

THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY

Newsletter

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

VOL. 4, NO. 2

EDITOR: GARETH SCHMELING

DECEMBER 1973

ANNOUNCEMENTS

We regret to announce the death of Vincenzo Ciaffi, a fine Petronian scholar.

Please note a correction in the Petronian Society Newsletter Vol. 4, No. 1, page 6, column 2: add the following words between line 55 and 56: was prevented by death from doing so. To Michael Caspar Lundorpinus, Lotichius attributes not only the Symbolae but.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldwin, B., "Ira Priapi," CP 68 (1973) 294-296. Baldwin does not believe that the ira Priapi is the efficient motif of the Satyricon.

Balme, M. G., The Millionaire's Dinner Party: An Adaptation of the Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).

Beck, Roger, "Some Observations of the Narrative Technique of Petronius," Phoenix 27 (1973) 42-61. "Petronian criticism...tends to treat the Satyricon primarily in terms of parody, satire, and a medley of literary entertainment...and only secondarily as an extended novel. In the study that follows I propose to take an opposite approach and to suggest a means of reconciling the discrepancies in Encolpius' character that at the same time sees in the Satyricon a well-wrought, sophisticated, and self-consistent work of narrative fiction" (page 45).

Carleton, S. B. B., Pétrone Démoralisé: The Ephesian Matron of John Ogilby (Diss., Texas, 1973). "The Ephesian Matron" is the last literary work of that seventeenth-century entrepreneur, translator, poet, and geographer, John Ogilby. A chapter in the history of Petronius in England, it was written in 1666 and published in 1668 in the course of an age friendly to Petronius, the Restoration. Examining the elements of which the poem, "The Ephesian Matron," is composed, this study begins with Ogilby's paraphrase of Aesop (1651), where Aesop appears in the unfamiliar guise of the amplified fable with classical, emblematic, and masque elements, serving the purpose of a disguised anti-Puritan tract. Ogilby's translations of Vergil (1649, 1654) are also disguised anti-Puritan tracts in which the emblematic tradition plays a prominent role. Ogilby's frame of mind, as reflected in his literary works, is Jacobean, but he was aware of changing tastes and attempted with some success to adapt himself to them. In his translation style he first follows the literal prescript of Ben Jonson but then adopts the freer style of Cowley, Denham, et al. with a resultant expansiveness of line in translation practice. Ogilby's translations of Homer (Iliad, 1660, Odyssey, 1665) are the fruit of happier times, and the humor so frequent in Homer appears unashamedly (but contrary to contemporary critical standards), a fact perhaps unique to Ogilby until in the nineteenth century, in theory, Samuel Butler (The Humour of Homer) and in the twentieth, in translation practice, Robert Graves. It is not inappropriate, then, that the element of the masque is found in Ogilby's Odyssey. With "The Ephesian Matron" Ogilby returns to his beloved Aesop and produces an amplification of almost a thousand lines in which the elements of the masque, the emblematic, the political, and the classical coalesce. In a framework which is a contaminatio of the versions of the Woman of Ephesus found in Petronius, the Romulean Aesop, and the Seven Sages, Ogilby writes a poem containing the elements already noted, dramatic in form (a

reworking of Chapman's The Widow's Tears according to Aristotelian principles), allegorical of the events leading up to the Restoration (the death of Cromwell and the demise of the Protectorate, the activities of General Monk, and the arrival of Charles II) and immediately inspired by Robert Wild's lampoon, Iter Boreale. By the use of a framework in which Petronius is emphasized, Ogilby pays court to the spirit of the Restoration and to its spokesman, the Seigneur de St. Evremond. This study offers an analytical critique of "The Ephesian Matron," both as a serious allegory and as a mock-heroic satire. A biography of John Ogilby is included, and, because the poem, "The Ephesian Matron," is not generally available, its complete text is appended. (S. Carleton)

Castorina, Emanuele, "La lingua di Petronio e la figura di Trimalchione," Siculorum Gymnasium 26 (1973) 18-40. An analysis of Trimalchio as a literary figure from the language he uses.

Duncan-Jones, R. P., "Scaurus at the House of Trimalchio," Latomus 32 (1973) 364-367. "It is not clear whether the name Scaurus as used by Petronius obviously referred to one individual even for contemporaries. But there can be little doubt that it was put into Trimalchio's mouth in order to suggest that he enjoyed familiarity with a senator of high standing" (pages 366-367).

