BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berger, G., "Zur Wiederentdeckung Petrons in Italien (Poggios Funde und der Codex Traguriensis)," Actes de la XIIe Conférence Internationale d'Etudes Classiques: Eirene. Cluj-Napoca, 2-7 octobre 1972. (Bucuresti: Editura Academiei, 1975) 429-434. Reprint of Berger's work in the Petronian Society Newsletter 4.1 (1973) 4-6.

Campanile, E., "Letture petroniane," SIFC 46 (1974) 41-50. Critical readings at 77.4; 77.5; 55.3; 58.7.

Cizek, E., "Face à face éloquent: Encolpe et Agamemnon," PP fascicolo 160 (1975) 91-101. This particular issue of La Parola del passato is devoted entirely to the proceedings of the first congress of the Société internationale des études néroniennes held in 1974. The volume contains eight papers: R. Verdière, "À verser au dossier sexuel de Néron," pp. 5-22; J. Melmoux, "C. Helvidius Priscus, disciple et héritier de Thrasea," pp. 23-40; C. Gatti, "Nerone e il progetto di riforma tributaria," pp. 41-47; O. Montevecchi, "Nerone e l'Egitto," pp. 48-58; T. Zawadzki, "La légation de Ti. Plautius Silvanus Aelianus en Mésie et la politique frumentaire de Néron," pp. 59-73; B. Marti, "Lucan's Narrative Techniques," pp. 74-90; E. Cizek, "Face à face éloquent: Encolpe et Agamemnon," pp. 91-101; M. Segre, "Una lettera di Corbulone ai coi," pp. 102-104.

Cizek provides a most convenient summary of his own article (p. 101): "Toujours est-il que Pétrone monte au début du Satyricon une veritable controversia, un face à face affectivement éloquent. Nous disons éloquent parce qu'il pose les problèmes de l'éloquence, parce que les personnages - notamment Agamemnon - tâchent de se montrer éloquents et, enfin, parce que la discussion revêt une complexe signification idéologique. D'ailleurs le fait qu'en dernière analyse Encolpe et Agamemnon tiennent des exposés assez compatibles et même complémentaires constitue un trait assez répandu dans les milieux des rhéteurs, même au cas où ils n'avaient rien à voir avec la philosophie de la Nouvelle Académie. Souvent les litiges rhétoriques mettaient en oeuvre des démarches compatibles et complémentaires au-delà des opposition manifestes. Ce n'est que l'humour de Pétrone et le burlesque de ses personnages qui apportent en ce cas de res novae au monde de l'éloquence. Quoi qu'il en soit, la controversia se dresse sous les yeux du lecteur, en plein roman comique, particularisée, paradoxalement modérée et grotesque à la fois - car l'auteur la veut discrète dans ses thèses opposées, mais dite par des personnages cocasses - mais réelle, vivante. Il s'ensuit qu'il ne convient plus de considérer l'affrontement habile auquel se livrent Encolpe et Agamemnon comme dénotant un véritable unité d'idées. Ou bien il y a plutôt lieu de penser que cette unité se dessine en filigrane, avec maintes nuances et au niveau d'une complexité significative. Nous pourrions donc conclure à une unité dans la diversité. Par dessus les précautions prises, l'antinomie semble irréductible sur beaucoup de points; et Pétrone bascule finalement dans le camp d'Encolpe. Un esprit avisé, comme celui du romancier, connaissait à fond tous les secrets de la dialectique de l'écriture."

Cizek, E., "Le roman 'moderne' et les structures du roman antique," BAGB 33 (1974) 421-444. The Satyricon represents a hostile reaction to early Greek romances, in fact, a parody of them. The Satyricon endorses the Epicurean carpe diem way of life. Petronius' concern with cultural problems, such as art and education, is also evident. Both the Satyricon and Apuleius' Metamorphoses have a philosophical infrastructure. Petronius' characters find comfort in the carpe diem principle, Apuleius' in Isis. (Sandy)

Colton, R. E., "The Story of the Widow of Ephesus in Petronius and La Fontaine," CJ 70 (1975) 35-52. Colton provides a detailed comparison of Sat. 111-112 and "La Matrone d'Éphèse, one of the Contes of the seventeenth-century French poet Jean de La Fontaine." It is interesting to observe what La Fontaine borrows directly from Petronius, what he alters, and what he omits.

Fredericks, S. C., "Seneca and Petronius: Menippean Satire under Nero," Roman Satirists and their Satire, ed. E. S. Ramage (Park Ridge, New Jersey: Noyes Press, 1974) 89-113. Fredericks holds that the Satyricon is an accurate reflection of Petronian sentiments about the Neronian court: " . . . the combination of decadence, wit, and sophistication that is found in the Satyricon is perhaps meant to be Petronius' expression of feelings that Nero had about art and society" (p. 99). Fredericks seems, however, by such statements to avoid clear and unequivocal statements about Petronius. The bulk of the piece is taken up with a review of recent Petronian scholarly opinion, and it does touch on some of the high points of contemporary controversy. We cannot expect that such a short overview could do more. The final statement of the piece echoes the latest scholarly opinion: "Perhaps, then like Ovid's poetry, the Satyricon is best appreciated as sophistication for sophistication's sake. It contains little profound moral thought and seems to have no deep moral purpose. It is simply clever commentary on the contemporary scene and should be viewed as such" (p. 113).

