UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Ad Mortem Via: Death in the *Satyrica* of Petronius

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Classics

by

Robin Marie Kretschmer Murray

Dissertation Committee:
Professor Andrew Zissos, Chair
Associate Professor Zina Giannopoulou
Associate Professor Andromache Karanika

2021

DEDICATION

To

my love

Sean

and my children

Caitlin, Colin, Nicolas, Jack and Anne-Marie

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to thank Dr. Andrew Zissos, an extraordinary teacher and mentor whose guidance has led me on the path to becoming a scholar. His high standards helped strengthen my arguments and make my analysis more profound. The experience I gained as his teaching assistant, and also as his student, was invaluable to my understanding of pedagogy.

I would also like to thank Dr. Andromache Karanika. In her seminars I knew I could express my ideas freely—even if they were wrong—and my development and skills as a classicist were greatly augmented by my work as her assistant editor on *TAPA*. My time with her was a vital part of my academic experience at UCI, one for which I am truly grateful.

My seminars with Dr. Zina Giannopoulou, and the time she devoted to helping me translate Greek texts, were integral to my formation. Her high scholarly standards are well complemented by her sense of humor and her ability to draw out the best from her students.

To my parents, Andy and Klaus, who raised me to prioritize my knowledge over more worldly considerations, and who always remind me that being kind is more important than being right. Thank you for your encouragement and support. And many thanks to my wonderful in-laws, Mike and Susan Murray, for giving me a quiet and peaceful place to conduct research for this project. I will always treasure the summer I spent with you.

Thank you to my dearest Sean. You are more than the love of my life. You endlessly believed in me, engaged in conversation, and supported me in so many ways. Without you I would never have accomplished this. And to my children Caitlin, Colin, Nicolas, Jack and Anne-Marie—thank you for sharing your mom with the ancient Romans and Greeks, watching out for each other (i.e., running wild for hours), and generally being wonderful people. You have been my anchor in an often surrealistic world and I love you to the moon and back.

CURRICULUM VITAE

1998-99	Teaching Assistant, Music Department, State University of New York at Binghamton
1999	B. A. *summa cum laude* in Classical Civilization, State University of New York at Binghamton
2010-2017	Teaching Assistant, Classics Department, University of California, Irvine
2017-20	Assistant Editor, TAPA (*Transactions of the American Philological Association*)
2018	M.A. in Classics, University of California, Irvine
2021	Ph.D. in Classics, University of California, Irvine

Fields of Study:

ancient novel, Roman funerary practice, Roman religion and philosophy, Petronian studies, social and cultural history of the Roman imperial period

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Ad Mortem Via: Death in the *Satyrica* of Petronius

by

Robin Marie Kretschmer Murray

Doctor of Philosophy in Classics

University of California, Irvine, 2021

Professor Andrew Zissos, Chair

The theme of death pervades the *Satyrica*, a Roman novel written by Petronius in the second half of the first century C.E. that exists today largely in fragmentary form. This dissertation investigates the role of death in the *Satyrica*, particularly its philosophical, sociological and symbolic representations of death. While other studies have addressed aspects of the subject, this dissertation seeks to synthesize much of the disparate scholarship and draw new conclusions. The chapters are thematic, ordered from the most tangible and concrete to the most abstract treatments of death in the *Satyrica*. In the first chapter, "actual death," the characters' own deaths and experiences of death provide insights into Roman perspectives on the relationship of the body and soul, views of the afterlife, and funerary practices. The second chapter, "apparent death," examines the purposeful staging of death—a frequent occurrence in

the narrative that reveals, in particular, the influence of the mime genre on the *Satyrica*. Petronius's satirization sheds light on such subjects as suicide in ancient Rome and the expected and actual sexual behavior of Roman widows. The third chapter, "anticipating death," focuses on the philosophical, spiritual and practical methods employed and satirized by its characters, such as the Stoics' methods of death preparation, initiation into mystery cults and the building of tombs. The fourth chapter, "symbolic death," examines less obvious evocations of death, especially impotence and infertility, and how these are rooted in the real anxieties caused by the high death rates and the decreasing populations of small Roman towns in the imperial period. This study concludes that one may focus on the serious philosophical, sociological and literary aspects of death without losing sight of the fact that the *Satyrica* was meant primarily to entertain. For Petronius, death and humor were entirely compatible.

INTRODUCTION

Start by admitting from cradle to tomb
It isn't that long a stay
Life is a cabaret, old chum
It's only a cabaret, old chum
And I love a cabaret!
Cabaret, 1966

In book sixteen of Tactus's *Annals,* we are told of a Petronius Arbiter whom Nero ordered to commit suicide for his suspected involvement in the Pisonian conspiracy of 65 C.E.[1] This was no ordinary suicide, if we can say there is such a thing as an ordinary suicide. Tacitus, who provides us with the most detailed account of his suicide describes it as characterized by striking lightheartedness.[2] It had the air of a pleasant evening spent in the company of friends, not the gravity usually associated with other ancient accounts of suicide, in particular other accounts of Tacitus from the Neronian age. The archetype of elite, state-ordered suicide was Socrates', made famous by Plato in his *Phaedo*. This is not the approach Petronius chose. After cutting the veins in his wrists, he bandaged them, and then periodically opened and closed the bandages. Instead of conversing on the immortality of the soul and the opinions of wise men he listened to light songs and easy verse. He feasted and indulged in sleep in order to impart a more casual air to his coerced death, and continuing in that spirit, instead of flattering Nero (or anyone else in power) in his will, he wrote down the promiscuous acts of the princeps next to the names

[1] The Pisonian conspiracy is named after Gaius Piso who was the purported ringleader of this unsuccessful plot to overthrow Nero: *Ann*. 15. 48-74.
[2] Tacitus's account of Petronius's death is the only complete account we have. Pliny the Elder references a myrrhine dipper that Petronius breaks on his deathbed to spite Nero: *NH* 37.20, and Plutarch briefly mentions him: *Quomodo adulator* 19.60.

of the male and female prostitutes he was acquainted with, along with other dirty secrets, and sent this to Nero.[3][4]

Tacitus's account of this suicide differs greatly from his textually proximate accounts of those of Seneca and his nephew, Lucan, who were both also commanded to commit suicide by Nero.[5] Seneca's suicide, modeled after Socrates', was performed with a noticeably different tenor.[6] Tacitus portrays Seneca's last moments as filled with serious conversation that included bequeathing the pattern of his virtuous life rather than possessions, to his friends. Even in his

---

[3] All translations are my own.

[4] Tacitus's full account of Petronius's suicide, which took place in 66 C.E.: *...et Cumas usque progressus Petronius illic attinebatur; nec tulit ultra timoris aut spei moras. neque tamen praeceps vitam expulit, sed incisas venas, ut libitum, obligatas aperire rursum et adloqui amicos, non per seria aut quibus gloriam constantiae peteret. audiebatque referentis nihil de immortalitate animae et sapientium placitis, sed levia carmina et facilis versus. servorum alios largitione, quosdam verberibus adfecit. iniit epulas, somno indulsit, ut quamquam coacta mors fortuitae similis esset. ne codicillis quidem, quod plerique pereuntium, Neronem aut Tigellinum aut quem alium potentium adulatus est, sed flagitia principis sub nominibus exoletorum feminarumque et novitatem cuiusque stupri perscripsit atque obsignata misit Neroni. fregitque anulum ne mox usui esset ad facienda pericula.*
And, having reached Cumae, Petronius was detained there; nor he did draw out further delay out of fear or hope. Nor did he headlong rush away his life, but having cut his veins, at the chosen time, opened the bandages again and spoke to his friends, neither about seriousness things nor about things which might bring praise of his firmness of character. And, he listened to nothing on the immortality of the soul and opinions of philosophers, but light songs and easy verse. He treated some of his servants with large gifts, others with beatings. He began a feast and indulged in sleep, so that death, although coerced, might have seem casual. Nor did he, like many of those dying, flatter in his will, Nero or Tigellinus or any other of those in power, but wrote out a full description of the shameful acts of the princeps under the names of the male prostitutes and women and the novelty of their lewd behavior and sent it under his seal to Nero. Then, he broke his signet ring lest it be used afterwards for making threats. (Tac. *Ann.*, 16.19)

[5] These suicides appear in close proximity in the *Annals* and are all a result of Nero's suspicion of their involvement in the Pisonian conspiracy. Besides Piso himself (*Ann.* 15.59),Tacitus describes several other men who were commanded to commit suicide as well. The passages for the suicide accounts of Seneca, Lucan and Petronius are: *Ann.* 15.62-63, 15.70, 16.18.

[6] Haynes 2010: 74 remarks on the comparison between these two suicides: "In contrast to Seneca's death which is so protracted as to become boring and ridiculous, Petronius's death provides a pain-in-pleasure of a similar kind to *coitus interruptus*: we want the witty scene of his death to continue or else terminate in a death that will confer some retrospective meaning on his life."

final moments he continued to dictate his wisdom.[7] Lucan, with blood flowing from the wounds he had made in his wrists, remembered a poem he had composed about a soldier wounded in a similar way, and died reciting these verses.[8]

Scholarly consensus is that the suicide victim Petronius in the Tacitean passage and the author of the *Satyrica* are one and the same person. This tentative identification, which will be discussed further later in this introduction, makes the Tacitean account an intriguing prism through which to read the *Satyrica*. What is striking about the description of Petronius's suicide, as Tacitus's account underscores, is the contrast between the serious nature of what is occurring, namely his death, and the apparently frivolous and lighthearted way he accomplishes it. This contrast is reflected in the presentation of death in the *Satyrica*, and at times, muddles an undercurrent of death that runs throughout it.[9] Conte notes: "The resonances between Tacitus's

---

[7] *ac denegante centurione conversus ad amicos, quando meritis eorum referre gratiam prohiberetur, quod unum iam et tamen pulcherrimum habeat, imaginem vitae suae relinquere testatur, cuius si memores essent, bonarum artium famam fructum constantis amicitiae laturos…et novissimo quoque momento suppeditante eloquentia advocatis scriptoribus pleraque tradidit…* (And, when the centurion denied this [request for writing tablets], he turned to his friends and seeing that he was prohibited from making a return of their services, he could at least choose to leave them that one most beautiful thing he still had, the image of his own life, which, if they kept in their memory, would bring renown for the practice of virtue and the fruit of unwavering friendship…even in the final moment his eloquence remained profuse and after calling his scribes, he communicated many things…(Tac. *Ann*. 15.62-63)

[8] *Exim Annaei Lucani caedem imperat. is profluente sanguine ubi frigescere pedes manusque et paulatim ab extremis cedere spiritum fervido adhuc et compote mentis pectore intellegit, recordatus carmen a se compositum quo vulneratum militem per eius modi mortis imaginem obisse tradiderat, versus ipsos rettulit eaque illi suprema vox fuit.* (Next, he ordered the murder of Lucanus Annaeus. With blood flowing out, when Lucan perceived that his feet and hands were growing cold, and his spirit withdrawing from his extremities little by little, with his heart still warm and with possession of his mind, Lucan remembered a poem of his own composition in which he described a wounded soldier that had perished in a way similar to his own type of death, and he repeated these very verses, and these were his last words. (Tac. *Ann*. 15.70)

[9] Although this study, like most recent ones, refers to the *Satyrica* of Petronius, it is called the *Satyricon* in the surviving manuscripts and in less recent scholarship and translations. *Satyricon*

portrait and the *Satyricon* are unquestionably intriguing. Describing the circumstances of Petronius's death…Tacitus depicts a paradoxical inimitable character."[10]

All three of the forced suicides mentioned above resulted from suspicion of involvement in Piso's conspiracy of 65 C.E. The aftermath of this conspiracy marked a downward spiral in Nero's reign that would culminate in the emperor's own suicide and end in the chaos of the "Year of the Four Emperors." This downward spiral was characterized by Nero's willingness to put people to death almost indiscriminately, as Suetonius states: *Nullus posthac adhibitus dilectus aut modus interimendi quoscumque libuisset quacumque de causa… Ed nec populo aut moenibus patriae pepercit*… (After this, neither distinction nor limit was employed in his slaughter of whomever it pleased him and from whatever cause… And he spared neither the people nor the walls of the city. *Nero* 37-8). Tacitus describes Rome at this time: …*compleri interim urbs funeribus, Capitolium victimis*… (…meanwhile the city was filled funerals, the Capital with sacrificial victims).[11] Indeed, Tacitus portentously opens his account of Nero's reign with an announcement of his first execution.[12] Edwards (2002) notes that "death was a particular preoccupation of the literature of Neronian Rome."[13] Petronius's *Satyrica* is no exception. Courtney (2001) identifies death as one of the key motifs of the *Satyrica*. He points

---

is the Latinized form of the Greek genitive plural and was meant to be understood with the Latin word for books: *libri*. The complete title was: *Satyricon libri* or, The Books of the *Satyrica*. See Courtney E. 2001:13, Slater 2013: 20. Where I cite scholars that have used *Satyricon* it remains in that form.

[10] Conte 1999: 455.

[11] Tac. *Ann*. 15.71.

[12] *Ann*. 13.1: *Prima novo principatu mors Iunii Silani proconsulis Asiae ignaro Nerone per dolum Agrippinae paratur*… (The first death under the new princeps, that of Junius Silanus, was orchestrated through the trickery of Agripinna…Tac. *Ann*. 13.1)

[13] Edwards 2002: 388. Also, Hopkins 1983: 72, Saller 1987, Champlin 1991: 105.

to the many references to death in the text—*morior* appears frequently,[14] as well as euphemisms for death: *vitali*: "bed of life" or "bier" (71.6), *vitalia*: "graveclothes" (77.7); *abiit ad plures*: "he has gone to the majority" (42.5). The same scholar also notes its particular pervasiveness in the episode of Trimalchio's dinner party (commonly referred to as the *Cena Trimalchionis* or simply the *Cena*), as well as in the thoughts, comments, and the stories of the diners, in the décor of Trimalchio's dining-room (29.1-8, 34.8); and, more obviously, in the recitation of his will (71.3-4), description of his tomb (71.5-12) and enactment of his funeral.[15] In a remarkably eccentric act, Trimalchio stages what he imagines his own funeral will be before his death (77.7-78.6) complete with the grieving of his wife, friends, and household; and physical props: graveclothes, oil for anointing the corpse, and wine for pouring libations to the dead. Reminders of death, such as a skeleton (34.8), and funeral trumpeters (78.6), are present all around the dinner guests.[16] Outside the *Cena*, a character named Lichas dies at sea (114-116), Encolpius, the main protagonist in the *Satyrica*, attempts suicide and Giton, Encolpius's lover, feigns suicide in the same episode (94.8-15). In addition, on the symbolic level, Encolpius's impotence—a punishment from the minor god Priapus, protector of fertility—is equated with death. The city of Croton, in southern Italy, which provides the setting for the final episode in the extant text is

---

[14] The text of the *Satyrica* used throughout is that of K. Müller (ed. 3 Munich 1983, with German translation by W. Ehlers).
References abound both inside and outside of the *Cena*: *morior* (to die, expire) 7.4, 46.8, 57.6, 58.12, 62.9, 72.2, 80.4, 94.10, 98.3, 101.2: *perire* (pass away, perish): 20.1, 21.3, 47.7, 63.10, 69.8, 79.8, 80.9, 94.1, 98.9, 109.10, 112.6, 115.17, 119.1, 129.7, 137.12.

[15] Courtney 2001: 96-97. The *Cena Trimalchionis*, or "dinner at Trimalchio's," episode takes place at chapters 26-78 and represents the most complete portion of the extant *Satyrica*. Henceforth this study will refer to this episode by the shortened form "*Cena*."

[16] Physical reminders of death are frequent in the *Cena*. In addition to those mentioned, Trimalchio's dining-room entrance is guarded by a painted dog (29.2) and his exit (72.9) by a real dog reminding those who come and go of the Underworld guarded by Cerberus; in the same mural where the painted dog appears, the three Fates spin the threads of life (29.6); and a clock with a trumpeter ticks away Trimalchio's life by the hour (26.9).

described as a society comprised of cadavers or those who prey on them (116.9).[17] It is here that our protagonist and his companions, in alliance with Eumolpus, an old man who has recently joined them, perpetrate a fraud as part of a "get rich quick scheme." Eumolpus, feigning illness to death makes the bizarre stipulation in his will that his beneficiaries must cut up and eat his body in order to inherit (141). Dunbabin (2003) claims that "[w]hen Petronius makes Trimalchio return constantly to the theme of death, whether ordering his tomb or laying himself out on his bier, he is only exaggerating a popular tradition for which we have extensive other evidence; it should not be taken to reflect a special morbid preoccupation."[18] This study however, will show there to indeed be a special morbid preoccupation with death throughout the *Satyrica* that goes beyond and runs much deeper than the exaggeration of popular traditions.

More precisely, the purpose of this study is to provide a comprehensive account of the theme of death in the *Satyrica* from three perspectives: philosophical, symbolic and sociological. However, this project is not the first to attempt to analyze the theme of death in the *Satyrica*. Many of the approaches taken in earlier scholarship also deal in some way with these philosophical, symbolic and sociological aspects.

Scholarship focusing on the philosophical treatment of death dwells in particular on Epicurean and Stoic elements. These were indeed the philosophical schools most prevalent among the elite during the early Principate.[19] Arrowsmith's pivotal work, "Luxury and Death in the *Satyricon,*" (1960) looks to the *Cena* to support his thesis that its themes of *luxuria* and death spell out the spiritual demise of Roman society. Arrowsmith argues that Petronius conveys the

---

[17] *Sat*. 116: *in quibus nihil aliud est nisi cadavera, quae lacerantur, aut corvi, qui lacerant*. (…in which there is nothing else but cadavers who are torn to pieces, or crows who do the tearing…).
[18] Dunbabin 2003: 132-133.
[19] That is, he period of the reign of Augustus to that of Marcus Aurelius, 31 B.C.E. to 180 C.E. The emperor Marcus Aurelius who ruled from 161-180 C.E. was a famous Stoic.

message that this decline is reversible only by a return to "Epicurean *askesis*," or the consistent practice of the philosophical teachings of Epicurus.[20] Arrowsmith looks beyond the *Cena* to the entire *Satyrica* to draw this conclusion, but much of the scholarship that deals with Petronius's portrayal of death focusses on the *Cena*. Sullivan, who wrote extensively on the *Satyrica*, briefly addresses the theme of death in his monograph, *The "Satyrica" of Petronius* (1968). In this study he points to similarities between the presentation of death in the *Satyrica* and in Seneca's writings, and concludes that "many Romans, including…Seneca, were, like Trimalchio, obsessed with the thought of death, whether their attitude was one of didactic resignation or fearful preparation."[21] Among the similarities he noticed between these two authors was how they treated the topics of the predictability of the death, the certitude of death, and the importance of burial.[22] Sullivan's main purpose in comparing these two authors was to evaluate how far Petronius, the Epicurean, meant to parody Seneca the Stoic.[23] Sullivan concludes there was "recognizable parody" of Stoic philosophy in the *Satyrica* achieved through parody of Seneca's

[20] Arrowsmith 1966: 309: "As constipation stands to food, so impotence stands to sexuality; both are the products of *luxuria* in a society which has forgotten its cultural modalities and which cannot recover life, except by Epicurean *askesis*, by rediscovering the sense of true need, of necessary economy, in pleasure." (LSJ s.v. ἄσκησις defined as "exercise, practice, or training.") The details of exercise or practice meant different things to different philosophical schools. But, generally, as Nido 2018:10 states: "[H]aving seen the insufficiency of one's values and understanding, one must weaken the passions that are at their root through practices of *askēsis* that limit the pursuit of sensual pleasures to what is prescribed by a philosophical school's teachings." Hadot 1995: 93-101 saw *askesis* as the practice of the "spiritual" exercises of a philosophical school. Arrowsmith builds on Highet 1941 who argues that Petronius is a moral satirist and an Epicurean.

[21] Sullivan 1968: 132.

[22] Sullivan 1968: 200-203.

[23] While it is far from universally accepted that Petronius was an Epicurean, if we must place him in a philosophical category, most scholars think he leaned towards Epicureanism. In addition to Arrowsmith, Highet 1941, Raith 1966, Sullivan 1968: 212-13, Rankin 1969, Walsh 1974, Kragelaund 1989.

writings.[24] More recently, Edwards (2007), draws our attention to the description of death, made by the Republican-era poet (and Epicurean adherent) Lucretius, as the departure of a contented guest from a feast.[25] In contrast to Arrowsmith she concludes, "Well-mannered guests recognize when the time to leave has come. Trimalchio's use of food as a strategy to deny death could be read as a kind of inversion of this philosophical injunction."[26]

Death appears symbolically in many forms in the *Satyrica*. As already mentioned, Arrowsmith argues that the philosophical and symbolic meet since, in his view, Petronius presents a philosophical solution to the symbolically dead Roman culture.[27] Many of the symbolic instances of death in the *Satyrica* have models in earlier literature, incorporating elements, especially of epic. These need to be addressed within a broader discussion of the literary influences on the *Satyrica*. Sullivan provides a detailed account of the literary influences.[28] Conte (1996), in his characterization of Encolpius as the mythomaniac narrator expressed the view that Petronius seeks "to hand over his stage to degraded characters nourished on great literary models."[29] For Conte, as well as several scholars before, one of the most

[24] Sullivan 1968: 210-213.
[25] Lucr. *DRN* 3.938-9.
[26] Edwards 2007: 171-172.
[27] Arrowsmith 1966: 329-30 argues that Petronius means to convey the idea that a return to true Epicuran values will infuse life into Roman society: "If society has organized itself around the satiety that brings death, man's hope is to rediscover the old pagan landscape, the radiance here and now, in which everything had *numen*, and nobody needed eternal life because life itself was good and had god in it."
[28] Sullivan 1968: 115-253. These include especially Homer, Virgil, Horace, Lucan, Ovid and Seneca.
[29] Conte 1996: viii. He elaborates (24) on what he means by "mythomaniac": "I mean this in the sense that even if [the narrator] does not consciously intend to falsify the narrative, he lacks the ability to keep separate in his account the level of mythical fantasy, inspired by literature, and the level of events around him."

important literary models for the *Satyrica* is the *Odyssey*.[30] Klebs' (1889) identification of the wrath of Poseidon against Odysseus in the *Odyssey* as the model for the wrath of Priapus against Encolpius is the first in a series of scholarly analyses to see interaction between the *Satyrica* and the Homeric epics in varying degrees. Some of the more important parallels include the association of Odysseus's *katabasis*, or descent to the Underworld, with Encolpius's experience at the *Cena* (*Od*. 11.20-47, *Sat*. 26-78); a comparison of Lichas to the Cyclops and Lichas's ship to his cave (*Od.* 9.187-542, *Sat*. 101.5-7); and Eumolpus's recognition of Encolpius by his genitalia with the recognition Eurycleia, an old nurse, makes of Odysseus when she sees his scar (*Od*. 19.335-507, *Sat*. 105.10). The implication of this would be that, in a large part, the *Satyrica* unfolds as a parody of the *Odyssey*. However, Conte cautions against taking these comparisons too far: "it seems risky to turn these allusions into a general key to interpretation…it is necessary to observe that Priapus's role in the fragments we have is sporadic and the place of divine persecution is quite small in the plot of the *Odyssey*."[31]

The *Aeneid* is another major epic that has been identified as a key model for Petronius. Morgan (2013) sees the *Cena* as a "rewriting of Virgil's rewriting of Homer: a metaphorical *katabasis*."[32] Between their entrance to Trimalchio's dining-room which is guarded by the painting of a dog accompanied by the words *Cave canum* (29.2) and their escape attempt which is initially thwarted by a real dog who is at length distracted by a few pieces of food thrown down my Giton (72.9), is a banquet that revolves so much around death that it is difficult to

[30] This view is comprehensively treated by several scholars starting with Klebs 1889, Sullivan 1968: 92-8, Walsh 1970: 28-30. Mordine 2013 directs our attention to Odyssean aspects of the *Cena* in particular.
[31] Conte: 1994: 464.
[32] Morgan 2013: 36; Also: Leeman 1967, Cameron 1970, Newton 1982, Bodel 1994, Conte 1996, Rimell 2002:182, Schmeling 2011: 95.

disagree with this characterization. This parallels the Underworld in the Aeneid which is guarded by the dog Cerberus. The Sibyl, who guides Aeneas through the Underworld, throws down honey-cakes to the distract Cerberus (6.417-423). In line with this he sees the death of Euryalus in the *Aeneid* (9.44-45) as a model for Encolpius's attempted suicide over Giton, his love interest (*Sat*. 94.8-10).[33]. The final episode of the extant *Satyrica* (116-141) is a symbolically dead society that provides a platform for Petronius to engage with the theme of *captatio*, a theme that Champlin (1991) shows is rooted in literature and not the real-life problem that Roman authors claim. The theme of impotence, which permeates the *Satyrica*, is another form of symbolic death. Murgatroyd (2000) looks to the influences of different references from epic, in particular, Dido's suicide scene (*Aen*. 4.630-93) and Aeneas's meeting with her in the Underworld (*Aen*. 6.440-47) in Vergil's *Aeneid*;[34] in addition, Murgatroyd sees a debt to Senaca's *Apocolocyntosis* (11.6) in Encolpius's soliloquy on impotence.[35] The novelty lies in the personification of Encolpius's genitalia and "for the first time the penis is a distinct and fully realized person."[36] With this device, Petronius parodies the aforementioned literary models: his lifeless penis takes on the characteristics of a tragic, dying figure. Rimell (2002) argues, somewhat more speculatively, that "the entire text grows out of the mischevious Latin pun of eating as being" (*est*= he eats/he is) and connects this to the theme of death in the Widow of Ephesus tale (*Sat*. 111.1-112.8), where literary models are metaphorically consumed into the text.[37] The result, in Rimell's view, is a kind of symbolic, literary death of epic. This interpretation emphasizes what she describes as "the power [of literature] to move, upset or

[33] *Aen*. 9.444-45.
[34] Murgatroyd 2000: 350, 51.
[35] Murgatroyd 2000: 350.
[36] Murgatroyd 2000: 347.
[37] Rimell 2002: 10.

change its readers" since "literature in the *Satyricon* is no longer written, static, and containable, but is imagined as a live body, a flesh or food ingested in the process of learning and spewed out from the bodies in performance."[38] Schmeling (2011) cautions against using such elaborate conceptual structures in interpreting the literary models. He prefers to attribute much to Petronius's mythomaniac narrator, Encolpius, "who interprets all events in his life as having parallels to events in epic and tragedy" and not to any intention of giving new meanings to earlier literary works.[39]

Often, these philosophical and symbolic elements of death illuminate sociological perspectives. Bodel (1994) views the *katabasis* of the *Cena* as a symbol of Trimalchio's entrapment in a society of freedmen from which Roman society provides no escape. Saylor (1987) claims that the *Cena* stands as a watered-down imitation of the funeral games from *Aeneid* Book 5, and points to how the attitude of the freedmen there reflects the reality of the use of slaves in gladiatorial games.[40] Champlin (1991) addresses the reality of legacy hunting—that is, the practice of people attaching themselves to rich, older people in order to be written into their wills—as depicted in Petronius's society of Croton. In addition to these more metaphorical approaches, the *Satyrica* reflects and provides commentary on real-life death preparation in Rome, Roman funerary customs and views on mortality. Dunbabin (2003) argues that the prevalence of *memento mori*, or "reminders of death," items displayed at the Cena was not uncommon and likely a way for people to address their mortality. Hope (2011) finds that

[38] Rimell 2002: 9. Schmeling 2011: xxxvii.
[39] Schmeling 2011: xxxvii.
[40] Saylor 1987:598 "[T]here seems to be a thin line for the freedmen of the dinner between watching a combat and being in one. The proximity to real games because of status seems to be another way of saying that games are part of the outlook of these characters because… part of their actions in real life."

Trimalchio's tomb and his epitaph "draw upon a repertoire taken from real tombs, although most real tombs were decorated with considerably fewer images than Trimalchio requests."[41]

Like the scholarship on other areas of the *Satyrica*, the scholarship on death is manifold in its approach and varied in its conclusions with no one having provided a unified overview of the subject. One objective of this study is to pull together and try to harmonize, to the extent possible, these disparate contributions.

Before proceeding, it will be useful to outline the various questions and uncertainties surrounding the *Satyrica* as they bear upon any study of the work. Most fundamentally these uncertainties arise in much part from the fragmentary survival of the work.

For the purpose of this study we will follow the scholarly consensus that the author of the *Satyrica* is the same Caius Petronius whose suicide is described by Tacitus in the passage quoted earlier. In other words, our operative assumption will be that the author was the so-called *arbiter elegatiae* ("authority on matters of taste") of Nero.[42] Even taking this as a working

---

[41] Hope 2013: 153.

[42] Tacitus describes this relationship between Nero and Petronius*: proconsul tamen Bithyniae et mox consul vigentem se ac parem negotiis ostendit. dein revolutus ad vitia seu vitiorum imitatione inter paucos familiarium Neroni adsumptus est, elegantiae arbiter, dum nihil amoenum et molle adfluentia putat, nisi quod ei Petronius adprobavisset.* (As proconsul in Bithynia and soon afterwards as consul, Petronius showed himself strong and equal to business. Then having turned back to vice, or pretending vice, he was admitted into the small group of those close to Nero as the authority on matters of taste, and he thought nothing charming or delicately extravagant unless Petronius approved it. *Ann*. 16.18). Conte outlines some of the similarities between the *Satyrica*, and Tacitus's description of Petronius. These similarities have been part of what confirms the identity of Petronius as its author. Conte summarizes: "It is clear that the portrait owes much to Tacitus's art, yet to many readers of the *Satyricon* the resemblances to the atmosphere of the novel have seemed too close to be coincidence." (1999: 455). Sullivan 1968: 26-7 also outlines the literary arguments in favor of Petronius's authorship. This identification would be corroborated by the various echoes of events in the reign of Nero found in the *Satyrica*, such as the "marriage" of Giton and Pannychis (25.1-26.6) as discussed in chapter 3.

assumption, the *Satyrica* remains notoriously difficult to interpret.[43] There are many reasons for this including the fact that the text has survived in a very fragmentary state. Indeed, the *Cena Trimalchionis* is the only complete episode of substantial length. Reconstructions by scholars have concluded that there were somewhere between between 16 and 24 scrolls corresponding to individual books. What is extant of the *Satyrica* today appears to be from only three of these, 14 through 16.[44] In other words, not only does this represent a tiny fraction of the original text, but also a narrow sample of the whole work. This compounds the problem of grasping even basic plot mechanics. For instance, it is not entirely clear what so upset Quartilla, a priestess of Priapus, that she deems it necessary to initiate Encolpius and Giton into her Priapean mystery cult (17-26) or what is behind Lichas's intense hatred of Encolpius (100.5-101.1).

At this point is will be useful to provide a summary of the plot to the extent that we can from the fragments. The following summary is based on the reconstructions of Conte and Schmeling.[45] The entire story is told from the first-person perspective of Encolpius, the narrator and protagonist.

---

[43] For accounts of the difficulties of the *Satyrica*, including who its author was, when it was composed, its manuscript tradition, and placing it in a genre, the following scholars provide comprehensive accounts: K.F.C. Rose 1971; Sullivan 1968: 21-33; Schmeling 2011: xiii-xvii; xviii-xxi for the manuscript tradition; Slater 2013; Prag and Repath 2009 and Hofmann 2014. Most scholars date its composition to the reign of Nero. Hofmann offers an important dissenting voice: "The setting in Neronian time or a bit later does not require contemporary composition, especially since many Greek novels are also set in a distant historical past. A date of composition in the first half of the second century by an otherwise unknown Petronius (later erroneously identified with the "Arbiter" in the *Annals*), or an author taking the name of Nero's courtier as *nom de plume*, would suit better the history of the genre and the type of author demanded by such a work."

[44] Slater 2013: 16, and 16-31. Hofmann 2014: 96-118. For opinions on reconstruction of the *Satyrica* see Ciaffi 1955, Sullivan 1968 34-80, Walsh 1970: 73-110, Jensson 2002 and 2004, and Schmeling 2011: xxii-xxv.

[45] Conte 1999: 457-58; Schmeling 2011: xxiii-xxiv. Habash 2018 provides an excellent account of the characters and analysis of Petronius's methods of introducing them.

The narrative as extant begins in the middle of book 14. Encolpius is listening to Agamemnon, a teacher of rhetoric (and not a very good one), complain about the decline of oratory, an important part of a complete education for Romans. It emerges that Encolpius is traveling accompanied by two companions: Ascyltos (who seems to be man of dubious character) and Giton (young, pretty, and possibly a former slave). The three are entangled in a love triangle.

A priestess of Priapus, a minor god and protector of fertility, named Quartilla, along with her maidservants, shows up at their lodgings in distress. She accuses Encolpius of illicitly viewing the secret rites of Priapus (a serious offense in the ancient world if one was not initiated into the cult) and claims that the only solution is to initiate him into the cult of Priapus. Encolpius, seemingly unaware of what this entails and wanting to help out, agrees. The initiation ceremony turns out to be an orgy orchestrated to fulfill Quartilla's insatiable sexual appetite. Here, for the first time, we see that Encolpius is struggling with impotence, and as the story continues, learn that this is likely a punishment from Priapus, fittingly since he is a minor god who protects gardens and orchards with "unrestrained sexuality."[46] The three escape after a couple of days of this and are invited to a dinner at the home of a freedman, Trimalchio.

In this dinner episode, often referred to as the *Cena Trimalchionis* or simply *Cena*, Trimalchio, a fabulously rich freedman, hosts one of the most elaborate and luxurious dinners ever described in literature. The dinner centers around the conversation of the dinner guests who are all freedman, as well. Death is one of the main foci of the conversation and as the dinner progresses it takes on an especially macabre tone when Trimalchio reads his will, composes an epitaph and gives directions for the building of his tomb. Disturbed, the three companions

[46] Conte 1994: 465.

attempt an escape but are thwarted by a guard dog. Then Trimalchio enacts his own funeral and so much noise is made by his funeral trumpeters that a fire brigade comes to investigate and the diners scatter. The three companions escape amidst the chaos.

Soon after this the love triangle falls apart. Ascyltos and Encolpius start to duel over Giton, but Giton intervenes and then chooses to go away with Ascyltos. Depressed and love-sick, Encolpius wanders into a picture gallery and meets Eumolpus, an old, itinerant poet who loves to recite his poetry in public, although he is not usually met with enthusiasm, and we are given the impression that the audience thinks his poetry is second-rate. Eumolpus accompanies Encolpius to his lodgings for dinner and Giton returns, penitent. Eumolpus is obviously attracted to Giton and Encolpius grows increasingly jealous. Events come to a head when Giton leaves the lodgings and Eumolpus locks Encolpius behind in the room so he can seek out Giton, unhindered. Despairing, Encolpius attempts suicide, but they return before he can follow through with it. Giton then dramatically pretends to kill himself with a blunt razor out of love for Encolpius and Encolpius follows suit.

The episodes up to this point take place in a coastal town in Campania called Puteoli (near modern-day Naples). The scene shifts to sea when the Eumolpus, Giton and Encolpius leave Puteoli in haste (perhaps they fell out with the landlord) and stowaway on a boat. When Encolpius and Giton hear the voice of the captain, Lichas, they are struck with fear. There are inidcations that prior to this scene Encolpius had a romantic encounter with Lichas (and perhaps also his wife) that did not end well. Attempts to disguise themselves fail, but they are ultimately saved by Tryphaena, Lichas's girlfriend, who takes a fancy to Giton. Here, Eumolpus tells the story of the Widow of Ephesus to a captivate audience of sailors. Soon after, a storm overtakes

the ship and Lichas drowns. Encolpius and his companions escape to shore where they encounter Lichas's body and bury it.

The final episode of the extant *Satyrica* takes place at Croton, a port city in southern Italy. When the three companions learn that a bizarre community of legacy hunters exist here, they decide to conduct a fraud. Eumolpus plays a dying old man and Giton and Encolpius his servants. Thinking that Eumolpus will leave his favorites a huge inheritance, the Crotonites fawn over the three companions. Here, Encolpius tries to have an affair with a beautiful woman named Circe, but his impotence gets in the way. He seeks out a remedy from an old woman, but to no avail. However, soon after, he magically recovers his sexual ability. The Crotonites discover the fraud of the three companions and, in a strange last act before they move on to new adventures, Eumolpus dictates a will that requires his legatees to cut up and eat his body.

A further complication for overall interpretation—again, partly arising from the fragmentary condition—is the problem of locating the *Satyrica* within a specific genre. As Slater (2013) observes, its title "seems to allude both to the tradition of Roman satire (*satura*) and to the novel's satyr-like subject matter, though ironically, since the narrator Encolpius often fails as a satyr."[47] Among ancient literary genres, there are two types of Greek texts that scholars consider especially influential to the *Satyrica*, namely Greek Romances (or novels) and Milesian tales. With respect to the first of these, Walsh (1970), among other scholars, makes a case for grouping it with the extant Greek novels: Chariton, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*; Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*; Xenophon of Ephesus, *Ephesiaca*; Longus the Sophist, *Daphne and Chloe*; and Heliodorus, *Ethiopica*.[48] These are a group of texts written by various authors between the first

[47] Slater 2013: 21.
[48] See Trenker 1958, Müller C. 1980, Lefèvre 1997, Harrison 1998. Schmeling distinguishes two parts to classifying the *Satyrica*: the outer and inner forms. Here I refer to the outer form about

and fourth centuries C.E. which are serious in nature "or at least the protagonists and their love are taken seriously and viewed as sufferers who arouse sympathy."[49] Modern scholars refer to them as "Greek novels" or "romances" for conceptual clarity, but in the ancient world they would have been referred to broadly as *fabula* (tales) or *historia* (stories).[50] They are set somewhere in the Greek-speaking world and written in Greek. Their plots, which are indebted to the Homeric tradition, follow a standard form: a male and female lover find themselves separated by difficult circumstances and must proceed through a series of adventures—shipwrecks, misidentifications, feigned deaths and travels to foreign lands—before they are reunited and live happily ever after.[51] The hallmark of these Greek novels is the seriousness with which love is treated: the action is often driven by the many problems the woman faces as she tries to preserve her virginity for her one, true love.[52] The *Satyrica* would appear to enact a parodic reversal of these conventions. Its storyline features a central pair of two lovers who go through many adventures similar to those in the Greek novels, but their love relationship is homosexual and chastity of any sort is mocked.[53] This and other features have caused scholars to classify it as a

---

which Schmeling 2011: xxxiv comments: "Since the term 'novel' is so broad and constantly becoming more inclusive, there should be little disagreement perhaps in applying it to the outer form of the *Satyrica*. For the inner form there is little or no agreement."

[49] Conte 1999: 459

[50] It should be pointed out that, as Conte cautions, "none of the modern terms that we use to designate a fictional narrative (short story, novel, etc.) has a classical tradition, nor does the ancient world have anything that corresponds to these terms." Conte 1999: 459

[51] Conte 1999: 463 notes: "parody of Homer has an immense literary tradition (comedy, epigram, and even the Priapea go in for it heavily); it has even been thought that the whole genre of the novel goes back, more or less directly, to Homeric epic." Conte 199: 459 also provides a general summary of the Greek Romance plot. Sullivan 1968: 96 describes the Odyssey, as "the ancestor of all *Reiserromanen*," that is, romantic adventure tales. Also, Schmeling 2011: xlv.

[52] Conte 1999: 455.

[53] Encolpius also has female lovers: Quartilla, (19-16); probably, Lichas's wife in an earlier, lost episode; and Circe, whom he meets at Croton (126-132.1). For Encolpius's bi-sexuality see: Hyde 2011: 354, Jašková: 2010, MacLean 2016. For a more general discussion of bi-sexuality in the ancient world see Pinheiro 2012.

parody of the Greek novel. There are, however, important discrepancies that may make this characterization inadequate, including the occasional pornographic focus which is completely foreign to the Greek novel. As Conte points out, Giton and Encolpius never undergo dramatic separations of the Greek novel type, nor are they the obsessive focus of the story.[54]

The second type of Greek text that scholars identify as exerting a significant influence on the *Satyrica* are the so-called Milesian tales or *fabulae Milesiae*. These humorous short stories took their name from Aristides of Miletus who wrote a collection of them, the *Milesiaka*, which, unfortunately, is no longer extant.[55] As far as can be told, the *fabulae Milesiae* incorporated erotic and titillating stories. The tale of the Pergamene Youth (85.1-87.10) and the Widow of Ephesus (111.1—112.8) are, in fact, both versions of famous Milesian tales.[56] Hoffman argues that "the *Satyrica* is a Roman adaptation of a Greek hypo-text in the style of the Milesian Tales with their specific narrative structure and their frivolous and salacious subject matter, with a blend of Greek and Roman elements."[57] This is not altogether convincing. As Schmeling notes, "the *Satyrica* is not merely a collection of episodes or tales, whether Milesian or of some other kind sewn together without motivations, causes, effects, or unifying characters."[58]

Other scholars, point to the *prosimetrum* form in the *Satyrica*, that is its alternation of poetry and prose. This would appear to indicate a specific affiliation to Menippean satire which

---

[54] Conte 1999: 460.
[55] Aristedes, a native son of the city of Miletus in Asia minor, wrote his now lost work around 100 B.C.E. Sisenna, an historian writing in the first century C.E., translated Aristedes' tales into Latin. At present we have only one fragment of Aristedes and ten of Sisenna. See Conte 1999: 460, Bowie 2013: 247-48.
[56] For a general discussion of Milesian Tales see Lefèvre 1997, Conte 1999: 461, Harrison 2007: 221 and Schmeling 2011: xxxi-ii. For a particular discussion of the Pergamene Youth see Courtney 2001: 136-9, Schmeling 2011: 358-365; for the Widow of Ephesus see Schmeling 2011: 427-435 and Bowie 2013: 249-251.
[57] Hoffman 2014:112.
[58] Schmeling 2011: xxxi.

however is a rather vague, generic category.[59] This formal feature by itself, however, seems insufficient to categorize it as Menippean satire.[60] It would appear that classifying it loosely as an ancient novel has heuristic value and to a degree accommodates most scholarly views, precisely because the aforementioned categories would not appear to be mutually exclusive. There is, of course, a risk here, as Schmeling points out "to describe or recognize the *Satyrica* as a novel is also to begin to interpret it…As a novel, the *Satyrica* is seen as a work of entertainment, but that does not mean that Petronius or other novelists always and everywhere intend to entertain only."[61]

Like the Greek Romances that have come down to us, the *Satyrica* incorporates elements of other genres, especially epic, but also tragedy, and in doing so, induces the implied reader to expect certain plot elements.[62] This holds true in its presentation of death. For instance, like Greek romance novels, the *Satyrica* contains instances of apparent death (*Scheintod*), but its characters are aware of the deception. Unlike the *Scheintod* of Greek romance, the deaths of the *Satyrica* serve as humorous episodes rather than integral parts of the plot. Its characters also deviate from death in tragedy and epic such as when suicide is committed for trivial reasons.

In addition to the above problems, the fact that the *Satyrica* reflects a culture so different from our own adds to the difficulties of interpretation. For instance, when Trimalchio directs

---

[59] Conte 1999: 461: "From the fragments we have, this type of satire seems to have been an open vessel, varying greatly in the themes it accommodated and especially in its form." Varro, writing in the second century B.C.E., referred to the writings of the Cynic philosopher Menippus of Gadara, who wrote in the third century, as "Menippean satires" but the term *prosimetrum* came into use in the Middle Ages. Relihan 1993, Conte 1999: Courtney E. 2001: 20-1. Harrison 2007: 215.
[60] Relihan 1993: 7-9, 10; Courtney E. 2001: 20-1; Schmeling 2011: xxx; Hofmann 2014: 112.
[61] Schmeling 2011: xxxvi.
[62] Conte 1999: 459-60.

Habinnas to build his tomb (71.5-12) we struggle to understand just how exaggerated Trimalchio's description is, though archeological evidence confirms that freedmen devoted considerable resources to one of the only ways they could display their status to posterity.[63] At the same time it is difficult to know how much we can take at face value from notoriously unreliable characters, especially Encolpius the narrator, through whom most of the narrative is filtered. Edwards states that it is "not easy to identify the moral perspective of a work whose central characters are hypocritical chancers, particularly when neither the opening nor the closing sections have survived."[64] In short, answering with any certainty even fundamental questions about the *Satyrica* is an impossible task.

The foregoing makes clear the difficulties of any thematic analysis of the *Satyrica*, including the present study of death. Schmeling, however, points to important sources of corroboration: "When we have finished analyzing the *Satyrica*, we realize that all the items (words and grammar, food and drink, superstition and religious beliefs, names and places, street life and nautical lore, clothes and jewelry, slaves and love affairs, human aspirations and failures, and so on) are corroborated by evidence in ancient literature, art, and archeology." Thus, the *Satyrica*, in spite of the problems it presents, may be a valuable resource for studying Roman death. In the *Satyrica* there are indeed powerful messages about death, messages that reveal, as well as provoke examination of, prevailing ideas of the time about how to anticipate and deal with death.

---

[63] Hope 2013: 155: "Funerary monuments and epitaphs allowed this social group to mark and celebrate their successes and achievements; in the cemetery the freed slaves had a freedom of expression denied them elsewhere; here they could create their identity unfettered by elite expectations and prejudices."
[64] Edwards 2007: 171.

This project attempts, partially, to bring much of this disparate information into one place but also to present its own unified view of four ways in which the theme of death manifests itself in the *Satyrica*. These four ways provide the framework for the structure of the dissertation as it considers the theme of death. The chapters are ordered from the most tangible and most concrete to the least tangible and most abstract treatments of death in the *Satyrica*.

The first chapter, titled "Actual Death" focusses on the one instance of death in the primary storyline, that of Lichas (114.6, 115.6-115.20), as well as those instances where characters share what they claim to be their own experiences of people who have died. Many of these appear in stories, such as Eumolpus's story of the widow of Ephesus (111.1—112.8) and those told by the freedmen at the *Cena* (in particular, by the characters Seleucus 42.1-7 and Echion 45.1-46.8). Here we see the characters of the *Satyrica* indicate their understanding that death was a physical separation of the body and the soul and express a variety of views on the fate of the soul. However, in dealing with actual death, we see an emphasis placed on life and living rather than dwelling on the macabre.

The second chapter, "Apparent Death," examines the instances of death which are purposely staged. Petronius creates a veritable theater for the presentation of death in the *Satyrica* which, in both its substance and form, harnesses theatrical material. In these cases, someone is "in on the joke," so to speak. The most obvious instance of this is Trimalchio's enactment of his own funeral (77.7-78.6)—in which his household and friends participate as well, playing the part of mourners at a funeral. Literary influences are especially important to this chapter since the instances of play-acting death are frequently rooted in the form of the mime and in the material of scenes from literature that would have been well-known to Petronius's audience. For instance, Giton stages his own suicide (94.12-15), a common occurrence in mime,

and Encolpius, appearing to believe it is real, reacts with his own real attempt at suicide. The fake suicide of Giton evokes, at least superficially, a tragic suicide, but more precisely suicide from New Comedy and mime insofar as Encolpius thinks it is real whereas the audience knows it to be a farce. At Croton, Giton and Encolpius play the parts of servants to Eumolpus who is pretending to be a dying old man, and Eumolpus describes their deception as a mime (117.4). Encolpius's speech over Lichas's body (115.9-19) resembles the lamentations found in epic as well as tragedy. In a more general sense, death is presented in a stylistically theatrical manner which effectively heightens the audience's response to these situations. As Haynes states: "Though the narrative of the *Satyrica* is often erotic, pleasure is always crossed with frustration, danger, and even death… Similarly, the pleasure/violence of the narrative is heightened by the theatricality with which it is often staged."[65] The tale of the Widow of Ephesus in which the widow is praised for being *univira*, or a one-man-woman, when she enters the tomb to die with her late husband is taken from a well-known story. Eumolpus's humorous retelling raises questions about the expected and actual sexual behavior of Roman women. Underlying the fun behind apparent deaths in the *Satyrica*, especially those that imitate suicide, is the more serious consideration of how these scenes comment on sociological attitudes towards self-killing in Rome.

