

---

---

# THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY NEWSLETTER

---

---

Editor:

GARETH SCHMELING  
Department of Classics  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, Florida

Vol. 15 No. 2  
June 1984

Associate Editors:

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

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barbieri, A., *Poetica Petroniana Satyricon* 132.15. Quaderni della Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale 16 (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1983). See review below.

Bastet, F.L., "Petronius en de Schilderkunst," *Hermeneus* 54 (1982) 139-152.

Bauer, J.B., "Semitisches bei Petron," *Festschrift für Robert Muth zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Paul Händel (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck) 17-23.

Bojadžiev, Dimităr, trans., *Petronij Satirikon* (Sofia, Bulgaria: Narodna Kultura, 1983) 151 pages. Translation of *Satyricon* into Bulgarian; no Latin text.

Boerma, R.E.H. Westendorp, "Het Weeuwte van Ephesus (Petron. Sat. 110.6-113.3)," *Hermeneus* 54 (1982) 94-109.

Bremmer, J., "ΜΑΛΧΟΣ 'King' and Trimalchio," *Mnemosyne* 34 (1981) 395-396. The connection of Trimalchio's name with the Semitic root for 'king' would have been understood by Romans; cf. Plin. *NH* 6.120 and the fact that a contemporary Nabataean king was named Malchus. (Astbury)

Coccia, M., "Circe maga dentata (Petron. 126-140)," *QUCC* 12 (1982) 85-90. Coccia speculates that the Circe in Petronius may be close to the wild and primeval Circe of Homer, and that Encolpius' impotence with her may have been caused as much by his fear of her *vagina dentata* as by the *ira Priapi*.

Fiaccadori, G., "Priapo in Egitto (Petronio, Sat. cxxxiii 3)," *PP* 201 (1981) 373-378. At Sat. 133.3 read *litus adorat/septifluum* instead of *Lydus adorat/septifluus*. Bibliographical citation omitted in previous Newsletter.

Flores, E., "Petronio e lo *schedium Lucilianae humilitatis*," *Prosimetrum e Spoudogeloion* (Genova: Università di Genova, Facoltà di Lettere, Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medioevale, 1982) 63-82.

Howell, P., "Some Elucidations of Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*," *Illinois Classical Studies* 9(1984) 35-41. Comments on 43 words or passages.

Hunter, R., *A Study of the Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) ix+136 p. Cambridge Classical Studies series.

Jones, A.H.M., "Slavery in the Ancient World," *Economic History Review* 9 (1956) 193 [185-99]. At Sat. 68.8 *trecentis denariis* is a very low price for a clever slave. Martin Smith and Peter Howells point out that Habinnas quotes the exact price to show what an outstanding purchase he had made. (reference from Howell; see above)

Leeman, A.D., "Petronius en de literatuur van zijn tijd," *Hermeneus* 54 (1982) 110-119.

Magi, F., *Il Calendario Dipinto sotto S. Maria Maggiore* (Rome [Città Vaticana]: Atti Pontif. Accad. Rom. di Archeol. Series 3<sup>a</sup>. Mem. ix. Tip. polig. del Vaticano, 1972). In a note on Sat. 30.3-4 et *duae tabulae ... notabantur* Howell (see above) records that "a calendar (4th century A.D.) painted on the walls of a portico has recently been discovered below S. Maria Maggiore" and described by Magi "who claims that the building was a market" and "that Trimalchio's calendar" has no connection to the one just found. Howell then refers the reader to a review of Magi by Joyce Reynolds, *JRS* 66 (1976) 247-48, who writes: "As Trimalchio's calendar

shows (*Satyr.* 30), a painting of the type discovered is not quite improbable in a private house; and I suspect that several of the questions noted above would be more satisfactorily resolved if that is what we have than in the public setting postulated by Magi" (p. 248).

Müller, K. and Ehlers, W., *Petronius Satyrica: Schelmenszenen* (Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1983<sup>3</sup>). See review below.

Murgatroyd, P., "The Millionaire's Dinner Party," *Akroterion* 26 (1981) 25-40. "These notes have been compiled partly because M.G. Balme's *The Millionaire's Dinner Party* (Oxford University Press, 1973) is read quite widely in schools ... and partly in the hope that they may help to make it read and prescribed still more widely." (p. 25)

Nelson, H.L.W., "Het vulgaire Latijn van Petronius," *Hermeneus* 54 (1982) 82-93.

Oberhelman, S. and Hall, R., "A New Statistical Analysis of Accentual Prose Rhythms in Imperial Latin Authors," *CP* 79 (1984) 114-130. The clausulae of Petronius are used in this survey and compared with those of other earlier and later writers.

van der Paardt, R. Th., "Tot welke genre behoort Petronius' *Satyrikon*?" *Hermeneus* 54 (1982) 68-81.

van der Paardt, R. Th., "Het *Satyrikon* als reisverhaal," *Hermeneus* 54 (1982) 384-386.

