Petroniana

Wade Richardson

PETRONIANA

WADE RICHARDSON

Jacobi Butricae ad Memoriam

THE TRANSMISSION

Of the more than three-score corrections to the text of the *Satyrica* here proposed, about half offer a new solution to difficulties treated by predecessors, from the first editors like Pithou, Scaliger and Scheffer, through Bücheler and contemporaries, notably Wehle, right down to active modern scholars such as Öberg. The entries under suspicion fall into recognized types of "indisputable error" within a text that is both damaged and corrected: omissions, inversions, confusions, dislocations, interpolations, mistakes of reading and punctuation (see e.g. Öberg 1999: x–xiii). The other half present solutions to freshly identified problem areas of similar character, and critics will be especially attentive to these claims of error as yet unperceived. The number of new readings here proposed may raise an eyebrow, and I fear the charge of unprofitable tampering. They are but the tiniest fraction of the thousands of changes from the manuscripts that have already gained favour. Martin S. Smith's Oxford *Cena* edition, well received and considered quite cautious, athetized thirty-five times and obelized ten times; and six of the rejected superfluities consist of phrases and even clauses of four to six words. The conservation-minded Öberg proposes around the same number of corrections as I, sixty-seven, to the *Cena* alone, and still no textual critic or translator could claim that few difficulties of sense remain that might benefit from textual healing.

The uncertainties relate in part to the work's damaged transmission. In summary, the *Satyrica* of today is an aggregation of lacuna-laced passages of varying lengths that form a progressive narrative. The whole, if it may so be termed, occurs close to the physical environment of the relatively well preserved section known as the *Cena Trimalchionis*, whose special features may have earmarked it for survival, carrying the ambient milieu along with it. Some reasonable manuscript evidence, accepted notably by Müller and van Thiel, suggests that the *Cena* occupied the fifteenth book of an original that went to a few books more. The inference is that the *Cena* and surrounds were contained upon a single papyrus roll that transmitted approximately books fourteen to

sixteen. This nucleus of our story, upon the single roll, survived into the early Carolingian era, and was therefore the archetype that could be reconstructed from the interrelations of the manuscript orders *L*, *O* and *H*, with each representing an excerpt taken from it in the ninth century. The physical state of the *Cena* is somewhat better than the rest, in that it has fewer significant lacunae and instances of dislocation. Furthermore, it conveys a somewhat fuller version of the archetype, as can be seen from a section of the archetype containing chapters 27 to 37, which happens to reside in both *L* and *H*. However, these advantages are off-set very manifestly by the severe copying problems evinced in our unique Renaissance manuscript constituting *H*. The many corruptions result, one surmises, from the combination of a difficult-to-read *Cena* archetype (which I would identify as the non-extant *Codex Coloniensis*; see *ad loc.*, c. 63.3, below), unfamiliar vocabulary and subject matter, and a hasty and untalented scribe who cared little for showing even elementary word divisions. For a recent assessment of the text's history see the maturest consideration of Müller 1995: iii–xxviii. The text lemmata in this article are taken from this edition. These are in most instances his preferred manuscript reading. Also Müller's are any brackets, asterisks or obeli. Where he favours a variant or emendation, the manuscript reading is shown in my brief apparatus. Combine Müller xlii–xlviii with the list of References to obtain the cited sources.

THE EMENDATIONS

The analytical work of Bücheler in the middle of the 1800s produced the most important advances in establishing something resembling the modern scholar's text, and it gave rise to a host of successful emendations. It also proposed a context and a rationale for so much corruption, not explicitly in a comprehensive theory, but at least by inference from an *apparatus* packed with Bücheler's hints and suggestions relating to corruption and solution. The ninth-century archetype, apart from inadvertent or inevitable defects, was larded with actual interventions by a well-meaning but not particularly gifted or scrupulous Carolingian copyist whose aim seems to have been simultaneously to recover, to correct and to explicate his text, notably by emending and interpolation. This is speculative.

It was surely from Bücheler's lead that, a century after his first edition, the team of Eduard Fraenkel and Konrad Müller developed, refined and enshrined the picture of an individual working to repair his remnant of the *Satyrica* and producing further corruption. This reasoning was set out, with many new examples of interpolation, in Müller's first edition (1961). The thorough reviews that followed, nota-

bly by Browning, Delz, Nelson and Nisbet, together with his own principled reservations, led Müller to conclude for his second edition (1965) that he and Fraenkel had gone too far in eliminating material. His recantation, though, should not be exaggerated: he maintains 70 percent of his deletions from the first edition and five new ones, with Fraenkel's contribution dropping to 56 percent. The existence of interpolations and their evaluation as an editing tool in Petronius is clearly established, and their affirmation may be seen in the work of J.P. Sullivan, Smith, Öberg and to some extent in all modern texts. In regard to The Interpolator, 1861 Wehle's "stupidus librarius," Müller's latest opinion (2003: xxvii) is that the whole theorizing question must be held in abeyance pending further study. Yet if the shared character of the corruptions is a worthy consideration, it would not be unreasonable to suspect the hand of a single individual behind them, working in response to the special exigencies of the surviving archetype in the only era that could account for their simultaneous importation into the tradition: a generation or so before the confirmed ninth-century date of our oldest manuscript of the *O* order, *B.*

In reviewing the present contribution I see that my suggestions are evenly divided between outright emendations, additions and deletions, with a few devoted to transposition and re-punctuation. Deletions are inevitably the most provocative, because they subtract from the text and raise the concern, as Nisbet put it, that "flakes of genuine paint … have come away in the cleaning." Also, they rest upon an individual scholar's claim to have discovered unacceptable stylistic or semantic redundancy or other compositional shortcoming unlikely to have been the responsibility of the author. Fortunately there is a way to hew to objectivity by invoking three conditions: when in the vicinity of the proposed deletion the same word exists in a better relation to the passage's sense; when the physical character of the text is conducive to certain types of scribal corruption, such as dittography, haplography and line skipping; and when better usage-parallels may be found from elsewhere in our text. The basic tool of editors, however, remains effrontery—their personal, trained sense of the sense—to guide their suspicions of failure and instincts for improvement.

Among the interpolations which are presumed to offer a short clarification or expansion of sense, one may tentatively perceive groupings that give some clue of their reason for existence. There are a few, for example, that appear to comment on the functioning of a "pederastic code" (cf. notably at 130.8). In other words, the basis for such an interpolation would be to assist comprehension, with a gloss, of a dynamic that may have fallen into obscurity in the copyist's era. Since the status of these particular words affects the soundness of modern efforts to

analyze and interpret, from the text, the sexuality in the *Satyrica* (a growth area), here is no better demonstration of the productive partnership of secure text and legitimate sense. A further grouping consists of conjunctions that appear manifestly too often and in incongruous positions, signifying a maladroit effort to "patch" the narrative flow. Thus the importance of this admittedly dull set of words is in their witness to a struggle to improve the sense and continuity of an entire paragraph that may be particularly damaged (cf. at 29. 3 *autem* and 81.1 *etiam*). All successful solutions naturally have the aim of contributing to enhanced translation and use of the passage in which they occur.

. . . .

