INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again–beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Bodel, John Putnam

FREEDMEN IN THE "SATYRICON" OF PETRONIUS

The University of Michigan PH.D. 1984

FREEDMEN IN THE SATYRICON OF PETRONIUS

by
John Putnam Bodel

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Classical Studies)
in The University of Michigan
1984

Doctoral Committee:

Professor John H. D'Arms, Chairman
Professor John W. Eadie
Professor Bruce W. Frier
Professor David O. Ross, Jr.

RULES REGARDING THE USE OF

MICROFILMED DISSERTATIONS

Microfilmed or bound copies of doctoral dissertations submitted to The University of Michigan and made available through University Microfilms International or The University of Michigan are open for inspection, but they are to be used only with due regard for the rights of the author. Extensive copying of the dissertation or publication of material in excess of standard copyright limits, whether or not the dissertation has been copyrighted, must have been approved by the author as well as by the Dean of the Graduate School. Proper credit must be given to the author if any material from the dissertation is used in subsequent written or published work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the Department of Classical Studies and the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies for generous support throughout my graduate career, and the Directors of the American Academy in Rome for making a year's uninterrupted work at that institution possible. At Rome I profited from conversation with a number of scholars; in particular, I am grateful to W.V. Harris and H.B. Evans, who commented on an earlier version of Chapter Four. My search for epigraphic parallels was greatly facilitated by the kindness of Professor S. Panciera, who granted me unlimited access to the incomparable resources of the Istituto di Epigrafia Greca e Latina at the University of Rome, where published inscriptions from the city of Rome are provided with individual bibliographical notations and where thousands of unpublished texts of urban provenance are transcribed and catalogued in a manner that makes them easy to consult. The members of my committee read a rough draft (in some cases, several drafts) of my dissertation with uncommon diligence and perceptiveness and enabled me to make a number of improvements in content and presentation. Above all, I am grateful to my supervisor, Professor John D'Arms, who guided my progress at every stage with a firm but benevolent hand. Whatever is good in the following pages owes

much to what I have learned from him during the past several years. Finally, I must express my deep appreciation to my wife, whose cheerful and unfailing support carried me through the times when I doubted that the successful completion of this dissertation was within my capabilities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The titles of journals and periodicals are abbreviated according to the system used in L'Année Philologique or are otherwise expanded in the interests of clarity. Short titles of books and articles cited frequently in the notes are recorded in the bibliography after the authors' names (below, pp. 248-266). Attention is called to the abbreviated titles of the following reference works, collections of scholarly papers, and editions of ancient documents, some of which may be unfamiliar to the reader.

ANRW	H. Temporini, ed., Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
CE	F. Bücheler and E. Lommatzsch (Suppl.), eds., Carmina Latina Epigraphica
CGL	Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
Diehl	E. Diehl, ed., Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres
Diz. Ep.	Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane
Eph. Ep.	Ephemeris Epigraphica
FIRA^2	Fontes Iuris Romani Antejustiniani, 2nd ed.
ILLRP	A. Degrassi, ed., Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae
ILS	H. Dessau, ed., Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae
MAAR 36	J.H. D'Arms and E.C. Kopff, eds., The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome: Studies in Archaeology and History (Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 36)
Mat. e Disc.	Materiali e discussioni per la storia della narrativa greco-latina (Perugia 1976-)
OLD	Oxford Latin Dictionary

PIR^2	Prosopographia Imperii Romani, 2nd ed.
P. Oxy.	B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt et al., eds. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri
RE	G. Wissowa, W. Kroll et al., eds., Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft
TLL	Thesaurus Linguae Latinae
TP	Tabulae Pompeianae, edd. C. Giordano and F. Sbordone (see p. 172 nt. 70)

CHAPTER ONE

PETRONIAN REALISM

> "The Satyricon...is not an easy work to assess in its values, judgments or implications. It is a work which mocks and sneers, but it is not Alice in Wonderland; Trimalchio may not be a wholly typical ancient figure, but he is not wholly untypical either."
>
> M.I. Finley, The Ancient Economy, 36

What, if anything, in the Satyricon is historically representative of the society it portrays? If the Satyricon contains reliable information concerning contemporary social realities, how can it be recognized? If this type of information is to be found in Petronius' narrative, what literary purpose did it serve? How did the technique of realism contribute to his artistic goals? These are the questions that the present study seeks to address within the limited context of Petronius' portrayal of the freedmen in the Cena Trimalchionis.

I have focused on the freedmen guests of Trimalchio rather than on Trimalchio himself, for two related reasons. First, whereas Trimalchio's position both within the historical context of the first century A.D. and within the literary context of the Cena has been extensively

discussed,[1] the other freedmen have been virtually ignored. As the central figure of the episode, Trimalchio deserves the share of critical attention that he has received, but I hope to show that the social background against which he is meant to be viewed contributes more significantly to Petronius' portrait of a wealthy freedman than has previously been recognized. Second, whereas Trimalchio fits comfortably into the role of the boorish host familiar from a long tradition of banquet satire,[2] the freedmen guests are less easily placed in a recognizable literary context. Consequently, it has been thought that Petronius' purpose in his characterization of them was simply to create a realistic picture of municipal Campanian society.

My principal concern in the following pages is to show that Petronius' representation of Trimalchio's fellow freedmen is elaborated as artfully as his portrait of their host. I will argue that, while there is indeed a large element of undiluted realism in Petronius' depiction of Trimalchio's milieu, the portraits of the individual freedmen are set within the context of a broader theme that runs throughout the Cena: a freedman is cut off from respectable society by virtue of his servile past and has no hope of ever escaping his inferior status. This idea is not wholly my own,[3] but I hope to establish its validity more convincingly than heretofore and to show that the theme is developed not only around the figure of Trimalchio, whose social aspirations are generally recognized to be futile,

but also around the other freedmen, who do not share Trimalchio's pretensions.

In the first chapter I will show how the issue of Petronian realism relates to the main issues of the Satyricon, and I will survey the explanations that are currently offered for Petronius' "realistic" depiction of Trimalchio's milieu. In Chapter Two I will argue that Petronius defines Trimalchio's social context as a freedman's society and represents it as a social underworld. In Chapter Three I will address the issue of Trimalchio's "typicality" from a new perspective; my interpretation will suggest that the qualities that Petronius emphasizes as characteristic of Trimalchio's circle and that are often attributed to his realism were designed to make the freedmen seem vulgar and may not be truly representative of the attributes of real freedmen. I will also show that Trimalchio's view of his place in society is fundamentally different from that of his freedmen guests.

In Chapter Four I will argue that the portrait of Hermeros is drawn without distortion or exaggeration and that Hermeros' pride in having worked his way out of slavery is meant to balance Trimalchio's pretensions to equestrian rank. Taken together, the two attitudes illustrate the immutability of a freedman's status and the futility of Hermeros' and Trimalchio's attempts to win respect in the eyes of their social superiors. By portraying Hermeros as a typical freedman, Petronius encourages his readers to

recognize that his literary representation of a freedman's society reflects the circumstances of real freedmen of the period, and that his aims in the Cena are not purely burlesque.

In Chapter Five I will show how, in the interlude following Trimalchio's departure from the table (41.10-46.8), Petronius develops the theme that a freedman's status is immutable and inescapable. I will argue that the freedmen's speeches recited in Trimalchio's absence reflect two important aspects of the personality of their host. Specifically, Ganymede's and Echion's speeches illustrate the conflict between Trimalchio's servile origins and his adoption of Roman upper-class attitudes, and the speeches of Dama, Seleucus, and Phileros reflect Trimalchio's self-centered hedonism and his preoccupation with death. Finally, I will suggest that many of Trimalchio's vulgar qualities -- qualities that are characteristic also of the boorish host -- are meant to be seen as resulting from Trimalchio's freedman status, which renders him incapable of seeing any existence other than his own.

With regard to Petronius' "realism", it is necessary at the outset to acknowledge two fundamental difficulties that arise when the term is used with reference to the Satyricon. First, to my knowledge, no general accepted definition of "realism" exists. Modern critical discussions of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century works to which the term is normally applied frequently call attention to the

diversity of objectives and techniques adopted by whatever authors are in question, and no two scholars addressing the issue of Petronian realism in particular have employed the same criteria for judging whether or not the Satyricon is in fact "realistic".[4] In Petronian scholarship, moreover, the term is often left undefined. Consequently, any attempt to evaluate the various existing interpretations of Petronian realism is hampered by the lack of a uniform standard for comparison.

Second and paradoxically, although few scholars today would accept that the Satyricon is a realistic novel in the modern sense,[5] many critics consider Petronius' realism to be one of the characteristic features of his work. Indeed, as we shall see presently, Petronius' "realistic" depiction of his contemporary society is the determining factor in several different interpretations of the author's artistic goals and of the literary genre to which the work belongs. At the risk, therefore, of misrepresenting the opinions of those scholars who refer to Petronius' realism without actually discussing it, identifying the features of his narrative that are commonly associated with that aspect of his work seems a necessary preliminary to the survey of scholarly views that will make up the bulk of this chapter.[6]

Substantial portions of the Satyricon, including the Cena, share three principal characteristics with the works that are generally regarded as examples of modern literary

realism. First, with regard to its subject matter, most of the Satyricon, and the Cena in particular, focuses on the lower and middle classes.[7] Furthermore, the characters are cast in everyday situations that faithfully reflect contemporary conditions and circumstances, and the narrative contains frank treatment of sexual matters (this last aspect of Petronius' realism, however, is less prominent in the Cena than in other parts of the novel). Second, with regard to Petronius' narrative technique, the plot unfolds without comment or explanation, and Petronius avoids intruding his authorial voice into the narration.[8] Instead, the characters reveal their personalities through their own actions and words and, particularly in the case of the freedmen, through the manner of their speech, which reproduces the vulgarisms and solecisms of colloquial Latin (see below, pp. 75-76).

Finally, like the protagonists in most modern works of realism, the actors in Petronius' drama are decidedly unheroic. Indeed, they are for the most part without redeeming virtues. Whether this aspect of Petronius' presentation implies a conscious philosophical position, in which case his realism approaches the "pessimistic determinism" traditionally known as naturalism,[9] or whether Petronius' attitude towards his characters is rather one of detached amusement is an issue that will be taken up later in the context of a discussion of the arguments for and against regarding Petronius as a moralist (below, pp. 16-18). Likewise, the extent to which any of Petronius'

characters can be said to be typical -- a quality of characterization frequently sought by practitioners of modern realism[10] -- is a subject of much debate that will be treated in detail below (pp. 84-88, 121-153; cf. pp. 20-22).

The features of Petronius' narrative outlined in the preceding paragraphs are not intended to represent a complete description of Petronius' realism, nor are they meant to imply that the Satyricon as a whole is "realistic" -- indeed, the spontaneous occurrence of verse passages in the narrative and the large elements of caricature, parody, and literary allusion scattered throughout the novel preclude any close association of Petronius with the modern realists. But the characteristics listed above enable us to form a general notion of what is commonly meant when scholars refer to Petronius' realism. In the rest of this chapter, I will show how Petronius' "realistic" depiction of his contemporary society has influenced discussion of the central issues of the Satyricon -- the date and author of the work, its form, and the author's literary intentions -- and I will suggest that approaches to the text that treat literary and historical problems as separate concerns are inadequate when applied to the problem of interpreting Petronius' representation of freedmen in the Cena Trimalchionis.

Arguments for dating the Satyricon have traditionally proceeded along three lines, historical, linguistic, and literary, of which the arguments on historical grounds -- that is, those pertaining to the "realistic"

elements in Petronius' narrative -- are most convincing.[11] The social and economic conditions revealed incidentally in the course of the narrative -- fortunes made in the Campanian wine trade, latifundia worked by gangs of slaves, brisk competition for municipal office, the pretensions of a nouveau riche freedman who adopts an agnomen -- all point to the first century A.D. and are not easily reconciled with a date later than the early Trajanic period.[12] The types of coins mentioned by the guests at Trimalchio's table furthermore suggest that the work belongs in the late Julio-Claudian or early Flavian era.[13] But a coincidence of references to three popular entertainers ensures that the banquet was meant to have taken place under Nero. A gladiator Petraites (52.3, 71.6) and a musician Menecrates (73.3), favorites of Trimalchio, were celebrities of the Neronian age, and a singer Apelles, whom one of the guests recalls from his younger days (64.4), was a contemporary of the emperor Gaius.[14] The Cena cannot have been set in a period earlier than the time of Nero or the references would have been anachronistic and mutually conflicting, nor can Petronius have written much later than the Neronian age or the allusions would have been lost upon a contemporary audience.[15] The action of the plot, then, is roughly contemporary with the composition of the novel, and both can be approximately dated to the time of Nero.

Since R. Martin's recent attempt to date the Satyricon to the middle years of Domitian seems to have swayed at

least one scholar and has not yet been challenged, a brief response to his refutation of the arguments given above will be necessary.[16] Martin accepts that the references are to the historical figures mentioned above but maintains that the gladiator Petraites and the citharoedus Menecrates are not contemporary figures but the heroes of Trimalchio's youth. In his view, Trimalchio's recollection of a singer from a bygone era would be "très normal et très vraisemblable....Seul un romancier maladroit pourrait placer dans [la] bouche [d'un vieillard comme Trimalchion] une chanson du répertoire moderne" (196-197). The freedman Plocamus who boasts that as a young man (adulescentulus) he had no equal but Apelles (64.3) suffers from chronic gout (podagricus) and is therefore over sixty years old. Thus, all three references point to a date in the mid to late eighties A.D.

Martin's theory regarding Petronius' methods of characterization runs into difficulties on three principal counts.[17] First, if we accept Martin's interpretation that Petronius chose to characterize Trimalchio by having him recall the heroes of his youth, then we are forced to conclude, in accordance with his own criterion (195) that references to popular entertainers could have been understood only by contemporaries, that Petronius was writing for an elderly audience, for only those who had reached maturity already by the time of Gaius could have appreciated the allusions being made in the Domitianic age. This seems

inherently improbable. Second, Martin's calculations are based on arbitrary, if plausible, assumptions about the ages represented by such general terms as senex (he chooses about sixty years) and adulescentulus (about twenty years). But the range of ages assigned to these words by writers of the Imperial period is so wide that arguments which assume a particular age value for a given term may justifiably be regarded with scepticism.[18] Finally, there is no reason to believe that when Petronius had Plocamus complain of his gout (64.3), he meant the audience to recognize that Plocamus suffered from the "chronic" rather than the "acute" form, and to therefore conclude that, since the former type rarely afflicts those under sixty, Plocamus was at least that old (198).[19] In short, Martin's refutation of the Neronian date seems unconvincing.

One further indication has been thought to provide a terminus ante quem for the composition of the work. At the end of the sixteenth century, Scaliger identified the author of the Satyricon with the Neronian courtier <C.> Petronius whose death by suicide in A.D. 66 Tacitus describes in some detail.[20] It is not known on what basis Scaliger arrived at his identification, which is extremely probable and is today nearly universally accepted,[21] but subsequent efforts to confirm his view have produced no argument or combination of arguments that can be considered conclusive.[22] This is of some consequence, since one of the most common explanations for Petronius' accurate depiction of Trimalchio's milieu is

largely dependent upon the identification of the Tacitean figure with the author of the Satyricon (see below, p. 19).

Greater precision in dating the work is not possible to attain, even if we accept the traditional identification of our Petronius with the figure described by Tacitus. Rose argues that the close similarities between the end of the miniature epic poem recited by Eumolpus in chapters 118 to 124 of the Satyricon and the last lines of Lucan's Bellum Civile allow us to date the composition of the former to the summer of A.D. 65.[23] But the resemblance between the two passages is slight, and none of the other supposed verbal parallels between the two works carries conviction.[24] Although it seems clear, despite recent views to the contrary,[25] that Eumolpus' poem and the chapter preceding it were intended to comment in some way upon Lucan's epic,[26] the connection does not allow us to date the Satyricon very precisely, since Petronius might have completed much of his narrative even before Lucan conceived the plan of his work. Finally, none of the alleged parallels between the works of Seneca and the Satyricon affords a means of dating the latter,[27] nor do any of the proposed allusions in Petronius to specific events in Nero's reign provide a firm basis for dating the composition of his work.[28]

With regard to the form of the narrative,[29] Petronius' realism has formed a major crux for practitioners of Quellenforschung. Mime, Milesian tales, Menippean satire, and oral popular fiction or "story-telling" have all been

invoked as possible literary antecedents of Petronius' depiction of lower-class characters in everyday situations, and all have been cited as primary influences in shaping the form of the Satyricon.[30] The Greek romance also has been suggested, chiefly because it constitutes the only known form of extended prose fiction in antiquity. The traditional view has been that Petronius parodies the Greek ideal romance by substituting a homosexual couple, Encolpius and Giton, for the traditional Liebespaar and by projecting them against a realistic rather than a sentimentalized background.[31] In this interpretation, Petronius' realism forms part of the burlesque.[32]

Recently, however, several new literary papyri have provided closer parallels to the Satyricon in form and content than any other known examples of ancient fiction. One of the new texts, the so-called Iolaus romance, deserves close inspection for two reasons: it seems to show a use of language as a means of characterization similar to that found in Petronius' depiction of the freedmen in the Cena, and the discussion concerning its classification as literature affords a fresh perspective on the controversy regarding the origins of the Satyricon.

The Iolaus text (P. Oxy. 3010) is a fragment of prose fiction narrated in the third person with a speech in sotadeans and a quotation from Euripides apparently embedded in the narrative. The language in the verse passage contains vulgarisms (e.g., εὐγενῆ (14); κρύβε (31)) and obscenities

(βεινεῖν (30)); the situation, to judge from the presence of a catamite (14), is less than dignified; and the plot, as plausibly reconstructed by E.R. Dodds, seems to have involved an elaborate ruse in which the central figure, Iolaus, is instructed in the manners of *galli* so that he may disguise himself as one in order to gain access to his lover. If Dodds' reconstruction is acceptable, then the narrative would be seen to display elements of parody in the verse speech (14-33), verbal humor -- a *double entendre* in τέλειος γάλλος (37), and sardonic wit in the description of a *gallus* as a νεκ[ρὸ]ν ἄταφον (21).[33] Most important, since the vulgarisms are found only in the verse speech, whereas the narrative is otherwise written in orthodox Attic prose, it appears that the anonymous speaker is characterized by his colloquial language, just as the freedmen in the *Cena* are distinguished from their better-educated tablemates by their vulgar diction.[34]

Petronius' authentic reproduction of colloquial speech is often considered to be one of the most striking aspects of his realism.[35] Indeed, E. Auerbach argues that, in allowing the freedmen to speak their own language and to discuss the matters that interest them, Petronius achieves the highest degree of realism of any author of antiquity. Furthermore, since the freedmen's speech would have been laughed at by the upper-class Romans for whom Petronius was writing, Auerbach concludes that in antiquity, "everything commonly realistic, everything pertaining to everyday life,

must not be treated on any level except the comic, which admits no problematic probing".[36] The Iolaus fragment, which provides the closest known ancient parallel to Petronius' method of characterizing the freedmen, would seem to support Auerbach's view, for the situation outlined by Dodds is clearly humorous. One of my principal concerns in the following pages, however, is to show that certain passages in Petronius' portrayal of the freedmen involved, if not "problematic probing", at least a serious attempt to represent the psychological effects of having been a slave, and that the tone in these passages is less derisive than disinterested.[37]

The first editor of the Iolaus narrative, describing the piece as a fragment of a comic novel, suggested that it belonged to a tradition of Greek comic fiction from which Petronius derived the inspiration for his work.[38] Since, however, the papyrus is dated to the early or mid-second century A.D. and therefore postdates the Satyricon by at least half a century, the existence of any earlier model for Petronius remains hypothetical. Furthermore, Parsons' tentative classification of the text as a fragment of a comic novel is far from certain. The point is worth emphasizing, since R. Astbury has recently used the Iolaus fragment to argue that "the Satyricon of Petronius has nothing to do with Menippean satire."[39] M. Haslam, however, noting the mixture of prose and verse in the Iolaus narrative, plausibly discusses the fragment in the context of Menippean

satire;[40] and the work has been attributed to Menippus himself.[41] G. Anderson suggests that the text might belong to either a comic or an ideal romance, or to a Menippean satire.[42] In short, the classification of the new fragment is as uncertain as that of the larger fragment with which we are concerned.

Detailed discussion of three other recently published literary papyri, one a prosimetric narrative perhaps recounted in the first person,[43] another with sensational elements reminiscent of Petronius,[44] need not concern us here. Considered together, the new texts suggest that modern distinctions between historical, ideal, and comic novels may not do justice to the variation allowed by ancient practice.[45] More generally, with regard to ancient fiction, formal characteristics may not be as important for determining the essential nature of a work as tone and the author's attitude towards his material.[46] In other words, Petronius' decision to include lower-class characters in his narrative and to portray some of them realistically is not to be explained by the existence of similar features in other genres from which he may have drawn.[47] Nor does the theory that the Satyricon parodies epic or the ideal romance adequately account for Petronius' unschematized depiction of Trimalchio's milieu, for realism is not burlesque.

What literary purpose, then, did Petronius' portrayal of the freedmen serve? The answers that have been returned to this question inevitably reflect their authors'

opinions concerning Petronius' literary aims in writing the Satyricon. Of the many different interpretations that have been proposed, most take a firm position with regard to the extent to which the Satyricon may be said to represent the ethical views of the author: either Petronius was a moralist who condemned the vices of his age,[48] or else he wrote specifically in order to amuse his audience and had no intention of passing judgement on the behavior of his characters.[49]

In 1941 G. Highet presented the first full statement of the view that regards Petronius as a moralist.[50] According to Highet, Petronius was an Epicurean who favored an undisturbed way of life (ataraxia) and whose implicit moral condemnation of all manner of excesses is to be felt behind every scene in the Satyricon. Highet's position has subsequently been taken up and developed by a number of scholars, but the underlying principle remains the same: since there is no overt criticism in the Satyricon, the reader "must impute a moral concern" to the author.[51] The freedmen are specifically arraigned for bad manners and cupidity, but Petronius' realistic portrayal of Trimalchio's milieu is treated no differently in these interpretations than his fanciful and exaggerated representation of other vices, such as sexual license and legacy hunting.

Others have sensed that Petronius' intentions in the Cena are different from his aims elsewhere in the novel. In their view, the accurate depiction of the freedmen implies a

more serious moral concern than the burlesque portrayal of other characters suggests. Thus, P. Veyne maintains that in the Cena Encolpius is allowed to speak for the author and to express Petronius' own reactions to what he saw as a genuine horror of his age -- the social pretensions of wealthy freedmen -- whereas in the other episodes the narrator's criticisms are undercut by an "auto-ironie".[52] Similarly, V. Ebersbach argues that, as an aristocrat, Petronius regarded the rise to power of certain freedmen under the early Empire as a threat to the established social order: by presenting an undistorted picture of a group of ex-slaves avid for wealth and prestige, Petronius meant to sound a warning to his senatorial peers to forge closer ties to the Princeps or lose what little political influence they still retained.[53]

Another scholar who considers the Satyricon to be a profoundly moral work interprets Petronius' depiction of the freedmen in exactly the opposite way. According to W. Arrowsmith, the vigor of the freedmen's speech is meant to point up the artificiality of the rhetorical language spoken by the other characters in the novel.[54] Expanding and modifying a thesis first presented by H. Bacon,[55] Arrowsmith sees Trimalchio's preoccupations with luxury and death as indicative of Petronius' intention to show a society corrupted by its own surfeit. For Bacon and Arrowsmith, the realism of the Cena conceals Petronius' moral purpose, which is revealed in his careful thematic development of these two motifs.[56]

In the most recent "moralist" interpretation, F.I. Zeitlin sees the Satyricon's disjointed plot and shifting characterizations as "integral emblems of a world-view that expresses a consistent vision of disintegration through the interrelationship of form and content". In other words, in the Satyricon, "artistic disorder mirrors world disorder". For Zeitlin, the colloquial speech of the freedmen represents the intrusion of the outside world into a literary symposium. The contents of the freedmen's conversations "are to be commended for their more realistic view of the world", but the speeches themselves are never discussed.[57]

All these views have been convincingly refuted by a number of scholars who emphasize that the Satyricon is a highly literary work in which the author views the objects of his satire with a detached irony. Petronius' intention, in their opinion, was not to instruct or condemn but to entertain.[58] G. Sandy and P. Grimal point out, rightly I think, that many of the figures in the novel share a tendency to self-delusion and posturing, and that these qualities constitute the principal targets of Petronius' satire.[59] Certainly Trimalchio is guilty of these affectations, but the other freedmen are not.[60] How, then, do those who believe that Petronius wrote with no moral purpose account for the realistic depiction of Trimalchio's milieu?

Three explanations have been proposed, none of which can be refuted, but none of which is entirely convincing. The first is consistent with the view that Petronius'

aspirations were purely literary: realism was an end in itself; Petronius delighted in characterization for the sake of characterization.[61] This is of course possible, but one might wonder why Petronius lavished such careful attention on the freedmen when he did not draw the portraits of other minor characters with equal precision. The second presumes that the identification of the author with Nero's "Arbiter of Elegance" is correct, or at least that the author shared the emperor's tastes. According to this view, Petronius' accurate portrayal of a lower-class milieu was designed to appeal to Nero's penchant for low-life, for the emperor was known to enjoy nocturnal slumming in the disreputable quarters of Rome.[62] If the traditional identification is not accepted, then this interpretation is considerably weakened, since there is little evidence that other members of the upper classes indulged in similar practices.

Finally, it has been suggested that Petronius secretly admired the freedmen, or envied their freedom from the sense of decorum that restricted the social and economic activities of the senatorial elite.[63] Several scholars have noted a hint of sympathy in Petronius' portrait of the boorish host, but the passages in which the freedmen appear less than ridiculous must be balanced against those in which they display qualities that would have offended upper-class Roman sensibilities.[64] To say that Petronius' attitude was one of pure admiration or that he approved of Trimalchio's lifestyle is to ignore the indications that he regarded the

freedmen as laughable and crude.

What is clear from the survey of views presented above is that there is no agreement among literary critics concerning Petronius' reasons for presenting an accurate picture of Trimalchio's milieu. Part of the difficulty, I suggest, stems from the fact that Petronius' realism serves no obvious literary purpose. Other prominent features of Petronius' narrative technique, such as parody and literary allusion, are more easily understood precisely because their referents are better understood. When Petronius develops the portrait of a poet whose lifestyle is lascivious but whose verses are chaste we can appreciate the humor because we recognize the literary topos that Petronius reverses.[65] But our understanding of the reality that Petronius sometimes faithfully mirrors and sometimes comically perverts is so imperfect that often we cannot be sure of what attitude is revealed by the ensemble, or even of what segment of society Petronius meant to represent.

Nowhere are these uncertainties more evident than in the works of a number of scholars whose interests in the Cena and its central figure are purely historical. J.H. D'Arms has recently pointed out that several prominent historians, convinced of Trimalchio's "typicality", "have given very different answers to the question 'typical of what?'".[66] The issue of Trimalchio's "typicality" will be taken up later (below, pp. 72-88) and need not concern us here, but a survey of the views discussed by D'Arms will

serve at this point to illustrate from a different perspective the problem of interpreting Petronius' realism.

The importance attached to Trimalchio by ancient historians can be traced back to the scholar who moved the study of Roman social and economic history in its current direction, M.I. Rostovtzeff.[67] Rostovtzeff was the first to find in Trimalchio "a typical representative" of his class, which, for Rostovtzeff, was the class of wealthy businessmen who made up what he called the urban bourgeoisie. According to Rostovtzeff, Trimalchio's economic pursuits characterized him as a capitalist; his freedman status was of secondary importance.[68] Rostovtzeff's view has found its modern supporters,[69] but most today consider Trimalchio's status as an ex-slave to be the determining factor in Petronius' characterization.[70] One scholar, however, has recently argued in separate passages for each of these views,[71] and another has suggested that Trimalchio speaks not only for wealthy freedmen and municipal businessmen, but also Roman senators and even, in some respects, persons from all walks of life in antiquity.[72]

Clearly, not only the tone of Petronius' presentation but also its target in an objective sense are in doubt. Would Petronius' audience have seen Trimalchio and his friends as freedmen engaged in commerce or as businessmen who happened to be ex-slaves? No doubt Petronius drew on his personal experience with both merchants and freedmen in creating his portrait of a boorish host, but it

remains likely that he expected his audience to recognize Trimalchio as primarily one or the other type. Whether or not Trimalchio can be said to be representative of either group has yet to be clearly demonstrated.[73] Some scholars, reacting against the practice of others who adduce isolated bits of information from the Satyricon in support of arguments on historical issues,[74] have suggested that Petronius' work cannot properly be cited as evidence of anything other than a fruitful imagination.[75]

As I hope to show, this last view is too drastic: the Satyricon does contain accurate information concerning social realities of the Neronian age, and it can be identified. But the legitimate doubts that some scholars express about relying on the Satyricon as an historical source point up the principal difficulty with interpreting Petronius' realism: often we do not know how the author's portrayal of his contemporary society relates to the society itself.

P. Garnsey, noting the current confusion among historians regarding the issue of Trimalchio's "typicality", calls attention to the recent work of a literary critic, F. Dupont, who advocates an approach to the Cena that focuses on the literary context of the episode to the exclusion of its social and historical context.[76] In Dupont's view, modern interpretations of the Cena are misguided in their reliance on "la lecture réaliste": "L'historien...commet un pas fatal quand, après avoir repéré quelques réalités bien datées...il décide que le texte où elles se trouvent est

donc représentatif du monde de son auteur...Alors commence un cercle vicieux, une ronde infernale, qui va du littéraire à l'historien et vice versa: l'historien utilise le texte comme document pour décrire une partie de la société, et le critique littéraire, s'appuyant sur le livre de historien, crie au réalisme, au 'pris sur le vif'. L'historien, fortifié dans sa méthode, utilisera sans vergogne, comme document, tout texte décrété réaliste par le littéraire, etc."[77]

Insofar as she attempts to combat this process by stressing the literary background of the Cena, Dupont wins Garnsey's support: "the literary problem does have priority; we need to ask what are the conventions, if any, to which the work conforms or which it flouts?...When such questions as these can be answered, we will be in a position perhaps to establish clear and reliable criteria by which the social evidence that the work undoubtedly contains can be recognized."[78] For another literary critic, J. Wright, on the other hand, "The question 'Was Petronius a moralist?' can be approached with final authority only by establishing a clear juxtaposition between the Satyricon, as a literary work, and the real world to which Petronius may or may not be morally reacting....That political and social historians will be able to penetrate the sources and give us a true picture of [the Julio-Claudian] era is of course an article of faith."[79] Clearly, the disagreement among literary critics concerning Petronius' artistic goals and among historians regarding the historical reliability of the text

has reached the point where members of each group are looking to the other group to solve the problem of Petronian realism.

In such circumstances the best approach to the Cena will be one that moves forward on both fronts simultaneously. In order to understand the nature of Petronian realism the critic must remain alert to the author's possible literary motivation as he checks the accuracy of Petronius' depiction of contemporary society. At the same time, as the relationship between the world of the Satyricon and the social realities of the Neronian age becomes clearer, the critic will better be able to determine the author's attitude towards the characters he represents. It is not a question of the priority of either the historical or the literary problem. If progress is to be made in either area, investigation of one must accompany investigation of the other.[80]

I have tried to follow this principle at every stage of my argument, although, inevitably, one or the other approach predominates in certain sections. My aim is to demonstrate that the elements of realism in Petronius' portrayal of Trimalchio's circle are neither gratuitous nor intended to reveal directly his own attitude towards freedmen. Rather, they serve as one component in a thematic representation of the nature of a freedman's status. In the next chapter I will try to confirm the view of those who consider Trimalchio's juridical status to be the dominant

element in his characterization and to show that Petronius meant the freedmen to be seen as a group cut off from the rest of society by virtue of their servile pasts. Even if my conclusions are not accepted, however, I hope that my method of arriving at them will have suggested that literary interpretations which fail to take account of the realities behind Petronius' presentation fall short of a complete appreciation of his artistic achievement, and that historical studies which disregard the author's literary intentions are liable to distort the considerable evidence that the Cena contains for the social conditions prevailing in Petronius' contemporary milieu.

Notes to Chapter One

[1]For Trimalchio's position in Roman society, see, generally, L. Friedlaender, Petronii Cena Trimalchionis[2] (Leipzig 1906) and A. Maiuri, La Cena di Trimalchione di Petronio Arbitro (Naples 1945), passim (hereafter, Friedlaender; Maiuri). Cf. also Th. Mommsen, Hermes 13 (1878), 115-121; E. Hübner, Hermes 13 (1878), 414-422; R. Bianchi Bandinelli, DdArch 1 (1967), 7-19 (Trimalchio's tomb and epitaph); G. Bagnani, AJP 75 (1954), 16-39; P. Zanker, JDAI 94 (1979), 460-523, esp. 521-523 (Trimalchio's house); H. Wrede, Consecratio in Formam Deorum: Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit (Mainz 1981), Index, p. 356 s.v. "Trimalchio" (the decoration in Trimalchio's portico: hereafter, Wrede, Consecratio); S. Mrozek, Chiron 5 (1975), 311-316, esp. 313-315; Historia 25 (1976), 122-123 (Trimalchio's wealth); P. Veyne, "Vie de Trimalcion", Annales ESC 16 (1961), 213-247 (hereafter, Veyne, "Trimalcion"); J.H. D'Arms, Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome (Cambridge, Mass. 1981), 97-120 (hereafter, D'Arms, CSS) (the "typicality" of Trimalchio). B. Baldwin, Acta Classica 21 (1978), 87-97 (Trimalchio's domestic staff) and P. Tremoli, Le iscrizioni di Trimalchione (Trieste 1960) (hereafter, Tremoli, Iscrizioni) provide useful overviews but are unreliable in details. The question of Trimalchio's typicality is by no means settled: see below, pp. 20-22. For Trimalchio as a literary figure, see the following note. All passages from the Satyricon are quoted from the text of K. Müller's most recent edition: K. Müller and W. Ehlers, Petronius Satyrica: Schelmenszenen (Darmstadt 1983) (hereafter, Müller-Ehlers[3]).

[2]See J. Revay, CP 17 (1922), 202-212 (Horace's Cena Nasidieni, Serm. 2.8); L.R. Shero, CP 18 (1923), 127-139 (Horace and Lucilius); W. Süss, Hermes 62 (1927), 349-356 (? Varro's Convivium Granii, Bk. 20); N. Rudd, The Satires of Horace (Cambridge 1966), 215-223; J.P. Sullivan, The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study (Bloomington 1968), 126-128 (hereafter, Sullivan, Satyricon) (Horace). Some features in Trimalchio's characterization may have been drawn from Theophrastus' Characters and Philodemus' Peri Kakion: see O. Raith, Petronius - Ein Epikureer (Nürnberg 1963), 20-27 (but cf. Sullivan, Satyricon, 138-139). For later authors, the vulgar or arrogant host proved an easy target: cf., e.g., Mart. 3.49, 3.60, 4.68, 4.86, 6.11; Juv. 5; Luc., Cronosolon 17-18, Ep. Sat. 3, Nigr. 22, Merc. Cond. 26. For modern variations, see G. Highet, Juvenal the Satirist (Oxford 1954), 262 nt. 1.

[3]Veyne, "Trimalcion", 230-231, 240 stresses the immutability of a freedman's status, but argues (e.g. 244-247) that Trimalchio accepts his social inferiority and

merely wants to appear as the equivalent of a Roman knight within his own class. M.I. Finley, The Ancient Economy (Berkeley 1973), 50-51 (hereafter, Finley, AE) rightly emphasizes the distinction between Trimalchio's senatorial "life-style" and the "social circles from which he was excluded [as a freedman]", but he too maintains that Trimalchio "made not the slightest effort to break into [those circles]" (elsewhere [pp. 63, 77], Finley notes the "evanescent" nature of a freedman's status, which was "restricted by law to a single generation"). It seems to me, however, that by adopting the manners of an aristocrat, Trimalchio wishes to be thought of as one: see V. Ciaffi, Struttura del Satyricon (Turin 1955), 43-50 (hereafter, Ciaffi, Struttura); cf. also below, pp. 94-95, 179 nt. 122.

[4]For various types of modern literary realism, see, e.g., G.J. Becker, "Realism: An Essay in Definition", Modern Language Quarterly 10 (1949), 184-197, with an appendix comprising fourteen different critical definitions of realism (pp. 195-197); id., "Modern Realism as a Literary Movement", in G.J. Becker, ed., Documents of Modern Literary Realism (Princeton 1963), 3-38 -- a valuable collection containing excerpts from the writings of many prominent practitioners of the technique (hereafter, Becker, Documents); H. Levin, "What is Realism?", Comparative Literature 3 (1951), 193-199 and the five essays collected in the same volume (pp. 200-285), in which various scholars discuss the subject of realism within the context of the national literatures of England, France, Germany, Russia, and America; W.C. Booth, The Rhetoric of Fiction (Chicago 1961), 22-64 (hereafter, Booth, Rhetoric of Fiction); E. Heller, "The Realistic Fallacy", in Becker, Documents, 591-598. For discussions of Petronian realism, see E.T. Sage, Petronius: The Satiricon, revised and expanded by B.B. Gilleland (New York 1969), 220-222 (hereafter, Sage-Gilleland); E. Auerbach, Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature, tr. W. Trask (Princeton 1953), 26-33 (hereafter, Auerbach, Mimesis); Sullivan, Satyricon, 97-106; V. Ebersbach, Das Altertum 19 (1973), 98-99; and the authorities cited in the following note. For the notion of "realism" in ancient literary theory, cf. R. McKeon, "Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity", in R.S. Crane, ed., Critics and Criticism: Ancient and Modern (Chicago 1952), 147-175.

[5]This view was first advanced by P. Thomas, "Le Réalisme dans Pétrone", RIB 36 (1893), 225-240, 316-333 and has most recently been advocated by B.E. Perry, The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins (Berkeley 1967), 362-363 nt. 10 (hereafter, Perry, AR); cf. also F.F. Abbot, CP 6 (1911), 257-270. For arguments against: E. Klebs, Philologus Supplb. 6 (1891-1893), 679-

683; E. Thomas, Pétrone: L'Envers de la société romaine[3] (Paris 1912), 224 nt. 1 (hereafter, Thomas, Pétrone[3]); C.W. Mendell, CP 12 (1917), 158-160, 172; Sullivan, Satyricon, 97-98.

[6]In attempting to extrapolate a general concept of Petronian realism from the diverse arguments cited in the two preceding notes, I have profited from the discussions of several critics who have drawn up guidelines for establishing a definition of modern literary realism: cf. esp. G.J. Becker, Mod. Lang. Quart. 10 (1949), 185-194; Documents, 24-36; Booth, Rhetoric of Fiction, 55-58; G. Lukács, The Meaning of Contemporary Realism, tr. J. and N. Mander (London 1962), 93-115 (on the differences and similarities between "critical" and "socialist" realisms) (hereafter, Lukács, Contemporary Realism).

[7]The term "bourgeoisie", completely appropriate in discussions of modern literary realism, is anachronistic and misleading when used in reference to the Satyricon, particularly when it is applied to Trimalchio and his peers: cf. Veyne, "Trimalcion", 244-245 (cited also by Finley, AE, 51); D'Arms, CSS, 98-99.

[8]The verses at Sat. 132.15, which are generally regarded as an aside to the audience -- Petronius' apologia pro opere suo, are best taken in context as the words of Encolpius (so, R. Beck, Phoenix 27 (1973), 50-55; C. Gill, CP 68 (1973), 183-185), although they probably express the author's views: see A. Barbieri, Poetica Petroniana: Satyricon 132.15 (Quaderni della RCCM 16) (Rome 1983), 8-48. No one would argue that Petronius consistently maintains the objectivity expected of modern realists.

[9]For the distinction between realism and naturalism, cf. G.J. Becker, Mod. Lang. Quart. 10 (1949), 192-194; Documents, 34-36 (quote from pp. 193 and 35 respectively); N. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays (Princeton 1957), 49-50. The fundamental explanation of naturalism, Zola's, "Le roman expérimental", an essay published in the volume of the same name (Paris 1880), is reproduced in English in Becker, Documents, 162-196.

[10]Cf. G.J. Becker, Mod. Lang. Quart. 10 (1949), 189; Documents, 29; Booth, Rhetoric of Fiction, 46, quoting Henry James. F. Engels, in a famous passage from a letter to M. Harkness dated April 1888, defines realism as "the faithful rendering of typical characters in typical circumstances" ("die getreue Wiedergabe typischer Charaktere unter typischer Umständen"): K. Marx and F. Engels, Über Kunst und Literatur (Berlin 1967), I 157. For a penetrating discussion of the difference between characters that are "typical" and those that are merely "average" or "topical", see Lukács,

Contemporary Realism, 122-124, 130.

[11]For the full range of arguments, see K.F.C. Rose, The Date and Author of the Satyricon (Mnemosyne Supplb. 16) (Leiden 1971) (hereafter, Rose, DAS). For an irreverent survey of scholarship on this issue, K.F.C. Rose, Arion 5 (1966), 275-301.

[12]See H.C. Schnur, "The Economic Background of the Satyricon", Latomus 18 (1959), 790-799. For the wine trade, see also R. Meiggs, Roman Ostia[2] (Oxford, 1973), 275-276 (hereafter, Meiggs, RO[2]); A. Tchernia, in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins, and C.R. Whitaker, edd., Trade in the Ancient Economy (London 1983), 103-104 (but cf. D. Rathbone, Opus 2 (1983), 93-94). The agnomen Maecenatianus, adopted by Trimalchio for his epitaph (71.12), need not imply that he was an ex-slave of Maecenas. But agnomina fell out of use among private freedmen during the latter half of the first century A.D. and are not found even in the nomenclature of Imperial freedmen after the reign of Hadrian. The joke would have been pointless if the novel were set in a period later than the first century: see P. Veyne, in Hommages à Albert Grenier (Coll. Lat. 58) (Brussels 1962), 1620-1624, esp. 1622-1623, now confirmed by P.R.C. Weaver, Familia Caesaris. A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves (Cambridge 1972), 90-92 (hereafter, Weaver, FC).

[13]See P. Moreno, "Aspetti di vita economica nel Satyricon", An. Ist. It. Num. 9-11 (1962-64), 53-73, esp. 57-63. For the coins in the Satyricon, see also R. Reece, "Roman Monetary Impact on the Celtic World - Thoughts and Problems", in B. Cunliffe ed., Coinage and Society in Britain and Gaul: Some Current Problems (The Council for British Archaeology. Research Report no. 38) (London 1981), 24-28, esp. 25, 26-27.

[14]For Petraites, see H.T. Rowell, TAPA 89 (1958), 14-24; G. Ville, in Hommages a Jean Bayet (Coll. Lat. 70) (Brussels 1964), 722-733. For Apelles (Suet., Gaius 33.1, Dio 59.5.2, Philo, Leg. ad Gaium 203), Menecrates (Suet., Nero 30.5, Dio 63.1.1), and arguments connecting all three references, K.F.C. Rose, CQ 12 (1962), 166; DAS, 21-22. The reservations of M.S. Smith, Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis (Oxford 1975) (hereafter, Smith), xii-xiii, 139-140 ad 52.3 are unwarranted. It is true that popular entertainers often adopted the names of their illustrious predecessors, and Smith is right to point out that the gladiator Petraites need not have been active exclusively under Nero. But we know of only one Menecrates and one Apelles, who are furthermore known only from the reigns of Nero and Gaius respectively, when both were famous enough to attract the emperor's attention: see Friedlaender, 12; cf. also Perry, AR, 364 nt. 11.

[15]This last argument is adduced by A. Momigliano, CQ 38 (1944), 100 in support of a supposed allusion to Nero's freedman Pallas at 57.4 that I find unconvincing. The concept of historical fiction seems not to have existed in antiquity: cf. Auerbach, Mimesis, 32-33; Sullivan, Satyricon, 22-23. Sullivan mentions the dialogues of Plato as possible exceptions but rightly points out that Plato's aims were very different from Petronius'. Tacitus' motivation for setting his Dialogus de Oratoribus in the recent past is convincingly elucidated by R. Syme, Tacitus (Oxford 1958), 108-110.

[16]R. Martin, "Quelques remarques concernant la date du Satiricon", REL 53 (1975), 182-224, 194-198 (see below, nt. 25). R. Beck, Phoenix 33 (1979), 244 nt. 23 and MH 39 (1982), 207-208 n. 4 is impressed by Martin's arguments, but is not thoroughly convinced. For refutation of earlier arguments (up to 1965) for dating the work to other periods, see Rose, DAS, 7-20, 34-37. The suggestions of H. Puzis, Meander 22 (1967), 29-43 (beginning of the second century) and E. Castorina, Sic. Gym. 26 (1973), 27-28 n. 27 (dramatic date of the Cena in the late Trajanic period -- evidently a revision of his earlier view that the work was composed at the end of the second century: GIF 1 (1948), 213-219) have not found any followers.

[17]Martin's case is further weakened by a misleading assertion about chronology -- "[Plocamus] avait environ vingt ans dans les années 40, sous le regne de Caligula" [obiit 24 Jan. 41] (198) -- and by a case of faulty arithmetic: "[Trimalchion] devait avoir, à cette epoque [sc. dans les années 60], entre vingt et trente ans, et puisqu'il en a au moins soixante à la date où se situe la Cena, c'est sans doute que celle-ci est censée avoir lieu entre 80 et 90" (197).

[18]According to Galen, for instance, adolescentia covered anything from 14 to 35 years and old age began at 48: see W. Suder, CB 55 (1978), 5-9, with many other examples; for adulescens, cf. also S. Treggiari, Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic (Oxford 1969), 260 nt. 6 (hereafter, Treggiari, RFLR).

[19]Petronius' intention was to show Plocamus boasting of his lavish lifestyle: gout was considered to be the rich man's disease par excellence: cf., e.g., Sat. 140.16; Juv. 13.96-97; Anth. Pal. 11.403.7-8 (Lucian). The effect would have been similar to having an upwardly mobile contemporary suburbanite complain that his tennis elbow had been acting up. P. Howell, Ill. Cl. St. 9 (1984), 38 suggests that Petronius may have intended an allusion to Ennius fr. 64, "numquam poetor nisi si podager".

[20]Tac., Ann. 16.17-20. In the inscription of a manuscript (codex Leidensis Scaligeranus 61) that Scaliger copied from several sources in or around 1571, the author's name is recorded as C. Petronius Arbiter Afranius. Scaliger can only have derived the praenomen, which is incorrect and which does not appear in any other manuscript of Petronius, from Tacitus; hence, credit for the identification is normally awarded to him: see G. Brugnoli, RCCM 3 (1961), 320. For the date of Scaliger's Leiden manuscript, see the introduction to K. Müller's editio maior, Petronii Arbitri Satyricon (Munich 1961), xiv-xv (hereafter, Müller[1]). The correct praenomen, Titus, is preserved in Pliny, NH 37.20 and Plutarch, Mor. 60d-e: see Rose, DAS, 47-49.

[21]Of course, those who date the work to a later period do not accept Scaliger's identification (see above, nt. 16); nor does M.S. Smith, 213-214, who believes that the work could belong to any time in the first century (xii). U. Knoche, Roman Satire, trans. E.S. Ramage (Bloomington 1975), 111 is agnostic.

[22]The most elaborate attempt to corroborate Scaliger's identification has been made by Rose, DAS, 38-43. It may be noted that the argument in which Rose places most faith -- that the Satyricon contains jokes and allusions which could only have been written (or recognized) by an intimate acquaintance of the Emperor's (p. 43) -- is seriously undermined by Dio 61.8.5 (A.D. 55): τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλα ὅσα καθ' ἑκαστὴν ἡμέραν καὶ ἔλεγον [sc. Νέρων καὶ Ἀγριππῖνα] ἐς ἀλλήλους καὶ ἔπραττον ἐξῆλει μὲν ἐκ τοῦ παλατίου...

[23]K.F.C. Rose, CQ 12 (1962), 166-168; DAS 65-68.

[24]For suggested parallels, see Rose, DAS, 65, 88-91; H. Stubbe, Die Verseinlagen im Petron (Philologus Supplb. 25.2) (Leipzig 1933), 104-151, passim (hereafter, Stubbe, Verseinlagen). For cogent criticisms, P.A. George, CQ 24 (1974), 119-133; Smith, 215-217. Cf. also A.C. Hutchinson, LCM 7.4 (April 1982), 46-47.

[25]P.A. George, CQ 24 (1974), 119-133 denies any connection between the two works. R. Martin, REL 53 (1975), 206-224 accepts many of the parallels suggested by Rose, but maintains that the primary model for Eumolpus' poem was the Punica of Silius Italicus (222). P. Grimal, La Guerre Civile de Pétrone dans ses rapports avec la Pharsale (Paris 1977) argues that the chronological relationship between the two works is the opposite of what has traditionally been supposed: Lucan wrote his epic in response to a recitation that Petronius had previously delivered on the same theme (cf. esp. pp. 239-260).

[26]The most convincing interpretations are those that see the poem as serving primarily to characterize Eumolpus: the faults of Lucan's versification are combined with a hackneyed Vergilian treatment of his subject matter. See P.G. Walsh, CP 63 (1968), 208-212; R. Beck, Phoenix 33 (1979), 239-253 with further bibliography; cf. also G. Anderson, Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play (American Classical Studies 9) (Chico, Ca. 1982), 100-102 (hereafter, Anderson, Eros Sophistes). J.P. Sullivan has recently restated his view that a political rivalry between Lucan and Petronius, whom he identifies with Nero's adviser, fostered a literary rivalry between the two: cf. TAPA 99 (1968), 453-467; Helikon 17 (1977), 146-149; "Petronius' Bellum Civile and Lucan's Pharsalia: A Political Reconsideration", in Neronia 1977 (Clermont-Ferrand, Adosa 1982), 151-155.

[27]For parallels, see Maiuri, 17-24, 239-240; Rose, DAS, 69-74; Sullivan, Satyricon, 129-138, 193-213. Most of these alleged borrowings assume that Seneca was the only contemporary proponent of Stoic philosophy for Petronius to criticize or that Petronius could have known of contemporary figures only from the Epistulae Morales: cf. A. Vassileiou, Ant. Class. 43 (1974), 244-246; Smith, 217-219; M.T. Griffin, Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics (Oxford 1976), 260 nt. 1 (hereafter, Griffin, Seneca). G. Bagnani, who suggests that the Apocolocyntosis was written by Petronius, admits that the verbal and stylistic similiarities between that work and the Satyricon fall short of proving any connection between the two: Arbiter of Elegance: A Study of the Life and Works of C. Petronius (Phoenix Suppl. 2) (Toronto 1954), 27-46, 80-82 (verbal parallels) (hereafter, Bagnani, Arbiter).

[28]For suggested allusions to events of the Neronian period or to the emperor himself, see Rose, DAS, 43, 75-86; B. Baldwin, Maia 28 (1976), 35-36. For possible allusions to persons and events earlier in the Julio-Claudian era, R.H. Crum, CW 45 (1952), 166-167; G. Giardina, Maia 24 (1972), 67-68; R. Duncan-Jones, The Economy of the Roman Empire. Quantitative Studies[2] (Cambridge 1982), 240 nt. 4 (hereafter, Duncan-Jones, ERE[2]). For the problems with using any alleged allusion as a means of dating, E. Ratti, "Petronio e Nerone: Difficoltà e necessità dell'allusionismo nell'interpretazione del Satyricon", in Neronia 1977 (1982), 145-150, esp. 147.

[29]For early theories, see R. Cahen, Le Satiricon et ses origines (Paris 1925). For more recent suggestions of literary influences on Petronius, see P. Veyne, REL 42 (1964), 310 nt. 2; below, nts. 30-32 ; cf. also H.D. Rankin, Petronius the Artist: Essays on the Satyricon and Its Author (The Hague 1971), 52-67 (hereafter, Rankin, Petronius the Artist) (Priapea); G. Schmeling, "The Exclusus Amator Motif

in Petronius", in Fons Perennis: Saggi critici in onore del Vittorio d'Agostino (Turin 1971), 333-357; R. Beck, MH 39 (1982), 206-214 (Roman elegy). Many argue that Petronius drew on various sources, especially Greek romance, Milesian tales, epic, mime, and Menippean and hexameter satire: see, e.g., P.G. Walsh, The Roman Novel: The "Satyricon" of Petronius and the "Metamorphoses" of Apuleius (Cambridge 1970), 7-30 (hereafter, Walsh, RN); U. Knoche, Roman Satire, 117-120; L. Callebat, REL 52 (1974), 281-303; Smith, xviii.

[30]Cf. D. Gagliardi, Vichiana 7 (1978), 114-115 nt. 26; G. Sandy, TAPA 104 (1974), 329-346 (mime); L. Pepe, Per una storia della narrativa latina^2 (Naples 1967), 218-230; Auerbach, Mimesis, 30 (Milesian tales: others cited by Perry, AR, 361 nt. 2); Sullivan, Satyricon, 89-91, 100; E.C. Courtney, Philologus 106 (1962), 86-100 (Menippean satire); S. Trenkner, The Greek Novella in the Classical Period (Cambridge 1958), 185 (popular fiction, story-telling); cf. also A. Cabaniss, Liturgy and Literature: Selected Essays (Alabama 1970), 72-96, 152-160 (Christian oral tradition).

[31]So first, R. Heinze, "Petron und der griechische Roman", Hermes 34 (1899), 494-519; cf. also G. Anderson, AJP 102 (1981), 50-53; A. Scobie, Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage: Essays on Apuleius, Petronius, and the Greek Romances (Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 30) (Meisenheim am Glan 1969), 83-90, with further bibliography. C.W. Mendell, CP 12 (1917), 158-172 argues that the Satyricon is not a parody of the Greek romance but an example of the genre in a late stage of its development: the presence of lower-class characters is due to the influence of Roman satire. G. Anderson, Eros Sophistes, 1-49 shows that four of the five complete Greek romances are less ideal and more comic than has previously been supposed.

[32]The same explanation of Petronius' realism applies also for the theories that regard the Satyricon as a parody of the Hellenistic travelogue (P. Veyne, REL 42 (1964), 320) or of epic (so, first, E. Kleba, Philologus 47 (1889), 623-635; recently, M.H. McDermott, LCM 8.6 (June 1983), 82-85: contra, B. Baldwin, CP 68 (1973), 294-296, unconvincingly).

[33]P. Parsons, "A Greek Satyricon ?", BICS 18 (1971), 53-68 and P. Oxy. 42.3010 (1974), 34-41, with Dodds' reconstruction on p. 35. R. Merkelbach, ZPE 11 (1973), 81-100 considers the fragment to be a parody of a religous initiation ritual; cf. B.P. Reardon, "Novels and Novelties or Mysteriouser and Mysteriouser", in The Mediterranean World: Papers Presented in Honour of Gilbert Bagnani (Peterborough, Ontario 1976), 92-98.

