

in the last three stanzas (and here again, the principle in part reaches back to the second stanza) are ordered according to a standard division of the universe into three realms—heaven, earth, and the underworld—inhabited respectively by the higher gods, men, and the lower gods and the dead. This is a categorization that Horace uses elsewhere to convey an impression of his subject's universal range.³ In *Odes* 1. 34, Jupiter's thunderbolt is represented as affecting the sky (*per purum*, 7), the earth, here divided into the land (*tellus*, 9) and the waters (*flumina*, 9) to increase the impression of scope, and the underworld ("Styx et invisi horrida Taenari / sedes," 10–11). To this vertical division of the universe, running from top to bottom, Horace adds that the thunderbolt shook the world throughout its horizontal dimension (*Atlanteusque finis*, 11) as well.⁴ By tracing its effect through each of the three realms, Horace persuades us of the tremendous magnitude of the thunderbolt's power. In the Hymn to Mercury, the same division of the universe, running from top to bottom, is turned to the purposes of praise, although in accordance with the needs of the Hymn, the three realms are here designated not by their geographical features but by their inhabitants. In the third stanza, Mercury delights the Olympian Apollo; the god's services to the Olympians are foreshadowed in stanza two ("magni Iovis et deorum / nuntium," 5–6). In the fourth stanza, he performs a service in the realm of men. In the fifth stanza,

he conducts his duties among the dead. To underline the significance of this plan, Horace concludes his description of the universal range of Mercury's praiseworthy acts with an expression of the commensurately universal delight and gratitude which he inspires. Mercury is "superis deorum / gratus et imis" (19–20). For the sake of brevity, Horace here replaces the triple division of the universe by a doublet, in which the range of Mercury's praise is marked out in terms of its upper and lower limits; once again, the elements run from the top of the universe to the bottom, recapitulating the movement of the earlier stanzas. It is important to observe that Horace heightens this final compliment by focusing on the divine participants in the delight and gratitude duly felt toward Mercury. This emphasis does not, however, detract from the universal scope of the praise, if only because the fact of human delight in the god is amply demonstrated by the Hymn itself.

I hope that the recognition of the plan which underlies its last three—in part, its last four—stanzas may help us read the Hymn with somewhat greater obedience to Horace's intention; and that, so read, the poem may enhance our delight not only in the "eloquent" god but in the eloquent poet, who is able in three brief stanzas to span the entire universe with praise.

RICHARD FREIS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

3. In addition to *Odes* 1. 34, compare *Odes* 3. 4. 41–48, where the list is arranged differently, but contains the same elements (with some additions), likewise employed to create an impression of universal scope. For a Greek poem which is arranged in accordance with the same division of the universe one may compare Pindar's *Olympian* 14, which opens with a scene in heaven, passes to a scene on earth, and closes with a scene in Hades; all the universe is implicated in the glory and praise of Asopichus, as here in the glory and praise of Mercury.

4. This would be equally true whether one accepts the view of L. Müller, reported by R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I* (Oxford, 1970), *ad loc.*, that "Horace was referring to the Atlantic Ocean, the [watery] boundary of the world," or their own view that Atlas here means the western portion of the Atlas range, and represents "the boundary of the *continental* world [italics mine]."

A NOTE ON PETRONIUS SAT. 31. 2

In 1929 Moses Hadas suggested in a fascinating, far-reaching, and learned article that Oriental (we should now say Near Eastern)

elements were much in evidence in Petronius.¹ This bold and original thesis was almost totally ignored by Petronian scholars.² Until

1. "Oriental Elements in Petronius," *AJP*, L (1929), 378–85.

2. Thus, Hadas' article, which bears on numerous passages in the *Satyricon*, does not seem to be mentioned anywhere in

very recently, virtually the only scholar who seemed to acknowledge the existence of Hadas' paper was Luigi Pepe, and he only for the purpose of completely rejecting it.³ Enumerating many of Hadas' "parallels," Pepe attempted to demonstrate that each "Orientalism" was not such. In fact, while many of Pepe's objections are well taken, others are quite groundless and arbitrary⁴ and make the reader feel that Pepe has approached the problem with some strange a priori assumption that there could not be Oriental elements in the *Satyricon*. Fortunately, however, Hadas' paper seems now to be gaining some of the recognition it merits. With an eye on Hadas' work, Hewitt has proposed that the game played at *Sat.* 64. 12 may be in its essence Oriental,⁵ while Flores has argued that both Habinnas and Massa are Jews with Semitic names and at the same time has praised Hadas for his efforts at synthesis.⁶ In addition, Dölger has interpreted *mata vita tau* (62. 9) as a partially Semitic expression.⁷