4.2/3 eloquentiam, qua nihil esse maius confitentur, pueris induunt adhuc nascentibus. Quod si paterentur laborum gradus fieri, ut studiosi iuvenes lectione severa irrigarentur,

ut studiosi [iuvenes] *lego*

The focus of this passage is on correcting the education of *pueri* before bad habits set in, and on the need to inculcate good habits of study and imitation early on in young boys; and the paragraph continues with reference only to young boys at this critical formative juncture, on the understanding that *nihil esse magnificum quod pueris placeret* (4.3). Then at 4.4 *pueri in scholis* are contrasted expressly with their outgrowth, *iuvenes … in foro*, youths who later, after their improper schooling, try out their speaking in the forum. It appears that *iuvenes*, which is not attested in *OLD* as a substantive for young children, has entered prematurely from the later context into the passage here, where it is neither indicated nor appropriate.

10.6 cras autem, quia hoc libet, et habitationem mihi prospiciam et aliquem fratrem.

aliquem: alium "*scripsi*" Bücheler

As Bücheler indicated, whereas the trio of Encolpius, Ascyltus and Giton have been (uncomfortably) sharing lodgings for some time (6.3; cf. 8.2), a small alteration here would better convey Ascyltus's point about now seeking a separate place to stay and another boyfriend. Presumably, if *alium* be acceptable, its sense is to be carried back to the first noun also. Yet it is semantically more logical to enter *aliam* sooner and carry its sense forward: *et <aliam> habitationem mihi prospiciam*

et [aliquem] fratrem.

11.3 opertum me amiculo evolvit et "Quid agebas," inquit, "frater sanctissime? Quid? †Verti†contubernium facis?"

vesticontubernium Turnebus: <sub> veste contubernium Fuchs: verticontu-
bernium

The soldier's cloak, *sagum*, served as a blanket on campaign, but was also a handy privacy screen for sexual activity and a familiar symbol in the pederastic ethos. Here *amiculum* (pun?) does duty. Turnebus' emendation thus seems secure (for other examples of "parasynthetic co-valent compound" nouns in Petronius see Swanson 1963: 83–84; e.g. 56.8 *serisapia*, 75.6 *fulcipedia*). Encolpius is recognized as enacting a trite role with a hackneyed prop, and is fair game for the sarcasm of Ascyltus, which becomes more pointed thus: *frater sanctissime, qui vesticontubernium facis?* Boy-scouting, is it? This structure Petronius finds useful: 10.3 *turpior es tu, hercule, qui ut foris cenares poetam laudasti*, and 134.9 *qualem putas esse, qui de Circes toro sine voluptate surrexit?*

15.2 advocati tamen [iam pene] nocturni, qui volebant pallium lucri facere,

del. Fuchs: iam poenae *olim* Bücheler: iam plane Giardina: iam bene Scioppius: iam p(a)ene Pithoeus: importune Nisbet | nocturni *"potius corruptum"* Bücheler

The ms. reading defies accurate translation (as efforts show; Branham-Kinney and Walsh simply gloss over the detail or delete with Fuchs), and Giardina's suggestion does not really help. What *nocturni* accomplishes is unclear. The proposed change, *advocati tamen iam plani [nocturni]*, renders: "but now mediators, crooks in reality (*iam*) intent on reaping a windfall from the cloak …" For *planus* and *nocturnus* together, possibly prompting the gloss, cf. 82.2 *miles, sive ille planus fuit sive nocturnus grassator.*

19.4 Tres enim erant mulierculae, si quid vellent conari, infirmissimae scilicet; contra nos, si nihil aliud, virilis sexus. Sed et praecincti certe altius eramus.

scilicet; contra *distinxit* Fraenkel | nos, <quibus> Dousa | sexus. Sed et Pithoeus: sexus esset. Et

This tricky and amusing passage has been resolved over the centuries in various ways. A further possibility is to delete *esset*, making neater

sense than most by recognition of the descriptive genitive as a not inelegant zeugma initial predicate of the following *eramus*: *contra nos, si nihil aliud, virilis sexus [esset] et praecincti certe altius eramus*: "while we at least were of the male sex and definitely more suitably dressed." For the construction cf. Caesar *BG* 2.15.5 *Nervios esse homines feros magnaeque virtutis*.

21.2 Ultimo cinaedus supervenit myrtea subornatus gausapa cinguloque succinctus … modo extortis nos clunibus cecidit

lac. ind. Bücheler

Balance in the description requires that the colour of the cummerbund or sash be supplied, and *cinguloque <cerasino> succinctus* may be a good choice (cf. 28.8 *ostiarius prasinatus, cerasino succinctus cingulo*), though *cinguloque succinctus <cerasino>* would also work. Cherry-and-green is an attested combination, the house livery, perhaps; cf. Smith on 27.1: "there is a notable frequency of red and green in the description of Trimalchio and his surroundings." Bücheler, without supplying a suggestion, suspected that a colour had dropped out, but appears to believe additional material to be missing after *succinctus* ("hiat constructio orationis"). *Galbino*, the colour of Fortunata's sash at 67.4, is another possibility, but while Fortunata therewith also conforms to the "house colours" (greenish sash and cherry-red petticoat), a dark-green, light-green combination here at 21.2 for the cinaedus, despite common associations of effeminacy, is neither regulation crimson and clover nor sufficiently striking.

23.3.4 Femore <o> facili, clune agili [et] manu procaces, Molles, veteres, Deliaci manu recisi.

manu *alterum corruptum opinor*

One suspects that second *manu* has encroached from the previous line, where it occurs in the same line-position but in a totally different sense. The repetition makes for poor poetry and a weak conclusion. For other usages in Petronius of cutting plus instrument, cf. fr. 51.12 *falce recisa Ceres*. More appropriate here too would be some instrument; and for genital cutting see fr. 47. 3 *ferro succiderit inguinis oram*. Cf. also 89.1.4 *[ferro] caesi vertices*, where the *O*-class reading is deleted by editors, though presently *ferro* cannot be supported for metrical reasons.

24.3 "per fidem," inquam, "[nostram] Ascyltus in hoc triclinio solus ferias agit?"

nostram: vostram (i.e. *vestram*) Dousa: *del.* Bücheler

Bücheler rightly suspected a gloss, since a qualifying possessive pronoun is not indicated. Cf. two good *per fidem* parallels, also from an emotional Encolpius, at 93.3 and 98.3. However, transposition and not outright deletion seems contextually indicated, in the familiar (here ironic) usage with the proper name: *"Per fidem," inquam, "[nostram], Ascyltus <noster> in hoc triclinio solus ferias agit?"* Cf. at 25.1 *cur non … devirginatur Pannychis nostra?*

24.6 "quare ergo," inquit, "me non basiavit?" Vocatumque ad se in osculum applicuit.