[34]So P. Parsons, BICS 18 (1971), 63, 65.

[35]Cf., e.g., A.M. Duff, A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age from Tiberius to Hadrian[3] (London 1964), 146; E. Pulgram, Italic, Latin, Italian 600 B.C. to A.D. 1260: Texts and Commentaries (Heidelberg 1978), 221-223; F.R.D. Goodyear, in E.J. Kenney and W.V. Clausen, edd. The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II.4: The Early Principate (Cambridge 1982), 141-142.

[36]Auerbach, Mimesis, 30-31; cf. Sullivan, Satyricon, 103.

[37]See below, pp. 89-97; 115-157, passim. Auerbach's suggestion that the portrait of Trimalchio is "mere caricature" (Mimesis, 31) has been effectively countered by Sullivan, Satyricon, 151-153.

[38]P. Parsons, BICS 18 (1971), 66, and, more explicitly, in P. Oxy. 42 (1974), 35.

[39]R. Astbury, "Petronius, P. Oxy. 3010, and Menippean Satire", CP 72 (1977), 22-31, quote from p. 22. With regard to the Satyricon, D. Bartonkova, Eirene 14 (1976), 82 likewise concludes, "even from the stylistic point of view the term 'Menippean satire' cannot be used in regard to Petronius' work without reservation." Cf. also G. Puccioni, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa 6 (1976), 35-52 with the response of E. Zaffagno in the same volume, 799-811, esp. 800-802.

[40]M. Haslam, in P. Turner (cit. below, nt. 43), 37.

[41]By Q. Cataudella, Cultura e Scuola 54 (1975), 42-48; cf. also "Un frammento di Menippo?", Sileno 1 (1975), 143-154, which I have not seen. The date of the papyrus of course provides only a terminus ante quem for the composition of the work.

[42]G. Anderson, Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction (Mnemosyne Subblb. 43) (1976), 107-108; in his later discussion, Eros Sophistes, 56, Anderson considers only the possibilities of the comic and ideal romance.

[43]The Tinouphis Romance (P. Turner 8): M.W. Haslam, "Narrative about Tinouphis in Prosimetrum", in Papyri Greek and Egyptian Edited by Various Hands in Honour of Eric Gardner Turner on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday (P. Turner) (Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs no. 68) (London 1981), 35-45, 210-211. Haslam is cautious about assigning the Tinouphis fragment to a particular genre: after rejecting Milesian tales, he admits Menippean satire and mime as possibilities but ultimately favors the Greek romance (39).

[44]Lollianus' Phoinikika: A. Henrichs, ZPE 4 (1969), 205-215; 5 (1970), 22; and the definitive publication, Die Phoinikika des Lollianos (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 14) (Bonn 1972); for further discussion of the text, see J.N. O'Sullivan, ZPE 50 (1983), 7-11 with bibliography. For interpretation, see G. Sandy, AJP 100 (1979), 367-376; C.P. Jones, Phoenix 34 (1980), 243-254; J.J. Winkler, JHS 100 (1980), 155-181; Anderson, Eros Sophistes, 57-58.

[45]Cf. also the Sesonchosis Romance (P. Oxy. 1826, 2466, 3319): S. West, P. Oxy. XLVII 3319 (1980), 11-19, which includes elements traditionally associated with the "separate" genres of sophisticated love romance and popular historical fiction: J.N. O'Sullivan and W.A. Beck, ZPE 45 (1982), 71-83, esp. 82-83. For a recent survey of views on the Greek Romances, including the new fragments: P.J. Parsons, in London Review of Books, 20 Aug.- 2 Sept., 1981, 13-14.

[46]Contra, Perry, AR, e.g., 183: "there is no connection in literary tradition or practice between the comic romance and the ideal". Perry died in 1970, before any of the new fragments had been published. F. Wehlri, MH 22 (1965), 133-154 argues that both the ideal and the comic novel developed from a common source of popular narrative themes. See now, Anderson, Eros Sophistes, passim, esp. 87-92.

[47]Cf. Perry, AR, 206: "As for the influence of satire and other literary forms and traditions upon the writing of the Satyricon, those are secondary matters having nothing to do with the genesis or raison d'être of the novel as such." Cf. also Sullivan, Satyricon, 100.

[48]The first glimmerings of a "moralist" interpretation of the Satyricon date back to two fifteenth-century manuscripts of the Bellum Civile (Sat. 119-124) in which the poem is described in the inscriptions as an invective assailing the vices of the Romans: see A.F. Sochatoff, TAPA 93 (1962), 454-455, who, with some qualifications, shares the same view (456-458); cf. also F.I. Zeitlin, Latomus 30 (1971), 56-82, esp. 67-82.

[49]G. Boissier, L'Opposition sous les Césars (Paris 1900), 258 seems to have been the first modern author to suggest that Petronius wrote the Satyricon specifically in order to entertain; but cf. Macr., Somn. Scip. 1.2.8, "Fabulae, quarum nomen indicat falsi professionem, aut tantum conciliandae auribus voluptatis aut adhortationis quoque in bonam frugem gratia repertae sunt....Auditum mulcent...argumenta fictis casibus amatorum referta quibus vel multum se Arbiter exercuit..."

[50]G. Highet, "Petronius the Moralist", TAPA 72 (1941), 176-194, to a certain extent anticipated by O. Schissel von Fleschenberg, in WS 33 (1911), 264, 272.

[51]Cf. Ch. Witke, Latin Satire: The Structure of Persuasion (Leiden 1970), 153-156, quote from p. 154; W.R. Nethercut, CB 43 (1967), 53-55; C. Piano, RAAN 51 (1976), 3-30, esp. 28-30. Cf. also W. Ehlers, in Müller-Ehlers[3], 495-496.

[52]P. Veyne, "Le 'je' dans le Satiricon", REL 42 (1964), 301-324, esp. 303-306.

[53]V. Ebersbach, "Petrons Stellung zu den sozialen Kräften der frühen Kaiserzeit", Das Altertum 19 (1973), 96-104, esp. 103; cf. also N.M. Santrossjan, "Über die ideologische und künstlerische Eigenart des Satirikon von Petronius", BCO 8 (1963), 92 (résumé of an article in Russian).

[54]W. Arrowsmith, "Luxury and Death in the Satyricon", Arion 5 (1966), 304-331, 319-320 (hereafter, Arrowsmith, "Luxury and Death").

[55]H. Bacon, "The Sibyl in the Bottle", Virginia Quarterly Review 34 (1958), 262-276.

[56]For a different interpretation of Petronius' use of the thematic association of lavish living with death, see below, pp. 194-197.

[57]F.I. Zeitlin, "Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity", TAPA 102 (1971), 631-685, quotes from pp. 633, 645, 680, respectively. On p. 680, Zeitlin generalizes that the freedmen's speeches "display an enslavement to the general values of the society which [they] yearn to enter". I discuss the freedmen's attitudes in detail below, ch. 3, pp. 89-98; chs. 4 and 5, passim.

[58]Cf. L. Canali, RCCM 3 (1961), 383-385; J.P. Sullivan, Arion 6 (1967), 71-98 (Satyricon, 106-111, 255-259; Bucknell Review 19 (1971), 107-117; Helikon 17 (1977), 149-153); G. Schmeling, CB 45 (1969), 49-50, 64; P.G. Walsh, G&R 21 (1974), 181-190. J. Wright, G&R 23 (1976), 32-39; V. Gigante, Vichiana 9 (1980), 61-78; G. Anderson, Eros Sophistes, 67-73, 95-97. For specific criticisms of Veyne's arguments: R. Beck, Phoenix 29 (1975), 280-282. H. Galsterer, "Petrons Gastmahl des Trimalchio und die römische Sozialgeschichte", in B. von Cerquiglini and H.U. Gumbrecht, edd., Der Diskurs der Literatur- und Sprachhistorie: Wissenschaftsgeschichte als Innovationsvorgabe (Frankfurt am Mainz 1983), 506 raises the possibility of Ebersbach's interpretation and gives good grounds for rejecting it but is evidently unaware that the view has actually been proposed

(hereafter, Galsterer, "Gastmahl").

[59]G. Sandy, "Satire in the Satyricon", AJP 90 (1969), 293-303; P. Grimal, "Une intention possible de Pétron dans le Satiricon", BAGB 4 (1972), 297-310.

[60]See below, pp. 89-96, 143-149.

[61]Cf. M. Coffey, Roman Satire (London 1976), 200: "Petronius'...main purpose...was to create a realistic social and economic sketch of the lives of small-town Campanian freedmen."; Sullivan, Satyricon, 152: "The result is a realism that operates for its own sake..."; D. Gagliardi, Vichiana 7 (1978), 114.

[62]Sullivan, Satyricon, mentions this nostalgie de la boue as a possible influence on Petronius' choice of content at several points in his discussion (101, 139, 215, 221), but in his conclusion it becomes a certainty (263); cf. also Rose, DAS, 42; F.I. Zeitlin, TAPA 102 (1971), 681-682. For Nero's forays into the seamier districts of Rome: Tac., Ann. 13.25, 47; Dio 61.8.1; Suet., Nero 26.3-4.

[63]Cf. C. Stöcker, Humor bei Petron (Diss. Erlangen 1969), 128 (admiration); Galsterer, "Gastmahl", 507 (envy); cf. also Arrowsmith, above, p. 17.

[64]In ch. 3, parts I and II, I have tried to indicate some of the features of both aspects of Petronius' characterization. For Trimalchio as a partly sympathetic figure, cf., e.g., G. Bagnani, Phoenix 8 (1954), 90-91; Sullivan, Satyricon, 152; Rankin, Petronius the Artist, 26-27; R.J.A. Talbert, JRS 66 (1976), 237 (less explicitly).

[65]Cf. P. George, Arion 5 (1966), 348; Sullivan, Satyricon, 230.

[66]D'Arms, CSS, 97-100, quote from p. 97; cf. also P. Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen and the Economy of Roman Italy under the Principate", Klio 63 (1981), 371 (hereafter, Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen").

[67]Despite Rostovtzeff's claims to the contrary in the preface to his Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (Oxford 1926), it is not entirely true that in seeking "to connect the social and economic evolution of the Empire with its constitutional and administrative development", he had no predecessors. But in focusing on the workings of Roman society beneath the senatorial and equestrian orders and in emphasizing the importance of archaeological evidence for historical interpretation, Rostovtzeff established the essential character of the discipline. For an appreciative assessment of Rostovtzeff's contributions

(and weaknesses), see G.W. Bowersock, Daedalus 103 (1974), 15-23; for the ideological preconceptions and inconsistencies that tainted Rostovtzeff's major works, M. Reinhold, Science and Society 10 (1946), 361-391; for the background that shaped Rostovtzeff's intellectual development, A. Momigliano, Chapter Five, in Studies in Historiography (New York 1966), 91-104.

[68]M.I. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, 2nd ed., revised by P.M. Fraser (Oxford 1957), 57-58; cf. 551 n.25 (hereafter, Rostovtzeff, SEHRE[2]).

[69]Cf. G. Vitucci, "Libertus", in Diz. Ep. 4 (1958), 930 (hereafter, Vitucci, "Libertus"); S. Mrozek, Chiron 5 (1975), 313.

[70]So, for example, A.M. Duff, Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire (Oxford 1928, repr. with additions and corrections, Cambridge 1958), 124 (hereafter, Duff, FERE); Veyne, "Trimalcion", 213-247, passim, but esp. 213, 247; J. Gagé, Les classes sociales dans l'empire romain (Paris 1964), 140 (hereafter, Gagé, CSER); E.M. Staerman and M.K. Trofimova, La schiavitù nell'Italia imperiale (Moscow 1971, Italian tr., Rome 1975), 122 (hereafter, Staerman, Schiavitù) [but cf. E.M. Staerman, Die Krise der Sklavenhalterordnung im Westen des romischen Reiches, trans. W. Seyfarth (Berlin 1964), 110-111 (hereafter: Staerman, Krise)]; J. Schmidt, Vie et mort des esclaves dans la Rome antique (Paris 1973), 174; K. Hopkins, Conquerors and Slaves: Sociological Studies in Roman History 1 (Cambridge 1978), 117 nt. 36 (hereafter, Hopkins, C&S).

[71]R. MacMullen, Roman Social Relations, 50 B.C. to A.D. 284 (New Haven 1974), 49-50: "Trimalchio...was meant by his creator to embody everything contemptible in the nouveau riche...he and his friends still called themselves businessmen even while drawing their income from arable or vineyards"; 103: "He is typical also in being an ex-slave" (hereafter, MacMullen, RSR).

[72]Finley, AE, 50-51 (freedmen); 78 (businessmen); 50, 115-116 (Roman senators); 36, 38, 61 (ancient attitudes in general).

[73]G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World from the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests (Ithaca 1981), 178 (hereafter, de Ste. Croix, CSAGW) and P. Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen", 371 question the wisdom of considering anything in the Satyricon to be typical. G. Bagnani, Phoenix 8 (1954), 77-91 has suggested that Petronius based his portrait of Trimalchio on a particular family freedman. Bagnani's arguments are unconvincing, but they point up the need for caution in assuming

Trimalchio to be typical. Cf. also M.W. Frederiksen, in JRS 65 (1975), 169 (review of Finley, AE).

[74]Cf., e.g., Duff, FERE, 18; W.L. Westermann, The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity (Philadelphia 1955), 100 (hereafter, Westermann, Slave Systems); J.P.V.D. Balsdon, Romans and Aliens (London 1979), 80 (hereafter, Balsdon, R&A) (prices of slaves); Balsdon, R&A, 154 nt. (nomenclature of ex-slaves who had had two masters); J.A. Crook, Law and Life of Rome (London 1967), 60 (motive for self-sale into slavery), 147 (investment of commercial profits in real estate), 186 (rights of search and seizure of runaway slaves) (hereafter, Crook, LLR); G. Alföldy Römische Sozialgeschichte (Wiesbaden 1975), 100-101 (profits from commerce and industry); Staerman, Schiavitù, 121-122 (patrons lending money to their freedmen); J. Gérard, Juvénal et la réalité contemporaine (Paris 1976), 131 nt. 1 (masters mistreating their slaves).

[75]Duncan-Jones, ERE[2] 238, 247-248; de Ste. Croix, CSAGW, 178.

[76]Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen", 371, citing F. Dupont, Le plaisir et la loi. Du Banquet de Platon au Satiricon (Paris 1977), 12-13 (hereafter, Dupont, Plaisir). Few, I believe, will want to accept that the Cena can be entirely divorced from the society it depicts, as Dupont seems to imply (cf. esp. pp. 10-11, 14, 186-187). For a specific instance in which Dupont's misunderstanding of Roman institutions leads to a misinterpretation of the text, see below, p. 185 with p. 214 nt. 10.

[77]Dupont, Plaisir, 12.

[78]Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen", 371.

[79]J. Wright, G&R 23 (1976), 37.

[80]Thus, for example, by subjecting the figure of Trimalchio to scrutiny under "critical callibrations... equally attentive to literary tradition, historical and geographical context, and points of language", D'Arms, CSS, 100-120 successfully illuminates Trimalchio's equestrian pretensions and refutes the widely held view that Trimalchio abandoned commercial pursuits entirely when he withdrew from active participation in trade.

CHAPTER TWO

FREEDMEN IN THE *SATYRICON*

Who are the freedmen in the *Satyricon* and how do we know that they are freedmen? The answers to these questions will suggest two related observations: first, Trimalchio's status as an ex-slave is the dominant feature in his characterization; and, second, by describing Trimalchio's milieu in terms of the civil status of its members, Petronius distinguishes the freedmen as a group from the other characters in the extant portions of the novel, who do not belong to any clearly identifiable segment of the population. Whereas outside the *Cena* the protagonists are "classless" figures, at Trimalchio's banquet their status becomes relevant because they are shown to be outsiders to the freedmen's society. Trimalchio's milieu is depicted as a social underworld and Encolpius' experience at the banquet as a *katabasis*. Trimalchio's status as a freedman, therefore, is not an incidental element in Petronius' portrayal of a boorish host but an integral part of his presentation.

We learn of Trimalchio's freedman status early in the *Cena* and are reminded of it at several points in the course of the banquet. Upon entering Trimalchio's home, Encolpius pauses in the portico to survey the murals, in

which various stages of Trimalchio's career, both before and after his manumission (29.3-6), are carefully rendered and explained by accompanying inscriptions (29.4). On several occasions in the dinner conversation Trimalchio alludes to his life as a slave (39.4, 52.2, 63.3, 69.3) and in the banquet's final scene delivers a full account of his successful rise from slavery to freedom and affluence (75.10-76.10). The Cena is thus framed by explicit and detailed references to Trimalchio's status as an ex-slave, and the reader is reminded of Trimalchio's servile past roughly once every ten chapters throughout the episode.

Like Trimalchio, two of the guests, Hermeros and Niceros, reveal their freedman status by referring to their servitude as a condition of the past: "annis quadraginta servivi....tamen - genio illius [sc. patroni mei] gratias - enatavi" (57.9-10: Hermeros); "cum adhuc servirem" (61.6: Niceros). Trimalchio at one point mentions that he bought his wife Fortunata off the slave auction block (74.13). Habinnas the stonemason is identified as a sevir Augustalis (65.5) and was therefore presumably thought of as a freedman (see below, p. 142 and nt. 86). About his wife Scintilla (66.5) we can be less certain, but her cognomen, which is rare, likewise suggests a servile origin.[1]

Most of the freedmen in the Satyricon, however, are identified not individually and obliquely by reference to their servile origins but directly and collectively through a single comment made in passing by one of Trimalchio's

dinner guests near the beginning of the Cena. At 37.1, Encolpius turns to Hermeros, who is reclining next to him (cf. 36.7), and asks who it is that is bustling about. After identifying the woman as Fortunata and describing the wealth of her husband, Hermeros warns Encolpius not to despise Trimalchio's fellow freedmen, because they too are rich: "reliquos autem collibertos eius cave contemnas. valde sucos[s]i sunt" (38.6). He then points out two of the dinner guests, one a porter who has only recently won his freedom ("est tamen sub alapa" (38.9): see Appendix 2, nt. 1), the other an undertaker who reclines "on the freedman's couch" ("qui libertini loco iacet" (38.11)),[2] thus making it clear that the colliberti to whom he refers are his and Encolpius' tablemates. The use of the term collibertus in this context is peculiar and requires some explanation.

The word occurs in classical literature only six times, once in Plautus (Poen. 910), once in Cicero (Verr. 6.154) and four times in Petronius (38.6, 57.1, 58.3, 59.1). In the legal sources (seven instances) and in inscriptions, where the word occurs hundreds of times, it almost always describes a person who has been manumitted by the same master as another ex-slave. H. Chantraine has documented three epigraphic examples in which a freedman apparently refers to his own freedman as a collibertus and another two, which must be considered anomalous, in which the term is associated with a person whose juridical status is that of a slave.[3] Apart from these exceptions, the word is thought

always to have described the relationship between two freedmen who shared the same patron.

In the Satyricon, however, the term is evidently used in a less restricted sense to describe an ex-slave simply in relationship to his peers. Of the two colliberti of Trimalchio whom Hermeros points out to Encolpius, one is named C. Pompeius Diogenes (38.10). This accords with the strict usage of the term, for Trimalchio's name, C. Pompeius Trimalchio Maecenatianus (71.12; 30.2), shows the same praenomen and gentilicium as Diogenes': in other words, both freedmen could have been manumitted by the same master. The other freedman, however, is named Julius Proculus (38.16) -- possibly, but not certainly, <C.> Iulius Proculus, as Bücheler first proposed.

We know of only two circumstances in which colliberti (in the strict sense) could have different gentilicia. If a slave were owned jointly by two masters, he might take the gentilicium of either one upon being formally freed, whereas another slave manumitted by the same two masters might take the name of the other: thus colliberti sharing the same patrons might bear different gentilicia. Likewise, if a master who had freed a number of slaves were subsequently adopted by another citizen and thereafter manumitted other slaves, the slaves freed before his adoption would take his given name, but those freed after would assume the name of their master's adoptive father.[4] Neither of these situations seems to apply to the case of

Trimalchio, who evidently served a single master who was himself never adopted.[5] It thus seems that at 38.6 Hermeros uses the term loosely to describe a group of persons who, like Trimalchio, had been slaves but who had not necessarily served the same master as Trimalchio.

Why did Petronius use a technical term, collibertus, in this sense when he might have written amici libertini or something similar instead?[6] The choice was deliberate, and Petronius expected his audience to recognize the anomalous usage, for Diogenes and Proculus are the only freedmen in the Cena besides Trimalchio whose gentilicia are reported.

M.B. Flory has recently shown that the word implies an especially close relationship between the persons to whom it refers -- indeed, "within slave society the terms 'conservus' and 'collibertus' undoubtedly had all the force of kinship designations".[7] By referring to Trimalchio's peers as his colliberti, Hermeros emphasizes a connection between Trimalchio and his friends in terms of their status as ex-slaves and establishes the nature of the social background against which Trimalchio is meant to be viewed. The society of the Cena is defined not by wealth or by occupation but by civil status; the reader is encouraged to recognize that Trimalchio's attitudes and behavior represent those of a freedman.

In the preceding chapter we noted the lack of agreement among historians as to whether Trimalchio was meant to be seen primarily as a freedman or as a municipal

businessman, and we observed that the characteristics of the two types need not have been mutually exclusive. In the following chapter I will point out some of the ways in which they coincide, and I will offer an explanation as to why Petronius represented his freedmen as petty merchants and traders. For the present I wish only to stress that, by establishing Trimalchio's civil status at the beginning of the episode through the description of the murals in his portico (a passage in which Trimalchio's commercial activities are alluded to only indirectly[8]) and by emphasizing Trimalchio's relationship to his peers in terms of their status as ex-slaves, Petronius ensures that his readers will regard Trimalchio primarily as a freedman. As we shall see (below, pp. 117-119, 155-156), the other three instances of "collibertus" in the Satyricon (57.1, 58.3, 59.1) likewise occur in a context in which Petronius emphasizes the connection between Trimalchio and one of his guests in terms of civil status.

The dinner guests thus identified by Hermeros as "fellow freedmen" of Trimalchio include not only Proculus and Diogenes but at least six other speaking characters: Dama (41.10), Seleucus (42.1), Phileros (43.1), Ganymede (44.1), Echion (45.1), Plocamus (64.2), and a vetus convive (33.8), if he is not one of those already mentioned (see further below, p. 158 nt. 2). In the course of the banquet the lives of twelve different freedmen are selectively revealed to us either through their own words or through the

testimony of their peers.[9] This figure becomes especially striking when we consider the remaining portions of the Satyricon, for outside the Cena we do not find a single character who is explicitly identified as an ex-slave.

The social and geographical origins of the narrator Encolpius and the precise nature of his criminal past have been extensively discussed, but a satisfactory answer to the question of his civil status has yet to be found.[10] The situation is similar with the other major characters in the novel. A few random remarks, mostly insults, have fueled speculation about the status of Encolpius' companions, Ascyltus and Giton. But the passages adduced in support of various theories have either been drawn from highly rhetorical contexts or are otherwise suspect because of the source from which they derive: Eumolpus' hired man Corax, for example, cannot be expected to provide accurate information concerning Encolpius' and Giton's civil status, since he knows even less of their past than we do.[11] Not surprisingly in these circumstances, scholars basing their arguments on the same few details have reached widely divergent conclusions: Ascyltus has been variously labeled as a freedman, a freeborn citizen, or a Roman knight;[12] Giton has been taken for a slave, a freedman, or a freeborn youth.[13] In short, none of the apparently direct indications in the text provides a sure means of establishing the social status of the protagonists.

On the other hand, there are good reasons for believing that Petronius intended the names of some of his characters to suggest their status as ex-slaves. Recent studies of the inscriptional evidence from Rome and central Italy have shown that persons bearing Semitic or oriental cognomina were almost always slaves or freedmen of Eastern extraction.[14] It is therefore likely that Petronius' audience, upon hearing the names of Trimalchio (26.9), Massa (69.5), Habinnas (65.5), Bargates (96.4), and perhaps Seleucus (42.1), would immediately have associated the characters with servile backgrounds and Eastern origins[15] In the cases of Trimalchio, Massa, and Habinnas, both conclusions are supported by independent testimony elsewhere in the narrative.[16] Of the characters to whom Petronius assigns oriental cognomina, however, only Bargates appears outside the Cena.

With regard to the Greek names in the Satyricon, the situation is more complex. Most scholars today agree that in Italy of the early Empire a Greek cognomen was a sign of servile origin, or of servile descent,[17] and the overwhelming majority of names assigned by Petronius to his characters (by my count, 52 of 75) are Greek.[18] This might suggest that a number of the characters in the novel would have been thought of as freedmen or slaves. But we are liable to distort the author's literary intentions if we assume that Petronius invariably chose his names with a view to establishing the social status of his actors. The

rhetorician Agamemnon provides a case in point.

It is well known that at all periods in Roman Italy most professional men of letters were slaves or freedmen,[19] and Agamemnon's Greek name would seem to confirm that he belongs to one of those two categories. Our suspicions are aroused, however, when we discover that Agamemnon's assistant is named Menelaus (27.4; cf. 81.1) and that the cognomen Agamemnon is exceedingly rare in the Roman world. When we remember that Varro assigned the same name to an inveterate declaimer ridiculed in one of his Mennipean satires (Virg. Div.) our doubts increase.[20] Finally, when we note that Agamemnon responds to Encolpius' praise of classical Greek authors and the purity of the Attic style (2.3-8) by quoting Cicero (3.2) and then going on to recite a "schedium Lucilianae humilitatis" (4.5) on the proper early training for the Roman law courts (5),[21] we realize that our assessment of Agamemnon as a freedman is, if not incorrect, at least misguided and beside the point. Clearly Petronius chose the name of his rhetorician not in order to indicate his civil status but rather for the literary possibilities it presented: the pedantic professor in the Satyricon recalls the figure in Varro, and Petronius embellishes the portrait by pointing up the incongruous contrast between Agamemnon's Greek name and lofty ideals and his pragmatic accommodation of the study of his native literature to Roman circumstances.[22]

Indeed, what strikes us most when we come to identifying the freedmen in the Satyricon is the sharp contrast between the Cena, where Petronius explicitly characterizes Trimalchio and his friends in terms of their civil status, and the rest of the novel, where the protagonists drift through a socially amorphous world in which class distinctions matter little.

At one point Petronius levels a passing shot at Roman knights by identifying a notorious lecher who intercepts Ascyltus at the baths as an eques Romanus (92.10). Earlier in the narrative, however, another figure who propositions Ascyltus is described simply as a pater familiae (8.2-4). This suggests that Ascyltus' alluring physique is the salient feature in both episodes and that the first character's status as a Roman knight is incidental. Elsewhere we are given a brief glimpse of social ambition in the form of a slave girl who refuses to have intercourse with anyone of less than equestrian rank (126.10). But the girl's sexual proclivities are brought into play simply in order to provide a contrast with the tastes of her mistress (cf. 126.11), and the picture of a slave girl attempting to rise above her station is never developed.

Apart from these instances, we have only one short scene outside the Cena in which the civil status of the characters plays any significant part in the plot. When Encolpius and Giton are discovered on board Lichas' ship and

their masquerade as fugitive slaves is exposed, Eumolpus, speaking in their defense, reverses his earlier position of claiming that they are recaptured runaways (105.2-3) and argues that they are in fact freeborn citizens (107.1-6; 108.3). The spurious claim to ingenuitas, however, is soon forgotten when the trial degenerates into a brawl (108.4-12), and with it disappears the "social" issue of Encolpius' and Giton's civil status.

In sum, there is little evidence outside the Cena that Petronius associated particular attitudes and behavior with specific segments of society, or that he exploited the satiric possibilities afforded by the nature of the Roman social hierarchy, in which target groups came ready-defined by civil status. Whereas in the Cena Trimalchio and his friends are characterized by their juridical position as ex-slaves, in the rest of the novel the targets of Petronius' satire are defined by type rather than social status: we are given portraits of a rhetorician, a poetaster, a cuckolded husband, libidinous women, legacy hunters, religious frauds, and so on, but not, for example, of a Roman knight, a senator, or a municipal magistrate.

The protagonists themselves are social opportunists who adapt their personae to suit their circumstances. Indeed, throughout much of the extant narrative they are represented as "classless" figures who belong to no identifiable segment of the population. In these respects, the "heroes" of the Satyricon resemble both their literary

forebears and their literary descendants. F.I. Zeitlin notes that the quality of versatility is typical of the hero in the picaresque novels, of which the Satyricon is often considered to be the prototype: "in order to meet the shifting picaresque world, the picaro must and does assume 'protean forms'. He should be adept at role-playing and disguise".[23] With regard to their "classlessness", the main characters in the Satyricon recall the protagonists of the Greek novels. Indeed, B.P. Reardon has described the social isolation of the hero as one of the characteristic features of the genre: in the Greek romances the protagonists "are stripped...of their social appurtenances....The novel's hero has no relationship to society".[24]

In the Satyricon, Encolpius' criminal past necessarily obliterates whatever social identity he may originally have possessed and places him in the diverse company of those extra legem viventes (125.4). But in the Satyricon the social rootlessness characteristic of the hero in the Greek romances and picaresque novels extends to the supporting actors as well, allowing them to slip easily into and out of various roles. We have already mentioned the episode in which Encolpius and Giton disguise themselves as runaway slaves in order to escape detection aboard Lichas' ship (103.3-106.4): until they are unmasked, Eumolpus pretends to be their master (105.3). Throughout the first half our fragment Encolpius and Ascyltus play the part of scholastici (1.1-78.8; cf. 10.6) and Giton the part of their

slave (24.5; 26.10; 58.1). In the final episode Encolpius and Giton, now joined by Eumolpus' hired man Corax, once again play the slaves of Eumolpus, while the latter assumes the role of a bereaved and wealthy African landowner (117.4-141.11). In only a small fraction of the extant text does the narrator appear *in propria persona*, and at no point outside the *Cena* does the social status of the principal actors, whether actual or assumed, dictate either their own behavior or the treatment they receive at the hands of others.[25]

In the *Cena*, however, the protagonists lose their "classlessness", not through any sudden recognition of their proper position within the social hierarchy, but simply because the freedmen treat them as outsiders to their own milieu. Unlike the other characters in the novel, Trimalchio and his friends are acutely aware of their own status.[26] Consequently, they tend to view the rest of society also in terms of class. V. Ciaffi has argued convincingly that, up until the arrival of Habinnas, Trimalchio's behavior at the banquet is motivated almost exclusively by his desire to impress Encolpius and Ascyltus, whom he believes to be freeborn *scholastici*.[27] Conversely, when Ascyltus and Giton at one point break into derisive laughter at the boorishness of their host, Hermeros attacks them by challenging Ascyltus' pretensions to equestrian status (57.4, 58.10) and by upbraiding Giton, whom he believes to be a slave, for overstepping the bounds of his presumed servile status

(58.2). Just as Hermeros stresses the bond between Trimalchio and his peers in terms of their status as ex-slaves, so his attack on Ascyltus and Giton draws attention to the fact that they do not belong to the same group. Similarly, Trimalchio's response to Ascyltus and Encolpius is based on his belief that they are members of a different, more respectable, segment of society.

Whereas elsewhere in the novel the protagonists are "classless", protean figures, in the Cena their social status becomes an issue because the freedmen themselves are intensely "class conscious". Ascyltus and Encolpius are treated as outsiders because they are thought to be free-born, Giton because he is regarded as a slave. Petronius emphasizes this contrast between the protagonists and the freedmen by representing Encolpius' visit to Trimalchio's home as a trip to the underworld.

Several scholars have noted a concentration of allusions near the end of the Cena which suggest that the freedmen's milieu be seen as a social underworld. Most notably, the scene in which Encolpius, Ascyltus, and Giton attempt to escape the banquet but are thwarted by a ferocious hound and an atriensis who advises them that none of Trimalchio's guests are ever permitted to leave by the same door through which they have entered (72.6-10) recalls two passages in Vergil's Aeneid 6. Just as, in the Cena, Giton placates the hound by tossing him dinner scraps (72.9), so in the Aeneid the Sibyl subdues Cerberus by

offering him a drugged cake (Aen. 6.419-423); the butler's reference to two doors (72.10), moreover, suggests the twin gates that Aeneas encounters upon leaving the underworld (Aen. 6.893-896).

Encolpius' next remark, "quid faciamus homines miserrimi et novi generis labyrintho inclusi" (73.1), makes the katabasismotiv explicit: in ancient art and literature labyrinths were associated particularly with death traps and tombs. Given the context, Encolpius' comment perhaps recalls Vergil's description of the Minoan labyrinth represented on the doors of the Temple to Apollo that Aeneas surveys before entering the Sibyl's cave (Aen. 6.23-33). In any event, Encolpius' reference to a "new kind of labyrinth" explains the unexpected prominence in the preceding scene of Trimalchio's cook, whose name is only then revealed to be Daedalus (70.1-3,12-13; cf. 74.5). Finally, the labyrinth motif is picked up later in the description of the protagonists' ultimately successful escape from the banquet (79.4).[28]

These allusions are sufficient to demonstrate that, by the end of the Cena, Encolpius, Ascyltus, and Giton are depicted as anti-heroes caught in a labyrinthine underworld. What has not previously been observed, however, is that the theme is established unequivocally at the beginning of the episode in a manner which indicates precisely the nature of the underworld that Trimalchio's home is meant to represent.

It has been suggested that the "attentive reader" might deduce from the unusual sign posted at Trimalchio's door, "quisquis servus sine dominico iussu foras exierit accipiet plagas centum" (28.7), that Trimalchio's home would present difficulties for those who tried to leave without permission, and that the protagonists' slow progress, impeded by various obstacles, from the outer doorway to the triclinium proper (28.6-31.3) establishes the labyrinth motif at the outset. It has further been noted that the "canis ingens, catena vinctus" depicted on the outer wall of Trimalchio's home (29.1) recalls the "canis catenarius" of 72.7 and that Encolpius' reaction to the former ("paene resupinatus crura mea fregi": 29.1) parallels Ascyltus' response to the latter ("ut Ascyltos etiam in piscinam ceciderit").[29] When viewed in retrospect, these passages may be seen to support the katabasismotiv established later in the Cena; but whether these or any of several other possible indicators would in themselves have suggested to Petronius' audience that Trimalchio's house was meant to be seen as an underworld remains doubtful.[30]

On the other hand, the decoration of Trimalchio's portico ensures that Trimalchio's house would have been recognized as a home of the dead. Interspersed with the realistic elements in Petronius' description -- the "cave canem" mural (29.1), the armarium supporting the lararium (29.8), and the scenes from the Iliad and Odyssey (29.9) -- are several features that would have struck a contemporary

Roman as particularly incongruous in a domestic setting. Specifically, the half allegorical, half realistic depiction of Trimalchio's career (29.3-6), the pictorial representation of gladiatorial games (29.9), and the fasces affixed to the doorposts of the triclinium (30.1) are unparalleled in Roman domestic art. By contrast, all three motifs occur in the decoration of Roman tombs and funerary stelae.[31] Petronius' audience would have considered these elements appropriate in the decoration of a sepulchral monument -- indeed, as we learn in the episode immediately preceding the protagonists' abortive attempt to escape the banquet (71.5-11), several of the same themes are repeated in the sculptural program for Trimalchio's tomb.[32] But in a domestic context, the same ornamentation would have seemed strangely macabre, and a contemporary Roman could not have failed to recognize that Trimalchio's house was being represented as a mausoleum. The nature of its occupant is made clear by the autobiographical frieze in Trimalchio's portico.

The first four scenes depict Trimalchio's career as a slave (29.3-4). The final scene, and the only one that concerns Trimalchio's life as a freedman, represents his elevation to the sevirate as an apotheosis: "levatum mento in tribunal excelsum Mercurius rapiebat" (29.5). As Trimalchio elsewhere makes clear, the god of commerce is his patron deity (77.4; cf. 67.7), but Mercury's role in the present context is that of the Psychopompus (cf. 140.12). The transition from slavery to freedom is portrayed as a

transition from life to the afterlife: Trimalchio's underworld is the world of a freedman.

Not only the content but also the style of Trimalchio's mural points to his status as an ex-slave. We have just noted that it is Mercury who escorts Trimalchio to the sevir's tribunal. As a slave, Trimalchio himself is depicted in the guise of the god of commerce: "ipse Trimalchio capillatus caduceum tenebat" (29.3). H. Wrede has recently shown that this type of allegorical representation, in which the deceased is identified with a particular deity, first appears in the funerary art of the late Julio-Claudian period and for the next eighty years occurs almost exclusively on the monuments of slaves and freedmen of Eastern extraction. Throughout this period the most frequently represented god is Mercury, whose prominence is explained by the fact that many ex-slaves wished to commemorate their successful careers in trade and commerce.[33] Thus, just as the content of Trimalchio's biographical cycle calls attention to his freedman status, so the style of the representation would have reminded Petronius' audience of the type of funerary relief that had recently begun to appear on the monuments of slaves and ex-slaves of Eastern origin.

Once we recognize that Trimalchio's house is depicted as an underworld inhabited by ex-slaves, it becomes possible to detect an added poignancy in Hermeros' identification of C. Pompeius Diogenes and Iulius Proculus as the

fellow freedmen of Trimalchio (38.6-16). We have noted above (p. 44) that Petronius draws attention to his peculiar use of the term "collibertus" at 38.6 by providing Proculus and Diogenes with the only gentilicia of any of Trimalchio's freedmen guests. Petronius' choice of surnames, and their juxtaposition with reference to Proculus' and Diogenes' status as freedmen, may themselves be significant.

When observed in close proximity, the names "Iulius" and "Pompeius" immediately call to mind the historical figures Julius Caesar and Pompey the Great. It is well known that the civil wars between Caesar and Pompey furnished many of the stock themes treated in rhetorical exercises during the first century A.D., and that the subject was particularly topical during the Neronian period, when Lucan was composing his Bellum Civile.[34] But the locus classicus for a literary representation of Pompey and Caesar together is a famous passage in Vergil's description of the underworld (Aen. 6.826-835).[35]

Commentators on the Vergilian passage frequently note that the poet calls attention to the quasi-familial relationship between the two enemies by alluding to Pompey's marriage to Caesar's daughter Julia twice in two lines: "aggeribus socer Alpinis atque arce Monoeci / descendens, gener adversis instructis Eois" (830-831). As we have seen, in the Satyricon Petronius emphasizes the bond between Diogenes, Proculus, and Trimalchio by referring to their shared freedman status with a term (collibertus) that had

"all the force of [a] kinship designation". In the next line of the Aeneid, moreover, Vergil suggests the folly of civil war by having Anchises address the two warriors disparagingly as "pueri" (831). The significance of this term for the relevant passage in the Satyricon will be obvious: "puer" was the standard term used in addressing an anonymous male slave. The poignancy of these possible allusions suggests that, in naming his freedmen "Iulius" and "Pompeius", Petronius may have intended his readers to recall Anchises' characterization of their illustrious namesakes in the Aeneid. If so, then the context of the passage in the Aeneid reinforces the interpretation of Trimalchio's milieu as a social underworld populated by freedmen.[36]

Finally, recognizing that Trimalchio's apotheosis represents his elevation from servile to freedman status (29.5) adds another dimension to the labyrinth motif developed elsewhere in the Cena (73.1, 79.4). It has been observed that Encolpius' explicit mention of a labyrinth at 73.1, when taken together with Petronius' pointed reference to the name of Trimalchio's cook, Daedalus, in the preceding scene (70.1-2), suggests that Trimalchio be viewed as a sort of Minotaur, who figuratively "devours" his guests by asserting his domineering personality and thereby draining them of their spirit.[37] The significance of the implied comparison is further enhanced by the similarity between the ambivalent status of the freedman and that of the monster.

At three points in the Cena, the freedmen draw an

implicit contrast between their former condition as slaves and their present status as free men by referring to themselves or their peers as "men among men".[38] Elsewhere Trimalchio stresses that slaves too are human beings: "amici,...et servi homines sunt et aeque unum lactem biberunt, etiam si illos malus fatus oppresserit" (71.1) In asserting their own "humanness", the freedmen reveal their acute awareness of the peculiar regard in which ex-slaves were held by the rest of humanity, for their comments reflect indirectly the common ancient belief that slaves were less than human, the equivalent, in many ways, of animals.[39] This notion is well illustrated by another passage in the Satyricon. On the road to Croton, Eumolpus' hired man Corax complains about the weight of the load that he is made to carry: "quid vos...iumentum me putatis esse aut lapidariam navem? hominis operas locavi, non caballi. nec minus liber sum quam vos" (117.12). The implication is that if Corax were a slave, then he could expect to be treated like a beast of burden.

As I hope to show in Chapters Four and Five, part of Petronius' purpose in the Cena is to show that a freedman can never escape the stigma of his servile past. When seen in this light, the analogy between Trimalchio's character and that of the Minotaur becomes apparent. Like the Minotaur, who is half man, half beast, Trimalchio is a hybrid: as a freedman, he has the status of a human being, but as an ex-slave he bears the indelible marks of his former

servitude, when he had no more rights than an animal. Like the Cretan monster, Petronius suggests, Trimalchio belongs in a prison, shut off from the rest of society. Furthermore, like the disembodied spirits that inhabit the underworld, who have the form but not the substance of humans, Trimalchio is a free man in appearance only: he lacks the essential quality of ingenuitas. Thus, both the labyrinth- and the underworld-motifs are reflected in Trimalchio's ambiguous status as a freedman.

In sum, I have argued that, by identifying Trimalchio's friends as his colliberti, Petronius emphasizes a connection between Trimalchio and his peers in terms of their civil status and establishes the nature of the social background against which Trimalchio is meant to be viewed. We have seen that Encolpius and his companions are outsiders to the freedmen's society, and that their visit to Trimalchio's home is represented as a trip to the underworld. I have tried to show that Petronius introduces the katabasis motif early in the Cena and links it specifically to Trimalchio's status as a freedman. My concern has been to demonstrate that Trimalchio's status is not incidental but a fundamental part of Petronius' characterization: Trimalchio's milieu is defined by the civil status of its members and that milieu is represented as a social underworld. To ignore that Trimalchio is a freedman is to deprive the katabasismotiv of much of its significance and to misrepresent Petronius' literary intentions in the Cena.

Notes to Chapter Two

[1]See I. Kajanto, The Latin Cognomina (Soc. Sci. Fenn., Comm. Hum. Litt. 36.2) (Helsinki 1965), 341 (hereafter, Kajanto, LC); S. Priuli, Ascyltus: Note di onomastica petroniana (Coll. Lat. 140) (Brussels, 1975), 25 (hereafter, Priuli, Ascyltus).

[2]The phrase "libertini loco", which is not found elsewhere, probably designated an inferior positon at table, to which Iulius Proculus may have been relegated because of his financial difficulties: cf. 38.12, "male vacillavit" (so Sage-Gilleland). Pliny, Ep. 2.6.3 suggests that freedmen and other dependents were often segregated from more important guests and served cheaper fare: cf. G. Highet, Juvenal the Satirist (Oxford 1954), 262 nt. 1 and A.N. Sherwin-White, The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary (Oxford 1966), 152-153 (hereafter, Sherwin-White, Pliny) with further refs. There is some evidence that the seating at Trimalchio's table was hierarchically arranged in an unconventional manner -- Trimalchio, the wealthiest of the freedmen, reclines, "novo more", summus in summo (31.8; cf. Smith ad loc.) -- but Petronius did not intend his audience to reconstruct the seating plan in any detail: only a few other specific indications are provided (38.7; 49.7; 57.1; 65.7 with Sen., Contr. 9.2.2), and more guests are mentioned in the course of the episode than could have been accommodated on the traditional nine couches.

[3]H. Chantraine, Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser: Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur (Forschungen zur Antiken Sklaverei 1) (Wiesbaden 1967), 119 (hereafter, Chantraine, Freigelassene). We need not concern ourselves with another four instances cited by Chantraine that involve discrepancies in gentilicia between married colliberti who were both imperial freedmen. Chantraine suggests that these cases are due to the partners having been freed by different emperors, but other, more conventional, explanations are possible: see S. Treggiari, Phoenix 35 (1981), 48 n. 14.

[4]See Vitucci, "Libertus", 911-912 for examples of both types.

[5]Friedlaender, ad 38.16 speculates that Trimalchio and Proculus had served the same master, who was a member of the Julian gens and who was adopted after Proculus had been freed; but there is no evidence in the text to support this view. Cf. also below, pp. 104-105 nt. 30.

[6]For the distinction between the terms libertus, a freedman in relation to his patron, and libertinus, a freedman in relation to the rest of society, see, e.g., Vitucci, "Libertus", 920; Treggiari, RFLR, 52-53. P. Grimal, RPh 16 (1942), 164 suggests that, in calling attention to Proculus' gentilicium, Petronius wanted his audience to recognize an allusion to a contemporary C. Iulius Proculus, a relative of the homonymous consul of A.D. 109. But the name is remarkably undistinctive and the existence of any Iulius Proculus in Neronian times remains hypothetical. Smith, ad 38.16 burkes the problem: "Proclus' gentile name shows that we should not take too precisely the word collibertos in [section] 6". But Petronius meant his readers to note the peculiarity of the term in the present context: see below in the text, p. 44.

[7]M.B. Flory, "Family in Familia: Kinship and Community in Slavery", AJAH 3 (1978), 78-95, quote from p. 89.

[8]In one scene Trimalchio is depicted holding a caduceus (29.3); in another Mercury raises him onto the tribunal to which he was entitled as an Augustalis (29.5). In both cases the iconography refers to Trimalchio's prospering in business under the patronage of the god of commerce: see now Wrede, Consecratio, 87, 93-94 with the remarks of R. Turcan, Gnomon 54 (1982), 679-680.

[9]Two other slaves are manumitted in the course of the festivities: the boy Dionysus, whom Trimalchio pronounces freed with the formula "liber esto" (41.6-8: see below, pp. 184-185) and the acrobat (petauristarius) who falls on Trimalchio's arm and is subsequently freed by Trimalchio with the same formula (54.5). In both cases Trimalchio performs an informal manumission inter amicos, which under the Empire conferred upon the newly freed slave only Junian Latin status: see A.N. Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship[2] (Oxford 1973), 328-334 (hereafter, Sherwin-White, RC[2]); Treggiari, RFLR, 29-30. There is no informal manumissio per mensam, a late innovation, at 70.10-11, and hence no need to date the Satyricon to the third century, as U.E. Paoli maintained, SDHI 2 (1936), 369-372, thus sparking a lively controversy in Italy during the late 1930s: cf. Rose, DAS, 15 nt. 1 for refs.; add, contra, G. Funaioli, BIDR 44 (1936-37), 385-395; RABol 10 (1936-37), 46-59; SIFC 15 (1938), 197-206; SIFC 16 (1939), 249-255.

[10]Cf., e.g., G. Bagnani, CP 41 (1956), 23-27; R. Pack, CP 55 (1960), 31-32; Sullivan, Satyricon, 39-46; J.F. Killeen, Hermes 97 (1969), 127-128; D.D. Mulroy, CP 65 (1970), 254-256; H. Van Thiel, Uberlieferung und Rekonstruktion (Mnemosyne Suppl. 20) (Leiden 1971), 61-65; M. Coccia, Le interpolazioni in Petronio (Quaderni della RCCM 13) (Rome 1973), 64-67 nt. 244 (hereafter, Coccia

Interpolazioni); P. Soverini, Mat. e Contr. 1 (1976), 97-107; A. Daviault, in Mélanges Etienne Gareau (Ottawa 1982), 165-172.

[11]The most frequently cited passages are, for Giton: 26.10, "et Gitona libentissime servile officium tuentem"; 81.5, "quid ille alter [sc. Giton]? qui [tamquam] die togae virilis stolam sumpsit" [Scaliger rightly compares Cic., Phil. 2.44-45; cf. A. Collignon, Etude sur Pétrone (Paris 1892), 287-288 (hereafter, Collignon, Etude)]; 97.10, "Ascyltus...se vero nihil aliud quam fugitivum suum dixit quaerere"; 107.3,5 (Eumolpus to Lichas and Tryphaena) "patimini liberos homines [sc. Encolpius et Giton] ire sine iniuria...in conspectu vestro supplices iacent iuvenes, ingenui honesti" (cf. 108.3; but cf. also 107.10 [Lichas to Eumolpus] "nam quod invidiam facis nobis ingenuos honestosque clamando, vide ne deteriorem facias confidentia causam"); 117.12, (Corax to Encolpius and Giton), "nec minus liber sum quam vos". For Ascyltus: 57.4 (Hermeros to Ascyltus), "eques Romanus es: et ego regis filius"; 58.10 (id.) "nisi si me iudicas anulos buxeos curare, quos amicae tuae involasti"; 81.4 "adulescens...stupro liber, stupro ingenuus".

[12]Freedman: L. Debray, NRD 43 (1919), 19-21; R. Browning, CR 63 (1949), 12; P.B. Corbett, Petronius (Twayne's World Author Series 97) (New York 1970), 66 (hereafter, Corbett, Petronius); Crook, LLR, 55. Freeborn: W. Ehlers in Müller-Ehlers[3], 516 (= Müller-Ehlers[2], 460). Roman knight: W.D. Lowe, Petronii Cena Trimalchionis (Cambridge 1905), xi, 96 (hereafter, Lowe); Ciaffi, Struttura, 80. The theory of E.V. Marmorale, La questione petroniana (Bari 1948), 317-323 (hereafter, Marmorale, QP), that Ascyltus had been born a slave, but was later manumitted and subsequently granted the ius anuli aurei, which conferred on him a fictitious ingenuitas, has been effectively refuted by A. Maiuri, PP 3 (1948), 125-127 and G. Bagnani, Arbiter, 3-4; see further below, pp. 121-122.

[13]Slave: E. Thomas, Pétrone[3], 36 nt. 4; Lowe, xi. Freedman: Corbett, Petronius, 66. Freeborn: R. Heinze, Hermes 34 (1899), 498 nt.1; Friedlaender, 210; Ciaffi, Struttura, 80.

[14]See H. Thylander, Etude sur l'epigraphie latine (Acta Inst. Rom. Regni Sueciae 8.5) (Lund 1952), 161; now confirmed on better evidence for the city of Rome by H. Solin, "Die Namen der orientalischen Sklaven in Rom", in L'Onomastique latine (Colloques internationaux du CNRS 564) (Paris 1977), 205-220, esp. 208-218 (hereafter, Solin, "Orientalische Sklaven").

[15]For "Trimalchio", see Priuli, Ascyltus, 35-41, esp. 39-40: "il nome Malchio, verosimilmente già a partire dal I secolo d.C....fosse sentito a Roma quasi sinonimo di 'ex schiavo orientale arrichito' in senso derisorio e dispregiativo". "Massa": Priuli, Ascyltus, 24 nt. 38 (Semitic, pace, G. Alessio, Hapax legomena ed altre cruces in Petronio, 289-290 [hereafter, Alessio, Hapax]). "Habinnas": H.C. Schnur, CW 47 (1953), 159 (Semitic, a nomen proprium): contra, T.H. Gaster, CW 45 (1955), 53 (Anatolian); Alessio, Hapax, 133-134 (Galatian); Veyne, "Trimalchio Maecenatianus", 1618 (Semitic). "Bargates": Solin, "Orientalische Sklaven", 218 (Semitic). "Seleucus": below, p. 79 and nt. 23. Cf. also the remarks on "Scaurus", "Pansa", and "Safinius", below, pp. 94-95, 200.

[16]For Trimalchio, see above, pp. 40-41 and cf. 75.10, "tam magnus ex Asia veni quam hic candelabrus". Massa is identified as a slave of Habinnas (68.4), and the fact that he is circumcised (68.8) probably indicates that he was thought of as a Hebrew: see E. Flores, RAAN 38 (1963), 57-58 (contra, Alessio, Hapax, 289-291, unconvincingly). For Habinnas, see, pp. 41, 78 and nt. 22. Note also that Bargates refers to his wife as a contubernalis (96.7), which suggests that he is an ex-slave; Seleucus is one of the colliberti of Trimalchio identified by Hermeros.

[17]The subject has been endlessly discussed. In his fundamental paper, "Race Mixture in the Roman Empire" (AHR 21 (1916), 689-708), Tenney Frank argued that in Italy of the first and second centuries A.D. bearers of Greek names were either themselves slaves or freedmen of Eastern origin or were descended from Eastern slaves. Subsequent studies have shown that a Greek cognomen does not necessarily imply an Eastern provenance, but Frank's conclusions regarding the reliability of Greek cognomina as indicators of social status have been generally confirmed. For the views of Frank, M.L. Gordon, A. Calderini, J. Baumgart, W.L. Westermann, A.M. Duff, H. Thylander, F.G. Maier, L.R. Taylor, I. Kajanto, and B. Rawson, see Chantraine, Freigelassene, 132-139; Weaver, FC, 83-87; and P. Huttunen, The Social Strata in the Imperial City of Rome (Acta Universitatis Ouluensis B.3.1) (Oulu 1974), 9-15 (hereafter, Huttunen, Social Strata). Weaver, 85, and Huttunen, 194-197, suggest that many Greek cognomina were borne by freeborn peregrini, but evidence for large numbers of resident aliens in Italy is wanting, and the arguments in favor of the traditional view remain strong: see H. Solin, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom (Soc. Sci. Fenn., Comm. Hum. Litt. 48) (Helsinki 1971), passim, but esp., 121-138, 146-158 (hereafter, Solin, Beiträge); I. Kajanto, Latomus 27 (1968), 517-534.

[18]G. Schmeling, Riv. Stud. Class. 17 (1969), 5, counted 57 Greek names, 13 Latin names, 3 Semitic, 1 Oscan, and 1 Gallic name in the Satyricon. The slight discrepancy between his figure for Greek names and mine is partly due to the fact that there exist no general accepted criteria for determining at what point a foreign name passed into the Latin vernacular: cf., e.g., I. Kajanto, Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage (Helsinki 1963), 55-56; LC, 11-12; and the reviews of the latter by H. Happ, Beitr. z. Namenforsch. 1 (1966), 86-90; C. De Simone, Gnomon 38 (1966), 386-387; and B. Rawson, CP 73 (1968), 156-157.

[19]See now J. Christes, Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom (Forsch. zur Antiken Sklaverei 10) (Wiesbaden 1979), passim; the tables on pp. 160, 167-168 provide a useful overview.

[20]The connection with Varro was first noted by V. Lancetti, Satire di T. P. Arbitro volgarizzate e annotate (Milan 1863), xlix, who observed that Varro had chosen the name "per la ragione che Agamemnone, Re de' Re, presso Omero è lungo e instancabile parlatore" (cited also by Priuli, Ascyltus, 55 nt. 189); cf. also Walsh, RN, 40-41. G. Sandy, TAPA 104 (1974), 339 nt. 21, citing CIL 6.9797 and the late antique collection of jokes known as Philogelos, suggests that there may have been a subliterary "tradition of a 'typecast' clownish scholar".

