THE RECOLLECTIONS OF ENCOLPIUS
A READING OF THE SATYRICA AS GRECO-ROMAN EROTIC FICTION

by

Gottskálk Pór Jønsson

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Graduate Department of Classics
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Gottskálk Pór Jønsson 1997
The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author’s permission.

L’auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L’auteur conserve la propriété du droit d’auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.
ABSTRACT
The Recollections of Encolpius:
A Reading of the Satyricon as Greco-Roman Erotic Fiction.
Ph.D. 1997
Gottskálk Pör Jensson
Department of Classical Studies
University of Toronto

While late nineteenth century scholars debated whether the Satyricon was a traditional or an original work in ancient literary history, twentieth century Petronian scholarship has mostly taken for granted that the author was a unique innovator and his work consequently a synthetic composition. Among the unfortunate consequences of this modern consensus have been the excessive emphasis on authorial intention and numerous studies of parts of the work, taken out of the larger context, which have tended to increase the already severe state of fragmentation in which the modern reader finds the Satyricon.

This dissertation attempts to counteract this latest trend in the almost two thousand years reception-history of the work by employing the ancient rhetorical theory of narratio for the analysis of the narrative form. By this means we are able to present a reading of the Satyricon as the mimetic and "spoken-to-be-heard" (as opposed to "written-to-be-read") performance of the narrator Encolpius, involving multiple impersonations of characters, who often become subordinate narrators as well; and the use of various discourse types, including metrical speech.

The textual presentation of the narrative of Encolpius as the "recollections" of the narrator requires a renewed effort at reconstructing the story told by this exiled Greek scapegoat with the education of a Roman aristocrat. Our reconstruction reveals a coherent
travelogue with a formulaic plot and consistent characterization, delivered to an audience which is socially and morally superior to the comic narrator, who, besides relating his erotic suffering, practices satire and social criticism in the manner of popular philosophy. The nature of this moral satire and how it relates to the narrator's ideal audience is analyzed in some detail.

Finally, we attempt to revise the Satyrca's position in the context of Greco-Roman literary history, revisiting the arguments of German fin de siècle philologist Karl Bürger, whose historically eclipsed thesis is vindicated by recently discovered Egyptian papyri. To Bürger's arguments we add an analysis of the linguistic and cultural layering in the Satyrca, and show that the work is most likely an adaptation of a specific Greek model, also written in a mixture of discourse types. As a result, we conclude that the Satyrca is best classified with the other "shameless" erotic fictions referred to in Roman sources as Milesiae, after Sisenna's early first century B.C.E. adaptation.
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INTRODUCTION
TEXT, CONTEXT AND IDENTITY

This study is an attempt to interpret the Satyricon in accordance with its original design as an extended fictional narrative, in defiance of the severe limitations imposed by the fragmented state of the extant text. Despite the copious measures of material still extant from the original Satyricon (185 pages in the standard edition),\(^1\) anyone wishing to advance a literary interpretation of the work faces the daunting task of working with an extraordinarily fragmented text. As the result of obscure events in the textual history of the Satyricon, the modern text must be reassembled from four different and overlapping traditions, the most extensive of which owes its preservation largely to late sixteenth century printed editions.\(^2\) Beyond these four textual traditions there are several important allusions to the work in late ancient sources (e.g., Servius, Boethius, Sidonius Apollinaris and Fulgentius), and some loose poems from separate traditions attributed to Petronius.


\(^2\) The Long Fragments (L), see Richardson (1993). The other textual traditions are the Short Excerpts (O), the Florilegia (φ), which cover much less but practically no other material than L; and finally there is the Cena Trimalchionis (H), which represents the only continuous and whole text, as far as it goes, and is preserved in a single manuscript, the Traguriensis or codex Paris. latinus 7989. For attempts to explain the obscure history of the text, and especially the unclear relationship between L, O and φ, see Müller (1983), 381ff.; Reardon (1983), 295ff.; Richardson (1975), 290ff.; and van Thiel (1971), 2ff.
When this modern patchwork of a text is read through, it becomes apparent from the contents that what we have first opens late in the story—probably no earlier than in the latter half of the original—and breaks off before there is an end in sight. That this is the case is also indicated by manuscript evidence which assigns the extant text to books 14, 15 and 16. The extant material could well derive from more than three books and thus take us beyond book 16, but we cannot say how many books there were in all. If the book numbers are to be trusted, the scale of the original appears to have been at least four times the extant text.

These statistics, however, do not tell the whole story, since the information that we have is by no means limited to what is fully preserved of the text. As in other extended fictional narratives, internal allusions abound. In theory at least, the entire context of the Satyricon is implicit in every preserved sentence. A few words can sometimes supply enough information to roughly outline the contents of entire episodes. As it happens, the information available to us has not been recognized for what it is worth. Due to the nineteenth century misunderstanding of certain crucial external fragments, and the general lack of interest in the larger form of the work in our century, there is a strong tendency in the scholarship to trivialize the significance of internal allusions, despite the fact that the extant text is conditioned by earlier episodes. My findings in this study indicate that we can improve considerably our knowledge of the plot in the missing early parts of the story, leading up to the point where the extant text begins.

3 Chapters 1.1-26.6 are likely to represent fragments from book 14. Book 15 most likely began at 26.7, with the arrival of a new day. How many books are represented by the rest (likely more than one), or where divisions are to be placed, is problematic. For a further discussion of the problem, see, e.g., Müller (1983), 410ff.
There is no denying that the study of the Satyrica has been greatly hampered by the incompleteness of the text, but another factor of major consequence is also a general, but not necessarily justified perplexity regarding the authenticity of what is extant. Even the current approach to the text, which was initiated and defined by Franz Bücheler's critical edition of 1862, fails to show adequate respect for the tradition. As I show in Chapter One of my study, the narrative of the Satyrica properly represents "spoken" discourse to be listened to, as opposed to a "written" text to be read, which explains why the style is so colloquial and improvised in flavor. This allows for unusual forms, colloquial syntax, brevity in descriptions, loose ends and quirky transitions. Recently published Greek papyri of prosimetric fiction indicate that it may be unreasonable to expect a fully polished literary text in this genre. Such a text does not invite rationalizing emendation. In fact, there is no reason to be overly skeptical about the tradition. As far as it goes, it seems reliable in preserving an unusual and very difficult text. In any case, nothing is known about the circumstances surrounding the loss of most of the text, and very little is known about the origin and relationships of the four overlapping traditions. There exists therefore no reliable historical basis on which to ground a systematic emendation of the text. Under these circumstances editorial conservatism seems obligatory.

The history of editorial responses to our text, however, reveals an astonishing unwillingness to accept the received tradition, as is demonstrated by the unusually great number of misguided attempts at repair, ranging from creative rewriting, to arbitrary reshuffling of fragments, to wholesale pruning of supposedly alien elements. The record shows that the text of the Satyrica has throughout history been threatened by a strange license taken with it by scribes and scholars alike. This attitude is discernible already in the

---

methods of the earliest "editor" of the work, the collector of the Short Excerpts (O). This unknown scribe seems to have been chiefly interested in sampling poetic and literary passages, and censoring pornographic material of the "homosexual" type. He appears to have attempted to stitch together the gaps where he had left out material, implying new continuity by means of clever juxtaposition.\(^5\) From the same manner of license stemmed Nodot's publication (Paris, 1694) of a supposedly complete text—passed off as the transcript of a newly found manuscript—that proved to be counterfeited. This literary hoax is an entertaining story on its own, but the promised *Petronius restitutus* is little more than the present fragments with the gaps imaginatively supplemented.\(^6\) Again the creative approach was attempted by Marchena (1800), who fleshed out the fragmentary Quartilla episode with sexually explicit material that owed little to the obscenity of the original.\(^7\)

The erotic nature of the *Satyricon* is certainly a factor contributing to the licentious approach which is traditionally taken to this text. Many of the difficulties that have beset the text throughout the ages derive from the irreconcilability of the work's pornographic material with the moral values of scribes and scholars.\(^8\) Whether in the libidinous additions of Marchena or in the censorious logic that guided the excerptor of the Short Fragments (O), the sexually explicit material in the *Satyricon* has been crucial for its textual preservation. 

\(^5\) See Müller (1983), 420ff.


\(^7\) Rose (1966), 268ff., prints the supplements.

\(^8\) Slater's (1990), 40, denial of the pornographic nature of the work overlooks much material, and relies on a too narrow definition of the "pornographic".
Today, this clash of values can be seen in the different reception afforded the least obscene part of the work, the *Cena Trimalchionis*, and the considerably more indecent main body of the *Satyrlica*’s text. The *Cena*, which is regularly published separately and sets the boundaries for most learned commentaries (e.g., Friedländer, Marmorale, Perrochat and Smith), is also traditionally the focus of half of all the scholarship on the *Satyrlica*. This exaggerated concentration on one third of the whole continues to produce readings of the *Cena* out of context, and is ultimately responsible for the rampant generalizations about the whole work based on that part alone. It seems no coincidence that this section of the text which most easily meets with moral approval should also be the best preserved, and vice versa. Most likely, the great loss of text was caused, not by accident, but by biased neglect or deliberate destruction. We should therefore be wary of the circularity of the argument that is often used to account for the modern neglect of the *L*-tradition in comparison with the much studied *Cena Trimalchionis*. Its inferior quality as text (real and hypothesised—discussed further below) in comparison to the *Cena* is hardly a legitimate rationale for continued disregard, since it was negligent attitudes in the first place that led to such poor preservation.

It goes without saying that the wildly creative restorations of Nodot and Marchena were rejected by modern editors, who have nevertheless failed to see the analogy with their own sometimes no less radical manipulation of the text. Related to the modern neglect of the Long Fragments is their indirect subversion by an over-confident indication of “new

---

9 It is, however, not correct to say that there exist no commentaries on the whole of the work; see, e.g., Paratore (1933), vol. 2, and Pellegrino (1975), 205-443. Many editions and translations also provide important commentaries in the form of notes.

10 See the bibliography of Schmeling and Stuckey (1977).
lacunae". A defense for this editorial practice could point out that the Long Fragments (L), where they overlap with the early sections of the Cena, 27.1 - 37.6, are misleadingly presented as an unbroken text and fail to indicate about eight short passages found in the Cena. This is certainly a cogent sign of poor quality in the L-tradition, although not a formal proof, since the argument involves generalizing about the whole text from a few passages that could, theoretically, be of inferior quality. It would, however, be wrong-headed to deny the importance of this evidence and it can surely be accepted. At this point, however, caution is needed, for although we may assume that there must be lacunae, we have no method of determining where they are and what is missing. To clarify this point, a brief examination is needed of the manifest but unmarked gaps in the L-tradition, where it overlaps with the Cena. This is, after all, the only place in the whole text where we can check the nature and location of the lacunae against some evidence.

What strikes one first is that all eight gaps in the overlapping area are small, one to four lines each, and therefore no crucial material for understanding the narrative has been lost. At least two seem the result of carelessness in copying. The eye of the copier has missed a line because the same word occurred in two lines in a row (34.7 vinum and 35.4 super). More to the point, half of the lacunae would have gone completely unnoticed (27.4.f., 28.3, 28.6f., 29.9f.) without the singular advantage offered by the complete text in the Cena manuscript, since in those places where the gaps occur there is no discernible break in continuity. As for the other four (30.5f., 34.4, 34.7, 35.4), three of them could

---

11 van Thiel (1971), 66.

12 27.4-5, cum has ergo miraremus lautitias, || Trimalchio digitos concrepuit...

28.3, iam Trimalchio unguento perfusus tergebatur, non linteis, sed palliis ex lana mollissima factis. tres interim iatraliptae in conspectu eius Falernum potabant. || hinc involutus coccina gausapa lecticae impositus est...
neither have been identified with certainty, nor supplemented without the *Cena*. This leaves us with only one lacuna (35.4), which would sooner or later have been noticed and could partly have been supplemented because it occurs in the middle of a fixed zodiacal catalogue, a context which determines that *scorpio* must be the missing sign, although the item placed on top of it would have remained a mystery (editors have not even accepted the evidence of the *Cena* manuscript on this account).

The editio Tornaesiana (Lyons, 1575), a handy little book in octavo and a major witness to the L-tradition, provides us with an excellent proof that our estimation is more than mere pessimism. Uncontaminated with the *Cena* (the Traguriensis manuscript had not yet been discovered) and clearly attempting to be critical in its presentation of the text, the Tornaesiana prints the section in question without noticing the first seven lacunae at all. However, the editor, Tornaesius, suspects the eighth one (35.4), suggests a possible supplement in case of a lacuna, gets the missing words *super scorpionem* correctly, although not the item on top.\(^{13}\) Significantly, he also hypothesizes three lacunae which are

\[
28.6-8, \textit{sequimur nos admiratione iam saturi et cum Agamemnone ad ianuam pervenimus.} \ll{in aditu autem ipso stabat ostiarius prasinatus...}
\]

\[
29.9-30.1, \textit{interrogare ergo atriensem coepi, quas in medio picturas haberent.} \ll{Iliada et Odyssian" inquit.} \ll{iam ad triclinium perveneramus...}
\]

\(^{13}\) An asterisk in the text, page 34f., refers to the following marginal note: *deest fortassis super scorpionem eiusdem nominis piscem*, i.e., the phrase possibly missing is "*super ... piscem.*"
not in \( H (28.1, 31.2f., 37.1) \), two of which are conjectures, as is carefully noted on the margin,\(^{14}\) and all of which were rejected by Müller.\(^{15}\)

Since we generalized about the quality of the whole L-tradition on the basis of its overlapping with the *Cena*, we must also recognize the implications of this low success-rate, only a part of one corruption out of a total of eight, for the likelihood of locating and correctly filling lacunae by guesswork. Moreover, since the exceptional case of a missing item in a fixed catalogue is not likely to present itself often, the little success that was shown can in practice be reduced to none. It is salutary to remember that modern editors have few tools in their hands which were not available also to the editor of the *Tornaesiana*, since this sort of emendation relies entirely on the editor’s “feeling” for the Latin language and logic of the story.

The unlikelihood of improving the text, however, has by no means weakened the confidence of modern editors in hypothesizing lacunae and lacuna-related corruptions in the text of the *Satyricon*. In the present standard edition (Müller, 1983), no less than seven new editorial lacunae have cropped up in the very same overlapping area that we have been discussing (27.1 - 37.6). On the whole, no editor was more productive in this field than Bücheler (Berlin, 1862), over forty of whose new editorial lacunae Müller and Ehlers have incorporated into the modern text. I count no fewer than seventy-five dotted (…) new

---

\(^{14}\)Where it says, "non est nota in \[veteribus\]c\[odicibus]\", and "deest aster in v.c."

\(^{15}\)Surprisingly so, perhaps, considering that editor’s penchant for accepting such suggestions and incorporating them into the text.
lacunae in the 1983 edition, which must be added to the one hundred and fourteen asterisked (*) old ones, i.e., *lacunae librorum auctoritate testatae*.16

These asterisks derive from the L-tradition, which uses them to mark lacunae, although they can signify various other things as well.17 Sometimes lacunae seem to have entered the text out of ambiguity about the meaning of the asterisks.18 Given the obscure origins of the L-tradition, whose main witnesses are printed editions, some of the "authoritative" lacunae are likely to be conjectures in the first place. In recent editions, however, not even the Cena itself has been spared new lacunae, whose single witness, the manuscript *Traguriensis*, nevertheless presents an unbroken text.19 In the 1983 edition, there are over twenty speculative lacunae in the Cena. By "speculative" I mean that the introduction of these gaps into the text of the Satyricon is based on *subjektive Deutungen*, i.e., pure guesswork. Moreover, the majority of the new editorial lacunae have been inserted without arguments for their support. By comparison, Helm's edition of the

16 For comparison Ernout's more conservative edition (*cinquième tirage*, 1962) has 36 dotted lacunae and 121 asterisked ones.

17 The O-class manuscripts lack indications of lacunae and present a continuous text. The Tornaesiana, an L-class witness, inserts one or more asterisks into the text, and uses two kinds of asterisks (six points = *lacunae*; five points = marginal gloss). Other L-class witnesses use multiple asterisks to indicate corruption in the text. They are variously placed within running lines, at the end or the beginning, or in otherwise empty lines. They can also indicate generic breaks in the discourse, especially before and after speeches and poems.

18 See Di Simone (1993), 88 n.5, for a case of such misunderstanding involving both Müller (1983) and van Thiel (1971).

19 "[T]he lacunae, if they exist, being few and unimportant", notes Gaselee (1915), in the introduction to his facsimile edition and transcript of the manuscript.
Metamorphoses of Apuleius has four lacunae in a text that is often difficult to make sense of and considerably longer than the Satyricon. Such steady accretion of textual ruptures has made the reading of the Satyricon—never an easy affair—increasingly difficult.

Other such licenses with the text involve the hypothesized dislocation of passages, this too on the ground of subjektive Deutungen. A case in question is three elegiac distichs (14.1), which apparently come out of the blue in the middle of Encolpius's narrative. Bücheler, partly on the authority of Anton's 1781 edition, postponed these verses by about five lines and appended them to words uttered by the character Ascylos in that passage. There, for the most part, they have sat ever since. This amounts to preferring the opinion of Anton and Bücheler to the authority of the best witness available of an L-class manuscript, a sixteenth century transcription in the hand of P. Daniel. Nor is it necessary to find an explicit speaker for the verse. It is in the nature of prosimetry that the narrator can dispense with declarative statements when switching from one discourse type to another. Besides, the moving of these distichs does not improve the text, since in their new place they disrupt the continuity of the passage that was there before. Less serious, perhaps,

\[\text{\footnotesize 20}^{\text{Pellegrino}} (1975), \text{however, has put them back in their original place, although, in the first volume of his multivolume edition (1986), they have unnecessarily been marked off by asterisks to indicate lacunae.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 21}^{\text{See Richardson (1993), 81-98.}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 22}^{\text{Ascylos says: "mihi plane placet emere, quamvis nostrum sit, quod agnoscimus, et parvo aere recuperare potius thesaurum quam in ambiguam litem descendere." [here the verses have been inserted] Sed praeter unum dipondium, sicel lupinosque quibus destinaveramus mercari, nihil ad manu erat. Fraenkel's emendation [sicel] <quo> lupos[que quibus], accepted by Müller, is too cumbersome. In support of the received text, see Schmeling (1992b), 531-36.}\]
but belonging to the same type of arbitrary editorial practices, is the isolation from their proper context of two other distichs (80.9 vv. 5-8), through Bücheler's introduction of lines to mark them off in the printed text. These unprecedented marks proved to be an influential factor in one recent critic's reading of the Satyricon, which presupposes a contextual autonomy for the verses. Read through, however, this latter half of an eight line elegiac poem appears completely sound and follows freely from the context of the first part.

In another, and perhaps more serious case (55.3), a humorous comment has been struck out of the text, and a "poem" has been corrected on metrical grounds, despite its being presented in demonstration of a character's ignorance and lack of versifying skills. In the Traguriensis manuscript, the sole witness to the passage, the text runs like this:

 [...] statimque codicillos posseit [sc. Trimalchio] et non
diu cogitatione distorta haec recitavit:
"quod non expectes, ex transverso fit
et super nos fortuna negotia curat."
Distichon Trimalchionis est cum elegio suo:
"quare da nobis vina Falerna, puer."
Ab hoc epigrammate coepit poetarum esse mentio [...]  

Bücheler declared as interpolation the phrase, distichon Trimalchionis est cum elegio suo, but the mocking irony which defines the first two quite unmetrical lines of Trimalchio's composition as "the distichon of Trimalchio" and the third as "his elegiac line", and ends by calling the entire composition "this epigram", makes the case for a scribal gloss seem unlikely. In fact, the metrical jargon is not being used correctly (as one would expect in a

\footnote{23Slater (1990), 13.}
grammatician) but rather to make it all the more obvious that Trimalchio's "poetics" do not conform with the rules of versification. Only the narrator, with his ironic and critical stance towards Trimalchio, is likely to be responsible for this catachrestic use of technical terms. The implication is that, here as elsewhere, Trimalchio is displaying his tendency to do things *novo more*, just as he does in his mad revisions of classical mythology. The narrator's interruptions of the delivery of Trimalchio's poetry to make the comment in the present, and then to resume the delivery of the last line to complete the piece, is the kind of playfulness which is very much in keeping with the tradition of prosimetry.²⁴ The editors of the Satyricon have shown insensitivity to the possibilities of this form by "correcting" the joke. The text of the Traguriensis is, in my view, not in need of emendation here.

Further changes have been introduced into this short passage. On the analogy of Trimalchio's first poem (34.10), which is composed of two hexameter lines and one pentameter line (an otherwise unheard-of arrangement in good literature),²⁵ Müller concluded (following Bücheler, following Heinsius) that the end of the first line and the beginning of the second had to be missing (because neither line scans), and so he inserted the earlier additions of Heinsius into the text, in an attempt to make the poetry of Trimalchio

²⁴*Sat*. 79.8-9, *sine causa gratulor mihi* (which is a comment in the present tense on the immediately preceding verse). Direct comments by the narrator on the style or manner of delivery must necessarily be in the present tense (e.g., 70.8, *pudet referre quae secuntur*), since this activity belongs to the moment of narration, as opposed to the past of the story. Sen. *Apoc*. 5, offers an example of interruption of poetry for the interjection of a comment, and then resumption; cf. also *Sat*. 108.14, where a non-poetic *verbum dicendi, exclamat*, is inserted into the middle of a line of hexameter.

²⁵Examples are found in the Anthologia Palatina (13.15), but Barnes (1971), 303-4, convincingly argues for its subliterary status and unconventionality by noting "that the metrical arrangement is found basically in funerary inscriptions on plebeian tombstones."
conform to the rules. But even after these learned improvements, the two lines are not a "distichon", nor is the "poem" as a whole an "epigram". The reason why only Trimalchio's first composition scans, but not his second, could be that the first is recited from memory, while the second is clearly composed on the spot. We do not, however, need to prove the soundness of the passage, merely in order to retain it, for the burden of proof obviously lies with those who wish to assume the license of rewriting the traditional text.

And there is more of the same. Several truly adventurous attempts have been made to reorganize the fragments of the Satyricon. Two scholars in particular, Italo Sgobbo (1930) and Helmut van Thiel (1971), have advanced influential theses proposing to reshuffle, not just paragraphs, but whole episodes of the extant text. The former proposed to move the whole of the Quartilia episode on the basis of his understanding of the work's topography, while the latter suggested the rearranging of fragments in accordance with his hypothesis regarding the synthetic nature of the Long Fragments (L), although he admits that his complex hypothesis is ultimately unprovable, and, even if proven, would not offer the necessary guidance for rearranging the fragments.

The last item on our list of misguided reactions to the problematic state of the Satyricon's text is a sweeping and still very influential hypothesis about supposed "scribal interpolations" in the work. Acting on the assumption that the L-tradition was put together in Carolingian times from badly damaged sources, Müller in his first edition of the text

26Walsh (1970), 128, rejected the changes and argued for the appropriateness of the verses to the persona of "the poetic tiro" Trimalchio.

27Suggested by Slater (1990), 161 n.11.

(aided and influenced by Eduard Fraenkel) hypothesized a learned auctor of the Long Fragments (L) who was to have interpolated his own explanations into the text to restore it. As a criterion for spotting these "foreign bodies" (Fremdkörper), Fraenkel, according to Müller himself, formed "a very personal conception of the elegant brevity and precision of Petronian prose" (eine sehr persönliche Vorstellung von der eleganten Knappheit und Präzision der petronischen Prosa), which was arbitrarily made to serve as the touchstone of textual authenticity. The ominous Tacitean term "elegant" (eleganten) demonstrates clearly the fallacy of authorial intention behind this further attempt to meddle with the text. The cult of the author (a product of the grammar-school) will always insist that the arbiter elegantiae of a Roman emperor must have expressed himself in "elegant" Latin, whatever this not necessarily stylistic (or positive) term is taken to signify. In Müller's first edition of the

29 Müller (1983), 471f.

30 The assumption that the text has been meddled with has been strangely tempting to scholars throughout history. The initial response to the rediscovery of the Traguriensis manuscript by Marino Statileo in the seventeenth century shows this. Two scholars, Johan Christoph Wagenseil and Adrien de Valois, argued then, on the basis of the unclassical Latin spoken by the freedmen, that H was a modern forgery. Strangely enough, this was in 1666, before the appearance of the first actual forgery, that of Nodot (Paris, 1694).

31 Müller (1983), 472.

32 On the question, see Dell'Era (1970), 21f; see also Parker (1994) for a telling example of how a simple phrase in standard classical Latin was misunderstood by three centuries of editors and translators, after its misinterpretation was first introduced by a seventeenth century commentator. The case raises a legitimate concern over whether the sensitivity of scholars to "Petronian" Latin is at all up to the task of "correcting" on stylistic grounds the fragments of the almost two-thousand-year-old Satyricon.
text (1961), no less than one hundred and fifty words and passages (some quite long) were printed in square brackets to mark them off as interpolations.

The result was not only a scholarly controversy that severely undermined the edition (and led many scholars to continue using the older edition of Ernout (1923)), but a text which was very hard to read because of the ambiguous status of the bracketed passages. In several subsequent revisions of his edition, Müller has drastically reduced the number of suspected loci, without however abandoning the idea entirely. Although in theory the attempt is to correct the text on the grounds of some esthetic Vorstellung about what kind of style would be most appropriate to an author reputed to be "elegant", Fraenkel and Müller nevertheless struck out passages not only for stylistic reasons, but because they contained references which connected episodes to one another. The continuity of the story in these places was considered too artificial by the editors. The outcome, of course, is a text which is more fragmented than ever.

Taken together these unbalanced responses to the text of the Satyricon, ranging from creative and fantastic restorations, rejected by "serious" editors, to cumulative puncturing, reshuffling of fragments, and pruning of passages, perpetrated by those same editors, have in common an unjustifiably high degree of confidence in the possibility of restoring the textual tradition. Clearly, we gain nothing by continuing this approach. It is not so much a question of being "right" as of adopting a sensible working hypothesis. We have no choice

---


34 Vital passages in the Quartilla episode which link it to the preceding market scene and the following dinner at Trimalchio's were bracketed. In the 1983 edition, 16.3 and 25.2 are still treated as "interpolations", although 26.7 has been restored to the text.
but to respect the text as it has been handed down by tradition, which means avoiding changes if at all possible. Filling the gaps and increasing their number is equally disrespectful of textual authority. The chances of scoring in the game of textual correction should be recognized as slim, unless the context is a wholly predetermined one, as in the case of the zodiacal catalogue. We therefore conclude that a new edition, according to conservative principles, is still needed.

The troubles besetting the text of the Satyricon at the hands of editors have never deterred interpreters from devising critical strategies to solve the perceived enigma of this ancient work of literature. Before we introduce further varieties into the already complex secondary scholarship, a method must be sought to give a brief overview of the modern schools of thought. In his narratological study of Apuleius's Metamorphoses, Jack Winkler made the pragmatic suggestion that, in philological interpretation, another text, deemed by the scholar to be of primary importance for the correct understanding of the text under study—a sort of Rosetta stone to decode the main text—might in fact be the real determinant of the resulting interpretation. Such a "comparison text" can constitute everything from a part of a work, to a whole work, or even a cluster of texts associated with one another, according to some criterion, so as to form a single context. In fact, a specifically highlighted part of the main text under consideration, a fragment for example, is often used as the "comparison text". Far from being secondary, this supposedly lateral and ___

35 Müller and Ehlers (1983) in two instances curiously enough both "identify" a lacuna, in 108.1 and in 123 v. 236, and then fill it exempli gratia. Such playfulness seems to me more like creative rewriting than the editing.

auxiliary text becomes the primary context in which the main body of text is read, at once a master-referent and a supplement. As Winkler persuasively demonstrated, distinct primary contexts in which the work of Apuleius had traditionally been read could readily account for the five interpretations that he listed as main contenders.

This clever idea is a handy way to account for the three readings of the *Satyricon* which have long dominated scholarship on the work. A brief survey of the thrust of the main arguments associated with these three primary contexts will facilitate the plotting of the scholarly landscape. For reasons on which I will further elaborate towards the end of this thesis, the readings show a rather obvious correlation to a triad of trends in the humanities at large: historicism, formalism (or "pure" philology), and the study of national literatures. The following, despite the matter-of-fact presentation, is intended as interpretive stances, rather than stated facts.

(i) *Testimonia.* The author of the *Satyricon* is commonly identified as the Roman consular Petronius who was a close associate of the emperor Nero, and whose coerced suicide Tacitus describes in a memorable passage of the *Annales* (16.17-19). Allegedly, at the hour of death, the *arbiter elegantiae* entertained himself with "light poems and easy verses" (*levia carmina et faciles versus*) and made it one of his last tasks to "write, sign and send to Nero a catalogue of his disgraceful passions, where under the names of debauched boys and women the novelty of each sexual act was described" (*flagitia principis sub nominibus exoletorum feminarumque et nouitatem cuiusque stupri perscripsit atque obsignata misit Neroni*). Tacitus and others also inform us of Nero's disposition for secret explorations of the brothels and riotous night-life of the capital. The *Satyricon* contains light poetry, it has a brothel scene, albeit fragmentary, and it is rich in explicit descriptions of orgies and riotous parties in Campania—where Petronius incidentally died in his villa—
which are vivid enough to give the impression of first-hand experience. "One of its chief aims was to advance the author's standing in the court circle by appealing to the emperor's literary tastes,"\textsuperscript{37} while parodying the literary products of personages of the court circle, notably Lucan and Seneca, who were falling out of favour with Nero.\textsuperscript{38}

(ii) \textit{Fragmenta}. The \textit{Satyricon} contains a copious sample of poetry composed in numerous meters, some of which has been detached from the work and is now found in other sources as \textit{loose Petronian poems}. From a separate manuscript tradition comes also the \textit{Cena Trimalchionis}, a long description of a dinner party reminiscent of symposium literature. In addition, we find in the work several \textit{rhetorical set pieces}; two short erotic narratives, so-called \textit{Milesian tales};\textsuperscript{39} and many fragmentary farcical scenes which in the text are explicitly compared to \textit{mime} and \textit{comic theater}. The fact that we can take such fragments of the \textit{Satyricon} and break them out by genre indicates that the sum of its parts is no more than a "large framework, or container, into which [Petronius] could pour... all the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{37}Sullivan (1985b), 1666.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{38}I have listed this context first, because it is still the dominant one. In the English language scholarship, J. P. Sullivan's influential work, \textit{The Satyricon of Petronius} (1968), is the best representative of this essentially historicist approach. Sullivan also prepared for publication posthumously the other fundamental text for this reading, K. F. C. Rose's (1971), \textit{The Date and Author of the Satyricon}.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{39}According to a persistent misunderstanding of the term \textit{Milesia(e)[sc. historia sive fabulae]}, which does not, in fact, denote "short stories" or "novelle"; see further Chapter Six.
\end{flushright}
wealth of literary, philosophical, and artistic expression that was welling up within his fertile genius.\textsuperscript{40}

(iii) \textit{Asinus Aureus}. The \textit{Satyricon} shares with the work of Apuleius a predilection for seemingly realistic and satirical descriptions of low life in regions of the Roman empire. It so happens that much of the extant \textit{Satyricon} is set in Campania, where two modern archeological sites, \textit{Pompeii} and \textit{Herculaneum}, have greatly improved our knowledge of the material and linguistic (through \textit{graffiti}) aspects of daily life in Roman Italy.\textsuperscript{41} The two Roman novels are the only extant comic and satiric prose fictions from antiquity, and they can be seen to form a contrast with the extant sentimental Greek romance.\textsuperscript{42} Moreover, the peculiar mixture of prose and poetry in the \textit{Satyricon} is the same as that used by Seneca in the \textit{Apocolocyntosis}, a form introduced to Roman literature by Varro in his lost \textit{Satureae}

\textsuperscript{40}Ben Edwin Perry, \textit{The Ancient Romances} (1967), 205. This reading was perhaps originated by Albert Collignon in his \textit{Étude sur Pétron. La Critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satiricon} (1892), but it was given its present and more dogmatic form by Martin Rosenblüth in his doctoral dissertation, \textit{Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren} (1909). Rosenblüth treats the \textit{Satyricon} only in pieces (\textit{Stücken}) which he compares with various genres to support the claim that Petronius was an "original" artist and his work a "synthetic" composition.

\textsuperscript{41}The archeological context was made use of first by Arminius von Guericke, \textit{De linguae vulgaris reliquiis apud Petronius et in inscriptionibus parietariis Pompeianis} (1875), and more widely by Amedeo Maiuri, \textit{La Cena di Trimalchione} (1945), who was the director of the archeological site at Pompeii.

\textsuperscript{42}Theodor Mommsen (1878) is certainly the ideologue behind the crudest form of the nationalist interpretation of the \textit{Satyricon}, which incidentally is only one aspect of his general attempt to read ancient Roman literature as "national" literature.
Menippeae. The *Satyricon* was therefore, as was said by Quintilian about hexameter satire, *tota nostra* for the Romans, and displayed a distinctly "native" or "national" point of view—Müller calls it "der italische Wille zu individueller Gestaltung"—which can be seen to parody, amongst other things, a Greek penchant for the fabulous. As a genre the Roman Comic Novel has found its Nachleben in the Spanish Picaresque Novel.

The three contexts above, all of which have a long-standing and well established relationship with the *Satyricon*, do not of course constitute a complete list; nor are they necessarily incompatible, since one regularly finds two or more used by the same interpreter, although with varying priority. All three are possible readings of the work. (I grant that my presentation of them may not show them in their best possible light.) What I wish to emphasize, however, is that whatever context we choose to put the *Satyricon* in as we read it—and for whatever reason—this context will influence, if not determine, our interpretation. This is especially true with respect to the vexed problem of finding a suitable generic label for our work.

---

43 Müller (1983), 496.

44 A by now classic example of this reading is P. G. Walsh's *The Roman Novel* (1971, repr. 1995). This general approach, however, was first invented by politically active German philologists in the nineteenth century; see Chapter Six for a survey of the scholarship. Other works of major importance for this reading include Albert Collignon's *Étude sur Pétrone* (1892), and Ettore Paratore's two volume edition *Il Satyricon di Petronio* (1933).

45 A recent development in Spanish studies, however, is the recognition of the positive critical reception of Heliodorus in the Renaissance, and his importance as a model for picaresque fiction in Golden Age Spain—see Alban K. Forcione (1970), *Cervantes, Aristotle and the Persiles*. Princeton.
A particularly interesting variation on the use of master contexts is found in two important full-book studies, *The Satyricon of Petronius* by J. P. Sullivan (1968) and *Reading Petronius* by Niall W. Slater (1990). In both studies a programmatic statement is extracted from a short selected passage of the work itself. It is assumed that in this passage the author bypasses the "unreliable" persona of Encolpius to explain his true purposes in writing the work. Suddenly we are no longer in the proper context of the work, but have been transported into the historical context. As such the chosen passage is granted a categorically different status from the rest of the text and gives, so to speak, a green light from the author to the scholars to go ahead with a certain interpretation. If we consider closely what it is about these small bits of the whole work—in both cases we are dealing with a couple of elegiac distichs—that makes them susceptible to this reading, the reason appears to be the occurrence of the words *opus*, "literary work" (132.15) in Sullivan's passage, and *pagina*, "page in a book" (80.9) in Slater's. Each term is understood by the respective scholar to designate the *Satyricon* itself. However, as the reader of the work will recall, the word *opus* (132.15) does not necessarily stand for the work as a whole, but is more naturally taken in the immediate context as reference to a comic oration addressed by Encolpius to a part of his body (132.8f.). The same is true of the word *pagina* (80.9), which does not necessarily designate a page in the *Satyricon*, but more obviously forms part

---

46 Sullivan (1968), 98-99, is here under the influence of Heinz Stubbe (1933), 150-53, who like him considered the phrase *simplicitatis opus* (132.15) a direct reference to the *Satyricon* and sought to support his argument by pointing out that *opus* could also mean "genre", according to Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.67ff.

47 Slater (1990), 13.

48 This was pointed out by Beck (1973), 51.
of what we may loosely term "poetic circumlocution." The phrase *ubi ridendas inclusit pagina partes*—"when the page closes upon the laughable roles" would be another way of saying "when the role-playing recitation ends." The immediate context is Encolpius's betrayal by his two friends and lovers, Giton and Ascylos, leading him to a state of disillusionment which makes their friendship seem, retrospectively, a farce that has ended abruptly. Thus there is in both cases another possible reading which does not require the peculiar allegorical hermeneutics used by these scholars. However, their two quite different readings are not really dependent on being correctly "authorized" by Petronius. The present analysis merely transfers responsibility from Petronius to the real authors.

To escape the methodological dilemma of excessive reliance on privileged passages and context, I propose in principle to treat the whole text of the *Satyrica* itself as its own privileged context. Instead of searching for the "basic idea" of the work in another text or generic system of texts (history, epic, drama, satire, realistic novel, picaresque novel etc.), we look for it in the text itself. In the light of general claims about the uniqueness of our work, this ought to allow us to discover something which is not easily found elsewhere. Nevertheless, I do not intend to deprive my reading of external contexts, so long as they are kept secondary to the main text; nor can I guarantee that I will give equal weight to every passage in the work. No reading can really take place in a contextual vacuum. The issue is not whether we read in context, but our choice of context, the quality of our intertextual analysis, what we do with the context and whether we properly respect textual boundaries. Hence the three traditional contexts and their implications for the reading of the *Satyrica* will often be referred to in this dissertation, while new "comparison texts" will also be

---

49 Sullivan's reading is of the historicist type, whereas Slater's is of the philologico-formalist variety with a strong emphasis on drama as the dominant genre in the "literary medley" that is, supposedly, the *Satyrica*. 
introduced to provide further contextual support to allow a revision of the traditional intertextual relationships, and thus to fully enable a new reading of the work.

The focus of my reading will inevitably be on how the person of the narrator tells his story, and how this story forms a coherent whole, meanwhile allowing the mysterious figure of the historical author to retire into the background, behind the mask where he originally chose to stay. Many scholars, on the contrary, seem to sense the authorial presence of Petronius behind the words of Encolpius, who is regularly described in terms such as "doublure" (Veyne), "puppet-actor" (Perry), "ambiguous" (Sullivan), or "chameleon" (Walsh). Slater even announces his discovery of "the absent presence of a narrator" which according to him is "the essence of Petronian comedy." 50 What the paradoxical language seems to be telling us, is not to recognize Encolpius as a person in his own right, but rather to watch in his every move for the signs of Petronius lurking behind a transparent mask. It may be questioned, however, whether a "transparent mask" is properly a disguise at all, for such a mask does not conceal the identifying signature of the face and substitute new features. In discussing artistic representation we conflate an important distinction—we risk losing sight of the important function of mimesis—if we allow degrees and transparency of identity, and speak of a person as "partly identical" to another. Although we are admittedly in proximity with perhaps the most difficult philosophical problem of modern times, the problem of the subject, from an anthropological point of view an explanation for the ability to effect a change in identity through artistic representation rests on a complex convention agreed on by performers and audience alike. To avoid digressing into the anthropological aspect of the problem, we may simply describe

50 Slater (1990), 173.
the general cognitive act of identifying the representing "this" with the represented "that" through the compact formulation provided by Aristotle: οἶνον ὅτι οὗτος ἔκεινος—"so that this one is that one" (1448b17).51

Cast in pragmatic and textual terms, identities and proper names can be described as transitional signifiers, which carry us from one context to another. Suetonius relates the following anecdote about Nero, the performer, which illustrates well the semantic and contextual power of identity.

[51]Suet. Nero 21, Tragoedias quoque cantavit personatus heroum deorumque, item heroidum ac dearum, personis effectis ad similitudinem oris sui et feminae, prout quamque diligerr. inter cetera cantavit Canacen parturientem, Oresten matricidam, Oedipodem excaecatum, Herculem insanum. in qua fabula fama est tirisculum militem positum ad custodiam aditus, cum eum ornari ac vinciri catenis, sicut argumentum postulabat, videret, accurrisse ferendae opis gratia.

[52]See Nagy (1989), 47. A useful discussion of masks as identities in performance is provided by Calame (1995), 97-115, who also supplies ample references to the relevant anthropological and semiotic literature.
in Suetonius's anecdote above, Nero is deliberately playing a game with identities by having the male masks made in his own likeness and the female masks in the likeness of a favourite mistress, but Nero’s conviction that his exceptional status in the world put him on par with heroes and deities, did not alter the fact that his unhappy identification could not be accommodated within the context of the myth of Hercules, for which it had thoroughly disruptive consequences. It is all very well to have the Greco-Roman hero dressed in mean attire and bound with chains "as the plot demanded" (sicut argumentum postulabat), but that is no way to treat the man who bears the supreme identity of Caesar. The young military recruit, by virtue of his youth and the values of state which he had imbibed through his military training, possessed the kind of simplicitas which was valued at Rome. So simplex was he that he read everything in the same context, the official context of Rome. His inability to restrain himself from rushing to Caesar's aid has the effect of valorizing the context of Nero as Caesar, and making unreadable the context of Nero as Hercules. This is the point of Suetonius's anecdote, for the imperial biographer's agenda is also to privilege the official context, and to condemn the man Nero for his unstately theatrical escapades while in the office of the Roman emperor.

Classical authors and storytellers have always known how to exploit the semantic magic of personal identities. Recognition scenes in Greek literature are based on the principle that identity is key to the meaning of words said and deeds done, as Sophocles's

53Such playfulness in the performance of the play about Hercules does not ruin the integrity of the myth itself of Hercules any more than Curiaius Maternus’s passionate impersonation of Cato, in reciting his historical tragedy, ruined the integrity of that text (Tac. Dial. 2.1). We should distinguish between specific interpretive performances and the general requirements of the story that its own logic be respected.

54Cf. also D.C. 63.9.4ff.
play, *Oedipus Rex*, so cleverly dramatizes. On a smaller and less artistic scale, we have seen earlier how the words *opus* (132.15) and *pagina* (80.9) in the *Satyricon* are given an entirely different range of reference, depending on who is "recognized" as their source. The unhappy *anagnorismos* of the historical author as the speaker of those words is enough to annihilate their immediate context and replace them in another context appropriate to the person of Petronius.

What historicists accomplish by reading Petronius and his emperor friend into the *Satyricon*, is to read the text in the primary context of the *testimonia*, without respecting the boundary between text and context. What remains of these historical personages is made of written "text", the same material as the *Satyricon*. By "recognizing" Petronius in Encolpius we indiscriminately fuse the *Annales* with the *Satyricon*. Such contextual fusion does admittedly have an illustrious pedigree. Ancient Greco-Roman grammarians, it seems, invented the allegorical hermeneutics of the historico-biographical reading. Servius's readings of Virgil's *Eclogues*—short personal narratives some of them—recognized and identified the communiqués of Virgil on the subject of his own life and times in the words of shepherds and goatherds with names like Meliboeus and Corydon.55 We will encounter further samples of this style of criticism, as this study progresses, for most of the *Satyricon*'s external fragments come in the awkward wrappings of the grammar-school.

Paul Veyne was perhaps the first late modern scholar to address directly the problem of identity in the *Satyricon*. He summarizes his conclusions thus: "dans la *Cena*, Encolpe est le porte-parole de Pétrone, dans le reste du roman, il est son alibi et lui permet de prendre

55 For something analogous in modern Petronian scholarship see Rose's (1971), 55, suggestion that Petronius was educated and spent his youth in Massilia; and Slater (1990), 10, who accepts the suggestion.
ses distances sur le genre mineur qu'il pratique." It is hard to resist the thought that Veyne's arbitrary splitting of Encolpius's person might be motivated by some institutional sense of propriety. Petronius's ventriloquial narration of Trimalchio's dinner party—through the dummy Encolpius—is tolerable, because in this, the least obscene part of the story, the protagonist is represented as aloof, while the narrator increasingly expresses a critical and mocking attitude towards the tasteless *parvenus*. However, in the rest of the story, where shameless obscenities fly thick and fast from the mouth of the narrator, the Roman consular Petronius must be seen to take appropriate distance, and moral responsibility is left with the dummy.

As Philippe Lejeune, the famous theorist of autobiography, has acknowledged with respect to his concept of *le pacte autobiographique*, there exists no method to distinguish between autobiography and the autobiographical novel on the basis of internal textual evidence, "[A]ll narrative in the first person implies that the protagonist, even if some distant adventures about him are being told, is at the same time the real person who produces the narration." What defines the status of the personal narrative, with respect to the external world, is merely the identity or lack thereof of the writer's proper name, on the title page, and the name of the narrator and protagonist, in the narrative.

A famous case involving the learned Byzantine scholar Photios provides an excellent illustration of Lejeune's point. Photios had two Greek Ass-Stories in front of

---

56Veyne (1961), 301.


him, a Μεταμορφώσεις in several volumes, and a Λούκιος ἦ "Ονος in a single book. They were both the narratives of Lukios of Patrai, and γέμει δὲ ὁ ἐκτερόου λόγος πλασμάτων μὲν μυθικῶν, ἀρρητοποίας δὲ αἰσχρᾶς—"each was stuffed with fabulous stories and shameless obscenity." Judging from internal textual evidence the only notable difference was the length. Photios seemed hesitant whether to declare the shorter an abbreviation of the longer or the longer an expansion of the shorter (the shorter happens to be still extant, but the longer is lost). However, he was convinced that Lucian had written the shorter version and was equally certain that Lukios of Patrai—Photios calls him ἄλλος Λουκιανός, "another Lucian"—had written the longer version. This information may have been derived from the title pages of the works. Bearing in mind the two authorial identities for virtually the same story (whether the shorter was an abbreviation of the longer or the longer an expansion of the shorter, the difference was only in detail and length), Photios interprets the intention of each writer thus: ὁ μὲν Λουκιανός σκόπτων καὶ διοικῶν τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν, ἀσπέρ κἀν τοῖς ἄλλοις, καὶ τῶν συνεταττεν. ὁ δὲ Λούκιος σκοποῦσαν τε καὶ πιστὰς νομίζων τάς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀλλήλους μεταμορφώσεις τάς τε ἐξ ἀλόγων εἰς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἀνάπαυν καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου τῶν παλαιῶν μύθων ὕθλου καὶ φλήναρφον—"Lucian designed his work to mock and ridicule Greek superstitions, as he does in his other writing, whereas Lukios in all seriousness believed in transformations of one human being into another, and into animals and back again, and the other nonsensical babble of ancient myths." The same story means two different things according to whose name is on the title page, i.e., according to whether the
naïve persona of Loukios is taken at his word, or whether there is a notorious jester hiding behind the mask, making the words of the simple persona acquire a double meaning.\textsuperscript{60}

The significant moment is when Photios points to what Lucian "does in his other works". This contextual reference transports the ass-story into the context of Lucian's other works and gives it a similar meaning. Without that context, and without the proper name of Lucian on the titlepage, Lukios is king of his story. In fact, despite many brave attempts, modern scholars have not been able to determine with certainty whether Lukios of Patrai, the author of the Μετομορφώσεις, is also a character in the master-context of res gestae, the historical context, or merely existed in the text of his personal story.\textsuperscript{61} Likewise, if we had no information about who wrote the Satyricon, we might well be debating today whether Encolpius, a Latin speaking Graeculus, actually existed, and if so, what he intended by his autobiographical narrative.

Fortunately, this is not the case and it seems, indeed, possible to determine with certainty that Encolpius is not a character in the historical context. The reason is that another's signature is found on the edge of the work. This edge, unlike the text itself, overlaps with the historical context. Provided we recognize the author designated by the name of Petronius Arbiter, as the Tacitean consular Caius Petronius, who played the role of arbiter elegantiae for Nero, we have a legitimate reason to dip the edge of the Satyricon into a vast ocean of historical context. But let us remember, no more than the edge. "Petronius

\textsuperscript{60}For a possible title-page with the name of Lukios of Patrai, see Mason (1994), 1669, n.16.

\textsuperscript{61}For excellent survey and extensive bibliography of the scholarship on the Greek and Roman Ass-stories, see Mason (1994), 1665-1707.
"Arbiter" and "Encolpius" are two different proper names embedded in two distinct contexts, each standing on the opposite side of the boundary between history and fiction.

But what, then, somebody may protest, of the oft noted similarity between the historical Petronius and the protagonist Encolpius, e.g., their mutual quality of *simplicitas* in word and deed—which Tacitus in fact suspects to be *faux* in his Petronius? This quality has sometimes been used as ground to identify the two men. However, estimating the similarity between two objects is only possible by measuring the extent to which they both share the quality of some third object or principle, which links them, and so the establishment of similarity constitutes a different cognitive act from that of identification. In this case the mutual element is *simplicitas*, a quality shared by both figures, although not of course exclusive to the pair of them.

Scholars have sometimes recognized in Tacitus’s thanatology of Caius Petronius a quotation from *Sat.* 132.15. The thesis of Tacitus "quoting" Petronius would be proven, if all three of the following conditions were fully satisfied: i) the identification of the two Petronii is correct in the historical context; ii) Tacitus knew and had read the *Satyricon*, at least as far as book sixteen, assuming he started from the beginning; iii) from the vast text of the original, Tacitus picked out a single word from a single poem, which he

---

62Tac. Ann. 16.18, *Ac dicta factaque eius quanto solutiona et quandam sui neglectiam praeferentia, tanto gratius in speciem simplicitatis accipiebantur.*

63The essential difference between similarity and identity in the classical context is discussed by Trimpi (1983), 166-75.

recognized as the direct communiqué and programmatic statement of Petronius, anticipating Heinz Stubbe (1933) by almost two millennia.

But let us grant that all three conditions have been satisfied. The consequences are not encouraging for those who had hoped to find the historical Petronius, since we would have to declare him contaminated by context with the Satyricon's wanton characters. For we must ask to what extent the reading of at least sixteen books of the lascivious Satyricon inspired Tacitus's bizarre account of Petronius, who had been dead for over half a century when the section was penned? We must ask how much of Encolpius has found its way into the character delineation of Petronius? Instead of historicizing Encolpius, we may end up fictionalizing Petronius.

The counter-intuitive argument that I have made in this introductory investigation can be summarized thus: The Satyricon means one thing if Encolpius is identified as the speaker, and it means something entirely different if we identify the speaker as Petronius, for the simple reason that different contexts come into play in these distinct readings. At this moment in the reception-history of the work we have accumulated countless readings of the work according to Petronius, this having been the subject of "Petronian scholarship". Rarely has the person of the narrator and protagonist been taken seriously enough for there to have been an interpretation of the Satyricon according to Encolpius; this is therefore what we will try to accomplish in the present study.

---

65 Caius Petronius died in 66, and according to Syme (1958), 473, "nothing forbids the assumption that Tacitus was writing as late as 120, or even 123." The chapter about Petronius comes in the antepenultimate year of the Annales, Tacitus's last work.

66 Beck (1973) and (1975) is an exception to the rule.
We will proceed from considerations of the contextual links that have been forged between the *Satyricon* and other works—in several places attempting to revise the traditional readings by re-interpreting old "comparison texts" and introducing new ones—to analysis of the proper context of the work, the whole extant text of the *Satyricon*. By focusing on the figure of the narrator at various levels of analysis ("performance", "discourse", "story", "narrative" and "genre") the re-integration of the fragments is brought about through recognizing the source of the whole in a single voice. In this mimetic and desultory voice, moreover, one encounters multiple impersonations and a roster of traditional moods and generic stances providing diverse impacts at different moments in the story. All autobiographical narratives imply that the person who produces the narration is as real as the protagonist himself, and, although the *Satyricon* has traditionally been read in historical context as the narrative of Petronius, the proper name and person of Encolpius distinguishes him from the author and provides the dominant organizing principle in the context of the story.

Chapter One analyses the act of narrating the *Satyricon*, as opposed to the story told in the narrative, which will be treated in subsequent chapters. The implications of the three traditional contexts on the question of performance are discussed and a new model of the performance is advanced. This new model is used to account for such features of the work as the subordinate narrators, the colloquial language and the variety of discourse types. Finally, we relate the critical and esthetic questions raised by the characters in the story to the plurality of form in the whole of the *Satyricon*.

Chapter Two attempts to reconstruct the story and logic of the "recollections" of Encolpius on the basis of the preserved text. As an aid to the reconstruction, the linear progression of Encolpius's travelogue will be used to map allusions in the extant text and the fragments onto the topographical grid of the story. In Chapter Three, this reconstructive
work will be continued with a special emphasis on the utterances of young Encolpius in soliloquies and *colloquia personarum*, where much of the information about lost parts of the *Satyricon* occur. Special emphasis will be placed on refuting the attempts of scholars to trivialize the significance of this important material. Chapter Four is a detailed summary or *argumentum* of my findings, to represent in as concise a manner as possible the proper context of the *Satyricon*. The summary, which itself is in the narrative form of a personal "recollection", draws on the conclusions of the two subsequent chapters, and aims at showing the conventionality of the plot compared to other ancient erotic fictions.

Chapter Five provides a critique of the current idea of the work as simultaneous narrative, by establishing a categorical difference in the temporal and cognitive status of the protagonist, on the one hand, and narrator on the other, as seen in the slow process of the protagonist from ignorance to knowledge, in contrast to the narrator's complete knowledge of the story, as demonstrated by his ability to narrate it. This chapter also analyses Encolpius's social and moral status with respect to his audience, which determines his comic narrative stance.

Chapter Six finally attempts to place the *Satyricon* in the literary-historical context. By surveying the early modern scholarship on the work, we conclude that contemporary ideologies exerted an influence on the scholarship, to the detriment of our understanding, and that a revision of the belief in Petronius's "Italian" characteristics and "originality" is called for, especially in view of recent discoveries of Greek papyri which show close affinity of tone and form with the *Satyricon*. Revisiting the camp of the apparently defeated traditionalists among late nineteenth century German scholars, we restate their case, and supplement earlier arguments with new ones of our own making.
CHAPTER ONE
PERFORMANCE: THE DESULTORY VOICE OF ENCOLPIUS

The ancient rhetorical theory of narrative, though often neglected by classicists and literary critics alike, arguably offers better tools for the study of narration and narrators than does the modern discipline of narratology. The ultimate reason for its excellence lies in the different goals and practices of ancient literary production. While the ancient theorists were attempting to explain a literature composed for vocal reading and public delivery, modern narratologists have naturally seen their task as that of studying printed texts read silently by a solitary reader. These pragmatic differences are reflected in the usage of terminology and central paradigms. For the ancient rhetoricians the person producing the narrative, and the circumstances surrounding that production, are always primary, whether it is the author or a fictional narrator, while the modern approach tends to privilege the story, and attempts to work backwards from it to the narrator, building a complex typology of narrators based on their connection with the characters of the story.

An early and problematic formulation in modern narratology regards the use of the grammatical person as the basis to establish a typology of narrators. The terms "first person narrator" and "third person narrator" derive from such early formulations. Petronian scholarship has made use of the modern terminology, apologetically, at least from the end

---

67 The ancient technical terms often derive from the theater (e.g., persona, "mask"); the modern are often borrowed from formal grammar (e.g., "first person narrative") or the criticism of painting and photography (e.g., "point of view").
of the nineteenth century. However, as most narratologists have come to understand, the grammatical first person as such does not mark a narrator in any but the most generic way, i.e., as "the speaker". All speakers can refer to themselves by using the first person, and its mere articulation does not change in the least the status of the discourse. Without further information the linguistic sign, "I", is devoid of identity. The difference between so-called "first person narratives" and "third person narratives" results from the identification or lack thereof of the speaker, or narrator, with a principal character of the story. In so-called "first person narratives", which usually take the form of recollections, we can distinguish between two meanings of the first person: "I" the speaker, and "I" the protagonist.

Although terminology is not of paramount importance (so long as we understand the crucial features of the form) a better way to refer to such narratives might be to call them, as I have already done above, "personal" recollections.

The advantage of the ancient rhetorical theory is perhaps most obvious in the way it accounts for the narrative phenomenon of utterance within utterance. Modern narratology, because it privileges the story, must treat the second discourse as "quotation", i.e., as a

---

68 See Klebs (1889), 631f, "[i]n den erhaltenen Stücken erzählt überall Encolpios in der ersten Person [...] Wir dürfen demnach mit Bestimmtheit sagen, daß das Ganze, um den nicht eben schönen, aber gebräuchlichen modernen Ausdruck anzuwenden, in der Form des Ich-Roms gehalten war."

69 This term bears a superficial resemblance to the terminology of Stanzel (1964), "der personale Roman", followed by Effe (1975) with some reservation. But Stanzel's "personal" novel is modern (late nineteenth century) and is characterized by the apparent absence of a narrator, i.e., an impersonal narrative stance. This is because Stanzel, as many modern narratologists, sees only the characters as personae, behind whom the author in his "personal" type somehow hides by means of a scenic presentation, and Stanzel accordingly fails to consider the narrator as the central narrative persona.
practically autonomous speech act which existed prior to its later quotation by the narrator during the telling of the story. Rhetorical theory, on the other hand, since it uses paradigms from performance literature, casts the problem as a question of identity, \textit{persona}. And so the difference between the main discourse and the discourse within that discourse becomes a matter of mimetic change in the identity of the speaker.\footnote{\textit{Arist. Po.} 1448a, \textit{μιμεῖσθαι ἔστιν... ἀπαγγέλλοντα ἐτερόν ὑπ' ἡγινόμενον}; \textit{Isid. Orig.} 2.21.32, \textit{ethopoeia est, cum sermonem ex aliena persona inducimus}; \textit{Hermog. Prog.} 9, \textit{ἡθοποιία ἔστι μίμησις ἡθος ύποκειμένου προσώπου, οἷς τίνας ἀν εἴποι λόγους Ἴνδρομάχη ἐπὶ Ἐκτορι.} \textit{Mimesis} as impersonation, or \textit{sermocinatio}, unlike the modern idea of "quotation", is mostly indifferent to concerns about historicity or \textit{verbatim} accuracy of the utterance, which it tends to replace with qualitative criteria such as the appropriateness and aptness of the speech with respect to the speaker and the circumstances when the words were uttered.\footnote{\textit{Prisc. Praeex.} 9, \textit{ubique autem servanda est proprietas personarum et temporum: alia sunt enim verba iuvenis, alia senis, alia gaudentis, alia dolentis...; habeat autem stilum suppositis aptum personis}; \textit{Isid. Orig.} 2.14.2, \textit{in quo genere dictionis illa sunt maxime cogitanda, quis loquatur et apud quem, de quo et ubi, et quo tempore; quid egerit, quid acturus sit, aut quid pati possit, si haec consulta neglexerit.} Another modern concept, "embedded" narrative, likewise gives the impression that the secondary discourse had a prior existence as an autonomous statement, and was only later incorporated into the main discourse. Since this is neither true of fictional narratives, nor of ancient historiography, the advantages of the ancient model are obvious.

According to extant rhetorical manuals, \textit{sermocinatio}, or speech within speech, is a stylistic device related to \textit{evidentia} or \textit{ἐναργεῖα}, and may be classified among figures of
speech which contribute to the emotional impact of narrative.\textsuperscript{72} Although it is at times possible to provide such detailed verbal descriptions of characters and events that the reader or listener may experience the illusion of almost "seeing" what in fact is being read or listened to, in truth, the only thing that language is capable of fully representing is more language. Accordingly, the greatest sense of presence in narrative is not created through the abundant description of details, and \textit{translatio temporum} (the use of the present for the past tense), but effected by direct speech in the person of a character. This figure also aims to collapse past and present, or re-present utterances from the past as present utterances. Because such statements effectively exist simultaneously in the past and in the present, they recreate the past and stand in for it, as it were, in the present.

The ancient theorists of narrative were less industrious than their modern colleagues when it came to developing comprehensive typologies of narrative. However, a few crucial distinctions were made, which could serve as the basis for a limited system of theoretical classification. Especially interesting to us is a type of narrative which is expressly said to be a separate functional class from narratives used in public speeches.\textsuperscript{73} This purely artistic and literary \textit{narratio} is subdivided into two types, one of which is marked by the occurrence of alterations in speaker identity: \textit{eius narrationis duo sunt genera: unum quod in negotiis, alterum quod in personis positum est}.\textsuperscript{74} This distinction may be more theoretical than practical, since most narratives involve at least some impersonation, but since this feature is

\textsuperscript{72}Quint. \textit{Inst.} 9.2.58, \textit{imitatio morum alienorum, quae ἡθοποιία vel, ut alii malunt, μίμησις dicitur, iam inter leniores affectus numerari potest.}

\textsuperscript{73}Cic. \textit{de inv.} 1.19.17, \textit{tertium genus [sc. narrationis] remotum a civilibus causis}; Auctor ad Her. 1.8.12, \textit{tertium genus est id, quod a causa civili remotum est.}

\textsuperscript{74}Rhet. Her. 1.8.13
adduced as the distinct characteristic of the class one may at least assume that what is meant is narrative which makes extensive use of the device. The type is further defined as *illa narratio quae versatur in personis*—"that type of narrative which employs masks."\(^75\)

According to Cicero, who so describes it, one can recognize therein, in addition to the "stuff", *res*, of the story, the "utterances", *sermones*, and through them the "minds", *animi*, of the *personae*.

In order to show the presence of the same basic structure in the narrative of the *Satyricon*, we need to demonstrate how exactly Encolpius, the teller of the story, manages to be the only speaker throughout the work, and how he impersonates all the other characters. There seems to be no better method to demonstrate this than to go briefly through the extant text to roughly mark the points at which Encolpius speaks as if he were someone else. To avoid making this an excessively long sequence (since the point of the demonstration is only to establish a model of the *Satyricon*’s narrative structure), we include only major passages of impersonation while many shorter utterances are left out.

In the following sequence the proper names may be thought of as verbal equivalents of masks (the narrator is marked by caps., ENCOLPIUS, even in minimal bridges crossing from one impersonation to another, but the impersonated masks by quotation marks, e.g., "Quartilla"). By accident, the extant *Satyricon* opens in the middle of a passage where the narrator is impersonating his younger self, a character in the story, as he spoke at that moment in the past, after which the central identity resurfaces and so on and so forth: […]

"Encolpius"—ENCOLPIUS (3.1)—“Agamemnon”—ENCOLPIUS (6.1-17.3)—
“Quartilla”—ENCOLPIUS (18.1-37.1)—“Hermeros”—ENCOLPIUS (39.1)—
“Trimalchio”—ENCOLPIUS (40.1-42.1)—“Seleucus”—ENCOLPIUS (43.1)—

\(^75\)Cic. *Inv.* 1.27.
The identity of the main speaker (ENCOLPIUS in the schema above) is not on the same footing as the subordinate masks that he dons. The difference lies in the fact that the speakers of the shorter discourses within the main discourse also feature as narrated characters in the main story, whereas the reverse is not true. The actions of these characters are related by the narrator and speech is assigned to them, either by oblique reference or by his speaking on their behalf, each in turn. From the ancient perspective, these utterances in personis are therefore not autonomous units, or in any way primary to the narrative itself, but can be interpreted only with respect to the context in which they appear. We only need
to translate them into indirect speech, which does not involve impersonation, to understand how integral they are to the narrative of the *Satyricon* as a whole.

It may seem strange to argue that Encolpius, himself a *persona*, can impersonate other *personae*, but such is the regular ancient understanding of the term. Cicero illustrates the type of narrative which operates through impersonation by quoting a *dramatis persona* from the *Adelphi* (60-64) of Terence impersonating another *dramatis persona* of that same play. Here the usefulness of the concept of mask is obvious, if correctly understood, for it emphasizes the change in identity, but does not seek to keep track schematically of all the possible identities involved in order to establish a complete theoretical hierarchy of identities; nor does it insist on a distinction between real and fictive *personae*. Thus the term *persona* allows us to treat historical authors and fictional narrators in the same way (the term *persona* was commonly used of people outside the theatrical or rhetorical context). As we showed in the Introduction (in our example of Photios reading the two Greek Ass-Stories) such a distinction would not have basis in any internal textual evidence. This simple method of accounting for discourse within discourse makes unproblematic further impersonations by impersonated characters, of which there is plenty in the *Satyricon*; just as Encolpius can speak in the person of himself as youth, he can also make his youthful self utter phrases in the person of a bombastic declaimer (1.1).

The central speaker identity of Encolpius is the basis of the *Satyricon's* thematic and stylistic unity. If the voices of the subordinate personae were truly the voices of others, and not simply the voice of Encolpius imitating the characters of his story, there wouldn't be

---

76 Cic. *Inv.* 1.27; cf. Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.58. Cicero's example can be a little confusing, because he has taken the expositional speech of Micio (over 80 lines long), which opens the first act of the play, as an example of *narratio*, although by definition a play as a whole is not narrative.
any organizing intelligence behind the *Satyricon*. If we follow the example of some modern narratologists and treat as primary the utterances of the characters and the events of the story, we cannot, for instance, account for such phenomena as the strange poetic utterance of Tryphaena (108.14), which at first appears to have been spoken by her in hexameters, but is then introduced by the narrator in the middle of the first line with the *verbum dicendi*, "exclamat". The peculiarity of this particular passage was noted by Michael Coffey,\(^{77}\) and recently remarked upon by Slater, who acknowledges that from his modern standpoint the speech of Tryphaena "raises a unique difficulty with regard to its status as utterance." After several attempts to account for it within the narrative of Encolpius as *verbatim* quotation, Slater eventually considers the possibility that it may not after all be a quotation. However, he immediately rejects this as unacceptable since "[i]f Encolpius is so unreliable a narrator that we find him altering direct speech he is supposedly reporting, how shall we find our way out of the resulting solipsism?"\(^{78}\) This apparent anxiety at discovering the power of the story-teller to give verbal form to the story seems quite modern, since for the ancient theorist of narrative the principal paradigms of theatrical performance and rhetorical delivery made it less problematic to assume that the actual words of any narrative, including utterances *in personis*, could well originate entirely with the narrator. The ancient theory is more sound since it is more generally applicable.\(^{79}\) The labyrinthine solipsism ("how shall

---

\(^{77}\) Coffey (1989), 189.

\(^{78}\) This and the former citation are from Slater (1990), 172.

\(^{79}\) Consider, for example, what happens in translation when every single word of the "direct" speech of a character is altered to another language and nevertheless retains its status as the direct speech of that same character.
we find our way out?"), which Slater abhors, is more often and less fearfully termed
narrative subjectivity.

Tryphaena's speech makes Encolpius's activity in creating the story unusually
obtrusive for the reason that he changes his discourse type from prose to hexameter at the
very moment he begins to speak as if he were Tryphaena. This makes us associate the
prose with his voice and the hexameter with her voice. But then, when we read (or hear)
the word, *exclamat*, in the middle of the first line of the meter, we realize that things are not
so simple. *Exclamat* is, of course, not spoken in Tryphaena's *persona*, but in the narrator's
own voice. We are therefore forced to reject the metrical form of the language as a mark of
her voice, and recognize that the narrator has merely switched to narrating in meter instead
of his customary prose. But what a place to make that switch! Our reconsideration and final
conclusion that Tryphaena cannot have spoken these words as such is based on the
observation that the "unit of meter", which in hexameter is the single verse, does not square
with the "unit of utterance" attributed to Tryphaena. In order to "restore" her actual speech,
we would have to remove the word *exclamat*, and leave a silent hole in the hexameter line.

The present case is the only instance of this exact type of jarring in the extant text of
the *Satyricon*, but a similar effect occurs indeed in all hexameter verses where the "unit of
utterance" does not square with the "unit of meter". Although in epic the main narrative is
conducted in hexameter, the heroes in such passages can no more have uttered their

---

80E.g., the "quotation" of Entellus in Virgil's narrative (*Aen.* 5.473-76):

hic victor, superans animis tauroque superbus,
"nate dea vosque haec," inquit, "cognoscite, Teucri,
et mihi quae fuerint iuvenali in corpore vires,
et qua servetis revocatum a morte Dareta."
dixit et...
speeches in the hexameter, since the declarative statement, when removed, there too leaves
a silent hole in the "original" utterance. The difference is that in the *Satyricon* we are made
more sensitive to the problem due to the jarring transition from prose to poetry at the very
beginning of the impersonated speech. For this very reason I do not think that the word
"exclamat" has been inserted by accident. The effect of the anomaly, if noticed by the
audience, is exceedingly appropriate to this story: a sudden realization that conventional
epic heroes address each other, absurdly, in verses! As we will discuss in more detail
below, this is very much in keeping with the general tendency in the *Satyricon* to represent
poetry comically as a sort of speech aberration.

The ancient theory of discourse within discourse is best considered in the context of
delivery and with respect to the capacity of the living voice to alter its identifying features.
The paradigm of the human voice is better suited for the problematics of narrative and
story-telling than is the static and silent formalist vision of the printed page, which knows
no other method of distinguishing voices than typographical signs. For marking the change
in speaker-identity, the natural modulations of the human voice ideally make unnecessary
even the paraphernalia of the theater. As Quintilian explains, voices are no less constitutive
of identities than are faces:

As the face, although consisting of very few features, is found in infinite
variety, so the voice, although there are only a few kinds to which we can give
a name, is proper to each; in fact the voice is no less recognizable by the ear
than the face is by the eye.  

\[81\] *Inst. 11.3.18.*, *ut facies, quamquam ex paucissimis constat, infinitam habet
differentiam, ita vox, etsi paucas, quae nominari possint, continent species, propria cuique
est, et non haec minus auribus quam oculis illa discernitur.*
Ut facies, ita vox is a succinct and appropriate formulation of the simple principle, which makes possible narrative impersonation, or speech in the voice of another. In practice this is accomplished by using the voice in a particular manner. The Rhetorica ad Herennium contains the following advice to the would-be orator as to how he should deliver the utterances of others concerning the case being exposed:

If it so happens that in the narration fall statements, questions, or answers, or some comments about the case we are relating, we shall give careful attention to express through the voice the feelings and thoughts of all the personae.\(^8^2\)

The semantic logic of identity makes it necessary for the old identity of the voice to be momentarily suppressed for the new one to come out, and so there is no keeping track of the layers of identities, although the actual moment of change is highly significant and allows us to partly retain the memory of the suppressed identity. This underlying identity, however, does not remain functional on the surface level, but is kept in suspension until the speaker is recognized again for what he was before.

This brings us to the methodological quandary of the currently popular theatrical interpretation of the Satyricon, which I presented earlier as one of several readings enabled by the use of the Fragmenta as "comparison text".\(^8^3\) The essential quality of narratives is

\(^8^2\)Rhet. Her. 3.14.24., si qua inciderint in narrationem dicta, rogata, responsa, si quae admirationes de quibus nos narrabimus, diligenter animum advertamus ut omnium personarum sensus atque animos voce exprimamus.

\(^8^3\)Panayotakis (1994a), xx, "The surviving Satyricon [...] should be regarded as a sophisticated synthesis of many different literary genres, including oratory, historiography, epic, elegy, satire, Greek romance, and drama [...] the element of theatricality is a dominant feature in the Satyricon".
that they are conducted through one *persona* (the underlying speaker identity which reappears after occasional subordinate impersonations) and thus the whole work falls into a single unbroken context, whereas the dramatic form makes use of many basic *dramatis personae* and therefore many textual *partes*, each of which forms a distinct context within the play (although in performance the action connects them). As before, it is the recognition of the speaker identity which places the utterance within its proper context and thus determines how it should be understood. A written dramatic text is practically unintelligible if the proper names of the characters (not pronounced on stage since the speakers are identifiable by their visible masks) are not included in the margin. On the page, therefore, the proper names function as masks do on stage, i.e., as contextual markers. The *Satyricon* can be thought of as theatrical only in so far as we recognize that in staging the work we would need only one actor for the basic voice, or *persona*, of Encolpius. "Actor", however, may be a misleading term, since the *Satyricon* is not a play and lacks all action in performance, apart from the gesticulation which would accompany a lively delivery.

It is as if the promoters of the theatrical interpretation of the *Satyricon* wanted to translate Encolpius's narrative into so many modern-style stage directions (ancient stage directions were carried in the text: not "enter X", but "here comes X"). As sometimes seems to happen in the writings of modern narratologists, the characters of the story are treated as primary and the narrator is sublimated into a sort of "voice from heaven". C. Panayotakis makes much of "the fact that the *Satyricon* can be read theatrically as if it were the narrative equivalent of a farcical staged piece with the dramatic structure of a play produced before an audience." It is quite possible that there is some "theatrical" quality to

---

84 Panayotakis (1994a), 320; the formulation of the phrase "narrative equivalent of a stage farce" belongs to Walsh (1974), 186, Panayotakis's supervisor at the University of Glasgow. This seems to be the main position of Slater (1990), 14, as well: "[R]eading is
the work, but there is certainly no "dramatic structure" in the narrative of the Satyrica. As we intend to show, the work is written to be recited in a lively manner. As such it is performance literature, as are plays. I would like to stress, however, the rather obvious fact that not all performance literature is drama. Indeed, a paradoxical requirement of the theatrical reading, at least in its most exaggerated form, is to virtually obliterate the only persona of the work which could be presented on stage, Encolpius the narrator.

Certain accidents of preservation have contributed to making apparently viable the dramatic interpretation. It so happens that the extant text of the Satyrica opens not in a passage of the narrative, but in the middle of an impersonated speech, in the voice of the character of young Encolpius. Likewise, by accident, the text breaks off in the middle of a speech of another character, the poet Eumolpus. But perhaps even more confusing than the mutilated condition of the beginning and the end of the manuscript tradition is the fact that in several places, where the text is very fragmentary, modern editors have added in the margin the names of characters who are thought to be the speakers of such isolated fragments (in some places the name of the supposed addressee and subject of the speech is also included). These additions derive originally from the scribes of the Longer Fragments: they are obvious attempts at reconstructing the internal context and of course were not found in the original text. Bücheler left them out of his edition, while later editors such as Ernout and Müller have included them. By virtue of these marginal glosses, parts of the fragmentary modern text have taken on the appearance of a dramatic text.

far from a passive process. It is just as participatory, though in different ways, as watching a performance in the theatre.

85 85.1, 94.1, 96.7, 99.1, 104.1, 107.1, 113.11, 126.1, 128.1, 128.3, 128.7, 129.1, 132.1, 134.1, 134.8.
Another contributing factor is faulty method. By reason of a certain unhappy use of terminology, the protagonist Encolpius is commonly referred to as the "narrator", although he is, from the point of view of narrative form, not the teller of the story, but a character represented in it.\(^6^6\) It is, of course, Encolpius the narrator (who exists in the present of the narrating act) who represents this younger self (existing in the narrated past), sometimes by providing information about him and sometimes by speaking on his behalf. In fact, the narrator's representation of his younger self is effected by more or less the same technique as is used for his treatment of other characters. Although the narrator is the same individual as the young man Encolpius, both the time and the circumstances of speech are different, and these comprise defining qualities of speaker *persona*.

If the *Satyricon* is not a dramatic text, and not even the "narrative equivalent"—whatever that paradoxical language means—of such a text, what then can we make of the handful of places where the narrated events of the story are explicitly described as mime-like and theatrical? To begin with we are certainly not required to interpret references of this sort as Encolpius's attempt to settle the typological problem raised by his narrative in favour of theatrical mime.\(^8^7\) If we consider closely how he uses terms such as *mimicus* or *scaena*, we note that it is to underline a certain strange and alien quality of narrated situations and acts. Quartilla's laughter is *mimicus* because it expresses her sinister joy at having the boys absolutely in her power (19.1). Trimalchio's dining room resembles the performance of a mime because, as Encolpius notes with amazement, both the slaves and the host himself are

\(^{8^6}\) On this "fallacy" in modern narratology, see Genette (1988), 223.

