

since then (the only one specified in the essay in Heseltine's Loeb). It is a very great book. Not great — magical is perhaps a better word and, what is even rarer, it is a humane book."

One automatically wants to add "Discuss". Petronius is clearly in the Canon. Connolly then becomes more specific: "Yet, though in Petronius we possess a fragmentary 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 picaresque — 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 lilt of transience which is the breath of readability." Petronius on the syllabus of creative writing courses? *Habent sua fata libelli*, indeed!

Connolly accepts the Tacitean Petronius as author of the *Satyricon*, suggesting on the basis of unspecified but obvious fragments that he came from Marseilles. A Neronian date is accepted because Lucan "must be the target" of Eumolpus' Civil War effusion and because Trimalchio "tries to sing a song by Menecrates whom Nero admired." Connolly is obviously alert to the traditional debates among Petronians. Saint-Evremond is quoted for the view that Petronius' suicide at Cumae is "the finest death in all antiquity." One of them, certainly, and it made a memorable scene for Canadian actor Leo Genn in the Ustinov *Quo Vadis?* But let's not forget the Pontia of Juvenal's (6.638) scholiasts, daughter of P. Petronius (a relative?) who, condemned by Nero for poisoning her sons upon being left a widow, after large intake of food and wine, being a fanatic saltatrix, danced herself to death — take note, John Travolta.

Connolly is *au fait* with other standard issues: "What was the *Satyricon's* real subject? Is Trimalchio's banquet a parody of Nero's entertainments or written to amuse him together with the hostile criticism of Lucan? Is it a *roman à clef*? He offers no answers, but as Voltaire said, one should judge a man by the questions he asks, not the answers he gives. A more off-beat suggestion by Connolly is that Encolpius chooses the alias Polyaeus because the latter was "a disciple of Epicurus" (was there such a person? Like Trimalchio, I never listened to a philosopher), ignoring or unaware of the onomastic echo from the *Odyssey*.

"The novel is written in alternate passages of prose and verse which produces a peculiar effect rather like a staccato recitatif (the term 'Menippean' is nowhere used) which leads up to an aria but the verse arias are not so memorable as the prose recitatif; they are less tense and vivid; good minor poetry and nothing more." Connolly exemplifies the prose by a lengthy quotation in the — unacknowledged — English of Heseltine from the Encolpius-Eumolpus encounter in the art gallery. Moving then into brief inspection of Latin stylistic details Connolly is much taken by the phrase *tam ambitiosus detumuit imber* "of a fine lady's tears" — thus following the general taste for Gruter's *detumuit* over ms. *detonuit*: Heseltine, incidentally, attributed *detumuit* to Buecheler who actually printed *detonuit* without qualm or notice of any emendations. He also commends Encolpius' "Existentialish reflection" on Lichas, "the only virtuous character." *si calculum bene ponas, ubique naufragium*.

One is glad to see no sign of the famous fake Petronianism about business training; cf. *PSN* 29, 1999, 5. Connolly does not here mention a bond of sorts with another of Petronius' *Nachleben* — his only novel, *The Rock Pool* (1936), was banned for a season for supposed obscenity. He concludes with the hope that more of the *Satyricon* may one day come to light, not least because (quoting Eumolpus in the gallery again on the victory of materialism over art) of its message for the 20th century: "Like many whose gaze is fixed

with longing on the past, he was apt to find himself looking into the future."

PETRONIUS ON TRIAL by Rod Boroughs

Tom Dardis's biography of Horace Liveright (*Firebrand: The Life of Horace Liveright*, New York: Random House, 1995) finds Petronius at the centre of one of the key literary censorship battles of the 20th century.

As co-founder of the Modern Library, Liveright was one of the most influential publishers of the 1920s New York publishing world. The unconventional and daring nature of much of his output frequently brought him into conflict with John S. Sumner, Secretary of the powerful New York Society for the Suppression of Vice. In 1922, Liveright published W.C. Firebaugh's translation of the *Satyricon* as a 'privately printed' luxury two-volume edition, issued on a subscription only basis and priced at a colossal \$30. One of the society's agents was sent undercover to the publisher's offices and managed to purchase a copy from a Liveright employee, who was then issued with a summons for selling obscene material directed to the public. Liveright and his editor-in-chief Tommy Smith were also summoned to appear in court. (Liveright's lawyer Arthur Garfield Hays attempted to get the case dismissed by arguing that such an expensive book could not pose a danger to the morals of the general public, but to no avail.)

