse culture of the late Roman Republic.

Keywords: Catullus; etymology; wordplay; *cognomina*; iambic poetry; Republican oratory

Names and naming are important in Catullus: the *Index Nominum* of Mynors' *OCT* runs to five pages,[1] and both the great public figures of the day and those about whom we know nothing other than their name feature in the Catullan corpus.[2] Many of the poems begin with a named addressee as their *incipit* or in their opening lines,[3] and Catullus names individuals explicitly in order to honour them (see, e.g., Cat. 1.3 and 68.41–6),[4] or,

* Earlier versions of this paper were delivered at the Work in Progress Seminars at the Universities of Edinburgh and Durham in 2010–11, and at the Annual Classical Association Conference in Durham in 2011; I am grateful to audience members for their helpful suggestions. My biggest debt of thanks is owed to Stephen Heyworth for his careful reading of earlier drafts of this paper, and to the anonymous *JRS* readers, whose comments have helped me towards a final version.

[1] Some of the proper names in the Index are those of mythological characters or gods, or else geographical epithets. Play can also be observed in Catullus' treatment of such names: in addition to the examples noted by Michalopoulos 1996, see e.g. Cat. 31.5 with Quinn 1973 ad loc. (at 185) for bilingual wordplay on Bithynia and Thynia, and Harrison 1915 on play with the pronunciation of the name of the Ionian Sea in Cat. 84.

[2] On this mixture of named individuals in the Catullan corpus, see Neudling 1955: v: 'If Catullus is one of the most biographical of ancient writers, he is also one of the most perplexing. Of the scores of names which appear momentarily or fleetingly in his poems — the pimps and prostitutes, young-men-about-town, wits and wastrels, poets, dilettantes, politicians, statesmen, ward-heelers, scoundrels, *poseurs*, orators great and small, who people his dazzling and decadent world in the capital — some are only names; others are shadowy figures slightly known in the history of their times but given life and blood for us by Catullus' characterization or caricature; a few are the great household names of Roman history.'

[3] Named addressees provide the *incipit* for poems 6, 9, 11, 12, 21, 23, 26, 30, 47, 58, 77, 94, 110 and 111; named addressees are found in the first three lines in the following poems: 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 24, 25, 28, 32, 33, 38, 40, 48, 49, 50, 56, 65, 69, 72, 75, 80, 81, 88, 91, 93, 96, 98, 99, 103, 108, 112 and 113.

[4] cf. poem 6, which centres around Catullus' curiosity about the identity of Flavius' latest flame, ending with the claim 'uolo te ac tuos amores/ ad caelum lepido uocare uersu' (6.16–17); Catullus would surely need to know this woman's *name* in order to eulogize her.

JRS 104 (2014), pp. 51–72. © *The Author(s) 2014.*
Published by The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
doi:10.1017/S0075435814000069

alternatively, to shame or insult them (see, e.g., Cat. 93.1 and 78b.4, which, although missing a proper name, strongly implies that its recipient was identified by name in a now missing portion of the poem).[5] Catullus' own name features twenty-five times in a corpus of only around 116 poems,[6] on which Amy Richlin comments 'the poet's own name recurs again and again, undistorted, insistent, and upstage'.[7] The name which has attracted by far the most attention in the Catullan corpus is, of course, that of his beloved Lesbia, and scholarly interest has been piqued by its use in poem 51, a translation of a fragment by Sappho of Lesbos; most famously of all, in poem 79, Catullus appears to identify the real woman behind the pseudonym 'Lesbia' via a pun; I shall treat an alternative, more controversial approach to the name Lesbia which is consonant with the argument that guides this paper in its final section. However, the significance of proper names and of the act of naming individuals in the Catullan corpus has not yet been fully explored, despite some studies of the phenomenon of Catullan play on proper names which have either concentrated on isolated examples,[8] or focused largely on such wordplay as exemplifying Catullan *doctrina*.[9] This paper examines several previously unidentified examples of play on the names of individuals within Catullan poetry, analysing them both in their contemporary socio-political context, and in terms of their alignment with archaic iambic verse. It thereby offers a new interpretation of the use and significance of names and naming in Catullus, and in particular the way in which Catullus both participates in the public abuse culture of late Republican Rome and writes himself into the tradition of iambic poetry.

Given the number and variety of names of individuals that feature within the Catullan corpus, a necessary preliminary to this investigation of Catullan play on names is the categorization of names within the corpus. Leaving aside the naming of mythological characters, such as Remus (Cat. 28.15 and 58.5),[10] we can divide the names of individuals in the Catullan corpus into five broad categories:[11] (1) those referring to known, living historical individuals: e.g. Julius Caesar (Cat. 11, 57, 93) and Cicero (Cat. 49);[12] (2) those denoting deceased historical personages (e.g. Simonides in Cat. 38.8 or

[5] Otherwise it is hard to see how *fama* as an old woman could tell *qui sis*: revealing the identity of the person who has offended Catullus must be one of the points of this poem.

[6] Compare the potential play with his own name (and geographical origin) in the likening of Catullus' iambic target's face to that of 'catuli … Gallicani' at Cat. 42.9 (a target who is, moreover, identified as a mimic in the previous line, i.e. an *almost* exact reproduction of Catullus himself: Heyworth 2002: 130); Hallett 1993 seems to have been the earliest scholar to have identified this play. Catullus' frequent use of his own name represents a high incidence of self-naming, even for a 'personal' poet; cf. self-naming in his near contemporaries: Propertius 8, Horace 5. None of the poets who appear in Hollis 2007 (many of them Catullus' direct contemporaries) name themselves in the (admittedly paltry) extant fragments.

[7] Richlin 1983: 148.

[8] The studies listed at Michalopoulos 1996: 75, all deal with isolated examples of either geographical or mythological proper names, and not the names of individual Romans in the Catullan corpus.

[9] Michalopoulos 1996, a wonderful study of etymologizing wordplay on proper names in Catullus, is nevertheless an example of what Hinds 2006: 13, labels the 'dominant aestheticizing tendency in Roman literary studies'.

[10] This is not to suggest that the names of such characters lack point: for example, the reference to the 'magnanimi Remi nepotes' ('the great-hearted descendants of Remus') at 58.5 shames contemporary Romans, who engage in grubby erotic encounters with Lesbia, by referring to them via their illustrious mythical ancestor.

[11] cf. the categories into which Rudd 1960: 161–2 divides named individuals in Horace's *Satires*. For significant names in Catullus' Roman predecessors, see e.g. Mendelsohn 1907 (on Plautus) and Snyder 1978 (on Lucretius).

[12] This is not to say that Catullus' poetry gives us direct access to these personages: Catullus' 'Caesar', for example, seems a careful construct and Catullan play with the proper names of historical individuals can be found. For example, *Caesar*'s placement at Cat. 93.1 between two strong caesurae may evoke the etymological connection between *Caesar* and *caedo* (an etymology played upon at, e.g., Ovid, *Fasti* 3.709–10 and *Met.* 15.480: see Barchiesi 1994: 119 (= 1997: 129) and Michalopoulos 2001: 46–7). Fitzgerald 1995: 78, notes play in the collocation *Cato*, *Catullum* (Cat. 56.3), which 'establishes a relation between the names of the principals' (with *Catullus* appearing almost as a diminutive of *Cato*) that is 'comically improbable if sonically effective'. Stephen Heyworth (*per epistulas*) suggests also Cat. 11.10, where Caesar is labelled *magnus*, thereby

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435814000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Callimachus, identified by the patronymic *Battiades*, at Cat. 65.16 and 116.2); (3) examples of invented names or pseudonyms behind which the reader is apparently supposed to be able to recognize historical individuals named directly elsewhere in the Catullan corpus: e.g. Mentula ('prick': Cat. 94, 105, 114, 115), who has been identified with Julius Caesar's *praefectus fabrum*, Mamurra (Cat. 29, 57);[13] (4) those which can neither be identified securely with known historical figures, nor seem to have a point particular to the context in which they appear; (5) those names referring to characters who cannot be identified with historical figures, and which seem to bear a significant charge in the context in which they feature, as Catullus plays up their (usually, but not always, etymological) connotations as part of his iambic attack. The first four of these categories will not be treated here at any great length, owing largely to constraints of space, but also to the major focus of this paper upon my fifth category: instances where Catullus can be observed to play upon the connotations of names and in which such wordplay contributes to the force and point of Catullus' invective.

A few scholars have considered the possibility of Catullan literary play on names through the phenomenon of 'speaking' names; that is, names which cannot be easily identified extratextually with any historical figure and which seem so pointed in the context within which they are deployed that they are 'certainly or probably chosen solely on account of their derivation', to use the words of Niall Rudd.[14] So Amy Richlin has suggested that 'Rufus' ('Red-head': Cat. 69, 77; see too my discussion of 'Rufa' and 'Rufulus' in Cat. 59, below), 'Gallus' ('Eunuch': Cat. 78), and 'Naso' ('Nose': Cat. 112) are *redende Namen*;[15] however, Richlin's examples seem to fall into the fifth and final category of Catullan names identified above. That is, these potentially 'speaking' names do not appear to fit the context of the poems in which they appear and thus they seem to constitute a case of simple 'name-calling' and insult, rather than the more sophisticated play I identify in the examples under consideration in this paper.[16] Better aligned with the examples under consideration in this paper is the play that Fitzgerald proposes upon the echoes of the word 'phallus' that he hears in the name 'Thallus' in Cat. 25: Fitzgerald connects this proposed play on the similarity between 'Thallus' and the word 'phallus' to 'the comparison of Thallus' softness with the languid penis of an old man (3)'[17] (Cat. 25.3 'uel pene languido senis situque araneoso'). However, Fitzgerald fails to note that the rapaciousness of Thallus ('turbida rapacior procella', Cat. 25.4), would fit nicely with Catullus' iambic characterization of rampantly greedy pricks elsewhere (e.g. 'Mentula' in Cat. 114 and 115), and thus undervalues the broader generic implications of such play on names. The unknown 'Porcius' and 'Socration' of poem 47 and 'Acme' of poem 45 have also been identified as possible examples of the phenomenon of Catullan play on the etymological force of names: so 'Porcius' in poem 47, with its obvious hints of the *porcus* or pig, fits well with the alleged lavish

usurping the name of his political rival and contemporary, Pompeius Magnus, and Caesar's identification as *imperator unice* at Cat. 29.11, where the term might have implied Pompey (the *cinaedus Romulus* of lines 5 and 9: see Cameron 1976 on the terms used to refer to the pair in this poem), but any such suggestion is swiftly removed by reference to *Britanniae* (20).

[13] See Neudling 1955: 114–15.

