

# THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY

## Newsletter

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

VOL. 4, NO. 1

EDITOR: GARETH SCHMELING

JUNE 1973

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brozek, M., "Petronii Satyrica capita 27.1-37.5 excerptis L inserta," Acta Conventus XI. Eirene, 21-25 October 1968 (Warsaw: Ossolineum 1971) 539-553.

Brozek, M., "Szeneriebeschreibungen bei Petronius," Eos 60 (1972) 285-291. "Im vorliegenden Aufsatz versuchen wir zu zeigen, wie die Beschreibungen der Szenerie in Werke des Petronius fungieren, wobei wir unter dem Begriff der Szenerie die Elemente der plastischen Szenenausstattung verstehen, die den materiellen Hintergrund des Raumes im Theaterstück bilden."

Castorina, E., "Petronio, Lucano e Virgilio," in Vergiliana, ed. H. Bardon (Leiden: Brill, 1971), as no. 3 in the series Roma Aeterna, 97-112. Largely on the basis of Sat. 2.7, which Castorina connects with the Second Sophistic, he places the authorship of the Satyricon in the first quarter of the second century A.D. Vergil is the model for the Bellum Civile rather than Lucan. (Sandy)

Davies, J. C., "Petronius Satyricon 39.12," RhM 114 (1971) 228. in aquario copones alludes to innkeepers who put too much water in their wine. Sage suggested this interpretation in 1929 and cited Martial 3.57.1-2 as a parallel passage.

Jocelyn, H.D., "Donatus ad Ter. Ad. 537," Mnemosyne 24 (1971) 90-91. Sat. 61-62.

Leeman, A. D., translator, Petronius Satyricon (Amsterdam: Athenaeum-Polak + Van Gennep, 1972). Reprint of Leeman's 1966 translation, Schelmen en Tafelschiumers.

Pianezzola, E., Gli Aggettivi Verbalii in-bundus (Firenze: Sansoni, 1965). A discussion of the -bundus adjectives in the Satyricon.

Puccioni, G., "Libera Cena in Petronio," GIF 24 (1972) 323-326. A study of Sat. 26.7: vererat iam tertius dies, id est expectatio liberae cenae.

Reeve, M. D., "Eleven Notes," CR 21 (1971) 324-329. Sat. 111.2: in conditorium etiam prosecuta est [defunctum].

Stégen, G., "Le fragment XXX de Pétrone," LM 29-30 (????) 16-19. The dream in this fragment displays a realistic approach by the author.

Walker, J. M., The Satyricon, The Golden Ass, and the Spanish Golden Age Picaresque Novel (Diss., Brigham Young, 1971).

### NACHLEBEN

Maderna, Bruno, Satyricon, a musical satire. World première on 16 March 1973 at the Cirkustheater in Scheveningen, Holland. Shown on Dutch television on 6 April 1973. It is surely a free adaptation of the Satyricon. There is a report of the opera in the Cultureel Supplement NRC Handelsblad (9-3-73) by Frans van Rossum. The above information was supplied by Mr. T. A. Edridge, Classical Editor of E. J. Brill, Leiden, and by Professor H. J. de Jonge of Leiden.

### WORK IN PROGRESS

Carleton, Samuel. Pétrone démolalisé: The Ephesian Matron of John Ogilby (Dissertation, Texas, 1973-4).

Sandy, Gerald. Verses in Sat. 55.6 are attributed to the mimeographer Publilius Syrus on evidence from the two Senecas. To appear in RhM.

Sandy, Gerald. Proposals regarding some mime-inspired techniques of "staging" in the Satyricon, especially in the Cena.

Shrake, Bud. Peter Arbiter (Austin, Texas: Encino Press, 1973). A novel with certain elements borrowed from Petronius.

### MRS. ZEITLIN AND THE LIFE OF PETRONIUS

by H. D. Rankin

An article that appeared recently in Nature (Urey 242, 32, 1973) linked the disappearance of dinosaurs at the end of the Cretaceous with climatic changes that may have followed from the impact of a comet: it suggested that an increase in humidity could have taken place of such a kind that the cold-blooded creatures might well have drowned of the condensation in their own lungs. Apart from the obvious obligation upon classicists to bear the fate of dinosaurs sensitively in mind, there is a clear enough lesson in this ingenious constellation of hypotheses: different groups of phenomena can combine to form the basis not of a demonstration but an hypothetical account that may stimulate new approaches to the subject as a whole, even if it does not say the last word. In the physical sciences this is a respectable procedure, as a glance at any copy of Nature or other scientific journals will confirm. Yet the science of literary criticism, as it is expounded by Mrs. Zeitlin in her critique of my modest contribution on Petronius (Newsletter 3, 1 (1972) 3-4) is much more austere in its methods. She takes me to task for using a 'discredited and outmoded technique of literary criticism' whereby inferences are made about the life, and personality and social environment of an author from a consideration of his works, and urges me to adhere to the text itself. She calls such inference the 'biographical fallacy', in the very name of which resides the presumption that those who use it are wrong. The study of literature is in some ways different from that of physical science, but both should be investigations carried out by the human intelligence. As I see it, Professor Urey's hypothesis in its speculation about the lives and deaths of dinosaurs goes so far beyond the texts of bones and rocks that it too involves a kind of 'biographical fallacy'. If I believed that it was fallacious to frame hypotheses that lie beyond the immediate scope of the concrete records of texts; and if I thought classicists were permitted less use of their powers of inference and invention than physical scientists, then I would consider that the study of classics was well worth giving up. The orthodoxy of the old philological schools caused many students to vote with their feet; I hope that we are not now to be afflicted with the orthodoxy of the 'New Criticism', which being about forty or so years old, is now ripe for full exploitation by classical scholars. I believe that our investigations of the ancient past in all its phases and with regard to all its achievements may be aided by whatever critical methods and means are available or occur to us. No approach should be barred off, providing it be understood on all sides that hypothesis, while it has its own unique value in the investigative process, is distinct from demonstration. I hold this to apply for all aspects of antiquity, but it is in a special sense true of an author like Petronius, brilliant, unique in literary genre, self-aware, and bafflingly fragmentary. Mrs. Zeitlin's approach is useful as a control, quite apart from its intrinsic virtues, in dealing with such an author; but if our study is to prosper, this can only be a part of the total investigative effort, not the whole. Having said this I will add that I intend no counter-blast to Mrs. Zeitlin's criticisms of Petronius the Artist. She is at liberty to conceive and utter whatever value judgements she wishes. A reviewer's remarks have their own freedom and finality; and it is, a true (and not unPetronian saying) that if one dislikes the smell of cooking, one should keep out of the kitchen. I have written the foregoing remarks sine ira et studio and merely as one whose professional en-

deavours have been occupied in preventing Classics from becoming overspecialized and dinosaurian and in seeking to adapt the study to the new environment of contemporary life.