The third chapter, "Anticipating Death," focusses on Petronius's portrayal of how the Romans prepared for death. Practical, philosophical and spiritual methods of preparation for death are the focus of this chapter. Practical methods of death preparation undertaken by Romans such as tomb-building and creating wills quite literally "take center stage" in the *Satyrica*, most notably when Trimalchio dramatically provides detailed instructions for building his tomb during

[65] Haynes 2010: 77.

the *Cena* and reads his will aloud (71.5-12, 71.2). Petronius continuously questions the efficacy of philosophy, and especially the way that philosophy encouraged its followers to anticipate and prepare for death. Long states: "It is difficult to think of a society where members of the upper class were more generally aware of philosophy than seems to have been the case in Imperial Rome. For some of them, indeed, that awareness will have been quite superficial and scarcely positive, but every senator and knight would have known the difference between the values of a Stoic and those of an Epicurean."[66] On the one hand, the very value of philosophy (in general, as well as Epicureanism and Stoicism in particular) is questioned by Trimalchio. Trimalchio directs Habinnas to write on his tombstone, *nec unquam philosophum audivit* (nor did he ever listen to a philosopher, 71.12). On the other hand, early in the *Cena*, Trimalchio muses on the shortness of life and the importance of living well in the moment (34.10). In the end, Trimalchio may be pointing to the ineffectiveness of philosophy's methods of death preparation for a freedman. Rather, he sees death as his final "emancipation."[67] Encolpius expresses views on burial that bear a strong resemblance to those promoted by Stoics and Epicureans alike. While the *Satyrica* does not seem to advocate a consistent view of philosophy's ability to provide preparation for death, this very inconsistency raises questions about the benefits of the methods of death preparation philosophy offered its followers. Spiritual methods of death preparation feature prominently in this chapter as well. Mystery cults—which often, through their promise of an

[66] Long 2003: 186. Long explains some of the major factors contributing to the spread of Greek philosophy among the Roman elite of the Imperial period. These include a greater access to Greek philosophers and texts; "requirements of higher education in the areas of rhetoric and grammar; the poverty of the roman religion in the area of ethics and spirituality; and…the civil wars that brought the Republic to an end leaving the Senate a rubber stamp of imperial autocracy rather than a satisfying arena for intellectual debate and self-definition. See also, Noyes 1973: 226. "Ethics was the philosophy of greatest importance in Rome, and, in the first century, Stoicism was the orthodox Roman morality."

[67] Bodel 1994: 253, *passim*.

afterlife, were a means of death preparation —are humorously treated through an initiation ceremony of the cult of Priapus (19-26.5). Other methods of anticipating death represented in this chapter include astrology (35.2-6, 39.3-13), which some believed could foretell one's hour of death, as well as *memento mori*, or "reminders of death" such as a clock that ticks away Trimalchio's life, the Fates spinning threads on a wall mural, and a skeleton (26.9, 29.6, 34.8). Additionally, characters muse on the topic of anticipating death. For instance, Lichas's death presents an opportunity for Encolpius to soliloquize about the futility of death preparation, mingling both theatrical and philosophical elements. While there is no entirely consistent view that emerges on the efficacy of the many forms of death preparation in the *Satyrica*, preparing to die spiritually and practically is important to its characters.

Chapter four, titled "Metaphorical Death," analyzes the role of the less obvious examples of death in the broader context of the *Satyrica*. Encolpius's persistent impotence is a frequent example of this and is the main focus of this chapter. Both impotence and, more generally, infertility, imply a certain type of death insofar as they prevent those afflicted with them from continuing their life through heirs and children. Petronius creates an infertile society at Croton which is described as a town *in quibus nihil aliud est nisi cadavera, quae lacerantur, aut corvi, qui lacerant* (in which there is nothing else but cadavers who are torn to pieces, or crows who do the tearing, 116.9). This category of "death" is particularly symbolic when considered in a broader context. Roman society in the principate was immersed in death by its high infant mortality rate, its wars, and the migration patterns of its people towards cities in their quest for work as an influx of slaves from various conquests rendered agricultural jobs increasingly scarce.

Humankind's ongoing struggle with the subject of death is reflected in works of literature from all cultures and periods. Fundamental to this struggle is the question of mortality. Among

the Romans, as in the present day, there was no clear consensus about the fate of humans *post-mortem*. The two poles of this spectrum of perspectives are reflected in the two great philosophical schools of Petronus's day, mainly Epicureanism which argued that death was the end of everything and Stoicism which offered assurance of some sort of immortality. This tension is represented in both the archeological and literary record, among the latter, the *Satyrica*. The evidence inclines towards the belief that Petronius himself was an adherent of the Epicurean school. Most of the time, Petronius appears to promulgate the "carpe diem" approach associated with the Epicureans and seems to mock those preoccupied with death. Whether or not we can say that Petronius meant to impart a serious message concerning death, however, might depend on how we define serious. Silk, in his monograph, *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*, in addressing how much political "seriousness" we can attribute to Aristophanes, provides the modification "serious-substantial": while Aristophanes treats of "serious-substantial" material, it is not possible to determine if he meant to effect any sort of political change in Athens through his comedies.[68] In a similar way, Petronius certainly deals with "serious-substantial" material and conveys "serious-substantial" messages about death. But at the same time, the *Satyrica* constantly engages in a game of making real deaths imaginary and imaginary deaths real; characters attempt to imagine their deaths and even experience them before they die; they create metaphorical deaths and even the one actual death in the primary narrative account mirrors a mythical death. In the final analysis, Petronius's primary focus is on the aesthetics of the art he is creating. However, in its abundant presentation of death, the *Satyrica* provides a rich source for understanding death from philosophical, symbolic and sociological perspectives and it is this project's purpose to better understand the role that death

[68] Silk 2000: 312-316.

plays in it and, by extension, in the culture of early imperial Rome. As Highet stated in his 1941 article on Petronius, "one motive of satire is laughter, and the other is truth-telling."[69] The fragmentary state of the *Satyrica*, may complicate our understanding of its vision of human existence but it is clear that death was a preeminent element of it.

[69] Highet 1941: 192.

CHAPTER 1 – ACTUAL DEATH

Real death is not a common event in the primary storyline of the extant *Satyrica*. In fact, it only happens once: when Lichas, an old enemy of Encolpius, drowns in a shipwreck (114.4). However, most of the characters have, or claim to have, personal experience of someone dying. Discussion of death in the *Satyrica*, necessarily starts with an understanding of what death meant to the Romans.[70] Firstly, this involves an understanding of what they believed happened to the soul at death, since there was widespread agreement that death involved a fundamental change in the relationship of the soul and the body. The living person, for ancient Romans, was a combination of these two. Cicero, in the first book of his *Tusculan Disputations*, provides a brief summary of the different views on the fate of the soul:

> *Sunt enim qui discessum animi a corpore putent esse mortem; sunt qui nullum censeant fieri discessum, sed una animum et corpus occidere, animumque in corpore extingui. qui discedere animum censent, alii statim dissipari, alii diu permanere, alii semper. quid sit porro ipse animus, aut ubi, aut unde, magna dissensio est.*
>
> For there are those who think that death is the separation of the soul from the body; there are those who are of the opinion that no separation occurs, but that the soul and body perish together, and the soul is extinguished in the body. Of those who think that the soul separates, some think that it dissolves immediately, others that it remains for a while, others always. Concerning what, in turn, the soul itself is, or where, or whence it comes, there is great disagreement. 1.9.

---

[70] Since the *Satyrica* was written in the first century C.E., this paper focusses on the cultural aspects of Roman death from roughly the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. Such chronological boundaries are difficult to define due to the limitations of our sources. Establishing a comprehensive picture of these practices is not possible from literary sources, exclusively, since they predominantly portray a limited elite, male view. Material evidence such as epitaphs, funeral monuments, grave items and human remains must contribute to the picture. Additionally, especially by the first century C.E., the concept of what being Roman meant was changing as the empire continued to expand and we still struggle to understand how integrated other cultures were in the Roman culture. Although Petronius was undoubtedly a member of the Roman elite, the *Satyrica* is valued as a particularly rich source of information on not only freedmen, but other "low" levels of Roman society. See Hope 2009: 7-12; Boyce 1991: 21 notes, from a spoken-language persepective: "Petronius is virtually the only author we have who deliberately attempted a thorough imitation of vulgar speech."

This passage turns our attention to the lack of consensus among Romans concerning the outcome of the soul at death, and these disparate views are reflected in the *Satyrica*. For those who believed that the soul physically went somewhere, usually to a vaguely defined underworld, the soul was a shadow of its living person and capable of action that could impact the world of the living. Since people believed that improperly mourned or buried corpses could come back from the dead and affect the living, many death rituals existed simply to eradicate this interaction, or at least to ensure that it was a positive one. On one hand, the *Satyrica* reflects these anxieties of the Romans. On the other hand, it also reflects the views of the philosophcial schools: those who believed that the soul perished after death (an Epircurean viewpoint) as well of those who believed that the soul continued, but as part of the universe, no longer as an individual soul (a Stoic position). The philosophical view is complicated by the fact that people who purported to hold these views still complied with mainstream funeral rites, the origins of which were rooted in ensuring rest for the dead: Epicurus himself made a will that included the continuance of funerary provisions for his family and the yearly celebration of his birthday by the Epicurean cult, and Seneca (the Younger) also made a will.[71]

Seleucus, a freedman and one of the Trimalchio's guests, expresses these contradictory views in a speech he gives at the *Cena*:

---

[71]I use Hicks 1925 for all references to Diogenes Laertius. Diog Laert. 10.18: "Εκ δὲ τῶν γινομένων προσόδων τῶν δεδομένων ἀφ᾽ ἡμῶν Ἀμυνομάχῳ καὶ Τιμοκράτει κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν μεριζέσθωσαν μεθ᾽ Ἑρμάρχου σκοπούμενοι εἵς τε τὰ ἐναγίσματα τῷ τε πατρὶ καὶ τῇ μητρὶ καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, καὶ ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν εἰθισμένην ἄγεσθαι γενέθλιον ἡμέραν ἑκάστου ἔτους τῇ προτέρᾳ δεκάτῃ τοῦ Γαμηλιῶνος, "And from the revenues of those which were given to me from Amynomachus and Timocrates let them as they are able, looking things over with Hermarchus, distribute funeral offerings for my father, mother, and brothers, and keep observed the customary celebration of my birthday on the tenth day of Gamelion in each year as before…). Cicero recognizes this contradictory behavior at *Fin*. 100; Lucian criticizes the fact that Romans seem to go through the motions of mourning without thinking about it. …νόμῳ δὲ καὶ συνηθείᾳ τὴν λύπην ἐπιτρέποντες (…they turn over their grief to custom and habit, *Luct.* 1).

...fui enim hodie in funus. Homo bellus, tam bonus Chrysanthus ***animam ebulliit****. Modo, modo me appellavit. Videor mihi cum illo loqui. Heu, eheu. Utres inflati ambulamus. Minoris quam muscae sumus, muscae tamen aliquam virtutem habent, nos non pluris sumus quam bullae. Et quid si non abstinax fuisset? Quinque dies aquam in os suum non coniecit, non micam panis. Tamen* ***abiit ad plures****. Medici ilium perdiderunt, immo magis malus fatus; medicus enim nihil aliud est quam animi consolatio. Tamen bene elatus est, vitali lecto, stragulis bonis. est optime…*

I was at a funeral today. Chrysanthus, a handsome man, as well as good, bubbled out his soul. Only a little while ago he called on me. It seems to me that I'm speaking with him. Alas, we are inflated bags walking around. We are less than flies for flies still have some virtue; we are nothing more than bubbles. And what if he had not gone on a diet? For five days he placed no water in his mouth, nor a morsel of bread. Still, he went the way of everyone. The doctors killed him, no, it was his bad fate.; a doctor is nothing more than comfort for the soul. Still, he was laid out well on his bier with nice coverings. The weeping was the best. 42.1-6.

This speech provides the starting point for understanding actual death in the *Satyrica*.[72]

This chapter first addresses how death is defined in the *Satyrica* and second, where the dead go. Views on the final destination of the soul are naturally influenced by views on its nature, including whether it continues to exist at all. This is the focus of the third and fourth sections: belief in the sentient *post mortem* soul versus the view that the soul no longer feels when its body ceases to exist. Finally, regardless of beliefs about the *post mortem* soul, death is always viewed through the living; the last section analyzes how experience with death impacts the behavior of the living in the *Satyrica*.

[72] Schmeling 2011: 166: "Phrases in the description (eulogy) of Chrysanthus by Seleucus read like epitaphs. Also, Bodel 1984: 194.

Animan ebulliit: Giving up the Ghost

Three examples from speeches and stories presented at the *Cena* serve to illustrate the idea that death was believed to be a physical separation of the soul from the body. The phrase *animam ebulliit* was, in fact, a colloquial expression used to describe death similar to the phrase "give up the ghost."[73]

Seleucus's speech above supplies the first examples. First, he uses *animan ebulliit* to convey that Chrysanthus died. Seleucus's description of humans as *utres inflati* (inflated leather bags) continues the image of the body as a container, as well as his comparison of humans to *bullae* (bubbles). [74] Just a little later at the *Cena* Niceros, one of the guests, uses this phrase to describe a near-death experience with his werewolf friend: *Ut larua intravi, paene animam ebullivi, sudor mihi per bifurcum volabat, oculi mortui, vix unquam refectus sum.* (I entered like a skeleton, nearly bubbled out my soul, sweat was pouring down my crotch, my eyes dead, scarcely was I at all able to be revived. 62.10) And finally, Trimalchio uses similar language when, towards the end of the *Cena*, a cock crows and he superstitiously speculates: *aut incendium oportet fiat, aut aliquis in vicinia animam abiciet*. (Either there must have been a fire, or someone close by has cast out his soul. 74.3).

Persius, a stoic adherent and poet of the early first century C.E., uses the same colloquial phrase to describe death in his second satire. *...illa sibi introrsum et sub lingua murmurat: 'o si ebulliat patruus, praeclarum funus!'* (But he turns there to himself and murmurs under his tongue: 'Oh, if my father should bubble out, what a beautiful funeral.' 2.9-10).

---

[73] See entries in OLD And TLL. See also Persius *Sat*. 2.10 (below), and Seneca *Apoc*. 4.2: *Et ille quidem animam ebulliit, et ex eo desiit vivere videri.* (And he bubbled out his soul, and he ceased to be seen to live.)

[74] Ovid *Am*. 3.12.29: *Aeolios Ithacis inclusimus utribus Euros*. (We shut the winds of Aeolus in a bag.) See OLD s.v. uter 1b.

The commentary provided by the scholia to Persius on this passage reads nearly as a commentary on the speech of Seleucus. The scholia explains how this phrase demonstrates that death was considered a physical separation of the soul from the body: (Schol. 2.0.2241.55 Pers. 2, 10 ed. Kurz) *ebullire … est metaphora a bulla, quae aliquo venti tenore sustentatur; quae si in aqua fit cadentibus guttis rumpitur et spiritum, quo continetur, amittit, ex quo etiam proverbialiter dicitur: homo bulla est.* (To bubble out…is a figurative use from bubbles, which are held together by a certain tenor of the wind; which**,** if it be made in water, is broken by falling drops and the spirit**,** from the place where it is enclosed, goes out; from which it is proverbially said: man is a bubble.)

The idea that the body and soul were physical entities that separated at death is found in literature and philosophy from the earliest written records. [75] The *Satyrica* provides confirmation that this idea existed through all levels of society and is in turn confirmed by material evidence as outlined later in this chapter.[76] Recognition of death as the physical separation of the soul from the body leads to the next question of where the soul went.

Tamen abiit ad plures

While there was disagreement over many aspects of death, everyone agreed that it was inevitable. This phrase spoken by Seleucus: *tamen abiit ad plures*, effectively captures two

[75] Homer, *Iliad* πολλὰς δ᾽ ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν ἡρώων (many brave souls of heros he sent to Hades 1.3). The Epicurean position is expressed by Lucretius through much of book three *De Rerum Natura*, and especially: *crede animam quoque diffundi multoque perire/ ocius et citius dissolvi in corpora prima,/ cum semel ex hominis membris ablata recessit.* Believe the soul also is diffused and dies much more swiftly, and dissolves more quickly into the primal bodies, when once it recedes, removed from the limbs of man. 3.437-39).

[76] By "levels of Roman society" I distinguish, in agreement with Boyce 1991: 2, between those who received formal education and those who did not. The latter includes *plebs* and freedmen who "lacked access to a liberal education and formed the vast majority of the Roman population." It is not easy to place all the characters of the *Satyrica* in classes, and there is much disagreement among scholars on this topic.

points: firstly, it affirms the view that death is a physical movement of the soul; secondly, death applies to everyone (*plures*) despite ones's best efforts to avoid it: Chrysanthus tried to delay it, but (*tamen*) ended up dead. Since we are all "in it together" the concept of death as the great leveler of all is a form of consolation. Lattimore elaborates: "To find solace for death in the idea that it is common to all may not be entirely humane, but …it is the consolation *par excellence* not only of classical but of modern times representing as it does the ultimate if meagre solace which not even despair of immortality can take away."[77]

This "*ad plures*" consolation is one of the themes of Encolpius's soliloquy over Lichas's body. As the only instance of actual death in the primary storyline of the *Satyrica*, Lichas's death merits special attention. Well into the adventures of the *Satyrica*, Encolpius, Eumolpus and Giton board a ship to travel south towards Croton. Once on board they realize that the captain, Lichas, is an old enemy of Encolpius. They try to keep their identity hidden, but are found out. Eventually a reconciliation takes place, achieved in part by Tryphanea, Lichas's girlfriend, who takes a liking to Giton, and in part by Eumolpus's story-telling ability. However, a storm overtakes them. Lichas attempts, like Chrysanthus by means of his special diet, to avoid death:

> *Itaque hercules postquam maris ira infesta convaluit, Lichas trepidans ad me supinas porrigit manus et "tu" inquit "Encolpi, succurre periclitantibus et vestem illam divinam sistrumque redde navigio. Per fidem, miserere, quemadmodum quidem soles." Et illum quidem vociferantem in mare ventus excussit, repetitumque infesto gurgite procella circumegit atque hausit.*

---

[77] Lattimore 1942: 250-51. This sentiment is expressed in numerous epitaphs. A few examples (Lattimore 1942: 255): *viximus hic omnis exitus unus habet* (We lived, one exit keeps everyone here); *omnes mortales eadem nam sorte tenemur* (for all us mortals are held by the same destiny); *una domus cunctis, nec fugienda viris* (there is one home for all, nor is there escape for men); *mors etenim hominum natura, non poena est/cui contigit nasci, instat et mori* (Since death is the nature of men, it is not a punishment/ for him who happens to be born, he remains also to die).

> Thus, by Hercules, as the violent wrath of the sea grew strong, Lichas, trembling, reached out his hand to me in supplication and said, "You, Encolpius, help us in our peril and return the divine garment and rattle to our ship. By faith, have pity, as indeed you are accustomed." And, indeed, the wind hurled him into the sea, still shouting, and the storm swirled him repeatedly around in a violent whirlpool and swallowed him. 114.4-7.

Lichas reappears in the story as a corpse floating in the water towards the three companions who have made it safely to shore. Even before he recognizes the dead body as Lichas's, Encolpius expands on how death affects not only the dead person himself, but also the living. He sympathizes with the universal fate of people left behind. *"Hunc forsitan" proclamo "in aliqua parte terrarum secura exspectat uxor, forsitan ignarus tempestatis filius aut pater; utique reliquit aliquem, cui proficiscens osculum dedit. Haec sunt consilia mortalium, haec vota magnarum cogitationum. En homo quemadmodum natat."* (For this man, perhaps," I spoke aloud, "a wife waits, safe, in some part of the world, perhaps a son or father, ignorant of the storm; assuredly he left behind someone, to whom, as he went out, he gave a kiss. These are the plans of mortals, these, the promises of grand plans. Ah, how the man floats. 115.9-11) Despite any person's best-laid-plans, death, and especially surprise death, affects everyone equally. As the corpse floats closer, Encolpius finds himself face-to-face with Lichas: *Adhuc tanquam ignotum deflebam, cum inviolatum os fluctus convertit in terram, agnovique terribilem paulo ante et implacabilem Licham pedibus meis paene subiectum*. (Up to this point I was weeping over an unknown being, but when a wave turned his face over, unhurt, on the shore, I recognized Lichas, just a little before dreadful and implacable, cast down nearly at my feet. 115.11)

Encolpius's recognition of Lichas first causes him to truncate his mourning and then address the corpse, focusing on how death brings all humans, including the powerful, to the same level. *Non tenui igitur diutius lacrimas immo percussi semel iterumque manibus pectus et "Ubi nunc est" inquam "iracundia tua, ubi impotentia tua? nempe piscibus beluisque expositus es, et*

qui paulo ante iactabas vires imperii tui, de tam magna nave ne tabulam quidem naufragus habes. (I did not cling to my tears any longer, but beat my chest once and twice with my hands and said, "Where now is your wrath, where your fury? Indeed, you are laid bare for the fish and wild beasts, and you who, a little before, tossed about the strength of your command, you are a shipwreck and indeed have not so much as a plank from your great ship. 115.12-16) Encolpius continues this theme: *Ite nunc mortales, et magnis cogitationibus pectora implete. Ite cauti, et opes fraudibus captas per mille annos disponite* (Come now mortals, and fill up your chests with great thoughts. Come cautious ones and arrange for a thousand years your wealth taken by fraud. 115.14).[78]

The sentiment expressed by Encolpius is that everyone, despite their plans, ends up in the same place: dead. A few chapters before this, Eumolpus tells the story of the Widow of Ephesus to everyone on the ship. In it, a soldier attempts to use this "*ad plures*" consolation to help the mourning widow by reminding her that *omnium eundem esse exitum sed et idem domicilium* (the end is the same for all people and they all have the same final home 111.8.)

This "*ad plures*" concept is what provided a framework within which Homeric heroes pondered how to live their lives. Achilles struggles with choosing between dying young at Troy but being gloriously remembered, or living to an old age with future generations oblivious of him. He reminds Thetis, his mother: οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίη Ἡρακλῆος φύγε κῆρα, ὅς περ φίλτατος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι: ἀλλά ἑ μοῖρα δάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλέος χόλος Ἥρης. (For not even

[78]See also Horace *Odes*: *Pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas regumque turris,* (Pale death beats with equal foot on the doors of the poor and the gates of kings. 1.4.13-14.); *Divesne prisco natus ab Inacho nil interest an pauper et infima de gente sub divo moreris, victima nil miserantis Orci*. (It makes no difference under heaven whether you are rich, born from ancient Inachus or poor and from a low-born people, you will die, nothing but a victim of miserable Orcus. 2.3.21-24.)

mighty Heracles avoided death, who was dearest to lord Zeus son of Cronos: but fate overpowered him and the painful wrath of Hera. *Il*. 18.117-19.) Even the gods try to work within the framework of mortality. The pain of watching Sarpedon, his son, die in book 16 of the *Iliad* causes Zeus to weep tears of blood (αἱματοέσσας δὲ ψιάδας κατέχευεν ἔραζε (he shed blood-red drops on the ground *Il*. 16.459). Yet, he cannot argue with Hera's point that Sarpedon, as a mortal man, was destined long ago to his fate of death—whether it happens at Troy or in his homeland of Lykia. 'ἄνδρα θνητὸν ἐόντα πάλαι πεπρωμένον αἴσῃ ἂψ ἐθέλεις θανάτοιο δυσηχέος ἐξαναλῦσαι." ("Do you wish to set free from hateful death a man, a mortal, long ago destined to Fate?" 16.441-42) In short, he will go the way of all mortals. Hera acknowledges that Zeus has the ability to bring Sarpedon back from his fate: ἔρδ': ἀτὰρ οὔ τοι πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι. 16.443) but advises, rather, that he assuage his grief by sending Death and Sleep to carry back Sarpedon's body to Lykia where his brothers and kinsmen can bury him and set up a gravestone as a reminder to future generations of his glorious deeds. In a similar way, Trimalchio uses this framework of mortality to choose his way of life. Pointing to a skeleton he brings at the *Cena*, he states: *Sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus. Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene.* (Thus we will all end up after Orcus carries us away. Therefore, let us live, while things are going well. 34.8).

Seneca points out: *...si mortem in homine non cogitavit, sibi inposuit. Flet aliquis factum, quod aiebat non posse non fieri? Quisquis aliquem queritur mortuum esse, queritur hominem fuisse. Omnis eadem condicio devinxit: cui nasci contigit, mori restat. Intervallis distinguimur, exitu aequamur.* (…if one has not thought that mortality is in the nature of man, he has cheated himself. Does anyone weep for a deed, which he has been saying is not possible *not* to happen? Whoever complains that someone has died, is complaining that he was a man. Each person is

tied up in the situation: a person who happens to be born, remains to die. Intervening time separates us, but we are made equal by our exit. *Ep*. 99.8-9).

As many epitaphs attest, this *ad plures* consolation was ubiquitous. However, while some comfort could be gleaned from this *ad plures* idea, most people desired further consolation through an answer to where the *post mortem* soul went. Indeed, the answer to the question of where, if anywhere, the characters in the *Satyrica* thought the soul went after death is naturally fundamental to understanding how they approach situations dealing directly with death such as burials and funerals. As stated above, Cicero distinguishes three positions held by the Romans who believed that the soul in some way left the body: it immediately dissipated, it remained for awhile (*diu*), or it remained always (*semper*).

The sentient* semper *soul

Petronius was familiar with literature that promoted the view that the soul continued a sentient existence after death. Several scholars have read the *Cena* episode as a parody of Aeneas's descent into the Underworld, one of the most important literary examples of souls that continue a sentient *post mortem* existence.[79] The idea that the soul remained *semper*, is the view most familiar to us of the ancient world. It encompasses the traditional views expressed not only by Vergil, but Homer, Plato, the Imperial Cult, as well as that of most mystery religions since

[79] Courtney 2001: 116-17 remarks that this becomes evident once a dog prevents Encolpius, Giton and Ascyltos from leaving the banquet, being told by the porter *"...Nemo unquam convivarum per eandem ianuam emissus est; alia intrant, alia exeunt."* ("None of the dinner guests has ever left through the same door; they come in one, they exit through another." 72). In the *Aeneid*, the entrance to the Underworld is guarded by doors made by Daedulus and depicting his labyrinth that housed the bull in the myth of Pasiphae and the Bull. Courtney concludes that at this point we see through all the luxury and understand that Trimalchio's dinner-guests "are experiencing a kind of living-death" (117), an interpretation shared by Arrowsmith 1966. See also Newton 1982; Courtney 1987; Gagliardi 1984, 1989; Bodel 1984: 53-61, 1994, 1999: 44-47; Connors 1998: 35-36, Schmeling 2011: 94, 97, 306-307.

they promised an afterlife to their followers. Generally, this belief centered around the idea that the soul continued after death, and required proper funeral rites before it could achieve rest.[80] As Toybee summarizes: "…among the great majority of people of the Roman age, as literature, epigraphy, and the structure and furnishing of tombs make clear, there persisted and prevailed the conviction that some kind of conscious existence is in store for the soul after death and that the dead and living can affect one another mutually. Human life is not just an interlude of being between nothingness and nothingness."[81] In book 11 of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus meet Elpenor whose body he and his companions left behind in Circe's house ἄκλαυτον (unlamented) and ἄθαπτον (unburied), words repeated together a few lines later when Elpenor explains the consequences of his improper burial:

> μή μ' ἄκλαυτον ἄθαπτον ἰὼν ὄπιθεν καταλείπειν
> νοσφισθείς, μή τοί τι θεῶν μήνιμα γένωμαι,
> ἀλλά με κακκῆαι σὺν τεύχεσιν, ἅσσα μοι ἔστιν,
> σῆμά τέ μοι χεῦαι πολιῆς ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης,
> ἀνδρὸς δυστήνοιο καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι.
>
> But do not go out and turn your back on me and leave me behind unlamented and unburied, lest I become a cause of the wrath to the gods to you, but burn me completely with my armor, all that belongs to me, pile up my grave on the bank of the gray sea, of a wretched man, that future men may learn of me. 11.72-6.

In the *Aeneid*, a similar situation occurs in book six when Aeneas seeks entrance to the Underworld. The Sibyl stipulates he must bury Misenus in a grave (*conde sepulchro*) first and bring black cattle as the first sacrificial offerings (*duc nigras pecudes, ea prima piacula sunto*) before he can enter since the unburied Misenus infects the whole fleet with his corpse (*totamque incestat funere classem*).[82] Here, as in Homer, proper funeral rites include both burial and proper

[80] Johnston 2013: 8-9. For descriptions of the Underworld: *Aeneid* 6.274-900, Ovid *Metamorphoses* 4.430-46, Lucian, *On Funerals* 2-9. Cumot 1922: 71-90, King 1998: 125-136, Bodel 2004, Conners 2001: 117; Hope 2009: 215-218.
[81] Toynbee 1991: 34.
[82] *Aen*. 6.150-2.

mourning and failing to perform these rites incurred consequences for both the living and the dead. Once Aeneas enters Hades he sees the fate of the unburied:

> *Nec ripas datur horrendas et rauca fluenta*
> *transportare prius quam sedibus ossa quierunt.*
> *Centum errant annos volitantque haec litora circum;*
> *tum demum admissi stagna exoptata revisunt.*
>
> Permission is not granted to pass through the terrible banks and raging waters before their bones rest in the ground. They wander and flit for a hundered years around these shores; then, finally, granted permission, they see the longed-for waters. 6.327-30.

Palinarus is among those Aeneas sees denied entrance to the Underworld. Wandering among this crowd whom the waters hold back, Palinarus speaks with Aeneas. Although he begs for special treatment from Aeneas or the gods to be allowed to cross the Styx unburied, the Sibyl chides him for expecting special treatment: *Tu Stygias inhumatus aquas amnemque severum Eumenidum aspicies, ripamve iniussus adibis? Desine fata deum flecti sperare precando*. (Will you, unburied, behold the Stygian waters and the harsh river of the Eumenidies, or, unbidden, approach the riverbank? Cease to hope to bend the fate of the gods with your praying." 6.374-76.).

In the examples above both the dead souls and the living experience the consequences of improper funeral rites. The dead souls can quite literally feel what happened to them. According to both Homer and Vergil this ability to feel extends to those who are in Hades as well. The examples of the famous sinners who are physically punished for their wickedness on earth such as Tantalus— eternally punished with insatiable hunger and thirst in both Homer and Virgil's versions of the Underworld—provide perhaps the most obvious examples of the souls that physically continued to feel after death. When Achilles tells Odysseus that he would rather be a laborer for another, without property, than a king in the Underworld, he presents a bleak view of

the soul's fate after death, perhaps indicating mental suffering in addition to physical.[83] Evidence in ancient literature also exists for the view that people could experience happiness after death, such as Achilles in the *Aethiopis*, and those who reach the Isle of the Blessed or Elysium in the *Aeneid*.[84]

In the *Satyrica*, Trimalchio himself is the best proponent of belief in an afterlife for the soul. Besides being properly buried, Trimlachio also wants to ensure a comfortable and pleasant existence for himself. He directs Habinnas to decorate his tomb thus:

> *"quid dicis" inquit "amice carissime? Aedificas monumentum meum, quemadmodum te iussi? Valde te rogo, ut secundum pedes statuae meae catellam ponas et coronas et unguenta et Petraitis omnes pugnas, ut mihi contingat tuo beneficio post mortem vivere; praeterea ut sint in fronte pedes centum, in agrum pedes ducenti. Omne genus enim poma volo sint circa cineres meos, et vinearum largiter.*
>
> "What do you say," he said, "dearest friend? Will you build my tomb in the way I have directed? To be sure, I ask that you place my dog, chained, at the feet of my statue and garlands and perfume, and all the fights of Petraites, so that I may continue to live after death by your kindness; besides this, let my tomb be one hundred feet in front and twenty in depth. And I wish there to be all kinds of fruit trees in a circle around my ashes and plenty of vines. 71.5-7.

Next, he defends the elaborate constructon of his tomb by describing it as a home after death: *Valde enim falsum est vivo quidem domos cultas esse, non curari eas, ubi diutius nobis habitandum est.* (For it is certainly wrong for there to be decorated homes among the living, but no care for those, where we must dwell for much longer, 71.7). Schmeling comments on the similarity between this sentiment of Petronius and that expressed by the epitaph: *aedis aedificat*

---

[83] *Od*. 11.489-92.

[84] See Edwards 1985: 218 who describes the bleak view of the afterlife for Achilles in the *Odyssey* "as odd-man-out… supported by evidence suggesting that the conception of a more fortunate existence after death was widespread before Homer. Belief in a realm of Hades was complemented by an alternative land of the blessed, usually an island located at the edges of the earth, where kings and other favored individuals enjoyed a happy eternity."

dives, sapiens monumentum:/hospitium est illud, corporis hic domus est./ illic paulisper remoramus a(t) his habitamus. (A rich man builds a house, a wise man a memorial (tomb):/ the former is a place for entertaining, the latter a home for his body./ That one lingers for a little while, but this one lives.)[85]

Finally, Petronius concludes this speech with the request that the epitaph on his tomb contain the claim: *nec unquam philosophum audivit* (he never listened to a philosopher, 71.12). The two most popular philosophical schools of thought during Petronius's time—the Epicureans and Stoics—both excluded the idea that the soul, even if it lived on in some way after death, would be concerned with what happened to the body on earth. Trimalchio pointedly separates himself from this view of the soul when he separates himself from philosophy.

This speech of Trimalchio, along with his conclusion that denies philosophy a place in his views, indicates belief in an afterlife for his soul since it finds comfort in a well-decked *domus*, in many ways better than the home he lives in while alive. More specifically, Trimalchio's comparison of his tomb to the homes of the living and his desire to make his home more beautiful in death than in life points to belief in a soul that cared about its comfort after death.[86]

---

[85] Schmeling 2009, 296: There is a "philosophy of life in death in the epitaph at CIL vi 27788. Petrovic 2005 argues that Trimalchio's depiction of full sails on his tombstone (*te rogo, ut naves etiam ... monumenti mei facias plenis velis euntes*….) instead of the usual closed sails is an indication of his belief in an afterlife: "[I]mages of ships, particularly in sepulchral *Berufsdarstellungen*, both in the case of sailors and merchants, suggest the same – the ships are typically shown destitute of sails, invoking the same 'end-of-a-journey' metaphor." Petrovic 2005: 89.

[86] It should be noted, however, that there is some confusion between the two views that the soul could continue to hang around its grave and could descend to the Underworld. It is not the purpose of this study to resolve the question of whether one of these views was more prevalent than the other because it seems that the ancients were confused about this as well. Part of the purpose of this study is to trace views on death in the *Satyrica* to their origins in Roman culture, and the *Satyrica* in fact highlights the existence of these blurred notions of exactly where the soul

Trimalchio's desire for his *post mortem* soul to live comfortably was a desire shared by many Romans. This existence of the belief in a sentient after-death soul, at least by some Romans, is confirmed by material and cultural evidence in addition to the literary evidence discussed at the beginning of this section. Firstly, we have archeological evidence that tombs in Italy were often built to look like homes as early the ninth century B.C.E.[87] Decorations in tombs indicate the importance of the soul's physical comfort. As Toynbee notes, "the tomb itself was the place in which the dead in some sense or at some times resided…as with the Etruscans the attempt to make the dead feel at home in the tomb by renderings in paint, marble, stone, or stucco of the useful and familiar objects—toilet articles, vessels for food and drink, furniture, tools, writing materials, and so forth—which had once served them."[88] Romans were especially keen to provide nourishment for dead souls. At the *Parentalia*—celebrated yearly from February 13th to 21st—offerings of food were placed at graves. At burials, simple food was presented at the gravesite and continuing interaction with the deceased is indicated by pipes that have been found for pouring libations. Toynbee confirms the purpose of these pipes as part of the "abundant evidence of an urge to keep the dead 'alive' by offerings made to them of food and drink, oil, and even blood and by their share in the funerary meals partaken of at the tomb by the survivors."[89] Epitaphs, especially the one nearly ubiquitous in Rome, Spain and Africa, *sit tibi*

---

went. However, both of these views indicate a belief in a sentient *post-mortem* soul. See Cumot 45-90, Gnade 1994, King 1998: 151-160.

[87] Bryan 1925: 4-5.

[88] Toynbee 1971: 37-38.

[89] Toynbee 1971: 37. "For this purpose holes were pierced and pipes provided, so that the offerings and portions allotted to the dead could penetrate to the burials." See also Carroll 2006: 59-60. See Hope 2009: Plate 7 for an image.

terra levis (let the earth lie lightly for you), indicates a possible belief that the dead were able to feel, and thus that the soul continued as a sentient entity after death.[90]

Petrounius's careful plan for an after-life dwelling is a testament to the belief that one could, if properly buried, not just exist, but enjoy this existence. In contrast to the literary examples above that indicate the negative consequences that resulted from improper burial are the many epitaphs and other funerary art that express hope for this type of happiness. Toynbee directs out attention to the fact that, starting in the late Republic, optimistic belief in an afterlife prevailed even if there was no consensus about its location. "Both literature (to some extent) and funerary art (to a high degree) do, in fact, reveal that there was in this age a deepening conviction that the terror and power of death could be overcome and that a richer, happier, and more godlike life than that experienced here was attainable hereafter, under certain conditions, by the souls of the departed."[91]

Manes insensibiles, animi indifferentes

In contrast with the belief in a sentient *post mortem* soul was that of the philosophical schools most prominent during the early Principate: Stoicism and Epicureanism. These views are expressed in several passages by Epicurus and Lucretius. Addressing real death in the *Satyrica* requires an evaluation of the philosophical ideas expressed by its characters on how to treat someone who had died; in other words, how to treat a corpse. There are two examples that reflect these predominant philosophical views on this issue.

---

[90] Lattimore, 1942: 68-74: "…the layman who caused his epitaph to be inscribed, could think as hard as he pleased of himself after death, as a shadowy ghost, as a citizen of Hades' world or of Elysium, as nothing at all, and still there would be a certain concern about the remnant of his body in its urn or coffin, and a very immediate sensation of discomfort at the thought of its being cramped or suffocated under a heavy weight."

[91] Toynbee 1971: 38.

Encolpius's soliloquy over Lichas's body raises some serious objections to the view that the *post mortem* body could feel or be concerned about its fate after death. As he speaks over Lichas's dead body, he questions the purpose of burial.

> *At enim fluctibus obruto non contingit sepultura. Tanquam intersit, periturum corpus quae ratio consumat, ignis an fluctus an mora. Quicquid feceris, omnia haec eodem ventura sunt. Ferae tamen corpus lacerabunt. Tanquam melius ignis accipiat; immo hanc poenam gravissimam credimus, ubi servis irascimur. Quae ergo dementia est, omnia facere, ne quid de nobis relinquat sepultura?"*
>
> But funeral rites do not touch the one covered by waves. As if it matters what business consumes the body that is to perish, whether fire or water or time. Whatever you do, everything comes to the same end. Beasts will tear a body, but, does fire treat it better? Certainly, we consider this the heaviest punishment when we are angry at our slaves. Why this madness, then, to do everything so that burial leaves nothing of us behind? 115.17-19. [92]

When Encolpius questions the usefulness of burial he is pointing to the philosophical view that the body, bereft of the soul, has no ability to feel and is therefore unconcerned about what happens to it. The examples from Homer and Vergil, above, specifically point to the necessity of burial for the happiness of both the living and the dead. The concept of a soul that was unconcerned with the fate of its body was a position advocated by philosophical schools long before the first century C.E.[93] Both Stoics and Epicureans believed in a materialistic soul that dissipated after death and denied that the soul was concerned with what happened to its body. These philosophical views, while predominatly found among the upper-classes in Rome in the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E, indeed spread outside of these elite circles. Toynbee points to several epitaphs that indicate this: *'sumus mortales, immortales non sumus'* (we are mortals, no immortal)*; 'omnia cum vita pereunt et inania fiunt'* (everything with life perishes and there is an

[92] *Sepultura* specifically refers to "the formal disposal of human remains, esp. burial." (OLD).
[93] As stated before, the two schools that dominated the early Principate were Stoicism and Epicureanism.

empty void)*;'nil sumus et fuimus. mortales, respice, lector,/ in nihil a nihilo quam cito recidimus'* (we are and we are not; mortals, look, reader, how quickly we fall back into nothing from nothing). As well as to "the recurrent formula" *'non fui, fui, non sum, non curo*' (I was not, I was, I am not, nor do I care.)"[94]

For the Stoics, the soul was made of the same substance that permeated the universe, a sort of fiery substance called *pneuma*. For an unspecified amount of time they would linger in the atmosphere and then "like the flesh and bones, [were] decomposed and dissolve into the elements which formed them."[95] At death, the soul returned whence it came and, in its existence as part of the universe, it lost its existence as an individual. The Stoics were not in agreement as to how long this process took, or if all souls equally shared in this return to a sort of immortality.[96] The unconcerned, *post mortem* Stoic soul is perhaps most succinctly illustrated by Lucan in his description of Pompey's soul as it looks down on the desecration of his body on the shores of Egypt: *risitque sui ludibria trunci* (And he laughed at the mockery of his cut-off body, 9.14)[97]

---

[94] Toynbee 1971: 34. The translations of the epitaphs are mine.
[95] Cumont, 1922: 15. Brennan 2009: 392. Lorenz 2009 especially chapter 5.
[96] See Cumont 1922: 12-14.
[97] Luc. *BC* 9.14. More completely:
Illic postquam se lumine vero
Inplevit, stellasque vagas miratus et astra
Fixa polis, vidit quanta sub nocte iaceret
Nostra dies, risitque sui ludibria trunci.
Hinc super Emathiae campos et signa cruenti
Caesaris ac sparsas volitavit in aequore classes,
Et scelerum vindex in sancto pectore Bruti
Sedit et invicti posuit se mente Catonis.
When he had filled himself with the true light in that place, and marveled at the wandering planets and the stars fixed in the poles, he saw how much under darkeness lay our days, and he laughed at the mockery of his cut-off body. Then he flew over the fields of Pharsalia and the standards of bloody Caesar and the fleets scattered in the sea, and, as sliberator of evils, sank into the sacred breast of Brutus and positioned himself in the mind of invincible Cato. 9.11-18.

In the following passage, which shares many similarities with Encolpius's comments above, Seneca illustrates Stoic beliefs about the *post mortem* body:

> *Sed ut ex barba capilloque tonsa neglegimus, ita ille divinus animus egressurus hominem, quo receptaculum suum conferatur, ignis illud exurat an lapis includat an terra contegat an ferae distrahant...Utrum proiectum aves differant, an consumatur 'Canibus data praeda* ***marinis****,'quid ad illum, qui nullus est...Neminem de supremo officio rogo, nulli reliquias meas commendo. Ne quis insepultus esset, rerum natura prospexit...Diserte Maecenas ait: 'Nec tumulum curo. Sepelit natura relicto.'*
>
> But just as we disregard hair clipped from the beard, so the divine soul exiting man, in which its own shelter was conveyed, whether fire burns it or a stone shuts it in or earth covers it or beasts tear it to pieces…Whether birds scatter it cast on the ground or whether it is consumed 'handed over as prey to sea-dogs,' means nothing to what is nothing…I ask no one this highest duty, I leave my remains to no one. Nature has foreseen that no one be unburied…Maecenas clearly expressed this: 'I do not trouble myself over a grave. Nature buries my remains.' Seneca, *Ep*: 92.34-5.

So many similiarities exist between Encolpius's speech and this letter of Seneca's that Sullivan states "it reads like a free pastiche of the philosopher."[98]

Epicurus's teaching on the nature of the soul is that is is dispersed throughout the body which is its framework. The framework is entirely unable to feel once the soul leaves it because it derives all of it sentient ability from the soul. τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἄθροισμα παρασκευάσαν ἐκείνῃ τὴν αἰτίαν ταύτην μετείληφε καὶ αὐτὸ τοιούτου συμπτώματος παρ᾽ ἐκείνης, οὐ μέντοι πάντων ὧν ἐκείνη κέκτηται· διὸ ἀπαλλαγείσης τῆς ψυχῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὴν αἴσθησιν. (The rest of this assemblage of atoms renders to the soul that characteristic [i.e., the power of sensation] and itself partakes of that property from it, but not of all those things which the soul posseses. Wherefore, when the soul escapes, [the body] does not have the power of sensation. Diog. Laert. *Epicurus*

[98] Sullivan 1968: 198, on the similarity between Encolpius's speech and Seneca's writings. Sullivan cites the following passages from Seneca: *QN* 4 praef.8; *Cons. Polyb*. 9.6-7; *Ep.* 101.4,6; *Ep*. 99.31*; Brev. Vit*. 20.5, *Cons. Marc.* 11.3-5; *Ep*. 99.8-9; *QN* 2.59.3-4; *Ep*. 92.34-5; *Rem. Fort*. 5.2,4,5; *Cons. Marc*. 10.6.

64). The soul, however, also needs the body in order to actualize its power of sensation. Once it leaves this framework at death, it also loses this ability. καὶ μὴν καὶ λυομένου τοῦ ὅλου ἀθροίσματος ἡ ψυχὴ διασπείρεται καὶ οὐκέτι ἔχει τὰς αὐτὰς δυνάμεις οὐδὲ κινεῖται, ὥσπερ οὐδ' αἴσθησιν κέκτηται. (And, when all its aggregate parts [i.e., the body] are loosened, the soul scatters and no longer has the same powers, nor does it move, just so it does not have sensation. (Diog. Laert. *Epicurus* 65) Lucretius devotes a considerable portion of his *De Rerum Natura* to demonstrating this concept and convincing his readers to eradicate their fear of death so they can enjoy life in the present. The following passage shares in both the language and concepts put forth by Encolpius in his speech over Lichas.

> *Proinde ubi se videas hominem indignarier ipsum,*
> *post mortem fore ut aut putescat corpore posto*
> *aut flammis interfiat malisve ferarum,*
> *scire licet non sincerum sonere atque subesse*
> *caecum aliquem cordi stimulum, quamvis neget ipse*
> *credere se quemquam sibi sensum in morte futurum;*
> *non, ut opinor, enim dat quod promittit et unde,*
> *nec radicitus e vita se tollit et eicit,*
> *sed facit esse sui quiddam super inscius ipse.*
> *vivus enim sibi cum proponit quisque futurum,*
> *corpus uti volucres lacerent in morte feraeque,*
> *ipse sui miseret; neque enim se dividit illim*
> *nec removet satis a proiecto corpore, et illum*
> *se fingit sensuque suo contaminat astans.*
> *hinc indignatur se mortalem esse creatum,*
> *nec videt in vera nullum fore morte alium se*
> *qui possit vivus sibi se lugere peremptum*
> *stansque iacentem se lacerari urive dolere.*
> *nam si in morte malumst malis morsuque ferarum*
> *tractari, non invenio qui non sit acerbum*
> *ignibus inpositum calidis torrescere flammis*
> *aut in melle situm suffocari atque rigere*
> *frigore, cum summo gelidi cubat aequore saxi,*
> *urgerive superne obrutum pondere terrae.*

> Then, when you see that a man is resentful of his very self, that after death he will rot in his buried body or might die in flames or in the jaws of wild beasts, one must know that he does not ring true, and that there lies concealed some blind

> prick of his heart however he himself denies that there will be any sense for himself in death. For he, I think, does not grant what he promises, but from which cause he does not lift up and cast himself out of life from the roots, but he, unkowing, makes to be a certain part of himself remaining. For when alive someone lays out his future self to himself, his body that vultures and wild beasts have torn in death, and he pities himself; for this reason, he does not divide himself nor does he remove himself enough from his cast down body, and he, standing near, imagines and mingles himself with his own sensation. For this reason, he is resentful that he was born mortal, nor does he see that in true death there will be no second self who, alive, will be able to mourn his destroyed self for him or standing near his laid-out body mourn that he is mangled or burns. For if it is an evil in death to be dragged by the jaws or bite of wild beasts, I do not know who would not be bitter that he, laid out, burns in blazing flames or set down chokes in honey and grows stiff with cold, when he lies on the highest surface of a freezing rock, or is pressed down buried by the weight of the earth above. *Lucr*. 3.870-94.

