
THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY NEWSLETTER

Editor:

GARETH SCHMELING
Department of Classics
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Vol. 15 No. 1
December 1983

Associate Editors:

Raymond Astbury
B.P. Reardon
Gerald Sandy
J.P. Sullivan

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baldwin, B., *Suetonius* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1983) 579 pages.
- Baldwin, B., *Timarion*. Translated with an Extended Commentary. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983). Byzantine Texts in Translation.
- Baldwin, B., *The Philogelos or Laughter-Lover*. Translated with an Introduction and Commentary (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1983). *London Studies in Classical Philology*, 10.
- Barbieri, A., *Poetica Petroniana: Satyricon 132.15* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1983) 64 pp. *Quaderni della Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale*, 16. L. 8000. (announcement reported by R. Astbury)
- Barrett, D.S., "Petronius (?), Fragment 37, and Judaism," *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 7.5 (May 1982) 72-73. Discusses the knowledge of Judaism revealed by the author of the fragment, concluding that "for a non-Jew, it is more than respectable". Suggests that the error in *porcinum numen* in line 1 was caused by the fact that both the pig and God were not referred to by name by Jews (though for different reasons), and that in line 6 the Sabbath is described as bound by *ieiuna lege*, not as a day of fasting but with *ieiunus* in the sense of "barren, uninteresting", referring to the restrictions on activity which the Sabbath involved. (Astbury)
- Bartoňková, D., "Der Begriff der Freiheit in antiken Romanen," *SPFB* 26(1981)67-73. Novelists are concerned with freedom only as it relates to aristocrats. (Summary in German)
- Beck, R., "Soteriology, the Mysteries, and the Ancient Novel: Iamblichus *Babyloniaca* as a Test-Case," in *La Soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'imperio romano*, edd. U. Bianchi and M.J. Vermaseren (Leiden: Brill, 1982) 527-540. Tests Merkelbach's position that the *Babylonian History* is a disguised Mithraic allegory. Beck's view is that for this to be true there should be a meaningful sequence or progression of disguised events compatible with Mithraic cult. This is true only of the early episodes concerning the cave and poisonous bees. The frequent instances of *Scheintod* are viewed by Beck as compatible with the wide-spread yearning in the Age of Anxiety of people "to slough off the old and put on the new" rather than specifically Mithraic allegory. (Sandy)
- Bodamer, C. & Huber, J., "Petrons *Cena Trimalchionis* als erste Autorenlektüre," *AU* 25(1982)4-22. (Stöcker). Owing to mechanical problems part of this entry was omitted from the last Newsletter.
- Booth, A.D., "La Valeur de la bonne naissance selon Herméros (*Satyricon* 57)," *EMC* 27(1983)1-4. Booth agrees with Friedlander's comments on Sat.57.4, *numquid pater fetum emit lamna*, but then goes on to note that many people, including Herméros, believed that noble birth was the most important determinant in life.
- Capponi, F., "Oclopete (Petr., Sat. 35.4)," *Latomus* 42(1983)397-403. Capponi abandons his earlier proposal [*Latomus* 29(1970)781-789] of *scolopeta* in favor of *H's oclopete* which he explains, on the basis of Plautus *Rudens* 659, *iube oculos elidere, itidem ut sepiis faciunt coqui*, as "seppia" or "mollusco cefalopede", perhaps specifically the "tbdaro comune". (Astbury)
- Caron, Louis-Marie, *Littérature et psychologie analytique: essai d'interprétation du Satiricon de Pétrone* (Université Laval, 1981). Thèse de Maîtrise.
- Cervellera, M.A., "Petronio e gli schiavi. A proposito di Petr. 71," *AFL* 8-10 (1977-80)231-240. Slavemasters, slaves, attitudes towards slaves; Seneca *ad Luc.* 47.
- Cogny, M^{me} et M., "Euphémisme et contre-euphémisme d'après quelques traductions de Pétrone," *Caesaronum XIV bis Calliope I. Colloque su la rhétorique*, ed. R. Chevallier (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979) 293-302. A review of the manner in which selected French translators have dealt with the problem of translating some obscene words and passages from the *Satyricon*.
- Croisille, J.-M., *Poésie et art figuré de Néron aux Flaviens. Recherches sur l'iconographie et la correspondance des arts à l'époque impériale*. Collection Latomus 179. (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1982) 742 pages, 167 plates.
- Daviault, A., "Mais, au fait, qui était donc Encolpe?" *CEA [Mélanges Étienne Gareau]* 14(1982) 165-172. Because the role of Encolpius is pivotal in our understanding of the *Satyricon*, Daviault believes it is worthwhile to speculate about the actor Encolpius. If he is a student, he is a most unusual student. It is also interesting to see Encolpius as a young man who grew up in Marseille.
- Fiaccadori, G., "Priapo in Egitto (Petronio, Sat. CXXXIII 3). At Sat. 133.3 read *litus adorat/septifluum* instead of *Lydus adorat/septifluus*."
- Frings, U., "Rezeptionsspielarten. Zur Mythenentwendung in Antike und Moderne," *AU* 23(1980)96-131. Myth-appropriation in Petronius (among others).
- Futre, M.P., "Essai littéraire et stylistique d'Héliodore, *Les Éthiopiennes*, V, 14," *Euphrosyne* 11(1981-82)102-110. Detailed analysis of the images, metaphors and verbal manipulation lavished by Heliiodorus on the ekphrasis of the amethyst ring. (Sandy)
- Hägg, Tomas, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983) XII & 264 pp., £15. Published in the USA by the University of California Press. To be reviewed in detail in a later issue of the Newsletter.
- Gärtner, Hans, "Der antike Roman. Bestand und Möglichkeiten," *Vorschläge und Anregungen*, edited by P. Neukam, pp. 24-56 (Munich: Bayerisches Schulbuch Verlag, 1980) 195 pp. Dialog Schule-Wissenschaftliche Klassische Sprache und Literatur XIII. General and well-balanced introduction to the ancient novels, particularly those in Greek.
- Gagliardi, D., "Eumolpo o dell'ambiguità," *Orpheus* 2(1981) 360-365. "Un dato mi pare sicuro in Petronio: la condanna del classicismo e della cultura ellenizzante rivolta al passato, che costituiva ancora la linea ufficiale Nerone poeta e di quanta contribuivano all'elaborazione dell'ideologia cesarea Orbene, Eumolpo appare appunto l'incarnazione del passato classicheggiante, lo scudiero di quel classicismo la cui polemica si era rivolta proprio contro la comicità plebea, contro tutto ciò che potesse offendere un certo ideale di *urbanitas* e di *decorum*..." (p. 361).
- Gigante, V., "Stile nuovo ed etica anticonvenzionale in Petronio," *Vichiana* 9(1980)61-78. Sat. 132.15 and *nova simplicitas*. It is best to reject new suggestions and to follow the readings of the manuscripts.

