III

First Rivalry over Giton: Encolpius versus Ascyltus (§§ 9–11)

— ※ —

At the beginning of the extant *Satyrica* (§§ 1–5), we meet Encolpius in deep conversation with a rhetoric teacher named Agamemnon. At some point (§ 6.1), Encolpius realises that his companion Ascyltus has left, and – taking a detour (§ 6.2–8.4) – he makes his way back to the lodgings where he is staying together with Ascyltus and his beloved Giton:

[**9**.1] *quasi per caliginem vidi Gitona in crepidine semitae stantem et in eundem locum me conieci …*
[2] *cum quaererem numquid nobis in prandium frater parasset, consedit puer super lectum et manantes lacrimas pollice extersit.* [3] *perturbatus ego habitu fratris quid accidisset quaesivi. at ille tarde quidem et invitus, sed postquam precibus etiam iracundiam miscui,* [4] *'tuus' inquit 'iste frater seu comes paulo ante in conductum accucurrit coepitque mihi velle pudorem extorquere.* [5] *cum ego proclamarem, gladium strinxit et "si Lucretia es" inquit "Tarquinium invenisti".'*
[6] *quibus ego auditis intentavi in oculos Ascylti manus et 'quid dicis' inquam 'muliebris patientiae scortum, cuius ne spiritus ⟨quidem⟩ purus est?'* [7] *inhorrescere se finxit Ascyltos, mox sublatis fortius manibus longe maiore nisu clamavit:* [8] *'non taces' inquit 'gladiator obscene, quem †de ruina† harena dimisit?* [9] *non taces, nocturne percussor, qui ne tum quidem, cum fortiter faceres, cum pura muliere pugnasti,* [10] *cuius eadem ratione in viridario frater fui qua nunc in deversorio puer est?' 'subduxisti te' inquam 'a praeceptoris colloquio'.* [**10**.1] *'quid ego, homo stultissime, facere debui, cum fame morerer? an videlicet audirem sententias, id est vitrea fracta et*

somniorum interpretamenta? [2] *multo me turpior es tu hercule, qui ut foris cenares poetam laudasti'.* [3] *… itaque ex turpissima lite in risum diffusi pacatius ad reliqua secessimus*

*

[4] *rursus in memoriam revocatus iniuriae 'Ascylte' inquam 'intellego nobis convenire non posse. itaque communes sarcinulas partiamur ac paupertatem nostram privatis quaestibus temptemus expellere.* [5] *et tu litteras scis et ego. ne quaestibus tuis obstem, aliquid aliud promittam; alioqui mille causae quotidie nos collident et per totam urbem rumoribus different'.* [6] *non recusavit Ascyltos et 'hodie' inquit 'quia tamquam scholastici ad cenam promisimus, non perdamus noctem. cras autem, quia hoc libet, et habitationem mihi prospiciam et aliquem fratrem'.* [7] *'tardum est' inquam 'differre quod placet'*

*

hanc tam praecipitem divisionem libido faciebat; iam dudum enim amoliri cupiebam custodem molestum, ut veterem cum Gitone meo rationem reducerem

*

[**11**.1] *postquam lustravi oculis totam urbem, in cellulam redii osculisque tandem bona fide exactis alligo artissimis complexibus puerum fruorque votis usque ad invidiam felicibus.* [2] *nec adhuc quidem omnia erant facta, cum Ascyltos furtim se foribus admovit discussisque fortissime claustris invenit me cum fratre ludentem. risu itaque plausuque cellulam implevit, opertum me amiculo evolvit* [3] *et 'quid agebas' inquit 'frater sanctissime? quid? †verti† contubernium facis?'* [4] *nec se solum intra verba continuit, sed lorum de pera solvit et me coepit non perfunctorie verberare, adiectis etiam petulantibus dictis: 'sic dividere cum fratre nolito'*
(§§ 9.1–11.4)

[**9**.1] As though through a fog I saw Giton standing on the kerb of the road, and I rushed to the exact same spot. …
[2] When I asked my brother if he had prepared anything for us to eat, the boy sat down and wiped away a stream of tears with his thumb. [3] I was shocked at my brother's looks and asked what had happened. The boy spoke slowly and unwillingly, in fact only after I had added anger to my entreaties: [4] "That brother or companion of yours ran into our lodgings a little earlier and wanted to rob me of my 'sexual purity' (*pudorem*).

[5] When I shouted out, he drew his sword and said: 'If you are Lucretia, you have found your Tarquinius!'"

[6] On hearing this, I raised my hands to Ascyltus' eyes and said: "What do you say, you submissive whore, playing the woman's part? Not even your breath is clean!" [7] Ascyltus pretended to be horrified, and soon raised his hands even more vigorously, shouting much louder: [8] "Will you not shut up, you filthy gladiator, who was discharged from the arena †on account of a downfall†? [9] Will you not shut up, you midnight assassin? Even in your best days you did not manage to fight with a clean woman. [10] I was the same kind of brother to you in the garden, as the boy is now in the lodgings." "You sneaked away from the conversation with the teacher", I replied. [**10**.1] "What should I have done, you idiot, when I was dying of hunger? Should I have listened to his views, that is broken glass and interpretation of dreams? [2] By Hercules, you are far worse than me, praising a poet to get a dinner invitation." … [3] And so our fierce quarrel dissolved into laughter, and we turned peaceably to other things.

*

[4] When his wrongdoing had come back into my head, I said: "Ascyltus, I understand we cannot get along. Let us divide our belongings and try to defeat our poverty, each with our own designs. [5] You are a man of letters as well as me. As I do not want to stand in the way of your business, I promise to do something else. Otherwise, a thousand things will bring us into conflict and will fuel rumours about us all over the town." [6] Ascyltus did not object, saying: "Since we, as *scholastici,* have promised to attend a dinner today, let us not waste the night. Tomorrow, however, I shall be pleased to find myself new lodgings and another brother." [7] I answered: "It is stupid to delay what has been agreed upon."

*

My lust was responsible for this hasty separation; for I had long wanted to remove that annoying chaperon, so that I might reestablish the former bonds with my Giton.

*

[**11**.1] After I looked everywhere in the town, I went back to our little room. I finally asked for kisses openly. I held the boy as closely as I could and enjoyed what I had wished for to the degree that anyone would have envied me. [2] And we had not even finished when Ascyltus came

sneaking up to the door, forcefully broke the bolts and found me playing around with my brother. He filled the room with laughter and applause, rolled me out of the cloak I was lying in [3] and said: "What were you up to, my purest brother? What? Are you †ruining† our companionship?" [4] And he did not limit himself to words alone, but pulled a strap off his bag and began giving me a proper flogging, adding sarcastic words: "You shall not share with your brother in this way!"

One of the most impressive aspects of this episode is Petronius' parody of the rape of Lucretia by Sextus Tarquinius, as it is known from Livy's *ab urbe condita* (1.57.4–59) and Ovid's *Fasti* (2.685–852).[233] Unlike the parallels between the *Satyrica* and comedy, Petronius' references to Livy and Ovid may be regarded as intertextual in the narrow sense of the term: Petronius uses clear allusions, i.e. formulations which point to other texts without explicitly naming them, and which are (partly) unintelligible without the knowledge of these reference texts. In this sense, Livy's *ab urbe condita* and Ovid's *Fasti* are 'present' in the *Satyrica.*[234]

§ 9.5: *gladium strinxit et "si Lucretia es" inquit "Tarquinium invenisti".*

Liv. 1.58.2: *stricto gladio ad dormientem Lucretiam venit sinistraque manu mulieris pectore oppresso 'Tace, Lucretia' inquit; 'Sex. Tarquinius sum; ferrum in manu est; moriere, si emiseris vocem.'*

Drawing his sword, he came to the sleeping Lucretia. Holding the woman down with his left hand on her breast, he said: "Be still, Lucretia! I am Sextus Tarquinius. My sword is in my hand. Utter a sound, and you die."

233 For a discussion of how Petronius parodies Livy and Ovid, cf. e.g. Ruden (1993: 21–2), Courtney (2001: 63), Schmeling (2001: 53–4), and Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*).

234 Cf. Genette's (1997: 1) definition of intertextuality (cited above in section I.4.1.1. Intertextuality, Transtextuality and 'Parallels') and his definition of allusions (*ibid*). Beyond the realm of verbal echoes, the parodic relationship between the *Satyrica* and these two earlier texts should be understood as one of hypertextuality, cf. Genette (1997: 10 and *passim*) as well as section I.4.1.2. Hypertextuality and Architextuality ('Genre').

Fast. 2.793–6: *surgit et aurata vagina liberat ensem*
et venit in thalamos, nupta pudica, tuos;
utque torum pressit, 'ferrum, Lucretia, mecum est'
natus ait regis, 'Tarquiniusque loquor.'

He gets up, frees his sword from its gilded sheath, and comes, 'pure' (*pudica*) wife, into your chamber. And when he has mounted the bed, the king's son says: "Lucretia, I have my sword with me, and I who speak am Tarquinius."[235]

Ascyltus explicitly recalls his literary role model, characterising Giton as another Lucretia, and himself as another Tarquinius. At the same time, Ascyltus' words neatly fit the structure of Livy's and Ovid's text, since in both cases Tarquinius announces himself by name and addresses Lucretia by hers.[236] Another clear allusion may be seen in the fact that Ascyltus draws his sword; the verbal parallel between *gladium strinxit* (§ 9.5) and *stricto gladio* (Liv. 1.58.2) is particularly salient. Encolpius, in turn, takes the role of Lucretia's husband Collatinus, who arrives at the scene some time after the crime:

Liv. 1.58.6–7: *Sp. Lucretius cum P. Valerio Volesi filio, Collatinus cum L. Iunio Bruto venit, cum quo forte Romam rediens ab nuntio uxoris erat conventus. Lucretiam sedentem maestam in cubiculo inveniunt. Adventu suorum lacrimae obortae quaerentique viro: 'Satin salve?' 'Minime' inquit; 'quid enim salvi est mulieri amissa pudicitia?'*

Spurius Lucretius came with Publius Valerius, Volesus' son. Collatinus brought Lucius Junius Brutus with whom he chanced to be returning to Rome when he was met by the messenger from his wife. Lucretia they found sitting sadly in her chamber. The entrance of her friends brought the

235 All translations of Livy are taken from Foster (ed., trans. 2002[1919]), those of Ovid from Wiseman & Wiseman (trans. 2011). At times, I have made alterations.

236 Possibly, Ascyltus' *non taces* (§ 9.8 and 9.9) recalls Tarquinius' *tace, Lucretia* (Liv. 1. 58.2).

tears to her eyes, and to her husband's question, "Is all well?" she replied, "Far from it; for what can be well with a woman when she has lost her 'sexual purity' (*pudicitia*)?"

Fast. 2.813–28: *iamque erat orta dies: passis sedet illa capillis,*
ut solet ad nati mater itura rogum,
grandaevumque patrem fido cum coniuge castris
evocat: et posita venit uterque mora.
utque vident habitum, quae luctus causa, requirunt,
cui paret exsequias, quoque sit icta malo.
illa diu reticet pudibundaque celat amictu
ora: fluunt lacrimae more perennis aquae.
hinc pater, hinc coniunx lacrimas solantur et orant
indicet et caeco flentque paventque metu.
ter conata loqui ter destitit, ausaque quarto
non oculos ideo sustulit illa suos.
'hoc quoque Tarquinio debebimus? eloquar' inquit,
'eloquar infelix dedecus ipsa meum?'
quaeque potest, narrat; restabant ultima: flevit,
et matronales erubuere genae.

And now the day had dawned. She sits with her hair loose, as a mother does when about to go to her son's funeral pyre, and she summons from their camp her aged father and her faithful husband. Each of them came, letting nothing delay them. And when they see the state she is in, they ask the reason for her grief. Whose funeral is she preparing, what misfortune has struck her? For a long time she is silent, and full of shame hides her face with her robe. Her tears flow like a never-ending stream. Her father on one side, her husband on the other comfort her tears and beg her to speak out; they are weeping and pale with blind fear. Three times she tried to speak, three times she stopped. She summoned her courage a fourth time, but even so she did not raise her eyes. "Shall we owe this too to Tarquinius?" she says. "Shall I speak it aloud – myself, unhappy

> woman, speak aloud my own disgrace?" What
> she can, she tells. The last part stayed untold. She
> wept, and the cheeks of a married lady blushed.

Giton clearly resembles Lucretia in that he takes a sitting position (§ 9.2: *consedit puer*; Liv. 1.58.6: *Lucretiam sedendem*; Ov. *Fast.* 2.813: *sedet illa*), and sheds tears (§ 9.2: *manantes lacrimas*; Liv. 1.58.7: *lacrimae obortae*; Ov. *Fast.* 2.820: *fluunt lacrimae*). Encolpius recalls Collatinus' behaviour in that he finds his 'spouse' in distress, is disturbed by his *habitus* (§ 9.3; cf. Ov. *Fast.* 2.817) and asks him about what occurred. Likely, Giton's reference to his *pudor* (§ 9.4) is another allusion to Lucretia, as she is closely associated with the concepts of *pudicitia* and *pudor*.[237]

A few more parallels will be discussed in the course of this chapter. At this point, two more possible allusions are worth mentioning: The meal Encolpius asks Giton about may be seen to recall the meal Lucretia prepares for Tarquinius in Ovid (*cum quaererem numquid nobis in prandium frater parasset,* § 9.2; cf. Ov. *Fast.* 2.789–90: *parat inscia rerum | infelix epulas hostibus illa suis*; "Unaware of what is happening, the luckless woman prepares a meal for her own enemies").[238] When Ascyltus catches Encolpius and Giton in bed (§ 11.2–4), we may be reminded of Tarquinius' dire threat against Lucretia, claiming that he will place her corpse next to that of a naked slave, so that she will appear to have been caught in the act of adultery.[239] We should also note, however, that not all elements in the *Satyrica* follow their literary antecedents this closely: As Natalie Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*) points out, Giton's cry for help (*proclamarem,* § 9.5) has no equivalent in what we learn about Lucretia.[240]

237 Cf. Liv. 1.58.4 (*pudicitia*), 1.58.7 (*pudicitia*), 1.58.10 (*impudica*); Ov. *Fast.* 2.757 (*pudica*), 794 (*pudica*), 819 (*pudibunda*).

238 This link has been pointed out by Courtney (2001: 63). In Livy's version, it remains unclear whether Lucretia prepared Tarquinius' meal herself, cf. Liv. 1.58.2: *Ubi exceptus benigne ab ignaris consilii cum post cenam in hospitale cubiculum deductus …* ("Being kindly welcomed, for no one suspected his purpose, he was brought after dinner to a guest-chamber").

239 Cf. Liv. 1.58.4 and Ov. *Fast.* 2.807–9; this will be further discussed in section III.3. Punishment (§ 11.1–4).

240 According to Livy, Lucretia is asleep when Tarquinius approaches (cf. Liv. 1.58.2 *ad dormientem Lucretiam,* cited above). Once Tarquinius has spoken, Ovid (*Fast.* 2.797–8) stresses the fact that Lucretia is unable to respond: *illa nihil, neque enim vocem viresque loquendi | aut aliquid toto pectore mentis habet* ("Nothing from her, for she has no voice, no power to speak and no thought in all her heart").

In general terms, Petronius' parody consists in substituting high-born figures out of mythic history with the low-life characters populating the *Satyrica.* These characters react to the rape in a radically different manner: While Lucretia commits suicide because she cannot live with the disgrace (cf. Liv. 1.58.10–11; Ov. *Fast.* 2.830–4), Giton remains decidedly passive during the episode as we have it; later in the story, he will even choose the rapist over his 'husband' (§ 80.6). The correspondences between Ascyltus and Tarquinius may be just as superficial. In fact, the sword Ascyltus draws is often interpreted as a metaphor for his penis.[241] Whereas Collatinus joins Brutus in taking revenge on Tarquinius and his family (cf. Liv. 1.59.2), Encolpius merely stirs up a battle of words that quickly dissolves into laughter (§ 9.6–10.3). The fact that Lucretia's role is played by a male character may be seen to intensify the parodic effect.[242]

Scholars investigating comic elements in the *Satyrica* have rightly stressed that episodes revolving around love matters, such as the three quarrels over Giton, need not solely be interpreted as parodies of the 'idealising' Greek novel. This point, first made by Preston (1915: 265–6), has received its most thorough discussion in Panayotakis' study (1995: 10–11). In this context, Panayotakis (*ibid.*) notes, Encolpius takes the role of the jealous spouse, the *zelotypus* known from Herodas' fifth mimiamb, Juvenal (8.196–7) and a mime papyrus.[243] Encolpius, however, is not the only one striking theatrical poses: It has been argued that Ascyltus' reference to himself as Tarquinius amounts to a case of role-playing, just as he *pretends* to be horrified a little later on (*inhorrescere se finxit Ascyltos,* § 9.7).[244] A similar case can be made for Giton. Panayotakis (1995: 14) claims that "everything in his [i.e. Giton's] behaviour shows that the way he expresses his feelings is entirely artificial and false." For corroboration, Panayotakis (*ibid.* 14–15) refers to some clear instances of role-playing in the *fabula palliata* (e.g. Plaut. *Merc.* 599–600, *Mostell.* 640–2) and to Seneca's description of how actors imitate *verecundia* (*Ep.* 11.7). Seeing

241 Cf. the discussion in section III.2. Altercation (§ 9.6–10.7).

242 For further remarks on Giton's feminisation and objectification, cf. Makowski (2012), Clark (2019: 64–8) as well as the discussion below. Williams (2010b: 28) refers to a few other cases in Roman literature where men cast their opponents (or themselves) in the role of females.

243 Cf. also Preston (1915: 266). For the mime fragments revolving around a jealous adulteress, cf. Wiemken (1972: 81–106) and Rusten & Cunningham (eds., trans. 2003: 390–400). Fantham (1986) gives an overview of ζηλοτυπία in ancient literature.

244 Cf. Wooten (1976: 71), Slater (1990: 34) and Panayotakis (1995: 15–16).

Giton's predilection for mythological role models,[245] George (1966: 341) has even suggested that "we can imagine his approval of the terms, if not of the substance, of Ascyltos' threat," i.e. of being forced to play Lucretia's part.[246] Overall, Panyotakis (1995: 16) thinks that Petronius' intertextual engagement with mythic history is in line with the parodic tendencies of the *Phlyakes* and the mime.[247]

Whereas most previous scholars have given precedence to matters of role-playing and parody, my theatrical reading of the First Rivalry over Giton will focus on its relationship to the *fabula palliata.* Essentially, I will interpret the episode as an amalgam of three conventional comic plot elements: 1) a rape, 2) an altercation, and 3) a punishment. Subsequently, I will investigate the narrative techniques that create the impression of a stage production, concentrating on what may appear to be inconsistencies in Encolpius' narrative stance. Far from denying that Livy and Ovid are major points of reference for this episode, I will show that Petronius' parodic treatment fits neatly into the tradition of comic rape plots.

III.1 Rape (§ 9.1–5)

III.1.1 Sexual Violence in Petronius and in the Comic Tradition

For modern readers, one of the most disturbing aspects of ancient comedies is how they routinely treat rape as a youthful indiscretion. In contrast to Old Comedy, where rape is only imagined or threatened and where these threats are almost exclusively made against slaves, in New Comedy rape is always carried out, the victims always being free citi-

245 Cf. e.g. § 80.3.: *infelicissimus puer tangebat utriusque genua cum fletu petebatque suppliciter ne Thebanum par humilis taberna spectaret …* ("The poor boy held on to our knees in tears and begged us not to let this lowly tavern witness a Theban duel").

246 Cf. also Panayotakis (1995: 110): "the lascivious couple, Ascyltus and Giton, imitate Tarquinius and Lucretia, in order to justify their sexual desires within a ridiculously sophisticated context."

247 There are fourth-century BCE *phlyax*-vases depicting mythological figures such as Cassandra and Antigone; cf. Panayotakis (1995: 16 n. 57) with references for further reading. We know that such figures did not only appear in 'literary' comedy (e.g. Plaut. *Amph.*) but also in the mime; cf. Wüst 1932: 1752 for the evidence. In the case of the *fabula Atellana,* mythological themes are attested to by play titles such as *Agamemno suppositus, Ariadne* and *Sisyphus* by Pomponius, and *Andromacha, Hercules coactor* and *Phoenissae* by Novius.

zen girls.[248] About one third of all Menandrian plays feature rape.[249] It usually takes place at night and in the context of a religious festival, the malefactor later claiming that – under the influence of wine and uncontrollable sexual passion – he could not help raping the girl he desired. As the rape always entails pregnancy, it poses the problem of a child born out of wedlock and thus sets in motion the plot of the play.[250] Eventually, the rapist will marry his victim, thus both rescuing the girl from her disgrace and legitimising the child.[251] It is important to note that the rape never occurs on stage, but rather belongs to the backstory of the play and is only hinted at in euphemistic terms.[252]

While the Greek pattern applies to most *fabulae palliatae* featuring rape, Terence's *Eunuchus* constitutes a striking exception to the rule.[253] Here, the rape not only takes place during the day, but it is also premeditated, thus lacking some 'mitigating factors' associated with sexual violence in ancient comedy.[254] Equally importantly, the *Eunuchus* is the only extant comedy in which the rape takes place *during* the play: The perpetrator is the young Athenian citizen Chaerea, who, having spotted the beautiful girl Pamphila, claims to have fallen in love (307) and decides that he must "take possession" of her (*potiar,* 320 and 362). Together with his slave Parmeno, he devises the plan to change places with the eunuch who is supposed to guard Pamphila in her chamber (365–90).

248 On the different contexts of rape in Old and New Comedy, cf. Sommerstein (1998). Riess (2012: 279–85) gives an overview of all instances of anticipated rape in Aristophanes; cf. also Robson (2014). On rape in other (non-)literary texts, cf. Doblhofer (1994), Riess (2012), Harris (2004), Robson (2013: 102–13), as well as the contributions in Deacy & Pierce (eds. 1997).

249 Cf. James 2013: 194 n. 2. For a detailed discussion of rape in New Comedy and the *fabula palliata,* cf. Rosivach (1998).

250 Riess (2012: 355) stresses the fact that the illegitimate child is much more problematic than the rape as such; cf. also Pierce (1997: 166) and Robson (2013: 109).

251 On rape affecting the victim's social status in ancient comedy, cf. Konstan & Raval (2018: 55–7).

252 In the Menandrian oeuvre, only the *Epitrepontes* addresses rape more openly, cf. Riess (2012: 341).

253 Rape is an element in five plays by Plautus (*Amphitruo, Aulularia, Cistellaria, Epidicus, Truculentus*) and in four plays by Terence (*Adelphoe, Andria, Eunuchus, Hecyra*).

254 In fact, Harris (2004: 45–8) demonstrates that Athenian law did not consider drunkenness and youthful passion to be legitimate excuses for serious crimes such as rape. Rather, he (*ibid.* 74 f.) suggests, the guilt of many comic rapists was lessened by the fact that they had acted out of love rather than malevolence and that they proved their 'good intentions' by marrying the rape victim.

Chaerea wrongly assumes the girl to be a slave (321, 366); his justification for the trick is that he wishes to take revenge on all prostitutes (381–5).[255] Having put the plan into effect, Chaerea is full of joy and, still wearing the eunuch's costume, tells his friend Antipho about his great success (578–606): Indeed, the girl's guardian Thais and all servants took Chaerea to be the eunuch; they laid Pamphila on her bed and left him alone with her. Finding the girl asleep and without any guard but himself, he seized the opportunity and raped her (601–6). While Chaerea stops short of describing the act of sexual violence as such, his is still by far the most explicit account of a girl's rape in all extant comedy. Only towards the very end does the play reorient itself toward the typical New Comedy plot: Having learned that Pamphila is not a slave but a citizen (858), Chaerea apologises to Thais, claiming that he acted out of love rather than arrogance (877–8). He pledges to marry the girl (888), thus ringing in the 'happy ending' of the play.

In the following section, I will argue that the First Rivalry over Giton has clear parallels with the comic rape plot, most specifically so with Plautine plays revolving around non-consensual sex with slaves. However, since Petronius' parodic engagement with Livy and Ovid usually attracts most scholarly attention, the starting point of my discussion is that Ascyltus is not the first literary rapist to compare himself with a famous role model. While the *Satyrica* allows only a glimpse at what might be going on in Ascyltus' head, Terence's *Eunuchus* gives ample space to the thought processes of Chaerea. Telling his friend about his achievement, Chaerea elaborates on what happened in Pamphila's room a little while before the rape:

> *dum adparatur, virgo in conclavi sedet*
> *suspectans tabulam quandam pictam. ibi inerat pictura haec,*
> *Iovem*
> *quo pacto Danaae misisse aiunt quondam in gremium imbrem*
> *aureum.*
> *egomet quoque id spectare coepi, et quia consimilem luserat*
> *iam olim ille ludum, inpendio magis animu' gaudebat mihi,*

255 As a matter of fact, Pamphila's social status is by no means clear. Her guardian Thais says that her mother had been given Pamphila as a present, i.e. as a slave (Ter. *Eun.* 108–10). However, there are strong indications, she relates, that the girl was a free citizen who should be restored to her family (*ibid.* 110–118). At any rate, Thais treats Pamphila like a citizen, as she has a eunuch guard the girl in her room; cf. Christenson (2013: 264): "in the sexual code of New Comedy, Pamphila is a virgin and potentially eligible for marriage."

deum sese in hominem convortisse atque in alienas tegulas
venisse clanculum per inpluvium fucum factum mulieri.
at quem deum! "qui templa caeli summa sonitu concutit."
ego homuncio hoc non facerem? ego illud vero ita feci – ac lubens.
(Ter. *Eun.* 583–91)

While things were being got ready, the girl sat in the room, looking up at a painting; it depicted the story of how Jupiter sent a shower of gold into Danae's bosom. I began to look at it myself, and the fact that he had played a similar game long ago made me all the more excited: a god had turned himself into human shape, made his way by stealth on to another man's roof, and came through the skylight to play a trick on a woman. And what a god! The one who shakes the lofty vaults of heaven with his thunder! Was I, a mere mortal, not to do the same? I did just that – and gladly.

Several parallels between the rapists in Petronius and Terence stand out. Just as Ascyltus presents himself as a new Tarquinius (*Tarquinium invenisti,* §9.5), Chaerea comes to think of himself as directly following in Jupiter's footsteps (*ego homuncio hoc non facerem?*).[256] In the *Eunuchus,* the parodic contrast is just as obvious as in the *Satyrica,* since Chaerea has as much in common with a god as Ascyltus has with a mytho-historical prince. Furthermore, in both cases parody is not restricted to the rapists themselves: In the *Satyrica,* verbal echoes of Livy are not only found in Ascyltus' words but in the entire passage (cf. above). In the *Eunuchus,* Chaerea's musings are inspired by a painting in Pamphila's room, i.e. by a part of Terence's 'stage design' that lends a certain irony to the scene

256 Arguably, Chaerea puts into action a line of reasoning that is already attested in Aristophanic comedy. In the debate between Better Argument and Worse Argument, the latter gives the following advice to lecherous men (Aristoph. *Nub.* 1076–82): ἥμαρτες, ἠράσθης, ἐμοίχευσάς τι, κἄτ' ἐλήφθης· | ἀπόλωλας· ἀδύνατος γὰρ εἶ λέγειν. ἐμοὶ δ' ὁμιλῶν | χρῶ τῇ φύσει, σκίρτα, γέλα, νόμιζε μηδὲν αἰσχρόν. | μοιχὸς γὰρ ἢν τύχῃς ἁλούς, τάδ' ἀντερεῖς πρὸς αὐτόν. | ὡς οὐδὲν ἠδίκηκας· εἶτ' ἐς τὸν Δί' ἐπανενεγκεῖν, | κἀκεῖνος ὡς ἥττων ἔρωτός ἐστι καὶ γυναικῶν· | καίτοι σὺ θνητὸς ὢν θεοῦ πῶς μεῖζον ἂν δύναιο ("Say you slip up, fall in love, engage in a little adultery, and then get caught. You are done for because you are unable to argue. But if you follow me, go ahead and indulge in your nature, romp, laugh, think nothing shameful. If you happen to get caught *in flagrante,* tell him this: that you have done nothing wrong. Then pass the buck to Zeus, on the grounds that even he is worsted by lust for women, so how can you, a mere mortal, be stronger than a god?"). In the case of Plautus' *Amphitruo,* of course, we have an entire comedy revolving around a divine sexual predator and his mortal victim.

as a whole. As the references to historiography give an air of sophistication to the low-life action in Petronius' work, Terence's comedy creates the same effect through clear allusions to tragedy and possibly to epic: In his fourth-century commentary on the *Eunuchus,* Donatus asserts that *sonitu concutit* (590) constitutes a *parodia de Ennio* ("a parody of Ennius") and that *templa caeli summa* (*ibid.*) was *tragice, sed de industria, non errore* ("tragic, but by design, not by mistake").[257] Lastly, we may point out that Chaerea, being dressed as a eunuch and excited about playing tricks (*luserat,* 586; *ludum,* 587; *fucum,* 589), is in no way inferior to Ascyltus in terms of role-playing.[258]

These parallels show that a comic and a parodic reading of Petronius' episode are not mutually exclusive alternatives, but that they really go hand in hand. The rape plot in the *Satyrica* can be envisioned as functioning on two levels, as it were, complementing each other by means of contrast. The 'lower level' revolves around the day-to-day matters of selfish, impulse-driven characters from the bottom end of society. As I will show in the following section, this plotline bears close resemblances to farcical comedies involving sexual desire for slaves. The 'upper level', in turn, is constituted by the sustained parody of the rape of Lucretia according to Livy and Ovid. This intertextual dimension, bringing to mind a decisive moment in Roman history, is deliberately introduced so as to clash with the 'reality' of the story. The striking point about the *Eunuchus* is not only that it presents rape through the same kind of parody, but also that the contrast between the two levels in Terence is just as much a matter of social status as it is in Petronius.