Pecere, O., Petronio. La novella della matrona di Efeso (Padova: Editrice Antenore, 1975). See review below.

Petersmann, H., "Textkritische Probleme bei Petron in neuer Sicht," WS 88 (1975) 118-134.

Priuli, S., Ascyltus. Note di onomastica petroniana (Brussels: Collection Latomus, 1975.) Collection Latomus 141.

Richardson, T. W., "Problems in the Text-History of Petronius in Antiquity and the Middle Ages," AJP 96 (1975) 290-305. "In the very early ninth century there emerged an archetype that may or may not have reflected in content Books 14-16 of the original Satyricon. This archetype was not an excerption or epitome but the result of copying a damaged and consecutive remnant of the original. Of that remnant altogether three editions were made, not necessarily at the same time or place but within a few years of each other; the first, containing a better and fuller version of what is now exclusively in L plus the complete Cena, was in intent complete. John of Salisbury may have possessed excerpts from it when it had lost already some of the Cena. Of it there is no manuscript tradition. There was one abbreviated edition, and one whole extract...
"Throughout this time the O-archetype was productive. R came not from B but from one intermediary or more . . . B itself lay untouched for centuries'. After R came P, a MS squarely thirteenth century by hand and readings. Its readings show affinities with L, as far as L can be vouched for through its sources. This agreement could be due solely to reading contamination, but more likely came through L being corrected on an O MS similar to P. L therefore also dates from the thirteenth century and is an attempted restoration of the full text of Petronius by an individual who had ac-

cess to an L* text, damaged and entirely without Cena after chapter 37. . .

"We are more fortunate with the O-class. BRP and the Bituricus were all made in France in their respective eras. Ş, a MS close to P, was discovered in France by Poggio and was sent by him from Britain to Italy. The survival of the Cena hangs from slender limbs. Since detachment it stayed in France until seen by John of Salisbury. Then, if it has a connection with Poggio's Cologne discovery, it made its way there. In the fifteenth century a Cena was copied in Italy together with a text of the O-class - both separately - into a single MS. It then disappeared almost immediately and was discovered two hundred years later having crossed the Adriatic. It perhaps typifies the troubled history of the text" (pp. 304-305).

Rissman, Leah, "Petronius and Homer: Another Common Thread," Eight Essays in Classical Humanities, ed. G. S. Schwartz (Millburn, New Jersey: R F Publishing, 1975). "It is generally acknowledged that the two major literary sources for the Cena Trimalchionis are Plato's Symposium, as Petronius' structural model from the genre of symposium literature, and Horace's Cena Nasidieni, for certain satirical elements and ideas. To these is added the non-literary inspiration provided by the behavior of certain of Petronius' contemporaries - both individuals and groups - and the author's own vivid sense of the ridiculous. Just as important as these, however, is the Odyssey, which provides the form which the mock-epic Satyricon supposedly mocks and whose fourth book - which takes place at the home of Menelaus - claims, among other marvels, the conventions of the hen-pecked, rich, slave-loving/hating buffoon of a husband, the bitch of a wife, an old bore (embodied here in the presence of the son of an old bore) and more silver and gold than one is accustomed to see even in epic. In addition to these stock characters, and no less important, there is the same spirit of sympathetic, playful satire which so permeates Cena Trimalchionis" (p. 71).

Soverini, P., "Sull'Uso degli avverbi in Petronio: avverbi intensivi e asseverativi," Atti della Academia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna 63 (1974-1975) 200-255.

Stanisław Stabryła, Funkcja noweli w strukturze gatunków literatury rzymskiej [The Function of the Short Story within the Structure of Latin Literary Genres] (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich. Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1974). This work consists of six chapters: Introduction, The Function of the Short Story in the Roman Epic, The Function of the Short Story in Historiography, The Function of the Short Story in the Roman Novel, The Short Story in Other Literary Genres, Conclusions. Chapter Four takes up the short story and the Roman novel and traces the geneology of the novel from the short story. A basic feature of the Roman novel is its tendency to move back toward the short story and other kindred forms. A large number of exmaples illustrating this phenomenon is found in the Latin novels of Petronius and Apuleius. The first part of Chapter Four presents the results of the inquiry into the function of the short story in the Satyricon, in which fragments four separate structures had been distinguished, each one identifiable as a short story. The author devotes much attention to the structure of the individual short stories in Petronius in order to push back the frontiers of the early history of the novel. Some of the functions of these short stories have been clearly delineated through the story itself, while other functions are revealed by an analysis of the connection between the short story and the intent of the whole work. One of the most predominant functions of these short stories is satirical and directed at the failure of good manners and morals. The two short stories involving Eumolpus appear to have a psychological function. (Witold Truszkowski)

Reviews

Priuli, S., Ascyltus: Note di onomastica petroniana (Collection Latomus 140, Brussels 1975). Pp. 67.

