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1. The Satyricon is a unique masterpiece of ancient literature that combines many outstanding qualities. Its author created a multi-layered work of fiction, alternating scenes of highly fantastic character with episodes in settings which prima facie appear like realistic representations of everyday life among the lower classes of Roman society.

In episodes of the latter kind, Petronius leads modern readers into a world that is rarely documented in ancient literature outside the Satyricon and hardly recoverable from other sources. The reader is confronted with the spectacular business career and the peculiar world views of the obscenely wealthy freedman Trimalchio, who epitomizes the literary figure of the newly rich but unrefined upstart. Furthermore, one can overhear
the chit-chat of other, less wealthy but equally vulgar, members of his class\textsuperscript{5} or get to know details of Roman slavery that, had it not been for the \textit{Satyricon}, would have remained unknown to us.\textsuperscript{6}

For a number of reasons, the \textit{Satyricon} does not lend itself to an easy interpretation.\textsuperscript{7} Due to the fragmentary nature of the surviving text the original composition can only be roughly reconstructed, hence the correct context of one or the other scene remains enigmatic to some degree. In addition to this, the original placement of some smaller fragments can only be guessed. Setting such general textual problems aside, for a historian Petronius’ text poses a number of further problems. Petronius wrote in order to amuse an educated readership and not to document contemporary everyday life. He composed a satire, not a social study. As a consequence, Petronius’ text can not be simply read as an objective eyewitness account of his time (if something of that kind is conceivable anyhow).

However, low life environments of the first century A.D. are the stage on which Petronius unfolds his satirical story and they provide the indispensable background to the narrative. The characters depicted in the \textit{Satyricon} are not only distorted by the inevitable bias of a member of the Roman nobility towards the lower echelons of society but also in order to achieve literary effects: Petronius frequently satirizes by exaggerating the realities of his days into grossly out of scale enormities when he wishes to create absurd situations or to ridicule his characters. In addition, the position taken by the narrator adds a further problem to a historical interpretation of the text: The first person story teller is Encolpius, an idler and petty criminal.\textsuperscript{8} His opinions must not be mistaken for Petronius’ own attitudes nor do they present an outlaw’s world view in a reliable manner.

Nevertheless, to a legal historian the world of the \textit{Satyricon} offers a rich yield.\textsuperscript{9} Petronius’ text sometimes employs legal language in a quite technical meaning. The education of this highly cultured courtier surely had equipped


\textsuperscript{7} See e.g., N.W. SLATER: Reading the \textit{Satyrica}. In: J. PRAG/I. REPATH (eds.): Petronius (note 1) 16-31.

\textsuperscript{8} He mentions his crimes in §§ 130, 2 and 133,3.

\textsuperscript{9} On the references to the law see L. DEBRAY: Pétrone et le droit privé romain In: RHDE 43 (1919) 5-70 and 127-186.
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him with a solid background of legal learning so that the interpretation of
the text can rely on the assumption that Petronius, in such cases, knowingly
employed the language of the law (and that he expected his equally educated
readership to comprehend what he intended to convey). Taking this into
account sometimes helps to detect an additional dimension in an episode that
can highlight its social background.

2. This paper will analyze passages in which Petronius portrays lawyers
or allows his protagonists to voice critical opinions on courts or the local
administration. In these instances the author uses persons from the bottom of
Roman society, destitute freedmen as spokesmen to direct criticism
against the legal system or the local power-holders. Given the special literary
character of the source, the central aim of this study is to explore Petronius’
intentions behind this criticism.

3. In the first remaining chapters of the novel, Petronius takes his readers
to the Campanian port town of Puteoli (today’s Pozzuoli north of Naples)
and allows glimpses at the daily life of a small but prosperous Roman town
during the time of emperor Nero’s reign. This picture, however, seems to be
out of focus. One hears nothing about the accomplishments of the rich and
important families, local politics or regular town life. Instead, Petronius
points at corruption and shortcomings both in the administration of justice and
the town government.

