

THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY

Newsletter

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

VOL. 2 NO. 1

EDITOR: GARETH SCHMELING

JUNE 1971

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldwin, B., "A Note on Trimalchio's Zodiac Dish," *CQ* 64 (1970) 364. Baldwin suggests that locustam (*Sat.* 35) be regarded as a pun on the celebrated lady poisoner Locusta (Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.66).

Baldwin, B., "Trimalchio's Poetry," *CJ* 66 (1971) 254-255. (See Woodall's review below).

Barnes, E. J., "Further on Trimalchio's Poetry," *CJ* 66 (1971) 255. (See Woodall's review below).

Brewster, P. G., "Some Notes on the Guessing Game, How Many Horns has the Buck?," *The Study of Folklore* edited by Alan Dundes (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965) 338-368. Reprinted from *Béaloideas: Journal of the Folklore of Ireland* 12 (1942) 40-78. Brewster writes about the origin and wide spread occurrences of the game bucca, bucca, quot sunt hic?, in *Sat.* 64.12.

Cizek, E., *Evolutia romanului antic* (Bucuresti: Editura Univers, 1970) 220 p., Lei 7,75 (paper covers). Petronius occupies a very prominent part of Professor Cizek's history and development of the ancient novel. Chapter VI, "Petroniu," pp. 105-147, deals with the position of the Satyricon in classical fiction.

Cutt, T. and Nyenhuis, J., *Petronius: Cena Trimalchionis* (Detroit: Wayne State University, 1970) 134 p., \$3.95. Vocabulary and notes are provided in this school edition of the Cena. Difficult sections of the Latin have been reworded.

Deman, Robert C., *Petronius Arbiter. Cena Trimalchionis* (Anvers, Belgium: De Sikkels, 1968) 36 p., 8 plates. Petronius is an author who deserves to be known by students because and of his modern views and because of his description of the common Roman. The work is anything but immoral; rather it is a kind of shock-literature à la Sartre, which compels us to compare it with modern works. The author's Latin is comparatively plain. My Cena Trimalchionis is an "adaptation" into classic Latin meant for pupils 13 or 14 years old (i.e. after 2 or 3 years study of the language). Characteristic expressions, proverbs, parataxis, and some vulgar words, have not been altered. The purpose of this work is to present an inexpensive Latin text and to prepare the older students to read the authentic Petronius. Because of the young age of the students this text has been "purged". The series "Latijn Lezen", (Reading Latin) to which my publication belongs, must be considered a first stage of what Marouzeau calls "lecture express". The witty table-talk, which figures so prominently in the Cena, has been treated at length. The personal characteristics, which the ordinary people (of all times?) have in common, come into prominence: their lust for money and sometimes bloodthirsty pleasure, their admiration and respect for riches, their gigantic credulity and immense superstition. This work is provided with comprehensive notes which are easily understood and which try to enlarge the scope of the young reader for the style of living of the old Romans. A special and separate complete list of words and numerous grammatical notes should help the young latinist to approach the text without any help. (Robert Deman)

Evenhuis, J. R., "Petronius," *Hermeneus* 41 (1969) 16-23. A general account of Petronius and his Satyricon from Tacitus to Fellini.

Huxley, H., "'Marked Literary Inferiority' in the Poems of the Satyricon," *CJ* 66 (1970) 69-70. (See Woodall's review below)

Krenkel, W., "Apelles bei Petron und Lucilius," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock* 17 (1968) 689-695.

A satire of the 29th book of Lucilius (fr. 807-841 K) deals with pederasty. It mentions in this context a masterpiece of Apelles and mentions Apollo as the patron of pederasty. It takes place in Rome or in Central Italy between Rome and Naples. A passage in Petronius (81 ff.), where a masterpiece of Apelles, the Monocnemos, is described, is brought into connection with Apelles and Lucilius. In this picture Apollo, patron of pederasty, appears as the central figure. The scene in Petronius' novel takes also place in Central Italy. The conclusion seems to be obvious that both passages describe the same painting of Apelles. (Werner Krenkel)

Leeman, A. D., *C. Petronius Arbiter. Schelmen en Tafelschuimers: Een satirische zedenroman uit de tijd van Keizer Nero* (Antwerp: W. De Haan, 1966) 176 p., 16 plates (paper covers). Professor Leeman's translation has become something of a best-seller in the Netherlands because, as one reviewer puts it, "he had managed to employ a strictly contemporary Dutch in his translation."

Leeman, A. D., "Morte e scambio nel romanzo picaresco di Petronio," *GIF* 20 (1967) 147-157. Underlying the apparent amoral attitude of Petronius there exists a "moral" structure in the Satyricon: life and death find parallels in reality and illusion, jest and seriousness.

Leeman, A. D., "Petronius als Dichter," *Hermeneus* 40 (1968) 65-69. Comments on the poetry of the Fragments of the Satyricon.

Linkomies, E., *Trimalkion Pidot*, 4th edition (Helsinki: Otava, 1968) 126 pp. Finnish translation, notes, 2 pages of maps. 1st edition 1945. Translation of the Cena only.

Nethercut, W., "Fellini and the Colosseum: Philosophy, Morality and the Satyricon (1970)," *CB* 47 (1971) 53-59. "What of Fellini's 'morality' in the Satyricon? It is difficult for the Northern European and the New World mind to allow his attribution of vitality, and even of purity, to Encolpio. We may tend to think of Encolpio, rather, as given to dissipation. Yet through orgies and crime he remains with golden head and white tunic. How can he avoid becoming one more seamy-cheeked middle-aged derelict with massive jowls? But the Mediterranean does not look forward toward death and judgment in this fashion. Like one of Pindar's athletes, eternal in his moment of victory, Encolpio stands before us now, as he is. We are not meant to think of an end when our existence will confront us. Time enough for trouble later. In this most glorious time of human life, Encolpio's honest response to the new day redeems the bodily heaviness of the hours just past in expenditure" (p. 58).