review by

J. P. Sullivan

This monograph was prompted by the discovery in 1954 of a mid-second or early third century sepulchral inscription containing the name Ascyltos, not otherwise attested outside the Satyricon. The inscription was published in 1966 in Epigraphica 28 (1966) 24-5. n. 10; Priuli's epigraphical comments on this are not to our purpose (Ch. 1, pp. 7-11), particularly since the illustrations he refers to ("tav. 11, Fig. 2", etc.) are not reproduced in my copy. Chapter II (pp. 14-20), surveys, without exhausting, the literature concerned with Petronius' choice of names for his major and minor characters; many items could have been omitted without loss. Most would agree with Priuli that this was a deliberate and informative part of Petronius' artistic technique, which provides all the more reason surely for a cold and non-permissive eye on the vagaries of past scholarship. Ch. III (pp. 21-27) briefly discusses whether the names in the Satyricon allow us to affiliate the work to Roman comedy or, more plausibly, to one form or another of the novel, the satiric-realistic version or the Greek erotic version. Ch. IV tackles the problem of the dating of the Satyricon and its author through a study of the names in the work. This is done by surveying previous work on the subject and reaching no firm conclusion, except that such an effort has its uncertainties and dangers. Ch. V, perhaps the most useful because of its detailed information, consists of a series of notes on a small selection of names in the Satyricon. There is far too much padding in the detailed discussion of previous scholarship, but Priuli does imply correctly that Petronius' choice of names is generally overdetermined, and so a number of alternative theories for a particular choice may be reconciled. Ch. VI, which reverts to the original impulse of this study, discusses the question of whether or not Ascyltos is a name coined by Petronius from the Greek adjective meaning "indefatigable." As usual, the conclusion is tentative: since the name, as a cognomen, is found on a later imperial inscription, then, however rare it be, given it could be an instance of Petronius' choosing a real name which was also appropriate for his artistic intentions. Ascyltos conforms to standard ancient practice for choosing a slave's name; secondly, it conforms to Petronius' normal (but not invariable) practice when naming his characters. Priuli then suggests, as an alternative, that a reader used the name from the Satyricon for one of his own slaves, since such literary names were not uncommon. Perhaps the growing popularity, according to the surviving inscriptions, of the name Encolpius (not to mention Eumolpus) is to be similarly explained (p. 64 f.). If so, its popularity will be due to people born in the time of Nero or not long after. Priuli's basic, if tentative, thesis is that the Satyricon had some limited, but effective, distribution which resulted in the increasing use, after the Neronian period, of such names as Encolpius and Eumolpus (pp. 64 ff.); because of its negative characteristics, Ascyltos was not too common, but did survive in this one inscription. Buried in the excessive and repetitive pages of this monograph there is a thought-provoking article and a few useful notes. Priuli's modest tentativeness in offering his suggestions might well have been reflected in a greater taste for brevity.

Pecere, Oronzo. Petronio: La Novella della Matrona di Efeso. Padova: Antenore, 1975 (Miscellanea Erudita XXVII). xv-150 pp. L.5000.

review by Hans Runte

O. P.'s innovative and thorough study will interest more than the Latin classicist for whom it is intended. Any modern language "amateur" of the immortal Matron of Ephesus, including the present reviewer, will have to take O. P.'s methodological approach as a new point of departure for a badly-needed European history of the tale. Italian criticism (Zambrini 1868, d'Ancona 1880, Rua 1888, Cesari 1890, Pitré 1894, Rotunda 1942 et al.) has not neglected the fate of one of Petronius's best-known creations. But like Grisebach's Wanderung (1873, 1877, 1883, 1886, 1889), none of the traditional studies have succeeded in presenting more than a list of translations or adaptations and a

