THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY

Newsletter

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

VOL. 2 NO. 2 EDITOR: GARETH SCHMELING DECEMBER 1971

CORRECTION FOR VOL. 1 NO. 2

Dobroiu, E., "Pour une édition du Satiricon III série," Studii Clasice 12 (1970) 79-93. Sat. 62.4: homo meus coepit ad stellas (=cemetery monuments) facere: sedeo ego cantabundus et stellas (stars) numero.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

D'Arms, J., Romans on the Bay of Naples (Cambridge: Harvard, 1970). The book provides a wealth of material relating to social life in the region around Naples, which is the putative setting of parts of the Satyricon. Chapter 5, "The Bay of Naples in the Imperial Age," especially the section on "Learning and Culture: the Studiosi," will be of particular interest to Petronians. See, too, "Catalogue II," No. 32. (Sandy)

Balkestein, J., "Trimalchio, een naam met een betekenis?" Hermeneus 43 (1971) 12-17. Balkestein repeats the well known arguments for a Syrian-Semitic origin of the name: the name 'Malchio' is found 40 times in CIL; points to 'Malchion' in Lucian's quomodo hist. The name Malchio also occurs in Punic territory. It is borne by freedmen of oriental origin. While the stem m-l-k seems obvious, B. considers the ending -io, corresponding to Gk. -ion, as "strange". However, he cites a number of semitic names with -ion termination. He believes with Lidzbarski, that the first component of such semitic names assumes the qatl-form, while the termination may be the aramaic suffix of endearment - ôn, so that e.g. Zabdi becomes Zabdion. Similarly, Nöldecke (Beitr. z. sem. Sprachw.) thinks of the hypocoristic aramaic diminutive ending wn. Thus, concludes B., Zabdion would mean "my little gift," Malchion, "my little king," etc. Unfortunately there is no bilingual to indicate that Gk. malchíon is a transliteration of sem. mlkiwn. There are two Nabatean inscriptions with mlkiwn which, however, have no evidential force. However, he thinks it highly unlikely that Μαλχίων represents mlki: the latter has the possessive of the 1st pers. sing., thus "belonging to the king," which in bilinguals is rendered as -αιος . We have thus, says B., some semitic name mlkiwn, where to the "Kosenamen" Malchî or the nisbe-form Malchai the hypocoristic diminutive -wn is added, thus "my little king."
Why did Petr. select this name? A king is not only powerful but also rich, so that Ernout's "le très puissant", or else Malchio (reinforced by Tri-), the very rich man, as in Martial, is indicated. (Schnur)

Barnes, T.E., The Poems of Petronius (Dissertation: Toronto, 1972). 345pp. Review to appear in a later issue.

Burnaby William, The Satyricon of Petronius. Revised with an introduction by Gilbert Bagnani and illustrated by Antonio Sotomayor. New York: Heritage Press, 1970. Originally published in 1694. XXIII, 246pp. including 54 drawings. $9.50 boxed.

Courtney, E., "Some Passages of Petronius", BICS 17 (1970) 65-69. Courtney proposes 26 readings. 2.7: corrupta eloquentia e⟨reptā⟩ regula; 4.4: confiteri ⟨non iam tenendum esse⟩ non vult; 5.15-20: change the line order to 15-16-20-17-18-19 and read vox operata in line 16 for exonerata, and per pugnas for dent epulas; 20.5-7: ancilla ⟨re⟩risu meo prodita; 23.5: [super] inguina; 41.9: invitare ⟨nos largius⟩; 87.7-8: et non plane iam ⟨cupiebam, nec tamen⟩ molestum; 88.7: ubi sapientiae ⟨concelebratum decus? nam ex quo coeperunt homines ire in-⟩ consultissima via; 91.7: petulantiam for paenitentiam; 94.11: Courtney supports the reading of lr, petiturus praecipitia fui; 102.13-14: quam [hic] solus... consentiant [et non] ⟨ut de⟩ natione; 103.2-4: umbra [supplicii] tegent; 105.9: read artus for manus; 108.1: aequalis [cum fronte] calvities; 112.2: ⟨quamvis⟩ castae; 113.11: non pluris ⟨illum⟩ facies; 114.11: litus ⟨ventus⟩ expellere; 118.6: Courtney suggests something like fabulosum ⟨argumentum velut tormento⟩ praecipitandus; 119.6: do not change in litore tantum; 125.2: quam ⟨copiam⟩; 126.17: read manus; nam pedum... positus Parium marmor; 127.9: read cumulavit for clamavit; 128.1: neglegens sudor? [puto] si haec; 131.1 read in ⟨idem nemus⟩; 134.1-2: ne [a] puero quidem, making puero an ablative of instrument; 135.8: read ore for aevo.

