PSN 40 Years

Forty Years On

Thanks to Alan Bennett, England’s funniest and often Petronian playwright, for the title. Now, were I John Henderson, I would embark on a *Fixere forties post Agamemnona* riff...

*Annis quadraginta servivi* (Sat. 57.9). My own *PSN* adventures were adumbrated in “Gareth & Me: A Petronian Pilgrimage,” devised for *Ancient Narrative: Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2006), the Festschrift for Our Master. I still have in my files a yellowing copy of the first *PSN*, hoping it may one day be worth as much as the first Batman comic. For the rest (I have a few *lacunae* in my collection), it was an agreeable *Recherche du Something Perdu* via the electronic archive elegantly presented and assiduously maintained by Jean Alvares of Montclair. This is also my cue to perpetuate the name of Martha B. McDonald for her long-time financial support of the *Newsletter*, given in the memory of her parents Sgt. Carl E. Byrd and Toyo M. Byrd—Byrds of a feather, indeed.

On reading the inaugural “Membership in the Petronian Society is open to anyone with an interest in Petronius and his *Satyricon*” (I fancy this would now read *Satyrica*), I recalled Groucho Marx’ (more or less) “I wouldn’t want to belong to any club that lets in guys like me.” Then, my native Englishness asserted itself: the point of a club is not whom it lets in but whom it keeps out. After which borborygms—I promptly joined.

Apropos of the *Newsletter*, “J. P. Sullivan’s gentle urging pushed me into making it a reality.” Remembering the late lamented JPS, I doubt “gentle” tells the whole story. Timing is everything. Sullivan’s seminal book on Petronius features in the first Bibliography, along with his influential *TAPA* article on literary feuding between Petronius, Seneca, and Lucan. Rubbing shoulders here are Scobie on the Ancient Romances and Corbett’s Petronian Twayne.

This inventory also pullulated with promise. No less than three new editions of the *Satyricon/Satyrica* were promised, respectively by E. Dobroiu, Carlo Pellegrino, and Oskar Raith. Pellegrino’s duly appeared (Rome 1976), but what happened to the other two? Also advertised as a 1970s treat was JPS’s “large critical edition for Brill,” which (ehu!) we never saw, though all hope this strange void will soon be publicly filled by Gareth’s stupendous (I’ve read the whole thing in manuscript) version. It was hard to be impressed by
Emanuele Castorina’s wraith-like entry, “A Book” (Step forward, Gertrude Stein). More lip-smackable was M. Coccia’s plan to compose a monograph on the manuscripts designed to confute the ever-rolling Muller, who has yet to learn that to be immortal you do not have to be eternal.

The second issue began with Corrections, a feature of all magazines, whose cleaning-up left Edward Courtenay under his previous masquerade “Courney.” Signalled under Work in Progress was Kenneth Rose’s celebrated monograph on our author’s identity and date, completed after his untimely death by JPS—a Rose by any other name... Also mentioned here was H. D. Rankin’s Petronius the Artist, destined to be broadsided in PSN 3.1, 3–4 by Froma Zeitlin, tenently countered (4.1, 1) by a non-rankling Rankin.

6.1 kicked off with a delightful Twainian “The announcement of the death of Prof. Ettore Paratore (sc. in 5.1) was greatly exaggerated”—was someone’s wish the father to the thought? 10.2 brought dramatic news of another kind. Henceforth, the exaggerated”—was someone’s wish the father to the thought? Henceforth, the Newsletter would have a changed format, its mandate extended to all ancient prose fiction, with four luminaries cop- opted to cope with this relaunch. Now sharing the masthead: Raymond Astbury, Bryan Reardon, Gerald Sandy, and—who else?—JPS.

18.1 brought a bit of low fun, via an editorial apology for unkund comments about William Arrowsmith embedded in a review of R. Jenkyns’ “Silver Latin Poetry and the Latin Novel.” Given the knockabout style of Arion, I imagine Arrowsmith could have looked after himself. This nonsense may serve to underline the dangers of publishing anonymous libel- li, one reason why the venerable Times Literary Supplement eventually abandoned this practice. Its defenders maintain that this “Outis” policy protects younger critics from their more powerful targets’ revenge—ad hoc sub iudice lis est.

Volume 23 (1993) might well have been edged in black. Looking at it again, I hum those well-known lines from Don Maclean’s “American Pie.” This annus horribilis robbed us, far too soon, of John Sullivan, who had as much glory in front of him as behind. In North Korean style, JPS remained on the masthead for the next two years, there joined successively by Michael Hendry, rightly springing to his own dogged defence of his original doggy piece against my animadversions thereon.

1994’s issue comported a prophetic first, the inclusion of Gareth’s e-mail address, omen of the mixed blessings of the electronic age, culminating in the transmogrification, a year after its 30th anniversary, of PSN into an on-line journal, in tandem with Ancient Narrative—sunt lacrimae rerum (the advantages of e-mail notwithstanding)...

I dare say others will wax eloquent over those fabled Petronian Society parties. Being almost as “unclubbable” as Sir John Hawkins, I am not the person for that. Anyway, as they say about the Sixties, if you remember them, you weren’t there. Best I recollect, my first one was in Boston, furnishing two memories: the publishing lady from Detroit who tagged along and afterwards remarked that it was a long time since she’d last had warm sherry, and the sight of a comatose dis- tinguished Harvard Latinist—name withheld to protect the guilty.

Sam Goldwyn once famously urged his script-writers to “find me some new clichés.” I’ll sign off with a familiar one that (alas) does not fit the ancients: Life Begins at Forty, an optim- ism guaranteed by the new helmspersons, Shannon Byrne and Edmund Cueva.

(At the time of penning, er, processing this—April 2009—PSN 38 (2008) had still not appeared—Absit Omen! Surely not a case of parturient montes...? More scope for another cliché: Festina lente...?)

Barry Baldwin

Petronius and the Greek Novel

I first learned of the existence of the Petronian Society at an APA meeting; I had arrived in the U.S.A. only recently from the U.K., where it was hardly known. Inevitably, it was not through any formal channel but in the bar, where the most important APA things always do happen, through the not-at-all formal, genial Gareth (and no doubt his then associate John Sullivan—be and I had been contemporaries at Cambridge, and by then we were both in California). I was invited to a party in Gareth’s rooms, and in such cases my arm twists easily. There, I discovered that there was free drink and talk of Petronius; both of these suited me—not that I was particu- larly interested in Petronius, but the two seemed to fit well enough. In the following year or two, I made a connection with what did interest me much more, the Greek novels: were they and Petronius different species? I suppose that question has not yet been fully resolved, and never will be. One of us suggested that there might be room for the Greek novel in the Petronian Society’s hunting grounds—and that was it. I needed to keep tabs on Greek novel publications for my own purposes anyway, and as well, while I was at it, add com- ments where appropriate (Gareth, with the assistance of other scholars, was already doing that for his contributions). One feature of the whole scene, of course, was and is that there is no entrance fee, no annual contribution: you are a member of the Petronian Society if you think you are—and that is the essence of Gareth’s approach to the whole field. The field grew considerably; so did the journal, and so did the cost of producing it; but these costs were met by an enlightened and generous sponsor and, one suspects, Gareth’s own pocket (certainly he never came begging to me). It wasn’t until the
1982 edition (vol. 12, No. 2) that the amalgamation between Latin and Greek prose fiction actually happened. Of course, that was the time when the Greek novels were spreading their wings, presumably to some degree under the impulse of the first ICAN in 1976 (how long ago, how primitive, that must seem now to the gratifyingly large number of survivors!). Gareth had already been including some Greek novel items in his general bibliography; given its own space, that topic could be treated more systematically (although even then, Petronius commanded much more attention than, say, Xen. Eph.—and one can see why). So I began to contribute bibliographical (and quite often critical) details on contributions to the Greek novel, though only every couple of years (sometimes three). All the same, the number grew each year. At one point (Vol. 24, June 1994, p. 7) I suggested that the whole subject of ancient fiction could mount its own specialist journal (with a mischievous name, Roman—which, though appropriate in itself, would fox librarians, but would also irritate users, I suppose). In practice, Gareth took to including Greek novel items pretty fully in his general bibliography anyway, so that no separate report on Greek fiction was now needed; and to my surprise and pleasure PSN did in practice virtually amalgamate with Ancient Narrative in due course in 2000 (vol. 30).

So that by now (2009) PSN itself is indeed forty years old. A fitting tribute to Gareth, who more than anyone else has been, from the beginning, the mainstay of bibliography and dissemination of knowledge of the novel, both Greek and Latin: where would “novelists’” be now without his sustained effort? Can a journal have a Festschrift? Well, PSN has; and no-one is more glad of Gareth’s labours than I am. It is his journal, it is a major part of his legacy to the whole topic, and in saluting it I salute him.

Bryan Reardon

Venit iam quadragesimus annus

(With apologies to Petronius)

The 40th year of the Petronian Society has not arrived with the expectation of a free meal, but it does usher in a wealth of warm memories. I remember above all the congenial gatherings hosted amiably by Gareth Schmeling in his hotel room in the various cities in which the annual meetings of the American Philological Association were being hosted. The drinks always flowed freely but never, as I recall, with the result that the fire brigade had to break down the door, although there were complaints from neighbouring suites of elevated levels of animated conversation and above all laughter. I also remember that when I applied to my faculty for travel funds to participate in one of the sessions organized by Gareth it was not always easy to convince the dean of my faculty that the Petronian Society was a serious scholarly organization. It was and is and has provided a venue for meeting like-minded Petronian and ancient-narrative scholars from around the world.

As we charter members of the Petronian Society fade away into our dotage younger members, much in evidence at ICAN IV in Lisbon in July 2008, will undoubtedly add to the advances in scholarship on the ancient novel that the Petronian Society helped to initiate and in the collaborative spirit that it has fostered.

Hoc iuvit, iuvat, et diu iuvabit; hoc non deficit incipitque simper.

Gerald Sandy
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Barry Baldwin reports

According to Stuart Gillespie, “Translation & Literature” 15.1 (2006), p. 47 (electronic publication), the unpublished papers of William Popple (1700–1764, a descendant of Andrew Marvell’s sister) include a stage adaptation of Petronius’ “Ephesian Matron,” now in the British Library. Popple also left translations of Juvenal 6 & 10, also much of Horace (his version of Ars Poetica was published in 1753). Most of Popple’s work was apparently done in Bermuda, which he governed from 1745 to just before his death. Gillespie has published the Juvenal and some Horace in “Translation & Literature” 15.1 (2006), 51–96, and 16.2 (2007), 205–35.

Professor Gillespie (University of Glasgow, Scotland) has most kindly provided the following bibliographical information from the British Library ms. catalogue: Add. 18614. “THE EPHESIAN Matron. A Tragi-Comedy of one Act,” by William Popple; with dedication to [philip Dormer Stanhope] Earl of Chesterfield. Paper; XVIIIthe cent. Folio.

I am further grateful to Professor Gillespie for much extra information about Popple and his works. Readers of PSN should consult his above-mentioned studies of Popple’s Horace and Juvenal for hitherto overlooked examples of the
influence of Roman Satire on this intriguing amateur playwright and translator.

Popple’s Ephesian Matron comes about midway between Walter Charleton’s Matrona Ephesia, sive, Lusus serius de amore (1659), and The Ephesian Matron, or The Widow’s Tears, a one-act comic opera (1769) with music by Charles Dibdin and libretto by Isaac Bickerstaff. The latter, an acquaintance of Samuel Johnson, was obliged to flee England in 1772 to avoid prosecution for homosexuality. This spoof of contemporary opera was premiered at the Ranelagh Gardens in London. Thanks to Google, I found a 2005 BBC press release describing its frequent modern performances in the 20th century, down to 2002 and 2003.

How long before we see Petronius on Broadway?

The Sunday Times (London)
October 19, 2008
Lamented prophet
BYLINE: Ian Fraser ian@ianfraser.org
SECTION: BUSINESS; Scotland Business; Pg.2
LENGTH: 138 words

“There’s a strange symmetry in the death last Sunday of Ian Rushbrook, the talented Edinburgh fund manager who has been predicting the crash for years.

“Ian received a lot of criticism while the debt-fuelled consumer party continued apace. More bullish investors couldn’t get their heads around Ian’s conviction that the party couldn’t last. Now that the bust he predicted several years ago is with us, he has been utterly vindicated.

“At the Personal Assets Trust annual meeting in 2007, Ian said: ‘Is the financial world sleepwalking into disaster? No. It’s worse than that. It’s walking into disaster, wide awake.’

Charles Kindleberger, author of Manias, Panics and Crashes, explains this by quoting the Roman writer Petronius: ‘Mundus vult decipi: ergo decipiatur’— ‘The world wants to be deceived, so let it be deceived.’”

