

collect comparisons involving cannibalism,⁵ 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).⁶ 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

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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,¹ 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',² a view shared also by H. Solin.³ Such an interpretation cannot be based on the reading of the A family, *nuda sub cute* (cf. Lindsay's App. crit.),⁴ 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*

¹ 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).

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

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

⁴ 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).

('bare prepuce', for this meaning of *cutis* cf. e.g., Celsus 7.25.1A) with the *Iudaeum pondus*.⁵ This *nulla sub cute* variant is unacceptable for two reasons: (a) It disregards the emphatic anaphora *sed...nuda* (3–4), *sed nudi* (5): excluding Laecania's slave everybody else is in the nude, and (b) it overlooks the comparison of Martial to his slave *sed meus, ut de me taceam, Laecania, servos/Iudaeum nuda sub cute pondus habet* (3–4) 'But my slave, not to speak of myself, has a *Iudaeum pondus* under his bare prepuce.' Since the issue is Laecania's covered slave, Martial first refers to the nudity of his slave, but in passing compares his endowment to his own. Thus the reading *nulla sub cute*, which circumcises the slave, unwittingly turns Martial himself into a *recutitus*.⁶

What is the nature, then, of the *Iudaeum pondus*, whose owner need not be a Jew? *Pondus* designates here the private parts of a male, whereas the attribute *Iudaeum*, which qualifies it, should be understood to convey the meaning 'such as Jews usually have,' 'befitting (or typical of) a Jew'; this meaning is further explicitly clarified and articulated by the words *mentula vera* (6).⁷ Martial and his slave have a true super-*mentula*, such as is typical of lustful, sexually potent Jews;⁸ still, both of them, as all the other males around, are uncovered and there for Laecania to behold. It is absurd, then, that she should insist on covering only her slave, as it would be absurd for her to cover her private parts while bathing in a female-only retreat.

Perhaps Martial did not own a Jewish slave after all.

Hebrew University, Jerusalem

DWORA GILULA

⁵ This reading is preferred also by J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982), 73, who, however, correctly takes *cutis* to mean prepuce.

⁶ The *nulla sub cute* reading, which initially came into being to do away with the prepuce, has generated a different (and quite preposterous) interpretation of *cutis*: a leather covering of the kind used by Laecania to cover her slave (*aluta*, v. 1), cf., e.g., P. Richard, *Les Épigrammes de Martial* (Paris, 1931), i.367 and 489, and Ker's translation in the Loeb series. This interpretation, however, does not solve the basic difficulty of the passage. Both Martial and his slave still have a *Iudaeum pondus*, which now is 'under no leather covering', and not 'under no prepuce'.

⁷ Adams, who equates *pondera* with testicles, op. cit. 13, and cf. 212, nevertheless understands *Iudaeum pondus* to be a description of a male who is *bene mentulatus*; cf. also p. 13.

⁸ For Jews' notoriety in this respect, cf. Tac. *Hist.* 5.2 *proiectissima ad libidinem gens*. Cf. the commentary of Stern, op. cit. ii.40ff.; Adams, op. cit. 13, who also cites Mart. 11.94, in which a lustful *verpus poeta*, who competes with Martial sexually, is attacked. The Romans treated Jews as a foreign ethnic group, one among many, and ascribed to them a stereotypic quality frequently ascribed to an ethnic group considered 'primitive', i.e. not effeminated by culture, cf., e.g., Mart. 7.3. It is not, however, a characteristic trait which appears in stereotypic descriptions of Jews in later literature; cf. also D. S. Barrett, *LCM* 9.3 (1984), 44.

A NOTE ON STATIUS, *THEBAID* 9.120f.

tandem intermissa iaculantum¹ nube potestas
reddere tela fuit.

Hippomedon is stoutly defending the body of his fallen comrade Tydeus against a mass of Thebans who press him hard: there is a break in the attack allowing him to return fire² while his allies Alcon and Idas with their troops come to his aid. It is

¹ Printed by all the modern editors (P. Kohlmann [Leipzig, 1884]; H. W. Garrod [Oxford, 1906]; A. Klotz [Leipzig, 1908, rev. T. C. Klennert, Leipzig, 1973]; G. Aricò and A. Traglia [Turin, 1980]; D. E. Hill [*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 79, Leiden, 1983]) and apparently the reading of all the principal manuscripts.

² The Loeb translator, J. H. Mozley (Cambridge, 1928), thought it was the Thebans who were returning fire, but the context clearly shows that it was Hippomedon who was under attack but