Classical Quarterly **39** (ii) 436–450 (1989) *Printed in Great Britain*

EPICURUS, PRIAPUS AND THE DREAMS IN PETRONIUS*

[*Lichas*] 'videbatur mihi secundum quietem Priapus dicere: "Encolpion quod quaeris, scito a me in navem tuam esse perductum".' exhorruit Tryphaena et 'putes' inquit 'una nos dormiisse; nam et mihi simulacrum Neptuni, quod Bais ⟨in⟩ tetrastylo notaveram, videbatur dicere: "in nave Lichae Gitona invenies".' 'hinc scies' inquit Eumolpus 'Epicurum hominem esse divinum, qui eiusmodi ludibria facetissima ratione condemnat.' ⟨*⟩ ceterum Lichas ut Tryphaenae somnium expiavit: 'quis' inquit 'prohibet navigium scrutari, ne videamur divinae mentis opera damnare?' (Petr. *Sat.* 104.1–4)

Priapus and Epicurus have frequently been claimed to be major influences, each in their particular way, on the plot and composition of the *Satyrica*.

In the work as extant one of the episodes which most clearly bear witness to the importance of that incongruous pair is the dream narrative quoted above. Their appearance together in this passage has however attracted surprisingly little interest.[1] Claiming that the main function of the reference to Epicurus is to 'delay the dénouement' and to indicate the 'philosophical allegiance of the heroes', J. P. Sullivan and P. G. Walsh for instance refrained from commenting further upon the philosophical and narratological implications.[2] But it is far more surprising that others, while adducing the passage as proof that the author adhered to the Epicurean school, have been equally uninterested in clarifying why Eumolpus is suddenly reminded of Epicurus, and what precisely his reference to the philosopher's 'highly witty manner' (*facetissima ratione*) could imply.[3]

A closer look at this dream narrative seems in order. My approach will be divided into four sections. The first offers an attempt to clarify the meaning of Eumolpus' sudden invocation of Epicurus. When taken in conjunction with some of the recently excavated fragments of the great Epicurean inscription from Oenoanda, the episode will, as I hope to show, shed a fresh light on a controversial aspect of Epicurus' theory of dreams.

* I am indebted to Ivan Boserup, Amanda Claridge, Nicholas Horsfall, Kristian Jensen and an anonymous referee for their critical comments, linguistic as well as factual, on earlier drafts of this article.

References to *Epicurea*, Epicurus, Petronius, and Pseudo-Quintilian, are to the editions of H. Usener (Leipzig, 1887; repr. Stuttgart, 1966), G. Arrighetti (Torino, 1973²), K. Müller (München/Zürich, 1983²) and L. Håkanson (Stuttgart, 1982).

The following studies will be cited by author's or editor's name alone:

G. Guidorizzi (ed.), *Il sogno in Grecia* (Bari, 1988)

H. Herter, *De Priapo*, RGVV 23 (1932)

P. Kragelund, 'Antikke drømmeteorier – og Freuds', *Museum Tusculanum* 40–3 (1980), 365ff.

O. Raith, *Petronius, ein Epikureer* (Nürnberg, 1963)

J. P. Sullivan, *The 'Satyricon' of Petronius* (London, 1968)

O. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder*, RGVV 8.1 (1909; repr. Berlin, 1969)

[1] Apart from here Epicurus is mentioned only in cap. 132.15 (quoted p. 449). For the debate *pro et contra* Petronius' adherence to the school, see Raith and V. Gigante, *Vichiana* 9 (1980), 61ff. (with prev. lit.); for the role of Priapus, E. Klebs, *Philol.* 67 (1889), 623ff. with the comments of E. Courtney, *Philol.* 106 (1962), 95f. and Sullivan, pp. 92–3.

[2] Sullivan, p. 193; cf. p. 110; P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 100 n. 3.

[3] G. Highet, *TAPA* 72 (1941), 185, E. Cizek, *L'époque de Néron et ses controverses idéologiques* (Leiden, 1972), pp. 249f. and C. Piano, 'La moralità epicurea del Satyricon', *RAAN* 51 (1976), 3ff. invoke but do not discuss the passage; in this as in other respects, the study by Raith is a salutary exception (cf. n. 32).

Dreams are also central to the following sections. While the second comments briefly on the dream simile in cap. 128 and on the catalogue of dreams commonly ascribed to Petronius (fr. 30), the third examines the dream account and the ensuing *pervigilium Priapi* of the priestess Quartilla (17ff.). The epilogue will argue that these five dream accounts, when seen together, provide a new means for assessing the nature of Petronius' problematic 'Epicureanism'.

I. THE DREAMS OF LICHAS AND TRYPHAENA

The episode quoted above forms part of Encolpius' and Giton's maritime adventures (cap. 100ff.). Having just escaped one predicament, the two heroes of course immediately land themselves in another: the ship on which they have hidden turns out to belong to their arch-enemy Lichas. Encolpius and Giton are trapped 'in the Cyclops' cave' (101.7).[4] From this point the narrative rapidly moves towards their final detection. Ironically, it is their very disguise which proves their undoing. The plan to dress up as runaway slaves involves shaving off their hair – but to shave on board ship is an ill-omened act demanding severe expiation.[5] A flogging scene ensues. Then their identity is revealed, in memorable fashion. Tryphaena recognizes Giton by hearing his cries and Lichas Encolpius by fondling his penis. As the narrator concludes:

miretur nunc aliquis Ulixis nutricem post vicesimum annum cicatricem invenisse originis indicem (105.10).

In preparation for this burlesque recognition, Petronius had recourse to a double dream: both Lichas and Tryphaena dreamt that they would meet their former lovers on board the ship. The introduction of this narrative device seems a deliberate echo.[6] One is instantly reminded of parallel scenes in Greek novels, a genre with which the *Satyrica* exhibits close affinities.[7] Indeed there appears to have been no other genre which so frequently employed this type of scene.[8] Given the tendency of the novel to

[4] cf. P. Fedeli, *MD* 6 (1981), 91ff.

[5] On the ritual (Petronius' invention?), see F. M. Fröhlke, *RhM* 123 (1980), 355ff.; on its narrative function, M. Scarola, *AFLB* 29 (1986), 39ff.

[6] Pithou (quoted by Burman, 1743) had already adduced Achilles Tatius 4.1; for further discussion, see C. Stöcker, *Humor bei Petron* (Diss.; Nürnberg, 1969), p. 51; F. M. Fröhlke, *Petron. Struktur und Wirklichkeit* (Frankfurt, 1972), p. 42 and J. Adamietz, 'Zum literarischen Charakter von Petrons *Satyrica*', *RhM* 130 (1987), 325 (with prev. lit.).

[7] Thus originally R. Heinze, 'Petron und der griechische Roman', *Vom Geist des Römertums* (Darmstadt, 1972), pp. 417ff. (= *Hermes* 34 (1899), 494ff.); even if one may disagree on particulars, it now seems commonly accepted (cf. e.g. T. Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 171ff.; N. Holzberg, *Der antike Roman* (München/Zürich, 1986), pp. 73ff. and J. Adamietz, art. cit. (n. 6), 329ff.) and few will for instance speak of the *Satyrica*'s 'chance resemblance to ... later Greek romances' (J. P. Sullivan, *ANRW* II.32.3 (1985), 1668). For all the uncertainty, the intriguing Iolaus fragment published by P. Parsons, *Bull. Inst. Class. Studies* 18 (1971), 53ff. and the likewise prosimetric Copenhagen papyrus published by M. W. Haslam, 'Narrative about Tinouphis in prosimetrum', *Papyri Greek and Egyptian edited ... in honour of E. G. Turner* (London, 1981), pp. 35ff. can only add strength to the assumption of Greek parallels to Petronius; for an inspiring survey, see A. Barchiesi, 'Tracce di narrativa greca e romanzo latino: una rassegna', *Semiotica della novella latina: Atti del seminario ... Perugia 11–13 aprile 1985* (Roma, 1986), pp. 219ff.

