NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

EGNATIUS' DENTAL FRICATIVES (CATULLUS 39.20)

There are, to speak in gross terms, two reasons why a poet might repeat one or more sounds and thereby highlight some phonetic feature. One possibility is that he or she is striving to make the poem a "work of art,"[1] for which a tried and true technique in the poet's arsenal is the manipulation, whether conscious or not, of these smallest units of speech.[2] Examples abound in every language, but from Latin we may take, for instance, the homoeoteleuton/rhyming scheme (horizontal and then vertical) at the very beginning of Catullus' poem 1, the dedication to Cornelius Nepos, which (whatever one may think in general about the ordering of the Catullan corpus as it has come down to us) surely did stand at the head of at least some collection that Catullus himself put together: *Cui dono lepidum novum libellum / . . . expolitum / . . . solebas / . . . nugas* (1–4).[3] The other possibility is that he or she is striving to imitate, or at least create an association with, certain sounds in the "real world" that are known to the audience, for example, the mispronunciations of foreigners. To take the most obvious example from Catullus, there is the matter of Arrius' un-Roman (?), or at any rate nonstandard, aspirates in poem 84: *Chommoda* (1) . . . *hinsidias* (2, 4) . . . *Hionios* (12).[4] Needless to say, the two reasons are not mutually exclusive, and in fact, the success of poem 84 rests to a certain degree on the artful ring composition of "wrong h-aitches": *Chommoda* is the very first word of the poem, *Hionios* is the very last (and it is all the more brilliant a conclusion since there have been no misaspirations since line 4).[5] In this paper, I suggest another, hitherto unnoticed, example of ethnic phonetic play in Catullus.[6] I contend that in poem 39, which treats Egnatius' non-Roman practice of dental hygiene, the threefold repetition of the cluster [st] in the penultimate line, *ut, quo iste vester expolitior dens est* (20), is iconic of Egnatius'

1. Compare the memorable phrase of Roman Jakobson, "Poetics deals primarily with the question, *What makes a verbal message a work of art?*" (1960, 350).

2. For the question of "subliminal verbal patterning" as applied to Latin, and specifically Catullan, poetry, see Vine 1989, esp. 95, with particular reference to Jakobson.

3. See, e.g., Deutsch 1939, 166–67; Herescu 1960, 169; Guggenheimer 1970, 194; Guggenheimer 1972, 15–16 and also 186, 191, and 197–98; and Ferguson 1985, 6.

4. I do not have an opinion on the vexed question of exactly where Arrius and his family are supposed to have come from. (Arrius is usually thought to be the tiresome orator Q. Arrius mentioned in Cic. *Brut.* 242–43; see especially Marshall and Baker 1975.) Fordyce 1961, 373–75, has a good discussion, and see also Kortekaas 1969.

5. Compare Quinn 1973, 419. The most recent and best study of the sounds of this poem is Vandiver 1990, who points out additional phonetic play with [s]: "the frequency in poem 84 of the hissing sound of the letter *s* reinforced Catullus' portrayal of Arrius' 'blast of aspirates'" (338); see also Thomson 1997, 512.

6. "Catullus was not unfamiliar with the ethnic/dialect joke": thus, Weiss 1996, 358, whose analysis of *salaputium disertum* suggests that the "joke in 53 turns on the conflict between substandard pronunciation of a (probably) rustic word and the fine literary appreciation shown by the content of the compliment."

activity (dental frication) and at the same time specifically marks him out as Celtibe-
rian (there is, as I shall show, other evidence that the Romans associated the cluster
[st] and the word *iste* itself with Celts).[7]

Unlike lexical repetition, which has recently been treated in exemplary fashion by
Wills 1996, phonetic repetition in Latin has not received as much attention as it
deserves (the exception is Guggenheimer 1972, which has been strangely neglected
in subsequent scholarship).[8] In the case of Catullus, too, scholars have commented
extensively on the poet's extraordinary fondness for repeating individual words, while
paying less attention to the repetition of sounds, apart from alliteration.[9] Thus, for
example, everybody realizes that poem 39 relies to some extent on lexical repetition:
#*renidet* (2), #*renidet ille* (4, 6), *renidet* (7), and *renidere* (15) combine to make the
reader as tired of Egnatius as Catullus himself is.[10] By contrast, almost nobody has
noticed the recurrence, especially in line 20, of the sound [st], a feature whose poetic
function is far less obvious.[11]

Let us consider the two sounds [s] and [t]. In phonetic terms, these are respec-
tively a voiceless dental/alveolar fricative and a voiceless dental/alveolar stop. Each
is produced by (1) placing the tip of the tongue against or very near to the teeth (or,
very slightly further back in the mouth, on the alveolar ridge); (2) pushing air
through the vocal tract without letting the vocal cords vibrate; and (3) either forcing
the air through a narrow constriction (in the case of [s]) or literally stopping it be-
hind the tongue (in the case of [t], a sound that cannot be produced until the con-
striction is released). The sequence [st] is thus a happy match: the [s] becomes a [t],
as it were, as the tongue moves a matter of millimeters from very near the teeth to
right up against them. Now, in most dialects of English (and in many other languages
the world over), [s] and [t] are alveolar rather than strictly dental. In Latin, however,
it is quite certain that [t] was pronounced with the tongue actually against the teeth,
and while [s] may on its own have been alveolar, it is likely that in the cluster [st],
the [s] became denti-alveolar in anticipation of the point of articulation of the fol-
lowing stop. The evidence for the pronunciation of Latin [t] comes from our knowl-
edge of the Romance languages, where "true dental articulation (as, for example, in
French)" is the norm (thus, Allen 1978, 13), and also from the words of the Latin
grammarians themselves. The testimonies of Terentianus Maurus ("*T*, qua superis

7. I see no reason to doubt that the real-life Egnatius (perhaps the same Egnatius who composed a poem
De rerum natura of which we have two small fragments, preserved by Macrobius), like the Catullan charac-
ter, was in fact a Spaniard or of Spanish background (though his name is Samnite); see, however, Syndikus
1984, p. 212, with n.17 and also p. 221. At the very least, he must have had certain features or tics that Ca-
tullus could plausibly have described as Hispanic.