\(^8^7\) Walsh's (1974), 189, assumption that "[t]he central action of the *Satyricon* […] is pointed up by so many references to the mime that the novel proclaims itself the narrative equivalent of a stage farce" [underlining mine] is superficial.
continuously singing cantica from literary mimes (31.6, 35.6, 55.5-6). The reason is that the freedman host, because of his lack of aristocratic education, when entertaining guests in his dining-room looks for his models in public entertainment such as the mime, and is quite ignorant of the proper etiquette of the Roman triclinium. It is therefore the mime which, in the narrator's mind, seems misplaced. Furthermore, the friendship of Ascylos and Giton is compared to a farce, because Encolpius sees it as having been deceitful in the light of their later betrayal (80.9). The mock-suicide of Giton is associated with the mime because it is blatant scheintod (94.15, mimicam mortem); the slave-disguise on the ship is a mime because it is designed as deception (106.1, mimicis artibus); and finally the confidence scheme of Eumolpus is given this name for the reason that Eumolpus and company take on roles to deceive for financial gain (117.4). Though certain incidents that supposedly happened to the narrator in his past strike him in hindsight, as he delivers the narrative, as if he had been trapped in a low and tasteless farce, this certainly does not justify the claim that mime is a "source" for the Satyríca, or that the work has been "influenced" or shaped by the genre of theatrical farces.

---

88 It is true that dinner-theater and other entertainments seem to have been frequent in the houses of the wealthy (Plin. Ep. 9.17.1; Quint. Inst. 1.2.8), but it is also true that moralists (Plut. Mor. 711A ff.) wanted such activities to be reserved for public entertainment on the stage, and Encolpius's words show that he sides here with that austere faction (Sat. 31.7). The blurring of public and private in dinner theater and theater-dinners is discussed by Jones (1991), 185-98.

89 Early protesters against Rosenbluth's (1909) original thesis that theatrical farce was an important "source" to Petronius, when he composed the Satyríca, include Möring (1915) and Paratore (1933), 1:99-104.
Such comparisons may come naturally to Encolpius, because in the first century the mime was by far the most popular form of theater.\(^9^0\) It is questionable whether it was even possible to depict common people without resorting to re-presenting them according to the convention of contemporary farce. Certain similarities, therefore, between the *Satyricon* and the contemporary theater, may well be commonplaces of the culture. Theater in general and the mime in particular, of course, provide potent metaphors in the *Satyricon*, and there is no question that the rhetorical and philosophical vocabulary relied heavily on the institutional practices of the theater. However, where mime is explicitly mentioned in the *Satyricon*, this seems to include a rejection of this form as "different" and no less unappealing to our narrator than, let us say, declamation, or verbose epic. As I have argued above, the theatrical reading of the work seems to be influenced by a vision of the text as fragments broken out by genre. To select one of these fragments as "the genre" of the *Satyricon* is unlikely to settle the question of the genre.

By concentrating on qualities that he rejects, Encolpius increases their importance as a "generic other" (and therefore as an indirect means to arrive at his "generic self"). It is more fruitful to see such allusions in the *Satyricon* as attempts to negotiate a "difference" and thus to establish the proper qualities of this narrative by positioning it with respect to other somewhat related forms. In this sense the work at hand conforms to the regular practice of ancient literature, since in the Greco-Roman generic system definitions of individual works are more often negative than positive, and arrived at by references to what the work is not, rather than what it is (not "this is elegy" but "this is not epic or tragedy"). We should resist the tendency to view an ancient genre as an absolute category, since, if this were the case,

\(^{90}\)For a recent survey of the documentary evidence for the ancient mime, see Maxwell (1993).
the constant re-negotiations within the system would not be necessary. 91 In fact, the laws of the genre are often violated in order to be re-established (a cliché of comic narratives runs something like this: "dear reader, know that we are ascending to the tragic buskin"). The difference between drama and narrative, however, is not a question of genre, and therefore does not depend on generic negotiation. This distinction is more basic, and regards the number and structure of the masks. Neither does the discourse-type, of which we find a great variety in the Satyricon, affect this distinction. Although generic categories are usually open to renegotiation, prosimetry is not properly a genre, in my view, any more than prose, for that matter, is a genre. 92

We now come to the mode of presentation implied by the narrative of Encolpius. At three points the narrator explicitly states that he is recalling from memory what he is relating. In two of the three cases it is an apparent attempt to remember the exact wording of a written text which prompts the reference to memory. The first instance occurs in the context of a detailed description of certain tablets in Trimalchio's house, one of which has an inscription, which Encolpius attempts to cite verbatim with the following reservation: *si bene memini*—"if I remember correctly" (30.3). Again he relates an incident when a cup was passed around with inscribed *pittacia*—"strips of cloth," which were recited while countless presents with punning associations were offered. After recounting eight of these


92 This rule did not, however, seem to apply to the discourse type of hexameter which was pretty much equated with the genre of "epic" in the tradition of ancient rhetorical criticism, see Koster (1970). For the opposite view of prosimetry as a genre, see Relihan (1993).
jokes, he says: sexcenta huiusmodi fuerunt, quae iam exciderunt memoriae meae—"there must have been six hundred of these, but they have now slipped my memory" (56.10). We note that it is implied by these references to memory that enough time has passed from the events related until the narrating instance itself (the word iam clearly marks the present of narration with respect to the past of the event) to make accurate recollection problematic. Measuring this time span may be impossible, but this is less important than understanding the basic premise of the Satyricon's narrative, viz., that it is presented as Encolpius's recollections of events experienced by him in the past. This is of course the classical constitution of autobiographical narratives, also called "recollections", or memoirs, to highlight the role played by memory in this narrative form.93

That references to the limitations of the narrator's memory should be prompted especially by the attempt to cite written documents verbatim implies a certain dichotomy with respect to how written and non-written words are treated when reported. Only the former, when cited, are subject to the verification which the medium of writing enables, whereas the latter are regarded as unverifiable and fleeting, and their citation, therefore, necessarily free of similar constraints. In this respect the Satyricon does not differ much from ancient historiographical texts, which represent written documents differently from the occasional speech attributed to a historical personage, which could be freely invented if due respect was paid to what was known about the individual in question and the situation in

93The important role of memory in the ancient formulation of the concept is emphasised in such terms as ύπομνήματα, ἀπομνημονεύματα, monumenta, commentarius. Once "memories" have been committed to writing the written text can in turn be viewed as an aid for reminding. Plato calls the art of writing οὐ μνήμης ἄλλ' ύπομνήσεως φάρμακον (Phaedr. 275A).
which the statement was made.\textsuperscript{94} It was with good reason that rhetorical theorists considered it a useful preparation for historiography to declaim in the persons of historical figures.\textsuperscript{95}

Now, if we press further this dichotomy of the written and the spoken, we of course notice that the Satyrica is itself a written text, although it is not entirely clear whether Encolpius is aware of this. There would have been many ways for him to acknowledge as much. A simple mention of the act of writing or reading, understood to apply to his narrative, would have sufficed, or he might have referred explicitly to his recollections as a book. Of the great ancient historians, Thucydides is at pains to clarify that his πόλεμος between the Peloponnesians and Athenians is a written document, κτημά τε ἐς αἰεὶ μᾶλλον ἡ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρήμα ἀκούειν—"and a property for the future rather than a contest for the occasional listener" (2.22.4). Herodotus, however, does not present his ἴστορίας ἀπόδεξις as written any more than spoken. Of the ancient novelists Chariton begins by defining himself as the scribe, ὑπογραφεως, of the rhetor Athenagoros, and in book 8 predicts that the ending of his written composition, τὸ ὁτῳ σύγγραμμα (8.1.4), will be the most pleasant to his readers, τοῖς ἀναγιγνώσκοις; Xenophon of Ephesus adds at the end that a written version of his tale of Anthia and Habrocomes was dedicated in the famous temple of Artemis in Ephesus (5.15.2); Achilles Tatius is silent about whether his love story, told in the persona of Clitophon, is to be thought of as a written document or merely as "spoken"; Longus is definitely engaged in the act of γράφειν (praef. 4);

\textsuperscript{94}E.g., Sallust limits himself to referring to Cicero's written and published speech against Catilina (orationem... quam postea scriptam edidit) without even relating its contents (Cat. 31.6), but freely recreates unpublished speeches.

\textsuperscript{95}Quint. Inst. 3.8.49.
Heliodorus's definition of his story at the end as σώντωγια makes it into a book; and Apuleius's Latin version of the Ass-Story is a papyrus to be read (1.1), and its narrator is destined to become several "books" (2.12).

Unfortunately, we do not have the whole text of the Satyrica and so the possibility cannot be excluded offhand that such a reference did in fact occur, for example, at the beginning. However, as far as it goes, our text of the Satyrica does not present its narrator as betraying any knowledge of the fact that his words constitute a written text. Tentatively, then, we can say that Encolpius's narrative is not just presented as a recollection from memory, but also seeks to hide its own textuality, leaving the impression of a living voice telling the story.

The idea of the "orality" of Encolpius's narrative is made perfectly clear with his third reference to memory, prompted by the recollection of certain items of food, quarum etiam recordatio me, si qua est dicenti fides, offendit—"the mere recollection of which, if the speaker is at all to be trusted, disgusts me" (65.1). What is being alluded to here is not something Encolpius claims he said or heard in the past of the story; this is Encolpius presenting himself in the act of "speaking" the Satyrica. The phrase goes beyond a mere passive omission of a reference to the fact that the narrative exists in the form of a written document, it actively attempts to create the impression that the narrator is "speaking" his story as the memories flood his mind. Significantly, the formula si qua est fides, occurs predominantly in the emphatic pleading of declamatory speeches, a genre of literature which must certainly be classified as performative and "spoken". Encolpius's particular use of

---

96 Sen. Con. 1.1.18, 7.1.7, 7.5.1, 7.6.9, 9.4.5, 9.6.19; excerpta 5.1.1, 7.5.1, 8.3.1; [Quint.] Decl. 1.5, 3.3, 4.2, 9.10, 12.8, 16.4 (si qua dicentis fides est). Apul. Apol. 43. Ovid uses the formula frequently (sometimes modifying it), especially in character speeches and when he directs his words to his puella or some other figure (e.g.,
the declamatory formula even includes for emphasis the rare additional feature of the present participle, *dicens*, referring to himself. There is no weightier testimony as to the manner in which he tells his story.

By the most natural reasoning, "remembering" equals "telling" (43.1, and 75.7, *vivorum meminerimus*), and the memory of past events necessarily triggers emotional responses in the present as the story is told.\(^97\) This is not just an intellectual recollection, but a vivid taste memory experienced as nausea in the present. The strong disgust of the previous passage is further underscored in phrases such as *pudet referre quae secuntur*—"It's disgraceful to relate what follows" (70.8), where the present tense of the verb, *secuntur*, shows that what follows is the narrative, not the events of the story themselves.\(^98\)

As the demand for literal accuracy prompted the first two references to memory, the necessity to induce belief in the outrageous and incredible elicits an appeal to trust, which ultimately depends on the authority and character of the speaker. At a subordinate level, Encolpius also impersonates Ascytlos as uttering the same declamatory formula of appeal, while questioning his own and Encolpius’s credibility in the *urbs Graeca* where they have

---

\(^97\)Met. 9.55, 371 and 15.361; Am. 1.3.16); Ovid’s language may well be influenced by declamation.

\(^98\)It is interesting to note that two English translators, Sullivan (1986) and Heseltine (1987), both change the tense of *quae secuntur* and translate "what happened (next)".
but newly arrived and are strangers to the locals (14.1, 'quis aiebat hoc loco nos novit, aut quis habebit dicentibus fidem?'). He also uses the same figure, when impersonating Trimalchio as he tries to induce belief in the superstitious werewolf-story of Niceros (63.1, 'salvo inquit tuo sermonem' Trimalchio 'si qua fides est, ut mihi pili inhorruerunt, quia scio Niceronem nihil nugarum narrare').

Once more he uses the figure, now again at the primary level, when he relates his own reaction that night after Ascytlos had abducted Giton from his bed while he was fast asleep in drunken slumber: itaque ego ut experrectus pertrectaui gladio despoliatum torum, si qua est amantibus fides, ego dubitavi, an utrumque traicerem gladio somnumque morti iungerem—"so as I woke up and ran my hands over the bed robbed of its joy and, if there is any faith in lovers, it occurred to me whether I should run each of them through with my sword and unite their sleep with death" (79.10). The idea of killing Giton, his love, and Ascytlos, his friend and former lover, is offered by Encolpius as a measure of his intense suffering. At the same time this outrageous event of his story is accounted for by reminding whoever is listening that this is a lover’s tale, one of many such tales (hence the plural in amantibus), and therefore normal and credible for its kind. It is not just that Encolpius was a lover in the narrated past when he supposedly experienced this unhappy incident, he still presents himself as a lover to his audience as he relates the story of that incident, for he uses the present tense: si qua est amantibus fides. The story is therefore not just about a lover, it is also told by a lover, which of course makes it a love story.

The main narrative of the Satyrica is free of any immediate context (the title and name of the author in themselves do not provide a context) and so it is not introduced by an external speaker, who then impersonates the narrator. This is the case, on the other hand, with Clitophon’s erotic recollections, in the work of Achilles Tatius. Here we get a full description of the young man before he starts telling his story. In the Satyrica, however,
only the subordinate speeches are introduced by Encolpius before he undertakes the change in speaker identity. Missing an ulterior narrator who tells us how Encolpius tells his story, we must try to figure this out from the story itself. This is not as complicated as it might seem at first and there is, indeed, a simple method for catching him in the act, as it were. If we carefully observe how he describes the manner of speech of the subordinate personae, before and after he impersonates them, we may capture at least the style of these parts of his narrative. By working our way from there, we can get an adequate picture of his over-all manner of telling the story.

As it turns out, Encolpius regularly leads the subordinate personae into his story clapping their hands (11.2, 18.7-19.3, 24.2, 34.7, 137.1),99 shouting (9.7-8, 30.5, 64.12, 97.1, 106.2), laughing (11.2, 18.7-19.3, 64.12), crying (81.2), expressing themselves with their faces,100 and gesticulating in various ways.101 Finally, there are descriptions of the tone of voice with which statements are uttered, of the type: ingerebat nihilò minus Trimalchio lentissima voce—"nevertheless Trimalchio kept repeating in the most deliberate tone of voice."102 On the whole, in fact, the Satyricon gives the impression of being an

---

99 Quartilla also wrings her hands till the joints crack (17.3).

100 30.10. See also 8.2, 9.7, 24.1, 48.1, 49.8, 52.8, 53.8, 57.1, 65.5, 69.2, 71.1, 75.3, 78.2, 79.11, 90.5, 91.2, 98.2, 100.4, 100.6, 101.1, 104.2, 105.1, 106.1, 106.2, 113.2, 114.5, 115.4, 126.9, 128.2, 131.7.


102 36.7. See also 126.8, vox clara 47.11; vox canora 68.4; rabiosa barbaraque voce 96.5; vox eiusmodi congemuit 100.3.
extremely "clamorous" text, judging from its uniquely rich vocabulary in this
department.\(^3\)

Based on this internal evidence it is clear that Encolpius's style of speaking is not at
all restrained. Every time he gives a description of the expression on the face of a persona,
or some simple gesture like clapping the hands, or the tone of voice in which he or she
utters the phrases, that description becomes also descriptive of how his own impersonation
is conducted, and is thus an important direction as to how the narrative itself should be
delivered in performance. When the reciter and performer comes upon a phrase of the type,
"and he shouted", followed by a character statement, the most natural manner of delivering
that statement is by mimicking a shouting tone of voice. The same is true of gesticulation.
These built in stage directions, in fact, are similar to those used in ancient drama in general,
where characters are regularly made to describe the manner of imminent action on stage in

\(^3\) clamare 1.1, 9.7, 14.5, 40.1, 46.8, 52.6, 58.5, 60.8, 68.3, 95.5, 107.10,
108.5, 108.7, 115.3, 127.9 v6, 137.4, 138.3; clamitare 92.7; conclamare 50.1, 54.1,
102.9; declamare 3.1, 48.4, 137.9 v5; exclamare 21.1, 22.4, 30.5, 49.5, 74.7 and 11,
83.4, 94.13, 95.3, 103.1, 105.5, 108.14, 135.2; proclamare 9.5, 14.6, 43.1, 54.2,
64.12, 67.13, 68.4, 80.4, 81.2, 97.1, 104.5, 105.7, 106.2, 115.9; clamor 14.7, 40.2,
59.6, 68.5, 73.4, 89.1 v20, 92.7, 94.9, 108.8, 109.1, 114.8, 136.13; declamatio 2.3,
6.1, 48.4, 107.12, 133.1; declamator 1.1.; vocare 24.6, 36.8, 47.11, 49.4, 67.3, 69.5,
117.10, 132.2, 133.1; vox 24.4, 34.1, 35.6, 36.7, 41.6, 44.9, 47.11, 59.3, 68.4, 70.7,
74.1, 91.5, 92.7, 96.5, 100.3, 100.5, 105.5, 105.6, 105.7, 105.9, 108.4, 108.5, 113.8, 118.4,
120 v78, 121 v102, 122 v155, 122 v180, 124 v183, 127.1, 127.5, 134.6, 140.9;
vociferatio 14.5; vociferare 114.6; strepitus 1.2; sonare 5 v18; exsonare 73.4, 109.6;
personare 122 v177; sonus 2.2, 5 v16, 41.7, 68.5, 100.5, 105.6, 115.2, 127.5; sonitus
123 v225; canor 5 v19; cantare 28.5, 31.4, 31.5, 34.1, 53.13, 62.4, 64.3, 70.7; canturire
64.2; cantus 109.6, 120 v72, 131.8 v8; canticum 31.6, 35.6, 73.3; exsibilare 64.5.
their actual dialogues, as opposed to such directions being external to the text and added on the margin in the manner of modern theatrical texts.\textsuperscript{104}

Another quality of the \textit{Satyricon}, which is owed to its presentational mode, is the curiously disruptive style of its narrative discourse. Although perhaps in danger of being confused with it, this characteristic of the work is very different from textual fragmentation. By virtue of the form, Encolpius the narrator has only one voice and can impersonate no more than one speaker at a time. But it is as if the many invoked identities of the \textit{Satyricon} were competing to possess his faculty of speech. In the opening passages of the extant text, Agamemnon interrupts Encolpius declaiming in the portico, just as the rhetor in a lost passage was interrupted "sweating out" a \textit{sausoria} in the school (3.1; 6.1); and the rhetorician is again interrupted by the \textit{ingens scholasticorum turba}—"the enormous mob of schoolmen" as he extemporizes a type of Lucilian satire in the portico (6.1-2). Frequently, in order to speak, a \textit{persona} must interrupt another's speech, who accordingly is not allowed to finish. Trimalchio interrupts Hermeros (39.1); Seleucus Dama (42.1); Phileros Seleucus (43.1); Echion Ganymedes—in the middle of a sentence—(45.1); Trimalchio his accountant (53.6-8); a slave reciting the \textit{pittacia} interrupts his master (56.7); Scintilla Habinnas (69.1); Encolpius Eumolpus (93.3); Encolpius, Eumolpus and Giton each other (102.1-103.1); Hesus Lichas (104.5); Lichas Eumolpus (107.7); Eumolpus Lichas (107.12); and finally Chrysis interrupts Encolpius (139.4). Occasionally, the events related in the narrative either make possible some character's speech (14.8), or more often the

\textsuperscript{104}E.g., Davos's words in Terence's \textit{Phormio}: "Ah, is that Geta (coming there)?... All right: here he is" (Ter. \textit{Ph.} 50f., \textit{DAVOS: sed videon Getam?... praestost.}), as opposed to the modern interlinear, "ENTER Geta FROM Demiphos's HOUSE", which has been added in the Loeb English translation.
narrated action cuts short some one who is speaking.\textsuperscript{105} Young Encolpius is at times left speechless from shame after a verbal onslaught from another character.\textsuperscript{106} Certain utterances also interrupt the events of the story.\textsuperscript{107} It also happens that events are supposed to take place in the background while a character is speaking.\textsuperscript{108} And there are other speech-related interruptions.\textsuperscript{109} All these have to do not just with how things supposedly happened in the past, but rather how Encolpius gives narrative form to his memories.

The way in which he organizes his narrative can also have significance for the overall impact he wishes to create. At the dinner party of Trimalchio, the host tyrannizes the faculty of speech and must, quite literally, be narrated to the pot in order to enable the famous speeches of the freedmen to take place (41.9). Upon returning, he again becomes the dominant persona (47.1). A most interesting paradox in the narrative of the dinner-party is the silence imposed upon the \textit{scholastici}, who are formally trained speakers (46.1, 58.8), while untrained speakers are allowed to ramble on freely (61.3-5). What causes the silence of the schoolmen is not that they appreciate the discourse of the freedmen, but the fact that they are Trimalchio's parasites and have only been invited to dinner to flatter him and allow

\textsuperscript{105} 52.4; 49.1, 54.1, 74.1, 90.1, 93.4, 99.5, 114.6, 110.1.

\textsuperscript{106} E.g. 10.3, from Ascytlos; 108.1, from Lichas.

\textsuperscript{107} 26.8, 53.1, 97.1, 100.3-5, 106.1, 105.7.

\textsuperscript{108} 7.5, 34.7, 41.6, 97.1, 124.2.

\textsuperscript{109} 115.4, 108.3.
him to pose as one who appreciates the liberal arts and associates with educated men.\(^{110}\)

When, finally, the long suppressed laughter of Ascytlos and Giton breaks out, it is met with the aggressive and solemistic "eloquence" of Hermeros (57.1-58.14).\(^{111}\) Ascytlos's attempt to respond is quickly cut short by the delighted host himself (59.1). Even when invited to relate the day's declamation, Agamemnon is interrupted by the freedman's need to drop an "urbane" remark (48.5). Throughout this part of the narrative we note the heavy irony of the narrator,\(^{112}\) and the freedmen's solemistic usage of literary phraseology,\(^{113}\) which seeks to substitute liberal letters with *litterae in domusionem*—"letters for domestic uses" (46.7, 48.4), which is the only form of literacy which they appreciate.\(^{114}\)

From the immediacy of the *Satyricon*'s presentation stems another unique feature of the work, namely the deliberate attempt of the narrator to treat all literature as oral literature, or as plain speech, not just his own narrative, but declamatory speeches, poetry of various

\(^{110}\)48.7, *haec aliaque cum effussissimis prosequeremur laudationibus*; and 52.7, *excepimus urbanitatem iocantis [sc. Trimalchionis], at ante omnes Agamemnon qui sciebat quibus meritis revocaretur ad cenam.*

\(^{111}\)32.1, *Trimalchio... expressit imprudentibus risum*; and 36.4, *ridentes.*

\(^{112}\)E.g., 39.1, *tam dulces fabulas*; 59.1, *eloquentia*; 60.1, *tam elegantres strophas*; 61.5, *haec ubi dicta dedit, talem fabulam exorsus est*; 70.7, *ingeniosus cocus*; 74.5, *doctissimo caco.*

\(^{113}\)E.g. 46.8, *litterae thesaurum est,* which refers not to liberal letters but *litterae in domusionem* (cf. 46.7, *emi ergo nunc puero aliquot libra rubricata, quia volo illum ad domusionem alicud de iure gustare. habet haec res panem. nam litteris satis inquinatus est*).

\(^{114}\)56.7, *iam etiam philosophos de negotio deiciebat*; 71.12, *nec unquam philosophum audivit.*
types, as well as the self-contained subordinate narratives. True, the Satyricon as a whole is a narrative and so even the wall-paintings in Trimalchio's house (29) can only be seen through the verbal commentary they provoke. However, the mode of presentation goes further here than is necessary in a written document since, as a rule, what is explicitly said to be written literature is not quoted directly from the written document (and displayed in writing on a page of the Satyricon), but only enters the narrative or is alluded to indirectly, when some one actually reads it aloud or recites from memory. To make this distinction is vital to our reading, since we wish to argue that although a physical text, the Satyricon pretends to be a "spoken" discourse which cannot resort to "displaying" its contents visually as a written text but must restrict itself to "proclaiming" audibly whatever it has to say. This performance aspect of Encolpius's narrative is then worked into the description of his past, where all speech (later to be reported by him in the narrative) tends to come to his attention as sonorous utterances in the manner of his own delivery, and not as texts read by him and then reproduced. For the modern "reader" of the Satyricon, the effect created is strictly speaking an illusion—the work is just as much a written text as any other—but it is an illusion worth noting for the information it gives about the design of this narrative.

Instances of straightforward reading include the recital of the estate-diary (53.1-9); poetry that is read aloud just after being composed on wax tablets (55.3); written jokes or riddles which are read aloud (56.8); a Latin translation of Homer which is recited in a sing-song manner (59.3); a testament which is read aloud (71.4); and verses mumbled by the poet as he is composing and writing them down (115.1-2), which are finally recited to the captive audience of the poet's traveling companions, either from memory or through the reading of the parchment on which they were written (118.1-124.2). This last composition, of course, is the Bellum civile, which is by far the longest piece of formal verse in the extant text.
Besides these regular readings there are several instances involving the recital of literature from memory. This can be seen as related to the process of reading because it requires the prior internalization of a written document in memory, and was conceptualized in antiquity as the ability to read without the physical text. Such is the manner in which the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* discusses the techniques of memorization:

Those who know their letters can thereby write out what is dictated to them and read aloud what they have written. Likewise, those who have learned the techniques of memorization can put what they have heard in "places", and from those places deliver it by memory. For the places are very similar to wax tablets or papyrus, the images like letters, the arrangement and placing of the images like writing, and the delivery is like reading.115

Even natural and untrained memory is regularly compared to wax writing tablets in the ancient philosophical and rhetorical contexts.116 It is of slight importance to us whether this analogy is valid as a clinical description of the workings of the human memory; it suffices that we accept that the accurate recital of written texts from memory required the texts to be internalized. In the *Satyrlica*, the Latin verb *recitare* is quite ambiguous about the presence or

115 *Rhet. Her. 3.17., Quemadmodum igitur qui litteras sciunt possunt id quod dictatur eis scribere, et recitare quod scripserunt, item qui mnemonica didicerunt possunt quod audierunt in locis conlocare et ex his memoriter pronuntiare. nam loci cerae aut chartae simillimi sunt, imagines litteris, dispositio et conlocatio imaginum scripturae, pronuntiatio lectioni.*

116 Pl. *Tht. 191c-d; Arist. Mem. 450a-b; Cic. *Part. 6.26, de Orat. 2.88.360.*
absence of the physical text, and in fact it does not make the distinctions that seem vital to us, between "reading aloud", "reciting from memory" or "extemporizing".\(^{117}\)

In the category of "reciting from memory" we find the professional *Homeristae* conversing in the original Greek of the poet (59.3); the singing of verses from the *Aeneid* at a dinner party (68.4); the singing of poetry at work or as entertainment (23.3, 34.1, 64.2-5, 70.7); the singing of verses from literary mimes (31.6, 35.6, 53.13, 55.6, 73.3); singing while traveling (28.5, 62.4); and even the recitation of poetry in the baths (73.3, 91.3, 92.6), and in the theater (90.5). The above seem to be instances of recitation from memory, although it is, understandably, difficult to determine in every case whether we are dealing with recitation from memory or extempore recitation.

The third class is that of pure improvisation or extemporization of speeches, poetry and stories. Despite appearances, this activity is also closer to reading than it is to the living voice. To the trained ancient speaker who had perfectly mastered the techniques of artificial memorization, the idea of reading from memory was so familiar, that even improvised formal speaking was thought of as the reading of what one was about to say.\(^{118}\) The voice of the extemporizer is variously restrained by written and memorized schemata, sententiae and exempla, and as such it is properly a scripted voice. Consider the astonishing capacity of the Elder Seneca—at least if we believe the rhetor’s own perhaps boastful claims in the introductory words of his (re)collection of *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae*—to recall innumerable *sententiae* and many whole declamations. Such memory of textual bits and pieces no doubt formed a crucial part of rhetorical training, without which speakers and

---

\(^{117}\)53.1, 53.9, 55.2, 56.8, 71.4, 91.3, 90.1, 92.6, 90.5.

\(^{118}\)Cic. *Orat.* 150, *ut in legendo oculus sic animus in dicendo prospicet quod sequatur*. 
poets were unable to extemporize declamations or verses. According to Quintilian speaking extempore is the *maximus fructus* and *praemium amplissimum* of the long labour of literary studies (*Inst. 10. 7. 1*).

In the *Satyricon* the importance of building a vast literary memory before attempting a formal composition is stressed both by the persona of the rhetorician Agamemnon and by that of the poet Eumolpus, who also happen to be well versed in each other’s art. In telling his story Encolpius alludes to or represents completely several extemporal pieces: young Encolpius’s declamation in the school portico (1.1-2.9); Agamemnon’s declamation and subsequent extemporization of a poem (3.1-5 v22); the *extemoralis declamatio* of the speaker who takes over from Agamemnon (6.1); Eumolpus’s dissertation on the liberal arts and the subsequent extemporization of a poem on the capture of Troy (88.2-90.1); a shorter poem by Eumolpus (93.2); and more declamations (101.7-103.2, 107.1-12, 132.8-133.1, 137.9 v5), both *controversiae* (15.3, 48.4-6, 118.2) and *suasoriae* (6.1). The persona of Eumolpus also delivers two short erotic narratives (85.1-87.10; 111.1-112.8), which are simply presented as his own recollections although they are clearly satirical fictions of certain generic texture. In contrast, we get in Niceros’s werewolf-story (61.6-62.14), and in Trimalchio’s ghost-story (63.3-10), as well as in his poetry (34.10; 55.3), the outcome of literary composition by men who haven’t done their homework.

---

1194.3, *studiosi iuveni lectione severa irrigarentur... ut quod vellent imitari diu audirent... iam illa grandis oratio haberet maiestatis suae pondus; 5 vv. 1-22, artis severae siquid ambit effectus... det primos versibus annos / Maeomiumque bibat felici pectore fontem./...sic flumine largo / plenus Pierio defundes pectore verba; 118.3-6, neque concipere aut edere partum mens potest nisi ingenti flumine litterarum inundata... nisi plenus litteris sub onere labetur.*
Lastly there is a class of "poetry" which is not marked as poetry at all but appears as pure speech, which on occasions makes the transition from prose to poetry and back again within the same syntactical unit (108.13f., 132.11). Quite often the narrator (both while narrating in his own person and during impersonation) switches from one discourse type to another without a warning and as if nothing had happened (14.2, 15.9, 18.6, 79.8, 80.9, 82.5, 83.10, 93.2, 112.2, 126.18, 127.9, 128.6, 131.8, 132.8, 132.15, 133.3, 134.12135.8, 136.6, 137.9, 139.2). Most of this metrical speech seems to be new composition, but twice the poetry is actually Vergilian pastiche (112.2, 132.11). This accounts for all the verse in the extant Satyrica.

What is the point of the eccentric presentation of the poetry of the Satyrica? Some glimpses of the theory behind it are preserved in the often frustratingly limited fragments of the work. The exposition of this theory comes as a part of the introduction of Eumolpus, the compulsive poetaster. After the poet has been pelted out of the pinacotheca for his recitation, young Encolpius is made to ask him, *Quid tibi vis cum isto morbo?*—"what do you think you are up to with this disease?" (90.3). He then proceeds to remark with amazement that, *minus quam duabus horis mecum moraris, et saepius poetice quam humane locutus es*—"during the less than two hours that you have been in my company you have more often spoken like a poet, than like a man" (90.3). The distinction here drawn is an essential one for the Satyrica: just as declaimers are possessed by some alien madness (1.1, *num alio genere furiarum declamatores inquietantur*), poets are crazy. The

120It might be said that I am here invoking a "comparison text" by selecting a passage of the work to serve as a master-key to the interpretation of the larger context. This is true to an extent and probably unavoidable in any interpretation. However, my reading does not require any transferal of context because Encolpius's qualification of Eumolpus's poetry as "mad" is already made in the context of (some of) the poetry in the Satyrica.
mark by which we recognized their madness is the way they speak. They do not speak *humane*, but fall into various defective and contrived speech mannerism which make them seem possessed by alien furies, or to have taken leave of their senses (90.4, *ego quoque sinum meum saxis onerabo, ut quotiescumque coeperis a te exire, sanguinem tibi a capite mittam*). Formal discourse is contrasted with "human", i.e., spoken language. The underlying conceit is to recognize no speech as sane other than conversational language and to measure all discourse types by that standard. Everything which deviates from the norm of urbane colloquialism is found to be alienating, insane, or plain ridiculous. The familiarity and spontaneity of conversational language is such that it seems uniquely "transparent" and normal and therein lies its unassuming but powerful critical authority.

To view poetry as inferior to plain talk is of course a reversal of the classical order of discourses. That order, in fact, is briefly promoted by the crazy poet who makes the point that poetry requires that one flee the "vile" and "plebeian" common language (118.4, *refugiendum est ab omni verborum, ut ita dicam, vilitate et sumendae voces a plebe semotae*). But the mad poet's ideas are immediately undercut by his own admission that poetry is, indeed, madness (118.6, *furentis animi vaticinatio*). The over-all difference in the reception afforded poetry and prose in the *Satyrica* is also striking, and shows how Encolpius himself does not sustain the classical order. While Eumolpus the poet is stoned for the recitation of his poetry, Eumolpus the teller of short erotic narratives, which are conducted in the same idiom as the main narrative, gets favourable reception from the other characters of the story.\(^{121}\)

\(^{121}\)See Beck (1979) for a comparison of Eumolpus as poet and story teller.
It is important to differentiate here between young Encolpius and the older narrator,\textsuperscript{122} who privileges a loose conversational language, and represents himself in the past as being both prone to rhetorical pomposity and lapses into poetic "madness". The narrator is considerably more sober, in this particular sense, and although he does occasionally lose his composure and "slip into verse" (mostly in connection with such turbulent topics as Giton or money), he usually corrects himself immediately in balanced conversational prose (e.g., 79.8-9, \textit{sine causa gratulor mihi}), and so is able to continue the narration in a calmer tone. The occasions when the narrator speaks metrically in his own voice are relatively few, but nevertheless significant. In such "lapses" and subsequent "corrections" the boundaries of genres are deliberately crossed for a variety of reasons, but only in order to be re-confirmed afterwards when the narrator's voice re-settles into conversational rhythm and diction.\textsuperscript{123} Although the purpose of the verse is often to "correct" the characters with a comment, such as a cynical observation about life (e.g., "money can buy anything"), the apparent "insanity" and lack of seriousness of the verse inevitably subverts the message that the narrator (and his characters) are attempting to deliver.\textsuperscript{124} This is a useful technique, since it ultimately allows the narrator to state things indirectly which he otherwise could not.

The basic theory of the mixed discourse seems to date at least to the third century B.C.E. and as far as we can tell it was invented by Cynic popular philosophers. Though

\textsuperscript{122}The difference between narrator and protagonist will be dealt with in greater detail in Chapter Five.

\textsuperscript{123}Beck (1973) alternatively proposed that the "slips into verse" by the narrator represented reconstructions of the protagonist's fantasies.

\textsuperscript{124}Relihan (1993) discusses in general the self-subverting quality of prosimetry.
their own work is mostly lost, their legacy is still preserved. For instance, a satiric dialogue by Lucian called *Menippus* exists. It takes the form of a conversation between the Cynic wise man and an unnamed friend, who acts the straight man to the clownish philosopher, who has just arrived from a trip to the underworld. He begins by addressing his friend with two verses, a pastiche from a play by Euripides. The friend answers with a greeting and a question. Menippus again quotes two lines from another play of Euripides. This goes on until Menippus has uttered nothing but pastiches from Euripides four times in a row and the friend gets irritated, though he is slightly bewildered as to what he should call the type of language that he wishes the philosopher to use, παῦσαι, μακάρε, τραγῳδῶν καὶ λέγε σύντοσι πῶς ἀπλῶς καταβάς ἀπὸ τῶν ιαμβεῖων—"Stop this tragic recital! my dear man—speak to me this way, somehow, plainly—step off the iambic metres!" Menippus steps off the iambics and answers in Homeric hexameters (!), quoting two lines from the *Odyssey*, except that he substitutes the word "mother" in Homer with "friend" to suite his addressee. In exasperation the friend retorts, οὗτος ἀλλ' ἡ παραποίεις· οὐ γὰρ ἀν σὺντος ἐμέτρως ἑρωσφῶδες πρὸς ἐνδρας φίλους—"Man, you are surely out of your mind, or you wouldn't rhapsodize metrically in this way to your friends." Menippus answers (now in conversational language), μὴ θαυμὸς, ἢ ἑταῖρε· νεωστὶ γὰρ Ἐυρυπίδη καὶ Ὀμήρῳ συγγενόμενος οὐκ οἶδ' ὁπως ἀνεπλήσθην τῶν ἐπῶν καὶ αὐτόματα μοι τὰ μέτρα ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα ἔρχεται—"Don't be so surprised, my friend, having been together with Euripides

---

125There exists no group of Cynic texts comparable with the Stoic and Epicurean collections. Editions of the fragments are rare and hard to come by and as a result "Cynicism" is often described on the basis of Musonius Rufus, Epictetus, and Dio Chrysostom, whose views are to a large extent Stoic. Lucian is a good source at least with respect to the nature of Cynic literature. The material in Diogenes Laertius is mostly anecdotal, and Julian's writings on the topic are late and biased. The Cynic epistles are an important but neglected source of information.
and Homer [in the underworld] somehow—I don't know how—I've become filled with poetry and verses come spontaneously to my lips."

We notice that, just as in the Satyrica, poetic speech is here treated humorously as a compulsive linguistic affliction; in the case of Menippus it is caused by too much time spent with famous dead poets, which is clever metonymy for excessive exposure to the Classics. Both Eumolpus and Menippus, who essentially belong to the same type, lose control and begin to speak in meter automatically, but return to humanity and sanity only when they speak again like ordinarily people. Normalcy is restored by switching from poetry to conversational prose. Another important similarity is the idea of being "filled with poetry" which must break out in ever new recitals. Agamemnon, Eumolpus, and young Encolpius use the same metaphor to describe the desired effects of literary studies, and the state of literary inspiration (5. v.13-22, 118.6, 126.8). It is as if the speaker had first become saturated or satur (food-metaphors come easily to the lips of these characters) with

\[\text{Sat. 5.vv.13-22, bibat felici pectore fontem. / max et Socratico plenus grege [...] sic flumine largo / plenus Pierio defundes pectore verba; 118.6, civilis ingens opus quisquis attigerit nisi plenus litteris, sub onere labetur, 126.8, itaque oratone plandissima plenus [...] inguam. The Iolaos (POxy. 3010) fragment provides a tantalizing parallel, which comes just before the "gallus" begins addressing Iolaos in Sotadean verse, 9-10, [διδασκαλικά δὲ πλὴρωσις γεγονότα] ἐπισθεὶς πρὸς [πὸν Ἰόλαον]. Although the text is lacunose, the letters πλὴρ[...] show that we have here the same metaphor of being "full" of learning before bursting into poetic speech.}

\[\text{127 Juvenal speaks of the farrago "hodgepodge" of his little book (1.86). Consider also this fragment from Varro's Saturae Menippeae, et ceteri scholastici saturis auribus scholica dape atque ebriis sophistice aperantologia consurgimus ieiumis oculis (Eumenides XXVIII). Satura was also the name of a dish of mixed ingredients. For a general discussion of food associations and satura, see Petersmann (1986), LeMoine (1991), and Gowers (1993).} \]
literature and had subsequently gone out of himself or lost his identity and normal manner
of speech to become possessed by poetic *persona* from the gallery of classical authors.

This effect upon the schoolman's psyche is even more worrisome, of course, if the
literature one is being exposed to is of inferior quality. In his declamation for Agamemnon,
young Encolpius first laments the unreal subject matter and bombastic style of declamation,
which he calls *mellitos verborum globulos et omnia dicta factaque quasi papavere et sesamo
sparsa*-"honey-balls of phrases, every word and act besprinkled with poppy-seed and
sesame" (1.3), and then he says that *qui inter haec nutritur non magis sapere possunt
quam bene olere qui in culina habitant*—"people who are fed on this diet can no more have
taste (or be wise) than people who live in the kitchen can smell good" (2.1). One can sense
here, in the figures of the language, a tone reminiscent of the ancient philosophical polemic
against sophism and rhetoric, which had been likened to the (undervalued?) profession of
cooking. This is the thesis that arranging words artfully is like seasoning food, basically a
deception.128 But apart from this there is the notion that excessive exposure to artful
literature will fragment the student's subject and control over future compositions. Seneca,
in a letter dedicated to the practice of literary studies (*Ep.* 84), shows awareness of the
possibly negative effects of ancient education through immersion, and strongly advises
students to "digest" (*Ep.* 84.7, *concoquere*) the intellectual food they take in through their
reading so that it can truly be assimilated into the bloodstream, or the seat of genius
(*ingenium*), not just into memory. Many voices singing in harmony is the classical ideal of
generic oneness and consonance (*Ep.* 84.9). The digestion is the process of transforming
and adapting the miscellany that one reads to the generic law of the new composition—

128 See Conte (1992), 300-312.
whether that is one's speech or writing—which should ideally level out any signs of alien discourses and make what came in many forms and shapes into a seamless whole.

In prosimetry the ideal of consonance is deliberately botched, and we are allowed to see the often stark differences between individual components of a work. It is this feature which gives the prosimetric narrator his scatterbrained quality. By eschewing consistency and unity, the mixed discourse not only deprives itself of an authoritative stance, it also subverts conservative and contrived genres by playing with them and subjecting them to jarring juxtapositions. The purpose of this exercise is ultimately to make it all the more obvious how artificial literary forms are with respect to common language. This type of prosimetry, though seemingly anarchic in its shape-shifting guise, is therefore not without a center and does possess a nonchalant authority of its own. The conversational style is at its heart and functions as a sort of non-literary center, which presumably stands beyond formal language and can therefore serve as a measure of the artificiality of literary language.

The one type of discourse certainly privileged in this genre is prose, and we should remember that the vast majority of the extant Satyricon (and we may assume of the original work) is written in this idiom. The "oral" presentation of the various discourse types found in the Satyricon is also what constitutes their unifying quality and shows clearly the generic dominance of the conversational tone of Encolpius's voice with respect to other types of discourse. His is the central speaker identity, underlying all other personae in the work, and

\[129\] Whether PROSimetry, as opposed to prosiMETRY, is the original function and purpose of the mixed discourse I dare not say with absolute certainty. Practically nothing is left of the works of Menippus and Varro's Menippean Satires are all in pieces. In order to determine the function of the mixed discourse we need relatively complete sections of text. Judging from what is extant either fully or partly (Menippus, Iolaos, Satyricon, Apocolocyntosis) the basis of the oldest prosimetry was simple prose.
therefore it should cause no surprise that all subordinate *personae* speak in forms of conversational language, though the quality and style often differ in accordance with their intended individual traits as characters in the story.

Perhaps the most frequently studied consequence of the "human language" mode of presentation in the *Satyrica* is the well known colloquial quality of its diction, morphology and syntax. We typically have two distinctions, one internal between what is spoken in the name of the narrator and the other educated characters, and what is spoken in the *personae* of the freedmen, and one external between the language of the *Satyrina* as a whole and the style of formal literary Latin. If the historical and linguistic analyses of Bendz (1941), Marmorale (1948), Swanson (1963), Dell'Era (1970), and Petersmann (1977) are to be trusted, not only the speeches of the freedmen in the *Cena*, but also Encolpius's main narrative and the conversations of his peers are rich in colloquialisms. This over-all quality of the language justifies the differentiation from the more elevated literary idiom.

While we are able to determine with great certainty the mode of presentation in the *Satyrina* as "spoken-to-be-heard", as opposed to "written-to-be-read", the classification of the language as "colloquial" or "literary" is meaningful only in a relative sense, and depends on our choice of "comparison text" to serve as a typical example of literary language. Due to the antiquity of the subject, all our evidence for spoken Latin comes from written texts, and no written text is so "literary" as to be free of the spoken language. For obvious reasons these categories are never discrete. Moreover, as we have clearly seen in our analysis of the discourse types in the *Satyrina*, the spoken mode of presentation does not exclude literary language, since for the composition of ancient "oral" discourse, whether in prose or in metrical language, a great repertoire of literary bits and pieces was required.
The internal distinction, however, between the utterances of the schooled and unschooled characters can be arrived at by comparing the speech mannerisms of these two different groups in the Satyrica. In reading through the work one senses a clear increase in the density of vulgarities in the speeches of the un-schooled freedmen. Representing this change by statistical means is fraught with difficulties, but fortunately unnecessary because Encolpius clearly acknowledges and intends this difference. In the persona of Echion, who is perhaps the most confident and the least apologetic of Trimalchio's freedmen guests, the story-teller pretends to address Agamemnon, the rhetor, in this fashion (46.2):

"Videris mihi, Agamemnon, dicere: 'quid iste argutat molestus?' quia tu, qui potes loquere, non loquis. non es nostrae fasciae, et ideo pauperorum verba derides. scimus te prae litteras fatuum esse."

["It seems to me that Agamemnon is saying: 'What is this tiring fellow blabbering about?' Well, it's because you, who know how to talk, don't talk. You're not like us, and so you make fun of how we poor bastards talk. But we know that you have been turned into a silly fool from that literature of yours.""]

This obviously defines the categories of the freedmen's speech versus that of the scholars in terms of literary and non-literary, or schooled and un-schooled. No external context is necessary to explain what characterizes this style with respect to the rest of the narrative, or why Encolpius has introduced this feature into his lively account of Trimalchio's dinner-party. However, scholars have often attempted to use external material (e.g., the apparently conversational language of Cicero's and Seneca's letters or the ungrammatical language of Pompeian graffiti) to fix a supposedly absolute and historical classification of the two levels

---

130 See also Niceros’s words before he begins his werewolf-story: *timeo istos scholasticos, ne me derideant* —"I fear those schoolmen, that they will mock me" (61.4).
of spoken language in the *Satyricon*. The use of such external contexts is often accompanied by certain assumptions about the purpose of this style, assumptions which sometimes ignore the indications in the *Satyricon* itself as to its intended significance.

Ever since the rediscovery of the Traguriani manuscript by Marino Statileo, in the mid seventeenth century, scholars have debated the significance of the strange language of the *Satyricon*. Initially the question of language was raised in relation to the debate over the authenticity of the *Cena* manuscript. 131 Johan Christoph Wagenseil remarked that the *barbara, monstrosa, immo ne humana quidem*—"barbarian, monstrous, not even human"—vocabulary of the *Satyricon*, especially in the speeches of the freedmen, could not possibly have come from the pen of the *elegantiarum Arbiter*, and tried to show that the real author had to be familiar with modern Italian. The crass autobiographical fallacy of the argument is obvious, and Wagenseil makes no allowance for the possibility that the author might have imitated linguistic manners that were uncharacteristic for his own historical person. On the basis of this simplistic position, Wagenseil concluded that the new fragment of Petronius was not by Petronius, and not even by a Roman, but an obvious forgery perpetrated by the Italian Statileo himself. 132

Adrien de Valois, whose study appeared together with that of Wagenseil and under the same title, 133 argued along similar lines. Whoever wrote the *Cena Trimalchionis*, he

131 In the following exposition of the scholarly literature on the language of the *Satyricon* I owe a great deal to Bret Boyce's very helpful recent survey of the scholarship (Boyce (1991), 14-34).

132 Wagenseil's treatise is the former of the two *Dissertationes de Cena Trimalchionis nuper sub Petronii nomine vulgata* (orig. Paris, 1666) that were reprinted in Burmann (1743), 2:342-350.

133 Reprinted in Burmann (1743), 2:350-358.
claimed, had to be a native speaker of—this time—French, though for de Valois, the
colloquial language of the narrative and the Graecisms of the Longer Fragments indicated
that Petronius lived under the Antonines and was himself indeed a Gaul from Massilia.
Again the premise of the argument is that the persona of the speaker in the narrative of the
Satyrīca is throughout none other than the historical author, Petronius Arbiter. This
assumption then leads to certain expectations about the style appropriate to the author’s
historical persona, expectations which are ultimately determined by a comparative reading
of the Satyrīca and the Annales. Another notable characteristic of their approach is the
completely new attempt to classify the strange language of the work by introducing a
modern "comparison text", in both cases the written texts of the Romance vernaculars.

A quick reply to these attacks on the authenticity of the Tragurienisis manuscript was
published the same year (1666) in Paris under the name of Marino Statileo himself.134 This
treatise correctly stresses that the language of the freedmen deviates from the language of
the other characters because of the inferior level of their schooling and literacy, and claims
moreover that Petronius deliberately wrote thus to make the language fit his characters
(personae). The author of this reply notes that the new Tragurienisis manuscript contains
such peculiar language, while the previously known Longer Fragments (L) don’t, for the
reason that only in the episode of the dinner-party is conversation dominated by uneducated
freedmen.135 The author of the treatise shows a good understanding of the fact that the
historical identity of Petronius as such is irrelevant to the language of the freedmen, which
should instead be explained by reference to the ancient criteria of appropriateness in

134 Reprinted in Burmann (1743), 2:359-379. The reply may not have been written
by Statileo, but by Pierre Petit of the Pléade latine; according to Gaselee (1909), 171.

135 Burmann (1743), 2:367.
The assumption that, apart from the freedmen, all characters in the *Satyricon* are urbane and educated, may not be fully accurate, but it is certainly correct that, of the extant episodes, only the *Cena* allows them to make longish statements.\(^\text{137}\)

Another important seventeenth century dissertation under the name of Statileo, but actually composed by Giovanni Lucio,\(^\text{138}\) introduced the question of vulgar Latin into the scholarship on the *Satyricon*. By noting the similarity of the language of the *Satyricon* to the Vulgate, and to the Romance languages, the scholar postulated that the colloquial language of the work was actually derived from the way Latin was spoken at the time by common uneducated people. However, in Lucio's mind, what prompted Petronius to imitate this idiom was by no means the desire to document the language of the people, but an urge to ridicule and "to laugh until his tears flow, together with the educated and elegant men who were present at that dinner party".\(^\text{139}\) It was not, in fact, Petronius who laughed at the freedmen, but his character Ascylos, as is clear from the fact that Lucio's language imitates *Sat. 57.1*. Besides, this interpretation obscures the fact that the jokes of the *Cena Trimalchionis* are told no less at the cost of the parasitic and clownish *scholastici*. There is no question that Encolpius agrees with the mordant wit of Echion, when he states that the

\[\text{136}\text{The author asks, justly outraged: Quae autem haec inscitia est, ne animadvertere quidem, quid personis, quas Petronius exhibet, conveniat? Burmann (1743), 2.373.}\]

\[\text{137}\text{Bargates speaks } rabisba barbaraque voce (96.5).}\]

\[\text{138}\text{*Apologia ad Patres Conscripti Reip. Litterariae Marini Statilei Traguriensis*, first published in Blaeu's edition (Amsterdam, 1670), and then reprinted in Burmann (1743), 2:379-394.}\]

\[\text{139}\text{Burmann (1743), 2:387.}\]
schoolmen have lost their senses from excessive study of bad literature. Such is the basic philosophy of prosimetry.

In general it is the character of this seventeenth century debate to treat the language of the freedmen not as an idiom on its own, which might be worth studying, but merely as an aberration from the correct Latin of Cicero and other exemplary authorities on matters of style. It took the intense romantic nationalism of nineteenth century German philologists to find in vulgaris sermo not just low "vulgarities" but the Volkssprache, "the language of the people", and so make this formerly disreputable idiom worthy of study in its own right.

The first study to approach the question of language in the Satyricon from this late modern perspective is an article of G. Studer (1849), which praises Petronius as practically the only Roman author, who "has left behind for us a written document" (der uns ein schriftliches Document [...] hinterlassen hat) of the Volkssprache that was spoken by the overwhelming majority of uneducated Romans, in the military and among the colonists of the provinces, where it later developed into the various Romance languages. The importance of Petronius as a document for this idiom is said by Studer to be even greater, because of the loss of all works which, like the mimes and Atellans, belonged to the "base and comic national literature" (der niedrigkomischen Nationallitteratur). The conspicuous terms Volkssprache,

---

140 The first German ideologue to regard language as such as the most significant expression of the Volksgeist was Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), but after the 1806 Prussian defeat at Jena, his ideas were disseminated in the more aggressive form given them by Johann Gottlieb Fichte in his Reden an die deutsche Nation (Hamburg, 51978), which he delivered in Berlin in the winter of 1807-1808.
Document and Nationalliteratur show that the premise of this nineteenth century discussion has changed fundamentally from the seventeenth century.\footnote{141}

As Boyce points out, several major projects now influenced the debate on the Satyrca’s language: G. Fiorelli’s archeological excavations of Pompeii (begun 1860); the publication of Bücheler’s new edition of the text (1862); the publication of the epigraphic evidence in the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (1863); and the publication of Hugo Schuchardt’s three volume study of the sermo plebeius (1866-1868). As the result of this development we have, moreover, a doctoral dissertation by Arminius von Guericke, De linguae vulgaris reliquis apud Petronium et in inscriptionibus parietarulis Pompeianis (1875), which compares the language of the freedmen to the graffiti on the walls of ancient Pompeii. The conclusion of this study, however, is that the language of the Satyrca, though interspersed with vulgar forms, including the poetry, is not a faithful representation of the contemporary Latin spoken by the lower classes, due to the constraints on the author to entertain an educated audience.

Unfortunately, all this archeological evidence and interest in historical linguistics (and the centrality of language in the ideologies related to the contemporary consolidation of national states in Europe) tended to obscure rather than to clarify the specific logic of the presentation of linguistic characterization in the Satyrca. Wilhelm Süß was the first modern scholar to draw attention to the important difference between the modern and the ancient approaches to vulgar Latin as it related to the Satyrca. In two Latin treatises, De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis ceneae sermone vulgari (1926), and Petronii imitatio sermonis plebei qua necessitate coniungatur cum grammatica illius aetatis doctrina (1927), he tries to

\footnote{141}{See Chapter Six for a fuller discussion of the influence of nationalism on Petronian scholarship.}
differentiate the study of Latin historical linguistics from the study of the specific reasons behind the imitation of speech characteristics in the *Satyricon*, which he emphasizes as being the more important for understanding the work:

non modo grammaticis singula esse ex historia et necessitate orationis latinae interpretanda, sed et philologis quae rerum esse, quo sit ductus consilio scriptor et qua sit usus ratione in coloribus vulgaribus dicendi et eligendis et distribuendis.\(^{142}\)

The reasons for the use of colloquial language in the *Satyricon* can only be discovered by carefully reading those passages in the work where the language of the freedmen is defined as un-schooled and ridiculous in the eyes of the schoolmen. This strongly suggests that it is there to form an antithesis to the correct Latin of the schools.\(^{143}\) Encolpius's attempt to imitate the language of the freedmen is surely called for because of the presence of the scholastici at the dinner party of Trimalchio. What tempts him to undertake this exercise in *mimetismo* is the contrast between these two groups. The episode is a sort of saturnalian reversal of roles, where scholars and orators are kept silent to allow those who violate the protocols of respectable public speech to ramble on in their "shameful" and "low" manner. Süß is also correct in arguing against the idea that Petronius tried to imitate the speech mannerisms of those who had Latin as their second language.\(^{144}\) Graecisms are widespread throughout the *Satyricon* and we may rest assured that if

\(^{142}\) Süß (1926), 3.

\(^{143}\) For a recent discussion of ancient schoolmen and society, see Kaster (1988).

\(^{144}\) This view was held, for example, by Salonius (1927).
Encolpius had intended to ridicule the freedmen especially for their use of Graecisms he would somehow have indicated as much.

Wilhelm Süß makes it the starting point of his latter thesis to investigate the ancient grammatical theory of barbarisms and solecisms. His conclusion is that the language of the freedmen displays many of the features known to grammarians as incorrect, although he avoids making this the only source of the vulgar language and believes Petronius miscusse innata acurnia ingenii cum usu eruditionis et consiliis artis ita, ut omnia nescio quam simulationem terneritatis haberent. Süß thus relies on the study of the external context of vulgar Latin only in so far as it supports the internal mode of presentation. This approach has the great advantage of respecting the Satyrica's own explanation of the significance and purpose of the language of the freedmen.

As we have seen it is anachronistic to assign to the author of the Satyrica an interest in imitating the language of the common people for the sake of realism or documentation, although this is often the underlying assumption of scholars who study Volkssprache in the Satyrica. In our Introduction we accounted for this reading as determined by the context of the other extant ancient prose fiction in Latin, the Metamorphoses of Apuleius, and pointed out that as an interpretive approach it shares many basic assumptions with the general study

\[145\] Süß (1927), 5.

\[146\] Boyce (1991), 24, whose study has been very useful to me for its thoroughness in surveying the scholarship, seems to believe that Petronius's purpose was to document the linguistic mannerisms of the underclass, and agrees with Meyer's negative and dismissive review of Süß's thesis: "In der Cena haben wir doch nichts anderes als ein von unerreichter Meisterhand geschaffenes Abbild der damaligen Volkssprache, wozu ein dürres System von Vitiagruppen eines Grammatikers nichts beigetragen hat" (quoted by Boyce).
of national literatures. Although modern scholars are obviously free to use any ancient text as a linguistic document to support their theories about the vulgar idiom of ancient Latin, the assumption should be resisted that the peculiar language of the un-schooled characters of the *Satyricon* is there for the same reason that scholars wish to study it.

If we are to revise the historical context of the colloquial language of the *Satyricon* to dissociate the work from such irrelevant texts as the Vulgate or the graffiti at Pompeii, the most obvious replacement for these traditional "comparison texts" should be looked for in the appropriately general and theoretical ancient discussion of styles. Here, indeed, we find in the lowest of the three stylistic characters, as defined by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, a text which shares many of the linguistic peculiarities of the *Satyricon*. This Latin treatise from the first century B.C.E. provides us indeed with an example of "plain speech", *oratio attenuata* or *sermo extenuatus*, which reads like a lost passage from the *Satyricon*:

> Nam ut forte hic in balneis venit, coepit, postquam perfusus est, defricari; deinde, ubi visum est ut in alveum descenderet, ecce tibi iste de traverso:
> "Heus," inquit, "adolescens, pueri tui modo me pulsarunt; satis facias oportet."
> Hic, qui id aetatis ab ignoto praeter consuetudinem appellatus esset, satis facias oportet.
> Iste clarius eadem et alia dicere coepit. Hic vix: "Tamen," inquit, "sine me considerare." Tum vero iste clamare voce ista quae perfacile cuivis rubores eicere potest; ita petulans est atque acerba: ne ad solarium quidem, ut mihi videtur, sed pone scaenam et in eiusmodi locis exercitata. Conturbatus est adolescens; nec mirum, cui etiam nunc pedagogi lites ad oriculas versarentur

---

147 *Rhet. Her.* 4.10. We note, e.g., the frequent use of diminutives (*oriculas*), Graecisms (*pedagogi*), idioms (*de transverso*), exclamations (*heus*), the verb *coepit* with the passive (*coepit ... defricari*), vulgar arcaisms (*pone* for *post*), the colloquial use of the ethical dative *tibi* with *ecce*, and demonstratives (*iste* for *hic* or *is*), the accusative of quality (*id aetatis*), asyndeton (*satis facias oportet*), and the evident preference for parataxis (*ita petulans est ... exercitata*).
inperito huiusmodi conviciorum. Ubi enim iste vidisset scurrum exhausto rubore, qui se putaret nihil habere quod de existimatione perderet, ut omnia sine famae detrimento facere posset?

An English translation would not do justice to the style of the passage, whose characteristic is the absence of rhetorical embellishment and the quick-witted and streetwise use of language (facetissima verborum adtenuatione). Accordingly, the language in this style may freely sink to the lowest everyday usage (4.10, ad infinum et coditianum sermonem demissum). It lacks any elevation or formal literary elegance being itself perceived not as literary discourse but as conversational language. The wrong use of this style does not involve vulgar vocabulary and forms, but is caused by clumsy repetitiveness, general stupidity and absence of wit.

The distinction between what Encolpius says by way of narrative, and what he says while putting on the masks of the freedmen, should not affect our evaluation of the over-all style of his narrative, for what we call "vulgar" language is an integral part of the plain

---

148 Rhet. Her. 4.11.

149 Although sermo extenuatus is far from being what we would term stylistically "elegant" elegantia may indeed have been the term used by the ancient theorist (cf. 4.11, ...adtenuata figura, puris et electis verbis conpositam orationem).

150 The Rhetorica ad Herennium also provides an example of the incorrect use of this genus: 4.11, Nam istic in balineis accessit ad hunc. Postea dicit: "Hic tuus servus me pulsavit." Postea dicit hic illi: "Considerabo." Post ille convicium fecit et magis magisque praesente multis clamavit. As we can see vulgarities or colloquialisms are not what makes the difference.
speech as the treatise defines it. Where impersonation involves an intensification of vulgarisms in comparison with the general narrative, this relative difference does not allow us to assign the main narrative to the category of formal literary style. At the same time we should be wary not to separate literary language entirely from the spoken language, since the two obviously overlap and are far from being discrete classes. As we have seen, certain types of formal "spoken" discourses existed in antiquity, both in prose and meter, which demanded a vast literary repertoire. In contrast to Encolpius, Lucius in the Metamorphoses uses a more elevated literary style, notwithstanding his pretense to speak as a foreigner, which puts him—relatively speaking—above colloquialisms and vulgarity. This is why Lucius and his subordinate *personae* all speak in an artificial and peculiarly literary manner. The difference seems to correlate with what we have noted previously, that there is a fundamental distinction in the mode of presentation in the Satyrical and the Metamorphoses; one is clearly performance literature, while the other presents itself as a written text to be read aloud by a solitary reader to himself.

It is pertinent to this whole question to consider the common denominator of those ancient works of literature which include linguistic mimicry, whether of regional dialects, foreign languages or vulgar idioms. The relevant material was collected recently by Boyce, who lists such examples as the "Persian" of the Persae of Aeschylus; the crude

151 The middle style steers clear of it by abstaining from the basest and thoroughly vulgar vocabulary (*Rhet. Her. 4.8, ex infima et pervulgatissima verborum dignitate*). In the example given by the rhetorical treatise the colloquial forms come from the narrator himself and not merely in his mimicking of the *scurra*. The whole point of the base style is to lower the dignity of the discourse down to the street level.

patois of the Phrygian or Persian captive in the fragment of the *Persae* of Timotheus (dated ca. 419-416 B.C.E.); the imitation of the Boeotian and Megarian dialects in Aristophanes's *Acharnenses*; the Laconian in the *Lysistrata*; the Thracian gibberish of the *Aves*; the solecistic Greek of the Scythian policeman in the *Thesmophoriazusae*; the "Indian" and the ranting monologue of the vengeful woman in a fragment of subliterary mime (*POxy*. 413, No. 76 [Page]); the general imitation of colloquial language in Plautus's plays; the "Punic" of the *Poenulus*; and finally the "vulgar" diction of the Atellan farces of L. Pomponius and Novius, as well as the mimes or *fabulae riciniatae* of D. Laberius, Publilius Syrus, and Cn. Matius.

Boyce concludes, in my view mistakenly, that "realistic literary depiction of the speech of commoners (and, we may add, of barbarians) is confined to the comic mode." Some of his own examples, however, are obviously not comedy, but come from tragic plays (Aeschylus, Timotheus) and to Boyce's list one could add the "Phrygian" in Euripides's *Orestes*, the "Egyptian" in Aeschylus's *Suppliants*. Instead of the "comic mode" we prefer to see the common denominator in all of these examples as "theatricality", since in every instance we are dealing with plays, written for performance in theaters and for an audience. The exclusive use of linguistic *mimetismo* in performance literature would therefore seem to support our contention that the *Satyrca* was composed for performance. Much the same could be said of the Iolaos (*POxy*. 3010), and the Tinouphis (*PHAun*. inv.

---

153 From comedy one could add the "Ionian" in Aristophanes's *Peace* and the Apulian calyx crater by the Tarporley painter (New York Metropolitan Museum of Art, No. 24.97.104). A reproduction can be found in Oliver Taplin *Comic Angels* (Oxford, 1993), plate 10.2.
400) papyrus fragments which like the Satyricon contain "a number of vulgarisms and uncorrected errors in both the prose and the verse sections of the text."\textsuperscript{154}

Although direct evidence of the performance of novelistic narratives is scarce,\textsuperscript{155} some indications are found in Lucian's Pseudologista. The outspoken sophist here impersonates the figure of "Reproach" ("Ελέγχος) to blast his enemy for delivering in Olympia, at a New Year's festival, an "improvisation" which was supposedly plagiarized from others and completely memorized beforehand. (What seems to have maddened Lucian especially was that the performer managed to turn his heckling against him and roused the laughter of the audience—unfairly, perhaps, but successfully.) The improvisation in question was a mixture of prose and poetry (ὦ μὲν τὴν φωνὴν ἐντρέψας ἐς μέλος),\textsuperscript{156} and Lucian's enemy, who according to him was a great sexual pervert, had first gained his reputation as a theatrical performer by impersonating Ninos and Metiochus.\textsuperscript{157} The juxtaposition of these two names of the male protagonists from the very earliest Greek

\textsuperscript{154}Stephens and Winkler (1995), 367.

\textsuperscript{155}There is, however, the mention of aretalogi, tellers of marvelous survival tales in the style of Odysseus's lying Phaeacian Tales (cf. Juv. 15.16; Manetho 4.447, ἐν δ' ἀρεταλογίῃ μυθεύματα ποικίλ' ἔχοντας; and Lucian Merc. Cond. 1f. and V.H. 1.3), as regular entertainers at Augustus's dinner parties (Suet. Aug. 74), who are probably the same as the lectores and fabulatores of the household to whom the emperor listened if he could not sleep (ibid. 78). We also have a reference to some one telling some "history" or "fable" in the circus (D.Chr. or. 20.10, τὸν δὲ ἱστορίαν τινά ἐπίθηκον διηγούμενον), but this last instance may not have been more than casual entertainment.

\textsuperscript{156}Lucianus Pseudol. 7.

\textsuperscript{157}Lucianus Pseudol. 25.
novels (probably first cent. B.C.E.)\textsuperscript{158} may provide some evidence of where, how and by whom the ancient novels were recited. Although neither of these two works seems to have been prosimetric or to have included linguistic mimicry, evidence that even fictional narratives without such features were recited in the theater may indirectly support our belief that a work such as the \textit{Satyrca}, which \textit{is} theatrical in its narrative style, was in fact composed for performance.\textsuperscript{159}

It may seem at first that all written texts are equally suited for literary recital in front of an audience, but it is not that simple. Certain texts include features which would make performance awkward. Consider, for example, how Thucydides's statement that his work was composed for posterity and not for a public recital might sound if read in front of an audience. Another example of performance-unfriendly figures are Lucius's many personal addresses to a single \textit{lector} in the \textit{Metamorphoses}. These would certainly sound awkward if they came from the mouth of a public reciter of the work; the reader, impersonating Lucius, would appear to be talking to another aspect of himself (as reader), while at the same time reciting for his audience! Although it is certainly impossible to write a text which can only be performed or only read by a solitary reader, there are ways to make works either more or less suitable for particular uses. As we have seen, nothing in the \textit{Satyrca} makes it averse to performance, while we have pointed to several features that would make it highly suitable for a lively recitation, a sort of one-man act in the theater. The \textit{Satyrca} shares some of the generic premises of theatrical texts, which—unless making fun of their own convention—

\textsuperscript{158}See Dihle (1978), 54-55.

\textsuperscript{159}For a discussion of the "aural" quality of early Greek novels and their intended "readership" as not only the educated reader, but also a semi-literate or illiterate "hearer", see Hägg (1994).
do not allude to the fact that the words which are spoken on stage have been written previously, or at least composed and memorized, but seek to create the illusion that the dialogues on stage are conceived on the spur of the moment. In likening the Satyricon to theatrical literature, however, we should be careful to distinguish between regular plays, which feature many interacting personae, and Encolpius's one-man recital.

Our conclusion makes it necessary to reconsider a pre-existing hypothesis about the Satyricon as performance literature, which was offered by the historicist school of Petronian scholarship. The historicist school however does not base its hypothesis, as we have done, on a close reading of the Satyricon, but assumes on the basis of the historical context that Petronius must have written and recited the Satyricon for an intimate circle of friends at the court of the Roman emperor Nero. Now, we must ask whether our demonstration that the Satyricon was written for performance is perhaps a vindication of the historicist assumption?

The lively gesticulation which is implicit in the text of the Satyricon; the mimicry of the speech mannerisms of the un-schooled freedmen; and the mixed form of the discourse, which abruptly switches from one discursive type to another and forces the reciting voice to repeatedly change its rhythm and tone; all this makes it clear that performing the Satyricon is a very difficult task, if it is to be done properly, and probably would require the training of a professional an actor. It may thus be argued that the Satyricon is unlikely to have ever been performed by the author.160 Historically, in the early empire the writer himself or a professional lector were variously used to perform a text.161 The practice of using lectores

160Arrowsmith (1987), x f., also argued for a professional performer: "For unless I am badly mistaken, the Satyricon was clearly written [...] to be recited aloud by a trained artist with a voice and virtuosity capable of registering the enormous variety of the work."

161Starr (1991), 337f.
in aristocratic circles was common. Incidentally, a *lector* of Pliny the younger was named Encolpius. In Plutarch's *Table-Talk*, a Stoic sophist describes a form of entertainment according to him recently brought in at parties in Rome:

"You are aware," he said, "that of the dialogues of Plato, some are narrative and others dramatic. Slaves are taught the most lively of these dramatic dialogues, so as to recite them from the mouth. They use a type of presentation appropriate to the personalities of the characters in the text, with modulation of voice and gestures and delivery suited to the meaning..."

Nothing prohibits that a livelier narrative than Plato's philosophical narratives—we note the careful distinction between the basic forms of narrative (monologue) and drama (dialogue) in the passage—such as the *Satyrlica* would be recited by a single slave. The enjoyment of the performance of the *Satyrlica* would naturally increase considerably from using a *lector* with the looks and qualities of Encolpius to act the narrator as he skillfully rides through his variegated narrative as a desultory horseman jumps between horses.

---

162 Starr (1991), 338.


164 Ancient recitals of literary texts were certainly not as formal as the modern academic lecture or readings of fiction or poetry by authors themselves. Jones (1991), 193, traces to Friedländer the incorrect view often expressed in commentaries and handbooks that private literary performances included only excerpts, or recitals by a single author.
The merit of the Neronian performance hypothesis is that it (unconsciously?) recognizes that the *Satyricon* is performance literature. Since we have made up our minds to identify Petronius Arbiter as the consular friend of Nero, it is conceivable that, like Nero, the author of the *Satyricon* may have had ambitions as an actor. Besides, ancient rhetorical training, which the author of the *Satyricon* obviously underwent, especially the training in delivery, was easily and consistently confused with acting. Hence, Petronius might have performed the work himself in the person of Encolpius. However, this historical possibility—for it is no more than that—if explored, merely lands us in a situation similar to the one discussed in the Introduction in relation to the Suetonian anecdote about Nero playing Hercules, and the reaction of the simple-minded young recruit: if we recognize the speaker as Petronius, we rupture the fabric of the story of Encolpius. The identity of Petronius Arbiter, whoever he was, cannot be accommodated in the travelogue and erotic recollections of Encolpius. In other words, it ultimately makes no difference to us whether it was Petronius who recited the *Satyricon* or an actor, because unlike the author of the *Apocolocyntosis*, who speaks in his own voice, Petronius would not have been identifiable as such while acting the *persona* of Encolpius. The fact is that no knowledge of the first historical performance is available, and the less we assume about this matter the less likely it is that we inadvertently confuse the personal attributes of Encolpius with those of the Neronian consular Petronius, a confusion with which we are all too familiar in the scholarship. The answer to the question that I posed above is therefore purely formal: the performance model does not imply any particular first performance context, and so does not validate or invalidate the hypothesis that Petronius wrote and recited the *Satyricon* for Nero.

---

165 It is not an implausible interpretation of Dio Cassius's (60.35.3) mention of the *Apocolocyntosis*, that Seneca recited it to Nero, Agrippina, and his brother Lucius Junius Gallio about the time of Claudius's funeral.
From a theoretical point of view the audience of performative literature is as undetermined as are the actors, since by design the work is "repeatable" and can be performed again at least as long as it retains the power to please audiences.\textsuperscript{166} The importance of the first historical performance of the \textit{Satyricon} has therefore been greatly exaggerated.

It is far more fruitful to pay attention to the audience whom Encolpius pretends to be talking to in the text of the \textit{Satyricon}. Who are his implied listeners? Nothing in the text indicates that they are a particular audience; rather it is relatively easy to show that his intended audience is a highly generic one. As the voice of Encolpius is scripted in the text, so is an imaginary "you", the so-called Ideal Second Person. Whenever Encolpius evokes this imaginary other (7.4, 22.5, 23.5, 31.7, 36.6, 83.2, 127.5, 136.13), he is trying to establish a community of opinion between himself and his projected audience.\textsuperscript{167} If we can make explicit this implicit presence of the act of narrating the \textit{Satyricon} we can establish the audience on the grounds of the words of the only reliable witness to this scripted setting, Encolpius himself. By collecting and studying the most significant of these references we can form a rough idea of what kind of audience the narrator is constructing as he speaks.

At one point he tells us that while hurrying after Ascytlos to the rooming-house he got lost in the Greek city and ran in circles until, exhausted and bathed in sweat, he approached a old street vendor whom he somewhat idiotically asked, \textit{mater, numquid scis ubi ego habitem}—"mother, you wouldn't happen to know where I'm lodged?" (7.1). To

\textsuperscript{166}Vogt-Spira (1990), 183-90, discusses historical performances of the work, both in antiquity and among nineteenth century German philologists.

\textsuperscript{167}This indefinite imaginary person takes a subjunctive where usually a definite person would have an indicative. The singular is conventional and should not be taken literally (it was used in public speeches, e.g., Liv. 31.7.11).
his surprise this *anus urbana* responded that she would, but then led him straight to a whore-house and said *hic debes habitare*—"here is where you should live" (7.2). Unexpectedly, he says, he found Ascytlos there in the *lupanar* in a similar state of exhaustion and adds, *putares ab eadem anicula esse deductum*—"you would have thought that the same little old woman had led him there" (7.4). As the narrative progresses Encolpius will soon tell of how he called Ascytlos to his face *muliebris patientiae scortum, cuius ne spiritus purus est*—"you whore, submissive as a woman, whose breath is not even clean" (9.6). The implicit audience has already been told everything about how Ascytlos submitted to Encolpius's sexual advances in "the garden" (9.10, *viridarium*). For Encolpius to assume, then, that his audience would have given the penniless prostitute, Ascytlos, the benefit of the doubt regarding his motives for being in the *lupanar*—unlike the *anicula* and the *pater familias*, who took Ascytlos straight to the brothel to have sex with him (8.2-4), both of whom have assumed exactly the contrary about both boys—is to assume a well-bred innocence in the audience, somewhat like that of the young man in the passage from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* quoted above. We may therefore conclude that Encolpius's ideal audience is trustful and presumably lacks insight into the machinations of rascals and swindlers such as Ascytlos.

Again, in relating his discovery that Trimalchio's slaves all sang while serving at table, Encolpius adds *pantomimi chorus, non patris familae triclinium crederes*—"you would have thought that it was a chorus of a pantomime, and not the dining-room of a father of a household" (31.7). The audience of Encolpius is so thoroughly familiar with the protocol of behavior in Roman *triclinia*, and so unused to a household like the one of Trimalchio, that they would not recognize it as such, but think instead that Encolpius was describing a public theater. The same assumption underlies Encolpius's next appeal to the imaginary other in regard to a slave who served food at the party, *processit statim scissor et*
ad symphoniam gesticulatus ita laceravit obsonium, ut putares essedarium hydraule cantante pugnare—"forth came a carver and moved so perfectly in tune with the music, that you would have though he was a charioteer fighting in the arena to the sound of the water-organ" (36.6). In the mind of Encolpius's ideal addressees there is a sense of decorum which draws a strict line between what is appropriate behavior in a respectable Roman domestic setting and what is acceptable only as public entertainment. His audience is not ideally in favour of confusing these two contexts.