The Observer (England)
February 3, 2008
OSM: SEX & SPORT: Sex gods: Sports stars have been erotic icons since the time of ancient Greece
BYLINE: Simon Goldhill
SECTION: OBSERVER SPORTS MAGAZINE; Pg. 27
LENGTH: 663 words

“The ancient Greeks thought that going to the gym regularly was a good way to prepare young men for war, and a necessary training for the body’s health. It was also the place to pick up boys.

“Socrates, the philosopher, always had an eye for the cute young man, and he describes the scene at Taureas’s gym when the hunk of the day walked in. ‘The fellow looked absolutely amazing: his beauty, his size. Everyone seemed to me to fancy him—they were so dumb struck and confused when he came in—with a great crowd of lovers following him.’ A friend adds: ‘If he took his kit off, you wouldn’t bother with his face…’

“This was a familiar scene to Socrates’s audience. The classical Greeks were obsessed with beautiful bodies and spent a good deal of time talking about them, honing them, and looking at each other’s flesh. In the gym, men—and men only—took all their clothes off, poured oil over their bodies and then had it scraped off, and then they exercised naked, including wrestling together. In a culture that supported affectionate and erotic relations between males, it is no surprise that going to the gym was a pretty sexy affair.

“This was part of the good life. Every Greek city worth its name had a string of gymnasia and many citizens went to the gym every day. One little poem celebrates the ideal vividly: ‘He’s a lucky guy, who’s in love, goes to the gym, comes home and sleeps with his beautiful boy all day.’ These words were written for performance by a man among his friends, drinking happily at a symposium—the evening parties at which men relaxed together. For the ancient Greek, sex and sport went together naturally.

“The professional athlete on his way to the Olympic Games was sometimes advised not to have sex before the day to save his strength. But the man who won at the Olympic Games returned home in a procession as grand as any ticker-tape parade, and, like any modern celebrity, became a sex-bomb overnight. Even the cabbage-eared boxer, sweaty from the fray, had his passionate admirers.

“Sport was where masculinity was on display—and masculinity was a turn-on for the Greek spectators. In a city such as Athens, the Greek man was surrounded by statues of beautiful heroes and warriors—naked bodies, impossibly developed, and perfectly formed. These statues are now seen as the masterpieces of classical art. But these wonderful bodies, like pictures of supermodels for women today, were a frightening ideal to live up to. The gym could also be an anxious experience.

“Men should ‘glow with fabulous conditioning: neither lean nor skinny, nor excessive in weight, but etched with symmetry.’ That’s Lucian, a Greek satirist from the Roman Empire, spelling out what to aim for: a six-pack, good legs, to be beautifully symmetrical but not too heavy with muscles…

“Socrates was famous for wandering up to acquaintances in the street and warning them that they had got flabby and clearly weren’t working out hard enough. Looking at citizens’ bodies and being looked at critically was all part of the life of the gym. In the city, there was no place to hide. Your body was open to the public gaze—and revealed what sort of a man you were.

“Athenians found it disgusting that in Sparta women also exercised. For them it was a turn-on for the Greek spectators. In a city such as Athens, the Greek man was surrounded by statues of beautiful heroes and warriors—naked bodies, impossibly developed, and perfectly formed. These statues are now seen as the masterpieces of classical art. But these wonderful bodies, like pictures of supermodels for women today, were a frightening ideal to live up to. The gym could also be an anxious experience.

“Men should ‘glow with fabulous conditioning: neither lean nor skinny, nor excessive in weight, but etched with symmetry.’ That’s Lucian, a Greek satirist from the Roman Empire, spelling out what to aim for: a six-pack, good legs, to be beautifully symmetrical but not too heavy with muscles…

“Socrates was famous for wandering up to acquaintances in the street and warning them that they had got flabby and clearly weren’t working out hard enough. Looking at citizens’ bodies and being looked at critically was all part of the life of the gym. In the city, there was no place to hide. Your body was open to the public gaze—and revealed what sort of a man you were.

“Athenians found it disgusting that in Sparta women also exercised. For them it was an all male business. And they recognised that sport in the gym was very much like the grappling of the bedroom. ‘Before wrestling under the rules of the Goddess of Love,’ wrote the novelist Achilles Tatius, ‘boys get to grapple on the wrestling mat, publicly locking bodies together in the gym—and no one says that these em-
braces are immodest.’ Wrestling is a training for when ‘bodies rub firmly against one another in the athletics of pleasure’.

“Achilles Tatius is a sly and wicked writer, but he touches the heart of the issue. For ancient Greeks, going to the gym was never just about sport. It was always about sex, too.”

**The Australian**
August 19, 2009 Wednesday
1-All-round Country Edition

**The Greeks had a blue word for it**

**BYLINE:** Luke Slattery

**SECTION:** FEATURES; Pg. 34

**LENGTH:** 1607 words


“The ancient Greeks, as every school boy and girl knows—or at least once knew—invented democracy, comedy, tragedy and philosophy. Even today many of our markers of cultivation—words such as academy, school, history, logic, grammar, poetry, rhythm, harmony, melody and music—can be traced to the Attic dialect of Athens.

“But not all gifts passed down from our esteemed ancestors are girt, for the Athenian citizenry also made an art form of what we now call smut, dirt, or soft porn. It’s not only that phallices adorned the streets and the surfaces of their famed black figure vases, the language of that unique Athenian contribution to Western civilisation—the theatre—was downright rude.

“In the past century the most authoritative translations from the classical tradition, preserved between the green (Greek) and red (Latin) covers of Harvard’s Loeb Classical Library, danced rather prissily around this fact. No longer. The Loeb library is rolling out a series of new translations and they shed a direct light on our literary inheritance.

“Aristophanes, the master of Old Attic Comedy, is especially unbridled. In his Women at the Thesmophoria, for example, two characters are discussing the tragic poet Agathon, whose effeminate looks were as legendary as his homosexuality.

“The conversation runs as follows:

“Euripides: There is Agathon.

“Kinsman: You don’t mean the sun-tanned strong one?

“Euripides: No, a different one. You’ve never seen him?

“Kinsman: Not the one with the full beard?


“Kinsman: Absolutely not, as far as I know.

“Euripides: Well, you must have f.ked him, though you might not know it.

“This replaces an earlier translation in which the final line, somewhat inexplicably, read: ‘I fear there’s much you don’t remember, sir.’

“A little later in the play Agathon, who is wearing a woman’s cloak, counsels his audience of the need to confront misfortune with submission. It’s a bit of a free kick for Euripides’ ribald kinsman. He shoots back: ‘You certainly got your wide arsehole, you faggot, not with words but in a spirit of submission.’

“In another play by Aristophanes, the oft-staged anti-war comedy Lysistrata, the women of Athens refer to themselves as a frail sex, but in the new dirty realist translation they become a ‘low and horny race’.

“Something of the classical world’s dual inheritance—the noble and the vulgar; elevated and base; beautiful and ugly—is caught by Frederick Nietzsche’s famous distinction between the sublime Apolline spirit and its scary alter ego: the Dionysiac. In a sense, all Greek drama has its roots in the Dionysiac impulse, and was performed at festivals of the wine god Dionysos, called Dionysia. But where tragedy aspires to the sublime, only comedy—an ancient genre believed to have begun with rustic phallic songs—retains its attachment to communal intoxication and merriment: hallmarks of the Dionysiac.

“The Loeb editors, for at least a century, have attempted to draw a veil across the edgy Dionysos. The previous translation of Aristophanes, first published in 1924, has only just been replaced by a five-volume series edited afresh by Boston University classicist Jeffrey Henderson. It was at least a decade in the making.

“‘This is a particular kind of comedy that was meant to be transgressive,’ explains Henderson, who is also general editor of the Loeb Classical Library. ‘The characters wore outrageous costumes and had big leather phallices. The point of the comedy was to shake people up. To expose what was normally hidden, to make fun of it, to take the important people down a peg or two and speak up for the ordinary man.’

“Harvard University Press felt the uncut Aristophanes was justified in order to meet advances in scholarship and a more liberal attitude to sexually explicit banter. As Henderson points out in his introduction to the new series, the old Aristophanes was ‘as Aristophanic as the Victorian era would allow’. Which is to say, not very.

“‘The original Loeb contract, dating from 1911, enjoined authors to alter or omit anything that might give offence,’ remarks Ian Stevenson, assistant editor at HUP.

“‘This injunction, which had as much to do with respect for the law as with prudishness, was removed in the late 1960s, as soon as the British and US obscenity laws were finally relaxed enough to allow the straightforward translation of racy authors; the first to benefit were Martial and Petronius, and since then the library has added, revised, or replaced others, such as Aristophanes, the Greek iambic poets and mime-writers, Catullus, Horace, Juvenal and Perseus, Plautus (in progress), and Terence. During this time Loeb policy has been to produce faithful translations: the nearest attainable Anglophone equivalent to the Greek or Latin without any filters.’

“In the original Loebs, obscene or explicitly sexual passages were often omitted, or sometimes translated into Latin. In the passage quoted above from Aristophanes’ Thesmophoria, for example, the real meaning of that pungent last line of Greek
was encoded in a Latin footnote (for the delectation of classicists).

"Some other passages were subtly altered.

"In the old translation of Aristophanes’ Acharnians the unlikely hero, Dicæopolis, is first to arrive at the Athenian assembly. ‘I pass the time complaining, yawning, stretching,’ he says in the old translation. And the new: ‘I sigh, I yawn, I stretch, I fart.’

“A little later in the play we have a phallic hymn and procession which seems to capture the untamed Dionysiac spirit of archaic comedy: ‘Yes, it’s far more pleasant, Phales Phales [the personification of the phallus], to catch a budding maid with pilfered wood—Strymodorus Thracian girl from the Rocky Bottom—and grab her waist, lift her up, throw her down, and take her cherry.’

“The old Loeb version was considerably more coy: ‘Far happier ‘tis to me and sweeter, O Phales, Phales, some soft glade in, to woo the saucy, arch, deceiving, young maiden, as from my woodland fells I meet her descending with my fagots laden, and catch her up, and ill entreat her, and make her pay the fine for thieving.’

“Stevenson offers this example from the Roman poet Martial. ‘You sang badly, Aegle, while your practices were normal. Now you sing well, but you aren’t to be kissed,’ ran the old version. This has been rendered anew as: ‘You sang badly, Aegle, in the days when you were f..ked. Now you sing well, but you aren’t to be kissed.’

“Alastair Blanshard, a University of Sydney classicist with an interest in ancient erotica, notes that in the old Loeb of Greek writer Achilles Tatus’ Leucippe and Cleitophon, as soon as the discussion of the supremacy of same-sex love over different-sex love moves on from mythological arguments to ‘the pleasure that lies in the works of love themselves’, the translation switches from English to Latin. A close encounter with the full-blooded reality of classical language can surprise even students raised on the argot of the internet. ‘I recall one student practically turning pink in his face upon his first encounter with the new Aristophanes translation,’ says Blanshard’s university colleague Julia Kindt, a German-trained classicist and expert in Greek religion. “The Loeb editions, both the old and the new translations, ultimately also show how we read ourselves into the texts when we translate. The different styles superbly reflect the cultural predispositions of the time when they were produced.’

“For scholars of earlier times a classical education was part of a broader project: cultivation and elite formation. The great German scholar Theodor Mommsen, born in 1817, hoped an education in the classics would ‘prepare the child of the cultivated classes to be a professor of classical studies’. And for several centuries after the physical rediscovery of the classical world at Rome, the Vesuvian cities of Pompeii and Herculaneum, Apollo’s sanctuary of Delphi, and Athens itself, these Apollonian ideals stressing rationality, mastery and proportion held sway.

“But the late-modern classical revival is widening our aperture on the past and enlarging the term ‘classical’ to include things that might once have seemed barbaric.

“We can now detect, using Nietzsche’s terminology, a refocusing of interest in the classical world around the Dionysiac elements of that tradition. Certainly, the makers of the US mini-series Rome pictured the ancient capital in the colours of a latter day Mumbai: as festive, unruly, blood-stained, and aglow. Contemporary scholars, who are more interested in transgression than connoisseurship, are finding a different use for the classics. The new-look Loeb is meeting this challenge, and bringing the classical world home.

“The only trouble with Aristophanes is that it’s not entirely clear in which camp he seems more comfortable: the Apollo-nian or the Dionysiac? His plays are crammed with fart, phal-lus and bum jokes, and scorn is his metier, while his theatrical language is a blend of the lofty and the vulgar.

