Classical Quarterly **41** (ii) 403–413 (1991) *Printed in Great Britain*

THE UNEXPECTED GUESTS: PATTERNS OF *XENIA* IN CALLIMACHUS' 'VICTORIA BERENICES' AND PETRONIUS' *SATYRICON*

Much of the fascination that Petronius' *Satyricon* holds for its readers originates in the work's gleeful violation of traditional categories of classical genres.[1] Critical terminology makes explicit the issue of unconventionality, as it is reduced to the neutral word 'work' in describing the *Satyricon*, which, as far as we can tell, belongs to no single category (e.g. novel, romance, satire), but appropriates elements from many sources in both poetry and prose. Perhaps if we had more evidence with which to compare the work, such as a greater selection of Menippean satire or proto-novels from antiquity, we might be able to identify it more accurately. But the suspicion remains that the intense variety of its evocations, allusions, and parodic passages differentiates it clearly from its component genres without allowing it to settle firmly in any one established genre. A certain amount of 'Kreuzung der Gattungen' is, of course, typical of both Alexandrian and consequently Roman texts.[2] But the *Satyricon* seems to revel in its generic instability; it plays with the notion of 'literariness' by revealing impulses from non-literary forms such as mime and sub-literary prose fiction, raising this material to an unfamiliar level of literary sophistication even as it debases other traditional genres (e.g. epic) through parodic techniques.[3] One of the results of this open experimentation with style and decorum is an extremely dense fabric of literary (and sub-literary) allusion which some would label 'literary opportunism'.[4] The reader quickly learns to expect intertextual pyrotechnics, swift changes from the sublime to the ridiculous, and humorous incongruities in plot and form, as the stylistic disorder of the text reflects the topsy-turvy Petronian world. The modern reader's response to this profusion of referents is to explore the recognizable categories and sources embedded in the work, to tease out the familiar elements in the hope of gaining a better understanding of the whole. Since a great deal of the allusion in the *Satyricon* functions parodically, there is yet another step necessary in the interpretation, namely taking into account the effect of the decontextualization of language and events from the source material and their recombination and transformation into the new text.[5]

Critics have suggested that Petronius' technique serves as a commentary on his own society's literary and cultural inadequacies: 'the past is invoked through literary allusions only to be distorted and made comic... Petronius' technique exposes the basic incongruity between the sordidness of reality and the literary texture which recalls a reality that no longer exists.'[6] But even as Petronius seeks to evoke a past

[1] See discussions in W. Arrowsmith, trans., *The Satyricon of Petronius* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1959), pp. vii–xix, and F. I. Zeitlin, 'Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity', *TAPA* 102 (1971), 634–42.

[2] For a thorough treatment of the concept, see W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1964), pp. 202–24; also J. E. G. Zetzel, 'Recreating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past', *Critical Inquiry* 10 (1983), 83–105.

[3] Zeitlin (1971), p. 636.

[4] J. P. Sullivan, *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1968), p. 267.

[5] W. Arrowsmith, 'Petronius', in T. J. Luce, ed., *Ancient Writers* (New York, 1982), p. 836.

[6] Zeitlin (1971), pp. 649–50.

that is 'ideal' and conventionally heroic, a culture worthy of literary nostalgia, his terms slip away from him to reveal the artificiality of the construct. Such a past exists only in the mind of the next generation, desperately seeking a model of stability and spiritual inspiration. Thus, 'the reader is torn between the suggestion that the past, unlike the present, had dignity and meaning, and the horrible possibility that the past and present are one.'[7] In the passage to be discussed, the scenes in which Encolpius arrives as an unexpected guest in the home of Oenothea (*Sat.* 135–8), the literary allusions will be shown to reveal precisely this double nature. In one short narrative section, Petronius alludes to both Latin and Greek sources: the Latin referent, Ovid, claims to offer a vision of an idyllic past where good conquers evil and gods reward the just, but the Greek source, Callimachus, was already in the process of questioning the concept of hero and anti-hero, juxtaposing epic and mock-epic characters, and commenting humorously on his own cultural crisis as expressed in literature of that time. The main point of this argument is not to take away from the 'originality' and uniqueness of the *Satyricon*, but rather to emphasize the multiple layers of allusion and the complex nature of Petronian intertextuality which can combine heterogeneous parts into a strange and wonderful new whole. In the process, I would also like to propose a hitherto unrecognized literary source from Callimachus' *Aetia*.

