



BLOOD ON HIS WORDS, BARLEY ON HIS MIND. TRUE NAMES IN CAESAR'S SPEECH FOR THE LEGENDARY 'BARLEY-MUNCHER' (BGALL. 7.77)*

ABSTRACT

Critognatus' speech has long been recognized as heavily by Caesar's hand, although few have questioned whether any speech was delivered by the Arvernian noble at all; and it has long puzzled readers with its contradictory manner and fierce criticism of Rome. But the etymologizing wordplay across several languages demonstrated below (along with other distinctly comical elements) renders it more than likely that both the speech and the speaker are products of the author's imagination. In its Nabokovian mode, it offers a glimpse of Caesar the linguist and introduces a playfulness into the dire situation before Alesia that suggests that the 'Barley-Muncher' and his speech should be reconsidered in a different, more humorous light.

Keywords: Caesar; Critognatus; true names; etymological wordplay; Gallic War

One author, however, has never been mentioned in this connection—the only author whom I must gratefully recognize as an influence upon me at a time of writing this book; namely, the melancholy, extravagant, wise, witty, magical, and altogether delightful Pierre Delalande, whom I invented. (V. Nabokov, *Invitation to a Beheading* [New York, 1989], 6)

In honour of the Herculean Thesaurists in Munich; with fond memories.

Vladimir Nabokov repeatedly acknowledges the influence Delalande's *Discours sur les ombres* had exerted on his own writing—only then to admit, in the just-quoted foreword to his *Invitation to a Beheading*, that he had 'invented' him. No surprise: across his *œuvre* he evokes from the shadowlands many a character whose whispering name he fashioned from the expansive histories of the several languages he roamed so enviably, nimbly; his paronomastic Humbert Humbert, most noticeably when 'pronounced with a French accent' (Humbert [ἕβεῤ] and *ombre* [ῶβε]), is merely its most notorious denizen.¹ Caesar is rarely ever associated with the author of *Lolita*; but his Critognatus, who, amidst the Gauls' ghastly situation in and around Alesia, famously roars that they should rather eat their own than cede to Rome, hails, as will appear, from the same shadowy lands.

* An early version of this argument was delivered in German to a numerous, welcoming and acute audience at the University of Dresden, and I should like to thank Professors Dennis Pausch and Martin Jehne for their kind invitation. It had advanced somewhat when it was presented at the highly successful 'Caesar Workshop' organized by Clara Brilke (Kiel) and Matthias Heinemann (Mainz), and I should like to thank them too for their invitation to deliver the keynote address and all participants for their lively and helpful questions and comments. Lastly, I happily acknowledge comments on drafts and other help from my colleagues and friends near and far: Hans Bork, Sinead Brennan-McMahon, Richard Martin and Grant Parker (all Stanford University); Luca Grillo (Notre Dame), Christina Kraus (Yale) and Tony Woodman (formerly UVA)

¹ Appel, notes to page 3, in V. Nabokov, *Lolita* (New York, 1991 [orig. 1955]), 320; *ibid.* for further references to Delalande.

From there he arrives at a crucial moment in Caesar's (narrative of his) campaign. It is the final phase of the final year, not of the war in Gaul, of course, which would rage on for two more years,² but of the *Gallic War*: Vercingetorix and his Gallic coalition (including Rome's longest-standing ally, the Aedui) had been battling Caesar and his legions since the winter of 53/2 (at least),³ then, in the early fall, he withdrew his troops to Alesia, a major stronghold of the Mandubii (*Alesiam, quod est oppidum Mandubiorum*, 7.68.1); on the verge of encirclement by Caesar's troops, siegeworks and fortifications, he dispatched his cavalry to request from his Gallic allies additional troops, to arrive within thirty days, which is when supplies would run out. It is then—the deadline passed, 'all grain consumed' (*consumpto omni frumento*, 77.1), succour still out of sight—that a man 'of the highest lineage amongst the Arverni and regarded as of great authority' (*summo in Aruernis ortus loco et magnae habitus auctoritatis*, 77.3) rises to address his beleaguered fellow Gauls: appealing to their *uirtus*, recalling their ancestors' savage endurance, he suggests euphemistically that they too subsist on human flesh rather than sortie or surrender (*eorum corporibus qui aetate ad bellum inutiles uidebantur uitam tolerauerunt neque se hostibus tradiderunt*, 77.12); rapacious Rome, he concludes, knew but one condition for other peoples: *perpetua seruitus* (77.16).

