

existence of a much easier and better solution. *Advena* in Latin is not 'stranger' but 'comer'. Certainly Tiber comes from elsewhere, but he is still a 'comer'. It makes perfect sense to say

and Tiber was a comer to our oxen.

(I use the word 'comer' here, *faute de mieux*, for interpretative purposes only. 'Visitor', suggested by a referee, might be more elegant.) Ovid and Varro, quoted above, show that Tiber was regularly regarded as *advena* (in their own time as well as in early times), so that *advena* is appropriate here. There are enough passages to show that *bubus* is appropriate; Heyworth himself quotes Ovid, *Fast.* 1.244:

tantaque res paucis pascua bubus erat.

The whole emphasis is on *bubus*;<sup>1</sup> Tiber came down to *oxen*, not to buildings. Similarly in the previous line the whole emphasis is on the single word *nuda*:

Tarpeiusque pater nuda de rupe tonabat. (4.1.7)

The sense of line 8 is clearly consonant with that of line 7, and it fits perfectly into the context. Why look any further for a solution?

This solution was anticipated by Guil. Hertzberg, who in *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Elegiarum libri quattuor* (1843), iii.390, says:

ne tamen hic in voce advena haereas, advena erat nihil est nisi adventabat, unde advenam commune fluviorum e remotioribus montium iugis venientium attributum esse recte Burmann observat.

He also quotes *advena Nilus* from Ovid, *Fast.* 5.268. I have been unable to find any more recent editions which adopt the same solution.<sup>2</sup>

*Polytechnic of North London*

N. B. BOOTH

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that Rothstein (Berlin, 1924), although he says that the most important idea is that Tiber comes from a foreign land, nevertheless adds 'aber auch *bubus* ist wichtig' and goes on to explain its significance. I agree entirely with Heyworth that Rothstein's interpretation, in which emphasis is laid on two things at once, makes nonsense of the sentence. In any case, Ovid, *Fast.* 2.68 and 3.524, which refer to Tiber as *advena* in Ovid's own times, show that *advena* does not mean that Tiber comes 'from a foreign land', only 'from elsewhere'.

<sup>2</sup> I am greatly indebted to Professor O. Skutsch, whose clear exposition introduced this problem to me in 1950.

### PETRONIUS, *SAT.* 141.4\*

his admoneo amicos meos ne recusent quae iubeo, sed quibus animis devoverint spiritum meum, eisdem etiam corpus consumant.

These are the very last words of Eumolpus' testament. The editors all print them thus, but I suspect a hidden corruption in *devoverint*. The text may seem to have an acceptable meaning, but only on a superficial reading inattentive to the whole context. A certain exegetical discomfort becomes noticeable if the translations are compared: Ernout renders 'maudire mon âme', Ehlers in Müller's second and third editions translates 'sie meinen letzten Atemzug herbeiwünschten' (thus giving *spiritus* a strained translation as though it were *extremus* or *ultimus spiritus*), and Cesareo-Terzaghi's edition (under Pasquali's supervision) prefers to render with a nuance of the future 'con quel cuore stesso con cui mi avranno maledetto l'anima'. Obviously,

\* I am very grateful to Glenn Most for translating this note.

*devovery* is being understood as synonymous with *exsecrari*. This is an attested secondary meaning, 'curse', 'execrate', which developed from the technical religious one connected with the ritual of *devotio*. According to this interpretation, the *captatores* cursed the fact that Eumolpus, apparently a sick man on the verge of death, continued to live longer than they could reasonably have expected when they began to court him. But the expression does not seem adequate for conveying this meaning: instead, we would expect something like *vitam meam devoveryint* or *me et caput meum devoveryint* or, better, *me ad mortem devoveryint*, or similarly explicit expressions.

But the real obstacle lies elsewhere. Reading the entire context of 141.3–4 makes it quite certain that Eumolpus' words here still sound well intentioned towards the aspiring heirs, whose good will he has every reason to wish to keep: *admoneo amicos meos ne recusent quae iubeo*... They are supposed to maintain the affectionate sympathy they had manifested towards old Eumolpus, and it is precisely in the name of this affectionate sympathy that they will have to eat his body now that he is dead, just as the *propinqui* feed upon their dead relatives (this is the premise recalled in the preceding paragraph). If, instead, *devoveryint* is taken to mean 'they wished I would die', the effect of grotesque malice is lost: Eumolpus would stop pretending to trust the friends who courted him when he was alive and now, in his testament, would unmask them, accusing them of hypocrisy. I believe that the *mimus* sketched out at the moment of entering Croton (117.4) is still going on; and the last joke Eumolpus intends to play on the *heredipetae* requires that they figure in the words of his testament as sincere friends, and not as 'cursers'. And if so, Eumolpus is obliged to keep up the pretence (even beyond his – real or feigned – death) in the interest of his accomplices: indeed, he cannot be indifferent to the dangers Encolpius and Giton would run if he revealed his deception and the *heredipetae* sought vengeance for having been tricked. It is quite true that the use of testaments as vehicles of posthumous malediction or of slanderous retaliation was a wide-spread practice, especially in the Neronian period;<sup>1</sup> but it is obvious that Eumolpus has no reason to be so aggressive: if anything, as I have suggested, he should be concerned precisely to achieve the opposite effect.

