

Giton's Performance of Status in the *Satyrica* of Petronius

Konnor Lee Clark

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2019

Reading Committee

Catherine M. Connors, Chair

Deborah Kamen

Sarah Levin-Richardson

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Classics

©Copyright 2019

Konnor Lee Clark

University of Washington

Abstract

Giton's Performance of Status in the *Satyrica* of Petronius

Konnor Lee Clark

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Catherine M. Connors

Classics

The character Giton in Petronius's *Satyrica* represents one of the most multifaceted characters in this piece of literature. The thesis of this dissertation is that Giton performs slavery in various ways throughout the novel, and his interactions with others reinforce this claim. Firstly, Giton is represented as performing a variety of tasks and roles typically assigned to enslaved persons: he serves as a bath attendant, he cooks, and he guides. Giton also is sexually objectified by a variety of characters in the novel in ways that are similar to the sexual objectification of slaves. Similarly, the narrator and fellow character Encolpius denies Giton's subjectivity by objectifying and feminizing the boy. Finally, some of the ways in which Giton performs slavery are emblematic of Roman comedy's clever slave. This investigation into how Petronius represents Giton's multifaceted embodiment and enactment of slavery advances our understanding of enslaved persons and their status by analyzing Giton's actions and interactions as social performances.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Background on the <i>Satyrica</i> and Petronius	1
Genre	2
Characters in the <i>Satyrica</i>	4
Summary of the Extant Plot	6
Review of Previous Literature and Theoretical Approach.....	8
Dissertation Contribution	14
Giton's Freeborn Status.....	15
CHAPTER 1: GITON AS SLAVE.....	25
A Jack of All Trades: Giton's Slave Roles	25
Perception is Everything: How Other Characters View Giton	42
CHAPTER 2: GITON AS SEX OBJECT	51
Sexual Attraction to Giton.....	54
Feminization and Objectification	63
Giton's Desire: A Willing Slave?	68
CHAPTER 3: GITON AND ENCOLPIUS	75
Giton as Brother Yet Boy Slave.....	76
Giton Feminized.....	87
Giton's Mock Suicide.....	93
CHAPTER 4: GITON THE COMIC SLAVE.....	99
Intelligence	101
Improvisation and Manipulation	107
Setting the Stage: Giton's Metatheatricality	115
CONCLUSION.....	123
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	129

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my committee for assisting me through this process: Sarah Levin-Richardson, Deb Kamen, and Cathy Connors immeasurably contributed to my thinking, and without their invaluable attention to this dissertation, it would not be half of what it is today. Their combined skillsets and insights beautifully created a dream team more thorough, helpful, and enlightening than the one I had even anticipated. My gratitude to Sarah, particularly for stretching my thinking and pointing out my blind spots, and to Deb for being so responsive, thorough, and kind, both on this committee and as my graduate advisor. My gratitude to Cathy for being so knowledgeable, patient, and understanding, both as my committee chair and as an advisor for my Latin teaching. I express my sincerest appreciation for the time and attention that these three wonderful individuals have given to this piece of scholarship.

I would also like to thank all the amazing faculty with whom I have had the pleasure of working all these years. The Grinnell Classics faculty formed the basis of my undergraduate education in Classics, and it was Ed Phillips, now Emeritus, who first sparked my love of Latin. Monessa Cummins kicked my still teenage self into high gear, when no one else did, and I still periodically appreciate the effect her tough love had on my motivation for academic self-improvement. The UCLA Classics faculty, during my post-baccalaureate, paved my way to graduate school, and without the counsel and friendship of Bob Gurval and Amy Richlin I would not have continued to my master's program. Amy reignited my waning love for Classics through her warmth, through her teaching, and by inspiring me to pursue my own interests. She introduced me to Petronius, to Fellini's *Satyricon* (what a trip), to Plautus, to satire, to issues of ancient slavery, sexuality, gender, and so many other aspects of Classics that I had not explored before. I thank her from the bottom of my heart for all her years of mentorship, and the

countless ways she has influenced me as a Classics scholar. Likewise, I wish to thank the faculty at the University at Buffalo for all their support as I completed my master's thesis. John Dugan's and Martha Malamud's tireless assistance on my master's committee was invaluable to my development as a scholar, and I thank them for all their counsel and insight. Lastly, I would like to thank the faculty at the University of Washington, who have been my instructors, advisors, supervisors, mentors, and role models for the last four years of my life. Thank you all for your patience with me, the intellectual and personal growth you have provided me, and your overall passion for our profession; I will truly miss every moment.

Finally, I would like to thank the friends and family who supported me throughout this seemingly never-ending process. The friends that I have made in Grinnell, Los Angeles, Buffalo, and Seattle have shown me the glories of life outside Classics, and their general apathy for the academic work that I do has been most reinvigorating. Thanks to my mother for instilling in me my interest in reading, which manifested into a love of fantastical fiction specifically: my youthful love of mythology is what got me into this mess, but my mess of a mother sparked my love of mythology in the first place. Thanks to my grandparents, without whose foundational love and support I would not have been able to continue to my master's and PhD. It was pure happenstance that both my grandparents' alma maters were in the same athletic conference as Grinnell, and without their advice to visit my undergraduate campus, I would never have applied, obtained the education that I obtained, or met my current spouse, Lauro; I can never repay them. It is Lauro that I most wish to thank. I have been a student throughout our entire relationship, which, at the time of writing this, has been over eleven wonderful years. He is my rock, my constant, my best friend, and he has kept me sane throughout this whole ridiculous, stressful, wonderful process. Without his willingness to travel the country with me, his support of, if

disinterest in, my academic journey, and his loving companionship, I would not be where I am today. He is the greatest gift that I have ever received, and I thank him for everything he means to me.

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation focuses on the sixteen-year-old character Giton and his interactions with the other characters of the *Satyrica*, a novel written by Petronius. I argue that Giton's actions and interactions in the *Satyrica* enact a performance of slavery. My aim is to highlight how representations of social performance in Petronius participate in a broader literary tradition of these representations and how these literary representations can inform our understanding of the character Giton, the *Satyrica*, and the lived experiences of enslaved persons.

Background on the *Satyrica* and Petronius

Scaliger was the first to identify the *Satyrica*'s author with the *elegantiae arbiter*, "judge of taste," in the court of the emperor Nero (Sullivan 1968a: 27; Schmeling 2011: xiii), and this has withstood the test of time as the *communis opinio*. Whether his *praenomen* was Titus, as Plutarch and Pliny attest, or Gaius as Tacitus does (*Ann.* 16.18), matters little for our purposes, but Schmeling prefers the former, noting that T. and C. are often confused in the manuscript tradition (2011: xiii).

Our minimal evidence regarding the life of Petronius comes from Plutarch, Tacitus, and Pliny (*ibid.*). Plutarch describes Petronius as ironically accusing Nero of stinginess (μικρολογία) and sordidness (ρύπαρία), knowing that Nero was perceived to be a lavish spendthrift (ἄσωτος and πολυτελής; *Mor.* 60 E). Pliny, discussing the value of fluorspar and its introduction to Rome, describes Petronius as having broken an expensive fluorspar ladling vessel to prevent Nero from acquiring it upon Petronius's death (*NH* 37.20). Tacitus's depiction of Petronius's outlandish public suicide at his own banquet suspiciously embodies the tone of the *Satyrica* itself

(*Ann.* 16.17-20), and so it is difficult to determine whether or not the historian has constructed his biographical narrative to model the author's novel.

Moreover, these reports of Petronius's life should not necessarily influence our reading of the *Satyrice* when the entire novel is spoken from the perspective of Encolpius. As Conte points out (1996: *passim*), we must distinguish between the hidden author that is Petronius, the narrator Encolpius, and even the character Encolpius: Encolpius is not Petronius, and even Encolpius the narrator is not identical with Encolpius the character. Therefore, even if we were to take these historical accounts of Petronius at face value, it would prove difficult to apply them to the novel itself.

Most scholars support dating the *Satyrice* to the reign of Nero, and Bodel's treatment of the subject provides compelling literary, linguistic, and historical reasons to do so (1984: 7; Schmeling 2011: xiv). Placing the *Satyrice* in the context of the complicated social status dynamics taking place during Nero's reign can help us to better understand the ambiguous and at times contradictory ways in which Petronius represents the social performances of status in the *Satyrice*. In representing these uncertainties and the fluidity of status, the *Satyrice* manifests the realities of the time period, when Nero surrounded himself with freedmen in his court and confounded elite perceptions of what it meant to be a freeborn citizen.¹

Genre

To categorize the *Satyrice* as neatly fitting within a specific modern genre is to deny the complexities of our extant story and disregard the genre contexts of its time. Its past attribution of Menippean satire (Frye 1957; Courtney 1962; Sullivan 1968; Walsh 1970) has now been

¹ See Acton 2011, who compares issues of performance of status during the reign of Vespasian to similar phenomena during the reign of Nero.

abandoned and disproven (Astbury 1977: 30; Courtney 2001: 21; Schmeling 1996; Schmeling 2011: xxxiv). Its common label as novel suffices only to a certain extent,² and indeed scholars do not consistently characterize it as such. Utilizing Welleck and Warren's "outer" and "inner" forms (1956: 231), Schmeling perhaps best summarizes the vast array of categorizations (2011: xxxiii-xxxiv):

The 'outer form' of the [*Satyrica*] is variously described as Menippean satire, an epic in prose, theater (mime) in prose, a novel (including an extended prose parody of the Greek novel, or a pornographic novel, or a kind of picaresque novel), prose satire; the 'inner form' is variously described as satire of some kind, a sympathetic portrayal of reality, parody, and entertainment, all of which strike a respondent chord in the modern reader who feels some affinity to the concerns of the actors in the work. Since the term 'novel' is so broad and constantly becoming more inclusive, there should be little disagreement perhaps in applying it to the outer form of the [*Satyrica*]. For the inner form there is little or no agreement.

Schmeling goes on to cite his own preference for reading the inner form as a type of confession, for which he would remove the label of satire and instead "read the work as a clash in understanding/misunderstanding reality" (xxxiv; Schmeling 1971; 1994-5; Plaza 2000). While I do place value on this interpretation, an absurd beauty of the *Satyrica* lies in its confounding conglomeration of genres. Schmeling himself says, "Perhaps ... the search for allusions ought to be turned on its head, and a search conducted to ascertain if there is any kind of literary work from which [Petronius] does not borrow, to which he does not allude, or which he does not treat in some fashion," hypothesizing the work to be an "ultimate mosaic—*tesserae* borrowed from every kind of literary work" (2011: xxxiv). It is this intentional amalgamation I wish to highlight here. To pin the *Satyrica* down as belonging to any one genre or categorization is to sacrifice the variegated pieces that make up the whole. As such, I do not aim to contribute to any discussion or argument for or against labeling the *Satyrica* as one specific genre, and I hope that this

² Despite this limitation, I will use the term novel in reference to the *Satyrica* for the sake of convenience.

dissertation's goal in highlighting the social performance of status within this work will still be successful without such a discussion.

Characters in the *Satyrica*

While there are many more characters in the *Satyrica* than those below, this dissertation is primarily concerned with Giton and the characters with whom he interacts. As such, the list below is limited to characters, in order of appearance, who are important for the subsequent analysis of Giton.³ This is not to devalue the other characters, but merely to postpone their involvement for a future treatment of the novel. This summary of characters and the subsequent summary of the plot are intended to make this study more accessible to those who are unfamiliar with the *Satyrica*.

Encolpius. The story's main protagonist and our unreliable narrator. His status is in question. He would seem to characterize himself as freeborn, judging by the thoughts he expresses against the freedmen at Trimalchio's dinner, among other scenes. The character Lichas, however, does not seem to grant him this privilege. Encolpius's name is Greek and means "In the Lap," or "In the Crotch." He recurringly struggles with impotence throughout the novel.

Giton. The subject of this dissertation is a sixteen-year-old whose affections many characters, but primarily Encolpius, Ascyltos, and Tryphaena, seek. His name is Greek and means "Neighbor," or "The Boy Next Door."

Ascyltos. A companion of Encolpius and Giton. He was a past lover of Encolpius, and competes for Giton's affections. His name is Greek and means "Undisturbed" or "Indefatigable," a possible allusion to his sexual appetite and stamina.

³ For a comprehensive index of characters, see Schmeling 2011: 595-597.

Psyche. A female slave of the priestess, Quartilla, below. Her name is Greek, and connotes, among other things, “soul,” “life,” and “mind.”

Quartilla. A priestess of Priapus, a fertility god most often depicted with an oversized and erect phallus. Hers is one of the few Roman names in the novel, and is the diminutive of *quarta*, or “fourth.”

Pannychis. A seven-year-old slave girl of Quartilla. Her name is Greek and means “All Night” or “All Night Girl.”

Trimalchio. An eccentric and extravagant freedman whose dinner Encolpius, Ascyltos, and Giton attend.

Hermeros. A freedman who attends Trimalchio’s dinner. He attacks Ascyltos and Giton for laughing at the dinner’s proceedings.

Eumolpus. A poet and former pedagogue who has a predilection for youths. He takes Ascyltos’s place as the third in the triad that includes Encolpius and Giton. His name is Greek and means “Good Song” or “Good Singer.”

Lichas. A captain of the ship that Encolpius, Giton, and Eumolpus board. He seems to have had a history with Encolpius in a lost part of the *Satyrica*.

Tryphaena. A former lover of Encolpius who shares his affections for Giton. A lost episode in the novel involves Encolpius and Giton running away from her.

Chrysis. A female slave of Circe, below, who self-professedly prefers men above her station. Her name is Greek and means “Golden.”

Circe. A freeborn female, it would seem, who prefers the sexual company of slaves. Her name is that of the sorceress in the *Odyssey*.

Summary of the Extant Plot

What we have of the *Satyrice* are fragmented episodes of probably an enormous work. If it was written in 24 books (Schmeling 2011: xxii), we have a fraction of the story, and a lacunose fraction at that. Below summarizes our extant tale, touching only on the most salient plot points.⁴ A more detailed description of relevant scenes will occur throughout the rest of this dissertation.

The surviving story begins with Encolpius attacking rhetoric in his conversation with Agamemnon. Encolpius becomes aware that Ascyrtos has escaped his notice, and departs in search of him. Encolpius loses his way and is led to a brothel, where, lo and behold, Ascyrtos has also been led.

Giton is introduced. He accuses Ascyrtos of raping him, and Encolpius and Ascyrtos fight, only to temporarily make up so as to attend Trimalchio's dinner together. Giton, Encolpius, and Ascyrtos enter the market and engage in subterfuge regarding an article of clothing that has money hidden inside it.

They return to their lodgings where they are confronted by a female slave and her owner, Quartilla, a priestess of Priapus. Feasting, drinking, and sexual violence ensues. A cinaedus,⁵ while performing the penetrated role, rapes Encolpius and Ascyrtos. Giton and the slave girl Pannychis enter into a mock marriage ceremony complete with consummation.

The three depart to attend Trimalchio's dinner. Theatrical displays of food and live entertainment abound. Freedmen guests speak in succession when Trimalchio briefly departs to relieve himself. Later on, the freedman Hermeros attacks Ascyrtos and Giton for laughing at the

⁴ For a fuller summary see Warmington, ed., 1969: xxxix-xlv. For an educated reconstruction of the text including the now lost material, see Schmeling 2011: xxii-xxv.

⁵ The cinaedus was an effeminate erotic dancer. For a fuller discussion, see Chapter 2: 72-73, and 72 n. 70.

gifts given to the guests. Trimalchio reads his will and a mock funeral begins. The three escape the dinner party.

Encolpius and Giton spend part of the night together during which Ascyrtos steals Giton away. A violent confrontation ensues, resulting in Giton choosing to leave with Ascyrtos. Encolpius insults the absent pair, and eventually meets Eumolpus, the poet. Eumolpus recounts his sexual escapades as a pedagogue with his pupil in Pergamum before reciting a poem that results in him being stoned out of the gallery. Encolpius finds Giton in the baths and steals him back from Ascyrtos. Eumolpus meets Giton, and Encolpius is threatened by this new rival for Giton's affections. Encolpius and Giton commit mock suicide attempts and a confrontation between Encolpius and Eumolpus ensues. Ascyrtos comes looking for Giton, but does not find him. Eumolpus, Encolpius, and Giton reconcile and depart on board a ship.

The ship turns out to belong to Lichas and is carrying Tryphaena, the two people whom Encolpius and Giton are fleeing. They attempt to disguise themselves, but are found out. A skirmish breaks out, before being resolved. Giton and Tryphaena make a contract regarding their relationship. Encolpius broods on the loss of Giton and the attention that his former lover, Tryphaena, gives the youth. A storm occurs, toppling the ship and killing most everyone on board. Eumolpus, Encolpius, and Giton survive.

They enter the city of Croton, a town of legacy hunters, where Eumolpus pretends to be rich and heirless to capitalize on the wheedling treatment he will receive. Giton and Encolpius pretend to be his slaves. While in Croton, Encolpius is approached by a female slave, Chrysis, whose female owner, Circe, desires the sexual company of slaves. Encolpius is unable to perform, is humiliated and abused, and undergoes various treatments for a cure to his impotence. He is ultimately successful. The fragments break off with Eumolpus announcing that the

beneficiaries of his will must consume his body first, offering historical examples of cannibalism.

Review of Previous Literature and Theoretical Approach

As noted above, Petronius's *Satyrice* is a conglomeration of multiple genres, registers, and character types. Although the sixteen-year-old character, Giton, is one of the most complex of these characters, he has not been the object of focused study. His involvement in the chaotic love triangle with the characters Encolpius and Ascyltos, his dramatic speeches, and his clever antics all create a multifaceted character whom it is difficult to pin down. In particular, Giton's apparent status (that is, whether he is enslaved or not) in Petronius's *Satyrice* is often unclear, inconsistent, and mutable. Richlin perfectly encapsulates this inconsistency in her succinct discussion of the ambiguous evidence for Giton's status, ending with "in this hall of mirrors, the only sure thing is Giton's fickleness" (2009: 87). This ambiguity has led to widely varying opinions on Giton's status in the novel.

Many scholars avoid the issue of Giton's status entirely. Conte calls Giton a boy or beloved (1996: *passim*), and Panayotakis calls him a lover (1995: 10; 52; 122; 136), a creature (14), a boy (*ibid.*), a friend (61; 106), and *frater* (110). While Panayotakis neither ascribes to Giton any particular status, seemingly presuming Giton is freeborn, nor engages with the evidence of that performed status, he does address Giton's performative behavior and compares his personality to the slaves of Roman comedy (14-15). Slater calls him a boy (1990: 32, 34) and companion (216), but does not discuss his status. George engages with Giton's manner of speech, highlighting it as literary, rhetorical, and tasteless (1966: 338-342). Williams calls him Encolpius's boyfriend (2010: 44).

Others suggest Giton is a slave or freedman. Abbot labels him as Encolpius's attendant (1907: 44). Walsh introduces Giton as a comely slave and boyfriend of Encolpius (1996: xvi; 159 n. 3) but does not engage with the evidence for such a claim. Severy-Hoven calls him boy, lover, and boyfriend (2014: 5; 109), but mentions Giton acting or playing the slave (6-7; 12). She states that, according to traditional Roman values, "Giton should be a pet, a *deliciae*, not someone around whom a respectable person builds his life" (29). Prag and Repath label him the "unfaithful male concubine of Encolpius" (2009: 12), a phrase which could at least convey a lower status than Encolpius. Courtney views Giton as a freedman based on Giton's Greek name and presumed non-Greek ethnicity (2001: 41), and Makowski agrees with Courtney's argument (2012: 225).

A few scholars even propose that Giton is freeborn. Schmeling calls him Encolpius's boy-love (1999: 25; 2011: 595) and a young lad (1999: 26), but seems to imply Giton is free when he says, "does Eumolpus know that [Encolpius] and Giton are free and not slaves?" (2011: 418 n. 3-4). Joshel and Petersen, aiming to provide support for the Roman association of nighttime activities with drunks and slaves, make no definitive argument on the status of Ascyrtos, Encolpius, and Giton, but imply that they are free persons who are lumped in together with drunks and slaves for being "nocturnal troublemakers" (2014: 115).

These varied accounts of Giton's status are understandable, as the evidence in our extant text, already lacunose, does not provide consistency. Thus, existing scholarship on the *Satyrice* has mentioned aspects of Giton, but not comprehensively and not in regards to his performed status. Therefore, what is Giton's status in Petronius's *Satyrice* and is such a question answerable? How do other characters interact with and conceive of Giton, and why? How is

Giton's status expressed, performed, and received in his interpersonal relationships with other characters?

I am most interested in analyzing the performativity of Giton's social status, investigating the ways in which Giton performs and is perceived to perform slavery, specifically. Often what others perceive as Giton's status and the status which Giton performs are inconsistent. By investigating the nuances of Giton's performance of his status, I complicate simplified notions of status and highlight its socially constructed nature. Since one's status is determined, in part, by how one behaves and how one, in turn, is received by one's audience, legal status and perceived status can be at odds; both are relative to the audience receiving, interpreting, and interacting with the performed behavior.

Here, I build on Austin's and Finnegan's work on performative language (1962; 1969) and Butler's on performative gender (1990; 1993). For Butler, a series of actions and interactions produce and reproduce the performance as well as the individual, largely in compliance with a culture's dominant ideology. Whereas critics have noted an inconsistent capacity for action of the performatively constituted subject in Butler's work, Brickell seeks to reconcile the issue with Goffman's concept of the "socially situated, reflexive self" (Brickell 2005: 35). Through Goffman (1956: 15), Brickell highlights performance as involving "one's management of self-impressions to other participants in the interaction" and as constrained by social restrictions and conventions (2005: 30-31), which Goffman calls "frames" and "felicity conditions" (1974: 10; 1983: 25). Brickell goes on to say that "self and subjectivity then are achievements that result from our interactive, publicly validated performances, undertaken within the organizational frames and felicity conditions provided" (2005: 32), and so we can "reclaim the social action and interaction central to the notion of gender performance without slipping back into essentialist

assumptions about the performers” (39-40). This reclamation of the subject in performativity and performativity’s highlighted dependency on social interactions will become especially useful in the subsequent analysis of Giton.

In line with Butler’s use of gender and gendered as a verb and participle, respectively, I employ a similar use of the terms “status” and “stated.” To status someone is to assign a social standing to that individual. The character Lichas, for example, statuses Giton as a slave (107.10). The term stated can be applied either to an individual, in which case that person has been assigned a specific social status, or to an interaction, in which case said interaction would be charged as regards the characters’ social statuses. In Eumolpus’s initial stated interaction with Giton, Giton is stated as a slave (92.3). Both of these passages (107.10 and 92.3) are discussed below.

A variety of modern anthropological studies have expanded performance studies, including Guano on performative class and gender in Genoa (2007), Whiteley on sociolinguistic performativity in the Hopi language (2003), Stevenson on performing slavery and freedom in the southern United States (2012), and Trainer on performing social status in the United Arab Emirates (2017). Less has been said on the social performance of status in Ancient Rome, and even less as regards marginalized groups.⁶ There have been valuable contributions on slavery and status in the ancient world (Finley 1980; Watson 1987; Joshel 1992, 2014; Herrmann-Otto 2009; Kamen 2013), but these focus on our evidence for the statuses themselves not their performative aspects. Many scholars engage with the social performance of the elite: Fredrick’s work on Pompeiian house paintings (1995), Gleason’s on rhetoric (1995), Krostenko’s on Cicero and

⁶ Though see Levin-Richardson 2011 on Pompeiian graffiti and the evidence it provides for the formation of (largely lower status) male sexuality and normative masculinity in opposition to two other groups: penetrated males and female sex workers (59; 68). See also Petersen 2006 on “freedman art,” freedmen in art, and the art’s implications for freedmen’s social status.

Catullus (2001), Kaster's on emotional restraint (2005), Hölscher's on the imagery and role of the emperor (2008), Cambron-Goulet's on the bishop Synesius (2017). Others focus on theatrical and dramatic performativity (Edwards 1997; Panayotakis 1995) or on the staging of plays (Slater 1985; Marshall 2006; Lippman 2015).

Other scholars come closer to my own aims. Stewart, who discusses slavery through the evidence of Plautus's plays, describes slave deference as a "performance of forced compliance" (2012: 173); for Stewart, "slavery is a relationship of power, and the statuses of master and slave are claims, not facts, that are created and enacted in relationship" (1). Similarly, Bungard discusses the staging of social dynamics between a slave, his owner, a pimp, and the pimp's slaves in the play *Pseudolus* (2015) for the NEH Summer Institute on Roman Comedy in Performance. Bungard and the participants ultimately aim to stage these power dynamics in an authentic way, and they engage with the text of the script, its implied staging directions, and the cultural reality of the time to do so. In this, they presume an element of realism in the social interactions of this play's characters, expressed amid the exaggerated and ridiculous to be sure, but present nonetheless. I adopt such a presumption of an element of realism in my analysis of Petronius. The social performance of the *Satyrica*'s characters and their interactions with one another convey a degree of realism that can be seen to authentically represent stashed relations in Rome during the novel's time.

This presumption of realism must be qualified,⁷ however, especially considering the ferocity with which some scholars discredit this social historical approach to literature.

Schmeling, for example, criticizing attachment to the supposed realism in the *Satyrica*, states that

⁷ See Auerbach for a treatment, if not an entirely unproblematic one, on representations of reality in Petronius compared with those of Tacitus and Judeo-Christian writings (1953: 24-49). See also Nuttall's review of Auerbach (2004).

“Everything ... coming to us from the ancient world in this novel must arrive via the narrator [Encolpius], who develops characters in the same way a plastic surgeon develops faces from silicon” (2011: xxxiv). I applaud the metaphor, but I will point out that, more often than not, a face is still recognizable post plastic surgery, else the surgeon would be out of a job.

Similarly, Conte suggests that “the realism of the *Satyricon* is of the same sort that we can find in the unicorn or the centaur, whose individual parts are realistic, but not the complete figure. The individual parts are exaggerated, bloated; and yet a total effect of realism is generated by the exaggeration and distortion of the parts” (1996: 175-176). Again, a beautiful analogy, but one implying that one can find the realistic horn on the mythical unicorn’s head, if one knows where to look.

Commenting on the slippery nature of the term realism and its many connotations, Conte suggests utilizing the term exclusively to mean “the use of language to get *beyond language* so as to discover some non-verbal truth lying outside language” (1996: 179 n. 15; Steele 1988: 4). Let us adopt this definition here. One result of this dissertation is the potential to tease out this realism, or, more specifically, the realistic aspects of the relationships Petronius represents through our unreliable narrator’s perspective. I contend that the characters’ performance of status in their interactions with one another conveys this qualified realism and can offer us insight into statused relations, particularly as regards Roman slaves. Any possible conclusion about the real-life experiences of Roman slaves’ performance of status is limited by my reader’s willingness to recognize this qualified realism in the novel, and any lack of recognition should in no way detract from the overall focus of this dissertation, which specifically investigates Petronius’s and Encolpius’s *representations* of these social performances in the *Satyricon*.

There have been tremendous strides in the literary, poetic, and dramatic scholarship on the *Satyrical*. Panayotakis's work on the theatrical and especially mimetic qualities of the novel provides a valuable way of understanding the *Satyrical* as "the narrative equivalent of a farcical staged piece" (1995: ix). Slater's theoretical approach to reading and re-reading Petronius offers an insightful discussion of our own meaning-making processes (1990). Connors successfully reintegrates the poetry of the *Satyrical* into its surrounding prose contexts (1998), while Hubbard reclaims its narrative cohesion through his reconceptualization of the novel's structure as a ring composition (1986). Rimell, rejecting the disjunctive and episodic treatment of Petronius, highlights its crafted organization and literary allusivity (2002).⁸ While acknowledging and commending all these treatments, this work seeks a new, untrodden direction in interpretation, and investigates the *Satyrical*'s representations of social status dynamics among its characters, with Giton acting as a case study.

Dissertation Contribution

First and foremost, this work offers a newly detailed analysis of the character Giton. An understanding of Giton, as a consistent protagonist alongside Encolpius, can help us to better understand the novel as a whole, especially as regards status, and, to some extent, the author's intentionality. Giton's complicated and ambiguous identity reflects and represents the complexities and ambiguities of the novel as a whole.

Furthermore, the social performativity of status is now well recognized, but its application in the field of Classics is slim, and for the *Satyrical*, non-existent. Applying these social theoretical approaches to literature is notoriously tricky, with some scholars rejecting such

⁸ See also Nagore (ed.) for an expansive collaboration on the intertextuality of the *Satyrical* (2003).

approaches (see above: 12-13), but I believe Sabnis has said it best in her study on how the presence and labor of enslaved persons are required for and implicit in literary descriptions of the use of lamps, especially in Apuleius (2012: 107):⁹

Since we will never have the evidence to support a full description of the practices and experiences of Greek and Roman slavery, I suggest ... that literary scholars and historians should continue to be sensitive to the subtle ways in which slaves and slavery may affect literary texts, and that the process of applying fiction to social-historical inquiries is both ongoing and fruitful.

In an analysis of the social performativity of muted, unrepresented, and underrepresented individuals, our material and inscriptional evidence, though present, is limited, while our literary sources are skewed and biased, offering us monolithic, reductive, or caricatured representations of a whole host of persons. Unlike Joshel, who in particular analyzes the inscriptions and epitaphs of “people who named themselves as servants, tradesmen, and professionals in Rome” (1992: 5), this dissertation does not investigate evidence from the position of its subjects.

Petronius was not a slave. He did not and could not relate to the slave condition in the self-identified way that Zena the cook did with her epitaph (*CIL* 6.6249; Joshel 1992: 62). Petronius does offer, however, what Conte would prefer to call “materialist elements” (1996: 180), and what I have dubbed qualified realism above. The realistic elements present in Giton’s performance of social status can offer us insight into the ways in which enslaved persons performed and were perceived to perform their status at Rome.

Giton’s Freeborn Status

Before discussing Giton’s performance of slavery, on which the rest of this dissertation will focus, let us first turn to the only two pieces of potential evidence for Giton’s freeborn status

⁹ See Chapter 1: 38-40 for further discussion of Sabnis’s work.

in the extant novel: when Encolpius, alone in his misery, insults Giton after the latter has chosen Ascyrtos (81.5), and when Eumolpus defends Giton and Encolpius against Tryphaena and Lichas (107.4-6). The passages themselves are rife with textual and interpretative problems and should by no means offer us a definitive stance on Giton's status. This discussion necessitates acknowledging positions that definitively ascribe a specific legal status to the character Giton. Such a position must be addressed before the subsequent chapters' focus on Giton's performance of slavery can take place, and the tone in the following treatment reflects this position of others rather than my own (see above: 8-9).

After Encolpius discovers Giton in bed with Ascyrtos, Ascyrtos and Encolpius fight, even drawing swords, before Giton acts as peacekeeper and convinces them to stop. Ascyrtos then suggests giving Giton the option of choosing his companion, and Encolpius agrees, thinking Giton will prefer him. Giton chooses Ascyrtos instead, and the two leave Encolpius alone in the lodgings. Here, Encolpius mourns, beats his chest, and insults Ascyrtos before turning on the absent Giton (81.5):

quid ille alter? qui [tamquam] die togae virilis stolam sumpsit, qui ne vir esset a matre persuasus est, qui opus muliebre in ergastulo fecit, qui postquam conturbavit et libidinis suae solum vertit, reliquit veteris amicitiae nomen et, pro pudor, tamquam mulier secutuleia unius noctis tactu omnia vendidit.¹⁰

And what of that other one? Who, [as if] on his adult male citizenship day, took up women's clothes instead, whose mother convinced him not to be a man, who performed a woman's role in the slave-labor camp (*ergastulo*), who, after he confounded and changed the basis of his desire, left behind the name of an old friendship and, for shame, sold everything in one night's work just like a female streetwalker.

Encolpius is furious with Giton's decision to abandon him, and immediately insults his masculinity and his modesty.¹¹

¹⁰ All Petronian citations are from Müller's Teubner (1995). All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

¹¹ Further analysis of this passage will occur in Chapter 3: 87-91.

The attribution of freeborn status to Giton stems from the second sentence in the above passage: *qui die togae virilis stolam sumpsit*, literally “who took up the *stola* on the day of his *toga virilis*.” The *stola* was an article of clothing exclusively for a woman who was married to a freeborn man (George 2008: 94),¹² whereas the *toga virilis* was a plain white toga worn by Roman men and taken up by Roman citizen boys upon reaching adulthood (Davies 2005: 121; Dolansky 2008).¹³ Thus, Encolpius attacks Giton’s masculinity by suggesting that, on the day Giton should have entered into manhood and taken up the manly toga, the boy chose to put on a woman’s garment instead.¹⁴ As regards Giton’s status, if he had the opportunity to take up the *toga virilis*, which was exclusive to Roman male citizens, then Giton must be freeborn, or so the reading goes.

