*Classical Quarterly* 56.2 538–547 (2006) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000528


# CAVE NAVEM*

The decoration of the doorway to Trimalchio's dining room presents us, according to F. S. Naiden, with two puzzles: its appearance and Petronius' choice of words.[1] Neither puzzle, it seems to me, is really a puzzle at all. The question of why Petronius chose the Greek word *embolum*, rather than the usual Latin *rostrum*, may be briefly disposed of; the problem of the object itself will require a slightly fuller discussion.

It may be helpful to quote the passage in full (Petron. *Sat.* 30.1–2):

nos iam ad triclinium perveneramus, in cuius parte prima procurator rationes accipiebat, et quod praecipue miratus sum, in postibus triclinii fasces erant cum securibus fixi, quorum imam partem quasi embolum navis aeneum finiebat, in quo erat scriptum: C. Pompeio Trimalchioni, seviro Augustali, Cinnamus dispensator. Sub eodem titulo et lucerna bilychnis de camera pendebat.

We came now to the dining room, in the first part of which the *procurator* was receiving accounts and, something which I found quite marvellous, fixed to the doorposts were *fasces* endowed with axes, the lowest part of which ended as if in a bronze ship's ram, on which was written: 'To Caius Pompeius Trimalchio, *sevir* of the Augustan cult, from Cinnamus, his *dispensator*'. Additionally, from the roof there hung a double bronze lamp, beneath a copy of the same inscription.[2]

First, the lexical problem. *Embolum*, as Bagnani and Naiden both note, is a Latin *hapax*, a Grecism. Bagnani was left in *aporia*: 'If *embolum* is really equivalent to *rostrum*, it is difficult to understand why Encolpius, who is not a Greek or an Oriental, would use it in preference to the extremely common Latin word.'[3] Naiden

* Most of the research for this study was undertaken in the Blegen Library of the University of Cincinnati, while holding a Margo Tytus Scholarship (June/July 2005). I am most grateful to the Department of Classics in Cincinnati for their generosity, to Getzel Cohen for his warm hospitality, and the staff of the library for their unfailing kindness and assistance; also to the University of Leicester for granting me study leave to take up the scholarship. John Bodel and Ian Repath both commented on an initial draft of this paper and did their best to improve the speculations of a self-confessed Petronian novice; I am grateful also to the anonymous referee of *CQ* for a number of useful comments and corrections. No blame should be attached to them for the result.

[1] F. S. Naiden, 'Embola Petroniana', *CQ* 53 (2003), 637–9, at 637. Cf. G. Bagnani, 'The House of Trimalchio', *AJPh* 75 (1954), 16–39, at 30, who raises the same questions, with alternative solutions, discussed further below.

[2] The translation is my own. The text is that of K. Müller, *Satyricon Reliquiae* (Stuttgart, 1995[4]). The original MSS read *unam* rather than *imam*, the latter being an emendation originally proposed by Lipsius, but with no actual manuscript support. In his earlier *Satyricon* (Munich, 1961), Müller notes in the apparatus: 'imam $m^m$, *Lipsius (elect. 1, 23, anno 1580)*→$p^2$ : unam $Hlmrtp^{1'}$ (i.e. *imam* is to be found in the codex *m*, with marginalia of Muretus, and in Lipsius, leading to its inclusion in the annotated version of *p*; however, MSS $Hlmrtp^1$ all read *unam*, where *lmrtp* are the majority of the MSS making up the branch *L*). F. Bücheler, *Satirarum Reliquiae* (Berlin, 1862) and L. Friedländer, *Cena Trimalchionis* (Leipzig, 1891) both read *unam*. The emendation is however palaeographically straightforward and, as the anonymous referee for *CQ* points out to me, ' "One [single] part of which" cannot be what Petronius meant'. Bücheler commented '*contra ego summam intellego*', but as all the physical parallels, which I adduce below, suggest, it is easier to conceive of the *fasces* rising above the *rostra*, rather than as pendant below. Cf. Bagnani (n. 1), 30 with n. 46.

[3] Bagnani (n. 1), 30.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

offers several suggestions: 'For the odd device, [Petronius] prefers the odd word'; the odd avoidance of *rostrum* in turn perhaps implies ignorance on Encolpius' part, fitting to Encolpius' own inadequacy; and it 'prompts questions about bilingualism', with Encolpius falling short in his combination of the two languages.[4] However, if we focus upon the word *rostrum*, rather than *embolum*, a further consideration emerges.

