
THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY

NEWSLETTER

(Publication of the *Newsletter* is made possible by the generous support of Martha B. McDonald who dedicates this volume *in memoriam* to her beloved parents, Sgt. Carl E. Byrd and Toyo M. Byrd)

Editor:

GARETH SCHMELING
Department of Classics
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611-7435
Tel. (352) 392-2075
FAX (352) 846-0297
email: schmeling@classics.ufl.edu

Vol. 27, Nos. 1 & 2
April 1997

Associate Editors:

Raymond Astbury
Barry Baldwin
Ewen Bowie
Gian Biagio Conte
Niklas Holzberg
B.P. Reardon
Gerald Sandy

PSN ON THE WEB

Thanks to Professor Jean Alvares, *PSN* can be read (from Vol. 26, 1996) on the web in Netscape or another browser. The address is <http://www.chss.montclair.edu/classics/petron/PSNNOVEL.HTML>

CORRECTIONS to PSN 26, May 1996

Some *Newsletters* were printed with two sides of page nine and no page ten. Please check your copy, and correct pages can be supplied.

Page five, left-hand column, end of first full paragraph. [Report in *Süddeutsche Zeitung*] should read [There is also a newspaper report of the Munich *Cena Trimalchionis* in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 20 January 1996].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrecht, Michael von, "Novel. The Roman Novel. Petronius," *A History of Roman Literature*, Vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 1205-1238.

Albrecht, Michael von, "Novel. Apuleius," *A History of Roman Literature*, Vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 1449-1467.

Alpers, K., "Zwischen Athen, Abdera und Samos. Fragmente eines unbekanntes Romans aus der Zeit der Zweiten Sophistik," in M. Billerbeck, J. Schamp, eds., *Kainotomia: die Erneuerung der griechischen Tradition* (Freiburg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag, 1996) 19-55. Items in the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (compiled in mid 9th century in Constantinople) might be fragments of a novel. Allusions(?) to the *Iolaus* (pp. 32, 54) and Petronius 21.2, 23.4, 85.3 (pp. 53-4): Alpers Fr. 4 (*Et. Gen. a* 947), *καμοὶ τὰ ψυχρὰ τὰτα καὶ ἀνεπαφρόδιτα προσμάττεις φιλήματα*: Petronius 21.2 *nos ... modo basiis olidissimis inquinavit*; 23.4 *immundissimo me basio conspuat*: Fr. 31 (*Et. Gen. s.v. Στελεγίσματα*) *κἄν πρὸς τὸ γυμνάζεσθαι καὶ πρὸς παλαίειν δέη, τὴν στελεγίδα καὶ τὴν λήκυθον οὔσει ἠδέως*: 85.3 *iam ego coeperam ephelum in gymnasium deducere*.

Alvares, J., "Maps of travels in the ancient novels, and of other famous journeys," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 803-814.

Anderson, G., "Popular and Sophisticated in the Ancient Novel," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 107-113.

Anderson, G., "Lucian's *Verae Historiae*," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 555-561.

Anderson, G., "Philostratus on Apollonius of Tyana: the Unpredictable on the Unfathomable," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 613-618.

Aragosti, A., "Il 'Primo' Petronio Italiano: la *particula* di Poggio Bracciolini e il *cod. Paris. Lat. 6842 D*," *SCO* 43 (1993) 235-250.

Aragosti, A., "L'Autobiografia di Trimalchione (il Passato Remoto e Prossimo)," in G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari, eds., *La Componente Autobiografica nella Poesia Greca e Latina fra Realtà e Artificio Letterario*. Atti del Convegno, Pisa, 16-17 Maggio 1991 (Pisa: Giardini, 1993) 299-303.

Beaton, R., "The Byzantine Revival of the Ancient Novel," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 713-733.

Beck, R., "Mystery Religions, Aretalogy and the Ancient Novel," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 131-150.

Bedon, R., Pétrone, *Satiricon*, XXX, *Le dispensator Cinnamus*," *BAGB* (1996) 151-166. Important place of Cinnamus, Trimalchio's steward at *Sat.* 30.2: "Le *dispensator* installé par Pétrone dans l'*atrium* de Trimalcion [30.9], selon toute probabilité le même que le Cinnamus nommé sur les inscriptions des objets de bronze [30.2], n'est donc pas un personnage d'importance secondaire dans la *Cena*. ... il nous est apparu comme un second Trimalcion, encore en gestation, et comme un élément de la biographie de son maître compris entre la frise et les inscriptions de l'*atrium*" (p. 165)

Benediktson, D.S., "Manum de tabula: Petronius *Satyricon* 76.9," *CP* 90 (1995) 343-345. *manum* to be understood in the sense of gambling "stakes", and Suetonius *Aug.* 71.3 is adduced as

well as Aulus Gellius NA 18.13.4.

Billault, A., "Characterization in the Ancient Novel," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 115-129.

Billault, A., "Peut-on Appliquer la Notion d'Asianisme à l'Analyse de l'Esthétique des Romains Grecs?," *AAntHung* 36 (1995) 107-118. Answer: yes.

Billault, A., "Le Temps du Loisir dans *Daphnis et Chloé*," in J.-M. André, ed., *Les Loisirs et l'Héritage de la Culture Classique* (Brussels: Latomus, 1996). Collection Latomus 230.

Billault, A., "La Nature dans *Daphnis et Chloé*," *REG* 109 (1996) 506-526. Abstract: "The art of Longus has often been praised because he was supposed to replace reality with an artificial world. But nature is genuinely present in the novel. If we study how, we can understand to what extent *Daphnis and Chloe* is a realistic pastoral novel."

Bowie, E., "The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 87-106.

Branham, B., "Inventing the Novel," in A. Mandelker, ed., *Bakhtin in Contexts: Across the Disciplines* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1995) 79-87; 200. "The purpose of this essay is threefold: to offer a brief account of the conception of the ancient novel developed by Mikhail Bakhtin in a series of idiosyncratic studies written in the 1930s and to ask, first, whether his work provides a theoretical basis for a genuinely historical approach to the genre and, second, given this approach, what a coherent picture of the evolution of narrative in antiquity would look like." (p. 79)

Branham, R. Bracht and Kinney, Daniel, eds. and trans., *Petronius Satyricon* (London: Dent, 1997). Paperback, 186 pp. This is a corrected paperback edition with additions of the 1996 hardcover version. In a most interesting section, "Petronius and his Critics" (p. 172-179) we learn that Leibniz (1693) knew the *Satyricon*, that there is yet another reference to Petronius in Diderot (1745), and that Jefferson apparently owned two editions of the *Satyricon*, which given to the country made Petronius part of the original Library of Congress.

Codoñer, C., "Encolpio Visto por el Narrador," in L. Callebat, ed., *Latin Vulgaire Latin Tardif IV*. Actes du 4^e Colloque International sur le Latin Vulgaire et Tardif. Caen, 2-5 Septembre 1994 (Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 1995) 701-714.

Colton, R., "The Story of the Widow of Ephesus in Petronius and La Fontaine," *Studies of Classical Influence on Boileau and La Fontaine* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1996) 125-144.

Connors, C., *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon*. To appear in the future from Cambridge University Press.

Conte, G.B., *The Hidden Author: an Interpretation of Petronius's Satyricon* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996). Sather Classical Lectures, vol. 60. x+ pp. 226. Chapter 1: The Mythomaniac Narrator and the Hidden Author, pp. 1-36; chapter 2: The Mythomaniac Narrator and the Longing for the Sublime; chapter 3: The Deceptiveness of Myth; chapter 4: Sex, Food, and Money. Low Themes versus High Scenarios; chapter 5: The Quest for a Genre (or Chasing Will o' the Wisps?). Some Skeptical Thoughts on Menippean Satire; chapter 6: Realism and Irony.

Cotrozzi, A., "L'Autobiografia di Trimalchione (il Presente e il Futuro)," in G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari, eds., *La Componente Autobiografica nella Poesia Greca e Latina fra Realtà e Artificio Letterario*. Atti del Convegno, Pisa, 16-17 Maggio

1991 (Pisa: Giardini, 1993) 305-309.

Cueva, E., "Plutarch in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*," *AJP* 117 (1996) 473-484.

Dalby, A., Grainger, S., *The Classical Cookbook* (London: The British Museum Press, 1996). A promising colored cover yields nothing for the Petronians.

D'Ambrosio, I., "Suicidio al Femminile (Petron. III, 2-3)," *Aufidus* 26 (1995) 69-90.

D'Ambrosio, I., "Scene da un Funerale (Petron. 111, 2)," *Aufidus* 24 (1994) 55-73.

Deitz, Luc, "Ioannes Wower of Hamburg, Philologist and Polymath. A Preliminary Sketch of his Life and Works," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58 (1995) 132-151. On p. 138 we find a report of Wower's 1596 edition of the *Satyricon*; new editions in 1601, 1604, 1608, 1623, 1626. Thanks to M.D. Reeve for pointing out the reference.

Deufert, M., "Das Traumgedicht des Petron: Überlegungen zu Text und Kontext von A.L. 651 (Petron frg. 30 Müller)," *Hermes* 124 (1996) 76-87. "Dieses allein im Codex Leidensis Vossianus Latinus F 111 neben drei anderen unter dem Namen des Petron überlieferte Gedicht wird ... unter die *Fragmenta* eingereiht ... (p. 76) ... Die vier Beispiele haben hinreichend gezeigt, wie wenig Vertrauen der Wortlaut der im Vossianus überlieferten Gedichte verdient. Die Handschrift ist das Werk eines Redaktors..." (p. 87).

Due, B., "Xenophon of Athens: the *Cyropaedia*," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 581-599.

Edwards, D., *Religion and Power. Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greek East* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996). Major role for ancient novels, particularly Chariton, in interpreting the interaction between religion and power in antiquity.

Flobert, P., "Le Latin des Tablettes de Murécine (Pompéi)," *REL* 73 (1995) 138-150. "... il a semblé utile de revenir sur les tablettes de Murécine ... Certaines tablettes sont d'une langue très négligée et apportent du neuf aux témoignages pompéiens recensés par V. Väänänen: latin évolué, mais aussi latin régional, fortement marqué par le substrat osque. On sait maintenant quelle langue écrivaient les affranchis du *Satyricon* de Pétrone." Flobert refers often to J. Andeau, "Affaires Financières à Pouzzoles au I^{er} Siècle ap. J.-C.: les Tablettes de Murécine," *REL* 72 (1994) 39-55. Thanks to R. Bedon

Fusillo, M., "Modern Critical Theories and the Ancient Novel," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 277-305.

Futre Pinheiro, M., "The Nachleben of the Ancient Novel in Iberian Literature in the Sixteenth Century," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 775-799.

Gaide, F., "Les Histories du Loup-garou et des striges dans la *Cena Trimalchionis* ou la Narration du 'Vécu': Deux Joyaux du Latin Vulgaire," in L. Callebat, ed., *Latin Vulgaire Latin Tardif IV*. Actes du 4^e Colloque International sur le Latin Vulgaire et Tardif. Caen, 2-5 Septembre 1994 (Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 1995) 715-723.

Gaide, F., "Intuitions Linguistiques de Pétrone dans sa Mise en Scène des Affranchis de la *Cena Trimalchionis*," *Latomus* 55 (1995) 856-863.

Gaide, F., "L'Ambiguïté Linguistique dans la *Cena Trimalchionis*: de la Grammaire Antique à l'Intuition du Sens Pragmatique," *RPh* 67 (1993) 251-256.

Galli, Lucia, *Petronio e il Romanzo Greco: una Verifica della Teoria di Heinze* (Dissertation, University of Pisa, 1992).

Galli, Lucia, "Meeting Again. Some Observations about Petronius *Satyricon* 100 and the Greek Novels," *GCN* 7 (1996) 33-45.

Giebel, M., "Petron in Neros Goldenem Haus in Rom," *Treffpunkt Tusculum. Literarischer Reiseführer durch das antike Italien* (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1995) 127-144. Petronius is seen as an Epicurean; cf. O. Raith, *Petronius ein Epikureer* (Nürnberg: Hans Carl, 1963).

Gigante Lanzara, V., "Gli Scenari del *Satyricon*," *Civiltà dei Campi Flegrei. Atti del Convegno Internazionale*, ed. M. Gigante (Naples 1992) 175-198.

Hägg, T., "Med Aisopos till Bayern och Costa Blanca," *Klassisk Forum* (1995) 35-38. Report of Tomas Hägg's travels and lectures on the ancient novel.

