This obviously ties in much better with what follows than the text as Cunningham has edited it. For we know that in the subsequent narrative Jesus will tarry, and when He will finally arrive in Bethany, it will be too late, and Martha will reproach Him, saying: Lord, if You had been here, my brother would not have died — meaning, according to Basil’s interpretation of their message: if You had been here, the Illness would have seen You, and would have run away!

We would therefore translate as follows:

The Illness (personification) — they were saying — did not respect Your friendship, for when You were absent, it took Your place and seized the one who loves You. But {come quickly, for} when the illness will see You present again, it will indeed (καλέ) run away. For even the mere sight of You suffices for a cure {— therefore, come quickly!}.

NOTES

1. For the dramatic nature of many homilies of the Early Church, see M.B. Cunningham, Preaching and the community, in: Church and People in Byzantium, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 20th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Manchester, 1986, 35; and MacCormack, Christ and empire, time and ceremonial, B 52 (1982) 287–309.


4. The image contained in the verb δραπετεύσασθαι.


6. See also 5.7: δει γαρ απόντος κατέσχεν, παρόντι προσφέρει, where προσφέρει clearly has a future reference!

7. Cunningham translates τὸν ἀγαπότα as if Jesus were the subject of the participle. However, it is Lazarus who is the subject!

J.H. BARKHUIZEN AND G.J. SWART

University of Pretoria

JEWS, FISH, FOOD LAWS AND THE ELDER PLINY

There is a good deal of evidence that Pompeii was home to a community of Jews. Not all of this evidence is equally compelling, however. One of the indications of a Jewish presence which is not absolutely definite, but an indication which nonetheless commands interest, suggesting perhaps that
the Jewish community was large enough even to influence the economy, is that inscriptions survive on several *amphorae* found in Pompeii, which can feasibly be taken to refer to kosher food. We have, for instance, MUR CAST (*CIL* 4.2609), that is ‘muria casta’, possibly ‘kosher pickle’. Given the continuing fame of Neapolitan sea food, this pickle would almost certainly have contained fish (as, clearly, does the *muria* at Pliny *HN*. 31.94), and, if ‘kosher’ for *casta* is correct, the fish would have complied with Jewish food laws, as laid down for example at Deut. 14.9–10: ‘Of all that live in water you may eat these: whatever has fins and scales you may eat. And whatever does not have fins or scales you shall not eat; it is unclean for you’ (NRSV 1989); cf. Lev. 11.9–12.

Also found at Pompeii have been *amphorae* with inscriptions possibly referring to a kosher brand of *garum*, the fish sauce for which the city was renowned (cf. for instance Pliny *HN*. 31.94). Note *CIL* 4.2569 GAR CAST, that is ‘garum castum’ (although the first letter is admittedly indistinct), and see the notes *ad loc.* in *CIL*, where the reader is invited to compare *CIL* 4.2611 PAN CAST (fortasse [g]A[r] (um) CAST), and an urn, possibly from Pompeii but now in the British Museum, which is inscribed GAR CAST.

As it happens, most *garum* would have been kosher: Pliny can be taken to imply (*HN*. 31.94) that Pompeian *garum* was usually made from mackerel, while in the *Geoponica* (46.1; cf. 3, 6) we hear for instance of smelt, red mullet, herrings, anchovies and tunny. Pliny goes on, however, to list some examples of different kinds of *hallec*, that is the sediment of *garum* (*HN*. 31.95; cf. *Geoponica* 46.2). These include varieties made from oysters (*ostreae*), sea urchins (*echini*) and sea nettles (*urticae maris*), whatever the last might be. Not one of these would satisfy Jewish food laws as regards scales and fins.

