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Lendakis, Vassilis, trans. Choraios Aphrodisios. Chaires kai Kalirrhoe (Athens: To Rodakio, 1995) 152 pp. Translation into Modern Greek. This is the first translation of this novel into Modern Greek. The translator says that he used "more than one edition" and refers to the edition (plus translation) by W. Blake (1938-9) and the one by G. Molinié and A. Billault (19892, Budé). The translation (pp. 7-137) is followed by a "Note of the Translator" (pp. 141-6), where he speaks - in a very concise way - about the author and his time (i.e. A.D.). He thinks that the story of Chaires and Callirrhoe is not a kind of "best seller literature," like the French "romans de conciergerie": there are in the novel so many references to classical texts, that only the educated reader could know and understand. Finally, he emphasizes the optimistic message of the novel: the goddess (Venus-Aphrodite) always cares for her faithful followers. (A. Sakellariou)


Müller, K., ed., Petronius: Satyricon Reliquiae (Leipzig/ Stuttgart: Teubner 1995). The Latin text of the Satyrica represents a reprint of Müller's 1983 Artemis-Verlag edition and is listed as the 4th edition. For this 4th edition the publisher allowed Müller to write a new Praefatio (III-XXVIII) and re-do and expand a section of the Fragmenta (pp. 184-195). This volume should be designated Müller, Petronius, 4th edition, Teubner.


Perkins, J., The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era (London: Routledge, 1995). Perkins "examines how and why Christians represented themselves as a community of sufferers ... (and) analyzes why themes of martyrdom and bodily suffering came to be so prevalent in early Christian texts ... (and) shows how a new form of human self-understanding was developing — the perception of the self as sufferer." With frequent references to Apuleius, Chariton, and Xenophon of Ephesus, Perkins sets the suffering heroes/heroines of ancient novels into context.


Sakellariou, A., “Varia Petroniana,” Παράγεις 37 (1995) 62-75. S. points out the similarities between the language of the *Satyricon* and Modern Greek: blessing and imprecations, superstitions (pp. 62-70); notes by Errikos Skassis (on a copy of Porrochat’s edition of the *Satyricon* (pp. 70-71); note on the nationality of proper names (pp. 71-73); a discussion of the possible connection between the stories of the Widow of Ephesos and the resurrection of Christ.


Salinari, M., “Un Indovino di Vaglia e un Palazzo Meraviglioso (Satyr. 75. 10-11 e 77. 4-5),” RCMC 36 (1994) 359-367.


Slater, N., “From harena to Cena: Trimalchio’s capis (Sat. 52.1-3),” CQ 44 (1994) 549-550. Suggests that Trimalchio’s Daedalus shutting Niobe in the Trojan Horse was a misunderstanding of a depiction of Daedalus enclosing Pasiphaë in the wooden cow; he refers to Suetonius *Nero* 12.2 for a depiction of this scene in Nero’s *Ludi Maximi* of 57 A.D.


Sütterlin, Alex, Petronius Arbiter und Federico Fellini: ein strukturanalytischer Vergleich. Studien zur klassischen Philologie 97 (Frankfurt: Lang, 1996) 239 pp. Sütterlin has divided his work into two major parts: Erster Teil: *Petronii Arbirit Satyricon*, which in turn is arranged into two large sections; “die Erzählheiten” and “die Textfelder”; and Zweiter Teil: *Fellini Satyricon* with seven divisions. There is an appendix in which Sütterlin sets the text of the *Satyricon* next to that of the film dialogue; the book concludes with an excellent bibliography of each *Satyricon*. Sütterlin dissects the *Satyricon* in a way in which only the younger generation, accustomed to approach texts visually, could have done. The results are most revealing. Even those uninterested in the cinema will profit from this new “reading” of Fellini. (To be reviewed at a later date.)


NACHLEBEN

Raymond Astbury reports (with photographic evidence) that there exists in Sorrento (1994) a store named “Petronius Shoes” (sic!).


Rod Boroughs notes that Princess Caraboo, a 1994 U.K. movie, tells the story, based on fact, of a servant girl who in 1817 managed to hoodwink the British aristocracy into believing that she was a Javanese princess. At a lavish costume ball presided over by the Prince Regent, the guests were entertained with a performance of Charles Dibdin’s 1769 opera inspired by Petronius’ *The Ephesian Matron*.

London Unexpurgated, a companion volume to *New York Unexpurgated* (New York: Grove Press, 1968), lists Petronius as the author but seems ignorant of that worthy Roman. However, in a chapter entitled “Where the Pick-Ups Are,” Petronius makes this startling revelation: “In the Garden of Remembrance in Golder’s Green Crematorium some young men have re-enacted the tale of the ‘Widow of Ephesus’ and discovered that grief was seldom inconsolable”. One observes that the authorities in Golder’s Green are as lax as was the Roman soldier guarding the crucified men in Sat. 111. *London Unexpurgated*. Format and Name PETRONIUS © Julian Press Inc. (London: New English Library 1969). Rod Boroughs asks if the name Petronius can be copyrighted.

**DAS GASTMAHL DES TRIMALCHIO**

EINE THEATRALT-GASTRONOMISCHE GESAMTINSZENIERUNG DIONYSOS MEETS APOLLO!

TREFFEN SIE TRIMALCHIO UND ERLEBEN SIE EINE ORGIE DER SUPERLATIVE!

report by Brigitte Egger

Attracted by this advertisement and eager for an Apollonian-Dionysian-Petronian orgy (possibly reminiscent of certain PS
parties at Classics conventions?), I attended a performance of the Cena Trimalchionis on January 19, 1996, in a Munich fringe theater (FestSpelHaus). As promised, this theatrical-gastronomic comprehensive production was quite an experience. In a hall arranged as a large triclinium, endless platters of delicious food were served by Roman-style slaves and gladiators to an audience asked to dress in togas at the door and to choose appropriate names for the evening. Lupus Maximus, Nero Augustus, Arminius, Grunio, several Clodias and Lesbias, even Sappho were among the elected identities of the spectators/diners (thus revealing themselves as mainly Latin professionals and students, I'd venture) reclining on the couches and relaxing more and more as the wine flowed freely.

The emphasis was definitely on the gastronomic part of the orgy, though some Petronian features were included, notably the roast pig filled with sausages and impromptu story-telling; the entertainment offered by saucy slaves freely exchanging banter with the audience and by a graceful belly-dancer was definitely in the spirit (if not in the text) of the Cena. Trimalchio was most splendid to look at in his flamboyant costume and did indeed meet his guests in person, as announced; late in the evening, nobody minded that he had not read his Satyricon too closely. [Report in Süddeutsche Zeitung]

CONFERENCES


PAPERS READ AT CAMWS, 10-13 April 1996

Chew, K., “εξαδείασεια παρθενοι: the Chaste and Chastened in Heliodorus’ Aithiopika.”
McMahon, J., “Paralysin cave: Folk Medicinal Elements in the Satyricon.”
Wright, T., “Guess Who’s Coming to Dinner: Literary Allusion in Petronius, Plato, and Xenophon.”

PAPERS READ AT APA, 23-30 December 1995

Bloomer, M., “Silencing the Novel.”
Stephens, S., “Fragmentation and Reintegration in Apuleius’ Golden Ass.”
Cooper, K., “Fragmentation and Recognition in the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions.”
Vine, B., “The Resonance of a Prose Rhythm: Apuleius, Met. 2.29.”

ANCIENT FICTION AND EARLY CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH NARRATIVE WORKING GROUP

The Group met for two sessions at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, 18-21 November 1995, in Philadelphia. One of the sessions was open and thus had papers on several topics. They were:

Kate Cooper, “Romance and the Dysfunctional Family: Incest, Rivalry, and Repudiation in Pagan and Christian Novels and their Parallels.”
Kathryn S. Chew, “Xenophon of Ephesus’ Ephesian Tale: Virtual Reality or Reader’s Digest Version?”
Dennis R. MacDonald, “Secrecy and Recognition in the Odyssey and Mark: Where Wrede Went Wrong.”

