BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alessio, G., Hapax Legomena ed altre Cruces in Petronio, Quaderni Linguistici 6-7, 1960-1961, (Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli, Istituto di Glottologia, 1967), 436 pp., 6000 lire, paper covers.

Betts, G. G., "Petronius c. 50 and a Gloss in Hesychius," Glotta 49 (1971) 259-260. See the Petronian Society Newsletter Vol. 1, No. 2.

Ferguson, John, Petronius and Juvenal (London: The Open University, 1972). This book is written specifically for students of The Open University and is designed to assist them as they read Petronius and Juvenal at home. Two radio lectures are given to supplement the readings in translation of Petronius and Juvenal. This book is available from The Open University.

Giardina, G. C., "Augusto Patri Patriae feliciter: Petronio 60.7," Maia n.s. 24(1972) 67-68. The dramatic date of the Satyricon is the time of Augustus.

Hunt, J. M., "Petronius 129.8," Latomus·30 (1971) 1162. Read: Gitonem ⟨moram⟩ roga.

Iandolo, C., "Dispare pallavit del Satyricon (nuova congettura testuale-semantica)," Vichiana 6(1969) 155-161.

de Jonge, H. J., "Pétrone 62.9," Mnemosyne 24 (1971) 401-402. Read: m⟨atur⟩ata vi⟨a⟩ tota v⟨i⟩.

Krenkel, W., "Erotica I: Der Abortus in der Antike," Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock 20 (1971) 443-452; "Varroniana I: Varro Men. 519 B," Ibid., 429-434; "Varroniana II: Varro Men. 531 B," Ibid., 435-441. Though not specifically written on Petronius, these articles might be of general interest to students of the Satyricon.

Luck, Georg, "On Petronius' Bellum Civile," AJP 93 (1972) 133-141. Professor Luck believes that the Bellum Civile "represents Petronius' personal and highly original reaction to the posthumous publication by a brilliant young writer of a probably unfinished epic poem which enjoyed immediate acclaim in Rome." Petronius parodies Lucan not out of jealousy or rivalry but for literary ethics: Lucan did not deserve to be popular because his epic was not good. Professor Luck hints at the literary rivalry which took place in the court of Nero and mentions other literary rivalries in classical literature. It would be a welcome thing to all scholars if someone with the erudition and literary sensitivity of Georg Luck, would treat rivalries, feuds and parodies among men of letters in the active periods of Latin literature. Luck's article was read as a paper at the Petronian Society meeting in New York, December 1970.

Parsons, P., "A Greek Satyricon?," BICS 18 (1971) 53-68. Potentially very important for Petronian studies: "We are dealing, then, with a work of prose fiction: a third person narrative, interrupted by a verse speech and a verse quotation" (p. 63), and, "I suggest that in Iolaus (a character in the "drama"), his clown and his gallus (other characters), bastard and lamentation and ribaldry in the past, furtive love in the future, the Greek Schelmenroman has at last become flesh" (p. 66). (Sandy)

Puccioni, G., "Libera cena in Petronio," GIF n.s. 3 (1972) 323-326. Sat. 26.7=free meal; cf. Pliny 30.17.14 and 35.23.11. (Sandy)

Rastier, Fr.,"La morale de l'histoire. Notes sur la Matrone d'Ephèse," Latomus 30 (1971) 1025-1056.

Richardson, T. W., "A Further Note on Trimalchio's Zodiac Dish," CQ 22 (1972) 149. Richardson questions the suggestion that the locusta of Sat. 35 is really the famous poisoner Locusta. Further, he points out that Baldwin's suggestion of the two locustae (CQ 20 (1970) 364) had been proposed in 1915 by Gaselee.