number of very speculative hypotheses concerning the transmission of the tale. Realizing not only the overpowering richness of the European Matron, but also the shortcomings of nineteenth-century research methods, O. P. has had the courage to exclude the "Fortleben" from his book (p. viii) in order to take a new and unobstructed look at the very base of the European tradition. These premises permit O. P. to replace the historical approach by a structural one: three quarters of his study (pp. 39-144) is devoted to a close reading during which he analyzes the narrative of the Petronian text sentence by sentence. The most general conclusions derived from this painstaking effort are summarized in the introduction (pp. 3-26). Here, O. P. cannot avoid discussing and sometimes rejecting the convictions of venerable fellow Petronists. In 1908, for example, G. Thiele had tried to trace the story to ancient collections of hellenistic argumenta or exempla. His precarious conjectures were supplanted in 1931 by O. Weinreich's Sisenna thesis. While O. P. rejects Weinreich's conclusions as being founded on too many hypotheses (p. 3), he retains the idea of an essential difference between the Latin "Hauptform" represented by Phaedrus-Romulus-Petronius, and Aesop's autonomous fable. For O. P., it is the historico-cultural background of the Latin "Hauptform" which distinguishes it radically from the Greek tradition: Aesop's "distrazione romantica" (p. 4) and Petronius's erotic adventure are too divergent to permit transmission; rather, Eumolpus's account is a genuinely Roman piece of writing (p. 4). O. P. accepts therefore E. Rhode's (1901) speculation about a relatively late Latin (or post-Aesopic Greek) model as the common source of the Phaedrus-Romulus-Petronius line (p. 4). Fortunately, O. P. consolidates these very general statements with a concise but thorough analysis of the structural manipulations which help define the independent character of the Latin material (pp. 5-7). His purpose might have been served even further had this analysis been conceived as a more contrastive study: the reader will find little on Aesop. As for the common structural elements which characterize the "Hauptform" and permit certain speculations concerning the Latin archetype, O. P. draws particular attention to the roles of the miles and the ancilla and the substitution of the traditional 2-character structure by a 3-character (or more) plot (pp. 5-6). Within the Latin tradition, O. P. discovers an essential dichotomy between the Phaedrus-Romulus fable and Petronius's novella. Curiously enough, Romulus is relegated in this discussion to a simple footnote (p. 7). Phaedrus's work is characterized as follows: (1) it is based on oral traditions; (2) the author's narrative autonomy is therefore limited; (3) consequently, the conflict between didactic purpose and narrative dynamism is resolved in favor of the former as witnessed by a very simple narrative structure; (4) the reflective, admonishing and moralizing thrust of the fable; (5) rules out historical actuality in favor of universal, eternal significance: the Matron is a type. Against this background, Petronius's novella is described as (1) having been written for a sophisticated reading public; (2) this radically different approach opened new horizons for the structuring of narrative which (3) in its complexity gives expression to the inventive tension created by traditional material filling a new form; (4) in Petronius's socio-literary analysis (5) the Matron is a multi-dimensional character. Over the past 900 years, most of Petronius's imitators have misunderstood his multi-faceted Ephesian widow and overlooked the sociological thrust of his satire. Above all, they have structurally damaged the pivotal seduction scene on which depends the success and literary value of any Matron story. As one of the great perpetrators of the Petronian tale, the European Seven Sages cycle is in this respect no more convincing than, for example, the French fabliaux tradition: in these often brutal diatribes against womankind, it was unnecessary and possibly disadvantageous to retrace the difficult psychological development from mourning to love-making of a widow whose unfaithfulness was established and taken for granted even before the narrative began. Satire here lay in the crude and unexplained juxtaposition of two diametrically-opposed states of mind, heart and body, while Petronian satire, as O. P. shows (pp. 82-106), feeds on the elaborate playing-out of a three-fronted amorous battle during which Petronius revels in the subver-

sive use of classical literary devices such as the "coup de foudre" (p. 74), the consolatio (pp. 80-81) and bellicose metaphors (p. 86). It is perhaps more than a happy coincidence that while O. P. was preparing his rigorous literary analysis in Rome, a compatriot of his was working on a new artistic interpretation of Petronius's Matron at Cinecittà on the outskirst of that same city. Federico Fellini's "Trimalchio's Tomb--The Story of the Widow of Ephesus" (Scenes 17-23, Shots 432-479) in Satyricon (which premiered in Venice on September 4, 1969) and O. P.'s La Novella della Matrona di Efeso, despite their divergent approaches, pay artistic and critical hommage to a brilliant example of their patrimony to which the world owes one of its most famous stories.

PETRONII ARBITRI: CENA TRIMALCHIONIS.
Edited by Martin S. Smith.
Pp. 233. Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press.£5.

by J. P. Sullivan

This is, on the whole, a very welcome edition of the Cena which should now replace Sedgwick for use in university curricula. The text is based on Müller's 1961 edition, but it is greatly improved by the judicious introduction of emendations put forward by more recent scholarship and the jettisoning of some of Müller's less plausible readings. It will be welcomed also by Petronian scholars, since it presents a fair picture of the cruxes as yet unresolved in the text. Naturally there will be disagreements about some of Smith's adopted readings, but that is to be expected. On the whole the text is sane, if a little conservative. The commentary is sensible, but occasionally somewhat briefer than one would like, although this economy may have been imposed upon him by the format of the series. Certainly there are a number of places where students might need enlightenment and will look for it in vain. On the other hand, Smith sometimes wastes valuable space in argument against readings or interpretations with which he disagrees. The introduction, bibliography and appendices are brief and interesting, but show additional signs of Smith's conservatism. He is unhappy about what he regards as the prevailing orthodoxy that the Satyricon was written about A.D. 64-66 by Nero's courtier, Petronius. Consequently he scarcely discusses the questions of Petronius' praenomen or the possibility that the author is T. Petronius Niger. Instead, he endeavours to minimize the most striking arguments for the Neronian dating, the Menecrates-Apelles-Petraites argument offered by H. T. Rowell and the Lucan-Seneca allusions most fully collected by K. F. C. Rose, and disregards, except in slighting references in the commentary, the mass of more circumstantial evidence supporting the thesis. Clearly, he hankers for an earlier dating (cf. p. 214 and the notes on 60.7 and 77.5) and an attribution of the work to a Petronius Arbiter, educated but of a lower rank, who was subsequently confused with Nero's arbiter elegantiae. Not an impossible idea (What is in Petronian studies?), but then many individual features of the Satyricon, not least the Bellum Civile, become difficult to explain and the author's motivation obscure. He is cautious also about the genre on which the Satyricon is based. He does not exclude "parody of romance as a partial and complementary explanation of the plot," but he also accepts the presence in the plot of some parody of epic. Mime and Menippean satire are also elements he is prepared to allow in the work, although he does not mention the near-contemporary Apocolocyntosis which indicates that Menippean satire was still a viable genre in early Neronian times. The chief omissions I found were, first, any extended discussion of the literary merits of the Cena in particular or Petronius in general. The still lively controversy as to whether Petronius is a major satirist of Rome's decadence and moral decay (the Highet-Arrowsmith-Bacon-Zeitlin thesis) or whether he is a highly artistic but less ambitious satirist, whose tasteful Epicureanism sets him perfectly at home in his milieu, whatever ironic and sceptical criticisms he may make for his and his circle's amusement. Secondly, he burkes any real discussion of Fraenkel's