Panagl, O., "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Petron 27,4," *WS* 83 (1970) 152-153. Read miramur for miraremur.

Rankin, H. D., "Notes on the Comparison of Petronius with Three Moderns," *AAntHung* 18 (1970) 197-213. Rankin compares Petronius with Marcel Proust, James Joyce, and F. Scott Fitzgerald, noting the influence of Petronius on each. It is the underlying aim of Rankin to dispel the common opinion that Petronius' Satyricon is second-rate.

Rose, K. F. C., *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 101 p. To be reviewed in the June issue of the Newsletter.

Sandy, G., *Comparative Study of Apuleius' Metamorphoses and Other Prose Fiction of Antiquity* (Diss. Ohio State University, Columbus, 1968) 157 p. The Satyricon is especially discussed on pp. 102-111.

Schmelting, G., "The Satyricon: Forms in Search of a Genre," *CB* 47 (1971) 49-53. The various theories of genre designation

are reviewed. The structure accepted by Schmeling is the romance or the novel; the content of the *Satyricon* is viewed as a particular mode of reality, that is pornography: "The content of the *Satyricon*, that is reality for Petronius, is obscene: the "real" world of Quartilla is obscene, as are the worlds of Trimalchio, Circe, and Proselenus. They are obscene, in the first place, because they are the verbal expression of a non-normal, non-conforming consciousness. The opposite of normalcy, irrespective of its erotic or sexual modes, is obscene. The consciousness of Petronius made concrete in his verbal fantasies is obscene, in the second place, because it depicts a private world which readers have no right to see" (p. 52).

Schmeling, G., "A Note on Petronius 62.9," *RCCM* 12 (1970) 38-39. Suggested reading: *gladium tamen strinxit et mata vitallia umbras cecidi, donec ad villam amicae meae pervenirem.*

Schnur, H. D., *Petron Satyricon: Ein römischer Schelmenroman* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1968) 260 p., Notes 199-260. A brilliant little pocket translation of the *Satyricon* into German. It has been very well received in Germany. The translation includes the forgery of Nodot, and Schnur has provided copious notes.

Sochatoff, A. F., "Imagery in the Poems of the *Satyricon*," *CJ* 65 (1970) 340-344. (See Woodall's review below)

Stégen, G., "Pétrone Fragment 50," *GIF* 21 (1969) 358-359.

Witke, Charles, *Latin Satire: The Structure of Persuasion* (Leiden: Brill, 1970) 280 p. See especially Chapter Six: "Petronius and Three Others," 152-167. "If the critic is to be fair to the implications of the *Satyricon* even in its truncated form, he must impute a moral concern to Petronius. To be sure, the writer's own reactions do not figure. However, his audience sooner or later senses a complete objectivity in the tone of the *Satyricon*'s presentation, even at its most grotesque moments. This objectivity and consistency of tone tend to suggest the desirability of having a reliable canon of ethical judgment to which the text may be referred. This canon is not suggested by the text but by the audience which the text creates. Precisely those who are attracted to Petronius' wit and style are capable of generating a reliable set of responses to the fantastic scenes which he represents as segments of his contemporary society" (p. 154).

Woodall, N. J., "Trimalchio's Limping Pentameters," *CJ* 66 (1971) 256-257. (See Woodall's review below)

Zeitlin, F., "Romanus Petronius: A Study of the *Troiae Halosis* and the *Bellum Civile*," *Latomus* 30 (1971) 56-82. Mrs. Zeitlin's approach to the *Satyricon* in general and to its two longest poems in specific is moralistic, and she places herself squarely in the camp of Highet, Bacon, Arrowmith, and Sochatoff. The moral decay of Rome is reflected in everything from art to politics. "In this sense, Lucan's work can be considered mainly political, while Petronius' is mainly social and moral. It is the relevance of the *Troiae Halosis* and the *Bellum Civile* to the contemporary moral environment which is important to him" (p. 81)... "The scene of the *Troiae Halosis* is a preparation for the *Bellum Civile*. It introduces a glimpse of the public world of Rome which the *Bellum Civile* will expand in verse and the symbolism of Croton will exploit. The *Troiae Halosis* negates Vergil's Troy, the *Bellum Civile* his Rome" (p. 82). [This paper was read at a session of the Petronian Society held in conjunction with the American Philological Association, in New York on 30 December 1970.]

