destroyer. He is already an example of her awesome power.

Stanzas one and four do not merely offer antithetical pictures of a boy making love in a cave and a sailor-poet dedicating garments in a temple. The poet has escaped alive (and offers homage to Neptune, not Venus), but this fact suggests that we might see the opposite, not so happy, fate in store for the youth. The opening stanza may not be as light —even ironically light—as it first seems.[9]

MICHAEL C. J. PUTNAM

BROWN UNIVERSITY

9. The love scene takes place *grato sub antro*, in a purportedly pleasant grot. But, at least by the time of Lucan, *antrum* means sepulcher or tomb as well. It is possible that this sense was in the back of Horace's mind as he composed. The new *OLD* gives three examples of this use of *antrum*: Luc. *Phar.* 8. 694 and 10. 19; and *CIL* VI, 28239. *TLL* adds *Vulg. Gen.* 23. 30; *Ier. Ep.* 108. 33; and *carm. epig.* 1362. 4.

PETRONIUS 81. 3

The purpose of this essay is to examine the evidence for the traditional assumption that the missing portions of the *Satyricon* portrayed Encolpius committing murder. It will be seen that the evidence for this assumption is not so strong as the number of authorities who subscribe to the assumption suggests.[1]

The mainstay of the assumption is a sentence in 81. 3. Encolpius has secluded himself at an inn on the shore. He is distressed over the loss of Giton to Ascyltos and fearful (for what reason is not clear) of encountering Agamemnon's assistant, Menelaus. The following complaints exemplify his mournful soliloquies at the inn: "ergo me non ruina terra potuit haurire? non iratum etiam innocentibus mare? effugi iudicium, harenae imposui, hospitem occidi, ut inter audaciae nomina mendicus, exul, in deversorio Graecae urbis iacerem desertus?"

According to the traditional interpretation, the last sentence (*effugi* to *desertus*) is a rhetorical question expecting a negative answer. The actions of the main clause are supposed to represent real events. The *ut* clause is said to represent purpose. The question allegedly amounts to this: "Did I go to the trouble of escaping judgment, cheating the arena, and murdering my host, in order to receive no more spectacular punishment than penniless exile?" As will be shown, the sentence admits of another interpretation. It should be noted first, however, that there are two difficulties in the traditional interpretation.

The first difficulty is that the actions of the main clause do not suggest a sequence of real events. Escaping judgment and cheating the arena are not readily compatible as separate actions. They are like draft-dodging and desertion. Persons do one or the other, not both. Accordingly, the Latin is usually stretched to mean: "I escaped judgment, *thereby* cheating the arena."[2] Again, it is not clear whether homicide was Encolpius' original crime. If it was, he might be expected to mention it first. If it was not, he should mention what his original crime was, since it too was apparently a serious offense.

The second difficulty is more complicated. The traditional interpretation demands that the actions in the main clause stand in contrast to the situation in the *ut* clause. It is ironic that penniless exile should be spoken of as an inappropriate situation for an escaped criminal.[3] Yet it is not difficult to suppose that such irony was intended here. The phrase, *inter audaciae nomina*, however, may not stand even in ironic contrast to the actions in the main clause, for it is clear that these actions exemplify "audacity" either in a pejorative or in an approbative sense.

Accordingly, although *inter audaciae nomina*

1. Cf., e.g., E. Thomas, *Pétrone* (Paris, 1902), p. 42; F. Bücheler (ed.), *Petronii Arbitri Satirarum reliquiae* (Berlin, 1904), p. 122; and more recently, G. Bagnani, "Encolpius *Gladiator obscenus*," *CP*, XLI (1956), 23–27, and R. Pack, "The Criminal Dossier of Encolpius," *CP*, LV (1960), 31–32.

