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Although arranged in discrete notes on particular passages, this paper is not a random miscellany. It comports a theme both coherent and combative, being in the main a stout plea for pragmatism and conservatism against the popular sports of interpolation-hunting and textual emendation engaged in by latter-day Petronian editors and their philological camp followers. True, I would not fight to the death for every phrase beginning *id est* or *scilicet*, nor for every last reading in *H* (the Codex Tragurienis). But far more are defensible than is allowed in other quarters, and the burden of proof or probability should be transferred back to those who tamper with the text rather than rest upon the shoulders of those who defend it. Above all, such phantoms as Fraenkel’s Carolingian interpolator should be exorcised in favour of level-headed consideration of each and every case on its individual merits.¹

26. 7: *venerat iam tertius dies, id est expectatio liberae cenae.* ² Müller followed Buecheler in deleting the *id* clause. Smith, finding this too drastic, suggested that *id est* has usurped something like *cumque eo*. This raises the whole interpolation issue.³ *Id est* is a very natural turn of phrase in Petronius’ racy narrative, also suiting the know-it-all pretensions of Encolpius, though in fact (as Petronius’ clever characterisation brings out) he is the original innocent in rich country—the reverse of Ronnie Appleyard in Kingsley Amis’ *I Want It Now!* This adds an extra dimension: when an Encolpian explanation looks implausible or plain daft, this may be to the credit of his creator’s art rather than the discredit of some interpolating X the Unknown. *Id est* is furthermore a regular feature in legal texts,⁴ a style Petronius might conceivably sometimes be guying. It is also commonplace in prose of various periods and types; the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* furnishes some pertinent examples in section 11 of its entry for *id*. Each *id* should be taken on its merits: does it explain a rare word, a technical term, an odd situation? With regard to the present case, the fact that the preceding section is lacunose should enjoin caution, though it has not! Smith is right in saying that the free meal does not refer to Trimalchio’s dinner party. *Expectatio* occurs twice more in Petronius (35. 1; 47. 10), both times in the *Cena*, both times of food. Like its cognate verb, it can mean ‘hope’ rather than ‘expect’. The sense, then, is clear. Encolpius and company were hoping for a free dinner, anywhere (not ‘I mean, a free dinner was promised,’ as in Warmington’s revised Loeb). They were *maesti* because of their pain and the thought of having to flee on empty bellies. Then comes Agamemnon’s slave with his tip on where to freeloard. It is often forgotten
that Encolpius and his friends are not invited by Trimalchio but by Agamemnon as *umbrae* — they are strictly gatecrashers. He never seems to speak to them directly, and does not know Giton’s name at 59.1 any more than did Hermeros when upbraiding that young man and Ascylos (also not named) in 57–8.

26. 10: *et Gitona libentissime servile officium tuentem usque hoc iubemus in balneum sequi*. Heraeus deleted *usque hoc*. It is perhaps better to shift the words to before *officium*, indicating the extent to which Giton was willing to pretend to be a slave, and thus obviating the objection rightly raised by Smith to the Loeb translation’s ‘till now’.

27. 1: *circulis ludentem accedere, cum subito videmus senem calvum . . . ludentem pila*. Müller, Smith, Sullivan, and Warming all say that Bücheler deleted the first *ludentem*, though the final edition (7th, Berlin, 1958, with additional material by P. Bachmann) of his *editio minor* prints Heraeus’ *ludentum* (a popular emendation, often itself re-emended to *ludentium*!)

Obviously, any form of the verb could have intruded here from the second *ludentem*. Smith thinks *circulis* by itself, ‘rather vague,’ but it would really be no more than Tacitus, *Agr.* 43. 1, *per fora et circulos*. Smith makes a better point concerning the rarity of *accedo* + dative, only here in Petronius and elsewhere largely the preserve of Ovid. In the latter, it is common with *caelo* of becoming a god (*Met.* 15.818, 870; cf. *Met.* 15.745, with *delubris*); is Petronius gently satirising a religious/poetic formula? Sullivan is also drawn to Seager’s deletion of *pila* on the grounds of its recurrence in the next sentence and because it allegedly spoils the dramatic effect. But *ludere pila* is a regular expression; cf. (for easy instance) Cicero, *De orat.* 1.73; Varro, *apud Non.* 104.26. On one reckoning, it might be better to delete *ludentem pila* altogether. But *pila* defines the *spectaculum* which draws attention in the next sentence, and hardly spoils any effect.

27. 3: *duo spadones in diversa parte circuli stabant, quorum alter matellam senebat argenteam, alter numerabat pilas, non quidem eas quae inter manus lusu expellente vibrabant, sed eas quae in terram decidebant.* An eunuch counting balls is an effectively crude joke in English, one unnoticed or suppressed by the commentators. Would a Roman reader get the same low pleasure? I know of no vulgar example of *pila*.

Smith is worried about the meaning of *lusu expellente*, observing that ‘it appears to have some technical meaning,’ a hesitant suggestion confirmed by the above-mentioned fragment (from the *Serapis*) of Varro, *pila expulsim ludere*.