Whether at the end of his stay in Croton Eumolpus really does die, or merely pretends to die in order thereby to escape the consequences of his deception, is irrelevant for the present discussion. Anyway it is impossible to decide on the basis of our fragments. What is certain is that Eumolpus *figures as dead* when, at this point in the story, his testament is publicly read out; but we cannot tell whether this death too is part of the original deception or a posthumous joke upon the *captatores* (although I myself incline to agree with those who think Eumolpus is undergoing a 'Scheintod').<sup>2</sup>

The codicils add to the testament a clause whose conditions for entering into possession of the legacy seem a decided deterrent; the heirs will have to eat Eumolpus' body. What I would call the theme of 'comedere corpus' becomes explicit here, but it was already foreshadowed by a hint at the very beginning of the Croton episode: cf. 116.9 *nihil aliud est nisi cadavera quae lacerantur, aut corvi qui lacerant*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On the contemporary atmosphere, cf. J. P. Sullivan, *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero* (Ithaca and London, 1985), 34f. and n. 35.

<sup>2</sup> This second possibility has been proposed, though doubtfully ('Ich phantasie also'), by H. van Thiel, *Petron, Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion* (Leiden, 1971), 50–1. For a discussion of the theme of 'Scheintod' in the ancient novel, cf. F. Wehrli, *Mus. Helv.* 22 (1965), 142–8.

<sup>3</sup> The theme manifests itself also in a varied form in a comparison with hunters and prey that symbolizes perfectly the 'captatory' activity of the *heredipetae*: 140.15, 'sicut muta animalia cibo inescantur, sic homines non caperentur nisi spe aliquid morderent.' For further examples of this theme cf. V. A. Tracy, 'Aut captantur aut captant', *Latomus* 39 (1980), 399ff.

In explaining the conditions with which Eumolpus binds his heirs, the clause performs a kind of retaliation, articulated in the text according to a scheme of strict parallelism: *quibus animis...spiritum ~ eisdem...corpus*. This scheme suggests we should find in the correlated phrase (*quibus...spiritum*) a verb in parallel with *consumere*. Hence I would emend to *quibus animis devorarint spiritum meum, eisdem etiam corpus consumant*.

*Devorarint* is a word particularly suited to expressing the ostentatious zeal (metaphorically: the insatiable appetite) with which the *captatores* had fed upon the *spiritus* of old Eumolpus, whom they had courted with such manifest enthusiasm. The words of the testament seem here to pay back in kind the adulatory flatteries of the *heredipetae*, the exaggerated demonstrations of respect with which they had expressed their admiration for Eumolpus' spiritual accomplishments. It will suffice to recall the matron Philomela's hyperbolic praise in 140.2 *...commendare liberos suos eius prudentiae bonitatie...illum esse solum in toto orbe terrarum, qui praeceptis etiam salubribus instruere iuvenes quotidie posset. ad summam, relinquere se pueros in domo Eumolpi, ut illum loquentem audirent*.

By an easy metaphor, *devorare* is used frequently to indicate the eagerness with which the spirit and the body can take up nourishment through the various senses (cf. Non. p. 454 *devorari non solum cibus gutture, sed et vox auribus potest*; Plaut. *As.* 649 *auscultate, et mea dicta devorate*; Poen. 968 *quam orationem hanc aures dulcem devorant*; Cic. *Sest.* 23 *verbum ipsum* [the Epicurean theory of pleasure] *omnibus <viribus> animi et corporis devorarat*); so too to indicate the enthusiasm aroused by certain things read (Cic. *Att.* 7.3.2 *qui illos libros devorasti* [ibid. 4.11.2 *nos hic voramus litteras*]) or seen (Mart. 1.96.2 *spectat oculis devorantibus draucos*). Plainly, in this meaning *devorare* is practically synonymous with *haurire*, the more usual word for designating the enthusiasm with which the spirit welcomes an idea, a feeling, a fine example to imitate: it will suffice to recall Curt. 6.2.21 *alacritatem et tanti animi spiritus haurire* (said of Alexander the Great's soldiers, who are inspired by his contagious zeal for battle); cf. also Val. Max. 7.2 ext. 1 *ipsam... [sc. eius] virtutem haurirent*; Sen. *Ep.* 59.9 *illa quae a sapientibus viris reperta sunt...apertis pectoribus haurimus* (many other comparable passages could be cited from Seneca).