Dardis's account of the subsequent legal proceedings makes fascinating and amusing reading:

"When Tommy Smith was asked by Magistrate Oberwager just what the *Satyricon* was all about, he was able to tell him something about its importance as a work of literature. The judge's reply was short: "I suppose I have to take your word for all this?" Smith replied, "Give me two weeks... I'll prove it to you." [Smith recalls:] "In two weeks we were back ... I had gone to various libraries and to friends and we came into Magistrate Oberwager's court with over 80 [critical works]. Books in Latin, French, English, Dutch, Swedish ... Liveright and ... Hays helped me take them out of the cartons and pile on Magistrate Oberwager's desk." The sheer bulk of so many testimonials to the literary value the *Satyricon* convinced the magistrate: all charges against the book were dismissed...

'In his brief, Oberwager had some important things to say about literary censorship: "The mere existence of isolated passages is not of itself sufficient to condemn a literary work as falling within the prohibitive pale, for, if such were the rule, an attack could be launched at almost every classic on the shelves of our libraries ... If one is to condemn simply because of the existence of isolated passages of obscenity, we are to condemn to a fate of obliteration Shakespeare, Chaucer, Voltaire, Rousseau, Boccaccio, Blazac, Flaubert, Zola, and even the Bible ... The works of art and literature of an ancient age cannot be judged by modern standards. The good of possessing those literary and cultural records of the past that constitute the very spiritual continuity of civilization cannot be outweighed by any imaginary evil that is alleged against the *Satyricon* ... To suppress the *Satyricon* is to suppress one of the two extant Latin novels of the post-classical age ... and thereby depriving students of any knowledge of the actual life of the Roman people. As literature is an interpretative description of human life, it cannot limit itself to the interpretation of one side of human nature only, for otherwise it would defeat its own aim of truth and power.

'Sumner refused to accept the decision, and took his complaint to the district attorney of Manhattan, who handed the matter to the

city's chief magistrate, William McAdoo, hoping that he would appeal Oberwager's acquittal. Unexpectedly, McAdoo refused to push the case, telling reporters that any further attempts by the vice society to suppress the *Satyricon* would only serve to encourage people to purchase the book. Undaunted, the district attorney then convened a grand jury as a preliminary step on the road to a trial of Liveright and Smith... [Liveright announced] that he would supply all twenty-three members of the grand jury with personal copies of his expensive book so that they could read it at their leisure. However, by the time the jurors had been selected it was recalled that no further copies of the *Satyricon* were now available. It was then agreed that the jury would have to spend two hours a day in court listening to the entire work read aloud — a task guaranteed to take at least a week. At this point, the district attorney gave up trying to suppress Petronius: [Liveright] had won.'

JOSÉ ANTONIO ARTÉS HERNÁNDEZ, *ESTUDIOS SOBRE LA LENGUA DE LOS HECHOS APÓCRIFOS DE PEDRO Y PABLO*, MURCIA, 1999, 353 PP.

summary by José Antonio Artés Hernández

The aim of this book, which is a revision of my doctoral thesis of the same name defended in 1994, is to analyse the Greek *Acta Pauli et Petri apocrypha*, specifically Πράξεις Παύλου καὶ Θέκλης, Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἀγίου ἀποστόλου Παύλου and Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἀγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρου, from a grammatical and lexical point of view. With a structure traditionally considered close to the novel, the apocryphal writings under review tell us about some of the ups and downs experienced by the apostles Paul and Peter during their preaching in the communities of Asia Minor and Rome, as well as the circumstances of their death.

