

* * * * *

ADDENDUM: Although, as observed above, LSJ has correctly interpreted the passages at issue in this paper, in the New Supplement to LSJ (ed. P. Glare) we find s.v. κύαθος 2 “*vessel for cupping, Insc. Perg. 8(3).72.9 (sp. κύεθος).*” So, ironically, LSJ too now allows for the meaning of κύαθος rejected by us as erroneous. The inscription in question dates to the Roman Empire and contains a list of common dedications (a ring, a lekythos, some silver and bronze figures, some clothing, etc.) to Asclepius and kindred gods. The fact that Asclepius is involved and the fact that the dedications include a νάρθηξ and an ὀθόν[ι]ον, items that can in a medical context designate a medicine box and a bandage respectively (as opposed to an unguent/cosmetic box and a strip of linen), prompt the inscription’s editor, Ch. Habicht, to see the κύαθος as a *Schröpkopf*. This interpretation is not convincing. Habicht himself cites a κύαθος and at least one ὀθόνιον on other inscribed temple inventories, none of them associated with Asclepius or a medical context; see *Altertümer von Pergamon*, Bd. 8.3, *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions* (Berlin, 1969), 109–10. But most important are the surviving inventories of dedications to Asclepius at Athens. These do record a κύαθος dedicated to Asclepius, but they also include four σικύαι: see S. B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, their Dedications and the Inventories* (Amsterdam, 1989), 44, 158, 321 and *IG 2² 47*, ll. 8, 11. Clearly these items are distinct objects, meaning that if the σικύαι are bleeding cups, which they clearly are, the κύαθος will hardly be other than a ladle. Note that one of the σικύαι, that on *IG 2² 47*, l. 8, is described as σικύα μ[εγ]ά[λη] ἀλύσει δεδεμένη, a description that corresponds exactly to a surviving specimen of bleeding cup now in Athens: cf. Milne, *Surgical Instruments in Greek and Roman Times* (Oxford, 1907), 103 and pl. XXXIII.

LAWRENCE J. BLIQUEZ
PRISCILLA RODGERS
University of Washington

TALKING FLAMINGOS AND THE SINS OF THE TONGUE: THE AMBIGUOUS USE OF *LINGUA* IN MARTIAL

There are thirty-five occurrences of the word *lingua* in the *Epigrams*: twenty-two are of a general nature referring either literally to the tongue’s various functions as part of the anatomy or speech-organ, or metaphorically to the kind of speech it conveys;¹ seven (in five epigrams) are of a specifically sexual nature and refer explicitly to *cunnilinctio* (male-to-female 3.81.2; 11.25.2; 11.61.1, 10; 11.85.1) and *fellatio* (male-to-male 2.61.2, 7);² while the remaining six examples are found in

I should like to thank Professor Barry Baldwin of the University of Calgary for his critical comments on an earlier draft of this article, and for friendship, support, and encouragement. He is not, however, responsible for any of the views expressed here, nor for any errors of fact or judgment which the piece may contain.

1. See *OLD* s.v. *lingua* for useful subdivisions.

2. For standard treatments of oro-lingual sexual practices in the ancient world, W. A. Krenkel, “*Fellatio und Irrumatio*,” *WZR* 29 (1980): 77–88, and “*Tonguing*,” *WZR* 30 (1981): 37–54, should generally be consulted.

poems which involve an element of intentional ambiguity which points to sexual innuendo (2.82.1; 3.80.2; 3.84.2; 7.24.8; 9.27.14; 13.71.2).

Given the notorious ease with which Martial is able to call a spade a spade in any circumstance, and employ the grossest indecency (especially sexual), it is perhaps of interest to note that he chooses an *implicit* treatment of the sexual use of *lingua* almost as often as he does an *explicit* one.³ Let us now consider these six cases of ambiguity in terms of content and context as subtle variations on a commonplace of epigrammatic obscenity.⁴

2.82.1:

Abscisa servum quid figis,⁵ Pontice,⁶ *lingua*?
nescis tu populum, quod tacet ille, loqui?⁷

In cutting out his slave's tongue before crucifying him, Ponticus seems to be going to extraordinary lengths to keep something quiet.⁸ But such drastic measures are futile: he may have succeeded in silencing one witness, but the multiple voice of rumour is unstoppable. Although the *lingua* here belongs to the (presumably) innocent slave and not to the master,—and is therefore not *per se* used in a sexual sense—its presence, coupled with *tacet* and *loqui*, convicts Ponticus of some grave, morally stigmatized offence. The sledge-hammer-to-crack-a-nut approach of the slave's double mutilation confirms the latter's possession of incriminating evidence against his master which, we may legitimately infer, is of a sexually scandalous nature.⁹ (In Martial rumour and gossip concerning men usually involves the *os impurum* motif.¹⁰) The seemingly innocent, neutral sense of *lingua* in the first verse, then, begins to assume a more sinister connotation, projected on to Ponticus himself, as soon as the information in v. 2 is supplied.¹¹

3. J. P. Sullivan exploded the myth concerning the scale of Martial's obscenity in "Martial's Sexual Attitudes," *Philologus* 123 (1979): 288–302.