The setting in §§ 12-15 is a sinister market place at Puteoli. Ascyltos

---

10 On the level of education of the ancient readership see R. Hunter: Ancient readers. In:
   T. Whitmarsh (ed.): The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel. Cambridge

11 See e.g., § 8: A person, first introduced as a trustworthy pater familias, tries to seduce/
   rape Ascyltos. In the description of the immoral request – prolatoque peculio coepit rogare
   stuprum – Petronius unmasks the pretensions of the assailant: Calling the money offered for
   the intercourse peculium Petronius shows his status as son-in-power or slave (or in case of the
   Satyricon possibly freedman as well; see §§ 75 and 76 for freedmen talking about their peculia).

12 The status of Encolpius and Ascyltos does not become clear; see J. Andreau: Freedmen
   (note 4) 117s. and A. Richlin: Sex in the Satyricon. Outlaws in Literatureland: In: J. Prag/I.
   Repath (eds.): Petronius (note 1) 86-88.

13 Only broken through the lens of the freedmen’s criticism in §§ 44-45 (see infra after note 45).

14 A literary analysis of the passage is provided by E. Lefèvre: Novellistische Struktur
   (note 11) 163-170; an economic interpretation presents K. Verboven: A Funny Thing Happened
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and Encolpius arrive there one evening to sell a stolen cloak (*pallium*). They encounter a peasant couple who is offering a shabby *tunica* for sale. Upon inspection of the threadbare *tunica*, Ascyltos recognizes it as the one they had lost in a previous (non-extant) episode of the novel and finds out that some coins which they had hidden in the seam of the *tunica* (their so-called *thesaurus*) are still in place. Now the retrieval of the *tunica* becomes their goal. While they discuss the best means to repossess the *tunica*, Ascyltos recommends some sort of trick, whereas Encolpius insists on legal means: Since the skeptic Ascyltos resists a lawsuit they agree on buying back the *tunica* with the proceeds from the intended sale of the cloak. But this plan fails because the peasants turn out to be the rightful owners of the cloak. To end the resulting quarrel, Ascyltos proposes an out-of-court settlement: He suggests an exchange of cloak and *tunica*. Although the peasants agree, this solution is frustrated by the intervention of *advocati nocturni* who try to seize both contended items, allegedly to allow a hearing of the case on the following day. At the same time, a bizarre part-time barrister offers himself as fiduciary and clearly plans to exploit the situation. The scene ends when the ennervated peasant throws the worn-out *tunica* into Ascyltos’ face and the scoundrels escape with their ‘treasure’.

4. The value of this episode for the study of Roman criticism towards the law and the legal profession has not escaped the attention of (legal) historians: D. Nörr quotes the scene as an example of criticism against corrupt judges in his book on *Rechtskritik* in Roman antiquity. For K. Verboven it can be either interpreted as “a bleak picture of how Roman law affected – or failed to affect – market practices”, showing “the lack of effective legal institutions”, or as

---


15 Most translators see them as some sort of night guard, comparable to the *tres viri capitales/nocturni*, on the other hand it could be some less respectable advocates (so e.g., A. Aragosti: Petronio Arbitro: Satyricon. Milano 2007, 161: *alcuni avvocati – o piutosto dei ladri, vista l’ora ed il luogo*). For the different interpretations see E. LEFÈVRE: Novellistische Struktur (note 11) 166.

16 According to E. LEFÈVRE: Novellistische Struktur (note 11) 167 he belongs “offensichtlich zu der zweifelhaften juristischen Halbwelt.”

17 There follows a lacuna of the text and the money is never mentioned in the remaining work. Most probably they faced a bitter disappointment. In this sense E. COURTNEY: Companion (note 2) 64s.

a reflection of “the limitations of the justice system rather than its defects”. However, the Rechtskritik in the scene is more complex than that. In order to fully appreciate Petronius’ intentions, the criticism has to be analyzed within its literary context, before an attempt can be made to explore its background and its possible justifications.