Ramin, J. and Veyne, P., "Droit romain et société: les hommes libres qui passent pour esclaves et l'esclavage volontaire," *Historia* 30 (1981) 496-97 [472-97]. Slavery offers some chance of advancement or hope for a better life in the early Roman Empire (Trimalchio), and some choose voluntary slavery (Hermeros, Sat. 57.4 *me dedi in servitute*) as a way to move up. (reference from Howell; see above)

Richlin, A., *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983). See review below.

Rosati, G., "Trimalchione in scena," *Maia* 35 (1983) 213-227. On the theatricality of the *Cena*. (Astbury)

Rouse, R.H., "Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans," *Viator* 10 (1979) 131-160. On p. 147 Rouse notes the existence of three citations from the *Satyricon* and concludes "that the annotator is not borrowing from the *Florilegium Gallicum* but rather from a manuscript of the *Satyricon*." For the significance of this see Müller (1983) 446-447.

Scarcella, A.M., "Analisi strutturale e ideologica dei *Poimenikà* di Longo Sofista," *Letteratura: Percorsi Possibili*, ed. Franca Mariani (Ravenna: Longo Editore, 1983) 163-179.

Schetter, W., "Scaliger, Cujas und der Leidensis Voss. Lat. Q. 86," *Hermes* 111 (1983) 363-371. This ninth century manuscript contains a number of poems, which have been attributed to Petronius (cf. Müller, 1961, XLVII) by Scaliger. Schetter again raises the possibility that they might be the work of Petronius.

Scobie, A., "Eselmensche," *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, Band 4, Lieferung 2/3, ed. Kurt Ranke (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1983) 445-452.

Schrijvers, P.H., "Het *Satyrikon* als reisverhaal," *Hermeneus* 54 (1982) 383-384, 386.

## REVIEWS

K. Müller and W. Ehlers, *Petronius Satyrice: Schelmenszenen*.  
Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1983<sup>5</sup>

a review by T. Wade Richardson

After eighteen years the publication of this third, revised edition by the foremost Petronius editor of this century is a most absorbing event. It is in the familiar *Tusculum* bilingual format with Professor Ehlers' German translation modified to reflect the textual changes. Ehlers updates his bibliography and acknowledgements but otherwise prints his literary essay and notes unchanged. Müller's first edition in 1961 performed many services, but the most controversial feature was the detection and athetization of large numbers of new interpolations by a Carolingian "scholar". Such was the theory of Müller's teacher, Edouard Fraenkel, and already by 1965, for his second edition, Müller allowed much to return. The changes were not explained, fuelling curiosity which now may be satisfied. For in this third edition, to explain his present position on the interpolations (a far more conservative one) Müller gives a frank account of his association with Fraenkel, whose influence was irresistible. We learn that Fraenkel opposed the 1965 restorations and "stuck to his guns" to the last. We are left with the impression that in the present edition, a generation later, Müller has exorcised the spell of his mentor and produced a text entirely his own. And indeed, the combination of Müller's meticulous scholarship and the ripest of ripe reflection has produced a version unlikely to be surpassed until major new manuscripts are discovered. However, one laments the absence of a *Textvergleich*, for then one could have seen almost at a glance the difference between this edition's readings and its predecessors' - *nihil sine labore!*

It is the traditional task of the Appendix to discuss the history of the text, both as an updating of manuscript knowledge and as an implicit justification of the readings chosen. Müller's may be taken in three parts: description (381-416), history (416-447), and the new excursus on the prose rhythm (449-470). Clearly the first section required the least modification, and one accepts the intrusion of practical needs, but it is disconcerting to see such a minimum of recasting. Is it appropriate after twenty years that four of the new fifteen Renaissance Mss. should be dangling, subordinate to the the others, in the same footnote (albeit one enriched by reference to Miss de la Mare's article)?

The description of the L-class witnesses - the editions of sixteenth-century French scholars, and the Mss. available to them - remains unchanged, and one will welcome more on their interrelations. Müller is still obliged to identify Scaliger's handwritten L (Leidensis Scaligeranus 61) as the copy of the *Cuiacianus* Scaliger says he made in 1571. Yet L is so clearly a worked-up, handwritten edition that far more reasonable than assuming Scaliger to be inaccurate is to surmise that he is referring to an actual copy, no longer surviving, made in that year. As to the date of L, a certain relationship to the Tornaesius edition suggests post-1575.