The word *rostrum* occurs once in the *Satyrica*, used by Trimalchio to describe his face in the context of shaving off his beard (*Sat.* 75.10). This 'colloquial' usage (so described by the *OLD*, s.v. *rostrum*, 1.c.) is employed by the freedmen, in the *Cena*, alongside the word *bucca*; by contrast, the more 'urbane' *os* / *ora* is only used twice by the freedmen, but nineteen times elsewhere.[5] Furthermore, as Antonio Dell'Era observes, Encolpius employs only seven *hapax legomena* in the 10,572 words which he speaks outside the *Cena*, in contrast to seventeen out of 4,660 words spoken within the *Cena*. The conclusion, which Dell'Era draws from this and other anomalies in Encolpius' language associated with the *Cena*, is that Encolpius' language is influenced by his environment, and he is drawn into a degree of mimicry of his freedmen dining companions.[6] Grecisms are, as has long been recognized, frequent in Petronius, and especially in the language of the freedmen; but the presence also in the *Cena* of the colloquial use of *rostrum* suggests that *embolum* is not simply there as an affected Grecism, but reflects the fact that in this company Encolpius actually has the right word—in the language of the freedmen, *rostrum* means something different. However, while the language may be apposite to the environment, the choice of word may serve nonetheless to highlight the incongruity of the object, precisely because such an object is never otherwise, in our surviving evidence, referred to as an *embolum* (but rather as a *rostrum*). It is to this incongruous object that we must now turn.

In one of several insightful articles on the *Satyrica*, Paul Veyne observed, 'Comme on peut le constater chaque fois qu'il est possible de serrer de près les *realia* de la *Cena,* Pétrone ne fait que caricaturer légèrement des réalités parfaitement authentiques ou même se content de choisir, dans la gamme de ces réalités, les cas extrêmes.'[7] While it may be true that 'the distorting mirror of the *Satyricon* was not always meant to reflect real life', what constantly emerges is that so many of the smaller details and elements are deliberate distortions of a recognizable reality.[8] Thus, the painted *cave canem* (*Sat.* 29) on which Veyne concentrated is not simply the recognizable Pompeian mosaic, and the joke is more than the simple 'gag' of Encolpius recoiling from its realism.

Naiden asks 'how we, along with the narrator, the bewildered Encolpius are to envision it' (i.e. this device on the doorposts). Like Veyne, we should do Encolpius justice: he finds the device quite marvellous (*quod praecipue miratus sum*), but he has

[4] Naiden (n. 1), 638–9.

[5] See the table in B. Bryce, *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius' "Cena Trimalchionis"* (Leiden, 1991), 59; for the specific instances, M. Korn and S. Reitzer, *Concordantia Petroniana* (Hildesheim, 1986).

[6] Full discussion in A. Dell'Era, *Problemi di Lingua e Stile in Petronio* (Rome, 1970), 29–32. Cf. Bryce (n. 5), 31, 'this hypothesis is in itself not at all implausible. Encolpius is throughout the novel a chameleon'. However, Bryce cautions that the statistics may in part reflect the poor transmission of the Codex Traguriensis.

[7] P. Veyne, 'Cave Canem', *MEFRA* 75 (1963), 59–66, at 62.

[8] J. F. Donahue, 'Euergetic self-representation and the inscriptions at Satyricon 71.10', *CPh* 94 (1999), 69–74, at 70 with further bibliography. Cf. J. Bodel, 'The *Cena Trimalchionis',* in H. Hofmann (ed.), *Latin Fiction: The Latin Novel in Context* (London, 1999), 38–51, at 41. F. I. Zeitlin, 'Petronius as paradox: anarchy and artistic integrity', *TAPhA* 102 (1971), 631–84, at 662 concludes that 'Incongruities and confusions appear on many levels'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

no difficulty describing it, and that is not where the issue lies. *Fasces*, the bundles of rods symbolic of a Roman magistrate's authority, on this occasion equipped with the axes significant of the *imperium* held by certain senior Roman magistrates, were fixed to the doorposts. These *fasces* terminated at one end in the form of an inscribed bronze ship's ram. As Smith observed, if the word *eodem* is to have any significance then the lamp described in the final sentence must be separate from this device, hanging beneath a separate copy of the inscription.[9]

So far, so good, and most of those who have commented on the device have reached a similar conclusion.[10] If commentators struggle, it is in imagining how the *fasces* and the *embolum* actually combined. Details of the construction are less clear (all bronze or part plaster? Painted or in relief? Fixed or carved?), but Petronius does not go into detail. If we are to make any progress, not simply as regards the form, but in understanding why this device was incorporated by Petronius, and why it should catch Encolpius' eye, then we must start by examining the possible parallels.

In his discussion of the *cave canem* painting, Veyne justifies the observation quoted above by offering two further examples, of which the first is the *fasces* described here in *Sat.* 30.1–2. As Veyne observes (and others before him, such as Friedländer, Mau and Maiuri), on this occasion reality is not so very distorted.[11] Technically, as a *sevir Augustalis*, Trimalchio had the right to one lictor only (and so a single bundle of *fasces*) and no axes, since *imperium* was normally accorded only to consuls (and the archaic military tribunes with consular powers), praetors, dictators, masters of horse, members of extraordinary boards and those awarded proconsular or propraetorian powers. However, numerous examples exist of both municipal magistrates (assigned two lictors but no axes) and *seviri* commemorated by monuments not only bearing more *fasces* than they were technically permitted, but often also endowed with axes (and the *fasces* almost never occur singly, but in symmetrical pairs).[12] *Prima facie*, Trimalchio is doing nothing out of the ordinary.