The criticism is embedded in the context of Encolpius’ and Ascylos’ attempt to retrieve the thesaurus in the tunica. For Petronius’ protagonists two ways seem possible: Encolpius favours a lawsuit, whereas Ascylos recommends illegal manoeuvres. As Encolpius’ lays out his legal strategy he displays some quite thorough legal knowledge (not only for a self-confessed outlaw): He is well aware of the alternatives interdictum or rei vindicatio. Ascylos is not interested in such details, because he regards legal means as hopeless.

It seems quite surprising that Encolpius considers going to court at all, since Petronius’ protagonists profess themselves outlaws and one would expect them to evade contact with the authorities. While Encolpius’ proposal constitutes a break with the self-assumed role of his literary character, Ascylos remains true to his outlaw nature by rejecting any appeal to the law. But in the discussion between the two the legitimacy of the law (leges) is never questioned: Ascylos opts for trickery (circuittu agendum) because he does not expect a fair hearing. His scepticism is by no means based on their outlaw-status; he rather believes that no judge will trust the words of aliens (quis habeit dicentibus fidem?). Furthermore he puts no trust in the courts assuming that the venality of judges excludes poor men per se from victory.

Since the case never goes to trial, the novel itself contains no further indications as to the validity of Ascylos’ suspicions. The tumultuous events during the ‘pre-trial’ phase at the market and the way Petronius’ characterizes
the members of the legal profession therein do not foster optimism in this regard.

Whether the administration of justice during the first century A.D. really warranted such allegations is hard to determine: Petronius’ picture could be a mere stereotype as well as a Roman nobleman’s frowning judgement on the Campanian courts or even a veiled attack on courts of the capital. The highly sophisticated literary character of the source does not allow judgement on this question by a simple straightforward reading of the text.

As to the retrieval of the thesaurus, however, Petronius’ position is clear: He sides with Ascyltos. The author’s special irony lies in the fact that he decides to prove Ascyltos – and not the this time law-abiding Encolpius – right by letting him recuperate the tunic from its unlawful possessors. This victory is not won by legal means, but quite on the contrary: It is only achieved because Encolpius’ idea to rely on the law proves a complete disaster from the outset. At least in the world of the novel, the day is won by the more realistic approach of Ascyltos, the unrepentant villain. Encolpius’ idealistic world view is no longer valid after the ruthless disclosure of the shortcomings of the legal system in this episode.

Petronius’ carefully composed satire reaches its literary climax when Ascyltos negotiates the bargain with the peasants. They should return the tunica in exchange for the cloak:

‘Videmus’, inquit, ‘suam cuique rem esse carissimam; reddant nobis tunicam nostram et pallium suum recipiant.’ (§ 15,1)

In a writer of Petronius’ sophistication the allusion to the famous suum cuique-formula in these lines is hardly incidental. As a matter of fact, the formula was already well known in learned circles at his time.26 Its use can be traced back as far as Cato the Elder; it frequently appears in Cicero’s writings and also once in Petronius’ contemporary Seneca.27

Suum cuique represents, according to Ulpian’s famous definition of iustitia, one of the central elements of justice.28 In Ulpian’s opinion, justice provides

---


27 Cato in Gell. 13.24: Suum cuique per me uti atque frui licet; for the evidence in Cicero see U. MANTHE: Beiträfe II (note 26) 11; Sen.epist. 81.7: ‘Hoc certe inquis iustitiae convenit, suum cuique reddere, beneficio gratiam, iniuriae talionem aut certe malam gratiam.’

28 D. 1,1,10 pr. (Ulp. 1 reg.) Iustitia est constans et perpetua voluntas ius suum cuique tribuendi: (1) Iuris praecepta sunt haec: honeste vivere, alterum non laedere, suum cuique tribuere.
the necessary moral guideline for the application of the law: In order to fulfil their function properly, lawyers should hold a firm intention (voluntas) to give everyone his due in accordance with the law. Only if applied according to the principles of justice can the law function as it should.29