- Gil, J., "Miscelánea crítica," *Eclás* 24(1980)135-142. Sat. 41.1.
- Grimal, P. "Le *Bellum Civile* de Pétrone dans ses Rapports avec la *Pharsale*," *Neronia* 1977. *Actes du 2^e Colloque de la Société Internationale d'Études Néroniennes* (Clermont-Ferrand: ADOSA, 1982)117-124. "Le poème de Pétrone, parce qu'il est inséré dans le *Satyricon*, n'a pas été composé forcément à la même époque que le roman. Il est concevable que Pétrone ait utilisé des fragments divers, qu'il avait en réserve. Le genre de la *satura*, auquel appartient le livre, le permettait. Pétrone avait, un jour, par caprice, esquissé un poème sur la Guerre civile, puis ce morceau était resté sans suite; mais il en avait donné lecture à ses amis du cénacle néronien, et Lucain, selon son habitude (nous connaissons, par ses biographies, ce trait de son caractère), s'était piqué au jeu; il avait relevé le défi, et commencé à composer une véritable épopée sur le thème proposé. Et ce fut la *Pharsale*" (p. 124).
- McDermott, M.H., "The *Satyricon* as a Parody of the *Odyssey* and Greek Romance," *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 8.6(June 1983) 82-85.
- De Maria, S., "Dati sull' architettura ed aspetti del paesaggio urbano nel *Satyricon* di Petronio," *Studi in onore di Ferrante Rittatore-Vonwiller*, Parte Seconda (Como: Società Archeologica Comense, 1980)141-162.
- Martin, R., "Le Roman de Pétrone et la 'Théorie du Roman,'" *Neronia* 1977. *Actes du 2^e Colloque de la Société Internationale d'Études Néroniennes* (Clermont-Ferrand: ADOSA, 1982)125-138. "Je ne devrais pas, en principe, présenter la communication qui va suivre dans le cadre de ce colloque, puisque je suis de ceux qui mettent en doute l'appartenance du *Satyricon* à la période néronienne, et que j'ai produit contre cette appartenance, voici deux ans, des arguments qui n'ont pas été réfutés jusqu'à maintenant. Je donne donc l'impression de me déjuger en parlant du roman de Pétrone dans ces journées d'études néroniennes; il n'en est rien pourtant: car c'est un fait que le *Satyricon*, même si l'on considère, comme j'incline à le faire, qu'il est postérieur de quelque vingt ou trent ans au règne de Néron, est tout de même une œuvre qui n'est pas sans rapports avec les temps néroniens, dans la mesure où plusieurs de ses personnages, notamment les deux *senes* Eumolpe et Trimalchion, sont des hommes qui ont été sans aucun doute contemporains de Néron" (p.125). Martin contends that Georges Lukacs in his *Théorie du Roman* (1920) was wrong to call *Don Quixote* the "premier grand roman de la littérature universelle"; Cervantes has been dethroned by Petronius. Martin examines the *Satyricon* from various perspectives and finds in it four ingredients or themes around which a novel is built: le thème de la quête, le thème de la marginalité, le thème de l'inauthenticité, l'absence du divin.
- Mason, H.J., "The Distinction of Lucius in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*," *Phoenix* 37(1983)135-143. The claims that Lucius makes about his family's distinction are consistent with historically attested examples of similar claims by the elite of the Greek-speaking regions of the Roman Empire. (Sandy)
- Moncelsi, Rossana, "Petronio e Anatole France," *A&R* 27(1982) 149-159.
- Müller, K. and Ehlers, W., ed., *Petronius Satyricon. Schelmszenen* (Munich: Artemis, 1983 [Tusculum Series]; and Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983). To be reviewed later.
- di Mundo, Rosalba, "La novella del fanciullo di Pergamo. Strutture narrative e tecnica del racconto," *AFLB* 24-25(1982-83)133-178. An analysis of Sat. 85-87 with special attention to the characterization of Eumolpus and Petronius' use of humor and irony.
- Murgatroyd, P., "The Millionaire's Dinner Party," *Akroterion* 26.3(1981)25-46. The lighter side of Roman life.
- Neronia* 1977. *Actes du 2^e Colloque de la Société Internationale d'Études Néroniennes*, Clermont-Ferrand, 22-28 Mai 1977, publiés par J.-M. Croisille et P.-M. Fauchère (Clermont-Ferrand: ADOSA, 1982) 256 pp.
- Neumann, G., "Drei Vorschläge zum Text von Petrons *Satyricon*," *Glotta* 61(1983)143-148. Sat. 50.2 *quid est autem Corinthum, nisi quid Corinthus habet*; 43.4 *mala parra <eum> pilavit*; 136.3 *non sine nisu erexi*. (Astbury)
- Ogrin, Marina, "*Schedium Lucilianae humilitatis*," *QFC* 4(1985)47-58. Comments on *Satyricon* 5.
- Pellegrino, C., "Problèmes d'interprétation du *Satyricon*," *Neronia* 1977. *Actes du 2^e Colloque de la Société Internationale d'Études Néroniennes* (Clermont-Ferrand: ADOSA, 1982)139-143. At Sat. 47.15 read *cocum patientiae admonitum*; instead of *cocum potentiae admonitum*; 56.8 read *aeclophagiae e suere*; at 66.2 delete *et certe betam*.
- Pellegrino, C., "Due note esegetiche al testo del *Satyricon*: 19,4 e 46,5," *AFLPer* 18, n.s.4(1980-81)25-33. At 19.4 read *contra nos, si nihil aliud virilis sexus* (genitive of quality, not nominative), *sed et praecincti certe altius eramus*; at 46.5 read *etiam si magister eius sibi placens sit; nec uno loco consistit, sed venit <et> "dem litteras, sed non vult laborare"*.
- Pellegrino, C., "Alcune considerazioni critico-filologiche sulla teoria estetica di Eumolpo: Satyr. c. 118," *BollClass* 1(1980)145-157. Read at 118.1 *teneriorem* with *sensum*; 118.6 *Fermentum* instead of *tormentum*; 118.3 *vanitatem ... inundante*.
- Pellegrino, C., "Il problema dell' anima tra scienza e ironia: Satyr. 47,6," *BollClass* 2(1981)221-231. *anathymiasis*, a medical and philosophical term for the vital force of the soul. Used by Petronius with reference to Epicurus but with the meaning of intestinal gas; cf. Suetonius, *Claudius* 32.
- Pellegrino, C., "Una meraviglia della casa di Trimalchione: L'hospitium (77,4)," *BollClass* 3(1982)224-226. At Sat. 77.4 read *hospitium hospes rapit*.
- Ratti, E., "Petronio e Nerone. Difficoltà e necessità dell'allusionismo nell' interpretazione del *Satyricon*," *Neronia* 1977. *Actes du 2^e Colloque de la Société Internationale d'Études Néroniennes* (Clermont-Ferrand: ADOSA, 1982)145-150.
- Reardon, B.P., "Une nouvelle édition de Chariton," *REG* 95 (1982)157-173. Unfavorable review of Molinié.
- Rodriguez-Adrados, F., *Historia de la fábula greco-latina* (Madrid: Univ. Complutense, 1979).
- Ruiz-Montero, Consuelo, "The Structural Pattern of the Ancient Greek Romances and the Morphology of the Folk tale of V. Propp," *Fabula* 22(1981)228-238. "We have analyzed the five romances considering that each of them exemplifies a theoretical model which only exists on a paradigmatic level. This abstract model chosen as an analytic pattern consists of the 31 functions which Propp detects in the Russian fairy tale. And, if we accept that Propp's results are also valid for the Greek romances, so we shall have to admit that this fact carries a series of consequences for the ultimate origin of these texts."
- Schwarzbaum, Haim, "Female Fickleness in Jewish Folklore (Aa-Th Narrative Types 1350, 1352* and 1510)," in *The Sephardi and Oriental Jewish Heritage*, Proceedings of the First International Congress on the Sephardi and Oriental Jewry, ed. I. Ben Ami (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press of the Hebrew University, 1982) pp. 589-613. The author discusses Type 1510, i.e., the *vidua* plot, in Jewish tradition, though not Petronius' text of it; however, he does mention (and rejects) Perry's suggestion that this story is an elaboration of the tale of the widow and the ploughman, found in *Vita Aesopi* 129. (William Hansen, Indiana University)
- Scobie, A., "A Quechua Esclmensch," *Fabula* 23(1982)287-291. "In *Fabula* 17(1976)275-7 I briefly discussed the relationship of a Chilean ass-tale to five Catalan tales... The Chilean tale... was the first version of the Graeco-Roman (Pseudo-Lucian, Apuleius) ass-tale to have been identified outside of the Europe-Asia landmass. Some months after the publication of the above note, I received a letter [about an ass-tale written in Quechua and found in 1951]... The aim of this note is to discuss the possible relationship of the Quechua tale to the Chilean and other narratives belonging to the Esclmensch complex."
- Solomon, Jon & Julia, *Ancient Roman Feasts and Recipes* (Miami: Seemann Publishing, 1977). On page 87 we find a recipe "Trimalchio's Pastry Eggs" which, we are told, serves four people. Eggs in this recipe are stuffed with shrimp, not with small birds.
- Sullivan, J.P., "Petronius' *Bellum Civile* and Lucan's *Pharsalia*: A Political Reconsideration," *Neronia* 1977. *Actes du 2^e Colloque de la Société Internationale d'Études Néroniennes* (Clermont-Ferrand, ADOSA: 1982)151-155. Sullivan argues against the theories of George and Smith who contend that there is no relationship between the *Pharsalia* of Lucan and the *Bellum Civile*. Petronius countered the "Republican Epic" of Lucan with his own poem justifying the actions of Caesar and Augustus as ordained by the gods. The two poems are, in the first place, political statements, and only in the second place literary.
- Valenti-Pagnini, Rossana, "Lupus in fabula. Transformazioni narrative di un mito," *BStudLat* 11(1981)3-22. The werewolf scene in the Sat. is discussed on pp. 16-22.