8. For brief comments on "sound allusion" (intertextuality rather than the repetition of some phonetic
feature within a given poem), see Wills 1996, 19 and the references in the Index, s.v. "sound allusion."

9. For lexical repetition, see Facchini Tosi 1983, 69–88 and the many references cited therein; for allit-
eration, see especially Ronconi 1953, 9–106, and Ronconi 1971, 11–86 (Ronconi 1971 is a revision of Ron-
coni 1953, but, curiously, without the excursus "Allitterazione e ritmo"). Perhaps the most virtuosically
"repetitious" poem in the Catullan corpus, 64, is the main subject of a subsection of Wills 1996, "The Impact
of Catullus" (130–45), where the author notes that this poem "dominates the early history of Latin epana-
lepsis" (131); for complementary remarks on other sorts of repetitions in this poem, see, e.g., Guggenheimer
1970, 193; Guggenheimer 1972, 151, 188–90, 196–97, 212–14, and 216–21; and Vine 1989, 88–90.

10. Compare Quinn 1973 ad 39.1–8. I cannot agree with this same scholar in his assessment that Catul-
lus' attempt in poem 39 "to transform prose statement by the structural force of repetition (e.g. the *renidet
ille*, repeated at the same position in the line, the parallel *cum* clauses) somehow fails" (Quinn 1969, 64).

11. For the observation of Ferguson 1985, 115, that four of the poem's twenty-one lines end in *est* (2, 6,
16, 20), see p. 341 below.

dentibus intima est origo, / summa satis est ad sonitum ferire lingua," 6.331.202–3 Keil), Marius Victorinus ("quotiens autem sublimata [sc. lingua] partem, qua superis dentibus est origo, contigerit, *t* sonore uocis explicabit," 6.33.27–28 Keil), and Martianus Capella ("*T* appulsu linguae dentibusque impulsis extunditur," 3.261) are not as clear as we might wish, but it is obvious that the teeth play a crucial role.[12] For [s], Terentianus Maurus and Marius Victorinus agree that it is pronounced somewhere behind the teeth (*pone dentes,* 6.332.242 and 6.34.18 Keil, respectively), and Martianus Capella 3.261 writes simply, S *sibilum facit dentibus verberatis.*[13] It is thus clear that the grammarians basically associated [s] with the teeth, and the fact remains that the process of anticipatory assimilation strongly suggests that an [s] pronounced just before a [t] was "more dental" than one that was not.[14]

The terms *dentalis* (whence *dental*) and *fricativus* (whence *fricative*) are not part of the Classical Latin language, showing up respectively only in medieval times and in Neo-Latin.[15] Nevertheless, it seems obvious that not just grammarians, but surely every Roman who gave the matter thought—and especially a sophisticated poet like Catullus—conceived of [s] and [t] as "dental," and it is hardly difficult to imagine that the production of the sound [s] and the noise associated with this sibilant might be described as "rubbing (the teeth)."[16] With this in mind, let us return now to Catullus' portrait of Egnatius, in both poem 39 and poem 37 ("Salax Taberna"). Not only is he one of Lesbia's lovers, but he allegedly makes his teeth gleam by rubbing them with urine,[17] a revolting (to Roman sensibilities) substitute for "tooth powder," a substance known in Rome as *dentifricium* (attested from Pliny the Elder and borrowed into English as *dentifrice*).[18] If the compound *dentifricium* is taken apart, we have the two words *dens* and *(de) fricare,* and it is precisely these two words that are crucial to the description of Egnatius and his teeth-rubbing in both poems: *dentem . . .*

12. See Allen 1978, 13–14, 20–21, and 95 (quotation from Terentianus Maurus) for an incisive discussion of the problems involved; see also Allen 1981, 120–21. Sturtevant 1940, 170–71, provides a fuller text of all three passages, along with translations into English.

13. See Sturtevant 1940, 160, and Allen 1978, 35.

14. Diachronically and synchronically, Latin shows both anticipatory and perseverant assimilation, but the former is considerably more common, and when what is assimilated is the place of articulation, then the assimilation is always anticipatory (see, e.g., Niedermann 1953, 138, 151, and passim).

15. On *dentalis,* see explicitly Allen 1981, 121: "Whilst it is clear that the Greeks recognised the distinction of three places of articulation for the plosives—labial, dental, and velar—, they never devised, as did the Indians, a simple terminology for these. . . . Not even in the Latin grammarians do we anywhere encounter such terms as '*dentalis*', '*labialis*', corresponding to the Sanskrit *dantya,* and so on; our own terminology here is of recent creation." According to *OED*^{2}, the first use in English of the word *dental,* in 1594, is in a phonetic context; *fricative* is attested only from 1860. I ignore here the Classical Latin word *dentale* (neuter of *dentalis*) 'sole or share beam of a plough'.

16. As Dionysius of Halicarnassus writes (*Comp.* 14.80): ἄχαρι δὲ καὶ ἀηδὲς τὸ σ καὶ πλεονάσαν σφόδρα λυπεῖ ("σ is neither charming nor pleasant and is very offensive when used to excess" [Loeb translation of S. Usher]). Cross-culturally, [s] is associated, among other things, with hissing and harshness, and there is ample evidence that, despite its heavy functional load in both Greek and Latin, many Classical poets tried to some extent to limit its use. For Greek, see most notably Clayman 1987; the Latin evidence is neither as well known nor, it would seem, as clear, but for brief comments from the perspective of Rome, see, e.g., Wilkinson 1963, 9–11, 13–14, 54, and 62 (compare also Wilkinson 1942, 130, a response to O. J. Todd's skeptical article of the same year [33–34 on the repetition of [s] in Latin]); Herescu 1960, 37–38; and Maurach 1995, 211–12.