Critognatus' speech, rousing and unsettling and the longest by far in all of the *Gallic War*, has long been recognized as *pulcherrimum Caesarianae eloquentiae monumentum*, as Philippe Fabia phrased it about one hundred and thirty years ago;⁴ opinions differ, however, on whether *any* speech was delivered at all: as recently as 2017 Kurt Raaflaub asserted that 'it [was] hardly completely fictitious. Caesar probably collected information from captives and some of the leaders who surrendered in the end.'⁵ Regardless, Caesar's inclusion of Critognatus' fiery criticism of Rome has met with surprise amongst his critics,⁶ as has the taut tension between, on the one hand, the speaker's elevated language and dignified notions of true virtue, freedom and respect of one's ancestors and, on the other hand, the crude cannibalistic proposal. It is, Sherwin-White summarized it memorably, as though '[w]e are bidden admire Gauls for

² In its entirety, the *Gallic War* covers Caesar's campaigns from the spring of 58 to December 50; but Caesar himself concluded his narrative with the seventh season (58–52); Hirtius added the final two years when he assembled the *Corpus Caesarianum* soon after Caesar's death (Hirt. 8 *pr.* 2; cf. Suet. *Iul.* 56.1; for discussion of both *testimonia*, see J.F. Gärtner and B.C. Hausburg, *Caesar and the Bellum Alexandrinum. An Analysis of Style, Narrative Technique, and the Reception of Greek Historiography* [Göttingen, 2013], 21–30).

³ Caesar's supposition of a *subitum bellum* at the beginning of *Bellum Gallicum* Book 7 notwithstanding (*quieta Gallia ... hac impulsu occasione ... de bello consilia inire incipiunt* [*sc. Galli*], 7.1.1–3), the war of 52 actually commenced in 54: C. Jullian, *Vercingétorix* (Paris, 1977 [orig. 1901]), 88–90. All translations of the Latin and Greek passages are my own, unless otherwise indicated. All references to the *Bellum Gallicum* are by numbers only.

⁴ P. Fabia, 'De orationibus quae sunt in commentariis Caesaris de Bello Gallico' (Diss., Paris, 1889), 70. L.J.M. Holtz, 'C. Iulius Caesar quo usus sit in orationibus dicendi genere' (Diss., Jena, 1913) offers fine observations on *clausulae*, D. Rasmussen, *Stil und Stilwandel am Beispiel der direkten Rede* (Göttingen, 1963), 55 a comparison of the lengths of all the speeches in the *Bellum Gallicum*. Critognatus' speech has very recently been discussed in R. Brown, 'The expulsion of the Mandubii and Caesar's subversion of the speech of Critognatus (*De Bello Gallico* 7.77–8)', *CW* 112 (2019), 283–307; he includes a comprehensive bibliography.

⁵ K.A. Raaflaub, *The Landmark Julius Caesar* (New York, 2017), 258, 7.77c.

⁶ *Romani uero quid petunt aliud aut quid uolunt, nisi inuidia adducti, quos fama nobiles potentesque bello cognouerunt, horum in agris ciuitatibusque considerare atque his aeternam iniungere seruitutem? neque enim ulla alia condicione bella gesserunt. quod si ea quae in longinquis nationibus geruntur ignoratis, respicite finitimam Galliam, quae in prouinciam redacta iure et legibus commutatis securibus subiecta perpetua premitur seruitute* (7.77.15–16). Cf. next note.

their resolution, and at the same time we are meant to shudder at the darker side of barbarism.⁷ The following observations are not intended to resolve these issues; they will, however, cast on them a wholly different and lighter light.

This light radiates through and (mostly) from Caesar's atypically emphatic preamble: *non praetereunda oratio Critognati uidetur propter eius singularem et nefariam crudelitatem* ('it is impossible, clearly, to pass over Critognatus' speech, given its singular and abominable cruelty', 77.2). The ponderous pentasyllable, tellingly saved up until the end for emphasis, is—as is well known—doubly noteworthy:⁸ it appears no more than twice within all of the *Gallia War*; and it is highlighted as being the very reason for the inclusion of the entire speech.⁹ Its choice is, then, choicely unfortunate: *crudelis hoc crudus, quem Graeci ὀμὸν appellant per translationem, quasi non coctus nec esui habilis* ('cruel, meaning *crude*, which the Greeks translate as ὀμὸς, as in *uncooked* and *inedible*', Isid. *Etym.* 10.48).¹⁰ The etymology is not, as far as I know, attested before Isidore; and it does not matter much that it passes modern muster (as Caesar's contemporaries may well have entertained their own etymology, as is so often the case: see below).¹¹ There are, however, some more contemporary and revealing synonymous uses of *crudelis*, including *crudus*;¹² and it may well be the association of 'raw meat' that accounts for the frequent syntagms of *crudelitas* with *alere*, *cruenta*, *insatiabilis*, *pascere*, *satiare*, or *saturare* (especially when blood is explicitly mentioned nearby).¹³ A different kind of support would seem to come from Polybius when he reports

⁷ A.N. Sherwin-White, *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome* (Cambridge, 1967), 25. Opinions on the contradictory character of the speech are reviewed in Brown (n. 4), 286–9. For discussion of the anti-imperialistic criticism, other instances of which include Sall. *Jug.* 81.1, *Hist.* 4.69 and Tac. *Agr.* 30.5–31.4, see J.P.V.D. Balsdon, *Romans and Aliens* (Chapel Hill, 1979), 161–92, including a helpful bibliography, to which add E. Adler, *Valorizing the Barbarian. Enemy Speeches in Roman Historiography* (Austin, 2011).