Encolpius's generic audience is not just morally superior but can also be relied on to appreciate illusive naturalism in painting and is familiar with the best known masters of this old and lost Greek art. The fifth century Zeuxis of the Attic school, who was said to have painted a boy holding grapes so realistic that birds flew to peck at them, which didn't please him, however, for he said the boy should have been life-like enough to scare the birds away (Plin. Nat. 35.66); Protogenes, a contemporary of Aristotle and a friend of Apelles, who covered his painting of the Rhodian hero Ialysus with four layers of paint so as to give it a longer life and included a life-like dog whose highly convincing exhale he was said to have finally made perfectly natural when in frustration and after many tries with the brush he chanced on the right effect with his sponge while removing paint (Plin. Nat. 35.102-168).

---

168 See also 60.1, where Encolpius calls tam elegantes strophas the antics of a food carver who mimics the madness of Ajax slaughtering the cattle.

169 88.1, consulere prudentiorem coepi aetates tabularum... simulque causam desidiae praesentis excutere, cum pulcherrimae artes perissent, inter quas pictura ne minimum quidem sui vestigium reliquisset.
Apelles, the most celebrated of all Greek painters, he whom Alexander the Great, through an edict, made his sole portrait painter; famous for his invisibly fine lines, he could paint horses so life-like that they were neighed at by the real animal (Plin. Nat. 35.95). It is in expressing his adoration for a painting of Apelles, titled Monocnemon, that Encolpius adds, tanta enim subtilitate extremitates imaginem erant ad similitudinem praecisae, ut crederes etiam animorum esse picturam—"for the outlines of the images where cut with such finesse, that you would even have thought that the painting was endowed with the force of life" (83.2).

Encolpius can safely assume in his ideal audience a knowledge of these the most celebrated of old Greek masters, since in the first century B.C.E. their works could especially be seen in the temples and squares of Rome. Fulvius Nobilior brought the Muses by Zeuxis to Rome. In the first cent. C. E. there was a Helen by him in the Porticus Philippi, and a Marsyas in the Delubrum Concordiae (Plin. Nat. 35.66). At the same time Protogenes's Ialysus was found in the Templum Pacis (Plin. Nat. 35.102). Pliny thinks that a famous painting by both Protogenes and Apelles with lines almost invisible to the eye was destroyed by fire in the imperial palace on the Palatine. Augustus dedicated Apelles's Venus Anadyomene in the Delubrum Caesaris. When it deteriorated with age, nobody could repair it, and Nero had it replaced with a painting by Dorotheus. Augustus also dedicated two paintings of Alexander the Great (one of which had the king triumphantly riding in a chariot and the image of War with hands tied behind its back) in a prominent

---

170Sextus Empiricus (Ph. 1.28) recounts a very similar anecdote involving, this time, Apelles's frustration and accidental success with the representation in a painting of a horse's foam.

171I take animus here to be the force of life, or that quality which distinguishes between the apparently similar dead effigies, including corpses, and actual living people.
location on his *Forum Augusti*. Later, Claudius had Alexander's face cut out and replaced by the image of Augustus.

The ideal audience of the *Satyricon* exists in the margin of the historical context of which the *Naturalis Historia* forms a part. The encyclopedia of Pliny (23 B.C.E.-79 C.E.) is appropriately generic, like the rhetorical treatises we have used above, to provide supplementation for the cultural context projected by Encolpius. Zeuxis, Protogenes and Apelles are properly characters in the historical context, although they are known to the fictional world of the *Satyricon*. The conservative Roman taste for these ancient masters likewise forms a part of the historico-cultural context of first century Rome. In this case we are therefore directed by Encolpius himself towards the crossing of the boundary of fiction and history. The simple fact that the Greek Encolpius addresses his audience in Latin also shows that his generic audience is not a universal one, but strictly Roman, and either upper-class or at least subscribing to the value-system of the nobler families. On the whole the implied audience is supposed to be familiar with literature of all genres—especially literature in Latin, which further shows this to be a specifically Roman audience—and able to discriminate between good and bad exemplars.

One important feature of Encolpius's audience is the fact that they are supposed to be well versed in the Homeric tale of the wandering Odysseus. Unlike Trimalchio, they can be relied on to receive correctly esoteric and parodic allusions to this fundamental work of Greco-Roman literature. In the humorous *anagnorismos* scene on the ship, Lichas recognizes Encolpius by his genitals alone and addresses them, not the man, with the words *Salve Encolpi*. ¹⁷² Immediately afterwards the narrator adds this philological

¹⁷² The passage makes one wonder what gestures would have accompanied this part of the narration.
observation: *miretur nunc aliquis Ulixis nutricem post vicesimum annum cicatricem invenisse originis indicem, cum homo prudentissimus confusi omnibus corporis indiciorumque lineamentis ad unicum fugitivi argumentum tam docte pervenerit*—“let no one be surprised any more that Odysseus's nurse discovered the scar which revealed his identity after twenty years, when a clever man hit upon the one test of a runaway so brilliantly, though every feature of his face and body was blurred” (105.10). The name of Encolpius, which is best rendered into English as Mr. Incrutch,\(^\text{173}\) appears to be a significant mark of his identity, and the narrator of the *Satyricon* is therefore, in some sense, a speaking phallus. His audience, however, is no less respectable for that.

Another Homeric allusion comes in the narrative of his infatuation with the young Crotoniate beauty significantly named Circe. At the time, Encolpius says he hid under the name of Polyaenos, an epithet of Odysseus, and had fallen head over heels in love with a prosaic version of the famous enchantress, as if following in the footsteps of the epic hero. After having impersonated the person of Circe speaking, Encolpius adds in his own voice, *haec ipsa cum diceret, tanta gratia conciliabat vocem loquentis, tam dulcis sonus pertemptatum mulcebat aëra, ut putares inter auras canere Sirenum concordiam*—“even as she spoke grace made her words so attractive, the sweet noise fell so softly upon the listening air, that you would have thought that the symphony of the Sirens was ringing in the breeze” (127.5).\(^\text{174}\) We note that the paintings adored by Encolpius—which all had a similar motif: an older lover abducting or chasing after a young boy, who is the object of

\(^{173}\)Walsh (1970), 81. On the name, see Maass (1925), 447. Martial uses a similar name, Encolpos, for a boy slave, the sexual partner of his master (1.31; 5.48).

\(^{174}\)The narrator/performer can thus retrospectively be seen as setting a high standard for his own delivery of 127.1-2 and 4—and prospectively for 127.6-7.
desire—were assumed to be adorable as well to his audience. And here this same audience is assumed to be susceptible to seduction by a fabulously beautiful young woman. The audience is accordingly allowed what seems to have been considered "normal" desires in ancient gentlemen for boys as well as pretty young women.175

What can we make of these explicit references to characters from the Odyssey, and the fact that Encolpius is on more than one occasion associated directly with Odysseus, who has been called "the very first explorer-narrator in the literary record"?176 To an audience assumed to be so familiar with the text of Homer and the whole tradition derived from the Homeric poem, a travelogue and narrative of erotic intrigues told by an unreliable but entertaining vagabond would present itself as a Phaeacian tale, a type of story so called after the yarn spun by Odysseus at the court of the noble if gullible king Alcinous.177 In the following two chapters we will adopt this ubiquitous cultural model (I make no specific claims that the Satyricon is a parody of epic or indeed has any direct intertextual relationship with the Odyssey) as the working hypothesis in our reconstruction of the central fable of the Satyricon, which is the story told by Encolpius to his audience of old fashioned Romans.

175 See also 127.1-2, Mox digitis gubernantibus vocem "si non fastidis" inquit [sc. Circe] "feminam ornatam et hoc primum anno virum expertam, concilio tibi, o iuvenis, sororem. habes tu quidem et fratrem, neque enim me piguit inquirere, sed quid prohibet et sororem adoptare?

176 Romm (1992), 183.

177 The ancestry of this type of literary fabrication is obvious, e.g., to Juvenal (15.16) and Lucian (VH 1.2).
CHAPTER TWO
RECONSTRUCTION: THE TRAVELOGUE

The coherence of the plot can be assumed to be the most important quality of the *Satyricon*, if it is to be read as an extended fictional narrative. Due to the limited interest shown lately by scholars in this larger aspect of the work, little consensus exists as to what was told by Encolpius in the lost early part of the story. In my view, the work as we have it cannot well be read without some idea about the earlier context. Throughout the extant text and in the fragments are scattered references to the lost earlier parts, which need to be elucidated, and not just explained away as meaningless embellishments of language. Anyone who has faced the frustration of students who approach this work for the first time would agree. Recently an American professor teaching a course on the Ancient Novel reported the following experience to *The Petronian Society Newsletter*: "A discovery particularly distressing [...] is that my students found Petronius to be the hardest text to deal with, not because of its matter (though quite a few were rather surprised by what they found) but because of its fragmentary nature and its generic peculiarities."\(^{178}\) It is therefore clearly not mere pedantry to resuscitate the seemingly dead debate on the reconstruction of the *Satyricon's* plot. It seems, indeed, from the above that we have little to lose, in terms of readability, if we endeavor to alter the current perception of the work as isolated episodes and loose fragments to that of a more coherent fictional narrative.

---

\(^{178}\)The report is that of Relihan, *The Petronian Newsletter* 22.8.
Let us then begin. There is good evidence (I will discuss it below) in the fragments to locate the origin of the story and Encolpius's home city in Massilia. Our hero is a young man and typically needs to leave his hometown in order for his adventures to commence. Such is the invariable beginning of ancient fictions which involve the adventurous stories of young people and teenagers. Ninos must leave his home and "traverse so much land" (Fr. A.II) and prove himself as king and leader of armies before he can propose to young Semiramis. According to Thomas Häggs reconstruction of the lost Metiochus and Parthenope, Metiochus leaves the Chersonese and arrives in Samos where Parthenope is the daughter of the tyrant Polycrates. From there on the story becomes an adventure story with wandering, separation and eventual reunion. In Chariton, Chaereas and Callirhoë first meet at the public festival of Aphrodite and then get married. Soon after he kicks her out of jealousy and apparently kills her. The plot starts like a squalid story of domestic violence, but the adventure first begins when she, still alive in her tomb, is removed by tomb-robbers and taken on a pirate ship away from Syracuse. The Wonders beyond Thule also opened with Dinias wandering from his Arcadian homeland in search of information. In Iamblichus's Babylonica, Sinonis and Rhodanes must flee Babylon to escape from the men of king Garmus, who has fallen in love with Sinonis. In Xenophon, Habrocomes and Anthia, meet at the local festival of Artemis and desperately fall in love. Despite a gloomy oracle they are married and sent abroad on a ship which is later captured by Phoenician pirates. In Achilles Tatius, Clitophon is betrothed to Calligone and would have married her had she not been kidnapped, and had he not met Leucippe and eloped with her from Tyre to Beirut, where they went on board a ship that soon after was wrecked in a storm. Longus's Daphnis and Chloe, although they never leave Lesbos, are exposed by their parents from

---

Mytilene, and their adventures involve his kidnapping by pirates and her kidnapping by the
Methymnian fleet. Heliodorus's *Aethiopica* tells, in its own elaborate manner, the story of
Theagenes, a young Theban, and Charikleia, apparently a Delphian maiden, who meet at
the Pythian games in her adopted home-city and fall in love. They decide to flee by sea, but
not unpredictably fall into the hands of pirates. Even the Greek Ass Story begins with
Lucius's having just left his home town Patras for Thessaly on business for his father.
Lucian's parodic *Vera historia*, likewise, begins when the hero has set out one day from the
pillars of Hercules, i.e., he has left the *oikoumene* or the inhabited world. Alexander, of
course, must leave Pella so that his adventures in the world can earn him the epithet
"Great". Apollonius king of Tyre also leaves Tyre and Antioch, and after he has married the
daughter of the king of Cyrene, they travel by sea and she gives birth to a daughter and
"dies" and he travels in distant parts before the family is reunited and goes back home.

It is therefore not surprising that Encolpius, too, must leave his home city. As we
have seen the protagonists of ancient fiction leave their home for various reasons: for love,
power and knowledge. Encolpius falls into the first category, but his love is not for a girl,
but for a boy. Does this make any difference? Scholars sometimes assume, apparently
following the German philologist Richard Heinze (1899), that as a "homosexual" love story
the *Satyrira* is unique in ancient literature and must somehow be parodying the
"heterosexual" so-called Ideal Greek Romances. This assumption is not warranted by the
evidence. A similar plot to that of the *Satyrira*, involving two young men as the loving
couple, is found in the brief narrative of Hippothous to Habrocomes in the *Ephesiaca* (3.1-
2). It is worth quoting in full, because, as we will see, it adheres to an established narrative
paradigm, which it has in common with the *Satyrira*. As a "comparison text" this one offers
the closest available parallel with respect to the identities of the protagonists and the figures
of the plot. We should especially pay attention to the highly generic circumstances and manner of introducing the narration of this "novel within the novel":

Kai di eisxhoxaménon authwn esténaven ó 'Ippótouos kai épedákrousan: ó de 'Afrókómysi hretos authn tis k aiáta twn daktuwn. Kai de "megálá" éph "tama dithímatu kai pollhén échontu tragíadían". 'Edéito 'Afrókómyhs eitein, upísthoxuméno kai tá kath authn dithísesthai. O de ánalaçw ánathen (móno de étughun óntes) éxegíetai tá kath authn.


'Aristómachos ékaléito. Ótous èthbas eúthos tì Períntho, ós utó tivos ãpestaláménov cat' emou theou, órf tìn 'Yperánthhn svn émoi kai eúthcws allísketai, toú meirakíov thurmássa to kállass, pánta óntínoú épághese duxaménvn. 'Erásthíès dé oukéthi metríias kateíche tòn érastá, allá tò mén prôta tò meirakíw prosopektpevn: ós dé ánínutov òn auth (ò gar 'Yperánthhs dià tìn próc émè eúnoian oudeúna proösíta), péithi tòu patéra authó, pounten ánndra kai éláttona chrámátnov: ó de auth dikwsi tìn 'Yperánthhn profofás diadaskaliás: ëlege gar éina lógon tehnítas. Paralabov dé authó tò mén prôta kattákliston eixe, metà tou toú dé áíhíe ev Bučántov. Eipómyn kagà, pántovn kattarofhíshas tòn émuutov, kai òsa éduamén svnýmhn tò meirakíw: éduamén dé ólíga, kai moi
And it was as they were carousing that Hippothous let out a moan and began to weep. Habrocomes asked him why he was weeping. "It's a long story," he
replied, "and a very tragic one." Habrocomes asked him to tell it and promised to tell his own as well. As they were alone, Hippothous told his story from the beginning.

"I belong," he said, "to one of the leading families of Perinthus, a city close to Thrace. And as you are aware, Perinthus is an important city and its citizens are well-to-do. There while I was a young man I fell in love with a beautiful youth, also from Perinthus, called Hyperanthes. I first fell in love with him when I saw his wrestling exploits in the gymnasium and I could not contain myself; during a local festival with an all-night vigil I approached Hyperanthes and begged him to take pity on me. He listened to me, took pity on me, and promised me everything. And our first steps in lovemaking were kisses and caresses, while I shed floods of tears. And at last we were able to take our opportunity to be alone with each other; we were both the same age, and no one was suspicious. For a long time we were together passionately in love, until some evil spirit envied us. One of the leading men in Byzantium (the neighboring city) arrived in Perinthus: this was Aristomachus, a man proud of his wealth and prosperity. The moment he set foot in the town, as if sent against me by some god, he set eyes on Hyperanthes with me and was immediately captivated, amazed at the boy's beauty, which was capable of attracting anyone. When he had fallen in love, he could no longer restrain himself but first made overtures to the young man; when that brought no result (for Hyperanthes would let no one near him because of his relationship with me), he won over the boy's father, a villainous man inferior to money. And he made over Hyperanthes to Aristomachus on the pretext of private tuition, for he claimed to be a teacher of rhetoric. When he first took the boy over, he kept him under lock and key, then took him off to Byzantium. I followed, ignoring all my own affairs, and kept him company as often as I could; but that was seldom, there were few kisses, and he was difficult to talk to: too many were watching me. At length I could hold out no longer. Nerving myself, I went back to Perinthus, sold everything I had, got my money together, and went to Byzantium; I took a sword (Hyperanthes had agreed to this as well), made my way into Aristomachus's house during the night, and found him lying in bed with the boy. I was enraged and struck him a fatal blow. All was quiet, and everyone asleep: I left secretly with Hyperanthes without further ado; traveling
all through the night to Perinthus, I at once embarked on a ship for Asia, unknown to anyone. And for a while the voyage went well. But a heavy storm struck us off Lesbos and capsized the ship. I swam alongside Hyperanthes, gave him support, and made it easier for him to swim. But night came on, and the boy could not hold on any longer, gave up his efforts to swim, and died. I was only able to rescue his body, bring it to land, and bury it. I wept and wailed profusely and removed the relics. I could only provide a single stone to serve as a memorial on the grave, and inscribed it in memory of the unfortunate youth with a makeshift epigram.

Hippothous fashioned this tomb for far-famed Hyperanthes, a tomb unworthy of the death of a sacred citizen, the famous flower an evil spirit once snatched from the land into the deep on the ocean he snatched him as a great storm wind blew. After this I decided not to return to Perinthus but made my way through Asia to Phrygia Magna and Pamphylia. And there, since I had no means of supporting myself and was distressed at the tragedy, I took to brigandage. At first I was only one of the rank and file but in the end I got together a band of my own in Cilicia; it was famed far and wide, until it was captured not long before I saw you. This, then, is the misfortune I am telling you about. But you, Habrocomes, my dearest man, tell me your own story, for I am sure that there was some great necessity that forced you to become a wanderer."

A stranger's narrative to a stranger, this story is only told after a specific request and a promise to reciprocate with another story. As Glenn Most has persuasively shown, a stranger's personal recollection of his woes in the Greek narrative tradition is typically not offered voluntarily, but is, as it were, "wrung from his lips by a moment of overwhelming compulsion." Such a moment is implicit for the narrative setting of the Satyricon as well.

180 The translation is based on that of Anderson, in Reardon (1989), 147-8.

181 Most (1989), 127.
and explains the often painful, or at least embarrassing feelings experienced by Encolpius at the recital of the story to his audience of good Romans. The typical symptoms of the very storied life of Hippothous are his Odyssean tears and wailing which directly prompt the request for his telling his life's tale.\textsuperscript{182} The circumstances of Odysseus's telling his tale of woes are so often invoked by later narratives that they cannot count as specific reference, but should rather be taken as a generic marker.\textsuperscript{183} The same narrative paradigm is used, in Sat. 61.1-6, when Trimalchio asks Niceros, who has remained silent during the party, to tell a story, and he agrees after some apologies, while the narrator describes his beginning with phrases reminiscent of Aeneas's narrative at the Carthaginian court, which is of course directly modeled on the Odyssean paradigm.\textsuperscript{184}

The tone and mood of the story of Hippothous show that it was quite possible to tell a romantic adventure story of two boys including envious divinities; cruel competitors who pose as educators; fathers who are described as "inferior to money" (cf. Sat. 84.2, \textit{infra pecuniam}); jealousy, murder, travel, shipwreck, piracy and brigandage, without in anyway undermining the seriousness and sense of tragedy that we are familiar with in the so-called

\textsuperscript{182} Alcinous, having observed the guest's misery, says: εἰπὲ δὲ ὁ τι κλαίεις καὶ ὁδύρεαι ἐνδοθι θυμῷ (\textit{Od.} 8.577), and in response to the request Odysseus tells his story.

\textsuperscript{183} Similar situations with explicit or implicit references to the Homeric paradigm occur, e.g., in Pl. \textit{R.} 614b; Verg. \textit{Aen.} 2.3; Chariton 4.3; X.Eph. 5.1; Juv. 15.16; [Lucianus] \textit{Onos} 1; Apul. \textit{Met.} 1.1-2; Lucianus \textit{VH} 1.3, \textit{Merc.Cond.} 1; Ach. Tat. 1.2, 2.34, 7.3-4; Longus 2.3; Hld. 1.8 and 2.21. For references to "first-person narratives" told to strangers in tragedy and comedy, see Most (1989), 120-121. For a discussion of the Odyssean "Ich-Erzählung" with respect to narrative technique in the ancient novel, see Suerbaum (1968).

\textsuperscript{184} 61.5, \textit{haec ubi dicta dedit, talem fabulam exorsus est}, and Verg. \textit{Aen.} 2.790, \textit{haec ubi dicta dedit, lacrimantem et multa volentem / dicere...
Ideal Greek Romances. These stories about young men and their often violent and lawless love affairs are at least as old as Thucydides.\textsuperscript{185} A frequent item in the plot is the killing of an older and more powerful competitor; they also often involve embarking on a career of brigandage and piracy, which includes living in bands of desperate young men who are outlaws from normal society. This may have some relation to the often initiatory nature of ancient pederasty, and its close relation with military camaraderie.\textsuperscript{186}

Interestingly, Hippothous is a role-player, just as Encolpius; one day he is a pirate, the other he and his company "pose as tourists" (X.Eph. 4.1). Role-playing in the Satyricon is a function of outlawry and the life-style of vagabonds for the marginal condition of vagabonds and drifters does not allow them to speak frankly or claim their right among strangers directly.\textsuperscript{187} The many lies and deceptions of Odysseus in the last twelve books of the Odyssey are the ultimate literary model for this tradition,\textsuperscript{188} as is signalled in the

\textsuperscript{185}See Thucydides (6.54), who relates a story from Athenian history; Parthenios (Parth. 7) who preserves a late fourth, early third century B.C.E. account by Phanias of Eresos; see also Parth. 24; Ach. Tat. 1.7-14, 2.34; and two of five short narratives in Plutarch's Love stories (Moralia 772d-774d).

\textsuperscript{186}See Sergent (1986), 40-54. See also the classic formulation of "the black hunter" / ephebe complex in Vidal-Naquet (1986).

\textsuperscript{187}Consider Ascytios's words: "quis", aiebat, "hoc loco nos novit aut quis habebit dicentibus fideum?" (Sat. 14.1).

\textsuperscript{188}See Trahman (1952), 34-42; Walcott (1977). For Athena, Odysseus assumes the role of a Cretan exile who has a family at home (Od. 13.256-286); for Eumaeus, he is a greatful beggar who originates again from Crete and is the son of a rich man and a concubine (Od. 14.199-359); for Antinous, his background is more condensed but similar, but the account of how he got to Ithaca has changed completely (Od. 17.415-444); for
Satyricon by Encolpius's taking up as pseudonym an epithet of the hero, Polyaeonos (Πολύαινος),\(^{189}\) "much praised", during the deceiving mimus (117.4) invented by Eumolpus to trick the legacy hunters of Croton. The Homeric scholia includes the following comment on Athena's strange praise of Odysseus's cunning lies to her:

"Travelers abroad are forced to lie, since, being among foreigners, they are exposed to harm" (Schol. Od. 13.294).\(^{190}\) Odysseus is the archetypal liar in later Greco-Roman literature (Arist. Po. 1460a; Hor. Ars 151; Juv. 15.16; Lucian VH 1.2f.; Eust. Comm. ad Od. 14.199) and, in fact, he is universally admired, even in the Homeric poems themselves for his rhetorical skill (Il. 3.204-224) and his guile and deceitful tales (Od. 13.287-310). His cunning verbal manipulations are generally successful, regardless of whether there is a grain of truth in them.

Just as Encolpius, Hippothous does not chase only after boys, he also becomes the object of women's desires (5.9). We must be careful not to generalize about ancient sexual personae on the basis of our own modern assumptions, for there are clearly major differences between our categories and the ancient ones, as has been shown in excellent

---

Penelope, he is Aithon brother of Idomeneus, friend of Odysseus (Od. 19.165-360); and finally to Laertius, he is Eperitus from Alybas (Od. 24.303-314).

\(^{189}\)Od. 12.184. The epithet is used by the Sirens, when they address Odysseus, in the famous episode when they try to lure him to wreck his ship (Od. 12.39-54; 158-200).

\(^{190}\)Cf. Eumaeus's words: κομιδής κεχρημένοι ἄνδρες ἀλήται / ψεύδοντ', οὐδ' ἐθέλουσιν ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι. (Od. 14.124-5).
recent studies. The apparent normality of the relationship of the boys should neither come as a surprise, for we have seen that the respectable audience of the Satyricon considers both boys and beautiful young women desirable as sexual partners and does not seem to rank one higher than the other. Neither does it make the least difference whether we are dealing with pederasty in a "Greek" or "Roman" literary work. This dichotomy in the scholarly literature is traditionally so steeped in nineteenth century ideologies that it is best left completely out of the picture. Encolpius's "homosexuality", therefore, is not what makes the Satyricon a parody—if that is what it is—, since the pederastic paradigm was open to many uses and variations. Nor is the tragic nature of the story of Hippothous, the death of the loved one, in any way determined by the gender of the couple. Facile critical dichotomies will merely pose obstacles to our understanding.

The supposed "homosexuality" of the protagonist was indeed not the main point of Richard Heinze's thesis, that the Satyricon was a parody of the "Greek Ideal Romance." Heinze's condemnation of Petronius for being at his most "shameless" when he expected his readers to accept Encolpius and Giton as a romantic couple (Unter den vielen

---

191 For an excellent treatment of the complicated question of modern homosexuality and ancient pederasty, and the various structural paradigms of ancient sexual relationships, see Konstan (1994).

192 Encolpius is a Greek, and as I will argue below, the Satyricon is most likely a Roman adaptation of a Greek model, which was just as prosimetic and comic as the Latin work. I will discuss in general the modern "Roman" / "Greek" dichotomy in Chapter Six.

193 For no less tragic love stories of male + female couples, see e.g. the story of Charite, Tlepolemus and Thrasyllus (Apul. Met. 8.1-14); see also Parthenios (4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36); Plutarch, Moralia 771f-772c; 774e-775b.

194 Heinze (1899).
Encolpius and Giton uns gefallen zu lassen) may have been no more than an obligatory nod to proper morals, although in recent scholarship the statement is at times assumed to have been the basis of his parody-thesis. The main achievement of Heinze's thesis, in my view, is not to have shown that the Satyricon was a parody of the Greek erotic fictions, but in fact to have shown that the work is just that, an erotic fictional narrative with a structure and plot organization comparable to those of the fully extant works.

Heinze pointed out, by means of a close comparative reading of the Satyricon and the Greek fictions, that there was a clear schematic analogy between the fortune and behavior of the couple in the fragmentary Latin text and the fully extant Greek erotic fictions. Encolpius and Giton get their fair share of wandering from place to place, and they even experience the generic storm at sea and shipwreck. Typically, their own beauty or desirability is their worst enemy, since this attracts many rivals who threaten the integrity of their bond. Such external threats, then, naturally lead to outbursts of jealousy, as well as instances of real betrayal, comparable to Cleitophon's and Daphnis's infidelities, or in some degree to Callirhoë's marriage to Dionysius. Heinze convincingly supported his sentimental reading of the work by reference to the frequent qualification in the text itself of the boys' relationship as vetustissima consuetudo (80.6), and conjectured that, unlike Ascyltos and Eumolpus, Giton must have been introduced at the beginning of the work and followed

195 See Bernd Effe (1987) for a criticism of the assumption that "homosexuality" in the Satyricon is a parody of the "heterosexuality" of the Greek erotic fictions. Clearly, no such parodic transformation was needed in the Greco-Roman world to give rise to a fictional love story of two boys.
Encolpius until the end. He also notes that Encolpius portrays himself as being very sentimental, and frequently bursting into tears over the adversity of fortune (24.1, 81.1, 91.4, 99.2, 113.9, 115.12, 134.5), much like the couples of the Greek works, and both he and Giton often claim to live only for their mutual love, and routinely turn suicidal at the prospect of losing each other (80.7, 94.8, 114.9-13, 127.4). Despite the supposedly outrageous "homosexuality" in the story, Heinze nevertheless recognized that serious erotic stories in Greek prose literature, featuring two males as the *Liebespaar*, certainly predate the *Satyricon*, and he fully recognizes that examples of this type are found in the Greek erotic novels themselves, such as the Hippothous story above. Heinze claimed, of course, that there were important generic differences between the Big Five extant erotic fictions and the *Satyricon*, but let us leave that problem until later, when we treat the comic narrative stance of Encolpius and his inferior moral status with respect to his audience (see Chapter Five), and examine here the evidence for the beginning of Encolpius's story.

Encolpius is certainly of Greek origin, although his audience is Roman and the extant text deals with episodes set in Italy, though mostly in Greek communities. The vast majority of characters in the extant story are Greek, and we can therefore with some justice say that the *Satyricon* is a Greek story, notwithstanding the language and the audience. The evidence for the ancient and long independent Greek city of Massilia, as Encolpius's birthplace, comes from two fourth and fifth century fragments, which read side by side

---

196 He also cites 10.7, *iam dudum enim amoliri cupiebam custodem molestum, ut veterem cum Gitone meo rationem reducerem*; and indications that Ascytlos is ignorant of, or pretends not to know of Encolpius's relationship with Giton (9.4-10, 11.3f.).

197 At least three quarters of the proper names in the extant *Satyricon* are purely Greek; cf. *Index personarum* in Ernout (1962), 207-10.
with a few passages of the *Satyrica* yield this information easily. Servius's commentary (*Aen. 3.57*) provides the following description (*Fr. I*) culled from the full-text *Satyrica*:

> auri sacra fames] sacra id est execrabilis. tractus est autem sermo ex more Gallorum. nam Massilienses quotiens pestilentia laborabunt, unus se ex pauperibus offerebat alendus anno integro publicis et purioribus cibus. hic postea ornatus verbenis et vestibus sacris circumducebatur per totam civitatem cum excrecationibus, ut in ipsum reciderent mala totius civitatis, et sic proiciebatur. hoc autem in Petronio lectum est.

Servius is, rather lamely, attempting to explain the word *sacra* in Virgil by assuming that since he was a Mantuan, and therefore from one part of Gallia, he might have used the word in a specifically Gallic sense. Hence the association with the Petronian passage, which Servius takes to be a reliable evidence for religious customs in Massilia (also situated in Gallia) in accordance with the grammarian's practice of indiscriminately culling historical and biographical information from literary works.

It is of no importance to us whether the information thus acquired is reliable, and whether, even if reliable, it represent Gallic customs.\(^\text{198}\) What matters is that Servius read in Petronius that one of the poor citizens of Massilia, *unus ex pauperibus* [*sc. civibus*], had volunteered to act the role of the ϕαρμακος ("scapegoat") in return for being fed for a whole year at public expense, and was then expelled from the city when that time was up.

---

\(^{198}\) Another commentary, that of Lactantius Placidus on Statius's *Thebais* (110.793-4) has sometimes been adduced as further evidence for the historical truth of this alleged Gallic custom, but as Paratore (1933), 1:152, has shown, it is entirely derived from Servius's clause, using very similar language, and therefore offers no independent evidence. Lactantius Placidus neither mentions Massilia nor Petronius.
The human scapegoat is sacrificed only in a social sense. His treatment is reminiscent of that of a beast marked for sacrifice. The beating and cursing of the ϕαρμακός to ward off sin, plague or famine was no doubt of importance in actual ancient ritual (e.g., the beating of boys in the ritual of Artemis Ortheia at Sparta), but the behavior of the human scapegoat was very likely conventionalized and may have resembled that of a writhing dancer or an actor in comedy, such as the stupidus of mime.

A relevant ancient account of such a ritual survives in the poems of Hipponax (Frs. 5-11 [West]). In threatening his enemies with destruction Hipponax provides a description of how the ϕαρμακός should be dealt with; a deformed and repulsive male is selected and feasted on figs, barley broth, and cheese, then whipped with fig branches and sea onions, and struck seven times on his membrum virile. Walter Burkert explains how there is a moral condemnation implicit in the rejection of this supposedly depraved individual:

It is clearly essential that the creature to be driven out be first brought into intimate contact with the community, the city; this is the sense of the gifts of food which are constantly mentioned. Figs are doubly contrasted to normal culture, to the fruits of the field and to the flesh of the victim; they point to sweetness, luxury, licentiousness, a breath of a golden age from which reality must be rudely distinguished [...] ; the outcast is then called the one wiped off

---

199 Walsh (1970), 73 n.3, seems to mistake the meaning of proieciebatur and translates "pushed of a cliff." The verb could possibly carry the sense "to offer as a sacrifice", but this is doubtful (probably always a corruption of porricio; see OLD under 'proicio' 3b and 7b.), whereas the sense "to drive out (a person)" or "to banish" (e.g., proicere in exile) is well attested (Ovid, Silius Italicus, Tacitus, Apuleius and Seneca).


201 For Greek scapegoat rituals generally, see Burkert (1985), 82-84. The same source is also to be credited for the information about the pharmakos in Hipponax.
all around, *peripsema*. There is not active killing, but simply a matter of offscourings which must be thrown across the boundaries or over the cliffs, never to return.

It is easy to see how this episode would fit into the *Satyrina*. Encolpius, Asyltos or Eumolpus are just the types to recklessly exploit such a situation without regard for the consequences.\(^{202}\) Constantly penniless and needy, they gladly take every opportunity that comes along to get food, money and sex.\(^{203}\) In the extant *Satyrina*, religious cults and rituals are generally represented as pretexts for sexual and financial exploitation, and we may accordingly imagine the tone and mood of the episode as anything but solemn. But most importantly, the possibility that the branches mentioned in the account of Servius have something to do with the beating of the scapegoat, and, in any case, the general prominence of Encolpius's phallus in the extant story, make him exceptionally well suited to play the φαρμακός in such a ritual. The feeding and fattening of Encolpius is also an important part of the Croton episode (125.2, *quotidie magis magisque superfluentibus bonis saginatum corpus impleveram*), where there is likewise a sense of imminent danger which spoils the pleasure of temporary well-being (125.2-4). Moreover, the individual's humiliating procession through the streets of Massilia has a partial but striking resemblance to the *Risus*-festival in Apuleius (*Met*. 3.1-12), where Lucius is made the butt of the entire

---

\(^{202}\) 99.1, *ego sic semper et ubique vixi, ut ultimam quamque lucem tamquam non redituram consumerem.*

\(^{203}\) 125.4, *nempe rursus fugiendum erit et tandem expugnata paupertas nova mendicitate revocanda.*
As we have seen above, a ritual or a religious festival are used in three (Chariton, Xenophon, Heliodorus) of the five fully extant erotic fictions to get the plot going. In the extant text of the Satyrca, the incident of the shaving of the head of Encolpius (and Giton), which is then interpreted as sinister for the entire ship's company (103.5) might be cited as a parallel. In the Greek cultural context, so preoccupied with the preservation of civic cohesion, to be thus cursed or mocked by a whole city, especially one's own, is nothing short of a nightmare and certainly the ultimate in humiliation. Servius says he read about this humiliated Massaliote in Petronius; from the extant part of the Satyrca we know that, of all the characters in the story, Encolpius himself is the most susceptible to humiliation.

This, I think, is as far as we would get with this fragment (Fr. I) were it not for another fragment (Fr. IV) from a poetic eulogy of Sidonius Apollinaris (Carm. 28.145-7):

145 quid vos eloquii canam Latini,
Arpinas, Patavine, Mantuane,
[...] 
155 et te Massiliensium per hortos
sacri stipitis, Arbiter, colonum
Hellespontiaco parem Priapo?

The late fifth century Christian bishop here apostrophizes three Roman literary worthies (Cicero, Livy and Virgil) by noting only their birthplaces. He goes on to address others and

204 It may be added here in a footnote that Fellini incorporated the Risus-festival into his cinematographic version of the Satyrca creating some quite memorable scenes.
amongst them "Arbiter", who is presented as being in Massilia, as if Petronius himself were that character of the *Satyricon* whom Servius refers to in the first fragment.205

Birt rightly rejected Cichorius's interpretation of *sacer stipes* as a hollow tree trunk wherein the statue of Priapus was placed,206 but he also rejected Bücheler's interpretation, unnecessarily in my view, that the word referred to the wooden image of Priapus. For Birt *stipes* was the removable phallic stake (*Knüttel*), which was stuck into the *simulacrum* of Priapus and withdrawn by the *vilicus* to penetrate the behind (!) of thieves who had stolen from the garden. A similar usage of the word *stipes*, although not mentioned by Birt, is attested in Seneca (*Dial. 6.20.3, alii per obscena stipitem egerunt*), where it is the executioner's stake for impaling criminals. It is relevant that Priapus is not elsewhere called *stipes*. Although Birt's interpretation seems possible, of the two stakes, Priapus and his phallus, I am inclined to prefer the god, especially because of the word *sacer*, which properly applies to the god (although metonymy cannot be ruled out completely). We therefore accept Bücheler's explanation that "*sacer stipes est ligneus Priapus"*. As is pointed out by Birt, the word *colonus* was in late Latin associated more broadly with *cultus* and so in the poem of Sidonius it should mean a worshipper or practitioner of a religion or virtue, in this case the *sacri stipitis* which is the genitive of object.207 It is therefore not Petronius who "cultivates", as a gardener, the gardens in Massilia where statues of Priapus are found,

---

205 Bücheler (1862), *ad Fr. IV*, who says the idea had been adumbrated by Lilius Gyraldus, was the first to unravel the biographical fallacy in Sidonius's reading (*ratus uidelicet eundem esse Petronium atque Encolpiun*).

206 Birt (1925), 95-6; Cichorius (1922), 439.

207 This usage of *colonus* is attested in fourth and early fifth century Christian writers, i.e., in the writings of the immediate predecessors of Sidonius: Hier. *In Is. 54.15*; Ruf. *Clem. 6.2*; Paul. Nol. *Carm. 26.333*, Ps.-Cypr. *Carm. 2.31*. 
but Petronius who cultivates Priapus whose wooden effigies are found throughout gardens in Massilia.\textsuperscript{208} There is an important difference, because the phrase \textit{Massiliensium per hortos} accordingly does not indicate any movement or action performed by Petronius.

The reductive method of reading fictive personal recollections became the dominant approach of the ancient grammarians in their commentaries. Maurus Servius above and Aelius Donatus were just such erudite figures. They belong to the fourth century and are therefore earlier than Sidonius.\textsuperscript{209} (In this tradition the \textit{Eclogues} of Virgil, for example, were read as the masked autobiography of the poet containing important historical testimony.) Similarly, Augustine shows some doubt as to whether he should believe the truth of Apuleius's statement "about himself" (\textit{inscribit sibi ipsi accidisse}) in the \textit{Metamorphoses}, that he had been changed into an ass, but he does not hesitate to apply Lucius's statement to Apuleius himself.\textsuperscript{210} This merely confirms what the Christian Saint himself confesses to in his work; as a young man he had gone through the grinding mill of pagan education in the classics.\textsuperscript{211}

Now, before we go any further in interpreting this fragment, let us identify its intertextual relationship with the \textit{Satyricon}. The three relevant lines:

\begin{quote}
\textit{arbiter ad libidinis concitamentum myrrhinum se polum bibisse refert.}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{208} A very different interpretation is advanced by Anderson (1934), 22.

\textsuperscript{209} Fulgentius (\textit{Fr. VIII}) offers more of the same when he states that \textit{Petronius Arbiter ad libidinis concitamentum myrrhinum se polum bibisse refert.}

\textsuperscript{210} August. \textit{C.D. 18.18, nec tamen in eis mentem fieri bestialem, sed rationalem humanamque servari, sicut Apuleius in libris quos Asini Aurei titulo inscriptit sibi ipsi accidisse, ut accepto veneno humano animo permanente asinus fieret, aut indicavit aut finxit.}

\textsuperscript{211} Some MSS of Apuleius's works give "Lucius" as his \textit{praenomen}. 
et te Massiliensium per hortos
sacri stipitis, Arbiter, columna
Hellespontiaco parem Priapo?

are clearly modeled on Satyr. 139.2:

me quoque per terras, per cani Nereos aequor
Hellespontiaci sequitur gravis ira Priapi.

To my knowledge, this observation has never been made before, although the similarities
(underlined) are too strong to be coincidental and Encolpius's last line is, in turn, a
reworking of Virgil (G. 4.111, Hellespontiaci servet tutela Priapi).212 We may therefore be
certain—if certainty is ever attainable in such arguments—that Sidonius was practicing
what must have seemed to him a clever biographical reading, reducing the fiction of the
story by twisting the words of Encolpius and applying them to Petronius.

My interpretation raises a question about the condition of the Satyr. text in the
late fifth century. Why did Sidonius happen to choose for his parody a poem that is still
extant? Considering the probable vastness of the original work, the likelihood that this
should happen accidentally does not seem great. It certainly would have been more to the
point to parody the beginning, where the causes of Encolpius's wanderings were laid out.
Or was Sidonius's Satyr. already a reduced version resembling our own?213 The fact that

212 A line which had been alluded to before by Ovid, Fast. 1.440, Hellespontiaco
victim grata deo. The victim in Ovid's amusing story was the asellus, another phallic
creature. The lines in the Satyr., moreover, have Odyssean resonances (Od. 1.1-4); cf.
Cat. 101 and Verg. Aen. 6.692-93, and the discussion of them by Conte (1986), 32-29.

213 See Richardson (1975), 292ff., for an attempt to understand when and why most
of the text was lost.
Sidonius somehow knew that the narrator was from Massilia might perhaps indicate that he possessed more of the text than we do. However the name and hometown of an ancient author do not necessarily come from the author's work. Sidonius himself was from Lugdunum (Lyons) in Gallia, a city closely associated with Massilia through traffic on the Rhone, and this might explain his interest in it. We can only know for certain at this point that he had poem 139.2 at hand, and it might very well be the seemingly grand statement from the hero, which this particular poem contains, which drew his attention.

Two things about the meta-text of Sidonius in relation to the text of this particular poem in the Satyrca make unavoidable the recognition of the equivocation of author and ego-narrator: what the bishop says about Petronius clearly recalls in form and content what Encolpius says about himself, but more obviously the detail about Petronius's supposed phallic looks betrays without doubt the identity of the narrator of the Satyrca. Just like Lichas, we too may recognize Encolpius by his mentula (105.9). The result is a jocular picture of a Petronius, who stays in his home town Massilia worshipping the sacred stake of Priapus found all over or throughout, per, the gardens of that city, being himself a phallic figure on par with the god.

The humour is of the type "send-it-back-to-where-it-came-from". In Sidonius's reading of the poem of Encolpius it is now Arbiter who is the speaker of the lines, and Arbiter is a Massaliote, and so the bishop deflates Encolpius's fabulous hyperbole, per terras, per cani Nereos aequor, by redefining the speaker's relationship with the grotesque

\[\text{\footnotesize Note, however, my reading of a letter by Sidonius, in Chapter Six.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize See the explanation of Bücheler (1862), ad Fr.. IV: par Priapo Arbiter uocatur quia Encolpius nilo deterius mutoniatus quam Mutunus tot tantasque res mentula duce gesserat, quibus etiam hodie quae extant chartulae refertae sunt.}\]
pagan deity, and setting it in the proper biographical ambiance, *Massiliensium per hortos.* The implication is that the only dealings Petronius had with Priapus were in the gardens of his home town. As for epic wanderings and persecution at the hand of a deity, in this he was merely spinning a yarn. That Sidonius is treating his catalogue of eloquent Roman writers in a playful manner is clear from what he has just said about Tacitus (*Carm. 28.153, et qui pro ingenio fluente nulli, Corneli Tacite, es tacendus ori*). The catalogue's function in the poem, a eulogy to Consentius, also makes this appropriate, for the literary worthies are listed in a *praeteritio* simply in order to be put down in comparison with the eulogized addressee.

However, we must avoid giving in to an interpretive delirium at this point, because Sidonius says nothing about any "crime" or "wrath of Priapus". These ideas are found only in Encolpius's poem (139.2), where they are best read in context with the hero's own conjecture that he was poisoned\(^1\) and unmanned by a *manus irata* (140.12)\(^2\) as a punishment for an offense he committed against Priapus, out of poverty and not with all of his body.\(^3\) In earlier scholarship it was possible to expand the "wrath of Priapus" into an overarching epic structure by reading Sidonius's poem in conjunction with *Sat. 139.2*, as if the two poems were one continuous context.\(^4\) Such contextual fusion can have disastrous

\[\text{\footnotesize 216 128.2, veneificio tactus sum; 138.7, partes veneificio, credo, sopitae.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 217 139.2, gravis ira Priapi.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 218 133.3, inops et rebus egenis attribus / facinus non toto corpore feci.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 219 This is originally an idea of Elimar Klebs, though he attributes it to Bücheler. Bücheler's (1862) comment on the text runs as follows: re vera denotasse mihi illis uerbis Sidonius uidetur ea quae in satiris Petronius narrauerat, ratus uidelicet eundem esse Petronium atque Encolpium qui primas harum fabularum partes agebat. sacer stipes est}\]
consequences for interpretation. Sidonius merely says that Encolpius (alias Arbiter) is from Massilia, and that he is the "equal" of the garden deity Priapus. In other words, the poem of Sidonius does not provide independent evidence that the gravis ira Priapi was a unifying motif in the Satyricon from the beginning of the plot in Massilia, contrary to what has often been asserted.220

This conjecture is not called for and in fact it creates grave obstacles when we try to reconstruct the opening of the plot, because in consequence a certain over-determination of causes for Encolpius's leaving his home city occurs: he is exiled as a scapegoat, and forced to leave the city because of some facinus he supposedly committed there against Priapus. The interpretation also makes too much of the anger of Priapus, which is likely to be no more than the subjective understanding of Encolpius, who in the episode where it occurs is desperately trying explain and remedy his impotence. The old thesis of the wrath of Priapus was indeed never fully accepted, since it tended not to solve but to complicate the problem, and since the arguments it relied on were tenuous in the first place. Unfortunately, it

The supposed Priapic happenings in Massilia were further elaborated by Cichorius (1922), 438-442, in an untenable interpretation of the fragment.

220This view seems to be making a come-back in the scholarship; see Schmeling (1994/1995), 213, who adds the detail that Encolpius was struck impotent by Priapus already in Massilia. But if he has been impotent all along, how can we explain his surprise at finding himself unable to get an erection in Croton?
eventually provoked hyper-skeptical responses which, so to speak, throw the baby out with the bath water. For even if there is no evidence for a Priapic episode in Massilia, it does not follow that a comic conception of the "wrath of Priapus" did not play an important role in the Croton episode, which may have connected it with earlier episodes.

The earliest and only incident which fits the description of a crime against Priapus belongs to Encolpius's dealings with Quartilla's cult of Priapus. In that episode, moreover, we have an explicit facinus against the god (20. 1, facinus, and 133.3 v.9, facinus), committed in a temple, out of poverty, and very likely with the help of Encolpius's over-sized mentula, which made him able to impersonate Priapus himself, and so would fit his own description of the "crime" (133.3 vv.7-10). In fact, the trick played on the cult of Quartilla before the Crypta conforms nicely with Encolpius's retrospective speculations, which refer to a previously narrated episode, although the presumed causal link between that past crime and his present impotent condition is based on suspicious evidence to say the least. The epic description of his wandering, per terras, per cani

---

221 See especially Baldwin (1973), 294-96; Slater (1990), 40. On the century-old debate, see Klebs (1889), 623-35; Cichorius (1922), 438-42; Perry (1925), 31f.; Birt (1925), 95-6; Anderson (1934), 20; Bagnani (1956), 23-7; Pack (1960), 31-2; Courtney (1962), 95-6; Sullivan (1968), 40 et passim; Mulroy (1970), 254-6; Walsh (1970), 73, 77; Rankin (1971), 52-67; and McDermott (1983), 82-85.

222 The killing of the sacred goose, 136.4-137.12, occurs after Encolpius finds himself impotent and also after his "ascertains" that the cause of it lies in the crime he committed against Priapus. In any case he quickly expiates the crime with a payment of two gold pieces.

223 The "evidence" is Giton's statement (133.2) that Ascylos, too, did not perform sexually on that night after the dinner at Trimalchio's, which was his first opportunity to have sex after the effects of the aphrodisiac they drank at Quartilla's had worn off. But
Nereos aequor (139.2 v.14), which is spoken in Croton, is accurate enough if taken to allude to the protagonist's travels since the incidents in the urbs Graeca. He has voyaged by sea from the harbour of the city to the gulf of Tarentum, and thence moved on foot to Croton (the plural in terras need only be parodic hyperbole to enhance the vaunted similarities with Odysseus and other oldies). The point of Encolpius's poem is not that he has been fleeing Priapus over sea and land. Not even Odysseus, his model, was fleeing Poseidon (the god was merely an obstacle to the completion of the hero's nostos). Rather, Encolpius seems surprised that the punishment for a crime he committed in the Greek city should hit him so far away in Croton. This he comically takes as proof of the might of the deity he thinks he is up against, and on the basis of that fantastic idea he fancies himself a hero, much needing to assert himself psychologically in a moment of physical weakness.

But what if Priapus nevertheless featured in the opening episode in Massilia? What could his function have been? As Heinze showed almost a century ago, in response to Klebs's thesis about the "wrath of Priapus", the role of Priapus in the Satyrca does not follow the conventions of epic, where gods come down to earth and meddle directly in human affairs, but resembles the more removed and mystical role of the gods in the fully extant ancient erotic fictions.\textsuperscript{224} The Satyrca's divine apparatus further resembles that of the other stories in the frequent references made by the protagonists to the mostly hostile force

\textsuperscript{224} Heinze (1899), 501-2.
of Fortuna (Sat. 13.1, 13.4, 82.6, 100.3, 101.1, 114.8, 125.2) or Τύχη. 225 These frequent references to the vicissitudes of fortune may in fact be a generic marker of this kind of narrative, as Karl Bürger had argued even before Heinze, 226 relying on Cicero’s inclusion of them as a defining characteristic. 227

In ancient erotic fictions the gods do not physically interfere in the action, but they are there in the background often for reasons of divine envy, and may provide subjective and theological explanations for the misfortune of the protagonists. In Hippothous’s story above, the boys love each other greatly until an evil spirit gets envious and grudges them their happiness (καὶ χρóνον συνήμεν πολλῷ, στέργοντες ἄλληλους διαφερόντας, ἕως δαίμων τις ἡμῖν ἐνεμέσησε). In Chariton, beautiful Charicleia is a devout worshipper of Aphrodite, and so it is Chaereas’s untimely jealousy which provokes the goddess’s anger (8.1, ὑπεθείσα χαλέπως διὰ τὴν ἄκαριον ζηλοτυπίαν). In Xenophon, Habrocomes arrogantly claims that he is more handsome and powerful than Eros, which of course makes the god furious (μηνίξ πρὸς ταῦτα ὀ Ἐρως). The most direct involvement of these gods is when they appear in some one’s dream and provide information that will influence the course of events, as in Achilles Tatius, when Artemis appears to Leucippe in a dream and assures her that she will preserve her virginity (4.1), or in Longus, when the Nymphs

225 Heinze (1899), 502, also mentions the possible use of a foreshadowing oracle in the original Satyrca (Fr. XXXVII).

226 Bürger (1892), 349.

227 Inv. 1.19, Hoc in genere narrationis multa debet inesse festivitas confecta ex rerum varietate, animorum dissimilitudine, gravitate, levitate, spe, metu, suspicione, desiderio, dissimulatione, errore, misericordia, fortuna commutacione, insperato in commodo, subita laetitia, iucundo exitu rerum.
appear to Daphnis and tell him where he will find a purse with three thousand drachmas (3.27), or in the *Satyricon*, when Lichas and Tryphaena dream respectively of Priapus and the effigy of Neptune, who inform them that the boys have been led back to the ship and will be found there (104.1-2). 

Since only such indirect involvement by the gods is allowed in the genre, Priapus can have entered the plot as early as Massilia no more directly than by grudging Encolpius and Giton their erotic pleasures, or, more likely, because Encolpius was his equal with respect to the size of his *mentula*, and may have inadvertently entered into competition with the god for the attention of worshippers. Nothing is more likely to cause divine anger than the impersonation of a god by a mortal, which is really what is implied by Sidonius, when he apostrophizes Petronius and calls him, or rather Encolpius, *Hellespontiacum parem Priapo*. If I am right in conjecturing that Encolpius impersonated Priapus when he disturbed the nocturnal ceremonies of Quartilla and her Priapic cult this would either be a repetition of an earlier motif or the only cause of the "wrath of Priapus". No direct epic-style confrontation or *facinus* is therefore necessary or even possible and we can let the information from fragment (*Fr. I*) suffice as an explanation of how and why

228 See also Quartilla’s dream inquiry in the temple (17.7, *medicinam somno petii, iussaque sum vos perquirere atque impetum morbi monstrata subtilitate lenire*); and the dream of Apollonius where an "angel" instructs him to go to Ephesus where he will find his "dead" wife (48).

229 Although Quartilla’s statement in 17.5, *nostra regio tam praesentibus plena est numinibus ut facilius possis deum quam hominem invenire*, is sometimes used to suggest the presence of the supernatural in the *Satyricon*, the words are entirely subjective to the priestess, and probably serve the purpose of excusing how easily she mistook Encolpius for Priapus himself.
Encolpius left his home city of Massilia. But let us look more closely at the city itself and see why it is especially appropriate as the origin of the narrator of the *Satyrica*.

Massilia, which prided itself of having a port of major commercial importance in the western Mediterranean, was especially famous for its Atlantic seafarers and their incredible travelogues. Pytheas of Massilia, for one, claimed to have sailed into the outer-sea and north along the coast. His voyage supposedly took him to many previously unknown lands and led to the discovery of the mysterious island of Thule. But he was branded the very worst of liars by Strabo (1.4.3) and mocked by Polybios (34.5.7) as someone too poor—another poor Massaliote—to undertake an expedition to far away places. Antonius Diogenes (late first century C.E.) certainly parodies Pytheas amongst others in his lost *The Wonders beyond Thule*.230 Euthymenes, another Massaliote adventurer, claimed to have rounded the southern tip of Africa and to have located the Nile’s source and thus solved this centuries-long debate. But he is called a braggart by the sophist Aelius Aristides and his *Periplous* nothing but an ἀκόλογος Ἀλκίνου (Aristid. *Aeg.* p.354 [Jebb]), i.e., of the same type as the lying fables told by Odysseus to the king of the Phaeacians. Because of such incredible travelers' tales connected with the city of Massilia the sophist can use the term μῦθοι Μασσαλιώτικοί (*Aeg.* p.353 [Jebb]) loosely to cover this type of travelogue and rely on his readers to know to what he is referring.

Of Roman authors contemporary to Petronius, Seneca quotes *Euthymenes* *Massiliensis* only to refute his claims and adds that in the olden days there was room for

such lies, for the realm of the outer sea was unexplored.\textsuperscript{231} Lucan, with an obvious allusion to Nero's interest in the problem of the sources of the Nile,\textsuperscript{232} also refers to the Massaliote's story as hearsay, \textit{rumor}, in a highly Odyssean conversation between Caesar and Acoreus, an Egyptian priest.\textsuperscript{233} Whether the Massaliotes Pytheas and Euthymenes were mere liars or misunderstood explorers far ahead of their time makes little difference. More important is that they were known by later authors as Odyssean spinners of yarns, which makes their city especially appropriate as the home city of Encolpius, the narrator of the travelogue we know as the \textit{Satyrica}.

So far our reading of the two fragments of Servius and Sidonius has yielded information about Encolpius's citizenship, poverty, voluntary assumption of the degrading role of scapegoat, and final expulsion from Massilia. However, if this information is right, we would expect some of it to be reflected in what Encolpius says about himself in the fragments of his narrative that have come down to us. This is indeed the case. Two \textit{loci} in the extant text of the \textit{Satyrica} immediately fall into place as soon as we accept this information. Encolpius, firstly, refers to himself as \textit{exul} (81.3) in a retrospective soliloquy at a moment of disillusion when he has no reason to misrepresent himself to the (original) audience/reader, who already knows the facts from hearing/reading the story; and secondly, Lichas calls him a φαρμακός ("\textit{quid dicis} tu \textit{latro? quae sola salamandra supercilia tua exussit? cui deo crinem vosvisti? pharmace, responde!}", 107.15). These retrospective references to the protagonist in the extant \textit{Satyrica} match so perfectly the fragment of

\textsuperscript{231}Sen. \textit{Nat.} 4.2.22-25, \textit{tunc erat mendacium locus; cum ignota essent externa, licebat illis fabulas mittere}.

\textsuperscript{232}Sen. \textit{Nat.} 6.8.3.

\textsuperscript{233}Luc. 10.255-7.
Servius—in both Encolpius is an exile and a scapegoat—that their appositeness is most unlikely to be merely coincidental. Let us deal with the latter reference first and then move to the question of exile.

That *pharmace* is a purely Greek term is demonstrated by the fact that it occurs only here in extant Latin literature. Now, the word has been generally understood as the equivalent of the Greek φαρμακός (note the location of the accent), and translated as "empoisonneur" (Ernout), "Giftmischer, Zauberer" (Stefenelli), "poisonous fellow" (Heseltine), "poisonous creature" (Sullivan). It is, however, incongruent with what we know about the character of Encolpius that he should be seen as a magician, and as Harlow has shown, *pharmace* is better taken as the Latin form of another Greek word φαρμακός, "scapegoat".\(^{234}\) This word belongs to the vocabulary of Greek satiric and comic authors such as Hipponax and Aristophanes, and it is used as a term of abuse, and so it might even occur here without a reference to anything specific.\(^{235}\) However, according to Harlow, "it is possible that the word is appropriate in its literal sense as well. It seems from Petr. Frg. I, that Encolpius himself may have acted as a scapegoat in Marseilles during an early stage of the novel. Lichas [...] seems to have had an intimate connection with the heroes at some point, and may very well have known of this. Even if he did not, the reader certainly

\(^{234}\)Harlow (1974), 377; Sullivan (1968), 42, confuses the two words. On the accent see the grammarian Herodianus 1.150 [Lentz]. Unlike many modern scholars an early commentator, Janus Souza, read *pharmace* correctly as the vocative of φαρμακός (Burmann (1743), 2:38).

\(^{235}\)E.g. Hippon. Fr. 7 [West], *et passim*; Ar. Ra. 733. The other word, φαρμακός, "sorcerer", is found e.g. in the vocabulary of the Greek *LXX*. φαρμακός, "scapegoat", would not have reference to poison or pharmaceutical substances, because the abusive sense is based on the fact that criminals could be used as scapegoats; v. *LSJ ad verb*. 
would.\textsuperscript{236} The speaker, Lichas, is a realist who has just unraveled Eumolpus's mendacious defense. Moreover, the other two items in the same address do have references to specific facts about Encolpius: he has stolen things from the ship and he has lost his eyebrows. The force of Lichas's question (107.15, \textit{quae sola salamandra supercilia tua exussit?}) is not that he himself believes that "a lone salamander" leaped from the sea aboard the ship and burnt off his eyebrows, but that he is mockingly anticipating some such ridiculous explanation from Encolpius.\textsuperscript{237} By rounding off his accusation with a nasty reminder of the humiliation Encolpius underwent in Massilia as a "scapegoat", Lichas delivers the final blow to the ego of our hero. Most significantly, perhaps, Encolpius the narrator immediately acknowledges the truth of Lichas's accusations (108.1, \textit{nec quid in re manifestissima dicerem inveniebam}).

Let us now examine in detail the description of Encolpius as an exile (81.3) and the significance of this for the story. Besides Encolpius, there are two other exules in the story. Tryphaena calls Giton an exul (100.4), and she herself is so referred to (100.7, \textit{exulem}) by Eumolpus, when addressing Encolpius and Giton who would certainly know the facts about her exile.\textsuperscript{238} It should be noted that the words \textit{exilium} and \textit{exul} were not used lightly in the Latin language and rarely in a transferred sense and then only of inanimate things and

\textsuperscript{236}Harlow (1974), 377.

\textsuperscript{237}A marine animal similar to the salamander, possibly some sort of "mollusc", is said by Pliny (\textit{Nat.} 10.188) to emit a substance with depilatory effects.

\textsuperscript{238}Encolpius at one point claims that Asclytos was \textit{sua quoque confessione dignus exilio} (81.4), which indicates that we have a fourth exile in the story. The \textit{editio Pithoeana} has \textit{exitus}, but it is not supported by other witnesses, and shortly before Encolpius has spoken of Asclytos and himself as having experienced similar fortune (80.8). Asclytos, however, was not on the ship of Lichas and so we do not know where he came from.
animals. Moreover, the terms are without abusive connotations (as opposed to *fugitivus*, "runaway", "fugitive") since they usually involve people of some rank and standing. An *exilium* is either a legal banishment,\(^{239}\) or a voluntary emigration in order to avoid extreme conditions.\(^{240}\) There is always in these terms an implicit contrast to *patria* and *domus*. For these three Greek characters in our story to be called *exules* in Campania and thereabouts proves that they are not Roman citizens, but come from an independent city outside Roman territory. That city is most likely as Greek as they are themselves.

The best way to understand the significance of the institution of exile in the Roman world is to consider it in the light of legal arrangements between independent states. An exiled Roman citizen could through the *ius exulandi*, "the right to live in exile", adopt a new *patria* and thus forfeit his Roman citizenship.\(^{241}\) This arrangement was reciprocal and *exules* from independent cities which had a *foedus* with Rome could take up citizenship there and thus relinquish their previous status at home.\(^{242}\) In early times the exiled Roman did not need to go far into exile and could find a new home without leaving Latium, in cities such as Tibur, Praeneste, Lavinium and Ardea, or he could go to the Latin colonies. In later times Tarquinii, Nuceria and Ravenna would serve the same purposes. But when the *ager Romanus* had been expanded so as to cover the whole Italian peninsula and especially after the civil wars, when all Italian cities had been granted Roman citizenship, such places had

\(^{239}\) The legal terms are *expulsio*, *ejectio*, *aqua et ignis interdictio*, *deportatio* and *relegatio*.

\(^{240}\) *demigratio*, *fuga*, *peregrinatio*.

\(^{241}\) See Kleinfeller (1958), 1683-85.

\(^{242}\) Cic. *de Orat.* 1.177, *cum Romam in exilium uenisset*, *cui Romae exulare ius esset*. 
to be sought outside Italy. In the early principate the closest foreign city to the North and West, and one that was preeminently qualified to accept Roman exiles, happened to be Massilia. This independent Greek city-state in the middle of the Roman province of Gallia Narbonensis, had had a politically privileged status in the area, ever since the war against the Gallic tribes in 123-21 B.C.E. In Roman sources, moreover, it is often mentioned as the preferred destination of Roman exules.

Even before the civil war, in 70 B.C.E., the corrupt former governor of Sicily, C. Verres, chose Massilia as his city of exile and took there much wealth. In 63 B.C.E. it seemed the obvious place to go to for Catilina, if he had chosen exile (Sal. Cat. 34.2). Milo, too, went there in 52 B.C.E. (Asc. Mil. 32.13; 45.23), became a citizen and despite his discontent could joke that he was happy to be in exile because of the excellent mullets of Massilia (D.C. 40.54). After the execution of Jullus Antonius by the order of Augustus, in relation to the adultery of Julia (2 B.C.E.), his adolescent son Lucius Antonius was sent to Massilia ubi specie studiorum nomen exilii tegeretur (Tac. Ann. 4.44). Tacitus (Ann. 4.43.5) reports an interesting envoy to Tiberius in 25 C.E. undertaken by the Massaliotes to ask for the legitimation of the testament of a certain Vulcancius Moschus, who had left his property to the city ut patriae. This well known rhetor (Sen. Suas. 1.2; Con. 2.3.4 et

\footnote{In Gallia, Greece or Asia (Cic. Mur. 89).}

\footnote{Strabo has a chapter on Massilia (Str. 4.1.4f.). In the early principate Massilia was still an officially independent Greek city-state which laid great store in its ancient customs and citizenship and had a long standing relationship of amicitia with the Romans. In Strabo’s time (ca. 63 B.C.E. - 19 C.E.) the city had a high reputation for its rhetorical and philosophical schools which attracted upper class Romans. Tacitus corroborates this reputation of the Massaliotes for rhetorical and philosophical skills (Ann. 4.44, Ag. 4). For a concise account of ancient Massilia, see Wackernagel (1966), 2130-53.}
*passim*) was born in Pergamum (Porphyrian *De Hor. ep.* 1.4.9), but had to face charges of murder by poison and therefore left Pergamum, despite his defense by Asinius Pollio (Sen. *Con.* 2.5.13.) and Torquatus, Horace's friend (*Ep.* 1.5.9). Later he had settled in Massilia as a rhetor. The Massaliotes brought the case before Tiberius to test the validity of the *ius exulandi* in Massilia, which was thus reaffirmed. Seneca wrote to Nero about a father who had shown his clemency to a son who had made an attempt on his life by "satisfying himself with exile—and a luxurious exile—he detained the parricide at Massilia and gave him the same liberal allowance that he had before" (*Cl.* 1.15.2). Finally, in 58 C.E., Nero on false charges bade Cornelius Sulla leave Rome and stay within the walls of Massilia (Tac. *Ann.* 13.47.3). These walls had been torn down by Caesar in 49 B.C.E., but were reconstructed by the wealthy Massaliote doctor, Crinas, with Nero's permission (Plin. *Nat.* 29.9).

Given the reciprocity of the institution of *exilium*, the frequency with which the Romans themselves chose Massilia as their place of exile makes this city the most probable, if not the only possible, place of origin of our first century C.E. Greek *exules* on board a Tarentine ship heading south along the west coast of the Italian peninsula. Since we know that Encolpius is a Massaliote, and we may assume that he left the city by sea on the ship of Lichas, a merchant who would have had his own reasons for going to Massilia, the conclusion is hard to resist that Giton and Tryphaena, who are also exiles and were also on that ship, originate from Massilia as well. The great complexity of the relationships of Encolpius, Tryphaena, Giton, Lichas and his wife (discussed in detail below), which is evident from the reciprocal accusations and apologies, when the boys board the ship again in the Greek city, requires them to have spent considerable time together on that ship before arriving in Campania.
The name of Massilia in Roman literature is loaded with political and cultural significance. The city's destiny was perceived as intimately connected with that of Rome from its very foundation. Legend had it that in the times of king Tarquinius the youthful settlers from Phocaea, which is sometimes portrayed as another sacked Troy, had sailed up the Tiber and made friends with the Romans before continuing on their journey to found Massilia in the midst of savage nations. For the Romans they remained a symbol of the old Greek civilization miraculously preserved in the heart of barbarian darkness. Severity, gravity and discipline were the communal virtues of Massaliotes lauded by Roman authors. These were virtues that the Romans did not commonly associate with Greeks, but rather with their own vetus Roma. Massilia was believed to have provided financial aid after the sack of Rome by Gauls, and for this, according to Justin (43.5.10), it was granted immunitas, a locus spectaculorum in senatu, and a foedus aequo iure. Like Rome it fought against the Carthaginians. It had the reputation of a faithful friend and ally to Rome in war and peace.

\[245\] Luc. 3.340.

\[246\] There is a short history of Massilia in Justin 43.3-5, which is an epitome of Trogus's Historiae Philippicae from the first century B.C.E.

\[247\] This aspect of the city's image is emphasized in numerous sources: Cic. Flac. 63, Phil. 8.9; Liv. 37.54; Sil. 15.168-72; V.Max. 2.6.7; Tac. Ag. 4; Mela 2.77.

\[248\] Cic. Flac. 26.63, cuius civitatis disciplinam atque gravitatem; Phil. 8.6.19, Caesar ipse [...] propter singularem eius civitatis gravitatem et fidem quotidie aliquid iracundiae remittebat. V.Max. 2.6.7, severitatis custos acerrima est; [...] Massilienses quoque ad hoc tempus usurpant disciplinae gravitatem.

\[249\] Just. 43.5.3, cum Romanis prope ab initio conditae urbis foedus summa fide custodierunt auxiliisque in omnibus bellis industrie socios iuverunt.
Massilia appears to have been an archaic community with an aristocratic constitution, and very conservative with respect to its religious customs and the Greek language. An archaic Ionic dialect kept its ground there, and Greek continued to be the spoken language until late antiquity. Accordingly, the siege and subsequent capitulation of Massilia to Caesar during the civil war was perceived as symbolic of the irreparable harm and madness of that conflict. For Rome to turn against such an ally was typical of the self-destructive fraternal slaughter that was the civil war. In the account given by Lucan in the *Pharsalia* (3.298f.), the Massaliotes face Caesar with "an un-Greek steadfastness" (3.302, *non Graia levitate*) and they appeal to him by reminding him of the historical relationship of the two states and demonstrating clearly their old fashioned hatred of tyranny and civil strife. Civil wars are evil, and if Rome has the good fortune to negotiate peace, Caesar and Pompey can both come to Massilia to dwell there in exile. But Caesar's perverse madness is not to be halted. Lucan depicts the siege as an inverted fall of Troy, with descendants of Aeneas attacking the walled city of descendants of the Greeks. Gruesome scenes of dismemberment symbolize the sundering of political and moral ties. Thus Massilia, like Troy in the poem of Eumolpus, might be presented as a projection of Rome

---

250 See Clerc (1971), 1:458-64, on the intellectual culture. The Greek inscriptions of Massilia dating from the Roman era are notable for their archaic and Ionian forms, though this may perhaps be due to an officially cultivated archaism to boost local patriotism rather than the survival of the old dialect in common speech. Another peculiarity is male proper names with otherwise feminine endings: Protis, Apellis, Thespis, Zenothemis, Taxaris, Charmis.

251 Luc. 333-5, *sit locus exceptus sceleri, Magnoque tibique, / tutus, ut, invictae fatum si consulat urbi, / foedera si placeant, sit, quo veniatis inermes.*
herself with respect to her fate in the civil war, the subject of another of Eumolpus's poems.

Encolpius's marked preference for old Greek literature and art, and his apparently genuine astonishment at things seen and heard on his trip through Italy under the Julio-Claudian dynasty are perfectly intelligible as aspects of his Massaliotic background. His surprise is thus due not to stupidity, but to his foreign and culturally more archaic origin, and may to a certain extent be used to measure the deviant mores of those whom he encounters. Due to his background, Encolpius stands closer to the admirable Greeks of the past than do those characters of the story who are more familiar with and accepting of the contemporary scene. His simple-mindedness was obviously an intellectual virtue, his fixation on Giton acceptable in a young man, and although disastrous in many respects, at least it emboldened him and made him into the protagonist of an adventure story. Finally, his literary mindset and nostalgia for the past glory of Greece is more appealing to his fine audience than the world of sordid acquisitiveness. This counts for a lot in a work which merely concedes to its personae relative virtues.

If our geographical and cultural remapping of the Satyricon has made more persuasive our thesis that Encolpius, Giton and Tryphaena boarded the ship of Lichas in Massilia, there is still much about their relationships and the events of the voyage that remains in the dark. We would, perhaps, know considerably more if we had Giton's hurried exposition of the causes of their enmities and the present threat, which puts the fear into Eumolpus (101.7, *raptim causas odiorum et instans periculum trepidanti Eumolpo exponit [sc. Giton]*). But since the audience/reader of the original had all this information, the narrator does not bother repeating it. However, as will become clear in the following, it is fairly easy to recover what caused the fall-out between the characters. The enmities
between Tryphaena and Lichas, on the one hand, and Encolpius and Giton, on the other, are virtually re-exposed by the narrative itself through the accusations and apologies which precede their partly forced reconciliation.

Tryphaena primarily misses Giton\(^{252}\) and Lichas is most eager to get his hands on Encolpius.\(^{253}\) In Giton's words the boys are on the run from these people (101.6, "hi sunt" inquit Giton "quos fugimus"). The angry adults accordingly refer to the boys as "runaways" and "culpable" (104.11 and 105.10, fugitivi; 106.3, noxii). At this stage the relationship between the boys and Lichas in particular is presented as that of runaway slaves to an irate master (101.10, vides, quam valde nobis expediat, ultro dominum ad fugientes accersere). The impractical declamatory solutions which the trio scholastically invent never manage to represent the boys as anything but slaves who have committed some wrongdoing against their master, although Eumolpus is the one who would pose as their dominus.\(^{254}\) In

\(^{252}\)100.4, "si quis deus manibus meis" inquit "Gitona imponeret, quam bene exulem exciperem." She dreams that the statue of Neptune, which she had noticed three times in the sanctuary at Baiae, says to her: "in nave Lichae Gitona invenies" (104.2); cf. 108.5, intentans in oculos Tryphaenae manus usurum me viribus meis clara liberaque voce clamavi, ni abstineret a Gitone iniuriam mulier damnata et in toto navigio sola verbermida.

\(^{253}\)Encolpius fears Lichas especially: sed repente quasi destruente fortuna constantiam meam eiusmodi vox super constratum puppis congruuit: "ergo me derisit?" et haec quidem virilis et paene auribus meis familiaris animum palpitantem percussit (100.3-4). The Priapus of Lichas's dream says to him: "Encolpion quod quaeris, scito a me in navem tuam esse perductum" (104.1). When Tryphaena hears Giton's voice and runs to him, Lichas runs to Encolpius: Lichas, qui me optime noverat, tamquam et ipse vocem audisset, accurrit et nec manus nec faciem meam consideravit, sed continuo ad inguina mea luminibus deflexis movit officiosam manum et "salve" inquit "Encolpi" (105.9).

\(^{254}\)102.9, conclamabo deinde nocte servos poenam graviorem timentes praecipitasse se in mare; ita tanquam servi Aethiopes; 103.4, implevit Eumolpus frontes utriusque
his defense of Encolpius and Giton the poet presents them as "free men", "noble" and "honest", but even so he too refers to them as "runaway slaves" and "enemies who have surrendered" in the same sentence (107.3-5). His only effective rhetorical argument is to appeal to whatever residual sentiments there may be after the amorous liaisons of the adults and the boys.\(^{255}\)

Eumolpus is, of course, lying outrageously in claiming that the boys willingly returned to the ship and will say whatever he thinks is going to be of help. Lichas protests to his calling the boys *ingenui* and *honesti* (107.3-5), not however by arguing that they are slaves in a legal sense, but because they have become "guilty", (107.9, *noxii*), and "liable" (107.10, *rei*), in his eyes. If Encolpius was his friend before, all the more reason to call him, besides a thief, a parricide as well (107.12).\(^{256}\) Neither boy is actually the slave of Tryphaena or Lichas. What has so debased them with respect to their former friends is that they have fallen captives (113.7, *captivitate*) to people whom they have hurt (107.10, *laesi*) and who now wish to wreak vengeance upon their heads (108.9, *dimicantium furor, illis pro ultione, nobis pro vita pugnantibus*). This double nature of the relationship between the people on board the ship shows that there is a dramatic switch, a "before" and "after" in the

\(^{255}\)106.2, volet Tryphaena misereri, quia non tantam voluptatem perdidera; 107.3-4, patimini liberos homines ire sine iniuria quo destinant. saevi quoque implacabilesque domini crudelitatem suam impediant, si quando paenitentia fugitivos reduxit, et dediticiis hostibus parcimus. quid ultra petitis aut quid vultis? in conspectu vestro supplices iacent iuvenes ingenui, honesti, et quod utroque potentius est, familiaritate vobis aliquando coniuncti.

\(^{256}\)107.11, at enim amici fuerunt nostri: eo maiora meruerunt supplicia

\(\text{ingentibus litteris et notum fugitivorum epigramma per totam faciem liberali manu duxit;}\)
\(105.2, \text{ ne viderer de nave carcerem facere, iussi squalorem damnatis auferri.}\)
boys' relationship with the adults, and that the partly erotic and partly criminal departure from the ship marks that turning point.\textsuperscript{257}

Harder to figure out are the original relationships in the pre-fall-out period when things were apparently going more smoothly. And even before this happy period we must posit an initial encounter, no doubt when the woman and the boys first boarded the ship of Lichas in Massilia. During this initial period, then, we may presume that Tryphaena, Encolpius and Giton were primarily \textit{exules} in the eyes of Lichas, who knew that Encolpius was exiled as a result of playing the scapegoat. The wife of Lichas (her name was most likely "Hedyle")\textsuperscript{258} was also on board the ship in the beginning and seems to have had an important role to play, especially in the boys' departure from the ship. Eumolpus's answer to Encolpius's question about the owner and the passengers gives us the basic facts about the captain and his most prominent passenger, Tryphaena. Lichas and the ship are returning to their home port in Tarentum, and he has been collecting merchandise to sell presumably on the local market (101.4, \textit{onus deferendum ad mercatum conduct})\textsuperscript{30}. Tryphaena is being brought to Tarentum as an exile (100.7, \textit{dixero Licham Tarentinum esse dominum huiusce navigii, qui Tryphaenam exulem Tarentum ferat?}). She is also, according to Eumolpus, the most beautiful of all women and travels hither and thither because of pleasure (101.5, ...