REVIEWS

Gerald N. Sandy. *Heliodorus. Twayne World Authors Series* #647. Boston: Twayne Publishers 1982. 148pp.

review by Donald Norman Levin

Professor Sandy, known to fellow Classical scholars and particularly to *aficionados* of ancient prose fiction for his work on Petronius and Apuleius and on the fragmentary remains of lost Greek romances, has lately directed his attention more and more to the most ambitious romance extant in Greek, the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus.

But when did the author of the *Aethiopica* live? S. prefers, as do so many scholars lately, to assume that when Heliodorus wrote his account of the siege of Syene he was already cognizant of an event datable in the year 350 A.D., namely the siege of Nisibis in Mesopotamia (described in a piece written by the future Emperor Julian) (pp. 4f.). Fourth centuryish too, according to S., are certain stylistic features of Heliodorus' novel (p. 5), likewise the hints of Neopythagoreanism or even of Iamblichian Neoplatonism in the orientation of the fictional Egyptian Isiac priest Calasiris (ibid.).

What of that other matter for controversy, the claim of Socrates, Photius, et al. that the ostensible sun-worshipping novelist later underwent conversion to Christianity and is even identifiable with the Heliodorus who served as Bishop of Thessalian Tricca? Though the fancifulness of the supposed historical record appears to increase in direct ratio to the chronological distance of the would-be chronicler from novelist and/or prelate, S. refrains from denying the identification (p. 4 ad init.), even, once he has acknowledged "the religious syncretism of the period" (he has in mind particularly the Emperor Constantine's continuing links to *sol inuictus* even after his own conversion to Christianity), offers a scenario which, unless I have misread his intentions, comports even with the novelist's having been a Christian from the start--or at least at the time of the composition of the *Aethiopica*:

Once, for whatever reasons, Heliodorus adopted the pre-413 B.C. *mis* [sic] -*en-scène*, verisimilitude required the pagan element, just as the appearance of Persian cavalry in book 9 dictated that it be the mailed type long associated with Persia. p. 4

Having said what little he can about "The Writer" in the first half of the first chapter (pp. 1-5), S. turns to "The Work" (pp. 5-8), which latter section is subdivided into "Ancient Attitudes toward Romance" (pp. 5f.) and "Diversity of Ancient Romance" (pp. 6-8). S. suggests that a cultural bias among Greek intellectuals operating in the Empire administered from Rome forced even romancers caught up in the so-called Second Sophistic to assign their plots to the period antedating the death of Alexander in 323 B.C. (p. 5 ad fin.). On the other hand, as S. also points out, "in dealing with the private lives of bourgeois individuals, the Greek romancers moved away from the classical canons" (pp. 5f.). Add cleavages in ancient fiction between the edifying and the merely entertaining and between idealizing and realistic narrative, cleavages which S. chooses to stress by contrasting Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, a work much more to his taste, and the sometimes sensationalizing *Leucippe and Clitopho* of Achilles Tatius (pp. 6ff., especially p. 8).

Although S. in entitling Chs. 2-5 successively "The Story" (pp. 9-20), "Presenting the Story" (pp. 21-32), "Manipulating the Story" (pp. 33-74), and "Embellishing the Story" (pp. 75-89) has established neat climactic series, he has established at the same time a sort of Procrustean bed. Had he opted for a less "cute" organizational scheme, S. might have established a tripartition in place of the present rather long and unwieldy fourth chapter and separated "Plotting" (pp. 33-37), "Interdigitation" (pp. 37-39), "Lapses" (pp. 40f.), and "Arranging the Story" (pp. 41-44) from "Motivation" (pp. 44-50), "Divine Agency" (pp. 50-54), and "Religion" (pp. 54-56),

which together should have constituted a fifth chapter, and from "Characterization" (pp. 56-74), which last by itself might well have constituted a sixth.