The second session was focused on the Life of Aesop and featured the following papers:

Lawrence M. Wills, “The Prophetic Protagonist in Aesop, Peregrinus, and Mark.”

At this year’s SBL meeting, which will be held in New Orleans from November 23-26, the Ancient Fiction Group will again have two sessions, one open and the other focused on a specific topic. That topic will center on two recent books on ancient narrative: Judith Perkins, The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era (Routledge, 1995), and Lawrence M. Wills, The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World (Cornell University Press, 1995). Plans are also underway to publish a
selection of the papers presented at the Group's meeting since 1992. Persons interested in the Group may contact the Co-Chairs: Ronald F. Hock, School of Religion, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0355, or Richard I. Pervo, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 2122 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60201.

NOTTINGHAM


WORK IN PROGRESS

C. Panayotakis is working on a new edition and commentary of the Roman mime and with his brother Stelios is translating P.G. Walsh's *The Roman Novel* into modern Greek.

Peter Habermehl is planning to write a commentary on the second half of the *Satyricon*, c. 79-141.

THE GREEK NOVEL

By B.P. Reardon

Once again, many or most of these entries have already appeared in *PSN* and/or *APh*; quite a number have been more or less lifted from those august journals. And unashamedly: do you keep *APh* by your bedside? Perhaps it is still worthwhile to gather them together; they give an overall picture of what is happening in the Wonderful World of the Greek Novel. I regard these reports as a way for me to keep abreast, and fondly imagine that if I like to do that, perhaps others do too; this last decade or so it has not been all that easy to keep up in this field. Certainly I find it of value to look at the whole picture over a couple of years or so. No doubt I miss things, but not a great deal, I hope.

Two points. First, ICAN III? Is it coming, slouching towards - where? (in alphabetical order) Groningen, Lisbon, Oxford? I have heard all three mentioned, although not in every case by the person(s) upon whom the work would fall. Another get-together would be fun. What would it be like? Theoretical, like much of ICAN II? *Strengh philologisch*? Guesses to Gareth Schmeling, who will give a prize for the best guess (a first edition of Rohde). Second, do I detect a certain slackening in the flow of books and articles? Have we reached a plateau? Or is it simply that this report covers only two years since the last one, which covered three? In short - to sum up the two topics - where do we go from here? On which, I commend a review article which landed on my desk as I wrote these lines, John Morgan in *CPPh* (1996) 63-73, "The Ancient Novel at the End of the Century: Scholarship since the Dartmouth Conference." Really, at bottom we are talking, like all critics, about ourselves. It may be a matter of where does the discipline of Classics go from here?

To our muntons.

COLLECTIONS


Stephens, S.A. and Winkler, J.J., *Ancient Greek Novels: the Fragments*, Princeton 1995. At last! And very welcome too, despite the long delay, which appears to be due to the press; no doubt not an easy text to print but they announced it in 1991 already. "This book is intended to combine two normally exclusive modes of scholarship: the edition of texts, and literary interpretation. We wished to make this material available for the nonspecialist and the non-Greek reader, as well as to provide adequate and easily accessible texts." Can you do both? The purest purist may regret that this is not in all respects as austere as a late-nineteenth-century German *Fragmente* - too many concessions to the less expert; but otherwise, would it have found a publisher? This specialist in Greek novels - not the fragments, he is not a papyrologist - is glad to have so much information and expert commentary gathered together in convenient form. There is plenty in the book for both kinds of reader. Some two dozen texts, some of them "ambiguous", in full editions, and information about another two dozen; extensive introductions, testimonia (but in English), bibliography; no index verborum (*v. López Martínez supr.*). Admirably judged introduction, which rightly emphasizes the difference the more lurid fragments have made to our picture of the genre.


CONFERENCE ACTA

Hofmann, H., ed., *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, vol. VI, Groningen 1995. Papers on Xen. Cyr. (M. Reichel), Achilles Tatius (E. Mignogna, H.L. Morales), and Alexander-Romance (R. Stemmen), *q.v. infr.*; and six papers on the Latin novels. For a time these Colloquia were rumoured to be endangered, but I am told that they will continue: once a year now, in May, over two days (two and a bit in fact, this year). They are very agreeable and worthwhile occasions; gratitude is due to their organisers, Heinz Hofmann and now Maaike Zimmerman.

NOVEL, GENERAL


Bowersock, G.W., *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*, Berkeley 1994, UC Press. The 1991 Sathers. The title and the author's name say it all. A correspondent observes, "you know the field has arrived when he takes it on;" yes, but the author tells me that he wrote his senior thesis at Harvard on Aulepus's *Metamorphoses*, and one of his earliest articles was on historical elements in it. Imaginative, bold, erudite, and predictably controversial - it would be tame if it were not. A major contribution for anyone interested, as we should all be, in the novel's social context as well as its literary form.


Holzberg, N., ed., *Der griechische Briefroman:Gattungstypologie und Textanalyse*. Essays by Holzberg (analysis of genre), C. Arndt (comparative/modern epistolary novels), N.C. Dührsen (*The Seven Wise Men in Diogenes Laertius*), S. Merkель/A. Beschorner (*Phalaris*), A. Beschorner (bibl. of "letters of famous men"). More "fringe" material, from the same stable as Aesop.


Morgan, J.R., "The Ancient Novel at the end of the Century," *CP* 1996 63-73. See introductory remarks above; assessment of work at and since ICAN-II, and acute analysis of current state of play: has post-structuralist theory reached an impasse, in this field?


Orlandini, M., "Note sul romanzo greco: il paesaggio urbano tra retorica e storiografia," *A. & R.* 38 (1993) 57-78. Echopraxies (noch einmal echopraxies...) show that real centre of interest is in human beings, not town or (still less) country.

Pernet, L., "Nouveaux regards sur le roman antique," *RPh* 67 (1993) 103-106. P., a formidable heavyweight in the field of ancient rhetoric, comments, il propos of recent work on the novel, on the considerable grip of rhetoric on the form: "sur le roman, flotte l'esprit d'Hermogène."

Plazenet, L., "Le Nil et son delta dans les romans grecs," *Phoenix* 49 (1995) 5-22. Novelists are not interested in the Nile in itself, or other such phenomena; we should look not for realism, but for literary, narrative purposes, an "investissement narratologique" (cf. Orlandini supr.).


Schmidt, V., "Romand Mysterium". Een opzienbare, omstreden these," in *Hermeneus* (v. supr.) 78-82.

Vessey, D.W.T., "Thoughts on 'The Ancient Novel', or What Ancients? What Novels?", *BICS* 38 (1991-93) 144-61. Free-ranging, interesting discussion: 'it is we, as readers, who make the ancient novel ancient.'


ACHILLES TATIUS


Morales, H.L., "The Taming of the View: Natural Curiosities in Leukippe and Kleitophon", *GNC* VI (v. supr.) 39-50. They are important, not marginal: "the novel becomes...an exotic zoo of animals and women - of natural curiosities." Perhaps the APA should put Ach. Tat. on its Index.
AESCOP


ALEXANDER-ROMANCE


ANTONIUS DIOGENES


CHARITON

Hernández Lara, C., Estudios sobre el aticismo de Carítón de Afrodisias, Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1994. V. PSN 1995 3 (s.n. Lara) for outline. An important work, more careful than Papanikolaou’s Charitonstudien, through not covering quite the same ground, and arriving at a more sensible conclusion (Chariton late 1st C. A.D.). Such studies can never provide “proof” of an author’s date, because they cannot measure the degree of his literary ambition as well, but they do limit the possibilities for error to some extent. The whole question of Atticism has never yet been studied properly (pace Schmid); but is extremely important for the novels, all of them. Get your graduate students to work (this book was a thesis in 1989) - if they know enough classical Greek to start with...
Hernández Lara, C., “El orden de palabras en Carítón de Afrodisias,” Mytria 2 (1987) 83-89 (summary in English 93). Evidently work in progress for the preceding entry. Usually SVO = NT/popular, but not much more often than the more archaic SOV - nor yet was archaic as the Atticists; literary koine. Which figures. (Mytria from the town of Murcia).
Marini, N., v. Fragments infr. for article on Chione, of which Chariton may be the author.