[8] Unfortunately, the survey by A. Wikenhauser, 'Doppelträume', *Biblica* 29 (1948), 100ff. ignores the evidence from the Greek novel; on which, see F. Weinstock, 'De somniorum visionumque in amatoriis Graecorum fabulis vi atque usu', *Eos* 35 (1934), 29ff. Although, for instance, historians and the narratives of miraculous healing (cf. S. Nicosia, 'L'autobiografia onirica di Elio Aristide' = G. Guidorizzi (ed.), p. 181) provide parallels, the device is to my knowledge far less characteristic of any other genre.

focus on the vicissitudes of two protagonists this is not surprising. The double dream is in a number of respects a highly useful narrative device. In some cases it foreshadows the final reunion of hero and heroine; in others it strengthens their dedication to chastity[9] or triggers an anagnorisis.[10]

There is undoubtedly an irony in the fact that Petronius' introduction of this divine apparatus serves a far less edifying purpose: no question here of foreshadowing a final reunion or strengthening anyone's dedication to chastity. But the scene would also have suggested a contrast to the ordinary novel in another respect. In that genre double dreams were commonly celebrated as manifestations of divine intervention.[11] This is clearly an aspect which the reader also is expected to keep in mind. Admittedly the two prophetic dreams are at first remarkably ineffective in influencing the course of action. Eumolpus' argument seems to have impressed Tryphaena (cf. 106.3), and even if Lichas insists on searching the ship as soon as he has expiated[12] the omen, his *ne videamur divinae mentis opera damnare* (104.4) has a despondent ring – but events soon give the lie to the Epicurean scepticism. Lichas' pious insistence that the sacrilegious stowaways should be flogged triggers their recognition. Once the prophecies have proved correct Lichas therefore becomes exultant. All doubts have now been dispelled. The miracle should forever silence those who reject the belief in divine providence. *Deus ... nihil agit*, claims Epicurus.[13] But had not the gods, by means of the two dreams, revealed the presence on board ship of Encolpius and Giton?

'deos immortales rerum humanarum agere curam, puto, intellexisti, o Tryphaena. nam imprudentes noxios in nostrum induxere navigium, et quid fecissent admonuerunt pari somniorum consensu. ita vide ut possit illis ignosci, quos ad poenam ipse deus deduxit ...' (106.3)

Apparently a god did intervene. Yet, given Petronius' otherwise irreverent handling of even the most venerable literary conventions, it would surely be odd if these dreams were indeed intended to suggest that Providence ultimately ordains all for the best. Nor can that have been his intention: what in this scene masquerades as divine Providence is in fact nothing but self-deluding desire. As indicated by a lexicographical detail, both dreams belong to the type in which the dreamer finds fulfilment of his innermost needs.[14] Throughout Latin literature writers would employ in such dreams verbs like *quaero*[15] or *invenio*[16] to designate what a particular person wished or

[9] Longus 1.7 (love and marriage); Achilles Tatius 4.1 (chastity).

[10] F. Weinstock, art. cit. (n. 8), 66 quotes Longus 4.34f.; Heliodor 4.12; 9.25; 10.3; Apul. *Met.* 11.3–6; 13 and 22; 27.

[11] cf. e.g. Longus 1.8; 4.36 (*πρόνοια θεῶν*); Apul. *Met.* 11.5; 27 (*providentia*).

[12] Arguing that it is 'strange that Lichas should first "expiate" Tryphaena's dream, and only then take steps to see if it was true', R. G. M. Nisbet, *JRS* 52 (1962), 231 proposed to read *expiaret* for *expiavit*; yet, even if not completely parallel, Tib. 1.5.13f.; [Sen.] *Oct.* 758; Suet. *Galba* 18.2; Plut. *Mor.* 165f–166 indicate that one would promptly turn to expiation if a prophecy seemed threatening. What I do not comprehend is Lichas' reason for seeing Tryphaena's dream as a threat to himself. Jealousy? Or should one follow J. Delz, *MH* 38 (1981), 63 in emending *expiavit* to *expavit* (for a parallel construction, see 23.2 *ut ... congemuit, eiusmodi versus effudit: 'huc, huc ...'*)?

[13] Sen. *Ben.* 4.4.1.

[14] On this category of dream, see Kragelund, 366ff.

[15] Lucr. 4.1097 *ut bibere in somnis sitiens cum quaerit*; *PLM* 4.103.1 *te vigilans oculis, animo te nocte requiro*; similarly, Macrob. *Somn. Scip.* 1.3.4 and Porphyrion *in Hor. Carm.* 4.1.37 (quoted in n. 16; 56).

[16] Petronius, fr. 30.11 *condit avarus opes defossumque invenit aurum*; [Ov.] *Her.* 15.125 *Illic* (*sc.* in somnis) *te invenio, quamquam regionibus absis*; Porphyrion *in Hor. Carm.* 4.1.37 and Macrob. *Somn. Scip.* 1.3.4. *esuriens cibum aut potum sitiens desiderare, quaerere vel etiam invenisse videatur.*

desired. It is hardly coincidental that Petronius uses the very same verbs in this context. For all the divine machinery, both dreams are thereby revealed as belonging to the category in which the hungry find food, the greedy gold, and lovers fulfilment.

The implications are clear: Lichas still seeks (*quaeris*) and yearns for Encolpius. That it is Priapus who guarantees the fulfilment of his wishes is a witty conceit. Even if it is unclear to what extent, the angry god is certainly a major factor in Encolpius' past and future troubles. However, his appearance is probably also intended to throw an ironic light on Lichas' attitude to Encolpius.[17] To judge from priapic poetry it was in him that the impotent, frustrated or hopeful would place their trust. Whether or not Lichas' name[18] is intended to declare him a *fellator*, the fact that he addresses his enthusiastic salutation *salve Encolpi* (105.9) to the naked hero's penis is certainly in keeping with his presumed devotion to the phallic god.

A vision would commonly strike the beholder with fear or wonder[19] – and awestruck (*exhorruit*) Tryphaena exclaims *putes una nos dormiisse*. Presumably, one is more likely to receive similar or identical divine admonition when sharing the same bed[20] – but given Tryphaena's lifestyle, irony is probably already here creeping in.[21] If she had slept with the captain, one would readily understand why she had dreamt of a ship, of her lover, and of Neptune.[22] It merely heightens the fun that her dream, like Lichas', conforms to the most venerable patterns. Often it was a celebrated *simulacrum*[23] which visited the sleeper – and, in view of the maritime setting and immoral implications of the episode, the Neptune from licentious Baiae is a suitable conveyor of the auspicious message, *Gitona invenies*. The verb again shows up the fact that the motivation of the dream is erotic; so, of course, does Giton's 'speaking' name.[24] Despite previous humiliations Tryphaena still fancies the boy – and when he insincerely (the weapon is blunt) but with great dramatic effect threatens to castrate himself, thereby removing *tot miseriarum causam* (108.10), it is characteristically Tryphaena who averts the disaster.

Thus both dreams form integral parts of the parallel erotic plots. Far from constituting a traditional but badly integrated[25] motif, they wittily deflate an edifying novelistic convention and prepare the parodic anagnorisis.

