as the atomic world the Epicureans believe in based on their naïve—the Stoic voice of Seneca suggests—way of inference.*

University of Oxford T.S. ALLENDORF
tobias.allendorf@classics.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838817000246

A NOTE ON TRIMALCHIO'S THREE (EQUALS TWO) LIBRARIES[1]

At Petron. *Sat.* 48.4 Trimalchio makes a famous boast about owning three libraries:

tres bibliothecas habeo, unam Graecam, alteram Latinam.

I have three libraries: one Greek, another Latin.

Because 'one' plus 'another (of two)' cannot equal three, editors since Tilebomenus (Jacques Mentel or 'Mentelius', in his edition published in Paris in 1664)[2] have helped the numbers add up by supplying *II* where the MSS have *tres*. Thus one sees a fairly even split in the major recent editions of the 'Cena Trimalchionis' of the *Satyrica* between those who have made the maths work by way of emendation (Bücheler, Smith, Müller, Öberg) and those who have stuck with what is quite obviously the *lectio difficilior* (Ernout, Sage & Gilleland, Schönberger, Schmeling).[3]

Those advocating *tres* have the MSS solidly on their side. But the stronger reading leaves them to make sense of a nonsensical assertion. It has been explained as 'dumme Angeberei' ['stupid bravado'] on Trimalchio's part;[4] as a joke that we can no longer get;[5] 'comic aposiopesis;'[6] an absurd assertion highlighting Trimalchio's stupidity and confusion about libraries coming only in pairs;[7] and as a reference to an actual

* I would like to thank *CQ*'s anonymous reader and editorial team as well as Tobias Reinhardt for their very useful feedback.
[1] Sincere thanks are owed to Bruce Gibson and to the anonymous *CQ* reader for providing comments and helpful criticisms. This paper is much better for their efforts, and any mistakes or misstatements that remain in it are entirely my responsibility.
[2] Jo. Caius Tilebomenus [Jacques Mentel] (ed.), *Anekdoton ex Petronii Arbitri Satirico* (Paris, 1664).
[3] F. Bücheler (ed.), *Petronii Arbitri Satirarum Reliquiae* (Berlin, 1862); K. Müller (ed.), *Petronius Satyricon Reliquiae* (Munich and Leipzig, 2003[4]); M. Smith (ed.), *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis* (Oxford, 1975); J. Öberg (ed.), *Petronius Cena Trimalchionis. A New Critical Edition* (Stockholm, 1999); A. Ernout (ed.), *Pétrone: Le Satiricon* (Paris, 1958[4]); E. Sage and B. Gilleland (edd.), *Petronius: The Satiricon* (New York, 1969[2]); O. Schönberger (ed. and trans.), *Petron Satyrgeschichten* (Berlin, 1992). Schmeling's text of Petronius is forthcoming. His case for *tres* appears in G. Schmeling, *A Commentary on the* Satyrica *of Petronius* (Oxford, 2011), ad loc.
[4] Schönberger (n. 3), 283.
[5] H. Schnur (ed. and trans.), *Satyricon. Ein römischer Schelmenroman* (Stuttgart, 1968), 211: 'Welcher Witz hier beabsichtigt ist, ist unklar.'
[6] B. Baldwin, 'Editing Petronius: methods and examples,' *AClass* 31 (1988), 37–50, at 45.
[7] As an 'absurd reading, and so probably correct', see W. Sedgwick, *The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius* (Oxford, 1950), ad loc. Fuller elaborations of Sedgwick's 'absurdist' interpretation have

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

third library (*Atellanae* in Oscan) that Trimalchio neglects to enumerate.[8] In his recent Oxford commentary, Gareth Schmeling has gathered up the main solutions that have been tried in support of keeping *tres* only to conclude, rather half-heartedly (*pace* Smith), that Trimalchio 'might not mean that he has *tres bibliothecas,* "three libraries", but rather that he has "three bookcases of books"'.[9] In a recent article not cited by Schmeling, Béla Adamik has sought to explain Trimalchio's three-library boast as a sudden flash of cultural inferiority on Trimalchio's part that finds him suppressing the third item in his list (more on this below).[10]

Emending *tres* to *II* makes things easy, because it makes Trimalchio boast of having two libraries as if that were a remarkable achievement when, in fact, double libraries (Greek and Latin) were the norm for the educated elite in first-century Italy. If *tres* is emended to *II,* the numbers add up, and Trimalchio is caught out for proudly tallying as two libraries what most Romans would take to be the norm, and perhaps count as only one.[11] To support emending *tres* to *II* editors have proposed a transmission history that has an original *II* (or an even more original *duas* subsequently rendered numerically as *II*) somewhere behind the fifteenth-century codex Traguriensis.[12] At some point that original *II* was mistaken for *III* and mistranscribed, and the mistranscribed *III* was subsequently spelled out by yet another hand (likely by the copyist who produced the codex Traguriensis) as *tres*. To this textual-transmission argument they lend grammatical support by pointing out that the pronoun *alter* means 'one or other (of two)' in any given list of two, such as the one that Trimalchio provides.

