

nauticarum mentio, quarum affluentia Puteolanum emporium celebrabatur, C'è da precisare che nessuno dei colliberti esercita un mestiere che abbia un rapporto col mare, né alcun riferimento al mare c'è nel discorso con cui Ganimede descrive la condizione politica e economica della città, la cui prosperità dipende esclusivamente dalla produzione agricola, dagli *agri* resi desolati dalla mancanza di pioggia. Né va dimenticato che tre dei cinque prodotti di cui Trimalchione carica le sue navi (*vinum, lardum, faba*) rinviano ad una società agricolo-pastorale. E alla luce di queste considerazioni diventano significativi anche particolari a prima vista insignificanti: l'*anicula* che si prende gioco di Ascilto (6,4) vende *agreste holus*, la scena del mantello (14, 3 sgg.) ha tra i protagonisti un *rusticus*, Pompeo Diogene *solebat collo suo ligna portare* (38,7), Crisanto ha fatto fortuna vendendo vino (43,4), Echione (46,1) cita l'espressione di un *rusticus* ("modo sic, modo sic", *inquit rusticus*), Trimalchione fa riferimento alla cucina contadina (47,10: *gallum enim gallinaceum, penthiacum et eiusmodi nenias rustici faciunt*), nel luogo in cui Trimalchione ha costruito il suo bagno c'era prima un mulino (73,2). Questi elementi potrebbero sembrare poco cogenti se non fossero corroborati dalla presenza massiccia e martellante nei discorsi di Trimalchione e dei suoi commensali non solo di proverbi ma anche di moduli espressivi, di comparazioni e di insulti rispecchianti un ambiente agricolo-pastorale. Che tutto ciò in uno scrittore realista come Petronio non poteva essere casuale aveva compreso il Lommatzsch, quando aveva sostenuto, con eccessiva concisione, che la città di Trimalchione era una città di *rusticuli*, di tutto ciò devono tener conto e devono dar ragione coloro che, pur ammettendo il realismo di Petronio, continuano a ritenere che la città sia Pozzuoli.

[Editor's Note: In a letter N. Horsfall states that he believes that M. Salanitro has not dealt with the substantial arguments (of D'Arms, etc.) in favor of Puteoli, that she has reacted to only three of his twelve points from *PSN* 23 (1993) 13, and that at this time he prefers to forego a formal reply.]

A New 'Petronian' Epigram

by Rod Boroughs

Contrary to Scobie's assertion that Petronius is never mentioned in any Spanish picaresque novel (*Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage*, B.Z.K.P. 30 [Meisenheim am Glan, 1969], p. 95), the author of the *Satyrica* is to be found cited by name in a lesser-known example of the genre: *Alonso, moço de muchos amos o El donado hablador* by Jerónimo de Alcalá Yáñez de Ribera (Part I, Madrid, 1624; Part II, Valladolid, 1626).

In Part II, Chapter 5, the narrator attacks marriage as a terrible misfortune and attributes the same opinion to 'Petronius Arbiter': 'Petronio Arbitro, poeta, aborrecia el casamiento de suerte, que en sus versos dijo:

Pessima res uxor, poterit tamen utilis esse,
Si breviter moriens det tibi quidquid habet.'

These verses are not elsewhere ascribed to Petronius; they are not even cited in the appendices of the early editions of our author, which comprise a number of poems that are no longer regarded as authentic. The epigram is to be found, however, in Hans Walther, *Carmina Medii Aevi Posterioris Latina*, II/3 *Proverbia Sententiaeque Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (Göttingen, 1965), p. 814, no. 21435. Walther does not give the name of an author, and from the sources that he cites it is only possible to trace the poem back as far as a collection of Latin verse produced in Germany in the eighteenth century—Dr. Andreas Sutor, *Latinum Chaos. Ein Teutsches durch einander von unterschiedlichen Sachen...* (Augsburg, 1716), p. 515, 'Matrimonium' no. 48—, where it also goes unattributed.