This passage from Lucretius also provides a response to Encolpius's question of why people go to extremes to ensure that no part of their bodies remain unburied: he does not remove himself enough from his cast-down body, and he imagines himself with sensation: *nec removet satis a proiecto corpore, et illum se fingit sensuque*...(nor does he remove himself enough from his cast-down body but imagines himself with sensation…). [99]

The story of the Widow of Ephesus, told by Eumolpus on board Lichas's ship before the storm, directly addresses the question of the abilities of the *post mortem* soul. Under the guise of a humorous story about the fickleness of women is expressed the Epicurean message that death is the absolute end of all life and sensation.

[99] Nussbaum summarizes (1989: 313): "But Lucretius is aware that there are many people who believe in the mortality of the person and who nonetheless fear death…Many such people, he perceptively points out, are in the grip of an inconsistent mental picture of death. Although they actually believe that the person ends at death, they also imagine a surviving subject who is pained and grieved by damage to his corpse, and by the loss to himself of the good things in life - of children, home, various delights and activities (111.870-911)…and once he is made to realize that he is not entitled to his absurd belief that death is a loss that can be experienced by the subject, he will naturally concede the truth of the Epicurean conclusion."

The Widow of Ephesus resolves firmly to bury herself in the tomb of her dead husband as the model of feminine virtue. But, a soldier, guarding a couple of crucified bodies in the same graveyard, enters the tomb when he hears her mourning. At first the soldier is unsuccessful at persuading the Widow to eat food. The soldier brings his dinner into the tomb. *...attulit in monumentum cenulam suam coepitque hortari lugentem, nihil profuturo gemitu pectus diduceret: omnium eundem esse exitum sed et idem domicilium, et cetera quibus exulceratae mentes ad sanitatem revocantur*. (…he brought his own dinner into the tomb and began to encourage the grieving woman, that there was no profit to her to heart in lamenting: there was the same end for everyone but also the same dwelling, and other things by which minds of those in pain are called back to sanity. 111.8-9).

The soldier fails to persuade the widow with either his words or his food because he uses the cliché consolation discussed above in the "*ad plures*" section. [100] This sets the scene for emphasizing the success of the maidservant who will persuade the Widow through appealing to Epicurean views on the non-existence of the *post mortem* soul. The widow *ignota consolatione percussa laceravit vehementius pectus ruptosque crines super corpus iacentis imposuit.* (She ignored his consolation and beat herself and more vehemently tore at her chest and placed her torn hair over the body lying there. 111.9).

The maidservant meets with success: *'Quid proderit' inquit 'hoc tibi, si soluta inedia fueris, si te vivam sepelieris, si antequam fata poscant, indemnatum spiritum effuderis? Id cinerem aut manes credis sentire sepultos? Vis tu reviviscere? Vis discusso muliebri errore,*

[100] This sort of consolation was common in literature and epitaphs as well. Schmeling 2009:430 and Seneca *Poly*. 5.1; *Ep*.99.6; *CLE* 965.9, 995, 1097. 2.

quam diu licuerit, lucis commodis frui? Ipsum te iacentis corpus admonere debet, ut vivas.'[101] (What profit is it to you, if you are set free by starvation, if you are buried alive, if before the fates demand it, you poor forth your spirit unsentenced? Do you believe that the buried shades or ashes feel? Do you wish to live again? Do you not wish to shake off the ignorance of a woman, to enjoy the benefits of the light as long as you may? The very body of the one lying there ought to bring to your mind that you should live." 111.11-12).[102]

The key intertext for the speech of the maidservant is that of Dido's sister, Anna, in Book 4 of the *Aeneid (*4.31-53), in which she persuades the Carthaginian queen to abandon her faithfulness (*pudicitia*) towards her dead husband and pursue a liaison with Aeneas.[103] In the *Aeneid*, Anna persuades Dido with these words: *Id cinerem aut Manis credis curare sepultos?* (Do you believe that the Shades or ash care? *Aen*. 4.34). The Widow's replacement of the word *curare* from the *Aeneid* with *sentire* is worth noting. As Rimell notes "…the replacement of *curare* with *sentire* may not be so accidental: our attention is focused on the widow's *physical* reaction to the soldier."[104] But more profound than what the maidservant says about the living widow is what she says about her dead husband when she replaces *curare* with *sentire*.

---

[101]Courtney (2001) notes that this is a quote from Aeneid 4.34, where Anna attempts to persuade Dido to give up her attachment to Sycheus in favor of Aeneas. She further notes replacement of *curare* with *sentire*:

[102] Rimell 2002: 131 on this passage: "Yet perhaps the most obvious way in which the tale mirrors and develops concerns of the *Satyricon* as a whole is in its metaphorical approximation of literature as food. When the widow does not respond to the soldier's platitudes on the inevibility of death (111.8), he persists in offering her food until the maid capitulates on her behalf…As she regains her strength, the *ancilla* joins the soldier in persuading the woman to eat, taking on the role of Anna in *Aeneid* IV." 131.

[103] For this intertextual connection see e.g. 2002: 131-137, Langesland 2006, 228-230, Schmeling 2009: 431.

[104] Rimell 2002: 137n.40.

The maidservant's appeal to the physical, that is, to eat and nourish the body, is really a reminder to the widow that, while she lives and breathes, her husband no longer exists. She chastises her mistress for believing that there is any sensation left in *cineres*, mere ashes. Schmeling states: "[b]y changing Virgil's *curare* to *sentire* Eumolpus increases the Epicurean colouring of the line: not only do the dead not care about us, they have no sensibility i.e., they have altogether ceased to exist."[105] The Widow is completely persuaded by these words. As Eumolpus comments: *Nemo invitus audit, cum cogitur aut cibum sumere aut vivere*. (No one listens unwilling when compelled to either eat food or to live. 111.13). She turns her attention from death to focus on her life and especially her life with the soldier. *Iacuerunt ergo una non tantum illa nocte, qua nuptias fecerunt, sed postero etiam ac tertio die, praeclusis videlicet conditorii foribus, ut quisquis ex notis ignotisque ad monumentum venisset, putaret expirasse super corpus viri pudicissimam uxorem.* (They lay together therefore not only the one night, on which they made their nuptials, but the next and also the third day, of course, with the doors of the tomb shut, so that anyone among those familiar or unfamiliar who came to the tomb, would think that the most chaste wife had breathed her last breath over the body of her husband. 112.3). However, one of the crucified bodies which the soldier was charged with guarding is stolen. Knowing the penalty for his negligence is death, the soldier states that he plans to kill himself (112.5). At this point, the roles of the soldier and Widow are reversed.[106] She not only persuades him to live, as he persuaded her just a few days before, but offers the body of her husband as a replacement for the stolen body.

---

[105] Schmeling 2009: 431. Note as well the common epitaph: *non fui, fui, memini, non sum, non curo*. Lattimore 1942: 84. *Diog. Laert*. 10.125 (on Epicurus): τὸ φρικωδέστατον οὖν τῶν κακῶν ὁ θάνατος οὐθὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἐπειδή περ ὅταν μὲν ἡμεῖς ὦμεν, ὁ θάνατος οὐ πάρεστιν. (The most awful of evils, death, is nothing to us, since when we no longer exist, death does not exist.)
[106] Schmeling 2009: 435.

The Widow's willingness to use her husband's body in this way confirms her acceptance of the idea that the *post mortem* soul is entirely unconcerned with what happens to its body. Essentially, she is willing to deny burial to her husband's body since being crucified meant just that. A likely destination for crucified bodies was a local river or worse.[107] But, this would happen after it was first left to be eaten by carrion birds.[108] The Widow's entire focus is now on life as opposed to death.[109]

These examples require us to look at the sincerity of the philosophical position that a body could lie unburied. Erasmo makes the point that "Maecenas' famous garden on the Esquiline, which was either on the site or the former site of a cemetery, also causes the reader to question his sincerity."[110]

Vivorum meminerimus

The Widow's reversal from focusing on death to focusing on life is not unlike Phileros's response to Seleucus's speech at the *Cena*. In response to Seleucus's speech entirely devoted to death, Phileros responds: *[m]olestus fuit*, *Phileros proclamavit" "Vivorum meminerimus*." (He was annoying, Phileros shouted: Let us remember the living."43.1)[111] While there existed a broad variety of beliefs about *post mortem* existence (or lack of it), perhaps the most important

---

[107] Hope, 2000: 116. "The final insult was not corpse mutilation but the denial of burial. Those left to rot on the Gemonian Steps or upon the cross received no final rites, no funeral, no burial, no tomb, and thus no rest for their souls…the best that their families could hope for was that eventually the body would be cast into the Tiber…The river washed away the remains of the enemies of the state and in the process purified the city.

[108] Courtney, 2001: 169.

[109] Arrowsmith 1966:328-29 expresses a similar point but in relation to the Widow of Ephesus's regimen of starvation as the *askesis* she needs to return to life.

[110] Erasmo 2008: 5.

[111] Boyce 1991: 78. "It is only in the case of Chrysanthus, now that he is safely dead, that Seleucus permits himself to express any human sympathy: his compassion does not extend to the living. He dwells not on Chrysanthus as he was during life, but rather on the details of his death and burial."

message in the *Satyrica* is that death should be a reminder to all to embrace life, regardless of views on *post mortem* existence. Phileros continues his speech with a tribute to Chrysanthus's life to counteract Seleucus. Boyce points out that Phileros's intent is not so much to attack Chrysanthus as to counteract Seleucus's depressing attitude. "Thus he seeks simultaneously to point out Chrysanthus' many human failings in order to tear down the sentimentalized portrait drawn by Seleucus, while at the same time to emphasize the concrete worth of Chrysanthus' achievements in order to counter Seleucus' assertion of the futility of his life, and of human life in general."[112] Seleucus indicates that human life seems barely worth living, ranking it even below that of flies.[113] Phileros, on the other hand, recognizes value in life, even for such a person as Chrysanthus whom he describes: …*durae buccae fuit, linguosus, discordia, non homo*…*salax*… (…he was of a harsh mouth, chatty, disagreeable, not a man…lecherous…43.3).

Many critics recognize the *Cena* as a parody of Aeneas's descent into the Underworld. By the end of the *Cena*, Encolpius and his companions are thoroughly disgusted by Trimalchio and the excessive luxury which seems merely to disguise the constant reminder of death. They are desperate to leave, but find themselves trapped by a dog, reminiscent of Cerberus who guards Hades. Courtney concludes: "The implication of all this is plain. All the luxury in Trimalchio's house is just a way of disguising the fact that its inhabitants and guests are experiencing a kind of living death; now we appreciate to the full the proximity of the banquet and the grave which

[112] Boyce 1991 :78. Also Ciaffi 1955: 120-124.
[113] Flies had at least a few uses. Pliny (*NH*: 34.6) notes the efficacy of flies for treating alopecy, making eyelashes grow, as well as curing epilepsy, healing boils and wounds, and even purported their usefulness for making a baby's eyebrows black if the mother ingested them while pregnant. Schmeling 2011: 165 references Pliny *NH* 30.92 where flies are listed as a remedy for epilepsy: *fuere et qui muscas XXI rufas, et quidem a mortuo, in potu darent, infirmioribus pauciores.* (There are some who recommend 21 flies be placed in a potion, indeed even from among those dead, fewer for those who are very weak.)

have been kept in our consciousness by continual occurence of the theme of death in the *Cena*."[114] As stated above, Bodel expands this interpretation by arguing that the social status of freedmen is precisely that from which Trimalchio and his guests cannot escape until death. This "living death" however, rather than creating nihilists out these former slaves, became a framework within which to enjoy life, hence Trimalchio's position: *Sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus. Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene*. (34.10) "…[T]he behavior of the ex-slave was often seen to reflect his former condition of servitude. Having been deprived of so many pleasures of human existence, the slave, once freed, naturally tended to indulge his appetites."[115] In other words, he wanted to live and live well. Trimlachio's choice to enjoy his life despite the framework of his status reflects the contrast between Seleucus's and Phileros's speeches.

The Widow of Ephesus's transformation from viewing life as no longer worth living to wholeheartedly embracing it, mirrors this contrast between Seleucus and Phileros as well. She chooses to deny the futility of life. However, the Widow's choice indictaes also that she denies the existence of the sentient *post mortem* soul, an Epicurean perspective. Once she accomplishes this, she puts her belief into action when she provides her husband's corpse as a replacement for the stolen crucifed corpse.

The Widow of Ephesus is certainly not normal. From the perspective of the living, burial and funeral rituals in general served a very practical purpose, defending themselves from dead spirits (and one in direct contrast to the Widow's example). Most Romans would have found the Widow's treatment of her husband's corpse not only repugnant, but dangerous. In fact, for those who believed that souls continued to feel, proper burial and mourning was necessary as a

[114] Courtney 2001: 117. Also, Arrowsmith 1966.
[115] Bodel 1994: 252.

defensive measure to ensure that the living remained safe from negative interactions. Cumont summarizes:

> Loud outbursts of grief followed by prolonged manifestations of mourning must prove to them, in the first place, that they were truly lamented and that no attempt had been made to get rid of them. Then, in their new abode to which they were conveyed, they must be ensured a bearable existence, in order that they might remain therein quietly and not trouble their families nor punish, by some intrusion, those who neglected them. Solicitude for the beloved, the desire to prevent their suffering, the hope of obtaining their protection, partly account for the origin and maintenance of these practices, but they were above all inspired by the terror which spirits called forth, as is proved by the fact that they were the same for all the departed without disctinction, for those who had been loved and those who had been hated.[116]

While trends in cremation and inhumation of the body changed over the course of Roman history, proper treatment of the corpse was essential. As stated above, the main philosophical schools, Epicureanism and Stoicism expressed indifference and even disdain for the fate of the *post mortem* body. The position of philospical schools, however, was not mainstream. "Most people, however, did care about what happened to the bodies of themselves and their loved ones and great importance was placed on proper disposal. To be inadequately buried, for a body to lie exposed or even worse to be mutilated was seen as a great indignity. Criminal punishment often entailed the denial of disposal. This was a way of destroying the identity of the deceased and meant that their soul would not achieve rest."[117] Rituals that followed the proper burial of the dead and were intended to purify the living of any contamination from the dead, also confirm that there was great concern over the possibility of negative interactions with the deceased: after burial, the family of the deceased underwent the *suffito*, a purifying ritual that involved cleansing of the family members as well as the home (by fire and water) and finally, after nine days of

[116] Cumont 1932: 47-48.
[117] Hope 2009: 80.

mourning (*feriae denicales*), a funeral feast was held (*cena novendialis*), signaling the end of the mourning period.[118] Additionally, further proof of the desire to prevent interaction and contamination with the dead was the forbidding, (documented as early as the Twelve Tables) of burials within the walls of the city. [119]

At the roots of Epicurean philosophy exists a contradiction between its denial of *post mortem* existence and the actions of its founder. Epicurus himself dictates in his will that the funeral offerings for his family continue after he dies and that his own birthday be commemorated each year and at monthly meetings.[120] The Widow of Ephesus story was meant to be an example of the fickleness of women, but in fact presents the example of an Epicurean who is willing to act consistently with the philosophical beliefs of the school. Given the knowledge of what was likely to happen to her husband's body once it was placed on the cross, we are reminded of the passages above from Seneca and Lucretius which claim indifference to the treatment of corpses, as well as of Encolpius's soliloquy over Lichas.

Encolpius's philosophical questioning of the efficacy of burial concludes, ironically, with the burial of Lichas. Encolpius even went so far as to describe as *dementia* the act of ensuring that no part of the body was left behind.[121] Cumont's point that funeral rites were performed

---

[118] Hope 2009: 86.
[119] Toynbee 1971:48. "All burials, whether of bodies or of ashes, had to take place outside the city. This regulation, laid down in the Twelve Tables, was normally observed until the late Empire, although exceptions could be made for special persons and for emperors. Sanitary precautions and fear of defilement readily explain the law."
[120] *Diog Laert.* 10.18. See n. 2 at the beginning of this chapter for the Greek text and translation.
[121] This may be a reference to the practice of *os resectum* which became popular in the republic as inhumation gave way to cremation for awhile. A small part of the body, usually a finger, was severed from the body to be buried before it was cremated. Cicero refers to this in *De Legibus* 2.22.55-57 and Varro *De Lingua Latina* 5.23. It was necessary for at least a small amount of earth to cover the bones in order for the burial to be sacred. *De Leg*. 2.22.57*: nam prius quam in os iniecta gleba est, locus ille, ubi crematum est corpus, nihil habet religionis*. See also Carroll

whether the dead person was hated or loved resonates in this situation. *Et Licham quidem rogus inimicis collatus manibus adolebat. Eumolpus autem dum epigramma mortuo facit, oculos ad arcessendos sensus longius mittit* ...(And, indeed, a funeral pyre built with enemy hands burned Lichas. While Eumolpus made an epigram for the dead man, and sent his eyes a long while searching for the right expression…115.20). Toynbee writes: "…to leave a corpse unburied had unpleasant repercussions on the fate of the departed soul…custom ordained that in normal circumstances the obsequies should be carried out with as much solemnity as circumstances in every case allowed."[122] Lichas, although an enemy and lost at sea, receives full funerary treatment.

As Encolpius and his companions move on towards Croton after burying Lichas, the narrator closes the scene: *Hoc peracto libenter officio*… (Having gladly performed this duty…116.1). Encolpius questions the efficacy of burial but indicates by his actions that something holds him back from fully embracing the idea that burial does not matter. In fact, Lichas is *libenter* buried and even receives a funerary speech from Eumolpus. This contradiction between action and sentiment exists even in the passages of Seneca and Lucretius, above. Each one may claim to be unconcerned with the treatment of his corpse, but there is an "implication that nature is performing a duty that should be performed by humans. Despite his statement to the contrary, the poet is, in fact, thinking about burial and the role of nature in disposing of the dead."[123]

2006: 68 Small pottery jugs disovered in the 18th century along the Via Appia, containing severed fingers, possibly demonstrate this practice.

[122] Toynbee, 1971.

[123] Erasmo 2008: 5.

Only the Widow of Ephesus presents the example of what happens when someone is willing to carry out to completion Epicurean and Stoic beliefs on the *post mortem* soul. Encolpius's burial of Lichas points to the difficulty real Romans would have had with fully embracing these philosophical teachings on *post mortem* existence. As Cumont states: "Peoples remained strongly attached to practices the omission of which would have seemed to them dangerous as well as ominous, for the spirits of the dead were powerful and vindictive."[124] Given the uncertainty about *post mortem* existence, the living found it much safer to act in accordance with tradition than against it.

Gladiators

Gladiators deserve attention in this chapter on actual death since Echion, the fifth freedman to give a speech in the *Cena*, devotes a large part of what he says to describing the upcoming *munera* of Glyco, and the deaths that will actually take place there. While fights, such as the one that Echion looks forward to, seem far removed from the solemnity of funerals, these games, or *munera*, originated as spectacles put on by the Roman elite during funerals.[125] These deaths are unlike the other deaths in the *Satyrica* since the seriousness of the event is masked under this guise of entertainment and from a superficial standpoint, the theatrical presentation of the fights mitigates the reality of the deaths taking place. Gunderson summarizes the dichotomy between the reality and fiction that the arena presented: "The shows of course happen, but what they say is neither true nor false. Everyone knows that this is mere theatre… Conversely, even where one knows that those really are real men and beasts dying and fighting down there, the

[124] Cumont 1932: 55.
[125] Edwards 2007: 47, 231. "Under the Republic, gladiatorial shows were generally given to mark an aristocratic funeral. The first instance recorded dates to 264 B.C.E. at the funeral games given in honour of Junius Brutus Pera by his two sons." Also: Val. Max. 2.4.7.

reality of their travails is subsumed under the apparatus of the arena itself. Real deaths thereby become fictive ones, and real blood is always also staged blood."[126]

Echion begins his speech midway through the *Cena* evaluating the quality of *munera* that are about to be put on nearby*:*

> *Et ecce habituri sumus munus excellente in triduo die festa; familia non lanisticia, sed plurimi liberti. Et Titus noster magnum animum habet et est caldicerebrius: aut hoc aut illud erit, quid utique. Nam illi domesticus sum, non est miscix. Ferrum optimum daturus est, sine fuga, carnarium in medio, ut amphitheater videat. Et habet unde: relictum est illi sestertium tricenties, decessit illius pater male. Ut quadringenta impendat, non sentiet patrimonium illius, et sempiterno nominabitur.*
>
> And behold, we are about to have an excellent game at the festival in three days; not only the company of gladiators, but many freedmen. And our Titus has a great spirit and is hot-headed: it will be either here or there, but something certainly. For I am a friend of his, he is no fickle fellow. He will give us the best fight, without flight, butcher shop right in our midst, so that the whole amphitheater may see it. He has the the wherewithal: thirty million was left to him, when his father died sadly. If he spends four hundred thousand his inheritance won't feel it, and his name will live forever. 45.4-6.

Of special note in this passage is the phrase *sine fuga* (without flight). As Schmeling states: "This contest promises to be a bloody one. Petronius, in using *carnarium* might wish to imply that the seriously wounded gladiators, instead of being brought through the *porta Libitinensis* into the *spoliarium* to be stripped of their accoutrements and killed there, would be killed before the eyes of the spectators."[127] This sort of fight removed one of the key elements of suspense usually associated with the games: the moment in which the victor of the game waited for the *editor* of the game to direct him to spare the life of the defeated fighter or kill him. If the editor decided that the defeated fighter should die, the fighter still had a chance to die bravely. Regarding the sentenced gladiator, Thomas Wiedemann notes: "He was expected to take the

[126] Gunderson 2003: 644 and Edwards 2007: 53.
[127] Schmeling 2011: 184.

coup de grace without protest, and the ritualized way in which it was carried out will have helped many gladiators fulfill this expectation. In that sense even the gladiator who died in the arena had overcome death."[128] Echion's speech confirms that gladiators developed reputations for themselves based on how bravely they fought and their fame won for them a sort of immortality not unlike that of the epic heroes.

Gladiators knew death was imminent and recent studies indicate that "even for relatively successful gladiators the chances of dying early were high."[129] Seneca confirms this when he expresses concern about the effect of watching death under the the guise of entertainment: *Nihil vero tam damnosum bonis moribus quam in aliquo spectaculo desidere.* (Nothing truly is so damning to good morals than to desire to go to any show. *Ep.* 7.2) Seneca's criticism follows: *Tunc enim per voluptatem facilius vitia subrepunt.* (For then it is that, through the show, vices creep in most easily. *Ep*. 7.2). He emphasizes the continuous killing that occurs all day and the bloodthirstiness of the crowd: *Mane leonibus et ursis homines, meridie spectatoribus suis obiciuntur. Interfectores interfecturis iubent obici et victorem in aliam detinent caedem. Exitus pugnantium mors est; ferro et igne res geritur.* (In the morning men are thrown to the bears and lions, at noon to their spectators. They command that the slayers be thrown to those who will soon slay them and they hold back the victor for another slaughter. The conclusion of the fights is death; the business is conducted by fire and sword. 7.4-5).

---

[128] Weidemann 1992: 35. Edwards 2011: 61 comments further on this passage: "Indeed perhaps one might say especially the gladiator who had died."

[129] Edwards 2007:51: "Condemned criminals…had almost no chance of surviving…a recent study suggest that even for relatively successful gladiators the chances of dying early were very high…About one gladiator in six…would meet death in each show." Also, Hopkins and Beard 2005: 86-94. Edwards (2007: 232) further notes a study conducted by Karl Grossschmidt and Fabian Kanz at the University of Vienna (*New Scientist* 22 Jan. 2005:14) on bodies of gladiators found at Ephesus confirming the high rate of gladiator deaths.

Echion seems especially excited about the added certainty of bloodshed in the upcoming fight. Seneca uses the situation of *sine fuga* as a metaphor for encouraging his audience to eradicate anxiety about the duration of their lives: *Numquid feliciorem iudicas eum, qui summo die muneris, quam eum, qui medio occiditur? Numquid aliquem tam stulte cupidum esse vitae putas, ut iugulari in spoliario quam in harena malit? Non maiore spatio alter alterum praecedimus. Mors per omnes it; qui occidit, consequitur occisum.* (Do you really think that person luckier who is killed on the last day of the games than him who is killed in the middle? Do you think any person to be so stupidly desirous of life that he prefers his throat cut in the *spoliarium* than on the sand? We procede one another by no greater interval. Death comes to everyone; he who slays, follows as the slain. *Ep.* 93.12).[130] Seneca's criticsm of the damaging effects of the viewing death in the arena is balanced by his appreciation of the opportunity that gladiators enjoyed for dying well. From the perspective of the gladiator, dying well in the arena could be a way to gain immortal fame much like heroes in war. In fact, as the Principate progressed, the elite saw fewer and fewer opportunities for gaining recognition for *virtus* in war, such as had been available to soldiers during the Republic. Fighting as a gladiator, on occasion, became a replacement for gaining the recognition previously afforded by traditions, such as the triumph or public funerals, and now usurped by the emperor.[131]

Echion opens his speech with the statement *"Oro te" inquit Echion centonarius "melius loquere. 'Modo sic, modo sic' inquit rusticus; varium porcum perdiderat. Quod hodie non est, cras erit: sic vita truditur.* ("I beg you," he said, "to speak more favorably. 'One time this way, another time that way,' said the country man when he lost his spotted pig. What is not today,

[130] Also, Schmeling 2011:184.
[131] Edwards 2007: 34, cites: Levick 1983: 99, Bartsch 1994: chapter one.

will be tomorrow: thus, life is pushed onward. 45.3). Burman and Lattimore both note the prevalence of the sentiment expressed by *quod hodie non est, cras erit: sic vita truditur* in epitaphs. Burman cites an epitaph with similar phrasing: *vixi ut vivis. morieris ut sum mortuus, sic vita truditur*. (I lived as you live. You will die as I have died, thus life is pushed onward.).[132] Lattimore, as outlined above, compiled epitaphs which expressed this consolatory sentiment of death as the inevitable fate of all mankind. Viewing death in the arena, and particularly fighters dying bravely, could afford a certain level of consolation. Edwards remarks that "the capacity of that other to meet death unflinchingly—even though he is otherwise morally inferior—can function as a sort of comfort as one contemplates one's own mortality."[133]

The final part of Echion's speech, however, reveals him to have more than a healthy appetite and appreciation for viewing death. It places him among the crowd of people Seneca criticizes for no longer appreciating the fact that real deaths are occurring in the arena. The last part of Echion's speech continues with a description of one of his favorite servants and his acomplishments. Having found him too fond of his pet birds, he takes action: *Ingeniosus est et bono filo, etiam si in aves morbosus est. Ego illi iam tres cardeles occidi, et dixi quod mustella comedit*. (He is smart and with a good nature, even if he is too attached to his birds. I have already killed three of his finches, and said that a weasel ate them. 46.4). Schmeling observes: "Echion looks forward to *carnarium in medio* and kills the finches of his *cicaro* without any feeling."[134]

Gladiatorial games offered a means for their participants, through the display of *virtus*, to gain glory and overcome the power of death by preserving memory of their deeds. Through

[132] Schmeling 2011: 182. Burman 1709 and Lattimore 1942.
[133] Edwards 2007: 69.
[134] Scmeling 2011: 194.

viewing death, spectators also confronted their own mortality. However, Petronious portrays, through Echion, someone who proves Seneca's criticisms of the arena.

CHAPTER 2 – APPARENT DEATH

While the last chapter dealt with instances of actual death in the *Satyrica*, this chapter examines apparent death. As the title suggests, apparent deaths are those which seem real to at least some people viewing them, and as a result, one of the hallmarks of this type of death is deception. The deception is sometimes aimed at a few select characters in the plot, sometimes includes all characters, and sometimes even the audience is deceived as well. This chapter examines this deception from many angles: its modes, motives, effects and literary and theatrical inspiration. Three episodes in particular demonstrate this type of death: Eumolpus plays the part of a dying old man at Croton (116.9-141), Giton dupes Encolpius with a feigned suicide (94.8-15) and the Widow of Ephesus pretends to die in her husband's tomb. The suicide scene of Encolpius and Giton and the episode at Croton are both part of the primary storyline of the *Satyrica* whereas the Widow of Ephesus episode takes place as a self-contained narrative within the main plot.

These instances of staged deaths exhibit the influence of both theatre and literature, and often at the same time.[135] It is important here to note that this was a phenomenon occurring in Petronius's time because under Augustus, the lines between these two genres became blurred.[136] In particular, Nero himself was an actor and a poet, but more importantly, actively sought to promote literature-as-performance. The Neronian, a poetic competition he started in 60 C.E.,

---

[135] Schmeling 2011: 340: "[T]ragedy and mime in the *Satyrica* tend to merge: 94.15~108.11, 117.4~140.6." This is one way in which high literary models are degraded in the *Satyrica* according to Slater 1990: 89

[136] On the popularity of spectacle in the Principate, Conte 1987: 403-4 writes that the audience of first century literature had grown to include "large masses of Italians and urbanized provincials" whose tastes dictated the changing face of literature which was traditionally "intended for a cultivated and ideologically restricted audience. In the face of this it is not surprising that contemporary literature, poetry especially, tends, within certain limits and in certain respects, to become a form of spectacle and to take on theatrical traits."

exemplifies this cultural agenda of Nero: he wanted cultural activities to be "public and in the nature of spectacles."[137] Petronius, especially considering his intimacy with Nero, may have been reacting in part to this atmosphere. In the theatrical realm, these episodes of feigned death in the *Satyrica* reveal the influence of the mime, and in the literary realm, especially, Greek Romance, epic and tragedy. [138]

It is obvious that pretend deaths exhibit the influence of theater and literature since they are, by their very nature, feigned or at least not real. In addition, the characters in the *Satyrica* are particularly disposed to literary and theatrical death because they consistently imitate characters from literature and theater. Schmeling observes "As difficulties arise in the lives of our heroes, they do not have enough familiarity with the real world to seek real-life remedies. Instead they turn to their books."[139] Conte delves into Petronius's literary strategy which constructs Encolpius as the unreliable 'mythomaniac' narrator who consistently finds himself in situations "that can be interpreted according to an epic-heroic model. The young man responds by adapting himself to this model and claiming it as his own, that is, transforming himself into a "rhetorically" determined role."[140]

During the time of Nero, the mime enjoyed great popularity and had even become the predominant form of comedy. [141] Panayotakis notes that one of the hallmarks of the mime was the fact that "all aspects of everyday life, and not just heroic or divine subjects" were imitated by

---

[137] Conte 1999: 402.
[138] Several modern scholars have compiled and examined the influences of theatre in general on Petronius, starting with Collignon in 1892.
[139] Schmeling 2011: 403. This is certainly true of these instances of fake deaths, although there are many ways in which Petronius's characters exhibit the ability to seek real-life remedies for dealing with death, as chapters one and three indicate.
[140] Conte 1997: 3-4.
[141] Panayotakis 1995: xix, xxi; Horsfall 1989: 194 and 206, n. 4.

it.[142] Scholars generally agree that of all all comedic genres, the mime had the most prominent influence on the *Satyrica*.[143] Some of the more important characteristics of the mime employed by Petronius were, as Sullivan describes, "swift disappearances, violence, quarrels, concealments, enforced baths, impostures and dramatic *bouleversements*."[144] Additionally, Sullivan points out that one of the special features of mine was "deception and imposture" and this in particular applies to this chapter on apparent death.[145]

The mime also enjoyed a long-standing association with death and funerals.[146] During the imperial period, Suetonius's account of Vespasian's funeral (79 C.E.) includes a reference to a mime actor who imitated the dead emperor in his funeral procession. Sumi observes that "Suetonius' language makes it clear that by his day such a theatrical display of the deceased was traditional."[147] Petronius, no doubt, capitalized on this close association of mime with death in

---

[142] Panayotakis 1995: xxi.
[143] Panayotakis 1995, xiii. He bases this observation on a quote from Diomedes (*Art. Gramm. Lib.* III p. 491 Kiel) Also, Sullivan 1968: 223: "In sum it may be said that mime subjects and situations provide part of the grist for Petronius's sophisticated and literary mill. They provide the melodrama, the movement, and incident for the picaresque plot and some of its farcical humor…the insistence in certain episodes on laughter and applause, ideas so opposed to the upper class Roman notion of *gravitas*, again indicates that one source of humor that Petronius was drawing upon, as I have suggested, the fusing of typical incidents from the plots of mime with a highly literary language and treatment—once more the humor of incongruity." However, the mime shares many characteristics with New Comedy as well, and the line between these two is not easily drawn. Preston 1915, 266: "Resemblances in style and subject-matter between the rather meager remains of the dramatic mime and the *Satiricon* lose something of their significance when we note that most of these elements are found also in the new comedy."
[144] Sullivan 1968: 223
[145] Sullivan 1968: 222.
[146] This association goes back to well before the Principate. Sumi (2001) provides a number of ancient sources: (560) Diodorus, 31.25.2; (561-62) Plautus, *Amph*. 458–59; (562-63) Polyb. 6.53.5–9.
[147] Sumi 2002: 564-565, notes the use of *ut et mos* in the following passage: *sed et in funere Favor archimimus personam eius ferens imitansque, ut est mos, facta ac dicta vivi, interrogatis palam procuratoribus, quanti funus et pompa constaret*… (At his funeral, that Favo, the chief mimic actor impersonated [Vespasian] and imitating, as is the custom, the deeds and speech of him as when he was alive, asked the procuraters directly, how much the funeral had cost… Suet.

Roman culture which would have made his humorous treatment of death easily accessible to his audience.

Attempted suicide and the motif of *Scheintod*, both common occurrences in the Greek Romance, find a home in the *Satyrica* as well.[148] Often, suicide and *Schientod* intermingle as is the case in the *Satyrica*. In the *Satyrica*, *Scheintod* facilitates the progression of the plot in the Widow of Ephesus story and the suicide of Giton, and Eumolpus is likely pretending to be dead when his will is read at the very end of the extant *Satyrica*. Suicide often mingles with *Scheintod* because the apparent death is frequently that of a beloved and becomes the impetus for the suicide of the lover.

Croton

From its very beginning, features of the mime dominate the episode at Croton.[149] Here, Eumolpus pretends not to be dead, but to be a dying elderly man. The three companions, Encolpius, and Giton and Eumolpus first learn about the special character of the city of Croton from the *vilicus* who meets them on their way:

> "*Sin autem urbanioris notae homines sustinetis semper mentiri, recta ad lucrum curritis. In hac enim urbe non litterarum studia celebrantur, non eloquentia locum habet, non frugalitas sanctique mores laudibus ad fructum perveniunt, sed*

Vesp. 19.2) But, Sumi also notes (566): "If such a performance were customary, and here we must admit that the fragmentary nature of the evidence discourages firm conclusions, then the mime's performance could have contributed to the festive, even "carnivalesque," atmosphere of Roman funerals… This penchant for burlesque, even self-parody, in a funeral ceremony encourages the view that the mime's performance might have been typically mocking and irreverent, although again our direct evidence from the high empire is limited to Suetonius' description of the mime at Vespasian's funeral."

[148] See among others: Achilles Tatius's *Leucippe and Clitophon*, the *Historia Appolonii Regis Tauri*, Chariton's *Callirhoe*, already listed in the introduction.

[149] Panayotakis 1994: 458 treats the entire episode at Croton as a "narrative equivalent of a theatrical farce" and divides his analysis between the "mimetic backdrop" of the episode and the theatrical elements.

> *quoscunque homines in hac urbe videritis, scitote in duas partes esse divisos. Nam aut captantur aut captant*.
>
> However, if as men of a more cultivated stamp you can sustain always lying, you are running straight to profit. For in this city the study of literature is not praised, nor does eloquence have a place, nor does frugality or the life of purity find its return in praise, but whatever men you see in this city, understand that they are divided into two parts. For they are either being hunted for legacies, or they are hunting for legacies. 116.5-7.

The *vilicus* ends his description of the Crotonites: *Adibitis" inquit "oppidum tanquam in pestilentia campos, in quibus nihil aliud est nisi cadavera, quae lacerantur, aut corvi, qui lacerant"* ...("You will go into a town just as onto a diseased plain in which there is nothing else but corpses which are torn to pieces or vultures which are tearing them to pieces"…116.9).

Eumolpus employs his talent for deception (*mentior*) and plans how to enact the role of a dying rich man: *"Utinam quidem sufficeret largior* ***scaena****, id est vestis humanior, instrumentum lautius, quod praeberet mendacio fidem…* (If only a larger stage could be found, that is, more refined clothes, more splendid tools, which could lend proof to our lie…117.2). Again, the role of deception is emphasized with *mendacium*, and he indicates the mode of delivering his deception:*"Quid ergo" inquit Eumolpus "cessamus* ***mimum*** *componere?* (Why, therefore, should we delay to make up a mime? 117.4). In addition to specifically stating that he plans to make up a mime, Petronius incorporates particular elements of the mime, in the content of this scene, as Sullivan observes, "the poor old man, who pretends to be rich and ill, and so profitably deceives the legacy hunters."[150]

The details of the feigned death scene are worked out. *Secundum hanc formulam imperamus Eumolpo, ut plurimum tussiat, ut sit modo solutioris stomachi cibosque omnes palam damnet; loquatur aurum et argentum fundosque mendaces et perpetuam terrarum sterilitatem…*

[150] Sullivan 1968: 222.

(Following this pattern, we commanded Eumolpus to cough often, have entirely loose bowels, and to openly damn all his food; he would speak of gold and silver and deceitful estates and the constant barreness of his lands. 117.10).

The purpose of Eumolpus's pretend dying is material gain and the three characters, at least for a while, are successful. After relating their tale to the townspeople they immediately press their own riches on Eumolpus with the greatest zealousness. (*statim opes suas summo cum certamine in Eumolpum congesserunt*. 124.3). Encolpius grows a little uncomfortable with the luck of their situation after a while and indicates that it may not last forever.

> *Ceterum ego, etsi quotidie magis magisque superfluentibus bonis saginatum corpus impleveram putabamque a custodia mei removisse vultum Fortunam, tamen saepius tam consuetudinem meam cogitabam quam causam, et "quid" aiebam "si callidus captator exploratorem in Africam miserit mendaciumque deprehenderit nostrum?*
>
> Still I, even if every day I had filled up my fat body more and more with good luxuries and I thought Fortune had removed her face from her guard on me, still, I was thinking more frequently over my experience and saying, "What if a shrewd legacy-hunter sends an explorer into Africa and catches hold of our lie?... 125.2-3.

Through the con of Encolpius and his companions Petronius is parodying a common literary theme of Roman writers: legacy-hunting. In playing the dying and rich old man, Eumolpus in his sham role of *testator* (will-maker) is taking advantage of the *captatores*' (legacy hunters) greed. In reality, the occupation of *captatio* (legacy hunting) was greatly exaggerated by Roman writers, but Champlin explains that this exaggeration was a metaphor used by writers to comment on the broad corruption of wealth in Roman society:

> "What is central here is captation's symbolic role in the standard perception of the evil effect of wealth on Roman society, of avarice and selfishness both tearing the family apart and perverting friendship absolutely. Given their great concern with wills, it is not surprising that Roman writers should express such evil in terms of inheritance hunting. Captation ignites the tensions at a major social frontier,

between family and friendship, at a time of great danger, the succession of generations."[151]

Seneca, in his philosophical writings, employs the theme of legacy hunting to illustrate the fact that intention determines whether the same action is either base or noble. The following two passages illustrate this: *Amico aliquis aegro adsidet: probamus. At hoc hereditatis causa facit: vultur est, cadaver expectat. Eadem aut turpia sunt aut honesta; refert, quare aut quemadmodum fiant.* (When someone sits next to a sick person, we approve. But when people do it for the sake of a legacy, they are vultures waiting for cadavers. The same things are either base or noble; what matters is why and in what way they are done. *Ep*. 95.43).

> *Ingratum voco, qui aegro adsidit, quia testamentum facturus est, cui de hereditate aut de legato vacat cogitare. Faciat licet omnia, quae facere bonus amicus et memor officii debet: si animo eius obversatur spes lucri, captator est et hamum iacit. Ut aves, quae laceratione corporum aluntur, lassa morbo pecora et casura ex proximo speculantur, ita hic imminet morti et circa cadaver volat.*
>
> I call the person ungrateful who sits next to a sick person, because he is about to make a will, for whom there is room to think about an inheritance or a legacy: if the hope of gain is observed in his soul, he is a captator and casts a hook. Just as birds, who feed on the torn flesh of bodies, keep watch from a close distance over flocks worn out and falling from disease, just so, this man looms over a dead man and circles around a corpse. *De Ben*. 4.20.3.[152]

The second passages displays an unmistakable similarity with the language Corax, the *vilicus*, uses to end his description of the Crotonites (above). Eumolpus and his companions, ironically, play at dying to a dead society: one that is ultimately closed to any "succession of generations" (Champlin, above) because of its lack of procreation.

---

[151] Champlin 1991: 97: "…[T]here can be no doubt that Pliny and other commentators saw *captatio* as a rampant evil, and that is important; but they do not provide evidence for its historical nature or extent." See also: Champlin 1991: 102.
[152] See Champlin: 97 for these passages as well.

Although the text becomes very fragmentary towards the end of the extant *Satyrica*, which is also the end of the episode at Croton, it becomes clear that the sham of the companions has been discovered and they find it necessary to move on. The potential *Scheintod* of Eumolpus must actualized in order to protect their scheme and shield his companions from the wrath of the Crotonites should they discover the deception. Eumolpus progresses from playing the *dying* old man to the *dead* man and his will is read to the Crotonites: *"Omnes, qui in testamento meo legata habent, praeter libertos meos hac condicione percipient, quae dedi, si corpus meum in partes conciderint et astante populo comederint"* ... (All those who have a legacy in my will, besides my children, will take possession on this condition, which I give, that they will cut up my body into parts and eat it standing in public. 141.2).

Here Eumolpus concretizes the metaphor of the Crotonites as feeders of cadavers by literally making himself a cadaver to be torn to pieces by his legatees. This may also be a satirization of one of the laws of the Twelve Tables, since Eumolpus (pretending to be dead at this point) was undoubtedly indebted to many residents of Croton: *Nam si plures forent, quibus reus esset iudicatus, secare, si vellent, atque partiri corpus addicti sibi hominis permiserunt. Et quidem verba ipsa legis dicam, ne existimes invidiam me istam forte formidare: 'Tertiis' inquit, 'nundinis partis secanto. Si plus minusve secuerunt, se fraude esto.'* (For if there were many, to whom the affair had been judged, they were allowed to cut the body of the man indebted to them, if they wished, and to divide it up. And indeed, I relate the very words of the law, lest you by chance think me afraid of its odium: on the third market day, let him be cut into parts. If they cut him more or less, let it not be an offence for them. Gellius, *AN* 20.1.49-50).[153] Gellius continues,

[153] Schmeling 2011: 546.

with the comment that it was unlikely that anyone implemented this law, rather that it was used as a deterrent.

Following through with the scheme to the end, a man by the name of Gorgias takes up the task of persuading the *captatores* to eat the body. *Gorgia paratus erat exsequi...*(Gorgias was ready to carry out his duty…141.5).[154] He continues to persuade the audience by promising their stomachs future rewards (*multorum bonorum pensationem*), by covering over the flesh with sauce (*blandimenta*), and by citing examples from other cultures where cannibalism was accepted (141.8-11).

It is likely that here, Petronius, by using this example of persuasion to the point of cannibalism, is emphasizing how degraded, the art of rhetoric had become by this time period at Rome, or parodying those who held this opinion. The name Gorgias reminds Petronius's audience of the famous fifth-century B.C.E. philosopher and sophist from Lenotini. Sophists were famous for their ability to make a weaker argument seem stronger and, generally, for their skill in persuasion.

Finally, Croton was traditionally considered the place where Pythagoras founded his philosophical sect. Although there is considerable confusion over whether Protagoras was himself a vegetarian, his followers by the fourth century, who had adopted many Orphis practices, likely were.[155] The metaphor of the Crotonians as birds preying on corpses or corpses

[154] Schmeling 2011: 548 notes the double meaning of *exsequi* in this passage: "to follow to the grave" and "to carry out a duty."
[155] Bremmer 2002: 13: "There are persistent traditions that Pythagoras, unlike later Pythagoreans, was not a vegetarian. Apparently, he refrained only from eating the ram and the plough-ox, which it once, reportedly, had also been a crime to kill in Athens, but he liked sucking kids and cockerels."

themselves, and its subsequent fulfillment in the requirements of Eumolpus's will, directly contradicts Pythagorian practices.[156]

Fake suicides

At chapter 94, soon after the end of the *Cena*, Encolpius and Giton engage in a suicide scene. This scene closely weaves together the theatrical and literary elements of mime, *Scheintod* and tragedy. Giton, in fact, seems to be composing his own master mime or chapter of a Greek romance through a theatrical framework of *Scheintod* and attempted suicide.[157] He manipulates Encolpius into a genuine enactment of the grief-stricken lover—in other words, Encolpius is not "in on the joke." This allows both those watching the scene within the plot, as well as the external audience, to view the scene as Giton creates it together with the genuine reactions of Encolpius. Beyond the theatrical and literary elements, Encolpius's "real" participation provides further sophistication of the scene by recalling philosophical criticisms of suicide committed for the sake of love.

Encolpius first meets Eumolpus after the end of the *Cena*. Directly afterwards, Giton chooses to betray Encolpius and run away with Ascyltus. One betrayal is followed by another, however, and Encolpius soon finds himself deceived by Eumolpus who, attracted by Giton's beauty, locks Encolpius in a room so he can seduce Giton unhindered. Despairing, Encolpius attempts, unsuccessfully, to kill himself:

> *Inclusus ego suspendio vitam finire constitui. Et iam semicinctio lecti stantis ad parietem spondam vinxeram cervicesque nodo condebam, cum reseratis foribus intrat Eumolpus cum Gitone meque a fatali iam meta revocat ad lucem. Giton praecipue ex dolore in rabiem efferatus tollit clamorem, me utraque manu*

---

[156] See Chapter 4 for more on this topic.

[157] Bowie 1996: 101. Petronius either "parodies the ideal romance…or draws on a Greek comic version that does…In either case, a Roman of the writing classes in the reign of Nero emerges as a fancier of one or other sort of Greek novel and as a writer who expects his readers to appreciate the parody."

> *impulsum praecipitat super lectum, "erras" inquit "Encolpi, si putas contingere posse, ut ante moriaris. Prior coepi; in Ascylti hospitio gladium quaesivi. Ego si te non invenissem, periturus per praecipitia fui.*
>
> Being locked in, I decided to end my life by hanging. And, now, I had tied a belt to the frame of the bed standing near the wall and was bringing my neck into the knot, when the door was unlocked and Eumolpus entered with Giton and called me back to the light now at the edge of death. Giton especially wild to the point of madness from sorrow raised up a shout, and he cast me down, pushed me with both hands onto the bed and said, "you are wrong, Encolpius, of you think that you are able to arrange it so that you may die first. I began this before. I sought a sword in the lodging of Ascyltus. 94.8-11.

