

# THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY

## Newsletter

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

VOL. 10, NO. 1

EDITOR: GARETH SCHMELING

JUNE 1979

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldwin, B., "Pigiciaca Sacra: A Fundamental Problem in Petronius?" *Maia* 29-30 (1977-78) 119-121. At 140.5 Baldwin speculates about the reading and meaning of *pygiciaca*; perhaps in view of Juvenal 6.488, *Isiaca* is a better reading? perhaps a reading: *ad (p)igra} ischiaca {sacra}. {sed} et podagricum* with a meaning: "to gouty rites. As he said he was a man with gout. . . ."

Baldwin, B., "Trimalchio's Domestic Staff," *Acta Classica* 21 (1978) 87-98. Baldwin contends that Trimalchio was not as rich as he would have his guests believe and that "With regard to staff, he is economical, constantly cutting corners by having slaves double up on their functions and the like." (p. 97).

Corbato, C., "Tacito, Ann. XVI.19: Considerazioni sulla tradizione del *Satyricon* di Petronio," in  $\phi\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu$  *Miscellanea di Studi Classici in Onore di Eugenio Manni* (Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1980). To appear.

Cosci, Paola, "Per una ricostruzione della scena iniziale del *Satyricon*," *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici* 1 (1978) 201-207. (George Kennedy)

Dillon, John, *The Middle Platonists* (London 1977), pp. 306-338. Accepting all the works attributed, with varying degrees of certainty, to Apuleius as genuinely Apuleian, and accepting the reference to Sextus of Chaeroneia at the beginning of the *Golden Ass* as a joking acknowledgement of one of Apuleius' teachers in Athens, Dillon surveys all the philosophical works—*De Mundo*, *De Deo Socratis*, *De Platone et Eius Dogmate* and *Peri Hermeneias*. He is above all concerned to discount the prevailing view of Sinko that the work of Albinus and Apuleius derives from the "school of Gaius." (Sandy)

Grondona, Marco, "Il modello dei Saturnali nella 'Cena di Trimalchione' (ed il testo di 58.2)," *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici* 1 (1978) 209-213. (George Kennedy)

Kilpatrick, R., "Apocolocyntosis and the Vision of Claudius," *CJ* 75 (1979) 193-196. Explanation of the title by comparing it to Aristophanes *Clouds* 327.

Kissel, W., "Petrons Kritik der Rhetorik (Sat. 1-5)," *RhM* 121 (1978) 311-328. "Wenn Agamemnon im Laufe des Werkes ganz gegen den Inhalt seiner eigenen Postulate handelt, ironisiert dies nur sein Leben gegenüber der Richtschnur seiner Worte, nicht umgekehrt. Ähnlich muss argumentiert werden, wenn im Auftreten und im Ausdruck von Encolpion an unserer Stelle eine ernste Natürlichkeit, in dem Agamemnons eine lächerliche Aufgeblasenheit konstatiert wird. Diese stilistischen Elemente benutzt Petron, um den in der Handlung deutlich werdenden Charakter seiner Personen zu unterstreichen, nicht aber, um ihre Aussagen, wo sie selbständig den Rahmen der Handlung durchbrechen, ihrerseits ihres Ernstes zu berauben." (pp. 327-328)

Peck, Harry Thurston, trans., "Petronius: From the *Satyricon*: From Trimalchio's Dinner," *The Portable Roman Reader* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977 [First published by The Viking Press, New York, 1951]) pp. 533-564. These pages contain extracts from *Trimalchio's Dinner* translated by Peck, New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1898.

Ricottilli, Licinia, "Quid tu? Quid vos? (Per il ricupero di una locuzione oscurata nel *Satyricon*)," *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici* 1 (1978) 215-221. (George Kennedy)

Sandy, G., "Ancient Prose Fiction and Minor Early English Novels," *Antike und Abendland* 25 (1979) 41-55. A sober approach to the influence of ancient prose fiction on the emerging English novel in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Spadaro, G., "La Novella della 'Matrona di Efeso' in un testo greco medioevale," *Studi Classici in onore di Q. Cataudella*, Vol. 2 (Catania: Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, 1972) 449-463.

Sullivan, J. P., "Petron in der neueren Forschung,"

*Helikon* 17 (1977) 137-154. A study which places Petronius both in the historical and literary setting of the court of Nero. Though the *Satyricon* is apolitical, Petronius does hold certain strong opinions about the practice of literature, many of which are in open conflict with those of Seneca and Lucan.