Bearing in mind the meaning of the suum cuique-formula, the market scene can be read as a sharp satire on the application of the law in this case. It is not by coincidence that Petronius uses the law-sceptic Ascyltos as the advocate of suum cuique tribuere when he proposes the reciprocal transfer of the clothes, and by this the accomplishment of justice. But in a world as upside down as that of the Satyricon no such thing must be allowed to happen. This attempt to realize the suum cuique is frustrated by the meddling of some ‘lawyers’: The advocati nocturni intervene to keep cloak and tunica for themselves (qui volebant pallium lucri facere) and a suspicious looking part-time attorney (seemingly some sort of Roman forerunner of the ambulance-chaser) adds to the chaos by trying to impose his services on them. Encolpius and Ascyltos keep their property only by getting out of reach of these ‘lawyers’.30

5. Petronius did not design this travesty as a representation of the Roman judicial system. The crude exaggerations definitely exclude such a prima facie reading of the passage.31 The warning against a decline in the administration of justice caused by selfishness and greed however should not be lightly set aside. The same theme recurs later in the novel when Encolpius praises the miraculous powers of money in a sarcastic poem (§ 137, 9):

Quisquis habet nummos, secura naviget aura
fortunamque suo temperet arbitrio.
uxorem ducat Danaen ipsumque licebit
Acrisium iubeat credere quod Danaen.
carmina componat, declamet, concrepet
 omnes et peragat causas sitque Catone prior.

29 D 1,1,1 pr. (Ulp. 1 inst.) Est autem (sc. ius) a iustitia appellatum: nam, ut elegant Celsus definit, ius est ars boni et aequi.
Richard Gamauf

*iurisconsultus* ‘parret, non parret’ habeto
atque esto quicquid Servius et Labeo.
multa loquor: quod vis, nummis praesentibus opta,
et veniet. clausum possidet arca loven.

From a have-not’s and outlaw’s perspective the rich man’s life promises success in any field. His ships master the seas and increase his wealth. His wife is worthy of Jupiter32. Furthermore he has success in art (*carmina componat*) as well as in court where he argues with better success than the prototype of a Roman *vir honestus*, Cato, because – even in the absence of rhetorical brilliance or legal expertise – his money will buy the judges’ favourable decisions.33

This indirect criticism does not sound like the caricature of small-town situations like in the market-scene. Petronius’ readers could detect a more general reproach against declining ethical and professional standards in the Roman legal profession.34 For this, the author contrasted the days gone by when *responsa* of eminent jurists had held authority in court with a present in which bribery replaced legal learning or forensic skills. By referring to jurists like Cicero’s teacher Servius Sulpicius or the Augustan jurist Antistius Labeo, Petronius showed that things had been better not too long ago.35

Our state of knowledge about the actual state of the administration of

32 This might also be a satirical side blow to Trimalchio. In spite of his business success his artistic aspirations were ridiculous and the relationship to his wife Fortunata was surely no reason for envy. On Petronius’ characterization of their relationship see S. STUCCHE: Su alcuni esempi di *ekphrasis* relativi alla caratterizzazione dei personaggi petroniani. In: L. CASTAGNA/E. LEFÈVRE (eds.): Studien zu Petron und seiner Rezeption/Studi su Petronio e sulla sua fortuna. Berlin/New York 2007, 241.

33 *Pare – non paret* clearly refers to the verdict of the *iudex privatus* (Festus p. 262 Lindsay: *Parret, quod est in formulis, …*); see U. BABUSHAUX: Id quod actum est. Zur Ermittlung des Parteiwillens im klassischen römischen Zivilprozeß, München 2006, 8-10. If one would accept interpretation of L. DEBRAY: Pétrone (note 9) 34 of the passage, Petronius would be accusing Servius and Labeo of venal *responsa* and law-bending!

34 D. NÖRR: Rechtskritik (note 18) 86; see also J. ANDREAU: Freedmen (note 4) 124.

On the question whether the modern term ‘profession’ can rightfully applied to Roman advocates see A. J. CROOK: Legal Advocacy in the Roman World. London 1995, 41-45.