At this point three of the most common ways of committing suicide have been mentioned: hanging, stabbing and jumping.[158] Here, Giton physically takes control of the scene he is about to set, but we are still unaware, since Encolpious is our source for information, that Giton is planning to play dead. He continues, now indicating Encolpius's place is in the audience rather than as a participant in the scene: *Et ut scias non longe esse quaerentibus mortem, specta invicem, quod me spectare voluisti." Haec locutus mercennario Eumolpi novaculam rapit et semel iterumque cervice percussa ante pedes collabitur nostros. Exclamo ego attonitus, secutusque labentem eodem ferramento ad mortem viam quaero*. (And, so you may know that death is not far from those seeking it, view in turn, what you wished me to view." He said this and seized the razor from the servant of Eumolpus and after once then twice striking his throat, fell at our feet. I was thunderstruck, and ran to him as he fell and sought the road to death with the same razor. 94.11-14). At this point Encolpius's behavior brings to mind the death of Nisus from book nine of the *Aeneid* over the body of Euryalus. *Tum super exanimum sese proiecit amicum confossus placidaque ibi demum morte quievit.*(Then he stabbed himself and

[158] Schmeling 2011: 387.

threw himself over the lifeless body of his friend and there at last he lay at rest in peaceful death. 9.444-45).[159]

Encolpious's two attempts at suicide have been in earnest and we, as the audience, have experienced his plight. However, as Conte notes, the impetus for this scene lies before this scene at chapter 80 where Giton plays the role of Jocasta who throws herself between Eteocles and Polynices when they battle before Thebes.[160] Here, Giton throws himself between Encolpius and Ascyltus when they start to duel over him. *Inter hanc miserorum dementiam infelicissimus puer tangebat utriusque genua cum fletu petebatque suppliciter, ne Thebanum par humilis taberna spectaret, neve sanguine mutuo pollueremus familiaritatis clarissimae sacra*. (In the midst of this madness of us wretched ones the boy touched both our knees and, suppliantly begged us with tears lest the humble tavern look upon a dueling Theban pair, or pollute the sancitiy of their pure friendship with each other's blood. 80.3-4).[161]

In regard to Giton's manipulation of this scene, Conte refers back to this scene from chapter 80:

> "Giton is well aware that he is putting on the mask of Jocasta's tragic role without being worthy of the role he is interpreting. But the sublime model reactivated by Giton-Jocasta still finds its usual victim, Encolpius. The poor *scholasticus* falls prey to the scenario prepared by Giton, and he stays deceived when the boy suddenly abandons the role of the tragic mother as impartial arbiter between the two sons and follows Ascyltus. Encolpius really believes in the values and models of high literature which they are impersonating. Giton mocks them both."[162]

---

[159] Conte 1997: 78.
[160] Seneca, *Phoen.* 443.
[161] See OLD *thebanus* which specifically refers to the duel between Polynices and Eteocles in Seneca's *Phoen*. 326
[162] Conte 1997:81.

At this point Encolpius becomes aware that Giton has been playing dead, and even refers to the scene as a mime (*mimicam mortem*) and then that this tale was played among by the lovers (*haec fabula inter amantes luditur* 95.1) At this point Encolpius realizes that the whole scene was theater.

> *Sed neque Giton ulla erat suspicione vulneris laesus, neque ego ullum sentiebam dolorem. Rudis enim novacula et in hoc retusa, ut pueris discentibus audaciam tonsoris daret, instruxerat thecam. Ideoque nec mercennarius ad raptum ferramentum expaverat, nec Eumolpus interpellaverat mimicam mortem*.
>
> But Giton was not injured with any indication of a wound, nor was I feeling any pain. For the razor was roughly finished and hammered in this way, and so it could give to boys in training the boldness of a barber, it had a sheath built on it. Therefore, the servant had not paled on account of the snatched razor, nor had Eumolpus interrupted the mimed death. 94.14-15.

Giton has played his role convincingly, causing Encolpius to attempt suicide in earnest, whereas Giton's control of the situation is indicated and emphasized by the use of *spectare*: ***specta*** *invicem, quod me* ***spectare*** *voluisti* (look in turn, on what you wished me to view). Giton places Encolpius, as well as us, the audience, in the role of spectators. We realize, along with Encolpius, that this has been a mime all along, something made apparent not only by Encolpius's description of the death as mimed (*mimicam mortem*) but also by the use of the *ferramentum*, or a dull barber's razor, a common prop in the mime.[163] Giton, Eumolpus and the servant of Eumolpus have appreciated that this is theater from the beginning of the scene. "The whole scene has been staged for Encolpius's benefit by Eumolpus and Giton…Giton bursts in at precisely the right moment to seize control of the theatrical frame and make Encolpius a spectator, not a participant, once more—despite a last attempt by Encolpius to join in."[164]

[163] Schmeling 2011:388.
[164] Slater 1990:103.

This play-acted suicide of lovers reflects several aspects of suicide in the reality of Rome. The contrast between the Giton's exaggerated staging of suicide and Encolpius's earnestness recalls several ancient philosophical warnings against committing suicide for frivolous reasons. Seneca draws Lucilius's attention to several of these: *Non vides, quam ex frivolis causis contemnatur? Alius ante amicae fores laqueo pependit, alius se praecipitavit e tecto, ne dominum stomachantem diutius audiret, alius ne reduceretur e fuga, ferrum adegit in viscera. Non putas virtutem hoc effecturam, quod efficit nimia formido?* (Do you not see from what frivolous causes [life] is held in contempt? One hangs himself from a doorway of a friend by a noose, another one makes himself fall from a roof, that he not listen any longer to his fuming master, another lest he be brought back from escape, drives his sword into his innards. *Ep*. 4.4).

Aristotle also criticizes using suicide as a means of escape from evils rather than as a noble act: τὸ δ᾽ ἀποθνήσκειν φεύγοντα πενίαν ἢ ἔρωτα ἤ τι λυπηρὸν οὐκ ἀνδρείου, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δειλοῦ· μαλακία γὰρ τὸ φεύγειν τὰ ἐπίπονα, καὶ οὐχ ὅτι καλὸν ὑπομένει, ἀλλὰ φεύγων κακόν. (But to die in order to escape from poverty, or love, or from some pain, is not the act of a man, but rather of a coward; for it is weakness to flee from painful things, and he submits not because it is a good, but to escape evil. *NE* 1116a12).

Stoic and Epicurean views on suicide are often difficult to determine with consistency, although both philosophical schools frequently viewed it as a noble way to end life.[165] Suicide committed in order to prevent betraying a friend was always viewed as a noble act among both Stoics and Epicureans whose views on suicide by the Principate time period, were, according to

[165] Hill 2004, 73-78.

Hill, "mutually reinforcing."[166] The Greek romances abounded with trivial suicide attempts. Conte notes the *Satyrica's* incorporation of these stock suicides:

> "In the basic 'morphology' of the adventure novel…we must include suicide attempts, those powerful scenes of melodramatic pathos in which the despairing protagonists (in order to defend unswerving loyalty in love) choose the ultimate solution of death by their own hand. This is a stereotype particularly exposed to the ironic attack of the *Satyricon*, inasmuch as a would-be suicide never really dies in the Greek romantic novel; as often as the protagonists attempt it, they survive."[167]

Finally, Roman suicides, at least their literary records such as those described by Tacitus, can be viewed as a sort of theater in their own right. "The Roman suicide is very much a social act, performed in front of an audience." In this way, Petronius reflects a reality of self-killing through Encolpius even though we must be wary of taking the unreliable narrator at face value. Hill draws attention to the frivolous nature of the suicides in the *Satyrica* stating that "because in the *Satyrica* social *personae* are always transitory and ephemeral…self-killing becomes for Petronius's characters an essentially trivial undertaking ungrounded in any ethical reality."[168] Without a doubt, Petronius intended his audience to understand his satirization of the trivial suicides found in the Greek romances and on this level they provide obvious entertainment. Hill explains Encolpius's readiness to commit suicide at the drop of a hat because he continuously adopts different literary personae. Hill's argument is based on his premise that Romans committed suicide in a manner that allowed them to fashion or maintain their own social personae. However, Hill also points out that Petronius's treatment of self-killing differs from previous treatments of this topic by Roman writers in two ways. Firstly, his suicides are always undermotivated, and second, his characters are willing to follow through with trivial suicide

---

[166] Hill 2004: 85.
[167] Conte 1997: 77.
[168] Hill 2004: 238. Also Schmeling 2011: 388.

intentions.[169] This last point underscores the seriousness of Petronius's portrayal of suicide, especially in the case of Encolpius who is earnestly willing to kill himself. It also reflects, to a certain degree, Petronius's own real suicide of 66 C.E. There, in form, Petronius commits what Hill describes as the "aristocratic noble death" but, in content, he spends his last moments in light-hearted conversation and recitation of verses.[170] It may be that in Petronius's real suicide, he took on the personae he had already created in his writings.

The Widow of Ephesus

The story of the Widow of Ephesus was discussed in the last chapter for the perspective it provides on the sentience and existence of the *post mortem* soul. The story itself, however, is a story of apparent death. Upon her husband's death, the Widow decides to bury herself alive with her husband. The tomb acts as a façade of death within which the widow turns from attempting suicide to embracing life.

> *...in conditorium etiam prosecuta est defunctum, positumque in hypogaeo Graeco more corpus custodire ac flere totis noctibus diebusque coepit. Sic afflictantem se ac mortem inedia persequentem non parentes potuerunt abducere, non propinqui; magistratus ultimo repulsi abierunt, comploratagque singularis exempli femina ab omnibus quintum iam diem sine alimento trahebat...Una igitur in tota civitate fabula erat, solum illud affulsisse verum pudicitiae amorisque exemplum omnis ordinis homines confitebantur...*
>
> …she followed the dead man even into his tomb, and all day and all night she began to weep and guard the body laid in a crypt in the Greek manner. Neither her parents nor her relatives were able to dissuade her from afflicting herself thus and pursuing death by starvation; finally, the officials went away repelled, and applauded by all as a woman of singular example, now was passing the fifth day without food. There was one story therefore in the whole city, and men of every

[169] Hill 2004: 242.
[170] Hill 2004: 239: "Performed before an elite audience, the courtier's death, prolonged beyond all reasonable measure by his periodic rebinding and reopening of his slashed wrists, conformed in its self-discipline and dispassion to the highest standards set by the ante mortem heroics of Seneca, Thrasea Paetus, and Cato." Hallett 2012: 233 describes Petronius's suicide in Tactus as "written consciously as a literary and philosophical parody of Socratic and Stoic suicides…"

> rank were acknowledging that this alone was the true example of chastity and love…111.2-5.

After closing herself in the tomb, the Widow is considered dead. By describing her story as a *fabula* ("tale" but also "common talk, or gossip" OLD 1a-b), Eumolpus emphasizes it as gossip as well as theater or play-acting. As already discussed in the previous chapter, the story unfolds as a soldier, guarding the criminals crucified near the tomb, hears the Widow's lamentations and enters the tomb. After the soldier's unsuccessful attempt to persuade the Widow to live, the maid meets with success when she manipulates the words of Anna from Book 4 of the *Aeneid* (4.31-53): *ne hanc quidem partem corporis mulier abstinuit, victorque miles utrumque persuasit. Iacuerunt ergo una non tantum illa nocte, qua nuptias fecerunt, sed postero etiam ac tertio die, praeclusis videlicet conditorii foribus, ut quisquis ex notis ignotisque ad monumentum venisset, putaret expirasse super corpus viri pudicissimam uxorem*. (Nor indeed did the woman hold back this part of her body, and the victorius soldier persuaded both parts. Therefore, they lay together not only that one night on which they made their marriage, but also the next day and the third, with the doors of the crypt closed, of course, so that anyone who came to the tomb from among those known or unknown to them would think that the most prudent woman had breathed her last breath over the body of her husband. 112.2-4).

There are two internal audiences in this example: those within the story of the Widow, and those who are listening to the story as Eumolpus tells it. In short, this is a *fabula* within a *fabula*. Eumolpus purports to tell the story as an example of the fickleness of women (*levitatem*). In particular, he claims that no woman is so chaste that she will not be turned all the way to madness by lust for a stranger (*nullamque esse feminam tam pudicam, quae non peregrina libidine usque ad furorem averteretur*. 110.7). And Eumolpus also distinguishes his story from mere fiction, stating that it was an affair that took place in his memory (*rem sua*

memoria factam 110.8). Throughout this story, Eumolpus highlights its theatrical elements through repetition of vocabulary that emphasizes the role of the internal audience in its role of viewing. The Widow starts and ends the story as the paradigm of virtue to those who are unable to see inside her husband's tomb.

Although like Dido in the *Aeneid* the Widow of Ephesus forsakes her pledge to her dead husband in favor of a new love interest, the Petronian character follows an inverse trajectory *vis à vis* her Vergilian prototype in most respects. Where Dido begins with life and ends with death, the Widow begins with death and ends with life completely under her control. Where Dido finds herself a victim of gossip and rumor in the *Aeneid* (*fama*) which has spread the gossip of her "unchaste" actions, the Widow takes advantage of the *fabula* of her noble death. She feigns her death using the tomb as a shield: *praeclusis videlicet conditorii foribus, ut quisquis ex notis ignotisque ad monumentum venisset, putaret expirasse super corpus viri pudicissimam uxorem*. (Naturally, having closed the doors of the tomb, so anyone among those who knew her or did not, would think that she had died over the corpse of her husband. 112.3).

Towards the end of the story, the soldier's life hangs in the balance when one of the crucified criminals he was sent to guard is stolen while he visits the Widow. He is intent on killing himself rather than waiting for punishment from the authorities: …*nec se exspectaturum iudicis sententiam, sed gladio ius dicturum ignaviae suae*… (nor would he await the sentence of a judge, but would dictate the judgement of his own ignorance by the sword…112.6).
The Widow takes full control of the situation, refusing to become the *spectator* of two deaths. *'ne istud' inquit 'dii sinant, ut eodem tempore duorum mihi carissimorum hominum duo funera spectem. Malo mortuum impendere quam vivum occidere.* ("May the gods not permit that I look on two funerals at the same time of the two men most dear to me. I prefer to hang a dead man

than to kill a living one." 112.7-8). The soldier is easily persuaded to live. Hill, in fact, views this as an example of the undermotivated suicide, typical of the characters in the *Satyrica*.[171] She expels the corpse of her husband from the tomb, placing him on the cross and keeping her lover alive. She has successfully manipulated the internal audience, using the tomb as her shield. Petronious successfully manipulates the literary role he gave her, as well.

Dido became helpless in the face of *Fama* and proved unable to control the perceptions of those around her. Her attempt to forego mourning her husband and live ultimately leads to her death, whereas the Widow of Ephesus's situation is the reversal of this. *Fama* spreads an unfavorable story of Dido, whereas the Widow of Ephesus enjoys the best of reputations while committing the same "sins" as Dido.

> *Ille dies primus leti primusque malorum*
> *causa fuit; neque enim specie famave movetur,*
> *nec iam furtivum Dido meditatur amorem:*
> *coniugium vocat; hoc praetexit nomine culpam…*
> *Haec tum multiplici populos sermone replebat*
> *gaudens, et pariter facta atque infecta canebat:*
> *venisse Aenean, Troiano sanguine cretum,*
> *cui se pulchra viro dignetur iungere Dido;*
> *nunc hiemem inter se luxu, quam longa, fovere*
> *regnorum immemores turpique cupidine captos.*
> *Haec passim dea foeda virum diffundit in ora.*
>
> That was the first day of death and the first cause of all evils; for she is not moved by her appearance or her reputation, nor now does Dido think her love secret: she calls it marriage; she covers her guilt by this name….Then [Rumor], rejoicing, fills the people with her words of many types, and sings equally of things true and false, that Aeneas has come, born of Trojan blood, and beautiful Dido has deigned to join herself to the man; now they nourish winter, however long, between themselves in luxury, forgetful of their kingdoms and overcome by base lust. These things the foul goddess spreads on the mouths of men. *Aen*. 4.169-72; 4.189-95.

[171] Hill 2004: 242-43. "The case of the Widow of Ephesus is paradigmatic here: although she begins the story resolved to die, the inconstancy of her affection for her husband is so great that she is readily seduced by a passing soldier while she stands vigil at his tomb."

The Widow of Ephesus story consistently promotes a *carpe diem* perspective. Arrowsmith interpreted this story in the *Satyrica* as the triumph of life over death: "Here Petronius seems to be saying, I give you an image of the rebirth of human life; here are the hope and energy which everywhere else are baffled by satiety and thereby transformed into death. In place of perversion, natural marriage; in place of impotence, consummation; in place of unappeasable appetite, satisfied desire; in place of death, life."[172] He sees here the only example of true Epicurean *askesis* in the *Satyrica*. It is through her frugality and denial—she was following him to death through starvation (*mortem inedia persequentem*) and when the soldier enters the tomb she was on her fifth day without food (*quintum iam diem sine alimento trahebat*)—that she is able to return to life, to return to enjoying life-giving activities, most notably food and sex.[173]

When Conte analyzes this story, admitting that it functions as a parody of "chaste romantic heroines" he concludes: "There is a complete inversion, from the bonds of *pudicitia* displayed in exemplary fashion to the absolute license of sexual pleasure. Working on a traditional theme of anecdote (the story of the unfaithful widow is also present in the corpus of Phaedrus and of Romulus), Petronius' ironic art transforms the secular tale into a very sophisticated narrative whose ultimate meaning is 'all appearances are deceptive'; indeed, the very appearance of moral perfection must be taken as sure evidence of fraud."[174] For Conte, the story of the Widow becomes one example among many in the *Satyrica* of the degradation of the

[172] Arrowsmith, 1966: 328-29.
[173] Arrowsmith, 1966: 328. "The design could hardly be more schematic, and it is confirmed by the convergence of all the familiar themes of the *Cena*, but this time inverted. Thus, whereas the *Cena* insists that satiety is death, the story of the Widow insists upon the stimulus conferred on desire by denial, frugality, *askesis*.
[174] Conte, 1996:106.

sublime to the low. But, it also an example of how Petronius uses the literary tool of *Scheintod* to poke fun at an inconsistency in republican and imperial ideology surrounding women's *pudicitia*.

The Widow's clever scheme that allows her to both take a sexual partner and maintain her appearance of virtue highlights the incompatibility between the idealization of Roman women for loyalty to one husband (*univira*) and pressure to procreate soon after being widowed (or divorced). In fact, the *lex Iulia et Papia*, enacted by Augustus, set two years as the time limit for widows (18 months for divorcees) to remarry if they wished to enjoy their portion of inheritance.[175] Pyy shows how Vergil highlights this inconsistency as well in his representations of Dido. Her resolve to remain chaste quickly dissolves when she meets Aeneas. "Dido appears to the audience as a *univira* who cherishes her prestigious status—but only until she gets an offer that is attractive enough, until the offer of a new marriage appears more beneficial than the honor gained by abstinence."[176] Clodia from Cicero's *Pro Coelio* exemplifies this inconsistency as well. Cicero accuses her of being a courtesan because she takes lovers and has failed to remarry after her divorce. "…[T]he whole situation is based on a striking paradox. –while the ideal of *univira* existed and was used to assess Clodia's behavior, remarrying was the only way she could have protected herself against the vicious rumors targeted at her chastity." Laes neatly sums up the ambiguous cultural perspective: "Roman appreciation of and fascination with the single woman [was] balanced between interpretations of her as an example of virtuous *pudicitia* or as a waste of the community's resources – almost an aberration from common standards."[177]

[175] McGinn: 74.
[176] Pyy 2019: 154.
[177] Laes 2019: 25.

There is also a philosophical perspective that the *Satyrica* expresses through the feigned death of the Widow of Ephesus. Arrowsmith's argument that it is the Widow's *askesis*, in this case, her practice of denying herself food for a period of time, that brings her to the point of being able to enjoy sex and food in moderation is well-taken.[178] Conte's analysis that the Widow's actions sink lower and lower, overlooks an important point.[179] While it is true that this story is a parody of epic, especially Virgil, the lowest point to which the Widow sinks (according to Conte), the placing of her husband's corpse on the cross, is yet another expression of the Widow's adherence to Epicurean values. The very last action she takes in this story (placing her husband's body on the cross), to save the soldier from prosecution and death is described as *prudentissima***.** In Epicurus's *Letter to Menoecus*, he describes this virtue (φρόνησις) as the most valuable, since a happy life is not possible without it.[180]

> τούτων δὲ πάντων ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ μέγιστον ἀγαθὸν **φρόνησις**. διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφίας τιμιώτερον ὑπάρχει **φρόνησις**, ἐξ ἧς αἱ λοιπαὶ πᾶσαι πεφύκασιν ἀρεταί, διδάσκουσα ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ἡδέως ζῆν ἄνευ τοῦ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ἄνευ τοῦ ἡδέως. συμπεφύκασι γὰρ αἱ ἀρεταὶ τῷ ζῆν ἡδέως, καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἡδέως τούτων ἐστὶν ἀχώριστον.
>
> Prudence is the origin of all these things and the greatest good. Wherefore also, prudence is more valuable than philosophy and from it all the remaining virtues spring, teaching us that it is not possible to live pleasantly without also living prudently and beautifully, and justly nor prudently and beautifully and justly without living pleasantly. For the virtues come together in living pleasantly, and living pleasantly is inseparable from them. *Letter to Menoecus* 132.

Whether the Widow intended to feign her death from the very start of her entrance into the tomb or was truly persuaded by her maidservant, she ends up feigning death in order to live

[178] Arrowsmith 1966: 328-9.
[179] See Conte 1996: 106.
[180] Both TLL s.v. *prudens* and LSJ s.v. φρόνιμος cite *prudens* and φρόνιμος as translations of one another.

life ἡδέως, pleasantly. What started as a tale of the fickleness of women ends up underlining the prudence of the Widow and her ability to use death as a means to life.

CHAPTER 3 – ANTICIPATING DEATH

sed omnis una manet nox
et calcanda semel via leti.
dant alios Furiae torvo spectacula Marti,
exitio est avidum mare nautis;
mixta senum ac iuvenum densentur funera, nullum
saeva caput Proserpina fugit…

But each person waits for the same night and crushes underfoot the same path to death. The Furies give some to raving Mars as spectacles, the greedy sea is an exit for sailors; the burials for the old and young are pressed together densely, no head escapes cruel Proserpina. Hor. *Carm*. 1.28.15-20.

The inevitability of death made its anticipation a necessary part of life for the Romans, as it still is for us today. This chapter considers the various forms that this anticipation takes in the *Satyrica*. It should come as no surprise that anticipating death often spurs individuals to prepare for death and in the first century C.E., there were many ways to do this. The *Satyrica* confirms and augments our understanding of these methods. Stoicism and Epicureanism provided philosophical ways of preparation, the foci of which were eradicating the fear of death. In addition to the standbys of astronomy and magic which could provide knowledge of future death and the hope of forestalling an untimely one, spiritual preparation options expanded as the number of mystery cults grew and often promised rewards in the afterlife for lives well-lived. Practical methods such as writing wills, and building tombs continued but were also utilized by an expanding class base as freedmen in particular strove to find ways to memorialize their new-found status. However, although anticipation often involves preparation for death, these are not interchangeable terms. Sometimes the anticipation of death instigates the opposite reaction: a desire to simply live in the moment, an attitude still recognized today as a '*carpe diem* perspective'. The *Satyrica* provides insight into four different approaches to death anticipation: philosophical, spiritual, practical, and finally, the *carpe diem* approach (or lack of preparation).

The Philosophical Approach- Eradicating the fear of death

No character in the *Satyrica* uses a purely philosophical approach to death, but there are many philosophical elements in the way its characters approach it. Socrates stated that philosophy was preparation for death: οἱ ὀρθῶς φιλοσοφοῦντες ἀποθνήσκειν μελετῶσι, καὶ τὸ τεθνάναι ἥκιστα αὐτοῖς ἀνθρώπων φοβερόν. (Philosophers rightly train how to die, and dying is the least fearful for them of all men. *Phaedo* 67e) Cicero translates and repeate this in his *Tusculan Disputations* 1.74: *Tota enim philosophorum vita, ut ait idem, commentatio mortis est*. (The entire life of the philosopher, as they say, is careful preparation for death. *Tusc. Disp.* 1.74).[181] This idea is an integral part of the Stoic and Epicurean philosophies, both popular among elite Romans in the first century C.E.[182] As has been noted earlier in this paper, Trimalchio is careful to state that he has never listened to a philosopher and he expresses this in the context of death, directing Habinnas to engrave on his tombstone: *"C. Pompeius Trimalchio Maecenatianus hic requiescit. Huic seviratus absenti decretus est. Cum posset in omnibus decuriis Romae esse, tamen noluit. Pius, fortis, fidelis, ex parvo crevit, sestertium reliquit trecenties, nec unquam philosophum audivit. Vale: et tu."* (Here lies Gaius Pompeius Trimalchio, from the household of Maecenas. He was formally decreed a priest of Augustus in

[181] Montaigne writing in the 16th century explained this quote: Cicéron dit que philosopher ce n'est autre chose que s'apprêter à la mort. C'est d'autant que l'étude et la contemplation retirent aucunement notre âme hors de nous et l'embesognent à part du corps, qui est quelque aprentissage et resemblance de la mort; ou bien c'est que toute la sagesse et discours du monde se résout enfin à ce point, de nous apprendre à ne craindre point à mourir. (Frame 1963: 20)

[182] Our understanding of how large a portion of Roman society believed in Epicurean/Stoic teachings about death is helped by the number of epitaphs that express these sentiments. See Cumont pgs 7-15. Lattimore 1942: passim and 218-19 cites Stoic-like epitaphs: *noli dolere, amica, eventum meum: properavit aetas, hoc dedit Fatus mihi* (Do not sorrow, friend, at fortune: a lifetime goes quickly, Fate gave this to me); for Epicurean epitaphs see pp. 260-3.

his absence. While he could have been among any of the decuria of Roman, he refused. Pius, brave, faithful, he grew from little, left behind thirty million, and never listened to a philosopher. Farewell: and you, too." 71.12).

There are many possible reasons for why Petronius was careful to distance Trimalchio so pointedly from philosophers. A closer look at the connection between death preparation and philosophy in the various philosophical schools with which Romans in Petronius's time would have been familiar sheds light on this.

Plato's *Phaedo* is perhaps the first comprehensive account of this connection between philosophy as preparation for death. The above quotation, that all philosophy is preparation for death, is preceded by a dialogue between Simmias and Plato on how a philosopher strives to purify his soul for death by freeing it from the shackles of the body as much as possible in this life:

> "κάθαρσις δὲ εἶναι ἆρα οὐ τοῦτο συμβαίνει, ὅπερ πάλαι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ λέγεται, τὸ χωρίζειν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ ἐθίσαι αὐτὴν καθ᾽ αὑτὴν πανταχόθεν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος συναγείρεσθαί τε καὶ ἀθροίζεσθαι, καὶ οἰκεῖν κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν παρόντι καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔπειτα μόνην καθ᾽ αὑτήν, ἐκλυομένην ὥσπερ ἐκ δεσμῶν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος;… λύειν δέ γε αὐτήν, ὡς φαμεν, προθυμοῦνται ἀεὶ μάλιστα καὶ μόνοι οἱ φιλοσοφοῦντες ὀρθῶς, καὶ τὸ μελέτημα αὐτὸ τοῦτό ἐστιν τῶν φιλοσόφων, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος;… οὐκοῦν τοῦτό γε θάνατος ὀνομάζεται, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος;… οὐκοῦν, ὅπερ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἔλεγον, γελοῖον ἂν εἴη ἄνδρα παρασκευάζονθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ἐν τῷ βίῳ ὅτι ἐγγυτάτω ὄντα τοῦ τεθνάναι οὕτω ζῆν, κἄπειθ᾽ ἥκοντος αὐτῷ τούτου ἀγανακτεῖν;"
>
> "And is not the purification an attribute resulting from, which was said long ago in our talk, separating, as much as possible, of the soul from the body and accustoming [the soul] to assemble and collect itself together from all parts of the body, and to live, as it is able, both in the present and in the hereafter, alone by itself, freed from the body as from chains?…And certainly this is called death, the release and the separation of the soul from the body?… And, as I said in the beginning, it would be laughable for a man preparing himself to live in life as close as possible to a state death, to be agitated when [death] was before him?" *Phaedo* 67d-e.

Two important concepts emerge from this dialogue: firstly, a philosopher prepares to die by trying to free himself from his body as much as possible in this life. Secondly, this is accomplished by practice (μελετῶσι).

From a different perspective, Lucretius expounds the Epicurean doctrine in *De Rerum Natura* that knowledge that there is nothing after death should eradicate any fear of it.

> *multo igitur mortem minus ad nos esse putandumst,*
> *si minus esse potest quam quod nihil esse videmus;*
> *maior enim turbae disiectus materiai*
> *consequitur leto nec quisquam expergitus extat,*
> *frigida quem semel est vitai pausa secuta.*
>
> Death must for us, therefore, be considered less than much, if it is possible for there to be less than what we see to be nothing; for a greater scattering of disturbed matter follows death nor does anyone awaken and stand up whom the cold stop of life has once pursued. Lucr. 3.926-30.

It was, in fact, the belief that we are completely destroyed upon death that helped Epicureans to thoroughly enjoy this life. They believed that the soul was made merely of atoms and dissolved upon death. "There is no one of the master's doctrines on which his disciples insist with more complacent assurance. They praise him for having freed men from the terrors of the Beyond; they thank him for having taught them not to fear death; his philosophy appears to them as a liberator of souls."[183]

It was important, however, not only to stop fearing death, but also not to place one's hope in it. Epicurus states:

> ἀλλ' οἱ πολλοὶ τὸν θάνατον ὁτὲ μὲν ὡς μέγιστον τῶν κακῶν φεύγουσιν, ὁτὲ δὲ ὡς ἀνάπαυσιν τῶν ἐν τῷ ζῆν κακῶν αἱροῦνται. ὁ δὲ σοφὸς οὔτε παραιτεῖται τὸ ζῆν οὔτε φοβεῖται τὸ μὴ ζῆν• οὔτε γὰρ αὐτῷ προσίσταται τὸ ζῆν οὔτε δοξάζεται κακὸν εἶναί τι τὸ μὴ ζῆν…ὁ δὲ παραγγέλλων τὸν μὲν νέον καλῶς ζῆν, τὸν δὲ γέροντα καλῶς καταστρέφειν, εὐήθης ἐστὶν οὐ μόνον διὰ τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ἀσπαστόν,

[183] Cumont, 1922: 7.

> ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὸ τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι **μελέτην** τοῦ καλῶς ζῆν καὶ τοῦ καλῶς ἀποθνήσκειν.
>
> Most people flee from death as the greatest of evils, or seize it as a rest from the evils of life. But the wise man does not decline life nor is he afraid to not live; for he does not set himself against life, nor does he think life some sort of evil…Commanding the young man to live well and an old person to die well, is simple-minded not only because of the welcomness of life but also because the training is the same for living well and for dying well. *Letter to Menoeceus* 125-26.

And finally, similar to Plato, Epicurus indicates that this preparation comes from practicing (μελέτα) his precepts day and night: ταῦτα οὖν καὶ τὰ τούτοις συγγενῆ **μελέτα** πρὸς σεαυτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς <καὶ> πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον σεαυτῷ, καὶ οὐδέποτε οὔθ' ὕπαρ οὔτ' ὄναρ διαταραχθήσῃ, ζήσῃ δὲ ὡς θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις. οὐθὲν γὰρ ἔοικε θνητῷ ζῴῳ ζῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἀθανάτοις ἀγαθοῖς. (So, these things and things similar to them practice for yourself day and night and with someone similar to you, and you will never be disturbed either awake or asleep, and you will live as a god among men: for a man living in the midst of immortal goods is unlike a living mortal. *Letter to Menoecus* 135).

Stoicism, which was the predominant philosophy among the elite during the first century C.E., provided a framework for eradicating fear of death as well. Seneca hammered home the Stoic doctrine that, quite literally, practicing, rehearsing and imagining death helped condition followers of Stoicism to eradicate their fear of death. *Hoc cotidie meditare, ut possis aequo animo vitam relinquere, quam multi sic conplectuntur et tenent, quomodo qui aqua torrente rapiuntur spinas et aspera*. (Meditate on this daily, so that you may be able to leave with a calm soul, life, which many grasp at and hold, in the same way those who are seized by rushing water grasp at and seize hold of roots and sharp things. *Ep*. 4.5). Continuously encountering death, meditating on it in this way was supposed to create such a familiarity with death that a person could become comfortable and even embrace it. "To endure the awareness of approaching death

required long practice. Seneca praised this accomplishment and expressed the view that brave endurance of death was among the greatest achievements of the human mind."[184] Hadot, a 20th century French philosopher, points to a specific group of philosophical exercises *praemeditatio malorum*, or meditations on sufferings, which Seneca especially advocated as part of preparing for death. These involved frequently imagining one's death so as to be prepared for it as well as the memorization of maxims that could provide comfort in stressful times. The general idea was that doing this eradicated anxiety when it actually arrived.[185]

Stoic schools did not have one view of what happened to the soul after death, although they did agree that is was, like the body, corporeal and destined to disintegrate at some point. They also agreed that preparation for death found its realization in how one practiced virtue in this life. "…[E]schatological theories had in reality only a secondary value in this system, of which the essential part was not affected by their variability. True Stoicism placed the realization of its ideal in this world…The sage, a blissful being, was a god on earth."[186] To illustrate this point, Seneca tells Lucilius in his *Epistles* of the governor of Syria who practiced his funeral every day:

> *Pacuvius, qui Syriam usu suam fecit, cum vino et illis funebribus epulis sibi parentaverat, sic in cubiculum ferebatur a cena, ut inter plausus exoletorum hoc ad symphoniam caneretur: βεβίωται, βεβίωται. Nullo non se die extulit. Hoc, quod ille ex mala conscientia faciebat, nos ex bona faciamus et in somnum ituri laeti hilaresque dicamus: Vixi et quem dederat cursum fortuna, peregi.*
>
> Pacuvius, who made Syria his own by profit, when he had celebrated a funeral feast for himself with wine and the usual funeral foods, was carried thus into his bedroom from the dining room, as among the applause of eunuchs this was sung to musical accompaniment: he has lived, he has lived. On each day he was carried out for burial. This, which he did from a bad conscience, let us do with a

[184] Noyes 1973: 229
[185] Hadot 1995: 85. Also Hadot 1969: 60-1 and Rabbow 1954: 169-70 for discussions of *praemeditatio malorum*.
[186] Cumont 1922: 14.

> good one and going to sleep joyfully and happily, let us say: I have lived, and the course which fortune has given me, I have finished. *Ep.* 12.8-9.

All of these philosophical approaches agree on the necessity of "practicing to die", although differing in the details of what practice means. They also agree on the concept that practicing to die eradicated the fear of death. In the Hellenistic period philosphers, such as Epicurus, developed the practice of imaginative exercises to focus on death. Meditating was similar to *melete* or practice. Hadot brings together these two words, that is *melete*, with *askesis*. "'Exercise' corresponds to the Greek terms *askesis* or *melete.* For ancient philosophers, the word *askesis* designated exclusively…inner activities of the thought and the will."[187] Petronius treats ironically of this philosophical approach to death when Trimalchio literally practices his own death by enacting his funeral and at the same time reminds us of Seneca's description of Pacuvius's practice.

> *Stiche, profer vitalia, in quibus volo me efferri. Profer et unguentum et ex illa amphora gustum, ex qua iubeo lavari ossa mea." Non est moratus Stichus, sed et stragulam albam et praetextam in triclinium attulit ...* ***iussitque nos temptare, an bonis lanis essent confecta****. Tum subridens "Vide tu" inquit "Stiche, ne ista mures tangant aut tineae? alioquin te vivum comburam. Ego gloriosus volo efferri, ut totus mihi populus bene imprecetur." Statim ampullam nardi aperuit omnesque nos unxit et "Spero" inquit "futurum ut aeque me mortuum iuvet tanquam vivum." Nam vinum quidem in vinarium iussit infundi et "Putate vos" ait "ad parentalia mea invitatos esse… Trimalchio ebrietate turpissima gravis novum acroama, cornicines, in triclinium iussit adduci, fultusque cervicalibus multis extendit se super torum extremum et "Fingite me" inquit "mortuum esse. Dicite aliquid belli." Consonuere cornicines funebri strepitu.*
>
> Stichus, bring me the graveclothes, in which I wish myself to be carried out. Bring also the oil and a draught from that jar from which I ask my bones be washed." Stichus, without delay, brought the white covering and garment into the dining-room…He commanded us to touch it, (to see) if it was made of wool. Then, laughing, he said, "see to it, Stichus, that neither mice nor moths touch it. Otherwise, I will burn you alive. I wish to be carried out gloriously so that all the people will pray over me." Immediately he opened the bottle of nard oil, anointed us all and said, "I hope that this will delight me when I die as much as it does me

[187] Hadot 1995: 128.

> alive." Then he commanded the wine to be poured into the wine bowl and said, "Pretend that you have been invited to my Parantalia…Trimalchio, deep in the most wretched drunkenness, commanded new entertainers, trumpeters, be led into the dining-room and he propped himself up with a bunch of pillows and stretched himself over his death-bed and said, "Imagine that I am dead. Say something nice. The funeral trumpeters immediately sounded. 77.7-78.6.

Trimalchio's funeral enactment interacts with several other philosophical concepts in addition to the idea of practicing to die. His focus on the feeling of the wool and its quality, (*iussitque nos temptare, an bonis lanis essent confecta*), his application of nard oil, drinking of wine, and the sound of the musicians, all bring into focus the sensual and bodily aspects of the funeral.[188] Far from removing and separating his body and soul, Trimalchio ironically seeks to practice his death by experiencing all of the bodily features of death. This also brings to mind the Epicurean disbelief in sensation after death: Trimalchio pointedly wishes to draw attention to his ability to cheat the belief that one cannot physically experience death.

Petronius clearly wished to indicate that philosophy did not play a role in preparing Trimalchio to die, while at the same time, to indicate that he was aware of what philosophica preparation required by parodying it with Trimalchio's living-funeral. Trimalchio's tombstone (see above) touts his success in this life, and indicates that he found other ways to become comfortable with and to embrace, his death. In particular, Trimlachio describes himself on his tombstone as *pius*, *fortis*, *and fidelis*, virtues lauded by philosophers as part of living a good life in preparation for death. While he is certainly obsessed with preparing for death, Trimalchio does not think that philosophy needed to play a vital role in his preparation.

Trimalchio, by focusing on life in this particulary unusual way—living his own death—is practising his own form of death preparation. For Stoics and Epicureans, this specific practice,

[188] See Hope 2017: 86-103 for a broad discussion of the role of the senses in Roman funerary rituals.

along with practicing virtue, would bring one close to a kind of immortality. Both Epicurus and Seneca compare the effort of living virtuously to becoming as close to a god while alive. Epicurus states: …ζήσῃ δὲ ὡς θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις. οὐθὲν γὰρ ἔοικε θνητῷ ζῴῳ ζῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἀθανάτοις ἀγαθοῖς. (…and you will live as a god among men: for a man living in the midst of immortal goods is unlike a living mortal. *Letter to Menoecus* 12). Likewise, Seneca writes: *Non potest ergo quisquam aut nocere sapienti aut prodesse, quoniam divina nec iuvari desiderant nec laedi possunt, sapiens autem vicinus proximusque dis consistit, excepta mortalitate similis deo.* (It is not possible, therefore, for anyone to harm or benefit the wise man, because the divine do not desire to be helped, nor can they be harmed, for the wise man lives as a next-door neighbor to the gods, like to a god except in mortality. Seneca, *De Con*. 8.2).[189]

Quartilla comments to Encolpius when she arrives to inititiate him into her Priapean cult: *Utique nostra regio tam praesentibus plena est numinibus, ut facilius possis deum quam hominem invenire.* (Our region is everywhere so full of the presence of gods that it is easier to find a god than a man. 17.5).[190] This ironic comment perhaps mocks the idea that many elite egotistically touted, their practice of becoming like a god. Petronius, through Trimalchio, brings us down to earth by reminding us that there is actually no need to become like a god. This is

[189] See also Cumont above.

[190] Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* in which the gods reject the Emperor Claudius's request for immortality and a place among the gods, humorously addresses the idea of rampant deification in this speech by Jove: *"Olim" inquit "magna res erat deum fieri: iam famam mimum fecistis. Itaque ne videar in personam, non in rem dicere sententiam, censeo ne quis post hunc diem deus fiat ex his, qui* ἀρούρης καρπὸν ἔδουσιν*, aut ex his, quos alit* ζείδωρος ἄρουρα." ("Once," he said, "it was a great thing to become a god: now you have made this a notorious farce. Therefore, lest I seem to speak against the person, not the practice iteself, I propose that no one after this day become a god from among those who eat the fruit of the earth or from those whom mother-earth nourishes." *Apocol*. 9)

perhaps best expressed through Habinnas, the stonemason who will prepare Trimalchio's epitaph. Habinnas excuses Fortunata, Trimalchio's wife when she flies into a rage at Trimalchio during the *Cena*: *"Nemo" inquit "nostrum non peccat. Homines sumus, non dei."* ("We all sin. We are men, not gods." 75.1).

The Spiritual Approach

Trimalchio claims to know the exact time of his death, right down to the day: "…*et nunc mi restare vitae annos triginta et menses quattuor et dies duos*. ("…and that thirty years, four months and two days of life remain for me." 77.2).[191] Serapa, who appears to have been a travelling astrologer (*mathematicus*) predicted this information for Trimalchio at one time, and also seemed to know a great deal of information about Trimalchio (*ab acia et acu mi omnia exposuit*, 76.11).

The character of Serapa attests to the popularity that astrology enjoyed during the early empire, as well as to a growing group of professionals who met the spiritual needs of the individual. "From Augustus onward, astrology and other predictive sciences (including physiognomics and the interpretation of dreams) flourish, and traditional divination disappears below the horizon. A form of knowledge predicated on the application of rational principles to a highly complex body of material by professionals displaces the traditional forms of knowledge embedded in the ruling class."[192] While Rome itself contributed little to the science of astrology, it kept alive what it learned from the Greeks and is responsible for the popularity astronomy enjoyed during the Reinaissance.[193] This Roman love for astrology permeated all levels of

[191] The belief that one's time of death was fixed from the very moment of birth found its way into epitaphs, even epitaphs of the lower classes. Cumont 1911. Lattimore 1942: 156: *sed quo fata vocant, nullus resistere possit*; etc.
[192] Wallace-Hadrill 2005: 65.
[193] Cramer 1954: 1

society and accounts for its frequent appearance in the *Satyrica*. Not surprisingly, a science that purported to make accurate predictions about the timing of future death was considered a valuable resource for death preparation. This information could have two effects: if the prediction was unwelcome or distressing, people might attempt to avoid their appointed death time, but if it was reasonable, it empowered them to prepare. For instance, in Trimalchio's case, his predicted death is impossibly far off and he has already lived a full life. For him, thirty years more of living would probably make him the oldest Roman alive and provide him with plenty of time for death preparation!

Since astronomy taught that there was a fixed time for death that could be calculated based on the time of one's birth, a rupture in this was considered a rupture in the order of the universe. The fate of those torn early from life was similar to the fate of those who were unburied (a situation already addressed in chapter one). Thus, Romans who considered astronomy a valid way of determining fate valued this information about death and might experience conflict in deciding whether to avoid or succumb to an unwelcome prediction.

There was more at stake for Romans than the loss of a life well-lived. During his descent to the Underworld, Aeneas meets with the shades of dead infants who hover just outside the entrance:

> *Continuo auditae voces, vagitus et ingens,*
> *infantumque animae flentes in limine primo,*
> *quos dulcis vitae exsortis et ab ubere raptos*
> *abstulit atra dies et funere mersit acerbo*.
>
> Immediately are heard voices, crying loudly, of the souls of babies, weaping at the beginning of the threshold, whom torn from the breast and deprived of sweet life the unlucky day stole away and immersed in bitter death. *Aen*. 6.426

These souls are denied access to the Underworld. Astrology taught that "the intervention of a human or divine will could oppose the fated course of things and abridge the normal duration of existence…The breaking of the laws of the universe was only apparent: a soul might by mischance or by a malevolent act be suddenly severed from its body, but remaining obedient to Fate, it had thereafter to linger on earth until its appointed time was accomplished."[194]

Predictions of death made astrologers powerful, dangerous and in-demand, particularly predictions made about the Emperor. "Although it is usually difficult to appraise the full measure of the court astrologers' influence in a given case, there can be little doubt that often the very life of members of the imperial family, or of influential Roman noblemen depended upon the interpretation of their horoscopes by the emperor and his trusted astrological advisers."[195] Agrippinna, Nero's mother, was confirmed in her aspirations for him to the throne by a prediction of Balbillus that included a prediction that he would murder her as well. How much of this was prediction of her murder and how much justification on the part of Nero has been the question of many ever since.[196] Domitian, according to Suetonius, had the body of an astrologer who predicted his death burned on a funeral pyre. However, this plan backfired when the body of the astrologer half-burned, fell from the fire, proving the astrologer's power and thus his prediction.[197]

From the beginning of the Roman empire astrology gained acceptance, rising during the reign of Augustus to a respected science by his death in 14 C.E. Its practitioners fell into two categories: official astrologers and those who practiced it informally, like Serapa in the *Satyrica*.

---

[194] Cumont 1922: 133-34. This belief is similar to the fate of those who failed to receive burial, such as Lichas, already addressed in Chapter 1.
[195] Cramer 1954: 84.
[196] Cramer 1954: 116. Tacitus *Annals* 6. 22; 14. 9.
[197] Suet. *Dom*. 15. Hope 2000: 111.

During the reign of the Julio-Claudians (and afterwards), emperors appointed court astrologers. Noteworthy among these figures are Thrasyllus who was a trusted adviser especially of Tiberius, but also of Augustus and Claudius, as well as a friend of Seneca; his son Balbillus, who enjoyed a close friendship with Nero; and Manilius who was part of Augustus's and Tiberius's circle and the likely author of *Astronomica*.[198] While there were several expulsions of astrologers during the empire, court astrologers were usually exempt from these expulsions since they enjoyed the reputation of reputable practitioners of the science. In C.E. 11 Augustus proscribed all divination that involved the prediction of an individual's death, an action likely instigated by a rumor that the emperor's death was imminent.[199] In response to these predictions, Augustus published his horoscope to prove that he was not about to die.[200] This edict persisted through the reign of Nero and may account for slight hesitancy that prefaces Trimalchio's announcement of his lifespan as predicted by Serapa: *quod vobis non dixerim*…(what I should not repeat to you…77.2).

The fact that knowledge of astrology became part of a complete education for upper class Romans during the empire indicates just how much of a respected science it had became. Although not an official astrologer, Seneca was a staunch believer in Fate and fatalistic astronomy—as were many other Stoics—and as tutor and close advisor to Nero during the beginning of Nero's reign, brought his knowledge of astrology to the political arena.[201] Astrology was, in fact an important aspect of Stoic philosophy which taught its followers to prepare for death by striving to live in harmony with Fate.

---

[198] Cramer 1954: 95
[199] Cramer 1954: 90
[200] Suetonius *Aug* 98.4. (Cramer ibid.)
[201] Cramer 1954: 117.

The astrology practiced and studied by the upper-classes at Rome, however, was different from that which appears in the *Satyrica*. Astrology as well as magic, among these upperclasses, claimed the status of sciences in which the "precise combination of physical ingredients and the repetition of exactly the same formulae were held to bring about the same results in every instance and at any time."[202] The astrology of the lower classes bordered on and shared many aspects of superstition since it loss much of the precision that was part of its foundational teachings among the educated elite. The astrology embraced by the lower classes was a sort of continuation of older divinatory practices to which were added new practices as they became available: "The common people, however, continued simply to add new methods of divination to the long familiar Latin or Etruscan ones. Until the end of pagan antiquity, they patronized devotedly the diviners of both the older and the more recent techniques. So strong was the popular faith in seers and prophets, for example, that Augustus in A. D. 7 found it prudent to feign belief in some crude superstition for the benefit of the restive populace of Rome."[203]

Trimalchio's presentation of a dish in the form of the zodiac is another indication of the widespread popularity of astrology for predicting death. Astrologers who believed in fatalistic astrology claimed to be able to predict one's time of death based on the zodiac sign under which a person was born. This dish is presented to the diners in between two speeches by Trimalchio that emphasize death and preparing for it. In the first speech Trimalchio comments on human fate using a skeleton as a prop: *Potantibus ergo nobis et accuratissime lautitias mirantibus larvam argenteam attulit servus sic aptatam, ut articuli eius vertebraeque luxatae in omnem partem flecterentur. Hanc cum super mensam semel iterumque abiecisset, et catenatio mobilis*

[202] Cramer 1954: 101.
[203] Cramer 1954: 98; Cassius Dio. 55. 3I. 2-3.

aliquot figuras exprimeret, Trimalchio adiecit: Eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est. Sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus. Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene. (As we were drinking and marveling over the detailed splendor, his slave brought in a silver skeleton made so that its joints and spine could be bent in every part. He laid it down on the table once, and then again, so that its supple jounts could be molded into several positions. Trimalchio commented, "Alas, we are wretched, man is entirely nothing. Thus, we will all be when Orcus bears us away. Therefore, let us live while we can live well." 34.10). Directly following this the Zodiac dish is brought in:

> *Rotundum enim repositorium duodecim habebat signa in orbe disposita, super quae proprium convenientemque materiae structor imposuerat cibum: super arietem cicer arietinum, super taurum bubulae frustum, super geminos testiculos ac rienes, super cancrum coronam, super leonem ficum Africanam, super virginem steriliculam, super libram stateram in cuius altera parte scriblita erat, in altera placenta, super scorpionem pisciculum marinum, super sagittarium oclopetam, super capricornum locustam marinam, super aquarium anserem, super pisces duos mullos. In medio autem caespes cum herbis excisus favum sustinebat.*
>
> The round plate had the twelve signs of the Zodiac place in a circle over which the cook had placed food unique and appropriate to the subject: over the Ram, chick-peas shaped like a ram's head; over the Bull a piece of beef; over the Twins, testicles and kidneys; over the Crab, a crown; over the Lion an African fig; over the Virgin, a sterile sow's womb; over the Scales, a tart in one of its scales, a cake in the other; over the Scorpio a little sea-fish; over Sagittarius a bull's eye; over Capricorn a lobster; over Aquarius a goose; over Pisces two mullets. In the middle there was a piece of sod with grass on it, supporting a honey-comb. 35.2-6.