theory of extensive interpolation in the work, although he
cautiously accepts, both in his text and commentary, that
there are indeed some. A valuable, somewhat tantalizing and
occasionally tendentious edition then, which should arouse
some detailed discussion. Here are a few points (among
others) at which I myself would disagree with his text:
(26.7) delete id est expectatio liberae cenae with Bücheler
and Müller; (27.1) read ludentem [pila] ; (37.7) vides tan-
tum auri; (46.1) quia tu, qui potes loqui, non loquere;
(59.6-7) et quidem galeatus secutus est Ajax strictoque
gladio; (62.11) omnia pecora <laceravit>, cf. 64.9, 74.5,
115., 116.18, 137.12 etc.; (67.7) sic nos babaecalae des-
poliamur (Heinsius); (77.4) [hospitium hospites capit].
One might add that there are probably more deletions to be
accepted in the text, and Smith has been overly cautious on
the matter.

NOTES

The Meaning of Some Proper Names in Petronius

by Joseph Wohlberg

It has been recognized that the names of some of the
characters of Petronius' Satyricon have meanings that ac-
tually describe their essential characteristics (e.g.
Eumolpus is the 'sweet singer') in the manner of G. B.
Shaw's Candida or Marchbanks. We can also guess that in a
loose way the general theme of the work is the wrath of
Priapus in parody of the Odyssey. It would be worthwhile
to see if the names of three of the important characters
of the Satyricon bear out the general theme.
Ascyltus offers little problem. The word Ϲκύλλω in
its primary meaning is 'to mangle', 'to tear', perhaps 'to
damage', and thus Ascyltus would mean undamaged. In view
of the general phallic theme of the work, by putting the
word φαλλός before the name, we would have φαλλὸς
ἄϲκυλτός , or undamaged penis. This characteristics is
amply deserved, particularly in Section 92, the scene in
the baths.
Giton is also simple. Γείτων means neighboring, neighbor-
ly, or perhaps accommodating. If we apply the same process
as above, we get φαλλὸς χείτων neighborly or accomo-
dating penis. The phrase tersely describes Giton, who
obliges anyone, whether it be Ascyltus, or Pannychis, or
Encolpius.
What happens if we apply the same procedure to Encolpius?
κόλπος means 'fold' and thus Encolpius should mean 'in
the fold', or 'within wraps'. In this way, φαλλὸς
ἐνκόλπιος should mean 'penis within the fold', or 'under the
wraps' (of the foreskin), and hence, unerected, the hero's
chief trait and problem.
In this way, by prefacing φαλλός before each of the above
proper names, Petronius would be carrying out the Priapean
theme and having a little 'in' joke with his intimate read-
ers.

SOME EMENDATIONS IN PETRONIUS

by J. P. Sullivan

37.7 est sicca, sobria, bonorum consiliorum - tantum auri
vides - est tamen malae linguae . . .

Hermeros is speaking of Fortunata and the phrase tantum auri
vides, although it has its defenders, has been proposed for
deletion by Nodot, Bücheler and Mueller. There would how-
ever be less objection to the sentiment ('see what a lot of
gold there is around thanks to her good sense'), if the form
of the interjection were improved. It is a characteristic
of Hermeros to use phrases such as vides tot culcitas; vides
illum. Similarly, transpositions of words are a character-
istic of H (cf. e.g. 43.4 uncta plena for plena uncta;
44.13, 56.9 etc.), read therefore vides tantum auri.

46.1 videris mihi, Agamemnon dicere: "quid iste argutat
molestus?" quia tu, qui potes loquere, non loqui.

H's reading loqui was altered by Burman to loquis to give
some remote plausibility to what the latest editor (M. S.
Smith, Petronius Cena Trimalchionis (Oxford 1975), p. 120)
describes as "very unusual active forms." Now Echion's
language is vulgar enough, goodness knows (e.g. pauperorum
verba at 46.1; te persuadeam, 46.2), but it usually stays
within the limits of the language spoken by the freedmen in
the Cena. It is therefore better to postulate again an easy
transposition as before, and read quia tu qui potes loqui,
non loquere, a perfectly acceptable form for loqueris, par-
ticularly with deponents. The temptation to accept any
morphological or syntactical nonsense in the text of the
freedmen's conversation because of the patent presence of
anomalies and bad grammar (by classical standards) is to be
resisted.