Dell'Era, Antonio, Problemi di lingua e stile in Petronio (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1970). 223pp. To be reviewed in a later issue of the Newsletter.

Dell'Era, A., "La geminazione in Petronio," GIF 22 (1970) 22-31. La funzione stilistica della geminazione si è rivelata essere l'innesto, in un discorso almeno tendenzialmente spontaneo, di un elemento di maggiore freschezza e immediatezza espressiva; si tratta al tempo stesso di un colon ritmico d'intensità sufficiente, in ragione diretta della sua brevità e reduplicazione, per essere completamente autonomo nell'ambito del periodo.

Dietrich, B.C., "Petronius, Satyr of Satirist," Orpheus 17 (1970) 17-43. General essay on the Satyricon. Adapted from an address before the Classical Association of South Africa, Grahamstown, 18 September 1968.

Dobroiu, E., "Le congrès de Bucarest" reports that Professor Dobroiu spoke on Petronius, his Latin, and his times.

Gottschalk, H.B., "Hircus in ervilia (Petron. 57.11)," CP 66 (1971) 187-188. Ascyltos is compared to a hircus who has overeaten in a field of vetch (in ervilia) and is suffering from bloat.

Herrmann, L., "La sauterelle et le perroquet," Latomus 30 (1971) 373-374. Discussion of Sat. 35 and Frag. 31.

Jacobson, H., "A Note on Petronius Sat. 31.2," CP 66 (1971) 183-186. Jacobson would read Sat. 31.2 as vinum dominicum, ministratoris gratis est, a binary proverb translated as "the wine is the master's, the favor is the butler's." It is based on a Talmudic proverb.

Killeen, J.F., "Petronius 43.6," Orpheus 15 (1968) 179-181. Killeen argues that the oricularios servos belong to Chrysanthus' brother, and that oricularios means "long-eared with the idea of blabbing."

Krenkel, Werner, Römische Satiren (Berlin und Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1970). Bibliothek der Antik. 607pp., 9.30 marks, hard cover. Besides other translation-series in the German Democratic Republic, such as 'Reclams Universalbibliothek' (the oldest paperback-series of the world) and the 'Sammlung Dieterich', there are two which are exclusively dedicated to ancient literatures, namely 'Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt', comprising bilingual editions in Greek/Latin - German, published by Akademie-Verlag Berlin, and the 'Bibliothek der Antike', in which German translations are published by Aufbau-Verlag Berlin and Weimar.
The booklet opens with an introduction of 30 pages. Here, a distinction is made between the satirical spirit (which permeates the works of Aristophanes, Xenophanes, Menippos, Bion, Archilochos, Hipponax, Kallimachos, fables, and the like), the satura proper (represented by Latin authors from Ennius to Sulpicia), and the satire (dealing not only with individuals and vices and shortcomings in general, but attacking weaknesses and failures in societies and political systems as well). All fragments of Ennius' saturae have been translated with short headings or captions; a selection of about 530 frag-

ments, or lines rather, has been taken from Lucilius, Satiren, Lateinisch und deutsch von Werner Krenkel, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1970 (Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt, Bände 23, 1.2), 771 pages, marks 90. Varro is represented by about 220 fragments from his Saturae Menippeae in Krenkel's version. He is followed by all of Horace' Sermones translated by Ch.M. Wieland, Persius in toto in W. Binder's translation, Seneca's Apocolocyntosis and Petronius (chapters 1 - 115) translated by Krenkel, all sixteen Saturae of Juvenal in E.C.J. v. Siebold's classical translation, and Sulpicia in H. Dünther's version, all of these having been checked and modernized by Krenkel. Some one hundred pages of notes and a two page bibliography conclude this booklet. (Werner Krenkel)

Magi, F., "L'adventus di Trimalchione e il fregio A della Cancelleria," Archeologia Classica 23 (1971) 88-92, and Plate XXVI. Magi compares "fregio A" to Trimalchio's adventus in Sat. 29.3 (et ipse Trimalchio capillatus caduceum tenebat Minervaque ducente Romam intrabat), and argues that the passage in Petronius proves that the status of Minerva as Domitian's special protectress was of long standing. I emphasize that Magi is not claiming a Flavian date for the Satyricon. Magi also argues against the conventional interpretation of capillatus as an indication of Trimalchio's status as a slave at the time of his adventus. He cites Martial 3.57 and 10.62, Suetonius Vesp. 23.8 and Juvenal 5.30 and claims that such an interpretation would not be in keeping with the solemnity of his adventus. For further details of the "Cancelleria Reliefs" see M.A. Hanfmann, Roman Art (London 1964) 109-110 and plate 111. (Sandy)