Richardson, T. Wade, Interpolations in Petronius (Diss. Harvard, 1972) 311 pp. This dissertation is an extensive but still preliminary study of some problems of form and content in the Satyricon that allow in their proposed solutions the formulation of a comprehensive theory of interpolation; it falls into two parts, the first being a discursive analysis of the textual setting, and the second comprising a list, with discussion, of suggested interpolations in print to the present time. Part I offers in four chapters a textual history of the work, reviewing through three distinct phases, Antiquity, Late Antiquity and the Dark Ages, and the Carolingian Era and beyond, the progress of Petronian interest. By such a method the writer has wished to illuminate the form and character of the Satyricon in the respective eras, seeing this as establishing as firm a basis as possible for interpolation-related conjecture. First to be treated is the question of the autograph's length. Pertinent evidence is not voluminous, but a review of the references to book-numbering has, with concessions to probability, for the writer confirmed the visualization of a work longer than our present text by eight- or ten-times, and divided into perhaps twenty or twenty-four books. Then follows a chronological discussion of the Petronian testimonia. General findings based on their witness are that Petronius was cited infrequently in the early centuries of our era, but that interest steadily increased until the sixth century A.D. From this and from the nature of the citations it was concluded that a complete or near-complete text was extant till then. In the seventh century evidence for a text longer than the present one is sharply reduced, but exists in Isidore of Seville. Thereafter, it was found, Petronius tapers off, and by the end of this century is silenced until Carolingian times. The two conflicting theories of the chronology of textual attenuation, a major problem, could then be discussed. Scholarly opinion has generally favored, with Bücheler, the view that the three limbs of the present Satyricon, L, O, and H, are excerpts taken from the autograph as far back as the fourth century A.D. This lodges the archetype (ω) in antiquity. The writer has hoped to show by his study of the testimonia that this is less probable than an alternative: a work more eroded by time and curtailed by suppression, accident and neglect, than preserved by selective excerption: elaborated on and extended is Konrad Müller's ten-year-old theory of a damaged but reasonably consecutive remnant seen through a recension by a Carolingian scholar. The ninth century now becomes the focus of concern. Intense Petronian interest at this time, as manifested by the creation of B and probably L and O, and by Heiric of Auxerre, points to the contemporaneous discovery of a fragment, the hypothesized damaged remnant, which the writer terms the pre-archetype. Interpolations within our present text, and occurring within the archetype, have been detected in numbers through four centuries of study. (A brief history of speculation on interpolations is provided.) But only in the last decades have scholars become aware that they might be systematic enough to suggest a methodological pattern, and, consequently, a single authorship. A principle interpolator is thus in prospect, and the most suitable candidate is a Carolingian scholar who interpolated his discovery, the pre-archetype, and made other adjustments on the

way to creating two copies, λ and Ψ, in which the archetype is discerned. Konrad Müller, it will be noted, has provided the framework for the writer's argument, and while the writer has differed in points of detail from that scholar and has developed many native strands for which he solely is responsible, such a theory was deemed to provide the most satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon of interpolation. Part II contains a list of suspected interpolations. Since the writer has hoped to make this section above all a useful tool of reference, completeness was favored over selectivity, and in excess of three hundred suggestions have resulted. Each example is provided with an apparatus criticus and a portion of discussion, ending with a decision whether to preserve or athetize. Several categories of interpolation come forward, and while the writer has used some extensively in cross-reference for identification purposes, he has refrained for the present from drawing up a testing-scheme to which each example might have been applied. (A broad classification guide is, however, offered in the Appendix.) For there was a methodological difficulty that seemed to warn of the danger of establishing "proofs" by such a scheme: there were too many exceptions. Thus it was found best to judge each suspected interpolation first on its own merits, although suggesting in cross-reference useful general criteria which could serve to minimize the role of subjectivity. Nevertheless the value of accepting in general terms the validity of such a scheme is apparent: it confirms for the majority of interpolations a conscious design and unity of authorship. In future studies the writer hopes to bring other evidence to bear on the detection of interpolations. There are two Indexes. The first tabulates all examples, with an asterisk signifying a preference to retain; the second lists all the words within the suspected interpolations. The writer has wished to suggest by the present study that neither conservatism, which tended to be sentimental, nor radicalism which tended to be cavalier, would help the text of Petronius. With the concept of interpolation basically sound, the answer lay in stern selectivity. (Richardson)

Schmeling, G., "The Exclusus Amator Motif in Petronius," Fons Perennis: Saggi critici di Filologia Classica raccolti in onore del Prof. Vittorio D'Agostino (Torino: Baccola and Gili, 1971) 333-357. A discussion of the instances and uses of the exclusus amator motif: "The lives of lovers throughout literature are frequently punctuated by separations of one kind or another; one partner or the other is an exclusus amator. This motif extends from the traditional lover excluded at the door to the lover frustrated by impotence in his attempts to seduce" (p. 349).

Settis, S., "Qui multas facies pingit cito (Iuven. IX, 146)," A + R 15 (1970) 117-121. On compendiaria picturae of Satyricon 2.9 and Juvenal.

van Thiel, H., Review of P. G. Walsh, The Roman Novel (Cambridge 1970) in Gnomon 44 (1972) 402-405. Special note on the Petronian Society.

NACHLEBEN

Wallace, Irving, The Word (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.) In Wallace's newest historical novel he introduces a character named Petronius. Wallace does not state clearly whether or not this is Petronius Arbiter. According to the narrative of Wallace certain fragments of an official report written in Greek by a certain Petronius, captain of the guard in Pontius Pilate's Jerusalem, to Sejanus in Rome, have been unearthed and made available to the scholarly (sic!) world. It was reportedly written in A.D. 30. Found with this fragment was another allegedly written by James, brother of Christ, reporting that Christ survived the cross and died in A.D. 54 under Nero. The Christian world is duped by the forgery, intended to spur the sale of bibles. Yet another Petronius forgery!