Sullivan, J. P., *Il Satyricon di Petronio: Uno Studio di Letterario* (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1977). Sullivan's *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study* (London: Faber, 1968) translated into Italian by Isabella Labriola.

Walsh, P. G., "Petronius and Apuleius," *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, ed. B. L. Hijams and R. Th. van der Paardt (Groningen: Bouma's Boekhuis, 1978) 17-23. "It is now possible to summarise the general findings. It seems highly likely that the structure of the *Met.* (adventures of the hero punctuated with anecdotes) owes much to Petronius' pioneering example. But the main lines of the narrative take their inspiration from the Greek *Metamorphoses*, and where Apuleius diverges in the original climax, the ideal love-romance rather than Petronius' comic version is the more probable model. In the inserted stories, there is little which points to the *Sat.*; perhaps the occasion of the Thelyphron story (the dinner-party at Byrrhaena's inserted by Apuleius), a few verbal touches in the Aristomenes anecdote, and above all the idealised story of Charite in her dead husband's vault, contrasting with the cynicism of Petronius' tale of the Widow of Ephesus. In the area of diction and style the connexions are so jejune that Petronius can be accorded at best only an insignificant role in the creation of the *Met.*" (page 23).

Williams, G., *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978). Sather Classical Lecture. Several general references to Petronius.

### TO APPEAR

In future volumes of *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Berlin: de Gruyter). J. P. Sullivan, "Petronius' *Satyricon* and its Neronian Context." E. G. Schmidt, "Furcht und Mitleid bei Petronius: Zur Rezeption der griechischen Poetik in Rom." J. B. Bauer, "Semiotisches in Petrons *Satyricon*."

### NACHLEBEN

Altobello, P. and D. Pierce, "The Food Lover's List," *Food and Wine* (August, 1979) 13. With a list of most notable banquets is included "Most Notable Banquet for Its Grotesquely Lavish Service, Trimalchio's Feast (circa 60 A.D.)." A description of the food follows.

Richardson, T. Wade, "Some Shared Comic Features in Petronius and P. G. Wodehouse," *Classical News and Views* 23 (1979) 64-70.

### SHORT NOTES

#### SAINT-EVREMOND AND PETRONIUS

by Raymond Astbury

This attempt to clarify from a bibliographical point of view the work done on Petronius by Saint-Evremont as well as other

related items, owes a great deal to the work of René Ternois in his *Saint-Evremond: Oeuvres en Prose* (4 vols. Paris 1962-69). Some loose ends remain; I hope that the publication of this note will stimulate those who are in a position to follow them up to do so.

## I

In 1664 appeared a work entitled *Jugement sur Senèque Plutarque et Petrone. Avec l'Histoire de la Matrone d'Ephese*. Paris: Claude Barbin, M.DC.LXIV (Schmeling and Stuckey Nos. 430 and 1725). This contained four items, of which three concern Petronius, viz.:-

p. 3: 'Sur Senèque, Plutarque et Petrone'. The Petronian section of this is an account of Petronius based on the Tacitean chapters; it should perhaps also be noted that in the section on Seneca Saint-Evremond devotes some space to the discussion of the view of one Berville that 'le faut Eumolpe fût le véritable Senèque'.

p. 24: 'Sur Petrone' (p. 33, Chapitre II; p. 41, Chapitre III). Though later editions and translations tend to print this as though it were a part of or pendant to the foregoing, it should be observed that it is a quite separate work which discusses Petronius as author of the *Satyricon*. The first chapter argues that Petronius was not a satirist or moralist but 'un courtisan delicat, qui trouve le ridicule'; in the second he discusses the extent to which Nero is mocked in the work; and in the third he gives his attention to Petronius' literary talents with particular praise for his skill in delineating character.

p. 87: 'La Matrone d'Ephese'; a prose translation of the episode<sup>1</sup>).