28. 3: *Trimalchio hoc suum propin esse dicebat*. Smith cites only an inscription for Heraeus’ *propin*, but it is in the manuscripts of Martial 12.82.11. But why is the *propinasse* of *H* ‘almost impossible’ (Smith)? The tense would suit the sequence of the sentence; cf. Martial 2.15.1, *calicem tuum propinas*.

28. 4: *lippus domino Trimalchione deformior*. Sullivan would delete *Trimalchione*. But we need some sort of emphasis between *domino* and *deformior*, hence either keep *Trimalchione* or assume that it has usurped (e.g.) *etiam*.

28. 4: *gausapa*. Smith thinks this word may be used to suggest effeminate
luxury, adducing 21.2, *cinaedus subornatus gausapa*. It may rather imply that Trimalchio has gone off (logically enough, after exercise and bath) in a sort of dressing gown; cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 53.3, *mitto me in mare, quomodo psychrolutam decet, gausapatum*. Seneca is not likely to have affected sodomite sartorial styles. In view of the *gausapatos apros* at 38.15, there may be some suggestion (cf. the concomitant *involutas*) that he looked like a pig in a blanket! A reference to Nero's careless dress (Suetonius, *Nero* 51) is possible, but I think needless.

29. 2: *quadrata littera scriptum*. Smith has no note on this welcome glimpse into the history of writing at Rome; cf. 58.7 where a freedman boasts *lapidarias litteras scio*, and Suetonius, *Aug.* 87.2, on the emperor's striking habit of not dividing words in his own writing. Petronius goes on to describe the biographical murals in Trimalchio's atrium, a conceit which can be compared to those planned by the girl in Apuleius, *Met.* 6.29.2: *depictam in tabula fugae praesentis imaginem meae domus atrio dedicabo.*

30. 5: *menta rapiebat*. Fraenkel's emendation *pavimento* is sufficiently refuted by 43.4, *mentum sustulit*.

30. 1: *non licebat multaciam considerare*. A notoriously corrupt sentence, one that has evoked many an emendation. The simplest, *multa iam*, is probably best, since it resumes and concludes the *longum erat excipere* of 28.1, an equally short sentence which justifies ignoring Buecheler's demand for a lacuna after *considerare*.

31. 11: *glires melle ac papavere sparsos*. Once banned under the sumptuary legislation of M. Scaurus in 115 B.C. (Pliny, *NH* 8.224), dormice became a popular dinner item, being a dish ridiculed by Ammianus 28.4.13. Trimalchio's cook may have committed a culinary solecism in his method of serving; Apicius
8.9 gives the recipe for stuffed dormice, mentioning many ingredients but neither honey nor poppyseed.

33. 1: *pinna argentea dentes perfodit.* The gross humour of this compound in context has not always been sufficiently appreciated, *perfodio* being usually employed in military or building contexts of excavating through large objects. Throughout the *Cena*, Petronius makes good use of per-compounds, e.g. 33.7, *ova pertundimus*; 34.7, *titulos perlegimus* (connoting the guests’ suspicions over Opimian wine); 41.8, *puerum sane perbasiamus*; 49.2, *ne gallum quidem gallinacaeum tam cito percoquiqui potuisse.*

33. 3: *omnium textorum dicta.* Smith obelises the text, rejecting all the parallels he cites for the phrase as equalling *omnia textorum dicta.* But there is no problem if we get rid of the associations with weavers postulated by Smith and others, and treat the word as a variant form of the noun *textus* (or emend to *textuum*); cf. Quintilian 8.6.57 for a similar passage (*significemus alii textum*), also 9.4.13, and (e.g.) Ammianus 15.7.6; 27.12.11. The word *textus* has various applications, including literary ones, and Petronius’ phrase is not particularly far-fetched.

33. 3: *quales esse solent quae incubant ova.* Sullivan deletes both this and *quales solent esse qui harenam in amphitheatro spargunt* at 34.4. As he admits, the exegetic *quales* clause is less common (these are, in fact, the only two examples) in Petronius than *id est* or *scilicet,* which in my opinion makes the offending words more likely to be genuine than scribal glosses. The description of the broody hen simply provides the reader with a picture of Trimalchio’s ingenuity (is there any other evidence for imitation hens at banquets?). The second *quales* clause clarifies the role of two long-haired Ethiopians and serves to point up the highly theatrical nature of a night at Trimalchio’s, an aspect often written about and now too familiar to dilate upon here. When Sullivan asks whether Ethiopians would be *capillati,* he overlooks both the possibility that Petronius makes Encolpius characteristically ignorant by getting such a detail wrong, also Herodotus 7.70 who attests to Ethiopians with straight hair. Sullivan also ridicules the notion (e.g. in the Loeb translation) that they scatter sand from their *utribus* (*How do you get the stuff in?’ he asks comically). Smith takes the reference to mean sprinkling arena sand with water. Neither Sullivan nor Smith notice Pliny, *NH* 33.90, *visumque iam est Neronis principis spectaculis harenam circi chrysocolla sterni, cum ipse concolori panno aurigaturus esset.* This explains the joke, and conceivably swells the register (it is not in Rose) of possible *Satyricon* allusions to Nero.