Professor Ehlers reports that the staff of the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae was asked to identify and locate a quote from Petronius. The quote is this: "We trained hard--but it seemed that every time we were beginning to form into teams 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." It is credited to Petronius Arbiter (210 B.C.) and was

found as a notice on a black board at NASA. After years of quarreling with late-daters of Petronius, we now must contend with early-daters. See also a notice of this from another source in the Newsletter 2.2, page 5.

Camargo, Maria S. "Satiricon e Macunaima," Minas Gerais (4 March 1972). This is a comparison of the Satyricon with Mario de Andrade's Macunaima, and a discussion of the possible influence of Petronius on de Andrade, a 20th century Brazilian writer. Macunaima is a kind of folklore fantasy and a linguistic tour de force.

Desjardins, Juliette, Gaeomemphionis Cantaliensis Satyricon (1628). Texte latin établi, présenté et annoté. Roma Aeterna, V. 1972, VI, 233 pages, Gld. 64. Il est paradoxal de faire des recherches sur le dix-septième siècle sans tenir compte de l'énorme masse des ouvrages écrits en latin. En particulier une étude sur le roman satirique ne peut pas ignorer les écrits latins de cette veine. L'un des plus curieux est sans doute le Gaeomemphionis Cantaliensis Satyricon. S'inspirant de Pétrone, d'Apulée, des romans picaresques, et, plus près de lui, du roman déjà célèbre de Barclay, l'Euphormionis Lusinini Satyricon, l'auteur, sous forme d'une sorte d'autobiographie romancée, fait défiler sous nos yeux divers aspects de la société et diverses personnalités de son époque. Gaeomemphion est un jeune homme plein d'espérance et de science, qui espère trouver une position en rapport avec ses mérites: mais il va de désillusion en désillusion. Nous le voyons tour à tour voyageur de grands chemins et détroussé par un voleur au hasard d'un mauvais gîte, précepteur des enfants du duc d'Epernon, mais bientôt disgrâcié, aspirant-Jésuite, laveur de vaisselle chez le duc de Joyeuse, professeur de collège, amant d'une grande dame de la Cour et briguant les faveurs de Concini, ne cessant d'observer tout d'un oeil avide de saisir les secrets du moyen de parvenir. Ce livre nous paraît être avant tout un document intéressant sur l'époque, sur la société, mais aussi sur les idées reçues, sur le goût, sensible dans le style et dans le ton, sur l'influence de l'étude des auteurs anciens, qui demeurent constamment présents par delà l'actualité, sur la condition des Lettrés qui contestent violemment une société qui ne reconnaît plus les valeurs qu'ils représentent. (Sold by E. J. Brill of Leiden).

REVIEWS

H. Van Thiel, Petron: Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion. E. J. Brill, Leiden. 1971. Pp. 78. f.28.

Review by T. Wade Richardson

For the textual study of the Satyricon the Müllerian stemma has, at least in its upper reaches, the virtue of simplicity: the archetype was obtainable from two traditions, and the longer of these, λ, produced two coeval Carolingian offspring, L and O (leaving aside ϕ for the present). L closely resembled its parent, while O was less than half the size--a substantial abbreviation. Van Thiel's hypothesis, which first appeared in Maia 22 (1970) 238-260, one of self-admitted complexity, puts L not on an equal footing with O at the head of our tradition, but subordinate to it and at the tail end. A failing of the common store of theorizing on L, a source for which there is no reading earlier than the sixteenth century, is its inability to give a truly satisfying explanation for this portion's curious character. It has no reason to exist as an excerpt of the archetype, nor is it easy to conceive of as a more or less complete segment. A third possibility is now raised by Van Thiel, that of its being a compilation from a number of disparate sources: O, an abbreviated forerunner of L (Λ), a grammatical-lexical anthology, and the florilegia. The unevenness of L could then be ascribed to the diversity of uses for which its components were intended. Van Thiel is thus postulating the construction of several excerpts of λ by ignoti over a period of many centuries. The twelfth-century date of ϕ is accepted, and because there was other Petronian activity at this time, as witnessed by John of Salisbury and the making of R, P and ς (?), a like date for L's compilation is indicated. A quality of Van Thiel's book that is refreshing, but also somewhat perplexing, is the absence of polemic--a surprise, considering

