

## CATULLUS XXXII

Amabo, mea dulcis Ipsicilla, 1  
meae deliciae, mei lepores,  
iube ad te ueniam meridiatum.

et si iusseris, illud adiubebo, 5  
ne quis luminis obseret tabellam,  
neu tibi lubeat foras abire,  
sed domi maneat paresque nobis  
nouem continuas fututiones.

uerum, si quid ages, statim iubeto: 10  
nam pransus iaceo, satur supinus  
pertundo tunicamque palliumque.

1 al. ipsicilla *R*, ad ipsicillam *D* in *titulis*: ipsi illa *O*, ipsithilla *GR*, alii alia<sup>1</sup> 4 adiubebo  
*scripsi* (adiubeto *Turnebus*): adiuuato *V* 5 luminis *O*: liminis *GR*, edd. *uulgo*

(1) *The lady's name*

This is clearly meant to 'speak', and offer thereby some clue to the interpretation. But what it 'says' is debatable. Most modern edd. settle for *Ipsit(h)illa* as the least badly attested form. The prominence of bidding in the poem best accords with the assumptions that the stem is indeed *ipsa* connoting 'mistress of the establishment' (cf. 3.8; *OLD ipse* 12, *OLD ipsimus*; *ipsula*, Pl. *Cist.* 450, *issulo et delicio suo CIL* 6.12156; *ipsuma*, Petron. *Sat.* 75. 11) and that the denotation is something facetious like 'Miss Bossy-wossy', 'Imperia', 'Your nibsy-wibsy'.

In that case, however, there is no accounting for the morphology of *Ipsi-t(h)-illa*: we need *Ips-im-illa* (superlative + diminutive; Baehrens, Leo), *Ips-ul-illa* (double diminutive; Sabbadini), or, safest, as keeping at least speciously within the paradosis, *Ips-ic-illa*, another kind of double diminutive, cf. *an-us*, *an-ic-ula*, *an-ic-illa*. Var. *L.* 7.94, though the normal series in such formations follows the pattern *au-is au-ic-ula au-ic-ella*, *moll-is moll-ic-ulus moll-ic-ellus* (Cat. 25.10), *bland-us bland-ic-ulus bland-ic-ellus*. In view of the occasional character of such formations, it is not particularly difficult to believe in the missing link *\*ips-ic-ulus*: cf. *lect-ic-ulus* (57.7) = *lect-ul-us* (50.15).

Any interpretation on these lines will of course leave it discreetly open whether 'the lady is a tramp', and if so, how much of a tramp, or in what sense, and will say nothing directly as to her social class, in particular, whether what is proposed is *furtum* – adultery. Clearly the clandestine note is not being sent to someone in some low-grade establishment run by a *leno*; 'Bossy-wossy' is in charge of things. But is she generically, e.g., the wife of *iste meus stupor* (17.21), or Lesbia alias Clodia? Or is she rather an unmarried professional of the same generic standing as, say, Erotium or Phronesium in Plautus or Thais in Terence, or, in the real life of Catullus' time, Cytheris alias Lycoris?

The question is relevant because of the light that the answer would cast on the comic impudence of our tentiginous Don Juan. Since Catullus is out to shock (lines 8, 11), the better answer, as the more shocking, must be that she is *uiridissimo nupta flore puella* (17.14) whose commitment to her husband is imperfect, and that this is a proposed *furtum*, not just the fixing of an appointment with some superior call-girl. Indeed, the closer one looks at this poem, the clearer it becomes that the subject of satire is the fantasist, not the fantasized.

<sup>1</sup> Hospitilla (Turnebus, *Adversaria* xii.1), Hypsithilla (Scaliger; diminutive of Hypsithea), Hispitilla (Vossius), Iphitilla (Guyet); Ipsitilla (Buecheler, Schwabe), Ipsicilla (Froehner, *Rh. Mus.* 13 [1858], 148, Herz, *ibid.* 17 [1862], 325).

The alternative is to try to elicit a proper name, Greek rather than Latin; if Greek, that might suggest that the addressee is a professional like, say, Erotium in Plautus' *Menaechmi*, but it would not absolutely exclude her being a married woman either (after all, cf. 'Lesbia').