In the *Satyricon* sections 134–8, Petronius describes Encolpius' eventful visit to the house of the witch Oenothea, where the unfortunate character hopes to find a cure for his impotence. It has long been recognized that Petronius alludes directly here to Callimachus' *Hecale* and indirectly to Ovid's Philemon and Baucis episode (*Metamorphoses* 8.611–724).[8] Both these literary models of conventional hospitality offered by a humble mortal to a god or hero in turn, of course, recall the canonical *xenia* of Eumaeus in Homer's *Odyssey* (book 14), and the topos is a popular one in both Greek and Latin literature of all genres.[9] But in attempting to trace the direct influence of the *Hecale* on the *Satyricon*, we immediately encounter difficulties; since most of the earlier text is lost, we rely for information about its narrative content primarily on fragments or later plot summaries. Most commentators, therefore, focus on the imitative Ovidian text as a *comparandum* in order to show how Petronius

[7] H. Bacon, 'The Sibyl in the Bottle', *Virginia Quarterly Review* 34 (1958), 262–76, esp. p. 266.

[8] See, for example, the following: A. Collignon, *Étude sur Pétrone* (Paris, 1892), pp. 262–3; I. M. Garrido, 'Notes on Petronius' *Satyricon* 135', *CR* 44 (1930), 10–11; E. Courtney, 'Parody and Literary Allusion in Menippean Satire', *Philologus* 106 (1962), 86–106, esp. p. 100; A. S. Hollis, *Ovid Metamorphoses Book 8* (Oxford, 1970), p. 107; H. Herter, 'Kallimachos', *RE Supplement* 5 (1972), 420–1; F. Bömer, *Ovid, Metamorphosen Buch 8–9* (Heidelberg, 1977), p. 195; K. Müller, ed. (with trans. by W. Ehlers), *Satyrica: Schelmengeschichten*[3] (Munich, 1983), p. 536.

[9] To list but a few: *Odyssey* 1.120ff. (Telemachus hosts Athena) and 14 (Odysseus at Eumaeus' hut), *Homeric Hymns* 2 (Demeter received by Celeus and Metaneira) and 5 (Anchises welcomes Aphrodite), 'Theocritus' 25 (Herakles and farmer), Nonnus, *Dion.* 17.37ff. (Brongos) and 47.34ff. (Icarios and Erigone), Vergil, *Aen.* 8.359ff. (Aeneas visits Evander), the *Moretum* (no divine visitor, but a description of a humble home), Ovid, *Met.* 1.209ff. (Jupiter visits Lycaon), *Fasti* 4.507ff. (Celeus and Demeter), 4.679ff. ('narrator' enters humble home and hears stories), and 5.493ff. (future father of Orion receives Jupiter, Mercury, and Poseidon), Juvenal, *Sat.* 11 (humble homes vs. urban luxuries), Lucan 5.504ff. (Caesar at fisherman's hut), Silius Italicus 7.162ff. (Falernus hosts Bacchus). On the subject of *xenia* in general, see G. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge, 1987), esp. pp. 41–72; A. S. Hollis, *Callimachus Hecale* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 341–54 (= appendix III: The Hospitality Theme). It would prove interesting to consider the questions raised in this article in the larger context of the topos of fractured *xenia*; the intertextual framework, however, is too elaborate for discussion here.

parodies earlier sources and adapts them to shape his disordered world view. These two main sources may now be complemented by a third literary antecedent, first published in 1976, namely Callimachus' 'Victoria Berenices', a story in the *Aetia* of Herakles' visit to the farmer Molorchus on his way to kill the Nemean lion.[10] Scholars have acknowledged in passing that Ovid's depiction of the 'testing' of Philemon and Baucis was in all probability influenced by the 'Victoria' as well as the *Hecale*, two similar stories of heroes visiting the homes of peasant folk on their way to ridding the neighbourhood of monsters.[11] I wish to take the argument one step further, and claim that Petronius knew of and utilized elements of the 'Victoria' in his section on Oenothea and Encolpius. One great advantage of this comparison is that the relatively abundant fragments allow us to restore not merely shared details of action and imagery, but even a similar subversive approach on the parts of both authors to the conventions of epic decorum. Petronius chooses to parody a text that is itself a kind of parody, effectively decentering his own narrative even more, and exposing the impossibility of a pure, heroic past; the vision of an honest, simple 'Golden Age' of innocence collapses into a sophisticated series of variations on the theme not of the decline of civilization, but of the eternal simultaneous existence of good and evil, strong and weak, epic and mundane.

In adducing this additional influence, I by no means wish to take away from the central importance of the already accepted sources. Let me review briefly some of the more direct allusions in the Petronian text.[12] The hexameters at the end of section 135 of the *Satyricon* specify the *Hecale* as the literary model for this particular *xenia*; Encolpius remarks as he observes Oenothea (*Sat.* 135.15–16):[13]

> qualis in Actaea quondam fuit hospita terra
> digna sacris Hecale...
>
> just as once in Attic land lived hospitable
> Hecale, worthy of sacred honours...