35 Cf. also the confrontation of *causidici* and *iurisconsulti* in Sen.apocol. 12.2: *Omnes laeti, hilares: populus Romanus ambulabat tanquam liber; Agatho et pauci causidici plorabant, sed plane ex animo. iurisconsulti et tenebris procedebant, pallidi, graciles, vix animam habentes, tanquam qui tum maxime reviviscerent. ex his unus cum vidisset capita conferentes et fortunas suas deplorantes causidicos, accedit et ait: “dicebam vobis: non semper Saturnalia erunt.”* See E. LEFÈVRE: Novellistische Struktur (note 11) 168.
justice in Petronius’ time does not put us in an easy position to assess the validity of such charges. One must not take Petronius’ criticism too literally, but his scepticism was also no singular opinion. Similar diatribes against the type of the venal attorney36 (“o causidici, venale genus”) can be found in other authors as well.37 And for conservative contemporaries the waning respect for the exempla of the veteres was a reason for concern.38

6. Both in the market scene and Encolpius’ poem, Petronius draws a direct connection between the declining ethical standards and the increasing importance of money. In order to put such reproaches into perspective one has to read them as elements of the Satyricon’s fictional cosmos. For any understanding of the author’s intentions with the whole work the cena Trimalchionis plays a crucial role. It captures a prominent part in the extant text and may have done so as well in the original composition. Recently J. Andreau pointed out its prominence for any understanding of Petronius’ views by stressing “that the Cena is a satire on the entirety of Roman life at the time, and not only of the world of the freedmen.“39

The cena presents a picture of society in which money constitutes the supreme value.40 Its main protagonist, the upstart freedman Trimalchio, mocks his inherited senatorial fortune (patrimonium laticlavium) as a mere nullity that he will never be content with: Nemini tamen nihil satis est.41 For an ex-slave money is the sole measure of success. But neither his money-fixation nor his vulgarity prevent Trimalchio from taking a leading role within the ‘parallel-

36 The Roman jurists, however, were exempt from this sort of critique; see D. Nörr: Rechtskritik (note 18) 86.
37 The quote is in Sen.apocol. 12,3; cf. also Tac.ann. 11,5,2: Nec quicquam publicae mercis tam venale fuit quam advocatorum perfidia, ... See also A.A. Dimopoulou: La rémunération (note 30) 310-317.
39 J. Andreau: Freedmen (note 4) 124.
40 V. Rudich: Dissidence (note 3) 186 states that the author unfolds the “not unfamiliar drama of a society where a spiritual quest is replaced by material pursuits.“ On criticism of materialism in Petronius and other contemporary authors see Rudich ibid. 202s., 232-237.
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society’ of freedmen. Devoid of regular prospects of social rise freedmen adopted a value system in which wealth was highly esteemed. To a nobleman of Petronius’ social standing, however, Trimalchio’s career provided a source of amusement and ridicule. On the other hand, for slaves or less prosperous freedmen it represented the fulfilment of their wildest dreams.

Among the freedmen gathered at his house, Trimalchio’s wealth was unique. Most of his freedmen guests were less prosperous; some faced a daily struggle for survival. A down-to-earth example of a freedman’s aspirations gives Echion, a rag dealer, when he describes the future he has in mind for his pet-slave (deliciae) Primigenius. The boy, so he hopes, will learn a trade either – and the hierarchy is telling! – barber, praeco (town crier, auctioneer) or at least barrister (causidicus). For Echion the attractiveness of the ‘law career’ lies in the prospect of a steady income (habet haec res panem). The ‘legal education’ to serve that purpose has to be equally cheap. As it seems, it shall consist of nothing more than the study of a few textbooks (libra rubricata!).