I am here concerned with one passage in the *Satyricon* whose meaning was elucidated by a Talmudic parallel that Hadas cited, since, through ignorance or neglect of his article, scholars continue to misunderstand it. At 31. 2

the servant, who has been spared punishment through the intervention of the adventurous heroes, declares to his saviors: "vinum dominicum ministratoris gratia est." Here are some representative translations: "Le vin du maître est la reconnaissance de l'échanson."⁸ "Der beste Wein des Herrn soll sich für den Mundschinken bedanken!"⁹ "Der Wein des Herrn ist der Dank des Mundschenks!"¹⁰ "Herrschaftlicher Wein ist Dank des Mundschenken."¹¹ "Son io che servo il vino del padrone."¹² "Dare il vino del padrone è un favor del coppiere."¹³ "The master's own wine will be the servant's thanks."¹⁴ "The master's wine is in the butler's gift."¹⁵ "The butler's gratitude is meted through his master's wine."¹⁶ "The boss's cellar is in the barman's gift."¹⁷ "The master's wine will prove the servant's gratitude."¹⁸ "The master's wine is the waiter's gift."¹⁹

These translations are possible, but the basic difficulties are manifest. *vinum est gratia* is certainly a strange and awkward phrase, circumnavigated generally by rendering *gratia* as "gift," a rather free translation and perhaps nowhere really paralleled.²⁰ In addition, the present tense is slightly hard, and Ryan and Arrowsmith take the small liberty

the commentaries of Marmorale, Paratore, Perrochat, and Maiuri; nor does it seem to have been used by Heraeus (third ed., 1939), Müller, and Schmeck (though the last cites the article in his bibliography) in their recent editions of the text. As far as can be told, none of the recent translators of Petronius has taken Hadas' work into consideration. Furthermore, in his lengthy chapter on "La Lingua di Petronio" in his *Questione Petroniana* (Bari, 1948), Marmorale fails to refer to Hadas' article. Sedgwick, however, in his second edition of the *Cena* (Oxford, 1950), does refer to Hadas' article several times in the addenda (pp. 142 ff.).

3. *Studi Petroniani* (Naples, 1957), pp. 75-82 (= *GIF*, II [1949], 269-72).

4. He gives no reason for his rejection of Hadas' remarkable theory that *burdubasta* (45. 11) is a transliteration of an Aramaic phrase, but only says that he prefers a different Latin derivation (*op. cit.*, p. 78). Hadas' understanding of "sociorum olla male ferve" (38. 13), founded on the very similar Aramaic proverb, Pepe refuses to accept, asserting (pp. 78-79) that a different interpretation better suits the context (though he fails to observe that it scarcely suits the Latin). But in fact Hadas' explication of this sentence, first put forth by W. Bacher, "A Talmudic Proverb in Petronius," *JQR*, V (1893), 168-70, is accepted by Friedländer, Maiuri, Perrochat, and Paratore; it seems to be thought at least likely by Marmorale. Pepe's mocking refusal (p. 82) to accept Hadas' suggestion that the tale of the widow of Ephesus may have Hebrew connections should be viewed in light of S. Lieberman's observa-

tion (*Greek in Jewish Palestine* [New York, 1942], p. 153 [henceforth Lieberman]) that the story "was most probably known to the Rabbis," a view recently maintained also by A. Scheiber, "Zu den antiken Zusammenhängen der Aggada," *Ant*, XI (1963), 149-54.

5. W. H. Hewitt, "Petroniana," *AClass*, III (1960), 90-92. J. F. Killeen's interpretation ("*Bucca, Bucca* Again," *CP*, LIV [1959], 178-79) of Luke 22: 63-65, if correct, would support a Near Eastern origin of this game.

6. E. Flores, "Un Ebreo Cappadocce nella 'Cena Trimalchionis,'" *RAAN*, XXXVIII (1963), 45-69.

7. F. J. Dölger, "Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichens II," *JbAC*, II (1959), 20-22.

8. A. Ernout (Paris, 1922).

9. W. Heinse (Düsseldorf, 1913).

10. C. Fischer (Munich, 1962).

11. L. Friedländer² (Leipzig, 1906).

12. G. A. Cesareo and N. Terzaghi (Florence, 1950).

13. V. Lancetti (Milan, 1863).

14. M. J. Ryan (New York, 1905).

15. M. Heseltine (LCL, New York and London, 1930).

16. P. Dinnage (London, 1953).

17. J. Lindsay (London, 1960).

18. W. Arrowsmith (Ann Arbor, 1962).

19. J. Sullivan (Baltimore, 1965).

20. *TLL*, VI, 2209, s.v. *gratia*. Probably none of the examples given really means *donum*. Moreover, there seems to be no sentence-type *aliquid est gratia*.