“But Aristophanic subversion had a rational end, as social critique essential for healthy democratic functioning. Dicæopolis, it’s worth remembering, the main character of Achar-nians, will ‘speak against everyone’ as he makes his lone case to the Athenians for a private truce with Sparta. But he will speak, nevertheless, the outrageous truth.

“As he tells the assembly, in words that transcend the fog of translation: ‘Even comedy knows about what’s right; and what I say will be shocking, but right.’"


Notices

American Philological Association, January 6–9, 2010 141st Annual Meeting, Orange County (Anaheim), CA

Panel: Petronius’ Satyrica: New Readings, New Directions

● Makowski, J., “Petronius’ Giton: Gender and Genre.”
● McCoy, M., “Petronius’ Other Rome: The Cities of the Satyricon in the Roman Imaginary.”
● Skinner, M., “Fortunata and the Virtues of Freedwomen.”

Panel: Visualizing Ancient Narrative: From Manuscript to Comics


Panel: One Hundred and Twenty Years of Homosexuality


Panel: Greek Novel and Rhetoric

● Groves, R., “Women, Sex, Bilingualism, and the Aethiopika.”
● Sloan, M., “The Original Locus for moria peristaseos.”
● Weaire, G., “Pedagogy and Politeness in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ De compositione verborum.”

Classical Association of the Middle West and South, 105th Annual Meeting, Marriott City Center Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 1–4, 2009

Panel: Petronius: Author, Identities, Reception

● Bay, S. M., “The Petronian Question within a Neroian Context.”
● Carter, M., “Petronius and Hunter S. Thompson.”
● McCoy, M. B., “The Cult of Priapus and Queer Identities in Petronius’ Satyrica.”
● Slater, N. W., “His Career as Trimalchio: Petronian Character and Narrative in Fitzgerald’s Great American Novel.”
Panel: Petronian Socie Newsletter 39, February 2010

● Capettini, E., “Ethiopian Andromache: philandria and eros.”
● Capra, A., “Erotic scenes, erratic narratives, ironic distances: Plato and Xenophon’s Antithetic Symposia.”
● Chew., K., “Erotikoi logos and sophrosune: [self-] control in Achilles Tatius, Longus, and Heliodorus.”
● Cotton, A., “‘Reading, learning and desire: narrative, frustration, and philosophical progress in Plato’s Phaedrus.’”
● King, D., “A survivor’s story: narrating painful experiences in a pleasing way.”
● Lacki, G., “Sex and sea: the temptations of narration (Ov. Her. 18–19).”
● Nimis, S., “Eros the novelist.”
● Panayotakis, S., “Desire and Storytelling in Apuleius’ Apuleius’”

Panel: Petronius & Apuleius

● Wiltshire, D. C., “Intertexts between Catullus’ Coma Berenices and Apuleius’ Met. 2.6–9.”
Panel: Tacitus

Panel: The Nature of Horror in Classical Antiquity


Classical Association of the Middle West and South, 90th Anniversary Meeting, November 13–15, 2008, Asheville, North Carolina, University of North Carolina at Asheville

Panel: Oprah’s Book Club

● Clapp, D., “The Metamorphosis of Fama in Apuleius’ Asinus Aureus.”

Classical Association of the Middle West and South, 106th Annual Meeting, Renaissance Convention Center Hotel, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, March 24–27, 2010

Panel: Petronius and Apuleius

● Garcia, L. F., “Trimalchio as Cultural Theorist: The Semiotics of Ambition in the Cena Trimalchionis.”
● Nguyen, J. T., “Life and Death in the Cena Trimalchionis.”

Panel: Greek Novel and Narrative

● Banta, J. L., “Reversing Meaning: Making Metaphor Reality in Lucian’s True Histories.”
● Regan, M., “Hellenistic Magic in the Argonautica.”
● Weiberg, E., “Narrative and Social Space in Heliodorus’ Aethiopica.”


● Cotton, A., “Reading, learning and desire: narrative, frustration, and philosophical progress in Plato’s Phaedrus.”
● King, D., “A survivor’s story: narrating painful experiences in a pleasing way.”
● Lacki, G., “Sex and sea: the temptations of narration (Ov. Her. 18–19).”
● Nimis, S., “Eros the novelist.”
● Panayotakis, S., “Desire and Storytelling in Apuleius’”

Panel: The Nature of Horror in Classical Antiquity


Classical Association of the Middle West and South, 90th Anniversary Meeting, November 13–15, 2008, Asheville, North Carolina, University of North Carolina at Asheville

Panel: Oprah’s Book Club

● Clapp, D., “The Metamorphosis of Fama in Apuleius’ Asinus Aureus.”

Classical Association of the Middle West and South, 106th Annual Meeting, Renaissance Convention Center Hotel, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, March 24–27, 2010

Panel: Petronius and Apuleius

● Garcia, L. F., “Trimalchio as Cultural Theorist: The Semiotics of Ambition in the Cena Trimalchionis.”
● Nguyen, J. T., “Life and Death in the Cena Trimalchionis.”

Panel: Greek Novel and Narrative

● Banta, J. L., “Reversing Meaning: Making Metaphor Reality in Lucian’s True Histories.”
● Regan, M., “Hellenistic Magic in the Argonautica.”
● Weiberg, E., “Narrative and Social Space in Heliodorus’ Aethiopica.”

“Theme: Truth and Fiction

● Pervo, R. I., “History Told by Losers: Dictys and Dares on the Trojan War.”
● Ramelli, I., “The Abgar-Tiberius Epistolary between Historical Truth and Fiction.”
● Schellenberg, R. S., “Suspense, Simultaneity, and the Providence of God: Theology and Narrative Structure in the Book of Tobit.”
● van den Heever, G., “X-Files, the Matrix, and Strange Tales of the Beyond: Truth, Fiction, and Social Discourse.”

Theme: Literary Portraits

● Amen, R., “The Protocol of the Industrious Slave in Ancient Fiction (as an Interpretive Context for Dorcas, the Female Disciple (Acts 9:36–43)).”
Reviews, Articles, and Dissertations

Barry Baldwin reports

A Bit More Gas(lee)

Das Buechelers Buch
In 1862, at the tender age of 25, Franz Buecheler (henceforth, B) issued from Berlin his Editio Maior of Petronius, postulated that same year by the Editio Minor, the latter reissued in 1871, 1882, 1895, 1904, 1912 (augmented by W. Heraus), 1922, 1958 (refurbished by Peter Bachmann), and 1963. It is presumably this record which Konrad Müller is aspiring to beat with his (so far) quintet of Teubners (1961, 1973, 1983, 1995, 2003) plus the 1965 de luxe version equipped with Teutonic rendering by Wilhelm Ehlers—Müller should get out more. (Haven’t seen the 2008 hard & paperback English edition (Bibliophil) from India, currently being flogged by Amazon and other Internet bibliopoles).

Those still arguing the titular toss between *Satyricon* and *Satyrica*—Müller in cake-having-and-eating style has used both—might note B’s own *Satirae*, posthumously mutated to *Saturae*, a vowel movement devotees of 1950 pop music may see as a tribute to Major Lanx. For my money, whichever option you choose, their plural forms suggest a large episodic novel rather than one tightly plotted, hence my long-standing (from *Classical Philology* 68, 1973, 294–296, to ‘Gareth and Me: A Petronian Pilgrimage,’ in *Ancient Narrative*, eds. S. Byrne/ E. Cueva/ J. Alvares, Groningen 2006, 37–40), heresy that *Ira Priapi* is not the controlling theme.

Stephen Gaselee (*The Bibliography of Petronius*, London 1910, 61–62) hailed the Editio Maior as “a very great date in Petronian literature...there can never be one editor who will not look back on his recension as the foundation of all really scientific criticism,” words and sentiments closely echoed in Warnington’s revision of Heseltine’s Loeb, xxviii, also Gareth Schmeling and Johanna Stuckey, (*A Bibliography of Petronius*, Leiden 1977, 20–21, and 139 for B’s Petronian papers). Gaselee endorsed his own praise with lavish quotation from André Collignon’s *Pétrone en France* (Paris 1905, 118: cf. his *Etude sur Pétrone*, Paris 1892; *Pétrone au Moyen Age*, Paris & Nancy 1893): “M. Buecheler, après avoir revu avec une rare conscience les manuscrits et les éditeurs anciens, a sur beaucoup de points très heureusement amendé le texte...Nul n’a donc au siècle dernier mieux que M. Buecheler

1 The summaries of the dissertations are from the data supplied by Pro Quest.
préparé la voie aux études ultérieures sur le Satiricon. Nul n’est plus maitre de ce sujet.”

“Criticorum facile principec,” opined Marx (not Karl or Groucho, but Friedrich, editor of Lucilius, scathingly reviewed—no surprise there—by Housman, to whom we shall recur). Not any more. Though dutifully commended for the advance marked by his Edito Maior, B nowadays lives mainly in what has well been dubbed “the twilight world” of footnotes and critical apparatuses. His readings are more often rejected than accepted in Martin Smith’s edition of the Cena (Oxford 1975)—notes on 29.9, 30.3, 38.10, 44.5, 44.16, 47.5, 53.12, 55.8, 58.14, 61.8, 62.11, 64.1, 73.5, 74.15. Müller is snide on his all-embracing critical apparatus: “amplissimo instruxit, in quem omnes omnium coniecturas bonas malasque unidue collectas consessit. Mihi alter agendum erat...” On the dating question, he is entirely missing from Kenneth Rose’s round-up of nineteenth century views (The Date and Author of the Satyricon, Leiden 1971, 8). One wonders how many graduate students, even their coaches, have ever read through the Latin prose of B’s introduction and apparatus? As we shall see, such delinquents are missing a lot of instructive fun.

British classicist-politician Enoch Powell remarked of Housman, “It was a big mind that chose to live in a small room.” B occupied several rooms in the mansion of Housmanic odium academicum (see in general, without the present examples, P. G. Naiditch, ‘The Slashing Style Which All Know And Few Applaud: The Invective of A. E. Housman,’ Aspects of Nineteenth-Century British Classical Scholarship, ed. H. D. Jocelyn, Liverpool, 1996, 137–150, with my review-article in Echos Du Monde Classique/Classical Views 42, 1998, 709–722). At best, neutral mentions in his Letters (ed. Archie Burnett, Oxford 2007, vol. 1, 406; vol. 2, 91, 310 n. 1, 392, 406–407). And some backhanded compliments. In his first Manilian Preface, Housman classifies B with other Teutons as one who practised “the art of explaining corrupt passages instead of explaining them,” also amongst “men of wide learning and no mean acuteness, but without simplicity of judgement,” postlading with the jesting compliments “they know too much Latin, and they are not sufficiently obtuse...that hebetude of intellect which they, despite their assiduous and protracted efforts, have not yet succeeded in acquiring,” crescendo to “Indeed, I imagine that Mr Buecheler, when he first perused Mr Sudhaus’ edition of the Aetna, must have felt something like Sin when she gave birth to death”—I myself imagine B would have felt the same when confronted with the (to borrow a lapidary phrase from Gaselee) “ridiculous farsings” of modern literary theory. B, though, would feel harsher Housmanic stings, notably in his Juvenal Preface where B’s method of recension is “a convenient substitute for mental exertion,” and above all this bravura performance from his Lucan Preface:

“We arrive at evening upon a field of battle, where lie 200 corpses. 197 of them have no beards; the 198th has a beard on the chin; the 199th has a false beard slewed around under the left ear; the 200th has been decapitated and the beard is nowhere to be found. Problem: had it a beard, a false beard, or no beard at all? Buecheler can tell you: it had a beard, a beard on the chin.”

The piquant thing is, H may have been inspired to some of his “thunderbolts of poisoned invective” (W. H. Auden) by B who, as will be seen, was no slouch at that.

I am writing elsewhere on alleged interpolations in Petronius. B has twenty-two entries in the vast inventory of J. P. Sullivan, ‘Interpolations in Petronius,’ Proceedings Of The Cambridge Philological Society 202 (1976), 90–122. To his eternal credit, only one is of the id est variety (the favourite target of textual pervers’ big-game hunting) , to wht the id est expectatio liberae cænae that opens the Cena narrative. B went to town on this: Compiler intertempestive inserit, dum meminit aliquam saturarum partem in qua referebatur de suprema cena gladiatorum, damnatum enim ad ludum Encolpium fuisse—mildly condemned by Smith as “too drastic.” For the rest, the time is (Trotsky’s phrase) not only ripe but rotten ripe to exorcise Fraenkel’s imaginary Carolingian Interpolator along with those other fashionable phantoms, Enman’s KG and Syme’s Ignotus.

