

## PETRONIANA\*)

11.3. Ascyrtos unexpectedly returns to the lodgings and finds Encolpius, with Giton, *opertum amiculo* (§ 2). He makes the following scornful remark: *quid agebas, inquit, frater sanctissime? quid? †verti contubernium† facis?*

The variant reading *vesticontubernium*, which is found in mtp and the margin of l, is considered by Müller to be an emendation of Turnebus; but of course such a correction could have been made independently by Scaliger, Pithoeus and the other Petronian scholars of that time. Fraenkel comments that a word like *vesticontubernium* is more Plautine than Petronian; other suggestions are *qui diverti contubernium* (Bücheler), *<sub>> veste* (Fuchs), *everti contubernium* (Müller<sup>2</sup>). Bosch, as quoted in Burman's editions *ad loc.* suggests the foolish *Vestae contubernium*, appealing to the authority of numerous MSS! Burman attributes this suggestion also to Saumaise (Salmasius).

However, Saumaise actually suggested something else, much more plausible. Pieter Schrijver (Scrivierus) in his *Dominici Baudii Amores* (Leiden, 1638, page 463) calls the word *vesticontubernium* a *unica monstrosa vox*, and records Saumaise's suggestion as *veste contubernium*; and this reading is given also by C. Clementi, *Pervigilium Veneris*<sup>3</sup> (Oxford 1936) 18. Thus Burman's misquotation has concealed Saumaise's excellent suggestion from subsequent editores. Schrijver was criticising the use of the word

---

\*) In the following notes on Petronius, the following references are made in shorter form:

Müller K. Müller (first edition, München 1961)  
 Müller<sup>2</sup> K. Müller (second edition, München 1965)  
 Ehlers in Müller<sup>2</sup>  
 Fraenkel in Müller<sup>1</sup>  
 Anton C. G. Anton, *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon* (Leipzig 1781)  
 Delz J. Delz, *Gnomon* 34 (1962)  
 Bücheler F. Bücheler (first edition, Berlin 1862).

I wish to state my grateful thanks to Professor Gilbert Bagnani for valuable advice, and criticisms of the present article.

in Dousa's faked four-line fragment of the *Pervigilium*, of which the last line is

*cum puellis dulce inire vesticontubernium.*

Fuchs' suggestion <sub> veste brings out the reference to *opertum amiculo* very well, and it is paralleled by Ovid, *Amores* 1.4.48, *veste sub iniecta dulce peregit opus*. But the reading *veste contubernium* is even neater: "are you setting up a home under your coat?"

19.4. sed ne quid tristius expectarem, comitatus faciebat. tres enim erant mulierculae, si quid vellent conari, infirmissimae †scilicet contra nos† si nihil aliud virilis sexus esset.

*scilicet*; *contra* distinxit Fraenkel; *sexus. sed et* Pithoeus; *nos* <quibus> *si* Dousa; *contra* <quas> Piccartus apud Bücheler; *scilicet contra nos* del. Rutgers.

In the context, Quartilla has just announced that our heroes are trapped in the inn, so that *remedium tertianae sine ulla interpellatione a vobis acciperem* (§ 2). The 'fever' has been mentioned previously in 17.7, and it is all too clear that the disease is the *libido* of the priestess of Priapus. In 19.3, when our heroes learn that they are expected to help cure the 'fever', they are at first terrified. In § 4 the general meaning of the corrupt text is that our heroes, as being at least males, could fight off the sexual advances of Quartilla and her companions; cf. § 5 *si depugnandum foret*. In the lacuna after § 5 something happens which takes away all their hopes.

The point of *si nihil aliud* in § 4 is, that none of the three males is interested in *sexual* combat with the women; Encolpius of course prefers Giton, Ascyltos is a *muliebris patientiae scortum* (9.6, cf. 92.10) and Giton is considered too young (25.3). It is in § 5 that Encolpius reflects *immo etiam* they may have to fight their way out or in some other way escape from a "fate worse than death".

I therefore suggest that the text of § 4 has been corrupted by a gloss *infirmissimae scilicet*, which looks like an unnecessary addition to the sense: "there were only three women against us – who at least were men". The *glossator* failed to appreciate the implications of the context, and thus felt it necessary to "help" the sense of the narrative by stressing that the women were physically weak (*infirmissimae scilicet*). The text can now be restored with Dousa's addition <quibus>, which is paralleled by the omis-

sion of the relative in 80.6 (suppl. Pithoeus), as follows: *tres enim erant mulierculae, si quid vellent conari, contra nos, quibus si nihil aliud virilis sexus esset.*

24.3. *deinde ut contubernali meo melius succederet, 'per fidem, inquam, †nostram† Ascylos in hoc triclinio solus ferias agit?'* [ut] <ne> Goldast; [ut] *contubernali meo* <ne> Fraenkel.