[21]For the course of study recommended by Agamemnon, cf. C. Pellegrino, Petronii Arbitri Satyricon (Rome 1975), 220-224, passim, who cites the relevant parallels from Cicero, Quintilian, and Tacitus' Dialogus (hereafter, Pellegrino); more generally, S.F. Bonner, Education in Ancient Rome from the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny (Berkeley 1977), 212-276 (hereafter, Bonner, EAR). See also the following note.

[22]For an astute analysis of the entire episode -- "through much of the scene as we have it, Encolpius is out dangling his literary line and Agamemnon is dancing at the end of it" -- see G. Kennedy, AJP 99 (1978), 171-178 (quote from p. 178). Noting the contrast between Encolpius' calculated pose as a Philhellene and Agamemnon's emphasis on Roman training, Kennedy concludes that "we are to regard Agamemnon, for all his Greek name, as a teacher of Latin declamation" (178). Cf. also E.J. Barnes, Latomus 32 (1973), 787-798, who argues convincingly that the views expressed by Agamemnon and Encolpius are commonplaces of Stoic rhetorical theory and should not be taken as representing the views of the author.

[23]F.I. Zeitlin, TAPA 102 (1971), 667; cf. p. 663: "the picaro's position is inevitably that of a misfit in society who wanders through life freed from the normal restraints and obligations imposed on respectable people. It is this position as a marginal man which allows the picaro his delicious satiric view of a hierarchical system". Zeitlin rightly notes that, unlike the typical picaro, Encolpius never fully adopts the mentality of the characters whose roles he assumes (668). In stressing the differences between Petronius' narrator and the typical picaro, however, Zeitlin misleads by suggesting that Encolpius poses "only briefly" as a slave (668-669) and that he never performs any servile duties: even if we discount the Bellum Civile (119-124.1), the Croton episode as we have it (117.4-141.11) constitutes nearly a fifth of the extant narrative, and the text throughout is highly lacunose. Furthermore, Eumolpus is so thoroughly engrossed in his role as master (125.1) that Encolpius expects to be flogged when Eumolpus discovers that he has neglected his chores for two days (139.5).

[24]B.P. Reardon, G&R 23 (1976), 121. Reardon sees the isolation of the hero as the chief attraction of the genre to the Greek reader of Hellenistic and early Imperial society, who "must have felt that he too was not master of his fate" (p. 122). Of course this need not apply to the Satyricon.

[25]A possible minor exception is the episode mentioned above, in which Circe's sexual attraction to Encolpius seems to be motivated by her belief that he is a slave (126.10-11).

[26]See below, pp. 90-96 on 44.10, 45.5, 46.1-2, 61.5; pp. 145-149, passim on 57-58. For the importance that freedmen place in manumission as an elevation in status, cf. 39.4, 57.10, 65.10, 71.1, 74.13. Cf. also 54.5: Trimalchio frees a young acrobat who had fallen on him, "ne quis posset dicere tantum virum esse a servo vulneratum"; 68.12, "Habinnas furtim consurrexit pedesque Fortunatae correptos super lectum immisit" with P. Veyne, Annales ESC 33 (1978), 43-44: Habinnas' action is motivated by his concern that the freedmen present a unified front in the presence of the freeborn company.

[27]Ciaffi, Struttura, 43-50.

[28]Ciaffi, Struttura, 77 was the first to point out (without, however, observing the Vergilian parallels) that Trimalchio's house is represented as a trap from which the protagonists are unable to escape. The allusion to Cerberus was first noted by E. Paratore, Il Satyricon di Petronio (Florence 1933), II, 255 (hereafter, Paratore). A.D. Leeman, GIF 20 (1967), 155 was the first to observe the parallel

between the two doors of Trimalchio's house and the twin gates of Vergil's underworld (contra, Grondona, Religione, 81) and the first to connect the two Vergilian reminiscences with Encolpius' reference to a novi generis labyrinthus. Averil Cameron, Latomus 29 (1970), 405-406 first related the passages concerning Trimalchio's cook, Daedalus, to the motifs mentioned above. All these themes have recently been taken up and developed by M.-C. Minazio, in Mélanges Esther Bréguet (Geneva 1975), 21-27; Dupont, Plaisir, 147-151; Grondona, Religione, 75; P. Fedeli, Mat. e Disc. 6 (1981), 91-117, esp. 102-109, 113-115; 111 nt. 51 (bibl. on the labyrinth in antiquity); R.M. Newton, CJ 77 (1982), 315-319 (the scene in Trimalchio's baths [73.2-5] recalls Vergil's description of the Elysian Fields [Aen. 6.642-659]; q.v. also for the suggestion that 73.1 parallels Aen. 6.14-41). Cf. also R. Beck, Phoenix 29 (1975), 277 nt. 13, who, however, fails to recognize the common association of labyrinths with death and the concept of passing into a new world: cf. esp. K. Kerényi, Labyrinth-Studien^2 (Zurich 1950), 17-20, 31-33; W.F. Jackson Knight, Cumaean Gates (Oxford 1936). I am unconvinced by Fedeli's attempt to show that the labyrinth motif is pervasive in the Satyricon and by the arguments of W.J. O'Neal, CB 52 (1976), 33-34 (anticipated by B. Gilleland, in Sage-Gilleland, 230-232) for regarding Niceros' adventures in the cemetary (62.3-9) as a parody of Aeneas' descent to the underworld.

[29]Cf. R.M. Newton, CJ 77 (1982), 316 and nt. 7; P. Fedeli, Mat. e Disc. 6 (1981), 103-104; cf. also H.D. Cameron, CJ 65 (1970), 338. For the significance in the Satyricon of doorways as barriers and thresholds to new worlds, see G.P. Caprettini, "Valenze mitiche e funzioni narrative: La 'porta' e la logica del racconto nel Satyricon", Strum. Crit. 10 (1976), 183-219, esp. 210-214 on 28.6-31.3 and 72.5-73.2, 78.7-8; cf. also Grondona, Religione, 77-80.

[30]P. Fedeli, Mat. e Disc. 6 (1981), 114 notes a parallel between Aeneas' careful inspection of the doors to the Temple of Apollo (Aen. 6.33-34) and Encolpius' perusal of the murals in Trimalchio's portico; the passages he cites from the Satyricon (28.6: "admiratione iam saturi"; 29.1 "dum omnia stupeo"), however, refer to different situations: the relevant parallel is 29.2, "ego autem collecto spiritu non destiti totum parietem persequi". If the reader approaches the opening scenes of the Cena with the Vergilian reminiscences of the later episode in mind, several possible allusions to Aeneid 6 suggest themselves: the magpie in a golden cage hanging "super limen" (28.9) perhaps recalls the two doves that lead Aeneas to the golden bough (190-204). Just as Aeneas is deceived by the apparitions of Scyllas, Gorgons, Harpies, etc. (285-294) so Encolpius is startled by the lifelike depiction of the watchdog (29.1) (cf. P. Veyne,

MEFR 75 (1963), 59-66). The slave who begs Encolpius and Ascyltus to rescue him from punishment (30.7-8) is perhaps reminiscent of Palinurus and his plea for burial (337-371). The haughty dispensator (30.10-11) suggests the surly ferryman, Charon (385-397; cf. 315: "nauita...tristis"); and the latter's greeting to the Sybil and Aeneas, "comprime gressum" (389) recalls the admonition directed at Ascyltus and Encolpius, "dextro pede" (30.5).

[31]See Maiuri, 154-157, passim; Grondona, Religione, 10-14; J. Kolendo, in Schiavitù, manomissione, e classi dipendenti nel mondo antico (Rome 1979), 162-166 (venalicia); P. Veyne, MEFR 75 (1963), 62-63 nt. 3 (fasces with axes); G. Bagnani, AJP 75 (1954), 28 (paintings of gladiators; Bagnani notes that a mosaic depiction of gladiatorial games has been found in a private villa datable to the end of the first century); for the allegorical elements in Trimalchio's frieze, see below in the text and nt. 37. Bagnani points out that "many of the scenes depicted on the walls of the portico can be paralleled by representations on tomb monuments" but fails to recognize the significance of this observation: "how like Trimalchio to decorate the main portico with a typically funerary decoration" (23). Grondona, too, attributes the funerary symbolism to Trimalchio's eccentric taste (13-14). Certainly the peculiarity of the furnishings serves to characterize Trimalchio, but the impression created in the reader's mind is the work of Petronius: the effect on a Roman audience would have been similar to that achieved in a modern work by the description of a house at which the inscription on the welcome-mat reads "R.I.P.".

[32]Trimalchio on a tribunal: 29.5, 72.9. Gladiatorial games: 29.9, 72.6. Reference to Trimalchio's maritime commercial ventures: 30.2, "fasces erant cum securibus fixi, quorum imam partem quasi embolum navis aeneum finiebat"; 71.9. The representation on Trimalchio's tomb of Fortunata as Venus (71.11) (cf. Grondona, Religione, 49 and nt. 146) recalls the marble statuette of Venus housed with Trimalchio's lares (29.8): for the statuette as a symbol of Trimalchio's marriage to Fortunata, and hence by extension of Fortunata herself, see P. Veyne, Latomus 23 (1964), 802-806.

[33]Wrede, Consecratio, 67-105, esp. 93-104. Cf. also the remarks of J.A. North, JRS 73 (1983), 172 who emphasizes the peculiarity of this type of representation, which is unprecedented in Hellenistic or earlier Italian art: "The surprising thing is that an immigrant group, insecure of its social origins, but having the money and influence to aspire to establish its status, should be so innovative in its self-expression....this particular form of funerary symbolism might well have been perceived by contemporary élite

opinion as vulgar and arrogant, in the manner of Trimalchio".

[34]For *suasoriae* whose subject matter was derived from the civil wars, cf., e.g., Bonner, *EAR*, 279-281, with refs.

[35]The popular rhetorical theme of Caesar crossing the Alps was drawn specifically from this passage of the *Aeneid* (6.830-31): cf. E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*, repr. of the 4th ed. (1957), (Darmstadt 1981), 330-331.

[36]P. Grimal, *RPh* 16 (1942), 164 sees a different significance in Petronius' choice of the surnames "Iulius" and "Pompeius" in the present context. In Grimal's view, the *gentilicia* of Trimalchio's fellow freedmen confirm his interpretation of Trimalchio's name, C. Pompeius Trimalchio Maecenatianus, as a complex web of allusions to the emperors Gaius and Nero and to the last direct descendent of Pompeius Magnus, Sextus Pompey, whom Gaius allegedly starved to death in order to inherit his wealth (162-164) (see also above, nt. 6).

[37]M.-C. Minazio, in *Mélanges Esther Bréguet* (Geneva 1975), 24, 25-26; P. Fedeli, *Mat. e Disc.* 6 (1981), 107. A startling parallel from the real world has been overlooked: surrounding the figure of a labyrinth etched on a pillar in the peristyle of a Pompeian house on the Via Stabiana is the following inscription: "Labyrinthus. hic habitat Minotaurus" (*CIL* 4.2331).

[38]Cf. 39.4 (Trimalchio): "patrono meo ossa bene quiescant, qui me hominem inter homines voluit esse"; 57.4-5 (Hermeros): "ipse me dedi in servitutem et malui civis Romanus esse quam tributarius. et nunc spero me sic vivere, ut nemini iocus sim. homo inter homines sum" (reading, with all modern editors except Pellegrino, Burmann's easy emendation *sum* for the ms. *suos*; Pellegrino obelizes the ms. reading and cites Scheffer's conjecture *vos* [wrongly attributed to Alessio, *Hapax*, 350-351] in the apparatus); 74.13 (Trimalchio on Fortunata): "ambubaia non meminit? [se] de machina illam sustuli, hominem inter homines feci".

[39]The condition of slaves in Roman law is considerably more complex than I have allowed -- see W.W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery* (Cambridge 1908), *passim* (hereafter, Buckland, *RLS*) -- but in popular belief, the slave was a thing, not a person: Juv. 6.222, "o demens, ita servus homo est?", expresses a typical Roman attitude. See further M.I. Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, 73-75, esp. 73: "Roman lawyers...were not dissuaded by the slave's human quality....Nor were the millions of

slave-owners who bought and sold slaves, overworked them, beat and tortured them, and sometimes put them to death, precisely as millions of horse-owners have done throughout history" (hereafter, Finley, ASMI).

CHAPTER THREE

THE ORDO LIBERTINUS

The freedmen guests of Trimalchio must be seen in relation to their host. Their purpose in the narrative is to offset and further define the central figure of the Cena, and the details of their characterization cannot be dissociated from Petronius' broader literary aims in developing the portrait of Trimalchio. The object of this chapter is, first, to suggest a new approach to the question of Trimalchio's "typicality" as a freedman and, second, to point out one important way in which Trimalchio differs from his peers. In the first section, the social background against which Trimalchio is to be viewed will be more sharply defined than heretofore. My interpretation will suggest that Petronius' portrayal of the freedmen's milieu is less objectively "realistic" than has previously been supposed. In the second section, a widely held view of the freedmen guests as "Trimalchios in miniature"[1] will be challenged; I will show that Trimalchio's conception of his place in society is fundamentally different from theirs.

I

Those who regard Trimalchio as typical have normally compared the text of the Satyricon with evidence compiled

from other literary and nonliterary sources. This approach is useful, since it allows us to check Petronius' accuracy against more reliable indicators of contemporary social and economic conditions. But it has also given rise to the widely divergent views mentioned above as to precisely what segment of the Roman population Trimalchio is meant to represent.[2] P. Garnsey has recently suggested that the problem is due in part to our uncertainty as to how representative the comparative evidence can be said to be: the details in Petronius' characterization can be plausible without necessarily being typical.[3] J. D'Arms identifies another aspect of the problem. In arguing that Trimalchio's autobiographical statement and the wording of his epitaph "constitute the fullest and least ambiguous evidence in the Cena for Trimalchio's activities, ambitions, and attitudes", whereas the evidence elsewhere in the Cena for Trimalchio's large-scale landholdings is undercut by the context in which it appears, D'Arms acknowledges openly what had previously been tacitly assumed: that certain details in Petronius' presentation are more worthy of the historian's attention than others.[4]

What, if anything, did Petronius intend to be seen as typical in the figure of Trimalchio? An answer to this question that would satisfy everyone is unattainable, for the reason that Garnsey indicates: we can never be certain to what extent the details of Trimalchio's life that are attested also in less tendentious sources are representative

rather than exceptional, and historians will continue to disagree about the number of cogent parallels sufficient to justify the claim that any given characteristic is "typical". But a criterion exists for beginning to answer this question, one which has not previously been exploited and which sheds light on the way that Petronius shaped his portrayal of contemporary society to suit his literary purposes.

It is generally agreed that the freedmen assembled at Trimalchio's table serve to characterize their host. Whereas Trimalchio is furnished with a more or less complete biography, the details of the other freedmen's lives are revealed selectively in a manner which suggests that Petronius meant to create a general impression of the social milieu in which Trimalchio exists.[5] It follows, then, that the qualities that Petronius attributes to several of the freedmen and that are repeated in the portrait of Trimalchio are the ones that he most wanted to emphasize.

Some of these qualities, such as a craving for wealth, cannot be considered distinctive to Trimalchio's circle, since they are shared with other characters in the Satyricon.[6] Other prominent features of Trimalchio's personality, such as his pretensions to learning, are not found in the portrayal of the other freedmen.[7] But the qualities common to Trimalchio and his friends that do not figure in the characterization of other actors in the novel form a valuable guide to those aspects of Trimalchio's personality

that Petronius intended to be seen as representative rather than idiosyncratic. Six characteristics can be thus identified. The first and most obvious -- a common servile past -- has been discussed in the previous chapter. The remaining five will first be presented individually and then considered collectively, for they too share a common characteristic which suggests that the issue of Trimalchio's typicality needs to be seen in a new light.[8]

First, Trimalchio and his fellow freedmen speak an earthy Latin that distinguishes them from their better-educated tablemates.[9] Since the turn of the century, a number of studies devoted to analyzing the freedmen's speech have shown that Petronius' representation of colloquial Latin is considerably more complex than the preceding statement would suggest.[10] For the present purposes, however, we need note only three points. First, there is good evidence that Petronius attempted to distinguish individual freedmen by varying the patterns of their speech and by attributing recognizable mannerisms to some of them -- most notably Hermeros, who begins a sentence with the phrase "ad summam" six times (37.5, 37.10, 38.2, 57.3, 57.9, 58.8).[11] More important, for all its oddities, the freedmen's speech never strays too far from the norms of Silver Latin.[12]

These two observations remind us that Petronius' aims were literary, not documentary. The technique of realism was useful only insofar as it served the purposes of characterization. When seen in this light, a recent

observation that the concentration of vulgarisms and abnormalities in the freedmen's speech is considerably higher than that calculated for the lower-class speakers outside the Cena acquires particular significance:[13] Petronius made the freedmen express themselves in a manner that not only distanced them from their tablemates but also distinguished them as a group from the other characters in the novel. This supports the view advanced earlier that in the Cena Petronius meant to portray the mores of a specific segment of society whereas elsewhere in the novel he directed his satire at more general targets (e.g., legacy hunters, libidinous women) or at specific types (e.g., parasitic rhetoricians, lecherous poetasters).[14]

Second, Trimalchio and his friends share an unabashed delight in profit-making that sets them apart from the other characters in the Satyricon.[15] As has been noted above (p. 74), the freedmen's preoccupation with wealth does not in itself distinguish them from the rest of society, either as it is portrayed in the Satyricon or in the real world.[16] But references to profits derived from business are not found elsewhere in the Satyricon, even in the portrait of the merchant captain Lichas, owner of a familia negotians (101.4), or of the imaginary African magnate played by Eumolpus, who bears the recent loss of two million sesterces with equanimity (117.7).

Third, the freedmen are small-time businessmen engaged in retail or service occupations. This characteristic

is closely related to the preceding one, as Petronius makes clear at one point by having Phileros adapt a hackneyed proverb to reflect the specific concerns of the businessman. Recalling the misfortunes of a dead friend, Phileros moralizes, "numquam autem recte faciet, qui cito credit" and then immediately adds "utique homo negotians", thus introducing a pun on the two senses of credere, "to trust" and "to lend", and at the same time revealing the narrowness of his perspective (43.6).[17] The type of businessman that Phileros has in mind may be illustrated by a survey of the occupations that Petronius assigns to his freedmen or to their associates: porter (C. Pompeius Diogenes: 38.7), undertaker (Iulius Proculus: 38.14), petty trader (Chrysanthus: 43.4), clothes-dealer or fireman (centonarius) (Echion: 45.1), huckster (or porter, again) (Phileros: 46.8), pleader (Phileros: 46.8), innkeeper (Terentius, the contubernalis of Niceros' girlfriend: 61.6), stage performer (Plocamus: 64.2-4), stone-mason and monument maker (Habinnas: 65.5), and perfume dealer (Trimalchio's friend Agatho: 74.15).

The occupations for which Echion and Habinnas have destined their deliciae belong to the same category: barber (46.7; cf. 64.4), auctioneer (46.7), muleteer, itinerant hawker or performer (circulator), cobbler, cook, baker (68.7). Trimalchio's lucrative shipping ventures set him apart from his peers and establish him as a trader on a grand scale -- the sort for whom Cicero once made partial

allowance in discussing the professions generally considered to be unbefitting a freeborn man.[18] For reasons that I shall make clear presently, however, (below, pp. 86-87) Petronius' audience would have regarded Trimalchio's occupation in same manner as they viewed those of his fellow freedmen.[19] Several of the professions listed above are attributed to minor characters elsewhere in the extant portions of the Satyricon,[20] and others may have been mentioned in sections now lost; but the concentration of them in Petronius' depiction of the freedmen's occupational milieu justifies their inclusion among the features that were meant to be seen as characteristic of the group.

Fourth, Petronius seems to have emphasized the Eastern origin of Trimalchio and his friends. Like Trimalchio (75.10), Ganymede (44.4) explicitly mentions his arrival from Asia. Hermeros implies that he was born in the provinces (57.4), and the high number of Graecisms in his speech suggests that he originated in the Eastern part of the empire.[21] Trimalchio at one point refers to Habinnas as a "Cappadocian" (69.2). It is unclear whether he is speaking literally or proverbially, but since Cappadocians are not elsewhere noted either for sexual vigor or for cleverness, the two characteristics that a proverbial use of the term in the present context would seem to require, it seems best to take Trimalchio's words literally.[22] The derivation of Habinnas' name in any case marks him as an ex-slave of Semitic or Anatolian origin (see above, p. 47 and nt. 15).

It is less certain that Petronius intended "Seleucus" to be regarded as a nomen proprium, since its popularity as a Roman slave name quickly obscured its original ethnic significance as well as its compound derivation.[23] But, given the vast pool of typical slave names from which to choose, Petronius' selection of a cognomen with specific Syrian connotations was probably deliberate.[24] Finally, M. Hadas attempted to trace many of the freedmen's more recherché expressions to Semitic roots. Not all of Hadas' suggestions carry conviction, but the number of cogent parallels that he adduced is nonetheless too great to dismiss as coincidental.[25]

Finally, with one possible exception,[26] none of the freedmen present at the banquet seems to have any ties to a patron. This characteristic of independence deserves close consideration for two reasons. First, the degree to which patrons exercised control over their freedmen's social and economic activities has recently been made the focus of several important studies that arrive at contradictory conclusions: two support the traditional view that freedmen normally remained in their patrons' service virtually in the capacity of slaves;[27] three others suggest that the number of freedmen who operated independently may have been greater and their impact on the economy of the early Empire more significant than has previously been supposed.[28] Second, with regard to the Satyricon, the study of Petronius that is most frequently cited by social and economic historians,

P. Veyne's "Vie de Trimalcion", takes a strong position on this issue that is not supported by the text. My interpretation will suggest that independence from a patron's authority can be clearly demonstrated only in the case of Trimalchio; that the case for Hermeros' being independent is strong; and that, for the rest of the freedmen, the evidence is inconclusive.

P. Veyne, in the article mentioned above, emphasizes that Trimalchio's social and economic independence is the result of an unusual combination of circumstances: Trimalchio was a _libertinus orcinus_, a freedmen manumitted by testament; he inherited a substantial fortune as coheir to his master's estate (76.2); and his master evidently left neither a widow nor descendants, for whom Trimalchio might have been obliged to perform _operae_ and to whom he would have owed _obsequium_.[29] Whether or not Veyne is correct in believing that Trimalchio's independence is unusual, the reasons he gives for regarding Trimalchio as independent are valid.

Veyne further maintains that Trimalchio's guests are as independent as their host and offers one argument in support of this view: the freedmen either do not mention their patrons or speak of them only in the past tense, implying that they are deceased.[30] It should be noted at the outset that the death of a patron did not necessarily release a freedman from his obligations, which were normally transmuted to the patron's heirs. Veyne himself stresses

this point in discussing the case of Trimalchio (see above, p. 80 and nt. 29). On the other hand, two points not fully considered by Veyne may be adduced in support of his theory that the freedmen were meant to be seen as independent.

First, Trimalchio's friends are old.[31] There is some agreement among modern authorities that slaves who were destined to be manumitted and who could afford a tombstone normally won their freedom between the ages of thirty and forty.[32] If this estimate is correct, then perhaps an old freedman would have been thought of as one who had already paid off his obligations to his patron.[33] Second, the freedmen are rich, or at least moderately wealthy.[34] The lex Aelia Sentia of A.D. 4 prohibited patrons from exacting money in place of operae, but allowed the arrangement if the freedman took the initiative.[35] From several other passages in the Digest, it may be inferred that the patron's agreement also was required (see below, p. 237 nt. 6). Perhaps, then, if a freedman had money and the operae imposed upon him were onerous, he would have been permitted to buy them off and would have desired to do so. We do not know how frequently such deals were made between patrons and freedmen: the legal sources show only that they were possible. The characteristics of old age and wealth are therefore suggestive but not conclusive evidence that Petronius' freedmen were meant to be thought of as independent.

With regard to Hermeros, three further points present a stronger case for his being independent. First, Hermeros paid his own manumission price (57.6) and survived his patron (57.10). The legal position of the servus suis nummis emptus is by no means clear, and Petronius does not provide enough information concerning the circumstances of Hermeros' manumission for us to determine whether or not in his case any of several subtle distinctions might apply. A number of legal texts indicate that a slave who bought himself out of slavery with money that he had been allowed to accumulate in his peculium was absolved of the obligation to perform operae, but the legal sources are in disagreement as to whether or not the patron retained other rights, such as the right to accuse the freedman of ingratitude and the right to claim half of the freedman's estate upon his death; whether any of these rights descended to the patron's heirs is even less clear.[36]

Second, Hermeros, like Habinnas (65.5) and Trimalchio (71.12), is a sevir Augustalis (57.6), and D'Arms has recently argued that "a clear majority of the Augustales [of Ostia and Puteoli, the setting of the Cena] belonged to the category of independent freedmen".[37] Finally, Hermeros is generally proud of his freedom and boasts that he owes money to no one: "homo inter homines sum, capite aperto ambulo; assem aerarium nemini debeo" (57.5). On balance, the evidence suggests that Hermeros is free from the financial and social restraints that obligations to a patron's heirs

might have imposed.

Concerning the other freedmen, the validity of Veyne's argument ex silentio is difficult to assess. The fact that Trimalchio's guests make little mention of their former masters might prove only that Petronius was not interested in exploring the nature of the patron-freedman relationship. On the other hand, if patrons exercised control over their freedmen's lives to the degree that some modern scholars suggest, we might expect to find some reference to their pervasive influence in the conversation of Trimalchio's friends, several of whom grumble about the hardships of life (41.10-42.5; 44.1-3,12-16). Finally, Petronius' decision not to raise the issue of a freedman's relationship to his patron may have been motivated by a different set of literary priorities than that which governed his "realistic" depiction of Trimalchio's milieu. If I am correct in arguing that Petronius' intention in the Cena was to show the freedmen cut off from the rest of society by virtue of their servile pasts, then too much talk of patrons -- potentially, at least, members of a more respectable group -- would have drawn attention away from the fact that a freedman by definition belonged to a separate order whose internal hierarchy to a certain extent paralleled, but at no point intersected, that of freeborn members of the population.[38]

In sum, the evidence of the Satyricon neither supports nor refutes Veyne's contention that all the freedmen

are independent. Nor, following the criteria outlined above (pp. 74-75), can we determine whether or not Petronius intended lack of a patron's authority to be seen as characteristic of the type of freedman that Trimalchio was meant to represent. Indirect evidence suggests that perhaps he did, but the freedmen's silence regarding their former masters can be explained on wholly different grounds. The ultimately insolvable problem of determining what factors were most influential in shaping Petronius' depiction of Trimalchio's milieu suggests that the Satyricon may not be a source from which historians can expect to draw reliable information concerning the position of independent freedmen in Roman society.

Thus far we have considered the typicality of Trimalchio solely on the basis of comparative evidence from the Satyricon itself. A survey of the evidence for real freedmen will provide a useful check on our conclusions.

Four of the characteristics -- vulgar speech, a preoccupation with profits, banausic occupations, and independence -- may be dealt with briefly. Many freedmen probably did not speak classical Latin; at least the written records they have left us in the form of inscriptions contain numerous grammatical and morphological peculiarities. Many were no doubt eager for financial gain, although evidence for this attitude is less easy to document. It is important to note, however, for reasons that I shall outline presently, that neither of these qualities

was peculiar to ex-slaves. A reading of any hundred inscriptions from the Corpus in which the status of the author is known will confirm that freedmen had no monopoly on vulgar diction; nor were they the only members of society openly delighted with deriving profits from their business enterprises.[39]

Similarly, with regard to the freedmen's professions, many, perhaps even most, craftsmen and petty merchants were ex-slaves, but many were not.[40] When we address the issue of typicality from the opposite perspective, that is, if we ask what proportion of freedmen spoke colloquial Latin, yearned for profits, or were engaged in commercial and service occupations, the evidence fails us.[41] As has been noted above, scholars disagree about the relative number of independent freedmen in Roman society, and in any case, we cannot be certain that Petronius intended this quality to be seen as typical of the freedmen.

Evidence for the final characteristic, Eastern origins, is less equivocal and will provide a useful transition to a consideration of all five qualities collectively. Modern authorities agree not only that Syria and the provinces of Asia Minor were the greatest sources of slaves under the Early Empire but also that the majority of Easterners in Italy were slaves or ex-slaves.[42] In other words, Eastern origins would have been considered both typical and distinctive of Roman freedmen in Petronius' day. The association of Eastern provenance with servile origins

is reflected in an attitude frequently expressed by contemporary authors; Syrians and the peoples of Asia Minor were thought to be temperamentally suited for slavery, since they had never known freedom.[43] The relationship between historical realities and upper-class Roman attitudes is in this case easy to discern: the vast numbers of oriental slaves entering Italy during the late Republic and early Empire reinforced the contempt that aristocratic Romans felt for Eastern peoples in general[44] and in particular fostered the notion that Syrians and the inhabitants of Asia Minor were born to be slaves.

With the exception of the quality of independence, for which specific evidence is lacking, the characteristics that have been identified above share this feature: upper-class Romans regarded them with disdain.[45] They are qualities that traditionally offended aristocratic sensibilities. This situation creates a problem for the historian wishing to extract from the Satyricon reliable information concerning the social and economic behavior of private freedmen: he cannot be certain whether Petronius is representing typical traits of real freedmen or whether he is attributing to his characters qualities that he knew would elicit contempt from his audience. Rostovtzeff recognized this difficulty when he wrote that he was "inclined to think that Petronius chose the freedman type to have the opportunity of making the nouveau riche as vulgar as possible".[46] Subsequent scholars approaching the issue of Trimalchio's

typicality have not always acknowledged Petronius' literary motivation with equal candor. In fact, three points suggest that Petronius' aim was not to present an unbiased picture of reality but rather to manipulate his readers' attitudes and prejudices in order to emphasize the freedmen's boorish qualities.

First, one of the features that Petronius emphasizes in his portrayal of the freedmen -- their professions as retailers and merchants -- was associated with servile origins by other authors of the late Republic and early Empire.[47] This suggests that Petronius may have been representing a conventional attitude of the upper classes. Second, we have noted that three of the characteristics that Petronius emphasizes, including the freedmen's occupational milieu, were not peculiar to ex-slaves; they were not distinctive of the group. Finally, Petronius' representation of colloquial Latin is unparalleled in classical literature.[48] Other Roman authors, Plautus and Terence, for example, and Apuleius in the Metamorphoses, portrayed lower-class men and women in realistic situations without significantly altering their language to reflect the circumstances of their characters.[49] In view of the reaction that Petronius could expect the freedmen's language to elicit from his audience (see above, p. 86 and nt. 45), his intention to make them appear vulgar seems deliberate.

These observations suggest that the issue of Trimalchio's typicality be cast in a new light. It seems that

the historian would proceed with greater justification, and his results would carry greater conviction, if he began with the premise that the behavior and attitudes of Trimalchio and his friends that are not easily checked against the evidence for real freedmen are representative not so much of the "typical" characteristics of a particular group as of the prejudices of the aristocracy towards that group. Of course prejudices are always to a certain degree grounded in reality, but no one familiar with the stereotypes of any age will doubt that upper-class beliefs are not always an accurate guide to actual conditions and circumstances. Even the process of selecting various attributes to represent a particular type implies a certain bias in determining what features deserve to be singled out.

Finally, this is not to say that Petronius' depiction of the freedmen is merely conventional. In the following chapter I will try to show how far Petronius was capable of penetrating beyond the limits of a stereotypical characterization when it suited his purpose. My object in the preceding pages has been to establish the background against which Trimalchio is meant to be viewed and to suggest that historiacal interpretations of the Cena that treat Petronius' picture of a freedman's society as if it were a sober transposition of fact are liable to distort the social and economic realities of the Neronian age.

II

A widely held view maintains that the freedmen guests of Trimalchio, though noticeably less vulgar than their host, are essentially no different from him. They are "Trimalchios in miniature", and their attitudes and behavior mirror those of Trimalchio.[50] In the previous section we surveyed several characteristics common to Trimalchio and his freedmen guests. My aim in the following pages is to show that Trimalchio's friends are far from being replicas of their host; on the contrary, their view of their place in society is fundamentally different from his. The point is worth emphasizing, because those who distinguish varying shades of characterization in Petronius' portrayal of the freedmen have for the most part restricted themselves to general assessments of the characters' personalities without explaining which particular attitudes and what behavior have led them to their conclusions.[51]

Whereas Trimalchio considers himself to be equal or superior to any member of society, the other freedmen view themselves as inherently inferior to large segments of the population, either because of their lack of education or because of their status as freedmen. The single exception is Hermeros, whose attitudes will be briefly indicated here and will be discussed in detail in the following chapter. The difference between the other freedmen's conception of their social standing and Trimalchio's view of his is clearly marked by their contrasting behavior towards the other

guests at the banquet, notably Agamemnon, and by the differing attitudes they express with regard to figures outside the drama. These two aspects will be considered in order.

Hermeros' contempt for Agamemnon can be inferred from a passage in the middle of his tirade against Ascyltus and Giton (57-58) in which he emphatically rejects the notion that an education in rhetoric is worthwhile: "non didici geometrias, critica et alogas menias, sed lapidarias litteras scio, partes centum dico ad aes, ad pondus, ad nummum. ad summam, si quid vis, ego et tu sponsiunculam: exi, defero lamnam. iam scies patrem tuum mercedes perdidisse, quamvis et rhetoricam scis" (58.7-8). If, in Hermeros' view, a higher education is a waste of time, clearly the implication is that those who teach the liberal arts are at best superfluous. Indeed, shortly after he challenges Ascyltus to a test of wits, Hermeros aims a barb directly at Agamemnon: "bella res et iste qui te haec docet, mufrius non magister" (58.13).

Echion's attitude is more complex. At one point he interrupts his monologue in order to answer a disparaging glance from Agamemnon: "videris mihi, Agamemnon, dicere: 'quid iste argutat molestus?' quia tu, qui potes loquere, non loquis. non es nostrae fasciae, et ideo pauperorum verba derides. scimus te prae litteras fatuum esse. quid ergo est? aliqua die te persuadeam, ut ad villam venias et videas casulas nostras?" (46.1-2). Three features of Echion's response should be noted.

First, Echion draws a vague but explicit comparison between Agamemnon and the members of his own group by stating that Agamemnon is "cut from a different bolt of cloth": "non es nostrae fasciae".[52] Second, the concentration of vulgarisms in this passage emphasizes the gulf that separates the rhetorician from the freedman, because Echion's language elsewhere is not nearly as incorrect. The peculiar character of Echion's solecisms, moreover, indicates the manner in which his response to Agamemnon is meant to be viewed, for many of his mistakes are hyperurbanisms, misguided attempts to make one's language grammatically correct.[53] This suggests that Echion is trying to impress Agamemnon on his own terms, that he recognizes Agamemnon as somehow more dignified than him and is trying to make his language conform to the standards of one whom he sees as his social superior. That Echion is uncertain precisely why Agamemnon commands more respect than he does is made clear by the fact that he confuses ignorance of letters with poverty: "tu qui potes loquere, non loquis...et ideo pauperorum verba derides".

Finally, Echion moves rapidly from a defensive position ("tu, qui potes loquere, non loquis") through an ad hominem attack that recalls Hermeros' gibe at Agamemnon ("scimus te prae litteras fatuum esse"; cf. 58.13) to an expression of indifference ("quid ergo est?") and an ultimately congenial invitation to Agamemnon to come to dinner. Echion's mercurial shifts of mood reflect his flustered

anxiety to create a good impression in the presence of one whose talents he hopes to enlist in the service of educating his cicaro (see below, pp. 201-202), and the inconsistency of his reactions to Agamemnon enhances Petronius' humorous portrait of a voluble toady. But underlying the comedy is a plausible representation of a certain type of mentality that distinguishes Echion from his peers. Unlike Hermeros, who combatively asserts that his kind of knowledge is more valuable than Ascyltus', and unlike Trimalchio, who pretends to equal Agamemnon in cultural refinement (see below), Echion acknowledges Agamemnon's intellectual superiority and then immediately dismisses it as irrelevant. The impression is of one who has accepted his lot and is trying to make the best of life in a society whose standards of respectability he neither fully understands nor wholly accepts.

Niceros reveals a similar indifference to ridicule, but he is not quite as thick-skinned as Echion. At Trimalchio's request, Niceros reluctantly agrees to relate a personal experience: "itaque hilaria mera sint, etsi timeo istos scholasticos, ne me [de]rideant. viderint: narrabo tamen; quid enim mihi aufert qui ridet? satius est rideri quam derideri" (61.4). The feelings of insecurity that in Echion threatened momentarily to erupt into open hostility manifest themselves more candidly in Niceros' personality. To judge from Encolpius' ironic comment on Niceros' prefatory remarks, "haec ubi dicta dedit" (61.5), his qualms are fully justified; but, like Echion, Niceros suppresses

his resentment in the interests of decorum.

The attitudes of Hermeros, Echion, and Niceros stand in marked contrast to those of Trimalchio, who confidently asserts his literary opinions for Agamemnon's expected approval (55.5) and attempts to outdo him in his own field (48.4-6). Agamemnon, "who knew how to earn another invitation to dinner" (52.7), defers to Trimalchio on both occasions, and Trimalchio addresses him familiarly and as an equal: "Agamemnon, mihi carissime," (48.7).

The difference between Trimalchio's conception of his place in society and the other freedmen's view of theirs is revealed as well through their respective comments on figures outside the drama. Whereas the social outlook of Trimalchio's fellow freedmen extends no further than the boundaries of their own municipality, Trimalchio's purview reaches all the way to Rome.

Ganymede fondly recalls a certain Safinius, a local magistrate from the period of his youth, whose democratic principles led him to address even slaves by name: "et quam benignus resalutare, nomina omnium reddere, tamquam unus de nobis" (44.10). Ganymede's reminiscence not only draws an explicit contrast between the members of his circle and members of the local aristocracy ("tamquam unus de nobis"), it also shows how small a courtesy is sufficient to win his gratitude. The implication is that slaves and ex-slaves were not normally accorded even such superficially egalitarian treatment. Similarly, Echion is proud to mention that he

belongs to the entourage of a local magistrate in office ("illi domesticus sum") and flaunts his familiarity by referring to him as "Titus noster" (45.5).[54] Clearly Echion measures his own status by that of the most dignified man with whom he can claim a connection.

Trimalchio likewise makes an appeal to the principle of respectability by association, but, whereas Ganymede and Echion mention only local worthies, Trimalchio implies that he mixes company with members of the imperial aristocracy. R. Duncan-Jones has argued convincingly that Trimalchio's reference to a certain Scaurus who owns an ancestral villa by the sea but who nonetheless preferred to stay with Trimalchio when he visited the area (77.5) must be seen as an allusion to one of the senatorial (and patrician) Aemilii Scauri, whose family boasted a Princeps Senatus by the end of the second century B.C.[55]

A similar allusion to the Roman nobility may be detected in the carefully engineered response of one of Trimalchio's slaves to his master's inquiry into his origins: "'empticius an' inquit 'domi natus?' 'neutrum' inquit cocus 'sed testamento Pansae tibi relictus sum.'" (47.12). The cognomen Pansa, borne by a long series of Republican magistrates since the end of the fourth century, had acquired such ennobling connotations by the Augustan period that a certain freedman L. Crassicius Pasicles, bent on concealing his servile origins, adopted it in place of his own less distinguished cognomen. More than a century

later, when Juvenal turned to the subject of pedigrees in his Eighth Satire ("Stemmata quid faciunt"), he chose the name "Pansa" to denote a fictitious governor plundering the provinces (8.96).[56]

The fact that the cook is alleged to have come into Trimalchio's possession by inheritance is itself significant. The practice of bequeathing legacies to one's friends and social superiors was so widespread in Roman society that, by revealing that he had been included in Pansa's will, Trimalchio implies that he and Pansa had been of at least equal social standing.[57] The same relationship is implied in the suggestion that Scaurus was regularly entertained as a guest at Trimalchio's home. Whether or not Trimalchio was in fact on such intimate terms with members of the senatorial elite is irrelevant. The point is that, by careful name-dropping, Trimalchio creates the impression that he belongs in the society of such men. Indeed, at one point, he makes his social pretensions explicit: "heri non tam bonum posui, et multo honestiores cenabant" (34.7). By contrast, Ganymede and Echion are proud to claim even a subordinate relationship with men of much lower station. The gulf that separates Trimalchio, pretending to be a big fish in a big pond, from his tablemates, small fish in a small pond, could hardly be wider.

In endowing the freedmen with a certain "class-consciousness", Petronius goes beyond the requirements of caricature and roots his characters firmly in his

contemporary society.[58] The spectrum of attitudes that he presents in order to illustrate the freedmen's views of their place in the world ranges from Ganymede's pathetic fixation on a single moment when he was made to feel a part of society to Niceros' faltering attempts to shrug off feelings of insecurity built up by a lifetime's exposure to ridicule to Echion's more resigned, less wounded, indifference to Hermeros' reactionary exaltation of the very qualities for which he is despised.

The extent to which Trimalchio's behavior is motivated by a similar preoccupation with his freedman status can best be measured by the depths of his determination to deny that class distinctions form an insurmountable barrier to one determined to win the respect of his social superiors. The comparative evidence for real freedmen, mostly sepulchral monuments and epitaphs, does not admit of such precise calibration, but we can see that a number of freedmen sought to disguise their servile origins and to emphasize their status as Roman citizens (see below, pp. 123-125, 152-153). It is reasonable to suppose that each of the attitudes represented by Petronius corresponds with some point on the historical scale.

One question remains, for which I can offer no definite answer: why did Petronius bother to color the freedmen's "class-consciousness" in such subtly different hues? Establishing that the freedmen were aware of upper-class prejudice towards them furthered his aim of

emphasizing their isolation from other segments of society, but beyond that, the representation of different manifestations of essentially the same feeling of insecurity serves no obvious literary purpose. Perhaps the answer is simply that Petronius delighted in characterization for the sake of characterization, and that variation reduced the potential for monotony with a theme that he intended to stress. But perhaps we are dealing with an author whose powers of observation enabled him to perceive the effects that the attitudes and behavior of his own group had on members of a different group, and whose basic humanity led him to paint a not unsympathetic picture of the staggering psychological burden that weighed upon a large sector of the population, but that he himself had never been constrained to bear. In the following chapter, I will try to show that Petronius was capable of representing the attitudes of real freedmen with remarkable accuracy and that he emphasized the theme of a freedman's view of his place in society in his portrait of Hermeros.

The preceding discussion, it is hoped, has shown that no great uniformity of values exists between Trimalchio and his freedmen guests. On the contrary, Petronius seems to have established the variety of attitudes held by the members of Trimalchio's circle. We have surveyed the most significant ways in which Trimalchio is similar to his friends and have pointed out one important way in which he differs from them. We can now turn to the portrait of

Hermeros, recognizing that it need not be the portrait of a "Trimalchio in miniature" and alert to the possibility that Petronius may not have painted it with the same satiric brush that he used on a far larger canvas for the portrait of Trimalchio.

Notes to Chapter Three

[1]I borrow the phrase from P.G. Walsh, RN, 120, who describes Hermeros as a "Trimalchio in miniature"; see further below p. 13 and nt. 53.

[2]See ch. 1, nts. 61-66. It should be noted that many scholars who consider Trimalchio to be typical offer little evidence to back their claims. Among those who support their views with arguments, only Veyne and D'Arms make use of comparative evidence from the Satyricon itself ("Trimalcion", passim; D'Arms, CSS, 101-102, 117).

[3]Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen", 371.

[4]D'Arms, CSS, 116-118, quote from p. 116; cf. p. 117: "[Trimalchio's vast productive estates] certainly require critical attention, but an attention commensurate with that given to them by Petronius and by Trimalchio." Cf. also pp. 97-99 (with the arguments on pp. 11-16), where D'Arms suggests that scholars' different views of Trimalchio reflect their different assumptions as to the nature of the Roman social and economic system.

[5]Petronius develops the character of Hermeros in greater detail than any of the other freedmen. I will explain the reasons for this in the next chapter.

[6]Cf. 14.2, 38.8, 44.17, 88.8-10, 116.4-9, 128.6, 141.5; F.I. Zeitlin, TAPA 102 (1971), 664, "Money is everywhere the standard by which men are judged in the Satyricon". For the pervasiveness of this attitude in Greco-Roman society of the real world, see, e.g., Finley, AE, 35-41. For the sometimes crude manner in which the freedmen express their appreciation of the value of wealth (e.g. Trimalchio's dictum, "assem habeas, assem valeas": 77.6), cf. Horace's description of the vir bonus et sapiens: "nec tamen ignorat quid distent aera lupinis" (Ep. 1.7.23).

[7]For Trimalchio's pretensions to learning as a trait that distinguishes him from his freedmen guests, see Walsh, RN, 125.

[8]P. Perrochat's survey, "Mentalité et expression populaires dans la Cena Trimalchionis", L'Information littéraire 13 (1961), 61-69, makes no attempt to distinguish features in Petronius' representation of the freedmen that occur frequently from those that appear only once. Furthermore, Perrochat discusses several traits that are not peculiar to Trimalchio's group. Under the category of "credulity", for example, after citing Encolpius' comment on

Niceros' werewolf story, "miramur nos et pariter credimus..." (64.1), Perrochat asserts (p. 64) that the statement is ironic with regard to Encolpius but ingenuous with regard to the rest of the guests. But Encolpius shows himself to be naive and foolish throughout the Cena (R. Beck, Phoenix 29 (1975), 277-283), and in any event, superstitious beliefs were not restricted to the lower classes: see J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, Continuity and Change in Roman Religion (Oxford 1979), 126-139 (hereafter, Liebeschuetz, CCRR); K. Hopkins, Death and Renewal (Cambridge 1983), 234 (hereafter, Hopkins, D&R).

[9]This was first noted by G. Studer, RhM 2 (1843), 73; first illustrated by F.F. Abbot, CP 2 (1907), 43-50; and has been most fully (and convincingly) argued by A. Dell'Era, Problemi di lingua e stile in Petronio (Rome 1970) (hereafter, Dell'Era, Problemi). Dissenting views, e.g. those of E.V. Marmorale (QP, 198-223) and D.C. Swanson (A Formal Analysis of Petronius' Vocabulary [Minneapolis 1963], xxxi-xxxii), have not commended themselves to most scholars, nor have the arguments of G. Bagnani, who maintains that "any distinction between the speech of the 'learned' and 'unlearned' characters in the Cena is entirely beside the point" (Arbiter, 73).

[10]For an overview of recent work on Petronius' Latin, see W. Ehlers in Müller-Ehlers[3], 497-505; for further bibliography see H. Petersmann, Petrons urbane Prosa (Vienna 1977).

[11]In 1926 W. Süss argued that Petronius assigned to each freedman a particular category of vulgarism designed to reflect his personality (De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis Cenae sermone vulgari (Dorpat 1926)). Süss' theory has not won general acceptance, but subsequent studies have confirmed that Petronius varied the type and frequency of colloquialisms in the speeches of individual freedmen to a considerable degree: see A.H. Salonius, Die Griechen und das Griechische in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis (Helsingfors 1927), 19-36; A. Marbach, Wortbildung, Wortwahl, und Wortbedeutung als Mittel der Charakterzeichnung bei Petron (Geissen 1931), passim, esp. 163-166. For convincing demonstrations of the manner in which Petronius conveyed personal idosyncrasies in the style of the freedmen's speeches, see U. Knoche, Roman Satire, trans. E. Ramage (Bloomington 1975), 121-123; H.L.W. Nelson, Petronius en zijn "vulgair" latijn. Een stilistisch-grammatische studie over de zoogenaamde "vulgaire dictie" in de Cena Trimalchionis (Utrecht 1947) (English summary on pp. 198-211), 5 (cf. 211). For Petronius' use of stylistic mannerisms as a means of characterizing other figures in the novel, cf. P.A. George, Arion (1966), 336-358 (Giton, Chrysis, Eumolpus, Encolpius); R. Beck, Phoenix 33 (1979),

245-253 (Eumolpus).

[12]See H. Petersmann, Petrons urbane Prosa, passim; Smith, xxi. H.L.W. Nelson (cited in the preceding note) points out that although Phileros' speech at 43.1-3 has a strong colloquial flavor, the passage contains only one grammatical irregularity that could be classified as a vulgarism.

[13]Dell'Era, Problemi, 52-53 calculates that the percentage of phonetic, syntactic, and lexical irregularities in the speech of the freedmen amounts to 6.02%, whereas the figure for "uncultivated" speakers outside the Cena, admittedly a much smaller sample, comes to only 0.88%. Dell'Era's figures are supported by the observation that of the 346 entries listed in D. Altamura's useful catalogue of proverbs and colloquial expressions in Petronius (Latinitas 22 (1974), 181-196), 259 or approximately three quarters (74.8%) are drawn from the Cena, although that episode constitutes only a third of our extant text. K. Müller's recent study of clausulae in the Satyricon (Müller-Ehlers[3], 449-470) adds further confirmation: in contrast to the speech of other characters in the novel, the language of the freedmen is decidedly "unmetrical".

[14]See above, pp. 49-52. It may be objected that Trimalchio represents a specific type -- the boorish nouveau riche freedman. But the fact that Trimalchio is set within the context of a particular social milieu distinguishes Petronius' treatment of him from his characterization of other figures in the novel.

[15]Cf., 43.1, "quid habet quod queratur? ab asse crevit et paratus fuit quadrantem de stercore mordicus tollere"; 43.7, "plane Fortunae filius, in manu illius plumbum aurum fiebat" (Phileros); 46.7, "volo illum ad domusionem aliquid de iure gustare. habet haec res panem" (Echion); 58.12, "ita lucrum faciam" (Hermeros); 61.3, "omne me...lucrum transeat nisi iam dudum dissilio quod te talem video"; 62.6, "ut mentiar, nullius patrimonium tanti facio" (Niceros); 70.1 "ita crescam patrimonio, non corpore"; 75.9, "bene emo, bene vendo...felicitate dissilio" (Trimalchio). Trimalchio's Lares are named Cerdo, Felicio, and Lucrio (60.8-9).

[16]On the other hand, the freedmen's association of money with status is particularly blatant: cf. 38.7, "reliquos autem collibertos eius cave contemnas. valde enim sucossi sunt"; 58.5, "dominus dupunduarius" (Hermeros); 43.1-2, "honeste vixit, honeste obiit...puto mehercules illum reliquisse solida centum, et omnia in nummis habuit" (Phileros); 45.6, "ut quadringenta impendat, non sentiet patrimonium illius, et sempiterno nominabitur"; 45.8, "Glyco

autem, sestertiarios homo"; 45.11, "gladiatores sestertiarios" (Echion); 74.15, "et ego, homo dipundiarius"; 77.6, "assem habeas, assem valeas; habes, habeberis" (Trimalchio). Elevations in status are sometimes indicated by reference to the financial conditions that they presuppose: cf. 44.14, "iam scio unde acceperit denarios mille aureos" (the minimum census requirement for decuriones) (Ganymede); 58.2 "quando vicesimam numerasti?" (the 5% manumission tax) (Hermeros). Conversely, a specific amount of money is at one point suggested by reference to the social status with which it is associated: 76.2, "accepi patrimonium laticlavium" (Trimalchio).

17For the proverb, cf. A. Otto, Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörterlichen Redensarten der Römer (Leipzig 1890), s.v. "credere" no. 2 (hereafter, Otto, Sprichwörter). For the pun, Smith, ad loc. cites Cic., Att. 1.16.10, where the play on credere is rather between the two senses "believe" and "trust", and Sen., Suas. 7.5, where the wordplay more closely parallels the usage in the present passage: "credamus Antonio, Cicero, si bene illi pecunias crediderunt faeneratores."

18"Mercatura autem, si tenuis est, sordida putanda est; sin magna et copiosa, multa undique apportans multisque sine vanitate impertiens, non est admodum vituperanda" (Cic., Off. 151). Trimalchio commanded an imposing fleet -- five ships at first (76.3), and later others that were "bigger and better" (76.5) -- and realized substantial profits from shipping (76.8). It should be noted, however, that his maritime ventures seem to have been limited to ferrying agricultural products, locally manufactured perfume, and slaves already imported from overseas (76.6) -- albeit in large quantities -- between Puteoli and Rome (76.3): for Trimalchio's cargo ("vinum, lardum, fabam, seplasium, mancipia": 76.6), see, generally, Friedlaender and Maiuri, ad loc.; for seplasium, produced at Capua, cf. also M.W. Frederiksen, PBSR 27 n.s. 14 (1959), 110-111; for Puteoli as a center of the Eastern slave trade, see below, pp. 227-228 and nt. 17. H.C. Schnur, Latomus 18 (1959), 795 points out that Trimalchio seems to have shipped only generic wine rather than any of the specialty vintages of Campania.

19D'Arms, CSS, 4 makes the important point that the phrase "sordida merces", which aristocratic authors regularly used to describe certain forms of commerce, "is employed exclusively in contexts where the scale of commercial operations is small, or the respectability of the practitioner is suspect". In Trimalchio's case, the latter situation applies.

[20]Cf., e.g., hucksters (cociones) (14.7, 15.4) and pleaders (causidici) (15.4) in the forum scene (12.1-15.7); another causidicus in fr. VIII; a herald (praeco) in the service of Ascyltus (97.1-98.2); an innkeeper (caupo) in the same scene (98.1); and the hired man (mercennarius) Corax, who serves Eumolpus as a porter (99.6, 117.11-12) and barber (103.1-3). For a possible reference to another unguentarius, cf. fr. XVIII (Büch.).

[21]For Graecisms in Hermeros' speech, see A.H. Salonius, Die Griechen und das Griechische in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis, 22-24; cf. also L.E. Rossi, SIFC 45 (1973), 28-45 on 58.7 "deurode"; add malista at 57.10, "dedi tamen operam ut domino satis facerem, homini malista [et] dignitos[s]o, cuius pluris erat unguis quam tu totus es", where, for the ms. mali isto, I adopt P.A. George's attractive conjecture (partially anticipated by Scheffer) rather than Muncker's maiesto, which most editors accept but which is unattested elsewhere: see Smith, ad loc.; for "maiesto", cf. E, Dobtoiu Ant. Class. 10 (1968), 167.