Harrison, S.J., "Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 491-516.

Hedrick, C., "Representing Prayer in Mark and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 22 (1995) 239-257.

Hofmann, H., ed. *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 7 (1996). Groningen, Egbert Forsten, X + 151 pp., \$37.50. J. Birchall, "The Lament as a Rhetorical Feature in the Greek Novel," pp. 1-17; G. Zanetto, "Textual Criticism of Longus and *Lessico dei Romanzieri Greci*," pp. 19-32; L. Galli, "Meeting Again. Some Observations about Petronius *Satyricon* 100 and the Greek Novels," pp. 33-45; M. Kardaun, "A Jungian Reading of the *Cena Trimalchionis*," pp. 47-61; R. Th. van der Paardt, "The Market-Scene in Petronius *Satyricon* (cc. 12-15)," 63-73; A. Kahane, "The Prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. A Speech Act Analysis," pp. 75-93; E. Mignogna, "Carite ed Ilia: Sogni di Sogni," 95-102; N. Shumate, "'Darkness Visible': Apuleius Reads Virgil," pp. 103-116; P. Habermehl, "*Quaedam divinae mediae potestates*: Demonology in Apuleius' *De Deo Socratis*," pp. 117-142.

Holzberg, N., "The Genre: Novels Proper and the Fringe," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 11-28.

Holzberg, N., "Novel-like Works of Extended Prose Fiction. A) Utopias and Fantastic Travel: Euhemerus, Iambulus. B) History: Ctesias. C) Fable: Aesop. Life of Aesop. D) Rhetoric: Dio Chrysostom. E) Letters: Chion," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 621-653.

Holzberg, N., Ovid: *Dichter und Werk* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1997). Pp. 220.

Hunter, R., "Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 361-386.

Johne, R., "Women in the Ancient Novel," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 151-207.

Kardaun, M., "A Jungian Reading of the *Cena Trimalchionis*," *GCN* 7 (1996) 47-61.

Kuch, H., "A Study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel: 'Barbarians' and Others," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 209-220.

Kuch, H., "Narrative Strategie bei Herodot," *Eikasmos* 6 (1995) 57-65.

Kytzler, B., "Xenophon of Ephesus," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 336-360.

Labate, M., "Petronio, *Satyricon* 80-81," *MD* 35 (1996) 165-175. On the influence of Ovid.

Laplace, Marie Marcelle Jeanine, "L'Emblème Esthétique des *Éthiopiennes* d'Heliodore: une Bague d'Ambre au Chaton

d'Améthyste Gravée," in *Poésie et Lyrique Antiques* (Lille: Septentrion - Presses Universitaires, 1996) 179-202.

Lawall, G., ed., *Petronius. Selections from the Satiricon* (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy, 1995) XVI + 260. 3rd revised edition.

Liviabella Furiani, P., "La Comunicazione non Verbale nelle *Etiopiche* di Eliodoro," in M. Pierotti, ed., *Epigrafi, Documenti e Ricerche. Studi in memoria di Giovanni Forni* (Perugia: Università degli Studi Perugia, 1996) 299-340.

MacAlister, Suzanne, *Dreams and Suicides: the Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire* (London: Routledge, 1996).

McMahon, J., "A Petronian Parody at *Sat.* 14.2-14.3," *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997) 77-81.

Merkle, S., "The Truth and Nothing but the Truth: Dictys and Dares," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 563-580.

Morgan, J.R., "Heliodorus," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 417-456.

Morgan, J.R., ed., *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe* (Warminster, Wiltshire: Aris and Phillips, 1997). Announced by the press that it is about to appear.

Napiorski, Lynn, *Petronius and the Greek Parodic Tradition* (Dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, 1996).

Paardt, R. Th. van der, "The Market-scene in Petronius *Satyricon* (cc. 12-15)," *GCN* (1996) 63-73.

Pervo, R., "The Ancient Novel Becomes Christian," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 685-711.

Petersmann, H., "Soziale und lokale Aspekte in der Vulgärsprache Petrons," in L. Callebat, ed., *Latin Vulgaire Latin Tardif IV. Actes du 4^e Colloque International sur le Latin Vulgaire et Tardif*. Caen, 2-5 Septembre 1994 (Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 1995) 533-547.

Plaza, Maria, trans. *Petronius Satyricon* (Stockholm: Fabel Förlag, 1996). Introduction by Tore Janson. 165 pp. Translation of the whole *Satyricon* into Swedish.

Plepelits, K., "Achilles Tatius," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 387-486.

Reardon, B.P., "Chariton," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 309-335.

Robins, W., *Ancient Romance and Medieval Literary Genres: Apollonius of Tyre* (Diss., Princeton 1995). 388 pp.

Robins, W., "Latin Literature's Greek Romance," *MD* 35 (1996) 207-215. On the *Historia Apollonii*.

Ruden, S., "Translating a Fight Scene in Petronius' *Satyricon*," *Akroterion* 39 (1994) 126-132.

Ruiz-Montero, C., "The Rise of the Greek Novel," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 29-85.

Runte, H., ed., *Newsletter of the Society of the Seven Sages* 23 (December 1996) reports on items appearing in the *PSN*. Hans Runte, Department of French, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 3JT, Canada.

Sakellariou, A., "*Aegaeum, pelagus spumans*," *Apopseis* 6 (1992) 121-145. The Aegean Sea in the epic and lyric poetry of the Silver Age. Petronius twice speaks in his verses about the islands of the Aegean Sea: 89.1, 29-30 and 133.2, 2-3. Perhaps Petronius visited the islands named in the *Sat*.

Salanitro, M., "Il Vino e i Pesci di Trimalchione (*Satyr.* 39, 2)," *REA* 97 (1995) 589-592.

Sandy, G., "The Heritage of the Ancient Greek Novel in France and Britain," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the*

Ancient World (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 735-773.

Scarcella, A.M. "The Social and Economic Structures of the Ancient Novels," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 221-276.

Scarcella, A., "Funzione Narratologica e Connotazione Ideologica del Cibo nei Romanzi Greci d'Amore," in M. Pierotti, ed., *Epigrafi, Documenti e Ricerche. Studi in memoria di Giovanni Forri* (Perugia: Università degli Studi Perugia, 1996) 397-410.

Schmeling, G., ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996): G. Schmeling, "Preface", pp. 1-9; N. Holzberg, "The Genre: Novels Proper and the Fringe", pp. 11-28; C. Ruiz-Montero, "The Rise of the Greek Novel", pp. 29-85; E. Bowie, "The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels", pp. 87-106; G. Anderson, "Popular and Sophisticated in the Ancient Novel", pp. 107-113; A. Billault, "Characterization in the Ancient Novel", pp. 115-129; R. Beck, "Mystery Religions, Aretalogy and the Ancient Novel", pp. 131-150; R. John, "Women in the Ancient Novel", pp. 151-207; H. Kuch, "A Study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel: 'Barbarians' and Others", pp. 209-220; A.M. Scarcella, "The Social and Economic Structures of the Ancient Novels", pp. 221-276; M. Fusillo, "Modern Critical Theories and the Ancient Novel", pp. 277-305; B.P. Reardon, "Chariton", pp. 309-335; B. Kytzler, "Xenophon of Ephesus", pp. 336-360; R. Hunter, "Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*", pp. 361-386; K. Plepelits, "Achilles Tatius", pp. 387-416; J.R. Morgan, "Heliodorus", pp. 417-456; G. Schmeling, "The *Satyrica* of Petronius", pp. 457-490; S.J. Harrison, "Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", pp. 491-516; G. Schmeling, "Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri", pp. 517-551; G. Anderson, "Lucian's *Verae Historiae*", pp. 555-561; S. Merkle, "The Truth and Nothing but the Truth: Dictys and Dares", pp. 563-580; B. Due, "Xenophon of Athens: The *Cyropaedia*", pp. 581-599; R. Stoneman, "The *Metamorphoses* of the *Alexander Romance*", pp. 601-612; G. Anderson, "Philostratus on Apollonius of Tyana: The Unpredictable on the Unfathomable", pp. 613-618; N. Holzberg, "Utopias and Fantastic Travel: Euhemerus, Iambulus", pp. 621-628; "History: Ctesias", pp. 629-632; "Fable: Aesop. Life of Aesop", pp. 633-639; "Rhetoric: Dio Chrysostom", pp. 640-644; "Letters: Chion", pp. 645-653; S. Stephens, "Fragments of Lost Novels", pp. 655-683; R. Pervo, "The Ancient Novel Becomes Christian", pp. 685-711; R. Beaton, "The Byzantine Revival of the Ancient Novel", pp. 713-733; G. Sandy, "The Heritage of the Ancient Greek Novel in France and Britain", pp. 735-773; M. Futre Pinheiro, "The Nachleben of the Ancient Novel in Iberian Literature in the Sixteenth Century", pp. 775-799; J. Alvares, 12 maps of travels in the ancient novels, and of other famous journeys, pp. 803-814; Bibliography, pp. 815-864; Index, pp. 865-876.

Schmeling, G., "The *Satyrica* of Petronius," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 457-490.

Schmeling, G., "Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 517-551.

Schmeling, G., "Genre and the *Satyrica*: Menippean Satire and the Novel," in C. Klodt, ed., *Satura Lanx. Festschrift für Werner A. Krenkel zum 70. Geburtstag* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1996) 105-117.

Schönberger, O., ed. and trans., *Petronius Satyrgeschichten* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992) 315 pp., hardcover. Latin and German on opposing pages; limited critical Latin text. Introduction pp. 1-54; text pp. 56-265; notes pp. 266-315.

Shumate, N. *Crisis and Conversion in Apuleius' Meta-*

morphoses (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996). See review in this issue.

de Sousa e Silva, Maria de Fátima, trans., *Cárton: Quéreas e Calíroo* (Lisbon: Edições Cosmos, 1996). Translation from the Greek into Portuguese, introduction and notes, L + 126 pp. This is the first of the five Greek novels to be translated into Portuguese in the series "Labirinthos de Eros" under the general direction of Marília Pulquério Futre Pinheiro.

Stephens, S., "Fragments of Lost Novels," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 655-683.

Stewart, R., "If Only Zenodotus Had Owned a Computer," *New England Classical Newsletter and Journal* 22 (August 1994). Reprinted in *Classical Computing*. The demonstration text is *Sat.* 49-50.1.

Stoneman, R., "The *Metamorphoses* of the *Alexander Romance*," in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 601-612.

Szepessy, T., "Les Actes d'Apôtres Apocryphes et le Roman Antique," *AAntHung* 36 (1995) 133-161.

Walsh, P.G., trans., *Petronius: the Satyricon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) lii + 212 pp., \$55.00 hardcover; English translation; paperback edition to appear. Introduction i-iii, translation 1-155, notes 156-203, index 205-212.

West, David, "Petronius and Horace," *CA News* 15 (December 1996) 7. West suggests that Trimalchio's claim (48) that his estate is bounded by Tarracina and Tarentum is an echo of Horace, in that the latter places many of the great Italian wines near Tarracina and in *Odes* 2.6 also refers to Tarentum as an area which can produce wine to match Falernian. So Trimalchio is "claiming in his modest way that this little estate of his is confine to the two great wine-producing areas of Horatian Italy, and, by implication, that it displays the best features of both." Also Trimalchio's desire to join Sicily to his other estates is an echo of Horace *Odes* 2.2 and the man who wishes to *continuaré agros*.

Wilkins, J., et al., eds. *Food in Antiquity* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1995). Nothing for the Petronians.

Wouters, A., Longos' *Daphnis and Chloe* — ein anspruchsvoller Roman für einen anspruchsvollen Leser," *Anregung* 42 (1996) 1-14.

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REPORT

Cláudio Aquati has furnished the special items from Brazil in this *Bibliography*. Special thanks to him.

Aquati, C., "O Narrador da *Cena Trimalchionis*: Ironia e Omissão," *III Congresso Nacional de Estudos Clássicos* (Rio de Janeiro: Sociedade Brasileira de Estudos Clássicos, 1995) 35-45.

Aquati, C., *Cena Trimalchionis: Estudo e Tradução*. Dissertação [Mestrado em Letras] (São Paulo: FFLCH - Universidade São Paulo, 1991).

Aquati, C., "Linguagem e Caracterização na *Cena Trimalchionis*: Hermerote," *Glotta* [Revista de Estudos Linguísticos: São José do Rio Preto, Universidade Estadual Paulista] 16 (1994-95) 47-63.