After a sly epigraph, probo amesques qui vis archetypas habere magas, B’s preamble kicks off with the reminder that Arbiter is a genuine cognomen, adducing via Mommsen a Neapolitan inscription (missed by Rose, 44) commemorating one L. Lucius L. l. Arbiter. Then, an epigraphic nugget (also neglected by Rose) from Rome’s Aurelian Way (no. 1175 in Orelli, partly reproduced in Richmond Lattimore’s Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs [Urbana 1962, 118], exhibiting M. Antonius Encolpus’ loving dedication to “his dearest wife, eleven years together without a quarrel,” Cerellia Fortunata, along with some instructions for tomb upkeep that slightly recall those of Trimalchio (Sat. 71.6–12). Pliny’s lector Encolpus (Epist. 8.1) might have been added to this onomastic tally. These ordinary bearers of such names may deter us from reading too much into Petronius’ choice of his characters’ nomenclature. B’s own conclusion admixes humour with hard-headedness: “ceterum nominum inter hanc lapidem et Petroniani satiram simillito aede casu eventit ut ne hoc quidem mihi persuadacem quod de Friderico Welcherio audire me memini, indita hominis ubi nominas esse Fortunatum et Encolpi ex libri Petroniani memoria.”

B’s name is missing from Rose’s inventory (82–86) of detectors of covert allusions to Nero in Petronius—I put my own hand up here. But, no doubts about chronology: “De aetate Petronii du multimque erroraverunt, hodie nullum posse spero haecstara,” a bold declaration in an age of widespread scepticism (Rose, 7–8, with mention of B’s named target Niebuhr, but not B himself). B owned himself convinced by Theophilus (Gaselee, 86, awards him the initial G) Studer’s ‘Ueber das Zeitalter des Petronius Arbiter,’ Rheinisches Museum 2, 50 & 202, positing Eumolpus’ Bellum Civile effusion as a critique of Lucan, a line of argument not accepted in all modern quarters.
After an exhaustive/exhausting, indeed chalcenetic examination of manuscript pedigrees, traditions, and variants, B lets rip with an often Housmanesquely rancid review of previous Petronian connoisseurs and editors, reaching back to one Ioannes Baptista Pius, a character untypically missed by Gaselee. Not that B brags of delving into every editorial nook and cranny: “Editiones Petronii primas neque inveni in eis bibliothecarum quorum in potestate mea usus erat neque curiosi
us alibi inquisivi quod non ita utiles mihi videbantur esse, multo minus necessariae, et inopia illarum abscondit mea compensationem copia deteriorium quos collatos habui codicum.”

The first Petronian pioneers pass relatively unscathed. First to be verbally felled is Ioannes à Wouweren: despite three editions (1594, 1596, 1604), “nihil fere novavit Ioannes Wouwe
rius,” a judgement recycled without acknowledgement by Gaselee (32, “Wouweren did not particularly improve the text or exegesis of our author”). Still, Wow-Wow got off lightly, compared to the unfortunate Ioannes Petrus Lotichius (1629), his effort Greekly dismissed as “paunch graama kai ou toron all’ elleinon,” a Judge Roy Bean verdict approved by Gaselee (16), “almost useless, not ill-described by Buecheler.”

Apropos of the debates over authenticity of the newly-discovered Tragurian Cena manuscript, B took a lofty view of Thomas Reinesius’ view (1666) that (in Gaselee’s unimprovable words) “there was a groundwork of genuine Petronian work, interpolated with ridiculous farsings by a late imitator” (36): “Thomas Reinesius saltem ‘aliquam partem Petroniastri alieuius esse’ sibi persuasit”—if only our literary critics (36): “”work, interpolated with ridiculous farsings by a late imitator”

vable words) “there was a groundwork of genuine Petronian work, interpolated with ridiculous farsings by a late imitator” (36): “Thomas Reinesius saltem ‘aliquam partem Petroniastri alieuius esse’ sibi persuasit”—if only our literary critics

would write like this!

When it came to the mysterious Michael Hadrianides (1669; cf. my investigation of him in PSN 32, 2002, 6–8), B declared “fusus egit de novo codice p. 73 ss., de cetero iam ineritum semper praebuit quam inerte futilem;” a fulmination owing something to Peter Burmann’s “stultitla & ineptis insignem fuisse ex notis eius facile perspexi,” a damnatio memoriae approved by Gaselee (37). The latter (38) also assented to B’s crushing verdict on the production (1677) of Ioannes Boschius: “quicquid novi habuit, habuit ex disciplina Heinsii.”

Pride of place in B’s fools’ gallery belongs to the unfortunate Ioannes Jacobus Reiskius, introduced in the venomous contrast “Heinsius vir optimi vel Reiskius vir pessimi,” his editing (1743) then succumbing to “correctorius munere abusus ita administravit, ut tuventi licentia verba insolensissime mutaret, semel atque iterum non inflicteri, centes prorsus insane,” words reproduced without mention of B by Gaselee (50). Mutatis mutandis, this could be mistaken for a Housman militancy.

After brief allusions to Anton’s (1781) edition and the Bipontine (1790), the ensuing period of aridity is excoriated as one in which “ludebant autem de corio Petronii sagati togaui,” echoing Suetonius, Divus Julius 48—other such flourishers include Petronius’ own (as we have him) opening Sed num alio genere furiarum, a remark whose “dryness” tickled Warnington’s fancy, also self-serving in that this drought would end with B himself. Not that we get a dose of Housma-nian ego: after generous praise of his mentor Otto Jahn, B ends on a note, doubtless not altogether serious, of self-deprecation: “itaque stupetactus profecto mediocrqi mea facultate, cum intueor quantum id sit quod multos annos versatus in hoc scripito contuli ad emendationem.”

The fun continues throughout the critical apparatus: how often can you say that? (Parenthetic references are to Petronius) Hadrianides emended a passage “inscrite” (45.6), Reiskius “inepte” (45.11). Schefferus interpreted one passage (46.7) “prave;” another (30.4) “monstruose,” also (53.1) positing a lacuna “sine causa.” Jacobus tinkered with a reading (17.7) “male Serapim intelligens.” A neat antithetical sentence (14.5) combines praise of one editor with censure of another: “ad-dendumuisseiamDouza sensit. tolli verbum Oudendorpius iussit.” Hildebrand’s sopitis carbonibus (22.1; cf. my discussion in PSN 38, 2008, 27–30) evokes the gorgeous: “carbonibus Petronium dedisse existimo.” This stands comparison with a choice Housmanism (Letters, vol. 1, 69, reproduced by P. G. Naiditch, A. E. Housman at University College London, Leiden 1988, 237): “Dr Rutherford ‘would restore to Euripides the senarius su men cheron to pneum’ ek polemon labon,’ which Euripides, I think, would restore to Dr. Rutherford.”

There are others in the same vein. A conjecture by Sambucus (137.9) is ridiculed by quoting a verse of Menander “Pray for what you want, you’ll get it.” Rejecting calls for a lacuna (131.4, where Müller still demands one), B observes “infearse-runt epigramma Priapeum anthropologiae Burmannianae.” Likewise, on prose fragment 2, “videntur desiderari Petronii verba nescio qua de causa Daniel,” Housmanesque sarcasm attends B’s remarks on poetic fragment 53, “quorum confius auctoritate forsitan quisi quispiam si dis placet Aetnam ignoti poe-tae cœna netterlœrit ad Petronium,” along with his assessment of other attributions: “certe falsos omnes adscribuntur Petronio. quorum multitudo quibus auctoribus creverit.”

Unlike Housman, B had a more homely side. “Id coniectit I. F. Gronovius et ego probo” (88.4); “mihi ut emenderem non contigit” (89.13). His mentors are not forgotten: Ribbeck is Ribbeckius meus (35.20), while the notions of Daniel and Goldastus on poetic fragment 22 are rejected in favour of what probabiliter Iahnius statuit. Reasons for postulating textual gaps are charmingly set out: “lacuum significavi quoniam prae secunditur, non foris sed in cellula agatur” (8.9); “lacuum posui qui miror nisi scriptor, ante quam lascivientes mulieres descripsit, in universam de ebris convivis mentionem fecerat” (70.9); “mirum sane si lecicaruius hoc officio fungitur quod analogous aut triclinarii fuisse putes” (34.3; cf. my ‘Editing Petronius: Methods and Examples,’ Acta Classica 31, 1988, 37–50).

B’s introduction concludes “rogo ex animi sententia Iahnium ante omnes, tum cetero viros quibus codicibus editionumque notitiam debeamus, ut illos ne poeniteat negotiorum quibus mihi gratificati sunt.” He needn’t have worried. Housman (Preface to his Lucan) gibed, “Buecheler died in 1908, and the troop of little dogs which trotted at his heels was scattered abroad in quest of other heels to trot at.” One of these minia-
ture canines was none other than Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, who lamented B’s untimely passing in a brief but moving necrology in The American Journal of Philology 29 (1908), 247:

“I never heard Buecheler lecture except once, and that was in the summer of 1880. The profound impression that lecture made on me is recorded in my Essays and Studies, p. 507. No name is given there, and I have been asked more than once whom I meant. As a manner of tribute to the great scholar, so suddenly called from life, I subjoin the passage here in lieu of a more elaborate expression of the sense of loss I share with the world of classical scholars.”

The passage (published in 1890) follows. It is too long to quote in full. Pertinent extracts: “I attended a lecture by a great master...I was much struck with the tone in which he announced his subject (sc. the vanishing of weak vowel sounds in Latin)...As he went on and marshalled the facts and set in order the long lines that connected the disappearance of the vowel with the downfall of a nationality, and great linguistic, great moral, great historical laws marched in stately procession before the vision of the student, the airy vowels that had flitted into the Nowhere seemed to be the lost soul of Roman life; and the Latin language, Roman literature and Roman history were clothed with a new meaning.”

In defiance of Housman’s barking, I am happy to trot along behind the giant breeds of Buecheler and Gildersleeve.

Happier Horace
To my previous two instalments (PSN 35 & 37), I adduce the conversation between Boccaccio and Petrarcha in Walter Savage Landor’s Pentameron. When the former brings up curiosa felicitas, the latter snaps: “There again! Was there ever such an unhappy (not to say absurd) expression! And this from the man who wrote the most beautiful sentence in all latinity.” The prize-winning words follow: gratias ago languori tuo, quo diutius sub umbra voluptatis lusimus. Unfortunately, adulation is not concomitant with accuracy, this being a misquoted version of Satyricon 129, 3–4: languori tuo gratias ago: in umbra voluptatis diutius lusi. Boccaccio’s response is brisk: “Tear out this from the volume; the rest, both prose and verse, may be thrown away.”

Nachleben
“Gérard threw a dinner with fifty courses. Why? Because it was his fiftieth birthday. Why else? When I first read the menu, it seemed incomprehensible to me, though there was an interior logic—the meal was designed after one described in Petronius’s Satyricon.”—Jim Harrison, Secret Ingredients: The New Yorker Book of Food and Drink (Random House, New York, 2007), p. 93,

“He had told himself, in his notebook, that it was no more disgraceful to fabricate a pièce d’occasion of which he knew almost nothing than to construct a baroque palace or write Trimalchio’s Feast”—Frederic Raphael, Fame and Fortune (JR Books, London, 2007), p.67. Raphael has himself published a translation of Petronius. (Folio Books, London, 2003).


“Romans like Trimalchio’s vulgar prototype might give banquets whose success depended upon the leaping of three naked virgins from a great crusted tart”—M. F. K. Fisher, The Art of Eating (Hoboken, 2004), p. 30 (If only!)

“Petronius Arbiter’s plump citizen could afford to boast: ‘Only command him, and my cook will make you a fish out of the pig’s chitterlings, a wood pigeon out of the lard, a turtle-dove out of the gammox, and a hen out of the shoulder’”—Fisher, p. 107 (she has read Satyricon 70—what a fine word is “gammox,” not in my Shorter OED, and unknown in this sense to Google).

“Friends are always sincere partners in grief or happiness...Petronius was sensible of this truth...”—The Female Tatler 54, Nov. 7–11, 1709. A clear allusion to Satyricon 61.9, in angustiis amici apparent, albeit unremarked by the magazine’s modern (London, 1992) editor Fidelis Morgan (p. 121).

“For it may easily be asked, in the words of the soldier to the Ephesian Matron, in Petronius, Id cinerem aut manes credis curare sepulcos?”—Thomas Tyers, A Biographical Sketch of Dr Samuel Johnson (Gentleman’s Magazine 54, Dec. 1784, pp. 899–911). Tyers’ curare preserves the full Virgilian line 9 (Aen. 4.31), instead of sentirre, read by modern editors. The detail is unnoticed by Tyers’ modern editors, O. M. Brack & R. E. Kelley, The Early Biographies of Samuel Johnson (Iowa, 1974). Curare has some manuscript support (details in the apparatus’ of Müller and Bücheler—the latter actually printed it), and may be right, sentirre being an easy product of a verse so rich in e and s.