⁸ Cf. M. Fontaine, *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy* (Oxford, 2009), 252, demonstrating that '[f]unny words can often be found ... as (a) the final word of a line, ...', and arguing further that such positioning is one of the ways at Plautus' disposal to alert the audience to wordplay.

⁹ *crudelitas* is attributed to Ariovistus (1.32.4): *absentisque Ariouisti crudelitatem*. The adverb is also used of him (*Ariouistum ... superbe et crudeliter imperare*, 1.31.12), then once more of Litavicus (*ipsos [sc. Romanos] crudeliter ex cruciatis interficit*, 7.38.9). See Brown (n. 4), 288 for additional literature. On *crudelitas* in the *BCiu.*, see L. Grillo, *The Art of Caesar's Bellum Civile* (Cambridge, 2012), 111.

¹⁰ Cf. Isid. *Diff.* 1.529. I owe this etymology (and all the following) to R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991).

¹¹ A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (Paris, 1967), 152. In Proto-Celtic, *krū- signifies 'blood' too: R. Matasović (ed.), *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic* (Leiden, 2009) s.v.

¹² Such synonymous uses include (all taken from the *TLL* 4.1228.11–13 [Hoppe]): *avidus sanguinis* (Stat. *Theb.* 6.174); *cruentus* (Sen. *Phoen.* 34; Quint. *Decl.* 322 p. 267.13; Cassiod. *In psalm.* 34.20); *crudus* (Amm. Marc. 26.6.8). For the use of *crudus* in a cannibalistic context, cf. Juv. 15.80–3 *totum [sc. mortuum] corrosis ossibus edit | uictrix turba, nec ardentem decoxit aeno | aut ueribus, longum usque adeo tardumque putauit | expectare focos, contenta cadauere crudo*.

¹³ *Rhet. Her.* 4.15.22 *nepotes suo sanguine aluerunt inimicorum crudelitatem*; *Pan. Lat.* IV(10) 31.3 *furor uinctus et cruenta Crudelitas inani terrore frendebant*. Cic. *Phil.* 11.8 *ut suam insatiabilem crudelitatem exercuerit non solum in uiuo, sed etiam in mortuo, atque in eius corpore lacerando atque uexando, cum animum satiare non posset, oculos pauert suos* (cf. Apul. *Met.* 9.38 *sanguine trium fratrum insatiabilem tuam crudelitatem pascere*; Sen. *Ben.* 7.19.8). Cic. *QFr.* 1.3.4 *inimici, quorum crudelitas nondum esset nostra calamitate satiata* (cf. Val. Max. 7.6.4). *Rhet. Her.* 4.45 *nullius maeror et calamitas istius explere inimicitias et nefariam crudelitatem saturare potuit*; Cic. *Vat.* 6 *sanguinem ... exsorbere, crudelitatem uestram ... saturare cuperetis*. Also Crass. *apud* Cic. *De or.* 1.225 *quorum crudelitas nisi nostro sanguine non potest expleri* (cf. Accius, *Trag.* 176). Once again, I have taken most of these from the *TLL* 4.1229.13–1232.35 [Hoppe].

how the Carthaginians had discussed the question of short supplies ‘repeatedly during council’ (πλεονάκις ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ); a companion of Hannibal’s, Monomachus, on one occasion ‘expressed the opinion’ (ἀπορήνασθαι γνώμην) that it would be necessary ‘to teach the troops to eat humans’ (διδάξαι ... τὰς δυνάμεις ἀνθρωποφαγεῖν). Hannibal found the proposal bold and pragmatic but could not embrace it. Polybius concludes, in as much an authorial voice as Caesar: τούτου δὲ τάνδρὸς εἶναι φασιν ἔργα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν εἰς Ἀννίβαν ἀναφερόμενα περὶ τῆς ὁμότητος, οὐχ ἦττον δὲ καὶ τῶν περιστάσεων (‘to this man, they say, belong the acts in Italy attributed to Hannibal in regard to his cruelty, and to circumstances no less’, 9.24.5–8). But, of course, Polybius’ similar play on ὁμότης—both ‘crudeness’ and ‘cruelty’ (LSJ s.v.)—in another cannibalistic context qualifies as support only if we accept that Caesar had Polybius in mind.¹⁴ So the truest evidence that Caesar had blood on his words, that he used the etymology’s ‘egregious narrative realism’ consciously, intentionally and effectively, lies in the cluster of etymological and etymologizing play to which it belongs:¹⁵ so when Critognatus expresses his concern for the Gauls’ *propinqui consanguineique*, an unparalleled *iunctura* wherein *consanguineus*, a ‘word of poetic origin’, is both (strictly speaking) superfluous and inviting of most unfortunate associations once more (especially in light of the association of *crudelitas* with *sanguis* as detailed in n. 13).¹⁶ There are, in fact, a total of six resonant instances: *crudelitas*, *nefarius*, *oratio*, *consanguineus*, *Mandubii* and, yes, *Critognatus*. It seems virtually inconceivable that such a density came of chance; let alone that it would have escaped the ear of a linguist such as Caesar.¹⁷

