

### III. The Gladiator Petraites and the Date of the *Satyricon*

HENRY T. ROWELL

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

In a book published in 1948, E. V. Marmorale challenged with ingenuity and learning the prevailing opinion that the *Satyricon* of Petronius was written in the time of Nero.<sup>1</sup> As he reinterpreted the evidence, the work belonged to the period of Commodus or later. To judge from the reviews, he did not convince many scholars of his principal thesis. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that his detailed arguments performed a very useful function: they compelled the supporters of the traditional view to reexamine the ancient evidence and the hypotheses erected on its various parts and to search for new indications of the date of composition.

Maiuri<sup>2</sup> and Bagnani<sup>3</sup> have now carefully reviewed the material treated by Marmorale and advanced a number of original arguments and observations in support of the usual dating. They both failed, however, to scrutinize a piece of evidence which Marmorale interpreted as an indication of later composition.<sup>4</sup> It concerns the gladiator Petraites and deserves fresh consideration. For although other scholars, who will be duly mentioned in the course of this paper, have noticed parts of the evidence, all the pertinent information which bears directly or indirectly on the problem has not, to the best of my knowledge, been assembled and analyzed. This I shall attempt to do in the following pages and if I may anticipate the result, it will show, I believe, that in Petronius' references to Petraites we have a remarkably clear reflection of the age of Nero.

Let us begin with the text of the *Satyricon*. During the *Cena*, Trimalchio twice mentions a man by the name of Petraites (52.3; 71.6). In both instances we hear of his *pugnae*, and it is obvious that he was a professional gladiator. Trimalchio must

<sup>1</sup> E. V. Marmorale, *La questione Petroniana*.

<sup>2</sup> A. Maiuri, *PP* (1948) 101-28.

<sup>3</sup> G. Bagnani, *Arbiter of Elegance: A Study of the Life and Works of C. Petronius* (Toronto 1954) 1-26.

<sup>4</sup> Marmorale (above, note 1) 299-300.

have been one of his most ardent *fautores*. He orders all the fights of Petraites to be represented on his tomb (71.6) and possesses cups of heavy silver on which the fights of Hermeros and Petraites are shown (52.3). The Latin reads "Hermerotis pugnas et Petraitis in poculis habeo." Because Petraites, as we shall see below, was regularly pitted against a gladiator named Prude(n)s, it is likely that Trimalchio's cups were of two kinds, one displaying the fights of Hermeros, the other those of Petraites.

Now a painting from Pompeii shows two pairs of gladiators. In one scene they are apparently about to begin combat, and in the other they are at the end of a fight. Under the figures of each pair the names of the two combatants appear. They are Tetraites and Prudes.<sup>5</sup>

The striking similarity between the Tetraites of Pompeii and the Petraites of Petronius did not escape the notice of scholars. In 1856 Friedlaender, referring to Goro, expressed the opinion that perhaps the names were synonymous.<sup>6</sup> In the first Pompeian volume of the *Corpus* (1871) Zangemeister took it for granted that we have the same name spelled with two different initial letters.<sup>7</sup> The problem, then, was to choose the correct form. Zangemeister chose Tetraites and held that the Petraites of Petronius should be emended accordingly. Fortunately editors were slow to tamper with the text.

In the meantime, certain mold-blown glass cups began to be discovered and published which are adorned with scenes of the circus and the arena. In most examples one or the other form of entertainment, the chariot race or the gladiatorial *munus*, is exclusively depicted on the outer surface. There are, however, a few in which both activities appear in different registers.

The first scholars to study these cups observed that some gladiators were represented who belonged to the period of Nero.<sup>8</sup> Consequently, they attributed their manufacture to the same

<sup>5</sup> *CIL* iv.538 = *ILS* 5138. The picture was first described in some detail by F. M. Avellino, *Atti della Società Pontaniana di Napoli* 3 (1819) 194, note 1.

<sup>6</sup> *RhM* 10 (1856) 553, note 5. The reference is to Ludwig Goro von Agyagfalva, *Wanderungen durch Pompeii* (Wien 1825) 106. I have not been able to obtain a copy of this book. From Friedlaender's reference it would seem that Goro was the first to identify Tetraites and Petraites.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the comment on *CIL* iv.538; cf. Mommsen on *CIL* iii.6014.2.