In conclusion: Eumolpus' mocking request that the *heredipetae* eat his *corpus* is a retaliation constructed upon his pretending still to believe in their sincerity and manifesting what is almost a desire to summon them to a loftier degree of initiatory *sapientia*: his disciples, having fed zealously upon his *spiritus*, are now invited to a kind of mystic 'communion'.<sup>4</sup> *spiritum devorarint* is a felicitous expression, generated by parallelism and analogy from the corresponding *corpus consumant*. *Spiritus* is obviously felt as the opposite of *corpus* (the two terms are complementary: numerous examples in *TLL* s.v. *corpus* 1003.49–64). *Devorare* is produced by the correlation with *consumere*, with which it is synonymous but to which it adds the further semantic feature of greediness (cf. *CGL* 4.42.29 *consumit devorat*; Quint. *Inst. orat.* 8.25 *ut 'hominem devorari' cuius patrimonium consumatur*). Eumolpus pretends to have been seduced by his suitors' 'hunger for virtue' and entrusts his joke to an apparently logical but in fact quite absurd line of argument which – by a play on words – dresses itself in the semblance of rigorous consistency: as earlier my spirit, so too now my body.

Considering Petronius' peculiar irony, it would have been appropriate not only to

<sup>4</sup> Jacobs must have been following a line of reasoning not very different from my own when he proposed *devorant*, as indicated by Bücheler's apparatus; he was emending *not devoverint* but the reading of Burmann's text, *devoveant*.

collect comparisons involving cannibalism,<sup>5</sup> but also to proceed in the diametrically opposite direction. The idea of a wise foreigner who arrives at Croton, distributes 'spiritual food', and then preaches anthropophagy, should put readers of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, for example, in mind of something. There a wise old man of Samos, exiled precisely in Croton, teaches a new truth to all mankind: *parcite, mortales, dapibus temerare nefandis / corpora...ora vacent epulis, alimentaue mitia carpant* (15.75f. and 478: but cf. Pythagoras' whole speech in between these two statements, which argues that men who eat the flesh of animals are just like the man-eating Cyclops and should be considered no different from cannibals).<sup>6</sup> The image of Eumolpus as a 'teacher of truth' which emerges from the emendation *devorarint* is a further ironic signal pointing in the same direction and accompanying the mocking reversal that turns the Crotonians' Pythagorean vegetarianism into anthropophagy.

Università degli Studi, Pisa

GIAN BIAGIO CONTE

<sup>5</sup> The traditional background of the theme of cannibalism in the *Satyricon* has been analysed by H. D. Rankin, "'Eating People is Right": Petronius 141 and a topos', *Hermes* 97 (1969), 381–4.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. V. Ciaffi, *Struttura del Satyricon* (Turin, 1955), 126f.

#### DID MARTIAL HAVE A JEWISH SLAVE? (7.35)

inguina succinctus nigra tibi servos aluta  
stat, quotiens calidis tota foveris aquis.  
sed meus, ut de me taceam, Laecania, servos  
Iudaeum nuda sub cute pondus habet,  
sed nudi tecum iuvenesque senesque lavantur.  
an sola est servi mentula vera tui?  
ecquid femineos sequeris, matrona, recessus,  
secretusque tua, cunne, lavaris aqua?

Mart. 11.75 is a variation on the same theme and may serve as a commentary on 7.35. As it was not common to wear clothing in the bath,<sup>1</sup> a Roman lady not wanting *mentulam videre* (11.75.4) should not have gone to a public bath, where all the nude males, including Martial and his slave (7.35.3–4), were definitely not *spadones* (11.75.6; cf. 7.35.6).

Commenting on *sed meus...servos*, etc. (7.35.3–4), M. Stern states that 'Martial alludes to his Jewish slave as being circumcised',<sup>2</sup> a view shared also by H. Solin.<sup>3</sup> Such an interpretation cannot be based on the reading of the A family, *nuda sub cute* (cf. Lindsay's App. crit.),<sup>4</sup> but on the B and C families' variant, *nulla sub cute*, which, to my mind, is not an independent reading, but an attempt to reconcile the *nuda cutis*

<sup>1</sup> P. Howell, *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial* (London, 1980), 148; on voyeurism at the baths, see also Mart. 1.96, and Howell's Commentary, 307–8; on Mart. 11.75 cf. N. M. Kay, *Martial Book XI: A Commentary* (London, 1986).

<sup>2</sup> M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem, 1974–1984), i.525. Stern prints Lindsay's text and his app. crit.

<sup>3</sup> H. Solin, 'Juden und Syrer in westlichen Teil der römischen Welt', *ANRW* II, 29, 2 (1983), 659.

<sup>4</sup> T has vv. 1–6; *nuda* has been preferred by Martial's editors since Schneidewin (in his edition of 1842) distinguished the three families of Martial's manuscripts, cf. M. D. Reeve 'Martial', in *Texts and Transmission*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983), 241ff.; Scriverius, who based his text on MSS mainly from the C family, has *nulla*, cf. L. Friedlaender's edition (Leipzig, 1886), i.121; on contamination amongst the ABC families cf. Reeve, loc. cit. (above).