[22]So, for example, Maiuri, 236; Alessio, Hapax, 133; E.V. Marmorale, Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis, 2nd ed. (Florence 1961); P. Perrochat, Pétrone. Le festin de Trimalcion, 3rd ed. (Paris 1962), ad loc. (hereafter, Marmorale, Perrochat). Cappadocians were, however, noted for physical strength, and Marmorale, ad loc., finds this characteristic associated with sexual energy in Ps. Lucian, Asin., 36. See also Balsdon, R&A, 66-67; and, for refs., J.E.B. Mayor, Thirteen Satires of Juvenal with a Commentary, 3rd ed. (London 1881), ad Juv. 7.15 (hereafter, Mayor, Juvenal); W.V. Harris, in MAAR 36 (1980), 139 nt. 109.

[23]See H. Solin, Beiträge, 145; "Zu den griechischen Namen in Rom", in L'Onomastique Latine (Paris 1977), 166. Kajanto's omission of "Seleucus" from his study of Latin cognomina (LC) is inconsistent with his practice of including such names as Graecus, Orientalis, and even Sarmata: see B. Rawson, CP 73 (1968), 157.

[24]Cf. the remarks above, p. 65, nt. 15 on the name "Trimalchio".

[25]M. Hadas, "Oriental Elements in Petronius", AJP 50 (1929), 378-385. Hadas' remarks on 42.2, "cor nostrum cotidie liquescit"; 45.8, "sed qui asinum non potest stratum caedit"; 45.11, "burdubasta"; and perhaps 41.3, "servus tuus" seem especially convincing. Cf. also W.B. Sedgwick's explanation of 77.4 "cusuc" in CR 39 (1925), 118, reproduced by Hadas, p. 384; below, pp. 212-213 nt. 7. For some valid criticisms of some of Hadas' other suggestions: L. Pepe, Studi Petroniani (Naples 1957), 75-82 [= GIF 2 (1949), 269-272]. For further suggestions of oriental elements in

Petronius, see J.F. Killeen, CP 54 (1959), 178-179 with W.H. Hewitt, Ant. Class. 3 (1960), 90-92 on 64.12, "bucca bucca quot sunt hic; F.J. Dölger, JbAC 2 (1959), 20-22 and W.O. Moeller, CP 71 (1976), 171 on 62.9, "matavitatau" (convincingly); E. Flores, RAAN 38 (1963), 45-69 on Massa and Habinnas; H. Jacobson, CP 66 (1971), 183-186 on 31.2, "vinum dominicum ministratoris gratia est" (supporting Hadas); D.S. Barrett, LCM 7.5 (1982), 72-73 on fr. 37 (Büch.) and Judaism.

[26]See Appendix 2, pp. 233-239, on C. Pompeius Diogenes.

[27]Fabre, Libertus; G. Alföldy, "Die Freilassung von Sklaven und die Struktur der Sklaverei in der römischen Kaiserzeit", RSA 2 (1972), 97-129. Cf. also Veyne, "Trimalcion", 222, but note that, taken together, Veyne's contentions that a freedman automatically became independent upon his patron's death (below nt. 29) and that most manumissions were testamentary (221-222) contradict this view.

[28]Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen", 359-371 (an appendix is devoted to "The historicity of Trimalchio"); D'Arms, CSS, passim, but esp. ch. 5 on "The 'Typicality' of Trimalchio" (97-120) and ch. 6 on the freedmen of Puteoli and Ostia (121-148); Treggiari, RFLR, 68-81. Finley, AE, 64-65 states this view without arguing it; contrast his later remarks in ASMI, 82.

[29]Veyne, "Trimalcion", 223. Elsewhere Veyne suggests, incorrectly, that manumission by testament or even the death of the patron was sufficient to render a freedman independent: cf., e.g., 225: "Mais si le patron venait à mourir ou s'effaçait volontairement, l'affranchi se retrouvait maître de son sort"; 226: "Enfin la fréquence des affranchissements testamentaires...a multiplié le nombre des affranchis qui ne dependaient plus d'un patron (libertini orcini)." Furthermore, Veyne suggests that the duty of obsequium would have constituted a greater burden than the obligation to perform operae, but this seems not to have been the case: see Treggiari, RFLR, 68-78, esp. 73-75.

[30]Veyne, "Trimalcion", 227-228, "Tous sont leurs propres maitres; ils ne parlent pas de leur patron ou en parlent au passé (57.10; 58.11; 76.2)." Veyne evidently believes that all the freedmen belonged to the same familia; cf. also 225: "Aussi les riches affranchis du Satyricon gardent-ils du respect et de la reconnaissance pour leur maître". The passage that he then cites to illustrate the freedmen's respect for their master (39.4) in fact belongs to Trimalchio and might have been included with the three references quoted on pp. 227-228 (see beginning of note). Of these, 76.2 likewise pertains to Trimalchio (cf. also 69.3);

the other two refer to Hermeros; cf. also 62.1 (Niceros). As for Trimalchio and his friends all having been freed by the same master, we have already discussed the discrepancies in the gentilicia of two of the guests which makes this unlikely (above, pp. 42-44). Note also that the biography of Hermeros, who was a slave for forty years (57.9) and who bought himself out of slavery (57.6), is not easily reconciled with that of Trimalchio, who at the dramatic date of the Cena is an old man (27.1) and whose master evidently died long ago.

[31] Trimalchio is described as a "calvus senex" (27.1). Plocamus suffers from gout and longs for the days of his youth (64.3-4). Hermeros was a slave for forty years and yet has been free long enough to accumulate a modest fortune (57.6,9). Ganymede (44.4) and Niceros (61.6) recall past events in a manner which suggests that they are long removed from the contemporary setting. The freedmen's friends are septuagenarians and are dying of old age (43.7; cf. 42.5).

[32] Cf. Hopkins, C&S, 115 nt. 30, 127 nt. 63 (thirty); W.V. Harris, in MAAR 36 (1980), 118, 134 nt. 9 (forty); Weaver, FC, 103-104: most freedmen in the familia Caesaris manumitted between the ages of 30 and 40, on average "probably between 30 and 35".

[33] We know that from the time of Augustus a freedwoman who was fifty years old or older could not be compelled to perform operae (cf. Dig. 38.1.35 [Paul, lib. 2 ad leg. Iuliam et Papiam]), but no such exemption for male freedmen is recorded.

[34] Cf. 38.6, "reliquos autem collibertos eius cave contemnas. valde sucossi sunt"; 38.8, "cum Incuboni pilleum rapuisset, [et] thesaurum invenit" (C. Pompeius Diogenes); 38.12, "sestertium suum vidit decies" (Iulius Proculus) -- it does not matter that Proculus has lost his fortune: see the text; 43.2, "puto mehercules illum reliquisse solida centum" (Chrysanthus); 57.6, "glebulas emi; lamellulas paravi; viginti ventres pasco et canem" (Hermeros) (see further below, pp. 128-131); 64.3, "quadrigae meae decucurrerunt, ex quo podagricus factus sum": gout implies a life of luxury (Plocamus). Ganymede and Echion are often considered to be poor, but both own houses (44.15; 46.2).

[35] Dig. 40.9.32.1 (Ter. Clem., lib. 8 ad leg. Iuliam et Papiam): "non prohibentur lege Aelia Sentia patroni a libertis mercedes capere, sed obligare eos: itaque si sponte sua libertus mercedem patrono praestiterit, nullum huius legis praemium consequetur."

[36] The most relevant legal texts seem to be CJ 6.3.2; 6.3.3; 6.3.8; 6.4.1.pr. (which asserts that the manumittor

retained omnia iura patronatus; Dig. 37.15.3; 38.2.3.4. The best discussion remains that of Buckland, RLS, 636-646, esp. 640-643; cf. also J.H. Michel, La gratuité en droit romain (Brussels 1962), 157-167; M. Morabito, Les réalités de l'esclavage d'après le Digeste (Paris 1981), 169 with further bibliography (hereafter, Morabito, Réalités). P. Garnsey's discussion ("Independent Freedmen", 363-364) does not do full justice to the complexities of the problem, although he does point out (p. 364) that we do not know at what point the principle that the servus suis nummis emptus owed no operae became law.

[37]D'Arms, CSS, 146-148, quote from p. 146. D'Arms defines an independent freedman as one "released from the restricting controls of a former master and his familia, and in a position both to accumulate wealth in commercial and manufacturing ventures where success depended upon his own capacities, contacts, and initiative, and to establish and maintain social relationships which were largely of his own choosing". For Puteoli as the location of the Cena, see Appendix 1.

[38]For this conception of the Roman social system, see, e.g., Veyne, "Trimalcion", 245-247. Finley, AE, 44-51 emphasizes that such rigid distinctions tend to obfuscate social and economic realities -- a point amply demonstrated by D'Arms' recent study of the organization of commercial operations in ancient Rome (CSS, passim). But we are speaking here not of actual conditions but of an aristocrat's literary representation of his society.

[39]See D'Arms, CSS, 119, with refs.

[40]For the city of Rome, see now Huttunen, Social Strata 139, whose estimate, based on a survey of every fifth inscription in CIL 6, that 49.5% of those inscriptions that mention occupation (of artisans, businessmen and merchants: cf. 121-128) were dedicated to freedmen and 25.9% by freedmen supersedes the earlier figures of Kühn (54% of fabri, 58% of opifices) and Gummerus (66.75% of artisans and merchants in general). For the limitations of the statistical approach to determining the proportion of different status groups in various professions, see S. Treggiari, "Urban Labour in Rome: Mercenarii and Tabernarii", in P. Garnsey, ed., Non-Slave Labour in the Greco-Roman World (Cambridge 1980), 55-56, q.v. also for the figures of Kuhn and Gummerus (hereafter, Treggiari, "Urban Labour"). For the preponderance of freedmen in Pompeian commercial and retailing operations, see E. Lepore, in Pompeiana: Raccolta di studi per il secondo centenario degli scavi di Pompeii (Naples 1950), 159.

[41]With regard to freedmen's professions, cf. Treggiari, RFLR, 87-161, esp. 160: "The part played by libertini in almost all types of work was important". Treggiari notes the almost complete lack of evidence for freedmen employed in agriculture but rightly observes that "evidence on farm-workers is in any case scanty" (107). Cf. however, B.W. Frier, ZSS 100 (1983), 670-671, esp. nt. 13, citing Dig. 40.5.41.15; R. Beare, CQ 28 (1978), 398-401. CIL 11.600 has been overlooked: if Mommsen's plausible restorations are accepted, the text shows freedmen "qui agros bene [et strenue colant...]".

[42]Cf., e.g., M. Bang, Röm. Mitt. 25 (1910), 247-248; R.H. Barrow, Slavery in the Roman Empire (London 1928), 15-18 (hereafter, Barrow, SRE); Westermann, Slave Systems, 97; W.V. Harris, in MAAR 36 (1980), 127-128.

[43]Cf. Cic., Prov. 10, "Iudaeis et Syriis, nationibus natis servituti" -- a sentiment which Livy puts in the mouth of Roman commanders on two occasions (35.49.8, 36.17.5) and which is echoed in the Neronian period by Lucan, 7.442-445. Cf. also Tac., Hist. 4.17; Philostr., Vit. Ap. 7.14, 8.7.

[44]For Roman attitudes towards Easterners, see A.N. Sherwin-White, Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome (Cambridge 1967), Index, s.v. "Syrians"; Balsdon, R&A, 60-64, 66-69.

[45]For aristocratic contempt for vulgar diction, see MacMullen, RSR, 107, with refs. on p. 194 nt. 58; and for open pursuit of profits, id., 117-118, with refs. on pp. 200-201, nts. 95-96. For upper-class attitudes towards artisans and petty traders, see, in general, Treggiari, "Urban Labour", 48-50; D'Arms, CSS, 2-5. Cicero's famous condemnation of retailers ("qui mercantur a mercatoribus"), artisans ("opifices omnes"), and laborers ("[ii] quorum operae, non quorum artes emuntur") (Off. 150) may be thought to cover most of the occupations listed above, p. 77, including those of stone-mason and centonarius, which are not specifically berated elsewhere (for the reliability of this passage of the De Officiis as an indicator of contemporary upper-class views, see P.A. Brunt, PCPS 19 (1973), 26-34, esp. 29). For aristocratic contempt of porters, innkeepers, hucksters, petty traders, stage entertainers, mule-drivers, bakers, auctioneers, cobblers, barbers, and perfume dealers, see MacMullen, RSR, 138-141 s.vv. "baiulus", "caupo", " κάπηλος ", "mercator", "mimus", "mulio", "negotiator", "opifex", "pistor", "praeco", "sutor", "tonsor", and "unguentarius". For pleaders (causidici), cf. Cic., Orat. 1.202; Quint., Inst. 12.1.25; Juv., 10.121; Tac., Dial., 1.1; Dio of Prusa, Or. 7.123. For cooks, cf. Cic., Off. 150, citing Ter., Eun. 257; Rosc. Am. 134; Vat. 32; Mart. 6.61.8. For undertakers, cf. Sen., Ben. 6.38. From Dig. 50.2.12 it may be inferred that contempt for tradesmen ("eos qui

utensilia negotiantur et vendunt") was common among the municipal aristocracy as well.

[46]Rostovtzeff, SEHRE[2], 58.

[47]See Treggiari, RFLR, 89, citing Cic., Off. 150; Sall., Cat. 50.1; Liv. 22.25.19; cf. also Juv. 1.102-111. This association should not be taken to indicate that upper-class Romans regarded wage-earning in itself as a form of slavery: see Treggiari, "Urban Labour", 52.

[48]Petronius' accuracy can be checked by comparing the relevant passages in the Cena against the material compiled by V. Väänänen, Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes[3] (Berlin 1966). There is some evidence that the writers of Atellan farces and mimes used colloquial Latin as a means of characterization: see G. Bonfante, Maia 19 (1967), 3-21.

[49]For realism in Plautus and Terence, see P.P. Spranger, Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklaven figuren des Plautus und Terenz (Wiesbaden 1960), 52-89 (hereafter, Spranger, Sklavenfiguren); and in Apuleius, F. Millar, JRS 71 (1981), 63-75. For the language, see L.R. Palmer, The Latin Language (London 1954), 74-94, esp. 88 (Plautus), 93 (Terence); 144-146 (Apuleius) (but cf. A.S. Gratwick, Hermes 99 (1971), 25-45: Punic elements in Hanno's speech in Plautus' Poenulus). That these authors depicted characters whose native tongue was Greek rather than Latin does not matter: all three were fully capable of conveying the flavor of colloquial speech had they so desired.

[50]Cf., e.g., Walsh, RN, 120-121 (quote from p. 121); Auerbach, Mimesis, 26-30; Arrowsmith, "Luxury and Death", 319-320; A. Cameron, Latomus 29 (1970), 419; Rankin, Petronius the Artist, 13; F.I. Zeitlin, TAPA 102 (1971), 663-665; P. Grimal, BAGB 4 (1972), 306; Grondona, Religione, 73. The persistence of this view in recent works of social and economic history may be attributed directly to its first explicit statement in Veyne's fundamental article on the life of Trimalchio. For Veyne, "Si Trimalcion dépasse tous [les riches affranchis invités au banquet] par sa richesse, il n'en est pas substantiellement différent"; "ils sont evidemment moins riches que lui, mais eux et lui communient dans les memes valeurs" ("Trimalcion", 227, 242, respectively). Cf. MacMullen, RSR, 50, Staerman, Schiavitù, 123; Balsdon, R&A, 27.

[51]These subjective character evaluations inevitably tend to contradict each other. Ganymede, for example, has been variously described as a whiner ("geignard", E. Thomas, Pétrone[3], 119; "brontolone", Maiuri, 47) or an "upholder of old-time morality" (Smith, 107), as "querulous and senile"

(F. Abbot, CP 2 (1907), 44) or essentially good-natured ("bonaccione", Paratore II, 142). Linguistic studies of the freedmen's speech have generally focused on the more narrow problem of categorizing and explaining the freedmen's vulgarisms and solecisms, with Süss' study being the notable exception: see above, pp. 100-101, nts. 9-12).

52The precise meaning of Echion's expression is uncertain, although the sense is clear from the context: see Alessio, Hapax, 117-118; Smith, ad loc.

53Vulgarisms: "argutat...loquere...loquis" (active forms for deponent); "pauperorum" (second declension for third); "prae" and "persuadeo" with the accusative (instead of the ablative and dative respectively). Hyperurbanisms: "cum dominam suam delectaretur" (deponent form for active) (45.7); "vinciturum" (for "victurum") (45.11); "nervia" (45.11), "libra" (46.7), "thesaurum" (46.8) (neuter forms for masculine): see J.P. Lynch, Helios 9 (1981-82), 35-38. Cf. Ciaffi, "Intermezzo", 135; Smith, xxi, 120-121. Echion shares the affectation of hypervulgarisms with Trimalchio: see M. von Albrecht, Meister römischer Prosa von Cato bis auf Apuleius: Interpretationen (Heidelberg 1971), 154-155; Dell'Era, Problemi, 41.

54For "domesticus", see TLL 5.1870 s.v. no. 3; and, better, OLD, s.v. "domestici" b; add Cod. Th. 1.12.3; CJ 12.7; for further legal nuances: B.W. Frier, ZSS 108 (1978), 251.

55R. Duncan-Jones, Latomus 32 (1973), 364-367; cf. Rankin, Petronius the Artist, 42 nt. 49. The allusion may have gained poignancy from the fact that the Princeps Senatus (cos. 115), though a patrician, was nonetheless a self-made man who raised his family from the obscurity into which it had sunk in recent years. His father was alleged to have been a dealer in charcoal, and the consul himself, after debating whether to go into politics or banking (De Vir. Ill. 72.1-2), ultimately won the reputation of being "inpiger, factiosus, avidus potentiae honoris divitiarum" (Sal., Jug. 15.4).

56"Pansa": Kajanto, LC, 241. Crassicius Pasicles: Suet., Gramm. 18 (for similar cases of freedmen exchanging their former slave names for more distinguished cognomina: P.R.C. Weaver, CQ 58 (1964), 311-313; Treggiari, RFLR, 251; M. Reinhold, Historia 20 (1971), 288). I am unconvinced by Highet's arguments that Juvenal's reference to a "Pansa" was intended as a specific gibe at one of his contemporaries (Juvenal, 293-294), and by P. Grimal's suggestion that Petronius meant his readers to recognize an allusion to C. Vibius Pansa (RPh 16 (1942), 162). P. Veyne, "Trimalchio Maecenatianus", 1617 notes the aristocratic connotations of

both "Scaurus" and "Pansa" in passing.

[57]See now Hopkins, D&R, 237-240.

[58]It should be noted that the "class consciousness" which Petronius attributes to the freedmen is largely a matter of individual awareness; there is little evidence that the freedmen feel any sense of class solidarity (but cf. P. Veyne, Annales ESC 33 (1978), 43-44). In identifying Trimalchio's guests as his colliberti (38.6), Hermeros limits his feeling of collegiality to his immediate circle of friends, as is made clear by the fact that he goes on to describe the liberti scelerati of Iulius Proculus, who were concerned only with their own welfare (38.12; cf. 43.6, "habuit autem oracularios servos, qui illum pessum dederunt": Phileros). Echion is delighted at the prospect of seeing the freedmen of his friend Titus massacred in the arena (45.4); Iulius Proculus, in financial straits, is relegated to the libertini locus (38.11). Trimalchio's humanitarian sentiments, "et servi homines sunt et aeque unum lactem biberunt" (71.1), and his sympathetic recognition of the powerlessness of slaves to control their own actions (76.11; cf. 45.8: Echion), are at variance with his harsh treatment of his own slaves (28.7, 47.13; cf. 34.5, "putidissimi servi"); cf. also M.T. Griffin's astute interpretation of Trimalchio's philosophizing as "a hit at the ex-slave who has learned all too well to play the master" (Seneca, 260 nt.1).

CHAPTER FOUR

HERMEROS

Of all the freedman guests, Hermeros has most to say.[1] He appears early in the Cena (36.8-38.16) and returns on two occasions, once to explain one of Trimalchio's elaborate jokes to Encolpius (41.3), and once to attack the rudeness of Ascyltus and, ultimately, Giton (57-58).[2] My aim in the following pages is to show that Hermeros is a figure of central importance for our understanding of Petronius' literary goals in the Cena. In his characterization of Trimalchio's friend, Petronius draws a consistent portrait, without distortion or exaggeration, of a successful independent freedman and sets it in contrast to his portrait of Trimalchio. Whereas Trimalchio tries to escape the social limitations of being a freedman by assuming the manners of a Roman knight, Hermeros is proud to have worked his way out of slavery and demands respect for having attained his present status. I will argue that Petronius' purpose in comparing the two freedmen's attitudes towards their social standing is to suggest that a freedman's status is immutable and inescapable: neither Hermeros nor Trimalchio can win respect in the eyes of an aristocrat because both are tainted by their servile pasts.

The pattern of Hermeros' interventions in the dinner conversation distinguishes him from the other freedmen, all but one of whom appear only once. Five of them deliver consecutive speeches in a carefully engineered interlude after Trimalchio has excused himself to go to the toilet (41.10-46: see below, ch. 5). Another recounts a fabulous werewolf story (61-62) and is immediately matched by Trimalchio, who tells a similar witch story (63). One boasts of his prowess as a singer and launches into a recital, but we are spared the content of his performance (64.3-5). Petronius allows none of the freedmen but Hermeros to have his speech go unanswered: each of the others is balanced by a corresponding speech delivered either by another freedman or by Trimalchio himself.

Habinnas, the guest of honor, arrives late in the banquet with his wife Scintilla and dominates Trimalchio's attention until the final scene (65.3-74.7). Throughout the last quarter of the Cena, he exerts a pervasive influence on the course of events (cf. 65.6, 67.3.10.12, 68.4.6, 69.4-5, 71.5, 72.1.4, 74.17, 75.1.3, 77.1). By contrast, Hermeros' contributions to the conversation are sporadic and isolated. With one notable exception, they do not interrupt the flow of the banquet, and Petronius reminds the reader who is speaking each time that Hermeros appears.[3]

With regard to the structure of the Cena, this one exception, Hermeros' invective against Ascyltus and Giton (57-58), sets him up as a foil to Trimalchio. Hermeros'

first speech (37.2-38.16) establishes the nature of Trimalchio's social environment within both the private context of his household (37.2-38.5) and the public context of freedman society (38.6-16). These two aspects of Trimalchio's milieu are further developed in two episodes that frame the central section of the Cena. The five freedmen's speeches recited in Trimalchio's absence (41.10-46.8) fill out the social background against which Trimalchio is to be viewed in his public rôle as "princeps libertinorum"[4]; the scenes immediately following the arrival of Habinnas and Scintilla (67.1-69.5) illuminate the domestic setting in which he appears as pater familias. In the former episode, Trimalchio's fellow freedmen discuss their political and social concerns; in the latter, Petronius provides a view of the marital relations of the two freedmen couples centering on the husbands' affection for their deliciae and the wives' expensive tastes in jewelry.

Between these two episodes, we encounter Niceros' werewolf story (61), which is offset by Trimalchio's witch story (62); Plocamus' brief contribution (64.3-5), which is never elaborated; and Hermeros' invective against Ascyltus and Giton (57-58), which meets with no direct response and finds its counterpart only in the climactic final scene (74.8-78.5), where Trimalchio's vitriolic reply to Fortunata's insults likewise leads to self-justification in the form of autobiography. By distinguishing Hermeros' final speech from the other freedmen's speeches in this manner,

Petronius suggests that it be seen as balancing Trimalchio's autobiographical monologue at the end of the Cena.

The significance of Hermeros' final speech may further be observed from a comparison of the Cena Trimalchionis with Horace's Cena Nasidieni (Serm. 2.8). If one considers the dramatic rôles filled by the major characters in both pieces, one finds that Hermeros plays Nomentanus to Trimalchio's Nasidienus.[5] Like Nomentanus, Hermeros is a regular fixture at his friend's dinner parties, where, like Nomentanus, he performs the function of interpreter (cf. 41.2), pointing out and explaining to the uninitiated guests the refinements of his host (Serm. 2.8.25-32; Sat. 36.8, 38.5, 41.2-4). In Horace's satire, Nomentanus has been seated next to the guest of honor, Maecenas (2.8.22-23); in the Cena, Hermeros reclines next to Encolpius, admittedly not the guest of honor, but one of the visitors whom Trimalchio most wants to impress (36.7, 57.1: see above, p. 52). Like Nomentanus, Hermeros describes the exotic measures that have been taken to ensure that the fare is of the highest quality (Serm. 2.8.31-33; Sat. 38.2-4). When their respective banquets are disrupted, both Nomentanus and Hermeros attempt to restore a sense of propriety to the festivities (Serm. 2.8.61-63; Sat. 57.2), and in both cases their efforts elicit only scornful laughter from the more sophisticated company (Serm. 2.8.63-64; Sat. 58.1).

But the vapid moralizing on the mutability of fortune with which Nomentanus in Horace's satire tries to

restore Nasidienus' confidence after the collapse of the awning (Serm. 2.8.61-63) finds expression in the Cena in the mouth not of Hermeros but of Trimalchio himself (55.3).[6] In its place Petronius substitutes Hermeros' protracted vituperation of Ascyltus and Giton, a piece which finds no parallel in the Horatian satire.

Much of the present chapter will be devoted to a detailed analysis of the autobiographical statements embedded in Hermeros' diatribe against Ascyltus and Giton. Before we turn to that episode, however, it will first be necessary to establish two points with regard to Hermeros' initial speech (37.2-38.16), since they bear on the interpretation of his outburst later in the Cena. The dramatic situation has been outlined above (p. 42): Encolpius' inquiry into Fortunata's identity leads Hermeros to expatiate on her character, Trimalchio's wealth, and the fortunes of two of the other guests, whom he identifies as the colliberti of Trimalchio. In describing Trimalchio's milieu, Hermeros reveals two aspects of his own mentality that are relevant for the present discussion.

First, Hermeros emphasizes that his friends have risen to prosperity from the lowest rung on the social ladder, slavery. After identifying Fortunata as the wife of Trimalchio, Hermeros first calls attention to the extent of her wealth ("nummos modio metitur") and then immediately alludes to her dubious background: "et modo modo quid fuit? ignoscet mihi genius tuus, noluisses de manu illius panem

accipere." (37.3). She was a prostitute (lupatris),[7] as it emerges (37.6), a Syrian flute-girl whom Trimalchio bought from the slave auction block (74.13).[8] Likewise, when Hermeros points out Pompeius Diogenes, one of Trimalchio's "juicy" (succos[s]li) friends, his first remarks emphasize the contrast between Diogenes' present prosperity and his humble origins: "vides illum qui in imo imus recumbit: hodie sua octingenta possidet. de nihilo crevit. modo solebat collo suo ligna portare." (38.7). Diogenes, it will be remembered, has only recently won his freedom and is therefore looking out for his own interests: "est tamen sub alapa et non vult sibi male" (38.9: see Appendix 2). What is important for Hermeros is not simply that his freedmen friends are rich, but that they have made themselves rich: they are self-made men.

Second, Hermeros recognizes that the possession of wealth based in commerce is unstable. By implication, whatever respect a businessman might enjoy on account of his wealth is likewise unstable. Immediately after he recounts Diogenes' meteoric rise to success, Hermeros relates the misfortunes of Julius Proculus, the undertaker who once boasted a fortune fit for a senator (38.12) and ate like a king (38.14), but who was swindled by his business partners (his own freedmen) (38.12-13) and is now fending off his creditors (38.16) and teetering on the verge of bankruptcy (38.12). Hermeros does not imply, as has sometimes been supposed, that society as a whole is unstable.[9] On the

contrary, as we shall see (below pp. 147-148) Hermeros has a very rigid conception of the Roman social hierarchy: he evaluates others in terms of their perceived civil status and adapts his own behavior accordingly.

Nor is it true, as is often maintained, that within Trimalchio's circle wealth and "status" are synonymous. Certainly, Hermeros is impressed by Trimalchio's financial resources and the material comforts that they provide (37.8-38.5). But elsewhere he shows that he does not believe social respectability to be entirely dependent upon wealth. In Hermeros' view, a man's true worth, unlike his social standing, is unaffected by his financial condition: of his friend Julius Proculus, he observes: "non puto illum capillos liberos habere, nec mehercules sua culpa; ipso enim homo melior non est." (38.12). By juxtaposing the two stories, rags to riches and riches to rags, Hermeros simply means to show that wealth provides only an uncertain foundation for prestige and "status", as we would use the term.

In the course of defending his host against Ascyltus' mockery, Hermeros gives a detailed account of his own life and thereby makes clear on what grounds he bases his own claim to respectability. As we shall see presently, Hermeros is especially proud of being a Roman citizen and stresses the hardships that he underwent in order to attain that distinction. Before we examine the autobiographical sections of Hermeros' monologue in detail, however, we should note that Petronius frames the speech with passages

which call attention to Hermeros' freedman status and which suggest that Hermeros' remarks be seen as reflecting a freedman's view of his place in society. Trimalchio has just regaled the company with a lengthy series of inane jokes, when Ascyltus, who has been barely restraining himself, finally bursts into laughter (57.1). Hermeros turns on him and unleashes a stream of abuse, but before he has played himself out, Giton interrupts with a snicker (58.1), thus adding renewed vigor to Hermeros' attack, which is then directed at Giton.

With the exception of the abortive escape attempt after Trimalchio has led the company off to his private baths (72.5-73.2), this is the only reported activity of either Ascyltus or Giton in the entire Cena. In each instance Encolpius comments explicitly on his companion's behavior. He considers Ascyltus' guffaws a display of "unbounded insolence": "ceterum Ascyltos, intemperantis licentiae, cum omnia sublatis manibus eluderet et usque ad lacrimas rideret" (57.1); Giton's laughter is poured out "indecently": "post hoc dictum Giton...risum iam diu compressum etiam indecenter effudit" (58.1). Furthermore, Petronius reminds the reader of the social background against which Ascyltus' and Giton's actions, and Encolpius' reactions to them, are meant to be viewed.

Earlier I argued that Petronius' peculiar use of the term collibertus to describe a freedman simply in relation to his fellow freedmen (38.6) emphasizes a connection

between Trimalchio and his peers in terms of their civil status (see above, pp. 42-44). The same connection is stressed in the present passage, where the word occurs three times. Hermeros is introduced as the "collibertus" of Trimalchio: "unus ex conlibertis Trimalchionis excanduit" (57.1). He himself calls attention to the relationship in the course of his speech: "ita satur pane fiam, ut ego istud conliberto meo dono" (58.3, reading Scheffer's obvious emendation for the ms. cum liberto); and the identification is confirmed at the end of the episode: "Trimalchio delectatus colliberti eloquentia" (59.1).

By punctuating Hermeros' speech with the only explicit references to Ascyltus' and Giton's participation in the banquet and by having Encolpius condemn their rudeness, Petronius draws attention to their behavior and Hermeros' reactions to it. By framing the episode with references to Hermeros' civil status, Petronius suggests that Hermeros' reactions be regarded as those of a freedman. By showing that Hermeros regards Ascyltus as freeborn and Giton as a slave (57.11, 58.1-2), he further suggests that Hermeros' attitudes be seen as reflecting a freedman's view of his place in society. Finally, by stressing a connection between Hermeros and Trimalchio in terms of their civil status, and by structuring his narrative so that Hermeros' speech parallels Trimalchio's final monologue, Petronius encourages the reader to compare the attitudes of the two characters.

After suggesting that Ascyltus has never before witnessed such refinements as Trimalchio displays (57.2) and commenting that maggots born in soft flesh always make his blood boil (57.3), Hermeros goes on to list his own accomplishments:

> eques Romanus es? et ego regis filius. "quare ergo servivisti?" quia ipse me dedi in servitutem et malui civis Romanus esse quam tributarius. et nunc spero me sic vivere, ut nemini iocus sim. homo inter homines sum, 5
> capite aperto ambulo; assem aerarium nemini debeo; constitutum habui numquam; nemo mihi in foro dixit "redde quod debes". glebulas emi, 6
> lamellulas paravi; viginti ventres pasco et canem; contubernalem meam redemi, ne quis in <capillis> illius manus tergeret; mille denarios pro capite solvi; sevir gratis factus sum; spero sic moriar, ut mortuus non erubescam. (57.4-6).

How are we to interpret this passage? Upon first inspection there is little that strikes the modern reader as particularly funny. Certainly the colorful invective that characterizes much of Hermeros' diatribe is absent from this section of his speech. Furthermore, the autobiographical details recorded by Hermeros seem plausible. On the other hand, it is well known that Petronius derives much of the humor in his portrait of Trimalchio from a subtle distortion or exaggeration of actual conditions and circumstances. By checking the details in Petronius' characterization against the evidence for real freedmen of the period, previous scholars have exposed Trimalchio's social pretensions and enhanced our appreciation of the author's literary technique in his representation of a boorish host (see above, p. 26 nt. 1). Conversely, we have seen that Petronius employed an

incongruous mixture of "realistic" details to more serious effect in developing the theme that Encolpius' visit to Trimalchio's home represents a trip to the underworld (above, pp. 55-57). In both cases, a careful comparison of the world of the Satyricon with the real world of contemporary Rome has led to a better understanding of Petronius' artistic goals in the Cena.

When applied to the portrait of Hermeros, the same methodology yields significant results. A point by point analysis of the attitudes and information revealed in the autobiographical passages of Hermeros' speech will show that all but one of the details in Petronius' characterization faithfully reflect the views and circumstances of real freedmen of the period. The single attitude of Hermeros' that stands out as peculiar will in turn suggest the manner in which Petronius intended the character to be viewed and will point the way to an interpretation of Petronius' purpose in drawing an implicit comparison between Hermeros' attitudes and those of Trimalchio.

First, there is no need to believe Hermeros' statement that he was the son of a king.[10] From a comment he makes later in his speech, we learn that he does not believe that Ascyltus is really a Roman knight.[11] Consequently, when he says, "You're a Roman knight? Then I'm the son of a king", he is simply topping Ascyltus' pretentious claim to a social status to which he has no right with an even more incredible claim of his own.[12] This interpretation is

supported by the context in which the phrase occurs. When we recognize that Hermeros' declaration forms the third element in a tricolon, we can see that it conforms to a structural pattern found twice elsewhere in the same speech: a direct question referring to his opponent's laughter is followed by two rhetorical questions, each expecting a negative answer, in which his opponent is accused of putting on airs.[13]

Hermeros' next declaration -- "ipse me dedi in servitutem et malui civis Romanus esse quam tributarius" (57.4) -- is more problematic. We know that some Roman provincials did indeed sell themselves into slavery,[14] but we do not know how many. In other words, we do not know whether the practice was common or unusual. Two recent studies approaching the problem from different angles have reached widely divergent conclusions. According to W.V. Harris, "neither the selling of one's own person into slavery, nor enslavement for debt, nor penal slavery can have accounted for a major proportion of the slave supply...at most these sources can have contributed a few thousand slaves a year." According to J. Ramin and P. Veyne, on the other hand, "under the Empire the three great sources of slaves were slave reproduction, the abandonment of children, and, we can perhaps now add, the voluntary enslavement of the freeborn poor."[15]

Which of these two estimates is closer to the truth? Harris' defense of his interpretation consists mainly of casting doubt on the ancient testimony cited by those who

hold the opposing view, and he produces no positive evidence in support of the theory that voluntary self-enslavement was uncommon. On the other hand, Ramin and Veyne base their arguments almost exclusively on an accumulation of passages drawn from the legal sources -- but the great number of legal texts attesting the existence of the custom of self-sale into slavery tells us nothing about the frequency with which the custom was practiced. In short, since many of Harris's criticisms are justified and since neither he nor Ramin and Veyne have adduced convincing new evidence, in the final assessment these two studies have increased, not reduced, our uncertainty as to whether or not voluntary self-enslavement was common under the early Empire. We must look to other indications if we are to determine Petronius' literary intentions in having Hermeros claim to have sold himself into slavery.

If we consider Hermeros' entire statement, the second clause, in which he explains that he preferred to be a Roman citizen rather than a tax-paying provincial ("malui civis Romanus esse quam tributarius"), suggests the manner in which Petronius intended his remarks to be viewed. Although no scholar has cited evidence other than this passage in Petronius for a freeborn person selling himself into slavery specifically in order to become a Roman citizen upon being freed,[16] evidence for the pride that freedmen felt in their citizenship is abundant.

This pride exhibited itself in many ways, not least in the assumption of a full Roman name, which every slave was entitled to upon being formally manumitted by a master who was himself a Roman citizen.[17] One of the most eloquent testimonials to this pride in the tria nomina is among the shortest. A woman from Aquileia had inscribed on her tombstone the following statement: "I was Glucera, the freedwoman of P. Anicius. I have spoken enough about my life." She goes on to say that her patron, who was also her husband, "raised [her] from the lowest order to the highest honor", presumably that of being his wife.[18] In another epitaph a father mourns the premature death of his son, a slave, who had been the deliciae of his master: "If he had lived," the father says, "he would have borne his master's name."[19] Another epitaph commemorates a certain Atticilla, "to whom a baneful plague denied the name Marcia".[20] In the Satyricon, moreover, we find Trimalchio consistently being addressed by his praenomen, Gaius. P. Tremoli has argued convincingly that this shows the diners' respect for their host in his presence, for when Trimalchio is out of earshot he is styled simply "Trimalchio", and the other freedmen, less worthy, are invariably called by their former slave names.[21]

Sometimes inscriptions mention explicitly the grant of citizenship that came automatically with formal manumission. One twelve-year old girl, a freedwoman, writes that she came to Rome, "which gave [her] the rights of a citizen,

and gave them to [her] when she was alive.[22] Another man, a Parthian, recorded on his tombstone that he was born free, captured as a child, and taken to Italy; there, when he was made a citizen, with the help of fate, he saved up his money until he was fifty.[23]

The proud declaration of Roman citizenship need not always have been expressed verbally. The Roman toga served throughout the Roman world to distinguish Roman citizens from less fortunate provincials and slaves.[24] Furthermore, as several recent studies of Roman funerary art have shown, a particular type of relief group portraiture in which togate figures play a prominent role was commissioned exclusively by freedmen and their children during the late Republic and early Empire. The portraits in these reliefs, carved in the conservative "realistic" style, are designed to convey the gravitas and dignitas of the deceased -- these being the cardinal virtues of the civis Romanus.[25]

Hermeros' pride in his Roman citizenship, then, is typical. If the manner of Hermeros' enslavement were unusual, I suggest, then Petronius' intention was to stress the extent to which this feeling of pride had taken hold in Hermeros' personality rather than the atypicality of his motive for selling himself into slavery. For, faced with the constant visible reminders of a freedman's pride in his citizen status, and acutely aware of his own slaves' desire for recognition, no contemporary Roman would have found Hermeros' attitude at all unusual.

Hermeros boasts that he doesn't owe anybody an as, that he's never been called into court; no one has ever had to tell him to "pay up": "assem aerarium nemini debeo; constitutum habui numquam; nemo mihi in foro dixit 'redde quod debes' (57.5). It is a point that he returns to more than once. A few sentences later he explicitly contrasts Ascyltus' presumed wealth with his own "good faith", in favor of the latter: "tu beatior es: bis prande, bis cena. ego fidem meam malo quam thesauros. ad summam, quisquam me bis poposcit?" (57.9); and at the end of his speech, Hermeros directs a challenge at his adversary: "eamus in forum et pecunias mutuemur: iam scies hoc ferrum fidem habere." (58.11).

The Roman epitaphs provide striking parallels for Hermeros' preoccupation with fides, "credit" or "trustworthiness", and for the pride he feels in never having been taken to court. One freedman who set up his own tombstone during the reign of Tiberius wanted it to be remembered that he had lived "without a lawsuit, without a quarrel, without even an argument; and without ever having borrowed money. [He] always kept his word to his friends, and, though he was poor in wealth, he was rich in spirit."[26] In another epitaph, a seller of goatskins boasts that his honesty was famed far and wide and that he always paid the moneys due to the imperial treasury; "I was straightforward in all my business dealings", he claims, "and as fair as I could be to everybody".[27] One freedman, after stating explicitly that he

himself composed the hexameters for his epitaph, goes on to say that he always returned what had been entrusted to him and gathered his friends together; he fulfilled his obligations to the best of his ability and settled all his differences out of court.[28]

These three inscriptions illustrate several of the themes that are found literally dozens of times in the epitaphs of lower class men and women throughout the Empire.[29] Some qualities, such as poverty and honesty, were so regularly associated with one another that one is tempted to regard "the honesty of the poor man" as merely another of the many standardized motifs that characterize the genre of the titulus sepulcralis.[30] But the fact that a concept occurs frequently in the epitaphs does nothing to diminish the sincerity of each individual expression of that concept. On the contrary, when we find a particular attitude being expressed in a variety of forms, we are entitled to regard it as representative of a view that was widely held by large segments of the population.

Horace, for example, was able to call a wealth of associations to his readers' minds simply by describing the praeco Volteius Mena as a man "tenui censu, sine crimine".[31] In the same manner, Petronius succinctly establishes Hermeros' place in society by attributing to him a set of values that a contemporary audience would have immediately recognized as typical of the petty craftsmen and merchants whose funerary monuments lined the thoroughfares leading out of

every town in Italy. The avoidance of lawsuits, financial solvency, and honesty in business transactions are among the themes that occur most frequently in the epitaphs of lower class men and women under the early Empire. Of course these qualities were not peculiar to freedmen, and not all freedmen would have held the same high regard for the virtues of a homo negotians. But in endowing Hermeros with attitudes characteristic of the small businessmen and traders who populated the towns of Italy, Petronius presents him as a typical member of a group that was composed largely of freedmen and slaves (see above, p. 106, nt. 40; cf. p. 87 and nt. 47).

Hermeros says that he saved up a little money and bought a little land, that he feeds twenty slaves and a dog: "glebulas emi, lamellulas paravi; viginti ventres pasco et canem." (57.6).[32] Little weight can be attributed to the diminuitives glebulas and lamellulas as evidence for the extent of Hermeros' wealth,[33] but the third detail is specific enough to allow comparison with figures derived from more reliable sources. Even if we discount the extravagant claims made for Trimalchio -- that seventy slave children were born on his Cumaean estate in a single day (53.2) -- there is abundant evidence from the early Empire for real slave familiae numbering in the hundreds, and even thousands.[34] At the other extreme, the legal sources suggest that even the fairly poor could afford at least one slave,[35] and a similar picture emerges from the incidental testimony

of the ancient literary authorities.[36] On the other hand, in all places and at all periods most people probably did not own any slaves at all.[37]

The isolated bits of information that have been preserved in ancient literary sources give us some idea of the limits of private slave-holdings under the Empire, but they are no more help to us in trying to determine the size of a typical slave *familia* than are the numerous references, particularly in the literature of the first century A.D., to the throngs of slaves that crowded the houses of the well-to-do.[38] That some very wealthy Romans kept hordes of slaves requires no demonstration; but when it comes to linking precise numbers with specific historical situations, the evidence fails us in all but a few instances, and these may in any case be regarded *a priori* as exceptional. In short, the modern quest for a typical slave *familia* is probably delusive. Circumstances varied so considerably from place to place and over even relatively short periods of time that estimates based on the random figures that have come down to us are liable to distort the social and economic conditions prevailing at any one time in any particular part of the empire.

Fortunately, we are in a better position to judge how an audience such as the one for whom Petronius was writing would have reacted to Hermeros' statement that he possessed a *familia* of twenty. It is generally agreed that the *Satyricon* was written for a highly literate, sophis-

ticated audience well acquainted with the manners of Roman high society. Such an audience came from a background of wealth, and wealth in the early Empire meant the ownership of slaves in considerable numbers. Augustus provided for slave familiae numbering more than five hundred in the restrictions on testamentary manumissions that he promulgated in the lex Fufia Caninia of 2 B.C., and the law evidently remained in effect down to the late third century (cf. Gaius, Inst. 1.40-43; SHA, Tac. 10.7). This suggests that slave holdings of five hundred or more were not uncommon during the early Empire. According to an informed estimate, the Younger Pliny's resources place him only in the second rank of senatorial wealth, and he probably owned far more than four hundred slaves.[39] The general level of prosperity among the senatorial class is not likely to have been less during the Julio-Claudian period.[40]

Indeed, a passage in Dio suggests that a wealthy Roman of the Julio-Claudian era would have associated a household of twenty with hardship circumstances, for Augustus is said to have limited to that number the slaves (or freedmen) who could accompany a banished nobleman into exile (Dio 56.27.3). The passage is further instructive in that it shows what appurtenances were thought to be commensurate with an entourage of twenty: one cargo ship, two smaller vessels, and property valued at not more than HS 500,000. This should warn us against underestimating the real value of an estate broadly characterized by a familia

of twenty: an equal number of slaves could be associated with financial resources comparable to those of a Roman Knight.

One famous equestrian of the Augustan period, the poet Horace, had a farm in the country worked by eight slaves under the supervision of a bailiff. Previously the land, estimated by one scholar as comprising between 100 and 160 iugera (ca. 10-16 acres), had supported five peasant families from the neighboring town. We do not know how many slaves Horace owned in all, but the number probably would not have exceeded twenty. Of course, Horace was hardly typical of the equestrians of his age, and it would be ludicrous further to compare him with Hermeros. But Horace's treasured Sabine farm, which he consistently describes as small and modest, we might today consider "comfortable" or even "spacious".[41] Even so in antiquity, the concept of affluence was relative: the size of another man's fortune depended to a large extent upon the height of the pile from which it was surveyed. Thus, an estate whose size could be suggested by the mention of a familia of twenty would have been despised by the wealthy Romans for whom Petronius was writing; but it would have represented a measure of financial success in which a municipal freedman could with some justification feel pride.

Hermeros says that he bought his wife out of slavery so that no one could wipe his hands on her: "contubernalem meam redemi, ne quis in <capillis> illius manus tergeret"

(57.6).[42] The physical and psychological degradation to which Roman slaves were regularly subjected has recently been made the subject of a forceful essay by M.I. Finley, who argues convincingly, against a widely held view, that occasional individual acts of kindness on the part of Roman *domini* are the exceptions which prove the rule and that ancient slavery as an institution was fundamentally inhumane.[43] Hermeros' desire to rescue his wife from this condition, then, is understandable, and, although comparative evidence is lacking, we must imagine that similar attitudes were widespread among the class of ex-slaves who were in a position to better the circumstances of the loved ones whom they had left behind in slavery.

Indeed, although explicit evidence for a freedman buying his *contubernalis* specifically in order to liberate her for a legal marriage is not to be found,[44] we have several epigraphic examples of freedmen freeing and marrying their former slave partners,[45] and countless other cases undoubtedly lie concealed behind the common formula "fellow freedwoman and wife" -- a formula which does not allow us to determine whether husband and wife were both freed by the same master or whether the husband had obtained his wife from their former master and freed her himself.[46] Likewise, when a freedman husband is commemorated as "patronus et coniunx", we may suspect that he and his wife had perhaps been partners in the same *familia* before either was manumitted.[47] In these instances we cannot know whether the

freedman bought his wife out of slavery or whether he obtained possession of her by other means -- most commonly, perhaps, through a legacy such as the one that Trimalchio promises to his slave Philagyrus (71.2). In short, although unequivocal evidence is lacking, many scholars today are willing to believe that freedmen regularly bought their old contubernales out of slavery in order free them for legal marriages.[48]

When we turn to Hermeros' next statement -- that he paid four thousand sesterces for his liberty (57.6) -- we encounter a similar situation.[49] Although specific historical examples of slaves paying their own manumission price are rare,[50] the frequency with which self-purchase of freedom is mentioned in legal texts[51] and the offhand way in which the practice is alluded to in the literary sources[52] have suggested to a number of scholars that those slaves who were allowed to retain the profits derived from the successful management of their peculia frequently bought themselves out of slavery with the funds that they had saved.[53] This view finds support in the papyrological evidence from Egypt, where self-purchase of freedom was evidently the most common cause for manumission, and in the manumission records inscribed on the retaining wall of the precinct of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, where it seems, for lack of evidence to the contrary, that the cost of manumission was normally borne by the slave himself.[54]

When it comes to evaluating the price that Hermeros claims to have paid for his freedom, we are on less certain ground. R. Duncan-Jones notes that "the only main area of Petronius' prices that seems broadly plausible is the prices for slaves", but rightly points out that the range of attested prices for slaves is so wide that it would have been difficult for Petronius to pick a sum that would not have fallen somewhere within the spectrum of actual slave prices.[55] Caution is further recommended by the observation that ancient attempts to estimate the true value of a slave seem to have been remarkably crude.[56]

On the other hand, several general indications allow us to calculate reasonably accurate figures for the average range of slave prices during the best documented periods of Roman history. Veteran slaves seem normally to have sold for less than novices[57] and females for less than males.[58] From the Hadrianic period until the time of Justinian, despite increasingly severe inflation and frequent devaluations of the currency, the legal compensation value for a slave remained set at 2,000 sesterces.[59] Most important for the present purpose, the prices slaves paid for their freedom seem generally to have corresponded to their market values.[60] After taking these factors into account, J. Ĉeska draws up the following table to illustrate the average prices for slaves, classified according to ability and training, during the first and second centuries A.D.:[61]

Highly qualified and specialized slaves....	HS	20,000-10,000
Well-educated slaves.....	HS	10,000-8,000
Slaves capable of working autonomously.....	HS	8,000-3,000
Robust slaves suitable for manual labor....	HS	± 2,000
Slaves of inferior quality, children, etc..	HS	± 1,000

According to this scale, Hermeros falls into the lower range of the middle register, being roughly twice as valuable as a manual laborer and half as valuable as an inexpensive slave trained in the liberal arts. If we compare the two slave prices closest to his own that are quoted by Petronius' contemporaries in contexts that are unlikely to present conscious distortion on the part of the author, we find that Hermeros' manumission price represents somewhat less than the sum that Columella, 3.3.8 recommends be paid for a skilled vine-dresser (HS 6,000 - HS 8,000) and somewhat more than the amount that the Elder Pliny, NH 9.67 implies would be a reasonable price for a cook (± HS 2,700). If further progress is to be made, we must determine as precisely as possible the amount of training Hermeros received and the level of his skills.

First, and most important, Hermeros has a craft or trade, of which he is proud: "ego quod me sic vides, propter artificium meum diis gratias ago" (58.14). This sets him apart from the majority of slaves -- those described in Česka's two lowest categories -- who had no particular skills and in most cases probably little hope for manumission. Second, we may infer that Hermeros, like Trimalchio (29.4), received his education as a slave, since he came to the Graeca urbs as a young boy (57.9). As we might

expect, Hermeros' good fortune in receiving even a rudimentary education is consistent with his privileged position as a domestic servant in his master's household (57.10).

Furthermore, as A.D. Booth has acutely observed, the reported admonition of Hermeros' school master "sunt vestra salva? recta domum" (58.13) shows that Hermeros was trained outside his master's home in the company of other students. When we combine this information with what we know of the subject matter of Hermeros' curriculum (lapidariae litterae and partes), it becomes evident that he attended a ludus litterarius, an elementary school designed to teach craft literacy and basic clerical skills to slaves and freeborn children without cultural aspirations.[62] In short, neither the nature nor the circumstances of Hermeros' training are unusual; on the contrary, they represent precisely the type of education that a slave destined for employment as a clerk or business agent would be expected to receive.[63]

More difficult to assess is the extent to which Hermeros excelled in the litterae serviles.[64] He claims to know "lapidariae litterae" and percentages: "non didici geometrias, critica et alogas menias, sed lapidarias litteras scio, partes centum dico ad aes, ad pondus, ad nummum" (58.7). The phrase "lapidariae litterae" has been variously interpreted, but a convincing explanation of Petronius' terminology has yet to be found.[65] In the absence of any parallel usage of the word "lapidarius", we must admit that

we do not know precisely what reading and writing skills Hermeros claims to possess. I shall return to this problem presently, when I will argue that Hermeros had the ability to read and subscribe business documents, but that the level of literacy required for these tasks was not high.

With regard to Hermeros' mathematical skills, we are on firmer ground. Hermeros boasts that he can do percentages in asses, weights, and sesterces (58.7). This conforms with the notion that he received only an elementary education, for Horace tells us that Roman schoolboys learned to calculate percentages of the as by long division (Ars Poet., 325-330). Inscriptional evidence confirms that Hermeros' arithmetic ability fell somewhere between that of an expert and that of a novice. One well-trained librarius versed in Greek and Latin literature was able to divide up to three hundred; in practical terms, this meant that he could compute an annual interest rate of 4% compounded monthly.[66] At the other end of the spectrum, a young boy, dead at eight, knew his times tables up to ten.[67] Like Trimalchio's delicium, who also knew his "ten parts" (75.4), this boy had taken the first step towards learning to calculate percentages of units normally divided into twelfths. Trimalchio's delicium, it may be noted, also "reads at sight" (75.4). Similarly, Echion's cicaro, who knows how to divide by four (46.3), is well along in the study of Greek literature and is progressing in Latin (46.5). The comparative evidence of the Satyricon thus supports S.F.

Bonner's view that Hermeros' "arithmetic ability must have far outstripped his reading and writing".[68]

This is just what we should expect in a man whose business transactions would have required considerable mathematical skills but only a rudimentary ability to read and write.[69] This aspect of ancient commerce has recently been confirmed by the discovery near Pompeii of a set of documents that provide striking evidence for the nature of a freedman's business dealings on the Bay of Naples precisely during the late Julio-Claudian period.[70] The personal files of C. Sulpicius Cinnamus record a variety of commercial and legal transactions involving a wide range of financial arrangements,[71] but the wording of the documents themselves is unremittingly formulaic. Considered together, the texts give the impression that little was required of the interested parties beyond a basic understanding of the relevant legal principles and an ability to fill in the correct figures at the appropriate place in a form.

Indeed, one of the famous waxed tablets of the Pompeian banker L. Caecilius Jucundus reflects precisely this situation.[72] In writing his own receipt, one of Jucundus' clients so bungled the job that the banker provided him with a clean tablet with which to start over. Caecilius saved the botched draft and later reused it for another transaction, leaving most of the text intact and changing only those parts that no longer applied: the name of the creditor, the sum, and the names of the consuls.

The same document shows that even in the case of chirographs (texts written in the creditor's own hand), Caecilius normally had the important, legally binding, sections of the receipt written out ahead of time by one of his secretaries. Only the space for the date and one of the exterior pages, usually reserved for a more or less verbatim paraphrase of the interior contents, were left to be filled in by the client.[73]

How low a level of literacy was sufficient to ratify one of these transactions may further be gauged from two anomalous documents, one from the archive of Caecilius Jucundus, one from the new Pompeii tablets, that present Latin texts written in Greek characters.[74] The authors of these chirographs evidently did not know Latin letters and yet they were able to reproduce the appropriate legal formulae to the satisfaction of their creditors. One document from the new archive shows that even complete illiteracy formed no obstacle to a successful business career. Tabula Pompeiana 46 apparently concerns a loan made in A.D. 40 by C. Sulpicius Faustus to a certain P. Annius Seleucus on the security of a quantity of Alexandrian wheat. The precise nature of the transaction is uncertain, but the sums involved are substantial: 13,000 modii (about 83 tons) of wheat and HS 100,000. The contract was drawn up by Nardus, the slave of Seleucus, because the latter "claimed not to know letters".[75] W.V. Harris notes Seleucus' evidently prosperous business dealings, despite his inability to

write, and suggests that he "is reminiscent of the freedman Hermeros in Petronius Sat. 58.7 ('lapidarias litteras scio')."[76]

It is Nardus, however, rather than Seleucus to whom Hermeros, at an earlier stage of his career, bears a resemblance. Of the ten slaves who were called upon to provide receipts for Caecilius Jucundus or for one of the principals of the new archive, only one did not write for himself, and he occupied an unusual position, inasmuch as he was an imperial slave who had previously belonged to a private citizen.[77] Several, like Nardus, wrote for domini who were themselves illiterate.[78] Almost without exception, the slaves who appear as agents in business documents from the Roman world were able to write their own contracts and receipts.