[14] Rudd 1960: 168, commenting on names within Horace's *Satires*; Rudd 1960 views the satiric genre as an important factor in Horace's choice of significant names for 'type' characters (a genre-based approach of obvious relevance for the current study).

[15] Richlin 1983: 153.

[16] 'Rufus' was a common cognomen in Rome, and apparently originated as a label for people who were 'red'-haired and thus non-native Romans; it was a common slave name, strengthening the ancient Roman association between such colouring and non-native origin: see Kajanto 1965: 134 and Corbeill 1996: 86. Yet Cat. 69 and 77 make no play upon such pejorative connotations of the name, unless Rufus' body odour in 69, a lack of his urbanity, is to be taken as a subtle hint at his foreign origins.

[17] Fitzgerald 1995: 102.

banqueting of this parasite, and 'Socration' ('little Socrates') in the same poem seems an ironic nickname (unless it is supposed to be a name indicating a 'type' or stock character; for this phenomenon, see further below) for a man accused of the same behaviour,[18] whereas 'Acme', with its connotations of the Greek word ἀκμη (and thus the suggestion that the girl is at the height of her loveliness or, in the words of Quinn, 'in the bloom of youth and beauty'),[19] seems an ironic moniker for a woman whom Septimius loves in hyperbolical terms which perhaps ridicule his passion and the couple (Cat. 45.3–6, 22).[20] It is possible that other examples of significant names and wordplay which add to the invective point of Catullus' poems may be found in addition to those that this paper explores.[21]

Yet the fact that some names in invective poems in the Catullan corpus fit the context in which they appear so perfectly, enhancing the poem's attack on the named individual, need not necessarily suggest that these are invented or 'speaking' names in the sense outlined above. It is possible that actual historical individuals are identified by the names under consideration in this paper: Roman *cognomina* do have meanings, often with pejorative connotations,[22] and such etymologies were frequently played upon by orators in the late Republic. There are always potential jokes to be realized within Roman names. As Anthony Corbeill demonstrated,[23] in the late Republic, *cognomina* were almost exclusively applied among men of the senatorial class, and names were treated as a marker of the character of their bearer;[24] *cognomina* were thus not just empty labels, but were believed to offer insight into the nature of the person who carried that name,[25] and public attacks on aristocratic men through the etymological connotations of their names were frequent, and have been argued to serve the function of regulating deviant if not actually illegal social behaviour.[26] In at least one of the instances I discuss below of Catullan play on names (that of Victor, my first example), Catullus seems to play upon the connotations of *cognomina* precisely in order to shame their bearers in respect to actions which his poetic corpus criticizes both in the poem relating to Victor and elsewhere, and his invective therefore participates within, and can fruitfully be compared with, the wider culture of abuse within the society in which he lived. In Catullus' late Republican Rome, Cicero's 'maledica ciuitas' (*Cael.* 38), slanders and libels were a very visible part of everyday

[18] Neudling 1955: 147 denies that 'Porcius' is a 'cryptogram' (i.e. a pseudonym concealing a real person) on the grounds that this is a well-known name of a prominent Republican *gens* (see further above for play on the connotations of real names); see too Dettmer 1985 for the connotations of these names.

[19] Quinn 1973: 224.

[20] It is unclear whether this poem's praise of the couple is heartfelt or ironic (and thus whether it might properly be viewed as invective): see e.g. Baker 1958, Akbar Khan 1968, and Frueh 1990.

[21] So Skinner 2003: 143 argues that speaking names are also found in poem 68, which lacks invective against its addressee/s, where she suggests that 'Mallius' (68.11, 30) evokes *malo*, *malle* and the notion of preference, and hence Mallius' advocacy of the 'formerly desirable Roman lifestyle Catullus has left behind', and that 'Allius' (68.41, 50, 66, 150) may pun on *alius*/ Greek ἄλλος, intimating 'other' or 'alternative', and hence embody 'the false dreams produced by the artistic imagination'.

[22] See, for example, Mau 1901, and Kajanto 1965 on the history of the Latin *cognomina* (originally 'largely nicknames': ibid.: 20) and, on pejorative *cognomina*, ibid.: 63–4, 235–46, 249, 264–71, 286–7. See further above on Roman nomenclature.

[23] Corbeill 1996: 57–97.

[24] Corbeill 1996: 58–60.

[25] See particularly Corbeill 1996: 71–8 for this notion of the *omen nominis* and of the idea that a name indicates something important about its bearer's character.

[26] See Corbeill 1996: 19 on the public shaming effected by Roman oratory and *flagitatio* or *flagitium* (a kind of folk-justice in which socially unacceptable but not actually illegal acts were publicly charged to their perpetators: for *flagitium* in Cat. 42, see Fraenkel 1961: 46–57, and for the practice more widely, see Usener 1901); see Corbeill 1996: 67 for the shaming of aristocrats through the connotations of their *cognomina* as a way of discouraging antisocial acts.

life,[27] and we shall see that Catullus' poetry is closely aligned with other invective of the period through its attacks on named individuals.

Conversely, while there were many public attacks on named individuals through the connotations of their names in the period during which Catullus was writing, it is also important to observe that the precedent of the Greek iambic tradition suggests that it may not *always* be necessary to link the names on which Catullus plays with historical individuals. For all of my examples of Catullan play on names occur within poems which have an iambic generic charge, in the sense that these poems attack the named characters who appear within them.[28] On a purely metrical definition, there are only twelve iambic poems in the extant Catullan corpus of around 116 poems, and many of these do not contain content which is typical of iambic; instead, as Stephen Heyworth has convincingly argued, Catullus plays on the generic expectations of the iambic tradition, as Catullan references to iambic poetry occur in non-iambic metres, and invective is found in poems of all metres.[29] There are good generic precedents for the practice of using invented, significant names in invective poetry, as we shall see in the first section of this paper, which treats both the generic background and selected examples of Catullan play on names, including some examples where the names look to indicate characters who seem temptingly fictional.[30] The second section analyses the implications of Catullan invective play on names for those characters within the corpus to whom Catullus addresses first-person erotic poetry, including Juventius and the notorious Lesbia. Finally, the conclusion traces some broader implications for the Catullan corpus, his late Republican context, and the poetry of the early Empire. A major concern throughout is to suggest that scholars' failure to recognize either the possibility and/or the implications of play on names in the Catullan corpus has minimized both the creative artistry of these poems and their self-conscious alignment with the broader contexts of invective in contemporary Roman oratory and the iambic genre.

The broader context of ancient verse is the starting point of my study of Catullan play with names. It is surely no coincidence that most of the suggested examples of this phenomenon which have been identified to date in the Catullan corpus occur in invective or iambic poems (broadly defined: see above), since archaic iambic poetry attacks individuals who have been identified as stock characters, with apparently 'speaking' names which chime with their poetic depiction and reveal their fictionality. So, for example, the name 'Neoboule' (or 'New plan'), of the woman who was initially promised in marriage to Archilochus, before the promise was broken by her father, Lycambes, seems so appropriate to the scenario Archilochus' poetry depicts that most scholars now believe that it is a fictional name chosen for its connotations;[31] similarly, the name 'Lycambes' has given rise to suspicions that he is a stock iambic

[27] For the Roman culture of abuse, see e.g. Richlin 1983: *passim*; Nisbet 1961: Appendix 6; Syme 1939: 149–52; Opelt 1965: 154–7.

[28] Pedrick 1993: 173 notes that 'When Catullus becomes abusive, he is inventive and cunning about it'; the wordplay on the names of his iambic targets that I argue for tends to confirm this claim.

[29] Heyworth 2002: 118. Cf. Fordyce 1961 on Cat. 40.2, who notes that Catullus uses the term *iambus* to denote abusive content 'without reference to the metrical form which gave its name to the genre' (190). In writing abusive poetry in metres other than the strictly iambic, Catullus followed earlier practice. Although genre was defined primarily by metre in the ancient world, iambic constituted an exception insofar as the iambic metre is so-called because it contains content which is typical of iambos and not vice versa: see West 1974: 22.

[30] Thus I suggest that generic considerations render unlikely the argument of Parker (2000: 457), who reacts against the now widely-held scholarly view that Horace puns upon the connotations of impotence in his own *cognomen*, Flaccus, in the invective *Epodes* (for which, see e.g. Hor., *Epod.* 15.12: 'nam siquid in Flacco uiri est', Fitzgerald 1988: 190, n. 7, and Watson 1995: 188, n. 3, 195).

[31] See n. 32 (below). Irwin 1998 is an exception to the general scholarly belief that Archilochean iambic contains 'speaking' names; cf. Stehle 1999: 164, who comments that 'The name Neoboule … is not one that a real girl would bear'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435814000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

character.[32] Given both the archaic iambic background and Catullus' interest in genre,[33] it is perhaps surprising that scholars have not studied names in his poetry with more focus on the influence of archaic iambic verse, in which punning on apparently invented proper names is a frequent feature;[34] however, the tendency to treat Catullus' poetry as autobiographical may go some way towards explaining this oversight. It is also unclear whether Catullus himself would have anticipated modern scholars in reading some of the names that are found in archaic iambic as invented or fictional, given the widespread ancient practice of reading first-person poetry as autobiographical, and, more importantly, the biographical tradition that the invective of Archilochus and Hipponax drove their victims to suicide.[35] Furthermore, vast chronological and other distances separate Republican Rome from archaic Greece, and it would be foolish to think that exactly the same generic rules and topoi were applied by poets in exactly the same way in these societies: one obvious difference is that the ritual aspect of iambic abuse has presumably dropped out by Roman times.[36] But a more important way in which Greece and Rome differ in terms of invective abuse is that Roman and Greek nomenclature are quite distinct from one another: unlike Greek names, which tend to have positive connotations,[37] Roman *cognomina* (as we have seen) often have negative connotations, which are played upon by orators and others who use these names to make public attacks on the qualities or actions of their bearers. Yet a public culture of abuse of real-life targets attacked under, and indeed, *for*, their own names need not preclude the possibility that Catullus could write invective poems attacking characters using speaking names that hint at the etymological connotations of those names, and thereby align himself more closely with the traditions of iambic poetry.[38] Certainly, we shall see that some of Catullus' plays on the names of individuals occur in contexts in which Catullus' poetry is linked closely with archaic iambic poetry; this is particularly the case in the attacks on Ravidus and Rufa/Rufulus discussed below.

In turning to Catullan play on the significance of names, I begin with an obvious example. In poem 80, Gellius, the target of Catullan invective in several poems (Cat. 74, 88–91, 116), is linked sexually with one Victor, who bears a name unique within the Catullan corpus:

> Quid dicam, Gelli, quare rosea ista labella
> hiberna fiant candidiora niue,
> mane domo cum exis et cum te octaua quiete
> e molli longo suscitat hora die?