Having registered my complaint, I now praise S. for having provided interesting discussions throughout Ch. 4 as presently organized and for having been on the right track most of the time. Certainly I approve of his suggestion that Heliodorus appropriates the methods of the stage even in the interlocking of various strands of a web of intrigue as the paths of the principal characters cross and recross (p. 33). Likewise commendable is the observation of S. at p. 48 that plot development in the *Aethiopica* depends less on "divine agency and visions" ("little more than window dressing," he insists), more on "the interplay of fully rounded characters [a far cry from the cardboard stereotypes of Xenophon of Ephesus: but this is my own observation rather than S.'s] engaged in pursuits consistent with their portrayal."

And yet in the very next section (that which I should have preferred to see established as first in Ch. 5 under the new arrangement already recommended above) S. finds himself compelled to discuss the rôle of supernatural powers, specifically Chance, Destiny, and Divine Will, all three of which appear to be cited by the heroine Chariclea herself at *Aeth.* I 22, 5-6 as she stalls off the amorous suit of Calasiris' elder son, the brigand leader and ex-priest Thyamis (p. 53 ad init.). S. contends nonetheless that in most instances, despite the belief of this or that character that supernatural causation is involved, plausible natural explanations can be set forth (p. 54).

What of religion, then? Pace Reinhold Merkelbach (whom S. does not even mention outside his bibliography, save toward the close of his section on characterization and even then in a context only tangentially tied to *Mysterienroman-theorie*), S. insists that the author of the *Aethiopica* "was ultimately more concerned to tell a good story than to present coherent religious doctrine" (p. 54 still).

And yet S. is willing to grant that Heliodorus' novel has documentary value with regard to religious thought of Greeks and Orientals, particularly insofar as syncretism is involved. He accords barely two pages thereto nonetheless, convinced as he is that religion in the *Aethiopica* is secondary to characterization, to which he accords almost twenty pages. Albeit in a separate article, "Characterization and Philosophical Decor in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*," *TAPA* 112 (1982) 141-167, S. devotes some ten pages to discussion of Neoplatonic elements in the same novel, ultimately he arrives at more or less the same conclusions as before.

In the present Ch. 5, a tripartite stylistic study concerned successively with "Verbal Texture" (pp. 75-80), "Sentence Structure" (pp. 80-83), and "Literary Texture" (pp. 83-89) the task which S. sets for himself in the first two sections is rendered rather difficult by the constraints imposed on scholars working within the *Twayne World Authors Series*, most notably the stipulation that as little Greek as possible be cited--and even that in transliteration--lest Greekless readers be disadvantaged.

And so S. finds himself forced to explain matters of style largely through the medium not even of transliterations so much as of translations. The results become positively grotesque when the complexities of Heliodoran periodic structure are illustrated through renderings into painfully literal and stilted English. Yet S. surely deserves praise for having made an heroic effort in this regard. He deserves praise likewise for having dispelled once and for all the mistaken strictures applied by nineteenth-century scholars who accused the author of the *Aethiopica* of failure to stay in tune with canons of Atticism which he himself had probably never even intended to follow.

S. is more at ease in any case in the section on literary texture which brings the fifth chapter to a close. For here it matters not so much whether the original or a translation be cited, the main concern being rather to demonstrate that employment of allusions to, adaptations of, or quotations from earlier works contribute to that grandeur which the eleventh-century Byzantine critic Michael Psellos assumes to have been Heliodorus' goal (p. 85). I need not run through all the borrowings from Homer in particular which S. follows the lead of earlier scholars, though he selects only an

example here and there, credits to Heliodorus. What I find interesting is S.'s demonstration that the author of the *Aethiopica* did not hesitate to combine Odyssean and Iliadic elements within a single sequence: e.g. in the confrontation of the brothers Thyamis and Petosiris hard by Memphis in *Aeth.* VII (pp. 87f.). Nor need I pause long over Ch. 6 ("Second Thoughts") (pp. 90-94), a brief, but successful demonstration of the thesis that the *Aethiopica* should be classified as essentially "Baroque." What strikes me here is the relevance of this classification to Ch. 7 ("The *Aethiopica* through the Ages") (pp. 95-124), wherein it is shown quite convincingly that the heyday for imitation of Heliodorus' novel in western Europe falls during the so-called Baroque period. Whereas S. confesses to only an indirect acquaintance with Spanish literature of the period in question, wherein imitation of Heliodorus is rife, he happens to be particularly well qualified to discourse on Heliodoran *Fortleben* in England and France. Witness the fuller treatment afforded in his separate articles, "Ancient Prose Fiction and Minor Early English Novels," *ASA* 25 (1979) 41-55, and "Classical Forerunners of the Theory and Practice of Prose Romance in France: Studies in the Narrative Form of Minor French Romances of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *ibid.* 28 (1982) 169-191. In the book's seventh chapter S. not only deals with novels imitative of the *Aethiopica*, among them the *Histoire Nègre-Pontique* of 1631 possibly attributable to a certain J. Baudoin (p. 116), but also looks to literary-critical recommendations offered already in the mid-sixteenth century by Jacques Amyot, the first to translate the *Aethiopica* into a vernacular tongue, who, along with other Renaissance theorists, placed Heliodorus' prose-romance on a par with Aristotle's *Poetics* and Horace's *Ars poetica* in the formulation of classically sanctioned principles for composing what later ages would come to know as the novel (p. 97).

Though such too may be subsumed under *Fortleben*, it seems to me that S. might have done better to set aside a separate chapter for discussion of "The *Aethiopica* in the Fine Arts" (pp. 120-124), further that, had Twayne Publishers only allowed it, he should have provided even in an Appendix a sampling of reproductions of paintings, drawings, and sculpture inspired by the *Aethiopica*. As for the possible influence, direct or indirect, of the *Aethiopica* on the libretto of Verdi's opera *Aida* (p. 124), should not discussion thereof have been assigned to a separate section of that recommended separate chapter?

I need not cavil further. Though I should have recommended some structural changes, had I been asked by the publishing firm to referee the original typescript, S.'s *Heliodorus* is in the main a sound piece of scholarship and a worthy companion to such earlier *Twayne World Authors Series* offerings as Philip Corbett's *Petronius* (New York 1970), W.E. McCulloh's *Longus* (*ibid.*, same date), and Gareth Schmelting's *Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus* (*ibid.* 1974 and Boston 1980).

Graham Anderson. *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1982. American Classical Studies #9. 199 pp.

review by Brent W. Sinclair

Anderson, the author of a pair of perceptive monographs on Lucian, has of late turned his attention to the Greek and Roman novelists. In the present study (already he promises a second) his purpose is by and large twofold: to explore the use of comic elements in the so-called ideal novels of Chariton, Achilles, Heliodorus and Longus, and to examine anew the internal playoff between comic and serious in Petronius and Apuleius. He concludes that with the exception of Xenophon of Ephesus (whom he treats as a foil), "the extant novelists tend to use their sophistication with a light and mischievous touch; and that they are consequently less committed in their attitudes to sentimental love and religion than is usually assumed" (p. 87).