I should emphasise that, by referring to a 'lower' and an 'upper' level, I do not mean to imply a sense of hierarchical order, i. e. that the intertextual level is more significant than the farcical one. Rather, both levels – or 'layers' – make an equally important contribution to the complexity of Petronius' work. I should also add that I do not deem the two levels to be independent of each other. As we shall see later on, the comic (and farcical) tradition itself is fond of allusions to elevated texts and genres. Speaking of two levels merely allows me to describe two phenomena that occur at the same time in the same text passage.

257 My translation. Barsby (ed. 1999 *ad loc.*) lists a few Ennian fragments to which Donatus might be referring. On Terence's use of tragic intertexts in general, cf. Sharrock (2013: 55–61).

258 On the metatheatrical quality of Chaerea's deception, cf. Christenson (2013: 265, 269–73).

III.1.2 Rape and Comic Slave Characters

Although Encolpius, Ascyltus and Giton obviously make a living as tricksters and parasites and thus hold a low rank in society, their exact status remains shadowy. The information that can be gathered from the text is inconclusive, not least owing to the fragmentary state of transmission and the continuous role-playing by various characters. Most scholars think it likely that the three protagonists are free citizens, while it remains uncertain whether they are freeborn or freedmen.[259] What is essential to my interpretation of the rape episode is that Giton frequently occupies a subordinate position among the trio. In general terms, he is younger than his two companions[260] and appears to play the receptive role in his sexual relationships with them.[261] More specifically, he is twice referred to as a slave or slave-like character by Encolpius: *Gitona libentissime servile officium tuentem* ("Giton, who was very willingly acting as our servant", § 26.10); *scires non libenter servire* ("You could tell he was not a willing slave", § 91.1).[262] When Ascyltus demands Giton back from Encolpius, he asserts that the boy was *fugitivum suum* ("his own runaway slave", § 97.10).[263] Moreover, Giton is assumed to be a slave by characters outside the trio, namely by Quartilla (§ 24.5) and Hermeros (§ 58.1–2).[264] We should also note that the term *puer* – which is applied

259 Habermehl (ed. 2006: XVIII–XIX), Breitenstein (ed. 2009: XVI–XVII) and Panayotakis (2019b: 184) suppose that Encolpius, Ascyltus and Giton are freeborn Roman citizens, whereas Courtney (2001: 41) argues that they belong "to the large class of educated freedmen, of undetermined ethnic background." Jensson (2004: 110) takes them to be (Greek) *exules* from outside the Roman territory. For an overview of the relevant passages and the questions they entail, cf. esp. Richlin (2009: 86–8) and Panayotakis (2019b: 182–6) with references for further reading.

260 Giton is referred to as a *puer* (cf. below) and is explicitly said to be around sixteen years old (cf. § 97.2). Encolpius and Ascyltus are called *adulescentes* (e.g. § 3.1, 20.6), i.e. "sexually-mature youth[s]" (Richardson 1984: 112).

261 Cf. Richlin (2009: 85): "Everything in the novel suggests that Encolpius and Giton conform to the normative man/boy pair, thus that Encolpius penetrates Giton, though we never see this." Cf. also section II.2.1. The Evidence of the *Satyrica*.

262 Much more problematic is Encolpius' statement that Giton once stayed in an *ergastulum*, a slave-prison (§ 81.5); cf. Courtney (2001: 41) and Habermehl (ed. 2006: XIX) for two contrasting interpretations.

263 Earlier, Ascyltus had said that Giton should *at least* have the freedom to choose his 'brother' (*sit illi saltem in eligendo fratre [salva] libertas*, § 80.5).

264 I have left aside references to the events taking place at Croton, where Encolpius and Giton are deliberately pretending to be slaves (cf. § 117.6). For further discussion of Giton's slave-like characteristics, cf. Panayotakis (2019b: 183) and esp. Clark (2019: esp. 25–50).

to Giton throughout the *Satyrica* (e.g. § 9.2, 9.10, 11.1) – regularly means as much as '(young) male slave' in Roman literature.[265] In a more narrow sense, the term may denote a 'boy favourite', i.e. a male slave who performs sexual services for his master.[266] As mentioned before,[267] such *pueri delicati* make up a distinct character type in Plautine comedy; the group's most prototypical representatives are Paegnium of the *Persa* and Pinacium of the *Stichus.* In the cast lists of their plays, these characters are simply called *pueri.* Their names – Παίγνιον ("Plaything") and Πινάκιον ("Little Picture") – are usually understood in an erotic sense, which is no less true for Giton (Γείτων, "Neighbour").[268]

While Giton's 'servile aspects' do not prove his legal status, their considerable number is significant in itself – perhaps nowhere more so than in the *Satyrica,* a work in which appearances often matter more than facts. What I aim at showing is that if we acknowledge Giton's slave-like characteristics, it becomes almost impossible to overlook the striking parallels between Petronius' episode and a certain strand in the comic tradition. In the hands of both Plautus and Petronius, rape plots turn into light-spirited farce.

In ancient Greece and Rome, the assessment of rape was highly dependent on the victim's social status. While the sexual abuse of a free citizen constituted a crime with serious consequences, abusing a slave was a radically different matter: From a legal perspective, owners were completely within their rights to have sex with the slaves they possessed, with or without their consent.[269] As mentioned above, Plautine slave masters often take this liberty with boys, their *pueri delicati.* When owners make sexual advances to their slave girls, the conflicts arising

265 Cf. *OLD* s.v. "puer 5"; *TLL* s.v. "puer II.B.1.b." In the *Satyrica,* cf. e.g. § 54.5: *venit decretum Trimalchionis quo puerum iussit liberum esse* ("There came Trimalchio's decree that the boy should be free"). For a thorough discussion of how Petronius' narrator employs the term *puer,* cf. Panayotakis (2019b: 188 f.).

266 Cf. *OLD* s.v. "puer 3"; *TLL* s.v. "puer II.B.1.d."

267 Cf. section II.2.2. The Evidence of Graeco-Roman Comedy.

268 Πινάκιον is the diminutive of πίναξ ("drawing- or writing-tablet; picture"), thus likely alluding to the boy's beauty (cf. Schmidt 1902: 379); note that the parasite Gelasimus compares Pinacium to a picture (*pictura,* Plaut. *Stich.* 271) when he makes his first appearance on stage. On Giton's name, cf. Habermehl (ed. 2006: XVI n. 20) with references for further reading. Clark (2019: 99–122) discusses some further links between Giton and Plautine slave characters (*servi callidi* in particular).

269 Cohen (2014) gives an overview of slaves' sexual rights in antiquity. On sex with slaves in Plautine comedy, cf. Richlin (2017: 105–26) and Witzke (2020: 343–4) with references for further reading.

thereof are restricted to their own family: In his comparison of Caecilius Statius' *Plocium* to the Menandrian original, Aulus Gellius (*NA* 2.23.8) mentions that the play featured an old man lamenting the loss of a beautiful slave girl; his wife had made him sell the potential mistress. We find similar plotlines in Plautus' *Mercator* and *Casina,* both taking for granted that slaves are sexually available to their owners.[270] In the *Mercator*, the *senex* Demipho falls in love with the *meretrix* Pasicompsa, who is incidentally the beloved of his son, and decides that he must buy her. Being afraid of his jealous wife, Demipho has his friend Lysimachus take the girl into his house so as to avoid suspicion. When Lysimachus' wife Dorippa turns out to be no less jealous than Demipho's, the tables turn against the old man and eventually induce him to give the girl to his son. The *Casina,* in turn, presupposes that a master is free to have sex with a slave girl who is 'married' to a male slave he owns.[271] In promoting the relationship between his slave Olympio and the beautiful Casina, the *senex* Lysidamus insists on his right to spend the wedding night with her himself. The old man's problem, again, is that his own son Euthynicus is in love with the same girl. As Euthynicus is absent from the play, however, his interests are represented by his mother Cleostrata, Lysidamus' wife. Cleostrata wants Casina to marry the slave Chalinus, as this would make the girl sexually available to Euthynicus and simultaneously keep her away from Lysidamus. In the wedding night, when both Olympio and Lysidamus think they can finally force themselves on Casina, whom they encounter in bed is not her but Chalinus wearing a concealing veil – a trap laid by Cleostrata. In the end, Olympio and Lysidamus get a beating and are thoroughly mocked by their opponents.[272]

270 On the similarities between Plautus' *Mercator* and *Casina,* cf. O'Bryhim (1989: 85–7).

271 On 'slave marriage' in ancient comedy, cf. Cox (2013: 171 f.) with references for further reading.

272 As we learn from some brief remarks in the play's prologue (Plaut. *Cas.* 81–2) and coda (1013–4), Casina will eventually turn out to be a free citizen and marry Euthynicus. Throughout the action as we have it, however, she is clearly treated as a piece of personal property; cf. e.g. Cleostrata's complaint about Lysidamus' insolence (193–95): *quin mihi ancillulam ingratiis postulat,* | *quae mea est, quae meo educta sumptu siet,* | *vilico suo se dare,* | *sed ipsus eam amat* ("He demands to give my slave girl, who is mine, who was brought up at my expense, to his overseer, against my will; but he himself is in love with her"); cf. also 260–2. Her friend Myrrhina replies that, since Lysidamus is the *pater familias,* Cleostrata does not have any claim to personal property (202): *hoc viri censeo esse omne quidquid tuom est* ("I believe that everything that is yours is your husband's"). On Cleostrata's rights as an *uxor dotata,* cf. Schuhmann (1977) and Gold (2020: 168–9). The revelation of Casina's citizenship does not problematise the men's behaviour, since they never actually have physical contact with her; cf. 81–3: *ea invenietur et pudica et*

The point of these summaries is to show that comic plots revolving around non-consensual sex with slave girls have more in common with the *Satyrica* than with the traditional New Comedy rape plot. Whereas plays in the Menandrian vein are essentially concerned with the respectability of citizen girls and with the legitimacy of children, such issues simply do not arise from the rape of slave girls. For, same as Giton, comic slave victims cannot fall any further down the social ladder to begin with. As there are no serious legal and/or social consequences to the sexual abuse of a slave, the plays in question do not work towards a resolution through marriage but instead focus on conflicts within the family. It is in this context that we encounter the motif of marital unfaithfulness, from where Panayotakis (1995: 10–11) has rightly drawn a connection to the *Satyrica.*[273] In broad terms, Ascyltus takes the role of the lecherous husband (Demipho, Lysidamus), Encolpius that of the jealous wife (Dorippa, Cleostrata), and Giton plays the part of the slave girl (Pasicompsa, Casina). The parallels, however, do not end there. While the element of sexual rivalry is present in many New Comedy plots, it is perhaps nowhere as pronounced as in the *Casina,* where we find no less than three pairs of rivals: Firstly, Lysidamus and his son compete over who gets sexual access to Casina, the son being represented by Cleostrata. Secondly, there are the two slave rivals Olympio and Chalinus, who are themselves eager to marry the girl and who engage in several insult matches in the course of the play. Thirdly, although Lysidamus supports Olympio and although they can look back at a sexual relationship of their own,[274] the two compete against each other during the wedding night over who gets to have sex with Casina first.

Sexual rivalry, as I will elaborate on below, is also at the heart of several Petronian episodes involving Giton. I will also show that Plautus' *Casina* comes remarkably close to the arrangement of plot elements in

libera, | *ingenua Atheniensis, nec quicquam stupri* | *faciet profecto in hac quidem comoedia* ("She [i.e. Casina] will turn out to be both 'pure' (*pudica*) and free, a freeborn Athenian, and indeed she will not commit anything in the way of fornication, at least not in this comedy"). Most scholars think that the coda's brief reference to a more conventional ending, i.e. Casina's recognition by her parents and her wedding to Euthynicus, is the result of a *contaminatio* of some sort; cf. Konstan (2014: 3–4) with references for further reading.

273 Of course, this motif is not limited to masters' sexual desire for their own slaves. In Plautus' *Asinaria* and *Menaechmi,* for instance, the wives' suspicions are aroused by prostitutes who – though paid for their services and often of slave status – are not the property of the men in question. On prostitutes in the comic tradition, cf. section IV.2. The Charms of Comic Prostitutes and *pueri delicati.*

274 Cf. section II.2.2. The Evidence of Graeco-Roman Comedy.

the First Rivalry over Giton: Both feature an attempt at non-consensual sex, verbal duelling as well as a slapstick punishment concluding the action. As far as rape is concerned, it is significant that Petronius and Plautus treat the sexual abuse of 'low' characters in a similar manner: Just as in comedy non-consensual sex with slaves is considered a 'crime' only inasmuch as it affects the central relationship between husband and wife (or father and son), the focus in the *Satyrica* is not on the rape and its victim but on the fight between Encolpius and Ascyltus that follows. Rather than giving rise to a complex plotline, raping a slave(-like) character is exploited for farcical entertainment.

A last point worth noting is that in order to read Petronius' episode in the light of comedies involving the sexual abuse of slaves, we need not necessarily assume that Encolpius or Ascyltus indeed own Giton. For, between the two extremes of a) raping a citizen, which was a crime with serious consequences, and b) raping one's own slave, which had no legal ramifications whatsoever, there is a middle scenario: If a man raped somebody else's slave, this did not constitute a crime as much as "an infringement on a master's property."[275] Such a 'minor offence', then, takes us back to Terence's *Eunuchus.* After the rape, when Chaerea is confronted by Pamphila's guardian Thais and her *ancilla* Pythias, the rapist makes the following excuse:

Thais: *quid feceras?*
Chaerea: *paullum quiddam.*
Pythias: *eho, "paullum," impudens?*
an paullum hoc esse tibi videtur, virginem
vitiare civem?
Chaerea: *conservam esse credidi.*
Pythias: *conservam! vix me contineo quin involem in*
capillum, monstrum: etiam ultro derisum advenit.
(Ter. *Eun.* 856–60)

Thais: What had you done?
Chaerea: Nothing very much.
Pythias: Hey, nothing very much, you shameless creature?
Does it seem to you nothing very much to rape a
citizen girl?

275 Cohen (2014: 194). The punishments for rape and adultery will be discussed in section III.3. Punishment (§ 11.1–4).

Chaerea: I thought she was a fellow slave.
Pythias: A fellow slave! I can scarcely restrain myself from flying at your hair, you monster! (*to Thais*) On top of it all he comes here to mock us.

Chaerea's assertion that Pamphila was a *conserva* is based not only on his misconception that she was a slave but also on his own pretence of being the eunuch who was supposed to guard the girl, i. e. another slave.[276] He bluntly dismisses the rape of a *conserva* as a matter of little significance (*paullum quiddam*). Perhaps even more remarkably, Pythias' words focus on Pamphila's social status just as much as Chaerea's do: As Donatus points out, Pythias *bene intulit civem, quod plus est etiam virginem vitiare:* αὔξησις *gradatim facta* ("She nicely introduced (the word) *civem* [citizen], which is even more serious than *virginem vitiare* [to rape a girl]: the αὔξησις [increase/amplification] is brought about step by step").[277] Pythias thus implicitly agrees with Chaerea's assumption that the rape of a slave amounts to a comparatively small offence. She leaves no doubt that a person's (perceived) social status was essential to how a sexual attack against them was categorised. This is true for the comic tradition no less than for the *Satyrica.*

III.1.3 Sexual Rivalry between Two Tarquinii

As outlined above, I intend to read Petronius' rape plot as an episode functioning on two levels. On the one hand, there is a plotline akin to Plautus' *Mercator* and *Casina,* in which the abuse of slave characters does not entail serious consequences but petty conflict: sexual rivalry. On the other hand, there is Petronius' intertextual engagement with Livy and Ovid. Evoking mytho-historical malevolence (Tarquinius) and virtue (Lucretia), the 'upper' level is carefully designed to contrast with the 'lower'.

It has already been remarked that Giton's demeanour at the beginning of the episode recalls Lucretia's tears and her sitting position when she is found by her husband Collatinus. This is the intertextual dimension of the episode. On the more basic level, it is interesting to note

276 Chaerea uses the same word at Ter. *Eun.* 366.

277 Donatus *ad* Ter. *Eun.* 857. My translation.

that the brief exposition of Giton's emotions is in line with the little we learn about female rape victims in comedy.[278] Again, the closest parallel is to be found in Terence's *Eunuchus*.[279] As we are informed by the *ancilla* Pythias, shortly after the rape Pamphila is in tears and unable to speak: *virgo ipsa lacrumat neque, quom rogites, quid sit audet dicere* ("The girl is crying and does not dare say what happened if you ask her", Ter. *Eun.* 659); this is reaffirmed by the girl's guardian Thais: *virgo conscissa veste lacrumans obticet* ("The girl's dress is torn, she is weeping, and she will not say a word", 820).[280] Giton's reaction resembles the girl's not only with regard to his tears but also with regard to his inability or unwillingness to speak about what occurred:

> *consedit puer super lectum et* ***manantes lacrimas pollice extersit****. perturbatus ego habitu fratris quid accidisset quaesivi.* ***at ille tarde quidem et invitus, sed postquam precibus etiam iracundiam miscui****, 'tuus' inquit 'iste frater seu comes paulo ante in conductum accucurrit coepitque mihi velle pudorem extorquere.* (§ 9.3–4)

Taken together with the points made in the previous section, these similarities allow us to read Giton's part in the episode as that of a rape victim in the comic tradition. To this basic role, then, Petronius adds the refinement of learned allusions: As will be elaborated on below, some verbal correspondences are indicative of a direct reception of Livy. In this case, however, it is intriguing to suspect a close relation to Ovid's *Fasti*

278 Reflecting social convention, New Comedy does not feature unmarried young women from bourgeois families speaking in public, i.e. in the street represented by the stage (cf. e.g. Riess 2012: 358 n. 384). In Plautus, we find two notable exceptions to this rule: The first one is the *virgo* in the *Persa*, who is, however, the daughter of a parasite and thus of relatively low social status (cf. Duckworth 1952: 254). The second exception is the small group of 'pseudo-meretrices' (cf. James 2013: 183–4), women who were raised to be prostitutes – thus being allowed to speak in public – and who turn out be free citizens only at the very end of the play.

279 On the problematisation of rape in Menander, cf. Riess (2012: 346–50). Terence's emphasis on the victims' perspective is the starting point for James (1998) to argue that the playwright presents rapists in an overall negative light; cf. also Christensen (2013: 266–8).

280 Cf. also Ter. *Eun.* 646, where Pythias says that Pamphila's dress was ripped and her hair torn. In comedy, the victims' dishevelled appearance is regularly emphasised so as to make clear that the women were raped rather than seduced (cf. Pierce 1997: 166 and *passim*).

(2.819–28), which places a great emphasis on Lucretia's initial inability to speak about the crime.[281]

At the beginning of this chapter, I claimed that Ascyltus' role can also be interpreted as functioning on two complementary levels. On the one hand, Ascyltus bears a striking resemblance to comic rapists, particularly to Chaerea in Terence's *Eunuchus*. On the other, he openly presents himself as another Tarquinius, an identification that is reinforced by further clear allusions in Petronius' narrative. In the remainder of this section, I will show that this comic/parodic interpretation can also be applied to Encolpius, the last member of the trio. In the second half of the episode, Petronius gives a twist to the initial constellation of characters: Instead of Ascyltus, he lends Encolpius the characteristics of a comic rapist and links him to Livy's Tarquinius by means of intertextual references.

Several scholars have noted that one of the most remarkable aspects of Petronius' episode is the role reversal between Encolpius and Ascyltus.[282] At the outset, Ascyltus desires to have sex with Giton. Encolpius appears and makes accusations against Ascyltus (§ 9.6). When Encolpius raises his hands to Ascyltus' eyes and hurls insults at him (*intentavi in oculos Ascylti manus et 'quid dicis' inquam* …, § 9.6), Ascyltus mirrors both the gesture and the verbal attack, even exaggerating them (*sublatis fortius manibus longe maiore nisu clamavit,* § 9.7). In the ensuing verbal duel, Ascyltus turns Encolpius' accusations against him: Having been called the worst kind of effeminate male (*muliebris patiaentiae scortum,* § 9.6), Ascyltus throws the insult right back at Encolpius: *ne tum quidem, cum fortiter faceres, cum pura muliere pugnasti* (§ 9.9–10). A detailed discussion of their altercation will follow in a later chapter.[283] The inversion is complete when Encolpius takes up the role Ascyltus previously held with regard to Giton: After the split-up, Encolpius is the one eager to have sex with the boy (§ 10.7), and Ascyltus is the one interrupting and making accusations (§ 11.2–4).

In general terms, of course, the techniques of inversion and mirroring are commonplaces of the comic tradition. For instance, we may think

281 Cf. the quote in section III. First Rivalry over Giton: Encolpius versus Ascyltus (§§ 9–11); esp. *illa diu reticet* (2.819); *ter conata loqui ter destitit* (2.823); *quaeque potest, narrat; restabant ultima: flevit* (2.827). In Livy (1.58.7), Collatinus' question is directly followed by Lucretia's reply.

282 Cf. e.g. Ciaffi (1955: 28), Gagliardi (1980: 48), Lefèvre (2007: 162), Breitenstein (ed. 2009: 119–20), and Williams (2010b: 31).

283 Cf. section III.2. Altercation (§ 9.6–10.7).

of Dionysus and Xanthias repeatedly exchanging their disguises in the course of their *katabasis* (Aristoph. *Ran.* 494–673), and of Jupiter and Mercury taking up the exact appearance of Amphitruo and Sosia respectively (Plaut. *Amph.*). More examples will be discussed in the course of this study. A parallel that is closer to the context of the *Satyrica* comes from Plautus' *Casina.* In the play's rivalry plot, we find the same tit-for-tat moves that also define Petronius' episode. For instance, when Lysidamus finds out that Chalinus could thwart his plans, he offers the slave's manumission under the condition that he back away from Casina (Plaut. *Cas.* 290–2). Counteracting her husband, Cleostrata makes the same offer to Olympio shortly afterwards (314–6). The same pattern can be observed in minute details: When Lysidamus tells Olympio to hit Chalinus (404), Cleostrata tells her slave to hit Olympio in return (*feri malam, ut ille, rusum,* "Hit his cheek in return, like him," 407). The inversion is clearly marked through verbal cues: *quid tibi instunc tactio est?* (406) ~ *quid tibi tactio hunc fuit?* (408). Olympio having referred to his master as his Jupiter (*quia Iuppiter iussit meus,* 406), Chalinus retaliates by calling Cleostrata his Juno (*quia iussit haec Iuno mea,* 408).[284] In short, Plautus' *Casina* brings together the same techniques that are at play in Petronius' episode.

What has not been noted by previous scholars is that the role reversal between Encolpius and Ascyltus is foreshadowed on the intertextual level. For, while most allusions draw a connection between Tarquinius and Ascyltus, there is one clear verbal echo that casts Encolpius in the role of the Livian rapist: Before Tarquinius forces himself on Lucretia, he confesses his love to her and, in his plea, mingles threats with entreaties (*miscere precibus minas,* Liv. 1.58.3).[285] Asking Giton about what occurred, Encolpius' behaviour is clearly modelled upon Tarquinius': *precibus etiam iracundiam miscui* (§ 9.3).[286] If we understand Giton's meal for Encolpius to allude to Lucretia's meal for Tarquinius (cf. above), this establishes an even closer link between the two.

The intertextual level foreshadows the inversion on the 'lower' one. Having taken Ascyltus' role, it is now Encolpius who displays the behav-

284 At Plaut. *Cas.* 230, Lysidamus had already referred to himself as Jupiter, and to his wife as Juno.

285 Cf. also Ov. *Fast.* 2.805–6: *instat amans hostis precibus pretioque minisque:* | *nec prece nec pretio nec movet ille minis* ("An enemy as a lover, he persists, with prayers and bribery and threats; but neither with prayer nor bribery nor threats does he move her").

286 Without further explication, Courtney (2001: 63) notes that this allusion is "functionally different" from the other ones in § 9.1–5.

iour of a comic rapist. In fact, Encolpius strongly resembles Chaerea in his anticipation of sexual satisfaction: Just as Chaerea claims that, being alone with the girl lying in bed, he could not help but rape her, Encolpius tells us in retrospect that his agreement with Ascyltus was brought about by his sexual desire: *hanc tam praecipitem divisionem* ***libido*** *faciebat; iam dudum enim amoliri cupiebam custodem molestum, ut veterem cum Gitone meo rationem reducerem* (§ 10.7).[287] One the one hand, this shows that Encolpius' behaviour is similar to that of comic characters not only in terms of his jealousy but also in terms of his lechery.[288] On the other, it is worth pointing out that Encolpius' new role, again, is marked on the intertextual level: Highlighting his *libido* clearly strengthens the connection between Encolpius and Tarquinius, since Livy associates the latter with this trait no less than three times: *Ibi Sex. Tarquinium mala libido Lucretiae per vim stuprandae capit* ("Sextus Tarquinius was seized with a wicked desire to debauch Lucretia by force," Liv. 1.57.10); *Quo terrore cum vicisset obstinatam pudicitiam velut victrix libido* ("At this dreadful prospect her resolute 'purity' (*pudicitia*) was overcome by his victorious lust," 1.58.5); *Ibi oratio habita … de vi ac libidine Sex. Tarquini* ("There he made a speech … about the violence and lust of Sextus Tarquinius," 1.59.8).[289]

Once they are alone with the object of their desire – having got rid of the house servants and Ascyltus respectively – Encolpius and Chaerea again resemble each other in their preparation for sex. The rapist in the *Eunuchus* first looks around to make sure everyone else has left, then bolts the door:[290]

> *interea somnu' virginem opprimit. ego limis specto*
> *sic per flabellum clanculum; simul alia circumspecto,*
> *satin explorata sint. video esse. pessulum ostio obdo.*
> (Ter. *Eun.* 601–3)

287 The *lacuna* directly before this passage hardly affects my interpretation. Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*) suspects that what is missing is the separation itself as well as Ascyltus' departure from the lodgings.

288 Lechery is characteristic not only of (some) *adulescentes* but also of *milites* and *senes amatores*; cf. section II.2.2. The Evidence of Graeco-Roman Comedy.

289 We may note that Ovid never uses the term *libido* with reference to Tarquinius' desire for Lucretia. Instead, we find expressions such as *caecus amor* (*Fast.* 2.762), a form of *cupere* (2.766), *amor* (2.778), *iniustus amor* (2.779), and *amans* (2.805).

290 Locking the door was part of the wedding ritual Terence may be parodying here, cf. Christenson (2013: 265).

> Meanwhile the girl fell asleep. I looked at her sideways through the fan, like this, and at the same time had a good look round to make sure that the coast was clear. I saw it was, and bolted the door.

Similarly, Encolpius goes outside to see whether Ascyltus has really left before rejoining Giton in the lodgings (*postquam lustravi oculis totam urbem, in cellulam redii,* § 11.1).[291] Encolpius does not tell us whether he locked the door, but we may infer as much from the fact that Ascyltus forcefully breaks the bolts when he enters unexpectedly (*discussisque fortissime claustris,* § 11.2). Once again, Encolpius' behaviour at the same time recalls that of Tarquinius, who makes sure the coast is clear before approaching Lucretia: *cum post cenam in hospitale cubiculum deductus esset, amore ardens, postquam satis tuta circa sopitique omnes videbantur, stricto gladio ad dormientem Lucretiam venit* ("he was brought after dinner to a guest-chamber. Burning with passion, he waited till it seemed to him that all about him was secure and everybody fast asleep; then, drawing his sword, he came to the sleeping Lucretia.", Liv. 1.58.2).[292] This allusion reinforces Encolpius' identification with Tarquinius one last time, before Ascyltus catches Encolpius red-handed and thus completes the role reversal.

Petronius' parody becomes all the more apparent when we take stock of the rivalry plot evolving on the lower level of the episode. The closest parallel, as far as I can tell, comes from Plautus' *Casina.* Looking back at the event, Olympio recounts what happened during the 'wedding night' with Chalinus, whom he believed to be Casina:

> *ubi intro hanc novam nuptam deduxi, recta via in conclave abduxi.*
> *sed tamen tenebrae ibi erant tamquam in puteo; dum senex abest*
> *'decumbe' inquam.*
> *conloco, fulcio, mollio, blandior,*
> *ut prior quam senex nup⟨tias perpetrem⟩.*
> […]
> *respecto identidem, ne senex * * **
> […]

291 I follow Köntges (ed. 2013 *ad loc.*) in taking *totam urbem* to be a hyperbole. Of course, the interpretation is complicated by the *lacuna* before § 11.1.