Froma I. Zeitlin, "Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity," *TAPA* 102 (1971) 631-684.

review by

William R. Nethercut

The Petronian question most important of all has been what sense the story makes. It was first assumed that it represented incidents from the novelist's own colorful life and that it had been offered to the reader as a commendation of the liberated and refined existence men close to Nero's court enjoyed. There were, it was true, passages which lamented the decay of standards evident everywhere in Rome—this, side by side with the debauchery. This criticism appeared to contradict the simple estimate previously made of the *Satyricon*, and one began to wonder whether Petronius might not have fooled centuries of prudes by disguising the fact that he really was condemning what he described. As a neo-Epicurean, Petronius might have been following Lucretius who gazes with detachment and occasional regret upon the turbulent sea where mortals struggle and sink. Even so, Petronius might have written his novel to censure Nero and others by recording dispassionately and with merciless objectivity their forays among the rich and rotting hulks strewing the beaches of the author's world. But again it was asked, from the other side, why, if Petronius was writing with moral intent like a true satirist, would he assign moralizing passages precisely to characters whose disreputable practices undercut the effect of their words? Why would Petronius have Eumolpus sing a dirge over the corruption of language and praise artistic restraint, only to compose a lengthy poem in exceedingly flowery and inflated verse? It is hard to imagine Petronius as a moralist, unless he wishes to reprove everything and everyone by the inconsistent colors with which he paints his scenes; but so round a repudiation does not become his style which has in it none of the *saeva indignatio* of a Juvenal or a Swift. Easier to picture him as an early Montaigne, urging us to be tolerant of our foibles. Breaking free from the moralist-immoralist debate, Sullivan and Schmeling have emphasized that it is fruitful to appreciate Petronius as a literary adventurer in search of a genre as he experiments eclectically with different styles, parodying and rebutting the work of Seneca and other writers of the day. But the question still remains: what praise can we give to the *Satyricon* as a coherent success of any kind? Sullivan has despaired of it—Petronius is inherently disunified: he does not write with the moral commitment of a satirist (his inconsistencies are too great to allow us to assume that he does espouse any moral view), and thus there is an uneasy tension between the expectations aroused by his adopted genre and what actually appears on his pages. The obvious paper for this stage of the discussion was one which would argue that the incoherence of Petronius was in fact consciously engineered and that this jumbling of subjects creates its own internal unity, thus allowing us to feel satisfaction that there is some sense to it all. No period in our analysis of art would suit this approach better than the present, when we have become used to accepting many works which offer little that is immediately enlightening, on the grounds that these works were not designed, first of all, to communicate, but, as the impositions of suffering souls, to live among us in their own self-contained worlds. And Professor Zeitlin has produced as handy a defence of Petronius as one might make.

She begins by examining classical genre theory, according to which compositions were rated by unity of tone, stylistic purity and simplicity, concentration on a single emotion, with a single emotion, with a single plot or theme to concern the reader. Petronius is consciously and radically anti-classical. He has at least three styles of prose—the elaborate and dramatic style into which Encolpius sometimes lapses, the *sermo urbanus* of narrative, more chaste and concise, the *sermo plebeius* of cotidian vulgarity. He mixes poetry with prose. There is no single plot or theme: characters come and go; slapstick is

crowded in with real slaps and beatings, scenes are not resolved, they disintegrate (like the *Cena*); events rush upon one, there are accidents, sudden violence. Forms are unstable: there is a "Daedalus" to make everything opposite from what it seems to be; thrushes burst in flight from the carcass of a roasted boar. Life and death, as Arrowsmith has shown, are inverted. Zeitlin's rehearsal of the fragmentation in Petronius is stunningly arrayed. The world-view of the *Satyricon* shows us man battered, assaulted by random fortune. One can only reel with the blows and be ready lightly to change the ways of today to meet the crises of tomorrow. This summary of life would have been easily engendered at a time of greater social uncertainty when traditional distinctions were breaking down, when there was increased mobility, when the fatal whims of an emperor made many, like Pliny, say that they were pleased to find their heads firmly atop their shoulders at the end of each day. All of this suits the political climate at Rome during the later first century A.D. (For the same world-view in the next century, see W. E. Stephenson, "The Comedy of Evil in Apuleius' *Arion* 3 [1964], 86-93). This world-view is in fact that of the *Picaresque Novel*—a form critics have compared in passing with the *Satyricon*, but which has not been systematically studied in this context by classicists. Zeitlin does a fine job, supplying useful definitions of the picaresque tale from leading scholars of that genre. The form is like, yet unlike Comedy: in both, the world is turned topsy-turvy; however, Comedy ends with a magical restoration of unity, whereas the picaresque form ends without anything really having happened. Disjointed scenes go on for as long as their author wishes, and then he simply stops. The *Picaresque Novel* is also somewhat similar to Romance, but again, a thing apart: as in Romance, lovers provide much interest, and wandering brings people together for a time and then leads them apart. However, in the picaresque story there is no improbable reunion at the very end. Once one has left, the *adieu* is permanent. While in its contours Petronius' work contains the disorder of the picaresque novel, its characters are not consistent. Zeitlin makes the important point that it is really Eumolpus, not Encolpius, who is the real picaro—the wanderer who is ready to exploit every situation—unscrupulous, incorrigible, totally pragmatic. The genuine picaro accepts the absurdity of the world, drops out, backs off from the scramble for wealth, thus gaining clarity and irony in his observation. He is a master of disguise, better than the color-changing cuttlefish to which Odysseus is likened, producing—with copious fecundity—new faces to meet the faces an insubstantial world presents to him. He knows no real love. He is wholly alone, but completely free. Encolpius, by contrast, is not a fully picaresque character. He is a romantic: he suffers real love. He is jealous. He has a vision of fulfillment and is pained when he can not reach his ideal. Encolpius is like Don Quixote, in that he can wax eloquent in expressing the elevation or abysmal despair he feels. Like the Don, too, he has his visions bequeathed by the past. The *Satyricon* utilizes heroic epic—the *Odyssey*, the *Aeneid*—and Encolpius moves within the ambience of these comparisons. Yet his ties to the past, his view of himself as a romantic hero, are not sustained, as they are in Cervantes, by any moral responsibility or sense of duty. Encolpius' contact with the great past of Greece and Rome, his role as a romantic hero, serve chiefly to disorganize him further. He is a creature molded by words born at a time when such words might have vitality. But the ideas have now become empty rhetoric. Encolpius is displeased by the emptiness of the present, yet he must live in the present—a *Roman* present where the colors of the moment distract one in a thousand directions (fragmentation), unlike the bone-white stretches of La Mancha and old Castille, whose austere mystical terrain is a study in stark concentration: man standing alone against the infinite. Encolpius has the romantic urge, but only the tools of the present. When he would speak against the art of his own day, his words become just one more *declamatio*. His love is nothing: the reunion with Giton, so far from insuring final satisfaction (as would be the case in a Romance), but opens the door to unrestrained promiscuity. Professor Zeitlin concludes her article by comparing Petronius with another well-known writer on the anti-heroic life, Euripides. She correctly calls attention to the often radiant endings where man, as in Hippolytus, stripped of his companionship with beauty (Hippolytus is abandoned by Artemis) reaches out to his fellow in compassion and