HISTORIA APOLLONII REGIS TYRI


HELIODORUS

Bowersock, G.W., “The Aethiopica of Heliodorus and the Historia Augusta,” in G. Bonamente & F. Paschoud edd., Historia Augusta Colloquium Genovense, Bari 1994 43-52. Not available to me, but this will be a close relative of Appendix B. of B.’s Fiction as History (v. supr.), on the date of Hld., cf. my Greek Novel report in PSN 1994 12 s.m.n. Hld./Chuvin: Hld. is latter 4th C. after all. And since the matter has arisen, look in due course for yet another demonstration of that, of a quite different kind.
Galli, L., “Amarsi come Alceste e Admeto (un’ allusione ad Euripide in Eliodoro),” SIFC 87 (1994) 197-207. Wider scope than the title suggests: use and functions of tragic models and allusions, in others as well as Hld. A rich vein, exploited often enough; it points up the literacy of the novelists.

LONGUS

Bernsdorff, H., “Longus und Lukian (zu Verae Historiae 2.5),” WS 106 (1993) 35-44. B.’s position is that Lucian’s description of the Islands of the Blest includes elements borrowed from Longus, so Longus must be dated earlier than Lucian. I see no reason why Longus should not be earlier than he is usually placed, say third quarter of the 2nd C., but I see no reason either why he should not be c. 200 as people usually say. But I cannot see any reason to think it “plausibler” (40) that Lucian used Longus than the other way round. Surely the koinos topos of the locus amoenus was koinos enough? Both of them used a literary tradition. Surprise, surprise.
Daudé, C., "Le roman de Daphnis et Chloé ou Comment ne pas être un 'animal politique'"., in Mêlènes Bernard (v. supr. Hid/Woronoff) 203-25.

Epstein, S.J., "Longus' Werewolves," CPh 90 (1995) 58-73. No human wolves in L., of course, but there are wolfish humans; more effective teachers of eros than sheep and goats; sexuality is aggressive; nature as educator.

Kussl, R., Longos: Daphnis and Chloe. School edition (PSN 1995). 2. A "school" (student) edition is in preparation in English too. Will schools - or university students - get "into" the novels in the original? If so, good; and in my experience Longus is easily the favourite of the young, especially the female of the species; not, I suspect, for its innocence, but for the absence of innocence (is that Politically Incorrect? I do my best).

Mason, H.J., "Romance in a Limestone Landscape," CPh 90 (1995) 263-66. L. gives details of (in particular) the hydrography of Lesbos that are not found in any other ancient account of Lesbos, and are "more likely to have been observed directly than derived from literary sources" (263). Cf. the debate (Green, Bowie, Mason) on just where Daphnis's farm was. Surely L. did know Lesbos - and what a splendid research topic!

Wouters, A., "Longus' Daphnis en Chloé: een 'precieuze' roman voor een 'prezieuze' lezer," in Hermeneus (v. supr.) 83-91. That is about the size of it.


LUCIAN


XENOPHON ATHENIENSIS, for a change

Reichel, M., "Xenophon's Cyropaedia and the Hellenistic novel," GCN VI (v. supr.) 1-20. Revisits familiar questions: influence on e.g. Ninus, Pantheia; early example of archetypal story-pattern? or direct model?

XENOPHON EPHESIUS


O'Sullivan, J.N., Xenophon of Ephesus: his compositional technique and the birth of the novel, Berlin, De Gruyter 1995. Reviewed by G.N. Sandy in PSN 1995, 12. A big salvo. Background of oral story-telling (cf. Irish tradition); not epitomized; no Sun-god interpolation; closer to basic novel technique than Chariton, so earlier (ca. 50 A.D., Char. ca. 55) (Xen. does not imitate Char.). A text bristling with difficulties and interesting problems (BPR dixit, though he isn't the first), as this and the two previous entries show. By no means for the garbage heap (though as far as we know not thought worthy even of that in antiquity - there are, alas! no papyri, and only one poor late mediseval ms.).


Turasiewicz, R., "De participii apud Xenophonem Ephesiun usui," Eos, 79 (1991) 17-22. Xen. uses koinē, but is not as far from classical Greek as is commonly thought - less than the earlier Chariton.


JEWISH NOVEL

Bohak, Gideon, Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis, diss. Princeton 1994 (Dept. of Religion). Conclusions very different from those of e.g. Philonenko (mystery-text, early 2nd C. A.D.): written by a Heliopolitan Jew, mid 2nd C. B.C.; central scene not a conversion-scene but a revelation-scene (how temple will be built in Heliopolis and Jerusalem temple destroyed); intended to justify building of Heliopolis temple: the author, "like so many other Hellenistic writers... was making socio-political statements about his present by making up a story about the distant past" (244-45). I am grateful to the author for sending me a copy.

Wills, L.M., The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World, Ithaca, Cornell Unv. Press, 1995. Another very substantial contribution: a comprehensive study of major texts, incl. Daniel, Tobit, Esther, Judith, Joseph and Aseneth, historical novels (e.g. Second Maccabees), and a lengthy "Analysis of Genre and the Poetics of the Jewish Novel". The field spreads and spreads; or more accurately is seen to spread and spread - like America, it was always there. Except for the

FRAGMENTS

which upset Rohde's applecart and go on upsetting ours (another exciting new revelation is coming here too - v. infr., Forthcoming, Alpers; really, the joint is hoppin').

Attempt to reconstruct: a) Chione not a princess, b) Chione an Ionian, c) probably another female present - a queen? - either helping or hindering Chione. Not possible to get very far.


NACHLEBEN

Colonna, A., “Un epigramma de Teodoro Prodromo sulla ‘Caricena’ di Eliodoro,” in S. Felici ed., Scritti R. Iaconogeli, Rome 1992 61-63. Some mss. of Hld. have verses at the end; they are attributable to Theodorus Prodromus.

FORTHCOMING

K. Alpers: what sounds like a most intriguing new fragment, or set of fragments: “Zwischen Athen, Abdera und Samos. Fragmente eines unbekannten Romans aus der Zeit der Zeit der Zweiten Sophistik,” already given as a paper to the Monacenses, and due to be given (at time of writing) as a paper to the Groningen in May. From a most unexpected source... To be published in: KAINOTOMIA. Colloquium Pavlov Tsermak, hr. von Magarette Billerbeck und Jacques Schamp, Fribourg, Universitäts-verlag 1996. Who would ever have guessed...?


NOTES

_utiqpe proport mascarpone_? (Sat. 134.5)*

by Wade Richardson

_Si factum non est, nihil est._ --Trimalchio

There is a risk here of parodying textual scholarship with a pseudo-investigation of a non-problem. Some might think that the lacunae and dislocation in the episode make any definite advance impossible. And the solutions are unpromising: either discard a unique phrase that at least has the merit of manuscript authority, or accept it without much confidence in the sense.

Nevertheless, _mascarpone_ has been queried, not to say disbelieved, by earlier editors and translators, and would give more pause today, but for everyone’s presumed knowledge of the subject. Philologist gourmands may have thought of mascarpone, a fatty, white cheese native to Northern Italy. The formulation seems too rare and the resemblance too close for independent construction. The Italian dictionaries are no help at all, referring the derivation only to “Lombardic dialect” as if further enquiry were hopeless in such cases.

