point, beginning with Dewar,[2] who, in response to Lesueur's conservative printing of *artus*, championed *atris* on four grounds. He accepts from Hill that *artus* is not found in the singular in Statius and expands Hill's line reference, 6.81, pointing out that *ignibus atris* is used there also in the context of a funeral. To these arguments Dewar adds that *atris* at 8.5 is balanced by *niger* at 8.6 and that the sentence is smoother with Amphiaraus as the subject for the verbs of lines 8.5–8.8.

Shackleton Bailey is the most recent scholar to deal with the problem. He prints *artus*, as Lesueur had done, but in his apparatus criticus gives '*artus* (acc. pl.)'. By taking *artus* as a Greek accusative he removes half of Hill's and Dewar's arguments: *artus* is plural and *conditus* has for its subject Amphiaraus.

In spite of this development, *ignibus atris* is worth further consideration. In addition to Hill's and Dewar's point that the striking idea of dark or murky flames is found in Statius' *Thebaid* at 5.175–6 and 11.226 (*niger ignis* in both), at 7.159 (*atra incendia*) and in a similar context and the same line position at 6.81 (*ignibus atris*),[3] two more arguments may be made. First, an exploration of Roman epic reveals that the exact phrase *ignibus atris*, at the end of a line, is part of the standard language of poets. It appears in Lucan (2.299, 3.98), Valerius Flaccus (2.236) and Silius Italicus (17.180). Secondly, while Statius may have had one of these authors in mind, it is most likely that he is adapting Virgil's *Aeneid* 11.186–7, which describe a Trojan funeral scene:

> subiectis ignibus atris
> conditur in tenebras altum caligine caelum.

Virgil's use of *conditur* suggests a concealing of the sky in darkness, though, since *condo* is a word used in conjunction with funerals, it may well evoke an 'entombing', while Statius' lines present the image of a body concealed, or even entombed, in murky flames.

The weight of the majority of the manuscripts, among them P, has convinced editors of the verity of *artus*. We should have confidence in *atris*, the reading of the minority of manuscripts, however, given that there are strong parallels, in sense and word, for *ignibus atris* in Statius, that it is part of the poetic stock of Roman epic poets and that we have a likely source of Statius' lines in Virgil's *Aeneid*.

University of Manitoba ROBERT NAU
nau@cc.umanitoba.ca
doi:10.1017/S0009838809990322

[2] M.J. Dewar, review of *Stace*, Thébaïde, *Livres V–VIII*, ed. and tr. R. Lesueur, *CR* 42.1 (1992), 194.

[3] This passage is absent from manuscript P and may be useful as a parallel not from Statius but an interpolator.

A NOTE ON PETRONIUS 79.6

After the episode of the *Cena* ends, we find Encolpius and his companions drunk and on the street at night. When they reach their lodging place, it turns out that the hotel staff has been even more successful in drinking and is already deeply asleep, so they

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990334 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are unable to enter. But suddenly something happens which allows them to break in. The text is evidently corrupt here (Petr. 79.6):

et forsitan pernoctassemus in limine, ni tabellarius Trimalchionis interuenisset x uehiculis diues.

inuenisset *cod. Leid. corr. P. Daniel* || x uehiculis diues *cod. Leid.* * uehiculis diues *ed. Torn.* decem uehiculis deuiis *Carcopino* uehiculum dirigens *Rose* uehiculo rediens *Blommendaal* ex uehiculo desiliens *Müller* ex uehiculo diuus *Watt*

Our apparatus is largely dependent upon the recent commentary by Habermehl.[1] The conjectures listed fail to be fully convincing. Most of them are forced, although Watt's conjecture is elegant, alluding to a timely *deus ex machina* who saves them from a night on the street. Yet the phrasing is unparalleled and the metaphor is elusive.[2] However, Habermehl's comment is interesting: 'Es kann sich allenfalls um *einen* Wagen handeln; auch dem kryptischen „wagenreich" läßt sich kein Sinn entlocken. Das *X* steht wohl irrtümlich statt eines Asteriscus, wie die ed. Torn. und Müller ihn setzen'.[3] We agree with this observation, except that we are able to make some sense of *uehiculis diues* by seeing it as a scribal gloss on a Greek term. The asterisk, a frequent marker of gaps in Petronius' MSS, in this case must have been meant to signal the omission of a Greek word undecipherable for the scribe. We propose that the text should run:

… tabellarius Trimalchionis interuenisset εὐάρματος.