---

42 On Trimalchio’s circle see J. ANDREAU: Freedmen (note 4) 120.
44 In § 43 a certain Chrysantus is mentioned who left a considerable estate.
45 Their various sources of income are discussed by J. ANDREAU: Freedmen (note 4) 118s.; on the economy in the Satyricon K. VERBOVEN: A Funny Thing Happened (note 14) 125-139.
46 On Echion’s occupation see J. ANDREAU: Freedmen (note 4) 119.
48 § 46,7 and 8: “... Emi ergo nunc puero aliquot libra rubricata, quia volo illum ad domus iniam aliquid de iure gustare. habet haec res panem. nam litteris satis inquinatus est. quod si resiliert, destinavi illum artificii docere, aut tonstreiunum aut praecenem aut certe causidicum, quod illi auferre non possit nisi Orcus. ideo illi cotidie clamo: „Primigeni, crede mihi, quicquid discis, tibi discis. vides Phileronem causidicum: si non didicisset, hodie famem a labris non abigeret. modo, modo, collo suo circumferebat onera venalia; nunc etiam adversus Norbanum se extendit. litterae thesaurum est, et artificium nunquam moritur”.
49 On this M. S. SMITH (ed.): Cena (note 4) 124 and E. COURTNEY: Companion (note 2) 92s.
51 W. KUNKEL takes this as an indication that some lawyers’ education consisted of book learning only; W. KUNKEL: Die römischen Juristen. Herkunft und soziale Stellung². 1967 (reprint Köln/Weimar/Wien 2001), 344 note 729. A Roman jurist admitting a slave boy into the circle of his auditores is indeed highly imaginable.
But the freedman does not regard this as a shortcoming, because neither famous advocates of Cicero’s calibre nor respected Roman jurists shall serve as role models for the boy, but the rather humble local *causidicus* Phileros. He too was a self-made lawyer who had not received any education during his youth but picked up some law later in his life (one wonders how and how much?) while he worked as a porter. Otherwise, Echion declares, Phileros would not be able to earn a living (*hodie famem a labris non abigeret*).

In the freedmen-world the legal profession is one possible occupation among many. In Primigenius’ case it shall not be chosen as a vocation for its intellectual merits or as a means to foster a career in politics but exclusively because it promises a steady income. This is what counts for Echion, and not the hope for the boy’s brilliant career as an attorney or a social rise.

These impressions of the education and the economic situation of small town legal practitioners – which seem quite reliable – shed a different light on the presentation of the advocate in § 15,4: Petronius introduces him as a *cocio* (dealer, broker) and occasional barrister (*qui solet aliquando etiam causas agere*). In contrast to Phileros, this un-named member of the ‘bar’ obviously could not live off the money he made from his legal practice alone. Therefore he was active in more than one profession and not very particular in his attempts to attract new clients.

In Pompeii may have existed ‘law schools’ run by local *causidici*. See J. KERSTEN: Kinder in Pompeji. Eine epigraphische Untersuchung, Klio 66 (1984) 204. A singular opinion is E. OLSHAUSEN: Soziokulturelle Betrachtungen (note 3) 27 who reads Trimalchios’s statement in § 48.4 (*Ego autem si causas non ago, in domusionem tamen litteras didici*) as a reference to some basic law studies for home use on his part: “Er hat sich aber auch für den Hausgebrauch in die Rechtswissenschaften eingearbeitet” (footnotes omitted).


53 On the status of *causidici* see A. A. DIMOPOULOU: La rémunération (note 30) 61s and 258s.

54 For examples of similar careers in Martial see A.A. DIMOPOULOU: La rémunération (note 30) 314.

55 If he can be identified with Phileros, the speaker in § 43, who displays intimate knowledge of the estate of a recently deceased rich freedman, then, if he had handled the estate, his income might not have been so meagre. E. COURTNEY: Companion (note 2) 93, however, denies the identity.

56 On this see also E. LO CAScio: La vita (note 3) 10s. Roman tradition (not practice) until the early principate was opposed to monetary rewards for advocates; this may have been different on lower levels; cf. A.J. CROOK: Legal Advocacy (note 34) 129-131; for a full treatment of the question of remuneration see A.A. DIMOPOULOU: La rémunération (note 30).