A brief summary of Anderson's principal arguments will perhaps entice potential readers to take up his book for themselves. After some introductory remarks on the literary pedigree of the novel (in particular the influence of epic poetry, Euripidean recognition-drama, Plato, New Comedy, and sophistic rhetoric) he proceeds to Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, the genre's earliest extant specimen. He sees it as a 'historical' New Comedy in prose (its plot resembles that of Menander's *Sicyonius*), its comic appeal as a function of

characterization, dramatic irony and rhetorical wit. While Chariton "remains unshakably loyal to the sentimental ideals and values implied in the basic outline of the ideal novel", however, Achilles subjects them to "refined and ingenious criticism, if not outright sabotage" (p. 20, 23). By Anderson's estimate *Clitophon and Leucippe* is an anti-*Phaedrus*, the product of a mischievous *praeceptor amoris* who uses sentimental love as a point of departure for unmitigated eroticism; indeed, Achilles was more interested in the rites of *eros* than he was in the sacred Mysteries to which, in any case, he accords a similar sardonicism. In Heliodorus the question of piety is less easily resolved--the *Aethiopica* makes extensive use of religious motifs, and the tone of those is impressively grave. The line of argument to which Anderson treats us is that "Heliodorus is less concerned with establishing right belief than in smiling at wrong", that he "specializes in misapplied piety, priestly deception, pompous processions, and ceremonies that will have to be abolished" (p. 34, 35). At some junctures, however, the intermingling of comic and serious is so complete as to defy interpretation. Longus is almost equally elusive: the presence of formal religion in *Daphnis and Chloe* is constant and the agonizing innocence of its bucolic *Liebespaar* verges on the unnatural. Nevertheless Anderson contends quite convincingly that Longus treats both subjects in a playfully ambiguous way, that in effect he trivializes his gods and magnifies the ineptitude of his 'lovers' to the point that neither can be taken very seriously.

Two chapters separate the major Greek novelists from their Roman counterparts. In the first Anderson analyzes fragments of novels (the *Iolaus*' and *Lollianus* papyri as well as more familiar material in the collections assembled by Lavagnini and Zimmermann) in hopes of demonstrating that their authors exploit comic possibilities through techniques similar to those employed by the extant novelists. In the other he gives cursory treatment to Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* and a curious assortment of works including *Apollonius of Tyre*, *Joseph and Aseneth*, and the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*. He argues that in his handling of religious and amatory motifs Xenophon is much closer to those than to Chariton and the others.

Finally, Petronius and Apuleius. Anderson champions the view of Heinze that the *Satyricon* is a wry parody of the ideal novel and so rejects the moralist interpretations of Bacon, Arrowsmith and Hight: "it is difficult to find a single episode in which (Petronius) does not neutralize his satirical material or pervert its satirical effect" (p. 70; see also Appendix II). Understandably his estimate of the *Metamorphoses* is more tentative. Having detected more than a touch of whimsy in Apuleius' handling of narrative detail and even in his use of symbol and allegory he notes that "it is almost irrelevant to ask whether such a writer is comic or serious" (p. 84). Thus his hesitant appraisal of Book 11: its whimsical Platonic allusions and occasional *jeu d'esprit* tend to offset whatever earnest message may lie concealed in the conversion of Lucius *Madaurensis*.

Any book on the subject of humor is open to charges of subjectivity, any assessment of the *Tendenz* of fragmentary works to suspicion and skepticism. Let those be recorded elsewhere. My principal objection has to do with Anderson's treatment of Xenophon. His argument--that since he failed to take advantage of a few occasions for mischief exploited by the others he lacked sophistication (p. 62.63) -- is unsatisfactory for two reasons. It deprives Xenophon of individuality, a quality that Anderson duly stresses in each of the 'sophisticated' novelists. Moreover, a few small episodes do not a novel make, and whether or not the *Ephesiaca* as we have it is an epitome one need not look far to find touches of wit akin to those he observes in Chariton and the others. I instance 1.8.2-5 (fun with traditional mythology at the expense of the *Liebespaar*), 1.13-14 (self-serving protagonists) and 5.1.4ff. (sick humor?; the passage must be read alongside 3.10.2-3 from which it derives a good part of its comic effect).

Although sure to prompt debate, *Eros Sophistes* is an exciting book whose strengths far outweigh its flaws. Anderson's command of the texts is all that could be desired, his perspicacity self-evident at almost every juncture. Latinists will encounter much that is sound and useful in his chapters on Petronius and Apuleius but his real contribution lies on the side of the Greek novelists. All who would view them as anything more -- or less -- than literary artists will find in him a formidable opponent.

Cizek, E. *Néron* (Paris: Fayard, 1982) pp. 474.

review by J.P. Sullivan

Cizek has produced a well-documented and stimulating book on Nero's character, reign, and decline. The coverage is extensive: Nero's image in his own time and in later history as anti-Christ (ch. 1); his tortured personality and the underlying psychological causes (ch. 2); his political, artistic and ideological aspirations -- *Néronisme* being chiefly a movement towards a Hellenistic, almost theocratic, despotism after growing disillusion with the senate's lack of cooperation (chs. 3 and 4); the cultural milieu at court and among the Stoic opposition (ch. 5); his internal policies, dominated heavily by a fear of conspiracies and a determination to root out any contender for power who had any connections with the Julio-Claudian line (ch. 6); his foreign policy, about which C. tries hard to contradict Suetonius' flat statement of N.'s non-expansionist program (*Nero* 18) by stressing his projected expeditions (ch. 7); Neronian religion, culture, and style take up ch. 8 and in ch. 9 the reasons for, and the events of, Nero's downfall are carefully examined. The bibliography and chronological table are commendably thorough. C.'s *aperçus*, expressed in a fast-paced French style, make the book a pleasure to read. T. Petronius Niger is pictured as a powerful intellectual influence at court (p. 133), as well as a refined and gently epicurean; Silia is named as his mistress shared with Nero (p. 312); his *Satyricon* is seen as expressing the relaxed epicureanism of the period -- *carpe diem* (p. 366) and its own baroque novelty, C. claims, contains attacks on contemporary principles of writing (p. 372); the feud with Lucan and Seneca is discussed on p. 374.

NOTES

On the Order of the Petronius Excerpts¹

by Helmut van Thiel

In 1968 H.C. Schnur published a German translation of Petronius. Like a number of translators before him, he filled the lacunae with the supplements from François Nodot's edition (1684), who maintained that they were genuinely Petronian. The quality of Nodot's suggestions, however, is generally regarded as most questionable - which has obviously not prevented their diffusion.

We should all like to have an idea as to the contents of the lost portions of the *Satyricon*. It is therefore surprising that no scholar has yet, to my knowledge, inserted his own guesses about the lost contents in connection with a translation or edition, where they would be most welcomed by the interested public.