The description of the *Cena* Ms. (H) contains minor additions (after de la Mare), followed by a true change. Müller now rejects his former view that the *Cena* is coincident with Book 15, arguing that it is more likely to have occupied Books 15 and 16. Instrumental in this change was the serious doubt that a single book in this genre could be so long. This unfortunately means rejecting the reliability of three out of the four book-citations extant, for the new view conflicts not only with the superscript and subscript in A but with Poggio's testimony. Müller believes that the scribe made a rather simpler error than previously supposed. Instead of trying to calculate from Poggio's evidence that what followed the *Cena* came from Book 16 he merely took some reference to Books 15 and 16 from the exemplar of H and misapplied it to A, the full vulgate. We are still left with Poggio's own *faux pas*, for which Müller has no explanation other than haste.

Müller's second section, certainly the 'meat' of the appendix, commences with a short review of the character of O with its familiar dislike of pederasty and preference for poetry. Müller shows how the excerptor (for such he was) was usually unperturbed by robbing remarks of their full and proper context but occasionally was moved to tidy up with a small interpolation here (126.11 *ancillam*) or deletion there (126.11 *iocis*). And yet it is all too obvious, Müller realizes, that many of these adjustments were unavailing and pointless.

The witness of the L-class Mss. lies buried in the sixteenth-century editions and it may never be possible to untangle all the readings. But thanks to the work of Professor van Thiel a clearer picture of the class is emerging. It is a picture at odds with Müller's earlier speculation and one which he now accepts: L is itself a medieval edition based on a slightly earlier exemplar (A) which is an excerpt (and not the fullest possible version), incorporating the *florilegia* and a contemporary Ms. of the O-class. Müller's own sets of proofs put this beyond question, and now that the matter is settled it is again worth recording to whom the credit for the "first ascent" should go. I quote from the 1936 unpublished Ms. of E.T. Sage in the Regenstein Library of the University of Chicago: "Not long after John and the florilegia ... c. 55 and perhaps stray readings from other passages were artificially restored from Family II [O], and a half-dozen passages ... were artificially restored from Family IV [φ]... I shall show that the Family I [L] Mss. were no earlier than the thirteenth century and these restorations had taken place by that time" (p. 250). ... "It would appear then that sometime in the 13th century there was in France a Ms. possessing the characteristics just mentioned. If in the process of restoring what could be salvaged of the lost portions a Family II [O] Ms. was consulted, and this is a necessary assumption to account for the recovery of c. 55, the entire Ms. had been emended on the basis of the Family II [O] Ms. used, the result would be just what we have in Family I [L] today" (p. 309).

On the character of A the condition of L in cc. 27.1-37.5 seems to have some bearing. To Müller these entries read more like a set of excerpts than copied fragments. Also, L's use, or rather misuse, of a number of *sententiae* leads Müller to conclude (following M.D. Reeve) that their source is φ, not A, and hence posit that A was not a complete or consecutive ("vollständig") text but a collection of excerpts. This acceptance that A also may be contaminated with O-readings opens up the possibility that O-readings in L do not always come directly from an O-Ms. R L readings agreeing in error against P (π) suggest this course. But how many of these are there? Must we face the prospect of an even obscurer origin for A: either a collection of excerpts or an even earlier "edited" Ms.?

In a useful section (429 ff.) Müller evaluates the integrity of the *Satyricon* and the reliability of L by assessing the compiler's options when we are in a position to know them, viz. in cc. 27.1-37.5 and where Oφ:L. Comparison of A with H extrapolates a discouraging view of the text's *bonitas* when we are dependent on A. Fortunately O when available provides a better reading, and occasionally L has an inspired emendation of its own (112.6 *faciat*, p. 435). Numerous minor differences in the traditions (such as word-inversion, *quid* vs. *quod*, etc.) furnish contradictory evidence on the merits of one source over another, and each case must often be decided on grounds of style and not pedigree. Certainly Müller's painstaking review of the stemmatic possibilities inspires every confidence in his judgment as an editor.

Müller's summary of the condition of the text in the Middle Ages (p. 442 ff.) leaves us with some exciting deductions: at the outset of the period Heiric himself possessed our archetype (ω), and, at the close, A may have existed in Fleury near to the end of the thirteenth century - surely a time almost contemporary with the *Cuiacianus* and *Benedictinus*?

Clausulae in Petronius have somehow escaped a full treatment (although I have seen the slim 1930 M.A. thesis on the topic by E.S. McCague, a pupil of E.T. Sage, on microfilm), and Müller's review of large numbers of favourite clausulae employed by Petronius performs some very useful functions. In general such studies impress upon me the remarkable care that has gone into the composition of even this light-hearted prose. And the finding that the language of the freedmen is generally "unmetrical" and in contrast to that of the educated, adds a new dimension to admire, in a way reminiscent of Petersmann's work. One grasps gratefully, also, at tools which help to make editing decisions more objective. For example, knowledge of metrical preferences helps Müller choose at 132.4 *precibus effusis* over *effusis precibus*, the choice of all other editors. Such opportunities are regrettably few.