17. As is well known, both Diodorus Siculus (5.33.5) and Strabo (3.4.16) report that urine was indeed used as toothpaste in Spain.

18. See Plin. *HN* 28.178–82, as well as 1.36, 29.46, 30.22, 31.117, 32.65 and 82, and 36.153 and 156. For a brief overview of Roman dental hygiene, see Hurschmann 1999, cols. 627–28.

defricare (39.19, part of the punch line)[19] picks up *dens . . . defricatus* (37.20, the final line),[20] and in poem 39, we find also *dentes#* (1), *dentatus#* (12), *dentes#* (14), and *dens* (20).[21]

There are few consonant clusters in Latin that could more aptly be referred to with the term "dental frication" than [st],[22] and I suggest that it is for this very reason that Catullus in the dénouement of poem 39 repeats this sequence with unparalleled intensity: *ut, quo iste vester expolitior dens est* is iconic of the habit of Egnatius that is being described,[23] and the reader (perhaps even more the hearer) gets the impression that this Celtiberian is so concerned with polishing his teeth that he even scours their back side with ugly sounds.[24] Indeed, the phonetic joke is set up already at the beginning of the poem and propelled along through the repetition of *est,* as well as its anagram *-tes: dentes#* (1), *est#* (2), *est . . . est#* (6), *est* (9), *dentes#* (14), *est#* (16), and finally *dens est#* (20, effectively mirroring the end of both line 1 and line 2). The multiple line-final repetition of *est* is noted already by Ferguson 1985, 115, who writes that "[t]his sort of rhyming effect is contrived for a purpose." I hope in the preceding to have explained at least part of that purpose.[25]

It may be possible, in light of my remarks, to consider from a new perspective a famous grammatical problem in Catullus 39.20. Along with Catullus 99.6, Ovid *Amores* 2.16.24, and [Seneca] *Hercules Oetaeus* 1513, this line is one of four instances in Latin literature in which *vester* seems to have a singular reference, that is, be equivalent to *tuus*. In a classic article on this matter, in which he specifically isolates these four passages, A. E. Housman writes with his customary archness that it is nonsensical to understand *vester dens* as *vestrum Hiberorum dens* (Housman 1909, 245):

19. It is generally agreed that Apuleius' memory is at fault when he quotes the Catullan line with the verb *pumicare* instead of *defricare* (*Apol.* 6); see, e.g., Syndikus 1984, p. 221, n. 18, who refers to Ov. *Ars am.* 3.216 (*nec coram dentes defricuisse probem*).

20. Or vice versa, if the composition of 39 should precede that of 37. I do not see how it is possible to decide: the argument of Quinn 1973, 208–9, in favor of 39's coming first seems to me quite reasonable (compare also Ferguson 1985, 112 and esp. 115), but see most recently Dettmer 1997, 74–76, and Thomson 1997 ad 39.1.

21. Poems 37 and 39, both in the choliambic meter, are further linked by the fact that the final lines of each contain three words found in the Catullan corpus only here: the personal name *Egnatius*, the toponym *Celtiberia*, and most notably a form of the verb *defricare* (see, e.g., Stoessl 1977, 100 and 107).

22. Compare Marouzeau 1946, 28–29, who writes, "L's est fréquemment combinée . . . avec des *t*, pour rendre un bruit aigu" (28).

23. As far as I can tell, this is the only line in Catullus with three word-internal instances of [st]. In itself, this is not necessarily significant—given that Catullan lines are of variable length and that the most common word in the language, *est,* contains this sequence and is often repeated (e.g., 62.61–64 [six times])—and I do not mean to imply anything about other clusterings of [st] in Catullus: rote counting can take one only so far unless the context, too, is taken into account (compare the salutary comments of Herescu 1960, 207–9). Similar to 39.20 is 31.11 (*est . . . est . . . laboribus tantis* [+ *venusta* in line 12]); compare also 3.14–15, 34.14–16, 64.126–28, 64.399–400, 68.14–15, and 68.112–13, as well as the remark of Guggenheimer 1970, 189, and Guggenheimer 1972, 193, that in poems 14 and 28, "the acoustic set *-ist-* . . . is used near extremities." The poem with the highest concentration of [st]'s (not once with *est!*) is 77, whose artful repetition of sounds and words is well known (see, e.g., Ferguson 1985, 259, and Thomson 1997, 504): ten instances of word-internal [st] in six lines (1 *frustra,* 2 *frustra,* 3 *subrepsti . . . intestina,* 4 *eripuisti . . . nostra,* 5 *eripuisti . . . nostrae,* 6 *nostrae pestis*). The highest concentration of both [s]'s and [t]'s is probably found in poem 7.

24. Note that there are two more dental fricatives in the crucial line: *expolitior* and *dens.*

25. I would not wish to read more into the other [s]'s and [t]'s throughout the poem except, perhaps, in the case of line 19: *dentem atque russam defricare gingivam.* As commentators note, *russus* 'ruddy' is a rare word (see, e.g., Fordyce 1961 and Quinn 1973, both ad loc.), and it seems reasonable to suppose that one of the reasons Catullus chose it rather than *ruber* or *rufus* was to stress Egnatius' dental frication.