Petronius in Cyber Space
Just a sampling, obviously. Type “Petronius” into Google, and you are offered 1,140,000 sites. The classier “Petronius Arbiter” slumps to 129,000. “Satyricon” leaps to 2,040,000, “Satyricon” plummets to 25,4000, a clear indication of which title still prevails.

Naturally, there is much overlap between the quartet, also a great detail of repetition within each one. Much of the contents is mundane: bibliography and book-sellers jostle at the top. Plain “Petronius” is swollen by homonyms and their respective cyber camp-followers. Overall, much menu ortho-
doxy. But, also, before your clicking-finger and eyes give out, a good deal of fun, high and low. Like any student with pressing essay deadline or mental inertia, I zoom first to the Wikipedia entry for “Petronius.” Straightforward and unexceptionable, for the most part. Some brows may shoot up at the postulated birth date of “ca. 27.” Others may wrinkle at the notion, albeit tendered only half-heartedly, that our author was born at Massilia, derived (of course) from the poetical mention of him by Sidonius Apollinaris. When it comes to explaining Tacitus’ failure to mention the Satyricon because it was “beneath the dignity of history,” our Wikipedia has evidently been reading Syme (Tacitus, 336) on why the historian ignored the Apocolocyntosis ascribed (wrongly, I think, still plowing a lonely furrow) to Seneca as “alien to the dignity of history.”

Still, I am grateful to this compiler for pointing me to the frequently-repeated intelligence that in Robert A. Heinlein’s novel The Door into Summer the protagonist has a ginger tom cat named “Petronius the Arbiter,” nicknamed “Pete.” Likewise for the (at the time of writing this, April 2007) first intimation of Jesse Browner’s fictional The Uncertain Hour, recasting Tacitus’ narrative of the famous Petronian last supper.

Such Nachleben are not earth-bound. A heavenly body-let discovered in 1960 by a trio of Dutch astronomers received the appellation “Asteroid 3244 Petronius.” Much lower down, in the Gulf of Mexico, the “Petronius Oilfield” found in 1995 is worked from the “Petronius Platform.” One of the jolliest terrestrial memorials is “The Krewe of Petronius,” a New Orleans Mardi Gras gay club and ball, founded in 1961, presumably in the minds of those Sunday Morning Tellyevangelists who interpreted Katrina as God’s Revenge on the city’s “homosexual plague.” This morbid view would have been espoused by the likes of John Dunlop who, in his History of Fiction (1814), quoted as preface to a cyber-bibliography offered by self-styled “The Above-Average Typist,” described Petronius’ book as “perhaps the most remarkable fiction which has dishonoured the literature of any nation.”

Book? An introductory bibliographical blurb claiming to list “all e-books written by Petronius Arbiter” disappointingly turns out to be just a catalogue of various translations. An even bigger let-down is the site entitled “Satyricum: fuck, fuck, fuck,” which on inspection is just a spot for random blogging. “Petronius,” an alias for Paul Tabori who penned London Unexpurgated and New York Unexpurgated, remains a popular nom de guerre for discrete bloggers et hoc genus omne. One site lists the chess games played by a “Petronius” (pawnpornography?). “A 26-year old Houston guy” trawls on-line for sex partners under the name. Similarly, “Peter from New Jersey” adopts the title of “Octavian Petronius” for his fantasy life as fellow-pupil of Harry Potter at Hogwarts (this might be the way to Hermione’s heart). Among the more opaque exhibits is a site that simply reads “Petronius semper ubi sub ubi = always where under when”—perhaps to be added to Trimalchio’s own collection of rebuses.

The “Petronius Arbiter” rubric is largely taken up with bibliographical material, from which I was glad to learn of W. C. Firebaugh’s (Adelaide, 2007) e-book Englishing, with notes that pop up on cognate sites. Choice cuts off different meat include “Roman Forum II,” describing a New York City revue in which “five Romans from Nero’s time” discuss the farce of the 2000 American presidential election with one Kevin Keaney playing “Petronius Arbiter,” along with the “Radical Academy” listing of cartoons skewering Bill Clinton and (it is promised) George Bush. As a Trekkie (original series only) of long-standing, I cannot leave out the intriguing “Petronius Arbiter II,” self-billed as “Formerly space cadet, rapidly promoted to Fleet Commander,” which inter plurima alia prompts the thought that William Shatner is now adipose enough to depict Trimalchio on stage or screen.

A cognate character, “Petronius Arbiter, Time Traveller,” wins one of the Baldwin Cyber Awards for his/her detailed and fully-referenced inventory of THAT quotation, an item that does much to fatten the number of Petronian sites, suitably prefaced “Expletive, but I am sick of seeing this fake quote.” Almost immediately, though, I was tempted to cancel the award on finding the notorious text attributed to “Petronius Arbiter, 210 BC,” a date that did not tempt even Marmorale. However, “the quality of mercy is not strained,” especially when I saw how common this chronology (sometimes pushed back to 256, sometimes forwarded to a round 200) is in this particular segment (German as well as English) of the Arbiter’s afterlife. More orthodox candidates range from “1st century,” with an innovatory title, Satyricum, to (e.g.) “about AD 30,” “AD 57,” “60 AD.” Special mention goes to Ms Tanny Wells of the South Rosedale Ratepayers Association (Toronto) for her reconciliatory confutation “Written in 210 BC by Petronius the Arbiter, who was a famous satirist during the reign of Nero.” Petronius himself undergoes similar transmogrifications, being “a Greek admiral” in his 210 BC incarnation, “a Roman centurion” in 200 BC, a “centurian” (sic) and more loftily “a Roman general” in his Neronian postings.

Pride of place in the ‘Satyricon’ listings is shared between the homoerotic bibliography “Satyricon au Go-go,” the Satyricon sea-food restaurant at Ipanema in Rio de Janeiro (does THAT Ipanema Girl of song eat there?), and the Norwegian black metal band Satyricon (its front man answers to the sobriquet “Satyr”), which has its own lengthy illustrated Wikipedia site. The “Satyrica” side is equal to this, with its 10-piece combo of the same name, formed at Edinburgh in 1995 by Messrs Carson Thirl and Sean Nolan, disbanded in 1997 after two years gigging and recording in the San Francisco Bay Area (worthy epigones of The Dead Kennedys?). More academic, though scarcely less intriguing, items include the quotation “Satyrca was a comedy wherein Satyrs were brought in” from Sir Thomas Eliot (1538, elsewhere famous for his book
on diet that condemned fruit and vegetables as unhealthy—step forward, carnivores and zombies everywhere), and the sentence Quid Satyrica? Sathanca, inquam, mordacitate et maledicentia in nostram scribere non erubuit, nos tamen referre piger in Amigrinus Jones’ A British Commentary of Iceland (ch. 29). Most tantalising is the notice posted from the 1999 San Francisco meeting of the Shakespeare Association crediting one Andrew Dalby with “a new ending for the Satyricon,” without actually giving it.

At this point, my murine finger failed and screen-vertigo triumphed, hence take this as but a praegustation to the rich menu of Petronian cyber-fare—To Your Google Muttons!


Reviewed by Maria Eugenia Steinberg

Jugar con la Academia y desafiar a los críticos más avezados con el pretendido hallazgo de un manuscrito parecen haber sido las intenciones de José Marchena, cuando se dedicó a escribir el pasaje que completaba una laguna del capítulo 26 del Satiricon de Petronio. Marchena eligió hacerse famoso no tanto por su producción convencional sino por su superchería, una de las más grandes, no por la brevedad del Fragmentum Petronii, de la historia de la falsificación.

Más allá de la anécdota y de las reacciones y debates que despertó el texto de Marchena, quedan por analizar las razones por las que un erudito sin filiación académica, sacerdote de la religión católica, decidió engañar a la comunidad científica con un desparpajo digno de libertinos de cuna. Marchena se detiene en detalles escabrosos de la relación de los personajes en la vigilia de Cuartila, cuando Encolpio, Ascito y Gitón se encuentran sometidos a la tiranía vengativa de la sacerdotisa de Priapo.

Parece al mismo tiempo una habilidad muy particular la que se requiere para dedicar horas de estudio y afanes filológicos a la redacción de un libro como el que nos ocupa, realizado con precisión y detalle por Joaquín Alvarez Barrientos (JAB), en la medida en que ha debido prestar tanta atención a un texto falso insertado en el medio académico por error.

Hubo un tiempo en el que yo misma escribí que los falsificadores son en realidad colaboradores del texto, en tanto se introducen en el continuum de la transmisión de textos muy deseados pero fragmentarios.2 Así como en 1650 había aparecido en la biblioteca de Niccolò Cippico un fragmentum que luego se determinó, tras arduos debates, que era auténticamente petroniano, las falsificaciones de Nodot y de Marchena recurrieron a un marco paratextual de gran perfección para otorgar a su impostura la posibilidad de confundir al público erudito; éste escudriñaría la pieza con solvencia y rigor.

En el caso que nos ocupa, la idea de generar un palimpsesto de la nada debe de haber surgido—en palabras de Díaz y Díaz—de un proyecto nunca aprobado, por el que Marchena se proponía estudiar la escritura subyacente del Código de Eurico en el códice rescripto de la Biblioteca Nacional de París en 1798. No obstante lo cual, la pieza de Marchena pasó por verdadera a los ojos de los especialistas porque calzaba en detalle al final del cap 26 conservado.

Dado que una de las páginas centrales del libro de JAB ofrece los criterios de edición, vale la pena exponerlos aquí también pues pensamos que en ellos se basa la calidad del libro que tenemos entre manos. Se trata de una traducción del texto del fragmentum Petronii de José Marchena y de las notas en francés preciso y de sintaxis clara produjo Marchena para poner en práctica la usanza académica en boga.

La nutrida “Introducción” de JAB da cuenta luego de una breve presentación, de la falsificación en sí, que debía llenar la laguna en el capítulo 26 luego de la palabra verberabant. Bajo el subtítulo de “El fragmento,” JAB reproduce la traducción del fragmento que aparecerá nuevamente más adelante cuando edita el texto a continuación del texto latino; y reproduce en nota al pie la traducción de Díaz y Díaz (1968), justificada en su duplicación “por su estilo más arcaizante.” Entre las páginas 35 y 52 se encuentra el apartado referente a “Las notas: erudición libertina y erotismo,” luego la sección “Filosofía materialista, sexualidad e historia cultural” donde JAB estudia los fundamentos filosóficos y culturales de la posición de Marchena que termina ofreciendo una historia de las costumbres sexuales hasta su propia época.

Finalmente, bajo el subtítulo “Por qué el fragmentum” insiste JAB sobre el significado de la producción de un fragmento en el marco cultural de la comunidad académica de comienzos del siglo XIX.

Finalmente, da comienzo con una portada impactante (pág. 71) la edición del texto en sí de la interpolaración de Marchena: Fragmentum Petronii ex Bibliothecae Sti. Galli Antiquissimo MSS. Excerptum, nunc primum in lucem editum, Gallice vertit ac notis perpetuis illustravit LALLEMANDUS, S. Theologiae Doctor, 1800.

Una dedicatoria al ejército del Rin abre la edición. Las notas al pie corresponden a JAB quien apoya las aseveraciones de Marchena en su dedicatoria al ejército del Rin. En esta dedicatoria, Marchena da cuenta de las circunstancias en las que en el marco de su impostura habría tenido lugar la aparición del Fragmento de Petronio, como adquisición de convenio. Leyendo un pergaminho con la obra de Genadio sobre las obligaciones de los sacerdotes, se percata de la existencia de otro texto cuyas incisiones habían intentado ser borradas. Afirma que no habría dudas acerca de la autenticidad, y se lo ofrece al “bravo ejército francés.” Para dar fe de su autenticidad, trae a colación el carácter fragmentario del episodio de Cuartila, más precisamente en el momento en que la sacerdotisa de Priapo y Encolpio observan

---

por la cerradura los escarceos amorosos de Gitón y Pánquiquis. El lector de este pequeño volumen de la edición de JAB queda sorprendido por la presencia de notas aclaratorias respecto por ejemplo de quién es Priapo (n.4 de JAB) junto a otras en las que el editor menciona por ejemplo la ironía de las expresiones de Marchena al referirse éste a la autenticidad del fragmento: afirma Marchena “El estilo del latín lleva de tal modo el sello de Petronio que es imposible creer que el fragmento sea falso.” Esta expresión de Marchena es complementada por JAB al pie de página con el siguiente comentario: “Marchena despliega en estas páginas, como a lo largo del texto, enorme ironía al tratar los distintos asuntos. Ahora evidencia, para quien quisiera entenderle, la falsedad de su fragmento, pues la alusión tan clara a no dudar de su autenticidad es obvia. Algo similar se encuentra también en Nodot.”