This third edition, while still slightly hampered, one feels, within the *Tusculum* format, presents the latest and a very persuasive view of the textual history of Petronius, and offers a text, to the accompaniment of an expanded apparatus, which is a model of sanity and balance - certainly the standard against which others shall have to be measured.

Aroldo Barbieri. *Poetica Petroniana Satyricon* 132.15. Quaderni della Revista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale 16. Edizioni dell'Ateneo, Rome 1983. Pp. 65, n.p.

a review by J.P. Sullivan

Barbieri sets out to address the question of the critical intentions of the author of the *Satyricon* and his position vis-à-vis the other artistic productions and literary debates of the Neronian age. He accepts the view of the majority of Petronian scholars that the twelve lines of Sat. 132.15 are indeed an aside by the author himself -- *un guidizio apologetico - programmatico*. The monograph is really an expanded article, which has unfortunately not been subjected to the severe proof-reading a journal editor would have given it, hence the many typographical errors. Given this, B. presents us with an elaborate attempt to deepen and illustrate the *communis opinio* that the close connection of the short poem not only to its immediate literary context but also to the whole work excludes the possibility that it is "un'esegesi unicamente interna e limitata" (p. 7). It is in fact a key to an understanding of P.'s creative achievement in the *Satyricon*. B. proceeds with a series of discussions of the relevant aspects of the novel. Since there is no table of contents, I provide a guide to B.'s approaches to the problem. These are often siftings of the arguments of recent authors. (1) *Il rapporto Petronio-Encolpio*: an examination of the relationship between the author and his principal character, Encolpius, which attacks Veyne's theory in "Le 'je' dans le *Satyricon*" (*REL*, 1964) of the dual role of Encolpius in the work, first as "Mask" of the author (in the *Cena*), and then as the author's "alibi" in the burlesque episode. (2) *L'episodio Circe-Polieno* (pp. 14 ff.) discusses the deeper sexual implications of the Circe episode. B. argues that much of it is rhetorical parody and those passages where Encolpius' Polyaeus refers to his past crimes should not be taken literally as referring to missing parts of the work. (3) *Il Satyricon, Priapo, La Gravis Ira* (pp. 20 ff.) unsurprisingly concludes that P. is indeed introducing epic parody of the *Odyssey* into his work, as well as parody of other genres, especially elegy and Priapic poetry, citing as prime examples *Ov. Met.* 3.7 and *Priap.* 68. (4) *Nova Simplicitas* (pp. 32 ff.) is an acute discussion of the use and connotations of that word in literary and moral contexts with a long excursus on the symbolism of *Catones*. (5) *Polisemia Petroniana* (pp. 39 ff.) is a linguistic inquiry into P.'s use of double-entendres and sexually loaded locutions, but this does not militate against the conclusion that the narrative style is deliberately down-to-earth, without artificiality or pretensions to seriousness. (6) *Pater veri doctus Epicurus* and (7) *Epicurismo di Petronio* (pp. 42. 50 ff.) discuss whether P. was a practical or practising Epicurean in life and contrasts his *nova simplicitas* with the *prisca simplicitas* of the Stoics and the consequences of this for the estimation of P.'s narrative mode and Seneca's reaction to the author. (8) *Moralità del Satyricon* (pp. 56 ff.) offers us B.'s estimate of the *Satyricon's* intentions. It is, partly at least, an amusing attack on contemporary philosophy and writing of a certain sort. This underlies the choice of Menippean satire. P. would have used the genre adopted by Seneca for his savage attack on Claudius and his court to offer his audience *una morale dell'immoralità* (p. 60). The aim was to discredit, comically, undogmatically, but severely, the incoherence of unquestioning moralism and so diminish at court and in society in general the influence of an irritating and arrogant Stoic, Seneca.

B.'s monograph is hardly revolutionary and it is chiefly useful for the information it contains and his willingness to criticize and elaborate on the views of some recent critics.

Amy Richlin. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983. pp. xi + 289.

a review by Brent W. Sinclair

For Richlin the garden of Priapus is a metaphor for the obscene, the god himself a symbol for the virile, threatening male figure from which the entire spectrum of Roman sexual humor emanates (Chapter 3). In order to fix its boundaries she gives due attention to the question of what the Romans

considered obscene as opposed to erotically appealing (Chapters 2-3). Her major interest, however, is in those who at one time or another entered it: Catullus, Ovid, Martial, anonymous writers of Priapic verse and Pompeian graffiti and the entire range of satirists from Lucilius to Juvenal, all of whom she views as exemplifying in some degree what Priapus himself stands for (Chapters 4-7). Brief appendices on adultery and homosexuality follow her summary of conclusions (Chapter 8).