These slaves need not have been institores; many, like Trimalchio (48.4), will have been educated in order to serve as bookkeepers and secretaries in their masters' households.[79] Nor need they have learned to read and write at schools such as the one Hermeros attended.[80] But it is certain that slaves who were sent to school acquired at least basic literacy, for all the evidence points to the fact that "reading, writing, and reckoning" were learned simultaneously at all levels.[81] The Pompeian evidence shows that the level of literacy attained by these business-trained slaves need not have been high; a teaching contract from Egypt further suggests that the period of their

instruction need not have been long.[82] But it is inconceivable that a Roman master would send his slave to school and not expect him to acquire at least minimum competency in reading and writing, as well as arithmetic.

The preceding discussion of the level of literacy observable from the records of Campanian businessmen during the late Julio-Claudian era enables us to put Hermeros' remarks in perspective. When viewed against the background of an education in litterae serviles, Hermeros' boast to know "lapidariae litterae" acquires specific form: Hermeros can read and write sufficiently well in order to work as a business agent or domestic clerk. In this, he is typical of the slaves and freedmen who normally filled these capacities. Furthermore, the amount of training indicated by an ability to calculate percentages and to compose business documents is consistent with Hermeros' claim to have paid HS 4,000 for his freedom, since this price places him in the category of slaves who were less than well-educated but nonetheless capable of working autonomously.

From another standpoint, the view of Hermeros as a petty businessman conforms to the impression gained earlier from an examination of the attitudes expressed in the first part of his autobiography -- pride in an avoidance of lawsuits, financial solvency, and a reputation for general honesty -- for these were found to be typical of the virtues that small-scale traders and merchants regularly commemorated on their tombstones. Finally, as was the case with

the extent of Hermeros' wealth, the clerical skills of which he is proud would have been scorned by Petronius' sophisticated audience. But within the context of municipal, and particularly Campanian, society, Hermeros' craft literacy constitutes a notable accomplishment, since many of his peers, including some men of substance, could neither read nor write.[83]

Hermeros was made a sevir Augustalis without having to pay the initiation fee: "sevir gratis factus sum" (57.6).[84] This priesthood was the highest public honor to which a municipal freedman could legitimately aspire.[85] The Augustales, who tended to be successful artisans and merchants, were generally selected by the town council from among the wealthiest local freedman.[86] J.H. D'Arms has argued plausibly that many were independent of ties to a patronus.[87] These characteristics are consistent with the portrait of Hermeros developed thus far. Furthermore, at Puteoli, where I believe the banquet of Trimalchio to have taken place (see Appendix 1), the institution of the Augustales seems to have prospered early, and to have owed its early prominence in part to the support of merchants who traded in Eastern markets.

From as early as the time of Augustus the members were divided into at least two centuriae, the Cornelia and the Petronia. In the same period a group of mercatores qui Alexandr(iai) Asiai Syriai negotiantu[r] dedicated an inscription to two members of a prominent local family, one

of whom built the local temple to Augustus. In A.D. 30 the Augustales set up a copy of the grandiose monument dedicated to Tiberius at Rome by fourteen cities of Asia Minor that had received aid after the damaging earthquakes of A.D. 17, 23, and 29. Curatores are recorded giving games in honor of Nero in A.D. 56; and, to judge from the mention of Augustales duplicarii, the ranks of the local order were divided internally at least from the early second century.[88]

The presence of two centuriae need not imply as many as two hundred members at any one time,[89] but the existence of centuriae, curatores, and duplicarii suggests that the Augustales at Puteoli were numerous enough to require formal organization in the manner of professional corporations.[90] In short, while the Augustales represented an elite minority with respect to the entire class of freedmen, within the Puteolan context of the Cena, Hermeros' membership in that body may not have distinguished him especially from the other freedmen assembled at Trimalchio's table: Habinnas (65.5) and Trimalchio (30.2, 71.12) are explicitly identified as seviri Augustales, and the remaining company seem for the most part to have shared the qualities of financial means and commercial occupations that characterize the typical Augustalis.[91]

Hermeros was appointed to the board of Augustales without having to pay the initiation fee. This was not at all uncommon, especially for freedmen who had shown particular munificence to their home towns.[92] Hermeros' claim,

entirely plausible, contrasts vividly with a similar claim made by Trimalchio, who wants recorded in his epitaph the fact that the office of sevir had been offered to him in his absence (71.12). As Mommsen recognized long ago, this never happened in the real world, and Trimalchio's pretentious boast serves mainly to illustrate his overwhelming desire to raise himself above his station.[93] In his public statement regarding his tenure of the sevirate, Trimalchio, like Hermeros, remains true to character. Before we discuss Trimalchio's and Hermeros' attitudes towards their social standing in greater detail, it will first be necessary to summarize what has been learned thus far about the portrait of Hermeros.

A close examination of the details presented in Hermeros' autobiography has shown that Petronius drew a remarkably consistent portrait of a successful independent freedman. Educated in craft literacy as a slave, Hermeros was evidently employed by his dominus as a business agent or household accountant. In paying his own manumission price and in buying his wife out of slavery, he is typical of those fortunate slaves who were allowed to accumulate capital in the form of a peculium. The price Hermeros paid for his freedom seems to correspond to the level of his abilities and training. Certainly the amount of his current wealth is consonant with his appointment to the local college of seviri Augustales. Finally, the qualities that Hermeros is proud of -- his Roman citizenship, above all,

but also his avoidance of lawsuits, financial solvency, and reputation for honesty -- are the qualities that real freedmen proudly commemorated on their tombstones. In short, the portrait of Hermeros is drawn without distortion or exaggeration. Rather, Petronius seems to have endowed Hermeros with qualities characteristic of a particular type of freedmen that his audience would have recognized from among the members of their own familiae.

The contrast with Trimalchio will be immediately obvious. Whereas Hermeros presents himself as a man typical of his class and demands respect for being a freedman, Trimalchio consistently tries to adopt attitudes and behavior appropriate only to persons of distinctly higher social status.[94] In particular, Trimalchio affects the manners of a Roman knight.[95] At one point he implies that he has transcended the social barriers imposed by his freedman status: "nam ego quoque tam fui quam vos estis, sed virtute mea ad hoc perveni" (75.8). A little later he remarks, "sic amicus vester, qui fuit rana, nunc est rex" (77.7). Trimalchio's metaphor, which has not been adequately explained, suggests that his financial success represents a metamorphosis. Within the Aesopic tradition from which Trimalchio draws his imagery, however, such transformations were notoriously unsuccessful. One popular fable represents the frog, proverbially the weakest of creatures, attempting to match the size and power of the bull (or ox) by puffing herself up until she bursts.[96]

Horace and Martial invoked this parable to illustrate the pretensions of their contemporaries and linked it specifically to ambitious private building projects. Elsewhere in the Cena Trimalchio applies the image to Fortunata and then declares that "he who is born in a hovel shouldn't dream of palaces".[97] In the present passage, Trimalchio's claim to have become a king from a frog immediately follows his description of the lavish appointments of his house (77.4-5) and leads directly to the arrangements for his own funeral (77.7-78.5). Whatever the fable that Trimalchio has in mind, surely Petronius intended his audience to recall the tale of the frog who tried to become something that she was not, with fatal consequences. The proverb thus illustrates both Trimalchio's belief that he has escaped his humble origins and the impossibility of his ever actually escaping his servile past.

Furthermore, in his social relations Trimalchio shows little regard for distinctions of class. On the one hand he claims intimacy with Roman aristocrats (see above, pp. 94-95) and on the other invites his slaves to join the company at dinner (70.10-13). In this Trimalchio mimics and at the same time debases a philosophy held by at least some members of the aristocracy, for the Elder Cato practiced and the Younger Seneca advocated similar behavior in treating slaves as equals.[98] But Cato and Seneca are unlikely to have allowed their humanitas to discomfit their guests (cf. 70.11), and it is difficult to believe that either would

have carried the principle of equality to the point of accepting wagers from their slaves (cf. 70.13).[99] Trimalchio's excessive camaraderie with his servants, like his equestrian pretensions, is socially inappropriate.

For Hermeros, on the other hand, the boundaries between social classes are inviolable. As we have seen (above, pp. 52-53), Hermeros' anger at Ascyltus is exacerbated by his belief that Ascyltus is usurping the badges of equestrian rank (57.4, 58.10), and his first words to Giton address Giton's impudence in daring to overstep the bounds of his presumed servile status (58.2). In the same passage, Ascyltus is condemned for not exercising his authority as a dominus: "curabo, iam tibi Iovis iratus sit, et isti qui tibi non imperat" (58.2). In Hermeros' view, Ascyltus' negligence explains Giton's behavior, for the character of a slave, deprived by law of status as a human being, is measured by the qualities of the dominus: "plane qualis dominus, talis et servus" (58.3).[100] Hermeros himself shows proper obsequium to his former master: "dedi tamen operam ut domino satis facerem, homini malista [et] dignitos[s]o" (57.10; for the text, see above, p. 103 nt. 21); and his deference to his host is couched in terms that emphasize their shared status as freedmen: "ita satur pane fiam, ut ego istud conliberto meo dono; alioquin iam tibi deprae-sentiarum reddidissem" (58.3). In short, much of Hermeros' behavior, and the behavior that he expects from others, is determined by his view of the social hierarchy as a

structure based primarily on distinctions of civil status.

In accordance with his desire to appear as the grand but unambitious equestrian, Trimalchio bases his claim to respectability partly on his literary pretensions (cf., eg., 39.3, 48.4) but chiefly on his phenomenal wealth: "assem habeas, assem valeas; habes, habeberis", he says at one point (77.6). Hermeros, on the other hand, holds little regard for learning. As we have seen (above, pp. 90, 92), he flaunts his ignorance of the liberal arts and suggests that an education in rhetoric is a waste of money (57.7-8). Furthermore, as Hermeros makes clear by juxtaposing the two stories of his fellow freedmen, one newly rich, the other recently fallen into bankruptcy (38.7-16), a social reputation based on wealth is unstable, since the possession of wealth is itself uncertain (see above, pp. 116-117). Indeed, Hermeros points out his preference for a good credit rating (*fides*) to money itself: "eamus in forum et pecunias mutuemur: iam scies hoc ferrum fidem habere" (58.11; cf. 57.5). What makes Hermeros feel that he is worthy of respect is simply that he struggled to achieve his present status:

> "annis quadraginta servivi; nemo tamen scit utrum servus essem an liber. et puer capillatus in hanc coloniam veni; adhuc basilica non erat facta. dedi tamen operam ut domino satis facerem ...et habebam in domo qui mihi pedem opponerent hac illac; tamen -- genio illius gratias -- enatavi. haec sunt vera athla; nam [in] ingenuum nasci tam facile est quam 'accede istoc'." (57.9-11)

We are now in a better position to understand why at the beginning of the *Cena* Hermeros pointed out to Encolpius

that Trimalchio and his friends had all been slaves. He himself is proud of having escaped from slavery, and he believes that in raising himself to the next highest rung on the social ladder he has earned a measure of respect. It remains to consider briefly whether Hermeros is typical in his pride in his freedman status, and whether the new details concerning his life as a slave conform to the image of a successful independent freedman developed thus far.

With regard to the period of Hermeros' servitude, we must admit that we lack a solid basis for comparison. Cicero once implied that prisoners of war who were industrious and honest could expect to be released within six years (Phil. 8.32). From a passage in Dio it may be inferred that in the time of Augustus some slaves were freed before twenty years had passed (Dio 53.25.4). Beyond this the ancient literary sources are silent. On the basis of an analysis of 1,201 inscriptions from the Roman west in which the age at death was recorded on the tombstones of freedmen, G. Alföldy concluded that most slaves were manumitted before the age of thirty and that the period of their servitude was often less than a year long.[101] Alföldy's interpretation of the epigraphic evidence has been rightly criticized by K. Hopkins and W.V. Harris, but both scholars agree that "privileged" slaves who were destined to be manumitted and who could afford a tombstone generally won their freedom before the age of thirty (Hopkins) or forty (Harris).[102] Certainly this is the category of ex-slaves to which Hermeros belongs.

It thus would seem that Hermeros' forty years as a slave represents an unusually long period of servitude for a slave who ultimately won his freedom. On the other hand, slaves who administered their masters' financial affairs or who otherwise held positions of responsibility were often kept in servitude longer than others because their services were considered to be indispensable.[103] Unless the picture of Hermeros' circumstances outlined in the preceding pages is grossly mistaken, it is quite likely that he filled one of these capacities in his master's familia. In any event, a servitude of forty years is not implausible.

As for the glimpse that Hermeros gives us of the difficulties he encountered within his household ("habebam in domo qui mihi pedem opponerent hac illac"), the upper class authors whose works have survived show little interest in the problems of their domestic servants, and such epigraphical evidence as we have -- for any segment of society -- tends to commemorate only congenial relationships.[104] Tacitus, however, through the mouth of the British commander Calgacus, provides a brief sketch of the newcomer to a slave familia being baited by his veteran colleagues (Agr. 31.2); and this passage of the Satyricon has convinced several scholars that Hermeros is describing what must have been a common phenomenon in Roman society: competition within domestic familiae for the master's favor.[105]

Finally, the matter of Hermeros' self-esteem. There is some evidence that freedmen felt a certain pride in their

status as ex-slaves, or, to be more accurate, that they did not feel ashamed of having been slaves. That, at any rate, is the implication of one election poster from Pompeii in which a certain Fabius Eupor is proclaimed the princeps libertinorum.[106] The first editor, G.B. De Rossi, argued that Eupor was the head of the local Jewish synagogue, but M.S. Ginsburg has rightly pointed out that the phrase "princeps libertinorum" refers only to social standing and has nothing to do with religious affiliation.[107] Ginsburg suggests that the title reflects a formal organization of freedmen at Pompeii and that Eupor was the patron of their collegium, but there is no reason to believe that the words represent anything but Eupor's own self-glorification.[108]

Further evidence that freedmen felt proud of their status as ex-slaves is difficult to find, but we may note a pair of inscriptions from Rome in which two freedmen, probably brothers, recorded that they were born ex patribus libertinis.[109] The significance of two inscriptions in which libertine status is stressed by the addition, after the names of freedmen, of a second abbreviation l(ibertus/a) is difficult to assess, but the repetition seems designed to distinguish the freedmen from their patrons, who were also freedmen, rather than to draw attention to their own status as ex-slaves.[110]

The interpretation of two funerary reliefs dating from the late Republic or early Empire and depicting venalicia in their central scenes is likewise uncertain.

The fact that in both cases the person commemorated in the accompanying inscription is a freedman has suggested to some scholars that the reliefs represent an important event in the lives of the deceased, namely their purchase by the masters who subsequently manumitted them. These freedmen would then be emphasizing the humble origins from which they had risen to prosperity.[111] M.W. Frederiksen, on the other hand, points out that one of the monuments was set up by a praeco who belonged to the same familia as the freedman commemorated in the epitaph. He suggests, more plausibly I think, that the two were partners in the slave trade and that the relief represents a scene from their daily business.[112] This interpretation gains support from a third monument discovered at Amphipolis, which portrays a gang of eight slaves chained together at the neck being led along by a man who is himself unfettered. In this case there can be no doubt that the scene commemorates the man's trade, for the dedicand, who likewise is a freedman, explicitly identifies himself as a σωματέμπορος.[113]

Far more frequently we sense a feeling of apology behind the admission of freedman status, as in a famous epitaph that begins "libertinus eram, fateor...";[114] and often we find explicit reference to qualities befitting a freeborn person, if not in the epitaphs of freedmen themselves, in those of their children. One girl writes that she was born of freedmen parents on both sides, who were poor but who had the character and morals of freeborn persons.[115]

A freedman father who composed his son's epitaph recorded that the boy had been educated in the "freeborn arts".[116] By contrast, we may note the epitaph of a freedman, foreign born, who complains that he was handed over into an undeserved slavery, which warped his natural character.[117]

Most significantly, L.R. Taylor has shown that freedmen attempted to conceal their libertine status in their epitaphs with increasing regularity throughout the first and second centuries A.D. by omitting the freedman designation (l.) from their nomenclature.[118] The sense of accomplishment that many freedmen must have felt in having worked their way out of slavery evidently did not offset the social stigma attached to having been a slave. Hermeros' open pride in having achieved his freedman status thus seems atypical. His irregular attitude towards his social standing stands out the more sharply because it is the only feature of his characterization that can be shown positively to have been unusual.[119]

Why did Petronius insert this one specious element into a portrait that shows every sign of having been carefully crafted and that otherwise presents a faithful picture of the circumstances and attitudes of a particular type of successful freedmen? The answer, I suggest, lies in a comparison with Trimalchio.

At the beginning of the chapter we observed that Hermeros' central speech stands apart from the other freedmen's speeches and meets with no immediate reponse. We

further noted that it marks a departure from the role that Hermeros otherwise plays as a second Nomentanus to Trimalchio's Nasidienus; in other words, it is without obvious literary precedent. We pointed out that it is punctuated by the only explicit references to Ascyltus' and Giton's participation in the banquet and framed by indications of Hermeros' status as a freedman, indications which emphasize his connection with Trimalchio in terms of their civil status. Most important, we observed that the structure of Hermeros' speech parallels the structure of the closing scenes of the Cena, in which Trimalchio's invective against Fortunata likewise leads to elaborate self-justification in the form of autobiography (cf. 57.2-3 with 74.10-75.7; 57.4-11 with 75.8-77.6). Hermeros' and Trimalchio's are the only two autobiographical statements in the Cena; as such they immediately call for comparison. One further correspondence between Hermeros' speech and Trimalchio's autobiographical passages at the end of the Cena confirms that the characters were meant to complement one another and furthermore suggests the manner in which the relationship between them was meant to be viewed.

J.H. D'Arms has recently shown that Trimalchio's epitaph (71.12), while ostensibly cast in the form of a genuine titulus sepulchralis, is in fact rife with literary overtones. Trimalchio's disinclination to pursue honors recalls the language not of inscriptions but of literature,

specifically the polite recusationes of such notable equestrians as Horace, L. Sestius, and especially, Maecenas.[120] By contrast, the autobiographical section of Hermeros' speech, from the point at which he says that he hopes to live in such a way as not to be a joke to anybody (57.5) up until the point at which he says that he hopes to die unashamed (57.6), reads remarkably like a Roman epitaph. The sentences are short, clipped, paratactic. There is a marked presence of alliteration, not especially noticeable elsewhere in Hermeros' speech, but frequently found in the undistinguished verses that make up the bulk of the Latin carmina epigraphica.[121] Perhaps most striking, the Latin in this passage, though far from elegant, is flawless. In this respect, Hermeros' account of his life stands in marked contrast to the rest of his speech, which is characterized by solecisms and grammatical irregularities. Finally, the passage is neatly framed by Hermeros' voiced hopes for a life and death without shame.

Hermeros' autobiographical statement, suitably articulated as his res gestae, thus presents a mirror image of Trimalchio's actual epitaph, which recalls an entirely different genre. Each presents a characteristic likeness of its subject, but it is as if the two specimens were viewed through opposite ends of the same lens. The antithetical relationship between Hermeros and Trimalchio is reflected in their radically different conceptions of the social hierarchy, and of the possibilities of transcending the

boundaries imposed by one's civil status.

With regard to their approach towards social standing, Hermeros and Trimalchio stand at opposite poles. One hopes to win respect by assuming the attitudes and behavior of the class to which he aspires,[122] the other by emphasizing the hardships of the class from which he has risen. But Hermeros can no more dignify his status by vaunting his accomplishment in having escaped slavery than Trimalchio can dignify his by adopting the manners of a Roman knight, for both are caught in their ambivalent status as freedmen. Possessing the rights of free citizens and the abilities to amass great wealth, the freedmen are nonetheless powerless to improve their own condition, because they can never escape their servile pasts.

In the final chapter I will show how Petronius develops this theme in the series of freedmen's speeches recited in Trimalchio's absence (41.10-46.8). I will argue that many of the qualities that characterize Trimalchio as a boorish host are reflected in the views of his guests are meant to be seen as resulting from his freedman status. In concluding the present discussion, I wish only to emphasize that, whereas the portrait of Trimalchio is caricature, the portrait of Hermeros is not. By drawing a picture, without distortion or exaggeration, of a type of freedman readily recognizable to his audience, Petronius rooted the character firmly in his contemporary society and encouraged his readers to consider seriously the ways in which his literary

representation of a freedman's condition reflected the circumstances of real freedmen of the period.

Notes to Chapter Four

[1]After Encolpius, Eumolpus, and Trimalchio, Hermeros speaks more words than any other character in the Satyricon and nearly twice as many as the next most voluble freedman, Echion. The precise figures, which have been culled from Dell'Era, Problemi, ch. 2, "Il mimetismo", 21-56, are as follows: Encolpius, 15,236 words; Eumolpus, 5,387; Trimalchio, 3,021; Hermeros, 1,108; Echion, 599; total words in the Satyricon as preserved: 30,840.

[2]Paratore's identification of Hermeros with the "vetus conviva" who appears at 33.8 (II, 112) is insusceptible of proof. Paratore credits Petronius with "un tratto finissimo di realistica penetrazione psicologica" in having Encolpius at 37.1 draw out the conversation of a guest whom he already knows to be both experienced of Trimalchio's jests and garrulous. But Encolpius naturally addresses the person reclining next to him (cf. 36.7). See further below, p. 112 and nt. 3.

[3]Cf. 36.7 "non erubui eum qui supra me accumbebat hoc ipsum interrogare"; 41.2 "duravi interrogare illum interpretem meum quod me torqueret"; 57.1 "unus ex conlibertis Trimalchionis excanduit - is ipse qui supra me discumbebat". This last clause has recently come under suspicion. In his first edition Müller followed Fraenkel in deleting the words "is...discumbebat" as an interpolation from 36.7: see Müller[1], xl-xli; cf. P. Soverini, BSL 4 (1974), 266-267; J.P. Sullivan, PCPS 22 (1976), 110 with 96, 122. But M. Coccia, Interpolazioni, 46-48 has argued convincingly that the clause is genuine, and most editors, including Müller in his second and third editions, allow the transmitted text to stand (cf. also R.G.M. Nisbet, JRS 52 (1962), 228).

[4]For the phrase, which is found in an election poster from Pompeii, see below, p. 151, and, for its application to Trimalchio, p. 177 nt. 108.

[5]Despite the number of cogent parallels that scholars have detected between Horace's satire and the Cena Trimalchionis, this one correspondence has been overlooked (cf. Collignon, Etude, 254-256; L. R. Shero, CP 18 (1923), 134-138; Sullivan, Satyricon, 126-128; Walsh, RN, 38-40). J. Révay, CP 17 (1922), 211 notes Petronius' debt to Horace, Serm. 2.8.63-64 "Varius mappa compescere risum / vix poterat" at 47.7 "castigamus crebris potiunculis risum" and 58.1 "risum iam diu compressum...effudit" and observes that "in beiden Gastmählern ist der Hausherr die Ursache des Lachens"; but he fails to notice the parallel rôles played

in their respective banquets by Nomentanus and Hermeros, each of whom delivers a speech that is the immediate cause of laughter.

[6]If R.Y. Tyrrell's plausible interpretation of Lucilius, 457-58 (Marx) is correct, Petronius' adaptation of the motif marks a departure also from the original model (Hermathena 2 (1876), 365). Tyrrell suggests that the hexameters "naumachiam licet haec, inquam, alveolumque putare, et / calces. delectes te, hilo non rectius vivas" represent "the words of a guest consoling the host for some such mishap as befell Nasidienus when the hangings came down"; cf. L.R. Shero, CP 18 (1923), 131.

[7]The ms. reading "lupatria" should probably be emended to "lupatris" (= "lupatrix") in order to yield the desired meaning, "a matrona who was once a prostitute": see G. Neumann, WürzJhB n.f. 6 (1980), 173-180. The term should not necessarily be seen as pejorative, pace the TLL and the OLD , s.v., since it occurs in a context in which Hermeros is praising Fortunata's qualities: "est sicca, sobria, bonorum consiliorum" (37.7). It is only in the following sentence, where the transition is emphatically marked by "tamen", that Hermeros shifts his attention to her less endearing traits: "est tamen malae linguae, pica pulvinaris...".

[8]It is possible that "ambubaia" at 74.13 should not be taken literally, since it occurs in a context in which Trimalchio indulges in much name-calling: cf. "codex, non mulier" (74.13), "Cassandra caligaria" (74.14), "fullcipedia", "milva", "amasiuncula" (?) (75.6), "sterteia" (75.9) "vipera" (77.4). But a literal interpretation gains support from a remark that Trimalchio makes elsewhere: "'nemo' inquit 'vestrum rogat Fortunatam meam ut saltet? credite mihi: cordacem nemo melius ducit.'" (52.8); and the profession well suits the description of Fortunata at 37.7 as a lupatrix: in Rome of the early Empire Syrian flute-girls and prostitutes seem often to have plied the same trade: cf. Porph. ad Hor., Serm. 1.2.1; Suet., Nero 27.2; Juv. 3.62-65; Maiuri ad 74.13, The rest of the clause, "non meminit? se de machina illam sustuli", though textually corrupt, is above suspicion: the manner in which the sentence is phrased ("non meminit") shows that Trimalchio is relating fact.

[9]Thus, for example, Auerbach, Mimesis, 28-30, quoted with approval by F.I. Zeitlin, TAPA 102 (1971), 664; H. Bacon, Virginia Quarterly Review 34 (1958), 262-276. passim, but esp. 276.

[10]So, for example, Lowe; Friedlaender; W.E. Waters, Petronius. Cena Trimalchionis (Boston 1902); Sage-Gilleland;

Marmorale; Perrochat; Smith; and Pellegrino, ad loc.; Rose, DAS, 26. Many compare the cases of Pallas, Claudius' minister of finance, and Acte, the concubine of the youthful Nero. But the cases of Pallas and Acte are exceptional and cannot be taken to imply that private freedmen regularly claimed royal birth (for Pallas, cf. S.I. Oost, AJP 79 (1958), 113-139; F. Millar, The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C. - A.D. 337) (London 1977), 75 [hereafter, Millar, ERW]; for Acte, see refs. assembled at PIR^2 C 1067). Others suggest that the coincidence of Hermeros' and Pallas' similar claims to royal ancestry indicates that Petronius intended Hermeros' statement to be seen as an oblique but specific allusion to the imperial freedman (so, first, Heinsius, apud Burmann^1, 282 [= Burmann^2, 372]; and, subsequently, K. Latte, Philologus 87 (1932), 266-267; A. Momigliano, CQ 38 (1944), 100; R. Browning, CR 63 (1949), 28; Perrochat, ad loc.; Rose, DAS, 26; Walsh, RN, 245). J. Ramin and P. Veyne, Historia 30 (1981), 496-497 suggest that Pallas, like Hermeros, sold himself into slavery. Perhaps, but this would not preclude the possibility that Hermeros' claim is ironic.

11"...nisi si me iudicas anulos buxeos curare, quos amicae tuae involasti" (58.10). Hermeros alludes to the ius anuli aurei, which during the Julio-Claudian era was invariably taken as a badge of equestrian rank: see Appendix 3, pp. 240-245. In suggesting that Ascyltus' rings are made not of gold but of boxwood, Hermeros implies that Ascyltus' pretentions to equestrian status are equally specious (for wooden rings, cf. Xen., Oec. 10.3; for the color of boxwood, a pale yellow, cf. Pliny, NH 8.71; Apul., Met. 1.19; Sidon., Ep. 3.13.6; and the passages cited by Lowe, ad loc.). I am unconvinced by the recent attempt of A.D. Booth, in TAPA 109 (1979), 14 and nt. 14, to show that Hermeros is here addressing Giton rather than Ascyltus, and that "amicae" refers not to an unspecified girlfriend but to Ascyltus himself.

12So, for example, Paratore II, 188 and nt. 2; Sedgewick, ad loc.; Bagnani, Arbiter, 4. For other views, see W. Ehlers in Muller-Ehlers^3, 516 (= Muller-Ehlers^2, 460); Veyne, "Trimalcion", 225 and nt. 1. Cic., Lael. 70 suggests that slaves of royal birth were a commonplace "in fabulis": P. Howell, Ill. Cl. Stud. 9 (1984), 36.

13Cf. 57.2: "quid rides...vervex? an tibi non placent lautitiae domini mei? tu etiam beatior es et convivare melius soles?"; 57.4: "quid habet quod rideat? numquid pater fetum emit lamna? eques Romanus es?"; 58.2: "'tu autem...etiam tu rides, cepa cirrata? io Saturnalia, rogo, mensis december est? quando vicesimam numerasti?".

[14]Although self-sale into slavery *ad pretium participandum* was probably not legally recognized before the middle of the second century A.D. (Staerman, *Schiavitù*, 22-23), and voluntary enslavement *ad actum gerendum* not before the time of Constantine (Morabito, *Réalités*, 72), the practice of selling oneself into slavery went back to at least as early as the time of Q. Mucius Scaevola (*Dig.* 40.12.23.pr.; cf. J. Gaudemet, *Institutions de l'antiquité* (Paris 1967), 544) and occupied the attention of jurists throughout the Imperial period (Morabito, *Réalités*, 72-74).

[15]W.V. Harris, "Towards a Study of the Roman Slave Trade", *MAAR* 36 (1980), 124, 137 nt. 75. J. Ramin and P. Veyne, "Droit romain et société: Les hommes libres qui passent pour esclaves at l'esclavage volontaire," *Historia* 30 (1981), 472-497, 496 (my translation). Cf. also M. Bang, *Röm. Mit.* 27 (1912), 207; G. Alföldy, *RSA* 2 (1972), 125. According to Ramin and Veyne (p. 497), Hermeros would have sold himself into slavery *sciens*, *ad pretium participandum* (for which type of voluntary slavery, see pp. 489-492).

[16]Cf. Friedlaender, *ad loc.*; Barrow, *SRE*, 12; Duff, *FERE*, 70; Crook, *LLR*, 60; Balsdon *R&A*, 14. In his discussion of the sources of slaves under the Empire, Westermann, *Slave Systems*, 84-86, does not consider the possibility of self-sale into slavery in order to become a Roman citizen, nor does Staerman in her discussions of *liberi qui bona fide serviunt*:*Die Blütezeit der Sklavenwirtschaft in der römischen Republik* (Wiesbaden 1969), 64-65 (hereafter, Staerman, *Blütezeit*); *Schiavitù*, 18-24. In arguing that Juvenal 3.33 "et praebere caput domina venale sub hasta" describes self-sale into slavery, J.F. Killeen, *Mnemosyne* 12 (1959), 343 adduces the present passage in Petronius and proposes that Juvenal is "satirizing" the same thing as Petronius, namely the custom whereby provincials would sell themselves into slavery in order eventually to become Roman citizens. But nothing in the text of Juvenal suggests that the satirist is interested in the motive for self-sale into slavery, only in the act itself. In any event, the various economic motives proposed by G.F. Schoemann, in *NJhb* 99 (1869), 765-767 and G. Highet, *Juvenal*, 254-255 n. 14 are more plausible than Killeen's proposal. W.V. Harris, *MAAR* 36 (1980), 137 nt. 75 and R. Meiggs, *RO*^{2}, 225 nt. 2 suggest that Hermeros' statement may be false, but there is no reason to doubt his sincerity at this point.

[17]See, for example, L.R. Taylor, *AJP* 82 (1961), 129-132; A. Fraschetti, *Opus* 1 (1982), 99-100; for the formal modes of manumission, *censu*, *vindicta*, and *testamento*, cf., e.g., Treggiari, *RFLR*, 20-31; Fabre, *Libertus*, 5-39. It is unclear whether Junian Latins, slaves freed by one of the informal modes (cf. Sherwin-White, *RC*^{2}, 328-334; Fabre, *Libertus*, 55-66), obtained the privilege of using a full

Roman name. For the evidence from comedy (Plaut. Epid. 730, Men. 1029, 1093ff.; Ter. Ad. 970), cf. Spranger, Sklavenfiguren, 89: "Dass es dem Dichter nicht darum ging, das römische Freilassungsverfahren mit all seinen Formalitäten und seinen juristischen Konsequenzen systematisch darzustellen, sollte sich von selbst verstehen." For papyri: I. Biezuńska-Małowist, L'esclavage dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine. Seconde partie: Période romaine (Archiwum Filologiczne 35) (Wrocław, etc., 1977)., 144 and nt. 149, with refs. (hereafter, Biezuńska-Małowist, EEGR II), superseding Duff, FERE, 21-22. For inscriptions: G. Vitucci, "Libertus", 910; cf. also CIL 14.1437 = ILS 1984, cited below, nt. 23. I do not know on what evidence S. Treggiari, LCM 2 (1977), 71 bases her statement, "Tiro certainly gained his freedom by formal manumission, for he bore tria nomina." For a different view of the significance of a freedman's assumption of the tria nomina, which stresses the relationship of dependence to a patronus that it implies, see Fabre, Libertus, 93-121, esp. 111-114.

[18]CIL 5.1071 = CE 66 (Aquileia): "Anicia P.l. Glucera / fui. Dixi de vita mea / satis. Fui probata / quae viro placui bono qui me ab imo / ordine ad summum / perduxit honorem."

[19]CIL 5.2417 = CE 1157 (Ferrara): "Parva sub hoc titulo Festi / sunt ossa lapillo quae maerens fato condi/dit ipse pater. Qui si vixisset, domini /iam nomina ferret...."

[20]CIL 14.632 = CE 845 (Ostia, end 2nd c. A.D.: cf. Buecheler ad loc.): "D.M. Atticillae / praenomen Marciae pestis cui dira negavit." For the use of "praenomen" instead of "nomen", see Buecheler ad CE 567. For the importance of the name itself as a sign of free status, cf. also CIL 6.17130 = CE 963 (11 B.C.), lines 8-10 with the comments of Buecheler ad loc. Mention should be made also of a handful of inscriptions in which a blank space has been left before the name of a slave in order that the master's praenomen and gentilicium might be added in the event of the slave's subsequent manumission. These texts point to the same pride, in these cases, anticipated pride, in the tria nomina (cf. Vitucci, "Libertus", 920, with refs.).

[21]Tremoli, Iscrizioni, 12-14. Tremoli suggests (p. 13) that Trimalchio sees in his praenomen a means of distinguishing himself from his fellow freedmen. Since Trimalchio consistently addresses his peers by their cognomina their use of the praenomen in reference to him is unlikely to be simply a sign of familiarity. Persius 5.73-82 and Horace, Serm. 2.5.31-32 ridicule the pleasure that a freedman derived from his praenomen. Cf. also the verses of Saevius Nicanor reproduced at Suet. Gramm. 5.1, where Saevius evidently jokes about his double cognomen and his

newly acquired Roman praenomen, Marcus (the text is corrupt).

22CIL 6.28228 = CE 1054: "Valeria).l. Lycisca / XII annorum nata / Romam veni / quae mihi iura dedit civis, dedit et /5 mihi vivae...". In her selective survey of the epitaphs from Rome, L.R. Taylor found explicit reference to manumission only in this inscription (AJP 82 (1961), 130 nt. 37).

23CIL 11.137 = ILS 1980 = CE 1580 (Ravenna, 1st c. A.D.: Dessau): "C. Iul(ius) Mygdonius, / generi Parthus, / natus ingenuus, capt(us) / pubis aetate, dat(us) in terra /5 Romana: qui, dum factus / civis R(omanus), iuvente fato co/locavi arkam, dum esse annor(um) L...". The expression "colocavi arkam" in lines 6-7 is difficult. An alternative interpretation would have Mygdonius "investing in a coffin" (so H. Geist and G. Pfohl, Römische Grabinschriften[2] (Munich 1976), 124 no. 326), but this seems less satisfactory than the explanation proposed in the text. For the usual configuration, cf., for example, Pet. Sat. 53.4: "in arcam relatum est quod collocari non potuit." For evidence of the importance that freedmen placed in their citizenship, cf. also CIL 14.1437 = ILS 1984, where the words "in consilio manumisso" were added at a later date after the name of a young freedman in order to indicate that his promotion from Junian Latin status to full Roman citizenship had been officially approved (so Dessau, ad loc.).

24Cf. Pliny, Ep. 4.11.3; Suet., Claud. 15.2; Dig. 49.14.32 (Marcianus, 14 Inst.). For slaves' dress, see Mommsen, StR 3.1, 220 A3.

25Cf. P. Zanker, "Grabreliefs römischer Freigelassenen", JDAI 90 (1975), 267-315, esp. 300: "Die Toga hat bei den Freigelassenen offensichtlich den Rang eines Statussymbols. In erster Linie sind sie cives Romani, alles andere ist sekundar."; D.E.E. Kleiner, Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire (New York and London 1977), 180-191; H.G. Frenz, Untersuchungen zu den frühen römischen Grabreliefs (Frankfurt am Main 1977), 65-66, 83-85.

26"v(ivus) C. Gargilius Haemon, Proculi, / Philagri divi Aug(usti) l(iberti) Agrip/piani f(ilii), / paedagogus, idem l(ibertus) / pius et sanctus. /5 vixi quam diu potui sine lite, / sine rixa, sine controversia, / sine aere alieno; amicis fidem / bonam praestiti; peculio / pauper, animo divitissimus. /10 bene valeat is qui hoc [sic] titulum / perlegit meum." (CIL 6.8012 = ILS 8436 = CE 134). For the date (from the nomenclature) see Weaver, FC, 302; for the nomenclature, see Borghese in CIL ad loc.; Dessau at ILS 8436; and, Chantraine, Freigelassene, 17 nt. 8, 296 (on

"Agrippianus"). For other examples of "awkward names in which the entire name of a patron who was Aug. lib. is given", L.R. Taylor, AJP 82 (1961), 121 nt. 2 cites CIL 6.8761, 15190, 18112. Note that Haemon, like the Greek-speaking freedmen in Petronius, tends to convert masculine nouns to neuter: cf. Bücheler ad CE 134 line 7 with, e.g., CE 502; and, for the freedmen in the Satyricon, M.S. Smith, 221.

27...notus in urbe sacra vendenda pelle caprina, / exhibui merces popularibus usibus aptas, / rara fides cuius laudata est semper ubique. /... solvi semper fiscalis manceps, / in cunctis simplex contractibus, omnibus aequus / ut potui, nec non subveni saepe petenti, / semper honorificus, semper communis amicis / ... /[15] exemplum laudis vixi dum vita manebat..." (CIL 9.4796 = ILS 7542 = CE 437). The name of the dedicator, L. Nerusius Mithres, is spelled out in an acrostic and repeated at the end of the epitaph. The cognomen Mithres suggests an eastern, and probably servile, origin: cf. Solin, "Orientalische Sklaven", 218-219.

28"Dis Manibus / M. Publici M. lib. Vnionis. / te rogo, praeteriens, fac / mora et perlege versus quos ego /[5] dictavi et iussi scribere quendam. /...reddedi depositum, / coaglavi semper amicos / ...praestiti quod potui, semper sine lite recessi..." (CIL 14.2605 = CE 477).

29MacMullen, RSR, 171 nt. 29 cites ten inscriptions that commemorate "a negotiator's fides and probitas or life lived sine fraude." Cf. also CIL 1^2 1218 (= 6.21975 = ILLRP 982 = CE 67; end of the Republic), "...nemini unquam / debui, vixsi quom fide...", with the remarks of Fabre, Libertus, 273; CIL 8.7156 (= CE 512), "fydes in me mira fuit semper..."; CIL 6.6275 (= CE 999), "hic est ille situs, qui qualis amicus amico / quaque fide fuerit, mors fuit indicio" (tomb of the Statilii); CIL 6.25570 (= CE 1000); CIL 6.33575 (= CE 2091); Eph. Ep. 8.191 (= CE 72), "[sine lite et quest]u ullius vixsi quom fide..." [supplevit Bücheler; alii aliter]; CIL 2.3449 (= ILS 8407), "vixit cum fide"; CIL 9.4169, "...vixit annos LXXXVII / sine aere alieno"; CIL 6.2489 (below, nt. 70). H.H. Armstrong, Autobiographic Elements in Latin Inscriptions (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series 3.4, pp. 215-286) (New York 1910), 224 notes that from the second century B.C. through the second century A.D., "with barely an exception", only the lower classes recorded autobiographical details in their epitaphs.

30Cf., e.g., CIL 6.2489 (= ILS 2028 = CE 991: after A.D. 29), "vixi quod volui semper bene / pauper honeste; fraudavi / nullum, quod iuvat ossa mea"; CIL 3.2835 (= CE 992); CIL 5.5930 (= CE 1589), "...apud superos vixi / plus fama quam fortuna..."; CIL 5.938 (= CE 372), "natus sum

summa in pauperie...nullo odio, sine offensa, missus quoq(ue) honeste"; CIL 8.11824 (= CE 1238),"pau[p]ere progenitus lare sum parvoq(ue) parente, / cuius nec census neque domus fuerat /...hic labor et vita parvo cont(ent)a valere / et dominum fecere domus et villa paratast / et nullis opibus indiget ipsa domus /...vitae pro meritis claros transegimus annos, / quos nullo lingua crimine laedit atrox. / discite mortales sine crimine degere vitam: / sic meruit, vixit qui sine fraude, mori."; CIL 8.15719 (= CE 623), "et iacet hic talis, qui nunquam fraudibus iste / laetatus post magnos actus pauperes reliquit liberos / spe liberos"; CE 2299, "certavi tecum con/iunx pietate vir/tute frugalitate / et amore..."; CIL 6.8012 (above, nt. 66); CIL 9.3358 (below, p. 178 nt. 115). Staerman, Krise, 114-116 notes that the theme of the honesty of the poor man recurs frequently in the fables of the freedman poet Phaedrus.

[31]Ep. 1.7.56, but the entire passage is instructive: "[Demetrius, Phillipi servus] it redit et narrat, Volteium nomine Menam, / praeconem, tenui censu, sine crimine, notum / et properare loco et cessare et quaerere et uti, / gaudentem parvisque sodalibus et lare certo / et ludis et post decisa negotia campo." (1.7.55-59). Whether or not Mena was meant to be seen as a freedman, as Treggiari, RFLR, 100, 109 suggests, it is clear that he would have fit comfortably into Trimalchio's circle: every detail of Horace's characterization is parallelled somewhere in Petronius' portrayal of his freedmen.

[32]"viginti ventres pasco". Hermeros refers specifically to his slave holdings rather than to his dependents in general, as is shown by a number of passages in which similar expressions are used to describe the responsibility of a dominus to maintain his slaves or, as here, to indicate the extent of a slave-owner's wealth: cf. Sen., Ep. 17.4 "facile est pascere paucos ventres"; Trang. An. 8.8; Juv., Sat. 3.141 "quot pascit servos?"; 3.167; 9.66-67; Plaut., Pers. 56 "parasitando pascere ventres suos".

[33]See Dell'Era, Problemi, 147-158, esp. 149 (lamellula), 153 (glebula).

[34]Cf., e.g., Pliny, NH 33.135 with P.A. Brunt, Latomus 34 (1975), 625 (the freedman C. Caecilius Isidorus left more than 4,000 slaves at his death in 8 B.C.); Apul., Apol. 77.1, 93.4 with H. Pavis D'Escurac, Ant. Afr. 8 (1974), 92 (more than 400 slaves owned by Aemilia Pudentilla in A.D. 158/9); P. Oxy. 3197, with Biezuńska-Małowist, EEGR II, 96-97 (at least 59 household slaves in the service of a prominent Alexandrian in A.D. 111); S. Treggiari, PBSR 43 n.s. 30 (1975) 72-77: 79 slaves and freedmen who can be positively assigned to the staff of Livia's household on the Palatine and another 40 probable or possible members of the

crew. See further, Westermann, Slave Systems, 87-89; cf. also Diodorus 36.2.3 (400 slaves on the Campanian estates of an equestrian, T. Vettius, in 104 B.C.); Palladius, Lausiac History 61 with Finley, ASMI, 123; AE, 85 (some 24,000 slaves owned by a Roman noble woman at the turn of the fourth and fifth centuries).

[35]See Morabito, Réalités, 53-54.

[36]Catullus represents the truly poor man as one who has neither a money box nor a slave (23.1, 24.5,8,10). Juvenal, in a passage which is perhaps meant to recall Catullus (cf. 9.54, "Dic, passer,..."), has the catamite Naevolus complain that he is so poor that he cannot afford a second slave (9.64-69). When Apuleius, on trial at Oea in A.D. 158/9, is accused of having designs on the fortune of his new wife, the fact that he has only three slaves is held up as proof of his poverty (Apul., Apol. 17; for the date of the trial, see R. Syme, REA 61 (1959), 310-319). Cf. also Juvenals' picture of a typical rustic household in "the good old days" of the third century B.C.: "...saturabat glebula talis / patrem ipsum turbamque casae, qua feta iacebat / uxor et infantes ludebant quattuor, unus / vernula, tres domini" (14.166-169), for which Mayor, Juvenal, 319 compares Pliny, NH 33.26, "aliter apud antiquos singuli Marcipores Luciporesve dominorum gentiles omnem victum in promiscuo habebant".

[37]Cf. Westermann, Slave Systems, 89; MacMullen, RSR, 88-94; Hopkins, C&S, 110.

[38]Cf. Pliny, NH 33.26, "mancipiorum legiones"; Sen., Ep. 110.17, "cohors culta servorum"; Ep. 47.2, "servorum turba"; Mart. 2.57.5, "capillatus grex"; Sen., Cl. 1.24.1; Tran. 8.6; Lucian, Navigium 22; Apul., Met. 2.2.; Ammianus 14.6.16-17. (Juv., Sat. 5.66 is spurious). Seneca believed that he was illustrating his frugality when he wrote that he and a friend embarked on a two-day excursion with only a single cartload of attendants (Ep. 87.2).

[39]Pliny, Ep. 2.4.3. See Duncan-Jones, ERE^2, 17-32, esp. p. 24. Pliny's estimated twenty million sesterces ranks only twenty-third on the list of known private fortunes under the Principate: see the following note.

[40]Of the thirty largest private fortunes known to us from the early Empire, twenty belong to the Julio-Claudian period as opposed to only seven for the Flavian and Trajanic periods combined (nine for the hundred years following the accession of Vespasian): see Duncan-Jones, ERE^2, 343-344 with the supplements on p. 385, excluding no. 20. For a possible skewing of the evidence in favor of the earlier period, and for senatorial prosperity under the Flavian

emperors, see J.H. D'Arms, Romans on the Bay of Naples: A Social and Cultural Study of the Villas and Their Owners from 150 B.C. to A.D. 400 (Cambridge, Mass. 1970), 123-124 (hereafter, D'Arms, RBN); CSS, 93; Duncan-Jones, ERE^2, 5 nt. 5. For some comparable figures on senatorial fortunes during the late Republic, see I. Shatzman, Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics (Brussels 1975), 35.

[41]For Horace as a Roman knight, see L.R. Taylor, AJP 46 (1925), 161-170; TAPA 99 (1968), 477-479; for his background "libertino patre natus", cf. G. Highet, AJP 94 (1973), 268-281 with the important reservations of Finley, ASMI, 171 nt. 25, 177 nt. 96. For the identification of Horace's Sabine farm, see G. Lugli, Mon. Linc. 31 (1926), 457-598, and, for its probable size, F. Coarelli, Guida archeologica Laterza 5: Lazio (Rome and Bari 1982), 111-112. Horace on his farm: Serm. 2.3.10 "villula"; 1.6.1 "modus agri non ita magnus"; 2.6.9; Ep. 1.14.1 "agellum"; worked by eight slaves: Serm. 2.7.117; under a vilicus: Ep. 1.16.1; previously cultivated by five local families: Ep. 1.14.2-3. Further refs. in G. Lugli, Horace's Sabine Farm, tr. G. Bagnani (Rome 1930). Horace's assessment of his estate is generally borne out by the information on farm-sizes and manning ratios given by the agricultural writers, whose figures, however, vary considerably depending upon the use to which the land is put: see Duncan-Jones, ERE^2, 325-328 for refs. and good discussion. From the same figures it can be deduced that Hermeros' estate would have comprised between 140 and 590 iugera -- a substantial tract. For a modern appraisal of Horace's farm, cf., e.g. J.E. Skydsgaard, JRS 61 (1971), 277: "a luxurious country estate".

[42]There is little to choose between the two most probable supplements to fill the lacuna before "illius", <ainu> (Heinsius) and <capillis> (Burmann), but the latter gains some support from a passage elsewhere in the Cena (27.6) in which Trimalchio is made to wipe his hands on the head of a slave boy. The suggestion of E.E. Burriss, CP 42 (1947), 244 that we have here an instance of true aposiopesis, in which Hermeros out of modesty has omitted an indelicate word, cannot be ruled out.

[43]M.I. Finley, "Slavery and Humanity", Chapter 3 in ASMI, 93-122; cf. further A. Dalby, Arethusa 12 (1979), 257-258 with the response of K.R. Bradley in the same volume, pp. 259-260; Hopkins, C&S, 117-132; A. Watson, Phoenix 37 (1983), 53-65.

[44]As interpreted by R.H. Barrow, SRE, 103, CIL 2.2265 would show a freedman manumitted ex testamento offering to remit a legacy in exchange for the freedom of his "uxor et famula", who remained the property of his former master's heirs. But Barrow's interpretation fails to

makes sense of the inscription preserved on the stone and is controverted by the restoration of the missing text proposed by Mommsen, exempli gratia, which Barrow incorporates incorrectly and without comment into his transcription of the text. For a more convincing explanation, see Mommsen, ad loc. The suggestion of B. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt that P. Oxy. 722 (A.D. 91 or 107) shows a freeborn citizen of Oxyrhynchus purchasing a female slave in order to marry her cannot be substantiated: see Biezuńska-Małowist, EEGR II, 147 nt. 156.

[45]Cf., for example, CIL 6.9044, 15598, 25090 (the first two certainly of Julio-Claudian date) with the remarks of S. Treggiari, "Contubernales in CIL 6", Phoenix 25 (1981), 48-49; CIL 1^2 1216 with Treggiari, RFLR, 16.

[46]As has been noted above (pp. 42-43), according to strict usage colliberti should share the same patronus, but Chantraine, Freigelassene, 119 has shown that sometimes a freedman refered to his own freedman as a collibertus. Jory and Moore's computerized index to CIL 6 yields 31 instances in which a marital relationship is recorded with a collibertus/a; six more epigraphic examples may be found in TLL 3.1600.57-60, s.v. "colliberta".

[47]In his selective sampling of 700 inscriptions from CIL 6 recording marital relationships in which at least one member was a slave or freedman, Weaver, FC, 180 found that of 143 patron-husbands, only eight can be positively identified as freedmen. On the other hand, only one is clearly freeborn. Given the well-known tendency of freedmen to omit their status indication with increasing regularity throughout the first and second centuries A.D. (L.R. Taylor, AJP 82 (1961), 118-123; Weaver, FC, 84), it is likely that a substantial number of the 134 remaining incerti were ex-slaves. Five freedmen, for example, are found among the 21 patron-husbands recorded in the inscriptions from the north of Italy collected by O. Pergreffi, Epigraphica 2 (1940), 330 (CIL 5.1160, 2950, 3415; 11.6845, 6879). Note also Weaver's calculation, based on the sampling of 700 inscriptions mentioned above, that 134 of 456 or 29% of all freedwomen who married married their patrons (FC, 193).

[48]Cf., e.g., Veyne, "Trimalcion", 222; Treggiari, RFLR, 15; G. Boulvert, Domestique et fonctionnaire sous le Haut-Empire romain (Paris 1974), 271 (hereafter, Boulvert, DF); Th. Wiedemann, Greek and Roman Slavery (Baltimore 1981), 52 no. 33 (hereafter, Wiedemann, GRS). P.A. Brunt, Italian Manpower 225 B.C. - A.D. 14 (Oxford 1971), 143 is more cautious (hereafter, Brunt, IM).

[49]W.Ehler's theory (Muller-Ehlers^3, 516 = Muller-Ehlers^2, 460) that the HS 4,000 which Hermeros claims to

have paid for his freedom represents only the vicesimum libertatis (that is, Hermeros' manumission price was HS 80,000) evidently springs from the conviction that Petronius meant to portray Hermeros in the same way as Trimalchio, as boastful and pretentious. But, as we have seen (above, pp. 89-96), the assumption that Hermeros, or any of the guests, is a Trimalchio in miniature is mistaken. A price of HS 80,000 would set Hermeros on a par with the most expensive luxury slaves imagined by Martial and the most valuable highly educated slaves known to have been sold in Italy in the first century A.D. (see M. Garrido-Hory, Martial et l'esclavage (Paris 1981), 113-114; Duncan-Jones, ERE^2, 349 i.3.6. Cf. also Pliny, NH 7.56: two slave boys fraudulently sold as identical twins to the triumvir M. Antony for HS 200,000). Clearly, Hermeros belongs to neither of these categories.

[50]Cf. Dig. 12.4.3.5: HS 10,000 paid by Paris, the pantomimus of Domitia Lepida, for his liberty in A.D. 56; CIL 11.5400 (= ILS 7812: 1st c. A.D.): HS 50,000 paid by a doctor and sevir Augustalis at Asisium. Cf. also Suet., Gramm. 15: Lenaeus, a slave of Pompey, having offered to pay his manumission price, is freed gratis because of his talent and learning; Tac, Ann. 14.42.1: one of the alleged motives for the assassination of Pedanius Secundus in A.D. 61 is his refusal to accept payment from his slave of a manumission price previously agreed upon.

[51]Morabito, Réalités, 56-57 lists 61 passages that mention the price paid by a slave for his liberty (add Dig. 12.4.3.5); another 11 texts in which redemptio suis nummis is discussed generally are cited on p. 166 nt. 164. For the legal position of the servus suis nummis emptus, see the authorities cited above, p. 105 nt. 36.

[52]Cf. Lucil. 893-895; Cic., Parad. 5.39; Verg., Ecl. 1.27,32; Dion. Hal. 4.24.6; Pliny, NH 7.128; Sen., Ep. 80.4. For the considerable evidence from Roman comedy, see Spranger, Sklavenfiguren, 67-68.