Solamente al leer el Fragmentum Petronii—que ocupa 36 líneas en las páginas 77 y 78 del libro y luego las páginas 79 a 81 con la traducción del latín al español—se toma conciencia de la enorme importancia que tienen en el panorama general de la falsificación de Marchena las notas sobre el fragmento de Petronio producidas en francés por Marchena, tan sólo 6 notas que ocupan sin embargo las páginas 83 a 135 de esta edición. En tal extensión quedan incluidas las notas al pie de JAB a las notas en sí de Marchena. Por otra parte, las notas de JAB a las notas de Marchena constituyen una suerte de aporte erudito acerca de hombres y dioses y sus datos básicos; tómese como ejemplo la nota 11 de JAB que comienza con el texto “Venus era la esposa de Vulcano” y a continuación aporta la consabida historia de los amores de Venus y Marte.

La primera nota de Marchena al texto “veréis que tratáis con un hombre” de su propia falsificación, consiste en una argumentación variada con ejemplos acerca de la prueba de que en época de los romanos las mujeres preferían a los militares antes que a otros hombres. Acerca del rapto en la antigüedad y de las relaciones de poder en una sociedad dividida entre los fuertes y los débiles, desarrolla Marchena sus pintorescas reflexiones antropológicas y literarias para dar rienda suelta a sus habilidades argumentativas. No le basta la antigüedad y asimila la actitud de los antiguos a la de de los tiempos de la caballería en España del siglo del Quijote. Marchena concluye citando un verso de Dryden y JAB en nota al pie aclara la referencia concreta de la cita de Dryden y aporta el dato de que “más tarde Henry Purcell le puso música.” La segunda nota de Marchena versa acerca del pasaje: “sus camaradas nos cogen a mí y a Cuartilla.” En el texto latino correspondiente se deslizan algunos errores que deben atribuirse a la edición que tenemos entre manos y no a Marchena: comites arctissimi vinculis me Quartillamque adligant donde debería leerse arctissimis; y a continuación nec sino magno risu donde está claro el error de sino por sine. Marchena discurre pintorescamente por el origen del oficio de las cortesanas, los tipos femeninos en Grecia y en Roma hasta finalizar en un detalle y referencia a cómo degeneran las más santas instituciones en referencia a la desaparición de las cortesanas de los ámbitos clericales. La tercera nota corresponde al texto Embasicoetas autem, jussu militis, oldi oris foedissimis osculis totum me miserum conspurcabat “El soldado ordena entonces al embasiceta que me colme con sus besos impuros.”

Como puede verse, la traducción al español no se ajusta claramente al texto latino. El recorrido de Marchena es esta vez por los vericuetos de la pederastia no sólo entre los paganos sino también entre los cristianos. Las notas de JAB aportan detalles de referencias concretas a la literatura mencionadas por Marchena. La nota 4 se refiere a “El embasiceta llegó en seguida a la cima de sus deseos.” Gaudium integrum hausit muestra el error de edición: integrit por integrum. Es la nota más breve de las seis referida al tema del onanismo y el pecado. Comprende entre otras referencias, la de una imitación del carmen 51 de Catulo, realizada por el propio Marchena según aclara en el nota JAB. La nota 5 bajo el título del texto relativo a “Gitón acababa de desflorarla y de conseguir una sangrienta victoria” desarrolla el tema de la virginidad, indudable preocupación del abad. Finalmente la nota 6 se detiene en el tema de la alcachueta a partir de una referencia a “Entonces una vieja…” en el que Marchena alaba a Mercurio en su papel de intermediario, y JAB trae a colación entre otros textos al Quijote y el proceso en el que Cervantes fue acusado de ser alcachuete.

El libro de JAB cumple la función de dar a conocer el texto en sí de la falsificación de Marchena y las notas que lo acompañan, las cuales según varios especialistas fueron probablemente redactadas por un grupo de amigos junto a Marchena, como testimonio de libertinos dedicados a actividades literarias de salón y tertulia. Estos habrían compuesto prácticamente un tratado de erotología clásica motivados en la erudición de las enciclopedias que circulaban por la época en Basilea, como la de Diderot y D'Alembert o las entradas del diccionario de Pierre Bayle. El texto latino, sin embargo no parece haber sido el objetivo principal de la edición de JAB puesto que se presenta con algunos errores morfológicos que dan cuenta de que su interés fue colocado en las notas de Marchena, y no tanto en el texto latino del abad.

El texto de Marchena resulta totalmente insatisfactorio para completar la laguna final del episodio de Cuatilla. Nada que agregar, pues, a Petronio; en cambio, mucho que complementar para una lectura de la recepción de los textos latinos a comienzos del siglo XIX. Un texto especial para lectores interesados en curiosidades libertinas y para la historia de la sexualidad, y acerca de un abad con aspiraciones académicas que no representa la posición de la iglesia en relación con aquélla. El mérito de JAB es poner a disposición un relato fantástico de una falsificación literaria, tanto más obsesionada con aspectos culturales de la historia de la sexualidad, cuanto menos valiosa como relleno narrativo de una de las lagunas del Satiricón.
This is a smart book with essays by some of the world’s leading Petronian scholars, and by scholars whose experience with different genres or disciplines well inform their insights to the cultural phenomena that Petronius’s work incorporates. There is a refreshing newness about this collection—it offers us Petronius for a new generation—and while the authors give ample credit to the scholarship (particularly) of the last one hundred years, the book reveals ample avenues for further discovery. It is no small feat, as I see it, that the editors have been able to encompass so much divergent material by so many scholars in a package that proceeds in such a reasonable progression of ideas. In turn, each essay helpfully includes a paragraph with recommendations for further reading.

The introduction by the editors summarizes the basic “what we know” about the work and its author: that it is identified by many as the first novelistic text in Latin, that the author is presumed by nearly all to be the Petronius mentioned in Tacitus as Nero’s courtier and presumed by nearly all to be the Petronius mentioned in Tacitus as Nero’s courtier and *elegantiae arbiter*. The authors, I suppose trying to be all-inclusive, open leave the possibility that the author’s identification may not be set in stone, but anyone who thinks so will have to come up with rather compelling arguments against the evidence presented on pages 5—10 which is a neat summary of Rose and Walsh. The editors state that it is time that scholars broke down the “sharp divide between literary and historical studies” (2). That is the principal (and admirable) aim of this collection.

Niall Slater offers a curtain call to his splendid 1990 study, explaining how fragmentation affects our experience with the novel—a theme that will be picked up later in Chapter 12 dealing with Fellini’s cinematic treatment of a fragmented text. Slater also explains the use of *Satyricon* rather than *Satyricon* for the title of Petronius’s work (*Satyricon* is used throughout the collection). He provides in some detail an analysis of themes in the novel (see the section “Wrath of Priapus”), and he touches upon the issues of prosimetrum and the performative aspects of Petronius’s text.

J. R. Morgan’s chapter unfolds the major influences of Homer, Plato and Greek fictional narrative on Petronius’s text. On Homer, Morgan suggests that a series of “meaningful resonances” should activate the educated reader to appreciate the parody and the comparative *ethos* that underlies each author’s text: (38) “The satirical and moral implications of the mythic, and specifically Homeric, intertextuality...are never drawn by the narrator. At this level, it is a tool in the communication between author and reader.” Morgan’s point is helpful, since it suggests that moralism need not be blatantly narrated to be present—the influences and models on the text provide a background of moral and ethical ideologies to which the present text responds. His discussion on Plato brings us back to Averil Cameron’s study on Petronius’s use of the *Symposion* in the *Cena Trimalchionis*. Morgan ends his essay with rather controversial point made in this collection: that Petronius’s *Satyricon* did not set out to parody the Greek romance novel. Taking aim at Heinze, he points to evidence in recent papyrological finds that “Greek fiction was generically less restricted than had hitherto been realized. The existence in Greek of analogous fictional narratives of comic low-life weakens the explanation of the *Satyricon* as a parody of idealistic love-romance” (43). These last five pages of Morgan’s essay are thus important for anyone examining the “literary texture” of the *Satyricon*.

Costas Panayotakis writes on the influences of Horace, Virgil, and Ovid, noting that (52) “the lion’s share of literary evocations go to Virgil.” In the Virgil section, in line with his own scholarly interests, he reads Encolpius’s Aeneas-like moments as role-playing theatricality, and relegates to previous scholarship the deeper moral and philosophical interpretations as to why Encolpius might evoke Aeneas. He uses the passive voice a lot at the end of this section “[Geton’s] and Encolpius’s exaggerated histrionics have been interpreted...” (54) and “Petronius has been seen as an author who...” (55). I would have liked to see further acknowledgment, such as that seen in Morgan’s piece, that the moral ground staked out in the *Aeneid* forces *Satyricon* into a spotlight for comparison. Panayotakis rigorously examines two episodes in which Petronius combines allusions. One such analysis is comically entitled, “Encolpius’s Penis and Dido,” and considers the relationship between *Sat*. 132, *Aeneid* 2.791–3, 6.700–1, 9.436 and *Amores* 3.7; it is definitely worth a read. The second example of combined allusions occurs on board Licchas’s ship (especially *Sat*. 103–105) where aspects of Greek and Roman novels, Roman oratory, and low drama interplay. His synthesis of arguments regarding the so-called quotation of Publius (*Sat*. 55.5–6) is especially good.

Victoria Rimmell explores the ways in which “the extreme rhetoricization of speech” and “overly crafted narrative” combined with “a carnivalesque poetics” result in “literary language blurring into violent action and incoherent noise” (66). Her three-page survey of the styles of speech around Trimalchio’s banquet-table is incredibly useful, and her study of the uses of *fundere, lacerare*, and *vibrate* in the extant text point to the layers of sound that Petronius creates. She also draws intriguing parallels between Eumolpus’s *Bellum Civile*

---


7 The phrase “The literary texture” is the title of chapter three in Walsh 1970, 32–66.
poem and the Cena Trimalchionis. In sum, Rimmell attributes to Petronius a new kind of artistry whereby “written representation can convey non-verbal or incoherent orality” (80). This is a particularly good piece that makes new inroads in the exploration of Petronius’s style.

Amy Richlin explores the sexual world that Petronius presents to us. She begins with a useful survey of Roman sexual norms, the phallo-centric nature of Roman society, and the treatment of slaves. She also offers a useful review of the evidence regarding the social status of the three main characters (86). She explores the Priapic theme in some detail, and she provides many examples of rhetorical or epic moments underlined by sexual connotations. She finishes with an interesting history lesson on how Petronius’s text began to overcome its taint of indecency and gain acceptance as a literary work. There are some over-generalizations or unexplained assertions, such as the suggestion that Roman slaves lived in a much different (?) sex/gender system from eastern Mediterranean slaves (83)—she offers no footnote or further explanation.

Caroline Vout’s chapter is a clever study of the overlaps or forced associations between Petronius’s text and Suetonius’s Nero. This phenomenon, she suggests, is not “a matter of direct impact, but one bred of diffusion” (109). She poses that the carefully crafted artificiality of Petronius’s narrative is one attempt to process the imperial period, and that same impulse underlies allusive passages within the Satyricon itself, the result is more than just parody, but a Petronian “hall of mirrors” that offers fragmented reflections of the experience of living in Nero’s Rome.

As John Bodel revealed in his seminal dissertation, the representations of freedmen, especially in the Cena, are fascinating portraits that have contributed to both configuring and challenging general assumptions about that class. There are two treatments of freedmen in this collection, one by Jean Andreu on the representation of freedmen in general in the Satyricon, and one by Shelley Hales comparing Trimalchio’s domus to the homes of real Romans on the Bay of Naples. Andreu traces the outlines of Trimalchio’s social status and discusses the significant treatments of this character as an economic player, as a member of the Roman “bourgeoisie,” and as a man hemmed in by the limitations of his status. Like Richlin, he offers an interesting summary of the arguments and possibilities regarding the status of the novel’s three main characters. Especially useful are his comparisons between incidents at the Cena and evidence on the lives of freedmen as found in the archaeological record and non-fictional literary sources. Hales examines identity as expressed in living spaces. She discusses the importance of the domus to Romans in general and the ways in which Trimalchio and other freedmen define their success by their home-ownership. With success, she offers three discussions on themes relevant to theatricality in the Cena where nothing is what it seems and the collision of “house, space, art and behavior…create an atmosphere of confusion and disorientation” (175). As she rightly points out, a similar atmosphere is detectable in the actual Campanian houses of the period (even ones not owned by freedmen). Particularly good is her discussion (177–178) on the desire for realism among ancient (and not so ancient) art historians, and the ironic nature of Trimalchio’s penchant for naturalism.