292 This element is absent from the Ovidian version.

*enim iam magis adpropero, magi' iam lubet in Casinam inruere * cupio illam operam seni surrupere, forem obdo, ne senex me opprimeret.*
(Plaut. *Cas.* 881–890/91)

When I led this new bride inside, I took her straight to a bedroom. But there was darkness in there like in a dungeon. While the old man was away, I said, "Lie down." I got her placed, supported her with pillows, soothed her, and coaxed her, in order to consummate the marriage before the old man. […] I looked back again and again so that the old man would not ***. […] Then I hurried to her more insistently, I was keener to throw myself upon Casina then. I wished to steal that job from the old man; I bolted the door so that my old master would not surprise me.

Despite the mutilation of Plautus' text, several parallels with Encolpius' situation are clearly discernible. Most obviously, Olympio resembles Encolpius in that he makes sure he is alone with the object of his desire (*respecto identidem*) and bolts the door (*forem obdo*). While these elements are also present in Terence and Livy, it is significant that Encolpius and Olympio do not want to avoid unwanted witnesses – as do Chaerea and Tarquinius – but to shut out one specific rival (*custodem molestum,* § 10.7; cf. *respecto identidem, ne senex … forem obdo, ne senex me opprimeret*). Just as Encolpius could not wait for Ascyltus to leave (*iam dudum enim amoliri cupiebam,* § 10.7), Olympio seizes the opportunity opened up to him by Lysidamus' absence (*dum senex abest 'decumbe' inquam*). When they are finally able to enjoy some time alone with Giton and 'Casina' respectively, they cannot help thinking about the rival on their heels (*fruorque votis usque ad invidiam felicibus,* § 11.1; cf. *cupio illam operam seni surrupere*). Ultimately, of course, both characters are unable to achieve the sexual gratification they long for: Encolpius is interrupted by Ascyltus, and Olympio eventually finds out he was in bed with Chalinus.

In the previous sections, I have delved deeply into two aspects of the First Rivalry over Giton: Petronius' intertextual engagement with the Lucretia story on the one hand, and his incorporation of theatrical elements on the other. One important question remaining is whether these two aspects should be conceived of as independent of each other, or whether there is an overlap between the two. In other words: When writing this episode, could Petronius have had in mind theatrical versions of the Lucretia story? As we shall see, there is indeed some evidence that

ancient audiences came to associate Lucretia with the theatrical stage long before Petronius' lifetime.

III.1.4 Lucretia on the Ancient Roman Stage

We know that the story revolving around the rape of Lucretia and the overthrow of king Tarquinius Superbus long predated Livy's *ab urbe condita.* As we learn from Dionysius of Halicarnassus (4.64), the events in question had already been discussed by Fabius Pictor, Rome's first historian (fl. late 3rd century BCE).[293] More importantly to the study at hand, we know that Lucius Accius (c. 170–84 BCE) treated the story in the form of a stage play, a *fabula praetexta* entitled *Brutus.* The reference, of course, is to Lucius Junius Brutus, who is present at Lucretia's suicide and subsequently brings about the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus, the father of the rapist Sextus Tarquinius.[294]

Four, possibly five, fragments of Accius' *Brutus* survive. The first two of these (Cic. *Div.* 1.43–4, 1.45) are the longest fragments of any Republican *fabula praetexta.* They deal with a dream Tarquinius Superbus has had, warning him of someone he assumes to be dumb and who will eventually cause his downfall. The person in question can be no other than Lucius Junius Brutus, who – before witnessing Lucretia's suicide – feigns being slow-witted in order to free himself from suspicion.[295] The other two fragments (Varro *Ling.* 5.80; Cic. *Sest.* 123) are comparatively short, each focusing on one specific word or phrase. Interestingly, though, the latter of these fragments tells us that Accius' *Brutus* was restaged in Cicero's lifetime.[296]

293 Cf. e.g. Ogilvie (1965: 218 f.).

294 Cf. e.g. Liv. 1.59–60 and Ov. *Fast.* 2.849–52. Wiseman (2008b: 271–92) argues that historians such as Livy merged into one the previously unrelated stories about Lucius Junius Brutus on the one hand and Lucretia on the other. However, if and when this merger really occurred cannot be proved.

295 Cf. e.g. Liv. 1.56.8.

296 Cic. *Sest.* 123: *utrum igitur haec Aesopum potius pro me aut Accium dicere oportuit, si populus Romanus liber esset, an principes civitatis? nominatim sum appellatus in Bruto: Tullius, qui libertatem civibus stabiliverat. miliens revocatum est* ("Ought then Aesopus or Accius to have pleaded thus for me, had the Roman People been free, or ought the chief men of the State? In the *Brutus* I was mentioned by name: 'Tullius, who stablished safe the people's freedom.' The line was encored a thousand times."). Trans. Gardner (ed., trans. 1958), slightly adapted. While Accius' text must refer to king Servius Tullius, the prede-

For our purposes, the most remarkable piece of evidence is the fifth surviving fragment, the one that cannot definitively be attributed to Accius. In his *de lingua Latina* (6.7), Varro discusses the expression *nox intempesta* ("in the dead of night") in the following terms:

> *Inter uesperuginem et iubar dicta nox intempesta, ut in Bruto Cassii quod dicit Lucretia: Nocte intempesta nostram deuenit domum.*
>
> Between the evening star and the morning star one speaks of the *nox intempesta,* as Lucretia says in the *Brutus* of Cassius: "In the *nox intempesta* he came to our house."[297]

Varro quotes the same line at *Ling.* 7.72, where he also attributes it to a certain Cassius. Many scholars believe Varro's text to be faulty, and that the name 'Cassius' should be emended to 'Accius', which would make the above quote the fifth extant fragment of Accius' *Brutus.*[298] Among other things, these scholars doubt that there were two *fabulae praetextae* of the same name. Others argue that the manuscripts' reading should be preserved.[299] Gesine Manuwald (2001: 239f.) suggests that the Cassius in question is C. Cassius Parmensis (fl. 50–40 BCE), an author who is known to have written *fabulae crepidatae.*

Regardless of whether we attribute the play to Accius or Cassius, the fact of the matter remains that Varro quotes a line from a character called Lucretia (*dicit Lucretia*). There can be no doubt that we are dealing with the wife of Collatinus: She is the only famous Lucretia known to us, and she alone has a close connection to Brutus' story.[300] In the fragment, Lucretia says that somebody came into her house late at night (*Nocte intempesta nostram deuenit domum*). Likely, she is referring to no other than the rapist Sextus Tarquinius; as she is speaking of him in the third

cessor of Tarquinius Superbus, Cicero suggests that it refers to himself (M. Tullius Cicero); cf. also Schol. Bob. *ad* Cic. *Sest.* 123, cited in Manuwald (2001: 62). The fact that Cicero names a famous actor of his own time (Aesopus) makes clear that Accius' play had been restaged in the recent past. For further discussion, cf. Manuwald (2001: 63, 234).

297 Trans. de Melo (ed., trans. 2019 *ad loc.*), slightly adapted.

298 Cf. most recently de Melo (ed., trans. 2019 *ad loc.*) and see Manuwald (2001: 238 n. 272, 273) for further references.

299 Cf. e.g. Ogilvie (1965: 218) and esp. Manuwald (2001: 237–9).

300 Cf. Manuwald (2001: 240).

person, we might be getting a glimpse at how she describes the rape (to her husband and/or others) after the fact.[301]

The fragments of Accius' *Brutus* – and possibly of Cassius' eponymous play – prove that the rape of Lucretia had been the subject of ancient theatrical productions well before Petronius' day. The fact that Accius' *fabula praetexta* was restaged in Cicero's lifetime speaks for the story's popularity. Of course, this does not necessarily mean that Petronius' First Rivalry over Giton was directly inspired by such a play. It does show, however, that contemporary readers/listeners plausibly associated the rape of Lucretia with the stage. Petronius, then, did not conjure up out of thin air theatrical renderings of Lucretia, Collatinus and Sextus Tarquinius.

In this chapter, I aimed to show that the comic rape plot is one important part of the literary tradition that the First Rivalry over Giton makes use of. Petronius' rape narrative functions on two levels: The first one bears a close resemblance to sexual rivalries in Plautus, particularly because some of these also involve non-consensual sex with characters low in the social hierarchy. Superimposed on this farcical plotline is the intertextual level, constantly inviting a comparison with the rape of Lucretia according to Livy and Ovid. Petronius' parody pertains not only to the rapist Ascyltus but also to the lecherous Encolpius in the second half of the episode. We have not only seen that Petronius' parodic treatment of a rape plot has precedents in the comic tradition, but also that contemporary readers/listeners of the *Satyrica* plausibly associated the Lucretia story itself with theatrical performances. In the following sections, I will investigate two further comic plot elements discernible on the 'lower level' of Petronius' text: an abusive verbal duel and a spectacular punishment.

301 These points have been made by Manuwald (2001: 241).

III.2 Altercation (§ 9.6–10.7)

The quarrel between Encolpius and Ascyltus (§ 9.6–10.3) has been briefly addressed in the preceding section as well as in the discussion of indiscriminate lechery in the *Satyrica* and in the comic tradition.[302] In this section, I will elaborate on the points of contact between this altercation and verbal duels performed in front of an audience – a plot element known from Aristophanes, Plautus, and other comic playwrights.

As my analysis will take into account a number of minute details, I shall begin by giving an overview of the motifs and the structure of the Petronian passage. In general terms, the insult match can be said to comprise 'two rounds', each consisting of an accusation by Encolpius against Ascyltus followed by the latter's reply.[303] Having listened to Giton's account of the rape (attempt), Encolpius confronts Ascyltus (*quid dicis …*). He raises his hands to his opponent's eyes (*intentavi in oculos Ascylti manus*), a gesture that he will reuse later in the story so as to underpin a threat against Tryphaena.[304] Encolpius accuses Ascyltus of being a prostitute (*scortum*) and of playing the disgraceful 'passive', i. e. receptive and 'feminine', part in sexual intercourse (*muliebris patientiae*).[305] Already at this point, Encolpius' words make it difficult to distinguish between what is based on the 'facts' of the story and what may be considered an insult pure and simple. We cannot categorically exclude the possibility, for instance, that Ascyltus sold his body in some lost portion of the *Satyrica*.[306] We know for certain, however, that *scortum* could be used as a term of

302 Cf. section II.1. Problems of Terminology and Categorisation as well as section II.2. Indiscriminate Lechery.

303 Cf. Lefèvre 2007: 159.

304 Cf. § 108.5: *intentans in oculos Tryphaenae manus usurum me viribus meis clara voce clamavi* ("Raising my hands to Tryphaena's face, I said loudly and clearly that I was going to use force …"). This gesture will be further discussed below, cf. n. 351.

305 On the unwritten rule that 'true males' should always be the ones penetrating others, never the ones being penetrated, cf. section II.1. Problems of Terminology and Categorisation. *pati* is the *terminus technicus* for the receptive role (cf. Adams 1982: 189–90). The phrase *muliebris patientia* recurs at § 25.3 when Encolpius states that the girl Pannychis was too young to have sex with Giton; for related expressions in Latin literature, cf. Williams (2010a: 157, 192, 225).

306 At § 8.3–4 Ascyltus tells Encolpius that he refused to accept money for sex. However, the fact that the *pater familiae* (§ 8.2) apparently takes him to be a prostitute may be significant in itself.

abuse without any reference to established facts.[307] The same is true for words hinting at the receptive role.[308] The second part of Encolpius' statement mentions Ascyltus' bad breath (*cuius ne spiritus ⟨quidem⟩ purus est*). In this sexual context, it seems clear that Encolpius accuses his opponent of having performed *fellatio,* a practice that was thought to cause *os impurum.*[309]

In response to Encolpius' verbal attack, Ascyltus pretends to be horrified and exaggerates his opponent's gesture[310]. His first reply has received much scholarly attention, since part of it possibly sheds light on lost episodes of the *Satyrica.* The first controversial expression is *gladiator obscene.* Taking the words at face value, some scholars surmise that Encolpius had once been condemned to fight in an amphitheatre[311] and/or that he had been a member of the *pars obscena* of a gladiatorial school.[312] In some regards, this supposition seems to be confirmed by Encolpius' own words at § 81.3: *harenae imposui* ("I cheated the arena"). Assuming that there is some truth to this, *quem †de ruina† harena dimisit* – if the reading can be maintained – could mean as much as "whom the arena dismissed on account of its collapse."[313] It has been speculated that the arena's destruction might have been caused by an earthquake, as had been the case with the amphitheatre at Fidenae in 27 CE

307 In his *Philippics* (2.44), for instance, Cicero refers to the young Mark Antony as a *vulgare scortum*; for more references, cf. Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad* § 9.6).

308 On verbal abuse referring to various sexual activities, cf. Opelt (1965: 154–7) and the discussion below.

309 Cf. already Wouveren and Erhard in Burman (ed. 1743 *ad loc.*). On the 'staining' of the mouth through oral sex, cf. Richlin (1983: 26–9), Obermayer (1998: 214–31) and Krenkel (2006: 219–20).

310 Cf. section III.1.3. Sexual Rivalry between Two Tarquinii.

311 Paratore (1933: 167), for instance, suggests that Encolpius had at some point been condemned to be a gladiator. This assumption has been criticised by Bagnani (1956: 25 f.), pointing out that freeborn Romans could not receive this punishment; if anything, he claims, Encolpius could have been condemned to fight against wild beasts in the amphitheatre.

312 Cf. Cerutti & Richardson (1989: 594). They (*ibid.* 589 f.) argue that such a *pars obscena* (cf. Sen. *Q Nat.* 7.31.3) may have consisted of effeminate fighters and served the purpose of comic relief in the course of extended *spectacula.* Taking up this line of thought, Jensson (2004: 158) speculates that the gladiatorial school in question might have belonged to the character called Lycurgus, who is mentioned at § 83.4 and 117.3.

313 For a discussion of this expression and for various conjectures, cf. Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*) and Köntges (ed. 2013 *ad loc.*).

(cf. Suet. *Tib.* 40), and that this had afforded Encolpius the opportunity to escape.[314]

Other scholars – cautioning against literal readings[315] – interpret Ascyltus' words as insults that may or may not refer to lost episodes of the *Satyrica*.[316] *gladiator* is amply attested as a term of abuse; the adjective *obscene* arguably marks it as a sexual slur.[317] Apart from the fact that gladiators were generally associated with sexual activity,[318] it may be significant that *gladius,* same as the names of various other elongated weapons, was a common metaphor for the *phallus*.[319] As mentioned before, the same *double entendre* may be at play at § 9.5, where Ascyltus draws his *gladius* and announces that he will rape Giton.[320] Assuming that the expression *gladiator obscene* is meant to make a point about Encolpius' sex life, it has been argued that *ruina* does not refer to the collapse of an amphitheatre but to a 'sexual collapse' on Encolpius' part.[321] Rather than denoting a brick-and-mortar building, *harena* would then designate the place of sexual intercourse, i.e. the bed. The entire phrase (*quem de ruina harena dimisit*) could then mean something along the lines of "the (sexual) arena let him go on a charge of impotence" (Schmeling 1994/5: 216).

A similar range of interpretations, literal and/or figurative, can be applied to Ascyltus' second accusation: *nocturne percussor.* It has often been read in connection with Encolpius' words at § 81.3 (*hospitem occidi*;

314 This hypothesis, first proposed by Bagnani (1956: 26), is advocated by Cerutti & Richardson (1989: 594), Courtney (2001: 47), and Jensson (2004: 140 f.).

315 In Bagnani's (1956: 25) view, Encolpius' words at § 81.3 (*effugi iudicium, harenae imposui*; "I escaped my trial, I cheated the arena") prove that he was never really condemned to the arena. Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011 *ad loc.*) claim that it would be "out of character for E. [sc. Encolpius] ever to have fought any person or animal in an arena."

316 For a metaphorical reading of the entire altercation, cf. Mulroy (1970) and Schmeling (1994/5). While Mulroy asserts that this kind of verbal abuse does not tell us anything about past events, Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011 *ad* § 9.8) claim that "there must have been something embarrassing which E. [sc. Encolpius] suffered and of which Ascyltus now makes fun."

317 On *gladiator* as mere abuse, cf. Bagnani (1956: 26) and Pack (1960: 31). For similar usage in other texts, cf. Opelt (1965: 136). Mulroy (1970: 255) points out the significance of the adjective *obscene.*

318 Cf. Schmeling 1994/5: 212 n. 18.

319 Cf. Schmeling (1994/5: 212) and note 226.

320 This was first suspected by Adams (1982: 21); *contra*: Courtney (2001: 63 n. 16).

321 Cf. Schmeling (1994/5: 215 f.). A similar argument is made by Obermayer (2003: 75).

"I killed my host") so as to refer to the fact that he committed a murder in some lost episode of the *Satyrica*.[322] It should be kept in mind, however, that Encolpius' words in his prayer to Priapus (§ 133.3) appear to contradict this hypothesis.[323] The alternative is to regard *nocturne percussor* as mere abuse, with the verb *percutere* as a euphemism for penetration and the adjective *nocturnus* as another marker of the sexual realm.[324]

As the following sections will make clear, my interpretation of the Petronian altercation tends to be metaphorical rather than literal in that I take it to be replete with sexual slurs. The narrative's state of transmission, however, does not allow us to summarily dismiss speculations about lost parts of the *Satyrica*. It is quite possible that Encolpius and Ascyltus are in some way referring to past events of the story. Significantly, though, these possibilities are not incompatible with figurative readings of the quarrel. The sexually 'active' connotations of *gladiator* and *percussor,* for instance, exist regardless of whether Encolpius ever was a gladiator or an assassin in the narrow sense.

Naturally, the different readings discussed above have an impact on how scholars understand the remainder of Ascyltus' first reply. Let us first consider the phrase *qui ne tum quidem, cum fortiter faceres, cum pura muliere pugnasti.* Those who take Ascyltus' words literally, i.e. that Encolpius had been some kind of gladiator, think it conceivable that he actually fought against a woman in the amphitheatre.[325] Others point out that both *facere* and *pugnare* are common metaphors for sexual activity.[326] It has been argued that Ascyltus makes a distinction between Encolpius' highly potent past (*cum fortiter faceres*) and his less potent – perhaps

322 Pack (1960: 31), for instance, claims that Encolpius "killed a man by night"; cf. Jensson (2004: 142 n. 324): "I simply take it [sc. *nocturne percussor*] to refer to a murder committed by Encolpius at night or at least in a secretive, non-virile manner." Paratore (1933: 168) went as far as to suggest that the person killed by Encolpius was Lycurgus. Though this link clearly belongs to the realm of speculation (cf. Pack 1960: 32), Paratore's hypothesis has recently been reformulated by Jensson (2004: 159); cf. also Courtney (2001: 48).

323 § 133.3: *non sanguine tristi | perfusus venio* ("I do not come to you stained with dark blood"); cf. Mulroy (1970: 256).

324 Cf. Opelt (1965: 46), Mulroy (1970: 255) and Schmeling (1994/5: 217). On the sexual connotation of Latin verbs meaning 'to beat' or 'to strike', cf. Adams (1982: 145–9).

325 Cf. Cerutti & Richardson (1989: 594) and Jensson (2004: 143).

326 Cf. Adams (1982: 204) on *facere* and *ibid.* (147) on *pugnare* in this Petronian passage. *fortiter facere,* a military expression, can be used to describe heroic, manly action (cf. Breitenstein ed. 2009 *ad loc.*).

even impotent – present.[327] The expression *pura muliere* is sometimes understood to refer to a 'decent woman' in general terms, the implication being that Encolpius was sexually more successful with 'indecent' women.[328] The more convincing interpretation, I believe, is that Ascyltus uses the imagery of (im)purity in the same way Encolpius does, i.e. that he accuses his opponent of having made use of a *fellatrix*.[329] At last, Ascyltus reminds Encolpius of the fact that they once had a (sexual) relationship of their own (*cuius eadem ratione in viridario frater fui qua nunc in deversorio puer est*); his reference to a garden (*viridarium*) has led to some speculations about non-extant parts of the *Satyrica*.[330]

After Ascyltus' elaborate reply, Encolpius abruptly changes the subject: He reproaches his opponent for sneaking away from the conversation with the teacher (*subduxisti te … a praeceptoris colloquio*), who can with some confidence be identified as Agamemnon.[331] In response, Ascyltus insults Encolpius (*homo stultissime*) and excuses himself by referring to his hunger (*cum fame morerer*) and the inanity of Agamemnon's talk (*vitrea fracta et somniorum interpretamenta*). Finally, he accuses Encolpius of having engaged in insincere flattery in order to receive a dinner invitation (*ut foris cenares poetam laudasti*).[332] Thereafter, the fierce quarrel dissolves into laughter (*itaque ex turpissima lite in risum diffusi*).[333] As most items addressed so far, the ending of the altercation has received divergent explanations. For the sake of a comprehensive

327 Cf. Obermayer (2003: 74 f.). Several other scholars, including Richardson (1984: 114), Schmeling (1994/5: 213) and Köntges (ed. 2013 *ad* § 9.8), also argue that Ascyltus is hinting at Encolpius' impotence. We need to note, however, that Encolpius' erectile dysfunction at this early point of the story is a matter of speculation (cf. e.g. Jensson 2004: 138 f.). McMahon (1998) discusses male sexual dysfunction in ancient Greece and Rome; on the *Satyrica,* cf. esp. *ibid.* 80–5, 92–7, 192–215 as well as Obermayer (2003) and Hallett (2012).

328 Cf. e.g. Mulroy (1970: 255) and Richardson (1984: 114). Without corroborating evidence, Soverini (1976: 105 f.) speculates that *impura mulier* might refer to a *pathicus*.

329 Cf. Soverini (1976: 103) and, for instance, Lefèvre (2007: 159 f.), Richlin (2009: 85) and Williams (2010b: 30 n. 14).

330 Jensson (2004: 147) suggests that this *viridarium* might have been located on Lycurgus' property.

331 Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011 *ad loc.*) suspect a *lacuna* after Ascyltus' first reply; *contra*: Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*).

332 For a thorough discussion of Ascyltus' words about Agamemnon, cf. Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*) and Köntges (ed. 2013 *ad loc.*).

333 Some scholars, deeming the transition to be too abrupt, have argued in favour of a *lacuna* after the words *poetam laudasti*; cf. Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*) for a discussion and for references for further reading.

overview, it makes sense to briefly discuss the possible rationale behind Encolpius' and Ascyltus' accusations.

III.2.1 The Dynamics of Petronian Quarrelling

Many scholars, not only those taking the passage quite literally, suggest that it is Ascyltus who 'wins' the altercation. For instance, Jensson (2004: 139) argues that Encolpius – having been called a *gladiator,* a *percussor* and an aficionado of oral sex (§ 9.8–10) – "says no more about the issue and thus implicitly acknowledges that his case has been destroyed." Accordingly, Jensson's (*ibid.* 140) interpretation of the quarrel's ending is that "Encolpius is outwitted and all he can do is to laugh in embarrassment at having been seen through. Ascyltos, who has won the argument with the help of his quick wit, joins him in the laughter." Others emphasise the artificiality and playfulness of the altercation, thus rendering (almost) immaterial questions about winners and losers. Before aligning myself with the latter group of scholars, in this section I will attempt to outline the 'strategies' Encolpius and Ascyltus appear to adopt in the course of the altercation.

As has been touched upon before, it seems clear that Ascyltus beats Encolpius at his own game, as it were. Ascyltus not only mirrors and exaggerates his opponent's gesture, but he also copies and multiplies the syntactical structure of his accusation: One term of abuse (*muliebris patientiae scortum*) in combination with a relative clause (*cuius …*) is answered by two such terms (*gladiator obscene … nocturne percussor*) and three such relative clauses (*quem … qui … cuius …*).[334] We may also note the anaphora (*non taces … non taces*) and the chiasmus – *gladiator* (A) *obscene* (B) … *nocturne* (B) *percussor* (A) – in Ascyltus' words. Walsh (1970: 87) is right to call them a "studied riposte" and to refer to the entire altercation as a rhetorical battle. How exactly, however, may Ascyltus be seen to come out victorious? His strategy is more readily discernible in the second round of the quarrel, particularly in the phrase *multo me turpior es tu.* Firstly, it shows that Ascyltus understands as an accusation Encolpius' reference to their conversation with Agamemnon (*subduxisti te … a praeceptoris colloquio*). Evidently, he thinks that Encolpius reproaches him for being *turpis* ("dishonourable" or "morally reprehen-

334 On the symmetry between the accusations, cf. e.g. Lefèvre (2007: 87) and Breitenstein (ed. 2009: 119 f.).

sible").[335] Secondly, the phrase shows that Ascyltus turns the accusation against his opponent, claiming that Encolpius' character is more reprehensible than his own (*me turpior*). The preceding two sentences apparently constitute Ascyltus' justification for his own behaviour: He was hungry (*cum fame morerer*) and saw no point in listening to Agamemnon (*vitrea fracta et somniorum interpretamenta*). The last phrase of Ascyltus' reply (*qui ut foris cenares poetam laudasti*) serves as evidence for Encolpius' *turpitudo.*

It is more difficult to assess Ascyltus' rationale in the first round of the altercation. Most scholars agree that his words involve a strong sexual element and may thus be considered an 'appropriate' response to Encolpius' slur. At least one expression rather plainly picks up on Encolpius' words: Having been called a *fellator* by reference to his impurity, Ascyltus turns the accusation around, reproaching his opponent for having used 'impure' *fellatrices* (cf. above). Problematically, however, while Encolpius clearly casts Ascyltus in the receptive role, Ascyltus appears to attribute the *insertive* role to his adversary: Whereas Encolpius claims that Ascyltus allows his mouth to be penetrated by other males, Ascyltus asserts that Encolpius has penetrated the mouths of females. The terms *gladiator* and *percussor* are also suggestive of the insertive rather than the receptive role.[336] The same applies to the last item of Ascyltus' first reply, in which he compares himself to the *puer* Giton, who – as we have seen – must be expected to play the receptive role with Encolpius. Can it really be Ascyltus' strategy to portray himself as a penetrated male and his opponent as a penetrating one? As Williams (2010b: 30 n. 15) rightly points out, "this would be a particularly ineffective stance for Ascyltos to take in a dispute, and would not have the obviously desired effect of insulting Encolpius."

335 Several scholars have argued that what Encolpius means to say by *subduxisti te a praeceptoris colloquio* is something along the lines of 'You sneaked off on purpose so as to have sex with my Giton!', cf. e.g. Ciaffi (1955: 25) and Jensson (2004: 139). Although they suspect that some words spoken by Encolpius might have fallen out, the interpretation proposed by Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011 *ad loc.*) is very similar. While this line of argument is intriguing, one important caveat remains: If Encolpius' words really entail criticism of his opponent's behaviour toward Giton, Ascyltus does not pick up on it but talks about food and nonsensical teachings instead. In the extant passage, Encolpius makes no special effort to direct the conversation toward the alleged rape.

336 Cf. the remarks above as well as Williams (2010b: 30): "The two roles in which Ascyltos casts his accuser … are described by agent nouns (*gladiator, percussor*) which are morphologically and culturally coded as masculine, male and active." For some exceptional cases of ambivalent and/or effeminate gladiators, cf. *ibid.* with n. 13.

Trying to account for this difficulty, some scholars have argued that Ascyltus' accusation is less concerned with insertive and receptive roles than with the sexual partners one pursues. However, as such hypotheses are incompatible with what we know about Roman perceptions of 'true masculinity', they need to be dismissed.[337] Other scholars, rightly emphasising that Romans were little concerned with whether a male was sexually interested in females or males, have called attention to different ways of looking at the altercation. Schmeling (1994/5: 213) suggests that there is a sense of irony to Ascyltus' words: Calling Encolpius a (highly virile) gladiator, he claims, is meant to highlight the fact that he is the very opposite: a man plagued by bouts of impotence (cf. above). Williams (2010b: 30) goes as far as to question our understanding of the relationship between Encolpius and Giton:

> Yet the point of Ascyltos' remark seems to be to make distinctions with regard to *how* they were 'brothers' (*eadem ratione … qua …*) and it is hard to avoid the conclusion that he is alluding to sexual role: in a previous encounter in a garden, Ascyltos had played the masculine, penetrating role with Encolpius and the young Giton is now doing the same in the inn. The remark scores a further point against Encolpius by implicitly casting him in the feminine penetrated role – even, quite against the norms of Roman masculinity, in his relationship with the young Giton.