It is impossible that the details of a man's personal toilet should affect the colour of his countrymen's teeth. The teeth whose whiteness proved Egnatius "bibisse lotium" were the private property of Egnatius, and no more belonged to any other Celtiberian than they belonged to the king of the Parthians. I never heard but of three persons to any one of whom the words *uester dens* could be addressed in any other sense than *tuus dens:* their names were Enyo, Pephredo, and Dino.

From a strictly logical point of view, Housman's argument can hardly be denied, but it seems to me, and to many others, that logic may not be the primary factor here (compare, e.g., Postgate 1919, 97). The full punch line of poem 39, the final five lines (17–21), reads:

nunc Celtiber ⟨es⟩: Celtiberia in terra,
quod quisque minxit, hoc sibi solet mane
dentem atque russam defricare gingivam,
ut, quo iste vester expolitior dens est,   20
hoc te amplius bibisse praedicet loti.

The fact that before line 20 the talk is about both the Celtiberian population in general and Egnatius in particular makes it especially easy to interpret line 20 to mean "the more polished is the collective tooth of you Celtiberians,"[26] or at least to view the combination of *iste* (easily understandable as referring just to the singular object of Catullus' scorn) and *vester* (referring to all nasty, urine-gargling Spaniards) as a context-induced cross. Note that *iste vester* + BODY PART is a Catullan collocation, found also at 29.13: *ut ista vestra diffututa mentula.*[27] I have neither the gumption nor the will to argue against Housman in the other three cases.[28] I agree that, on balance, the evidence does favor the view that *vester* in the meaning *tuus* is good Classical Latin, if only marginally so; given that the use of a second-person plural pronoun as a singular honorific is cross-linguistically very common, it is perfectly possible that anyone could come up with the idea of using *vester* in this way and that we are therefore dealing with a nonce usage. Still, the distribution is peculiar: two examples in Catullus (only one if 39.20 is eliminated),[29] one

26. Thus, now, S. J. Heyworth, in Harrison and Heyworth 1998, 94. Heyworth tempers his remark by suggesting, tentatively and too daringly for my taste, that in line 21, "[o]ne might try *uos* for *hoc te:* 'the more urine it reveals you collectively to have drunk'; the correlating *hoc,* omitted by the author as Latin idiom allows, has been supplied by a reader, and driven out the correct pronoun."

27. Compare Heyworth, in Harrison and Heyworth 1998, 94. It should be pointed out that *vestra* in 29.13 is not at first glance totally obvious either, though commentators generally agree that "the plural, as in *fouetis* (21), refers to Caesar and Pompey, though Pompey is not explicitly addressed until l. 24" (thus, Fordyce 1961 ad loc.).

28. Other examples of singular *vester* are occasionally adduced (see most notably Postgate 1919), though most scholars since have simply cited Housman's foursome; *OLD,* for example, lists just these, s.v. *uester* 2c ("app. w. ref. to a single person, etc., unless some vaguely defined associated group is included"). Note that Housman ends his article by noncommittally mentioning that *vester* might mean *tuus* in two further passages (including Catull. 71.3) and by more or less rejecting a couple of *variae lectiones* that would lead to such an interpretation.

29. Compare the discussion in Fordyce 1961 ad 39.20. I am not particularly impressed by the attempt of many scholars to explain away *vestrae . . . saevitiae* at 99.6 as meaning "that *saeuitia* which is characteristic of young men like you" (thus, Quinn 1973 ad loc.); the idea of Heyworth, in Harrison and Heyworth 1998, p. 94, n. 17, that "one might think of reading, e.g., *taetrae; tibi* [in line 5] already supplies a second person" is in my opinion unpersuasive. Thomson's 1997 edition of Catullus is particularly open to the notion that there are other instances of *vester* for *tuus,* most notably at 55.22 and also 68.151; see his notes ad locc., as well as ad 29.13, 39.20, 64.160, 71.3, and 99.6. It is worth noting that in all the Catullan passages just cited, there is some manuscript support for forms of *noster* instead, except at 99.6.

in Ovid,[30] and one in pseudo-Seneca.[31] It can hardly be accidental that all four alleged examples of *vester* for *tuus* are in poetry, not prose, and I suggest that in Catullus 39.20, it is motivated at least in part by a specific consideration, namely the poet's desire to repeat the cluster [st] in adjacent words.

So far, I have argued on purely poetic grounds that the repetition of [st] in Catullus 39 is important. In what follows, I aim to bolster this argument by briefly considering questions of ethnography and linguistics. In my view, the fact that Egnatius is a Celt makes Catullus' play on this cluster even more interesting. The Celts with whom the Romans had the most contact were, of course, the Gauls (note that Catullus himself was born in Verona, in Cisalpine Gaul), and it will be useful to think first about the Gaulish language, and Roman reactions to it, before turning to Celtiberian speech.

To those who study the Continental Celtic languages, of which Gaulish is obviously one, few features are more conspicuous than what is conventionally referred to as "tau Gallicum." In brief, this designation covers an extraordinary variety of graphemes, including the Greek-derived ⟨Θ⟩ and ⟨ΘΘ⟩ and the more Roman ⟨Đ⟩, ⟨ĐĐ⟩, ⟨S⟩, and ⟨SS⟩, for a "dental affricate or dental fricative or sibilant in Gaulish arising from combinations of dentals, from *st, ds,* and *ts.*"[32] Far and away the most common view of the synchronic status of this sound is that it is the voiceless dental affricate [ts] (or something very much like it),[33] and I believe that this is correct.[34] We unfortunately do not possess any native Gaulish reflections on phonology, but one reason to think that "tau Gallicum" represents a sound that has both a [t]- and an [s]-component is the Roman parody of (presumably) Gaulish rhetoric in [Vergil] *Catalepton* 2, which happens to be the sole ancient source for the modern term "tau Gallicum":

> Corinthiorum amator iste verborum,
> iste, iste rhetor, †namque quatenus† totus
> Thucydides, tyrannus Atticae febris,
> tau Gallicum, min et sphin ut male illisit,
> ista omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.[35]

The text is horribly corrupt,[36] and with one exception (noted below), I have printed it as it appears, with an enormous apparatus, in the 1966 Oxford Classical Text of

---

30. I am sympathetic to the comment of Fordyce 1961 ad Catull. 39.20 that "if *uester* was interchangeable with *tuus,* it is almost incredible that Ovid resorted to this expedient only once." Goold 1965, 41–42, has a clever way to explain the possessive in Ovid's *vestros, curva Malea, sinus* (*Am.* 2.16.24) as a plural—but can he be right? Booth 1991 ad loc. does not really think so, but McKeown 1998 ad 2.16.23–24 is inclined to agree with Goold or find some other way to understand *vestros* here.