It is unfortunate that of the several authors examined in this book Petronius comes off the worst. Richlin gives him several pages, most of those in a chapter entitled "Sexual Satire" where she touches upon various subjects including the sexuality of his principal characters and his depiction of freedmen and women (190-195). There is no detailed discussion of individual passages, no attempt at novelty in methods or conclusions: we are told of the ways in which Trimalchio is mocked (194) and how Encolpius is portrayed as a comic Odysseus (192), yet the boy of Pergamum received comment in only a single sentence, the widow of Ephesus in not many more (195). The footnotes too are thin. Heinze goes unmentioned as the proponent of the view that Petronius aimed to parody the Greek novel; critics of Arrowsmith's "Luxury and Death" are altogether ignored; only Gill and Bagnani are cited on the issue of authorial privilege. Richlin finds the distinction between Petronius and Encolpius "useful" (n. 53, 254) but abandons Gill and ignores Beck (*Phoenix* xxvii 50 ff.) in asserting that 132.15 "applies...to the work Petronius is writing" (5). In a similar vein she tends to see the tirades of Agamemnon and Eumolpus on literary decline as "genuine views of the author" (192-193) in spite of Kennedy (*AJP* lxxxix 171 ff.) and the egregious errors in chapter 8 (Walsh, *The Roman Novel* 96f.) which undermine everything Eumolpus says there and thereafter. But the extent of Petronius' involvement in his work informs a larger and more slippery question: what is the nature of satire in the *Satyricon*? Richlin offers no definition (Beck, *MH* xxxix 206 ff. is now instructive), only the view that the work paints a dark world quite devoid of redeeming light (195). Of course that is a moot point -- most likely a sense of humor on the part of the reader is illumination enough -- though if it is correct then surely the *Satyricon's* alleged misogyny (190, 194) is anything but obtrusive.

Other authors and subjects fare better. Richlin is very much at home with Catullus, for example, whose complex of sexual and related images she unravels with considerable flair (144-156). She does a commendable job of Cicero (18-26, 96-104), the *Priapea* (116-127, 141-143) and Lucilius (164-174), and her remarks on Ovid (156-163) and Persius (185-190) are generally useful if frequently superficial -- an inevitable consequence of the tremendous disparity between matter and the space allotted to it. Her Chapter 2 is necessary reading for all who have been puzzled by the dirth of complimentary references to the female sexual anatomy in Latin literature; however, W.C. McDermott's interpretation (*Athenaeum* xxxviii 409) of the *pyxis Caeliana* of Quintilian 6.3.25 (cf. *Pro Caelio* 69) would suggest that there was at least one Roman who did not think that "women's genitalia...are more obscene than erotic" (56). Chapter 3 on theories of humor from Freud forward is equally fascinating, though its relevance to the larger subject at hand is not always completely clear.

A few oddities, errors and omissions deserve brief mention. 2ff.: from this discussion of *apologiae* Ovid, *Trist.* 2 is conspicuously absent. 18ff.: with *Ad Fam.* 9.22 see also *Orator* 154. 53-55 131ff.: reference is lacking to Sullivan's useful article (*Philologus* cxliii 288ff.) on the sexual content in Martial. 151: the logic of the argument that *cacata carta* in Catullus 36.1 denotes Volusius' "anal/oral receptivity" is elusive to say the least. 159: at *Amores* 2.14.17-18 Ovid is using an *exemplum* to argue the case against abortion, not "suggesting that Venus might have wished to abort the Julian gens". 173: Metellus' speech in support of marriage (Gell. 1.6) is more than "semiserious" (witness its use by Augustus in Livy, *Per.* 59); there is no reason to doubt his sincerity on the matter of *salus perpetua* vs. *brevis voluptas*. 196: in Juvenal 1.2-3 Cordus is most certainly an epic poet, and *togatas* (sc. *fabulas*) are not "historical dramas". 223-225: on the epigraphical evidence for Roman homosexuality see Griffin, *JRS* lxxvi 102.

## THE GREEK NOVEL

by B.P. Reardon

The following list - not necessarily complete - contains items which have appeared since the last report on this subject (*Newsletter* 12.2/13, May 1982). For convenience I have repeated, briefly, some items that have appeared in intervening numbers, mostly hidden in the general Bibliography; some announced as forthcoming in the previous report are also repeated, now with full references. PSN = *Petronian Society Newsletter*.