[32] cf. West 1974: 26–7: 'Is it not remarkable that the same element - amb - appears in the name of a figure who plays a recurrent part in the iambi of the most celebrated exponent of the genre? — The possibility I am suggesting is that Lycambes and his daughters were not living contemporaries of Archilochus but stock characters in a traditional entertainment …'; cf. e.g. Nagy 1979: 242. Carey 1986 argues against Archilochus as a stock character.

[33] As evinced by (e.g.) Catullus' metrical generic experimentation (on which, see e.g. Heyworth 2002) and work in many different genres.

[34] In addition to the names of the major iambic characters already discussed, for iambic punning on proper names, see Rosen 1988: 10.

[35] See e.g. Ovid, *Ibis* 54 with scholia, and Pliny, *N.H.* 36.11–12; Carey 1986: 60, has further references. For the practice of reading poetry as an autobiographical record of poets' loves and hates more generally, see e.g. Cic., *Tusc.* 4.71: 'quid denique homines doctissimi et summi poetae de se ipsis et carminibus edunt et cantibus? fortis uir in sua re publica cognitus quae de iuuenum amore scribit Alcaeus! nam Anacreontis quidem tota poesis est amatoria. maxime uero omnium flagrasse amore Reginum Ibycum apparet ex scriptis' and Apul., *Apol.* 10.

[36] For ritual abuse in Greece, see West 1974: 23–7.

[37] See Corbeill 1996: 58–60.

[38] For 'speaking names' used in literary texts in Latin, see Hijmans 1978, and on etymologizing play in Latin literature, see (e.g.) Ahl 1985; Cairns 1996; Michalopoulos 1999; Hinds 2006 (the last of which contain much further bibliography).

nescio quid certe est: an uere fama susurrat
grandia te medii tenta uorare uiri?
sic certe est: clamant Victoris rupta miselli
ilia, et emulso labra notata sero. (Cat. 80)

Why should I say, Gellius why those rosy lips of yours
are whiter than winter snow,
when you leave the house in the morning and when the eighth hour
in the long day rouses you from gentle rest?
Surely something's up. Does Rumour whisper truly
that you devour the great stretchings of mid-man?
That's what's up. The broken loins of poor little Victor cry out
and the lips marked with milky whey.[39]

The implications of Victor's name (if this is indeed a name and not a common noun) and the way in which it is here introduced have only been partially explored to date: Curran comments: '… the point of the poem might turn out to be the revelation by Catullus himself of the beloved's identity. (This is, of course, a *part* of the point of the poem, if Victor (7) is, as seems probable, a proper name).'[40] Curran's assertion that the revelation of Victor's identity is an important part of the poem seems correct; the structure of the poem, with three couplets building up to Victor's identity and name in the final couplet, suggests that here we have an almost epigrammatically pointed poem, and that Victor's name must be an important part of the point.[41] Nevertheless, Curran does not go on to consider what this proper name suggests, and William Fitzgerald comes the closest among modern scholars to doing so: 'Victor is an ironic name because his loins "shout" only insofar as they betray the signs of having been "broken" by the ministrations of Gellius.'[42] Fitzgerald rightly detects irony in the way in which the 'victorious shout of the *irrumator*'[43] evokes a military conquering hero who, having 'broken' loins, hardly lives up to his name (as I shall discuss further below), but Fitzgerald seems, along with other scholars, to miss a point of broader significance about the connotations of Victor's name.

That is, the name 'Victor' exactly fits the rôle its bearer plays in this poem in terms of Roman (and Catullan) ideas about appropriate sexual rôles and behaviour, where the 'active', penetrating, and, above all, masculine partner appears as the winner in the sexual contest, and superior to the 'passive', penetrated one, who suffers shame as he takes on a subordinate, 'womanly' and 'conquered' rôle:[44] compare Catullus 16.1–2

[39] The text is that of Mynor's 1958 *OCT* and the translation mine, as for all Latin and translations in this paper.
[40] Curran 1966: 25.
[41] cf. e.g. Calvus fr. 39.2 (in Hollis 2007: 56) for the pay-off in the final couplet of an invective epigram which opens with a question.
[42] Fitzgerald 1995: 71–2.
[43] Fitzgerald 1995: 72.
[44] See Williams 2010: 178–97 on the sexual behaviour appropriate to men (i.e. penetration), and the shaming as unmanly of those who are penetrated; however, Williams does not note the use of the vocabulary of *uincere* in this respect. For *uincere* and its cognates used with sexual connotations of the penetrating male as 'winning' in a metaphorical erotic 'battle' or contest (a common image with a long pedigree in antiquity, which helps to make 'Victor' work as a 'speaking' name here: see e.g. Adams 1982: 157–9; Spies 1930), see e.g. Lucil. 1323 'uicimus, o socii, et magnam pugnauimus pugnam'; Ov., *Ars* 1.699–700 (of Deidamia's rape by Achilles; the image is given particular force by the suggestion in ***uiribus*** that Achilles, disguised as a woman, is nevertheless a *uir*, that is, one who penetrates: cf. Williams 2010: 183–4) 'uiribus illa quidem uicta est (ita credere oportet),/ sed uoluit uinci uiribus illa tamen' and (playing on this notion) 2.728 ('cum pariter uicti femina uirque iacent') with Janka 1997: 498. For such imagery applied to 'passive' males, compare Martial 14.201 (on a slave-wrestler whom Martial sends as a gift) 'non amo quod uincit, sed quod succumbere nouit/ et didicit melius τὴν ἐπικλινοπάλην' (= 'I love him not because he wins, but because he knows how to submit/ and he

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435814000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for Catullus' investment in this penetrative model of masculinity and domination. In poem 80, Victor inserts his penis into Gellius' mouth and therefore fully deserves the label *uir* which is attached to him in line 6.[45] Gellius' shameful rôle as the implied loser in this sexual encounter is underlined by the name of 'Victor' for the one who penetrates him and by Victor's characterization as a *uir* who penetrates. Compare Sen., *Epist.* 47.7 on the slave who is 'in cubiculo uir, in conuiuio puer' ('a man in the bedroom, a slave-boy in the dining room'); Williams comments on the thrust of this passage's insult against the slave's master and his passivity as 'conveyed precisely by the word *uir*'.[46] Similarly, Victor in this poem is a 'man' insofar as he takes the penetrating rôle in sex, and Gellius is thereby shamed by his unmanly rôle in the same encounter.

Catullus may further play on the name Victor as suggesting the winner in a sexual encounter when he describes Victor's 'ilia' as 'rupta' (lines 7–8) by Gellius' ministrations; although the only other example of *rupere* attached to *ilia* is also found in a similar sexual context in Catullus (11.20), the description of this area of the body being broken by Gellius may suggest that Victor is wounded in combat, since the *ilia* are frequently the site of wounds to warriors in epic poetry.[47] The connotations of victory in this name are thus ironized.[48] Furthermore, while making use of standard Roman ideas about male sexuality by drawing attention to the connotations of Victor's name, Catullus simultaneously undermines such societal norms, firstly by presenting Victor as less than the conquering hero via the diminutive 'misellus' (7) which enhances the description of his loins as 'rupta', and also by presenting Gellius as an enthusiastically and abnormally active partner,[49] given that performing fellatio was seen as shameful for Roman men, since they were thereby failing to take an 'active', penetrating rôle, in accordance with Roman ideas about appropriate sexual rôles and behaviour. In this sexual encounter, both participants are ultimately presented as 'losers', even though Victor's name may initially suggest that he plays a victorious and manly rôle; this shaming of both participants should come as no surprise, given the repulsive picture of Gellius that Catullus paints in the corpus as a whole (on which, see further my appendix below).[50]

has learned better "bedwrestling"'), with Leary 1996: 268–9 on the sexual innuendo in *succumbere* ('submit' in terms of wrestling and sexual 'submission'; obviously to be contrasted with *uincit*, which is itself thus also capable of a sexual sense here) and ἐπικλινοπάλη (both a wrestling hold and 'bedwrestling': cf. Suet., *Dom.* 22).

[45] The term *uir* was only attached to those biologically male individuals who were entitled to its privileges (hence disreputable males, youths, slaves, and others were deprived of the label): Skinner 1997: 14.

[46] Williams 2010: 183.

[47] cf. e.g. Virgil, *Aeneid* 10.778; Ovid, *Met.* 3.67, 4.734, 12.340, 441, 486; Valerius Flaccus 3.105; Sil. 10.252; Stat., *Theb.* 7.594–5; admittedly, these examples all postdate Catullus.

[48] In Martial, who had of course read his Catullus closely, the connotations of the name 'Victor' are also ironized in a sexual context, strengthening my interpretation of such play in Catullus: Victor appears at 11.78, where he is advised, in advance of his marriage, to learn the feminine embraces (1) that are unknown to him as an apparently exclusive lover of boys up to this point (4). Victor is warned that his wife will permit him to penetrate her anally only once (5), 'dum metuit teli uulnera prima noui' ('while she fears the first wound of the new weapon' (6); compare the play in the Catullan poem on the physical effects of the 'battlefield' of war/love on Victor's loins), and told that a prostitute will make him a *uirum* ('a man' in a similar sense of one who penetrates, but also 'a husband' in this context: see Williams 2010: 380, n. 34).

[49] Gellius' mouth, its actions, and the results of its ministrations receive much attention: cf. *rosea … labella* (1), the stress on the colour of his lips (2), *uorare* (6), and *labra* (8); he seems an enthusiast for this type of activity. This strengthens the impression that Gellius crosses the usual boundaries in his sexual voraciousness: cf. e.g. Cat. 74, where it is suggested that Gellius would irrumate even his uncle; the taboo-breaking crimes with multiple partners of which he is accused (most spectacularly in poem 89); and, above all, the claim that he would be prepared to act as simultaneously 'active' and 'passive' (in terms of Roman sexology) partner in an act of self-irrumation that forms the punchline to poem 88 (7–8); hence the irony noted by Fitzgerald.

[50] Catullan endorsement of Roman ideas about normative male sexuality combined with the simultaneous disruption of such norms is paralleled in Cat. 16, where Catullus 'proves' his masculinity to Aurelius and Furius by threatening them with buggery and irrumation, yet describes his verses as *molliculi* (8) and is happy to talk about kisses rather than more penetrative sexual acts in his poetry (12; although see Henderson 1999: 77 on when a kiss is just a kiss).