Petron, Seneca und Nicholas Blake
by Chr. Stöcker

Findet man den Tod des Petronius als zentrales Motiv in einem Kriminalroman, so wundert man sich; liest man dann aber, dass sich hinter dem Pseudonym des Autors ein veritabler 'Professor of Poetry' der Universität Oxford verbirgt, der etwa auch eine Vergil-Übertragung veröffentlicht hat, so legt sich diese Verwunderung und macht dem Staunen Platz, dass ein feinsinniger Gelehrter einen Kriminalroman verfasst und es dabei sogar fertigbringt, einen guten zu schreiben. Es handelt sich in diesen Falle um den Kriminalroman "The Worm of Death" von Nicholas Blake (= Cecil Day Lewis).⁽¹⁾ Das Opfer in diesem Roman, ein alter Arzt, fühlt sich von einem Menschen bedroht, dem seine mit Schuldgefühlen vermischte Zuneigung gilt. Dieser Arzt, Dr. Piers Loudron, schreibt in sein Tagebuch, das den Beginn und den Schluss des Romans bildet:

Mein Gott ... Ja! Das wäre die Lösung. Ich muss ihm zuvorkommen! Wenn ich sterbe, ehe er mich umbringt ... Ja. Dann wäre das Problem gelöst. Warum bin ich nicht längst darauf gekommen! Dann wäre der Gerechtigkeit Genüge getan, ohne dass er darum zum Mörder werden muss. Der edle Ausweg der alten Römer. Man stürzt sich in sein eigenes Schwert. Nur habe ich kein Schwert, und selbst wenn ich eins hätte - ich bin so leicht, dass sich das Ding vermutlich nicht tief genug in mich hineinbohren würde. Dann also die Methode des Petronius, des alten Hedonisten. Euthanasie. Ja, das ist es.⁽²⁾

Als dann die Leiche des alten Herrn aus der Themse gezogen wird, weisen Schnitte an den Handgelenken auf Selbstmord hin, allerdings sprechen die Umstände der Auffindung und die Gleichmässigkeit der Einschnitte sowie das Fehlen von Versuchsschnitten für Mord. Verhältnismässig bald taucht nun in den Überlegungen des Privatdetektivs Nigel Strangeways und seiner Freundin der Gedanke an einen "Selbstmord im Bade" auf:

Die Römer pflegten sich in ihrem Bad zu töten. Haben sich einfach die Pulsadern aufgeschnitten. Angenommen, Dr. Piers hätte es genauso gemacht und wäre im Bad verblutet? Und jemand hätte das Wasser ablaufen lassen? Dann gäbe es keine Spuren - vorausgesetzt, das Badezimmer und die Wanne würden anschliessend ordentlich geschrubbt.⁽³⁾

Nun kann man gewiss nicht von einer Gewohnheit der Römer sprechen, im Bad Selbstmord zu begehen, diese Art des Selbstmords ist meines Wissens nur von Seneca überliefert (Tac. ann. 15, 64). Offensichtlich hat die Schilderung des Selbstmords von Seneca mit ihren bewegenden und manchmal schauerlich eindrucksvollen Details hier in der Erinnerung des Autors (oder doch zumindest seiner Gestalten) die 'Todesfeier' des Petronius verdrängt. Diese Fehlleistung ist durchaus verständlich, wenn man sieht, wie Tacitus die beiden Selbstmorde als auf einander bezogene Gegensätze darstellt. Dass hier eine echte Verwechslung vorliegt, beweist die folgende Stelle; Nigel befragt den Adoptivsohn von Dr. Piers Loudron, der ihm als Beweis für den Selbstmord seines Vaters die Seite mit der oben zitierten Anspielung auf Petronius aus dem verschwundenen Tagebuch seines Vaters liefert:

"... Wissen Sie übrigens, was Petronius getan hat?"

"Ich habe es nachgeschlagen. Er hat sich im Bad die Pulsadern aufgeschnitten ... Sie sagten neulich, es sei unmöglich, die Schnitte hätten nicht gleich tief sein können. Ich meine, was Petronius fertiggebracht hat, das konnte mein Vater genausogut."

"Ich glaube, Petronius hat es von einem Sklaven machen lassen..."⁽⁴⁾

Leider hat der Autor nicht nachgeschlagen, und das kunstvoll angelegte Motiv, das den Verdacht des Lesers, zumindest des gebildeten Lesers, in einer bestimmten Richtung lenken sollte, verliert durch die Verwechslung seine Wirkung: die 'Methode des Petronius, des alten Hedonisten' ist in Wirklichkeit die Methode Senecas, des alten Stoikers. (1) Zitate nach der deutschen Ausgabe, Nicholas Blake, Der Tod des Patriarchen, Rowohlt ro-ro-ro thriller 2049 Hamburg 1964, Originalausgabe N. Blake, *The Worm of Death*, Collins, London (1961?). (2) p. 8 f; cf. p. 202. (3) p. 61. (4) p. 152.

P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel. The 'Satyricon' of Petronius and the 'Metamorphoses' of Apuleius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970. Pp. xiv + 272.

Review by Gerald Sandy

In the opening chapter, Walsh defines and interprets the two novels as "Related to the Greek satirical fiction shaped partly by the Milesian tradition inaugurated by Aristides, and also by the fictitious themes in Menippean satire." He continues, "Both authors present their tales in a literary texture in which there are frequent reminiscences of Greek and Roman poetry and constant parody of the conventions and styles of the various prose-genres.... This protracted, episodic narrative-form, into which are inserted apposite novelle and mannered reflexions on life and literature, justifies the claim that the Romans rather than the Spaniards invented the picaresque novel" (pp. 1-2). The two authors' exploitation of the formative genres is the subject of the most successful chapter of the book, Chapter 3, "The Literary Texture." Because comic literary evocation is a comparatively insignificant feature of