4. Reference to, or explanation of, most of these ambiguities is nothing new, and may be found in the popular translations and (where they exist) the standard editions. This present article proposes simply to gather such references together in one place, and to offer additional remarks of brief commentary with a concluding overview.

5. Editors record textual variants at this point: *quid figis* (γ); *quod fugis* (β). The note of the Bohn translation (London, 1860) ad loc. favors *foedas* over *figis*, and invites a comparison with the opening of the next epigram in Book 2 (2.83): *Foedasti* [. . .] *moechum*. (For *figis* = *cruci figis* see Friedlaender, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri mit erklärenden Anmerkungen* [1886; reprint Amsterdam, 1967], ad loc.)

6. In "Zu Martial," *Philologus* 68 (1909): 87–117, at 94–95, G. Friedrich outlines the possibility of reading here the name *Pontia* (the notorious poisoner of 2.34.6 where the variant *Pontica* is recorded in the manuscript tradition).

7. All Latin quotations of Martial are taken from D. R. Shackleton Bailey's Teubner text (Stuttgart, 1990).

8. B. Baldwin kindly informs me that excision of the tongue before crucifixion is performed on the Christian Chilo in Henryk Sienkiewicz's novel (and presumably also in the film version of) *Quo Vadis?* (New York, 1969), 458–61.

9. For the double mutilation scholars adduce Cic. *pro Clu.* 66: "Nam Stratonem quidem, iudices, in crucem esse actum exsecta scitote lingua—mulier amens—metuit ne condemnaretur extrema servuli voce morientis." We may note also in passing the words of the hypothetical personified tongue in Lucian's *Pseudologista* 25, where it is given free rein to express indignation and disgust at the perverted misuse to which its owner has subjected it: ὡς ὄφελε κάμει τις ὥσπερ τὴν τῆς Φιλομήλας ἐκτεμεῖν. μακαριώτεροι γούν μοι αἱ γλώτται τῶν τὰ τέκνα κατεδηρόκοτόων.

10. For a lexical analysis of rumour/gossip in Martial, see Greenwood, "Martial, Gossip, and the Language of Rumour," in *Martial*, ed. F. Grewing (Stuttgart, 1998).

11. H. Szelest isolates this epigram with 2.66 to illustrate Martial's humane regard for slaves, in "Martial und die römische Gesellschaft," *Eos* 53 (1963): 182–90, at 186–87. For the subject of slavery in general in Martial, see M. Garrido-Hory, *Martial et l'esclavage* (Paris, 1981).

3.80.2:

De nullo loqueris,¹² nulli maledicis, Apici:
rumor¹³ ait *linguae* te tamen esse malae.

In abstaining from any gossip or detraction concerning his fellow men, Apicius is the paragon of human charity;¹⁴ and yet rumour has it that he has an “evil tongue.”¹⁵ Once more after its apparently neutral association with *loqueris* and *maledicis*, *linguae* is immediately tainted by its pairing with the ambivalent *malae* at the close of the epigram.¹⁶ Martial’s exposure of Apicius’ deviant oral practices (whether of *cunnilinctio* or *fellatio*¹⁷) is made all the more damning by his use of subtle verbal restraint; the language is ambiguous, but it points paradoxically to a revelation which could not be clearer.¹⁸

3.84.2:

Quid narrat tua moecha? non puellam
dixi, Gongylon. quid ergo? *linguam*.

The “point” of this epigram is as much dependent on the unusual use of *moecha* as it is on the final *linguam* which bears the weight of the whole piece.¹⁹ *lingua* is used literally here, admittedly, but it is bound up in the play on *moecha/non puellam*.²⁰ Even when the *moecha* = *lingua* equation has been revealed, the accusation is still not explicit, and ambiguity remains—of word if not of thought. It is clear that *cunnilinctio* is alluded to, though the literality of the Latin leaves just enough room—for those who choose to do so—to adopt a kinder reading.

12. Some manuscripts (ßγ) have *quereris* (which H. J. Izaac prefers in his Budé edition, Paris, 1930–33) and *quaereris* (in “F”: see Friedlaender’s apparatus) at this point.