Aquati, C., "Uma História Arrepiante no *Satyricon*," *Clássica*, Suplemento 2 (1993) 55-61.

Brito, Mário da Silva, "Sobre O *Satyricon*," *Notícia Bibliográfica e Histórica* [Campinas, Universidade Católica de Campinas] 28 (1971) 335-357.

D'Onófrío, S., "A Estrutura do *Satyricon* e de *O Asno de Ouro*," *Mimesis* 3 (1977) 53-80.

Faversani, F., *A Pobreza no Satyricon de Petronio*. Dissertação [Mestrado em História] (São Paulo: FFLCH — Universidade de São Paulo, 1995).

Feitosa, L., *Homens e Mulheres Romanos: o Corpo, o Amor e a Moral Segundo a Literatura Amorosa do Primeiro Século d. C.* Tese [Mestrado em Letras] (Assis: Universidade Estadual Paulista, 1994).

Gonçalves, C. dos Reis, *A Cultura dos Libertos no Satyricon: uma Leitura*. Dissertação [Mestrado em História] (Assis: Universidade Estadual Paulista, 1996).

Leminski, P., trans., *Petronio. Satyricon* (São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1985).

Guapiaçú, P., *Dimensões da Narrativa Petroniana*. Dissertação [Mestrado em Letras] (Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 1974).

Mello e Souza, Gilda de, *Exercícios de Leitura* (São Paulo: Duas Cidades, 1980).

Mello, José G., *Humor Romano: o Satyricon*. Tese [Doutorado em Letras] (São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, 1985).

Mello, José G., "O *Satyricon*: Um Novo Itinerário do Humor Romano," *Glotta* [Revista de Estudos Linguísticos] 14 (1992) 53-66.

Molinari, E.L., *Credices e Superstições na Cena Trimalchionis*. Dissertação [Mestrado em Letras] (Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 1973).

Molinari, E.L., "A Religião Popular Romana em Petronio," in *In Memoriam Vandick Londres da Nóbrega* (Rio de Janeiro: Sociedade Educadora Pedro II, 1985) 59-70.

Moog, V., *Heróis da Decadência*, 2nd edition (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1964).

Muricy, A., "O *Satyricon*," *Revista Brasileira de Cultura* [Rio de Janeiro, Conselho Federal de Cultura] 5 (1970) 143-152.

Oroz, R., "Em Torno al Estilo de Petronio," *Jornal de Filologia* [São Paulo, Saraiva] 3 (1955) 87-106.

Peterlini, A.A., "A Tristeza Carnavalesca do *Satyricon*," *Textos de Cultura Clássica* [Rio de Janeiro, SBEC] 17 (1994) 19-28.

Ruas, Miguel, trans., *Petronio. Satyricon* (São Paulo: Atena Editora, n.d.). 1970?

Santarrita, Marcos, trans., *Petronio Satyricon* (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1970).

NACHLEBEN

Pasolini, Pier Paolo, *Petrolio* (Turin: Giulio Einaudi, 1992/3). Page 3: "Tutto *Petrolio* (dalla seconda stesura) dovrà presentarsi sotto forma di edizione critica di un testo inedito (considerato opera monumentale, un *Satyricon* moderno)." Thanks to Alessandro Barchiesi for sending us a copy of the Italian novel.

Baldwin, B., *The Latin and Greek Poems of Samuel Johnson*. Text, Translation and Commentary by Barry Baldwin (London: Duckworth, 1995). Bits of Petronian content and influence.

Doody, M., "Classic Weldon," in *Fay Weldon's Wicked Fictions*, ed., R. Barreca (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1994) 37-58. Comparisons with Chariton, pp. 48-53.

Munzi, L., "Restauro d'Autore. Domenico Regi e il suo Volgarizzamento del *Satyricon*," *MD* 35 (1996) 177-206. On the *Nachleben* of the *Satyricon*.

Wishart, David, *Nero* (London: Sceptre, 1996). "David

Wishart's *Nero* is presented through the recollections of his associate Petronius ...", from a review by Catharine Edwards, *TLS* (27 December 1996).

Ebersbach, Volker, *Der Schatten eines Satyrs* (Leipzig: Buchverlag Der Morgen, 1985, 1989²). First-class historical novel about Petronius and his age by a scholar and novelist.

Wilkins, J., "Food and Drink," *CA News* 15 (December 1996) 6-7. Recipe for boar and pork (*Sat.* 40, 47-49, 69), altered to make it tasty.

CONFERENCES

Twentieth Groningen Colloquium on the Novel will be held 22-24 May 1997, Rijksuniversiteit, Groningen, organized by Maaik Zimmerman. This will be the last Groningen Colloquium, an even score of colloquia, but Groningen will continue to be a center of work on the ancient novel, as Maaik Zimmerman works on plans for ICAN-III, the Third International Conference on the Ancient Novel, scheduled for the summer of 2000 in Groningen.

The speakers for the 1997 Colloquium will be (22 May): B.P. Reardon, "Landmarks in the Study of the Ancient Novel — the Special Case of Chariton"; (23 May): M. Kleijwegt, "The Social Dimensions of Gladiatorial Combat in Petronius' *Satyricon*"; S. Frangoulidis, "Demochares' Spectacle vs. the Robbers' Staged *consilium* (Apuleius *Met.* 4.13-21)"; V. Hunink, "Apology as Comedy"; S. Harrison, "The Milesian Tales and the Roman Novel"; Hendrick Müller, "Amor as the Connecting Theme of Ovid's and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*"; L. Santini, "Unmasked Fiction: Short Stories in Lucian and the Fascination of *ψεύδος*"; (24 May): K. Töchterle, "Chariton als der bessere Dramatiker"; J. Pletcher, "Some Euripidean Allusions in the Arsake Episode of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*"; B. van Zijl-Smit, "Gyges and Kandaules in Ancient and Modern Literature"; T. Hilhorst, "Novelistic Elements in the *Shepherd of Hermas*"; J. Bremmer, "The Readers of the Ancient Novel or What Tomas Hägg and Ewen Bowie Did Not Tell You"; P. Lalleman, "The Sources of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles or What Richard Pervo Did Not Tell You".

American Philological Association, 28-30 December 1996, New York: W. Smith, "Lucius and Luke Tell a Story"; G. Harrison, "Problems with the Genre of 'Problems': Plutarch's Literary Innovations"; J. Alvares, "Love and Learning: Chaireas, Dionysios and Artaxerxes in Chariton's *Chaireas and Callirhoe*"; C. Weiss, "The Charm of a Small Bath: Dream as Metaphor and Programme in Aelius Aristides' *Ἱεροὶ Λόγοι* 47.19 Kaibel".

Classical Association of the Middle-West and South, 3-5 April 1997, Boulder: W. Hansen, "Was There an Ancient Greek Popular Literature?"; J. Francis, "Serious Fiction: New Questions to Old Answers on Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*"; J. Alvares, "The Dream of Social Regeneration and the Greek Romance"; S. Nimis, "Cycles and Sequences in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*"; J. Berry, "Cultural Irony and the Construction of Fictional Realities in the *Aithiopika*"; T. McCreight, "*Exemplum* or *Historiola*? Literature as Magic in Apuleius' *Apology*"; E. Cueva, "Male Sexuality and Failure in Ancient Roman Fiction".

NOTICES

An announcement is made that we are to have an *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*, edited by S.J. Harrison, to be published in fall 1998. The volume will consist of 15 articles

published previously: I. Introduction: S. Harrison, "Twentieth-century Scholarship on the Roman Novel," *JRS* 83 (1993), considerably expanding a section of this article. II. Petronius: F. Zeitlin, "Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity," *TAPA* 102 (1971) 631-684; R. Beck, "Some Observations on the Narrative Technique of Petronius," *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 42-61; R. Astbury, "Petronius, P. OXY. 3010, and Menippean Satire," *CP* 72 (1977) 23-31; G. Rosati, "Trimalchio on the Stage," translation of "Trimalchione in Scena," *Maia* 35 (1983) 213-227; H. Petersmann, "Environment, Linguistic Situation and Levels of Style in Petronius' *Satyrica*," translation of "Umwelt, Sprachsituation und Stilschichten in Petrons *Satyrica*," *ANRW* II.32.3 (1985) 1687-1705; A. Barchiesi, "Traces of Greek Novels and the Roman Novel: a Report," translation of "Tracce di Narrativa Greca e Romanzo Latino: un Rassegna," in *Semiotica della Novella Latina* (Perugia 1986) 219-236. III. Apuleius: A. Wlosok, "On the Unity of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*," translation of "Zur Einheit der *Metamorphosen* des Apuleius," *Philologus* 113 (1969) 68-84; J. Tatum, "The Tales in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*," *TAPA* 100 (1969) 487-527; W.S. Smith, "The Narrative Voice in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*," *TAPA* 103 (1992) 513-534; H.J. Mason, "Fabula Graecanica: Apuleius and his Greek Sources," in *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Groningen 1978) 1-15; R. Th. van der Paardt, "The Unmasked 'I': Apuleius *Met.* XI. 27," *Mnemosyne* 34 (1981) 96-106; F. Millar, "The World of the *Golden Ass*," *JRS* 71 (1981) 63-75; J. De Filippo, "Curiositas and the Platonism of Apuleius' *Golden Ass*," *AJP* 111 (1990) 471-492; E. Finkelpearl, "Psyche, Aeneas and an Ass: Apuleius *Met.* 6.10-6.21," *TAPA* 120 (1990) 333-348.

ANCIENT FICTION AND EARLY CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH NARRATIVE WORKING GROUP

The Group met for two sessions at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, 23-26 November 1996, in New Orleans. Douglas Edwards presided over the first session whose theme was "New Books about Ancient Fiction". The speakers were: Gareth Schmeling, "Authority of the Author". This was followed by a panel review of *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era* by Judith Perkins (London: Routledge, 1995): the panelists were Virginia Burrus, Christine Thomas, Judith Perkins. The second panel review was of *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* by Lawrence Wills (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995): the panelists were J. Bradley Chance, David McCracken, Lawrence Wills.

The second session was presided over by Richard Pervo and had as its theme, "New Perspectives on Ancient Fiction". The speakers were: Richard Stoneman, "Another Ethiopian Story: Alexander and Candace, from Meroe to Meteora"; Melissa Aubin, "Recovering Romance; the Acts of Thecla and the Ancient Novel"; Dennis MacDonald, "Young Men, Naked or Otherwise, in the Netherworld: the Classical Origins of Mark's *νεανίσκος*"; Jo-Ann Brank, "Divine Birth and Apparent Parents"; Alon Goshen-Gottstein, "Narrative and Interpretation: Creating a Life of Elisha ben Abuya".

For the 22-25 November 1997 annual meeting in San Francisco there will be reviews of two books and five papers:

Glen W. Bowersock, *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

Reviewers: Richard Stoneman, Routledge Publishers, London
Richard I. Pervo, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

Respondent: Glen W. Bowersock, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Douglas R. Edwards, *Religion and Power: Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greek East* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Reviewers: Loveday Alexander, University of Sheffield, England

Ronald F. Hock, University of Southern California

Respondent: Douglas R. Edwards, University of Puget Sound

Christine R. Shea, Ball State University

"Setting the Stage for Romances: *Ecphrasis* Again"

Richard I. Pervo, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

"Rewriting the Bible Before It Was the Bible: The So-Called *Protevangelium* of James in the Windy Cave of Early Christian Fiction

Tawny L. Holm, Johns Hopkins University

"Daniel 1-6: A Biblical Story-Collection"

Chaim Milikowsky, Bar Ilan University, Israel

"Midrash as Fiction and Midrash as History"

Robert Eisenman, California State University Long Beach

"MMT as a Jamesian Letter to the Great King of the Peoples beyond the Euphrates"

Ph.D. Dissertations, USA

McGlathery, D. *Petronius and Neronian Literary Ideology*, University of Michigan. Completed.

Trzaskoma, S., *An Exegetical Commentary on Longos, Daphnis and Chloe*. University of Illinois. In progress.

McLaren, C. *A Narratology of Heliodorus' Aethiopika*. Stanford University. In progress.

Hirt, S., *Eros and Conversion: the Narratives of Aseneth, Thecla, Lucius and Augustine*. Stanford University. In progress.

Jensson, G., *A Reading of the Satyrca as Greco-Roman Erotic Fiction*. University of Toronto, 1996.