These words resemble a loose translation of the first line of Callimachus' *Hecale* as noted in the Diegesis (fr. 230 Pf. = *Hecale* fr. 1 H):

> *Ἀκταίη τις ἔναιεν Ἐρεχθέος ἔν ποτε γουνῷ...*
>
> Once there lived an Attic woman in the hill-country of Erechtheus...

The beginning of line 16 offers some textual problems,[14] but if we follow Müller's

[10] Text published by C. Meillier, 'Callimacque (P.L. 76d, 78abc, 82, 84, et 111c)', *CRIPEL* 4 (1976), 261–86; P. Parsons, 'Callimachus: Victoria Berenices', *ZPE* 25 (1977), 1–50; E. Livrea, 'Der Liller Kallimachos und die Mausefallen', *ZPE* 34 (1979), 37–42; P. Parsons and H. Lloyd-Jones (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin & New York, 1983), pp. 100–17.

[11] M. De Cola, *Callimaco e Ovidio* (Palermo, 1937), pp. 66–7; L. P. Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled* (Cambridge, 1955), p. 189 and note; B. Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 203–5, 384–6; Hollis (1970), pp. 106–7; Bömer (1977), p. 192. See in contrast W. Anderson, *Ovid's Metamorphoses Books 6–10* (Oklahoma, 1972), p. 390, who calls the assertion that Ovid borrowed directly from Callimachus' *Hecale* both unprovable and unnecessary since the 'allusion' is really part of a larger and highly conventional topos.

[12] Much of the following was brought to my attention by the unpublished doctoral dissertation of Catherine Connors, *Petronius'* Bellum Civile *and the Poetics of Discord* (University of Michigan, 1989).

[13] The text of the *Satyricon* used throughout is that of K. Müller (1983), referred to above in note 8.

[14] The manuscripts (including both the L and O traditions) at *Sat.* 135.16 originally read 'Hecates', an obscure reference to the goddess, but most editors have long printed 'Hecale' suggested by Junius (according to F. Buecheler, *Petronii Arbitri Satirarum Reliquiae* (Berlin,

text, 'digna sacris Hecale' suggests the close of Callimachus' narrative, when Theseus honoured the old woman with the establishment of sacred rites in her memory (frr. 263–4 Pf. = *Hecale* frr. 80, 83 H).[15] The lines continue (16–17):

> ...quam Musa loquentibus annis
> † Bachineas veteres mirando † tradidit aevo.

Müller has emended this notorious crux to the slightly more intelligible

> ...quam Musa loquentibus aevis
> Battiadae vatis miranda tradidit arte.
>
> ...whom the Muse of the poet descended from Battus
> passed down to the speaking generations with wondrous skill.

Given the near certainty of Hecale's appearance in the previous line, a learned reference to Callimachus, the 'poet descended from Battus', seems undeniable.[16] Petronius thus includes a gloss in Encolpius' allusion, explaining, lest there be any doubt, that he means specifically the Callimachean version of the Hecale story. He uses a typically epic-sounding periphrasis: the Muse of the poet of Battus' clan, i.e. the man from Cyrene. From the surviving fragments of the *Hecale*, it is possible to trace certain shared details: Hecale invites Theseus into her hut and offers him a couch covered with a tattered blanket snatched from her own bed (frr. 239–41 Pf. = *Hecale* frr. 28–30 H); Encolpius is rudely pushed down on the priestess Oenothea's bed and successively seduced (in vain) and beaten by one old woman, and kissed by the other, from whose promised magic 'cures' he shrinks in horror (*Sat.* 134–5).[17] Hecale takes down wood stored aloft to build a fire,[18] and boils up water to use either for cooking or to fill a basin as a foot-bath for the weary traveller (frr. 242–5 Pf. = *Hecale* frr. 31–3, 60 H);[19] the rustic food she prepares for her guest is elaborately described (frr. 248–51, 344 Pf. = *Hecale* frr. 35, 36.4–5, 37–9 H), and testifies to her industry and generosity. In contrast, Encolpius' hostess forces her guest to shell beans for his own supper, scolds him for his sloth, and prepares to serve him disgusting pig's brains (*Sat.* 135–6). In the *Hecale* (fr. 256 Pf. = *Hecale* fr. 63 H), we are told that the old woman sleeps in a corner of the hut on her bed, while Theseus presumably sleeps near the fire (as does Odysseus in Eumaeus' hut), perhaps on an improvised couch; in the *Satyricon*, much of the grotesque humour comes from the image of both

1862), K. Müller, *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon* (Paris, 1961) and A. Ernout, *Le Satyricon* (Paris, 1970)) or Pius (according to Müller 1983). Considering the context, the presence of Hecale must be correct.

[15] But see now also fr. 342 Pf. (= *Hecale* fr. 81 H) and fr. 252 Pf. (= *Hecale* fr. 82 H) and Hollis' (1990) discussion on pp. 265–8 (op. cit. n. 9).