While Müller brackets *tamquam*, “as if,” as requiring deletion, its inclusion would bolster an argument against such a reading: “who, as if on his adult male citizenship day, took up the dress of a woman.” In this case, Giton did not merely have the opportunity to put on the dress of a Roman male citizen, and instead chose the dress of a Roman female citizen. Rather, Giton chose the dress of a Roman female citizen “as if it were the day of his *toga virilis*” or “on the day of his *toga virilis*, so to speak,” since he would not have been able to enjoy a privilege solely reserved for male citizens. Courtney would also keep *tamquam* and so supports such a reading (2001: 41). In this way, Encolpius transposes the custom of a Roman citizen onto Giton, as a way of marking Giton’s entry into adulthood. Such a reading adds to the gendered insult taking place by insulting his status as well: he chose the dress of a female citizen *as if (tamquam)* he had the

¹² See also Scholz 1992; Sebesta 2001: 48-9; George 2008: 108 n. 1.

¹³ See also Wilson 1924; 1938: Chapter 4; Stone 2001 (Davies 2005: 128 n. 2).

¹⁴ Cicero similarly insults Antony in the *Phillipics* with the phrase *toga muliebris* (2.44; Dyck 2001; Davies 2005: 121; Richlin 1992: 14).

privilege of wearing the dress of an adult male citizen, even though his status prevents him from wearing either.

Finally, an *ergastulum* most often refers to the sleeping quarters and labor camps of slaves.¹⁵ In his discussion on the villa and its constituent parts, Columella states the following (*De Re Rustica* 1.6.3): *vinctis quam saluberrimum subterraneum ergastulum plurimis, sitque id angustis inlustratum fenestris atque a terra sic editis, ne manu contingi possint*, “For very many chained slaves [there should be] an underground prison (*ergastulum*), as wholesome as possible, and let this be illuminated by narrow windows built so far from the ground that they are unable to be touched by the hand.” The *OLD* states that it is “a kind of prison on a large estate” (s.v.), while the *TLL* considers it, in its strictest sense, *locus in quo servi vincti operantur*, “a place in which chained slaves work” (s.v.), citing a gamut of sources.

The inclusion of *ergastulum* is not debated, but its interpretation alongside the deletion of *tamquam* produces an internal inconsistency that is not easily reconciled. Is it as likely that Encolpius would reference Giton’s freeborn status, then cite his time in a slave prison? By contrast, the inclusion of *tamquam* above coupled with *ergastulum* would provide a consistent representation of Giton’s non-free status. The term *tamquam* precisely describes Giton as not having the privileges of a Roman male citizen, and *ergastulum* reaffirms that he lacked free status.

Even if, with Müller, we remove *tamquam*, this would only suggest that Giton was at some point free, at least from Encolpius’s perspective, but subsequently enslaved as evidenced by the term *ergastulum*. If this is the case, we should not privilege Giton’s prior free status over his subsequent enslavement, especially considering his consistent slave behavior and treatment

¹⁵ Severy-Hoven translates the term as a “prison” or “chain gang” (2014: s.v. 158)

throughout the rest of the novel, as will be discussed below. In short, Giton was never free, and if he was, he is not any longer. This ambiguity, the dependence on the deletion of a word at the choice of editors, and the overwhelmingly slave connotations of the term *ergastulum* should call any definitive stance on Giton's freeborn status into question.

Another scene possibly supporting a claim for Giton's freeborn status occurs when Encolpius, Giton, and the poet Eumolpus board a ship, only to discover the vessel belongs to Lichas and carries Tryphaena as a passenger, the two people from whom Encolpius and Giton have previously fled. The three decide that Encolpius and Giton should shave their heads, mark their foreheads to look like runaway slaves who have been captured and branded, and hide in plain sight (103). They are quickly discovered.

In the following passages, Lichas and Eumolpus argue about Encolpius and Giton, the reasons for the deception, and whether or not the latter two should be punished. Asking for mercy and leniency, Eumolpus analogizes the current situation with that of a slave and his owner (107.4): *saevi quoque implacabilesque domini crudelitatem suam impediunt, si quando paenitentia fugitivos reduxit, et dediticiis hostibus parcimus*, "If ever remorse has brought runaways back, harsh and unforgiving owners check their cruelty too, and we spare enemies who have surrendered." Eumolpus places Encolpius and Giton in the position of runaway slaves who have returned to their owner out of some sense of remorse. However, he does not view this analogy as mapping onto their current situation directly. He proceeds to repeatedly label both Encolpius and Giton as freeborn individuals (107.5): *in conspectu vestro supplices iacent iuvenes, ingenui honesti, et quod utroque potentius est, familiaritate vobis aliquando coniuncti*, "These youths lie before you as suppliants, upstanding freeborn men, and what is more important than either, they were once connected to you in intimate friendship." He continues (107.6):

servitia ecce in frontibus cernitis et vultus ingenuos voluntaria poenarum lege proscriptos,
“Look, you see slavery on their foreheads and their freeborn faces marked with the voluntary sentence of punishment.” The double use of *ingenuus*, “freeborn,” in such quick succession emphasizes Eumolpus’s focus on their free status. His use of *servitia* and the terms *voluntaria* ... *lege* pointedly suggest that Encolpius and Giton have chosen to return to their master and be marked with the brandings of slavery (*servitia*), even though they are freeborn (*ingenuus*).

Of course, we know that Eumolpus is lying throughout much of this speech; he is backpedaling, suggesting that Encolpius and Giton had intended to turn themselves in, looking as they do with their shaved heads and tattooed faces. Lichas interrupts him, refuting each of Eumolpus’s attempts at further deception, before responding to Eumolpus’s use of *ingenuus* (107.10): *nam quod invidiam facis nobis ingenuos honestosque clamando, vide ne deteriorem facias confidentia causam,* “and since you are making ill-will for us by shouting ‘freeborn’ and ‘upstanding,’ see to it that you do not make your case worse with your impudence.” With *invidiam* ... *nobis*, Lichas recognizes that Eumolpus is trying to garner public support on the ship by drawing attention to the potential abuse of freeborn citizens. With the term *confidentia*, Lichas suggests Eumolpus has overstepped his bounds by labeling Encolpius and Giton as freeborn, for Lichas evidently does not agree.

After the argument between Lichas and Eumolpus, the text becomes somewhat lacunose, but the emotion and tension of the scene seems to rise to a point at which violence breaks out. Eumolpus continues to cite Encolpius’s and Giton’s freeborn status in an attempt to gather support and to dissuade Lichas from any further punishment (108.3): *negat Eumolpus passurum se, ut quisquam ingenuos contra fas legemque contaminet, interpellatque saevientium minas non solum voce sed etiam manibus,* “Eumolpus said that he would not allow anyone to defile

freeborn citizens in violation of custom and law, and he interrupted the threats of the angry people with not only his voice but also his hands.” Whether Eumolpus actually believes Encolpius and Giton to be freeborn or utilizes the term *ingenuus* for a public, performative, and pathetic effect, he staunchly maintains his position even in the face of physical violence. This marks the third time that Eumolpus has employed the term *ingenuus* to describe Encolpius and Giton.

In Giton’s case, it is possible that Eumolpus fabricates his position for this specific situation. When Eumolpus first meets Giton, at any rate, he suggests Giton is a slave (92.3): *viditque Gitona in conspectu ministrantem, movit caput et ‘laudo’ inquit ‘Ganymedem. oportet hodie bene sit,’* “He saw Giton serving close-at-hand, and said, ‘I applaud your Ganymede. Today ought to go well.’” The verb *ministrare*, “to serve,” is used of slaves,¹⁶ and while Encolpius narrates this action, Eumolpus nonetheless sees Giton attending to them, as a slave would, and calls him Ganymede. This name was given to slaves who were used for serving and sex (e.g. *Mart.* 7.50.4; Richlin 2015: 358), whence the corrupted Latin *catamitus*, “catamite” (e.g. *Pl. Men.* 1.2.35;¹⁷ Richlin 2009: 90). Trimalchio, in fact, has a freedman guest named Ganymede, a name suggesting the performance of such duties during his time as a slave (44.1). This is the only other surviving scene in which Eumolpus offers us evidence for his perception of Giton’s status. Eumolpus’s first interaction with Giton would then suggest that everything about Giton’s demeanor, behavior, and appearance leads Eumolpus to assume he was a slave, rather than a freeborn male.

¹⁶ For example, it is used to describe the actions of the slave Palinurus in *Curculio* (369). Stichus, near the end of the eponymous play, uses the term of his and the slave Sagarinus’s self-served banquet (689). See also the *TLL* s.v.

¹⁷ For the prevalent use of Plautus in this dissertation, see the introduction to Chapter 4: 99-100.

Therefore, does Eumolpus initially think Giton is a slave, learn he is free, and tell what he thought was the truth on the ship, or does he think Giton is a slave and lie on board ship for public support? He is inconsistent, the text lacunose, and a definitive assessment of his perception is entirely uncertain. Overall, Eumolpus's initial impression of Giton, the context on board ship, and Lichas's perceptive response suggest that Eumolpus does not view Giton as enjoying legal freeborn status.

As one final testament to the inconsistencies and complexities in the novel's representation of Giton's social status, let us look at one more passage on board Lichas's ship. Here, all fighting has ceased, and a contract has been drawn up for Tryphaena and Giton to determine the nature of their relationship (109.2):

ex tui animi sententia, ut tu Tryphaena, neque iniuriam tibi factam a Gitone quereris, neque si quid ante hunc diem factum est obicies vindicabisve aut ullo alio genere persequendum curabis; ut tu nihil imperabis puero repugnantem, non amplexum, non osculum, non coitum venere constrictum, nisi pro qua re praesentes numeraveris denarios centum.

On your conscience, Tryphaena, that you will not complain of injustice done by Giton, nor if anything was done before today will you bring it up or punish him or order it be followed up in any other way; that you will order nothing to the boy, if he opposes it, not an embrace, nor a kiss, nor sexual union, unless you count out 100 coins up front.

We see treaty language at the offset with *ex tui animi sententia*. As Cicero says of the phrase, *non enim falsum iurare periurare est, sed, quod "EX ANIMI TVI SENTENTIA" iuraris, sicut verbis concipitur more nostro, id non facere periurium est*, "For it is not perjury to swear a false thing, but to take an oath 'on your conscience,' as is expressed with the words of our custom, it is perjury to not do this" (Cic. *Off.* 3.29.108). Though Tryphaena's and Giton's treaty is not nearly as serious as Cicero's example of Marcus Atilius Regulus's oath to return to his Carthaginian captors, the formula invokes a similarly binding principle. This is parody (Slater 1990: 205), to be sure, but what could we glean of Giton's status from this treaty?

If Giton is free, why would he have to negotiate this sort of relationship with Tryphaena, when he could simply leave her? If he were a slave, how could he have the opportunity or social or legal power to demand and exact such a treaty, even a parodic one? It is interesting to note that the treaty requires Tryphaena, and later Lichas, to swear their respective oaths, not Giton or Encolpius. Does this exclusion tell us anything about Giton's and Encolpius's respective statuses, a lack of citizenship perhaps, or does their position as the treaty's benefactors eliminate such an interpretation? Perhaps Giton was a freedman, perhaps Tryphaena's freedman, allowing him a degree of agency in these matters while ultimately requiring him to remain at her disposal. Here, we perhaps see the closest answer to a determination of Giton's status, and it is far from determinative. Instead, it is better to put the notion of a definitive status for the character Giton to rest and look at other avenues of exploration.

It is an erroneous line of questioning if we are asking ourselves as scholars to find out the truth of Giton's alleged status. Even in a technical sense, if one were to ask about the legal statuses of these characters in the novel, the questioner would be missing the mark; it is clear from Petronius alone that to simplify a person's status in Rome is to disregard the complex social situations required to enact and perform this status. If we must answer such a question, then, on the evidence of the surviving fragments, it is possible that Giton was at one point a freeman who was subsequently enslaved and who finally ran away to regain his self-perceived free status, but was subsequently treated as a slave by the overwhelming majority anyway. What is more apt for any inquiry into the *Satyrice*, however, and what I hope will become apparent from this dissertation's investigation, is how the performance of a particular social status, including the interactions between characters, determine the characters' statuses. Giton's possible status as a free person matters little if he consistently performs the role of a *servus* throughout the novel,

and indeed since he is largely perceived as one by the vast majority of the other characters. In this way, Giton is a *servus* regardless of any simplified notion of his legal status. It is this aspect of Giton that we will now investigate throughout the rest of this dissertation.

Chapter 1 lays the groundwork for establishing Giton's slave status. Here, I investigate his roles and duties as well as the ways in which specific characters express their perception of his status. Chapter 2, 3, and 4 investigate the more specific slave behaviors that Giton performs. Chapter 2 discusses his role as a sex object, and the various characters that treat him in such a way throughout the novel. Chapter 3 analyzes his complicated and at times contradictory relationship with Encolpius, our unreliable narrator: Encolpius calls Giton a brother but interacts with him and describes him as a boy slave. Chapter 4 compares Giton to the comic *servus callidus*, "clever slave." I conclude with the ramifications of these slave performances for Giton, the *Satyrica*, and non-literary slaves: the social performances of status in Petronius prove invaluable for investigations into sexuality, slave resistance, and the historical contexts of the time.

CHAPTER 1: GITON AS SLAVE

This chapter will analyze Giton's general characterization as a slave, including his roles as attendant, cook, and guide. I then proceed to investigate other characters' perceptions of Giton's slave status, teasing out the underlying assumptions that can be discerned in the text. This analysis will be philologically inclined, but with an eye toward the performed behavior of the roles in question.

A Jack of All Trades: Giton's Slave Roles

Firstly, Giton often fulfills the role of general attendant, undertaking duties that slaves typically perform. Giton is represented doing so both willingly and unwillingly, successfully and unsuccessfully. In particular, he acts as a bath attendant for Encolpius and Ascyltos.

Slaves were a ubiquitous presence in the Roman bath experience: for people who could afford them, slaves drew the bath water, tended to and administered the bath oil, and scraped sweat, dirt, and oil off their owners' bodies. The emperor Commodus is reported to have ordered the death of slave who drew his bath in an unsatisfactory way (HA *Comm.* 1.9; Laes 2008: 258). A floor mosaic in the bath section of the House of the Menander depicts strigils,¹⁸ an ointment jar, and a male bath attendant carrying two water vessels; those entering the room must physically tread upon the attendant (I.10.4, 14-16; Joshel and Petersen 2014: 29; Clarke 1998: 122, 125, 129-36). Juvenal, satirizing the dangers of the streets of Rome, imagines slaves bustling about at home, preparing the strigils, oil, and towels for their owner's bath, oblivious of

¹⁸ The *strigilis* was a curved, often metal instrument used to scrape off sweat, dirt, and oil during a bath (Schmeling 2011: 378 n. 1; cf. Martial 14.51).

their owner's demise (3.262-4). In short, slaves organized nearly every facet of the slave-owner's bath experience.

Slaves at the baths were also subjected to sexual attention. Pliny, discussing the applications of gold, mentions gold-adorned slaves from the *paedagogium*, "page school," and the welcome presence of their beauty as they accompanied their owners in the public baths (Pliny *NH* 33.40; Laes 2008: 255). In one of Martial's epigrams, Philomus asks why the groins of the narrator's bath slaves (*pueri*) are so well-endowed, to which the narrator responds: *pedicant, Philomuse, curiosos*, "They butt-fuck nosy people, Philomus" (6.63.5).¹⁹ The male bath attendant in the House of the Menander mosaic mentioned above is represented with an erect phallus. Paired below it, the ointment jar is arranged phallically while the strigils are positioned vulvically. Since this imagery rests in the entrance of the *caldarium*, "hot bath room," Clarke suggests the mosaic's purpose could have been to ward off guests' envy of and ill-will toward the owner of such luxury (1998: 129-36), but the sexual suggestivity of the slave and the bath slave's accoutrements could also highlight the owners' and guests' potential sexualization of bath slaves. Bath slaves could be noticed, and they were noticed for sexual reasons.

Moreover, slaves regularly escorted their owners to public baths and were tasked with minding the owners' clothing (Fagan 2002: 38). Two pieces of graffiti in the *apodyterium*, "changing room," of the Stabian baths (VII.1.8) could have been drawn by slave children as they performed such tasks (Eschebach 1979: 17; Huntley 2011: 86). It is in this last role as bath attendant that Giton most often serves Encolpius and Ascyltos.

¹⁹ Kamen does well to address the presentation and yet neutralization of the well-endowed slaves' agency in this passage (2011: 193). Cf. Martial 6.75 in which the narrator suggests that Caelia uncover her slave's member in the baths.

Upon receiving news about Trimalchio’s dinner, Encolpius narrates, *amicimur ergo diligenter obliti omnium malorum, et Gitona libentissime servile officium tuentem [usque hoc] iubemus in balneum sequi*, “Therefore we attentively clothe ourselves, all misfortune forgotten, and order Giton, who was most willingly upholding his slave duty, to follow us into the bath” (26.10). This passage is our first indication in the surviving text that Giton will play the part of a slave for Trimalchio’s banquet. Giton is ordered as a slave to accompany Encolpius and Ascyrtos into the bath before the banquet begins. Though the lacuna that follows prevents us from knowing Giton’s actions in the baths themselves, we can assume that he will at the very least tend to his supposed owners’ clothing, as would be the expectation for slaves in such a location (Schmeling 2011: 85 n. 10). With the line *Gitona libentissime servile officium tuentem*, Encolpius notes Giton’s oxymoronic performance: Giton is a willing slave.²⁰

On this supposed willingness, we might compare the following passage in Plautus’s *Captivi*, in which the citizen Hegio directs a *lorarius*, “flogger,” on the management of two captives (114-124):²¹

He. sinito ambulare, si foris, si intus volent, sed uti adserventur magna diligentia.	115
liber capitvos avi’ ferae consimilis est: semel fugiendi si data est occasio, satis est, numquam postilla possis prendere.	
Lo. omnes profecto liberi lubentius sumu’ quam servimus. He. non videre ita tu quidem.	120
Lo. si non est quod dem, mene vis dem ipse—in pedes?	

²⁰ The term *officium* could have a sexual valence here, especially considering the sexualization of bath slaves. Cf. Sen. *Contr.* 4. pr. 10 on Haterius’s defense of a freedman accused of sexual relations with his patron: *inpudicitia in ingenuo crimen est, in servo necessitas, in liberto officium. res in iocos abiit: “non facis mihi officium” et “multum ille huic in officiis versatur.” ex eo inpudici et obsceni aliquamdiu officiosi vocitati sunt*, “A lack of sexual propriety is a crime for a free man, a necessity for a slave, and a duty for a freedman.” The matter turned into jokes: ‘You are not doing your duty by me,’ and ‘that guy is well-versed in his duties for this guy.’ From this, those lacking virtue and the obscene were often called ‘dutiful’ for some time.” The term is used with similar suggestiveness at Petr. *Sat.* 25.7 and 140.1. Cf. the *TLL* s.v.

²¹ All Plautine citations are from the Lindsay’s Oxford Classical Texts. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

He. si dederis, erit extemplo mihi quod dem tibi.
Lo. avi' me ferae consimilem faciam, ut praedicas.
He. ita ut dicis: nam si faxis, te in caveam dabo.

He. Let them walk, if they wish, outdoors or indoors,
But in such a way that they may be watched over with great care.
A freeman made captive is like a wild bird:
If the opportunity for flight has been given just once,
It is enough, you could never catch him after that.
Lo. Indeed, we all are more willingly free
than slaves. **He.** You certainly don't seem to think so.
Lo. If there is nothing for me to give, do you want me to give myself—to flight?
He. If you do give yourself to flight, I'll give you something immediately.
Lo. I shall make myself like a wild bird, as you say.
He. As you say: for if you do so, I'll put you in a cage.

The *lorarius* himself is a slave, as evidenced by his supposed offer of flight, and he is charged with the management of other slaves. Hegio begins with the sharp dichotomy of *liber captivos*, “a freeman made a captive slave,” and warns of a captive slave’s potential flight when that slave is granted too much freedom by analogizing the slave to a captured wild bird. With this statement, Hegio recognizes the prior freedom of his current captive slaves and their natural instinct to reclaim that freedom.²² The *lorarius*, in response, juxtaposes the antonyms *liberi ... sumus*, “we are free,” and *servimus*, “we are slaves,” with the oxymoronic relationship between *libentius*, “more willingly,” and *servimus*. We are all more willingly free than enslaved, says the *lorarius*, or, in other words, no slave is a slave willingly. Hegio as the slave owner contests this point, giving the *lorarius* himself as a counterexample. He implies either that the *lorarius* should act more accommodatingly to his owner if the *lorarius* wishes to procure his own freedom, or perhaps that the *lorarius* could have freed himself already with his own funds but has neglected to do so (de Melo 2011: 519 n.6). The *lorarius* responds by stating that he does not have an adequate amount to free himself, and sarcastically offers to do as the wild bird does: flee

²² cf. Aristotle’s *Politics* on the distinction between a supposedly natural slave (1254a17-b39) and a captured free person who is made a slave (esp. 1255a16-18).

(perhaps the *lorarius* too was formerly free?). Hegio then ends the exchange with the threat to cage him.

Throughout this interaction, the *lorarius* verbalizes resistance against his owner through the expression of his own will: his desire to be free. The owner's threatening responses, with *si dederis, erit extemplo mihi quod dem tibi*, "If you do give yourself to flight, I'll give you something (i.e. a blow) immediately," and *si faxis, te in caveam dabo*, "If you do so, I will give you to the cage," confirm that the slave has expressed resistance to his owner. With the term *libentius*, the *lorarius* contrasts the nature of freedom and slavery. Free persons are "more willingly" free by virtue of their freedom itself: a free person by their nature wants to maintain their freedom, and so while captive slaves may have lost their legal freedom, they have not lost their free nature.²³ Moreover, a slave like the *lorarius* is unwillingly a slave not only because he wishes to be free and may have been so formerly, but also because he is not enfranchised to exercise his will to be free, at least without the proper funds.

With *libentissime* in the Petronian passage, then, Giton is thus oxymoronicly represented as choosing slavery, in diametric opposition to the point made by Plautus's *lorarius*. The narrator Encolpius therefore attributes to Giton a degree of agency that is antithetical to his slave role: the slave's ability to exercise his own will is invalidated by the slave's very status. Moreover, this will is largely inconsequential to the majority of Giton's audience: as a slave, Giton's willingness only matters to those of higher status insofar as he successfully fulfills his slave tasks. Encolpius thus portrays Giton's willingness as representative of Giton's success in his performance as well as Giton's own lack of resistance to this slave role.²⁴

²³ *ibid.*

²⁴ Giton performs the role of bath attendant in a similar way later in the *Cena*. When Trimalchio suggests that he and his guests enter his personal baths, Encolpius and Ascyltos try to slip away, but fall into a pond, and ultimately decide to go to the baths after all (73.2): *lavari iam coeperat votum esse ... proiectisque vestimentis, quae Giton in*

This role resurfaces later on, after Giton and Ascyrtos have left Encolpius, but Giton is not so willing this time. Encolpius finds Giton in the bath and describes the scene (91.1): *video Gitona cum linteis et strigilibus parieti applicitum tristem confusumque. scires non libenter servire*, “I see Giton with linens and scrapers, glued to the wall, sad and confused. You could tell he was not a willing slave.” Giton holds the accoutrement of a slave, the *strigilis*, “scraper.”²⁵ Since slaves generally carried these into the baths (Persius 5.126; Schmeling 2011: 379 n. 1), it would seem that Ascyrtos expected Giton to carry out his slave performance beyond Trimalchio’s banquet.²⁶ Ascyrtos expected Giton to clean and scrape him with the strigils, as a bath slave would do. In narrating this scene, Encolpius implicitly contrasts, self-interestedly so, Giton’s unwillingness to perform slave tasks for Ascyrtos with what he earlier described as Giton’s willingness to perform slave tasks for Encolpius himself.

Moreover, as mentioned above, slaves in the baths were expected to guard their owner’s clothing. The term *lintea*, seen here, can be used of clothing (TLL *s.v.* n. 5), particularly of lowly and slave garb. In a list criticizing the people and king of India, Quintus Curtius uses the term of Indian headwear (8.9.21). Quintus’s list, including linen, works to portray Indian customs as foreign, inferior, and full of vice (esp. 8.9.20, 23, 31). Suetonius highlights Caligula’s insulting treatment of the senate thus (*Cal.* 26.2): *quosdam summis honoribus functos ad essedum sibi currere togatos per aliquot passuum milia et cenanti modo ad pluteum modo ad pedes stare succinctos linteo passus est*, “He allowed certain [senators] who had held the highest

aditu siccare coepit balneum intravimus, “Now washing began to be desired ... we threw off our clothes, which Giton began to dry in the entryway, and we entered the bath.” Giton is represented as both willing and successful in this performance by actively taking the clothing and drying them out, with no order given in the text. Thus, both at the beginning of the banquet above (26.10), and here, nearer its end, Giton willingly undertakes and completes the tasks of a bath attendant for Encolpius and Ascyrtos.

²⁵ The strigils are also depicted in the same House of the Menander mosaic discussed above (Clarke 1998: 122, 125, 129-36)

²⁶ Ascyrtos’s perspective on Giton’s status will be discussed in-depth below.

offices to run in their togas alongside his chariot for several miles and to wait on him as he dined, sometimes at the top of the couch and sometimes at his feet, while they wore linen clothing.”²⁷

The mention of linen clothing heightens the insulting notion that senators would be running alongside a chariot or waiting upon someone like a slave. In Petronius, when the drunken lodgers attack Eumolpus, Encolpius describes one of the participants as an *anus praecipue lippa, sordidissimo praecincta linteo*, “particularly bleary-eyed old lady, wrapped in the dirtiest of linen” (95.8). The woman is poor, as are Encolpius, Giton, and likely many of the lodgers in this location. The *linteum* is already a poor person’s attire, and that this old woman is wearing one entirely soiled (*sordidissimo*) further highlights her lowly status. Giton is not just a bath slave, but a bath slave of a lowly owner, namely Ascyrtos.

That the mentioned linens (*lintea*) in Giton’s possession include Ascyrtos’s clothing is further confirmed by Eumolpus’s report of Ascyrtos in the baths. Here, Encolpius and Giton have departed the bath without Eumolpus, who witnesses the aftermath of the pair’s departure (92.7): *ex altera parte iuvenis nudus, qui vestimenta perdiderat, non minore clamoris indignatione Gitona flagitabat*, “In another part of the bath, a naked youth (Ascyrtos) who had lost his clothing was disdainfully demanding Giton with no less a shout.” Giton was clearly tasked with attending to Ascyrtos’s clothing in the baths, as a slave would be, but neglected his duties when he departed with Encolpius: Giton took Ascyrtos’s clothes with him.

We see, then, that Giton is again performing the role of bath attendant, but here, in contrast with his performance during Trimalchio’s banquet, Encolpius represents Giton’s slave performance for Ascyrtos as lacking consent (*non libenter*). As mentioned previously, however, his will matters to his pseudo-owner, Ascyrtos, only insofar as Giton does or does not fulfill his

²⁷ Rolfe explicitly notes the slave connotations of the material in this passage (1914: 457 n. 54)

duty as a slave. His represented lack of willingness here, therefore, is markedly significant, as it results in Giton not carrying out the assigned task. When Encolpius confronts Giton in the baths, Giton leaves with Encolpius, depriving Ascyrtos of his clothing, and Giton therefore abandons the slave tasks he has been assigned. Encolpius thus represents Giton as resisting this slave performance through the boy's demonstration of his unwillingness on the one hand and his rejection of his slave duties on the other.

Aside from being a general attendant, Giton is twice represented as Encolpius's and Ascyrtos's cook in the novel. That slaves routinely performed the cooking in Roman households is widely attested, and Lowe argues for the prevalence of cooks' slave status in all Roman periods (1985: 83). As for the material record, Joshel and Petersen analyze owners' architectural control over slave movement, particularly as regards banquet preparations (2014: 40-59): at Pompeii in the House of Sutoria Primigenia (I.13.2), for example, slaves were given lower and narrower doorways as direct passageways to and from service areas, including the kitchen (44). Side doors prevented slaves from obstructing the guests' views of the garden (44-45). A lararium painting in the kitchen of this house reinforces the slaves' status by depicting the household deities (*lares*) as oversized, the husband and wife as next largest, and the slaves as the smallest in their faces and in their stature (45). The slaves would view this painting daily, preparing meals on the cooktop of the adjacent wall (45-46).

Plautus regularly represents his cooks as slaves (e.g. *Capt.* 917; Lowe 1985: 90-91).²⁸ In *Menaechmi*, the sex worker Erotium issues a series of commands to the cook Cylindrus (218-225):

²⁸ Lowe thinks it likely that Plautus conceived of his plays' cooks all as slaves (1985: 101). Of particular interest is Lowe's analysis of the times in which Plautus inherits Greek comedy's *mageiros*, "cook," or aspects of the *mageiros*, while at other times Plautus modifies the character or incorporates the Roman *coquus*, "cook," as an addition (85 and following).

Er. evocate intus Culindrum mihi coquom actutum foras.
sportulam cape atque argentum. eccos tris nummos habes.
Cy. habeo. **Er.** abi atque opsonium affer; tribu' vide quod sit satis: 220
neque defiat nec supersit. **Cy.** quouismodi hic homines erunt?
Er. ego et Menaechmus et parasitus eius. **Cy.** iam isti sunt decem;
nam parasitus octo hominum munus facile fungitur.
Er. elocuta sum convivas, ceterum cura. **Cy.** licet.
cocta sunt, iube ire accubitum. **Er.** redi cito. **Cy.** iam ego hic ero. 225

Er. Call out cook Cylindrus for me from inside immediately.
Take a basket and money. Look here are three coins for you.
Cy. I have them. **Er.** Go and bring a dish; see to it that it is enough for three:
That it is neither too little or too much. **Cy.** What sort of people will be here?
Er. Myself, Menaechmus, his leech of a friend. **Cy.** That's ten already;
For the leech easily does the work of eight people.
Er. I have told you about the guests, see to the rest. **Cy.** Of course.
The dishes are cooked, tell them to go to dining room. **Er.** Return quickly. **Cy.** I will be
back shortly.

Erotium orders a group (*evocate*) to summon her cook, and proceeds to issue Cylindrus a list of commands: she tells him to take a basket and money (*cape*); she orders him to leave (*abi*) and bring back food (*opsonium affer*); she orders him to see to it (*vide*) and take care of it (*cura*); finally, she orders that he return quickly (*redi cito*). With this string of imperatives, Erotium conveys her authority over her cook Cylindrus, who must be her slave. That he calls Erotium *era mea*, “my mistress” (300), further supports such a reading (Lowe 1985: 90-92).

Martial consistently views cooks in the same way (3.13.3-4; 5.50.7-8; 7.27; 8.23; 11.31; Kamen 2011: 198, 201 n. 38). In a brilliant treatment analyzing Martial’s representations of and undermining of slave agency, Kamen discusses the following passage as exemplifying the control slaves held in the kitchen and the ways in which Martial negotiated that control (3.94):
esse negas coctum leporem poscisque flagella./ mavis, Rufe, cocum scindere quam leporem,
“You say that the rabbit is not cooked and you demand a whip./ You prefer, Rufus, to cut up the cook than the rabbit.” The whip (*flagella*) and the violence of *scindere* make it clear that the

cook is a slave whom Rufus intends to punish. As Kamen rightfully argues, the cook's agency is diminished in the indirectly-worded statement, "the rabbit is not cooked," as the rabbit becomes the subject of the action rather than the cook himself (2011: 197).

In the *Satyrical* itself, Trimalchio asks his cook from which slavery division the cook hailed, questions whether he was purchased or born in the house, and threatens to demote him to the division of slave messengers (47.11-13). Later on, Trimalchio discusses how he named his cook Daedalus for the latter's cleverness with food (70.2), employing the convention of naming slaves in relation to their line of work.²⁹ Encolpius expresses his disgust at the cook's smell and the intermingling of statuses when the cook and other slaves are given seating among the dining guests (70.10-13; Roller 2017: 20).

Giton is twice described as cooking for himself, Encolpius, and Ascyrtos. Upon seeing Giton through the fog, Encolpius narrates, *quaererem numquid nobis in prandium frater parasset*, "I asked whether my brother had prepared anything for us for lunch" (9.2).³⁰ It is a brief comment of Encolpius, and certainly not the focus of the scene, but it indicates Encolpius's expectation of Giton: that Giton would cook for Encolpius as a slave would do.

Encolpius later recounts, *primum beneficio Gitonis praeparata nos implevimus cena*, "Soon we filled ourselves with the dinner prepared through Giton's kindness" (16.1), just before Quartilla's maid Psyche enters their lodgings. Giton is thus regularly expected to perform the slave task of meal preparation for the group's benefit. In what survives of the *Satyrical*, neither Encolpius nor Ascyrtos are ever represented as fulfilling this role, suggesting that they assume Giton exemplifies this slave behavior more than they do. Encolpius seems here to project agency

²⁹ cf. Trimalchio's punning use of *Carpe*, "Carve," both as a name for the slave and as a command for the action that the slave is meant to perform (36.5-8).