13. In *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982), 212, J. N. Adams refers to F. C. Forberg, *Antonii Panormitae Hermaphroditus, primus in Germania edidit et apophoreta adiecit F. C. Forberg* (Coburg, 1824), p. 287, n. ‘q’ (echoed later, incidentally, by W. Gilbert, “Zur Erklärung von Martials Epigrammen,” *NJhrB* 135 [1887]: 143–51 at 143) who points out that Martial on a number of occasions uses *rumor* when alluding to *fellatio/irrumatio* (perhaps glancing at the etymology *ruma/rumis* = “teat”), e.g., 2.72.6; 3.73.5; 3.87.1. “It is possible that verbal puns were intended” (Adams, *Sexual Vocabulary*, 212).

14. Neither this Apicius nor the one mentioned in 7.55.4 appears to be the infamous gourmet who flourished at the time of Augustus and Tiberius.

15. In *Zur Form von Martials Epigrammen* (Berlin, 1977), 86, E. Siedschlag couples this piece with 4.34: “Wirkungsvoll sind diese Epigramme dadurch, daß die erschlossene zweite Bedeutung eine Bosheit enthält.” For puns in Martial see especially U. Joegen, “Wortspiele bei Martial” (Ph.D. diss., Bonn, 1967).

16. For the notion of *mala lingua* elsewhere in a sexual context, cf. Min. Fel. 28.10: [. . .] *qui medios viros lambunt, libidinoso ore inguinibus inhaerescunt, homines malae linguae* [. . .].

17. Either practice may be alluded to. However Sullivan in *Martial the Unexpected Classic: A Literary and Historical Study* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 199, n. 24, cites this particular epigram as one that deals exclusively with *cunnilinctio*, presumably on account of the reference to the man’s *lingua*. But Chrestus’ *Catoniana lingua* at 9.27.14 refers quite specifically to *fellatio* not to *cunnilinctio*. This is evident from the mention of *aliquis* [. . .] *draucus, / iam paedagogo liberatus* (10–11) who may fall prey to Chrestus. For further references to pathics cruising the baths for men with large penises, see A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor* (New Haven, 1983 [1992 ed., Oxford], in “Addenda and Corrigenda,” p. 276 supplementing the text of p. 43).

18. Cf. Mart. 11.61.1: *Lingua maritus, moechus ore Nanneius*. A neglected note on this distich (3.80) can be found in J. E. B. Mayor, “Notes on Martial, Book III,” *JPh* 16 (1888): 229–43, at 241.

19. For “adultery of the tongue” in a very different (patristic) context, see N. Adkin, “‘Adultery of the Tongue’: Jerome *Epist.* 22, 29, 6f,” *Hermes* 121 (1993): 100–108.

20. The *moecha/lingua* relationship is “corrected and explained” by Shackleton Bailey, “More Corrections and Explanations of Martial,” *AJP* 110 (1989): 131–50, at 134.

7.24.8:

Cum Iuvenale meo quae me committere temptas,
 quid non audebis, perfida *lingua*, loqui?
 te fingente nefas Pyladen odisset Orestes,
 Thesea Pirithoi destitutisset amor;
 tu Siculo fratres et maius nomen Atridas
 et Ledaee poteras dissociare genus.
 hoc tibi pro meritis et talibus imprecor ausis,
 ut facias illud quod, puto, *lingua*, facis.

Here we find ourselves in the midst of a personal attack by Martial on some unnamed malefactor who has tried to come between him and his friend, Juvenal,²¹ by spreading spiteful untruths. In the closing couplet the malevolent gossip is addressed in synecdoche as *perfida lingua* to underline the perceived enormity of his crime. In the final verse personified *lingua* is addressed once again, this time in an oblique but loaded curse. The meaning and force of the veiled reference to *cunnilinctio/fellatio* latent in the words *facias illud quod, puto, lingua, facis* is all too plain to the hearer/reader, but never directly spelled out.

9.27.14:

Cum depilatos, Chreste, coleos portes
 et vulturino mentulam parem collo
 et prostitutis levius caput culis,
 nec vivat ullus in tuo pilus crure,
 purgentque saevae cana labra vulsellae;
 Curios, Camillos, Quintios, Numas, Ancos,
 et quidquid usquam legimus pilosorum
 loqueris sonasque grandibus minax verbis,
 et cum theatris saeculoque rixaris.
 occurrit aliquis inter ista si draucus,
 iam paedagogo liberatus et cuius
 refibulavit turgidum faber penem,
 nutu vocatum ducis, et pudet fari
 Catoniana, Chreste, quod facis *lingua*.²²

Chrestus' sexual hypocrisy²³ is exposed from the outset in no uncertain terms: the effeminate, depilated state of his body²⁴ does not square convincingly with his vociferous preference for traditional hirsute rôle-models and his professed adherence to old-world moral values—and any passing *draucus*²⁵ is easy prey. Martial's parting

21. According to Shackleton Bailey's note on 7.24.1 in his 1993 Loeb translation this is "very probably, but not quite certainly, the future satirist."