337 Cf. section II.1. Problems of Terminology and Categorisation. The reason I am devoting any attention to such hypotheses is that certain elements thereof have found their way into recent discussions of the *Satyrica*. Soverini (1976: 103) claims that – by referring to their past sexual relationship – Ascyltus reminds Encolpius of his ongoing "pervertimento omosessuale," i.e. of the fact that Encolpius' 'depraved' interest in boys is not limited to the present (*nunc*) but also pertains to the past, the time when he was with Ascyltus. According to Soverini (*ibid.* 104), the period in which Encolpius was still 'full of strength' (*fortiter faceres*) is tantamount to the time when he still had 'normal' sex – albeit oral – with women. Having abandoned women for men, Encolpius is said to have lost part of his strength, thus attracting criticism from Ascyltus. Lefèvre (2007: 160) suggests that Ascyltus has in mind a hierarchy of male-female and male-male relationships: "Ascyltos stellt offenbar eine absteigende Rangfolge sexueller Betätigungen auf: zwischen Männern (erfordert viel Kraft), zwischen Mann und Frau (erfordert weniger Kraft), zwischen Mann und Knaben (erfordert am wenigsten Kraft)." Although Jensson (2004: 139 n. 311) explicitly criticises Soverini (1976) for his "anachronistic insistence that the boys are accusing each other of 'homosexuality,'" certain parts of his interpretation sound remarkably similar. He (*ibid.* 139) claims that, in Ascyltus' view, "the dominant male […] earns his reputation for sexual virility primarily by engaging in vaginal intercourse" and that "Encolpius' dominance […] over Ascyltos in the *viridarium* and Giton in the *deversorium*, fail to qualify him as a dominant male, since buggery does not really register in this respect."

By reversing the sexual role Encolpius is usually assumed to play, Williams attempts to 'normalise' the thrust of Ascyltus' insult, as we would expect him to throw the charge of effeminacy right back at his opponent. This hypothesis is plausible, inasmuch as there is no direct evidence of Encolpius penetrating Giton rather than the other way around. Yet, since several passages portray the two as a traditional man/boy pair, following Williams' suggestion might pose more questions than it is able to answer.[338]

The interpretation that seems most convincing to me is the one proposed by Niall W. Slater (1990: 34), claiming that the "basic strategy Ascyltus employs is to destroy each moral posture Encolpius tries on." In the second part of the argument, when referring to Agamemnon, Encolpius is said to present himself as a "lover of true learning" (*ibid.* 35) – a pose which Ascyltus is quick to destroy by pointing out his opponent's true motive: hunger. The same strategy can be detected in the first part of the altercation: "Encolpius is angry over Ascyltus's desire for Giton – but Ascyltus points out that he and Encolpius have had the same kind of relationship" (*ibid.* 34–5).

One of the strong points of Slater's argument is that it allows us to explain Ascyltus' particular emphasis on the phrase *non taces.* It may be seen to imply something along the lines of 'You are in no position to make such accusations', as in the proverb 'people who live in glass houses should not throw stones'. Considering the points made above, I shall attempt to complement Slater's interpretation in a few regards. The most important realisation, I believe, is that Ascyltus does not simply copy the accusation of sexual 'passivity' – as suggested by Williams – but rather points out the ways in which Encolpius' behaviour and character undercut his posture of moral outrage. Following this line of thought, part of Ascyltus' first reply may be summarised thus: 'On the one hand, you reproach me for having performed *fellatio,* even as you yourself are known to have used the services of *fellatrices.* As you enjoy other peoples' 'impurity', you have no right to open your mouth about this (*non taces*). On the other hand, you criticise me for playing the receptive role in sex, even as you are a known lover of penetrated males. Not only are you in a relationship with a penetrated male now (Giton), but in the past you also took advantage of my sexual submission. Since you are therefore complicit in my 'debauchery', you are in no position to disapprove of it'. With

338 For the relevant passages, cf. above section II.2.1. The Evidence of the *Satyrica* and section III.1. Rape (§ 9.1–5).

this addendum, Slater's interpretation of the passage 1) attributes a reasonable and consistent strategy to Ascyltus' replies, 2) accounts for the fact that Ascyltus appears to win the argument, and 3) is compatible with the apparent nature of the sexual relationship between the protagonists, i.e. that Encolpius plays the insertive role, whereas Giton and Ascyltus (at least with Encolpius) play the receptive one.

III.2.2 Verbal Duelling in the Comic Tradition

After this digression into the minutiae of Petronian quarrelling, in this section I aim to show that major aspects of the altercation between Encolpius and Ascyltus have forerunners in Graeco-Roman comedy. As has already been mentioned, previous 'theatrical' readings of the passage have stressed the artificiality of the protagonists' accusations as well as their penchant for role-playing.[339] Apart from the rhetorical nature of the argument, such interpretations are supported by the explicit reference to Ascyltus' insincerity (*se finxit*) and by the laughter concluding the altercation.[340] While the quarrel is thus regularly understood as a kind of performance given by theatrical minds, palpable parallels with the ancient stage have received very little attention. Elaborating on some passing remarks by Eckard Lefèvre (2007: 161) and Amy Richlin (2009: 85), I will place the dispute between Encolpius and Ascyltus in the context of comic insult matches. Specifically, I will demonstrate that the accusations and discursive strategies of Petronius' characters strongly resemble those of verbal duellists in Aristophanes and Plautus.

From the very outset, comedy has featured characters trying to outdo one another by means of arguments and/or threats and insults. Such verbal duels frequently occur in Aristophanes, most prominently so in the form of the so-called epirrhematic agon, a type of altercation that is composed of corresponding metrical portions and involves not only the quarrellers themselves but also the chorus (cf. e.g. *Eccl.* 571–709; *Lys.* 467–607; *Ran.* 895–1098).[341] Though not bound to the epirrhematic formula

339 Cf. Walsh (1970: 87), Slater (1990: 34 f.), Panayotakis (1995: 16), and Williams (2010b: 27–31).

340 Cf. Panayotakis 1995: 16.

341 Cf. Gelzer's (1960: 3 f.) definition of the epirrhematic agon. He (*ibid.* 11–36) offers a full discussion of the extant examples in Aristophanes. For a brief overview of altercations in Old Comedy, cf. also Wallochny (1992: 99–101).

and referring to different themes, similar quarrels also play a significant role in Middle and New Comedy plots as well as in the *fabula palliata.*[342] Crucially, verbal duels in a broader sense, i.e. exchanges between two parties "that challenge each other to a performative display of verbal skilfulness in front of an audience" (Pagliai 2009: 63), are by no means restricted to 'literary' comedy but constitute a form of 'popular' entertainment common to many cultures across the world. One of its best-known modern varieties is the rap battle.[343] In Greek 'popular' comedy, such altercations appear to have occurred as early as in Epicharmus.[344] In a Roman context, the most important piece of evidence for verbal duels as a form of 'popular' spectacle is a passage from Horace's *Iter Brundisinum*: Having arrived at the villa of L. Cocceius Nerva, the satiric persona recounts how his company was entertained at dinner by an insult match between the *scurra* Sarmentus and Messius Cicirrus (Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.50–70). It has been suggested that Horace's description was inspired by the *fabula Atellana,* and there are some indications that verbal duels were a regular feature of this genre.[345] In extant Roman literature, entertaining quarrels are nowhere as frequent as in the Plautine oeuvre, where they occur in virtually every play.[346] They are commonly held between slaves but may also involve other 'low-life characters' such as parasites and pimps.[347] Since many verbal duels in Plautus are but loosely connected to the overall plot, they are often suspected of being farcical additions to the New Comedy originals.[348]

342 Gelzer (1960: 179–288) examines the development of the epirrhematic agon in the history of Greek comedy. Cf. Wallochny (1992: 102–27) on disputes in Middle and New Comedy.

343 On verbal duelling as a global phenomenon, cf. e.g. Richlin (2017: 156 n. 26) with references for further reading.

344 Titles such as Γᾶ καὶ Θάλασσα ("Earth and Sea") and Λόγος καὶ Λογίνα ("Mr and Mrs Word") may suggest as much; for a discussion, cf. e.g. Wallochny (1992: 99 f.).

345 For a detailed examination of Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.50–70 and its possible relationship to the *fabula Atellana,* cf. Petersmann (1989). Novius' title *Mortis et vitae iudicium* may hint at a verbal duel (cf. Wallochny 1992: 99); for further discussion, cf. also Richlin (2017: 155).

346 For a detailed discussion of verbal duels in Plautus, cf. Wallochny (1992: 128–93) and Richlin (2017: 155–71).

347 Cf. Wallochny 1992: 62 f.

348 Cf. e.g. Wallochny (1992: 133): "Auseinandersetzungen, die sich zwangsläufig und folgerichtig aus einer Zuspitzung der Ereignisse ergeben, sind bei Plautus in der Minderheit." She (*ibid.* 189–93) also discusses possible connections to the *fabula Atellana* and the mime. For general remarks on farcical elements in Plautus, cf. section I.3.2. Farcical Elements in 'Popular' and 'Literary' Comedy.

III.2.2.1 Mirroring and Exaggeration

Taking the insult matches in Aristophanes and Plautus as prototypical examples, I will argue that the altercation between Encolpius and Ascyltus is heavily indebted to the tradition of verbal duelling on the comic stage. For the sake of clarity, I shall proceed from broader aspects to small details.

It has been pointed out that, in basic terms, Ascyltus responds to Encolpius' first accusation by mirroring and exaggerating his behaviour. This strategy, i.e. outdoing one's opponents at their own game, is very common in comic verbal duels, not least in Aristophanes' *Knights,* where Paphlagon and the Sausage Seller compete over the favour of Mr Demos. Their lengthy dispute (cf. *Equ.* 225–481, 691–1252) contains several of the same phenomena we have observed in Petronius. For instance, the Aristophanic altercation contains a literal shouting match, with the Chorus Leader explaining the 'rules' to Paphlagon beforehand:

Κορυφαῖος·	ἀλλ' ἐὰν μέντοι γε νικᾷς τῇ βοῇ, τήνελλος εἶ·	276
	ἢν δ' ἀναιδείᾳ παρέλθῃ σ', ἡμέτερος ὁ πυραμοῦς.	
	[…]	
Ἀλλαντοπώλης·	τριπλάσιον κεκράξομαί σου.	285
Παφλαγών·	καταβοήσομαι βοῶν σε.	
Ἀλλαντοπώλης·	κατακεκράξομαί σε κράζων.	
	(Aristoph. *Equ.* 276–87)[349]	

Chorus Leader:	Well, if you manage to beat him with your shouting, you are the man of the hour; but if he outdoes you in brazenness, we take the cake.
	[…]
Sausage Seller:	I will shout three times as loud as you!
Paphlagon:	I will outbellow you with my bellowing!
Sausage Seller:	I will shout you down with my shouting!

349 For the names of the Aristophanic characters, I follow the edition by Henderson (ed., trans. 1998–2007). The text edition by Hall & Geldart (eds. 1900–1) has Κλέων for Παφλαγών and Χορός for Κορυφαῖος.

This scene resembles Ascyltus outdoing Encolpius by his more vigorous gesture and his more forceful shouting: *intentavi in oculos Ascylti manus et 'quid dicis' inquam* (§ 9.6) vs. *sublatis fortius manibus longe maiore nisu clamavit* (§ 9.7).[350] Incidentally, we may note that Encolpius' threat against his opponent's eyes is reminiscent of various conflicts in the *fabula palliata*.[351] The basic principle of the quarrel in the *Knights* – as of many other ones in the comic tradition – is that the Sausage Seller hears out Paphlagon's statements, only to throw even more daring claims or insults right back at him.[352] Just as Ascyltus asserts that Encolpius is worse than himself (*multo me turpior es tu*), the Sausage Seller exaggerates Paphlagon's accusations, e. g.:

Παφλαγὼν·	οὔτοι μὰ τὴν Δήμητρ', ἐὰν μή σ' ἐκφάγω ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς γῆς, οὐδέποτε βιώσομαι.
Ἀλλαντοπώλης·	ἢν μὴ 'κφάγῃς; ἐγὼ δέ γ', ἢν μή σ' ἐκπίω κἀπεκροφήσας αὐτὸς ἐπιδιαρραγῶ. (Aristoph. *Equ.* 698–701)
Paphlagon:	I will not go on living, by Demeter I will not, if I do not devour you right off this earth!
Sausage Seller:	If you do not devour me? Same goes for me if I do not guzzle you down, even if swallowing you makes me burst!

350 In another act of non-verbal competition, Paphlagon and the Sausage Seller try to outrun each other on their way into the house (Aristoph. *Equ.* 1109–10).

351 Encolpius' gesture (*intentavi in oculos Ascylti manus*, § 9.6) can be understood as an act of aggression in general terms, or more specifically as a threat to gouge out Ascyltus' eyes (cf. Breitenstein ed. 2009 *ad loc.*). Referring to Prop. 4.5.15 and Chariton 6.5.8, Habermehl (2004: 65 n. 46) argues that the latter type of attack was coded as feminine. At least as far as the *fabula palliata* is concerned, however, this is not the case (cf. Williams 2010b: 29 n. 10). In fact, most comic characters making such threats are males, cf. Plaut. *Aul.* 53 (the *senex* Euclio), *Capt.* 464 (the parasite Ergasilus), *Mostell.* 203 (the *adulescens* Philolaches), *Pers.* 794 (the *puer* Paegnium), *Rud.* 759 (the *servus* Trachalio), *Trin.* 463 (the *adulescens* Lesbonicus), Ter. *Ad.* 318 (the *servus* Geta), *Eun.* 648 (the *ancilla* Pythias), *Phorm.* 989 (the parasite Phormio nonchalantly suggesting that Demipho's slave may gouge out his eyes). For Petronius' expression, cf. also Sen. *Ep.* 71.22 (*in oculos nunc mihi manus intentat*), where the gesture is not coded as feminine either. For further references, cf. Sittl (1890: 44–5).

352 With reference to Plautus, Wallochny (1992: 65) explains that "Bei der *verbivelatio* ["word-skirmishing", cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 307] kommt es darauf an, eine als Herausforderung gedachte Bemerkung nicht auf sich sitzen zu lassen, sondern Kontra zu geben. […] Wie Libanus und Leonida in der *Asinaria* vorführen, kann das Kontern in freier Form […] oder in kunstvoller Entsprechung […] geschehen."

In the above example – as Ascyltus twists around Encolpius' reference to impurity – the Sausage Seller explicitly picks up on his opponent's words: ἐὰν μή σ' ἐκφάγω ... ἢν μὴ 'κφάγῃς;[353] Yet, as we have seen, Ascyltus' strategy of mirroring and exaggeration also pertains to the area of syntax, answering Encolpius' formula (term of abuse + relative clause) with an amplified version of it (two terms of abuse + three relative clauses). While such syntactically corresponding insults also occur in Aristophanes (cf. e.g. the threats at *Equ.* 286–7 cited above), the most virtuoso example of mirroring occurs in Plautus' *Persa*, namely in a verbal duel between the slave Toxilus and the pimp Dordalus:

Toxilus: *oh, lutum lenonium,*
commixtum caeno sterculinum publicum,
inpure, inhoneste, iniure, inlex, labes popli,
pecuniai accipiter avide atque invide,
procax, rapax, trahax – trecenis versibus
tuas inpuritias traloqui nemo potest –
accipin argentum? accipe sis argentum, inpudens,
tene sis argentum, etiam tu argentum tenes?
possum te facere ut argentum accipias, lutum?
non mihi censebas copiam argenti fore,
qui nisi iurato mihi nil ausu's credere?
Dordalus: *sine respirare me, ut tibi respondeam.*
vir summe populi, stabulum servitricium,
scortorum liberator, suduculum flagri,
compedium tritor, pistrinorum civitas,
perenniserve, lurcho, edax, furax, fugax,
cedo sis mi argentum, da mihi argentum, inpudens,
possum [a] te exigere argentum? argentum, inquam, cedo,
quin tu me argentum reddis? nihilne te pudet?
leno te argentum poscit, solida servitus,
pro liberanda amica, ut omnes audiant.
(Plaut. *Pers.* 406–26)

Toxilus: Oh, you pimp dirt, you public dungheap mixed with filth, dirty, dishonest, unjust, unlawful crea-

353 In the *Knights*, cf. also e.g. 702–4 and 965; for further discussion of this technique, cf. Wallochny (1992: 17).

ture, downfall of the people, greedy and hateful money hawk, daring stealing, thieving – in three hundred verses no one could list your dirty tricks completely – will you not take the money? Take the money, will you, you impudent person! Have the money, will you have the money now? Can I make you take the money, you piece of dirt? You did not think I would have the opportunity to get hold of the money, did you? You did not dare trust me until I gave you an oath.

Dordalus: Let me catch my breath so that I can reply you. You most respected man of the people, brothel for slave girls, liberator of prostitutes, sweating chamber of the whip, wearer-away of shackles, inhabitant of the mills, eternal slave, swilling, guzzling, thieving runaway, give me my money, will you, give me my money, you impudent person! Can I get the money out of you? Give me my money, I insist! Why will you not give me the money? Do you not have any shame at all? The pimp is demanding money from you, you embodiment of slavery, for setting your girlfriend free, so that everybody can hear.

Most conspicuously, Dordalus copies the overall structure of Toxilus' verbal attack: He answers four lines of insults (406b–410a) with four lines of his own (418–21); Toxilus' five lines of questions (412–6) receive five lines of requests and counter-questions in reply (422–6). What is more, several individual items of Dordalus' tirade closely correspond to his opponent's words: For instance, the expression *stabulum servitricium* (418) harks back to Toxilus' *sterculinum publicum* (407), and *edax, furax, fugax* (421) clearly recalls *procax, rapax, trahax* (410).[354] Although this scene from the *Persa* is more elaborate than most other examples in extant comedy, the technique of mirroring can be regarded as a *topos* of verbal duelling on the ancient stage.[355] Equally importantly, we may

354 For a detailed analysis of the correspondences, cf. Woytek (1982 *ad loc.*) and Richlin (2017: 158–60).

355 For similar altercations, cf. e. g. Plaut. *Asin.* 297–9 with Richlin (2017: 165) as well as *Asin.* 167–70, *Cas.* 604–9 or *Cas.* 404–8 (cited above in section III.1.3. Sexual Rivalry between Two Tarquinii).

note that Dordalus' words are at least as much a "studied riposte" (Walsh 1970: 87, cited above) as Ascyltus'. The artificiality, the rhetorical nature, of the entire altercation is even more blatant than in the *Satyrica*.[356] Furthermore, both opponents add some metatheatrical remarks to their insults – Toxilus: *trecentis versibus | tuas inpuritias traloqui nemo potest* (410 f.); Dordalus: *sine respirare me, ut tibi respondeam* (417) – thereby reminding the audience that this is a good-humoured performance rather than serious business. As we have seen, a similar effect has been attributed to Ascyltus' role-playing and to the laughter at the end of the Petronian quarrel. The fact that they appear to enjoy quarrelling for its own sake is one more aspect connecting Encolpius and Ascyltus to verbal duellers of the comic tradition.[357]

III.2.2.2 Sex and Food

The altercation between Encolpius and Ascyltus resembles comic verbal duels not only in terms of its structure but also in terms of its subject matter. A look back at the quarrel between Paphlagon and the Sausage Seller makes clear that Aristophanes is in no way inferior to Petronius when it comes to sexually explicit insults:

Ἀλλαντοπώλης·	ἐγὼ δὲ βυνήσω[358] γέ σου τὸν πρωκτὸν ἀντὶ φύσκης.
Παφλαγών·	ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἐξέλξω σε τῆς πυγῆς θύραζε κύβδα. (Aristoph. *Equ.* 364–5)
Sausage Seller:	And I will stuff your arsehole like a sausage skin.
Paphlagon:	And I will drag you outside by the butt, upside down.

356 Cf. Wallochny (1992: 63): "Wie wenig ernst das alles gemeint ist, geht meist schon aus der künstlerisch-komischen Formulierung hervor." For references for further reading, cf. *ibid.* n. 16.

357 For a discussion of Plautine characters who do not take altercations seriously, cf. Wallochny (1992: 63–4, 142). With reference to the ending of the altercation between Encolpius and Ascyltus, Lefèvre (2007: 161) rightly points to the abrupt endings of several verbal duels in Plautus, e. g. *Rud.* 583.

358 I follow Henderson (ed., trans. 1998–2007 *ad loc.*), who prefers Jackson's conjecture βυνήσω to the manuscripts' readings κινήσω or βινήσω.

Similar to Encolpius' verbal attack against Ascyltus (*muliebris patientiae scortum*), the Sausage Seller's threat against Paphlagon hinges on the unwritten law that a 'true male' should never allow himself to be sexually penetrated. As has been shown in an earlier section, such slurs are not uncommon in ancient comedy.[359] As far as parallels between the *Satyrica* and Plautine comedy are concerned, the verbal duel between the slaves Pinacium and Phaniscus in the *Mostellaria* may serve as a typical example. Their altercation, which is only very loosely connected to the overall plot, revolves around Phaniscus' sexual relationship with their master Callidamates:

manesne ilico, impure parasite? 887[a]
Phaniscus: *⟨dic tu⟩*[360]
qui parasitus sum?
Pinacium: *ego enim dicam: cibo perduci poteris quovis.*
Phaniscus: *mihi sum, lubet esse. quid id curas?*
Pinacium: *ferocem facis, quia te erus amat.* 890
Phaniscus: *vah!*
oculi dolent.
Pinacium: *qur?*
Phaniscus: *quia fumu' molestust.*
Pinacium: *tace sis, faber, qui cudere soles plumbeos nummos.*
Phaniscus: *non ⟨pol⟩ potes tu cogere me ut tibi male dicam.*
novit erus me. 894–5
Pinacium: *suam quidem [pol] culcitulam oportet.*
Phaniscus: *si sobriu' sis, male non dicas.*
Pinacium: *tibi optemperem, quom tu mi nequeas?*
at tu mecum, pessume, ito advorsus.
Phaniscus: *quaeso hercle apstine*
iam sermonem de istis rebus.
(Plaut. *Mostell.* 887[a]–98)

Pinacium: Will you not stop at once, you dirty parasite?[361]
Phaniscus: Tell me, how am I a parasite?

359 Cf. section II.3. Other Male-Male Relationships in the Comic Tradition.

360 This conjecture is de Melo's (ed., trans. 2011–3 *ad loc.*).

361 While de Melo (ed., trans. 2011–3 ad loc.) translates *parasitus* with "hanger-on," I prefer the straightforward rendering "parasite."

Pinacium:	Yes, I will tell you: With food you can be enticed anywhere.
Phaniscus:	That is my own business, I like to be one. Why do you care?
Pinacium:	You are playing the hard man because master loves you.
Phanicus:	Bah! My eyes hurt.
Pinacium:	Why?
Phaniscus:	Because your gas is a nuisance.
Pinacium:	Be quiet, you moneyer who always mints base coin.[362]
Phaniscus:	You cannot force me to insult you. Master knows me.
Pinacium:	He ought to know his little pillow.
Phaniscus:	If you were sober, you would not insult me.
Pinacium:	Should I obey you when you cannot obey me? But do go with me and fetch him, you worst of all creatures.
Phaniscus:	Please keep the conversation away from those topics.

Let us begin by pointing out some minor, though significant, resemblances between this verbal duel and the one in Petronius. In very basic terms, the fact that Pinacium uses a superlative adjective for an insult (*pessume,* 897) may remind us of a similar superlative used by Ascyltus: *homo stultissime* (§ 10.1). Indeed, such expressions are not infrequent in comedy; in Terence's *Phormio* (218) a slave – verbally abusing a pimp – uses almost the exact same words as Ascyltus: *hominum homo stultissime.*[363] On another note, Pinacium's imperative *tace* (892) may bring to mind Ascyltus' *non taces* (§ 9.8, 9.9), an expression that makes a regular appearance in the *fabula palliata.*[364]

362 Cf. de Melo (ed., trans. 2011–3 *ad loc.*): "his jokes are stale." For further discussion, cf. Lorenz (ed. 1883 *ad loc.*).

363 At § 65.5, Agamemnon also addresses Encolpius as *homo stultissime.* Augier-Grimaud (2014: 339) offers a full list of similar formulations in Plautus and Terence. For general remarks on the resemblances between insults in Petronius and in the *fabula palliata,* cf. Paschall (1939: 18–22) and Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011: 29 f.). Lilja (1965) is the standard work on terms of abuse on the Roman stage; on verbal abuse elsewhere, cf. Opelt (1965).

364 Cf. e. g. Plaut. *Amph.* 700 and *Asin.* 931. In fact, for the period until around 200 CE, the *Library of Latin Texts – Series A* (Brepolis) delivers sixteen hits for the phrase *non*

More importantly, the verbal duel in the *Mostellaria* is concerned with two themes that also play a dominant role in the Petronian altercation: sex and food. Pinacium claims that Phaniscus is the beloved of his master (*erus te amat,* 890) and that he acts as the master's pillow (*culcitulam,* 894–5), thereby clearly implying that Phaniscus allows himself to be penetrated by Callidamates. This verbal attack differs from the Sausage Seller's (βυνήσω γέ σου τὸν πρωκτὸν), inasmuch as the latter threatens to penetrate Paphlagon *himself,* whereas Pinacium hints at Phaniscus' sexual submission to a third party. In this regard, Pinacium's insult – being the more common type in Plautus[365] – functions along the same lines as Encolpius' *(muliebris patientiae …*). The denigration associated with men performing *fellatio* – as implied in Encolpius words (*ne spiritus ⟨quidem⟩ purus est*) – is also not unheard of on the comic stage.[366] Neither are insults implying that one's opponent engages in prostitution (*scortum*).[367]

For the analysis at hand, the most significant term of abuse in the quarrel between Pinacium and Phaniscus is *impure parasite* (887[a]). Most obviously, it contains the notion of impurity which is so prominent in Petronius (§ 9.6 and § 9.10). Though there is no link to Phaniscus' mouth and thus to oral intercourse, the expression clearly has a sexual connotation: Pinacium explains that an *impurus parasitus* is someone who will do anything for food (*cibo perduci poteris quovis,* 888), more precisely, we may deduce from the context, someone who receives food in exchange for sexual favours for his master. The idea that parasites perform sexual services for the men who feed them occurs several times in the Plautine

taces. Twelve of these are to be found in Plautus, two in Terence, and the remaining two are those in Petronius. In Ter. *Phorm.* 1004, we encounter a quarrel between two old men, making use of the same verbal material as Encolpius (*quid dicis*) and Ascyltus (*non taces*): Demipho's question (*hem quid ais?*) is answered by Chremes' counter-question (*non taces?*). Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011: 29) have already noted that Encolpius' question is reminiscent of *quid ais?,* a frequent expression in Plautus.

365 Cf. section II.3. Other Male-Male Relationships in the Comic Tradition. Paegnium's insult hurled at the slave Sagaristio constitutes an exception to this rule: *non hercle, si os perciderim tibi, metuam, morticine* ("I would not be afraid if I broke into your mouth today, you cadaver", Plaut. *Pers.* 283). Most likely, Paegnium implies that he would force Sagaristio to play the receptive role in oral sex, cf. Woytek (1982 *ad loc.*) and Lilja (1983: 17).

366 Cf. e.g. Aristoph. *Equ.* 166–7, 375 as well as Plaut. *Pers.* 283 (cited in note 365), *Amph.* 348 f. and *Pseud.* 782.

367 The slave Grumio refers to his fellow-slave Tranio as *deliciae popli* ("darling of the people", Plaut. *Mostell.* 15), i.e. a common prostitute (cf. Lilja 1983: 25); cf. also Plaut. *Aul.* 285 (cited in section III.3. Punishment (§ 11.1–4)).

oeuvre.[368] Strikingly, Pinacium's insult thus brings together two themes at the centre of the altercation in the *Satyrica*: The themes of sexual denigration (*impure*) and of putting one's appetite before all other concerns (*parasite*). We should note that the latter point not only occurs in Ascyltus' accusation levelled against Encolpius (*ut foris cenares poetam laudasti*), but that Ascyltus also justifies his own actions with reference to the needs of his belly (*quid ego … facere debui, cum fame morerer?*). A little later, the quarrellers put their differences aside for the sake of a free dinner: *non recusavit Ascyltos et 'hodie' inquit 'quia tamquam scholastici ad cenam promisimus, non perdamus noctem'* (§ 10.6). Though Petronius' text lacks the *terminus technicus,* then, both Encolpius and Ascyltus are portrayed as parasites, people for whom food is a number one priority.[369]

While Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad* § 10.2) is right to point out that parasites occur in epigrams and satires, we must not forget that they are first and foremost associated with the comic stage, where they had been a stock type from Middle Comedy onwards.[370] The defining characteristic of parasites is their desire to dine at somebody else's expense, for which they are willing to entertain their benefactors in various ways: by flattering, telling jokes or even by enduring physical abuse.[371] When Encolpius commends Agamemnon (*poetam laudasti*), he resembles comic parasites who play the yes-men to those extending dinner invitations.[372] As noted by Rosenblüth (1909: 55), the same applies to the protagonists' behaviour

368 Cf. section II.3. Other Male-Male Relationships in the Comic Tradition. Opelt (1965: 102–4) offers an overview of the insults comic parasites have to endure.