Koenraad Verbvoen’s chapter contains much useful information for those interested in the imperial economy. For example, 78 percent of the extant funerary inscriptions that list the profession of the deceased belong to slaves or freedmen (129); and a recently discovered cache of Pompeian writing tablets provide detailed documentation of the private credit enterprise of the freedmen family of the Sulpicii (135). Verbvoen dispels some of the mythologies about enterprising freedmen but leaves room for more exploration into the vital role of freedmen in a credit-based economy. As Verbvoen cautiously admits, there is still a great deal that can be learned about the ancient economy from Petronius’s text.

Valerie Hope continues her insightful work on tomb inscriptions with a chapter-length treatment of Trimalchio’s tomb. She provides useful summaries of the normal attitudes and rituals regarding death, and then uses that to indicate the trespasses of Trimalchio in the Cena. This kind of analysis is familiar to most scholars of Petronius, but Hope, to some extent reiterating the message of Lauren Petersen, reminds us that we should not “set up a false polarity between the tastes of the elite and tastes of freed slaves” (158).

Stephen Harrison and Joanna Paul bring the collection to a close by examining the works that indicate the extensive influence and nachleben of Petronius’s work. Harrison provides us a list of the fictional works that date as far back as 1594 (Thomas Nashe’s The Unfortunate Traveller) and as recently as 2007 (Jesse Browner’s The Uncertain Hour). To those who may still question the categorization of Petronius’s work, Harrison writes (196), “novelists since the nineteenth century have had no problem in seeing the Satyricon as a narrative of novelistic character.” Joanna Paul presents a fascinating study on Fellini’s directorial decisions in cinematically adapting Petronius’s novel. There are many intriguing bits of information in this chapter, but one particular gem is the explanation of the film’s name, “Fellini—Satyricon.” The combined notions of fragmentation, as discussed by Slater in chapter one, and dislocation play out a great deal in Fellini’s concept of the film, as Paul demonstrates in a useful summary and analysis of the plot. Fellini himself compared his film to an unearthed object from the ancient world (214), “the images should
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9 These documents are published: G. Camodeca, Tabulae Pompelanae Sulpiciorum. Edizione critica dell’archivio puteolano dei Sulpicii (Rome, 1999).
10 Lauren Hackworth Petersen, The Freedman in Roman Art and Art History (Cambridge, 2006).
evoke the texture of ashes, earth, and dust.”\textsuperscript{11} Fellini’s film is somewhat difficult to watch, but Paul seems to agree with the critics who praised his work for its presentation of antiquity “as simultaneously alien and timeless” (215). Both these essays raise intriguing philosophical questions about what Petronius means today.

The bibliography fills sixteen pages and is an absolutely essential addendum to the bibliography published by Schmeling and Stuckey in 1977.\textsuperscript{12} The indices are helpful and well edited. In all this is an excellent resource for those well-versed in or newly interested in Petronius. A prior review faulted this book for the lack of Latin passages within most analyses,\textsuperscript{13} but the essays treat a considerable number of issues relevant to the text. The editors made the right choice to leave larger matters of Petronius’s style and language to more focused scholarship.


Reviewed by Nadia Scippacercola

Al corposo volume della Ragno (in seguito R.), dedicato al tema della fabula scenica della matrona di Efeso, fa da introduzione un contributo, corredato da una propria bibliografia, di G. Cipriani (pp. 9–50). Indi segue la premessa dell’Autrice (pp. 51–54); poi l’insieme degli studi di R. si articola in tre sezioni o ampi capitoli, di differente lunghezza (pp. 55–492); chiude il volume una ricca bibliografia (pp. 493–570).

Il saggio di Cipriani, dal titolo Passioni ‘prese in parola’: Adiuvanti, mezzane, ingiunzioni all’amore (Virgilio, Seneca e Petronio), si sofferma su tre figure letterarie femminili non protagoniste: la nutrice di Fedra, Anna sorella di Didone e l’ancilla della vedova efesia; tali donne appaiono accomunate tra loro dal ruolo ‘mediano’ ricoperto, in rapporto alle proprie fabulae di riferimento, all’interno della costituenda coppia di amanti, e dal compito—che in sostanza esse stesse si arrogano (così è per la matrix in Seneca, cf. pp. 12–16)—di parlare per persuadere all’amore un soggetto ritroso. Cipriani affronta la lettura di Sen. Phaedr. 431–482 e Verg. Aen. 4,31–53,—passaggi di cui è anche riportato il testo ed è offerta una traduzione—mediante una compita analisi retorico-contenutistica. Fra le due suaroridiae ad amandum, il discorso di Anna, già dimostratosi efficace nell’ambito della propria fabula—seppur nel più agevole compito di muovere all’amore un cuore femminile (cf. p. 42)—si conferma “ottimo modello di persuasione” (p. 41); della sua parodia ripresa intertestuale, nel discorso rivolto alla vedova dall’ancella petroniana, si tratta infine (pp. 42–44). Questo nitido e ben dosato studio di Cipriani mette in luce alcune dinamiche di un certo rilievo: se, da un lato, è riscontrabile nella tradizione letteraria greco-latina una tendenza alla mitigazione dello scandalo dell’unione sessuale consumata tra due membri dello stesso nucleo familiare o, persino di un tabù come l’incesto, median te l’assimilazione di questi ultimi ad una, meno inquietante, relazione di tipo mercenario, dall’altro lato, le stesse adulterie protagoniste delle nostre fabulae tenderebbero ad acquisire un’identità più marcatamente cortigiana mediante il velato slittamento del ruolo delle loro figure attanziali da ‘figure di mezzo’ a mezzane.

Il motivo della matrona di Efeso rappresenta uno degli snodi cruciali nella storia delle letterature di tutti i tempi. R. svolge un’accattivante indagine sul testo della novella di Petronio e sull’“endogena teatralità” della sua diegesi, muovendo dalla volontà di colmare un vuoto presente nel panorama degli studi del Fortleben dei Satyrila. La studiosa dedica, infatti, le felici pagine del terzo capitolo all’esame di quattro importanti ‘iper-testi’ drammatici del racconto della vedova, noti presso il grande pubblico d’Europa e risalenti al secondo quarto del XX secolo.

Nel primo capitolo (Theatrum Arbitri. Elementi di (meta)teatralità nella ricezione dei Satyrila di Petronio), di carattere più generale, è delineato, sulla scia degli studi di C. Panayotakis, lo status quaestionis relativò all’impostazione teatrale del romanzo petroniano. Ciò comporta di necessità lo sforinamento (nel primo paragrafo) della vexata quaestio, nella quale la studiosa però non intende inserirsi, sul ‘genere’ cui apparterebbe il romanzo antico. R. richiama e commenta un passaggio di Macrobio (somn. 1,2,8) ricordando, con toni misurati, che le romanze latine furono avvicinate, per più motivi, al genere comico-teatrale. Ripercorrendo gli studi sui rapporti tra i Satyrila e il genere mimico, la studiosa si muove con destrezza su un altro “terreno minato”. R., ben documentata sulla questione, dirige l’attenzione sulle movenze ‘meta-teatrali’ del romanzo petroniano e formula delle considerazioni di un certo interesse. Proprio il ‘sentimento teatrale’ manifestato, a più riprese, dai personaggi della ‘farsa’ di Petronio, che mostrano di partecipare con cognizione, nel ruolo di attori o spettatori, alla propria recita, infierirebbe l’idea che la relazione tra il romanzo dell’Arbiter e il mimo si fondi, prima di tutto, sulla comune propensione alla mimetica. La funzione della componente mimica, indubbiamente presente nell’opera petroniana, non andrebbe pertanto cercata nell’ispirazione al ‘realismo’, ma riconsiderata nell’ambito di una grottesca esibizione del ‘teatro della vita.’

Nel terzo paragrafo, “Tutus mundus agit histrionem: Giovanni di Salisbury, il teatro di Shakespeare e due ‘falsi’ frammenti petroniani”, articolato in più sottoparagrafi, sono ricostruite, anche mediante il supporto di una nutrita serie di studi moderni, le suggestive vicende di inganni storico-filologici che hanno interessato il motto in latino nel corso dei secoli.

\textsuperscript{11} The quote is originally from Fellini’s preface (p.45) in D. Zanelli, ed., Fellini’s Satyricon (New York, 1970).
\textsuperscript{12} Gareth L. Schmeling and Johanna H. Stuckey, A Bibliography of Petronius (Leiden, 1977)
\textsuperscript{13} BMCR 2009.07.36.
Si segnala in particolare il par. 3.2, compito *excursus* sull’origine (greca), socratico-platonica, e sul fortunato sviluppo dell’antico *cliché: theatrum mundi, minus vitae*. Se dunque la notizia—trasmesse dagli editori shakespeariani Johnson-Steevens (1778) e Malone (1790) e risalente ad un perduto manoscritto di William Oldys—che dal 1599, sull’insegna del primo edificio del Globe Theatre (distrutto da un incendio nel 1613) avrebbe campeggiato la frase *Totus mundus agit histrionem* assieme alla figura di un *Caelifex*, appare quanto meno ‘arbitraria’ (Schanzer 1968; Stern 1997), e se dubbia resta la relazione della massima con il famoso verso dell’*As You Like It*: “All the world’s a stage” (cf. R., p. 102–103), del tutto incorretta risulterebbe l’attribuzione della *gnome* al genio di Petronio, effettuata, a più riprese, dai vari editori dei *Satyricon* e avallata dall’illustre umanista Giusto Lipsio. Tale sentenza ed un’altra (sul ‘mimo della vita’) sull’origine (greca), socratico-platonica, e sul fortunato sviluppo dell’antico *cliché: theatrum mundi, minus vitae*. Le notizie—trasmessi dagli editori shakespeariani Johnson-Steevens (1778) e Malone (1790) e risalenti ad un perduto manoscritto di William Oldys—che dal 1599, sull’insegna del primo edificio del Globe Theatre (distrutto da un incendio nel 1613) avrebbero campeggiato la frase *Totus mundus agit histrionem* assieme alla figura di un *Caelifex*, appare quanto meno ‘arbitraria’ (Schanzer 1968; Stern 1997), e se dubbia resta la relazione della massima con il famoso verso dell’*As You Like It*: “All the world’s a stage” (cf. R., p. 102–103), del tutto incorretta risulterebbe l’attribuzione della *gnome* al genio di Petronio, effettuata, a più riprese, dai vari editori dei *Satyricon* e avallata dall’illustre umanista Giusto Lipsio. Tale sentenza ed un’altra (sul ‘mimo della vita’) sono contenute, in realtà, nel *Policraticus* (3.8) di Giovanni di Salisbury in due *loci* di carattere ‘esaggiamento’ e quindi al *Saresberiensis*, in ultima istanza, andrebbe addebitata la loro paternità (R., pp. 120–131). Il secondo capitolo (“Lo *spectaculum* della matrona. Elementi di teatralità e metateatralità nel racconto della vedova infedele”) è dedicato più specificamente all’esame dell’‘ipotesi’ petroniana, di cui è riportato il testo (Petron. 110,6–113,2), corredata da una nota critica, ed è fornita una traduzione. Una ‘naturale’ contaminazione tra il genere novellico-narrativo e quello mimico-teatrale, favorita anche dalla concreta prossimità di occasioni, tempi e spazi entro cui erano fruiti i due generi, è circostanza ammissibile; e il concetto potrebbe ritenersi valido anche per la *fabula* *Milesia*. L’indagine della R. si propone di svelare, nel frangente, i “segnali autoriflessivi” (Barchiesi 1996, pp. 200–201), disseminati nelle sedi liminari del racconto di Eumolpo, per la sua propensione al vino e per l’abile uso della parola, sarebbe assimilabile ad una *lena* di tradizione mimica, comica o elegiaca. Infine, sull’abbrivio degli studi di matrice bakhtiniana, R. pone l’accento sulla presenza di una doppia *audience* che assiste allo *spectaculum* della Matrona: quella interna, rappresentata dal *populus* di Efeso e il pubblico dei *nautae*, esterno alla novella. La terza e ultima sezione (*Una matrona in scena. Aspetti della fortuna teatrale del racconto della matrona di Efeso*) si compone di due studi; nel primo—dedicato ai secc. XVII–XVIII e già in parte edito altrove—, alla luce delle critiche espressse da G.E. Lessing (Hamb. Dram. 36. *Stück*) sugli adattamenti teatrali della novella della vedova, sono ripercorsi i problemi insiti in un’operazione di “transmodalizzazione intermodale” (Genette 1982); indi è affrontato l’esame delle due incompilate redazioni di mano lessinghiana del *Die Matrone von Ephesus*. Il secondo studio ci porta nel XIX sec., soffermandosi in particolare sulla decade 1936–1946. Una brillante analisi, da tenere presente negli studi futuri, è riservata all’atto unico di Jean Cocteau, dal pregnante titolo: *L’École des veuves*, al poco noto dramma breve *La Matrone d’Éphèse* di Paul Morand, ai quattro atti, con il medesimo titolo, del belga Georges Sion e quindi alla commedia in versi, *A Phoenix too frequent*, dell’inglese Christopher Fry. E però impossibile riasumere l’intera messe di informazioni veicolate dal libro di R., che si dimostra uno studio dotto, versatile, ottimamente aggiornato e redatto con onestà intellettuale. Il volume copiosamente annotato, copre un amplissimo arco temporale e tratta pure, seppur non *ex professo*, delle versioni medievali della *fabula* (n. 95, pp. 391–393), delle varie riscritture in ambito europeo con approfondimento della ricezione delle versioni orientali, recupera il XIX sec. (p. 406) e arriva fino alla contemporaneità (cf. n. 120; p. 403). Qui e li, il discorso si scompone in note di tipo verbale, in dettagli storici-biografici, e in varie digressioni che approfondiscono specifiche tematiche: le testimonianze offerte dalla letteratura giuridica, le modalità storico-letterarie del compianto funebre nel mondo greco-romano, il ridicolo, la crocifis-
Abstract: This dissertation is a study of dreaming as a narrative device in the eight canonical ancient novels: Chariton’s Callirhoe, Xenophon of Ephesus’ Ephesiaca, Achilles Tatius’ Leucippe and Clitophon, Longus’ Daphnis and Chloe, Heliodorus’ Aethiopica, Petronius’ Satyricon, Apuleius’ Metamorphoses, and the anonymous Historia Apollonii. It argues that the recurrent motif of dreaming in these works is best understood as a central element in a religious structure which is characteristic of the ancient novels, and concludes that religious ideas are an important part of these novels: not as part of their “message,” but as a pattern of cultural expectations upon which they draw to achieve an emotional effect upon the reader.