2. Bagnani (see above, n. 1) renders: "I escaped judgement —thus cheating the gallows—by killing a stranger."

3. Cf. 125. 3–4: "Quid, si etiam mercennarius . . . fallaciam invidiosa proditione detexerit? Nempe rursus fugiendum erit, et tandem expugnata paupertas nova mendicitate revocanda. Dii deaeque, quam male est extra legem viventibus!" Here Encolpius views penniless exile as the natural result of crime.

appears as part of the situation in the *ut* clause, it must, if one is to defend the traditional interpretation, refer back to the main clause. There is, however, no indication in the text that this is the case. Consequently, editors have sought to supply the necessary indication. F. Jacobs added the correlative *tot* after *inter* and has been followed by some editors and translators.[4] E. Fraenkel has suggested changing *inter* to *meritus* on the basis of a phrase in Lucan.[5] Both emendations have the effect of referring *audaciae nomina* back to the main clause, as if the phrase were a way of summarizing Encolpius' past crimes and had an adversative effect within its clause: "despite so many proofs of audacity," "though having earned a reputation for audacity."

Since the traditional interpretation involves these difficulties, it seems reasonable to seek an alternative interpretation. One alternative is to take the *ut* clause as a clause of result. Thus, "Did I escape judgment, cheat the arena, murder my host, so as to lie with a reputation for audacity, a beggar, an exile, deserted in an inn in a Greek city?" The implicit answer would be, "No, I have committed no such crimes. I am the innocent victim of unrequited love." This interpretation eliminates the difficulties of the traditional one. First, there is no longer any need to fit *effugi iudicium*, etc., into an intelligible sequence of events. Rather, since actions only exemplify crimes, they make perfectly good sense as they stand: in ascending order of magnitude. Second, since the *ut* clause is taken as the natural result of the actions of the main clause, there is no need to refer *inter audaciae nomina* back to the main clause. The interpretation is, however, incompatible with the assumption that at this point in the narrative Encolpius had, in fact, escaped judgment, or cheated the arena, or murdered his host.

Two other passages have been cited as evidence that Encolpius committed murder. The first is 9. 8 and 9, where Ascyltos is abusing Encolpius: "non taces, inquit, gladiator obscene quem de ruina harena dimisit? non taces, nocturne percussor, qui ne tum quidem, cum fortiter faceres, cum pura muliere pugnasti, cuius eadem ratione in viridario frater fui, qua nunc in deversorio puer est." If Ascyltos' insults are intended literally and based on fact, it follows that Encolpius probably did cheat the arena, and, from that, that the other crimes mentioned in 81. 3 are also allusions to fact. It is, however, difficult to make sense of these insults on a literal level. There is no apparent connection between gladiators and nocturnal assassins in their prime (*cum fortiter faceres*) and chaste women (*pura muliere*). On the literal level, the insult demands a man of unimpaired fighting ability, not a *pura mulier*.

The last two clauses suggest a solution to this difficulty. Ascyltos' insults are not meant literally, but rather as a figurative description of Encolpius' sex life. This is also suggested by the adjectives, *obscene* and *nocturne*. On this interpretation, the *ruina* involved is a previous collapse of Encolpius' virility. *Gladiator* and *percussor* suggest erotic exertions. *Cum fortiter faceres* refers to past heterosexual affairs, like the one with Tryphaena (113. 7). The *pura mulier* represents the object of competent seduction and stands in contrast with women like Tryphaena. On this interpretation, the last two clauses do not constitute an abrupt transition, as they do if what precedes is taken literally.

A second passage, which has only recently been cited as evidence of Encolpius' crimes,[6] also demands a figurative interpretation. It is 130. 1–4: "fateor me, domina, saepe peccasse; nam et homo sum et adhuc iuvenis. nunquam tamen ante hunc diem usque ad mortem deliqui. Habes confitentem reum; quicquid iusseris, merui. proditionem feci, hominem occidi, templum violavi: in haec facinora quaere supplicium. sive occidere placet, ferro meo venio; sive verberibus contenta es, curro nudus ad dominam. Illud unum memento, non me, sed instrumenta

4. Among editors, notably by Bücheler; among translators, by W. Arrowsmith. A. Ernout omits *tot* from his text but translates "tant d'audacieux attentats."