34. 3: *insecutus est (supel)lecticarius argentumque inter reliqua purgamenta scopis coepit verrere.* The manuscripts have *lecticarius.* Some editors fancy Dousa’s *supellitecarius* on the grounds that a litter-bearer would not be doubling as a sweeper in Trimalchio’s establishment, and that Encolpius could not have recognised a *lecticarius* as such. This latter point can be countered by supposing Petronius’ dramatic realism to have slipped, or on the assumption that litter-bearers, as in an earlier (28.4) case of *phalerati cursores,* were recognisable by
their uniform. The passage is a perfect example of the need to synthesise literary
taste with awareness of historical background. At first blush, Dousa's proposal is
attractive. It is consonant with the principle of lectio difficilior eoque potior; the
word supellecticarius is elsewhere only in the Digest (33.7.12). And Trimalchio's
man might also be thought analogous to the a supellectile attested for Livia's
household. In spite of all this, however, Trimalchio would still be made to look
ignorant or parsimonious in his staff arrangements. For a supellecticarius should
no more have been sweeping up than a litter-bearer. In good houses, there were
scoparii to do this.

34. 8: articuli eius vertebraeque luxatae. Heinsius' conjecture luxatae for the
luxatae of H is supportable by Pliny (with whom the word is a favourite), NH 30,
79, articulis luxatis.

34. 10: ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene. An earlier suggestion that esse in
this last of three Trimalchian verses on the brevity of life is the infinitive of edo
rather than sum is altogether ignored by Smith. But a pun at least seems almost
inescapable. Trimalchio is frequently in sententious mood, and his philosophical
pretensions are more than once (40.1; 56.7) sneered at by Encolpius. He is
parodying or garbling the famous dictum of Socrates (cited, e.g., by Stobaeus 3.
17.21) that one should eat to live rather than live to eat, an aphorism frequently
reformulated in Roman writers. Just prior to hitting off this poem, he had (34.7)
produced the reflection eheu ergo diutius vivit quam homuncio... vinum vita est.
The language and thought of his verses are an obvious reprise. Nor would the
linguistic and philosophical foolery be unique; cf. Plautus, Pers. 113, dum mane
est, omnis esse mortales decet.

35. 1: laudationem ferculum est. 'Too bald to satisfy,' claims Smith in support
of Müller's suspicion of a lacuna, contrasting the more florid 48.7, haec aliaque
cum effusissimis prosequeremur laudationibus. But laudatus proper elegantias
earlier (34.5) was little less bald, and a simple laudationem is quite enough so
soon after.

36. 2: quo facto videmus infra scilicet in aliero ferculo. For once, I think excision
of the scilicet clause (first proposed in the second edition of Pithoeus, Paris, 1587)
justified, and would agree with Sullivan that such explanations are the most
suspect, though Petronius in and out of the Cena uses scilicet a good deal, and
every case has to be taken on its own merits.

36. 6: hydraule cantante pugnare. Often taken to allude to Nero's interest in
such devices on the basis of Suetonius, Nero 41.2 and 54, but both these passages
belong to the years 67/8, hence too late for Petronius on the traditional
reckoning, especially as Suetonius classifies them as novi et ignoti generis. Also, as
Smith shows, water organs of some type had arrived in Rome at least as early as
Cicero's day.

38. 2: arietes a Tarento emit et eos culavit in gregem. The verb culo is a hapax,
one omitted from Lewis & Short. Smith's rendering, 'got them to bash his ewes,' is
questioned by Adams, op. cit. 111, who insists it must mean 'push by the culus.'
Smith adduces the French reculer, but it might be better (with James Bond,
Casino Royale 51 in the 1953 paperback edition!) to observe ‘mais n’enculons pas des mouches.’

38. 9: est tamen sub alapa. This reading of H is quite defensible, though I agree with Smith that it may not have been well defended. A reference to the symbolic slap administered to a slave upon manumission suits a new freedman sitting in imo imus, and this notion of pain fits the consequent non vult sibi male, correctly rendered by Smith as ‘he doesn’t mean to harm himself’ in preference to the Loeb ‘has a fine opinion of himself;’ what little we are told of this character Diogenes in no way suggests a boaster. Hence there is no need to invent such words as Buecheler’s subalapa or Heraeus’ subalapator.

39. 6: plurimi hoc signo scholastici nascuntur et arietili. This last word is a conjecture (a fact not disclosed by Smith) for the manuscript ariet illi. Absent from Lewis & Short, it only occurs elsewhere in Columella in a different sense. The obscene sense suspected by Smith suits both the zodiacal sign in question (cf. the sexual sense of ‘ram’, both as a noun and a verb, in British vernacular) and the double-entendres liberally scattered through Trimalchio’s astrological lecturette.11

39. 11: in sagittario strabones. Nero came under this sign, being born on December 15 (Suetonius, Nero 6.1), and had weak eyes (ibid. 51); should this be added to Rose’s register?