Morford, M.P.O., "The Distortion of the Domus Aurea Tradition," Eranos 66 (1968) 158-179. Morford interprets Sat. 120.87-89 as a criticism of Nero's lavish building programme, in particular his Domus Aurea. For this purpose Petronius adopts the traditional language of Roman moralists (pp. 171-2). (Sandy)

Nelson, H.L.W., "Bemerkungen zu einem neuem Petrontext," Mnemosyne Series 4, Vol. 24 (1971) 60-87. Verf. erörtert anhand einer kritischen Besprechung der neuen Petronausgabe von Konrad Müller, München 1961 (und unter gleichzeitiger Berücksichtigung der 'Tusculum'-Edition von K. Müller und W. Ehlers, München 1965) allerlei Probleme der Überlieferung unseres Autors. Dabei wird unter anderem auf die von Müller (im Anschluss an Ed. Fraenkel) aufgeworfene These näher eingegangen, dass die Überlieferung sämtlicher Petrontexte auf einen einzigen karolingischen Abschreiber zurückzuführen sei, der eine alte nur noch streckenweise lesbare Handschrift nicht nur exzerpiert, sondern ausserdem die auf diese Weise gewonnenen Bruchstücke durch Einschaltung von erklärenden Interpolationen erweitert habe.
Verf. analysiert eine Auswahl aus den zahlreichen Stellen, die im Müllerschen Text als karolingische Einschiebsel bezeichnet sind, und kommt aufgrund sprachlicher wie sachlicher Argumente zu dem Ergebnis, dass, von wenigen Ausnahmen abgesehen, keine Gründe vorliegen, die petronische Urheberschaft jener Stellen anzuzweifeln. Ferner wird von ihm hervorgehoben, dass das Vorhandensein von Petronexzerpten bereits für eine viel frühere Zeit als die karolingische nachgewiesen werden kann: so kannte z.B. schon Isidorus von Sevilla Petron lediglich aus Auszügen. Eine Inhaltsübersicht der uns überlieferten petronischen Fragmente macht es, so führt Verf. fort, sehr wahrscheinlich, dass es sich hier um eine von spätrömischen Grammatikern hergestellte Exzerptsammlung handelt (diese Grammatiker interessierten sich für Symposionliteratur, literarische und rhetorische Diskussionen, pikante Anekdoten, auffällige Phraseologien und sonstige sprachliche Raritäten, neuartige Etymologien usw.).
In einem Exkurs behandelt Verf. noch das Problem des ursprünglichen Umfanges des Satyricon: dass der Originaltext 16, ventuell gar 18 oder 20 Bücher umfasst habe, dürfte nach der Ansicht des Verf. sehr unwahrscheinlich sein (vielleicht rührten die - recht widersprüchlich überlieferten - sogen. Buchzahlen von Anordnungsnummern alter Prosaflorilegien her). (H.L.W. Nelson)

Paratore, E., La narrativa latina nell'età di Nerone: La Cena Trimalchionis di Petronio (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1961). 261pp. A valuable book overlooked in all bibliographies. In addition to useful insights into the Satyricon Paratore furnishes interesting parallels to Apuleius' Metamorphoses.

Pecere, O., "Cronache e commenti," RFIC 99 (1971) 217-242. On pp. 237-8 Pecere discusses Sat. 4.3 (verba atroci stilo effoderent) as it relates to Persius.

Radermacher, L., "Petroni Saturae 111-112," Latin with German translation in Altgriechische Liebesgeschichten Historien und Schwänke (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970) pp. 58-63.

Raith, O., "Unschuldsbeteuerung und Sündenbekenntnis im Gebet des Enkolp an Priap (Petr. 133.3)," Studii Clasice 13 (1971) 109-125. "Das Gebet, das bei Petron Enkolp, der komische Held der Geschichte, an Priap richet, ist bisher hauptsächlich einerseits als Ausgangspunkt für die Rekonstruktion der Idee des Romans benützt, andererseits summarisch als Beispiel für die Gattung der Gebetsparodie betrachtet worden. Im vorliegenden Aufsatz wird nur ein Teil dieses Gebets, die Unschuldsbeteuerung und das auf sie folgende Sündenbekenntnis (V. 6-11), behandelt. Die Untersuchung erfolgt in zwei Abschnitten: Im ersten wird die literarische Herkunft des genannten Motivkomplexes geklärt, soweit es möglich ist, im zweiten nach seiner Bedeutung im Zusammenhang bei Petron gefragt (p. 109)."

Rankin, H.D., "Some Comments on Petronius' Portrayal of Character," Eranos 68 (1970) 123-147. "The power of Petronius' character portrayal, and the way in which it is wedded to the styles of speech which the characters respectively use, which is individual while it still remains Petronian, makes it the more regettable that large tracts of the book are lost. There are, as it is, many minor characters who create their own atmospheres, such as the haughty steward who magnanimously forgives his fellow slave a whipping... His characters are all imbued with his peculiar thought and emit the special flavour of his own philosophy of life. This, I would suggest, is true of Petronius' portrayals of character " (p. 140).