Weiss, C., *Sophistic Aretalogy: Aelius Aristides and Apuleius*. Yale University. In progress.

OBIT

With deep regret we announce the death of Professor J. Adamietz, University of Marburg, who was killed by an automobile, as he rode his bicycle. Professor Adamietz was well known to Petronians.

PETRONIAN SOCIETY — MUNICH SECTION

Director: Niklas Holzberg

31 July 1996:

Karlheinz Töchterle (Universität Innsbruck)
"Aufdringliche Priester und ein aufdringlicher Erzähler in den *Metamorphosen* des Apuleius"

- 9 December 1996: Danielle van Mal-Maeder (Universiteit Groningen)
 "Lector intende, laetaberis": Das Enigma des letzten Buches der *Metamorphosen* des Apuleius"
- 29 January 1997: Peter Wülfing (Universität Köln)
 "Elemente der Erzähltheorie auf Ovidische Szenen angewendet"
- 27 February 1997: Volker Ebersbach (Leipzig)
 "Ahnunglose Gäste: Petron als Roman-gestalt. Der Autor in Lesung und Gespräch"

REVIEWS

Margaret Anne Doody. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996. Pp. xx + 580. \$44.95.

review by David Konstan, Brown University

This ample and leisurely tome, like a nineteenth century triple-decker novel, narrates the story of its protagonist — the novel itself — from its youth in Greek and Roman antiquity to its riper years in modern times. Like a good novelistic hero, the novel in Doody's account possesses a unity of character that abides throughout its long and varied life: "To put it more grandly, the form itself has constantly contained within itself all its potential — like the eggs in an infant's ovaries" (p. 298). This claim for the continuity of the novel from the so-called ancient romances to the epoch of novelistic realism and beyond is one of the central theses of the book.

What are the unifying traits that Doody's hero — or is it heroine? — possesses? From its ancient origins onward, according to Doody, the novel is the privileged locus of the private or individuated self. This self is a sentimental figure who is capable of engaging in romantic love — an attachment that entails a respect not so much for chastity in the abstract as for fidelity, that is, sexual loyalty to another individual person (pp. 78-81). That the private self is represented in the ancient novel is all the more remarkable because it was still only nascent in the circumambient social world.

Furthermore, the novel throughout its history is peculiarly the domain of the feminine, or, more precisely, it is the space in which the feminine principle exists in equilibrium with the masculine. This characteristic too is evident from the very beginning: "Ancient novels are visibly endeavoring to achieve or represent some sort of balance between the male and female powers" (p. 439). Indeed, the novel may be said to have its own religion — "the religion of the *Novel*, as distinct from the religion of the *novelist*" — and this is "a religion of the Goddess" (p. 458). Like many a novelistic hero, the novel acquired its religion in its youth, that is, the Hellenistic and early Roman epochs of antiquity which witnessed a revival of practices of goddess-worship in the growing popularity of deities such as Isis and the Great Mother. Doody interprets this maternal inflection in ancient religion as a come-uppance for the "conquest and abjection of the female generative deity" which was "an important objective of the Achaian cultural system in its conflict with the inhabitants of Asia Minor" (p. 63); our protagonist has good

multi-cultural credentials. The religious orientation of the novel, moreover, remains urgent in the modern world: "As long as there is a cultural insistence on enforcing an image of the Divine as Masculine. . . , so long will there be a need for a 'pocket of resistance'" (p. 466), i.e., the novel.

When the novel comes of age, in the Renaissance, it betrays a certain nostalgia for its younger years. One of the most interesting parts of Doody's narrative is the account of the translations of and commentaries on the ancient novel that were produced at the dawn of the age of printing (ch. 10). True, the novel later attains a respectable and rather strait-laced maturity — during the high point of realism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries — when it would prefer to disassociate itself from its more extravagant youth: hence its attempt to distinguish itself as "novel" from its infantile avatar, the "romance." Fortunately, however, it has now outgrown this phase of middle-aged gentility: "the modern novel," which includes such exotic creatures as the Gothics, *Ulysses*, and the magical realism of Latin American writers, "retains and incorporates the novel of antiquity" (p. 298).

In the final third of the book, Doody, who entertains a certain suspicion of history as a genre, abandons the formula of Bildungsroman, with the *Roman* as its star, and switches to a catalogue raisonné of novelistic tricks of the trade, the way the biographer of an artist might conclude his work with an analysis of his subject's painterly technique. Here, Doody lists the several tropes that are characteristic of the novel, whether ancient or modern: features such as the muddy marginal places in novels that are regularly sites of regeneration; the pits, tombs and caves that "serve as a fostering place of transition" (p. 343), whether in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaka* or in James Barrie's *Peter Pan*; or the redemptive role of the figure Eros: "For the Novel..., acknowledgment of Eros is almost compulsory" (p. 368).

If Doody's *True Story of the Novel* is itself something of a novel, her own technique is somewhat similar to that of a philosophically minded novelist like Tolstoy, who will pause in the course of the narrative to dilate on a favored thesis. But, like any good novelist, Doody's preferred mode is description rather than theory, and she mostly relates the events in her protagonist's life — what happens in the several novels — and lets the morals emerge in the telling. This entails, in the nature of the case, a certain amount of plot summary, but Doody naturally reserves the author's privilege of offering edifying commentary on the action. One device for doing so is the interpretive aside. Thus, in her account of *The History of Apollonius, King of Tyre*, Doody remarks parenthetically of Tharsia's brief stay in a brothel: "Tharsia is the only true working woman among the heroines of the ancient novel" (p. 86), though I wonder why Anthia's similar stint in the *Ephesiaka* does not count. Alternatively, there is the pocket analysis. Of Tharsia's attempts to encourage her father Apollonius in his depression, Doody observes: "Tharsia's (relative) health seems to have resulted not in spite of her being separated from her family, but because of it" (p. 86). She goes on to reflect, with an allusion to Freud:

The capacity to exist outside the family and to make friends outside it is one of the great novelistic subjects. The "Family Romance," which is all we have been trained to see in such stories, is really a story of obsession, illness, and ill fate — unless and until the family becomes aerated and ameliorated by something other than the family.

Comparable again is the thumb-nail interpretation that Doody offers of Heliodorus's novel:

At the end of the *Aithiopika*, hero and heroine have escaped from the realm of the legalistic Father (represented by Charikles) and from the dangerous realm of the possessive Mother (witch, Kybelé, Arsaké) . . . They celebrate a wedding, a *hieros gamos*, that unites the male and female forces. (p. 104)

A more subtle form of commentary is the passing reference to parallels. While rehearsing the story of Achilles Tatius' *Clitophon and Leucippe*, Doody mentions Nietzsche, *Jane Eyre*, Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones* (Melite "gazes upon our hero like Mrs. Waters upon Tom Jones at the Inn at Upton"), St. Catherine of Alexandria, Gilbert and Sullivan, and Huckleberry Finn (pp. 54-59). Allusions such as these serve, of course, Doody's larger purpose of demonstrating the fundamental continuity of the novel as a genre.

There is much in *The True Story*, like the recuperation of the ancient romances as novels, with which readers of *PSN* are likely to agree; sprinkled throughout the volume are genial insights and aphorisms that will entertain or inspire a moment's reflection. Other claims, like those relating to mother goddesses, seem to this reviewer to be fanciful. There are some errors that remind one that the author is not a professional classicist, and that should have been caught in the copy-editing, for example the occasional mistranslation from the Greek (*apithi* as if from *apeitheō* on p. 37) or the misspelling of Dionysus as Dionysius (p. 51, etc.).

For its sheer length, often prosy style, and somewhat assertive sense of its own importance, the book makes for rather heavy going. Blockbusters, however, are popular, and if this means a wider readership for the ancient novels, it is all to the good.

Axel Sütterlin, *Petronius Arbiter und Federico Fellini: Ein strukturanalytischer Vergleich*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 97. Frankfurt a.M., etc.: Peter Lang, 1996. 239 pp. ISBN 3-631-49311-8.

review by Martin M. Winkler

This book, originally a 1994 Heidelberg dissertation, examines the narrative structures of Petronius' *Satyricon* and Fellini's film of the novel. The book's publication and its inclusion in a series of classical monographs is a welcome sign that comparative approaches to classics and cinema now appear to be gaining ground in the land of traditional *Altertumswissenschaft*. It is refreshing to find a classicist use a term like "Filmphilologie" (173) without the slightest trace of irony. Interested readers will turn to the book's subject with high expectations. Regrettably, the author (hereafter S.) does not always meet them.

Despite its title, which suggests equal emphasis on both works, the book's chief focus is on the novel; Fellini receives less than a fourth of the space given to Petronius. The book's general conclusion (205-214) is the only place in which S. discusses both novel and film. There is a brief bibliography but no index. Minor typographical errors and grammatical solecisms, which occur throughout, do not seriously impair the volume. But there are indications of hasty word-processing, as on page 99; n. 513 breaks off in midsentence. S. bases his study on Konrad Müller's

third edition of Petronius (Munich 1983).

S. divides the *Satyricon* into 81 units which he calls "textual fields" and examines the extant text for the links between them. He turns to changes of space and time in the narrative which can be traced independently of its fragmentary state and the length and content of its lacunae. These changes, S. believes, reveal the structural principles hidden in the episodic nature of the narrative. A series of changes in location accompany the characters' actions and serve as the "fixed points" (19) of S.'s approach. He turns first to the novel's eight large narrative units. There is some terminological imprecision in that he had earlier used the term "narrative unit" to introduce the concept of textual fields (14). Both with the eight units and with the individual fields S. focuses on the presence or absence of boundaries and transitions to find out how Petronius connects them in terms of content and form. In the large units S. finds four transitional patterns: 1) a main character's exit necessitates another's reaction; 2) the sudden entrance of a character, often a minor one, leads to a change in mood or atmosphere; 3) a static scene changes to an active one when characters react to another's interference; 4) a scene with ongoing actions is stopped by an emotional moment, and the next unit begins with a "mood picture." These insights, however, are limited in their value not least since there are only seven such transitions, 1) and 3) may be considered to be closely related, and only 2) occurs more than once. S.'s conclusion about the narrative units — that there is a change in narrative tempo: a static moment is followed by one with action, and vice versa — is so elementary an analysis as to be applicable to most narratives.

The following examination of textual fields constitutes the largest part of S.'s endeavors. Most of it does not rise above the level of paraphrase or plot summary, and the brief discussions contained in the notes, when they do not simply cite textual passages, could have been integrated into S.'s main text with better effect.

S. divides his textual fields into types (those without lacunae or with lacunae in various positions) and classes (presence or absence of text connecting a field to a preceding or subsequent one). Before turning to those fields which constitute one of the larger narrative units S. provides a table numbering and classifying this unit's fields and giving their individual size, which consists of the number of letters and spaces between words, excluding punctuation marks. This information is symptomatic of much of S.'s work, and I admit to not having been tempted to check the accuracy of his numbers, which range from 38 for the smallest field (field 9; *Sat.* 8.4) to 60,243 (field 30; *Sat.* 31.3-72.6). S. gives no indication of their importance and never employs them for any interpretive purpose. When he claims to have found that the size (not the number) of lacunae is smaller than usually assumed, he relegates this information to a footnote (n. 174), nor does he convincingly demonstrate how or why this is actually the case.

S. conscientiously lists textual connections (marked l) and gaps (marked by round brackets and, if indicated in Müller's edition, by square ones). These minutiae may strike a reader as confusing; extreme cases are fields 21, 30, 41, 49, 51, and 72. The structural information for 41 appears as

83.1)in pinacothecam{((4x{(((14x))))})}+poetam vocaret+1 90.1, and this is nothing compared to field 72. The fact that S. regularly considers from two to five fields together rather than separately is telling as well: the importance of the transitions between fields does not seem quite as important as S. would have us believe. Of his 81 fields he treats only 37 individually.

Despite some good observations on individual points there are too many instances of trivialities and vague figures of speech throughout. To characterize the ship journey as a metaphor of Petronius' fundamental motif of a change in location (123) is to reduce the author's artistry or intention to the level of superficiality. S. comes close to admitting the limitations of his approach when he states (139) that the Croton episode with its intricately linked strands of narrative demands a more differentiated view but that this complexity has no bearing on his system of analysis (cf. also nn. 391 and 554). On page 69 S. confuses Encolpius and Ascyltus at *Sat.* 8.1-2.