how radically he is seeking to amend the accepted view of L's
constitution and date. Thus while quoting Müller frequently
to agree with him he presents for inspection a picture quite
at variance with Müller's. An area for major disagreement,
however, is the role of contamination. Whenever L was deter-
mined by Müller to agree in error, as in numerous instances,
with an inferior O-Ms., it was due to a contaminated reading.
Such an explanation has satisfactory plausibility seeing
that knowledge of L comes from sixteenth-century editions that
had access to O also. Van Thiel would impute theses agree-
ments to use by the compiler of L, in the particular areas,
of an inferior O-Ms. On other occasions the compiler would
have used Λ or the other sources at his disposal to make his
edition. This is in theory not difficult to accept, but the
proof of it is another matter. Van Thiel has to scrutinize
the contexts of L and O and establish criteria to clarify
their relationship: depending on specific local conditions,
a passage in L might derive either from O or from Λ or from
another source. To cite examples: if a passage found in O
is set off by material found only in L, the source for the
segment is Λ; if in a passage the beginning and end coincide
in L and O, it was derived from O. By referring selected
passages throughout the text of LO to his altogether nine cri-
teria, and comparing the readings in them, Van Thiel under-
takes to cast light on the sources of L in conformity with
his hypothesis. His general finding is that L took more from
O before the Cena, reflecting some difference of content in
the excerpts Λ and O, while after the Cena L borrows more
evenly, reflecting greater overlapping. From this he deduces
that both excerptors sharply abbreviated the archetype in the
first instance, while in the second they copied more fully.
Such conclusions are not very startling, and do not do much
to advance knowledge of the archetype, or of when, why and
from what the excerpts of the Satyricon were made. Perhaps
later on the author will give his views on these problems.
The chief value of Van Thiel's labors is that they offer a
detailed new alternative explanation for a large number of
the textual difficulties of the longiora excerpta, including
c. 55, the relationship of L to Φ, the lacunae, and the as-
terisks in sixteenth-century editions and manuscripts (cf.
Maia 23 (1971) 57-64). The question, as with Müller's fine
speculation on the form of the archetype, is one of inherent
probability. The second of the book's two chapters, compri-
sing about two-thirds, is given to a discussion of the plot
of LO. Van Thiel summarizes the narrative remains straight-
forwardly, and then with an interpretative commentary tries
to provide answers to some of the problems of meaning. His
normal method is to concentrate on the lacunae, which he
considers generally to be short, supplying material that
might best remove immediate inconsistencies and explain
allusions. His style is to do this with some hesitancy
and many an alternative, which quite befits the difficul-
ties, but somehow does not provide many satisfactory ad-
vances. For instance, he does not probe the problem of the
two hodie's (10. 6; 26. 9), but wonders over the alterna-
tives. One solution offered is that Trimalchio postponed
the dinner when he heard that Agamemnon was bringing addi-
tional guests in order to make more elaborate preparations.
To me this does not sound in character. Van Thiel puts his
theory of composition of L to most effective use when he
suggests that logic and sequence in the narrative may be
improved by a small transposition: a mistake in the arrange-
ment of sources caused minor dislocation. Thus 113. 10 to him
fits better in the lacuna after 110. 5. For the grave con-
fusion in the love affair of Circe and Encolpius he has no
optimistic solution, suggesting that the excerptor might be
filling up space in his copy with bits from the manuscript
that he had earlier omitted. Passim within the second sec-
tion are, with reasons, Van Thiel's textual espousals. A
convenient apparatus of his adopted readings appears in Ap-
pendix II. These most often concern lacunae, but there are
also suggestions for athetization, and interpolation-hunters
may add them to the swelling list. In Appendix III the re-
sults of Van Thiel's research into the proper textual order
are summarized in a table listing fully his proposals: he
is generally more confident about signalling a dislocation
than determining its correct position. There is of course
room for debate on many of his findings, and it will be in-
teresting to see in due course what measure of agreement he
will be accorded. Much depends on the validity of his meth-

odology and--ultimately--the acceptance of his hypothesis on
the method of composition of L with the comparatively late
date. For my part I find it difficult to accept that a Ms.
source described in the Tornaesius edition as "exemplar vetus-
tissimum in membranis descriptum" (the codex Cuiacianus)
could be thirteenth-century or so. Appendix I, Van Thiel's
second Maia article, presents a useful excursus into the prob-
lem of manuscript breaks and asterisking. This has hitherto
been treated only superficially, and the conclusions are most
welcome. Van Thiel constructively reasons that the compiler
of L was responsible for them, using Λ as his textual source.
Their appearance when not required, and vice-versa, he at-
tributed to misunderstanding of the method of lineation in
Λ, where poetry might appear set off by a gap from the main
body without suggestion of discontinuity. No value is seen
in the worth to the tradition of the ascriptions to narrator
or speaker that commence at c. 85. This is probably right,
but Van Tiel would not seem correct in saying that they ex-
isted only in the Cuiacianus. r, a manuscript of the Bene-
dictinus-Group, contains some, without other evidence of con-
tamination. A table follows, showing the type and disposi-
tion in the sentence of all the asterisks with the late Mss.
and editions of the L-Class. Attention to this enables Van
Thiel to determine on each occasion whether an asterisk is
either a true or a false indicator of a lacuna, and the la-
cuna's exact position and compass. Once again the reasoning
is ultimately dependent on the hypothetical existence of Λ,
and one does have hesitation in replacing one set of hypo-
thetical forebears with another. In all, this small but com-
plex work provides a new look at Petronian manuscript study,
one that is at times significantly at variance with ortho-
doxy. One would not be surprised if Van Thiel's contribution
to textual understanding of our author founds a school of
opinion the equal in influence to that of Konrad Müller.