\textsuperscript{257}113.3, \textit{non dubie redierat in animum [sc. Lichae] Hedyle expilatumque libidinosa migratione navigium.}\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{258}Hedyle is Bücheler's conjecture for the \textit{hedile} or \textit{edile} of the tradition. That Lichas had a wife on board and that she played an important role, however, is not in question: 106.2, \textit{Lichas memor adhuc uxoris corruptae iniuriarumque, quas in Herculis porticu acceperat; 113.2-3, at non Lichas risit [...] non dubie redierat in animum Hedyle expilatumque libidinosa migratione navigium; 114.4-5, Lichas trepidans ad me supinas porrigit manus et "tu" inquit "Encolpi, succurre periclitantibus, id est vestem illam divinam sistrumque redde navigio".\textsuperscript{30}
omnium feminarum formosissima, quae voluptatis causa huc atque illuc vectatur. The reason he gives for her travels (voluptatis causa) might seem to conflict with her status as exile.

However, if her exile had something to do with her lust, as is likely since this seems to be her dominant character trait, this is not a problem. Eumolpus might also be referring to her and Lichas’s search for the boys, which seems to have been their sole activity from the time the boys left the ship. Tryphaena somewhat resembles an unusually wealthy Greek hetaira, but considering her status as exile she is more likely to be—on the analogy of Lichas’s wife and the recently married Circe in Croton—the libidinous wife of a wealthy Massaliote who has abandoned husband and home. Besides, her amorous attachments would hardly be so culpable were she a professional harlot. But perhaps most significantly she blushes at the end of Eumolpus’s satire about the Widow of Ephesus, a story introduced as a demonstration of female levity, how easily they fall in love, how fast they even forget their children; that no wife is so virtuous that she isn’t willing to sacrifice everything for the love of a stranger (110.6-7, peregrina libidine). Why would she have blushed so greatly (113.1, erubescente non mediocriter Tryphaena), if she had nothing in common with the widow of the story?

When peace has been brokered she and Giton are very close again (109.8; 110.3; 113.1 and 5). That they have been close before is shown by the fact that Tryphaena’s "most faithful slaves" (114.7), especially the ancillae, recognize Giton’s immediate cry of pain

\footnote{According to the conventions of New Comedy, going into exile is the natural reaction to frustrated love, see Zagagi (1988), 193-209.}
even before their mistress.\textsuperscript{260} She knows his voice well enough to be subliminally \textit{turbata} at hearing it,\textsuperscript{261} even if she does not recognize it immediately. When all her slave girls have run to his aid and called on their mistress for help\textsuperscript{262} she is quick to respond.\textsuperscript{263} Likewise, when Giton threatens to cut off his genitals, she stops him by showing herself earnestly willing to forgive \textsuperscript{(108.10, \textit{inhibuitque Tryphaena tam grande facinus non dissimulata missione}).\textsuperscript{264} This unconditional forgiveness is a sure symptom of love (in the \textit{Satyrica} a sentiment no different from lust) as Encolpius so well demonstrates by his willingness to take Giton back whatever the little brat has done. The reason for the familiarity of the handmaidens with the boy is not that Giton is Tryphaena's slave, as some have suggested, but that these creatures were indispensable intermediaries in comic love affairs. Accordingly, they are especially knowledgeable about the most intimate of their mistresses' 

\textsuperscript{260}The text is strange here: 105.6, \textit{non solum ergo turbata est, sed ancillae etiam omnes familiaris sono inductae ad vapulantem decurrunt}, but need not be corrupt. Bücheler hesitatingly suggests \textit{sola} for \textit{solum}, but prints a lacuna after \textit{sed} and suggests the missing words: \textit{accessit quoque proprius et acrior vociferantem intuetur}. Ernout changes \textit{ergo} to \textit{era}, and adduces Bücheler as the authority. Müller adopts Novák's emendation and adds \textit{<ea> after ergo}. Even if \textit{era} is accepted, this does not necessarily imply that Giton is Tryphaena's slave, since her status as mistress would be justified by the reference to her handmaidens, and does not necessarily have anything to do with Giton.

\textsuperscript{261}105.5, \textit{Tryphaenae aures notissima voce repleret [...] turbata est}

\textsuperscript{262}105.6, \textit{ancillae [...] omnes familiaris sono inductae ad vapulantem [sc. Gitona] decurrunt [...] pariter proclamant}

\textsuperscript{263}105.8, \textit{deflectit aures Tryphaena iam sua sponte credentes raptimque ad puerum devolat}

\textsuperscript{264}Lust also motivates Encolpius when he wishes to break up his friendship with Ascytlos (10.7), and love when he receives Giton back and forgives him later on (91.6).
secrets. To convince ourselves of this we need only observe the likeness of Tryphaena's 
*ancillae* to Quartilla's Psyche and Circe's Chrysis. The chamber-maidens of Tryphaena 
typically repair the beauty of the boys by restoring to them their lost hair and eyebrows with 
their mistress's cosmetics (110.1-5). In one isolated fragment one of them seems to be 
ingratiating herself with Encolpius (113.11), just as Chrysis later attempts to replace her 
mistress as the young man's lover (139.4). These subordinates can at times be quite 
imperious and they are not always under their owner's control, much like the slaves of 
Trimalchio (e.g. the *dispensator*).

Against the idea that Giton is Tryphaena's slave speaks also the tenor of her initial 
reference to him as *exul* (100.4), as does Eumolpus's statement that the boys were once 
close friends with the adults (107.1, *petieruntque ut se reconciliarem aliquando 
amicissimis*), a statement which is acknowledged by Lichas (107.11, *at enim amici fuerunt 
nostri*). This seems an improbable way to refer to slaves in the ancient world. Furthermore, 
Encolpius was Tryphaena's lover (113.8, *neque Tryphaena me alloquebatur tamquam 
familiarem et aliquando gratum sibi amatorem*) before Giton took his place (113.7, *nec 
tamen adhuc sciebam utrum magis puero irascerer quod amicam [sc. Tryphaenam] mihi 
auferret, an amicae quod puerum corrumperet*). It seems quite pointless to assume that she 
lost interest in Encolpius and fell in love with her own slave whom we must presume she 
knew well before.

If the little information we have of the boys' relationship with Tryphaena is matched 
with the pattern which Vincenzo Ciaffi was first to point out (discussed in detail below) of 
Encolpius making friends and lovers of people who then become his enemies as soon as 
they take interest in Giton, we can both account for Tryphaena's switch from Encolpius to 
Giton and the development from friendship to animosity. With a certain amount of 
plausibility we may therefore assume that Encolpius first had an affair with Tryphaena in
Massilia. True to type, she would like Circe have lusted after Encolpius during that year when he was being fed for his role as scapegoat and when the reputation of his penis would have been likely to attract the interest of the libidinous women of the town. According to the satiric ethos, wealthy and beautiful ladies like Tryphaena, Hedyle and Circe are expected to lust after sexy outcasts, slaves, gladiators and condemned criminals (126.10, viderint matronae, quae flagellorum vestigia osculantur). Later then, when Encolpius had been expelled, she may have run away from home with him—in the same manner as Hedyle, Ascytlos and even Eumolpus, other initial friends and lovers of Encolpius who join the "brothers" on their travels, only later to become unwanted and suspected by the protagonist. An alternative (which does not necessarily exclude the first option) would be that she was found out by her husband, and thus too became a voluntary exile to escape the consequences of her infidelity, i.e., the wrath of her husband. A third possibility would be that the boys and Tryphaena met on the ship. But this seems to me less likely, since the boys typically need a third partner to help them move from one episode to another. The initial affair is certain to have been complicated, but the logic of erotic liaisons which primarily motivates the action of the Satyrica is relatively simple and constitutes a remarkably reliable referent for figuring out the lost parts of the plot. Only later, then, when they were on board the ship of Lichas would Tryphaena have developed her flaming passion for Giton, which so excited the rabid jealousy of Encolpius as to cause him to plan a desperate escape.²⁶⁵

²⁶⁵ 108.5, nec quicquam pro me deprecabar, sed intentans in oculos Tryphaenae manus usurum me viribus meis clara liberaque voce clamavi, ni abstineret a Gitone inuiriam mulier damnata et in toto navigio sola verberanda; 108.8, rabies libidine perditorum collecta; 108.14. v. 5, sed contemptus amor vires habet; 113.5, Tryphaena in gremio Gitonis posita modo implebat osculis pectus, interdum concinnabat spoliatum crinibus
The voyage presumably lasted long enough for Encolpius to have had erotic relationships also with Lichas and later his wife, although a long narration is not as such an indication that a long time must have passed. However, Encolpius had at different times and in different situations been erotically involved with each of the important individuals on board the ship: Giton, Tryphaena, Lichas and Hedyle. When Tryphaena had lost interest in Encolpius and had made Giton the new object of her lust, Encolpius was free to begin the relationship with Lichas, which must have been initiated by the captain. Lichas's wife, then, would typically have been angered at her husband's marital infidelity, and might have used it as an excuse to do likewise.\(^{366}\) In Apuleius's *Metamorphoses* we have the story of the *pistor* who punishes his wife's youthful lover by taking him to bed and having him flogged the day after (9.27-8), but Lichas seems genuinely to lust after Encolpius and so it is more likely that he preceded his wife as Encolpius's lover. I suspect that Eumolpus's ostensible fiction about the boys (supposedly his slaves) having spent the night with a fictitious *amica* (105.3) may somehow in the solipsistic world of this story mirror how

\[
vultum.\textit{ ego maestus et impatiens foederis novi non cibum, non potionem capiebam, sed obliquis trucibusque oculis utrumque spectabam. omnia me oscula vulnerabant, omnes blanditiae, quascumque mulier libidinosa fingebat.}\]

\(^{366}\) Compare this to the marital row of Fortunata and Trimalchio. Note especially the reference to *ex aequo ius firmum* (74.9).
Hedyle was "corrupted". The boys and Lichas's wife seem to have made a pact against her husband, although Encolpius was primarily thinking of getting Giton away from Tryphaena. According to the central erotic pattern Hedyle would sooner or later have taken an interest in Giton and so would eventually have to be gotten rid of as well by our love-sick hero, although some variation may have been built into the motif. Something, in any case, caused them to part company for when we meet the "brothers" in the first extant scenes, she has ultimately been replaced by Ascyltos as the third man and rival. (We will leave to Chapter Three the discussion of the many adventures that Encolpius experienced in the long interval while he wandered about in Campania, after he escaped from the ship and before we meet him in the Greek city).

The location where the confrontation and escape of the these three characters took place is named in the text as *Herculis Porticus* (106.2). Julius Beloch, in his magisterial survey of ancient Campania, locates this portico in Puteoli by conjecturing that a part of the long *Säulenhallen* by the harbour, which Cicero calls *Porticus Neptuni*, may have been called *Porticus Herculis*. This is probably the strongest evidence there is to locate the

---

267 Eumolpus says to Lichas: 105.3, "*inter cetera apud communem amicum consumpserunt pecuniam meam, a qua illos proxima nocte extraxi meru unguentisque perfusos. ad summam, adhuc patrimonii mei reliquias olent."

268 See Beloch (1890), 134: "Die verschiedenen Theile dieser Portiken waren nach Göttern benannt. So die Porticus Neptuni, die Cicero erwähnt [Acad. pr. 2.25.80], nach der abbildung bei Bellori etwa zwischen dem grossen Molo und der Kirche Purificazione a mare gelegen. Ein anderer Theil dieser Säulenhallen war wohl die Porticus Herculis, von der Petron erzählt. Sie boten den Puteolanern einen beliebten Spaziergang." Other explanations for the change from Neptune to Hercules could be poetic licence or faulty memory, but inventing such arguments is too easy for them to count as evidence. The fact is that no one can positively identify the place.
place. Scholars most often assume that *Herculis Porticus* was somewhere in the complex of monumental buildings which adorned the resort at Baiae, because Tryphaena refers to having thrice seen there in a sanctuary the *simulacrum* of Neptune.\(^{269}\) Here at least we have a definite location, but nothing forces us to assume that the boys left the ship at Baiae, just because Tryphaena says she had been there. However, the *urbs Graeca* is bound to be close to Baiae. If we consider the first encounter with Quartilla, which precedes the arrival of the boys at the *urbs Graeca*, everything points to their having left the ship somewhere else than in the city of Agamemnon and Trimalchio, which they entered on foot. And Baiae does seem the appropriate setting for the corruption of a matron (Hedyle), considering its reputation (*Var. Men. 44* [Asthbury]; *Prop. 1.11*; *et al.*). For Petronius to pass by Baiae without making use of it in his licentious work would be an uncharacteristic act of restraint, and would certainly have left his audience disappointed. However, if the boys left the ship

\(^{269}\)The received text runs like this: 104.2, *exhorruit Tryphaena et "putes" inquit "una nos dormisse; nam et mihi simulacrum Neptuni, quod Baistor asylo notaveram, videbatur dicere: 'in nave Lichae Gitona invenies'.* Scaliger isolated *Bais* (often written *Baiis* with Bücheler). Heinsius emended *tor asylo* to *<in> peristylo*; Gronovius to *<in> peristylio*; Bücheler to *<in> tetrastylo*, and that reading was adopted by Ernout, Heseltine and Müller. However Ribezzo (1930), 57, has provided by far the best solution: "Bais *ter asylo notaveram."* By emending only one character, *tor* to *ter*, which is likewise emended by all other editors, we get a fine sense to the passage. *Asylum* is a general word for sanctuary (and perhaps "resort", see quotation from Fronto below), and no *peristylum, peristylium, or tetrastylum* has been found at Baiae (Beloch *op.cit.*, 186). The locative ablative *asylo* without *in* is also possible (*Verg. Aen. 2.761, *Iunonis asylo*; *Fro. Amic. 2.3, asylo recreari*), and *ter* adds an appropriately superstitious tone to Tryphaena's statement (Petronius is very fond of *ter* in this formulaic sense both in prose and verse; 88.4, 98.4, 123.1.v.240, 131.5, 132.8.v.1 and 2, 133.3.v.16; the model is without doubt *Verg. Aen. 6.229, 10.873, 11.188f.*). Of some relevance here is perhaps Ribezzo's report of a "recent" underwater find at Baiae of a statue of Neptune.
before it reached Baiae, there wouldn't have been any episode set there, for nowhere in the preserved part of the story does Encolpius as narrator offer a narrative of things to which he hadn't been a direct witness himself. We can just imagine that if the boys—and therefore the narrative as well—had left the ship before reaching the famous resort, Tryphaena's reference to having seen the effigy of Neptune at Baiae would only have inflamed the interest of the reader without satisfying the desire for knowing more about so congenial a setting for the Satyricon. The risk is that the reader would have seen this as a missed opportunity. It is one thing never to arrive in Tarentum, but Baiae is a different story altogether. I think it fair to assume that since Baiae is mentioned at all in the Satyricon it is bound to have been treated in at least one episode. After all, it is summer and the right season for Baiae. Would Tryphaena and Hedyle, given their type, have agreed to pass by the hedonistic Baiae? We know at least that Tryphaena did not.

Now, if Beloch was right that the Herculis Porticus referred to is the same as the long portico by the harbour in Puteoli, the southward movement of the large vessel of Lichas would mean that it first entered the port of Puteoli with the boys still on board, for there would not be any means for a large ship like that to stop at Baiae itself. Puteoli had

270 In this respect he differs from Achilles Tatius's Clitophon (Reardon (1994), 82), although we cannot know for certain what Encolpius did in the lost parts of the work. This argument seems to me to make Walsh's (1970), 74, "tempting" emendation of Herculis Porticus to Herculis Portus, or Monaco, loose its plausibility. Moreover, our inability to locate exactly this particular portico is surely not evidence for corruption in the text. The modern knowledge of Campanian cities in the first century is certainly not so complete. Finally, Herculis Portus on its own might be misunderstood, since there was more than one place by that name, and ancient Monaco would perhaps be better referred to in full as Herculis Monoeci portus (v. Paulys-Wissowa ad verb.).

been the biggest commercial harbour in Campania for two centuries and it was especially furnished with a giant mole, over three hundreds meters long, whose remains are still visible.\textsuperscript{272} From there the characters could have gone on foot to Baiae, which is very close. Thus, the boys, by returning to the ship before the others, could have stolen the rattle and robe of the ship's effigy\textsuperscript{273} and then made their escape in the company of Hedyle, but only to be confronted by Lichas and Tryphaena in the portico of the harbour itself, in an incident from which the captain and his pretty passenger are still smarting and from which they evidently came away scathed and humiliated.\textsuperscript{274} After running away from Puteoli, the boys would eventually—they had many adventures inbetween which we will discuss in the following chapter—have gone through the \textit{Crypta Neapolitana} and so entered the Greek city of Neapolis by the normal route.

But is the \textit{urbs Graeca} Neapolis? This equation cannot of course be proven, but it has the merits of making some sense of the otherwise confusing references in the extant text. The problem is that the city is also characterized as a \textit{colonia}, which may be taken to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{272} Beloch (1890), 131: "Unterhalb des Burgfelsens und durch ihn vor dem Scirocco geschützt liegt der Hafen der Stadt, der erste an dieser ganzen Küste nach dem von Misenum. Als aber Puteoli anfang, sich zum ersten Handelsplatz Italiens aufzuschwingen, genügte dieser natürliche Schutz nicht mehr und es wurde jener Molo in's Meer geworfen, den schon das Alterthum als eins der grössten Wunderwerke pries und der noch heute von allen Ruinen Pozzuoli's unser grösstes Interesse in Anspruch nimmt."
\item \textsuperscript{273} 113.3, \textit{non dubie redierat in animum [sc. Lichae] Hedyle expilatumque libidinosa migratione navigium}; 114.5, "\textit{tu} inquit [sc. Lichas] "\textit{Encolpi, succurre periclitantibus, id est vestem illum divinam sistrumque redde navigio.}"
\item \textsuperscript{274} 106.2, \textit{Lichas [...] iniuriarumque, quas in Herculis porticu acceperat; 4, nec se [sc. dixit Tryphaena] minus grandi vexatam iniuriam quam Lichas, cuius pudoris dignitas in contione proscripta sit.}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
denote a Roman colony. Rose argued that the *urbs Graeca* could not be Neapolis because it didn’t become a colony until Antonine times. But Puteoli, Rose’s candidate, officially became a colony only in 63 C.E. (Tac. *Ann.* 14.27), and Hermeros says that he came to the *colonia* as a boy (57.9, *puer capillatus in hanc coloniam veni*). Are we to imagine that the dramatic date of the *Satyricon* is that late? Are the claims of Ganymedes (44.12, 16), Hermeros (57.9), and Trimalchio (76.10) that their city is a *colonia* reliable evidence for its legal status according to Roman law? One could counter this argument by saying that they could just as well be using the Latin word *colonia* in the Greek sense, as the equivalent of ὀλοικία, and in that sense Neapolis was certainly from its very foundation the *colonia* of Cumae. Loose and untechnical language would be highly characteristic of these men.

Encolpius’s statement (8 1.3) that he is in a city with a Greek identity is intrinsically more reliable and informative than the freedmen’s use of *colonia*. Now, of the three principal candidates, Cumae, Puteoli and Neapolis, only the last one could be, and was

---

275 Rose (1962), 404-5.

276 Serv. *Aen.* 1.12, *veteres colonias ita definiunt: colonia est coetus eorum hominum, qui universi deducti sunt in locum certum aedificiis munitum, quem certo iure obtinerent: alii: colonia est quae graece ὀλοικία vocatur.

277 Rose (1962), 404, quotes Juvenal (3.60-61), *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem*, which refers to Rome itself. But this statement of Juvenal is backed up with much context which contrasts successful Greeks in the capital itself with the poor local citizens. I do not deny that there are indications that the place is Roman, beyond the word *colonia*. As I will explain in Chapter Six, these are most likely Roman elements added to the description of a Greek city, during the process of adapting the *Satyricon* from a Greek model.
regularly, referred to as a Greek city. Neapolis happened to be the Campanian center for Greek culture, and it was known as a place which offered rhetorical and philosophical education to youth and civilized peace and quiet to retired politicians and other wealthy Romans. The road from Neapolis to Puteoli was lined with the villas of the great statesmen (Cicero, Pompey, Caesar, Domitian, Lucius Piso, Cato Ulicensis, Lucullus). An important part of the Neapolitan identity was its schools and education (Stat. Silv. 5.3.112), which gave to the city the byname docta Neapolis (Col. 10.134; Mart. 5.78.14). Many known literary figures were citizens. Agamemnon, accordingly, and the other scholastici, the pinacotheca in the temple portico, and last but not least Eumolpus the poet himself, are therefore very much at home in Neapolis. Furthermore, the lack of an atrium and other significant details about the house of Trimalchio show it to be Hellenistic and unlike the typical Roman houses on Campanian

278 Tac. Ann. 15.33; Str. 5.246, 6.253; Cic. Tusc. 1.86, Arch. 5.10. The official language, even after Naples became a municipium, was Greek (Cic. Fam. 13.30.1, Att. 10.13.1). And the city also had a Greek calendar. Cumae, on the other hand, although a very ancient Greek settlement (Str. 5.243), was sacked in 421 B.C.E. by Campanian Samnites and became after that predominantly Oscan, while the Greek inhabitants fled to Naples, their own colony. According to Livy (40.42.13) Rome granted Cumae in 180 B.C.E. the right to use Latin as the official language at the request of the citizens themselves. As for Puteoli, its origins are obscure, but in 194 B.C.E. three hundred Roman families were settled there (Liv. 32.29, 34.45). Later, Sulla and Augustus may also have sent coloni, and from the second century onwards its strategic and commercial importance as the main harbour of Rome was such that its identity could not be other than Roman. Its oriental and Jewish inhabitants did not necessarily contribute to making its character Greek.

279 Str. 5.246, Hor.Epod. 5.43, otiosa Neapolis; Verg.G. 4.363; Ov. Met. 15.712, in otia natam Parthenopem; Stat.Silv. 3.5.85.
excavation sites. The plan of Encolpius and Ascytlos to earn a living from their knowledge of letters (10.4-6), a plan which they undoubtedly formed prior to arriving, thus seems to spring from the reputation of docta Neapolis, in the same manner that the conception of Eumolpus's profitable mimus rises from information about the reputation of the ghost-town of Croton. Finally the similar cultural identities of Massilia and Naples with respect to Rome make this city a likely place for the fugitive Encolpius to want to seek out.

As for earlier stops in other seaports on the way from Massilia, there is no reason why we should not accept Encolpius's statement that he was in Rome during the Saturnalia (69.9). It seems appropriate that a big commercial vessel on the way from Massilia to Tarentum would make a stop in Ostia. This was after all Rome's main harbour for vessels coming from the west, and due to costly improvements it was slowly taking over the role of Rome's biggest harbour, which Puteoli had played for two centuries. Besides, it is absurd to imagine that Encolpius's visit to Rome belongs to some other occasion than the present journey. Being a Massaliote youth, he would never have left his city on any other occasion. The Saturnalia in Rome, just like Baiae, is an ideal settings for the Satyrca. By taking the narrative straight from Massilia to the topsy-turvy world of a Roman Saturnalia Petronius would have driven home the contrast and similarities of the two places and provided an exceptional basis for the Satyrca's theme of Roman, and therefore the world's degeneration.

---

280 See Maiuri (1945), 244: "[L]a casa di Trimalchione [è] indubbiamente modellata più sul tipo della casa ellenistica che dalla casa roman. Ha un atrium ma, in luogo dell' atrium, ha, subito dopo la fauce, una porticus nel cui mezzo è una piscina, e un hospitium come le case di Delo."

281 A voyage without a stop from Ostia to Massilia was quite possible (D.C. Hist. Rom. 60.21.3, καὶ καταπλεύσας ἐς τα "Ὡστία ἐκείθεν ἐς Μασσαλίαν παρεκομίσθη").
We now come to the beginning of the extant text, but before we proceed with our reconstruction of the plot of the fragmentary extant part, some words must be said about the most adventurous attempt to reorganize the fragments. In 1930 the Neapolitan scholar Italo Sgobbo hypothesized that the Quartilla episode was wrongly placed in our tradition; that its proper place was before the initial encounter with Agamemnon at the school of rhetoric.\footnote{Sgobbo (1930), 354-61.} This rearrangement would make the Cena take over more or less directly from the initial scene in the Campanian urbs Graeca (Sgobbo was convinced that it was Puteoli) and thus solve the problem of the apparent lack of continuity from the invitation to dinner procured by Agamemnon (10.6) and the dinner at Trimalchio’s, which he assumed were the same. The thesis involved locating the forum scene and the pervigilium Priapi in Naples. However, the sacrum or sacellum Priapi in front of the Crypta Neapolitana (16.3, Fr. XVI), is referred to in a manner that shows it to be at some distance from the lodging house, where the second encounter with the priestess initially takes place (16.4, ipsa venit; 17.6, huc venisse). This distance is the distance between the Greek city and the shrine outside the Crypta. Now, Puteoli and Neapolis (the strongest candidates for the urbs Graeca) were connected by the Via Puteolana and midway between them (a short walk from either city) is the Pausilypum promontory through which the tunnel, Crypta Neapolitana, runs.\footnote{This tunnel was constructed by Cocceius, an architect of Augustus, and is often referred to in literary sources. It still exists, although many times restored and remodeled, and now measures over 700 meters. On the Neapolitan side there was a necropolis by the road and there somewhere stood Virgil’s tomb. For ancient references and a map, cf. Beloch (1890), 83ff.}
We need to demonstrate that the phrase in 16.3 (Quartillae... sacrum ante cryptam) refers to the Crypta Neapolitana, for there is the possibility (v. OLD, ad verb.) that crypta can refer to an underground room for religious rites, a vault or a crypt. However, the crypta is not referred to as the shrine of Priapus. The shrine sacrum (16.3; 17.8, quod in sacello Priapi vidistis) is expressly said to be before, ante, the crypta, and so the crypta might well be written Crypta. The phrase ante Cryptam is therefore a specification of where the shrine of Priapus is located and not a reference to the shrine itself. The singular in sacrum, "shrine" (here only in the Sat.), shows that the word does not denote "sacred rites" or "worship" (something which could be performed outside a shrine, if the crypta were the shrine itself), for which Petronius always uses the plural sacra.284

Now, the urbs Graeca is definitely on one or the other side of the important landmark Crypta Neapolitana and the boys came upon the cult somewhere outside the city where a rusticus found Encolpius's shirt in solitudine. If we add to this the observation that the word crypta is a rather obscure architectural term, and that it is demonstrable that the Crypta Neapolitana did feature in an episode of the Satyricon,285 which necessarily was attached to the extant episode in the urbs Graeca, it seems that the phrase ante Cryptam is most naturally taken as a reference to the famous tunnel between Neapolis and Puteoli. Indeed, the reference, in 16.3, to an unspecified Crypta would be highly problematic, if the Crypta Neapolitana was not intended. Moreover, if the Greek city is Naples (truly the only urbs Graeca of the possible candidates) it would be redundant to refer to the tunnel there in

284The early commentary of Janus Sousa, likewise, located the sacrum of Priapus before the Crypta Neapolitana, and identified the urbs Graeca as Neapolis (Burmann (1743), 2: 9f).

285From the glossary of Dionysius comes Fr. 16, Petronius "satis constaret eos nisi inclinatos non solere transire Cryptam Neapolitanam".
full as *Crypta Neapolitana*, since any mention of it simply as the *Crypta* would be immediately understood. The *sacellum Priapi* accordingly stood by the road before the entrance to this tunnel (whether any such place existed in reality does not matter), probably on the Neapolitan side.

Either Quartilla went to the city on the same side of the tunnel as her *sacellum* or she went through the tunnel to the other side (less likely because of 17.5, *nostra regio*). Whichever we choose to believe, there is need for one city only. Paratore did his best to refute Sgobbo's thesis three years after it was first presented;\(^{286}\) nevertheless it still seemed plausible to Sullivan in 1968, who felt that "the Quartilla episode (12-26.6) [was] very much out of place",\(^ {287}\) and is still regarded by Schmeling as the leading hypothesis.\(^ {288}\) In my opinion, the difficulties caused by the traditional order of the fragments have been greatly exaggerated. Let us now go through this part of the narrative in some detail to show that it is after all possible to make sense of the fragments.

The encounter with Agamemnon at the school and the invitation to dinner (10.6) fall in the morning\(^ {289}\) of the first day of the young men's stay in the city, which is completely new to them (6.3, *nec quod stabulum esset sciebam*; 11.1, *cum errarem*). Encolpius and Ascytlos meet Giton again at the lodging house around lunch time (9.2, *prandium*), and the invitation to dinner is scheduled that evening (10.6, *hodie*). Despite their quarrel, the boys

\(^{286}\)Paratore (1933), 1:155-158.

\(^{287}\)Sullivan (1968), 35.

\(^{288}\)Schmeling (1996a), 463, claims that the Quartilla episode (16-26) "is generally believed to be out of place and to precede the opening scene with Agamemnon."

\(^{289}\)The regular hours for school activities in the Greco-Roman world.
postpone the break-up of their friendship until the day after (10.6, cras), so as not to be deprived of the dinner, since they are hungry (10.1, fame morirer) and penniless (14.3). In the afternoon (12.1, deficiente iam die; obscuritas temporis) they go to the forum hoping to sell the stolen pallium (12.2). By surprise they regain their lost treasure, sown into the shirt of Encolpius, and can now at last buy something to eat. When they happily return to their lodgings Giton prepares dinner for them and they stuff themselves with food (16.1, nos implevimus cena). No sooner had they eaten (16.1, ut primum), than the woman from the market scene just before (16.3, paulo ante)\(^{290}\) shows up at their lodgings and identifies herself as the maid of Quartilla. Next, the priestess herself, leaving the sacrum or sacellum of Priapus, where the young men surprised her on a previous night (17.7, nocte; 17.9, nocturnas religiones), arrives at their lodgings (16.4, ipsa venit in stabulum; 17.6, huc venisse), in the same area (16.4, suam regionem; 17.5, nostra regio). At first she is polite and merely pleads with them to be silent about what happened and what they saw and to help her overcome her tertian fever according to the remedies revealed to her by Priapus in a dream, but when Encolpius shows himself most ready to please her, the women's mood suddenly changes and they become threatening (18.7-19.1). Quartilla announces that she has taken control over the lodging house and is keeping out all visitors (19.2, vetui) for the rest of that day (19.2,odie). The boys prepare to fight assuming their gender, if nothing else, will secure them victory. Something upsets their calculations (19.6).\(^{291}\) Encolpius expects death, and begs for a speedy execution (20.1). Psyche spreads a mat on the floor and tries to stimulate his oversized inguina to no effect (20.2). The boys' feet and hands are tied (20.4), and thus they were perhaps carried back to the scene of the crime, to the

\(^{290}\) I retain the connecting phrase (16.3) considered by Müller to be a "gloss".

\(^{291}\) Most likely Quartilla's auxiliary forces: 18.5, parata erat in cras tinum turba.
sacellum of Priapus, where Quartilla lives, in the same manner that her colleague Oenothea in Croton has her home (137.3, domicilium meum) in the—admittedly less grand—cella sacerdotis (134.3) of the templum (136.7) of Priapus in Croton. We note in a later reference to Pannychis the temporal primum, "the first time" (25.2, ea ipsa quae primum cum Quartilla in cellam venerat nostram), which would not be needed had the company not moved from the stabulum to the sacellum Priapi. Not much needs to be missing here for describing the move to the other location, because Encolpius's narrative transitions are usually precipitous.

Suddenly, however, we are in the middle of a sympotic setting and it appears that we have missed some (erotic?) stories that were told (20.5; more on this below), and therefore a considerable amount of text may be missing in this most fragmentary part of the episode (19.6-21.3). The boys have now left the stabulum (16.4) or deversorium (19.2), which is not alluded to again in the episode. The sacellum, due to its location outside the city, would be ideal for keeping hostages for there would be no one near to hear them scream (21.1, volebamus miseri ex clamare, sed nec in auxilio erat quisquam). Here

292 Other references to temples in Priapic sources include, sacellum (Priapea 14.2; Appendix Verg. Pr. 3.8), aedicla (CIL 5.3634), templu (CIL 5.2803).

293 Müller marks the clause with square brackets as an interpolation, but the text is no less sound here than in 16.3 and other similar cross-references, which are necessary to preclude confusion, when the narrative gets complicated.

294 One short sentence usually does the trick: 11.1, in cellulum redii; 12.1, veniebamus in forum; 15.8, in deversorium praecepites abimus; 82.1, in publicum prosilio furentisque more omnes circumeo porticus; 90.2, subsecutus fugientem ad litus perveni; 91.3, raptimque in hospitium meum pervolo; 116.1, momento temporis in montem sudantes conscendimus;
Encolpius comes close to overdosing on the aphrodisiac satyrion,295 whose properties make even Quartilla sexy in his eyes (20.7). The boys are then tortured, mounted by a cinaedus and made to swear not to tell the frightful secret of the cult (21.3, tam horribilem secretum). Next they are rubbed down by masseurs and led into the adjacent cella (21.5, proximam cellam), which has been arranged as a luxurious triclinium (22.3, 25.3) with silverware (22.3) and a family of servants (22.2). They are treated to fine food and Falernian wine. When they are about to fall asleep, Quartilla reminds them that they are attending a pervigilium for Priapus and thus demands that they stay awake (21.7). More torture and sexual exploitation ensue and finally the whole household falls asleep out of sheer exhaustion (22.1-3).

Syrian burglars try to steal a silver lagoena (large jar with handles) and unwittingly wake up the revelers. It is still night, and the butler adds more oil to the dying lamps (22.6, tricliniarches [...] lucernis occidentibus oleum infuderat). The party continues (23.1, refectum est convivium). Musical entertainment is provided by a cymbalistria (23.1). Quartilla invites the revelers to begin drinking again and orders a "bedclimber" (24.1,

---

295 According to Pliny (Nat. 26.96f., 128) the Greek word satyrion is a general term for plants with aphrodisiac properties. The roots or seeds of these plants have phallic shapes or resemble testicles. One type with a testicle-shaped root causes erections if taken in the milk of a farm-yard sheep, but makes erections subside if taken in water. Another type arouses sexual desire if the root is merely held in the hand, but is more potent if taken in dry wine. Yet another can stimulate if carried on one’s person. Pliny cites Theophrastus, a weighty authority in botanical matters, on the anecdote that the touch of an unspecified brand of satyrion provoked seventy successive copulations.
embasicoetas) for Encolpius, who knows this name for a specific type of drinking cup. 296 Instead, a cinaedus enters, who was "obviously worthy of that house" (23.2, et plane illa domo dignus). This person delivers a poem in the Sotadean meter and then climbs into bed with Encolpius and tries in vain to have sex with him. When Encolpius tearfully complains about his treatment, Quartilla mocks him for his supposed lack of urbanitas, i.e., for not knowing that "bedclimber" is a cinaedus. 297 Encolpius now wishes that the thing be given to Ascytlos as well. At this Giton cracks up, and Quartilla seems to take an interest in him for the first time. 298 To Encolpius's dislike she fondles his vasculum and plans to have it as an erotic appetizer the day after, since she has already had something bigger that day (24.7, belle cras in promulside libidinis nostrae militabit; Hodie enim post asellum diaria non sumo; cf. 20.7). The maid proposes to let the boy Giton devirginare (25.1) the young girl Pannychis, and this fine idea is immediately put into practice. Finally, after spending most of the night at Quartilla's, the boys somehow escape and make it to their beds at the lodging house where they spend the rest of this long and wakeful night (26.6, abiecti in lectis sine metu reliquam exegimus noctem). They have provided the remedium they were asked for and thus they can put aside fear for the moment.

296 embasicoetas, (-ae) [ <Gk. ἐμβασικοίτας (ἐμβαίνω + κοίτη)] is an obscure Greek term for a specific type of drinking cup (Ath. 11.469a, τὸ καλοῦμενον ποτήριον ἐμβασικοίταν), which according to the name seems to be intended for drinking in bed.

297 The OLD (ad verb.) assumes, on the basis of the Satyricon, that cinaedus is the primary meaning, but the TLL (ad verb.) correctly explains this sense as derived from a playful interpretation of such a strange name for a drinking cup.

298 When Giton first laughed (20.8), the virguncula was said to have put her arm around his neck and kissed him "numberless" kisses. Giton characteristically made no attempt to resist her amorous advances.
The mysterious third day arrives (26.7, *venerat iam tertius dies, id est expectatio liberae cænae*). As Ciaffi has explained the *tertius dies* can only have reference to the much feared tertian fever of Quartilla. According to A. Cornelius Celsus, tertian fever is so called because a second attack may be expected on the third day *(expectandus est dies)*.

299This is where H begins, probably because a new book began here, since it is common in long epic and prose narratives to use such temporal shifts to mark the breaks between books. In Fr. Vb [Müller]—derived from Boethius’s commentary on Prophry’s Εἰσαγωγή to Aristotle’s * Categoriae*—we find: et ego: “faciam inquam "libentissime. sed quoniam iam matutinus, ut ait Petronius, sol tectis arrisit, surgamus, et si quid illud est, diligentiores postea consideracione tractabitur." Cf. Apul. *Met.* 2.1, *Ut primum nocte discussa sol novus diem fecit et somno simul emersus et lectulo; 3.1, Commodum punicantibus phaleris Aurora roseum quatiens lacertum caelum inequitabat, et me secures quieti revulsum nox diei reddidit; 7.1, Ut primum tenbris abiectis dies inalbebat et candidum solis curriculum cuncta consilistrabat, quidam de numero latronum peruenit; 10.1, *Die sequenti* [...]. The fragment from Boethius comes at the very end of a book and looks forward to a new beginning, which strongly suggests that the Petronian passage being referred to had a similar place in the original and that at least one other book of the *Satyrice* (beside the one which began with the *Cena*) had the same formulaic opening. This is important for our present argument because it shows that the copyist who is responsible for H, and who we may assume was working with the complete text, did not begin with *venerat iam tertius dies, id est expectatio liberae cænae* because he thought that *libera cena* referred to the dinner at Trimalchio’s. He began so because the book containing the *Cena* began with those words.

300Ciaffi (1955), 40.

301The encyclopedist and contemporary of Tiberius, whose eight preserved books are all on medicine, and constitute the most important source for our knowledge of ancient medicine after Hippocrates.
tertius).\textsuperscript{302} It is this tertian attack which Quartilla fears, or pretends to fear (17.7, ipsa quidem illa nocte vexata tam periculoso inhorruir frigore ut tertiana etiam impetum timeam), and it is the orgiastic remedy prescribed by Priapus in a dream, which provides her with a pretext for the detainment and sexual exploitation of the boys. The motif of the "love fever" as a physical sickness, of course, is too well known from the sentimental novels to require specific examples. The night referred to in 17.7 (illa nocte), is therefore the night before the first day in the urbs Graeca, since by inclusive reckoning the impetus of the tertian fever would be expected to fall on the second day after the fever is first felt. This shows that we have not lost an entire day, or even more, somewhere in the fragments, as has often been assumed.\textsuperscript{303} It also shows that the Cena takes place on the second day of the boys' stay in the urbs Graeca and not on the third day.

\textsuperscript{302}Cels. 3.5.2, quamuis unam accessionem secuta integritas est, tamen quia tertiana timeri potest, expectandus est dies tertius.

\textsuperscript{303}Which is not to say that much text may not be lost. The whole of the Cena, a third of the extant work, covers only one dinner-party, and in the Quartilla episode there seems to have been entertainment over dinner in the form of erotic story-telling, chatting and/or more performances like the poetry delivered by the cinaedus (20.5, iam deficiente fabularum contextu; note the plural in fabulae and the metaphor of weaving in contextu, which indicate a series of stories or speeches). In similar situations at Trimalchio's, and on the ship, stories, speeches and performances are referred to as fabulae: 37.1, longe accersere fabulas coepi; 39.1, interpellavit tam dulces fabulas; 42.1, excepit Seleucus fabulae partem; 47.1, eiusmodi fabulae vibrabant; 59.3, scitis quam fabulum agant; 61.5, talem fabulum exorsus est; 110.6, ne sileret sine fabulis hilaritas; 113.1, risu excepte fabulam nautae. The gap between 20.4 (where the boys are tied up) and 20.5 (were the context of fabulae is said to have been broken) may be considerable. The presence of a gap there supports my assumption that the boys were tied up in order that they might be carried to another location and that the transition from the lodging house to the quarters of the
The boys wake up late since they are soon off to the baths. Although they have been forced to provide Quartilla with a "remedy" to counter the expected tertian attack, they do not know whether it has worked (unlikely considering the sexual nature of Quartilla's fever). Whatever *libera cena* was intended to signify, it certainly does not mean "a free dinner" or "a meal free of cost", for the Latin word *liber* did not have such modern economic connotations. More to the point would be a final dinner at Quartilla's, the dinner of their promised liberty, or a dinner which she has promised would be free of the captivity and harassment they had just suffered (26.7, *tot vulneribus confossis*; cf. 22.1 and 2, *tot malis*). We recall that Quartilla had expressed plans for enjoying Giton the day after (24.7), an intention no doubt particularly upsetting to Encolpius and enough to make him want to escape at all costs. Thus the narrator might be displaying his characteristic irony by referring to the feared next encounter in Quartilla's euphemistic terms. The word *quies*, however, refers to the waiting (*expectatio*) until the *libera cena*, and not to the cena itself which evokes the image of stormy clouds gathering on the horizon (26.8, *praesentem procellam*). The boys themselves now seem as apprehensive about the onset of the *tertianae* priestess came here. Beyond the transition, the accommodation in the new location and the early part of the party are therefore missing.

---

304 Puccioni (1972), 323-26, argues differently and reads *liber=gratuitus* on the basis of *aedes liberae* (Liv. 30.17.14, 35.23.11). But as Puccioni himself acknowledges this meaning of *liber* is nowhere else attested, does not stand with *cena*, and seems to belong to an archaic diplomatic formula.

305 Trimalchio says of his slaves, whom he is promising freedom: *cito aquam liberam gustabunt* (71.1). The promise of liberty is a carrot used to motivate slaves in their work. The boys' wretched fortune often makes them as vulnerable as slaves. See also *TLL*, *ad verb*. 
impetus as seemed the priestess herself, for they even deem preferable the hazards of fleeing from the city to a much needed rest (26.7, fuga magis placebat quam quies). But just like their plans to go to the first dinner-party (as they had promised Agamemnon) were interrupted, they never attend the “dinner of liberty” either, because while they are gloomily deliberating (26.8, cum maesti delibermus) what stratagem they can employ to shun the oncoming storm (26.8, quonam genere [sc. evitandi] prae sentem evitarem us procellam), they are distracted by a character coming from the episode before the pervigilium Priapi who offers them a different kind of escape. The slave of Agamemnon seems surprised and irritated at their not knowing at whose place today's party will be (26.9, “quid vos” inquit "nescitis, hodie apud quem fiat?”), and he immediately sets their thoughts and actions onto a new course, making them forget the threat from Quartilla (26.10, amicumur ergo diligenter obliti omnium malorum). Agamemnon seems to have sent his slave to fetch them, because they didn't show up the day before as they had promised. The rhetorician has taken the boys under his protection and wants to take them along to more than one party. In Horatian terms they are his umbrae or the companions of a properly invited guest, Agamemnon himself.\(^{306}\) The word hodie (26.9) clearly sets Trimalchio's dinner apart from the other dinner of the day before. From their reactions it is evident that the boys have never heard of Trimalchio before, and were not considering the possibility that Agamemnon might procure another dinner invitation so soon, which shows that even if we agree with Sgobbo in transfering the Quartilla episode, we simply cannot identify the first invitation to dinner (10.6) with the dinner at Trimalchio's.

\(^{306}\) Hor. S. 2.8.21-2, cum Servilio Balatro / Vibidius, quos Maecenas adduxerat umbras; Ep.1.5.28, locus est et pluribus umbris.
There may be some points in this interpretation that others would settle differently, but on the whole it shows that the episode is sufficiently intelligible. What is more important, it sits well where it is and its components require no reordering. Considering the gaps in the text and the nightmare quality of the orgy, it would be unreasonable to expect complete intelligibility of this part of the narrative.
CHAPTER THREE
RECONSTRUCTION: RETROSPECTIVE SOLILOQUIES AND DIALOGUES

In the oldest of the extant Greek romances, those of Chariton (first century C.E.) and Achilles Tatius (second century C.E.) a common motif is the stepping aside of the hero or heroine to utter an emotionally charged statement containing a retrospective survey of fateful events thus far unfolded. In Chaereas and Callirhoe, such outbursts (mostly Callirhoe's) take the form of soliloquies, prayers and dialogues with other characters, and tend to focus on the turning points of the story (the festival of Aphrodite and the wedding, Callirhoe's scheintod, the robbing of the tomb, the voyage to Ionia and her sale to the new husband). 307 In Leucippe and Clitophon, most of which is a personal narrative like the Satyricon, this narrative figure is common as well. There the enumeration of former evils leads up to the present moment which is regarded as the definitive culmination. 308 As a rule the recapitulations in the fully extant erotic fictions are reliable and they summarize the events that have gone before.

As Richard Heinze was the first to show, the extant Satyricon, too, has a few such retrospective passages, 309 which were surely important in the full-text original, but have

307Chariton 1.8.3-4, 1.14.5-10, 3.8.9 (prayer to Aphrodite), 3.10.4-8, 4.1.11-12, 4.3.10 (dialogue), 5.1.4-7, 5.5.2-4, 5.10.6-9, 6.2.8-11 (dialogue), 6.6.2-5, 7.5.2-5. See Hägg (1971), 262, for detailed analysis.

308Ach. Tat. 3.16.3-5, 4.9.5, 5.7.8-9, 5.11.1-2, 5.25.2-8, 7.5. Hägg (1971), 283.

309Heinze (1899), 514.
taken on added importance for us the readers of the fragments because they help us in reconstructing the story in the missing parts of the work. Although scholars have lately tried to minimize the significance of these retrospective allusions, there is no reason to assume that they are any less reliable in the *Satyricon* than in other ancient erotic fictions. Read carefully they indeed make good sense and complement the picture that we have already constructed on the basis of external fragments and the geography of the story. The first such passage comes early in the extant fragments and has the form of a dialogue, or more specifically a shouting-match, between Encolpius and his newly found, and soon to be lost, friend Ascyltos. Here it is Ascyltos, rather than Encolpius himself, who provides information about some of the hero’s past crimes and humiliations. As we will see, Ascyltos only knows about those recent adventures which they have experienced together (80.8, *carissimum sibi commilitonem fortunaeque etiam similitudine parem*).

The reader will recall the incident as narrated. While Encolpius had been listening to Agamemnon’s poetic rendering of the ideal education, he had suddenly noticed that Ascyltos had snuck away. Ever fearful of rivals for the pleasures afforded by Giton he had immediately set off after his friend but had not been able to find his way back to the lodging-house, being unfamiliar with the city. Eventually, he had been tricked into a brothel by “an urbane old lady”, where he by chance had run into Ascyltos, who told him that he too had been lost but had been led to the *lupanar* by a gentleman who at first seemed helpful, but as it turned out had only wanted to hire him for sex. After escaping from the brothel Encolpius finally finds his way to the guest-house when he glimpses Giton standing in a street. No sooner are the “brothers” reunited than Giton starts crying. Under pressure from Encolpius, he reluctantly tells of how Ascyltos had arrived in a haste a little earlier and had attempted to rape him. Hearing his worst suspicions confirmed, Encolpius is enraged
and points his fingers into Ascyltos's face demanding an explanation. Let us now print their important quarrel in full (9.6-10.3):

"quid dicis" inquam "muliebris patientiae scortum cuius ne spiritus purus est?"
inhorrescere se finxit Ascyltos, mox sublatis fortius manibus longe maiore
nisu clamavit: "non taces" inquit "gladiator obscene, quem de ruina harena
dimisit? non taces, nocturne percussor, qui ne tum quidem, cum fortiter
faceres, cum pura muliere pugnasti, cuius eadem ratione in viridario frater fui
qua nunc in deversorio puer est?" "subduxisti te" inquam "a praeceptoris
colloquio." "quid ego, homo stultissime, facere debui cum fame morerer? an
videlicet audirem sententias, id est vitrea fracta et somniorum interpretamenta?
multo me turpior es tu hercule, qui ut foris cenas poetam laudasti."

itaque ex turpissima lite in risum diffusi pacatius ad reliqua secessimus.

"So!—I said—what have you to say for yourself, you prostitute, submissive
as a woman, whose breath is not even pure?—Ascyltos first pretended to be
shocked, but then came on more aggressively raising his fists and yelling with
considerably more vehemence: Won't you shut up, you filthy gladiator, whom
the amphitheater dismissed when it collapsed? Won't you shut up, you night-
time assassin, who then, when you where at your strongest, weren't even a
match for a decent woman, whose brother I was in the same sense in the
garden that the boy is now in the lodging-house?—You sneaked away from
the colloquium with our instructor, I added.—What was I supposed to do, you
stupidest of all men, when I was dying of hunger? Should I perhaps have
listened to his rhetoric, nothing but broken bottles and dream interpretations?
By Hercules, you're much baser than I, you flatter the poet to get an invitation
to dinner.

So out of this completely disgraceful quarrel we dissolved into laughter and
backed off for a more peaceful remainder."

We can begin our analysis of the passage by noting that Encolpius appears to have
concealed from Ascyltos the nature of his love relationship with Giton, perhaps as a part of
some ploy to keep the other from developing designs against the boy's chastity, but more likely because Ascytlos himself had been Encolpius's lover in the viridarium, as emerges from the passage. Encolpius now demands an explanation from his friend as to why he, who before has submitted to penetration and whose breath isn't even pure (from having engaged in fellatio), is now posing as a dominant male and trying to rape Giton. After having made his young self utter this accusation, the narrator then supplies the information that Ascytlos was not truly offended by the accusation, although he found it convenient at the moment to fake indignation (inhorrescere se finxit).

Accordingly, Ascytlos's even louder answer does not seek to offer a defense against the assault on his virility, but instead aims at dragging Encolpius down with him, and demonstrating that he is in no position to criticize, or even to speak (note the repeated and angry "non taces"), since he too is seriously lacking in virility. The logic of Ascytlos's counterattack on Encolpius's virility is not the accusation of impotence that some have thought (that condition comes as a great surprise to the characters as late as the Croton episode) but seems instead to appeal to a more general definition of the dominant male as someone who displays military prowess and has sex with a "pure woman". An obvious analogy is drawn between fighting, or stabbing, and sexually penetrating. The phrase, "pure woman", picks up the quality of the "pure breath", spiritus purus, which is what Ascytlos supposedly lacked. A "pure woman" seems therefore to be mainly a woman who does not engage in fellatio and by implication in other "dirty" sexual activities. In

---

310 The use of purus or impurus to denote this specific type of defilement is attested, beside the above passage, in several poems of Martial. Adams (1982), 199, provides further examples. Soverini (1976), 99-107, rightly stresses the importance of the interpretation of purus, but his argument is unnecessarily marred by his anachronistic insistance that the boys are accusing each other of "homosexuality". In fact, Encolpius
principle, then, the dominant male here earns his reputation for sexual virility primarily by engaging in vaginal intercourse.

In the sexual department, therefore, Encolpius's dominance ("cum fortiter faceres"), over Ascytlos in the *viridarium* and Giton in the *deversorium*, fail to qualify him as a dominant male, since buggery does not really register in this respect. His exploits in the military department (as an obscene gladiator rejected by the amphitheater and as a night-time assassin) are likewise found to be very much lacking in manliness. By thus applying a positive standard of virility, instead of the negative definition employed by Encolpius ("you are sexually submissive and therefore not virile"), Ascytlos puts a different rhetorical colour on the facts of the case and argues that Encolpius cannot criticize another for lacking a virtue he does not possess himself. Encolpius says no more about the issue and thus implicitly acknowledges that his case has been destroyed.

Encolpius, however, does not give up completely, and now accuses his friend of having deliberately sneaked away from their instructor. The charge is that Ascytlos did so with the intention of catching Giton alone in the guest-house to sexually abuse him. Ostensibly, this goes to show that he would prefer the pleasures of buggery to his own literary edification. Again Ascytlos interrupts Encolpius before he can make an explicit case and claims a legitimate reason for leaving: he was dying of hunger. He then mounts a counter-attack and reminds Encolpius of his motives in staying to listen to Agamemnon: he was dishonestly praising bad poetry in order to earn an invitation to dinner. At this blow, accuses Ascytlos only of not being dominant, but submissive like a female whore, to the point of engaging in *fellatio*. In the Roman discourse on sexuality a distinction between "homosexuality" and "heterosexuality" did not have the fundamental importance that it seems to have in modern sexual vocabulary; see Williams (1992).
Encolpius is outwitted and all he can do is to laugh in embarrassment at having been seen through. Ascyltos, who has won the argument with the help of his quick wit, joins him in the laughter.

It has been necessary to offer in some detail an explication of the crude logic of this quarrel as a preliminary to using the information it contains for the reconstruction of the story. If I am right that the phrases "gladiator obscene" and "nocturne percussor" are used by Ascyltos to demonstrate Encolpius's lack of military prowess, the fact that Encolpius fully accepts these examples demands that there be a factual basis behind them. The narrative, therefore, at some point told of Encolpius as some sort of gladiator, "an obscene gladiator", who was however rejected by the (h)arena, or amphitheater, in relation with its collapse (quem de ruina harena dimisit).

The words, de ruina, have unnecessarily troubled editors.\textsuperscript{311} The preposition, de, can either have a temporal ("following from", "after"), or a causal ("on account of") sense here.\textsuperscript{312} At least one collapsed amphitheater is known from contemporary history. According to Suetonius (\textit{Tib.} 40) twenty thousand people died in the reign of Tiberius when the amphitheater at Fidenae just north of Rome collapsed during a gladiatorial

\textsuperscript{311}The \textit{editio Tornaesiana} alone of the textual witnesses prints an asterisk between de and ruina, and Bücheler concurs with it by indicating a lacuna. Nodot had tried to improve upon the passage by supplying the words \textit{hospitis homicidam} after quem; based on 81.3. Müller (1983) prints de ruina between daggers. Ernout, on the other hand, accepted the unproblematic text of \textit{codex Leidensis}.

\textsuperscript{312}Burris (1941), 276, provides a defense for the Latinity of the expression: "[t]he preposition \textit{de} is used in all periods of Latin literature in the sense "as a result of, because of"."
show. The disaster entered the collective memory (Suet. Cal. 31). The gladiatorial ludus in Pompeii is known to have been destroyed in an earthquake in 62 B.C.E. That Ascyltos has knowledge of the disgraceful gladiatorial experience of Encolpius indicates that the incident belongs to that part of the story in which Ascyltos played a part. Accordingly, the episode was set in Campania. As we will see further on there is indication that an earthquake caused the collapse of the building. Campania's reputation as a seismically active region would provide a sufficient excuse for presenting such a story, and even if no comparable incident had actually been known to have happened, it could nevertheless sound credible as the sort of thing that might well happen in that area. The Fidenae incident and the one at Pompeii had proven that such disasters could happen.

A fragment of Petronius might explain how exactly the collapse of the amphitheater caused or preceded the dismissal of Encolpius. Fulgentius in his treatise on the contents of Virgil's works makes a note of an unusual word, *aumatium*, meaning "a private place in public as in theaters or in a circus", and he goes on to quote this phrase from the original

---

313 Suet. *Tib.* 40, *supra viginti hominum milia gladiatorio munere amphitheatru ruina perierant*. Bagnani (1956), 25f., connected the incident to the story of Petronius but because he was arguing that Ascyltos's address of Encolpius as *gladiator obscene* was merely a general term of abuse and not a reference to a lost episode in the work he used the association with the disaster at Fidenae to hypothesize an unattested expression of abuse, *gladiator Atilianus* (the freedman Atilius produced the show for the sake of profit and his parsimony was blamed for the accident). According to him then "[t]he general meaning of the remark of Ascyltos would be: 'You lousy gladiator, whose only chance of dismissal was to be engaged by such a down-at-heel contractor that his shoddy amphitheater collapsed!"

text of the *Satyrlica*: "I hurled myself into the latrine." Such a turn of events would have given a typically humiliating spin to Encolpius escape from a grave danger. Its particular usefulness for the plot of the *Satyrlica* would be that of providing a cynical "happy ending" to the episode, i.e., the salvation of the hero by way of the destruction of others. This would be analogous to the escape from Lichas and Tryphaena through the wreckage of Lichas's ship and his drowning (114.6), and partly like the escape from Trimalchius when the vigiles break down the door of his house (78.6f.), although on that occasion casualties are not required for the boys' salvation.

We have argued above that the adjectives in the phrases, "gladiator obscene" and "nocturne percussor", have the function of degrading Encolpius's exploits in the military department. Some scholars have argued that Ascylos's language has limited or no relevance at all to the protagonist's hypothetical "criminal dossier." The general tenor of these objections relies on the assumption that either the rhetorical and abusive character of the boys' quarrel, or the sexual content, is so strong that it neutralizes any possible

315 Fr. XIII, *aumatum dicitur locum secretum publicum sicut in theatris aut in circo. unde et Petronius Arbiter ait "in aumatum memet ipsum conici".

316 Sullivan (1968), 43, made the same association between Fr. XIII and the lost gladiatorial episode.

317 The phrase is from the title of Pack (1960).

318 Thus Mulroy (1970), 225, proposes a full-blown allegorical interpretation which is entirely sexual: "Ascylos's insults are not meant literally, but rather as a figurative description of Encolpius's sex life. This is also suggested by the adjectives, *obscene* and *nocturne*. On this interpretation, the *ruina* involved is a previous collapse of Encolpius's virility. *Gladiator* and *percussor* suggest erotic exertions. *Cum fortiter faceres* refers to past
retrospective allusions. Gilbert Bagnani so argues that Asculitos is "an artist in abuse, [who] knows the force of alliteration and assonance", and who practices mere abuse and elaborate name-calling; accordingly, "one should not inquire too closely as to the exact meaning [...] of the expressions used."319 Walsh echoes Bagnani, when he speaks of "the scholastic nature of this exchange" and "the artificial nature of the controversy". According to him it is all "a charade" devoid of any realistic references.320 Roger Pack readily agrees with Bagnani "that gladiator obscene is mere abuse", although he does not think the case is thereby closed, and rightly points out that the passages in 81.3 (they will be treated below) must be accounted for before the prima facie content of Asculitos's phrases can be written off.321 Recently, Gareth Schmeling has once more urged the reader "not to accept at face

heterosexual affairs, like the one with Tryphaena (113.7). The pura mulier represents the object of competent seduction and stands in contrast with women like Tryphaena."

319Bagnani (1957), 24-5. The same scholar suggests a term, "prosopographical", for the type of invective allegedly used by Asculitos in the passage, and describes it as "the unflattering and usually imaginary description of the antagonist's career." He provides an example from Pompeian graffiti, in which the object of ridicule is first reminded of all the low professions he has practiced and still practices, and then this is topped by the following statement: si cunnun linxeris, consummaris omnia (della Corte (1954), 329). The problem with this evidence is that we do not know whether the receiver of this insult had actually done what he is accused of. For obvious reasons, insults which allude to something real, even if they put a malicious spin on the facts, are more biting.

320Walsh (1970), 87.

value that which Encolpius hands him. We disagree because on the face of it these statements are retrospective allusions, and since we have lost so much text from the original Satyrica, it may be better in principle to assume for the sake of argument that they do indeed refer to lost episodes—unless our attempts at reconstruction clearly show that we have been misled. My findings indicate that a reconstruction according to the apparently retrospective allusions in the Satyrica is less problematic than has often been thought.

It remains for us to explain what exactly Ascytlos could be referring to by calling his friend "an obscene gladiator". The first idea that comes to mind is the association with Encolpius's most significant attribute, his phallus. Lucius the narrator of the Metamorphoses, while in the form of an ass and thus no less a phallic figure than Encolpius, is sent into the arena to copulate with a condemned woman (Met. 10.34). This Apuleian episode has its direct counterpart in the Greek Ass Story. However, Encolpius is not a donkey and therefore cannot have afforded the spectacle of intercourse between an animal and a human being. A more likely and possible scenario may be that he was made to fight with a woman, an Amazon of the arena, and may have escaped from that encounter only because of the collapse of the amphitheater. Let us explore this further.

In the extant Satyrica, Echion, a guest at Trimalchio's dinner, in praising the upcoming munus given by Titus, probably that year's aedile, stresses that there will be a


323 The other phrase nocturne percussor I simply take to refer to a murder committed by Encolpius at night or at least in a secretive, non-virile manner. A sexual interpretation of the phrase would perhaps be possible in another context but here it would indicate that Encolpius was, contrary to what Ascytlos is arguing, a dominant male.

324 See Colin (1952), 315-86, for a documentation of "gladiatorial perversions".
woman fighting from a chariot, *mulier essedaria* (45.4).\(^{325}\) This passage, which is the only one on the subject in the extant text, also presents a scathing criticism of last year's games in the amphitheater, presented by one Norbanus, and especially of the weaklings then fighting in the arena. In the Quartilla episode moreover Encolpius, As cyltos and Giton line up for battle with Tryphaena, Psyche and Pannychis respectively (19.4-6). Here the language and subject-matter is military in a non-metaphorical sense.\(^{326}\) Encolpius is certainly not a soldierly type. On the contrary, he strikes other characters in his narrative as having the qualities and looks of a prostitute,\(^{327}\) and he was certainly no match for the soldier he met on that night of jealous rage when he intended to kill As cyltos and Giton (81.6-82.4). It is therefore hard to imagine that any patron of gladiatorial games would dare to present someone as unsoldierly as Encolpius to do combat with professional fighters. If, however, he was made to fight a woman gladiator, something which may have suggested the imagery of As cyltos's language ("*ne quidem cum fortiter faceres cum pura muliere pugnasti*"), although here the reference is to sexual intercourse rather than fighting in the literal sense. Encolpius, the delicate phallic youth, fighting a much stronger female warrior in the amphitheater would have provided good entertainment to please such audiences as Echion and his friends.

---

\(^{325}\)Statius reports that women and dwarfs were used as gladiators by Domitian in Rome (*Silv.* 1.6.51ff.).

\(^{326}\)The phrase, *contra nos, si nihil aliud, virilis sexus*, especially, shows that the idea of confronting Encolpius with a gladiatorial Amazon to further demonstrate his disqualification from the category of the dominant male, is present in the work.

\(^{327}\)7.2, "*hic [sc. in lupanari]" inquit "debes habitare*"; 126.1, *quia nosti venerem tuam, superbiam captas vendisque amplexus.*
Admittedly the evidence concerning the exact practices of ancient gladiatorial games are limited, but as Steven Cerutti and L. Richardson have attempted to show the *Satyricon*'s reference to "obscenity" in the amphitheater may be more specific than has often been assumed. It appears that the games in the amphitheater were not all about bloody killing but "included mock fights and slapstick duels as comic relief."\(^\text{328}\) It seems that the gladiatorial schools had more than one division; beside the part where the really virile gladiators were kept there was also a *pars obscena* (Sen. *Nat.* 7.31.3) for those who were deliberately chosen for their lack of *virilitas*. The so-called "Oxford Fragment" of Juvenal speaks with outrage of a certain type of men, similar to *cinaedi* (O3, *similesque cinaedis*), who are allowed to taint respectable households with obscene words and behaviour (O1-2, *vivit luditque professus / obscenum*), but would more appropriately be kept separate in the gladiatorial trainer's *ludus* and in a separate *cella* in his jail.\(^\text{329}\) The logic of this arrangement is hardly obscure. "It is as the opposite of this stereotype [of the virile gladiator] that we must see the *retiarius tunicatus*, a mock gladiatorial figure, of equivocal sex, regularly dressed in costume of some sort, possibly usually as a woman, and matched against a *secutor* or *murmillo* in a mock gladiatorial exhibition [...] we know that there were women gladiators, and the sight of a woman got up in body armor matched against a light-armed man in drag would surely have been a spectacle the Roman crowd would have

\(^{328}\) Cerutti and Richardson (1989), 589.

\(^{329}\) O1-13; at Juv. 6.365-6, *purior ergo tuis laribus meliorque lanista, / in cuius numero longe migrare iubetur / psillus ab eupholio; quid quod nec retia turpi / iunguntur tunicae, nec cella ponit eadem / munimenta umeri pulsatamque arma tridentem / qui nudus pugnare solet? pars ultima ludi / accipit has animas aliusque in carcere nervos.*
relished."\textsuperscript{330} Ordinarily, male gladiators fought almost naked, apart from wearing the subligaculum, which may explain the otherwise obscure reference which Encolpius makes, that beyond being of the male sex the boys' tunics were at least girt higher than the women's (19.5, \textit{sed et praecincti certe altius eramus}), when they matched themselves with Quartilla and her maids.

The sexual innuendo traditionally associated with gladiators and mock-gladiators fits the passage in the \textit{Satyricon} well and shows that the insulting language used by Ascyltos would work at least as well, if not better, if there had been a previous episode involving Encolpius's participation in an actual performance in the amphitheater. In order to explain the complicated insults exchanged between Encolpius and Ascyltos it is therefore not necessary for us to assume that the language is factually meaningless, i.e., a mere embellishment of style. In fact, insults in general are clearly more to the point if there is some real or apparently real reference behind them. If Encolpius had actually been an obscene gladiator in the arena, as Ascyltos says he had, reminding him of that fact would be a very useful way to silence him after his accusation. Even Schmeling, though the uncompromising premise of his article is that all retrospective allusions in the extant \textit{Satyricon} must be mere embellishments of language and Ascyltos's words here must be empty invective, reluctantly concedes the possibility that "in a small town [...] Encolpius had acted out the part of a \textit{gladiator}—whether in a private house, garden, or small \textit{harena}."\textsuperscript{331} In order to deal with the actual meaning of the phrases "nocturne percussor" and "viridarium", it will be necessary to introduce another important passage, this time a

\textsuperscript{330} Cerutti and Richardson (1989), 593.

\textsuperscript{331} Schmeling (1994/1995), 215. I fail to see, however, on what evidence Schmeling can claim that both the town and the \textit{harena} were "small".
genuine soliloquy, in which scholars have generally recognized similarities to the phrases so far discussed.

Let us first briefly rehearse the context. After two difficult nights in a row (the pervigilium with Quartilla and the dinner with Trimalchio), Encolpius finally had Giton all for himself, but he had been too drunk to accomplish more than kisses and soon fell asleep (79.8-9). While he was sleeping, Ascylos had taken Giton away from him and carried him off into his own cubicle. When Encolpius woke up and discovered the truth, he had first considered killing both of them, but then decided against this violent plan and merely roused Giton with a beating and demanded Ascylos's immediate departure. Already two days before he had wanted to break up the friendship with Ascylos in order to re-establish his old sexual relationship with Giton. Ascylos now agreed to leave and they had divided their spoils without mistrust, but when it came to the boy, Ascylos demanded that they split him as well. Encolpius first thought he was joking, but when Ascylos drew his sword and threatened to cut off his part of Giton, he prepared to meet him in battle. Giton, however, by pleading with them and blaming himself for all that had happened, succeeded in averting this imminent "Theban tragedy". Next, Ascylos had suggested they solve the crisis by allowing the boy himself to choose whom to follow. Encolpius agreed, trusting that his old relationship with Giton would weigh heavily in the boy's decision. Without even giving the matter much thought, Giton had chosen Ascylos and left with him. Thunderstruck and abandoned by his two friends and lovers, Encolpius collected his baggage and rented "a secret place by the shore", where he locked himself in and frequently lamented in this manner (81.3-6):

332 10.7, hanc tam praecipitem divisionem libido faciebat; iam dudum enim amoliri cupiebam custodem molestum, ut veterem cum Gitone meo rationem reducerem.
"ergo me non ruina terra potuit haurire? non iratum etiam innocentibus mare? effugi iudicium, harenæ imposui, hospitem occidi, ut inter audaciae nomina mendicus, exul, in deversorio Graecæ urbis iacerem desertus? et quis hanc mihi solitudinem imposuit? adulescens omni libidine impurus et sua quoque confessione dignus exilio, stupro liber, stupro ingenuus, cuius anni ad tesseram venierunt, quem tamquam puellam conducit etiam qui virum putavit. quid ille alter? qui tamquam die togæ Wilis stolam sipsit, qui ne vir esset a matre persuasus est, qui opus muliebre in ergastulo fecit, qui postquam conturbavit et libidinis suae solum vertit, reliquit veteris amicitiae nomen et, pro pudor, tamquam mulier secutuleia unius noctis tactu omnia vendidit. iacent nunc amatores obligati noctibus totis, et forsitan mutuis libidinibus attriti derident solitudinem meam. sed non impune. nam aut vir ego liberque non sum, aut noxio sanguine parentabo injuriae meae"
and maybe, when they are worn out from their mutual satisfaction they mock
my solitude. But not with impunity! For I'm not a man and a freeborn citizen,
if I will not avenge these insults by spilling the guilty blood."

In this passage the same underlying erotic considerations as before are easily recognizable.
Although not named, we must take Ascytlos to be the first one mentioned and Giton the
second. Ascytlos's defilement through impure sexual acts, especially *fellatio*, was the topic
of the earlier passage as well, and he is again here described as a male prostitute. It is now
Giton who is the "female" in the *ergastulum*, "the private jail", whereas earlier it was
Ascytlos who submitted to Encolpius in the *viridarium*, "the garden", although his sexual
passivity was then likened to that of Giton in the *deversorium*. The two places mentioned,
the *ergastulum* and the *viridarium*, are most likely related. As we will see further on, both
probably refer to the villa of cruel Lycurgus,\(^{334}\) which is the kind of place, a villa, which
we would typically find in Campania, and where we could easily find both a garden and a
private jail all in one. Giton and Encolpius go a long way back together (*reliquit veteris
amicitiae nomen*), whereas Ascytlos is a rival who has recently entered the picture, and now
has temporarily managed to abduct the boy from the sorry protagonist. This erotic
melodrama between the three boys exhibits few mysteries that are not readily understood.

The initial death wish, however, has caused much speculation which directly
impinges upon how much material for reconstructing lost episodes can be extracted from
the passage. Here again scholars have argued that the form somehow overpowers and
cancels out some of the content. Ever since Otto included the opening sentence of

\(^{334}\)83.6, *"at ego in societatem recepi hospitem [sc. Ascytlo] Lycurgo
crudeliorem"*; 117.3, *placeret vestis, rapinae comes, et quicquid Lycurgi villa grassantibus
praebuisset*. 
Encolpius's remorseful soliloquy ("ergo me non ruina terra potuit haurire?") in his collection of Roman Sprichwörter, the phrase has passed for "a more or less stereotyped expression." From this it has been thought to follow that the words, ruina and terra, ought not be connected with de ruina harena (9.8), despite the reappearance of (h)arena only ten words later, in "harenæ imposui", where the reference, even according to Bagnani, is "clearly autobiographical." However, to include the supposed stock-phrase in his collection, Otto was forced to separate it from its parallel phrase which is syntactically dependent upon it: "non iratum etiam innocentibus mare [sc. me potuit haurire?]") The reason why Otto did not include the whole expression is, of course, that no stock phrase is attested for the latter half—nor is any for the first half, as we shall see.

A close parallel for the latter half is found in Achilles Tatius, likewise in a soliloquy of the younger self of the narrator Clitophon (3.10.6):

\[
\text{μάτην σοι, ὦ θάλασσα, τὴν χάριν ὁμολογήσομεν· μέμφομαι σου τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ· χρηστοτέρα γέγονας πρὸς οὕς ἀπέκτεινας, ἥμις δὲ σώσασα μᾶλλον ἀπέκτεινας. ἐφθόνησας ἡμῖν ἀληστεύτους ἀποθανεῖν.}
\]

\[335\] Otto (1890), 345, v. terra (3).

\[336\] The quoted words are Bagnani's (1956), 25. Klebs (1889), 626, however, was writing too early to be influenced by Otto's work. Paratore (1933), 1:148, consequently accuses him of being naive in interpreting the phrase "ergo me non ruina terra potuit haurire?" as a reference to a lost episode.

\[337\] Note the compatibility of Ascyltos's words: 9.8, "gladiator obscene, quem de ruina harena dimisit"; and and Encolpius's statement: 81.3, "harenæ imposui".

\[338\] Bagnani (1956), 25. He accordingly concedes "a condemnation to the arena", but then hurries to add that Encolpius "was never condemned to the arena, though he would have been had he not made his escape."
"O sea, foolishly did we thank you for your mercy. Now I have only blame for your philanthropy; more useful were you to those you killed, for by saving us you have killed us twice over. You meanly refused us our death, and saved us for bandits to kill."

The reference here is to a specific voyage which ended in shipwreck. In fact, in the case of the Satyricon, too, scholars have not doubted that a specific voyage from a lost part of the work was referred to. We are, nevertheless, asked to believe that in Encolpius's opening sentences he first expresses (in a rhetorical question) the wish that he had been swallowed up by the earth in a collapse—without reference to any specific incident—and then refers to a specific incident on sea in a parallel phrase using the same grammatical construction. This seems like an overly complicated explanation.

If we take a better look at the "stock phrase" of Otto, whose origins are traced to Homer, we note that it consists of a wish for a supernatural removal of the hero from the face of the earth before he should accept to do something cowardly or shameful, and is something of a fixture in the pep-talk of epic warriors before a deadly confrontation. Being a wish, Homeric Greek uses the optative and the reference is always to the near future. In Latin, Otto quotes with a bold typeface the prime example of the epic phrase (Verg. Aen. 4.24, tellus optem prius ima dehisceat). The other Latin examples provide several variations, but none deviates from the basic wish for a supernatural intervention before

\[339\] Il. 4.182, τότε μοι χάνοι εὑρεία χθόν; 17.416, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ γαῖα μέλαινα πᾶσι χάνοι.
some disgrace happens in the future—except the Petronian passage.\textsuperscript{340} For what Encolpius says is not that he wishes for the earth to swallow him before he does something disgraceful, but that he wishes that the earth \textit{had} swallowed him \textit{in the collapse} instead of saving him for further disasters. The meaning is quite different. We are therefore entitled to wonder whether Otto was justified in including Encolpius's wish that he had not been saved at some time in the past as an example of this epic stock-phrase. Schmeling adduces Giton's words at 98.9, \textit{utinam me solum inimicus ignis hauriret vel hibernum invaderet mare}—"I wish some terrible fire would burn be up, just me, or some freezing sea would cover me", as a parallel to Encolpius's words at 81.3, and adds that van Thiel called such phrases "stereotype rhetorische Fragen", but neither statement is a rhetorical question, and the more typical future optative mode of Giton's words obviously contrasts with the past perfect tense of Encolpius's statement.\textsuperscript{341}

At issue here is not Encolpius's heroic sense of shame—he is for the most part shameless—but, as in the Achilles Tatius passage above, the pointlessness of his past salvation in the light of his continued misfortune. Unlike the other examples of the stock-phrase this one poses the question: when, exactly, was there a particularly opportune moment in the past narrative of Encolpius for him to be "swallowed up by the earth in the collapse"? We, of course, know when he could have been swallowed up by the sea; this was on his earlier voyage on the ship of Lichas. A past incident involving a collapsing amphitheater would certainly provide us with a specific moment to serve as a parallel for the

\textsuperscript{340}Otto lists one other occurrence in the past tense (Ov. \textit{Ep.} 6.144, \textit{"hiscere nempe tibi terra roganda fuit"}), but in the passage Hypsipyle is addressing Jason and recalling a specific moment in the past when he should have wished for the earth to swallow him.

other element. How else are we to account for the mysterious word *ruina*? To wish that "the earth swallow one up in the collapse," is hardly a formulaic turn of phrase.\(^{342}\) There may well be in Encolpius's words a play on the epic cliché, but the resemblance is no more than superficial, and the adaptation of the collapsing amphitheater to the paradigm of the gaping earth is certainly a bit forced.\(^{343}\)

*Haurire* seems a singularly inappropriate substitute for the Vergilian *dehiscere*, and is obviously better suited to *mare* in the latter half of the sentence, than *terra*. Since Ascytlos evidently knew about the gladiatorial adventure of Encolpius and the collapsing amphitheater, this episode must necessarily have come after the earlier voyage(s) on the ship of Lichas, since Ascytlos was not on the ship and so was introduced into the story after the first voyage(s) and before the last one. Therefore we can conclude that in Encolpius's soliloquy the collapse of the amphitheater in an earthquake, and the storm at sea, appear in an inverse temporal sequence. This may be due to a deliberate affectation of a similarity with the epic cliché. In this order Encolpius can start with something which has a superficial resemblance with the stock phrase. I can see no compelling reason to preclude the possibility that these retrospective statements regard episodes not found in the extant fragmented text of the *Satyricon*.