How Alcalá came to make this spurious attribution is not clear. But there is another epigram expressing a jaundiced view of marriage which went under Petronius's name in the sixteenth century:

Uxor legitimus debet quasi census amari
Nec censum vellem semper amare meum.
(Scaliger, *Catalecta*, p. 238; Ernout fr. 43)

It may be then that Alcalá had consulted an anthology of Latin verse and confused two epigrams on similar themes; and his reference to Petronius as a 'poet' would seem to support this hypothesis. However, there are good reasons for supposing that Alcalá was aware of the *Satyrica* as a whole. For like almost all the Spanish picaresque novelists, Alcalá was well-grounded in classical literature, having studied classics and theology at the University of Alcalá in the late sixteenth century; and we know that editions of Petronius were circulating in Spain by this time—early editions are well-represented in the major Spanish libraries, as well as being cited in the indices of prohibited books which were regularly issued during the period of the Spanish Inquisition. Besides, the *Alonso* also contains a number of likely reminiscences of the *Satyrica's* prose narrative. At the beginning of the novel (Part I, Chapter 1), for example, the hero, Alonso, who is recounting his life to the vicar of the convent in which he is a lay-brother, criticises the dissolute life led by the students he had known at the University of Salamanca. The blame he lays squarely on the shoulders of the indulgent parents who give their children everything they desire:

'Hay padres que son causa de la perdicion de sus hijos por las malas costumbres con que los criaron, ciegos con el amor y aficion de hijos, no poniendo freno á sus libertades, dejándolos seguir el camino de los vicios, adonde, como libres, sin orden ni gobierno vienen á perderse. ...'

The *Satyrical* also opens with a dialogue between the hero, Encolpius, and an older figure of authority and learning, Agamemnon. And Alonso's remarks echo the complaints made by Agamemnon about the parents of his students—'parentes obiurgatione digni sunt, qui nolunt liberos suos severa lege proficere...' (4.1ff).

Another Silly Pun in Petronius (Sat. 34.10)

by Michael Hendry

After serving his guests *Falernum Opimianum annorum centum* (labeled as such) and exhibiting his flexible silver skeleton (34.6-9), Trimalchio recites three lines of (for him) surprisingly competent verse (34.10):¹

eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est!
sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus.
ergo uiuamus, dum licet esse bene.

It has been suggested more than once that *esse* in the third line is one of Trimalchio's too numerous puns, and should be taken as both *esse* (from *sum*) and *esse* (from *edo*): *esse bene* would then mean not only "enjoy ourselves" (M.S. Smith, *ad loc.*, with parallels), but also "eat well".² The second meaning would be particularly appropriate in this context, the last sentence of chapter 34. After the *gustatio* (31-33), the guests have been mostly drinking in 34, while 35 ushers in the zodiac dish. Eating well and enjoying themselves will then be synonymous.

In support of the pun, B. Baldwin has adduced two passages of Plautus, *Persa* 113 and *Vidularia* 38, where *esse/esse* puns are likely, though not provable.³ There is an even better parallel in Martial's 'Αποφόρητον 14.70, where the pun on *esse* and *esse* is unmistakable:⁴

[*Priapus siligineus*]

Si uis esse satur, nostrum potes esse Priapum;
ipsa licet rodas inguina, purus eris.

Although this is one of the more bizarre of Martial's Realien, and the point is not strictly relevant to Petronius, I can report a modern parallel. Ten or twelve years ago, a bakery in Annapolis, Maryland, attracted a good deal of publicity, most of it negative, with their anatomically-correct gingerbread-men and gingerbread-women. As I recall, complaints from state legislators

forced them to start keeping the pastries concealed under the counter and to check their customer's IDs to make sure they were old enough to purchase pornographic objects.