62.10 in larvam intravi, paene animam ebullivi.
in larvam H probantibus Süss et Nelson larva Müller ut
larva Bücheler

There is not the remotest parallel for an expression like
this, not because of in + accusative which can be paralleled
(see Leumann and Hofmann, Lateinische Syntax u. Stylistik,[a]
p. 275), but because larva is not used the way we use
'ghost' in expressions such as 'pale as a g.', 'white as a
g.', 'a veritable g.' A larva is an evil spirit (cf. eum
dedi larvis, Sen. Apoc. 9.3; cum mortuis non nisi larvas
luctari, Plin. Nat. pr. 31), even a model skeleton (larvam
argenteam, Sat. 34.8), and it can be used as a term of in-
sult (cf. larvas sic istos percolopabant, Sat. 44.5), but
why should poor frightened Niceros refer to himself so in-
sultingly? Commentators have been misled by the fancied
resemblance of the transmitted phrase to our modern expres-
sions. Read therefore in larem intravi in the sense of 'I
entered the house' (for parallels, see OLL s.v.). The cor-
ruption may have been due to the influence of the context,
the general spookiness of the story.

62.11 lupus enim villam intravit et omnia pecora ⟨*⟩ :
tamquam lanius sanguinem illis misit.

villam H: ovilia George dubitanter post pecora lacunam
statuerunt Bücheler, Mueller, Smith et alii: perculit
add. Bücheler praemordit add. Mueller[2] alii alia
The cases that can be made for a zeugma with intravit
or asyndeton are obviously very weak and most editors agree
that something has dropped out. Now the standard word in
Petronius for savaging or tearing apart, the idea that
clearly fits this bloody context, is lacerare (see in par-
ticular 64.9 Scylax. . .Margaritam(que) Croesi paene la-
ceravit; 115.18 ferae tamen corpus lacerabunt; 116.9
cadavera quae lacerantur aut corvi qui lacerant. lacera-
vit may therefore be restored here with some confidence.

Lucretian Motifs in Petronius' Satyricon

by

Natalie Woodall

In Book 3 of Lucretius' De Rerum Natura are found some
remarks commenting on and rejecting man's fear of death, as
well as comments on various mythological characters suppos-
edly punished by the gods for their misdeeds. Lucretius
dismisses these and the whole concept of a Hell to which
wrong-doers repair after death. Instead he points out that
humans create their own Tartarus here on earth because of
their fears of death and punishment for their crimes. An-
other Epicurean writer, Petronius, had some comments on
these ideas, as well as on the rewards of excessive vices
and licentiousness. His work suggests a conscious effort
to echo the thoughts of Lucretius in such a way as to pre-
sent them in a manner acceptable to the reader of his own
day. This paper is an attempt to explore the borrowings of

Petronius and to give a reason for them. Oskar Raith (Petronius ein Epikureer, 1963, 6-19) has also done some work on Petronius and Lucretius. References will be made to his comments and observations in several places. Lucretius' statements on death in Book 3 include the example of the man who has died in a shipwreck far away from home. Never again will he see wife and children (Luc. 3.930-62). This corresponds to the soliloquy spoken by Encolpius, the so-called hero of the Satyricon, over the dead body of Lichas, his enemy (Sat. 115). Many of the images of the two passages are identical: the shipwreck, drowning, wife and children left alone, the fate of father and husband unknown. But while Lucretius points out that this man also has no more worries, Petronius makes his character take the part of the anguished survivor to whom Lucretius refers when Encolpius says, "Haec sunt consilia mortalium, haec vota magnarum cogitationum. En homo quemadmodum natat" (Sat. 115). With this ironic statement, for Lichas certainly is not swimming, indeed can no longer swim, Petronius illustrates the Lucretian idea that it is the living and not the dead who suffer by death. It is even more ironic when Encolpius discovers who it is that he has been mourning. One is reminded of the old statement that one does not speak ill of the dead. Encolpius instead throws up to the corpse the incomplete desires of a lifetime, as if the body cares now what has and has not been accomplished. No matter what one does, the end of each person's life is the same. The body bobbing in the water symbolizes the futility of attempting to amass great wealth and prestige. Better to stay home quietly and peacefully with wife and family. Raith compares Encolpius to a Cynic who would laugh at a body seen drifting in the water. On the contrary, Encolpius cries. For Raith, the funeral for Lichas points out Encolpius' true Epicureanism because this act gives him a sense of peace (Raith, 15). This author views Raith's ideas with some skepticism. The true Epicurean, like the Cynic, would not have been concerned over the body. Encolpius, however, is shown conforming to society's rituals, even for a mortal enemy. Weeping over the body was a part of that ritual. Giving the body a funeral was another. Lucretius speaks at length of the man who is concerned over the fate of his corpse, saying that he who worries about his dead body really does not believe that there is no sensation after death. Encolpius says, "At enim fluctibus obruto non contingit sepultura. Tamquam intersit, periturum corpus quae ratio consumat, ignis an fluctus an mora" (Sat. 115). To those who survive Lichas, a decent funeral may mean a lot, but Lichas himself no longer cares. Petronius and Lucretius, in their discussions of the fears man has for his corpse, both use the example of wild beasts who may maul or even eat the body. Lucretius then points out that although they may fear the ravages of wild beasts, men do not find embalming or cremation offensive, as if one fate for the body may be felt and the other may not. Petronius makes Encolpius say, "Quicquid feceris, omnia haec eodem ventura sunt. Ferae tamen corpus lacerabunt. Tanquam melius ignis accipiat; immo hanc poenam gravissimam credimus, ubi servis irascimur. Quae ergo dementia est, omnia facere, ne quid de nobis relinquat sepultura?" (Sat. 115). Both authors share the idea that it is foolish to worry over one's body after death because there is no sensation, no feeling. If one does not feel embalming or cremation, then one will certainly not be bothered if animals devour the corpse. Again, it is for the living, the survivors, that burials must be given and funerals held. Besides commenting on man's fear of death, Lucretius seeks to show that the fear of punishment after death is unrealistic. This fear of such punishment actually creates a Hell here on earth for mortals. Three characters from the Satyricon, Encolpius, Eumolpus, and Trimalchio, are expanded from Lucretius' list of personalities supposedly in Hell paying dire punishment for their crimes. Lucretius says that there is no Tantalus, "sed magis in vita divom urget inanis / mortalis, casumque timent quem cuique ferat fors" (Luc. 3.982-83). This description fits Encolpius, the narrator of the Satyricon, very well. He is impotent, made so, he thinks, by a curse imposed by Priapus, whose rites he invaded in a no longer extant section of the work; he evidently has murdered someone too; towards the end of the book he takes part in a deception of the legacy-hunters of Cro-