---

\(^{342}\)Bagnani (1956), 25, claims that *"ruina terra haurire is a more or less stereotyped expression equivalent to our own 'would the earth had swallowed me up'"*, but this modern idiom, which I have been told does indeed exist, is hardly reliable evidence for Latin usage in the first century C.E.

\(^{343}\)I have found no examples of *ruina* used with *terra* to denote the gaping of the earth, as in the epic stock-phrase. *Ruina* properly denotes "fall" or "collapse" and is most common in references to collapsing buildings and ruined cities: *Sat.* 115.16, *illum diis vota reddentem penatum suorum ruina sepelit*; *Suet.* *Tib.* 40, *supra viginti hominum milia gladiatorio munere amphitheatris ruina perierant*.
In the light of his present abandonment, Encolpius muses that his two miraculous salvations from the brink of disaster, first on sea and then on land, have been completely in vain. But he also lists two more narrow escapes and one murder that have ultimately brought him nothing but loneliness and excommunication. In a rhetorical question he asks: "Have I escaped trial, have I cheated the amphitheater, have I killed my host, so as to lie amid suspicions of delinquency, poor as a beggar, an exile abandoned in the lodginghouse of a Greek city?" The answer required by this rhetorical question is, of course, negative. Moreover, since the opposite of being left alone by Ascytlos and Giton—this is what provokes the state he is in and is emphasized in the passage—is being with Ascytlos and Giton, Encolpius seems to be claiming that the impudent acts he has committed were motivated by a desire to be in their company. Now we know that he has been trying to get rid of Ascytlos to be alone with Giton, and so it is not the loss of Ascytlos which is bothering him, but the loss of Giton his old passion.

This interpretation is less forced than Mulroy's, who answers the question: "Did I escape judgment, cheat the arena, murder my host, so as to lie with a reputation for audacity, a beggar, an exile, deserted in an inn in a Greek city?", thus: "No, I have committed no such crimes. I am the innocent victim of unrequited love." Mulroy identifies correctly that Encolpius is primarily blaming Giton for what he has gone through. As the "victim of unrequited love" he may have some excuse, but this certainly does not show that he didn't do what he indeed claims to have done. The general thrust of Encolpius's story is his desire to have Giton all for himself. In so doing he has exiled himself from his city, won enemies, and accumulated a "criminal dossier". When the boy

344 Mulroy (1970), 255.
then chooses on his own to leave him for Ascyltos, Encolpius is left to face the enormity of his many-faceted isolation.

If we find it difficult to believe Encolpius capable of killing somebody, we should remember that he ends this very soliloquy by deciding to kill both Giton and Ascyltos, which is the second time he entertains the idea (cf. 79.10). Encolpius's character certainly has the necessary violent streak (96.1-4). That the comic plot of the *Satyrical* would allow someone to actually die is clear from Lichas's death at sea, while he pleads with Encolpius to return the sacred objects that he had stolen (114.5-6). On the whole, the law of the genre is not at all averse to killing off minor characters, especially those who pose obstacles to the uniting of the lovers, and could otherwise obstruct the continuation of the adventurous plot. The fully extant ancient erotic fictions are replete with violence and death. Moreover, as we have seen from the story of Hippothous and other examples (e.g., Thuc. 6.45; Parthenios 7), actually assassinating one's rival—-and not just fantasizing about it—-seems to be a well known motif in ancient erotic tales of two boys in love.

We now need to connect our findings here with our previous geographical re-mapping of the plot of the *Satyrical* to establish where exactly on the route south it was that Encolpius played the gladiator, escaped trial, and killed his host. According to the fragment of Servius (Fr. 1), Encolpius was exiled, not for any crime committed by him, but because he volunteered to play the scapegoat in return for being fed for a whole year at public expense. He seems therefore to have boarded the ship simply as a humiliated exile and as such was merely *en route* to a new city where he could take up habitation, most likely in Tarentum, the final destination of Lichas's ship. But Tryphaena's monopoly of Giton becomes intolerable for him, and so he impulsively decides to flee from the ship. As we have seen earlier this is most likely to have been in a harbour somewhere south of Baiae and
north of Neapolis, since Tryphaena mentions Baiae in connection with the boys’ escape (104.2), and because the boys are thunderstruck at discovering that in Neapolis they have again boarded Lichas’s ship (100.3ff.), which therefore cannot be the same city where they left it. Since Puteoli had a big harbour, came earlier on the route from Massilia than Neapolis, but later than Baiae, and was close enough to Neapolis for the boys to have moved on foot, this is probably where the boys ran away. Let us assume so, in any case, to see whether the reconstruction will continue to make sense if we base it on these premises. After all we are engaged in assembling something like a jig-saw puzzle, and success is measured by how many pieces find a comfortable and unforced place in the picture. The only premise that we can rely on with absolute certainty is that once there was a clear and ordered picture.

After fleeing from the ship of Lichas in the harbour of Puteoli in the company of Giton and the captain’s wife, and after stealing the robe and sistrum of the ship’s tutelary deity, Isis, Encolpius finds himself in addition to being an exile, a fugitive with his enemies chasing after him. In his efforts to get Giton way from Tryphaena, and in order to provide for the boy and himself on the run, he has embarked on a career of petty criminality by robbing the shrine on the ship. More than just theft, this was technically also sacrilege. On the whole, Encolpius is involved in the theft of no less than three garments, which need to be kept carefully separated. The first is the vestis divina (114.5) from the navigium of Lichas, the second is the tunicula ... aureis plena (13.3), which is the same as the vestis

345 Before Puteoli began to play an important commercial role, Naples had functioned as the main harbour of Campania and the city even had its own fleet (Polyb. 1.20.14, Liv. 35.16, 36.42, Appian. bell.civ. 1.89). There is, in other words, no evidence to preclude the landing of the ship of Lichas in Neapolis as well as Puteoli.
rapinae comes (117.3), with the money stolen from Lycurgi villa (117.3). The third is the raptum latrocinio pallium (12.2), taken from the sacellum Priapi (19.8) presided over by Quartilla. Two are expensive on their own and one is a rag which contains valuables.

Once off the ship, Encolpius and Giton do not seem to have gotten far in their flight. Their apprehension is alluded to in Tryphaena's conjecture, when she asks quid ergastulum interceptisset errantes—"what jail-house had intercepted the fugitives on their flight" (105.11). Although the character Tryphaena is not supposed to know at this point what really happened, she nevertheless arrives at the truth from false premises (she believes that the painted letters on the boys' foreheads are truly branded marks), for we know from a previous passage that Encolpius and Giton have in the meantime been, indeed, in an ergastulum (81.5). Such happy guesses by characters are possible for the simple reason that what is told in the story and how it is told is entirely controlled by the narrator. The pattern also requires that soon after Encolpius escaped from Lichas and Tryphaena he should fall into new captivity.

Perhaps he was caught trying to sell the vestis divina and the sistrum of Isis, in the same way that he and Ascyltos are later caught trying to sell the Priapic pallium, in a shady forum of the urbs Graeca. Somehow or other the stolen objects seem to have been discovered in the possession of the boys. In the name of divine retribution, it would seem that objects stolen from shrines and temples should normally lead to the capture of the

---

346 117.3, quicquid exigeret, dummodo placet vestis, rapinae comes, et quicquid Lycurgi villa grasseantibus praebisset. One may wonder how it came through the shipwreck, but this may be asking for too much verisimilitude from this adventurous plot. Encolpius has at least not complained of poverty since he recovered the shirt with the golden coins in the market scene, and although Ascyltos would presumably have received half, there could still be enough left to give Eumolpus the appearance of affluence.
thieves. Fragment XII, *tot regum manubies penes fugitivum repertae*—"so many regal spoils discovered in the possession of escapees" may well refer to this. The word *manubies*, or *manubiae*, which caught the eye of Fulgentius, and so led to the preservation of Fragment XII, is, indeed, used by Encolpius for the spoils that he and Ascytlos divide between themselves when they split company (79.12). When Encolpius boards again the ship of Lichas, the captain at least seems to think that the boy still possesses the objects he stole from the ship.

Foremost in Encolpius's enumeration of his exploits, which we may take to be in a temporal sequence, comes his escape from trial (81.3, *effugi iudicium*). The hyperbolic and accusatory style of Fragment XII leads us to think that these may be the words of Encolpius's prosecutor at this trial. The obvious exaggeration in the phrase "so many regal spoils" seems to be designed for the sake of rhetorical effect. The name of the prosecutor may even be provided by another of Fulgentius's fragments of the *Satyrlica*. According to

---

347 In Apuleus, *Met.* 9.10, the priests of the Syrian goddess are captured as well.

348 114.4-5, *Lichas trepidans ad me supinas porrigit manus et "tu" inquit "Encolpi, succurre periclitantibus, id est vestem illam divinam et sistrumque redde navigio".*

349 The sequence is the same in 9.9, "*non taces* inquit "*gladiator obscene, quem de ruina harena dimisit? non taces, nocturene percussor; and 81.3, *effugi iudicium, harena imposui, hospitem occidi.* As a rule such enumerations in ancient erotic fiction follow the sequence in which events have taken place. A similar enumeration in Chariton (first or second century C.E.) follows the correct temporal sequence (5.5: "I have died and been buried; I have been stolen from my tomb; I have been sold into slavery—and now, Fortune, on top of that I find myself on trial!" [Translation by Reardon, 1989]). I have explained above why Encolpius may have inverted the sequence of the voyage and the earthquake in order to begin with the earthquake and so adapt his past to the needs of the epic stock-phrase.
Fragment VIII, a ridiculing turn of phrase was used by the narrator\textsuperscript{350} about a certain advocate named Euscion, who \textit{Cerberus forensis erat causidicus}—"was a Cerberus of the courts."\textsuperscript{351} Not only does the barking of Euscion's accusatory rhetoric justify the comparison to the hellish dog, Encolpius also finds himself on the Campanian coast, in the area of Cumae, the Sibyl, and lake Avernus, where the entrance to the underworld was supposedly located. Likewise, in the dinner at Trimalchio's scholars have noted signs that the episode was intended as an allegorical journey to the underworld.\textsuperscript{352} The court case Encolpius had to face was probably similar to the one threatened by the \textit{advocati} in the market-scene in the extant \textit{Satyrica}, i.e., Encolpius was under \textit{latrocinii suspicio} (15.3).

We do not think that Fragment XIV\textsuperscript{353} belongs to this trial. The charge of \textit{dolus malus} is different from a straightforward accusation of theft. It is hard to see how Encolpius, whose \textit{simplicitas} makes him an ideal victim of fraud, could be charged with \textit{dolus malus}, and even harder to see him twisting the meaning of legal terms as is done by the speaker of Fragment XIV. It is Eumolpus who is the master of fraudulent confidence schemes. He interprets the accusation of Encolpius, that he deliberately lead the boys back

\textsuperscript{350}Fulgentius, in fact, assigns the words to Petronius, but it is the usual manner of the grammar-school to refer to the fictional narrator of personal recollections as if he were the same as the author.

\textsuperscript{351}\textit{Fr. VIII}: \textit{Tricerberi enim fabulam iam superius exposuimus in modum iurgii forensisque litigii positam. Unde et Petronius in Euscion ait "Cerberus forensis erat causidicus"} (Fulgentius).

\textsuperscript{352}See, e.g., Bodel (1994).

\textsuperscript{353}\textit{Isid. Orig. 5.26.7}, \textit{dolus est mentis calliditas, ab eo quod deludat: aliud enim agit, et aliud simulat. Petronius aliter existimat dicens "quid est, iudices, dolus? nimirum ubi aliquid factum est quod legi dolet. habetis dolum, accipite nunc malum."
to their enemies, as that of *dolus malus* and the *minus* he concocts against the legacy-hunters of Croton is a classic example of fraud.\(^{354}\) It is therefore more plausible to assign this fragment to a missing phrase from the extant episode on the ship or to a court case in Croton brought against Eumolpus by Gorgias, whose name makes him an ideal player in a trial scene.

How did Encolpius escape from being found guilty of the charges brought against him by Euscion? We know that he did, because he tells us that he escaped the trial, *effugi iudicium*. According to his elegiac exposition of the nature of contemporary justice (14.2), all juries are venal. Who bribed the jury and why? Surely the boys did not have the means to do that. Their only assets, apart from their knowledge of letters, is usually their sex-appeal. Scholarship can procure them dinner invitations (10.4-6), but cannot motivate men of means to undertake great expenditures on their behalf (83.7-84.3). In the world of the *Satyricon* the sexual asset, however, seems to justify great expenditures by wealthy men. This is evident from the career of Trimalchion, who was his master's favourite sex-slave before inheriting his property (75.11-76.2). If we consider Lichas's sexual attraction to Encolpius, the eagerness of the *pater familias* to pay cash for having sex with Asculytos in the lupanar-scene (8.2-4), and the ease with which he finds a saviour in the infamous *eques Romanus*, when he is left without clothes at the baths (92.10), there is nothing to stop us from assuming that another gentleman of a similar stature was motivated by the same desire. In the *Satyricon* men and women alike are consistent and predictable in their vices. A prime candidate for this role is cruel Lycurgus, who is listed as the main rival for Giton's love next before Asculytos (83.6), and so belongs to this part of the story, and whose villa

\(^{354}\)To give false information about one's possessions in order to establish false credit is a prime example of what the legal literature intends with the term *dolus malus* (*dig.* 4.3).
(117.3), which at some point was burglarized by the boys, as we have mentioned before, would fit exceptionally well in an episode set in Campania.

According to the pattern established by Vincenzo Ciaffi, Encolpius's escape from one captivity is usually mediated by the appearance on the scene of a good helper who no sooner than the escape has been accomplished turns into a new menace, when he or she takes an interest in Giton. It is therefore likely that Lycurgus himself bought Encolpius and Giton from justice by bribing the jury, or by somehow or other exerting undue influence upon justice. His reasons can have been either sexual interest in the boys, or possibly a more financially motivated desire to acquire cheap labour for his villa. An unexpected verdict of innocence, after a trial where Encolpius's guilt was definitively established by the hostile Euscion, would have been in the right spirit. When Ascytlos laments that no one knows them in the Greek city and that therefore they cannot expect to win a court case, it is likely that his speculations about their situation are directly influenced by the experience of the first trial narrated, although Ascytlos does not seem to have entered the story until later. It seems likely, however, that Ascytlos underwent a similar experience before or after Encolpius, that he too was a petty criminal bought from justice by Lycurgus. Encolpius's remarks about the similarity of their fortune would thus be justified (80.8).

Whatever happened in detail, it is likely that the appearance of Lycurgus indirectly resolved the trial episode by simply opening an escape route for Encolpius. The boys would now have followed their apparent saviour to his villa. Such a villa would, as we have said, typically have been found in Campania. This is after all the part of Italy where

\[\text{355}\text{Ciaffi (1955), 65.}\]

\[\text{356}\text{14.1, contra Ascytlos leges timebat et "quis" aiebat "hoc loco nos novit aut quis habebit dicentibus fidel?"}\]
wealthy Romans preferred to build their sumptuous Hellenistic palaces modestly called villae. Besides, as we have also seen, Lycurgus immediately precedes Ascytlos in the remarkably orderly succession of rivals for the possession of Giton. This indicates that the place where Encolpius and Ascytlos met and had their initial erotic experience, the garden, viridarium (9.9), or the chain-gang, ergastulum (81.5), is indeed the same as the villa of Lycurgus. In accordance with Ciaffi’s pattern, Ascytlos is likely to have been instrumental in the scene where Encolpius and Giton escape from Lycurgus.

This is what underscores the unwitting appropriateness of Tryphaena’s words when she asked what ergastulum had intercepted the boys on their flight (105.11). An ergastulum (< Gr. ἔργοςτηρίμον) was a kind of prison on large private estates to which refractory or unreliable individuals were sent for work in chain-gangs, mostly slaves, but also freeborn men in debt (Sen. Con. 10.4.18; Liv. 2.23.6). Suetonius reports in the Life of Tiberius (Tib. 8) that one of the first responsibilities of the future emperor’s civil career was to investigate and purge the private ergastula throughout Italy, which had gained a bad reputation for holding captive not only travelers, but also those whom dread of military service had driven to such places of concealment. This was around 23 B.C.E. As the imperial biographer explains in the Life of Augustus (32.1f.), the practice had survived as a result of the lawless habits of the civil wars, but Octavian put an end to them by having all the ergastula inspected, and by stationing guards wherever it seemed advisable.

Other such practices were the formation of guilds to commit crimes of every sort. It seems, indeed, that the boys and Eumolpus have formed just such a gang/guild

---

35783.6, "at ego in societatem recepi hospitem [sc. Ascyton] Lycurgo crudeliorem"; 92.4, "timuique ne in contubernium recepissem [sc. Eumolpion] Ascyti parem."
themselves. Encolpius's choice of adventures to tell to his Roman audience seems to be guided by a certain tendency towards sensationalism. The abuse of ergastula seems to have been one of those persistent rumours, like piracy and brigandage, which were rampant in the empire, and caused especially foreigners to fear, often needlessly, the highways of the Roman empire.

We may nicely fit Fragment XI into this context. The mosquitoes which troubled Encolpius's comrade (or himself according to some manuscript readings), and may have caused him to hallucinate, would be appropriate in the viridarum. Apart from being forced to work as a slave, which he cannot have done well due to his inexperience of work and youthful delicacy (102.12), Encolpius may have been incorporated into Lycurgus's gladiatorial troupe. The name of Lycurgus may evoke Spartan harshness and military boot-camps. It may also evoke the myth of the violent and drunken Thracian king who attacked Dionysus and his party of nurses (II. 6.130-40) and was subsequently imprisoned in a

\[\text{358}\] 117.5-6; 29.2, collegae quidem mei; 101.2, pro consortio studiorum; 117.5, in verba Eumolpi sacramentum iuravimus:uri, vinciri, verberari ferroque necari, et quidquid aliud Eumolpus iussisset, tanquam legitimi gladiatores domino corpora animasque religiosissime addicimus.

\[\text{359}\] I believe it was Sandy (1979), 367, who introduced the excellent descriptive term "sensational" into the discussion of Greco-Roman fictions.

\[\text{360}\] On the topic of piracy under the principate and the ideology of imperial eradication, see Braund (1993), 195-212.

\[\text{361}\] Fulg. serm. ant. 52 (p. 124 [Helm]), alucinare dicitur vana somniori, tractum ab alucitis, quos nos conopes dicimus. sicut Petronius Arbiter ait "nam contubernalem alucitae molestabant" ("contubernalem" is Bücheler's emendation for a variety of readings in the manuscripts).
rocky cave (Soph. Ant. 955-65), later to cut off his foot (Hyg. Fab. 132.), commit suicide (Hyg. Fab. 242.2), or be killed (Apollod. 3.5.1). Both connotations are ideal for someone engaged in the nasty business of training and dealing in gladiators (some of whom were incidentally called "Thracians"). The fact that Lycurgus is the namesake of the legendary Spartan legislator and the mythical Thracian king makes his name is no less viable in this story than such names as Agamemmon, Menelaos, and Gorgias. As a real captive under the control of Lycurgus, Encolpius could have been sent into the arena as a member of the pars obscena of Lycurgus's gladiatorial ludus to fight, possibly, a woman who seemed likely to kill him. He could then have escaped from the (h)arena, when it collapsed in an earthquake, by throwing himself into the latrine.

According to Ascylos's accusation and Encolpius's own confession, he killed a man at night, who was his host. In both cases, this comes in sequence after he cheated the amphitheater (9.9; 81.3), and he certainly robbed Lycurgus's villa in the company of some one else (117.3). He speaks of Ascylos, too, as being the co-possessor of the money stolen, then lost and later found again (13.2-3), and of his animosity against this Lycurgus as analogous to that which he directed at Ascylos, because of competition over Giton (83.5-6). Therefore we may assume that in this lost episode Encolpius told of a

362 117.3, *atquin promitto quicquid exigeret, dummodo placet vestis, rapinae comes, et quicquid Lycurgi villa grantsibus praebuisset. nam nummos in praesentem usum deum matrem pro fide sua reddituram.*

363 13.2-3, *Ascylos postquam depositum esse inviolatum vidit … seduxit me paululum a turba et "scis," inquit "frater, reidiase ad nos thesaurum de quo querebar? illa est tunicula adhuc, ut appareat, intactis aureis plena."

364 83.5-6, *et omnes fabulae quoque habuerunt sine aemulo complexus. at ego in societatem excepit hospitem [sc. Asclyton] Lycurgo crudeliorem.*
lusty affair between himself and Ascylos in a chain-gang in the garden of Lycurgus's villa, while Giton was doing *opus muliebre in ergastulo* (81.5) under the command of Lycurgus. The account evidently ended with the murder of Lycurgus, the burglary of his villa, and the flight of Encolpius, Giton and Ascylos. The sequence of competitors for Giton's love seems to confirm this too. Ascylos takes over from Lycurgus (83.5f.), just like Encolpius fears that Eumolpus is taking over from Ascylos (92.4).365

The importance and logic of the rivalry for possessing Giton in the *Satyricon* is well explained in the scene set in the pinacotheca when Encolpius projects his own anxiety onto the pictures of ancient masters in the gallery. Just as in the poem where Encolpius fancies his fortune to be comparable to that of ancient heroes struggling against divine wrath (139.2), the pictures of mythological lovers here inspire in the protagonist a lament about his own inability to have Giton completely for himself (83):

365The mysterious Doris (126.18, *itaque tunc primum Dorida vetus amator contempsi*) is probably not a woman whom Encolpius had amatory association in the past. The word can either refer to a marble statue of the wife of Nereus and the mother of the Nereids, since the protagonist has in the previous passage been comparing Circe's beauty favourably to marble sculptures; or, as seems more probable, it is a *nom de guerre* temporarily assumed by Giton, like Polyaenus. The feminine gender may be explained by Giton's role as a sexual pathic, or possibly by reference to the frequency of male proper names of a female grammatical form (e.g., Protis, Apellis, Thespis, Zenothermis, Taxaris, Charmis) attested on inscriptions from Massilia. In any case, Giton is properly the only person with respect to whom Encolpius is a *vetus amator* (10.7, *veterem cum Gitone meo rationem*; 86.6, *vetustissimam consuetudinem*; 81.5, *veteris amicitiae nomen*), and the subject of the following negotiation is exactly Encolpius's willingness to betray Giton (127.3, *dono tibi fratrem meum*) with Circe, who has heard about their relationship, while there is no mention in the context of any past female lover of Encolpius.
"ergo amor etiam deos tangit. Iuppiter in caelo suo non invenit quod eligeret, et peccaturus in terris nemini tamen injuriam fecit. Hylan Nympha praedata imperasset amori sui, si venturum ad interdictum Herculem credisset. Apollo pueri umbram revocavit in florem, et omnes fabulae quoque habuerunt sine aemulo complexus. at ego in societatem recepi hospitem Lycurgo crudeliorem."

"So love touches the gods as well. Jupiter finds nothing to his taste in his heavenly kingdom, but when he goes to earth, his sinful intention does injury to nobody. The nymph who raped Hylas would have controlled her desire, had she thought that Hercules would come to forbid her. Apollo makes the likeness of his boy reappear in a flower, and all the myths feature an intercourse with no rival. I, on the other hand, took into my companionship a friend more cruel than Lycurgus."

Encolpius forces a positive interpretation of the originally tragic stories of Hylas, Hyacinthus and Zeus's many loved ones in order to depict himself as the only tragic lover who cannot embrace his loved one sine aemulo. From the context we may determine that the more cruel "friend", hospes, is Ascyltos, and the supposedly less cruel "host", hospes, is the same Lycurgus who is the owner of the villa which the boys later burgle (117.3). Taken together, all of Encolpius's rivals for the possession of Giton can be ordered into a sequence, which provides another linear structure to supplement the southward progression of the ship of Lichas, which has been established according to the geographical map. If we allow for a possible missing rival in Massilia itself, that one would have been followed by Tryphaena, then possibly Hedyle, then certainly Lycurgus, Ascyltos, and Eumolpus himself for awhile, and finally Tryphaena again. These two linear structures taken together, the geographical one and the amatory one, show well how the plot is structured and episodes are connected around the earlier and the later voyage on the ship of Lichas, with the great interlude in Campania coming in-between, while Encolpius and Giton stay off the
ship. What this shows primarily is that we had in the original Satyrora, not several radically distinct episodes as most scholars have thought, but a truly novelistic structure with a great deal of continuity from one episode to the next, fully comparable to the plots that we find in the extant erotic fictions.

As symbols of this continuity are the three garments stolen by Encolpius, which follow him from episode to episode and continue to play a role in the plot. The vestis divina from the navigium of Lichas was stolen in the lost episode when the boys escaped from the ship and continues to play a role on the ship after the boys board it again (114.5). It may also have occurred in the trial scene (Fr. XII). The tunicula aureis plena is lost in the episode prior to the beginning of our text and then reappears in the market scene (13.3), and again in Croton as the vestis rapinae comes (117.3), with the money stolen from Lycurgi villa, which takes us even further back to the escape from Lycurgus. The raptum latrocinio pallium (12.2), which the boys try to sell in the market scene, turns out to be from the sacellum Priapi (19.8) an episode before the boys entered the urbs Graeca. In that scene Quartilla played a role; she disappears while the boys go to the school of rhetoric the morning after, and then reappears after the market scene to force the boys to remedy her tertian fever. These connections and reappearances between scenes make the episodes of the story anything but discrete.

To complete our analysis of Encolpius's soliloquies and the material therein for the reconstruction of the plot of his story, we must take a look at two more passages. The former of the two is Encolpius's (alias Polyaeon's) short letter, written on wax tablets, in response to the libidinous young matron Circe, after having failed her miserably as lover. The following is the full text of the letter (130.1-6):
"Polyaenos Circae salutem. fateor me, domina, saepe peccasse; nam et homo sum et adhuc iuvenis. numquam tamen ante hunc diem usque ad mortem deliqui. habes confitentem reum: quicquid iussis, merui. proditionem feci, hominem occidi, templum violavi: in haec facinora quaere supplicium. sive occidere placet, ferro meo venio, sive verberibus contenta es, curro nudus ad dominam. illud unum memento, non me sed instrumenta peccasse. paratus miles arma non habui. quis hoc turbaverit nescio. forsitan animus antecessit corporis moram, forsitan dum omnia concupisco, voluptatem tempore consumpsi. non invenio quod feci. paralysin tamen cavere iubes: tamquam ea maior fieri possit quae abstulit mihi per quod etiam te habere potui. summa tamen excusationis meae haec est: placebo tibi, si me culpam emendare permiseris".

"Polyaenos greets Circe. I confess, my mistress, that I have often done wrong; for I am both human and still young. But never before this day have I committed a mortal sin. You have a confessed criminal at your disposal: whatever punishment you order, I have earned it. I have betrayed; I have killed a man; I have violated a temple: punish me for these crimes. If execution is fitting, I'll bring my steel; or if you settle for the lash, I'll run naked to my mistress. Just remember one thing: It wasn't me, but my equipment, that sinned. A ready soldier, I had no arms. I don't know who caused the damage. Perhaps the spirit rushed ahead of the sluggish body; perhaps when I was aflame with desire for all, I spent my pleasure meanwhile. It's beyond me what I did. You tell me, however, to beware of paralysis: as if there could be any more than the one that took away from me that through which I could even have had you. Ultimately, however, my excuse amounts to this: I will please you, if you allow me to make up for my wrongdoing"

What stands out here are the three crimes to which Encolpius confesses. Two of them at least seem familiar: "I have killed a man; I have violated a temple (by temple robbery)," but the way in which this information about Encolpius's past is presented, and especially its irrelevance to the addressee, Circe, combine to make it somewhat hard to explain. The first
confession: "I have betrayed (a man)," is no different from the other two, although less familiar, for it can easily refer to the betrayal of Lichas, who never seems to have earned the treatment he got from Encolpius, since he was his saviour and lover until Encolpius robbed the shrine of his ship and corrupted his wife. Lichas's betrayal by the boys is in fact referred to by Eumolpus as proditio (107.6) in the apology he offers to the captain for the boys' behavior. But why confess all this to Circe, who doesn't know Lycurgus, Lichas and the other people in Encolpius's past, and is interested only in having sex with him?

The rhetorical structure of the argument offered by Encolpius in apology for his conduct is based on his being human and still young (nam et homo sum et adhuc iuvenis) and therefore having often sinned (fateor me, domina, saepe peccasse), but never until this day, when he let down his mistress sexually by being unable to have an erection, has he committed a sin that is (almost) mortal (numquam tamen ante hunc diem usque ad mortem deliqui). Then he enumerates his many previous sins and shows his willingness to take out punishments for these (habes confitentem reum: quicquid iussesis, merui... in haec facinora quaere supplicium. sive occidere placet, ferro meo venio, sive verberibus contenta es, curro nudus ad dominam). The list is the one we have discussed above (proditionem feci, hominem occidi, templum violavi). The trivialization of these serious crimes in comparison with the truly trivial offense of impotence is best taken as an amatory exaggeration for the sake of flattery of a loved one. The truthfulness of the crimes confessed to by Encolpius, and the predictable lack of moral condemnation on Circe's side, is exactly the point of this letter, which satirizes the presumed lawlessness of certain matrons who lust after slaves, bare-legged boys, gladiators, mule drivers, stage-actors, and condemned criminals (126.5-

---

366 The word proditio never refers to high treason in the Satyrca, but simply to giving oneself or some one else away or betraying a person's trust (cf. 98.2, 125.3).
10). Such women, according to the moralistic ethos underlying the *Satyricon*, prefer the man they are having sex with to be all at once a traitor, murderer, and a temple-robber, since in their eyes this makes him more exciting as a lover. Encolpius can freely offer himself up for punishment for such crimes because he knows that Circe considers his sexual failure to be his only serious offense. Having said this, Encolpius can turn to the real apology.

His real apology to Circe is based on the dissociation of himself from his sexual organ, which has now become his sword or weapon, in a curious fusion of elegiac and Priapic humour: *paratus miles arma non habui*. Encolpius as a lover is also a soldier, and his sword is his *mentula*; it is the part of his body in which he expects to be an Achilles (129.1), but something has gone wrong with the equipment, and for this, he claims, he cannot be blamed. Perhaps he was just over-excited. In any case, another try will certainly fix the situation. Our reading of the letter accounts sufficiently for the confessions of Encolpius, and there is no need to say with Schmeling that Encolpius suffers from some obscure condition of "confession-compulsion", nor that his activity is comparable to the self-flagellation of the priest of the Syrian goddess in Apuleius (*Met.* 8.28).

---

367Even if what Encolpius is saying in *habes confitentem reum etc.* is "treat me as if I had betrayed, killed, robbed" or "let's pretend that I... and punish me accordingly", this does not preclude that his supposedly false confessions are based on the truth. In fact, if no murder took place, the audience of the original full-text *Satyricon* might well get confused at this point, because Encolpius has certainly both betrayed Lichas and violated the temple of Priapus before the *Crypta Neapolitana*. What would be the point of mentioning here, for the third time (cf. 9.7, 81.3), a murder that never took place, side by side with other crimes that did?


The last passage that we will consider belongs to the same context of Encolpius's impotence. We have seen many forms of declarations, a dialogue, soliloquies and a letter. This time it is a poem and a prayer in one. Encolpius has been desperately seeking a cause and remedy for his impotence. After failing Circe for the first time, he immediately claimed that he had been poisoned (128.2, *veneficio contactus sum*). He began to wonder whether he had been permanently deprived of physical pleasure (128.5). He finds himself impotent with Giton as well (128.7, 129.1). Circe blames his relationship with Giton and suggests that he will regain his virility by abstaining from the boy for three days (129.8). Encolpius asks Circe for another rendezvous (130.6). Chrysis thinks it is just one more case of the local witches having put a spell on somebody, and therefore a cure should readily be available (129.10-11). Encolpius has tried to cut down on luxury: he skips baths, uses less oil, eats strong food, and drinks less wine; he takes a walk, and heeds Circe's words by going to bed without Giton (130.7-8). Chrysis had brought a local witch who tried her hand at the task, and succeeded in giving Encolpius an erection (131.4-7). The cure, however, did not last and when he met her he failed Circe again; she has had him whipped, spat on, and thrown out; Chrysis has been flogged as well, and Proselenos, the witch, was thrown out of the house (132.2-5). Hiding in bed Encolpius has let loose his anger at the "cause of all evil", his penis. In Sotadean or cinaedic verse he described his attempts to cut his member off with an ax but it escaped into the wrinkles of its foreskin (132.8). Next he had harangued the thing, demanding an explanation from the guilty party, but his *mentula* had only drooped in silence like Dido in the underworld (132.9-11). Afterwards he felt momentarily ashamed for having talked with his sexual organ, but he soon found justification for this behavior in numerous literary precedences of heroes talking to various body parts and he had also been able to appeal to the supposed belief of Epicurus that sex was the *τέλος of life* (132.12-15). When he finished delivering this declamation, he called
Giton and demanded that the boy tell him on his honour whether Ascyltos had stayed awake that night, when he abducted him, and whether he had molested him. Giton swore that Ascyltos did not use violence (133.2). We next find Encolpius kneeling on the threshold in the shrine of Priapus praying to the god in hexameters.

Before we consider the relationship between his impotence, his question to Giton about Ascyltos's sexual advances, and Priapus, let us go through the poetic prayer. After a very elaborate address to the god, Encolpius continues his invocation (133.3):

"huc ades, o Bacchi tutor Dryadumque voluptas, et timidas admitte preces. non sanguine tristi perfusus venio, non templis impius hostis admovi dextram, sed inops et rebus egenis atritus facinus non toto corpore feci. quisquis peccat inops, minor est reus. hac prece quaeo, exonera mentem culpaeque ignosce minori, et quandoque mihi fortunae arriserit hora, non sine honore tuum patiar decus. ibit ad aras, sancte, tuas hircus, pecoris pater, ibit ad aras corniger et querulae fetus suis, hostia lactens. spurnabit pateris hornus liquor, et ter ovantem circa delubrum gressum feret ebria pubes".

["Draw near, bastion of Bacchus and darling of the Dryads, hearken to my humble prayers. I come not bathed in gloomy blood, nor have I raised my right arm as faithless enemy against temples, but poor and desperate in dire need and not with my whole body did I do the deed. He who errs penniless, is less a felon. In prayer I beg you, ease the mind and forgive a minor offense, and sometime when fortune smiles, I will not let your glory be short of honour; to your altar, holy one, will go a horned goat, father of the flock; to your altar will go the farrow of a grunting sow, a milky victim. New wine will foam in open bowls, and drunken lads will dance and rejoice three times round your shrine."]
After having witnessed Encolpius's confession to homicide and violating a temple in the letter to Circe, and after what we know about his stealing sacred objects from at least two shrines, we must ask whether there is a contradiction in his proclamation here of innocence with respect to Priapus's temple: \textit{non sanguine tristi / perfusus venio, non templis impius hostis / admovi dextram}. What exactly is Encolpius saying? He is approaching (\textit{venio}) the god/temple not as one steeped in blood, i.e., as a murderer seeking sanctuary, or as one who has committed an act of violence in a temple and hence sacrilege, but as one who committed a crime because of poverty and only with a part of his body. In effect, he is saying: "I may—or may not—have committed murder in the past. I may—or may not—have acted with deliberate violence in a temple in the past. These are irrelevant to the issue at hand, a crime against you, Priapus, for which I plead (i) that I was driven by poverty, and (ii) that I did it \textit{non toto corpore}—"not with all of my body". Encolpius's hope is that Priapus will forgive a minor offense, especially if promised a rich sacrifice in return for the clemency. The answer to the question above is therefore that we do not see any contradiction between the confession in the present prayer and the general crimes that Encolpius has already confessed on other occasions.

But what is the connection between Priapus and Encolpius's impotence? We have briefly discussed this problem in the previous chapter as part of our reading of the Fragment of Sidonius, and again as part of our reconstruction of the Quartilla episode, or episodes, just before and after the boys enter the \textit{urbs Graeca}. Now we must review the evidence in the light of our closer reading of the confessional passages above.

The poem and prayer to Priapus indicates that Encolpius now derives the cause of his inability to have an erection from some offense, \textit{facinus}, against Priapus. As we have seen, it is because of his continuing impotence that he later claims that he, like other heroes,
is haunted by the wrath of a god, in this case of the garden deity Priapus. The alienated talk about a part, *pars*, of his body as if it were a separate entity and not integral to himself is genuine Priapic humour, which is common in the extant corpus of Priapic poetry. Encolpius's excuse to Priapus in the prayer is the same that he gave Circe: *illud unum memento, non me sed instrumenta peccasse* (130.4), in both cases he blames *illa pars corporis* (129.1) where he once was an Achilles. Circe had asked him "Well, do you come whole today?" (131.10, "ecquid hodie totus venisti?"), and the narrator maliciously describes how he went *toto corpore* (131.11) into her embrace and enjoyed her to the full but only with his unbewitched kisses! His bewitched penis is still not functioning. Encolpius's attention continues to be fixed on his *mentula*, his *omnium malorum causa* (132.7). He even addresses a schizophrenic blame speech to it as if it were a separate individual from himself (132.12, *cum ea parte corporis verba contulerim*).

There is no room for doubt, then, that the *facinus* he confesses to having committed with only a part of his body was committed only with his *membrum virile*. But when and where did Encolpius commit a crime against Priapus only with his penis? Not in Croton, obviously, because the last thing Encolpius did before praying to Priapus, and what furnishes him with proof of what is wrong, was to inquire from Giton about how Ascylos had behaved sexually, i.e., whether Ascylos too was impotent, when he abducted Giton from his bed that night after the party at Trimalchios's. He gets an answer from Giton

370 139.2, *me quoque per terras, per cani Nereos aequor / Hellespontiaci sequitur gravis ira Priapi.*

371 133.1-2, *Gitona voco, et "narra mihi" inquiam "frater, sed tua fide: ea nocte, qua te mihi Ascylos subduxit, usque in inuiriun vigilavit an contentus fuit vidua pudicaque nocte?" tetigit puer oculos suos conceptissimesque iuravit verbis sibi ab Ascylo nullam vim factam.*
which is highly unreliable because Giton constantly fears Encolpius's jealousy, but this is
less important for the reconstruction than the fact that Encolpius himself traces his
impotence back to the urbs Graeca. Now, what happened to both Encolpius and Ascyltos in
the Greek city, which involved a crime against Priapus that could have led to their
impotence? The answer to the question is clear. The boys disturbed the nocturnal rites of
Quartilla's Priapic sacrum ante Cryptam (16.3), and stole a pallium from the members of
the cult. They were subsequently punished by Quartilla, who came to their lodgings and
sexually abused them through feeding them on the aphrodisiac satyrion, and, as we recall,
they were supposed to go back to her place the night after, but instead went to Trimalchio's
party. This is Encolpius's one and only prior crime against Priapus in the extant text.

As Christopher Faraone has shown, the satyrion that Encolpius drank so much of in
Quartilla's party (21.1), like other such drugs, was well known in antiquity for its double
effects: it could both cause an erection and act as poison and render men impotent. We have
already come across Pliny's (Nat. 6.96f. and 128) statement that a certain type of satyrion
with a testicle-shaped root causes erections if taken in the milk of a farm-yard sheep, but
makes erections subside if taken in water.372 Faraone adds an interesting example from
Achilles Tatius (4.15), where an Egyptian soldier lusting after Leucippe lets his servant mix
an aphrodisiac into her wine. But the servant forgets to dilute the potion and Leucippe

372Faraone (1990), 115, adds the information that "Mandrake, for instance, was
used both as an aphrodisiac (Theophr. HP 9.9.1) and as a narcotic to paralyze an enemy
(Plato, Rep., 6.488c), or to treat insomnia (Arist. PA 456b31). Theophrastus reports that
the roots of the orchis and another unnamed Plataean drug can both encourage and suppress
sexual desire (HP 9.18.3-5). In the latter case, impotence could allegedly be extended as
long as three months and could be used to discipline and manipulate servants. This
correlation between debilitating narcotic and philtra is underscored in Plutarch's advice to
young brides not to use such aphrodisiacs against their husbands (Mor., 139a)."
becomes mysteriously mad until the cause of her delirium is discovered by Clitophon and the antidote is administered. The type of liquid an ancient aphrodisiac was mixed in and the quantity consumed was evidently believed to be of great importance for the drug's effect. Significantly, Encolpius drank all the satyrion at Quartilla's, and later does not merely blame the wrath of Priapus, but also claims that he was poisoned.373 As often is the case in ancient magic, the cause is over-determined.

But how did Encolpius commit a facinus with only that part of his body which later is so disgracefully incapable of performing? At the time it evidently did perform, and the instrument was therefore in the erect position. Priapus is a phallic god and his erection is his iconographic emblem. In Aristophanes's Lysistrata (982) a man with an erection is mistaken for Konisalos, a phallic creature associated with Priapus, in a joke which resembles many in the Satyricon: "Are you a man or a Priapus?"374 If we analyze the references to the alleged facinus against Priapus, there was some urbanitas or practical joke involved;375 the impudent robbery is said to be more than fabulous;376 and a point is made of the facility with which it is possible to encounter a god in that region, as if to provide an

373 138.7, forsitan rediret hoc corpus ad vires et resipiscerent partes veneficio, credo, sopitae.

374 Ar. Lys. 982, σό δ' εἶ τί; πότερ ἄνθρωπος ἢ κονίσαλος; Sat. 38.15, phantasia, non homo; 43.3, discordia non homo; 44.6, piper non homo; 58.13, mufrius non magister; 74.13, codex non mulier; 134.9, lorum in aqua non inguina; 92.9, habet enim inquinum pondus tam grande, ut ipsum hominem laciniam fascini crederes.

375 16.4, "nec accusat errorem vestrum [sc. Quartilla] nec punit, immo potius miratur, quis deus iuvenes tam urbanos in suam regionem detulerit."

376 17.4, "quaeam est" inquit [sc. Quartilla] "haec audacia, aut ubi fabulas etiam antecessura laticinia didicistis?"
excuse for how easily Quartilla and her acolytes were taken in by the boys. Although Quartilla insists that the facinus, or scelus, committed by Encolpius and Ascytlos cannot in principle be expiated for, she is also aware that the strange ritual which the boys, who were driven by youthful horseplay, saw in the temple of Priapus could be seen as a risible joke by the "uninitiated"; at the time Encolpius undressed and left his old tunic full of gold lying in a deserted place, and was perhaps clothed in a religious garment, for as he tells us in the market episode, he lost his shirt and acquired a splendid pallium with an intricate design. The supposition that best accounts for all of these bizarre references is the impersonation of Priapus by the naked Encolpius by virtue of his characteristic phallic looks. The reference of Sidonius Apollinaris to Encolpius (alias Arbiter) as Hellespontiaco parem Priapo, directly connects the phallic looks of the protagonist to Priapus and thus further underscores our reconstruction of the lost first Quartilla episode.

If we were to look for a "comparison text" to aid us in the reconstruction of this obscure episode, it would soon become apparent that the motif of a man impersonating a

---

377 17.4-6, "utique nostra regio tam praeuentibus plena est numinibus ut facilius possis deum quam hominem invenire."

378 17.6, "imprudentes enim, ut adhuc put, admisistis inexpiabile scelus"; 17.7, "iuvenili impulsi licentia quod in sacello Priapi vidistis"; 17.8, "petoque et oro ne noctunas religiones iocum risumque faciatis."

379 12.5, videbatur ille [sc. rusticus] mihi esse qui tunicula in solitudine invenerat; 12.2, raptum latrocini pallium [...] splendor vestis; 14.5, mulier [...] inspectis diligentius signis.

380 The line of Sidonius is a pastiche of 139.2, vv. 8-9, me quoque per terras, per cani Nereos aequor / Hellespontiaci sequitur gravis ira Priapi, which as we saw above can only refer to the Quartilla episode, and its aftermath in Encolpius's impotence.
god to exploit the superstition of some simple person is common enough in ancient literature. Josephus (AJ 18.66) tells a story from the reign of Tiberius of a young knight, Decius Mundus, who fell in love with an unassailably virtuous matron, Paulina. When bribing her didn't work, he decided to kill himself. But his freedwoman, Ida, discovered a way to save him. She promised money to the priests of the temple of Isis in Rome, and one of them went to Paulina to say that the god had fallen in love with her and wished to see her. She became proud at the news and with her husband's permission went to the temple. When she had dined and the doors were closed and the lamps removed, in place of Anubis, Mundus stepped forth and had sex with her the whole night. Later Paulina told her husband and womenfriends and all marveled at the incident. But Mundus confronted Paulina and told her the truth, and the lady told her husband. Tiberius had both the priests and the freedwoman Ida crucified, but not Mundus himself. He was sent into exile, since he was considered to have been compelled to the deed by the sheer force of his desire! The incident was soon worked into a mime, *Moechus Anubis* (Tert. *Apol.* 15).

The tenth letter of Pseudo-Aeschines provides further examples of the motif. The main story is set in Ilion. The lad Cnemon hides by the banks of Scamander, while the local virgins, and especially Callirhoë, perform a ritual in which they wash in the river and address the river god with these words: "Take, Scamander, my maidenhood." When Callirhoë pronounces the formula Cnemon jumps forth from the bushes saying: "I accept with pleasure, and I take Callirhoë—being Scamander, I will do many good things," and then disappears again with the maiden. A few days later, Callirhoë recognizes him in a procession and immediately throws herself flat in reverence to the god, and looking askance at her nurse she says: "Behold the god Scamander, to whom I gave my virginity." The older woman understood what had happened and the story got out. Having related this story, Pseudo-Aeschines then goes on to tell how Cnemon wasn't afraid but on the
contrary provided him with other examples of similar deeds: many stories involving gods impersonated, stories which told of how Meander, Heracles, Apollo, and Dionysus unjustly gained a reputation for being μοιχοί.

Relevant to Encolpius's postulated impersonation of Priapus are what appear to be similar perversions of religious rituals in the fragments of Lollianos's Φοινεικικό (POxy. 1368) and the Iolaos fragment (POxy. 3010). In the former a group of young men dress themselves in black or white garments to play ghosts in preparation for what seems to be a raid by robbers. In the latter, according to the reconstruction of E.R. Dodds, a young man of full male potency attempts to gain access to a woman by impersonating a castrated gallus or cinaedus. Such trickery seems to be generic to ancient erotic fictions, especially the sensational and criminal ones.

It seems therefore plausible to assume that Encolpius's crime against Priapus may derive from the lost incident at the Priapean temple presided over by Quartilla in the vicinity of Neapolis by the road to the Crypta Neapolitana. Accordingly, Encolpius would suspect that he was secretly poisoned by Quartilla as a revenge. He certainly does derive his impotence from the curse of somebody who wished harm both to himself and Ascytlos. His inquiry about Ascytlos's capacity for lovemaking would otherwise barely make sense. Quartilla and her satyrion, however, offer a plausible explanation. The dramatic irony in Encolpius's accepting as evidence of Ascytlos's impotence what Giton tells him adds a further comic twist to the episode. Giton is, of course, likely to offer false assurances only to calm Encolpius who is prone to rabid jealousy. The wrath of Priapus is therefore likely to be no more than Encolpius's fantasy, which is not to say that it isn't important for the


382See also Sandy (1979), 374-5.
story. Besides, in this connection between the episodes before and in the *urbs Graeca* we have another indication of the lack of discreteness of the episodes, and a further support for our thesis that in the *Satyricon* we are dealing with a typical ancient novelistic plot.

To wrap up our reconstruction of the *Satyricon* in this and the preceding chapter it will be helpful if we summarize the four main principles on which our restoration of the story is based. The first is geographical and pertains to the movement of the ship of Lichas from Massilia, to Ostia, to Puteoli, to Neapolis, and finally to the bay of Tarentum, where the ship and its captain meet their destruction. The linear and regular progression of the ship was evidently the main organizing principle of the plot of the original *Satyricon*. Where Encolpius & Co. go after Croton is impossible to say, but we are inclined to think that Trimalchio's ambitions to cross over to Africa from Neapolis without ever sailing along the confines of another man's property (48.3), and Eumolpus's posing as an African landowner (117.8, 125.3, 141.1), might be anticipatory indications in Encolpius's narrative that this is where the plot is soon heading, when the extant text breaks off. Perhaps, the legacy-hunters of Croton decided go with Eumolpus to inspect his supposed African estates, when he didn't die from the sicknesses that he was feigning. More likely, Eumolpus fades out (as others before), perhaps by *Scheintod.*383 Africa and especially Egypt provide the background for many an episode in the extant erotic fictions. Whatever happened next, Encolpius in any case seems to tell the story in Rome itself, just like Lucius in the *Metamorphoses*, since his audience is so typically Roman. We should keep in mind

383I see no grounds for believing with Schmeling (1992a) that the plot is nearing closure in the Croton episode.
that Encolpius does not have to return to Massilia any more than Hippothous or Lucius, in the Latin version of the Ass Story, return to their homes.384

The second principle of reconstruction is literary and relies on the convention of ancient narratives to recapitulate prior happenings of the story in later episodes. The most informative of these recapitulations regard Encolpius's relationship with Ascytlos, who enters the story first after Encolpius and Giton leave the ship of Lichas. We thus get recapitulations of the events that happened between the first and the second voyages, and brief allusions to a trial, a stay in the private jail of Lycurgus's villa, Encolpius's adventure in the arena, and finally his murder of the host, Lycurgus, and escape from the villa/jail-house, in the company of Ascytlos and his dear Giton.

A third principle regards the remarkable regularity of the pattern, first observed by Ciaffi, of the threats to Encolpius's love affair with the irresistible Giton. A third individual appears as a saviour, only to later turn into a rival and therefore an enemy of the protagonist. Thus we can construct a sequence of such rivals, which agrees with the reconstruction based on the former two principles: Tryphaena, (Hedyle), Lycurgus, Ascytlos, Eumolpus, Tryphaena. The key to the reconstruction is the realization that the driving force of the plot is not so much the "wrath of Priapus" as the jealousy of Encolpius. His possession of Giton is constantly being threatened by rivals and outsiders who fancy the pretty boy as well.

The fourth structural principle is the observation that the episodes of the Satyrca are not autonomous or discrete units, as is often assumed on the basis of more or less isolated

---

384The view that Encolpius goes to Lampsacus on the Hellespont is unfounded and derives from a misunderstanding of the role of Priapus in the plot.
readings of individual parts of the work,\textsuperscript{385} but no less an organizational whole than the plots of the fully extant ancient fictions. From the route of the voyage, the recapitulations and the sequence of rivals which threaten Encolpius, it is clear that the first part of the extant \textit{Satyricon}, as well as much of what preceded it and is now lost, was merely a long digression between the first and the second voyages on the ship of Lichas. Apart from the very first books of the original \textit{Satyricon}, which were set in Massilia and dealt with the year of preparation for Encolpius's excommunication from the city, the greatest part of the story is structured around the voyage on ship and the complex love affairs between the passengers, the captain and his wife. The voyage included several interludes on shore. Stops were made in Ostia, which allowed Encolpius to visit Rome during the Saturnalia, but most importantly, Encolpius abandons the ship in Campania in an attempt to free himself from Tryphaena's monopoly of Giton's affection and perhaps the captain's interest in himself. This absence from the ship involved several episodes and the introduction of new characters. However, the return to the ship, shows that we are not dealing with loosely connected episodes, but a consistently structured novelistic plot.

On the whole, we have tried to recover as much information as possible about the missing episodes of the \textit{Satyricon} by sketching a pattern of the missing pieces of the jig-saw puzzle that is the reconstruction of the work, so that the few pieces that we do have are made to cohere in a reasonably structured composition. Necessarily, this reconstruction is tentative and sometimes \textit{exempli gratia}. Although we have occasionally for the sake of

\textsuperscript{385} For a recent attempt to modify this view, see Schmeling (1994–95), 209, "The \textit{Satyricon} appears to be written in discrete episodes each with its own beginning and end but strung and held together by one narrator who is also an actor in each." Although true in so far as it stresses the importance of the narrator for the unity of the narrative, Schmeling's statement nevertheless wholly ignores the unity of plot in the \textit{Satyricon}. 
argument insisted on arranging the pieces in one way rather than another, it is clear that it could at some points be otherwise in detail.
CHAPTER FOUR
RECONSTRUCTION: THE SUMMARY

The interpretive summary I am about to offer will bring together my reconstruction in the previous chapters and serve as an aid to the reader for rehearsing the fragmentary and sometimes incoherent story told in what is left of the Satyricon. The preserved text contains numerous explicit and implicit references to lost episodes. We should interpret these references just as we do other passages of the work, and in doing so we inevitably form ideas about what was in the lost parts. Any complete interpretation of the Satyricon's fragments includes this sort of expansion, for otherwise we must paradoxically treat the extant text as an artistic whole, ignoring its original design as an extended narrative. The episodes related before the extant text begins are naturally interpretive, but they are based on our arguments in the previous chapters. What I have done is merely to map out a minimum narrative that accommodates, i) all references back from the text, and ii) all germane fragments. The reception of the extant text of the Satyricon has been a singularly creative one from the very beginning. My creative summary is therefore merely in accordance with the traditional response to the fragmented state of the tradition. By offering a separate restorative summary, however, I have avoided the graver mistake of exercising my ingenuity on the text itself with arbitrary emendations.

Our short narrative reads as erotic fiction. Sullivan, in his major study of the work from the late sixties, stopped short of providing a summary, because he thought "a summary of the missing (and extant) episodes gives a misleading impression, the
impression merely of a picaresque romance or an adventure story." If a summary gives that impression, however, that seems indeed to have been the extended form of the work. In recently commenting on the introduction of modern theory into the study of the ancient novel, Sullivan himself made the specific point that reader-oriented theories such as that of Wolfgang Iser, because they in any case make much of the reader's role in extracting a meaning from the text, should be taken by Petronian scholars as an encouragement "to be more enterprising in their theories about the missing portions of the Satyricon." It seems to me justifiable to go into considerable detail in the summary, which will make it rather long. This should be viewed as an attempt to introduce my position on numerous points which are in danger of being lost if merely presented as part of a detailed and demanding argumentation. I will retain the form of personal recollection for the sake of fidelity to the narrative structure of the original, although this goes contrary to the general practice in summaries. Though the basic stance of the original is thus respected, no

---

386 Sullivan (1968), 38.


388 It may be argued that the summary I am providing is a reconstruction of the text since it postulates one sort of text rather than another. However, I nowhere intend to restore the lost text verbatim nor do I claim the status of the original for my speculative summary. Instead, the summary is entirely supplementary to the received text and fragments, merely attempting to explain and interpret those.

389 For a summary of the Asinus Aureus which likewise respects the narrative form of the original, see Winkler (1985), 3f. For other and sometimes different summaries of the plot, see Ernout (1923), xlii-vii; Sage (1929), xxxv-xxxvii; Waters (1902), xxv-xxxi; Maiuri (1945), 51-85 (only the Cena, but very detailed); Bücheler (1862), 233-6; Sullivan (1968), 34-80; van Thiel (1971), 25-65; and now Schmeling (1996), 461-469.
attempt will be made to represent faithfully the discursive variety of the work, since this would complicate the story, and in any case the *Satyricon* is not primarily poetic, but, as we have seen earlier, clearly privileges prose as its discourse of choice. In form, this summary could be seen as standing in the same relationship to the original full-text *Satyricon*, as the epitome Λούκιος Ἄονος stands with respect to the lost Μεταμορφώσεις. Since I believe that Apuleius kept the basic structure of *narratio in personis* from the Greek model, the epitome is, in my view, primarily from the central *fabula* ("narrative") of the work, the subordinate narratives having been removed, or only briefly alluded to. This is also the idea behind the following summary. Because the complex mimetic structure and the discursive diversity are suppressed, the recollections and adventures of Encolpius himself can be more easily studied. (The book numbers are merely speculative.)

[ca. 2 books]. Since you insist, I will tell you the varied tale of my woes, and how I traveled to many cities and got to know the minds of many people. I'm from Massilia, and my name is Encolpius. My ancient Greek settlement in the middle of barbaric Gallia counts among its famous citizens certain travelers who explored the outer-ocean, and came back to tell incredible tales. In this aristocratic and austere outpost of civilization I was given an old-fashioned education. But when I was still young, I fell in love with a boy named Giton, a neighbor of mine, the most handsome and intelligent lad in the whole of Massilia. Unfortunately, my poverty caused me to have little to give him in return for his favours. However, a plague had afflicted the city and the priests were looking for someone who was fit to play the scapegoat in return for being fed for a whole year at public expense. And so, out of need, I offered myself as the scapegoat, and was accepted on account of my anatomy. During this period of easy living I grew fatter and healthier every day from eating figs and other pure food. The rumor about my large penis soon filled the city, and fanned the flames of desire in a certain lady of good standing whose name was Tryphaena. This beautiful and wealthy woman approached me through her maids, and great intimacies began between us.
This year of good living, however, was soon ending and the much dreaded ritual drew nigh. On the appointed day, I was dressed up according to custom with branches and in sacred attire, and so exposed to the rage of the citizenry, I was led through all the streets of the city, while they cursed my person and seemed for some reason to direct their wrath particularly at my private parts. This awful experience, which was not just painful but extremely humiliating to myself, finally ended in my being cast out of the city and into exile.

Tryphaena finally came to my rescue, for she knew the captain of a large merchantman from Tarentum anchored in the harbour of Massilia. His name was Lichas and he had his wife with him on the ship. When I refused to leave without Giton, Tryphaena consented to his coming with me for she knew that we couldn't live without each other. She herself decided to sail off into voluntary exile, to freely pursue her own pleasures in the world. With her came a large retinue of slaves and many other possessions.

[ca. 3 books]. Although the ship was ultimately bound for Tarentum, where the captain had his wealthy estate, we had to make many stops on the way. We first set sail for Ostia, the harbour city of Rome itself. Once at sea, Tryphaena began to show greater interest in Giton than in me, and to my distress the boy seemed not much to mind her attention. The captain, however, made little attempt to hide his interest in my person, and under the circumstances I could not refuse him certain favours in token of my gratitude. After a few days sailing a violent storm fell upon us, and suffering much hardship we made it into Portus, the harbour of Ostia. From there we went on land to the world's capital. During our stay the Romans celebrated an ancient festival in commemoration of the licentious equality which prevailed on earth in the golden age of Saturn. For several days unrestrained liberty prevailed in the streets of Rome; slaves ridiculed their masters, and spoke with license on every subject; priest made sacrifices with their heads uncloaked; criminals were spared; schools were closed; all was riot and debauchery.

[ca. 2 books] Once Lichas had finished his business, we boarded the ship again and headed for Campania. Now, the sweet harmony which had reigned among crew and passengers was beginning to turn bitter. I could no longer tolerate Tryphaena's monopoly of Giton's affection. The two were attempting to exclude me, and the unfairness of it made my blood seethe with rage.
Besides, on board was also the captain's wife, Hedyle, who from the start did not like her husband's interest in me, and had now caught him in his flagrant marital violations. Predictably, she wanted somehow to take revenge on him and at the same time to satisfy her own desires. Upon arriving in another Roman harbour, in Puteoli, we left the ship and went on foot to nearby Baiae. In this wanton bathing resort, the matron Hedyle, Giton and I secretly shared some licentious moments in the company of her maids, and finally we struck a pact to flee from the ship. I first of all wanted to get Giton away from Tryphaena to restore our old relationship. When the others were still at Baiae, the three of us went back to the ship and I stole the sistrum and fine robe of the ship's protecting deity, Isis, because, as I hoped, it would fetch a fine price later when sold. In the olden days travelers used to be fed by pious people, but in our times nobody helps a stranger without a profit. When we were still in the portico of Hercules in the harbour area of Puteoli, we ran into Lichas and Tryphaena who had come to suspect what was afoot. A violent confrontation ensued where I denounced Tryphaena's wicked ways and said that she was to blame for our elopement. Hedyle appealed to nearby sailors for help, claiming her husband was a common pirate who was trying to abduct her friends and herself. The last we saw of them was that our noble sailors were beating and making ready to mug a clamouring and furious Lichas.

[ca. 2 books]. It slowly dawned on me that I was embarking on a criminal career, and my fear of being caught made me intensely uneasy. At first we stayed with Hedyle, but soon we parted company with her, since it seemed to me that she was turning into another Tryphaena. What I wanted primarily was to be alone with Giton. In a market in Puteoli, I tried to sell for our sustenance the fine robe and rattle of Isis. However, an advocate named Euscion caught us and accused us of having simply stolen the expensive items. The cruel man loudly screamed that we were fugitives and couldn't possibly be the rightful owners of so many regal spoils. A true Cerberus of the courts, he kept barking his accusations until we were forced to hand over the goods and had to promise that we would show up in court the day after. We were badly shaken and our chances of escaping were slim, but as it happened a rich gentleman by the name of Lycurgus spotted us and took an immediate liking to our persons. Lycurgus
was an influential man, and he sent his steward to make a deal with the magistrates, who upon being paid handed us over to his custody. [ca. 3 books]. And so it was that against all odds I escaped trial. We, of course, were very happy to have found a saviour, and gladly went with him to his sumptuous Campanian villa. Soon, however, it became clear what he intended for me, because, as I discovered, he had a private jail-house on his estate. Though I had escaped the harshness of public justice, the hardships I suffered in the private paradise of this cruel man were worse. Giton, however, got a different treatment, for in the daytime Lycurgus made him do the job of a woman in the jail, but at night he brought the boy to his bed. This arrangement greatly upset my feelings. In this slave-gang for free men, I met Ascytolos, a young man of a very similar fortune as myself. He didn't run from my sexual advances, and so we became lovers in the garden, where we otherwise often suffered great hardships from being bitten by flies, but mainly because we were still young and unhardened and certainly not accustomed to working. In fact, because of my delicate nature, I was not of much use to Lycurgus, until he decided that he could use me in his gladiatorial company. I wasn't even trained, but when the day arrived they dressed me in a delicate tunic, and forced me into the center of the spectacle, where I was shamefully matched with a woman, who almost killed me. As the laughter filled the amphitheater, Fortune saw fit to save my life by bringing on a great earthquake which shook down the theater. Many died but I escaped by hurling myself into the latrine. After the disaster, when night had fallen, I returned again to the villa of Lycurgus. As I met Ascytolos again, he commented on the awful stench that came from my person, but decided to join me in my plans to escape. I had been careful to hide from Ascytolos the true nature of my relationship with the Giton. Ascytolos and I broke into the villa and found Giton sadly sleeping in the arms of Lycurgus. When he did not want to give up his possession, I was so enraged that I killed my enemy and so saved my dearest Giton. The boy helped me to find a treasure of gold coins that Lycurgus had sowed into his shirt. This we took with us and some other articles that we could carry. [Book 13?]. The three of us, Ascytolos, Giton and I, had now formed a company and decided to share our belongings. It was our plan to take refuge in a Greek city nearby, which was reputed to have good schools and inhabitants
who loved eloquence and the liberal arts. We hoped there to reap benefits from 
an environment so congenial to the educated. At night we moved southwards 
along the highway, but as we emerged from the Crypta Neapolitana we came 
upon a shrine sacred to Priapus. The cult was engaged in a wild orgy, and 
when I suddenly appeared to them during the celebration half naked and out of 
owner, they immediately fell to my feet and worshipped me as if I were 
Priapus. There I stood impersonating the god, stick and all, and those 
superstitious people first completely undressed me then clothed me in an 
expensive robe. I was still wearing this outfit when I ran away and accidentally 
left behind the gold coins in the old shirt. From a distance I saw a rustic find it 
where I had left it unguarded. As cyltos did not believe me and suspected that I 
had stolen the money myself. Late that night we finally arrived at our 
destination, where we checked into a lodging house. That night I still couldn't 
enjoy the pleasures of Giton because As cyltos kept a wakeful eye on the boy. 
[Book 14]. When the sun came up the next morning, As cyltos and I put our 
plan into practice and went straight to the local school of rhetoric where we first 
encountered the antescholarius Menelaus and then listened to a suasoria 
delivered by the rhetor Agamemnon. In the portico outside the school we 
introduced ourselves to him and he promised to take us along to a dinner-party 
that night. The discussion turned to eloquence and I tried to impress him by 
delivering a short tirade against the vices of modern declamation. Agamemnon 
appreciated my sound judgment, but defended his profession and extemporized 
a little poem on morals and education. As cyltos disappeared in the middle of 
the poem, and when I noticed this, I too went after him because his recent 
interest in Giton caused me not to trust him. But I got lost in the city and when 
I asked for directions to my home, a street-vendor tricked me into a brothel 
where she said I must live. There I ran into As cyltos who said he had similarly 
been tricked by a man who wanted to have sex with him. We barely managed 
to escape from this place. Resuming my erratic search for the inn I finally 
cought a glimpse of Giton in a mist, standing in the street. When the boy had 
showed me our lodgings, I asked him about lunch, but he started sobbing and 
told me that As cyltos had been there earlier and had attempted to rape him. I 
was furious and quarreled bitterly with As cyltos, who defended himself by 
reminding me that he had allowed me to do to him in the garden what he had
attempted to do with the boy at the inn. I wanted to break up our friendship right away, in order to resume my old relationship with Giton. Ascytlos, however, pointed out that Agamemnon had invited us that night to go with him to a dinner-party, and so, since I was both hungry and penniless, I reluctantly agreed to postpone the breakup until the day after. After checking to see whether Ascytlos hadn't left I hurried to take my pleasure with Giton, but before I was completely finished, Ascytlos came back and interrupted our love-making, beating me and taunting for what I was doing with Giton.

As a preparation for dividing our belongings we went to the forum to sell the stolen robe from the cult of Priapus. Through Fortune's wondrous play, the man and the woman who came up to us and showed interest in the garment, had with them our shirt with the money. I realized that the man was the rustic, who had found the shirt, and that he was trying to sell it without knowing its actual worth. I wanted to claim my property, but the courts are corrupt, and so we decided that it was better to buy it back, except we had no money. Suddenly, the woman recognized the pallium from its signs and called out for the bystanders to grab the thieves! We were each holding on to the others garment, when some shady jurists came up to us. They claimed both parties were suspected of stealing and therefore we had to deposit the pallium to be exhibited in court the day after. We, of course, demanded likewise that the others also deposit the shirt. But the rustic grew so indignant at being accused of stealing the seemingly worthless shirt that instead of depositing it he threw it in Ascytlos's face. And so by chance we fully recovered our treasure. But on the way back we were followed by the woman who turned out to be the maid of Quartilla, the priestess of the cult of Priapus, which I had tricked the night before. She herself soon arrived at the inn and demanded that we help her find a remedy for her tertian fever, which she said was caused by the cold which resulted from her religious awe after the sacrilegious trick played on her. She now took over the inn, and her maid immediately went to work on my mentula, which was totally frigid. When Ascytlos and I tried to struggle we were tied up and taken back to the shrine of Priapus where I was given the aphrodisiac satyrion and we told each other erotic stories. After I had drunk most of the satyrion, I became all fired up and Quartilla and I had intercourse. Later she had us tortured and assaulted by a cinaedus. The whole party fell asleep out of
exhaustion, but we soon woke up again, and Quartilla made sure we stayed awake most of the night, claiming that the orgy was an all-night vigil for Priapus. She and her maid Psyche staged the marriage of poor Giton and "Nightlong" (Pannychis), a slave girl of hers who looked no older than seven. Neither boy nor girl seemed to mind getting manie& and Quartilla dragged me close to her to watch their childish play through a hole in the door. Towards morning Ascylos, Giton and I were allowed to return to our lodgings, after promising to return for a last dinner of liberty the day after.

[Book 15]. Now came the second day of our stay in the city, when the tertian attack of Quartilla would come, if our remedy hadn't worked. We were terrified of the prospect of returning to her place, and I was especially worried about her threat to have Giton as an erotic appetizer that evening. But one of Agamemnon's slaves came by to remind us of another dinner invitation for scholars, this time to the house of the freedman Trimalchio. So we forgot about Quartilla and walked to the baths, where we met with this extremely wealthy and eccentric person and later went home with him. His house was a maze of eccentric decor and his servants behaved like public entertainers and tricksters rather than the household of a pater familias. The food was likewise, and every dish turned out to be made of something other than what it had seemed at first. Trimalchio was constantly showing off his love of the liberal arts and readily put on display his jumbled knowledge, but we, educated schoolmen that we were, were forced to stay silent except to flatter him, or else never be invited again. Meanwhile the freedmen, who were his guests, rambled on in an unschooled manner, even attacking us for our arrogance and calling us fools because of our education. Habinnas, a stonemason working on the host's tomb, was a late arrival to the party. When Trimalchio recklessly wanted us to take a bath on a full stomach we tried to escape from his house for the first time, but we were turned back by the doorkeeper and his hellish watchdog. The place was beginning to seem like the underworld, as we were unable to leave. When the household was rehearsing the funeral of their drunken master the noise was so great that the night-watch thought the villa was on fire and broke in. Then we took the opportunity, said good-bye to Agamemnon, and finally made our escape.
[Book 16?]. Through Giton's intelligence we at last made it back to our lodgings in the dark of night, and once there I tried to make love to the boy, but fell asleep in the middle of the action out of sheer drunkenness. While I was unconscious, Ascytlos, the scoundrel, stole Giton away from me and brought him to his own bed. When I woke up the morning after and found my bed empty I first planned to kill both of them in their sleep but decided not to and instead beat Giton out of the bed and demanded that Ascytlos leave right away. He didn't protest and we proceeded to divide the spoils. But then he insisted that we split Giton as well, as if he too were our common property. I thought he was joking, but he drew his sword and threatened to cut off his share. I grabbed my sword and we prepared to fight, but Giton begged us to calm down, and said he alone deserved to die, because he had violated the oath of friendship. Ascytlos suggested that the boy be allowed to choose whom he wished to follow, and I eagerly consented to this plan, thinking that my long-standing relationship with the boy had forged unbreakable ties between us. Given a choice the boy didn't even hesitate but straightway preferred Ascytlos and left with him. I was thunderstruck with sorrow and jealousy and moved to another lodging where I locked myself in for three days. I realized the mistake I had made. In getting rid of Lycurgus I had taken into my trust Ascytlos, who was even crueler. I decided to revenge my disgrace and kill the couple, and so I armed myself with a sword and went out to look for them in the porticoes. But a soldier I met on the way stopped me and confiscated my sword. Perhaps he was just a thief. Later I was glad that he had frustrated my murderous plan.

I came to a temple where there was a gallery full of old paintings. A poet named Eumolpus entered the temple and introduced himself to me as I stood there admiring pictures of mythical lovers who, unlike me, enjoyed their loved ones without competition. Eumolpus tried to persuade me that his ragged looks were a proof of his talent, since it showed him to be better than the parasites who compromise artistic integrity by flattery at the tables of the rich. Rich men, he said, hate and persecute the lovers of letters in order to make them, too, seem inferior to the value of money. I told him about Giton and my erotic sorrows, and to cheer me up he told me a tale of his conquest of a Pergamene boy. His story was intended to show how all boys put up resistance at first, and have to be bought, but later cannot get enough of a good thing. Then we
discussed the decline of classical art and that led to his improvising on the fall of Troy, which was the subject of the painting I had been admiring in the gallery. Eumolpus had to stop reciting when those walking in the gallery pelted him with stones. He fled the temple and I followed him down to the sea fearing that I too might be taken for a poet. When we were out of reach from their missiles, I told him he was crazy and that I too would throw stones at him if he didn’t stop talking like a poet instead of a man. He acknowledged that he had often met with such negative applause and promised to control himself in the future. We decided to have dinner together at my place.

We went to the baths and there I found Giton alone guarding the clothes of Ascytlos and looking unhappy. I took him back to the inn and left Eumolpus reciting at the baths. My love for Giton quickly caused me to forgive him. He told me he had only chosen Ascytlos because he was stronger, out of concern for my welfare, because otherwise I would have suffered at his hands. When night came and dinner was served Eumolpus returned. I was afraid he would bring back Ascytlos, but when he turned out to be alone, I let him in. He told of how some one by the name of Ascytlos had lost his clothes in the baths and had been left standing naked, while a crowd gathered to admire his enormous member, which made the boy himself look like a mere appendage. Finally, the young man was escorted home by a Roman knight who eagerly came to his assistance. The poet finally contrasted this fine appraisal of a penis to the disgraceful rejection of his poetry. When Eumolpus saw Giton, he immediately became interested in him and I feared that I had taken into my trust yet another rival for Giton’s love. I was further irritated by Giton’s positive admiration for the old man. I showed Eumolpus the door, but he tricked me by locking me in and going after the boy. I decided to hang myself, but was stopped by the two of them upon returning. Giton said he would die before me and proceeded to cut his throat with a razor. I too grabbed the same weapon and tried to kill myself but it turned out to be an especially blunted razor for beginners and so neither of us was harmed. A lodger now entered the room complaining about the noise and soon Eumolpus was fighting with a whole group of lodgers outside. I was so angry at him that I enjoyed watching him being beaten. When Giton wanted to help the old man, I hit him on the head and made him cry. Finally, Bargates the caretaker of the block saved Eumolpus, for they were
acquainted and he wanted to employ the poet to compose invective against his mistress. At this moment Asclytos arrived with a public herald to proclaim the loss of Giton and offer rewards for his restitution. I made Giton hide under a bed and sought to soften Asclytos's anger by lying to him that I had not seen Giton, and claimed that his search was just a pretext to kill me. He assured me that he was still my friend, and in the end he left with the herald. Eumolpus now rushed into the room and threatened to fetch Asclytos again to collect the reward. But I pleaded with him, saying that the boy had run away, but then Giton sneezed and gave himself away. The boy nursed the old man's injuries and together we appealed to his humanity and culture. He said it was his custom to live dangerously and promised to spare us, but demanded that we either follow him or lead the way to somewhere else.

[Book 17?]. It was dark night when we followed him aboard an unknown ship and spread our blankets in a secret place on the deck.