Rowell, Henry T., review of J.P. Sullivan, The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study (London: Faber, 1968) in AJP 92 (1971) 92-100.

Sage, Evan T., "Petronius, the Realist," Ancient Fiction: A Series of Nine Radio Talks (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1930) 13-20. Radio Publication No. 62. Previously unreported in any bibliography.

Sage, Evan T., "The Satyricon - Chiefly Adventure," Ancient Fiction: A Series of Nine Radio Talks (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1930) 21-28. Radio Publication No. 62. Previously unreported in any bibliography.

Sandy, G.N., "Petronius and the Tradition of the Interpolated Narrative," TAPA 101 (1970) 463-476. Sandy examines Petronius' methods of encompassing the utterances of dramatized narrators, e.g. Niceros' framed narrative about the werewolf, Trimalchio's about witches, Eumolpus' about the Pergamene boy, the matron of Ephesus, his poems about the fall of Troy, and de bello civili, and he compares them with the devices used by a wide range of authors, concluding that Petronius is almost totally conventional in his treatment of interpolated narrative. Sandy further argues that the interpolated narratives of the Satyricon have only a strictly immediate relevance. (Sandy)

Schmeling, G., Petronius' Satyricon. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971. 58 pp. A short, critical summary of the Satyricon intended for the young, Latin-less reader.

Schnur, H.C., "Petronius. A Correction," Hermeneus 42 (1970) 257-258. Vitriolic attack on the scholarship of J.R. Evenhuis, "Petronius," Hermeneus 41 (1969) 16-23.

Shey, H. James, "Petronius and Plato's Gorgias," CB 47 (1971) 81-84. Shey holds that many of Petronius' comments on "rhetoric, food, excess, and death" are linked to and perhaps echoes from Plato's Gorgias.

Sullivan, J.P., "Petronius and his Modern Critics," Bucknell Review 19 (1971) 107-124. Professor Sullivan discusses the arguments of scholars like Highet, Arrowsmith, and Bacon, who would read the Satyricon as a moral tract against the sterility and decay of Roman society. Themes thus interpreted are rejected by Sullivan, who sees the Satyricon as a supreme literary effort written for the literary coterie around Nero.

Sullivan, John, Petronius: The Satyricon and the Fragments (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965). This translation of the Satyricon will be translated into modern Greek and published by Iniochus of Athens.

Sullivan, J.P., review of P.G. Walsh, The Roman Novel: The Satyricon of Petronius and the Metamorphoses of Apuleius (Cambridge 1970) in Phoenix 25 (1972) 191-193.

Tandoi, V., "Una proposta di matrimonio per Trimalchione," Studia Florentina A. Ronconi sexagenario oblata (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1970) 431-453. Il testo del codice in Satyr. 74,15 here proxime è stato corretto da molti filologi moderni senza necessità (herae J. Scheffer; herae proximae Bücheler, Ernout, W. B. Sedgwick, Ciaffi; hic proxime H. Fuchs; hercle K. Müller; ecc.), oppure, quando viene mantenuto, risulta in genere frainteso dagli editori. Qui veramente si vuol dire "ieri l'ultima volta", cioè Petronio lascia intendere che l'unguentarius, da mezzano provetto della società bene, andava consigliando spesso a Trimalchione un nuovo matrimonio (previo divorzio da Fortunata), e non una semplice avventura galante. Sufficienti conferme in tal senso forniscono sia l'analisi di lingua e stile che quella degli indizi archeologici. E se così è, nella scena possiamo cogliere un'eco fantastica ed estrosa della vicenda matrimoniale di Nerone, mentre era incerto fra Ottavia e Poppea, dato che la cena Trimalchionis risente in qualche maniera del mondo di corte neroniano, fino a sembrarne, talvolta, non inconscio stravolgimento in libera chiave satirica (come hanno già variamente sostenuto moltissimi interpreti, da alcuni Umanisti a G. Boissier e Ribbeck, da E. Cocchia a K.F.C. Rose, ecc.). Nell'insieme però il litigio fra i due coniugi, che è anche parodia dei vecchi discorsi idealistici sull'amore, consueti nei symposia, dà qui anzitutto la misura del realismo comico di Petronio, cioè della sua vera grandezza di scrittore. (V. Tandoi)