<sup>8</sup> De la Villegille, *Bulletin du comité de la langue, de l'histoire et des arts de la France* 4 (1857 [Paris 1860]) 923; W. Froehner, *La verrerie antique: description de la collection Charvet* (Le Pecq 1875) 68.

period. Anton Kisa, however, on the basis of many more examples and a far more meticulous investigation concluded that they were produced in workshops of Gaul and Britain toward the end of the first and the beginning of the second century A.D.<sup>9</sup> In the most recent discussion Harden speaks of the "overwhelming external evidence that these cups were made during the first century A.D."<sup>10</sup>

The clearest evidence of time of manufacture is furnished by the names of the gladiators and charioteers who are depicted. I shall not treat charioteers in this paper since they do not pertain to my immediate purpose; that is, to identify the Petraites mentioned by Petronius. In attempting to achieve it, however, I shall have to consider all gladiatorial cups; and if my conclusions about them are valid, they may be useful to the student of ancient glass or at least encourage a reexamination of the actual remains.

On the gladiatorial cups each figure is regularly accompanied by the name of the gladiator whom it represents, and the figures are arranged to cover the outer surface of the cup in easily recognizable pairs. We shall begin by giving a brief description of each cup or fragment on which the name of Petraites or its equivalent appears or can be restored with certainty.

**Cup A.** Joseph Arneth, who was one of the first scholars to publish a fragment of such a cup in Vienna bearing the names *AITES PRUDES CALAMUS* over the figures of three gladiators, did not recall the Tetraites and Prudes of Pompeii.<sup>11</sup> The fragment reminded him of the fighters who appear with their names on the *contorniati*, and consequently he assigned the glass fragment to the period of Constantine or his family.

**Cup B.** About a decade later de la Villegille made the first serious study of this kind of cup on the basis of an almost perfect example which had come to light near Chavagne-en-Paillers in the Vendée.<sup>12</sup> On it are represented four pairs of gladiators. Of the eight names only one was not clearly legible. De la Villegille read it as *PETRAHES* but adds that *TETRAIDES* or

<sup>9</sup> A. Kisa, *Das Glas im Altertum* 3 (Leipzig 1908) 726-50.

<sup>10</sup> D. B. Harden, *Archaeology* 11 (1958) 5.

<sup>11</sup> J. Arneth, *Die antiken Cameen des k.k. Münz- und Antiken Cabinettes in Wien* (Wien 1849) 42-3, pl. 22.5. The reading of the names is correct; cf. *CIL* iii.6014.2. Here [*Tetr*]aites has been restored on the basis of *CIL* iv.538. But as we shall see below, [*Petr*]aites is an equally justifiable restoration.

<sup>12</sup> De la Villegille (above, note 8) 916-25; cf. *CIL* xiii.10025.178.

*TETRAITES* might be more exact.<sup>13</sup> This figure is fighting against *PRUDES*. The other pairs are Spiculus and Columbus, Calamus and Holes, Proculus and Cocumbus.

De la Villegille knew his Pompeii well. He recalled that a gladiator named Spiculus also appears in a Pompeian inscription as a *Ner(onianus)*.<sup>14</sup> This gave him a Neronian date. Furthermore he remembered that the pair Tetrates and Prudes were twice referred to at Pompeii, and he observed that Calamus is represented on the Vienna cup (A) as well as on the one from Chavagne. After making some stylistic observations, he drew the reasonable conclusion that his Petrahes or Tetrates or Tetrades must be identical with the Tetrates of Pompeii and that the Chavagne cup together with that of Vienna (A) was made in the period of Nero. He does not mention the Petraites of Petronius.

**Cup C.** In an appendix to his original article, de la Villegille prints a report of Rabut on another gladiatorial cup unearthed at Montagnole near Chambéry.<sup>15</sup> It too contains four pairs of gladiators: Tetrates and Prudes, Spiculus and Columbus, Gamus and Merops, Calamus and Hermes. On the Montagnole cup there cannot be the slightest doubt about the reading Tetrates.<sup>16</sup>

**Cup D.** So far the form Tetrates was the only one firmly attested on the cups. But in 1876 near Lillebonne a fragment was found depicting a fight between two gladiators whose names are given as *PETRAHES* and *PRUD[ES]*.<sup>17</sup> Buecheler interpreted Petrahes as a contraction of Petrahites (he compares *Samnitis* and *Samnis*, *ditis* and *dives*, *ancipes* and *anceps*) and explained the H as a vulgar intrusion between vowels.<sup>18</sup> He also recognized that the name was originally Greek *Petraitēs* and was formed from Petraea as *Phōkaitēs* from Phocaea.