40. 4: ex coptoplacentis facti. It is worth supplementing Smith’s note with Vespa, ludicum coci et pistoris 47, where the baker boasts nos populo facimus studiose coptoplacentas.

40. 5: non ille Carpus accessit, qui altilia laceraverat. Sullivan deletes the qui clause, and a number of such explanatory relative clauses have been expunged by various editors. But in the present case it is a good while (36.7) since Carpus had performed, and it is natural for Petronius to put in this reminder of what he had done.

41. 1: in multas cogitationes diductus sum, quare aper pilleatus intrasset. A fellow-guest’s explanation, that the boar had been rejected by the previous night’s guests and was thereby ‘freed’, is at once accepted by Encolpius, but Smith finds (unspecified) difficulty with it. It is supportable by 66.7, nam pernae missionem dedimus. But there may be another joke involved. Aulus Gellius (6.4.1) says that servi pilleati on the auction block indicated unwarrantable merchandise. This boar could then be another of Trimalchio’s calculated insults to his guests; cf. 34.7, heri non tam bonum posui et multo honestiores cenabant; 75.8, nam ego quoque tam fui quam vos estis, sed virtute mea ad hoc perveni.

41. 8-10: circumueuntem puerum sane perbasiamus. ab hoc ferculo Trimalchio ad lasanum surrexit. nos libertatem sine tyranno nacti coepimus invitare convivarium sermones. Dama itaque primus cum pataracina poposcisset. . . . Smith and others find all sorts of groundless reasons for suspecting coepimus . . . sermones.12 It is enough to say that Smith starts from the false premiss that all the guests have kissed the boy and that the shift to Encolpius, Ascylos, and Giton is consequently awkward. But there is no need to assume that all the guests had homosexual
inclinations (emphasised by the strong perbasiamus), whereas Encolpius and his cronies definitely do in other parts of the Satyricon. And Smith is too rationalising when he finds Dama’s speech too brief to be an answer to anything: has he never been in an English pub or at a boozy party? Pataracina is a much suspected word that did not make the pages of Lewis & Short or the OLD. If Dama is asking for larger goblets (likely enough, given his stated love of the bottle), Smith’s note, ‘a familiar enough request but not usually made in the absence of the host,’ is naive: that is precisely the point!

41. 11: calda potio vestiarius est. Smith thinks vestiarius ‘probably’ means clothes-dealer, but how that suits Dama’s sentiment I cannot see. We should take Smith’s unenthusiastic alternative of seeing it as another masculine for neuter. To say that a hot drink makes a good overcoat gives excellent sense, and we can easily allow the tipsy Dama one more solecism.

42. 2: frigori laecasin dico. Smith rightly points out the rarity of actual obscenity in the language of the Satyricon. This brings up an interesting general issue, too big to do more than signal here. To judge from Pompeian graffiti, Romans swore as much as we do, albeit with equal lack of imagination. The verse satirists, of course, indulge in some rough language. This Petronian sacrifice of realism is not unique, nor confined to Latin literature. The most enduring and popular soap opera on British TV, Coronation Street, has a remorselessly proletarian setting, but no character has ever uttered a four-letter word on it, though these are not banned from British television as from American.

43. 1: Phileros. It is rarely noted by commentators how nicely this name comes after the antiquus amor cancer est of the previous sentence; cf. the juxtaposing of Ganymedes with Phileros at 44.1, and pentiachum after the contribution of Echion at 47.10 (Echion being the father of Pentheus in myth).

43. 4: vendidit enim vinum, quantum ipse voluit. Smith retains quantum as the first example in Latin of the accusative of price, against the earlier and obvious emendation quanti; but quantum might perhaps mean ‘as much as he wanted.’

43. 6: habuit autem oracularios servos, qui ilium pessum dederunt. Smith suggests that oracularios (found only here) means oracle-mongers, as do the dictionaries, a sense that is quite wrong for what follows; moreover, the freedmen generally believe in oracles. Reinesius’ auricularios (an attested variant for auricularios) if taken (with the Loeb) to mean ‘eavesdropping’, is much better — servile tattle-tattling is a common enough motif; cf. Martial 11.184.13, etc.

43. 7: cui datum est, non cui destinatum. I cannot see why so many editors mark this as corrupt. The cynical remark is in place, especially with the consequent plane Fortunae filius; cf. 77.6, assem habeas, assem valeas; habes, habeberis.

44. 8: quomodo singulos vel pilabat tractabat. Vel and one of these verbs should certainly be expelled as a gloss, but which one? Editors are divided. I am sure Scheffer was right to keep pilabat and jettison tractabat. This would give a conscious echo of the previous speaker’s pilavit at 43.4 (a reading needlessly suspected), which is exactly in Ganymedes’ manner — he repeats Phileros’
amicus amico and caps his discordia non homo with piper non homo. Also, pilo is a verb much more likely to attract a gloss than the common tracto.