It goes without saying that _mascarpone_ is hapax. The word belongs to a suffix class that D.C. Swanson, _A Formal Analysis of Petronius’ Vocabulary_ (1963) calls “the most difficult and complex but also the most interesting” in all of Latin. He says also that “it is the most undesirably Vulgar Latin suffix of the classical period.” But even in that class it appears to differ from the rest found in Petronius (ianio, mulio, stelio, Lucrio, Felicio), in that it is formed from neither noun nor adjective, being the only “synthetic compound” (Swanson). The sense seems pejorative, one shared with _stelio_

It was Burman who first collected humanist reaction to the manuscript reading: a need to emend or gloss (sometimes it is hard to tell the difference), yielding _masturbator, masturbio, masturrator, mastupratio_. The manuscript credentials are actually surprisingly good for the context, suspected to the salacious. If it is clearly and consistently the reading of both O, the hyparchetype that gives us the surviving medieval manuscripts BRP, and L, the sum of humanist texts collated from O and the lambda manuscripts that do not survive. A watchful Carolingian editor did take some pains to censor out of O bits of the whole episode (126-140), an extended sexual encounter between Encolpius and a “respectable lady” (_matrona_ ) called Circe. For instance, the scene three chapters earlier of Proserenos, Circe’s elderly female retainer, manually restoring, albeit temporarily, and testing Encolpius’ virility (131.5 _adnotissque manus temperate coepti inguinum vires_), was deleted. But the scene now under review, containing our problem phrase in allegedly similar language, was everywhere allowed to remain - which may provide information on its meaning: did the excerptor believe Proserenos here to be administering a routine and uninky thrusting? To this we shall return.

Now to the episode. One of the duties of Chrysis, Circe’s young maid, is to procure for her mistress handsome, rough-looking men, often slaves, for sex. Encolpius in slave disguise is selected. Circe is produced out of the shadows. Amatory compliments are exchanged, and the lovers move on to _robusta voluptas._ Encolpius, who of course is not as rough as his disguise suggests, finds himself impotent, and Circe rushes off in confusion. An exchange of letters follows. Before a new meeting is arranged Chrysis returns with a witchy old woman, Proserenos, who has been retained to get Encolpius back to strength. After the application of spells, spit, pebbles and genital manipulation Encolpius seems cured, but the return bout with Circe fails also. He is soundly beaten (_catonisarii_) by Circe’s attendants, spat upon and tossed out. In despair he contemplates self-castration, but instead goes to a shrine of Priapus and prays for forgiveness and redemption. Proserenos enters, leads him into a side room of the priestess, throws him onto a bed and in anger (134.1-2) administers a second beating - the setting for our textual focus. Presently the priestess Oenothea arrives to take charge personally of a long and elaborate “restoration,” with prayers and ceremonies, including the painful application of a leather dildo (134.10-138.2). Encolpius manages at last to give the two “drunken and libidinous” _aniculae_ the slip, only to run into Chrysis who proclaims unexpectedly her own love (139.4). Her hopeful opportunism would seem to indicate that Encolpius is on the mend, and shortly thereafter his cure seems confirmed (140.12), though we meet Circe no more.
We may now focus on utique proper mascarpionem within its own paragraph. What have translators made of it? The phrase appears to qualify in some way the narrator Encolpius’ beating by Proserenos: ingemui ergo utique proper mascarpionem ... Ernout tried, "surtout quand je sentis son attouchement obscène," but admitted in a footnote that the sense was doubtful. Ehlers in Müller’s tried, "zumal weil sie handgeflücht wurde" (especially at the laying-on of hands). Sullivan selected a different tack with, "particularly at the cuts aimed at my groin."

The solving process may be approached from a combination of perspectives: from a conception of realism and technical appropriateness, from language and style, and from linguistics. First, realism. Encolpius tells us the old woman "pushed me over a bed" (impulitique super lectum). It would be usual for someone so dealt with either to lean half-standing or to fall stomach-first — in any case to expose the head, back, buttocks and back of legs; or else to collapse in a curled position on the side presenting a small surface to blows being applied by a cane rod. Encolpius says he offered no resistance ( nihil recusans, nihil respondens), though his arms go up automatically to protect his head. In fact he clearly finds his arms and head most at risk from the assault (134.4). This is a virtual repeat of his reaction to the first thrashing: 132.4 (oppono ego manus oculis meis, nullis precibus effusio, quia sciebam quád meruissem). The picture I get is simply not consistent anatomically with the inflicting of pain to the genitals. We might think such an aim appropriate, given the nature of the offence, given Encolpius’ own murderous fantasies against his member, and given Proserenos’ previous well-targeted manipulation. But there is no evidence now beyond the questioned phrase that Proserenos is here administering anything different from the sort of businesslike thrashing that slaves get all the time. The question finally becomes whether Petronius wrote it or some scribe, seeking to expand ingemui to explicate the supposed sexual setting.

Turning to language and style, let us pass over the word itself for the moment and inspect the context. Glosses do exist in classical texts, and interpolations, the insertion of material by persons other than the author, are recognized still in Petronius, some of them explanatory. The argument goes that certain words like scilicet and id est might signal their presence, and phrases should be particularly suspect when conveying information that may be either incorrect, irrelevant or otiose. The second condition is established, I should argue, from the physical details described above. As for vocabulary, both utique the intensifier and proper the confident reason qualify as serviceable introductions to a gloss, here doubled. Interpolation theory has it that sometimes the insertion is suggested to the scribe from a nearby occurrence. We note that utique, also in the meaning of something like "especially," appears a few lines below, utique die fierarum. We should now see whether ingemui needs to be qualified.

Encolpius is an unabashed crybaby. He sheds a good many tears in the course of our work, without finding it necessary as narrator to explain the reason. The context provides. Eliminating the phrase altogether yields ingemui ego lacrimseque ubertim manantibus obscuratum dextra caput super pulvinum inclinavi. This reproduces quite closely the structure of another tearful occasion, 91.8 haec cum inter gemitus lacrimasque fusidsem, deterrit ille pallio vultum. In other words, utique proper mascarpionem disrupts a "sub-and-tears" cliché suited to this melodrama also. Admittedly, inclusion offers a new direction, some conceivably comic detail on where it is hurting most: but this rather depends on what mascarpio may mean.

Scholars seem divided, as seen, on whether to make the word an agent verbal noun or an abstract verbal noun. It recalls masturbor, masturbio and masturbatio, seeming in the first element to share their etymology, proposed as deriving from manus or perhaps mas as an underlying accusative. Manus is the more likely (especially in masturbor), with the man- as attested in other compounds undergoing assimilation and loss of "n" before a new "s," perhaps here of "stuprare"; cf. manusescere (dative). Mascarpio would be an analogous coinage, a neologism not on strict linguistic lines, with the first element supplying ablative function. Whoever coined the word, Petronius or some unknown scribe, the sense seems better suited to sexual pulling than striking. Can this sense carry the context? Proserenos strikes Encolpius repeatedly and hard, so hard that her cane immediately splinters — to the head. Any change of aim (Sullivan) would come without warning and in contradiction; and an actual poking or pulling with the hand would require letting go of the stick — unless Proserenos uses her other hand for mascarpio. I do take this as a possible explanation.

The obscurity and awkwardness of the phrase make it a candidate for outright deletion. I am not aware of an earlier proposal to atetheit, even from the 1960s when Eduard Fraenkel, Konrad Müller and John Sullivan were in full cry. Retention suits today’s caution better, and it even seems worth retaining in some sense to reinforce the narrating Encolpius’ self-absorption. If not genuine, however, whence mascarpio? Would Lombardic mascarpone provide a clue? The terminus post quem is about 800, the age of the archetype. The phrase should at least come under suspicion, while providing an interesting focus for debates on realism, character depiction, style, language, and the like.

*An earlier version of this was given at the Leeds International Latin Seminar, 28 October 1994. Since then I received through the kindness of David Bain a copy of R. Tuomi’s "Appendix, Zu mascarpio," (p. 41-48), from Syntax und Etymologie des Lateinischen Verbs masturbari/masturbare (Turku 1989). Tuomi’s treatment is compromised by the inference of a sexual intention for this particular scene ("der zweite Versuch der Proserenos, Encolpius’ Impotenz zu heilen; und ihr Mittel dazu sind jetzt die Pruegel."). This thrashing, like the previous one of 132.2-5, takes the form of a punishment, not a sexual turn-on. Witness the reaction of Encolpius. And Proserenos, even in the state of drunken arousal assigned to her by Encolpius, could not have hoped for a sado-masochistic payoff. The sexually charged setting of the entire episode (126-140) is an uncertain guide to the meaning of the present scene.