Gill, C., "The Sexual Episodes in the Satyricon," CP 68 (1973) 172-185. "Scenes in the Satyricon which include a strongly sexual element compose a not inconsiderable amount of the extant text... It seems worthwhile then to appraise the distinctively literary qualities of these scenes, within the context of the style of the whole work; and that is the aim of this article" (page 172).

Merkelbach, R., "Fragment eines satirischen Romans: Auttor-derung zur Beichte," ZPE 11 (1973) 81-100. See review of P. Parsons, "A Greek Satyricon," BICS 18 (1971) 53-68, in the Petronian Society Newsletter Vol. 3, No. 1.

Miralles, C., La novela en la antigüedad clásica (Barcelona, 1968). Petronius is discussed separately as a rara avis on pp. 21-44. Miralles offers nothing beyond what introductions normally include, giving only slightly scholarly explanations of relevant topics as they arise in his paraphrase—antecedents, date, locality; and his knowledge of scholarship on Petronius seems at best imperfect, e.g. stating on p. 29 that Möring, like Rosenblüth, insists that mime has a formative role in shaping the Satyricon, when, in fact, Möring's dissertation is a point-by-point critique of Rosenblüth. B. P. Reardon, Phoenix 24 (1970) 274-275, has reviewed the book in detail. (Sandy)

Puccioni, Giulio, "L'Ilioupersis di Petronio," in Argentea Aetas: In Memoriam Entii V. Marmorale (Genova: Università di Genova, 1973) 107-138. A reconsideration of the purpose of the Troiae Halosis and its connection with Lucan's Pharsalia.

Scobie, A., More Essays on the Ancient Romance and Its Heritage (Meisenheim/Glan: Anton Hain, 1973). This collection of essays is intended as a companion volume to the author's "Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage," Meisenheim/Glan, 1969. Of the seven essays contained in this new collection, four deal with questions associated with Apuleius' Metamorphoses: The Structure and Unity of Apuleius' Met.; The Confirmation of the Unbelievable in Apuleius' Met.; Juvenal XV and Apuleius' Met. (an elaboration of Reitzenstein's theory that Satire XV is a parodic aretology); the Dating of the Earliest Printed European Translations of Apuleius' Met. (a short essay in which new evidence is advanced for the revision of the currently accepted dates for the printing of the first

Spanish, French, and Italian Translations. Of the remaining three essays two deal with aspects of the Greek romances: Similes in the Greek Romances (a factual exposition of their relative frequency and a classification of their subject matter); Barbarians in the Greek Romances (the attitudes of each author towards "barbarians" and the role they play in each romance). The final essay, The Ancient Romance and the Modern Novel, gives a brief general survey of some of the main differences and similarities between the main categories of ancient and modern novelistic fiction. (From the Publisher)

FORTHCOMING

Sandy, G., "Scaenica Petroniana," in TAPA 104 (1973). A detailed study of some theatre—and, especially mime-inspired features of the Satyricon.

NACHLEBEN

Bruno Maderna's one-act opera, Satyricon, was performed at Tanglewood as part of the annual Berkshire festival of contemporary music on 6 August 1973 (New York Times, 7 August 1973):

L. Pepe, "La Narrativa," in Introduzione allo studio della Cultura Classica, Vol. 1, Letteratura (Milan: Marzorati, 1972), pp. 395-472.

review by

Gerald Sandy

Stulti hau scimus frustra ut sumus, quom quod cupienter dari petimus nobis, quasi quid in rem sit possimus noscere. Certa mittimus dum incerta petimus. (Pseudolus 683-685)