But attempts at elucidation along those lines cannot but involve more assumptions than the other hypothesis, and nothing decisively better has in fact been suggested;<sup>2</sup> and, as indicated, an elaborate diminutive of *ipsa* is bound to be a better positive hint than any Greek name could that what is proposed is *furtum*.

The decisive evidence on that point is in line 5. Editors and commentators all go along with Turnebus *Adversaria* (Paris, 1565) xiv.8 in taking the correct text to be *liminis tabellam* and try to explain this either as a way of saying 'door' or 'lock'. But that is surely impossible.

*Limina* 'horizontal members of a door-frame' and the opposite *postes*, the vertical, can mean 'door' by synecdoche only in the style of Epic, Elegy, and Lyric, not in this chatty mode, and even there, the word is never simply deployed as a four-square synonym for *ianua*, see *TLL* 7 *limen* 1405.5–21 (abode of beloved; Cat. 63.65 *mihi ianuae frequentes, mihi limina tepida*, 22–40 (of patron *vel sim.*); 'lintel-panel', 'threshold-panel' are incredible in either mooted sense.

Turnebus, of course, could not know that the MSS. offered anything other than *liminis tabellam*; O was only first reported by Ellis and Baehrens in their edd. of 1867 and 1876–85, and its true importance in relation to X, the lost source of G and R, was only properly appreciated in the present century. It is still somewhat surprising that modern editors have completely overlooked the fact that this is one of those places where O preserves the truth against X:<sup>3</sup> *luminis tabellam* makes perfect sense and

<sup>2</sup> A long time ago the present writer pointed out (*Glotta* 44 [1966/7], 174–6) that the technically most economical alternative to *Ips-ic-illa* would be *I-psith-illa* from *Psithia* ' (kind of) Grape' (LSJ *ψίθος*) with the connotations erotic and evocative of wine that go with names like *Astaphium*, *Lesbia*, *Staphyla*; for the Romans the major festivals of Venus were the *Vinalia* (April, August), and of course *sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus* (Ter. *Eun.* 732; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter der Römer* s.n. Venus). In this case the diminutive would be formed in the same way as *Septim-ille* (from *Septimius*, 45.13), which presents no problem, but on this view we have to interpret the initial vowel as anaptyptic, a striking vulgarism only explicitly attested in much later Latin (*ipsilion*, *ipsyllium* = *ψύλλιον* CGL iii.557.46, 558.64, 622.51, *ipsatirus* = *ψαθυρός*, Oribas. *Syn.* 4.1, *Ypsichius* = *Psychius*, CIL 13.3826 (a Christian epitaph). That is not a quite fatal objection, for *ps*-words are not common, and this kind of anaptyxis should in any case be distinguished from rather than compared with the well-known and increasingly systematic development in Imperial times of a supporting prothetic vowel in native words beginning *sc-* *st-sp-* in the spoken Latin from which the Romance languages descend (cf. M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* [Munich, 1977], p. 104). For initial *ps-* in Greek names and loanwords may always have been presenting some Latin-speakers with a pronunciation-problem to which the anaptyxis would have been a ready solution (there is similarly late antique evidence for *t-* and *pit-* as Latin renditions of *pt-*, which, however, will again always have been a difficult combination for Latin speakers). If this analysis were right, then the name would 'speak' with linguistic irony: by her pronunciation, the speciously exotic Hortense de Paris betrays that she really comes from ... well, some nearer and less romantic background. But this explanation, which I repeat here only to repudiate it, involves a linguistic assumption temerarious in the absence of better corroboration and I now agree with M. Gwynn Morgan (*Glotta* 52 [1974], 233–6), though not for the reasons he offers, that there is more outrageous point to the poem if the addressee is meant to be of superior rather than inferior social status, as indicated above and in what follows.