369 The word *parasitus* occurs nowhere in the extant *Satyrica.*

370 Similarly, Augier-Grimaud (2014: 96) argues that the Petronian protagonists are closer to the parasites of satire than to those of comedy. Cf. her (*ibid.* 129–31) broader discussion of parasitism in the *Satyrica.*

371 On parasites in the comic tradition, cf. Damon (1997: 23–101), Tylawsky (2002), Antonsen-Resch (2005), and most recently the contributions in Bandini & Pentericci (eds. 2019). The type occurs in an adultery mime; cf. Wiemken (1972: 81–106) and Rusten & Cunningham (eds., trans. 2003: 390–400). Note that several stock types of the *fabula Atellana* are associated with gluttony, cf. Kocur (2018: 259–61) and section I.3.1. Theatrical Performances in Petronius' Day. For an overview of what a parasite's occupation entails, cf. e. g. Ter. *Eun.* 232–64. The physical abuse they have to endure will be discussed in section V.3.2.1. Jugs, Jars and Pots.

372 In Terence's *Eunuchus* (251–3), the parasite Gnatho spells out this principle: *quidquid dicunt laudo; id rursum si negant, laudo id quoque; | negat quis: nego; ait: aio; postremo imperavi egomet mihi | omnia adsentari. is quaestus nunc est multo uberrimus* ("Whatever they say, I praise it; if they then say the opposite, I praise that too. They deny, I deny; they affirm, I affirm. In short it is my self-imposed rule to agree to everything. It is by far the most profitable way to earn a living these days").

at Trimalchio's banquet.[373] We may add that Ascyltus' unwillingness to let a free dinner go to waste (*quia… ad cenam promisimus, non perdamus noctem*) closely corresponds to one of the principles of a parasite's vocation, as put into plain words by Curculio: *vocat me ad cenam; religio fuit, denegare nolui* ("he invited me to dinner; it would have been against my principles, so I did not want to refuse," Plaut. *Curc.* 350). Moreover, as Ascyltus defends his actions with reference to his hunger, so do comic parasites. We may consider, for instance, Artotrogus' explanation as to why he tolerates, even encourages, the soldier Pyrgopolinices' vainglriousness: *venter creat omnis hasce aerumnas: auribus | peraudienda sunt, ne dentes dentiant, | et adsentandumst quidquid hic mentibitur* ("My belly is creating all this misery: I have to hear this with my ears so that my teeth will not grow toothy from inactivity, and I have to agree with whatever lies he dishes up," Plaut. *Mil.* 33–5). Both Ascyltus and Artotrogus refer to the alleviation of hunger as a fundamental necessity that justifies their behaviour. A last point worth making is that the need to procure food is not restricted to parasites but also determines the actions of slaves and various other poor characters on the comic stage. In Plautus' *Asinaria,* when explaining why she intends to prostitute her daughter Philaenium to the highest bidder, the *lena* Cleareta uses nearly the exact same words as Ascyltus: *ne nos moriamur fame* ("lest we die of hunger," 531).[374]

III.2.2.3 The Dynamics of Comic Altercations

Apart from structural matters and overall themes, Petronius' quarrellers resemble comic ones in terms of the argumentative strategies they employ. Above, we have observed that – not unlike Ascyltus – verbal duellers commonly beat their opponents at their own game. Additionally, some comic characters resemble Encolpius in that they point out their adversaries' shortcomings even though, strictly speaking, they are in no position to voice such disapproval. For example, we may consider a quar-

373 Cf. Rosenblüth (1909: 55): "ganz wie professionelle parasiten benehmen sich nun bei Petron Agamemnon und die als seine schüler eingeführten Encolp und Ascyltus, wenn sie dem hausherrn in jeder weise schmeicheln, sein bild küssen, seine dummsten witze belachen; auch die übrigen gäste geben dem nicht viel nach (vgl. Hermeros cap. 57,2)." For the praise Trimalchio receives from his guests, cf. § 34.5 (*laudatus propter elegantias dominus*; "our host was complimented on these elegant arrangements") and *passim.*

374 On hunger as a motivating factor in Plautine comedy, cf. Richlin (2017: 126–36).

rel between the slaves Olympio and Chalinus in Plautus' *Casina,* a later portion of which has already been discussed.[375] Having endured a verbal attack from his opponent (359), Chalinus tells their master Lysidamus that he should 'keep in check' Olympio: *comprime istunc* (362). The latter picks up on another possible meaning of the verb *comprimere* ('to sexually penetrate')[376] and throws the insult right back to where it came from: *immo istunc qui didicit dare* (literally: "No, *him* [sc. you should 'keep in check'], who has learned how to give," 362). Answering one *double entendre* with another, Olympio says that Chalinus should be the one suffering penetration, as he already knows how to 'put out' (*dare*), i.e. how to play the receptive role with his master.[377] Olympio launches this insult despite the fact that – as the audience will learn a little later – he himself has a sexual relationship with Lysidamus.[378] Apparently, when it comes to verbal duelling, Olympio is as little concerned with the validity of his indignation as Encolpius.

While Olympio – at least for the time being – gets away with his hypocrisy, other comic characters are not as lucky. The conversation between the *adulescens* Diniarchus and the *ancilla* Astaphium in Plautus' *Truculentus* is a case in point. Diniarchus (Di.) used to be the main customer of the prostitute Phronesium, Astaphium's mistress, but lost this position to a wealthier rival. In this passage, he complains to Astaphium (As.) about the large amount of money he has spent at their brothel:

Di.: *vos mihi dedistis otium.*
As.: *qui, amabo?*
Di.: *ego expedibo.*
rem perdidi apud vos, vos meum negotium apstulistis.
si rem servassem, fuit ubi negotiosus essem. 140
As.: *an tu te Veneris publicum aut Amoris alia lege*
habere posse postulas quin otiosus fias?
Di.: *illa, haud ego, habuit publicum: pervorse interpretaris;*
nam advorsum legem meam ob meam scripturam pecudem
cepit.

375 Cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 404–8 and section III.1.3. Sexual Rivalry between Two Tarquinii.

376 Adams (1982: 182 f.) discusses the sexual meaning of *comprimere.* The same word play, with a similar reply, occurs at Plaut. *Rud.* 1073–5.

377 On this meaning of the verb *dare,* cf. Williams (2010a: 312 n. 51).

378 Cf. the discussion in section II.2.2. The Evidence of Graeco-Roman Comedy.

As.: *plerique idem quod tu facis faciunt rei male gerentes:*
ubi non est scripturam unde dent, incusant publicanos.
Di.: *male vortit res pecuaria mihi apud vos: nunc vicissim*
volo habere aratiunculam pro copia hic apud vos.
As.: *non arvos hic, sed pascuost ager: si arationes*
habituris, qui arari solent, ad pueros ire meliust.
hunc nos habemus publicum, illi alii sunt publicani.
Di.: *utros pergnovi probe.*
As.: *em istoc pol tu otiosu's,*
quom et illic et hic pervorsus es. sed utriscum rem esse mavis?
Di.: *procaciores esti' vos, sed illi peiiuriosi;*
illis perit quidquid datur neque ipsis apparet quicquam:
vos saltem si quid quaeritis, exhibitis et comestis.
postremo illi sunt inprobi, vos nequam et gloriosae.
As.: *male quae in nos ais, ea omnia tibi dicis, Diniarche,*
et nostram et illorum vicem.
Di.: *qui istuc?*
As.: *rationem dicam:*
quia qui alterum incusat probri, sumpse enitere oportet.
tu a nobis sapiens nihil habes; nos nequam aps te habemus.[379]
Di.: *o Astaphium, haud istoc modo solita es me ante appellare,*
sed blande, quom illuc quod apud vos nunc est apud med habebam.[380]
(Plaut. *Truc.* 138–63)

Di.: You have given me free time.
As.: How, please?
Di.: I will explain. I lost my possessions at your place, you have taken my business away from me. If you had saved my possessions, I would have somewhere to do business.
As.: Do you really expect to be able to occupy the public land of Venus or Love except on the terms of becoming a man of leisure?

379 Enk (ed. 1953) – followed by de Melo (ed., trans. 2011–3) – convincingly emended the manuscripts' reading *habeamus* to *habemus.*

380 Following Enk (ed. 1953), Hofmann (ed., trans. 2001) and de Melo (ed., trans. 2011–3), I prefer the emendation *habebam* to the manuscripts' *haberem.*

Di.: She occupied the public land, not me. You are giving it a wrong twist: against the law she impounded my cattle in lieu of pasture tax.

As.: Most people do the same as you when they are unsuccessful: When they do not have the means to pay the pasturage tax, they blame the tax collectors.

Di.: Your land for grazing cattle has turned out poorly for me; now in turn I want to have a little plow land here at your place, as far as circumstances allow.

As.: This is not land for plowing, but for grazing. If you are keen on having plow land, you should better go to boys, who are used to being plowed. We occupy this public land, but over there are other tax collectors.

Di.: I know both very well.

As.: There, that is why you are a man of leisure, because you are misguided both there and here. But which of the two do you prefer to have dealings with?

Di.: You are more licentious, while they are addicted to perjury. Whatever is given to boys is lost to those who give it, and the boys themselves do not have anything to show for it. You at least drink and eat it up when you get something. In short, they are shameless, you are wicked and conceited.

As.: All the insults you utter against us you utter against yourself instead of us and them, Diniarchus.

Di.: How so?

As.: I will tell you the reason: Because a man who accuses another of an offense ought to be blameless himself. You, the wise man, have nothing from us, we, the bad women, have it from you.

Di.: O Astaphium, that is not the way you used to address me before, but flatteringly, when I had the property at my place which is at yours now.

In this altercation, argumentative skills – rather than mere ingenuity in the area of verbal abuse – play a greater role than in the comic insult matches discussed above. Before pointing out parallels with the *Satyrica,* a few aspects of the quarrel in the *Truculentus* deserve elucidation: Both Diniarchus and Astaphium make use of an extended metaphor in which, broadly speaking, activities in the field of agriculture stand for activities in the field of sexual intercourse. Most obviously, the verbs *arare*

('to plough')[381] and *pascere* ('to graze') refer to (anal) sex with boys and (vaginal) sex with women respectively (148–50).[382] The same imagery is employed to describe the relationship between prostitutes and their customers. Diniarchus portrays himself as a 'farmer' whose natural interest in 'ploughing' and 'grazing' is thwarted by greedy 'tax collectors' (*publicani*), i.e. prostitutes, who have illegitimately taken away all his property (144).[383] He not only blames Phronesium for the financial losses he has endured but also launches a tirade of insults against prostitutes in general (154–7).

In the following analysis, I suggest that Astaphium 'wins' the altercation with Diniarchus in roughly the same way as Ascyltus prevails against Encolpius.[384] Astaphium's triumph over her opponent, I argue, finds its expression in a role reversal marked by various textual cues. At the beginning of the passage Diniarchus accuses Astaphium, and by implication also Phronesium, of 'giving things a wrong twist' (*pervorse interpretaris,* 143) by placing the blame for his financial difficulties on him (141 f.).[385] Later, it is Astaphium who calls her opponent 'twisted' (*pervorsus es,* 153) on account of his promiscuity. After Diniarchus has claimed that the fault was not with him but with Phronesium (*illa, haud ego,* 143), Astaphium points out that the exact opposite is true: *male quae in nos ais, ea omnia tibi dicis, Diniarche,* | *et nostram et illorum vicem* (158 f.). While accusing everyone else around, Diniarchus is blind to his own flaws. He reproaches the prostitutes for his money problems even though he must have been aware of their terms of business: Customers have to pay up.[386] After all, Diniarchus – without discerning the link to his financial ruin – admits to having used the services of prostitutes very frequently

381 For the sake of consistency, I use the British English spelling "plough" rather than the American English "plow" in de Melo's (ed., trans. 2011–3) translation.

382 Cf. e.g. de Melo (ed., trans. 2011–3: *ad loc.*). On sexual metaphors drawing on agricultural implements and/or activities, cf. Enk (ed. 1953 *ad* Plaut. *Truc.* 148) as well as Adams (1982: 24 f., 82–5, 154 f.). In Plautus' *Asinaria* (874), the *matrona* Artemona uses this imagery to complain about her husband's secret affair with the prostitute Philaenium: *fundum alienum arat, incultum familiarem deserit* ("He is ploughing someone else's field and leaves his own uncultivated"). Note that *arare* apparently refers to vaginal intercourse here.

383 For some remarks on the pasturage tax in Plautus' day, cf. Hofmann (ed., trans. 2001 *ad* Plaut. *Truc.* 136).

384 We may note, however, that their conversation continues until Plaut. *Truc.* 208.

385 Note also Diniarchus' *advorsum legem* (144) and *male vortit* (147).

386 In this regard, Diniarchus resembles debtors who blame the tax collectors for their own failure (cf. 145–6).

(*utrosque pergnovi probe,* 152). In the end, the role reversal comes around full circle: At the beginning, Astaphium asked 'why?' (*qui, amabo,* 138) and Diniarchus offered explication (*ego expedibo,* 138). Now, it is Diniarchus' turn to ask this question (*qui istuc,* 159) and Astaphium's to give an explanation (*rationem dicam,* 159).[387]

There are significant parallels between the argumentative strategies of Astaphium and Ascyltus. Essentially, both destroy the moral postures their opponents try on.[388] Since the first round of the Petronian altercation concerns the protagonists' sex life, it is here that we find the closest resemblances to the *Truculentus.* As Encolpius reproaches Ascyltus for (allegedly) being an impure, effeminate *pathicus* up for sale (*muliebris patientiae scortum* …), Diniarchus accuses prostitutes – among other things – of being shameless, wicked and conceited (*illi sunt inprobi, vos nequam et gloriosae,* 157). The case each of them is making has the same weakness: Both Encolpius and Diniarchus are themselves deeply implicated in what they are criticising their opponents for. As Ascyltus and Astaphium remind them, they are fond of surrounding themselves with the kind of people they insult and, therefore, are in no position to feel superior to them. In Plautus, this principle is conveniently spelled out in the form of an aphorism that can loosely be rendered as 'because people who live in glass houses should not throw stones' (*quia qui alterum incusat probri, sumpse enitere oportet,* 160). Thereafter, Diniarchus appears to have run out of arguments and speaks of different matters: He reminds Astaphium of the pleasant times when he was still the brothel's most cherished customer (162 f.), a move that may remind us of Encolpius' change of the subject at § 9.10.

This section started out from a thorough discussion of how previous scholars have interpreted the altercation between Encolpius and Ascyltus. While questions as to lost episodes of the *Satyrica* could not entirely be left aside, my analysis focused on the structure, themes and argumentative strategies discernible in the quarrel. In a next step, I tried to demonstrate that all major aspects of the Petronian passage have forerunners in the comic tradition. From Aristophanes onwards, verbal duellers regularly mirror and exaggerate their opponents' words and actions. Matters

387 In her final blow against Diniarchus, Astaphium picks up one of his terms of abuse and, ironically, applies it to prostitutes such as herself: *tu a nobis sapiens nihil habes; nos nequam aps te habemus* (161; cf. *nequam* in line 157). Obviously, Diniarchus is the opposite of a wise man (*sapiens*) for failing to see his own shortcomings.

388 For this formulation, cf. Walsh (1990: 34), cited in section III.2.1. The Dynamics of Petronian Quarrelling.

of sex and food are as common to the ancient stage as they are to the *Satyrica*. Even specific details of the Petronian altercation, such as the protagonists' playfulness and Ascyltus' technique of exposing Encolpius' hypocrisy, could be shown to have close parallels in extant comic scripts.

III.3 Punishment (§ 11.1–4)

In the first part of this chapter, I pointed out a number of parallels between the First Rivalry over Giton and comic plotlines revolving around non-consensual sex with slave characters, as in Plautus' *Mercator* and *Casina*. Taking up this line of argument, I will interpret the last part of Petronius' episode against the backdrop of comedies culminating in spectacular scenes of punishment. Again, the *Casina* will prove to be an important point of reference.

It has been noted that the First Rivalry over Giton features a role reversal between Encolpius and Ascyltus. At the beginning, Ascyltus wants to have sex with Giton; Encolpius comes into the lodgings and reproaches Ascyltus. At the end, it is Encolpius who is eager to get into bed with Giton; Ascyltus enters and makes accusations against Encolpius. More specifically, Ascyltus' first action inside the room is to laugh and to applaud (*risu itaque plausuque cellulam implevit,* § 11.2). Maria Plaza (2000: 67) interprets his laughter as an expression of *Schadenfreude,* a "celebration of his power to destroy the unfortunate Encolpius' happiness."[389] The description of Ascyltus' next action (*opertum me amiculo evolvit*) contains a sexual pun: As *amiculo* may refer to a 'cloak' (*amiculum*) as well as to a 'little friend' (*amiculus*), Ascyltus may be seen to take away Encolpius' cover and/or to break up his embrace with Giton.[390] A similar case can be made for Ascyltus' question *quid agebas,* where the verb *agere* may be seen to refer to sexual activity.[391] When Ascyltus commends Encolpius for his morally upright character (*frater sanctissime*), his word choice is clearly ironic, suggesting that he feels betrayed.[392] The following phrase is corrupt: The manuscripts' reading *verti contubernium*

389 For other possible readings and for further discussion, cf. Plaza (2000: 67–9).

390 The pun has been noted, e.g., by Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*) and Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011 *ad loc.*).

391 Adams (1982: 205) discusses the sexual connotations of *agere* and its derivatives.

392 Cf. Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*). For *sanctus* in the sense of "scrupulous, upright, blameless, virtuous etc.," cf. *OLD* s.v. "sanctus 4."

facis could mean as much as 'Are you ruining our companionship?'[393] Ascyltus proceeds to pull a strap (*lorum*) off his bag and to beat Encolpius with it (*me coepit non perfunctorie verberare*). His last words, aptly characterised as *petulantibus dictis,* hold yet another sexual pun: *sic dividere cum fratre nolito.* On the one hand, the verb *dividere* refers back to Encolpius' proposal to split up their belongings (*itaque communes sarcinulas partiamur,* § 10.4). Ascyltus insists that this agreement be honoured with regard to Giton, i.e. that Encolpius should not try to keep the boy to himself. Note that Giton is here clearly treated as a piece of personal property. Later in the story, Ascyltus takes this line of reasoning one step further, suggesting that they literally cut Giton in half.[394] On the other hand, the verb *dividere* can have a sexual meaning which, remarkably enough, is first attested in a conversation between the slave Strobilus and the two cooks Anthrax and Congrio in Plautus' *Aulularia*:

Strobilus:	*postquam obsonavit erus et conduxit coquos*	280
	tibinasque hasce apud forum, edixit mihi	
	ut dispertirem opsonium hic bifariam.	
Anthrax:	*mequidem hercle, dicam ⟨pro⟩palam, non divides;*	
	si quo tu totum me ire vis, operam dabo.	
Congrio:	*bellum et pudicum vero prostibulum popli.*	285
	post si quis vellet, te hau non velles dividi.	
Strobilus:	*atque ego istuc, Anthrax, aliovorsum dixeram,*	
	non istuc quod tu insimulas.	
	(Plaut. *Aul.* 280–8)	

393 As Petersmann (1977: 213 f.) explains, the verb *facere* must here mean 'to cause' (to destroy our companionship). For a detailed discussion of this phrase, cf. Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*), Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011 *ad loc.*) and Köntges (ed. 2013 *ad loc.*) with references for further reading. The conjecture that has received most scholarly approval is *vesticontubernium,* a neologism denoting 'a companionship under the covers'.

394 Cf. § 79.12–80.1: *postquam optima fide partiti manubias sumus, 'age' inquit 'nunc et puerum dividamus'. iocari putabam discedentem. at ille gladium parricidali manu strinxit et 'non frueris' inquit 'hac praeda, super quam solus incumbis. partem meam necesse est vel hoc gladio contemptus abscidam'* ("After we had most faithfully divided our spoils, he [sc. Asclytus] said: 'Come on, let us now split up the boy, too.' I thought this was a parting joke. But he drew his sword with a murderous hand and said: 'You will not enjoy this booty you are sitting on alone. Though I have been slighted, I must have my share, even if I have to cut it off with this sword.'").

Strobilus:	After the master did the shopping and hired cooks and these flute-girls in the market, he decreed that I should split the shopping here in two parts.
Anthrax:	I will tell you openly, you will not split me. If you want me to go somewhere complete, I will oblige.
Congrio:	What a charming and 'pure' (*pudicum*) common whore indeed! If anyone wanted to do so afterwards, you would not say no to being split.
Strobilus:	Now now, Anthrax! I said this in a different sense, not the one you allege.

When Strobilus says that he intends to 'split' (*dispertirem*) what he got on the market (280–2), Anthrax and Congrio take this to refer not only to the food (*opsonium*) but also to the personnel, i.e. to the flute-girls and to the cooks themselves (*coquos tibinasque*). In the latter context, the verbs *dispertire* and *dividere* evidently mean 'to sexually penetrate'.[395] Strobilus conveniently spells out the fact that – just as in the *Satyrica* – we are dealing with a *double entendre* (*aliovorsum dixeram,* | *non istuc quod tu insimulas*).[396]

It has been argued that Ascyltus' behaviour in this passage amounts to a kind of punishment exacted upon Encolpius. For instance, Walsh (1970: 87 f.) claims that "Ascyltus becomes a *Remus redivivus,* taking a comic revenge on Romulus."[397] This interpretation, of course, refers to the intertextual level of Petronius' narrative.[398] The 'lower level', as we have

395 For further discussion, cf. Maclennan & Stockert (eds., trans. 2016 *ad loc.*). Adams (1982: 149–51) discusses the sexual connotations of Latin words meaning 'to cut' and 'to split'. Cicero (*Fam.* 9.22.4) mentions the obscene quality of the noun *divisio.*

396 The connection between Ascyltus' words and the Plautine conversation cited above was noted as early as in Burman (ed. 1743 *ad loc.*).

397 Walsh (1970: 88 n. 1) points to the archaic word form *sic* in Petronius (§ 11.4) – further emphasised by *nolito* (*ibid.*) –, which may be seen to recall Romulus' formulation in Livy (1.7.2): *sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea* ("*So* perish whoever else shall leap over my walls!"). Although Walsh does not explicitly mention it, the possible link between Ascyltus/Encolpius and Romulus/Remus may owe something to the fact that Petronius' protagonists refer to each other as *fratres.*

398 Courtney (2001: 64 n. 18) proposes another intertextual reading, suggesting that Ascyltus' final words (*sic dividere cum fratre nolito,* § 11.4) constitute a parody of Sen. *Ep.* 88.11: *quid mihi prodest scire agellum in partes dividere, si nescio cum fratre dividere?* ("What good does it do me to know how to divide a small estate into shares, if I do not know how to divide it with my brother?"). Trans. Courtney *ibid.*; cf. already Burman (ed. 1743 *ad loc.*).

seen, revolves around matters of sexual rivalry and unfaithfulness, stock motifs of the ancient comic stage. While at the beginning of the episode Ascyltus presents himself as a rapist and meets an outraged 'spouse' (Encolpius), at the end he casts himself as a cuckolded husband who catches an 'adulterer' (Encolpius) *in flagrante delicto* and takes it upon himself to castigate the offender.[399] In a footnote, Panayotakis (1995: 18 n. 70) mentions that the physical violence Ascyltus inflicts upon Encolpius should be seen "in the tradition of pseudo-violence in the comedies and the mime." Taking up this cue, my analysis will place Ascyltus' attack on Encolpius in the context of comic slapstick punishments. It will be shown that the punitive measures exacted against Encolpius closely resemble those suffered by adulterers and other wrongdoers on the comic stage.

III.3.1 Μοιχεία and *adulterium*

Similarly to what has been remarked on the issue of rape, Greek and Roman attitudes towards 'adultery' (μοιχεία, *adulterium*) were intricately linked to questions of gender and social status.[400] When it came to questions of marital fidelity, ancient morality was characterised by a double standard: On the one hand, wives were considered adulteresses if they engaged in any sexual activity outside their marriage. Husbands, on the other hand, were free to have sex with their own slaves as well as with prostitutes and concubines. A man was only deemed to be an adulterer if he had sexual relations with a citizen woman married to another man.[401]

If a case of adultery came to light, punishment could be severe: According to the *lex Iulia de adulteriis* introduced by emperor Augustus, an *adultera* was to suffer the confiscation of half her dowry and a third of her property; she should then be relegated to an island. The *adulter* was to have half his property confiscated and be relegated to another island.[402] Our evidence of the pre-Augustan period is less clear. Apparently, cases

399 This interpretation, implied in Panayotakis' (1995: 9–19) reading of the episode, is concisely summarised by Williams (2010b: 31).

400 For a recent overview of the concept of μοιχεία, cf. Robson (2013: 90–115) with references for further reading. On *adulterium,* cf. Treggiari (1993: 262–319) and Dixon (2012: 17–88).

401 On this double standard, cf. e.g. Treggiari (1993: 299–309) and Robson (2013: 92).

402 Cf. Treggiari 1993: 290.

of adultery were predominantly dealt with in family councils rather than in public courts.[403] When we learn of punishments, they are often even harsher than those imposed in the Imperial era. In Livy's account of the rape of Lucretia, for instance, Tarquinius intimidates his victim by suggesting that she might meet the fate of an *adultera*:

> *Ubi obstinatam videbat et ne mortis quidem metu inclinari, addit ad metum dedecus: cum mortua iugulatum servum nudum positurum ait, ut in sordido adulterio necata dicatur. Quo terrore cum vicisset obstinatam pudicitiam velut victrix libido …*
> (Liv. 1.58.4–5).
>
> When he found her obdurate and not to be moved even by fear of death, he went farther and threatened her with disgrace, saying that when she was dead he would kill a slave and lay him naked by her side, that she might be said to have been put to death in adultery with a man of base condition. At this dreadful prospect her resolute 'purity' (*pudicitia*) was overcome, as if with force, by his victorious lust.

Tarquinius threatens that, should Lucretia continue to resist his sexual aggression, he will kill her and make it look as if she had committed *adulterium* with a slave.[404] This procedure would not only add to Lucretia's disgrace (*dedecus*) but might also allow Tarquinius to get away with murdering her. For, Graeco-Roman customs – at least under certain circumstances – considered death to be an appropriate punishment for adulterers caught in the act. According to the *lex Iulia de adulteriis,* for instance, a woman's father had the right to kill both the adulterer and his own daughter if he caught them together in his house or in the house of his son-in-law.[405] Under similar circumstances, the *lex Iulia* allowed the woman's husband to kill the adulterer (though not his wife),

403 For references and further discussion, cf. Benke (2012: 287 f.) and Dixon (2012: 27–48).

404 Cf. also Ov. *Fast.* 2.807–9: *nil agis: eripiam' dixit 'per crimina vitam: | falsus adulterii testis adulter ero: | interimam famulum, cum quo deprensa fereris'* ("'It is no good,' he said. 'I will take your life through accusations. I, the adulterer, will be false witness to adultery. I will kill a slave, and it will be said you were caught with him'").

405 Cf. Treggiari 1993: 282. We should add that, for a father to have the right to kill his daughter, she needed to be *alieni iuris* (rather than *sui iuris*), which meant she was legally subject to her father or her husband (cf. Benke 2012: 286, 289). Benke (*ibid.* 292 f.) suggests

granted that the man he had caught was a person of low and/or disreputable status.[406] In the Second Rivalry over Giton (§§ 79.8–82), Encolpius wakes up to realise Giton is no longer in bed with him (§ 79.10). Finding the boy together with Ascyltus – in another case of perceived adultery –, Encolpius contemplates killing both of them in their sleep: *si qua est amantibus fides, ego dubitavi an utrumque traicerem gladio somnumque morti iungerem* ("If there is any faith in lovers, I was uncertain whether to run them both through with my sword and make sleep and death one," § 79.10).[407]

The conviction that *adulteri* and *adulterae* must be purged from society, perhaps, finds nowhere as drastic an expression as in the story of Lucretia. Once she has told her relatives about what had occurred, she asks them to swear that Tarquinius will get what he deserves:[408]

> *'Sed date dexteras fidemque haud impune adultero fore. Sex. est Tarquinius qui hostis pro hospite priore nocte vi armatus mihi sibique, si vos viri estis, pestiferum hinc abstulit gaudium.' … 'Vos' inquit 'videritis quid illi debeatur: ego me etsi peccato absolvo, supplicio non libero; nec ulla deinde impudica Lucretiae exemplo vivet.' Cultrum, quem sub veste abditum habebat, eum in corde defigit, prolapsaque in volnus moribunda cecidit.*
> (Liv. 1.58.7–10)

> "But pledge your right hands and your words that the adulterer shall not go unpunished. Sextus Tarquinius is he that last night

that the narrow definition of the father's *ius occidendi* likely meant that it was very rarely put into practice. In fact, our sources mention only one specific case in which this provision of the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* came into play (cf. *Dig.* 48.5.33(32) pr.).

406 Cf. Treggiari 1993: 283 f. Greek laws permitted a woman's κύριος – i.e. the man under whose protection she was, usually her father or husband – to mete out punishment to the adulterer (regardless of his social status). If he killed the adulterer after catching him in the act, his vengeance could be considered a case of justifiable homicide (cf. esp. Dem. *Or.* 23.53–4 and Lys. 1.30); for further discussion, cf. Cole (1984: 100–4), Carey (1995: 408–13) and Robson (2013: 93–4).