van Thiel, H., "Sulla tradizione di Petronio," Maia 22 (1970) 238-260 und 23 (1971) 57-64. Man zweifelt bis heute nicht prinzipiell daran, dass die Reihenfolge der Petronexzerpte im wesentlichen dem Gang des Originals entspreche. Man glaubt, die sog. Langen Exzerpte (L) seien durch Exzerpieren des vollständigen Werkes entstanden, die kürzeren Exzerptensammlungen (O und ϕ) durch erneutes Exzerpieren von L.
L hat jedoch in bestimmten begrenzten Abschnitten zahlreiche (insgesamt 75) Varianten mit jüngeren Zeugen von O gemeinsam, die in der Mehrzahl schlecht oder einwandfrei falsch sind. Es gibt dafür nur eine Erklärung: L hat diese Abschnitte aus einem jüngeren Zeugen von O übernommen, vermultlich, weil sie in der Hauptvorlage von L, die ich $\wedge$ nenne, nicht enthalten waren.
L hat auch aus ϕ einzelne Stücke übernommen, und zwar zumindest die isolierten Sentenzen der Cena (43,6. 44,17. 45,2 usw.). L steht demnach nicht am Anfang, sondern am Ende unserer Petronüberlieferung: es ist eine sekundäre Kombination verschiedener Exzerptensammlungen, von denen uns zwei erhalten sind (O und ϕ). Wenigstens zwei weitere lassen sich erschliessen: die Hauptvorlage $\wedge$ und eine grammatisch-lexikalische Sammlung, aus der die zahlreichen kurzen Bruchstücke stammen, die unserem Verständnis so große Schwierigkeiten entgegensetzen (8, 4-9,1.19,6-21,3. 113,10-13. 128,7-129,2. 138) - diese Bruchstücke stehen fast alle falsch! Die Sammlung L ist vermutlich im 12. Jahrh. in Frankreich hergestellt worden.
So erklärt sich, warum man nie erkennen konnte, nach welchen Gesichtspunkten L angefertigt ist, solange man seinen Hersteller für einen Exzerptor hielt. Er war im Gegenteil ein Sammler, der die gesamte verfügbare Überlieferung des Petron, d.h. die verschiedenen, nach jeweils einheitlichen Gesichtspunkten angefertigten Exzerptensammlungen, ineinandergearbeitet hat. So hat $\wedge$ z.B. nur den Anfang der Cena (c. 27-37, 5) enthalten, die übrigen Stücke daraus in L stammen aus O (c. 55) und ϕ.
Der Sammler L hat sich offensichtlich bemüht, die ursprüngliche Reihenfolge der Textstücke wiederherzustellen; dabei werden ihn vor allem die Textüberschneidungen und die relative Reihenfolge der einzelnen Exzerptenklassen geleitet haben. Trotzdem war er bei seiner Arbeit oft genug auf Kombination angewiesen, und oft genug hat er falsch kombiniert. So gehört 20,8 direkt hinter 19,1, wie es in O steht; umgekehrt unterbricht 18,7f. vermutlich den ursprünglichen Text dadurch, dass L die Reihenfolge von O fälschlich beibehielt. Die Reihenfolge der Petronexzerpte ist also nicht durchgehend zuverlässig.
Man versteht die Zeugnisse über den Umfang der Satyrica so, als habe die Cena den Inhalt eines einzigen, des 15. Buches, gebildet, so dass die einzelnen Bücher mindestens 50 Seiten, das gesamte Werk mindestens 1000 Seiten umfasst haben müssten Genauere Untersuchung zeigt jedoch, dass zwar das Ende der Cena wahrscheinlich mit dem Ende des 15. Buches zusammenfiel, dass hingegen über dessen Anfang kein Anhaltspunkt gegeben ist. Wahrscheinlich ist, dass die Buchlänge der Satyrica, wie der übrigen antiken Romane, zwischen 20 und 25 Seiten lag, so dass das gesamte Werk bei einem Umfang von vielleicht 24 Büchern 500 - 600 Seiten umfasst hätte. (H. van Thiel)

Van Thiel, H., Petron: Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion. Mnemosyne Supplement 20. (Leiden: Brill, 1971). Pp. 78. This book will be reviewed at length in another issue of the Newsletter. As the title indicates there are two main parts to this book: (1) Die Überlieferung and (2) Die Handlung des Romans. In addition there are three "Anhänge": (1) Die Lücken in L; (2) Vorschläge zum Text; (3) Vorschläge zur Reihenfolge der Petron-Exzerpte.

Truszkowski, W., "Z zycia gastronomii starożytnej" (La gastronomie antique imitée par les modernes), Filomata 86 (1937) 387-391.