ton. In fact Encolpius himself echoes Lucretius' statement when he says, "Dii deaeque, quam male est extra legem viventibus. Quicquid meruerunt semper exspectant" (Sat. 125). Later he says that nobody deserves to have bad fortune more than the man who desires somebody else's good luck (Sat. 140). Lastly he tells Eumolpus that Fortuna is about to leave them (Sat. 141). This is in reference to the fact that the deception which Eumolpus and Encolpius have been carrying on in Croton is about to be exposed. Encolpius blames Fortune for this, while actually the stupidity of the group is at fault. Encolpius is also modeled after the Lucretian passage which likens a frustrated lover to Tityos who has been forever doomed to have his liver torn and eaten by birds. "Sed Tityos nobis hic est, in amore iacentem quem volucres lacerant--atque exest anxius angor--/ aut alia quavis scindunt cuppedine curae" (Luc. 3.992-94). Encolpius' boyfriend, the fickle and faithless Giton, causes him no small amount of grief. When Ascyltus, a so-called friend, and Encolpius quarrel over the boy, Giton sides with Ascyltus, thereby crushing Encolpius emotionally. When Giton and his former lover are finally reunited, the boy gives Encolpius an evasive answer as to why he chose Ascyltus, saying that he did so to prevent bloodshed. By now, however, he has had second thoughts about his choice, since Encolpius finds him acting as Ascyltus' servant in the public bath (Sat. 91). For the remainder of the book Encolpius lives in constant fear that Giton will turn his affections elsewhere. Tryphaena, for example, offers Encolpius a few bad moments when she and Giton become quite familiar (Sat. 113). Encolpius also discovers that Eumolpus may be a prospective rival and worries about this (Sat. 92). Since Giton is not really worth the effort which Encolpius expends on him, Petronius' development of Lucretius' type of the jealous lover as a concrete case is quite effective. As Raith points out, love has even been removed by Petronius from the Epicurean's list of emotions to be avoided. It has been replaced by "livor et luxus" (Raith, 13 and n. 34). The faithlessness of Giton only demonstrates more clearly how deeply Encolpius is consumed by his love for the boy. Eumolpus is the Lucretian Sisyphus who is eager for public acclaim (Luc. 3.995-1002). Unlike the politically-minded Roman aristocrat, however, Eumolpus cares nothing for public office; his goal is to be acknowledged as a great poet. This is a goal, however, which it appears will never be fulfilled, because everywhere he goes he is stoned or driven out (Sat. 90). Eumolpus believes that art has degenerated to the point where what is good is no longer appreciated, and that money nowadays will buy what merit used to earn (Sat. 88). He carries on at length about the ability of money to corrupt and degrade. "Tum ille 'pecuniae' inquit 'cupiditas haec tropica instituit. Priscis enim temporibus, cum adhuc nuda virtus placeret, vigebant artes ingenuae summumque certamen inter homines erat, ne quid profuturum saeculis diu lateret'" (Sat. 88). Eumolpus on the other hand is eager to bring to the world what he considers to be excellent examples of poetry. Even shipwreck leaves him unperturbed, for Encolpius has trouble getting him to escape when he is composing a new poem which he says, "laborat in fine" (Sat. 115). Eumolpus, like Sisyphus, rolls his stone, here the wish to be a great poet, up the hill constantly, only to have it roll down again when people do not appreciate his efforts. Even Encolpius cannot stand his verses (Sat. 90). A third type taken from Lucretius is that of the person who is never satisfied, no matter how much he has (Luc. 3.1003-1010). Surely this sketch fits Trimalchio, the best-developed character in the Satyricon. Trimalchio needs his excessive wealth to give him a personality. Since he is a freedman, wealth is the only thing which can give him a sense of pride. Even his name--C. Pompeius Trimalchio Maecenatianus--is showy, combining the names of a great general and of an outstanding literary patron, the latter a thing which Trimalchio considers himself to be. His desire to belong to an upper stratum of society is in some way appeased by this wholesale borrowing of names. Trimalchio makes no secret of the fact that he began his career as a slave, working his way to prosperity by currying favor with his master, eventually inheriting half his wealth (Sat. 75). As Trimalchio himself says, however, "nemini tamen nihil satis est" (Sat. 76). He recounts his business adventures for his guests. Although