Of the two attributes that vivify *crudelitas*, one comes with connotations all too fitting according to an alleged contemporary etymology: *nefarius*, *ut Varro aestimat, non dignus farre, quo primo cibi genere uita hominum sustinebatur* (‘*nefarius* [is], according to Varro, [derived from] *not being worthy of barley*, which was the kind of food that in the early days sustained human life’, *Isid. Diff.* 1.423, *Etym.* 10.188).¹⁸

¹⁴ Rasmussen (n. 4), 48 alludes to the significance of the episode for Caesar, as does G. Cipriani, *Cesare e la retorica dell’assedio* (Amsterdam, 1986), 12; neither offers arguments. But Polybius’ presences elsewhere in *Bellum Gallicum* Book 7 increase the likelihood of Caesar’s having the Greek historian in mind. For one such presence, see C.B. Krebs, “‘Making history’: constructive wonder (aka *Quellenforschung*) and the composition of Caesar’s *Gallic War* (thanks to Labienus and Polybius)”, in A.D. Poulsen and A. Jönsson (edd.), *Usages of the Past in Roman Historiography* (Leiden, 2021), 91–114. More generally on Polybius and *Bellum Gallicum* Book 7, see C.B. Krebs, *C. Julius Caesar: Bellum Gallicum Book VII* (Cambridge, 2023), index s.v. ‘Polybius’.

¹⁵ N. Struener, ‘Fables of power’, *Representations* 4 (1983), 108–27, at 108. For discussion of such etymological clusters elsewhere, cf. J.J. O’Hara, *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor, 2017 [orig. 1996]), 92–4. Cf. the ‘remarkable ... density of polemical etymologizing’ at the beginning of the first *Eclogue* (N. Adkin, ‘Etymologizing in Virgil, *Eclogue* I, 11–15’, *LAC* 80 [2011], 163–6, at 166). J. Farrell, ‘Intention and intertext’, *Phoenix* 59 (2005), 98–111, at 104 discusses this ‘principle of reinforcement’ in the context of intertextuality.

¹⁶ But there are late Christian instances that merit mention: Dracontius, *Laud. dei* 3.265 *consanguineos ... iugulare propinquos*, *Jer. Ep.* 118.4 *consanguineis ... propinquos*; Gudeman’s *TLL* entry also refers to the Vulgate, *Leu.* 21.2, *Oros.* 7.29.18 (*TLL* 4.360.9–10). The quoted characterization is by D.O. Ross, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, 1969), 62.

¹⁷ On *De analogia* and Caesar’s linguistic doctrine, see G. Pezzini, ‘Caesar the linguist: the debate about the Latin language’, in L. Grillo and C.B. Krebs (edd.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar* (Cambridge, 2018), 173–92.

¹⁸ Cf. Non. 59.5M (*GRF* 253, 199), referring to Varro once more: *a farre; quod adoreum est, id quo scelerati uti non debeant, non triticum sed far*. It matters little that, in reality, *nefarius* is derived from *fas* (Ernout and Meillet [n. 11], 217 s.v. *fas*). *crudelitas nefaria* is attested repeatedly in Caesar’s time: e.g. *Rhet. Her.* 4.45 (quoted in n. 13 above), *Cic. Verr.* 6.146 and 6.159, *Phil.* 5.42.

Caesar's contemporary readers would have been all the more likely to associate *far*, if in its more general sense of 'grain' (for example Verg. *G.* 1.73 *flaua farra*; cf. Vitruvius *De arch.* 10.5.2 *subministrat molis frumentum et eadem uersatione subigitur farina*), as they had just been reminded that 'all the grain had been used up' (*consumpto omni frumento*, 77.1); Critognatus' audience was literally barred from cereals.¹⁹

The etymological connotation of *oratio*, meanwhile, is all too well known: *oro ab ore et perorat et exorat et oratio et orator et osculum dictum* ('I ask is derived from mouth and [so is] he begs and he implores and speech and speaker and kiss', Varro, *Ling.* 6.96); it would not register under normal circumstances, surely, except here it is 'awoken' by its vicinity to similarly minded words, including the two outstanding.²⁰ First, the Mandubii: introduced as the inhabitants of Alesia (*Alesiam, quod est oppidum Mandubiorum*, 7.68.1), they contribute, voluntarily or involuntarily, to Vercingetorix's efforts to secure nourishment for thirty days, as 'a great number of [cattle] had been gathered by [or: wrested from] them' (*pecus, cuius magna erat copia a Mandubiis compulsa*, 7.71.7). The last we hear of them is that they were forced to leave Alesia when supplies had run out, and Critognatus' proposal had failed to carry; but Caesar held them at the Roman fortification and denied them food and shelter (*Mandubii, qui eos oppido receperant, cum liberis atque uxoribus exire coguntur. hi, cum ad munitiones Romanorum accessissent, flentes omnibus precibus orabant ut se in seruitutem receptos cibo iuuarent. at Caesar dispositis in uallo custodibus recipi prohibebat*, 7.78.3). An elusive tribe, they are attested nowhere else but once in Strabo, who almost certainly copied them from the *Bellum Gallicum*.²¹ But their name's vibrant strands seamlessly blend in with the rest of Caesar's canvas: it is not only, as Christina Kraus has pointed out to me, that *manducare*, 'to chew, to eat' (*OLD* 1, 2), would spring to a Roman's mind rather naturally in this context; but also that Manducus, 'Gnasher', was a gluttonous stock character of the famously popular *fabula Atellana* whose masks featured sizeable jaws with 'enormous chattering teeth'.²²