To our extreme horror we soon discovered that we had inadvertently returned to the ship of Lichas and that Tryphaena was still aboard. When we told this to Eumolpus, he begged us to believe that although he had used the ship before he hadn't known about our enmities with the captain and his passenger. In our confusion we sought a solution to our problems by arguing pro and contra as they do in the schools but we found declamation useless for solving real problems. Finally, we shaved our heads and Eumolpus inscribed our foreheads with ink to give credence to his story that we were his branded runaway slaves. As we were shaving, however, a seasick passenger saw us and reported our ominous behavior at sea. Both the captain and Tryphaena, who had been desperately looking for us, had mysteriously dreamt that we had come on board the ship again. When we were dragged before the captain and his female passenger, she and her handmaidens recognized Giton, and he himself recognized my penis whom he addressed by my name ("Incrotch"). Eumolpus boldly pleaded our case, but without success. It was only when the ship was in a state of mutiny because of us, that Eumolpus was able to broker an armistice with a formal treaty, according to which Tryphaena and Lichas were required to pay good cash in compensation if they ever sexually assaulted Giton or myself.
Festivity took over from hostility. Eumolpus entertained us with a satire about a certain widow from Ephesus, who was so faithful to the memory of her dead husband that she even followed him into his tomb and stayed there for days. The story was intended to show that although women may seem chaste at first, putting up austere defenses, they fall in love all too easily, and in the end forget their own children in their mad desire for a complete stranger. The sailors laughed at the story, but not Lichas who was reminded of his wife. Tryphaena blushed with shame and buried her face in Giton's neck. My jealousy was rekindled at being excluded from their sweet caresses, though the dear boy was probably just being cautious not to upset a newly brokered armistice. Now a storm came on and when Lichas was asking me with hands outstretched for the stolen robe and rattle of the ship's protective goddess, he was suddenly carried off by the wind and disappeared into the sea. Tryphaena escaped safely into the ship's dinghy along with her family of slaves. Giton and I tied ourselves together to be united in the moment of death. We drifted ashore in the storm-tossed wreck. Eumolpus, however, did not even notice what was happening, since he was inspired under deck writing out a poem on a huge parchment. We had to drag the frenetic poet out of the wreck. I also found Lichas's body lying on the beach and improvised on the theme of how human planning is regularly frustrated by Fortune. Later we burnt the corpse on a pyre and Eumolpus improvised an epigram.

We headed on foot for Croton, originally an illustrious and warlike Greek colony, but now a mere ghost-town and obsessed with legacy-hunting. It was Eumolpus's plan to pose as a shipwrecked African landowner with great estates, who had recently been bereft of his only son and was himself in bad health. We were to pose as his slaves. This was intended to trick the locals into providing for us in the hope of inheriting Eumolpus's alleged property. Here the gold from the villa of Lycurgus and the clothes I had stolen were useful to give Eumolpus the appearance of affluence. On the road to Croton, the poet recited his unfinished political epic about the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, the one he was inspired to compose on the storm-tossed ship. He effused this composition with whirling fluency until he finally stopped, just in time for us to arrive at our destination. Once there, we executed successfully the inspired plan of Eumolpus.
[Book 18?]. For a long time we lived in great luxury and stuffed ourselves with food, though like most outlaws I anxiously waited for the punishment I had in store. In Croton, where I had taken up the pseudonym Polyænos, I was solicited by a beautiful young matron, appropriately called Circe. As I learned from Chrysis, her handmaiden and go-between, the young woman typically burned with desire for condemned criminals and flogged slaves. When we met in the grove by Love's temple, I beheld a beauty even beyond the best marble statues of the great ancient sculptors. I was naturally eager to please her, but I found myself unable to have an erection. As it turned out, I couldn't even succeed with Giton. I tried various remedies before seeing Circe for the second time but I was still unable to please her. I went home in utter shame, having been not unjustly flogged and spat upon by her slaves. Though I failed in my attempt to cut off my useless and deceased member, at least I succeeded in verbally berating it. Afterwards, I felt a little embarrassed for talking to my penis, but as I reasoned to myself one can find epic precedents for this kind of behavior, since ancient heroes never thought much of conversing with parts of their body, the heart for example or the eyes.

It dawned on me that I might have been rendered impotent by the poison I drank in such quantities during Quartilla's orgy back in the Greek city. So I checked with Giton to find out whether Ascyltos, too, had abstained from lovemaking that night when he carried the boy off to his own bed while I was asleep. The way I figured it, this would furnish me with a proof. Giton swore that Ascyltos had not forced him. Armed with this evidence for poisoning, I went to the temple of Priapus and kneeling on the threshold I apologized to the god for my crime, which, as I explained, was not all that serious, and had in fact been committed out of need, and, besides, with only one part of my body. Finally I promised him a sacrificial banquet when things would get better. When I was still at the temple, Proselenos, the old hag who had tried before to cure my impotence, dragged me into the priestess's cell and started beating me for having excited the wrath of the gods against her. Oenothea, the priestess of the cult, now arrived in her cell, and upon hearing the story of my failure she declared that she could fix any problem with her magic, and mine especially if I only spent a night with her.
And so I became a guest in the priestess's squalid cell. She was in the middle of preparing a disgusting dinner, when she fell off a chair, landed on the stove, toppled the pot and put out the fire. While she was away fetching more fire at a neighbor's, I was attacked by the sacred geese of the temple, whose leader I heroically slew in a fierce battle. I feared that Oenothea would become angry at finding the goose dead and so I tried to leave, but as I was about to go, she returned with the fire. I pretended that I had been waiting for her there on the threshold. I told her what had happened and showed her the goose and she panicked at beholding such sacrilege. When Proselenos arrived she too acted as if I had killed my own father. They were completely calmed, however, as soon as I offered them two gold pieces for the goose. If you have money you can get away with anything, including murder. We now cooked the goose and drank wine, and the drunken and libidinous women tortured me with their useless medicine for impotence until I fled the temple with them in pursuit. Next, Chrysis, the maid of Circe, fell in love with me. She had obviously changed her mind from the time she told me that she only fancied upper-class men. But I was still useless for lovemaking.

A certain matron whose name was Philomela put her two children in the care of Eumolpus, ostensibly for their education but really to prostitute them for a share in his presumed legacy. Eumolpus straightway took advantage of the situation and copulated with the daughter, although he tried everything to preserve the pretense that he was in bad health. I tried to have the son when he was peeping on his sister and Eumolpus, but found the god still against me.

Finally I told Eumolpus that Mercury, who often plays this role, had conveyed that particular part of my body back from the dead. I lifted my tunic and Eumolpus approved all. He was taken aback at first, but in order to better believe it, he handled the favour of the gods with both his hands. I warned him that the fortune-hunters were tired of his promises and that they were growing less generous. In his last will, Eumolpus stated that each one of his heirs, except we his freedmen, would be required to eat a piece of his dead body before receiving any inheritance. One of the legacy-hunters, Gorgias by name, showed himself willing to satisfy the condition...
CHAPTER FIVE
NARRATIVE: ENCOLPIUS AND HIS AUDIENCE

After the preceding three chapters, dedicated to the summary and reconstruction of the Satyricon, we are now ready to consider in more detail the two personae of Encolpius. We take it to be axiomatic that the attributes and situation of a speaker's persona are fundamental to any interpretation of the utterances ensuing from that persona. Therefore, it is necessary to include in these considerations the narrator's presentation of his story to the audience which, despite having so far received little attention from scholars, is of no less importance than the protagonist's interaction with the characters of the story. One could even argue that the narrative situation was the most important aspect of the story, for there is no information available to us about young Encolpius and the other characters which is not shaped by the narrator's words. This does not, however, alter the validity of the perception that the two are distinct. The protagonist is created—and thus takes on a life of his own—by the narrator's act of impersonating his younger self, in exactly the same way that he portrays other characters of the story and utters fragments of speeches in their name.

The unresolved scholarly debate regarding the nature of the difference between the narrator and the protagonist has mostly centered around the perceived ethical qualities of these two personae, and the problem has most frequently been cast as a question of whether the narrator is considerably older and more mature than the protagonist. This is necessarily a difficult interpretive problem, which cannot, it seems, be solved to everyone's liking. The history of this debate can be traced back to the last decades of the nineteenth century when
Elimar Klebs (1889) and Richard Heinze (1899) made the first attempts to describe Encolpius’s tone and narrative stance in the Satyricon. Klebs, who employed critical terms from modern narratology, advanced his once influential thesis that the Satyricon was an almost modern realistic novel, only with an epic structure borrowed from the Odyssey, which supplied it with esthetic and artistic unity.390 The purpose of the parodic comparisons of the protagonist’s experience with the lot of epic heroes, according to Klebs, was to express, by way of irony, the narrator’s awareness of his pathetic humiliation. This irony was supposedly both sophisticated and self-conscious and resembled the complicated narrative posturing often assumed in modern realistic novels.

Klebs’s interpretation was countered by Heinze, whose understanding of the narrative structure of the Satyricon was more rooted in Greco-Roman literary history.391 Heinze correctly revises the highly modern idea of the stance of Encolpius as an ironic self-conscious reflection upon his own humiliation. He argues that such irony is missing in his pathetic description of his suffering in the love scenes with Giton, and points out that this makes it difficult to determine where self-irony begins and where it ends. Instead of modern irony, Heinze sees the self-deprecation of the narrator as part of the ancient comic stance. He compares the narrative stance of Encolpius to the narrators of the Greek erotic fictions and observes major differences: whereas the tone of the latter shows that the trials and tribulations of its heroes are meant to be taken “very seriously”, the work of Petronius sports an attitude which implies that, whatever pain and sorrow is endured by Encolpius and his comrades, is “fully deserved”, and “can only, and should only arouse laughter in the reader.” The difference between these two narrative types, he claims, is akin to the

390Klebs (1889), 631f.

391Heinze (1899), 503.
difference in drama between tragedy and comedy or farce. An even closer parallel would be tragedy and satyr-plays, or tragic parody. Although Heinze showed a deep understanding of the problems involved in determining the tone and stance of the narrator, he never advanced much beyond saying that Encolpius's pose was comic and parodic in comparison with the more serious narratives.

The problem resurfaced with a vengeance in the scholarship of the sixties and the seventies of this century, a period particularly interested in questions of psychology and character. Veyne, Sullivan, Walsh, Rankin and George saw Encolpius as an inconsistent and fragmented personality, who was further complicated by being merely a "transparent mask" for the historical author, who accordingly was the real narrator.392 It was as an attempt to reconcile "the discrepancies in Encolpius' character" and to clearly differentiate the narrator's persona from that of the historical author that Roger Beck presented his initial thesis, which vastly improved on the theory of narrative so far used by scholars:393

The key to the solution is, I believe, a realization that in dealing with Encolpius one is concerned not with a single person but with two. Not only are they two distinct persons separated by what is presumably a considerable span of time (the narrator is looking back on his own past adventures) but they are also two very different characters. The narrator [...] is sophisticated and competent, while his former self is chaotic and naïve. Strictly speaking, one should say only that that version of his former self which the narrator chooses to present is chaotic and naïve. For we should be aware that the Encolpius who is the protagonist in the adventures related is as much the creation of the Encolpius

392Veyne (1964), 301-324; Sullivan (1968), 119; Walsh (1970), 81; Rankin (1971), 19; George (1966), 349f.

393Beck (1973), 43. The arguments are further elaborated in Beck (1975).
who tells the story as are the other characters who make their appearance in the novel.

After his clear exposition of the structural relationship between narrator and protagonist in the *Satyricon*, Beck proceeds to establish the sophistication of the narrator versus the naïveté of the protagonist. As it happened, it was this further elaboration of the thesis which would be incorrectly construed as the touchstone of the validity of his basic description of the narrative structure. The correctness of Beck's model, however, does not only rely on the internal evidence of the *Satyricon* but is supported by the general narrative paradigm of personal recollections, which, as we have seen, ultimately goes back to the *Odyssey*.

If we take a brief look at how ancient narrators of fiction account for their relationship with the characters and material of their stories, we see that there was a variety of well defined stances available for use. The author of the *Apocolocyntosis*, which takes place in heaven and hell, somehow had to account for his knowledge about affairs in places which were naturally inaccessible to him. He therefore wittily pretended to have a "source" for his information in a man, an historical individual, who had become notorious in the times of Caligula for swearing to the senate that he saw Julia, the emperor's sister, ascend to heaven. Lucian, in the prologue to his freely invented *Vera Historia*, similarly starts by expounding the long tradition in Greek letters, founded by Homer in the *Odyssey*, of mendacious story-telling and then makes the confession once and for all that the subsequent story presented in the form of an autobiography is totally untrue in accordance with this venerable tradition! Everywhere in ancient fiction we meet with this requirement to establish a source for the fictional information.394 Mysterious documents, found in an ancient tomb,  

394 Even Odysseus must account for his information about what was spoken by gods in heaven: "This I heard from fair-haired Calypso, and she said that she herself had
are said to guarantee truthfulness of the story, as in Antonius Diogenes's tale *The Wonders Beyond Thule*. A supposedly authentic relief illustrates how everything happened, the narrative being simply an authoritative interpretation of the pictures, as in Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*. Occasionally the story-teller hides behind the authority and general lack of accountability of ancient historians—*quis unquam ab historico iuratores egit?* (Apoc. 1)—and attaches his story to insignificant details in classic historical narratives, as in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoë*, which might be seen as a fictional digression from Thucydides's account of the Sicilian expedition. In Homeric epic the assistance of divine omniscient Muses guarantees the accuracy of the account. When particularly detailed passages occur, the goddesses are re-invoked in order to forestall doubt or disbelief among the audience. In autobiographies, real or fictive, *memory* (the mythological mother of the goddesses) plays the part played by the Muses in epic. When Encolpius casually refers to his memory during the narration of his story, this too is an attempt to induce the reader to accept the account as real and reliable.

In an answer to Beck, F. Jones at first appears to accept the basic formal distinction between Encolpius *qua* narrator and Encolpius *qua* protagonist. But then he proceeds to cast doubt on the extent of the maturity and sophistication of the narrator, although he, too, sees him as having abandoned the bombastic rhetorical style of his youth. Nevertheless, despite the apparent differences in the two *personae*, Jones concludes by virtually closing again the gap between the two Encolpii as a cautionary measure after Beck's supposed failure to positively define the difference in the character of the two *personae*:

---

heard it from the messenger Hermes" (*Od.* 12.389f.). The same requirement to account for information conditions the elaborate beginnings of Plato's *Parmenides* and *Phaedo*. 
Sometimes, however, the narrator seems to get so involved in the act of narration that his distance [from the protagonist] vanishes. This enhances the idea of the bewildering nature of one’s [sic] environment—some things are never properly understood, especially where "love" (Giton) is involved—it also provides a clear connection between the narrator and his former self and by thus giving solidity and continuity to this character it gives us a perspective whereby to see the development.\(^{395}\)

Jones’s willingness to blur the distinction between narrator and protagonist seems to throw us back on the idea of a single and solid Encolpius, however contradictory as a character, unless we succeed in providing a method to pinpoint exactly those character traits of the narrator which will put him at a secure psychological distance from the protagonist.

This formulation of the problem risks confusing psychological distance, or difference in mood and personality, with temporal and situational distance, or difference in \textit{personae}. I can think of no reason why we should regard the ancient rhetorical term \textit{persona} so narrowly as to equate it with the modern psychological term "personality".\(^{396}\) As we have seen in Chapter One, the term \textit{persona} accommodates conceptually not just character, but even more the social type and situation (including the audience to be addressed) in which the speaker finds himself at the moment of uttering the speech. When considered thus, the difference between narrator and protagonist in the \textit{Satyricon} is decisive and cannot be obliterated. While Encolpius \textit{qua} narrator is telling his audience a story from memory, and pretends at least to remember almost everything that has happened to him within a certain period of his past, Encolpius \textit{qua} protagonist is an agent stuck in a given

\(^{395}\)Jones (1987), 819.

\(^{396}\)On this topic, see Gill (1990)(ed.) and Gill (1996).
moment in time, both completely ignorant of what lies ahead, and generally not very resourceful in dealing with people and events.

Much has been made of the "fact" that the narrator of the Satyricon never alludes to what lies ahead in the work.\(^\text{397}\) Not only is this claim discrepant with the evidence, as is shown by the following statement close to the middle of the Cena episode: *nec adhuc sciebamus nos in medio lautitarum, quod aiunt, clivo laborare*—"we didn't yet know that we were struggling, as they say, half way up the slope of delicacies" (47.8), but the assumption that such proleptic statements are necessary in narrative in the form of personal recollections is also unfounded. They are indeed rare in the Greco-Roman erotic fictions as a whole—if we exclude indirect proleptic statements in prophetic oracles and dreams—and this is one of only two in the extant Satyricon.\(^\text{398}\) Anticipating what comes later is hardly a requisite of any story, although it may of course be of use as a narrative figure. In the Satyricon as in other classical narratives, the preterite maintains throughout an unmistakable temporal gap between the time of narration and the time when the events of the story supposedly took place. Even where the narrator uses the present tense for narrating past events (a figure which momentarily creates an impression that the two are existing at the same moment), this does not constitute a true fusion of the two *persona* of Encolpius.\(^\text{399}\)

\(^\text{397}\) Jones (1987), 816; and Slater (1990), 46, who concurs in this view.

\(^\text{398}\) Another technically proleptic statement in the Satyricon is 70.8, *pudet referre quae secuntur*, which refers to the following narrative itself and not the events related as is clear from the present tense (Arrowsmith and Sullivan incidentally translate the present into past tense, but Ehlers gets it right: *Man schämt sich, das Folgende zu berichten*).

\(^\text{399}\) As Jones (1987), 819, seems to indicate. Dowden (1982), 29-30 with n.45, argues for a similar collapse of Lucius, the *auctor*, and Lucius, the *actor*, in Apuleius's *Asinus Aureus*. 
This use of the present tense to intensify the discursive report is part and parcel of the art of narration and does not affect the basic rule of the preterite.

As Gérard Genette has shown in his comprehensive discussion of the moment of narration with respect to the time of the story itself, there are four basic types of narrating acts to be reckoned with: "subsequent (the classical position of the past-tense narrative, undoubtedly far and away the most frequent); prior (predictive narrative, generally in the future tense, but not prohibited from being conjugated in the present […]); simultaneous (narrative in the present contemporaneous with the action); and interpolated (between the moments of the action)." From this schema it is evident that a real fusion of narrator and protagonist can only occur when the time of narration and the time of the story itself are "simultaneous". It is easy to demonstrate that the narrative structure of the Satyricon is unrelated to this avant-garde modern type. The dominance of the preterite in the Satyricon's narrative obviously excludes it from being identical in structure with Robbe-Grillet's early novels, or the so-called French "New Novel". In these works the narrator is the protagonist, and literally tells the story as it happens. Furthermore, since the Satyricon is not an interrupted past tense narrative, such as the "novel by letters" or the "private diary", nor predicting in any sense future events, we are unsurprisingly left with only one slot into which we may fit it, namely the classical past-tense narrative.

To my knowledge, no scholar had argued for a complete collapse of narrator and protagonist until Niall W. Slater introduced his own brand of reader-oriented criticism into the study of the Satyricon. Slater's uncompromising stance may, perhaps, be seen as a logical consequence of the premise which he adopts for his study, for if the reader is the

---

400 Genette (1972), 217.

401 Slater (1990), 46-7.
ultimate reference, in matters of time as well as in other respects, the only meaningful present in narrative is the moment when the reader casts his eyes upon a particular page, and the only meaningful past is that same person's recollection of pages read. Now, if we trace the origin of Slater's method, we recognize without hesitation the pervasive influence of the late Jack Winkler, who was an innovator in the study of the Ancient Novel, and whose method of criticism is most evident in his study of Apuleius's *Asinus Aureus*. In Winkler's method the principal critical concept is the "first reading", and the "first reader". In essence, this idea stresses the reader's linear experience of the text, when first read, as radically different from what happens in the reader's mind during a subsequent reading, when it is known where the story as a whole is leading.

When applied, however, by Slater to the incomplete text of the *Satyricon*, Winkler's concept of the "first reading" is almost transformed into an argument *ex silentio* to the effect that since the modern reader has not "so far" experienced the prologue of the *Satyricon*, where we must assume the narration of Encolpius was introduced, there remains no reason for him to distinguish between the present of the narrating act and the past of the story:

 [...] the notion of a split in Encolpius between narrator and actor, old persona and young persona, [is not] supported by anything the reader has so far experienced in the text. Even if there were in the lost beginning something to set up the notion of Encolpius recounting his past adventures, we should expect some reinforcement of this temporal perspective in the text. There is none.  

---

402 Winkler's *Auctor & Actor* (1985) is missing from the bibliography at the end, no doubt from oversight, but Slater (1990), 140 n.2, elsewhere clearly acknowledges his debt to Winkler's discussion of reading and critical method.

403 Slater (1990), 47 with n.26.
If I understand Slater correctly, he is saying that even if the lost prologue of the *Satyricon* introduced Encolpius as an older narrator commencing the narrative recollections of his past, *even* this would not matter because this temporal "split" is supposedly not reinforced in the extant text. However, his attempt to level out the temporal dimensions of the *Satyricon, de facto* leads to the obliteration of the narrator, which leaves the protagonist alone, as it were, acting out the narrative. Consequently, Slater at times seems to think that the *Satyricon* is not narrated at all, but is rather presented directly as if it were a play or a film. It is demonstrably incorrect that there is no "reinforcement of [the] temporal perspective in the text." What, then, are we to make of the past tense of the narrative? With respect to what, if not the moment of narration, is the time of the story in the past? There need be no doubt, moreover, that the recollections of Encolpius, towards the end, reached their conclusion by picking up theme phrases or, at least, ideas from the prologue in order to clearly resume the present occasion of narration. The form of the classical travelogue, which clearly originates with Odysseus's *Phaeacian Tales*, dictates that Encolpius survived to return and tell his tale; and it is likely, although impossible to prove, that at the end our "hero" reached Rome, the most obvious location of his narrative performance in front of a recognizably Roman audience.404

In Greco-Roman prose fictions, as a rule, the prologue is used to provide important information about the external circumstances under which the story is told, and therefore

404 The only exception to this rule is the narrative of Achilles Tatius's Cleitophon, who notoriously does not return to the initial moment of narration. However, Cleitophon is from the point of view of narrative form a subordinate narrator, since the "author" introduces him before he begins his story, a feature which made problematic the full return to the initial moment. See Most (1989), 114-33.
we most sorely miss this part of the Satyricon. In the prologues to the two fully extant personal recollections, Clitophon's narrative in Achilles Tatius and Lucius's narrative in the Latin Metamorphoses, the narrators are clearly presented as distinct from their younger selves. Both the time and location of the narrative versus the events of the story leave no doubt that the narration of the story takes place after the events are fully over. In Lucius's case, the Latin of the narrative further distances his telling of the story from the events themselves, as they supposedly took place in a Greek-speaking environment.

In the Satyricon the prologue is lost, but the extant text still retains clear references to those initial defining passages, which necessarily introduced Encolpius as giving an account of his past based on his memory of events. One reinforcement of this initial moment is afforded by the obtrusiveness of the process of recollection in passages implying conjecture and doubt, particularly about the intentions and motives of other characters. I am referring to such interjections as *credo*—"I believe" (52.10, 68.4, 110.1, 113.8); *(ut)* *apparebat*—"(as) it seemed" (6.1, 15.5); *scilicet*—"evidently" (14.7, 16.3, 19.4, 20.3, 64.9); *puto*—"I suppose" (136.4); *non dubie*—"no doubt" (113.3); *sive ... sive*—"either this or that" (79.9, 82.2). On the whole Encolpius's recollection of the past is extremely confident—perhaps suspiciously so—but this only increases the significance of such moments of hesitation. They clearly show that the information on which he must base his account of the past is necessarily limited both by the accuracy of his memory, and also by what he himself witnessed or was told by others in the past.

Narratives which take the form of recollection differ in one important way from narratives in which the relation of the storyteller is less clearly defined with respect to the characters and events of the story. Since a recollection narrative is based on the memory of one of the characters, it cannot therefore, without accounting for it especially, introduce
material which was not available to that person as data at the time. Although this may seem to put great constraint on the narrator, there is a hidden advantage. By divulging to the reader no more information than he himself had to act on at a given moment, the narrator leaves the reader to speculate continuously about the meaning and direction that events are taking. This, in turn, makes the reader more likely to appreciate the complexities of the moral and practical problems which the hero must face, and thus creates an audience disposition advantageous to the narrator, whose past follies are often present liabilities. The audience cannot judge the protagonist on the basis of information that they do not have, which assures a fairer trial for the hero (and therefore narrator) who is necessarily under their scrutiny.

In Encolpius's love story, the narrator's continuing blindness with respect to his own obsessive behaviour, not just towards Giton but also towards those who threaten to take him away, could potentially diminish the fides of his audience. For example, a moral critic of Encolpius's account could argue that what introduces the many rivals for Giton's love is not at all the boy's treacherous nature, but Encolpius's own sexual opportunism (at least in the cases of Tryphaena and Ascytos). He is hypocritical, and violates that fidelity which he desiderates in Giton and sets as the model of their relationship. Both narrator and

---

405 See Reardon (1994), 81-82, whose analysis of the narrative method of Achilles Tatius, i.e., of Cleitophon's narrative within that work, reveals the same basic structure.

406 Heinze (1915) speaks of "a feeling of uneasy tension" (ein Gefühl unruhiger Spannung) caused by the restrictions imposed on the authorial perspective during the delivery of the personal account of Aenas in the Aeneid, books 2-3.

407 See Most (1989), 114-33. Recollections are, of course, closely related to such genres as formal apologies and the defendant's speech.
protagonist remain quite oblivious to this dissonance. Indeed, it's one of the respects in which Encolpius remains immature.

We may call this style of narration the *adhuc*-effect, i.e., the deliberate gradual feeding of information to the audience as the story progresses, never making them privy to the narrator's full knowledge about the outcome of events, until each scene has been narrated fully and in detail. There is, however, no absolute necessity compelling the narrator to do this, and as we have seen, at least once in the *Satyricon*, the narrator makes an exception which proves the rule (47.8). Exactly as the narrator says, young Encolpius and his friends, did not know at that time that they were only half way through the dinner party of Trimalchio, although the narrator knows this full well, because he has long since left that dining table and thereafter done many other things as well (some of which we can read about in latter part of the extant *Satyricon*) until the time he tells the story to his audience. At this particular point Encolpius uncharacteristically wishes the audience to share in his knowledge of the hero's future, which is nevertheless in the narrator's past, since this knowledge can be used to give a sense of the excessive quantity of food offered at the party. The guests were already bursting, when half of the food was served. Limited as this information may be, it still constitutes an exception from the constraints on narrative information in the *Satyricon* that we have called the *adhuc*-effect.\textsuperscript{408}

Just as the narrator can, technically, leap ahead into the future of the protagonist (at least into that part of it which is still in the narrator's past), he can also jump back in time and refer to a past, which is shared both by himself and the protagonist. For the sake of clarity we can call this the *paudo ante* effect. An example of this would be when the narrator

\textsuperscript{408}Cf. the use of *adhuc* in 11.2, 13.1, 17.1, 33.3, 54.3, 70.4, 96.3, 99.5, 106.2, 113.7, 115.11.
represents his youthful self as standing on the beach over the corpse of his enemy Lichas: "I recognized Lichas, who a short while ago (\textit{paulo ante}) had been so frightful and unforgiving, now lying prostrate, as it were, before my feet" (115.11, \textit{agnovique terribilem paulo ante et implacabilem Licham pedibus meis paene subjectum}). The ability of the narrator to leave the present of the protagonist and go back in time seems, however, less interesting than his leaps into the future, because it does not distinguish him from the protagonist, who can and does accomplish such feats as well (115.12). It is important to note that here the phrase \textit{paulo ante} refers to a point in time just before the protagonist's present, and yet it is the narrator and not the protagonist who is speaking. This fixation on the past is the rule in the classical past-tense narrative.410

To establish through close reading the temporal difference between narrator and actor, I have chosen two passages from different parts of the work, both of which illustrate the contrast between young Encolpius's continuous heuristic progress from ignorance to knowledge as opposed to the narrator's prior knowledge of the outcome of events. Shortly after the opening of the extant \textit{Satyricon}, the narrator tells us that he left Agamemnon reciting in the portico and ran after Ascyltos, whom he suspected of not being the best of friends. Exhausted and completely lost in an unknown city, as a last resort he approached an old street vendor to ask for directions, not truly expecting that she could tell him where he lived:

\begin{itemize}
\item\textbf{409} Cf. the use of \textit{paulo ante} in 16.3, 49.3, 74.5, 80.8, 96.1, 137.12.
\item\textbf{410} In modern narratology the fixation on a particular character and moment in the past is usually referred to as a "point of view", or as "focalization" through that character.
\end{itemize}
"rogo" inquam "mater, numquid scis ubi ego habitem?" delectata est illa
urbanitate tam stulta et "quidni sciam?" inquit consurrexitque et coepit me
praecedere. divinam ego putabam et subinde ut in locum secretiorem venimus,
centonem anus urbana reiecit et "hic" inquit "debes habitare". cum ego negarem
me agnoscere domum, video quosdam inter titulos nudasque meretries furtim
spiantes. tarde, immo iam sero intellexi me in fornicem esse deductum.
execratus itaque aniculae insidias operui caput et per medium lupanar fugere
coepti. 411

[I said, "Listen, mother, you wouldn't happen to know where I live?"—She,
charmed with such stupid wit, answered: "And why shouldn't I?"—then she
stood up and began to lead the way. I took her to be some sort of apparition,
and when we came to a locale more out of the way, the humorous old woman
drew back the curtain—and said: "This should be where you live."—While I
was saying that I didn't recognize the place as my home, I see some naked
whores furtively tip-toeing amid written signs. Slowly (or rather now when it
was too late) I understood that I had been led to a whorehouse. I immediately
cursed the trickery of the old lady, covered my head, and took to flight through
the center of the bordello.]

The fundamentally different cognitive status of narrator and protagonist emerges clearly
from this recollection of a past incident (the present tense in video is of course without any
temporal significance). The narrator's description of the old woman's reaction to the
question, and especially the mocking qualification of that question as urbanitas tam stulta,
signals that the mood and understanding of the narrator is just the opposite of that of the
desperate and helpless protagonist. The split continues: while young Encolpius thinks the
old woman divina for knowing where he lives and being willing to show him the way, the
older Encolpius knows full well that something else than altruism is behind the good deed.

411 Sat. 6.5-7.4.
His knowledge is signaled by the anticipatory qualification of the old woman as *urbana*. The contrast between the absolute naïveté of the one and the knowing amusement of the other could not be clearer. The realization of what is happening comes painfully slowly to the youth, and only gradually does he fully recognize that he is being led on and insulted (*tardo, iam sero intellexi*). For some reason, however, we detect little or no resentment in the narrator's account of this humiliating incident. There seems rather to be in him a clownish enjoyment of how easily he himself was taken in, and how silly he was to trust that old practical joker.

Another passage, this time from the *Cena*, provides further illustration of the gap between the narrator's knowledge and the protagonist's ignorance of events in the future of the latter. This passage is the narrator's account of his own puzzled reaction to one of the many deceptive articles of food offered at Trimalchio's table:

> [...] gustantibus adhuc nobis repositorium allatum est cum corbe, in quo gallina erat lignea patentibus in orbem alis, quales esse solent quae incubant ova. accessere continuo duo servi et symphonia strepente scrutari paleam coeperunt erutaque subinde pavonina ova divisere convivis. convertit ad hanc scaenam Trimalchio vultum et "amici," ait "pavonis ova gallinae iussi supponi. et mehercules timeo ne iam concepti sint; temptemus tamen, si adhuc sorbilia sunt." accipimus nos cochlearia non minus selibras pendentia *ovaque ex farina pingui figurata pertundimus*. ego quidem paene proieci partem, nam videbatur mihi iam in pullum coisse. deinde ut audivi veterem convivam: "hic nescio quid boni debet esse", persecutus putamen manu pinguissimam ficedulam inveni piperato vitello circumdatam.412

> [...] we were still busy with the hors d'oeuvres, when a tray was brought in with a basket on it, in which there was a hen made of wood, spreading out her

---

412 *Sat.* 33.3–8.
wings as they do when they are sitting. The music grew loud: two slaves at once came up and then hunted in the straw. Peacock's eggs were pulled out and handed to the guests. Trimalchio turned his head towards this performance, and said: "I gave orders, my friends, that peacock's eggs should be put under a common hen, and by Hercules I'm afraid they might now be addled. However, let us see if they can still be sucked." We took our spoons, half-a-pound in weight at least, and hampered at the eggs, which were made out of flour and fat. I almost threw away my portion. I thought a peachick had already formed. But hearing a practiced diner say, "What treasure have we here?", I poked through the shell with my finger, and found a very fat fig-pecker, rolled up in spiced yolk of egg."

I quote these two passages in full, because the linear experience of reading them cannot be described and must quite simply be experienced. Again we notice that the narrator communicates the essential facts to the audience (ovaque ex farina pingui figurata pertundimus) several lines before the protagonist has found out that the eggs are not real. Once this information has been divulged, a dramatic irony kicks in and the painfully slow understanding of the hero is made all the more evident. This is clearly the intention, as can be seen from the phrase: "I almost threw away my portion," which self-consciously exaggerates young Encolpius's clownishness beyond what actually happened at the time.

P. Veyne argued that in the Cena Encolpius takes the stance of fausse naïveté as a sophisticated means of exposing not only Trimalchio's bad manners, but also his own collegae, the schoolmen, who seem to mock their host and his guests more crudely than he.413 As Beck has shown, what Veyne failed to take into account was the difference between the attitude of the young Encolpius at the Cena and the narrating Encolpius, on

413Veyne (1964), 301-324.
whose words we must rely for the account of the dinner-party as a whole.\footnote{Beck (1975), 280f.} What needs to be explained is the "manifest discrepancy between Encolpius' stated conduct and reactions on the one side and the tone of cool irony that informs the narrative on the other [...] this discrepancy [...] disappears as a problem when one takes into account the fact that a later Encolpius, the narrator, is reporting the adventures of an earlier Encolpius, the protagonist."\footnote{Beck (1975), 280.}

As we saw in the Introduction, Veyne did not take the persona of Encolpius at face value, but tried to peek behind it, especially in the narrative of the dinner-party at Trimalchio's. His excuse for doing so was based on the supposed uniqueness of the tone and purpose of this episode. Unlike the rest of the Satyricon, the Cena was supposed to illustrate a veritable scandal of the early empire, which was the excessive wealth of freedmen. That the depiction of Trimalchio's dinner-party is intended as a scandalous account is undoubtedly correct; however, as we have seen through the reconstruction, the same could be said of several other episodes which satirize such popular causes of complaint as the sorry state of rhetoric, the abuse of religious cults for financial and sexual exploitation, the abuse of the private ergastula, women's eagerness to have affairs with strangers. It seems that the Cena was not so different from the rest of the work after all. A scandalous and sensational narrative is usually entertaining as such and the emphasis is obviously on making the most of that element of entertainment, rather than delivering an outright moralistic condemnation. Passing a judgment is left up to the ideal audience, who are eminently capable of doing so, having been created as the implicit "normal" subjectivity which witnesses the narrator's comic act.
In the examples quoted above, one is certainly struck by the limited apology offered by the narrator for the pathetic performance of his past self. Narrating his experience, he seems particularly conscientious when reporting the verbal abuse to which he was subjected by other characters. We recall, for example, his quarrel with Ascylos early on, from which he emerges an exposed hypocrite and branded as *homo stultissimus* (9.2-10.3). Far from trying to cover up the disgrace of this defeat by attempting to ennoble his intent, the narrator announces bluntly that the only reason why his young self so hastily sought divorce from his friendship with Ascylos was "lust" for Giton (10.7, *hanc tam praecipitem divisionem libido faciebat*). Another example of such deleterious testimony about himself comes a few pages later, when Encolpius reports that Quarter laughs at him as "a brilliant guy and a real source of homegrown wit" (24.2, *homo acutus et urbanitatis vernaculae fons*). Several times does he describe in detail his stupefied astonishment at Trimalchio's house. Once he tells his audience that his friends laughed at him for panicking at the sight of a painted dog and the sign which said *cave canem* (29.1-2). An obviously clownish reaction to a common enough phenomenon, as any modern visitor to the archeological sites of southern Italy can testify. Later, when he must confront the real dog, he again exaggerates the extent of his terror at this infernal beast, by promptly reminding his audience that he had even been afraid of a painted dog. He likewise tells of how frightened he was by the "majestic" entrance of the stonemason Habinias, a reaction which earned him again the title of *homo stultissimus* (65.5), this time from Agamemnon himself.

How should we explain the narrator's self-deprecation and jokes at his own cost? What is it in the narrative situation which makes this clownish posturing expedient? It is

---

416 Beck (1975), 277-278.
conceivable that Encolpius has now improved his social standing, but this would hardly explain why he consistently humiliates himself in front of his audience. On the contrary, one would expect any social elevation to express itself in a more assertive tone of voice. It seems that we can only explain why Encolpius puts himself down, if we keep in mind the considerable social inequality inherent in the narrative situation. The narrative persona of Encolpius, a Romanized Greek of poor origin, is very much inferior to his aristocratic Roman audience. It is usually the social superior who indulges himself in long-winded narratives about his own past to an inferior, and not the other way around. For narrative authority to work, there must be some such power at play, whatever the basis of the reader's respect for his writer. In addressing himself to a distinguished audience, which by far outranks himself socially and morally, no matter how much he may have improved his lot subsequent to his adventures, Encolpius would have to adopt a humble and clownish persona in order not to offend or bore his discriminating listeners. The frequently outrageous nature of his story, and the ignoble past which it reveals, would make such comic posturing even more necessary.

There is, however, another side to his posturing. Throughout the Cena episode, for example, Encolpius tries to earn some points with his audience by implying that the reason why he made so many dumb mistakes was only his ignorance of such vulgarities as took place in that house. This supposedly noble simplicitas, coupled with his much emphasized disgust with the social monster Trimalchio, may be best explained as a rhetorical ploy to seduce his noble audience into believing that he and they, despite everything, share certain ethical principles. I do not want to exaggerate the narrator's sophistication here. He is merely trying what any speaker would try under the circumstances, namely to secure the benevolence of his audience. What allows Encolpius to "get away with" his satire is his self-deprecation, his careful definition of himself as a comic figure, partaking of the
inadequacies of the characters in the narrative and thus no threat morally, any more than socially, to his presumed elite and cultured audience. We find something similar in Horace's stance in the *Sermones*, where mixed with the often biting social satire the narrator reminds his audience of his humble origins as a freedman's son. We should, however, resist the idea that this ambiguous posturing is distinctly "Roman", since the generic stance of satire, according to the Roman satirists themselves, originated with Greek comedy and a type of popular philosophical diatribe.\footnote{\textsuperscript{417}}

There are two obvious social concerns with which Encolpius attempts to colour his narrative. First, the well known anxiety of Roman aristocrats about the moral implications of a widespread study of Greek rhetoric and literature. Secondly, the even greater anxiety and threat felt by these people in the face of moneyed individuals from the lower classes. These two concerns, which are prominent themes in the satires of Horace, Persius and Juvenal, are found in Attic comedy and a wide range of Greek literature as well. It would be overly modern to think that the critical distinction to be made here was merely that between "Roman" and "Greek" values. The study of national literatures is a late development in European humanism. Greek aristocrats were no less apprehensive about the democratic arts of public speaking and education for the common man than were their Roman counterparts. Neither is this aristocratic ideology unfamiliar to the Greek narrator, who evidently received his education in rhetoric and classical letters in his home city, Massilia. As a rule, however, Encolpius is notoriously elusive and un-committed to specific positive values. This attitude clearly derives from his marginal and socially ambiguous status as he communicates his report from the underworld across the unbridgeable gap between ancient social strata. He is speaking to an audience which is fundamentally

\footnote{\textsuperscript{417}I support this claim and develop the argument further in Chapter Six.}
different from himself, and his only means of retaining their interest and willingness to listen is to shape his discourse in conformity with their values and anxieties. This is his discursive strategy and the resulting narratorial stance comprises a major literary conceit in the *Satyricon*.

Although noble, his audience betrays signs of decadence and frustration. They are willing to believe that the world is going to pieces, precisely because it has lost the noble values perceived to be traditional in their own class. In an interesting passage Erich Auerbach attempts to tackle the complexities of the authorial stance in the *Satyricon*. It is worth quoting for the insight it contains into the social stratification which comes to play in the *Satyricon*:

Petronius [...] looks from above at the world he depicts. His book is a product of the highest culture, and he expects his readers to have such a high level of social and literary culture that they will perceive, without doubt or hesitation, every shade of social blundering and of vulgarity in language and taste. However coarse and grotesque the subject matter may be, its treatment reveals no trace of the crude humor of a popular farce. Scenes [...] exhibit, it is true, the basest and commonest ideas, but they do so with such refined cross-purposes, with such an array of sociological and psychological presuppositions, as no popular audience could tolerate.418

The importance attached to the audience of the *Satyricon* by Auerbach is his genuine contribution to the understanding of the work. He sees the narrative as being addressed to a sophisticated audience, radically different from any of the lowly characters which appear in the story. Auerbach is perhaps not entirely successful in positioning the author with respect to the narrator, but he is clearly sensitive to the problems involved (Petronius is

418 Auerbach (1953), 47.
significantly said to "look from above at the world he depicts"). Encolpius and Petronius are not of the same social rank. It is the "sociological and psychological presuppositions" of the audience, rather than the narrator, which set the tone of social criticism and satire in the Satyricon.

In the following section I will attempt to explore in some length the "serious" side of Encolpius's seriocomic narrative. First I will treat the portrayal of lower-class rhetoricians and poets as upstarts and fakes, and thereafter I will deal with the moral-economic side of the aristocratic grudge against the lower classes. As the extant text opens, the narrator is impersonating his youthful self, declaiming against declamation (1.1-2.9). What he says is that declaimers are possessed by an alien kind of madness (alio genere furiarum declamatores inquietantur) as they shout their declamations on exaggerated subject-matter in empty and noisy sententiae (rerum tumore et sententiarum vanissimo strepitu). Students, moreover, are stultified by these exercises, since they hear and see none of the customs that are in general use (nihil ex his quae in usu habemus aut audiunt aut vident). As a result they feel as if they had been transported to another world when they visit the real courts of law in the forum (cum in forum venerit, putent se in alium orbem terrarum delatos). The distinction here made between hearing and seeing those things which are in general use and the virtual disease (veluti pestilenti quodam sidere) of certain

419 Traditionally there are three schools of thought regarding satire in the Satyricon. Scholars who tend to emphasize the earnestness of the moral satire include Hight (1941), Bacon (1958), Reith (1963), Arrowsmith (1966), and Zeitlin (1971 and 1971a). Scholars who stress the comic and non-moralistic nature of the work include Sullivan (1971) and Walsh (1974). The middle ground is taken by Sandy (1969) and Beck (1982), who like myself believe that the Satyricon is a comic satire which does not preach its message directly.
contrived forms of speech is at the heart of the conservative "restraint" (*mens bona*)
stylistics which Encolpius tries to emulate in addressing his audience.

These ideas, however, occur in a speech uttered in the name of young Encolpius
and the narrator does not explicitly promote them as his own views. On the contrary, he
seems to deliberately undercut his younger self, when he adds at the end of the excited and
inspired tirade: *non est passus Agamemnon me diutius declamare in porticu quam ipse in
schola sudaverat*—"Agamemnon didn't allow me to declaim any longer in the portico than
he had himself sweated in the school" (3.1). Declamation is exactly what the young man
had criticized most, and yet his older self refers to that very criticism as "declamation".
Moreover, when Agamemnon, in response to the criticism, extemporizes a satire in the
style and meters of Lucilius, attempting to correct his own parasitic vices and failures as an
educator (5 v1-22), young Encolpius cannot resist the lure of the rhetor's metrical
verbosity (6.1, *dum hunc diligentius audio... et dum in hoc dictorum aestu motus
incedo...*). So much so that he fails to notice that Ascytlos has run out on him (*non notavi
mihi Asclyti fugam*). Only later, during his quarrel with Asclytlos (9.10-10.3), is he made
to realize that the poetry of Agamemnon was nothing but "broken bottles and dream
interpretations" (*vitrea fracta et somniorum interpretamenta*), in the words of his young
friend, and that his motives for listening to it were less than noble (*multo me turpior es tu
hercule, qui ut foris cenares poetam laudasti*). He seems therefore neither to have the power
to speak without rhetorical ornament—not even about the evil of rhetorical ornamentation—
nor does he have any resistance to the deceptive attractions of this perverse art.

---

420 Note that the whole poem is structured in the figure of *correctio* (i.e., *non x, sed y*), and switches from scazons to hexameters exactly at the *sed* which introduces the
antithesis. For a general description of the figure, see Lausberg (1960), 386-7.
Clearly the narrator is not presenting his younger self as any sort of credible reformer, whether in stylistic matters or moral. As for himself at the time of narrating, he is content with not letting his characters get away with boastful claims without proving them wrong immediately. Encolpius is making fun of himself in the past and he is far from excluding himself from the criticism that he has leveled against the schoolmen. He is a speaker who is willing to give deleterious testimony about his own ineptitude on the condition that this be viewed as symptomatic of universal decline. As he treats the scholastici, so does he treat every other type of people he meets in his story. They are all inept in comparison with the audience, who affords the only example of apparent virtue and positive moral values in the Satyrica. In Aristotelian terms, Encolpius and all his characters are comic in the sense that they are worse than the audience. Their only redeeming factor is perhaps that they at times seem to know that they are comic figures.

When Encolpius and Ascyltos realize how shameful their quarrel is, they burst out laughing (itaque ex turpissima lite in risum diffusi), which is also the reaction of the scholastici when they come out from the extemporal declamation of the speaker who took over from Agamemnon (iuvenes sententias rident ordinemque totius dictionis infamant). In Trimalchio’s house, laughter is also a spontaneous reaction to the way the host speaks and conducts himself, although it must be suppressed for reasons of flattery. As Trimalchio is first carried into his dinning room to background music and placed on fluffy pillows, the sight “squeezes a laugh from the imprudent” (32.1, expressit imprudentibus risum). After he gives a speech on the topic of bowel movements and the importance for health of unrestrained farting, even in the dining room, his guests politely thank him for his concern

\footnote{52.7, excipimus urbanitatem iocantis, et ante omnes Agamemnon qui sciebat quibus meritis revocatetur ad cenam.}
for them, while "hiding their laughter in the cups" (47.7, castigamus crebris potiunculis risum). Laughter in the Satyrica is thus often the only sign of moral rectitude in the characters of the story. It is a relieving and reassuring sign of sanity, in an otherwise mad world, and it can never be completely suppressed. During moments of laughter the characters and the audience unite, as it were, in their understanding of the moral implications of the story.422

Three of the freedmen express their fears that the scholastici are laughing at how they speak. Echion knows well that in their eyes his manners are ridiculous, and so he takes it upon himself to defend his point of view unprovoked. He pretends to sense a critical attitude in Agamemnon himself towards the way he speaks, and he imagines the rhetor as saying: "What is that boring man blabbering about?" (Quid iste argutat molestus?). He then quickly provides an answer to this hypothetical criticism: "Because you, who know how to speak, don't speak. You are not like us, and so you laugh at poor men's words, but we know that your brain has gone soft from literature (46.1, Quia tu, qui potes loquere, non loquis. Non es nostrae fasciae, et ideo pauperorum uerba derides. Scimus te prae litteras fatuum esse). Niceros, likewise, when asked by the host to tell a story, is afraid of the scholastici, who he thinks will laugh at his words (61.4, timeo istos scholasticos ne me rideant). The narrator, to accentuate the shortcomings of such an incompetent story-teller, introduces his badly told ghost-story in pompous epic language,

422This repeated "background" laughter may be a generic feature of comic personal recollections. Since the protagonist is often the butt of the jokes, reports of spontaneous outbursts of laughter among the characters is clearly a good way for the narrator to signal to the audience when something is intended to be funny. Perry (1925), 40 n.3, lists instances of this same figure in the epitome of the Greek Ass Story.
haec ubi dicta dedit... exorsus est (61.5), as is clear from the fact that the phrase, haec ubi dicta dedit, is repeated in Eumolpus's exaggeratedly epic poem (l. 100).423

After the pittacia—jokes are read aloud to the guests, they all laugh for a while (56.10, diu risimus), for different reasons though. Ascytlos who has not mastered Agamemnon's art of flattery, cannot hold back any longer and throws up his hands in a gesture of general dismissal and laughs until his tears start flowing (57.1 Ceterum Ascytlos, intemperantis licentiae, cum omnia sublatis manibus eluderet et usque ad lacrimas rideret). At this Hermeros is roused to his host's defense, and tries to restore order by suppressing this unwanted laughter. He argues that Ascytlos is alone in finding Trimalchio funny, and that Agamemnon, his senior as scholasticus, does not think the freedmen are ridiculous (57.8, Tibi soli ridiculei uidemur, ecce magister tuus, homo maior natus: placemus illi). He naturally does not delve into the reasons behind the rhetor's acceptance of their manners. At this onslaught, Giton, likewise, "indecently" lets out a long suppressed laugh (58.1, post hoc dictum, Giton... risum iam diu compressum etiam indecenter effudit). At this Hermeros, who assumes Giton is a slave, turns his attentions towards him and prides himself for not knowing the nonsense of liberal education (Non didici geometrias, critica et alogas naenias). He furthermore insists that Giton's master has wasted his money on the boy's rhetorical education (58.7-8, lam scies patrem tuum mercedes perdisisse, quamuis et rhetoricam scis), for it is his classical education which has bred such arrogance in a common slave. Forming a contrast to Giton's useless education is

423 The same phrase is found in Verg. Aen. 2.790.
Hemeros's own simple and practical instruction and the trade that he learned, the basis of his financial prosperity (58.13-14).^424

In this manner the dinner party at Trimalchio's can be seen as one long match between declaimers who practice formal oratory as if they were possessed by alien furies—and who have therefore lost all sense of the reality of Roman institutions and life as it should be according to aristocratic values—and the freedmen who have not learnt to speak at all, and for whom the only knowledge worth acquiring is their lowly trade. In practice, the freedmen may be said to win the match, despite being constantly subjected to ridicule, because the scholastici are not even allowed to open their mouth in their own defense, and because they are parasites at the freedmen's table. What their defense would have been, however, is no mystery because Agamemnon has ultimately blamed the madness of declamation on his students and their parents, by defining them as lunatics and claiming that learned teachers were simply forced to play along with their madness (3.2, *nil mirum in his exercitationibus doctores peccant, qui necesse habent cum insanientibus furere*). The parents of Agamemnon's pupils are of the same social class and have the same values as Trimalchio and his guests.

From the standpoint of Encolpius's audience, the comic value of this encounter between two social types lies in the fact that the two groups have undertaken a mutual deception which exposes both as deprived and hypocritical. While the scholastici attract their young students and earn invitations to dinner parties with honeyballs of words all spiced up with poppy and sesame seeds (*mellitos verborum globulos et omnia dicta*

---

^424 As seen from the ending of Hermeros's speech, 58.14, *Ego, quod me sic uides, propter artificium meum diis gratias ago*; and the speech of Echion, 46.8, *artificium numquam moritur*, as well as Trimalchio's words, 56.1, *Quod autem, inquit, putamus secundum litteras difficilimum esse artificium? Ego puto medicum et nummularium.*
factaque quasi papavere et sesamo sparsa), Trimalchio, in Encolpius's language, uses similarly spiced up dormice (glires melle ac papavere sparsos) to attract the scholastici to his dinner table. The scholastici trade compliments for food, whereas the freedmen trade food for compliments (35.1, laudationem insecutum est ferculum). The whole encounter is like that of two groups of human satyrs led by their Sileni, Agamemnon and Trimalchio. It is in contrast with a noble audience which is beyond criticism that both these groups are found inferior and ridiculous.

We now come to versification, which is another type of discursive madness, to be contrasted with the "normal" manner of speech practiced by Encolpius in addressing himself to his fine audience. As we have seen, in Chapter One, the Satyrlica's comic discrimination based on manner of speech is an essential feature of the work. Rhetoricians and poets alike are recognized by their inability to speak human language (read: the urbane Latin idiom of well-bred Romans). The underlying conceit is to recognize no other category of speech than the conversational language of the aristocratic audience, and measure all statements by that standard. On this criterion young Encolpius is saner than such linguistic madmen as Agamemnon and Eumolpus, but much inferior to the narrator who has acquired an idiom which is almost that of his audience.

No sooner is the narrator done with narrating the confrontation of the schoolmen and the uneducated tradesmen, than he introduces the poet Eumolpus. The poet begins by claiming not to be venal (like the scholastici) and adduces as proof of his artistic integrity the fact that rich men (read: rich upstarts like Trimalchio) do not like his poetry. But no one likes his poetry, except perhaps Bargates who speaks with rabiosa barbaraque voce (96.5), and who needs the poet to compose invective against his mistress. Eumolpus is a compulsive versifier who with his extemporization in the pinacotheca on the capture of
Troy provokes ordinary people walking in the temple portico to drive him away with a shower of stones as a cursed madman. He himself takes this response to his poetry as an inverse compliment, but young Encolpius fears to be taken for a poet as well (90.2, timui ego ne me poetam vocaret), while he is in the other's company. Safely out of reach, the narrator reports that he asked the poet what he intended with this disease (90.3, Quid tibi vis cum isto morbo?). During the less than two hours that they had spent together, he says, Eumolpus had more often spoken like a poet, than like a man (90.3, minus quam duabus horis mecum moraris, et saepius poetice quam humane locutus es). Even though the poet promises to abstain from this "food" for the whole day (90.6, toto die me ab hoc cibo abstinebo), Encolpius leaves Eumolpus some moments later reciting again in the bathhouse (91.3, relictio Eumolpo, nam in balneo carmen recitabat). There he gets his usual hostile reception (92.6, paene vapulavi, quia conatus sum circa solium sedentibus carmen recitare, et... de balneo tamquam de theatro ejectus sum).

Perhaps the most comic description of Eumolpus's peculiar madness comes at the end of the episode of the voyage (115.1-5), where the poet, in a moment of inspiration, is completely oblivious to the life-threatening storm and shipwreck they are suffering; a scene which could be read more generally as the "shipwreck" of poetry, adapting the classic "ship of poetry" topos to fit the context. Encolpius describes how the boys heard strange sounds coming from the captain's cabin, as if some beast were trying to break out of its cage (quasi cupientis exire beluae gemitum). They followed the noise and found Eumolpus in the midst of covering a great parchment with written verses. Amazed that he should have leisure to write poetry in such proximity with death, the boys dragged him out shouting and told him to restrain himself (mirati ergo quod illi vacaret in vicinia mortis poema facere.

\[425\text{Connors (1994), 233.}\]
extraction clamantem iubemusque bonam habere mentem). The poet was merely angered and didn’t want to be disturbed, begging to be allowed to finish his idea, because, as he said, the poem was struggling towards its end ("sinite me" inquit "sententiam explere; laborat carmen in fine"). Eventually, Encolpius tells how he asked Giton for help and took the "frenetic" and "mumbling poet" by the hand and pulled him onshore (inicio ego phrenetico manum... et in terram trahere poetam mugientem). The day after, Eumolpus with absolute consistency of character was again composing poetry, rolling his eyes seeking to pick up signals from afar (115.20, oculos ad arcessendos sensus longius mittit), this time for an epigram in memory of the drowned ship-owner Lichas.

On the way to Croton, Eumolpus takes the opportunity to recite his unfinished poem (nondum recepit ultimam manum) to his fellow travelers, another captive audience, which he introduces in a mock critical preface. He starts by claiming that poetry is more than just versifying and using poetic diction, and then proceeds to distinguish himself from another equally undistinguished group, the declaimers, who he says are mistaken if they think that poetry is easier than composing controversies with vibrating sententiae (118.2, controversiam sententiolis vibrantibus pictam). Poetry is different from prose history, or the oratory of the courts with testimonies from witnesses, in that it does not have to establish what really happened (118.6, non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe melius historici faciant... potius... vaticinatio appareat quam religiosae orationis sub testibus fides). Poetry requires a headlong plunge of the free spirit (praecipitandum est liber spiritus) into circumlocutions and divine agency with fabulously twisted expression of sententious opinions (per ambages deorumque ministeria et fabulosum sententiarum tormentum). The desired result will be like prophetic madness (furentis animi vaticinatio), although, according to the poet, the stuff of the civil war is crushingly heavy (quisquis attigerit ... sub onere labetur), and only for someone replete
with letters (plenus litteris) to attempt. Laid down for imitation are such established institutions as Homer and the Greek lyric poets, but Virgil is included as well, and Horace, the only lyric Roman worth mentioning. The master poet must flee from all vulgarity of language and chose words removed from the common man (refugiendum est ab omni verborum, ut ita dica, vilitate et sumendae voces a plebe semotae, ut fiat "odi profanum vulgus et arceo"). Finally, the rhetorical sententiae should not be obvious and stand out from the body of the poetry, but should be woven into it (praeterea curandum est ne sententiae emineant extra corpus orationis expressae, sed inteto vestibus colore niteant).

It is clear that this contradictory programme is not to be taken seriously. Its function is to be a further sketch of Eumolpus's poetic madness. The prologue is hortatory in tone and yet it is completely deprived of authority, coming from such a character. Like so many grand statements in the Satyrical this one falls flat on its face. The rather long poem of Eumolpus, which follows, is an obvious, although not overly exaggerated, parody of epic conventions. This programmatic statement serves exactly the same function as the poem of Agamemnon, in that it comically makes the poet preach against vices which are his own in a language that is ridiculous and absurd. When the verbose and fantastic poem finally ends with the arrival in Croton (cum haec Eumolpos ingenti volubilitate verborum effudisset, tandem Crotona intravimus), the poet's equally verbose and fantastic confidence scheme is described in similar language as his poetry (124.3, ex praescripto ergo consilii communis exaggerata verborum volubilitate, unde aut qui essemus, haud dubie credentibus indicavimus).

426 Eumolpus's verse and its postulated targets in the larger context of Roman literature is an immense topic which falls outside the scope of this thesis. We are only concerned with reading the poem in its immediate context and with respect to the personae of the narrator Encolpius and his character, the poet Eumolpus.
We now come to the second dominant moral theme in the Satyricon, namely how the supposedly un-Roman interest in money-making has replaced all other values with the value of currency. It is here that we will find accumulative evidence for Encolpius's consistent claim that the world suffers from an over-appreciation of the value of money. This theme especially allows for a reading of the Satyricon as a whole as an example of Saturnalian literature, a literature which aims at portraying a "verkehrte Welt". On a purely syntactical level this tone of the work is manifested in the ubiquitous figure of *correctio* ("it was not what you would expect, but something entirely different" or "you should not flatter the rich as everybody does, but study hard and be virtuous"), which contributes to the sense of scandal and impracticable moralism of the characters. In addition to the widespread linguistic aberrations analyzed above, everything in the world of the Satyricon sooner or later finds itself *infra pecuniam* (84.2), as Eumolpus puts it.

Retracing our steps we recall that in the opening passages of the Satyricon, Encolpius blamed Agamemnon and other teachers of rhetoric for having destroyed eloquence (*primi omnium eloquentiam perdidistis*) by teaching young boys contemporary declamation. Agamemnon's answer is to defend his profession and explain what he ironically calls the secret art (*ars secreta*) of rhetorical schools. As the hypocritical flatterer who seeks invitations to the dinner-parties of the wealthy, the teacher of eloquence (*eloquentiae magister*) must think first of all of that which is most pleasing to his students. Of course (*nimirum*), says Agamemnon, the teachers act incorrectly (*peccant*) when they make youths practice declamation ostensibly to improve their eloquence, but really to entertain them and

---

427 For the "verkehrte Welt" theme, especially in relation to the Cena and the Croton episode, see Döpp (1993) 144-177.
attract them to the schools. But it is really the parents who are to blame (parentes obiurgatione digni sunt) who sacrifice their own children, like everything else, to self-interest (spes quoque suas ambitioni donant), and hurry them into the courts before their education is finished. Despite the fact that the parents themselves profess to believe that eloquence is a good and noble thing, it is still their ambitio, which we may translate in this context as "greed" or "corruption", that gets the better of them.

This topic is further illustrated in a later episode (46), which we have previously looked at from another angle. At the dinner-party of Trimalchio, Echion the fireman (centonarius) addresses Agamemnon in a long speech, which reads as a supplement to exemplify Agamemnon's statement. The son of Echion, who is a promising student and has the right ingenium to become an eloquent lover of classical letters, will not be allowed to waste his time on such unprofitable and "polluting" pursuits. His father, who is a deliberately insensitive type (non debemus delicati esse), kills his goldfinches and disapproves of the boy's painting (we recall that painting is another special interest of Encolpius alongside most forms of literature), because, according to the freedman, these things make the boy idle and unprepared for life's real goal, money-making. Only law counts as a worthy subject in Echion's mind, for it offers the promise of pecuniary profit.

The values expressed by Echion form a striking contrast, for example, with Horace's account of his education in the sixth satire of Book I. The reader will recall that the poet's freedman father, a man of the exact same rank as Echion, despite his inferior social status, wouldn't send his son to the local school, run by a nobody called Flavius, where, as Horace puts it, the sons of "mighty" centurions went. Instead he took young Horace to Rome where he would get the best contemporary education with the sons of knights and senators. We note the implicit acknowledgment of a two-tiered educational system. A good Roman education for boys was usually not to be had outside of the
The thought of Echion’s Primigenus as another potential Horace, destroyed by his ignorant father, may possibly be distressing to some, but Echion has a different view of things. What he sees are the local schoolmen, including Agamemnon, who have been reduced to the role of parasites, and he naturally doesn’t see this as a desirable future for his son.

Any knowledge or even interest in the aristocratic schools of Rome is completely beyond this simple man. In the world portrayed by Encolpius, the final analysis must be that neither Echion’s cruel pragmatism, nor Agamemnon’s erratic educational programme, can offer the slightest hope to young Primigenus. He is simply a member of the lower classes, and as such will not receive a good education, no matter how talented. The same moral can be read from Encolpius’s account of the children of Philomela, the matron of Croton, who prostitutes them to further her own legacy-hunting, while professing to leave them in the care of Eumolpus for the sake of their education (140). In Encolpius’s report from the underworld, there is not a glimmer of hope for such children. The lower classes are utterly ridiculous in their inferiority and their pathetic striving after wealth.

Another incident illustrates how money corrupts justice (12-15). Encolpius and Ascyltos go to the market in the twilight to try to sell the stolen pallium. Through wondrous fortune (*o lusum fortunae mirabilem!*), the prospective buyers of their stolen cloak are also the possessors of a tunicula, full of gold coins that the duo had stolen earlier and then lost. Young Encolpius, true to his training in declamation, is ready to argue the case formally on the elementary statute that a person refusing to return the belonging of another can be forced to do so with the injunction of a law court (*negavi circuitu agendum, sed plane iure civili*

---

428Except when private tutors were used in upper-class households. Why else does Quintilian make such a lengthy pitch for sending youths to school (*Inst. Or.* 1.2.9-31). On the education of Roman boys in general, see Bonner (1977) and Kaster (1988).
dimicandum ut si nollet alienam rem domino reddere, ad interdictum veniret). But here the narrator Encolpius suddenly interrupts his narrative to introduce his own more cynical point of view:

quid faciant leges, ubi sola pecunia regnat,
aut ubi paupertas vincere nulla potest?
ipsi qui Cynica traducunt tempora pera
non nunquam nummis vendere verba solent.
ergo iudicium nihil est nisi publica merces,
atque eques in causa qui sedet, empta probat.

[What can laws accomplish, where money alone rules, or where poverty can win nothing? The self same men who go through life with a Cynic's purse, are not unaccustomed to selling their testimony. Accordingly a lawsuit is nothing but a public auction, and the knight who sits in the jury delivers a verdict that has been bought.]

These lines about the inefficacy of the law in a society where corruption is a matter of routine, are a rare direct statement from Encolpius in another discourse type which marks them off from the rest of the narrative. This moral "message" is dressed up as poetry to deliberately undercut the seriousness of the socio-cultural critique. When Encolpius dons a versifier's mask, as he does here, it is intended to draw a little bit of the sting and immediacy of the explicit social criticism by transmuting it from the real and relevant world to an impotent and tritely poetic one—entertainment displacing or veiling social commentary. To understand the subversive effect of this sudden switch from conversational prose to poetic recital we should always keep in mind the performance aspect. Poetic rhythm and diction, which Encolpius treats, according to the convention of prosimetry as a speech aberration, is a specialized "number" from his bag of tricks; the audience never
knows whom they're going to be seeing or hearing next, so they surrender to the entertainer's charm and inventiveness, allowing the social message, which is scattered throughout the narrative and hidden in the talk of clowns and social inferiors, to build up by indirection.

In the past Encolpius was full of simplistic optimism, but in the present narrative situation, his older self seems fully cognizant of the degenerate state of things, but he never allows his "serious" face to show itself. The narrator's self-deprecating strategies not only protect him from his audience, but also protect the audience from the force of the satire by subverting it (the satire): indeed, he protects himself precisely by protecting his audience. The satire needn't be taken seriously, because it's not advanced in a serious way by people (the narrator and his troupe of personae) whom the audience has to take seriously. However, the building up of the message and the consistency of the narrator's ideas about the power and rule of money is unfailing and almost begins to function as a reliable truth about the world of the Satyricon.

Through the otherwise transitory events narrated, the characters behave in perfect harmony with this general principle. In the market scene, both parties to the quarrel above at last want to settle with a simple exchange of goods, because both think that this will be most profitable. But the forces of law and order, "advocates and yet little more than thieves" (advocati tamen iam paene nocturni), who want to make profit out of the cloak, insist that the disputed property be deposited with them, hoping that neither party will show up in the morning in front of the judge out of fear. Their argument is that the case is not a matter of simple dispute between two parties of the type common in text-book cases of rhetorical controversia (neque enim res tantum quae videtur in controversiam esse), since each accuses the other of stealing (in utraque parte scilicet latrocinii suspicio haberetur) and neither party even pretends to be innocent.
None of the characters truly appreciates declamatory exercises for the simple reason that they are useless in the world of the Satyricon, where quarrels are not resolved in highly formalized disputes but through cash payments. Trimalchio, the uneducated but wealthy host of the scholars, knows this only too well, but in order to lend credence to his posturing as a well-bred lover of literary studies, he asks Agamemnon to perform an exposition of the _controversia_ he declaimed that day. Agamemnon starts with a standard cliché: "A poor and a rich man were enemies" (_pauper et dives inimici erant_). But he gets no further for the moment because the other interrupts with his clever remark: "What is a poor man?", for which he receives the obligatory praise from Agamemnon. The implication seems to be that Trimalchio, who once was a slave and not even in possession of his own body, is now so rich that he can afford to ignore the existence of poverty. The narrator then continues with the completely disinterested phrase, "and Agamemnon introduced some controversia or other" (_nescio quam controversiam exposuit_), not even bothering to report the argument of Agamemnon's _controversia_. After the exposition of the case, it takes Trimalchio two short sentences to clear up the problem definitively: "If this happened, then there's nothing to argue about. If it didn't happen, it is nothing" (_hoc ... si factum est, controversia non est; si factum non est, nihil est_). If we inquire into why, according to Trimalchio, a real case between a poor man and a rich man is not a controversy, the obvious answer is that since the rich man is able to bribe the jury, he will win in any case, and so there is nothing to argue about! However, if it is an imaginary case, it's a meaningless nonsense. So much for the interest of Trimalchio, a man of the real world, in the scholastic subtleties of _controversiae_. \(^{429}\)

\[^{429}\text{Ever since Heinsius, various commentators and translators have interpreted the words of Trimalchio: "hoc, si factum est, controversia non est", as meaning that since a}
The same topic also comes to play when the narrator introduces Eumolpus, the poet, into the pinacotheca and thus into his story: "Behold!... an old man grown white entered the gallery, a person with a tortured face who seemed to promise something or other great, but not accordingly well-groomed or smartly dressed, so that he evidently belonged of that brand of literati which is despised by the rich" (ut facile appareret eum hac nota litteratorum esse quos odisse divites solent). As if this were not enough Eumolpus introduces himself with these words: "I'm a poet and as I hope not of the humblest spirit, if in fact laurels, which favouritism also awards to the unworthy, are to be relied upon. You ask then why I'm so badly dressed. Well, it's because caring for one's genius has never made anyone rich" (amor ingenii neminem unquam dividem fecit). Then he delivers six lines in hexameter about how the merchants, soldiers, flatterers and adulterers all profit from their activity when eloquence alone shivers in frosty rags and calls with inops lingua (83) upon the deserted arts. He then switches back to prose to elaborate further:

[84] "non dubie ita est: si quis vitiorum omnium inimicus rectum iter vitae coepit insistere, primum propter morum differentiam odium habet; quis enim potest probare diversa? deinde qui solas extruere divitias curant, nihil volunt inter homines melius credi quam quod ipsi tenent. insectantur itaque, quacumque ratione possunt, litterarum amatores, ut videantur illi quoque infra pecuniam positi."

---

rhetorical controversia may be defined as a fictitious case, therefore a real event cannot be a controversia. This implies both knowledge and genuine interest on the part of Trimalchio in the formal terminology of the rhetorical schools. Such learned scholasticism in Trimalchio seems wholly out of character. This is a man who proudly adds to his funeral inscription: nec unquam philosophum audivit. Besides, if Trimalchio thinks that controversiae must be fictional cases, what does he then mean when he adds, "si factum non est, nihil est"?
"No doubt that this is the way it is. If a man sets himself against every vice and starts off on the straight and narrow, he's immediately hated because of his different ways. No one can approve of conduct different from his own. And secondly, those who are interested in piling up money don't want anything else in life regarded as better than what they hold themselves. So lovers of literature are persecuted by every means possible so that they too will seem inferior to money."

It might for a moment seem from these words that a virtuous individual was speaking, but this is certainly not the case with Eumolpus. The man who calls poverty the sister of bona mens turns out to be an expert confidence man, who is willing to cook up the most elaborate deceptions for a profit. As so many characters in the Satyrca he professes to know what is right, but claims that he cannot practice his virtues because of rich men and their corrupt ways. Despite the boastful claims, he too is infra pecuniam positus (84.2).

Encolpius tells his audience that while they were still standing in the pinacotheca, he asked the poet about the reason behind the slothful state of contemporary arts and especially painting. This discourse is reminiscent of the one initiated by Encolpius when he met Agamemnon. The state of contemporary literature and visual arts is a constant preoccupation of his. Eumolpus's answer is prompt: "the greed for money has caused this upheaval, for in the olden times, when naked virtue still had its appeal, the liberal arts were strong and there was a mighty competition among men not to let anything of benefit to the ages lie hidden for long" (88, pecuniae ... 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).\footnote{As Walsh (1970), 96f., explains, Eumopus is dead wrong about the prisca tempora from a strictly historical point of view.}
Religion has gone the way of the arts. Eumolpus in the above speech in the pinacotheca laments that people have stopped praying in temples for such things as eloquence and philosophical wisdom. And they don't even pray for such obvious blessings as mens bona and good health. Instead, they have hardly reached the Capitol when they start promising gifts to the god for arranging the death of a rich relative, for letting them find a treasure, or allowing them to reach a certain level of wealth without any risk. Even the senate, says Eumolpus, which should be a model of what is good and right, regularly promises quantities of gold to the supreme god of the state cult, Capitoline Jove. Thus even this most respectable gathering of Roman citizens legitimates the greed of every one by assuming that even the father of the gods is infra pecuniam positus (84.2). Accordingly, there is no wonder that the appreciation of beautiful art has decreased when to gods and men a mass of gold seems more beautiful than the works of Apelles and Phidias, those "crazy little Greeks" (Graeculi delirantes).

The edge of this criticism is, of course, blunted by the absurdity of the speaker, a crazy poet—as it must be. Encolpius cannot afford to preach senatorial corruption unfiltered to the Roman elite. The cleverness of the technique is to let the narrator develop a number of blurred or limited perspectives through his character personae and his own central narrator's persona on the same social problem. Because none of these personae has the authority to address the elite audience as a social and moral equal, their different voices cannot give offense. Collectively, though, their indictment is both accurate and damning. Again, if we consider the performance aspect, the stance is very effective. Instead of causing anxiety and paranoia among the ruling elite, as did, according to Tacitus (Dial. 2.1), Curiatius Maternus's passionate impersonation, while reciting his historical tragedy, of the stoic "revolutionary" Cato, Encolpius can say worse things indirectly through his mask of a silly poet, so long as he does it in an entertaining fashion.
Likewise in the speech of the insignificant freedman Ganymedes (44), we notice the same preoccupation with the corruption of religion by money. Ganymedes is concerned about the misery caused by corruption in his home town, the *urbs Graeca*. There is no bread to be had, he complains, because the aedile of the market makes dirty deals with the bakers to fix the market price. This wasn't so, he says, when he first came there from Asia as a boy. Then the magistrates were lions and punished those who imported bad corn from Sicily. Now, however, the aedile is more keen on making a buck for himself than to preserve the lives of the townspeople. But then, unexpectedly perhaps, he takes a leap of faith and conjectures that all the misery must be caused by angry gods. His fatalism, of course, undercuts the political message without, however, retracting what has been said.

No one, says Ganymedes, regards heaven for what it is, no one fasts and Jove is not worth a single hair to people, but every one counts his money with eyes wide open (*Nemo enim caelum caelum putat, nemo ieium servat, nemo lo vem pili facit, sed omnes opertis oculis bona sua computat*). He goes on to describe a memorable picture of how the matrons of old in their best clothes used to climb the hill barefooted, hair loose and mind pure, and pray to Jove for rain. In those days, of course, it started raining by the bucket and they returned home "like drowned rats" (*udi tamquam mures*). This nostalgia for the good old times, before men grew obsessed with money, works to accentuate the sense of despair in the present.

The topic continues with obsessive persistency. Encolpius says that in Croton he sought a cure for his impotence from the witch-doctor Oenothea. While she is away renewing the fire she had unwittingly put out, he fights a mock-epic battle with a flock of geese, commemorated in a virtual epic simile of at least five hexameter lines. He eventually kills their "leader and teacher of cruelty" (136, *dux et magister saevitiae*). When the priestess returns, she informs him through shrieks and curses, that he has committed a
hideous sacrilege by killing a goose that was sacred to Priapus. However, as soon as
Encolpius offers to expiate for the crime by paying two gold pieces, with which they, as he
puts it, "could buy both gods and geese" (unde possitis et deos et anseres emere, 137),
both Oenothea and her friend Proselenos, are immediately calmed and become more than
willing to cover up the sacrilege. And now, in a typical fashion, Encolpius delivers six
elegiac distichs about the manifest omnipotence of money:

quisquis habet nummos, secura naviget aura
  fortunamque suo temperet arbitrio.
uxorem ducat Danaen ipsumque licebit
  Acrisium iubeat credere quod Danaen.
carmina componat, declamet, concrepet omnes,
  et peragat causas sitque Catone prior.
iurisconsultus "parret, non parret" habeto
  atque esto quicquid Servius et Labeo.
multa loquor: quod vis, nummis praesentibus opta,
  et veniet. clausum possidet arca Iovem.

[Whoever has money sails in safe wind, and dilutes his fortune in a private
mixing bowl. Let him take Danaë to wife, and tell Acrisius himself to believe
the story he told to Danaë. Let him write poetry, make speeches, command the
world by snapping his fingers, win his court-cases and outdo Cato in moral
authority. As a legal expert, let him have his "Proven" or "Not proven," and be
all that Servius and Labeo were. I'm talking serious stuff; whatever you want,
with ready cash, make a wish and it will come true. Your money-box has
Jupiter shut up inside.]

The pessimistic argument, "money is omnipotence", is here considerably expanded to cover
a vast sphere of influence. The rich man sails in safe wind, and does not have to suffer
shipwreck in life. He dilutes his fortune suo arbitrio, i.e. he is the arbiter bibendi in life's
drinking party. He weakens the effects of bad fortune, strengthens those of good fortune. As Jupiter himself he shall have Danae by showering her with gold, and her father will have to swallow his pride and accept whatever lies are offered. The rich man can freely compose poetry, too, whatever the state of his talent; he can even declaim to the guaranteed applause of everyone present. These general statements about the power of money are interesting in themselves, but when juxtaposed with the narrated behavior of Trimalchio and his guests, for example, they take on a special importance for the overall design of the _verkehrter Welt_ of the _Satyricon_. We recall Trimalchio's compositions (34; 41; 55) and his astrological _philologia_ (39), all of which was met with ample applause from his educated audience. The rich man can also play every instrument, win cases in court and be considered morally superior to Cato himself. Should he choose to practice law, money will guarantee the persuasiveness of his arguments no less than eloquence of old guaranteed the success of Servius and Labeo. In short, everything the rich man wants is permitted him, because mighty Jove is at his service, locked up in his money box.