5. In K. Müller (ed.), *Petronii Arbitri "Satyricon"* (Munich, 1961), *ad loc.* The emendation apparently was suggested by Lucan 10. 544.

6. Pack (see above, n. 1).

peccasse. Paratus miles arma non habui." The context leaves no doubt that this is a letter in which Encolpius apologizes to Circe for having failed her as a lover. The implication of the first two sentences is, accordingly, clear: "I confess that I have often sinned, for I am both human and still young. Never, however, before today have I erred grievously (by comparison with insulting you)." At this point, on the assumption that Encolpius goes on to list actual crimes from his past, his train of thought becomes convoluted: "You have the accused (Encolpius accused by Circe of insulting her) confessing (to having indeed insulted her). Whatever you might command (as punishment for the insult), I deserve (anyway, that is, apart from the insult on the grounds of my past crimes). I have committed treason, murder, sacrilege. Devise punishment for these crimes. I will co-operate. Remember this one thing (to mitigate the punishments you devise for my past crimes): it was not I but my instruments that sinned (in insulting you today)."

The assumption that Encolpius uses these crimes as metaphors or euphemisms for his real crime yields a more straightforward argument. "Whatever you command, I deserve (because of the gravity of my insult to you). I have (in a figurative sense, in terms of the gravity of the deed) committed treason, murder, sacrilege. Remember this one thing: it was not I but my instruments that sinned (in figuratively committing treason, etc.). A ready soldier (in a figurative sense), I lacked weapons." This interpretation does not necessarily imply that Encolpius has not committed any of the crimes that he mentions. Consequently, that in 133 he apparently admits stealing from a temple of Priapus does not exclude a figurative interpretation of *violavi templum* in 130.

Finally, it is noteworthy that in the passage just mentioned (133. 3) Encolpius prefaces a prayer to Priapus for forgiveness with the words, *non sanguine tristi / perfusus venio*. This is positive, if not conclusive, evidence that Encolpius had not committed murder at that point in the narrative.

In summary, there is no certain indication that the missing portions of the *Satyricon* portrayed Encolpius committing murder. There is one positive indication to the contrary. Accordingly, one does not seem to be justified in including homicide on the part of Encolpius in reconstructing the missing episodes of the *Satyricon*.

DAVID D. MULROY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

FOSSA IN CATULLUS' SIMILE OF THE CUT TREE (17. 18–19)

Insulsissimus est homo, nec sapit pueri instar
bimuli tremula patris dormientis in ulna.
cui cum sit uiridissimo nupta flore puella
et puella tenellulo delicatior haedo,
adseruanda nigerrimis diligentius uuis,
ludere hanc sinit ut lubet, nec pili facit uni,
nec se subleuat ex sua parte, sed *uelut alnus*
in fossa Liguri iacet suppernata securi,
tantundem omnia sentiens quam si nulla sit usquam
[Cat. 17. 12–20].

In a recent article on Catullus 17,[1] H. Akbar Khan advances a convincing explication of this striking simile. The key to its interpretation and function, he points out (pp. 91–92), is its dominant sexual imagery. It is clear that Catullus is describing a completely indifferent, sexually inert husband (*nec se subleuat* [18]). The poet's choice of imagery—a cut tree lying in a *fossa*—is suited perfectly to his task. Khan's basic interpretation of the simile is undoubtedly correct: the (cut) tree represents the husband's (useless) phallus.[2] His remarks on the symbolic meaning of *fossa* (pp. 91–92), however, are unduly vague:

> Furthermore, the word *fossa* has distinct sexual overtones. It is connected with *fodere*, and when it occurs in an erotic context would be based on the widespread conception of the woman as a field to be ploughed by the man. Also, it seems to have

1. H. Akbar Khan, "Image and Symbol in Catullus 17," *CP*, LXIV (1969), 88–97.

2. As Khan points out (*op. cit.*, p. 91), this symbolism is well attested in Latin literature: cf. Ov. *Am.* 3. 7. 15, Plaut. *Truc.* 674, and Cic. *Pis.* 9. 19.