31. I am not aware of any comments specifically on [Sen.] *Hercules Oetaeus* 1513 aside from Postgate 1919, 94–95: "*uester comes* means 'accompanying you *and* all your celestial train'" (95). Zwierlein 1986, 411, simply cites Housman.

32. Thus, Evans 1967, 410–11. The discussion of "tau Gallicum" on pp. 410–20 of Evans' book is the most detailed account of the matter.

33. See Watkins 1955, 15, and numerous scholars since (e.g., Lambert 1994, 44, the most comprehensive recent treatment of the Gaulish language).

34. The fullest discussion is to be found in Eska 1998; note, though, that Eska doubts that "tau Gallicum" represents [ts].

35. The other, limited, evidence for a Celtic "tau" is collected in Evans 1967, 420, who cites Ausonius and Gregory of Tours. Ausonius in his *Technopaegnion* refers to the *Catalepton,* writing, "dic quid significent Catalepta Maronis: in his *al* / Celtarum posuit, sequitur non lucidius *tau,* / et quod germano mixtum male letiferum *min*" (15.5–7 Green = 13.5–7 Di Giovine). For discussion of what exactly this might mean, see Green 1991, 595, and Di Giovine 1996, 232–37.

36. Note, for example, that the version of the poem preserved for us by Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.3.28) is rather different.

J. A. Richmond.[37] The gist of the tirade (in choliambics, like Catull. 37 and 39[38]) is reasonably clear, however, if somewhat bizarre: it is directed against T. Annius Cimber, a rhetorician and friend of Antony who is said to have poisoned his brother and who—crucially for our purposes—aspired to the pure Attic speech of Thucydides (his father Lysidicus seems to have been a Greek freedman; compare Cic. *Phil.* 11.14), but still appears to have spoken with a Celtic accent.[39] Now, the most striking rhetorical feature of the poem is its insistence on the cluster [st], and I am in complete agreement with Frank 1935, 255–56, that this repetition is meant as a mockery of Celtic speech: as my underlinings show, [st] is attested five times (perhaps only four: Richmond favors *ita omnia ista verba*[40]) in as many lines, and invariably in a form of the pronoun *iste*.[41] Frank, discussing the connection between the "tau Gallicum" and all the *iste*'s in the poem, writes of the poet (whom he calls Vergil) that he "lived long enough in the Po region to know the difficulties that some Celts had in attempting to pronounce intervocalic *st*. . . . Cimber's brogue as well as his style was a standing joke. I venture to suggest that Vergil meant the readers who knew Cimber to pronounce the words *iθe, iθe rhetor,* in imitation of Cimber's manner of speech."[42] In other words, Cimber presumably pronounced the un-Gaulish cluster [st] as though it were the sound represented by a "tau Gallicum," which Frank thought was something like a lisp (thus, [θ]), but which, as mentioned above, is now generally considered to have been the un-Roman (and cross-linguistically frequently despised) cluster or affricate [ts].[43] The crucial fact to glean from the second *Catalepton* is that Romans knew that Celts spoke "funny" and that having a Gaul attempt to say [st] over and over was a particularly good way to get a laugh.[44]

The joke may have a morphological as well as a phonological component. Although geminated demonstratives are not particularly rare in Latin, they also are not very common, especially without an intervening word (i.e., *iste, iste rhetor* is rather

37. The standard commentary on the poem is Westendorp Boerma 1949, 18–40 (conspectus of earlier literature on pp. 18–19); see also Buchheit 1970 and Götte and Götte 1970, 612–15.

38. It is in fact possible that the author of the second *Catalepton* was directly influenced by Catull. 39. For the close relationship between the *Catalepton* and the poems of Catullus, see Westendorp Boerma 1958, 53–54 (with special reference to P. Sommer), who compares the spirit of *Catal.* 2 to that of Catull. 84 (see also Westendorp Boerma 1949, p. 36, n. 2, as well as p. 40).

39. See especially Frank 1935, 254, who refers to N. W. De Witt. Frank goes so far as to suggest that Cimber "claimed descent from some Celtic chieftain; hence the adjective Britannus." (Quintilian's version of the poem [see n. 36 above] has the line *Thucydides Britannus, Atticae febres;* see Richmond's apparatus.) The cognomen *Cimber* would, of course, imply rather a Germanic association, but note that the Cimbri were sometimes mistakenly believed to be Celts (see especially Diod. Sic. 5.32.1–5).

40. The apparatus reads "ita *BH, codd. Quint.:* ista *AR (cf. ad* V 1 ite)." (The beginning of the fifth *Catalepton* is *Ite hinc, inanes, ite, rhetorum ampullae;* the opening *ite* appears as *iste* in *H.*) Frank 1935, p. 254, n. 1 and p. 255, with n. 5, favors *ista:* "Since Vergil is so insistent in repeating *iste—ista,* this reading is probable, giving us one more iteration of the *st*" (p. 255, n. 5); see also Westendorp Boerma 1949, 18, 31, and 39–40.