³⁰ For the sexual implications of the term *frater* here, see Chapter 3: 76-78.

onto Giton with the term *beneficium*, which is generally only applied to the actions of citizens. Seneca explicitly discusses this term and its connotations in *De Beneficiis* (3.18 and following). Seneca’s claim is that a slave can indeed perform a *beneficium*, while Seneca’s imagined opponent views the prospect as entirely antithetical to the slave condition, which precludes a slave from choosing. Therefore, the opponent claims, *ministerium*, or “service,” is a better term for the actions of a slave (3.19.1). Seneca goes on to suggest that a slave can perform a *beneficium* provided that the action goes above and beyond the typical expectations of a slave (3.21). The fact that Seneca imagines an opponent to contradict him and proceeds to defend his claim at length at least could suggest that a large number of Roman citizens during his time did not feel the same way as he did; Seneca pushes back against popular notions of the term *beneficium*, complicating conceptions of the free and enslaved.³¹

The term *beneficium* is also mostly only used of citizens in Plautus (*Capt.* 358; *Merc.* 996; *Poen.* 635; *Trin.* 638, 1130). In *Asinaria*, the father, old man, and citizen character Demaenetus recounts his experiences with his own father to rationalize helping his son (67-72):

uolo amari a meis;
uolo me patris mei similem, qui causa mea
naulerico ipse ornatu per fallaciam
quam amabam abduxit ab lenone mulierem; 70
nec puduit eum id aetatis sycophantias
struere et beneficiis me emere gnatum suum sibi

I want to be loved by my children;
I want to be like my father, who, on my account,
In shipowner’s attire, through trickery, himself
Got the woman I loved away from a pimp;
Nor was he ashamed to contrive tricks at his age

³¹ Seneca does not suggest that the slave is any freer for performing a *beneficium*, but that a slave would be performing above and beyond the obligations of a slave in carrying out a *beneficium*. This still largely associates the term *beneficium* with free behavior, as Seneca’s imagined opponent claims, and so Seneca simply nuances the term while ultimately reinforcing the dominant ideology’s connotations of it. Overall this would seem in conversation with Roman elites’ strategies to alleviate their anxieties regarding the power that they wield over enslaved persons: if a slave can perform a *beneficium*, then there is a degree of willingness in the individual’s enslavement.

And to buy me off, his son, with favors.

Thus, Demaenetus wishes to perform the role of his own father in helping his son obtain the woman that he loves. Demaenetus describes the “favors” of his father as *beneficia*, which in turn describes the similar actions of Demaenetus himself. Though this example is surely comedic, considering the type of behavior that Demaenetus describes, we can see how these *beneficia* are represented as favorable actions that a citizen father performs for the benefit of his citizen son.

In *Persa*, the slave Toxilus serves as one of a few apparent exceptions: he self-reports his own actions as a *beneficium* to the pimp Dordalus, though Toxilus in fact has cheated Dordalus (*Per.* 719). Shortly thereafter, Toxilus uses the term again of both the aid he has received from others and the thanks he will give in return (762), but this is a gnomic statement after he has compared himself to a victorious general (759a; Richlin 2005: 737 n. 758a). Shortly after this scene, Toxilus suggests celebrating his birthday, a celebration officially reserved for freeborn persons (Richlin 2005: 178 n. 769a). In describing his actions with the term *beneficium* and in proclaiming the celebration of his birthday, Toxilus is framing his actions as those of a free man. In *Rudens*, the slave Trachalio also uses the term *beneficium* of his own actions (*Rud.* 1221), but he has flipped the script, briefly commanding the role of master in his exchange with the citizen Daemones. After acknowledging Daemones’ series of commands, Trachalio takes charge and starts to demand various rewards for his actions, whereupon the roles of the two become reversed (*Rud.* 1205-1226). Through their claims of performing *beneficia*, Toxilus and Trachalio explicitly compare themselves to or enact the role of citizens and, in conjunction with the word *beneficium*’s prevalent application to citizens’ actions, this strongly suggests that the term evokes the behavior of free persons.

In Petronius then, *beneficium* would imply that Giton is cooking for the group out of the “kindness” of his freeborn heart. We have already seen, however, Encolpius’s expectation that Giton cook for him in the passage above (9.2), so the attribution of agency in this circumstance falls flat. Giton cannot perform the role of cook through his benevolence alone if he is consistently expected to do so regardless.³² In terms of Giton’s behavior, *beneficium* thus serves as a ridiculous oxymoron that Encolpius constructs, like *libentissime* above (26.10): a slave performing his slave duties out of sheer goodwill, a slave acting as a free person. As with Seneca’s discussion of *beneficium* above, we can view this perception or description of a slave’s supposed willingness as a strategy of owners to relieve anxieties concerning their own power while simultaneously reinforcing that power.

In a similar vein, Giton is also expected to guide the drunken Ascyrtos and Encolpius home. The three plan to slip away as Trimalchio’s party proceeds to the bath (72.7): *cum haec placuissent, ducente per porticum Gitone ad ianuam venimus*, “When these plans seemed pleasing, Giton led us through the portico and we arrived at the door.” Though the participle *ducens*, “leading,” could be seen as granting Giton a degree of agency, this is qualified by the context of Giton’s behavior. Plautus often uses *ducere* in commands to slave sex workers and other slaves. In *Mostellaria*, the citizen Callidamates, stumbling drunk, tells his girlfriend and sex worker, Delphium *lepida es./ duc me amabo*, “You’re a doll. Lead me please” (*Most.* 323-324; cf. *Rud.* 386). In *Epidicus*, after the citizen Periphanes has unwittingly purchased the female slave love-interest of his son, he orders a slave *heus! foras/ exite huc aliquis. duce istam intro mulierem*, “Hey, someone come outside here. Lead this woman indoors” (*Epid.* 398-399). As the imperatives *duc* and *duce* are often directed toward slaves, any potential slave agency in

³² For Encolpius’s romanticizing of his relationship with Giton and his occasional but inconsistent elevation of Giton’s status, see Chapter 3: esp. 76-86.

“leading” is diminished by the slave being commanded to do so. Giton’s agency is further reduced by the fact that his action does not function as the main verb but rather is relegated to the ablative absolute, *ducente Gitone*.

Moreover, slaves are regularly depicted as guiding drunken revelers home (Sabnis 2012: 79; Schmeling 2011: 329 n. 1). Sabnis, in a wonderful discussion of Apuleius’s *Metamorphoses*, analyzes the lamp as a slave symbol and makes clear that this concrete object speaks to the “novel’s interest in literal and metaphorical types of slavery” (Sabnis 2012: 106). In a similar vein, Lenski discusses a terracotta lamp (*EA 37561*), dated to the second or first century BCE, which is fashioned in the shape of a drunken reveler supported by a slave attendant holding a lamp. Lenski notes that by bearing a lamp, “the slave ... thus stands in as a metonym for the object of which he forms a part” (2013: 133). The lamp depicts the action for which the lamp would be utilized and even the slave who would carry the lamp itself.

In a passage of Apuleius’s *Metamorphoses* that Sabnis has discussed, a slave guides Lucius home after a banquet, before the lamp is extinguished and bandits set upon them (2.31-32). Lucius narrates how he and the slave head home when *vento repentino lumen quo nitebamur extinguitur*, “the light on which we were relying is snuffed out by a sudden wind” (2.32). The slave is never explicitly mentioned, let alone given a name; as Sabnis points out, the passage marks the slave’s presence only through its use of the plural, including *nitebamur* here, while his agency is further minimized through his represented instrumentality (2012: 84-85): Lucius narrates their joint reliance on the lamp, but, especially since he is drunk, he in fact relies on his slave’s guidance in order to arrive home safely.

Similarly, when Giton, Encolpius, and Ascyrtos do manage to escape Trimalchio’s, they drag their bleeding feet over sharp stones and potsherds, not knowing where they are going,

before Giton spares them (79.3-4): *tandem expliciti acumine Gitonis sumus. prudens enim puer, cum luce etiam clara timeret errorem, omnes pilas columnasque notaverat creta, quae lineamenta evicerunt spississimam noctem et notabili candore ostenderunt errantibus viam*, “At last we were freed by Giton’s sharp wit. For the clever boy, since he feared straying even in daylight, had marked all the pillars and columns with chalk, which markings overcame the darkest night and with a notable gleam pointed out the path to us as we wandered.” Scholars have given much attention to the comparison of Giton with Ariadne here (Schmelting 2011 330 n. 2-4; Courtney 2001: 228; Makowski 2012: 226),³³ and to the general allusions to the myth of the minotaur and the Minoan labyrinth throughout the banquet (Leeman 1967: 147-57; Bodel 1984: 60-61; 1994; Schmelting 2011: 306 n. 1).³⁴ Additionally, however, Giton fulfills the role of a slave by guiding the drunken Ascyrtos and Encolpius to their lodgings.

While Encolpius acknowledges Giton’s intelligence (*acumen; prudens*), it is the markings (*lineamenta*) that ultimately show (*ostenderunt*) the path to the wandering drunks. In this, Giton is diminished to the instruments he has employed, just as Lucius’s slave has been in Apuleius. Giton performs the role of guide, already aligning himself with a slave, but then is further reduced to the function of a tool, or in this case, a *lineamentum*. Sabnis addresses this instrumentalizing phenomenon by investigating the social implications of Roman connections between slaves and lamplight,³⁵ particularly in Apuleius (2012). She draws attention to the “general tendency of slaveholders to discount or ignore the cumulative actions and rationality of

³³ Giton’s cleverness will be discussed in Chapter 4: esp. 101-107. Makowski highlights the fluidity of Giton’s gender performance through Giton’s embodiment of epic, mythological, and tragic characters.

³⁴ In this myth, Theseus is able to exit the labyrinth of King Minos due to a ball of thread with which he marked his path, at Ariadne’s suggestion (see e.g. *Ov. Ep.* 10 and *Hyg. Fab.* 41-43). Encolpius, in fact, calls Trimalchio’s house a labyrinth at 73.1. Giton, therefore, plays Ariadne to Encolpius’s Theseus.

³⁵ cf. *Sat.* 75.10, where Trimalchio himself reports that he used to measure his height against a lampstand and donned its oil to promote the growth of his beard (Sabnis 2012: 89 n.14). See also Bielfeldt, who engages with Trimalchio’s report in her discussion of the reification of slaves and the anthropomorphized lampstands of Pompeii (2018). Bielfeldt envisions the lampstand that Trimalchio mentions as one of these lamp statues.

slaves, to see through them, to speak through them, to hear through them, and generally to use them as instruments” (85). The reduction of Giton to his instrumentality reflects Roman slave owners’ tendency to minimize slave presence and activity in the Roman literary tradition, a blind spot that scholars perpetuate by focusing only on the literary references in this passage.

Finally, Giton plays Eumolpus’s slave in an elaborate ruse in Croton. After Giton, Encolpius, and Eumolpus survive the wreck of Lichas’s ship, they agree to perpetrate a trick, wherein Eumolpus will act rich and without heirs so that the legacy hunters in Croton will wine and dine him (117.4-6):

‘quid ergo’ inquit Eumolpus ‘cessamus mimum componere? facite ergo me dominum, si negotiatio placet.’ nemo ausus est artem damnare nihil auferentem. itaque ut duraret inter omnes tutum mendacium, in verba Eumolpi sacramentum iuravimus: uri, vinciri, verberari ferroque necari, et quicquid aliud Eumolpus iussisset. tamquam legitimi gladiatores domino corpora animasque religiosissime addicimus. post peractum sacramentum serviliter ficti dominum consalutamus.

“Then why,” said Eumolpus, “do we hesitate to construct a farce? Now make me the master, if the matter is pleasing.” No one dared to disapprove of such a harmless artifice. And so, to keep the lie safe among us all, we swore an oath in the words of Eumolpus: to be burned, bound, beaten, killed by the sword, and whatever else Eumolpus ordered. Just like actual gladiators, we most solemnly vowed our bodies and souls to our master. After the oath was made, in our fictitious roles we saluted our master slavishly.

And so, in the manner of gladiators, Encolpius and Giton voluntarily give up what should be the inviolability of their free bodies. Eumolpus becomes the owner (*dominus*) in this performance, while Encolpius and Giton act the slaves (*serviliter*). With the word *ficti*, Giton and Encolpius perhaps perform some sort of deferential salute that would be identified as a slave’s greeting to his owner. The adverb *serviliter* is infrequent: Cicero employs it when advising men against responding to pain in a slavish or womanly manner (*Tusc.* 2.23.55); Tacitus uses it of Otho, portraying his wheedling and demagogic behavior as characteristic of a slave, before Otho’s overthrow of the emperor Galba (*Hist.* 1.36.13); a captive maiden in Apuleius describes her

enslaved plight with the term, lamenting how she will be caged like a slave (*Met.* 4.24). In short, the term seems to be attributed to free persons who are engaging in slave-like actions or experiences. In the mouth of the narrator, Encolpius, perhaps this serves as an affirmation of his free status at the moment he starts pretending to be a slave. The adverb *serviliter* thus signifies the enactment of their slave performance, but it also heightens the ridiculous irony in the oxymoronic *choice* of slavery, as with *libentissime* and *beneficio* above. Their affectation of slavery is paradoxically their own choice.

Unfortunately, for nearly the rest of the Croton episode, Giton does not make an extensive appearance in our extant text. Circe and Encolpius discuss Giton (127-128.1; 128.8) and Encolpius speaks with him alone (133.1-2;³⁶ 139.3), but his absence and the dearth of evidence for Giton at this point in the novel prevent further analysis of his performance of status in Croton. Our only other representation of his performance occurs shortly after the above oath, after the group sets out on their journey to Croton (117.11): *sed neque Giton sub insolito fasce durabat*, “But Giton could not endure under his unaccustomed burden.” Giton’s first performance as slave in this new location is his difficulty in executing his task: he is not able to carry the luggage. The slave tasks he performs for the rest of the Croton episode are uncertain, but we can assume that he had less difficulty, as the people of Croton do not seem to have discovered the scam by the end of our extant text.

Giton thus performs various slave tasks in several distinct situations. While not relegated to slaves exclusively, these roles contribute to the pervasive representation of Giton as a slave and explain why other characters treat Giton as a slave in their interactions with him. Throughout Trimalchio’s banquet, Giton willingly acts as the slave of Encolpius and Ascyltos. In Croton, he

³⁶ This passage will be addressed in Chapter 3: 83.

joins the ruse and plays the role of Eumolpus's slave. Although he does so alongside Encolpius, Giton is the one who has to carry the bundles. These circumstances presented the opportunity for intentional subterfuge, in which Giton actively participated. His actions as cook and guide, however, reveal a different kind of role. He cooks for Ascyltos and Encolpius in their private lodgings, fulfills the role of slave guide even outside of Trimalchio's banquet, and is seemingly forced to be Ascyltos's bath attendant. Encolpius and Ascyltos expect Giton to be a slave even when no one is watching. The narrator's use of the terms *libentissime*, *beneficio*, and *serviliter* all serve to heighten the issues of will and agency in the representation of Giton's enslaved status. The terms also demonstrate at least Encolpius's perception of Giton's lack of resistance to these slave performances, in contrast with *non libenter*, with which Encolpius self-interestedly highlights his perception of Giton's resistance to and rejection of the boy's slave role for Ascyltos.

Perception is Everything: How Other Characters View Giton

At this point, we now turn to other characters' perception of Giton as a slave. Since construction of the self is reflexive, being built through continuous social interactions (Brickell 2005: 32; Goffman 1963: 106), an analysis of Giton's status must not only address his performance but the ways in which other characters perceive that performance. We have already seen Eumolpus's perception of Giton as a slave upon their first meeting (92.3) as well as Lichas's reaction to Giton on board ship (107.10; see Introduction: 19-22). Other characters also assume Giton is slave, including Hermeros, Ascyltos, and Tryphaena.

At Trimalchio's banquet, Giton laughs when the freedman Hermeros hurls abuse against Ascylos (58.1).³⁷ In response to Giton's outburst, Hermeros rails against him in turn (58.2-7, 9-14). Throughout this beratement, Hermeros consistently implies Giton's slave status. He exclaims *io Saturnalia, rogo, mensis december est?* "Happy Saturnalia, I ask, is it the month of December?" (58.2). His question is sarcastic: it is not December, but Giton has overstepped his bounds, as a slave had license to do during the Saturnalia festival (Seneca *Ep.* 18; Henderson 1969: 122 n. 1; Balsdon 1969: 124-26; Schmeling 2011: 240 n. 2). Hermeros continues: *quando vicesimam numerasti?* "When did you pay your freedom tax?" (58.2), referring to the five percent tax levied on the sale price of a slave upon manumission (Livy 7.16.7; Henderson 1969: 123 n. 1; Bradley 1987: 104-7, 149-50; Schmeling 2011: 240 n. 2). With this question, Hermeros sarcastically presumes that Giton has not in fact purchased his freedom, again implying that Giton has transgressed the status of an enslaved person. Hermeros continues to insult Giton throughout the rest of this passage (58.2-7), twice referring to Ascylos as Giton's *dominus*, "owner" (58.3; 58.13), and calling Giton a *servus*, "slave," directly (58.3). He clearly views Giton as a slave, but what about Giton's behavior causes Hermeros to assume Giton is a slave?

Up to this point, Giton has stood as a slave at the foot of Encolpius's couch, as marked by *qui ad pedes stabat*, "who was standing at my feet" (58.1). In general, the standing, attending posture of slaves marks a stark contrast of status from the seated and reclining guests (Roller 2017: *passim* and esp. 19-22). The slaves at this banquet, including Giton, are standing, mobile, and ready to serve, while the attendees are reclining, relaxed, and attended upon. Roller takes note of the hierarchical positioning in these situations: though the slaves are physically above the

³⁷ Discussions of freedmen's language in the *Cena* abound: Abbot 1907, George 1966, Bodel 1984, Marchesi 2005, et al. See references in Vannini 2007: esp. 319-24.

diners, their standing at attention and readiness to take action in deference to a relaxed “other” mark them as inferior (2006: 20). Yet the slaves are also active while the diners are dependent, and in the diners’ expectation of the slaves’ “scripted choreography” lies the opportunity for slave resistance (Joshel and Petersen 2014: 60).³⁸ Joshel and Petersen see tactics of resistance in the slaves’ feigned mistakes in, manipulations of, and interruptions to the owner’s narrative of events (Joshel and Petersen 2014: 60, and esp. 59-67), further evidenced by the complaints made against slaves’ disruptiveness, idleness, and laziness in Latin literature (e.g. Seneca *Ira* 2.25.1, 3.28.1, 3.34.1; Joshel and Petersen 2014: 60, 233 n. 74). When Giton laughs aloud, Hermeros perceives a slave who is overstepping his station and resisting the choreography of the banquet, and Hermeros reacts accordingly. The stakes are high, as Hermeros has been a slave himself, and so Giton’s outburst is a direct affront to the social hierarchies in which Hermeros has participated, and to the opportunities for upward mobility upon which Hermeros has capitalized. Giton has flagrantly disregarded the social order of the banquet, in which the slaves, including Giton, are meant to be silent and attentive while the diners converse among themselves. Giton has not played the game correctly, as Hermeros claims to have done.

Ascyltos also views Giton as a slave. After Encolpius and Ascyltos have been fighting over Giton, Giton intervenes, pleading with them to stop, and the following scene occurs (80.5): *inhibuimus ferrum post has preces, et prior Ascyltos ‘ego’ inquit ‘finem discordiae imponam. puer ipse quem vult sequatur, ut sit illi saltem in eligendo fratre [salva] libertas,’* “We held back our swords after these requests, and Ascyltos, the first to speak, said ‘I will introduce an end to this disagreement. Let the boy himself follow whom he wishes, so that there at least may be freedom for him in choosing a brother.’” The reference is subtle. The *saltem*, “at least,” here

³⁸ See also Joshel and Petersen 2014: 232 n. 73; Joshel 1992: esp. 163-165.

could imply that Giton does not, in fact, have general *libertas*, “freedom,” but that, at Ascyltos’s suggestion, Giton will at least have freedom in this choice (Richlin 2009: 1987). If, however, the *saltem* were taken with *illi* due to the two terms’ proximity, the implication would seem to suggest that at least *Giton* would have freedom in choosing a brother, if no other individuals, or if neither Encolpius nor Ascyltos do. Would this mean that Encolpius and Ascyltos did not have freedom in choosing their own brothers? If so, why would that be significant here? Or could the phrase be idiomatic, like our English “if nothing else”? In this case, the meaning would be something akin to “If no one else has freedom in choosing a brother, at least let Giton have it.” If so, perhaps this could be a comment, in general, on the relative lack of sexual autonomy and agency for someone in Giton’s position. The phrase would then suggest a departure from the norm in that Ascyltos offers Giton the opportunity to choose.

If *saltem* should be taken with *illi*, this last interpretation would seem to correspond most with the context, and the phrase would still portray Giton as a slave. If Giton were free, with the freedom to choose, then this choice would exist without Ascyltos’s offer. Therefore, the fact that Ascyltos provides Giton the freedom to choose necessitates Giton’s prior lack of freedom to choose. This is a fabricated freedom for Giton, similar to Encolpius’s use of *beneficio* above, a freedom that Ascyltos and Encolpius can remove. Giton in fact directly addresses his lack of choice during the confrontation after Encolpius discovers him in the bath. He states, *ubi arma non sunt, libere loquor*, “As there are no weapons, I speak freely” (91.2), calls Ascyltos a *latroni cruento*, “bloody robber” (*ibid.*), and claims that he merely fled to the stronger of the two armed men (91.8).³⁹ Encolpius’s willingness to believe Giton (Courtney 2001: 144; Schmeling 2011: 379 n. 2 and 7-8) and Giton’s dramatics here have been well discussed (Schmeling 2011: 379 n.

³⁹ For Giton’s potentially manipulative behavior in this scene, see Chapter 4: 108-110.

2; Panayotakis 1995: 118, 122), but I highlight Giton’s representation of events: the freedom Ascyrtos granted Giton was no freedom at all. Giton saw two armed men and fled to the stronger of the two, presumably out of self-preservation. This is not a brother who has freedom of choice and equal standing. Ascyrtos’s feigned offer of freedom rings as false to Giton as it does to the reader. Thus, whether *saltem* limits *libertas* or *illi*, Ascyrtos clearly perceives Giton to be a slave.

Ascyrtos makes use of the term *puer*, “boy,” to describe Giton. While *puer* can be used of a sex slave or even a child (Richlin 2009: 86; Richlin 2015: 353), it is also a common term for a slave in general (Joshel and Murnaghan 1998: 10):⁴⁰

The fact that the male slave could be a legitimate sexual object for another man even as an adult meant that he was both like a woman and like a perpetual boy – a status that was pointedly evoked in the Latin designation of male slaves of all ages as *puer*, “boy.”

Thus, we can read Ascyrtos’s choice of the term *puer* as highlighting Ascyrtos’s sexual use of Giton as well as Giton’s general slave status. It is clear at this point in the novel that Ascyrtos already views Giton as a sex object: Giton has already reported that Ascyrtos raped him (9.2), and Ascyrtos’s theft of Giton in the night has escalated the former’s conflict with Encolpius and ended their friendship (79.9-80.8).

Ascyrtos’s perception of Giton as a slave is consistent throughout Ascyrtos’s time in the novel. Later on, after Encolpius has taken Giton from the baths, Ascyrtos enlists a crier to aid in his search, who shouts the following (97.2): *puer in balneo paulo ante aberravit, annorum circa XVI, crispus, mollis, formosus, nomine Giton. si quis eum reddere aut commonstrare voluerit, accipiet nummos mille*, “a boy wandered off a little while ago in the bath, about 16 years old, curly-haired, effeminate, attractive, by the name of Giton. If anyone wishes to return him or

⁴⁰ See also Richlin 1992: 34-44; Williams 2010: 83, 204-208, 268.

point him out, he will receive one thousand coins.” Ascyrtos again uses the term *puer* to describe Giton, this time through the mouth of the crier. Moreover, the crier’s words echo the inscriptions on Roman slave collars.⁴¹ One of these, the Zoninus collar, is thus inscribed (*CIL* 15 (2) 7194; Trimble 2016: 447): *Fugi, tene me. Cum revoc(a)veris me d(omino) m(eo) Zonino, accipis solidum*, “I have run away, seize me. When you have returned me to my owner, Zoninus, you will receive a gold coin.” Though several centuries later than Petronius, this collar adequately parallels Ascyrtos’s own words through the crier. Both the crier and the collar begin with the issue at hand: *puer ... aberravit*, “A boy ... wandered off,” and *fugi, tene me*, “I have run away, seize me.” The crier offers descriptors of the boy, while the collar, presumably on the slave’s person, needs no such description. Both then offer a reward for the slave’s return and use the same verb, *accipio*, to do so: *accipiet nummos mille*, “He will receive one thousand coins,” and *accipis solidum*, “You will receive a gold coin.” The words of both, therefore, typify the language of recapturing individuals who have escaped slavery.⁴² While the collar has adopted the language of a crier, removing the need for the middle man, Giton does not have such a collar, and so Ascyrtos enlists a crier to reclaim what he views as his lost property. In short, Ascyrtos behaves like he has lost a slave, and interestingly it is the fact that Giton has not carried out his slave duties that has precipitated Ascyrtos’s perception of Giton’s slave status. As Giton has deprived Ascyrtos of his clothes upon leaving the bath and abandoned him, Giton has not fulfilled, indeed he has defied, his owner’s expectations, or so goes Ascyrtos’s version of events.

⁴¹ See Trimble 2016.

⁴² cf. Bruns 159.3, an advertisement for two runaway slaves that similarly details the nature of the owner’s grievance and includes an offer of reward (Wiedemann 1981: 184-185).

Shortly after the above scene, Ascyrtos confronts Encolpius in his lodgings, but the latter feigns ignorance and pretends to believe that Ascyrtos is there to kill him. Ascyrtos believes Encolpius's lies (97.10): *amolitur Ascyrtos invidiam et se vero nihil aliud quam fugitivum suum dixit quaerere*, "Ascyrtos cast off his ill will and said that he truly sought nothing other than his own runaway." While the term *fugitivus* can denote a deserter (cf. Caes. *B.G.* 1.23.2), this would be an inapplicable interpretation here, where the word must refer to a runaway slave (cf. Pl. *Trin.* 1027; *Ps.* 365). Utilizing the same etymological root as the Zoninus collar's *fugi* above (*CIL* 15 (2) 7194), Ascyrtos labels Giton a *fugitivus* who must be returned to his owner.⁴³ Once again, Giton is perceived as a slave to be captured.

Tryphaena too does not view Giton and Encolpius as freeborn individuals, and she also uses the term *fugitivus* of Giton. Shortly after the above passage, when Encolpius and Giton have been discovered on board Lichas's ship, Tryphaena sees the painted faces of Encolpius and Giton. She believes these markings are real, and that Encolpius and Giton are slaves who have run away, been recaptured, and marked as fugitives (105.11):

Tryphaena lacrimas effudit decepta supplicio – vera enim stigmata credebat captivorum frontibus impressa – sciscitarique submissius coepit, quod ergastulum interceptisset errantes, aut cuius tam crudeles manus in hoc supplicium durassent. meruisse quidem contumeliam aliquam fugitivos, quibus in odium bona sua venissent.

Tryphaena burst into tears at our feigned punishment – for she believed the brands of captives marked on our foreheads were real – and she began to inquire more gently, what workhouse had seized us in our wandering, or whose hands were so cruel as to harden us for this punishment. But, in fact, runaways who scorn their good fortune deserve some abuse.

⁴³ The term *fugitivus* is also used just prior to this passage, when the innkeeper finds Encolpius, Giton, and Eumolpus struggling and asks them, *ebrii estis, an fugitivi, an utrumque*, "Are you all drunk, runaway slaves, or both?" (*Petr.* 95.2). See Joshel and Petersen 2014: 115. Here, in a wonderful treatment of the association of nighttime activities with drunks and slaves, Joshel and Petersen seem to imply that Encolpius, Eumolpus, and Giton are free: "In his depiction of an inn at night, Petronius throws nocturnal troublemakers into the same category as drunks and slaves." (see Introduction: 9)

Tryphaena recognizes their markings as those forced upon runaway slaves (*stigmata ... frontibus*);⁴⁴ she labels them as *captivi*, or individuals who have been captured and made slaves; she uses the term *ergastulo*, or “slave-labor camp” (cf. *Sat.* 81.5 and see Introduction: 18-19); she calls them *fugitivos*, or “runaway slaves.”⁴⁵ At first, Tryphaena feels sorry for the harshness of their punishment (*lacrimas effudit; crudeles*), but then checks herself and suggests that, as *fugitivi* who somehow came back willingly or allowed themselves to be recaptured, they deserved it.

The passage indicates that Tryphaena supposes, or indeed knows, that Encolpius and Giton have actually been slaves and escaped. Her reaction to them on Lichas’s ship suggests that she sees them as two runaways who were caught and suffered the punishment of branding and manual labor for their flight. She does not express surprise that they are runaways, or cite their prior freeborn status in outrage, but rather initially pities the harsh punishment of branding that she believes they have received *as* runaways. For Tryphaena to call them runaways in the last line must reference an earlier, lost passage of the *Satyrice* in which the two ran away from her and Lichas (Schmeling 2011: 400-401 n. 7).⁴⁶ With this last line, Tryphaena demonstrates her perception that the two are runaway slaves and that they were deserving of punishment befitting their fugitive status. To Tryphaena, then, Encolpius and Giton fit the role of runaways, and are not freeborn individuals.

⁴⁴ See Kamen 2010: *passim*, but who also notes the implication of branding here, rather than tattooing, with the term *impressa* (100).

⁴⁵ This marks the third and last time Giton is labeled as a *fugitivus*. Here, I discount Eumolpus’s analogy (107.4; see Introduction: 19).

⁴⁶ Schmeling suggests that Encolpius, Lichas, and his wife all had a sexual relationship, citing 105.9, when Lichas touches Encolpius’s groin to recognize him, and the fact that the wife betrayed Lichas in favor of Encolpius, possibly helping Encolpius to rob Lichas’s ship (*ibid.*) That Encolpius and Lichas’s wife had some sort of liaison is evidenced by Encolpius’s narration in 106.2. As regards Tryphaena, it seems that Giton negatively and publicly affected the *pudoris dignitas*, “value of her modesty” (106.4).

Thus Hermeros, Ascyltos, and Tryphaena all assume Giton's slave status, but in different ways. Hermeros observes Giton's performance of slavery during the banquet and reacts to Giton's overt resistance accordingly. When Ascyltos has sole possession of Giton, he forces Giton to function as his bath attendant, and, after he loses the boy, he acts like he has lost a slave, offers a reward for Giton's return, and calls him a *fugitivus*. Tryphaena, meanwhile, is not surprised at Giton's branding, but is rather only distraught at the harshness of the punishment. Her reaction implies the possibility of Giton undergoing such a penalty, given his station. She too calls Giton a *fugitivus*.

All this evidence points to Giton performing the duties of a slave and, in turn, being perceived as a slave. But what do we do with this information? How does this performance of slavery further manifest in Giton's relationships with others? How does Petronius's representation of Giton embody the broader literary models for slaves and slavery? The subsequent chapters will explore these questions and the ways in which Giton embodies a multiplicitous performance of slavery itself.

CHAPTER 2: GITON AS SEX OBJECT

After analyzing Giton's slave roles above, this chapter and those following will focus on particular aspects of Giton's representation that also take on connotations of slavery. In this chapter I will focus on the sexual objectification Giton experiences from individuals aside from Encolpius.⁴⁷ Despite this focus, we must remember that all Giton's sexual interactions are only ever portrayed through the lens of Encolpius. Giton is continuously treated as a sex object, and is viewed as such by a variety of characters in the novel. Here, I highlight the one-sided nature of these sexual interactions: Giton himself almost never expresses sexual desire.⁴⁸ This lack of attributed sexual agency represents Giton and his interactions with others as subservient.

Any discussion of sexuality and gender owes much to the feminist, gender, and queer theorists of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. Of these, Foucault and Butler have had perhaps the most profound impact on queer and feminist studies (Foucault 1978, 1986, 1988; Butler 1990 and 1993). While Butler's problematization of the terms "gender" and "sex" was the "single most crucial advance contributed by late twentieth-century feminism to social theory" (Skinner 2014: 8; Flax 1990: 21; Sedgwick 1990: 27-8), both parties contributed to the now accepted notion that gender and sexuality are social constructions. This has had a profound impact on analyses of sexuality and gender expression in the ancient world, but it has divided us into two main camps, split as to what extent these social constructions overlap with our own. The Foucauldian camp goes so far as to argue that "homosexuality" and indeed "sexuality" did not exist in the ancient world (Foucault 1978: 43; Halperin 1990: 8, 18, 24 *et passim*), while opponents staunchly defend the opposite (esp. Richlin 1993: *passim*). Some attempts have been

⁴⁷ Encolpius and aspects of his relationship with Giton will be discussed in Chapter 3.