In my opinion, this is partly owing to the fact that the transmitted order of the Petronius excerpts, though in many places hard to understand, is regarded as corresponding to the order of their appearance in the original work. But much suggests that this is not so. There are, for example, portions of text which interrupt the flow of a perfectly continuous or hardly damaged narrative. Maintained in their transmitted positions, such passages occasion great difficulties.

Chapter 113 may serve as an example. The first-person narrator, Encolpius, together with his young friend Giton and the poet Eumolpus have accidentally boarded the ship of Lichas. Encolpius had once been on intimate terms with Lichas, but had subsequently offended him severely. The rich Tryphaena is also on board, and she in the course of an affair with Encolpius and Giton had been cheated by the two. When the scoundrels are detected, the result is passionate melodrama until Eumolpus reconciles differences and relates the tale of the Widow of Ephesus. Lichas remains gloomy, while Tryphaena rediscovers her old affection for Giton. The latter responds and Encolpius must attempt to suppress his jealousy.

At this point come four short passages which appear to be the remnants of an extremely complicated and extended portion of narrative. Then the continuous narrative is renewed:

"dum haec taliaque iactamus, inhorruit mare - while we were parading these and similar emotions, the sea grew rough." ("While we were talking about this and similar things," John Sullivan in his Penguin translation, because of the intervening fragments).

This sentence would follow quite naturally after the description of Encolpius' grievous jealousy and the preceding affairs. But as the text stands, we must assume that we have lost a whole series of complications in a menage consisting of four, five or more parties, preserved only in the following miserable shreds of text:

in partem voluptatis temptabat admitti, nec domini supercilium induebat, sed amici quaerebat obsequium* * [Ancilla Tryphaenae ad Encolpium] 'si quid ingenui sanguinis habes, non pluris illam facies quam scortum. si vir fueris, non ibis ad spintriam' * * me nihil magis pudebat quam ne Eumolpus sensisset, quicquid illud fuerat, et homo dicacissimus carminibus vindicaret * * iurat Eumolpus verbis conceptissimis * *

The last scholar to suggest how the course of such events might have run is John P. Sullivan (*The Satyricon of Petronius*, 1968, 64f.). He writes:

The text now becomes very fragmentary and perhaps we have lost a whole night of amorous adventure and intrigue. It would seem that Lichas attempts, without his usual arrogance, to get into the gay circle of Tryphaena, Giton, and Eumolpus, from which Eumolpus is still excluded (113.10). The next fragment (113.11) is puzzling:

'If you have any decent blood in your veins, you won't regard her as anything more than a whore. If you're a man, you won't go to such a perverted creature.'

The manuscripts attribute this to Tryphaena's maid addressing Encolpius. Maids are not necessarily blind to their mistresses' character, and she may be trying to win Encolpius for herself or, as Ciaffi suggests, for Lichas. But Encolpius has no further sexual interest in Tryphaena and is jealous of her besides. It would fit the situation best if it were Encolpius speaking to Lichas.

The next two fragments concern Eumolpus (113.12-13). Encolpius is afraid that Eumolpus will discover something, perhaps what had happened with Lichas or Tryphaena, and take revenge for Encolpius' earlier injuries to him by composing poems on the subject. Perhaps he pleads with the poet and Eumolpus' solemn oath (113.13) is a promise to let the past stay buried.

A storm interrupts the conversation...

This is all rather unsatisfactory, and it is my contention that one should rather ignore the intervening fragments. One of the reasons that this appears to be the proper solution is offered by the form of the fragments.

No name is mentioned in the first fragment. It would seem that the excerptor chose this passage not for its significance in the plot, but for linguistic peculiarities (esp. domini supercilium induebat). The ascription of the second fragment to Tryphaena's maid has no textual value, as Sullivan rightly argues. Like all similar ascriptions (of which some, e.g. 132, 134.1, are demonstrably false), it occurs only in a single branch of the manuscript tradition. In all likelihood it is the false conjecture of a medieval scribe. The excerptor himself, however, was probably not interested in the identity of the speaker, but rather in the rare word *spintria*. Regarding the fourth fragment, Bücheler already suggested that the superlative *conceptissimis* was the reason for its preservation.

It seems from these textual observations that the excerptor, who frequently selected quite comprehensive portions of narrative, occasionally lost interest in the plot and directed his attention to vocabulary and unusual phraseology. But did such passages really stand in these respective positions in the original work? Did the excerptor glean these short fragments which contribute nothing to the plot in the same time (or in the same process) that he recorded the long fragments? Are we dealing in fact with one excerptor only?

One of the fragments discussed above may be helpful in this consideration. The word *conceptissimis* occurs elsewhere in a broader context. At 133.2 we read the following about Giton: *tetigit puer oculos suos conceptissimisque iuravit verbis...* It is not convincing to suppose that the same man excerpted the short fragment 113.13 on account of *conceptissimis* and that just a few pages later he offered a larger chunk of text which contains the same word. It is more probable that two different men with different interests chose

two passages containing the phrase *iurare verbis conceptissimis*. Or even they excerpted the same passage, and the shorter excerpt, treated more freely, was subsequently put in the wrong place at 113.13 and falsely ascribed to Eumolpus, who is mentioned in the fragment before.

The other fragments which present such obstacles to our understanding of the text may have been incorrectly inserted in ch. 113 in a similar fashion.

One should now note that there are elsewhere comparable short fragments which interrupt the flow of otherwise continuous narrative. These fragments occur similarly in clusters. As in ch. 113, they occur almost always in erotic scenes, which apparently offered much linguistic interest, and they usually occasion similar difficulties for our understanding of the text, which disappear with their removal.²

The history of our text must account for such confusion. Without the *Cena* it is transmitted in three different groups of excerpts:

1. The so-called Short Excerpts. They contain chiefly pieces of literary interest and scenes of dialogue.
2. A Florilegium which contains chiefly short pieces of a sententious nature.
3. The so-called Long Excerpts. With the exception of four short sentences in the Short Excerpts, the Long Excerpts contain all the pieces gathered in the other two collections. Below the contents of the three groups are schematized; the short passages in the middle are significant.