The work begins with a general introduction (pp. 19-44), paying great attention to the problems of authorship, place and date of composition (the texts belonging to Paul could be dated ca. 180 A.D., while those corresponding to Peter not further than 250 A.D.), genre and textual transmission. We may divide this study into two main parts: the first one devoted to phonetics, morphology (pp. 47-61), syntax (with a study of the style of καί), word order and stylistics (pp. 63-96), the second one dealing with lexical uses. In the *internal analysis* (pp. 101-129) I compare the words that appear only in the three texts studied, in the *external one* (pp. 133-324) — with several chapters devoted to Atticisms (pp. 193-253), colloquialisms, literary terms attested in the Attic prose, poetic terms, Ionicisms, late terms, *Christian words* (pp. 255-267), unusual terms (pp. 269-276), terms originating in Latin (pp. 277-290) and proper names (pp. 291-324 — I compare the texts to non-literary (papyri, inscriptions,...) or literary works, as well as to different stages of language, relatively contemporary or included in a common tradition, like the one concerning the historian Flavius Iosephus in the 1st century A.D. and Plutarch in the 1st - 2nd century A.D., ancient Greek novels or New Testament canonical works, particularly that of Luke. The book ends with general conclusions (pp. 325-341) and a bibliographical index (pp. 343-353).

As I have already said, in this book I try to throw some light on the predominant level of language in the *Acta Pauli et Petri apocrypha* through a detailed grammatical and lexical analysis. *Acta Pauli* and the *manuscript G*, with a different end from the one offered by the Πράξεις, could have been written by the same unknown author. Colloquialisms stand out because of their paucity. The existence of literary terms attested in the Attic prose in our texts is revealed, but in a very limited percentage and not in all of them.

There is a very sparse use of poetic terms (although we can find more implied forms than in the case of the Attic prose), very far from their proliferation in other relatively contemporary authors. The moderate presence of Ionisms, with their closeness to the spoken language, could be considered outstanding, but more from a phonetic-morphologic point of view. The existence of terms close to the language of medicine, but coming from a common popular substratum, and the abundance of late terms and those denominated *Christian words*, speak clearly about the language level which we propose for our texts: the *Acta Petri et Pauli* are created for their final purpose, to be intelligible to the largest number of readers; therefore, content prevail over form in them. Finally about the possible generic ascription of this kind of writing: the specialists, headed by Söder, lean toward the ancient novel, but that is something debatable: following Vielhauer, I propose a combination of stories concerning θεῖοι ἄνδρες (*res*) and fiction πράξεις (*verba*), all reelaborated as περιόδοι.

REVIEWS

S.J. Harrison, *APULEIUS: A LATIN SOPHIST*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. VIII + 281 pp.

review by Gareth Schmelting

As the title indicates, this book is first about Apuleius, his *persona*, and the influences on his thinking, and then about his extant writings. Harrison divides his book into six chapters: (1) Apuleius in Context: Life, Background, Writings (the bulk of this chapter is taken up with a discussion of the fragments of Apuleius and the testimonia to lost works): "Consideration of this long list of extant and lost works leads to several points. First and most obviously, Apuleius' literary output shows an extraordinary variety and versatility: there seems to have been almost no branch of ancient learning in which Apuleius had no interest, almost no genre in which he did not write a work... It is also clear from the evidence ... that Apuleius was more of a compiler of existing materials than an original investigator" (pp. 36-37); (2) A Sophist in Court: the *Apologia*; (3) Sophistic Display: the *Florida*; (4) Popular Philosophy: *de Deo Socratis*; (5) Philosophical Exposition: *de Mundo* and *de Platone*; (6) A Sophist's Novel: the *Metamorphoses*.

Harrison's respect for Apuleius is everywhere evident, and he leaves the Latin quotations without translation — out of respect for the intelligent reader and the baroque richness of the language. In the best tradition of a *Handbuch* Harrison sets Apuleius and his works into the intellectual milieu of the second century A.D. All of the extant writings of Apuleius, not just the ever more popular *Metamorphoses*, receive a thorough analysis. The readers of *PSN* will not be disappointed in the 50 page essay on the *Metamorphoses* which concludes the work under discussion. Harrison confronts the problems of the *Metamorphoses* (*Metamorphoses/Golden Ass*, [Lucian] *Onos*, Apuleius/Lucius, how can a work have 11 books, etc.) with common sense, wit, and a first-rate scholar's judgment. Oxford University Press continues a tradition of excellence in Apuleius studies begun at Cambridge University in 1970 by P.G. Walsh.