What remains problematic is Epicurus' role in all this. What exactly is Eumolpus' point in arguing 'hinc scies Epicurum hominem esse divinum qui eiusmodi ludibria facetissima ratione condemnat' (104.3)?

It has commonly been assumed that Eumolpus merely intended to evoke Epicurus'

[17] Herter, p. 223.

[18] On the possibly obscene connotations, see Sullivan, p. 228 and S. Priuli, *Ascyltus. Nota di onomastica petroniana*, Coll. Latomus 140 (1975), p. 59; others argue for a Sophoclean allusion (cf. A. Barchiesi, *MD* 12 [1984], 169ff.). The one need not exclude the other.

[19] cf. F. Pfister, s.v. 'Epiphanie', *RE. Suppl.* 4 (1924), 317–18; similarly, to deceive Claudius, Narcissus and Messalina professed with *admiratio* to have dreamt identical dreams: Suet. *Claud.* 37.2.

[20] cf. Dracontius, *Orestis Tragoedia* 554–5 where the hero and his friend receive similar admonitions while sleeping in each other's arms: *dum narrare parat* (*sc.* Orestes) *sua somnia noscit ab ipso* (*sc.* Pylades)/ *ac stupet attonitus.*

[21] E. Paratore, *Il Satyricon di Petronio I–II* (Firenze, 1932), p. 336 n. 1 likewise suspects a *double entendre.*

[22] cf. [Sen.] *Oct.* 742–4: *coniugem thalamos toros/ vidisse te miraris amplexu novi/ haerens mariti?* (the nurse interpreting Poppaea's wedding-night dream).

[23] cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 15.653ff.; Suet. *Aug.* 94.8; Amm. Mar. 20.5.10; on 'seeing the gods', see now R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (Harmondsworth, 1986), pp. 102ff.

[24] S. Priuli, op. cit. (n. 18), p. 50.

[25] *Contra*, F. M. Fröhlke, op. cit. (n. 6), p. 42, according to whom Petronius failed to integrate the motif, perhaps because *ihm* (*sc.* Petronius) *ein Abgleiten ins Numinose missfiel.*

well-known rejection of divination.[26] This, he might hope, would prevent the two boys from being detected. Yet, as we shall see, the episode also in a more specific sense presupposes Epicurean doctrine. Commonly overlooked, there are in particular two aspects which should be held to mind.

Firstly, Lichas' and Tryphaena's dreams are patently wish-fulfilments – and, as the recovery of new evidence has made clear, this category of dream was central to the Epicurean dream theory. To judge from Lucretius among others, dreams were commonly interpreted within the framework of the school's basic please–pain doctrine.[27] Apart from what we would call day-residue dreams, Epicureans particularly frequently invoked instances of wish-fulfilments.[28] The new fragments of the monumental Epicurean inscription from Oenoanda, unearthed and published by Martin Ferguson Smith[29] over the last two decades, confirm that members of the school commonly clarified its stance in such matters by reference to this category of dream.[30] The same approach is represented by such diverse Epicurean sources as a poem usually ascribed to Petronius (below, p. 445) and one of Pseudo-Quintilian's declamations[31] – and it is of course also this type of dream which Eumolpus has in mind.[32] On the one hand the amorous nature of Lichas' and Tryphaena's dreams is obvious, on the other both dreamers interpret them in a religious key. We know this was the very kind of self-deluding inconsistency which Epicureans were feared for unmasking[33] – and whatever Eumolpus' personal views, he would be sure to offer a credible imitation of the school's approach.

[26] cf. n. 3.

[27] For surveys and discussions, see D. Clay, *AJPh* 101 (1980), 342ff. and P. H. Schrijvers, 'Die Traumtheorie des Lukrez', *Mnem.* 33 (1980), 128ff. (with prev. lit.); on the pain–pleasure aspect, Kragelund, 388ff. and J. Pigeaud, 'Le rêve érotique dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine: *l'oneirogmòs*', *Littérature, médecine, société* 3 (1982), 10ff. = Guidorizzi (ed.), pp. 137ff.

[28] cf. Lucr. 3.116 *laetitiae motus et curas cordis inanis* (*sc.* in somnis). Similarly, his dream catalogue highlights the impact of interest, habit and eagerness (4.962–5) as well as of more violent, fearful (1011ff.) and gratifying feelings (1024ff.). In view of the references in Diogenes NFF 1 and 12 (n. 30) to joy and happiness, it is tempting in Lucr. 4.984 to accept Lachmann's *studium atque voluptas* (Bailey [1898]; Ernout [1975²]) for the *voluntas* of the *codd.* (retained i.a. by Diels [1923], Martin [1953²] and Büchner [1966]). While Diogenes in NF 1 as well as in NF 27 col. 1.2–4 (= M. F. Smith, *Thirteen New Fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda*, Denkschriften der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 117 [1974], p. 40) follows his master (Epicurus, fr. 7 Arr. = 2 Us.) in using εὐφροσύνη to denote kinetic pleasure, Lucretius would elsewhere (4.627) not hesitate to use *voluptas*.

[29] Of the fragments so far published by Smith, the following carry references to the dream theory: NF 1 = *AJA* 74 (1970), 51ff. with comments in *CQ* 22 (1972), 161f.; NFF 5–6 = *AJA* 75 (1971), 357ff.; NFF 13–12 = op. cit. (n. 28), p. 46 and NF 122 = *AS* 34 (1984), 43. On the links between fr. 7 (Ch.) and NF 1, see A. Barigazzi, *Prometheus* 3 (1977), 12 and A. Casanova, *Prometheus* 7 (1981), 225ff.; on NFF 13–12, see further the discussion by A. Laks and C. Millot, *Études sur l'Épicurisme antique* (Lille, 1976), pp. 354ff., D. Clay (n. 27) and A. Casanova in *Prometheus* 9 (1983), 257ff.

[30] cf. the emphatic references to joy in NF 1.2, 5–6 (εὐφροσύνην) and NF 12.7–8 (κατ[ευ]φραίνει) and to fear and pain (φόβου; γεμίζει καὶ φόβου) in NF 1.1, 14 (as read by A. Barigazzi 1977 and A. Casanova 1981 [n. 29]) and NF 12.12. Given the parallels in proper Epicurean sources, there is little to support the surmise, implausible in other respects too, that Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.82ff. *pourrait avoir inspiré* Diogenes (thus D. Gourevitch, *MEFRA* 94.2 [1982], 824).

[31] [Quint.] *Decl. mai.* 10, 200.5ff.; in the few discussions of the work (listed by L. Håkanson, *ANRW* II.32.4 [1986], 2272ff.) the Epicurean stance of the boy's father (cf. e.g. 209.22; 215.18) has either been ignored (not in Us.) or mistaken for a belief in magic (thus H. Wagenvoort, *Mnem.* 55 [1927], 426; 442).

[32] Raith, p. 11, hesitantly adduces Lucr. 4.1026–9 as a parallel: 'an ähnliches muss Petronius gedacht haben'. The erotic 1030ff. is of course far more pertinent.