That stock character, along with others, found a second home in Plautus' *fabula palliata* where it caused the Parasite—a stock character of Greek New Comedy—to take on a more Roman complexion and to be defined primarily by hunger.²³

¹⁹ Tony Woodman draws my attention to Tac. *Ann.* 4.13.2 *reus tamquam frumento hostem Tacfarinatem iuuisset*. In his commentary (A.J. Woodman, *The Annals of Tacitus, Book 4* [Cambridge, 2018], ad loc.), he remarks: 'one hopes that the prosecution made something of the fact that grain would be needed by a leader who had flour inscribed in his name.'

²⁰ Cf. W. Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (London, 1949), 25 on sleeping metaphors.

²¹ καὶ περὶ Ἀθησῖαν πόλιν Μανδουβίων, ἔθνους ὁμόρου τοῖς Ἀπουέροισι, 4.2.3; cf. A. Falileyev, A.E. Gohil and N. Ward, *Dictionary of Continental Celtic Place-Names. A Celtic Companion to the Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World* (Aberystwyth, 2010), s.v. The archaeological evidence around Alesia is discussed in P. Barral, J.P. Guillaumet and P. Nouvel, 'Les territoires de la fin de l'âge du fer entre Loire et Saône: les Éduens et leurs voisins. Problématique et éléments de réponse', in D. Garcia and F. Verdin (edd.), *Territoires celtiques. Espaces ethniques et territoires des agglomérations protohistoriques d'Europe occidentale* (Paris, 2002), 271–6.

²² M. Bieber, *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater* (Princeton, 1961 [orig. 1939]), 248 (with figs. 546–8). Too little is known about the effigy called *Manducus* that was carried around in festive processions (Paul. Fest. 115L); nor is the related passage in Plaut. *Rud.* 535 (*quid si aliquo ad ludos me pro manduco locem?*) at all clear; cf. J. Pieczonka, 'Stock characters from *Atellana* in Plautus' *palliata* – the connections between Dossennus-Manducus and the Plautine parasites reconsidered', *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 24 (2019), 193–210, especially 195–7. It will not matter much to my argument.

²³ On the appearance of the *Bucco* in Plaut. *Bacch.* 1088, see E. Lefèvre, 'Atellana e palliata: gli influssi reciproci', in R. Raffaelli, A. Tontini (edd.), *L'Atellana letteraria* (Urbino, 2010), 16–36,

Gelasimus boils this down beautifully, when he ventures that hunger must have been his mother, as never since his birth has he ever felt full (*famem ego fuisse suspicor matrem mihi, | nam postquam natus sum, satur numquam fui, Stich.* 155–6). Elsewhere, the parasite Saturio reproaches Toxilus, who had welcomed his opportune arrival (*O Saturio, opportune aduenisti mihi*), with a pointed quip on his name: *nam essurio uenio, non aduenio saturio* ('For it is Mr Starvurio who arrives, not Mr Sat(ed)urio', *Persa* 101–3).²⁴ Such wordplay is common, of course, but particularly noticeably developed in the famous passage in the *Captiui* (158–65): the parasite Ergasilus, barely more than 'skin and bones' (*ossa atque pellis sum*, 135), complains about the absence of Philopolemus, 'since [thereby] the companies of banqueteers have now been disbanded' (*quia nunc remissus est edendi exercitus*, 153).²⁵ Since the latter's capture, he continues, 'everyone has shirked this "assignment"' (*fugitant omnes hanc prouinciam*, 156); Philopolemus' father is not surprised (158–65 [translation by Wolfgang de Melo]):

non pol mirandum est fugitare hanc prouinciam.
 multis et multigeneribus opus est tibi
 militibus: primumdum opus est Pistorensibus;
 eorum sunt aliquot genera Pistorensium:
 opus Panicis est, opus Placentinis quoque;
 opus Turdetanis, opus Ficedulensibus;
 iam maritumi omnes milites opus sunt tibi.

Well, it's not strange that they've been shying away from this task. You need many soldiers of different kinds: first you need the ones from Bakerville. There are several types of soldiers from Bakerville: you need those from Breeding and you also need those from the Cake District. You need soldiers from Thrushia and you need soldiers from Puerto Fico. Then you also need all the soldiers from the coast.