There is awkwardness in the text that needs attention. *Applico* would appear to require the reflexive object, as also Quartilla at 25.4 *maioribus me pueris applicui*; and at 67.5 *applicat se illi toro*. It is effectively repaired as *vocatique [ad se] in osculum <se> applicuit.* The phrase *vocati in osculum* I would therefore argue to be a humorous mild legal echo of *vocare in ius, vocare in iudicium, vocare in discrimen* (*OLD* s.v. 4.c): *osculum* therefore as a form of *supplicium.* The error is explained by the accusative context of *me* and the influence of *osculum.*

27.3 non quidem eas quae inter manus lusu expellente vibrabant,

lusu H: luxu L: *del.* Smith | expellentes Asztalos *in* Öberg

Difficulty with the sense was noted by Smith, but his deletion still leaves the cryptic oddity of *expellente.* Friedlaender struggles to defend the phrase with not very apposite citations on the evident property of bounce in ancient balls (a rare commodity, no doubt, in the absence of rubber). Müller retains, and Ehlers alongside translates "die im Prellspiel von Hand zu Hand flogen." This is still a stretch, and I would delete and emend to *[lusu] expellentium.* The number of catches as the ball made the round of the players was—unexpectedly—not counted, but rather the times it touched the ground after ejection. *Expellentium* emphasizes the chain of catch and discharge. *Expellentes* is almost satisfactory, but the difficulty with *lusu* remains. The corruption has some haplographic basis in the consequent *vibrabant*: *inter manus expellentium vibrabant.*

29.3 Erat autem venalicium <cum> titulis pictum,

add. Burmannus

Autem here requires the sense of *enim*, more as a convention of style

than semantics. Cf. 42.2 *fui enim.* It was in the previous sentence in the sense of mild contrast: *et collegae quidem mei riserunt, ego autem … non destiti ….* And it occurred twice just prior to that, at 28.8 and 28.9, in the sense of "moreover." This stylistically excessive incidence of *autem*, especially in the last sense, where the context would seem to rule it out, is suspicious. Cf. at 81.1 for similarly excessive uses of *etiam.* For a similar cadence cf. 30.3 *<erant> et duae tabulae.* I believe I should see *Erat enim venalicium* in preference to outright deletion.

34.4 Subinde intraverunt duo Aethiopes capillati cum pusillis utribus, quales solent esse <eorum> qui harenam in amphitheatro spargunt,

esse: habere Braswell | *suppl.* Müller

The Latin is seen by many as suspect, and adjustments have been proposed that would generally convert the subject in the relative *qui*-clause from instrument to agent (to have people as opposed to skins spattering the sand). *Esse eis qui* would be an alternative to Müller's, though such a spelling for the dative and ablative is rare in Petronius.

35. 4 super scorpionem … [pisciculum marinum],

lac. ind. Gaselee: *del.* Smith | super scorpionem <locustam> [pisciculum] marinam Gaselee | marinum *del.* Jacobs | super scorpionem pisciculum <illum> marinum Öberg

The text is flat and the rebus seems to deserve better. Öberg's recent attempt is creditable. Another possibility is neatly secured in Pliny *Nat.* 1.32, 9.162, 32.151, by the presence of the *scorpio marinus*, the common venomous-spined Mediterranean scorpion-fish, or sea-weever (genus *Trachinus*), or perhaps the sculpin. Thus *super scorpionem <scorpionem> [pisciculum] marinum.*

40.1 iuramus Hipparchum Aratumque comparandos illi homines non fuisse,

homini Heinsius | comparatos illi, homines Rohde

A problem is indicated by *homines.* Perhaps delete as a glossator's reminder that Trimalchio's competition was at least mortal.

40.4 Circa autem minores porcelli ex coptoplacentis facti,

The emphasis on the piglets (or perhaps petite grown pigs) as smaller seems particularly uncalled-for. And Swanson (1963: 88) notes that only here does Petronius use an adjective of smallness to modify a diminu-

tive (though this occurs, principally with *parvus*, in Martial). But the comparative is less defensible, and *minores* should rather be taken as a leaden and reflexive glossator's reminder on the smaller size (compared to 40.3 *primae magnitudinis aper*) of the surrounding sucklings.

43.6–7 Tamen verum quod frunitus est, quam diu vixit. †Cui datum est, non cui destinatum.

quod sua *vel* quod vitam *vulgo* | <nec improbo, habet enim> cui *miratur* Bücheler | Cui <datum est>, datum est Muncker

There is actually a plausible Petronian way out of the first puzzle, suggested by 75.3 *"Habinna, sic peculium tuum fruniscaris."* Render *quod <suum> frunitus est, quam diu vixit*. Final sense may be provided concisely by *<Est> cui datum [est], non cui destinatum*: "It's what you obtain that counts, not what you're owed."

46.5 etiam si magister eius sibi placens fit nec uno loco consistit. Scit quidem litteras, sed non vult laborare.

fit Bücheler: sit | Scit quidem Blümner: sed venit dem | venit <abit. Scit qui>dem Wehle

There have been several efforts to repair this seeming truncation, though even *dem* of the ms. reading has been defended as a subjunctive. Mine is a simplification of Wehle, with an advantage in paleography: haplography: *nec uno loco constitit, sed venit, <it. Scit qui>dem litteras.* I believe the sense of *consistit* is largely literal: this *magister* will not settle into doing the time and work (*non vult laborare*).

52.6/7 Ille dimissus circa mensam percucurrit … et "aquam foras, vinum intro," clamavit.

lac. ind. Bücheler

Bücheler implies a lacuna of a fair size, in which there is a bathroom visit, followed by the change of subject for the witticism. The lacuna may, however, be as brief as a small insertion and deletion combination: *Ille dimissus circa mensam percucurrit <Trimalchionis qui> [et] "aquam foras, vinum intro," clamavit.* This antecedent/relative is common (cf. at 31.8 *Trimalchionem, cui*); note at 40.2 another instance of running around a single table; and the *aquam* could refer not to Trimalchio's toilet but to the spilled contents of the *calix* at 52.4 (though the guests never got water for handwashing; 34.5). The *calix* is simple, dispensible ware; cf. 75.10 *calicem in faciem Fortunatae immisit*; and 74.5 *calicesque circa fictiles* (in contrast with *vinum … sacco defluens*).

54.1 Cum maxime haec dicente eo puer … Trimalchionis delapsus est.

eo Müller: Gaio | *lac. susp.* Scheffer; baronis in bracchium *suppl.* Öberg |
Trimalchionis: in bracchium eius Wehle

Far preferable is simply to delete: *puer [Trimalchionis] delapsus est.*
The account is beautifully paced by the narrator: the boy is introduced
at 53.1 and his routine described; attention is diverted by a typical
Trimalchionian aside on the spectacle; the boy falls; the guests cry out at
the unsavoury omen. Any expression of ownership or indication of di-
rection at this point robs the narrative of the surprise in store:
Trimalchio lets out a groan and nurses his arm (54.2): he is hit.

62.9 Gladium tamen et †matauitatau† umbras cecidi

ma tan Hekatan Heraeus: mataiotatos Kelly

There have been various adjustments of the ghost word, either emend-
ing as an expletive or bringing into line with acceptable onomatopoeia
to present the thwack of the sword-swipes. Following Kelly, I am sup-
porting the regular Greek superlative, though preferring the translit-
erated adverb form *mataiotata[u]* for being both grammatical and plau-
sible on paleographic grounds: the *u* from following *umbras* has been
assumed. Swanson 1963: 212 cites the use of five other Greek exclama-
tory adverbs: *sophos, pax, io, en, deurode.* Translate "all too uselessly."