<sup>3</sup> O is by and large a poorer representative of what Catullus actually wrote than X (the lost source of G and R), but is in some ways a more faithful representative of the common source V, for here and there it preserves the truth where the scribe of X has gone wrong, sometimes by accident, sometimes by over-ambitious 'correction' not attempted by the humbler scribe of O;

idiom as 'window-panel', i.e. 'shutter', cf. Apul. *Met.* 2.23 ... *me perducit ad domum quampiam cuius ipsis foribus obseptis per quandam breuem posticulum intro uocat me et conclauē quoddam obseratis luminibus umbrosam <intrans> demonstrat matronam flebilem fusca ueste connectam*, Vitruv. 5.1.7 *reliqua spatia per intercolumnia luminibus sunt relicta*; Paneg. 11.11.3 *omnibus aut per fores in publicum proruentibus aut per superiora aedium lumina* (Livineius: *limina* codd.<sup>4</sup>) *imminentibus*; OLD *lumen* 8, TLL vii.1814.1–31 (unambiguous cases), 32–72 (ambiguous).<sup>5</sup>

The farcical point is that the lover's usual means of entry and exit at this address is not the *door* but the *window*, cf. Prop. 4.7.15f. *iamne tibi exciderant uigilacis furta Suburae, et mea nocturnis trita fenestra dolis?* There the lover commits his sexual burglary, as one might expect, by night; but here, the impudence of the *persona* is represented to be such that he comes and goes (or at least in fantasy tries to) in broad daylight! The poet is with wry humour recalling previous occasions when he had turned up to spend siesta-time with 'Imperia' only to find the window shutter-board barring his entry, and others when, having managed to get in, he found her gone, having 'forgotten' that he was coming.

Cat. 32 was part of Ovid's mental furniture when he wrote *Amores* 1.5, where the scene for siesta is strikingly set with reference to the shutters – one closed, one half-open, so the room is subtly lit 'as in a forest glade'; though the role of the shutters in that elegy is much more poetical, it is perhaps not fanciful to take this as an indirect indication that Ovid too read *luminis tabellam* in Catullus.

Well, if the lover cannot just knock at the door, then clearly Ipsicilla is forbidden fruit – someone's wife. The poet is ironically displaying 'himself' as the last word in a shamelessness so utter and audacious and at the same time so comically frustrated, that no-one but the excessively literal-minded (cf. poem 16) could possibly take it as autobiographical. The whole thing is a joke.

## (2) *The sequence of thought*

This has been misapprehended by commentators. It may be paraphrased thus: 'I'm telling you to tell me to come for siesta-time. If you tell me yes, then I further tell

cf. e.g. 11.5 *arabae O, arabasque X*; 24.4 *mi dededisses O, mi dedisses X*; 26.1 *uestra O, nostra X*; 29.19 *scit O, sit X*; 34.21 *sis ... placet O, scis ... placent X*; 49.7 *patronus O, patronum X*; 63.27 *notha O, nota X*; 64.139 *blanda O, nobis X*, 179 *ponti O, pontum X*; 183 *lentos O, uentos X*; 219 *cui O, quem X*; 231 *tum O, tu X*; 353 *messor O, cultor X*; 67.72 *ullo O, nullo X*; 68.50 *alli O, ali X*; 79.4 *notorum O, natorum X* (this list is merely illustrative). In view of the easiness of the merely palaeographical confusion of *lumen* / *limen* it is impossible to say for certain whether *liminis* in X was just a slip or a 'correction'.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. V. *Aen.* 6.255 *ecce ... primi sub lumina* (PR Servius, Claudius Don., Char. 307 B; *limina FM*, both readings *Probi centonis* 160) *solis et ortus sub pedibus mugire solum*, cf. 8.69 *aetherii ... orientia solis lumina*.

<sup>5</sup> We are obviously not meant to bother about the practical details. Ground-floor windows in Greco-Roman town-houses were normally set much higher up and the street-aperture was typically much narrower than in modern houses, obviously for security (cf. Plin. *N.H.* 19.59); at Pompeii, they range from mere slits (2½") to about 12" in width and c. 30" in height: at best, a tight squeeze for the sneak-thief! The inner aperture was of course much wider, to maximize illumination. The outer apertures of upper-storey windows could be appreciably wider, affording a good view of a procession (Ovid, *Met.* 14.752), a vantage point for an address to the crowd (Livy 1.41.4) or for soliciting (Martial 11.61.3), or affording an easy jump to suicide (Juv. 6.31). Upstairs and down, removable shutter-boards, single shutters hinged at the side or at the top, and double-hinged shutters are all attested by the literary and archaeological evidence, grills too, but in their absence, good stout bars were obviously essential for any but the narrowest downstairs windows. See C. Daremberg and E. Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, t. 2 (1896), 1032ff., 1037–8 (shutters), Mau, *RE* 6, 2180–5 *fenestra*, Herbig, *Rh. Mus.* 44 (1929), 260ff., G. Cressedi, *Enciclopedia dell'Arte antica classica ed orientale*, ed. R. Bianchi Bandinella, t. 3 (1960), 694ff.

you...; if you tell me no, because you're going to be engaged, then I tell you to tell me to come now, because...'; Pyrgopolynices *ciuicus* wants to apply some organization and discipline to the relationship. But, as someone else was shortly to point out, *uarium ac mutabile semper femina*: it won't work.