[33] [Quint.] *Decl. mai.* 10, 200.5ff.; 204.13ff. (the Epicurean dismissing the bereaved mother's visions of her son as products of her longing); similarly (nightmares caused by fear) in Plut. *Brut.* 37 = 328 Us. but the version is garbled. For similar discussions of 'prophetic' dreams, see the

It has recently been argued that the emphasis on wish-fulfilments was a fairly late development in Epicurean psychology.[34] Even if it were, the relevance of the concept in this context seems obvious – but in my view there can be little doubt that this was an original component in the school's thought. On closer inspection the doctrine can in fact be shown to have been central not only to the school's psychology but also to its theology. While the classic Epicurean doctrine stressed how superstition, in an endless spiral of self-increasing fear, would influence and be influenced by dreams which seemingly confirmed the fearful existence of divine intervention and, beyond the grave, retribution,[35] Epicurus himself claimed that the true vision of the gods was a spectacle which induced 'the highest of pleasures' (*maximis voluptatibus*). This is not the place to go into the complex problems raised by Cicero's[36] testimony, but other sources confirm that the vision in question would typically have been a dream.[37]

Epicurus' *gnosis theon* was in other words as intimately connected with his psychology as were his attacks on all the superstitious inferences to which divination lends support. Given this background it is easier to comprehend the Epicurean preoccupation with the joys and fears experienced in dreams. Elegantly, the school could thereby provide a commonsense psychological foundation for the seemingly paradoxical doctrine which acknowledged on the one hand that dreams could be the source of the truest of pleasures, namely of viewing the blessed immortals, and on the other that they could foment the terrible extremes of superstition.

But we should return to the episode under discussion, which carries yet another important reference to Epicurus' doctrine. It has commonly gone unnoticed that Eumolpus, to strengthen his position, alludes to one of the most favoured weapons of the school, namely ridicule. Appealing to their master's writings,[38] there was no end, it seems, to the irony[39] and drastic comedy with which Epicureans would expose what they saw as the hypocrisy and self-delusion of their opponents. The tone of Colotes' scornful dismissal of Plato's tale of Er outraged educated opinion from Cicero down to Macrobius.[40] The indications are that the master himself ridiculed divination,[41] but only a few details have been transmitted. Yet, whether or not this was an important component in the original Epicurean image, references in Dionysius

fragmentary reports in Diogenes Oenoandensis NF 122 (n. 29) and in Sisenna (*HRF* fr. 5 = 328 Us.): Sisenna apparently discussed the correspondence (*mirifice ad verbum cum re convenisse*) between dream and event in some detail; to Cicero his dismissal of the prophecy smacked of Epicureanism (*credo ab Epicureo aliquo inductus*).

[34] Thus P. H. Schrijvers, art. cit. (n. 27), 149ff. (suspecting an influence from medical literature).

[35] Lucr. 1.132ff.; 4.33ff.; 5.62f.; similarly, e.g. [Quint.] *Decl. mai.* 10.209.22; 215.18.

[36] *NatD.* 1.49 = 352 Us.: *Epicurus... docet... cum maximis voluptatibus in eas imagines mentem intentam infixamque nostram intelligentiam capere, quae sit et beata natura et aeterna.* For discussions of this passage, see K. Kleve, 'Gnosis theon', *Symbl. Osl. Suppl.* 19 (1963), pp. 44ff.; 118ff. and D. Lemke, *Die Theologie Epikurs* (München, 1973), pp. 43ff. (with prev. lit.).

[37] Lucr. 5.1171; 1181; Sext. Emp. *Math.* 9.25 = 353 Us.

[38] cf. Philodemus, *De dis* 1.4.1 (Diels) and Plut. *De def. or.* 434d = 395 Us. (Epicureans invoking physiology to ridicule the belief in prophetic dreams).

[39] cf. Plut. *Quaest. conviv.* 635e (Plut. refraining from narrating a dream at a party where he is teased by a witty Epicurean).

[40] cf. Macrobius, *Somn.* 1.1.9 *hanc fabulam Cicero licet ab indoctis... doleat irrisam*; 1.2.3 *Epicureorum tota factio aequo semper errore a vero devia et illa semper aestimans ridenda quae nesciat, sacrum volumen et augustissima irrisit naturae seria.*

[41] *nihil tam inridet Epicurus quam praedictionem rerum futurarum*, Cic. *Nat.D.* 2.162 = 395 Us.; similarly, on the school, *Div.* 2.39. For Epicurus' polemics, see K. Kleve, 'The Philosophical Polemics in Lucretius', *Lucrèce. Fondation Hardt. Entretiens 24* (Genève, 1977), 61 (with prev. lit.); some prefer to discard the evidence as a late fabrication: K.-D. Zacher, *Plutarchs Kritik an der Lustlehre Epikurs* (Königstein, 1982), pp. 45–7 (with prev. lit.).

of Halicarnassus,[42] Plutarch and Lucian[43] confirm that the members of the school were by then notorious for their impudent mockery. It is a natural assumption, therefore, that Eumolpus is referring to these terrifying peals of laughter when he evokes Epicurus' *facetissima ratione*.

To conclude: parallels throughout Roman literature show that Petronius' implicit reference to wish-fulfilments would have been considered neither unfamiliar nor esoteric.[44] Quite the contrary: proverbs[45] go far to suggest that the existence of such dreams was common knowledge. In fiction – as presumably in fact – people would blush or stammer, turn defensive[46] or sceptical,[47] if a dream portended what they secretly wished. Understandably, by far the greater part of such episodes are restricted to genres traditionally focusing on the private and personal, but even an epic or tragic[48] vision would not preclude oblique or direct reference to such experiences.

It is not clear to what extent the awareness of such psychological phenomena was perceived as incompatible with a wholehearted acceptance of divination. Following the great example of Plato, many would doubtless be content with dismissing such dreams as irrelevant specimens belonging to a specific 'lower' category which sometimes blurs the prophetic vision.[49] In theory admirable, this compromise must in practice have been difficult to handle. Categories tended to overlap so that some would view as prophecies what others simply ascribed to psychological factors.[50] Since even a Stoic of Panaetius' calibre could question the validity of divination, it is not surprising that inconsistency and confusion seem to have been widespread.[51] How

[42] *Ant. Rom.* 2.68.2 (attack on 'atheists' [i.e. probably Epicureans] making fun of religion).

[43] Lucian, *Alex.* 25 = 395 Us.; Plut. *De def. or.* 420b = 394 Us.; *De sera* 548c; *Adv. Col.* 1124e–f = 368 Us. (with the comments of R. Westman, *Plutarch gegen Kolotes*, Acta Philosophica Fennica 7 [1955], pp. 198–9).

[44] Kragelund, 369ff.

[45] *credimus? an qui amant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?* Verg. *Ecl.* 8.108 (*quod per proverbium est locutus*, Servius ad loc.); the proverb may of course have referred to day-dreaming (as in Ter. *An.* 971; Publilius Syrus 16): J. P. Postgate, *ClPh* 10 (1915), 26–7. In any case the nocturnal wish-fulfilment was claimed to be familiar: *ut solet* (*PLM* 5.49.38); *ut fit* (n. 56); see also n. 46; 61.

[46] Ov. *Met.* 9.468–71; cf. the instances of *pudor* caused by incestuous (Ausonius, *Ephemeris* 8.13) or erotic dreams (Ov. *Her.* 15.133; 19.64 and Stat. *Theb.* 8.626) – the latter with the comment of Lactantius Placidus ad loc.: *excusavit* (*sc.* Ismene) *quia illa videre dicimur in somniis, quae habemus in voto.*

[47] Sall. *H* 3.109 (Maurb.) *contra ille calvi ratus quaerit, extisne an somnio portenderetur thesaurus*; similarly, Theoc. *Id.* 21.63ff.

[48] cf. e.g. Luc. 7.7ff. (with the scholia ad loc.) and [Sen.] *Oct.* 115ff.; 712ff. with the discussion in Kragelund, *Prophecy, Populism and Propaganda in the 'Octavia'* (København, 1982), pp. 22ff.