[16] The emendation to 'Battiadae' had been suggested early on by several scholars: Pius is said to have originally discerned it (Müller 1983), while Daniels may have first offered the full phrase 'Battiadae vatis' (Müller 1961; Ernout 1970). Müller (1983) also altered 'annis' to 'aevis' and argued for 'miranda ... arte' based on a parallel in Ovid, *Am.* 1.15.13–14.

[17] Comparable scenes may be observed in *Od.* 14.48–51, when Eumaeus offers his guest a couch with coverings; *Met.* 8.639–40, where a bench with rough coverings is provided for Jupiter and Mercury; and again in *Met.* 8.655–9, a curious texual 'doublet' where the old people pull out another couch and deck it with festive yet old and well-worn balnkets for the gods. On this latter passage, see the discussions in Hollis (1970), pp. 117–18, and Anderson (1972), pp. 394–5.

[18] See also fr. 295 Pf. (= *Hecale* fr. 114 H), which may refer to further preparations for lighting the fire; for a discussion of this fragment, see Hollis (1990), pp. 299–300.

[19] Hollis (1990), pp. 210–11 argues against the existence of an episode of foot-washing at this point in the *Hecale*.

old crones trying to jump into bed with the unwary guest. Throughout this comparison, we can see how Petronius overturns his model by presenting an inverted and non-canonical version of hospitality: Encolpius' dreamy soliloquy in verse at the end of section 135 only highlights the gap separating the typical rustic reception from his miserable experience at the hands of the witch. The final scenes of both versions are equally polarized: on the one hand, Theseus founds a religious cult in Hecale's honour, while on the other hand Oenothea worries that she may lose her priestly status as a result of Encolpius' murderous defilement of her house.

Turning to the Ovid text, the allusions are even more numerous and similarly subversive in nature. The same hexameter section mentioned above refers both to the *Hecale* and *Metamorphoses* in its express mockery of the well-established literary figure of a poor but hard-working and pious person visited by a hero or god. Petronius claims that Oenothea's house was not yet shining with a marble floor (*Sat.* 135.8.2): 'nec iam calcato radiabat marmore terra.' This has been shown to be a reference to the eventual transformation of Philemon and Baucis' home into a marble temple (*Met.* 8.699–702).[20] Similarly, much of Encolpius' poetic fantasy of Oenothea's 'paupertatis ingenium', with its bountiful peasant food and festive atmosphere, resembles the Ovidian literary reality. In stark contrast, the prose sections reveal a clear parody of the Ovidian hospitality. In the *Metamorphoses*, the old couple's home is tidy and clean: a basin hangs from a hook on the wall,[21] and the cracked wine cups are lovingly mended with beeswax. The meal includes fresh garden vegetables and a young local wine served by Baucis, in addition to dried meat stored under the rafters which is taken down with a fork (*Met.* 8.647, 'furca levat')[22] and cooked over a carefully stoked fire. In Petronius' version, as the basin is taken off its hook, the hook falls out of the wall, intimating a general state of disorder and decay quite alien to the Ovidian atmosphere. This is reinforced by further parodic details: Oenothea repairs her cracked wine cup with smelly pitch rather than wax; the meat, taken down from storage with a fork (*Sat.* 135.4; 'detulit furca'), turns out to be a mouldy piece of pig's brain,[23] described as 'coaequale natalium suorum', equal in age to Oenothea herself, a witty recontextualization of the customary praise of an old wine, which in turn disparages the local new wine (all that the pair can afford) in Ovid; the vegetables are equally ancient dried beans, their shells unappetizingly compared to dead flies, which the guest must prepare himself. Both the food and the behaviour of Oenothea thus repudiate the traditional customs of *xenia*. In contrast to Baucis' skill at resuscitating the previous day's coals, Oenothea clumsily puts out her fire by breaking a decrepit stool with her weight and falling on the cooking pot, which spills all its water on the coals.[24] Finally, in an obvious attempt to invert the Ovidian narrative as well as

[20] Garrido (1933), p. 11.

[21] There may be a reference here to the basin's function as a foot-bath for weary travellers, but not all the manuscripts preserve these lines (*Met.* 8.652–4). For further textual discussion see Hollis (1970), p. 118, and Anderson (1972), p. 394.

[22] For the various arguments for Philemon ('ille') as opposed to Baucis ('illa') as the person doing the lifting, see F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen* (Heidelberg, 1969–86), p. 206 and his bibliography on the subject.

[23] The 'long-preserved' (*Met.* 8.649, 'servatoque diu') bacon of Philemon and Baucis is thus mocked as Oenothea's pork is well past its prime. Compare, however, the passage in Horace, *Satire* 2.2.89–93, where rancid boar appears to suggest the best kind of ancient hospitality, as it proves that the host was not so greedy as to eat it all while fresh, but put some aside until guests might visit.