⁴⁸ The one exception to this may be Giton's experience with Pannychis, which scene will be discussed below.

made to reconcile these seemingly disparate models (e.g. Skinner 2014), and I too aim for reconciliation. There is value in viewing gender and sexuality as socially constructed, especially when discussing a slave's negotiation of his/her identity, but I would not go so far as to agree with the Foucauldian line of argument that "homosexuality" did not exist in the ancient world. While this claim is valid in the strictest sense, inasmuch as the term was coined as a pathology in the 19th century, the textual and iconographical examples of same-sex attraction attest to the fact that the concept existed, even if the specific terminology did not (see Richlin 1993), and we have to assume a degree of identification with this attraction, even if such identification does not perfectly map onto our own. One could argue that this sentence and the specific connotations of each word being read now did not exist in Ancient Rome either, as anything we say is a product of our own sociocultural and sociolinguistic baggage (see esp. Bruner 1996). If this were taken to the extreme, we would not be able to discuss ancient sex/gender systems at all. However, while I feel the concept of homosexuality, if qualified, should be included in our discussions of sexuality, the term "homosexuality" could be construed as connoting a degree of identification incongruent with that of the ancient world, and, because of its pathological and clinical associations, I will generally not employ the term in this work (Clark 2015: 1-2).

It is important to keep in mind that it was largely expected for Roman adult males to take sexual pleasure in more sexes/genders than one.⁴⁹ In fact, it was common for a Roman citizen to have sexual relations with his male slaves, and this behavior was largely acceptable to the Roman populace (Clark 2015: 2). Richlin observes that "literary texts from Catullus ... to Martial ... manifest desire both for women and for teenage boys," and that "boys, like women,

⁴⁹ For discussions of the issue, see Adams 1982, Richlin 1992, Hallet and Skinner 1997, Parker 1997, Hubbard 2014, Williams 2010, Masterson 2014, and Kamen and Levin-Richardson 2015.

are said to be conscious of themselves as sex objects” (2009: 82). The sexual paradigm that results from this Roman male perspective has been termed the Priapic or penetration model, in which a male citizen, provided that he is the penetrator, could have sex with certain persons because the act of penetrating, to some extent, defined Roman manliness (Walters 1997: 30; Parker 1997: *passim*). Largely, this model entails sexual aggression, often rape, for the purposes of either humiliation or sexual humor (Richlin 1992: 58-9). Whereas a male citizen’s body was idealized as impenetrable, “the penetrability of the slave’s body, male and female, made sex an expected part of servitude and left the freed slave with a life-long stigma” (Richlin 2009: 83).

This is not to say that the Priapic, penetrative model is the sole model by which we should define sexuality in Ancient Rome. The agency of the individuals in question also plays a role in Roman conceptions of sexuality and sexual expression (Kamen and Levin-Richardson 2015). A male enduring rape and one seeking out his own penetration were not conceived to belong to the same category of persons. That Romans viewed these two categories of persons as distinct is clear from the four terms Kamen and Levin-Richardson investigate: *irrumatus* and *pedicatus* connote a passive person who has been orally and anally raped, respectively; *fellator* and *cinaedus/pathicus* suggest persons who actively choose to be penetrated orally and anally (Kamen and Levin-Richardson 2015: esp. 450-55). Considering Kamen and Levin-Richardson, the term passive will be used throughout this work to signify a lack of sexual agency, and not necessarily penetrated sexual status.

Roman society often diminished the roles of slaves or excluded slaves from narratives of agency and consent, and Petronius represents characters who exist and interact with one another in ways structured by this diminishment and exclusion. As for Giton, he is constantly receiving affection or functioning as the object of someone else’s desire, and he is almost never

represented as having active sexual feelings of his own. This lack of sexual agency that Encolpius attributes to Giton portrays Giton as sexually passive, and this sexual passivity in turn characterizes Giton as a slave.

Sexual Attraction to Giton

Several characters express sexual attraction to Giton, including Eumolpus. Shortly after Eumolpus calls Giton a Ganymede (92.3; see Introduction: 21-22), Giton criticizes Encolpius for censoring Eumolpus's poetry, there is a lacuna, and Eumolpus praises Giton's wit and beauty (94.1-2):

‘o felicem’ inquit ‘matrem tuam, quae te talem peperit: macte virtute esto. raram fecit mixturam cum sapientia forma. itaque ne putes te tot verba perdidisse, amatorem invenisti. ego laudes tuas carminibus implebo. ego paedagogus et custos etiam quo non iusseris sequar. nec iniuriam Encolpius accipit, alium amat.’

“How fortunate is your mother,” he said, “who gave birth to the likes of you: well done. Beauty has made a rare union with wisdom. So do not think that you have wasted all your words, you have found a lover. I will round off your praises with verse. I shall follow you as your pedagogue and guardian even where you do not order. Encolpius receives no offense, he loves another.”

Eumolpus, blissfully unaware of Encolpius's relationship with Giton, offers to be Giton's *paedagogus*, “teacher,” and *custos*, “guardian.” The term *paedagogus* conveys sexual implications when we consider that, just prior to this passage, Eumolpus has recounted his role as *paedagogus* for the boy of Pergamene (85-87): while Eumolpus professed himself to the boy's parents as a legitimate teacher, he confesses to have been an insatiable pederast instead. He describes the boy as *annis ad patiendum gestientibus*, “at an age passionate for penetration,” (87.7) and that *inter ... tritus, quod voluerat accepit*, “with the poundings, [the boy] received what he wanted” (87.8). He couples with the boy to varying degrees on several occasions. As he had done with the Pergamene boy then, Eumolpus surely suggests he will play the penetrative

role with Giton now. The *-tor* suffix in Eumolpus's *amatorem* confirms that Eumolpus plans on performing the role of "lover," or penetrator, while Giton acts as the "beloved," or penetrated. Encolpius immediately recognizes the implications of Eumolpus's words, states that he would have killed Eumolpus on the spot if he still possessed his sword, and compares Eumolpus to Ascyrtos as another rival for Giton's affections (94.3). Eumolpus thus is yet another person who desires to penetrate Giton.

Furthermore, Eumolpus's use of the term *iniuria*, "offense," could suggest that he views Giton as Encolpius's slave. This is a legal charge that could "[consider] the damage inflicted upon an owner through the offender's interaction with his or her slave" (Perry 2015: 58). This damage applied to, among other things, sexual interactions with slaves, provided the slave's owner was unaware or did not approve (*Dig.* 47.10.9.4, Ulpian; Perry 2015: 71): *si quis tam feminam quam masculam, sive ingenuos sive libertinos, inpudicos facere adtemptavit, iniuriam tenebitur. sed et si servi pudicitia adtemptata sit, iniuriam locum habet*, "If anyone makes an attempt to make someone, male or female or free or freed, unchaste, he will be liable for offense. Even if the chastity of a slave has been attempted upon, he is liable for offense." Thus, sexual affronts to slaves, as extensions of their owners, could be seen as an insult to the owners themselves. Eumolpus's comment therefore suggests that he will not have committed any legal offense; he believes that Encolpius loves another person and will therefore allow a sexual relationship between Giton and Eumolpus. If Eumolpus views Giton as a slave, as *iniuria* would seem to suggest, Eumolpus's use of the term *paedagogus* could be seen either as a cruel joke, since only freeborn boys would have a *paedagogus* (Keegan 2013: 73), or it could be considered something like a turn of phrase, where Eumolpus offers himself as the equivalent of a freeborn youth's *paedagogus*.

Giton's own sexual interest in Eumolpus is never expressed, though he does capitalize on Eumolpus's later on (98.7-9; see Chapter 4: 113-114). Eumolpus inserts himself into Giton's life unasked, nor does he demonstrate concern with Giton's wishes in this regard. Instead, Eumolpus's own desires assume priority, whereas Giton's own are never considered. Giton is thus the object of Eumolpus's attraction, not the expresser or agent of his own.

On Lichas's ship, the sailors and Tryphaena also express interest in Giton.⁵⁰ When Giton cries out from being whipped, just before being discovered, Encolpius narrates how the boy had already won the sailors over by his looks alone (105.7): *iam Giton mirabili forma exarmaverat nautas coeperatque etiam sine voce savientes rogare*, "Giton had already disarmed the sailors with his marvelous beauty, and had begun to prevail upon his abusers without even a word." Giton is a beauty to be admired, one toward whom the sailors direct their attention and sexual interest.

In Tryphaena's case, this one-sided attraction becomes even more apparent. Once the fighting stops, Giton and Tryphaena recline together, and Encolpius notes her expressions of attraction to Giton time and time again. First, after Giton's shaven head is covered with a curly wig, Tryphaena *bona fide puero basium dedit*, "gave the boy a kiss with full sincerity" (110.3). Following this interaction comes Eumolpus's tale of the widow of Ephesus. Tryphaena's initial reaction to the story, a story which was set up as highlighting the fickleness of women (110.6), is described as follows (113.1): *erubescete non mediocriter Tryphaena vultumque suum super cervicem Gitonis amabiliter ponente*, "Tryphaena blushed deeply and lovingly rested her head on Giton's neck." Encolpius continues (113.5-7):

ceterum Tryphaena in gremio Gitonis posita modo implebat osculis pectus, interdum concinnabat spoliatum crinibus vultum. ego maestus et impatiens foederis novi non

⁵⁰ Appropriately, Tryphaena's name seems to derive from the Greek word τρυφάω, "to be wanton" (Schmeling 2011: 401 n. 7).

cibum, non potionem capiebam, sed obliquis trucibusque oculis utrum spectabam. omnia me oscula vulnerabant, omnes blanditiae, quascumque mulier libidinosa fingeat. nec tamen adhuc sciebam utrum magis puero irascerer, quod amicam mihi auferret, an amicae, quod puerum corrumperet.

But Tryphaena, resting on Giton's lap, was filling his chest with kisses, and at another moment was adjusting his appearance, now deprived of its curls. I, gloomy and intolerant of our new alliance, took no food or drink, but I was watching both of them with harsh, sideways looks. Every kiss wounded me, every caress, whatever the wanton woman fashioned. I was still uncertain at this point whether I was angrier at the boy, because he took away my girlfriend, or at the girlfriend, because she was seducing my boy.

Encolpius's anger toward Giton is not because the boy has affection for Tryphaena, at least as Encolpius presents it, but because Giton has drawn Tryphaena's affection away from Encolpius himself: *quod amicam mihi auferret*, "because he took away my girlfriend." This amounts to the closest degree of agency Encolpius imparts upon Giton in this scene, but even here Encolpius focuses on the direction of Tryphaena's attentions toward Giton, not Giton's active attempts to seduce Tryphaena: though Giton is the grammatical subject of *auferret*, Giton is not represented as doing anything to draw Tryphaena's attraction, outside of his own existence. Tryphaena kisses Giton and caresses him, but Giton's actions are left undisclosed. That is, Encolpius notes the affection Tryphaena directs toward Giton, but does not describe any reciprocity. With Tryphaena as the subject of *quascumque mulier libidinosa fingeat*, "whatever the wanton woman fashioned," Encolpius presents the *oscula*, "kisses," *blanditiae*, "caresses," and other actions of affection as deriving from Tryphaena alone. Encolpius's focus is on Tryphaena's sexual attention, not Giton's sexual agency.

Encolpius has already noted Tryphaena's attention to Giton earlier, when they were first discovered, stating that *volebat Tryphaena misereri, quia non totam voluptatem perdiderat*, "Tryphaena wanted to pity us, because she had not lost all her desire for Giton" (106.2). With this comment, Encolpius recognizes that Tryphaena's leniency is not due to his own past

relationship with her or any current feelings of affection she holds for him. Encolpius thus consistently presents Tryphaena's desires as the issue at hand, not Giton's.

Even when Encolpius complains about Giton's behavior, he frames Giton's failings only in terms of the boy's interactions with Encolpius himself (113.8): *nec Giton me aut tralacticia propinatione dignum iudicabat aut, quod minimum est, sermone communi vocabat, credo, veritus ne inter initia coeuntis gratiae recentem cicatricem rescinderet*, "And Giton did not consider me worthy of the usual toast to my health, or talk to me in group conversation at the very least, I believe because he was afraid that he would reopen the fresh scar as the beginnings of friendship were coming together."⁵¹ Encolpius's complaint, in short, is that Tryphaena is giving attention to Giton, and Giton is not giving attention to Encolpius himself. Giton is thus presented not only as the passive recipient of Tryphaena's affections, but also as expressly inactive as regards Encolpius. This reduction of agency in this scene highlights Giton's sexual objectification.

Despite this reduced agency, it is interesting to note that Encolpius does convey his desire for Giton to express affection for him. Moreover, Encolpius represents Giton as deliberately avoiding paying attention to him, which does grant Giton a degree of agency. This would seem to suggest that, despite how Encolpius uses and treats Giton as a slave, Encolpius does recognize Giton's capacity for agency. Kamen discusses Martial's depiction of this qualified slave agency in the sexual relationships of slaves and their owners (2011: 193-195). Owners who are sexually desirous of their slaves sometimes find themselves at their slaves' whim: some slaves withhold

⁵¹ For scars and their associations with slaves, cf. Pl. *Am.* 446, *Poen.* 398-399, *As.* 551-552 (Richlin 2014: 182). For scars as tokens by which to recognize freeborn individuals, cf. Pl. *Poen.* 1073-4, a trope going back to Odysseus's scar and the nurse recognition scene in the *Odyssey* (Hom. *Od.* 19.392-393; Connors 2004: 193-194; Henderson 1999: 34). For honorable scars, especially those received on the front of the body during war (*adversus*), cf. Sal. *Iug.* 85.30, Gel. *NA.* 2.11.1-4, and Plin. *NH.* 7.101, among others (Evans 1999).

kisses or sexual relations (3.65.10; 8.46.5-6, 46.7-8; Kamen 2011: 194); one slave demands compensation on threat of ceasing sexual interaction (11.58.1-4; Kamen 2011: 194); another simply does not show up to their agreed-upon rendezvous point (11.73.1-4; Kamen 2011:195). Whereas the narrators and owners in Martial's epigrams often gain the upper hand by minimizing the slaves' agency and/or exacting their desires regardless of the slaves' resistance, Encolpius is not in a social position on Lichas's ship to enforce his wishes, and so is relegated to reducing Giton's agency where he can.⁵²

With Tryphaena, the issue of Giton's consent becomes the most pronounced. Giton does not seem to reject Tryphaena's affections, but Encolpius does not represent Giton as welcoming them either. Hypothetically, could Giton refuse Tryphaena's advances, and what would happen if he did? When we look at the topic of consent with Eumolpus and the sailors for comparison, we see that Giton's consent proves immaterial to those around him. Eumolpus never asks Giton whether Giton wants the man as a pedagogue; he simply offers and assumes all parties welcome the idea, including Encolpius. The sailors eye Giton's beauty, but Giton's willingness to be perceived in such a way is disregarded. The immateriality of Giton's consent in these scenarios epitomizes a slave's lack of agency in this regard. Giton is not enfranchised to refuse sexual advances any more than a slave would be.

Encolpius, of course, is the kind of character who would deny Giton's actual affection for anyone other than himself,⁵³ but Encolpius's presentation of Giton, including other characters' interactions with the boy, is still informative for our understanding of Giton. He largely blames Ascyrtos alone for stealing Giton away in the night (79.9-11), and even excuses Giton's behavior

⁵² This aspect of Encolpius's and Giton's relationship will be developed further in Chapter 3.

⁵³ Our narrator Encolpius's stake in presenting his perspective this way and the implications for his conception of Giton through such narration will be discussed in Chapter 3.

with Tryphaena, discussed above (113.8; Courtney 2001: 174; Schmeling 2011: 435 n.

8). Moreover, given Giton's dramatic skills (80.3-6, 94.9-14, 101.1-2, 108.10-11, 114.8-12), discussed further below, it is possible that Giton reciprocates Tryphaena's affections even without Encolpius's acknowledgement of such behavior. In the following scene, he convinces Encolpius that he has committed suicide after Encolpius is prevented from doing the same (94.12-14):

haec locutus mercenario Eumolpi novaculam rapit et semel iterumque cervice percussa ante pedes collabitur nostros. exclamo ego attonitus, secutusque labentem eodem ferramento ad mortem viam quaero. sed neque Giton ulla erat suspicione vulneris laesus neque ego ullum sentiebam dolorem.

Having said these things, he seizes the razor from Eumolpus's hired hand, strikes his neck twice, and collapses before our feet. I shout, shocked, ran to him as he fell, and I sought the path to death with the same iron razor. But Giton had not been struck by any mark of a wound, and I did not feel any pain.

The blade was dull to be used as a training tool for apprentice barbers, Encolpius explains (94.14), which is why neither the hired hand nor Eumolpus reacted to Giton grabbing the razor (94.15). Giton would have known this upon attempting to slit his own throat, yet he still collapsed to the floor in the fashion of a lovers' mime or mock-tragedy (Panayotakis 1995: 127; 154). If Giton can perform in such a way as to control Encolpius's perception of the events in this scene, it stands to reason that he could also successfully manipulate Encolpius's perception of his interactions with Tryphaena.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, at least through the lens of Encolpius, Giton is only ever represented as passive with Tryphaena in that he only ever receives her affection without any demonstration of his own desires.

In fact, Encolpius consistently presents Giton as sexually attractive, but more specifically as an object of sexual attention, and others interact with Giton in a similar way. In the passages

⁵⁴ For Giton's manipulation of Encolpius and the slave connotations of such behavior, see Chapter 4: esp. 107-115.

above, Giton consistently receives other characters' sexual interest while his own desire is never expressed or represented. In this, we particularly see Encolpius's presentation of Giton's inertness, one of Nussbaum's categorizations in her excellent treatment of the concept of objectification: throughout the above passages, "the [objectifiers treat] the object as lacking in agency, and perhaps also in activity" (Nussbaum 1995: 257). Eumolpus conveys his attraction to Giton, but this is never reciprocated. The sailors are disarmed by Giton's beauty, but Giton presents no interest in the sailors. Tryphaena showers Giton with kisses and attention, but Giton merely functions as a passive recipient of her affections. Throughout, Giton's desire and consent are immaterial: he is never a sexual agent in these scenarios but an object of attraction.

Others literally objectify Giton by reducing him to the status of an object.⁵⁵ After a *cinaedus* violates Encolpius and Ascyrtos, Encolpius narrates the following interaction between Quartilla and Giton (24.5-7):

stabat inter haec Giton et risu dissolvebat ilia sua. itaque conspicata eum Quartilla, cuius esset puer, diligentisima sciscitatione quaesivit. cum ego fratrem meum esse dixissem, 'quare ergo' inquit 'me non basiavit?' vocatumque ad se in osculum applicuit. mox manum etiam demisit in sinum et pertractato vasculo tam rudi 'haec' inquit 'belle cras in promulside libidinis nostrae militabit; hodie enim post asellum diaria non sumo.'

Meanwhile Giton was standing there and splitting his sides with laughter. And so Quartilla caught sight of him, and she asked with attentive inquiry whose boy he was. When I said that he was my brother, she said, "Then why has he not kissed me?" Once he was summoned to her, she steered him into a kiss. Soon she even sent a hand down into his lap, thoroughly handled his vessel, so unformed, and said, "This will serve well tomorrow as an appetizer of our desire; for today I do not dine on rations after a main course."

⁵⁵ Nussbaum's category of instrumentality: "the objectifier treats the object as a tool of his or her purposes" (1995: 257).

Quartilla notices Giton after he laughs,⁵⁶ almost as if she did not do so before then.⁵⁷ She views him as a *puer*, a slave, in someone else's possession (*cuius*). She orders him (*vocatum*) and directs his body to hers. The term *adplicuit* with the preposition *in* can be used of directing a ship (cf. Cic. *Inv.* 2.51, 153; Liv. 33.17; Caes. *B.C.* 3.101), and so here we can view Quartilla as captain with Giton the boat at her disposal. She gropes him – it is not his place to refuse – and comments that he will be an appetizer for tomorrow as she has already indulged in the main course today.⁵⁸ Throughout this exchange, Giton's agency is reduced and denied, and he is never once represented as sexually interested. Quartilla views him as a slave, a *puer*, and so treats him like a sex object. She even reduces him to his sexual appendage with *haec*, which must reference the unmentioned term *mentula*, or “penis” (Schmeling 2011: 73 n. 7). Giton is not the agent of *militabit*, but the feminine *haec*, “this,” performs the action instead. With *militabit*, “[this] will serve,” a word connoting military service, Quartilla further limits Giton's agency by suggesting that Giton's member will do its duty and follow orders like a soldier. And so, just as with the *lineamenta* above (see Chapter 1: 38-40), Giton is reduced to the instruments he employs, or in this case is set to employ on the following day.

An *ancilla* of Tryphaena⁵⁹ similarly reduces Giton to his sexual body parts. She speaks to Encolpius regarding Giton after she insults Tryphaena (113.11): *si vir fueris, non ibis ad*

⁵⁶ Does he laugh because his pseudo-owner Encolpius is now powerless and suffering abuse like a slave at the hands (and other body parts) of the *cinaedus*? Does he laugh at his own fear, a fear of being subjected to the same sort of tortures Encolpius and Ascylos are enduring? In this case, his laughter quells his own fear of sexual violence, just as slaves viewing Roman comedy might laugh at jokes about slave beatings to quell their own fear of being beaten (Richlin 2014: 181). Such an interpretation would make what follows all the harsher, as Giton too will soon be subjected to the very sexual tortures of which his laughter expresses fear. Relatedly, Parker argues that Roman citizens might have laughed at jokes about slave beatings out of fear of slaves and slave revolts (1989: 235-238).

⁵⁷ See Sabnis 2012: esp. 83-88.

⁵⁸ The term *asellus* can refer both to a donkey, a term given to a person with a large sexual appendage and appetite, or to a type of fish that the Romans considered a delicacy (Schmeling 2011: 73-74 n. 7). It is possible that Quartilla refers to a recent coupling with Ascylos with this comment (*ibid.*).

⁵⁹ According to codex *l* and *Lambeth*.

spintriam, “If you are going to be a man, you will not go to a butt-fuck boy.” While the fragmentary nature of this passage and those surrounding prevent us from fully understanding the context here, the term *spintria* comes from the Greek σφιγκτήρ, or “sphincter,” and generally refers to a male sex worker who would play the penetrated role in sexual intercourse (cf. Tac. A. 6.1; Suet. *Tib.* 43). Thus, this female slave reduces Giton to his sexual body parts just as Quartilla does with *haec* above.⁶⁰

Just like a slave, then, Giton is objectified and thereby robbed of his agency. To Quartilla, Giton, or more specifically his member, is a *promulsis*, “an appetizer,” to whet her appetite for tomorrow’s feast where Quartilla will serve as the commanding officer (*militabit*). To Tryphaena’s slave, Giton is a *spintria*, “a sphincter,” to be used for sexual pleasure. In short, Giton’s agency and desire do not matter to these characters; he is merely an object or tool to be used by others.

Feminization and Objectification

Giton is further objectified in his feminization. The following scene is our first encounter with Giton’s sexual objectification in the novel, when Giton reports that he was raped by Ascylos. Giton has sat down on the bed and started crying when Encolpius asks him what is the matter. After Encolpius becomes angry, Giton responds (9.4-5): *‘tuus’ inquit ‘iste frater seu comes paulo ante in conductum accucurrit coepitque mihi velle pudorem extorquere. Cum ego proclamarem, gladium strinxit et “si Lucretia es” inquit “Tarquinius invenisti,”* ““That brother of yours,’ he said, ‘or friend came into the apartment a little while ago and began to attempt to

⁶⁰ Though the term *spintria* itself does not mean “sphincter,” but rather a specific kind of male sex worker, the obvious etymological relationship to the Greek word for sphincter reduces the sex worker to the status of an object, his anus, and thereby implicitly objectifies both him and Giton.

wrench away my modesty. When I began to shout out, he drew his sword and said, “If you are Lucretia, you have found Tarquin.””” Giton thus maintains his own position of virtue with *pudor*, while accusing Ascyrtos of rape.

Ascyrtos, in Giton’s telling, compares Giton with Lucretia and himself with Tarquin. Lucretia, the wife of Collatinus, commits suicide after she is raped by Sextus Tarquinius (Tarquin), a story most popularly described by Livy (1.58-60). Her death instigates the fall of the monarchy and the beginnings of the Roman Republic, and she becomes a model of chastely virtue (Schmeling 2011: 28 n. 5). Pushing the analogy too far will result in its collapse, but the parodic parallels that arise are too clever to pass up. Though Giton never commits suicide, his false attempt (94.12) can be seen as embodying Lucretia’s death. If Giton is Lucretia to Ascyrtos’s Tarquin, then this would seem to place Encolpius in the position of Collatinus, Lucretia’s husband. Encolpius’s backlash against Ascyrtos (9.6-10.2) and resulting falling out of friendship (79.11-80.6) can thus be seen as parodying the fall of Rome’s monarchy, subsequent to and instigated by Lucretia’s death.

Much has been made of this allusion to the story of Lucretia and Tarquin. Panayotakis views Giton’s “technique of expressing virtue” as resembling “Seneca’s account ... of the methods, which actors adopt to imitate modesty” (1995: 14).⁶¹ Panayotakis wishes to highlight the literary parody present in this passage and its relationship to the farcical stage, so he naturally focuses on the theatrical elements of Giton’s report, and such a focus has largely predominated in scholarly interpretations of this scene. Slater too highlights the theatrics involved (1990: 34), and Richlin addresses the importation of the “high drama of Roman chastity ... into a decidedly low scene” (2009: 95). Schmeling notes Petronius’s literary parody of Livy’s tale, citing the

⁶¹ Chapter 4 discusses the parallels between Giton and the slaves of Roman comedy.

verbal parallel of Petronius's *gladium strinxit* to Livy's *stricto gladio* (Schmeling 2011: 28 n. 5). Both Schmeling and Panayotakis cite Adams in acknowledging the double entendre of *gladium* to mean both "sword" and "penis" (*ibid.*; Panayotakis 1995: 15 n. 54, Adams 1982: 21), but neither offer further analysis of the sexual implications present in this comparison of Giton with Lucretia.

Commenting on Giton's initial tears and reluctance to divulge the rape to Encolpius, Panayotakis concludes that "the persistent refusal to tell the truth, the stubbornness, the tears, the hypocritical dignity ... everything in his behavior shows that the way he expresses his feelings is entirely artificial and false" (1995: 14). He contests whether the rape actually took place based on Giton's description, and goes on to state that "this role-playing ... has nothing to do with psychological or any other kind of anxiety or with the necessity for self-expression either by the main characters or by the author of the novel" (*ibid.*: 15). On the contrary, Giton's reaction to and initial silence about the rape perfectly aligns with what we know about rape victims' behavior,⁶² and could attest to the level of psychological development Petronius has created in these characters. Petronius can portray literary parody, farcical theatrics, and lived slave experience all in this one scene. The presence of parody and theatrics here perhaps work to minimize and caricature Giton's portrayal of the emotions and the struggles congruent with those of rape victims, but that portrayal is present nonetheless; the experiences of slaves and other marginalized groups regularly must be filtered through such lenses in analyzing Roman literature.⁶³

⁶² See Searles and Berger, eds. (1995) and esp. Koss in this collection. See Jaycox, Zoellner, and Foa for a discussion on cognitive-behavioral therapy for the post-traumatic stress disorder that victims suffer, including difficulty communicating the trauma (2009).

⁶³ Cf. the above discussion of Apuleius (Chapter 1: 38-40), when the slave, never mentioned, is reduced to the lamp he holds (*Met.* 2.32). Such portrayals minimize slave presence in Roman literature, and scholarly attention given solely to the literary and theatrical can unintentionally reinforce this minimization by adopting the perspective of the Roman authors themselves.

But a determination of the supposed actual occurrence of the rape is unnecessary and indeed counterproductive for our purposes, as is a psychoanalytical evaluation of Giton's state of mind. What matters more for this treatment is the believable representation of both Ascyrtos and Giton in this reported scene. Petronius introduces farce and parodies Livy, but we, the readers, and Encolpius also recognize Giton's narrative as congruent with the behavior of the characters in question: Giton is sexually objectified constantly, as will be further discussed below, and Ascyrtos both exacts sexual control over Giton (79.9-10) and treats the boy as a slave (see Chapter 1: esp. 44-48). This scene functions as our earliest characterization of Giton and one of our earliest of Ascyrtos in what survives of the novel, so we must look forward before we can view this behavior as consistent with their characters, but, once we do, the behaviors described are not surprising. Whether or not we "believe" Giton, I highlight the representation of Giton as rape victim and Ascyrtos as rapist as consistent with their characters.

Therefore, what comes about from Ascyrtos's comparison of Giton with Lucretia and what does it imply for Giton's potential slave status more specifically? This comparison looks forward to Encolpius's accusation that Giton put on the *stola* instead of the *toga virilis* (81.5; see Introduction: 16-18), an attack on Giton's masculinity, not a statement of fact. In the same way that Giton did not actually wear a female citizen's *stola*, Giton is not a violated female citizen (like Lucretia).⁶⁴ The analogy here instead highlights Ascyrtos's sexual objectification of Giton,

⁶⁴ When Encolpius and Ascyrtos prepare to fight over Giton, Giton intervenes and is similarly feminized, though perhaps less objectified (80.3-4). Scholarly focus on the scene largely rests on its performative, farcical theatrics and literary allusivity. With the posturing of Ascyrtos and Encolpius, and Giton's comparison of the pair to Polyneices and Eteocles (*Thebanum par*), the three put on a mime and parody tragedy (Schmeling 2011: 336 n. 3; Panayotakis 1995). Giton, in turn, can be seen to play the role of peacekeeping Jocasta, the mother of Polyneices and Eteocles, and to mock Seneca's tragedy in which Jocasta also commands the two brothers to turn their weapons against her (Sen. *Phoen.* 443-444; Conte 1996: 79-81; Labate 1996: 166; Schmeling 2011: 337 n. 4). Here, we may also recall the Sabine women's plea to the warring factions: they blame themselves as the cause of the strife and suggest that they be killed instead (Livy 1.9-13), as Giton does. Moreover, when Giton is given the choice to leave with Encolpius or Ascyrtos (80.5-80.6), his immediate selection of Ascyrtos has been compared with the rashness of Medea's decision to leave with the stranger Jason instead of remaining with her own father (Apollon. 3.616-35;

which is implicit in his feminization: Ascyrtos denies Giton's autonomy and subjectivity in his rejection of Giton's resistance, treats Giton's body as violable, and regards Giton as his own property,⁶⁵ his own slave.

Ascyrtos makes the comparison with Lucretia and Tarquin only after Giton shouts in protest (*proclamarem*). This represents the only time in the surviving fragments that Giton is portrayed as actively resisting the sexual advances of another character. Giton's claim of *pudor* and his resistance to Ascyrtos asserts a level of agency and status that Ascyrtos does not view Giton as having; to Ascyrtos, Giton is a slave whose very existence precludes any possession of *pudor*. For Ascyrtos, Giton has overstepped his bounds by resisting Ascyrtos's advances, which Ascyrtos then compares, through the character of Lucretia, to a citizen woman's right to inviolability. Ascyrtos continues this role-playing by countering with the role of Tarquin: the paper to Giton's rock. In Ascyrtos's mind, Giton's body is not inviolable, and even if it were, he would not care any more than Tarquin did in the case of Lucretia. In response to Giton's resistance, Ascyrtos suggests that even if Giton's body were inviolable like Lucretia's, Ascyrtos is the Tarquin to disregard that inviolability.⁶⁶

Giton continues to adopt a feminine role as the novel progresses, and this in turn again corresponds to Giton's objectification. When Encolpius discovers Giton and Ascyrtos in bed together, Encolpius suggests that he and Ascyrtos part ways and divide their property. Ascyrtos responds, '*age*' inquit '*nunc et puerum dividamus.*' *iocari putabam discedentem. at ille gladium parricidali manu strinxit et 'non frueris' inquit 'hac praeda, super quam solus incumbis. partem*

Labate 1996: 167-8; Schmeling 2011: 337 n. 6). While these literary allusions have been well discussed, little has been said about the implications of these female roles for Giton.

⁶⁵ These represent four of Nussbaum's seven categorizations of objectification (1995: 257).

⁶⁶ It is important to note, however, Roman society at large would have abhorred Tarquin's behavior, as Tarquin transgressed societal norms by committing sexual violence against a citizen woman. Livy himself, for example, describes Tarquin's lust for Lucretia as *mala libido*, "evil desire" (1.57.10).

meam necesse est vel hoc gladio contemptus abscidam, ‘‘‘Come now,’ he said, ‘‘let us divide the boy.’ I thought he was joking as he was departing. But he drew his sword with a murderous hand and said, ‘You will not enjoy this spoil, on top of which you alone lie. Scorned, I must cut off my share even with this sword’’ (79.12-80.1). Ascylos refers to Giton as an object throughout this passage. He suggests physically dividing him (*dividamus*), as they had done with their other belongings, and calls Giton *praeda*, or ‘‘spoil of war.’’ With this last attribution, Ascylos represents Giton as a woman, a slave, and a sex object all at once. Ascylos calls him a *praeda* because he conceives of Giton as a prize to be won. In this, we may think back to Briseis of the *Iliad*, Achilles’ sex slave who is handed over to Agamemnon after the latter loses his own sex slave, Chryseis (*Il.* 1.182-187, 318-348). Both heroes call Briseis a γέρας, ‘‘gift of honor,’’ ‘‘prize’’ (*Il.* 185, 356). Giton is that sex-slave prize over whom two rivals fight, just as Achilles and Agamemnon fought over Briseis.