That Pliny had some inkling of the dietary requirements of Jews is indicated in the same section of his work, that on varieties of *hallec*, where he writes: ‘aliud (sc. genus hallecis aut *garum*) vero (est), castimoniarum superstitioni etiam sacrisque Iudaeis dicatum, quod fit e piscibus squama carentibus’. This passage poses some problems, both of interpretation and text, which I wish to address. To begin, two minor points. Firstly, *est*, supplied by Mayhoff (Teubner 1967 repr.), is possibly right (cf. for example Pliny *HN*. 20.59 ‘alterum est genus [sc. lactucae] quod ...’). Secondly, the Loeb translator renders ‘castimoniarum superstitioni etiam sacrisque Iudaeis dicatum’ as ‘is devoted to superstitious sex-abstinence and Jewish rites’, and he is not alone in his interpretation; cf. M. Whittaker, *Jews and Christians: Graeco-Roman Views*, Cambridge 1984, p.76. But *castimonium* / *-a* can be used of religious or ritual abstinence from things other than sex, for instance food, and there seems no point at all in introducing sex here. Rather, it seems probable that Pliny is either referring to two faiths or superstitions, one Jewish and the other not, but which both adhere.
to similar dietary principles, or that he is referring by way of hendiadys to
the Jewish faith alone.

More problematic is 'squama carentibus'. Serbat (Budé 1972, p.165)
points out that this conflicts with such biblical passages as Lev. 11.9–12
(referred to above), and correctly states that therefore there must either
have been some mistake in the transmission of the text, or that Pliny must
have made a factual error. He denies, without reasons, the possibility that
Pliny could have been mistaken, and has therefore to deal with the text.
Serbat refers his readers not to the more recent MSS followed by editors
since Hardouin, who print 'squama carentibus', but to the older V and F,
which have 'squamamacerentnentibus', and to R which, following
the erasure of some letters, now reads 'quam ... carent ... tibus'. The
simplest explanation of '-ma-' after 'squama-' in VF's reading is that it
resulted from dittography, just as '-cerentnentibus' could have resulted from
the duplication of letters in carentibus. But instead of adopting this simple
explanation, Serbat improbably takes '-ma-' as a corruption of non, printing
'squama non carentibus'.

Palaeographic arguments for reading 'squama carentibus' aside, one
should of course not lose sight of contextual considerations. After 'quod fit
e piscibus squama carentibus', Pliny continues 'sic hallec pervenit ad ...'
and there follows the list of oysters, sea-urchins and sea-nettles referred to
above. Had Pliny written 'squama non carentibus', sic would have been
inappropriate to the scaleless sea-creatures to which he then turns. In
discussing sic, Serbat appears not to appreciate this.

If we then read 'squama carentibus', we are obliged to accept, against
Serbat, that Pliny has made a mistake. While realising that scales were im-
portant in deciding whether a fish was kosher or not, he has got things the
wrong way round. Nor is such an error unthinkable. It is not unknown, for
instance, for him to misread or misunderstand his sources: see D.E. Eich-
holz, CR 76 (1962) 63, reviewing J. André's Budé edition of Book 15. Also,
although several Roman authors show an awareness of the idiosyncracies
of Jewish food laws, this is not to say that their understanding of them was
accurate. Thus, for instance, Jewish abstention from pork gave rise to the
supposition that they worshipped pigs (Petron. fr. 47 [Bücheler] 'Iudaeus
licit et porcinum numen adoret', Plutarch Quaest. conv. 5.1). Given the
general level of Roman ignorance regarding Jews, that Pliny should make
a mistake of this nature should not warrant surprise.

Notes

1. I am grateful to a great many people for discussing with me the contents of this
note, and in particular to Professor J.B. Hall and Brenda Bell. I must also thank the
referees of Acta Classica. Any shortcomings which the note still contains are due to me alone.

2. See J.B. Frey, Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum 12, New York 1975. I propose to discuss some of this and other evidence elsewhere.


4. Since specific evidence that castus means 'kosher' is in short supply, a measure of caution is necessary. Note, however, that castus can be used to gloss καθαρὸς (CGL 2.216.47), καθαρὸς being the Greek word commonly used of kosher food: see A Patristic Greek Lexicon ed. G.W.H. Lampe, Oxford 1961, s.v. καθαρὸς §F1; cf. Origen de Orat. 27.12 τὸ καθαρὸν βρώμα καὶ τὸ ἁκάθαρον κατὰ τὸν Μωυσέως νόμον. Note also Acts 10.14, 11.18.

5. For the spelling, see ThLL 6.3.2517.82 ff.

6. For castimonium/ -a of ritual or religious abstinence from food, or specific types of food, cf. Apul. Met. 11.30 and see J. Gwyn Griffiths (Leiden 1975, 290) on 11.23.
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