[53]So, for example, Buckland, RLS, 496; Duff, FERE, 15-16; Alföldy, RSA 2 (1972), 121; G. Pucci, DdArch 10 (1977), 645; Hopkins, C&S, 118, 128-129; Fabre, Libertus, 273-274; cf. also Brunt, IM, 144. Treggiari, RFLR, 17 is more cautious. For the institution of the peculium, the importance of which for our understanding of the social and economic realities of Roman slavery has only recently been emphasized (by M.I. Finley), see Finley, AE, 64-65, 189 nt. 3; ASMI, 82, 102; Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen", 363-364; D. Musti, Opus 1 (1982), 61.

[54]See, respectively, I. Biezuńska-Małowist, "Les affranchis dans les papyrus de l'époque ptolémaique et

romaine", in Atti del'XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Milano 2-8 Settembre 1965 (Milan 1966), 439-440 (hereafter, Biezuńska-Małowist, "Affranchis"); and Hopkins, C&S, 133-171 (but cf. 168-169; P. Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen", 364 nt. 21).

55R. Duncan-Jones, ERE^2, 247, 243-244. On pp. 349-350, the slave prices from Petronius are listed under "Rome" rather than "Italy", where the only entry, inexplicably, is Juvenal 4.25-27 (a mullet bought at Rome). But all indications point to the fact that Petronius carefully depicted a Campanian, not a Roman, milieu.

56See R. Duncan-Jones, in Les "dévaluations" à Rome: époque republicaine et imperiale I (Rome 13-15 Nov. 1975) (Rome 1978), 164; ERE^2 385 ad p. 348. Of course, the Romans recognized many factors which might affect the value of a slave: origin, health, training, and "character", for example, are mentioned in the legal sources: see Buckland, RLS, 52-58; cf. also Gell. 4.2, and, now, chapter 29 of Diocletian's Price Edict (M. Crawford and J. Reynolds, ZPE 34 (1979), 177).

57See J. Andreau, Les affaires de Monsieur Jucundus (Rome, 1974), 107-108, citing Dig. 21.1.37 (hereafter, Andreau, AMJ).

58This situation, which is clearly attested for the first and second centuries B.C. in the manumission records from Delphi (Hopkins, C&S, 159) and for the late third century A.D in the new fragment of Diocletian's Price Edict from Aezani (A.D. 351: M. Crawford and J. Reynolds, in ZPE 34 (1979), 198), is generally borne out by the bulk of the inscriptional evidence from the intervening period. The close similarity in the ratios between the prices for male and female slaves recorded in the Delphic manumissions (5:4) and those in Diocletian's Price Edict (3:2) suggests that the relative cost of male and female slaves may have remained fairly constant throughout the late Republican and Imperial periods.

59Cf. Dig. 4.4.31; 5.2.8.17; 5.2.9; 40.4.47.pr.; CJ 6.1.4.pr.; 6.43.3.1; 7.4.2; 7.7.1.5; 8.29.3; and CIL 8.23956 with F. Grosso, "Pretium servi ex forma censoria", in Hommages à Marcel Renard II (Coll. Lat. 102) (Brussels 1969), 302-310. Hopkins and Morabito (cit. below, nt. 61) base their estimates of the average price for unskilled adult male slaves chiefly on the figure of HS 2,000 derived from the legal sources. I am unconvinced by the arguments of G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, CSAGW, 585-587 nt. 1 for regarding the aureus as equivalent to HS 1,000 rather than HS 100, and for therefore concluding that "the standard valuation of a slave in the legal writers was HS 10,000" (586).

[60]This was true in Delphi (Hopkins, C&S, 160; cf. esp. GDI 1717 with C.W. Tucker, TAPA 112 (1982), 234-235; contra, H. Rädle, Historia 19 (1970), 615) and Egypt (Biezuńska-Małowist, EEGR II, 147), and, to judge from the legal sources, probably also in Rome (Morabito, Réalités, 57-58).

[61]J. Češka, Diferenciace otroku v Itálii v prvních dvou stoletích principátu (Prague-Brno 1959), 58-63. This is the most detailed discussion of slave prices currently available. The estimates of other scholars tend to coincide with the figures at the lower end of Ceska's scale -- naturally, since the vast majority of slaves undoubtedly belonged to the categories of unskilled laborers there described: N. Brockmeyer, Antike Sklaverei (Darmstadt 1979), 181 (HS 800 - HS 2,500); Hopkins, C&S, 110 (HS 2,000 for an unskilled adult male); Morabito, Réalités, 59 (HS 2,000); G. Alföldy, Römische Sozialgeschichte, 122 (HS 2,000 ?); A.H.M. Jones, in Finley, ed., SCA, 1-15, 10 (HS 2,000 - HS 2,400 for an unskilled adult, throughout the empire except in Egypt); Duff, FERE, 18 (HS 2,000 - HS 4,000); Staerman, Schiavitù, 25 (HS 2,000 - HS 6,000). Barrow's estimate of HS 8,000 as an average price for a "good" slave is difficult to assess; it is evidently based on the testimony of two literary passages (SRE, 77 nt. 4). W.V. Harris, MAAR 36 (1980), 136 nt. 46 gives good reasons for believing that earlier estimates are, if anything, too high; in his view (p. 121), an average price of HS 1,000 is "not at all likely to be too low". For the recorded slave prices from Egypt, which tend to be lower than in other parts of the empire, see Biezuńska-Małowist, EEGR II, 165-167.

[62]A.D. Booth, "The Schooling of Slaves in First-Century Rome", TAPA 109 (1979), 11-19, esp. 16. For the type of informal street school that Hermeros probably attended, see S.F. Bonner, AJP 93 (1972), 509-528; EAR, 116-117.

[63]For some of the characteristics of the category of slaves who were involved in business, see P. Garnsey, Opus 1 (1982), 105-108; cf. also "Independent Freedmen", 364-365.

[64]For the phrase "litterae serviles", which defined a recognized concept in the Neronian age, see Sen., Trang. 9.5 with A.D. Booth, TAPA 109 (1979), 15.

[65]Hermeros can read only inscriptions: Friedlaender, Ernout, Paratore II, 197-198, J.S. and A.E. Gordon, Contributions to the Paleography of Latin Inscriptions (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1957), 73-74; G. Bagnani, Phoenix 13 (1959), 20; G. Susini, The Roman Stonecutter: An Introduction to Latin Epigraphy, trans. A.M. Dabrowski (Oxford 1973), 52. Hermeros can read block capitals in general: Perrochat, Sullivan, Müller-Ehlers[2-3], Warmington,

Pellegrino. Hermeros can read and write, at least in a limited way: R.W. Daniel, ZPE 40 (1980), 157-159 (see further in the text). The suggestion of P. Tremoli, Iscrizioni, 10 that Hermeros' knowledge of block capitals represents "una conoscenza di un livello più alto, più nobile e quasi inconsueta nell'ambito normale della cena" is unsupportable.

66"v(ivus) f(ecit) / C. Terentius / Fructus / sibi et / Attico ser(vo), / qui vixit ann(os) / XX, litteratus / Graecis et Latinis / librarius, / partes dixit CCC..." (CIL 11.1236 = ILS 7753): see F. Hultsch, NJPhP 139 (1889), 342-343.

67"[D. M. / . Aulreli Apri / [. Aulrel(ius) Oclatius / [et] Aurel(ia) Nonnica / filio posuer(unt) / qui vixit an(nos) VIII m(enses) VI dies VI. Is ambulavit ann(o primo); partes habuit X..." (CIL 5.7274). Both inscriptions are cited by Friedlaender, 303 ad loc.

68Bonner, EAR, 183.

69For the mathematical difficulties engendered by the Roman duodecimal system of weights and measures and by the Roman numerical notation, see, respectively, F. Hultsch, NJPhP 139 (1889), 335-343; G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, in A.C. Littleton and B.S. Yamey, eds., Studies in the History of Accounting (1956), 50-52, 60-61.

70The documents, inscribed on nearly 70 waxed wooden tablets, were discovered in 1959 in a wicker basket that had been abandoned on the day Vesuvius erupted in A.D. 79 in a villa or hotel located in the agro Murecine near the presumed site of the port of ancient Pompeii. The texts were edited by C. Giordano and F. Sbordone in a series of articles published between 1967 and 1980 in the Rendiconti of the Naples Academy: RAAN 41 (1966), 107-121; 43 (1968), 195-202; 45 (1970), 211-231; 46 (1971), 173-197; 47 (1972), 307-318; 51 (1976), 145-168; 53 (1978), 249-259. For bibliography up to 1979, see L. Bove, Documenti processuali dalle Tabulae Pompeianae di Murecine (Naples 1979), 17-19, 125-127 (hereafter, Bove, Documenti); cf. also J. Crook, ZPE 29 (1978), 229-239; J.G. Wolf, ZPE 45 (1982), 245-253 with further bibliography at p. 245 nt. 1. In refering to the tablets, I follow the provisional numeration of Bove, op. cit., 17-19 for tablets 1-89 and, for the fragments (90-134), that of Sbordone, RAAN 53 (1978), 256-269. The earliest tablet (TP 62) dates from 14 July A.D. 29, the latest (TP fr. 114) from A.D. 62. Evidently, all but three of the transactions took place at Puteoli; TP 78 was enacted at Cumae, TP 79 and the so-called "addendum" to TP 79 (A. Landi, Att. Ac. Pont. 29 (1980), 193) at Capua: see J.G. Wolf, ZPE 45 (1982), 245 nt. 1.

[71]The documents mostly concern *mutua* (loans) and *vadimonia* (more or less informal agreements between a plaintiff and a defendant binding the latter to appear in court on a set date), but leasing contracts, auction notices, summonses, and other types of transaction are also represented: see Bove, *Documenti*, 8-14 for a survey of the contents of the archive.

[72]For the archive of Caecilius Jucundus, see Andreau, *AMJ*. The texts are assembled in *CIL* 4, Suppl. I, 3340[1-153] (ed. K. Zangemeister, Berlin, 1898). V. Arangio-Ruiz provides a representative sampling of 31 of them in *FIRA*[2] III, *Negotia*, 400-422; 12 others are reproduced by Andreau, *AMJ*, 312-338.

[73]*CIL* 4.3340[32]: see Andreau, *AMJ*, 80-81 and nt. 4; cf. also *P. Oxy.* 1706 (A.D. 207): a slave-sale form with spaces left blank for names and ages, partly filled in by a different hand.

[74]Cf. *CIL* 4.3340[32]; *TP* 134 (Sbordone, *RAAN* 53 (1978), 269) with J.G. Wolf, *ZPE* 45 (1982), 245-253. Cf. also *CIL* 4.3340[136]; *TP* 13 (Sbordone, *RAAN* 43 (1968), 195-200).

[75]"...Nardus P. Anni Sel[eu]ci servus sc[rip]si coram et iussu Se[leu]ci domini mei, quod is negaret se litteras sc[ire..." (*TP* 46 = Giordano, *RAAN* 46 (1971), 195 = Sbordone, *RAAN* 51 (1976), 145-147). Cf. J. Crook, *ZPE* 29 (1978), 236-237; L. Casson, in *MAAR* 36 (1980), 28-29.

[76]W.V. Harris, *ZPE* 52 (1983), 108 nt. 96.

[77]Cf. *TP* 7, 26, 46; *CIL* 4.3340 nos. 6, 7, 20, 23, 138-153 -- the *apochae rei publicae* written by Secundus (138) and Privatus (139, 141-148, 150, 151, 153), public slaves of the colony of Pompeii (cf. N. Rowland, *Chiron* 7 (1977), 261-278). The imperial slave Abascantus Phillipianus who failed to write his own receipt (*CIL* 4.3340 no. 30) may have been pressed into service as the emperor's agent without having first received the customary training (i.e. without having been taught to read and write) because he happened to be on the spot; the sum entrusted to him was not large (HS 2,732).

[78]Mommsen long ago suggested that those clients of Caecilius Jucundus whose receipts were written by intermediaries with such formulae as "scripsi rogatu et mandatu [alicuius]" were unable to write for themselves (*Hermes* 12 (1877), 104-105). This theory, recently supported by W.V. Harris, *ZPE* 52 (1983), 107 with new arguments, is confirmed by *TP* 13, where the usual formula "rogatu et mandatu" is accompanied by explicit testimony that the client was

illiterate: "Q. Aelius Romanus scripsi rogatu et / mandatu M. Barbati Celeris coram / ipso quod is litteras nesciret" (Sbordone-Giordano, RAAN 43 (1968), 200). Thus, I consider the clients whose slaves wrote these formulae in CIL 4.3340 nos. 7 and 23 to be illiterates. Cf. also TP 7, 46.

[79]The slaves who appear in the tablets of Caecilius Jucundus are perhaps more likely to be domestic servants than business agents, since their masters tended to be members of the municipal bourgeoisie rather than entrepreneurs: see J. Andreau, DdArch 7 (1973), 250-254; but cf. G. Pucci, DdArch 10 (1977), 631-647. Cf. also Varro, Men. 517, "Diogenem litteras scisse domusioni quod satis esset"; Cic., Rep. 5.3.5, "dispensator litteras scit."

[80]Some slave children in the wealthiest households received a liberal education through the institution of the paedagogium (see S.L. Mohler, TAPA, 71 (1940), 262-280). Occasionally, slave paedagogi picked up letters while accompanying their master's sons to school; Remmius Palaemon is a well-known example (Suet., Gramm. 23.1.). For other possibilities, see C.A. Forbes, TAPA 86 (1955), 339-342.

[81]I borrow the phrase from S.F. Bonner, EAR, ch. 13, q.v., 180-181.

[82]An ex-cosmetes from Oxyrhynchus who drew up a contract with a shorthand writer to teach his slave tachygraphy expected the slave to have learned all the signs and to be able to "read and write flawlessly from prose of all sorts" within a period of two years: "...τὴν δὲ τρίτην [sc. δόσιν] λήψομαι ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ παιδὸς ἐκ παντὸς λόγου πεζοῦ γραφόντος καὶ ἀναγεινώσ[κον]τος ἀμέμπτως.... " (P. Oxy. 724: A.D. 155).

[83]See W.V. Harris, ZPE 52 (1983), 102-111; cf. also CJ 10.32 (31).6 (A.D. 293), "expertes litterarum decurionis munera peragere non prohibent iura." A careful study of the relationship between age-rounding and illiteracy in the Roman Empire based on comparative evidence from modern societies leads R. Duncan-Jones, Chiron 7 (1977), 347 to the stark conclusion that "a substantial proportion of those commemorated on Roman tombstones might have had difficulty in reading their epitaphs, or at least difficulty in writing their names."

[84]I am assuming, as have all scholars before me, that Hermeros here uses sevir to mean sevir Augustalis and that he does not refer to the quite different imperial organization (not yet fully understood) whose members were called seviri without further specification: see R. Duthoy, Epigr. Stud. 11 (1976), 207-214; "Les *Augustales", in ANRW

II.16.2 (Berlin 1978), 1264. The omission of Hermeros from J. Gagé's discussions of Augustales in the Satyricon (CSER, 140, 171), seems due to an oversight rather than to a conscious intention to distinguish Hermeros' office from that of his peers (see below in the text).

[85]Freedmen were barred by a lex Visellia of A.D. 24 from holding municipal office: CJ 9.21.1.pr. In two inscriptions from Singilia in Spain, two Augustales are specifically described as having attained the highest honor open to freedmen: CIL 2.2023, 2026 (= ILS 6915).

[86]Cf.R. Duthoy, Epigraphica 36 (1974), 134-154, esp. 135-141 (freedmen), 141-143, 150 (merchants and craftsmen); ANRW II.16.2 (1978), 1266, 1281 (appointed by local decurions). Duthoy's calculations (Epigraphica, 134 nt. 1) that 85% of all seviri Augustales and 92% of all Augustales were freedmen must be treated with caution, since he employs two questionable criteria in evaluating the epigraphical evidence: first, he asserts (139-140) that "at least nine out of ten persons with Greek cognomina were freedmen" (my translation), but this is far from certain; second, he assumes (139) that the proportion of freeborn to freed persons in the substantial group of incerti will be the same as in the group of persons whose status is known, but this need not have been so. The overwhelming preponderance of freedmen among the Augustales is in any case obvious from a survey of the epigraphical evidence.

[87]D'Arms, CSS, 126-148, esp. 140-148.

[88]Centuria Petronia: CIL 10.1873 (= ILS 6331); 1888; 8178 (= ILS 6321; dedicated Aug(usto) sacr(um)): cf. D'Arms, CSS, 106 nt. 45. Cornelia: CIL 10.1874 (= ILS 6330); Eph. Ep. 8.369 (= ILS 5186). Eastern merchants (CIL 10.1797 = ILS 7273) and Tiberian Augustales (CIL 10.1624 = ILS 156): see Rostovtzeff, SEHRE^2, 562-563 nt. 18. Curatores: CIL 10.1574 (= ILS 226). Duplicarii: see R. Duthoy, ANRW II.16.2 (Berlin 1978), 1286 nt. 252. See also A.D. Nock, "Seviri and Augustales", in Z. Stewart, ed., Arthur Darby Nock: Essays on Religion and the Ancient World (Oxford 1972), 352-353 (hereafter, Nock, "Seviri").

[89]So J.P. Waltzing, Etude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusq'à la chute de l'empire d'Occident (Louvain 1895-1900) I, 360-361 (hereafter, Waltzing, Etude); D'Arms, CSS, 127. Contra, Duncan-Jones, ERE^2, 285.

[90]Puteoli has yielded the greatest number of inscriptions pertaining to local Augustales (37) of any town in Campania, although the city itself has never been systematically excavated (cf. Duthoy, Epigr. Stud., 148-154

(Regio I), passim). The names of 33 individual Augustales are known: cf. D'Arms, CSS, 175-176.

[91]See above, p. 77 (occupations), p. 105 nt. 34 (wealth). R. Duthoy, Epigraphica 36 (1974), 150 notes the similarities between Petronius' freedmen and the "typical" Augustalis from the opposite perspective: "La Cena Trimalchionis nous démontre à quel point il était devenu évident qu'un homme appartenant à cette catégorie d'artisans ou de commercant fortunés et de souche servile faisait partie des *augustales."

[92]Cf. epigraphic parallels cited by R. Duthoy, ANRW II.16.2 (1978), 1266-1267, 1281; P. Garnsey, Historia 20 (1971), 324 nt. 83.

[93]Th. Mommsen, Hermes 13 (1878), 118-119, recently reaffirmed by D'Arms, CSS, 109-110.

[94]On this point scholarly opinion is nearly unanimous. I do not understand how G. Bagnani, the lone dissenter, can say "Trimalchio is not a climber and has no social ambitions" (Phoenix 8 (1954), 78).

[95]See Veyne, "Trimalcion", 245-246 and, more fully, D'Arms, CSS, 112-116.

[96]Cf. Babrius 28; Phaedrus 1.24. For the weakness of frogs, cf. Babrius 25; Phaedrus 1.30; B.E. Perry, Babrius and Phaedrus (Loeb) (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1965), 438 no. 90.

[97]Hor., Serm. 2.3.307-320; Mart. 10.79; Pet. 74.13-14, "at [sc. Fortunata] inflat se tamquam rana...sed hic qui in pergula natus est aedes non somniatur." Trimalchio perhaps conflates (and garbles) two different fables concerning frogs: the frog who bursts herself and the frog who refuses to abandon his dwelling in a puddle for more appropriate lodgings in a nearby pond (B.E. Perry, Babrius and Phaedrus 433 no. 69).

[98]Plut., Cato Maior 3; Sen., Ep. 47.13: cf. Griffin, Seneca 259-260.

[99]Gambling and addressing masters frankly are explicitly mentioned as privileges allowed only during the Saturnalia festival: see K.R. Bradley, SO 54 (1979), 113, 117 nt. 16 with refs.; cf. also M. Grondona, Mat. e Disc. 1 (1978), 209-213.

[100]We are perhaps justified in here crediting Petronius with an astute representation of a slave mentality. Compare the remarks of an American ex-slave, looking back at

the attitudes of his fellow slaves: "They seemed to think that the greatness of their masters was transferable to themselves. It was considered as being bad enough to be a slave; but to be a poor man's slave was deemed a disgrace indeed!" (F. Douglass, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave, Written by Himself (Boston 1845), 44).

101G. Alföldy, "Die Freilassung von Sklaven und die Struktur der Sklaverei in der römischen Kaiserzeit", RSA 2 (1972), 97-129, 120.

102Hopkins, C&S 115 nt. 30, 127 nt. 63; W.V. Harris, in MAAR 36 (1980), 118, 134 nt. 9; cf. also P. Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen", 361-362, citing K. Kurz's detailed critique of Alföldy's methodology in Listy Fil. 86 (1963), 207-222; Weaver, FC, 103-104: most freedmen in the familia Caesaris manumitted between the ages of 30 and 40, on average "probably between 30 and 35".

103Cf., e.g., Weaver, FC, 104; J. Ramin and P. Veyne, Historia 30 (1981), 488.

104M.B. Flory, "Family in Familia", AJAH 3 (1978), 78-95 paints a rosy picture of domestic harmony within slave familiae but rightly points out (95 nt. 47) that the epigraphic evidence upon which her study is based is unlikely to give fair representation to the darker side of a slave's relations with his conservi.

105Staerman, Krise, 61; R. Duthoy, Epigraphica 36 (1974), 152; cf. P. Zanker, JDAI 90 (1975), 312.

106"Cuspium Pansam / aed(ilem) Fabius Eupor princeps libertinorum" (CIL 4.117 = ILS 6419g).

107G.B. De Rossi, Bull. Arch. Crist. 2 (1864), 69-72, 92-93; M.S. Ginaburg, "Princeps Libertinorum", TAPA 65 (1934), 198-206.

108So Rostovtzeff, SEHRE^2, 96 no. 4 (and already in SEHRE^1 [1926]), who calls Eupor a "Pompeian prototype" of Trimalchio; cf. also Veyne, "Trimalcion", 240. Despite misinterpreting the inscription, MacMullen, RSR 191 nt. 45 hits on the essential significance of the phrase when he suggests that it reflects a notion of "some sort of caste".

109CIL 6.27609a-b = ILS 6047, 6047a, on which see Vitucci, "Libertus", 920.

110Cf. CIL 6.9208b and a new inscription published by W. Eck, in ZPE 36 (1979), 224 no. 10, q.v. for the interpretation given in the text.

111So Rostovtzeff, SEHRE^2, 68 and, most recently, J. Kolendo, in Schiavitù, manomissione e classi dipendenti nel mondo antico (Rome 1979), 164-166, with further bibliography. The inscriptions: CIL 10.8222 (Capua); CIL 13.3986 (Arles).

112M.W. Frederiksen, PBSR 27 n.s. 14 (1959), 115.

113See M.I. Finley, "Aulus Kapreilius Timotheus, Slave Trader", ch. 13 in Aspects of Antiquity: Discoveries and Controversies (London 1968), 162-176. The inscription: AE 1946, 229; further bibliography in J. Kolendo, (above, nt. 111), 162 nt. 5.

114CIL 14.2298 = ILS 1949 = CE 990. The inscription, approximately datable from the identification of the freedman's patron with Ovid's friend M. Aurelius Cotta Messalinus, consul in A.D. 20, has attracted the interest of scholars for a number of reasons, though not for the one for which it is adduced here: cf. Vitucci, "Libertus", 920; Veyne, "Trimalcion", 220, 244-245; P.A. Brunt, Latomus 34 (1975), 633; D'Arms, CSS, 103-104 and nt. 31, 127 nt. 21; de Ste. Croix, CSAGW, 178.

115"...sum libertinis ego nata parentibus ambis / pauperibus censu, moribus ingenuis..." (CIL 9.3358 = CE 1125).

116"...artibus ingenuis, studio formatus honesto..." (CIL 11.7856 = CE 2068); for "artes ingenuae", cf. also CIL 11.4866.

117"...barbara quem genuit tellus, [hu]nc tradidit usu[s] / servitio, [i]ngenium ut flec[t]eret, [i]nmerit[o]..." (CIL 12.5026 = CE 1276).

118L.R. Taylor, "Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome", AJP 82 (1961), 118-123; cf. Weaver, FC, 84.

119The only other details in Hermeros' characterization that may have been unusual -- his self-sale into slavery and the length of his servitude -- emphasize the hardships of his former condition. Hence, they make his pride in having attained his present status more understandable (and psychologically more plausible), but not more typical.

120D'Arms, CSS, 111-113, 116.

121"et nunc spero me sic vivere ut nemini iocus sim. homo inter homines sum; capite aperto ambulo; assem aerarium nemini debeo; constitutum habui numquam; nemo mihi in foro

dixit 'redde quod debes'. glebulas emi, lamellulas paravi; viginti ventres pasco et canem; contubernalem meam redemi ne quis in <capellis> illius manus tergeret; mille denarios pro capite solvi; sevir gratis factus sum; spero sic moriar, ut mortuus non erubescam." For alliteration in Latin verse epitaphs, cf. E. Galletier, Etude sur la poésié funéraire romaine d'après les inscriptions (Paris 1922), 306-308; H. Dessau, ILS, Index XVI, s.v. "Alliteratio", p. 873.

122Veyne, "Trimalcion", 244-246 argues that Trimalchio does not actually pretend to equestrian status, but rather "[il] entreprend d'en donner une réplique dans sa catégorie"; "il suggère simplement qu'il est, dans sa categorie, l'equivalent d'un chevalier romain". The distinction seems difficult to sustain. Trimalchio, like many of his peers, suppresses the indication of freedman status in the nomenclature adopted for his epitaph (71.12) and furthermore incorporates into the sculptural program for his monument elements (anuli aurei quinque) that could only have been taken as the badges of equestrian rank (71.9).

CHAPTER FIVE

LIBERTINITAS

At one point early in the banquet Trimalchio excuses himself from the table, and the guests are left to entertain themselves (41.9). In the scene that follows five of the freedmen deliver speeches in which a number of banal topics are reviewed: the weather, the recent funeral of a friend, the nature of his career, the price of bread, and the upcoming municipal elections (41.10-46.8). Petronius' purpose, according to the common view, is to set Trimalchio in his social context by giving a representative sampling of the table-talk of a group of small-town freedmen. With regard to the structure of the Cena, the interlude provides a respite from Trimalchio's overbearing presence and allows Petronius to display his talents at characterization. All this has been amply illustrated elsewhere and need not concern us here.[1]

The object of the following reading is to challenge the view that Petronius aimed at nothing more than variatio and "background" in the scene following Trimalchio's departure from the table.[2] I will argue that the speeches are linked together by a common theme and arranged in pairs to reflect two important aspects of the portrait of

Trimalchio, namely the crude "carpe diem" philosophy that characterizes his approach to life and the conflict between his servile origins and his adoption of Roman aristocratic values.

The observation that the speeches recited in Trimalchio's absence form a separate and self-contained episode seems to be older even than our text of the Cena: at 41.9, "nos libertatem sine tyranno nacti coepimus invitare convivarum sermones", the words convivarum sermones, which at one time stood apart as a sort of chapter heading or scribal notation, have evidently been interpolated into the narrative in order to patch up a lacuna after invitare.[3] Various structural features of the episode have been noted: each speaker makes a longer contribution than his predecessor; the speeches alternate between presenting generally optimistic and generally pessimistic views of society; the last four speeches seem to fall into pairs, in which the second member of each pair responds to the first. But only V. Ciaffi has attempted to interpret the entire episode in a manner which takes account of all its constituent parts.[4]

According to Ciaffi, the speeches illustrate a progressive awakening to consciousness of a class without roots gradually becoming aware of its own problems. For Dama, life is a blur of alternating physical sensations: hot and cold, night and day, Dama thinks only of the immediate needs of his body (41.10-12). Seleucus and Phileros recall a dead

friend, Chrysanthus, but never succeed in transferring their thoughts about his life and death to the condition of man in general (42-43). Ganymede raises the discussion to a higher plane by giving a forthright appraisal of the economic plight of the urban poor; for Ganymede, life is an ongoing struggle between the oppressors and the oppressed, and economic problems are the only realities that matter (44). Echion reverts to a more cautious and self-serving view of municipal politics and ends the conversation by outlining his practical approach to his Cicero's education (45-46).[5]

There is much to be said for Ciaffi's interpretation, which has the principal merit of tracing a linear development that ties the speeches together. Ciaffi is correct, I believe, in seeing the movement as one that proceeds from vague reflections on man's existence to a more focused appreciation of contemporary municipal life, but the model that Petronius adopts to develop this theme follows a temporal sequence that Ciaffi did not recognize.

Dama's first words, "dies...nihil est. dum versas te nox fit" (41.10), suggest the popular conception of life as a brief period in light and of death as eternal darkness, and the notion of living in the face of imminent mortality.[6] Of the speakers who follow, Seleucus and Phileros speak only of the dead, whose lives are a part of history and therefore belong to the past, whereas Ganymede and Echion concentrate on living in the present. Seleucus recalls the funeral of Chrysanthus and the final days of his life. Phileros

recounts the principal events of Chrysanthus' career. Ganymede compares the recent past with the present. Echion looks to the future: "quod hodie non est, cras erit" (45.2); he begins by discussing contemporary politics and ends by reviewing the prospects for his cicaro's education. In one sense, then, the speeches move from the grave (Seleucus) to the life of the deceased (Phileros) to the world of the living, both past and present (Ganymede), to the present and future (Echion). This progression parallels the development from abstract to concrete thought that Ciaffi outlines and reinforces the unity that Petronius intended.

Ciaffi's linear model is compromised, however, by his belief that Ganymede emerges as the hero, not only of the Cena, but of the entire Satyricon as we have it. For Ciaffi, Ganymede represents all that is sincere, courageous, and noble in the populus minutus (44.3) of the early Empire. In his view, Petronius presents a figure of uncommon intelligence and vision, whose candor sets him apart from his peers, men forever reconciled to dissimulation and compromise by the memory of their servile past. One suspects that Ciaffi's championing of Ganymede as the revolutionary proletarian par excellence reflects a Marxist ideology more appropriate to a modern political mentality than an ancient one. But the chief problem with Ciaffi's interpretation is its failure to recognize that Petronius makes his point not in the middle of the episode but at its beginning and end. In particular, Petronius sets the entire discussion within

the context of a schematic representation of the peculiar nature of freedman's condition.

Immediately preceding Trimalchio's departure from the table, Petronius presents two of Trimalchio's jokes back to back, which, taken together, illustrate precisely the point that he makes in his portrait of Hermeros. A roast boar is brought in crowned with a pilleus, the cap that newly freed slaves traditionally wore as a token of their liberty (40.3).[7] Encolpius turns to his "interpreter", Hermeros, and asks what the joke is (41.2). Hermeros responds, "plane etiam hoc servus tuus indicare potest; non aenigma est, sed res aperta. hic aper, cum heri summa cena eum vindicasset, a convivis dimissus <est>; itaque hodie tamquam libertus in convivium revertitur" (41.3-4). Before Hermeros has finished speaking a slave boy Dionysus enters singing and proceeds to imitate various aspects of the god of wine (41.6). Trimalchio turns to the boy and orders him to assume the guise of the Italian Liber: "'Dionyse' inquit 'Liber esto'" (41.7). The boy, instructed beforehand, pretends to recognize in his master's words the formula by which Roman slaves were informally manumitted and immediately claps the boar's cap of freedom on his own head. Trimalchio then addresses the company: "non negabitis me ...habere Liberum patrem", and thus introduces a second pun on the two senses of pater liber, "a free father" and "Pater Liber", the full designation of the Italian Dionysus.[8]

Now, if Trimalchio had had a free father, then he himself would have been freeborn; this is formally possible, since we do not know the circumstances of Trimalchio's birth, but there is no reason to suspect that he was sired by a Roman citizen in one of the Asian provinces. In any event, under Roman law no one who had been a slave could ever again claim the rights and privileges of ingenuitas except under very unusual circumstances, none of which applies in the case of Trimalchio.[9] By juxtaposing these two scenes Petronius points out how easy it is for a slave to become a freedman, and how little the promotion in civil status improves the actual "status" of the new citizen. The boar is "liberated" by a simple ritual, and remains what he was, a pig; the transformation is purely superficial. Similarly, the boy Dionysus is informally manumitted inter amicos by a simple declaration from his master, but in essence he remains unchanged. The transition from slavery to freedom is easy; the transition from freedman status to freeborn status is impossible. Neither Trimalchio nor any of the other freedmen has the right to claim that he is freeborn.[10]

The point is the same one that Petronius makes in drawing an implicit contrast between Hermeros' and Trimalchio's attitudes towards their former servitude: a freedman can never improve his social standing because he can never erase the stigma of having been a slave. By introducing the freedmen's speeches with two jokes that

illustrate the immutability of a freedman's status, Petronius creates the expectation that the episode will in some way comment upon the nature of a freedman's condition. To emphasize the point, he continues the play on "libertas" into the opening scene: "nos libertatem sine tyranno nacti coepimus invitare..." (41.9).

Dama begins by calling for larger cups (41.10). The motif is a commonplace in Greek symposium literature, going back to the origins of the genre, and is specifically associated by Cicero with drinking Graeco more.[11] The stage is thus immediately set for a symposium in the Greek style, with conversation centering on a fixed topic. That the freedmen do not focus on a single issue but rather discuss a variety of topics is, I believe, part of Petronius' point. The obvious literary model for a philosophical discussion conducted at the dinner table is Plato's Symposium, a work that Petronius elsewhere makes playful use of in patterning Habinnas' drunken arrival on Alcibiades' similar appearance late in the banquet at Agathon's home.[12] In Plato's dialogue, as in the present episode, five speakers contribute to the discussion before the central figure delivers his oration (Symp. 201 D - 212 C: Socrates; Sat. 47.2-6: Trimalchio). Furthermore, just as in the Symposium the argument of Pausanius the sophist is based on a "principle of moral indifference", so in the Cena Phileros, whose name recalls the topic of conversation at Agathon's table, is specifically identified as a causidicus (46.8) and likewise

reveals a lack of moral scruples.[13]

These and other indications suggest that the freedmen's speeches be seen in part as a sort of anti-*Symposium*.[14] The key difference that Petronius intended his readers to recognize, I suggest, is between the abstract and disinterested discussion in the *Symposium* and the intensely self-centered monologues in the *Satyricon*. Whereas the speakers in Plato's dialogue accept the proposed topic of conversation and stay within its guidelines, each of the freedmen in the *Cena* presents a highly personal view of what he thinks the rest of the company *should* be concerned about. I will argue below (p. 208) that this quality of egocentricity is meant to be seen as symptomatic of a freedman's condition. For the present, it is enough to recognize that Petronius introduces this theme at the beginning of the episode by drawing three points of comparison between the freedmen's speeches and the conversation at Agathon's table.

First, whereas in Plato's dialogue the company agrees at the outset to dispense with wine and music (*Symp.* 176 A-E), in the *Cena* Dama begins by calling for larger cups (41.10) and acknowledges that he is already drunk: "staminatas duxi, et plane matus sum. vinus mihi in cerebrum abiit" (41.12).[15] Second, Petronius emphasizes the contrast between the social milieu of his *Cena* and that of the *Symposium* by giving his first speaker, Dama, the literary slave name *par excellence*.[16] Finally, rather than mooting a topic for discussion, as Eryximachos does in the *Symposium* to

everyone's approval (Symp. 176 E - 177 A), Dama launches, unbidden, into his own crude philosophy of eating, drinking, and bathing in order to ward off the cold (41.10-11). Each of the speakers who follows begins by objecting to the views of his predecessor and then goes on to express his own opinion as to what is important in life. Instead of Plato's sober philosophical discourse, carried on by educated physicians, lawyers, and poets, Petronius focuses upon the drunken maunderings of semi-literate ex-slaves, whose conversation reflects their individual interests.

The transitional passages between speakers show that Petronius intended the last four speeches to be considered in balanced pairs. The first speakers in each pair are not allowed to finish their monologues but are interrupted by the second speakers, each of whom brings his speech to a definite conclusion. Seleucus' monologue trails off with a string of four consecutive but unrelated proverbs, which give the impression that he intends to ramble on indefinitely: "sed mulier quae mulier milvinum genus. neminem nihil boni facere oportet; aeque est enim ac si in puteum conicias. sed antiquus amor cancer est" (42.7). At this point Phileros breaks in: "molestus fuit, Philerosque proclamavit: 'vivorum meminerimus'" (43.1). Ganymede is interrupted by Echion in mid-sentence: "'itaque dii pedes lanatos habent, quia nos religiosi non sumus. agri iacent --' 'oro te' inquit Echion centonarius 'melius loquere'" (44.18-45.1). By contrast, Phileros and Echion end their speeches

decisively: "nec improbo, hoc solum enim secum tulit" (43.8: Phileros); "litterae thesaurum est, et artificium numquam moritur" (46.8: Echion). Finally, the two pairs of speeches are neatly divided at the center by a paratactic sentence that looks both forward and back: "haec Phileros dixit, illa Ganymedes:" (44.1). Clearly, Petronius intended Seleucus' speech to be considered together with Phileros' and Ganymede's together with Echion's.

The first two speeches center on the same figure, a certain Chrysanthus, whose recent demise Seleucus vividly recalls (42.3-5). But whereas Seleucus mentions only Chrysanthus, Phileros speaks of Chrysanthus' brother as well. His speech, however, is so artfully confused, mainly through his irregular use of the demonstrative pronoun ille, that the reader cannot always tell when he is speaking of one and when of the other.[17] At one point only is the distinction between the two brothers clear: referring at first to Chrysanthus, Phileros says, "durae buccae fuit, linguosus, discordia, non homo. frater eius fortis fuit, amicus amico, manu plena, uncta mensa" (43.4). Herein lies the key to understanding both Phileros' and Seleucus' speeches Both descriptions apply equally well to Trimalchio.

At one point Encolpius marvels at Trimalchio's changeable behavior: "nihil autem tam inaequale erat; nam modo Fortunatam <verebatur>, modo ad naturam suam revertebatur" (52.11). Trimalchio's treatment not only of Fortunata but of his entire household is capricious. At

times he appears malicious, quarrelsome, and fractious (*durae buccae, linguosus, discordia non homo*), but at others he shows himself to be generous, courteous, and composed.[18] Trimalchio's entrepreneurial daring at any early stage of his career provides evidence of his fortitude (76.5: "alteras [sc. naves] feci maiores et meliores et feliciores, ut nemo non me virum fortem diceret"; cf. 71.12), while the array of refinements put on display in the course of the banquet attests to his "ready hand and lavish table". The beholden attitude that Hermeros (58.3) and Niceros (61.3) adopt towards their host suggests that he could be "a friend to a friend" as well.[19]

Indeed, many of the biographical details assigned to Chrysanthus (and to his brother) are repeated in the portrait of Trimalchio. The studied confusion of the two characters in Phileros' narration, I suggest, represents the fusion of conflicting traits in Trimalchio's personality. In other words, any attempt to make coherent sense of Phileros' jumbled references to the two brothers runs contrary to Petronius' purpose, which is to present a composite picture of a "Trimalchio in miniature". Seleucus and Phileros are in effect pronouncing the eulogy that Trimalchio requests in his final words: "'fingite me' inquit 'mortuum esse. dicite aliquid belli'" (78.5). The two speeches thus foreshadow the banquet's final scene. More importantly, they allow Petronius to present a view of Trimalchio as seen through the eyes of his peers. Before we consider Seleucus' and

Phileros' assessments of Chrysanthus' career, it will be necessary first to outline the points of correspondence between the portraits of Chrysanthus and his brother and the portrait of Trimalchio.

As has often been noted, Phileros begins with an injunction to "remember the living" and then goes on to speak exclusively of the dead. Phileros' words, "vivorum meminerimus" (43.1) are echoed by Trimalchio at 75.7, where they serve a similar function in introducing his lengthy autobiographical review. Chrysanthus, like Trimalchio, grew up from nothing: "ab asse crevit" (43.1); "ex parvo crevit" (71.12).[20] As is the case with Trimalchio, whatever Chrysanthus touched grew like a honeycomb: "itaque crevit, quicquid tetigit, tamquam favus" (43.1); "quicquid tangebam, crescebat tamquam favus" (76.8).[21] Chrysanthus' modest fortune of HS 100,000 (43.2) is dwarfed by Trimalchio's proverbial thirty millions (71.12), but both are proud to have it known that those sums represent only the amounts that they had in ready cash or out on loan: "puto mehercules illum reliquisse solida centum, et omnia in nummis habuit" (43.2); "sestertium reliquit trecenties" (71.12).[22] Like Trimalchio, Chrysanthus suffered a setback after his first venture into seaborne commerce, and, like Trimalchio, Chrysanthus traded in wine (cf. 43.4; 76.3-8). Phileros says of Chrysanthus that an inheritance "lifted his chin up": "et quod illius mentum sustulit, hereditatem accepit" (43.4). Both the image and the circumstance are repeated at

different points in the portrait of Trimalchio: "in deficiente vero iam porticu levatum mento in tribunal excelsum Mercurius rapiebat" (29.5); "cohederem me Caesari fecit, et accepi patrimonium laticlavium" (76.2).

Chrysanthus, angered at his brother (or vice versa), left his money to some "son of the soil": "et ille stips, dum fratri suo irascitur, nescio cui terrae filio patrimonium elegavit" (43.5).[23] At one point Trimalchio all but disinherits Fortunata (71.3), ordering Habinnas not to include her statue on his tomb and refusing to allow her to kiss his corpse (74.17). In view of Trimalchio's affection for his cicaro (64.11-12; 71.11) and the manner in which he acquired his own fortune (75.11-76.2), it is reasonable to suppose that, having spurned Fortunata, he might likewise bequeath his patrimony to a "terrae filius". Chrysanthus, who lived into his seventies, had some oraclemonger slaves who "did him wrong": "habuit autem oracularios servos, qui illum pessum dederunt...et quot putas illum annos secum tulisse? septuaginta et supra" (43.6-7). Trimalchio, already a calvus senex (27.1), places inordinate faith in an astrologer's prediction that he will live another thirty years (77.2).[24] Chrysanthus was Fortune's son (43.7); Trimalchio represents Fortuna watching over him in the mural painted in his portico (27.6). Chrysanthus led a salacious life, even in old age, and had a penchant for boys (43.7-8); Trimalchio shows a similar vigor and sexual inclination (64.11-12, 74.8).

Seleucus' recollections of Chrysanthus contain fewer biographical details that can be compared with the portrait of Trimalchio, but we may note that Chrysanthus, like Trimalchio, seems to have been at the mercy of doctors who were unable to cure his ailments (42.5; 47.2). Furthermore, Chrysanthus' funeral was much as Trimalchio hopes his will be: "tamen bene elatus est, vitali lecto, stragulis bonis. planctus est optime -- manu misit aliquot" (42.6). Trimalchio gives careful instructions to his slave Stichus not to let the moths and mice ruin his funeral clothes (78.2) and encourages the company to test the quality of the fabric (78.8). He hopes to be buried in style ("ego gloriosus volo efferi": 78.2), and his intention to manumit his entire household staff (71.1,4) ensures that he will be well mourned. Chrysanthus rescued his wife from degrading circumstances but did not win her undying gratitude: "maligne illum ploravit uxor. quid si non illam optime accepisset! sed mulier quae mulier milvinum genus" (42.6-7). We may suppose that Trimalchio, who bought Fortunata off the slave auction block (74.13), can expect similar treatment if he makes good his threat to have her statue stricken from the sculptural program for his monument (74.17). Seleucus describes Chrysanthus' devotion to his wife as a disease: "sed antiquus amor cancer est" (42.7); Trimalchio suggests that his constancy has been to his detriment: "at ego dum bonatus ago et nolo videri levis, ipse mihi asciam in crus impegi" (74.16). Finally, E. Dobroiu has suggested that the

musings on the hollow state of man's existence (42.4) that follow Seleucus' vivid recollection of his dead friend (42.3) represent the words of Chrysanthus himself.[25] If so, we may compare Trimalchio's similar reflections on human physiology: "nemo nostrum solide natus est...credite mihi, anathymiasis in cerebrum it et in totc corpore fluctum facit" (47.4,6).[26]

As has been noted above, Seleucus' and Phileros' recollections of Chrysanthus take the form of a eulogy. It is not surprising, then, to find that many of the phrases they employ are drawn from the language of epitaph[27] and that many of the ideas they express are conventional ones which find parallel in sepulchral inscriptions.[28] This simply confirms that Petronius has given a faithful representation of contemporary popular attitudes and diction. But one facet of popular philosophy is developed with particular care and serves a further literary purpose in reflecting the portrait of Trimalchio. The last section of Phileros' speech (43.8), when taken together with Dama's brief contribution (41.10-12) and the beginning of Seleucus' speech (42.1-2), presents the elements of a theme that occurs in various forms in the epitaphs and which is best exemplified by the following couplet: balnea vina Venus corrumpunt corpora nostra, / set vitam faciunt b(alnea) v(ina) V(enus).[29]

Dama's primitive philosophy embraces both concepts: bathing and drinking warm the body and are therefore

salutary, but drinking leads to intoxication (41.10-12). Seleucus has no use for the baths, which are debilitating, but finds nothing wrong with drink: "ego...non cotidie lavor; balniscus enim fullo est, aqua dentes habet, et cor nostrum cotidie liquescit. sed cum mulsi pultarium obduxi, frigori laecasin dico" (42.2). Dama and Seleucus mention only balnea and vina, and both recommend drinking as a defense against the cold; but the negative aspect of the epigram is brought out in Dama's drunkenness, which prevents him from contributing more than a few simple sentences, and in Seleucus' explicit condemnation of the baths.

Phileros adds the third element of the motif and emphasizes only the positive side of the couplet. He points out that Chrysanthus lived life to the fullest -- "tamen verum quod frunitus est, quam diu vixit" (43.6) -- and closes his eulogy with an appreciative account of Chrysanthus' sexual exploits, adding as his final judgement: "nec improbo, hoc solum enim secum tulit" (43.8). This last concept occurs frequently in the epitaphs, where it is often linked with precisely the earthly pleasures of eating, drinking, bathing, and sex.[30] We noted above (p. 182) that Dama's first words, "dies...nihil est. dum versas te, nox fit", suggest the shortness of life and the inevitability of death. We can now see that Dama's next statement, "itaque nihil est melius quam de cubiculo recta in triclinium ire" (41.10), represents a crude carpe diem philosophy. Phileros' final remark thus carries us back to the beginning of the

episode by reaffirming Dama's belief that one should enjoy life while one can, because death ends all pleasures.

Trimalchio expresses this same attitude at three points in the Cena, and in each case he specifically associates the finality of death with one of the three activites mentioned by Dama, Seleucus, and Phileros. At one point early in the banquet, after serving a vintage that purports to be a hundred years old, Trimalchio is moved to reflect on the relative longevity of wine and men: "eheu...ergo diutius vivit vinum quam homuncio. quare tangomenas faciamus. vinum vita est" (34.7). To emphasize the point, he casts a silver skeleton upon the table and recites some verses on the frailty of human existence: "eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est! / sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus. / ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene" (34.10; cf. 55.3).[31] Elsewhere, he tries to convince Scintilla that Habinnas' sexual relationship with his delicium is commendable, since "no one will gratify his Manes with that pleasure" (69.2). Trimalchio's phrase, "hoc enim nemo parentat", is not easily rendered into English, but it expresses the same idea as Phileros' comment, "hoc solum enim secum tulit" (43.8).

Finally, near the end of the Cena, when the entire company has been reduced to tears after hearing the plans for Trimalchio's tomb, Trimalchio dispels the melancholy by proposing a visit to the baths: "'ergo' inquit 'cum sciamus nos morituros esse quare non vivamus? sic vos felices

videam, coniciamus nos in balneum, meo periculo, non paenitebit" (72.2-3). Habinnas' hearty approval, "vero, vero...de una die duas facere, nihil malo" (72.4) recalls Dama's "dies...nihil est. dum verseas te, nox fit" (41.10). In short, just as the life of Chrysanthus recalls that of Trimalchio, so the philosophy expressed by his peers reflects the views of their host. Like Trimalchio, and like many contemporary Romans whose tombstones have survived, Trimalchio's friends associate drinking, bathing, and sex with the good life. But whereas Dama and Seleucus recognize the harmful effects of drinking and bathing (balnea vina Venus corrumpunt corpora nostra), Trimalchio sees only the finality of death and the need to make the most of life (vitam faciunt b(alnea) v(ina) V(enus)).[32]

The passages in which Dama, Seleucus, and Phileros articulate their hedonistic philosophy of life frame Seleucus' and Phileros' description of Chrysanthus' career and comment in a general way upon it. Elsewhere Seleucus and Phileros pass explicit judgement on particular aspects of Chrysanthus' behavior. What emerges from their random remarks, which are not always favorable (cf. 42.7, 43.3, 43.5, 43.6), is the clear belief that one should look out for one's own interests, even to the extent of acting dishonorably.

In criticizing Chrysanthus' devotion to his wife, Seleucus suggests that any form of altruism is misguided: "neminem nihil boni facere oportet; aeque est enim ac si in

puteum conicias" (42.7). Phileros begins by declaring that Chrysanthus had lived and died honestly (43.1) and then goes on to describe how he embezzled funds from an inheritance: "hereditatem accepit, ex quo plus involavit quam illi relictum est" (43.4). In Phileros' view, this is pardonable, or at least unimportant: what matters is who has money, not who should have it: "cui datum est, non cui destinatum" (43.7).[33] Furthermore, according to Phileros, one should be circumspect in one's business dealings: "numquam autem recte faciet, qui cito credit, utique homo negotians" (43.6). Seleucus' and Phileros' attitudes thus amount to a philosophy of self-interest: one should get what one can, keep it for oneself, and enjoy it, since death is final. This cynicism (in the modern sense) and the vulgar Epicureanism discussed in the preceding paragraphs are the principal characteristics that Petronius emphasizes in his portraits of the first three speakers.

Ganymede's and Echion's contributions may be dealt with more briefly. As has been noted above, the structure of Petronius' narrative suggests that the two speeches be seen as complementing one another. The relationship between them, however, is less clear than in the case of Seleucus' and Phileros' monologues, both of which concern the same person. Whereas Ganymede harps on a single theme -- the high price of bread (44) -- Echion discusses two separate issues: municipal politics (45) and his cicaro's education (46).

Several scholars have remarked that the topics discussed by Ganymede and by Echion in the first section of his speech (45) reflect the two principal interests of the Roman plebs under the early Empire: bread and circuses.[34] Petronius adapts the picture to suit a municipal context -- the _populus minutus_ (44.3) of Puteoli are concerned not with the dole and horse races but with the price of bread and gladiatorial games -- and the details he provides seem plausible, insofar as we can check them against the evidence for contemporary social and economic conditions.[35] But the "realistic" depiction of Campanian society is secondary to his main purpose, which is to show that Ganymede's and Echion's interests are self-centered and trivial: like the lower classes at Rome, Petronius suggests, Trimalchio's fellow freedmen view politics only in terms of personal gratification.

The relationship between Ganymede's speech and the second section of Echion's monologue (46) has not previously been observed. As was the case with the speech of Phileros, the key lies in recognizing that Ganymede's and Echion's attitudes reflect two contradictory aspects of Trimalchio's personality. In different ways, both speeches illustrate the conflict between Trimalchio's status as a freedman and his adoption of Roman upper-class values. In each, one of the two aspects predominates. Specifically, Ganymede's role as a _laudator temporis acti_ parallels Trimalchio's attempts to rise above his station, and Echion's plans for his _cicaro_'s

education suggest the part of Trimalchio that cannot escape his servile past. Thus, the two speeches complement one another.

As a champion of old-time morality, Ganymede cuts an incongruous figure, and Petronius calls attention to the absurdity of Ganymede's harangue by emphasizing the contrast between his Eastern origins and his Roman attitudes. Ganymede is the only freedman besides Trimalchio to mention explicitly his arrival from the East (44.4). Shortly thereafter Ganymede recalls a certain Safinius, the hero of his youth (44.6-10) and the only character in the extant portions of the Satyricon who bears an Osco-Samnitic name.[36] The collocation of the two details is striking: Ganymede, the ex-slave of foreign origin, eulogizes a magistrate of unmistakably indigenous stock. Furthermore, Ganymede's explanation for the cause of the current drought is peculiarly Roman: the gods have forsaken the colony because men have neglected the gods: "nemo enim caelum caelum putat, nemo ieiunium servat, nemo Iovem pili facit, sed omnes opertis oculis bona sua computant" (44.17; cf. 44.18).[37] The festival to which he refers, the ieiunium Cereris, was instituted at Rome in 191 B.C. and had no Greek counterpart.[38] Likewise, the ritual that he describes as having produced rain in the olden days occurred in a specifically Roman context: "antea stolatae ibant nudis pedibus in clivum, passis capillis, vestibus puris, et Iovem aquam exorabant" (44.18).[39]

By calling attention to Ganymede's Eastern origins, and by giving him a name that his readers would have immediately associated with pederasty and subservience,[40] Petronius stresses the inappropriateness of Ganymede's role as a defender of Roman values. In a similar manner, by frequently reminding the reader of Trimalchio's status as an ex-slave,[41] Petronius emphasizes the absurdity of Trimalchio's attempts to effect the manners of a Roman knight.

Just as the portrait of Ganymede presents an incongruous blend of a servile background and traditional Roman attitudes, so Echion, in the second section of his speech (46), reveals the mentality of one whose experience as a slave has prescribed a certain set of values but whose aspirations for his cicaro encourage him to adopt a different set. Echion is proud of his cicaro's progress in school; if he lives, Echion will send him to Agamemnon to complete his education with training in rhetoric (46.3). In other words, Echion intends to give the boy a liberal education. But Echion is dissatisfied with his cicaro's current teacher, who is self-satisfied and lazy (46.5), and has therefore hired a second tutor[42] to teach the boy something practical: "emi ergo nunc puero aliquot libra rubricata, quia volo illum ad domusionem aliquid de iure gustare. habet haec res panem...quod si resilierit, destinavi illum artificium docere, aut tonstrinum aut praeconem aut certe causidicum..." (46.7). In short, the boy has been polluted by literature enough already: "litteris satis

inquinatus est" (46.7).