In this passage, each Zodiac sign is paired with a body part from its corresponding animal. Trimalchio explains the connections between the body parts he chose to represent each Zodiac sign and the characteristics and fates of the people born under them (39.3-13), ending: *Sic orbis vertitur tanquam mola, et semper aliquid mali facit, ut homines aut nascantur aut permeant.* (39.13).

While Trimalchio's audience likely would have connected the zodiac dish with death without any prompting, its placement between these two speeches of Trimlachio solidifies this relationship. Grondona observes: "Trimalchione non lascia via qualcun altra sentenza sulla vita e sul destino… Lo Zodiaco di per se stesso e un'immagine del destino e Trimalchione tirandone le fila verso un chiaro e preciso-- non fa nulla di diverso dallo scultore che scolpi un cerchio zodiacale sul sarcofago....[204] Several existing sarcophagi attest to this relationship.[205]

The fatalism of astronomy (not unlike the doctrine of predestination in Christian religions) created a tension for many erudite thinkers between it and the concept of free will. The sign under which a person was born did more than point to the hour of death, it indicated both external events that would exert an influence on a person's life, as well as internal characteristics and inclinations that would dictate one's personality. The two problems with fatalistic astronomy were, firstly, that the predictions were often wrong. Numerous inscriptions attest to disappointments from the predictions of astrologers. Manilius, who wrote the *Astronomica* during the reign of Augustus in which he gave detailed instruction about how to predict one's time of death based on the precise time of the setting and rising of stars at one's birth, is cursed in several inscriptions for his inaccuracy.[206] Secondly, when carried through to its logical conclusion, fatalistic astronomy could eradicate culpability for one's actions. Seneca reconciles the conflict between Fate and free will in his *Questiones Naturales* which allows for free will to work within the confines of an all-knowing Fate, which is interpreted through the

---

[204] Grondona 1980: 17.
[205] Platt 2012: 225. Vermeule 1965: 381 fig. 34.
[206] See Cramer 1954: 97 for inscriptions attesting to the disappointment felt by those attempting this. (Among others:) *Planetam suum properare vos moneo; in Nemesi ne fidem habeatis: sic sum deceptus* (CIL 5: 354 no. 3466). Book 3 of the *Astronomica* provided directions for predicting one's death based on Pythagorean numerology that assigened a certain value to each of the planets. From this, a time of a newborn's exact death could supposedly be calculated.

science of astrology.[207] In this way, part of the Stoic way of death preparation involved understanding astrology and one's Fate since living in harmony with it led to being well-prepared to die. In this way, Stoicism incorporated astrology, but there were other ways to prepare spiritually for death that transcended the predictions of astrology and the ability to overcome Fate.

Mystery cults

Mystery cults were one avenue that many Romans pursued to prepare for death and provided a solution to the fatalism of astrology. Astrology might predict one's time of death, but initiation into a mystery cult provided a way to transcend this. As Cumont states: The "mythological conception of salvation was combined in the mysteries with another, which was more scientific, that of fatalism, which was the chief dogma imposed by astrology on the Roman world…he who had been initiated and had acquired the same quality was, as a funeral inscription expressed it, 'exempt from the lot of death'."[208]

Generally, evidence of what occurred in mystery cult rites is often not well-documented, precisely because the rites were meant to be seen only by the initiated, and were well-protected by its members. We do know that mystery cults existed throughout the Empire and were widespread before this time in Greece and Asia Minor and as early as the second century in Italy and Rome.[209] Mystery cults make an appearance in the *Satyrica* in the form of a cult that centers around worship of the god Priapus. There is an abundance of evidence both literary and material for the worship of Priapus as a minor deity throughout Rome and the provinces, and especially in

[207] Cramer 1954: 118.
[208] Cumont 1922: 117-18.
[209] Roller 2013: 304-307; Salzman 2013: 388-390.

rural settings, for his value in bringing fertility and warding off evil.[210] However, there is no evidence for a full-fledged mystery cult of Priapus like that of Isis or Mithras, and the absurdity of one devoted to him is likely why Petronius created one in the *Satyrica*.

The relationship of Mystery Cults to death preparation is two-fold. Firstly, devotion to a mystery cult's deity promised "to help the participant overcome Fate/and or succeed in life."[211] Secondly, most promised an afterlife in various forms to their initiates. Both of these elements shaped the behavior of the initiates in this life by requiring them to follow certain rules in preparing for a successful death. In this way, these mystery religions shared something in common with philosophy. Orginally, philosophical schools and mystery cults, as they developed in the sixth through fourth centuries and prior to the Hellenistic period, competed with each other in the methods of death preparation and the concepts of the afterlife they offered their followers. During the Hellenstic and imperial periods this competitive aspect disappeared and both methods were often used by the same individual, for instance, Plutarch who was both priest and philosopher.[212]

> Eastern religions offered their followers various forms and concepts of "salvation". But their liturgies and especially their initiations were deemed to ensure protection in this world and the next, without breach of continuity. Isis, Mithras, Cybele, and the Syrian Baals each enjoyed a supremacy which transcended the Roman perspective of a propitiation that was well-defined but had no future. These divinities guaranteed total security of the soul both inside and outside the body. The recomposition and revitalization of Osiris, the awakening or revival of Attis, the survival of Adonis, thanks to the love of goddesses who were wives, mothers (or wives *and* mothers), were the pledges of a victory over misfortunes and death.[213]

[210] Wright 1957
[211] Salzman 2013: 388.
[212] Waldner 2013: 219-220.
[213] Turcan 1996: 26.

Early in the narrative the protagonists meet Quartilla (16), a priestess of Priapus. As treated in the *Satyrica* the cult of Priapus contains all the superficial marks of a mystery cult but none of the substance.[214] The presence of the cult of Priapus in the *Satyrica* is riddled with ambiguity. A great deal of this confusion stems from the missing parts of the *Satyrica*, but also from the divide that separates us from Roman culture. The function of the cult of Priapus in the plot of the *Satyrica* might seem to a modern audience to have little or no relation to death preparation, but to the Roman audience, familiar with the role of mystery cults in broader Roman culture, three characteristics would have made the connection clear: the anxiety that Encolpius's ilicit viewing of the mysteries causes, the fact that it is described as an initiation, the presence of young children, the association of the inititation with death (and subsequent rebirth), and the celebratory meal (16.2-26.5). These elements provide the structure of an initiation ritual, but hardly match Burkert's description of such rites as "initiation rituals of a voluntary, personal, and secret character that aimed at a change of mind through experience of the sacred."[215]

Quartilla, tormented by the fact that Encolpius and his companions (in a lost part of the *Satyrica*) had viewed the secret rites of the cult of Priapus, comes to Encolpius, seeking a remedy for the anxiety this situation has caused her in this scene just prior to the initiation:

> *"Quaenam est" inquit "haec audacia, aut ubi fabulas etiam antecessura latrocinia didicistis? misereor mediusfidius vestri; neque enim impune quisquam quod non licuit, adspexit. Utique nostra regio tam praesentibus plena est numinibus, ut facilius possis deum quam hominem invenire. Ac ne me putetis ultionis causa huc venisse, aetate magis vestra commoveor quam iniuria mea. Imprudentes enim, ut adhuc puto, admisistis inexpiabile scelus. Ipsa quidem illa nocte vexata tam periculoso inhorrui frigore, ut tertianae etiam impetum timeam. Et ideo medicinam somnio petii iussaque sum vos perquirere atque impetum morbi monstrata subtilitate lenire. Sed de remedio non tam valde laboro; maior*

[214] The figure of Quartilla has been identified by critics as a parody of the Sibyl in *Aeneid* 6. This establishes an intertextual connection to the Vergilian *katabasis* and realm of the dead. Walsh 1970: 89, Connors 1998: 35.
[215] Burkert 1987: 11.

enim in praecordiis dolor saevit, qui me usque ad necessitatem mortis deducit, ne scilicet iuvenili impulsi licentia quod in sacello Priapi vidistis, vulgetis deorumque consilia proferatis in populum. Protendo igitur ad genua vestra supinas manus petoque et oro, ne nocturnas religiones iocum risumque faciatis, neve traducere velitis tot annorum secreta, quae vix mille homines noverunt."

"What, pray you, is this insolence, or where did you learn stories that excel even robbery? By the gods, I pity you. No one looks upon what is not permitted without punishment. Our region is so full of gods in the flesh, that you can more easily find a god than a man. And do not think I have come here for the sake of revenge; I am more concerned for your age than my injury. Ignorance, I still think, made you commit this inexpiable crime. Indeed, that night I, in turmoil, shivered more from the danger than the cold, so that I even fear an attack of the tertian fever. Therefore, I sought a remedy for my dream, and I was commanded to seek you out and to soften the attack of my sickness with your keen advice. But, I am not entirely troubled over the remedy. For in my heart burns a greater sorrow, which leads me all the way to the point of death, namely that because of the license of unrestrained youth you will divulge everywhere what you saw in the temple of Priapus and announce in public the rites of the gods. Therefore, I stretch out my hands, palms up, to your knees and I beg and I pray that you not make the holy nocturnal rites a mockery and a joke, that you not wish to disgrace the secrets of so many years, which scarcely a thousand men know." 17.4-9.

In this opening scene, Petronius highlights the grave consequences if an initiate failed to keep the mysteries of a cult secret. Quartilla is clearly distressed because Encolpius has viewed the secret rites of her cult. She describes Encolpius's ilicit viewing of the rites as *inexpiabile scelus*—in other words, there is no way to make up for the crime. It was well-known that initiates of mystery cults who revealed secrets could be punished by death and this is likely what Quartilla refers to when she states *usque ad necessitatem mortis deducit*.[216] Although Encolpius voluntarily agrees to help Quartilla, it becomes clear that Quartilla also had a back-up plan if she had met with resistance. Encolpius really seems to have no option but to be initiated if he wants

[216] Johnston 2013: 109: "…under the threat of death, initiates kept their secret well." The serious requirement of not divulging the mysteries is evident as far back as in the Hymn to Demeter 478-80: τά τ' οὔπως ἔστι παρεξίμεν οὔτε πυθέσθαι/οὔτ' ἀχέειν: μέγα γάρ τι θεῶν σέβας ἰσχάνει αὐδήν (Things which no one can transgress or utter or sound out: for the great awe of the gods holds in check the voice.) Waldner 2013: 221.

Quartilla to live, but Quartilla also had no intention of allowing Encolpius to go free: *mortalium admitti, ut remedium tertianae sine ulla interpellatione a vobis acciperem."* (I admit no mortal, so that I may find a remedy from this tertian fever without any interruption. 19.3). Encolpius describes his reaction when he realizes Quartilla had not intention of letting them free: *Ut haec dixit Quartilla, Ascyltos quidem paulisper obstupuit, ego autem frigidior hieme Gallica factus nullum potui verbum emittere.* (As Quartilla said these things, Ascyltus was briefly astounded, I, however, became more frozen than a Gallic winter and could speak not a word. 19). This is a far cry from the voluntary nature of cult initiation outlined above.

Encolpius continues, narrating his plan to defend themselves against the women if necessary (19), but then the initiation begins in earnest when he describes the initial experience as something close to death: *Tunc vero excidit omnis constantia attonitis, et mors non dubia miserorum oculos coepit obducere ... "Rogo" inquam "domina, si quid tristius paras, celerius confice; neque enim tam magnum facinus admisimus, ut debeamus torti perire" ...* (Then, all of our perserverence gave way to astonishment, and certain death began to fall over the eyes of us wretched ones. "I ask you, lady," I said, "if you have anything worse planned, do it quickly; for we have not committed deeds so bad that we ought to die of torture. 19.6-20.1). This association of initiation is nearly ubiquitous in mystery cults. The mystery of Eleusis for instance is rooted in Persephone's rape by Hades, and susequent descent to the Underworld. In the cult of Mythras, the mithraeum was "designed and constructed for the purpose of inducting the initiate into a mystery of the descent of souls and their exit back out again."[217] Here, Encolpius voices the absurdity of the idea that viewing sacred rites was considered such a grave crime.

[217] Beck 2017: 130.

What follows is a parody of mystery-cult initiation. Initiation was perhaps the most significant hallmark of mystery cults. Burkert notes that the Greek word *mysteria* was translated into the Latin as *initia* and that "mysteries are initiation ceremonies, cults in which admission and participation depend upon some personal ritual to be performed on the initiated."[218] The ritual peformed in this cult is sex with Quartilla. As Schmeling points out, Quartilla is no doubt boasting that hers is "an exclusive cult, entrance into which is limited to the one thousand who have had sex with her."[219] Encolpius and his companions are initiated, that is, sexually manipulated by Quartilla, her maidservants and a *cinaedus*.[220] They are helpless to escape the situation and their manhood is called into question by their lack of control. *Volebamus miseri exclamare, sed nec in auxilio erat quisquam*… (We, wretched, wished to cry out, but there was no one to help us. 21.1). At the end of this orgy Encolpius and his companions vow not to divulge the secrets of the "initiation" as much out of adherence to the mystery cult requirements as out of a desire to keep their shame hidden.[221] *Uterque nostrum religiosissimis iuravit verbis inter duos periturum esse tam horribile secretum* ...(We both swore with sacred words between us two that the dreadful secret would die with us…21.3). Furthermore, the word *risum* occurs frequently in this portion of the text. Directly after begging Ecolpius and his companions not to

[218] Burkert 1987: 7-8. Salzman 2013: 388. "…[M]odern scholars have grouped these cults together and called them 'mystery cults,' after the Greek word *mystēs* ('initiate')."
[219] Schmeling 2011: 53, quoted in full below.
[220] Quartilla's role in this initiation places her in the role of Priapus who is depicted as a "minatory" figure whose most common punishment for trespassing his gardens was rape. Richlin 1992: 58-9.
[221] Richlin 2013: 83. Men who were penetrated by other men lost more than their honor in Roman society and to be at the mercy of women as here is especially demeening and hilarious.

make *iocum risumque* of their nocturnal rites, *risum* occurs seven times before the end of the initiation along with *hilaritas* and *hilaris*.[222]

Contrary to the seriousness of mystery cult initiations as "of a voluntary, personal, and secret character that aimed at a change of mind through experience of the sacred," Quartilla's initiation of Encolpius and his companions is involuntary and hardly sacred.[223] Initiation here is out of necessity, or, rather, Quartilla's desire for sex. [224] Johnston points to a few other criteria that most mystery cults shared: improvement for the initiate in this life and the next, as well as the development of an individual relationship with a cult's deity. [225] Both these aspects are treated humorously in this initiation into the "cult" of Priapus.

Immediately following the "initiation" there is a celebratory meal, another common feature of initiation ceremonies. In the cult of Mithras, for instance, iconography frequently represents a "cult meal which the initiates celebrated together on the ubiquitous side-benches which are the mithraeum's defining feature."[226]

Another, perhaps less noticed, element that might have reminded Roman audiences of mystery cult initiatiation is the mock marriage scene between Giton and the very young Pannychis, whom Encolpius describes as *non plus quam septem annos* (not more than seven years old 25.2). This occurs at the very end of the Priapean initiation scene (25.2-26.7). Encolpius and Quartilla peep through the door at the "deflowering" of the young girl, Pannychis,

---

[222] *Risum* occurs at 18.4.2, 18.7.1, 19.1.1, 20.6.1, 20.7.3, 20.8.1, 24.5.2; *hilaritas* at 23.1.4; *hilarior* at 18.4.1.
[223] Burkett 1987: 9.
[224] Schmeling 2011: 53: "The large number of people (far exceeding three) in Quartilla's troupe, not all of whom are likely to be servants, all know the *secreta*, and at 18.2-3, Ascyltos swears that they will not divulge them. Quartilla is surely bragging that hers in an exclusive cult, entrance into which is limited to the one thousand who have had sex with her."
[225] Johnston 2004: 99.
[226] Beck 2006: 21.

by Giton as part of a distorted wedding ceremony in what is surely a travesty of the *hieros gamos* (sacred marriage) which is a common mystery cult element."[227] Sarah Iles Johnston points out the similarities between Mediterranean "rites of passage" and the initiation ceremonies of mystery cults, pointing out that mystery cults flourished "precisely in cultures where rites of passage were missing," including Greece and Rome.[228]

In book 11 of Apuleis's *Metamorphoses*, Lucius, after spending the majority of the novel in the form of a donkey as punishment, is transformed back into a human and initiated into the cult of Isis. The tone of this initiation, in contrast, reveals how much of a parody Petronius's portrayal is. Lucius relates (as much as a member is permitted) his initiation experience:

> *Accessi confinium mortis et, calcato Proserpinae limine, per omnia vectus elementa remeavi; nocte media vidi solem candido coruscantem lumine; deos inferos et deos superos accessi coram et adoravi de proximo. Ecce tibi rettuli quae, quamvis audita, ignores tamen necesse est. Ergo quod solum potest sine piaculo ad profanorum intelligentias enuntiari referam.*
>
> I came to the boundary of death and, after trodding on the threshold of Proserpina, was brought through all the elements and came back; in the middle of the night I saw the sun flashing with bright light; I came face to face with the gods above and the gods below and I worshipped them up close. Behold I have told to you things which, although you have heard them, it is necessary you not know. Therefore I will relate only what I can tell without sin to the minds of the uninitiated. 11.23.

---

[227] This disturbing scene might also have reminded contemporary readers of the initiation of young children into mystery cults, a practice which offered a solution to the anxieties of parents arising from the high rate of infant mortality in the ancient world, as well as, in some cases, the fatalism of astronomy. Petronious may be offering a twisted echo of such practices here. Rather than risk an untimely death and being locked out of the Underworld, parents were known to initiate their children into mystery cults as a way to avoid this. As Cumont 1922: 138 observes, "…[*P*]*ueri* and *puellae* are often found admitted at the most tender age among the adepts of the secret cults…They are imagined as partaking in the beyond of the joys which these cults promised to those whose salvation they ensured."

[228] Johnston 2004: 105-106. Johnston (106) summarizes: "Rome, which eagerly adopted Greek mystery cults and then went on the create some of its own, similarly shows few traces of adolescent rites of passage after the third century B.C.E."

Following his initiation ceremony, Lucius celebrates his birth into the cult with a feast. (11.24). In contrast, Encolpius's initiation ceremony unfolds in real time before the audience as a forced orgy. Throughout the initiation it is clear that Encolpius and his companions, rather than being initiated into a cult that offers a release from death and a better life, are forced by the threat of death to undergo an orgy that they find repulsive, and for Encolpius, not even successful sexually.[229] (*Super inguina mea diu multumque frustra moluit*. (For a long time he ground himself over my groin in vain 23.5).[230] Finally, still held captive by Quartilla, Encolpius is exhausted by their initiation experience: *Venerat iam tertius dies, id est expectatio liberae cenae, sed tot vulneribus confossis fuga magis placebat, quam quies.* (Now the third day had come, with it the hope of a good dinner, but the idea of escape pleased us even more than rest we were beaten up with so many wounds. 26.7). Initiation for Encolpius and his companions turns out to be an utter failure in death preparation.

Since mystery religions revolved around devotion to particular deities, Lichas's attachment to Isis is perhaps another example of this sort of death preparation. His behavior as his ship is overcome by the storm in chapter 114 exemplifies the consequences of a rupture in the give and receive (*da ut des*) of votive religions. Lichas believes that his inability to preserve these sacred symbols has led to the deity's wrath in the form of the violent storm. He implores Encolpius: *Itaque hercules postquam maris ira infesta convaluit, Lichas trepidans ad me supinas porrigit manus et "tu" inquit "Encolpi, succurre periclitantibus et vestem illam divinam sistrumque redde navigio. Per fidem, miserere, quemadmodum quidem soles."* (Thus, by Hercules, as the hostile anger of the sea grew strong, Lichas, trembling, reached out his hand to

[229] See Habash 2006: 26.
[230] See Adams 1982: 152-152 for the sexual connotation of *molo*.

me and said, "You, Encolpius, aid us in our perils and return the dress and divine rattle to the ship. By faith, be merciful, as indeed you are accustomed. 114.4-5). Lichas is convinced that the ship's patron deity is punishing them for the loss of the dress and rattle. It is very likely that these belonged to Isis, a common patron deity of ships and seafaring.[231] Mystery cults grew out of votive religions and Lichas's devotion, integrally tied to these items represents either his adherence to votive religion or even to the mystery cult of Isis. Ironically—since Lichas is the only character that dies—members of the cult of Isis believed that she had "the authority to forestall impending death and grant a new life, *novae solutis curricula*."[232]

Finally, Petronius's conflation of the terms *superstitio* and *religio* brings us to the next section on superstition. "Whereas *religio* denoted the belief in the sacrum "the holy", accepted by an entire community, *superstitio* derived from *superstare*, according to its etymology, meant "overwhelming"—in religious context the "overwhelming" of demonic powers by means of magic practices which were no approved of by all members of the same community." Petersmann observes Petronius's inclination to confuse the meanings of *religio* and *superstitio* and that where "*religio* denoted the belief in the sacrum 'the holy', accepted by an entire community" but "*superstitio* applied to practices which were not approved of by all members of the same community."[233]

Quartilla refers to the rites that Encolpius viewed thus: *Protendo igitur ad genua vestra supinas manus petoque et oro, ne nocturnas* ***religiones*** *iocum risumque faciati*… (I stretch forth my suppliant hands to your knees, and I beg and pray that you not make a joke and mockery of

[231] Schmeling 2013: 438. Apuleius *Met*. 11.4: *Nam dextra quidem ferebat aereum crepitaculum*…(For in her right hand she was carrying a golden rattle…)
[232] Burkert 1987: 18.
[233] Petersmann 2002:40.

my nocturnal rites…17.9). "Petronius…uses the word *religio* in a parodic sense where normally one would speak of *superstitio* so in chapter 17.9 where the mysterious obscene practices performed during the night in a sanctuary of the god Priapus are called *religio*, but in Encolpius's narrative a few lines further on they are ironically referred to as *sacra*." *bonum animum habere eam iussi et de utroque esse securam: nam neque* ***sacra*** *quemquam vulgaturum…* (I told her to have a strong spirit and to be reassured about everything: no part of her sacred rights would be divulged…18.3).

Lichas presents another character who conflates *religio* and *superstitio*. Lichas states: *"Deos immortales rerum humanarum agere curam, puto, intellexisti, o Tryphaena.* But this is described a few lines later by the narrator as *superstitiosa oratione*. (I think, Tryphaena, that you understand that the immortal gods have a care about human affairs. 106.3). Petersmann observes, regarding this passage, that "it seems obvious that Petronius parodically identifies religion with superstition."[234] This blurring of the lines between religion and superstition is in fact a reflection of what occurred among lower classes such as the freedmen of the *Cena*.

Superstition

Superstition was an integral part of death preparation in early imperial Rome, especially for the lower classes, in several ways. Superstitious practices provided a way to avert the wrath of supernatural beings offended by some sort of transgression, but also to protect people from supernatural beings who were vengeful by nature. Quite simply, not performing supernatural practices could lead to death. It was a common popular belief that people could be carried off by evil spirits before their time and that this accounted for at least some untimely deaths.[235] This

[234] Petersmann 2002: 40.
[235] Witches were also believed to steal away body parts from corpses for use in various magic rituals. See Apuleius, *Met*., 2.21-22.

sort of death was one of the ways to account for astrology's incorrect prediction of a person's time of death, the "belief that intervention of a human or divine will could oppose the fated course of things and abridge the normal duration of existence."[236] Trimalchio's claims to have witnessed such situation as a young boy when he tells the story of the Cappodocian boy (63). In his story, first a spirit steals away Trimalchio's master's favorite, and then the touch of a *strigae* kills the Cappodocian boy. These *strigae*, believed to be "ominous and dangerous birds, kidnapping babies and devouring their intestines… euphemistically were also named *nocturnae* who, by hitting a human being manually, caused insanity, pain and finally death."[237] The diners react to to the story: *Miramur nos et pariter credimus, osculatique mensam rogamus nocturnas, ut suis se teneant, dum redimus a cena.*(We were amazed and at the same time believed, and after kissing the table we prayed the night-spirits, that they might keep themselves to themselves while we were returning from dinner. 64.1). Here the diners express the belief that creatures of the night could affect them to the point of death and kiss the table to prevent this. Kissing the table is "an apotropaic ritual to ward of the *Nocturnae* based on the belief that it "is the *ara* of the *genius domus*."[238]

In a similar fashion, Trimlachio responds to a cock crowing: *Haec dicente eo gallus gallinaceus cantavit. Qua voce confusus Trimalchio vinum sub mensa iussit effundi lucernamque etiam mero spargi. Immo anulum traiecit in dexteram manum et "non sine causa" inquit "hic bucinus signum dedit; nam aut incendium oportet fiat, aut aliquis in vicinia animam abiciet*…" (After he said these things, a cock crowed. At the sound, Trimalchio was disturbed and

[236] Cumont 1922: 134. Ancient theology distinguished between the untimely deaths of children and those who had not reached the age of reason and the deaths of the guilty. (Cumont 1922:136-139.)
[237] Petersmann 2002: 42.
[238] Schmeling 2011: 264. See also Dölger 1930.

commanded his wine to be poured under the table and the lamp also to be sprinkled with unmixed wine. For good measure, he switched his ring to his right hand and said, "not without cause did this trumpeter give a signal; for, either there must be a fire or someone nearby has cast out his soul. 74.1-3). The rooster was symbolic of a myriad of beliefs and superstitions for the Romans, as Trimalchio's behavior at hearing its crow reflects. In this particular situation, Trimalchio is concerned with warding off the evil that the cock forebodes. While he hopes the superstitious actions he takes—pouring wine under the table, sprinkling the lamp and switching his rings—will prevent a bad outcome, he is in fact ignorant of the proper superstitious action. Water, not wine is mentioned by Pliny as the proper liquid to avert bad omens and "the flicker of a flame was regarded as an omen indicating the sure happening of an expected event. But in our context the expected event is an unlucky one, and Trimalchio on all accounts should have tried to prevent this omen."[239]

From Trimalchio's perspective, he is genuinely performing the necessary actions to ward off evil, and in particular, death. But from the perspective of the audience, who is aware of his flawed knowledge as it reveals itself throughout the *Cena*, Trimalchio proves the ineffectiveness of superstitious practices while at the same time representing a class of people who believe in them as a viable way to prepare for and prevent death.

The Practical Approaches: funerals, wills, tombs and epitaphs

The first part of this chapter focused on the intangible ways to prepare for death. While the overwhelming consensus of the characters in the *Satyrica* is not to listen to philosophers about death preparation, some of its characters—Encolpius and the Widow of Ephesus, in particular— seem to flirt with questioning the pruprose of practical death preparation. How

[239] Petersmann 2002: 44.

these two characters question the existence of an afterlife has already been addressed in chapter one. Philosophical and spiritual positions on the afterlife, however, were not in the final analysis incompatible with practical death preparation and even philosophers like Seneca who seemed to staunchly scorn the idea of an afterlife enthusiastically participated in practical preparations. While the philosophical and spiritual approaches to death preparation dealt largely with attempting to understand, predict and interpret the unknown, there were many ways that the Romans prepared for death in the here and now. The characters in the *Satyrica* prepare practically for death in three ways: planning for funerals, writing wills and building tombs.

Funerals

Plans for funerals, like other practical methods of preparing for death, often began in life. While the entire funeral might not be planned out, the heir was required by Roman law to carry out the funeral and to ensure, at the very least, the proper disposal of the deceased. Roman funerals consisted of several elements and began at the deathbed with the presence of family in an ideal experience of dying. Roman funerals could be very expensive, a situation confirmed by the existence of burial *collegia*. In exchange for their contributions, members would receive a funeral and burial after they died, and social interaction while they were alive. This is an interesting example of how life and death were intertwined in Roman society. Hope goes so far as to surmise that "for some members, the comradeship offered by the society may have stood in the place of family."[240] In the *Satyrica*, we have examples of funerals from four characters: Lichas, Chrysanthus, Habinnas and Trimalchio. Lichas's and Chrysanthus's funerals have already been addressed in chapter one since these were funerals that dealt with actual death. Perhaps the most important thing to note about these two funerals is how they contrast with each

[240] Hope 2007: 87.

other. Chrysanthus's elaborate funeral and Habinnas's description of the funeral feast he attended stand as examples of typical Roman funerals wheras Lichas's funeral was nothing like this. He ends up buried by enemy hands and with a eulogy delivered by a stranger.

Roman funerals were often not outlined well by testators since there were accepted and predictable rituals for funerals and one could expect these to be followed. We see much more evidence of people planning tombs, epitaphs and other enduring aspects of *post-mortem* existence. Champlin remarks on the lack of funeral instructions (except for Augustus's) in Roman wills: "…ritual was prescribed by custom…those testators who cared to express concern dealt with one of two items, how much the funeral would cost and where precisely it would end. Each of these was really part of care for the tomb: the arrival, not the journey, was what mattered."[241]

However, in the case of Trimalchio, the journey and the arrival are both important. From the very beginning of Encolpius's entrance into Trimalcio's dining room, it becomes clear that Trimalchio is eager to display his own accomplishments in the same place where the elite normally displayed their *imagines*.[242] Because of his status as a freeman, Trimlachio would not have owned these, but in their place he puts several items with funerary associations. One is the mural depicting his life and apotheosis, and the other is the display of *fasces* which were often placed outside of tombs.[243] "It is in any case clear that the half-allegorical, half-realistic depiction of Trimalchio's career adorning the portico would have struck Petronius's original readers as incongruous, even macabre, in a domestic setting, for no contemporary Roman could

[241] Champlin 1991: 171.
[242] Bodel 1994: 245-246. Flower 1996: 185-222.
[243] Prag 2006: 541.

have failed to recognize that Trimalchio's house is decorated in manner of a Roman tomb. "[244] The dinner commences, the entirety of which can be seen as a funeral feast, and the ending scene of the *Cena* is Trimalchio's enactment of his own funeral: the final touch on a macabre evening.[245] He clearly intends to enact his funeral as humorous entertainment for his diners, but at some point, his sense of humor goes too far. His funeral begins after he gives directions to Habinnas for his epitaph: *Flebat et Fortunata, flebat et Habinnas, tota denique familia, tanquam in funus rogata, lamentatione triclinium implevit.* (Both Fortunata wept and Habinnas, at lenth the whole household as if they were at a funeral, and the dining-room was filled with lamentation. 72.1). A short haitus occurs in which Trimalchio and the diners bathe. (Since Trimalchio is about to lay himself out in imitation of a corpse, this bath is like Socrates' washing of his body just before he dies in the *Phaedo*). After this bath he begins his funeral in earnest in the passage already cited in the above section.[246]

While the household continues to play the part along with Trimalchio, Encolpius brings us back to the reality of the situation: *Ibat res ad summam nausea*… (The situation had become completely sickening. 78.5-). ...*fultusque cervicalibus multis extendit se super torum extremum*

---

[244] Bodel 1994: 243.

[245] The very setting of the *Cena*, a feast, suggests that the entire episode is a mock funeral. A mutual relationship existed in Roman society between the the living and the dead in the context of funerals and feasting. Feasts were an integral part of funerals, as Habinnas indicates, and it was very common for diners at feasts to be surrounded by reminders of death. See Dunbabin 2003.

[246] Socrates also bathes himself directly before he drinks hemlock in the *Phaedo* to save his body from needing to be washed after he dies. (115a) Directly before this scene the cock crows, as mentioned above in describing Trimalchio's superstitious tendencies. Trimalchio commands the death of the cock and has it cooked in pan. This may be a reference to the end of Plato's *Phaedo*. Socrates's last words, directly before he succumbs to the effects of the hemlock: εἶπεν—ὃ δὴ τελευταῖον ἐφθέγξατο—'ᾧ Κρίτων, ἔφη, τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ ὀφείλομεν ἀλεκτρυόνα: ἀλλὰ ἀπόδοτε καὶ μὴ ἀμελήσητε.' (He spoke—this was these were his last words—"Crito," he said, "we owe a cock to Asclepius; but, pay this debt and do not neglect it." *Phaedo* 118a)

et "Fingite me" inquit "mortuum esse. Dicite aliquid belli." (He propped himself up with a bunch of pillows and stretched himself over his death-bed and said, "Imagine that I am dead. Say something nice." 78.5-6).

One of the trumpeters blows his horn a little too loudly and rouses the neighborhood. This ends Trimalchio's funeral and the end of the *Cena*. Trimalchio's funeral perhaps imitates real-life funeral procedures too closely, as Encolpius's reaction attests. Custom dictated proper funeral ritual especially for the elite in society but Trimlachio sees this as an opportunity to re-create his image after death; by rehearsing his funeral, Trimlachio begins this process before he dies by aligning himself with other examples of the elite who have rehearsed their own funerals. Notable among these examples are Pacuvius and Sextus Turannius. Seneca reports of Pacuvius (repeated from above for convenience): *Pacuvius, qui Syriam usu suam fecit, cum vino et illis funebribus epulis sibi parentaverat, sic in cubiculum ferebatur a cena, ut inter plausus exoletorum hoc ad symphoniam caneretur:* βεβίωται, βεβίωται. (*Ep.* 12.8).[247]

Sextus Turannius enacts his own funeral when he finds himself forced into retirement by Caesar: S. *Turannius fuit exactae diligentiae senex, qui post annum nonagesimum, cum vacationem procurationis ab C. Caesare ultro accepisset, componi se in lecto et velut exanimem a circumstante familia plangi iussit. Lugebat domus otium domini senis nec finivit ante tristitiam, quam labor illi suus restitutus est.* (Sextus Turannus was an old man of enduring diligence, who after he turned ninety, when he had received a release from his official duty from Caesar himself, commanded himself to be laid out on his bed and his family to mourn him as if dead standing around him. *Brev. Vitae* 20.3-4).

[247] See Schmeling 2011:327. Walshe (1970: 137) and Sullivan (1968: 131) consider Trimalchio's mock-funeral a reference to Seneca's epistle.

Seneca criticizes both of these examples. He describes Pacuvius as motivated from *mala conscientia* in his enactment and places Sextus in the category of men who are unable to accept death since their desire to work lasts longer than their ability (*diutius cupiditas illis laboris quam facultas est*, *Brev. Vitae* 20.4). However, Seneca presents the perspective of the elite philosopher who can take the status of his position in society for granted. Trimalchio sees in his particular kind of death preparation a means of elevating his status while he is alive and perpetuating it afterwards. Bodel's analysis of the *Cena* centers around the interpretation that the entire episode symbolizes Trimalchio's inability to move up the social ladder in Rome due to his position as a freedman. "Trimalchio is a free man in appearance only: he lacks the essential quality of *ingenuitas*, free birth. Hence the mood of melancholy many have felt pervades the determined merriment at Trimalchio's table; hence also Trimlachio's preoccupation with death, the final emancipation. Once property, now propertied, he and his fellow freedmen love against the clock, desperately striving to compensate for a past that can be neither redeemed nor effaced."[248]

Wills

The unorthodox wills in the *Satyrica* were perhaps inspiration for Petronius when he made his will during his suicide forced by Nero in 66 C.E.: *ne codicillis quidem, quod plerique pereuntium, Neronem aut Tigellinum aut quem alium potentium adulatus est, sed flagitia principis sub nominibus exoletorum feminarumque et novitatem cuiusque stupri perscripsit atque obsignata misit Neroni.* (And [Petronius], indeed did not flatter in his will, as many of those dying did, Nero or Tigellinus or any of the other powerful men but wrote down a list of the

[248] Bodel 1994: 253. See chapter four for a discussion of the role of sexual exploitation in Trimlachio's manumission, but also as a societal norm in manumission generally.

emperor's shameful acts, along with the names of his partners, both men and women, and the strangeness of this debauchery, and sent it under seal to the emperor. Tacitus *Annals*: 16.19.).

Wills occupy a prominent place at two points in the *Satyrica*: when Trimalchio reads his aloud and dictates changes to it at the end of the *Cena*, and when Eumolpus, at the end of the extant *Satyrica*, instructs his beneficiaries to cut up and eat his body as a stipulation of their inheritance. Additionally, wills are alluded to throughout the episode at Croton, since this is a society populated by legacy hunters.[249] As part of his disguise at Croton, Eumolpus talks about how he revises his will every day: *sedeat praeterea quotidie ad rationes tabulasque testamenti omnibus mensibus renovet*. (Besides, he must sit over his accounts daily and revise the pages every month. 117.10).[250]

Wills were important elements of death preparation for Romans and recognized as such by Roman society. "[T]estators' freedom of expression depended not so much on their lack of posthumous accountability as on their reasonable certainty that society would sanction their carefully considered last wishes, within the confines of the law. There was, in brief, a commonly recognized *licentia testamentorum*." [251] There were two aspects to Roman wills. The first included the practical matter of designating heirs and apportioning possessions. The second was the use of the will as means for its author to express opinions about and pass judgement on people, a practice especially true during Neronian Rome. [252] Lucian (*Nigr.* 30) writes famously

---

[249] Champlin 1991: 97 calls our attention to the fact that inheritance hunting, while a popular subject with satirists, was not necessarily rooted in fact: "…: there can be no doubt that Pliny and other commentators saw *captatio* as a rampant evil, and that is important; but they do not provide evidence for its historical nature or extent."
[250] *Sat*. 117. On this topic of will revision, Champlin :67. "…the satirists merely exaggerate reality when they depict frequent revision as a ploy of the would-be victim of *captators*…
[251] Champlin 1991: 11. Also, Davies 2013: 142.
[252] Champlin 1991: 16-17: "…the testator's last judgment mattered terribly to the living. Accordingly, the concept of the supremum *iudicium* pervades both Latin literature and Latin

that men told the truth only once: in their wills. "The Romans accepted this license of testators to say what they wished because it was felt to be the truth, confirmed or revealed; one could be sure of what another person thought only after he or she had laid aside the mask of daily life."[253]

In this light, the Roman will can be considered a true revelation of the character of its author. But, in the *Satyrica*, wills take on a different significance because they are publicly read *before* their authors die. This subverts the role of the will "as a vessel of truth, a document carefully weighed and written free of ordinary constraints and without fear or favor, since it became public knowledge only when its author was past caring."[254] Rather, the will becomes a manipulative tool which at worst encourages dishonest relationships, but at the very least makes it impossible to determine its truthfulness. In addition, the will becomes a dead document once read, void of any real power since its author, being still alive, could simply write another one.[255] Trimlachio reads aloud his will towards the end of the *Cena* and reveals in his own words his motivation: he wishes to experience the grief of his household while he is still alive: *"Ad summam, omnes illos in testamento meo manu mitto...Et haec ideo omnia publico,* ***ut familia mea iam nunc sic me amet tanquam mortuum****." Gratias agere omnes indulgentiae coeperant domini, cum ille oblitus nugarum exemplar testamenti iussit afferri et totum a primo ad ultimum*

---

epitaphs; and, most importantly, the metaphor was accepted and very heavily used by the jurists who dealt so often with inheritance disputes: *testamentum* and *supremum iudicium* were synonymous." Conte 1987: 530: "It is quite true that the use of testaments as vehicles of posthumous malediction or of slanderous retaliation was a wide-spread practice, especially in the Nero." See also Sullivan 1985: 34f and n. 35, Conte 1987: 530.

[253] Champlin 1991: 11.

[254] Champlin 1991: 10.

[255] One of the more famous instances of a Roman will being read *pre*humously is the public reading of Marc Antony's will by Octavian around 30 B.C.E. In this instance (regardless of whether it was actually Antony's will or not) it was used as a tool to declare Antony a traitor to Rome and discredit him in the eyes of Romans. This was possible precisely because of the societal acceptance of the veracity of Roman wills. (Dio 50.3, 50.20; Suet. *Aug*. 17.2; Plut. *Ant*. 58)

ingemescente familia recitavit. ("In a word, I set free in my will all of them…And all this publicly, so that my whole household may show their love for me now just as if I were dead." Everyone began to thank the lord for his tenderness and then he forgot trifling matters and commanded a copy of his will to be brought in and he read it out from beginning to end as the household wept. 71.2-5).

Rife with feigned emotion, this scene contains many confusing elements. Trimalchio is perhaps attempting to indicate that he cares for his household and wants to ensure a secure future for them. It is more likely, however, that Petronius wished to satirize how wills were used in Roman society to manipulate the affection of potential legatees. Champlin confirms this as one of the motivating factors for this practice beyond gaining a physical or financial advantage.[256] From Trimalchio's perspective, the experience of affection (and any other advantage) is for the living, not the dead. Considered in light of his imminent pretend death at the end of the *Cena*, it can perhaps be viewed as part of a complete death-scene. But more importantly, this is part of a complete death-scene that allows Trimalchio to experience what he cannot experience once dead. Turning to what the philosophical schools of Epicurus and the Stoics preached about wills helps to illuminate Petronius's treatment of wills, both Trimalchio's and Eumolpus's.

As stated above, many of the Roman elite followed the Stoic or Epicurean philosophies, both of which denied any benefit to being concerned about *post-mortem* existence. This comes across more strongly in the Epicurean philosophy which explicitly denies any post-mortem existence, but also aggressively argues this point by denying any sensation to the *post-mortem* soul. The idea of a true follower of Epicurean or Stoic philosophy writing a will has met with criticism, even from ancient writers. However, there is more than one case of the followers of

[256] Champlin 1991: 24-25.

these philosophical schools writing wills, and these include both Epicurus himself and Seneca. If important figures of these schools found it necessary to make a will, Petronius points out an inconsistency between their purported beliefs and actions. If an Epicurean or a Stoic could claim to be entirely unconcerned about what happened after death, how can this be reconciled with will-making which necessarily conveys concern for what happens after death? Cicero noticed this contradiction between Epicurus's belief and practice:

> *eiusdem testamentum non solum a philosophi gravitate sed etiam ab ipsius sententia iudico discrepare. Scripsit enim et multis saepe verbis et breviter aperteque in eo libro quem modo nominavi, 'mortem nihil ad nos pertinere; quod enim dissolutum sit, id esse sine sensu; quod autem sine sensu sit, id nihil ad nos pertinere omnino.'*
>
> I judge there to be an inconsistency with not only the will of this same philosopher, but also with his own teachings. For he often wrote both with many words and briefly in that book which I just named: 'death concerns us not at all; for what is destroyed, that must be without sensation; what, however, is without sensation, that affects us not at all. *Fin.* 100.

James Warren explains Cicero's objections to Epicurus's will-making: "…unless something is perceived by a subject as pleasant or painful, that something cannot be good or bad for that subject. Since, therefore, at death the subject is annihilated and can no longer perceive, *post mortem* events can have no value for the subject."[257] Warren continues by outlining the various objections that can be raised to this line of thought. Either one may believe that there is a *post mortem* being that can feel pleasure or pain, or one could be concerned about what happens *post mortem*, even if these events are unperceivable. Epicurus's own teachings seem to not allow for the latter, and while some scholars[258] have attempted to reconcile will-writing with the idea of the pleasure it gave the author while still alive, Petronius skirts around this quagmire of

[257] Warren 2004: 167-8.
[258] Warren 2004: 170-72.

philosophical thinking by making Trimalchio experience, while still alive, the pleasure (or pain) his will may bring to his intended audience, best summarized by his own words: *ut familia mea iam nunc sic me amet tanquam mortuum*.

Eumolpus's will presents a singularly odd case but continues to carry through to their logical conclusions philosophical objections to will-making. Already addressed in the last chapter on "Apparent Death," this chapter looks at this episode from the perspective of anticipating death. It unites an essential part of Roman death preparation with cannibalism and even attempts to persuade its audience of the benefits of a practice generally considered abhorrent to Romans. This scene has puzzled many critics (a confusion compounded by the fact that this bizarre proscription comes at the end of the extant *Satyrica* where it is especially fragmentary). Eumolpus writes:

"Omnes, qui in testamento meo legata habent, praeter libertos meos hac condicione percipient, quae dedi, si corpus meum in partes conciderint et astante populo comederint." ...
(All those who have a legacy in my will, besides my freedmen, will inherit on this condition which I give: if they cut up my body into parts and eat it in front of everyone. 141.2).
The most obvious explanation for the directions Eumolpus gives in his will can be found by looking back at the opening scene of Croton. As stated in the last chapter, Eumolpus merely requires the Crotonians to concretize the metaphor of their society provided by the *vilico* at the beginning of the episode. Croton is a town *in quibus nihil aliud est nisi cadavera, quae lacerantur, aut corvi, qui lacerant* (in which there is nothing other than cadavers and who are torn apart, or crows who tear them. 116.9). Conte points out: "Eumolpus' mocking request that the *heredipetae* eat his corpus is a retaliation constructed upon his pretending still to believe in their sincerity and manifesting what is almost a desire to summon them to a loftier degree of

initiatory *sapientia*: his disciples, having fed zealously upon his *spiritus*, are now invited to a kind of 'mystic communion'."[259] Eumolpus's motivation is similar to Trimalchio's: presumably he is not actually dead (merely pretending to die) and would witness the reaction of his "heirs" to the directions in his will. While they would not lament him as if he were dead, he would see their reaction to Gorgias persuading them "to put their mouths where the money is" so to speak. The scene unfolds as a rhetorical exercise. Eumolpus tries to persuade his audience:

> *"Apud quasdam gentes scimus adhuc legem servari, ut a propinquis suis consumantur defuncti, adeo quidem, ut obiurgentur aegri frequenter, quod carnem suam faciant peiorem. His admoneo amicos meos, ne recusent quae iubeo, sed quibus animis devoverint spiritum meum, eisdem etiam corpus consumant"*
>
> "We know to this point that among certain nations a law is observed, that the dead are eaten by their relatives, so that frequently the sick are blamed, because they make their flesh worse. I remind my friends of these things, lest they object to what I command, but in the spirit that they devoured my soul, in that same spirit let them eat my body…" 141.3-4.

Directly after Eumolpus's argument, we see that he has left a man named Gorgias in charge of carrying out his *post-mortem* instructions. Gorgias, of course, was the name of the historical figure from Leontini famous for his rhetorical skill. Before he takes over the persuasion, we are informed by the narrator that the promise of money has blinded the rationality of the heirs: *Excaecabat pecuniae ingens fama oculos animosque miserorum* (His fame for being fabulously wealthy blinded the eyes and souls of these wretched ones. 141.5). It appears that the heirs are ready to swallow almost anything at this point. This emphasizes the view that rhetoric is not so much an appeal to reason as an exercise in persuasion where the ends justifies the means. In the following paragraph, Gorgias tries three approaches to persuade his audience. First, he suggests that they pretend they are eating the money rather than human flesh: *"De*

[259] Conte 1987: 531.

stomachi tui recusatione non habeo quod timeam. Sequetur imperium, si promiseris illi pro unius horae fastidio multorum bonorum pensationem. Operi modo oculos et finge te non humana viscera sed centies sestertium comesse. (I do not have any fear of the refusal of your stomach. It will follow your command if you promise it the payment of many good things for the loathing of one hour. Just cover your eyes and imagine that you are not eating human viscera, but a hundred sesterces. 141.6-8).