he had some bad luck in the beginning, at last he was able to amass a huge fortune. He says that he then retired. His reason was that he was now richer than everyone in town put together (Sat. 76). But did he really give up his business? Trimalchio himself says not, and demonstrates this by his wish to acquire the whole of Apulia (Sat. 77). In another example of ostentation and the desire for more and more, Trimalchio reports that he has added on to his house which he declares was once a "casula", but is now a "templum". He is proud of the fact that the place has four dining rooms, two marble porticoes, and twenty bedrooms, besides the quarters for the master and mistress, and other assorted refinements (Sat. 77). Trimalchio's possessions also include his slaves, of whom he has many--so many in fact that he has them organized in military units. While he can be a severe master, he is also quite friendly towards them. At one point he says that slaves are human, just like their masters. He even insists that some of them join the guests at dinner (Sat. 70). He announces that he plans to free all his slaves by will, and to prove it, (and by the way to win sympathy and approval from them and his guests) he has the will brought out and read to the whole company (Sat. 71-72). The desired effect is produced; everybody weeps profusely. Trimalchio, however, is not satisfied even with this, for he soon orders a slave to bring out his funeral garments. He then demands funeral music, and announces that he is going to pretend to be dead so that he may hear some nice things said about him: ". . .fingite me" inquit "mortuum esse. Dicite aliquid belli" (Sat. 78). One wonders how often this scene is repeated for the benefit of an insecure master. Lucretius' type as expressed in the character of Trimalchio is psychologically sound. Trimalchio's possessions are what give him a personality. The more he has, the bigger man he is. His ostentation is a mere reflection of his need, as a member of the lowest stratum of Roman society, to be "someone". In fact Trimalchio admits this, saying "credite mihi, assem habeas, assem valeas; habes, habeberis. Sic amicus vester, qui fuit rana, nunc est rex" (Sat. 77). His constant need for attention and affection, even from slaves and people he hardly knows, demonstrates this situation well. He has even gone so far as to put his biography into a series of wall panels so that all who enter his house will immediately be exposed to his good luck story. In other words, Trimalchio consciously tries to use his wealth to make others like and admire him. He reminds Habinnas, one of his guests, that an astrologer once told him he was unlucky in his friends and that they were never grateful enough for what he did for them. Grumpily he observes, "Nemo umquam tibi parem gratiam refert" (Sat. 77). He cites his wife Fortunata, whose freedom he bought, as an example, because she is jealous of his favorite slave Croesus. This need for affection will extend even beyond the grave, since Trimalchio gives orders that his name be placed on a large sundial which will form a part of his tomb. In this way, the person who wishes to know the time must also become aware of the man who provided the timepiece, long after Trimalchio has died, as if he would have any sense of it (Sat. 71). It was the desire, then, of both Petronius and Lucretius to show how man's unrealistic fears and unnecessary desires led him to disaster and despair. Raith comments that out of these fears sprang the introduction of gods. Because he was not able to explain natural phenomena, man began to assume that they were caused by some higher being. This assumption led to a lack of calm (Unruhe) and to fear (Angst) (Raith, 12). Lucretius' arguments were designed to free his fellow Romans from these problems. In must be presumed that Petronius thought that these ideas had not succeeded in winning many converts. His own effort, then, was to illustrate, by giving life to several of these Lucretian types, the precepts for a better and more peaceful life. For if ever a character brings problems upon himself and fears for his life because of superstition, suspicion, and jealousy, Encolpius does. Raith says that Petronius, unlike Lucretius and Epicurus, was openly scornful of the gods (Raith, 18), and further that he purposefully set out to prove that they were a fiction (Raith, 12). This is best pointed out by Encolpius' impotence which has supposedly been brought about by Priapus. The fact that Encolpius is at times perfectly capable of performing the sex act demonstrates the foolishness of attributing this malady to the gods. In the case of Trimalchio the Epicurean model of retirement from seeking after gain is reinforced. Here is a man who ostensibly has all, but in reality has nothing, since he requires that people he scarcely knows pay homage. These two characters, and others in the Satyricon, represent everything which the Epicurean wished to avoid--greed, fear of death, desire for public affection and acclaim. And it is to Petronius' credit that he was able to set forth his ideas in a comic setting. As Raith points out, for some things it just did not pay any longer to be serious (Raith, 19). In other words, if a serious discussion concerning the fear of death and eternal punishment did no good, perhaps a darkly humorous story would.