## I. GENERAL

Anderson, Graham, *Eros Sophistes* (PSN May 1982), reviewed PSN Dec. 1983, Sinclair.

Gärtner, Hans, "Der antike Roman. Bestand und Möglichkeiten," *Vorschläge und Anregungen*, ed. P. Neukam (München: Bayerischer Schulbuch-Verlag, 1980) 24-56. Not only a "well-balanced introduction to the ancient novels", as reported in PSN Dec. 1983; it also gets inside Rohde's *Der griechische Roman* better than any other account known to me of that dominating book, and as it were lights it up from inside. A characteristically authoritative article.

Hägg, Tomas, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, and Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983) (PSN May 1982 and Dec. 1983). Reviewed enthusiastically by Ken Dowden, *G&R* 31(1984) 80-81, less warmly by Brian Vickers, *TLS* (April 20, 1984) 427. (see below).

Kuch, H., "Zu den Entstehungsbedingungen des antiken Romans," *Concilium Eirene XVI* (Proceedings of the 16th International Eirene Conference, Prague 31.8 - 4.9.1982), ed. P. Oliva and A. Frolíková (Prague: Kabinet pro studia řecká, ýmská a latinská ČSAV, 1983) vol. 1, 320-25. The social circumstances of the Hellenistic world are what is most relevant.

Ruiz-Montero, C., "The Structural Pattern of the Ancient Greek Romances and the Morphology of the Folktale of V. Propp," *Fabula* 22(1981) 228-38. PSN Dec. 1983.

Sandy, G.N., "Classical Forerunners of the Theory and Practice of Prose in France: Studies in the Narrative Form of Minor French Romances of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", *A&A* 28(1982) 169-91. PSN May 1983.

Socas, F., "La fortuna en la novela antigua" *Unidad y pluralidad en el mundo antiguo*, Actas del VI congreso español de estudios clásicos [Sevilla, 6-11 abril de 1981](Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1983) vol. 2, pp. 63-66. (Not seen: *Gnomon* 55.6 [1983] Bibl. Beil. 3.62).

Vickers, Brian, "The Ingredients of a Romance", *Times Literary Supplement* (April 20, 1984) 427. Review article on ancient romance, reviewing Hägg (see above) and Hunter (see below); informed and sensible discussion.

## II. AUTHORS

*Achilles Tatius*

Laplace, M., "Achille Tatius, *Leucippé et Clitophon* II.14. 8: sur un fleuve prétendument 'Ibérique'," *AC* 52 (1983) 243-45. Read Ἰουρδικός for Ἰβηρικός.

Laplace, M., "Achilleus Tatius, *Leucippé et Clitophon*: P. Oxyrhynchos 1250," *ZPE* 53(1983) 53-59. Both in its readings and in its order of narration the papyrus offers a better text than the ms. vulgate preferred by editors.

Laplace, M., "Légende et fiction chez Achille Tatius: les personnages de *Leucippé* et de *Io*," *BAGB*(1983.3) 311-18. Starts from a note of Merkelbach's (*Roman und Mysterium* 115 n.2). *Leucippe*, in effect, is *Io* (= Europa = Isis, says M.); her adventures reflect the legend of *Io*.

*Chariton*

Reardon, B.P., "Une nouvelle édition de *Chariton*", *REG* 95 (1982) 157-73. PSN Dec. 1983.

*Heliodorus*

Futre, M.P., "Essai littéraire et stylistique d'*Héliodore*, *Les Ethiopiennes*, V.14," *Euphrosyne* 11(1981-82) 102-110. PSN Dec. 1983.

Morgan, J.R., "History, Romance and Realism in the *Aithiopia* of Heliodorus," *Classical Antiquity* (formerly *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*) 1.2(1982) 221-65. PSN May 1982.

Morgan, J.R., "Noctes Aethiopiae: Notes on the Text of Heliodorus' *Aithiopia* 9-10," *Philologus* 127(1983) 87-111. "Improvement on details" over Rattenbury/Lumb; thirty-four passages.

Pouilloux, J., "Les *Ethiopiennes* d'*Héliodore* et la réalité delphique", paper read to the Société des Études Grecques, Paris, May 14, 1984. Heliodorus shows real knowledge of social history. Theagenes is an Aenian (2.34); the Aenians and their capital Hypata were in fact important in the second and third centuries. Heliodorus' account of the cult of Neoptolemus represents historical fact, as demonstrated by archaeological evidence. Some of this important discussion will appear in *Mélanges Lerat*, ed. P. Lévêque, Besançon.