[9] M. S. Smith, *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis* (Oxford, 1975), 62, ad loc.

[10] Friedländer and Bücheler both interpret it thus, with the only difference that Bücheler assumes the *embola* were above rather than below; A. Maiuri, *La Cena di Trimalchione di Petronio Arbitro: saggi, testo e commento* (Naples, 1945), 157, ad loc. is quite clear on the form, uncertain only if the *fasces* also were of bronze; Bagnani (n. 1), 30, is explicit ('on either side of the entrance', nailed to the doorposts), following Maiuri; Smith (n. 9), ad loc. explores the options of either side or a single device above the door, and opts for the former, considering the latter to strain the Latin; J. C. Dumont, 'Le décor de Trimalcion', *MEFRA* 102.2 (1990), 959–81, at 974 assumes one each side of the door; P. G. Walsh, *Petronius: The Satyricon* (Oxford, 1996), 22, is skilfully ambiguous in his translation. Naiden (n. 1), 638 is alone in his blunt rejection of the idea of one on each doorpost, which is founded on the observation that *embolum* is singular—but that is to ignore the grammar of a relative clause (*quorum unam partem quasi embolum navis aeneum finiebat*); if *embolum* were plural that would imply multiple rams on each set of *fasces*.

[11] Veyne (n. 7), 62, n. 3; cf. Friedländer (n. 2), 206 ad loc.; A. Mau, *Pompeji in Leben und Kunst* (Leipzig, 1908[2]), 444–5; Maiuri (n. 10), 157 ad loc.

[12] E.g. the tomb of M. Arrius Diomedes at Pompeii, considered by Mau (n. 11), 445; or that of C. Cartilius Poplicola (a *duovir*), at Ostia (M. F. Squarciapino, 'I rilievi della tomba di Cartilio Poplicola', in ead. (ed.), *Scavi di Ostia. III. Le necropoli. Parte I. Le tombe di età repubblicana e augustea* (Rome, 1958), 191–207, at 191–3 (see further below); or that of L. Octavius Trophimus from Tridentum (Trento), *CIL* V.5035, cited already by Friedländer and illustrated in A. M. Colini, *Il fascio littorio* (Rome, 1933), 118, no. 55 with tav. XII. Veyne (n. 7), 62, n. 3 has a long list of examples. A full catalogue of examples is now in T. Schäfer, *Imperii Insignia: Sella curulis und Fasces* (Mainz, 1989), with the specific case of *seviri Augustales* discussed at 218–21 (the aforementioned instances are C13, C7, C93). Schäfer observes that depiction of two bundles of *fasces* is in fact the norm on funerary monuments of *seviri*, taken to reflect their equation to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

What is striking, however, is that, as on other occasions, Trimalchio has brought elements of funerary and / or public display into a private / domestic setting.[13] Outside of a period of office-holding, display of the *fasces* normally occurred as a part of the commemorative tradition, not during the individual's lifetime. What is more, when portrayed on tombs, the *fasces* commonly appear on either side of a doorway on, or into the tomb.[14] J. Bodel's thesis, that the sequence of elements described prior to the dining room marked out to Petronius' readers the connections with a descent into the underworld, is reinforced: the doorway to the dining room is decorated like the doorway to a tomb.[15] Here is one source of Encolpius' amazement.

But it is the *embolum* to which Naiden rightly draws our attention, and which was perhaps a greater source of surprise for Encolpius. The bronze ship's ram that terminated each set of *fasces* has received considerably less attention from commentators, who mostly focus upon the more readily explicable *fasces*.[16] The *embolum* is usually picked up either because it prefigures the later allusion to ships in Trimalchio's plans for his tomb (*Sat.* 71), or else as a simple parallel to the *fasces*, a typically official and military monument, in this case apparently alluding to Trimalchio's commercial activities.[17] In neither case is the object pursued any further.

municipal magistrates in the act of putting on public games. See also M. Silvestrini, *Un itinerario epigrafico lungo la Via Traiana: Aecae, Herdonia, Canusium* (Bari, 1999), 58 A18 and 115 Cc4, with the observation that in Apulia the display of *fasces* seems to be particularly associated with *Augustales*. Compare the excellent discussion, focused upon the tomb described at *Sat.* 71, by J. Whitehead, 'The "Cena Trimalchionis" and biographical narration in Roman middle-class art', in P. J. Holliday (ed.), *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art* (Cambridge, 1993), 299–325, at 310–11 on the over-expression of the sevirate in Trimalchio's monument and other historical examples. On the similarly inflated notion of *sevir creatus absens*, in Trimalchio's epitaph, see T. Mommsen, 'Trimalchios Heimath und Grabschrift', *Hermes* 13 (1878), 106–21, at 118–19; E. Hübner, 'Zum Denkmal des Trimalchio', *Hermes* 13 (1878), 414–22; J. D'Arms, *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome* (Harvard, 1981), 109–10; and see further below, n. 40.