Gorgias follows this with the suggestion that the bad-tasting flesh can be covered over with sauce. In short, what the imagination can supply in the role of persuasion (namely, the promise of money), reality can supply in the form of sauce: *Accedit huc, quod aliqua inveniemus blandimenta, quibus saporem mutemus. Neque enim ulla care per se placet, sed arte quadam corrumpitur et stomacho conciliatur averso.* (For this purpose, we will find some sauce with which we can change the flavor. No flesh by itself is pleasant, but it must be covered over and made acceptable to a hostile stomach. 141.8-9).

These suggestions bring us full circle to the beginning of the *Satyrica* when Encolpius describes the damage rhetoricians have done to eloquence:

> *Et ideo ego adulescentulos existimo in scholis stultissimos fieri, quia nihil ex his, quae in usu habemus, aut audiunt aut vident, sed piratas cum catenis in litore stantes, sed tyrannos edicta scribentes, quibus imperent filiis ut patrum suorum capita praecidant, sed responsa in pestilentiam data, ut virgines tres aut plures immolentur, sed mellitos verborum globulos et omnia dicta factaque quasi papavere et sesamo sparsa."*
>
> And I think that young men become fools in schools, because they hear and see nothing from these things which we have in reality, but pirates standing on shore in chains, or tyrants wrtings edicts in which they command sons to cut off the heads of their own fathers, and replies given during pestilence that three virgins of more be sacrificed, and honeyed-balls of words and everything spoken or done as sprinkled with poppeyseed and sesame. 141.

The tyrant writing a command for sons to cut off their fathers' heads is not entirely different from Gorgias persuading someone to eat human flesh. Gorgias turns a rhetorical exercise into reality, and concretizes the rhetorician's exercise, just as he concretized the *vilicus's* metaphor. The "honey balls of words" and deeds and acts that are sprinkled with poppyseeds and sesame are analogous to real flesh covered over with sauce.

Finally, he names examples of people who have eaten human flesh in order to lend support to his argument:

> *Quod si exemplis quoque vis probari consilium, Saguntini oppressi ab Hannibale humanas edere carnes, nec hereditatem exspectabant. Petelini idem fecerunt in ultima fame, nec quicquam aliud in hac epulatione captabant, nisi tantum ne esurirent. Cum esset Numantia a Scipione capta, inventae sunt matres, quae liberorum suorum tenerent semesa in sinu corpora"*
>
> But, if cousel may be proved by examples, the Saguntines, when oppressed by Hannibal, ate human flesh, nor did they hope for an inheritance. The Petelines did the same in the throes of famine, nor did they get anything else from this feasting, except that they were not as hungry. When Numnatia was captured by Scipio, mothers were found who held the half-eaten bodies of their own children in their laps. 141.

Supporting an argument by means of example was a well-known rhetorical tactic.[260] The unstated fact—probably well-known to readers of the *Satyrica*—is that Croton was considered the founding city of the Pythagorean cult. One of the tenets of this cult was the belief in reincarnation.

Additionally, as already stated in the last chapter, although Pythagoras himself was probably not a vegetarian, Pythagoreanism became associated with abstention from meat through other southern Italian thinkers who followed Pythagoras: Empedocles and Parmenides. And furthermore, while the Crotonians who first welcomed Pythagoras were affluent, Pythagoras

[260] See Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1393a23-1393b4.

taught his followers to hide their wealth. These three hallmarks of the cult closely associated with Croton—reincarnation, vegetarianism and avoidance of excessive wealth—are the foci of Eumolpus's will. The Crotonians become an example of a society so far-removed from its founding principles that it is, in essence, a dead society; they can even be persuaded to cannibalism. Again, the words of the *vilicus* in the beginning of Crotonian episode are fulfilled in this final scene: *In hac enim urbe non litterarum studia celebrantur, non eloquentia locum habet, non frugalitas sanctique mores laudibus ad fructum perveniunt, sed quoscunque homines in hac urbe videritis, scitote in duas partes esse divisos. Nam aut captantur aut captant.* (In this city no one engages in the study of letters, neither does eloquence have a place, nor frugality or the customs of holiness find their fruit in praise, but all the men you see in this city, you will see divided into two parts. For they are either hunted for their legacies or they are the legacy-hunters. 116). The entire Crotonian society, it turns out, lives in a perpetual state of anti-death-preparation.[261] Their entire existence is supposedly focused on maximizing their experience in the here and now by manipulating those who are dying.

Tombs

The description Trimalchio gives to Habinnas for the construction of his tomb is one of the most detailed of a Roman tomb in all ancient literature. While more elaborate than most tombs would have been, archeological evidence confirms that its description is rooted in reality.[262] This archeological evidence also indicates that freed men and women were much

[261] Champlin 1991: 96-97: "Similarly, both Pliny and Longinus link inheritance hunting with (in effect) the decline of polite letters. However, Petronius makes the same connection in speaking of Croton, where *captatio* is the sole way of life and "literature and the arts go utterly unhonored; eloquence there has no prestige; and those who live the good and simple life find no admirers."
[262] Champlain 1991: 173-74. The blueprint of the *testamentum Lingonis* combines the two cardinal elements of tombs: the representation of the living and the celebration of the dead. The first unites here both plastic and written portraits of the testator, that is, a statue and an

more likely to make elaborate preparations to commemorate their lives after death. As Hope states, freed men and women "may have been particularly conscious of the family—children and spouses—that had been denied to them as slaves and stood now as symbols of the foundation of a new citizen family."[263] Here they could freely commemorate their lives. It becomes for Trimalchio, in his own words, a continuation of life: *Respiciens deinde Habinnam "quid dicis" inquit "amice carissime? Aedificas monumentum meum, quemadmodum te iussi*?... *ut mihi contingat tuo beneficio post mortem vivere*…" (Then, looking at Habinnas, he said "what do you say, dearest friend? Will you build my tomb in the way I command you? So that for me it may continue by your kindness to live after my death…" 71).

The existence of the phrase *vivus fecit* (indicating that the construction began while its owner was still alive) in many epitaphs emphasizes the importance of tomb-building for practical death-preparation.[264] Tomb-building bridged the life and death of its owner also in its depictions. Trimalchio's description includes many depictions of his life and he intends to leave a caretaker for the express purpose of ensuring that his tomb will remain intact. In short, he wants his tomb to continue to be a testament to his life for a very long time after he dies. Trimalchio gives a reason for his elaborate tomb: *Valde enim falsum est vivo quidem domos cultas esse, non curari eas, ubi diutius nobis habitandum est.* (For it is indeed wrong for someone to take care of his home in life, but not to be concerned about that one where we must dwell for longer. 71). This contrasts sharply with the philosophical point of view that denies any

---

inscription. Thousands of such commemorations in reality are best summed up and satirized by the overwhelmingly baroque exemplar of Trimalchio's tomb, arranged *inter vivos*… An exaggeration, perhaps, but no busier than some of the more elaborate surviving monuments, such as the tomb of the Haterii.

[263] Hope 2013: 153-54.

[264] Hope 2013: 153.

need for any form of attention—whether to the body or memory—after death. The idea of a tomb as an eternal home is attested much earlier than the time of the *Satyrica*, in fact, as early as the ninth century B.C.E.[265]

Trimalchio continues this line of thought when he adds: *Et ideo ante omnia adici volo: hoc monumentum heredem non sequitur.'* (And, for this reason I wish to have added before everything: 'This monument does not fall to an heir'.71). The inscription that Trimalchio requests here was formulaic and often abbreviated to HMHNS, but his exaggerated concern over being immortalized is confirmed by the phrase *ante omnia* as well as his own explanation that follows: *Ceterum erit mihi curae, ut testamento caveam, ne mortuus iniuriam accipiam. Praeponam enim unum ex libertis sepulcro meo custodiae causa, ne in monumentum meum populus cacatum currat* (Furthermore, there will be care taken by me, as I will order in my will, that I not receive any injury when I am dead. For I will place one from among my freedmen as a guard over my grave, so that people don't run up and shit on my tomb. 71).[266]

Trimalchio has prepared everything in his power to ensure that his monument will endure as a testament to his identity. Whether he does this because he simply wants to be remembered or because he believes in an afterlife is of little importance. His method of death preparation contrasts with that which philosophers purported to embrace, and based on the archeological evidence, he was far from alone in his desire to make practical preparations for his death. There is also indication from Trimalchio's directions that he believed in an afterlife. Petrovic explains that most depictions of boats on tombs during this time period were sail-less, a

---

[265] Lattimore 1942: 166. Bryan 1925: 4-5.

[266] Schmeling 2011: 296 notes: While the latter phrase is part of the formula for epitaphs, the *ante omnia* phrase is special and has a point: under no circumstances does the monument pass out of T's possession." See Mommsen 1878: 116 for the significance of *ante omnia* noted as well by Schmeling.

metaphor, aligned with Stoic and Epicurean beliefs, that death was the last harbor of the living person. Contrary to this, Trimalchio explicitly demands "full sails" as he begins these elaborate directions for the decoration of his tomb (a continuation of the directions given to Habinnas, above):

> *Te rogo, ut naves etiam ... monumenti mei facias plenis velis euntes, et me in tribunali sedentem praetextatum cum anulis aureis quinque et nummos in publico de sacculo effundentem; scis enim, quod epulum dedi binos denarios. Faciatur, si tibi videtur, et triclinia. Facias et totum populum sibi suaviter facientem. Ad dexteram meam ponas statuam Fortunatae meae columbam tenentem: et catellam cingulo alligatam ducat: et cicaronem meum, et amphoras copiosas gypsatas, ne effluant vinum. Et urnam licet fractam sculpas, et super eam puerum plorantem. Horologium in medio, ut quisquis horas inspiciet, velit nolit, nomen meum legat.*
>
> I ask you, also for there to be made ships on my tomb with full sails, and me sitting wearing my toga *praetexta* with five gold rings and pouring forth coins publicly from a bag; for you know that I gave a dinner for two denarii. A dining couch should be made, if you can see to it. Have all the people making a good time for themselves. At my right hand put a statue of Fortunata holding a dove: and let her lead a puppy fastened with a collar: and my favorite boy, and full jugs plastered with gypsum, lest the wine overflow. And have carved a broken urn, and over it a boy crying. In the middle of it all a sundial so that anyone who looks at the time, whether or not he wishes, may read my name. 71.9-12[267]

This description continues to bridge death and life beyond hinting at an afterlife: Trimalchio endeavors to document prestigious elements of his life, here obtaining the office of *sevir Augustalis*, as well as his good character (he was generous with his money and gave fancy dinners). To ensure that this commemoration of his life will not go unnoticed, he directs a sundial to be placed in the middle of it all so that anyone passing by, wishing to check the time, will also notice his tomb. Champlain remarks: "Burial and cult were important to society, memory was what mattered to the individual. Ulpian summed up the common conception: a

[267] Several elements of Trimalchio's tomb have counterparts in archeological evidence: Dunbabin 2003: 89: *Augustales* seated at a tribunal; general similarities: Whitehead 1993: 312. (Noted by Schmeling 2011: 298-99.)

monument exists for the sake of preserving memory. That is one reason why tombs jostle for space close to the roads just outside the walls of an ancient city, their *tituli* demanding, often in so many words, that the traveler stop and read them."[268] The addition of the sundial draws even more attention than an inscription.

The *Satyrica*, while confirming the importance of tomb-building for Romans in the Principate, generally, also provides insight into the importance of this form of death preparation for freedmen in particular. At the same time that tomb building became more and more important for the elite of Roman society, it was also becoming more important for rich freedmen as a way to commemorate a newfound status that was a portal into Roman citizenship.

Epitaphs

Epitaphs, like tombs and planning for funerals were an important part of practical death preparation since they were often prepared by a living person to be displayed after death. In this way they bridged the gap between life and death, but also because they were a way for a dead person to communicate back to the living. While tombs provided a visual message, epitaphs were an opportunity to provide a more specific message and the prominent location of the tombs on which they were placed—lining roads that led into cities and towns—made an ideal location for conveying such messages. Sometimes this information was about the life of the dead person such as when Trimalchio directs Habinnas to inscribe his epitaph: *"C. Pompeius Trimalchio Maecenatianus hic requiescit. Huic seviratus absenti decretus est. Cum posset in omnibus decuriis Romae esse, tamen noluit. Pius, fortis, fidelis, ex parvo crevit, sestertium reliquit trecenties, nec unquam philosophum audivit. Vale: et tu."* (Here lies Gaius Pompeius

[268] Champlin 175. Ulpian *Dig*. 11.7.2.6.

Trimalchio, from the household of Maecenas. He was formally decreed a priest of Augustus in his absence. While he could have been among any of the decuria of Roman, he refused. Pius, brave, faithful, he grew from little, left behind thirty million, and never listened to a philosopher. Farewell: and you, too." 71.12).

Sometimes an epitaph was a way for the dead person to advise the living, using wisdom learned while alive. This "wisdom" took many forms ranging from serious warnings to humorous and witty quips to philosophical concepts of the soul and expressions of love and grief. Lattimore provides a detailed survey, arranged thematically, of the sorts of epitaphs we have encountered from archeological evidence.[269]

The *Satyrica*, besides confirming these general aspects of the role of epitaphs in Roman society, provides insight into how epitaphs were especially important to the freedmen class. Epitaphs, since they were a form of writing, allowed freedmen to both pinpoint their new status in a different way than decorative sculptures and depictions and to reach a literate audience. A freedman could precisely state that he had become wealthy or served as a member of such prestigious parts of society as the *Familia Caesaris*. Weaver remarks: "From the legal point of view the slave-born orders (*servi*, *liberti*) were inferior to free-born society (*plebs*, *equites*, *senators*). However, from the social point view many *liberti* enjoyed higher status than many of the *plebs*. In the *Familia Caesaris*, most *servi* and *liberti* were higher in status than most of the *plebs* and indeed some had status equal to that of some equestrians. They thus serve as a clear example of status dissonance, rating highly on some status criteria, such as acquired skills, ability and possibly intelligence, power ranking, and to a considerable extent, wealth and style of life, but low on others, such as birth legal status." Trimlachio's epitaph contains both elements

[269] Lattimore 1942.

of social history as well as embellished literature. He precisely indicates that he rose to the rank of *seviratus* which was the highest rank that freedman could obtain.[270] On the other hand, he claims that this honor was bestowed *in absentia*, an unlikely situation since this was only done for men in the highest positions, and D'Arms notes the lack any inscriptional parallel.[271]

A further puzzling element of Trimalchio's epitaph is his claim that he could have obtained any of the *decuriae*, but declined them. (*Cum posset in omnibus decuriis Romae esse, tamen noluit.*). It is true that freedmen could buy a position on some of the *decuriae* panels at Rome, but the *decuriae* for clerks of *aediles* and *quaestores* were open only to the freeborn.[272] The question is, why does Trimalchio, a freedman, claim that honors not open to his class were available to him and why does he refuse them? D'Arms points out that the parallels for this behavior are literary. Some Romans chose to decline *honores* so as to pursue intellectual activities and others to pursue increasing their own fortunes. Both could fell under the category of *honestum otium*.[273] Trimalchio is decidedly interested in the latter type of *honestum otium*. This refusal of *honores* and pursuit of personal wealth as a form of *honestum otium* was exemplified as D'Arms states by "the exemplar of the grand but unambitious *eques Romanus*: Maecenas, whose name Trimalchio actually appropriates as the final element of his own nomenclature."[274]

Trimlachio thought it important to prepare for death by creating this far-fetched epigraph. His desire, as a freedman, to permanently display his new-found status is rooted in the reality of the epitaphs we have of freedmen, but the exaggeration reflects the changing nature of society, as

[270] Schmeling 2011: 301.
[271] D'Arms 1981: 109; Schmeling 2011: 301.
[272] D'Arms 1981: 110.
[273] D'Arms 1981: 112-114.
[274] D'Arms 1981: 112.

seen through the eyes of Petronius. He presents the perspective of the elite members of Roman society who resented the new and often powerful roles that freedmen were taking on in Roman society. In the character of Trimalchio he presents a freedman who reaches for societal levels which were closed to him. His choice of an epitaph to convey this perspective reinforces the converging of two parts of society that was occurring during the imperial period. Epitaphs, as well as tombs, were becoming increasingly important ways to prepare for death: for the elites of society, as the Emperor took control of many elements of governance that had been a means of ganing prestige; for freedmen, as a way to preserve their new-found status that opened the way to citizenship as well as their rise to high levels of power in the households of the elite, or their rise to riches.

Trimalchio's epitaph reveals another important role of death preparation for the class of freedmen that can only be understood in conjunction with the speeches of Phileros and Hermeros in the *Cena*. Both Phileros and Hermeros, although not directly stating their epitaphs like Trimalchio, give speeches that contain elements of epitaphs. Phileros's speech contrasts with Seleucus's negative speech on the funeral of Chrysanthus. He rebukes Seleucus by responding: *Vivorum meminerimus*, but then continues to speak of the dead Chrysanthus immediately. Phileros states: *Ille habet, quod sibi debebatur: honeste vixit, honeste obit*. Lattimore lists several Latin epitaphs that contain the theme of death as a "repayment of a debt":

-*Quod quaritis, id repetitum*

Apstulit iniustus creditor ante diem[275]

-*debita cum fatis venerit hora tribus*.[276]

[275] *CE* 1001, 3-4 (Rome). Lattimore 1942: 171.
[276] *CE* 1120, 2 (Vicetia). Lattimore 1942: 171.

-*quot dedit, it repetit natura*.[277]

-*Debita, non optata dies iuvenili advenit aetati*.[278]

-*debitum naturae solvit, debitum persoluit*.[279]

-*debitum reddidit*.[280]

Inscriptions about a life well-lived include:

-*Quandius vixit, honeste vixit*.[281]

-*Que beate vixsit, beate abiit*.[282]

Not surprisingly, Schmeling remarks that "Phileros seems to speak in adages and from wall inscriptions."[283] Hermeros, after sketching a biography of his life, ends his speech in the *Cena*:

> *Et nunc spero me sic vivere, ut nemini iocus sim. Homo inter homines sum, capite aperto ambulo; assem aerarium nemini debeo; constitutum habui nunquam; nemo mihi in foro dixit redde quod debes.' Glebulas emi, lamellulas paravi; viginti ventres pasco et canem; contubernalem meam redemi, ne quis in sinu illius manus tergeret; mille denarios pro capite solvi; sevir gratis factus sum; spero, sic moriar, ut mortuus non erubescam.*
>
> And now I hope that I thus may live, so that I may be a mockery to no one. I am a man among men, I walk about wth my head uncovered.; I owe no one a bronze coin; I have never been sued;[284] no one said to me in the forum 'return what you owe.' I have bought some little bits of earth, I have acquired some small plates; I fed twenty bellies and a dog; I bought my *contubernalis*, lest anyone wipe his hand in her bosom; I paid a thousand *denarii* for my head; I was made a priest of Augustus free of charge; I hope that I may die in a way that I not blush at my death. 57.5-6.

---

[277] *CE* 1327, 13 (Cirta). Lattimore 1942: 171.
[278] *CE* 2156, 1 (Aquileia). Lattimore 1942: 171.
[279] CE 1316 (Hispalis); *CIL* 6, 3580, 11693, 37317 (Rome); 8, 16374, 16410 (Aubuzza); *Rev. Arch*. 6, 2 (1933), 389 (Salonae).
[280] *CIL* 6, 25617. Lattimore 1942: 171.
[281] *ILS* 7408. Schmeling 2011: 167.
[282] Diehl (1924-31), iii, no. 2383; CIL vi. 10021. Schmeling 2011: 167.
[283] Schmeling 2011: 167.
[284] See Schmeling 20122: 236 for this meaning of *constitutum*.

Bodel states that this part of Hermeros's speech "reads remarkably like a Roman epitaph. The sentences are short, clipped, paratactic. There is a marked presence of alliteration…frequently found in the undistinguished verses that make up the *carmina epigraphica*…Finally, the passage is neatly framed by Hermeros' voiced hopes for a life and death without shame."[285] Schmeling further speculates: "Perhaps this section represents the bulk of Hermeros' planned epitaph; the correctness of the Latin might imply that a professional wrote it for him and he memorized it."[286]

Trimlachio and Hermeros are attempting to shape their social status in different ways, and for the freedman, this shaping is an essential part of death preparation. Bodel rightly points out that "Hermeros can no more dignify his status by vaunting his accomplishments in having escaped slavery than Trimalchio can dignify his by adopting the manners of a Roman knight, for both are caught in their ambivalent status as freedmen. Possessing the rights of free citizens and the ability to amass great wealth, the freedmen are nonetheless powerless to improve their own condition because they cannot escape their servile past."[287] What the *Satyrica* reveals to us, however, is the importance of death preparation in the form of visual representations such as tombs and epitaphs in transcending their past, even if freedmen could not escape it while alive.

Likewise, the fact that Phileros's speech bears resemblance to epitaphs emphasizes the importance of this sort of death preparation for freedmen. The process of preparation which occurs in life allows for a certain sort of experiencing of this transcendence which can only be actualized in death. This applies to Trimalchio's enactment of his funeral as well, in fact, to all methods of practical death preparation practiced by freedmen in the *Satyrica*. Trimalchio

[285] Bodel 1984: 155. Schmeling 2011: 236.
[286] Schmeling 2011: 236.
[287] Bodel 1984: 156.

eschews philosophical preparation, as the other freedmen likely do, because that sort of interior death preparation held no proof of transcendence for the freedman.

Carpe Diem Approach: a living death?

The *Satyrica*, and especially the *Cena*, has often been characterized as arguing for a *carpe diem* perspective, or the idea that the present moment must be enjoyed to the fullest without thought to the future. Horace is credited with creating the phrase in his first Ode 1.11: *carpe diem quam minimum credula postero*. (Seize the day with as little thought as possible for the future.). At first it may appear that this attitude towards death is shared by philosophers. Seneca writes in one of his epistles: *Ille enim ex futuro suspenditur, cui inritum est praesens… in spem viventibus proximum quodque tempus elabitur subitque aviditas et miserrimus ac miserrima omnia efficiens metus mortis.* (That person is distressed on account of the future to whom the present is useless…time is slipping away to those living in hope of whatever is next and greed and wretchedness enter in and the fear of death makes everything miserable. Ep. 101.9-10).

However, for Seneca, serenity towards the future comes from preparing daily for it: "…*Sic itaque formemus animum, tamquam ad extrema ventum sit. Nihil differamus. Cotidie cum vita paria faciamus. Maximum vitae vitium est, quod inperfecta semper est, quod aliquid ex illa differtur. Qui cotidie vitae suae summam manum inposuit, non indiget tempore.* (Therefore, let us thus form our souls as if they had reached the end. Let us put off nothing. Let us make our life balanced every day. The greatest defect of life is that it is imperfect, that something is put off from it. A person who daily places the finishing hand of his life is not in need of time. 101.9). Seneca describes the failure to prepare for death—his way—in the following two epistles. Seneca explains who are the living dead:

> *Hos itaque, ut ait Sallustius, "ventri oboedientes" animalium loco numeremus, non hominum, quosdam vero ne animalium quidem, sed mortuorum. Vivit is, qui multis usui est, vivit is, qui se utitur; qui vero latitant et torpent, sic in domo sunt, quomodo in conditivo. Horum licet in limine ipso nomen marmori inscribas, mortem suam antecesserunt.*
>
> Those, therefore, as Sallust says, "are obedient to their bellies" let us count among the animals, not among men, and truly certain men not among the animals, but among the dead. He lives who is used by many, who uses himself; they who hide and grow torpid, are thus in their home just like in a tomb. Let them there on the very threshold write their name in the marble, for they have already achieved their own death. *Ep*. 60.3-4.

And again:

> *Sunt qui officia lucis noctisque perverterint nec ante diducant oculos hesterna graves crapula quam adpetere nox coepit… Hos tu existimas scire quemadmodum vivendum sit, qui nesciunt quando? Et hi mortem timent, in quam se vivi condiderunt? Tam infausti quam nocturnae aves sunt. Licet in vino unguentoque tenebras suas exigant, licet epulis et quidem…totum perversae vigiliae tempus educant, non convivantur, sed iusta sibi faciunt. Mortuis certe interdiu parentatur.*
>
> It is they who overturn the functions of the day and night nor do they part their eyes heavy with yesterday's inebriation until night begins to fall…Do you think these know how one ought to live, who do not know in when? And do these men fear death, who have buried themselves while still alive? They are as unfortunate as nocturnal birds. It pleases them to pass their nights in wine and perfume, it pleases them to spend all the time of their corrupt sleeplessness in feasts, they are not dining, but they are conducting funeral rights for themselves. But, the Parentalia are conducted for the dead during the day. *Ep*. 122 2-3.

Seneca description of the living dead resembles much of the way of life of the characters in the *Satyrica*, prodding us to consider if a *carpe diem* lifestyle is as deadly as he wants us to believe. Edwards summarizes Seneca's point: "The notion that a life devoted to the satisfaction of bodily cravings, indeed the life of excess more generally, in failing to live up to properly human goals, may be seen as anticipating death…[288]"

[288] Edwards 2007: 172.

Horace's ode specifically points away from preparing for death through astrology or any method that uncovers the time of death for an individual set by the gods and even describes this attempt as *nefas*:

> *Tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi*
> *finem di dederint, Leuconoe, nec Babylonios*
> *temptaris numeros. ut melius, quidquid erit, pati…*
> *sapias, vina liques, et spatio brevi*
> *spem longam reseces. dum loquimur, fugerit invida*
> *aetas: carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero.*
>
> Do not ask, to know is a sin, what end the gods will give to you, to me, Leuconoe, nor test Babylonian stars. So much better, to suffer whatever will be…be wise, strain the wine, and cut back far hope into a brief space. While we are talking, envious time will flee: seize the day, put as little trust as possible in the future. *Od*. 1.11.1-3.

Both Horace's exhortation and the examples of living well in the *Satyrica* emphasize enjoyment of two pleasures: food (and wine) and sex.[289] The descriptions Seneca provides of people who are among the "living dead" align with nearly all the characters in the *Satyrica* but Trimalchio and three women (Quartilla, the Widow of Ephesus and Circe) especially advocate for this way of living as a way of preparing for death. All of these characters use an artificial construct to separate or protect themselves from the norms expected of them in Roman society. Quartilla shields herself under the guise of being a priestess and the Widow uses the physical construct of a tomb; Circe is placed in an artificial society of the dead at Croton and Trimlachio's *Cena* is itself, as stated above, a metaphorical underworld.

The Widow of Ephesus appears prepared to die in her husband's tomb, but is soon persuaded to enjoy life. Her maid is the one who uses a *carpe diem* argument to persuade her:

[289] Horace's exhortation must also be understood withing its context as a seduction poem: he is encouraging a woman, Leuconoe, to take advantage of the present without thought to the future, that is, to sleep with him.

Vis tu reviviscere? Vis discusso muliebri errore, quam diu licuerit, lucis commodis frui? Ipsum te iacentis corpus admonere debet, ut vivas.' (Do you wish to live again? Do you not wish to shake off the ignorance of a woman, to enjoy the benefits of the light as long as you may? The very body of the one lying there ought to bring to your mind that you should live." 111) The Widow exemplifies the *carpe diem* approach to death because she epitomizes the view that the pleasures of life, in her case first food and then sex, are worth more than any virtue she first showed at the beginning of the story. This becomes true to the point that she concocts a plan to use her husband's corpse so she can save the soldier and thus continue to enjoy life with him. Eumolpus's intent in sharing this story is to highlight the idea that women are fickle, especially when it comes to switching sexual partners. Lichas becomes increasingly jealous of Tryphaena, his girlfriend, when she takes a liking to Giton when he comes aboard the ship. Her behavior prods Eumolpus to share the story of the Widow of Ephesus with this introduction: *Eumolpus…multa in muliebrem levitatem coepit iactare: quam facile adamarent, quam cito etiam filiorum obliviscerentur, nullamque esse feminam tam pudicam, quae non peregrina libidine usque ad furorem averteretur.* (Eumolpus…began to toss out many insults on female fickleness: how easily they fell in love, how quickly they were forgetful of even their own sons, and that no woman was so chaste that she would not be turned to madness by desire for a stranger. 110).

Quartilla, as the priestess of Priapus, defines her life with sex. As stated above, her claim that *vix* a thousand men have been initiated into her cult really indicates a huge number of sexual partners. Finally, Circe exhibits this viewpoint as well. Her address to Encolpius indicates that she enjoys multiple sexual partners:

> *"Si non fastidis" inquit "feminam ornatam et hoc primum anno virum expertam, concilio tibi, o iuvenis, sororem. Habes tu quidem et fratrem, neque enim me*

piguit inquirere, sed quid prohibet et sororem adoptare? Eodem gradu venio. Tu tantum dignare et meum osculum, cum libuerit, agnoscere." And, furthermore, she links Encolpius's inability to enjoy sex to death: *Narrabo tibi, adulescens, paralysin cave. Nunquam ego aegrum tam magno periculo vidi; medius fidius iam peristi. Quod si idem frigus genua manusque temptaverit tuas, licet ad tubicines mittas*.

"If you do not despice," she said, "a decorated woman who has enjoyed a man first in this year, I will come to you, young man, as a sister. Indeed, you have also a brother—I was not ashamed to ask—what prevents you from taking on also a sister? I come in the same relationship. But, when it may please you, you must deem my kiss worthy to recognize. 129.

Trimalchio, by both his words and actions, presents the most obvious example of *carpe diem* death preparation and reminds us of the "living dead "in Seneca's letters. Trimlachio is well aware of the fact that he must die at an appointed time but seems entirely unperturbed by this knowledge. Bringing out a skelton in chapter 34.8, besides being a *mememto mori*, provides an opportunity for Trimalchio to comment on the futility of preparing for death: *Eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est. Sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus. Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene.* (Ah, for us wretched ones, all of little man is but nothing. Thus, we will all be, after Orcus carries us off. Therefore, let us live, while it is possible to live well. 34.10).

Dunbabin considers the pervasiveness of *memento mori* among Romans of this time period a reason to dismiss the idea that here in the *Satyrica* they indicate a morbid preoccupation. However, while archeological items like skeleton mosaics in dining rooms remind us that the Romans were comfortable with *memento mori*, Petronius breathes death into almost every aspect of the *Cena*, beyond the presence of mere *memento mori*. In addition to the reading of his will and enactment of his funeral at the end of the Cena, Seleucus and Habinnas both recount their own recent attendance at funerals, Gaius Julius Proculus (one of the freedmen at the dinner) was once an undertaker. (*Libitinarius fuit. Solebat sic cenare, quomodo rex: apros gausapatos,*

opera pistoria, avis, cocos, pistores. Plus vini sub mensa effundebatur, quam aliquis in cella habet. Phantasia, non homo. (He was an undertaker. He used to dine thus, like a king: boars covered with a cloth, the works of the baker, chefs, cooks and bakers. More wine was poured under his table than anyone had in his cellar. He was a ghost, not a man. 38.15-16) Trimalchio is pointedly using these items—here, the skeleton—to convey the message *vivamus bene*. Other reminders include the clock that reminds him how much of his life is left, (26.9) and the Fates spinning out the threads of life on the mural at the entrance to the dining room (29.6).[290] These reminders of death culminate in the very enactment of his funeral where Trimalchio jokingly experiences death, turning himself into a living *memento mori* and death itself into part of his bag of *vivamus bene* tools.

Petronius provides Lichas as the ultimate contrast to those who embrace the *carpe diem* approach to death preparation. Lichas's superstitious tendencies manifest the fact that he regularly considers his own death (as Seneca would approve) and takes steps to avoid it as much as possible Barchiesi notes: "Ironicamente, per una persona così ossessionata dale superstizioni, la cifra della morte si nasconde, o si evidenzia, già nel suo nome."[291]

---

[290] Barchiesi 1981: 109-115 discusses the how these foreshadow the theme of death. Also, Courtney E. 2001: 13, Bodel 2013: 142.

[291] Barchiesi, 174. Examples of Lichas's superstitious character include: in response to Tryphaena's dream that Giton might be on board the ship: …*ceterum Lichas ut Tryphaenae somnium expiavit,"quis" inquit "prohibet navigium scrutari, ne videamur divinae mentis opera damnare?"* (Then Lichas prayed that the evil caused by the dream of Tryphaena might be averted, "who," he said, "keeps us from looking over the ship, so that we not seem to curse the works of the divine spirit?"104); Anxiety over someone cutting hair on the ship: *Excanduit Lichas hoc sermone turbatus et "Itane" inquit "capillos aliquis in nave praecidit, et hoc nocte intempesta? Attrahite ocius nocentes in medium, ut sciam, quorum capitibus debeat navigium lustrari."* (Lichas grew anxious and seethed at this speech and said, "What, has someone cut his hair on my ship and in the dead of night?" 105; reacting to Tryphaena's appeal to forego punishing Giton and Encolpius for shaving their heads on board: *turbato vehementius vultu proclamat: "Deos immortales rerum humanarum agere curam, puto, intellexisti, o Tryphaena. Nam imprudentes noxios in nostrum induxere navigium, et quid fecissent, admonuerunt pari*

Encolpius's encounter with Lichas's corpse provides a running commentary on the futility of preparing for death. The character of Lichas presents an especially appropriate example of this futility, considering what we know about him. The emptiness of death and especially the futility of any plans taken during life to mitigate this find their realization in this scene. Even in the few parts of the *Satyricon* that we have, it is clear that he was a superstitious man who took many precautions to avoid the wrath of the gods.[292] The representation of Lichas in this light allows Encolpius to stress, all the more strongly, the futility of planning to avoid death and, by extension, the foolishness of not enjoying life in the moment. On these two characters Schmeling notes: "Lichas is the only person to die within the plot of the extant S. He is, however, the person most knowledgeable about affairs at sea; he interprets the weather, tides, winds, seas, and routes. Yet he is the only one to die…Lichas' ability to interpret reality does not save him."[293]

Standing on the shore after the shipwreck in chapter 115 where Giton and Encolpius have just rescued Eumolpus from nearly drowning, Encolpius sees a body: *...repente video corpus*

---

somniorum consensu. Ita vide, ut possit illis ignosci, quos ad poenam ipse deus deduxit. Quod ad me attinet, non sum crudelis, sed vereor, ne quod remisero, patiar." Tam superstitiosa oratione Tryphaena mutate…" (He was very shaken up and with a disturbed look he shouted: I think, Tryphaena, that you understand that the immortal gods have concern for human affairs. For they, unaware, brought these harmful people onto our ship and what they did, they warned us by of in similar dreams. See, then, that it is not possible to pardon them, whom god himself brought for punishment. As it concerns me, and I am not bloodthirsty, I am afraid that I may suffer should I forgive them. 106). When a storm assails the ship, believing it to be Iris's wrath because her vestment was stolen by Encolpius in a lost part of the *Satyrica*: *Itaque hercules postquam maris ira infesta convaluit, Lichas trepidans ad me supinas porrigit manus et "tu" inquit "Encolpi, succurre periclitantibus et vestem illam divinam sistrumque redde navigio. Per fidem, miserere, quemadmodum quidem soles."* (Then, by Hercules, as the hostile wrath of the sea gained strength, Lichas, trembling, stretched out his hands to me and begged me, "you," he said, "Encolpius, come to me aid and return the robe and rattle of the goddess to our ship. By faith be merciful, as you usually are. 114.3-4) See also Barchiesi 1996: 174.

[292] See n.5.

[293] Schmeling 2011: 438.

humanum circumactum levi vertice ad litus deferri. (Suddenly I saw a human body being brought to shore turning round on a gently eddy.). Still unaware of the corpse's identity, Encolpius finds himself saddened. *Substiti ergo tristis coepique umentibus oculis maris fidem inspicere*. (I stood there sadly and began to view the treachery of the sea with wet eyes.). Encolpius vividly imagines the unseen life of the dead man, the *uxor secura* (untroubled wife) and the children or father far away who await his return, even imagining the wife or child *cui proficiscens osculum dedit* (to whom he gave a kiss as he left). Finally he exclaims: *Haec sunt consilia mortalium, haec vota magnarum cogitationum* (These are the plans of mortals, these the promises of great plans. 115). And then, emphasizing the futility of life-plans in the face of inevitable death: *Ite nunc mortales, et magnis cogitationibus pectora implete. Ite cauti, et opes fraudibus captas per mille annos disponite* (Come now mortals, and fill up your chests with great thoughts. Come cautious ones and arrange for a thousand years your wealth taken by fraud.).

As the unknown body floats closer, Encolpius recognizes it as Lichas and tailors his soliloquy to the man he knew.

> *"Ubi nunc est" inquam "iracundia tua, ubi impotentia tua? nempe piscibus beluisque expositus es, et qui paulo ante iactabas vires imperii tui, de tam magna nave ne tabulam quidem naufragus habes. Ite nunc mortales, et magnis cogitationibus pectora implete. Ite cauti, et opes fraudibus captas per mille annos disponite. Nempe hic proxima luce patrimonii sui rationes inspexit, nempe diem etiam, quo venturus esset in patriam, animo suo fixit. Dii deaeque, quam longe a destinatione sua iacet. Sed non sola mortalibus maria hanc fidem praestant. Illum bellantem arma decipiunt, illum diis vota reddentem penatium suorum ruina sepelit. Ille vehiculo lapsus properantem spiritum excussit, cibus avidum strangulavit, abstinentem frugalitas. Si bene calculum ponas, ubique naufragium est.*
>
> Where now is your wrath, where now your fury? Indeed ,now you are laid bare for fish and beasts, you who just a little while ago bragged about the strength of your command and you have not so much as a plank from your great ship, but a shipwreck. Thus now mortals, fill up your chests with great thoughts. Go ahead cautious ones, set in order your wealth gained by fraud over a thousand years. Without a doubt this man looked into the accounts of his estate at the last light,

> without a doubt he even fixed the day in his own soul at which he would home. Gods and goddesses, how far he lies from his destination. But, not only the sea offers this promise to mortals. Weapons betray the man as he fights, the crumbling of his own walls burys a man as he recites promises to the gods. Another man slips on his carriage and shakes out his spirit in his haste, another, greedy for food, chokes, temperance kills the man abstaining from food. If you cast your pebble well, shipwreck is everywhere. 115.

Encolpius's soliliquy up to this point highlights two issues with death. First and generally, regardless of identity, death renders all the great plans of the living useless. To confirm his point, Lichas provides the example of the sort of person who took all the necessary steps to prepare for death well: he prepared for his financial future, knew when he would come back home, and took care to pay attention to the deities in control of his ship. All of Lichas's preparations, superstitious, spiritual and practical, did nothing to help him avoid death. Preparation for death was futile.

If Lichas provides the example of how not to live, Chrysanthus is the counter-example. Phileros ends his speech on Chrysanthus: *Tamen verum quod frunitus est, quam diu vixit...Nec improbo, hoc solum enim secum tulit.* (Still, the fact is that he enjoyed himself as long as he was alive...I will not judge him since he takes only this with him.)[294] Boyle remarks on Phileros's speech: "The ironic inconsistency with which Phileros interrupts the previous speech with the

---

[294] Phileros speaking about Chrysanthus in chapter 43: *Ab asse erevit et paratus fuit quadrantem de stercore mordicus tollere. Itaque crevit, quicquid tetigit, tanquam favus. Puto mehercules illum reliquisse solida centum, et omnia in nummis habuit*. (He rose up from a penny and was willing to pick up the smallest coin from the sewer. Thus, whatever he touched was like honeycomb. I think, by Hercules, that he left behind a solid hundred, and he had it all in cash.) And: *durae buccae fruit, linguosus, discordia, non homo*. (He took pleasure in his foul mouth, and was annoying and chatty, not a man.) In contrast to his brother: *Frater eius fortis fuit, amicus amico, manu plena, uncta mensa*. (His brother was strong, a friend to a friend, with a generous hand and rich table.) And regarding slave relations: *Noveram hominem olim oliorum et adhuc salax erat. Non mehercules illum puto in domo canem reliquisse*. (I knew the man as long as I can remember and he was always a lecherous fellow. By hercules, I don't think he let alone a dog in his house.)

exclamation *vivorum meminerimus* only to continue to talk about the dead Chrysanthus and his dead brother has often been noted by commentators.[295] But where Seleucus focused on Chrysanthus' death and funeral, Phileros concentrates on his life. In fact, Phileros offers a point for point refutation of the eulogy delivered by Seleucus…he seeks simultaneously to point out Chrysanthus' many human failings in order to tear down the sentimentalized portrait drawn by Seleucus, while at the same time to emphasize the concrete worth of Chrysnathus' achievements in order to counter Seleucus' assertion of the futility of his life, and of human life in general."[296]

The figure of Chrysanthus contrasts sharply with the character of Lichas. Where Lichas appears to have lived a life driven by superstition or piety, Chrysanthus *frunitus est quam diu vixit.* Phileros contrasts Chrysanthus's character with his brother's goodness, emphasizing that he was not a virtuous person. Yet, his funeral was nearly everything Roman custom would have demanded as opposed to Lichas's. In fact, it appears that how he lived his life is of little consequence, rather, the quality of his death is in direct proportion to his enjoyment of life, and enjoyment seems to have nothing to do with virtue. The small attempt he made to prolong his life, not eating, seems to have had the opposite effect. Hope states: "Whether Chrysanthus was a good man and prepared for death…is of little importance here; what affects the quality of his death is the quality of his life spent earning and enjoying the pleasures of the flesh."[297] The experience of these pleasures is indeed the only thing that Phileros thinks the dead Chrysanthus carried with him. Comparing the deaths of these two men and the opinions expressed by those who knew them, we cannot help but take away the lesson that all of Lichas's attempts to "do the right thing" and be prepared for death failed to bring him a happy death; however, all of

[295] Panayotakis 2009.
[296] Boyle 1991: 78. See also Schmeling 2011: 167.
[297] Hope, 2009: 144.

Chrysanthus's enjoyment of life brought him a successful one. Seleucus complains that humans are worse than flies, mere vessels that bubble away their souls at death, but Phileros reminds him that enjoying life is enough preparation for death: *honeste vixit, honeste obiit…hoc solum enim secum tulit*. (He lived decently, he died decently…he takes only [his pleasures] with him. 430).

CHAPTER 4 – SYMBOLIC DEATH

Some of the types of symbolic death in the *Satyrica* have already been addressed briefly in the preceeding chapters. This chapter turns to its most pervasive example of symbolic death: impotence. This is arguably what drives the storyline, as Encolpius finds himself hounded by the wrath of Priapus who has punished him by taking away his sexual ability. Everpresent are the themes of fertility, sexual ability and reproduction and they are intimately tied to death. Encolpius frustration with and quest to cure his impotence dominates his journey and takes center stage at Croton which is portrayed as an entire society on the brink of death. Three instances in particular emphasize this association of Encolpius's sexual ability with death: Encolpius's inititation into the cult of Priapus (20-45), Giton's rejection of him for Ascyltos (80), and his unsuccessful sexual encounter with Circe and subsequent healing at Croton (140). Underlying Encolpius's impotence, especially, but also the sexual experiences of the other characters, is a rich treasure of literary, sociological and cultural perspectives on death.

Encolpius's identity and sex-appeal

Sexual ability is integrally linked to the character of Encolpius and this is portrayed from both sociological and literary perspectives. Although Encolpius's social status is never explicitly identified, it seems likely that he is a freedman. Encolpius's name means "bosom companion." Courtney calls attention to the fact that "Encolpius itself is quite a common slave name, which suggests itself as the name of a *puer delicatus*, a mignon, and it would not be surprising if Encolpius earned his freedom by the same means as Ascyltos."[298] A male member of traditional Roman society established his identity in no small part by proving his virility through sex. As McLaren states: "the real man was an impenetrable penetrator;" and Roman slavery provided

[298] Courtney 2001: 42. See also Prag and Repath 2009: 12, Priuli 1975: 47 and 64.

numerous victims, both male and female, for this abuse.[299] Ascyltos and Trimalchio both gained their freedom at least in part through the affection or gratitude of masters who had exploited them sexually. Encolpius labels Ascyltos with the insult *stupro liber, stupro ingenuus*, (disgraced freeman, freeborn by means of disgrace, 81.4) and Trimalchio affirms that this played a role in his freedom (*Tamen ad delicias ipsimi annos quattuordecim fui. Nec turpe est, quod dominus iubet. Ego tamen et ipsimae dominae satis faciebam.*[300] Still, for fourteen years I was the favorite of [my lord]. Nor is it base [to do] what the lord commands. I also used to satisfy my mistress. 75.11). [301] This reflects a broad pattern in Roman society of granting freedom to slaves sexually exploited by their masters. While Trimalchio admits that sex made his manumission possible, Bodel argues that he sees death as his final emancipation since he cannot escape his status as freedman in this life. [302] Seneca points out the common practice of masters forcing slaves to grant sexual favors, as well as the practice of warding off the signs of puberty at which a boy was considered a man and no longer attractive as a passive sexual partner (*delicia*): *Alius vini minister in muliebrem modum ornatus cum aetate luctatur: non potest effugere pueritiam, retrahitur, iamque militari habitu glaber retritis pilis aut penitus evulsis tota nocte pervigilat, quam inter ebrietatem domini ac libidinem dividit et in cubiculo vir, in convivio puer est.* (Another, the server of wine, decked out like a woman struggles with his old age: it it not possible for him to escape his boyhood, he is held back; already with a soldierly appearance he is

[299] McLaren 2007: 4.
[300] Although *stuprum* was used of a broad range of illicit sexual acts, it was often applied specifically to sexual exploitation see OLD s.v. *stuprum* 2 and Adams 1982: 201.
[301] See Bodel's (1989) argument that *annos quattuordecim* refers to the year at which Trimalchios ceased to be sexually exploited by his master, not the duration of years. Schmeling 2011: 318. For the pregnant sense of *satis facio*: OLD: s.v. *satis* 6b, and Adams 1982: 197.
[302] Bodel 1994: *passim*, but especially 253. This important issue of emancipationwas discussed more broadly in chapter three.

kept smooth with hair shaved down or plucked entirely, and he keeps watch the whole night, and divides his time between the inebriation and lust of his master and he is man in the bedroom, but a boy in the dining-room. *Ep*. 47.7).[303]

Encolpius's love-affair with Giton and the erotic rivalry that Ascyltos's attraction to Giton introduces into the plot emphasize the importance that Encolpius places on his love-life and the role of sex in it. When Giton abandons him for his rival, Encolpius attempts suicide and contemplates the murder of Ascyltos (80). His privileging of sexual prowess in his self-image goes beyond homosexual love since his angst over his impotence reaches a climax at Croton where, after finding himself unable to perform sexually with Circe, he seeks the help of Oenothea to restore his virility.

Encolpius's victimization by and various plot associations with Priapus also connect his identity to sexual ability. In Roman religion, Priapus was a fertility god as well as the guardian deity of gardens and male genitalia. Images and statues of him were frequently positioned in gardens and fields symbolizing his role as punisher of those who trespassed. His symbol was an erect phallus, and his connection to sexuality is reflected in the form of punishment he often inflicted on trespassers, namely rape.[304] In the cycle of poems named after him, the *Priapea*, Priapus figures as a protector of fertility and sex.

---

[303] Seneca *Ep*. 47.7. Trimlachio refers to attempting to make a beard grow faster by putting oil on his lips: …*et ut celerius rostrum barbatum haberem, labra de lucerna ungebam* (75.11). Bodel 1989: 73. "What one expects after *celerius* (sc. *solito*) ... *tamen*, then, is not the age at which he played Ganymede but the age at which he stopped, a watershed that normally coincided with the advent of puberty. True, beard growth did not always commence precisely at fourteen, and the ancients knew as much, but no other age was so widely associated with the physiological changes accompanying adolescence, and no other age would have been so readily taken as a sign that the flower had begun to fade."