44. 9: nec sudavit umquam nec expuit, puto eum nescio quid assi a dis habuisse. Assi a dis is Burman’s correction of H’s asia dis, adopted by Smith and Müller. I much prefer Buecheler’s Asiaidis, albeit conceding Smith’s observation that it would be an odd form. The point is, Petronius as so often in the Cena makes a speaker expose his cultural ignorance. To say that Safinisius never sweated nor spat because he spoke Asiatically is the reverse of the truth: such things were typical of Asianist oratory; cf. (e.g.) Quintilian 11.3.56; Lucian, Rhet. Praec. 19–20. Smith’s note on Persian avoidance of spitting and the ‘too esoteric knowledge’ required of Petronius’ joke is quite beside the point.

44. 14: nunc populus est domi leones, foras vulpes. Smith adduces a similar sentiment from Aristophanes, but it is also worth noticing Carbo’s mot that Sulla was a fox and a lion in one, reported by Plutarch, Sulla 28.3 (cf. his Comparison between Sulla and Lysander 3.1), and inaccurately revived by Eunapius, fr. 20.4 (in the edition of R.C. Blockley, Liverpool, 1983).

45. 6: camarium in medio, ut amphitheater videat. Sullivan deletes the ut clause, a good example of textual criticism ignoring the Roman facts of life. Smith marshals the evidence for normal off-stage dispatching of doomed gladiators; defeated fighters were anyway often allowed to survive, to save the lanista’s investment if for no other reason! We should also remember that one reason for multiple pairs and mass slaughter of animals was to give the spectators in the bleachers something to see — they were too far away in a world without opera-glasses to appreciate the finer points of swordsmanship, something relegated to the praelusio. The rarity of this figurative use of camarium enhances the rarity of this ‘treat’.

45. 13: manus manum lavat. Smith quotes a Greek equivalent; cf. the identical proverb in Albanian, njera dore lan tjetren.

46. 2: omnia hoc anno tempestas disparpallavit. This verb is Cholodniak’s invention for the dispar pare pallavit of H, one of many proposed emendations. I would suggest a new one, dispar pilavit, palaeographically closer than most, and to be seen as another echo of the earlier pilavit and pilabat.

46. 4: libentissime pingit. So did Nero, on the evidence of Suetonius, Nero 52, habuit et pingendi fingendique non mediocre studium. Some may wish to add this to Rose’s repertoire of Neronian allusions.

46. 7: quia volo illum ad domusionem aliquid de iure gustare. Smith might have commented on the rarity of domusio, not in Lewis & Short and found only here, at 48.4 (if Wehle’s emendation be correct), and Varro, Men. 517, Diogenem litteras scisse, domusioni quod satis esset; in view of their common context, Varro could be Petronius’ inspiration.

46. 8: litterae thesaurus est. Cf. Pliny, NH præf. 17, ut ait Domitianus Piso, thesauros oportet esse, non libros, for a Latin parallel in expression to add to Smith’s quotation from Xenophon.

47. 8: nec adhuc sciebamus nos in medio lautitiarum, quod aiunt, clivo laborare.
Most editors follow Fraenkel in deleting lautitarum. Wrongly. As the quod aiunt practically telegraphs, Petronius is nicely parodying Stoic doctrine, a pertinent formulation of which is Seneca, Dial. 7.15.5, illius (sc virtutis) gradu clivus iste frangendus est. Lautitarum, then, is not awkward as Smith claims, but neatly satirical, and if (Smith again) it labours the point, that suits Encolpius very well. It may be worth subjoining Juvenal.149, omne in praecipiti vitium stetit.

47. 11: continuoque cecum vocari iussit. The hexametric opening and imperious vocari iussit suggest a deliberate parody of the epic tone.

48. 4: H bylibiothecas habeo, unam Graecam, alteram Latinam. Most editors nowadays confine Trimalchio to two libraries, albeit H gives him tres. I would retain the three, seeing the joke in Trimalchio beginning a boast he cannot sustain and trailing off into comic aposiopesis; Petronius may also have intended a recognisable reminiscence of Ennius’ linguistic tria corda.

48. 9: porcos, sicut in circulis mos est, portenta aliqua facturos. Erdman deleted the sicut clause, but a brief promise of what sort of tricks the porkers were going to perform is quite in place.

50. 5–7: omnes status . . . in unum rogam congesit et eas incendit; factae sunt in unum aera miscellanea . . . sic Corinthea nata sunt, ex omnibus in unum, nec hoc nec illud. Sullivan would delete the second in unum, but the triple repetition suits Trimalchio’s didactic vein, and each in unum is offset by an opposite (omnes . . . miscellanea . . . ex omnibus). Also to be noticed is the in commune fluxerunt in Florus’ account (1.32.6–7) of the same episode.17

51. 5: hoc facto putabat se coelum Iovis tenere. Most editors abandoned coelum, the reading of H, in favour of Heinsius’ solium. Warmington in a regretful note calls it ‘a glorious piece of blasphemy,’ but Smith thinks it too coarse for the tone of the Satyricon, also objecting to the singular. Editors have often lost their heads over this. Thus, Buecheler calls H’s reading mirifice, but it is surely implied by the coelum in John of Salisbury’s version18 of this same story of the unbreakable glass, coelum being a blatant metathesis for coelum, accidental or bowdlerising. And coelum may not be at all that coarse if Cicero, Ad fam. 9. 22.4, at honesti colei Lanuvin, Cliternini non honesti, is anything to go by. The singular is certainly eye-catching.19 Are we to think in terms of a monorchid Jupiter, rather like the one-balled Hitler of British army marching songs? The joke may owe something to standard instructions to grab various delicate parts of an opponent in wrestling manuals (e.g. P. Oxy. 466); testicles are also grabbed at Aristophanes, Av. 142.