Every location is chosen because its name allows for the apt association of food: Pistorium is a town in Etruria, *pistor* 'a pounder of *far*, (subsequently) a ... miller/baker' (*OLD*); the *Panici* may evoke the Punici or refer to the town Panna in Samnium—it certainly puns on *panis*, 'bread'; the Placentini inhabit Placentia and pun on *placenta*, 'a kind of flat cake' (*OLD*); *turdus* is the 'thrush', just as the Turdetani are a Spanish tribe; and while the location hidden in the *Ficedulenses* has not been established, their name puns on *ficedula*, 'a small bird esteemed a delicacy ... , beccafico' (*OLD*).²⁶ In light of these (and many other) passages, it is easy to see why Horace would single out the hungry parasite as one of the memorable parts in

especially 16–22. On the hungry Roman parasite, see J.C.B. Lowe, 'Plautus' parasites and the Atellana', in G. Vogt-Spira (ed.), *Studien zur vorliterarischen Periode im frühen Rom* (Tübingen, 1989), 164–5. C. Panayotakis, 'Native Italian drama and its influence on Plautus', in M.T. Dinter (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Comedy* (Cambridge, 2019), 32–46 is too sceptical. In fact, the arguments in favour of a stronger presence of *Manducus* (in particular) in Plautus—as presented by Pieczonka (n. 22)—to me seem stronger even than the author herself appears ready to vouch for; the many references to the parasite's teeth are particularly germane ([n. 22], 201–6).

²⁴ Fontaine's 'Starvurio' ([n. 8], 70) works beautifully; my 'Sat(ed)urio' follows the same lines.

²⁵ H.C. Elmer's translation 'companies of banqueteers' (H.C. Elmer, *T. Macci Plauti Captiui* [Boston, 1900], ad loc.) nicely captures the sense of Plautus' playful metaphor (*exercitum remittere* = to dismiss the military assembly); he adds: 'So long as Philopolemus was present, there was someone to muster the troops, i.e. someone to give dinner parties.'

²⁶ Cf. W. de Melo, *Plautus: Amphitryon; The Comedy of Asses; The Pot of Gold; The Two Bacchises; The Captives* (Cambridge, MA, 2011), 523 n. 7. But Panna in Samnium is proposed by Elmer (n. 25), ad loc.

Plautus' *œuvre* (*Epist.* 2.1.173): *aspice, Plautus, ... | quantus sit Dossennus edacibus in parasitis*, which Brink translates: '[look ...] how much of a (primitive Atellan) Dossennus Plautus is among (that is, when he represents) gluttonous spongers'.²⁷ In identifying this part, Horace associates Plautus with a(nother) 'type figure of the Atellanae', the sibling, perhaps even identical twin, of the Manducus mentioned above.²⁸

Given this prominence of the hungry part on the Roman stage and its embodiment by the stock character Manducus with his frightening mask—who in Rome would not associate the Mandubii in starving Alesia with the chomping Manduci? In fact, with such masks on the Alesian stage, who could challenge the wayward logic of Caesar's tale wherein the ever-hungry 'Gnashers' are singled out for expulsion from their (!) starving town? By the same token, their desperate plea to be helped with food (*OLD iuuo* 1) reads like a twisted gloss on their culinary cravings (cf. *OLD iuuo* 5 'to give pleasure to, delight').

'But wait! Who is coming our way? Oh why! It is Gnatho, the ... parasite' (*sed quis hic est qui huc pergit? attat! hicquidemst parasitus Gnatho*, Ter. *Eun.* 228). By now we know which way the wind is blowing, *Crito(-)gnat(h)e!* For Gnatho(n/s), as predestined by name (γνάθος, 'jaw'), was in his role as an often gluttonous parasite just as much of a stock character as the Manducus.²⁹ In point of fact, Caesar's part has a nonce-name that befits the context all too well—and twice over to boot.³⁰ Firstly, its Greek constituents suggest 'high-born', comprising both κριτός, 'chosen, choice', and *γνήτος, 'born' (γενέσθαι, cf. γνήσιος), comparable to κασίγνητος, 'brother' (for example Hom. *Od.* 8.585); the name Mr 'High-Born' joins the company of many a Plautine name of similar significance, such as the just-mentioned Ergasilos, who may reasonably be identified as 'Εργάσι-ιλος, "Mr Energetic" or "Mr Strenuous"'.³¹ In the case of Mr 'High-Born', his name bespeaks the high standing that Caesar attributes him in his description as *summo in Aruernis ortus loco* (77.3, translated above). This rather blatant gloss on the Greek name may serve as a signpost of sorts to alert the reader to the name's further linguistic dynamics at play in the context.³² For, secondly, Caesar's parasitic part suffers peculiar cravings, perhaps, but such as are all too understandable in his situation: for another ready association in this context is κριθή, 'barleycorns', which joins γνάθος, 'jaw', to identify this man who disappears as suddenly as he arrived without leaving a trace anywhere inside or out of the *Gallic War* as the 'Barley-Muncher'—as such, too, he

²⁷ C.O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry. Epistles Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus* (Cambridge, 1982), 213.

²⁸ On the possibility that Dossennus was an alternative name for Manducus, see Pieczonka (n. 22), 198–9.

²⁹ For Gnatho(n) and New Comedy and the novel, see R.L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge, 1983), especially 69–70. It must be noted, even if it is of little consequence to my argument, that Terence's Gnatho is the exception, however, in that he 'is purely a flatterer, as is indicated by the fact that the play of Menander from which Terence borrowed him was entitled *Colax*': Lowe (n. 23), 163.