[13] Cf. J. Bodel, 'Trimalchio's underworld', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore and London, 1994), 237–59, at 241–3.

[14] A. J. Marshall, 'Symbols and showmanship in Roman public life: the fasces', *Phoenix* 38.2 (1984), 120–41, at 133–4 highlights the oddity of Trimalchio's usage (and comments explicitly at 134, n. 36 that 'Trimalchio's use of the insignia for house décor is naturally a comic invention'). For *fasces* on tombs, see Squarciapino (n. 12), 193 and Schäfer (n. 12), 383–415.

[15] Bodel (n. 13), 246: 'no contemporary Roman could have failed to recognize that Trimalchio's house is decorated in the manner of a Roman tomb'. Bodel focuses upon the biographical paintings in the portico, and he does not mention the *fasces*; he does not claim to be the first to recognize the funereal theme, either more generally or in this scene in particular, but he gives it a new coherence (for further references, see especially his nn. 4, 5, 38, 39).

[16] So, e.g., E. Courtney, *A Companion to Petronius* (Oxford, 2001), 79, omits all mention of the *embola*, concentrating on the *fasces* alone.

[17] On the literary structure of the *Satyrica*, Bodel (n. 8), 44–5, after T. Hubbard, 'The narrative architecture of Petronius's *Satyricon*', *L'Antiquité Classique* 55 (1986), 190–212. Bodel (n. 13), 243, n. 40 explicitly picks out the *embola* of this passage and the ships of *Sat.* 71.9 as one of the many elements of ring composition. Smith (n. 9), ad loc., Walsh (n. 10), ad loc., and Dumont (n. 10), 974 all simply note the military / commerce transposition without further comment. The ships depicted on Trimalchio's tomb are well discussed in L. Pepe, 'Sul monumento sepolcrale di Trimalchione', in id., *Sermo Milesius* (Perugia, 1987 [1957]), 163–76, at 169–73, and Whitehead (n. 12), 309–10 (cf. Hübner [n. 12], 417), both of whom reject the frequently assumed implication of Trimalchio's commercial success and point out the common symbolic role of ships in funerary art of the period. As Whitehead astutely notes, we learn of the ships on Trimalchio's tomb (*Sat.* 71) before we learn of his shipping (*Sat.* 76), and so we must 'read the motif as a standard cliché at first because his biography is still not revealed to us'. The same must apply to the *embolum*. D'Arms (n. 12), 117 picks up a different echo, between the 'beaks of his merchant ships' in *Sat.* 30.1 and 'his actual ships at sea' at *Sat.* 39.8, but this latter reference is so fleeting and allusive that it can be safely passed over.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

However, the *embolum* is not wholly ignored. A. Maiuri noted the existence of possible parallels at Pompeii, where, in the House of the Silver Wedding, a double pair of bronze bosses, from each of which projects a ship's *rostrum* in union with a bull *protome*, were found on the walls of the *atrium* (and one can all too easily imagine a commentator's difficulties in trying to make sense of a cursory ancient—or modern—description of these objects).[18] G. Bagnani, in addition to the oddity of the word *embolum*, like Naiden found it 'difficult to see how the cylindrical *fasces* could end in a *rostrum* that is a projecting and horizontal object'. He offered the peculiar suggestion that we should understand it as something like the stanchions or mooring rings known from the Nemi barges, and situated on the top of the *fasces*.[19] Naiden in turn has sought to resolve the difficulty by placing emphasis on a lesser meaning of *embolum* in Greek, 'a peg', but this seems no more satisfactory.[20] I fail to see the difficulty of combining a horizontal projection from a wall or doorpost with a vertical object, probably in relief, rising above it. To take an extreme example, the Nike of Samothrace should be sufficient to dispel such perplexities. A terracotta *rhtyon* from Vulci, Italy, now in the British Museum, likewise gives a pretty good idea of the physical possibilities (the handled cup rises out of the prow of a ship, which is itself adorned with a *rostrum*).[21]

One commentator does however point us in a possible direction. Smith (n. 9, ad loc.) notes the relevance of Cic. *Phil*. 2.18.68: *An tu, illa in vestibulo rostra [spolia] cum adspexisti, domum tuam te introire putas? Fieri non potest* ('Do you, when in that forecourt you have seen ships' beaks [and spoils], think you are entering your own house? It cannot be'). Cicero is speaking of Cn. Pompeius Magnus' house, decorated with the spoils from Pompeius' campaigns against the pirates (cf. Plut. *Pomp*. 28), and later acquired by M. Antonius. The distinctiveness and fame of Pompeius' house emerges not least from the memory of it preserved in the SHA, *Gord*. 3.6–7.[22] The fact that the *embolum* has on it an inscription drawing attention to Trimalchio's acquired

[18] Maiuri (n. 10), ad loc. See A. Sogliano, *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* (1905), 245–57, at 254–6 with figs. 7–8; Mau (n. 11), 262, fig. 135 reproduces one of these. A different sort of parallel can now be cited from Hellenistic / Republican Soluntum, on the north coast of Sicily, east of Palermo: painted stucco ships' prows (in profile), of the late second or early first century B.C. Two examples are currently on display in the Museo Archeologico Regionale di Palermo "Antonino Salinas", N.I. 40938 and 40948, from the (mostly unpublished) 1950s excavations at Solunto.