**Cup E.** Petraites, spelled exactly as it is in Petronius, appears on a perfect cup which was found in Oedenburg in Hungary in

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* 919. But Gourraud who examined the vase carefully after de la Villegille states that the initial letter cannot be a *P*; *ibid.* 924-5. He supports the reading Tetrates.

<sup>14</sup> *CIL* iv.1474. On the term *Neronianus*, see Mau, *RM* 5 (1890) 38-9.

<sup>15</sup> De la Villegille (above, note 8) 927-30; cf. *CIL* xii.5696.32 = *ILS* 5137.

<sup>16</sup> In the photograph of this cup recently published by Harden (above, note 10) 4 the *T* of *Tetrates* can be plainly seen.

<sup>17</sup> *CIL* xiii.10025.182.

<sup>18</sup> Buecheler, *RhM* 27 (1872) 474 = *Kleine Schriften* 2 (Leipzig-Berlin 1927) 30.

1892.<sup>19</sup> On it are depicted two pairs of gladiators: Petraites and Prudes, Ories and Calamus.

**Cup F.** These names have been restored with virtual certainty on a sixth cup found in Engiwald near Bern, enough of which is left to indicate that it was very similar but not identical with the Oedenburg cup (E).<sup>20</sup> The restoration reads [*Petrai*]tes—*Pr[ude]*s—*Or[ies]*—[*Calamus*].

Let us now analyze the evidence.

1. Petraites is firmly attested by E; it almost certainly stood on F; it may or may not have stood on A.

2. Tetraites is firmly attested by C; it is likely that it stood on B (Gourraud's reading; cf. note 13); it may or may not have stood on A.

3. Petrahes, a contraction of Petraites, is firmly attested by D.

4. On all six cups Petraites or Tetraites or Petrahes is shown fighting against Prudes.

5. Calamus appears on A B C E and is restored with virtual certainty on F, a total of five cups. On E he appears with Petraites (certain reading) and on C with Tetraites (certain reading).

6. The pair, Spiculus and Columbus appear twice, on B C.

From this analysis I do not see how we can fail to conclude that Petraites or Petrahes and Tetraites were one and the same gladiator. Regardless of the form of the name, the person is always paired with Prudes; and Calamus appears twice in his company, once when he appears as Petraites and once when he appears as Tetraites. Furthermore, it is only logical, when we find the pair Tetraites and Prudes mentioned twice in Pompeii,<sup>21</sup> to identify it with the pair on all the cups. De la Villegille did so on the basis of two cups alone, A B<sup>22</sup>; Buecheler also, when the evidence was more complete, although he did not analyze it fully or mention cup E, the only one on which the form Petraites appears for certain.<sup>23</sup>

Buecheler characterizes Petraites as "spectatissimus famosusque

<sup>19</sup> *CIL* III.14374<sup>1</sup>. This cup has recently been republished by Harden (above, note 10) 3-4.

<sup>20</sup> *CIL* XIII.10025.184.

<sup>21</sup> *CIL* IV.538 = *ILS* 5138.

<sup>22</sup> De la Villegille (above, note 8) 920-4.

<sup>23</sup> Buecheler, *Glotta* 1 (1907) 1-2 = *Kleine Schriften* 3 (Leipzig-Berlin 1930) 372.

circa Tiberii et Claudii tempora gladiator."<sup>24</sup> With regard to the date, I think we can be more precise. First of all we can assume that the other gladiators who appear on the same cups as Petraites were his contemporaries in life. As de la Villegille observed, Spiculus appears in a Pompeian inscription as *Neronianus*.<sup>25</sup> If Mau is correct in interpreting this term to mean that the gladiator in question came from a *ludus gladiatorius* established by Nero,<sup>26</sup> then we have the period of Nero at the earliest. Moreover since Spiculus is termed a *tiro* in the same inscription, he must have begun his career under that emperor. Now we hear of a Spiculus who was a favorite of Nero,<sup>27</sup> and it is only reasonable to identify him with the Spiculus *Neronianus* of Pompeii. This Spiculus, however, was killed by the mob in Rome after Nero's death.<sup>28</sup> Consequently, the period of his fame falls entirely within the reign of Nero.