41. Note also *quatenus totus / Thucydides, tyrannus* (2–3), *febris, / tau* (3–4), and *illisit* (or *sit,* if we read *et "male illi sit,"* 4), as well as *et sphin* (4).

42. Frank 1935, 255–56. Compare already Buecheler 1883, 508, and Galletier 1920, 154.

43. Compare Watkins 1955, 15: "The simplest interpretation [of Cimber's speech] is that [st] is replaced by [ts]." It is striking that almost no examples of [st] show up in attested Gaulish (see Schrijver 1995, 402–3) and, conversely, that the only Latin word with [ts] is *etsi* (itself obviously a combination of *et* and *si*). Tsur 1992, vii and esp. 65–66, comments on the status of two "especially 'ugly' sounds," one of them the affricate /ts/, noting that they are "rare in the world's languages and . . . frequently express disgust, contempt, or disapproval; some French find them, indeed, extremely displeasing in foreign languages and poems" (65).

44. For a different interpretation, see Killeen 1974 and O'Sullivan 1986, 496–98, who maintain that the reference to *tau Gallicum* has to do with Cimber's difficulty with pronouncing the Greek sound [tʰ] (i.e., ⟨θ⟩).

more peculiar than *ista omnia ista verba*).[45] It is worth pointing out, then, that the one Indo-European subfamily that delights in geminated or reduplicated pronouns is Celtic, where they have been a prominent feature from Proto-Celtic times up to the present day.[46] Even though nothing quite like *iste, iste* is assuredly present in the current corpus of Gaulish (on Gaulish *ison son* and especially the Celtiberian evidence, see below), I believe that the gemination of the pronoun points as strongly to Cimber's Celticity as the cluster [st] does.

We can finally return to Egnatius and the Celtiberians. What do the Gaulish trouble with [st] and the "tau Gallicum" have to do with Catullus' Spaniard? It goes without saying that the Gauls and Celtiberians are not interchangeable, and their languages, Gaulish and Celtiberian (also known as Hispano-Celtic), are different, too, and not mere dialects. Nevertheless, I think it reasonable to suppose that Catullus meant with his line *ut, quo iste vester expolitior dens est* to parody Egnatius the Celtic speaker as well as Egnatius the Celtic tooth brusher. In the first place, Celts were "barbarians," and it is well known that people in a given culture often gloss over ethnic distinctions, or at least can do so when it suits a purpose: the crucial separation is between "us" (Romans) and "them" (everyone else). The more important point, though, takes into account the fact that when speakers of one language hear another language that they do not know, or know only imperfectly, they latch onto those forms that are structurally akin to, or somehow resemble, words in their own speech. As we have seen, the joke in *Catalepton* 2 relies at least in part on the audience's understanding that Cimber would pronounce *iste* with a Gaulish accent and might even have a tendency to repeat the pronoun (*iste, iste*). In addition, the Romans may have associated the very word *iste* not just with their own language, but also with the speech of Celts of various origins, for the demonstrative stem **isto-* makes an appearance not only in Italic (whence Latin *iste*), but also in Celtic.[47] In Gaulish, we do not find an exact match for *iste*, though the pronoun *ison* ((m./)nt. acc. sg.) and the adverb *isoc* 'so, thus' (both presumably pronounced something like [itso-][48]) are quite close, as also is pronominal *ísos* (m. nom. sg.) in Lepontic (a dialect of Gaulish).[49] Indeed, according to Fleuriot 1976–77, 187, and some other scholars, the sequence *...isonson* on line 10 of the Gaulish inscription of Chamalières (written in *scriptio continua* and famously problematic as regards both reading and interpretation) is to be read as a geminated pronoun, *ison son* (the latter presumably with aphaeresis).[50] Even more remarkable, however, and also certain, is that Celtiberian has the very form *íste* (written ⋈ΛΛ⟁ or i-ś-Te, in the usual

<hr />

45. See Wills 1996, 76–79, who quotes *Catal.* 2.1–2 on p. 78.

46. At issue here are geminated pronouns (a rhetorical device, as in Verg. *Aen.* 9.427 [*me, me . . . in me*]) rather than reduplicated, "emphatic," ones (more or less "normal language," witness the common form *sese*), but there are, of course, affinities between the two. I have discussed reduplicated pronouns in Italic, Celtic, and elsewhere in Indo-European on a number of occasions and send interested readers to the following works. For personal (i.e., first- and second-person and reflexive) pronouns, which are found in reduplicated form in the Indo-European languages almost exclusively in Latin and Celtic (especially the latter), see Katz 1998a, esp. 269–70, and, in greater detail, Katz 1998b, 60–63. As for demonstratives, Schrijver 1997 has discussed these with particular insight; see also Katz 2001.

47. See Eska 1991. (See also Schrijver 1997, 63, who is somewhat hesitant to accept Eska's morphological analysis of the Celtic forms.) This stem seems to be exclusive to these two Indo-European subbranches.

48. Plain (s)/(S) is one of the many spellings of "tau Gallicum"; see p. 343 above.

49. For a summary of the evidence, see Eska 1991, 70, as well as, e.g., Schrijver 1997, 16 and 63.

50. Note that the adverb *isoc* (if this is the correct reading; *tsoc* has been proposed) shows up earlier on the same line. In various publications (see, e.g., Lambert 1994, 67, 151, and esp. 158), Pierre-Yves Lambert

transliteration of Iberian script, and pronounced something like [iste][51]) and that it is attested as a geminate: in the phrase *iste anCioś iśte eśanCioś* '(be) it *anCioś* (or be) it un-*anCioś*' (*Bot.* I, A9),[52] *iśte* seems to be a fossilized deictic particle whose function resembles that of the Latin word with which it is effectively homophonous, namely *iste*.[53] Therefore, it may well be the case that when Catullus employs *iste* in the phonetically charged line 20 of poem 39, he is doing so with the knowledge that this gives the poem a special Celtiberian touch.