[19] Bagnani (n. 1), 30. These beautiful objects, sadly lost, are illustrated in G. Moretti, 'I bronzi figurati', in G. Ucelli, *Le Nave di Nemi* (Rome, 1950), 205–23, esp. figs. 230–8. This 'solution' seems to me to be a counsel of despair, since: (a) we have no obvious parallels for such decoration; (b) they have no obvious iconographic significance (they resemble the modern lion's head doorknocker, but once removed from a boat they would surely be difficult to connect with anything); (c) there is no parallel for the use of the word *embolum* (or *rostrum*) to designate such an object; and (d) they are, if anything, even harder to imagine combined with *fasces*.

[20] Naiden (n. 1), 637–8. Naiden's argument requires examples from Greek tragedy and Hesychius, as opposed to the word's normal and common meaning throughout this period of 'ship's ram', which is surely what would have occurred to any reader (and why else is the word *navis* present?). As should become clear, there are plenty of parallels for this element of the object described.

[21] BM Terracottas D201, illustrated in L. Basch, *Le musée imaginaire de la marine antique* (Athens, 1987), fig. 815.

[22] Cited by Bodel (n. 13), 240, because it records that Gordion I displayed a painting of a gladiatorial exhibition of his aedileship in the *domus rostrata* of Pompeius; Bodel is interested in the painting of a *munus*, to parallel Trimalchio's own murals, and refrains from commenting on the *rostra*. One wonders what Petronius would have made of this later imitation of fiction by reality.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*praenomen* and *nomen*, C. Pompeius, can hardly be coincidental. As W. M. Murray and P. M. Petsas speculated, in a footnote to their discussion of Octavian's campsite monument at Actium (which displayed somewhere between thirty-three and forty *rostra*), 'Do we have here [at *Sat.* 30] a satirical reflection of Pompey's own ostentatious display?'[23]

It is however important to note that Pompeius was not acting in a vacuum. The major public examples of triumphal *rostra* are well known, in particular the *columna rostrata* of C. Duilius, and those in the Roman forum.[24] However, a number of ancient authors record that it was customary in the Republic to hang spoils on, or in private houses. Furthermore, this was not simply the preserve of triumphing generals, but actually open to those private soldiers who were rewarded for their valour in battle. One of the primary locations for such display was, precisely, the doorposts of the house.[25] The reference to the house of Pompeius would seem to be clear; furthermore, Vergil's *Aeneid* contains a description of Latinus' palace which, while clearly intended to allude to Augustus' Palatine complex, would also, as T. P. Wiseman suggests, have reminded readers of the house of Pompeius.[26] Vergil's account reflects the fact that in the Augustan period such decoration of the doorways of great houses had its principal association with the *princeps*—as Ovid's own passage on the Palatine palace highlights.[27] In fact, the custom seems largely to disappear with

[23] W. M. Murray and P. M. Petsas, 'Octavian's campsite memorial for the Actian War', *TAPhA* 79.4 (1989), i–xi + 1–172, at 117, n. 12 (at 116–23 they consider the wider monumental context); the total number of rams on the Actium monument is discussed on p. 56. John Bodel *per litteras* believes that an allusion to Pompeius' *domus rostrata* is primary. The connection is also made explicitly by T. P. Wiseman, '*Conspicui postes tectaque digna deo*: the public image of aristocratic and imperial houses in the late Republic and early Empire', in *L'Urbs: espace urbaine et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)* (Rome, 1987), 393–413, at 394, n. 5.

[24] On the *rostra* in the Roman forum, see F. Coarelli, *Il foro romano. I. Periodo arcaico* (Rome, 1983), 145–60; and id., *Il foro romano. II. Periodo repubblicano e augusteo* (Rome, 1985), 308–24 on the *rostra* of the temple of the Divus Iulius. On the column of C. Duilius, see most recently E. Kondratieff, 'The column and coinage of C. Duilius: innovations in iconography in large and small media in the Middle Republic', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 23 (2004), 1–39. Livy 10.2.14 recalls, from autopsy, a similar monument at Patavium.

[25] Spoils on display in private houses: Plin. *NH* 35.7; Livy 10.7.9, 23.23.6, 38.43.10; Cato, *ORI*[4] (Malcovati), 97; Plut. *C. Gracch.* 15.1; Sall. *Cat.* 12.4; Prop. 3.9.26; Tib. 1.1.54; Suet. *Ner.* 38.2. In the houses of ordinary soldiers: Polyb. 6.39.10. The principal discussions are Wiseman (n. 23), and E. Rawson, 'The antiquarian tradition: spoils and representations of foreign armour', in W. Eder (ed.), *Staat und Staatlichkeit in der frühen römischen Republik* (Stuttgart, 1990), 158–73.