This collection was reprinted in 1670 (Schmeling and Stuckey No. 431) and in 1678 as *Cinquième Partie des oeuvres meslées de M. De S. E.* Paris: Claude Barbin, M.DC.LXXVIII, and frequently thereafter. Various translations of these items into English appeared in the fifty years following their first publication. The earliest was: *Judgement on Alexander and Caesar and also on Seneca, Plutarch and Petronius. Translated out of the French*. London: A. Maxwell, for Jonathan Edwin, 1672 (Schmeling and Stuckey Nos. 266, 770 and 1726); the translator was John Dancer and all three of the Petronian items mentioned above were included. 'A Judgement upon Seneca, Plutarch and Petronius' and 'Upon Petronius' appeared in: *Miscellaneous Essays: By Monsieur St. Evremont. Translated out of French. With a Character, by a Person of Honour here in England. Continued by Mr. Dryden*. London: John Everingham, 1692 (Schmeling and Stuckey No. 1727). The two items appear in Vol. I pp. 233-43 and 243-57 respectively. Eight years later there was published: *The Works of Mr de St. Evremont. Translated from the French*. London: Awnscham and John Churchill, 1700. Vol. I contained 'A Judgement upon Petronius' (pp. 221-3); 'Upon Petronius' (pp. 223-35); and 'The Ephesian Matron' (pp. 236-41). Lightly revised versions of the 1700 translations appeared in: *The Works of Monsieur De St. Evremont. Made English from the French Original*. London: J. Churchill, 1714. 'A Judgement upon Seneca, Plutarch and Petronius' is in Vol. I pp. 160-7; 'Sur Petrone' (without a separate title) in I pp. 167-79; and 'The Ephesian Matron' in I pp. 179-83.

## II

1669 saw the publication of *Recueil de diverses pieces. Faites par plusieurs personnes illustres*. La Haye: Jean et Daniel Steucker, MDCLXIX. This collection, which is divided into three separately paginated parts, contains thirteen items, of which ten are by Saint-Evremond, though his name is nowhere mentioned. In the first part we find 'Jugement sur Senèque, Plutarque et Petrone' (p. 58), 'Sur Petrone' (p. 69) and 'La Matrone d'Ephese' (p. 91). Of these the first and last are substantially the same as the versions which first appeared in 1664. But 'Sur Petrone' is not the same; in the third chapter there has been considerable expansion at one point (see Ternois, *op. cit.* II pp. 175-7 for the text of the additional material).

In addition to this extended version of 'Sur Petrone' the book also contains in its third section two Petronian items which are not by Saint-Evremond. On p. 34 we find 'La Veufve de Petrone', a verse adaptation in 45 ten-line stanzas of the Matron of Ephesus<sup>2</sup>), and on p. 56 'De Petrone a Martia. Epigramme', a translation of Petron. frg. 43 Buecheler = 33 Ernout.

## III

Two other items of Petronian interest appeared in *Oeuvres meslées*. . . Par M. De S. E. *Troisième Partie*. Paris: Claude Barbin, MDCLXX. These were 'Fragment de Petrone. De l'Eloquence' (pp. 39-118), a translation, greatly expanded, of Petron. 1-5, which Saint-Evremond, according to Ternois, *op. cit.* II p. 179, disclaimed in a letter to Barbin in 1700, and 'La Matrone d'Ephese' (pp. 119-55), which is not the version by Saint-Evremond published in 1664 but a revised version of that which first appeared in *Nouvelles en vers tirées (sic) de Bocace et de l'Arioste, par M. de L. F.* (i.e. La Fontaine). Paris: C. Barbin, 1665. P. Desmaizeaux, in his *Mélange curieux des meilleurs pieces attribuées à Mr. de Saint-Evremond* (Amsterdam 1706) ascribes both of these works to M. de la Valterie<sup>3</sup>). Translations of both of these items were published in Vol. I pp. 242-80 of the 1700 *Works* mentioned above, and the same translations with slight revisions were reissued in the 1714 *Works*. The third volume of that work contains, separately paginated, *Memoires of the Dutchess of Mazarin. Written in her Name by the Abbot of St. Real. With a letter containing a true character of her person and conversation. To which are added, Some Pieces attributed to Monsieur De St. Evremont, and by him approved. Printed in the Year, 1713* (Schmeling and Stuckey No. 1726). The translations in question appear on pp. 80-110.