³⁰ *TLL* Onomasticon 2.726.76–8 [Reisch]. On the importance of 'context and linguistic analogy', cf. Fontaine (n. 8), 4 and *passim*.

³¹ Fontaine (n. 8), 64.

³² Caesar glosses elsewhere, for example when with 75.4 *quae Oceanum attingunt* he comments on the Celtic etymology *are-mori* = 'along the sea' (*DLG* 53) of the name of the Aremoricae (Krebs [n. 14 (2023)], ad loc.). On Caesar's signposting his engagement with Plato's *Phaedrus*, see C.B. Krebs, 'Greetings Cicero! Caesar and Plato on writing and memory', *CQ* 63 (2018), 517–22, at 518 n. 5, where I also suggest a further instance.

would fit right in with Plautus' food-punning company. Once again, then, the wayward logic of Caesar's drama is not to be denied: for what *is* a 'Barley-Muncher' to do when he lacks barley (*far*) desperately? If, lastly, 'Critognatus' would have translated into Celtic as 'fils de la terreur', as has been suggested, it would have made the name all the more palatable to Caesar, who had learned *some* Celtic (at least).³³

But there are two further twists, one of which—as Richard Martin has suggested to me—mines the fine phonetic difference between Critognatus and Crithognathos, while allowing for both very different 'translations'.³⁴ The inability to pronounce aspirated consonants in Greek was a stereotypical linguistic marker of the 'barbarian' as represented most famously by the Scythian archer in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusa* (for example 1120 ἐπτόνθησα instead of ἐφθόνθησα).³⁵ At Caesar's time, proper aspiration (*uocalis aspiratio*, Cic. *Orat.* 150) as a marker of sound education was de rigueur: *rusticus fit sermo, inquit* [sc. P. Nigidius Figulus], *si adspires perperam* ('Speech becomes rustic, Nigidius says, if you aspirate wrongly', Gell. *NA* 13.6.3); not for nothing is it parodied in Catullus' taunt of Harrius (*chommoda dicebat*, 84.1).³⁶ With that ideologically charged (in)ability in mind, Critognatus, Mr 'High-Born', becomes Crithognathus, Mr 'Barley-Muncher', to Caesar's Roman audience who knew how to pronounce Greek properly and to listen for *true* names.

For the second—and final and possibly most ingenuous—twist, we first need to bring M. Caelius Rufus, Cicero's keenly witty, naughty protégé, into the conversation.³⁷ In his defence speech *de ui* in that *cause célèbre* of 56, he 'called the rhetor' L. Plotius Gallus [*sic*], who had penned the speech for Caelius' accuser L. Sempronius Atratinus, 'a barley-fed speaker; and he taunted him as puffy, trifling and sordid' (*hordearium eum rhetorem appellat, deridens ut inflatum ac leuem et sordidum*, Cael. *Or. frg.* 21M, *apud* Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 26).³⁸ The precise meaning of the sobriquet has not been established;³⁹ but there is agreement that Caelius reused what would appear to have been a well-known nickname (and criticism) of Dinarchus, the last of the canonical ten Attic orators, whom 'some, by way of a joke, called rather disarmingly "the barley-fed Demosthenes"' (τινὲς καὶ προσπαίζοντες αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀχαρίτως κριθῶν

³³ X. Delamarre, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise* (Paris, 2003), 129. On Caesar's Celtic, cf. n. 32 above. One might then say that the whole speech, intended to inspire terror in its Roman audience, is the performative calque on the speaker's name.

³⁴ Cf. Fontaine (n. 8), 70–1 for evidence of phonetic alteration, and O'Hara (n. 15), 61–2 on the (limited) effects of differing vowel quantities on etymologizing.

³⁵ See S. Colvin, *Dialect in Aristophanes. The Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford, 1999), 290–1 (with n. 38). For epigraphic evidence, see L. Thraette, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions, I. Phonology* (Berlin, 1980), 453–5.

³⁶ Cf. J.N. Adams, *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 B.C. – A.D. 600* (Cambridge, 2007), 174, to whom I owe both the quotation from Gellius and the translation. Cf. Adams's fascinating interpretation of the error that occurred during Cerialis' dictation ([this note], 634–5). Further on Catullus: E.S. Ramage, 'Note on Catullus' Arrius', *Philologus* 54 (1959), 44–5.

³⁷ His reference to Clodia as *quadrantaria Clytaemestra* (Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.53) inspired Cicero (*Cael.* 62, 69; no stranger to barbed jokes, he [Plut. *Cic.* 5.6]); and his polysemous quip in *triclinio Coam, in cubiculo Nolam* was not forgotten by Quintilian's time either (*Inst.* 8.6.53): see S. Saylor, *The Venus Throw* (New York, 1995), 328–9.

³⁸ I translate *hordearius* as 'barley-fed' as this was the meaning of the term in reference to a group of gladiators (Plin. *HN* 18.72): *antiquissimum in cibis hordeum, sicut ... apparet ... gladiatorum cognomine, qui hordearii uocabantur*. I see no reason why Caelius' application should differ (on the contrary, in fact; see below).