Rogier, A., "Le roi d'Ethiopie et les Syénéens chez *Héliodore*," *REG* 95(1982) 453-60. Heliodorus 9.26.3, Hydaspes remits the Syenaeans' taxes after overcoming Oroondates, although not claiming sovereignty over them; this establishes him as magnanimous and philanthropic.

Sandy, G.N., "Characterization and Philosophical Decor in Heliodorus' *Aethiopia*," *TAPA* 112(1982) 141-67. Deals with the characterization of Calasiris and Platonist views expressed by Calasiris. These views are rather an aspect of the characterization of C. than coherent philosophical doctrine; "philosophy functions in the *Aethiopia* as decor rather than as message or *clef*" (141).

Sandy, G.N., *Heliodorus*, Boston, Twayne, 1982. Reviewed in PSN Dec. 1983 (Levin).

*Longus*

Calder, W.M., "Longus I.2: The She-Goat Nurse," *CP* 78 (1983) 50-51. Realistic, not fanciful; the right formula, so to speak.

Effe, Bernd, "Longos: zur Funktionsgeschichte der Bukolik in der römischen Kaiserzeit," *Hermes* 110 (1982) 65-84. *D&C* is more pastoral than novel, a townie's attempt to get away from it all; but essentially phony, "a literary picnic". E. Rohde was more right than G. Rohde.

Green, Peter, "Longus, Antiphon, and the Topography of Lesbos," *JHS* 102(1982) 210-14. PSN May 1982.

Hunter, R.L., *A Study of "Daphnis and Chloe"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) [Cambridge Classical Studies]. pp. 136. Intended as "a basic guide to the literary and rhetorical background against which this work was written" and to "combine information of a kind which is usually found in a continuous commentary with an outline of the interpretative directions in which that information points". Reviewed quite favorably by Brian Vickers, *TLS* (April 20, 1984) 427 (see above).

Reeve, M.D., Teubner edition, Leipzig, 1982. At once becomes the standard text. Reviewed by J.R. Morgan, *CR* 34(1984) 24-25.

Scarcella, A.M., "Analisi struttutale e ideologica dei 'Poimeniká' di Longo Sofista," in F. Mariani ed., *Letteratura: percorsi possibili* (Ravenna: Longo Editore, 1983) 163-179. Cf. earlier work by the author. Structuralist analysis after Genette and Eco: narratological categories of narrative duration, mode, voice; ideologically, nature predominates over culture; with *explication* of initial sections of Bk. I.

Wouters, A., "De *Daphnis en Chloe* van Longus: een Kennismaking met de Griekse Roman," *Klêio* 13.4(1983) 165-98 (Leuven, Belgium). *Haute vulgarisation* in Flemish; not just Longus but a general view of the whole genre. Perhaps not readily accessible in any sense, but a bit of persistence will reveal a very sound general treatment, thorough, up-to-date, and with extensive bibliography in the notes. The volume also includes articles on *Daphnis & Chloe* in other parts: I. Bossuyt, "Maurice Ravel en het Ballet 'Daphnis et Chloe'" (199-211), and B. Van De Wijer, "Enkele picturale Voorstellingen van *Daphnis en Chloe*" (212-20) [cf. Hägg's Pictorial Supplement, 214-27].

*Xenophon Ephesus*

Albiani, M.G., "Xenophon Ephesius 1.8.3," *Museum Criticum* 15-17(1980-82) 197-98 (not seen; *Gnomon* 55.6 [1983] Bibli. Beil. 4.93).

O'Sullivan, J.N., "Notes on Xenophon of Ephesus Book I," *RhM* 125(1982) 54-58. Textual notes on thirteen passages.

Ruiz-Montero, C., "Una interpretación del 'estilo καλ' de Jenofonte de Efeso," *Emerita* 50(1982) 305-23 (not seen; *Gnomon* 55.6[1983] Bibli. Beil. 4.93).

*Others*

Kortekaas, G.A.A., ed., *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (Groningen: Bouma's Boekhuis, 1984) pp. xxxi + 472. Text edition of the two principal Latin recensions (A, B), with extremely full prolegomena (274 pp.: see 132-46 + 264-74 for summary). The recensions are printed on facing pages. In this exhaustive study (cf. *Erotica Antiqua* 45-46) K. concludes on a Greek original, and attempts a description of it 125-31. "In its original form the HA was a typical representative of the Greek romance...it possessed two specific features, viz. astrology and a certain vague foundation on historical fact, and ... it may be taken to have come into being at the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 3rd century, most probably in Syria".

## III. FRAGMENTS

Beck, R., "Soteriology, the Mysteries, and the Ancient Novel: Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* as a Test-Case," in U. Bianchi and M.J. Vermaseren, edd., *La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'impero romano* (Leiden: Brill, 1982) 527-40. *PSN* Dec. 1983.