But 'the fact' that the list's grammar is solidly on the side of *II* has recently been called into question by Bela Adamik, in a detailed analysis of the linguistic and grammatical habits of itemized explanatory lists in the *Satyrica* as a whole. Adamik has shown that in all two-item lists other than the one in question (Trimalchio's library boast) Petronius does not in fact use an *unus–alter* construction but an *alter–alter* construction. Even more significantly, Adamik demonstrates that, in laying out lists longer than two, Petronius always begins *unus–alter*, precisely the way Trimalchio begins (and concludes) the list of his libraries. The set of passages that Adamik has at his disposal as exact *comparandi* is too small to prove decisive,[13] but they are enough to suggest that the grammatical support for *II* is less certain than it has been made to seem, and that, within the microenvironment of the *Satyrica* itself, the stronger

been developed by R. Starr, 'Trimalchio's libraries', *Hermes* 115 (1987), 252–3, and N. Slater, *Reading Petronius* (Baltimore and London, 1990), 67 n. 37.

[8] See J. Geiger and H. Rosen, 'Osca bybliotheca?', in J. Herman and H. Rosen (edd.), *Petroniana: Gedenkschrift für Hubert Petersmann* (Heidelberg, 2003), 123–5.

[9] Schmeling (n. 3), 205, referring to Smith (n. 3), ad loc.: '*bibliotheca* sometimes means little more than a bookcase with its contents'.

[10] B. Adamik, '*TRES BIBLIOTHECAS HABEO, VNAM GRAECAM, ALTERAM LATINAM:* textkritische, philologische und soziolinguistische Interpretation von Petrons *Satyricon* 48.4', *Acta Ant. Hung.* 45 (2005), 133-42, at 133.

[11] Starr (n. 7), 252: 'a wealthy Roman generally spoke of both his Greek books and his Latin books as composing a single library'. He goes on to point out that the plural designation *bibliothecae* tends to be used not of private collections but of the big public libraries of the early Empire: '[Trimalchio] makes the extraordinary claim that his collections find their parallel only in the imperial libraries' (253). Taking a slightly different tack is Smith (n. 3), ad loc.: 'Trimalchio boasts of possessing what a better-educated person would take for granted.'

[12] Further on the presumed transmission-history that accounts for a change from *duas/II* to *III/tres*, see Adamik (n. 10), 135.

[13] For two-item lists using *alter–alter*, Adamik cites Petron. *Sat.* 20.4, 27.3, 30.3-4 and 40.3. For longer lists beginning with *unus–alter*, he cites Petron. *Sat.* 47.8 and 60.8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

grammatical argument is in fact on the side of *tres*. In short: elsewhere in the *Satyrica* Petronius does not unfold two-item lists the way he does in the case of Trimalchio's three-library boast, but he always begins larger lists of three or more in exactly this way (*unus–alter–tertius* etc.).

The grammatical evidence leads Adamik to conclude that a third item has been suppressed from Trimalchio's list. Reviving an argument that was once put into play by Pellegrino,[14] Adamik argues that the missing item is a library of Semitic texts that Trimalchio sets out to name (thinking himself, as an owner of three libraries, that much more impressive than the emperor, who has only two), but then thinks better of naming because to do so would call attention to his humble origins as a slave from Asia Minor.[15] Adamik supports his argument by showing just how doggedly the Romans adhered to a strictly binary sense of what counted for literary learning and culture, refusing to acknowledge, and at times actively discounting, the cultural worth of anything that was not Greek and/or Latin.[16] The thesis is both provocative and well argued, but it presents a number of further difficulties that make it hard to credit in full. To my mind, the two most significant drawbacks are: (i) that it requires readers to supply an entire linked set of observations in the blink of an eye (Trimalchio failed to name a third library; he is Semitic; his third library is therefore probably Semitic; he must have had second thoughts about mentioning it), all based on the failure of a nonsensical blowhard to make sense. And (ii) that it catches in a moment of self-doubt and embarrassed self-reflection none other than Trimalchio, a man who is otherwise tone-deaf to the niceties of Roman high culture, and utterly incapable of correctly assessing how he might be coming off.