1) 1 - 26.5 55.1 55.4-6 80.9 - 137.10
2) 45.2 55.3 56.6
3) 1 - 37.5 45.2 55.1, 3, 4-6 56.6 79 - 141

To my knowledge, it had universally been assumed that the Long Excerpts reflect the earliest stage of the tradition and that the Short Excerpts are a secondary selection from the Long Excerpts. The passages from ch. 55 suggest rather the contrary, namely that the Long Excerpts drew on the two shorter collections. For it is quite unlikely that, out of a total of nine short pieces between chapters 37 and 79, the Florilegium chose seven, one of them from ch. 55, and the Short Excerpts the two remaining ones from chapter 55. Hence, the Long Excerpts do not derive from the original work but are rather secondary to the Short Excerpts. Furthermore it appears that the Long Excerpts incorporated material not only from the short collections which are preserved but also from one or more other collections which are no longer preserved, e.g. a collection of excerpts made by a man with grammatical and lexical interests (whence the above-discussed fragments 113.10-13).³ The compiler of the Long Excerpts, it seems, placed not only these short excerpts but numerous other ones as well, which could not be localized by overlapping his main source, in places which appeared appropriate to him, but which in fact can be wrong. This is even true of every fragment of the Short Excerpts, the place of which is not guaranteed by unailing textual connection.⁴

Graciously the compiler has proved this. The three friends Encolpius, Ascyltus and Giton are visited by a priestess of Priapus and her companions. Now we read:

(18.7 - 19.1) *complosis deinde manibus in tantum repente risum effusa est ut timeremus. idem ex altera parte et ancilla fecit quae prior venerat, idem virguncula quae una intraverat. omnia mimico risu exsonuerant, cum interim nos, quae tam repentina esset mutatio animorum facta, ignoraremus ac modo nosmet ipsos modo mulierem intueremur.*

Now the Long Excerpts have somewhat more than one page with contents of a quite different nature. Then we read at 20.8:

ac ne Giton quidem ultimo risum tenuit, utique postquam virguncula cervicem eius invasit et non repugnanti puero innumerabilia oscula dedit.

The same personnel (Giton and the *virguncula*) and the same situation allow one to conclude that the pieces belong together. In the present case, however, it is not necessary to be content with conjecture alone: in the Short Excerpts, the two sections adjoin each other. This is how the original must have run. In the Long Excerpts a continuous piece of narrative has been torn in two.

In this fashion, the whole text of Petronius must be scrutinized. One must check if the order of the different fragments really corresponds to the original. Future editions and translations should not allow the gaps which can be closed to remain open. And we should certainly not resort to Nodot's phantasies, but rather apply our own understanding (and phantasy), taking advantage of what can be demonstrated by philology and judgment.

Footnotes

1. In 1971 I published a short book *Petron, Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion*, in which I tried to shed light on some vicissitudes of the text and the consequences for the plot and our understanding of it. Since it appears that I have not wholly succeeded to demonstrate the logic of the approach, I submit it in a somewhat different manner, as a lecture I never delivered. Konrad Müller, in his admirable book (*Petronius Satyrice*, 3.ed. Munich 1983, 423-48), has now accepted my stemmatic conclusions, but none of the inevitable consequences. They remain to be realized. I wish to thank Bob Daniel, who has translated a first draft of my paper into English.
2. Passages excerpted for lexical or phraseological peculiarities (cf. van Thiel, *Petron* 6, and H.L.W. Nelson, *Mnemosyne* 24, 1971, 78-80): 8.4-9.1 (cf. Sullivan 55, Thiel 27f.). 19.6-21.3 (Sullivan 48-53, Thiel 33f.). 113.10-13 (Sullivan 64f., Thiel 47n.). 128.7-129.2 (Sullivan 69, Thiel 56). 138 (Thiel 59).
3. The character of the grammatical excerpts is similar to known collections, e.g. *De dubiis nominibus* (Gramm. Lat.V, 567-594: MSS of sec. IX!), whence our fragment Petronius XXIII.
4. Passages which appear to be placed in false positions (the text should be read without them; cf. the summary in van Thiel, pp. 76-78): 8.4 adeo - 9.1; 18.7 - 19.1 (and 20.8, see next paragraph); 19.6 - 21.3; 80.9 grex - 81.2 pectus; 82.5; 84.5; 99.1 113.10-13; 128.7 - 129.2; 131.8; 132.1; 132.15; 134.1-2; 135.2 detersisque ... basiavit; 135.7-8; 137.4; 138.5 - 139.2; 140.14.



Tech/Klemke

The Background of Petronius Fr. XXVIII

by J.P. Sullivan

Nam citius flammās mortales ore tenebunt
quam secreta tegunt. quicquid dimittis in aula,
effluit et subitis rumoribus oppida pulsat.
nec satis est vulgasse fidem: cumulatius exit
proditionis opus famamque onerare laborat.
sic commissā verens avidus reserare minister
fodit humum regisque latentes prodidit aures;
concepit nam terra sonos calami que loquentes
vulgavere Midam, qualem narraverat index.

AL 476 de cod. Leid. Voss. Q 86. versus 6-9 citat
Fulgentius myth. III 9 p. 74 unde et Petronius Arbiter
ait 'sic commissā - index' || 1 ore Scaliger: ora ||
4 cumulatius Jacobs: simulatius || 6 vere(n)s et reser-
are Fulgentius: ferens et servare cod. || 9 vulgavere
Shackleton Bailey: invenere Fulgentius: incinuere
Salmasius, Palmer: invenere Midam Fulgentius: inven-
erem idem cod. | narraverat cod.: conceperat
Fulgentius: conspexerat Muncker

Shackleton Bailey's reading (*Towards a Text of Anthologia Latina*, Cambridge 1979, p. 63) seems convincing. On the authorship of the poem he leaves room for doubt, despite its being quoted by Fulgentius as belonging to Petronius Arbiter. Bücheler records in his apparatus (1868) that Bourdelot would find a place for it at the end of *Sat.* c. 113 in the lacuna between *carminibus vindicaret* (12) and *iurat Eumolpus verbis conceptissimis* (13). Less plausibly Burmann suggests as a possible location c. 117 presumably where the company swear an oath to obey Eumolpus in everything (5-6), but the narrative is seamless at that point. What is obvious from the fragment is that it must be part of a longer verse or Menippean narrative and not a self-subsistent poem.

To anchor the fragment more firmly to the Neronian age and so to the *Satyricon*, one might note that various aspects of the Midas myth provide poetic allusions and themes in that period. The best known instance occurs in Persius, when he finds out the secret that contemporary Roman literature, particularly that inspired by Nero's court, is critically and morally decadent:

Men muttire nefas, nec clam, nec cum scrobe?
Nusquam? hic tamen infodiam. Vide, vide ipse, libelle,
Auriculas asini quis non habet.

(*Sat.* 1.119 ff.)

The scholiast, plausibly taking much of the satire as an attack on Neronian court poetry, even states that the last line had originally read:

auriculas asini Mida rex habet.

According to the *Life*, this had been changed either by the poet or by Cornutus to avoid giving offence to Nero; Σ ad 121 repeats the information about the change, attributing it this time to Persius himself: *et dicitur Neronem et Claudium tetigisse sub allegoria Midae, qui aures maximas habuerunt. denique Persius hoc mutavit ita componens auriculas asini quis non habet. sed veritus est ne Nero in se dictum putaret.* The scholiast's far-fetched explanation, for which there is no justification in the coin portraits or other literary sources, misses the point of Persius' criticism here and elsewhere in the satire (cf. 1.92-106, which, as I have argued before (*AJP* 99 (1978) 159), contains quotations from Nero's *Attis*). Persius is attacking bad literary taste, not physical faults. But why use the story of Midas to attack Nero? Mythical analogies for Nero were generally scurrilous. Graffiti are recorded comparing him to the matricides, Alcmaeon and Orestes (Suet. *Nero* 39). But other references to Midas survive from the Neronian Age, besides the allusive occurrence in Persius' first satire. Midas is appropriately the name of the umpire in the shepherds' singing match described in the first *Ein-siedeln Eclogue*, which culminates in sarcastic allusions to Nero's poetic achievements in the *Troica*. The seventh Eclogue of Calpurnius, describing Corydon's amazed admiration of the affluence of Nero's Rome and the grandeur of his new amphitheatre, stresses the profusion of gold, cf. vv. 36-37, 41, 47, 53, 72, another aspect of the Midas legend. References to the *aurea aetas* which the young emperor is to restore on earth had become a propaganda motif (cf. e.g. Sen. *Apoc.* 4; Calp. *Ecl.* 1.42 ff.).