Let us now consider Columbus. We hear of a gladiator by that name who was poisoned in Rome by Caligula.<sup>29</sup> Clearly, then, we have another gladiator by the same name in the Columbus who appears in Pompeii pitted against a *Pinna Neronianus*.<sup>30</sup> This Columbus of the time of Nero must be the one who is paired with Spiculus on two of our cups (B and C). We probably have a third Columbus in the *murmillo Columbus Serenianus*, an Aeduan, whose epitaph was discovered in the amphitheater at Nîmes.<sup>31</sup>

Other independent indications of time are less certain. A gladiator Herma fought in Pompeii.<sup>32</sup> A Hermes appears on our cup C and a fragment of a cup from Britain.<sup>33</sup> The name Proculus of our cup B possibly appears under the picture of a gladiator in Pompeii.<sup>34</sup> The reading is uncertain. But he cannot be identified with the Aesius Proculus who was compelled to fight in the arena by Caligula.<sup>35</sup> This Proculus was not a

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> De la Villegille (above, note 8) 920.

<sup>26</sup> Mau (above, note 14).

<sup>27</sup> Suet. *Nero* 30; 47.

<sup>28</sup> Plut. *Galba* 8.7.

<sup>29</sup> Suet. *Calig.* 55.

<sup>30</sup> *CIL* iv.2387.

<sup>31</sup> *CIL* xii.3325 = *ILS* 5101.

<sup>32</sup> *CIL* iv.2508.27.

<sup>33</sup> *CIL* xiii.10025.181.

<sup>34</sup> *CIL* iv.5215.

<sup>35</sup> Suet. *Calig.* 35.

professional gladiator; and his single appearance in the arena, after which he was humiliated and killed although twice victor, was a form of punishment. A fragment of a gladiatorial cup bearing the name of Calamus alone was found in a tomb near Gubbio.<sup>36</sup> According to Galli, the other objects in the grave can all be assigned to the first century A.D.

Finally, to complete the evidence, let us note that we have a cup on which the names are so badly blurred that we can read only *Spiculus Calamus* and *Hermes* for certain<sup>37</sup> and fragments showing respectively *Spiculus*, *Columbus* and *Calamus*,<sup>38</sup> *Calamus* alone<sup>39</sup> and *Prudes* alone.<sup>40</sup>

To summarize, *Spiculus*' career fell entirely within the reign of Nero, and *Columbus* appeared in the arena in the same period. *Petraites* and *Prudes* are both firmly attested in a Pompeian inscription. The others were their contemporaries; and when some of their names appear in Pompeii, it is likely that the same persons were meant. This type of cup, then, insofar as we can judge from extant samples, was adorned exclusively with the heroes of the arena of the Neronian period.

This fact should give pause to those who with Kisa would date the manufacture of these cups at the end of the first century.<sup>41</sup> It will not do to assume that the gladiators depicted on them were later men who had adopted the names of famous predecessors.<sup>42</sup> That this was done from time to time is shown by the existence of the three *Columbi* mentioned above.<sup>43</sup> But the practice must have been limited to scattered individuals. To assume that the names of the famous pairs of the Neronian period were adopted wholesale by later pairs defies reason.

Thus if we cling to a later date for the cups, we must conclude that the famous gladiators of at least a generation before were still fresh in the public mind; even more, that their names could

<sup>36</sup> Cf. E. Galli, *NS* (1948) 46-56, esp. 53-55. A preliminary report appeared in *Arch. Anzeiger* 1940.417; cf. *AEpigr.* 1941.45.

<sup>37</sup> *CIL* XIII.10025.179.

<sup>38</sup> *EphEp.* 4.708.

<sup>39</sup> *CIL* XIII.10025.180.

<sup>40</sup> *CIL* XIII.10025.183.

<sup>41</sup> Kisa (above, note 9) 726.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Bohn, *CIL* XIII.3, page 672.

<sup>43</sup> But see L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'orient Grec* (Paris 1940) 298, where it is shown that different gladiators bearing the same name may have adopted it for another reason.

still attract buyers, for the kind of commercial art to which these cups belong depends for its market on immediate interest. The fact that the figures, all of them types, were given the names of living gladiators of a circumscribed period shows clearly that they were designed for buyers who took particular interest in these men. These buyers would have been the contemporaries of their heroes who had seen them in action or followed their exploits at second hand. This would be the time when the gladiators themselves would enhance the value of the cups and create a profitable market.

On the other hand, the fame of great entertainers fades quickly after their retirement or death. We can believe that the generation which had passionately admired the Neronian gladiators and bought the cups when they were flourishing continued to keep them as mementos of better times. But it seems most unlikely that those who remained of this generation would have provided an adequate market many years later when a new generation would have already selected its own heroes. In view of these considerations, I conclude that these gladiatorial cups were manufactured in the time of Nero. Where the production took place, I must leave to an expert in ancient glass to establish.