[49] For the approach, see e.g. M. Gelzer, 'Zwei Einteilungsprinzipien der antiken Traumdeutung', *Juvenes dum sumus* (Basel, 1907), 40ff.; subsequent study has focused primarily on the religious component: cf. e.g. C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides* (Amsterdam, 1968), pp. 171ff. and A. H. M. Kessels, 'Ancient Systems of Dream-classification', *Mnem.* 22 (1969), 389ff., but note J. Pigeaud, art. cit. (n. 27) and P. H. Schrijvers' discussion of Herophilos in *Mnem.* 30 (1977), 19ff.

[50] Despite his declared intention (1.1) to discard dreams of the latter kind, a professional like Artemidorus (1.78–80) would for instance display much ingenuity when discussing the prophetic implications of dreams featuring sex with mothers, sons, corpses etc. Not all his contemporaries would have been taken in – and from some quarters he is likely to have heard scathing comments.

[51] On Panaetius, see Cic. *Div.* 1.6; *Lucullus* 107. A characteristic exponent of such inconsistency is Pliny the Elder, who in the *NH* studiously chronicled (cf. e.g. 7.166; 22.44; 25.17) and in one instance (the preface to his *Bellorum Germaniae viginti*?) even invoked prophetic dreams (Plin. *Ep.* 3.5.4). Yet he also maintained that the arguments *pro et contra* prophetic dreams are of equal strength: *NH* 10.211.

widespread is debatable.[52] What remains incontestable is that Epicureans would claim that such experiences proved the utter irrelevance of divination:

> somnia ne cures, nam mens humana quod optat
> dum vigilat sperat, per somnum cernit id ipsum.[53]

Eumolpus is quick to perceive the tactical advantages in adopting this latter position. As luck would have it, the attempt misfired. Still, the irony is that while events seemingly prove Eumolpus wrong he is of course perfectly right. One need not be an Epicurean to appreciate that what here masquerades as a Stoic miracle is nothing but lust.[54] And the fact that both dreams seemingly had come true is of course neither here nor there. Lichas' and Tryphaena's dreams simply belong to a category which is inherently prone to assume a similarity with prophecy. Wishes are, after all, commonly concerned with the future. Arising from a need, a dream of this category tends to anticipate its future fulfilment. The evidence suggests that the Epicureans integrated this observation into their system. Influenced by the past and concerned about the future[55] the ever-vigilant *animus* may, when the body is asleep, experience a great variety of sensations ranging from extreme fear to pure pleasure. These may, if anticipatory, take on a 'prophetic' note: what one fears, or hopes, sometimes happens. One may for instance lose (fear) or find (hope) the person one loves.[56] But as an Epicurean would observe, the mere fact that some of our dreams correspond to the event is no proof that they are prophetic. Eusebius, for instance, quotes an Epicurean philosopher who in an attack on Chrysippus' discussion of fate flatly dismissed such coincidences as 'the product of pure chance'.[57] Other sceptics would agree on this. So Cicero claimed that no one would have believed in dreams, if by some lucky 'accident or chance' they had not 'come true' every now and then.[58]

This seems very much to be the kind of lesson Petronius wishes his reader to draw. And as if to bring it home to us, the narrative of what subsequently happened holds a number of discreet, but unmistakable allusions to Lichas' and Tryphaena's

[52] Slight and elitist, according to E. Büchsenschütz, *Traum und Traumdeutung im Alterthume* (Berlin, 1868), pp. 34ff. and E. R. Dodds, 'Dream-Pattern and Culture-Pattern', *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley, 1951), p. 121 (the latter study has not a single reference to Epicurus). I am less confident. In any case, it should be kept in mind that the whole range of Hellenistic and Roman literature presupposes familiarity with such ideas.

[53] *Disticha Catonis* 2.31 (ed. M. Boas, 1952); the text has been questioned (cf. Boas' *app. crit.*), in my view unnecessarily. For its meaning, see the edition of G. Némethy (1895), 53: *noli credere somniis; nam quod optamus, id vigiles speramus, dormientes autem iam ante oculos habere videmur.*

[54] The fact is overlooked by M. T. Griffin, *JRS* 66 (1976), 230 (reviewing Cizek, op. cit. [n. 3]) and V. Gigante, art. cit. (n. 1), 75, both claiming that the Stoic, not the Epicurean, interpretation of these 'veridical' dreams had proved 'correct'.

[55] *Commenta Lucani* 7.8 = 327 Us.: *Epicurus dicit atomos influere animis nostris in imaginibus corporum et ea quae gessimus aut quae gesturi sumus per quietem videri.* While the majority are what we would term day-residue dreams, some of the examples in Lucretius (4.1020ff.; 1097ff.) and Petronius, fr. 30.11–13 likewise illustrate the tendency of the mind to anticipate future gratification, or pain.

[56] cf. e.g. Porphyrion in Hor. *Carm.* 4.1.37: *dicit se Ligurinum ex desiderio semper somniare et, ut fit, ⟨t⟩errore quodam mentis imaginari quasi cum diu quaesitum tandem invenerit ... ex ipsis manibus amitteret*; in the very similar passage in Pseudo-Acro the *codd.* have *terrore*, but Keller opted for Porphyrion's *errore*. However, the parallel in Macr. *Somn.* 1.3.4 and others show that dreams of finding vs. losing were commonly interpreted as expressions of one's proper hopes (*pro desiderio*) and fears (*pro timore*).

[57] τυχικῆς αἰτίας ἔργον Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 4.3.6 = 395 Us. (add.); whatever Diogenianus' date, A. Gercke, 'Chrysippea', *Jahrb. f. kl. Phil. Suppl.* 14 (1885), 701 convincingly identified his position as Epicurean.

[58] *casu ... forte*, Cic. *Div.* 2.141.

deceptively auspicious dreams. Thus Lichas is in the sequel forced to accept a 'treaty' which wittily echoes Priapus' command (104.1) by stipulating that he must not in future 'seek out' (*quaerere*)[59] his former lover. For Tryphaena events at first conform to Neptune's prophecy, but soon her hopes too are frustrated. By a cruel irony it is eventually Neptune's own element, the 'angry sea', which separates her from her Giton – and reunites him with Encolpius:

'...ecce iam ratem fluctus evertet, ecce iam amplexus amantium iratum dividet mare. igitur, si vere Encolpion dilexisti, da oscula, dum licet, ultimum hoc gaudium fatis properantibus rape.' (114.9)

II. DREAMS IN A SIMILE (128.6) AND IN A CATALOGUE (FR. 30)

Lust is also central to one of Petronius' poetic references to dreams.[60] The poem in question (cap. 128.6) deals with Encolpius' impotence. By equating this predicament with a dream the narrator evokes a long tradition. Homer set the pattern by comparing the utter frustration of Hector's efforts to escape Achilles with the familiar category of dream in which the dreamer cannot do what he wishes to do.[61] While Virgil upheld the heroic perspective, Lucretius would describe sex in similarly pessimistic terms: an endless quest for an ever-receding aim. His magnificent dream simile depicts the lover desperately trying to quench his insatiable thirst.[62]

Such pessimism is foreign to Encolpius. His problems are far more immediate, like a joyful dream that suddenly turns unpleasant. The imagery of the poem is traditional, and so is the juxtaposition of gratification (*gaudia*)[63] and fear (*timor*): having found a treasure, he is suddenly threatened with losing it. Awake, his mind can only ponder regretfully on the lost treasure and irretrievable bliss.[64]

In contrast to the commonsense views expressed by Encolpius, the lengthy catalogue (fr. 30) preserved with other poems by Petronius in the *codex Vossianus* comes far closer to standard Epicureanism. Bourdelot therefore proposed inserting it in cap. 104.[65] But although it is clear that this portion of the text, like many others, suffered abridgement in the process of transmission, editors have in my view rightly been sceptical, not because the fragment seems spurious, but, considering how small the preserved portion of the *Satyrica* is in comparison with the lost whole, such hypothetical re-insertions may easily mislead. Moreover, while modern scholars have sometimes failed to grasp Eumolpus' point, nothing indicates that the ancient reader would have been similarly handicapped. And finally it seems to me that the poem dilutes rather than clarifies Eumolpus' point. Would we not expect, rather than a catalogue, a comment on the philosopher's wit or stronger emphasis on the importance of wish-fulfilments?