Apuleius, the bulk of the discussion, as in the two earlier chapters, is concerned with the Satyricon. The material in this chapter, most of which derives ultimately from Collignon, is presented in a lively, intelligent fashion. As Klebs recognized many years ago, Petronius turns epic poetry to his comic aim, and Walsh provides perceptive comments on the process. His delightful description of Eumolpus deserves to be quoted, "The manic poetaster with a chip on his shoulder about the exigent status of the literary genius" (p. 41). He explains the two major poems declaimed by Eumolpus in terms of Petronius' characterization of him, "The chief purpose is derisive parody of the poetic styles of Seneca and Lucan, who represent the facile versifiers of the age" (p. 50). "Petronius is parodying here [in the Troiae Halosis] ... a contemporary phenomenon, a city of tragic versifiers" (p. 47). The only seriously questionable view in the chapter is a perhaps exaggerated picture of the influence of Varro's Menippean satires on Petronius. Walsh provides no evidence to support his claim that Varro's "satires incorporated ... actual verses from earlier authors" (p. 34). (Even Courtney is unable to cite certain examples of direct quotation. On p. 103 Walsh implicitly acknowledges that Varronian satire has a tone and purpose different from those of the Satyricon. See further Collignon, pp. 23-26 and 32-33.) In Chapter 4, Walsh analyzes the Satyricon. He incisively characterizes it as "essentially a jeu d'esprit in which all the major figures ... are mannered scholars who confront a series of hazards, physical and moral, with the exaggerated rhetoric of their trade and with the studied postures of the mimic stage" (p. 109). His enlightening description of the novel, its narrator and its principal figures is marred, however, by his gratuitous unwillingness to accept the evidence of the ancient testimonia that at least thirteen books have been lost (pp. 73-78) and by the discredited view ("at present out of favor," p. 8) that "the Satyricon is a sustained skit on the Greek romance" (p. 8; see, too, pp. 78-79). The true explanation, I believe, is that the ideal romance and its comic counterpart are both extensions of epic, the tertium quid, or, as J. P. Sullivan has described the relationship, that the Odyssey is the father of all Reiseromanen. He comes close to recognizing this in his discussion of Eumolpus' appearance at an art gallery (p. 93; cf. pp. 32 and 82). Walsh's analysis of the Cena Trimalchionis is the best appreciation of the episode that I have read (Chapter 5):

The commentary of the narrator Encolpius is interwoven with the revealing words and actions of Trimalchio himself. And in several scenes the character of the host is reflected in the language and attitudes of his boon-companions at the table (p. 113).

He provides a clear, detailed account of Trimalchio's characterization from each of these points of view. Two minor points:

1) What evidence is there for supposing that a painting of a dog with the subscription "cave canem" is in poor taste (p. 118)? 2) If the character of Nicerus and Trimalchio discredits their "ghost" stories (p. 122), the same supposition should apply to the crone and her story of Cupid and Psyche in Apuleius, a story of which Walsh makes much in his interpretation of the novel. (There is nothing in the narrative [Satyricon 63.1] to suggest that Encolpius' reaction is "ironical," "agnostic," or that of "scholars." Cf. Pliny's account of the boy and the dolphin, Ep. 9.33.) Chapters 6 and 7 on the Metamorphoses follow the format of the earlier two devoted to the Satyricon: an analytical description of the work and a detailed discussion of what Walsh regards as the centrepiece, in this case the conte on Cupid and Psyche. The first half of his interpretation of the novel is certainly correct, "Its moral is that full knowledge of reality is gained not by magic but by the contemplation of divinity in the other, more real world, and that true happiness is to be sought not in sensuality but in the gratuitous love of the godhead" (p. 142). Sensuality, that is, enslavement to sex, is, however, hardly a "weakness" of Lucius (p. 180; also pp. 177, 179, 184). Lucius does, admittedly, yield twice to carnal attractions. In the second case, Apuleius provides the ass-Lucius with the excuse of long abstinence (10. 21.4; cf. 10. 19. 4). Earlier in the novel, Lucius explains unequivocally that his anticipated love-affair with Fotis is only a means of access to Pamphile, whom he avoids because she is a married woman (hardly the act of one enslaved to sex) (2.6). Moreover, he states that Fotis has already made her interest in him known but that he has not responded (ibid.; See also Jung-