H. D. Rankin, Petronius the Artist. Essays on the Satyricon
and its Author. Martinus Nijhoff: The Hague, 1971. Pp. 119.

Review by Froma I. Zeitlin

Rankin has been publishing articles and notes on Petronius and
the Satyricon since 1965 and has now assembled this material
into a slender volume entitled Petronius the Artist. Eight
pieces of uneven length, interest, and quality are put to-
gether with no alterations or modifications, prefaced by a
short introduction, and supplemented with an index, a list
of citations, and a short bibliography. Although collections
of articles on a single subject can, in some instances, prove
very valuable, there is a risk that the resulting book will
lack the coherence that can only be achieved by careful edit-
ing and revision. Such is the case with Rankin's book, for the
general effect of his format is one of confusion and inflation.
Contradictions and inconsistencies crop up occasionally, but
repetitions of themes and ideas are maddeningly frequent,
despite the variety of subjects covered. Three articles dis-
cuss the vignette of Petronius in Tacitus, three more are
concerned mainly with the Satyricon itself and investigate
respectively character portrayal, themes of concealment and
pretense, and the relation of Priapus and the Priapean corpus
with the Satyricon. One essay compares Petronius with Proust,
Joyce, and Fitzgerald, and finally there is a short piece
on the topos of cannibalism ("Eating People is Right.") The
tone, too, is uneven, shifting from broad and sonorous gener-
alizations ("There was, quite probably, a Roman-ness in Pet-
ronius which cut through the adventitious layers of philo-
sophy that overlaid Roman character in the intellectuals of
the opposition." p. 7) to specialized analyses of some scho-
larly points. There is also a curious blend of the modern
and the archaic in Rankin's approach to his material which
suggests not a confident eclecticism in literary criticism,
but a tendency to naiveté and superficiality. References to
McLuhan, Freud, Thorstein Veblen and others are casually in-
serted but not convincingly supported or explained. Proust
and Petronius are compared both on the basis of their parodic
skills and on their fondness for remaining indoors in the
daytime. Modern psychological insights are proposed as a
result of free-wheeling speculation. In his essay, "Petronius,
Portrait of the Artist," Rankin creates an interesting view
of the man, but it is, by necessity, almost wholly in the
subjunctive mood. The major flaw in Rankin's approach to the

Satyricon is his surrender to the biographical fallacy, that outmoded and discredited technique of literary criticism, which pervades his work even when he has important ideas to communicate. (The author's personality "is of importance in the Satyricon, and is inevitably revealed in it and by it." p. 16.) At times, Rankin seems less interested in trying to understand the Satyricon as a work of art than in using it as an instrument to elicit the elusive personality of Petronius. Even if we possessed information other than the tantalizing morsel from Tacitus, Petronius the man would not be a reliable guide to his artistic production. Rankin agrees in theory (p. 17) but succumbs to the temptation everywhere. Furthermore, to equate Petronius the man with Petronius the artist can only lead to serious distortions. Even the two most successful essays, one on Petronius' portrayal of character and one on themes of concealment and pretense in the Satyricon, are marred by biographical intrusions. In the latter, for instance, Rankin relates the motifs of trickery, disguise, and hypocrisy both to the specific social milieu of the Neronian age and to the characteristic Roman toleration of legal fictions and internal and external standards of behavior to make the point that the Satyricon reflects "the fluidity, untruthfulness, insecurity, and ambivalence of Roman society" (p. 39). His sociological analysis is generally very good, despite some oversimplifications and faulty terminology, and his identification of these themes is illuminating. But why introduce in support of one's arguments a parallel between Petronius "'Epicurean' mode of self-destruction" and the pretended death of Trimalchio? And why end with speculations on the author's "retreat from the light of day" (one of Rankin's obsessions throughout his work) as seriously relevant to themes of concealment? Similarly, the article on character portrayal in the Satyricon contains many sensitive and penetrating insights. Rankin again uses sociological data to relate the erratic and disconnected behavior of Encolpius and his friends to the situation of the displaced intelligentsia in an anomic society rather than to Petronius' disinterest in creating coherent characters. ("Encolpius, Ascyltos and Giton, are markedly unstable, and are...essentially "on the run," pursued by the intractability of the world and the inevitability of debasing misfortunes: they have no policy and in no respect are they in control of their actions." pp. 13-14.) His arguments are often convincing, his remarks frequently shrewd. Yet Rankin cannot abandon the quest for the mysterious Petronius. ("His [Petronius'] characters from time to time express hysterical despair and then are switched away from it. Is this his own despair? Did he cultivate a volatility which could turn it aside for a period? If we hypothesise a literary receptacle for such despair, perhaps we might suggest that Encolpius...plays the author's part. Possibly this Encolpius is Petronius, as Petronius might have been if he had been unsuccessful" p. 18.) In the future, it is to be hoped that Rankin will abandon this line of questioning and will concentrate instead on the text of the Satyricon. He exhibits many virtues, a cautious yet lively intellect, a judicious attention to detail, and an interest in the application of modern theories to the interpretation of the Satyricon. He is obviously capable of making a genuine contribution, and, even in this collection of essays, the attentive reader will find much valuable material to ponder.