Although the name Victor is unattested in Republican inscriptions,[51] it is frequent later on, and the fact that this was a common name in Rome may strengthen the possibility that Catullus deployed it here as a fictional 'speaking' name in order to draw attention to the sexual rôle-play in the encounter (see further the material in my appendix on Victor's partner in shame, Gellius, as a potential iambic stock character). More likely than this, however, is the possibility that Catullus uses the name of a real individual, Victor, to point out that this man fails to live up to this honorific *cognomen* (presumably bestowed on an ancestor rather than the man himself), and thereby particularly shames him for a (probably inherited) name which acts as a false advertisement of his nature.[52] For invective attacks based on the mismatch between a name and the bearer of that name, compare the comment of Corbeill, on invective in oratory in the late Republic: 'Occasionally name and behavior do not coincide. Since cognomina denoting positive characteristics appear to be relatively infrequent, the failure to live up to a positive name often brought special censure.'[53] Corbeill provides a relevant parallel in his analysis of a similar play on names in a Ciceronian invective oratorical fragment, *In Clod.* 25, 'sed credo, postquam speculum tibi adlatum est longe te a pulchris abesse sensisti' ('but, I reckon, after the mirror was brought to you, you realized that you were far from one of the beautiful ones'), which must be read in the context of Publius Clodius Pulcher's alleged gate-crashing of the rites of the Bona Dea in the dress of a woman. The word *pulchris* here operates as a pun on two levels, as Corbeill explains: on the connotations in Publius Clodius' *cognomen* 'Pulcher' (or 'beautiful'), referring to his 'pretty' (that is, effeminate) appearance as he attempts to disguise himself as a woman,[54] as well as 'foreground[ing] the extent to which Clodius differs from his ancestors, the illustrious Pulchri'.[55] Catullus' play on the connotations of victory in Victor's name seems to partake of the same Republican desire to attack contemporaries as failing to meet the expectations raised by their illustrious family heritage, in particular in the matter of less than manly behaviour. In Catullus, an attack on an individual on the grounds of a name falsely indicating positive aspects of their conduct or character might usefully be compared with the (admittedly far less savage) indictment of Suffenus for failing to live up to the public image that he projects of an urbane, witty and charming individual (Cat. 22.2), by being in fact a dreadful, unsophisticated poet ('caprimulgus aut fossor', 22.10, a rustic goatmilker or a ditchdigger, instead of 'urbanus', 9).

Scholars have long noted parallels with a fragment of Archilochus in my next example, Cat. 40:

> Quaenam te mala mens, miselle Rauide,
> agit praecipitem in meos iambos?
> quis deus tibi non bene aduocatus
> uecordem parat excitare rixam?
> an ut peruenias in ora uulgi?
> quid uis? qualubet esse notus optas?
> eris, quandoquidem meos amores
> cum longa uoluisti amare poena.
>
> Poor little Ravidus, what harmful impulse
> drives you headlong into my iambics?

[51] See Neudling 1955: 187.
[52] For play on the connotations of victory in the case of an undoubtedly real individual, compare the epitaph on one Victoria, a wife who gained a pyrrhic victory over her husband by dying later than him, at *Anth. Lat.* (Buecheler/ Riese) 1142.13–14 'inuita hoc munus coniunx Victoria fecit,/ quodque uirum uicit'.
[53] Corbeill 1996: 79.
[54] For play in Catullus and others on the connotations of effeminacy in *pulcher* and Clodius' name, see above.
[55] Corbeill 1996: 80.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435814000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

What god called upon — not well — by you
prepares to stir up a frenzied quarrel?
Or was it your intention to be on the lips of the crowd?
What do you want? To be well known at any price?
You will be, with a long punishment, since
you wanted to love my beloved.

Compare Catullus' accusations of madness, implication that the addressee has made some sort of aggressive move against the poetic persona, tone of concern for the iambic target, repeated questions, and threat of public humiliation (which is fulfilled by the poem itself) with Archilochus, fr. 172 (West):[56]

πάτερ Λυκάμβα, ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε;
τίς σὰς παρήειρε φρένας,
ἧς τὸ πρὶν ἠρήρεισθα; νῦν δὲ δὴ πολύς
ἀστοῖσι φαίνεαι γέλως.

Father Lycambes, what do you mean by this?
Who has unhinged your wits
that used to be so sound? Now you are
the big laughing stock of the town.

Catullus' homage to Archilochus, however, becomes both wittier and more pointed if we hear in the otherwise unattested name 'Rauidus' a suggestion of the adjective *rabidus* (= 'raging, frenzied, mad'),[57] which is possible aurally in terms of the ancient pronunciation of these labials.[58] Indeed, Catullus seems to play upon such connotations in his addressee's name in emphatically imputing madness to his addressee: as if *mala mens* in the first line were not a clear enough indication of Ravidus' raging nature, the quarrel he is involved in is described as 'uecordem' (4), and 'praecipitem' (2) may also have connotations of recklessness and frenzy which fit the aural connotations of this name.[59]

Support for my argument that Catullus uses the aural connotations of the name Ravidus as part of his play on the madness of his addressee is paralleled in the (admittedly slightly later) case of the Augustan orator, Labienus, who became known as 'Rabienus' (or 'The Frenzied'), according to Seneca, *Contr.* 10, praef. 5: 'libertas tanta, ut libertatis nomen excederet, et, quia passim ordines hominesque laniabat, Rabienus uocaretur' ('[he exercised] such great licence, that he went past the term "licence", and, because he kept savaging the social orders and folk indiscriminately, he was called "Rabienus", with its connotations of madness'). Corbeill notes this example as a type of play on names in which the true name is 'distorted' or inaccurately represented by the change of a few syllables (compare e.g. 'Biberius Caldius Mero' = 'Tiberius Claudius Nero'), and cites disapproval from Quintilian for such wordplay as feeble (*frigida*).[60] However, since

[56] This comparison is necessarily brief, given the scope of this paper; Wray 2001: 178–9 argues well for the connections between the two poems.
[57] OCR transmit *rauide*, which was altered later in the fifteenth century to *raude* in the interests of scansion. *Rabidus* and its cognate *rabies* are found with obvious connotations of madness elsewhere in the Catullan corpus: Cat. 63.4 (Attis) 'stimulatus ... furenti rabie', 38 'rabidus furor animi', 44, 57 (Attis talks of his mind once lacking *rabie fera*), 93 (with implications of Attis' madness).
[58] Grandgent 1962: 133–5 notes examples of confusion between v and b both aurally and in writing; cf. Havet 1911: 218–19.
[59] cf. perhaps Cat. 64.244 where Aegeus arguably hurls himself 'impetuously' (*OLD* 3) as well as 'headlong' (*OLD* 1).
[60] Quint., *Inst.* 6.3.53; Corbeill (1996: 95–7) also cites Sen., *Contr.* 10 praef. 11 and his disapproval of the lack of eloquence of an orator, Moschus, from whom Seneca then records an example of this sort of play.

Catullus does not actually distort the name 'Ravidus' but rather suggests its connotations by exploiting the aural possibilities of such proximity in sound, Catullus' wordplay here would perhaps have escaped the censure of such experts in rhetoric.

Not least because Catullus uses the term rarely,[61] several scholars have explored the appropriateness and significance of Catullus' use in this poem of the word *iambus* ('iambos', Cat. 40.2), given that the poem evokes Archilochus.[62] We might push its significance further in relation to the possibility that Ravidus is a name invented for the purposes of this poem: Catullus would therefore follow Archilochus in including a character with a speaking name in a poem which is indebted to Archilochus on many levels, and would signal his debt to his iambic predecessor as the inventor of the tradition of giving characters such names via the use of the word *iambos*, which points the reader back to the presence of the name Lyc*amb*es in his model. Catullus' postulated comment upon Archilochus' use of invented names as Catullus uses a speaking name himself would therefore help to establish Catullus' place in the iambic tradition.

An additional Archilochean debt and generic point worth exploring further in relation to the name Ravidus is the potential significance of the connotations of animality evoked by its suggestion of *rabidus*. The word is applied by Catullus himself to animals at 63.85 (as he talks of the 'rabidum … animum' of Cybele's lion), and there are many other examples (some predating Catullus) of the term's application to animals, although it is also used more widely.[63] If the name Ravidus works to paint Catullus' opponent as a rabid animal in this poem,[64] this would fit well with the animalization of the targets of invective both before and after Catullus: compare Hipponax' *Bu*palus, evoking the figure of the bull,[65] the connotations of wolves in the name *Lyc*ambes, Archilochus' fable of the vixen and the eagle (frr. 172–81, 186–7 West),[66] and, in Catullus' iambic successor, Horace, *Epode* 6, which presents readers with numerous animals or animalized foes pitted against each other ('canis/ lupos' at 1–2; 'Molossus aut fuluus Lacon/ fera' at 5 and 8; Horace raises his *cornua* at 12, and his enemy attacks *atro dente* at 15), and makes reference to Archilochus and Hipponax via the animalistic names of their victims ('Lycambae', 13, and 'Bupalo', 14).[67] Scholars have previously identified a potential self-referential animal pun on Catullus' own name in the description of Catullus' target in poem 42 as 'ridentem catuli ore Gallicani' (9),[68] but to

[61] Only here and at 36.5 and fr. 3.

[62] Allusions to Archilochus are also rare in Catullus' poetry: as Heyworth 2002: 127 notes, the other undoubted allusion to Archilochus in the Catullan corpus is in poem 56, which recalls Archilochus, fr. 168 West; given the Archilochean connotations of the significant name that I argue for in poem 40 (above), this might lead us to take 'Cato' (Cat. 56.1, 3) similarly as a speaking name: the obvious interpretation would therefore be that, contrary to the majority scholarly status quo, Cato here is not Catullus' contemporary and fellow literateur P. Valerius Cato, but rather the noted moralist Marcus Cato Uticensis (for this identification, see Ellis 1889: 197–8; Buchheit 1961; Scott 1969: 25–6). This interpretation would be supported by the emphasis on Cato's reaction, and, given the immorality of the tale Catullus tells in poem 56, the request to Cato to laugh at the tale which Catullus tells would be ironic, marking him out as an unsuitable type of person to whom to tell this sort of story, given that he was reported by Val. Max. 2.10.8 to have walked out of an indecent mime performance; cf. my comments above on Victor and irony.

[63] See *OLD* 1570.

[64] Compare, in the passage from Seneca cited above, the animalistic vocabulary of *laniabat* (see *TLL* 7.2.931.3–932.50 for many examples where the verb refers to the savaging inflicted by animals) applied to Labienus/ Rabienus.

[65] See Rosen 1988b: 32.