hanns [cited in Walsh's bibliography], p. 148, n. 48.). Walsh is misleading when he writes, "Then, juxtaposed with this confession of heightened curiositas, follows the admission of enslavement to the charms of Fotis" (p. 180). Lucius has just asked Fotis to help him witness Pamphile's secret rites and adds: you, too, seem to be practiced in the magical arts, [for] I'm not normally attracted to women [his earlier indifference to Fotis], but I find your charms irresistible: "you've cast a charm onto me" (3.19; so Lucian, Asinus 11. See, too, Vallette's note in his Budé edition, ad loc.). The phrase servilem modum addictum (3.19.5), which is echoed in serviles voluptates (11. 15), refers to Lucius' obsessive curiosity to learn the mysteries of witchcraft, and it is from this that Isis "saves" him, not from the pleasures of the flesh, which are alien to his character (note that curiositas and serviles voluptates are linked at 11. 15). I have felt it necessary to emphasize the mistaken part of Walsh's interpretation, but I do not wish to detract from the many merits of Chapters 6 and 7, where he convincingly argues that the Metamorphoses is "more than a delightful ... entertainment: it is also a fable" (p. 176), and places the work in the context "of the contemporary reconciliation between Platonism and the Isiac faith" (p. 144). Walsh interprets the fable of Cupid and Psyche as "the centrepiece of the whole Metamorphoses." He adds, "The adventures of Psyche are deliberately shaped to stress the connexion between the maiden's error, suffering, and redemption and the similar experiences of Lucius" (p. 190), and are a synthesis of "a well-known folk-story with the theme of the love of Cupid and Psyche as depicted in the poetry and art ... of the Hellenistic period," which "is then further developed by apposite motifs from the evocation of well-known scenes from Greek and Latin poetry" (p. 217). (In reporting on even this excellent chapter, I feel that I must remonstrate against Walsh's tendency to adduce irrelevant or insignificant episodes from the Greek love-romances in order to support what I think is his mistaken view that Apuleius has purposefully attempted "to achieve the ironical comedy of a Lucian and the edification of a Chariton" [p. 176; also p. 175]. More often than not the references to supposed parallels in the ideal romances are grossly misleading. Limitations of space permit me to cite examples only by page number: p. 155, n. 1; p. 163, n. 2 ["popular": any other examples?]; p. 170, n. 2; p. 202, n. 4; p. 205, n. 2 ["fortune-motif" common in other writers also, e.g. Lucian]; p. 206, nn. 2 and 3; pp. 209-210 [visit to Ceres' shrine; cf. Tibullus 1. 1. 15]; p. 212, n. 1 [Romans regularly deified abstract concepts; see Grimal's note at 5. 30. 3 in his annotated edition of the tale of Cupid and Psyche and Ashmore's note on Terence, Adelphoe 761-762]; p. 213, n. 3 [note the references to Propertius and Tibullus]; p. 214, n. 2 [so Ovid, Metamorphoses 1. 689 ff.].) The book is rounded off nicely with a salutary chapter on "Nachleben": The Roman Novel and the Rebirth of the Picaresque, where similarities are noted in form between Apuleius and Petronius and their literary heirs: Spanish, French and English picaresque romances, and with appendixes on the dates of composition of the Satyricon (Neronian) and the Metamorphoses (late: 180-190) and on an Isiac aretology. There are a bibliography, an index of passages cited and a general index. In summary, the book is a synthesis rather than an innovative venture; though it offers little that is new, it does present the material in an engaging, intelligent manner. Walsh is strongest where he has had good guides like Collignon, Klebs, Paratore, Junghanns and Rieftahl, from whom he has learned and to whom he has added much. The principal shortcomings of the book result from his oversimplified, "biological" conception of the genesis of the two novels: Petronius' cynicism leads him to parody the Greek love-romances, and "Apuleius takes a more idealistic view of human nature under the stimulus of the ideal romance" (p. 162; cf. p. 164). The proof has been read carefully. Greater clarification is needed, however, on p. 152, n. 4, on p. 58, where the sentence after "Res ac .. flagitât" needs to be quoted to support the view that Apuleius burlesques features of historiography, and on p. 57, n. 6, where the reader should be informed that the quoted sentence is addressed to an ass.

Satyricon Poetry

Review of five articles by Natalie Woodall.

A. Fred Sochatoff, "Imagery in the Poems of the Satyricon," Classical Journal 65 (1970) 340-344. This article, which has already produced four "illegitimate" offspring, was written for the sole purpose of showing for what purposes and how convincingly Petronius used images in his poetry. With clear examples Sochatoff demonstrates the proof of his thesis: "[an image is]a device used to impart a sensory experience to the reader, most frequently invoking the sense of sight but certainly possible of activating any one of the other four senses as well". (p. 340) The reader is then presented with two poetic excerpts which are meant to contrast between green meadows and barren wasteland. Sochatoff points out that images concerning luxury and hedonism recur throughout the Satyricon and suggests that they may have had a double meaning--this could have been the work of the elegantiae arbiter who was titillating his friends at court, or could have been the work of a serious satirist who was sincerely concerned about the moral degeneracy of the times in which he lived. I found it amusing to read that "Petronius...has been seen to be greatly concerned with the moral degeneracy of the time, a condition which he correlated with a literary decline as well," (p. 344) and to see that Mr. Sochatoff agrees with himself in the footnote. Sochatoff's troubles with his article's "offspring" began when he introduced: "Heu heu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est/Sic erimus cuncti postquam nos auferet Orcus". (Sat. 34.10) It wasn't enough to say that "nos auferet Orcus" was a cliché; Sochatoff further stated that the third line in the poem was "imperfect metrically", (p. 342): "Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene".

2

Sochatoff then introduced the poem in Sat. 55.3: "Quod non expectes ex transverso fit/et super nos Fortuna negotia curat/quare da nobis vina Falerna, puer." Once again he attempted to show that a cliché is apparent and said that the line is "imperfect metrically". (p. 342) Herbert Huxley, "Marked Literary Inferiority" in the Poems of the Satyricon, Classical Journal 66 (1970) 69-70. Barry Baldwin, "Trimalchio's Poetry," Classical Journal 66 (1971) 254-255. E. J. Barnes, "Further on Trimalchio's Poetry," Classical Journal 66 (1971) 255. Natalie J. Woodall, "Trimalchio's Limping Pentameters," Classical Journal 66 (1971) 256-257. Herbert Huxley, as well as Barry Baldwin and E. J. Barnes, picks up "nos auferet Orcus". Huxley attacks Sochatoff for even suggesting that this is a cliché, and further points out that if Trimalchio is deliberately recalling an "Horatian idiom" then "his culture is more than superficial". (p. 69) E. J. Barnes takes Huxley to task (it is interesting to note how Barnes even steals Huxley's own phraseology in his first sentence) about "nos auferet Orcus". Barnes maintains that what is at stake is not that the phrase is a cliché, but that Horace makes the cliché come alive, while Trimalchio's efforts fail. Barry Baldwin stays out of the argument between Huxley and Sochatoff, and merely points out that after Trimalchio says "nos auferet Orcus", Echion the ragseller also tosses out a version of it.