I do not mean to imply that Pepe's literary chase is foolish or that it has been totally in vain, but unless the Italian word "narrativa" conveys nuances of which I am ignorant he has fallen victim to the endemic tendency of classical scholarship to go off on wild-goose chases. I should add the further qualification that I cannot determine from the review-offprint of Pepe's article whom he and the editor of the series envisage as their likely readers; to judge by the summarised plot that Pepe provides of the extant examples of the prose fiction of classical antiquity and by the title of the series, his essay is aimed at the novice seeking guidance; if so, that category of students will leave Pepe's article with the impression that, to quote Sophie Trenkner, The Greek Novella in the Classical Period (Cambridge 1958), p. 173, "Aristides is the origin of everything amusing and salacious in the narrative literature of Roman times." The first three parts of his essay (pp. 395-419) are concerned primarily with the origins and development of novella, which, in Part 1, Pepe sees evolving in biological fashion from a primitive early form into a complex, autonomous organism. (Pepe uses biological analogies throughout the essay, disregarding completely B. E. Perry's forceful criticisms of the approach in The Ancient Romances [Berkeley 1967].) In Part 2, Pepe turns to Aristides' Milesiaca, of which one word and ten fragments of the thirteenth book of Sisenna's translation (collected in Buecheler's critical edition of Petronius) survive. There are in addition thirteen testimonia relating to Aristides and his Roman translator, the most valuable being Ovid's self-defense and the prologue to "Lucian's" Amores. Pepe infers from this meagre evidence that Aristides was a participant, under his own name and in his own person, in the framed narratives. The work was, then, he believes, an Ich-Erzählung, and he compares

the technique of combining in one person listener, narrator and protagonist with narrative features of Petronius and Apuleius. Indeed, Pepe ventures to construct a "stemma" of the Eselsromane. Like others, he sees a reference to Aristides-Sisenna at Apuleius, Metamorphoses 4. 32. 6:

Sed Apollo, quanquam Graecus et Ionicus, propter Milesiae conditorem sic Latina sorte respondit.

The correct interpretation of this passage is, I believe, to connect it with l. l. 1, At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram; and with l. l. 5, where Apuleius apologises for his imperfect use of Latin; that is, Lucius is the conditor Milesiae. Since at least the time of R. Reitzenstein, Das Märchen von Amor und Psyche (Leipzig 1912), Sisenna, frag. 10, ed. Buecheler, has been used to substantiate the theory advanced by Pepe: Ut eum penitus utero suo recepit. This passage is then compared to Apuleius, Metamorphoses 10. 22. 3:

Artissime namque complexa totum me prorsus, sed totum recepit.

(A. Scobie, Aspects of the Ancient Romance and Its Heritage [Meisenheim am Glan 1969], pp. 33-34, surveys the fortunes of Reitzenstein's theory.). This seems a very shaky foundation on which to construct the theory that "Lucian" and Apuleius drew the material for their Eselsromane from the story of an ass-man recounted in Aristides-Sisenna. This is not all. Sisenna's full name is Lucius Cornelius Sisenna, and, accordingly, Pepe supposes that Sisenna replaced Aristides' name with his own as that of the listener-narrator-protagonist, which accounts for the Roman name Loukios in "Lucian's" Lucius sive Asinus. Using the analogy of Sybaritica, Sophie Trenkner, op. cit., has pointed out that a title denoting a locality may have no significance beyond predicating a national type: e.g., Boeotians are country-bumpkins, and the women of Ephesus make fickle wives; a tale recounting stylised national characteristics need not have originated in the eponymous locality. Pepe, however, bases his views that Petronius and Apuleius drew on Aristides-Sisenna largely on the geographical settings common to the three authors (and translator). Accordingly, he notes Metamorphoses 2. 21. 3, Pupillus ego Mileto profectus...; and the Asiatic backdrop to Satyricon 63. 3-10 as well as Trimalchio's description of himself at the time of the episode: Cum adhuc capillatus essem ...(63,3). These "parallels," Pepe believes, indicate a common origin: Aristides-Sisenna. Pepe further maintains that the Asiatic mise en scène of the tale of the boy of Pergamum and Eumolpus' role in it as narrator-protagonist corroborate his findings (Satyricon 85-87). The third part of the essay deals in more general terms with the origin of novella, especially the question of possible interaction between eastern and classical literature. It would have been appropriate at this point in the essay to mention the valuable contribution of J. W. B. Barnes, "Egypt and the Greek Romance," in Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Neue Serie, 5. Folge (Vienna 1956), pp. 29-36, which connects Greek translations of Demotic novelle with the Greek love-romances. In view of the widely accepted view of C. F. Russo, "Pap. Ox. 1250 e il romanzo di Achille Tazio," RAL series 8, 10 (1955), pp. 397-403, that the discrepancy between the order of the diadosis and the papyri at Achilles Tatius 2. 2-3 and 8-9 is the result of the compilation of anthologies, it is a bit cavalier to suggest without cogent reasons that the romance grew out of the nucleus of a novella. Pepe turns in the last two parts of his essay from comparatively speculative consideration of the origins of novella to a descriptive account of extant prose fiction. In Part 4, he traces the evidence for a tradition of story-telling in Athens and emphasises the novelle, i.e., digressions, in Homer as well as in Herodotus. He provides thumbnail sketches of the Greek love-romances, first surveying scholarship on their origins and placing them within a chronological framework, then summarising their plots. Part 5, "Narrativa latina," will be of most interest to readers of the Newsletter. Neglecting even to mention Apollonius of Tyre, which is often but for no compelling reasons taken to be a Latin translation of a Greek original (see Perry, op.