The reading of the MSS *ut* is clearly right; the point is that Ascylos, as a *muliebris patientiae scortum* (9.6) and much stronger than Encolpius (92.9), is to be considered much better able to withstand the attentions of the *cinaedus*; hence *melius* is quite appropriate. The very name Ascylos might indicate this aspect of his character; the Greek word is very rare, and seems to mean "untroubled, undisturbed". It is possible that Petronius chose this name with an ironic reference to Epicurean *ataraxia*.

*nostram* is deleted by Bücheler, whereas Dousa emended to *vestram*; but Petronius never uses *per fidem* with an adjective (93.3, 98.3, 100.5, 114.5). I would prefer to read *num*, which intensifies the indignation and suffering of Encolpius; cf. 24.1 *non tenui ego diutius lacrimas*.

43.8. *noveram hominem olim †oliorum†, et adhuc salax erat. non mehercules illum puto in domo canem reliquisse. immo etiam †puellarius† erat, omnis Minervae homo.*

*olimorum* Wehle; *olim annorum xl* Strelitz; *molliorem* Anton; *alii alia*.

Great efforts have been made to show that *oliorum* is tolerable Latin, meaning "for ages and ages". Even if these efforts can be considered successful, there remains one objection: the statement of Phileros seems rather illogical and pointless: "I had known the man for a very long time and he was still lecherous". After *olim* some word is required which indicates the lecherousness of the man when he was younger; this is indicated by the emendations of Reiske (*molitorem*) and Heinsius and Scheffer (*mulierosum* or *mulierarium*). All of these give good sense and are not far from the *ductus litterarum*; but perhaps OLIMOLIORUM contains a dittographical corruption of the simple *olim*.

Burman emended *puellarius* to *pullarius*, which is found in glosses (cf. W. Heräus, *Kleine Schriften*, Heidelberg 1937, 65) and which has been accepted by most editors. But here again the sequence of thought is quite illogical: it is absurd to say of a man

"he was so lecherous that he assaulted the dog, and *immo etiam* he was a paederast". There must be a contrast between *non canem reliquisse* and †*puellarius*†, and this is simply provided by Mentel's *puellaris*. In this way *immo etiam* shows the contrast between Chrysanthus' all-embracing *active* sexuality (culminating in *non canem reliquisse*) and his *passive* inclinations (*puellaris*).

97.10. *amolitur Ascyrtos invidiam et se vero nihil aliud quam fugitivum suum dixit quaerere, mortem †nec hominis concupisse nec supplicis†, utique eius quem post fatalem rixam habuit carissimum.*

*nec supplicium* Bücheler; *nec <insontis> hominis* Fuchs. The sequence *nec hominis ... nec supplicis* is clearly wrong, and the simplest solution is to transpose *mortem* and *nec*, deleting the second *nec* and taking *hominis* and *supplicis* in apposition, as Ernout suggests. The sentence is still more improved by deleting *hominis* also, thus: *nec mortem concupisse supplicis, utique eius...* Given the basic corruption as the transposition of *nec* and *mortem*, *hominis* will have been interpolated into the reading *mortem nec concupisse nec supplicis*.

Critics have tried in various ways to alter the phrase *utique eius quem post fatalem rixam habuit carissimum*. Bosch reads *ante* for *post*, whereas Reiske and Bücheler prefer *praeter*; before *post* Gaselee adds *et*, Sullivan *vel* and Gurlitt *etiam*. These suggestions are quite unnecessary; the point is, that the *fatalis rixa* was for Ascyrtos a source of great happiness, since it was the only way he could get Giton away from Encolpius! Before the *rixa* in chapter 80, there had been previous quarrels but Ascyrtos had been very furtive in his approaches to Giton (6.1, 9.4, 79.9). Of course, when Ascyrtos uses the word *carissimum* he is speaking ironically, and thus the MSS reading provides us with an amusing remark which should not have been altered by the critics.

108.1. *obstupueram ego supplicii metu pavidus, nec quid in re manifestissima dicerem inveniebam turbatus et deformis praeter spoliati capitis dedecus †superciliorum etiam aequalis cum fronte calvities, ut nihil nec facere deceret nec dicere.*

Most editors have followed Bücheler in placing a lacuna after *turbatus*; this lacuna is filled by Ehlers as *turbatus et deformis*; <*tantopere mihi obfuit*>, whereas Sullivan supplies <*ita enim me opprimebat*>. Gaselee suggested *enim* for *etiam*, but this still does not restore a coherent sentence; Muncker suggested *aequali ... calvitie*, but this reads rather unevenly.