To return to Petronius, it seems to me that Trimalchio's little poem is not so much an impromptu comment on his *larua argentea* as a carefully-rehearsed pseudo-impromptu,⁵ designed to provide a transition to the zodiac dish, and that the pun on *esse* and *esse* is an essential part of the introduction to that dish. If we look at the immediate context, the fact that the silver skeleton of 34.6-9 is not only dead but very thin is surely pertinent—*sic erimus cuncti*: skinny, unfed, and entirely without digestive apparatus.⁶ We have good reason to wish to enjoy ourselves now, and eating well will be the most appropriate way to do so.⁷

Taking *esse bene* in 34.10 as a pun may also help to explain the following sentence, *laudationem ferculum est insecutum plane non pro expectatione magnum* (35.1), which has caused difficulty. Smith says "this is too bald to satisfy" and seems to assume that the *laudatio* is provided by the guests, as indeed it was a few lines before (*laudatus propter elegantias dominus*, 34.5). For the same reason, Müller in his first edition — the idea is suppressed in the second and third, and I have not seen the fourth — proposed inserting a lacuna between the two chapters. H. Fuchs made the usual assumption explicit by proposing to read *laudationem <nostram>*.⁸ On the other hand, Hirschfeld (apud Friedlaender) and Ernout (in the Budé) take Trimalchio's *laudatio* as the mock *laudatio funebris* which Trimalchio has just delivered over his toy skeleton.⁹ P. Perrochat mentions both possibilities without deciding between them, though the two are hardly compatible.¹⁰

It seems to me likely that the *laudatio* is not the guests' flattery of Trimalchio, but partly, as Hirschfeld and Ernout have it, his *laudatio funebris*, and mostly his praise of his own food as expressed in the poem, particularly in the crucial (and excruciating) pun. This interpretation is more in line with Trimalchio's character, especially his *putidissima iactatio* (73.2). Perhaps more important, we know from the reaction of the guests (*non pro expectatione magnum*), that they were expecting something rather grand for the first *ferculum*. No doubt this is mostly from what they know or have already seen of Trimalchio's character, but it is most plausible if they have been told to expect some such thing. Whether a punning invitation to enjoy themselves and at the same time to eat well is quite sufficient to justify their high expectations or to qualify as a *laudatio* of the food, is a difficult question.¹¹ Consequently, even if the *laudatio* is Trimalchio's own, some might wish to read *<hanc> laudationem* or something similar in 35.1. But if I am right no large change or lacuna is needed. Of course, in such a swamp as the text of Petronius, we can never be very confident in ruling out a lacuna.

NOTES

- 1 Omitting one pentameter and ending the other with a pyrrhic are very small potatoes by Trimalchio's standards of illiteracy. The fact that the lines scan at all is surely significant. They are certainly far less incompetent than the three lines recited in 55.3, though the difference in quality is conceivably due to the vagaries of transmission or to the amount of wine drunk in the intervening chapters.
- 2 Mostly recently by H. Huxley and B. Baldwin in *CJ* 66 (1970) 69-70 and 254-5, respectively. (The series began with A.F. Sochatoff's aspersions on the quality of the poem in *CJ* 65, 1969-70, 340-44, and continued with notes by E.J. Barnes and N.J. Woodall in *CJ* 66, 255 and 256-7.) Baldwin repeated his suggestion and fortified it with parallels and further arguments in "Petronius 34.10" (*Maia* 31, 1979, 145 = *Studies on Greek and Roman History and Literature*, Amsterdam, 1985, 155). In fact, the idea that *esse bene* is a pun goes back at least to T. Marcilius (1604), who is quoted by Burman, *ad loc.*: "Lusit dilogia, dum licet esse in vita, aut edere." Burman also quotes an Anonymous who is rather more explicit: "Fortasse esse est pro edere, ut ex ambiguitate gratiam loco quaesierit, & praesentem instructum atque apparatus senserit." There were apparently others who read the line this way, since Burman, a bit further on, rejects the punning interpretation with this comment: "Alii esse exposuerunt, edere. Sed male." The idea has no doubt occurred to other readers before and since, and the number of separate occurrences is a strong argument in favor of it. In the latest discussion of these verses, J. Bodel rather takes the pun for granted: "The typically atrocious pun on 'eating' and 'being' in the final phrase (*esse* < and *edo*) articulates one of his fundamental concerns: for Trimalchio, living is eating", "Trimalchio's Underworld", in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search For the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore and London, 1994, 237-59, at 237.
- 3 See his note in *Maia*, referenced in note 2 above.
- 4 The fact that Martial is later than Petronius is irrelevant, since the point in question is whether Romans generally would have recognized a pun on these two words: I take it that Baldwin is not suggesting direct Petronian imitation of Plautus.
- 5 Not carefully enough, if the unusual metrical scheme is intended to suggest that he has forgotten one of the pentameters. The fact that the syntax is complete makes it more likely that this is an intentional omission by Petronius, intended to characterize Trimalchio as a bumbler who has unintentionally omitted a line. Consequently, I see no need to mark a lacuna, with Scaliger, or interpolate an appropriate pentameter, with Tornaesius and Scriverius.
- 6 It appears that the skeleton is used as a kind of stage-prop to support and justify the pun which introduces the next course. The variant *nil erimus cuncti* of the secondary tradition, taking up *nil est*, is attractive only if we do not consider the context.
- 7 There may of course be a similar pun on *nil est* as well. If the *homuncio* is the *larua argentea*, rather than