The Wrong End of the Stick, or Caveat Lector: A Reply to Barry Baldwin

by Michael Hendry

Two years ago in this journal, I published a short and (I hoped) provocative note entitled "Trimalchio’s Canis Catenarius: A Simple Solution?"1 This elicited an intemperate and in several respects inaccurate reply from Barry Baldwin in the next issue,2 to which I now reply.

Perhaps I should begin by saying that I don’t quite see what I have done to pull Baldwin’s chain, as it were. Contrary to the implications of his last paragraph, I can testify that I am not now nor have I ever been a member of the international Deconstructionist movement, nor have I ever aimed at the overthrow of the dominant paradigm, nor, so to speak, travelled along with those
who do. I solemnly renounce and abjure Derrida and all his works, and willingly pledge allegiance to the noble principles of logocentrism. My passing allusion to Magritte’s painting “Ceci n’est pas une pipe” was intended jocularly and surrealistically rather than deconstructively. That some literary theorists have, as they would put it, “fetishized” the phrase is no concern of mine. In any case, my colleagues in French assure me that it was Foucault, nor Derrida, who named a book after Magritte’s painting, and that Foucault was not a deconstructionist. If I add that I have read neither, that is neither a boast nor an apology, but a simple statement of fact. In lumping me together with one or both of them, Baldwin is barking up the wrong tree. I hope the dog that he keeps behind his gate is better than its master at distinguishing friends from enemies, and does not make a habit of biting the former and fawning on the latter.

In considering the relationship of the painted dog of Sat. 29.1 to the canis catenarius of 72.7-9, I tentatively proposed two possible solutions: (a) that Trimalchio had arranged to have a real dog substituted for the painted one in the interval, and (b) that the dog was still painted in 72.7-9 and our heroes too drunk by then to tell the difference. In introducing the first hypothesis, I said that I thought it “the less likely” of the two. Baldwin takes this as saying that I think the first hypothesis simply false and the second simply true. One need not be any kind of critical theorist to find this a simplistic way of looking at things: if I had thought that either hypothesis was simply false, I would have omitted it, and if I had thought that either was simply true, I would not have put the query in my title, much less have provided an alternative. The plausibility of Baldwin’s confidence in his ability (and that of anyone not manifestly insane) to divine the plain meaning of a text so corrupt, lacunose, and culturally alien as Petronius’ is rather undermined by his difficulty in sniffing out and tracking down the meanings of my own decidedly unhermetic words.

Despite Baldwin’s dogged insistence that Encolpius and company are not drunk, or not very drunk, when they attempt to leave the party, the evidence to the contrary is overwhelmning. In a quick read-through of my dog-eared copy of Petronius, I noted the following pieces of evidence. Encolpius asks for a drink (potio) at 31.5: it is not entirely clear whether he gets one. The guests are served mulsim, apparently not for the first time, at 34.1 (Trimalchio ... fecerat ... petosatem clara voce, si quis nostrum iterum uellet mulsim sumere). The “Opimian” wine arrives at 34.6. The guests again turn their attention to the wine at 39.1. Finally, Trimalchio (already drunk) says “aquam foras, uinum intro” at 52.7. Since there is no apparent reason why Encolpius and his companions should abstain while others drink, I think it is safe to assume that they do their share of drinking. This presumption of confirmed, at least for Encolpius, at 64.2, where he says sane iam lucernae mihi plures uidebantur arderde totumque triclinium esse mutatum Though Baldwin denies the consequence, a man who is drunk enough to be seeing double is already well on his way to seeing painted dogs as real. The fact that Giton leads the other two on their abortive escape-attempt does not prove that he is sober or even that he is less drunk than Encolpius: since he is impersonating a slave (26.10), it is his job to lead the way, whether he feels up to it or not, and he may easily be sober enough to find the way back to the entrance, but not to tell a real dog from a painted one. In any case, it is Asylos who fall in first, Encolpius second, Giton not at all: he is too busy pacifying the dog with their precious leftovers.

The disputed passage (72.7) deserves and repays careful analysis: ducente per porticum Gitone ad ianum uenimus, ubi
of, one that keeps invited guests from leaving rather than burglars from entering. Trimalchio’s house is rather like Hades, or the Bates Motel, or a Roach Motel: guests check in, but they don’t check out — not without a great deal of difficulty, anyway.

Notes

3. "Interextualists," whom Baldwin includes in his comprehensive dismissal, are a rather different breed of scholar, and have precisely nothing to do with the issue at hand.
4. If it is true, as the Red Dog red dog says, that "you are your own dog", that will be good news for the criminal classes of Calgary.
5. "Hendry considers but rightly rejects another explanation" (17). I do nothing of the sort. In fact, the first is looking a bit more likely: more on this in my final paragraph.
6. The fact that no separate article has been devoted to the problem (Baldwin, note 1) proves nothing. For what it is worth, there have now been three in three years. The fact that Smith does not mention it in his commentary (Oxford, 1975) is also irrelevant. His useful but unpretentious school commentary is not a triple-decker monument on the scale of Fraenkel’s *Agamemnon* or Brink’s *Horace On Poetry*, and does not purport to answer every possible question that might be asked about its text. In fact F.R.D. Goodyear’s main criticism in his review (*PACA* 14 [1978] 52-6 = *Papers on Latin Literature* [London 1992] 258-62) was that “scores of matters which demand elucidation receive none”.
7. And, as I argued two years ago, the painted dog was sufficiently lifelike to frighten Giton even before the drinking started.
8. It is only in modern criminal justice that there is a clear and distinct line between drunk and not drunk, as defined by the percentage of alcohol in one’s blood, and even then the legal limit differs from one jurisdiction to another.
9. Baldwin is quite right to chastise me for saying that “Encolpius and his companions” had done so: I would be on my way to the doghouse with my tail between my legs if he had not made a more serious howler of his own in denying that entrance and (abortive) exit are in the same place — more on this below. (If Giton is the only one who feeds the dog, that is no doubt because he, as pseudo-slave, is carrying the food. Some may find it ironic that the contents of the ‘doggy bag’ end up as dogfood.)
10. Another fact points in the same direction. Giton dries the other two’s clothes while they are in the bath (73.2). Unless he is doing this naked, which seems unlikely, only Encolpius’ and Ascytlos’ clothes are wet. Since they are the two who fell into the fishpond, it looks as if their clothes are wet for that reason, and not because Encolpius was splashed by Ascytlos before falling in. Otherwise, why are Giton’s clothes not also wet? Other things being equal, he was as likely to be splashed as Encolpius, and there is no reason to believe that he was standing further away.
11. And we would expect them to exit by the same way they came in, particularly in a strange house. Note too that the atriensis makes no attempt to help them get past the dog and out the door. Once again, this must be because this is the way they came in and he is not permitted to let them out, though he can apparently direct them to the balneum (73.1).
12. I may have been influenced by my memories of working in a record store in Chicago some years ago, a store whose owner had a fake burglar alarm: grey strips of tape around all the windows, with bits of electric wire at the corners leading nowhere in particular, and a little sign that said “Protected by XYZ Security” — the whole thing pure bluff. (It didn’t work as well as Trimalchio’s painted dog.)


by Wade Richardson

M.D. Reeve makes a number of points to show his dissatisfaction with certain chapters of this book, and even the chapters receiving guarded acceptance are to him marred by defects — all of which contributing to a dislike of the book as a whole.