[59] *ut tu Encolpion nec verbo contumelioso insequeris nec vultu, neque quaeres ubi nocte dormiat aut, si quaesieris, pro singulis iniuriis numerabis praesentes denarios ducenos* (109.3); the parallel to Priapus' *quaeris* (104.1) seems deliberate. Müller's bracketing *si quaesieris* (proposed 1961; withdrawn 1978; readopted 1983) is therefore best ignored.

[60] I discard the likewise erotic dream poem *PLM* 4.103 = [Petronius] fr. 56 (quoted in n. 15) since there is no evidence to support Binet's attribution.

[61] Hom. *Il.* 22.199ff.; Verg. *Aen.* 12.908ff.; on its familiarity, see Tib. Claudius Donatus ad loc.: *omnibus hominibus per somnum talia consuerunt accidere, ut dormientes videantur velle, quae inplere non possunt* eqs.

[62] 4.1100: *in medioque sitit torrenti flumine potans.*

[63] For *gaudia* denoting erotic pleasure in dreams, see also Ov. *Her.* 13.106; 15.126.

[64] Ov. *Her.* 13.106 *dum careo veris, gaudia falsa iuvant* (of a dream); for similar emphasis on the contrast between (day-) dream and reality, see e.g. *Her.* 19.65ff. and Verg. *Ecl.* 2.58ff. with Servius ad loc.

[65] Accepted by E. Paratore, op. cit. (n. 21), pp. 334ff., but not, it seems, by any modern editor.

However that may be, in layout the catalogue has numerous parallels.[66] Petronius first sets out (1–5) the basic principles: dreams are not sent by the gods, *sed sibi quisque facit* (3). Then, in customary fashion, he lists various instances. But his exposition lacks the formal clarity of its counterpart in Lucretius, some of his examples differ, and he does not employ proper Epicurean terminology. An allusion to Lucretius was therefore hardly intended. As for the *exempla*, the first series (5–8) focuses on neutral day-residue dreams, but in the second there are also references to fear (*pavidi* 10) and more gratifying sensations (*avarus ... invenit aurum* 11) as well as a passage

eripit undis
aut premit eversam periturus navita puppem (12–13)

which brings out well the typical nightmare conflict of hopes and fears of what the future may bring.[67] Then follows a verse on the dreams of lovers, but the penultimate verse appears to have been interpolated, and it looks unlikely that the conclusion we have is the original.

In discussions of the *Satyrica*'s presumed *moralità epicurea*, this fragment naturally holds a special position. According to some scholars, passages of this type confirm that we are dealing with the work of a true Epicurean and that the philosophy of the Garden was a major or even decisive influence on the scope and form of his novel.[68] However, on closer inspection it seems to me that the implications of this celebrated fragment are far from clear. For one thing, since we know nothing about the original context of the poem, we can only guess at Petronius' intentions. They could well have been ironic, or even parodic.[69] Moreover, the author's familiarity with the doctrine is no proof of his allegiance. In a novel celebrating the gratification of many basic human appetites Epicurus' psychology would surely come in handy (whatever the author's private views) as a means to explain and debunk much self-deluding pretension – and, as we shall see in the following section, the *Satyrica* contains another illuminating instance of its application.

III. QUARTILLA'S *INCUBATIO*

It has not previously been noted that the double dream discussed above has a close parallel in the Quartilla episode in cap. 17. Once more we are dealing with a Priapus epiphany,[70] and once again the parody brings Epicurus' teachings to mind: while the dream in question is yet another wish-fulfilment, the priestess insists, whether sincerely or not, on its supernatural origins. Admittedly, there is in this episode no overt reference to Epicurus himself. Still, the method and scope of this comic debunking of incubation, nocturnal *pervigilia*, and *divina providentia* (18.3) makes it tempting to suspect that here too the master's alleged ideal of combining wit and wisdom has made its impact.

[66] For parallels, see for instance Ernout-Robin and Bailey ad Lucr. 4.962ff.

[67] cf. Lucr. 4.1097ff.; for a discussion of this category of dream, see Kragelund, op. cit. (n. 48), pp. 23ff.

[68] cf. e.g. G. Highet, art. cit. (n. 3), 185 and Raith, p. 3: *Epikureische Philosophie hat seinem Interesse die Richtung gewiesen, und aus ihr stammt das Verfahren, nach dem er sein Werk gestaltet hat.*

[69] On Petronius' complex uses of *Verseinlagen* and the ensuing difficulties for determining the scope of the fragments, see A. Barchiesi, art. cit. (n. 7), 231ff. and V. Gigante, art. cit. (n. 1), 76. While C. Piano, op. cit. (n. 3) ignored the problem, Raith, pp. 3ff., repeatedly admitted it, but did not therefore abandon the thesis of the work's Epicurean 'message'.

[70] Herter, p. 264.

Sadly fragmented, the passage was brilliantly elucidated by Otto Weinreich. A chain of parodies links the 'miraculous' opening of the doors and the incubation dream to the subsequent celebration of the *pervigilium*.[71] The god whose presence and power are manifest throughout the scene is Priapus. In a lost episode Encolpius and his friends had violated his mysteries. Priapus' priestess therefore turns up at their lodgings to demand satisfaction. She presents two claims. They must not, she says, divulge the secret of the mysteries: only a few had been initiated. And secondly they must help her get rid of her disease. As a result of their offence, she had fallen ill, and the god had chosen them as instruments to alleviate her fever. In a dream in reply to her prayers for a remedy, he revealed the proper cure:

'et ideo medicinam somno[72] petii iussaque sum vos perquirere atque impetum morbi monstrata subtilitate lenire.' (17.7)

Encolpius pledges that they will reveal nothing; and all will be done to help 'divine providence' cure her fever.

As Weinreich pointed out, the 'subtle method revealed to her' (*monstrata subtilitate*) by the god was of course *coitus*, according to some authorities an effective medicine for the treatment of fevers.[73] Quartilla's god, Priapus, might be expected to prescribe exactly such medicine – and even in its present fragmented state the ensuing description of the *pervigilium* (with much wordplay on *remedium* [18.3; 19.2] *medicina* [18.5] and *medicamentum* [20.6]) makes it clear that this was in fact the prescribed 'cure'.