of using the future. Perhaps most important, all these translations ignore the chiasm with the juxtaposition of *dominicum* and *ministratoris*, which seems to indicate that a real contrast or antithesis is here being made between master and servant, a contrast which is nowhere present in these versions. However, Hadas' interpretation, made in accord with an Aramaic proverb, is very satisfying. He suggests simply that this sentence is the Latin version of the Talmudic proverb: "hamra lemareh tivuta leshakyeh," i.e., "The wine is the master's, the favor is the butler's."²¹ The virtual identity of the individual words in the two dicta makes it quite hard to believe that we are not dealing here with one and the same proverb. Thus, *hamra* = *vinum*, *lemareh* = *dominicum*, *tivuta* = *gratia*, and *leshakyeh* (belonging to the cup bearer or butler) is quite close to *ministratoris*. Therefore, the statement in Petronius is a binary proverb and should be punctuated "vinum dominicum, ministratoris gratia est."²² This is supported by the fact (observed by Bücheler, Friedländer, and others) that the Latin sentence is a

senarius, a sign that it may be proverbial.²³ If one takes the statement as one clause (as has commonly been done), then it scarcely has proverbial sense, but seems rather an *ad hominem* remark, relevant to the very specific occurrence in the *Satyricon*. As two clauses, however, the statement perfectly suits the specific context and also has an obvious proverbial significance. One might add here that Pepe opportunely avoids mentioning this Aramaic parallel in his discussion.²⁴

Proverbs are reflections of common human experience and are not necessarily defined by cultural differences. Thus, one cannot categorically assert that Petronius was here making use of a Semitic proverb or even that this was originally a Near Eastern proverb that at some earlier time became a part of Greco-Roman wisdom. (One could conceivably even argue that the flow was in the opposite direction.)²⁵ One can scarcely deny, however, that much light is shed on the potentially ambiguous Latin statement by the Aramaic dictum;²⁶ indeed it seems likely that the meaning of the Latin is the same as that of the Aramaic.²⁷

21. Hadas translates, "the thanks the butler's." It is perhaps somewhat better to translate *tivuta* (and *gratia*) as "favor" (as does Lieberman, p. 153, following the Talmudic commentary known as *Tosaphoth on Baba Kamma*, 92b). The meaning is essentially the same either way, for he who does the favor receives the thanks. This interpretation was actually first suggested by Zielinski in *Philologus*, LXIV (1905), 20. Friedländer's objection that such a sense "passte hier nicht" is certainly unfounded. The servant points out that, although he is only a servant and the wine belongs to the master, the servant bestows the favor by selecting and serving the wine.

22. It is true that, when two clauses share the copula, it is more usual to find it in the first clause with the ellipsis in the second, but this is no real objection.

23. A. Marbach, *Wortbildung, Wortwahl und Wortbedeutung als Mittel der Charakterzeichnung bei Petron* (Diss. Giessen, 1931), p. 46, n. 105, observes that the Latin "bildet einen Senar und ist daher wahrscheinlich sprichwörtlich."

24. It should be remarked that Lieberman (pp. 152-53), a leading authority on the question of cultural interrelationships between the Hellenistic-Roman and Jewish worlds, independently pointed out the similarity of the Petronian sentence to the Aramaic proverb and interpreted the Latin as a binary proverb.

25. For an interesting discussion of the relationship of Talmudic proverbs to Greco-Roman ones, see Henry A. Fischel's article, "Proverbs, Greek and Latin in Talmudic Literature," in the new *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem forthcoming).

26. In similar fashion, Friedländer revised his interpretation of *sociorum olla male feruet* (38. 13) in the light of the Aramaic proverb noted by Bacher, which he accepted as

illuminating the Latin proverb, though not necessarily reflecting any influence from one culture on the other.

27. Zielinski (*loc. cit.*) has pointed to Aristoph. *Eg.* 1205, τοῦ παραδέντρος ἡ χάρις, which he considers the Greek version of the proverb. If he is right, then the possibility that Petronius chose the proverb as an Oriental one may be diminished. (We might, however, note that Aristophanes makes reference to the walls of Babylon at *Birds* 552, and wrote a play *Babylonians*. Herodotus, too, describes Babylon and the Babylonians at some length [I. 178-200]. In general, we should do well to remember M. L. West's insightful, if overstated, remark that "Greek literature is a Near Eastern literature" [*Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), p. 31].) In any event, the case for understanding the Latin as we have here argued is probably strengthened, for in Aristophanes only the second half occurs: τοῦ παραδέντρος ἡ χάρις = *ministratoris gratia est*. This phrase could only stand by itself if the dictum were a binary proverb. If, as most have thought, "vinum dominicum ministratoris gratia est" is one clause, then τοῦ παραδέντρος ἡ χάρις (*ministratoris gratia est*) by itself scarcely makes sense. It will perhaps be methodologically valuable to add here another remarkable parallel cited by Hadas (and Lieberman, p. 153), which Pepe again conveniently ignores. At 45. 8 there occurs the sentence "qui asinum non potest stratum caedit." As Hadas well points out, this is the verbatim equivalent of the proverb found in the Midrash: "mi sheeno yakhol lehakot lahamor makeh et haukaf." In sum, Petronian scholars would do well to take under consideration Paratore's remark that the *Satyricon* may contain "tracce della civiltà ebraica" (II, 116, n. 5), or at least Lieberman's conclusion (p. 154) that both Petronius and the Babylonian Rabbis "drew from a common oriental source."