There is an obvious similarity in the way the narrator introduces these lines here and the three elegiac distichs on corruption (14, _quid faciant leges, ubi sola pecunia regnat_). These poems—if that is the proper term—constitute the closest thing to a committed statement from the narrator that we will ever find in the _Satyricon_. The change of discourse type, from the urbane colloquialism appropriate to addressing the distinguished audience, to the more involved discourse type of elegy, is a clear indication that Encolpius does not want to voice such criticism without undercutting the "message" with poetic madness. Although the ubiquitousness of this "message" in the preserved fragments means that it must have been also an important aspect of many a lost episode, the craziness of the poetry endows such statements with less, not more authority than is found in the prose. It is precisely to avoid being taken seriously by the audience that Encolpius lapses into verse.
Technology is next. Unsurprisingly, we detect the same pattern once more. The Winklerian second reader will recall the later statement of Eumolpus (88) to the effect that in the "olden times" there was a great competition between men not to let anything of benefit to the ages lie hidden for long, but that among his contemporaries the greed for money had made an end of this unselfish scientific spirit. Trimalchio himself in an "urbane" outburst is made to illustrate the principle with an outrageous anecdote, the famous story of the man who invented unbreakable glass and was promptly rewarded by the princeps:

[51] "Fuit tamen faber qui fecit phialam vitream, quae non frangebatur. Admissus ergo Caesarem est cum suo munere, deinde fecit repporrigere Caesari et illam in pavimentum proiect. Caesar non pote valdus quam expavit. At ille sustulit phialam de terra; collisa erat tanquam vasum aeneum; deinde martiolum de sinu protulit et phialam otio belle correxit. Hoc facto putabat se coleum Iovis tenere, utique postquam illi dixit: 'Numquid alius scit hanc conditum vitreorum?' vide modo. Postquam negavit, iussit illum Caesar decollari: quia enim, si scitum esset, aurum pro luto habemus."

["Mind you, there was a craftsman once who created a glass bowl that didn't break. So he got an audience with the Emperor and gave it to him as a present. Then he made Caesar hand it back to him and threw it on the floor. The emperor was visibly shaken. The fellow picked the bowl off the ground—it had been dented like a bronze dish—pulled out a hammer from the fold of his dress and proceeded to fix the bowl and make it as good as new. After this performance he thought he held Jove by the balls, especially after the emperor asked him: Is there anyone else who knows this process for making glass?—But see what happened!—When the man answered 'No!', the emperor had his head cut off, the reason being that if it was made public, gold would have become dirt cheap."]

This little story, whatever its origin, captured the imagination of ancient authors. Pliny (Nat. 36.195) includes it in his encyclopedic work, without however giving it full
credence. According to him a craftsman under Tiberius invented a method for making glass unbreakable. For this his workshop was destroyed in order that precious metals would not lose their commercial value. In Dio Cassius (57.21.5-7) roughly the same story is made to exemplify Caesar's jealousy and the moral of the story is entirely different. There the inventor is an architect who had already accomplished the restoration of a collapsing portico in Rome, for which Tiberius rewarded him with money and exile. At another occasion when the architect was seeking pardon he deliberately dropped a crystal goblet and then repaired it, evidently to show off his skill at restoration yet again, but this time it cost him his life. Isidore (Etym. 16.16.6.) has the story in a version similar to that of Petronius and attaches the same moral to it, even asserting that it is true that if glass were unbreakable, it would truly be better than gold and silver. John of Salisbury (Pol. 4.5) relates the story as that of Trimalchio in Petronius but adds much detail, although he preserves the moral of the story: Caesar has the artisan killed to prevent gold and silver from becoming cheap as dirt. With respect to our investigation, Caesar in Trimalchio's story uses his power to literally kill an invention "of benefit to the ages", in the words of Eumolpus (88). And he does this for the exact same reason that the poet alleges as the cause of the demise of contemporary science, namely an obsessive concern with the acquisition and protection of wealth.

The last time the topic occurs in the extant Satyrica is at the very end where the motif of captatio or legacy-hunting is treated. The comic evils of captatio are a well exercised theme in Roman satire. Horace (S. 5.2) treats this theme in a parodic dialogue which is a reworking of a motif from the Odyssey, Book 11, and represents Tiresias advising Odysseus in the underworld on how to enrich himself upon arriving in Ithaca a poor man. The topic is not particularly Roman, of course, since Horace is here borrowing a Greek comic topos which exploits the convention of taking mythological trips to the
underworld to seek information from the dead. The comic νέκυια was the favourite of Menippus and other Cynics.

In the Satyricon, Croton is a city which has completely fallen to this nasty vice. Encolpius, Giton and Eumolpus have survived the shipwreck and just buried Lichas, the owner of the ship, when they take to the road again. From a distance they see a city and inquire from "a certain bailiff" about the nature of the place (116). The ancient glory of Croton is here deliberately emphasized in order to heighten the misery of its current state. Encolpius usually sketches the distant past in very positive terms to better highlight the disgust with the present. The overseer, who has no other purpose in the narrative than to yield information to the vagabond characters, is not unsurprisingly concerned with the same cultural losses the narrator keeps lamenting. Literary studies are no longer celebrated in Croton, and neither is eloquence, and the virtues are in a state of neglect. No one raises a family either, for people with natural heirs are not likely to be courted by legacy hunters.

This absurd city stages yet another episode of the Satyricon's protracted love-affair between parasites and hosts. Eumolpus invents a confidence scheme and poses as a shipwrecked man of great property, without heirs of course and in miserable health, in order to stimulate the generosity of the people of Croton. The spin which Encolpius puts on this traditional topic of satire is quite interesting. By letting Eumolpus & Co. outsmart the legacy-hunters by exploiting their greed to their own advantage, the narrator again pitches one group of madmen against another and so retains his audience's good will by blunting the impact of the satire on his audience.

What seems to be only a simile in the city's description by the vilicus—vultures eating corpses in a plague-ridden countryside—is later translated directly into action in the will of Eumolpus. The eating of his corpse is obviously proposed by Eumolpus as a deterring condition for those planning to collect his imaginary inheritance, but not even this
arrests the appetite of the human vultures of Croton: "The enormous reputation of his money blinded the eyes and minds of those miserable people" (excaecatabat pecuniae ingens fama oculos animosque miserorum). In the glorious home-town of Pythagoras, the famous vegetarian philosopher, the citizens are willing to become cannibals for financial profit, violating the most sacred taboo of Greco-Roman civilization. Eating human flesh is the proper behavior of Cyclopes, one-eyed monsters living beyond civilization and not bound by the laws of any city. As in the figurative language above, blinding is the punishment of cannibalistic Cyclopes. The episode of Croton, the uncivilized city—an oxymoron in Greco-Roman political thought—can thus be read as that of a troupe of satyrs (Encolpius, Giton and Corax), lead by their Silenus (Eumolpus), who take up habitation in the caves of the Cyclopes (Crotoniates). In other words, a narrative obeying in some sense the laws of satyr-drama, the generic name of which was δρᾶμα σατυρικόν, or in the plural σατυρικά, and the preferred plots of which centered around the fabulous tales of Homer's Odyssey.

The mention of cities and civilization brings us lastly to the fantastic poem on the civil war, recited by Eumolpus just before entering Croton. Here the same theme of greed destroying the City dominates the sensational description of the causes of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey (119). This unfinished impetus of a poem (hic impetus... nondum recepit ultimam manum) of almost 300 hexameter lines is, as we have seen, introduced by its fictional author as composed in the spirit of canonical epic literature. But what is begun by involving the gods in a fabulously exaggerated version of Roman history, characteristically ends with their flight and disgust with humanity. Thus the loftiness of traditional high poetry collapses into a description of the sordid facts of life.

The poem begins with a description of Rome at the height of her power and wealth. The Roman possessed the whole world and yet he wasn't satisfied (Orbem iam totum victor Romanus habebat...nec satiatus erat). If there was still anywhere gold or sellable goods to
be found, that land, that people was declared an enemy and war was waged for profit (3-18). This greed leads to shameful immorality which is as hard for the poet to relate (119 v.19, heu, pudet effari perituraque prodere fata) as it was hard for Encolpius to narrate the account of Trimalchio's madness (70.8, pudet referre quae secuntur):

Nec minor in campo furor est, emptique Quirites
ad praedam strepitumque luci suffragia vertunt.
venalis populus, venalis curia patrum,
est favor in pretio. senibus quoque libera virtus
exciderat, sparsisque opibus conversa potestas
ipsaque maiestas auro corrupta iacebat.
40 pellitur a populo victus Cato; tristior ille est,
qui vicit, fascesque pudet rapuisse Catoni.
namque hoc dedecoris populo morumque ruina
non homo pulsus erat, sed in uno victa potestas
Romanumque decus. quare tam perdita Roma
45 ipsa sui merces erat et sine vindice praeda.
Praeterea gemino deprensam gurgite plebem
faenoris illuvies ususque exederat aeris.
nulla est certa domus, nullum sine pignore corpus,
sed veluti tabes tacitis concepta medullis
50 intra membra furens curis latrantis errat.
arma placent miseris, detrataque commoda luxu
vulneribus reparantur. inops audacia tuta est.
hoc mersam caeno Romam somnoque iacentem
quae poterant artes sana ratione movere,
60 ni furo et bellum ferroque excita libido?

[The same madness is in public life, the true-born Roman is bought, and changes his vote for plunder and the cry of gain. The people are corrupt, the senate of the fathers is corrupt, their support hangs on a price. The freedom and virtue of the old men had decayed, their power was swayed by largesse, even their dignity was stained by money and trodden in the dust. Cato is beaten
and driven out by the mob; his conqueror is more unhappy than he, and is
ashamed to have torn the rods of office from Cato. With him died the shame of
the nation and with him fell its character. In his person the power and glory of
Rome was humbled. So Rome in her deep disgrace was herself price and prize,
and she despoiled herself without an avenger. Moreover greed for usury and
the handling of money had caught the common people in a double whirlpool,
and destroyed them. Not a house is safe, not a man but is mortgaged; the
madness spreads through their limbs, and trouble bays and hounds them down
like some disease sown in the dumb marrow. In despair they turn to violence,
and bloodshed restores the good things lost by luxury. A beggar can risk
everything in safety. Could the spell of sane reason stir Rome from the filth
where she rolled in heavy sleep, or only madness and war and the lust
wakened by the sword? (lines 39-60)]

Contrary to what we were led to expect from the poet's introduction, this passage contains
some straightforward historiographical reasoning in a rhetorico-moralistic style worthy of a
Tacitus. These lines are exactly what they are not supposed to be: history in verse.

According to Eumolpus's argument, the depravity and loss of virtue in the senatorial
class is to blame for the initial corruption which led to the civil war. In view of the character
of Encolpius's audience and the dominance of the theme of money in the work as a whole,
this passage seems of great importance for understanding the underlying moral
presuppositions of the narrative. What is more, it seems from the face of it, that we are to
think of the civil war as finally putting an end to glorious antiquity and inaugurating the
shameful contemporary state of affairs, a thoroughly corrupt Rome. If we add to this the
glorifying description of the Younger Cato and the unfavourable treatment of the mad
general Julius Caesar, we are forced to recognize here an example of the rallying cry of
libertas, a nostalgic refrain in the rhetoric of the Roman senatorial class under the
principate, sometimes called the Stoic opposition. The Younger Cato was an unmistakable
symbol for these sympathies, especially in the times of Nero. He was looked upon as the last defender of the Roman Republic and *libertas* (not, of course, a democracy but an oligarchy in the hands of the noble families).\(^3\)

Lucan gives an imposing portrait of Cato in the *Pharsalia* and for Seneca he is the ideal Roman Stoic. These may be deflated ideals to us, but in the early empire such ideas could easily be seen as politically flammable stuff. However, by putting them in the mouth of the crazy poet Eumolpus, Encolpius can promote the message comically without committing himself to anything. These lines, surprisingly considering the nature of the audience, but unsurprisingly considering the persona adopted by the narrator, contain a criticism of the old Roman aristocracy. Eumolpus says that with the loss of virtue and venality among the *populus* and the *curia patrum*, the upper-classes (19-30), the *plebs* was defenseless against usury, mortgages and bondage from debt (31-5). Eumolpus has before blamed the *senatus* for not living up to its role as moral authority (88, *ipse senatus, recti bonique praeceptor*). And it seems that if these opinions of his—which the narrator has prudently assigned to a character other than his youthful self—are to be acceptable to Encolpius's audience, they must be of unusual moral integrity for Roman aristocrats.

We can see from this that the implicit or ideal audience of the *Satyricon* is clearly not a real audience but an idealized construct of the narrator and his text. It is important that we not believe excessively in the historicity of Encolpius's good audience, who really play no more important role in the text than as intelligent and respectable foils to his comic act. The

---

\(^{3}\)See Sullivan (1985), 117ff. But Sullivan, who in general treated Petronius as a flatterer of Nero, and more so than for instance Seneca or Lucan, nowhere treats the political implications of this passage. My own impression is that the political views seemingly shared by the narrator and implied audience of the *Satyricon* are not significantly different from what is expressed by other writers and intellectuals of the time.
ideal audience is the locus of the Satyricon's moral sanity and effectiveness as social and cultural satire, since the narrator, at least on the face of it, is just a clown and a fool. But the sanity of the audience does not derive from any actual performance before an unusually responsible, clear-sighted and truly cultured bunch of aristocrats. It's the narrator and his text that create the audience and its values, and they do so obliquely, by triangulation from several flawed perspectives. What the narrator has Agamemnon, Echion, Eumolpus, and his own self say and do about education, postulates, when all put together, an audience capable of drawing sane and sophisticated moral conclusions about good and bad paideia and the state of letters and the arts. But the satire need not be taken seriously, because it is not advanced in a serious way by people whom the audience has to take seriously. Even when Eumolpus criticizes the corrupt senate, no offense will be taken, because the narrator has previously taken care to marginalize Eumolpus as a crazy poet.

It is not that the historical audience of the Satyricon was composed of people who were unusually tolerant of criticism or personally upright. The audience, like audiences for satire in all times and places (including, e.g., the Athenian demos listening to Aristophanes), are ordinary hypocritical human beings. They tolerate the satirist not because they are truly exempt from his criticism but because the effective satirist makes sure the "who-the-hell-does-he-think-he-is" moment never arrives. There is also the matter of flattery—the real audience wishes to identify with the implied audience, which is beyond moral criticism. From the historical author's perspective, Petronius achieves this effect, (i) through an inferior narrator who "knows his place" and flatters his audience, (ii) through the limitations of the various personae through whom the narrator speaks, and (iii) through the limitations, triteness, even absurdity of the various discourses of those personae.
The *Satyricon* is a performance text, and this makes the act of telling the story even more obtrusive than it would otherwise be. In this respect it is very different, for example, from the classical modern novel, which is typically written for the silent and solitary reader. To give due respect to this performance aspect of the *Satyricon*, we need to place before our eyes, as it were, the figure of Encolpius as he relates his adventures to his audience. Although nothing absolutely necessitates the geographical location in Rome of this implicit setting, the capital itself would be most in keeping with the nature of the audience. There is no need, however, to be too specific about this, since it could be argued that for such a generic audience a generic setting is all that is needed.

The importance of dress, gesticulation, and the use of the voice is enormous in any performative situation, and the Romans in general were no exception in paying attention to such details. However, beyond the internal textual evidence of great liveliness in Encolpius's style of performance, we know little about how the narrator is supposed to be dressed or groomed, when he rides through his tale. Something may, perhaps, be deduced from the fact that he is originally a Greek from Massilia, although he seems to have acquired a highly Roman cultural outlook by the time he tells the story, an outlook which he then unrealistically projects onto his younger self. On the other hand, information is abundant about such things as clothing and general appearance, when we look to the young Encolpius traveling through Italy. It is more difficult to figure out how much of this description is still valid for the story-teller, some unspecified time after the adventures are over. We must necessarily proceed with caution here, and yet it is clear that the information provided by the narrator about his past self, beyond describing the protagonist directly, also functions as an indirect self-portrayal. To take an example, when Encolpius tells us of the practical joke played on him by the *anus urbana* (7.2), the implications are not likely to be
lost on any audience. The old woman led him straight to a brothel which, she said, was where he "ought to" live (7.2, "hic" inquit "debes habitate").

If we gather the details of the appearance of this unhardened youth and his friends (102.12, iuvenes adhuc laboris expertes), we begin to grasp the underlying criticism in the old woman's mockery. As Encolpius tells us himself, he had long locks of hair falling over his ears (18.4), the momentary loss of which caused him much grief (108.1, 110.4), a sorrow that was, however, easily cured by the aid of a curly blond wig (110.5). For clothes, he wore a short undergarment or tunic, the so-called χιτών (12.5, 19.5), and on his feet he had the unsoldierly slippers, phaeasìa (82.3), which quickly ruined his attempt to pass himself off as a member of the military. The persona of Encolpius is built up from several sources, both explicit and stated in his narrative, and implicit and based on cultural and literary stereotypes, which the audience is supposed to recognize. A constant of his identity, at least as a youth is his origin from Massilia. Community stereotypes were as common in the ancient world as they are now (consider for example Homer's Phoenician pirates and Cretan liars), and some of Encolpius's attributes may be features of his Massaliotic origin. The conservative and old fashioned Massaliotes, according to ancient sources, tied their hair in a knot, wore long and many-coloured (women's) dresses, used perfumes and were accordingly considered soft and delicate, even effeminate.432 To sail to Massilia" or to "go to Massilia" were proverbial expression for falling into luxurious ways.433 As is understandable in such a community, women were not allowed to drink anything stronger than water, the place being wanton enough without the women getting

432 In Latin the adjective Massiliensis could occasionally be synonymous with "licentious" (Pl.Cas. 963).

433 Suda, e. 499, 3161; Ath. 12.25.
drunk on wine.\textsuperscript{434} Thus the \textit{phaecasia} (82.3)\textsuperscript{435} worn by Encolpius are not necessarily a sign of his wanting to prostitute himself, but may also be seen as the regular manner in which respectable Greek men dressed in Massilia.\textsuperscript{436} His foreign style of dressing is open to two interpretations, it can be seen as archaic and respectable or luxurious and effeminate.

However, as Encolpius's narrative progresses, it becomes ever clearer that the wicked old woman was not alone in associating the young man with prostitution. The curious \textit{foedus} of peace brokered by Eumolpus on the ship (109.2-3) is mostly taken up with the specification of the price to be paid by the adults for having sex with the boys (200 \textit{denarii} for Encolpius, half that amount for Giton). Furthermore, the handmaiden of Circe, Chrysis, provides a detailed description of this aspect of our hero (126.1):

"quia nosti venerem tuam, superbiam captas vendisque amplexus, non commodas. quo enim spectant flexae pectine comae, quo facies medicamine attrita et oculorum quoque mollis petulantia, quo incessus arte compositus et ne vestigia quidem pedum extra mensuram aberrantia, nisi quod formam prostituis ut vendas?"

\textsuperscript{434}Ael. \textit{VH} 2.38. The same custom was supposedly used in luxurious Miletus and curiously enough Rome.

\textsuperscript{435}\textit{φαεκάσια} were white shoes traditionally worn by Athenian gymnasiarchs, as well as Attic and Alexandrian priests. Antony wore a pair as a part of a typically Greek costume, when he was in Alexandria acting as a private individual and frequenting the schools and temples of that learned city (App. \textit{BC} 5.11).

\textsuperscript{436}Suda, e. 3161, ἔς Μασσαλίαν πλεύσειας—ἐπὶ τῶν θηλυτέρως καὶ μαλακῶς ζῶντων. οἱ γὰρ Μασσαλιώται θηλύτερον ἔξων στολαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ποδήρσι καὶ μύροις χρώμενοι; \textit{Ath. Epit.} 2:2 (p.81), Μασσαλιώται δὲ Ἰβηρικῶς μὲν εἰσιν ἐσταλμένοι, ἔθηλύνθησαν δὲ καὶ ἀσχημονοῦσι διὰ τὴν ἐν ψυχαίς μαλακίαν, διὰ τρυφῆν γυναικοπαθοῦντες, ὀθεν καὶ ἡ παροιμία: πλεύσειας εἰς Μασσαλίαν.
"Because you know your sex appeal, you become arrogant, and sell your embraces, instead of granting them freely. What is the object of your nicely combed hair, your face plastered with make-up, and the soft glance even in your eyes, and your walk arranged by art so that never a footstep strays from its place? It means, of course, that you are prostituting your beauty and selling it off."

The boys, and not just Encolpius, although he is our prime concern, are primarily sexual objects in the eyes of women and older men.

Lichas's "recognition" of Encolpius tells the same story, for he identifies the bald and disguised Encolpius not by his face (and hands), but by his genitals, which he might be seen as addressing directly by the name of Encolpius since as he utters the greeting his hand and eyes are headed in that direction (105.9, nec manus nec faciem meam consideravit, sed continuo ad inguina mea luminibus deflexis movit officiosam manum et "Salve" inquit "Encolpi"). This recalls the earlier witticism of Eumolpus about Ascyltos: habebat enim inguinum pondus tam grande ut ipsum hominem laciniam fascini crederes (92.9). The appeal of the genitals is such that the man himself becomes but an extension of them. From this observation we can furthermore conclude that when Lichas addresses Encolpius's genitals by his proper name, the implication is that the man Encolpius takes his name from his genitals. Encolpius's phallic identity, of course, is most clearly evident in his *rendender Name*. It is therefore not surprising to find a large part of the extant narrative

---

437 Quartilla is interested in Giton's genitals: 24.7, mox manum etiam demisit in sinum et pertrectato vasculo tam rudi "Haec" inquit "belle cras in promulside libidinis nostrae militabit; hodie enim post asellum diaria non sumo." Eumolpus also carefully examines Encolpius's resurrected member (140.13).
to consists of a long episode relating the dysfunction of Encolpius's *mentula*, a treatment of
this subject which is unique in its frankness and scope in all of ancient literature.\(^{438}\)

The phallic clown is a well known archetypal figure in Greek culture. His earliest
appearance may perhaps be noted in the Homeric underdogs, Thersites and Iros, and
certainly in the parodic epic figure Margites, and the philosophical clown and slave Aesop.
Other marginal figures of literature include the satyrs and especially Silenus, whose looks
were commonly made use of to describe the philosopher Socrates. Another philosopher,
Diogenes the Cynic, may be counted in, and such comic characters as the *stupidus* of mime
and the *scholasticus* of ancient jokes belong to the type. Beside the obvious attribute, the
phallus, this figure was regularly identifiable by its shaven head or baldness, pointed ears,
snub nose, and a pot-belly. Not all of these attributes need to be present for the figure to be
recognizable. Baldness is an especially prominent sign of the creature's phallic identity,
often replacing the phallus itself. The reason for this is that baldness, besides making the
man himself look more phallic, was intimately associated with sexual activity in Greco-
Roman culture. According to Aristotle's *Historia Animalium* loss of hair from the head or
eyebrows only occurs after a man has become sexually active (*HA* 518a). Moreover, no boy
or woman or castrated man ever goes bald (*HA* 518a). Likewise, the hairs of the eyelashes
are said to fall off, when sexual activity begins, and the more the greater this activity is (*HA*
518b). Finally, in those who are given to sexual activity the congenital hair (the hair on the
head, eyelids, and eyebrows) is more likely to fall off (*HA* 518a, \(\rho\varepsilon\upsilon\varsigma \delta \varepsilon \mu\alpha\lambda\lambda\nu\ \alpha\iota\)
\(\tau\rho\iota\chi\varepsilon\varsigma \tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\iota\rho\varphi\rho\delta\iota\sigma\iota\sigma\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma \alpha\iota \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\)). Incidentally, Aristotle himself is the target

\(^{438}\)The topic of ancient representations of male impotence has been recently studied
of invective preserved in the *Greek Anthology*, which casts him as the lecherous bald man with the other defining characteristics of the phallic clown.\(^{439}\)

Plato's description of Socrates's looks in the *Symposion* as resembling those of Silenus, relies on the same easy association. The transferal of the attributes of Silenus (baldness, snubbed-nose and pot-belly) to Socrates became the basis of his later portraits, and a cliché in later literature.\(^{440}\) In theatrical costumes, baldness could represent phallic looks with or without the accessory phallus, and was used to characterize parasites, slaves, cooks, (dirty) old men, money-lenders, and in general male characters with strong corporal appetites over which they had little or no control. The pimp of New Comedy is bald and has a phallic name (e.g., Sannio, Ballio).\(^{441}\) These types, moreover, were the favourite subjects of vase painters and makers of terra-cotta figurines.\(^{442}\) In mime, the most common character was a bald clown called the "stupidus", who was usually a cuckolded husband and would regularly be beaten during the act.\(^{443}\)

When the shaven and eyebrowless Encolpius is recognized by his *mentula* by Lichas, he resembles a cinaedus (Gel. 6.12.5, and Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 20). This is perhaps a


\(^{440}\) *Var. Men.* 490, *tam glaber quam Socrates*.

\(^{441}\) See, e.g., Plaut *Rud.* 371, and Pollux 4.145, "receding hairline or bald".

\(^{442}\) For illustrations, see Nicoll (1963), 43-89.

\(^{443}\) Arnobius says that you might see *stupidorum capitibus rasis* at the *Ludi Florales* and hear the *salapittarum* (blows, boxes on the ears) *sonitu atque plausu* applied to the *stupidi* (*Adv. nat.* 7.33). Nonius Marcellus (6M=10L) defines caluitur: *dictum est frustratur: tractum a caluis mimicis quod sint omnibus frustrati*. (Cited by Maxwell (1993), 10).
sign of what is coming, and Encolpius is certainly in some sense a *cinaedus* since he delivers his description of an attempt at self-castration in the Sotadean meter (132.8). But he also resembles the men with shaven heads, memorably described by Lucian (*Merc. Cond.* 1), who gather in crowds at the temples and spin yarns about their shipwreck and unlooked-for deliverance, which is exactly what the narrator Encolpius is doing as he gives us this account of his shameful "recognition" and subsequent unexpected salvation.

The association of baldness and a phallic nature was equally close in late republican and early imperial Rome, as is testified by a popular verse against Julius Caesar, *Urbani, servate uxores: moechum calvom adducimus*,444 and another verse by Juvenal, *calvo serviret Roma Neroni*, which is given a sexual interpretation by Servius.445 Pliny reports, in language reminiscent of Aristotle's *Historia Animalium*, that among the hairy tribes of the Alps and Gallia Comata, loss of hair is rare in the case of a woman, unknown in eunuchs, and never occurs in any case before sexual intercourse has taken place.446 Seneca, the philosopher, believed that baldness and gout in women were recent, and a sign of the times. Born to be passive in sex (*pati natae*), women had violated the law of nature by somehow (Seneca does not elaborate this point) becoming actively engaged in sex through penetration (*viros ineunt*). As a fitting punishment, argues the philosopher, they now have lost the privileges of their sex and are beginning to suffer from virile diseases (*damnatae sunt morbis virilibus*).447


447 Sen. *Ep.* 95.21; see Adams (1982), 190f.
If I am correct in assuming that Encolpius the narrator must be a bald man in conformity with his age and type—a point which will necessarily remain speculative—, a good parallel to him would be offered by Lucius, the narrator of the *Asinus Aureus* of Apuleius. This luckless young nobleman turned phallic creature by magic lotions, appropriately portrays himself at the end of his narrative as completely bald or shaven, and thus marks himself off as being still a phallic clown, despite having regained his human form and lost the donkey-penis at the time of narrating his story (the shaven head of Lucius the *pastophorus* is as ambiguous as Encolpius's white shoes; it is open to a respectable religious interpretation and a shameful phallic one). Significantly, in the shape of an ass, Lucius, like the "stupidus" of mime, is constantly being beaten. Jack Winkler has speculated that an openly phallic narrator is an indication of a certain lack of control over the material of the story. Such surrender of power is of course likelier to be a narrative stance than a measure of the narrator's lack of sophistication.

This lack of control can manifest itself in formal features such as a mixture of discourses (an indication of inconsistency and lack of authority in the character), a method of composition that may go all the way back to the Homeric poem *Margites*. This is so despite the fact that the phalus, the erect penis, may also be thought of as the prime symbol of dominance and patriarchal authority. Although ithyphallic effigies were common at festivals, as well as in apotropaic trinkets and wall-carvings, those who actually exercised patriarchal authority seem to have rigorously concealed this organ or preferred to portray it as small and immature.\(^{448}\) Thus Right in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes promises a small penis

\(^{448}\)A notable exception from this rule is Caesar's obscene threat to the senate after his military successes in Gallia that *proinde ex eo insultaturum omnium capitis*us (Suet. *Jul.* 22.2).
as one of the good results of an old-fashioned aristocratic education.\textsuperscript{449} As a dramatic
device in Old Comedy, the depiction of men with huge artificial erections, was designed to
produce laughter. Mocking laughter seems likewise to be what met the bald man of
antiquity on stage and off.\textsuperscript{450} These "deformities" were seen as a sure sign of a low and
shameless nature, and therefore justified the instantaneous degradation of the individual in
question. A male who is so obviously not in control of his appetites is seen as the very
opposite of the free male citizen, who was required to adhere rigorously to the ideals of
individual autonomy and restraint. Any sign of obsessive behavior or dependency can
quickly become a liability when the basis of the individual's citizen-rights derive from the
assumption that he is a free and rational agent.\textsuperscript{451}

We have therefore the paradox of the over-sized phallus, which is both clownish
and unmanly. Just as Lucius, in the form of an ass, is constantly beaten and ridiculed, the
luckless male prostitute, Encolpius, is sought after and used for the sexual gratification of
other characters in the story, and can be seen as the very opposite of a dominant male.
Although these two narrators share such fundamental aspects, we need not rely on Ciaffi's
thesis (1960) that Apuleius transferred some of Encolpius's traits onto his Latin adaptation
of the Greek Ass story. We may speculate that Encolpius, the narrator of the \textit{Satyrlica}, was
bald without deriving this attribute from anything more specific than a stock figure of
Greco-Roman culture.


\textsuperscript{450}Plu. \textit{Mor.} 86b-92f (88 E 10); Lucian \textit{DMort.} 1.2; \textit{D.C Hist. Rom.} 76.8.4.;

\textsuperscript{451}Or as argued by Halperin (1990), 88-112, and Edwards (1993), 63-97, the male
citizen's mastery of his appetites as the condition for his mastery of his social inferiors.
If Encolpius the narrator were bald, every reference to the hair that he was so proud of in the past would thus acquire special significance. Take for example the discomfort expressed in these words, *abscondebam... frequentius vultum intellegebamque me non tralatica deformitate esse insignitum* (110.4), and compare them to Lucius’s long and lofty eulogy about the importance of hair on the head of beautiful women (2.8-9). Coming from bald and phallic narratorial *personae* such obsession with hair and beauty makes good sense as comic characterization, but would otherwise be somewhat pointless. It would also be a further sign of shamelessness for Encolpius to deliberately draw attention to this significant attribute, and make fun of it.

A work called *Satyrca*[^1] which features the travelogue and erotic memoirs of a man called Encolpius, narrated in a mixture of discursive types to an audience of his betters, is very likely a continuation of the general comic tradition which begins with Margites and continues with satyr-plays and the comic theater. If young Encolpius is a satyr, the narrator may be likened to a Silenus. They are both of related nature, but the older one has lost most of his youthful pretensions and posturing (along with his hair), and acquired a gift for telling stories. The distance between the implied nobility and virtue of the audience and the shamelessness and low social status of the narrator assures the effectiveness of both the comedy and the satire.

[^1]: The adjective σατυρικός is used, for example, by Plutarch to describe the fun loving crowd of the theaters and palaestra, to which the emperor Nero had been so generous: ἐφήμεροι καὶ σατυρικοὶ τοῖς βίοις ἄνθρωποι (*Galba* 16).
CHAPTER SIX

COMPOSITION: THE GRECO-ROMAN EROTIC NOVEL

In this final chapter, we intend to submit some new arguments regarding the origin and mode of composition underlying the Satyrca of Petronius. We have attempted earlier to show that our text is written expressly for performance by a single actor, or ancient lector in the sense of a lively reciter. It has also been shown, in the central chapters, that the original Satyrca was not radically episodic, as is often assumed by scholars, but rather exhibited a central plot constructed around the person of the narrator, and organized by a technique which on the whole resembles that used in other known Greek and Greco-Roman prose fictions. In the preceding chapter, moreover, we have discussed the narrator Encolpius and his comically subordinate social and moral status with respect to his audience. All these arguments have aimed at restoring to the Satyrca its original form as an extended fictional narrative with a unity and logic of its own, unrelated to the author's biography. It is now time to place the work as described in the context of Greco-Roman literary history.

By scrutinizing the peculiar mixture of Greek and Roman linguistic and cultural elements in the text, I argue that the realism of the Satyrca is illusory, because its blend of Greek and Latin cultures was nowhere and never exemplified in the real world. To account for the hybrid nature of the work, we advance a new hypothesis regarding the composition of the Satyrca, which can resolve various difficult problems in the traditional scholarship, without diminishing the value of much excellent work in the field. According to our hypothesis Petronius was not merely working in the tradition of the Greco-Roman comic novel, when he wrote the Satyrca, but was freely adapting a specific Greek model, now
lost, which was likewise written in a mixture of discourse types. Because of the many Roman elements in the Satyrlica, studies of its intertextual relationship with other Roman works are important, even if the work as a whole has a Greek model. Petronius can, now as before, be seen to draw on other genres, both Greek and Latin, for various other effects, techniques, themes, and subjects, though the emphasis should naturally be on the main generic features of the narrative.

The direction of my argument calls for an exploration of the possible antecedents of the Greek work behind the Satyrlica, now preserved as little more than titles. Later works belonging to the same genre will also be taken into account, including the Greek model of the Metamorphoses of Apuleius, and recently discovered Greek papyri containing fragments of prosimetric and non-prosimetric erotic and criminal fictions. This evidence should make it possible, in conjunction with our explication of the narrative structure of the Satyrlica, to provide a rough description of this all but lost literary form.

The greatest obstacle to revising our understanding of how the writer of the Satyrlica went about composing his work is not so much the lack of ancient sources as the peculiar place occupied by Petronius Arbiter in modern narratives of Greco-Roman literary history. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, Petronian scholarship—under pressure from pervasive ideologies, relating to the consolidation of national states in Europe, and the general upheaval caused by the revolutionary progress in science and technology—began to

---

453Petronius can be seen, with Sandy (1974b), as drawing on contemporary farce as continuing metaphor, and, with Panayotakis (1995), as drawing on the same genre to facilitate the imaginative "staging" of certain episodes of the narrative; likewise he can be seen, with Bücheler (1862), as drawing on Varronian satire for the application of prosimetry in Latin, and, with Beck (1982), as drawing on Lucilian satire in the construction of a narrative persona.
invest unstintingly in a vision of Petronius as a national writer and a great innovator. According to this new interpretation, Petronius had, in the fashion of contemporary writers of Naturalist documentary novels, such as Emile Zola, invented a new form of literature for describing the daily life and manners of his ancient Italian fellow countrymen. This conception of Petronius as the ancient Roman master of a modern literary genre, coincided with the tendency of politically active German philologists to see in the unification of ancient Italy under Roman rule a classical model for their own project of building a modern national state.

Although a modified version of this romantic idea of our author has until recently held a great deal of currency in the scholarship, it cannot be taken for granted that today's students of the Satyricon are generally familiar with the books and articles where this interpretation was first presented with the backing of learned scholarly argumentation. To name one distinguished example, Winkler and Stephens, in a commentary on the Iolaos fragment, claim that the problem of composition in Petronian scholarship has been influenced by the "prejudice of Hellenists that Petronius 'must have had' a Greek antecedent." It is not very difficult to demonstrate that the truth is exactly the opposite, for a strong bias has existed for well over a century towards viewing Petronius as the quintessential Roman or ancient Italian author, whose artistic "originality", supposedly, was not compromised by "foreign" Greek influence. Because of this oblivion about the origins of the ruling trend of Petronian scholarship in this century, even among the best of scholars, it will be necessary to survey in some detail the often hot-headed but mostly brilliant writings of the early modern Petronians, almost exclusively German philologists,

who, in the last decades of the nineteenth century, defined the problems and invented the solutions on which subsequent criticism relies for its understanding.

The modern history of the scholarship on the Satyrca begins with Bücheler’s first critical edition of the text, published in 1862. Before this date, the seventeenth century had produced many astute studies of the "vulgar" Latin in the work and its relationship with social personae, and even with the Romance languages; the Satyrca had been very popular and widely read in the eighteenth century; however, the early nineteenth century had used it as little more than a historical document, and an embarrassing one at that, due to its often obscene subject-matter. In a section of his introduction devoted to composition and over-all structure, Bücheler first acknowledges the difficulties involved due to the state of the text, and then summarizes what appear to be roughly the facts about the narrative form, the plot, and the time in which the story is set:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ita} [...] con\textit{c}exuisse Petronius \textit{satiras videtur ut dicta factaque omnia Graeco more ad unam referret personam Encolpii sua fata en\textit{narrant}is. hinc ille p. 77, 16 etiam recordatio me \textit{inquit} si qua est dicenti fides, offendit et p. 83, 18 pudet referre quae secuntur. deinde \textit{res gestas disposit}ur \textit{per} varias \textit{urbes} \textit{quas peregrinando Encolpios obierat. et libri quidem quae servarunt}, \textit{in Campania aguntur et apud Crotoni\textit{tas}}, \textit{alia} \textit{autem et priorem partem satirarum apud Massilienses actam esse colligo ex fr. III et I. ceterum incidisse susce\textit{pta} ab Encolpio \textit{itina scriptor nescio an finxerit in ultimos annos quibus regnabat Tiberius.}
\end{quote}

Bücheler’s reconstruction was the necessary first step in the direction of defining the larger form of the full-text Satyrca, but he assumes, as have done other scholars after him, that Petronius wholly invented the plot of the wandering Greek Massaliote. The influences he allows from Greek sources are restricted to New Comedy and philosophical character
sketches. Of Roman works, however, he considers Varro's *Satirae Menippeae* as the model, and he finds Horatian influence likely as well. In Bücheler's presentation of the work, there is still no sign of the anomaly or paradox that was later to become our author’s hallmark.

The source of the modern interpretation of Petronius and his work can be traced to a single article, published in the 1878 issue of *Hermes*, and written by Theodor Mommsen, a Berlin professor who then towered over a generation of philologists. The article sets out to accomplish the apparently straightforward task of locating the Campanian city of Trimalchio and analyzing the epigraphic style of the freedman's projected epitaph, for the purpose of dating the work. However, the impact it had on the scholarship derived from a side issue, addressed by the historian with such enthusiasm, and appealing to so many contemporary passions, as to spark a revolution in the study of the *Satyricon*.

After praising the account of the adventures of Encolpius and his comrades as being in the first rank in Roman literature for "originality" and "skillful mastery", Mommsen acknowledges—obliged to do so by Bücheler’s description of the work—that the author of the *Satyricon* has an obvious fondness for setting the scenes of his story in Hellenic environments, first in Massilia, and then in Greek Campania and Croton. However, despite this fact, Mommsen claims that it is "highly conceivable" (sehr begreiflich) that Petronius has "like hardly any other, given full expression to the distinctItalic identity" (wie kaum ein anderer die italische Individualität zum vollen Ausdruck gebracht hat), and "perhaps alone of all the Romans, has followed the route of his own genius, independent of Greek

---

455 Mommsen, Th. (1878), 106-121. This article is identified by Bürger (1892), 346 n.2, as the origin of the unprecedented view that the work of Petronius was "vielleicht das künstlerisch höchststehende Erzeugniss der ganzen römischen Litteratur."
Having formulated this paradox, Mommsen must now offer an explanation for how Petronius could give "full expression" to his Italian identity in a work of literature about Greek characters moving in a Greek environment. On the one hand, he argues, Petronius had to be careful not to give any hint of "the firm footing of his own nationality" (den festen Boden der eigenen Nationalität) and spoil "his setting in an essentially Hellenic environment" (seine Scene in das eigentlich hellenische Gebiet), but on the other—and to the same effect—, he had no mind to dispense with "the influence of the Greek essence" (die Einwirkungen des griechischen Wesens) in the representation of "his home country" (seiner Heimath) and his times. Mommsen’s Petronius, who is an "artist" (Künstler), and a "portrayer of manners and a satirist" (Sittenmaler und Satiriker), was thus constrained to write a Greek story to be faithful to the reality of Hellenization in Italy, and once having embarked on such a project, was forced to conceal his unquestionable Italian nationality, to which he nevertheless managed to give the fullest expression.

To understand the modern anxiety behind the constitution of Mommsen’s Petronius, we will certainly benefit from paying less attention to the Roman socio-cultural background of the first century C.E. than to the revolutionary events taking place in central Europe in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. The man who invented the modern Petronius was a romantic nationalist and a self-confessed animal politicum,\(^457\) who had

\(^{456}\)The term "Italic nationality" (italische Nationalität) is meaningless, unless we understand this to be the ancient correlate of the fledgling Italian nationality. Mommsen’s English translator, W.P. Dickson (London, 1868, 4 vols.), did not hesitate to translate "italische" as "Italian".

\(^{457}\)In Mommsen's own testament, Wucher (1956), 218f.
been exiled from Saxony in 1850 for the part he played in the struggle of philologists and other intellectuals for a unified greater Germany. At the time of writing the article on Petronius, Mommsen had been a National Liberal in the Prussian Landtag for five years, and his sympathies towards the recently victorious Italian risorgimento movement were obvious and derived from the kindred struggle of the two nationalist movements, the German and the Italian, at times against common enemies (the Garibaldini, for example, were greatly aided by Bismarck's military successes in the Franco-Prussian war).

Mommsen's famous and widely successful Römische Geschichte (1854-56) was, rather than the history of that ancient empire, the history of the "Italic" nation from the earliest immigrations to the end of the Roman Republic. His interest in ancient history went far beyond the scientific, and he consciously attempted to write a work of "political" history which would focus on the significance of classical antiquity for his own times. Roman history was his subject of choice, principally because the Italic nation "alone among all the civilized nations of antiquity succeeded in constructing a national unity based on political independence" (errang allein unter allen Kulturvölkern des Altertums bei einer auf Selbständigkeit ruhenden Verfassung die nationale Einheit). The terms used by the historian, "nation", "independence", "unity", were of course the political buzzwords of the time. The untenable antithesis in much of Mommsen's historical writings holds that "Roman" somehow stands for practical realism and a genius for state-building—his Napoleonic Caesar is "durch und durch Realist" RG. III.450—, while "Greek" is seen as synonymous with fabulous story-telling and abstract philosophizing.

---

458 Römische Geschichte (1854), 1:30.

459 Wucher (1956), 63.

460 Wucher (1956), 139f.
Although Mommsen does not mention Petronius in his *Römische Geschichte*, he there molds Terentius Varro into a similar Italian genius. Due to the great influence of Isaac Casaubon's classic, *De Satyrice Graecorum Poesi & Romanorum Satira* (1605), scholars had carefully tried to differentiate satirical works written in the Latin language from various satirical and comic genres written in Greek, although no comparable differentiation existed in antiquity. It is therefore Varro's writing of satire that provided the basis for turning him into a quintessential Roman author, despite ample evidence that he was adapting into Latin a Greek satirical genre. Petronius, likewise, could be recruited as the voice of the Italian nation, because of Bücheler's use of *Satirae* as the title of the work, instead of *satyricon*, for example, or the nominative *satyrica* ("satyr-plays"), and because this first modern editor of the work had derived it from the satirists Varro and Horace. However, even preferring the Latin name to the Greek, as the original title of the work, is not sufficient to preclude its association with Greek satiric and comic genres. Even so, the ancient audience would have directly connected the satires of Petronius with those dissolute and shameless creatures named σάτυροι.

---

461 Henriksson (1956), 77, concludes in his study of Greek book-titles in Roman literature that the Roman readership of Petronius could probably not differentiate the meaning of the forms *Satiricon* and *Satyricon*, since there is no sign that such etymological understanding existed. In other words, satyrs and satire were closely related concepts.

462 Schol. Hor. Ep. 1.11.12, *saturam ... dictam sive a saturis, quod similiter in hoc carmine ridiculae res pudendaeque dicuntur, quae velut a saturis proferuntur; sive a satura lance;* Evanth. de Com. 2.5, *satyra ... a satyris, quos in iocis semper ac petulantitis deos scimus esse, vocitata est;* Schol. Pers. prol. 1, *satira ... a saturitate, quod plena sit conviciis et reprehensionibus hominum;* 11.8, *dicta ... satira a saturitate, unde in choro Liberi patris ministri vino atque epulis pleni Saturi appellabuntur.*
Contrary to Casaubon's insistence on a clear differentiation, ancient authors tended
to associate closely poetic satire, satyr-plays and comedy, and never regarded these genres
in terms of national identities. Accordingly, the sixth century Joannes Lydus lists Petronius
after Turnus and Juvenal, claiming that all three have violated the σατυρικός νόμος,
because of their invective. To his ancient audience Petronius may have been a satirist, but
the broad term of "satire" could also include works like the Cyclops of Euripides, and a
whole variety of other Greek genres. Satire and comedy in general are for the most part
subversive genres and as such they often made communal Hellenic heroes and ideals the
butt of their jokes and criticisms. The persona of the satirist requires a writer of satires to
play an outsider in society, but this is a different status from being an insider in another
society, and should also be carefully differentiated from nineteenth and twentieth century
gloss-roots and "volk"-culture.

No evidence, indeed, exists to support the wholesale identification of ancient satire
as "Roman". The much quoted phrase of Quintilian, satira quidem tota nostra est (Inst.
10.1.93.), merely refers to the hexameter satires of Lucilius, Horace and Persius. It
follows the discussion of love elegy, in which genre Roman authors are said to have given
Greek poets competition. For the rhetorician to say that hexameter satire is "all ours",
however, could well be ironic, considering the general Roman dislike of innovation and
admiration for archaic traditions. Moreover, Quintilian's claim, limited as it is, is
contradicted from the Greek side by Joannes Lydus. A weightier testimony, however,

463 Lyd. Mag. 62.41, Τούρνος δὲ καὶ Ἰουβενάλλιος καὶ Πετρώνιος, αὐτόθεν ταῖς
λοιπορίαις ἐπεξελθόντες, τὸν σατυρικὸν νόμον παρέτρωσαν.

464 Mag. 62.41, τὸν Ρίνθωνα, ὃς ἐξαμέτρως ἔγραψε πρῶτος καμῳρίαν· εἷς οὗ
πρῶτος λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς Λουκίλλου ὃ Ρωμαίος ἤρωικὸς ἐπεσιν ἐκωμῳρίσεν.
μεθ' ὅν καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτὸν, οὕς καλούσι Ρωμαίοι σατυρικοῦς.
comes from Horace, who defines his own hexameter poems as *Bionei sermones* (*Ep.* 2.2.60), and claims, furthermore, that Lucilius, his Roman model, borrowed his wit and invective, if not the meter, from Greek Old Comedy. The hexameter, of course, shows that we are dealing essentially with a Greek poetic tradition adapted to Latin uses. No ancient authority, moreover, claims that the Cynic mixture of prose and poetry, that "other and even older kind of satire" (*alterum illud etiam prius satirae genus*), was in any sense a Roman creation, or in any way reflected a specifically Roman or Italian outlook on life.

But there was also another important factor which made possible Mommsen's revision of what Petronius stood for in literary history. Two years before the publication of his article, a thirty-one-year-old Erwin Rohde had published a ground-breaking literary historical study, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (1876), which rejected any generic relation between the *Satyricon* and the extant Greek romances. According to

---

465 With reference to the Cynic diatribes of Bion, an early third century Athenian. It is probable that some of Horace's satires are straightforward adaptations of earlier works, e.g. *serm.* 2.5, which is a satirical νέκυια in the manner of Menippus and other Cynics. On this aspect of Horace's *Satires*, see recently Freudenberg (1993).

466 Hor. *S.* 1.4.1-6, *Eupolis atque Catinus Aristophanesque poetae / atque alii, quorum comoedia prisca virorum est [...] / hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus / mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque.*

467 Besides Bion, Timon of Phlius (ca. 320-230 B.C.E.) also wrote satirical hexameter poems (including dialogues). Known as ὁ συλλογράφος, he was of sceptical philosophical inclination and a follower of Pyrrho. Timon also, typically, wrote satyr-plays and cinaedic poetry.

468 Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.95.

469 Rohde (1876), 248-50.
Rohde's thesis, the extant Greek prose fictions are both sentimental and fabulous, because the form had been put together out of two preexisting Hellenistic genres, erotic poetry and the prose narratives he called Reisefabulistik; but the style is also artificial, because the two genres had, as it were, been welded together into a new synthetic type by a verbose and rhetorically fluent Second Sophistic. Although not strictly belonging to his subject, Rohde nevertheless dedicates one of his extended philological footnotes to the Satyrica (248 n.1), which he refers to simultaneously as a "picaresque novel" and a "Menippean satire".470

Following Bücheler, Rohde derives the work from a mostly lost type of ancient literature which he describes as "a humorous genre of popular-philosophical writing" (witzige Gattung popular-philosophischer Schriftstellerei), a specifically κονικὸς τρόπος in a mixture of prose and poetry, which is evidenced to a certain extent by ancient character sketches, but more importantly by the writings of the Cynics Bion, Menippus, Krates, Monimus and Meleager. This genre, according to Rohde, was first adapted into Latin by Varro, and later imitated by the younger Seneca. In this formulation, Rohde acknowledges a debt to his friend Friederich Nietzsche, who had argued a few years earlier, on the evidence of Probus (ad Verg. Ecl. 4.31), that Varro followed Menippus closely both with regard to the form and spirit of his satires.471

The next big step in the modern interpretation of the Satyrica was directly influenced by the arrival on the scene of a new manner of writing, documentary Naturalism. As so

470 The definition of the Satyrica as picaresque novel, or Schelmenroman, was later reiterated by von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, in Hinneberg (1912), 190; and by Leo, ibid., 459, and is still the basic term used by Müller and Ehlers, although it has drifted from Schelmengeschichten (1965) to Schelmenszenen (1983), in accordance with the increasing fragmentation of the work at the latest trend of scholarship.

471 Nietzsche (1870), §11 ad fin; in Colli and Montinari (1982), 2:1, 240f.
often in German literature, this movement was heralded by pamphlets demanding a new scientific objectivity in literature. The principal model was Émile Zola and the organs of the movement were such journals as the *Kritische Waffengänge* (1882-84), in Berlin, and *Die Gesellschaft* (1885-1902), in Munich. Among the moderately progressive philologists of the day some apprehension was felt that the heritage of classicism and romanticism was in danger of being discredited. This concern, at least, inspired Elimar Klebs to formulate the first explicit thesis about the composition of the *Satyricon*, in his classic article, 'Zur Composition von Petronius Satirae' (1889).

Klebs's Petronius is simply "the strongest realist of antiquity" (*der stärkste Realist des Alterthums*) as well as a satirical genius whose great achievement is to have given "artistic character" (*künstlerische Charakter*) to "realism" (*Realismus*), in contrast with the writers of Klebs's own time, who "merely share with Petronius the long-winded treatment of smut" (*die mit ihm nur die breite Behandlung des Schmutzes gemein haben*). For Klebs, no attempt is necessary to explain the existence of a realistic novel in antiquity, and so he grants a degree of universality to this predominant form of his times, which enables it to transcend the limits of time and space. Klebs nevertheless notes the similarities of Encolpius's narrative persona (an intelligent and well educated person telling the story of his wanderings and chaotic adventures outside the reach of law and civilization) to that of Lucius, in the Greek ass story and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. But he also finds a

---

472 A similar definition of the *Satyricon* as "antike Schmutz" is found in Nietzsche's posthumous fragments, where the philosopher, after comparing favourably the experience of reading the *Satyricon* to that of reading the New Testament, poses the following question: "ist nicht der antike Schmutz noch mehr werth als diese ganze kleine anmaßliche Christen-Weisheit und -Muckerei?" See Nachgelassene Fragmente; Herbst 1887 bis März 1888 10 [93] (213); in Colli and Montinari (1970), 8:2, 175-6.
partial analogy in the *Satyricon* with the picaresque novel of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Neither link, however, is seen to have literary-historical implications other than demonstrating the universality of the form.

Contrary to what Klebs's argument has come to represent in the later scholarship, his intention was not to argue that the work of Petronius is a prosaic parody or travesty of such epic poems as the *Odyssey* or the *Aeneid*:

Daran wird natürlich kein Verständiger denken, daß es Petrons Absicht gewesen sei eine prosaische Travestie zu den Gesängen vom Zorn Poseidons oder Junos zu schreiben. Ein werk mit einer solchen Fülle lebensvoller Schilderungen der Wirklichkeit erhebt von selber dagegen Einspruch, unter die reinen Literatur-Satiren eingereiht zu werden.\(^{474}\)

According to Klebs, then, rather than creating a simple parody of epic, Petronius merely used an epic structure in the *Satyricon* for the purpose of achieving "inner unity" (*innerer Einheit*) for the otherwise loosely structured realistic portrayal of his times.

Klebs's once influential thesis, which postulates an over-arching epic theme of divine wrath in the *Satyricon*, was in part an expansion of Bücheler's suggestion that the fragment from Sidonius Apollinaris (*Fr. I*) might be seen as indication of Priapic involvement in the story as early as the opening episode in Massilia. To this Klebs added several instances in the extant text where Priapus seems to have a role in the plot. Hence, he concluded that the strife between Encolpius and Priapus was a unifying motif of great importance in the original story. He also drew attention to the many parodic allusions to

\(^{473}\)Perry (1967), 186, "another sees in it a parody on the epic", with a footnote reference to Klebs's article.

\(^{474}\)Klebs (1889), 630.
Greek myth and Roman legends, which serve the same purpose, especially allusions to the Homeric *Odyssey*, as for instance in the comic recognition-scene where Lichas identifies the bald and shaven Encolpius by his *mentula*, and the narrator explicitly compares this to Odysseus's more heroic recognition by his scar (*Od.* 19.386-507).

The purpose of such parody in the *Satyricon*, according to Klebs, is to express, by way of irony, the narrator's awareness of his pathetic humiliation. This irony is both sophisticated and self-conscious and therefore resembles the narrative posturing frequently assumed by modern authors. To buttress his claim, Klebs highlights the ironic pathos of the narrator where it finds its clearest articulation, in the poem in 139.2, where Encolpius states that the *gravis ira Priapi* signifies for him what the fateful wrath of Poseidon meant for Odysseus (*der Zorn des Priapus bedeutet für Encolpios Schicksale, was Poseidons Zorn für Odysseus*). Klebs, in effect, privileges this particular poem and uses it as master text for interpreting the whole of the *Satyricon*. According to Klebs, by giving the "I-novel" (*Ich-Roman*) of Encolpius an epic structure, Petronius endowed his *Realismus* with "artistic character" (*künstlerischer Charakter*). This supposed achievement of the ancient author is then promoted as the ideal for contemporary writers, an esthetic reconciliation between unrestrained modernity and a possibly endangered classical tradition.

The general attempt to enlist Petronius on the side of progress and innovation, in the great modern struggle of ideas, did not win immediate and uncritical acceptance. One scholar in particular, Karl Bürger, in the article 'Der Antike Roman vor Petronius', made difficult, for awhile, the visionary reinterpretation of Petronius, by mounting historically and philologically viable counter-arguments, although these ultimately came to naught,

---

475 Bürger (1892), 345-58
since, as it appears, they did not hold out equally exciting promises of interpretation to his more progressive colleagues.

The tone of Bürger's article is polemical, but not offensive, and the reader gets the impression that he was carefully trying to correct a picture of the ancient novel which he considered flawed, despite its having been embraced by the philological community at large. He begins by sketching the exaggerated picture of two radically different ancient novels, which according to him had already become scholarly "dogma" (ist es zum Dogma geworden) through the publication of Rohde's Der griechische Roman (1876). According to this picture, we have, on the one hand, a sentimental and fabulous Greek romance, regarded as the creation of the Second Sophistic, and on the other, the supposedly unrelated Satirae of Petronius, regarded as "the remnants of a genuinely realistic novel of manners" (die Trümmer eines echt realistischen Sittenromans), without any antecedents in Greek literature. Bürger regretfully tells the story of Thiele's unhappy earlier attempt to address the problems of this unlikely dichotomy,\(^476\) and expresses optimism that a better argued and more detailed demonstration of the existence before Petronius of "realistic Greek novels" (realistischer griechischer Romane) will win followers among scholars.\(^477\)

Bürger is generally favourable to Klebs's thesis and seems to agree on the issue of epic structure and especially on the similarity of the Satyricon to the Spanish picaresque novel, but he rejects as insufficient Rohde's attempts to derive it from Menippean satire. Bürger argues that a novel of such size (at least seventeen books) and technical virtuosity as

\(^476\) Thiele (1890), 124.

\(^477\) The sequence of this scholarly controversy is the following: Thiele (1890); Bürger (1892) (the present article); Susemihl (1892); Thiele (1893); Rohde (1893), 125-39; Schmid (1904), 471-85; Reitzenstein (1906), 91-99.
the *Satyrica* cannot, any more than other great works of literature, have been created out of nothing, and is more easily accounted for if we assume that it follows a whole series of similar works, even if these were of a lesser size and inferior artistic quality. Whether such early novels were written in Latin or Greek, he deems to be of little importance, although, on the analogy of the rest of Roman literary compositions, the conclusion that this genre as well was initiated in Greek might be arrived at through inductive reasoning.\(^{478}\) He raises objections to the "more commonly expressed opinion" that the *Satyrica* contains a specifically "Italic" character (*Man hat freilich öfter die Meinung ausgesprochen, grade Petrons Werk trage einen specifische italischen Character*), a view that he traces to Mommsen's article.\(^{479}\) Bürger points out that the arguments advanced in support of the "Italic" character of the *Satyrica*, which typically rely on the presence of "vulgar" Latin idioms in the diction,\(^{480}\) misconstrue what is merely a Greek technique of imitating linguistic mannerisms, well known in Hellenistic authors like Theocritus and Herondas.

In order to establish the early existence of prose narratives in the style of Petronius, Bürger begins by revisiting the argument which Thiele had used before him, and finds in Cicero's *De inventione* (1.19.27) and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (1.8.12) a description of a general, non-judicial,\(^{481}\) artistic *narratio in personis*, with a plot and a narrative technique

\(^{478}\)This reasoning, despite relying on an undeniable general trend in classical literary history, did not only outrage Rohde in 1893, it is still treated as "bias" by some scholars today; see Stephens and Winkler (1995), 364f., and Schmeling (1996a), 480.

\(^{479}\)See, e.g., Heinze (1899), 506 n.1; Müller (1983), 496.

\(^{480}\)Probably an indirect reference to Studer (1849).

\(^{481}\)Cic. *Inv.* 1.19.17, *tertium genus [sc. narrationis] remotum a civilibus causis*; Auctor ad Her. 1.8.12, *tertium genus est id, quod a causa civili remotum est.*
which he takes to indicate that the pathetic comic novel was well established already in the first century B.C.E.:

illa autem narratio, quae versatur in personis, eius modi est, ut in ea simul cum rebus ipsis personarum sermones et animi perspici possint, hoc modo:
venit ad me saepe clamans: "quid agis Micio?
cur perdis adolescentem nobis? cur amat?
cur potat? cur tu his rebus sumptum suggeris?
vestitu nimium indulges, nimium ineptus es."
Nimium ipse est durus praeter aequumque et bonum.\footnote{Ter. \textit{Ad.} 60ff.}
Hoc in genere narrationis multa debet inesse festivitas confecta ex rerum varietate, animorum dissimilitudine, gravitate, levitate, spe, metu, suspicione, desiderio, dissimulatione, errore, misericordia, fortunae commutatione, insperato in commodo, subita laetitia, iucundo exitu rerum.\footnote{Cic. \textit{Inv.} 1.19.27.}

Whereas Thiele had constructed his thesis, based on a certain understanding of the sometimes problematic terminology of ancient rhetorical theory, Bürger stresses simply that the passage above shows the existence already in the first century B.C.E. of entertaining narratives with a variety of subject-matter, affected characters of numerous dispositions, and a comic plot, emphasizing the vicissitudes of fortune, and the resulting emotional pathos of the characters, which finally result in a happy ending.\footnote{Cic. \textit{Part.} 9.32, \textit{suavis autem narratio est, quae habet admirationes, exspectationes, exitus inopinatos, interpositos motus animorum, colloquia personarum, dolores, iracundias, metus, laetitas, cupiditates.}} Although Bürger takes this theoretical passage to be a direct description of the ancient novel, which is possible,
many of the features could possibly apply to literary narrative in general, such as epic poetry, and even history. However, the emphasis on variety, character, pathos and happy ending, does not fit as well epic and history. As Richard Reitzenstein noted, the oldest extant narrative which certainly conforms to this description is Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoë*. As we saw in Chapter One, the model offered by the rhetorical treatise's *narratio in personis* actually accounts for the narrative structure of the *Satyricon*. Even if Cicero's example, taken from the tradition of New Comedy, is somewhat confusing, the fact that Micio's expositional narrative from the first act of the play is here used to illustrate narration shows that we are supposed to ignore the dramatic form of the whole play. What Cicero wishes to illustrate is Micio's impersonation *qua* narrator of his brother Demea.

Although convincing as a description of novelistic narrative, Bürger claims that we do not have to rely only on vague rhetorical theory, because luckily both names of authors and titles of novelistic narratives are extant. The oldest known "lascivious erotic novel of manners" (*lasciv eroticischen Sittefrromans*), he argues, was the Μιλησιακά of Aristides, a work written some time before 78 B.C.E., when Lucius Cornelius Sisenna, its the Latin adaptor / translator, was praetor. Bürger now advances compelling arguments to the effect that contrary to the prevailing opinion—still a widespread assumption in the scholarship—, the Μιλησιακά was not a simple collection of erotic "short stories", or *novelle*, but no less a novelistic narrative than the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. A great deal of the misunderstanding of the form, Bürger argues, derives from the association of "Milesian tales" with Boccaccio's *Decameron*, a collection of proper *novelle* embedded in a larger but

---

485 See Cicero's letter to Lucceius, on writing history (*Fam. 5.12*).

486 Reitzenstein (1906), 94-96.
distinct and static narrative frame. This misunderstanding follows almost automatically from the use of the critical term novella in this context, a term which is no older than the Italian renaissance.

But more to the point, Bürger notes that the opening sentence of Apuleius's Latin adaptation of the Μεταμορφώσεις, *At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram*, is regularly misinterpreted by scholars, since the adjective Milesus—which presumably derives from the title of Sisenna's Latin adaptation of the Μυλησιακά rather than directly from the Greek work—stands with the singular sermo and does not relate grammatically to the plural variae fabulae. Furthermore, the word fabula in the *Metamorphoses* (1.1), although often used in reference to smaller narratives told by the main narrator, frequently in the personae of subordinate narrators, is not by any means the semantic equivalent of the generic term "short story" or novella. It seems that once again

---

487 Bürger was directly arguing against Rohde's historicist reading of the Apuleian work as quasi-autobiographical narrative; cf. Rohde (1885), 66-91. For the common use of the *Decameron* to explain the structure of the work of Aristides, see, e.g., Schmid (1904), 474: "einem Werk, das man nach allem, was wir darüber wissen, als eine Novellensammlung, einen antiken Decamerone betrachten muß."

488 The term was frequently used in nineteenth century German literature to describe a modern genre of realistic short stories much practiced by authors of the period. Many of these collections were simply called Novellen.

489 *Fabula*, of course, often means only "play". A quick look at the *Metamorphoses* shows that even the most general term in English, such as "story", does not fully capture the meaning of fabula; in fact, the singular is not used consistently to denote a distinct narrative (e.g., the the old woman refers to the story of Psyche in the plural, as fabulae, 4.28), and various connotations are possible: "talk" (1.25), "chat" (1.25), "account" (4.30, 9.17, 9.23), "gossip" (5.31, 6.23), "comedy" (10.2), and "adventure" (11.20).
the study of the ancient "novel" has been obscured by the careless use of anachronistic critical terms.

We may add that the principal meaning of *fabula* [<fari] agrees closely with *sermo*, which explains why Apuleius uses the word to denote a specifically oral and therefore presumably "unreliable" or "unstable" quality in narrative, in contradistinction to written and therefore permanently fixed *historia*. The *Metamorphoses*, of course, are both a *lepidus susurrus*, and therefore a *fabula*, and a *papyrus inscripta*, and therefore a *historia*. Hence, Apuleius's promise to the reader to *varias fabulas consererere* (1.1) is properly a generic description of the *Metamorphoses*, which picks up the description of the work as a miscellany of interwoven narratives. This description may have been part of the prologue of the original Greek Ass Story, which seems reflected in Photius's description of the work. The phrase *varietas rerum* in Cicero's theoretical description of the non-judicial *narratio in personis* seems to be a similar generic description, and the same can be

---

490 Isid. *Orig.* 1.40.1, *fabulas poetae a fando nominaverunt, quia non sunt res factae, sed tantum loquendo fictae.*

491 *Met.* 1.1: *At ego tibi ... varias fabulas consereram auresque tuas beniuolas lepidus susurro permulceam; 6.29: in fabulis audietur doctorumque stilis rudis perpetuabitur historia; 8.1; referam ubis a capite quae gesta sunt quaeque possint merito doctiores, quibus stilos fortuna subministrat, in historiae specimen chartis inuoluere.*

492 *Met.* 2.12: *nunc enim gloriam satis floridam, nunc historiam magnam et incredundam fabulam et libros me futurum*

493 Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 129) describes the original Μεταμορφώσεις as λόγοι διάφοροι, and says about both Greek Ass Stories that γέμει δὲ ὁ ἐκατέρου λόγος πλασμάτων μὲν μυθικῶς, though the description seems to fit the epitome less well, since it was probably made simply by pruning off the subordinate narratives and abbreviating the central *fabula.*
said of Apuleius's mention of *historias varias rerum* (Fl. 9) among his works, which is best taken as a reference to his novelistic writings. There is reliable evidence, moreover, that the characteristic diversity of the literary form of *Milesia* involved variety of discursive form no less than variety of content.

The singular *sermo Milesius* (1.1), therefore, means the same as *fabula Milesia*, which agrees in general with the consistent self-referential terminology in Apuleius's work. The work as a whole is referred to, at different points in the story, as *fabula Graecanica* (1.1), *incrédunda fabula* (2.12), *Milesia [sc. fabula]* (4.32), and simply *fabula* (10.2, 10.33). Bürger notes that the term *historia* is normal in references to works of this kind, although he makes no attempt to differentiate its meaning from *fabula* ("written" versus "spoken") on the basis of Apuleius's usage, since he is more concerned with their general interchangeability. That view is shown to stand up, at least if one judges by the internal references in the text of the *Metamorphoses* (2.12., *historiam magnum*; 6.29, *historia*; and

---

494 Martinus Capella *de Nupt.* 2.100, *nam certe mythos, poeticae etiam diversitatis delicias Milesias historiasque mortalium, postquam supera conscenderit, se penitus amissuram non cassa opinatione formidat.* Philologia is speaking, and the reference is weightier because the work itself is prosimetric.

495 The meaning of the adjective *Graecanica* is "adapted into Latin from Greek" (Var. *L.* 10.70-71). The phrase is therefore best taken as a definition of the Latin version of the Greek *Metamorphoses*.

496 Bürger, in fact, does not say that the whole work is referred to as *fabula*, but only as *Milesia* (Bürger (1892), 353 n.1). This, however, is both incorrect and damages the viability of his otherwise excellent argument.

497 He refers in this connection to an earlier article where he had first attempted to refute Rohde's influential autobiographical reading of Apuleius; Bürger (1888), 497; Rohde (1885), 66-91.
8.1, *historiae specimen*), which show that Apuleius uses both *fabula* and *historia* to refer to the story as a whole. It follows, then, that Apuleius considered his adaptation of the *Metamorphoses* to be of the same genre as the *Mēlišiaκά* (note the similarity of the form to extant fictional titles in general), which accordingly must have been an extended narrative performance with a central *fabula* which gave unity to the whole.

A reference to Aristides in the Lucianic corpus supports Bürger's interpretation that the work of Sisenna was of a similar structure to the *Metamorphoses*, viz., a main story told in the first person, with various subordinate narratives interwoven into the central fable: πάνυ δή με ἕπο τὸν δρόθον ἡ τῶν ἀκολάστων σου διηγημάτων σημύλη καὶ γλυκεῖα πειθῶ κατεύφρανεν, ὅστ' ὅλιγον δεῖν Ἦριστείδης ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τοῖς Μηλισιακοῖς λόγοις ύπερκηλούμενοι—"This morning I have been quite entertained by the sweet and enchanting seductiveness of your licentious stories, so that I almost thought I was Aristides being utterly enthralled by those Milesian tales" (Lucianus *Am.* 1). The passage implies that Aristides first heard, then retold the *Mēlišiaκά*, which shows that the form of the work was that of personal recollection. Such a narrative would correctly be termed *narratio in personis*, according to ancient narrative theory, since the main narrator represents himself in the past of the story as witness or audience to the narratives of other *persona*es, whom he then impersonates in the present while retelling the same material to his own audience.⁴⁹⁸ Given this form of the narrative we can interpret Ovid's obscure reference

---

⁴⁹⁸ In the *Satyríca*, the Quartilla episode seems to have included entertainment over dinner in the form of erotic story-telling, chatting and/or more performances like the poetry delivered by the cinaedus (20.5, *iam deficiente fabularum contextu*); and note the plural in *fabulae* and the metaphor of weaving in *contextu*, which indicate a series of stories or speeches. In similar situations at Trimalchio's, and on the ship, stories, speeches and performances are referred to as *fabulae*: 37.1, *longe accersere fabulas coepi*; 39.1, *interpellavit tam dulces fabulas*; 42.1, *excepit Seleucus fabulae partem*; 47.1, *eiusmodi*
to Aristides's work, *iuxit Aristides Milesia crimina secum*—"Aristides associated delinquent Milesian behavior with his own person" (*Tr.* 2.413), as an attempt to render that same narrative structure. Another similar reference to Sisenna's Latin adaptation of Aristides's *Μιλεσίακα* follows a few lines later in Ovid's poetic apology, *vertit Aristidem Sisenna, nec obfuit illi / historiae turpes inseruisse iocos*—"Sisenna translated Aristides, and no one held it against him to have woven shameless jokes into his story" (*Tr.* 2.443-4). The interpretation of the figurative language in *iuxit Aristides secum* and *historiae inseruisse iocos* is barely intelligible unless we understand these to be generic references to the narrative structure of *fabula Milesia*, of the kind Apuleius makes in the prologue of the *Metamorphoses*, where he promises the reader to *varias fabulas consere* (1.1). The virtuosity of narrative technique in works of this genre was evidently a defining characteristic.

Although the ancient references to the man Aristides have usually been taken as referring to an historical individual, it is certain that the narration was carried by a fictional *persona*; either the name Aristides is the name of a fictional narrator, or the author was called Aristides and the fictional narrator is not considered worthy of mention. It would be highly consistent with ancient practice not to make the distinction in brief references to this type of narrative. The genre in question is structurally different from that created by Boccaccio in the *Decameron*, but closely related to the narrative technique of the *Satyricon* and the *Metamorphoses*. The *Milesia* should also be differentiated from the first person

---

499 The word *historia* is better taken as a reference to the *Milesiae*, also called *Milesia historia*, than to Sisenna's historical writings.
narrative of Clitophon in Achilles Tatius, which is not a narratio in personis to the same extent, since it keeps mostly to a single narrative persona and lacks the variety of material. We are attempting here to differentiate between extensive impersonation, which is characteristic of the narrative form of the Satyrica and the Metamorphoses, and shorter colloquia personarum which can be found in most narratives.

The internal definition of the Metamorphoses of Apuleius as Milesia historia or fabula forges a generic succession from the Μιλησιακά of Aristides to the anonymous Μεταμορφώσεις, written in the late first century C.E., of which the bare plot is preserved in the Greek epitome, Λούκιος ἡ Ὀνος, found in the Lucianic corpus. A generic succession, of course, should be understood to allow differences between works, without however departing from a loosely defined law of the genre. Even more importantly for the study of the Satyricon, the classification of the Metamorphoses as Milesia defines the literary project of Apuleius as the re-enactment of the earlier performance of Sisenna, whose classic Latin version of the Μιλησιακά was perhaps two and a half centuries old at that time—old enough to have inspired other similar projects, of which there is some evidence before Apuleius. The aptness of this link is not easily dismissed, since for the dismissal to be convincing we would have to presume that Apuleius knew little about either the Greek work or its Latin version, neither of which were obscure, and nevertheless chose to define his work as Milesia.

As a generic term, Milesia is not necessarily the coinage of Apuleius, considering the antiquity of Sisenna’s Latin version with that title, and the fact that several other Roman authors use Milesia, both in the singular and plural, as a generic term for light entertaining

500 For the dating of the Greek work, see Mason (1994), 1701.
narratives (of unspecified length) with no reference to Apuleius.\(^{501}\) Only in one case is the term associated directly with Apuleius, and in that instance other elements than Apuleius's prior use of it seem to have prompted the association. The reference comes from the highly unreliable collection of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, but the possible historical inaccuracy of the account is not necessarily of importance to our argument. The case in question deals with a younger contemporary, Clodius Albinus, who is said by the author of his biography, "Capitolinus",\(^{502}\) to have originated, like Apuleius, from a Punic settlement in Africa, and is further said in one of the two references to his *Milesiae* to have occupied himself with *Milesiae Punicae Apulei sui*.\(^{503}\) The mention of this supposed work of Albinus, in the context of "Punic" *Milesiae* by Apuleius, is a tantalizing piece of information when put in context with the recently found papyrus fragment of Lollianos's sensational and scandalous fiction, the Φοινικικό (*POxy*. 1368), especially when we

\(^{501}\) Tert. *de Anima* 23.4, *historias atque milesias aenon*; Jerome *Con. Ruf.* 1.17, quasi non cirratorum turba milesiarum in scholis figmenta decantet et testamentum suis Bessorum cachinno membra concutiat atque inter scurrarum epulas nugae istius modi frequententur; Es. 12.prac., multo pars maior est milesias revolventium quam Platonis libros. In altero enim ludus et oblectatio est, in altero dificultas [...] testamentum Grunnii Corocottae porcelli decentant in scholis puerorum agmina cachinnantium; Mart. *Cap. de Nupt.* 2.100, nam certe mythos, poeticae etiam diversitatis delicias milesias historiasque mortalium [...] se amissuram [...] formidabat; Sid. *Appol. Ep.* 7.2.9, *fabulam Miletiae vel Atticae parem*.

\(^{502}\) On the problem of authorship and reliability of the *SHA*, see Barnes (1978).

consider that scholars have observed close parallels between the material of the Lollianos fragment and the episode in the robbers' cave in Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*. Several scenarios seem possible to connect Albinus, Apuleius, and Lollianos, the most probable being that Lollianos is indeed the author of the anonymous *Μεταμορφώσεις*, as well as the *Φοίνεικικά*, which may then have been adapted by Albinus. This could, perhaps, explain the association, but nothing can be proven in this connection.