³⁹ See A. Cavarzere, 'Hordearium rhetorem', *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Patavina* 85 (1972/3), 209–18, especially 210–12. Cf. next note.

Δημοσθένην εἰρήκασσι, Hermog. *Id.* 2.11).⁴⁰ What had earned him that nickname is not clear from Hermogenes' sketch (nor from Longinus, who appears to report it as well);⁴¹ except that Dinarchus, while variously deficient, 'wield[ed] a style that, generally speaking, seemed very Demosthenic, what with its harshness and vigour and vehemence' (καθόλου τε ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐμφαινόμενον ἔχει πολὺ τὸ Δημοσθενικὸν διὰ τὸ τραχὺ καὶ γοργὸν καὶ σφοδρὸν, Hermog. *Id.* 2.11). Nor has all doubt been lifted as to what precisely κριθῖνος implies: is it the low-quality barley bread in opposition to the high-quality wheat bread, or coarse beer in contrast to fine wine?⁴² But Max Nelson has recently brought the Caelius fragment more forcefully into the debate about the 'barley-fed Demosthenes', observing that all three Roman adjectives (*inflatum ac leuem et sordidum*) 'can describe barley bread which is insubstantial, not very nourishing, and grainy; but they also can be suitably applied to an orator who is bombastic, ineffectual, and base. It is less plausible for these words to refer to beer instead'.

What, then, emerges from all of this for the Caesarean 'Barley-Muncher', first of all? Quite probably greater name recognition amongst his Roman audience (if Caelius' apparently casual use is anything to go by)—but not, of course, of the good sort: for anyone familiar with the derogatory rhetorical use of κριθῖνος/*hordearius* in reference to a speaker, a speaker by the name of Crit(h)ognat(h)us is at a predetermined disadvantage (much as was Verres, say, in his way);⁴³ and he is hardly to be taken all *that* seriously. This may well have dulled the sting of his critique of Rome. Second, and now regarding the precise significance of κριθῖνος/*hordearius* in the rhetorical context: part of Caesar's joke consists in evoking the metaphorical κριθῖνος/*hordearius* in a scene defined by the actual absence of *literal* cereals. Given the significance of food (rather than drink) in this episode, the joke works better if the notion implied by the derogatory term is one of bread; then again, even if beer as opposed to wine is the pejorative association, what better location could be imagined for its use than the land of the drinkers of beer (Posidonius, fr. 67 E–K)?⁴⁴

This leaves us with a town of *ever-hungry Gnashers*, where all *grain* supplies had been consumed, and starvation was suffered by all, when *the low-grade speaker* Mr 'Barley-Muncher', known to his own as Mr 'High-Born', broached his *crude* proposal. This leaves us with Caesar *dicti studiosus*, who fashions shades across the languages as nimbly and facetiously as Nabokov, thus contributing an especial instance to the strong tradition of etymologizing and punning on names in historiography (broadly conceived), and an audience back in Rome both more varied and more 'learned' than has often been assumed.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ I am quoting from H. Rabe, *Hermogenis opera* (Leipzig, 1913), 398–9. A.D. Booth, 'Rhéteur d'orge', *Glotta* 60 (1982), 125–9, especially 127) is certainly right 'que Caelius rappelle **une calomnie classique** [*my emphasis*] que son auditoire cultivé aura reconnue sans difficulté, pour flétrir la réputation de Plotius et par conséquent celle d'Atratinus'.

⁴¹ Longinus, fr. 54 in M. Patillon et L. Brisson, *Longin, Fragments Art rhétorique; Rufus, Art rhétorique* (Paris, 2002), 217.

⁴² Cf. M. Nelson, 'The Barley Demosthenes', *Glotta* 92 (2016), 175–80; for the following quotation see Nelson (this note), 178.

⁴³ On Verres' suffering from his name (= 'boar'), see B.K. Krostenko, *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance* (Chicago, 2001), 159–62.

⁴⁴ For further evidence and discussion of the Greek and Roman identification of Gauls as beer-drinkers, see M. Nelson, *The Barbarian's Beverage: A History of Beer in Ancient Europe* (London, 2005), 50–1.

⁴⁵ For Cicero as the intended primary audience for Caesar's allusion to the *Phaedrus*, see Krebs (n. 32). More on his varied audience and wordplay in *Bellum Gallicum* Book 7 in: Krebs (n. 14

Last but not least, it leaves us with a question: if Critognatus is no more and no less than the bloodless and ultimately comical function of Caesar's narrative, why, then, did the latter feel the need, at this climactic moment, to evoke and revoke him?⁴⁶

Stanford University

CHRISTOPHER B. KREBS
cbkrebs@stanford.edu

[2023]), index s.vv. 'audience' and 'wordplay'. On names in historiography, see the note on Tac. *Ann.* 3.75.1 *Antistium ... praecellentem* in A.J. Woodman and R.H. Martin, *The Annals of Tacitus, Book 3* (Cambridge, 1996).

⁴⁶ I am hoping to address this larger question in 'On cannibals. Caesar, Montaigne and the anxiety of imperialism' (forthcoming).