To give added support to this interpretation of the Latin and perhaps to increase the plausibility of the thesis that the proverb is originally and essentially a Near Eastern one, I want to call attention to an ancient Babylonian proverb hitherto unnoticed in this connection. On one of the many bilingual (Sumero-Akkadian) tablets that have been preserved from the Babylonian civilizations there is found a series of proverbs among which are the following:²⁸

na-da-nu šá šarri ū-bu-bu šá šá-qí-i
 <na-da-nu šá šarri> dum-mu-qu šá a-ba-rak-ku

Though at the early stages of Assyriology it was not altogether clear what these meant,²⁹ there now seems to be agreement and Lambert's translation represents the generally accepted view. We have here, in effect, two versions of the same proverb: 1) "Giving per-

tains to a king, doing good to a cup-bearer"; and 2) "Giving pertains to a king, showing favour to a steward."³⁰ It is hardly necessary to point out that we have here essentially the same proverb as in the Talmud and, most likely then, in Petronius. Also, the Near Eastern origin of the saying is made even more probable, especially when one realizes that the Babylonian version (not the tablet) may go back to the third millennium.

In brief, the Aramaic and Babylonian proverbs make it highly likely that the sentence in Petronius should be read as two clauses, and they also give added substance to Hadas' suggestion that Oriental elements are present in Petronius.³¹

HOWARD JACOBSON

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA

28. The text is that of W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford, 1960), pp. 258–59.

29. See, for example, the interpretation of S. Langdon in *Amer. J. Sem. Lang.*, XXVIII (1912), 231, which is quite different from the currently held view.

30. Lambert, *loc. cit.*

31. It is heartening to note that P. Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff, 1966), p. 17, has recently suggested that Near Eastern literature "is a legitimate field of research if one tries to identify Ovid's source material." Indeed, the

ancient world was smaller than scholars usually suppose. Let me express here my sincere thanks to three scholars whose help was invaluable to me in the writing of this paper: to Professor Moshe Held, who gave freely of his learning on Assyriological matters; to Professor Henry A. Fischel, who allowed me to make use of his forthcoming article cited in n. 25 and also criticized an early version of this article; and especially to Professor Louis Feldman, who read a draft of this paper and made numerous valuable suggestions, nearly all of which have been incorporated.

ARISTOTLE *RHET.* 1413b3

ἐὰν γὰρ τις τὰ τοιαῦτα (i.e., repetition) μὴ ὑποκρίνηται (i.e., μὴ ὡς ἐν λέγοντα τῷ αὐτῷ ἦθαι καὶ τόνῳ εἰπεῖν) γίνεται "ὁ τὴν δοκὸν φέρων."

The expression ὁ τὴν δοκὸν φέρων, when commented on explicitly or implicitly, is referred to monotony ("chi non sa bene atteggiarle & pronuntiarle, porge, come si dice per proverbio, un piattelino di quei medesimi," A. Caro [1570]; "monotonian notat," Spengel [1867]), or sometimes to stiffness, in which latter case English-language commentators refer to the expression, "like one who has swallowed a poker" (Cope-Sandys [1877]; Welldon [1886]; Freese [LCL, 1926]; L. Cooper [1932]). But it is often enough translated without comment (as by Jebb-Sandys [1909]; Rhys Roberts in Ross; Gohlke [Paderborn, 1959], "wenn man soetwas nämlich nicht richtig vor-

trägt, kommt heraus 'der Balken Tragende'"). Only one scholar, so far as I can see, openly admitted the puzzling nature of the expression. Knebel (Stuttgart, 1838) in a note *ad loc.* (p. 205) wrote, "Der Sinn ist unstreitig: 'so kommt eine unerträgliche Monotonie heraus.' Was aber 'der Mann der den Balken trägt' mit diesem Sinne zu schaffen habe, vermögen wir nicht zu erklären."

No doubt Aristotle, if he had ever heard of a man swallowing a poker, could see some similarity between his condition and that of one carrying a beam; but I doubt if he would have found the comparison any apter than that involved in the "scream of Calliope" (*Rhet.* 3. 2. 11). In any case, neither of the expressions, per se, has any obvious reference to repetition, which is what he is here talking about (τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν), the διλογία that was