62.11 lupus enim villam intravit et omnia pecora … : tamquam lanius
sanguinem illis misit.

omnia pecora: o mea pecora *Iac.* Gronovius | *lac. ind.* Bücheler, lancinavit
cogitans; laceravit *suppl.* Heraeus; *anacoluthon statuit* Hofmann

Melissa was badly shaken but perhaps not at a loss for words. Further
possibilities include *laniavit*, an apt word for the work of a wild beast;
for the *figura etymologica* cf. Suet. fr. 176 *laniat lanius cum membratim
discerpit*; and *necavit*, with a certain paleographic justification (haplo-
graphy: *pec..a* and *neca-*), but less suitable for describing a graphic
killing.

62.14 Viderint alii quid de hoc exopinissent;

alii quid de hoc Bücheler: quid de hoc alii Heinsius: viderint qui hoc de alibi H

Some small change from the ms. is needed, and surely *viderint qui de
hoc aliter* must be counted as a good possibility, for closeness and sense:

people who have a *different* explanation (of the soldier's neck wound) had better watch out.

63.3 ipsimi nostri delicatus decessit, mehercules margaritum, catamitus et omnium numerum

ipsimi nostri Scheffer: ipim mostri | catamitus Jacobs: caccitus H

The first of two difficulties treated here is a special case, in that Jacobs appears to have recovered by correction a gloss in an earlier exemplar of H that was misread and corrupted by the Renaissance scribe of the *codex Traguriensis* (H), created in 1423. The non-extant exemplar is thought to be the *codex Coloniensis*, discovered in Germany in 1420, apparently an old ms., possibly Carolingian, that was difficult to read— or so one judges from the famous plethora of copying errors in H. I should therefore urge the deletion of *catamitus*, not the nonsensical *caccitus*, as the medieval gloss on the term of endearment *margaritum.* Secondly, I am not comfortable with *numerum* (though others are), in the face of 68.8 *esset omnium nummorum* (the reading of H, usually emended to *numerum*). With the deletion of *caccitus* the phrase has a good, colloquial balance: *mehercules margaritum et omnium nummorum*—God he was a pearl beyond price!

67.10 Mulieres si non essent, omnia pro luto haberemus; nunc hoc est caldum meiere et frigidum potare.

It is not altogether clear how this proverb of vain urination, which endures in various guises today, can be a summation of Habinnas's good-natured "without women everything would be cheap as dirt" rant, but one sense would be more logical with inversion: *frigidum potare et caldum meiere.* This is thus one of those proverbs denoting the expenditure of laborious, futile effort—drink it in cold and piss it out (i.e., warm it up only to get rid of it) hot.

68.8 Nam quod strabonus est, non curo: sicut Venus spectat. Ideo nihil tacet, vix oculo mortuo umquam.

nihil latet Delz: mihi placet Heinsius

Another piece of obscure folk wisdom from Habinnas leaves the application unclear. Surely the boy's attractive squint cannot be summed up (*ideo*) by the present reading—a non-sequitur to finish off the sentence. On the other hand, a proposed *iacet* continues the visual metaphor well and can be reconciled with *vix oculo mortuo* (hyperactive, eyes never

shut). Perhaps the scribe's own eye was caught by 69.3 *ideo … tace*, just a few lines further down. In regard to syntax and sense, if *nihil tacet* can mean "he's never quiet" (Walsh), I see little difficulty in translating *nihil iacet* as "he never lies down" or "he never sits still." For this indeclinable noun in adverbial force see *OLD* s.v 11, citing Plautus *Mil.* 625 *nihil amas.* Cf. also the following entry, *nihil sibi defraudat.*

69.2 "adcognosco," inquit, "Cappadocem: nihil sibi defraudat, et mehercules laudo illum;"

Adcognosco (or *accognosco*), though deemed an acceptable vulgarism by Heraeus 1899: 48, is very rare, and occurs nowhere else in Petronius. *Agnosco* is the normal and frequent form; cf. at 7.3 *cum ego negarem me agnoscere domum.* The double prepositional prefix may be due to the incorporation into *H* of an *ad* superscript offered as a correction to the *cog-* of *cognosco* in the exemplar.

69.7 Insecuta sunt Cydonia etiam mala spinis infixa, ut echinos efficerent.

effingerent Heinsius

Two problems: the quinces themselves, presumably even Cretan ones, are not unusual; it is their arrival with thorns embedded in them that startles. Thus a transposition to *mala etiam spinis infixa* is indicated. And in this elegant narrative by Encolpius *efficerent* is suspect. It is not that the thorns produce sea-urchins; they suggest or represent them. Thus *effingerent* is to be preferred, with Heinsius. The text corruption is readily attributable to *effecisset*, a mere line beneath, in the accurate "producing" sense: 69.7 *ferculum longe monstrosius effecisset ut vel fame perire mallemus.* Cf. 4.5 *quod sentio et ipse carmine effingam.* I submit the basis for change as part of a proposal I had made independently.

70.6 Consternati nos insolentia ebriorum intentavimus oculos

ebriorum: servorum *aliquis in* Bücheler, *quem refutat*

Here is another oddity of logic, since it is not the slaves' insubordination of being drunk that upsets the guests, but their ignoring of their master and smashing of an amphora. One prospect is to replace *ebriorum* as a gloss that drove out the underlying *servorum*, a solution rejected by Bücheler on the rather arch ground that *ebriorum* is ironical in view of the guests' drunkenness, and therefore appropriate. An alternative

solution favoured here is to delete the phrase *insolentia ebriorum*; cf. 60.2 *consternatus ego exsurrexi et timui, ne…* (no reason provided). The slaves' disobedience and violence startle and upset the guests. That they are fueled by drink seems irrelevant and beside the point. Thus the phrase smacks of a miscued explanatory gloss. *Insolentia* is, according to Encolpius, a characteristic of Trimalchio (50.3 *pro reliqua insolentia*).

73.2 balneum intravimus, angustum scilicet et cisternae frigidariae simile, in quo Trimalchio rectus stabat.

angustum scilicet et *del.* George: angustum … simile *del.* Sullivan | in quo Bücheler: in qua H

Modern objections register discomfort with the picture of a hot tub the size of a cold water reservoir; or else, if the *balneum* is understood as the entire indoor area, the comparison is even less workable. The text is made to stand as Encolpian sarcasm, but there is something about the use of *simile*, with its explanatory resonance, that to me suggests a gloss by someone who either never knew the ancient proportions or ratios, or mistakes the meaning of *balneum*; thus retain *angustum scilicet*, indeed as irony, but delete *et cisternae frigidariae simile*, which provides intrusive, misdirected data.

79.4 notabili candore ostenderunt errantibus viam.

Errantibus was used, with perfect application, just above: 79.1 *quae iter aperiret errantibus.* Here it does not seem right for immediate repetition, inelegance apart, now that the main problem has been eliminated by chalk blazes on the columns. Cf. also 79.4 *cum … timeret errorem.* It is a candidate for deletion as an imported, echoic gloss.