[24] Are we perhaps to imagine here a reference to the earlier foot-baths in Callimachus and Ovid, as Oenothea by mistake gives herself (and the fire) an unwanted 'bath' in the spilled water? Note also how the double fire scenes find parallels in the double baths given by Hecale

'nature', Encolpius is chased by a gaggle of geese, reminiscent of the goose which Philemon and Baucis in vain try to catch and sacrifice to their divine visitors. In Ovid, the guests reject the sacrifice, satisfied with the humbler fare, and allow the goose to live (*Met.* 8.684–9). In Petronius, the guest Encolpius not only kills the leader of the pack with great bravado, but uses a broken table leg to do the deed, pointedly alluding to Ovid's wobbly table whose leg needs to be propped up by pottery shards in order to hold the frugal meal steady.[25] Philemon and Baucis are rewarded with the granting of their wish, and their home becomes a temple; Encolpius pollutes the house of the priestess of Priapus with blood, absolves his guilt with gold, and runs away with his wish for a cure for his impotence unfulfilled.

In the examples mentioned above, we can see Petronius writing (and Encolpius enacting) parody, questioning the heroic ethos that informs the convention of *xenia*, and inverting or subverting details to produce a picture that ridicules the idealism of his literary predecessors. The models themselves, as far as we can tell from the evidence, are to be read as representative of 'tradition' – tinged perhaps with a bit of gentle humour, as in the goose scene, but certainly far from the biting wit of Petronius, who heightens the impact by inserting mock-heroic hexameter verses at crucial moments in the plot. But in Callimachus' 'Victoria Berenices' I think we can find a model for the disruption of conventional generic decorum and the contrast of the heroic with the anti-heroic that characterizes Petronius' approach in the Oenothea passage, as well as further details which suggest an evocation of or allusions to the earlier text.

In the opening to the third book of the *Aetia*,[26] Callimachus writes an epinician for Queen Berenice which includes a mythic section honouring Herakles' slaying of the Nemean lion. Not surprisingly, the poem avoids a 'traditional' approach, and challenges numerous generic conventions: it is written in elegiacs rather than hexameters, and in an Ionic dialect. Callimachus spends relatively little time, as far as we can tell from surviving fragments, on the actual *agōn*, and focuses primarily on a 'minor' incident in the heroic foundation myth: Herakles' visit to the hut of Molorchus. The heroic deed is thus 'deheroised into rustic chic. The hero lodges with an old peasant; the ruined hut and frugal supper are described in the richest and most recherché diction; and as Herakles sallies forth to hunt the lion which is terrorising the countryside, we see Molorchus hunting the mice who have eaten up his larder.'[27]

The decentering of the narrative away from the *aretē* of Herakles and onto the daily toil of the farmer Molorchus is typically Hellenistic – the more obscure the angle of the story, the better. But what is most interesting for my purposes here is how the narrative plays with and gradually subverts the convention of *xenia*, as Molorchus finds himself utterly unprepared for his heroic visitor. Unlike Oenothea, Molorchus is quite embarrassed by his inability to offer the customary hospitality, but the result amounts to the same thing: a frustrated and less than satisfied guest.

(fr. 246 Pf. = *Hecale* fr. 34 H: she pours out the old water and brings fresh water for rinsing) and Eurycleia (*Od.* 19.469–504: after an accident in which the tub is overturned and the bath water spilled, the nurse fetches fresh water for Odysseus' feet).

[25] See Connors (1989), p. 27.

[26] I agree here with Parsons' ((1977), 46–50) ordering of the fragments to form the proem to Book 3, although there has been some debate since then on the sequence of the textual reconstruction; see A. S. Hollis, 'The Composition of Callimachus' *Aetia* in the Light of P. Oxy. 2258', *CQ* 36 (1986), 467–71, criticized by E. Livrea, 'P. Oxy. 2463: Lycophron and Callimachus', *CQ* 39 (1989), 141–7.

[27] P. Parsons, *Council of University Classical Departments Bulletin* 10 (1981), 7.

When Herakles arrives at Molorchus' hut (*SH* 257), he finds the farm overgrown with weeds, the restless flocks locked up in their pens, and the farmer afraid even to go out to cut firewood.[28] The whole land has been brought to a standstill by the wild beast. Molorchus attempts an explanation (*SH* 257.21–5):

αἰνολέων ἀπόλοιτο . ϵ[
καὶ θεὸς η καινϵ[ ]ι.....[.]..μ.[
ὄφρα κϵπιω.[ ]ω σϵ πάλιν πυρὶ δ[ϵ]ῖπνον
...]μϵνον δυϵρῇ μηδὲ σὺν ἀξυλίῃ
...]α νυν, δρϵπάνου γὰρ ἀπϵυθέα τέρχν[ϵ]α [

May that dreadful lion perish...
and may the god (grant that you) either kill...
so that... you again food for the fire...
...not with wretched lack of wood...
...(as) now, for the young trees are ignorant of the pruning hook...