S.'s conclusion about textual fields (159-165) adds little to what he stated earlier in regard to the eight narrative units but reveals the limitations of his analysis most clearly. A table almost two pages long is of as little use as the earlier ones had been, despite a new set of categories. The most that can be said of S.'s approach is what he himself claims in a brief paragraph (162): he has shown that textual lacunae need not have occurred as frequently as has been assumed (cf. his list at n. 556), and the *Satyricon* appears to be "more compact" now that he has diminished Bücheler's suspicions about supposed breaks in the narrative. His subsequent attempt at an appreciation of Petronius' achievement yields little more than trivial observations, as when we read that Petronius influenced his "system of communicating the plot" to his readers and that his aim was to prepare a long narrative in a manner intelligible to them (163). Trendy jargon precedes a final paragraph of commonplaces (164).

S.'s examination of Fellini's film continues along the same lines in both approach and result: too much paraphrase, too few insights. He introduces his examination of the film with a short overview of its critical reception, especially by classicists (omitting Sullivan's 1991 contribution to *Classics and Cinema*), and with brief comments on cinematic adaptations of literature. About the *Satyricon* he observes that Fellini does not use a first-person narrator (175; cf. below) and that commentary expressing thoughts, apprehensions, or fears does not appear in the film. Here S. leaves unclear what exactly he has in mind since he is aware that Fellini's Encolpius expresses emotions in voice-over (nn. 627 and 638; cf. p. 209); he also compares Fellini's way of communicating characters' emotions to his viewers to Petronius' (186-187), and describes Eumolpus' words in the art gallery as "Fellini's commentary" (189-190; cf. also 188 and 199).

S. again includes less than useful statistical information, such as the length of scenes and their percentages of the film's length. When he notes (182) that Fellini regularly presents episodes in a manner reminiscent of the stage and that he does so more extensively than Petronius, he might have added that this is not surprising: the theater is related to the cinema in that both are visual art forms, and in his baroque phase Fellini regularly relied on theatricality and evident artifice created in the studio to achieve artistic control over every part of filming. The stage aspect of Fellini's cinema is an important element in the creative process but not decisive for the structuring of his plots.

Some minor points: it is surprising that a classicist should not mention the Apuleian parallel to Encolpius' public attempt at lovemaking with Oenothea (cf. Apul., *Met.* 10.29-35) or state without any comment (221) that Tryphaena is already present at Trimalchio's dinner. Billy Wilder's *Some Like It Hot* is not a remake (n. 568), and there is no fast-motion cinematography for the soldier in the "Widow of Ephesus" tale (n. 676); rather, the character moves in a theatrical manner appropriate to the telling of the story. In the Vernacchio sequence Giton appears as Eros

not Apollo (184), and the representation of his face in the art gallery is not as clear as S. makes it out to be (189).

In his conclusions about the film S. correctly states that Fellini's emphasis on the motif of death is more pronounced than Petronius' had been (*pace* Arrowsmith). That the camera takes over the function of the novel's first-person narrator, Fellini thus linking the viewer to his "determining interpretation of his subject" (206), is an observation both true (as far as it goes, e.g. not in the suicide sequence) and trivial, and so are S.'s statements that Fellini creates a compact whole consisting of the most varied parts and that he shaped his material in his mind before filming it (207). As often before, S. couches these elementary observations in ostentatious language. He comes close to self-contradiction when he says (208) that Fellini in the *Satyricon*, unlike his other films, presents the locations of his narrative as complete inventions but then notes that in other films he gives subjective interpretations to well-known places (n. 709), or when he quotes Fellini on the dream-like quality of the film after rejecting the view that it is the result of dreamy creation (cf. also 211 and the quotation at n. 720). The simplistic claim that the film's scenes of dark colors represent the artist's inability to imagine the ancient world (211) leads S. into his final contradiction; on the next page we are told that the film's ending reveals a way by which Fellini and the viewers can approach the past and that Fellini "with his images full of imaginative power affords us a glimpse of his interpretation of the ancient text". So much for artistic inability. S.'s ultimate assessment of the result of his examination of novel and film (213) speaks for itself: he says that the film conforms to the novel whenever it takes plot elements from it. It is unfortunate that S., whose research spans several disciplines, could not find the necessary guidance and advice in both philology and film studies which would have turned his work into a genuine contribution to comparative scholarship.

Petronii Arbitri Satyricon, Recognoverunt et Emendaverunt
Ioannes Carolus Gardina et Rita Cuccioli Melloni.
(Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum, Torino 1995)

review by Wade Richardson

In 1995 notable gaps were filled in two text series of record by the appearance under the Teubner imprint of Konrad Mueller's *fourth* edition (so secured by the printing information on the title reverse; let us clear up this confusion once and for all: 1983 was the *third*); and of this one for Paravia. They were evidently prepared independently, for Mueller does not refer to the work of Gardina Melloni (GM), and the latter cite up to Mueller 1983 (as his *Fourth*) in their Praefatio.

The simultaneous arrival of the two editions invites comparison. Mueller's, after a fully rewritten Praefatio, is his 1983³ with a further polish: accurate, judicious, spare, familiar. Gardina Melloni is a new production from these scholars, with a full reconsideration of manuscript variants, cruces and conjectural emendations, but it too winds up with the conventional look that goes back to the foundation of the modern texts, Mueller 1961¹. In the main, the text is well presented and judiciously thought, a low-risk venture with just enough different choices to justify its existence. The positive apparatus is fullish — far in excess of Mueller 1995⁴ by virtue of its special contribution, the recounting of numbers of conjectures by scholars from the 1960s on, not a few by Gardina Melloni themselves. For my taste there is

simply too much of this, and most of the modern emendations are not worth recording. Still, one welcomes the reappearance of some of the Fraenkeliana from Mueller 1961¹ — notably the athetizations.

The manuscript citations aim for the complete record up to *delta*, thus the scope is like that of Mueller 1961¹, but no attempt has been made to privilege certain of the *L* class or early printed witnesses by showing lines of borrowing. This I still find to be a valuable feature of Mueller 1961¹. The alternative, giving implicit equal weight to a reading found in *dmsrpt*, is rather misleading. It stands only as a descriptive source record.

GM in fact offers nothing new in text history, nor in fairness does it seek to: the Praefatio, unlike that of the Mueller 1995⁴, confines itself to a statement of the manuscript sources for the classes *O*, *L* and *H*, plus florilegia, and is barely four pages. This is fortunate, since in its view of *L* it seems to be going backward. The witnesses *dmsrpt* to this class are rightly called contaminated, but the manuscript sources, *Benedictinus* (unhappily mistyped as *Benedectinus*) and *Cuiacianus*, are surely not Carolingian, as here stated. Some of that contamination has a twelfth-century character, as demonstrated by Sage, van Thiel and Mueller 1983³, 423f., fixing those manuscripts rather to that period. Relatedly, the concluding GM stemma has *L*, *O* and the florilegia all hanging independently from *lambda*. In the case of *L* this is unlikely, since the congeries of aphorisms from the *Cena* context found in *lrpt* in c. 82 is surely the result of direct copying from contaminated *Benedictinus* and *Cuiacianus*, whose origin in this guise must be *L* and not *lambda*. *Lambda* would be uncontaminated and Carolingian. And in the case of *O*, for my money it does not derive from *lambda* but from the archetype *omega* — though neither seems provable. Uncertainties remain.

The manuscript material in the apparatus is sometimes problematic. It is apparent that it is not always the result of the new, independent collation promised in the Praefatio (“testes traditionis denuo contulimus”). Dependence on Buecheler and Mueller (who are fortunately very accurate) can sometimes be seen by the copying of the same rare error. Some variants are given sigla that are not mentioned in the Praefatio and thus should have been explained or eliminated in revision. And where Buecheler and Mueller miss variants in important sources such as *l* they on occasion turn up missing here also. I append some technical corrections and comments (all concerning the apparatus, up to c. 100, as time permitted):

- p. 1: for the manuscript testimonia to the title, read PETRONII ARBITRI SATIRICON (not SATYRICON) *Bd* [this must have caused some gnashing of teeth]
- p. 4 (4.5): for *vel improbitatis humilitatis l* read *vel improbitatis vel humilitatis l* [error of Mueller 1961¹ caused by misreading Buecheler]
- p. 4 (5.1): *hamat E* [*E*, alleged reading of *Codex Messaniensis* as cited by Buecheler, not Mueller: not in Sigla Testium of GM; unlikely to be XV cent.; prob. seen only in *l^m*, where “*hamat. Non.*” (= Nonius)]
- p. 5 (5.9): for *armigerae* GM read “corr. in mg. *l²*” [?]; *l^m* reads *armigenae al. c.* [error also in Buecheler]
- p. 5 (10.5): for *drmp* read *dmsrpt*
- p. 9 (11.2): for 11 *cellam opertam m* read 12 *cellam r^m: cellam opertam dm*
- p. 10 (12.4): for GM *tunicae contemplatione iniectae super umeros rustici malebat* Buecheler¹ I see nothing resembling this in Buecheler, who reads in app.

tunicae pendentis

- p. 10 (13.3): for 21 *ergo* read 20 *ergo*
- p. 11 (14.2): several reff. to readings of *Voss.* without its appearance in the Sigla Testium; also, note should be made in the source line of the independent appearance of this poem in *Codex Leidensis Vossianus lat. F. 111*
- p. 11 (14.4): GM miss remarkable textual variant of Scaliger, who reads *viritim* in *l* for *interim* [missed also by Mueller, Buecheler]
- p. 13 (15.5): add *veste is l^m* [in view of Fuchs’s correction *veste lis*, cited by GM, which seems inspired by Scaliger]
- p. 14 (17.6): *aetate magis vestra*: add *l^m*
- p. 15 (18.5): for (*vos*) *lite* Buecheler¹ read *lite (vos)* Buecheler¹ [error copied from Mueller¹]
- p. 19 (22.1): for *labra L*, del. Vossius, we need a reference.
- p. 19 (22.3): for *diductam l* read *diductam L*
- p. 23 (26.5): for *obiter om. m* add *spatio relicto*
- p. 23 (26.7): for 26, 7-10 om. *r* ... Something has gone wrong here. *r* does have line 7; as for 8ff., of course *r* omits, since this the *Cena*’s first paragraph occurs only in *H*.
- p. 25 (28.4): for *Trimalchione delebamus olim* read del. Sullivan
- p. 28 (31.11): variants and conjectures on *tomacula* have been omitted
- p. 30 (34.2): for *obiurgari H* read *obiugari H*
- p. 48 (52.2): for *patronus meus* Verdière perhaps read *patavina* (Buecheler)
- p. 51 (54.5): for *livoratum* Delz¹ read Buecheler
- p. 51 (55.5): add *fuisse om. B*
- p. 52 (56.6): add 20 *ideo autem] apes ideo Lφ*
- p. 55 (58.7): *Athana nihil est cur* in 58.6 [read 58.7] Dorica vox usurpetur; but here we have a different speaker (from at 38.3 *ab Athenis*)
- p. 77 (79.4): *prudens* del. *l^c* [incorrect: Scaliger underlines, as frequently, without signalling deletion: he calls attention]
- p. 77 (79.4): for *tribuenda* read *tribuendae*
- p. 78 (79.8): at *mortalis* important punctuation variants are needed
- p. 78 (79.11): for *dein l^m* read *dein l* [it is in text of Scaliger]
- p. 80 (80.9): *O* not accurately reported: this quatrain is also in *B*
- p. 81 (82.6) it is worth recording the presence here in *L* of the *H* maxims
- p. 83 (83.10): record the presence of poem in *Leid. Voss. lat. F. 111*
- p. 87 (88.4): for *excelsissimi t* read *excelsissimi t^m*
- p. 87 (88.4): *inventionem*] cite *mentionem r*
- p. 88 (89.21): *tardant e^m*: unexplained symbol from Mueller 1961¹
- p. 89 (89.43): add *Lauconte Scaliger. Lacoonti*
- p. 90 (89.58): add *solet ubi r*
- p. 90 (89.55): *invocat AW*: unexplained symbols taken from Mueller 1961¹; for *p pi* read *l p pi*
- p. 90 (90.1): for *his r* read *his rtp*
- p. 93 (92.10): for *officioso (custode)* Mueller⁴ read Buecheler
- p. 93 (92.10): for lac. *indicavimus* read lac. ind. Buecheler
- p. 97 (96.4): for *iniuriaque t* read *iniuriaque l^mt*
- p. 98 (97.10): for *nec mortem* Ernout read Buecheler read [*nec*] Ernout