3

On the next point, concerning "Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene", all four "offspring" get into the act. Is a pyrrhic ending un-Ovidian? Is this line "imperfect metrically"? Does imperfect metrically mean metrically incorrect? Huxley assumes that the pyrrhic bene was un-Ovidian, "but not therefore incorrect". Baldwin says the pyrrhic ending bene may be un-Ovidian, but thinks the ancient poets were not as finicky about rules for pentameter lines as we are. Barnes questions whether "imperfect" means "incorrect" and decides that it does not. His view is that Sochatoff has been misunderstood, in that Petronius, in all other instances in the Satyricon, conforms to Silver Age practice in ending pentameters with a long syllable. Natalie Woodall's article points out instances in which Ovid uses pyrrhic endings; these are found throughout several of his works. Therefore, it would appear that the "un-Ovidian" pyrrhic ending will have to be claimed by Ovid after all.

Woodall is guilty of faulty proof-reading, since she incorrectly gives the citation of 34.10 as 33.4. We must now return to "dum licet esse bene". Huxley is not happy with Heselstine's translation, "while it goes well with us," and suggests that "eat sumptuously" would fit just as well, if not better. Baldwin likes the idea, but Barnes refers the reader to the Lexicon Petronianum, which gives several instances of "esse bene" and "melius esse", all meaning "to be". At least that's what the lexicographers thought. Admittedly, the phrase is vague, and I would suggest that Petronius may have consciously intended a play on the word. Huxley ends his article by asking someone to show him the metrics of lines 1 and 2 of 55.3. He wants to make an analogy here with 34.10, by using Heinsius' emendations for these two lines, which would make them good hexameters, with line 3 as a pentameter, just as in 34.10.

4

Baldwin and Barnes both say that the lines can't be scanned. Barnes chides Sochatoff for not hearing the metrical quality of these lines, and even goes so far as to say that these lines "used to be hexameters", although Sochatoff has seen fit to leave them as Bicheler did, that is, without Heinsius' emendations. Only Woodall attempted to show how the lines could be scanned. She rejected the notion that there had to be some missing words, and relied on Encolpius' statement that the lines (haec) were distorta. If Encolpius meant this, then one should not look for metrically beautiful and correct lines to come out of the mouth of a drunken semi-literate such as Trimalchio. These four articles, or "offspring", demonstrate very clearly how academia may take a point and wear it right to death without settling anything. Sochatoff had a good idea in promoting the uses of and reasons for imagery in the Satyricon. But Huxley, Baldwin, and Barnes all find fault with two small points and say nothing about their overall approval or disapproval of the ideas put forward by Sochatoff. An investigation into Ovid's pentameters would have kept these writers from making the conclusion that a pyrrhic ending is "un-Ovidian". Why not an un-Tribullan, or un-Propertian pyrrhic? Woodall's article, at least, tried to do something with the poetry as it stood, not feeling the need for emendations or the compulsion to make every piece of verse in the Satyricon a model hexameter or pentameter.

A Myth is as good as a Mile

Some comments on Averil M. Cameron, 'Myth and Meaning in Petronius', Latomus 29 (1970), 397-425.

Review by Barry Baldwin

Cameron presses two themes: the relationship between Petronius and Eliot, Joyce, and Pound; and the plethora of motifs from the Odyssey discernible in the Satyricon. I am all for the comparative approaches of J. P. Sullivan (whose The Satyricon of Petronius: a Literary Study is analyzed and criticised by Cameron, passim) and the Arion "school". Comparisons need not always be odious. But the road leads only one way. Eliot and company can be illuminated by their classical models; I cannot see how the techniques of Petronius can be explained by appealing to twentieth century epigones. The trouble with Cameron's method is that it is infinitely variable. For instance, she elaborates (399-400) on the familiarity with the Satyricon evinced by Eliot and Joyce. Eliot, we are told, read Petronius at Harvard, and was much impressed. So what? It would be easy to substitute, say, Henry Miller for Eliot, and still have an article. Miller is acquainted with Petronius (see his The Books in My Life), and links with his Tropics and Road Crucifixion would be easy to forge (I use the verb advisedly). The question is not whether Eliot liked Petronius, but whether Petronius would have liked Eliot. I think he would not. I take one of the Satyricon's targets to be cultural snobberies and in-group vogues. Petronius might have approved the verdict of Kingsley Amis (The James Bond Dossier): "A few mentions of (say) Nestlé's condensed milk, Woodbines ... and Scotch-and-Apollinaris would have done The Waste Land a world of good. As it is, the poem, by setting out not to be limited to or by its immediate period, has no social-temporal context either, and has become just one more

of the featureless, flavourless lumps of cultural lumber it purports to be superior to." Cameron follows the common assumption that the Satyricon was based on the theme of the wanderings of Odysseus, with Priapus as the god in pursuit. This may or may not be true. Picaresque narrative demands an itinerant setting if the hero is to have any substantial number of adventures. And Cameron concedes that one might as legitimately adduce the Aeneid as the Odyssey. The gravis ira Priapi (Satyr. 139) need not relate to the main plot (if indeed the Satyricon had one). It occurs in a short poetic outburst towards the fragmentary conclusion, and can be assigned no definite personal or contextual reference. True, it should relate to Encolpius' impotence, and the victim compares himself to Ulysses' hounding by Neptune. But a randy hero afflicted by unwonted and unwanted impotence might naturally complain of the anger of Priapus in figurative, not literal terms. It is also true that Encolpius had intruded upon a sacellum Priapi, and is warned (Satyr. 17) by Quartilla that he may have committed inexpiabile scelus. But Quartilla's main concern is that he may reveal the rites in populum; Encolpius assures her that he will not. No great sacrilege is evident.