79.6 ni tabellarius Trimalchionis intervenisset * †vehiculis dives†.

Trimalchionis *del.* Delz | intervenisset Fr. Daniel: invenisset | ex vehiculo divus Watt: * vehiculis dives t: x vehiculis dives lp | dives] "*latetne* rediens?" Müller

The emendation to *ex* is well justified by the manuscripts, and the meaning of the *deus ex machina* seems established, but one wonders if the minor insertion of *<quasi> ex vehiculo divus* is needed to convert metaphor to simile. Granted that there is figurative language in our author, with links to proverbs and vulgar Latin, that does not have the qualifier: cf. 57.8 *immo lorus in aqua*; yet *quasi* is used in addition very commonly in Petronius (17x), as perhaps here in the narrative of Encolpius, to comment ironically on a representation of reality by a

substitute; cf. two apposite examples in this notion of "unreal" or impossible comparison: 1.3 *omnia dicta factaque quasi papavere et sesamo sparsa*, and 2.8 *omnia quasi eodem cibo pasta.* Here too, in this supernatural evocation, *quasi* (or *velut*) is indicated to draw full attention to a clever and self-conscious metaphoric image.

79.7 stabuli ianuam effregit et nos †per eandem terram† admisit.

per eam tandem Gurlitt: per eandem tramisit Watt, *non probante* Müller

Because of the choice of preposition (*per*), one has interest in *immisit.* Forms of *admitto* exist elsewhere, notably with different complements: 19.2 *vetui hodie in hoc deversorio quemquam mortalium admitti*, and 51.2 *admissus ergo Caesarem.* But cf. 72.10 *per eandem ianuam emissus*, which I believe strengthens the case for *immisit* by its proximate use in precisely the same semantic context and construction. Thus (*pace* Müller): *stabuli ianuam effregit et nos per eandem [terram] immisit.*

80.8 Egreditur superbus cum praemio Ascyltos

Egreditur <ergo> superbus would be indicated, after a verb of "motion," as often, to sum things up and smoothe the change of subject from Encolpius to Ascyltus. Cf. at 67.4 *Venit ergo galbina succincta cingillo.* Here there is a paleographic basis for its disappearance: haplography.

81.1 Nec diu tamen lacrimis indulsi, sed veritus ne Menelaus etiam antescholanus inter cetera mala solum me in deversorio inveniret,

No less than four occurrences of *etiam* in the first part of 81 signify that it is one of those chapters where light repairs to the manuscript account have been attempted, yielding an uncertain relation of grammar to sense (cf. at 29.3 *autem*). The postponement of *etiam* to its manuscript position imports conflicting emphases; whereas it accentuates *veritus* and answers *tamen* better thus: *veritus <etiam> ne Menelaus [etiam]*: "still fearing" (i.e., though he might reasonably be considered safe in his room; OLD s.v. 1: "still, yet, even now"). Encolpius concedes his lingering fear of being the only one to be found, to receive the full brunt of any chiding by Menelaos for skipping out on the dinner party, since he is apparently traceable (location known to the *tabellarius*, 79.6–7).

83.5 et omnes fabulae quoque habuerunt sine aemulo complexus.

et *et* fabulae quoque *del.* Fraenkel | quoque] quondam *"fortasse"* Müller, *qui "nondum sanatus" declarat*

The awkwardness might be eliminated by printing *[et] omnes fabulae quoque <modo> habuerunt sine aemulo complexus*: "All these stories contained in some manner [i.e., in common, though in different permutations] love with the field clear." This necessitates taking *quoque* not as a conjunction but as ablative of the distributive pronominal adjective in the transferred attested post-classical sense of *quocumque*; see L. & S. II; cf. the use of *cuiusque modi*, "of every kind," *OLD* s.v. 7.

87.1 rogare coepi ephebum ut reverteretur in gratiam mecum, id est ut pateretur satis fieri sibi,

id … sibi *del.* Haley

Some special insertions in our text occur in the homoerotic environment and appear addressed to explaining or underscoring an aspect of the pederastic code that to our minds (and presumably to those of the author's original audience) need no explaining. While Haley's full interpolation is plausible along these lines, I should like to confine the intervention to *[id est ut] <et>* for having the ability to retain sense and point, with the bonus of a *double entendre*: "I set to asking the lad to be friends with me again, and to allow me the chance to make it up to him." Cf. entries at 91.3 and 130.8 for the pederastic code. For the cadence of the construction cf. at 49.5 *cum constitisset ad mensam cocus tristis et diceret se oblitum esse exinterare.*

87.8 Et non plane iam molestum erat munus.

[non] paene *"fortasse"* Müller

In prospect is intercourse for the third time that evening, and Müller's intervention signals a growing doubt in Eumolpus at his own resolve or capacity. Yet I am not in favour of disrupting a sense of the inherent agreeability of the duties, thus would retain *plane*, in transposed position for better pacing: *Et plane iam non molestum erat munus*: "Well, to be sure, even now this was no disagreeable task." Cf. 53.1 *Et plane interpellavit*, and compare with other uses of the postpositive negation: 35.3 *plane non pro expectatione*; 63.6 *et plane non mentiar.*

88.1 Erectus his sermonibus consulere prudentiorem coepi … aetates tabularum et quaedam argumenta mihi obscura simulque causam desidiae praesentis excutere,

coepi <et interrogare> aetates *proposuit in lacuna dubitanter* Bücheler

The sentence as it stands is ungrammatical, and a less radical solution than Bücheler's is to read *aetates<que>*: "I commenced to take counsel from a wiser head and to interrogate [*OLD excutere* 9] him on the dates of the paintings and certain themes that were unclear to me, plus the reason for the present stagnation."

88.7 Ubi sapientiae †consultissima† via?

sapientiae Tornaesius *in margine*: sapientia cultissima R: inlustrissima *"fortasse"* Müller

The ms. reading of *consultissima* has detractors with alternatives, but it is a good word found in Gellius and Fronto for "highly prudent" and "most well-advised," perhaps more palatable with a proposed insertion (error through haplography): *Ubi sapientia consultissima <vitae> via?* Cf. 84.1 *rectum iter vitae coepit insistere.*

90.1 *ex is, qui in porticibus spatiabantur, lapides in Eumolpum recitantem miserunt.

Our sources for *L* (the passage is not in *O*) posit the lacuna. If the gap (following the Sack of Troy) is very small, as it could be, *quidam ex is* would be a good bet. Cf. 7.3 *video quosdam inter titulos nudasque meretrices furtim spatiantes* (an interesting coincidence though not probative).

91.3 Supprimere ego querellam iubeo, ne quis consilia deprehenderet, relictoque Eumolpo

What plans would these be? At this point the lovers are not planning flight. I believe *convicia* would fit the context far better, since the protagonists frequently show concern for the confidentiality of their pederastic relationship that a typical lover's fight would expose: a common theme in their gossip-obsessed culture. Cf. 10.3 *ex turpissima lite* and 10.5 *mille causae nos quotidie collident et per totam urbem rumoribus different*; and 129.2 *Veritus puer, ne in secreto deprehensus daret sermonibus locum.*

91.7 Postquam se amari sensit, supercilium altius sustulit

The sense in context seems to be "still loved" (despite betrayal of a long-standing relationship, 80.6); thus Ehlers: "noch immer geliebt," Walsh: "retained my affection," rather than "actually loved." In which case surely this would be more accurately represented by *se <adhuc> amari*

sensit. Cf. 141.3 *scimus adhuc legem servari.* There is a slight haplographic basis.