Browne, G.M., "Ad Lolliani Phoenicica," *ZPE* 46(1982) 135-43. On BI.

Hägg, T., "The Parthenope Romance Decapitated?" *SO* 59 (1984) 61-92. "The tales of the Egyptian martyrs have the character of decapitated Greek romances" (attributed to J.W.B. Barns). The *Martyrdom of St. Parthenope*, which shows several features found in Chariton, appears to be based on *Metiochus & Parthenope*, which is also close to Chariton, and which did have a *Nachleben* in the East (an eleventh-century Persian verse romance is based on it). H. offers a reconstruction *exempli gratia*, based on the *Martyrdom*, of *Met. & Parth.* An important and interesting piece of genuine research, impeccably conducted.

O'Sullivan, J.N. and Beck, W.A., "P. Oxy. 3319: the Sesonchosis Romance," *ZPE* 45(1982) 71-83. A further attempt at reconstruction, after West and Luppe (*PSN* May 1982).

O'Sullivan, J.N., "Some Thoughts on Lollianus fr. BI," *ZPE* 50(1983) 7-11. Cf. Browne, above.

Parsons, P.J., "Facts from Fragments," *G&R* 29(1982) 184-95. Recent papyrological contributions to literary history; a paragraph (p. 190) on novel fragments - *Met. & Parth.*, *Phoen.*, *Iolaus*, *Tesenuphis* (= *Tinouphis*, *PSN* May 1982).

## ANNOUNCEMENT

Professor James Tatum, Department of Classics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755, U.S.A. announces preliminary plans for the second International Conference on the Ancient Novel to be held at Dartmouth in July 1987 or 1988. Tatum had originally planned to hold the conference in 1986, but certain difficulties in scheduling have led him to reconsider and to look forward to 1987 or 1988. Anyone interested in this conference should contact Professor Tatum.

## NACHLEBEN

Dick, Manfred, *Der junge Heinse in seiner Zeit* (München: W. Fink Verlag, 1980). An interesting contribution to the personality, life, and background of Heinse and his translation of the *Satyricon* (especially 96-119). Heinse's teacher, F.J. Riedel, had already dealt with Petronius, and in his letters "Über das Publicum" (1768) he gives an apology for the "unzüchtigen" author (p. 113): "Ein billiger Richter wird diesen Autor leicht entschuldigen, der mitten in dem Getümmel der Höflinge eines einfältigen Claudius und eines viehischen Nero lebte, der selbst eine Zeitlang der Aufseher über die Lustbarkeiten des Hofes war, und der noch weit unreiner müste schreiben haben, um seine Schilderungen den Originalen völlig ähnlich zu machen." (Stöcker)

## NOTES

More on Petronius and Anthony Powell

by Barry Baldwin

Since Raymond Astbury and myself published our notes on this subject in *PSN* 10.2 (1979) and 12.1 (1981), Powell himself has brought out the fourth and final volume of his memoirs, *The Strangers All Are Gone* (London, 1982). This yields two *Petroniana*, an aphorism and an anecdote, that may be of interest to colleagues in the field. I take them from the Penguin omnibus edition of Powell's memoirs (London, 1983). First, in discussing his own marginal involvement in the famous trial of Lady Chatterley's Lover at the Old Bailey in 1959, Powell (p. 369) observes that "Lawrence, capable of an occasional joke in his letters, is consistently without humour in his books, a failing rarely if ever to be found in novelists of the highest class from Petronius to Proust." In 1965 Powell was coerced into giving a lecture at Cornell. He tells us (pp. 383-4) that "I fought back to the extent of saying that if I were forced to give a lecture I could do so only by including a reading of certain passages translated from the *Satyricon* of Petronius. A search was made. It turned out that the only English translation of the *Satyricon* to be found in the libraries of Cornell was a comparatively recent one rendered in Twenties gangster slang. I was told afterwards that Petronius read aloud in an English accent, and transferred to the language of an Edward G. Robinson or George Raft gangster movie, was bizarre in the extreme." We can well believe that! I wonder what translation of Petronius is meant whether the library of Cornell was really so impoverished, and whether any reader of *PSN* was actually present at this surely memorable and very Petronian occasion? In supplement, in case anyone missed it, and since I do not think it has appeared (yet) in the *PSN* bibliographies, I would draw colleagues' attention to T.P. Wiseman, 'The Centaur's Hoof: Anthony Powell and the Ancient World,' *Classical and Modern Literature* 2.1 (1981), 7-23, a delicious paper with (pp. 16-7) some Petronian content. Also, pertinent items might turn up in the *Anthony Powell Communication's* newsletter published by Professor Nancy Cutbirth, Department of English, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.



Tech/Klemke



Tech/Klemke