22. This poem adapts *Anth. Pal.* 11.155 (Lucillius). See the treatment of Burnikel, *Untersuchungen zur Struktur des Witzepigramms bei Lukillios und Martial*, Palingenesia 15 (Wiesbaden, 1980), 22–26 ("der heuchlerische Fellator"), and also p. 35, n. 66.

23. Treated by Juvenal in the second Satire (G. Highet's "The Faerie Queenes." See his *Juvenal the Satirist* [Oxford, 1954], 59–64, especially 60–61).

24. For male depilation in Martial cf. 3.74, with G. Hagenow, "Kosmetische Extravaganzen," *RhM* 115 (1972): 48–59.

25. "[...] men] who perform feats of strength in public [...] and who are] also in request for another purpose and could now and then earn pocket-money in their spare time" (p. 115; see below). Housman's note on the true meaning and import of the word *draucus*—corrective of the "lurid moonshine" of earlier editors and lexicographers—in "*Draucus* and Martial xi 8 1," *CR* 44 (1930): 114–16, is characteristically both learned and entertaining.

shot is a superb example of his closure technique: the mock-naïve, non-committal *pudet fari* is enough to fix *Catoniana* . . . *lingua* firmly in its “shameful” context. *lingua* of course picks up the earlier reference to Chrestus’ puritanical rantings (vv. 8–9), while the inspired choice of *Catoniana* completes the *dramatis personae* of staunch Roman worthies from v. 6.²⁶ In the last verse hypocrisy, irony, and ambiguity embrace to provide a skilfully shrewd alternative to explicit denunciation.

Finally, the case of the talking flamingo.

13.71.2:

Phoenicopteri

Dat mihi pinna rubens nomen, sed *lingua* gulosus
nostra sapit. quid si garrula *lingua* foret?

A possible innuendo contained in *garrula lingua*²⁷ has been suspected at least since Housman’s correction²⁸ of Schrevel (and note the combination of vowels and liquids suggestive of an over-active mouth and flapping tongue). In this distich we move from the flamingo’s tongue as a gastronomical delicacy²⁹ to an organ ripe for gossip.³⁰ The opening colour-derivation is probably a red-herring here.³¹ The important words are *lingua* (both times), *gulosus*, and *garrula*.³²

Flamingo-tongue is a delight to gourmets; but what if the tongue were to gossip? There are two elements of the surreal here: first, a bird that can talk (in a manner that exceeds mere psittacine repetition and mimicry—the *mihi* of v. 1), and second, the suggestion that its severed tongue, prepared in some culinary dish, might tell tales. Whenever *lingua* is used cryptically in Martial, the *sous-entendu* is usually obscene, and there is enough mystery in the last verse to suggest just such a reading. But *gulosus* is a great hint towards an interpretation of sexual depravity.³³ For it can mean “gourmet” or “gourmand,” indicating either serious connoisseurship or gluttonous excess respectively.³⁴ To cloud the issue, it may be ambiguous in having

26. Cf. 1.24. The adjective *Catonianus* is rare, especially in poetry; see *TLL* s.v. for an overview. The imposing figure of Cato, whose austere moral standards were proverbial, recurs in Martial at 1.*pref.*; 1.8; 1.78; 2.89; 5.51; 6.32; 9.28; 11.2; 11.5; 11.15; 11.39; 12.3.

27. For the adjective *garrulus* used of people who are unable to keep secrets see *OLD* s.v., 1c.

28. See below n. 30.

29. Cf. Pliny *HN* 10.133: *Phoenicopteri linguam praecipui esse saporis Apicius docuit*.

30. Cf. *lingua* [. . .] *loquax* at Sen. *Thy.* 92. In a note on this epigram *ad loc.* from the original 1919–20 Loeb edition, Ker remarks: “This may be an allusion to Aesopus, the tragic actor, who served up a dish only of singing birds: Plin *NH* x. 141–42. Housman, however, thinks that *garrula* = telltale, and that the bird could say how impure the mouths were that fed on it.” The mention of Housman refers to the scholar’s thoughts on 13.71, which appeared in “Corrections and Explanations of Martial,” *JPh* 30 (1907): 229–65, at 264. Housman ends his note on the flamingo-epigram by opining: “This is the old wearisome indecency, ever fresh and entertaining to Martial and his public: *lingua, si garrula foret, narraret fortasse gulosorum ora sese manducantem impura esse*.” Izaac in a note from his Budé edition (see above n. 12), however, is not persuaded by Housman’s explanation: “. . . c’est peut-être ajouter de l’esprit à celui de Martial.”