forgiveness. In Euripides' world, man makes operative his mental understanding of beauty—even when he can no longer associate with it physically—to bless other men. Man redeems the world in love. This Greek conception may lie behind the conversation between Achilles and Priam at the end of the *Iliad*. In Petronius, however, the role of man is passive and has neither intellect nor love. The ethical viewpoint is one of cynicism, of a realism disabused of every expectation. There can be no promise in a world where man can only wait for mistress Fortune to deal another blow. Zeitlin suggests an informative progression from the world-view of Homer, to that of Vergil, and then on to Petronius'. Odysseus' life is ordered for the future, and in the *Odyssey* this future becomes a present reality. The efficacy of man is stressed. In Vergil's *Aeneid* there is a similar dedication to a long-range goal (Rome will rise), but this goal is not reached within the limits of our story: we end ambiguously with no mention of construction or of harmonization, but with Aeneas' murder of Turnus. In Vergil, the future is clear, but the meaning of each man's life is diminished as an end in itself; we become so many sections of a chain which stretches on over the horizon. Still, there is a future; the story is all about man's mind. But with Petronius, all of this has changed. We have entered a world where the future does not exist at all, where we find only the strewn fragments of the present.

Can the laughter, the exuberance of Petronius' creations really counter so negative an impression? Arrowsmith, Sullivan, and now Zeitlin all leave us with this confidence. But if we follow the ground rules of the present article and seek to evaluate Petronius' world-view, taking this as far greater than any of the individual points of laughter, one must hesitate. For the world-view documented here is anti-focus, anti-mind (man's principal means of focus), anti-life (on the mental level). To function, man must create structures. By these, he insures continuity in his world and becomes able to seize the future. Man seeks wholeness. And if we extend Zeitlin's comparison of Homer, Vergil, and Petronius one more stage, the point is made: Apuleius, a century later, gives us a world no less irrational and violent than that of Petronius, but he insists indirectly that suffering here is a necessary prelude before one attains the harbor of salvation. There must be a conception of the future to tie the present together, to create the present as unified. In our paper at hand, the very argument—one worthy of Heraclitus—that artistic fragmentation can provide a comprehensible unity, represents at heart a very human refusal to accept, really to accept, Petronius' world of pieces.

ESSAYS ON CLASSICAL LITERATURE selected from ARION  
with an Introduction by Niall Rudd (Heffer, Cambridge:  
Barnes + Noble, New York, 1972.) Pp. xx, 275.

William Nethercut

Professor Rudd has selected twelve articles from the first six volumes of *ARION*. Four concern topics in Greek literature, four more, subjects in Latin literature, and four offer discussions on problems in the translation of Greek and Roman poets. Two of the papers deal with Petronius. The introduction (vii-xvii) sketches the recent history of classical scholarship in England and in the United States. This useful survey sets the strongly philological tradition overseas, which has produced an abundance of leading texts and commentaries, against the more literary emphasis prevalent here, which has been responsible for translations and interpretive studies, and presents the works included in this book as examples of the broad-ranging criticism of the classics as literature, prominent in America during the past decade. C. J. Herington's "Aeschylus: the last phase" leads off the Greek section (1-17). He argues that the *Suppliants* and the *Prometheus* belong to trilogies which can be grouped with the *Oresteia* and belong to the last years of Aeschylus' life (458-455 B.C.). All have the form A, A, B, according to which the last play synthesizes the tensions which have caused the second play to reproduce the tragedy of the opening drama. A fragment from the finale of the *Suppliants*-trilogy closely echoes the regard of the *Oresteia* for an accommodation of

male and female, heaven and earth, to insure fertility. The *Prometheus*-trilogy concluded with the founding of torch-races, while the torchlight procession at the end of the *Eumenides* likewise signals a new stage in society's—and even the world's—evolution. Richmond Lattimore's "Phaedra and Hippolytus" (19-32) is not as rewarding as Herington, but contains observations which can successfully counter-balance any monochromatically negative assessment of Phaedra's actions. Douglas Young has a long article (33-78) on the matter of formulae in Homer ("Never Blotted a Line: Formula and Premeditation in Homer and Hesiod"). He adduces a wealth of evidence from Scottish bards, Middle English romances, French *chansons de geste*, to make the point that the Parry-Lord view of Homer as an illiterate improviser who never worked out a performance in advance is very probably incorrect. Homer polished his tales in his own head and then dictated them, or wrote them down himself. Thomas Gould, "Plato's Hostility to Art" (80-101), departs from the criticism of poets in the *Republic* to a comparison of Plato with Aristotle's views on poetry. Aristotle everywhere "pulled the teeth" from his teacher's most disconcerting concepts. Like Freud, Plato was a confirmed dualist, believing in the existence of an energy which, brought into operation, could disrupt life: artists who might elicit this force must be banned. Like Jung, Aristotle reduces such a view to one which allows man to accept the urges he feels and control his world by combining properly the various elements in it. Jung and Aristotle have gained the greater following. Among the Latinists, Kenneth Quinn treats us to a high point in the special brand of criticism he has been developing—one which is rich in sensitive insights, but which, rather than stating them with emphasis near the beginning, or "proving" them by steps, instead leads the reader gently from an uncommitted and neutral position to the point where the many possible sides of a work disclose themselves voluntarily. Highest praise for "Horace as a Love Poet: A Reading of *Odes* 1.5" (103-121). C. J. Herington has a second paper in *ESSAYS*, "Senecan Tragedy" (170-219). It is a vast examination of Seneca's meter and diction, his visual imagination, the way in which the structure of his plays distinguishes itself from that of his Greek antecedents. Herington succeeds in showing us the vivid qualities in all of these, and is most sympathetic in his study of Seneca's Stoicism. In the last part of this book there are essays on translating Bacchylides (D. S. Carne-Ross, "The Gaiety of Language", 221-244), Homer (H. A. Mason, "Arnold and the Classical Tradition", 245-253; Henry Ebel, "Arnold, H. A. Mason, & The Classical Tradition", 254-259), and Vergil (Robert Fitzgerald, "Dryden's *Aeneid*", 261-275). All of these are good reading. Carne-Ross is my own choice, for his discussion of the many compound epithets in Bacchylides and his careful scrutiny of translators' attempts to capture the clear grace of their original. Mason and Ebel were, perhaps, less engaging, alternately castigating and offering a better perspective of Matthew Arnold's understanding of Homer. Fitzgerald gives a fair appraisal of Dryden's success, and limitations, in translating Vergil; an informative article. It is interesting, too, to become acquainted with Dryden's daily circumstances during the course of his endeavor.