The narrative leads us to suppose that Encolpius should be embarrassed by both his shaven head and his bare eyebrows. Hence *praeter* might be changed to *propter*, which will then govern both *dedecus* and *calvities*; *aequalis calvities* can hardly be accusative plural, and thus *aequalem ... calvitiam* can be substituted. The closer association of *dedecus* and *calvitiam* is completed by reading *dedecus* (et) *superciliorum* [etiam] *aequalem cum fronte calvitiam*: "I could find no words, being confused and made hideous by the shame of my bald head and the equal bareness of my forehead and eyebrows".

The alteration of *etiam* to *et* is of course elementary; in the same way, in 110.1 I would prefer to read *et* (iam) *ineptiora prae-teritis*; *et* seems rather insipid, especially since Encolpius always expresses great contempt for Eumolpus' poetry.

112.2.                    placitone etiam pugnabis amori?  
nec venit in mentem, quorum conserderis arvis?

The second line is found in the oldest and best MSS of the O-class, but is missing from the *Florilegia* and from one of the L-class MSS, the Lambeth codex 1, where it is deleted by the copyist; the line was omitted from the *codex Memmianus*, which has not survived. Müller presumes that Daniel Rogers, the scribe of 1, deleted the verse because it was absent from one of his sources, the *Memmianus*, and he also explains the presence of the verse in the L-MSS by contamination with the O-class. However, it remains possible that the line was in L, and that only the *Memmianus* omitted it, by chance or design.

If the line is to be deleted, it remains to explain how or why it was interpolated. The interpolation has to go back to the ninth century, the date of our oldest MS the *Bernensis*, and therefore we are probably not dealing with a scribe who let his memory of Vergil run away with him even at the expense of including a verse which does not seem immediately appropriate in the context. On the other hand, it is easy to maintain that some less faithful scribe omitted the line because he thought it was *not* appropriate. Interpolations in the *Satyricon* seem to have been introduced to facilitate the reading of the text, not to obscure it.

The basic question, then, is: is the line inappropriate? Taken literally as part of the *ancilla's* argument, it seems to be. But in the *Satyricon* we have to bear in mind Petronius' ambiguous quotations of Vergil, most obviously seen in the cento in chapter 132.11: *illa solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat*,



nec magis incepto vultum sermone movetur  
quam lentae salices lassove papavera collo

where the subject of *illa* is *mentula Encolpi!*

With this in mind, it now appears that the second line in 112.2 can also be taken *in malam partem*. For Petronius' use of *sedere* in this sense, cf. 126.10, 140.7 and N. J. Herescu, *Glotta* 38 (1959) 125 ff. For the use of *arva* to mean *pudenda* cf. Lucretius 4.1107, Vergil, *G.* 3.136, Plautus, *Truc.* 149: *non arvos hic, sed pascuo 'st ager*, where the whole context is an elaborate *double-entendre*. For a similar metaphor, cf. *Priapea* 5.3-4 Bücheler:

quod meus hortus habet, sumas impune licebit,  
si dederis nobis quod tuus hortus habet.

Cuperus, as quoted by Burman, seems to have understood Petronius' Vergilian quotation in something like the above sense, but he wished to emend *consederis* to *consueveris*, thus failing to appreciate the cleverness of Petronian ambiguity.

132.1. [Encolpius de Endymione puero] ipsa corporis pulchritudine me ad se vocante trahebat in venerem. iam pluribus oculis collisa labra crepitabant, iam implicitae manus omne genus amoris invenerant, iam alligata mutuo ambitu corpora animarum quoque mixturam fecerant.

*ad se vocante* del. Fraenkel; *trahebar* Burman. The problems of this passage are both textual and contextual. The text reading *ipsa corporis pulchritudine me ad se vocante* is very clumsy, whether *ipsa* is taken as nominative, referring to Circe, or as ablative agreeing with *pulchritudine*. Thus both the emendations mentioned above have some value.

The *titulus* raises several possibilities. If it indicates that the original context described a love scene with a boy named Endymion, then the paragraph is an interpolation and *ipsa* cannot be taken as nominative singular. It is possible that the original context involved Giton, who could have been described as or compared to the sleeping Endymion, but this is most improbable. J. P. Sullivan suggests, in the notes of his recent Penguin translation (Baltimore 1965), that in the lacuna before 132.1 there was a poem which mentioned Endymion, in which case the paragraph refers to Circe and is not out of place.

Thus it appears that the problems of text and context are interconnected, and the crucial question is, whether the paragraph belongs in its present position in the text. If it is not, then we are

forced to accept the evidence of the *titulus* and delete § 1 as an interpolation from some lost portion of the *Satyricon*.