407 For a discussion of possible intertextual references in this passage, cf. Habermehl (ed. 2006 *ad loc.*) and Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011 *ad loc.*). Panayotakis (1995: 111 n. 2) compares Encolpius' words to those of a cuckolded husband in the adultery mime (Chor. *Apol. Mimorum* 55).

408 Indeed, Lucretia's meeting with her husband and his companions may be interpreted as a traditional family council, convened so as to come up with an appropriate response to the crime that has occurred in the private realm (cf. Treggiari 1993: 265).

> returned hostility for hospitality, and armed with force brought ruin on me, and on himself no less – if you are men – when he worked his pleasure with me." […] "It is for you to determine," she said, "what is due to him; for my own part, though I acquit myself of the sin, I do not absolve myself from punishment; not in time to come shall ever 'impure' (*impudica*) woman live through the example of Lucretia." Taking a knife which she had concealed beneath her dress, she plunged it into her heart, and sinking forward upon the wound, died as she fell.

At first sight, it seems clear that the Lucretia story centres around the issue of rape, since Tarquinius forces himself on her against her will. In *ab urbe condita,* Tarquinius' violent act is three times described as *stuprum,* i.e. as a case of 'illicit sexual intercourse'.[409] At this crucial point, however, Lucretia calls the aggressor an adulterer (*adultero*), thereby presenting the crime as an instance of *adulterium.* Her formulation finds an echo in Ovid's *Fasti* (2.808), where Tarquinius refers to himself as an *adulter.*[410] This choice of words is not easy to understand from a modern perspective. Unlike today, where the partners' consent determines whether a sexual encounter constitutes rape, ancient laws were little concerned with women's (or boys') point of view. Rather, what mattered was the consent of their father, guardian, or husband: Having sex with an unmarried woman or with a boy behind their fathers' back was considered a crime against the father; sex with a married woman was regarded as a crime against her husband. Accordingly, some Roman jurists claim that the distinction between a *stuprator* and an *adulter* solely depends on the gender and marital status of the other person involved: Illicit sexual intercourse with a married woman constitutes a case of *adulterium,* whereas it is *stuprum* with an unmarried woman or with a boy.[411] This means that Lucretia may conceive of Tarquinius as an *adulter* simply because she is a woman married to another man.

409 Cf. Liv. 1.57.10 (cited in section III.1.3. Sexual Rivalry between Two Tarquinii) as well as 1.59.8 and 3.44.1. On the concept of *stuprum,* cf. section II.1. Problems of Terminology and Categorisation.

410 Cited above in note 404.

411 Cf. Modestinus in *Dig.* 48.5.35.1: *Adulterium in nupta admittitur: stuprum in vidua vel virgine vel puero committitur* ("Adultery is committed with a married woman; *stuprum* is committed with a widow, a virgin, or a boy"). Trans. Watson (trans. 1998); cf. also Papinian in *Dig.* 48.5.6.1 and the discussions by Dixon (2012: 20). Note that these legal provisions relate to free persons only.

While women's (and boys') consent was of little importance to the guilt of the *stuprator* or *adulter,* it was essential to determining whether the wives, daughters or sons themselves deserved punishment. Since Lucretia made every attempt to stop Tarquinius' sexual attack, she is legally innocent of any wrongdoing.[412] In the light of this, it is striking that Lucretia regards herself as a potential role model for *impudicae,* i. e. for women who have intentionally forfeited their *pudicitia* through an act of *struprum* or *adulterium.*[413] For free Roman citizens, losing one's *pudicitia* meant to give away one's right to physical inviolability and thus to approach the (sexual) status of slaves.[414] Even though her relatives point out that the guilt lies with Tarquinius alone (cf. Liv. 1.58.9; Ov. *Fast.* 2.829), Lucretia feels she cannot go on living.[415] By committing suicide, she inflicts on herself the same punishment she wishes her rapist to receive.[416] Tarquinius is expelled from Rome and – having fled to Gabii – meets his death at the hands of some old enemies (cf. Liv. 1.60.2).

As has been elaborated on above, the First Rivalry over Giton is characterised by a sustained parody of the Lucretia story. Apart from the links between Ascyltus and Tarquinius as well as between Encolpius and Collatinus (and Tarquinius), there is a strong connection between Giton and Lucretia. Giton's reference to his *pudor* (§ 9.4), for instance, clearly evokes Lucretia's *pudicitia* and her concern about *impudicae* who might 'follow her example'. It is not too far-fetched, then, to argue that the ending of Petronius' episode – Ascyltus catching Encolpius and Giton in bed – parodies Tarquinius' threat to implicate his victim in a case of *sordidum adulterium* (Liv. 1.58.4).[417] In fact, as we have seen, the motif of adultery goes beyond Tarquinius' menacing words, since both Livy and Ovid give overtones of *adulterium* to the Lucretia story as a whole.

412 On this legal principle, cf. Treggiari (1993: 279). However, as Christine Walde reminded me, Lucretia has no way of proving her innocence after the fact.

413 In Roman legal texts, both *stuprum* and *adulterium* are treated as the opposite of *pudicitia* (cf. Dixon 2012: 25).

414 Cf. Williams (2010a: 107) and section II.1. Problems of Terminology and Categorisation.

415 As Robson (2013: 112) makes clear, even rape victims were sometimes regarded as 'stained'.

416 On other rape victims or adulteresses who committed suicide, cf. Dixon (2012: 40 f.) and Robson (2013: 103). Augustine (*Civ.* 1.16–9), quite ahead of his time, points out that there is no reason for rape victims to feel ashamed, let alone committing suicide. He (*ibid.* 1.19) explicitly criticises the pagan *exemplum* of Lucretia, the woman who 'saved her virtue' by killing herself. For further discussion, cf. Feichtinger (2018: 71–6).

417 This connection has been drawn by Ruden (1993: 22).

Therefore, when I now proceed to interpret the First Rivalry over Giton against the backdrop of spectacular punishments in the comic tradition, this is not to suggest that theatrical elements in the *Satyrica* supersede allusions to historiography, elegy or other genres. Rather, the latter type of references may be envisioned as taking place on the intertextual level of Petronius' narrative. In the remainder of this section, however, my discussion will concentrate on the 'low', the farcical level of the *Satyrica.*

III.3.2 Adultery and Punishment in the Comic Tradition

Fines, relegation and death are not the only punishments adulterers may fear. Among other things, we learn of men who were detained for ransom or subjected to physical abuse.[418] Crucially to the study at hand, adultery and its consequences repeatedly take centre stage in ancient comedy. For instance, the practice of (ἀπο)ραφανίδωσις, i.e. the insertion of a radish or other phallic objects into the adulterer's anus, is first attested in Aristophanes' *Clouds.*[419] The most drastic punishments occur

418 For an overview of Greek punishments for adultery, cf. Cole (1984) and Robson (2013: 93–9); Dixon (2012: 62–77) discusses Roman cases. Valerius Maximus (6.1.13) offers an impressive compilation of examples: *Sed ut eos quoque qui in vindicanda pudicitia dolore suo pro publica lege usi sunt strictim percurram, Sempronius Musca C. Gellium deprehensum in adulterio flagellis cecidit, C. Memmnius L. Octavium similiter deprehensum †pernis† contudit, Carbo Attienus a Vibieno item Pontius a P. Cerennio deprehensi castrati sunt. Cn. etiam Furium Brocchum qui deprehenderat familiae stuprandum obiecit. quibus irae suae indulsisse fraudi non fuit* ("But to run briefly over those who in avenging 'sexual purity' (*pudicitia*) made their own hurt stand for public law: Sempronius Musca scourged C. Gellius, whom he had caught in adultery, with lashes, C. Memmius beat L. Octavius, similarly caught, with thigh bones, Carbo Attienus and Pontius were caught and castrated by Vibienus and P. Cerennius respectively, the man who caught Cn. Furius Brocchus gave him to his slaves to be raped. None of these was penalized for indulging his anger"). Trans. Shackleton Bailey (ed., trans. 2000), slightly adapted.

419 Worse Argument having suggested that an adulterer caught in the act could always use the example of Zeus as an excuse (Aristoph. *Nub.* 1076–82, cited above in note 256), Better Argument replies (1083 f.): τί δ' ἢν ῥαφανιδωθῇ πιθόμενός σοι τέφρᾳ τε τιλθῇ, | ἔξει τινὰ γνώμην λέγειν τὸ μὴ εὐρύπρωκτος εἶναι; ("But say he listens to you and then gets violated with a radish and depilated with hot ash; what line of argument will he have on hand to avoid becoming wide-arsed?"). Of course, references to such punishments are not restricted to comic scripts. In Catullus 15, for instance, the speaker asks his friend Aurelius to guard his darling boy (1–5). In case Aurelius was to lay hands on the boy, the speaker threatens that he will be penetrated with radishes and mullet fish (*raphanique mugilesque,* 19); cf. O'Bryhim (2017). Juvenal (10.314–7) also mentions adulterers punished by the insertion of mullet fish. For a detailed discussion of (ἀπο)ραφανίδωσις, cf. Philippides (2015); Espach (2018: 105–12) gives an overview of further sexual punishments inflicted on adulterers.

in Herodas' fifth mimiamb and in a mime papyrus of the second century CE.[420] Herodas' text revolves around the mistress Bitinna, who accuses her slave Gastron of having abandoned her for another woman (1–3). In her jealous rage, she orders her slaves to tie Gastron up (11), strip him of his cloak (18), give him a proper beating (32–4), and tattoo his forehead (65 f., 79). At the end, Bitinna is persuaded to show some leniency (80–5). The beginning of the mime fragment (1–16 Rusten & Cunningham) is remarkably similar. An unnamed mistress reproaches her slave Aesopus for ignoring her sexual needs and for having a relationship with a slave girl called Apollonia. She handles a whip (9 f.), threatens to knock out Aesopus' teeth (11) and orders both him and Apollonia to be killed (16).

While these texts provide us with important evidence on the motif of ζηλοτυπία in the comic tradition, they do not involve 'penalties for adultery' in the narrow sense of the term. The mistresses do not punish Gastron and Aesopus by virtue of having been betrayed – i. e. with the help of legal and/or customary privileges for those wronged by μοιχεία/*adulterium* – but by virtue of owning them. As we are dealing with master-slave relationships, the mimiamb and the mime fragment are somewhat removed from comic plots featuring the exceptional phenomenon of corporal punishment exacted upon citizens. Here, as in the *Satyrica,* free characters inflict violence on their peers.

When it comes to the punishment of free citizens, two types of scenes from the *fabula palliata* are particularly relevant. The first group involves the chastisement of pimps (*lenones*), prototypically evil characters on the comic stage.[421] For instance, in Plautus' *Rudens* (656–63 and 706–891) the pimp Labrax is punished for trying to forcefully drag two of his slave girls out of the temple of Venus, thereby violating a priestess.[422] In the final scene of Plautus' *Persa* (789–858) the pimp Dordalus, who has already been sentenced in court for buying a freeborn citizen girl (cf. 738–52; 777–82), is extensively mocked and physically abused by the play's protagonists.[423]

420 For the papyrus, cf. note 243. Panayotakis (1995: 18 n. 70) mentions these two texts in the context of "pseudo-violence" in the First Rivalry over Giton.

421 On the stock character of the *leno* in Plautus and Terence, cf. e. g. Duckworth (1952: 262–4). Pomponius wrote a *fabula Atellana* entitled *leno* (cf. Frassinetti ed. 1967: 38).

422 For Labrax' crime, cf. especially Plaut. *Rud.* 641–55 and 839–40. Konstan & Raval (2018: 58–60) discuss the legal background of the scene.

423 The punishment of a pimp also plays a role in Plaut. *Curc.* 679–729. In Plaut. *Poen.* 1338–1422, the *leno* Lycus gives up without putting up a fight.

The second group of scenes – more immediately relevant to the First Rivalry over Giton – concerns the punishment of *adulteri* or *moechi.* Minor references to this motif occur in Plautus' *Amphitruo,*[424] *Bacchides,*[425] and *Poenulus,*[426] as well as in Terence's *Eunuchus.*[427] It is a central plot element in Plautus' *Miles gloriosus* and *Casina.* Both cases will be discussed in more detail in the following sections. In the *Miles gloriosus,* the soldier Pyrgopolinices is keen on having a sexual relationship with a woman – the *meretrix* Acroteleutium playing the role of a *matrona* – whom he believes to be married to another man.[428] As soon as he enters the house of the supposed husband, he falls into the trap that had been laid for him and faces penalties worthy of a *moechus.* In the *Casina,* the *senex* Lysidamus and his slave Olympio are punished for trying to have sex with Casina against the will of Cleostrata, Lysidamus' wife. Although

424 Towards the end of the play, Amphitruo decides to break into his own house and kill the adulterer he is certain to find there. In his rage, he threatens to kill everyone else in the house with him (Plaut. *Amph.* 1048–50): *certumst, intro rumpam in aedis: ubi quemque hominem aspexero,* | *si ancillam seu servom sive uxorem sive adulterum,* | *seu patrem sive avom videbo, optruncabo in aedibus* ("I am resolved to burst into the house. Anyone I see there, maid or slave, wife or adulterer, father or grandfather, I will slay in the house").

425 The *senex* Nicobulus is tricked into believing that his son Pistoclerus is having an affair with the wife of the soldier Cleomachus. When Nicobulus meets the soldier, he is afraid that he will kill Pistoclerus as an adulterer. Therefore, he instructs his slave Chrysalus to buy his son off (Plaut. *Bacch.* 866 f.): *pascisce ergo, opsecro, quid tibi lubet,* | *dum ne manifesto hominem opprimat nive enicet* ("Settle the issue, then, please, on any terms you like, so long as he [i. e. Cleomachus] does not surprise the chap [i. e. Pistoclerus] in flagrante and kill him").

426 In a conversation with his fellow-slave Milphio, Syncerastus makes the following joke (Plaut. *Poen.* 862 f.): *facio quod manufesti moechi hau ferme solent.* | *… refero vasa salva* ("I am doing what adulterers caught in the act usually do not do. […] I am carrying my utensils back safe and sound"). As *vasa* may refer to the male sexual organs, the formulation hints at the castration of adulterers caught in the act; cf. Maurach (1988 *ad loc.*) and the discussion below.

427 Rather than Chaerea, who had entered Thais' house in disguise and raped Pamphila without any scruples (cf. section III.1.1. Sexual Violence in Petronius and in the Comic Tradition), the character who receives a punishment in this play is Chaerea's slave Parmeno (Ter. *Eun.* 923–1024). Thais' *ancilla* Pythias, believing that he put Chaerea up to the rape (cf. 944, 965 f., 1013 f.), decides to take revenge on Parmeno (940). She does so by making him believe that Chaerea had been caught by Pamphila's brother, who – being of a violent disposition (955) – has tied up the rapist (956) and is now preparing to treat Chaerea as an 'adulterer' (957 f.): *nunc minatur porro sese id quod moechis solet:* | *quod ego numquam vidi fieri neque velim* ("Moreover he is now threatening to do what they do to adulterers, a thing I have never seen and would not wish to see").

428 For her alleged status as a married woman, cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 964 f. At line 1276, Pyrgopolinices makes clear that he is concerned about what he is about to do: *egon ad illam eam quae nupta sit? vir eius me deprehendat* ("I should go to the place of a woman who is married? Her husband might get hold of me").

the old man's attempt to rape the slave girl does not constitute adultery in the legal sense, he is called a bigamist (*dismarite,* Plaut. *Cas.* 974) and is said to have been caught *in adulterio, dum moechissat Casinam* (literally: "in the act of adultery, while committing adultery with Casina," 976).[429] A close analysis will bring to light striking parallels between Ascyltus' treatment of Encolpius and the punishments inflicted upon adulterers (and some other characters) in the comic tradition.

III.3.2.1 Laughter

As noted above, the first thing Ascyltus does once he has taken up the role of the cuckolded husband is to laugh and to applaud: *risu itaque plausuque cellulam implevit* (§ 11.2). In comic scenes of punishment, laughter is a very common element. In the *Casina,* for instance, when Lysidamus and Olympio have just walked off with Chalinus (whom they believe to be Casina), Cleostrata's friend Myrrhina professes to be full of glee:

> *acceptae bene et commode eximus intus*
> *ludos visere huc in viam nuptialis.*
> *numquam ecastor ullo die risi adaeque,*
> *neque hoc quod relicuom est plus risuram opinor.*
> (Plaut. *Cas.* 855–8)

> After we [i.e. Myrrhina, Cleostrata and her *ancilla* Pardalisca] have been entertained well and pleasurably we are going outside here into the street to watch the wedding games. I have never, on any day, laughed as much, nor do I think I will laugh more during all the rest of my life.

Myrrhina describes the unfolding spectacle as *ludi nuptiales,* a metatheatrical reference to the fact that Plautus' audience is about to witness a play-within-a-play.[430] This may remind us of Ascyltus, who – upon entering the trio's room – acts "as if he were watching a scene on stage" (Williams 2010b: 31). In fact, Myrrhina's explicit mentions of laugh-

429 Dixon (2012: 142) comments on the somewhat exceptional use of the term *adulterium* in this passage. For a detailed analysis of the ending to the *Casina* in the context of adultery and its punishment, cf. Philippides (2015).

430 For further discussion, cf. e.g. Christenson (2019: 70 f.).

ter (*risi*; *risuram*) can be attributed to the same kind of *Schadenfreude* Ascyltus expresses toward Encolpius.[431] One of the women's expressed aims is to hold Lysidamus and Olympio up to mockery.[432] After his unexpected encounter with the he-bride (*nuptum,* 859) Chalinus, Olympio realises that he and his master have become laughing stocks:

> *ita nunc pudeo atque ita nunc paveo atque ita inridiculo sumus ambo.*
> …
> *operam date, dum mea facta itero: est operae pretium auribus accipere,*
> *ita ridicula auditu, iteratu ea sunt quae ego intus turbavi.*
> (Plaut. *Cas.* 877–80)
>
> So much am I ashamed now, so much am I afraid now, and so much have we both made fools of ourselves. […] Pay attention while I recount my deeds; it is worthwhile to take it in with your ears: the mess I made inside is so funny to hear and recount.

Olympio confirms Myrrhina's assessment: Witnessing a humiliating (though appropriate) punishment can be an excellent source of laughter (*inridiculo*; *ridicula*). There is a considerable number of similar formulations in other scenes of punishment.[433]

III.3.2.2 Applause

Usually, the only time dramatic scripts mention applause is when it is demanded from the audience at the very end of the play. Note, for instance, the last line of Plautus' *Menaechmi* (1162): *nunc, spectatores, valete et nobis clare plaudite* ("Now, spectators, farewell and give us your loud applause"). During the punishment of the pimp Dordalus in the *Persa,* how-

431 Cf. section III.3. Punishment (§ 11.1–4).

432 Note Pardalisca's words about Lysidamus at Plaut. *Cas.* 685–8: *ludo ego hunc facete;* | *nam quae facta dixi omnia huic falsa dixi:* | *era atque haec dolum ex proxumo hunc protulerunt,* | *ego hunc missa sum ludere* ("I am fooling him wittily: what I told him has happened was a lie from first to last. My mistress and this woman from next door have hatched this trick, and I have been sent to fool him"); cf. also Plaut. *Cas.* 868 (*ludibrio*).

433 Cf. Plaut. *Pers.* 803 (*ludos*), 807 (*inridere*), 847 (*ludificari*), 850 (*inrides*) as well as Ter. *Eun.* 1004 (*ridiculo*), 1007 (*rides*), 1008 (*ridendo*), 1010 (*ludos*), 1017 (*rides*), 1018 (*inridere*).

ever, we encounter a reference to applause that does not pertain to the audience but to the characters on stage. Towards the end of the play, the slave Toxilus has already achieved everything he could have wished for: Firstly, he has managed to buy the freedom of his girlfriend Lemniselenis. Secondly, the pimp Dordalus, Lemniselenis' former owner and Toxilus' archenemy,[434] has fallen for the trick that had been devised for him. He was persuaded to trust the words of a 'Persian merchant' (actually the parasite Saturio in disguise) and bought at his own risk a girl whom he believed to be a slave kidnapped from Arabia (cf. Plaut. *Pers.* 470–710). Almost immediately afterwards, Dordalus was confronted by Saturio (now undisguised), stating that the girl was his daughter and a freeborn Athenian citizen who, of course, could not be sold or bought by anyone. Saturio summons Dordalus to court (745 f.), where he is sentenced to return the girl without compensation. When Dordalus re-enters the stage, Toxilus, together with Lemniselenis and his friend Sagaristio, has already begun celebrating his victory. Seeing the miserable pimp approach, Toxilus asks Dordalus to join their party, insincerely heaping praise upon him: *homo lepidissume, salve* ("Dordalus, most charming chap, my greetings," 791).[435] Incidentally, this formulation may remind us of Acyltus' ironic laudation of Encolpius' character (*frater sanctissime,* § 11.3).[436] Most remarkably, and equally disingenuously, Sagaristio calls upon his friends to give the pimp a round of applause: *agite, adplaudamus* ("Go on, let us give him a big hand," 791).

This cheerful acknowledgement of Dordalus' dismal re-entry upon the stage,[437] I suggest, is a close parallel to Ascyltus' applause for Encolpius in the First Rivalry over Giton. In both cases, clapping one's hands amounts to a form of mockery, no less an expression of *Schadenfreude* than the laughter discussed above. In the *Persa,* it even extends to the conventional request for applause at the very end of the play: Toxilus bids the audience farewell (*mei spectatores, bene valete. leno periit,* "My spectators, goodbye. The pimp has perished," 858), and the troupe replies *plaudite* ("Give us your applause," 858).

434 Cf. their verbal duel in section III.2.2.1. Mirroring and Exaggeration.

435 The irony has been noted by Woytek (1982 *ad loc.*).

436 For more such ironic remarks in the context of comic punishments, cf. e.g. Plaut. *Pers.* 849 or Plaut. *Cas.* 977.

437 Cf. Woytek 1982 *ad loc.*

III.3.2.3 Physical Abuse

Ascyltus does not content himself with mockery but resorts to violence: *nec se solum intra verba continuit, sed lorum de pera solvit et me coepit non perfunctorie verberare* (§ 11.4). As has already been mentioned, ancient texts regularly refer to brutal punishments for adulterers. As far as the comic tradition in concerned, the treatment of the soldier Pyrgopolinices in Plautus' *Miles gloriosus* is particularly striking. Shortly after he has entered the house of the *'matrona'*, the supposed husband Periplectomenus (Peri.) has Pyrgopolinices (Pyrg.) manhandled by a group of slaves and a cook named Cario:

Peri.: *ducite istum; si non sequitur, rapite sublimem foras,*
facite inter terram atque caelum ut siet, discindite. 1395
Pyrg.: *opsecro, hercle, Periplectomene, te.*
Peri.: *nequiquam hercle opsecras.*
vide ut istic tibi sit acutus, Cario, culter probe.
Cario: *quin iamdudum gestit moecho hoc abdomen adimere,*
ut faciam quasi puero in collo pendeant crepundia.
Pyrg.: *perii!* 1400
Peri.: *haud etiam, numero hoc dicis.*
Cario: *iamne ⟨ego⟩ in hominem in-*
volo?
Peri.: *immo etiam priu' verberetur fustibus.*
Cario: *multum quidem.*
…
Peri.: *qur es ausus subigitare alienam uxorem, inpudens?* 1402
Pyrg.: *ita me di ament, ultro ventumst ad me.*
Peri.: *mentitur, feri.*
…
Peri.: *qur ire ausu's? em tibi!* 1405
Pyrg.: *oiei! sati' sum verberatus. opsecro.*
Cario: *quam mox seco?*
Peri.: *ubi lubet: dispennite hominem divorsum et distendite.*
Pyrg.: *opsecro hercle te ut mea verba audias priu' quam secat.*
…
Peri.: *iura te non nociturum esse homini de hac re nemini,* 1411
quod tu hodie hic verberatu's aut quod verberabere,
si te salvom hinc amittemus Venerium nepotulum.
Pyrg.: *iuro per Iovem et Mavortem me nociturum nemini,*

quod ego hic hodie vapularim, iureque id factum
arbitror; 1415
et si intestatus non abeo hinc, bene agitur pro noxia.
Peri.: *quid si id non faxis?*
Pyrg.: *ut vivam semper intestabilis.*
Cario: *verberetur etiam, postibi amittendum censeo.*
(Plaut. *Mil.* 1394–1418)

Peri.: Bring him along; if he does not follow, lift him up and carry him out, make sure that he is between earth and heaven, tear him apart.
Pyrg.: I entreat you, Periplectomenus!
Peri.: You are entreating me in vain. Make sure that that knife is properly sharp, Cario.
Cario: Indeed, it has been keen for a long time now to cut off the adulterer's lower parts, so that I can make them hang round his neck like a child's rattle.
Pyrg.: I am dead!
Peri.: Not yet, you are saying this too early.
Cario: Am I to fly upon him now?
Peri.: No, first he should be beaten with cudgels.
Cario: And a lot.
…
Peri.: Why did you dare to make a move on another's wife, you shameless creature?
Pyrg.: As truly as the gods may love me, advances were made to me without encouragement on my part.
Peri.: He is lying, hit him.
…
Peri.: Why did you dare to go? Take that!
Pyrg.: Ow! I have been beaten enough. I entreat you!
Cario: How soon am I to cut him?
Peri.: As soon as you like. [to servants:] Spread him out and stretch him.
Pyrg.: I beg you to listen to my words before he cuts me!
…
Peri.: Swear that you will not harm anyone for having been beaten here today and for being beaten later on, if we let you go away from here safely, you little grandson of Venus.

Pyrg.: I swear by Jupiter and Mars that I will not harm anyone for having been beaten here today, and I think it serves me right. And if I do not go away from here without the power to bear witness as a man, I am getting off lightly.
Peri.: What if you do not keep your word?
Pyrg.: Then may I always live without that power.
Cario: Let him get another beating; after that I think he ought to be let off the hook.

It can hardly be stressed enough that it is extraordinary for a free person to be treated in such a violent manner. Normally, corporal punishment could only be inflicted upon slaves, whereas free persons – by virtue of their status – were entitled to bodily integrity.[438] Pyrgopolinices, however, is tied up and carried out of the house (1394 f.), thereby losing all control over his body and being reduced to begging for mercy (1396, 1406, 1408, 1425).[439] Being repeatedly beaten with cudgels (1401, 1403, 1405, 1418), he resembles Encolpius receiving blows from Ascyltus. Most drastically, Pyrgopolinices is threatened with castration by the hands of Cario, who appears to take some cruel enjoyment in his task (1398 f., 1407). Once the soldier has sworn not to take revenge for what he has suffered (1414 f.) – thereby escaping the most imminent danger – he comments on his situation in the manner of a pun: *si intestatus non abeo hinc, bene agitur pro noxia* (1416). His words play on the two meanings of the noun *testis,* i. e. either 'witness' or 'testicle': At first sight, Pyrgopolinices claims that he does not want to be "incapable (because of wrong-doing) of giving evidence" (Hammond et al. eds. 1963 *ad loc.*). More to the point, he wishes to avoid castration and thus being 'without testicles'.[440] This type of sexual *double entendre* does not only find a parallel in the punishment of Olympio in the *Casina* (909 f.)[441] but may also remind us of

438 Cf. e. g. Quint. *Inst.* 1.3.14 on the punishment of pupils: *Caedi vero discentis … minime velim, primum quia deforme atque servile est et certe (quod convenit, si aetatem mutes) iniuria* ("I disapprove of flogging […] because in the first place it is a disgraceful form of punishment and fit only for slaves, and is in any case an insult, as you will realise if you imagine its infliction at a later age"). Trans. Butler (ed., trans. 1920–2). For further references and a detailed discussion, cf. Walters (1997: 37–9).

439 At line 1425, Periplectomenus makes clear that the soldier had been tied up inside the house: *solvite istunc* ("untie him").

440 Cf. also Plaut. *Mil.* 1417 (*intestabilis*), 1420 (*salvis testibus*), 1426 (*carebis testibus*). The same pun occurs at Plaut. *Curc.* 30–1; cf. also Cic. *Fam.* 9.22.4.