## IV

The translation of Petronius by Wilson, Burnaby, Blount, etc. published in 1708 and (and in its later editions) [Schmeling and Stuckey Nos. 274-81] contains on pp. i-xvii 'The Life of Petronius Arbitrator'. Written by Monsieur St. Evremont; Made English by Mr. Tho. Brown'. This essay has no connection with any of the items previously mentioned in this note and the claim that it is by Saint-Evremond appears to require investigation. A different translation of the same essay is to be found on pp. 1-14 of Addison's 1736 translation of Petronius (Schmeling and Stuckey No. 283), where it is described as 'The Life of Petronius Arbitrator. From the French'. The title-page reads as follows: *The Works of Petronius Arbitrator, In Prose and Verse. Translated from the Original Latin, By Mr. Addison. To which are prefix'd the Life of Petronius, Done from the Latin: And a Character of his Writings by Monsieur St. Evremont*. Actually prefixed to the translation are:- 1) The Preface. This consists largely, after a brief preliminary, of a translation of Chapter III of 'Sur Petrone', duly credited to 'the late celebrated Mons. St. Evremont'; it is the 1714 translation with one or two minor changes. 2) The Life of Petronius Arbitrator. From the French. 3) A Key to the Principal Characters. 4) The Contents. It appears therefore that Addison does not follow the 1708 translation in ascribing the original of 'The Life' to Saint-Evremond.

- 1) These items may be consulted most conveniently in Ternois, *op. cit.* I pp. 154 ff.
- 2) Schmeling and Stuckey No. 441 is also a seventeenth century French verse translation of the Matron of Ephesus; I have not been able to check the possibility that it may be the same as that listed above.
- 3) This is presumably the De La Valterie who translated Homer, Persius and Juvenal; cf. *Bibliographie Universelle, Ancienne et Moderne* T. 47 (Paris 1827) 413.

## REVIEWS

Imperatore, G. F., *SAGGIO DI ANALISI CRITICA DELLA BIBLIOGRAFIA NERONIANA DAL 1934 AL 1975* (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1978).

Review by  
J. P. Sullivan

This intelligent, if incomplete, discussion of recent historical writings on the Neronian age should prove useful for students of Petronius, even though Imperatore, who regrettably died at the early age of twenty-three and whose posthumous thesis this is, decided not to discuss the mass of articles and books (see p. 12-13) on the surviving literary

works of the period. (Petronius Arbiter does not even appear in the index.) Even the non-historian, however, will find useful his survey (ch. 1) of the discussions of the sources from which we ultimately derive our image of Nero and Nero's court. Nero's bad press, so to speak, is more of an accident than we assume, even though one may not wish to agree with the blasphemous wit who remarked that anyone who persecuted Christians could not have been all bad. The following nine chapters survey the work on, respectively, Nero's early years; the perennial problem of the *quinquennium Neronis*; domestic and palace politics; Nero's philhellenism and his stance on religion; the fire of Rome and the persecution of the Christians; the economic and financial measures adopted by the regime; Nero's foreign policy and military activities; then, finally, his fall and death. The ten pages of bibliography that follow contain as good a general guide to the period as one could wish, although one is puzzled as to why the editors were not more vigilant in eliminating the many misprints (p. 132, K. R. Grandley? p. 139, B. L. Ullma?) and why they allowed the quotation marks around each journal and reference work, or indeed the over-punctuation ("Iatomus," "C.A.H.," "T.A.Ph.A."). Perhaps it is time for an international style sheet for classical periodicals along the lines of the MLA style sheet. After all, our textual apparatuses are reasonably homogeneous. Nevertheless, this is a useful work for those not over-familiar with the history of the period and I learned much from it. It is, I believe, important for those immersed in literary studies to brush up occasionally on their ancient history and their archaeological Realien. For the age of Nero it would be hard to find a better, more comprehensive or more objective guide to the current historical discussions.

Ratti, Edoardo, *L'Età di Nerone e la Storia di Roma nell'Opera di Petronio*. (Bologna: Patron, 1978). Pp. 236, £5000.