I have saved for the last the papers on Petronius. These are the well-known articles by William Arrowsmith ("Luxury and Death in the *Satyricon*", 122-149) and J. P. Sullivan ("Petronius: Artist or Moralist?", 151-168). I had read Arrowsmith originally with much appreciation for the novel thesis that the *Satyricon* does not champion the extravagance of its remarkable characters, but is, rather, squarely within the moralistic and satiric tradition of Roman literature to that time, containing an Epicurean reproach against contemporary society. This reproach is expressed by the weight Petronius places upon the motifs of death, eating, luxury, sexual impotence, the perversion of language. I remembered the last pages of the paper as especially beautiful: after painting so dark a vision of Rome, Arrowsmith and Petronius gave us a final, wider view, which uplifted the vitality and gaiety of Encolpius and his friends against the corruption and decay of Trimalchio and others like him, and which elevated the story of the Widow of Ephesus and the poetic passage on the mating of Heaven with Earth to parables. They embody life. They are truth recalled, by which the crumbling present may be measured—by whose recollection the future

may be blessed. Arrowsmith's final pages speak of hope and rebirth. Having re-read this work carefully, I find that while there is much which seems reasonably observed (Death is a motif Petronius employs symmetrically to open and conclude the *Cena*, the silver skeleton does allow one to say that Petronius is combining the ideas of luxury and death, the themes of eating and death and money are certainly joined at Trimalchio's and again at Croton, the connection between food and rhetoric is indeed made clear at the beginning of the *Satyricon* (S. 3) and at its end where Gorgias presides at the grim feast),—while all these links are individually present, there are nevertheless a good many pages on which A.'s fertile mind races ahead of us and joins several concepts without demonstrating that Petronius establishes so firm a connection, leading logically from one matter to another. A.'s technique is opposite to that of Quinn (above): we are not led to discover possibilities, beginning at a neutral point, so much as we are given glasses at the start through which to react to the rest of the text. There is special pleading: for example, the werewolf story is supposed to illustrate the death that luxury brings. At the end there is left only a straw dummy with "no heart, no guts or anything." But Trimalchio, who is alive, is telling how he, not the poor slave for whom the witches substituted the dummy and who did die, was raised in affluence. The relationship between death and luxury is not tight; the two subjects co-exist in the same story, but there is no logical connection provided by Petronius. It is this tendency to draw many things under one heading which one must constantly be on guard to check. Many will feel uneasy, too, with respect to the position that Petronius uses Encolpius' impotence and the subject of homosexuality to allude to Roman decadence. Encolpius is a second Odysseus, the wandering "Hero of a Thousand Faces", whose journey is cast, without much strain on Homer, as a sexual Odyssey: the different adventures involving group sex, homosexual love, and finally heterosexual consummation can be owed more to Petronius' inventiveness in recasting the familiar search of self, than to the desire to censure. Beyond this, A. may be going farther than Petronius when he juxtaposes the Widow of Ephesus with the funereal feast of Trimalchio: there is no reason to connect them in the text, for the *Cena* ends in S.78, and the story of the widow begins only in S.111. I wonder if Pellini did not in fact utilize A. as one more of his unacknowledged sources (Pellini's advisors never have admitted in print the debt of the "Fellini *Satyricon*" to Apuleius' *Risus* Episode or to Tacitus' account of Seneca's suicide). For Fellini does literally what Arrowsmith envisions and placed the Ephesus story, with its affirmation of life, in the middle of Trimalchio's mock funeral. It is the "Fellini *Satyricon*", more than Petronius', which harmonizes what is beautiful with what is shocking in the highly artistic manner Arrowsmith employs.

Sullivan's paper was published, at least in part, as a rejoinder to the work of his colleague. For Sullivan, Petronius is not a true satirist. He does have Epicurean colors, but this is a neo-Epicureanism, widespread in the first century A.D., less austere than the philosophy of Epicurus or even of Lucretius—witness S. 133.15, where amare is the  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  Epicurus is said to have regarded! The passages which preach become suspect because of the disreputability of the speakers. Sullivan holds that Petronius is a literary artist who wanted to chronicle the people alive in his day and to reshape the familiar epic pattern, according to which a hero wanders from adventure to adventure, as a vehicle for his chronicle. The genre best suited for such a project was Satire; but Satire had always fused moral commitment with art, and this commitment is lacking in Petronius. For Sullivan, Petronius is more interested in showing the many facets of Trimalchio's incredible life-style than he is in holding him up as evil and debauched. S. admits that the subject matter of the *Satyricon* is pretty grim, but maintains that since Petronius distances himself from what he is describing, and since there is vitality and humor even in the kind of life Encolpius leads, the novel is not a pessimistic work. Both Arrowsmith and Sullivan offer fresh and creative views of Petronius: Arrowsmith, by showing us more exactly just what cement the author used to build his structure; Sullivan, by freeing our minds from the narrow debate over Petronius' "immorality" (to which Arrowsmith's article was a rebuttal) and allowing us to imagine, as we might not have, the genuine originality

of the novelist's conception. Problems remain: if we need not emphasize that the motifs of death and decay are intended to portray Rome negatively, still we should seek to explain just what role these ideas do play, inasmuch as they make up an important part of Petronius' imagery. If we do not press, with Arrowsmith, for the interpretation which makes Petronius a moralist, we yet should do more than Sullivan by way of examining exactly why Petronius has brought out the particular ideas he associates. Arrowsmith looks more closely at the text itself, while Sullivan may appear to side-step Petronius' imagery by commenting that the distance of the observer from the action makes even what is disconcerting seem funny and humorous. This contention needs specific examples to illustrate it, although it is sound in theory: Lucretius (like Petronius, an Epicurean voyeur in Book II, 1-4) does use suave to characterize his own detachment.