[304] Richlin 1992:58. "One minatory figure stands at the center of the whole complex of Roman sexual humor; he will be represented here by the god Priapus. The general stance of this figure is

In intertextual terms, Encolpius's sexual problems mark him out as a parodic anti-hero. Just as the angry Poseidon pursues Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, so Priapus features in the *Satyrica* as the wrathful deity that pursues Encolpius: what Posiedon is to the *Odyssey*, Priapus is to the *Satyrica*.[305] Petronius fashions Encolpius's struggle with sexual dysfunction as a reversal of epic sexual potency.[306] In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus finds himself hounded by the wrath of Posiedon as he journeys back to Ithaca but along the way encounters a pair of goddesses who share their beds with him.[307] While characters find Encopius attractive in the *Satyrica*, his sexual experiences are rather more problematic than those of typical epic hero. It is likely that Encolpius was punished with impotence in an early part of the text that has not survived.[308] This finds corroboration at various point in the surviving text. Quartilla, a priestess of Priapus (139), accuses Encolpius and Giton of having offended the god when they viewed his sacred rites (17.), Lichas reveals that Priapus, in a dream, claimed responsibility for Encolpius's presence on his ship (104), and Encolpius himself attributes his impotence to the wrath of Priapus. In the last case, Encolopius directly compares his situation to Odysseus's: *Non solum me numen et implacabile fatum persequitur…regnum Neptuni pavit Vlixes. Me quoque per terras, per cani Nereos aequor Hellespontiaci sequitur gravis ira Priapi…* (Unappeasable will and fate pursues

---

that of a threatening male. He is anxious to defend himself by adducing his strength, virility, and (in general) all traits that are considered normal." McLaren 2007: 4.

[305] The case for the *Odyssey* as a crucial model and specifically, the parallelism between Poseidon's and Priapus's wrath, has been made by numerous ealier scholars. See the introduction for a full discussion.

[306] As McLaren 2007: 4 observes more broadly: "The flaccid penis represented failure since for the virile in the ancient world sex could only mean penetration."

[307] θεοὶ δ' ἐλέαιρον ἅπαντες// 0νόσφι Ποσειδάωνος: ὁ δ' ἀσπερχὲς μενέαινεν// ἀντιθέῳ Ὀδυσῆι πάρος ἣν γαῖαν ἱκέσθαι. (All the gods had pity on him except Poseidon: he raged unceasingly at the godlike Odysseus until he reached his homeland. *Od*. 1.20)

[308] See Schmeling 2011: xxiii-xxiv for reconstruction of the storyline that places the sacrilegious encounter with Priapus in the first book. Habash 2007.

not only me…Ulysses was terrified at Neptune's kingdom. The weighty wrath of Priapus follows me also over the Hellespontine earth, thorugh the hoary water of Nereus. 139).[309] This comparison with Odysseus by divine wrath: where Odysseus enjoys the pleasures of sex as he journeys back to Penelope,[310] Encolpius, despite his desires, finds himself continuously thwarted. In one case, Odysseus uses his sexual power to manipulate Circe: by momentarily witholding sex, he compels her to restore his companions to human form. Encolpius, by contrast, finds himself sexually manipulated when he is forcibly initiated into the cult of Priapus by Quartilla (17.1-26.5) and sexually powerless in his relationship with Giton when the latter chooses to run off with Ascyltos (80.6).

At Croton, Encolpius meets a character called Circe, which provides an ironic contrast with Odysseus: his encounter with Circe in *Odyssey* 10.[311] When Odysseus meets Circe (*Od*. 10.312), he has already been warned by Hermes of her magic potion and told where to find the herb to combat its effects (*Od*. 10.275-306). When Circe realizes her potion has been ineffective, she attempts to entice Odysseus into her bed where he will be powerless (*Od*. 313-335). But, Odysseus, forewarned of this also, requires Circe to first swear an oath that she will set free his companions, thus using sex as a means to manipulate her (*Od*. 345-47). At Croton, Encolpius, taking the false name of Polyaenus, projects sexual potency, and is clearly attractive, but is powerless when put to the test. As Murgatroyd comments: "There are all kinds of mischievous twists and inversions in Petronius. For example, the cowardly and immoral Polyaenus/ Encolpius

[309] See introduction for comparison with *Odyssey*.
[310] ἐλθόντες δ' ἄρα τώ γε μυχῷ σπείους γλαφυροῖο//τερπέσθην φιλότητι, παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες. (They, then, going together into the innermost corner of a hollow cave, rejoiced in their love-making, staying with each other. *Od*. 5.225)
[311] Habash: 2007: 135 points to her name as a predictor of the effect she will have on Encolpius, similar to the effect she had on Odysseus.

after his embarrassing failure with the woman Circe puts himself on a par with the noble Odysseus in the midst of his greatest adventure (and, of course, Odysseus experienced no such embarrassing failure with his Circe)."[312] Morgan notes this failure of Encolpius as well: "…Encolpius is likewise immune to Circe's spell, but only in the sense that he is repeatedly impotent with her. Here it is not the companions but the hero himself who is metaphorically dehumanized, and as he casts himself in the role of Odysseus, he is simultaneously revealed as an ineffectual version of that hero."[313] As already outlined in chapter three, the Croton episode is set up as a theatrical expedition from the very beginning. Encolpius's assumed name, Polyaenus (πολύαινος, "much praised" or "full of wise speech"), is one of the epithets used for Odysseus in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[314] Chrysis indicates Encolpius's sex-appeal is evident to all:

> *Quia nosti venerem tuam, superbiam captas vendisque amplexus, non commodas. Quo enim spectant flexae pectine comae, quo facies medicamine attrita et oculorum quoque mollis petulantia, quo incessus arte compositus et ne vestigia quidem pedum extra mensuram aberrantia, nisi quod formam prostituis, ut vendas? Vides me: nec auguria novi nec mathematicorum caelum curare soleo, ex vultibus tamen hominum mores colligo, et cum spatiantem vidi, quid cogitet scio. Sive ergo nobis vendis quod peto, mercator paratus est, sive quod humanius est, commodas, effice ut beneficium debeamus.*
>
> Because you know you are sexy, you seize your arrogance and sell your embraces, you don't buy them. For whom is your hair softened with a comb out on display, for whom your face rubbed with color and the soft petulance of your eyes, for whom the walk composed with skill and the footsteps not straying beyond the length of a foot, if not because you display your beauty, so that you may sell it? You see me: I do not know about omens, nor am I accustomed to paying attention to the signs of astrologers, but I can deduce the customs of men from their countenances, and when I see them walking, I know what they think. Therefore, if you will sell what I seek, there is a buyer ready, but if you bestow it—which is kinder—let me be indebted to your kindness. 126.1-4.

---

[312] Murgatroyd 2000: 349.
[313] Morgan 2013: 33.
[314] *Il*. 9.673, 10.544, 11.430 and *Od*. 12.184. Schmeling 2011:472. Schmeling rightly points out that this is not the adjective used by Chrysis to describe Odysseus in *Od*. 10, rather by the Sirens at 12.184.

Encolpius's sexual ability is clearly an important part of his self-image, and he compares his sexual dysfunction to a sort of death in a comical address to his penis after failing to achieve an erection: *"Quid dicis" inquam "omnium hominum deorumque pudor? Nam ne nominare quidem te inter res serias fas est. Hoc de te merui, ut me in caelo positum ad inferos traheres? / Ut traduceres annos primo florentes vigore senectaeque ultimae mihi lassitudinem imponeres? Rogo te, mihi apodixin defunctoriam redde."* (What have you to say," he said, "shame of all gods and men? For to even name you in polite company is a sacrilege. Did I deserve this of you, that, having placed me in heaven, you should bring me down to Hades? That you should disgrace my flowering years in the prime of their strength and place the weakness of the end of old age on me? I ask you, recite your cursory proof." 132.11).[315]

Despite his obvious sex-appeal and his assuming of a name resonant of epic heroism, Encolpius fails to achieve a successful sexual encounter at Croton, as elsewhere in his wanderings. It is this impotence, haunting him throughout his adventures, that becomes a multi-layered metaphor for death.

Impotence and Death

From the foregoing it is clear that Encolpius's impotence and quest to restore sexual virility constitutes one of the most important threads running through the narrative. Because sex is an integral part of Encolpius's identity, the loss of this ability represents a kind of death for him. Indeed, ancient Greek and Roman societies assumed that impotence accompanied old age and approaching death.[316] Petronius returns repeatedly to the metaphor of impotence as death not only from Encolpius's perspective, but also that of other characters.

---

[315] Petronius likely meant this address to refer to Dido's suicide at *Aen*. 4.690-91: *Ter sese attollens cubitoque adnixa levavit; ter revoluta toro est…* Schmeling 2011: 507.
[316] McLaren 2007: 12.

As Encolpius's initiation into the cult of Priapus begins, we become privy to his thoughts as he reassures himself that he and his companions can protect themselves from Quartilla: *Tres enim erant mulierculae, si quid vellent conari, infirmissimae, scilicet contra nos, quibus si nihil aliud, virilis sexus esset.* (For they were three little women, weak, and if they wished to attempt anything against us, if nothing else, our male sex was in our favor. 19.5). As it turns out, they are thoroughly stripped of their masculinity by Quartilla and her companions.

At Croton, Encolpius speaks to Giton after his unsuccessful encounter with Circe: "*Crede mihi, frater, non intellego me virum esse, non sentio. Funerata est illa pars corporis, qua quondam Achilles eram*... (Believe me, brother, I do not understand myself to be a man, I do not feel it. That part of my body has been buried in which I was once Achilles. 129.1).

Here, Encolpius equates his sexual potency with the quintessential hero, Achilles. Encolpius sees himself as equal to the epic hero in this one area, once again pointing to the fact that he identifies himself strongly with his sexual function. Much of the humor of Encolpius's impotence is drawn from Ovid *Am*. 3.7, which likewise treats male sexual impotence as death, depriving its victim of the status of *vir*.[317] *Digna movere fuit certe vivosque virosque; Sed neque tum vixi nec vir, ut ante, fui*. (She was able to arose living men, but as before, I was neither alive nor a man. *Am*. 3.7.59-60).[318]

In the *Satyrica*, Circe writes a love-letter to Encolpius in response to the unsuccessful encounter:

> *Circe Polyaeno salutem. Si libidinosa essem, quererer decepta; nunc etiam languori tuo gratias ago. In umbra voluptatis diutius lusi. Quid tamen agas, quaero, et an tuis pedibus perveneris domum; negant enim medici sine nervis*

[317] Sullivan 1968: 217. Hallett 2012: 222 regarding this interaction with Ovid: "in the section of Encolpius' impotence in the *Satyricon*, Petronius portrays Encolpius as responding to Ovid in *Amores* 3.7 in the realms of both phallic and literary performance."
[318] See also Hallett 2012: 213.

homines ambulare posse. Narrabo tibi, adulescens, paralysin cave. Nunquam ego aegrum tam magno periculo vidi; medius fidius iam peristi. Quod si idem frigus genua manusque temptaverit tuas, licet ad tubicines mittas. Quid ergo est? Etiam si gravem iniuriam accepi, homini tamen misero non invideo medicinam. Si vis sanus esse, Gitonem roga. Recipies, inquam, nervos tuos, si triduo sine fratre dormieris. Nam quod ad me attinet, non timeo, ne quis inveniatur cui minus placeam. Nec speculum mihi nec fama mentitur. Vale, si potes.

Circe to Polyaenus, I greet you. If I were a lusty woman, I would bewail my deception; even now I give thanks for your weakness. For too long I have played in the shadow of desire. Still, how you are getting along, I ask, and whether you came to your home on your feet; doctors deny that a man is able to walk without his manly organs. I will tell you, young man, beware paralysis. Never have I seen a sick man in such great danger. By god, you are now dead! If that same cold touches your knees and hands, you might just as well send for the funeral trumpeters. What therefore am I to do? Even if I have received a grave injury, I do not grudge a man his medicine. If you want to be healthy, ask Giton. You will take back you sinews, I say, if you sleep for three days without your brother. For what relates to me, I am not afraid lest someone be found to whom I am less pleasing. Neither my mirror nor my reputation deceive me. 129.4-9.[319]

As McMahon points out, Circe's concern that Encolpius's impotence may be a sign of worse things to come for him is "reflective of an ancient and popular belief in the knees as the seat of both male sexuality and of the vital fluid of life itself."[320] Indeed, as the same scholar points out, the ancients recognized that "in any state of exhaustion the joints themselves become weary, and the knees in particular, linked with the processes of life, are mentioned in scenes of death."[321]

In Encolpius's response to Circe's letter, the metaphor of impotence as death features prominently once again:

"Polyaenos Circae salutem. 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,

[319] *Nervus* was frequently used for "penis" (OLD, 1b): Hor. *Epod*. 12.19, *Priap*. 83.42, Juv. 9.34, Apul. *Met*. 2.16. and "sexual powers, virility" Ov. *Am*. 3.7.35. Adams 1982: 38.
[320] McMahon 1998: 95.
[321] McMahon 1998: 95.

ferro meo venio, sive verberibus contenta es, curro nudus ad dominam. Illud unum memento, non me sed instrumenta peccasse. Paratus miles arma non habui. Quis hoc turbaverit, nescio. Forsitan animus antecessit corporis moram, forsitan dum omnia concupisco, voluptatem tempore consumpsi. Non invenio, quod feci. Paralysin tamen cavere iubes: tanquam ea maior fieri possit, quae abstulit mihi, per quod etiam te habere potui. Summa tamen excusationis meae haec est: placebo tibi, si me culpam emendare permiseris" ...

Polyaenus sends greetings to Circe. Trust me, lady, I have sinned often; for I am both a man and young. Never yet before this day have I erred to the point of death. You know the avowed deed: whatever you command, I deserve. I have committed treachery, I have killed a man, I have violated a temple: seek a penalty for these deeds. Or if it pleases you to kill me, I will come with my sword, or if you are happy with whipping me I will run naked to my lady. Remember this one thing, that not I, but my tools, sinned. What stirred this up, I do not know. Perhaps my soul went before the delay of my body, perhaps while I strove to have it all, I exhausted my desire with time. I do not understand what I did. You tell me to beware paralysis: as if it were possible for this thing to be greater which robs me of the means through which I can possess you. Still, this is the sum of my excuse: I will please you, if you allow me to correct my fault. 130.1-6.

Circe convinces Encolpius to seek help from a professional. He ends up being brought to Oenothea, a priestess of Priapus. Directly before this Encolpius has castigated his penis for its impotence and is obviously depressed as Oenothea greets him: *"Quid vos" inquit "in cellam meam tanquam ante recens bustum venistis? Utique die feriarum, quo etiam lugentes rident."* ("Why have you," she said, "come into my room as if you were coming before a fresh funeral-pyre? Especially on one of the holidays, in which even the mourners are smiling. 134.7).

Both sex and death are embodied in the figure of the gladiator, and in the extant text there are two instances where Encolpius is associated with gladiators. First, Ascyltos insults 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?"* ("Shut up," he said, "indecent gladiator, weren't you sent out of the arena in shame? Hold your tongue, stab-in-the dark, indeed not even then when you were manlier could you exert yourself with a pure woman;

was I not a brother to you in the same way in the garden as the boy now is in your lodgings?" 9.9-10); and again, he swears the gladiator oath before entering Croton. Gladiators, although among the lowest classes in Roman society, were nonetheless connected with sexual prowess.[322] Gladiators were associated with male *virtus* and especially in the context of death. "The Roman people came [to the arena] to see a professional performance of male self-control, *virtus*, in the face of death."[323] "Gladiators were notorious for their virility, and by this characterization Ascyltus is able to summarize skillfully Encolpius' sexual insufficiency and his amphitheater persona."[324]

The origin of the term gladiator comes from *gladius* which in both literature and visual artifacts is commonly represented as a penis.[325] Aristocratic women fell in love with gladiators enough that satirists took notice. At Croton (after Encolpius has sworn the gladiator oath) Chryses describes the type of man that attracts her mistress, Circe, and gladiators are incuded:

> *Nam quod servum te et humilem fateris, accendis desiderium aestuantis. Quaedam enim feminae sordibus calent, nec libidinem concitant, nisi aut servos viderint aut statores altius cinctos. Harena alias accendit aut perfusus pulvere mulio aut histrio scaenae ostentatione traductus. Ex hac nota domina est mea: usque ab orchestra quattuordecim transilit et in extrema plebe quaerit quod diligat.*
>
> For when you confess that you are a low slave, you kindle the desire of one on fire. For certain women burn for the base-born, nor can they rouse up their sexual desire, unless they see slaves or a girded attendant of another. The arena stirs up some, or one covered in mule dust, or an actor dismissed from the stage on account of his performance. Of this type is my mistress: she passes as far as fourteen rows from

---

[322] Schmeling 2010: 63. Hopkins 1983: 22, citing the many associations of the gladiator with sexuality. Gladiator as a term of abuse: Edwards 2007:50. Cicero *Phil*. 6.5.13: *tantumne sibi sumpsit, quia Mylasis myrmillo Thraecem iugulavit, familiarem suum?* and *Risc. Am.* 3.8;6.17: *ab his hoc postulare homines sicarios atque gladiatores, non modo ut supplicia vitent quae a vobis pro maleficiis suis metuere atque horrere debent verum etiam ut spoliis ex hoc iudicio ornati auctique discedant?*

[323] Bergman 1999: 22. Edwards 2007: 53.

[324] Panayotakis 1995: 17.

[325] Adams 1982: 19. "[Weaponry] is the largest category of metaphors" for obscenities. Also, McLaren 2007:4.

> the orchestra and seeks out something to love among the common people farthest back. 126.4-7.

It may seem obvious that death was also integral to their identity, but this connection deserves more explanation than the simple fact that gladiators often fought to the death. The figure of the gladiator represented a phenomenon that is hard for people unaccustomed to constant reminders of death to appreciate. By Petronius's time, although war continued in other parts of the empire, Rome had become accustomed to peace. However, this society had grown out of a people accustomed to frequent wars and participation of the vast majority of its citizens in them. It was also a society whose death rate was high from disease and infant mortality. In short, death was in their blood and in the air.

> Gladiatorial shows and their accompanying executions provided opportunities for the reaffirmation of the moral order through the sacrifice of criminal victims, of slave gladiators, of Christian outcasts and wild animals…At the psychological level, the gladiatorial shows provided a stage for shared violence and tragedy. They also gave spectators the reassurance that they themselves had yet again survived disaster.[326]

Secondly, and less obviously, gladiator games were rooted in funeral rites. The shows started small and were first produced only privately by aristocrats honoring their deceased at funerals. The first gladiator show in Rome was in 264 B.C.E. in the context of a funeral for the brother of D. Iunius Brutus Pera, an ex-consul, featuring only three gladiators. Funereal-gladiatorial shows continued, increasing in scale, but still as private funeral shows.[327] Hopkins notes the changing character of these shows: "In the city of Rome, in the late Republic and early principate, the religious and commemorative elements of gladiatorial shows were increasingly fused with, even eclipsed by the political and the spectacular."[328]

---

[326] Hopkins 1983: 29-30.
[327] Hopkins 1983: 4.
[328] Hopkins 1983: 5.

So much of Encolpius's character is linked to sex that the loss of something so integral stands as an identity crisis, a metaphorical death. His likely status as a freedman was won through offering sex or being forced into it and his subsequent sexual relationships are haunted by this past association. Encolpius is clearly an attractive man, yet, unlike Odysseus who is empowered by his sexual potency, his sexual potency does not match his sex-appeal.

Consequences of Impotence

When Priapus robs Encolpius of his sexual potency he is assaulting the very core of his victim's identity. Sexual impotence, like sterility with which it was often confused and conflated, was essential to the overall sense of virility for a Roman male. Impotence meant a certain kind of social death for a Roman male insofar as it removed him from male-driven Roman society. This alienation is attested to in Roman literature and in Roman law by the rewards provided to and penalties levelled at those who produced children. McMahon remarks: "…the cures for impotence, as numerous and varied as they were, served as the means by which the impotent male not only might regain his physical prowess but also might re-integrate himself into the androcentric culture of which he was by birth a part."[329] At Croton, Encolpius attests to

[329] McMahon 1998: 10. See also Hopfner who compiled a comprehensive study of the ancient cures for impotence. To cure his impotence, Encolpius will try avoiding his bath as well as food and magic. …*curavi diligentius noxiosissimum corpus, balneoque praeterito modica unctione usus, mox cibis validioribus pastus, id est bulbis cochlearumque sine iure cervicibus, hausi parcius merum. Hinc ante somnum levissima ambulatione compositus sine Gitone cubiculum intravi.* (I took great care with my noxious body, and after omitting my bath I made use of a moderate amount of oil, then, after nourishing myself with strong food, that is, on onions and the necks of snails without sauce, I drank unmixed wine sparingly. I then composed myself before sleep with an easy walk and entered my bedroom without Giton. 130) Some thought onions were a sexual stimulant and Encolpius's meal here is mentioned by Celsus as a remedy for paralysis. He calls it *inbecillitas corporis* and the remedy: *vino tantummodo remoto cotidie validiorem cibum debet adsumere, donec satis virium corpori redeat*. (Celsus 3.19.6). *At resolutio nervorum frequens ubique morbus est: interdum tota corpora, interdum partes infestat. Veteres auctores illud ἀποπληξίαν hoc παράλυσιν nominarunt: nunc utrumque παράλυσιν appellari video… Scilla quoque contrita bulbique contriti cum ture recte inponuntur* (But, a

the existence of these cures when he seeks out the cure for his own impotence first at the hands of Proselenus (131.1-3) and then with help of Oenothea (134.1-138.4). At the same time, Petronius points out the lack of monetary success of this profession through his description of Oenothea's humble surroundings.[330]

Encolpius's failure at sex and his quest to recover his sexual prowess reflect the importance of sex in several areas of Roman culture and society. As stated in chapter three, people lived on through their heirs and the established norms for Roman wills are a testament to this. One was expected to make one's children heirs, in a certain order, and protections existed to ensure this. Augustus encouraged and rewarded citizens of Rome for producing children and indicated that this was the primary role of a Roman marriage.[331]

While it is difficult to deduce the legal status of the main characters in the *Satyrica*, their sexual behavior is consistent with that of slaves and former slaves. This is important because it sheds light on the sort of sexual behavior that they embrace as well as what would have been expected of them. As Amy Richlin points out, citizens of Rome were subject to certain sexual

---

loosening of the sinews is a frequent disease everwhere: sometimes the whole body, other times a part is infected. Ancient writers called the first apoplexy, the second paralysis: now I see both called paralysis…. Crushed squills and onions mashed with frankincense are appropriately placed.) *Celsus* 3.27.1) See Schmeling 2011: 498 for impotence cures. Oenothea sprinkles a leather phallus with oil, pepper, and crushed nettle-seeds and inserts it into Encolpius anus as a final remedy for his impotence (138.1): *Profert Oenothea scorteum fascinum, quod ut oleo et minuto pipere atque urticae trito circumdedit semine, paulatim coepit inserere ano meo…* See Kiefer 2007: 404 and McLaren 2007: 16-19 for this cure used by Oeneothea as well as a broader discussion of impotence cures in the ancient world.

[330] *Sat*. 135. Schmeling (2011: 519) comments: "The impotence-curing business without Viagra is probably competitive, and, judged from Oenothea's poor possessions, not very rewarding." On Oenothea's name, Schmeling 2011:519: Oenothea's "name means 'wine goddess' but since she is not a goddess, an interpretation would be 'she whose goddess is wine'." As the episode unfolds, we see that she is appeased by wine and by sex. Sex is perhaps one of the perks of her profession since it is not one that pays well.

[331] Treggiari 1991: 8.

norms and in turn, these sexual norms defined Roman society. "The bodies of freeborn Romans were defined by law, custom, and morality as not to be penetrated except for wives by husbands; conversely, the bodies of slaves were defined as penetrable…Adult males who allowed their bodies to be penetrated lost their honor and some civil rights…"[332] Heterosexual sex, in the context of marriage that could produce children and thus citizens, was the only honorable form of sex.[333] But, nowhere in the primary storyline of the *Satyrica* does this sort of consensual sex happen; the one case of successful heterosexual sex, that between the Widow of Ephesus and the soldier, occurs in the humorous story told by Eumolpus

The final chapters of the *Satyrica* take place in a society that devalues most of the provisions enacted by Augustus in the *Lex Iulia Papia* to protect marriage, encourage fertility and ensure the continuation of the Roman populace.[334] Many of these provisions continued much longer than the reign of the Julio-Claudians. Champlain and other scholars have pointed out that, while *captationes* were a common theme in literature, in reality, Roman laws and culture provided a framework for inheritance from which few Romans strayed. As stated in chapter three, people lived on through their heirs and the established norms for Roman wills is a testament to this. One was expected to make one's children heirs, in a certain order, and protections existed to ensure this. Even if a person expressed in his will a desire to act outside of the expected norms, these desires could be overruled *post-mortem*. Champlin points to an

---

[332] Richlin 2013: 97.
[333] Richlin 2013: 83: "Adult males who allowed their bodies to be penetrated lost their honor and some civil rights, as did free prostitutes, although prostitution was legal. A citizen so dishonored was called *infamis*, a category both legal and moral."
[334] These were orginally two laws: the first, *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* was legislated in 18 B.C.E. by Augustus who exercised his *tribunica potestas* to enforce passage. The second, the *lex Papia Poppaea* was passed by the suffect consuls in 9 C.E. These two laws are generally referred to as one since the *lex Poppaea* acted as a continuation as well as correction of the *lex Iulia*. See McGinn 2003: 71.

important distinction between relationships of fathers with their children before and after death. While relationships could be strained during life and might even lead fathers to loudly and openly censure their sons, this almost never extended to disinheritance. Champlin emphasizes the strength of the bonds of *pietas* that prevented this: "society and lawyers both frowned on disinheritance effected without good reason; parents and children were both caught up in a web of obligations; and despite all the tension the ultimate repudiation of disinheritance was not common."[335]

The society at Croton also suppresses the family in general, a fact that is not supported by what we know of how Roman society viewed the family. Familial structure was supported by and integral to the Roman state and this importance is confirmed not only by legislation, but also by the sheer number of public festivals that emphasized the family. "Hardly a month passed without a festival associated with the family. Political programmes reinforced the desirability of bearing children. This cultural symbolism was paralleled by everyday life: most people (in cities, at least) were married most of the time, even if mortality rates and divorce meant that marriages were serial rather than single and lifelong. Thus, children grew up expecting to marry, to value children, and to form families of their own (with natural, adoptive, or stepchildren).[336] There was, in fact, a certain view of the "ideal" family. While the origins of this idealized view have been placed in the late Republic, it was prominent under Augustus. It was marked by affection between spouses and towards children, as well as sexual attraction between spouses.[337]

---

[335] Champlin 1991: 108. Also, Shaw 1987. For an account of how the bonds of *pietas* were important in inheritance see Saller 1988: 399-403.
[336] Rawson 2000: 17.
[337] Treggiari 1991: 220-227; 263-319

However, while it is true that the society at Croton devalues family structure and reverses the reality of Roman inheritance, it does point to an important problem among the Romans: the issue of mortality, especially child mortality. High childhood mortality emphasizes issues of inheritance: if there are no children, who inherits? The *lex Julia Papia* confirms this persistent problem because it allowed spouses to inherit from each other based on a sort of scaled survival of their children. "Children conceived in the marriage itself gave parents full capacity with respect to each other if one child survived past puberty, if two lived more than three years, or if three survived to their "naming day" (nine days past birth for males, eight for females)."[338]

Exact statistics for childhood mortality are hard to come by, since no official report was necessarily made for anyone at any age, much less for children. Complicating the matter is the fact that cognizance of age for Romans was rather vague when compared with precise modern-day records.[339] However, several sources provide estimates of Roman life-expectancy. The first is calculation of taxes to be paid by legatees on annuities. Ulpian records a means of calculating how these annuities were to be portioned out over the course of a legatee's lifetime based on an estimate of the median life-expectancy of the person at different ages. Based on this calculation, in the third century C.E., from birth to 19, a person's life-expectancy was 30 years, but from ages 20-29 years, this number (30) remains steady. Thus, if a person lived to age 19, chances were greater that he or she would live to 60. This emphasizes the mortality rate of children.[340] Burns extrapolated from more recent data on *adult* life-expectancy in India in the early 20th century to

[338] McGinn 2003:73. Rawson 2000: 14.
[339] Precise knowledge of one's age is a recent phenomenon. It was not until 1902 that the Bureau of Census was established in the United States and kept official records of birthdays.
[340] Frier 1982: 217.

conclude that in Roman Africa, infant mortality was around 25 percent.[341] Gardner and Wiedemann place the infant mortality rate closer to 50 percent based in part on evidence from inscriptions: Three of Cornelia Gracchus's original 12 children survived to adulthood and six of Agrippina's, wife of Germanicus. "A small number of inscriptions confirm the impression that fewer than half the babies born alive had an expectation of living to adulthood. In other words, every Roman couple needed to half five children if the population was to reproduce itself."[342]

Even if precise statistics are impossible to establish, the mortality rate for infants and children in the Roman Empire was clearly very high, and this no doubt contributed to anxieties over producing legitimate heirs and the importance attached to legitimate progeny more broadly. In his narrative universe, Petronius offers a curious and striking exception to this rule, namely the city of Croton, vistited by the novel's protagonists towards the end of the work as we have it. The Croton of the *Satyrica* operates in an inverted moral universe inasmuch as it reverses the conventional Roman obsession with legitimate progeny. Indeed, as Encolpius, Giton and Eumolpus are about to enter the city, they encounter a *vilicus* (a servile farm manager) who characterizes it as follows: *in hac urbe…homines…in partes duas esse divisos. Nam aut captantur aut captant. In hac urbe nemo liberos tollit, quia quisquis suos heredes habet, non ad cenas,1 non ad spectacula admittitur, sed omnibus prohibetur commodis, inter ignominiosos latitat*. *Qui vero nec uxores unquam duxerunt nec proximas necessitudines habent, ad summos honores perveniunt.* (In this city men are divided into two classes: those who are chasing legacies

[341] Burns 1953: 14. "It seems therefore not unlikely that among the relatively healthy free Romanised population of Africa, whose adult mortality approximated to that of rural China, early twentieth-century India, or a Victorian slum, the infant mortality also approximated and was of the order perhaps of 200 to 250 per 1,000; while on the Danube frontier or among the slaves at Carthage, whose adult mortality (and also their reported child mortality) was so much heavier, the infant mortality was also proportionately worse."
[342] Plut. *T.G.* 1.4. Gardner and Wiedemann 1991: 99.

and those who are being chased. In this city no one raises up children, because anyone who has heirs, is neither invited to dinner or to the theater, but he is barred from all priveleges and abides in shameful obscurity. But, those who have never married nor have close relatives, attain the highest positions. 116.7-8). Croton is essentially a society unable to guarantee a proper and legitmate future for itself.

This description, of course, reflects the reality that people were not always swayed by societal and legal incentives to produce children. Augustus's attempts to increase birthrate were reported as unsuccessful by Tacitus: *Relatum dein de moderanda Papia Poppaea, quam senior Augustus post Iulias rogationes incitandis caelibum poenis et augendo aerario sanxerat. nec ideo coniugia et educationes liberum frequentabantur praevalida orbitate*… (And then it was proposed that the *Papia Poppæa* be moderated, which the elderly Augustus had enacted after the Julian decrees to increase the penalties for celibacy and to augment the treasury. Nor, indeed, did marriages or the rearing of children become more common with childlessness prevailing… *An*. 3.25).

Ironically, given the lack of reproduction, the episode at Croton is the place where Encolpius regains his sexual potency, possibly as a result of the abating of Priapus's wrath. In more concrete terms the return of Encolpius's sexual ability is apparently achieved through a quasi-medicinal application of herbs and physical intervention (138.1).[343]

Petronius's overall characterization of Croton resembles a development within Priapean poetry which comes to depict the god's domain as increasingly infertile. associated with Priapus by virtue of the prayer that Encolpius utters to that hostile deity identified as *comes nympharum*

[343] See Lo and Re'em 2018, particularly regarding recipes for curing impotence, 443-448.

Bacchique (comrade of the Nymphs and Bacchus, 133.2). [344] and reflect a literary phenomenon of the Priapean poems associated with this minor god. Uden traces the evolution of the *Carmina Priapea* poems in the development of their own genre as follows:

> This generic narrative moves from country to city, from fertility to infertility, from a focus on the natural world, its cultivation and productivity, to a focus on lust, leisure and impotence. The sense of narrative progression is particularly strong in poem 33…with its very strong temporal juxtaposition: the ancient Priapi (*antiqui Priapi*), says Priapus, had Naiads and Dryads to satisfy their lust, but now *(nunc*)- in his current generic incarnation- he has to masturbate because "all the nymphs have passed away" (*Nymphas omnis interiisse*), a vivid metaphor for the development of the genre.[345]

The *vilicus* who describes Croton before the companions enter the city is reminiscent of the *vilicus* who appears at the end of the Pseudo-Vergilian *priapea*.[346] The appearance of the *vilicus* was as Uden points outpart of the surprise ending of that poem, but it "becomes a kind of running motif in the *Carmina Priapea* which are, by contrast, shot through with the language of elite land ownership."[347] The gardens of Priapus, in the *Carmina Priapea* become characterized by artificial gardening and a lack of natural fertility. Priapus's necessary dependence on masturbation came about because his access to ready sex companions was erased when these gardens became less welcoming to Naiads and Dryads.[348] While it would be implausible to affirm a direct connection between the evolution of the Priapean poems and Petronius's Croton, it is striking that both reflect the literary theme of a dead environment resulting from a transition from country to city and from fertility to infertility.

---

[344] As a deity of the countryside, Priapus was naturally associated with nymphs; and the god Bacchus was generally identified as his father.
[345] Uden 2010: 207.
[346] Vergil App. Verg. *Priap* 2.19.
[347] Uden 2010: 199.
[348] Uden 2010: 208.

While Petronius may have intended his Croton to reflect the issue of childlessness in Roman society his specific choice of that city merits attention. In the first place, Croton was one of the original colonies of Magna Graecia making it somewhat different from indigenous Italian cites. At the same time, it experienced the same changes that other towns on the Italian peninsula experienced in the waning centuries of the Republic. These changes included mass emigration to larger cities, especially Rome, Due to the loss of small farm holds and the lack of agrarian labor available to the free poor in Italy. Wealthy land owners increased their land holdings and replaced Italian labor with servile work forces from Rome's foreign conquests. Recruitment for the Roman army in prolonged foreign campaigns contributed to this phenomenon by separating the laborers for many years from the land they worked. The scale of urban migration, particularly in the first century B.C.E. was staggering. Hopkins estimated that "between 80 B.C.E. and 8 B.C.E., that is to say, in a mere two generations roughly "half of the free adult males in Italy left their farms and went to the Italian towns or were settled by the state on new farms in Italy or the provinces."[349] Petronius's Croton, populated by unemployed legacy hunters, may constitute a parodic representation of this broad problem that continued into the early imperial period. With the jobs hard to come by those unwilling to consider emigration might well have considered legacy-hunting to be the best professional option. Croton's peculiar social history may have additionally suggested itself to Petronius as an apt target for satirizing as a dead society.

[349] Hopkins 1978: 66. Hopkins bases this information on official records: the census between 28 and 8 BCE, the records kept of the number of soldiers discharged and the records of the founding of colonies.

Croton was established around 750 B.C.E. along with several other Greek colonies during the Greek colonization of the eighth and seventh centuries.[350] Its power grew throughout the sixth century and it was famous as the city where Pythagoras founded his cult.[351] Croton was the first head of the Italiote League formed in the sixth century to provide communal protection against the Athenians dominance over Magna Graecia. The use of the temple of Hera Lacinia as the meeting place for the League as well as the location of the treasury makes Croton's leadership at this time likely.[352] Pythagoras was reputed to have founded his cult at Croton towards the end of the sixth century, around the time Croton reached the zenith of its power. In fact, the Pythagoreans would expand their influence beyond the philosophic and religious spheres to become an oligarchis ruling class.

Croton's influence appears to have begun to decline at the beginning of the fifth century; eventually Syracuse would take over and occupy Croton along with several neighboring colonies in the 390s B.C.E. Following this, the Italiote League was revived by Tarentum which grew in power during the Syracusan occupation.[353] As Rome continued its expansion, the common Roman perception was that the Greek cities of Magna Graecia fell into decline and

---

[350] Lomas 2005: 37. The colonization of southern Italy lasted into the fifth century, Heraklea being the last one in 433 BCE.

[351] Poly. 2.39. Strabo 6.1.10 provides proof that Croton was reputed to have fallen in importance after it was defeated by local colonies in the 5th century: ταύτην δὲ τὴν συμφορὰν αἰτίαν τοῖς Κροτωνιάταις φασὶ τοῦ μὴ πολὺν ἔτι συμμεῖναι χρόνον διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τότε πεσόντων ἀνδρῶν. (They say that the blame for this mischance was on the Crotonites, and after the city did not stay together for a long time on account of the great number of men that had fallen at that time.) Evidence exists that "a strong Pythagorean tradition" developed in Rhegium and Metapontum as well: Lomas 2005: 42.

[352] Lomas 2005: 44.

[353] Lomas 2005: 48: "The capture of Croton left the Italiote League without a *hegemon*, and it is probably at this point that Tarentum assumed leadership of the league and transferred the treasury to Heraklea."

were increasingly deserted.[354] This view, which has in fact been partially refuted by recent archeological evidence perhaps, no doubt influenced Petronius's choice of a waning Greek colony as the setting for his symbolically dead society.

The specific choice of Croton from among the numerous Greek cities may have been influenced by its Pythagorean past. In characterizing Croton as a society that shuns learning, treats families with children as outcasts, and whose younger members prey like vultures on cadavers, Petronius underscores the extent of its lapse from its Pythagorean cultural hertiage. Pythagoreans were eminently educated; Pythagoras is credited with the philosophical idea that the workings of the universe could be expressed mathematically. [355] The *vilicus* warns Encolpius and his friends of the lack of appreciation for learning: *In hac enim urbe non litterarum studia celebrantur, non eloquentia locum habet.* (In this city the study of literature is not celebrated, nor does eloquence have any place. 116.6). Pythagoras is also credited with curbing the rampant luxury and lack of virtue that existed at Croton, but the *vilicus* claims that the Crotonites appreciate neither of these: ... *non frugalitas sanctique mores laudibus ad fructum perveniunt*. (Neither frugality not the customs of holiness find the fruit of praise. 116.6).

The *vilicus* also warns that no one has children, or if they do, they are the outcasts of society:

> *Nam aut captantur aut captant. In hac urbe nemo liberos tollit, quia quisquis suos heredes habet, non ad cenas, non ad spectacula admittitur, sed omnibus prohibetur commodis, inter ignominiosos latitat. Qui vero nec uxores unquam duxerunt nec proximas necessitudines habent, ad summos honores perveniunt, id est soli militares, soli fortissimi atque etiam innocentes habentur. Adibitis" inquit "oppidum tanquam in pestilentia campos, in quibus nihil aliud est nisi cadavera, quae lacerantur, aut corvi, qui lacerant ...*

---

[354] Cic. *Am*. 13. See further Lomas 1993: 1-3.
[355] While Pythagoras himself never wrote down any aspect of his teachings, many subsequent philosophers did later, including Porphyry, Plato, Aristotle and Aristonxenus.

> For they are either being chased for a legacy or chasing legacies. In this city no one raises up children, because anyone who has legatees, is neither invited to dinner or to the theater, but he is barred from all priveleges and abides in shameful obscurity. But those who have never married nor have close relatives, attain the highest positions, namely, they alone are considered soldierly, they alone are the brave and upright. You will come into a town that is like a diseased field, in which there is nothing except cadavers which are mutilated or vultures who do the mutilating. 116.7-9.

Pythagorean teachings on sex and reproduction were focused primarily on the former as a tool for the latter.[356] Specifically, sex outside of marriage or unaccompanied by the intent to reproduce was not acceptable. Each sexual act was supposed to be for the express purpose of producing offspring. Although later writers attribute this idea to Plato and/or the Stoics, in reality, it belonged to Pythagoras because both Plato and the Stoics allowed for sex outside of procreation. Plato, while advocating that men and women should be careful to use sex only for procreation for a set amount of time in their reproductive lives, states that after that time, it was unreasonable to expect them to continue this practice.[357]

The Stoics, while encouraging sex for mostly procreative purposes, recognized it as an experience that increased friendship between two people. Seneca, however, teaches much more restrictive boundaries for sex in line with Pythagorean teachings. Seneca's view on the role of sex may indeed by the one with which Petronius was most familiar. In the famous "penis poem" where Encolpius admonishes his penis for its inability to perform, he calls out Cato and his followers for this view:

---

[356] Iamblichus says of Pythagoras: ἐπ' ἐνίων μὲν οὖν ἐπιλέγεται <διὰ> τί δεῖ, οἷον ὅτι δεῖ τεκνοποιεῖσθαι ἕνεκα τοῦ καταλιπεῖν ἕτερον ἀνθ' ἑαυτοῦ θεῶν θεραπευτήν…(Adding to these things he says, *why* it is required, such as that it is necessary to beget children in order to leave behind another worshiper of the gods in place of oneself. Iambl. *VP* 86; Laks and Most 2016: 114)

[357] Gaca 2000: 122-123; Regarding the end of the fertile period for couples: *Laws* 784b 1-3. See *Laws* 835c 2-8, 836a6-b2 for views on sex outside of the reproductive years.

Quid me constricta spectatis fronte Catones
damnatisque novae simplicitatis opus?
Sermonis puri non tristis gratia ridet,
quodque facit populus, candida lingua refert.
Nam quis concubitus, Veneris quis gaudia nescit?
Quis vetat in tepido membra calere toro?
Ipse pater veri doctos Epicurus amare
iussit, et hoc vitam dixit habere τέλος ...

> Why do you, Catonites, look at me with frowning foreheads and curse the work of fresh honesty? Happy pleasantness of my pure speech laughs, and whatever the people do, my honest tongue relates. Who does not have sex, who does not know the pleasures of Venus? Who forbids his member to grow hot on a warm couch? The father himself of truth, Epicurus, commanded those he taught to love, and he that this was the end of life… 132.15.

These Stoics strictly prohibit sex outside of procreative intent, and this may be partly what Petronius is satirizing. He describes a society very much opposed to procreation, as well as a society with inhabitants very much interested in casual sex. In addition, he ironically makes Croton the location where Encolpius recovers his sexual ability, but not for the purpose of procreation. In the first half of the first century B.C.E., Pythagoreanism experienced a revival at Rome known as Neopythagoreanism and it is likely that Seneca's views on sex come from his familiarity with this revival since his views on sex are not in line with the Stoics. "Consequently, even though Seneca tends to be classed as a Stoic in many respects, he is anti-Stoic in his sexual ethics. It is utterly foreign to Stoicism to contend, as Seneca does, that one must do away with the experience of erotic love except for the reproductive urge within marriage."[358]

Petronius may be showing what might happen to a society that was forced to follow Pythagorean precepts on sex as well as the hard-line Stoic position that Seneca took. At the beginning of the fifth century B.C.E., literary sources indicate that there was a general casting out of oppressive Pythagorean leaders throughout Magna Graecia. Perhaps Petronius wanted to

[358] Gaca 2000: 129.

indicate what a full-scale sexual rebellion against such precepts would look like, or perhaps he meant to present a society his audience would have recognized as a complete reversal of Pythagorean sexual ethics. Either way, his Crotonian society is completely opposed to procreation, but not at all to sex, and a consequence of this is a serious lack of children to maintain its population.

The result of an exaggerated lack of procreation that Pythagorean sexual prohibitions might produce is the society of Crotonites the *vilicus* describes—vultures who feed on cadavers— but this is also a satirization of other Pythagorean teachings, especially those related to diet. While it is difficult to determine Pythagoras's exact dietary restrictions, in the literary tradition there is evidence that people thought Pythagoras was a vegetarian.[359] One of the most important beliefs of Pythagoras was metampsychosis, or reincarnation, which, in many religions and cultures, is often is accompanied by vegetarian restrictions.[360] He taught that the soul could be reborn in other humans as well as animals, and while it seem that these first Pythagoreans were not vegetarians, his later followers of the 4th century were, including those of the Neopythagorean revival in the first century B.C.E.[361] Empedocles, who was closely associated with Pythagoras and lived in Southern Italy during the same time period, was a vegetarian and expresses his revulsion at the thought of eating meat.[362] οἴμ' ὅτι οὐ πρόσθεν με διώλεσε νηλεὲς

[359] In the case of Pythagoras, uncovering his teachings is complicated by the fact that he himself never wrote down anything.
[360] Xenophanes reported of Pythagoras (in one of the fragments we have from his elegies) that Pythagoras chided a friend for maltreating a puppy, claiming that it was the soul of a friend whom he recognized in its bark. 7a Pergit Diogenes in Gerber 1999: 422. Aristotle *De An*. 407b20
[361] Bremmer 2003: 32
[362] Bremmer 2003: 5: "Empedocles drew the extreme consequence from his views about the migration of the soul into animals and considered the danger of some sacrifices being a kind of cannibalism. Like the Orphics, then, he must have practiced a kind of vegetarianism." Also, Trepanier 2017: 136.

ἦμαρ, πρὶν σχέτλι᾽ ἔργα βορᾶς περὶ χείλεσι μητίσασθαι. (Alas, that the ruthless day did not destroy me before now, before I contrived the wicked deeds of food around my lips. Porph. *Abst*. 2.31.5 in Laks and Most 2016: 382.).

Cicero links the teachings of Empedocles and Pythagoras together: *Pythagoras et Empedocles unam omnium animantium condicionem iuris esse denuntiant clamantque inexpiabilis poenas impendere iis a quibus violatum sit animal.* (Pythagoras and Empedocles declare that there is one condition for all living things and proclaim that inexpiable punishments hang over those by whom violence be done to an animal. Cic. *Rep*. 3.11.19).

And Empedocles clearly promotes vegetarianism:

> οὐ παύσεσθε φόνοιο δυσηχέος; οὐκ ἐσορᾶτε
> ἀλλήλους δάπτοντες ἀκηδείῃσι νόοιο; (Will you not stop from evil-sounding murder? Do you not see that you are devouring one another in the carelessness of your mind? Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math* 9.129, Laks and Most 2016: 378.
> μορφὴν δ᾽ ἀλλάξαντα πατὴρ φίλον υἱὸν ἀείρας σφάζει ἐπευχόμενος μέγα νήπιος· οἱ δ᾽ ἀπορεῦνται λισσόμενον θύοντες, ὁ δ᾽ αὖ νήκουστος ὁμοκλέων σφάξας ἐν μεγάροισι κακὴν ἀλεγύνατο δαῖτα. ὡς δ᾽ αὔτως πατέρ᾽ υἱὸς ἑλὼν καὶ μητέρα παῖδες θυμὸν ἀπορραίσαντε φίλας κατὰ σάρκας ἔδουσιν.
>
> The father lifts up his beloved son changed in shape and slaughters him while praying, great fool. The others are at a loss as they sacrifice the one praying, but he, deaf to reproaches, has already completed the slaughter and prepared an evil feast in his halls. Just so a father seizes a son and children their mother and ripping out the life, they eat the flesh of their dear ones. Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math*. 9.129, Laks and Most 2016: 380.

Ovid has Pythagoras preach against eating the flesh of any living thing in the following passages:

- *primusque animalia mensis arguit imponi*… (…and he first censured putting down living things for eating *Met*. 15.72-72).
- *"Parcite, mortales, dapibus temerare nefandis corpora!* (Refrain, mortals, from desecrating your bodies with impious feasts…*Met*. 15.75).

- *Heu quantum scelus est in viscera viscera condi / congestoque avidum pinguescere corpore corpus / alteriusque animantem animantis vivere leto!* (Alas, how great is the crime established, viscera on viscera, and a greedy body to grow fat with the body ingested, and another to provide life to a living being by the death of another living being. *Met*. 15.89-91).
- *Quod, oro, ne facite, et monitis animos advertite nostris! / Cumque boum dabitis caesorum membra palato, / mandere vos vestros scite et sentite colonos.* (I pray that you not do this, but give ear to my counsels! When you are given the pieces of a cow slaughtered for your palate, know and feel that you chew on your own fellow tillers of the soil. *Met.* 15.139-42).