Review by  
J. P. Sullivan

This book by the late Edoardo Ratti consists of four chapters devoted, respectively, to the "labyrinth" of Nero's vices; the "labyrinth" of the Trojan mural; the "labyrinth" of the Zodiac, and finally, the significance and function of Petronius' last testament. The author, an esteemed jurist, tries tentatively to make sense of the alleged allusions to Nero in the *Satyricon* and, in addition, to throw light on the otherwise inexplicable characters of the novel and the many allusions to the first century A. D. Ratti's theory is that the novelist, whoever he was, adopted from Tacitus' *Annals* 16.18-19 the pseudonym Petronius Arbiter and then wrote the pretended testament of the dead courtier, incorporating a significance invisible to the common reader. It is, in fact, an ancient parody and polemic written between the second century and the end of the third. Here are a few of the ways Ratti teases out the meaning of the work. Daedalus, Trimalchio's cook, and his trickery in disguising one thing as another, and Massa (= Moses), an analogous figure, furnish important clues to Petronius' strategy: in the *Cena*, Petronius' "seal," he is constructing a literary labyrinth for his own esoteric purposes. In one way, the work is a carefully disguised denunciation of Rome's and Nero's vices; in another it is a weapon in the war between Christians and Jews, the Christians being denounced for their praise of Rome, which eventually they were to co-opt in their own cause (pp. 191-2). The *Satyricon* is an apocalyptic *testamentum novissimum* (of universal love!) which satirizes the *Novum Testamentum* (p. 192-5) by its hidden, not its surface, comedy. The symbolism of the labyrinth is therefore crucial to Ratti and he elaborates on it for most of his pages. He finds connections between the *Satyricon* and the *Apocalypse* (p. 45)—the two beasts of St. John become Trimalchio and Habinnas. Much is deduced from the symbolism of the Zodiac dish (pp. 137 ff.) and from the rebuses of *Sat.* 56. Hidden meanings, "seals," and geometric tabulations abound and great play is made of the old familiar ROMA-AMOR, to which is then connected MORS. For all its useful learning and its far flung references to non-classical fields, the basic thesis that a writer, versed in the allegorical, symbolic and pseudoetymological inter-

pretations of the Bible and classical authors such as Homer and Vergil, then constructed a text of his own suitable for such exegesis, and faked its provenance as the first century A.D. and the pen of a dead courtier of Nero's, is fantastic and implausible. Indeed Ratti's language, in his conclusions, verges on the mystical (*linie contorte di una geometria implacabile* are his very last words!). Here he is far and away in advance even of Petronius' moralizing critics, such as Bacon, Arrowsmith, and Cameron, who, more plausibly, hold him to his place in Neronian literature. To explain the nature and date of the *Satyricon* we have no need of such hermeneutics. But aberrations of learned minds are not uncommon and we must remember the ingenuities of the Baconians and Newton's dealings with sacred scripture, when approaching a work so rich in imagination.

Grimal, Pierre, *La Guerre Civile de Pétrone dans ses rapports avec la Pharsale*. Collection d'études ancienne, Budé (Paris 1977), pp. 312. N.p.

Review by  
J. P. Sullivan

G. addresses himself to some old but still vexed questions about Petronius' *Bellum Civile*: what is the purpose and function of the poem in the context of the *Satyricon*? What is the relationship, if any, between the *BC* and Lucan's *Pharsalia*? His radical solution consists of an attempt to prove that the *Pharsalia* was written after the *BC*, and that any apparent allusions or echoes discernible in the works, when they are not easily dismissed as illusory or as deriving from common sources, can be attributed to Lucan's dependence on Petronius, not *vice versa* (p. vi). Before embarking on such an ambitious reversal of received opinion, G. should have acquainted himself with K.F.C. Rose's monograph on the date and authorship of the *Satyricon*, published, after all, in 1971, instead of his much briefer article in *CQ* 1962; also unmentioned is P. George's sceptical article, "Petronius and Lucan de *Bello Civili*" in *CQ* 1967. It is therefore not surprising that the bibliography is so confusing as well as defective. G.'s first chapter analyzes Eumolpus' aesthetic principles. Despite some familiar textual nitpicking and some red-herrings, G.'s assertion that the preface to the *BC* cannot be directed at Lucan remains mere assertion and his subsidiary claim that the Civil War inspired 'bien des poètes' is an exaggeration. G. argues implausibly that the function of the divine in both the *BC* and the *Pharsalia* is much the same: it is abstract and symbolic, following in the path of Vergil. Ch. 2 analyzes the causes of the war in both poems. Here again, G. finds that Eumolpus depends only on standard historical sources (who would deny it?), and therefore any critique of Lucan in this respect is to be ruled out. In the third chapter G. analyzes the dialogue between Pluto and Fortuna and finds it probable that it is an original creation, despite its strong dependence on Vergil, and that Lucan has seen fit to use certain elements of it. A similar conclusion is drawn in G.'s comparison of Petronius' and Lucan's treatment of the portents of the war ("*Lucain avait conservé dans sa mémoire le souvenir du poème de Pétrone, un souvenir qui... revenait l'inspirer*, p. 148). The next chapter discussing the respective treatments of Caesar's descent into Italy ends with the conclusion that the two writers simply followed parallel paths in their depictions, one Stoic and one Epicurean. Any resemblances are to be explained once more by Petronius' chronological priority. Ch. 6 on the panic in Rome argues for the likelihood that in the similarities the model is Petronius and the imitator is Lucan. A main argument here (p. 192) is that a given line or passage is more obscure than the equivalent in Lucan and therefore the latter must have been clarifying the former. One might equally well argue that Petronius' shorter scope leads him to compress the sentiments or descriptions of his model. Ch. 7 deals with the gods and the Civil War. G. repeats that the gods do not intervene in the action, thereby minimizing the difference in the attitudes that Lucan and Petronius adopt towards the divine machinery employed by Vergil in the *Aeneid*. Once again, G. argues that it is more likely that, in the various relevant passages, Lucan is recalling Petronius than *vice versa* and he stresses (p. 214, 228) Lucan's great familiarity with Eumolpus' poem, a phenomenon