Echion's intention to provide his cicaro with the training prerequisite for acceptance into upper-class society is subverted by his insistence that the boy learn a lucrative profession. For Echion, the model of success is his fellow-freedman Phileros, a man who once hawked his wares as an itinerant street-peddler but who now, thanks to his learning, has become a wealthy pleader (causidicus) (46.8). As we have seen, this profession was not one to which an aristocratic Roman would aspire.[43] Echion's inability to disavow the acquisitive attitudes that serve him in his occupation as a centonarius (45.1) recalls Trimalchio's persistent preoccupation with profits.[44] Furthermore, just as Trimalchio's frequent gaffes belie his pretensions to culture, so Echion's misunderstanding of upper-class values betrays his lack of sophistication, even when he believes that he is demonstrating his appreciation of the liberal arts.[45]

In sum, the speeches of the five freedmen guests are carefully arranged to reflect various aspects of the portrait of their host. Seleucus and Phileros describe a "Trimalchio in miniature" and in the process reveal their own cynicism. The hedonistic philosophy articulated by Dama, Seleucus, and Phileros in the passages surrounding the eulogy of Chrysanthus complements their egoism and reinforces the portrait of Trimalchio. Ganymede and Echion are similarly self-centered, but their desire for

gratification reveals itself rather in the narrow view they take of municipal politics. Ganymede's role as an upholder of Roman morality recalls Trimalchio's aspirations to assimilate himself to the nobility of his adoptive homeland, while Echion's inability to suppress his concern with profits reflects the futility of Trimalchio's efforts to negate his servile past.

Earlier I suggested that Petronius makes his point at the beginning and end of the episode and that the two jokes preceding Trimalchio's departure from the table indicate that the speeches recited in his absence are meant to comment in some way upon the nature of a freedman's status (see above, pp. 183-186). It remains to consider the second half of Echion's speech (46) from a slightly different perspective in the hopes of illustrating the point that Petronius makes at the end of the episode. My interpretation of this final passage will in turn serve as a useful introduction to an explanation of how the characteristics summarized in the preceding paragraph reflect a freedman's condition, and to some concluding remarks concerning Petronius' representation of freedmen in the Satyricon.

The final chapter in the series of freedmen's speeches, in which Echion outlines his plans for his cicaro's education, has impressed a number of scholars as the most sympathetic portrayal of freedmen in the Satyricon. In their view, even if Echion's intentions are misguided, a

father's concern for his son's future is understandable and admirable. Furthermore, the prospects for social advancement are far brighter for Echion's freeborn son than they are for any of the freedmen, whose status as ex-slaves excludes them, both legally and socially, from many activities. The episode thus ends on an optimistic note; the reader is left with the impression that, for all their vulgarity, freedmen share with their freeborn peers a basic humanity that cuts across class lines.[46] This interpretation, I believe, is mistaken. Echion's cicaro is not a son but a delicium, probably an alumnus, but certainly not freeborn. Petronius' intention, rather than to suggest the successful integration into society of the descendents of freedmen, is to show that a freedman is not only unable to escape his own status but is furthermore bound by his freedman's mentality to perpetuate the same attitudes in his protégé.

Most scholars, even those who see no hint of sympathy in Petronius' characterization of Echion, agree that Echion's cicaro is his son. As early as the ninth century, however, Eugenius Vulgaris observed, in what is evidently a paraphrase of 46.5, "ceterum iam Graeculis calcem impingit", that Echion's cicaro is a foster child: "iam alumna creperam Graeculis calcem impingere norit".[47] The word cicaro occurs in this form only at 46.3, "iam tibi [sc. Agamemnoni] discipulus crescit cicaro meus", and at 71.11, where Trimalchio uses it in reference to his pet slave, Croesus (cf. 64.5).[48] Echion's next remark to Agamemnon, "iam quattuor

partis dicit; si vixerit, habebis ad latus servulum" (46.3), suggests that the term has the same application in the present passage. Those who regard Echion's cicaro as a freeborn son are forced to explain Echion's description of the boy as a "servulum" either as being proverbial or as a verbal slip indicative of Echion's inability to forget that he is no longer a slave.[49] Either explanation is possible, and the arguments presented above (pp. 201-202) might be thought to support the latter view. But Echion's concern that his cicaro learn a trade should not be taken to imply that he is unaware of his own status as a citizen: as we have seen (above, pp. 93-94) Echion is proud to be the domesticus of a local magistrate (45.5), and he looks forward to using his vote in the upcoming elections (45.10).

Furthermore, Echion's obvious affection for his cicaro says nothing about the boy's civil status. Many slave delicia assumed the position of natural children in their masters' households, and many were informally adopted.[50] A verse epitaph from Beneventum illustrates well the possibilities for social advancement open to a young slave chosen as his master's favorite: "Maroni alumno / C. Calpurnius / Lausus. / domino dilectus quoquo iret, semper /[5] comes poculi minister / doctus palaestrae puer / eques / sepultus hic sum na/tus annos octo et / decem" (CIL 9.1880 = ILS 5170 = CE 100). "Domino dilectus" and "poculi minister" point to the boy's original status as a slave, "alumno" to his subsequent informal adoption, and "eques" to the

substantial wealth he acquired (presupposing his manumission) -- all by the age of eighteen. Nor should the name "Primigenius" be thought to provide an indication of the boy's status: the cognomen was popular among slaves and freeborn persons alike, particularly at Rome.[51] In short, there is no reason to suspect that Echion does not use the term cicaro in the same way as Trimalchio, to describe his delicium, and there is good reason to believe that he does ("habebis ad latus servulum").[52]

Echion's cicaro, then, is destined to follow in his foster father's footsteps. Like Echion, he will one day become a freedman, and, like Echion, he will practice a freedman's trade. The theme is picked up later in the portraits of Habinnas and Trimalchio. At one point Habinnas boasts of the talents of his delicium, Massa: "desperatum valde ingeniosus est: idem sutor est, idem cocus, idem pistor, omnis musae mancipium" (68.7). A little later Trimalchio defends his affection for an attractive slave boy by praising his abilities: "puerum basiavi frugalissimum, non propter formam, sed quia frugi est: decem partes dicit, librum ab oculo legit, thraecium sibi de diariis fecit, arcisellium de suo paravit et duas trullas" (75.4). The two passages recall Echion's pride in his cicaro's accomplishments (46.3-4) and his intentions to train the boy as a barber, auctioneer, or pleader (46.7).[53]

We have noted that Petronius prefaces the series of five freedmen's speeches by emphasizing the immutability of

a freedman's status and that the point is made with a joke which illustrates that a freedman has no right to claim free birth -- in other words, with a joke that calls attention to the nature of a freedman's past. As Petronius elsewhere makes clear, the freedmen assembled at Trimalchio's table, like their host, are ex-slaves of Eastern origin (see above, pp. 78-79). Uprooted from their homelands and transplanted in a new world, they have no past beyond the memories of their childhood. Unlike the Roman aristocrats whom Trimalchio strives to emulate, Trimalchio has no imagines and no distinguished family tree to adorn his atrium, only a representation of his own career, prominently displayed in the portico (29.3-6), and, with his household gods, a likeness of himself (60.9).[54]

We can now see that Petronius closes the episode by showing that a freedman's mentality is bound to perpetuate itself. The temporal progression in the speeches (outlined above, pp. 182-183) is limited at either end. Echion's future, embodied in his cicaro, is that of a freedman. With one possible exception, none of the freedmen at Trimalchio's banquet seems to have any children.[55] With regard to the central figure, Petronius is explicit: "Agatho unguentarius here proxime seduxit me et 'suadeo' inquit 'non patiaris genus tuum interire'. at ego dum bonatus ago et nolo videri levis, ipse mihi asciam in crus impegi" (74.15-16). In the world of Petronius' freedmen, there are no freeborn sons. The protégés of Habinnas and Trimalchio will belong to the

same social category as their patrons. Petronius depicts a society bound within the limits of a man's lifetime. Freedmen have no roots and, as Petronius portrays them, no future.[56]

This explains how the characteristics emphasized in the episode of the freedmen's speeches are meant to reflect the nature of a freedman's status: egoism, a preoccupation with death, materialism, hedonism -- all are understandable in view of the fact that a freedman has grown up from nothing and sees no existence other than his own. Echion's idea of providing for his cicaro's future is to teach him to provide for himself. Trimalchio's monument is to be a highly personal memorial: "et ideo ante omnia adici volo: 'hoc monumentum heredem non sequatur'" (71.7). The formula declaring the tomb to be inalienable is in itself unremarkable, although Trimalchio's substitution of the subjunctive form "sequatur" for the customary present or future indicative would have struck a contemporary Roman as peculiar. The positioning of the restriction "ante omnia", however, is extraordinary. As Mommsen astutely observed, the importance that Trimalchio attaches to the phrase suggests that his concern is less to prevent Fortunata (cf. 71.3) from disposing of the tomb as she wishes after his death than to emphasize that the monument itself will not pass out of his possession.[57]

Above all, Petronius emphasizes the freedmen's preoccupation with "image" and their own reputations. We

have examined this aspect in some detail in the preceding chapter with regard to Hermeros and throughout our discussion with regard to Trimalchio. C. Pompeius Diogenes (38.10) and Iulius Proculus (38.16) post public notices attesting to their affluence. Seleucus admires the style of Chrysanthus' funeral (42.6), Phileros the amount of ready cash he left when he died (43.2). Plocamus likens himself to Apelles (64.4). Habinnas' official garb and retinue elicit admiration from Encolpius (65.3-4,6). Scintilla and Fortunata show off their jewels (67.6,9). Most tellingly, Echion derides the folly of a certain Glyco who, by consigning his dispensator to the beasts, publicly acknowledges that he is a cuckold: "Glyco, Glyco dedit suas; itaque quamdiu vixerit, habebit stigmam, nec illam nisi Orcus delebit" (45.9). For Echion, as for the other freedmen, a man's reputation while he is alive is of the utmost importance; but death ends all. Petronius' freedmen see no further than the limits of a man's lifetime.

Conclusion

In the first chapter I suggested that current explanations for Petronius' "realistic" depiction of Trimalchio's milieu are inadequate, and that an approach to the text which integrated literary and historical interpretations might lead to a better understanding of Petronius' artistic goals in the Cena. In the second chapter I tried to show that Petronius emphasizes the freedmen's civil status as the

determining characteristic in his portrayal of Trimalchio and his friends and that he shows them to be a group cut off from the rest of society: the freedmen's milieu is depicted as a social underworld and Encolpius' visit to Trimalchio's home as a katabasis. In Chapter Three I argued that the qualities that Petronius intended to be seen as characteristic of the group and that are often attributed to his realism were designed to make the freedmen seem vulgar and may have been included mainly for that purpose. Furthermore, I pointed out that the common conception of Trimalchio's guests as "Trimalchios in miniature" is mistaken: Petronius gives a more subtly varied representation freedmen's views of their place in society than is generally recognized.

In Chapter Four I argued that the portrait of Hermeros is drawn without distortion or exaggeration and that Hermeros' pride in having worked his way out of slavery is meant to balance Trimalchio's pretensions to equestrian rank; taken together, the two attitudes illustrate the true immutability of a freedman's status. By presenting Hermeros as a "typical" freedman, Petronius suggests that his literary representation of a freedman's society be seen as reflecting the circumstances of real freedmen of the period. In the present chapter I argued that Petronius' intention in the interlude following Trimalchio's departure from the table was to show how the peculiar nature of a freedman's condition shapes his mentality: the freedmen have no pasts and, as Petronius portrays them, no future; consequently,

their interests in life center on themselves. Throughout my discussion, I have tried to explain how Petronius' realism served his literary purposes.

Finally, I suggest that Petronius' achievement in the Cena is to have integrated the requirements of his chosen literary form with a plausible representation of his contemporary society more successfully there than in any other extant episode of the Satyricon. The stock figure of the boorish host familiar from a long tradition of banquet satire -- self-centered, arrogant, and lacking good taste -- shares many qualities with the wealthy freedmen who populated the cities of Campania during the Julio-Claudian era. But Petronius' depiction of Trimalchio's milieu is more than just a successful blend of "experience and imagination".[58] It is a carefully crafted picture of a society shaped by forces in the real world, where slaves transformed into citizens were barred by law and prejudice from entering into respectable Roman society. Having noted the similarities between the literary figure and the contemporary type, and having recognized what he believed to be the cause of the ostentatious materialism displayed by many freedmen, Petronius in the Cena developed the theme that Trimalchio's "vulgar" attitudes and behavior are explainable by the nature of a freedman's status, which is immutable and inescapable.

Notes to Chapter Five

[1]Cf., e.g., Maiuri, 46-48; Walsh, RN, 121-122; P. Trost, Listy Fil. 99 (1976), 150-152. For the freedmen's language, see above, pp. 75-76; pp. 100-101, nts. 9-11.

[2]M.S. Smith's comment on ch. 47 (125) is a fair representation of the communis opinio: "Petronius could not afford to let the inane conversation of the freedman guests drift on for too long."

[3]This was noted independently by H. Fuchs, "Verderbnisse", 63, and by E. Courtney, BICS 17 (1970), 66 and has been incorporated into the text of K. Müller's most recent edition (Müller-Ehlers[3]). Courtney suggests: "invitare <nos largius> [convivarum sermones]"; cf. also Smith's comment ad loc.

[4]Ciaffi, "Intermezzo", 113-145.

[5]Ciaffi's article has been unjustly ignored by most Petronian scholars, many of whom would have profited from his discussion. Ciaffi notes many verbal and thematic reminiscences which link the speeches to one another and which show that Petronius meant them to be viewed as a cohesive unit. Recognition of this alone would have done much to dispel the common misconception of the freedmen's talk as nothing but idle chatter. On the other hand, there is much in Ciaffi's argument of a speculative nature that will not always bear the inferences he derives. For example, Ciaffi's willingness to accept Ganymede's and Echion's disingenuous use of the diminuitive casulae (44.15, 46.2) as an accurate reflection of their economic condition (e.g., 129, 130, 134) forms a major stumbling block, since the word is best seen as one of the affected mannerisms that Trimalchio and his friends are wont to adopt in imitation of their social superiors: see Dell'Era, Problemi, 150-158, esp. 157-158 ("casula" on p. 152).

[6]I will argue below that Dama's contribution is designed to present the elements of a popular "Epicurean" philosophy. For the light of life and the darkness of death, see R. Lattimore, Themes in Greek in Latin Epitaphs (Urbana 1942), 161-164 (hereafter, Lattimore, TGLE); for the idea of "turning oneself" (versas te), cf. Sen., De Ira 43.5, "dum respicimus, quod aiunt, versamusque nos, iam mortalitas aderit."

[7]For the pilleus, see E. Samter, Philologus 53 (1894), 535-543, esp. 540-543. The boar with the pilleus may have reminded Petronius' audience of Trimalchio's Syrian

origins, in which case M. Hadas' explanation of "servus tuus" [= ego] at 41.3 as an expression of oriental derivation (AJP 50 (1929), 380) becomes more convincing (see above, p. 103 nt. 25). R.E.A. Palmer has recently explained the toponym ad Ursum Pileatum associated with a Christian cemetery in the Trastevere region of Rome as a relic held over from the days when a sanctuary to the Dea Syria had occupied the same location: "the bear wearing the libertycap was a stone statue garbed like the goddess's altar attendants" (cf. Luc., Dea Syria 41-42) (Proc. Am. Philosoph. Soc. 125 (1981), 393-397, quote from p. 394). I am unconvinced by L. Pepe's suggestion, GIF 1 (1948), 331-336 that the pileus was meant to be seen as a hint that the dish was a porcus Troianus, a pig stuffed with live game (cf. Macr., Sat. 3.13.13).

[8]See A.E. Housman, CR 32 (1918), 164. For similar puns on liber in which one of the senses involves the notion of civil status, cf. Plaut., Capt. 577-78, Cat. 84.5; CIL 3.1653 = 8143 (= CE 2162), "...liberti et heredes / a se f(aciundum) c(uraverunt) / non fui maritus et reliqui liberos", with Lommatzsch's comment ad loc. Cf. also Plaut., Cist. 127-128; CIL 8.15719 (= CE 623), "laetatus post magnos actus pauperes reliquit liberos spe liberos." In Trimalchio's case, the joke is particularly apt, since Pater Liber was not only the god of liberty for the Roman plebs (Plut., Quaest. Rom. 104) but also the divine protector of vintners and wine merchants (cf. 76.3,6): see A. Bruhl, Liber Pater: Origines et expansion du culte dionysiaque à Rome et dans le monde romain (Paris 1953), 41-42, 268-270, respectively.

[9]The rights of the freeborn could be conferred on a freedman by one of two, or possibly three, legal procedures: bestowal of the ius anuli aurei, restitutio natalium, and adrogatio libertini. The first two required the direct intervention of the Princeps and are attested in the early Empire only for ex-slaves who were particular favorites of the emperor. Direct evidence for the third is limited to two late texts which do not make clear whether adoption by a freeborn Roman citizen conveyed all the rights of ingenuitas; in any case, the procedure seems to have become obsolete already by the Ciceronian era. For the ius anuli aurei, see Appendix 3; for restitutio natalium, see Duff, FERE, 86-88; Millar, ERW, 489-490; for adrogatio libertini, see A. Watson, The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic (Oxford 1967), 90-98; Fabre, Libertus, 37-39; and, for a possible epigraphic instance datable to the Flavian period or slightly before, S. Panciera, in NSc 1975, 222-229 (but cf. S. Treggiari, LCM 6.3 (March 1981), 71-72).

[10]H. Bacon, Virginia Quarterly Review 34 (1958), 274-275 recognizes that the two jokes are meant to comment

on the freedmen's speeches, but I cannot see how her explanation of their significance relates to the rest of the episode: "In the scene that follows, the theme of freedom, wildness, and liberty is played on at every level from superficial punning to the searching irony of the portrayal of the world of freedmen who don't know how to use their freedom." For a different interpretation of the two jokes, see Dupont, Plaisir, 105-114, where, however, the argument is vitiated by the author's misunderstanding of Roman institutions: cf., e.g., p. 112: "Vous ne direz pas que je n'ai pas un père libre, c'est-à-dire: Vous direz que je suis citoyen romain".

[11]Cf. Xen., Symp. 2.23; Cic., 2 Ver. 1.66; other examples cited by J. Révay, CP 17 (1922), 208-209; L.R. Shero, CP 18 (1923), 136 nt. 2.. Cf. Hor., Serm. 2.8.35.

[12]So, first, A. Lehmann, PhW 20 (1900), 925-926; cf. Averil Cameron, CQ 19 (1969), 367-370; Dupont, Plaisir, 77 nt. 21 with further refs.

[13]For the characters in Plato's dialogue, see R.G. Bury The Symposium of Plato[2] (Cambridge 1932), xxiv-xxxvi, esp. xxvi-xxviii on Pausanius (quote from p. xxvii). For Phileros' conviction that might makes right, see below, p. 198.

[14]Cf. Dupont, Plaisir, 61-89, whose arguments I only partially accept. I am unconvinced by Dupont's main thesis that the entire Cena can be explained in terms of the absence of a "logos sympotikos", which is succinctly defined on p. 39 as "une médiation du plaisir".

[15]For "matus" = "soaked" (i.e. "drunk"), see M. Herren, CP 76 (1981), 286-292.

[16]Cf. Hor., Serm. 1.6.38, 2.5.18, 2.7.54. Persius' use of the name at 5.76 provides a particularly cogent parallel: "heu steriles veri, quibus una Quiritem / vertigo facit. hic Dama est? non tresis agaso / vappa lippus et in tenui farragine mendax? / verterit hunc dominus, momento turbinis exit / Marcus Dama.../ haec mera libertas, hoc nobis pillea donant" (5.75-82): see O. Pecere, SIFC 51 (1979), 131-138. Cf. also E. Post, Selected Epigrams of Martial (1908, repr. Norman, Oklahoma 1967), 292 ad 12.17.10: "Dama seems to be used in a half conventional way for any slave, as Gaius stands for any free citizen." Needless to say, "Dama" (or "Damas") was a common slave name in Rome and elsewhere: cf. Solin, Beiträge, 137 nt. 1 (Rome); Maiuri, 237 (Campania).

[17]Those who have tried to unravel Phileros' speech do not agree as to which sentences refer to which character:

cf., e.g., Waters; Sage-Gilleland; Maiuri; Ciaffi, "Intermezzo", 116 nt. 1; Marmorale; Perrochat; J.F. Killeen, Orpheus 15 (1968), 179-181. Smith, ad 43.4 "et inter initia" is cautious: "although there is no explicit statement it gradually becomes clear that Phileros is once more speaking about Chrysanthus and not about his brother."

[18]Malicious and quarrelsome: 47.5, 74.13-17, 75.6, 75.9 (Fortunata). Difficult to get along with: 28.7, 52.4-6, 47.13, 49.5-6 (the last two instances, however, are staged) (slaves); 74.10 (Fortunata). Generous: 50.1, 70.3, 70.10, 71.1-2 (slaves); 52.8, 71.3 (Fortunata). Courteous: 33.1 (?), 34.1, 48.1, 61.2, 64.2-3. Composed: 54.5, 59.1-2, 64.11. "Linguosus", which occurs only here and at 63.2, perhaps means simply "talkative", a more appropriate sense in the latter passage: Trimalchio's loquacity requires no demonstration. For Trimalchio's changeable personality, see Sullivan, Satyricon, 153; F.I. Zeitlin, TAPA 102 (1971), 660; Walsh, RN, 129-130.

[19]Cf. also 76.9 with D'Arms, CSS, 103; Rankin, Petronius the Artist, 25: "No doubt the freedmen who are present at [Trimalchio's] dinner party are in his debt" -- a plausible but unsupportable assumption.

[20]Cf. Hermeros on C. Pompeius Diogenes: "de nihilo crevit" (38.7). Of course any ex-slave could be said to have risen from nothing, since a slave had nothing; furthermore pride in having increased one's patrimony was not restricted to freedmen: cf. CE 1868, "patiens laborum / frugi vigilans sobrius / qui rem paravit haud / mediocrem familiae / domumque tenuem / ad equestrem promovit gradum"; CIL 12.1981 (= CE 438) with Bücheler's restoration, "de parvis rebus censum [sibi opesq(ue) paravit]" (both inscriptions evidently refer to freeborn men). This parallel, however, gains cogency from the other resemblances between the two portraits.

[21]J. Delz's correction of the ms. reading at 43.1 "itaque crevit, quicquid crevit" on the basis of the text at 76.8 (Gnomon 34 (1962), 682) has been accepted by all subsequent editors except Pellegrino: see Smith, ad loc.

[22]For "in nummis" meaning money lent at interest (not, as Smith maintains, "invested"), cf. Cic., Att. 8.10.1; Ver. 2.4.11; cf. also Hor., Serm. 1.3.88, where "nummos" means the principal owed. Trimalchio intends to have the phrase inscribed on his tombstone. In the only known epigraphic parallel for this practice, the deceased records the total worth of his patrimony: "...hic pridie quam mortuus est reliquit patrimoni HS (milia quingenta viginti)" (CIL 11.5400 = ILS 7812: 1st c. A.D.): cf. Th. Mommsen, Hermes 13 (1878), 120. Cf. also the will of

C. Caecilius Isidorus (obiit 8 B.C.) as reported by Pliny, NH 33.135: "Isidorus testamento suo edixit ...relinquere servorum IIII CXVI, iuga boum III DC, reliqui pecoris CCLVII, in numerato HS [DC] ...", on which see P.A. Brunt, Latomus 34 (1975), 625 nt. 17.

[23]Minucius Felix, Oct. 21.7 describes terrae filii as ignobiles et ignoti: see Otto, Sprichwörter, s.v. "terra" no. 2. With regard to the epitaph of a freedman, "mater genuit materq(ue) recepit" (CE 809) Hense, ad loc. compares Anth. Pal. 7.371 and notes that in Greece slaves were known as sons of the earth.

[24]As Grondona, Religione, 31 nt. 82 notes, this correspondence lends support to the ms. reading oracularios at 43.6, which many modern editors, following Reinesius, emend to oricularios (= auricularios) (so Müller). For a different defense of the ms. reading, see Alessio, Hapax, 211-212.

[25]E. Dobriou, Stud. Class. 10 (1968), 159.

[26]Grondona, Religione, 27-32 points out several of the parallels mentioned above and observes (p. 31): "da parte di Petronio, c'è stata l'intenzione di far sembrare la vita di questo sconosciuto simile in qualche modo a quella del padrone di casa". But he does not recognize how closely the portraits resemble one another, nor does he offer any suggestion as to what Petronius may have intended in drawing the parallel.

[27]"abiit ad plures" (42.5): CIL 6.142. "ille habet quod sibi debebatur" (43.1), as Lowe notes, a double entendre: 1) good fortune in life 2) death, a debt which all must pay; for the latter sense, cf. B. Lier, Philologus 62 (1903), 578-583; J. Tolman, A Study of the Sepulchral Inscriptions in Buecheler's "Carmina Epigraphica Latina" (Chicago 1910), 86-87 (hereafter, Tolman, Study); Lattimore, TGLE, 170-171. "amicus amico" (43.4): CIL 6.6275, 6548, 25570, 33575. "annos secum tulisse" (43.7): CIL 2.1413; 5.3496; 6.12178; 8.18110; 10.2311, 3030; 12.955.

[28]"medici illum perdiderunt" (42.5): CE 94, 543; ILS 9441; CIL 3.14188; A.M. Vérilhac, in G. Sabbah, ed., Centre Jean Palerne, Mémoires III: Médecins et médecine dan l'antiquité (Saint-Etienne 1982), 159-161. "malus fatus" (sic) (42.5): CE 1565; CIL 6.25808; further, Lattimore, TGLE, 157 and nt. 140 (cf. also Hor., Serm. 2.3.292-293, "casus medicusve"). "oracularios servi, qui illum pessum dederunt" (43.4): CE 1163, "non [ig]itur lector lachrimes? [de]cepit otrosque / maxima mendacia fama mathematici". "bene elatus est" (42.6): ILS 8529. "honeste vixit, honeste obiit" (43.1): many inscriptions record a life lived

honestly (cf. Tolman, Study, 42-43), but I have found only two that combine this thought with the idea of an honest death: CIL 6.10021; Diehl 2883 (cf. Maiuri ad loc.). "uncta mensa" (43.4): CE 483, "hic conviva fuit dulcis, nosset qui pascere amicos"; cf. CIL 4.1880, "at quem non ceno, barbarus ille mihi est". "malam parram pilavit" (43.4): CE 1533, the epitaph of a merchant shipper, "alma Fides, tibi ago grates, sanctissima diva, / fortuna infracta ter me fessum recreasti"; CE 950; R. MacMullen, Ancient Society 2 (1971), 109 and nt. 29 (astrologers' predictions); "Fortunae filius" (43.7): CE 512, 1533.

[29]CIL 6.15258 (= CE 1499). The same couplet occurs in two inscriptions that were judged by the editors of CIL to be modern forgeries: CIL 5.390*, 6.1649*. Bücheler notes that the model for the first line is to be found in Anth. Pal. 10.112. Grondona, Religione, 26 cites the same inscription apropos of the speeches of Dama and Seleucus but does not note the relevance of Phileros' final comment, nor does he explain how Petronius develops the theme.

[30]Indeed, in the epitaph cited above, nt. 29, we find the words "hic secum habet omnia" immediately preceding the couplet quoted in the text (p. 194). Cf. also CE 1317, "manduca, vibe, lude et veni ad me cum voles. cum vives benefac; hoc tecum feres"; CE 856, "ego sum discumbens ut me videtis. / sic et aput superos annis quibus fata dedere / animulam colui, nec defuit umqua Lyaeus / ...amici qui legitis, moneo, miscete Lyaeum / et potate procul redimiti tempora flore / et venereos coitus formosis ne denegate puellis: / cetera post obitum terra consumit et ignis."; CE 1318, "vixi Lucrinis potabi saepe Falernum. balnea vina Venus nocum senuere per annos"; ILS 8158, "tu qui legis, vade in Apolinis [sic] / lavari, quod ego cum coniu/ge feci; vellem si aduc possem"; CE 244, "quod edi bibi, mecum habeo, quod reliqui, perdidi." See further Lattimore, TGLE, 260-263 and especially, B. Lier, Philologus 63 (1904), 56-64 for many other examples drawn from Greek and Latin literature as well as from epitaphs in both languages.

[31]Note the pun in the final line: "esse" = "to be" (sum) and "to eat" (edo), which plays on the notion, commonplace in antiquity, that "one should eat to live rather than live to eat": see B. Baldwin, Maia 31 (1979), 145, with refs. For the equally commonplace association of dining with death, and in particular for the widespread use in convivial contexts of a skeleton as a memento mori, see W. Deonna and M. Renard, Croyance et superstitions de table dans la Rome antique (Coll. Lat. 46) (Brussels 1961), 99-104; Rostovtzeff, SEHRE[2], 56 and Plate VII.

[32]At one point Trimalchio implies that he will not be deprived of all sensation in the afterlife: "atatim

ampullam nardi aperuit omnesque nos unxit et 'spero' inquit 'futurum ut aeque me mortuum iuvet tamquam vivum'" (78.3); elsewhere he suggests that he will continue living in his tomb (71.7: cf. Lattimore, TGLE, 165-167). But in the same passage he explicitly states that he will survive after death only by the kindness of Habinnas, who will immortalize him by placing a statue on his monument (71.6). The overwhelming impression is that Trimalchio believes death to be final. Similar inconsistencies of belief are found in sepulchral inscriptions (Tolman, Study, 117-120).

[33]The ms. reading seems to be lacunose. The best solution is Muncker's, "cui <datum est>, datum est...", which many editors adopt. Others have tried to explain the text as transmitted (G. Süss, De eo quem dicunt..., 67; Ciaffi, "Intermezzo", 121 and nt. 1) or have suggested other supplements (Lowe, Pellegrino). The sense is clear in any case.

[34]Cf. E. Thomas, Pétrone[3], 118; Corbett, Petronius, 60; and, less explicitly, Walsh, RN, 122. For the pairing of bread and circuses, cf. Jos. AJ 19.16; Dio Chrys. 32.1; Juv. 10.80-81; Fronto, Princ. Hist. 2.18; see further, Mayor, Juvenal II, 98 ad Juv. 10.80-81.

[35]See, generally, Friedlaender, Maiuri, and Smith, ad chs. 44-45, passim. For Ganymede's accusation of collusion between the bakers and the aediles (44.3,13-14), cf. Sedgewick, 136, citing CIL 4.429, 434. For hostilities between local magistrates and the populace (44.3-4,14): Tac., Ann. 13.48.1-2 (Puteoli, A.D. 58), further, P.A. Brunt, Historia 10 (1961), 213 nt. 76; E. Wistrand, Eranos 79 (1981), 105-116 (on CE 417). For the price of bread (44.10-11), S. Mrozek, Eos 66 (1978), 153-155 (Alexandrian grain much cheaper at Puteoli in A.D. 37 than at Pompeii in the last years of the city); further, Duncan-Jones, ERE[2], 380-381; add CIL 4.4227 (?), 8561, 8566, 10674. For a sportula of HS 8 (45.10), Duncan-Jones, ERE[2], 138-144, esp. 141 (HS 8 average for Augustales). For Echion's political allegiance being determined by his opinion of the games given by rival candidates (45.11-13), cf. CIL 4.4999, "M. Casellium Marcellum aedilem bonum et munerarium magnum"; CIL 11.575, "ita candidatus fiat honoratus tuus / et ita gratum edat munerarius...". For a combat "sine fuga" as a special treat (45.6), P. Sabbatini Tumolesi, Gladiatorium Paria. Annunci di spettacoli gladiatorii a Pompei (Tituli 1) (Rome 1980), 150. For "magis illa matella digna fuit quam taurus iactaret" (45.8) as an allusion to the persecution of Christians under Nero, L. Pepe, GIF 3 (1950), 57-59.

[36]For "Safinius", cf. Maiuri, 236.

[37]Cf., e.g., Livy, 3.20; Hor., Carm. 3.6.1-8; and esp. Prop. 3.13.47-50. For the association of religion with morality, see Liebeschuetz, CCRR, 90-100, and for the importance attached to the correct observation of ritual as a peculiarly Roman phenomenon, id., 4-7.

[38]Cf. Livy 36.37.4; Friedlaender, ad loc.

[39]For the nudipedalia, cf. Tert., Apol. 40.14; Ieiun. 16; for the stola as the distinctive dress of Roman matrons, see Lowe, ad loc.; clivus = Capitolium, whether at Rome or in a colony.

[40]Smith, 107 notes the significance of Ganymede's name.

[41]Cf. 29.3-4, 30.2, 38.6, 39.4, 41.8, 48.4, 52.2, 58.3, 63.3, 69.3, 75.8-76.2.

[42]Some consider Echion to be describing not two different tutors but two sons, one bookish, the other inquisitive: Lowe, ad loc.; E.E. Best, CJ 61 (1965), 74-75; Arrowsmith, "Luxury and Death", 323-324. But the intended contrast seems to have been between the "good" teacher, who is diligent but not very learned (46.6), and the "bad" teacher, who is lazy but scholarly (46.5). Blümner's attractive conjecture "scit quidem litteras" for the ms. "sed venit dem litteras" (accepted by Müller in his second and third editions) completes the sense admirably; for defense of the ms. reading and for other suggestions, see Coccia, Interpolazioni, 77 nt. 289.

[43]See above, p. 107 nt. 45; cf. also Mart. 8.16.1-2: "pistor qui fueras diu, Cypare, / causas nunc agis et ducena quaeris". Little formal training was required: cf. CIL 6.4886, "...primus invenit causidicos imitari" with Habinnas' comments on his deliciae's education: "et num<quam>...didicit, sed ego ad circulatores eum mittendo erudibam. itaque parem non habet, sive mulliones volet sive circulatores imitari" (68.6-7).

[44]See D'Arms, CSS, 100-120, esp. 120: "the symbols to which [Trimalchio] attaches chief importance are not those of show but of substance: his zodiacal sign, cancer, that of the merchant (39.8); his patron deity, Mercury, protector of traders (29.3, 67.7, 77.4); and his household gods: Gain, Luck, and Profit (60.8)".

[45]By resorting to home tuition after he has already sent his cicaro out to school, Echion inverts the normal sequence and shows his ignorance of standard upper-class practice: A.D. Booth, TAPA 109 (1979), 18. Furthermore, in boasting that his protégé paints well (46.4), Echion

inadvertently reveals his plebeian attitudes: for Valerius Maximus and the younger Seneca, painting was sordidus and illiberalis: cf. MacMullen, RSR, 115, citing Val. Max. 8.14.6; Sen. Ep. 88.18. For Trimalchio's blunders, cf., e.g., 29.9, 31.8, 39.5-40.1, 47.2-7, 48.7-8, 52.1-3, 52.8-9, 55.5, 59.3-7.

[46]Cf., e.g., E. Thomas, Pétrone[3], 117; Maiuri, 47-48; Perrochat, 96; J.P. Lynch, Helios 9.1 (1981-82), 41-42. Even Ciaffi, who argues that Petronius' intention is to show Echion stifling his son's artistic inclinations, writes: "Che in Echione ci sia ora un maggiore intensità d'affetto, donde in noi una maggiore simpatia, è naturale: direi anzi che non a caso Petronio ha qui stabilito per lui il rapporto di tutti più favorevole" ("Intermezzo", 142-145, quote from p. 143).

[47]Non. Germ. Hist., Poetae Lat. Aevi Carol. 4.1, 430, cited by Müller[1] in app. crit. ad 46.5. M. Haupt, Hermes 7 (1873), 192 argued that, since Vulgarius does not seem to have known any other part of Petronius, he must have copied the phrase from Fulgentius; Müller[1], xxxiv nt. 1 is more cautious.

[48]The word "Cikaro" has been found in upper Germany stamped on several terra sigillata vases datable to the Augustan period (F. Marx, Bonner Jhrb. 107 (1901), 85), and the cognomen Cicarus is attested in inscriptions from Gaul and the Côte d'Or (see Alessio, Hapax, 69 with refs.). The etymology of the word, however, remains uncertain, despite Alessio, Hapax, 73-75, who attempts to link the term to the Etruscan clan (son) and clen-ar (sons): cf. Marbach, Wortbildung, 20-21; Kajanto, LC, 89; Pellegrino ad loc.

[49]Proverbial: Smith. Verbal slip: Friedlaender, Lowe, Perrochat. Most commentators are silent.

[50]Cf. CIL 6.18754 (= ILS 8554): a verna held "loco f(ilii)"; CIL 12.2039, a foster mother's epitaph to her delicium, "quem vice fili educavit et studis liberalibus produxit"; for the adoption of slaves, see further Fabre, Libertus, 37-39. Most alumni were slaves or freedmen: E. De Ruggiero, Diz. Ep. 1 (1895), 438-439; (note that Gellius 13.9 calls Tiro the alumnus of Cicero). For the social position of deliciae, cf. esp. Stat., Silv. 2.1.72-87, 113-119; 2.6; CIL 11.6435 (= CE 434); CIL 3.14206 (= ILS 7479); further, S. Aurigemma, in Diz. Ep. 2.2 (1910), s.v. "Delicium", 1600-1603; Veyne, "Trimalcion", 218-221; MacMullen, RSR, 174 nt. 67; W.J. Slater, BICS 21 (1974), 133-140 (esp. for their representation in literature). Sen., Ep. 12.3, which shows that not all deliciae retained their master's affection, has been overlooked.

[51]Cf. J. Champeaux, Latomus 34 (1975), 949; Kajanto, LC, 77, 134, 290.

[52]Veyne, "Trimalcion", 219-220 was the first modern scholar to recognize that Echion's cicaro is an alumnus and delicium rather than a freeborn son. His view has subsequently been taken up and supported with arguments similar to those given in the text by J. Champeaux, Latomus 34 (1975), 945-947 nt. 80 and A.D. Booth, TAPA 109 (1979), 16-17. M.S. Smith ad 46.3 observes that "Echion's concern for the boy's education does not prove that a boy of free birth is meant" and at 71.11, "cicaronem meum", he notes: "used similarly by Echion at 46.3".

[53]For the occupations mentioned by Habinnas and Echion, see above, p. 107 nt. 45. With regard to Trimalchio and the puer non inspeciosus (74.8), R. Schievenin, Boll. Stud. Lat. 6 (1976), 302 notes: "Il puer è già dunque bene incamminato sulla via del suo padrone....Nel puer dunque Trimalcione rivede se stesso, anzi si sente padre, orgoglioso del proprio figlio, già sicuro dei suoi successi futuri." Cf. Dupont, Plaisir, 163-166, where some astute remarks concerning this aspect of Petronius' depiction of the freedmen are intermingled with observations that are beside the point (e.g. that the "freeborn" protagonists Encolpius and Ascyltus are similarly childless).

[54]K. Hopkins, D&R, 255-256 has recently challenged the traditional view (after Mommsen, StR[3], I 442-446) that the ius imaginum was restricted to curule magistrates and their descendants. Hopkins' arguments do not significantly affect the interpretation advanced in the text: if he is correct, then the irony of Trimalchio's self-representation is even more poignant, since his inability to commemorate his ancestry distinguishes him not only from Roman aristocrats but also from any freeborn Roman citizen. For imagines put on display in Roman atria and arranged to form family trees, cf. refs. cited by Hopkins, D&R, 202 nt. 2. For Trimalchio's portico functioning as the atrium of his house, see G. Bagnani, AJP 75 (1954), 19-20 (Bagnani's arguments that the atrium itself was located "in medio" (29.9), however, are unconvincing).

[55]At 44.16, Ganymede says "ita meos fruniscar, ut ego puto omnia illa a diibus fieri": "meos" perhaps refers to a wife and children, but it might stand for Ganymede's familia; the phrase is in any case formulaic.

[56]In the real world the situation was different: at least in Italy and the western provinces, a substantial number of freedmen's sons entered into the world of municipal politics: see, e.g., M.L. Gordon, JRS 21 (1931), 65-77; P. Garnsey, in B. Levick, ed., The Ancient Historian

and His Materials: Essays in Honour of C.E. Stevens on His Seventieth Birthday (Farnborough 1975), 167-180, esp. 178.

[57]Th. Mommsen, Hermes 13 (1878), 116. For a plausible explanation of Trimalchio's use of "sequatur" in place of "sequitur" or "sequetur", see Tremoli, Iscrizioni, 19-20; the subjunctive form, though rare, is not without parallel: see E.J. Jory's and D.W. Moore's computerized word index to CIL 6 (part 7), s.v. "sequatur".

[58]The phrase is D'Arms', CSS, 99. For balanced assessments of the mixture of literary and "realistic" elements in Petronius' presentation, cf. Sullivan, Satyricon, 125-157; Walsh, RN, 133-140, esp. 139.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

LOCATION OF THE CENA

Baiae, Capua, Cumae, Herculaneum, Minturnae, Misenum, Neapolis, Pompeii, Puteoli, Terracina-Anxur. The list of towns nominated as candidates for the location of the Cena is long, but only three -- Naples, Cumae, and Puteoli -- have ever commended themselves to more than a few scholars.[1] Naples claims pride of place as the oldest nominee: in the ninth century, an anonymous Carolingian scribe glossed the words Graecae urbis at 81.3 with a laconic "Neapolis".[2] Naples was first suggested in print in the late sixteenth century, and for the next two hundred fifty years challenges to her birthright were few and generally unpersuasive.[3] But in the latter half of the nineteenth century, a number of scholars came out in favor of rival candidates, and the balance of scholarly opinion was upset.

The most original contribution was that of Mommsen, who in 1878 argued forcefully for Cumae.[4] There can be no doubt that the weight of Mommsen's opinion did much to encourage skepticism towards the traditional identification, but few were persuaded by Mommsen's choice, and the arguments of his contemporaries, who favored Puteoli, ultimately prevailed. In fact, most of the cogent reasons for identifying the Graeca urbs with Puteoli had already

been advanced by C. Ianelli at the beginning of the century.[5] But it was not until Ianelli's arguments had been bolstered by Friedlaender, Klebs, and Haley and authoritatively endorsed by Beloch and Nissen that Puteoli began to usurp the position previously held by Naples.[6] Since the beginning of this century, the case for Puteoli has been frequently strengthened and reaffirmed, while support for Naples and Cumae has dwindled, with the result that rival claims are no longer accorded serious consideration by those inclined to identify Trimalchio's city with a specific town.[7] Today, the chief oppostion to identifying the Graeca urbs with Puteoli comes from a different quarter.

As early as 1862 Bücheler expressed doubts about the usefulness of attempting to link the town of the Cena with a particular city. Noting what he believed to be fatal objections to both Puteoli and Naples, Bücheler suggested that Petronius may not have been particularly concerned to represent one town as opposed to the other.[8] Bücheler's cautious interpretation was at the time overshadowed by the contemporary debate over the rival claims of Puteoli, Cumae, and Naples. Eventually, however, cultivated by other hands, it blossomed into a full-blown theory that Petronius purposefully depicted an imaginary or conflated Campanian town.[9] In recent years, this view of the Graeca urbs as a "composite creation" has won a considerable following.[10]

It is one thing, however, to argue, as Bücheler did, that Petronius did not trouble to describe Trimalchio's city

in such a way that we are able recognize it, and another to claim that he consciously portrayed an imaginary town. The main problem with the latter theory (which is less acute in the case of Bücheler's proposal) is that it assumes that in their socio-economic makeup the towns on the Bay of Naples were essentially homogeneous and therefore interchangeable. But this was evidently not the case.[11] Furthermore, it seems ill-advised to imagine that Petronius' audience was less aware than we are of the cultural distinctions that gave Baiae, for example, a reputation for luxuria and Naples one for Greek culture and learning: wealthy Romans of the Julio-Claudian era passed much of their leisure time in villas situated around the crater delicatus, and many of them would have been intimately familiar with the various towns of the region.[12] Puteoli in particular so outstripped her neighbors in importance as a commercial center during the first century A.D. that it would have been difficult for a contemporary Roman, upon hearing of a freedman's ventures in seaborne commerce on the Bay of Naples, not to think immediately of Rome's principal port, perhaps the third largest city in Italy.[13]

That the conversation of Trimalchio's guests concerns other matters than shipping and trade, an objection frequently raised against Puteoli by proponents of the "composite town" theory,[14] is irrelevant. Petronius was under no obligation to restrict his characterization of the freedmen to their business concerns, and in any case, we

have seen that realism was not his primary concern in his depiction of the freedmen's occupational milieu (above, pp. 86-88; cf. pp. 76-78). The second objection to identifying the Graeca urbs with Puteoli is equally unconvincing. Mommsen excluded Puteoli on the grounds that the chief magistrates of that town were known as duoviri, whereas in the Cena we find reference only to local praetores (65.4,7).[15] But even if we discount the possibility, plausible in itself, that the term is used loosely to describe any chief magistrate,[16] the reference to praetors comes from an unreliable source, the narrator himself, who mistakes the garb and retinue of a sevir Augustalis for the trappings of municipal office (65.4). Encolpius, who can barely find his way around the city (cf. 6.3-4, 79.4), cannot be expected to provide accurate information regarding the designation of the local officials.

If we consider the location of the Cena not from the modern critic's standpoint -- by weighing the topographical, architectural, and administrative indications given in the text against the qualifications of various towns -- but rather from the author's literary point of view, it appears that Puteoli would have offered an especially attractive setting for a satire on freedmen, particularly those of Eastern origin. D. Musti has recently argued, partly from the onomastic evidence provided by Puteolan inscriptions, that from the second century B.C. until at least the end of the first century A.D., Puteoli functioned as an important

center for the trade in Eastern slaves -- in Italy, perhaps, second only to Rome.[17] D'Arms has calculated that freedmen outnumber the freeborn in the nearly 1,500 known inscriptions from Puteoli by a ratio of approximately 10 to 1.[18] Finally, we have seen that the institution of the Augustales, which provided a political outlet for municipal freedmen with wealth and social ambition, was especially prosperous at Puteoli, where the seviri were numerous enough to require formal organization into centuriae (above, pp. 142-143). This evidence suggests, first, that Eastern slaves and freedmen in general were particularly common in Puteoli, and, more important, that the phenomenon of the successful independent freedman may have been especially conspicuous in Italy's principal port. What better environment, then, in which to place an imaginary creature like Trimalchio than one in which real members of the species thrived?

If a modern author writing for an American audience were to set his novel in a major port that was within a day's traveling distance of Boston, Philadelphia, and Washington, his readers would not need to be told what city he had in mind. And if this novel included a portrayal of the mores of a conspicuous immigrant group, say, Puerto Ricans, he would of course be at liberty to locate his characters in Hartford or Hoboken, or in any "imaginary" city, but his drama would gain in poignancy as well as verisimilitude if they were allowed to reside in New York. Even so with the Satyricon, Puteoli towered over all other

candidates as the appropriate setting for a satiric portrait of an ex-slave of Eastern origin. We should not expect the Graeca urbs to have been described so specifically that two thousand years later we could reconstruct her skyline. Petronius was not Pausanius. But all indications point to the fact that Petronius lavished careful, and by ancient standards, unusual attention on his urban landscapes.[19] Is he then likely to have been less discriminating in his choice of a canvas on which to paint? The Graeca urbs probably was identified at some lost point in the narrative; if that scrap of the Satyricon should fortuitously come to light, we can feel confident that the text would read: Puteoli.

Notes to Appendix 1

[1]For Capua, Herculaneum, Minturnae, and Terracina-Anxur, see references cited by K.F.C. Rose, TAPA 93 (1962), 403 nt. 4. For Cumae, Misenum, Naples, and Puteoli, see Marmorale, QP, 118-123; below, nts. 2-7. Pompeii: Sedgewick, 22; Baiae: A. Savio, NAC 3 (1974), 123 nt. 6. I omit the most aberrant suggestions: Ancona and even "some Roman colony in the Greco-Oriental world outside of Italy" have been mooted (see A. Rini, Petronius In Italy (New York 1937), 119 nt. 711).

[2]The vetus glossarium S. Benedicti Floriacensis which Pierre Daniel acquired from the Benedictine Abbey at Fleury after its sack by the Huguenots in 1562 has recently been identified by K. Müller with a ms. in the British Museum (cod. Harleianus 2735): see Müller-Ehlers[2], 405 nt. 29 = Müller-Ehlers[3], 408 nt. 31.

[3]K.F.C. Rose, TAPA 93 (1962), 403-404 awards credit for the identification to Jan Dousa (van der Does), Praecidanea (Leiden 1583), 1.2.8 (= Burmann[2], 9 col. 2), H.W. Haley, HSCP 2 (1891), 28 to Pierre Pithou, whose two editions of Petronius were published at Paris in 1577 and 1587.

[4]Th. Mommsen, Hermes 13 (1878), 108-115.

[5]C. Ianelli, In Perottinum Codicem...Dissertationes Tres (Naples 1811), 189-261, esp. 242-246. Puteoli had first been mentioned by N. Ignarra, De Palaestra Neapolitana (Naples 1770), 183-184, who preferred Naples. Ignarra, loc. cit., was the first to recognize that there were only three plausible candidates: Puteoli, Naples, and Cumae.

[6]L. Friedlaender, Index Lect. Acad. Albert. (Regimonti 1861), 3-4; Cena[2] (1906), 8-10; H.W. Haley, HSCP 2 (1891), 35-40; E. Kleba, Philologus Supplb. 6 (1891-93), 677-680; K.J. Beloch, Campanien: Geschichte und Topographie des antiken Neapel und seiner Umgebung[2] (Breslau 1890), 88-143, passim, 451; H. Nissen, Italische Landeskunde II.2 (Berlin 1902), 737-743.

[7]For Puteoli, see I. Sgobbo, RAL 31 (1922), 354-363, 395-406; A. Maiuri, Cena (1945), 5-14; PP 3 (1948), 106-108; K.F.C. Rose, TAPA 93 (1962), 403-405; Sullivan, Satyricon (1968), 46-47; G. Camodeca, Puteoli 1 (1977), 92-94; D'Arms, CSS (1981), 105-106. Occasionally nowadays a scholar suggests an alternative candidate (e.g. R. Martin, REL 53 (1975), 223 nt. 6: Naples; A. Savio (above, nt. 1): Baiae), but no new arguments are being advanced.

[8]F. Bücheler, Petronii Arbitri Satiriarum Reliquiae (Berlin 1862), viiii: "itaque caveamus oportet ne arbitrario iudicio interpretati verba scriptoris qui fortasse unam et eandem coloniam ne ipse quidem statuerat, praepostere nos alteram utram decernamus."

[9]Cf. Paratore I, 180-185, 209-211; Marmorale, QP, 127-133. Cf. also Sage-Gilleland, 219-220. The theory of P. Veyne, REL 42 (1964), 321-322 nt. 2 that Petronius portrayed a specific location (Puteoli) in the Cena but elsewhere sketched in only an imaginary urbs Graeca was largely anticipated by E. Lommatzsch, Lexicon Petronianum (Leipzig 1898), iii nt. 2, who proposed that Trimalchio's banquet was set in Naples (the Graeca urbs) but that outside the Cena Petronius imagined only an unspecified Roman town. Neither view is convincing.

[10]Cf. Walsh, RN, 75-76, quotation from p. 75; H.C. Schnur, CW 66 (1972), 14; M. Coffey, Roman Satire, 181; Duncan-Jones, ERE^2, 247-248.

[11]The outlines of this problem have only recently begun to take shape, now that comprehensive studies of several individual towns are available: see D'Arms, CSS, 87 nt. 66 citing works by Frederiksen, D'Arms, Lepore, Andreau, and Castrén on Capua, Puteoli, Naples, and Pompeii; cf. also E. Lepore, PP 10 (1955), 423-439 on Herculaneum, and the remarks of G.W. Houston, in MAAR 36 (1980), 166 regarding the possibly anomalous nature of the socio-economic conditions prevailing in Puteoli of the imperial period.

[12]See D'Arms, RBN, passim, esp. 42-43, 119-120 (Baiae); 56-58, 142-146 (Naples).

[13]For Puteoli, see M.W. Frederiksen, RE 23 (1959) s.v. "Puteoli", 2043; D'Arms, RBN, 81-82, 138-139; CSS, 122-125; S. Panciera, in I Campi Flegrei nell'archeologia e nella storia: Convegno internazionale 1976 (Atti dei Convegni Lincei 33) (Rome 1977), 191-211; for the size of the population: G. Camodeca, Puteoli 1 (1977), 88-91. Nero's scheme to link Lake Avernus to the Tiber mouth by means of an inland canal attests the importance, and for Petronius perhaps also the topicality, of Puteoli precisely in the late Neronian period: cf. Tac., Ann. 15.42.2-4 (A.D. 64); Suet., Nero, 31.3; D'Arms, RBN 97-98.

[14]Most recently by Duncan-Jones, ERE^2, 247.

[15]Th. Mommsen, Hermes 13 (1878), 113-114, followed by many. Mommsen did not consider the phrase "praetorio loco" at 65.7, the significance of which has been only partly explained (by Friedlaender, ad loc).

[16]Cf. E. Klebs, Philologus Supplb. 6 (1891-93), 670-676.

[17]D. Musti, in MAAR 36 (1980), 197-215; second only to Rome: Harris, in op. cit., 126. Musti treats the Satyricon with caution, and his arguments are convincing even if one discounts the evidence for Eastern slaves and the slave trade in Petronius (cf. esp. his remarks on p. 205). Musti's rough estimate (213 nt. 20) of the proportion of Oriental names in Puteolan nomenclature (much greater than 2%) is appreciably higher than the figure of 1.9% arrived at on a more scientific basis for Rome by H. Solin, "Orientalische Sklaven", 212 (but cf. Solin, Arctos 15 (1981), 161).

[18]J.H. D'Arms, JRS 64 (1974), 112 nt. 71.

[19]See now the interesting study of C. Rindi, "Lo scenario urbano del Satyricon", Maia 32 (1980), 115-134. Rindi concludes (130) that the similarities between Croton and the Graeca urbs in Petronius' representation are far greater than the differences -- further proof that imaginative description blended easily with realism in Petronius' portrayal of Roman towns.

APPENDIX 2

SAT. 38.9: EST TAMEN SUB ALAPA

reliquos autem collibertos eius cave contemnas. valde aucosi sunt. videa illum qui in imo imus 7
recumbit: hodie sua octingenta possidet. de nihilo crevit. modo solebat collo suo ligna
5 portare. sed quomodo dicunt -- ego nihil scio, 8
sed audivi -- cum Incuboni pilleum rapuisset, [et] thesaurum invenit. ego nemini invideo, si quid deus dedit. est tamen sub alapa et non 9
vult sibi male. itaque proxime cenaculum hoc 10
10 titulo proscripsit: "C. Pompeius Diogenes ex kalendis Iuliis cenaculum locat: ipse enim domum emit".

5 cum Bücheler (quom) : quomodo H 7 et del. Scheffer 8 quid Bücheler : quo H : alii alia 9 cenaculum Bücheler : oecum Iac. Gronovius : cum H : post cum aliquid excidisse suspicatus est Fraenkel (apud Müller[1]), item H. Fuchs, in Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik, edd. H. Dahlmann et R. Merkelbach, 62-63.