The opening *amabo* is nicely chosen. A Roman reader would naturally take it as 'please', originally at any rate a woman's wheedling expression, 'I'll be nice to you', 'I'll submit', a disguised equivalent to *rogo* or *iubeo*, cf. e.g. Pl. *Men.* 425 *sed scin quid te amabo ut facias*, 524f. *Menaechme*, *amare ait te multum Erotium ut hoc...deferas*; and there is in these matters no distinguishing where 'asking' merges into 'bidding'. Indeed, the first three lines amount to this: 'Bossy-wossy, I'm telling you to tell me to come to spend siesta with you'...: sending the note is itself a *iussio*: Catullus as male makes the first move, but disguises it with a somewhat ambiguously effeminate expression.

The sequel develops this in a mock-legalistic way: '...if you do bid me, then... (lines 4–8); if not, then... (line 9), like the *condiciones* in a case at law. The *do ut des* formality, the thematic word *iube*, and the connotations of the name evoke the idea of a game for two players with clearly alternating moves. That is why in line 4 we need *adiubebo*: '...and if you do bid me to come, then I shall make the following additional bid – no barring the window-shutter, no taking it into your head to go out; instead, stay at home and get ready for...'; cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 6.20 *πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις κελεύσασιν...ἐπικελεύειν τόδε*, 'εὖ κύνες, εὖ ᾧ κύνες'. Ipsicilla makes her move, Catullus has to counter it *in the first person*.

This is the substantive objection both to the transmitted *adiuuato* and to Turnebus' partial improvement *adiubeto* (*Adversaria* xii.1).

When *illud* rather than *hoc* refers forward, as often in Lucretius (e.g. *illud in his rebus uereor, ne forte rearis*..., etc.), the words so introduced are given a more specific status than *hoc* would lend, as being something well-known at least to the speaker, and often both to him and to the addressee, deserving, as it were, quotation-marks; cf. 100.3f. *hoc est quod dicitur illud 'fraternum' uere 'dulce sodalicium'*, OLD *ille* 13–14. So *illud* implies that the content of the little edict *ne quis*... is in fact something Ipsicilla will readily recognize: there is the humorous suggestion that on previous occasions certain comical hitches (4–5) have frustrated the lover as indicated.

*Adiuuato illud*, 'ne quis...obseret tabellam...' would mean 'Then expedite you-know-what, nobody to bar...etc.'. There is no objection to that on grounds of Latinity, though, as Turnebus and others evidently felt,<sup>6</sup> it is a curiously stilted expression, and in suggesting *adiubeto* 'give an extra order' he was lighting on *le mot juste*, but not identifying the real problem, that here Catullus, not Ipsicilla, should be the subject. For the instruction 'Then bid you-know-what besides, (namely), that no-one bar the window shutter, and that you do not take it into your head to go out'<sup>7</sup> would be impossibly arch: Ipsicilla issuing orders not only to the staff, but also to herself. That objection does not arise if we read *adiubebo*, and the appropriate reciprocity is restored.

The verb *adiubere* = *ἐπικελεύειν* is a coinage for the nonce like e.g. Horace's

<sup>6</sup> The same conjecture was subsequently proposed, in several cases certainly independently, by Dousa senior (*Praecidanea pro Catullo*, Antwerp, 1582), Casaubon, Gifanius, Livineius, Heinsius, Bentley, and E. Mehler (*Mnemosyne* 2 [1853], 180).

<sup>7</sup> E.g. *adiubant*, Fronto p. 120 N, *adiubauit*, Itala cod. Ottob. gen. 49. 25, *aiubante* *carm. epigr.* 1807), and *paronomasiae* involving *iubeo* and *iuuare* become a mannerism in later Latin once intervocalic /w/ and /b/ had wholly coalesced as /β/, cf. TLL 7.583.76ff. For confusion of *iubeto* and *iubebo* cf. e.g. V. G. 3.329 (whichever there be right).