No one denies that Petronius includes mock epic parodies and Odyssean allusions. Cameron finds them everywhere, and insists on meanings deeper than simple fun. Some examples:

400: Cameron points to such Homeric nomenclature as Agamemnon and Menelaus. Is this more than a literary joke? I doubt it. And, if this is not so, it may be less rather than more than a jest. Epic appellations occurred in real life. Cicero (Brutus 100) mentions a rhetor called Menelaus, and Pollux may be adduced from the Second Sophistic. Cameron insists here (and elsewhere; see 419) that Petronius' characters are (like Bloom and Daedalus in Joyce) marked by their names as representing more than themselves. She instances Encolpius, Eumolpus, Philomela, Circe, Pannychis, Oenoethea. The truth is more mundane. A sexual connotation may be allowed to Encolpius, but the name is not restricted to fiction. Pliny the Younger had a lector of this name (Ep. 8. 1), and (unless he is a fabrication) an Encolpius wrote a biography of Alexander Severus (HA, Alexander 17, 48). Herod the Great had a concubine named Pannychis (Josephus, BJ 1. 511). There is an Encolpos in Martial (1. 31; 5. 48), also a Philomelus (3. 31; 4. 5) and a Pannychus (2. 36; 9. 47). Moreover, I cannot resist making a spurious point by utilizing Cameron's first technique. In Jean-Luc Godard's film Made in USA, there are two thugs called Richard Nixon and Robert McNamara. And Godard's earlier film Le Mépris had as its theme the filming of the Odyssey!

401: Encolpius reflects on the pictures of mythological scenes he sees in an art gallery (Satyr. 83) and there is an Odyssean comparison in the gravis ira Priapi poem. Which proves nothing. Trimalchio had scenes from Homer painted in his hall (Satyr. 29): do these make him an epic figure also?

408: Gíton hides under a bed like Odysseus under the sheep. This is pure slapstick; where else, after all, could he have hidden?

Cameron's quest goes beyond the Homeric. Encolpius and his two comrades are lost at the end of the Cena in the labyrinth of Trimalchio's house. This is supposed to be an image of death (405). But Encolpius has been lost before (Satyr. 6); a man who cannot even find his own lodgings can stumble around a strange mansion without any imagery of death. Emphasis is laid (following Sullivan) on the theme of scopomixy and the sexual act as symbolic of new life (409-410). But scopomixy is not uniquely Petronian. What of Martial's masturbating slaves (11. 104. 13 f.)? They are scopophiles, and the poem actually includes a reference to Penelope and Odysseus. The situation is tailor-made for comedy. If a gloss is required, let it be a literary one: a bawdy variant of the paraclausithyron. It is possibly pertinent to recall that the codicilli sent by Petronius to Nero were verbally scopophilic in that they registered the intimate details of Nero's bedroom (Tacitus, Ann. 16. 19).

Writing of Trimalchio's trick dishes and Daedalus the cook (406), Cameron says "they are not simply jokes." Why not? The Romans were fortunate in that they lived in a world unencumbered by psychology. It is still legitimate to believe that Petronius wrote a comic novel with comic intent. His

epic touches were for parody (as are those of Juvenal) and fun. The literature of the first century was infested by epic poetasters; this doleful phenomenon called for spoofing. It can be recollected that Milton was followed by Oldham, Dryden, Swift, and Pope. Cameron's analysis depends upon the assumption that the Satyricon had a serious intent and a coherent plot. It need not have had either. We know nothing about the details of its publication, whether or not it was finished, and for what audience it was intended. The traditional title may or may not be authentic; if it is, there is a strong hint that episodic construction rather than sustained plot was the dominant element. For whom was it intended? If for the court, Cameron can hardly be right (415) in understanding Eumolpus' complaint that prizes are given etiam ad imperitos (Satyr. 83) as a hit at Nero's poetry. An arbitrator elegantiae holds his position only with a good measure of tact. And there is no evidence that Petronius shared the contempt of Tacitus for Nero's verses. Tigellinus was unable to dredge up any such accusation when he procured the ruin of Petronius (assuming the equation between the author of the Satyricon and the Petronius of Ann. 16. 18-19), whereas Seneca's enemies were able to play on Nero's artistic touchiness (Ann. 14. 52). The Petronius who makes diplomatic criticism and private mock of Nero's poetry belongs not to history but to Quo Vadis? Lucan (is it politically significant that he is parodied in the Satyricon?) was not the only writer to come to grief. Antistius Sosianus was the first victim of maiestas trials under Nero; his offence was to publish adversus principem carmina (Ann. 14. 48). Fabricius Veiento suffered for his satirical squibs against senators and priests (one would have expected Nero to enjoy those). No, Eumolpus' complaint is simply sour grapes.

Cameron concludes by interpreting the humour of the Satyricon against "the background of emptiness." It was, she continues, "the product of corruption and over-sophistication." Possibly; even probably. But acceptance of this does not compel belief in Petronius as a sort of Symbol Simon. The tears of Heraclitus are balanced by the laughter of Democritus. Cameron's analysis might work with Fellini; not, I think, with Petronius himself.

Petronio, El Satiricón. Traducción del latín, prólogo y notas de Francisco de P. Samaranch. (Biblioteca de Iniciación al Humanismo.) Madrid: Aguilar. 1967. Pp. 282.