humanity in general, it indeed "eats nothing". Since the former is more or less symbolic of the latter, I do not see that either can be ruled out.

- 8 "Verderbnisse im Petrontext", in H. Dahlmann and R. Merkelbach (edd.), *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik*, Köln 1959, 57-82, at page 62: no argument is offered. Buecheler's apparatus gives the same interpretation without changing the text: "*laudationem cogites poetae Trimalchionis per conuiuas factam*".
- 9 "Hirschfeld versteht unter *laudatio* hier die Leichenrede", L. Friedlaender, *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis*, Leipzig, 1906², *ad loc.*
- 10 *Le Festin de Trimalcion*, Paris, 1962 *ad loc.*
- 11 The fact that the invitation is expressed in rather lofty, though imperfect verses, and backed up by the use of the skeleton as a prop, suggests that it is intended to do so.

Trimalchio's Canis Catenarius: A Simple Solution?

by Michael Hendry

A well-known problem in the *Cena Trimalchionis* is the change from the painted watchdog which greets Encolpius and company on their entrance (29.1) to the live (and quite lively) dog which prevents them from leaving (72.7-9). It has been argued that this is a deliberate pairing, part of the elaborate ring-composition of the *Cena*, and J. Bodel points to the similarity of the narrator's reaction in each case as emphasizing the echo: in 29.1, Encolpius is knocked over by the sight, while 72.7 Ascyrtos falls into the fishpool and Encolpius is dragged in with him.¹ Some will have it that the painted dog has somehow come to life in the interval,² or is a warning notice for the real one.³ While not wishing to discount the fantastic (and phantasmagoric) effects of the *Satyricon*, I suggest that a more naturalistic explanation is possible, or rather two quite different naturalistic explanations.

According to the first solution, which I consider the less likely of the two, this is another of Trimalchio's elaborate practical jokes, and we are to understand that he has arranged to have the actual dog Scylax substituted for the painted dog during dinner, perhaps immediately after 64.7-10.⁴ This would certainly ensure that none of the guests could leave by the same door by which they had entered, as indeed we see happen. Trimalchio is undoubtedly fond of elaborate practical jokes, and sometimes combines silliness with cruelty or threats of cruelty: an example is the unguited pig of 49, whose cook is stripped for flogging. On the other hand, the threats of violence are generally directed only at the slaves, and are not followed through. In fact, Trimalchio's threats have a way of turning into jokes. Our passage would reverse this procedure, with the silly joke-dog turning into an all-too-real and not at all friendly one: this is one reason why I prefer my

second solution. We might even read the painted dog's label, *caue canem*, as implying a further warning: "watch out for the watchdog, which is not necessarily this picture of a dog" — "ceci n'est pas un chien", as it were. In any case, my first interpretation resembles Courtney's (note 3 above) in taking the first dog as a warning of the second. However, I take the warning as an ironic label accompanying a planned practical joke and intended to be heeded only when it is too late, whereas Courtney, I think, takes it as a straightforward and unironic "Beware of Dog" notice.