Kelly, E. H., Petronius Arbiter and Neoclassical English Literature (Diss., Rochester, 1970).

Review by Johanna Stuckey

Edward H. Kelly's unpublished Ph.D. dissertation deals with the influence of Petronius on Neo-classical English literature, a period extending, roughly, from 1660 to 1800. As he states in his "Foreword," Kelly is interested in "the main literary figures of this age. Among those he discusses in some detail are Rochester, Dryden, Addison, Steele, Pope, Fielding, Smollett, and Goldsmith. Particularly impressive is Kelly's analysis of the parallels between the work of Petronius and Rochester, an analysis which clearly shows how similar indeed were the attitudes of these two to life and literature. In dealing with the three views of Petronius prevalent during the Neo-classical period, Kelly suggests that

the first--admiration--started in the Restoration and carried through to the early years of the Eighteenth Century; the second--qualified approval--is that, he points out, of many Augustan Age writers (for example, Swift, Addison, and Steele) and early novelists such as Fielding. The third attitude--disapproval--Kelly demonstrates, began with the early novelist Smollett and was reinforced by Samuel Johnson and Oliver Goldsmith, who considered Petronius a lewd and effeminate rake and his writings very dangerous. While it is true that totally unqualified admiration of Petronius the man and his Satyricon is the usual attitude during the Restoration, there can be little doubt that, by the last twenty years of the century, writers were taking, for the most part, the second attitude, qualified admiration. Such was the final position of John Dryden who died in 1700. And later there were those who approved of Petronius. The problem is of course that in most ages there are some, or many, writers taking each of these attitudes. What is significant is which one was most usual, for from that determination we can, perhaps, say something about literary taste and its variations. Kelly's dissertation is a useful and enlightening contribution to this latter investigation and to Petronian studies in general.

Hughes, Eileen, On the Set of the Fellini Satyricon (New York: Morrow, 1971). 248 pp., $2.95.

Review by William Nethercut

To compare a creative adaptation with its original is always a fruitful endeavor. Thus--to cite a ready example--we can appreciate better what Vergil desires to express when he alters some of Homer's most famous similes, and, working the equation backward, we are better able to perceive the unique qualities of Homer himself, of the Greek apart from the Roman. With Homer and Vergil, certainly, numerous parallels afford an extended opportunity for evaluation. In the case of Petronius and the Fellini "Satyricon", matters stand differently. There is uncommonly little which reappears from the Latin in the Italian version. As the film director himself is quoted: "It is eighty percent Fellini and twenty percent Petronius." My own hopes were high that one of the most important features of this new book by Ms. Hughes would be an account of the artistic decisions by Fellini and his advisors in their modification and arrangement of what little of Petronius the film still retains. Such a discussion would be of benefit for classical scholars who might well gain in their attempts to approach Petronius the Artist. Nothing like this is included. Fellini did not intend his work to be the reinterpretation of a famous predecessor which Vergil offers us of Homer. He wanted, first, to create a fantasy of people. And for this end the selection of Petronius as the guide in western literature is most apposite. The paper, or book, can yet be written which will draw upon Fellini's use of symbols in other films and will enlighten us as to his specific employment of Petronian material; this research will emphasize the differences between the two creations and will analyze what these differences imply. The present work suggests, rather--albeit it indirectly--that Fellini is indeed like Petronius: both are spurred by the voyeur's impulse to capture human postures; both produce works of exaggeration and apparent incoherence, as different postures, suddenly thrust before us, gain in clarity and prominence, their ties with any greater context severed.

We learn that Fellini keeps a huge file of photographs and portraits, garnered by a team of agents and scouts which competes in size and efficiency with that of any professional athletic club. The members of this team canvass the country and even extend their efforts outside of Italy, in search of faces which the director will study with a careful eye to the presence of some quality that can be exaggerated. Following firmly in the tradition of Theophrastus, and of the great Roman Satirists, Fellini collects the most suggestive faces by category. "These men look like chickens" is scrawled on the card of one drawer. He then employs an elaborate balance of facial types in the composition of any scene.