Hermeros points out one of the freedmen guests to Encolpius and explains that, although the man has recently come into some money, he is nonetheless "under the slap". The expression "sub alapa" is generally taken to mean that the porter C. Pompeius Diogenes has only recently received the open-handed cuff on the head which was a common, though not essential, feature of the manumission ritual.[1] Lowe, basing himself on a comment which Friedlaender made in his first edition (1891) but which he later omitted from his second edition (1906), thought that it meant "'he can still put up with his old master's petulance,' the habit of self-suppression being still deeply ingrained." According to Bücheler (in his fourth edition), Hermeros meant that

Diogenes was not yet truly rich, that he was still a slave to business and moneymaking.[2] Sage proposed: "'He has not forgotten his manumission (and the way -- probably discreditable -- he got the money to buy his freedom)'" and claimed that this was "a meaning confirmed by the rest of the sentence". V. Pisani suggested: "ha ancora le idee confuse dal suo mutamento di condizioni".[3] All other commentators who accept the ms. reading interpret the phrase generally to mean that Diogenes has only recently been freed.

But the context requires something more specific: the expression must mark a contrast with the preceding sentence (tamen) and explain the motivation for the actions described in the following sentence (itaque). Only Bücheler's suggestion adequately satisfies both requirements. In light of the remarks that Hermeros makes elsewhere, however, with regard to his own trade (cf. 58.14, "quod me sic vides, propter artificium meum diis gratias ago") and to acquisitive pursuits in general (cf. 58.12, "ita lucrum faciam") it is unlikely that he would condemn, or lament, the same attitudes in Diogenes.

I suggest that the phrase was perhaps, in freedman's argot, an expression to describe a libertus who was still under obligation to provide operae to his patron.[4] We know that under the Empire a patron had the option of accepting a sum of money equivalent to the value of a freedman's operae in place of the services themselves;[5] but he was under no

obligation to do so,[6] and many operae were of such a nature that they could not readily be translated into monetary terms.[7] Diogenes' windfall, then, need not have released him from his duties to his patron, and Hermeros would have good reason not to begrudge him his substantial wealth (38.8), twice the equestrian census (38.7), since it brought him no closer to independence from his former master. An overlooked graffito from Pompeii shows that the term "alapa" was current in popular usage and could be used metaphorically, most probably to describe a person in some form of subordination to another person (or, perhaps, in subservience to a deity).[8]

We may now consider how the phrase relates to what follows. Hermeros says that Diogenes does not wish himself any harm ("non vult sibi male")[9] and therefore ("itaque") set up the following rental notice: "C. Pompeius Diogenes ex kalendis Iuliis cenaculum locat: ipse enim domum emit". The social pretensions revealed by Diogenes' public declaration to have bought a house are generally recognized. This sheds some light on Petronius' literary intentions in his portrayal of the freedmen but does not explain how the notice is meant to protect Diogenes' interests. Only Maiuri takes this factor into account. He notes a further implication behind the wording of the first clause which suggests that Diogenes may have had an entirely different motive for posting the notice: "[Diogenes] tiene a dichiarare [perchè a dato in fitto il cenacolo, ma non la bottega, quando è

comprato una casa] per non dare a credere che, cedendo il cenacolo, abbia smessa la diretta gestione del suo commercio."[10] Maiuri's interpretation finds support in the legal sources. Noting that several passages in the Digest associate the paying off of operae by artisans with restrictions on the patron's right to exact services no longer "consonant with the freedman's dignity", E.M. Staerman observes: "evidentemente, venivano presi in considerazione i ricchi liberti che ritenevano umiliante eseguire lavori artigianali".[11]

The interpretation suggested above does not diminish the likelihood that Petronius' primary intention in this passage was to show a freedman's boastfulness in announcing the purchase of a house. But it explains why the posting of the rental notice would have been a direct consequence of Diogenes' not wishing to hurt his own interests: he would have been forestalling any possible difficulties with his patron by reassuring him that he intended to continue practicing his trade, from which his patron could expect to continue receiving the benefits of the operae due him.[12]

Notes to Appendix 2

[1]Cf., e.g., Maiuri and Marmorale, ad loc.; Alessio, Hapax, 345-346. There is no need to suppose that the word represents an otherwise unattested compound derived from the verb alapari, "to boast", which is found only in glossaries, and to emend the ms. reading to subalapo (= subalapator) (Heräus, 110, Friedlaender, Sedgwick) or subalapa (Schmeck, Müller[1-3], Smith). For the etymology of both alapa and alapari, which perhaps stem from the same root, see M. Gonzales-Haba, Glotta 47 (1969), 253-264. The suggestion of W. Havers, IF 28 (1911), 189-190, "he has been struck by the mala manus and is therefore crazy" is untenable, despite T. Hudson-Williams, CR 25 (1911), 205-206). For the alapa of manumission, see R. Nisbet, JRS 8 (1918), 5-14.

[2]Cf. Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum VI.47, s.v. "alapus": "qui propter mercedem alapas patitur".

[3]V. Pisani, Rend. Acc. Linc. 4 (1928), 347-349.

[4]The bibliography of modern scholarship on operae is daunting. Fabre, Libertus, 317 nt. 5, cites 24 modern studies in a select list compiled from works of this century alone. For good recent discussions, see Treggiari, RFLR, 75-78; Fabre, Libertus, 317-331, esp. 325-331; cf. also D'Arms, CSS, 103 nt. 30.

[5]Cf. Dig. 40.9.32.1 (Ter. Clem., lib. 8 ad leg. Iul. et Pap.) : "non prohibentur lege Aelia Sentia patroni a libertis mercedes capere, sed obligare eos", on which, see Fabre, Libertus, 324-325, with bibliography.

[6]Cf. Dig. 38.1.24 (Jul., 52 Dig.): "ex commodo patroni libertus operas edere debet."; 38.1.22.pr. (Gaius, 14 ad ed. prov.): "cum enim operarum editio nihil aliud sit quam officii praestatio, absurdum est credere alio die deberi officium quam quo is vellet, cui praestandum est."; 38.1.25.4 (Jul., 65 Dig.): "nonnumquam autem ipsis libertis postulantibus patroni operas locant: quo facto pretium magis operarum quam mercedem capere existimandi sunt."

[7]In this regard, Treggiari, RFLR, 77 cites some of the "hardly definable jobs carried out by Tiro (such as maintaining contact with his patron's friends, acting as family go-between, and keeping an eye on the political scene)". We may suspect that, in certain circumstances, the services of a skilled doctor (Dig. 38.1.26) or painter (38.1.24) or actor (38.1.7.5; 38.1.27), or of one whose duties included "custodia domus" (38.1.49) would be equally difficult to assess in financial terms.

[8]"Cissoni alapa duuveris [= pueris ? duoviris ?] felic(i)ter" (CIL 4.4944); cf. CIL 4.3196a. For "Cissonius", a surname of the Gallic Mercury as well as a gentilicium, see P. Castrén , Ordo Populusque Pompeianus: Polity and Society in Roman Pompeii (Rome 1975), 154. Compare the use of "umbra" to describe an uninvited guest or hanger-on, e.g., in Plaut., Pers. 298; Hor., Serm. 2.8.22; Ep. 1.5.28.

[9]Most translators and commentators either take the expression as an example of litotes or substitute their own paraphrases: cf. "he is a high-flyer and looks out for number one" (Waters); "[he] doesn't begrudge himself the very best" (Lowe); "he looks after his interests well" (Sage); "[he doesn't] stint himself" (Sedgwick); "yes sir, he's doing all right" (Arrowsmith, Satyricon trans. [Ann Arbor 1959]); "[he] wants to give himself a good time" (Sullivan, Satyricon trans. [London 1965]); [he] has a fine opinion of himself" (Warmington) [Loeb]; "non si tratta male" (Paratore, II, 115); "si tratta bene" (Marmorale, Dèttore, Satyricon trans. [Milan 1953]); "il veut se donner du bon temps" (Ernout); "gönnt sich das Beste" (Friedlaender). Many compare 38.11, "quam bene se habuit", or 58.3, "bene nos habemus", but the idiom depends upon the verb, and the parallels are therefore unconvincing. Until better evidence is found that "non vult sibi male" can mean the opposite of what it says, it seems best to take the expression literally, as, indeed, all the examples of "velle male/bene" cited in the OLD s.v. "volo" no. 15 suggest. Thus I prefer translations such as Smith's, "he doesn't mean to harm himself", and Ehlers', "läsat sichs nicht schlecht gehen" (Müller-Ehlers[2-3]).

[10]Maiuri, 170. Note that in the Satyricon the contubernalis of Niceros' girlfriend, though an innkeeper, nonetheless lives in a "villa" (61.6,9).

[11]Staerman, Schiavitù, 113.

[12]From Dig. 38.1.16.pr. (Paul. lib. 40 ad ed.) it may be inferred that freedmen who practiced a trade or craft normally paid off their operae with services related to their profession: "Eius artificii, quod post manumissionem didicerit libertus, operas debebit praestare,...nec semper hae [has: Mommsen], quae manumissionis tempore praestari debuerunt." Treggiari, "Urban Labour", 53-54 notes the paucity of explicit evidence for freedmen shopkeepers discharging their operae in this manner but rightly points out that the "fairly frequent references [in the Digest] to operae fabriles vel pictoriae and to artificia suggest that particular importance was attached to craftsmen." Cicero, writing to Atticus concerning two of his freedmen who had broken their oaths to perform operae and to protect his son, was shocked at the behavior of one of them, whom he favored

"propter litterularum nescio quid", but was less surprised that the other, an "operarius homo", had been derelict (Att. 7.2.8). The implication is that wage-earners and craftsmen could be expected to welch on their obligations to their patrons.

APPENDIX 3

THE IUS ANULI AUREI IN THE JULIO-CLAUDIAN PERIOD[1]

Until A.D. 23 the *ius anuli aurei* had been restricted to senators and *equites equo publico*. In that year a *senatus consultum* extended the privilege to equestrian *iudices* who could prove the census qualification of HS 400,000, freeborn status for three generations, and the right to sit in the first fourteen rows at the theater.[2] Ever since the time of Octavian, however, the Princeps had occasionally bestowed the *ius anuli aurei* on privileged freedmen, thereby granting them a fictitious *ingenuitas*.[3] Evidently this honor was highly valued and eagerly sought after, for widespread usurpation of the *ius anuli aurei* by freedmen during the Augustan and early Tiberian periods led to the enactment in A.D. 24 of a *lex Visellia de libertinis* in which specific penalties, including *infamia* as well as fines, were proscribed for ex-slaves who laid claim to the offices and privileges of the freeborn.[4] In A.D. 48 an equestrian named Flavius Proculus arraigned four hundred persons under this law, and in the time of Vespasian the Elder Pliny complained that usurpation of the prerogative had become so prevalent that a rank meant to distinguish the holder from other men of free birth was being shared even with slaves.[5]

I know of no discussion of the *ius anuli aurei* during the Julio-Claudian period that is both complete and wholly correct. On many points the contribution of Duff remains fundamental, especially in correcting the view held by Mommsen and Stein that during the first century the *ius anuli aurei* conveyed also the *equus publicus*.[6] But Duff is mistaken in believing (p. 220) that the *senatus consultum* of A.D. 23 was designed specifically to negate the legality of imperial grants of the *ius anuli aurei*, and that the *lex Visellia* of the following year reversed the *senatus consultum* because it had proved impractical. Imperial conferral of the *ius anuli aurei* was never repealed by law: the Emperor's prerogative was in this case strictly extra-legal.[7] Furthermore, our only source for the content of the *senatus consultum*, Pliny, *NH* 33.32, suggests that the restrictions were directed not against those who had legitimately won the privilege by imperial favor -- these in any case were few[8] -- but rather against those who had illegally usurped it.[9] The clause in the *lex Visellia* exempting legitimate holders of the right from penalty[10] merely confirmed what had long been established practice.

Among recent discussions, that of Reinhold is most complete, but Reinhold is incorrect in maintaining that the grant of the gold ring "dissolved the rights of patrons over freedmen."[11] M.I. Henderson's careful analysis of Pliny, *NH* 33.32-33 leads to a diagnosis of corruption in the text. In arguing that the phrase "quoniam in ferreo anulo et equites

iudicesque intellegebantur" (33.33) is a scholiast's explanatory comment interpolated into the text, Henderson eliminates a red herring and dispels much of the confusion surrounding Pliny's statements regarding freedmen's usurpation of equestrian status.[12] But her admirably lucid argument is vitiated by the omission of any discussion of the lex Visellia of A.D. 24.

Henderson is followed closely by Treggiari, who likewise disregards the lex Visellia. Treggiari points out that imperial bestowal of the gold ring seems not to have carried with it the right to sit in the first fourteen rows, which was jealously guarded by equestrian iudices and equites equo publico.[13] Sherwin-White (2) inexplicably conflates the senatus consultum of A.D. 23 and the lex Visellia of the following year, citing Pliny, NH 33.32 as evidence for both and claiming that the latter, which he assigns to the year 23, merely "implemented" the former.[14] But Pliny clearly dates the senatus consultum to A.D. 23; equally clearly, Pliny ignores the lex Visellia, which belongs to the year 24, when L. Visellius Varro was ordinary and hence eponymous consul.[15] Despite confusing the dates of the two laws, Sherwin-White (2) makes the important point that although the imperial grant of the ius anuli aurei bestowed only fictitious ingenuitas and not equestrian status per se, the two are inextricably associated in literary texts down to the time of Trajan.[16]

The brief outline given above of the status of the *ius anuli aurei* during the Julio-Claudian period allows us to put Hermeros' remarks at 57.4 and 58.10 into perspective.[17] First, and most important, during the first century gold rings were universally taken as a sign of equestrian status. Second, true transgressions of the law restricting the right to wear them to those who possessed the proper qualifications were common, even after enactment of the *lex Visellia* in A.D. 24. Third, Ascyltus, like Trimalchio, only infringes on the law without actually breaking it: Hermeros implies that Ascyltus' rings are made not of gold but of boxwood, and that he has stolen them from his girlfriend.[18]

Notes to Appendix 3

[1]In this Appendix the following abbreviations are used:

Duff = A.M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Oxford 1928), 85-86, 214-220.
Henderson = M.I. Henderson, "The Establishment of the Equester Ordo", *JRS* 53 (1963), 61-72.
Kaser = M. Kaser, *Das römische Privatrecht*[2] (Munich 1971).
Kolb = F. Kolb, "Zur Statussymbolik im antiken Rom", *Chiron* 7 (1977), 239-259.
Millar = F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (Ithaca 1977).
Mommsen = Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*[3] (Leipzig 1887-88), vol. III, 517-519.
Nicolet = Cl. Nicolet, *L'ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine (312-43 av. J.C.)* (Paris 1966).
Reinhold = M. Reinhold, "Usurpation of Status and Status Symbols in the Roman Empire", *Historia* 20 (1971), 275-302.
Sherwin-White (1) = A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford 1966).
Sherwin-White (2) = A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*[2] (Oxford 1973).
Stein = A. Stein, *Der römische Ritterstand. Ein Beitrag zur Sozial- und Personengeschichte des römischen Reiches* (Munich 1927), 30-47, 54-57.
Treggiari = S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic* (Oxford 1969).
Vasileiou = A. Vasileiou, "Deux remarques sur l'anneau d'or", *Ant. Class.* 40 (1971), 649-657.
Weaver = P.R.C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris. A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves* (Cambridge 1972).
Wiseman = T.P. Wiseman, "The Definition of 'Eques Romanus' in the Late Republic and Early Empire", *Historia* 19 (1970), 67-83.

[2]Pliny, *NH* 33.32.

[3]Cf. Dio 48.45.7; Suet., *Aug.* 74; Appian, *BC* 5.338.

[4]Cf. *CJ* 9.21.1, 9.31, 10.33.1; *CT* 9.20.

[5]Pliny, *NH* 33.33; cf. 33.29, Mart. 2.29, 5.14, and esp. 11.37.

[6]Duff, Mommsen, and Stein: see above, nt. 1; cf. also Wiseman, 76-83 for the distinction between *equites* and *equites equo publico*, operative already under Augustus and

(following Mommsen, III 490-491) not made obsolete until sometime between Vespasian's census in 72 and the time of Hadrian.

[7]Henderson, 70.

[8]Weaver, 282-283.

[9]Cf. Pliny, NH 33.33: "passimque ad ornamenta ea etiam servitute libertati transiliant."

[10]"nisi iure anulorum impetrato a principe sustenantur" (CJ 9.21.1.pr. (Diocl. a. 300?)).

[11]Reinhold, 284-287, 287; cf. Frag. Vat. 226; Ulpian, Dig. 38.2.3.pr., 40.10.6, 2.4.10.3; CJ 9.21.1.pr. See Kaser, I 299 and nts. 25-26, II 142; Nicolet, I 141; Millar, 488-489.

[12]Henderson, 67-70.

[13]Treggiari, 66-67; cf. also Wiseman, 72. But cf. Mart. 2.29, esp. v. 3, "et puros eques ordines recepit"; 5.14.2.

[14]Sherwin-White (2), 331. In his earlier discussion (Sherwin-White (1), 453-454), Sherwin-White preserves the distinction between the two measures and the correct dating.

[15]For the consuls of A.D. 23, cf. PIR^2 A 772, 1242; for L. Visellius Varro, cf. R. Hanslik, in RE IX A.1 (1961), s.v. "Visellius", 360-361 no. 7.

[16]Sherwin-White (2), 331 nt. 1; cf. also Kolb, 247, 249, 252-253; contra, Vassileiou, 654-657, who adds the observation that the phrase "ius anulorum" (or its Greek equivalent) which is found in several imperial authors (e.g. Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio, and Plutarch) represents a "technical plural" and that the ius anuli aurei strictly conferred only a single ring (649-654).

[17]"eques Romanus es: et ego regis filius" (57.4); "nisi si me iudicas anulos buxeos curari, quos amicae tuae involasti" (58.10).

[18]Trimalchio wears only an anulus grandis subauratus (32.3) but intends to have himself represented "cum anulis aureis quinque" on his tomb (71.9): see the comments of W. Ehlers in Müller-Ehlers^3, 511-512 (= Müller-Ehlers^2, 455-456. For Hermeros and Asacyltus, see also above, pp. 121-122.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography comprises two sections. The first section consists of a list of the editions and commentaries that are cited in the notes by author's name alone. In the second section I have listed, in additon to the works mentioned several times in the preceding pages, a number of studies cited only once or twice that have a direct bearing on the problem of interpreting Petronius' representation of freedmen in the Cena or that have otherwise significantly influenced my understanding of the Satyricon.

I

List of Editions and Commentaries

Bücheler, F., Petronii Arbitri Satirarum Reliquiae, editio maior (Berlin 1862); 4th ed. (Berlin 1904).

Burmann, P., Titi Petronii Arbitri Satyricon Quae Supersunt (Utrecht 1709); 2nd ed. (Amsterdam 1743).

Ernout, A., Pétrone, Le Satiricon, 3rd ed. (Paris 1923).

Friedlaender, L., Petronii Cena Trimalchionis, 2nd ed. (Leipzig 1906).

Lowe, W.D., Petronii Cena Trimalchionis (Cambridge 1905).

Maiuri, A., La Cena di Trimalchione di Petronio Arbitro (Naples 1945).

Marmorale, E.V., Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis, 2nd ed. (Florence 1961).

Müller, K., Petronii Arbitri Satyricon, editio maior (Munich 1961).

Müller, K. and Ehlers, W., Petronius, Satyrica: Schelmengeschichten, 2nd ed. (Munich 1965).

Müller, K. and Ehlers, W., Petronius, Satyrica: Schelmenszenen, 3rd ed. (Darmstadt 1983).

Paratore, E., Il Satyricon di Petronio, I: Introduzione, II: Commento (Florence 1933).

Pellegrino, C., Petronii Arbitri Satyricon (Rome 1975).

Perrochat, P., Pétrone, Le Festin de Trimalcion, 3rd ed. (Paris 1962).

Sage, E.T., Petronius, the Satiricon, revised and expanded by B.B. Gilleland (New York 1929).

Schmeck, H., Petronii Cena Trimalchionis (Heidelberg 1954).

Sedgwick, W.B., The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius together with Seneca's Apocolocyntosis and a Selection of Pompeian Inscriptions, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1950).

Smith, M.S., Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis (Oxford 1975).

Warmington, E.H., Petronius and Seneca, Apocolocyntosis (Loeb Classical Library) (Cambridge, Mass. 1969).

Waters, W.E., Petronius Cena Trimalchionis (Boston 1902).

II

Select Bibliography

Abbot, F.F., "The Use of Language as a Means of Characterization in Petronius", CP 2 (1907), 43-50.

--------, "The Origin of the Realistic Romance Among the Romans", CP 6 (1911), 257-270.

Alessio, G. Hapax legomena ed altre cruces in Petronio (Univ. degli Studi di Napoli, Ist. di Glottologia, Quad. Ling. 6-7) (Naples 1960-61) (= Alessio, Hapax).

Alföldy, G., "Die Freilassung von Sklaven und die Struktur der Sklaverei in der römischen Kaiserzeit", RSA 2 (1972), 97-129.

-------, Römische Sozialgeschichte (Wiesbaden 1975).

Altamura, D., "Quibus ex Graeca lingua translatis verbis in Cena Trimalchionis ennaranda Petronius usus sit", Latinitas 6 (1958), 194-202.

-------, "Proverbia locutionesque populares apud Petronium", Latinitas 22 (1974), 181-196.

Anderson, G. Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play (American Classical Studies 9) (Chico, Ca. 1982) (= Anderson, Eros Sophistes).

Andre, J., "L'Esclavage sous Néron: statut juridique et condition réelle," in Neronia 1977 (Clermont-Ferrand 1982), 13-22.

Andreau, J., "Remarques sur la société pompéienne (à propos des tablettes L. Caecilius Jucundus)", DdArch 7 (1973), 213-254.

-------, Les affaires de Monsieur Jucundus (Coll. de l'Ecole fr. de Rome 19) (Rome, 1974) (= Andreau, AMJ).

Armstrong, H.H., Autobiographic Elements in Latin Inscriptions (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series 3.4, pp. 215-286) (New York 1910).

Arrowsmith, W., "Luxury and Death in the Satyricon", Arion 5 (1966), 304-331.

Astbury, R., "Petronius, P. Oxy. 3010, and Menippean Satire", CP 72 (1977), 22-31.

Auerbach, E., Mimesis. The Representation of Reality in Western Literature, trans. W. Trask (Princeton 1953) (= Auerbach, Mimesis).

Bacon, H., "The Sibyl in the Bottle", Virginia Quarterly Review 34 (1958), 262-276.

Bagnani, G., Arbiter of Elegance: A Study of the Life and Works of C. Petronius (Phoenix Suppl. 2) (Toronto 1954) (= Bagnani, Arbiter).

-------, "Trimalchio", Phoenix 8 (1954), 77-91.

-------, "The House of Trimalchio", AJP 75 (1954), 16-39.

-------, "Encolpius, Gladiator Obscenus", CP 41 (1956), 23-27.

Baldwin, B., "Trimalchio's Domestic Staff", Acta Classica 21 (1978), 87-97.

Balsdon, J.P.V.D., Romans and Aliens (London 1979) (= Balsdon, R&A).

Bang, M., "Die Herkunft der römischen Sklaven", Röm. Mitt. 25 (1910), 223-251; 27 (1912), 189-221.

Barbieri, A., Poetica Petroniana: Satyricon 132.15 (Quaderni della RCCM 16) (Rome 1983).

Barrow, R.H., Slavery in the Roman Empire (London 1928) (= Barrow, SRE).

Bartonkova, D., "Prosimetrum, the Mixed Style, in Ancient Literature," Eirene 14 (1976), 65-92.

Beck, R., "Some Observations on the Narrative Technique of Petronius", Phoenix 27 (1973), 42-61.

-------, "Encolpius at the Cena", Phoenix 29 (1975), 271-283.

-------, "Eumolpus Poeta, Eumolpus Fabulator: A Study of Characterization in the Satyricon", Phoenix 33 (1979), 239-253.

-------, "The Satyricon: Satire, Narrator, and Antecedents," MH 39 (1982), 206-214.

Becker, G.J., "Realism: An Essay in Definition", Modern Language Quarterly 10 (1949), 184-197.

-------, ed., Documents of Modern Literary Realism (Princeton 1963) (= Becker, Documents).

Best, E.E., "Attitudes Toward Literacy Reflected in Petronius", CJ 61 (1965), 72-76.

Bianchi Bandinelli, R., "Arte Plebea", DdArch 1 (1967), 7-19.

Biezuńska-Małowist, I., "Les affranchis dans les papyrus de l'époque ptolémaique et romaine", in Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Milano 2-8 Settembre 1965 (Milan 1966), 433-443 (= Biezuńska-Małowist, "Affranchis").

-------, L'esclavage dans l'Egypte gréco-romaine. Seconde partie: Période romaine (Archiwum Filologiczne 35) (Wrocław, etc., 1977) (= Biezuńska-Małowist, EEGR II).

Bonner, S.F., "The Street-Teacher: An Educational Scene in Horace", AJP 93 (1972), 509-528.

-------, Education in Ancient Rome from the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny (Berkeley 1977) (= Bonner, EAR).

Booth, A.D., "The Schooling of Slaves in First-Century Rome, TAPA 109 (1979), 11-19.

-------, "Some Suspect Schoolmasters", Florilegium 3 (1981), 1-20.

Booth, W.C., The Rhetoric of Fiction (Chicago 1961) (= Booth, Rhetoric of Fiction).

Boulvert, G., Domestique et fonctionnaire sous le Haut-Empire romain (Ann. Litt. de l'Univ. de Besancon 151) (Paris 1974) (= Boulvert, DF).

Bove, L., "A proposito di nuove Tabulae Pompeianae", RAAN 44 (1969), 25-51.

-------, "Proscriptiones nelle nuove tavolette Pompeiane", RAAN 47 (1972), 167-186.

-------, Documenti processuali dalle Tabulae Pompeianae di Murecine (Naples 1979) (= Bove, Documenti).

Brockmeyer, N., Antike Sklaverei (Darmstadt 1979).

Browning, R., "The Date of Petronius", CR 63 (1949), 12-14, 28-29.

Bruhl, A., Liber Pater: Origines et expansion du culte dionysiaque à Rome et dans le monde romain (Paris 1953).

Brunt, P.A., Italian Manpower 225 B.C - A.D. 14 (Oxford 1971) (= Brunt, IM).

-------, "Aspects of the Social Thought of Dio Chrysostom and of the Stoics", PCPS 19 (1973), 11-34.

-------, "Two Great Roman Landowners", Latomus 34 (1975), 619-635.

Buckland, W.W., The Roman Law of Slavery (Cambridge 1908) (= Buckland, RLS).

Burriss, E.E., "Breaks in Conversation in the Text of Petronius", CP 42 (1947), 244-248.

Cahen, R., Le Satiricon et ses origines (Paris 1925).

Callebat, L., "Structures narratives et modes de représentation dans le Satyricon de Pétrone", REL 52 (1974), 281-303.

Cameron, Averil, "Petronius and Plato", CQ 19 (1969), 367-370.

Camodeca, G., "L'ordinamento in regiones e i vici di Puteoli", Puteoli 1 (1977), 62-98.

Castrén, P., Ordo Populusque Pompeianus: Polity and Society in Roman Pompeii (Acta Institi Romani Finlandiae 8) (Rome 1975).

Ceska, J., Diferenciace otroku v Itálii v prunîch dvou stoletich principátu (Spisy University v Brne, Filosoficka Faculta 62) (Prague-Brno 1959).

Champeaux, J., "Primigenius ou de l'Originaire", Latomus 34 (1975), 909-985.

Chantraine, H., Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser (Forsch. zur Antiken Sklaverei 1) (Wiesbaden 1967) (= Chantraine, Freigelassene).

Christes, J., Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom (Forsch. zur Antiken Sklaverei 10) (Wiesbaden 1979).

Ciaffi, V., Struttura del Satyricon (Universitá di Torino, Pubblicazioni della facoltá di lettere e filosofia 7.1) (Turin 1955) (= Ciaffi, Struttura).

-------, "Intermezzo nella Cena Petroniana", RFIC 33 (1955), 113-145 (= Ciaffi, "Intermezzo").

Coccia, M., Le interpolazioni in Petronio (Quaderni della RCCM 13) (Rome 1973) (= Coccia, Interpolazioni).

Coffey, M., Roman Satire (London 1976).

Collignon, A., Etude sur Pétrone: La critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satiricon (Paris 1892) (= Collignon, Etude).

Corbett, P.B., Petronius (Twayne's World Author Series 97) (New York 1970) (= Corbett, Petronius).

Crook, J.A., Law and Life of Rome (Ithaca and London 1967) (= Crook, LLR).

-------, "Working Notes on Some of the New Pompeii Tablets, ZPE 29 (1978), 229-239.

Daniel, R.W., "Liberal Education and Semiliteracy in Petronius", ZPE 40 (1980), 153-159.

D'Arms, J.H., Romans on the Bay of Naples: A Social and Cultural Study of the Villas and Their Owners from 150 B.C. to A.D. 400 (Cambridge, Mass. 1970) (= D'Arms, RBN).

-------, "Puteoli in the Second Century of the Roman Empire: A Social and Economic Study", JRS 64 (1974), 104-124.

-------, and E.C. Kopff, eds., The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome: Studies in Archaeology and History (Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 36) (Rome 1980).

-------, Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1981) (= D'Arms, CSS).

Daviault, A., "Mais, au fait, qui était donc Encolpe?", in Mélanges Etienne Gareau (Ottawa 1982), 165-172.

Dell'Era, A., Problemi di lingua e stile in Petronio (Rome 1970) (= Dell'Era, Problemi).

Duff, A.M., Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire, Oxford 1928, repr. with additions and corrections (Cambridge 1958) (= Duff, FERE).

Duncan-Jones, R., "Scaurus at the House of Trimalchio", Latomus 32 (1973), 364-367.

-------, "Age-Rounding, Illiteracy and Social Differentiation in the Roman Empire", Chiron 7 (1977), 333-353.

-------, "Two Possible Indices of the Purchasing Power of Money in Greek and Roman Antiquity", in Les "dévaluations" à Rome: époque republicaine et impériale I (Rome 13-15 Nov. 1975) (Ecole fr. de Rome, Suppl. 37.1) (Rome 1978), 159-168.

-------, The Economy of the Roman Empire. Quantitative Studies, 2nd ed. (Cambridge 1982) (= Duncan-Jones, ERE^2).

Dupont, F., Le plaisir et la loi: Du Banquet de Platon au Satiricon (Paris 1977) (= Dupont, Plaisir).

Duthoy, R., "La fonction sociale de l'Augustalité", Epigraphica 36 (1974), 134-154.

-------, "Réchérches sur la repartition géographique et chronologique des termes sevir Augustalis, Augustalis, e sevir dans l'Empire romain", in Epigraph-

ische Studien 11 (Cologne and Bonn 1976), 207-214.

-------, "Les *Augustales", in ANRW II.16.2 (Berlin 1978), 1254-1309.

Ebersbach, V., "Petrons Stellung zu den sozialen Kräften der frühen Kaiserzeit", Das Altertum 19 (1973), 96-104.

Fabre, G., Libertus: Recherches sur les rapports patron-affranchi à la fin de la république romaine (Coll. de l'école fr. de Rome 50) (Rome 1981) (= Fabre, Libertus).

Fedeli, P., "Petronio: il viaggio, il labirinto", Mat. e Disc. 6 (1981), 91-117.

Finley, M.I., ed., Slavery in Classical Antiquity (Cambridge 1960) (= Finley, SCA).

-------, "Aulus Kapreilius Timotheus, Slave Trader", ch. 13 in M.I. Finley, Aspects of Antiquity: Discoveries and Controversies (London 1968), 162-176.

-------, The Ancient Economy (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1973) (= Finley, AE).

-------, Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology (London 1980) (= Finley, ASMI).

Flory, M.B., "Family in Familia: Kinship and Community in Slavery", AJAH 3 (1978), 78-95.

Forbes, C.A., "The Education and Training of Slaves in Antiquity", TAPA 86 (1955), 321-360.

Frederiksen, M.W., "Puteoli", RE 23 (1959), 2036-2060.

-------, "Republican Capua: A Social and Economic Study", PBSR 27 n.s. 14 (1959), 80-130.

-------, "Theory, Evidence, and the Ancient Economy" (review article of Finley, AE), JRS 65 (1975), 164-171.

Frenz, H.G., Untersuchungen zu den frühen römischen Grabreliefs (Frankfurt am Main 1977).

Fuchs, H., "Verderbnisse im Petrontext", in H. Dahlmann and R. Merkelbach, edd., Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik (Köln 1959), 57-82 (= Fuchs, "Verderbnisse").

Gagé, J., Les classes sociales dans l'empire romain (Paris 1964) (= Gagé, CSER).

Gagliardi, D., "Il comico in petronio (continuità e trasformazione di una 'categoria')", Vichiana 7 (1978), 110-116.

Galsterer, H., "Petrons Gastmahl des Trimalchio und die römische Sozialgeschichte", in B. von Cerquiglini and H.U. Gumbrecht, edd., Der Diskurs der Literatur- und Sprachhistorie: Wissenschaftgeschichte als Innovationsvorgabe (Frankfurt am Mainz 1983), 492-510 (= Galsterer, "Gastmahl").

Garnsey, P., "Honorarium Decurionatus", Historia 20 (1971), 309-325.

-------, "Descendants of Freedmen in Local Politics: Some Criteria", in B. Levick, ed., The Ancient Historian and His Materials: Essays in Honour of C.E. Stevens on His Seventieth Birthday (Farnborough 1975), 167-180.

-------, ed., Non-Slave Labour in the Greco-Roman World (PCPS Suppl. 6) (Cambridge 1980).

-------, "Independent Freedmen and the Economy of Roman Italy under the Principate", Klio 63 (1981), 359-370 (= Garnsey, "Independent Freedmen").

-------, "Slaves in 'Business'", Opus 1 (1982), 105-108.

Garrido-Hory, M., Martial et l'esclavage (Ann. Litt. de l'Univ. de Besancon 255) (Paris 1981).

Gaudemet, J., Institutions de l'antiquité (Paris 1967).

George, P.A., "Style and Character in the Satyricon, Arion 5 (1966), 336-350.

--------, "Petronius and Lucan de Bello Civili," CQ 24 (1974), 119-133.

Gigante, M., Civiltà delle forme litterarie nell'antica Pompei (Naples 1979).

Ginsburg, M.S., "Princeps Libertinorum", TAPA 65 (1934), 198-206.

Giordano, C., Tabulae Pompeianae, published in RAAN 41 (1966), 107-121; 43 (1968), 200-202; 45 (1970), 211-231; 46 (1971), 183-197.

Gordon, J.S. and Gordon, A.E., Contributions to the Paleography of Latin Inscriptions (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology 3.3)

(Berkeley and Los Angeles 1957).

Griffin, M.T., Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics (Oxford 1976) (= Griffin, Seneca).

Grimal, P., "Sur quelques noms propres de la Cena Trimalchionis", RPh 16 (1942), 161-168.

-------, La Guerre Civile de Pétrone dans ses rapports avec la Pharsale (Paris 1977).

Grondona, M., La religione e la superstizione nella Cena Trimalchionis di Petronio (Coll. Latomus 171) (Brussels 1980) (= Grondona, Religione).

Grosso, F., "Pretium servi ex forma censoria", in Hommages à Marcel Renard II (Coll. Latomus 102) (Brussels 1969), 302-310.

Hadas, M., "Oriental Elements in Petronius", AJP 50 (1929), 378-385.

Haley, H.W., "Quaestiones Petronianae", HSCP 2 (1891), 1-40.

Harris, W.V., "Towards a Study of the Roman Slave Trade", in MAAR 36 (1980), 117-140.

-------, "Literacy and Epigraphy, I." ZPE 52 (1983), 87-111.

Haslam, M.W., "Narrative about Tinouphis in Prosimetrum", in Papyri Greek and Egyptian Edited by Various Hands in Honour of Eric Gardner Turner on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday (P. Turner) (Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs no. 68) (London 1981), 35-45, 210-211.

Hallaaler, R., ed., Nachträge zu A. Otto Sprichwörter und sprichtwörterlichen Redensarten der Römer (Darmstadt 1968).

Henrichs, A., Die Phoinikika des Lollianos (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 14) (Bonn 1972).

Herāus, W., Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen (Leipzig 1899); repr. in his Kleine Schriften (Heidelberg 1937) (= Herāus).

Highet, G., Juvenal the Satirist (Oxford 1954) (= Highet, Juvenal).

Hopkins, K., Conquerors and Slaves. Sociological Studies in Roman History Volume 1 (Cambridge 1978) (= Hopkins, C&S).

-------, Death and Renewal. Sociological Studies in Roman History Volume 2 (Cambridge 1983) (= Hopkins, D&R).

Housman, A.E., "Jests of Plautus, Cicero, and Trimalchio", CR 32 (1918), 162-164.

Hultsch, F., "Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des volkstümlichen Rechnens bei den Römern", NJPhP 139 (1889), 335-343.

Huttunen, P., The Social Strata in the Imperial City of Rome (Acta Universitatis Ouluensis B.3.1) (Oulu 1974) (= Huttunen, Social Strata).

Jones, A.H.M., "Slavery in the Ancient World", Ec. Hist. Rev. 9 (1956), 185-199; repr. in Finley, SCA, 1-15.

Kajanto, I., The Latin Cognomina (Soc. Sci. Fenn., Comm. Hum. Litt. 36.2) (Helsinki 1965) (= Kajanto, LC).

-------, "The Significance of Non-Latin Cognomina", Latomus 27 (1968), 517-534.

Kaser, M., Das römische Privatrecht, 2nd ed. (Munich 1971) (= Kaser, DRP^2).

Kennedy, G., "Encolpius and Agamemnon in Petronius", AJP 99 (1978), 171-178.

Klebs, E., "Petroniana", Philologus Supplb. 6 (1891-93), 659-698.

Kleiner, D.E.E., Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire (New York and London 1977).

Knoche, U., Roman Satire, trans. E. Ramage, (Bloomington and London 1975).

Kolb, F., "Zur Statussymbolik im antiken Rom", Chiron 7 (1977), 239-259.

Kolendo, J., "Elements pour une enquete sur l'iconographie des esclaves dans l'art hellenistique et romain", in Schiavitù, manomissione e classi dipendenti nel mondo antico (Univ. degli Studi di Padova, Pubb. dell'Ist. di Stor. Ant. 13) (Rome 1979), 161-174.

Lattimore, R., Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 28.1-2) (Urbana 1942) (= Lattimore, TGLE).

Leeman, A.D., "Morte e scambio nel romanzo picaresco di Petronio", GIF 20 (1967), 147-157.

Lepore, E., "Orientamenti per la storia sociale di Pompeii", in Pompeiana: Raccolta di studi per il secondo centenario degli scavi di Pompeii (Naples 1950), 144-166.

Levin, H., "What is Realism?", Comparative Literature 3 (1951), 193-199

Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., Continuity and Change in Roman Religion (Oxford 1979) (= Liebeschuetz, CCRR).

Lier, B., "Topica carminum sepulcralium latinorum", Philologus 62 (1903), 445-477, 563-603; 63 (1904), 54-65.

Lukács, G., The Meaning of Contemporary Realism, tr. J. and N. Mander (London 1962) (= Lukács, Contemporary Realism).

Lynch, J.P., "The Language and Character of Echion the Ragpicker: Petronius, Satyricon 45-46", Helios 9.1 (1981-82), 29-46.

MacMullen, R., Roman Social Relations 50 B.C. to A.D. 284 (New Haven and London 1974) (= MacMullen, RSR).

Marbach, A., Wortbildung, Wortwahl, und Wortbedeutung als Mittel der Charakterzeichnung bei Petron (Geissen 1931).

Marmorale, E.V., Petronio nel suo tempo (Naples 1937).

-------, La questione petroniana (Bari 1948) (= Marmorale, QP).

Martin, R., "Quelques remarques concernant la date du Satiricon", REL 53 (1975), 182-224.

Mayor, J.E.B., Thirteen Satires of Juvenal with a Commentary, 3rd ed. (London 1881) (= Mayor, Juvenal).

Meiggs, R., Roman Ostia, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1973) (= Meiggs, ROst).

Mendell, C.W., "Petronius and the Greek Romance", CP 12 (1917), 158-172.

Michel, J.H., La gratuité en droit romain (Brussels 1962).

Millar, F., The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C. - A.D. 337) (Ithaca and London 1977) (= Millar, ERW).

-------, "The World of the Golden Ass", JRS 71 (1981), 63-75.

Minazio, M.-C., "La maison-piège de Trimalcion", in Mélanges Esther Bréguet (Geneva 1975), 21-27.

Mohler, S.L., "Slave Education in the Roman Empire", TAPA, 71 (1940), 262-280.

Momigliano, A., "Literary Chronology of the Neronian Age", CQ 38 (1944), 96-100.

Mommsen, Th., "Die Pompeianischen Quittungstafeln des L. Caecilius Jucundus", Hermes 12 (1877), 88-141.

-------, "Trimalchios Heimath und Grabschrift", Hermes 13 (1878), 106-121.

-------, Römische Staatsrecht, 3rd ed. (Leipzig 1887-88), repr. Tübingen, 1952 (= Mommsen, StR).

Morabito, M., Les réalités de l'esclavage d'après le Digeste (Ann. Litt. de l'Univ. de Besancon 254, Centre de recherches d'hist. anc. 39) (Paris 1981) (= Morabito, Réalités).

Moreno, P., "Aspetti di vita economica nel Satyricon", An. Ist. It. Num. 9-11 (1962-64), 53-73.

Mrozek, S., "Wirtschaftliche Grundlagen des Aufstiegs der Freigelassenen im Römischen Reich", Chiron 5 (1975), 311-316.

-------, "Abundantia Pecuniae (A propos de la richesse des affranchis à Rome)", Historia 25 (1976), 122-123.

Musti, D., "Il commercio degli schiavi e del grano: il caso di Puteoli. Sui rapporti tra l'economia italiana della tarda repubblica e le economie ellenistiche", in MAAR 36 (1980), 197-215.

Newton, R.M., "Trimalchio's Hellish Baths", CJ 77 (1982), 315-319.

Nisbet, R.G.M., "The Festuca and the Alapa of Manumission", JRS 8 (1918), 1-14.

-------, review of K. Müller, Petronii Arbitri Satyricon (Munich 1961), JRS 52 (1962), 227-232.

Nock, A.D., "Seviri and Augustales", Ann. de l'Inst. de Phil. et d'Hist. orientales 2 (1933-34) (Mélanges Bidez), 627-638; repr. in Z. Stewart, ed., Arthur Darby Nock: Essays on Religion and the Ancient World (Oxford 1972), 348-356. Page references are to the reprinted version.

Oost, S.I., "The Career of M. Antonius Pallas", AJP 79 (1958), 113-139.

Otto, A., Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörterlichen Redensarten der Römer (Leipzig 1890) (= Otto, Sprichwörter).

Pack, R., "The Criminal Dossier of Encolpius", CP 55 (1960), 31-32

Palmer, L.R., The Latin Language (London 1954).

Palmer, R.E.A., "The Topography and Social History of Rome's Trastevere (Southern Sector)", Proc. Am. Philosoph. Soc. 125 (1981), 368-397.

Panciera, S., "Appunti su Pozzuoli romana", in I Campi Flegrèi nell'archeologia e nella storia: Convegno internazionale 1976 (Atti dei Convegni Lincei 33) (Rome 1977), 191-211.

Parsons, P., "A Greek Satyricon?", BICS 18 (1971), 53-68; cf. also P. Oxy. XLII 3010 (1974), 34-41, with the plot reconstruction by E.R. Dodds.

Pavis D'Escurac, H., "Pour une étude sociale de l'Apologie d'Apulée", Ant. Afr. 8 (1974), 89-101.

Pecere, O., "Pers. 5,76 sg. e Petron. 44,13" SIFC 51 (1979), 131-145.

Pergreffi, O., "Richerche epigrafiche sui liberti", Epigraphica 2 (1940), 314-336; 3 (1941), 110-131.

Perrochat, P., "Mentalité et expression populaires dans la Cena Trimalchionis", L'Information Littéraire 13 (1961), 61-69.

Perry, B.E., The Ancient Romances. A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins (Berkeley 1967) (= Perry, AR).

Petersmann, H., Petrons urbane Prosa (Osterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzungsberichte 323) (Vienna 1977).

Priuli, S., Ascyltus: Note di onomastica petroniana (Coll. Latomus 140) (Brussels 1975) (= Priuli, Ascyltus).

Pucci, G., "Considerazioni sull'articolo di J. Andreau 'Remarques sur la société pompéienne (à propos des tablettes de L. Caecilius Jucundus)'", DdArch 10 (1977), 631-647.

Raith, O., Petronius ein Epikureer (Erlanger Beitr. z. Sprach- u. Kunstwissensch. 14) (Nürnberg 1963).

Ramin, J. and Veyne, P., "Droit romain et société: Les hommes libres qui passent pour esclaves et l'esclavage volontaire", Historia 30 (1981), 472-497.

Rankin, H.D., Petronius the Artist: Essays on the Satyricon and Its Author (The Hague 1971).

Ratti, E., "Petronio e Nerone: Difficoltà e necessità dell'allusionismo nell'interpretazione del Satyricon", in Neronia 1977 (Clermont-Ferrand 1982), 145-150.

Reardon, B.P., "Aspects of the Greek Novel", G&R, 23 (1976), 118-131.

-------, "Novels and Novelties or Mysteriouser and Mysteriouser", in The Mediterranean World: Papers Presented in Honour of Gilbert Bagnani (Peterborough, Ont. 1976), 78-100.

Reinhold, M., "Usurpation of Status and Status Symbols in the Roman Empire", Historia 20 (1971), 275-302.

Révay, J., "Horaz und Petron", CP 17 (1922), 202-212.

Rindi, C., "Lo scenario urbano del Satyricon", Maia 32 (1980), 115-134.

Rose, K.F.C., "Time and Place in the Satyricon", TAPA 93 (1962), 402-409.

-------, "The Date of the Satyricon", CQ 12 (1962), 166.

-------, The Date and Author of the Satyricon (Mnemosyne Supplb. 16) (Leiden 1971) (= Rose, DAS).

Rostovtzeff, M.I., The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, 2nd ed., revised by P.M. Fraser (Oxford 1957) (= Rostovtzeff, SEHRE^2).

Rowell, H.T., "The Gladiator Petraites and the Date of the Satyricon," TAPA 89 (1958), 14-24.

Ste. Croix, G.E.M. de, "Greek and Roman Accounting", in A.C. Littleton and B.S. Yamey, edd., Studies in the History of Accounting (1956), 14-74.

-------, The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World from the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests (Ithaca and 1981) (= de Ste. Croix, CSAGW).

Salonius, A.H., Die griechen und das Griechische in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis (Soc. Sci. Fenn., Comm. Hum. Litt. II.1) (Helsingfors 1927).

Samter, E., "Der pilleus der römischen Priester und Freigelassenen", Philologus 53 (1894), 535-543.

Sandy, G., "Scaenica Petroniana", TAPA 104 (1974), 329-346.

Savio, A., "Sui prezzi del frumento e del pane a Pompei", NAC 3 (1974), 121-126.

Sbordone, F., Tabulae Pompeianae, published in RAAN 43 (1968), 195-200; 46 (1971), 173-182; 47 (1972), 307-310; 51 (1976), 145-168; 53 (1978), 249-269.

Schmidt, J., Vie et mort des esclaves dans la Rome antique (Paris 1973) (= Schmidt, Vie et Mort).

Schnur, H.C., "The Economic Background of the Satyricon", Latomus 18 (1959), 790-799.

-------, "Petronius: Sense and Nonsense", CW 66 (1972), 13-20.

Segebade, J. and Lommatzsch, E., Lexicon Petronianum (Leipzig 1898).

Sgobbo, I., "La città campana delle Saturae di Petronio", RAL 31 (1922), 354-363, 395-406.

Shatzman, I., Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics (Coll. Latomus 142) (Brussels 1975).

Shero, L.R., "The Cena in Roman Satire", CP 18 (1923), 126-143.

Sherwin-White, A.N., The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary (Oxford 1966) (= Sherwin-White, Pliny).

-------, Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome (Cambridge 1967).

-------, The Roman Citizenship, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1973) (= Sherwin-White, RC^2).

Slater, W.J., "Pueri, Turba Minuta", BICS 21 (1974), 133-140.

Solin, H., Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom (Soc. Sci. Fenn., Comm. Hum. Litt. 48) (Helsinki 1971) (= Solin, Beiträge).

-------, "Onomastica ed epigraphia. Riflessioni sull'esegesi onomastica delle iscrizioni romane", Quaderni Urbinati 18 (1974), 105-132.

-------, "Die Namen der orientalischen Sklaven in Rom", in L'Onomastique Latine (Colloques Internationaux du CNRS 564) (Paris 1977), 205-220 (= Solin, "Orientalische Sklaven").

-------, "Zu den griechischen Namen in Rom", in L'Onomastique Latine (Paris 1977), 161-174.

Spranger, P.P., Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz (Abh. Akad. d. Wiss. u. d. Lit. in Mainz, Geistes- u. Sozialwiss. Kl. 8) (Wiesbaden 1960) (= Spranger, Sklavenfiguren).

Staerman, E.M., Die Krise der Sklavenhalterordnung im Westen des römischen Reiches, trans. W. Seyfarth (Berlin 1964) (= Staerman, Krise).

-------, Die Blütezeit der Sklavenwirtschaft in der römischen Republik (Wiesbaden 1969) (= Staerman, Blütezeit).

-------, and M.K. Trofimova, La schiavitù nell'Italia imperiale I - III secolo, Ital. trans. (Rome 1975) (= Staerman, Schiavitù).

Stefenelli, A., Die Volkssprache im Werk des Petron im Hinblick auf die romanischen Sprachen (Stuttgart 1962).

Stubbe, H. Die Verseinlagen im Petron (Philologus Supplb. 25.2) (Lepzig 1933).

Studer, G., "Uber das Zeitalter des Petronius Arbiter," RhM 2 (1843), 50-92, 202-223.

Suder, W., "On Age Classification in Roman Imperial Literature", CB 55 (1978), 5-9

Süss, W., De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis Cenae sermone vulgari (Univ. Tartuensis: Acta et Commentationes B.ix.4) (Dorpat 1926).

Sullivan, J.P., The Satyricon of Petronius. A Literary Study (Bloomington and London 1968) (= Sullivan, Satyricon).

-------, "Interpolations in Petronius", PCPS 22 (1976), 90-122.

-------, "Petron in der neueren Forschung" Helikon 17 (1977), 137-154.

-------, "Petronius' Bellum Civile and Lucan's Pharsalia: A Political Reconsideration", in Neronia 1977 (Clermont-Ferrand 1982), 151-157.

Susini, G., The Roman Stonecutter: An Introduction to Latin Epigraphy, trans. A.M. Dabrowski (Oxford 1973).

Syme, R. Tacitus (Oxford 1958).

Taylor, L.R., "Horace's Equestrian Career", AJP 46 (1925), 161-170.

------- "Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome" AJP 82 (1961), 113-132.

------- "Republican and Augustan Writers Enrolled in the Equestrian Centuries" TAPA 99 (1968), 469-486.

Thomas, E., L'Envers de la société romaine. Pétrone, 3rd ed. (Paris 1912) (= E. Thomas, Pétrone^{3}).

Tolman, J., A Study of the Sepulchral Inscriptions in Buecheler's "Carmina Epigraphica Latina" (Chicago 1910) (= Tolman, Study).

Treggiari, S.M., Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic (Oxford 1969) (= Treggiari, RFLR).

-------, "Jobs in the Household of Livia", PBSR 43 n.s. 30 (1975) 48-77.

-------, "Urban Labour in Rome: Mercennarii and Tabernarii", in P. Garnsey, ed., Non-Slave Labour in the Greco-Roman World (PCPS Suppl. 6) (1980), 48-64 (= Treggiari, "Urban Labour").

-------, "Contubernales in CIL 6", Phoenix 25 (1981), 42-69.

Tremoli, P., Le iscrizioni di Trimalchione (Trieste 1960) (= Tremoli, Iscrizioni).

Tucker, C.W., "Women in the Manumission Inscriptions at Delphi", TAPA 112 (1982), 225-236.

Väänänen, V., Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes, 3rd. ed. (Berlin 1966).

Vasileiou, A., "Le riche Calvisius Sabinus (Sen., Ep. 27.5-8)", Ant. Class. 43 (1974), 241-256.

Veyne, P., "Vie de Trimalcion", Annales ESC 16 (1961), 213-247 (= Veyne, "Trimalcion").

-------, "Trimalchio Maecenatianus", in Hommages à Albert Grenier (Coll. Latomus 58) (Brussels 1962), 1617-1624.

-------, "Cave Canem", MEFR 75 (1963), 59-66.

-------, "La Vénus de Trimalcion", Latomus 23 (1964), 802-806.

-------, "Le 'je' dans le Satiricon", REL 42 (1964), 301-324.

-------, and Ramin, J., "Droit romain et société: Les hommes libres qui passent pour esclaves et l'esclavage volontaire", Historia 30 (1981), 472-497.

Vitucci, G., "Libertus", in Diz. Ep. 4 (1958), 905-946 (= Vitucci, "Libertus").

Walsh, P.G. The Roman Novel. The "Satyricon" of Petronius and the "Metamorphoses" of Apuleius (Cambridge 1970) (= Walsh, RN).

-------, "Was Petronius a Moralist?" G&R 21 (1974), 181-190.

Waltzing, J.P., Etude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'empire d'Occident, 4 vols. (Louvain 1895-1900) (= Waltzing, Etude).

Weaver, P.R.C., "Cognomina Ingenua: A Note", CQ 58 (1964), 311-315.

-------, Familia Caesaris. A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves (Cambridge 1972) (= Weaver, FC).

Westermann, W.L., "Athenaeus and the Slaves of Athens", HSCP Suppl. (1941), 451-470, repr. in Finley, SCA, 73-92.

-------, The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity (Memoirs of the Am. Philos. Soc. 40) (Philadelphia 1955) (= Westermann, Slave Systems).

Wiedemann, Th., Greek and Roman Slavery (Baltimore and London 1981) (= Wiedemann, GRS).

Wolf, J.G., "Aus dem neuen Pompejanischen Urkundenfund: Graeca leguntur", ZPE 45 (1982), 245-253.

Wrede, H., Consecratio in formam deorum: Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit (Mainz 1981) (= Wrede, Consecratio).

Wright, J., "Disintegrated Assurances: The Contemporary American Response to the Satyricon", G&R 23 (1976), 32-39.

Zanker, P., "Grabreliefs römischer Freigelassener", JDAI 90 (1975), 267-315.

-------, "Die Villa als Vorbild des späten pompejanischen Wohngeschmacks", JDAI 94 (1979), 460-523.

Zeitlin, F.I., "Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity", TAPA 102 (1971), 631-684.