The prefix εὐ- can be ambiguous, and often implies abundance, as in εὐανδρία or εὔβοτος.[4] The same sense appears to be implied in εὐάρματος at Soph. *Ant.* 844–5, an epithet of Thebes. LSJ gloss it as meaning 'with beauteous car', but a different interpretation is suggested by the analogous πολυάρματος at Soph. *Ant.* 149, again spoken of Thebes. That εὐ- can be rendered *diues* by a Latin-speaking scholiast can be inferred, for example, from Ov. *Fast.* 5.731 *diues aquis … Amphitrite*, where the epithet is very likely an equivalent of εὔυδρος (rather than of πολύυδρος, *hapax* in classical Greek).[5] This is *uehiculis diues*. Yet in a second sense, more appropriate for the context of our passage, εὐάρματος is the Pindaric epithet of a victorious charioteer, 'having a fine car' (cf. Pind. *P.* 2.5, *I.* 2.17). In other words, Trimalchio's *tabellarius* is hyperbolically and flatteringly aligned with a victorious Pindaric charioteer. One more Grecism in the text of Petronius is not problematic; his predilection for the Greek language is well-known.[6] For example, there is another corrupted Grecism at 132.2 where Saumaise's *catomizari* is usually accepted for *catorogare* of the MSS, and at 132.15 we have another instance of literary Greek – in a poetic composition the word τέλος occurs as a term quoted from Epicurus. Yet such erudition is certainly better attested elsewhere; Cicero's letters to Atticus offer numerous examples,[7] but there is a memorable one at 5.21.4 *in his γλυκύπικρον illud*. We therefore conclude that

[1] P. Habermehl, *Petronius, Satyrica 79–141. Ein philologisch-literarischer Kommentar.* Bd. 1: *Sat.* 79–110 (Berlin, 2006), 5–6.

[2] Cf. Habermehl (n. 1), 6.

[3] Habermehl (n. 1), 6.

[4] See LSJ s.v. εὖ VI and P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris, 1968–80), s.v. ἐΰς.

[5] Cf. LSJ s.v. εὔυδρος and πολύυδρος.

[6] For an extensive list of Petronius' Grecisms see A. Ernout, *Aspects du vocabulaire latin* (Paris, 1954), 81–3.

[7] Cf. G.O. Hutchinson, *Cicero's Correspondence: A Literary Study* (Oxford, 1998), 13–15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990334 Published online by Cambridge University Press

uehiculis diues in the text of Petronius is the unfortunate gloss deriving from an erudite scribe.[8]

Warsaw University MAGDALENA ZAWADZKA
m.zawadzka@uw.edu.pl
JAN KWAPISZ
jan.kwapisz@uw.edu.pl
doi:10.1017/S0009838809990334

[8] We are very grateful to Rhiannon Ash, Mikolaj Szymanski, and *CQ*'s referee for suggesting various improvements.

A FLOWERY MEADOW AND A HIDDEN METALEPSIS IN ACHILLES TATIUS

It is commonly known that Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* is set apart from the other ancient Greek novels by its narrative technique.[1] It is the only extant Greek novel in which the story is narrated by the protagonist himself.[2] The novel's prologue is set in Sidon, where an anonymous narrator beholds a painting of Europa's abduction by Zeus and gives a lengthy description of it (1.1.2–13). The painting is simultaneously viewed by a young man who turns out to be Clitophon, the hero of the novel, and the two men begin a conversation about the power of *eros*. Clitophon is invited by the primary narrator to tell about his own experiences with *eros*. Once Clitophon has started his narration (1.3.1), the primary narrator never intervenes, and the frame narrative in Sidon is apparently never resumed.[3]

This note contributes to the wider issue of narrative structure in Achilles Tatius. I argue that Clitophon's portrayal of Leucippe at the end of the first book (1.19) contains a deliberate reference to the frame narrative and thus constitutes an example of the narratological device of metalepsis, defined by G. Genette as 'a deliberate transgression of the threshold of embedding'.[4] Metalepsis, then, is the slippage between different levels of narration, or, in M. Fludernik's words, 'the move of existants or actants from any hierarchically ordered level into one above or below'.[5] In

[1] The novel is usually dated in the early second half of the second century A.D. See *OCD*[3] s.v. Achilles Tatius and E. Bowie, 'The chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B.E. Perry: revisions and precisions', *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002), 47–63, at 60–1, who proposes A.D. 164 as a *terminus ante quem*.

[2] On the uniqueness of this homodiegetic narration in the novelistic corpus, see, among others, B.P. Reardon, 'Achilles Tatius and ego-narrative', in J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (edd.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London, 1994), 80–96.

[3] On possible explanations of the absence of any return to the frame story, see I. Repath, 'Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*: what happened next?', *CQ* 55 (2005), 250–65, S. Nakatani, 'A re-examination of some structural problems in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', *Ancient Narrative* 3 (2003), 63–81 and S. Rabau, 'Le roman d'Achille Tatius a-t-il une fin? Ou comment refermer une œuvre ouverte ?', *Lalies* 17 (1997), 139–49.

[4] G. Genette, *Narrative Discouse Revisited* (Ithaca, NY, 1988), 88. See also the definition of metalepsis in G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (Ithaca, NY, 1980), 234–5: 'any intrusion by the extradiegetic narrator or narratee into the diegetic universe (or by diegetic characters into a metadiegetic universe, etc.), or the inverse'.

[5] M. Fludernik, 'Scene shift, metalepsis, and the metaleptic mode', *Style* 37 (2003), 382–400, at 383.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990334 Published online by Cambridge University Press