In deference to the scholars who have produced so many possible (but ultimately unprovable) solutions on both sides of the *II* vs *tres* divide, I would like to propose a rather mundane syntactical solution that will allow one both to stick with the MSS reading of *tres,* and to make Trimalchio's 'one' plus 'another' equal it, without actually adding a third library. I propose it as yet another possible (but unprovable) solution to be added to an already overburdened list. The solution is suggested in the fine print of *OLD* s.v. *alter*^{2} 6. There we are informed that phrases of the *unus et alter* type mean 'one or two persons or things' in the sense of 'a few' or 'a mere handful'. Generally not a literal 'two', in other words, but 'several'. Giving more room for explanation and examples, Lewis and Short s.v. *alter* 2d α list a number of cases where *unus–alter* is used to mean exactly 'two', but then follows at 2d β a longer list of *loci* where the phrase is used to mean 'several' or 'a few' ('more freq. of an indef. number'). The phrase has a literal sense of 'two', in other words, but its preponderant usage is in the sense of 'one or another', or 'a handful', or 'a few'.

Examples of both types are to be had from literary sources of all types. One sees clearly that *unus–alter* means exactly 'two' at Cic. *Leg.* 2.5, where Cicero has Marcus claim that 'I think that all citizens of a municipium have two fatherlands, one of nature, the other of the state' (*omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias,*

[14] C. Pellegrino, 'A proposito delle tre biblioteche de Trimalchione e dei uitia di Massa (Petron. *Satyr*. 48.4 e 68.8)', *Sileno* 7 (1981), 187–201.

[15] Adamik (n. 10), 142: 'Während der Konversation mit dem hochgebildeten Rhetor Agamemnon wurde sein Minderwertigkeitskomplex aktiviert, der dann den Abschluss seiner Aufzählung bzw. die Nennung seiner dritten Bibliothek, gewiss von einer seitens der römischen Elite verachteten Sprache, verhindert hat.'

[16] On *eloquentia* as a binary (Greek and Latin) concept in Roman thought, see B. Gibson, *Statius,* Silvae *5* (Oxford, 2006) on 5.3.90: *gemina plangat Facundia lingua* (300).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unam naturae, alteram ciuitatis). The same 'two = one plus another' phraseology is found at Cic. *Top.* 6, where he says that 'every systematic reckoning of argumentation has two parts, one of invention, the other of judgement' (*omnis ratio diligens disserendi duas habeat partis, unam inueniendi alteram iudicandi*). Trimalchio matches the Ciceronian examples in his phraseology, but his counting is mysteriously off by one ('three = one plus another').

As the Lewis and Short entry makes clear, phrases of the *unus* (*et*) *alter* type are used far more often in Classical Latin to imply an indefinite small number that exceeds the number two. Examples abound in well-known sources. At *Epist.* 2.1.74-5 Horace says of stiffly wrought archaic poems that 'lines here and there may strike us as better crafted than the rest (*uersus paulo concinnior unus et alter*, 74), but they ought not to carry and sell the entire work', and at *Sat.* 1.6.100-2 he complains that, if he were to run for public office, 'I should immediately have to acquire a large establishment, greet more visitors, take one or two companions with me (*unus | et comes alter*, 101-2) to avoid being on my own when going off to the country' (trans. Rudd). At *Rem. am.* 363-4 Ovid says 'as long as I am sung throughout the entire city, let a handful of naysayers impugn my work as much as they like' (*quamlibet impugnent unus et alter opus*, 364). In all such cases the phrase implies not a literal 'two' but an indefinite 'handful', and this is by far the predominant use of phrases of the type.[17] Most examples of 'one and another' meaning 'several' use *et*, *aut*, *atque* or *–ue* to link some form of *unus* to a matching form of *alter.* But Plin. *Ep.* 9.10.3 uses the words in asyndeton to produce exactly the same sense of 'some small number'. Writing to Tacitus, Pliny says *oratiunculam unam alteram retractaui* 'I have revised one or two short speeches' (trans. Walsh).

Back to Trimalchio. One sees what he is (quite possibly) up to: he is straining the potentials of the *unus* (*et*) *alter* phrase to say 'two' and 'a handful' at the same time (double entendre). He says 'I have three libraries', then he proceeds to count them out in a punning doubly-resonant way that finds 'one plus one' adding up to a literal 'two' (*unam Graecam, alteram Latinam*), but implying a loose smattering of 'several' at the same time. In terms of basic syntax, the specific phraseology that Trimalchio uses ('one *this*, another *that*') has to mean 'two', not 'several', because it assigns one adjective to each part (as in the Ciceronian examples cited above). I am not arguing that Trimalchio's words say and mean 'several', but that he is playing with the phrase so as to imply that it does. Taking Adamik's linguistic data in a different direction, I argue that Petronius deviates from the phraseology that he uses elsewhere for two-item lists not because he would have us surmise that a third item is being suppressed from the list, but because the same double effect is not available to phrases of the *alter–alter* type (*unus et alter* can be used to mean 'several', *alter et alter* cannot).