Truszkowski, W., Edition linguistique des parties vulgaires de la Cena Trimalchionis No. 37-39, 41-43. Edition critique avec l'apparat critique, precédée d'une introduction, d'une bibliographie des manuscrits, des éditions et des études linguistiques et suivie d'un vocabulaire succint. Teksty łaciny potocznej (Textes du latin vulgaire). Warszawa 1957. Texte p. 14-26. Introduction générale p. 3-13 étudie les problèmes du latin vulgaire.

Truszkowski, W., "Aspekt językoznawczy i aspekt socjologiczny w badaniu języka łacińskiego na tropie łacińskiego argot" (Aspect linguistique et l'aspect sociologique dans l'étude de la langue latine), Sprawozdania Oddziału Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Krakowie (Comptes-rendus de la Filiale de l'Academie polonaise à Cracovie (1962) 57-60. C'est une étude approfondie de l'expression pétronienne tangomenas faciamus et des expressions semblables. Le texte intégral de ce travail va être publié en français.

Traszkowski, W., "Język potoczny i retoryka w Satyrykonie Petroniusza" (Langue vulgaire et la rhétorique dans le Satiricon de Pétrone), Sprawozdania Oddziału Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Krakowie (1970) 36-38. Le texte intégral de ce travail va être publie prochainement en français.

NOTICES

On 29 December 1971, in Cincinnati, Ohio, at the 103rd annual meeting of the American Philological Association, the Petronian Society held its second annual meeting. Six speakers presented a unified approach to Petronius and his Satyricon: Helen Bacon, "Petronius the Moralist"; John Sullivan, "Petronius the Parodist"; Georg Luck, "Petronius the Poet"; William Nethercut, "Petronius the Astrologer"; Johanna Stuckey, "Petronius the 'Ancient'"; Harry Schnur, "Petronius: Sense and Nonsense". About 125 people attended the session, and more would have attended, had the room size and accommodations allowed. It was an extremely enthusiastic session, and it illustrated the reception the Petronian studies continue to receive. Anyone desiring a copy of the papers delivered should contact Professor Gareth Schmeling.

Beginning with Vol. 41 (1970) of L'Année Philologique, The Petronian Society Newsletter will be indexed under "Petronius."

K.F.C. Rose, The Date and Author of the Satyricon. Leiden: Brill, 1971. Pp. xi+107.