Starting with the latter, in my chapter on the *Notae* attributed to F. Daniel, I am said to contradict myself over whether the scribe omitted “things” (Reeve’s word) deliberately or by mistake. Not so. In the note cited by Reeve in evidence I refer to the accidental omission of “lemmata and variants,” a special category which I thought I was careful to distinguish from deliberate small changes and shortcomings of different material, as defined nearby in some detail (p. 10).

It seems also to have escaped me that “many” of this commentator’s conjectures recur among those ascribed in t to Pithou. In fact there are five out of the fifteen. I had marked these correspondences in my copy of PDG, and certainly agree that a point could have been made in a footnote.

Relative to the *Coniecturae* attributed to de Mesmes (n. 42), I would still have the “exemplar manuscriptum” refer to the notes themselves but to a manuscript source, though I freely concede my careless transposal of the Leiden and Bern B fragments removes a convenient corroboration.

As for Reeve’s itemized criticisms on the more culpable chapters (on m, d and r), it might be helpful to those keeping the score to divide them into two parts, the first largely conceding the point, and the second not. The letter symbols are Reeve’s (pp. 8-9).

**Points conceded.** (a) I tried to eliminate beta from the stemma on the basis of differences between t and dmr, as indeed Müller had postulated beta on the same basis. I reached my opposite conclusion by noting the errors of t against dmr (as applicable), whereas Müller noted t’s superiority. This was not to misjudge Müller, but I do regret not dealing with his data as well. Had I done so, my conclusion would have been an even harder sell, since maintenance of my new stemma would have to be achieved from correct readings in a Cuiicianus source close to 1.

(b) The erroneous list heading of “unique tm differences” resulted from my eye being on the Sage school data (Fulmer), to whom r was unknown. The tm readings lost their uniqueness with the admission of r, as I stated later. The list still has value because r was not accessible to tm.

(c) N. 64 could have benefited from mention of the Scaliger quote, or at least Ullman’s citation. The double-listing of m found by Reeve at 13.4, p. 17, was a typesetting error - regrettable, but hardly ominous. As for not distinguishing corrections from text in r, I deemed them, being in the same scribal hand, to have equivalent value for collating purposes in the two instances cited. **Points not conceded.** (b) and (c). I adhere to my view, though without dogmatism, that d and r were comparatively free of contamination. For d there is insufficient change to justify belief in comparison with an O source like s (there would be more of it),
and for r some material, as I said, could have come from the vetus liber.

I regret somehow giving Reeve the impression that I was answering a charge made by Müller that florilegia influenced the text of r. On the relevant page I cited Müller in full for all to see, and made it very clear, I thought, that my focus here and difference with Müller rested on the handwriting of the florilegium material only, in the margin indeed. On the next page I even supplied a disclaimer, “none of the above has any bearing on whether florilegia were used as collating sources for r (p. 130),” before proceeding away from Müller and the handwriting dispute to address this issue.

(d) The term vetus liber in r isn’t to be distinguished from vetus, which got its discussion earlier, in n. 150 — standard sixteenth-century generic for a manuscript. In the sentence “Haec duo prima folia collata sunt cum fragmento veteris libri qui Cuicici fuerat,” I don’t believe I read a quod for the qui in order to sustain my argument. It seems to me anyway that a “fragment of a manuscript” is a Latin way of saying a “manuscript-fragment.” Considering the possibility, as Reeve urges, that this sentence with its “duo” refers to an exemplar is one thing; accepting it is quite another. My best estimate of the habits of the scribe of r takes the “haec” demonstrative to refer to the leaves of r that follow, and surely not to an absent exemplar.

Anthony Powell on Petronius Again

by Barry Baldwin

Quite some year ago (PSN 10.2. 1979. 4; 12.1. 1981. 5), both Raymond Astbury and myself independently provided some jottings on Petronius in Anthony Powell, largely confined to his A Dance To The Music of Time series of novels. A recent perusal of his Miscellaneous Verdicts (London & Chicago, 1990), a collection of book reviews and essays, has yielded a couple of further items. First, Petronius is pressed into service as conclusion to Powellian parody of Cyril Connolly, thus: “We must ponder the lament attributed to Petronius, that disinherited Roman clubman: Fueri mater amica optima est.” Connolly, incidentally, was a Petronius enthusiast, once writing in an essay as follows: “Though in Petronius we possess a fragmentary Roman Proust, how few have studied him; how little known to generations of boring novelists is the secret of his rapidity of style, of his visual clarity, biting dialogue, intellectual fastidiousness or of the haunting fugacity of the picturesque - that art which keeps characters on the move from waterfront to waterfront, brothel to palace, adventure to adventure. The analysis of such a book could help many young writers to give movement and montage to their characters, the lift of transeience which is the breath of readability.” (On Re-reading Petronius,” in Selected Essays of Cyril Connolly, ed., Peter Quennell [New York 1984] 152-156.) The other Powell item occurs in an essay on Geoffrey Grigson and classical art. Regarding a supposed aversion from homosexuality on the part of Aphrodite, Powell argues: “At least that seems to be suggested by Petronius in the case of Aphrodite's son, Priapus.” Ira Priapi lives, alas; cf. my disbelief in it as the dominant motif of the Satyricon's plot, CPh 68, 1973, 294-96.

Trimalchio the British Aristocrat

by Barry Baldwin

In her recent (London 1994) biography of Evelyn Waugh, Selina Hastings provides (p. 285 n. 2) this tidbit about the infant Julian Asquith, future 2nd Earl of Oxford:

Raymond Asquith saw his son, born in 1916, only once, when the baby was sucking greedily at his mother's breast; this inspired his father to call him Trimalchio, after the famously greedy parvenu in Petronius' Satyricon.

We further learn that for the rest of his life this English gentleman was known to family and friends as Trim. He turned out well, though, being (p. 286) “big on good sense and good manners. Studious, holy and respectful.”

REVIEWS


review by Aldo Setaioli, University of Perugia

The title of the book is a quotation of Marius Mercator, Liber subnotationum in verba Iuliani 5.1 (PL 48, 133): theatrum Arbitri Valeriique. The reference to Martial (Valerius), quoted with Petronius, probably aims at the prose preface to the first book of the Epigrams (non intrei Cato theatrum meum), which clearly elaborates on Petronius' famous "apology" (Sat. 132.15).

Though Panayotakis does not dwell upon Martial, the consistent theatrical reference found in these authors points to the validity of his approach: an analysis of the Satyricon in the light of the traditions of ancient theater, mainly, though not solely, Roman farce, with special stress on the mime. The bulk of the book is therefore devoted to the study of the novel from this point of view, following the order of the text.

Panayotakis' principles are very sane and can largely be shared. He makes it clear that the Satyricon was never meant to be staged and that neither the mime nor the theater in general can be considered Petronius' only sources or models, if nothing else in view of the very length and scope of the work; still he insists that this is precisely the element from which the novel draws its peculiar liveliness, and in many cases he may well be right.

Not only does Panayotakis stress the countless references in the text to the theater, he also provides the reader with a wealth of invaluable indications on the presence of theatrical elements (with innumerable parallels from plays and other texts) and on how they function in the narrative (as a good example I will mention the use of music in the Cena Trimalchionis).

Other interesting observations concern the double audience-spectacle pattern, whereby some of the characters watch an act performed by others, being at the same time part of the show for the reader (e.g. pp. 19; 27; 37; 50; 128-129;188); and the role-playing of the characters of the Satyricon (e.g. pp. 15; 32; 110), in the sense that they are made to act according to and to play with specific literary clichés.

Panayotakis goes as far as transposing sections of the text into theatrical scripts made up of spoken parts and stage directions (e.g. pp. 40ff.; 113). As can easily be imagined, the book makes an extremely pleasant and informative reading. If we add that the author shows a
perfect command of all relevant bibliography, it must be acknowledged that Panayotakis has presented Petronian scholarship with an invaluable and much-needed contribution, in that his work not only is the first systematic inquiry on an essential element of the Satyricon, but also provides a new understanding of many aspects of the novel through this approach.