which strains at least this reviewer's credibility. (One should note that on pp. 234-5 G. wrongly surmises that to explain the facts one must postulate just one year or so for the composition of the *Satyricon*, particularly since he adopts the thesis that different parts of the *Satyricon* may have been written non-sequentially at different times.) G.'s conclusions are as follows: Petronius' thinking is independent of Lucan's. Incidents and ideas common to the two works are due to their common subject, their common aesthetic (Aristotelian and Horatian), p. 254, and their natural reliance on the obvious historical sources, such as Livy, and, above all, on Virgil and other Latin poets. The few unmistakable echoes are to be explained by Lucan's dependence on Petronius. What G.'s hypothesis, which has to presume that Petronius wrote the *BC* before A.D. 60 (p. 256) and inserted it into the *Satyricon* later, along with the *Troiae Halosis*, does not explain is the date and context of the *BC*; certainly it is a most peculiar production to be the "conservative" poetic demonstration that G. sees in it (p. 248). Indeed, if Eumolpus' *opus* is more or less disavowed by Petronius himself, why would Lucan echo anything of it in his serious epic? It is true that G. has now given us a closer analysis, in the interests of his paradoxical thesis, of the resemblances between the two works, but it must be said that the book is overlong and padded; the text printed of *BC* is conventional, and the translation unnecessary. The parallels from Lucan printed underneath the text are far less complete than Rose's collection (a random example omitted by G. would be the possible resemblance between *BC* 160, cf. 294, and *Phars.* 7.473), although the citations from other authors may be useful to have on the same page. The implausibility of G.'s thesis lies in this: would an unfinished, hardly impressive, sketch of the opening of an epic, written, say in A.D. 61, have so impressed the young and arrogant Lucan that he incorporated into his own massive work so many echoes, allusions, and other borrowings? the common source theory (cf. *George art. cit.* above) is difficult enough to argue, since there is little evidence for the many common sources that must be postulated, and it fails to explain the statistically odd grouping of the resemblances between the *BC* and *Pharsalia* I-III and X. But G.'s thesis overlooks the literary context of the *Satyricon*, the allusions, for instance, to Seneca's philosophical works in the *Satyricon* (was Seneca, Lucan's uncle, also borrowing from Petronius?). The *BC* itself and its relationship to the *Pharsalia* remain somewhat puzzling. Petronius makes Caesar the heroic centre; the *Pharsalia* Cato. Is it therefore a political and opportunistic corrective of Lucan's revisionism? Both poems rely heavily on Vergil. Are there then many other poetic, or even historical, sources that may further explain the resemblances and echoes described in the two? The *BC* is no obvious parody of the *Pharsalia*, but could there not be elements of parody in it, particularly of Lucan's strained *sententiae* or imagery? If not an overall parody, is it perhaps an unpretentious and sketchy model of *how* an epic on the civil war should be tackled, reintroducing the gods that Lucan, with great insight and originality, had omitted? Could all of these elements, and more, be present? G.'s hypothesis to explain the relationship between the two works may indeed fit the facts more economically. The theory, however, involves so much subjectivity and such large assumptions about the chronology and the profound and inexplicable familiarity of the serious younger poet with the mocking and self-deprecatory mini-epic of Eumolpus that the generally accepted opinions on the relative chronology and the dependence of the one on the other, despite their difficulties, remain much more plausible.

A. S. Kalenić, *Petronius' Views of Language Philosophy*. (Petronijevi pogledi na filozofiju jezika) Zagreb: biblioTEKA, 1978. Pp. 142. Din. 240.