Review by Barry Baldwin

Were sanity to prevail, Rose's book would justify the hope expressed by J.P. Sullivan (who has seen the volume through the press, and furnished an introduction and augmented bibliography) to the effect that the date and identity of the Satyricon and its author have now been established as far as is humanly possible in the present state of knowledge. Rose has proved nothing, and has not claimed to. What he has done is to assemble and present the available evidence ("clues" might be a better term) for believing that the author of the Satyricon was the consular T. Petronius Niger, a man to be equated with the arbiter whose suicide under Nero in 66 is described by Tacitus (Annals 16, 17-20). The Tacitean account is familiar, as are the problems it poses. His picture of the insouciant consular has often been assumed to fit the author of the Satyricon so well (in terms of personality) that the identification has become an article of faith. It is validly objected that this faith rests only on a coincidence. But it is safer to accept this coincidence (albeit, one helped along by Quo Vadis?) than tender the alternative, and surely greater, one: that there were two Petronii, each dubbed arbiter, of the same engaging stamp. Again, Tacitus ascribes no literary productions to Petronius, beyond the codicilli (on which, more later) sent to Nero. It is also notable that Tigellinus only accused him of friendship with Scaevinus; there was apparently no attempt to play on Nero's artistic jealousies as there had been in 62 on the part of Seneca's enemies (Annals 14. 52). Which proves nothing. Tacitus is not famous for including detailed accounts of a man's literary activities. He was also an easily shockable moralist and might have deemed the Satyricon beneath contempt and unfit for mention in his sober pages. Some have doubted that the Satyricon was as bulky a work as is inferred from the tradition that the extant portions come from Books 15-16 (see P. Corbett, Petronius (1970), 42-3, for the latest expression of these doubts). Rose sensibly points to the enormous size of later European erotica. The matter ties in with two other issues. Few now think that the Satyricon should be equated with the codicilli. Now, it is not quite impossible that these latter could have contained a suitable extract from the former (though Tacitus' account leaves no such impression). And it is worth noting (Rose does not) that Fabricius Veiento had been exiled in 62 on a maiestas charge for penning satirical attacks on senators and priests quibus nomen codicillorum deberat (Annals 14.50). Codicilli might have been in the process of becoming a common form or generic term in satirical literature. In Petronius' case, Tacitus states that the codicilli received by Nero contained embarrassingly circumstantial material (hence the fate of Silia). The other matter germane to the above is the "pornographic" content of the Satyricon. This nonsense is sensibly treated by Rose. It has been said that pornography is in the groin of the beholder. That may be; the Satyricon does not contain all that much sexual matter in proportion to its size. It may be significant that the Cena section has virtually no erotic content (in spite of the impression left by such bowdlerisers as Heseltine and Sedgwick). The sexual content is harmless, compared to, say, Martial, and one should recall that Roman moralists were far too quickly shocked. The erotic passages (double entendre intended) are often played for laughs, there is little one could fairly call sado-masochistic, and only poor little Pannychis could be regarded as a victim of sexual brutality (neither Giton nor Eumolpus' young catamite need my sympathy). Rose supplies (pp. 82-6 a list of alleged references to Nero in the Satyricon. Detecting such has always been a popular game, and Rose's register is an amusing monument to misplaced ingenuity. It raises the matter, however, of Petronius' audience. Was the Satyricon designed for a select imperial and court group? If so, was Nero capable of enjoying a joke against himself? For all we know, he was; the Tacitean Nero is a one-sided and malicious creation. Nero was capricious, to be sure, in this matter. Suetonius comments on his pachydermatous acceptance of graffiti and lampoons, yet the first two victims of maiestas trials were both aspirant satirists (Fabricius Veiento and Antistius Sosianus). The tendency to see Nero in the guise of Trimalchio has been perverted by the accident of the survival of the Cena as the most elaborate and coherent set-piece. The banquet was a commonplace in satirical literature, and probably looked less of a roman à clef to a Roman audience than to some modern scholars. In this context, it needs to be remembered that the circles of influence at Nero's court shifted constantly, and resembled nothing so much as a nest of chinese boxes. Seneca was allegedly eclipsed in 62, but survived a few years more. Tigellinus must have felt out of place at the emperor's literary soirées, as will have the deformed Vatinius, whose influence was allegedly broken by a play of Curiatius Maternus (Dialogus 11). Silia was Petronio perquam familiaris, but Nero was at first puzzled as to how Petronius knew the details of his boudoir lubricities. And so on. There were times when an elegantiae arbiter (a court title, or Tacitus' own phrase?) will have been welcome; at other moments he was an embarrassment. In one mood, Nero may have enjoyed the Satyricon. In another, he might have been as unamused as Queen Victoria. Rose is eminently cautious and fairminded. He never presses points beyond sober speculation, and always gives rival theories their due (more than their due, in the case of Marmorale's absurd thesis and still more ridiculous arguments). The cavilling reviewer will notice occasional misprints (p. 38, n.2: voluptatium; p. 46; "indicrimately"; p. 45: eleganiiae), and the statement (p. 20 and p. 27) that Alexander Severus banned essedariae in A. D. 200; Septimius Severus is surely meant here (see Dio, 75.6.1). But to have pitched a review at this level would have been an insult to an important and persuasive book. One again appreciates the tragedy of Rose's death at the early age of 29.

NACHLEBEN

Grossvogel, D., "Fellini's Satyricon," Diacritics 11 (1971) 51-54. "The fact that this humanity is also composed of pederasts, boors, braggarts interests Petronius primarily for what he sees and hears: the sketch fascinates him more than its moral lesson. Where the Nasidienus of Horace suggests a frame of reference that denigrates the character, Trimalchio becomes a comic force that sweeps aside moral considerations. There is in fact a sympathy born of observation and interest that keeps Petronius too close to his creatures to allow the distance in which the moral lesson develops (p. 52)... There was never sufficient distance in Fellini for him to judge his people or to derive a moral lesson. His world was, like that of Proust or Petronius, informed only by his sympathetic curiosity" (p. 53).

Hughes, Eileen, On the Set of Fellini Satyricon (New York: Morrow, 1971). 248pp. 16 black and white photographs. Hughes followed Fellini from the beginning of his filming the Satyricon to the end, and provides a day by day account of the master in action. It is a book about Fellini not the Satyricon. Here and there rather innocuous statements about Petronius are recorded.

Kelly, E.H., Petronius Arbiter and Neoclassical English Literature (Rochester: Dissertation, 1970). 368pp. To be reviewed in a later Newsletter.

Segal, E., "Arbitrary Satyricon: Petronius and Fellini," Diacritics 1 (1971) 54 57. "Though convinced of the inaccessibility of the past, Fellini did massive research. He read dozens of tomes; he mined Jerome Carcopino's magisterial Daily Life in Ancient Rome. He visited and catechized the great Italian classicist, Ettore Paratore. He even had a Latin scholar in daily attendance on the set. And yet again and again he told interviewers how impossible it was to understand the pagan mentality... But Fellini did understand. He simply could not accept. He felt compelled to present an incoherent, inaccessible Rome that was neither the true past nor the present either (p. 56)... In further explaining 'our' inability to understand the pagan world, Fellini argued that we cannot imagine a world without Christ, and most of all, without sin" (p. 57).