57 A. J. CROOK: Legal Advocacy (note 34) 44 excludes that “advocacy in itself conferred high social status”.

161
Petronius’ sneering representation of greedy lawyers in § 15 can very well reflect the economic situation of small town legal practitioners, possibly from a freedmen background. They may have used means to land cases for which a Roman nobleman lacked any understanding. From the moralizing upper class perspective a professional habitus that was necessary to survive under such circumstances indicated character flaws, such as thievishness, greed or money fixation. But within the different value system in the lower social strata an outwardly concern for money was nothing to be ashamed of, given the everyday struggle for survival.58

7. The meagre economic situation of the average freedmen less lucky than Trimalchio dominates the political discussions during the cena.59 Not the top level political life60 but their everyday upkeep occupies the speakers’ minds most. Hence the aediles who are in charge of the grain supply61 bear the brunt of criticism:62 They are accused of acting in collusion with the pistores (millers/bakers) to keep the prices of flour and bread up during a drought and to profit from enormous bribes.63 The speakers feel themselves as victims of these malversations (§ 44.3: itaque populus minutus laborat):64 They find it hard to procure bread65 and are even forced to sell their small belongings to afford the expensive grain66 while the leading families exploit their misery. Their deep-going discontent makes the freedmen even blame the drought itself

58 A. J. Crook: Legal Advocacy (note 34) 43 assumes that advocates who did not belong to the top levels of society could make only a precarious living out of litigation.
59 § 44 and 45. V. Rudich: Dissidence (note 3) 242s. sees the freedmen suffering from an “inferiority complex”.
60 A praetor (another term for duumvir cf. e.g., E. Courtney: Companion, note 2, 108) is mentioned once in § 65.4; J. Andreau: Freedmen (note 4) 123 stresses that in general the elite is absent from the Satyricon. On the role of politics in the cena cf. E. Olshausen: Soziokulturelle Betrachtungen (note 3) 20 and V. Rudich: Dissidence (note 3) 244s.
62 See also E. Olshausen: Soziokulturelle Betrachtungen (note 3) 21.
64 On the victims of food shortages and popular reactions P. Garnsey: Famine (note 63) 32 and 240-243.
65 § 44.2: Non mehercules hodie buccam panis invenire potui.
66 § 44.15: Quod ad me attinet, iam pannos meas comedii, et si perseverat haec annona, casulas meas vendam. On the social background see J. Andreau: Freedmen (note 4) 119; see also P. Garnsey: Famine (note 63) 33.
on the moral decline of the better circles that enrich themselves but ignore the religious rituals.\textsuperscript{67}

In this passage, Petronius paints the picture of a general moral decline: Both the top families and the ordinary citizenry no longer live up to the standards of the past. In the speakers’ self-criticism the utter lack of political influence of the ordinary freedmen unveils itself.\textsuperscript{68}

8. As already stated at the beginning, the study of the \textit{Satyricon} as a historical source rests on the reliability of the seemingly ‘naturalistic’ elements of the story. Even though the novel was by no means intended as a colportage, its author presents a surprisingly coherent picture of life at the margins of Roman society. Cohesiveness alone – though arguably intended by Petronius\textsuperscript{69} – does not suffice to qualify the text as a reliable historical source. It may very well be that “the \textit{Satyricon} informs us not about reality, but about ways of representing reality in a given period.”\textsuperscript{70} In order to understand Petronius’ position towards lawyers one must differentiate the various layers of the narrative: A simple, \textit{prima facie} realistic interpretation of the market scene would exploit it for highlighting shortcomings of the Roman judicial system of the time.\textsuperscript{71} Although the points raised by Petronius’ were criticised by other writers of the time as well,\textsuperscript{72} the criticism in itself remains too unspecific to warrant any attempt to link it to specific contemporary developments. Read in that way, the market scene expresses no more than a general suspicion vis-à-vis the legal profession, a stereotype that can be found at almost any time in history.\textsuperscript{73}

Upon closer scrutiny of the literary techniques employed by the author and by contextualizing the scene, the genuinely Petronian points of view can be discovered. Petronius’ criticism is not \textit{Rechtskritik} but \textit{Juristenkritik}.