## NOTES

Zur Wiederentdeckung Petrons in Italien  
(Poggios Funde und der Codex Traguriensis)

Günther Berger

Schon seit einiger Zeit hat man versucht, den Codex Parisinus latinus 7989 (früher Traguriensis, im folgenden immer *Traguriensis* genannt), der Tibull, Propert, Catull, Ovids 15. Heroide, von Petron 1) die kurzen Exzerpte und 2) die *Cena Trimalchionis* sowie noch das Pseudo-Virgilianische *Moretum* und Claudians *Phoenix* enthält, mit Poggios Petronfunden in England und Köln in Verbindung zu bringen. Von diesen Funden des italienischen Humanisten wissen wir aus seinen Briefen. Am 28. Mai 1423 in einem Brief aus Rom an seinen Florentiner Freund Niccolò Niccoli erwähnt er eine particula Petronii, die er, Poggio, ihm aus England geschickt habe, und spricht des weiteren von einem XV liber Petronii Arbitri, den er in Köln gefunden habe, und von dem eine Abschrift in Rom eingetroffen sei. Zwei Tatsachen nun: 1) Poggio spricht von zwei verschiedenen Petron-Texten: der *Traguriensis* enthält zwei verschiedene Petron-Texte, 2) Poggios Handschriftenfunde fallen in die Jahre 1420 (die particula) und 1423 (der XV liber): ein Teil des *Traguriensis* ist 1423 fertiggestellt worden, haben besonders dazu geführt, Poggio zu dem *Traguriensis* in Beziehung zu setzen. Dabei werden zwei konträre Thesen verfochten: 1) Poggios particula aus England entspricht der *cena* im *Traguriensis*, sein XV liber aus Köln den Kurzen Exzerpten, 2) Die particula ist den Kurzen Exzerpten gleichzusetzen, das 15. Buch entspricht dem Teil des *Traguriensis*, der die *Cena Trimalchionis* enthält. Referieren und prüfen wir nun die erste These, die von A. C. Clark (in: *Classical Review* 22, 1908, 178-79) und Remigio Sabbadini, *Per la storia del codice traurino di Petronio* (in: *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 48, 1920, 27-39) vertreten wird.

1) Für Clark genügt eine einfache assoziative Verbindung von der ersten Erwähnung Petrons bei Poggio in seinem Brief an Niccoli aus London vom 13. Juni 1420: "De Petronio Arbitro quod scire cupis quid tractet, lege Macrobbii principium super somnio Scipionis ubi enumerans genera fabularum dicit in eis esse argumenta fictis amatorum casibus referta quibus multum se Arbitr exercuit. Est autem homo gravis versu et prosa constans et ut concilio paulo post tempora Augusti." und seinen Brief an denselben aus Rom vom 28. Mai 1423: "Allatus est mihi ex Colonia XV liber Petronii Arbitri, quem curavi transcribendum modo, cum illac iter feci. Mittas ad me oro Bucolicam Calpurnii et particulam Petronii, quas misi tibi ex Britannia." mit der Datierung des *Traguriensis* auf den terminus post quem November 1423, um seine These aufzustellen: "the particula discovered in England was the *Cena*, while the Cologne MS., copied by Poggio's order, belonged to the vulgar family. The Trau MS. combines these. First come the ordinary excerpts with the subscriptio' Petronii Arbitri Satyri fragmenta expliciunt ex libro quinto decimo et sexto decimo, and after the subscriptio, the new fragment, the particula sent from England."

Ferner suggeriert ihm die Petronkenntnis des Johannes von Salisbury, der Petron in seinem Werk *Polycraticus* öfters erwähnt und zitiert (die Zitate entstammen teils der *Cena*,

teils auch Partien ausserhalb ihrer) eine irgendwie geartete, nicht näher begründete Verbindung zu Poggios Englandfund und weiter zum Traguriensis. Sabbadini unterstützt diese These, sieht jedoch ihre Schwierigkeiten, die sich bei genauerer Prüfung des Faktenbestandes ergeben, und versucht, diesen durch eine Hypothese zu entgehen. Auch er setzt die Petronhandschrift des Johannes mit Poggios particula und der Cena im Traguriensis gleich. Der Schwierigkeit: Wie kann Johannes auch Petronstellen ausserhalb der Cena zitieren, wenn seine Hs. umfangmässig dem Traguriensis Teil H entsprach, und wie lässt sich Poggios Urteil über Petron: homo gravis versu et prosa constans aus der Cena erklären? begegnet Sabbadini mit der Hypothese, Poggio habe eben nur einen Teil seiner Hs. (daher particula) kopieren lassen, und dieser Teil sei in den Traguriensis als Teil H (Cena) eingegangen. Bei der Identifizierung des Kölner Fundes mit den Kurzen Exzerpten (=Traguriensis Teil A) begnügt sich Sabbadini mit dem Hinweis auf die Übereinstimmung der Buchzahlen: XV liber bei Poggio entspricht in etwa dem Titel fragmentum ex libro quintodecimo et sextodecimo und der Subscriptio fragmenta expliciunt ex libro quintodecimo et sextodecimo der Kurzen Exzerpte im Traguriensis. Ferner führe der Gesamtinhalt des Traguriensis wegen der Menge der darin enthaltenen—teils seltenen—Werke unbedingt nach Florenz als Herstellungsort. Prüfen wir die Hypothese anhand der Fakten: Aus Poggios Londoner Brief an Niccoli geht hervor, dass letzterer offenbar von ihm wissen will, welcher Thematik sich Petron verschrieben habe, mit anderen Worten, entweder hat Poggio ihm von seinem Fund berichtet oder er hält diesen schon in seinen Händen; Poggio antwortet mit einem Hinweis auf Macrobius und seinem eigenen Urteil über Petrons Stil (Macrobius: argumenta fictis amatorum casibus referta; Poggio: homo gravis versu et prosa constans), die beide nicht zur Cena passen. In seinem Brief vom Mai 1423 aus Rom bittet Poggio den Niccoli, er möge ihm doch die particula Petronii schicken, die er selbst an Niccoli aus England geschickt habe. Wenn Niccoli in dem Augenblick, in dem Poggio den Brief 1420 aus London an ihn schreibt, noch keinen Petrontext in seinem Besitz hat, ist es unverständlich, wie Poggio ihm eine derartige Charakteristik von Petron geben kann, um nachher doch nur einen Teil kopieren zu lassen (particula), auf den diese Charakteristik nicht zutrifft. Besitzt Niccoli dagegen die particula Petronii in diesem Moment schon und wünscht von Poggio eine Auskunft über den Inhalt dieser Hs., dann erhält er von Poggio eine völlig unzutreffende Information, die er keinesfalls anhand seines Textes verifizieren kann. Auch ein weiteres Argument Sabbadinis, dass der Inhalt des Traguriensis wegen der grossen Varietät auf Florenz als Entstehungsort hinweise, trifft nicht zu, denn derartige Hss. hätten zu dieser Zeit durchaus in Venedig, Mailand oder gar Mantua und Pavia zusammengestellt werden können.