31. “[. . .] habe ich eine Zeitlang versucht, Mart. 13, 71 zu verstehen,” so Siedschlag, *Form*, 98. Not content with the explanations of Housman, he ponders over the possibility of a latent, and as yet unrecognised, witticism involving an attributive, rather than a predicative, reading of *garrula*, a significance in the reference to colour, and the eating of feathers (p. 99).

32. *garrulus* is a common epithet for bird-chatter, for which see *L&S* and/or *OLD* s.v., both section 2a.

33. Cf. 11.61.13: *partem gulosam solvit indecens morbus*.

34. *L&S* and *OLD* do not help us here, but *TLL*, together with some of Martial’s usage, does. The epithet *gulosus* (= *gulae deditus vitio, sive multorum sive lautorum*; see *TLL* s.v. 6².2.58.5ff.) appears in a play on the

both meanings at the same time, as is the case in this epigram. Here its sense is initially descriptive of the *bon vivant* epicure, until the final question which all but confirms an unsavoury undertone.³⁵

Some final observations: four of these six examples occur in distichs, the remaining two being found in somewhat longer pieces. But note the part played by *lingua* in all cases but one (2.82.1): it is a word of closure, crucial to the “point,” and located in the last verse. In contrast, the seven sexually *explicit* examples from the same poet make use of *lingua* only once as *fulmen in clausula* (11.25.2), the other instances appearing elsewhere in an epigram in the company of a verb describing oral activity (*lambebat . . . fellaret* 2.61.2, 7; *lambere* 3.81.2; *linguam . . . fututricem* 11.61.10; *lingis* 11.85.1). Five of the six epigrams from the “ambiguous” category are addressed directly to named men in the vocative, and could refer either to *cunnilinctio* or *fellatio*, or both (with the exception of 3.84.2 where *cunnilinctio* alone is specified, and 9.27.14 where the reference to *draucus* confirms male-to-male *fellatio*). 13.71.2 is addressed generally to the reader, but the oral practices possibly implied by *gulosus* could again involve congress with either or both sexes. As a further variation on the narrative approach employed in the “ambiguous” pieces, we notice that in the “explicit” poems the male perpetrators of oral sex are twice addressed directly (*Baetice* 3.81.2; *Zoile* 11.85.1), twice described by name in the third person (*Linus* 11.25.2; *Nanneius* 11.61), and once anonymously in the second person, but with a clear indication of a male identity (*cum tibi vernarent dubia lanugine malae* 2.61.1). If the “ambiguous” epigrams are, on the one hand, all but one addressed to males who indulge in generally *unspecified* oral activity, on the other hand, by way of contrast, the “explicit” epigrams depict males who engage in quite *specific cunnilinctio* (2.61.2, 7 being the exception where male-to-male *fellatio* is described).

M. A. P. GREENWOOD, OSB.

St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate, England

two senses at 12.41.1: *Non est, Tucca, satis quod es gulosus: / et dici cupis et cupis videri* and at 12.64.2 with, I would suggest, a sexual connotation: *Vincentem roseos facieque comaque ministros / Cinna cocum fecit. Cinna gulosus homo est*. Moreover in 11.61, the *linguam . . . fututricem* of v. 10 is described as *partem gulosam* in v. 13. Indeed, the metaphorical use of the vocabulary of “eating” applied to the sexual sphere is well attested in Latin; see Adams, *Sexual Vocabulary*, 138–41.

35. Might I also here record the suggestion of a possible play on *Phoenicopteri* in the *titulus* and the Greek φοινικίσειν (perform *cunnilinctio/fellatio/irrumatio*)? Whether the *titulus* be authentic or not, there is enough in the distich alone to identify the bird physically (*pinna rubens*), and by reference to its culinary exclusivity (*lingua gulosus/nostra sapit*).

MAKING LUCIAN LOGICAL: AN UNNECESSARY EMENDATION IN THE OXFORD TEXT OF THE *VITARUM AUCTIO* (23)

The Oxford text¹ of Lucian's *Vitarum Auctio* (23) reads (Chrysippus is the speaker):

1. MacLeod 1974.