52. 11: modo Fortunatam suam reverebatur modo ad naturam. This reading of H has been very variously emended, and indeed can hardly stand as it is. My own suggestion is modo Fortunatam modo naturam suam reverebatur, which does little violence to the ductus litterarum, and involves simple transposition and a tiny scribal slip in the verb rather than the more drastic remedies and postulated lacunae of others. If more traditional solutions such as reverebatur . . . reverebatur are preferred, Smith’s objections to the resultant word play can be encountered by Tacitus, Dial. 36.5, hos iuri in provincias magistratus reverebatur, hos reversi.
colebant.
53. 8: excanduit Trimalchio. Petronius has not received enough credit for using this verb here, in the context of a fire. It is also worth noting that in his imperial biographies Suetonius confines this verb to emperors, including Nero: Claud. 40.3; Nero 40.4; Vesp. 14 (there is one non-imperial example at De rhet. 6).
54. 1: hominem tam putidum. In spite of Smith, this surely refers to Trimalchio. Ipse Trimalchio at the start of the next sentence is not pointlessly emphatic, as Smith puts it, but neatly divides the two actions of plorare and ingemuisset. Smith's argument, 'if Trimalchio were meant, the other guests would be credited with a dislike for their host which is scarcely evident elsewhere,' does not stand up. Encolpius constantly offers such collective insults to his host; notable cases include his putidissimam iactationem (73.1) and the comment sine tyranno at 41. 9 where Smith had to struggle in his note thereon to mitigate that sentiment.
55. 2: codicillos poposcit et non diu cogitatione distorta haec recitavit. Editors divide between the distorta of F and Fuchs' distortus. I do not see why Smith thinks distorta must be ablative. It is surely accusative. Cogitatione needs no adjective, being already qualified by non diu, whereas haec distorta exactly suits the quality of the verses that follow. It also fits the unflattering description of Nero's poetry given by Tacitus, Ann. 14. 16, and so for completeness' sake might be added to Rose's register, though I personally see no imperial allusion.
57. 4: eques Romanus es; et ego regis filius. Is this serious or ironic? Smith oddly insists on the former, albeit conceding counterparts in British vernacular. Momigliano took this to be the one passage that proves a Neronian dating: it must allude to Pallas' claims to kingly origins (Tacitus, Ann. 12.53). But apart from Horace, Odes 1.1.1, on Maecenas, we can compare Suetonius, Vit. 1.2 and Vesp. 12, for similar items, so Pallas need not be meant.
58. 2: quando vicesimam numerasti? quid faciat . . . Smith and others see the change of person from second to third as an indication of a lacuna. But such changes are quite common in, e.g., British demotic where a person may be addressed, then spoken of in his presence to a third party, as though he were not there.
58. 8: iam scies patrem tuum mercedes perdisses, quamvis et rhetoricam scis. Cf. Cicero, Phil. 2.43, duo milia iugerum campi Leontini Sex. Clodio adsignasti et quidem immunita, ut populi Romani tanta mercede nihil sapere disceres.
60. 3: circulus ingens de cupa videlicet grandi excessus demittitur. Most editors follow Fraenkel in deleting de cupa . . . excessus as a late gloss, Smith going so far as to call it fatuous and not appropriate to Encolpius. I on the contrary find the notion of a luxury-crammed hoop knocked out of a cheap barrel effectively hilarious, and the homely detail exactly the sort that the bibulous and lowborn Encolpius would put in. Editors also fail to explain why anyone would gloss circulus with an explanation that owes nothing to Petronius' text, also why a late writer would use the relatively classical and infrequent videlicet instead of the commoner late scilicet. Petronius himself is sparing with videlicet, elsewhere having
it only at 10 (in a different sense), 111 (where the text is doubtful) and 112, these last two cases both in the Widow of Ephesus’ tale.

62. 4: *homo meus coepit ad stellas facere, secedo ego cantabundus et stelas numero.* Thus H Editors rightly accept Reiske’s *stelas* in the first case, but it seems to me that we want *stellas* in the second — H simply got them the wrong way round. Counting the stars is a universal habit, much more so than counting gravestones, and anyway since the narrator is looking away from the soldier-werewolf, he could hardly be doing this very effectively. Smith rightly defends *cantabundus* against Delz’ *cunctabundus.* Oddly enough, in its only other classical appearance, Aulus Gellius 9.13.6, *cantabundus* has also been challenged by editorial *cunctabundus,* in a similar soldierly context. Is Petronius here parodying military demeanour (cf. Juvenal 16 for the cognate theme) or historians’ military narratives? — Gellius is citing Quadrigarius’ account of a duel between a Roman and a Gaul.