2) Prüfen wir nun die konträre These: die particula aus England entspricht den Kurzen Exzerpten, mithin dem Teil A. Poggios XV liber aus Köln der Cena im Codex Traguriensis Teil H. Diese These wird vorsichtig und in Ansätzen von Evan T. Sage, Petronius, Poggio und John of Salisbury (in: *Classical Philosophy* 11, 1916), dagegen bestimmt und ausgearbeitet von Konrad Müller im Anhang "Textüberlieferung" zu seiner Petron-Ausgabe, München 1965 vertreten. Die Schwierigkeiten, die sich bei der Identifizierung der particula aus England mit der Cena und damit dem Cod. Trag. H ergeben, hat schon Sage bemerkt. Seine Einwände lauten: 1) Die Bezeichnung particula passt nicht gut für die Cena. 2) Das Zitat des Macrobiuskommentars bei Poggio argumenta fictis amatorum casibus referta ist auf die Cena nicht anwendbar. 3) Poggios Stilurteil über Petron homo gravis versu et constans prosa kann sich nicht auf die Cena beziehen, denn a) die Cena enthält keine Verse und b) ist sie voller Vulgarismen, während ausserhalb der Cena die Sprache des Enkolp gut zu constans prosa und Poggios zeitlicher Einordnung paulo post tempora Augusti passt. Diesen Einwänden fügt Müller noch eine weitere Beobachtung hinzu: 4) Die Überlieferungsgemeinschaft des Calpurnius und des Petron im Codex P, der die Kurzen Exzerpte enthält, stimmt zu der gleichzeitigen Erwähnung des Petron und des Calpurnius in Poggios Brief an Niccoli aus Rom vom 28. Mai 1428. Während Sage sich mit der negativen Feststellung begnügt, dass die particula nicht mit der Cena gleichzusetzen sei, und eine Identifizierung der particula ohne neues Material für unmöglich hält,

folgt Müller aus 4), dass mit particula die Kurzen Exzerpte gemeint sein müssten, die dann später als Teil A im Cod. Trag. auftauchen. Doch hier sind m.E. Zweifel anzumelden: Wenn Poggios Londoner Hs. Calpurnius Buccolica und Petron in den Kurzen Exzerpten enthielt, und aus dieser Hs. der Cod. Trag. kopiert wurde, warum finden wir im Cod. Trag. keine Spur von Calpurnius. Was Poggios in Köln gefundenen XV liber angeht, so ist Sage schon eher geneigt eine Identifizierung zu wagen, ohne sie allerdings mit letzter Bestimmtheit zu behaupten. Sage bringt folgende Argumente für eine Identifizierung der Kölner Hs. mit der Cena (dem Cod. Trag. H) vor: 1) Die Datierung der Trau-Hs. auf 1423 und die Erwähnung in Poggios Briefen aus derselben Zeit, 2) Die Ähnlichkeiten der Buchzahlen in beiden Hss. 3) Nur diese 2 Hss. enthalten Angaben über Buchzahlen.

Prüfen wir zunächst das Argument der zeitlichen Koinzidenz: Aus der Subscriptio der Catullgedichte ergibt sich für die beiden Petron-Teile als terminus post quem der 20. November 1423. Insofern ist die Behauptung Müllers: Der Codex Traguriensis ist 1423 vollendet worden, falsch, denn das "vollendet" kann sich ja wohl nur auf den Teil der Handschrift beziehen, der bis einschliesslich Catull reicht. So sieht den Tatbestand auch Van Thiel, *Petron, Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion*, Leiden 1971, S. 22: Van Thiel verweist darauf, dass die Subscriptio des Catulltextes mit der Datierung auf den 20. November 1423 sich nur auf den vorhergehenden Catulltext selbst beziehen kann, wobei er sich auf eine genaue Prüfung des Traguriensis durch Georg Petzl, Abrechnung eines humanistischen Schreibers, Die Subscriptio p. 179 des Codex Parisinus 7989 (Traguriensis) bezieht, der als erster gesehen hat, dass die Subscriptio wie folgt zu lesen ist: epistole 60. versus 2290, d.h. 60 Catullgedichte zu 2290 Versen. Die Catullsubscriptio hat also nichts mit dem Rest der Handschrift zu tun. Wenden wir uns nun den Angaben zu, die Poggio in seinen verschiedenen Briefen macht: a) vor dem 13. Juni 1420 hat Poggio in England eine Petron-Hs. gefunden, die particula. b) Vor dem 28. Mai 1423 hat Poggio einen weiteren Codex, den er in Köln gefunden hat, kopieren lassen, und zu diesem Zeitpunkt befindet er sich in seinen Händen. Gleichzeitig verlangt er die particula, die sich derzeit im Besitz von Niccoli befinden, von diesem zurück. c) Am 6. November 1423 befindet sich ein Petron-Codex noch immer in den Händen Poggios--offensichtlich die Kopie der Kölner Hs., denn die particula ist Niccoli ja bekannt. Diesen Petron-Text wollte Poggio persönlich seinem Freunde nach Florenz bringen, ist aber bis dato noch nicht dazu gekommen. Ob er das später nachgeholt hat, ist fraglich. Walser (Poggio, S. 84) ist jedenfalls der Ansicht, dass Poggio wegen der kurz aufeinanderfolgenden Briefe aus Rom unmöglich zwischen 1423-1424 in Florenz sein konnte, wie Sabbadini aus seinem Brief an Bruni vom April 1424 aus Rom Schloss: Cum essem Florentiae... Diese Angabe müsse sich, so Walser, auf Poggios Zwischenaufenthalt in Florenz auf der Heimkehr von England nach Rom beziehen. Immerhin gibt es zwischen November 1423 und Januar 1424 eine derart grosse Pause in den Briefen, dass in diesem Zeitraum durchaus ein Besuch in Florenz möglich war. Das ist aber nur eine Möglichkeit, die durch kein Dokument erhärtet ist. Andererseits hält Walser für die Zeit zwischen Januar und Juni 1424 einen Aufenthalt Niccolis in Rom für möglich. d) Poggio wirft Niccoli vor, einen Petronius Arbitri schon sieben Jahre oder länger bei sich zu haben. Welcher Text kann damit gemeint sein? Doch wohl nur die particula aus England, die ihm Niccoli anscheinend doch nicht geschickt hat. Denn die particula ist seit 1420 in Niccolis Händen, während der XV liber erst Ende 1423 oder Anfang 1424 in Niccolis Besitz ist. Dies entnehmen wir einem Brief Poggios an Niccoli aus Rom vom 13. Dezember 1429: Tenuisit iam Lucretium duodecim annis, et item Asconium Perdianum, et septem annis aut amplius Petronium Arbitrum. Dass wir dieser Angabe vertrauen dürfen, beweist der Hinweis auf Lukrez, von dem wir wissen, dass er sich tatsächlich 12 Jahre in Niccolis Händen befand. Aus diesen vier Angaben ergibt sich also, dass es durchaus möglich, aber nicht beweisbar ist, dass der Codex Traguriensis mit den beiden Petron-Texten zwischen 1423 und 1424 in Florenz oder Rom hergestellt wurde. Bleibt nun noch das Argument der Übereinstimmung der Buchzahlen in Poggios Brief vom Mai 1423, wo er von einem XV liber spricht, und dem Titel Petronii Arbitri fragmentum ex libro quintodecimo et sextodecimo und der Subscriptio Petronii Arbitri fragmenta

