

same time, Plato's dramatic interests in recording, for example, the exchange between Socrates and Zeno (128 A–E) or the reaction of Parmenides and Zeno to Socrates' theory (130A) are also best served by having a narrator report on them.

In short, the psychological motives for bringing Antiphon into the narrative in the first place, the subsequent need to explain the transmission of the story, and the dramatic interest in recording the participants' reaction to one another might easily lead Plato to abandon *oratio recta* in favor of *oratio obliqua*. Furthermore, he need not feel bound to employ *oratio obliqua* throughout the dialogue, but rather until that point at which its use becomes too intrusive and clumsy. Thus, having served its purpose in the first part, *oratio obliqua* is replaced by *oratio recta* in the second part of the dialogue.

SPIRO PANAGIOTOU
McMaster University

GENTLEMAN'S AGREEMENT: CATULLUS 103

This witty epigram involves a logical disjunction: the addressee Silo is told to choose between (a) returning ten thousand sesterces to the speaker, in which case he may be as *saevus et indomitus* as he pleases, or (b) keeping the money, in which case he should stop trying to be both a *leno* and *saevus et indomitus*. Since the cognomen "Silo" implies respectable Italian parentage, the epigrammatic point must lie in an unexpected and insulting use of *leno*.¹ Catullus' target is a man of good family who has accepted a large sum to serve as a go-between; thus he performs precisely the same function as a disreputable slave dealer. Unfortunately, he performs it ineptly, for he displays a lordly insolence toward his rich client, whereas a real pander would know enough to be properly ingratiating.

The incongruity between Silo's demeanor and his sordid office is underscored by an artful play on words. In the last line, the elision of *leno* and *esse* produces a sound superficially reminiscent of *lenis*—close enough, at any rate, to gratify a determined punster.² Now, the late grammarians Priscian and Eutyches posit an etymological link between *leno* and the verb *lenire*.³ Although there is no evidence to establish that this etymology was current in Catullus' time, the jingle at *Poenulus* 639, "bene volumus leniter lenonibus," suggests that Plautus may have perceived a paradoxical connection between the last two words. Moreover, *lenire* is often put in direct opposition to *saevus* and its cognates: Plautus *Bacchides* 408 "leniter qui saeviant sapiunt magis"; Livy 2. 56. 15 "plebem saevientem precibus lenisset" and 27. 34. 14 "parentium saevitiam . . . leniendam esse"; Silius *Punica*

1. This interpretation is accepted by W. Kroll, *Catullus*³ (Stuttgart, 1959), p. 276, and by C. L. Neudling, *A Prosopography to Catullus*, Iowa Studies in Classical Philology 12 (Oxford, 1955), pp. 163–64, who documents it with inscriptional evidence for the name. K. Quinn, *Catullus: The Poems* (London and Basingstoke, 1970), p. 443, merely assumes that Silo is a professional pimp.

2. The elision of final long -o as in *leno* possibly involved contraction with the following initial vowel to produce a single long vowel or diphthong: see W. S. Allen, *Vox Latina* (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 78–82. Catullus would then have pronounced the first foot as *lenōs-* or *lenōes-*. There is a somewhat similar pun at 40. 8, *poema/pene* (first noted by L. Richardson, Jr., "Furi et Aureli, comites Catulli," *CP* 58 [1963]: 102).

3. Priscian 121. 17 Keil²: *a leniendo "leno"*; Eutyches 454. 23 Keil⁵: *lenio leno*. This etymology is of course rejected by modern scholars, for whom the actual derivation of the word is a matter of dispute.

10. 160 "tentarat precibus saevum lenire furorem." Similarly, Claudian *In Eutropium* 1. 84 sets *lenire* against *indomitus*: "indomitasque mora, pretio lenibat avaras." It is significant that Eutropius, like Silo, is performing the *lenonis opus* by approaching married women on behalf of would-be lovers. Placed in antithesis to *leno*, *saevus et indomitus* might well trigger a latent pun on *leno/lenire*. This neat verbal touch would emphasize Catullus' caustic observation that for a man in Silo's dubious moral position the appropriate attitude is not patrician arrogance but pliant servility.⁴

MARILYN B. SKINNER
Northern Illinois University

4. I wish to thank my colleagues E. Spofford, L. Stephens, and M. Wigodsky for helpful advice and comments. This note has greatly benefited from the criticism of the anonymous *CP* referee.

THE MEANING OF *IRRUMARE* IN CATULLUS AND MARTIAL

foedasti miserum, marite, moechum,
et se, qui fuerant prius, requirunt
trunci naribus auribusque voltus.
credis te satis esse vindicatum?
erras: iste potest et irrumare.

You have made the wretched adulterer revolting, husband,
and his face, shorn of nose and ears,
looks in vain for itself as it had been before.
Do you believe you have been sufficiently revenged?
You are wrong; he can still irrumate.¹

It is hard to see the point of Martial 2. 83 as it stands. The problem can be isolated in one word—*irrumare*—in line 5. Why should Martial point out to the offended, vengeful husband that the adulterer can still irrumate? If the point is that the husband should cut off the penis in addition to the nose and ears, it seems strained to use irrumation as an example of what the adulterer can still do. Moreover, the phrasing of the question and answer in lines 4–5 suggests no shift in focus from the present punishment to the possible future activity of the adulterer. The retention of *irrumare* in the text calls for some defense, but a sound defense is hard to find.

The first possibility is to take *irrumare* literally,² to mean that the adulterer still has a penis with which to commit adultery with the wife and irrumate her. Martial 3. 85 has been adduced as a parallel:

quis tibi persuasit naris abscidere moecho?
non hac peccatum est parte, marite, tibi.
stulte, quid egisti? nihil hic tibi perdidit uxor
cum sit salva tui mentula Deiphobi.

I am indebted, as always, to Gordon Williams, for his stimulating criticism and for his very helpful and material suggestions on this article.

1. All translations presented here are original. Throughout, *irrumare* ("force to fellate"—in tone, something like "fuck [someone's] mouth") will be translated "irrumate"; the difference between irrumation of a man and of a woman will be discussed below.

2. Thus, for example, T. Farnaby, *M. Val. Martialis epigrammaton libri* (Sedan, 1624), ad 2. 83; refuted by A. E. Housman, "Praefanda," *Hermes* 66 (1931): 407–9.