cit., pp. 321-323), Pepe remarks that novella and romance are interfused in the two extant examples of Roman prose fiction: Petronius and Apuleius. Although, he says, their highly individual geniuses created highly original works, nonetheless he sees Aristides lurking in the background, and it is with this putative influence that Pepe is here concerned. He describes the influence of Aristides-Sisenna as a nourishing stream largely submerged between the time of Sisenna himself and Petronius. It surfaces occasionally, however, as in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, where Pepe tries to uncover traces of Milesian influence, e.g. the *Ich-Erzählung* of Cephalus' tale in Book 8. Phaedrus, who adds a human dimension to Aesop's fables, is seen as a very important figure in the evolution of Roman novella. Pepe links no. 15 in "Perotti's Appendix," which is a variant form of the tale of the matron of Ephesus, with the tradition of Aristides-Sisenna, from which, he maintains, Petronius also drew his version of the story. The discussion of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* centres on the "novellistic" insets. The novelle of the first two books, Pepe notes, reinforce the principal themes of the romance: *curiositas* and *voluptas*. Like E. Paratore, *La novella in Apuleio* (Palermo 1942), and, more recently, P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge 1970), Pepe sees the influence of the Greek love-romances in Apuleius, especially in the so-called "Charite-Komplex." They have inspired an intrusion of sentimentality in a realistic, i.e., comic, romance. The novelle of Books 1-2 and 9-10 reflect the "Milesian" range of interests: magic, piquant eroticism and sanguinary cruelty. It should be evident that my principal reservation about Pepe's introduction to prose fiction is that he has opted to speculate on the *incerta* and largely to ignore the *certa*. Of the former category the best that can be hoped, as Scobie has said, is to "try...to disentangle probabilities from possibilities." The tradition of the extant prose fiction of classical antiquity is rich enough and interesting enough to warrant extensive, penetrating attention, as the recent publications of Walsh, *op.cit.*, and B. P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des II^e et III^e siècles après J. -C.* (Paris 1971), prove.

PETRONIUS IN CALIFORNIA

T. Wade Richardson

The California Classical Association held a joint conference of its Northern and Southern Sections in San Francisco at the end of March, and among the eighteen panel discussions there was one on Petronius, fetchingly entitled "Petronius: Attic Salt in Nero's Pie?". Ten enthusiasts came to the meeting, chaired by Professor Joachim Stenzel of California State University at San Jose and featuring in addition Professor John Dillon of U. C. Berkeley. Professor Stenzel began on a note that seemed to set the tone of the discussion: there was more justification than ever in seeing Petronius as suitable for instruction in schools, there being much in the *Satyricon* to which the youth could respond. Petronius himself was anti-heroic and deliberately inconsistent, assuming the stance of social gaiety by means of caricature and parody, especially in the *Cena*. His principals were picaresque but not heroic, and Eumolpus was the stoned anti-hero. Professor Stenzel wondered if our author would maintain his vitality to students, now that sexual explicitness had been matched and surpassed by modern works. At any event, the contemporary qualities of the work remained, and might serve to diminish the sense of distance and remoteness with which classical works came equipped. Professor Dillon began his remarks by saying that he would argue, despite problems of interpretation, that Petronius is profoundly anti-classical and iconoclastic. His reading of the state of Petronian scholarship had confirmed for him a work as moralistic as satire required, while Petronius' creative development of the Menippean form gave him the leeway within which to develop his satiric theme. For example, Trimalchio is being ridiculed and the audience must