explicunt ex libro quintodecimo et sextodecimo der Kurzen Exzerpte im Traguriensis, während sonst in allen anderen Petronhandschriften keine Buchzahlen überliefert sind. Daher liegt es natürlich nahe, beide in eine Beziehung zu bringen. Das haben Sage und Müller auch getan. Problematisch dabei ist nur, wenn man annimmt, dass Poggios XV liber aus Köln die *Cena* enthielt, dass nicht dieser Teil des Traguriensis die Angabe XV liber enthält, sondern nur die Kurzen Exzerpte Titel und Subscriptio mit Buchzahlen haben. Dennoch müssen wir annehmen, um diese Theorie aufrechtzuerhalten, dass diese Angaben auch in der Kölner Handschrift standen und ihr entstammen. Müller begegnet diesem Problem nun mit der folgenden Hypothese: "Wie wir wissen, steht Kapitel 55 der *Cena* etwas verkürzt auch in den Kurzen Exzerpten; daraus war zu ersehen, wo die *Cena* im vollständigen Text ihren Platz gehabt hatte. Anstatt aber H dort in A einzuschieben, zog man es vor, die Texte A und H, jeden für sich, wie sie gefunden worden waren, hintereinander zu stellen, doch wurde nun der erste (A) mit Inscriptio und Subscriptio versehen. Dadurch sollte angedeutet werden, dass H in den Rahmen von A hineingehöre." Diesem Argument nun kann ich nicht folgen: Zwar konnte der Schreiber des Traguriensis durch die Überlieferung des Kap. 55 in den Kurzen Exzerpten feststellen, wohin die *Cena* gehörte; doch nehmen wir an, dass im Kölner Codex nur eine Subscriptio stand, die etwa lautete liber XV explicit, dann ist nicht einzusehen, warum der Schreiber des Traguriensis nur das Nachfolgende in den Kurzen Exzerpten per coniecturam als XVI Buch und nicht auch das der *Cena* Vorausgehende etwa mit Buch XIV bezeichnet hat.

Gänzlich unwahrscheinlich ist hingegen eine Alternativlösung Müllers, dass im Kölner Codex gestanden haben könnte: Petronii Arbitri Satyricon liber XV explicit: Incipit liber XVI, obwohl doch gar kein XVI Buch mehr folgte. Zusammenfassung: Mit all dem bisher Gesagten sollten und konnten die Theorien von Sage und Müller nicht ad absurdum geführt werden. Es ist durchaus möglich, dass Poggios particula aus England und sein XV liber aus Köln als Kurze Exzerpte (A) und als *Cena* (H) in den Cod. Trag. eingingen. Doch zur letzten Klärung wird es neuen Materials bedürfen, das etwa in noch nicht edierter Humanisten--Korrespondenz und in dem bisher unverwendet gebliebenen Renaissancehandschriften Petrons zu suchen wäre.

#### A Petronian Miscellany

A. Fred Sochatoff

That the closing third of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century were marked by intense activity on the *Satyricon* is apparent from a number of pieces of evidence. For one thing, editions of the work in the form then extant (the form that preceded the coming of the *Cena Trimalchionis* to light in 1650) and of the *Fragmenta* came forth in an unceasing stream. The edition issued by Sambucus at Antwerp in 1565—the first to be published in forty-five years and, more important, the first to evince concern over the reproduction of a clean text—ushered in a period during which new editions and reprintings appeared at intervals never exceeding ten years and, more often, of shorter lapse. In one year alone, 1629, no fewer than three separate editions came out. These numerous printings of the *Satyricon* contain an additional evidence of the intense activity devoted to Petronius and his composition: namely, the inclusion within them of bodies of commentary. These range in size from brief glosses to lengthy essays and extensive compendia and in content from textual suggestions and brief interpretative comments to remarks on the author, the work, the genre of which it is a representative, as well as extended disquisitions on expressions and passages in the *Satyricon* and the *Fragmenta*. The worth of the commentaries, both in their own time and in a later period such as the present, is variable; but from their voluminous quantity alone, one may derive an index of the interest in and attention to the writings of Petronius. This despite the fact that the alleged obscenity of those writings made them an unsatisfactory subject of study in the eyes of some! The editions of the *Satyricon* give no notion of various other