There are very few points open to doubt, which in no way undermine the high quality of the book. I’ll mention a couple for completeness’ sake.

At p. 176 one is rather surprised by the suggestion that the mimes did not go far as presenting female nudity on stage, in view of the testimonies about the nudatio mimarum.

Now and then the search for testimonies of theatrical parallels may result in unduly stretching the meaning of the texts referred to. This may be the case with Seneca, Ep. 47. 14 (p. 104 n. 30): the philosopher only records the usage of familares for servi in the mimes. This must be seen in the context of his theories on language (see my Seneca e i Greci. Citazioni e tradizioni nelle opere filosofiche, Bologna 1988, p. 39-40 and n. 126), rather than as a sign of respectable treatment of slaves in the mimes. Surely Trimalchio’s attitude to slaves is influenced by Seneca himself (rather than the mimes: pp. 82 and 104). At another Senecan passage, Ep. 94. 71 (p. 174 n. 33), ambitio et luxuria et impotentia scaenam desiderant means of course “ambition, luxury and excess craving for a public”, with no reference to sexual impotence as a fitting theatrical subject.

The only interpretation I find difficult to accept is the equation of Giton to the male lover, of Encolpius to the adulterous wife, and of Ascyllos (and Eumolpus) to the cuckolded husband at Sat. 97. 1-99. 4, an episode interpreted as an adultery mime (pp. 130-135). Such roles are hardly consistent with the ones played by these characters in the Satyricon and may result from forcing a mimetic pattern upon a live and lively scene of the novel. It is only fair to remind, however, that Panayotakis himself warns against any mechanical approach to Petronius’ “own variation on the theme” (p. 170), and almost with no exception has admirably stuck to this rule.

The remarks that follow are in no way meant as a criticism of the book, whose goal to illustrate the theatrical element in the Satyricon has been masterfully carried out by the author, but only as a reminder that besides this fundamental component there are many other elements to be taken into account, if one is to hope to gain not too incomplete an understanding of Petronius.

Several times (e.g. pp. 23; 37; 41ff.) Panayotakis credits the characters of the Satyricon with mimicry and facial expressions not specifically mentioned in the text. This is of course perfectly legitimate, if we are not oblivious to the fact that sometimes a character’s emotions are rendered by Petronius not through the theatrical (i.e. visual) elements alone, but through a skillful combination with the resources offered by narration (see for instance pp. 23-24: at Sat. 12.5 aliquo motu refers to an undefined inner commotion, to add to the more visual description of Sat. 12.4).

As already hinted, the concept of role-playing is a very interesting and fruitful approach. If we give it absolute validity, however, it will be difficult for example (p. 16), to use Ascyllios’ insults at Sat. 9. 9 to reconstruct lost parts of the novel (but see Sat. 81.3). What’s more, it will be all but impossible to desory any element of seriousness and sincerity in what Petronius’ characters do or say; whenever they talk about serious matters, they will have to be considered as hypocritical pretenders. Such, according to Panayotakis (pp. 1-9), are Encolpius and Agamemnon in their discussion of rhetoric at the beginning of our text (though Encolpius does not flatter Agamemnon: see Sat. 2.2; nor does the latter admit being a swindler: at Sat. 3-4 he is only lamenting a situation that forces him to resort to methods he theoretically disapproves of). Panayotakis regards as equally false and hypocritical both Encolpius’ interest in the decline of the arts and Eumolpus’ lecture on the subject (pp. 117-121). If the latter is only the hackneyed opinion of a lecher playing a role, are we to surmise that Eumolpus’ criticism of Lucan should be interpreted in the same way? Unfortunately Panayotakis says nothing on the matter. He does, however, dismiss the famous “apology” of Sat. 132.15 as unsuergic (pp. 175-176) on the ground of two somewhat conflicting arguments: the rather usual comment that the statement comes from an undignified character in a risible situation, who therefore cannot be identified with Petronius, and the clever literary use of the sexual theme in the novel, allegedly a far cry from crude pornography. This, however, supports the seriousness of the apology and theorization of the admission of the sexual element into sophisticated literature; on the other hand, the identification of Encolpius with Petronius may be regarded as an irrelevant problem here, as the literary situation forces us to assume it by necessity for the matter at hand, in that the author is making the narrator theorize on his own narration, which is of course identical with the novel and is even called an opus.

Finally, according to Panayotakis (p. 157), Encolpius’ lament for Lichas should also be considered as ironic and insincere. It is quite true, of course, that the passage is highly rhetorical and full of philosophical (one might almost say “Senecan”) commonplaces.

Even this element, however, should be considered in the proper light, in order to avoid serious limitations in the approach to the novel’s characters. The host of the Cena, for example, is certainly the theatrical director and protagonist of his banquet, but there is a lot more to him than just this. To be sure, he does have an inkling, no matter how distorted and reduced to his measure, of Seneca’s generous and humane ideas on slaves. His satisfaction at the success of his theatrical schemes cannot strip him of this. Neither can his undoubted vulgarity and arrogance deprive him of a sort of greatness of his own.

As already hinted, this is true for Eumolpus too. He is certainly a mime-player, no matter how far removed from a theatrical stock-figure (p. 121). Hypocrisy, however, is only one side of his personality (as is made clear for example at Sat. 115.1-5). The novel’s characters cannot be dismissed as one-sided and one-dimensional.

Besides, if stress is placed on (perforce insincere) role-playing, it become difficult not to credit the author with a standard against which this “insincerity” must be checked, and, in the final analysis, with a critical attitude towards the lowly universe constituting the object of his narrative. In this sense Panayotakis is fully justified when he stresses the negative sides of the novel’s characters. If then, to quote Panayotakis’ very last words (p. 196), a conception of the Satyricon as nothing but a “sophisticated, scabrous book” results from its theatrical “reading”, this is only a further proof that the invaluable insights into the nature and framework of the novel provided by this approach must be supplemented by taking into account all the other elements that contribute to the making of this unique piece of literature.

**Summary by Maria Kardaun**

This study presents an interpretation of the *Satyricon* of Petronius from the (classic) psychoanalytic point of view. Applying psychoanalytic theory to literature, and especially to ancient texts, is controversial. The first half of the study is therefore devoted to the methodological aspects of psychoanalytic literary criticism in general, and to some of the possibilities and dangers of a psychoanalytic approach to the *Satyricon* in particular.

Undeniably, there exist many different literary interpretations of the *Satyricon*. Some of these are compatible with one another, whereas others are competing. Since the assumption that all these interpretations are equally adequate to the text has to be dismissed as implausible, the question arises whether it is possible to formulate effective general criteria to distinguish satisfactory literary interpretations from less satisfactory ones. On what reasonable grounds, if at all, can we decide that one interpretation of the *Satyricon* does more justice to the text than a competing one?

First of all, evidently, it is necessary to determine the perspective from which the text is interpreted. Unless there is an agreement on the adopted point of view a fruitful discussion about the value and the effectiveness of an interpretation is impossible.

Literary interpretations in the strict sense should aim at presenting the literary text as a coherent and meaningful unity from the perspective adopted. In addition, to ensure that they are not purely speculative, but reveal something of the text involved, literary interpretation should to a reasonable extent be testable against intersubjective data given in the text.

The question whether psychoanalytic literary interpretations can be formulated in such a way that they are not fundamentally speculative differs from the question whether the theoretical framework of psychoanalysis itself is fundamentally speculative. It is maintained that, even though actual testing rarely takes place, the “testability” of the set of psychoanalytic theories from which psychoanalytic literary interpretations gain their conceptual framework is in a less deplorable condition than critics of psychoanalysis would have us believe.

Psychoanalytic theory as used in literary criticism should be regarded as an explorative theory that allows for the formulation of testable psychoanalytic text interpretations. This explorative theory is fertile (leads to interesting new questions), effective (provides the means to formulate answers to those questions) and reasonably coherent (the internal consistency of psychoanalytic theory is relatively well established).