In his magisterial book on repetition in Latin poetry, Wills 1996, 3, writes that "[f]or our purposes, repetition is a clean, formal feature; it has the advantage of possessing little or no semantic value." That this is often the case is beyond doubt. Nevertheless, I hope in this paper to have described how phonological repetition can in fact have a great deal of meaning. In my opinion, Catullus contrives to repeat the cluster [st] three times in 39.20 (a goal he achieves, among other things, by means of the unorthodox use of *vester* for *tuus*) in order to emphasize the main theme of the poem, dentifrication. In addition, this repetition is surely related to the recurrence of *iste* in [Vergil] *Catalepton* 2, our best evidence for Roman awareness of particularities of Celtic speech; the fact that [iste] is part of the Celtiberian vocabulary, too, may have influenced Catullus' choice of this pronoun. I thus conclude that the phonetic repetition in this Catullan line not only serves an artistic purpose, but has an ethnographic dimension as well.

JOSHUA T. KATZ
Princeton University

LITERATURE CITED

Allen, W. S. 1978. *Vox Latina: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin.* 2d ed. Cambridge.
———. 1981. The Greek Contribution to the History of Phonetics. In *Towards a History of Phonetics,* ed. R. E. Asher and E. J. A. Henderson, 115–22. Edinburgh.
Booth, J. 1991. *Ovid: The Second Book of "Amores."* Warminster, England.

---

has argued for a completely different segmentation and analysis (*rissuis onson* 'à nous devant vous (??)'), but even if it should turn out that we must not read *ison son* 'cela . . . cela', with Fleuriot, Lambert's idea is untenable (see, e.g., Katz 1998a, pp. 277–78, n. 60, and Katz 1998b, p. 87, n. 92). It is not clear whether *son* really is the aphaeretized version of *ison* (compare Celtiberian *śtam* [fem. acc. sg.] and perhaps also *śtena* [nt. acc. pl.] alongside the "full" form *iśte,* discussed immediately below in the text [see Eska 1991, who follows M. Lejeune]; on pronominal aphaeresis more generally, both in Celtic and elsewhere, see Katz 1998a and Katz 1998b, passim); it could simply be a form of the stem **so-* (as in Greek ὁ and Old Latin *sa-psa*).

51. It is thus clear that Celtiberian, unlike Gaulish, does have the cluster [st]; see, e.g., Schrijver 1995, 403, with references. Note that recent work by Francisco Villar has demonstrated that the sign ⋀, conventionally rendered ⟨ś⟩, and the sign ϟ, conventionally rendered ⟨s⟩, were pronounced [s] and [z], respectively (see Villar 1995a, 17–82, and 1995b). It is therefore now increasingly common to see ⟨s⟩ used for ⋀ and ⟨z⟩ for ϟ. In the present paper, I have thought it useful, however, to retain old-style *iśte* for the Celtiberian pronoun so as to avoid any possible confusion with Latin *iste*.

52. The text in question, the so-called "first" inscription of Botorrita (a second- or first-century B.C.E. bronze tablet discovered in 1970 in Botorrita, the ancient town of Contrebia Belaisca), has received two book-length treatments: Eska 1989b and Meid 1993. The meaning of (*eś*)*anCioś* is unclear (see Meid 1993, 60 and 83–84); Eska 1989b, 23, translates the passage "whether it be large or small."

53. See Eska 1989a, as well as Eska 1989b, 71–72 and 165, and Eska 1991; see also Meid 1993, 97.

Buchheit, V. 1970. Literarische Kritik an T. Annius Cimber (Verg. *Catal.* 2), Cicero (Cat. c. 49) und Sestius (Cat. c. 44). In *Forschungen zur römischen Literatur: Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Karl Büchner,* ed. W. Wimmel, 37–45. Wiesbaden.

Buecheler, F. 1883. *Catalepton. RhM* 38:507–25. Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften,* vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1927), 500–515.

Clayman, D. L. 1987. Sigmatism in Greek Poetry. *TAPhA* 117:69–84.

Dettmer, H. 1997. *Love by the Numbers: Form and Meaning in the Poetry of Catullus.* New York.

Deutsch, R. E. 1939. The Pattern of Sound in Lucretius. Ph.D. diss., Bryn Mawr College.

Di Giovine, C. 1996. *Decimus Magnus Ausonius: "Technopaegnion."* Bologna.

Eska, J. F. 1989a. Italic *e/iste,* Hispano-Celtic *isTe. Emerita* 57:317–23.

————. 1989b. *Towards an Interpretation of the Hispano-Celtic Inscription of Botorrita.* Innsbruck.

————. 1991. The Demonstrative Stem **isto-* in Continental Celtic. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 44:70–73.

————. 1998. *Tau Gallicum. Studia Celtica* 32:115–27.

Evans, D. E. 1967. *Gaulish Personal Names: A Study of Some Continental Celtic Formations.* Oxford.

Facchini Tosi, C. 1983. *La ripetizione lessicale nei poeti latini: vent'anni di studi (1960–1980).* Bologna.

Ferguson, J. 1985. *Catullus.* Lawrence, KS.

Fleuriot, L. 1976–77. Le Vocabulaire de l'inscription gauloise de Chamalières. *EC* 15:173–90.

Fordyce, C. J. 1961. *Catullus.* Oxford.

Frank, T. 1935. *Tau Gallicum,* Vergil, *Catalepton* II, 4. *AJPh* 56:254–56.

Galletier, E. 1920. *(P. Vergili Maronis) Epigrammata et priapea: Édition critique et explicative.* Paris.