Giton’s feminization and objectification are closely intertwined, and both imply sexualization. In Ascylos’s feminizing comparison of Giton to Lucretia, Giton is objectified. In Ascylos’s objectifying analogy of Giton as a *praeda*, Giton is feminized. Thus, as Lucretia, as Briseis, as a *praeda*, Giton plays the role of a woman, of a sex slave, of a sex object.

Giton’s Desire: A Willing Slave?

Seemingly the one exception to the portrayal of Giton’s lack of agency and demonstrated sexual attraction could be with the slave girls of Quartilla, arguably the only individuals in the scene with a lower status than Giton’s own. The first girl remains unnamed, while Quartilla calls

the second Pannychis, or “All-night.”⁶⁷ Yet even in these scenes, Giton is represented as passive and remains subjected to the will of Quartilla.

The first girl is described as entering the trio’s lodging alongside Quartilla (17.1): *una comitata virgine*, “[Quartilla], accompanied by a single girl.” When she enters the narrative again, joining in Quartilla’s eruption of laughter, she is called a *virguncula*, “little girl” (18.7), with the diminutive of *virgo* potentially highlighting her extreme youth. The text here becomes particularly lacunose, and so the full context proves difficult to parse, but Ascyrtos and Encolpius have begun to be subjected to various acts of sexual violence before the following occurs (20.8): *ac ne Giton quidem ultimo risum tenuit, utique postquam virguncula cervicem eius invasit et non repugnanti puero innumerabilia oscula dedit*, “And finally not even Giton held back his laughter, in any case after the little girl assailed his neck and gave innumerable kisses to the boy, who did not resist her” (20.8). “Did not resist” is hardly a phrase of overt sexual interest. Though Giton laughs, presumably positively receiving the girl’s affection, he is not represented as directing any sexual attention to her. The phrasing of the girl’s action with *invasit* connotes an attack or assault against him, while Giton is represented as *non repugnans*, or “not fighting back.” The metaphor of fighting as representative of sexual activity pervades Latin literature. Compare the following scene from Apuleius, in which Photis calls for battle when she and the protagonist are about to engage in sexual intercourse: *‘proeliare,’ inquit ‘et fortiter proeliare, nec enim tibi cedam nec terga vortam. comminus in aspectum, si vir es, derige et grassare naviter et occide moriturus*, “‘Join battle,’ she said, ‘and join battle bravely, for I will

⁶⁷ Though the two girls may be one in the same, the phrasing of Pannychis’s introduction with *continuoque producta est puella satis bella*, “and immediately a pretty enough girl was brought forth” (25.2), would seem to suggest this is a new character. This would then support Fraenkel’s choice to delete the false gloss immediately following this introduction (25.2): *et ea ipsa quae primum cum Quartilla in cellam venerat*, “and the very same girl who had first come with Quartilla into the room” (Warmington, ed. 1969: 42 n. 1; Müller 1995: 19 n. 25/26).

not yield to you nor turn my back. Face-to-face, if you are a man, take aim and attack me diligently and kill me as you're about to die."⁶⁸ Photis clearly frames her sexual interaction with Lucius as a martial conflict between the two warring factions. By contrast, in the sexual war of the Petronius passage, the slave girl acts as the aggressor while Giton remains the passive recipient of her assault, even if he does so quasi-willingly.

Even his potential willingness does not necessarily detract from the minimization of Giton's agency and status in the scene that follows. At Psyche's suggestion, Quartilla and her posse begin mock marriage preparations for the seven-year-old Pannychis and Giton. When Psyche first suggests that Pannychis lose her virginity, Quartilla says, *cur non, quia bellissima occasio est, devirginatur Pannychis nostra?* "Since this is such a wonderful opportunity, why shouldn't our Pannychis be de-virgined?" (25.1). Giton is thus a mere means to an end. When Encolpius protests that Pannychis is too young and Giton too respectable (25.3), Quartilla ignores his point about Giton and instead compares her own sexual experiences with Pannychis's future (25.4-7). To Quartilla, Giton's modesty and well-being do not need to be considered. Only Pannychis's initiation into Quartilla's world matters, and Giton's purpose is merely to effect that initiation. Giton and Pannychis are soon subjected to sexual relations with each other (26.2-4):

Quartilla quoque iocantium libidine accensa et ipsa surrexit correptumque Gitona in cubiculum traxit. Sine dubio non repugnauerat puer, ac ne puella quidem tristis expaverat nuptiarum nomen. Itaque cum inclusi iacerent, consedimus ante limen thalami, et in primis Quartilla per rimam improbe applicuerat oculum curiosum lusumque puerilem libidinosa speculabatur diligentia.

Even Quartilla herself rose, as she was also inflamed by the lust of those joking, then she seized Giton and dragged him into the bedroom. Without a doubt, the boy did not resist, and not even the unhappy girl feared the name of matrimony. And so, when they lay down, closed in, we sat before the threshold of the bedroom, and Quartilla firstly had

⁶⁸ See Adams 1982: 159 for the metaphors of both killing and dying.

wickedly placed her curious eye up to a chink in the wall, and watched their child's play with wanton attention.

The same words, *non repugnaverat*, are used here of Giton as in the episode with the slave girl above (20.8). Giton once again does not “fight back,” but passively accepts the actions of others upon him. That the girl is unafraid could attest to how unthreatening Giton, his status, and his behavior are to her. Would she be more afraid if he were actively pursuing her?

Giton is never in control in this scene: Quartilla takes control of Giton's body with *correptum* and *traxit*. Just as with the various sexual tortures Ascyltos and Encolpius undergo, so too is Giton subjected to the same sort of sexual violence. Though the lacuna that shortly follows this scene prevents us from reading anything further about Giton's and Pannychis's interaction, we could assume that the expectations Quartilla outlines come to pass (25.4-7), and that Giton penetrates Pannychis. If this were the case, we might presume Giton's arousal and sexual interest in Pannychis, which might lead us to attribute a degree of agency to Giton in that he exerts his own sexual interests over another individual. But this would be to deny the power dynamics in this scene and to convey a level of sexual control that Giton does not possess. Giton may play the penetrator in his sexual interaction with Pannychis, but he does so at the orders and orchestration of Quartilla, not through his own agency. His body and his actions are at Quartilla's disposal, and her command over his performance inherently deprives Giton of any sexual power.

That Encolpius calls the sexual performance *lusus puerilis*, “child's play” (26.4), and twice a *spectaculum* (26.5), “show,” further minimizes Giton's agency by reducing the mock marriage to the entertainment it provides for Quartilla and Encolpius. The purpose of Giton's sexual relations with Pannychis, therefore, are the girl's initiation on the one hand, and the entertainment of Quartilla on the other, but not Giton's own sexual pleasure. Despite his

penetration of and potential attraction to Pannychis, Giton's semi-willingness is not at odds with his overall slave-like obedience and lack of agency.⁶⁹

Here, we must reconceptualize the agency of penetrating males, just as Kamen and Levin-Richardson successfully reconceptualize the agency of the penetrated by highlighting the distinction between individuals who actively sought out their own penetration and those who unwillingly underwent penetration as a result of sexual violence (2015). Let us compare the rape of Encolpius at the hands of a *cinaedus*, whom Encolpius immediately reviles (23.2): *Intrat cinaedus, homo omnium insulsissimus et plane illa domo dignus, qui ut infractis manibus congemuit*, "A *cinaedus* enters, the most tasteless person of all, and clearly worthy of that house, who cracked their⁷⁰ fingers and groaned." The *cinaedus* was an "effeminate dancer ... sometimes suggestively wiggling his buttocks in such a way as to suggest anal intercourse" (Williams 2010: 193), who can be categorized as actively desiring to be penetrated (Kamen and Levin-Richardson 2015: 453-455). After the *cinaedus* recites a poem, Encolpius narrates a sequence of disturbing events (23.4-5):

consumptis versibus suis immundissimo me basio conspuit. mox et super lectum venit atque omni vi detexit recusantem. super inguina mea diu multumque frustra moluit. profluebant per frontem sudantis acaciae rivi, et inter rugas malarum tantum erat cretae, ut putares detectum parietem nimbo laborare.

With their⁷¹ verses finished, they spat on me with the foulest of kisses. Soon they even came on the bed and with all their strength stripped me, though I resisted.⁷² They grinded on my groin a lot for a long time in vain. Rivers of sweaty makeup were flowing across

⁶⁹ Cf. Plautus's *Casina*, where the slave Chalinus mocks the slave Olympio (896-914), no doubt willingly and joyfully so, but still at the behest of his owner, Cleostrata (769, 775; Clark 2015: 37-39).

⁷⁰ Blood's excellent paper reclaims the *cinaedus* as a transwoman (2014). Some view *cinaedi* as more generically gender deviant (Ormand 2009: 19; Williams 2010: 177-8, 193-4, 232-43) while others see them as men who desire penetration from other men (Richlin 1993). Kamen and Levin-Richardson, addressing these perceptions, also mention how *cinaedus* could simply describe someone who is generally wanton, including examples wherein *cinaedi* penetrate and perform oral sex on females (2015: 453, 458 n. 24). Because of these multiplicitous associations, I will employ the gender neutral personal and possessive pronouns "they," "them," and "their" in the singular when referring to the *cinaedus*.

⁷¹ Again, note that this is the action of a single *cinaedus*.

⁷² Or perhaps Encolpius resisted with all his strength. Likely, both parties did so.

their forehead, and there was so much powder among the wrinkles of their cheeks that you would think an uncovered wall was under distress in a rainstorm.

Everything about Encolpius's description conveys his disgust for the *cinaedus*. With the adjective *immundissimus*, "foulest," and the verb *conspuit*, "spat," Encolpius expresses the common notion that the very breath of the *cinaedus* was unclean and impure due to their perceived predilection for performing fellatio (Richlin 1992: 28-29).⁷³ Encolpius's grotesque description of the runny makeup of the aged *cinaedus* further highlights Encolpius's own lack of sexual interest in this scene. Encolpius describes himself as *recusans*, "protesting" or "refusing," the removal of his clothing, but he seems to be powerless to effect this refusal.

The actions of the *cinaedus*, as they grind their buttocks on Encolpius's member,⁷⁴ are *frustra*, or "in vain." We could surmise Encolpius's lack of attraction to the *cinaedus* as the cause, especially considering all of the vocabulary of disgust present in this passage, but Encolpius has trouble performing sexually later on in the novel, so this could also display another instance of his impotence. Regardless of the reasons for Encolpius's failure to perform, if we consider the *cinaedus* the active penetrated party in this scene, then Encolpius plays the passive penetrating role, if unsuccessfully so. The violence of the *cinaedus* in this scene and Encolpius's own apparent lack of control supports such a view of these power dynamics.

I argue that we should view Giton's experience with Pannychis in a similar if not entirely congruent way. Giton is certainly not as unwilling as Encolpius, judging from the phrase *non repugnauerat*, "he did not resist," and he is not subjected to the same sort of violence that

⁷³ Cf. Martial 3.17, where the narrator of the poem insinuates that Sabidius, his mouth, and his breath, are impure from oral sex.

⁷⁴ The *moluit*, "grinded," in conjunction with *super*, "on top of," suggest that the *cinaedus* was attempting to have Encolpius anally penetrate him. Shortly after this scene, when Encolpius suggests that it become Ascyrtos's turn to endure this sexual violence, Quartilla agrees and Encolpius narrates, *ab hac voce equum cinaedus mutavit transituque ad comitem meum facto clunibus eum basiisque distrivit*, "At this word the *cinaedus* changed mounts and, having made the transition to my comrade, rubbed him to pieces with their buttocks and kisses" (24.4). We can thus assume this was the same activity inflicted upon Encolpius.

Encolpius has been. However, Giton's lack of resistance should not necessarily be seen as a demonstration of his potential desire but as Quartilla's abnegation of Giton's will when confronted with her own. In the same way that Giton accepts defeat in his lack of engagement with the unnamed slave girl's onslaught, so too does Giton accept Quartilla's orders and control of his body. Because of this abnegation, both Giton and Pannychis experience sexual violence as a result of Quartilla's sole control over the action. In this way, Giton penetrates and Pannychis is penetrated without their own agency: Giton is passive and penetrating while Pannychis is passive and penetrated.

In effect, then, Giton's own desire does not matter to other characters in the novel. Many characters are attracted to him, many objectify him, and even in his role as penetrator he proves to be passively at the disposal of another. In this, Giton fulfills the role of a slave sex object. Just as the slave attending Lucius in Apuleius is reduced to his lamp (Sabnis 2012: 79, 84-85; see Chapter 1: 38), or the slaves in Martial are deprived of their agency (Kamen 2011; see Chapter 2: 58-59), or Giton himself is instrumentalized to the *lineamenta* he employs (see Chapter 1: 38-40), Petronius's and Encolpius's portrayal of Giton's sexual agency forms part of a broader Roman literary trope of devaluing, denying, and dismissing the actions of slaves. The character Giton embodies such a slave, reduced to a passive recipient of others' sexual advances, just as the Roman elite would view their own slaves to be.

CHAPTER 3: GITON AND ENCOLPIUS

This chapter will analyze Encolpius's perceptions of his relationship with Giton and the ways in which Giton reaffirms these perceptions. We have already seen the extent to which Encolpius influences our perceptions of Giton's character through Encolpius's role as narrator and through his one-sided, biased presentation of events: Encolpius calls Giton a woman and insultingly suggests the boy played the penetrated role in sexual intercourse at a slave labor camp (81.5; see Introduction: 16-19); Encolpius treats Giton as a bath attendant (26.10; 91.1), mentions Giton's cooking (9.2; 16.1), and minimizes Giton's agency in the boy's role as guide (72.7; 79.3-4; see Chapter 1: 25-42); it is through Encolpius that we see other characters sexually objectify Giton (*passim*), and Encolpius undoubtedly reduces Giton's own sexual agency in these scenes (see Chapter 2). While these representations of Giton should be seen as a function of not only our narrator Encolpius's perspective, but the perspectives of the other characters as well, we cannot escape the lens of the narrator Encolpius in these scenarios. Giton is only ever Petronius's Encolpius's Giton.

However, if "performances or presentations of self ... involve one's management of self-impressions to other participants in the interaction" (Brickell 2005: 30; Goffman 1956: 15), then Giton's relationship with Encolpius and their staged interactions are determined, at least in part, by Giton's ability to convey specific performed behavior successfully in relation to Encolpius's conceptualization of said behavior. At times Giton proves successful in this performance, while at others Encolpius commandeers or rejects Giton's management of this performance, or its management falls out of Giton's control. Because Encolpius functions as the sole lens through which we can engage with the action of the novel, Encolpius's expectations of Giton's behavior, Encolpius's presentation of their interactions, and Encolpius's resulting

quare desine me vocare fratrem,
ne te, Charmenion, vocem sororem. 15

Since you boast that you are a countryman of Corinthian bronze,
Charmenion, with no one denying it,
Why do you call me your brother, I born from
The Iberians and Celts, a citizen of Tagus?
Do we seem to be similar in appearance?
You wander around pretty with your curly locks,
I with stubborn Spanish hair;
You are smooth with daily depilation,
I with hairy thighs and cheeks;
Your mouth is lisping, your tongue is weak,
A *daughter* will speak more loudly than I:
The dove is not as different from the eagle
Nor the fleeting deer from the harsh lion.
On which account, stop calling me your brother,
Charmenion, lest I call you my sister.

Martial plays with the notion that calling someone *frater* connotes a connection and reciprocity between the two parties. Charmenion has called Martial his *frater*, but Martial recognizes that they come from two distinct regions, and so a geographical connection cannot be the reason Charmenion has done so. This would imply that two individuals of similar geographical citizenry could be expected to call one another *frater*, which would evoke a relationship of equal standing: such individuals would be brothers due to their shared motherland. Since this relationship is not the case, Martial sarcastically asks *an vultu similes videmur esse*, “Do we seem to be similar in appearance?” No, this is not the case either, Martial claims, as Charmenion walks around with curls (*flexa*) and plucked body hair (*dropace*), while Martial claims stubborn Spanish hair (*contumax*) and hirsuteness (*hirsutis*). Again, this would imply that two individuals of similar appearance could consider themselves equals, and therefore brothers. They speak differently too, as Charmenion has a lisp (*blaesum*), which Martial attributes to a weak tongue (*debilis*), while Martial seems to suggest that he himself has some sort of commanding voice in line eleven. Perhaps if they each held equal command over their respective voices, they could be

considered brothers, but they do not and cannot. Martial finally compares Charmenion to a dove or a deer, himself to an eagle or lion, their differences made apparent.

He ends his poem with a threat. Martial has feminized Charmenion throughout the poem (Olson 2014: 196, 196 n. 99), and suggests that perhaps he should start calling Charmenion his *soror*, or “sister,” if Charmenion continues to call Martial his *frater*, “brother.” Martial plays on the potential sexual connotations of the term *frater*, indeed perhaps this was the angle Charmenion meant all along, by flipping the script back on Charmenion: if Charmenion wishes Martial to be his male sexual partner, then Charmenion can be Martial’s female sexual partner. In other words, Martial suggests that he will penetrate Charmenion as a sexual *soror* if Charmenion continues to call Martial a sexual *frater*.⁷⁷ Both the sexual and the potentially egalitarian connotations of *frater* are thus apparent in Martial, and they are likewise well entrenched in the cultural milieu in and around the first century CE.

Giton does, at times, convey quasi-equal standing with Encolpius, as when he communicates his opinions to Encolpius on board Lichas’s ship, scathingly criticizing Encolpius’s plan to dress as Ethiopian slaves (102.14-16).⁷⁸ Likewise, their sexual relationship is represented as initially egalitarian in the following passage’s use of the plural: *haesimus calentes/ et transfudimus hinc et hinc labellis/ errantes animas*, “We clung to each other, hot, and with kisses everywhere we poured out an exchange of our wandering souls.”⁷⁹

Encolpius, however, also characterizes Giton as a *puer*, suggesting a less than egalitarian relationship, and Giton, in turn, does play a more subservient role for Encolpius, as we have seen

⁷⁷ Cf. Mart. 2.4.3 wherein Martial ridicules the sexual relationship of the poem’s mother and her son along with their use of the terms *frater* and *soror* for each other.

⁷⁸ This passage will be discussed in Chapter 4: 116-118.

⁷⁹ The poem ends, however, with *ego sic perire coepi*, “And so I began to finish,” with *perire* as a metaphor for orgasm (cf. Apuleius *Met.* 2.17.3 and see Barnes 1971: 297; Connors 1998: 69; Adams 1982: 159; Schmeling 2011: 332 n. v.5). The singular *coepi* shatters the mutual gratification suggested in the plurals of the verses prior; that is, at the moment of completion, any egalitarianism or focus on Giton’s own sexual desires is entirely disregarded.

(see Chapters 1 and 2). Thus, in his relationship with Encolpius, Giton would seem to perform the paradoxical roles of a more equal-standing *frater* as well as a subservient *puer*. Giton does not, however, maintain these roles equally. While Encolpius occasionally projects a reciprocal romance, more often Encolpius positions Giton beneath him in status as a slave and the object of Encolpius's desire or abuse.

One way in which Encolpius undercuts the egalitarianism in the term *frater* is by pairing it with *puer*, the sexual and subservient connotations of which have been discussed above (see Chapter 1: 46). When Encolpius narrates Ascyrtos's theft of Giton, he uses both terms in quick succession (79.9): *Ascyrtos, omnis iniuriae inventor, subduxit mihi nocte puerum et in lectum transtulit suum, volutatusque liberius cum fratre non suo*, "Ascyrtos, inventor of all offense, stole away my boy in the night and transferred him to his own bed, and having rolled around freely with a brother not his own." This coupling of *frater* with *puer* would then seem to undermine the possibility of an equitable relationship by diminishing the potential egalitarianism of *frater* with the slave connotations of *puer*. Instead, their juxtaposition would seem to highlight the sexual implications of both terms. Given the context of the scene, in which Ascyrtos has stolen Giton for Ascyrtos's own sexual pleasure, nothing about *frater* here needs to convey an equitable relationship. Rather, the sexual aspects of both *puer* and *frater* predominate. Encolpius further portrays his perception of Giton as a slave with the term *iniuria*. As discussed above (see Chapter 2: 55), *iniuria* could be a legal offense by which the perpetrator was considered to have insulted the owner through interaction, including sexual, with the owner's slave. Encolpius thus perceives Ascyrtos to have committed this offense through his sexual abduction of Giton, in which case Giton would represent the slave of the offended party, Encolpius.

Encolpius also diminishes Giton's agency in this scene, reinforcing his perception of Giton as a *puer* instead of a more equal-standing *frater*. He blames Ascyrtos for stealing Giton, not Giton for leaving with Ascyrtos. Encolpius calls Ascyrtos the inventor of offense (*iniuriae inventor*); Giton and Ascyrtos are not co-inventors. The singular verbs *subduxit* and *trastulit* along with the singular participle *volutatus* emphasize Ascyrtos as sole agent, with Giton the sole object of the action. Furthermore, Encolpius contemplates killing the pair upon seeing them and awakens Giton with blows, to be discussed below, but he directs his anger and words toward Ascyrtos alone (79.11): *Ascyrtos autem truci intuens vultu 'quoniam' inquam 'fidem scelere violasti et communem amicitiam, res tuas ocius tolle et alium locum quem polluas quaere,'* "Then looking daggers at Ascyrtos I said, "Since you have violated our trust and common friendship with your crime, quickly pack up your things and search for another place to defile." Ascyrtos has singularly destroyed their trust and friendship, as indicated by the singular verbs *violasti* and *polluas*. Encolpius tells Ascyrtos alone to pack up his bags with the singular imperative *tolle*. In short, Encolpius acts as if Ascyrtos has committed the *iniuria* that Encolpius perceives the offense to be, and thus grants Ascyrtos the agency to have committed such a crime while denying the same agency to Giton. Encolpius thus disregards Giton's own agency or consent in any potential sexual interactions with Ascyrtos. In this, Encolpius treats Giton like a slave. That Encolpius never describes Giton as performing any action in this scene until Encolpius and Ascyrtos nearly come to blows reinforces Encolpius's representation of Giton's passivity.

After Encolpius confronts Ascyrtos for raping Giton, Ascyrtos similarly juxtaposes *frater* and *puer* in addressing Encolpius (9.10): *cuius eadem ratione in viridario frater fui, qua nunc in deversorio puer est,* "[You] whose brother I was in the garden just as the boy is now in the

lodging.” Ascyltos thus claims to have been Encolpius’s brother in the past, just as Giton is Encolpius’s brother now. Richlin notes that Ascyltos either admits here to have been penetrated by Encolpius, as Giton likely is, or insults Encolpius by suggesting that Giton currently penetrates Encolpius (2009: 85). In either case, this passage shows that the terms *frater* and *puer* are by no means mutually exclusive, and again highlights that their sexual connotations prevail when used in close proximity by the same speaker. There need not be any sense of egalitarianism with Ascyltos’s use of *frater* here, especially when the conversation revolves around the three’s sexual relationship.

Furthermore, Encolpius the character thrice calls Giton *frater* when speaking to him, while Encolpius the narrator, in the same passage, refers to him as *puer* when speaking about him. In the first of these, we see Giton for the first time in our extant text (9.1-2): *quasi per caliginem vidi Gitona in crepidine semitae stantem et in eundem locum me conieci ... cum quaererem numquid nobis in prandium frater parasset, consedit puer super lectum et manantes lacrimas pollice extersit*, “I saw Giton, as if through a fog, standing on the edge of the path and I sped off to the same location ... when I asked whether my brother had prepared anything for us for lunch, the boy sat on the bed and wiped away his falling tears with his thumb.” Encolpius reports his conversation with Giton, and we may imagine the direct question as something like *aliquid, frater, nobis in prandium paravisti?* “Have you prepared anything for us for lunch, brother?” By contrast, as the narrator after this reported speech, Encolpius reveals his perception of Giton as a *puer*, highlighting the tension between Encolpius’s idealized representation of their relationship and the narrator’s understanding of the one-sided power dynamics between them. Giton changes from being called a *frater* to being described as a *puer*. Thus, on the one hand, Encolpius performs a version of egalitarianism in his interactions with Giton, enacting

Giton's status as a *frater* by calling the boy as such, but, on the other hand, he characterizes Giton and Giton's performed behavior as that of a *puer*.

The same distinct character and narrator usage of *frater* and *puer*, respectively, occurs later in Croton. Here, Encolpius speaks to Giton about Encolpius's impotence (129.1-2): *'crede mihi, frater, non intellego me virum esse, non sentio. funerata est illa pars corporis, qua quondam Achilles eram' ... veritus puer, ne in secreto deprehensus daret sermonibus locum, proripuit se et in partem interiorem aedium fugit*, "Believe me, brother, I do not recognize that I am a man, I don't feel like one. That part of my body has been killed, with which I was once an Achilles' ... The boy, scared that he would give cause for gossip if he were caught in private with me, rushed off and fled into an inner part of the house." Again, lacunae prevent us from grasping the fuller context, but it is clear that Encolpius confides in Giton about the former's sexual inadequacies. The lacuna that follows Encolpius's speech proves unfortunate in that we cannot be certain how closely Giton's scared reaction follows Encolpius's words. The second passage, however, does seem appropriate to the context of the first even if it is not immediately subsequent. Giton reacts to their private conversation, regardless of how extended it might have been, as a potential threat to their ruse; they are both pretending to be Eumolpus's slaves, after all, so they have attempted to keep their dynamic a secret while they defraud the inheritance seekers. The correlating contexts of both passages suggests that we should be able to analyze the two passages alongside one another.

Between Encolpius's words and Giton's narrated action we again see a disconnect in what Encolpius the character presents to Giton and what Encolpius the narrator describes. When confiding in Giton directly, Encolpius calls him *frater*, projecting a connection and comradery with Giton that one would expect of a confidant. However, when describing Giton's reaction to

Encolpius's words, Encolpius labels him as a *puer*, not a partner or brother but a child and a slave. Once again, the narrator Encolpius thus perceives their relationship as being more unequal than the character Encolpius presents to Giton himself.

Lastly, Encolpius asks Giton about the night that Ascyrtos stole Giton away (133.1-2): *hac declamatione finita Gitona voco et 'narra mihi' inquam 'frater, sed tua fide: ea nocte, qua te mihi Ascyrtos subduxit, usque in iniuriam vigilavit an contentus fuit vidua pudicaque nocte?' tetigit puer oculos suos conceptissimisque iuravit verbis sibi ab Ascyrtos nullam vim factam,* "When my speech was finished, I call Giton and say, 'Tell me, brother, but be honest: that night, when Ascyrtos snuck you away from me, did he spend the night continuously awake committing offenses or was he content with a chaste night without consummation?' The boy covered his eyes and swore a most formal oath⁸⁰ that Ascyrtos never forced himself upon him." Once again, we see Encolpius the character calling Giton *frater* when speaking to him but labeling him as *puer* when speaking about him. In this scene, Petronius provides a further development in Encolpius's perceptions of Giton with Encolpius's additional use of the term *iniuria*. In Giton's case, then, Encolpius suggests that Ascyrtos would have committed this offense against Encolpius if Ascyrtos and Giton had engaged in sexual intercourse. Giton assures Encolpius that they did not, but he phrases his answer in such a way that could be interpreted as a half-truth.⁸¹ Encolpius's use of *iniuria* coupled with *puer* thus suggests that he views Giton as a slave, despite any ideas about companionate or amatory brotherhood he professes in direct conversation with Giton.

That Giton's and Encolpius's relationship involves unequal power dynamics manifests itself at various points throughout the novel. In addition to using the term *puer* to refer to Giton

⁸⁰ For the notion that Giton's oath-swearing is not in keeping with his slave performance, see Chapter 4: 110-111.

⁸¹ For Giton's manipulation of words in this scene, see Chapter 4: 110-111.

in the above scenarios, Encolpius regularly treats Giton like a slave, including issuing Giton commands and physically abusing him. Giton in turn performs slavery through his fulfillment of Encolpius's commands and the ways in which he endures Encolpius's abuse. Together, the pair enact and reinforce Giton's slave status.

We have already seen Encolpius and Ascyltos order Giton with the term *iubeo* before Trimalchio's dinner (26.10; see Chapter 1: 27). There are two other scenes in which Encolpius orders Giton, with Giton immediately obeying the command. In the first, Encolpius orders Giton to hide under the bed so that Ascyltos cannot find him (97.4-5).⁸² In the second scene, Encolpius and Giton find Eumolpus, who is apparently in the sinking wreckage of the ship writing poetry. Eumolpus refuses to be saved before he has finished expressing his poetic inspiration and Encolpius narrates *inicio ego phrenetico manum iubeoque Gitona accedere et in terram trahere poetam mugientem*, "I throw my hands on the madman and order Giton to come and drag the bellowing poet to land" (115.5). Though the following lacuna prevents us from witnessing Giton immediately obeying the command as in the previous passage, Eumolpus's survival and subsequent role in the events at Croton suggest that Giton executed Encolpius's order.

While the broader contexts of each scene are distinct, Encolpius orders Giton to perform an action in both passages, and Giton carries out said action. Through this stasised interaction, both parties reinforce the power dynamics at play: Encolpius statuses himself as owner and Giton as slave in Encolpius's command, and Giton in turn reciprocates this relationship through his obedience and execution.

In two other scenes, Encolpius physically abuses Giton in the manner that an owner would a slave. When Encolpius discovers Giton and Ascyltos in bed, Encolpius resorts to

⁸² The context of this scene and Encolpius's attribution of Odysseus to Giton will be discussed in Chapter 4: 102-107.

violence (79.11): *tutius dein secutus consilium Gitona quidem verberibus excitavi*, “Then after pursuing the safer plan, I woke Giton up with blows (*verberibus*).” The term *verber*, “whip” or “beating,” is often used as punishment for slaves. Compare the following scene from the end of Plautus’s *Mostellaria*. After the tricks of the play have been revealed, the slave Tranio asks what is to become of him for orchestrating the deception (1166), to which his owner, Theopropides, responds *verberibus, lutum, caedere pendens*, “You will hang and be cut with whips (*verberibus*), you filth” (1167). A friend of Theopropides’ son then asks Theopropides to pardon Tranio (1168-1180), and tells Tranio to be silent (1173), to which Theopropides responds *ego illum, ut sit quietus, verberibus subegero*, “I will subdue him with beatings (*verberibus*) so that he is silent” (1174). Theopropides therefore regards this term *verber* as signifying the punishment given to a slave, in this case to Tranio. In the Petronian passage, the term *verberibus* likewise indicates that Encolpius is physically assaulting Giton as an owner might have punished a slave.

Giton’s lack of reaction to this abuse is also telling for Encolpius’s representation of Giton’s status in this scene. Encolpius does not describe Giton as performing any action in response to these beatings or in response to Encolpius’s words to Ascyrtos. Giton indeed is absent from the action until Ascyrtos and Encolpius begin to threaten each other with violence. Before this, Giton merely receives Encolpius’s abuse and hears Encolpius’s and Ascyrtos’s words as a passive recipient of the action. He remains in our mind’s eye, perhaps on the bed terrified, perhaps backing away from the two contenders, but he briefly leaves the narrative before returning in the role of Jocasta (see Chapter 2: 66 n. 64). In this, Encolpius diminishes Giton’s presence and agency in a way that is similar to Encolpius’s reduction of Giton’s agency in his role as guide: there Giton was reduced to the instruments he employed (see Chapter 1)

whereas here his body and agency are removed from the scene. Giton's lack of representation in a scene in which he has just been beaten thus corresponds to Encolpius's representation of Giton as a slave.

This is not the only abuse Encolpius inflicts upon Giton. When Encolpius is delighted to watch Eumolpus fight with the lodgers, Giton suggests mercy and Encolpius reacts violently (96.3-4): *ego durante adhuc iracundia non continui manum, sed caput miserantis stricto acutoque articulo percussi. et ille quidem flens consedit in lecto*, "With my rage still enduring, I did not restrain my hand, but I struck his merciful head with my sharp, drawn knuckle. And for his part, he sat on the bed, crying." This is not the relationship of equals. Here, the curtains have been drawn back, and Encolpius's true command over the relationship reveals itself. Giton tries to perform the role of *frater*, speaking with Encolpius as an equal and advising mercy. But Encolpius rejects this performance, denying Giton this equal status, and instead interacts with him violently as he would a slave. Giton's reaction confirms his recognition of this relationship: he stops pleading for mercy on Eumolpus's behalf and must resign himself to sitting on the bed and crying in pain.

In summation, Encolpius may occasionally represent his relationship with Giton as one of brotherly egalitarianism, particularly in using the term *frater* to refer to Giton in conversation, but often this idealized fabrication shortly unravels. Encolpius treats Giton as a *puer*, or boy slave, and when Encolpius chooses to shatter the illusion of brotherhood, Giton is left with no alternative but to interact with Encolpius accordingly. Time and time again, Giton must accept the loss of his status as a temporary *frater* and in turn perform the role of a more permanent *puer*.