The first two chapters look at the way dreams operate purely within the narrative universe of the novels themselves. In the first chapter, evidence is presented to support the claim that dreams in the ancient novels are for the most part assumed to be divine in origin. The second chapter investigates the reasons these dreams are sent, and concludes that while they may have various roles, or even no role at all, in shaping the novels’ plots, the one constant is that they are sent for their beneficial emotional effect on the dreamer or protagonist.

The third and fourth chapters ask how these functions of dreams within the novels can be connected to the role of the novels in the real world. The third chapter argues that the dreams have a metalingual function in relation to the novels themselves: they essentialize the novels by providing insight into their basic structures of meaning in simplified and thus more easily comprehensible form. The emotional effect and connection with the divine provided to the protagonists through their dreams is thereby offered to the reader through the novels. The fourth chapter examines these related functions of religious meaning and emotional effect, and shows how they fit into and offer evidence for the socio-historical context of the novels. It concludes with a brief examination of the dreams in each of the novels taken individually.
and arena. Lucan’s *Bellum Civile* and Petronius’ *Satyricon* are both filled with gladiatorial allusions and motifs which are closely connected to images involving boundary violation. Within environments such as the theater and arena, Nero transgressed important and clearly defined boundaries by performing as an actor and by encouraging other elites to perform as well. Inside the Roman arena, an elite male member of Roman society could experience a violation to his physical self and this sometimes caused him to question who he was as an individual (a Roman elite citizen being defined as impenetrable and an intact totality). As my study shows, Lucan and Petronius experienced similar concerns and anxieties about what made an individual and how he was defined. This is clearly reflected in their literary works as they present literary worlds in which physical and social boundaries are very fragile and easily violated.


**Abstract:** This dissertation traces the literary influences that affect the *Kyng Alisaund* from their origination in the decades following Alexander the Great’s 323 BCE death to their expression in the fourteenth-century CE Middle English romance. This work examines the Middle English author’s mediation of the intertextual influences of its immediate sources and the ancestral texts from which medieval Alexander literature descends. The *Kyng Alisaund* resists the drift towards fantasy embraced by the overall literary Alexander tradition by grounding its narrative in human agency and in a particularized, concrete world.


**Abstract:** Narrative criticism, which utilizes elements of secular narratology to interpret the Gospels, has developed into a major methodological approach in Biblical Studies. Characterization is a fundamental aspect of narrative discourse. As such, it is no surprise to find the category playing host to dominant ideologies of both “literature” and “the self” while also giving rise to confusions between narrative characters and historical persons. This dissertation revisits characterization in the Gospel of Mark, which I read in conversation with two Greek novels—*Leucippe and Clitophon* by Achilles Tatius and the anonymous *Life of Aesop*. This intertextual reading attempts to problematize both implicitly modern notions of literary characters as autonomous “agents” and “naturalizing” treatments of literary characters as historical referents.

The dissertation begins with an assessment of the current state of New Testament narrative criticism that demonstrates the persistence of modernist conceptualizations of “character” in contemporary narrative-critical engagements with the New Testament, and the extent to which historical concerns continue to hold sway over efforts to analyze the narrative dynamics of the gospels. I then set out to establish a poststructuralist narratological framework. For analyzing literary characters, which dislodges notions of “unity” and “coherence,” jettisons categorizations of characters as “flat” and “round,” and problematizes the long-standing dichotomy of story and discourse. The remaining three chapters perform readings of specific themes and episodes in Mark, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, and the *Life of Aesop*. Attending to the aspects of focalization, dialogue, and plot as they relate to characterization, these readings illustrate the inherent ambiguity of narrative discourse, particularly with regard to referentiality, human agency, and the complex relationship between literature and history. Moreover, they illustrate the diverse and complex ways that narratives always, of necessity, produce fragmented characters that refract the inherent paradoxes of narrative itself and of human experience. Human beings identify with characters most, I suggest, in the way that their lives and experiences are mediated through narratives—discourses that are never complete, subjectivities that are perpetually under construction in and through language.


**Abstract:** This dissertation looks at four authors (all “unqualified Second Sophists”) whose literary activity covers the same period in the latter half of the second century: Lucian of Samosata, Maximus of Tyre, Publius Aelius Aristides of Mysia, and Lucius Apuleius of Madaura. Though born and in general operating at the geographic periphery of the Greco-Roman world, these second-century authors wrote with profoundly acculturated voices. At the same time, there was great concern in their work to emulate the themes and language of Classical Greece, and thereby add their names to the long tradition of Greek thought. The friction between various cultural trends such as the centripetal force of Rome, the movement of the Sophists around the East, and the importance of the tradition of fifth- and fourth-century Greek letters adds a particular force to their treatment of Plato. For these authors hailing from Asia and Africa, one strategy of appealing to past Hellenic literary glory was to invoke Plato and the tradition of Platonicism. This dissertation aims to describe the backbone of the Middle Platonic tradition in order to identify the significant influence Plato had on nearly all the literature from the Second Sophistic.

Abstract: Fairy tales present an often unrecognized source for the discussion of weighty cultural and societal issues, which are matters that continue to return to the forefront of cultural consciousness throughout multiple generations. The tale of “Beauty and the Beast” deals with motifs which are universal to the human experience, and because of this it has remained relevant for hundreds of years. This paper explores the changing thematic expressions of sexuality, the encounter with the other and gender roles in different renderings of this tale. Though these issues are perceived as static, they are constantly being redefined by social and cultural consciousness, a fact which is represented in the texts. Apuleius’ “Cupid and Psyche,” Marie-Catherine d’Aulnoy’s “The Green Serpent,” provide an historical starting point for the analysis of twentieth- and twenty-first-century texts utilizing psychoanalytic, feminist and sociocultural discourses. Primary texts analyzed include: Jean Cocteau’s La Belle et La Bete; Irina Povolotskaya’s Alenkiy Tsvetochek; Walt Disney’s Beauty and the Beast; Angela Carter’s “The Tiger’s Bride”; Pat Califia’s “St. George and the Dragon”; and finally, Victor Pelevin’s The Sacred Book of the Werewolf.


Abstract: My aim in the present study is to offer a close analysis of the ways in which statues function in the literature of the Roman Empire from the Augustan period to the highpoint of the Second Sophistic in the late 2nd and early 3rd centuries CE. In their presentation of the literary statue, Roman authors manipulate the defining criteria of the sculpted medium—fixity, materiality and silence. My analysis of the strategies employed by Imperial authors in “writing” the statue reasesses the presentation of art in a literary context and how the sculpted medium challenges simple description. I have structured my dissertation as a series of case studies that analyze the unique features of the statue and their translation from a visual to a literary medium. In particular, I investigate the sculptural medium’s negotiable relationship to an original source or model; the consequences of resemblance to and approximation of life; and the challenge posed to the primacy of text with regard to fixing permanence and effectively representing “reality.” These areas of inquiry also include a consideration of the sculptor as a creator-figure, especially in the case of religious or cult images as well as the use of statues as a metaphorical field in the sexualized description of female beauty. I begin my inquiry with an analysis of the statue in Ovid’s Metamorphoses as a methodological introduction. I then turn to a consideration of several related themes: resemblance and the portrait statue (Pliny the Younger), the issues of replication and substitution (Histories of Tacitus; Favorinus’ Corinthian Oration), canonical artists and the sculpting of the divine (Propertius 4.2), the perspective that integrates viewing and reading as parallel and interrelated processes—something I term “epigrammatic viewing” (Silvae 1.1 and 4.6), and finally, the metaphorical complex that writes women as statues and how that affects the text through reciprocity (Petrionius’ Satyricon 126–132). In my conclusion, I analyze a fictional letter by Alciphron that puts on display the portrait statue, divine images, and the confrontation between model and image, as well as the relationship between artist, model and statue.


Abstract: This paper aims to explore the connections and parallels between Longus’ Daphnis and Chloe and Ovid’s Metamorphoses. The conclusions reached should provide fertile ground for further studies in the intertextual play between novels and Latin poetry. To reach these conclusions, there will be a multi-pronged approach at analyzing the questions and implications raised by the potential connections. First Longus’ novel will be situated within a context of Greek literature under the Roman Empire that consciously utilized Vergilian poetry. Having done that, I will turn to the similar methods that each author uses to play with genre and the visual worlds in his work, a process that shows that Longus was using Ovid as a definite model/kindred spirit for his novel’s approach to these topics. Following that, there will be an extended examination of specific episodes in Daphnis and Chloe through which Longus reveals his knowledge of Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Finally, this paper will attempt to situate the arguments and conclusions that are made in the context of the current debates over the readership of the novel to present a strong case for bilingualism in the ancient world.


Abstract: Apuleius’ Metamorphoses is a novel singularly obsessed with sight, spectatorship, the acquisition of experience from viewing, and the permeability of social and physical boundaries created by acts of viewing. I intend to analyze the variety of changes that viewing creates and how viewing itself throughout the novel signals the permeability of boundaries between classes and states of being. An examination of the patterns of motivation and consequence in acts of viewing reveals a concern with the delineation of boundaries of status and their transgression. The patterns of sight and transgression
of boundaries unify the disparate elements of the narrative with Lucius’ initiation into the worship of Isis. This study will argue that the novel is ultimately structured into a narrative of conversion by these scenes of seeing and transgression. The first chapter considers viewing in the context of tales inserted into the narrative. The second chapter covers instances in which the narrator, Lucius, is held in the gaze of others. Finally, the third chapter examines the ways in which Lucius views women, from the slave Photis to the goddess Isis.


Abstract: This dissertation represents a novel approach to the Lucianic corpus and studies paradox, with rhetorical, philosophical, and aesthetic implications, as Lucian’s distinctive discursive mode of constructing cultural identity and literary innovation. While criticizing paradoxography—the literature of wonders—as true discourse, Lucian creates a novel, avowed false, discourse, as a form of contemplation and regeneration of the Greek literary tradition.

Paradoxography is Lucian’s favorite self-referential discourse in prolalitai, rhetorical introductions, where he strives to earn doxa through paradoxa—paradigms of exoticism applied to both author and work. Lucian elevates paradox from exotic to aesthetic, from hybrid novelty to astonishing beauty, expecting his audience to sublimate the experience of ekplexis from bewilderment to aesthetic pleasure.

Lucian’s construction of cultural identity, as an issue of tension between Greek and barbarian and between birthright and paideutic conquest, is predicated on paradoxology, a first-personal discourse based on rhetorical and philosophical paradox. While the biography of the author insinuates itself into the biography of the speaker, Lucian creates tension between macro-text and micro-text. Thus, the text becomes also its opposite and its reading represents almost an aporetic experience.