[26] Vergil, *Aen.* 7.170–86, esp. 183–6: *Multaque praeterea sacris in postibus arma captivi pendent currus curvaeque secures et cristae capitum et portarum ingentia claustra spiculaque clipeique ereptaque rostra carinis* ('There were hanging also on hallowed pillars many weapons, chariots which had been captured, axes with curved edges, crests from helmets, huge bars from gates, spear-heads, shields and rams wrenched off ships' [tr. Jackson Knight]). Wiseman (n. 23), 397 notes further that *carinis* is potentially a punning reference to the location of Pompeius' house (cf. e.g. Vell. Pat. 2.77.1). Familiarity with the passage is implied, as Rawson (n. 25), 162 notes, by Silius Italicus' mimicry of the lines (1.617–29).

[27] Ov. *Tr.* 3.1.33–40: *Singula dum miror, video fulgentibus armis | conspicuos postes tectaque digna deo 'Et Iovis haec' dixi 'domus est?' Quod ut esse putarem | augurium menti querna corona dabat. | cuius ut accepi dominum, 'non fallimur,' inquam, | 'et magni verum est hanc Iovis esse domum | cur tamen opposita velatur ianua lauro | cinget et augustas arbor opaca fores?* ('While I was marvelling at one thing after another, I beheld doorposts marked out from others by gleaming arms and a dwelling worthy of a god! "Is this also Jove's abode," I said, and for such thought an oaken wreath gave to my mind the augury. And when I learned its master, I said, "No error is

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Augustus, or at any rate to be restricted to the *princeps*, and, as Suetonius implies, in Petronius' own day the great fire of Rome destroyed many of the other remaining examples.[28] If the Petronian allusion is to Pompeius, the associations are also imperial.

There is therefore a second theme running through Trimalchio's domestic decoration at this point, besides the funerary one emphasized by Bodel, which is that of the triumph. If the *fasces* are primarily funereal, the *rostrum* is primarily triumphal.[29] Furthermore, it is in the context of honorific, rather than funerary practice that the inscription set up by Trimalchio's *dispensator* belongs: Augustus' *vestibulum* also contained the inscription of his title *pater patriae*, and as both W. Eck and J. Bodel have noted, from the Augustan period onwards, honorific inscriptions move into the space of private homes, with a growing degree of crossover between honorific and funerary commemoration.[30]

Aristocratic and imperial parallels and allusions for Trimalchio's behaviour hardly come as a great surprise to the reader. It is, however, worth bearing in mind that we do not need to rely solely upon such grand parallels. Besides the fact that the dimensions of, for example, a bronze ram from Bremerhaven clearly demonstrate that hanging the real thing in a private house was not beyond the bounds of practicality, there is another private parallel that deserves notice.[31] Excavations in the 1990s on the southern hill of the acropolis at Segesta, in western Sicily, unearthed the remains of several stone prows from the main room of a peristyle 'villa' of the late second century B.C.[32] These objects, of which three survive largely intact (there may have been as many as eight originally), measure 0.96 × 0.38 × 0.36 m; one end is squared off for insertion in the wall (eight reconstructs neatly as two per wall of the room), while the other end is ornately carved in the form of a ship's prow, with both *embolon* and *proembolion*. Holes in both the *proembolion* and the top of the prow imply the original addition of bronze fittings, for which both lamps and statues (such as a Nike) have been suggested; one imagines that *fasces* could fit just as well, although clearly not in this instance.[33] While we need not accept G. Nenci's suggestion that the house

mine; it is true that this is the home of mighty Jove. But why is the door screened by the laurels before it, their dark foliage surrounding the august portals?"' [Loeb transl.]). Augustus' own account is in *RG* 34.

[28] Suet. *Ner.* 38.2. Rawson (n. 25), 160 suggests that the right was lost to generals from the Augustan period; cf. Wiseman (n. 23), 398, and J. Bodel, 'Monumental villas and villa monuments', *JRA* 10 (1997), 5–35, at 26–30.

[29] H. I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford, 1996), 212–13 finds the triumphal theme in the wall paintings of *Sat.* 29 more striking than the funerary context.

[30] *RG* 35.1. W. Eck, 'Senatorial self-representation: developments in the Augustan period', in F. Millar and C. Segal (edd.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford, 1984), 129–67, at 134; cf. Bodel (n. 28), 31.

[31] For the Bremerhaven ram, a Hellenistic or Roman bronze ram, probably from a small galley with a single bank of oars, between 30 and 60 cm in height, 26 cm wide, and weighing 53 kg, see *Nefer* 5 (Zurich, 1987), 25, no. 40 and Murray and Petsas (n. 23), 56, 103–4 with fig. 58, and 112–13. For a typology of rams in this period, see L. Basch, 'Another Punic wreck in Sicily: its ram. 1. A typological sketch', *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration* 4 (1975), 201–19; cf. Basch (n. 21), 390–1.