63. 1: *ut mihi pili inhorruerunt.* Earlier, Trimalchio has been described as *calvum* (27.1) and as having *caput adrasum* (32.2). Is Petronius guilty of a lapse in continuity, or is this just a joke? Probably the latter, the phrase being conventional.

63. 8: *tangit et videt manuciolum de stramentis factum . . . scilicet iam puercum strigae involaverant et supposuerant stramenticum vavatomen.* Sullivan deletes the entire *scilicet* clause. I have some sympathy with his reasoning (Trimalchio can tell a good story succinctly, and this sentence adds nothing), but would some *glossator* be more likely than Petronius to use the unique *vavatonem* (not in Lewis & Short, only here inOLD)? Perhaps Petronius is here guilty of overwriting, likewise with *sunt mulieres plussciae, sunt nocturnae* in the next sentence, part of which Sullivan (after Fraenkel) also wants to jettison, though *plussciae* is a hapax, not in Lewis & Short.

64. 7: *Scylacem iussit adduci ‘praesidium domus familiaeque’. *Petronius is, as Smith too cautiously suggests, parodying Roman bombast about pets, especially dogs. Apart from Martial 11.69, the best parallel is Apuleius, *Met.* 8.17, where villagers keep very fierce canines (as is Scylax) *ad tutelae praesidia.*

64. 9: *Margaritamque Croesi paene laceravit.* A dog called Margarita is actually memorialised in *CLE* 1175, in high-flown verse.

65. 10: *cum vicensimariis magnam mantissam habet.* Smith is right to scout efforts to translate this very rare word as ‘pretty penny.’ It might just be defensible in its one attested (Lucilius, quoted in Paulus-Festus 103. 1) meaning of useless makeweight. The deceased slave had been dear to his mistress, cost her dear in a funeral wake, and will turn out even dearer when reckoning with the liberation-tax men, hence he turns out to be a loss to her, compared to what she has put out for him. I agree this is a bit strained, but perhaps not too much so for a tipsy guest, and it is hard to see how another reading (unless equally obscure) could get corrupted into this Tuscan rarity. Smith seems to fancy P.A. George’s *antistasim,* which no dictionary registers in Latin dress.

67. 11: *dum altera diligentiam matris familiae iactat, altera delicias et indili-
gentiam viri. Smith does not discuss which wife is which. In view of what has previously transpired in the narrative, it is best to take Scintilla as the first one (she will then be countering her husband’s just-concluded accusation of extravagance), Fortunata as the second (Trimalchio had just been kissing a boy in her presence). The text of *H* has been needlessly mucked around with by editors, with Smith wanting to replace ‘the rather frigid’ *indiligentiam* by *indulgentiam* (the reading of the first edition of the *Cena*, Patavia, 1564), whilst Sullivan improves the shining hour by deleting *delicias et* as a prurient interpolation that anticipates the quarrel between Fortunata and Trimalchio. But this is to overlook previous references to the latter’s catamite(s) at 28.4 and 64.11. *Indiligentiam* refers to his sexual neglect of her, thereby comporting a nice punning variant on Scintilla’s *diligentiam*. Their connubial arrangements are overall a bit obscure. At 47.5, Trimalchio complains that she keeps him awake all night, though this is a non-sexual medical context. At 75.6, he calls her *sterreia*, which is perhaps why at 77.4 she has her own *sessorium*, though this latter word is rare and here could mean changing room rather than bedroom. They may have a son, the *cicaronem meum* who is to be represented on Trimalchio’s tombstone, unless he is a favourite catamite; *cicaro* does mean natural son at 46.3 (of Echion’s), yet at 74. 16 Trimalchio is concerned lest his family die out.

68. 4–69. 5. In this scene, a slave of Habinnas recites (very badly) from *Aeneid* 5, an interesting choice given that book’s modern reputation as a relatively flat interlude between 4 and 6, and the guests are also treated to impersonations of nightingales and trumpeters, culminating in a full-scale rendition of *mulionum fata*. These sound awfully boring (one thinks of Boswell’s animal imitations in a London theatre, with their mixed reception), but Encolpius does not sneer at them, unless they are so subsumed under the *nec ullus tot malorum finis fuisset* that begins the next section. It can be added to Smith’s excellent discussion that Petronius may be satirising court entertainments, but not just Nero’s. *ILS* 5225 memorialises *Caesaris lusor/mutus argutus imitator/Ti. Caesaris Augusti, qui/ primum invenit causidicos imitari.*