\textsuperscript{67} § 44,17s. On this see E. \textsc{Olshausen}: Soziokulturelle Betrachtungen (note 3) 23.
\textsuperscript{69} On self-referentiality in Petronius see C. \textsc{Panayotakis}: Petronius and the Roman Literary Tradition. In: J. \textsc{Prag}/I. \textsc{Repath} (eds.): Petronius (note 1) 61s.
\textsuperscript{70} C. \textsc{Vout}: The \textit{Satyricon} (note 2) 102.
\textsuperscript{71} See supra at note 19.
\textsuperscript{72} See supra note 37.
\textsuperscript{73} Cf. the judgement of E. \textsc{Lefèvre}: Novellistische Struktur (note 11) 168: “Das ist eine \textit{Satire auf die gegenwärtige Justiz. Sie ist zeitlos ...}”
Even when Ascyltos favours fraud to get the tunic back, he never disputes the legitimacy of the *leges* as such. In order to affirm the moral superiority of the outlaw’s position, Petronius, the brilliant stylist and satirist, lives up to the highest literary standards by weaving in an allusion to the *suum cuique*-formula. When he allows Ascyltos to succeed, the author dooms Encolpius’ naïve trust in the law and sides with the one outlaw who has remained true to his assigned role. But he expects a reader who recognizes the idea of *suum cuique tribuere* behind Ascyltos’ proposal to do the same on moral grounds. Petronius, the ‘immoral immoralist’ (*V. Rudich*), paints a bleak picture of a society in which the laws are (unintentionally, one supposes) upheld only by outlaws such as Encolpius and Ascyltos. The professional ‘lawyers’ show no such intentions at all. Petronius portrays them as a much greater danger to law and society than the two outlaws, as those responsible for the fact that one can not trust lawful means to achieve *suum cuique*.

For this demise of the legal profession Petronius singles out avarice as the determining factor. As the poem in § 137,9 again confirms, in the world of the *Satyricon* everyone assumes that success in court can and has to be bought. The author presents the *iudicium* not as the place where one may expect *suum cuique tribuere*, but as a market where justice is turned into a *publica merces* that goes to the party placing the highest bid. By “*quid faciant leges, ubi sola pecunia regnat?”* Ascyltos laments the loss of authority of the laws and denounces the preponderance of materialistic interests. But not all characters in the *Satyricon* share this opinion. *Pecunia regnat* could also sum up the quintessence of Trimalchio’s crudely materialistic outlook. In the *cena* the nouveau-riche freedman demonstrates his firm conviction that he can buy whatever he wants. But as *P. Veyne* has demonstrated, by this Petronius unmasks Trimalchio’s shallowness because he never internalized the ethical standards necessary for a ‘sensible’ use of his wealth. He epitomizes the immoral rich that is the target of the narrator’s implicit criticism in § 137,9. Undoubtedly Trimalchio would not have had any scruples to buy court rulings in his favour. Both passages bitterly censure a society that has lost its ethical foundations.

In the *cena* Petronius targets the freedmen as a group. The discussions of the professional prospects of attorneys in the *cena* provide the social background of the *Juristenkritik* the market scene. Petronius’ avaricious

---

74 *P. Veyne*: Vie (note 4).

75 *V. Rudich*: Dissidence (note 3) 187 holds that Petronius’ “oeuvre must be firmly related to the crisis in the *mos maiorum* … threatened at this point with ultimate disintegration”.

76 According to *E. Courtney*: Companion (note 2) 87 (quoting *E. Auerbach*: Mimesis.
lawyer surely comes from the lower social strata; he may be a freedman with a background similar to that of Phileros77 or a freeborn person of equally low standing.

So one can see that the depicted decline of the legal profession is not a merely moral phenomenon but related to contemporary social phenomena, in this case, the rise of the freedmen and their likes during the first century A.D. who in small Italian towns were taking over functions previously held by the local nobility. The *arbiter elegantiae* observed their business practices disapprovingly because he ignored their everyday miseries that caused them. For him this remained a strange world and he amused his audience by showing them what they usually ignored right before their eyes. Even if naturalistic or social critical tendencies were far from his mind, his carefully styled presentation still allows us to learn a lot about the meaner aspects of the world that surrounded him and his readers.


77 *Supra* after note 53.