As he does so often in the course of his *cena*, Trimalchio is engaging in linguistic play, striving to impress, but not quite managing to pull it off. The joke is both dull and un-clever, but that is fully in keeping with the rest of Trimalchio's jokes. Seen this way, the harder reading *tres* stands up to hard scrutiny, and nothing outside the potentials of the phraseology itself is needed to defend it. That said, translating Trimalchio's strained linguistic joke into reasonably funny and self-obvious English is another matter altogether.

[17] Two further examples (of hundreds): Ov. *Tr.* 1.3.15-16 *alloquor extremum maestos abiturus amicos, | qui modo de multis unus et alter erat*; Cic. *Verr.* 2.75 *dicit unus et alter breuiter*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The best I can manage is something along the lines of the following: 'I have three libraries, Greek and Latin … one of each, a handful in a pair!' Or 'I have a handful of libraries: a Greek one, and a second Latin one to go with the first [*sc*. Latin one]. That makes three!'.

Yale University KIRK FREUDENBURG
Kirk.Freudenburg@yale.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838817000064

VALERIUS FLACCUS' *LANIABOR*-ACROSTIC (*ARGONAUTICA* 4.177-84)

litore in extremo spelunca apparuit ingens
arboribus super et dorso contecta minanti,
non quae dona die, non quae trahat aetheris ignem,
infelix domus et sonitu fremibunda profundi.
at uarii pro rupe metus: hinc trunca rotatis
bracchia rapta uiris strictoque immortua caestu
ossaque taetra situ <et> capitum maestissimus ordo;
respicias quibus aduerso sub uulnere nulla
iam facies nec nomen erat.
(*Argonautica* 4.177-85)

'Of course *laniabor* is not a name.' Thus very recently Cristiano Castelletti in a discussion of this notorious acrostic, which he associates with Aratean ἄρρητον (*Phaen*. 2) and Virgilian MA VE PV (*G*. 1.429-33).[1] If, however, *laniabor* is itself 'not a name', the aim of the present *annotatiuncula* is to argue that it is an etymological play on a 'name'. *Laniabor* spans the description of Amycus' cave, which is adorned with the dismembered limbs of his victims: Amycus himself will shortly suffer the same fate at Pollux' hands.[2] The name 'Amycus' was etymologized from ἀμύσσω[3] ('tear'; LSJ s.v. I), which exactly matches *lanio* ('tear'; *OLD* s.v. 1a). Hence by a cutely etymological *jeu onomastique* 'Tearer' says 'I'll be torn'.

[1] C. Castelletti, 'Aratus and the Aratean tradition in Valerius' *Argonautica*', in A. Augoustakis (ed.), *Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past* (Leiden, 2014), 49–72, at 58. Castelletti's recent review (*Gnomon* 84 [2012], 367–9, at 369) of P. Murgatroyd, *A Commentary on Book 4 of Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica* (Leiden and Boston, 2009) chides this commentator for resembling all his predecessors in failing to be aware of this acrostic, which was also discussed by Castelletti in 'Riflessioni sugli acrostici di Valerio Flacco', *GIF* 60 (2008), 219–34, at 221–4, where (221) Castelletti wrongly describes this acrostic as 'l'unico di Valerio accettato da Hilberg': *laniabor* was in fact dismissed as a 'neckisches Spiel des Zufalls' in Hilberg's canonical collection ('Ist die *Ilias Latina* von einem Italicus verfasst oder einem Italicus gewidmet?', *WS* 21 [1899], 264–305, at 269), though he did qualify it as 'die merkwürdigste Stelle' of all his 'Zufallsakrosticha'.

[2] Cf. M. Korn, *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica 4.1-343: Ein Kommentar* (Hildesheim, 1989), 138, who on line 192 ([*te*] … *tua silua ferat*) comments: 'Pollux denkt wohl daran, die Leiche des Amycus bzw. deren Teile (damit entspräche die Rache dem begangenen Frevel; vgl. *bracchia* 182, *ossa* 183, *capitum* 183) an einem oder mehreren Bäumen dieses Waldes aufzuhängen.'

[3] Cf. W.H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig, 1884–1890), 1.326 (s.v.).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000064 Published online by Cambridge University Press