Passing from adjustments of a minor nature to the meat of any new edition: the editors' selections for text and apparatus. At this historical stage in *Satyricon* text production, after the devotions of Buecheler and contemporaries, and several editions of Mueller, little in the way of gains can be realized by reshuffling manuscript variants. There is still a name to be made, however, with the conjecture in solving cruces, emending manuscripts and correcting small perceived problems of style and sense. GM adopt some readings of other scholars, and perhaps an equal number of their own, for the text, and offer considerable more in both categories for inspection in the apparatus. In closing, I should like to comment on some of the contributions of the editors themselves:

- 2.4 *canere timuerunt*] fort. *non timuerunt* [sensible but not justified]
- 3.2 *doctores (nil) peccant*] *addidimus* [no; exoneration out of place]
- 6.3 *sed nec [viam] ... tenebam viam*] [one solution, but order less good]
- 9.8 *de ruina*] *detrusum* [no]
- 11.4 *de veste contubernium*] [*vesticontubernium libri*; not quite necessary]
- 12.6 *timeret*] *suspectum [parvi aestimeret* expected; not justified]
- 14.3 [*dipondium*] *sicel*] *delevimus* [a possibility; *sicel* usually deleted]
- 15.2 *iam pene immo plane vel paene* [not good sense]
- 17.9 *vix tres homines* Nisbet: *vix mille h.: vix x h.* [interesting]
- 30.9 *in thecario*] [for *in oecario*; seems unexampled]
- 33.1 *triclinium venire sed ne diutius absens morae vobis essem*] [solution of Heinse, except *absens* replaces *absentius*; a loss]
- 37.8 *argenti*] [for *argentum*; part. gen. makes it more educated; why?]
fortunis] suspect: *ferculis* proposed [unnecessary]
- 47.2 *respondit*] *respondet* proposed [perfect seem OK after *multis diebus*]
- 47.3 *venter*] *ventrem [veterem* Heinse better, since *venter* is repetitious]
- 48.4 *Latinam ...*] *lac. indicavimus* [possible; but the transition seems worthy of Trimalchio's train of thought]
- 48.7 *ille Cyclopi* for *illi Cyclops* [reasonable, but passage corrupt]
- 52.10 *dixerit*] tense suspect; *dixit* or *dixisset* preferred
- 55.4 *carminis sermonis* was once favoured [extreme; there is corruption]
- 58.7 *lelogismena*] for *elogias menias* [uncertain text: a bit removed]
- 58.12 *ita bene moriar ut* Heinsius: *aut H: et* proposed [third in sequence not needed]
- 73.4 *currebant*] *se curvabant* proposed [why?]
- 83.8 *quae ... solet*] a possible deletion [too ambitious; unobjectionable]
- 85.4 *auctaverat*] for *artaverat* [good; though sense still got from ms.]
- 88.3 *hercule*] *falcula* proposed [clever, but right for *expressit*?]
- 95.1 *amantes*] *amentes* offered [no!]
- 105.8 *adrigit aures*] for *deflectit aures* [good Latin, but do we improve on Petronius?]
- 114.3: *Siciliam ... dabat*] obelized; proposed: (*nam in*) *Siciliam*

... *flabat* [interesting, but Sicilian wind seems the direction also of *Aquilo*; and *flabat*?]

- 115.20 *nictat* adopted for *mittit* [it is Latin, but I don't follow the gesture: closing? casting is not objectionable enough]
- 117.2 *penem*] obelized, with *inopiam* earlier proposed, but this requires a meaning of "continue" for *differrem*; *rapinam* (Buecheler) or *praedam* (Mueller) is better
- 117.12 *crepitu*] for *strepitu*; this is Corax farting, a sound described as *crepitu* in the next line where Giton answers him. Do we keep the ms? I think so, because of the qualifier *obsceno*.
- 118.5 *felicitas*] *facilitas* was once proposed, thank goodness abandoned
- 127.5 *relucentem*] for *relucente* [seems unnecessary]
- 132.2 *catorogare*] obelized; editors generally follow Saumaise with *catomizari*; *obiurgare* is offered [weak, wrong voice]
- 140.10 *nisu*] for *risu* [it takes confidence to alter this scene, but the point is to have Eumolpus pull it off with a minimum of his own effort: keep the laughter]

As seen above, there are flashes of adventurousness amid the sobriety, and that is as it should be. All in all, this is a rather appealing edition, and a good basis for continuing textual discussion. I shall not hesitate to order it for my mix of senior undergraduates and graduates next year.

Nancy Shumate, *Crisis and Conversion in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*. pp. vi + 357. University of Michigan Press, 1996

review by S.J. Harrison

Professor Shumate (S.) in this well-written and sophisticated book argues for the religious aspect of the *Met.* in the post-Winkler era, reading the novel as 'a narrative of religious experience and specifically as a narrative of conversion' (1). S. makes clear her acceptance of the ambivalent Winklerian reading of the work, emphasising comic as well as serious elements, but stresses that her account counterbalances Winkler's concentration on the narratological tricksiness of Apuleius-*auctor* by taking more seriously the presentation of Lucius-*actor* as a character undergoing religious conversion. The instability of knowledge and undermining of conventional values which the pre-conversion Lucius experiences in Books 1-10, and his pattern of existential crisis, conversion and reintegration into a community in Book 11, she argues, correspond closely to the models of conversion to be found in the psychology of religion since William James' *Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902); these latter are extensively documented and discussed in several chapters of the book, and provide its main theoretical underlay. The *Met.* is thus 'simultaneously a satire of credulity and a seductive evocation of religious belief' (7).

S.'s thesis has some factors in its favour. It is difficult to dismiss as wholly parodic the religious rapture shown by Lucius in his initial contacts with Isis at the beginning of Book 11, and the stress on the religious element redresses the balance of Winkler, who despite his ambivalent overall interpretation of the work placed little emphasis on Lucius-*actor*'s religious experience. Her model provides an attractive explanation of the nightmarish and

surreal atmosphere in many parts of the *Met.*, and it is also refreshing to have a religious reading of the novel which is free from Merkelbach's overschematic Isiac allegory. On the other hand, the analysis of Lucius' career as an existential crisis followed by a conversion is perhaps not the most natural reading of the text; the 'sin and redemption' model, attacked by S., is that which the text itself seems to authorise in the words of the priest Mithras to Lucius (11.15), and Lucius' complete lack of retrospective self-analysis seems to differentiate the *Met.* from other examples of the 'crisis and conversion' autobiographical narrative such as Augustine's *Confessions*, much used by S. (as in her 1988 article in *Phoenix*). Further, the description of Lucius' naive involvement with the rapacious cult in the second half of Bk. 11 surely leads the reader to devalue any religious experience of Lucius, and undermines a serious interpretation. S. recognises all these difficulties (indeed one of the many virtues of this book is its capacity continually to raise the main objections to its arguments), but regards the power of the conversion model as being nevertheless fundamental. A basic tension thus underlies the book: S.'s main interest in the scientifically documented psychology of conversion leads her to want a serious and realistic interpretation of Lucius' story, the interpretation which in fact drives most of the book, but her scrupulous adherence to Winkler's aporetic model and recognition of the text's satirical qualities leads to her more balanced final view, that the *Met.* 'is simultaneously an invocation and a critique of religious experience; this dual identity alone can account for its seriocomic tone' (327).

S. is careful to argue that her application of a model from modern social psychology is balanced with a consideration of second-century literary and intellectual context (especially in her opening chapter, which carefully orients her approach and has much well-aimed criticism of earlier work). But in fact the intellectual context of the *Met.* receives relatively little weight in the overall argument. S.'s history of *spoudaiogeloion* (9-10), the literary tradition in which she would place the *Met.*, excludes consideration of Petronius, *Iolaus* or *Phoinikika*, novels in which religious ideas are clearly used without much seriousness, and which might be thought to provide generically and thematically relevant parallels for Apuleius. More successful is her stress on ontological dualism as a feature both of the psychological process of conversion and of the Platonic cast of Apuleius' own intellectual world, and important point; Plato is very generally invoked, and here one would have liked rather more on Platonic dualistic epistemology and metaphysics, on the Platonic interpretation of *curiositas* persuasively offered by DeFilippo, and on the Isiac/Platonic sycretism in Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*, clearly relevant to the world-view of the *Met.*

But S.'s thesis is naturally best assessed by her application of it to the reading of the *Met.* Here it is often powerful, but can sometimes seem one-sided or less attached to the text than it might be. For example, S. sees the fish-trampling scene at the end of Book 1 as one of many examples of the absurd breakdown of normal values and structures; this is an attractive reading, but it undervalues the episode to exclude both an element of Plautine slapstick and a hint at Isiac ritual — in a rich Winklerian reading all can be present. Similarly, the festival of Risus in Book 3 and the cruel *Schadenfreude* of the citizens of Hypata towards the hapless and humiliated Lucius are seen as another indication of the breakdown of normal values: but again there are substantial counterarguments — Lucius' status is restored by civic honours, and the *Schadenfreude* is itself simply normal for Roman popular

culture (see for example Antony Corbeill's recent *Controlling Laughter*). Her reading of the Cupid and Psyche episode argues in a persuasive general way that Psyche like Lucius undergoes a life-crisis and is brought to serious thoughts through disaster stimulated by *curiositas*, and contains several interesting ideas, but could be worked out rather more fully: for example, Psyche's wanderings in Book 6 would fit neatly into the pattern of existential crisis, and the fact that Venus assents to Psyche's reintegration as well as persecuting her needs more explanation in terms of the conversion model. The extensive comparative material given here from Dante and Sartre is interesting, but closer attention to the Apuleian text might have been more illuminating.

But it is in analysing Book 11 that any religious interpretation of the *Met.* must stand or fall, and S.'s last chapter deals with the Isis-book. Once again most space is spent outside the Apuleian text (of some forty pages fifteen are on the psychology of conversion, ten on Augustine, Dante and Sartre), and the account of Lucius picks out Jamesian features (again persuasively: here we plainly have crisis and reintegration) rather than attempting a linear account of his experience in Book 11. This seems a pity, as the narrative surprises, redirections and false closures in the *actor's* account are here particularly relevant for interpretation; not least Lucius' own increasing doubts about successively more expensive initiations (duly noted by S.), but also the astonishing metalapse of *Madaurensis* at 11.27 (which S. omits); both these would seem to undermine L.'s 'conversion' more than S.'s account allows. S. criticises the Isiac approach of Griffiths for having little to say on 'how Isis satisfies the fundamental cognitive (and emotional) needs of Lucius' (312), but herself observes that Lucius' feelings towards Isis constitute 'a redirection of erotic impulses' (320; or as one of my students once put it, 'Isis is the girl for Lucius'). Her desire to jettison an Isiac structure is here counterbalanced by her scrupulous reading of the text, and she might have added the familiar parallels between 'false' female relationship, illumination and initiation of Lucius with Photis and the 'true' version of all these with Isis, which would respond well to her model of ontological dualism. And the fundamental tension noted earlier emerges here most fully: she can see the 'inescapable suggestion that Lucius is a dupe, a gullible sucker who is so enamoured of his new love that it blinds him to the possibility that he is in the hands of religious charlatans' (325), but still wants to view the *Met.* as 'extremely sympathetic' towards religious experience (328).

In sum, this is a challenging and elegant recuperation of the serious religious aspects of Lucius' characterisation in the *Met.* Its tensions reflect real tensions in the work (or at least in Book 11) between satirical comedy and interest in religious experience, and its stress on epistemological and ideological confusion as part of pre-conversion crisis provides an interesting explanation of certain features of Books 1-10 (though not all will be convinced) as well as reflecting an appropriately dualistic Platonic metaphysics. Many will feel that ultimately, and despite her repeated recognition of the comic element, S. wants to take the notion of conversion too *seriously*, rather than as simply yet another mode of patterning the narrative (along with epic structures, Platonic metaphysics, and Isiac initiation, none to be taken as a token of ideological commitment or didacticism). Rather than viewing the *Met.* as a narrative of conversion primarily interested in realistic religious experience, might we not see it more effectively as including amongst other elements a comic meta-narrative about conversion? This would explain the incorporation of the psychological conventions of conversion

which S. so effectively demonstrates, but subordinate this material to a fundamentally entertaining and comic purpose. This would (as S. admits) fit well into the intellectual context of Apuleius' own period, the period of religious claims and satirical responses to them (for example the works of Lucian; I have suggested elsewhere that first-person religious experience narrative such as the *Sacred Tales* of Aelius Aristides may be the target of parody in Book 11). It would also fit better than S's model the famous Winkler definition of the *Met.* as 'a philosophical comedy about religious knowledge'.