The average cinema-viewer finds Fellini's technique of bringing faces suddenly before the camera, out of context,--

his habit of switching abruptly from one scene, with its faces and action, to another without transition, disconcerting. We are reminded of Petronius' leaps of locale and subject, which are impressive even if we take into account the gaps in our text. We can understand Fellini better if we see him as an artist whose great achievement is to isolate different moments of human appearance, immortalizing them as types out of sheer fascination with their eccentricity. This is a basic fascination of the satirist: one thinks of Swift in Gulliver's Travels, and of the reversal of sizes he utilizes in books one and two so that we may see - really see - what the human body and its movements look like. Even so, Fellini can never give us even moderately stylish prostitutes, but always mountainous whores. Nor does he increase their size in order to increase his condemnation of their lives in a moral vein (we nod at a long-vexed question of Petronian criticism). Exaggeration need only testify to the immense impact of a thousand varied visual impressions. Before moral censure, astonishment and fascination lie close to the heart of fantasy and satire.

If we follow Fellini as we follow Swift (or Petronius), we can accept the different scenes with their faces of the moment, satisfied. The problem of incoherence still remains for the entire work. No explanation or transition has been offered, most of the time, which would allow any overall direction to emerge. This seems even more true for Fellini than it does for Petronius; though in Petronius, too, one wonders what role the Widow of Ephesus filled in the original, full-length novel.

Both Fellini and Petronius are satirists (observers of the variety of life). Both do what the other observers of human conduct and idiosyncrasies, like Theophrastus and the Roman satirists before Petronius, did in their own works: they characterize by exaggeration and present their audiences with a series of types (the names in the Satyricon make clear the truth of this, as does the astrological discussion at Trimalchio's banquet, for example). Horace and the Latin writers give a single poem to each study in behaviour. They then collected their individual poems. The title implied that the point of the collection was not to tell a story or to create a continuity of any kind, but to put forward together a number of distinct perceptions and analyses of human conduct. Petronius' experiment was daring and original: he expanded the satirist's collection of separate studies beyond a given social milieu like Trimalchio's House or The City, out into the world at large. For this he adopted the larger framework suggested by the Greek Romance, which, with its traditional variety of geographic scope (lovers separated, taken overseas, returning home after many adventures) offered the perfect backdrop against which to develop the fundamental concern of Satire with variety in human attitude. We can not be certain that the original Satyricon created for its readers the same problem in the relation of individual scenes to the whole which Fellini's version raises; critical studies of Latin authors indicate that much care was lavished upon the interrelationship of parts to each other and to the entire structure.

Both Petronius and Fellini lend themselves to misunderstanding and the charge of incoherence because they are consciously creating a tension between the widest possible diversity and a single artistic framework. We feel this even more keenly with Fellini, whose "Satyricon" is singular (Petronius may have entitled his work Satyrica, implying, in the earlier tradition, a collection of studies in satire). We become disoriented, within the space of one film, with so many faces peering and leering unexpectedly at us. But by this tension Fellini implies the presence at every moment around us -- comprehended within the frame of one world -- of a limitless and extraordinary spectacle for those who will but look.

The foregoing paragraphs supply the Petronian critic with a means of relating the satirist's work to that of his most recent interpreter. They derive from the central point Fellini makes about his creation -- that it is a fantasy of people and is not to be expected to reproduce the Rome of monuments and triumphal processions. The content of the book under review has very little to do with Petronius, and it is occupied chiefly with the personality of the director on stage, his vivid vocabulary for cursing (a thesaurus for Italian argot), his psychological acumen in eliciting the proper nuance from

the different members of his cast, his warm and affectionate marriage with Giulietta Massina, who comes each day to knit and brings the director his lunch. Ms. Hughes is a free-lance writer and journalist, widely published in Life Magazine, and she exercises an unerring instinct in picking out what will interest a casual audience.

Beyond this, the following information appears worthy of reproduction here:

Fellini is not a moralist in any traditional sense. Countless conversations are included which attest to his dislike for traditional Catholicism. The scene with the Hermaphrodite venerated by cripples is a parody of the Virgin Birth; the cannibalism at the conclusion contains touches of the Holy Communion. "It is not an erotic picture, but very chaste if seen with virgin eyes, not as the Catholics see sex." Fellini maintains that the reason the opening night audience left the theatre in Venice saying "brutto spettacolo" is because they were only able to look upon the past through the distorting veil of Christian values thrust between our time and Petronius' Rome. Fellini, we hear, has a hatred for the Church like that 'of a child for a bad mother who has put him out in the dark to punish him." He is not a moralist in the way that term is usually conceived, but he is indeed just that, if we look at the word objectively. He emphasizes the grotesque to bring across to us how perverted our own moral view is. "In Rome, homosexuality was just a part of sex."