Reviewed by E. J. Barnes

This little volume has escaped notice hitherto in enough of the usual journals and reviews that its very existence is unsuspected by a good number of Petronians. The book was intended, quite obviously, as a college-level paperback translation, perhaps for Latin-less students in humanities courses or in classics-in-translation. These students and their instructors (many of whom might well have no deep experience in Petronian studies) deserve some notice of the book, if only as one reviewer's opinion of the value of their second-hand contact with this significant Latin author. The fact that the Latin text is not provided makes it pretty clear that undergraduate Latin students, probably, and more advanced laborers of this particular vineyard, especially, are not the publisher's prime target. This is as it should be, at very least; the book has absolutely nothing to offer any student of Latin, and would be a scandal in academic circles if it ever fell into the hands of a some Petronian and suffered the consequent ignominy of review in a periodical read by Latinists. Petronius has fallen prey to fraud of divers sorts since the murky days of Tigellinus. One thinks of the pious titles penned for emasculated snippets by mediaeval compilers of florilegia; or of the pranks of Nodot which were allowed to sully the otherwise immaculately seductive illustrated translation by Laurent Tailhade; or of the naughty lack of concern shown by Pierre Pithou in his citations of variae lectiones from the Cuiacianus (the problem is stated conveniently by G. Bagnani, "On Fakes and Forgeries," Phoenix 14 [1960] 233 and n. 11). This sad little book, however, bears unto oblivion the stain of plagiarism. From start to finish it is a Spanish translation of much of the Introduction and all of the French translation published by Ernout as his Paris edition of 1962, and nowhere within its covers is this awesome debt acknowledged. Such a charge demands proof.

One extended passage of the introduction must suffice, though in fact the entire book should be seen to be believed. On page X Ernout writes, "Il n'y a rien dans ce récit qui fasse mention du Satiricón. Depuis longtemps, il est généralement admis que la satire composée par Pétrone contre Néron durant sa dernière nuit ne saurait être assimilée à notre roman, et le bon sens de Voltaire entre autres avait déjà fait justice de cette hypothèse trop légèrement formulée et accueillie. A vrai dire, le récit lui-même de Tacite n'est pas sans invraisemblance..." On page 11 of this Spanish book is written, "Y ni una sola alusión al Satiricón. Hace ya tiempo se ha admitido generalmente que la sátira que Petronio compuso contra Nerón en su última noche no puede identificarse con la novela de que aquí hablamos. Ya Voltaire había hecho justicia en favor de esta hipótesis, rechazando la de la identidad entre ambos escritos, demasiado ligera. En realidad, hasta lo que dice Tácito resulta un tanto inverosímil." As far as the story itself is concerned, it is clear that S. has translated Ernout's French if only because his punctuation reproduces that of Ernout's translation, not that of any Latin text (even Ernout's). A "Prologo" on 9-18, though actually signed by S. himself, translates entire Ernout's handy "L'Homme et l'Oeuvre." ("Le Texte de Pétrone" is not translated for this volume since the Latin text is omitted.) On 19-31 is given a translation of Ernout's "Sommaire," again signed by S. Then follows the translation of Ernout's translation. Occasionally, one must admit, some evidence of selectivity emerges. On 13 S. absorbs part of Ernout, page XIII, n. 3, into his text (this occurs also, e.g., on 16). A few footnotes given by Ernout are excluded from the Spanish, e.g., Ernout 1, n. 1 (this is done especially with translations of other Latin authors illustrating a specific detail). On 59, n. 2, is a contributed definition of the Latin familia. On 65, n. 27, Ernout's edition is mentioned (for the only time in this book) for his translation of the variously interpreted phrase libera cena. On 66, "aunque valía la pena hacerlo" corrects the misprint "voulaiant" for "valaient" noticed in Ernout's corrigenda. On 109 S. gives the Latin words used in the puns at Sat. 56. There are misprints of a type suggesting that whoever proofread the volume knows little Latin: e.g., on 181, for "Epistolasi 4 12" read "Epistolas I, 4, 12"; on 205, for "tabalarum" read "tabularum." Inconsistencies occur: on 37, n. 1, S. adds to Ernout's note (ad 2.9) the unhelpfully lazy remark, "Recuérdese también el Brutus, de Cicerón, pas-sim." Perhaps understandably, recent scholarship on troubled details is omitted; yet on 77, n. 41, S. translates Ernout's note on oclopetaw without noticing other views. The question here is, Why bother giving the note at all? Can it really interest a Latin-less reader? And so it goes. Nothing further need surely be said to give the interested reader a fair idea of what to find in this book. There remains the unexplained fact of the book's existence. The publisher's customary "Reservados todos los derechos" is here fraudulent and, I should think, actionable. The translator, a professor at the Universidad de Puerto Rico, should be denied credentials in any respectable institution of learning; his moral lesson, to say the least, betrays that "humanismo" which his publisher's series should be attempting to honour. In my opinion the venture merits universal contempt, and its exposure is somewhat overdue.

Professor John P. Sullivan, Faculty Professor at the State University of New York at Buffalo, delivered the thirty-fourth annual Earle Lecture at Hunter College of the City University of New York, April 16, 1971. The title of the lecture was "Petronius and his Modern Critics: T. S. Eliot to Fellini."

The following papers presented at the special session of the Petronian Society held in conjunction with the American Philological Association in New York on 30 December 1970, will be published: Gerald Sandy, "Petronius and the Tradition of the Interpolated Narrative," TAPA 101 (1970); Froma Zeitlin, "Petronius Romanus: Troiae Halosis and Bellum Civile," Latomus 30 (1971); J. P. Sullivan, "Petronius and his Modern Critics," Bucknell Review.

Professor Carlo Pellegrino's critical edition of the Satyricon will appear in Italy this fall.