In short, he has no fuel to build a fire, and apologizes for his inability to provide a cooked meal (or a sacrifice) for his unexpected guest. The promised sacrifice to Herakles and ensuing celebratory meal must wait until the task at hand has been accomplished, when Molorchus can slay a ram to cook a real feast for the hero (*SH* 264).[29] In the meantime, the two must make do with vegetarian, uncooked fare, surely a disappointment for the traditionally gluttonous Herakles.[30]

The text of *SH* 259 offers several clues that Callimachus is evoking the convention of *xenia*: in lines 5–6 we read a customary reference to sunset as the time when farmers unyoke their oxen; in lines 2–4, an unidentified woman reaches up with a two-pronged fork for food provisions stored under the rafters, and divides up portions for those present:

δίκρον φιτρὸν ἀϵιραμένη
].λϵλα[....]...ι στέγος οὐδ' ὅσον ϵ.[
]παιδὶ νέμουσα μέρος.

lifting up a double-pronged fork
...the roof, not as much as...
...dividing up a portion for the child (...).

The phrase μέρος or μέριδα νέμειν is technical for animal sacrifice or meat distribution intended for human consumption. But since there can be no question of Molorchus' cooking the meat, we can appreciate the humour as the topos of *xenia* is

[28] We can find support for this state of affairs in 'Theocritus' 25, lines 216–20, where Herakles tells his version of the lion-hunt: 'it was midday, and I had not yet been able to trace his prints or hear his roar; nor was there anyone... busy with the cows or fieldwork whom I might question, for pale fear kept them all inside their homes.'

[29] Contrast, however, *SH* 266: Probus' summary of the sequence of events in which Herakles appears to ask Molorchus to postpone the slaughter of his only ram until more opportune times, i.e. either as a celebration or in honour of the hero's shade (if unsuccessful). I hope to argue in a future article against Probus' evidence, which I interpret as an error of contamination or 'reading backwards' from later sources.

[30] Herakles' reputation as a glutton is evidenced in Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* (3.145–61) where the hero waits for the goddess to return home with some fat morsel, and encourages her to bypass deer and hares for larger game. Further evidence for the vegetarian nature of this first meal may be found in Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* 17.51–4, where the author compares Brongos' reception of Dionysus to Molorchus' hosting of Herakles: 'so he served a meal that was no meal, a table without meat, such as they say in Cleonae, Molorchus provided for Herakles on his way to fight the lion'.

simultaneously acknowledged and challenged; Callimachus describes what is not meat with specifically meat-oriented vocabulary.

There is some question as to who actually participates in this hospitality. Some scholars assume that the hero is not yet present at this juncture, and that Molorchus and the woman, either his wife or a maid, prepare the meal for themselves.[31] Others are of the opinion that, although Herakles may be present, the child mentioned in line 4 is actually the son of Molorchus, and the unnamed woman therefore his mother; a slight problem then arises with ancient testimony that claims the child had been killed by the lion, presumably earlier in the tale.[32] The main point, however, of hospitality at this stage of the narrative is to underscore the impossibility of conventional *xenia* for the hero; this requires that he be the central focus of his hosts' attention during the cold supper, as well as the cause of their apologetic embarrassment when faced with the task of feeding him. I therefore prefer to read these lines as a scene of attempted *xenia* in which the female servant serves Herakles, reverently named the child of Zeus or Alkmene.[33]

The two-pronged fork used to reach food (e.g. cheeses, dried fruits and nuts, etc.) stored under the roof beams is clearly the model for Ovid's 'furca bicorni' (*Met.* 8.647).[34] I would argue that Petronius also imitates Callimachus' passage in diction (*Sat.* 135.4, 'detulit furca', and *SH* 259.2 *δίκρον φιτρὸν ἀειραμένη*) as well as in the situation which follows when he decides to remove Oenothea temporarily from the scene: he has her accidentally extinguish the fire and then rush off to borrow new coals 'ne res aliqua sacrificium moraretur', so that nothing may delay the sacrifice (*Sat.* 136.3). It is during this hiatus that the geese enter.