[66] This fable is linked by authors ancient and modern with Archilochus' narrative of Lycambes' betrayal: see most conveniently Irwin 1998: 179.

[67] Heyworth 2002: 136 notes that there is a lack of 'animal comparison' in Catullan iambic compared with other examples of iambic; my argument suggests that there is more animality in Catullus than has been noted previously.

[68] See n. 6 above, and note as a comparison that the victim of iambic is a *dog* in line 8 of an epode — attributed to both Archilochus (see Fraenkel 1957: 31 n. 2) and Hipponax (fr. 115 West) — wishing shipwreck on the iambic target.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435814000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

date there has been a lack of analysis of Catullus' use of this topos via proper names.[69] The possibility that 'Ravidus' through its approximation to *rabidus* evokes animals therefore suggests that Catullus, like his iambic predecessors and successors, participates in this pre-eminently iambic topos.

A further archaic iambic topos which Catullus frequently employs — indeed, arguably even develops (although our view may be distorted due to the loss of relevant archaic material) — is that of imputing incestuous acts to his enemies: compare Hipponax fr. 12.2 (West) ὁ μητροκοίτης Βούπαλος ('the mother-fucker Bupalus')[70] with Catullus 88, 89, 90, and 91, all of which accuse Gellius of incest with a variety of partners,[71] or 111, which suggests that Aufillena commits incest with her uncle.[72] Some scholars have noted the overtones of brother-sister incest in my next exhibit, poem 59:[73]

> Bononiensis Rufa Rufulum fellat,[74]
> uxor Meneni, saepe quam in sepulcretis
> uidistis ipso rapere de rogo cenam,
> cum deuolutum ex igne prosequens panem
> ab semiraso tunderetur ustore.
>
> Bononian Rufa sucks off little Rufus;
> she's the wife of Menenius, whom often in the cemeteries
> you have seen grabbing her dinner from the very pyre,
> pursuing a loaf that has rolled down from the fire,
> getting banged by the half-shaved cremator.

The near-identity of the names 'Rufa' and 'Rufulus' hints that this adulterous act is exacerbated by the sibling relationship of its participants. I suggest further that the physical juxtaposition of the words 'Rufa' and 'Rufulus', and the closeness with variation in these names (the simple feminine form and the masculine diminutive) emphasizes that the point to incest taboos is in fact juxtaposition and closeness with variation; that is, the closeness (in terms of blood relation) yet variation (in terms of individuals sharing the same family heritage yet being distinct individuals) of family

[69] Although animalistic qualities have been recognized in some victims of Catullan invective: according to Curran 1966: 26, Gellius in poem 80 is described in 'barnyard', agricultural language, like Aemilius in poem 97; see also Cat. 25.1–2, 29.8, 60.1, 69.6, 71.1, and cf. 37.5, where Catullus' self-satisfied enemies regard other men as *hircos*.

[70] Unless the word is to be interpreted as a softened, more general insult, used in much the same way as it is nowadays, without implying *actual* incest. For sexual language being used with much wider connotations than the literal sense, see e.g. the comments of Housman 1931: 406–9 on the metaphorical use of *irrumare* (at, e.g., Cat. 10.12 and 28.9).

[71] His mother and sister: Cat. 88, 89, 91; cousins: 89; mother: 90. In addition to accusations of incest itself (i.e. sex with close blood relatives), Catullus also accuses Gellius of other inappropriate sexual acts within the family such as sex with his uncle's wife (Cat. 74, 88, 89), and even goes so far as to suggest that Gellius might irrumate his uncle (Cat. 74).

[72] Catullus also excoriates other named individuals for quasi-incestuous sexual acts: Gallus in poem 78 is shamed as the man who brings together one of his nephews with the wife of another of his brothers and Balbus in poem 67 is rumoured to have had sex with his son's wife: see especially lines 23–4 ('sed pater illius gnati uiolasse cubile/ dicitur et miseram conscelerasse domum') and the comment that 'egregium … mira pietate parentem,/ qui ipse sui gnati minxerit in gremium'. The collocation *ipse sui* emphasizes the quasi-incestuous aspect inherent in the violation of such a close relationship (for Greco-Roman horror at the 'homosociality' of quasi-incestuous acts in which same-sex relatives cuckold each other, see Wray 2001: 187, n. 67 and Brown 2004: 197).

[73] e.g. Neudling 1955: 156–7 and Nappa 1999: 331. In addition, poem 79 is often interpreted (partly because of insinuations of incest between Publius Clodius Pulcher and his sister in Cicero's *Pro Caelio*: see below, n. 81) as hinting at sibling incest between Lesbius and Lesbia (as Holzberg 2000: 40 notes, this was first recognized by Stroh 1979: 332 n. 35).

[74] I accept Avantius' emendation *Rufulum* for V's unmetrical *rufum*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435814000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

members who become too physically close.[75] 'Rufa' and 'Rufulus' thus act as pointed names in this poem insofar as they indicate that these people are brother and sister, and they are examples of Catullan word play in that Catullus uses juxtaposition and slight variation to comment on the very nature of the phenomenon that the names taken together suggest. 'Rufa' and 'Rufulus' are thus of a slightly different kind from the other examples of play on names that I treat in this paper, since Catullus' iambic attack on the pair in combination is not based solely on the connotations of these individual names (to which I shall return below), as Catullus deploys these names together in pointed arrangement to score an iambic hit in the context in which they are combined; compare the use of *Lesbia* and *Lesbius* in poem 79, where most scholars understand the names to hint at incest.

The most obvious connotation of the names Catullus uses in this poem is their status as outsiders who have red hair, and all that this implies;[76] however, Catullus does not seem to make anything of such connotations, preferring the more oblique attack on the sibling pair I have analysed above. Andreas Michalopoulos has already identified another subtle attack on Rufa based on the connotations of her name, in an argument which is worth revisiting here: noting that 'Rufa' may be a pseudonym (presumably on the grounds that the connotations of the name seem too good to be true in context), he recognizes that the name is highly appropriate for one identified in the next but one word as a *fellatrix* ('Rufa … fellat', Cat. 59.1), given that the Greek verb ῥοφέω (or ῥυφέω in Ionic) means 'to suck'.[77] This provides a good parallel to the play on the sexual connotations of Victor's name identified above, and a clever bilingual pun on Rufa's name that insults her even further.

However, Catullus' iambic affiliations in poem 59, a poem which attacks Rufa on so many different grounds, have not been fully explored to date. Christopher Nappa rightly notes that poem 59 'implicate[s] Rufa in nearly every possible form of sexual vice':[78] the poem accuses Rufa of performing the shameful sexual act of fellatio (1), as well as incest (1) and adultery (2), hints that she is a graveyard prostitute (2), and goes on to conclude with the claim that she submits to public sex with a cremator (who may be a slave (5)). I suggest that the generic implications of interpreting Rufa and Rufulus as names that bespeak an incestuous sibling pair — and, indeed, of Rufa as a name that indicates that its bearer is of course a *fellatrix* — should be taken further. To accuse one's enemies of a wide variety of sexual misdemeanours — indeed, to implicate them in as many forms of sexual vice as possible — seems to be a part of iambic poetry from the very inception of the genre: in Hipponax, fragment 12 (West), it may be significant that Bupalus is called 'mother-fucker' while apparently engaged in a sexual act with another woman, Arete;[79] the point to sexual imputations against one's enemies is that the crimes alleged are varied, over-the-top, and virtually comprehensive, as befits the vices of stock characters. The Rufa of poem 59 thus fits this iambic picture perfectly; so does Gellius, whose degradation in poem 80 has previously been discussed, and whose potential rôle as a stock iambic character I discuss in my appendix.

Rankin has attributed Catullus' interest in incest to personal disgust at the incestuous behaviour of Lesbius ('quem Lesbia malit/ quam te cum tota gente, Catulle, tua': Cat.

[75] For ancient disquiet about this aspect of incestuous relationships, see e.g. Ov., *Met.* 10.339–40 (Myrrha speaks about her father being 'hers' and therefore not being a possible beloved): 'iam meus est, non est meus, ipsaque damno/ est mihi proximitas.'

[76] See n. 16.

[77] Michalopoulos 1996: 76.

[78] Nappa 1999: 332.

[79] The fragmentary nature of this poem means that Hipponax may have expanded on Bupalus *qua* mother-fucker elsewhere in the poem. Alternatively, Masson 1949 (later retracted at Masson 1962: 169, n. 2) has identified *Arete* as Bupalus' mother, on slender evidence which includes her appearance in fr. 12 (West).

79.1–2) with Catullus' beloved Lesbia, who are commonly identified in and partly on the basis of poem 79 as brother and sister,[80] and 'Lesbius est pulcer' (Cat. 79.1) is widely read as a punning pointer to Publius Clodius *Pulcher*, who is elsewhere alleged to have conducted an incestuous relationship with his sister.[81] My argument about Catullan play on names in this paper suggests that Catullus' use of the theme should also be viewed as part of an ongoing iambic tradition, an approach to reading Catullus that does not preclude the possibility of attacks on a personal enemy for real-life transgressions, but that also allows for an element of literary homage in framing attacks on his enemies in terms which recall earlier iambic poetry.