91.9 Exosculatus pectus sapientia plenum inieci cervicibus manus, et ut facile intellegeret redisse me in gratiam et optima fide reviviscentem amicitiam, toto pectore adstrinxi.

I propose *<eum> toto corpore adstrinxi.* First, we are getting rather far from an object, and this one is indicated by the sense; second, the phrase *toto pectore,* though unexceptionable when the noun is used metonymically in the sense of *cor, animus, sensus, affectus, amor* (e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 9.276 *Te vero, venerande puer, iam pectore toto Accipio*—"wholeheartedly"; cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.3.66 *pectora iuncta*—"hearts knit") is ruled out by the anatomical sense required from the graphic *adstrinxi.* Though the phrase escaped suspicion by its plausibility, a closer appraisal reveals an inept, not to say impossible, physical picture. *Pectore* has assuredly crept in from the line above, *pectus sapientia plenum,* with help from nearby 91.6 *in hoc pectore. Toto corpore* is required, as often in Petronius, for the full lover's press; cf. 86.3 *totoque corpore citra summam voluptatem me ingurgitavi*; and 131.11 *Totoque corpore in amplexum eius immissus.* Thus here too we should render, "I attached myself to him with my entire body." *Pectus* is unattested as a physical synonym for *corpus.*

92.2 Deinde ut solum hospitem vidi, momento recepi.
deinde Scaliger: demum

The manuscript sources ask us to accept the absence of an object for *recepi,* and it gives me trouble; re-supplying *solum hospitem*? The insertion *< Eumolpon> momento* is appropriate. We might link its omission to an ample supply in this little sentence of words with shared letters, especially *momento* (haplography). I would accept *demum* (with Bücheler), the attested reading of the *L* sources (*O* is absent), though some demur, thinking initial position to be impossible; but cf. Plaut. *Merc.* 3.2.9 *demum igitur cum senex is, tum ....* What we have here is a quite elegant style-transposition from Encolpius to avoid commencing the sentence with *ut,* with the usual enclitic rhythm retained in the background. I see little wrong in reading *demum ut* (= *ut demum*) to mean "when and only when." See *OLD* s.v. 1: "at the stated time and not before"—the rather stronger and more pointed reflection of Encolpius's caution, and of his expectation that the intimidating Ascyltus might accompany Giton (when last seen, they had departed together at 80.8).

92.7 Ex altera parte iuvenis nudus, qui vestimenta perdiderat, non minore clamoris indignatione Gitona flagitabat.

Clamoris is a good candidate for deletion as a gloss borrowed from just above, 92.7 *clamitare*, since the expression is quite doubtful—defining genitive? For a similar setting of repeated indignation without characterization cf. 100.4 *eadem indignatione mulier lacerata ulterius excanduit.*

93.3 totam concitabit viciniam, et nos omnes sub eadem causa obruet.

The phrase *sub eadem causa* seems unexpected. "On the same accusation"? Possibly read *sub eodem casu*, which goes better with *obruet*. Cf. 87.1 *cum similis nos casus in eandem fortunam rettulisset.*

94.14 Rudis enim novacula et in hoc retusa, ut pueris discentibus audaciam tonsoris daret, instruxerat thecam.

tonsoris *del.* Fraenkel

I read *novacula <erat>* (haplography) and delete *instruxerat thecam.* First, the author's style and ear for rhythm support the inclusion of the verb. For a reason for it to slip out see two lines above, *neque Giton ulla erat suspicione vulneris laesus.* Relatedly, the absence of the verb forces *novacula* to be the subject of *instruxerat*, for the clause to mean something like, "For the practice razor was still in its sheath." This is difficult Latin and a bad image in context, since it weakens the realism of Giton's gesture and makes the restraint of the servant and Eumolpus too obvious. This was a purposely blunted practice razor which did not require a protective sheath to ensure safety. Furthermore, if it were in its sheath such a description would be irrelevant—a point seemingly lost on the interpolator. The inclusion of *erat* and deletion of the offending words as an inappropriate gloss make for the concision and pacing we expect from Encolpius's story-telling.

97.4 ac sic ut olim Ulixes †pro† arieti adhaesisset, extentus infra grabatum scrutantium eluderet manus.

pro] Cyclopis Bücheler | arieti Bücheler: ariete

Earlier interpolation hunters such as Fraenkel had a field day with this passage, which certainly seems to contain some corruption consequent on Encolpius's elaborate imagery, especially as *pro* is unlikely in any

way to describe Odysseus's position, hanging upside-down and gripping the belly-fleece of the lead ram (*Od.* 9.425–430). Bücheler initially posited a short lacuna and emendatation, *pro … arieti adhaesisset*, with various suggestions for the filler. My preference is to read *Ulixes Polyphemi arieti adhaesisset.* The error may have commenced with the *po…* and *pro* resemblance. Cf. 101.7 *antrum Cyclopis*, a citation which may later have inspired Bücheler (*in adn.*) here.

100.6 ut subter constratum navis occuparemus secretissimum locum,

subter Müller: super | super constratum *del.* Fraenkel: super constratum navis *del.* Müller *in prima*

The change to *subter* seems secure as necessary to the context, and *constratum* can hereby be preserved. I should like, however, to remove *navis* as both unnecessary and encumbering: in the fifteen other uses of forms of *navis* the descriptive is important to the sense (see e.g. 110.1 *cum ancilla Tryphaenae Gitonem in partem navis inferiorem ducit*); not here. The plausibility of the phrase is perhaps due to proximate 100.3 *super constratum puppis.*

101.2 comprehendi Eumolpi genua

I read *comprehendi <ego> Eumolpi genua.* The modesty of this change should not prejudice its correctness, since Encolpius's rhetorical sense and style are improved by it. The graphic narrative switches from subject Giton swooning on top of him, to his sweat reviving both, to his own action here as subject. It is a favourite story-telling cadence; see, among many examples, 25.3 *obstupui ego* and 90.2 *timui ego.*

101.7 Quaerendum est aliquod effugium, nisi naufragium †ponimus† et omni nos periculo liberamus.

optamus Müller

"We've got to find some way out, unless we cause a shipwreck and put an end to all our worries!" With Müller I am uncomfortable with the Latin of *naufragium ponimus*, and prefer *imponimus* in an overlapping sense: the shipwreck is to be arranged prejudicially ("inflicted," *OLD* s.v. 5); and it is to be caused by deception (cf. 81.3 *imposui harenae* and 102.13 *permutato colore imponemus inimicis*, "cheat," "put one over"; *OLD* s.v. 16). The paleography is plausible: …*-ium <im>…*

102.14 tamquam hic solus color figuram possit pervertere et non multa una oporteat consentiant, ut omni ratione mendacium constet.

oporteat Heinsius: oportet | ut omni Crusius: et non | ratione Pithoeus: natione

Giton in full sarcastic flow has produced many adjustments over the centuries. *Pervertere* to me seems strong ("distort," "falsify," rather than *convertere*, "change," as at 102.15), but simplest is to accept Müller's text up to *consentiant*, then print *[et non] nationi <ut> mendacium constet*. The deletion and insertion are Bücheler's, the small adjustment to *nationi* mine (dative with *consentiant*, a Silver usage): … *et non multa una oporteat consentiant nationi, ut mendacium constet*: "as if there shouldn't be plenty else to harmonize with a people [such as the mentioned Ethiopians, Jews, Arabs, Gauls—all *nationes*] for the deception to hold up."