Giton Feminized

We have seen Ascyrtos compare Giton to Lucretia and treat him as a spoil of war (9.4-5; 79.12-80.1; see Chapter 1) as well as Giton's adoption of the role of Jocasta in his attempt to prevent the "Theban duel" between Ascyrtos and Encolpius (80.3-4; see Chapter 2: 66 n. 64). In Encolpius's and Giton's relationship too, Encolpius feminizes Giton. This feminization or emasculation, depending on our viewpoint, correlates with Encolpius's sexual objectification of Giton.

When Encolpius is angry with Giton after Giton chooses Ascyrtos over him, he calls him a *mulier*, among other insults, in a passage initially analyzed above for its apparent implication of Giton's free status (81.5-6; see Introduction: 16-19):

quid ille alter? qui [tamquam] die togae virilis stolam sumpsit, qui ne vir esset a matre persuasus est, qui opus muliebre in ergastulo fecit, qui postquam conturbavit et libidinis suae solum vertit, reliquit veteris amicitiae nomen et, pro pudor, tamquam mulier secutuleia unius noctis tactu omnia vendidit.

And what of that other one? Who, [as if] on his adult male citizenship day,⁸³ took up women's clothes instead, whose mother convinced him not to be a man, who performed a woman's role in the slave-labor camp (*ergastulo*), who, after he confounded and changed the basis of his desire, left behind the name of an old friendship and, for shame, sold everything in a one night's work just like a female streetwalker.

Encolpius attacks Giton's masculinity and sexual propriety by claiming that Giton preferred women's clothes over men's (*toga virilis ... stolam*), was persuaded never to become a man (*ne vir esset ... persuasus est*), performed the penetrated role (*opus muliebre*) in the workhouse, actively so (*fecit*), and immodestly sold his entire self like female sex worker (*omnia vendidit, mulier secutuleia*).

The gendered significations of the clothing terms *toga* and *stola* have already been discussed, as have their status implications for Giton (see Introduction: 16-18): citizen males

⁸³ For a discussion explaining this translation, see Introduction: 16-18.

donned the *toga virilis* upon entering adulthood, and citizen females donned the *stola* upon marriage to a freeborn man. Encolpius thus attacks Giton's masculinity by suggesting that Giton chose an article of women's clothing over men's.

There are other sexual implications for this insult concerning Giton's choice of apparel that are closely tied with gender expression. One's gender expression in Roman culture, especially through clothing, could be considered closely intertwined with one's sexual behavior (Corbeill 2015: 158). Compare this passage in Suetonius, for example, in which the author describes Julius Caesar's choice of appearance (*Jul.* 45): *Etiam cultu notabilem ferunt: usum enim lato clavo ad manus fimbriato nec umquam aliter quam ut super eum cingeretur, et quidem fluxiore cinctura; unde emanasse Sullae dictum optimates saepius admonentis, ut 'male praecinctum puerum caverent,'* "They also say he was notable in his style: for he was always covered over with a wide striped tunic, fringed at the wrists, and indeed with a rather loose belt; from this arose the saying with which Sulla often warned the optimates, that 'they should beware of the badly-belted boy.'" Sulla's comment is indicative of the disparaging ideas surrounding Caesar's fashion, and he calls Caesar a *puer*, the sexual and slave connotations of which have been discussed, potentially insinuating that Caesar is sexually penetrated like a slave boy. The term *fluxiore*, "rather loose," is used of effeminacy and a lack of moderation (cf. Livy 7.29). Caesar's loose belt therefore indicates an effeminate lifestyle, which in turn can be suggestive of sexual penetration (Corbeill 2015: 160),⁸⁴ especially when taken with *puer*. This would not be the first time Caesar has been accused of such behavior, as Suetonius himself reports Caesar's alleged relationship with Nicomedes, the king of Bithynia (*Jul.* 2, 49). Whatever Sulla's or

⁸⁴ This is not to say that this correlation was always the case, merely that it seems to be so here in this passage. There are numerous examples in which Roman authors accuse the same person of both effeminacy and heterosexual licentiousness (Williams 2010: 156-170; Langlands 2006: 292-93; Olson 2014: *passim* and see esp. 199 n. 122).

Suetonius's motives in portraying Caesar in this way—to debase Caesar's reputation, to distinguish themselves from such behavior and appearances, to report perceived truths—the Roman association between one's appearance and one's sexual proclivities is apparent (see Gleason 1995: 21-54).

Encolpius too seems to express this perceived connection between dress and effeminacy, and between effeminacy and the desire to be sexually penetrated. Giton goes from dressing as a woman, to never being a man, to performing the sexual position of a woman, to selling his entire body as a female sex worker. The accusations build upon one another into a crescendo, and as such are necessarily related to one another. Encolpius presents Giton's fabricated choice of feminine apparel as directly correlating with Giton's feminized sexual behavior.

Next let us consider Encolpius's accusation that Giton's mother persuaded the boy never to be a *vir*, "a man." The term *vir* has loaded status and power connotations, as it not only conveys gender but also the rights associated with the Roman male citizen: his own idealized impenetrability and his ability to penetrate certain individuals of lesser station (Walters 1997; Ormand 2009: 35). Giton's mother, therefore, as Encolpius presents it, has Giton reject these potential rights and instead remain a perpetual boy. By doing so, Giton would maintain the sexual susceptibility that corresponds to non-citizen males and females, namely penetration by men of higher status. We need only think of Trimalchio's favorite slave (*deliciae*), Croesus, who is called a *puer vetulus*, an "old slave boy," to see how long a slave could remain his owner's sexual slave boy and reap the rewards from such a position (28.4; 64.5-6).

Encolpius continues to build on his accusations by claiming that Giton performed *opus muliebre*, or "women's work," at the slave-labor camp. The phrase *muliebria pati*, "experiencing womanly things," is a common expression to signify a man's receptive role in

same-sex intercourse (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 13.3, Tac. *Ann.* 11.36, et al.; Walters 1997: 30, 42 n. 2). The term *opus* too can be used in a sexual sense (cf. Pl. *As.* 873; *OLD* s.v. 1d; Adams 1982: 157; Schmeling 2011: 246 n. 5). In other words, Giton supposedly performed the penetrated role during his time at this slave prison. Whether he did so with the owners of the estate on which the prison was housed or with other slaves is unclear from Encolpius's remarks. That Encolpius uses the verb *fecit*, however, to describe Giton's action grants Giton a degree of agency that adds further insult to injury: Giton has performed the penetrated role in sexual intercourse not simply due to his youth or slave status, but out of his own volition. As mentioned previously (see Chapter 2: 53), the choice to be penetrated versus undergoing penetration against one's will, though both degrading to one's reputation, were conceived as distinct behaviors. In this case, Encolpius suggests that Giton was a *fellator* or a *pathicus*, someone who chose to be orally or anally penetrated, respectively. Though Encolpius does not use these terms, the implications from his insult are clear. Encolpius's final personal attack against Giton drives this point home by comparing Giton to a female sex worker, a *secutuleia*, a woman who follows and solicits potential clients. This accusation works to extend Giton's behavior to the heights of feminized sexual wantonness, coupled with all its associations of penetrability.

Encolpius's indirect comment on Giton's perpetual boyhood (*qui ne vir ... est*), his specific accusation that Giton was penetrated at the slave-labor camp (*qui opus muliebre ... fecit*), and his subsequent comparison of Giton to a sex worker all at once exemplify a Roman connection between feminine sexuality and slave penetrability. Giton is not a man: as a slave, Giton endures sexual penetration like a woman; like a female sex worker, Giton's entire body is subjected to penetration by a man. In this sexual behavior and in his sexual susceptibility, Giton

is both like a woman and a slave, or more specifically Giton is not like the idealized male citizen.

In addition to insulting Giton by calling him a woman, Encolpius similarly feminizes and sexualizes Giton by interacting with the Giton as if the boy were Encolpius's wife or *contubernalis*. When Encolpius finds Giton lying with Ascyltos, Encolpius reacts like a husband discovering an adulterous wife with her lover (79.10): *itaque ego ut experrectus pertrectavi gaudio despoliatum torum ... si qua est amantibus fides, ego dubitavi an utrumque traicerem gladio somnumque morti iungerem*, "And so, as I awoke, I felt all over the marriage bed, robbed of its joy ... if there is any trust among lovers, I hesitated whether I would pierce the two of them with my sword and join their sleep with death." Panayotakis's discussion of the passage highlights Petronius's strategy of evoking the theatrics of adultery mimes, citing Choricus as possessing a parallel structure if not a parallel outcome (*Apol. Mimorum* 30, 55; 1995: 111-112, and see 111 n. 2, 112 n. 3; Schmeling 2011: 33 n. 10). Encolpius thus performs the cuckolded husband, debating whether Giton's performance of the adulterous wife should result in the fatal ending such a performance deserves. But what could the attribution of such a role suggest for Giton and his relationship with Encolpius?

The sexual terminology of the passage suggests that Encolpius's feminization of Giton is a function of Encolpius's sexual objectification of Giton. The verb *pertrectavi* is euphemistic (Adams 1982: 186-7), and throughout the *Satyrice* its root signifies someone fondling the member of another:⁸⁵ Quartilla places her hands on Giton's member (*vasculo*) and fondles (*pertractato*) it (24.7); Eumolpus recounts his desire to fondle (*tractavero improba manu*) the boy of Pergamum in exchange for gifting the boy fighting roosters (86.1); Eumolpus fondles

⁸⁵ Cf. Plautus *Asin.* 224, where a breast (*papilla*) is fondled (Schmeling 2011: 73 n. 7).

(*tractact*) Encolpius when the latter reveals his fully-functioning member (Schmeling 2011: 73 n. 7). Such a prevalent sexual connotation of the term could suggest that Encolpius initially intended to grope Giton for further sexual interaction but encountered the empty bed instead.

The word *torum* strongly connotes the bed of married couples (cf. Ov. *A.A.* 1.487; Ov. *Met.* 6.431), and as such is even employed as a metonym for marriage itself (cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.319, 1.620, 7.91; Sen. *Phaed.* 97). Relatedly, it is representative of sexual intercourse (Val. Max. 2.6.14; Ov. *Tr.* 2.378; Sen. *Phaed.* 97) and can even stand in for a mistress (Plin. 35.10, 36.87). In the poem just preceding this passage, versifying Encolpius's and Giton's sexual intercourse, the bed was a *mollis torus*, "soft marriage bed," a welcome and conducive element in Encolpius's and Giton's sexual union. Here, by contrast, the bed is *despoliatum*, "despoiled" and "robbed" of its function, its joy (*gaudio*).

With these sexual terms and focus on the marriage bed (*torus*), Encolpius analogizes his and Giton's relationship to a husband's and wife's but emphasizes solely the sexual aspects of such a relationship. His subsequent reaction to finding Giton in bed with Ascyrtos also reduces Giton's wifedom to sexual behavior: Giton takes on the role of an adulterous wife in his sexual interaction with another man, Ascyrtos, instead of his "husband," Encolpius. As with the invective passage above (81.5-6), Encolpius associates his feminization of Giton with his sexual objectification of Giton. In turn, and especially here in this passage, this sexual objectification corresponds to Encolpius's perception of Giton as his slave, as is evidenced from the beatings (*verberibus*) with which Encolpius wakes Giton (79.11; see above: 84-86). Encolpius projects an intimate relationship with Giton in their versified sexual encounter and in Encolpius's idealized notion of their relationship as a marriage, but then shatters the illusion by resorting to

violence that characterizes the sufferings of slaves. Encolpius's feminization of Giton thus entails his sexualization of and attribution of slave status on Giton.

Giton's Mock Suicide

In addition to Encolpius's treatment, abuse, and feminization of Giton, Giton interacts with Encolpius in ways that have been interpreted as evocative of Greek romance and Greco-Roman mime (see esp. Panayotakis 1995). In this connection, we could view Encolpius and Giton as devoted lovers, even if parodically so. However, we should also entertain the notion of Giton as the devoted slave, whose affection for his owner, Encolpius, extends even to suicide, or at least mock suicide.

When Giton finds Encolpius attempting to kill himself by hanging, Eumolpus and Giton save Encolpius, and Giton responds as follows (94.10-14):

'erras' inquit 'Encolpi, si putas contingere posse ut ante moriaris. prior coepi; in Ascylii hospitio gladium quaesivi. ego si te non invenissem, petiturus praecipitia fui. et ut scias non longe esse quarentibus mortem, specta invicem quod me spectare voluisti.' haec locutus mercenario Eumolpi novaculam rapit et semel iterumque cervice percussa ante pedes collabitur nostros. exclamo ego attonitus, secutusque labentem eodem ferramento ad mortem viam quaero. sed neque Giton ulla erat suspicione vulneris laesus neque ego ullum sentiebam dolorem.

"You are mistaken, Encolpius," he said, "if you think you could die before me. I thought of it first; I searched for a sword in Ascylos's lodgings. If I had not found you, I would have walked off a cliff. And so that you know death is not far away from those seeking it, watch in turn what you wanted me to watch." Having said these things, he seizes the razor from Eumolpus's hired hand, strikes his neck twice, and collapses before our feet. I shout, shocked, ran to him as he fell, and I sought the path to death with the same iron razor. But Giton had not been struck by any mark of a wound, and I did not feel any pain.

Panayotakis views the scene as a *mimica mors*, a farcical death scene of the mimic stage (1995: 122-130). He notes the parallel stock-motif of fake deaths in ancient romances (cf. Slater 1990: 103), themselves traced back to mimic theater, and cites the description of the stage prop knife in

Achilles Tatius (3.21.3-5) as a comparandum for the dulled razor (*novaculam*) in Petronius. Encolpius's own attempt to follow suit and end his own life with the same razor has also drawn comparison with other literary parallels: Nisus's death following Euryalus's in the *Aeneid*, for example (9.444-5; Conte 1996: 77-8; Schmeling 2011: 388 n. 12). But Giton is not solely fulfilling the mimetic "role of the faithful concubine" in this mock suicide (Panayotakis 1995: 127), nor should we focus solely on the scene's parodic allusivity to the two virtuous male lovers in Virgil. What could this mock suicide imply for Giton's status? In addition to the scene's histrionics and literary allusivity, what valences would Giton's methods and motivations have held for Eumolpus, Encolpius, and the reader?

Firstly, Giton reports his preferred method of suicide, at least initially, to be a sword (*gladium*). Van Hoof in his 439 case studies of represented male suicide in the Greco-Roman world determined that, at 46%, the most common means was by weaponry (1990: 44; Schmeling 2011: 387 n. 11). That is to say, suicide through weaponry was the most represented form of male suicide in ancient Greco-Roman literature. Giton's initial impulse is to do just that: find a sword and end his life. He is denied this option as he cannot find one, nor is he in a position to acquire one. He is not among the class of persons who would own a sword, like a knight or an elite citizen would, and as such this method is not available to him.

Next Giton reports that he had intended to search for a cliff from which to throw himself. This is a method less representative of male and more representative of female suicide. Van Hoof finds that only 13% of male suicides were by jumping (1990: 44; Schmeling 2011: 387 n. 11). By comparison, 22% of female suicides were by jumping, the third most common form of female suicide (*ibid.*). It seems to have been considered a method of the desperate, and was not considered particularly respectable. The relative lack of representation of male suicide

by means of jumping (13%) in comparison with the higher frequency by means of weaponry (46%) could suggest that jumping was a less-than-ideal, disgraceful alternative to the use of arms (Van Hoof 1990: 73, 78). Giton thus shifts from the possibility of the most common and most respectable form of suicide (weaponry), to the prospect of a less-than-favorable alternative (jumping). This path too, however, proves inaccessible.

Finally, Giton chooses a razor to the neck. We must unpack the associations of cutting one's own throat with a razor for a fuller understanding of such an act's implications for Giton's character. While using a weapon to pierce oneself or open one's veins was considered somewhat appropriate for male suicide (Loraux 1987: 12-13), that Giton uses a barber's razor to cut his own throat diminishes any potential respectability. Not only is no blood spilt, as this proves to be a mock suicide, but the choice of a razor to the throat connotes a lesser-statured and less respectable suicide.

Firstly, Giton's reflex to harm his own neck could have both a gendered and a statured valence. Loraux discusses the prevalence of hanging as the most common female suicide of Greek literature (1987: 9, 71 n. 8), and she emphasizes the neck as women's most vulnerable body part (50-53).⁸⁶ She discusses the term *σφαγή* in Greek as connoting sacrificial throat cutting (1987: 13), while the *δέρη*, "throat," was a "strong point of feminine beauty" as well as an object of self-harm when the woman was in mourning (*Il.* 3.39; Sappho fr. 216; Eur. *Med.* 30-31; Eur. *El.* 146-47; 1987: 50, 84 n. 3). Hanging in particular was considered as a less dignified, even disgusting pathway (Van Hoof 1990: 65), one relegated to women, slaves, and people of lower social status, though hanging still seemed to be the most common form of suicide overall (Van

⁸⁶ While Loraux largely focuses on Greek literature, if we are to compare the Petronian passage to Greek romances or Greco-Roman mime, as scholars have done (Panayotakis 1995: 127; Slater 1990: 103, et al.), then Greek attitudes toward the neck could shed important light on the connotations of suicides through harm of this body part.

Hoof 1990: 78). Of the suicides represented in Greco-Roman literature that Van Hoof analyzes, hanging represents the most common path for women at 34% (Van Hoof 1990: 44).

Moreover, the imagery of a slit throat evokes associations with sacrificial animals, executed gladiators, and executed criminals.⁸⁷ In the above passage, Encolpius narrates the phrase *cervice percussa*, “with his [Giton’s] neck having been struck.”⁸⁸ Schmeling notes the prevalent use of *cervix* for criminals (2011: 394 n.9; cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2. 21. 51), and while nothing necessarily criminal is happening in this Petronian passage, the suggestion of Giton’s status as analogous to that of a criminal could suggest that perhaps Encolpius perceives Giton to be at fault or even deserving of this kind of punishment.

Lastly, let us consider the connotations of the razor itself. While others have been represented as killing themselves with a razor, such as Clodius Epirius (Dio Cassius 66.16.3; Van Hoof 1990: 91), it does not seem to have been viewed favorably (Van Hoof 1990: 157). Tacitus reports the death of the prefect Tigellinus in his *Histories* (1.72): *Tigellinus accepto apud Sinuessanas aquas supremae necessitatis nuntio inter stupra concubinarum et oscula et deformis moras sectis novacula faucibus infamem vitam foedavit etiam exitu sero et inhonesto*, “Tigellinus, at the baths of Sinuessa, received the message of his final hour and amid the debaucheries and kisses of his mistresses, disgraceful in his delays, cut his throat with a razor, and befouled his infamous life all the more with his delayed and disgraceful departure.” Nothing about Tigellinus’s suicide, including his method of death with a razor to his

⁸⁷ Previously, Giton bared his neck for the slaughter when attempting to break up Ascylos and Encolpius, but his expression *nudo ecce iugulum*, “Look I bare my throat,” made use of the term *iugulum*, “throat,” instead of *cervix*, “neck” (80.4). The term *iugulum* is often relegated to condemned gladiators and sacrificial animals (OLD *iugulo* 1; Gowers 2002: 155) or to proscription (Gowers 2002: 156; Hinard 1985: 41).⁸⁷ As Gowers notes: “According to one inscription, the crowd in the arena shouted either *missos, missos*, “let them go”; or *iugula, iugula*, “slit their throats.” (Dessau ILS 5134; Gowers 2002: 156). The use of *iugulum*, then, would also closely align Giton with an animal or a lowly gladiator.

⁸⁸ Tacitus makes use of the same two roots when describing the death of Sempronius Gracchus, who *cervicemque percussoribus obtulit*, “offered his neck to the strikers (assassins)” (*Ann.* 1.53).

throat, was considered favorable. Couple this lack of favorability with the fact that Giton's razor belonged to a slave barber, and we can see the potentiality for a lower-status suicide in Giton's performance.

As for Giton's motivations for this suicide, scholars have focused on representing him as a quasi-caricatured devoted lover, but let us also consider the possibility of viewing him as a devoted slave. Females and slaves were two groups of persons that shared similar marginalization in ancient Rome. In Parker's comparison between wives and slaves as outsiders in *exemplum* literature, Parker states that "slaves and wives received analogous symbolic treatment: the cultural categories in which they were placed were markedly similar" (Parker 1998: 155), and this statement is well supported (Wiedemann 1987: 25; Just 1985). The scholarly view of Giton as representing a devoted female lover thus should be in conversation with the view of Giton as a devoted slave; each treatment of Giton should consider the other.

As van Hoof remarks (1990: 18): "*Fides*, loyalty, and *devotio* are virtues of servants. Among subordinates loyalty till death generally does not have an abstract object like the fatherland. In almost all cases there is a personal relationship in which the lesser partner sacrifices himself on behalf of the master."⁸⁹ We can see Giton enact this kind of devotion in his mock suicide. Though Giton never carries out the literal act in our extant text, we can view his mock suicide as a metaphorical performance of slave loyalty for Encolpius.

⁸⁹ To push the idea of the suicidal slave further, we could also consider how suicide among slaves was such a frequent method of escape that it attracted the attention of jurists, as is evidenced by the well-documented preoccupation of slave suicide in Roman law (Van Hoof 1990: 20). Perhaps too we can think of Seneca's suggested resistance to tyranny through suicide (*Ira* 3.15.4): *vides iugulum tuum, guttur tuum, cor tuum? Effugia servitutis sunt ... quaeris quod sit ad libertatem iter? Quaelibet in corpore tuo vena!* "Do you see your throat, your gullet, your heart? These are your ways to escape slavery ... Do you ask what is the path to freedom? Any vein at all in your body!" Though Seneca was speaking about freeing oneself from the enslavement of tyranny (Edwards 2008: 102-3), and relatedly of unbridled emotion, could slaves not just as quickly recognize this pathway of freedom from their literal enslavement? Could we view Giton's mock suicide attempts as representative of his need for freedom?

Through Encolpius's coupling of *frater* with *puer*, his abuse towards Giton, and his feminization of Giton, Encolpius views and treats Giton as subservient. In Giton's role as *puer*, in his performance of Encolpius's wife or *contubernalis*, and in Giton's mock suicide, Giton reaffirms Encolpius's perceptions by interacting with Encolpius in the manner of someone who is of lesser status.

Moreover, especially in the juxtaposition of the character Encolpius's use of *frater* and the narrator Encolpius's use of *puer* to describe Giton, to what extent can we understand Encolpius's motivations for such treatment of Giton? If the narrator views Giton as a *puer*, but the character calls Giton a *frater* when speaking to the boy, perhaps we can consider this duality as representative of Encolpius's sexual-psychological manipulation of Giton. Encolpius's oscillation between expressions of affection or egalitarianism (e.g. *frater*) on the one hand and abuse (e.g. *verberibus*) on the other aligns perfectly with our modern-day understanding of both abusers' tactics to maintain control over their victims as well as victims' co-dependency on these abusers and their subsequent psychological trauma (Walker 1979; Spiegel 1986: 61-78; Hayes 2014: esp. 6). In this, viewing Giton as the devoted slave takes on a deeper valence, one that speaks to the level of psychological characterization that Petronius employs in addition to his literary and performative allusivity to Greco-Roman romance and mime. Petronius thus represents Encolpius as manipulating the power dynamics in his relationship with Giton: Encolpius performs affection for and egalitarianism toward Giton at times, but the illusion shatters when Encolpius becomes angry with the boy and the hierarchical aspects of their relationship come to the fore.

CHAPTER 4: GITON THE COMIC SLAVE

Any discussion of the aspects of comic theater present in Petronius builds on the scholarly contribution of Panayotakis, who analyzes the comic and mimic content, style, and structure of the *Satyrica*. Such an analysis of the characters' dramatic performances can be informative for this dissertation's discussion of the character Giton's social performances. While Panayotakis's analysis largely focuses on Greco-Roman mime due to its predominance as theatrical entertainment during Petronius's own time period (1995: ix), this chapter aims to analogize Giton's performance to that of a comic stock character who has no correlative in mime: Roman comedy's *servus callidus*, "clever slave."⁹⁰ However, Panayotakis rightly notes (1995: 192):

[Petronius] does not follow the slapstick tone of *either* the popular drama, as it is represented by the Atellan sketches and Plautus' 'cloaked' plays, *or* the mimic tradition of the Graeco-Roman mime, as it survives on the phylax-vases, or in the plays of Rhinthon, Sophron, Epicharmus, Herodas, Decimus Laberius, Publilius Syrus ... It is rather the whole farcical tradition of comedy to which Petronius is indebted for the theatrical situations of his novel.

As such, while this chapter will focus on Plautus and the ways in which Giton's performance of slavery aligns with the *servus callidus* of Roman comedy, I do not wish to contend or imply that Petronius alludes to Roman comedy necessarily or that Plautus is the only means by which we can analyze Petronius's engagement with comic theater, but rather that Giton's performance of the comic slave stems from a broader comic tradition in which Plautus also participates. Since this dissertation focuses on Giton's performance of slavery, and since Roman comedy provides us with a vast corpus through which we can consistently evaluate slave characters in comic

⁹⁰ As Panayotakis states, "We can say that in mime there are no stock characters who star in different comic situations every time," and he contrasts this with the prevalence of stock characters in Atellan farce (1995: xviii).

theater, I have chosen the plays of Plautus as a concrete, representative, but surely not exclusive sample.

The *servus callidus* of Roman⁹¹ comedy is the “clever slave” who generally schemes to aid his owner, often the *adulescens*, “young man.” In discussing the relationship between the *servus callidus* and *adulescens* in Roman comedy, Parker states (1989: 243): “the [*servus callidus*] is the young man’s confidant, advisor ... and especially his factotum.”⁹² In Bungard’s concluding remarks on staging *Pseudolus*, he discusses how he and his participants “[highlighted] the improvisatory skill of the *servus callidus* in responding to whatever situation is at hand” (2015: 81). In a similar vein, Slater analyzes Plautus’s plays’ illusory lack of scriptedness, especially exemplified in the performed improvisation of the *servus callidus* (Slater 1985: esp. 16). Commenting on Slater’s analysis, Petrides notes that Plautus’s clever slaves, “like puppeteers, or indeed like playwrights, [have] the sheer mind and willpower to control all the characters that surround them, be they masters, pimps, or other slaves. They also possess the creative intelligence to conjure up unlikely solutions to impossible problems” (Petrides 2014: 431). The intelligent, manipulative, and improvisational performance of the *servus callidus* exemplifies this stock character’s role in Plautus’s plays. Giton too exemplifies these characteristics.⁹³ As such, in this chapter, Giton commands and expresses agency and resistance in ways that are similar to the *servus callidus* of Roman comedy (McCarthy 200: 21; Bungard

⁹¹ For the Romanness of this character type, see Fraenkel 2007.

⁹² We have seen Giton as factotum in his roles as guide, cook, and bath attendant (see Chapter 1: 25-42). We have also seen how Encolpius confides in Giton about his impotence in Croton (see Chapter 3: 82-83). This chapter will focus on the other ways in which Giton performs behavior characteristic of a *servus callidus*.

⁹³ Panayotakis also notes the comic nature of Giton’s behavior (1995: 14): “The author does not fail to point out the dramatic side of Giton’s personality: the persistent refusal to tell the truth, the stubbornness, the tears, the hypocritical dignity (9.2-3), everything in his behavior shows that the way he expresses his feelings is entirely artificial and false. In fact, the boy’s technique of expressing virtue and his hesitation to disclose what happened, resemble strikingly Seneca’s account (*Ep.* 11.7) of the methods, which actors adopt to imitate modesty, and the tricky ways of slaves in Roman comedies in order to succeed in enticing other characters into a trap.”

2015: 77; Stewart 2012: 168). This reflects a departure from the previous chapters of this dissertation which highlight how Giton's agency is comparatively minimized, qualified, or otherwise disregarded.

Intelligence

The representation of Giton's intelligence manifests itself at several times throughout the novel,⁹⁴ and he is described as *sapiens* or *prudens*, specifically, on a few occasions. Eumolpus praises Giton's simultaneous possession of both wits (*sapientia*) and beauty (see Chapter 2: 54),⁹⁵ and Encolpius describes Giton as witty (*acumen*) and wise (*prudens*) for marking out their path with chalk (see Chapter 1: 38-40). Such cleverness is a defining quality of the *servus callidus*, as *callidus* implies. This term comes from the verb *calleo*, "to be hardened," or "to be thick skinned," and Richlin, citing Plautus and Cicero, notes that this implies a person who has learned the hard way from experience (Cic. *ND* 3.25; Pl. *As.* 186; *Truc.* 416, 931-2; 2017: 393-394). The translation of *servus callidus* as "clever slave," therefore, connotes something like "the slave from the school of hard knocks." That is, a *servus callidus* is clever in that he has acquired wits and education from his life experiences.

While the terms *sapiens* and *prudens* can connote their own versions of intelligence (*TLL s.v.*), both can be synonyms with *callidus* (*ibid.*), and the two terms are frequently juxtaposed with *callidus* (cf. Cic. *Inv.* 1.58.10; *De Part.* 76.3-4; *S. Rosc.* 61.5; *Scaur.* 24.5; Sal. *Epist. ad Caes.* 2.1.2.1; Tac. *Ann.* 4.33.7). In *Persa*, for example, the daughter of the parasite Saturio

⁹⁴ Giton's manipulative intelligence, in particular, will be discussed below.

⁹⁵ Encolpius also comments on Giton's intelligence in this same scene. At Eumolpus's compliment, Encolpius becomes irate and narrates (94.4): *nec fefellit hoc Gitona. itaque extra cellam processit tamquam aquam peteret, iramque meam prudenti absentia extinxit*, "And this did not escape Giton's notice. So he proceeded to exit the room as if to retrieve some water, and the absence of the clever boy extinguished my anger."

reluctantly pretends to be a slave to help trick a pimp. In admiration of her answers and her ability to answer the pimp's questions cleverly without lying (Lowe 1989: 393), the slave Toxilus replies, *ah, di istam perdant! ita catast et callida./ ut sapiens habet cor, quam dicit quod opust!* "God damn! She's so proper and clever (*callida*)./ What a wise (*sapiens*) heart she has, how she says what's necessary!" (622-623). The two terms, *callida* and *sapiens*, are given in close juxtaposition and can be considered synonymous here: both comment on the intelligence with which the supposed slave girl responds to the pimp. In these compliments, Toxilus also praises the very characteristics he himself exhibits by highlighting the aspects of the woman's performance that partially define his status as the clever slave of the play.

We can see Encolpius project this kind of intelligence onto Giton when he twice compares the boy to Odysseus.⁹⁶ When Encolpius and Giton are about to be discovered by Ascyrtos, Encolpius instructs Giton to hide under the bed (97.4-5):

imperavi Gitoni ut raptim grabatum subiret annecteretque pedes et manus institis, quibus sponda culcitam ferebat, ac sic ut olim Ulixes †pro† arietem adhaesisset, extensus infra grabatum scrutantium eluderet manus. non est moratus Giton imperium momentoque temporis inseruit vinculo manus et Ulixem astu simillimo vicit.

I ordered Giton to go under the bed quickly and fasten his hands and feet to its bindings, with which the frame of the bed held the mattress, then, as Ulysses once had clung to a ram, stretch out under the bed, and escape the hands of those investigating. Without delay, Giton immediately entangled his hands in the binding and beat Ulysses at his own game of wits.

Though Encolpius thinks up the idea and delivers the command, he nevertheless compares Giton to Odysseus in two different ways: first, Giton will play the role of Odysseus by hiding underneath the bed, as Odysseus did under a ram in the Cyclops's cave (Hom. *Od.* 9.431ff.); second, Giton's intelligence is comparable to Odysseus in Giton's *execution* of Encolpius's command. With the phrase *Ulixem ... vicit*, Encolpius views Giton as outdoing Odysseus

⁹⁶ Encolpius compares Giton to Odysseus a third time when Eumolpus later discovers Giton under the bed (98.3-5).

himself, while the term *astu* emphasizes that Giton has surpassed Odysseus in intelligence specifically. Encolpius may have had the wits to come up with the plan, but Giton's own cleverness manifests itself in his delivery and performance of that plan.⁹⁷

As with *sapiens* and *prudens* above, *astus* can be juxtaposed with *callidus* as its synonym (cf. Apul. *Met.* 4.12.16; Cic. *Caec.* 4.4; *Clu.* 183.10; *Off.* 3.57.9-10; Gel. 12.12.1.1; Pl. *Mos.* 270-71; Sen. *Tro.* 523). Such a union of the two terms occurs in Plautus, potentially suggesting that we can view *astus* and its derivative *astutus* just as descriptive of the comic slave as the term *callidus*. In *Amphitruo*, for example, Mercury, disguised as the slave, Sosia, comments on Sosia's arrival (265-69):

quando imago est [huius]⁹⁸ in me, certum est hominem eludere. 265
et enim vero quoniam formam cepi huius in me et statum,
deceat et facta moresque huius habere me similis item.
itaque me malum esse oportet, callidum, astutum admodum,
atque hunc telo suo sibi, malitia, a foribus pellere.