The final example of a speaking name which I will treat in this section of my paper is Quintia, who features in poem 86 alone in the Catullan corpus,[82] and is attacked in rather more gentle terms than Rufa or indeed the unnamed woman of the very similar poem 43. Poem 86 has rarely been read as having iambic features: there are far more crude and graphic ways to insult women in ancient verse,[83] and it is easy to interpret Quintia's sole literary function here as lying in her use as a foil to the utterly beautiful Lesbia.[84] Nevertheless, the iambic aspect of poem 86 should not be overlooked: to deny a woman's attractiveness is an insulting theme inherently suited to iambic poetry, and occurs from the earliest examples we possess onwards: see e.g. Archilochus, fr. 188 (West) and fr. 196a.26–8.[85]

Quintia's name, I would argue, forms part of the iambic texture of 86 as the poem comments on the connotations of this name. For Catullus allows Quintia three of the qualities which make up his definition of *formosa* ('candida, longa,/ recta', 1–2), but withholds *uenustas* and *sal* (3–4). Can Catullus' division of the ingredients of beauty into 3 + 2 here be a mere coincidence? After all, this poem repeatedly emphasizes the importance of the numerical: compare *multis* (1), *singula* (2), *tota* (5), and *omnibus una omnis* (6). My interpretation of Quintia as a speaking name evoking the number five is of course open to two objections: firstly, that Quintia is an extremely common Roman name.[86] This is undeniable, but Catullus could have chosen to give any (or, indeed, on the parallel of poem 43, no) name to the woman he slightingly compares with Lesbia in this way. Perhaps a more serious objection is that Quintia's name strictly speaking means 'fifth' rather than 'five', but the name nevertheless suggests the number five, despite its precise meaning. That Quintia's name evokes the number five and that five qualities are given or denied to her (thus ironizing the name) should therefore be read as Catullan literary play.[87] Scholars have already recognized that part of the point to this poem lies in its punning on proper names: for the reason for Catullus' denial of the quality of *uenustas* (3) to Quintia is revealed only in the final line of the poem, and ultimately its final word, which makes an etymological pun on the proper name *Venus*

[80] Rankin 1976: 120.
[81] Cic., *Cael.* 32, 36, 78; *ad Quint. Fratr.* 2.3.2; *Pis.* 28; *Sest.* 16.
[82] Although (e.g.) Neudling 1955: 154, Fordyce 1961: 377, and Quinn 1973: 423 suggest she may be related to the Quintius of poems 82 and 100.
[83] See, e.g., Archilochus frr. 172–81, 185–7 (West); Sem. fr. 7 (West); Horace, *Epode* 8 and 12, and cf. *CIL* 4.1516 (graffiti from Rome): 'hic ego nu[nc f]utui formosa(m) fo[r]ma puella(m)/ laudata(m) a multis, set lutus intus.'
[84] cf. poem 43, where the nameless woman (although she is identified as 'decoctoris amica Formiani', 5) attacked as a rival to Lesbia ('tecum Lesbia nostra comparatur?', 7) is subjected to much more negative description than Quintia: 'nec minimo … naso' (1), 'nec bello pede nec nigris ocellis/ nec longis digitis nec ore sicco/ nec sane nimis elegante lingua' (2–4).
[85] Furthermore, the poem teases the reader with a hint of further iambic themes: the final line's reference to Lesbia having stolen (*surripuit*, 6) all the Venuses plays with the typical iambic theme of theft: see e.g. Cat. 12, 25, and 33.
[86] Yet the etymology of Roman *cognomina* means that Roman audiences would always have been potentially aware of the semantically significant value of any name, so this objection is hardly serious.
[87] Catullus displays his interest in play with number elsewhere: see Henderson 1999.

as connected with *uenustas*:[88] Quintia cannot have *uenustas* ('*love*liness', one of Catullus' five elements of beauty), for Lesbia has taken for herself all of this quality. A double pun on proper names which advertises Catullus' numerical play with the implications of the name Quintia seems to me an impressive, if unobtrusive, example of literary play.

I now turn to erotic verse, where there has been some attention to Catullan play on names, but not from the invective angle that this paper argues is so important. To approach the names of those loved by Catullus as containing play with a potential iambic charge on their connotations can reveal more about Catullan play, artistry and investment in invective. It has been widely recognized in the case of both the later Latin love elegists and certain of Catullus' contemporaries that the names of love objects are pseudonyms which have literary connotations:[89] among Catullan contemporaries, witness Ticida and his 'Perilla', whose name has been argued to evoke the inventor of Phalaris' brazen bull, Perillus/Perilaus, and therefore the erotic burning inflicted on her lovers by the woman for whom this was a pseudonym.[90] Compare too Catullus' contemporary Varro Atacinus and his beloved 'Leucadia', presumably a pseudonym with long-resounding literary implications, alluding to Sappho's suicidal leap from the Leucadian rocks, and therefore perhaps to Catullus' own Lesbia, but possibly also suggesting links to Apollo, anticipating the Apolline connections of the names of many of the women loved by the Latin love elegists.[91] Such a common literary practice of writing about beloveds with names that seem to matter in both contemporary and near-contemporary erotic poems suggests that we should therefore pay attention to the implications of these names. Furthermore, despite textual uncertainties and controversy over the meaning of the name, the 'Ipsitilla' of Catullus 32 has widely been recognized as an invented name,[92] authorizing us to look harder at the objects of Catullus' love and the names which they bear. Finally, I have already argued that invective elements should encourage us to interrogate the potential force of names. While Lesbia and Juventius are clearly not solely or straightforwardly iambic figures, poems concerning both do contain invective elements: for example, Lesbia is attacked by name as she is accused of various sexual offences in poems such as 11, 58, and 79, and poems 24 and 81 represent attacks on Juventius and/or the man or men he prefers to Catullus.

Scholars have long expressed surprise that Juventius, the male beloved who features by name in poems 24, 48, 81, and 99,[93] appears to bear without any traces of a disguise the name of a distinguished aristocratic family;[94] indeed, Catullus explicitly addresses him as a member of the *gens* at Cat. 24.1–3:

[88] Catullus also puns on the etymological connection between the name 'Venus' and the quality of *uenustas* at Cat. 3.1–2: 'Lugete, o Veneres Cupidinesque,/ et quantum est hominum uenustiorum.' See Michalopoulos 1996: 75 and (e.g.) Cic., *De Nat. Deor.* 2.69 'ex ea [i.e. Venus] potius uenustas quam Venus ex uenustate'.

[89] See Randall 1979.

[90] For Perillus, cf. e.g. Prop. 2.25.11–12, 3.24.13; *Ars* 1.653–6; Skinner 1993 and Nisbet 1995: 397 n. 27 argue for these connotations. On the basis that Callimachus, *Aet.* frr. 44–6 most famously treated Perillus' fate, Ingleheart 2010 suggests that Ticida may anticipate Tibullus and Propertius in using Callimachean-influenced pseudonyms for a mistress.

[91] On which, see Randall 1979. As a reference to Sappho's suicide leap from the Leucadian rocks (for which, see e.g. Menander's *Leucadia* fr. 258 and Ov., *Heroides* 15), *Leucadia* would revisit the Sapphic connotations of Catullus' 'Lesbia' (cf. Randall 1979: 30), but it may also allude to Callimachus' treatment of Diana Leucadia (*Aet.* fr. 31) and suggest connections with Apollo, anticipating the Apolline connections in the names of the mistresses of Tibullus and Propertius (cf. Randall 1979: 30–3).

[92] On the connotations of the name (if it is indeed a name), see e.g. Neudling 1955: 87, Morgan 1974, and Gratwick 1991. Bob Cowan detects bilingual wordplay in operation: Cowan 2013.

[93] Although Juventius is not named in Cat. 15 or 21, the scenario of a male rival for Catullus' *puer* (15.5, 21.11) fits with poems in which Juventius is named (Cat. 24, 81; although it is worth noting that Juventius is actively pursued in 15 and 21, whereas in 24 and 81 he prefers a rival to Catullus). Furthermore, Cat. 16, on Catullus' 'kiss poems', may refer to Cat. 48 and 99 as well as the Lesbia kiss poems, 5 and 7.

[94] See Neudling 1955: 94–6 and 163–4; Quinn 1973: 164, noting that the Iuuentii were a distinguished Roman

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435814000069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

O qui flosculus es Iuuentiorum
non horum modo sed quot aut fuerunt
aut posthac aliis erunt in annis.

O, you who are the floweret of the Juventii
not only of those today but as many as there have been
or will be after this in other years.

Such surprise is occasioned by Catullus' deviation from the common poetic practice of using pseudonyms for the objects of one's passion, a practice usually interpreted as having the function of sparing the blushes of the real-life beloved. In this case, scholars suppose the embarrassment would have been particularly acute, because Catullus' poetry on Juventius concerns a relationship which would have gone against Roman sexual mores, as it seems to depict Catullus attempting to seduce a freeborn, aristocratic boy into playing a subordinate rôle (as the 'passive' recipient of kisses in Cat. 48 and 99) in a male-male encounter, a prosecutable offence.[95] Some critics have attempted to explain away Catullus' apparent failure to use a pseudonym in these circumstances by claiming that Catullus' Juventius poems are modelled on Greek pederastic poems, thus rendering them safely 'literary'.[96] One explanation for Catullus' apparent departure from the usual literary practice of using pseudonyms for the names of beloveds might be that Juventius is in fact a pseudonym and moreover a 'speaking' name which hints at qualities that this boy possesses; alternatively, given the wordplay that has been observed in the case of the names of real people, Catullus may refer to an actual member of the Juventii (albeit an individual who cannot be securely identified) in what constitutes a broader attack on this *gens*. That the name 'Juventius' has connotations of youth has been recognized by some scholars,[97] although I have found no full discussions of the point to such connotations. Moreover, it has not been fully recognized that Catullus draws attention to his play on the youthful connotations of this name; this is evident from the reference to him as *flosculus* ('little flower') at Cat. 24.1,[98] and the reference to *annis* at 24.3 may further allude to the boy's own youthful years.[99] Furthermore, Juventius is represented as playing at Cat. 99.1, a quintessentially childish activity,[100] and Cat. 81 also seems relevant, as Juventius is contrasted there with a *homo* (2) described as a guest from 'moribunda … sede Pisauri' (3, 'a fellow … from the decaying seat of Pisaurum'); *moribunda* here may act as a transferred epithet from the man to the place he comes from, which would suggest that his advanced age is a further reason why this rival to Catullus is painted as unattractive, perhaps drawing on Greek lyric and iambic, where being aged renders lovers unsuitable to play the game of love.[101] Secondly, the youthful connotations of Juventius are eminently suited to the sexual rôle that Juventius is implied to play in Catullus' poetry: for like Victor, whose

family, observes 'which, if any of them is addressed here we cannot tell', a fact which lessens the potential scandal and break with practice that scholars identify in the naming of Juventius (see further above).

[95] See Williams 2010: 103–36 and Fantham 1991.

[96] e.g. Arkins 1982: 104; for the homophobia inherent in this sort of verdict, see Hexter forthcoming.

[97] Fontaine 2008: 63 says 'If Juventius in c. 48 really was (or is portrayed to be) a boy, as his name or pseudonym implies …', but does not push this any further; Ferrero 1955: 214 argues that 'Juventius' is in fact a pseudonym although he does not consider the name's etymological connotations. The name's suggestion of youth is played upon at Cic., *Planc.* 58, according to McCartney 1919: 350; *contra*, Corbeill 1996: 95, n. 108.

[98] Both the diminutive and the reference to him as a flower evoke youth: cf. Attis' boast that he was in his earlier years the 'gymnasi … flos' (Cat. 63.64).

[99] Although the phrase is also close to phrases in poems 21 and 49.

[100] Although Catullus also uses the vocabulary of playing for *literary* play (e.g. Cat. 50.1 *lusimus*), there are no hints here that Juventius is playing in this sense.