The *locus classicus* for the story of Midas among the Romans was naturally Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 11.85-193, a neo-Alexandrian work which would accord with the literary taste of Neronian poetic circles sources. Ovid's narrative gives equal weight to Midas' golden touch; his general folly; his poor taste in preferring Pan's pipes to Apollo's lyre; his punishment by Apollo; and, finally, his servant's indiscretion in confiding the secret of his ass-like ears to the reeds. There are even echoes of Ovidian language in our fragment (cp. v.8 *fodit humum* and vv. 185-6 *humumque/effodit*; vv. 7, 9 *regisque latentes prodidit aures, Midam, qualem narraverat index* and vv. 186 ff. *domini quales adspexerat aures...indiciumque... Prodidit...* What the secret was in the Petronian context, for which an aspect of the story of Midas was used as a parable, can hardly be ascertained, but the occurrence of the story in Neronian literature is interesting.

One might tentatively speculate that Nero's penchant for lavish display and luxury, visible in the *theatrum peculiare* mentioned by Pliny (*NH* 37.19) and culminating significantly in the *Domus Aurea* (Suet. *Nero* 31), may have led some wit to compare him with Midas, whose touch, by the grace or ill-will of Bacchus, turned everything to gold. He was fond of giving gold coins as payment and gifts, even to the populace (*ibid.* 10, 11, 20). He wore a snakeskin set in a gold bracelet (*ibid.* 6); he had selected passages from his poems printed in gold lettering on plaques dedicated to Jupiter Capitolinus (*ibid.* 10), to whom he also dedicated his first beard in a golden box (*ibid.* 12). Similarly, in his last days, a gold box was used for Locusta's poisons (*ibid.* 47). He used a golden net for fishing (*ibid.* 30). His passion for gold even made him gullible, as in the case of Caesellius Bassus' promise of Dido's lost gold treasures (*ibid.* 31; Tac. *Ann.* 16.1-3).

More hostile critics might then link Nero's practice of poetry and playing the lyre to another feature of the Midas story: the king's poor taste in preferring Pan's music to Apollo's lyre, for which he received Apollo's booby prize for criticism, ass's ears (Ov. *Met.* 11.73).

Of course a passion for gold is not uncommon among rulers, but literary and artistic enthusiasms are. So the Midas myth had obvious contemporary relevance in Neronian times and a Petronian allusion to it would not be surprising.

NACHLEBEN

A Fragment of Petronius Paraphrased
Against Fruition by Mr. Oldham

by J.P. Sullivan

John Oldham (1653-1683) was born in Gloucestershire and died near Nottingham. He was a son of a Presbyterian minister. Graduating from St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, he became a school-teacher, tutor, and finally a chaplain. He is perhaps the most savage of English satirists before Dryden, because he used Juvenal as his model, but this translation of the famous poem attributed to Petronius (LIV), a *trouvaillie* encountered in the Rawlinson MS (poetry) 173, shows that his reputation as a writer of "rugged verse" is not always well deserved. It is a more prolix paraphrase than Ben Jonson's well-known version, but, in my opinion, it runs more smoothly.

I hate fruition when 'tis past
Tis all but passionate at best.
The homely'st thing that man can do,
Besides 'tis short and fleeting too,
A squirt of slippery delight
That with a moment takes its flight,
A fulsom bliss that soon doth cloy
And makes us loath without enjoy.
Than let us not too eager run,
By passion blindly hurry'd on,
Like beasts, who nothing better know,
Than what meer Lust incites them to:
For whom in floods of Love n'are drencht,
The Flames are by Enjoyment quencht.
But thus, let's thus together lie,
And kiss out long Eternity!
There we dread no conscious spies,
No blushes stain our guiltless joys;
There no Faintness dulls desires,
And Pleasure never flagg's nor tires;
This has pleas'd and please's now,
And for ages will do so.
Enjoyment here is never done,
But fresh, and allways but begunn.

Henry King's Version of a Petronian Poem (Sat. 15)

by J.P. Sullivan

Henry King (1591-1669) became Bishop of Chichester in 1642. An acquaintance of King Charles I, he was also one of John Donne's executors. Apart from various religious works, he produced *Poems, Elegies, Paradoxes and Sonets* in 1657. It is pleasant to know that he may have owned a copy of the *Satyricon*. His version of the poem may be unfamiliar to some of your readers.

Petronius - Quid faciant leges ubi sola pecunia regnat

To what serve Lawes where only Money reignes?
Or where a poore man's cause no right obtaines?
Even those that most austerly pretend,
Hire out their tongues, and words for profit lend.
What's Judgment then? but publick merchandise;
And the Court sits but to allow the price.

NOTICES

Anderson, G., *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Greek and Roman World*. To appear in 1984 from Croom Helm, London. The description that follows is from the publisher's announcement. "The ancient novel has too often been regarded as a trite concatenation of conventional motifs, plot-elements and cardboard characters. To some extent this myth has been perpetuated by the wilful classification of the best ancient fiction (Longus or Petronius) outside the category of novel. Seen in a more generous perspective, it can offer simple excitement as good as that of *Ben Hur* (with its strikingly similar plot-pattern) or amusement as subtle as that of *Shamela*. Its roots too are diverse, reaching out to the *Odyssey*, Euripides' late romances, New Comedy, Xenophon's *Education of Cyrus* and the Argonautica of Apollonius of Rhodes.

This book considers all the major authors of ancient fiction, showing the great variety of treatment they give to often standard material, the different ways in which they instill life into New-Comedy type characters, and illustrating the assumptions about religion, morality and so on which underlie their narratives. It discusses the role of the learned excursus, so beloved of writers of the Second Sophistic, and characterises their outlook, ultimately, as a Gibbonian one on the Antonine age as a Golden Age." CONTENTS: 1. Origins. 2. Theme and Variation. 3. Character. 4. Learning. 5. Religion. 6. Social and Moral Standards. 7. The Fringe. 8. Petronius. 9. Apuleius. 10. Novel and Novella; The Novel and History. 11. *Nachleben*.

Dorken, Susan, "The Roman Novel, Front and Center," *CJ* 79(1984)153-154. A report of a successful course on the Roman novels-in-translation taught at the University of Ottawa.



C. Stöcker