My second solution to the watch-dog problem is just as naturalistic, though not, I think, drierly so. Simply put, the dog is still painted in 72.7-9, but the guests are too drunk to tell the difference.⁵ After all, even when sober, Encolpius had been knocked off his feet by his first sight of the painted dog. Although a second look should come as much less of a shock, they have drunk a great deal in the interval between entrance and attempted exit, more than enough, surely, to outweigh any advantage from prior acquaintance.⁶ I prefer my second solution mostly because it seems wittier. Indeed, the picture of Encolpius and his companions bouncing their morsels of food off a wall-painting, under the impression that it is greedily snapping them up, is one I find irresistible.⁷ One final, though rather speculative, point might also be put in the scales on the side of the second interpretation. If, as now seems generally agreed, Petronius is parodying *Aeneid* VI, with the dog (or pair of dogs) standing in for Cerberus,⁸ then a false dream would be very much in order here. Of course, a drunken hallucination is not the same thing as a false dream, and they do not succeed in exiting by this gate in any case, which is why I call the point speculative.

Notes

- 1 J. Bodel, "Trimalchio's Underworld", in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore and London, 1994, 237-59, with further bibliography at 255 n. 24.
- 2 A recent example is N.W. Slater, who is rightly a bit tentative: "As the creations of Trimalchio's imagination grow more and more dominant, it is perhaps significant to see this watchdog [the one in 72.7-9] as the painted one first encountered now come alive", *Reading Petronius*, Baltimore and London, 1990, 77 n. 66.
- 3 E. Courtney, "Petronius and the Underworld", *AJP* 108, 1987, 408-10: "the chained dog which they had been warned about before". That there is a real watchdog in the house, in addition to the painted one, is clear from 64.7-10, where Scylax, *ingentis formae . . . canis catena uinctus and praesidium domus familiaeque*, is sent for and shown to the guests, with unfortunate results. We are not told how or when he leaves after attacking Margarita, or where he goes, but

it is plausible enough to suppose that he has been sent to his guardpost, to appear again in 72.7-9. That is certainly L. Friedlaender's assumption in his note on 72: "*canis catenarius*: der 64 vom ostiarius ins triclinium gebrachte" (*Petronii Cena Trimalchionis*, Leipzig, 1906²). If Friedlaender is right in identifying the dog which attacks the guests in 72.7-9 with Scylax, the only question is why he was not at his station in 29.1. If he was asleep down the hall somewhere, he is not much of a watchdog, and the whole point of the chain is to prevent him from leaving his post, except when sent for by his master.

- 4 Since the dog of 29.1 was painted right on the wall (*in pariete*), he is doubtless still there, but departing guests would hardly be likely to notice once they had seen and heard the real one. Consequently we need not assume that a tapestry has been hung over the picture or that Scylax is standing in front of it and concealing it, or anything along those lines.
- 5 Where is Scylax in 72.7-9? Wherever he was in 29.1, I suppose. If the dog in 72.7-9 is Scylax, we might except Encolpius to notice, unless all vicious dogs look the same to him.
- 6 Although it would be easy enough to count up the references to drinking in the intervening pages, it should suffice to point to *ebrius* in our chapter (*nec non ego quoque ebrius [qui etiam pictum timueram canem,] dum natanti opem fero, in eundem gurgitem tractus sum*, 72.7) and *ebrietate discussa* in the next (73.5). The two passages support each other, so Jahn's *exterritus* for *ebrius* (72.7) can be dismissed. (Müller's excision of the *qui*-clause, though abandoned in his third edition, with W. Ehlers, Artemis, 1983, seems necessary: it looks like an early and unsuccessful attempt to deal with the two-dog problem.)
- 7 The fact that it does not actually bite them would tend to make them believe that the tactic had worked. Since they were no doubt intending to live on their takings for a while, their voluntarily throwing all the precious leftovers away, although they are in no danger, is almost pathetic. The fact that the *atriensis*, who must surely know that the dog is painted, apparently helps rescue them from it, is not necessarily an objection, since we have only Encolpius' version of the events, and his might have been quite different.
- 8 Courtney's article (note 3 above) is probably the most important, while Bodel (note 1 above) gives the most up-to-date bibliography on the question.