It seems that the passage cannot be describing the love-scene between Encolpius and Circe. The three phrases introduced by *iam* clearly describe the stages leading to the "right true end of love" – passionate kissing, intimate fondling, and *alligata corpora*; the phrase *animarum quoque mixturam* seems to imply that there was also a *mixtura* (cf. Greek *μῖξις*) *corporum* and thus *coitus plenus et optabilis*, as Bücheler, *ad loc.*, observes. *animarum* is interpreted in TLL 8.1196.8 as *breath*, but surely it means *souls* – sc., as well as bodies.

131.11 had previously described the passionate kissing *usque ad satietatem* between Encolpius and Circe, but in 132.2 it is clear that all has not gone well. Thus § 1, which describes kissing also, is not appropriate after 131.11, especially since it also describes sexual fulfilment, which Circe has obviously not received in § 2. Encolpius is impotent during the whole of the Croton episode, from 127.10, with boys as well as with women (cf. 128.7, 130.8, 132.8, 134.9 &c.); his virility is briefly restored by witchcraft in 131.6 and again, presumably, before 138.3, but it is not until 140.13 that he regains his powers without the help of magic (cf. 140.12 *dii maiores sunt*).

Since it now appears that § 1 cannot refer to Circe, and that the passage is out of place, we must infer that *ipsa* cannot be nominative and that the *titulus* must be accepted as genuine. As the emendations of Burman and Fraenkel indicate, to take *ipsa* as ablative produces a very clumsy phrase. But since it appears that the passage refers to a boy, all stylistic difficulties are removed by reading *ipse* for *ipsa*; *ipse, corporis pulchritudine me ad se vocante, trahebat in venerem*. The corruption is easily explained; a scribe will have had his mind on the love-scene in the previous chapter and written *ipsa* accordingly. The *titulus* may have been overlooked, or added by a later hand.

135.8.6–7. hic †molli stillae latus† et de caudice lento  
vineae lances maculataque testa Lyaeo.

*mollis* Sambucus; *stillae* O *stilla* L *scyllae* vel *scillae* O dett. aliquot; *lacus* Scaliger et Pithoeus, recte; *mollis tiliae* Pithoeus, probant Delz et Müller<sup>2</sup>.

*mollis* was supposedly the reading also of the MS E, but both the date of this lost MS and the accuracy of its collation by Jahn are uncertain. Heinsius wrote the lines thus:

hic mollis stillare favus de caudice lento  
vimineae lancis cumulataque testa Lyaeo.

The main problem in emending these lines is the rather strained and clumsy diction used here by Petronius. Thus in lines 4–5 *nova terrae pocula* can be taken to mean “new clay pots” – not impossible, if we compare such phrases as *Cereris vacuae nemus* meaning “straw”. The clay pots are cheap and carelessly made (*facili vilis rota finxerat actu*, line 5); hence the *lacus* should refer to the liquid seeping out of the cracks and faults in the pottery. Since the liquid seeps *out* of the pots, *hinc* is a probable correction of *hic*. Clearly some form of *still* is required, but a noun is already provided by *lacus*. Therefore I would read *molliter hinc stillans lacus*; if *molliter* and *hinc* were transposed in the tradition, *molliter* will have been changed to *mollis* (*molli*) in order to restore the metre. Thus the sense is restored by four very elementary changes: *hinc*|*hic*, *molliter*|*molli*, *stillans*|*stillae*, and *lacus*|*latus*.

University of Texas

Kenneth Rose

---

## SPRACHLICH-STILISTISCHES ZU BRIEFEN DES SYMMACHUS

---

### 1. Symm. ep. 1, 14 (an Ausonius)

Symmachus beklagt sich im Jahre 371 beim Autor der *Mosella*<sup>1)</sup>: er habe ein Exemplar des Gedichts immer noch nicht

---

1) Die Zeitbestimmung des Briefes hängt ab von der Datierung der *Mosella*. Für diese ist t.p.q. das Jahr 369, unterste Grenze 375 (Tod Valentinians I.), wegen *Mos.* 450f. Alle anderen Indizien sind unsicher. Übersicht: C. Hosius, *Die Moselgedichte des Dec. Magnus Ausonius und des Venantius Fortunatus* (\*1926) 17/22; Schenkl, *D. M. Ausonii Opuscula*, M.G.H.a.a. V, 2, p. XV; Schanz–Hosius 4, 1<sup>a</sup>, 40. Übereinstimmungen mit *Auson. ep.* 16, 2 Schenkl (*Hosius a.O.* 20f, nach Boecking) machen eine Beziehung auf *Sex. Petron. Probus* und sein Konsulat wahrscheinlich, rücken das Gedicht also an das Jahr 371 heran. In *Mos.* 450 ist *nati* codd. mit den neueren Herausgebern gegen *natus* (*Avantius*) durchaus zu halten, ohne daß daraus, wie Schenkl a.O. richtig bemerkt, ein jüngeres Datum