Since I am disguised as him, I'm definitely going to mess with him.
And since I took his appearance and dress,
I should have similar actions and habits likewise.
And so, I should be bad, clever (*callidum*), shrewd (*astutum*) to the extreme,
And I should drive him away from the doors with his own weapon, wickedness.

Mercury defines the *servus callidus* here by detailing the adjectives that characterize the comic slave: *malus*, *callidus*, and *astutus*, “bad,” “clever,” and “shrewd.” Mercury conveys his intention to take on these characteristics of a slave in order to effect a convincing performance of his disguise.

Similarly, in Plautus's *Pseudolus*, the clever slave and title character also seems to define the *servus callidus* as he describes the ideal candidate to carry out his plan. First, he states *ad*

⁹⁷ In this we can see Conte's discussion of Encolpius as a mythomaniac narrator (Conte 1996: 1-139, and esp. 1-36): Encolpius sees someone lofty and epic like Odysseus, even when the lowly Giton is hiding under a poor bed in some paltry lodgings. The irony in such a juxtaposition between Giton and Odysseus certainly is not lost on the reader.

⁹⁸ The OCT has *huius*, which, I believe, is a typographical error for *huius*.

eam rem usust hominem astutum, doctum, cautum et callidum,/ qui imperata ecfecta reddat, non qui vigilans dormiat, “For this matter I need a shrewd (*astutum*), smart, cautious, and clever (*callidum*) person, who effects commands, not one who sleeps while he’s awake” (*Ps.* 385-6). Here, Pseudolus defines the *servus callidus* as Mercury did above: a clever (*callidus*) and shrewd (*astutus*) slave is someone who can execute commands effectively, not one who is half-paying attention. Pseudolus reemphasizes this point later on in the play, when he again describes the kind of person for whom he is searching: *malum,/ callidum, doctum, qui quando principium prehenderit,/ porro sua uirtute teneat quid se facere oporteat*, “[Find me] someone bad, clever, smart, who, when he comprehends the beginning of a plan, has the capacity to understand what he needs to do further” (*Ps.* 724-726). Pseudolus then clarifies that he would much prefer a slave over a free person for his plan to succeed (*Ps.* 727-8), emphasizing his perception that slaves better characterize these descriptors than free persons. Twice, therefore, Pseudolus characterizes the cleverness of a slave as an awareness of how best to effect the commands of another; for Pseudolus, a clever slave must have the wherewithal to act independently and perceive the best plan of execution on his own.⁹⁹

We can view these characterizations, therefore, as indicative of a further semantic range for *callidus* and *astutus*, building on Richlin’s point above. In addition to possessing the general intelligence gained from their life experiences, the *callidus* and *astutus* slave must also command the specific intelligence to effect an order that they have received without further direction. We can see such a characterization of Giton in the scene from Petronius, and the fact that Encolpius describes Giton’s actions with *astu* could thus suggest an intelligence evocative of the comic slave.

⁹⁹ Cf. McCarthy 2000: 21.

Giton follows Encolpius's order, but when the public slave (*servus publicus*) searches under the bed with a cane on Ascylos's behalf, Giton must decide what to do to best carry out Encolpius's command. Encolpius describes the scene (98.1): *subducebat Giton ab ictu corpus et retento timidissime spiritu ipsos sciniphes ore tangebat*, "Giton withdrew his body from the blow, held back his breath ever so gently, and touched the very bedbugs with his face." Giton squeezes his body, holds his breath, and even presses his face close to the underside of the bed, all to carry out Encolpius's command. Encolpius does not order Giton to do any of these things, but Giton's recognition of their necessity amusingly exemplifies the kind of intelligence that Encolpius characterizes as Odyssean and that Mercury and Pseudolus characterize as belonging to the clever slave of Roman comedy. Encolpius's emphasis on Giton's comparability to Odysseus lies in Giton's ability to recognize what needs to be done beyond the orders given, in the way of the comic, clever slave.

Finally, while the allusions and parody of Homer in this scene have been well discussed (Walsh 1970; Sandy 1974; Ferri 1988; Panayotakis 1995: 133-4, 144-5; Schmeling 2011: 395. n. 5, 403 n. 7), less has been said about the implications of this Homeric intertextuality for Giton himself. That Odysseus embodies the clever character par excellence requires no argument: a variety of intelligence-related epithets usually accompany Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, his intelligence and forethought manifests itself at various points in the epic poem, and both ancient and modern readers generally consider him to be clever: the brains to Achilles' brawn. From this association of cleverness with the king of Ithaca, it may seem that Giton's intelligence proves more evocative of a freeborn individual than a slave. Instead we should compare this Homeric allusion to a similar treatment of Odysseus in Roman comedy, where slaves are compared to Odysseus as a means of characterizing the slaves' intelligence.

Firstly, to be sure, non-slaves compare themselves to Odysseus too: the freeborn youth, Pistoclerus, in Plautus's *Bacchides* does so, but only in relating to the extent of Odysseus's misfortunes; and Encolpius compares Lichas's recognition of Encolpius's member to Eurykleia's recognition of Odysseus's scar. A more systematic analysis of the different ways in which non-slaves and slaves invoke Odysseus could prove fruitful, but for now, based on the above evidence, it is possible that non-slaves represent themselves and slaves as commanding different aspects of Odysseus: Encolpius's recognition scene constitutes a reversal of identity similar to Odysseus's own, where both are disguised as individuals of lesser station than they are; Pistoclerus, in *Bacchides*, aligns himself with the πολύτλας, "much-suffering" Odysseus (cf. *Il.* 8.97 et al.).

Slaves, by contrast, seem to be compared consistently with Odysseus πολύτροπος or πολύμητις, "of many wiles" (cf. *Il.* 1.311; *Od.* 1.1; 10.330; *Od.* 21.274 et al.). Chrysalus, the clever slave in Plautus's *Bacchides*, delivers an extended analogy comparing himself to Agamemnon and Odysseus (925-1075); he correlates his own stratagems in the play with Odysseus's Trojan horse (*ibid.*; cf. *Od.* 4.271-289, 8.492-520; Verg. *Aen.* 2.13-56). Similarly, the *senex*, "old citizen," of *Pseudolus* calls Pseudolus an Odysseus twice for the slave's crafty efforts (1063; 1245; Scafoglio 2005; Fletcher 2017: 43-44). If there exists a distinction between the Odyssean aspects of non-slaves and those of slaves, Encolpius's identification of Giton with the intelligent aspects of Odysseus could correlate with the similar comparisons of slaves to Odysseus in Roman comedy.

Furthermore, Odysseus himself can be read as a slave in the *Odyssey*. Rankine argues that various scenes of the *Odyssey* are emblematic of the ritualistic social death and domination that is slavery, as when Odysseus is powerless on the goddess Calypso's island (41-42). Considering

Rankine's analysis, Giton could represent an inversion of the metaphor here: the Odyssean Odysseus as slave versus the Petronian slave as Odysseus. Throughout most of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus has lost his previous identity and status, so the represented manifestations of his intelligence largely occur at times when he does not maintain a position to exact his rights as king of Ithaca. In this way, we can compare his intelligence to the intelligence performed by slaves, especially comic ones, who also have had their identities and statuses stolen from them. As such, the clever aspects of Odysseus could be viewed as better corresponding to the cleverness of slaves, while non-slaves identify with other aspects of Odysseus's character that are not so closely tied to his deprivation of status.

Improvisation and Manipulation

Improvisation in Plautus's plays manifests itself in a variety of ways, from the illusion of improvisation in the verbal duels between characters, often slaves,¹⁰⁰ to the potential improvisation of the plays' actors themselves, as could be evidenced by the presence of variant lines (Marshall 2006: 266-72; Richlin 2017: 380 n. 48). The clever slave's manipulation and orchestration of events in Plautus proves perhaps even more ubiquitous, as nearly every one of Plautus's plays involves a slave performing this kind of action in one way or another. In Petronius, the represented improvisational skills of Giton are closely tied with his manipulateness: though Petronius carefully crafts his storyline (cf. Hubbard 1986; Rimmel 2002), he often represents Giton as reacting seemingly impromptu, and these reactions are often designed to manipulate Giton's audience.

¹⁰⁰ Sometimes this involves a slave and a free person, like Pseudolus and Charinus cited below (*Ps.* 735-48), but most often these take place between slave characters (Richlin 2017: 161-162; cf. *Pl. Ps.* 913-948, *Mos.* 885-903, et al.).

We have already seen Giton react to the fighting of Ascyrtos and Encolpius by offering up his own life (see Chapter 2: 66 n. 64) and how he reactively manipulates Encolpius in his theatrical fake suicide with the razor (see Chapter 3: 93-97). He also threatens to castrate himself, possibly with the same razor, when everyone is fighting on board Lichas's ship (108.10-11):

tunc fortissimus Giton ad virilia sua admovit novaculam infestam, minatus se abscisurum tot miseriarum causam, inibuitque Tryphaena tam grande facinus non dissimulata missione. saepius ego cultrum tonsorium super iugulum meum posui, non magis me occisurus, quam Giton quod minabatur facturus. audacius tamen ille tragoediam implebat, qui sciebat se illam habere novaculam, qua iam sibi cervicem praeciderat.

Then Giton the valiant moved the hostile razor to his member, and threatened to cut off the cause of our many troubles, and Tryphaena stopped so great a crime with the genuine offer of a cease-fire. I placed a barber's knife at my throat several times, not planning on killing myself any more than Giton would have done what he was threatening to do. Still he filled the tragic role more brazenly, since he knew that he held that razor with which he had already cut his neck.

As with Ascyrtos and Encolpius fighting before, Giton recognizes himself as the source of contention on Lichas's ship. Tryphaena sexually desires Giton, and so Giton threatens to remove his own sexual appendage to end the ship's conflict. With *minatus ... causam*, Encolpius identifies Giton's member as the reason for the ship's quarrel; he too recognizes the role that sexual attraction to Giton has played in the ship's and his own misfortunes. Giton's threat of castration forces Tryphaena to call an end to the conflict, and in this cessation of violence Giton successfully manipulates his audience into doing what Giton desired.

Giton's threats of self-harm are only one way in which he manipulates his audience, however. In the true fashion of a *servus callidus*, Giton also manipulates Encolpius with word play, and this too is framed as improvisational. When Encolpius finds Giton in the baths, the two depart, leaving Eumolpus and Ascyrtos behind before locking themselves in Encolpius's lodgings (91.3-9):

diu vocem neuter invenit; nam puer etiam singultibus crebris amabile pectus quassaverat. ‘o facinus’ inquam ‘indignum, quod amo te quamvis relictus, et in hoc pectore, cum vulnus ingens fuerit, cicatrix non est. quid dicis, peregrini amoris concessio? dignus hac fui?’ postquam se amari sensit, supercilium altius sustulit ... ‘nec amoris arbitrium ad alium iudicem <de>tuli. sed nihil iam queror, nihil iam memini, si bona fide paenitentiam emendas.’ haec cum inter gemitus lacrimasque fudissem, deterisit ille pallio vultum et ‘quaeso’ inquit ‘Encolpi, fidem memoriae tuae appello: ego te reliqui an tu <me> prodidisti? equidem fateor et prae me fero: cum duos armatos viderem, ad fortiorem confugi.’ exosculatus pectus sapientia plenum inieci cervicibus manus, et ut facile intellegeret redisse me in gratiam et optima fide reviviscentem amicitiam, toto pectore adstrinxi.

For a long time, neither of us could speak; for the boy even shook his lovely chest with his repeated sobbing. “What a crying shame,” I said, “because I love you, though you left me, and though there was a huge wound in this chest, there is no scar. What do you say, leaving your love to a stranger? Did I deserve this offense?” After he perceived that he was loved, he raised his brow higher ... “I did not bring our love’s case to any other judge. But I make no complaint, and I remember nothing, if you honestly express your regret.” When I had poured out groans and tears along with these words, he wiped his face with his cloak and said, “I ask you, Encolpius, I call on the honesty of your memory: did I leave you or did you abandon me? I definitely confess, I admit it plainly: when I saw two armed men, I fled to the stronger.” I kissed his chest, so full of wit, and threw my arms about his neck, and entirely fastened him to my chest so that he would clearly understand that I had returned to love and friendship with him, renewed with the utmost confidence.

We have seen the legal implications of the term *iniuria* and the ways in which this term positions Giton as a slave (see Chapter 2: 55). We can see similar legal language in Encolpius’s subsequent statement: *nec amoris arbitrium ad alium iudicem <de>tuli*, “I did not bring our love’s case to any other judge.” With *iniuria* and this following legal reference, Encolpius frames their relationship as one between an owner and a slave, but he never exacts any of these supposed rights over Giton if he has them.¹⁰¹ Encolpius confronts Giton for leaving him: he describes himself as *relictus*, “left behind,” and blames Giton for mistreating him. Nevertheless, Encolpius claims that he will choose to remember (*memini*) nothing, and that all will be forgiven, if Giton shows remorse for his actions. Here, Giton turns the tables. He appeals to Encolpius’s

¹⁰¹ The potential force of the final word *adstrinxi*, which can connote “bind” or “put under obligation” (cf. Pl. *Trin.* 699; Cic. *Att.* 10), could further support such a reading of the owner and slave dynamics at play here.

memory, *memoria*, utilizing the same root as Encolpius's preceding *memini*. Similarly, Giton turns Encolpius's use of *relictus* against him, by asking whether he "left" (*reliqui*) Encolpius. By turning Encolpius's words against him, Giton successfully places the blame on Encolpius himself. Giton's response necessarily depends on making use of Encolpius's own words, and so Giton is presented as developing this clever response on the spot, as improvised speech. Encolpius comments on Giton's wit (*sapientia*), possibly recognizing this flipping of the script, or perhaps marveling at how quickly Giton was able to come up with an answer of which Encolpius would approve: Giton did not prefer Ascyrtos, but rather chose Ascyrtos out of fear for his own, and perhaps Encolpius's, safety.

Similarly, near the end of the extant fragments, Encolpius asks Giton whether Giton and Ascyrtos had sexual relations the night before their fight, in a passage we saw above (133.1-2; see Chapter 3: 83): *hac declamatione finita Gitona voco et 'narra mihi' inquam 'frater, sed tua fide: ea nocte, qua te mihi Ascyrtos subduxit, usque in iniuriam vigilavit an contentus fuit vidua pudicaque nocte?' tetigit puer oculos suos conceptissimisque iuravit verbis sibi ab Ascyrtos nullam vim factam*, "When my speech was finished, I call Giton and say, 'Tell me, brother, but be honest: that night, when Ascyrtos snuck you away from me, did he spend the night continuously awake committing offenses or was he content with a chaste night without consummation?' The boy covered his eyes and swore a most formal oath that Ascyrtos never forced himself upon him." Giton swears that no force was used (*nullam vim*), satisfying Encolpius's line of questioning, but potentially suggesting that he was a willing participant. He carefully phrases his answer so as to be truthful, but not entirely forthcoming. Moreover, if we are to read Giton as a slave, and this dissertation argues that we should, then an oath is not in keeping with Giton's status. As Richlin notes, discussing the use of *fides* in Plautus, "a slave's

promise, or oath, has nothing to back it, for a slave officially has no honor to lose, a slave has no *fides*” (Richlin 2017: 183).¹⁰² Giton’s response here is then doubly meaningless: not only does he speak a half-truth, but he also swears an oath, which is itself inconsequential from someone of his status.

These last two examples of verbal manipulation are especially evocative of Roman comedy, in which the clever slave often makes use of word play and ambiguous truths to get the better of his owner and other free persons (Stewart 2012: 175-176; Richlin 2017: 61; 314-318). In *Poenulus*, for example, the slave Milphio uses his owner Agorastacles’ own words against him (292-295):

Ag. at vide sis, cum illac numquam limavi caput.
Mi. curram igitur aliquo ad piscinam aut ad lacum, limum petam.
Ag. quid eo opust? **Mi.** ego dicam: ut illi et tibi limem caput.
Ag. i in malam rem! **Mi.** ibi sum equidem. 295

Ag. Look, I’ve never gotten dirty with that woman.
Mi. Well then, I’ll run somewhere, to a pond or lake, and get some muck.
Ag. What for? **Mi.** I’ll tell you: to muck up you and her!
Ag. Go to hell! **Mi.** I’m already there.

While de Melo views the phrase *limare caput*, literally “to cast mud¹⁰³ on the head,” as referring to kissing (de Melo 2011 45 n. 19), Wright thinks the suggestion is more sexual (1974: 71; Richlin 2005: 257 n. 292-94).¹⁰⁴ Whatever degree of euphemism present in Agorastacles’ implications, it is clear that Milphio capitalizes on Agorastacles’ usage in order to get the better of his owner. The owner uses *limavi caput* metaphorically, but the slave Milphio puns on his owner’s phrase with a literal take on *limus*, “mud.” This effectively mocks the owner, who responds in kind with the phrase *i in malam rem*.

¹⁰² Cf. Richlin 2017: 185.

¹⁰³ Whence the verb can mean “besmirch.”

¹⁰⁴ In Richlin’s notes on the phrase (*ibid.*), she offers the translation “slimed.”

Similarly, in *Amphitruo*, the god Mercury coopts the clever wit of slaves while he plays the role of the slave Sosia. Though Mercury himself is not a slave character in this play, much of his character embodies and reflects, however problematically, perceptions of slave behavior through his appropriation of the slave character Sosia's identity. Though Mercury at times transgresses what owners would have considered appropriate slave behavior, Mercury also employs a slave-like cleverness in his interactions with others, and so, in this way, he can be seen to exemplify this aspect of the clever slave in Roman comedy (1021-1027):

Me. Quis ad fores est? **Am.** ego sum. **Me.** quid 'ego sum'? **Am.** ita loquor. **Me.** tibi Iuppiter
dique omnes irati certo sunt qui sic frangas fores.
Am. quo modo? **Me.** eo modo, ut profecto vivas aetatem miser.
Am. Sosia. **Me.** ita: sum Sosia, nisi me esse oblitum existumas.
quid nunc vis? **Am.** scelesti at etiam quid velim, id tu me rogas? 1025
Me. ita, rogo. paene exfregisti, fatue, foribus cardines.
an fores censebas nobis publicitus praeberier?

Me. Who is outside? **Am.** I am. **Me.** "I am" who? **Am.** The one speaking. **Me.** Jupiter
And all the gods are surely angry with you for breaking the doors like that.
Am. How so? **Me.** Like so, that you certainly live a wretched life.
Am. Sosia. **Me.** I am Sosia, unless you think I have forgotten.
What do you want now? **Am.** Blast, what do I want, are you asking me this?
Me. Yes, I am asking. You nearly broke the hinges off the door, idiot.
Or did you think the doors were bought for us at public expense?

Mercury's employment of partial truths is especially clear in the line *sum Sosia, nisi me esse oblitum existumas*. Mercury claims to be Sosia, unless Amphitruo thinks that he, Mercury, has forgotten which character Mercury is pretending to be. Amphitruo, of course, does not recognize such an admission, and only hears something to the effect of, "That's my name, don't wear it out!" In a similar way to the slave Milphio above, Mercury throws Amphitruo's *rogas* back at him with his response, *rogo*.

Later on in the play, Mercury similarly plays with words in his interactions with Sosia, the very slave Mercury is pretending to be. When Sosia says *per Iovem iuro med esse neque me*

falsum dicere, “I swear by Jupiter that I am me and I am not lying,” Mercury responds *at ego per Mercurium iuro tibi Iovem non credere;/ nam iniurato scio plus credet mihi quam iurato tibi*, “But I swear by Mercury that Jupiter does not believe you;/ For he believes me more without swearing than he believes you with swearing” (*Am.* 435-437). Though Sosia merely speaks an expression designed to convey the seriousness of his statement, Mercury plays on the literal nature of the situation in the *Amphitruo* by commenting on the real Jupiter’s allegiances: Jupiter will believe Mercury’s Sosia over the real Sosia any day.

Just as in Plautus’s plays then, Giton capitalizes on a skillset largely showcased in the speeches of clever slaves. Utilizing the owner’s own words against him and speaking partial truths are both techniques of the clever slave in Roman comedy. The clever ways in which Giton chooses to massage or bend the truth with Encolpius place him in the role of a *servus callidus*.

Finally, Giton’s sexual manipulations can also be compared with the sex slaves and prostitutes of Roman comedy. When Eumolpus confronts Encolpius about lying in the lodgings, Giton uses his sexuality to assuage Eumolpus’s wrath (98.7-9).

Giton longe blandior quam ego, primus araneis oleo madentibus vulnus, quod in supercilio factum erat, coartavit. mox palliolo suo laceratam mutavit vestem, amplexusque iam mitigatum osculis tamquam fomentis aggressus est et ‘in tua’ inquit ‘pater carissime, in tua sumus custodia. si Gitona tuum amas, incipe velle servare. utinam me solum inimicus ignis hauriret vel hibernum invaderet mare. ego enim omnium scelerum materia, ego causa sum. si perirem, conveniret inimicis.’

Giton was far more persuasive than I. First, he treated the wound on Eumolpus’s eyebrow with spider webs soaked in oil. Then he changed out Eumolpus’s torn clothing with his own dear cloak, then hugged him, now pacified, assaulted him with kisses as though they were healing draughts, and said, “Dearest father, we are entirely in your care. If you love your Giton, save him. If only the hostile fire would swallow me alone, or the wintry sea attack me. For I am the source of all the wicked deeds, I am the cause. If I were to die, everything would be harmonious for you two rivals.”

Giton nurses Eumolpus’s wounds, providing a loving, gentle touch. What was once a *pallium*, “cloak” (91.8), now becomes the diminutive *palliolum*, “dear cloak,” as an attestation of Giton’s

care for Eumolpus (Schmeling 2011: 395 n. 7). Once Eumolpus has had time to calm down (*mitigatum*), Giton embraces and kisses him (*amplexus* and *osculis*), touching Eumolpus more explicitly sexually. Giton emphasizes the power dynamics upon which he wishes to capitalize: Eumolpus is the citizen father (*pater*), while Encolpius and Giton are his captives, the slaves in his custody (*custodia*); though Giton manipulates Eumolpus here, he frames himself and Encolpius as powerless, completely at Eumolpus's disposal. Giton goes on to present his conditional statement *si ... servare* as a simple present: "If you love your Giton, then spare him," where the *amas* can have strong sexual connotations.

Male slaves are often accused of having performed the penetrated role in sexual intercourse with their owners and others, and sometimes the slave reports receiving a reward for such a role that can be accompanied by a reclamation of their sense of agency. The freedman Trimalchio says as much about himself in the *Cena* (75.11), and, for his efforts, he reports being made his former owner's co-heir alongside Caesar (76.2). Similarly, in *Persa*, the slave Sagaristio insults the slave Paegnium for having been penetrated (284-86):

Sag. video ego te: iam incubitatus es. **Pa.** ita sum. quid id attinet ad te?
 at non sum, ita ut tu, gratis. **Sag.** confidens. **Pa.** sum hercle vero. 285
 nam ego me confido liberum fore, tu te numquam speras.

Sag. I see you: you've just been topped. **Pa.** So I have. What's it to you?
 But I have not done it for free, like you. **Sag.** Confident. **Pa.** I am indeed, by Hercules.
 For I am confident that I will be free, but you never hope to be.

The concept of a slave *incubitatus*, literally "lain upon," which I have translated here as "topped," is typical of Plautine comic invective.¹⁰⁵ Here, however, contrary to other responses to such an accusation,¹⁰⁶ we see an intriguing admission from the slave accused of being penetrated. Paegnium affirms that he has, but he will receive manumission for this act, in

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *Cas.* 362; *Epid.* 66; *Mos.* 42-3 et al. (Richlin 2017: 107-108).

¹⁰⁶ Cf. *Most.* 890-96, wherein two slaves similarly insult each other but neither admits to having been penetrated.

contrast to his insulter, Sagaristio, who has done the same thing for free. Both Trimalchio and Paegnium frame their sexual interactions with others as their own decisions. They use “I” statements, as though they were the ones who chose to do so, though they likely also encountered sexual violence. They talk about the rewards they received for their efforts, and by so doing frame their sexual experiences as reciprocal exchanges with others: sexual services for manumission. Within this reframing, they have chosen to manipulate others sexually in order to obtain their freedom.

As with Trimalchio and Paegnium, Giton chooses to capitalize on his sexual appeal to take control of the situation, benefiting both himself and Encolpius. This exchange can be read as a vignette of the kinds of scenes to which Trimalchio and Paegnium only allude: a slave demonstrates his agency through his sexual manipulation of another, which will ultimately benefit the slave in turn. While Eumolpus and Giton are never represented as engaging in sexual intercourse, as Trimalchio and Paegnium report to have done with their owners, Giton similarly manipulates Eumolpus sexually to achieve his own ends. He does not necessarily display any attraction to Eumolpus by doing so, but he recognizes the benefits he and Encolpius will attain through his sexual manipulation of Eumolpus.

Setting the Stage: Giton’s Metatheatricality

Finally, let us turn to a few examples that exhibit Giton’s metatheatricality, which too proves evocative of Roman comedy’s clever slave. Below, Giton advises Encolpius and Eumolpus on board Lichas’s ship, as the three come up with strategies for escaping Tryphaena and Lichas (101.8):

‘immo’ inquit Giton ‘persuade gubernatori ut in aliquem portum navem deducat, non sine praemio scilicet, et affirma ei impatientem maris fratrem tuum in ultimis esse. poteris

hanc simulationem et vultus confusione et lacrimis obumbrare, ut misericordia permotus gubernator indulgeat tibi.’

“No,” Giton said, “persuade the helmsman to lead the ship into some port, not without a bribe of course, and claim that your brother is at his wits’ end and cannot bear the sea. You will be able to conceal the pretense with your confused expression and tears, so that the helmsman will be moved by pity and be kind to you.”

In response to this suggestion, Eumolpus details the ways in which the plan would be folly, including the size of this ship, the likelihood of someone having become sick already, and the possibility of Lichas asking to see the sick individual (101.9-11). This back and forth continues as Encolpius suggests his own plan, which Eumolpus in turn again criticizes (102.1-7); Eumolpus then offers another, which Encolpius rejects (102.8-12). When Encolpius suggests dyeing their bodies in order to look like Ethiopian slaves, it is Giton’s turn to take up the critical response (102.14-16):

‘quidni?’ inquit Giton ‘etiam circumcide nos, ut Iudaei videamur, et pertunde aures, ut imitemur Arabes, et increta facies, ut suos Gallia cives putet: tamquam hic solus color figuram possit pervertere et non multa una oporteat consentiant, ut omni ratione mendacium constet. puta infectam medicamine faciem diutius durare posse; finge nec aquae asperginem imposituram aliquam corpori maculam nec vestem atramento adhaesuram, quod frequenter etiam non accersito ferrumine infigitur: age, numquid et labra possumus tumore taeterrimo implere? numquid et crines calamistro convertere? numquid et frontes cicatricibus scindere? numquid et crura in orbem pandere? numquid et talos ad terram deducere? numquid <et> barbam peregrina ratione figurare? color arte compositus inquinat corpus, non mutat. audite quid timenti succurrerit: praeligemus vestibus capita et nos in profundum mergamus.’

“Why not?” Giton said, “Circumcise us too, so that we seem to be Jews, and pierce our ears, so that we mimic Arabs, and chalk our faces, so that Gaul thinks we are her own citizens: like this color alone would be able to undo our shape and like it’s not necessary for many things to work together for a lie to be consistent in every way. Imagine the appearance of this stained dye could last a long while; suppose that a drop of water would not place some mark on our body and that our clothing would not cling to the black ink, clothing which often sticks even without the application of gluey dye; come now, can we also plump our lips with a most repulsive swelling? Can we also change our hair with curlers? Can we also cut our foreheads with scars? Can we open our legs in a circle and walk bow-legged? Can we bring our ankles down to the ground? Can we shape our beards in a foreign style? With skill, color stains the body, it does not change it. Listen to

what has come to assist fearful me: Let's tie our heads with our clothes and plunge into the deep.”

Giton begins his critique with sarcastic suggestions that extend, exaggerate, and parody Encolpius's own. He mocks Encolpius's plan by comparing it with correlative suggestions for adopting the appearance of other ethnic groups: circumcision for Jews, pierced ears for Arabs, and pale faces for Gauls. Giton states that many working parts are needed to strengthen a convincing lie (*multa ... consentiant*) and that dye simply stains the body without altering it (*color ... non mutat*). While these statements could imply a need to include the mannerisms and behavior required to pull off such a disguise fully, Giton never makes such a claim explicit. Giton criticizes Encolpius's suggestion that dyeing their bodies alone could work, but Giton's examples also rely only on appearances (lips, hair, forehead scars, etc.). In short, Giton frames his response as filling out the holes in Encolpius's own superficial plan, but Giton's suggestions are merely superficial fixes; the combination of these numerous visual elements works to create a more believable disguise, or so Giton would seem to claim.¹⁰⁷

Schmeling views Eumolpus as stage director here (2011: 403 n. 7), especially with the narration that Eumolpus *iubet quemquam suam sententiam promere*, “orders each of us to offer our own opinion,” which starts off this interchange. The meta-theatrical elements present in Giton's initial recommendation and subsequent response to Encolpius, however, suggest that Giton too has taken on some level of stage direction. Giton suggests that persuasion, bribery, a confused expression, and tears all will work to sway the helmsman to their side. The last two in particular highlight performative expressions designed to stir the helmsman to pity. Likewise, in Giton's response to Encolpius, Giton takes on the role of a stage director, a better one than

¹⁰⁷ Panayotakis views Giton's suggestions as critiquing and ridiculing the disguise-motif as a whole (1995: 148), but Giton's point could emphasize the use of dye alone as the problem, not disguises in general. In this, Giton may not highlight the failings of the concept, but rather Encolpius's naïve suggested method of execution.

wherein he advises the use of tears to convince the helmsman, discussed above. Both similarly include the stage direction to induce crying as a means of instilling pity and providing credibility. Toxilus goes on to describe the clothing that the fake seller, who will be the slave Sagaristio, and Saturio's daughter should wear: both should look like foreigners (*peregrinus; in peregrinum modum*). While Giton's descriptions focus on a foreigner's physical markers (102.14-16), and Toxilus's are purely sartorial, both are lists of visual clues to signify foreignness. Saturio does in fact carry out Toxilus's plan (Pl. *Per.* 463-65), while Giton merely frames the list of visual makers as impossible to achieve, but both convey the imagery needed for a successful disguise. Toxilus thus lists all the accoutrements that Sagaristio should wear in order to appear as a foreigner, just as Giton does for his trio on board Lichas's ship.

Moreover, Giton's recognition of the necessities for such a performance can be compared to a similar recognition demonstrated in *Pseudolus*. Here, the clever slave Pseudolus interrogates Charinus about the capabilities of another clever slave, Simia (*Ps.* 735-48):

Ps. etiam opust chlamyde et machaera et petaso. **Ch.** possum a me dare. 735
Ps. di immortales! non Charinus mihi hicquidem, sed Copiast.
 sed iste servos ex Carysto qui hic adest ecquid sapit?
Ch. hircum ab alis. **Ps.** manuleatam tunicam habere hominem addecet.
 ecquid is homo habet aceti in pectore? **Ch.** atque acidissumi.
Ps. quid, si opu' sit ut dulce promat indidem, ecquid habet? **Ch.** rogas? 740
 murrinam, passum, defrutum, mellam, mel quoivismodi;
 quin in corde instruere quondam coepit pantopolium.
Ps. eugepae! lepide, Charine, meo me ludo lamberas.
 sed quid nomen esse dicam ego isti servo? **Ch.** Simiae. 745
Ps. scitne in re advorsa vorsari? **Ch.** turbo non aequae citust.
Ps. ecquid argutust? **Ch.** malorum facinorum saepissime.
Ps. quid quom manifesto tenetur? **Ch.** anguillast, elabitur.
Ps. ecquid is homo scitust? **Ch.** plebi scitum non est scitius.

Ps. Also I need a cloak and a sword and a hat. **Ch.** I can provide those myself.
Ps. Good gods! This guy's name doesn't just mean Favor, but Abundance.
 But that slave from Carystus who's here, has he any whiff of sharpness?
Ch. Very pungent; his armpits smell like goat. **Ps.** He should wear long-sleeves.
 Does he have any vinegar in his chest? **Ch.** Yes, he's bitterly sharp.

Ps. What if he needs to bring out sweetness too, does he have this? **Ch.** You have to ask? Myrrh wine, raisin wine, grape liqueur, honey wine, any kind of honey; Why he once intended to set up a bazaar in his heart.
Ps. Wonderful! Well done! You have beaten me at my own game splendidly, Charinus. But what shall I call this slave? **Ch.** Simia.
Ps. Does he know where to turn when things turn sour? **Ch.** A whirlwind doesn't turn as fast.
Ps. Is he of sound judgement? **Ch.** Mostly of wicked crimes.
Ps. What about when he is caught red-handed? **Ch.** He is an eel, he slips away.
Ps. Is he willful? **Ch.** The will of the people is not more willful.