103.6 silentioque compositi reliquas noctis horas male soporati consumpsimus.

compositi *"nescioquis"* Bücheler: composito

Since Bücheler the ms. reading has been avoided, and the anonymous emendation looks sound (see below), but the thought is not yet quite complete. I propose an insertion: *silentioque lecto compositi*: "settling down on our beds in silence." Cf. fr. 48.1 *lecto compositus vix prima silentia noctis / carpebam*. The zeugmatic double-ablative in separate functions ("manner" and "place") seems striking but possible.

109.7 Ecce etiam per antemnam pelagiae consederant volucres, quas textis harundinibus peritus artifex tetigit;

textis] structis Butrica | artifex] auceps Butrica

There is a question over redundancy in either *peritus* or *artifex*. English might tolerate "a craftsman skilled in his trade," but in the Latin it seems more obtrusive despite the narrator's expansive mood. Butrica's *structis* has the merit of better sense and a Propertian parallel (2.19.24 *structo* [*stricto* mss.] … *calamo*)—i.e. the reeds are assembled and not woven; and *textis* might have replaced it from a look along the line to *tetigit*. *Auceps* also is strengthened by sense and the parallel at 40.6 *Parati aucupes cum harundinibus fuerunt*. It would of course end the need for a deletion.

114.2 †Siciliam modo ventus dabat†, saepissime [in oram] Italici litoris aquilo possessor convertebat huc illuc obnoxiam ratem.

ventus <Africi> *"exspectabam"* Müller | in oram t: *del.* lrp

Various measures have been tried to make sense of this sailing arcanum and consequent disruption. In my version below I offer some admittedly fussy surgery: an initial *nam* to lead off this elaborate explanation, then a *Siciliam* corrupted through dittography; *dabat* is specious, but the intransitive sense is not paralleled, and I propose *flabat*—common enough for winds, as is ablatival origin of direction; *in oram* is a miscued scribal gloss that draws the genitive to it instead of where it belongs with *aquilo possessor* (see below). Thus: *<Nam> Sicilia[m] modo ventus flabat, saepissime [in oram] Italici litoris aquilo possessor, convertebat huc illuc obnoxiam ratem*: "For now the wind would blow from Sicily, and then very often Aquilo, controller of the Italian littoral, turning the exposed ship first in one direction and then in another." The awkwardness may be the result of anacoluthon at *convertebat*. For *possessor* with genitive in a similar nautical context see Sil. 6.687 *possessor pelagi … captivos puppes ad litora victor agebat. Modo* occurs frequently in Latin with another temporal adverb (on the analogy of *modo … modo*): cf. at 41.6 *modo Bromium, interdum Lyaeum Euhiumque confessus.*

115.8 Substiti ergo tristis coepique umentibus oculis maris fidem inspicere

maris fidem *susp.* Fraenkel | maris malam fidem *quaerit* Müller

Inspicere, making *umentibus oculis* instrument rather than circumstance after *coepi*, does not seem right, and a word of upbraiding instead, such as *increpare*, improves things; for such a locution, cf. Cic. *Q.Fr.* 2.3.3 *cum illius in me perfidiam increparet, auditus est magno silentio malevolorum.* The permissibility of *maris fidem* is not fully settled. It has been accepted presumably through irony, though I do not have a parallel.

117.1 *Prudentior Eumolpus convertit ad novitatem rei mentem genusque divinationis sibi non displicere confessus est

divinationis ltp: divitionis r: ditationis Dousa: divitationis Gruter

None of our *L* sources has the variant right, though *r* comes close. The lacuna (*) signalled by the *L* editors may have been encouraged by the reading *divinationis*, with its implication of an elaborate alternative strategy, perhaps from Giton (see Bücheler *app. ad loc.*, where his logic is surely fanciful). Though the comparative may imply some comment or expression of surprise or dismay now missing in a small lacuna, I posit with some confidence *divisionis* as the apt characterization of a

novel situation which Eumolpus is quicker than the others to grasp, relish and put to good use. This word arises naturally out of the circumstances at Croton just described by the encountered *vilicus*, and recapitulates the essential fact of the strict binary division of the citizens of Croton into "hunters" and "hunted" (see *OLD* s.v. "divisio" 2). The exploitation of this dichotomous *divisio* becomes, in short order, the precise basis for Eumolpus's scam.

117.12 "Quid vos," inquit, "iumentum me putatis esse aut lapidariam navem?"

An adjustment in the punctuation raises the tone of indignation and sarcasm from Corax: *"Quid? Vos," inquit, "iumentum me putatis esse aut lapidariam navem?"* Cf. 127.4 *"Quid? Tu," inquit illa, "donas mihi eum sine quo non potes vivere …?"*

127.5 Haec ipsa cum diceret, tanta gratia conciliabat vocem loquentis, tam dulcis sonus pertemptatum mulcebat aera,

Loquentis is plainly not needed after *cum diceret*, and though the redundancy could be minimized by some such rendering as "she imbued her voice as she spoke with such charm …," an imbalance with the second object is created. I should like to delete, though admitting to uncertainty at the glossator's need for the stressed identification with Circe.

128.4 et postquam omnes vultus temptavit, quos solet inter amantes risus fingere,

risus: lusus *"fortasse"* Müller | fingere Cuperus: frangere

The emendation of Cuperus seems secure (see below), but uncertainty clouds this charming image of Circe rehearsing funny faces for her lovers in front of a mirror. I find it impossible to justify *solet.* Good sense can be reached by employing the Petronian *quales solent* (33.3; *quales* is common): after Circe had tried out all the expressions that customarily produce (*OLD* "fingo" s.v. 7) a laugh between lovers. For this use of *fingere* as a feminine wile cf. 113.7 *Omnia oscula me vulnerabant, omnes blanditiae, quascumque mulier libidinosa fingebat.* An amusing parallel evoking both passages is found in Apuleius *Met.* 10.21 *et blandissimos adfatus: "amo" et "cupio" et "solum te deligo" et "sine te iam vivere nequeo" et cetera, quis mulieres et alios inducunt et suos testantur adfectationes.*

130.8 Hinc ante somnum levissima ambulatione compositus sine Gitone

cubiculum intravi. Tanta erat placandi cura, ut timerem ne latus meum frater convelleret. Postero die, cum sine offense corporis animique consurrexissem, in eundem platanona descendi

Tanta … convelleret *suspicor*

Encolpius's going to bed without Giton (*sine Gitone cubiculum intravi*) is a direct and full response to the instructions of Circe, 129.8 *si vis sanus esse, Gitonem relega*. This piece of commentary inserted into the narrative flow is banal and uncalled-for—which alone would not be grounds for deletion. But there are two other features of suspicion: in its unique vulgarity it violates a lovers' convention in the pederastic code of discreetly shading crude physical details; and the logic that the syntax forces upon the meaning is very doubtful: "I took such pains to appease (her), that I was afraid my lover would break my balls." The interpolation seems to be an admittedly ambitious scribal attempt to "spell out" what was only too obvious for participants and ancient audience. Cf. at 134.5.