Closely adhering to the technical vocabulary of initiation as well as to current beliefs in miracle cures, the parody is remarkably precise. Even the manner in which the god prescribes the cure (rather than instantly healing) conforms with ordinary practice: this was very much the way in which contemporary inscriptions at an Asclepeion would describe the god's intervention.[74] But Petronius' audience would hardly have failed to recognize that the miracle had far less pious implications. Unlike Lichas and Tryphaena, Quartilla has a clear motive for talking so much of her dream: the god's command entitled her to demand what she so ardently wished. However grave their offence, Encolpius and his friends had clearly made a favourable impression on the women at Priapus' sanctuary. As her *ancilla* reassures them, Quartilla was in fact wondering 'which god had brought such charming young men (*iuvenes ... urbanos* 16.4) to her part of the world'; and once Encolpius has consented to her plan, the priestess merrily starts kissing and caressing him (*basiavit ... spissius* 18.4). Small wonder, therefore, that her very dream narrative, with its characteristic *perquirere* (cf. above, p. 438) declares it a wish-fulfilment. Whatever the precise extent of the school's influence on this parody, the injunction of Quartilla's 'god' that she should 'seek out' the boys and demand a cure is clearly one of the *ludibria* which Epicurus would have dismissed *facetissima ratione*.

[71] Weinreich, pp. 182ff.; for valuable observations on this passage, see further id. *Türöffnung im Wunder-, Prodigien- und Zauberglauben der Antike, des Judentums und des Christentums*, Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 5 (1929), p. 396, Raith, p. 38 and Sullivan, p. 48.

[72] *somno codd.* and Müller 1961; *somnio* (Wouweren) Müller 1978 and 1983; there are sound arguments for either view. As for Ernout's Budé editions, the first and third (1922; 1950) had *somno*, but at some point *sommo* (*sic*) crept in, along with numerous other misprints: to the list of *corrigenda* included in its seventh (1970) but omitted in its ninth (1982) imprint, add *ist⟨e⟩* 9.4; *ponitis* for *ponetis* 27.4; *quae ⟨huc⟩ atque illuc* 37.1; *quod ⟨nec ad caelum⟩ nec* 44.1 and *⟨e⟩tiam* 114.11. A thorough revision seems overdue.

[73] Weinreich, p. 183.

[74] Weinreich, p. 110; for the evidence, E.J. & L. Edelstein, *Asclepius* I–II (Baltimore, 1945).

IV. PETRONIUS AND EPICURUS

A double dream, a simile, a catalogue and an *incubatio*: even in fragments Petronius' work betrays the virtuoso of style, cheerfully deflating a whole series of traditional motifs. One would dearly love to know what was the inspiration for these powerful parodies. That Epicurean attacks on the Stoic doctrine of pronoia were a major influence seems clear. However, this was not the only school which from time to time would air scepticism or hostility. Those who had undertaken the so-called *somniorum patrocinium*,[75] the defence of the belief in the miraculous nature of dreams, were exposed to attacks from several quarters. In addition to the Epicurean, other schools,[76] such as the Cynic, are likely to have employed a similarly aggressive wit. And the attacks were not confined to philosophical discourse: in the lower or marginal genres, at a reasonable distance from the monopolistic claims of official culture, the parody of magic, myth and divination was clearly a favoured sport.[77]

When seeking to assess the possible influence from such directions on Petronius' procedure, we are severely handicapped by the extreme paucity of evidence: transmission was never favourable to heterodoxy. To judge from what we have, however, it is important to distinguish between on the one hand philosophical critique and on the other blasphemy: the latter is seldom the expression of a consistent outlook. Rather than undermining piety, blasphemy has indeed often had an indirectly affirmative function, merely providing a brief and 'Saturnalian' outlet for dissent.

There can be little doubt that such parodies of ritual and religion in general provided a major inspiration for Petronius, but there is one category in particular which must be taken into account. At Rome by Petronius' day, Priapus was celebrated as a *Witzgott*, a trickster mediating obscenity and piety, the base and the sublime. A folklore had evolved, with witty artefacts and paintings, poems and tales. Ambiguously hovering between ironic innuendo and outright sacrilege, the poems celebrating the power of the god are remarkable for their parodic range.[78] In the present context, an inscription from Tivoli is pertinent.[79] A witty *jeu d'esprit* which once adorned a herm in the gardens of an imperial freedman, Iulius Agathemerus, the lengthy hymn pays homage not only to Priapus but also to the poets who had bestowed renown on the fashionable resort.[80] In its first stanza, this amiable *a cura*

[75] Cic. *Div.* 2.150.

[76] cf. Cic. *NatD.* 3.91: *ego multorum aegrorum salutem ... ab Hippocrate potius quam ab Aesculapio datam iudico*; similarly, Diog. Laert. 6.24; 43; (Diogenes the Cynic's dismissal of belief in dreams); on the doubts and reservations of philosophers, see Cic. *Div.* 1.6ff.; in addition to the Epicureans and Cynics, Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 4.2.13 also includes the Peripatetics among the sceptics.

[77] cf. Cic. *Div.* 2.25: *totum omnino fatum etiam Atellanio versu iure mihi esse irrisum videtur; sed in rebus tam severis non est iocandi locus.* For parody in the Mime, see e.g. Tert. *Apol.* 15; Aug. *CivD.* 6.7. As for the reference to an *incubatio* in Varro's *Eumenides* (*Sat. Men.* fr. 147 Cèbe) *in somnis venit iubet me cepam esse et sisymbrium*, J. P. Cèbe, *Varron. Satires Ménippées* 4 (Rome, 1977), p. 679 may well be right that Varro was being ironic, but the point is obscure.

[78] Herter's remains the basic study; for parodies, cf. *Priap.* 37 (of *ex voto*); 52 (of Catullus); 68 (of epos). For discussions of the poetry, see V. Buchheit, *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum* (München, 1962) and A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus* (New Haven/London, 1983).

[79] *CIL* 14.3565 = *CLE* 1504; on the poem, see further V. Buchheit, op. cit. (n. 78), pp. 69ff.

[80] On the allusions to Catullus and Horace, see Buecheler's *apparatus* in the *CLE*. While Buecheler and the editors of the *Concordanze dei CLE* (Bari, 1986) suggested a date in the second century, V. Buchheit, op. cit. (n. 78), p. 72 on metrical criteria would make it predate Martial. As the stone has been lost and the freedman's name cannot yield precise criteria (cf. H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom*, I (Berlin/New York, 1982), pp. 4–5) the question remains *sub judice*.

amicorum[81] prays for success in love, with boys and girls:

SALVE SANCTE PATER PRIAPE RERVM
SALVE DA MIHI FLORIDAM IVVENTAM
DA MIHI VT PVERIS ET VT PVELLIS
FASCINO PLACEAM BONIS PROCACI
LVSIBVSQVE FREQVENTIBVS IOCISQVE
DISSIPEM CVRAS ANIMO NOCENTES
NEC GRAVEM TIMEAM NIMIS SENECTAM
ANGAR HAVD [MISER]AE PAVORE MORTIS
QUAE AD DOMV[S] TRAHET INVIDA[S AVER]N[I]
FABVLAS MANES VBI REX COERCET
VNDE FATA NEGANT REDIRE QVEMQVAM
SALVE SANCTE PATER PRIAPE SAL[V]E

What matters here is the claim that this mock-serious[82] invocation of the phallic cosmocrator (GENITOR...ET AVCTOR/ ORBIS AVT PHYSIS IPSA PANQVE) was 'inspired by a dream' (SOMNO MONITVS). By a process reminiscent of Petronius', a venerable religious formula[83] is here deflated. The freedman's jocular reference to the more basic urges which influence our dreams is, however, in no way polemical. No hints here of Epicurean impiety: quite to the contrary, the parody is affectionate and persistently polite.