Both the texts thus present a cessation of normal activity, specifically cooking or sacrifice: in Callimachus the countryside is paralyzed by the danger of the lion, and in Petronius by the clumsiness of the old witch. Encolpius is suddenly confronted with the invasion of a group of sacred geese; angry at not receiving their customary noon meal from Oenothea (yet another fractured *xenia*!), they gobble up the shelled beans intended for Encolpius' supper, and viciously attack his legs. In Callimachus, Molorchus is on edge because of the threats of the lion nearby, and he jumps in fright when he hears a sudden noise in his hut, but quickly realizes that it is merely an invasion of mice, come yet again to ravage his already meagre food supply. The language of both passages is worth considering more closely. The geese, according to Encolpius, 'impetum in me faciunt foedoque ac veluti rabioso stridore circumsistunt trepidantem' (*Sat.* 136.4) – 'they make a charge against me and, with horrible cackling, as if insane, they surround me as I tremble.' When Molorchus hears the noise of scampering feet, a simile also follows which implies an initial shiver of fear (*SH* 259.9–11):

> ...]τηρι θύρην ὁ δ' ὅτ' ἔκλυεν ἠχ[ήν,
> ὡς ὁπότ' ὀκν]ηρῆς ἴαχ' ἐπ' οὖς ἐλάφου
> σκ]ύμνος,...
>
> ...door; but when he heard the noise,
> just as the cry of a lion cub reaches the ears
> of a timid deer...

[31] Hollis (1986), p. 470.

[32] E. Livrea (1979), p. 38 and 'Callimachi Fragmentum de Muscipulis (177 Pf.)', in R. Pintaudi, ed., *Miscellanea Papyrologica* (Florence, 1989), 135–40, esp. p. 137.

[33] This idea was first suggested by C. Corbato, in a jointly written article by E. Livrea, A. Carlini, C. Corbato and F. Bornmann, 'Il Nuovo Callimaco di Lille', *Maia* 32 (1980), 225–51; see esp. p. 240, where Corbato supplements the text of *SH* 259 to read: 'the child of Alcmene' (*Ἀλκμήνης παιδί*).

[34] See Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 177 (= p. 146).

He waits until he can identify the source more clearly, and then addresses the mice (*SH* 259.12–14):

'ὀχληροί, τί τόδ'] αὖ γείτονες ἡμε[τ]έρων
ἧκατ' ἀποκναίσοντες, ἐπεὶ μάλα [γ'] οὔτι φέρε[σθε;
ξ]είνοις κωκυμοὺς ἔπλασεν ὔμμε θεός.'

wretched neighbours of ours, why
have you come again to ravage? for certainly you bring nothing good;
some god created you as a curse on hosts.

In both texts, the normally harmless (even comic) animals are introduced in epic and military terms, and both men present themselves as helpless victims terrified of their attackers: Encolpius is 'trepidantem', Molorchus a timid deer. Exaggerated similes add to the tension and the inevitably comic effect: the geese make a sound like madmen and act like soldiers on the offensive, attacking the enemy and pillaging his food supplies, while the mice are first indirectly compared to lions in Molorchus' fertile imagination (or more specifically, inflated only to the level of lion cubs),[35] and then repeatedly described with lion terminology well after Molorchus has realized his mistake. In *SH* 259.23 the mouse's tail is called an ἀλκαία, a word usually reserved for the tails of lions, and in line 29 the mice are called σίνται, 'destructive' or 'ravenous', used of lions and wolves in the *Iliad*.[36] The narratives continue to use imagery and diction to play with heroic and epic models, undercutting them by the inherent silliness of the unequal battles. Encolpius reports the attack: one goose tears his tunic, another unties and carries off as plunder the laces on his sandals; the third one, 'dux et magister saevitiae' (*Sat.* 136.4), pecks his leg with its sharp beak. Meanwhile, the rest of the birds consume all the carefully shelled beans. Molorchus offers a similar list of evil deeds: the animals drink up his lamp oil, steal food, and keep him awake at night (*SH* 259.22–8); but the worst deed of all (*SH* 259.30: κύνταton), which angers him the most, was the night they gnawed through his clothes, his cloak, and his wallet (*SH* 259.29–31). Petronius here adapts the Callimachean list format for the series of misdeeds, as well as the detail of the shredded clothing. On the level of diction, for the word κύνταton (itself a clever play on the Homeric term of abuse etymologically linked with dogs, not mice), Petronius writes 'pugnacissimum animal' (*Sat.* 136.5), adopting both the superlative form and the irony of a 'pugnax anser'. Of course, considering the martial actions of the Capitoline geese and the sometimes vicious nature of the animals even when domesticated, the phrase is marginally less oxymoronic than the dastardly deed of a mouse. Encolpius responds to the crisis by avenging himself with the death of the ringleader (*Sat.* 136.5, 'morte me anseris vindicavi'), not satisfied just to chase it away, but brutally beating it to a pulp with a novel and extremely unheroic weapon, a table leg he has broken off from Oenothea's rickety furniture. Molorchus repulses his invasion by plotting a 'double death' (*SH* 259.32, διχθαδίους φονέας) for the mice: he invents two versions of the as yet unknown mousetrap (*SH* 259.33), again a weapon unworthy of a 'true' hero, and markedly domestic in nature.