Petraites in the form *Petraeitēs* is an epithet of the Asiatic god Men.<sup>44</sup> In this connection its etymology has long been discussed, but no firm conclusion has been reached. If it is a Greek *ethnicon* formed with the suffix *-itēs* in the normal way, the first element must have been *Petraion* or *Petraia*.<sup>45</sup> Of more importance is its attestation as a proper name. In an inscription from Julia Gordos in Lydia which is dated in 109/110 A.D. we have the epitaph of a certain [*T*]etraeitēs set up by his wife and friends.<sup>46</sup> On the fac-simile I have not been able to discern any trace of the initial letter. Presumably, then, a *P* could have been restored instead of a *T*. That this restoration of a *P* is preferable is shown by a Lycian tombstone from Telmessus which presents the figure of a gladiator who can be identified as a *retarius*.<sup>47</sup> The inscription reads as follows: 'Ερμεί Παυτραείτης μετὰ τῶν συνκεκληρίων

<sup>44</sup> The evidence has been collected and analyzed by Oppermann, *RE* 19.1274-6.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. K. Buresch, *Aus Lydien* (Leipzig 1898) 82.

<sup>46</sup> Keil-V. Premerstein, "Bericht über eine Reise in Lydien und der südlichen Aiolis," *Denkschr Wien* 53 (1910) 2.75, no. 157.

<sup>47</sup> The relief is reproduced in Benndorf, *Reisen in Lykien und Karien* (Wien 1884) 41, fig. 30, cf. *Tituli Asiae Minoris* 2.107.



μνήμης χάριν.<sup>48</sup> Buecheler saw in the Greek name the equivalent of Petraitēs.<sup>49</sup> Heraeus followed him in this; but ignoring the rest of the evidence from Asia Minor, he attempted to make Petraitēs an *ethnicon* of Nabataean Petra.<sup>50</sup> The obstacle there is that we know that the usual *ethnicon* of Petra was *Petraios* and that the alternate form *Petrītēs* was formed in the regular way from *Petra* and *-itēs*.<sup>51</sup> All in all, then, we had better adhere to the evidence which we have and consider the Latin Petraitēs, from Greek *Petraeitēs*, a name indigenous to Asia Minor.

Who then was this Lycian Petraitēs? Heraeus and Robert assume that he was a gladiator who adopted the name of the more famous Petraitēs of Pompeii and the cups.<sup>52</sup> Although the Lycian inscription is not dated, it is natural to assume that it is later than the time of Nero. Nor is it likely that the famous Italian gladiator left the arenas of Italy to settle in a *ludus* of Asia Minor and that we have his name on the stone of Telmessus. If Petraitēs is a name native to Asia Minor, as we have supposed, it is possible that our Lycian gladiator was given the name at birth without regard to the fame of his predecessor.

Marmorale naturally identifies the Lycian with the Petraitēs of Petronius.<sup>53</sup> He does not discuss the evidence furnished by the cups and the inscription of Julia Gordos. He categorically denies that Petraitēs can be an Osco-Campanian form of Tetraitēs, as proposed by Sedgwick.<sup>54</sup> In this he is surely right, but he is hardly fair in letting Sedgwick speak "per tutti."

Buecheler, who recognized Petraitēs as the original, advanced some possible explanations of the form with the initial *T*.<sup>55</sup> He recalls such vulgar transpositions as *tanpister* for *tantisper* or *Menolavos* or *Memelavos* for *Menelaus*. He also suggests that the many compounds in *tetra-* may have exerted their influence.

With regard to assimilation, I doubt very much that it would have occurred unless it had given the name a new connotation.

<sup>48</sup> *IGRR* 3.541; Robert (above, note 43) 147, no. 109.

<sup>49</sup> Buecheler (above, note 23).

<sup>50</sup> W. Heraeus, *Kleine Schriften* (Heidelberg 1937) 47.

<sup>51</sup> Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Petra*, gives *Petraios* as the only *ethnicon*. But Heraeus, *ibid.*, points out that we find *Petrītēs* (dative singular meaning wine from Petra) in Pliny, *H.N.* 14.75.

<sup>52</sup> Heraeus, *ibid.*; Robert (above, note 43) 297.

<sup>53</sup> Marmorale (above, note 1) 299–300.