forms of activity on the work. They do not reflect, for example, the publication of collections and anthologies, like the *Poetae Veteres* of Stephanus or the *Catalecta* of Scaliger, which included Petronian excerpts in their contents. Nor do they impart an exact idea of the pieces of commentary which were composed independently of publication in any edition. Exceptional was the experience of the *Praecidanea* of the Elder Dousa; these were first published alone in 1583, but two years later they were joined to an edition of the *Satyricon* printed at both Leyden and Paris. In contrast, we may note a number of other commentaries which either never found their way into printed editions or were included in variorum editions only after the passage of many years. And these do not include the commentaries which contemporary testimony indicates to have been written but which for one reason or another soon disappeared from sight, sometimes never to re-appear. Also, the editions rarely give evidence of comments concerning the *Satyricon* made in compositions devoted to other classical authors and writings, such as the *Plautinae Quaestiones* of Ianus Guilielmus Lubecensis. The light cast on these more obscure forms of activity is one reason for the worth of the *ΟΜΟΛΟΓΟΥΜΕΝΑ*, a miscellany printed in the third decade of the seventeenth century. The Greek title (to be replaced hereafter in this article by the Latin transliteration *Homologoumena*) does not reveal the nature of the contents so accurately as the sub-title: *Elogia, Testimonia, et Iudicia veterum recentiumque Scriptorum de Petronio Arbitro et eius Scriptis*. The work thus is, strictly speaking, not so much itself a commentary as a collection of comments by various personages on Petronius and his writings. The kinds of comments included will be set forth presently, after a word concerning the authorship of the *Homologoumena*. The authorship is tied up with the question of the identity of Georgius Erhardus Francus, a commentator whose *Symbolae in Petronium et Fragmenta* appeared first in the Goldast edition of the *Satyricon* printed in 1610 and subsequently in the reprintings of that edition, those of 1615, 1618, and 1621. In enumerating the contents of the edition, the Bipontine edition of 1790, on page xxvi, makes the arresting remark that "sub quo nomine [Georgio Erhardo, that is] Goldastum latere patet." In other words, Georgius Erhardus is declared to be a pseudonym for Melchior Haiminsfeldius Goldastus (1576-1625). This identification is accepted by Buecheler (ed. mai., page xxxviii), among others. The Bipontine edition, however, contains a footnote imparting the information "Sed et sunt, qui Mich. Casp. Lundorpinium hoc nomine assumisse contendunt." This association of Erhardus with Michael Caspar Lundorpinus was set forth in a much earlier edition of the *Satyricon*, that of Lotichius published in 1629. A footnote (on pages 345-346) declares that Lundorpinus adopted the name Erhardus because of his professional position: "quod esset Praeceptor Classicus in Schola huius Urbis, invidiam Scholarum Collegarumque suorum veritus." The footnote adds that he intended to make his true identity known in a reprinting of the *Symbolae* but also the *Homologoumena*. Both in the entry for the latter work in the table of contents and in a marginal gloss on the first page of its appearance within the text, Lotichius declares that the composition had formerly been issued under the name Erhardus but was now acknowledged to be that of Lundorpinus. This is the authorship recognized by the Elder Burmann in his edition of 1709 (page 270 and page 277). The author of the *Homologoumena* may be designated a compiler more properly than an original composer. What principle governed his compilation of Petroniana, it is difficult to determine, nor are his methods clearly discernible. Understandable is the presentation of the well-known passage concerning C. Petronius from chapters 18-20 of Book XVI of Tacitus' *Annales*, but not easy to understand is the placing of it fourth, after quotations from Pliny the Elder, Tertullianus Maurus, and Plutarch. Moreover, although the Pliny citation is documented explicitly, by book number and chapter number, the Tacitus passage contains no reference to chapter numbers and runs the chapters together into a single paragraph. The final entry of the *Homologoumena* is no more than a listing of seven editions of the *Satyricon* as their titles were found in the library of Georgius Draudius, a German churchman of the early seventeenth century. Between the references from classical authors and those from contemporary individuals are found quotations from writers, editors,

and commentators of the entire intervening period. The Late Empire and the Early Middle Ages are represented by quotations largely paralleling those in the Fragmenta, but without the completeness of the latter. The compiler of the Homologoumena is content to present a sentence or two often having recourse to the symbol "etc." as if he assumes that his responsibility does not go beyond indicating to the reader a passage which the latter may find in fuller form on consulting the source listed. The same practice governs the presentation of quotations from writers of the Late Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance, like Johannes Sarisberiensis and Vincentius Beluacensis. Most of the excerpts in the collection are drawn from the late fifteenth, the sixteenth, and the early seventeenth centuries. These are presented in what purports to be chronological order. The more recent quotations vary in size and in nature. At times little more than the name of Petronius is presented. At other times brief allusion is made to a statement from the Satyricon. Reproduced at still other times is the wording of the title-page of an edition of the Satyricon. Of the lengthier comments, one is in a class by itself: a biography of Petronius composed by Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus (1459-1552), which, though it originally appeared in the third of his Dialogi de Latinis Poetis, was incorporated in the Tornaesius edition of the Satyricon in 1575 and thereafter was often reprinted. The other lengthier comments are of two main varieties. There are, first, observations of those engaged in the preparation of an edition or of those with whom such editors communicated. Thus we find comments by Turnebus, Pithoeus (and his publisher Patissonius), Lipsius, and Wouwer, among others. More numerous are the critical statements of a number of persons, most of them persons engaged in scholarly activities. Extensive though these comments of both kinds are, comparison of them with their originals (where those originals are available in other places) discloses the former to be abridged, with no indication where omissions have been made and only occasionally with the symbol "etc." The roster of personages represented in the quotations of the Homologoumena not only is a lengthy one but also includes some of the famous names in the annals of classical scholarship. In addition to those already referred to, present are Scaliger, Casaubonus, Gruterus, to mention only a few. Also, the roster contains persons prominent in the records of Petronian study--Brassicanus, Petrus Daniel, Barthius,

and Schoppius, besides those already named. The excerpts from the writings of each of these are in general brief; the purpose, again, seems to be to call attention to the writing and quote just enough to enable the reader to locate the complete version elsewhere. The best-known edition of the Satyricon containing the Homologoumena is that of Peter Burmann (Burmann the Elder) published at Utrecht in 1709. The collection as printed there, however, is incomplete. For the complete compilation one must have recourse to the earlier mentioned edition issued by Ioannes Petrus Lotichius at Frankfurt in 1629. The second volume of that work, comprising commentaries on the Satyricon by persons other than Lotichius (his own notes appear in the first volume), opens with the Homologoumena, printed on pages 1-34. A supplement is presented on pages 339-350 under the heading Testimonia de Petronio Arbitro, eius Vita, Scriptis, etc. Quae in Londorpiensis omissa sunt. (This supplement is not listed in the table of contents of the volume.) The 1709 Burmann edition also contains Testimonia in Lndorpiensis omissa, but the contents as well as the title are drastically abbreviated. Whether the supplement was composed by the author of the original Homologoumena is not indicated. On this point there is complete silence on the part of Lotichius, who elsewhere shows no reticence in appending marginalia and notes on a variety of matters. That a second person entered into the activity on the supplement is suggested by two pieces of evidence. The impersonal way, first, in which the title is worded seems to imply authorship by a different individual--far from conclusive testimony, it must be admitted. More convincing is a second condition, the fact that the quotations do not demonstrate the same pertinence as those of the Homologoumena. The presence of the name Petronius seems to be adequate justification for the quoting of a passage, whether or not the name refers to the author of the Satyricon. The original collection, despite its unmethodical practices and despite its tendency to abridge, has the virtue of pertinence to the Satyricon and the Petronius identified with the writing of that work. The scholar who is aware of the shortcomings of the Homologoumena is able to recognize the composition for what it is--a compilation of references to Petronius from 75 to 1625--and use it accordingly. He will find in it, furthermore, reflections of Petronian activity likely to be unknown as well as specimens of that activity sometimes worth more than a cursory glance.