Despite Bürger's sophisticated explanation of the nature of the ancient genre called *Milesiae*, he was not able to distance himself entirely from the mainstream of German scholarship, claiming that the work of Aristides was "the original paradigm of the realistic novel of manners" (*als erstes Muster des realistischen Sittenromans*). However, instead of relying on national stereotypes to account for ancient realism, he attempts a genuinely literary-historical explanation of the rise of this genre in antiquity, based on the modern analogy. Just as the realistic novel of his times, he says, was influenced by the progress of science, especially the natural sciences, and manifests a drive towards the concrete and material, in reaction to a past tendency towards abstract philosophical speculation and idealistic poetry, so similar things must have been taking place in the spiritual life of the empire from ca. 100 B.C.E. to ca. 100 C.E. If for nothing else, this analogy may at

---


505 Suggested as a possibility by Jones (1980), 254.

506 Bürger (1892), 355, "Veranlasst war das Aufkommen einer solchen Literatur ebenso wie die analoge literarische Bewegung in der Genenwart durch die gegen früher ganz veränderte Geistesrichtung jener Zeit und ihren Zug auf das Concrete und Materielle, wie er uns auch sonst in dem Erlöschen der abstracten philosophischen Speculation und der idealistischen Dichtung und in der gleichzeitigen Blüthe der Wissenschaften, besonders auch der Naturwissenschaften, auf das allerdeutlichste entgegentritt."
least serve to further illustrate in what sense the German philologists of the time experienced Petronius's "realistic novel" as modern and progressive, while they saw the Greek novels as somehow old-fashioned and reactionary.

Bürger now surveys the other examples of the genre of Milesia, based on ancient references. Ovid lists, immediately after Aristides, and in the same bibliographical context, a certain Eubius, an impurae conditor historiae, who wrote a narrative, which was not the manual on abortion that some have thought, but description of the "molestation of mothers' babes" (qui descripsit corrumpi semina matrum).507 The context certainly allows sex with children, a regular topic in pornographic literature, which is, moreover, frequently used by Petronius in the extant Satyricon. Besides, how could abortion serve as erotic entertainment? This writer, Eubius, according to von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff,508 is the same as Eἰννος, who is mentioned by Arrian (Epict. 4.9.6), likewise in a bibliographical context, also after Aristides, as another writer of obscene material. Ovid adds a third "recently composed work",509 the Sybaritica, which seems to be the same as the Sybaritici libelli referred to by Martial (12.95.2) as the emulated Greek model of a pornographic composition in Latin (a Roman adaptation?) from the stylus of a certain Mussetius (12.95.1, Musseti pathicissimos

---

507 Ov. Trist. 2.413f. For this meaning, cf. Sat. 113, nec sciebam [...] utrum magis puero irascerer, quod amicam mihi auferret, an amicae, quod puerum corrumpere; Scob. luv. 4.105, iste Rubrius Iuliam in pueritia corrupperat. For semina in the sense of "offspring" or "the young", cf. Verg. G. 2.151f., at rabidae tigres absunt et saeva leonum / semina.

508 v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (1876), 300, writes Eubius vero ab Eueno in ore Byzantino una tantum litterula distat. But there are also many variants of the name Eubius in MSS of Ovid.

509 Trist. 2.417, nec qui composuit nuper Sybaritica
Finally, today, we can add to this list the fragments of Lollianos's Φοινεικῶτα (POxy. 1368), the Iolaos narrative (POxy. 3010) in prosimetrum, and perhaps as well the Tinouphis narrative in prosimetrum (PHAun. inv. 400); the new fragments are all found on second-century papyri, which does not mean that they are not older, but merely gives us a terminus ante quem for their dating.

Some of these works are little more than titles, but we should remember that the bibliographical context in which they are embedded defines their nature and not the title itself. There is no denying the fact that there did exist before Petronius other lascivious erotic prose narratives, which Ovid considered comparable to the Μιλησιακά of Aristides. We should also bear in mind that, according to the poet, these works were to be found in Roman libraries early in the first century C.E. At that point in time, one of them had certainly been adapted into Latin (Sisena); in the time of Martial, another work which emulated the Sybaritica had been written in Latin (Mussetius); in the second century, Apuleius adapted the Μεταμορφώσεις; and shortly afterwards, Clodius Albinus may have occupied himself with "Punic" Milesiae in the same style. The cumulative effect of this list,

---

510 We might add to this list Philip of Amphipolis and his work, the Ποδιακά, which according to Souda (s.v.) was full nineteen books and "about wholly shameful things"; Philip is also listed with Iamblichos, and they are said to be writers of charmingly told amatoriae fabulae that "stimulate sexually" (Theodor. Prisc. 133.5-12).

511 The suggestion of Stephens and Winkler (1995), 7 and 363-5, that these Greek compositions may be imitations of the Latin Satyricon, besides being a further example of special pleading in Petronian scholarship, assume that the age of the papyri is also the definite date of the works.

512 Trist. 2.420, suntque ea doctorum monumentis mista virorum, / munerebusque ducum publica facta patent.
even if we allow for some misunderstanding due to our limited sources, makes unnecessary the scenario of Petronius, the great Italian inventor. Not only did there exist erotic Greek novels before Petronius, it seems that Petronius was not even the first of several writers of *Milesiae* in Latin.\(^{513}\)

The same year that Bürger published his article on the Greek antecedents of Petronius, Albert Collignon, a French scholar, published a work of importance for the scholarship, *Étude sur Pétrone* (1892). Collignon completely rejected the hypothèse séduisante that there existed a genre of licentious Greek romance which Petronius might have imitated generically. Even the apparently similar Pseudo-Lucianic ass story, he claims, is different, since it is not Menippean in form.\(^{514}\) In sum, Collignon joins the camp of Mommsen and Rohde, and emphasizes the alleged categorical difference of the Greek and Roman novels: "Les romans grecs que nous possédons et le *Satiricon* ne proviennent pas des même sources, et n'ont ni le même objet, ni le même ton".\(^{515}\) He also argues with Rohde that the *Satyricon* is a picaresque romance in subject matter and Menippean satire in form, and he makes of Petronius the inventor of an absolutely original and synthetic genre

\(^{513}\) Macrobius puts Apuleius and Petronius in the same class and describes their works in a manner which indicates that their works are both *Milesiae fabulae*; *Somn. 1.2.7-8, Fabulae, quorum nomen indicat falsi professionem, aut tantum conciliandae auribus voluptatis, aut adhortationis quoque in bonam frugem gratia repertae sunt. auditum mulcent [...] argumenta fictis casibus amatorum referta, quibus vel multum se Arbiter exercuit vel Apuleium non numquam lusisse miramur. hoc totum fabularum genus, quod solas aurium delicias profitetur."

\(^{514}\) Collignon (1892), 39.

\(^{515}\) Collignon (1892), 38.
(une œuvre absolument originale), the Roman novel (roman Latin), the only prototype of which is the Satyricon itself.\textsuperscript{516}

If we leave out Rohde's (1893) hot-headed attack on Bürger, which I will deal with towards the end of this survey, such was the scholarly background into which Richard Heinze (1899) brought his unexpected thesis about the close kinship of the extant Greek novels and the Satyricon. Heinze attempts at the outset, following Bürger, to sketch the unlikely picture of two completely unrelated ancient novels:

Hier das 'Meisterwerk eines picarischen Romans', das aus dem vollen Leben geschöpfte Zeit- und Sittengemälde, realistisch nach Inhalt und Form, lasciv und frivol bis zur Frechheit; dort die bald feierlich schreitenden, bald zierlich tänzelnden, immer aber raffiniert stilisierten Producte einer Kunstrichtung, die, aller Wirklichkeit abgewandt, blut- und wesenlose Marionetten in einer Phantastischen und sehr moralischen Welt phantastisch sich gebärden lässt.\textsuperscript{517}

Heinze is the first scholar who seeks to undermine this artificial antithesis by means of a close reading of the Satyricon itself. By using this method he is able to point out the schematic analogy between the wandering couple, Encolpius and Giton, and the boy-girl heroes of extant the Greek romances. In what appears to be an obligatory nod to proper morals, Heinze condemns Petronius as being at his most "shameless" when he expects his readers to accept Encolpius and Giton as a romantic couple (\textit{Unter den vielen Frechkeiten Petrons scheint mir die frechste die, das er uns zumuthet, als Liebespaar Encolpios und Giton uns gefallen zu lassen}). But he convincingly supports his sentimental reading of the work by reference to the frequent qualification in the text itself of the boys' relationship as

\textsuperscript{516}Collignon (1892), 39.

\textsuperscript{517}Heinze (1899), 494.
vetustissima consuetudo (80.6), and conjectures that, unlike Ascyltos and Eumolpus, Giton must have been introduced at the beginning of the work and followed Encolpius until the end. He also notes that Encolpius portrays himself as being very sentimental, and frequently bursting into tears over the adversity of fortune (24.1, 81.1, 91.4, 99.2, 113.9, 115.12, 134.5), much like the heterosexual couple of the romances, and both he and Giton often claim to live only for their mutual love, and routinely turn suicidal at the prospect of losing each other (80.7, 94.8, 114.9-13, 127.4).

Despite the supposedly outrageous innovation of Petronius, Heinze nevertheless recognizes that romantic stories in Greek prose literature, featuring two males as the Liebespaar, certainly predate the Satyricon, and are even found in the Greek sentimental novel itself, as we saw in Chapter Two. As the romantic couple of the Greek Novel, Encolpius and Giton get their fair share of wandering from place to place, and get to experience the generic storm at sea and shipwreck. Typically, their own beauty or desirability is their worst enemy, since this attracts many rivals who threaten the integrity of their bond. Such external threats, then, naturally lead to outbursts of jealousy, as well as instances of real betrayal, comparable to Cleitophon's and Daphnis's infidelities, or in some degree to Callirhoë's marriage to Dionysius.

---

518 He also cites 10.7, iam dudum enim amoliri cupiebam custodem molestum, ut veterem cum Gitone meo rationem reducerem; and indications that Ascyltos is ignorant of, or pretends not to know of Encolpius's relationship with Giton (cf. 9.4-10, 11.3f.).

519 E.g., "Antileon and Hipparinos", in Parthenios (7).

520 E.g., the stories of Hippothoous and Hyperanthos (X.Eph. 3.2); and Kleinias and Charikles (Ach. Tat. 1.7).
With respect to the alleged centrality for the plot of Priapus, Heinze rejects Klebs's supposition that the structure is borrowed from epic, and claims that a closer parallel can be found in the Greek sentimental novel, wherein such angered deities as Eros and Aphrodite provide the unity to bind together an episodic plot. He also rejects Klebs's interpretation of the Sidonius fragment (Fr. I) as an indication of an original crime against Priapus committed by Encolpius in Massilia, since he considers this notion to be excluded by the hero's denial in the prayer to Priapus (133.2, vv. 6-9). He finds further resemblances between the Satyricon's divine apparatus and the Greek romances, in the frequent references made by the protagonists to the mostly hostile force of Fortuna or Tyche, and even in a possible use of a foreshadowing oracle (Fr. XXXVII). At the end of this careful comparison, Heinze concludes that for all these similarities to occur in two completely unrelated genres, granting that Rohde is right to derive the Satyricon from Menippean satire, or others to derive it from Milesian short stories, would be no less than a "miracle of literary history" (litterar-historisches Wunder).\

However, and here Heinze concedes major differences between the Satyricon and the Greek romances, whereas the tone of the one shows that the trials and tribulations of its heroes are meant to be taken "very seriously" (bitter Ernst), the work of Petronius sports an attitude which implies that whatever pain and sorrow is endured by Encolpius and his comrades is "fully deserved" (verdienen sie reichlich) and "can only, and should only,\

---

521 Further references in note 1 on page 502 are obscured by errors of typography.

522 There is a misunderstanding of Bürger (1889), 356, in the reference to unnamed scholars who derive the genre of Petronius's Satyricon from Milesian short stories, for though Bürger does say that the Greek "realistische Romanliteratur" derives "von dem kleinsten Erzeugnisse der erzählenden Prosadichtung, den Novellen", it is precisely his point that such shorter narratives should not be called "Milesian tales".
arouse laughter in the reader" (die der Leser nur zum Lachen reizen können und sollen).
The difference between these two narrative types, he claims, is comparable to the difference in drama between tragedy and comedy or farce. An even closer parallel would be tragedy and satyr-plays, or tragic parody. Heinze deserves credit for rejecting the attempt to explain the difference between the extant Greek sentimental novels and the Satyricon in terms of "Greek" and "Roman", and instead marking this difference correctly in accordance with ancient generic systems. This formulation, obviously, allows for serious "Roman" works, such as The Story of Apollonius King of Tyre, and comic Greek works, such as the Milesia.

Heinze also correctly revises Klebs's highly modern idea of the narrative stance of Encolpius as an ironic self-conscious reflection upon his own humiliation. He points out that such irony is certainly missing in Encolpius's description of his suffering in the love scenes with Giton, and that this makes it difficult to determine where self-irony begins and where it ends. In contrast, he sees the self-deprecation of the narrator as part of the ancient comic stance. He believes that in such scenes as the boys' encounter with Quartilla, in the battle aboard the ship, and in Encolpius's skirmish with the holy geese in Croton, battle scenes from the Greek romance are being parodied. Likewise, according to him, the slapstick incident, where the boys use a blunt razor to cut their throats, parodies the "apparent death" device of the Greek romance. The allusions to epic and tragedy in the Satyricon also serve the same parodic purpose. Accordingly, Encolpius's address to his own mentula is a parody of the heroic dialogue of Odysseus with his heart; and the boy's fancy that he is persecuted by Priapus, says Heinze, is merely a comic send-up of the struggle of epic heroes against grander deities.

In order for the Satyricon to be a parody of the Greek romance, the genre had to be older than the Second Sophistic; in fact, it had to be older than Petronius. Although this part
of Heinze's thesis is weak, his perceptive comparative reading showed clearly how both types conform with the first century B.C.E. rhetorical description of non-judicial narrative. In that sense, he did show that Rohde was wrong to think that Antonius Diogenes was an early (first century C.E.) and not fully developed specimen of the genre. Heinze did not take the Ninos fragments, A and B, which had been published six years earlier,\(^\text{523}\) to contain a full refutation of Rohde's thesis, because of the difficulty of their dating. He does, however, use these fragments to support his thesis that rhetorical elements in Petronius (which he also finds in the Ninos fragments) show that the late flourishing of rhetoric in the Second Sophistic should not, as Rohde had maintained, be viewed as a necessary prerequisite for the development of the narrative technique and style of the Greek erotic novel. Although he praises Rohde for his demonstration of the influence of the rhetoric of the Second Sophistic on the Greek erotic romance, Heinze nevertheless stresses that earlier specimens of the genre contain just as much rhetoric, but perhaps of an earlier and somewhat different brand. In a part of his article he tries to show both the similarities and differences of various rhetorical schemes found both in Petronius and the Sophistic Novel, and concludes that the main difference lies in Petronius's keeping his admirably artless prose separate from his poetry, while the sophists wrote prose that was "contaminated" with poetic artificiality.

Following such stylistic observations, he asks whether the writers of serious Greek romances also wrote in the manner of Petronius. The question, he says, constitutes "the hardest literary-historical problem raised by the Satyricon" (\textit{das schwerste litterarhistorische Problem, das uns die Saturae aufgeben}). And how did Petronius get the idea to dress his comic romance, which he presumably wrote following some one else, in the form of a

\(^{523}\text{Wilcken (1893), 161-93.}\)
Menippean satire? The answer he gives is disappointing, and not in tune with his main argument. Petronius, he claims, was the first "to turn the novel into a satire" (Petron, wie ich annahme, der erste war, der den Roman zur Satura machte). However, although he acknowledges that he cannot prove that there already existed, before Petronius, a parody of the Greek erotic novel, he finds it very hard to believe that the same author, who invented this original mixture, was also the first to parody the Greek erotic novel; or, as he incredulously puts it, "zwei so erhebliche Neuerungen pflegen nicht zu gleicher Zeit von demselben eingeführt zu werden." Heinze's article ends on the by now conventional tone of appraisal of Petronius's genius (einen Geist wie Petron) for the modern virtue of realism.

Last in this survey of the founders of modern Petronian scholarship comes Martin Rosenbluth with his inaugural dissertation, Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren (1902). This German philologist, who was a student of von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff in Berlin and of Felix Jacoby in Kiel, shows little interest in epic unity or novelistic structures, but, like the ancient grammarian, culls the work for interesting pieces (Stücken), and compares these to similarly hand-picked pieces from other literary genres, in order to support his case that the Satyrica is generically "synthetic" (der bescheidene Zweck meiner Arbeit ist vielmehr, durch Zusammenstellung einzelner Partien von Petrons Werk mit vergleichbaren Stücken aus anderen Literaturgattungen einen Beitrag zur Quellenkunde der Satiren zu geben).524 Along with Collignon, Rosenbluth is certainly the father of the "synthetic" reading of the Satyrica, which is a necessary correlate to the radical claim of originality for Petronius.

By the time of Rosenbluth the image of Petronius as the original Italian genius and artist had become so entrenched that Heinze's theory of Petronius's reliance on a Greek

524Rosenbluth (1909), 6.
parodic novel could be understood as an attempt to "rob the Roman of all his originality" (beraubt den Römer ... jeder originalität). The aim of Rosenbluth's study is to show that Petronius was not following any single preexisting genre when he wrote the Satyricon. The argumentative strategy is to portray the plot of the work as radically episodic and to emphasize the poor condition of the text as an obstacle to any coherent thesis about the original shape of the whole—all such theses, of course, tending towards undermining Petronius's originality—without offering any new suggestions about the larger aspect of the full-text Satyricon (Doch ich will mich auf eine polemische Auseinander-setzung mit Heinzes Ansicht nicht einlassen, will auch keine positive neue Erklärung des literarischen Rätsels, das die Satiren bieten, an ihre Stelle setzen). To Rosenbluth belongs also the invention of a common preamble of many modern studies of Petronius—the one which begins by listing all the (failed) theses about the genre of the Satyricon without committing to any one of them, or offering alternatives, thereby obscuring the work and giving the author an aura of mystery.

Though Rosenbluth's position may appear to be only motivated by a painstaking concern for establishing the truth, he throws caution to the winds when he subscribes to the paradigm of the Realistische Sittenroman so popular with the previous generation of German philologists, which he elevates to the level of the primary authorial intent: "An einem ist nicht zu zweifeln: Petrons schriftstellerische Absicht war die Darstellung der Sitten seiner Zeit, und zwar ohne jede moralische Tendenz. Es ist gut, das für die folgende

525 Rosenbluth (1909), 92; v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff expresses the same anxiety about the possibility of scholarship reducing Petronius's reputation for "originality", in Hinneberg (1912), 124f.: "dem Dichter soll wahrlich seine Originalität nicht verkleinert werden."

Untersuchung immer im Auge zu behalten. Rosenbluth clearly consents to the emerging scholarly consensus that the *Satyrina* is a romance written in the Menippean form, but his original contribution consists of the claim that this already composite work is also filled with the "spirit of Mime". Furthermore, without giving reasons for his belief, Rosenbluth is in no doubt that the *Satyrina* forms a genre with the *Metamorphoses*: "beide Werke gehören in eine Kategorie, die wir als den realistisch-komischen Abenteurerroman bezeichnen können." Rosenbluth seems blind to the literary-historical implications of assigning the *Satyrina* of Petronius to the same genre as the Roman adaptation of the Greek Μεταμορφώσεις. For if the *Satyrina* is of the same genre as the *Metamorphoses*, it follows that the *Satyrina* is also of the same genre as its Greek model, the Μεταμορφώσεις. If Petronius was the inventor of the comic novel, we must therefore assume that the author of the Μεταμορφώσεις was imitating the *Satyrina* (or some intermediate source), which would establish the necessary generic link from the earlier *Satyrina* to the later Μεταμορφώσεις. This supposition is unfounded and contradicts Apuleius's classification of the genre of the *Metamorphoses* as Milesia, i.e., as ultimately deriving from the much earlier Μιλησιακά of Aristides. Therefore, assigning the *Satyrina* and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius to the same genre—per se a sound critical judgment—means that Petronius did not invent the genre.

---

527 Rosenbluth (1909), 9.

528 Rosenbluth can be said to have laid down the foundation of the current scholarly discourse which interprets the *Satyrina* as the "narrative equivalent" of a play on stage, Walsh (1974), Slater (1990) and Panayotakis (1995), or at least sees the mime as a major source of influence on its style and composition, Sandy (1974b).

529 Rosenbluth (1909), 93.
Rosenbluth spends a full five pages towards the end of his dissertation in an attempt to refute Bürger's (1892) thesis, but only succeeds in refuting its weakest assumption, i.e., that there was a "realistic" novel before Petronius. In general he relies on Rohde, who had quickly responded to Bürger's arguments *cum ira et studio* which at times is rather insulting.\(^{530}\) It is Rohde's observation that nothing in the words of the rhetorical treatises referred to by Bürger proves the existence of a "realistic" method of writing (*in diesen Worten nichts liegt, was auf eine "realistische" Dichtungsweise schließen ließe*), which convinces Rosenbluth, who fully concedes the possibility of earlier Greek *Liebesromane*. Moreover, Rohde's concepts of the "novel" (a psychological character-study of an epic dimension) and the "short story" (a concise treatment of a dramatic situation) were highly modern. It is on the basis of such concepts that he excluded categorically that the ancient Greeks ever had a "bourgeois novel", since such a novel could not possibly develop from "short stories", due to the precisely defined nature of the latter.\(^{531}\) Although Bürger claimed that the *Milesia* had developed from the "novelle", his understanding was also that there was no essential difference between shorter and longer ancient *narrationes*, which therefore allowed shorter ones to be expanded and longer ones to be abbreviated. Bürger's understanding seems to be in accordance with ancient rhetorical theory.\(^{532}\) In Bürger's

\(^{530}\)Rohde (1893), 125-139.

\(^{531}\)Rohde (1893), 135, "von der Novelle war eine organische Erweiterung zum bürgerlichen Roman nicht zu erwarten, da ein solches Wachstum, wie es scheint, durch die genau umgrenzte Natur der Novellendichtung überhaupt ausgeschlossen ist."

\(^{532}\)Theo *Prog. 3*, κοι γάρ ἀπαγγέλλομεν τὸν μῦθον, κοι κλίνομεν, κοι σύμπλέκομεν αὐτὸν διηγήματι, κοι ἐπεκτείνομεν, κοι συστέλλομεν.
understanding the ancient *Milesiae*) were an elaborate fabric of many *fabulae* woven together into a whole around the central adventure of the narrator.\(^{533}\)

Rohde himself had claimed in his monumental study of the Greek romance that there was no point in denying that story-telling on a smaller scale and the ancient Greek novel were related, and while describing Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*, had argued that this novel was composed of a series of idyllic scenes woven together into a whole by means of an erotic fable.\(^{534}\) The rules somehow changed, however, when the discussion turned to the seemingly modern "realistic novel" and "realistic short story" of antiquity, despite the rather obvious relationship of the *Satyricon* and the *Metamorphoses* with shorter, subordinate narratives of a similar nature as the main fables. Finally, Rohde adopted the position that the *Milesia*) of Aristides was "eine Reihe selbständig in sich abgeschlossener Erzählungen, die wir Novellen nennen würden, nur lose verbunden neben einander."\(^{535}\)

The question that Rohde and Bürger were debating seems to have regarded how tightly or loosely Aristides wove together the diverse narratives of the *Milesia*). The answer to which determines whether the work should rather be called a series of interconnected shorter narratives, or a loosely composed novel, in the style of the *Satyricon* and the *Metamorphoses*, with shorter subordinate narratives interwoven into a central main narrative.\(^{536}\) Rosenbluth also finds unacceptable the solution offered by Hans Lucas, who

\(^{533}\) Bürger (1902), 20 f.

\(^{534}\) Rohde (1876), 7, 510.

\(^{535}\) Rohde (1893), 127.

\(^{536}\) See Winkler's (1985), 165, insightful analysis of the tension between unity and diversity in Apuleius's *Metamorphoses.*
argued that the work of Aristides was neither a Roman, nor a simple collection of short stories, but a collection of novellas worked into a *Rahmenerzählung*. Rosenbluth's influential conclusion that the work was simply "sammlung erotischer novellen", perhaps with a "prooimion", *also etwas anderes, als es Petrons Satiren sind* (90), is both contrary to the evidence that the narratives of Aristides were interwoven, as opposed to distinct, and contradicts his own reading of Lucian and Ovid, according to which Aristides (or his narrator) played audience to other narrators, in the manner of both Petronius's Encolpius and Apuleius's Lucius. Rosenbluth wraps up his dissertation by stating that, since we cannot ascertain that there existed a "realistic" novel before Petronius, it is safest to assume that he created it, though he is careful to allow the possibility that the sands of Egypt may change that situation: "Diese Frage ist mit Sicherheit nicht zu entscheiden. Für uns ist Petron jedenfalls der erste auf diesem Gebiete und wird es bleiben, falls der Boden Ägyptens uns nicht auch hier Überraschungen bereitet."

We conclude this survey by reiterating that, for good and for ill, today's Petronian scholars are still sitting on the shoulders of German philologists of roughly a century ago. Moreover, because attempts to introduce into the study of the Satyricon modern ideological and esthetic criteria from the study of national literatures were not successfully challenged by scholars working in the field, we are still labouring under presuppositions which tend to...

---

537 Lucas (1907), 16ff

538 Rosenbluth (1909), 90. n.1: "aus den Anfangsworten des Apuleius und aus Lucian geht hervor, daß das Charakteristische an den Milesiaca die *variae fabulae* waren; aus den beiden Ovidstellen und Lucian, daß sie ἀκόλουθα διηγήματα, erotischer natur waren; aus Lucian weiter, daß Aristides sie sich erzählen ließ. (ich glaube, daß dies auch der sinn der dunklen Ovidstelle: *iunxit Aristides Milesia crimina secum* ist.)."

539 Rosenbluth (1909), 91.
exaggerate the differences and minimize the similarities of the Satyricon to ancient Greco-Roman fictions at large. It seems that those German scholars who found little of interest for the subject in the exclusive analytical rigour of nationalism, and saw ancient literary history more in terms of continuation from Greek to Latin, were mostly ignored by subsequent generations. This was unfortunate because the philological arguments still incline towards the case of Latin adaptation from Greek, but perhaps most compelling, the verdict of the sands of Egypt, to which both parties to the quarrel had the wisdom to appeal, has been unanimously in favour of Bürger and Heinze and against Mommsen, Rohde and Rosenbluth.

It is perhaps a measure of Mommsen's (1878) authority, that his attempt to account for the linguistic and cultural mixture of the Satyricon as Petronius's direct and faithful representation of life in Campania has not been questioned by later scholars. Most likely,
what gave Mommsen such influence over subsequent generations of classicists was his acknowledged mastery of the material remains of Roman culture, especially through his extensive study of Latin inscriptions as the editor of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.

In order to identify the city of Trimalchio, he first develops a complex argument regarding the cultural background of the *Satyricon*. As is still visible to the eye in the ruins of Pompeii, he argues, this epoch in Roman history is so thoroughly permeated with Hellenic elements, that a purely Latin rural town, such as those presented in the *togata* of the late Republic, which surely existed in isolated places, could only serve as a comic antithesis (*nur etwa noch als komisches Gegenstück zu verwenden im Stande war*) to a depicter of manners and a satirist (*der Sittenmaler und Satiriker*) such as the literary artist Petronius.

Nowhere in Italy was Greek culture stronger than in the Hellenic foundations of the West, which preserved their origin from a Greek stock (*welche ihrem Ursprung nach einen Stamm griechischen Wesens bewahrend*), although they were by necessity Latinized to a degree through their environment, drawing the reigning double-structure (*die herrschende Doppelbildung*), as it were, from out of their living quarters and into themselves (*von Haus aus in sich trugen*). The Greek language of these Westerners may have appeared as a provincial idiom to the Athenian, but in an epoch when the Hellenic nationality resided predominantly in the diaspora (*das hellenische Wesen überwiegend auf der Diaspora ruhte*), the Greek of Campania will not have been inferior to the one from Antioch and Alexandria, and in comparison to the educated man from Patavium, Lugudunum, Corduba, and

---

*Priapeia.* Collignon (1892), 323, merely suggested that Petronius might perhaps have used some plot ideas from a Greek model; Perry (1925), 39f., likewise, thinks Petronius an original and merely claims that he used the same method as the author of the Greek Ass Story, i.e., wrote the central fable "on the basis of folklore plots".
Carthage, he was still always a native Greek, whose mother tongue was, at the same time, the universal language of the times. At least in Naples, the official language of the city's government remained demonstrably Greek until the times of Domitian and likely much longer. The Greek leisure, the Greek games, the united tribes of Greek artists and men of learning turned this city into an island of Hellenic culture in Italy, which lasted until the breakdown of Italic prosperity and education (den Zusammenbruch des italischen Wohlstandes und der italischen Bildung). Therefore, Mommsen argues in a stupendous anticlimax, the city of Trimalchio cannot be Naples, although Naples would be the most obvious urbs Graeca in Campania, since, in the Greek city of the Satyrca, everyone speaks Latin, even the town crier (Sat. 97.2).

Mommsen, to his credit, realized that in a faithful description of contemporary life, Greek characters moving in a Greek environment, should neither speak Latin perfectly like educated Romans, nor quote Roman authors off the top of their heads. To work around this fact, within the constraints he had created, he identified the city of Trimalchio as Cumae, a city that was founded in the legendary period of Greek colonization. However, Mommsen conveniently omitted significant facts about Cumae, namely that it had already lost its Greek identity in the late fifth century B.C.E., when it was sacked and repopulated by Oscan tribes (D.S. 11.51, 12.76)—its former Greek citizens allegedly fleeing away to found the city of Naples—until it eventually took up the Latin language early in the second

---

543 The following is the complete list of Greek and Roman authors in the Satyrca: Demosthenes (2.5), Homer (2.4, 48.7, 59.3, 118.5), Euripides (2.3), Hyperides (2.8), the nine lyric poets (2.4, 118.5), Pindar (2.4), Plato (2.5), Sophocles (2.3), Thucydides (2.8), Democritus (88.3), Eudoxus (88.4), Chrysippus (88.4), Epicurus (104.3, 132.15v.7), Cicero (3.2, 5v.20, 55.5), Lucilius (4.5), Publilius Syrus (55.5), Horace (118.5), Virgil (68.5, 118.5), Cato (137.9v.6), Labeo and Servius (137.9v.8).
century, later to become a legal Roman colony. Besides, in the unlikely event that Cumae could still be considered a "Greek" city in the first century, Mommsen's suggested solution does not begin to explain why Encolpius, Giton, Ascyltos, Eumolpus, Tryphaena, Lichas and the other Greek characters, who neither originate from, nor permanently reside in the urbs Graeca, are still fluent speakers of Latin, expressing themselves as if educated Roman citizens of high social standing.

Later scholars either tend to brush off the anomaly or they fail to notice it at all. In his study of the "Roman novel", Walsh describes the Satyricon as taking its reader on "what purports to be a conducted tour of the Greek city-life of Gaul and Italy, but which is essentially a review of the Roman contemporary scene. Though the hero and his friends are Greeks, their attitudes and preoccupations are wholly Roman. The inconsistency did not trouble Petronius, whose aim was ephemeral entertainment, not a closely articulated work of art; and the Romanising of the characters and situations lends the novel a greater immediacy and realism." Unlike Mommsen, Walsh does not think that Petronius's use of a Greek narrator, characters and cities for his "Roman novel" calls for an explanation. He merely leaves his readers with a rhetorical antithesis between "what purports" and what "is essentially", which begs the question, why Petronius should have taken it upon himself to write a Greek story to convey "a review of the Roman contemporary scene." Walsh's idea that the very "inconsistency" and artificiality of the "Romanising" of this Greek story could both be entertaining and result in "immediacy and realism" is an attempt to have it both ways. Such a hybrid diminishes rather than enhances the "immediacy and realism."

Another scholar who has touched upon the question, Gareth Schmeling, likewise notes in a study on the personal names in Petronius that, "Greek names so pervade and

544 Walsh (1970), 79.
dominate the Satyricon that the whole atmosphere becomes Greek [...] Instead of populating his novel with Greek freedmen, former slaves, and present slaves, Petronius could have used Roman characters. He chose not to. The only literary genre in earlier Roman history to use such a large number of Greek characters was comedy. The Greek style of comedy was called fabula palliata, a term derived from pallium, a Greek cloak.545 Although Schmeling does not say so, the Greek names in the comedies of Plautus and Terence were taken directly from the Greek plays that they were adapting into Latin. The likely conclusion, therefore, that could be drawn from the similarity of the use of names in the Satyrlica and Roman comedy is that the former is a Roman adaptation as well. The point, however, is missed by Schmeling, who claims that Plautus and Terence used Greek names in their plays in order "that they might escape the charge of ridiculing and demeaning their own race." Schmeling goes on to argue, on the basis of this unfounded Roman chauvinism in authors who were not even true-blooded Romans, that "to the Roman audience the use of such a high proportion (77%) of Greek names in a work of literature written by a Roman could mean only one thing: comedy."546 Schmeling's conclusion is untenable, of course, since Greek names in Latin tragedies, such as Ovid's Medea, were certainly no indication of comedy to the Roman audience.547

We obviously need to understand a little better the logic of the linguistic and cultural mixture in the Satyrlica. The main character and narrator is a Greek exile from Massilia, who was brought up and educated in the Greek language, but who in the extant part of the

545 Schmeling (1969b), 5.


547 The same applies to any of Seneca's (or the Republican tragedians') adaptations of Greek tragic subjects and works.
work, while a luckless youth wandering in the Greek cities of southern Italy, is represented as fluent in Latin and possessing a mature knowledge of such Roman authors as Cicero, Lucilius, Virgil, Livy and Horace. The native language of Massilia in the early empire was certainly Greek. The Massaliote rhetor, Agroitas, whom the Elder Seneca describes as having spoken *arte inculta* on a certain *controversia*, in order to resemble a Roman, even so utters his *sententia* in Greek (Sen. *Con.* 2.6.12). As a rule, Greek rhetors declaimed in Greek and Roman rhetors in Latin—and possibly Greek, if they had the perfect knowledge of the language that rhetorical exercises demanded. Even if Encolpius is supposed to be a highly atypical Greek who learned Latin as an adult, as for example Dionysius of Halicarnassus claimed to have done, which would have made it possible for him to tell his story in Latin, the narrator's representation of his own youthful self remains problematic. Fresh from the Greek speaking Massilia, it is impossible to believe that he would have been so sensitive to the correct pronunciation of Latin that an imperfect recital of Vergilian verses should offend him.

---

548 According to Varro three languages were spoken in Massilia, Greek, Latin and Gallic (Isid., *origin.*, 15.1.63, *Trilingues, quod et graece loquuntur et latine et gallice*). But the conservative native Greeks of Massilia were not trilingual. The Gallic language was not written, although undoubtedly spoken by slaves and traders, and Latin was only spoken by the Romans residing in Massilia, at least until the second century C.E., for Latin inscriptions in Massilia are written out in Greek characters (*CIL* 12.56), and Roman names first begin to appear towards the end of the second century C.E., when Massilia at last became a city under Roman administration. See Clerc (1971), 1:460.

549 After he settled in Rome where he lived for twenty two years, as he explains in the introduction to *Roman Antiquities*.

550 *Sat.* 68.5.
In the declamation in Latin, which opens the extant text of the *Satyricon*, this well-trained Greek youth begins by expressing his disgust with bombastic rhetorical exercises, which he describes as filled with fabulous plots and sound-effects, and far removed from the realities of the typically Roman courts in the *forum* (1.2); he then proceeds to evoke a whole gallery of Greek-only literary worthies (Sophocles, Euripides, Pindar, the lyric poets, Homer, Plato, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Hyperides), who according to him never had to undergo such useless schooling and yet became masters of artistic discourse; and he ends by blaming the decline of oratory on a "windy and enormous loquacity that has recently migrated to Athens from Asia" (2.7, *nuper ventosa istaec et enormis loquacitas Athenas ex Asia commigravit*), referring to the notorious bogeyman of the "Asianic" style, or "Asianism". While it seemed at first that we were situated in the vicinity of the law courts of a Roman *forum*, the bulk of young Encolpius's inept declamation shows no further awareness of things Roman, but upholds what can only be described as an Attic point of view, to the extent of having led scholars to suspect that young Encolpius's language and opinions are "owed to a Greek source."551

This strange mixture of "Roman" and "Greek" is potentially even more confusing in the subsequent Lucilian—and therefore surely "Roman"—metrical rendering, improvised by the Greek Agamemnon, on the important subject of the proper schooling for boys. The highly circumlocutory hexameter part of this "poem" could be summarized in the following way: Whether born in Athens, Sparta or Naples (*sirenumve domus*), the boy should begin with Homer, and soon after study Plato and Demosthenes; but then the boy should switch languages and become immersed in Roman authors, which will relieve him of the burden of Greek sounds, and when he is thoroughly steeped in Latin literature his taste will change

551 See recently Sinclair (1984), 234, who surveys the older scholarship as well.
(5.15-16, *hinc Romana manus circumfluat et modo Graio / exonerata sono mutet suffusa saporem*),\(^{552}\) and he can employ Cicero as model for the composition of epic poetry.

An educational programme like this one never existed anywhere in Greco-Roman antiquity. Firstly, there is discrepancy between form and content. Why does a "Roman" satire (*sed ne me putes improbasse schedium Lucilianae humilitatis, quod sentio, et ipse carmine effingam*) deal with the education of Greek schoolboys from Athens, Sparta and Naples? Secondly, the bilingual nature of the curriculum does not square with what we know of the education of Greek boys. Thirdly, it is absurd that a Greek schoolboy would perceive the switch from his own language, Greek, to a foreign language, Latin, as a relief of burden (*hinc Romana manus circumfluat et modo Graio / exonerata sono*). It is true that certain elements here could fit the education of Roman schoolboys, who traditionally began with Greek (the Romans took over wholesale the Greek educational system), before they moved on to works written in Latin. At that point in his education, the Roman boy might well be relieved to switch from a foreign language, Greek, to his own mother tongue, Latin.\(^{553}\) But the poem deals with the education of Greek, not Roman boys.

Agamemnon's school programme is said to be for Greek boys, but it is really for Roman boys, and yet Agamemnon is himself Greek (he does not have a Roman praenomen

---

\(^{552}\) There is an interesting parallel in *Fr. XXXI*: *Indica purpureo genuit me litore tellus, / candidus accenso qua redit orbe dies. / Hic ego diuinios inter generatus honores / mutauit Latio barbara uerba sono. / Iam dimitte tuos, Paean o Delphice, cyncnos; / dignior haec uox est quae tua tempta colat.* According to Bücheler, Dousa suggested the speaker was a parrot, but even so this parrot would be modeled on the typical *advena* in Rome. For *sonum* in the sense of "the sound of the spoken language" see also Ov. *Fast.* 5.195, *Corrupta sono Latino litera Graeca.*

\(^{553}\) The education of Echion's son follows the same Roman pattern: 46.5, *ceterum iam graeculis [sc. litteris] calcem impingit et Latinas [sc. litteras] coepit non male appetere.*
any more than most of the characters), and he lectures in a Greek city (apparently Greek-speaking Naples), where Greek school-boys would normally exist. Even if we assume, contrary to appearances, that Agamemnon is a thoroughly Romanized Greek—and he would have to be, since improvising poetry in Latin was not an easy feat, even for native speakers—this highly atypical linguistic condition still clashes with the fact that he intends his curriculum for Greek boys. The truth is that, however we turn this poem on its head, we can never show that anything of the kind could ever have been composed by any real individual in any real ancient Campanian city. The poem and its setting are simply not, as Mommsen argued, a realistic representation of the cultural mix of southern Italy in the first century.

If we presume that Petronius recomposed in Latin a preexisting Greek poem on the same topic and shaped it in the form of a Lucilian satire, adding a Roman layer on top of the Greek foundation, this process could easily have produced what we have in this poem today. The underlying Greek poem and context would have presented Agamemnon trying to impress Encolpius by improvising in Greek on the topic of how Greek boys had to be raised on the ancient musical diet of Homer (epic), Plato (philosophy), and Demosthenes (rhetoric), so that they could later imitate these canonical authors in their own literary productions. When Petronius reached this poem in his Greek model, in order to rewrite it as Lucilian satire, he first had to make changes in the meter. Imitating the most famous contemporary writer of satires in Latin, A. Persius Flaccus (34-62), who imitated the meters of Lucilius in the prologue of his works, the Greek rhetor Agamemnon now breaks into Latin scissors, or limping iambics, and then switches abruptly to hexameters. Towards

554 The real linguistic constitution of such men was more like that of Lucian’s humiliated Greek scholar in the household of a wealthy Roman pater familias who τὴν Ἱερωνίμος φωνήν βαρβαρίζων (Lucian Merc. Cond. 24).
the end of Petronius's Latin recomposition, then, the switch of languages is reflected in the boys' curriculum, and Cicero is added to their reading, regardless of their being as Greek as their teacher.

If my description is anywhere near how Petronius worked when composing this particular poem of the Satyricon, then this part at least of his Greek model was just as prosimetric as its Latin adaptation. The unavoidable implication is that the Greek model of the central fabula of the Massaliote Encolpius was prosimetric as a whole. We need not doubt that other sections of the work, such as the shorter fabulae of Eumolpus, both of which are set in Asia Minor, Pergamum and Ephesos, had their Greek models. It is harder to determine, however, whether the large poems attributed to the poet had any counterparts in the Greek model or were just added by Petronius, since the traditional method of Roman adaptation could include to some extent completely new material, or material which came from other works, either Greek or Latin, by "contamination".

One amusing side-effect of this thesis is that it seems that we can now finally put to rest the long standing debate about the identity of the city of Trimalchio. In tune with the characteristic layering in the Satyricon of Roman elements on top of Greek foundations, it becomes evident that the "Greek city" / "Roman colony" never really existed in ancient Campania, but was created by Petronius through the process of adaptation. Which explains why, despite the fairly detailed description of the place, it has still been impossible to determine its identity to everyone's satisfaction. Neither the extensive archeological research in the area, nor the great amount of scholarly ink spilled over the problem since Mommsen, has changed much in this respect. The real reason for this state of things is not the incompetence of scholars, but the frustrating inconsistency of the information provided by the Satyricon itself. One the one hand, the place is a "Greek city" with the presence of Greek scholars and a Greek cultural environment (therefore Neapolis), and on the other, the
language spoken there is Latin, and it seems that we are dealing with a Roman colony with Roman institutions and magistrates (therefore Puteoli, or even Cumae). Neither Mommsen’s claim that Cumae was properly a *urbs Graeca*, nor Rose’s contention that the term *urbs Graeca* is mere mockery of the place—in the manner of Juvenal calling Rome itself a Greek city—solves the problem. Cumae and Puteoli were not Greek cities by any stretch of the imagination, and the term *urbs Graeca* issues from the mouth of a native Greek, and is not intended as the mockery of a quintessentially Roman place, but instead of a city which shows many positive signs of being indeed Greek.

The lack of cultural and linguistic realism, which we have been observing in the *Satyricon*, has been studied by Gordon Williams in other works of Roman literature. In a truly insightful chapter, 'The blending of Greek and Roman', Williams explains how Roman authors acted as if the transition from Greek to Roman literature was a natural continuation of the same tradition: "Roman poets treated both earlier Roman poets and Greek poets in the same way that Greek poets had themselves treated their own predecessors." In fact, a Roman adaptation is neither a translation, which presupposes that one language can function as the unproblematic parallel of another, nor a complete reworking, which transforms cultural settings and forces them to comply with the new environment. Instead, Roman adaptations blend Greek and Roman elements in such an undifferentiated manner, that attempting to distinguish them almost amounts to tearing apart the work itself. However, if we nevertheless care to do such violence to these compositions, the works turn out to be basically Greek, but on top of the Greek base is an added Roman linguistic and cultural layer, which assures that the final outcome is, strictly

555Rose (1962), 404; Juv. 3.60-61, *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem*.

556Williams (1968), 254.
speaking, a utopian creation. These symptoms are obvious in those works which we know to be direct Roman adaptations from Greek literature, such as the works Williams makes the objects of his study, the comedies of Plautus, Virgil's *Eclogues*, and Horace's *Odes*.

In an interesting twist of this Greco-Roman layering, the most fully Romanized Greeks of the *Satyricon*, such former slaves as Gaius Trimalchio and his friends, speak an inferior Latin compared to the genuine Greeks! Perhaps the hardest thing to imagine for many a student of the *Satyricon* is the idea that the "vulgar" Latin of the freedmen, some of whom are originally of Greco-Asian background, does not represent a realistic imitation of how such characters would actually have spoken Latin. The "vulgar" Latin of the freedmen does not betray any unusually strong Greek qualities which would show them to be Petronius's faithful representation of the speech-mannerisms of this particular ethnic minority in Rome.\(^{557}\) The modern impression is accidental, and follows directly from the assumption of Mommsen, that Petronius set up to document the contemporary scene, in the manner of modern literary Naturalists. Ancient mimicry of speech mannerisms aims at ridiculing the subjects who are imitated, and never shows the modern interest in preserving an accurate image of their ways, for the sake of scientific documentation. Just as the Latin of the "genuine Greeks" of the story is the generic colloquial Latin of educated Romans (a well defined stylistic category in the rhetorical treatises), the Latin of the Romanized Greeks of the story is the generic language of native speakers among the lower orders, always the legitimate target of ridicule in the stratified ancient Mediterranean societies.

\(^{557}\)We have no examples of what the argot of this class was actually like.
As the best of the seventeenth century critics understood, the freedmen's language is the literary aping of half-educated colloquial Latin, and as such it is closer to the idioms of Varro's *Menippean satires*, for example, or Seneca’s *Apocolocynthosis*, than to the truly uneducated style of the Pompeii graffiti. No doubt the uneducated characters of the Greek work adapted by Petronius spoke a colloquial and solecistic Greek, and Petronius decided to retain this feature in his Latin adaptation. The fragments of Greek prosimetric narratives, the Iolaos (*POxy. 3010*) and Tinouphis (*PHAun. inv. 400*), show signs of loose writing and “vulgarity” of language. Sisenna’s adaptation of the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides seems to have been in that style too, and judging from the plain language of the epitome of the Greek ass story and Apuleius’s attempts to imply colloquial language without actually writing in that mode, the *Μεταμορφώσεις* probably exhibited examples of linguistic mimicry, which in general is a feature of *sermocinatio* in performance literature. Once the acting of lowly social types hits the stage, the mimicry of their speech mannerisms is irresistible.

The nature of the linguistic errors of the freedmen is akin to Trimalchio’s mistakes in mythology; they are errors by design for the sake of humour, since they systematically subvert the correct myths in a way that no true ignoramus could accomplish. Trimalchio’s *persona* is the creation of an educated mind. Niceros’s ghost story (61.3-62.14), likewise,

---

558 E.g., the author of the treatise published in 1666 under the name of Mario Statileo, probably Pierre Petit; See Chapter One.

559 According to Stephens and Winkler (1995), 367, both texts contain "a number of vulgarisms and uncorrected errors in both the prose and the verse sections of the text."

560 *Fr. Aur. 4.3.2, id genus in verbis rusticanis et iocularibus ac ridiculariis... Sisennam in lascivis.*
is deliberately mis-told and the character appropriately fears the mocking laughter of the
scholastici (61.4), not because Latin is his second language, but because he is violating the
principles of good rhetorical narration. However, it is not per se the common and colloquial
nature of his language which is ridiculous, but the obvious lack of wit and elegance which
violates the fine balance required for the genus attenuatum to be successful. When all is
considered, the language of the freedmen in the Satyrca is no harder to account for in a
Roman adaptation of a Greek model, than the language of the Greek characters of Plautus,
another traditional source for "vulgar" Latin.

Trimalchio's behavior, indeed, offers an interesting example of Latinization as he
overlays the Greek of the Homeric poems with a Latin translation. When his Homeristae
are "insolently" exchanging Homeric verses in Greek, he drowns their recital by reading
loudly a Latin translation of Homer to his guests.\textsuperscript{561} In the same manner of overwriting the
Greek voices of the Satyrca, Plocamus, one of Trimalchio's guests, is made to assert that
his "abominable hissing" is Greek,\textsuperscript{562} but the Massaliote Encolpius is unable to confirm this
in his witty Latin narrative, as if his knowledge of Greek was limited to the correct literary
Greek of school exercises.

Again, the Greek characters Encolpius and Eumolpus, while describing and
discussing the works of Greek artists and thinkers, significantly refer to them as Graeci
(83.2) and Graeculi delirantes (88.10), as if they were assuming the patronizing attitude of
native Romans towards themselves! Although the latter is obviously ironic, the former is

\textsuperscript{561} 59.3, ipse Trimalchio in pulvino consedit, et cum Homeristae Graecis versibus
colloquerentur, ut insolenter solent, ille canora voce Latine legebatur librum.

\textsuperscript{562} 64.5, oppositaque ad os manu nescio quid taetrum exsibilavit, quod postea
Grecum esse affirmabat.
spoken by Encolpius in all seriousness in a simple reference to a Greek term (83.2, *quam Graeci "monocnemon" appellant*). What Encolpius should have said, if he were a simple Latin-speaking Greek, is *quam nos "monocnemon" appellamus*. Something strange is going on here, as Müller indirectly admits by wanting to delete "Graeci", just as Fraenkel wanted to delete "Graeco more" in Eumolpus's description of the type of burial intended in his Ephesian story.\(^{563}\) Neither place is unsound, according to the logic of adaptation. Consistent with this logic, the *urbs Graeca* in the middle of Roman territory is seen by our Greek exile, not as a congenial and hospitable place, but on the contrary as a "foreign place" (*locus peregrinus*). Encolpius, the exile from Massilia, may of course view another Greek city as "foreign", but this sense is excluded by the manner in which he emphasizes the Greek identity of the place in a parallel passage which follows soon after (80.8, *in loco peregrino destituit abiectum; 81.3, exul in deversorio Graecae urbis iacerem desertus*). Because the place is Greek, it is hostile to Encolpius the Greek, who has been adapted into Latin!

No ancient author dramatizes the process of Latin adaptations of Greek works as well as Apuleius, who prided himself on equal command of both languages.\(^{564}\) In adapting the *Metamorphoses*, he has added a whole new frame to the work to account for the new language in which Lucius now narrates his story. Whereas Λούκιος, the narrator and hero of the *Metamorphoses*, returns to his home city of Patras after his adventures are over, Lucius of the *Metamorphoses* gets involved with the cult of Isis, which he did not need to do considering that he knew already that roses were the antidote to his asinine condition.

---

\(^{563}\) 111.3, *in conditorium etiam prosecuta est defunctum positumque in hypogaeo Graeco more corpus [...] custodire coepit.*

\(^{564}\) Apul. *Fl.* 18, *vox mea utraque lingua iam vestris auribus [...] cognita.*
His involvement with the cult eventually lands him in Rome, where he acquires the Latin language with great hardship, so that he can tell the story in that language.\(^{565}\) In the prologue of the *Metamorphoses*, Lucius is made to apologize for being a foreign speaker, and refers explicitly to the change of language as *vocis immutatio* (1.1), and his Latin adaptation as *fabula Graecanica* (1.1). Although this translation into Latin and translocation to Rome is only mentioned briefly in the prologue, the general circumstances of Lucius in Rome are fleshed out in book eleven (11.28), and it becomes clear that he has been all along in the center of Rome, where he lives as a resident foreigner, *advena*, formally associated with the temple of Isis in the Martian Field. Although he was *tunc* (in the past tense of the story) a noble Greek-speaking youth, he is *nunc* (in the present tense of the narrating act) a bilingual Greek orator in Rome, virtually fluent in Latin, a language he first learned after his suffering at the hands of Thessalian witches was well in the past.\(^{566}\)

The humour of Lucius’s *vocis immutatio* with respect to Apuleius’s Latin adaptation of the Metamorphosis, did not go unnoticed by Rudolf Helm: *Servavit autem Apuleius Lucii nomen, quem ut ipse res posset narrare, linguum Latinam didicisse facete dicit.*\(^{567}\) The change of language in the narrative voice of Lucius provides some interesting discrepancies

\(^{565}\) *Met.* 1.1, *mox in urbe Latia advena studiorum Quiritium indigenam sermonem aerumnabili labore nullo magistro praeente aggressus excolui.*

\(^{566}\) *Met.* 11.26, *digredior et recta patrium larem reuisurus meum post aliquam multum temporis contendo paucisque post diebus deae potentis instinctu raptim constrictis sarcinulis, naue conscensa, Romam uersus profectionem dirigo tutusque prosperitate uentorum ferentium Augusti portum celerrime peruenio ac dehinc carpento peruolai uesperaque, quam dies insequebatur Iduum Decembrium, sacrosanctam istam ciuitatem accedo [...] eram cultor denique adsiduus, fani quidem aduena, religionis autem indigena.

\(^{567}\) Helm (1993), vi.
in the *Metamorphoses*. In addition to making Lucius apologize for his foreign accent, he emphasizes that Latin is not the proper tongue in the implied world of the story, when the ass tries to save himself by uttering the august name of Caesar *inter turbelas Graecorum genuino sermone* (3.29). In the story of Psyche, moreover, Apollo, *quamquam Graecus et Ionicus*, is jokingly said to have given an oracular response in Latin "as a favour to the writer of this Milesan tale" *propter Milesiae conditorem* (4.32). The omniscient god was in any case known to be a polyglot.\(^{568}\) Again the *vocis immutatio* is evident in an incident taken from the Μεταμορφώσεις, as we know from its reflection in the epitome, Λούκιος ἧ Ὀνος (44). In the Greek work, the ass's owner, a poor Greek gardener, while traveling along a highway, is arrogantly addressed by a Roman soldier in Latin, a language he does not know. In the Latin *Metamorphoses* the poor man tries to explain that he doesn't know Latin and the Roman soldier turns out to be bilingual and so he repeats his words in Greek, "ubi ducis asinum istum?" The gardener then answers the soldier equally *Graece*, except that his words are also written in Latin (9.39).

Despite Apuleius's humorous attempt to account within the fictional world of the *Metamorphoses* for the irregularities resulting from the reworking in Latin of preexisting Greek texts, he does not seek to avoid wholly the giveaway symptoms of this process, and sometimes even exploits the discrepancy for its comic potential. For example, he lets an uneducated Greek slave boy begin an angry tirade against Lucius in the form of an ass, with a clear echo from Cicero's first oration against Catilina: *quo usque tandem* (3.27). In the characteristically Greek story of young Psyche, set in Asia Minor, which was possibly

\(^{568}\) The oracle of Ptoan Apollo once delivered an answer in "Carian" (Hdt. 8.135).
found in the Μεταμορφώσεις, the Greek gods behave, much like their counterparts in the Apocolocyntosis, as if they were the proud members of the Roman senatorial class. Jupiter claims, for example, that Cupid has driven him to violate public morality and specifically the lex Iulia (6.22), a famous Roman law criminalizing adultery which was passed under Augustus in 18 B.C.E. And similarly, the prize offered by Venus for the recovery of Psyche is a "French" kiss, and the informant is to meet with the goddess behind the metae Muriae (6.8) in Rome, which was so called because it was close to the temple of Venus Murcia. It is evident from this reference to a temple in Rome, in the middle of a story set in Asia Minor, that even in a narratio in the persona of an old woman, the primary location in Rome of the narrator of the Latin adaptation intrudes. As such, this would be a breach of the rules of narration, if it were not for the fact that the work is a Roman adaptation. In Gordon William's words, what the Roman adaptor of Greek works "created, almost by accident, was a world of imagination that was in its main essence Greek but into which he fitted things Roman with such gay abandon that the resulting world was pure ideal creation."

To return to the Satyrca, we note the same mixture in witty analogies from Roman history used by Greek characters, as for example in the comparison of Ascytolos's rape of Giton to Tarquinius's rape of Lucretia (9.5). Dialogues like these can only take place in the never-never land of Roman reworkings of Greek texts. As I said at the beginning of this chapter, studies of its intertextual relationship with other Roman works are important, even if the work as a whole has a Greek model, because of the many Roman elements in the

---

569 As is shown, e.g., from the alteration of the language of the oracle from Greek to Latin (Met. 4.32). For further discussion, see Dietze (1900), 136f.

570 Williams (1968), 288.
Satyrina. In fact, given my conclusion that the Satyrina is essentially a hybrid, a Latin adaptation of a Greek work written in a multiplicity of discourse types, variety of filiation is inescapable. My hypothesis is therefore quite compatible with much of the scholarship on the Satyrina to date, despite its radical revision of the premises on which most studies rest. The main difference is perhaps that the Roman material in the Satyrina can no longer be adduced as evidence of Petronius's Romanitas or "originality". The whole question of the origin of those elements of the work which modern scholarship often too hastily assumes to be purely "Roman", i.e., satire and mime, is indeed made more complicated, since we must now reckon with the possibility that the Greek model of the Satyrina was already both satirical and influenced by the mime.571

To add further support to our reading of the Satyrina as fabula Milesia, we present an hitherto unnoticed piece of ancient evidence that such is, indeed, the correct term to describe the erotic fiction of Petronius. A letter by Sidonius Apollinaris to a certain Graecus, who was bishop of Massilia, tells the scandalous and lightly erotic story of their letter carrier Amantius.572 The interesting parts about this otherwise undistinguished literary exercise in a private letter are clear verbal and thematic echoes from the Satyrina in a narrative which is then defined as fabula Milesia. We have Sidonius Apollinaris, of course, to thank for the preservation of an important Fragment (Fr. II) of the Satyrina, and so we know with certainty that he was to some extent familiar with the Satyrina. Practically his

571 The recent claim of Panayotakis (1995), p. x, for example, that "farcical features which recur throughout the narrative support the interpretation of this composite text as an eccentric innovation in the area of literature" is therefore not an argument.

572 This letter is, surprisingly, referred to by Ruiz-Montero (1996), 63 n.153, as an example of "non-licentious" Milesiae in an attempt to support the expansion of the meaning of term to cover "stories of a sentimental or idealist kind."
only other references to Massilia belong to the other letters he wrote to Graecus. In the letter in question (Ep. 7.2), Sidonius apologizes humorously for having introduced Amantius to the bishop as their letter carrier, because the same man had previously abused the good-will of Eustachius, Graecus's predecessor as bishop of Massilia. Sidonius portrays the character of Amantius as a "wily traveller" (callidus viator) who has spun a yarn utterly at variance with the truth, and caused himself to repeat the false information. But then he promises to tell to the bishop the story of Amantius, which would make a pleasant tale, he says, if told by a worthy narrator (quae tamen gesta sunt, si quispiam dignus relator revolveret, fierent iucunda memoratu). Responding to a previous demand from the bishop for a cheerful read, he begins the story of Amantius in the Greek style by naming the home city and parents of the hero.

When Amantius had first arrived in Massilia a penniless youth he had exploited the blessing of the bishop to insinuate himself into good society, which he deceived by making a spectacle of his chastity and sobriety; after having the good citizens of Massilia compete in giving him gifts and granting favours, he began seducing the prepubescent daughter of a certain lady of good fortune. It is worth quoting this passage in full, since it may well contain direct verbal echoes from the Satyricon:

forte accidit, ut deversorio, cui ipse successerat, quaedam femina non minus censu quam moribus idonea vicinaretur, cuius filia infantiae iam temporibus emensis neendum tamen nubilibus annis appropinquabat. huic hic blandus (siquidem ea aetas infantulae, ut adhuc decenter) nunc quaedam frivola, nunc ludo apta virgineo scrutu donabat; quibus isti parum grandibus causis plurimum virgunculae animus copulabatur. anni obiter thalamo pares: quid morer multis? adulescens, solus tenuis peregrinus, filius familias et e patria patre non solum non volente verum et ignorante discedens, puellam non inferiorem natalibus, facultatibus superiorem, medio episcopo, quia lector, solacio comitis, quia cliens, socru non inspiciente substantiam, sponsa non
despiciente personam, uxorem petit, impetrat, ducit. conscribuntur tabulae nuptiales; et siqua est istic municipioli nostri suburbanitas, matrimonialibus illic inserta documentis mimica largitate recitatur.

[It chanced that near the lodging where he had taken up residence there lived a certain lady as well suited in character as in income, whose daughter, though no longer a baby, was still a good way short of the marriageable age. He ingratiated himself with the child, her tender years still allowing it without impropriety, and would give her from time to time some frivolous gifts or trinkets suitable for the play of a maiden: and for these less than great reasons he came to occupy an intimate place in the little virgin's mind. The years arrived when she was fit for the marriage chamber. Not to make a long story of it, this young man, alone and of modest resources, a stranger, a minor who left his native place not only without the consent but without the knowledge of his father, sought, won, and married a girl of not inferior birth and of superior fortune, with the mediation of the bishop, for being a Reader, and with the sympathy of the Count, for being a client; for the mother did not look into his means any more than the girl looked down upon his person. The nuptial tables are written out, and what rustic eloquence could be found in our little municipal town, was entered in the matrimonial documents and recited with theatrical grandeur.]

Sidonius then ends the tale of Amantius with the words: "here you have the history of a splendid young man, a fable worthy of Milesia or an Attic play" (habetis historiam iuvenis eximii, fabulam Milesiae vel Atticæ parem).573 Once again historia and fabula are two terms which can be used to refer to the same novelistic narrative, which shows that fabula Milesia as a generic term refers to the kind of extended fictional narrative we might call a "novel".

573 The fable is alternatively an Attic "play" (fabula) for no other reason than Sidonius, in the preceding sentence, referred to Amantius mockingly as noster Hippolytus.
Above and beyond the Massaliotic connection (the fact that Sidonius knew Petronius and associated him with that city), we have here astonishingly close thematic and verbal parallels with a number of stories and episodes in the extant *Satyrica*. As in the episode at Croton, a poor traveler and trickster arrives as a stranger in a foreign city, simulates virtue and high social status and succeeds in having the citizens compete (*certatim*) in giving gifts and granting their favours (*Sat* 124.4, *cum certamine in Eumolpum conesserunt... certatim omnes heredipetae muneribus gratiam Eumolpi sollicitant*). Day by day (*in dies*) the stranger's status improves and the beneficence (*beneficiis*) of the citizens increases (*Sat*. 125.1, *beneficio amicorum; 2, quotidie magis magisque superfluentibus bonis*). The stranger, pretending to be a paragon of virtue, is taken into the house of a certain lady, where he succeeds with seducing the child of the family aided by cheap presents. The parallel with Eumolpus's seduction of the Pergamene boy (*Sat*. 85-87), and again his "seduction" of Philomela's daughter (*Sat*. 140), by posing as a virtuous educator, is obvious. The theme of effective, though eccentric, wooing is echoed from the story of the widow of Ephesus, where the soldier gives the widow gifts of food (compare *huic hic blandus* with *Sat*. 112.1, *quibus blanditiis*).

Most striking, however, is the verbal echo in Sidonius's *Milesia* of the bizarre narrative of the deflowering of the girl Pannychis in the Quartilla episode of the *Satyrica* (16-26). We find here no less than nine verbal parallels, some of which involve both rare and extremely rare words (*thalamus, scrutu, virguncula*), which are not used by Sidonius elsewhere, not to mention one instance of a concentration within six lines of the extant *Satyrica* (18.7-19.2) of three such words (*virguncula, mimicus, deversorium*). Such conceptual and semantic reminiscences would seem unlikely, if the texts are unrelated: *deversorio* (*Sat*. 19.2 deversorio); *filia infantiae iam temporibus emensis necdum tamen nubis annis appropinquabat* (*Sat*. 25, *plaudentibus ergo universis et postulantibus*).
Considering the number of similarities, it seems unlikely, although possible, that Sidonius's account goes back to some general narrative template. Even so, this would not affect our conclusion since both text obviously belong to the same class, even if they are not directly related. It does, however, seem most probable that Sidonius was using as model the Satyricon of Petronius (whether consciously or subconsciously from a recent reading), a work he demonstrably knew to some extent at least, when he composed his humorous account of Amantius's profitable erotic adventure in Massilia. In that case, the letter would provide specific evidence that the generic term milesia, or Milesia, is indeed the correct one for denoting the genre of the Satyricon. This fits the information that we have from Macrobius, that Petronius and Apuleius were judged in late antiquity to be writers of playful fabulae about fictional lovers (argumenta fictis casibus amatorum referata) as entertainment (tantum conciliandae auribus voluptatis [...] hoc totum fabularum genus, quod solas aurium delicias profitetur). We know that Apuleius himself defined the Metamorphoses as fabula Milesia, and now we may have direct evidence that Petronius's

574Macro. Somn. 1.2.7-8
Satyricon is rightly classified as another such work. Macrobius, in fact, seems to think of Petronius's work as a somewhat purer example of the genre than the Metamorphoses.

With respect to the mixture of prose and poetry in the Satyricon, this too might be a part of the generic description of Milesiae. Edward Norden long ago suggested that the Μιλεσιακα of Aristides was prosimetric in form. The evidence cited by Norden includes the presence of Sisenna, the Latin adaptor of the work, in a list of poets by M. Cornelius Fronto (Aur. 4.3.2) with a clear enough reference to the Milesiae (in lascivis). In addition, Bücheler rightly pointed out that that Fr. VII (nocte vagatrix) must be poetry, judging from the rhythm and diction. However, Felix Jacoby was probably right to consider erroneous Norden's interpretation of Fr. CXXVII of Sisenna's Historiae as a description of the desultory style. Direct proof, overlooked by Norden and Bücheler, is provided by Martianus Capella, who in a work which itself is written in the prosimetric

---

575 Norden (1909), 756, and 603 n.5, writes, regarding the characterization of Apuleius's style as desulatoriae scientiae stilus, "Varro schrieb eine Satire Desulatorius peri τον γράφειν, was schon Buecheler im Rhein. Mus. XX (1865) 408, 6 aus dem sprungweisen Wechsel dieser Kompositionsart nach Inhalt und, was bei Varro, Seneca, Petron, Martian und Boethius hinzukommt, nach Form (cf. auch Bekker Anecd. Gr. 198, 11 s. ανοβάτης), erklärt hat. Hätten wir den Roman des Aristeides, so würden wir die sprunghafte Art der Darstellung an der Quelle studieren können."


577 For Jacoby's criticism, see Norden (1909), "Nachträge, 5, Zu S. 603.5." Gel. 12.15.2, ne vellicatim aut saltuatim scribendo lectorum animos impediremus.
form, refers to "delightful Milesiae of poetic diversity" (poeticae etiam diversitatis delicias Milesias).\(^{578}\) Considering the latest discoveries of prosimetric papyri of Greek sensational erotic and criminal fiction, the case for prosimetric Milesiae is completely convincing.

According to Lucian, the author of the Sybaritica (described by Ovid as comparable to the Μίλησιακά of Aristides), went by the name of Hemitheon (or Minthon), and was furthermore called "the cinaedus".\(^{579}\) This "author" is most certainly a fictional narrator. Since Hemitheon is referred to as "the cinaedus" he belongs to the group of writers and performers generally referred to as κινοτολόγοι, the imitators of Sotades and Timon of Phlius. They were so named because they sang or recited their compositions.\(^{580}\) If the author of the Sybaritica was a cinaedus, the work itself was a performance text in the mixed form, related to the Satyrlica (23.2, 132), and the Iolaos fragment, both of which feature prosimetric presentations of cinaedic poetry.\(^{581}\)

---

\(^{578}\) Mart. Cap. de Nupt., 2.100.

\(^{579}\) Lucian Ind. 23; Pseudol. 3.

\(^{580}\) Demetr. Eloc. 37; Plb. 5.37.10; Plin. Ep. 9.17.1; Str. C648. Maxwell (1993), argues that these compositions were mimes, which is ultimately a matter of terminology. I do not wish to argue that Sotades and Timon were "novelists". If the category of mime is made to include many types of performances, which in antiquity seems to have been the case, the Satyrlica could in theory be lumped together with the many species of mime on the grounds of being performance literature without this implying at all that it was dramatic in form. However, one problem regarding the classification of the Satyrlica as mime (not a part of Maxwell's thesis) is that it ignores the evidence that there was already in use among Latin writers another generic term, milesia fabula, for this type of work.

\(^{581}\) On the origin of cinaedic poetry, see Ath. 620e; Plaut. Stich. 769. Although both the Μεταμορφώσεις and the Metamorphoses feature cinaedi without the prosimetric presentation of cinaedic poetry, their presence can still be considered a generic marker.
Plutarch likely contains another previously unnoticed reference to the Sybaritica in the context of the Milesiaca. At the end of the Life of Crassus, he tells the story of how the work of Aristides (presumably its Latin adaptation by Sisenna) was found in the baggage of the Roman military man, Roscius, and how this gave the Parthian Surena an occasion to heap insults on the defeated Romans. But then Plutarch, curiously, adds that Surena's attack was not successful because "the people of Seleucia, nevertheless, appreciated the wisdom of Aesop when they saw Surena with a pera stuffed with obscenities from the Μυλησιακά in front of him, but trailing behind him a Parthian Sybaris in so many wagon-loads of concubines." Plutarch is here casting Surena as the man in the fable of Aesopus (# 303) carrying one πήρα in front of him with others' faults, while dragging behind him his own. The "Parthian Sybaris", of course, is the retinue of Surena, and Plutarch also claims that the Parthians had no business criticizing the Romans, since many of their royal line were sprung from Milesian courtesans! However, the choice of the phrase, "Parthian Sybaris", would not make much sense unless it contained an indirect reference to the Συβαριτικά of Hemitheon, which thus would provide the desired parallel to the work of Aristides. It is perhaps of some significance that in Plutarch a scandalous and sensational description follows upon this mention of the two works, which features a performance in the Parthian camp of the Bacchae of Euripides, using the head of Crassus for that of Pentheus, during the recital of the verses of Agave.

As a city, Sybaris was proverbial for the same quality that made the Milesians notorious, luxury and licentious behavior. Hesychius counts Συβαριτικός as synonymous

582 Plut. Crass. 32.4, τοῖς μέντοι Σελευκείσιν ἐδόκει σοφός ἀνήρ Αἴσωπος εἶναι, τὸν Συρήναν ὡρᾶς τὴν τῶν Μυλησιακῶν ἀκολαστημάτων πήραν ἐξηρτιμένον πρόσθεν, ὁπισθεν δὲ Παρθικὴν Σύβαριν ἐφελκόμενον ἐν τοσαύταις παλακιδίων ἁμάζαις.
with τρυφερός, the weakness from which Petronius's Tryphaena gets her name, and numerous ancient sources are scandalized at the unrestrained catering at the proverbial τρόπες τα Συβαριτική. The glorious ancient city of Croton is the setting of the last preserved part of the Satyricon. Since this is the only intact introduction to a Greek city in the story as we have it, we can use it as an example of what might have been a pattern. Why Croton? What wars are being referred to in the introduction of Croton as a city which has "squandered its wealth in frequent wars" (116, post attritas bellis frequentibus opes). The ancient Greek colony of Κρότων is best known in literature for destroying great and luxurious Sybaris in 510 B.C.E. Sybaris, in turn, had been closely affiliated with wealthy and powerful Miletus, until that city's demise in the late fifth century. Just as luxurious Sybaris and wealthy Miletos, powerful Croton is a legend of the distant past, from the period after Greek colonial expansion. Such tales of the life in famous ancient cities may have been termed μόθοι πολιτικοί, "community legends", and are worthy of consideration as a genre on their own.\footnote{Schol. Arist. Vesp. 1259a.}

If the Greek model of Petronius was not called simply Σατυρικά, which seems most probable and would have associated the work with Greek satyr drama (δράμα σατυρικόν or δράματα σατυρικά),\footnote{Henriksson (1956), 185, in his study of Greek book-titles in Roman literature, concludes "dass die aus dem Griechischen übersetzten Werke sehr oft den Titel des Originals behielten. Dasselbe gilt für Werke, die nach einem griechischen Vorbild inhaltlich oder stilistisch geformt sind." At least one Greek work was entitled Σατυρικά, written by a certain Derkyllos (Ps.-Plu. Fluv. 10.3, FGrHist. III A, 172.) another possible title is Μασσαλιωτικά, given the home city of the narrator and the tradition of naming such narratives after place names. The adventures of Encolpius are to some extent a parody of the Phaeacian tales of his reputedly
mendacious countrymen, Pythias and Euthymenes. Instead of spinning their kind of μύθοι Μασσαλιωτικοί, however, he weaves his own Sybaritic tale.\(^{585}\) Instead of going beyond the pillars of Hercules, he leaves his own Massilia to go south along the Italian peninsula to expose the lies and hypocrisy of Greek (and Roman?) communities in that area.\(^{586}\) Just as the Μεταμορφώσεις tells a story of superstitious Thessaly, the Σατυρικά, Μασσαλιωτικά—or whatever the title was—offered a Greek satire on the degradation of the Hellenic communities in the Diaspora under Roman rule. Neapolis is a city of bogus erudition and voracious appetites, Croton of lost greatness and cannibalistic greed. The vilicus who appears out of nowhere to supply our friends with information about Croton says: "in hac enim urbe non litteraria studia celebrantur, non eloquentia locum habet" (116.6), as if he wanted to clearly differentiate the present city from the last one, philoscholastic Neapolis.

No doubt these very ancient μύθοι πολιτικοί provided the basis for composing longer narratives which would absorb a number of such tales into a central fable and so create an extended and entertaining performance narrative, cultivated especially by men who looked upon themselves as rhetoricians/schoolmen/sophists/philosophers, by including a

\(^{585}\) Aelius Aristides Aeg. p.353 [Jebb], makes fun of the fourth century B.C.E. historian Ephoros, who originated in Cumae, and was therefore from Magna Graecia, for abandoning his native Sybaritic tales for the Massaliotic tales of Euthymenes (μύθοις Μασσαλιωτικοίς ἀντὶ τῶν Συβαριτικῶν), because he was persuaded by the traveler's account of the origin of the Nile.

\(^{586}\) Reitzenstein (1963), 30f., "Es war ein glücklicher Gedanke für die Wunderbare Fahrt an unbekannten Küsten und die Abenteuer mit Fabelvölkern und Märchenwesen eine Reise längs der allbekannten Küste Galliens und Italiens einzusetzen, und jede neue Stadt zur typischen Vertreterin eines neuen Lasters zu machen."
variety of material and discourse types. Another significant input obviously came from the Cynic satire, which as a performance genre was well established in the third century B.C.E., i.e., early enough to have influenced the form and general outlook of the Milesiae. As I have shown in Chapters One and Five, the underlying literary and ethical concerns of Encolpius and his implied audience are closely related to some of the basic theses of the Cynic philosophers, who invented the mixed discourse and rejected money and all that it represented as a reliable measure of value—"redefine the currency" (παραχρονογιόν τὸ νόμισμα) was the great metaphor and slogan of Diogenes of Sinope (D.L. 6.20f.);\textsuperscript{587} such moral concerns are of course presented in the genre according to the serio-comic style appropriate to popular philosophy as entertainment. We also find a fair deal of erotic titillation and sensational violence intermixed with the moral message—at times rather shocking and amoral elements—which although they seem to contradict the satire may to some extent have been intended as a bait to attract audiences.

From the shamelessness and criminal delinquency of the Milesiae, dabbling in such literature could potentially ruin the reputation of otherwise honourable men.\textsuperscript{588} In every

\textsuperscript{587}A valuable but neglected source on the history and ideas of Cynicism is the Cynic letters, most of which derive from the Augustan period (Malherbe (1986), 2 and 14). Diogenes's Epistles 30-40, in particular, contain material which is often strangely reminiscent of passages in the Satyricon. We have here the same emphasis on the wandering human explorer who goes from city to city and is exemplified by such heroic figures as the beggar Odysseus (34.2-3); we also have striking instances of phallic humour and masturbation (35.2), and perhaps most remarkably the ridicule of stupid signs posted outside private houses in foreign cities (36.1). The best edition of the letters is still Hercher's Epistolographi Graeci, which offers a Latin translation.

\textsuperscript{588}The Cynics liked to shock the moral sensibilities of the ordinary man by arguing that various immoral activities could be sensible practices under certain circumstances,
ancient reference to the genre, from Ovid to Martial, from Plutarch to "Capitolinus", we encounter excitement and fascination with *Milesiae* mixed up with a strong sense of scandal and an urge to condemn. It is ironic that scholarship has so seldom followed antiquity in imputing the genre to Petronius, an author, who, if his Tacitean portrait is at all accurate, would have regarded the imputation with wry equanimity.

notwithstanding "public opinion" (δόξη), which they considered the very antithesis of wisdom. On the Cynics in general, see Dudley (1980), and the annotated bibliography of Navia (1995).
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