Götte, J. and M. 1970. *Vergil, Landleben: "Bucolica"—"Georgica"—"Catalepton."* Würzburg.

Goold, G. P. 1965. *Amatoria critica. HSPh* 69:1–107.

Green, R. P. H. 1991. *The Works of Ausonius.* Oxford.

Guggenheimer, E. H. 1970. Acoustic Symmetry in Catullus. *Dialectica* 24:185–95.

————. 1972. *Rhyme Effects and Rhyming Figures: A Comparative Study of Sound Repetitions in the Classics with Emphasis on Latin Poetry.* The Hague.

Harrison, S. J. and S. J. Heyworth. 1998. Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Catullus. *PCPhS* 44:85–109.

Herescu, N. I. 1960. *La Poésie latine: Études des structures phoniques.* Paris.

Housman, A. E. 1909. Vester = tuus. *CQ* 3:244–48. Reprinted in *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman,* ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1972), 790–94.

Hurschmann, R. 1999. Körperpflege und Hygiene. In *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike,* ed. H. Cancik and H. Schneider, vol. 6, cols. 627–29. Stuttgart.

Jakobson, R. 1960. Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In *Style in Language,* ed. T. A. Sebeok, 350–77. Cambridge, MA. Reprinted in *Selected Writings,* vol. 3, *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry,* ed. S. Rudy (The Hague, 1981), 18–51.

Katz, J. T. 1998a. Archaische keltische Personalpronomina aus indogermanischer Sicht. In *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen: Akten der X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Innsbruck, 22.–28. September 1996,* ed. W. Meid, 265–91. Innsbruck.

————. 1998b. Topics in Indo-European Personal Pronouns. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University.

————. 2001. Review article of *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles,* by P. Schrijver. *Kratylos* 46. In press.

Killeen, J. F. 1974 [publ. 1975]. Tau Gallicum (Vergil *Catalepton* 2, 4). *Orpheus* 21:57–59.

Kortekaas, G. 1969. Arrius en zijn uitspraak van het Latijn. *Hermeneus* 40:269–86.

Lambert, P.-Y. 1994. *La Langue gauloise: Description linguistique, commentaire d'inscriptions choisies.* Paris.

Marouzeau, J. 1946. *Traité de stylistique latine.* 2d ed. Paris.

Marshall, B. A. and R. J. Baker. 1975. The Aspirations of Q. Arrius. *Historia* 24:220–31.

Maurach, G. 1995. *Lateinische Dichtersprache.* Darmstadt.

McKeown, J. C. 1998. *Ovid: "Amores."* Vol. 3, *A Commentary on Book Two.* Leeds.

Meid, W. 1993. *Die erste Botorrita-Inschrift: Interpretation eines keltiberischen Sprachdenkmals.* Innsbruck.

Niedermann, M. 1953. *Historische Lautlehre des Lateinischen.* 3d ed. Heidelberg.

O'Sullivan, N. 1986. Two Notes on [Vergil] *Catalepton* 2. *CQ* 36:496–501.

Postgate, J. P. 1919. *Voster* and *tuus. Hermathena* 18:91–98.

Quinn, K. 1969. *The Catullan Revolution.* 2d ed. Cambridge.

———. 1973. *Catullus: The Poems.* 2d ed. New York.

Richmond, J. A., ed. 1966. *Priapea* et *Catalepton.* In *Appendix Vergiliana,* ed. W. V. Clausen et al., 127–46. Oxford.

Ronconi, A. 1953. *Studi catulliani.* Bari.

———. 1971. *Studi catulliani.* 2d ed. Brescia.

Schrijver, P. 1995. *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology.* Amsterdam.

———. 1997. *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles.* Maynooth, Ireland.

Stoessl, F. 1977. *C. Valerius Catullus: Mensch, Leben, Dichtung.* Meisenheim am Glan.

Sturtevant, E. H. 1940. *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin.* 2d ed. Philadelphia.

Syndikus, H. P. 1984. *Catull: Eine Interpretation.* Vol. 1, *Einleitung; Die kleinen Gedichte (1–60).* Darmstadt.

Thomson, D. F. S. 1997. *Catullus.* Toronto.

Todd, O. J. 1942. Sense and Sound in Classical Poetry. *CQ* 36:29–39.

Tsur, R. 1992. *What Makes Sound Patterns Expressive?: The Poetic Mode of Speech Perception.* Durham, NC.

Vandiver, E. 1990. Sound Patterns in Catullus 84. *CJ* 85:337–40.

Villar, F. 1995a. *Estudios de celtibérico y de toponimia prerromana.* Salamanca.

———. 1995b. *A New Interpretation of Celtiberian Grammar.* Innsbruck.

Vine, B. 1989. Some "Vertical" Phonetic Effects in Catullus. *SyllClass* 1:87–95.

Watkins, C. 1955. The Phonemics of Gaulish: The Dialect of Narbonensis. *Language* 31:9–19.

Weiss, M. 1996. An Oscanism in Catullus 53. *CP* 91:353–59. [An earlier version appeared in "Studies in Italic Nominal Morphology" (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1993), 61–65.]

Westendorp Boerma, R. E. H. 1949. *P. Vergili Maronis libellus qui inscribitur "Catalepton."* Vol. 1. Assen.

———. 1958 [publ. 1959]. Vergil's Debt to Catullus. *AClass* ("'Roman Life and Letters': Studies Presented to T. J. Haarhoff") 1:51–63.

Wilkinson, L. P. 1942. Onomatopoeia and the Sceptics. *CQ* 36:121–33.

———. 1963. *Golden Latin Artistry.* Cambridge.

Wills, J. 1996. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion.* Oxford.

Zwierlein, O. 1986. *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas.* Mainz.