132.2 Manifestis matrona contumeliis verberata tandem ad ultionem decurrit

verberata: exacerbata Bücheler: vexata Nisbet: efferata Müller

Though metaphorically plausible and attested (Cic. *De Rep.* 1.9, *contumeliarum verbera subire*), *verberata* has given considerable pause, perhaps because it is Encolpius who will shortly be on the receiving end of an actual lashing. If there is in fact a stylistic hindrance, Petronian precedent for another metaphor can be found at 100.4 *eadem indignatione mulier lacerata ulterius excanduit.*

132.7 conditusque lectulo totum ignem furoris in eam converti, quae mihi omnium malorum causa fuit.

in eam <rem> *lego*

Surely something has dropped out after *eam*, and my solution seems better than taking the antecedent demonstrative to anticipate the distant *causa* or to imply something like *mentulam*. Cf. with nearby 132.12 *secretoque rubore perfundi, quod oblitus verecundiae meae cum ea parte corporis verba contulerim, quam ne ad cognitionem quidem admittere severioris notae homines solerent.*

134.5 Ingemui ego utique propter mascarpionem, lacrimisque ubertim manantibus obscuratum dextra caput super pulvinum inclinavi.

utique propter mascarpionem *delendum puto*

Here, in the context of *O* and *L*, is another ambitious, perhaps sexually tinged, gloss, uncovered by doubtful sense and formulation (cf. at 130.8, above). The phrase interrupts the flow of a "sobs-and-tears" cliché suited to the melodrama (cf. 91.8 *haec cum inter gemitus lacrimasque fudissem, detersit ille pallio vultum ....*). *Mascarpio* itself is a mystery word which has translators divided on derivation and meaning. Some belabouring of Encolpius's groin seems indicated, though the context does not support it, and the action is more punitive than libidinous.

140.2 Ea ergo ad Eumolpum venit et commendare liberos suos eius prudentiae bonitatique … credere se et vota sua.

lacunam ind. Bücheler | bonitatique coepit *cum aliis impletis conatur* Müller: bonitatique <coepit atque> credere se *lego* | se: spes Heinsius

Minimal surgery sets the stage and the pun with great point and precision; exclusion through haplography. Cf. 140.14 *Socrates … nec … oculos suos crediderat* for *credere* with object of person or thing consigned; also Ter. *An.* 272 *mihi suom animum atque omnem vitam credidit.*

140.2/3 Illum esse solum in toto orbe terrarum, qui praeceptis etiam salubribus instruere iuvenes quotidie posset. Ad summam, relinquere se pueros in domo Eumolpi, ut illum loquentem audirent … quae sola posset hereditas iuvenibus dari.

lacunam ind. Bücheler

In this passage, directly following the preceding entry, the need to signal a lacuna (for which Müller offers a nine-word filler) can be avoided entirely by transposition: *Illum esse solum in toto orbe terrarum, qui praeceptis etiam salubribus instruere iuvenes quotidie posset, quae sola posset hereditas iuvenibus dari. Ad summam, relinquere se pueros in domo Eumolpi, ut illum loquentem audirent.* The logic is improved: the only true legacy that one can vouchsafe to one's young is surely not an audience with Eumolpus, but a diet of daily instruction in wholesome values. This places *iuvenes … iuvenibus* repetitiously in the same sentence (instead of consecutive ones), but deliberately so. For it is the reported pitch of the breathlessly conniving Philomela, at pains to stress the attractive *youthfulness* (read: underage but viable status) of her children. It is a piece of representation for purposes of characterizing Philomela and her indelicate plan. For the anaphora cf. Juv. 3.157–8 *inter / Pinnirapi cultos iuvenes iuvenesque lanistae*; and Shorey on

Hor. *Od.* 1.13.1 (of "Telephus"): "repetition has the effect of a direct quotation of her fond iteration."

140.8 Ille lente parebat imperio puellaeque artificium pari motu remunerabat.

To *reward* the girl's tricks or to *match* them? *Renumerabat* occurs to me as a better accompaniment to *pari motu* in this tableau. Corax "paid back" what was "owed," i.e., balanced the tally by repaying in kind and number her motions, thrust for thrust. The metaphor is slightly different, but the metaphorical use of *renumerare* is no less plausible than metaphorical *remunerare*, and more appropriate, since the idea of "rewarding" the girl is not really the point here. In fact *renumerare* is hardly metaphorical at all, and the focus is kept squarely on the duties performed for Eumolpus by his man.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND CLASSICS PROGRAM
MCGILL UNIVERSITY
855 SHERBROOKE STREET WEST
MONTREAL, QC H3A 2T7

REFERENCES

Bracht Branham, R. and D. Kinney. 1996. *Petronius Satyrica.* Berkeley/Los Angeles.

Browning, R. 1962. Review of Müller 1961 in *CR* n.s. 12: 218–221.

Bücheler, K. 1862. *Petronii Arbitri Satirarum Reliquiae.* Berlin. Editio Maior.

———. 1904, 1922. Editiones Minores 4 et 6.

Butrica, J. 2005. Email correspondence to author.

Delz, J. 1962. Review of Müller 1961 in *Gnomon* 34: 676–684.

Ehlers, W. 1965. *Petronius Satyrica, Schelmengeschichten.* Munich.

Kelly, F.W. 1854. *The Satyricon of Petronius Arbiter.* London.

L & S = C.T. Lewis and C. Short, eds. *A Latin Dictionary.* Oxford 1879.

Müller, K. 1961. *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon.* Munich. Editio Maior.

———. 1965, 1983. *Petronius Satyrica.* Munich. Editiones 2 et 3.

———. 1995, 2003. *Petronius Satyricon Reliquiae.* Frankfurt. Editio 4 et Correctior.

Nelson, H.L.W. 1971. "Bemerkungen zu Einem Neuen Petrontext," in *Mnemosyne* 24: 60–87.

Nisbet, R.G.M. 1962. Review of Müller 1961 in *JRS* 52: 227–232.

Öberg, J. 1999. *Petronius Cena Trimalchionis.* Stockholm.

OLD = P.G.W. Glare, ed. *Oxford Latin Dictionary.* Oxford 1982.

Smith, M.S. 1975. *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis.* Oxford.

Sullivan, J.P. 1976. "Interpolations in Petronius," *PCPS* 22: 90–122.

Swanson, D. 1963. *A Formal Analysis of Petronius' Vocabulary.* Minneapolis.

Van Thiel, H. 1971. *Petron, Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion.* Leiden.

Walsh, P.G. 1996. *Petronius, The Satyricon.* Oxford.