<sup>54</sup> W. B. Sedgwick, *The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius* (Oxford, 1925) 111.

<sup>55</sup> Buecheler (above, note 23).

We can readily imagine that at some point in his career Petraites performed some dazzling feat in the arena that was connected with the number four; e.g. four successive victories within so many days or even within a single *munus*.<sup>56</sup> What would be more natural, then, than that a witty and admiring *fautor* should have called him Tetrates? Such improvised nicknames, when they hit the mark, can acquire currency almost over night and in time perform the function of a true name. The cups and the Pompeian inscription indicate that the gladiator was equally well known by his name and his nickname.

To return now to the *Satyricon*, Trimalchio possessed silver cups adorned with the fights of Petraites (52.3). They immediately recall the glass cups on which the Neronian Petraites appears. We can assume that Trimalchio had them made to order as a token of his admiration. It was clearly fashionable to possess such cups at this time, and Trimalchio was in fashion. But whereas the average man was content with the glass cup manufactured commercially, in which Petraites and his opponent had to share honors with another or other pairs of gladiators, Trimalchio could afford—and boast about it—to celebrate the feats of his hero in a more exclusive and extravagant manner. This is not the least effective of the deft strokes by which Trimalchio's love of ostentation is set forth by Petronius.

Trimalchio also orders all the fights of Petraites to be depicted on his tomb. There is no indication that he was thinking of a *munus funeraticium* to be held after his death—the kind of *munus* that is represented on the tomb of Umbricius Scaurus.<sup>57</sup> Moreover, even allowing for Trimalchio's habit of exaggeration, the word "all" excludes the thought.

Maiuri suggests that Petraites may have taken part in *munera* held at Trimalchio's expense.<sup>58</sup> It is, of course, quite possible that he had courted popular favor by putting on gladiatorial shows, and we can be sure that he would never have made Norbanus' fatal mistake of attempting to entertain his fellow citizens with *gladiatores sestertiarum* (45.11). Nevertheless, I feel

<sup>56</sup> Although it is not a direct parallel, we might observe here that Martial (5.24.15) calls the famous gladiator Hermes *Hermes omnia solus et ter unus*. The *ter unus* refers to the three kinds of armor in which Hermes appeared in the arena.

<sup>57</sup> *CIL* iv.1182, cf. x.1024; cf. Overbeck—Mau, *Pompeji*<sup>4</sup> (Leipzig 1884) 188–93; 420.

<sup>58</sup> A. Maiuri, *La cena di Trimalchione* (Napoli 1945) 210.

that his desire to have *all* Petraites' fights depicted on his tomb sprang chiefly from his sincere enthusiasm for his hero. At the same time, it would be the kind of decoration that would cause the passer-by to stop and look at the monument. Let us recall that anyone who approached the sundial to find out the time of day would have to read the name of Trimalchio willy nilly (71.11). Obviously, the attraction would be greatest if the fights that were depicted were those of a famous contemporary. Men who had seen Petraites in action would be particularly curious about the way in which his fights were represented. They would recall them with the same pleasurable sense of personal participation with which they recalled the fine free dinner of which another piece of decoration reminded them (71.10). In immortalizing Petraites in this way, Trimalchio was not only expressing his admiration; he was also attracting attention to himself, the immortalizer.

That Petronius would mention a contemporary by name need not be a cause of surprise. Petraites belonged to a group of famous entertainers whose names were common property.<sup>59</sup> Trimalchio drunkenly butchers the arias of Menecrates in his bath (73.3). We know of only one *citharoedus* by that name who was the favorite of Nero.<sup>60</sup> The singer Plocamus states that in his youth Apelles alone was his equal (64.4). A *tragoedus* by that name was killed by Caligula.<sup>61</sup> As a gladiator whose name was on everyone's lips, the Neronian Petraites could be mentioned by name as carelessly as the Neronian Menecrates.

To conclude, the evidence points to only one Petraites as the Petraites of Trimalchio. He is the famous gladiator of the time of Nero. Even if we had no other indications that the *Satyricon* was written under that emperor—and that is not the case—Petraites alone would furnish sufficient evidence of this date.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Maiuri, *PP* 8 (1948) 113 who refutes Marmorale's view (above, note 1, 69–72) that the actors or singers whom we are about to discuss cannot be identified with historical persons.

<sup>60</sup> Suet. *Nero* 30.

<sup>61</sup> Suet. *Calig.* 33.