Stuckey, J., "Petronius in Restoration England," Classical News and Views 15 (1971) 1-13. The influence of Petronius grew in England with the return of Charles II in 1660, who was determined to live an Epicurean life. The popularity of the Frenchman Saint-Evremond, who knew all the literary men of his age and who held to Epicurean tenets, aided this growing influence.

Tupling, W. Lloyd, "Washington Report," Sierra Club Bulletin (June 1971) 31: "The reorganization by itself is not necessarily a panacea if not a new idea. History is replete with reorganizations that went sour. A friend recently gave me a brief quotation attributed to Petronius Arbiter, a chief lieutenant of Roman Emperor Nero. It said: 'We trained hard but it seemed that every time we were beginning to form up we would be reorganized - I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any new situation by reorganizing, and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralization.'"

ad Petronium 61.3

M. A. Davis

The text of Mueller's second edition of the Satyricon gives this passage as:

> si quid ab illa petii, numquam mihi negatum; fecit assem, semissem habui; ⟨quidquid habui⟩ in illius sinum demandavi, nec umquam fefellitus sum.

Buecheler's addition of quidquid habui, adopted by Mueller, is good in intent, but a repetition of habui is unnecessary. I propose to read:

> si quid ab illa petii, numquam mihi negatum fuit;[1] assem, semissem, ⟨quidquid⟩ habui in illius sinum demandavi, nec umquam fefellitus sum.

It does not seem likely that Petronius would omit a form of sum in a perfect passive verb in representations of colloquial speech. A carefuly study of the text reveals few examples of such omission, the only others in a direct quote being in 41,4 and 53. The latter is an accountant's report, which would be prone to abbreviation. The former example was questioned by Heinsius and Scheffer as an omission in transcription. Mueller says of our passage, 'est' post 'negatum' addendum censeo. But a confusion of fuit, as it looks on a manuscript page, with fecit, is more plausible than an unusual omission. The sense of the passage is much improved by the substitution of fuit. Facere in an abstract expression is evidenced in extant Latin, as in Cicero, Verr. 2. 6(17), maximum uno anno pecuniam facere posset. Thus far I find no example of facere used with assem or any other concrete noun to indicate earning or acquiring money--except in the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae,[2] where our passage is the evidence given! It is difficult to see why Melissa, the attractive wife of an innkeeper, would give money to a slave in payment for favors or for safekeeping. On the other hand a slave saving for freedom or desiring Melissa's favors could certainly be expected to entrust money to her. (1) For additional uses of fui with the perfect passive participle in the Satyricon, see 22,1;31,11; 40,6; 43,1; 53,8; 54,3; 102,9; 135,4. Grammars such as Neue, Formenlehre der Lateinischen Sprache (III,p. 135ff.) and Kühner-Stegmann, Lateinische Grammatik (I,p. 164) confirm and give examples of the acceptability of this verb formation. (2) Teubner, Leipzig, 1900-1906, Vol. I.

Note on Petronius 5.20

R. Verdière

grandiaque indomiti Ciceronis uerba minentur. I find that the words grandia...uerba are exactly at the same place in Petronius and in Persius' verses (3.45-46):

> grandia si uellem morituri uerba Catonis
> discere et insano multum laudanda magistro.

Now Persius' verses seem to have been inspired by Manilius (5,452-453):

> pascentur curis ueterumque exempla reuoluent
> semper et antiqui laudabunt uerba Catonis.

This being so, as it strikes me, Persius has perhaps contaminated Manilius' and Petronius' verses. If one admits that such is the case, it is also necessary to admit that the Satyricon had been written before the third satire of Persius. We know that Persius made some recitationes (but we do not know whether the third satire had been read or not), and we also know that his satires had been published only after his death (24 Nov. 62). This seems to confirm the date proposed by Eugen Cizek: "Le Satyricon de Pétrone e été rédigé, puis publié entre 61 et 63 ap. J.-C." ("Autour de la date du Satyricon de Pétrone," Studii Clasice 7 [1965] 206). The expression grandia...uerba does not constitute imitation-evidence, but rather presumptive-evidence, and my hypothesis would unquestionably fall to pieces, if the words were found in a former writer. For this reason I add that I have found the expression grandia uerba in Martialis (2.69.8;9.27.8;9.32.5), Hieronymus (Epist. 53.7.1) and Ausonius (417.51.54) - all writers later than Petronius and Persius. In another connection I point out that Manilius maybe owed his inspiration to an incertus poeta, who could be Pompeius Lenaeus (cf. A. TRAGLIA, Poetarum Latinorum Reliquiae, VIII, Rome, 1962, p. 101):

> et uerba antiqui multum furate Catonis.
> Crispe, Iugurthinae conditor historiae.