441 When Olympio recounts his encounter with Chalinus (whom he thought to be Casina), he mentions that he grabbed something that reminded him of a hilt (Plaut.

the word play on *amiculus/amiculum* (§ 11.3) and on *dividere* (§ 11.4) in the *Satyrica.*

Pyrgopolinices' humiliation is complete when he is ordered by Cario to hand over the symbols of his status and profession: *de tunica et chlamyde et machaera ne quid speres, non feres* ("As for your tunic, cloak, and sword, do not fool yourself, you will not take them with you," Plaut. *Mil.* 1423). Notably, the removal of clothes also plays a role in Petronius (*opertum me amiculo evolvit,* § 11.2) and in the punishment scene of the *Casina.* Fleeing from Chalinus, Olympio leaves his cloak (*palliolum,* 934) inside the house, thus entering the stage in a tunic, "the Roman equivalent of underwear" (Christenson 2019: 71). Under the same circumstances, Lysidamus loses his cloak (*pallium,* 975) and his walking stick (*scipione,* 975), tokens of his status.[442] While it is possible to interpret the violence against Pyrgopolinices in the context of his profession as a foreign mercenary or more generally in the context of the Second Punic War, it is important to keep in mind that Plautus' characters portray his treatment as an appropriate punishment for an adulterer.[443] The soldier is referred to as an *adulter* or *moechus* throughout the play.[444] The threat of castration fits sexual offenders and is mentioned elsewhere in the comic tradition and beyond.[445]

Although Pyrgopolinices' case is particularly drastic, he is not the only free man to (nearly) suffer corporal punishment in the *fabula palliata.* In Plautus' *Persa,* the pimp Dordalus not only endures various

Cas. 909 f.): *dum gladium quaero ne habeat, arripio capulum.* | *sed quom cogito, non habuit gladium, nam esset frigidus* ("While I was checking that she does not have a sword, I got hold of a hilt. But when I think about it, she did not have a sword, because it would have been cold"). Pardalisca (and the audience) understand the *capulus* to be Chalinus' penis; for further discussion, cf. e.g. Christenson (2019: 72, 85 f.). Note that Ascyltus' sword (§ 9.5) is also commonly interpreted as a metaphor for his penis, cf. section III.2. Altercation (§ 9.6–10.7).

442 For further discussion, cf. e.g. Christenson (2019: 72) and Gold (2020: 173).

443 Pyrgopolinices is a military commander, sent to Ephesus by king Seleucus of Syria for the sake of raising troops (cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 75–7 and 948–50). If the mention of king Seleucus goes back to the Greek original, it may refer to Seleucus I, who reigned between 306 and 281 BCE; cf. Hammond et al. (eds. 1963 *ad loc.*) for further discussion. Leach (1980) argues that Pyrgopolinices can be read as a Hannibal figure. Konstan & Raval (2018: 51) rightly point out that Plautus' text puts the emphasis on domestic matters, specifically on an outsider threatening the sanctity of the citizen household.

444 For Pyrgopolinices as an *adulter,* cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 90 and 802; for him as a *moechus,* cf. 775, 924, 1131, 1390, 1398, 1436.

445 Cf. e.g. Plaut. *Poen.* 862 f. with note 440 above as well as Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.44, 1.2.132 f. and Val. Max. 6.1.13 (cited above, note 418).

kinds of mockery (cf. above) but also takes a beating from Toxilus and his companions (esp. Plaut. *Pers.* 809 f. and 846). The pimp Labrax in the *Rudens* receives an equally violent treatment.[446] During their off-stage encounter in bed, Chalinus kicks Olympio in the chest and punches him in the face (Plaut. *Cas.* 930 f.). The danger of rape and ῥαφανίδωσις looms over Olympio's head.[447] Though Lysidamus is spared such an attack – the slave Olympio, in a way, standing in for his master[448] – he faces several serious threats, including the breaking of his loins.[449] At the end of the *Casina,* Lysidamus acknowledges that he has wronged Cleostrata and begs for her forgiveness (997, 1000). Making clear that the power dynamics between husband and wife have radically changed in the course of the play, he allows Cleostrata to inflict corporal punishment on him in the future: *si umquam posthac aut amasso Casinam aut occepso modo,* | *ne ut eam amasso, si ego umquam adeo posthac tale admisero,* | *nulla caussast quin pendentem me, uxor, virgis verberes* ("If I ever make love to Casina hereafter or if I only begin to do so, yes, as soon as I make love to her, if I ever become guilty of such a deed hereafter, there is no reason why you should not hand me up and beat me with rods, my wife", Plaut. *Cas.* 1001–3).[450]

446 Cf. section III.3.2. Adultery and Punishment in the Comic Tradition.

447 Cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 909–14, where Olympio relates how he mistook Chalinus' penis for a sword or a hilt and Pardalisca asks him whether it might have been radish or a cucumber. For further discussion, cf. Philippides (2015: 247–9). When, during Quartilla' orgy, a *cinaedus* penetrates both Encolpius and Ascyltus (§ 22.1), this can be interpreted as a sexual punishment; cf. Adams (1982: 146) and the discussion in n. 418.

448 Cf. Christenson (2019: 85 f.): "Decorum in a society in which masters' bodies must remain inviolable prevents the representation, either onstage or in (offstage) reported narrative, of Lysidamus suffering a beating or sexual violation, but Olympio's description of his experience with Chalinus is suggestive enough." For other scenes in which slaves arguably suffer their masters' punishment, cf. Ter. *Eun.* 923–1024 with note 426 as well as Plaut. *Mostell.* 1064–1181, discussed by Konstan & Raval (2018: 52 f.).

449 Cf. Lysidamus' words at Plaut. *Cas.* 967 f.: *perii! fusti defloccabit iam illic homo lumbos meos.* | *hac iter faciundumst, nam illac lumbifragiumst obviam* ("I am dead! He [i.e. Chalinus] will smash my loins with his club now. I have to turn this way [i.e. towards Cleostrata]; that way a loin wreck is facing me"). The verb *defloccare* might also refer to the plucking of Lysidamus' pubic hair, another common punishment for adulterers; cf. Philippides (2015: 251 n. 27).

450 Cf. also Plaut. *Cas.* 950. Just as Lysidamus humbles himself to his wife, the *senex amator* Demipho humbles himself to his son and his neighbour at the end of Plautus' *Mercator* (1001 f.): *opsecro,* | *sati' iam ut habeatis. quin loris caedite etiam, si lubet* ("I beg you two to consider it enough now. Beat me with straps too if you want"); cf. the section below on *lora.*

III.3.2.4 The *lorum* and the *lorarius*

A last point worth making concerns the instruments (or props) and the personnel of comic punishments. In the *Satyrica,* Ascyltus beats Encolpius with a *lorum* (or *lorus*), which – as the passage (§ 11.4) neatly illustrates – can not only refer to a leather strap used for tying something up but also to a leather whip.[451] Interestingly enough, Quintilian (*Inst.* 5.10.88) – discussing different argumentative strategies – connects *lora* to the punishment of adulterers: *si adulterum occidere licet, et loris caedere* ("If it is lawful to kill an adulterer, it is lawful to flog him").[452] In the only specific discussion of Ascyltus' *lorum* I am aware of, Thomas Köntges (ed. 2013 *ad loc.*) interprets it in the context of an important reference point in the *Satyrica*: At § 134.9 the priestess Proselenos uses the expression *lorum in aqua* ("a leather strap in water") to describe Encolpius' impotence. A similar meaning appears to be implied in the words of the freedman Hermeros at § 57.8.[453] With reference to the First Rivalry over Giton, Köntges (ed. 2013 *ibid.*) concludes that *lorum in aqua* "was a 'floppy cock' and Petronius produces a pun if Ascyltus (the 'never-failing') looses his *lorus* and whips Encolpius with it. Encolpius' diction presents the scene as some kind of priapic punishment."[454] His reading is not incompatible with the points made above, particularly since Olympio's encounter with Chalinus' sword-penis, for instance, can also be understood as a Priapic punishment (cf. note 418). Nevertheless, in the remainder of this section, I will propose another line of interpretation.

In the *fabula palliata,* several masters are said to use *lora* for the chastisement of their slaves.[455] In Terence's *Adelphoe* (180–2), the *adulescens* Aeschinus threatens to have the pimp Sannio whipped to death with *lora.*

451 Cf. *OLD* s. v. "lorum 1" and "lorum 2"; *TLL* s. v. "lorum 1a" and "lorum 1c." At § 102.8, Eumolpus suggests disguising Encolpius and Giton as pieces of luggage, tying them up with *lora.*

452 Trans. Rusell (ed., trans. 2002). Val. Max. 6.1.13 (cited above, note 418) speaks of *flagella* used for the punishment of an adulterer.

453 For further discussion, cf. Adams (1982: 42) and Schmeling & Setaioli (eds. 2011 *ad loc.*). *lorum* for penis occurs twice in Martial's epigrams (7.58.3 f.; 10.55.5).

454 For further discussion of Ascyltus' name – derived from ἄσκυλτος ("undisturbed, unwearied") –, cf. e. g. Habermehl (ed. 2006: XVII) with references for further reading.

455 The pimps Dordalus in the *Persa* (731 f.) and Ballio in the *Pseudolus* (143–7) talk about whipping their slaves with *lora.* The prologue speaker of the *Poenulus* (23–7), addressing the audience of the play, claims that slaves will be punished with *lora* for taking up seats assigned to free citizens. On the use of whips in Greek comedy, cf. Diggle (1974: 91).

The latter objects *loris liber?* ("The whip for a free man?"),[456] making plain that flagellation – just as other kinds of physical abuse discussed above – was associated with slaves, not with free citizens. More importantly, the *lorum* marks (and lends the name to) a stock character of the Roman comic stage: the *lorarius*. Slaves referred to as *lorarii* are distinguished from other household slaves by the function they perform, i.e. by the fact that they look after their masters' interest by means of brute force. Previous scholars have referred to them as "disciplinary and punitive agents" (Prescott 1936: 100) or simply as "thugs" (Diggle 1974: 90). We have already encountered them in an earlier section: When we discussed the slaves who drag Pyrgopolinices out of the house, tie him up and beat him (Plaut. *Mil.* 1394–1427), we were dealing with *lorarii* belonging to Periplectomenus. At line 1424, one of them addresses his master directly: *verberon etiam, an iam mittis?* ("Am I to beat him [i.e. Pyrgopolinices] once more or are you letting him off in peace now?"). To be exact, we should note that the word *lorarius* does not occur in the text of any extant play but only in the scene superscripts and other marginal notes in the manuscripts.[457] While these *notae personarum* may not go back to the playwrights themselves, there is some further indication that ancient audiences recognised *lorarii* as a distinct character type.[458] Discussing a speech by Cato the Elder entitled *de falsis pugnis* ("On Sham Battles"), Gellius (*NA* 10.3.19) notes that – after the end of the Second Punic War – the Romans punished the Bruttii for having colluded with Hannibal:

> *Romani … Bruttios ignominiae causa non milites scribebant nec pro sociis habebant, sed magistratibus in provincias euntibus parere et praeministrare servorum vicem iusserunt. Itaque hi sequebantur magistratus, tamquam in scaenicis fabulis qui dicebantur lorarii, et quos erant iussi, vinciebant aut verberabant;*
>
> The Romans […] by way of ignominious punishment refused to enrol the Bruttii as soldiers or treat them as allies, but commanded them to serve the magistrates when they went to their provinces, and to perform the duties of slaves. Accordingly, they accom-

456 My translation.

457 For a full list of references, cf. *TLL* s.v. "lorarius". Prescott (1936: 99–103) and Richlin (2017: 452–4) offer an overview of the role of *lorarii* in the *fabula palliata*. Diggle (1974: 90 f.) and Lowe (1991: 31) discuss a few further points.

458 Bader (1970: 152) tentatively suggests that the relevant superscripts go back the period between the late first century CE and the middle of the second century CE.

> panied the magistrates in the capacity of those who are called "floggers" in the plays, and bound or scourged those whom they were ordered.[459]

Gellius not only associates *lorarii* with theatrical plays (*in scaenicis fabulis*),[460] but he also mentions the same kinds of activities we can observe in the *fabula palliata*: At their masters' behest, these slave characters tie people up or beat them (*vinciebant aut verberant*). In Plautus' *Captivi,* for instance, the *senex* Hegio instructs his three *lorarii* to bring out their straps (*ecferte lora,* 658), to handcuff the captive slave Tyndarus (659, 667) and lead him to the quarry (721–3).[461] In the punishment scene of the *Rudens,* the old man Daemones orders his *lorarii* to drag the pimp Labrax out of the temple of Venus (660). Directly afterwards, the slave Trachalio comments (661): *audio tumultum. opinor, leno pugnis pectitur* ("I can hear an uproar. I think the pimp is being combed with fists"). At line 710, Daemones instructs a *lorarius* to punch the pimp (*pugnum in os impinge*). He later orders them to fetch two cudgels (*duas clavas,* 799) and to make sure Labrax stays away from the girls Palaestra and Ampelisca in the temple (807–13). They do so by threatening Labrax with violence in case he dared to approach any further (821–36, esp. 833). The main characteristic of the *lorarii* is their physical strength – rather than their rhetorical skill[462] – and their readiness to use it against their master's adversary. They are all "comic muscle" (Richlin 2017: 452), being one of the most visible manifestations of power on the Roman stage (cf. *ibid.* 454).

With regard to the First Rivalry over Giton, I suggest that we appreciate the parallels between Ascyltus and the comic stock character of the *lorarius.* The fact that Ascyltus makes use of a *lorum,* of course, is the most obvious connection between the two.[463] More specifically, a) he employs the strap for beating, which is what *lorarii* do, and b) he uses it in the context of a punishment, which is when *lorarii* are most likely to

459 Trans. Rolfe (ed. trans. 1927), slightly adapted.

460 Cf. also Donatus' commentary on Terence's *Andria* (860), where the author evidently uses the term *lorarius* to refer to a stock character of the comic stage.

461 For further discussion of the *lorarii* in Plautus' *Captivi,* cf. esp. Lowe (1991).

462 Cf. Richlin (2017: 454): "When they [i.e. *lorarii*] speak at all, they often say something stupid that underscores their own brute powerlessness, making a joke of a real-life terror. It is a surprise when they speak." Prescott (1936) discusses *lorarii* in an article entitled "Silent Rôles in Roman Comedy."

463 As Diggle (1974: 91) points out, even though *lorarii* sometimes use cudgels or other weapons, their closest association is with *lora.*

make an appearance on stage. Arguably, Ascyltus casts himself not only as the cuckolded husband but also as the punitive agent charged with rectifying the harm that has been done. In an act of improvisation, he transforms the strap of his bag into a weapon closely associated with comic violence. Ascyltus becomes the *lorarius* of the *Satyrica.*

III.4 Interim Conclusion

I have divided the First Rivalry over Giton into three sections, each of which, I argue, includes one or more plot elements known from the Graeco-Roman comic tradition. The first paragraph (§ 9.1–5) has been interpreted against the backdrop of comic rape plots, may they involve citizen victims or slave(-like) ones. The middle part (§ 9.6–10.7) has been shown to be akin to verbal duels in the vein of Aristophanes, Plautus and the *fabula Atellana.* Finally, I have suggested the last section of the episode (§ 11.1–4) to be in line with spectacular punishments displayed on the comic stage, particularly those meted out against (perceived) adulterers.

As far as (stock) types and their characteristics are concerned, we have seen that Giton bears a close resemblance to *pueri delicati* and other (perceived) 'low' characters on the comic stage. In terms of their appetite for both food and sex, Encolpius and Ascyltus are in no way inferior to comic parasites and lechers. What is more, at the very end of the episode (§ 11.4) Ascyltus arguably turns himself into a comic thug, a *lorarius.* Various other elements have been touched upon. As so many extant comedies, this episode revolves around the themes of adultery, rivalry and, of course, sex – the considerable number of *double entendres* is worth emphasising. We have also observed that Petronius' way of representing violence – be it sexual, verbal or physical – is akin to what we find in the many branches of Graeco-Roman comedy.

I have paid much attention to Petronius' allusions to the Lucretia story according to Livy and Ovid. On the one hand, I have shown that Petronius' parody functions along the same lines as the parody of mythological figures and literary predecessors in Terence's *Eunuchus.* On the other, I have argued that the intertextual dimension is not only central to the first paragraph of Petronius' text (§ 9.1–5), but that it adds a layer of sophistication to the episode as a whole: Both Ascyltus and Encolpius are cast as parodic reincarnations of Sextus Tarquinius. As to other comic techniques, we have seen that Ascyltus' penchant for role-playing and

exaggeration connects him to rapists and verbal duellers of the comic tradition. The episode brings about a role reversal between its protagonists – a *topos* of ancient comic scripts.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will focus on one aspect of Petronius' episode that sets it clearly apart from comic plays. The audience of a theatrical performance sees, hears (and feels) what is unfolding: They have direct visual and auditory contact, as it were, with the actors, their words and actions, as well as with the objects and the very stage in front of them. For the audience of a narrative, however, the situation is entirely different: Rather than having immediate access to the story – i.e. to the 'reality' of what is going on in the narrative – they receive their information in a filtered form. In the case of the *Satyrica,* the one who does the (immediate) seeing, hearing and feeling is Encolpius, the narrator and focaliser of the narrative.

III.5 Narrative Technique

Having identified a wide range of theatrical elements in the First Rivalry over Giton, I will now address the question of *how* Petronius adapts these elements for narrative prose fiction. For the most part, my analysis will focus on two specific categories of narrative techniques or strategies. On the one hand, there are those techniques that, somewhat paradoxically, use the narrator's voice so as to create the impression of a stage performance, seemingly allowing the audience to have an unadulterated look at the unfolding story. These strategies give further substance to Panayotakis' (1995: ix) claim that the *Satyrica* is "the narrative equivalent of a farcical staged piece." On the other hand, there are narrative techniques that tend to bring about the opposite effect. They use Encolpius' voice in a way that is peculiar to narratives and could not (easily) be brought to bear on stage. In other words: They make the audience aware of the fact that they are *not* dealing with a theatrical performance but with a piece of virtuoso storytelling. Lastly, I will address the question of whether the narrative patterns we have observed may allow for conclusions to be drawn as to the character of Encolpius as protagonist and/or narrator.

III.5.1 A Narrative Emulating Stage Performances

III.5.1.1 Μίμησις, or: Narrative of Events

In Plato's *Republic* (*Resp.* 392c–394), Socrates makes one of the earliest contributions to what we today call narratology. He notes that the poet (i.e. the narrator) of an epic can choose between two ways of storytelling: On the one hand, the narrator may speak in his own voice, as it were, thereby drawing the audience's attention to the fact that there *is* a narrator. The Platonic term is διήγησις ("narration"). This is the case, for instance, when the narrator directly comments on the story or when he represents the words of the story's characters in the form of indirect speech. Since this mode of storytelling tends to emphasise the narrator's words rather than (the events of) the story as such, Genette (1980: 166) refers to the outcome as a 'narrative of words'. On the other hand, the narrator may impersonate the story's characters and thus make it appear as if they were speaking for themselves: The Platonic term is μίμησις ("imitation"); it is part of Genette's concept of a 'narrative of events' (cf. below). What is important to point out here is that Plato's Socrates and his interlocutor Adeimantus explicitly link the latter mode of storytelling to the theatrical stage. They agree that μίμησις proper belongs to tragedy and comedy (*Resp.* 394b–c).

The connection between narrative 'imitation' and stage plays is most obvious, of course, in the area of speech representation.[464] In fact, Genette (1980: 164) points out that true narrative μίμησις can only exist when the object of imitation is language (i.e. words). In all other cases – e.g. when representing events, object or character traits – a narrative can, at best, give the *"illusion of mimesis."*[465] As far as speech representation is concerned, though, the narrator may create something very similar to a dramatic script simply by reproducing all of the characters' words in the form of reported speech,[466] without adding further information in between.[467] Taking this finding as a starting point, I will argue that Petronius' nar-

464 Speech representation refers to the different ways in which the narrator may reproduce the words of characters in the story; cf. Genette (1980: esp. 170–4).

465 Genette (1980: 164), emphasis in the original.

466 We are dealing with reported speech when "the narrator pretends literally to give the floor to his character" (Genette (1980: 172). This is the case, for instance, when the narrator quotes Agamemnon's words at §§ 3–5.

467 In the case of §§ 79.11–80.6, Panayotakis (1995: 112 f.) has shown how easily some parts of Petronius' narrative could be turned into a dramatic script.

rator, at times, emulates theatrical performances by a) foregrounding the words and actions of the story's characters, and b) reducing his own (perceived) presence to the bare minimum.

This technique, as it were, is most clearly discernible in the dialogue between Encolpius and Ascyltus, i.e. in their altercation and the ensuing discussion about their break-up (§ 9.6–10.7). The passage comprises 200 words, 159 of which are taken up by reported speech. Some of the remaining phrases simply mark the quarrellers' words as reported speech (e.g. *inquam,* § 9.6; *inquit,* § 9.8). It almost goes without saying that, in terms of narrative speed, we are here dealing with a 'scene' – a term aptly borrowed from drama –, which means that story time virtually equals narrative time:[468] Encolpius and Ascyltus (hypothetically) need about the same time to interact as we need to read (or hear) about their interaction. This, of course, is similar to what the audience of a theatrical performance would experience if the two were quarrelling on stage.

Yet, the above-mentioned finding constitutes but a superficial connection with the stage. While a long succession of reported speech may easily be seen as an emulation of a *dramatic script,* this is not necessarily true for a *dramatic performance.* The latter specifies matters such as the play's setting and musical accompaniment as well as the characters' costumes, movements, and tone of voice – thus going far beyond the information provided by the script. Keeping this in mind, it becomes clear that – as far as narrative techniques are concerned – speech representation alone will inevitably fall short of the rich variety of impressions theatrical performances have to offer. This, I argue, is where the additional remarks made by Petronius' narrator come into play. To a large extent, the words the narrator speaks *in propria persona* fill the audience in on what the First Rivalry over Giton looks and sounds like: The narrator describes Encolpius' angry gesture (*intentavi in oculos Ascylti manus,* § 9.6) and Ascyltus' exaggerated reaction (*sublatis fortius manibus,* § 9.7). He also specifies that Ascyltus' reply was spoken much louder than Encolpius' initial accusation (*longe maiore nisu clamavit,* § 9.7). Similarly, the references to laughter (§ 10.3, 11.2) and applause (§ 11.2) provide the audience with information about the episode's soundscape.

468 Story time is the duration of the story, i.e. the amount of time taken up by an event or a section within the story "measured in seconds, minutes, hours, days, months, and years" (Genette 1980: 88). Narrative time, on the other hand, is the time it takes to read or listen to a section of the narrative and is thus "measured in lines and in pages" (*ibid*). Narrative speed is the relationship between story time and narrative time.

Often enough, rather than naming an emotion felt by one of the characters, the narrator prefers to describe how they *physically express* these emotions.[469] For instance, rather than simply stating that Giton was sad and/or distraught, the narrator describes how the boy sits down and wipes away his tears with his thumb (*consedit puer super lectum et manantes lacrimas pollice extersit,* § 9.2). Just as the mention of Encolpius' and Ascyltus' gestures, this finding may be interpreted as an emulation of stage performances: Although the narrator could provide us with his own take on what is going on, in these cases he merely tells us what the situation looked and sounded like. Just as if they were watching a play, the audience is left alone to judge what the characters' words and actions signify.

It is worth noting that the narrator's tendency to describe physical reactions rather than name feelings is not due to Encolpius' limited knowledge – no matter whether we are referring to Encolpius as *actor* or *auctor.* Even when the narrator talks about his past self – whom, of course, he knows better than anyone else –, he alternates between simply spelling out his emotions (e. g. *perturbatus ego,* § 9.3) and describing his own emotive gestures (e. g. *intentavi in oculos Ascylti manus,* § 9.6). My argument, therefore, is that the narrator's strong emphasis on the visual and auditory aspects of the story is to be understood as part of Petronius' narrative technique. Its effect – among other things – is to reinforce the impression that we are dealing with a stage performance in narrative guise.

Lastly, we may add that these findings are in line with what Genette refers to as a 'narrative of events'. This mode of storytelling is not restricted to direct speech representation but, in more general terms, refers to texts characterised by a high "quantity of narrative information (a more developed or more *detailed* narrative) and the absence (or minimal presence) of the informer – in other words, of the narrator."[470] I claim that the points made above neatly characterise the dialogue between Encolpius and Ascyltus as a narrative of events. The narrator provides the audience with details about the action – information aiding its visualisation (gestures, laughter, loudness) – without foregrounding his own presence: The narrator's 'intrusions' into the words of the characters are comparatively brief, and – at least in the cases discussed so far – they are limited to 'objective' descriptions of what is going on. What I mean is that, as far as we can tell, the narrator does not manipulate the story

469 With reference to §§ 1–9.1, this point has been made by Ruden (1993: 18).

470 Genette (1980: 166), emphasis in the original.

in any significant way: His words are not shaped by Encolpius' feelings towards the action (as is the case elsewhere, as we will see). To use a theatrical metaphor, then, we may conceive of the narrator's brief intrusions into the dialogue between Encolpius and Ascyltus as 'stage directions' in a stage-like narrative.

III.5.1.2 Paralepsis

In the preceding section, we have discussed rather straightforward instances of stage-like storytelling. I will now proceed to cases in which Petronius' emulation of theatrical performances goes as far as to strain narrative plausibility. What I mean is that the narrator Encolpius occasionally discloses more information than he can (technically) possess; in Genettean narratology, this phenomenon is known as paralepsis (derived from λαμβάνω, "to take (up)").[471]

Let us begin by referring once more to Panayotakis' seminal study on theatrical elements in the *Satyrica.* Apart from identifying several comic motifs and character types in the First Rivalry over Giton, Panayotakis (1995: 18 f.) points out an important structural parallel between Petronius' work and the Graeco-Roman comic tradition: Occasionally, comic characters do something on stage that goes unnoticed by other characters present, for instance when Chalinus eavesdrops on a conversation between Lysidamus and Olympio (Plaut. *Cas.* 451–66)[472] or when the *matrona* Artemona watches her husband Demaenetus enjoying himself with the prostitute Philaenium (Plaut. *Asin.* 878–910).[473] Such scenes follow what Panayotakis (*ibid.* 18) refers to as a "'double audience-spectacle' pattern:" The audience watches both parties simultaneously – registering, e. g., the husband's actions and his wife's *re*-actions – and appreciates the complications arising from this constellation. The same structure, Panayotakis (*ibid.* 19) elaborates, characterises the ending of Petronius' episode when "Ascyltus is behind the door and silently watches Giton and Encolpius making love. The audience of the novel watches not only the homosexual couple but Ascyltus and his movements […] at the same time" (*furtim se foribus admovit discussisque fortissime claustris,* § 11.2).

471 Cf. Genette 1980: 195 and see the discussion below.

472 Cited in section II.2.2. The Evidence of Graeco-Roman Comedy.

473 Cf. Panayotakis (1995: 19 n. 72 and 73) for more examples.

I suggest that Panayotakis' remarks on the double audience-spectacle pattern in the *Satyrica* are broadly in line with Petronius' 'stage directions' discussed in the preceding section: The narrator informs the audience about Ascyltus' actions without directing their attention to the fact that there is a narrator 'filtering' the elements of the story. In that he describes Ascyltus' actions as being simultaneous with what Encolpius and Giton were doing (*nec adhuc quidem omnia erant facta, cum,* § 11.2), the narrator allows the audience to 'watch' both parties at the same time – an effect that, as Panayotakis points out, comes close to what the audience of a theatrical performance would experience.

The narratological difficulty with this interpretation is that, strictly speaking, the narrator has no way of knowing what Ascyltus is (or was) doing outside the room. It seems clear that Encolpius the protagonist cannot see what is happening behind the door. Neither does it seem likely that he hears Ascyltus approaching; not only because Encolpius is deeply preoccupied with Giton (§ 11.1) but also because Ascyltus is explicitly said to approach stealthily (*furtim,* § 11.2). Apparently, then, we are not dealing with the knowledge of the protagonist (i. e. with a case of experiencing focalisation). Does this mean that Encolpius the narrator is stepping in and providing the audience with hindsight knowledge (narrating focalisation)? Of course, this is not altogether impossible, but it certainly requires some scholarly ingenuity: We have to assume, for instance, that Ascyltus told Encolpius about his actions after the fact, or that Encolpius the narrator simply surmises what must have happened.[474]

A more straightforward proposition is that – in order to achieve the desired (stage-like) effect – the narrator is here allowed to give more information "than is authorized in principle in the code of focalization governing the whole [narrative]" – which is Genette's (1980: 195) definition of paralepsis. This means that, for a brief moment, Encolpius tells the story as if he was an omniscient narrator.[475] The latter explanation is all the more plausible because this is by far not the only case of par-

474 Cf. Jones' (1987: 815) remarks on the same narratological difficulty at § 97.7: "the narrator describes Ascyltos' growing excitement in his search for Giton, although Ascyltos is on the other side of a door. This is a slight case of extended perspective: signs of the excitement could doubtless be heard through the door and Encolpius' perception or imagination will have been magnified by his fear." Goldman (2006: 19) is right to dismiss this explanation as overly complicated.