The book consists of an Introduction (with a section on the problem of language in Greek philosophy) and five chapters: I. Roman Literature, II. Literary Language of Petronius' Time, III. The Literary Type of Petronius' Work, IV. Language Philosophy in Petronius' *Satyricon* (the central chapter), and V. Conclusions. Chapter IV is subdivided into (1) Petronius in the *Satyricon*, (2) *Sermo Quotidianus* and Poetry, (3) Speech and Truth, (4) Speech and Beauty, and (5) Speech and History. Though Petronius' *Satyricon* offers the widest variety

of language—from high literary (*sermo latinus elegantissimus*) down to the most vulgar parlance (*sermo plebeius*)—it is noticeable that the different levels are somehow stressed in the work: (a) regular language (*sermo quotidianus*), the entire conversational range of vernaculars from the sophisticated down to the simplest, and (b) the literary (poetic) idiom. The two levels are conspicuously contrasted in the sentence: *saepius poetice quam humane locutus es* (90.3) which we translate as "you have talked more often like a poet than like a man". What this sentence tells us is that, in addition to the human language, there exists a language that is not. The paradox consists in the fact that both poets and non-poets belong to the same language community. When speaking comprehensibly, poets speak the language they have in common with the non-poets; but their language becomes antithetical when they speak poetically. The discord between the "poetic" and "human" exists not from time immemorial (cf. c. 2.3 sq.; 88.2 sq.), since there was a time when poetic language was in the fullest sense human language. The discord opened up a new antagonism between contemporary and ancient artistic production. While ancient artistic production (when *virtus* carried *τέλος* within itself) formerly grew out of life and was thus the *ἐνέργεια* of the real and human historical world, contemporary artistic production is marked by sharp breaks between language and reality. Therefore the language of such artistic productions shows neither an understanding of the reality nor an agreement about the world, but rather a misunderstanding. Alienated from real life and from its contemporary setting, such a language is just a semblance of language, incomprehensible and foreign to "ordinary" people. The difference lies in this: the ancient poetic comprehended its own times and was thus comprehensible to its contemporaries. Modern poetic production, alienated from life is developing outside its contemporary surroundings and therefore comes into conflict with its contemporaries. This conflict comes into focus in the *Satyricon* in the form of misunderstandings between contemporary and earlier cultural productions, and also in the misunderstandings by "ordinary" contemporaries of ancient cultural products. The *Satyricon* therefore expands our horizon for comprehending the sentence *saepius poetice quam humane locutus es* to include three types of disagreement: (a) disagreement between contemporary "poetic" and "human" languages, (b) between the contemporary and ancient "poetic", and (c) between the contemporary "human" and the ancient poetic, which, however, appears to be identical to its own human state at the time. These latter disagreements again branch out into disagreements between contemporary language and the linguistic heritage. In the *Satyricon* there are really three different idioms: (a) the contemporary "human", (b) the contemporary "poetic" which is "unhuman", and (c) the ancient "poetic" which still is human. To find out what the three idioms hold in common and separately, and to see whether they are truly these different idioms or just appear so, we must examine the relationship between language and reality. Our next question is: how can the truth about the world influence the language? Man is necessary for language, which does not exist in the abstract, since every individual speaks a defined language. Willy-nilly, humans cannot contain within themselves any sensations without voicing them (cf. Pl. *Soph.* 363E). The word is at one and the same time both the sensation and the notification. In the sentence *saepius poetice quam humane locutus es, humane loqui* really means the primordial understanding of speech as a dialogue which is actually the essential proof of man's existence in the world. No one has a private language; man must share his language with others. Every dialogue presupposes and generates a common idiom. Petronius' *Satyricon* points out language (*candida lingua* c. 132.15, v. 4) as the environment in and from which burns (*lucet*) the light of truth. The truthfulness of the word does not dwell in its correctness, i.e. in its being properly denotive, but in its creation of meaning. All words are truthful since their existence is in their meanings. Language is the way things talk to man in a dialogue between man and world. Speech is not just the search for meaning but a particular capacity of language to say what is true. Language in its essence is dialogue and therefore more than the mere equation of word = thing, because language is exactly the vehicle in which sensation and thing combine for the first time. The word (*nomen*) is not the carrier of the truth, but the *λόγος* (= *verbum*) is that which essentially manifests itself as *διάλογος* (= *sermo*).