In light of these literary traditions passed down about Pythagoras as a vegetarian, Eumolpus's stipulation to his legatees that they eat his own flesh before they can inherit is likely Petronius's continuing satirization of Pythagoras and Croton. But, his cleverness does not end here. The relevant text of Eumolpus's will is again quoted below:

> *Omnes, qui in testamento meo legata habent, praeter libertos meos hac condicione percipient, quae dedi, si corpus meum in partes conciderint et astante populo comederint" ...Apud quasdam gentes scimus adhuc legem servari, ut a propinquis suis consumantur defuncti, adeo quidem, ut obiurgentur aegri frequenter, quod carnem suam faciant peiorem. His admoneo amicos meos, ne recusent quae iubeo, sed quibus animis devoverint spiritum meum, eisdem etiam corpus consumant....*
>
> All, who have a legacy in my will, besides my freedmen, will take possession on this condition, which I give, if they cut up my body into parts and eat it standing in front of the people. We know that among some countries up to now that a law is preserved, that the dead are eaten by their own relations, to the extent that frequently the sick are rebuked, because they spoil their own flesh. I warn my friends with these things, lest they refuse what I command, but they, with that gusto they cursed my soul, with the same gusto should consume my body…. 141. 3-4.

Conte makes a compelling argument for *devorarint* instead of *devoverint*.[363] He emends this passage to: *quibus animis devorarint spiritum meum*. He argues that Eumolpus wants to keep up at least the façade of good-will towards the *heredipetae* at the end of the Croton episode.[364] To call them out for cursing his soul would not accomplish this. But, if indeed Petronius finds many ingenious ways of satirizing Croton, to suggest that the inhabitants at Croton first eagerly devoured Eumolpus's spirit, would suggest that perhaps they first fed upon spiritual nourishment. This would have likely been understood by his audience as a reference to Pythagoras's introduction of philosophy and a new way of life to the Crotonians. In particular, it is this direction that the legatees consume Eumolpus's body with the same spirit as the inhabitants of Croton consumed his spirit when they courted him for *post-mortem* favor that brings the episode at Croton full circle from its introduction by the *vilicus*. "Eumolpus' mocking request that the *heredipetae* eat his *corpus* is a retaliation constructed upon his pretending still to believe in their sincerity and his manifesting what is almost a desire to summon them to a loftier degree of initiatory *sapientia*: his disciples, having fed zealously upon his *spiritus* are invited to a kind of mystic communion."[365]

Pythagoras was certainly credited with bringing this spiritual nourishment to Croton and the surrounding areas. Cicero writes about 'certain people' who introduced the idea of the soul's continued existence after death to Magna Graecia, likely Pythagoras.

---

[363] Part of his argument is reinforced by the fact that his emendation respects the parallelism between *spiritus* and *corpus*: "…*spiritum devorarint* is a felicitous expression generated by the parallelism and analogy from the corresponding *corpus consumant*. Spiritus is obviously felt as the opposite of *corpus*." Conte 1987: 531. Conte points to TLL s.v. *corpus* 1003.49.
[364] Conte 1987: 530: "I believe that the *mimus* sketched out at the moment of entering Croton (117.4) is still going on; and the last joke Eumolpus intends to play on the *heredipetae* requires that they figure in the words of his testament as sincere friends, and not as 'cursers'."
[365] Conte 1987: 531.

> *neque enim adsentior eis, qui nuper haec disserere coeperunt, cum corporibus simul animos interire atque omnia morte deleri. plus apud me antiquorum auctoritas valet, vel nostrorum maiorum, qui mortuis tam religiosa iura tribuerunt, quod non fecissent, profecto, si nihil ad eos pertinere arbitrarentur, vel eorum qui in hac terra fuerunt magnamque Graeciam, quae nunc quidem deleta est, tum florebat, institutis et praeceptis suis erudierunt…*
>
> Nor do I agree with those, who recently have begun to argue the position that the soul along with the body is lost and everything is destroyed by death. The opinion of the ancients is more in line with mine, or of our ancestors, who conferred such religious rites on their dead, which they would not have done, surely, if they judged it to be of no concern to them; or of those who were in this land and educated Magna Graecia which now is desolate but was then flourishing, their precepts and traditions… *Am.* 13.

Directly before Eumolpus's will is read, Philomela brings her children to Eumolpus for spiritual instruction. She brings her children to Eumolpus under the guise of seeking him out as a teacher of virtue for her children when in reality she intends to prostitute them in exchange for becoming a legatee. She herself used to garner legacies through prostitution, and now in her old age, uses her children to continue gathering wealth. *Ea ergo ad Eumolpum venit et commendare liberos suos eius prudentiae bonitatique ... credere se et vota sua. Illum esse solum in toto orbe terrarum, qui praeceptis etiam salubribus instruere iuvenes quotidie posset. Ad summam, relinquere se pueros in domo Eumolpi, ut ilium loquentem audirent ... quae sola posset hereditas iuvenibus dari.* (She, therefore, came to Eumolpus to hand over her children to his wisdom and virtue…that she trusted herself these promises. He was the only person in all the earth who could instruct her young ones daily with wholesome precepts. And to this point, she left her children in the home of Eumolpus, so that they might listen to him speaking…which was the only inheritance she could give to her young children. 140.3).

Philomela leaves to give thanks at the temple and what follows is an orgy between Eumolpus, the two children and Encolpius and the servant Corax.[366] In this final ironic twist, Croton has become the place where prostitution of one's own children is provided in exchange for inheritance, but all under the guise of receiving instruction in wisdom and virtue.[367] It is in this scene that Encolpius regains his sexual potence.

> *"Dii maiores sunt, qui me restituerunt in integrum Mercurius enim, qui animas ducere et reducere solet, suis beneficiis reddidit mihi, quod manus irata praeciderat, ut scias me gratiosiorem esse quam Protesilaum aut quemquam alium antiquorum." Haec locutus sustuli tunicam Eumolpoque me totum approbavi. At ille primo exhorruit, deinde ut plurimum crederet, utraque manu deorum beneficia tractat ...*
>
> There are greater gods, who have restored me whole, for Mercury, who is accustomed to lead and re-lead souls, has returned to me his benefits, which his angry hand had crippled, so that you may understand me to be more beloved than Protesilas or any other ancient men." Having spoken, I lifted up my tunic and demonstrated my whole self to Eumolpus. But he, at first afraid, then that he might believe as much as possible, drew the favor of the gods into both his hands. 140. 12-13.

Encolpius, in this passage, describes his regained sexual power as a sort of rebirth, a conveying of himself back from the dead in the same way Mercury conveys souls back from Hades to earth. Conte summarizes: "impotence takes on for Encolpius the connotations of either death or castration, and so Mercury the healer can act on both being called upon by the text in his double prerogative of psychopomp and ithyphallic god. As psychopomp he brings back to life the dead member of Encolpius, and in his ithyphallic manifestation he has the power to restore

---

[366] Prostitutes were just as likely as other women to take part in the religious life in Roman society. Strong 2016: 172 points out that women were "more unified by their gender, which strongly affected which gods they worshipped and in what contexts, than they were divided by their social and moral categories."

[367] Impotence is intimately connected with childlessness, which had an impact on inheritance which in turn could lead to captation through the giving of sexual favors. See Champlin 1991: 25. This is what happens at Croton when the mother leaves her children with Eumolpus and Encolpius.

its virility."[368] This rebirth or return from the dead is also a satirization of the Pythagorean belief in metampsychosis. Soon after this, the game is up for the three companions. Likely they go on to more episodic adventures similar to the ones they have already experienced and hopefully Encolpius can now enjoy them more completely.

[368] Conte 1996: 101-102.

CONCLUSION

One of the purposes of this dissertation has been to provide the literary, philosophical and sociological groundings to Petronius's presentation of death in the *Satyrica*. In its organization of the types of death—actual death, apparent death, anticipation of death, and symbolic death—it becomes clear that there is often more than one underpinning (literary, philosophical or sociological) to the same episode. For instance, the story of the Widow of Ephesus appears in multiple chapters because its characters express philosophical views about the fate of the soul, but it also refers to the conflict between the idealized idea of the *univira*, or the one-man woman, and the importance of procreation to ancient Rome. When Encolpius soliloquizes over Lichas's body, he also flirts with philosophical ideas about the usefulness of burial, but at the same time, performs Lichas's burial in accordance with the expectations of the time. In other words, there is always more than one side to the death-coins of the *Satyrica*. This is the genius and difficulty of the *Satyrica* and explains the overlap of episodes in each chapter.

However, another purpose of this study has been to determine how much seriousness can be attributed to Petronius's presentation of death. In general, how much realism and truth are in the *Satyrica* is still a matter of great debate. Scholars see the valuable contributions the *Satyrica* provides to our understanding of the Roman world such as the changing face of oratory, the ideas of different social classes—especially lower ones, the language of the lower classes, and the increasing number of religions such as mystery cults. The *Satyrica* also points to the fact that Romans thought about death from many angles, as chapter three in this study shows. But, at the same time, these scholars caution against taking the *Satyrica* at face value: Trimalchio's tomb is much more elaborate than the archeological evidence for any freedman's tomb.

Like any approach to understanding the *Satyrica*, a study of the seriousness of its representation of death must proceed with caution. While this dissertation does not purport to place Petronius in the category of a "moralist," it should be clear from the analyses in the previous chapters of this study that this does not mean that the *Satyrica* is without serious elements.[369] (In fact, the majority of this study is very serious in nature although the *Satyrica* is primarily a humorous novel.). Once again, the term Silk uses in his analysis of the seriousness of Aristophanes' comedies, "serious-substantial," helps clarify the seriousness of death in the *Satyrica*. To be sure it is impossible to ignore Petronius's artistic humor with respect to his treatment of death. Nonetheless, we encounter much about death that is "serious-substantial." These are the underpinnings—philosophical, literary and sociological—of death that this study has brought into focus. But, Petronius meant, above all, to entertain, and this is reflected in his humorous treatment of death.

As the trio, Eumolpus, Giton and Encolpius, patch up their jealous quarrel and set out to board Lichas's ship, Eumolpus states (in a fragment): *"ego sic semper et ubique vixi, ut ultimam quamque lucem tanquam non redituram consumerem."* (I always and everywhere have lived so that I used up each day as if it were my last. 99.1). This sentiment is expressed in a more serious context by Horace and Seneca as well, and transcends all categories of death preparation: philosophical, spiritual or practical.[370] Eumolpus is hardly represented as a serious character, but

[369] This purely "moralistic" interpretation of the Satyrica was made by Highet 1941 and Arrowsmith 1966, and is explained in the introduction. Most scholarship trends away from this approach now.

[370] Horace *Ep*. 1.4.13: *omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum* (Believe that every day shines down the last day for you; Seneca *Ep*. 93.6: (*diem*) *sed nullum non tamquam ultimum aspexi*. (I have look upon every day as if were my last.)

that does not mean this statement is frivolous. Yet, at the same time, to view this when spoken by Eumolpus is not the same as when we see it expressed by Seneca in his epistles.

In examining the literary, philosophical and sociological underpinnings of death in the *Satyrica*, we can focus on the serious aspects of death. But, at the same time we should not lose sight of the fact that often, Petronius's manipulation of these very underpinnings is what would have made the Roman audience laugh. Trimalchio's claim "to never have listened to a philosopher," when so many elite Romans did at least claim "to listen" is an important example of this meeting of the humorous and serious. Bodel concludes about Trimalchio: "On the surface, it would seem, that Trimalchio has thought of everything: his tomb, his epitaph, and even the details of his funeral. Yet, in focusing on worldly things Trimlachio neglects the moral and spiritual preparations that were the characteristic of the truly wise man."[371] However, as this study has shown, this is precisely the point of how Trimalchio approaches death, and indeed, perhaps Petronius as well. There is more than one way to follow the philosophical injunction "to live each day as if it were one's last" and this is, in fact, what constitutes wisdom for Petronius.

In fact, Encolpius, despite his role as the unreliable narrator, encounters death multiple times and in many forms. When Encolpius thinks that his love, Giton has died, he tries to follow him: *secutusque labentem eodem ferramento ad mortem viam quaero.* (I followed after him as he fell, and sought the road to death with the same blade. 94.14). This is not the first, nor is it the last of Encolpius's "near-death" experiences. He feels that he is almost dying when Quartilla begins her initiation of him into the cult of Priapus, he prepares himself to die with Giton in the storm that takes Lichas's life, and he feels nearly dead at Croton when his impotence prevents his intimacy with Circe. Conte claims that "the reader cannot help adopting the *bona mens*, that

[371] Bodel 2013: 142.

common sense which is so often invoked in the *Satyricon* as the significant missing element."[372] There is certainly truth in this statement, but at the same time, Conte misses the point when it comes to the theme of death. Common sense is beside the point—there is more than one road of preparation for death. When Encolpius expresses his willingness to follow Giton on the road of death (*ad mortem viam*), and indeed, to experience death in so many forms, whether voluntary or not, he is not so different from Trimalchio. Both seek the road to death in humorous ways, and we are supposed to laugh at them. Undoubtedly Petronius's suicide in 66 C.E. provoked laughter as well.

[372] Conte 1996: 22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alvar, Jaime. *Romanising Oriental Gods: Myth, Salvation and Ethics in the Cults of Cybele, Isis, and Mithras*. Translated and edited by R. Gordon. *RGRW* 165 Leiden, 2008.
2. Arrowsmith, William. "Luxury and Death in the Satyricon." *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 5.3, 1966, pp. 304-331.
3. Bacon, Helen H. "The Sibyl in the bottle." *The Virginia Quarterly Review* 34.2, 1958, pp. 262-76.
4. Baldwin, Barry. "Suicide in Rome." *Roman and Byzantine papers*, pp. 524-31.
5. Barchiesi, A. "Extra legem: consumo di letteratura in Petronio, Arbitro." *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*, edited by Pecere, O. and Stramaglia, M., Cassino, 1996, pp. 189-206.
6. Barchiesi, Marino. "L'orologio di Trimalcione (struttura e tempo narrativo in Petronio ." *I Moderni alla ricerca di Enea*, edited by Barchiesi M., Rome, 1981, pp. 109-146.
7. Barton, Tamsyn. "Astrology and the State in Imperial Rome." *Shamanism, History, and the State*, University of Michigan, 1994, pp. 146-163.
8. Barton, Tamsyn. *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine Under the Roman Empire*. University of Michigan Press, 2002.
9. Bartsch, Shadi. *Actors in theAaudience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Harvard University Press, 1994.
10. Beck, Roger. "Some Observations on the Narrative Technique of Petronius." *Phoenix* 27.1, 1973, pp. 42-61.
11. ---. *The Religion of the Mithras Cult in the Roman Empire: Mysteries of the Unconquered Sun*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
12. ---. "If So, How?: Representing 'Coming Back to Life' in the Mysteries of Mithras." *Coming Back to Life: The Permeability of Past and Present, Mortality and Immortality, Death and Life in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Frederick S. Tappenden and Carly Daniel-Hughes, McGill University Library, 2017, pp. 129–152.
13. Bergmann, Bettina Ann, and Christine Kondoleon, editorss. *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. National Gallery of Art, 1999.
14. Bernstein, Alan E. *The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian worlds*. Cornell University Press, 1993
15. Bodel, J. "Freedmen in the Satyricon of Petronius." *Diss. Univ. of Michigan* (1984).
16. ---. "Trimalchio's Coming of Age." *Phoenix*, vol. 43, no. 1, 1989, pp. 72–74.
17. ---. "Trimalchio's underworld." *Tatum* 1994, pp. 237-59.
18. ---. "The Cena Trimalchionis." *Latin Fiction: The Latin Novel in Context*, edited by H. Hofmann, Routledge, 1999, pp. 38-51.
19. ---. "Death, the Afterlife, and Other Last Things: Rome." *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*. Belknap press, Cambridge, 2004, pp. 489-492.
20. Bowersock, Glen Warren. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*. University of California Press, 1994.
21. Bowie, Ewen. "The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novel." *The Novel in the Ancient World*, edited by Gareth Schmeling, Brill, 1996, pp. 87-106.
22. ---. "Milesian Tales." *The Romance between Greece and the East*, edited by Tim Whitmarsh and Stuart Thomson, 2013, pp. 243-257.

23. Boyce, Bret. *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis*. Brill, 1991.
24. Bremer, Jan Maarten, Theo PJ van den Hout, and Rudolph Peters, editors. *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World.* Amsterdam, 1994.
25. Bremmer, Jan N. *The Rise and Fall of the After Life: The 1995 Read-Tuckwell Lectures at the University of Bristol*. Taylor and Francis, 2003.
26. Brennan, Tad. "Stoic Souls in Stoic Corpses." *Body and Soul in Ancient Philosophy*, edited by Dorothea Frede and Walter Burkhard, Walter de Gruyter, 2009, pp. 389-408.
27. Bryan, Walter Reid. *Italic Hut Urns and Hut Urn Cemeteries*. American Academy in Rome, 1925.
28. Bryant, Clifton D. *Handbook of Death and Dying*. Sage Productions, 2003
29. Burkert, Walter. *Ancient Mystery Cults*. Harvard University Press, 1987.
30. Burn, A. R. "*Hic Breve Vivitur*. A Study of the Expectation of Life in the Roman Empire." *Past & Present*, no. 4, 1953, pp. 2–31.
31. Butler, Shane, and Alex Purves. *Synaesthesia and the Ancient Senses*. Taylor and Francis, 2013.
32. Cameron, H. D. "The Sibyl in the 'Satyricon'." *The Classical Journal* 65.8, 1970, pp. 337-339.
33. Carroll, Maureen. *Spirits of the Dead: Roman Funerary Commemoration in Western Europe*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
34. Carroll, Maureen. "From Fragments to Ancestors: Re-defining the Role of *os resectum* in Rituals of Purification and Commemoration in Republican Rome." *Living Through the dead. Burial and Commemoration in the Classical World*, edited by Maureen Carroll, and Jane Rempel. Oxbow Books, 2011.
35. Cavalca, Maria Grazia. *I grecismi nel Satyricon di Petronio*. Bologna: Pàtron, 2001.
36. Champlin, Edward. "*Creditur Vulgo Testamenta Hominum Speculum Esse Morum*: Why the Romans Made Wills." *Classical Philology* 84.3, 1989, pp. 198-215.
37. ---. *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 BC-AD 250*. Univ of California Press, 1991.
38. Ciaffi, Vincenzo. *Struttura del Satyricon*. Torino, 1955.
39. Collignon, Albert. *Étude sur Pétrone: la critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satiricon*. Hachette et cie, 1892.
40. Connors, Catherine. "Famous Last Words: Authorship and Death in the *Satyricon* and Neronian Rome." *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History, and Representation*, edited by Jaś Elsner and Jamie Masters. University of North Carolina Press, 1994, pp. 225-35.
41. ---. *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
42. Conte, Gian Biagio. "Petronius, Sat. 141.4." *The Classical Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 2, 1987, pp. 529–532.
43. ---. *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon*. Princeton University Press, 1996.
44. ---. *Latin Literature: A History*. Translated by Joseph B. Solodow. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
45. Courtney, E. "Parody and Literary Allusion in Menippean Satire." *Philologus-Zeitschrift für antike Literatur und ihre Rezeption* 106.1-2, 1962, pp. 86-100.

46. --- *Musa Lapidaria: A Selection of Latin Verse Inscriptions*. Scholars Press, 1995.
47. ---. *A Companion to Petronius*. Oxford University Press, 2001
48. Courtney, E. and Petronius Arbiter. *The Poems of Petronius*. Scholars Press, 1991.
49. Cumont, Franz. *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*. Open Court Publishing Company, 1911.
50. ---. *After Life in Roman Paganism: Lectures Delivered at Yale University on the Silliman Foundation*. Yale University Press, 1922.
51. D'Ambra, Eve, and Guy Métraux, editors. *The Art of Citizens, Soldiers and Freedmen in the Roman World*. British Archaeological Reports Limited, 2006.
52. Damon, Cynthia. *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage*. University of Michigan Press, 1997.
53. D'Arms, John H. *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*. Harvard University Press, 1981.
54. Davies, Jon. *Death, Burial and Rebirth in the Religions of Antiquity*. Routledge, 2013.
55. Davies, Penelope. *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*. University of Texas Press, 2010.
56. De Ligt, Luuk, and Laurens Ernst Tacoma, editors. *Migration and Mobility in the Early Roman Empire*. Brill, 2016
57. Dölger, Franz Joseph. "Zu den Zeremonien der Messliturgie: II. Der Altarkuss." *Antike und Christentum* 2, 1930, pp. 190-221.
58. Delz, Josef. "Drei Konjekturen zum Petrontext." *Museum Helveticum* 38.1, 1981, pp. 62-63.
59. Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume II: Books 6-10.* Translated by R. D. Hicks. Loeb Classical Library 185. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.
60. Dopp, Siegmar. "Leben und Tod in Petrons, *Satyrica*." *Tod und Jenseits im Altertum*, edited by G. Binder. Trier, 1991, pp. 144-166.
61. Dunbabin, Katherine. "*Sic erimus cuncti*... The Skeleton in Graeco-Roman Art." *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 101, 1986, pp. 185-255.
62. ---. *The Roman Banquet: Images of Conviviality*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
63. Edwards, Anthony T. "Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Aethiopis*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 26.3, 1985, pp. 215-227.
64. Edwards, Catherine. "Acting and Self-Actualization in Imperial Rome: Some Death Scenes." *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, edited by Pat Easterling and Edith Hall. Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 377-394.
65. ---. *Death in Ancient Rome*. Yale University Press, 2007.
66. Erasmo, Mario. *Reading Death in Ancient Rome*. Ohio State University Press, 2008.
67. Fanny Dolansky. "Honouring The Family Dead on the *Parantalia*: Ceremony, Spectacle, and Memory." *Phoenix*, vol. 65, no. 1/2, 2011, pp. 125–157.
68. Flower, Harriet I. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford University Press, 1996.
69. Frame, Donald, translator and editor. *M. Montaigne's Essays and Selected Writings*. Martin's Press, 1963.
70. Frier, Bruce. "Roman Life Expectancy: Ulpian's Evidence." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86, 1982, pp. 213-251.

71. ---. “Roman Life Expectancy: The Pannonian Evidence.” *Phoenix* 37.4, 1983, pp. 328-344.
72. Friggeri, Rosanna. *The Epigraphic Collection of the Museo Nazionale Romano at the Baths of Diocletian*. Mondadori Electa, 2001.
73. Gaca, Kathy L. “The Reproductive Technology of the Pythagoreans.” *Classical Philology*, vol. 95, no. 2, 2000, pp. 113–132.
74. Gager, John G. *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*. Oxford University Press, 1992.
75. Gagliardi, D. “Il corteo di Trimalchione. Nota a Petron. 28, 4-5.” *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 112, 1984, pp. 285-305.
76. ---. “Il tema della morte nella Cena petroniana.” *Orpheus* 10, 1989, pp. 13-25.
77. Genoni, L. “Petronio, *Sat*. 116: un prologo da commedia?” *BstudLat* 27 2, 1997, pp. 454-459.
78. Gerber, Douglas E., translator and editor. *Tyrtaeus, Solon, Theognis, Mimnermus. Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC.* Loeb Classical Library 258. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
79. Gill, Christopher. "The Sexual Episodes in the *Satyricon*." *Classical Philology* 68.3 1973, pp. 172-185.
80. Gnade, Marijke. “Iron Age Cinerary Urn from Latium in the Shape of a Hut: Indicators of Status?” *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World*, edited by J.M Bremer, R. Peters, and Th. P. J. Van den Hout. Amsterdam, 1994, pp. 235-240.
81. Goga, Stefana. “Encolpe dans la ‘Cena’: Une aventure de ‘l’ego’.” *Latomus* 57. Fasc. 2, 1998, pp. 375-379.
82. Graham, Emma-Jayne. "The Quick and the Dead in the Extra-Urban Landscape: The Roman Cemetery at Ostia/Portus as a Lived Environment." *Proceedings of the Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference*. 2005.
83. ---. “From Fragments to Ancestors: Re-Defining *Os Resectum* and Its Role in Rituals of Purification and Commemoration in Republican Rome.” *Living through the Dead: Burial and Commemoration in the Classical World*, edited by M. Carroll and J. Rempel. Oxford: Oxbow, 2011, pp. 91–109.
84. Griffin, Miriam. “Philosophy, Cato, and Roman Suicide: II.” *Greece and Rome (Second Series)* 33.02, 1986, pp. 192-202.
85. Grisé, Yolande. *Le suicide dans la Rome Antique*. Bellarmin; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1982.
86. Grondona, Marco. *La religione e la superstizione nella Cena Trimalchionis*. Latomus, 1980.
87. Grossardt, Peter. “Heimkehr, Traum und Wiedererkennung - Zur Rezeption der *‘Odyssee’* in Petrons *‘Satyrika’*.” *Hermes*, vol. 135, no. 1, 2007, pp. 80–97.
88. Habash, Martha. “Petronius’ *Satyrica* 24.7: Quartilla's *asellus*.” *Ancient Narrative*, 2006, pp. 24-30.
89. ---. “Priapic Punishments in Petronius' *Satyrica* 16–26.” *Syllecta Classica* 18.1, 2007, pp. 213-224.
90. ---. “The Introduction of Characters in Petronius.” *At the Crossroads of Greco-Roman History, Culture, and Religion: Papers in Memory of Carin MC Green*, edited by Sinclair Bell and Lora L. Holland, 2018, pp. 133-154.

91. Hadot, Ilsetraut. *Seneca und die Griechisch-Römische Tradition der Seelenleitung*. Walter de Gruyter, 1969.
92. Hadot, Pierre, and Arnold Ira Davidson. *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises From Socrates to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
93. Hallett, Judith. "Anxiety and Influence: Ovid *Amores* 3.7 and Encolpius' Impotence in *Satyricon* 126 ff." *Narrating desire: eros, sex, and gender in the ancient novel*, edited by Pinheiro, Marília P. Futre, Marilyn B. Skinner, and Froma I. Zeitlin. Walter de Gruyter, 2012, pp. 211-222.
94. Hansen, William F. *Ariadne's Thread: A Guide to International Tales Found in Classical Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.
95. Harrison, Stephen J. "The Milesian tales and the Roman novel." *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*. Vol. 9., 1998, pp. 61-73.
96. ---. "The Novel." *A Companion to Latin Literature*, edited by Stephen Harrison, Blackwell Publishing, 2007, pp. 213-222.
97. Haynes, Holly. "The Tyrant Lists: Tacitus' Obituary of Petronius." *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 131, no. 1, 2010, pp. 69–99.
98. Herzog, Reinhart. "Fest, Terror und Tod in Petrons *Satyrica*." *Das Fest*, edited by W. Haug and R. Warnings. München: Wilhelm Fink, 1989, pp. 120-150.
99. Highet, Gilbert. "Petronius the Moralist." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, vol. 72, 1941, pp. 176–194.
100. Hill, Timothy D. *Ambitiosa Mors: Suicide and the Self in Roman Thought and Literature*. Routledge, 2004.
101. Homer and D. B. Monro and T. W. Allen, editors. *Oxford Classical Texts: Homer Vol. I Iliad (Books 1-12)*. Clarendon Press, 1963.
102. ---. *Oxford Classical Texts: Homer Vol. II Iliad (Books 13-24)*. Clarendon Press, 1963.
103. ---. *Oxford Classical Texts: Homer Vol. III Odyssey (Books 1-12)*. Clarendon Press, 1963.
104. ---. *Oxford Classical Texts: Homer Vol. IV Odyssey (Books 13-24)*. Clarendon Press, 1963.
105. Hope, Valerie. "Contempt and Respect: The Treatment of the Corpse in Ancient Rome." *Death and disease in the Ancient City*, edited by Valerie Hope and Eireann Marshall, Routledge, 2000, pp. 104-127.
106. ---. *Death in ancient Rome: A Sourcebook*. Routledge, 2007.
107. ---. *Roman death: The Dying and the Dead in Ancient Rome*. Continuum, 2009.
108. ---. "A Sense of Grief." *Senses of the Empire*, edited by Eleanor Betts, Routledge, 2017, pp. 86-103.
109. Hope, Valerie and Eireann Marshall, editors. *Death and Disease in the Ancient City*. Routledge, 2000.
110. Hope, Valerie and Janet Huskinson. *Memory and Mourning: Studies on Roman Death*. Oxbow Books, 2011.
111. Hopfner, Theodor *Das Sexualleben der Griechen Und Römer: Von Den Anfängen bis ins 6. Jahrhundert nach Christus, auf Grund der Literarischen Quellen, der Inschriften, der Papyri und der Gegenstände der bildenden Kunst Systematisch—quellenmässig dargestellt*. Prag, J.G. Calve, 1938.
112. Hopkins, Keith. *Death and Renewal*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
113. Hopkins, Keith, and Mary Beard. *The Colosseum.* Harvard University Press, 2005.

114. Horace and Wickham, E. C., editor and Garrod, H.W., editor second edition. *Oxford Classical Texts: Horace Opera*. Clarendon Press, 1963.
115. Horsfall, Nicholas. *The Culture of the Roman Plebs*. Bristol Classical Press, 2003.
116. Hyde, Roy. "Greece and Rome Come together: Later Literature." *Classical Literature: An Introduction*, Routledge, 2011, pp. 342-375.
117. Huxley, H. H. "Storm and Shipwreck in Roman Literature." *Greece & Rome*, vol. 21, no. 63, 1952, pp. 117–124.
118. Jašková, Nina. "Parody and Irony in the Works of Petronius: Encolpius' Wandering." *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*. 2010, vol. 15, iss. 2, pp. 81-90.
119. Jensson, Gottskálk. "The Satyrica of Petronius as a Roman palimpsest." *Ancient Narrative* 2, 2002, pp. 86-122.
120. ---. *The Recollections of Encolpius: the Satyrica of Petronius as Milesian Fiction*. Barkhuis, 2004.
121. Johnston, Sarah Iles. *Religions of the Ancient World*. Harvard University Press, 2004.
122. ---. *Restless dead: Encounters between the living and the dead in ancient Greece*. Univ of California Press, 2013.
123. Keenan, James. "Tacitus, Roman Wills and Political Freedom." *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists*, vol. 24, no. 1/2, 1987, pp. 1–8.
124. Kiefer, Otto. *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome.* Routledge, 2001.
125. King, Charles William. *The Living and the Dead: Ancient Roman Conceptions of the Afterlife*. Diss. University of Chicago, Department of History, 1998.
126. Klebs, Elimar. "Zur Composition von Petronius' *Satirae*." *Philologus,* vol. 47, 1889, pp. 623-635.
127. Knight, W F. J. *Elysion: On Ancient Greek and Roman Beliefs Concerning a Life After Death*. London: Rider, 1970.
128. Konstan, David, "Epicurus." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, 2018, (Online Resource Accessed August 5, 2020).
129. Kragelund, Patrick. "Epicurus, Priapus and the Dreams in Petronius." *The Classical Quarterly* 39.2, 1989, pp. 436-450.
130. Kyle, Donald G. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. Psychology Press, 1998.
131. Labate, M. "Il cadavere di Lica. Modelli letterari e istanza narrativa nel *Satyricon* di *Petronio*." *Taccuini*, 8, 1990, pp. 83-89.
132. Laes, Christian. "What's in a Single? Roman Antiquity and a Comparative World Approach." *The Single Life in the Roman and Later Roman World*, edited by Sabine R. Huebner and Christian Laes, Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 3–34.
133. Laks, André and Most, Glenn W., editors and tranlators. *Early Greek Philosophy, Volume V: Western Greek Thinkers, Part 2*. Loeb Classical Library 528. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016.
134. Langlands, Rebecca. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, 2006.
135. Lattimore, Richmond Alexander. *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs*. University of Illinois Press, 1942.
136. Leeman, A. D. "Morte e scambio nel romanzo picaresco di Petronio." *Giornale italiano di filologia: rivista trimestrale di cultura* 20, 1967, pp. 147-157.
137. Lefèvre, Eckard. *Studien zur Struktur der "Milesischen" Novelle bei Petron und Apuleius*. Stuttgart: Fr. Steiner, 1997.

138. Levick, Barbara. “The Senatus Consultum from Larinum.” *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. 73, 1983, pp. 97–115.
139. Lindsey, Hugh. “The Cost of Dying at Rome.” *Ancient History Resources for Teachers* 31.1, 2001, p. 17.
140. Lomas, Kathryn. *Rome and the Western Greeks, 350 BC - AD 200: Conquest and Acculturation in Southern Italy*. Routledge, 1993.
141. Long, Anthony Arthur. “Roman philosophy.” *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*, edited by David Sedley, 2003, pp. 184-210.
142. Lorenz, Hendrik, “Ancient Theories of Soul.” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, 2009, (Online Resource Accessed June 2, 2020).
143. Lucian and M.D. Macleod. *Oxford Classical Texts Oxford*: *Luciani Opera, Vols. 1-4*. Oxford University Press, 2016
144. Luck, Georg. *Arcana Mundi: Magic and the Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A Collection of Ancient Texts*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
145. Maclean, Rose. “A Petronian Brothel in The Great Gatsby.” *Ancient Narrative*, 2016, pp. 17-35.
146. McDermott, Hubert. *Novel and Romance: The “Odyssey” to “Tom Jones.”* Springer, 1989.
147. McGinn, Thomas A. J. *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
148. McGlathery, Daniel B. “The Tomb of Epic: Bakhtinian Parody and Petronius’ Tale of the Widow of Ephesus.”*Carnivalizing Difference: Bakhtin and the Other*, edited by Peter I. Barta et al. Routledge, 2001, pp. 119-140.
149. McLaren, Angus. *Impotence: A Cultural History*. University of Chicago Press, 2007.
150. McMahon, John M. *Paralysin Cave: Impotence, Perception, and Text in the* Satyrica *of Petronius*. Brill, 1998.
151. Minazio, Marie-Claude. “La maison-piege de Trimalcion.” Genève, 1975, pp. 91-117.
152. Mommsen, T. “Trimalchios Heimath und Grabschrift.” *Hermes*, 1878, pp. 106-121.
153. Monella, Paola. “‘*Non humana viscera sed centies sestertium comesse*’ (Petr, *Sat*. 141,7): Philomela and the Cannibal *Herdipetae* in the Crotonian Section of Petronius’ Satyricon 223-238.” *Intende, Lector - Echoes of Myth, Religion and Ritual in the Ancient Novel*, edited by Marília P. Futre Pinheiro, et al. Walter de Gruyter, 2013, pp. 223-236.
154. Mordine, Michael. “Odyssean Adventures in the *Cena Trimalchionis*.” *Classical Antiquity*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2013, pp. 176–199.
155. Morgan, J. R. “Petronius and Greek literature.” *Petronius: A Handbook*, edited by Ian Prag and Jonathan Repath, 2009, pp. 32-47.
156. Morris, Ian. *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
157. Mouritsen, Henrik. “Freedmen and Decurions: Epitaphs and Social History in Imperial Italy.” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 95, 2005, pp. 38-63.
158. Müller, Carl Werner. “Die Witwe von Ephesus-Petrons Novelle und die “Milesiaka” des Aristeides.” *Antike und Abendland* 26.2, 1980, p. 103.
159. Murgatroyd, P. “Petronius, ‘Satyricon’ 132.” *Latomus*, vol. 59, no. 2, 2000, pp. 346–352.
160. Newton, Rick M. “Trimalchio's Hellish Bath.” *The Classical Journal*, vol. 77, no. 4, 1982, pp. 315–319.

161. Nido, Daniel. “Pierre Hadot on Habit, Reason, and Spiritual Exercises.” *Journal of Religious Ethics*, vol. 46, iss. 1, 2018, pp. 7-36.
162. Noyes, Russell. “Seneca on Death.” *Journal of Religion and Health*, vol. 12, no. 3, 1973, pp. 223–240.
163. Nussbaum, Martha C. “Mortal Immortals: Lucretius on Death and the Voice of Nature.” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 50, no. 2, 1989, pp. 303–351.
164. Oliphant, Samuel Grant. “The Story of the Strix: Ancient.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, vol. 44, 1913, pp. 133–149.
165. Oliver, Graham John. *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*. Liverpool University Press, 2000.
166. Ovid and Richard J. Tarrant, editors. *Oxford Classical Texts: P. Ovidi Nasonis: Metamorphoses*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
167. Panayotakis, Costas. “A Sacred Ceremony in Honour of the Buttocks: Petronius, *Satyrica* 140.1-11.” *The Classical Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 2, 1994, pp. 458–467.
168. ---. *Theatrum Arbitri: Theatrical Elements in the* Satyrica *of Petronius*. Brill, 1995.
169. ---. “Petronius and the Roman Literary Tradition.” *Petronius: A Handbook* edited by Ian Repath and Jonathan Prag, 2009, pp. 48-64.
170. Paschalis, Michael. “The Afterlife of Emperor Claudius in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*.” *Numen*, vol. 56, no. 2/3, 2009, pp. 198–216.
171. Paschalis, Michael, Stelios Panayotakis, and Gareth L. Schmeling, editors. *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel*. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing, 2009.
172. Patterson, John R. “Patronage, Collegia and Burial in Imperial Rome.” *Death in Towns: Urban Responses to the Dying and the Dead 100-1600*, edited by Steven Basset, Leicester University Press, 1992, pp. 15-27.
173. Pecere, Oronzo. *Petronio, la novella della Matrona di Efeso*. Padova: Antenore, 1975.
174. Perry, Ben Edwin. “Demetrius of Phalerum and the Aesopic Fables.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 93, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962.
175. Petersmann, Hubert. *Lingua et Religio: Ausgewählte kleine Schriften zur antiken Religionsgeschichte auf sprachwissenschaftlicher Grundlage*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.
176. Petronius and K. Müller, editor, W. Ehlers translator. *Satyrica*. Munich, 1983.
177. Petrovic, Andrej. “Under Full Sail: Trimalchio's Way into Eternity. A Note on Petr. *Sat*. 71.9-10.” *Acta Antiqua* 45.1, 2005, pp. 85-90.
178. Pinheiro, Marília P. Futre, et al, editors. *Narrating Desire: Eros, Sex, and Gender in the Ancient Novel*. Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
179. Platt, Verity. “Framing the Dead on Roman Sarcophagi.” *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 61/62, 2012, pp. 213–227.
180. Plaza, Maria. *Laughter and Derision in Petronius’* Satyrica: *A Literary Study*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2000.
181. Plutarch. *Plutarch's Morals*. Translated from the Greek by several hands. Corrected and revised by William W. Goodwin, PH. D. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1874, 3.
182. Popović, Mladen. *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism*. Brill, 2007.
183. Prag, Jonathan. “Cave Navem.” *Classical Quarterly*, 2006, pp. 538-547.
184. Prag, Jonathan, and Ian Repath, editors. *Petronius: A Handbook*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

185. Preston, Keith. “Some sources of comic effect in Petronius.” *Classical Philology 10.3*, 1915: 260-269.
186. Price, Simon. “From Noble Funerals to Divine Cult: The Consecration of Roman Emperors.” In *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial inTtraditional Societies*, edited by David Cannadine and Simon Price, 1987, pp. 56-105.
187. Priuli, S. *Ascyltos*. Brussels, 1975.
188. Pyy, Elina. “Tracing Roman Ideas on Female Singleness: Virgil’s *Aeneid*.” *The Single Life in the Roman and Later Roman World*, edited by Sabine R. Huebner and Christian Laes, Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 147–164.
189. Raith, Oskar. *Petronius, ein Epikureer*. Nuremburg, 1963.
190. Rankin, Herbert D. “‘Eating People Is Right’: Petronius 141 and a τόπος.” *Hermes*, 1969, pp. 381-384.
191. Rauh, Stanly H. “Cato at Utica: The Emergence of a Roman Suicide Tradition.” *American Journal of Philology*, vol. 139 no. 1, 2018, p. 59-91.
192. Relihan, Joel C. *Ancient Menippean Satire*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
193. Renger, Almut-Barbara, and Alessandro Stavru, editors. *Pythagorean Knowledge from the Ancient to the Modern World: Askesis, Religion, Science.* Harrassowitz Verlag*,* 2016*.*
194. Richlin, Amy. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. Oxford University Press, 1992.
195. ---. “Emotional work: Lamenting the Roman Dead.” *Essays in Honor of Gordon Williams: Twenty-Five Years at Yale*, edited by Elizabeth Tylawsky and Charles Weiss. New Haven: Henry R. Schwab Publishers, 2001, pp. 229-248.
196. ---. “Sex in the Satyrica: Outlaws in Literature Land.” *Petronius: A Handbook*, edited by Jonathan Prag, and Ian D. Repath, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 82-100.
197. Rimell, Victoria*. Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
198. Roller, Lynn. “Religions of Greece and Asia Minor.” *The Cambridge History of Religions in the Ancient World. Volume II from the Hellenistic Age to Late Antiquity*, edited by Michele Renee Salzman and William Adler. Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 295-320.
199. Rose, K.F.C. *The Date and Author of the Satyricon*. D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1962.
200. Rosivach, Vincent. “*Anus*: Some Older Women in Latin Literature.” *The Classical World* 88.2, 1994, pp. 107-117.
201. Rudich, Vasily. *Political Dissidence Under Nero: The Price of Dissimulation*. Routledge, 2005.
202. ---. *Dissidence and Literature Under Nero: The Price of Rhetoricization*. Routledge, 2013.
203. Saller, Richard P. “Men's Age at Marriage and Its Consequences in the Roman Family.” *Classical Philology*, vol. 82, no. 1, 1987, pp. 21–34.
204. ---. “*Pietas*, Obligation, and Authority in the Roman Family.” *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaft: Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 65 Geburstag*, edited by P. Kneissl and V. Losemann, Darmstadt, 1988, pp. 393-410.
205. ---. *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman family*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

206. Salonius, Aarne Henrik. *Die Griechen und das Griechische in Petrons* Cena *Trimalchionis*. Centraltryck, 1927.
207. Salzman, Michele Renee. "Religion in Rome and Italy from the Late Republic Through Late Antiquity." *The Cambridge History of Religions in the Ancient World. Volume II from the Hellenistic Age to Late Antiquity*, edited by Michele Renee Salzman and William Adler. Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 371-397.
208. Saylor, Charles. "Funeral Games: The Significance of Games in the 'Cena Trimalchionis'." *Latomus* 46. Fasc. 3, 1987, pp. 593-602.
209. Schmeling, Gareth. "The 'Satyricon': The Sense of an Ending." *Rheinisches Museum Für Philologie*, vol. 134, no. 3/4, 1991, pp. 352–377.
210. ---. "*Quid attinet veritatem per interpretem quaerere*? *Interpretes* and the *Satyricon*." *Ramus* 23.1-2, 1994, pp. 144-168.
211. ---., editor. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Brill, 1996.
212. ---. "Battle of Banquets." *Materiali e Discussioni per L'analisi Dei Testi Classici*, no. 44, 2000, pp. 217–220.
213. ---. *A Commentary on the Satyrica of Petronius*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
214. ---. "Confessor Gloriosus: A Role of Encolpius in the *Satyrica*." *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 20, 2016, pp. 207-224.
215. Schuster, Mauriz. "Der Werwolf und die Hexen: Zwei Schauermächen bei Petronius." *Wiener Studien*, 48, 1930, pp. 149-78
216. ---. "Sachliche und sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Petrons Märchen." *Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1931, pp. 49-51.
217. Scobie, Alex. "Some Folktales in Graeco-Roman and Far Eastern Sources." *Philologus* 121.1, 1977, pp. 1-23.
218. Sedley, David, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
219. Segal, Charles. *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety: Poetry and Philosophy in* De Rerum Natura. Princeton University Press, 1990.
220. Seneca, Lucius Annaeus and L. D. Reynolds, ed. *Oxford Classical Texts: L. Annaei Senecae: Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales: Volume I: Books I-XIII.* Oxford University Press, 1965.
221. ---. *Oxford Classical Texts: L. Annaei Senecae: Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales: Volume II: Books XIV-XX.* Oxford University Press, 1965.
222. Setaioli, Aldo. "La poesia in Petr. *Sat*. 79.8." Prometheus. *Rivista di studi classici* 27.2, 2001, pp.136-144.
223. ---. "I due 'epigrammi'di Trimalchione:(Petr. Sat. 34.10, 55.3)." *Prometheus. Rivista di studi classici* 30.1, 2004, pp. 43-66.
224. Shaw, B.D. "The Family in Late Antiquity: The Experience of Augustine." *Past and Present* 115, 1987, pp. 3-51.
225. Shey, H. J. "Petronius and Plato's Gorgias." *The Classical Bulletin*, vol. 47, no. 6, 1971, pp. 81-84.
226. Silk, M S. *Aristophanes and the Definition of Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
227. Slater, Niall W. *Reading Petronius*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
228. Solin, Heikki. *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom: ein namenbuch*. Vol. 2 Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

229. Spencer, Diana. *Roman Landscape: Culture and Identity*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
230. Stefenelli, Arnulf. *Die Volkssprache im Werk des Petron im Hinblick auf die romanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 1. Braumüller, 1962.
231. Stewart, Susan. "The Epistemology of the Horror Story." *The Journal of American Folklore,* vol. 95, no. 375, 1982, pp. 33–50.
232. Strong, Anise K. *Prostitutes and Matrons in the Roman World*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
233. Stubbe, Heinz. *Die Verseinlagen im Petron*. Dieterich, 1933.
234. Sullivan, John Patrick. *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study*. Indiana University Press, 1968.
235. Sumi, Geoffrey S. "Impersonating the Dead: Mimes at Roman funerals." *American Journal of Philology* 123.4, 2002, pp. 559-585.
236. Synnott, Anthony. *The Body Social*. Routledge, 2002.
237. Szantyr, A, and Hofmann, J.B. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: Beck, 1965.
238. Tatum, James. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
239. Toynbee, Jocelyn. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
240. Treggiari, Susan. *Roman Marriage:* Iusti Coniuges *from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Clarendon, 1991.
241. Trenkner, Sophie. *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*. Cambridge University Press, 1958.
242. Turcan, Robert. *The Cults of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
243. Vermeule, Cornelius C. "A Greek Theme and Its Survivals: The Ruler's Shield (Tondo Image) in Tomb and Temple." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 109, no. 6, 1965, pp. 361–397.
244. Veyne, Paul. "Le'je'dans le *Satiricon*." *REL* 42, 1964, p. 301.
245. Virgil and Sir Roger Mynors, editor. *Oxford Classical Texts: Virgil Opera*. Clarendon Press, 1969.
246. Völker, Thomas, and Dirk Rohmann. "'Praenomen Petronii': The Date and Author of the *Satyricon* Reconsidered." *The Classical Quarterly* 61.2, 2011, pp. 660-676.
247. Waldner, Katharina. "Dimensions of Individuality in Ancient Mystery Cults: Religious Practice and Philosophical Discourse." *The Individual in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean* edited by Jörg Rüpke, Oxford University Press, 2013, pp. 215-42.
248. Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. "*Mutatas Formas*: The Augustan Transformation of Roman Knowledge." *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by Karl Galinsky, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005, pp. 55–84.
249. Walsh, P.G. *The Roman Novel: The 'Satyricon' of Petronius and the 'Metamorphoses' of Apuleius*. Cambridge University Press, 1970.
250. Warren, James. *Facing Death: Epicurus and His Critics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.
251. Weaver, P. R. C. "Social Mobility in the Early Roman Empire: The Evidence of the Imperial Freedmen and Slaves." *Past & Present*, no. 37, 1967, pp. 3-20.
252. Whitehead, Jane. "The 'Cena Trimalchionis' and Biographical Narration in Roman Middle Class Art." *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, edited by Peter J. Holiday, 1993, pp. 299-325.

253. Wilcox, Amanda. “Exemplary Grief: Gender and Virtue in Seneca's Consolations to Women.” *Helios* 33.1, 2006, 73-100.
254. Zeitlin, Froma I. “Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. Vol. 102, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971, pp. 631-684.