[32] See B. Bechtold, 'Una villa ellenistico-romana sull'acropoli sud di Segesta', *Atti delle Seconde Giornate Internazionali di Studi sull'Area Elima (Gibellina, 22–26 ottobre 1994)* (Pisa, Gibellina, 1997), 1.85–110.

[33] Besides Bechtold (n. 32), see also R. Camerata Scovazzo, 'Two prow-shaped consoles', in G. Pugliese Carratelli (ed.), *The Greek World: Art and Civilization in Magna Graecia and Sicily* (Milan and New York, 1996), 636, no.2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

belonged to the *navarcus Segestanus*, Heraclius, mentioned in Cicero's *Verrines*, this private monument belongs in a wider Roman, and quite possibly military context.[34]

Although this Sicilian example is unique, so far as I know, in the context of an apparently private house (below the level of a Pompeius), it is not unique in the private sphere. A number of examples, principally, but not only, from the Hellenistic world can be cited. Besides the grand examples of public naval monuments such as the Nike of Samothrace, now in the Louvre, or the Cyrene naval monument, there is a fair number of smaller monuments, some from private contexts.[35] Roman examples also exist in the form of funerary monuments, in particular two stone examples from Aquileia of the Augustan period or early principate, and another marble example in the museum at Leipzig.[36] We should not, perhaps, be surprised to return to funerary monuments, and it is with a funerary monument from Roman Ostia, not far from Trimalchio's own Puteoli, that I shall conclude this brief survey.

Outside the Porta Marina of Ostia stand two monumental tombs of the late first century B.C. Although the city later expanded into this area, the tombs continued to be respected by later building work down into the third century A.D. One of these tombs, dated *c.* 25 B.C., belonged to an Ostian *duovir* called C. Cartilius Poplicola. The square tomb rested on a stone base, 6.21 m on each side and over 6 m tall. On the front of the tomb, bracketing the epitaph recording the deceased, were two symmetrical sets of eight *fasces* (without axes). Above, a frieze, on which were depicted men and ships, ran around the tomb below a surmounting cornice. From the level of the inscription upwards, the survival is very fragmentary, but parts of all of these elements survive. The upper surfaces of the blocks of the cornice indicate that a further set of blocks originally stood above.[37] The tomb already offers several tempting parallels for Trimalchio, and not just in its scale and location. The sixteen bundles of *fasces* are highly unusual (twelve is the normal maximum), and the combination with a monument of such size for a municipal magistrate (with the right

[34] Cic. *Verr.* 5.111 and 120 with G. Nenci, 'Novità epigrafiche dall'area elima', in *Atti delle Seconde Giornate Internazionali di Studi sull'Area Elima (Gibellina, 22–26 ottobre 1994)* (Pisa, Gibellina, 1997), 3.1187–1202, at 1196–7. See now A. Pinzone, 'I socii navales siciliani', in M. Caccamo Caltabiano, L. Campagna and A. Pinzone (edd.), *Nuove Prospettive della Ricerca sulla Sicilia del III sec. a.C.* (Pelorias 11, Messina, 2004), 11–34, at 21, n. 42.

[35] See, e.g., the various instances from Rhodes, Delos and elsewhere discussed by A. L. Ermeti, *L'Agorà di Cirene.* III.i. *Il monumento navale* (Rome, 1981), 60–78. Additionally, two further examples may now be cited from ancient Tyndaris (modern Tindari, north-east Sicily), currently on display in the site's antiquarium. These could in principle be from either public or private contexts. (1) A stone *rostrum*, inv. no. 487, from the area of the so-called 'basilica' and dated to the second/first century B.C., apparently intended to project from a wall (*c.* 0.75 m long, 0.6 m high); see U. Spigo (ed.), *Tindari: l'area archeologica e l'antiquarium* (Milazzo, 2005), 73–4, fig. 3; the closest parallel for this example is probably the marble *rostrum* from Ostia discussed below. (2) A free-standing stone replica of a ship's prow (on display outside the antiquarium, *c.* 0.7 m high, 1.4 m wide, 1.4 m long), which may best be compared with one of the Aquileia examples cited in the next note. I am grateful to Dott.ssa M. C. Lentini and Dr D. Blackman for bringing these two examples to my attention, discussion of which they hope to publish in future.

[36] The Aquileia examples are illustrated in Ermeti (n. 35), pls. 24–5, with references pp. 57, n. 5 and 58, n. 1; the Leipzig example is cited on 57, n. 2. These and other examples are also illustrated and discussed in Basch (n. 21), 354–71, 387–91, 418–56; see also P.-M. Duval, 'Panneaux de dépouilles navales', in R. Amy et al., *L'Arc d'Orange* (Gallia Supplement 15) (Paris, 1962), 94–106 at 99.