77. 4: *aedificavi hanc domum. ut scitis, cusuc erat; nunc templum est.* Most editors have abandoned *cusuc*, a unique word absent from *TLL* and Lewis & Short, and only admitted as dubious by *OLD*, in favour of any one of a number of dull conjectures such as *casa* or *casula*. But would such plain Latin get garbled into something so odd? Segdwick defended *cusuc* on the analogy of the Persian *kushk* and Turkish *kioshk*; one may add the Albanian *kushak* (‘door bolt’ or ‘reinforcement house beam’). How likely is it that an Eastern oddity would feature in a Latin text? Well, kiosk and gazebo have become English, a suggestive parallel if not an argument. Trimalchio is from the East, and a foreign word would fit him. As if our Petronius is Tacitus’ Arbiter, he might have heard and remembered the term from Bithynian *patois*. Another foreign word for hovel that entered Latin was the Punic *mapalia*, in both Virgil and the *Satyricon*; cf. Smith on 58.14. All in all, retention of *cusuc* seems warranted. It can be subjoined that Trimalchio’s antithesis and boast are reminiscent of Nero’s
Golden House bragging at Suetonius, *Nero* 31.2, and the two architectural accounts are worth comparing, though this need not add up to an allusion to *Nero*; cf. Pliny, *Ep.*5.6.14–41, concluding with the conceit *amo enim, quae maxima ex parte ipse incohavi aut incohata percolui.*

**NOTES**

1. To avoid what has well been called the superfoetation of footnotes, I have largely refrained from spelling out the details of articles written on some of these points. Thanks to the meticulous layout of M.S. Smith's 'A Bibliography of Petronius (1945–1982),' in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.32.3, Berlin, 1985, 1624–65, readers can there see at a glance who has written on what. Some items subsequent to 1982 have, however, been signalled.


3. By far the best discussion is that of J.P. Sullivan, 'Interpolations in Petronius,' *PCPS* 202 (1976) 90–122, including sensible reservations about Fraenkel's Carolingian interpolator and a very full and handy register of who has deleted what. I do not wish my frequent disagreements with Sullivan over particular details to conceal my admiring debt to his work. Another important treatment is that of R.G.M. Nisbet contained in his review of Müller's first edition in *JRS* 52 (1962) 227–32, though it will here be obvious that I am out of sympathy with his excisive approach ('like slashing Bentley with his descriptive hook'). Nisbet wrote by way of preface that 'the elegant novel of Petronius Arbiter has been scandalously neglected by textual critics,' whereas after the carnage wreaked by the interpolation-hunters I would suggest that it has been scandalously unneglected. Müller's long statement (2nd ed., 381–430), providing a conspectus of readings between his two editions, should also be read; as a conservative, I permit myself a happy snigger at the severe retrenchment of square brackets in his second. Fraenkel's contributions are as reported by Müller and Sullivan. It is interesting (though I am not entitled to draw any inference) that Petronius was altogether passed over by J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism,* Urbana, 1972.

4. See A.M. Honoré, *Emperors and Lawyers,* London, 1981, 93–4 who defends *id est* clauses in the Law Codes against the charge that they are glosses or interpolations thus: 'They are the rhetorician's attempt, if he must use technicalities, to explain them.' Whilst this formula certainly does not fit every case in Petronius, it is a factor unduly neglected by his editors. After writing the first draft of this paper, I was able to see the cognate defence of *id est expectatio liberae cenae* by D.R. Shackleton Bailey, 'On Petronius,' *AJP* 108 (1987) 458–9.

5. And none is registered by J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary,* London, 1982. Some word play on *pilus* (denoting pubic hair) might be imagined (cf. Adams 76), but the passage can be enjoyed without looking for verbal subtleties.


7. Explained thus by P. Veyne, *A History of Private Life: From Pagan Rome to Byzantium,* tr. A. Goldhammer, Cambridge, Mass., 1987, 18: 'In other words, he did not know how to read the cursive script of books, private papers, and documents, but he could decipher shop and temple signs and posters publicizing elections, plays, houses to rent, and auction sales, to say nothing of epitaphs.'

10. The argument is fully expounded by B. Baldwin, ‘Petronius 34. 10,’ *Maia* 31 (1979)145. It is worth adding the one-line epitaph of a Roman soldier at Pisidian Antioch (= Buiccheri, *CLE* 243): *dum vixi, bibi liber; bibite vos qui vivitis.*
12. Watt, *op. cit.,* improves the shining hour by reading *coepimus invicem communicare sermones,* which is not emendation but rewriting.
15. Watt follows Burman’s attempt to kill two birds with one stone, reading *quant et quantum,* adducing pseudo-Quintilian, *Decl.* 12. 21, *vendit quantum voluit quanti voluit.*
16. The latest discussion of R.J. Starr, ‘Trimalchio’s libraries,’ *Hermes* 115 (1987)252–3, is in favour of two, the joke then being that Trimalchio is claiming cultural parity with Roman emperors who founded and/or sponsored separate Greek and Latin libraries, whereas ordinary Romans spoke of their book collections in the singular *bibliotheca.* Either way, we should not overlook Trimalchio’s behaviour at 59. 3, *cum Homeristae Graecis versibus colloquerentur, ille canora voce Latine legebat librum;* cf. 53. 12 for his tastes in *comoedi,* Atellan farce, and Latin songs on the pipes.
19. The *TLL* adduces only *Gloss. Lat.* 2. 387, 41, and there is no example in Adams 66–7.
21. ‘Literary Chronology of the Neronian Age,’ *CQ* 38 (1944)100.
22. *TLL* otherwise adduces only one example from a later grammarian.
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