*addocere* (Ep. 1.5.18) 'teach an extra lesson', but of a kind that is perfectly natural in this kind of colloquial Latin. It was therefore almost inevitable that *adiub-* would generate the more obvious *adiuu-*, for in later antiquity *adiub-* was almost a standard spelling for *adiuu-*<sup>8</sup>, both factors probably facilitating misapprehension and deliberate 'correction' of *adiubebo* with *adiuuato*.

With line 9 *uerum si quid ages*... Catullus is not just adding an afterthought ('P.S. But if you're really interested...'; so commentators and translators); he is reverting to the bifurcation implicit in line 4 *et si iusseris*...; if she says yes, then ABC...; but if she says no, then XYZ: 'but if (your reply states that) you are going to be busy / engaged (this afternoon) (a suitably euphemistic way for her to say 'no', and allowing us to wonder what sort of 'business' that might be...!), then... what about now?', and, while one is still reeling from the first comic bombshell *nouem continuas fututiones*,<sup>9</sup> he knocks us flat with an equally massive second – *pertundo tunicamque palliumque*.<sup>10</sup> It is of course quite wrong to compare the idiom common in Comedy *age si quid agis*, an impatient way of saying 'get on with it!', in support of the interpretation 'But if you're interested', 'if you're on', 'if you mean business', which surely quite misses the point anyway.

University of St Andrews

A. S. GRATWICK

<sup>8</sup> *iubeo hoc / illud*, as well as both *iube ueniam* (cf. 3) and *iubeo ut ueniat* are constructions attested from Plautus right through Latinity beside *iube me uenire*, *iubeo eum uenire*; but *iubeo ne ueniat* (as opposed to *ueto [ne] ueniat*) first appears only in Tertullian, cf. *TLL iubeo*. That rules out the punctuation *et si iusseris illud, adiubeto* (or *adiubebo*) / *ne quis... obseret tabellam*, but readily allows *iubebo illud, (scilicet), ne quis... obseret tabellam*.

<sup>9</sup> *...paresque nobis* sounds as though it should lead innocently to '...a pleasant little lunch à deux' (e.g. '...priuatim leue prandium iocosque' or the like); the comic surprise is not only in the substance but in the way it is expressed – a concentrated tricolon crescendo, words two and three of increasing length.

<sup>10</sup> An equally massive three-word line, differently articulated. The close pairing *-que...-que* (itself mock-heroical) rules out the possibility of taking *pallium* as 'blanket': the point here is not that Cat. has just had breakfast in bed (Quinn *ad loc.*), but that he is dressed and ready to go – and in appropriately dandified garb. The last two words explicitly identify Don Juan as a greasy *Graeculus*, or a shamefully un-Roman Roman, cf. Cic. *Ver.* 5.31 *cum iste cum pallio purpureo talarique tunica uersaretur in conuiuiis muliebribus*, Suet. *Tib.* 13.1, etc. Dressing like that is a reproach in itself according to the conventional Roman *grauitas* at which this poem is so clearly cocking a cheeky snook.

## THE DRAMATIC COHERENCE OF OVID, *AMORES* 1.1 AND 1.2

In his magisterial new commentary on the *Amores*<sup>1</sup> J. C. McKeown alleges an 'inconsistency' or 'flaw in the dramatic continuity' between *Amores* 1.1 and 1.2: 'whereas Ovid is fully aware in 1.1 that he is under Cupid's domination, he shows no such awareness in the opening lines of 1.2.' Previously A. Cameron had used this 'inconsistency', together with the evident programmatic character of 1.2, as an indication that the second poem must in fact have been the first poem of one of the original five books of *Amores*; then when Ovid decided to reduce the number of books from five to three, he wanted to keep *Esse quid hoc dicam* and had no choice but to put it as near as possible the front of the first book, immediately after that book's own introductory poem.<sup>2</sup> This reconstruction McKeown rightly rejects on the ground that

<sup>1</sup> *Ovid: Amores Volume II. A Commentary on Book One* (ARCA 22, Leeds, 1989), p. 33, cf. *Ovid: Amores Volume I. Text and Prolegomena* (ARCA 20, Liverpool, 1987), p. 93 n. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *CQ* n.s. 18 (1968), 320–2.