How do these humorous 'digressions' affect the rest of their narratives? Molorchus' conquest over the mice is meant to anticipate Herakles' upcoming victory over the Nemean lion. But the ludicrous comparison hints to the reader that Callimachus took great delight in exposing the humour in the disparity between the unheroic

[35] Compare the similar image of a lion cub used to depict fierceness in Horace, *Od.* 4.4.13–16, where the relatively young age of a military leader is emphasized in the comparison with a newly weaned lion about to kill its first deer.

[36] The poetic word σίντης is used of lions at *Iliad* 11.481 and 20.165; of wolves at *Iliad* 16.353.

Molorchus, who responds through trickery and cunning rather than brawn, and the traditionally glorious deed of Herakles; the poem seems to focus on the interaction and comparison of the two disparate 'heroes' rather than on the conventional hunt and kill.

The humorous clash that Callimachus achieves within the same text by juxtaposing two very different types of characters, Petronius achieves by having his hero fabricate models of comparison outside the text, from the world of mythology. Encolpius responds to his domestic victory with a marvellous hexameter hymn of self-glorification (*Sat.* 136.6):

> Tales Herculea Stymphalidas arte coactas
> ad caelum fugisse reor, caenoque fluentes
> Harpyias, cum Phineo maduere veneno
> fallaces epulae.
>
> Thus, I imagine, the Stymphalian birds, constrained by Herakles,
> fled to the heavens, and thus the Harpies,
> flowing with filth, when the elusive feasts
> were soaked in poison for Phineus.

It is quite telling, in my opinion, that Encolpius chooses to evoke the spirit not of Theseus, as might be expected with reference to the *Hecale* as the primary literary model, but rather of Herakles, by introducing two of his heroic deeds: the Stymphalian birds and the Harpies. The Harpies, those supernatural beings who plagued Phineus by carrying off his food and defiling with excrement what they left behind,[37] are a 'logical' (if that word can apply to the Petronian text) choice for Encolpius' inflated vision of his battle with the greedy geese who interrupt his dinner by stealing the spilled beans. In one version,[38] Herakles does not kill the Stymphalian birds, but drives them away by loudly shaking some sort of rattle; this offers yet another analogy to the use of nonconventional weapons in both texts. Encolpius' attempt to dignify his own situation by appealing to epic models, as he had done earlier in hexameter by transforming Oenothea into a latter-day Hecale (*Sat.* 135), serves here also to widen the gap between model and imitator.

After Oenothea returns and has been placated by a bribe to overlook the impious act of murdering an animal sacred to Priapus, Encolpius ends up with a much tastier dinner than originally planned: they sacrifice the goose and, combined with a great deal of neat wine, enjoy a plentiful feast (*Sat.* 137). Similarly, after Herakles returns victorious to Molorchus, the farmer collects wood for a fire and sits down with the hero for the promised celebratory meat dinner (*SH* 264–5). Hecale, however, is already dead by the time Theseus returns to celebrate his victory with her, and the intended feast of thanksgiving turns instead into funeral honours.

Let me now summarize the main points for which I have been arguing in this paper. First, given that Ovid used Callimachus' *Hecale* and the 'Victoria Berenices' for his Philemon and Baucis scene, and given that Petronius used Ovid and the *Hecale* overtly in his text, it is very likely that Petronius was also familiar with the 'Victoria', and used it as a literary model in his *Satyricon*. While the *Hecale* and its reincarnation in the *Metamorphoses* certainly influenced Petronius, it is the 'Victoria Berenices' that corresponds in its mock-heroic tone: the hungry mice and the geese attack their hosts in a parody of *xenia* gone awry, and the victims respond in efforts that to them seem quite heroic, but to us as readers rather ridiculous. The 'Victoria' offers a model for the humour and incongruity that can result from a juxtaposition of unheroic and

[37] Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.187–93; Verg. *Aen.* 3.210–57.
[38] Pausanias (8.22.4) attributes this version to Peisander of Camira.

heroic images within the same text which Petronius takes to further extremes in his hexameter insertions and intertextual references. The impact of the disruption of heroic decorum is quite different, of course, in the overall literary goals of the two authors, but in this passage, Callimachus provided Petronius with the perfect model of inversion.[39]

Yale University PATRICIA A. ROSENMEYER

[39] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association in December of 1989. At that time the extremely useful edition of A. S. Hollis' *Callimachus Hecale* (Oxford, 1990) had not yet been published, which explains the somewhat awkward double reference system employed herein. I should like to thank G. Williams, J. E. G. Zetzel, and the editors of *CQ* for helpful suggestions and criticisms. I am particularly grateful to C. Connors and B. Vine for their valuable insights and generous advice on the Petronian material.