laugh, in a snobbish way, but not seethe with indignation. For he is in fact presented and delineated with the preceptive-ness of affection. While Encolpius, far from being a *persona* of Petronius, is undermined, and he compares with the freedmen in an unfavorable light. Eumolpus is used by Petronius to resolve some principles, but the author maintained distance by undercutting him, and can thus on occasion accept credit, but not responsibility for Eumolpus' inadequacies, and the evils of rhetorical education cannot be laid at his door. Petronius' profound anti-classicism, Professor Dillon continued, celebrates the here-and-now with abuse of the present, a world quite out of touch with contemporary reality. The most vital elements in society, the freedmen, ironically see in this mockery of established education their only chance of culture, and, no doubt with Petronius' approval, they get it all wrong. Further proof of the author's sympathetic handling of this problem is found by Professor Dillon in the charming patter of Seleucus (Sat. 42), set against the cynical bombast of Encolpius' funeral oration over Lichas (Sat. 115). Petronius seems to argue that the baggage of "modern" Lucanian rhetoric should be discarded in favor of Vergilian purity — although he has no desire to write Vergilian Epic. The final point prompted Professor Stenzel to cite the *Troiae Halosis*. Was it a parody of the Sack of Troy of Vergil, from which vocabulary had been lifted, and what was the significance of the iambics? Professor Dillon saw in it the suggestion of a windy, overblown Senecan tragedy, a kind of declaimed messenger-speech. The Vergilian phrases were offered without criticism, as past literary history. Professor Stenzel wondered if Petronius treated anybody respectfully. He saw in Encolpius' Lichas-speech a kind of parody of Horace *Odes* I, 1, a substitution of different modes of dying for those of living. What in fact Professor Stenzel missed more of in Petronius was the stance of social critic. Was the language of the work alone sufficient to convince students that the personages were as vital as contemporaries? What in turn bothered Professor Dillon was that Petronius' offbeat treatment seemed to undermine the conventional authors, to the extent that students could ask why they were studied: "After all, Petronius didn't think much of them." Further discussion from the table produced the suggestion that Petronius could be appreciated nowadays for his novelistic kinship; and a point was made that he admired that which he parodied.

Eine bisher unbeachtete Handschrift Petrons:
Belluno, Biblioteca Lolliniana, ms. 25

by Günter Berger

Diese Handschrift wird zwar von Konrad Müller in seiner Ausgabe erwähnt, bleibt jedoch für die Edition unbenutzt [*Petronius Satyrice: Schelmengeschichten*, ed. K. Müller und W. Ehlers. München, 1965, p. 384]. Gefunden hat die Handschrift Rini [A. Rini, *Petronius in Italy from the Thirteenth Century to the Present Time*. New York, 1937, p. 16], beschrieben wird sie von Brugnoli [*Petronius*, ex rec. Georgii Brugnoli. Rom, 1961, p. 11] und Mazzatinti [G. Mazzatinti und A. Sorbelli, *Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia*, Bd. II, Forlì, 1892]. Die Beschreibung sei hier kurz wiederholt: Es handelt sich um eine Papierhandschrift des 15. Jhs. mit 84 Blättern. Sie enthält ausser Petron (ff. 52-84) noch das Gedicht Constantinopolis in vier Büchern des Ubertinus Puscus aus Brescia. Der Titel des Petron-Textes lautet: "Petronius Arbiter Satyricon incipit". Inc.: "Quum alio genere furiarum"; expl.: "possidet arca Jovem"; das Werk ist subskribiert: "PETRONIUS // Arbiter Saty//ricon finit

διὰ τοῦ χεῖρος corr. in τῆς χεῖρ(ός)
Ἐρακληάνου ἀβερτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι
τοῦ θεοῦ πατρός τοῦ
καὶ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεῦ
ματος ἄμεν.