[101] See (e.g.) Sappho fr. 121, Ibycus fr. 287, and Anacreon fr. 379.

name fits his rôle, the youth Juventius plays the erotic rôle of younger, 'passive' male to Catullus' active older man, thus fitting (Greco-)Roman ideas about appropriate sexual mores. Yet these social norms are — as in the case of Victor — simultaneously disrupted as Catullus seems to break Roman social mores by naming his beloved as part of an aristocratic *gens* where one might expect him to use an obvious pseudonym to spare the boy's blushes. Therefore Catullus may teasingly play with the idea both that Juventius is the name of a real individual from the *gens* of the Juventii but also potentially a pseudonym for a boy whose name marks him out as the youthful, subordinate partner in his relationship with Catullus, and one who is attracted to older, unattractive men at that.

The final candidate for Catullan play on names that this paper will treat is also by far the most controversial: Lesbia. The connotations and significance of this name, generally agreed to be a pseudonym, have been much debated, not least because it is clear to the most biographically-minded critic that there are literary connotations from poem 51 alone, where the name 'Lesbia' denotes the object of Catullus' desire as Catullus translates a first-person erotic poem by Sappho of Lesbos, fr. 31. Poem 79 has, however, probably been the poem most examined in discussions of the name, since it is widely read as containing a pun which daringly reveals Lesbia's true identity.[102] Yet biographical approaches have limited the extent to which scholars have recognized Catullan play on this name; scholars have been happy to accept that Catullus' choice of pseudonym constitutes (in the words of Niklas Holzberg (2000), 33) 'a romantic idealization of his *puella*'[103] inasmuch as Lesbia's name obviously alludes to Sappho of Lesbos. Most readers are also happy to hear in 'Lesbia' a reference to the famous beauty contests which took place on the island of Lesbos in antiquity.[104] However, another possible connotation of this name has not won widespread acceptance. Undercutting romantic readings of Catullus, Holzberg argues that the name is to be connected with the Greek verb λεσβιάζειν = *fellare*, and suggests therefore that Lesbia is depicted through her name as well as in the descriptions of her in the poems as a *fellatrix*.[105] Michael Fontaine has developed Holzberg's theory with reference to poem 5 in particular, arguing for a bilingual pun whereby its opening words 'uiuamus, mea Lesbia' can be translated into Greek as ζῶμεν, Λεσβιά, and then the order of these words reversed to give an obscene allusion to the Greek verb λεσβιάζωμεν (with Catullus declaring to the significantly named Lesbia, 'let us perform fellatio').[106] I detect a further example of play upon these connotations of the name Lesbia:[107] I suggest that

[102] One might compare Catullus' apparent disregard for the privacy of Juventius; I argue above that the tease is the point to such 'revealing' use of naming in both cases.

[103] Holzberg 2000: 33.

[104] Wiseman 1985: 135.

[105] Holzberg 2000: 40 supports his controversial claim with reference to the description at Cat. 11.20 of an unnamed woman *ilia rumpens*, adducing the parallel of poem 80, where, as we have already seen, Victor's *ilia* are *rupta* by fellatio. Holzberg 2000: 41 accepts that his argument is weakened by the fact Lesbia is not *named* in this poem; however, the intratextual allusion via the metrical allusion to poem 51 (the only other poem in the Catullan corpus in Sapphics, where Lesbia *is* named) is strong enough to render unnecessary the identification *by name* of the woman of poem 11 with Lesbia.

[106] Fontaine 2008; see particularly 55–8 for parallels for the way in which this punning would work.

[107] In accordance with my conviction that unnamed women in the Catullan corpus are not necessarily to be identified with Lesbia, I have omitted two potential further examples from my main argument, although they are worth mentioning here: in poem 78b, where at least the name of the male partner involved in this scenario has clearly dropped out of the text, 'sauia comminxit spurca saliua tua' (2), suggests that the girl has been performing fellatio (see e.g. Richlin 1983: 26–7). In poem 68, furthermore, an unnamed woman is thus described: 'lux mea se nostrum contulit in gremium' (132); I am grateful to Sebastian Momtazi for the unromantic suggestion that *gremium* here alludes to the male genitalia (cf. Cat. 67.30 'minxerit in gremium' of female genitalia: see too Adams 1982: 77), and that this line therefore delicately alludes to Catullus enjoying fellatio in his love-nest; afternoon delight indeed.

the final line of poem 7 alludes to fellatio, appropriately enough for a poem which concerns above all the actions of the mouth (at issue are the number of *basiationes* (1) which Lesbia asks would be enough to satisfy Catullus; *basia* and *basiare* feature at line 9). Catullus concludes the poem and his hyperbolic claims about the number of kisses it would take to satisfy him thus at lines 9–12:

> tam te basia multa basiare
> uesano satis et super Catullo est,
> quae nec pernumerare curiosi
> possint nec mala fascinare lingua.
>
> To kiss you so many kisses
> is enough and to spare for crazy Catullus,
> kisses which neither the nosy could count up
> nor a bad tongue put the hex on.

David Wray comments on these lines: 'Poem 7 … locates the feared threat in the curse or bewitchment (*fascinus*) of wicked tongues (7.12). *Fascinus* was the Latin name given both to magic spells and also to the phallic charm worn around the neck to avert them.'[108] Catullus therefore here brings together the two organs involved in the act of fellatio, the phallus (via allusion to the *fascinus* or *fascinum*) and the *lingua*. Although previous arguments that the name 'Lesbia' evokes fellatio have not won widespread acceptance, my study of Catullan play on names would tend to support theories that this name can have such connotations. Finally, although only a few of the poems in which Lesbia is named make a linguistic connection between words evoking women from the island of Lesbos and the activity *lesbiazein*,[109] once that link has been made — and this is a link which dates back to Old Comedy, far predating Catullus[110] — we might ask ourselves whether it can ever be entirely erased for the audience.

My paper has thus far explored the possibilities for, and of, play on proper names in the Catullan corpus, suggesting that there are far more examples than have previously been recognized; I have argued, furthermore, that Catullus thereby asserts his place in both the contemporary Roman culture of abuse of prominent men of the senatorial class, and the literary iambic tradition. Furthermore, such wordplays emphasize the artistry of short poems which are often overlooked. It is worth considering here the flipside to the possibility this paper has explored that some Catullan play on names may involve invented or 'speaking' names; for some might object that to approach some of the figures who appear in Catullus' iambic poetry as being fictional and having speaking names gives us a Catullus whose iambic bite has a rather blunted edge because if some of these names seem so clearly to have the ring of invention and to fit the contexts in which they appear so perfectly, Catullus does not attack in those poems readily identifiable historical individuals: Catullan iambic becomes less dangerous if it is less personal. Furthermore, as noted above, there are many examples in the Catullan corpus where Catullus *does* attack the great public figures of the day such as Pompey and Caesar, and sometimes in a very uncompromising manner; it could be objected that the Catullan corpus would thus be disconcerting for the reader insofar as it contains both 'speaking' names indicating fictional, stock characters and the names of historical figures. I would, however, be tempted to view such a lack of unity rather as part of the

[108] Wray 2001: 152. Cf. *OLD* 677.
[109] However, not many poems actually name Lesbia: she is named sixteen times in thirteen poems.
[110] I am grateful to Sarah Miles for this point: for the link between Lesbians and fellatio, see e.g. Strattis, *Troilus* fr. 42 (Kassel-Austin) with Miles forthcoming: 174–5, schol. Ar. *Wasps* 1346, and Pherekrates, *Kheiron* fr. 159.

appealing and obviously *designed* variety of Catullus' corpus. Moreover, in generic terms, it is notable that stock characters seem to have been a feature of archaic iambic (see above), so that the stock characters that I have suggested can be found in Catullan iambic, whose status may perhaps be hinted at by their seeming to bear 'speaking' names, give it the general applicability that we find in archaic iambic and that Heyworth 2002, 136 misses in Catullan iambic.[111] Thus while Catullan invective may lose some of its *personal* bite if it includes characters attacked under 'speaking' names, its *generic* charge is nevertheless enhanced.

To conclude, then, this paper offers a reading of play on names in Catullan 'iambic' poems (with the generic term understood in a broad sense: see above) which suggests that Catullus is invested in both the abuse culture that has been much more widely studied in late Republican oratory, and the traditions of iambic poetry that stretch back to archaic Greece. Catullus' attacks on contemporaries of the senatorial class and alignment with the iambic poetic tradition both serve to position him as an 'insider': in terms of his contemporary society, he joins in with the shaming — and consequent social control — of outsiders, that is, those who do not conform to contemporary *mores*. In more literary terms, Catullus' play on names and exploitation of the themes of archaic iambic demonstrates his urbanity and literary *doctrina* as he participates in a literary genre with an impressive pedigree. Wordplay involving names in Catullus is thus an important part of his poetic programme *and* persona.[112]

APPENDIX: GELLIUS AS A STOCK IAMBIC CHARACTER?

The suggestion that the 'Victor' of poem 80 may bear a potential 'speaking' iambic name appropriate to his rôle in Catullus' poetry may encourage us to look for stock elements in the depiction of the Gellius depicted in this poem (and elsewhere in Catullus) too; compare also my interpretation of Rufa as a stock iambic character (above). Gellius is an excellent candidate for the rôle of a stock character in Catullan poetry: he is presented as so comprehensively sexually depraved that we should perhaps be inclined not to take such over-the-top abuse seriously. For the variety of crimes of which Gellius is accused include incest with a variety of partners, male and female, adultery, being the 'passive' partner in irrumation, and rejoicing in any offence which involves criminality (91.9–10); poem 88 ends on the note that 'nam nihil est quicquam sceleris, quo prodeat ultra,/ non si demisso se ipse uoret capite' (7–8).[113] Stephen Heyworth has already noted of Gellius that 'the complex sequence of invectives addressed to him makes him comparable to a Lycambes',[114] and one could also point to Syndikus' view of the Gellius poems not as a cycle of abuse but rather a demonstration of the range of iambic attacks which are possible.[115] As J. K. Newman has plausibly suggested, Catullus may offer a pointer via wordplay to Gellius' status as an iambic construct in poem 116, where we learn that Gellius has been aiming hostile weapons at Catullus'

[111] Heyworth 2002: 136.
[112] Compare Fitzgerald 1995: 9–10 on Catullus' 'social handicap' as a Transpadane Gaul at Rome, and the ambiguous Roman cultural position *vis à vis* the heritage of Greece.
[113] I am grateful to my graduate student Lauren Knifton for the suggestion that this couplet finds a modern parallel in rumours that the singer, Marilyn Manson, has had some of his ribs surgically removed so that he can perform auto-fellatio; Manson is such a cartoonish, constructed figure that he arguably plays the rôle of a stock character, a *bête noir* for the modern world (cf. the controversy-courting adoption of the name of the serial killer Charles Manson as the second part of his pseudonym, and the adoption of the iconic first name Marilyn, hinting at Marilyn Monroe).
[114] Heyworth 2002: 138.
[115] Arkins 1982: 39 says that '… Gellius is a particularly striking representative of "the sick society" …' and Syndikus 1990: vol. 3, 147 comments on the Gellius poems not being a cycle or sequence but rather a demonstration of a *range* of possible iambic attacks: 'Vielleicht hat Catull in diesem Zyklus das ganze Spektrum der Möglichkeiten eines jambischen Angriffs entfalten wollen.'

head ('tela infesta … mittere in usque caput', 4); *tela* is equivalent to the Greek βέλη and ἴαμβος can be etymologized as βέλη βάλλω (*Etym. Magn.* 463.28).[116] The proposed generic point here is strengthened by the iambic scenario which poem 116 implies: that Gellius, himself the target of Catullan invective, has been insulting Catullus, recalls the alleged back-and-forth of insults in the iambic relationship between Bupalus and Hipponax, and anticipates the mutual hostility and attacks of the poet *and* his target in iambic poems such as Horace, *Epode* 6, which I have discussed briefly above.