The psychoanalytic interpretation in question aims at presenting the *Satyricon* as a coherent piece of literature, insofar as the fragmentary state of the text allows for it. Much of the text that appears at first sight to be loosely structured or even incomprehensible can be understood from the psychoanalytic point of view as meaningful in its context. The successive episodes of the *Satyricon* — including many supposed inconsistencies and irrelevant insertions — are shown to form a psychoanalytically coherent narrative structure which, according to psychoanalytic theory, appeals to an unconscious sensitivity of the reader. (It may be useful to add here that the unconscious psyche of Petronius is not under investigation. What is intended, is a contribution to the reader’s best possible understanding of the psychoanalytically relevant dimension of the *Satyricon*.)

From indications in the text it is clear that the protagonist and narrator Encolpius has in the past evolved from a more or less content pre-oedipal narcissist, who was sleeping around unproblematically with both sexes, into an impotent and dissatisfied one, who suffers from hidden and unfulfilled longings.

Unconscious oedipal desires of Encolpius, probably awakened in connection with his profaning of the Priapus mystery, bring Encolpius into conflict with the ithyphallic god himself. Of course, it is not really the deity Priapus, but "Priapus", that is to say Encolpius’s own inner Priapus image, that is at stake in the *Satyricon*, since we read a lot about Encolpius’ hopes and fears in connection with the deity, but never about the deity itself. Encolpius lacks the capacity of mastering his conflict with "Priapus": he simply feels helpless toward the omnipotent god and, measuring himself with him, becomes, and probably remains, impotent.

One could conclude that the *Satyricon* is centered around the classical oedipal motif, but without a happy ending: instead of the father’s being killed by the son and the son’s living happily ever after with the mother, the son is thoroughly frustrated and remains stuck in the pre-oedipal state, neurotically suppressing his forbidden desires out of extreme (unconscious) oedipal castration-fear.


**Summary by John M. McMahon**

This dissertation elucidates the ways in which the problem of male sexual dysfunction is portrayed in literary contexts by analyzing the popular perceptions of its causes, the traditional methods of treatment, and the astro-magical belief system upon which these are predicated. In addition, it draws conclusions about how the social implications of impotence are reflected by the genre of the texts in which sexual dysfunction plays a thematic role. Finally, it analyzes passages in the *Satyricon* in which the personal and social difficulties caused by sexual dysfunction find resolution in the first-person expression afforded its main character.

The Introduction examines the intersection of the cultural and literary representation of male sexuality and establishes a methodology for the investigation as a whole. It concludes that while an aggressive virility stands as the predominant imagery in a cultural landscape marked by a patriarchal viewpoint, references to impotence appear relatively infrequently; and that sexual dysfunction is most commonly associated with literary genres of
humorous or invective nature. Consequently, evidence for popular reactions to impotence should be sought in both literary and sub-literary documents.

Chapter One surveys the primary sources and considers the acceptability and reliability of scientific and subliterary sources for analyzing attitudes toward impotence and for providing information on cures. It also examines the continuity and persistence of popular belief in generically dissimilar texts representative of widely separated periods. Beginning with evidence that discourse about male sexual activity is pervasive and long-lived in cosmopolitan Greco-Roman culture, the chapter establishes the location of pertinent information within a variety of written sources.

Chapter Two examines the processes of evocation, association, and identification responsible for ancient theories about impotence and associated magico-medical cures. It identifies two chief branches of folk healing, the “natural” and the “supernatural”, and demonstrates how causes for affliction were believed to be of both natural (physiological) and supernatural (divine or magical) origin. Such systems are based on the perception that life consisted of an array of corporal, mental, and spiritual elements and that good health resulted from a balanced combination of these. Ancient approaches correspond closely to certain modern folk medicinal systems in which impotence is seen as a creeping paralysis that involves the entire body and which results from a failure to cope with everyday stresses or from externally generated malign influences.

Chapters Three, Four and Five examine one particular belief system which associates certain bulbous plants, serpents, and magical stones or amulets with the phallus. For example, references to the stimulative properties of plants included under the general terms ἔστατος and ὄμβλησις appear in such diverse works as agricultural and botanical tracts, the culinary discussions of Athenaeus, Attic Comedy, Roman Elegy, and the Satyricon. Garlic and onions, because of visual associations with the male organ, were especially prized as were a number of other species.

Observations of the visual and behavioral characteristics of animals, linked them with male sexuality in the ancient mind as well. In the case of serpents their perceived ability to rejuvenate themselves by sloughing the skin came to connect them closely with the sexual functions of the male organ. Serpents’ venom, moreover, in partaking of the cooling qualities of deadening poisons, was perceived as the kind of magical substance that could bring about the paralysis of impotence. As a result, plants with visual associations with both the male organ and serpents were often considered as particularly stimulative because of the heating qualities they possessed.

In the associative relationship of plants and serpents sympathetic magic also played a significant role, and the essence of this influence was considered readily transferrable to objects. In particular the perceived efficacy of magically charged stones and amulets was based on visual features and on other perceived interconnections with serpents and serpent-like plants. The ability to manipulate the powers of these objects became a specific source of empowerment for those who availed themselves of their sexually and socially reintegrative properties.

Chapter Six demonstrates how an understanding of such a belief system can inform the interpretation of several well known texts. Vegetable imagery appears in Catullus 67 in describing an impotent male, and Horace’s Epode 3 has a sexual subtext derived from the close association of garlic, serpents, and venom with male sexuality. The wide range of social concerns and accepted cures of impotence appear in Ovid Amores 3.7, and in the Satyricon these elements combine to paint a narrative picture of folk mediocrity whose recognition is essential for a true understanding of the work’s cultural matrix. The numerous attempts by Encolpius to remedy his impotence stand as evidence for popular perceptions about the efficacy of traditional remedies where both natural and supernatural elements function in an integrated treatment typical of folk medical systems.

The Satyricon itself takes this intersection one step further by showing how the failures of the impotent Encolpius are superseded by the personal account of the victim. This then becomes the means by which the humiliation and agony of the sexually dysfunctional male enable his concerns about his condition to be resolved. Through the actual narrative process itself the parodic nature of the Satyricon is incorporated into a critique of the traditional concepts of ritual and magical practice which are taken for granted in other literary representations of male sexual dysfunction.

Chariton: Nachleben

by B.P. Reardon
(on information from A. Billault)


Les deux amants restaient embrassés et ne parlaient pas; ils baibutaisent; ils étaient noyés de larmes, ils se regardaient avec une passion inextinguible et, comme une lampe presque épuisée dans laquelle on verse de l’huile, l’amour de Mohsen reprenait la vie et son corps se ranimait.

Cf. Callirhoe 1.1.15 (Callirhoe has just been told she is to be married, but does not yet know to whom):

...she was unable to speak, darkness covered her eyes, and she nearly expired ... his parents brought the bridegroom to the girl. Then Chaereas ran forward and kissed her; recognizing the man she loved, Callirhoe, like a dying lamp once it is replenished with oil, flamed into life again and became taller and stronger — ἄσπερ τι λύχνου φῶς ήθε σβηστόμενον ἐπιχρύσωτος ἢλαον πάλιν ἀνέλαμψε καὶ μελζων ἐγένετο καὶ κρείττων.

trans. G.P. Goold

Goold points out a possible source in Xenophon, one of Chariton’s favourite models: Symposium 2.24, wine awakens kindly feelings ἄσπερ ἢλαον φῶς ἠθε νέιφεις; D’Orville, in his edition of Chariton, lists some others, less close (Maximus Tyrius, Plutarch - both too late for Chariton in my view, through some might disagree about Plutarch; Ovid - Chariton had surely not read Ovid?). Gobineau, an aristocrat, had surely read Ovid and perhaps Plutarch, but this seems closer to Chariton, who did exist in French translation in his day.

At 8.1 Chaereas and Callirhoe, reunited at last and in each other’s arms, are “like people plunged in a deep well barely able to hear a voice from above” (trans. Goold). Has anyone a parallel - either before or after - for that?