For all the similarities, such restraint was never Petronius' line. Every page of his work testifies to his never-ending joy in the juxtaposition of official seriousness and popular irreverence.[84] Masking his fascination as disdain, his manner of mimicking popular art-forms, vulgar manners and low speech displays a familiarity acquired by assiduous and keen observation. To a man of such predilections, the bitter and interminable strife *pro et contra* the belief in Providence must have seemed a godsend, for the debate held many of his favoured ingredients. The edifying anecdotes which characterized the so-called pronoia literature[85] would be countered in such circumstances by vivid tales of superstition and religious fraud.[86] We have no means of determining how common such feuds were. However, the indications are that the Epicureans held their ground with remarkable tenacity.[87] But since their opponents

[81] For the office, cf. e.g. *CIL* 6.604; 630 (Trajanic) and 8795–9.

[82] H. Kleinknecht, *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike*, Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 28.3 (1937), p. 5 n. 2 would not preclude a possibly serious intent (Antonine revival of the cult). I follow E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Berlin/Leipzig, 1913), p. 156 and V. Buchheit, op. cit. (n. 78), p. 71 in considering the dedication a joke.

[83] cf. *somn(i)o monitus* in *CIL* 3.1032; 6.1490; 14.4318 *et alibi*; for further instances, see the sample in A. De Marchi, *Il culto privato di Roma antica*, I (Milano, 1896), pp. 285ff. (private dedications); L. Gamberale, 'Il voto del sacerdote', *Studi...a Francesco della Corte* (Urbino, 1988), 397ff. (the *carmina epigraphica*).

[84] My view of Petronius is indebted to E. Auerbach, *Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur* (Bern, 1967[4]), pp. 28ff. as well as to the work of M. M. Bakhtin, particularly his *Rabelais and his World* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968). On the hybrid quality of Petronius' language and poetics, see for instance A. Stefenelli, *Die Volkssprache im Werk des Petron*, Wiener Romanistische Arbeiten 1 (1962); R. Beck, 'Eumolpus *poeta*, Eumolpus *fabulator*', Phoenix 33 (1979), 239ff.

[85] On the anecdotal material in the pronoia literature, see Weinreich, pp. 130ff.

[86] For the uses of fraudulent dreams, see Men. Rhet. 390 (a rhetorical device); Plut. *Sert.* 11.4 (political purposes) and Joseph. *AJ* 18.66ff. (a matron seduced by the 'god' during an *incubatio*); Lucian's *Alexander* suggests that Epicureans would put such instances to good use.

[87] For the importance of the school during the first and second century A.D., see the circumspect assessments by T. Gargiulo, 'Epicureismo Romano', *Studi...a Marcello Gigante*, II (Napoli, 1983), p. 647 and W. Schmid, 'Epikur', *RAC* 5 (1962), 767ff.

only seldom quote such 'atheist' polemics, our view of the strife is perforce somewhat one-sided.[88] Against this background, the stray testimony of Petronius is all the more important: apart from Lucian,[89] it is, if I am not mistaken, in Petronius' parodic dream scenes that one still hears the clearest echo of Epicurean laughter.

If one concedes that the passages under review betray a sound knowledge of Epicurean doctrine, the question then remains of the author's own adherence to the school. This is a complex and much debated issue, and in what follows I shall merely summarize my stance in relation to the three main problems.

Of these the first arises from the author's choice of literary form. As has frequently been observed, Petronius' manner of installing Encolpius as the narrator of events greatly complicates the precise delineation of his personal stance. The effect may well be deliberate. The *Satyrica* does not at all come across as a work intended to convey a positive 'message'.[90]

Secondly, biography has been invoked. But even if Tacitus' portrait of the Petronius Arbiter commonly identified with the author conveys a cheerful disrespect for Stoic values, this is still far from proving that he had Epicurean leanings in his life, or, indeed, in his writings.[91]

And finally, returning to the instances under discussion, it is, I believe, well worth noting that Petronius' use of Epicurean techniques in reviling divination is motivated by a spirit which in significant respects differs fundamentally from the master's doctrine. Thus it has rightly been doubted whether an adherent intending to propagate the gospel (or at least not wishing to bring it into disrepute) would suggest what their opponents never tired of alleging, that carnal pleasure was in fact its true *telos*. Like Petronius, the Epicureans themselves would invoke erotic dreams to illustrate the way man instinctively seeks to satisfy his basic appetites, but this is still a far cry from stating, as Encolpius does,

> '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.' (132.15)

Whether or not one accepts the emendations of Canterus (*doctos ... amare* for *doctus ... in arte*, or *arce*),[92] it is, I believe, clear that this instance of Encolpius' philosophizing (which forms part of a burlesque debate with his uncooperative member) cheerily reduces Epicurus' lofty notion of all-embracing *amicitia* (φιλία) to a question of carnal pleasure.[93] In other words, Encolpius' exposition can hardly be

[88] Reactions ranged from imperial patronage, benevolent tolerance or tacit dismissal to undisguised antagonism: in the latter category, note e.g. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 11–12 (Paris, 1960), 484–6 (Milesian Platonist's anti-Epicurean epitaph), Lucian, *Alex.* 25; 47 (anti-Epicurean proclamations; burning of Epicurus' *Kyriai doxai* in the marketplace of Abonouteichos); similarly, Ael. fr. 89 (Asclepios ordering a sick Epicurean to apply the ashes of Epicurus' writings as a plaster).

[89] On his Epicurean affinities, see P. Innocenti, *RSF* 33 (1978), 33ff. (with prev. lit.).

[90] Apart from the emphatic dismissal by J. P. Sullivan, art. cit. (n. 7), 1670ff. see also A. Richlin, op. cit. (n. 78), pp. 190ff.; N. Holzberg, op. cit. (n. 7), pp. 81ff.

[91] Tac. *Ann.* 16.19; the evidence favouring an identification with the Neronian consul is conveniently set out by J. P. Sullivan, art. cit. (n. 7), 1666ff. Like the scholars quoted in n. 3, Raith (p. 57) simply maintains: *Der Petronius des Tacitus war Epikureer.*

[92] Müller accepts the emendations; so did Buecheler, in 1912, but Ernout and Pellegrino (1975) retain the text; despite the efforts of O. Raith, *WS* 4 (1970), 138ff. and V. Gigante, art. cit. (n. 1), 61ff., I remain unhappy with *doctus*, linguistically and metrically.

[93] cf. E. Bignone, *Riv. Fil.* n.s. 2 (1924), 150ff.

considered a serious attempt at illuminating the uninitiated. That the joke might impair the reputation of the 'Garden' does not seem to have worried the author.

Petronius' parody of 'prophetic' dreams reveals an equal disinterest in serious proselytizing. Again it is the presence of Priapus that sets the tone. And neither Quartilla nor the blatantly hedonistic Tryphaena comes to mind as being intended to illustrate the misery which superstition has brought into the world.

Inspired by enlightened and altruistic zeal Epicurus' true pupils would strive, like doctors curing the sick, to liberate their fellow men from the superstitious fear to which dreams could give rise.[94] The master had himself promised that his followers would be blessed with a peace of mind which nothing would disturb, 'neither when waking nor sleeping'.[95] In Petronius one searches in vain for such altruistic concern. Elusive, shifting and ironic, his art inspires riotous laughter, not peace of mind. The presiding deity of his gardens is far more likely to have been the phallic trickster than the great philosopher.

The Danish Academy in Rome PATRICK KRAGELUND

[94] On the attitude in general, see M. Gigante, '*Philosophia medicans* in Filodemo', *Cronache Ercolanesi* 5 (1975), 53ff.; on corresponding discussions of dreams, Plut. *Brutus* 37; [Quint.] *Declam. mai.* 10, 217.3–5; 19–22.

[95] *οὔθ' ὕπαρ οὔτ' ὄναρ* Epicurus, *Ep. ad Men.* 135.