Durham University
jennifer.ingleheart@durham.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. N. 1982: *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London
Ahl, F. 1985: *Metaformations*, Ithaca
Akbar Khan, H. 1968: 'Catullus 45: what sort of irony?' *Latomus* 27, 3–12
Arkins, B. 1982: *Sexuality in Catullus*, Hildesheim/Zürich/New York
Baker, S. 1958: 'The irony of Catullus' Septimius and Acme', *Classical Philology* 53, 110–12
Barchiesi, A. 1994: *Il poeta e il principe: Ovidio e il discorso Augusteo,* Rome/Bari = 1997: *The Poet and the Prince*, Berkeley/Los Angeles
Brown, S. A. 2004: 'Philomela', *Translation and Literature* 13.2, 194–206
Buchheit, V. 1961: 'Catull an Cato von Utica (c. 56)', *Hermes* 89, 345–56
Buecheler, F., Riese, A., and Lommatzsch, E. (eds) 1964: *Anthologia Latina* vol. 2.2, Amsterdam
Cairns, F. 1996: 'Ancient "etymology" and Tibullus', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 42, 24–6
Cameron, A. 1976: 'Catullus 29', *Hermes* 104, 155–63
Carey, C. 1986: 'Archilochus and Lycambes', *Classical Quarterly* 36, 60–7
Corbeill, A. 1996: *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*, Princeton
Cowan, R. 2013: 'Boring Ipsitilla: bilingual wordplay in Catullus 32', *Museum Helveticum* 70, 190–8
Curran, L. C. 1966: 'Gellius and the lover's *pallor*: a note on Catullus 80', *Arion* 6, 24–7
Dettmer, H. 1985: 'A note on Catullus 47', *Classical World* 78.6, 577–9
Ellis, R. 1889: *A Commentary on Catullus* (2nd edn), Oxford
Fantham, E. 1991: '*Stuprum*: public attitudes and penalties for sexual offences in Republican Rome', *Échos du monde classique* 10, 267–91
Ferrero, L. 1955: *Interpretazione di Catullo*, Turin
Fitzgerald, W. 1988: 'Power and impotence in Horace's *Epodes*', *Ramus* 17, 176–91
Fitzgerald, W. 1995: *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London
Fontaine, M. 2008: 'The Lesbia code: backmasking, pillow talk, and cacemphaton in Catullus 5 and 16', *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica* 89, 55–69
Fordyce, C. J. 1961: *Catullus. A Commentary*, Oxford
Fraenkel, E. 1957: *Horace*, Oxford
Fraenkel, E. 1961: 'Two poems of Catullus', *Journal of Roman Studies* 51, 46–53
Frueh, E. 1990: '*Sinistra ut ante dextra*: reading Catullus 45', *Classical World* 84.1, 15–21
Grandgent, C. H. 1962: *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, New York
Gratwick, A. S. 1991: 'Catullus XXXII', *Classical Quarterly* 41.2, 547–51
Hallett, J. P. 1993: 'Plautine ingredients in the performance of the "Pseudolus"', *Classical World* 87.1, 21–6
Harrison, E. 1915: 'Catullus LXXXIV', *Classical Review* 29.7, 198–9
Havet, L. 1911: *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins*, Paris
Henderson, J. 1999a: 'Who's counting – Catullus by numbers', in Henderson 1999b, 69–92 (= 'Who's counting – Catullus by numbers', in H. D. Jocelyn and H. H. Pinsent (eds), *Tria*

[116] Newman 1990: 67.

Lustra. Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent, Liverpool Classical Papers 3, Liverpool (1993), 243–54)
Henderson, J. 1999b: *Writing Down Rome*, Oxford
Heyworth, S. J. 2002: 'Catullian iambics, Catullian "iambi"', in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi (eds), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, Lanham, MD, 117–40
Hexter, R. forthcoming: 'The kisses of Juventius and policing the boundaries of masculinity: the case of Catullus', in J. Ingleheart (ed.), *Ancient Rome and the Construction of Western Homosexual Identities*, Oxford
Hijmans, B. 1978: 'Significant names and their function in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in B. Hijmans and R. van der Paardt (eds), *Aspects of Apuleius' "Golden Ass"*, Groningen, 107–22
Hinds, S. 2006: 'Venus, Varro and the *vates*: toward the limits of etymologizing interpretation', *Dictynna* 3, 1–19
Hollis, A. S. (ed.) 2007: *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 BC–AD 20 (FRP)*, Oxford
Holzberg, N. 2000: 'Lesbia, the poet and the two faces of Sappho: "womanufacture" in Catullus', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 46, 28–44
Housman, A. E. 1931: 'Praefanda', *Hermes* 66, 402–12 (reprint in J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (eds), *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, vol. III, Cambridge (1972), 1175–84)
Ingleheart, J. 2010: *A Commentary on Ovid,* Tristia, *Book* 2, Oxford
Irwin, E. 1998: 'Biography, fiction, and the Archilochean *ainos*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 118, 177–83
Janka, M. 1997: *Ovid Ars Amatoria, Buch* 2. *Kommentar*, Heidelberg
Kajanto, I. 1965: *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki
Leary, T. J. 1996: *Martial Book XIV: The Apophoreta*, London
Masson, O. 1949: 'Sur un papyrus contenant des fragments d'Hipponax', *Revue des Études Grecques* 62, 314–15
Masson, O. 1962: *Les fragments du poète Hipponax*, Paris
Mau, A. 1901: 'Cognomen', *RE* 4, 225–30
McCartney, E. S. 1919: 'Puns and plays on proper names', *Classical Journal* 14, 343–58
Mendelsohn, C. J. 1907: *Studies in the Word-Play in Plautus*, Philadelphia
Michalopoulos, A. N. 1996: 'Some etymologies of proper names in Catullus', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 9, 75–81
Michalopoulos, A. N. 1999: 'Etymologising on common nouns in Catullus', *Emerita* 67, 127–45
Michalopoulos, A. N. 2001: *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's* Metamorphoses*: a Commented Lexicon*, Leeds
Miles, S. forthcoming: *Strattis, Tragedy, and Comedy* unpub. PhD dissertation, Nottingham University
Morgan, M. G. 1974: 'Ipsithilla or Ipsicilla? Catullus, c. 32 again', *Glotta* 52, 233–6
Mynors, R. A. B. 1958: *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, Oxford
Nagy, G. 1979: *The Best of the Achaeans*, Baltimore
Nappa, C. 1999: 'Catullus 59: Rufa among the graves', *Classical Philology* 94, 329–35
Neudling, C. L. 1955: *A Prosopography to Catullus*, Oxford
Newman, J. K. 1990: *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility*, Hildesheim
Nisbet, R. G. M. 1961: *In L. Pisonem Oratio*, Oxford
Nisbet, R. G. M. 1995: *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*, Oxford
Opelt, I. 1965: *Die Lateinischen Schimpfwoerter und Verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen*, Heidelberg
Parker, H. N. 2000: 'Flaccus', *Classical Quarterly* 50, 455–62
Pedrick, V. 1993: 'The abusive address and the audience in Catullan poems', *Helios* 20.2, 173–96
Quinn, K. 1973: *Catullus: The Poems*, Bristol
Randall, J. G. 1979: 'Mistresses' pseudonyms in Latin elegy', *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 4, 27–35
Rankin, H. D. 1976: 'Catullus and incest', *Eranos* 74, 113–21
Richlin, A. 1983: *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, New Haven/London
Rosen, R. M. 1988a: *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*, APA American Classical Studies 19, Atlanta
Rosen, R. M. 1988b: 'Hipponax, Boupalos, and the conventions of the Psogos', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 118, 29–41

Rudd, N. 1960: 'The names in Horace's *Satires*', *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 10.2, 161–78
Scott, W. C. 1969: 'Catullus and Cato (c. 56)', *Classical Philology* 64.1, 24–9
Skinner, M. B. 1993: 'Perillus at Tomis', in H. D. Jocelyn (ed.), *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent*, Liverpool Classical Papers 3, Liverpool, 301–10
Skinner, M. B. 1997: 'Introduction: *Quod multo fit aliter in Graecia* …', in J. P. Hallett and M. B. Skinner (eds), *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton, 3–25
Skinner, M. B. 2003: *Catullus in Verona: a Reading of the Elegaic* Libellus, *Poems 65–116*, Columbus
Snyder, J. M. 1978: 'The significant name in Lucretius', *Classical World* 72, 227–30
Spies, A. 1930: *Militat omnis amans. Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik*, unpub. dissertation, University of Tübingen
Stehle, E. 1999: Review of D. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (1997), in *Phoenix* 53, 163–6
Stroh, W. 1979: 'Ovids Liebeskunst und die Ehegesetze des Augustus', *Gymnasium* 86, 323–52
Syme, R. 1939: *The Roman Revolution*, London
Syndikus, H. P. 1990: *Catull: eine Interpretation*, (3 vols), Darmstadt
Usener, H. 1901: 'Italische Volksjustiz', *Rheinisches Museum* 56, 1–28
Watson, L. C. 1995: 'Horace's *Epodes*: the impotence of iambos?' in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace. A Bimillenary Celebration*, Oxford, 188–202
West, M. L. 1974: *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin
Williams, C. A. 2010: *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity* (2nd edn), New York/Oxford
Wiseman, T. P. 1985: *Catullus and his World: a Reappraisal*, Cambridge
Wray, D. 2001: *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*, Cambridge