Fellini consulted Professor Canali of the University of Pisa on Roman civilization. His sourcebooks (mentioned by Hughes) were Robert Graves' Hadrian's Memoirs and Jerome Carcopino's Daily Life in Ancient Rome of which a 25 page reduction was prepared by a team of readers. It is stated on p. 7 that Fellini himself invented the "Villa of the Suicides" and the "Labyrinth"--, but Seneca's suicide is never acknowledged. Fellini was personally responsible for the graffiti outside the lupanar near the beginning of the film. He is said to have laughed mischievously as he wrote EGO HIC FACEVIT AMOREM. To Fellini, likewise, goes the credit for choosing a price for Philaenium (XXX nummis) in pieces of no specific money.

The character of Eumolpus has exerted a special charm for the director, who sees the poet as the pure artist beset by a vulgar and materialistic society. Eumolpus can strike back by insuring that the only way the money hunters can profit is by tasting of his body in a holy communion. They must nourish themselves on flesh which was sustained in life by poetry. This, when coupled with the corpse's leer at the end of the film, will all seem too much for Professors Highet (TAPA 72, 1941, pp. 176-194) and Arrowsmith (Arion 5, 1966, 304-331)!

Fellini is deeply interested in Jungian psychology, astrology, and the occult. Over his desk sits a poster bearing the sign of the Goat-Fish (Capricorn, Fellini's birth). He inquires of his friends "Are you under a good Moon today?" "Where is his sign?" His bookshelf features volumes on Zoroastrianism and Religious Fantasy, the Heroes of Myth, Religion and Myths of the North, and Tarot cards. A medium drops by to inform him that he has just contacted Nero and Petronius and they are pleased with the director's decision to play up the people not the physical contours of the past; in addition, they have told the medium what music to use in the score -- music which, curiously, does appear in the film! It is suggested that Fellini intended to incorporate astrological symbolism in the figure of the Hermaphrodite. The creature combines Mercury (masculine) and Venus (feminine). No other hint is given, however, as to what it all may mean.' An astrologer would feel that it was poor astrology: Mercury in astrology is sexless, neutral, whereas the Hermaphrodite is potent on two accounts. Ornella Volta, an Italian psychic, compares Fellini with Bunnel and remarks that her countryman is only superficially encumbered by occult trappings - he dabbles in the area for visual and surface effects, but lacks an inward realization of any of it. Yet the basic sense of mystery, of tension between the present and known and the beyond is the mark of a metaphysician, and Fellini confirms his experience of the sea as a compelling symbol (p. 136 -- of. W.R. Nethercut, The Classical Bulletin 47, 1971, 53-59). Nevertheless, the eyes must be served first, the spectacle is uppermost.

Fellini is an Italian, and so, Quintilian recognized proudly, were the great observers, the important satirists of antiquity. And, as Luigi Barzini has been saying, no other people love to watch each other and everybody else so much!

At one pont during the filming of the "Satyricon" somebody asks why Fellini does not put himself in his own films as so many directors do. "Ah, but he does." "But what role does he play?" "The camera!" And so, we might add, did Petronius.

NOTICES

Another Petronian Mystery

When Evan T. Sage died on 30 May 1936 he left an almost completed manuscript entitled The Manuscripts of Petronius. A student of Professor Sage, Adalaide J. Wegner finished the manuscript, added a four page Preface and Table of Contents, and prepared it for publication by the American Philosophical Society. For some unknown reason (perhaps its size) the manuscript was rejected by the APS. Today it still remains in typescript in the Special Collections of the Regenstein Library, University of Chicago. For some years now the location of the manuscript was unknown. By tracking down the widow of Professor Sage, who had remarried and moved away, I was led to the University of Chicago library. There is some confusion whether or not the manuscript belongs to the library or the family of Sage. At first I was told the library did not have it; later the library found it and microfilmed a copy for me. But, alas, some 246 pages had been lost or mislaid. The University of Chicago library has given up searching for them. On microfilm then I have a copy of the first 396 pages of introduction; coll. 247 (Sat. 80.9, verse 6) to coll. 633 (Sat. 141.11), each on a separate page, thus at least 633 pages; 246 pages are missing. The manuscript had originally over 1000 pages. With such careless conditions prevailing in American libraries, we should never criticize Medieval monks and libraries who did not even have computors.

WORK IN PROGRESS

Dobroiu, E., a dissertation entitled, Les sources épigraphiques de Pétrone.

Dobroiu, E., "Deux notes sur Pétrone," Studii Clasice 14 (1972).

Lindo, L.I., A Literary and Exegetic Study of the Satyricon of Petronius (Dissertation, University of London, 1973)

Scobie, A., a monograph on ancient romance for Anton Hain, Meisenheim am Glan, 1972-73.

Slusanski, D., a dissertation on the vocabulary of Latin literary criticism, in which is a chapter entitled, "Le vocabulaire de la critique littéraire dans le Satiricon de Pétrone.

Sullivan, J.P., The Satyrican of Petronius: A Literary Study (London: Feb. 1968) will be translated into Italian.