[37] The information summarized in this paragraph can be found in I. Gismondi, 'Le architetture', in M. F. Squarciapino (ed.), *Scavi di Ostia*, vol. 3, *Le necropoli. Parte* I. *Le tombe di età repubblicana e augustea* (Rome, 1958), 169–90, with a reconstruction of the front of the tomb in fig. 74; on the cornice, see p. 177.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to only two *fasces*) is unparalleled.[38] The ships on the frieze, while a more commonplace motif, have their echo in Trimalchio's planned tomb (*Sat.* 71.9), as the editors noted.[39] The inscription records Cartilius' election to the duumvirate *in absentia*, for which again parallels are few, and one of those noted by the editor, besides the well-known case of C. Marius' consulship, is Trimalchio's own epitaph (*Sat.* 71.12).[40] However, it is the final element, which originally surmounted the cornice, that is of most interest here. The tomb's editors are reasonably certain that a *rostrum*, made up of two blocks of Carrara marble, found in the vicinity, was part of the missing upper level. The blocks fit with the rest of the tomb physically, architecturally and in their execution (stylistically and technically).[41] The reasons why Cartilius' monument placed such emphasis upon naval activity, both in the frieze and the *rostrum*, are a matter for speculation, but it matters little here (although the uncertainty as to whether we can legitimately infer military activity on Cartilius' part is worth noting).[42] Of far greater significance is the scale of the monument, its Ostian context, its date and the conjunction of elements in its decoration traditionally associated with Roman consuls and naval victories.

I do not pretend to have offered an exact match for Trimalchio's doorpost decoration. The precise combination of *fasces* and *rostrum* is indeed unparalleled. But the *rostrum*, or *embolum* itself is by no means unattested, in both public and private contexts, and should present us with no difficulties. Both the *fasces* and the *rostra* can readily be construed as further examples of the incongruous, possibly funereal, typically public or monumental, and overweening elements which appear elsewhere in Trimalchio's life and house. The tomb of Cartilius must have occasioned a certain amount of comment in its day, just like that of the 'baker', Eurysaces, outside the Porta Maggiore at Rome. Cn. Pompeius Magnus' *domus rostrata* likewise attracted

[38] Squarciapino (n. 12), 191–3 on the *fasces*. The most plausible explanation for the number is that they represent Cartilius' eight elections to the duumvirate; see also Schäfer (n. 12), 217–18 and C7.

[39] Squarciapino (n. 12), 200–4; cf. above n. 17.

[40] H. Bloch, 'C. Cartilius Poplicola', in M. F. Squarciapino (ed.), *Scavi di Ostia*, vol. 3, *Le necropoli. Parte* I. *Le tombe di età repubblicana e augustea* (Rome, 1958), 209–20 at 217. C. Marius' *elogium* is *Inscr. It.* XIII.3. *Elogia*, nos. 17 and 83. The Cartilius inscription is re-edited with an additional fragment by S. Panciera, 'Il sepolcro ostiense di C. Cartilius Poplicola ed una scheda epigrafica di Gaetano Marini', *Archeologia Classica* 18 (1966), 54–63; at 62–3 with nn. 27–9 Panciera surveys the known instances of election *in absentia*, observing that most examples are Augustan (and there are no pre-Augustan epigraphic examples), and that the later examples concern municipal magistrates or priests (although not *seviri*).

[41] Gismondi (n. 37), 177 on the cornice; 179 on the two blocks, one of which was found by the other tomb, the so-called 'mausoleum'; 181 on the belief that they were cut by the same stone mason as the frieze, and that the nature of the monument's foundations supports the conjecture. Also Squarciapino (n. 12), 194, in detail, and citing parallels such as the Aquileia examples noted above (n. 36).

[42] Cf. Squarciapino (n. 12), 204–6. See further the discussions of F. Zevi, 'Monumenti e aspetti culturali di Ostia repubblicana', in P. Zanker (ed.), *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* (Göttingen, 1976), 1.52–63 at 56–60, and B. Frischer, '*Monumenta et Arae Honoris Virtutisque Causa:* evidence of memorials for Roman civic heroes', *BCAR* 88 (1982–3), 52–86, at 53–5 and 76–8, and note esp. 76, 'his *monumentum* is decorated with the very Augustan imagery of warships, because warships—symbolic not so much of a specific naval victory (like the one at Actium) as of Roman sea power generally and good government, and perhaps even evocative of Themistocles' monument at the entrance to the Piraeus—appear on many Augustan monuments from Miletus to Orange'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

attention. To return to Veyne, 'Pétrone ne fait que caricaturer légèrement des réalités parfaitement authentiques ou même se content de choisir, dans la gamme de ces réalités, les cas extrêmes'. Encolpius' surprise should occasion no surprise in us, in terms of the object; what it may say about Encolpius is another matter.

*Merton College, Oxford* JONATHAN R. W. PRAG
jonathan.prag@merton.ox.ac.uk

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press