Es wird nur eine kleine Auswahl der Lesarten dieser Handschrift geboten, die es ermöglichen soll, sie in die handschriftliche Tradition des Petron-Textes einzureihen [Zur Kollation der Hs. diente mir ein Mikrofilm, den mir die Biblioteca Lolliniana freundlicherweise zur Verfügung stellte]. Unsere Handschrift gehört zu den *vulgaria excerpta*: so fehlen z.B. cc. XXVI, 6 - LIV, 5. Zur weiteren Bestimmung des Verhältnisses der Belluno-Handschrift zu anderen Textzeugen bedienen wir uns der Ausgabe Büchelers [*Petronii Arbitri Satirarum reliquiae*, ex rec. Fr. Buecheleri. Berlin, 1862], da Müllers Apparat für diesen Zweck nicht ausführlich genug ist. Auffällige Übereinstimmungen ergeben sich aus der Kollation unserer Handschrift mit Büchelers Handschrift G (cod. Gueif. extravag. 299). Es seien einige nur diesen beiden Handschriften gemeinsame Fehler aufgeführt:

II, 2 effecistis : efficitis Bell.G
 II, 9 compendiarium : compendiarum Bell.G
 III, 4 scierit : sciret Bell.G
 XVI, 2 quis : quid Bell.G
 XVI, 2 cecidit : cedit Bell.G
 XVI, 3 illa : illam Bell.G
 XVI, 3 paulo : om. Bell.G
 XVI, 3 putabatis : putabitis Bell.G

Andererseits gibt es auch Fälle, in denen unsere Handschrift mit der übrigen Tradition übereinstimmt, während G Sonderfehler aufweist:

II, 1 haec mss. Bell. : om.G
 II, 3 deberent mss. Bell. : debere G
 II, 8 enituit mss. Bell. : enitui G
 IV, 3 paterentur mss. Bell. : pateretur G
 IV, 4 turpius mss. Bell. : turpius G
 Aber auch der umgekehrte Fall ist nicht selten:
 VII, 4 sero mss. G : sere Bell.
 XVI, 4 potius mss. G : om. Bell.
 XIX, 1 exsonuerant mss. G : exonuerunt Bell.
 XIX, 1 nos, quae mss. G : nosque quae Bell.

Aus den angeführten Beispielen lässt sich zwar eine enge Ver-

wandtschaft unserer Handschrift mit G schliessen, eine direkte Abhängigkeit besteht zwischen ihnen jedoch nicht. Der Schreiber unserer Handschrift hatte jedoch nicht nur eine nah mit G verwandte Handschrift zur Vorlage, sondern hatte gleichzeitig eine andere, nicht näher bestimmbare Handschrift der O-Klasse zur Verfügung: Er hat jeweils eine Lesart in den Text aufgenommen und die andere mit dem Hinweis "legitur et" am Rand vermerkt. Dass ihm beide gleichzeitig vorlagen, geht daraus hervor, dass einmal diese, ein anderes Mal jene Lesart im Text, bzw. am Rand erscheint. Auch dazu wieder einige Beispiele:

III, 3 divitum mss. Bell. : ad nutum margo Bell.G
 V, v. 4 regiam mss. Bell. : regina margo Bell.G
 VIII, 3 egressus mss. margo Bell. : ingressus Bell.G
 LXXXVIII, 5 plastas mss. margo Bell. : plastes Bell.G
 LXXXIX, v. 2 messis mss. margo Bell. : messes Bell.G
 LXXXIX, v. 26 metu mss. margo Bell. : motu Bell.G

Zu diesen von der ersten Hand am Rand hinzugefügten Lesarten kommen noch einige weitere hinzu, die von einer späteren Hand (des 16. Jhs.) stammen. Diese Lesarten von m2 sind der Edition des Sambucus (1565) entnommen, wie die folgenden Stellen zeigen:

LXXXIX, v. 22 ictusque : laetasque Bell. : lesusque m2 S(amb)
 LXXXIX, v. 64 ab aris : avaris Bell. : at aris m2 S
 CXIX, v. 14 auro : areo Bell. : arcu m2 S
 CXXXII, v. 153 optavitque : oravitque Bell. : intravitque m2 S
 CXXXIII, v. 191 stabant, et vincta : stabant, et victa Bell. :
 vinctaque mox stabant m2 S

Wenn auch unsere Handschrift als eine der verderbtesten Renaissance-Handschriften Petrons keinen Wert für die Konstitution des Textes hat, so ist sie doch ein weiterer Zeuge des - freilich relativ geringen - Interesses - das dem Autor der *Satyrica* im Quattrocento entgegengebracht wurde. Ein grösseres Interesse als allgemein damals üblich brachte zumindest der Schreiber der Belluno-Handschrift dem Petron entgegen, indem er für seine Abschrift zwei Vorlagen benutzte.