Lucia Galli, *Petronio e il romanzo greco: una verifica della teoria di Heinze*, Diss. Pisa 1992.

summary by Lucia Galli

La mia dissertazione si proponeva di studiare i rapporti tra il *Satyricon* e la narrativa erotica greca, cercando di precisare quale ruolo giocasse quest'ultima all'interno del largo spettro dei modelli letterari petroniani: si trattava, in sostanza, di verificare se la tesi proposta da Heinze nel 1899 (*Petron und der griechische Roman*, "Hermes" 34, 1899, 494-519) fosse ancora sostenibile, e in che misura lo fosse. La mia ricerca si è concentrata soprattutto sui cinque romanzi conservati per intero piuttosto che sui frammenti, pure interessanti, giunti su papiro, in quanto consentivano confronti a più ampio raggio per un testo esso stesso frammentario e di interpretazione difficile.

Nell'introduzione tentavo dapprima di tracciare una storia del problema dalla quale risultasse il modo riduttivo in cui si era talvolta riassunta la tesi di Heinze nella formula (non heinziana) "il *Satyricon* come parodia del romanzo greco", e che mettesse in luce la parte più feconda dell'articolo di Heinze. Cercavo quindi di trarre le mie conclusioni sul rapporto tra Petronio e il romanzo greco, da considerare a mio parere su due livelli: da un lato vi è il riuso di tecniche narrative affinate dalla letteratura romanzesca nel suo complesso (erotica e no); dall'altro, sono riconoscibili singole riprese, per lo più con intento parodico, di motivi caratteristici del romanzo d'amore.

La tesi si articola poi in tre capitoli, in cui indagavo le relazioni tra *Satyricon* e narrativa greca da prospettive diverse: nel primo capitolo analizzavo il monologo di Encolpio in *Sat.* 81, evidenziando il riuso di alcuni motivi ricorrenti nei lamenti degli innamorati del romanzo erotico; nel secondo confrontavo i modi in cui viene elaborato il tema della morte, soffermandomi sulle morti vere (la morte di Lica), sulle morti apparenti (la morte di Eumolpo?) e infine sui tentati suicidi (la tentata impiccagione di Encolpio in *Sat.* 94); nel terzo studiavo un meccanismo narrativo che chiamavo li gli "incontri con persone note" (in inglese sono divenuti, più semplicemente, "second encounters"). Quest'ultima parte è stata trasformata in una conferenza, e quindi in un articolo apparso nei "Groningen Colloquia on the Novel" (*Meeting again. Some observations about Petronius Satyricon 100 and the Greek novels*, "GCN" 7, 1996, 33-45).

Alla tesi è infine acclusa, in appendice, una traduzione italiana dell'articolo di Heinze.

Ulrich Rütten, *Phantasie und Lachkultur: Lukians "Wahre Geschichten"*, Diss. Munich 1997

summary by Ulrich Rütten

Thema des Buches ist die literaturwissenschaftliche Analyse einer für das erhaltene antike Textkorpus höchst ungewöhnlichen Schrift: einer paradoxerweise als 'Wahre Geschichten' betitelten phantastischen Lügengerzählung des Lukian von Samosata. Vor allem der in der Fachliteratur erstaunlicherweise vernachlässigte Aspekt des Leserlachsens als erwarteter Reaktion auf den eminent komischen Text, der sich als eine kunstvolle Mischung von Reiseroman, science fiction und literarischem Kreuzworträtsel präsentiert, steht im Mittelpunkt der Analyse von „Phantasie und Lachkultur“ in den 'Wahren Geschichten'. Parodie und Satire, Grotteske und ironisches Fiktionsspiel werden dabei als Mittel des Komischen nacheinander untersucht und in ihrer spezifischen Funktion vorgestellt.

Die Ergebnisse der Einzelinterpretation werden schließlich mit Blick auf die Frage nach der Gattungszugehörigkeit des Textes zusammengefaßt: Zunächst wird das Lukianische Lachen in den 'Wahren Geschichten' als Phänomen einer umfassenden und in vielfältiger Weise manifestierten Grenzüberschreitung gedeutet, das sich folglich einer eindimensionalen Funktionalisierung widersetzt. Es liegt nahe, dieses Lachen mit M. Bachtins ambivalentem Lachen und dann auch mit der von ihm zur Archegetin karnevalisierter Literatur stilisierten, sogenannten 'menippeischen Satire' in Verbindung zu bringen. Hier ergibt sich allerdings als Konsequenz einerseits aus der Unmöglichkeit, die 'Menippea' aus antiken Befunden zu rekonstruieren, andererseits aus der „Vielstimmigkeit“ des Lukianischen Textes, die Feststellung, daß es sich bei den 'Wahren Geschichten' um einen zwar gattungsbewußten, aber gattungstheoretisch nur sehr schwer zu fixierenden Text handelt. Dennoch läßt sich der Bachtinsche Katalog des Karnevalesken — freilich eher im Sinne einer „Merkmalkonfiguration“ — mit Gewinn auch auf die 'Wahren Geschichten' anwenden, sofern die einzelnen Punkte nicht als „objektive Gattungsuniversalien“, sondern als „individuell gesetzte Parameter wissenschaftlichen Forschens und Ordners“ angesehen werden. Am Ende steht die Erkenntnis, daß es sich beim Lachen Lukians um das Lachen eines virtuosen literarischen Spielers handelt, der, vergleichbar sogar manchem post-modernen Autor, nicht zuletzt auch seiner Leserschaft durch eine höchst eigentümliche Form phantastischer Fiktion „mitzuspielen“ versteht.

Hans Peter Obermayer, *Martial und der Diskurs über 'Homosexualität' in der Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Diss. Munich 1997

summary by Hans Peter Obermayer

Die Dissertation analysiert auf breiter interdisziplinärer Grundlage (Sexualwissenschaft, Anthropologie) den Diskurs, der in den Texten der frühen Kaiserzeit über "male-to-male lovemaking" geführt wurde. Sie schließt damit eine Lücke, die trotz oder wegen der bahnbrechenden Arbeiten von M. Foucault (*Histoire de la sexualité*. Paris 1976-1984) und K.J. Dover (*Greek Homosexuality*. Cambridge 1978) offen blieb: die Untersuchung der "Roman Homosexualities". Die Setzung des Plurals ist durchaus sinnvoll,

denn Foucault, P. Veyne (in: *Sexualités occidentales*. Paris 1982) und die "Foucauldians" D.M. Halperin (*One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*. New York, London 1990) und J.J. Winkler (*The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York, London 1990) haben eindringlich und überzeugend davor gewarnt, moderne Auffassungen von Homosexualität auf die antiken Gesellschaften zu übertragen.

Im Zentrum der Dissertation stehen die skoptischen und homoerotischen Epigramme Martials. Sie sind Produkt einer literarisch ungemein fruchtbaren Epoche, in der die Autoren auffallend häufig zu Aspekten mann-männlicher Sexualpraktiken Position beziehen: hier ist vor allem an die Epigramme der *Anthologia Graeca* (insbesondere an Stratons "Mousa paidika") und des *Corpus Priapeorum*, an Petrons "Satyrica" und an die Satiren Juvenals zu denken.

Die Monographie ist inspiriert von Analyseverfahren, wie sie H. Hofmann (*Die Flucht des Erzählers*. In: *GCN* 5/1993), 111-141) und Winkler (*Auctor & Actor. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius's "Golden Ass"*. Berkeley, L.A., London 1985) für Apuleius bereits erfolgreich praktiziert haben. Die strikte Trennung zwischen den narrativen Instanzen "acteur", "narrateur", "narrataire" gemäß dem Modell von G. Genette und J. Lintvelt (cf. Hofmann) wird in den Einzelinterpretationen ebenso funktional eingesetzt wie R. Barthes' strukturalistisches Konzept (paradigmatisch in: *S/Z*. Paris 1970; cf. Winkler 1985). Darüber hinaus hat Foucaults These von der "Mikrophysik der Macht" dazu ermuntert, die Texte aufmerksam auf ihre Machtbeziehungen zwischen "acteur" und "narrateur" = "acteur" zu befragen.

Die Arbeit gliedert sich in sieben Abschnitte: Kapitel 1 umreißt die Welt der Liebe von Mann zu Mann aus der Perspektive der "Persona Martialis". Hier werden sexualideologische Äußerungen des "narrateur" = "pedico" untersucht, Organisationsfragen bzw. Strategien, mit Hilfe derer der "narrateur" männliche Sexualpartner zu gewinnen sucht, seine Idealvorstellungen, und in Kontrast hierzu die nüchterne, oftmals erbärmliche "Praxis": Einzelne Liebesgeschichten, in die der "narrateur" verstrickt ist, Situationen, in denen er sich als Werbender oder als Abgewiesener stilisiert, bis hin zu Epigrammen, in denen er sich gegen die rufschädigende Verdächtigung zur Wehr setzen muß, daß er selbst ein "pathicus" sei.

Kapitel 2 interpretiert den Stellenwert des Motives "Haartracht—Bartwuchs — Körperbehaarung". Die Behaarung wird als Grenze gewertet, die je nach Perspektive herbeigesehnt ("pueri": Trichophilie) oder gefürchtet wird ("erastai": Trichophobie): Ihre Bedeutung zeigt sich in den Festakten, die für die "depositio crinium" bzw. "depositio barbae" ausgerichtet werden. Unterschiedlich reagieren die "pedicones" - "narrateurs" auf die Haar-Bart-Norm: Sie respektieren sie, indem sie den Sexualkontakt "prima barba" abrechnen oder sie mißachten sie, indem sie die Proteste der vermeintlich bärtigen "pueri" ignorieren bzw. als unbegründet zurückweisen. Der Zeichencharakter der Behaarung ist evident, aber nicht eindeutig: So gilt "depilatio" zwar als untrügliches Zeichen für "cinaedi", es gibt aber auch getarnte "cinaedi", die durch üppige Körperbehaarung ihre passive sexuelle Disposition zu verbergen suchen: "cinaedi pilosi" bzw. "cinaedi Socratici".

Kapitel 3 "Ausgrenzung des Anus: Die Lust des pathicus" widerlegt ein Dogma der Altertumswissenschaft, das besagt, daß der rezeptive Partner beim mann-männlichen Sexualkontakt nur die Rolle des gefühllosen Dulders gespielt habe. Zahlreiche Epigramme (AG, Martial), aber auch die allen PSN-Lesern wohlbekannte Novelle "Der Knabe von Pergamon" (Petron. 85-

87) belegen eindrucksvoll, welch hoher Lustgewinn einer passiv erfahrenen "pedicatio" zugesprochen wurde; bei Martial findet sich diese Lust im "culus-tritus"-Motiv sogar zu einer Sucht gesteigert, die den Anus grotesk deformiert. Im Mittelpunkt des Kapitels 4 "Strafender Phallus: Sexualpraktiken als Strafe — Strafe für sexuelle Praktiken" steht die Interpretation des *Corpus Priapeorum*, das zusätzlich zu den bei anderen Autoren geläufigen Strafanordnungen "pedicatio", "irrumatio" und Kastration auch die Straftakte Priapismus und Strafverweigerung kennt: letztere setzt wiederum die Lust des Delinquenten am analen Abstrafen voraus.

Kapitel 5 "Das Motiv des unreinen Mundes" und Kapitel 6 "Invektiven gegen pathici" konzentrieren sich auf Martial, das Schlußkapitel "Männliche Impotenz" ist umfassender angelegt: Die Gestaltung des Motivs bei Martial wird ausführlich mit dem klassisch-vorbildhaften Hypotext (nach Genettes Terminologie in: *Palimpsestes*. Paris 1982) Ovid *Am.* 3, 7 verglichen, der gleichsam als "Proto-Text" für alle literarischen Impotenztexte gelten kann. In einer akribischen Analyse der intertextuellen Entsprechungen und Variationen wird die Weiterentwicklung der Impotenzmotivik von <Tib.> Priap. 2 "Quid hoc novi est?" über die Epigramme der AG und des CP bis hin zu einer eingehenden Interpretation der Impotenzhandlung bei Petron aufgezeigt. Die Impotenz *Encolps*, die häufig für die gesamte Romanhandlung fraglos vorausgesetzt wird, läßt sich auf die Circe-Episode beschränken: Die Dissertation schließt versöhnlich mit der "Heilungshandlung", die an *Encolp* letztlich erfolgreich vorgenommen wird: "haec locutus sustuli tunicam Eumolpoque ME TOTUM approbavi" (Petron. 140, 13).