First, as with Toxilus above, Pseudolus details the clothing he requires for Simia to pull off his scheme. He then asks Charinus numerous important questions regarding Simia's capabilities: is he smart, does he have a sharp wit, can he be sweetly persuasive, can he get out of a tight situation? In short, aside from the visual accoutrements with which he will be disguised, can Simia successfully perform the role that Pseudolus requires of him? This is the perspective that Giton has adopted in his engagement with Encolpius's suggestion. Giton's response is framed sarcastically, and he ultimately rejects Encolpius's idea, but he walks through the steps required of such a performance in the same way that Pseudolus questions Charinus. In their respective interrogation and critical response, both simultaneously detail all the necessities of a convincing performance, and by so doing convey their own understanding of the inner workings for such a performance.

While Panayotakis does well to analyze the performative aspects of all of these farcical scenarios in Petronius (1995: 144-9), especially the prevalence of the disguise motif in Roman comedy, we should also emphasize the essential role of slaves as the facilitators of such a motif: the clever slave, Simia, dresses up in the garb of a soldier's slave (Pl. *Ps.* 905ff.), but does so through the clever slave Pseudolus's planning (Pl. *Ps.* esp. 735); Sagaristio and Saturio's

daughter dress up as foreigners at the clever slave Toxilus's design (Pl. *Per.* 151-8).¹⁰⁹ In short, this sort of stratagem is the clever slave's realm of expertise,¹¹⁰ and Giton demonstrates this understanding in his treatment of Encolpius's superficial suggestion of dyeing themselves with ink.

Giton thus exhibits many characteristics exemplified by the slaves of Roman comedy. Petronius therefore does not only incorporate the comic tradition generically or thematically, but also as a quintessential element in his development of his characters. Petronius incorporates the farcical scenarios and plotlines of mime and Roman comedy, but also engages with the comic tradition's representation of slaves in a more nuanced and complex way than originally perceived. As much as Giton is the factotum slave, the sex slave, and Encolpius's slave, he is also the comic slave.

Considering the parallels between Giton's agency, resistance, and cleverness and that of the slaves of Roman comedy, we may also consider comparing the motivations for both parties. The slaves of comedy never act without a purpose, and most often personal gain or the possibility of manumission motivates these actions: we saw Paegnium of *Persa* (284-86) admit to being penetrated for the goal of manumission (see above: 114-115), the titular character of *Pseudolus* earns a bundle of money for his efforts, and Epidicus is manumitted for unintentionally reuniting his owner with his owner's daughter, a result of Epidicus's stratagems.

¹⁰⁹ Similarly, the slave steward Collybiscus dresses up as a foreigner (*Poen.* 578ff.), but through the clever slave Milphio's strategy to aid his owner (*Poen.* esp. 425).

¹¹⁰ Are Eumolpus and Encolpius taking on slave roles in their participation in this brainstorm of stratagems? A detailed analysis of other characters' performance of status must be relegated to forthcoming publications, but there are several ways in which one can answer "yes." For instance, when Eumolpus suggests hiding the pair in leather skins, scholars have noted the similarities to the story of Cleopatra hiding in a rug or mattress in order to meet with Caesar (Panayotakis 1995: 147; Schmeling 2011: 405 n. 8). If this were the case, Eumolpus takes on the role of Apollodorus, Cleopatra's slave, who hides Cleopatra (Plut. *Caes.* 49).

In Giton's case, we should consider whether he hopes his own slave cleverness will result in freedom too.

CONCLUSION

The most immediate purpose of the dissertation has been to analyze Giton's representations of slavery in order to glean a more complete perception of Giton's character and Petronius's novel. This is not to say that this is the only framework within which we should view Giton, but that studying Giton in this way has provided fruitful avenues of exploration with which to engage in Petronius's characterization of his novel's actors and the broader literary tradition at play. Understanding Petronius's characterization of Giton as a slave *factotum*, as a slave sex object, as Encolpius's slave, and as a comic slave highlights the complexities behind Petronius's creation of Giton and Petronius's narrative as a whole. This multifaceted, multivalent aspect of Giton's character can provide further insight into the implications of the novel and its characters, as I will argue below. The methodology of this dissertation also provides a framework for investigating other texts, similarly lacunose or otherwise. Whereas reliance on explicit textual evidence for characters' legal statuses can constrain our perceptions and interpretations of those characters, a performative approach investigating the implications behind a character's actions and interactions with others can reveal intrinsic details about those characters, the literary parallels involved, and the potential for representations of non-literary realities.

First and foremost are the implications for our understanding of the character Giton. If Giton performs slavery and others interact with him accordingly, as this dissertation attests, then all of the interactions between Giton and other characters can take on a new valence; the performance and perception of his slave status can inform every interaction he has in the novel. We can see an explanation for his mistreatment, his objectification, and the denial of his subjectivity that cannot be relegated to his age, his reported attractiveness, or his relationship

with Encolpius alone. His slave status performance provides a complex social environment in which his status is negotiated and reinforced in his interactions with others consistently, and such interactions no doubt require further analysis beyond even the contents of this dissertation.

We can also issue a response to the debate over Giton's slave, freedman, or freeborn status. As this dissertation has emphasized, Giton's performance of slavery proves to be a most salient feature of Giton's character, and so we can say that Giton is a slave in that his performance of status suggests that he is a slave. A more definitive position, however, is likely more complicated than an answer of simply "free" or "slave." It is entirely possible that he was freeborn before coming into Tryphaena's possession, performed the role of her sex slave, then subsequently escaped only to perform the role of Encolpius's and Ascyltos's sex slave. Therefore, Giton could have been free prior to his time with Tryphaena, then a slave of Tryphaena, and finally quasi-free with Encolpius and Ascyltos; if he was a runaway slave with Encolpius, he enjoyed certain freedoms while on the run, but he was also constantly under the purview of either Encolpius, Ascyltos, or Eumolpus, so his freedoms were limited. If he was ever free, Giton is never represented as enfranchised to exercise the rights of such a position. Even in Giton's performance of slavery, Encolpius never exercises any legal command over Giton; Encolpius's use of the word *iniuria* (Chapter 3: 79-80, 83; Chapter 4: 108-109; cf. Chapter 2: 55), for example, is never followed up with legal action. In short, for the entirety of the novel as it survives, Giton remains in a place of legal liminality, wherein his performance of slavery overrides any definitive legal status.

Moreover, this dissertation showcases Petronius's representations of the performance of slavery, and, in turn, the broader literary representations of slavery upon which Petronius builds. In Petronius's incorporation of the literary tradition's representations of the performance

of slavery, we can see an engagement with Roman culture's perceptions of what it means to be a slave in the literary world. This literary tradition is perhaps clearest in Giton's embodiment of the clever slave of Roman comedy, but we have also seen how Petronius incorporates literary representations of other slave roles, sexual objectification of slaves, and slave relationships with their owners. In this, Petronius does not utilize any one author or genre, but provides an amalgamation of slave representations which Giton embodies. Moreover, other characters can be considered to perform slavery in Petronius, including the slaves of Trimalchio's *Cena* and even Encolpius and Eumolpus (see esp. Chapter 4: 121 n. 110). These slave performances and their implications have yet to be explored, but their contribution towards a fuller understanding of these characters and the *Satyrical* will prove invaluable.

To the extent that we wish to envision these literary representations as holding a degree of application to the non-literary world, they can provide significant implications for Petronius's and like-minded people's perceptions of the performance of slavery outside of literature. We have seen some of the ways in which Petronius's literary representations coincide with non-literary evidence, as exemplified in the similarity between the crier's words, announcing a reward for the return of Giton (97.2), and the inscription on the Zoninus collar, offering a similar reward for a runaway slave (*CIL* 15 (2) 7194; see Chapter 1: 47). That these literary representations of slavery have direct parallels in the material record suggests that Petronius incorporates realistic elements of the performance of slavery in his novel that cannot be dismissed as mere inventions. This connection necessarily implies that some of the ways in which Petronius represents Giton's performance of slavery can have broader implications for Petronius's and, more broadly, certain Romans' perceptions of non-literary slaves. What it means to be a slave in the literary world and what it means in the non-literary world are not

mutually exclusive categories, and so Giton's performance in the *Satyrica* can shed light on our understanding of slaves, their performance of their status, and others' interactions with them beyond the *Satyrica*.

In addition to the typical tasks and roles that owners expected slaves to perform (see esp. Chapter 1), Giton's character and his relationships with others can attest to the kinds of interactions we can expect to have taken place between non-slaves and slaves. Others' objectification of Giton (see Chapter 2), the sexual violence Giton reports that Ascylos has committed against him (see Chapter 2: 63-67), and the physical abuse from Encolpius (see Chapter 3: 84-86) all support what we know about the lived experiences of slaves before, during, and after this time period.

Relatedly, this dissertation provides broader implications for the Romans' sexualization of slaves, of which Giton represents one complicated aspect. On the one hand, Giton was subjected to sexual abuse, but on the other Giton manipulates others through his sex appeal. Because of this juxtaposition of abuse and objectification alongside agency, Giton's character highlights that we should view slave status and slave sexualization as a negotiation between slaves and others, in which a slave's own performance plays a vital role. A non-slave alone does not dictate a slave's status, but this status is reinforced and renegotiated in the interactions between non-slave and slave. In these interactions exists the possibility of failing in the performance of slavery, as when Giton laughs at the insults the freedman Hermeros hurls against Ascylos; these failed performances are often met with subsequent abuse, as we saw when Hermeros turns his invective against Giton himself. Other interactions demonstrate the known sexual abuse slaves experienced; whether we wish to believe Giton's account of his rape at the hands of Ascylos (see Chapter 2: 63-67), the believability of this account for Encolpius and the

novel's readers should not be in question. Even in situations when the slave plays the penetrating role, as we saw with Quartilla and Pannychis, the slave is not in control of his own body (see Chapter 2: 68-74).

But in these interactions also lie opportunities for resistance, as when Encolpius describes Giton as unwilling to play the slave role for Ascyrtos in the baths (see Chapter 1: 30-32). Moreover, in addition to the abuse and objectification of the slave, there also lies the opportunity for sexual manipulation on the part of the slave through the slave's sex appeal (see Chapter 4: 113-115) or in the threat of its removal (see Chapter 2: 60; Chapter 4: 107-108), something we also find in Plautus (see Chapter 4: 113-115). Through Giton, we can see how slaves recognized and could capitalize on their sexualization, and how non-slaves recognized this potential for sexual manipulation on the part of slaves.

Moreover, Petronius especially highlights the tension between a non-slave's denial or reduction of a slave's agency on the one hand with a slave's circumstantial autonomy on the other. We can see this especially exemplified when Encolpius instrumentalizes Giton to the chalk Giton employs (see Chapter 1: 38-40), but this objectification proves at odds with the required foresight, agency, and know-how to come up with such a plan in the first place. We can see this as emblematic of Roman citizens' own tension reconciling the objectification of living property with the fact that a slave was capable of independent, rational thought. Giton embodies this tension in the novel, and the denial of Giton's subjectivity in Chapters 1-3 of this dissertation is complicated by the agency and intelligence that Giton expresses especially in Chapter 4.

Beyond this dissertation lies the opportunity to explore the ways in which Petronius plays with the performance of status in general, not just of slavery. Encolpius, Eumolpus, Ascyrtos, and many others prove just as multifaceted as Giton in respect to their performed statuses, and a

sustained treatment of each character's status performance will prove informative for our understanding of the *Satyrice* as a whole. Relatedly, framing these status performances in light of Nero's own complication of status expectations during his reign could prove equally fruitful. As emperor, Nero performed on stage as an actor,¹¹¹ a role that the elite generally disrespected as lowly and equating to prostitution.¹¹² Moreover, Claudius and Nero expanded slaves' and freedmen's involvement and influence in the imperial administration,¹¹³ potentially threatening elites' views on their own social positions and power. An overall treatment of status in Petronius could frame the *Satyrice* as a broader social commentary on the mutability and inconsistency of status during Nero's reign. The complexities behind Giton's own performance of his status can be seen as emblematic of this larger theme in Petronius.

¹¹¹ For a comprehensive discussion on this topic, see esp. Bartsch 1994, who notes how Nero shifts the audience from spectators to performers themselves. In the first appendix of this work, Bartsch also briefly engages with the *Cena* as theater and the ways in which this can be seen as reflective of Nero's reign. Other scholars have noticed these parallels as well (Crum 1952; Walsh 1970; Sandy 1974; Bartsch 1994: 199), but much of the focus lies on the dramatic theatrics of the *Cena* specifically and their relationship to Nero's own theatricality. A broader look at social performance and the confounding of status during Nero's time could open such a line of inquiry to the whole of the *Satyrice* and not just the *Cena*.

¹¹² See esp. Edwards 1997 and Duncan 2006, the latter of whom focuses on Plautus but also cites later republican laws and sentiments regarding the *infamia* of both prostitutes and actors (e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 45.3; Cic. *Rep.* 4.10; Duncan 2006: 255). Roman connections between these two groups continued into the imperial period (Dupont 1985: 95; Edwards 1997; Flemming 1999; French 1998; Duncan 2006: 271 n. 5).

¹¹³ See Wallace-Hadrill 1996; Weaver 2005; Acton 2011: esp. 113.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot, Frank Frost. 1907. "The Use of Language as a Means of Characterization in Petronius." *Classical Philology* 2: 43-50.
- Acton, Karen. 2011. "Vespasian and the Social World of the Roman Court." *The American Journal of Philology* 132, 1: 103-124.
- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Duckworth.
- Astbury, R. 1977. "Petronius, *P. Oxy.* 3010, and Menippean Satire." *Classical Philology* 72: 22-31.
- Auerbach, Erich. 1953. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. (W.R. Trask, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Harvard University Press.
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 1969. *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome*. McGraw-Hill.
- Barnes, E. 1971. *The Poems of Petronius* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto.
- Bartsch, Shadi. 1994. *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Harvard University Press.
- Bielfeldt, Ruth. 2018. "Candelabrus and Trimalchio: Embodied Histories of Roman Lampstands and their Slaves." *Art History* 41, 3: 420-443.
- Blood, H. Christian. 2014. *Stifling 'Scare Figures.'* Paper presented in the SCS panel Stifling Sexuality? Chicago, IL.
- Bodel, John Putnam. 1984. *Freedmen in the Satyricon of Petronius* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (Accession No. 8502770).
- . 1994. "Trimalchio's Underworld," in *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, ed. James

- Tatum: 237-259. John Hopkins University Press.
- Bradley, K. R. 1987. *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control*.
Oxford University Press.
- Brickell, Chris. 2005. "Masculinities, Performativity, and Subversion: A Sociological Reappraisal." *Men and Masculinities* 8, 1: 24-43.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1996. *The Culture of Education*. Harvard University Press.
- Bruns, C.G. 1909. *Fontes iuris Romani antique*, 7th ed. Gradenwitz.
- Bungard, Christopher. 2015. "Negotiating Mastery: Staging Status in Pseudolus." *The Classical Journal* 111, 1: 67-81.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge.
- . 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* Routledge.
- Cambron-Goulet, Mathilde. 2017. "Social Performance in Synesius' Letters." *Phoenix* 71, 1/2: 119-137.
- Clark, Konnor. 2015. "Morigerus: The Masculine, Servile, and Homoerotic Prevalence of 'Wifely' Behavior." MA thesis. SUNY Buffalo.
- Clarke, John R. *Looking at Lovemaking: Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art 100 B.C.—A.D. 250*. University of California Press.
- Connors, Catherine M. 1998. *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon*.
Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. "Monkey Business: Imitation, Authenticity, and Identity from Pithekoussai to Plautus." *Classical Antiquity* 23, 2: 179-207.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 1996. *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon* (Elaine Fantham, Trans.). University of California Press.

- Corbeill, Anthony. 2015. *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*. Princeton University Press.
- Courtney, Edward. 1962. "Parody and Literary Allusion in Menippean Satire." *Philologus* 106: 86-100.
- . 2001. *A Companion to Petronius*. Oxford University Press.
- Crum, Richard H. "Petronius and the Emperors." *Classical World* 45: 161-167; 197-201.
- Davies, Glenys. 2005. "What Made the Roman Toga *virilis*?" in *The Clothed Body in the Ancient World*, eds. Liza Cleland, Mary Harlow, Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones: 121-130. Oxbow Books.
- Dolansky, Fanny. 2008. "Togam Virilem Sumere: Coming of Age in the Roman World," in *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, eds. Jonathan Edmondson and Alison Keith: 47-70. University of Toronto Press.
- Dyck, A.R. 2001. "Dressing to Kill: Attire as a Proof and Means of Characterisation in Cicero's Speeches." *Arethusa* 34: 119-30.
- Duncan, Anne. 2006. "Infamous Performers: Comic Actors and Female Prostitutes in Rome," in *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, eds. Christopher A. Faraone and Laura McClure: 252-273. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dupont, F. 1985. *L'acteur-roi, ou, Le théâtre dans la Rome antique*. Belles Lettres.
- Eschebach, H. 1979. *Die Stabianer Thermen in Pompeji*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Edwards, Catharine. 1997. "Unspeakable Professions: Public Performance and Prostitution in Ancient Rome," in *Roman Sexualities*, eds. Judith P. Hallett and Marilyn B. Skinner: 66-95. Princeton University Press.
- Evans, R.J. 1999. "Displaying Honourable Scars: A Roman Gimmick." *Acta Classica* 42: 77-94.
- Fagan, G.G. 2002. *Bathing in Public in the Roman World*. University of Michigan Press.

- Ferri, R. 1988. "Il ciclope di Eumolpo e il ciclope di Petronio: *Sat.* 100 ss." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 20-1: 311-15.
- Finley, M.I. 1980. *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*. Viking.
- Finnegan, Ruth. 1969. "How to Do Things with Words: Performative Utterances Among the Limba of Sierra Leone." *Man* 4, 4: 537-552.
- Flax, Jane. 1990. *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*. University of California Press.
- Flemming, R. 1999. "*Quae corpore quaestum fecit*: The Sexual Economy of Female Prostitution in the Roman Empire." *Journal of Roman Studies* 89: 38-61.
- Fletcher, K.F.B. 2017. "Characterization through the use of Myth in Plautus' *Menaechmi*." *Syllecta Classica* 28: 25-50.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1: An Introduction. Trans. R. Hurley. Vintage Books.
- . 1986. *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure. Trans. R. Hurley. Vintage Books.
- . 1988. *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 3: The Care of the Self. Trans. R. Hurley. Vintage Books.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 2007. *Plautine Elements in Plautus*. Oxford University Press.
- Fredrick, David. 1995. "Beyond the Atrium to Ariadne: Erotic Painting and Visual Pleasure in the Roman House." *Classical Antiquity* 14, 2: 266-288.
- French, D.R. 1998. "Maintaining Boundaries: The Status of Actresses in Early Christian Society." *Vigiliae Christianae* 52: 293-318.
- Frye, N. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton University Press.

- George, Michele. 2008. "The 'Dark Side' of the Toga," in *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, eds. Jonathan Edmondson and Alison Keith: 94-112. University of Toronto Press.
- George, Peter. 1966. "Style and Character in the *Satyricon*." *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 5, 3: 336-358.
- Gleason, Maud W. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton University Press.
- Goffman, E. 1956. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Doubleday.
- . 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Prentice-Hall.
- . 1974. *Frame Analysis*. Harper and Row.
- . 1983. "Felicity's Condition." *American Journal of Sociology* 89, 1: 1-51.
- Gowers, Emily. 2002. "Blind Eyes and Cut Throats: Amnesia and Silence in Horace "Satires" 1.7." *Classical Philology* 97, 2: 145-161.
- Guano, Emanuela. 2007. "Respectable Ladies and Uncouth Men: The Performative Poetics of Class and Gender in the Public Realm in an Italian City." *Journal of American Folklore* 120, 475: 48-72.
- Hallet, Judith P. and Marilyn B. Skinner, eds. 1997. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton University Press.
- Hayes, Sharon. 2014. *Sex, Love and Abuse: Discourses on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Halperin, David M. 1990. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*. Routledge.
- Henderson, Jeffrey. 1999. "Hanno's Punic Heirs: Der Poenulus-Neid des Plautus," in *Writing*

- Down Rome: Satire, Comedy and other Offences in Latin Poetry*, ed. Jeffrey Henderson: 3–37. Oxford University Press.
- Herrmann-Otto, Elisabeth. 2009. *Sklaverei und Freilassung in der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Georg Olms Verlag.
- Hinard, François. 1985. *Les Proscriptions de la Rome Républicaine*. École Française de Rome.
- Hölscher, Tonio. 2008. “The Concept of Roles and the Malaise of ‘Identity’: Ancient Rome and the Modern World.” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Supplementary Volumes 7*: 41-56.
- Hubbard, Thomas K. 1986. “The Narrative Architecture of Petronius’ Satyricon.” *L’Antiquité Classique 55*: 190-212.
- , ed. 2014. *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Huntley, Katherine V. 2011. “Identifying Roman Graffiti in Roman Campania: A Developmental Psychological Approach,” in *Ancient Graffiti in Context*, eds. J.A. Baird and Claire Taylor: 69-89. Routledge.
- Jaycox, Lisa H., Lori Zoellner, and Edna B. Foa. 2002. “Cognitive-Behavior Therapy for PTSD in Rape Survivors.” *Journal of Clinical Psychology 58*, 8: 891-906.
- Joshel, Sandra. R. 1992. *Work, Identity and Legal Status at Rome: A Study of the Occupational Inscriptions*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- . 2010. *Slavery in the Roman World*. Cambridge University Press.
- Joshel, Sandra R. and Sheila Murnaghan. 1998. “Introduction: Differential Equations,” in *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, eds. Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan: 1-21. Routledge.
- Joshel, Sandra R. and Lauren Hackworth Petersen. 2014. *The Material Life of Roman Slaves*.

- Cambridge University Press.
- Just, Roger. 1985. "Freedom, Slavery and the Female Psyche." *History of Political Thought* 6, 1: 169-188.
- Kamen, Deborah. 2010. "A Corpus of Inscriptions: Representing Slave Marks in Antiquity." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 55: 95-110.
- . 2011. "Slave Agency and Resistance in Martial," in *Reading Ancient Slavery*, eds. Richard Alston, Edith Hall, and Laura Proffitt: 192-203. Bristol Classical Press.
- . 2013. *Status in Classical Athens*. Princeton University Press.
- Kamen, Deborah and Sarah Levin-Richardson. 2015. "Revisiting Roman Sexuality: Agency and the Conceptualization of Penetrated Males," in *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, eds. Mark Masterson, Nancy Rabinowitz, and James Robson: 449-460. Routledge.
- Kaster, Robert A. 2005. *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*. Oxford University Press.
- Keegan, Peter. 2013. "Reading the 'Pages' of the *Domus Caesaris: Pueri Delicati*, Slave Education, and the Graffiti of the Palatine Paedagogium," in *Roman Slavery and Roman Material Culture*, ed. Michele George: 69-98. University of Toronto Press.
- Koss, Mary P. 1995. "Hidden Rape: Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Students in Higher Education," in *Rape and Society: Readings on the Problem of Sexual Assault*, eds. Patricia Searles and Ronald J. Berger: Westview Press.
- Krostenko, Brian A. 2001. *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*. University of Chicago Press.
- Labate, M. 1996. "Petronio, *Satyricon* 80-81." *MD* 35: 165-75.

- Laes, Christian. 2008. "Child Slaves at Work in Roman Antiquity." *Ancient Society* 38: 235-283.
- Langlands, Rebecca. 2006. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leeman, Anton. 1967. "Morte e cambio nel romanzo picaresco di Petronio." *Giornale italiano di filologia: rivista trimestrale di cultura* 20: 147-57.
- Lenski, Noel. 2013. "Working Models: Functional Art and Roman Conceptions of Slavery," in *Roman Slavery and Roman Material Culture*, ed. Michele George: 129-157. University of Toronto Press.
- Levin-Richardson, Sarah. 2011. "Facilis hic futuit: Graffiti and Masculinity in Pompeii's 'Purpose-Built' Brothel." *Helios* 38, 1: 59-78.
- Lindsay, W.M., ed. 1904 *T. Macci Plavti Comoediae*, v. 1. Oxford University Press.
- , ed. 1905. *T. Macci Plavti Comoediae*, v. 2. Oxford University Press.
- Lippman, Michael. 2015. "Embodying the Mask: Exploring Ancient Roman Comedy Through Masks and Movement." *The Classical Journal* 111, 1: 25-46.
- Lowe, J.C.B. 1985. "Cooks in Plautus." *Classical Antiquity* 4, 1: 72-102.
- . 1989. "The Virgo Callida of Plautus, Persa." *The Classical Quarterly* 39, 2: 390-399.
- Makowski, John F. 2012. "Petronius' Giton: Gender and Genre in the *Satyrica*," in *Narrating Desire: Eros, Sex, and Gender in the Ancient Novel*, eds. Marília P. Futre Pinheiro, Marilyn B. Skinner, and Froma I. Zeitlin: 223-233. Walter de Gruyter.
- Marchesi, Ilaria. 2005. "Traces of Freed Language: Horace, Petronius, and the Rhetoric of Fable." *Classical Antiquity* 24, 2: 307-330.
- Marshall, C.W. 2006. *The Stagecraft and Performance of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge University Press.

- Melo, Wolfgang David Cirilo de. 2012. *Plautus. Volume VI* (Loeb classical library; 260).
Harvard University Press.
- Müller, Konrad. 1995. *Petronii Arbitri: Satyricon Reliquiae*. Teubner.
- Nagore, Josefina, ed. 2003. *Estrategias intertextuales en la narrativa latina: El Satyricon de Petronio*. Editorial Universitaria de Buenos Aires.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 1995. "Objectification." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 24, 4: 249-291.
- Nuttall, A. 2004. "Auerbach's 'Mimesis'." *Essays in Criticism* 54, 1: 60-74.
- Olson, Kelly. 2014. "Masculinity, Appearance, and Sexuality: Dandies in Roman Antiquity." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 23, 2: 182-205.
- Ormand, Kirk. 2009. *Controlling Desires: Sexuality in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Praeger.
- Panayotakis, Costas. 1995. *Theatrum Arbitri: Theatrical Elements in the Satyricon of Petronius*.
Brill.
- Parker, Holt. 1989. "Crucially Funny or Tranio on the Couch: The *Servus Callidus* and Jokes About Torture." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 119: 233-246.
- . 1997. "The Teratogenic Grid," in *Roman Sexualities*, eds. Judith P. Hallett and Marilyn B. Skinner: 47-65. Princeton University Press.
- . 1998. "Loyal Slaves and Loyal Wives: The Crisis of the Outsider-Within and Roman *exemplum* Literature," in *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, eds. Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan: 152-173. Routledge.
- Perry, Matthew J. 2015. "Sexual Damage to Slaves in Roman Law." *Journal of Ancient History* 3, 1: 55-75.
- Petersen, Lauren Hackworth. 2006. *The Freedman in Roman Art and Art History*. Cambridge University Press.

- Petrides, Antonis K. 2014. "Plautus between Greek Comedy and Atellan Farce: Assessments and Reassessments," in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, eds. Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro: 424-444. Oxford University Press.
- Prag, Jonathan and Ian Repath, eds. 2009. *Petronius: A Handbook*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rankine, Patrice. 2011. "Odysseus as Slave: The Ritual of Domination and Social Death in Homeric Society," in *Reading Ancient Slavery*, eds. Richard Alston, Edith Hall, and Laura Proffitt: 34-50. Bristol Classical Press.
- Richlin, Amy. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. 2nd ed. Yale University Press.
- . 1993. "Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the Cinaedus and the Roman Law against Love between Men." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3, 4: 523-573.
- . 2005. *Rome and the Mysterious Orient: Three Plays by Plautus*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- . 2009. "Sex in the *Satyrice*: Outlaws in Literatureland." In *Petronius: A Handbook*, eds. Jonathan Prag and Ian Repath, 882-100. Wiley-Blackwell.
- . 2014. "Talking to Slaves in the Plautine Audience." *Classical Antiquity* 33, 1: 174-226.
- . 2015. "Reading Boy-Love and Child-Love in the Greco-Roman World," in *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, eds. Mark Masterson, Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz, and James Robson: 352-373. Routledge.
- . 2017. *Slave Theater in the Roman Republic: Plautus and Popular Comedy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rimell, Victoria. 2002. *Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rolfe, John Carew. 1914. *Suetonius*. Harvard University Press.

- Roller, Matthew B. 2017. *Dining Posture in Ancient Rome: Bodies, Values, and Status*. Princeton University Press.
- Sabnis, Sonia. 2012. "Invisible Slaves, Visible Lamps: A Metaphor in Apuleius." *Arethusa* 45, 1: 79-108.
- Sandy, G.N. 1974. "Scaenica Petroniana." *TAPA* 104: 329-46.
- Scafoglio, Giampiero. 2005. "Plautus and Ennius: A Note on Plautus, *Bacchides* 962-5." *The Classical Quarterly* 55, 2: 632-638.
- Schmeling, Gareth. 1971. "The *Satyricon*: Forms in Search of a Genre." *The Classical Bulletin* 47: 49-53.
- . 1996. "Genre and the *Satyricon*: Menippean Satire and the Novel," in *Satura Lanx: Festschrift für Werner Krenkel zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. C. Klodt: 105-17. Olms.
- . 1999. "Petronius and the *Satyricon*," in *Latin Fiction: The Latin Novel in Context*, ed. Heinz Hofmann: 23-37. Routledge.
- . 2011. *A Commentary on the Satyricon of Petronius*. Oxford University Press.
- Scholz, B.I. 1992. *Untersuchungen zur Tracht der römischen Matrona*. Cologne and Weimar.
- Searles, Patricia and Ronald J. Berger, eds. 1995. *Rape and Society: Readings on the Problem of Sexual Assault*. Westview Press.
- Sebesta, J.L. 2001. "Symbolism in the Costume of Roman Women," in *The World of Roman Costume*, eds. Judith Lynn Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante: 46-53. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 1990. *Epistemology of the Closet*. University of California Press.
- Severy-Hoven, Beth. 2014. *The Satyricon of Petronius*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Skinner, Marilyn B. 2014. "Feminist Theory," in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*,

- ed. Thomas K. Hubbard: 1-16. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Slater, Niall W. 1985. *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind*. Princeton University Press.
- . 1990. *Reading Petronius*. Baltimore/London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Spiegel, David. 1986. "Dissociation, Double Binds, and Posttraumatic Stress in Multiple Personality Disorder," in *Treatment of Multiple Personality Disorder*, ed. Bennett G. Braun: 61-78. American Psychiatric Press.
- Steele, H. Meili. 1998. *Realism and the Drama of Reference*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Stevenson, Brenda E. 2012. *Performing Social Status in Slavery and Freedom: Southern Black Marriage Rituals, 1840-1900* [Video]. Retrieved from <https://www.americanacademy.de/videoaudio/performing-social-status-slavery-freedom/>
- Stewart, Roberta. 2012. *Plautus and Roman Slavery*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stone, Shelley. 2001. "The Toga: From National to Ceremonial Costume," in *The World of Roman Costume*, eds. Judith Lynn Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante: 13-45. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sullivan, John P. 1968. *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study*. Faber & Faber.
- Trainer, Sarah. 2017. "Piety, Glamour, and Protest: Performing Social Status and Affiliation in the United Arab Emirates." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 46, 3: 361-386.
- Trimble, Jennifer. 2016. "The Zoninus Collar and the Archaeology of Roman Slavery." *American Journal of Archaeology* 120, 3: 447-472.
- Vannini, Giulio. 2007. *Petronius 1975-2005: bilancio critico eu nuove proposte = Lustrum* 49: 7-511.

- Vine, Brent. 2009. Review of J. Clackson and G. Horrocks, *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2009.03.21.
- Walker, Lenore E. 1979. *The Battered Woman*. Harper & Row.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 1996. "The Imperial Court." *CAH* 10: 283-308.
- Walsh, P.G. 1970. *The Roman Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1996. *Petronius The Satyricon*. Clarendon Press.
- Walters, Jonathan. 1997. "Invading the Roman Body: Manliness and Impenetrability in Roman Thought," in *Roman Sexualities*, eds. Judith P. Hallett and Marilyn B. Skinner: 29-43. Princeton University Press.
- Warmington, E.H., ed. 1969. *Petronius: Satyricon; Seneca Apocolocyntosis*. (Rev. ed.). Harvard University Press.
- Watson, Alan. 1987. *Roman Slave Law*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Weaver, Paul. 2005. "Phaon, Freedman of Nero." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 151: 243-252
- Welleck, R. and R. Warren. 1956. *Theory of Literature*. Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Whiteley, Peter. 2003. "Do 'Language Rights' Serve Indigenous Interests? Some Hopi and Other Queries." *American Anthropologist* 105, 4: 712-722.
- Wiedemann, Thomas. 1981. *Greek and Roman Slavery*. Taylor & Francis.
- . 1987. *Slavery: Greece and Rome, New Surveys in the Classics* 19. Oxford University Press.
- Williams, Craig A. 2010. *Roman Homosexuality*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, L.M. 1924. *The Roman Toga*. John Hopkins Press.

———. 1938. *The Clothing of the Ancient Romans*. John Hopkins Press.