475 Cf. Breitenstein (ed. 2009 *ad loc.*): "Hier findet ein kurzer Wechsel von der personalen zur auktorialen Erzählsicht statt." In Genettean terms, we may speak of zero focalisation, "where the narrator knows more than the character, or more exactly *says* more than any of the characters knows" (Genette 1980: 189), emphasis in the original.

alepsis in the extant *Satyrica.* The clearest instance occurs during the orgy at Quartilla's, when Encolpius (the protagonist) falls asleep (§ 22.2), but he (as narrator) nevertheless tells his audience in detail about how two Syrians break into the place and try to steal some valuable items (§ 22.3–5).[476]

Such passages make clear that Petronius may sometimes 'sacrifice' narrative plausibility for the sake of narrative efficiency (among other things). As far as the particular case of § 11.2 is concerned, I suggest that the paralepsis is in line with my findings on μίμησις: The narrator – despite Encolpius' restricted perspective – allows the audience to witness the actions of all narrative agents virtually at the same time: Encolpius and Giton on the one hand, Ascyltus on the other. The brief moment of an 'outside perspective' – i.e. the supply of information that is beyond Encolpius' knowledge – bridges the gap between Encolpius' point of view and what the audience would see if they were watching a theatrical performance.

Before moving on, I will address another (minor) instance of paralepsis in the First Rivalry over Giton. When discussing the motif of role-playing in this episode, I have stressed the point that Ascyltus is said to *pretend* to be horrified when he is confronted by Encolpius (*inhorrescere se finxit,* § 9.7). We may now add that, strictly speaking, Encolpius the narrator cannot know whether Ascyltus was being sincere or not. Again, I believe it is beside the point to ask how Encolpius might have acquired this piece of information. Rather than breaking up the scene by the addition of an elaborate explanation, the narrator is simply allowed to spell out what the audience is supposed to learn: Claiming that Ascyltus was faking his indignation, in a matter-of-fact way, is a succinct way of presenting the ensuing altercation in a farcical light.

III.5.2 A Narrative Emancipated from Stage Performances

In the preceding sections, I have discussed narrative techniques in the First Rivalry over Giton, particularly in the dialogue between Encolpius and Ascyltus (§ 9.6–10.7), that create the impression of a stage performance. As we shall see now, however, such techniques are only one part of Petronius' narrative repertoire. For, elsewhere in the episode the experi-

476 For further discussion of this and other instances of paralepsis in the *Satyrica,* cf. Goldman (2006: 12–20).

ence of Petronius' audience is markedly different from that of theatregoers. Rather than providing us with a steady flow of visual and auditory information – as a theatrical performance would do – the narrator of the *Satyrica* manipulates the story by means of emphasis, condensation, subjective storytelling, and foreshadowing.

III.5.2.1 Emphasis: Variations in Speech Representation

While the dialogue between Encolpius and Ascyltus is characterised by a high portion of reported discourse, the beginning of the episode employs different modes of speech representation. When the narrator tells us about Encolpius' conversation with Giton (§ 9.2–5), he presents Encolpius' (i.e. his own) words in an indirect mode. Both questions he poses to Giton are rendered in transposed speech, i.e. "in an indirect style, more or less closely subordinated" (Genette 1980: 170): *cum quaererem numquid nobis in prandium frater parasset,* 9.2; *quid accidisset quaesivi,* § 9.3. His angry entreaties (*precibus etiam iracundiam miscui,* § 9.3) present us with an instance of narratised speech:[477] The narrator treats Encolpius' speech act as one among many events of the story, without indicating what exactly Encolpius was saying.[478] In both cases, then, the narrator rephrases Encolpius' words and thereby increases the perceived presence of himself (as the intermediary between the story and the audience). This is also evident in the fact that the narrator – by (partly) summarising Encolpius' words – accelerates the pace of the narrative (story time > narrative time).

In contrast to these indirect modes of representation, Giton's words are spelled out in full (reported speech, § 9.4–5), which has the effect of slowing down the pace of the narrative (story time = narrative time) and reducing the distance between the audience and the character's statement. This narrative pattern – in which Encolpius' words, in a way, function as a prelude to Giton's – places great emphasis on Giton's accusation against Ascyltus. Strikingly, a very similar pattern can be observed in the way Giton represents his own words and those of Ascyltus: He

477 Admittedly, this only holds true if we are to imagine Encolpius' angry entreaties to consist of words rather than mere gestures.

478 Cf. Genette's (1980: 170) definition of narratised speech. Of course, we need to remember that Petronius' text refers to a very similar phrase in Livy's *ab urbe condita* (*miscere precibus minas,* Liv. 1.58.3).

presents his own shouting as a kind of background information (*cum ego proclamarem,* § 9.5) and leaves the prominent end position of his statement to Ascyltus' words: *"si Lucretia es" inquit "Tarquinium invenisti"* (*ibid.*). Giton's statement thus enhances the dramatic effect of Ascyltus' rape threat.[479]

It is important to note that this narrative technique runs contrary to what we have observed in the preceding section. Rather than allowing all characters to speak in their own words – as we would expect them to do on stage – Petronius' narrator places different weights on the statements of his narrative agents. Even though such variations in speech representation are not inconceivable in theatrical productions, Petronius' narrative technique is here clearly not meant to emulate the stage but to bring to the fore a few choice elements of the story. As we will see in the following section, this is part of a broader tendency in the First Rivalry over Giton.

III.5.2.2 Condensation: Matters of 'Visibility'

In many regards, Petronius' episode condenses into a narrative of less than 400 words a range of elements (plots, characters, motifs) that could fill entire stage plays. One important instrument making this condensation possible is ambiguity: As we have seen, much of the First Rivalry over Giton can be read in different ways – or on different levels, as it were –, as it presents us with a complex interplay of intertextual references and sexual innuendos. For now, I will point out a few more ways in which Petronius foregrounds certain aspects of the story while having others fade into the background.

Apart from the area of speech representation, variations in emphasis are most obvious in the 'visibility' of Petronius' characters. It has been noted that Giton, having set in motion the conflict between Encolpius and Ascyltus, remains decidedly passive for the most part of the episode. Arguably, this inaction enhances the parodic contrast between the boy and the heroic figure of Lucretia. On closer examination, however, we may note that we have no way of telling whether Giton really remains passive during the conflict between Encolpius and Ascyltus. The only thing we can say with certainty is that, in the last two thirds of the epi-

479 These corresponding patterns of speech representation have been noted by Laird (1999: 218 f.). He refers to this narrative technique as 'angled narration of dialogue'.

sode, we learn next to nothing about what the boy is doing (let alone thinking or feeling). This is an important distinction. Although – as far as we can tell – Giton is with Encolpius and Ascyltus the entire time, the narrator chooses to tell us precious little about him after his accusation against Ascyltus. He is only present, inasmuch as that Ascyltus talks about replacing him (*mihi prospiciam et aliquem fratrem,* § 10.6) and that Encolpius refers to him as the object of his sexual desire (§ 10.7–11.1). At the end of the episode, the boy is nothing but a reference point in sexual jokes (*opertum me amiculo evolvit,* § 11.2; *sic dividere cum fratre nolito,* § 11.4).

The fact that Giton is (almost) invisible for a large portion of the episode can be interpreted as the result of a deliberate narrative strategy – a strategy which, incidentally, sets the *Satyrica* clearly apart from what would be possible in the context of a theatrical production. If the episode was performed on stage, Giton would have to be seen *doing something* during the conflict between Encolpius and Ascyltus. Perhaps, we would have to image the boy standing (awkwardly) in the background whilst the two rivals are engaging in their verbal duel and whilst Ascyltus is punishing Encolpius for having sex with Giton behind his back. Throughout the scene, the actor playing Giton would have to indicate how the boy feels about what is happening, for instance by means of gestures and/or by stepping away from the quarrellers. Giton's behaviour, then, might have some effect on those watching the play – be it that they (are more likely to) empathise with Giton or that they (further) appreciate the ways in which he fails to live up to the role model of Lucretia.

While these considerations clearly belong to the realm of speculation, it is crucial to note that, on stage, Giton's character might direct the audience's attention away from the farcical conflict between Encolpius and Ascyltus. In Petronius' text, however, the narrator pre-empts this potential diversion: He simply omits Giton's part in the story when he sees fit, thus making sure the audience focuses exclusively on what is (apparently) deemed to be at the heart of the story: the farcical rivalry between Encolpius and Ascyltus. In narratological terms, we may here speak of a paralipsis (derived from λείπω, "to leave (aside)"), i.e. the "omission of one of the constituent elements of a situation in a period that the narrative does generally cover" (Genette 1980: 52). This technique entails the condensation of Petronius' text, inasmuch as that, of course, his narrative would necessarily slow down (story time < narrative time) if it meticulously took stock of every character's behaviour at all times. Petronius' narrator disposes of information he deems unimpor-

tant, which helps him fit a relatively high amount of (relevant) information into a relatively short narrative episode.

Strikingly, the technique of paralipsis may also be observed with reference to Ascyltus. At the beginning of the episode, Encolpius finds Giton in tears and asks him about what has occurred. Eventually, Giton tells him that "a little earlier" (*paulo ante,* § 9.4) Ascyltus came into the room, wanting to rob the boy of his 'sexual purity' (*pudorem*). Upon hearing this, Encolpius immediately makes a threatening gesture towards Ascyltus and starts to hurl insults at him (§ 9.6). Does this mean that Ascyltus was inside the room with Giton and Encolpius the entire time? Is Ascyltus' presence (part of) the reason why Giton hesitates to answer Encolpius' questions (§ 9.3)? Or are we to imagine that Encolpius and Giton are (somehow) talking in private? The answer to these questions is that we do not know: The beginning of the narrative as we have it simply does not specify where Ascyltus is and what he is doing during the conversation between Encolpius and Giton. As these pieces of information are apparently not relevant to what the narrator wants the audience to learn, he simply omits – or 'sidesteps'[480] – Ascyltus' part in this section of the story. Here, Ascyltus is just as invisible as Giton will be for most of what follows.

III.5.2.3 Condensation: Petronius' 'punchline'

On a similar note, I argue that the narrator has the episode break off exactly where it is supposed to break off – he has it end in a sudden twist that forces the audience to re-evaluate what has come before.[481]

As has been stated before, the entire episode revolves around the rivalry between Encolpius and Ascyltus; the two compete over who gets to have sex with Giton without the interference of the other. About midway through the text, Encolpius suggests that the two 'brothers' part ways and split up their belongings (*communes sarcinulas partiamur,* § 10.4). At the very end of the episode, Ascyltus revisits this idea in the form of a *double entendre: sic dividere cum fratre nolito* (§ 11.4).[482] On the one hand, Ascyltus' statement suggests that Giton is part of the belongings they

480 Cf. Genette 1980: 52.

481 Although this cannot be proved beyond doubt, I here assume/argue that the ending of the First Rivalry over Giton is complete.

482 Cf. section III.3. Punishment (§ 11.1–4).

had agreed to share. On the other hand, the sexual meaning of *dividere* refers to the situation in which Ascyltus has just caught Encolpius: He found him 'playing' (i.e. having sex) with Giton (*ludentem,* § 11.2). Since Ascyltus here 'twists arounds' what Encolpius said a little earlier, his words also mark the comic role reversal between the two rivals we have discussed above. My point is that the last sentence of the episode performs the function of a punchline at the end of a joke.[483]

Apart from noting that there is a punchline, however, we have to emphasise the fact that this is exactly where Petronius' narrator has the episode break off. We do not get any information on what happens immediately afterwards, e.g. on when Ascyltus stops beating Encolpius – which he must do eventually – and on how Encolpius reacts to Ascyltus' pun (as well as the beating). Since, therefore, a certain amount of story time here corresponds to no narrative time whatsoever, we are dealing with a temporal ellipsis.[484] Apparently, it is employed by the narrator so that the First Rivalry over Giton – just as so many jokes – may end precisely where its comic effect is most powerful.

Remarkably enough, this technique is not easy to categorise with regard to whether it amounts to an emulation of stage performances. At first sight, it seems as if such an abrupt break-off was impossible to achieve in the context of a theatrical production. Ascyltus – after delivering the punchline – would eventually have to leave Encolpius alone simply to allow all characters (including himself) to go off the stage. The mere fact that actors need to make entrances and exits is a hindrance to sudden 'joke-like' endings. On closer inspection, however, we may remember that Cicero (*Cael.* 65) associates abrupt endings with the mime, even claiming that this is one aspect that clearly distinguishes mime performances from other theatrical productions:

> *mimi ergo est iam exitus, non fabulae; in quo cum clausula non invenitur, fugit aliquis e manibus, deinde scabilla concrepant, aulaeum tollitur.*

483 Cf. Schmeling's (1991: 364) remarks on Petronian episodes such as the ones about the widow of Ephesus (§ 111–2) and the Pergamene youth (§§ 85–7): "It seems (but not to the first-time reader) that a goal of each story is to conclude with a brilliant line or an outrageous scene. It is almost as if Petronius had heard or had composed a witty statement and then worked backwards to build a story around it. Not that the stories are badly constructed, but that the purpose and structure of the stories seem to be contrived to conclude with a clever or witty punch-line."

484 Cf. Genette (1980: 106–9).

> This, then, is now the end of a mime, and not of a play, in which, when an ending cannot be found, someone flees from another's hands, then the clappers rattle and the curtain is pulled.[485]

Arguably, then, the abrupt ending of the First Rivalry over Giton is the narrative equivalent of mime actors suddenly fleeing off the stage or the curtain closing unexpectedly.

III.5.2.4 Subjective Storytelling and Foreshadowing

Foreshadowing *per se* is not exclusive to narratives. Hints at what is to come later in the story can be given in a variety of ways, for instance through what the audience of a theatrical performance is told by the play's chorus, its prologue speaker, or any other character. One important way in which Petronius employs the technique of foreshadowing, however, does not have a one-to-one correspondence on the stage.

I have already remarked that the distinction between Encolpius the protagonist and Encolpius the narrator is often difficult to draw, since the narrator usually chooses to tell his story in the mode of experiencing focalisation (= narrated I). This is also the case for most of the First Rivalry over Giton. Let us, for instance, consider § 10.7, where the narrator tells us why he (in the past) agreed to part ways with Ascyltus:

> *hanc tam praecipitem divisionem libido faciebat; iam dudum enim amoliri cupiebam custodem molestum, ut veterem cum Gitone meo rationem reducerem*
>
> *

It is immediately clear that these statements are not an 'objective' description of the story's events – unlike the Petronian 'stage directions' we have discussed earlier. Rather, the narrator's words are coloured by what Encolpius felt at the time. Seeing that the protagonist wants to have sex with Giton as soon as possible, the narrator refers to Ascyltus as an annoying chaperon (*custodem molestum*); his word choice gives expression to the protagonist's aversion towards Ascyltus. Similarly, the fact that Giton is called "my Giton" (*Gitone meo*) marks the protagonist's affection for the boy as well as his 'claim of ownership' over him.

485 Trans. Marshall (2006: 10).

It is crucial to note that the narrator does not indicate whether he still sees Ascyltus and Giton in this way. As far as we can make out, the narrator tells the story as if he was (again) looking through the protagonist's eyes. This subjective representation of the story, of course, is in itself a phenomenon rather alien to the stage. When watching a play, the audience has direct access, as it were, to the events of the story (e.g. to the words and actions of the characters). The only scenes in which there is a similar 'filtering' of information are those featuring a messenger, a prologue speaker, or a similar type of character who then functions as a narrator on stage.[486]

My point, however, goes beyond this rather basic distinction between narratives and theatrical productions. For, there is one instance in the above quote where the narrator actually reveals his distinct standpoint, telling his story – for a brief moment at least – in the mode of narrating focalisation (= narrating I). The formulation in question is *hanc* ***tam praecipitem*** *divisionem libido faciebat.* Referring to the split-up between Encolpius and Ascyltus as hasty or precipitate means to judge the protagonist's decision by its outcome, i.e. by the fact that their separation will only last for a very short time and that Encolpius will receive a beating for trying to outmanoeuvre Ascyltus.

This evaluation cannot possibly represent the point of view of the protagonist, who, at the time, is simply glad to have gotten rid of Ascyltus. Rather, it is based on the hindsight knowledge of Encolpius the narrator, who thereby gives the audience a subtle hint at what is to come later in the story. He puts his readers/listeners on their guard, as it were, having them watch out for a sudden change of fortune. This kind of foreshadowing, of course, is hardly conceivable on stage. It is (almost) the narrative equivalent of a *deus ex machina* giving hints at the outcome of the play.

III.5.3 The Character of Encolpius as *actor* and *auctor*

In many regards, the findings of this chapter touch upon a long-standing dispute in Petronian scholarship: The debate 1) on whether there is a (significant) difference in character between Encolpius the protagonist and Encolpius the narrator, and 2) on what aim, if any, the narrator

486 For a narratological analysis of such scenes in ancient tragedy, cf. Goward (1999) and de Jong (2014: 198–203) with references for further reading.

pursues in telling his tale the way he does. Among other things, this debate concerns the following questions: Is Encolpius the protagonist a naïve simpleton? Is he (at least) more of a naïve simpleton than his 'older' counterpart, the narrator? If so, does the narrator deliberately make fun of his former self?

Beck (1973; 1975; 1982) answers all three questions in the affirmative.[487] Jensson (2004) – while agreeing with Beck's broader argument – asserts that the narrator is not really any 'wiser' than the protagonist. Rather than having learned from his past mistakes, the narrator is said to distinguish himself from the protagonist merely by speaking after the fact and (therefore) by knowing the outcome of the story. In Schmeling's (1994/95; 2018) view, Encolpius the narrator is not so much concerned with making fun of the protagonist as with openly confessing to his past mistakes and/or shortcomings and humiliations.

On the other end of the spectrum, Conte (1996) claims that Encolpius the narrator is *not* the master of his own narrative. Rather, he is said to be characterised by a condition called *mythomania,* which means that he constantly tries to present the petty events of his (past) life as a tale of mythical and/or literary greatness. According to Conte, however, these attempts are inevitably thwarted by the *hidden author* (= implied author), who has the narrator's delusions clash with the 'reality' of the story.

All scholars agree that there is a sense of irony to the *Satyrica.* They disagree, though, as to whether this irony is created by the narrator – in what we could call an act of self-deprecation – or by the implied author, who invites the audience to amuse themselves at the expense of Encolpius (as protagonist and narrator) behind his back.

Of course, I will not be able to answer the above questions once and for all – not only because I am dealing with a rather small text sample, but also because some parts of Petronius' narrative technique simply cannot be ascertained beyond doubt. Nevertheless, the findings amassed in the preceding sections allow for some conclusions to be drawn as to the character and/or function of Encolpius the narrator and his relation to the story he tells.

487 For a more detailed overview of previous research, cf. section I.5. Basic Premises for a Narratological Reading of the *Satyrica.*

III.5.3.1 *Mythomania*

As we have observed above, the First Rivalry over Giton is remarkable for Petronius' intertextual engagement with the rape of Lucretia according to Livy and Ovid. Giton is cast in the role of Lucretia, Ascyltus (and Encolpius) in that of Tarquinius, and Encolpius in that of Collatinus. At first sight, then, the episode appears to present us with a prototypical case of Conte's (1996) *mythomaniac* narrator: Encolpius tries to make his audience believe that his past deeds were worthy of a figure as exalted as Collatinus, but the events of the story (through the work of the implied author) counteract the narrator's misrepresentation of them. At the end, rather than accepting Encolpius as a second Collatinus, the audience perceives the two figures to be connected by a parodic contrast. In other words, the readers/listeners of the First Rivalry over Giton share the implied author's ironic gaze at the narrator's follies.

This is certainly a valid argument. What needs to be pointed out, though, is that the narrator's *mythomania* is only one part of Petronius' intertextual game. It is true that the narrator recounts some aspects of the story in a way that clearly evokes the *ab urbe condita* and the *Fasti.* For instance, he mentions Giton's tears and his sitting position, thereby reminding us of Lucretia's behaviour.[488] He even inserts a verbal echo of Livy into his text (*precibus etiam iracundiam miscui,* § 9.3; cf. Liv. 1.58.3). This technique, however, is not only employed by the narrator but also by the narrative agents Ascyltus and Giton.

The most obvious reference to the episode's mytho-historical role models – the one that no one will miss – is to be found in the words of Ascyltus, quoted by Giton (and requoted by the narrator): *si Lucretia es … Tarquinium invenisti* (§ 9.5). We have no reason to believe that Giton (or Encolpius) wrongly puts these words into Ascyltus' mouth: The latter, though given the chance, never objects to this insinuation; nor does the narrative contain any other indication to this effect. This means that, at least in this episode, Ascyltus is no less of a *mythomaniac* than the narrator: He casts himself as a second Tarquinius, even more bluntly so than Encolpius presents himself as a second Collatinus. In fact, I argue that the intertextual references made by the narrator (*in propria persona*) here function to prepare, and to enhance, the parodic effect created by Ascyltus' words. Rather than trying to identify a single source of irony in the First Rivalry over Giton, I suggest that we appreciate the

488 Cf. section III. First Rivalry over Giton: Encolpius versus Ascyltus (§§ 9–11).

ways in which the different layers of Petronius' text (its events, narrative agents, and narrator) work hand in hand, as it were.

We may note that this 'collaboration' can also be observed in the way Giton quotes Ascyltus' threat. The latter's allusion to the Lucretia story is not only prepared by the formulations of the narrator but also by a clear reference to Livy in the words of Giton: The boy's description of how Ascyltus drew his sword (*gladium strinxit,* § 9.5) is clearly reminiscent of how Livy's narrator describes Tarquinius' attack on Lucretia (*stricto gladio,* Liv. 1.58.2). We may also note Giton's reference to his *pudor* (§ 9.4), a term harking back to Lucretia's *pudicitia.*[489] This means that, just as the narrator, Giton chooses his words in accordance with what (he knows) Ascyltus has to say.[490] I argue, therefore, that all three – Ascyltus, Giton and the narrator – are in on the intertextual joke defining this episode; in a way, they are all *mythomaniacs.*[491] The only question that remains open is whether Encolpius the protagonist is aware of the (perceived) links with the Lucretia story before they are made explicit by Ascyltus. The narrative simply does not provide us with conclusive information on this point.

III.5.3.2 The Aim of the Narrator: A Confession or a Piece of Entertainment?

Schmeling (2018) argues that the *Satyrica* amounts to a confession of Encolpius' past mistakes. With regard to the First Rivalry over Giton, he (*ibid.* 79) makes the following suggestion:

> Ascyltos' unchallenged indictment of Encolpius, that he had never laid a decent woman and that he, Ascyltos, had been Encolpius' female partner just as Giton is now, is in reality a confession by Encolpius of the nature of his sex-life, the words being put into

489 Cf. note 237.

490 This does not necessarily mean that Giton deliberately casts himself in the role of Lucretia. As I will argue throughout this study, we need not (always) equate the effects achieved by an episode with the 'agendas' of its characters.

491 Notably, this is not the only time characters other than Encolpius (the narrator) strike us as *mythomaniacs.* Giton, for instance, likens a quarrel between Encolpius and Ascyltus to the conflict between Eteocles and Polynices (§ 80.9). Both Encolpius the protagonist (§ 97.4) and Eumolpus (§ 101.7) compare their party's difficulties to those encountered by Ulysses in the Cyclops' cave.

> Ascyltos' mouth. After a lacuna Encolpius is caught in bed with Giton by Ascyltos who in good humour flogs him. This is the first of many confessions of sexual humiliation […].

Although I do not assume that the narrator can freely put words into Ascyltus' mouth,[492] I accept Schmeling's as a valid interpretation of the First Rivalry over Giton. However, two reservations remain: Firstly, when referring to their past sexual relationship, Ascyltus casts Encolpius in the penetrating role and himself in the receptive one (cf. § 9.10 and the quote from Schmeling above). Since Encolpius is thus said to have acted in accordance with the norms of Roman masculinity,[493] I fail to see how this amounts to the confession of a mistake and/or shortcoming. I have proposed my own reading of Ascyltus' accusation against Encolpius in an earlier section: Having been called a *pathicus* and a *fellator,* Ascyltus reminds Encolpius of the fact that he is a lover of *pathici* and *fellatores/fellatrices.* In a nutshell, Ascyltus tells Encolpius that 'people who live in glass houses should not throw stones'.[494]

My second reservation with Schmeling's interpretation is that it can only account for a few of the findings presented in this chapter: It takes some ingenuity to explain, for instance, why the *confessor* Encolpius tells us about the (attempted) rape of Giton by Ascyltus, only to virtually ignore the boy's point of view for most of the episode; or why he bothers to turn the story of his past sins into a parody of the Lucretia story.

The most plausible explanation, I believe, is that it is the narrator's aim to amuse his audience. The First Rivalry over Giton strikes me as a piece of entertainment rather than a confession because, as I have shown at length, it foregrounds the farcical aspects of the story. The ending of the episode, for instance, not only highlights Encolpius' sexual humiliation, but it also performs the function of a punchline. In addition to what has already been said about this matter, we should stress the point that the narrator's word choice prepares the audience for the pun to be delivered by Ascyltus: By introducing Ascyltus' words as being wanton or lascivious (*petulantibus dictis,* § 11.4), the narrator clearly hints at their sexual overtones. The ending of the episode is thus presented as a joke, not (primarily) as an act of humiliation.

492 Cf. section I.5.3. Narrator vs. (Implied) Author.

493 Cf. section II.1. Problems of Terminology and Categorisation.

494 Cf. section III.2.1. The Dynamics of Petronian Quarrelling.

The punchline, of course, marks the role reversal between Encolpius and Ascyltus, which accounts for much of the episode's comicality. This may exemplify, once more, the ways in which the different layers of Petronius' text work towards the same effect. For, we should note that the role reversal is undoubtedly a feature of the story as such: At first, Ascyltus desires to have sex with Giton; Encolpius makes accusations. Later, Encolpius wants to have sex with Giton; Ascyltus makes accusations. This is the level of the characters' words and actions, i.e. of the story proper. The narrator, then, does not 'create' the role reversal – he does not misrepresent the story so as to make it fit this comic pattern –, but he merely emphasises the aspects of the story that pertain to this role reversal. As far as the narrator's selection of information is concerned, the relevant techniques have been discussed under the headings of 'condensation' and 'foreshadowing'.

In some cases, however, the narrator's penchant for entertainment goes beyond emphasising what the story provides. As has been mentioned above, at § 11.2 the narrator introduces a *double entendre* (*opertum me amiculo evolvit,* punning on the ambiguity of *amiculo*). This is not part of the story as such: In 'reality', Ascyltus either takes away Encolpius' cover (his *amiculum*) or Giton (his *amiculus*). The (amusing) ambiguity as to what happened is the product of the narrator's word choice. His formulation makes clear that the narrator, at least occasionally, adds entertaining elements to a story that is already entertaining in itself. At any rate, since the episode is full of sexual *double entendres,* the narrator certainly does not counteract the general thrust of the story; he merely enhances it.

III.5.3.3 The Function of the Narrator

Why does Encolpius the narrator tell the story in a way that casts a poor light on his past self? Why does he, for instance, allow Ascyltus to deliver a punchline at his expense (although he could have chosen to omit this part of the story)? Why does he go as far as to enhance the thrust of Ascyltus' joke through his particular way of storytelling? As I have argued above, the narrator's *mythomania* (Conte 1996) or his "confession-compulsion" (Schmeling 1994/5: 221) can be no more than part of the answer. In the First Rivalry over Giton, at least, Encolpius' narrative techniques evidently aim at bringing to the fore the farcical aspects of the story: He is actively involved in creating the comic effects that characterise the episode as a whole.

This amounts to suggesting, as Beck and Jensson do, that it is the narrator's aim to entertain his audience. As long as we are referring to the basic stance of the narrator, this conclusion is certainly correct for the First Rivalry over Giton. Nevertheless, I wish to warn against the assumption that there is a one-to-one correspondence between what the narrative techniques of the episode achieve and what its narrator 'wants'. In other words: We should not overstress the agency of Encolpius the narrator. As the instances of paralepsis in the First Rivalry over Giton show, Petronius occasionally sacrifices the consistency of Encolpius' perspective for the sake of narrative efficiency. This is a finding we should heed at all times. Very likely, it is not possible – not to speak of necessary – to fit every narrative technique we find in the *Satyrica* into a neat character description of Encolpius the narrator. Sometimes, Encolpius' is simply the *vox sine qua nulla fabula est*[495] – he is allowed (or made) to say what the audience is meant to hear, almost regardless of what this implies for (the credibility of) his character.

Incidentally, we may note that it is not uncommon for ancient comedies to put aside certain technicalities – such as consistency in the depiction of a character – for the sake of farcical fun. We have discussed, for instance, the scene in Plautus' *Miles gloriosus* in which Pyrgopolinices is punished for trying to sleep with a married woman. When he is seriously beaten up and threatened with castration, the soldier – rather surprisingly – puns on his situation: He claims that he does not want to leave this place *intestatus,* i.e. either "incapable of giving evidence" or "without testicles".[496] I have compared Pyrgopolinices' sexual joke to Encolpius' pun on *amiculum/amiculus* and, in fact, the two puns give rise to similar questions: Why does the soldier joke about being robbed of what is most dear to him (i.e. his penis)? Why does Encolpius joke about being robbed of what is/was most dear to him (i.e. his Giton)? Is this not completely out of character? Quite possibly, the answer is as simple as this: When the opportunity presented itself, neither Plautus nor Petronius could resist having their characters pun on the subject.

495 I borrow this formulation from Schmeling (2007: 449).

496 Cf. section III.3.2.3. Physical Abuse.