NOTES

THE *NOVAE SIMPLICITATIS OPUS* AND PETRONIUS' POETICS¹

by Aldo Setaioli

1. The epigram at *sat.* 132.15 differs from all other literary pronouncements of Petronius' novel in as much as it is concerned not with poetry or rhetoric in the abstract, but with the very expression of the narrator in the first person, whose *sermo* must perforce be considered identical with the text of the novel. The author's full awareness of this is confirmed by the word *opus*, which can only be taken as a reference to the *Satyrica* as a self-contained literary work.

It is indeed difficult to grasp how it has been possible to argue that this obvious interpretation is groundless and actually would force an incongruous element upon the text. Paradoxically, this line of argument often results in renewed evidence for the absurdity of denying the epigram the import of a statement about the literary goals and criteria of the *Satyrica*.²

In reality the whole passage from 132.12 to 132.16 is a consistent and sophisticated literary manifesto — which of course does not mean that Petronius has failed to make it agree quite aptly with his character's specific situation. The *severioris notae homines* (132.12) are one and the same with the *Catonnes* (132.15.1). *Encolpius'* reference to his *sermo* (132.12 *paenitentiam agere sermonis mei coepi*) not only anticipates the *sermo purus* of 132.15.4, but clearly possesses a literary color in its own right: the narrator would have no reason to regret or justify a mere private outburst; he is obviously thinking of the reaction of the reader — or listener — who will come across the literary rendering of such an outburst.

Moreover, we should notice the references to literature and everyday life at 132.13-14. Ulysses' reproach to his heart (132.13) is a nod to the *Odyssey*, avowedly one of the most obvious underlying texts of the whole *Satyrica* (quite aptly, here, the reproach is shifted from the heart to the *mentula*). The accompanying reference to tragedy reminds one of some narrative passages in the novel where *tragoedia* implies situations very similar to the one outlined in our context: namely a complaint about the functions of one's body (140.16; cp. 117.9-10), or indeed a reproach to the *mentula*, with the added threat to cut it off (108.10-11).

The two literary allusions are framed by two references to everyday behavior: not just epic or tragic heroes, but also ordinary people speak disparagingly of (malfunctioning) parts of their body (132.13 and 14). Quite aptly the first complaint mentioned here (*ventri male dicere solemus*) is identical with Trimalchio's (47.2).

Obviously not only does the author have his own literary work in mind, but he is quite consciously hinting at the two main components of the novel, the first being "realistic" (or mimetic), the second "literary" (or paradoxical). The epigram at 132.15 now appears as the culmination of a consistently "programmatically" passage.

2. The epigram purports to be a defense against the charge of lewdness on the part of the supporters of both traditional morality and Stoicism (the *Catonians*), and rejects their avowed *tristitia* (cp. *Cic. fin.* 4.79; *Brut.* 113; *Quint.* 11.1.33-34).

The *simplicitas* ("frankness") Petronius advocates is opposed, first of all, to what in his view amounts to the hypocrisy (*facta severitas* 132.16) of such critics. That very quality was often idealistically associated with the candor of the Romans of old, and in Petronius' time this ancient *simplicitas* had been newly reevaluated by Seneca (e.g. *ep.* 59.6; 95.13 and 29; *nat. quaest.* 1.17.5; *Helv.* 19.5), the most prestigious of contemporary Stoics, who, incidentally, had bestowed lavish praise upon Cato. This being so, it is hardly surprising that Petronius' *simplicitas* is pointedly termed as *nova*.

It is quite pointless to argue whether this *nova simplicitas* implies just a merely literary "realism" or is meant to include a new, more liberal attitude to sex in real life. Petronius' epigram advocates a frank literary treatment of sex precisely on the basis of people's behavior in sexual matters. It cannot therefore be denied that his *nova simplicitas* aims at opposing the hypocrisy not so much of the *prisca simplicitas* of Roman tradition as of the claim to its unceasing validity in the contemporary world. At the end of this note we shall add some more detailed remarks on the full import of the novelty of Petronius' *simplicitas*.

Simplicitas was also traditionally coupled with *veritas*, ever since Aeschylus (fgt. 176) and Euripides (*Phoen.* 469) — in a line that, again, had been taken up and translated into Latin by Seneca (*ep.* 49.12). Quite wittily Petronius' epigram does not sever the link between the two concepts, but his *candida lingua* imparts a very particular meaning to "truth", by turning it into "realism" devoid of any moral intention whatsoever, *simplicitas* becoming its appropriate expressive vehicle.

3. Obviously Petronius' *simplicitas* rejects the shunning of any element of both reality and language; but, as a literary program, it can hardly be reconciled with the reduced scope it acquires in Martial. Though the latter does lean upon Petronius, essentially he does so just to claim the right to use coarse language: the *Romana simplicitas* now becomes tantamount to downright obscenity (Mart. 11.20.10). The introductory epistle to the first

book of Martial's *Epigrams* may be considered as a veritable new elaboration of Petronius' lines — which incidentally proves that the programmatic import of the epigram at *sat.* 132.15 had already been perceived in antiquity. True, the *simplicitas* mentioned there has a slightly different meaning (it signifies "innocence" or "lack of second thoughts"), though this too could easily be extracted from Petronius' epigram. However, the latter's main message — or Martial's own narrower version of it — comes up immediately afterwards in the introductory epistle (*lascivam verborum veritatem*); other Petronian elements are the word *tristis* (cp. also Mart. 11.20.2; 11.2.1) and the reference to Cato (the Younger Cato, as shown by the allusion to the story recorded in Val. Max. 2.10.8; cp. Sen. *ep.* 97.8).

There can be very few doubts, in my opinion, that we are confronted not merely with a coincidence of literary programs, but rather with a conscious reworking of Petronian ideas (this ought to cause no wonder: Mart. 13.62.2 repeats *sat.* 119 v. 33; Mart. 2.12 is a conflation of Petronian elements: see Petr. fgts. VII and XXVIII; and so forth).

4. *Simplicitas* also has more specifically stylistic and literary connotations (cp. e.g. Sen. rhet. *contr.* 2 pr. 2; Sen. *ep.* 100. 6; Quint. 11.1.93), which come to the fore in the third line of the epigram (*sermonis puri non tristis gratia ridet*), whose vocabulary is reminiscent of the traditional qualities of the plain style as defined by the schools of rhetoric. *Gratia* was the universally acknowledged endowment of Lysias (Quint. 9.4.17, coupled with *simplex*; Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 10 ff.), as was purity of diction (Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 2, p. 9.11ff. U.-R.). At Rome it will suffice to mention Terence (*Heaut.* 46 *pura oratio*) and Caesar (on Terence, v. 2 *puri sermonis amator*). On the other hand *purus sermo* was considered the epitome of *Latinitas* (that's why Martial can play with such expressions as *Latine loqui, verba Latina* and *Romana simplicitas*; a parallel may be seen at *Priap.* 3.9-10).

We are clearly confronted with the clever use of traditional concepts and vocabulary of literary theory in order to give expression to very untraditional ideas. Petronius' *sermo purus* is not the same as the Atticists'. The new element may be seen in his expressively (*lingua*) and mimetically faithful (*candida*) depiction of the whole of human reality. The Atticist ideal of lack of artificiality naturally evolves into the advocacy of an authentic reproduction of people's language and behavior (*quod facit populus*). In these lines Petronius foreshadows the two basic elements of his "realism"; a hint at the "literary" component has already been pointed out in the prose preceding the epigram.

5. Petronius justifies his "realism" and his subject matter through their avowed closeness to life (*quod facit populus*); not surprisingly, here too he was followed by Martial (8.3.19-20; 10.4.8-10). Quite differently from a satirist like Persius, however, he is interested in aspects of human reality that will not result in any moral advantage to his readers. In spite of all Catos, people's sexual behavior is an integral part of life — which is sufficient to impart it literary dignity. All that is needed is the proper artistic treatment: we have moved from morals to aesthetics. This is confirmed by the very "philosophical" justification of the last lines. We have seen that the use of Atticist terminology does not warrant the labeling of Petronius as an Atticist; quite similarly, he employs some so-called Epicurean elements to define the very personal aesthetic and literary traits of his work.

With few exceptions scholars agree that Petronius cannot properly be termed an Epicurean. For one thing, these lines grossly misrepresent Epicurus' ideal of the greatest good by making him identify it with the pleasures of sex. It is not

impossible that on this point Petronius may intentionally mean, again, to oppose Seneca's view of the Greek master's teachings. At the same time, his appeal to Epicurean philosophy may aim at providing a foundation not merely to the depiction of people's actual behavior, but to the expressive vehicle he had chosen as well. The *non tristis gratia* of his *sermo purus* is inseparably linked with "laughter" (*ridet*). Now, Philodemus the Epicurean denied any moral and educational goal in literature. If the latter has no such goal, nor does it pursue the synthesis of *utile* and *dulce*, it follows that the *τέλος* of literature can be no different from the general goal of life, namely pleasure.

6. Here Petronius could go back to a strain of national literature that had its fountainhead in Catullus. The latter not only declared pleasure the goal of literature, but identified it not with catastematic *ἡδονή*, but rather with sensual titillation to be achieved through lascivious verse (Cat. 16.6-8). We are later confronted with the same position in Martial (8.3.19; 1.35.5 and 11). We can quite confidently surmise that some such idea is implied in the *ridere* of Petronius' *non tristis gratia* too — witness the meaning of this very same verb in Martial (11.15.3 *hic totus volo rideat libellus*).

However, Petronius' approach is endowed with considerable originality. Catullus had theorized a sharp separation of art and life (16.5-6 *castum esse decet pium poetam / ipsum, versiculos nihil necessest*): the erotic content of poetry does not necessarily entail the refusal of traditional ("Catonian") moral standards in the author's actual way of life. Aside from the unforeseen implications of such a distinction, it is not difficult to recognize it as a practical compromise with traditional moral ideas. This is clearly illustrated by the appropriation in self-defense of the Catullan motif by Ovid in exile (*trist.* 1.9.59-60; 2.353 ff.; 3.2.5-6), whereas before his banishment the same poet had boasted brazenly of his erotic poetry (*rem.* 361-396), if justified by the specific demands of the genre. The same idea appears in Martial (1.4.9 *lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba*; 11.15.13; and cp. 9.28.5).

Nothing of the sort appears in our Petronian text; indeed its very approach makes it impossible to mark a separation between art and life. As Petronius' spokesman is his own literary creation, no attempt is made — nor could be made — at somehow reconciling the author's lascivious writing with traditional moral standards by positing a sharp distinction between his art and his life. But in the epigram's very text the inseparable unity established between actual experience (*quod facit populus*) and the aesthetic level confirms the complete intertwining of the two. Petronius' position is much bolder and more consistently revolutionary than Catullus', the exiled Ovid's, and Martial's. True, a client, such as Martial, was hardly in the position of a powerful courtier, such as Petronius; but let's not forget that even an upper class gentleman such as Pliny the Younger was not any bolder than Martial (cp. Plin. *ep.* 4.14, where the very Catullan verses discussed above are quoted).

Petronius could therefore quite legitimately claim that his *simplicitas* was *nova* — not merely as an aesthetic ideal conflicting with the *prisca simplicitas* of traditional morality, but rather as a consistently and globally revolutionary stance, with no recourse to the slightly hypocritical disclaimer of a life quite distinct from or even opposed to the contents of his writing.

It is very clear, after perusing this epigram, that no moral purpose, however disguised, can be read into Petronius' narrative, as it has sometimes been done by such as could not accept his candor and *simplicitas* for what they are. It is also clear, however,

that he was in an unassailable position in his attack on the hypocrisy and *ficta severitas* of the ever-present censors of any manifestation of other people's immorality.

Notes

1. A fuller version of this article will appear shortly, in Italian, in *Prometheus*.

2. Cp. e.g. R. Beck, "Some Observations on the Narrative Techniques of Petronius," *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 42-61 (Beck must very implausibly refer *opus* only to Encolpius' outburst in the preceding paragraphs and posit a lacuna between lines 4 and 5 of the epigram).



"Your father was a jackass."

(progenies Luci)

Drawing by Cotham; © 1997
The New Yorker Magazine, Inc.