

TEXTUAL NOTES ON PETRONIUS¹

2. 3 nondum iuvenes declamationibus continebantur, cum Sophocles aut Euripides invenerunt verba quibus deberent loqui.

deberent loqui: loqui debemus *T^v Tol.*: deberemus *Puteanus ex v.c.*: debere *G*: deceret *incertus aliquis*: dei deberent *Wilamowitz*: qui in fabulis excellerent deberent *Fuchs*

The uneasiness caused by *deberent loqui* is reflected in the variant readings and the emendations put forward. Is there in fact a personal subject? To understand *iuvenes* is possible but clumsy, but if the tragic poets themselves are intended, then these great writers are strangely selfish. Petronius surely is talking about the proper language for good oratory (cf. 2. 7), which depends on a healthy literary language in general. This rules out Wilamowitz's too particular and Fuchs's uglier supplements: easier than *deceret* would be *deberet*, paralleled almost exactly in Petronius' contemporary, Seneca (*de Ira* 3. 3. 1). *Deberent* and *deberemus* were doubtless due to a desire to provide a personal subject for the misunderstood impersonal verb.

7. 3. video quasdam inter titulos nudas[que] meretrices furtim spatiantes.

quasdam . . . nudas[que] *Fraenkel*: quosdam λ inter titulos *O**, *vetus codex Pithoei p*: inter viculos *Ms* \rightarrow *drt*: internuculos 'in uno Petroniani Satyrici exemplari ita scriptum repperi' *Pithoeus 1564* \rightarrow *lm*

A commendable innocence has resulted in misplaced surgery. Prostitutes inside a brothel have neither the need nor the inclination to walk furtively: only their customers, for whom *quosdam* would be as appropriate a pronoun as *quasdam* would be inappropriate with *meretrices*. The real difficulty lies in *titulos*, as some of the older commentators saw, emending to *puellulos* and other things. Tornaesius's explanation, *tabernarum meretriciarum inscriptiones*, despite protests and other interpretations recorded in Burman ad loc., has prevailed. But although prices and names were inscribed over or on the doors of *cellae* (cf., e.g., Sen. *Controv.* 1. 2. 1; Mart. 11. 45. 1), nevertheless the collocation here of *tituli* and *meretrices* is neither vulgar nor funny. The reading *inter viculos* may conceal a hint of the truth, which is, I suggest, *vetulas*. The unfavourable connotation of this word is seen elsewhere in the *Satyricon* (28. 4, *puer vetulus, lippus, domino . . . deformior*) and would go well with the sordidness of the brothel (8. 1, *loco tam deformi*). Read therefore: *video quasdam inter vetulas nudasque meretrices furtim spatiantes*.

38. 10 itaque proxime cum hoc titulo proscrispsit: 'C. Pompeius Diogenes ex kalendis Iuliis cenaculum locat . . .'

cum *H*: cenaculum *Bücheler*: post cum aliquid perisse suspicatur *Fraenkel* (item *Fuchs*²)

Müller² obelizes *cum*, but Bücheler's emendation is very plausible. Encolpius' neighbour is repetitive (cf. *est . . . est . . . est*; *tamen . . . vides . . . vides . . . vides*, 37. 7 ff.). A few sentences later he tells us about the *libitinarius*: *cum timeret ne*

¹ The text printed is K. Müller's (Munich, 1961) with some additions to the apparatus. Müller² refers to the second edition printed in Petronius, *Satyrica* (Munich, 1965) by

Müller and W. Ehlers. I am grateful to Mr. L. D. Reynolds for some helpful comments on this paper.

creditores illum conturbare existimarent, hoc titulo auctionem (Scheffer, *caucionem* H) *proscripsit*: '⟨C.⟩ *Iulius Proculus auctionem faciet rerum supervacuarum.*' The bare (and natural) *hoc titulo* here throws doubt on the earlier *cum hoc titulo*, and the repetition (within five words) of *auctionem* ought similarly to guarantee Bücheler's *cenaculum*. As for Fraenkel's and Fuchs's suspicion of a lacuna, where an explanation of the circumstances might be provided, it may be pointed out that *proxime* provides a temporal parallel for *cum . . . existimarent*, and Diogenes' reasons for renting are given both at 38. 9 (*non vult sibi male*) and in the notice itself.

38. 12 *sed liberti scelerati, qui omnia ad se fecerunt.*

Encolpius' neighbour does not normally omit verbs. If we understand *sunt*, the statement is too sweeping in view of the company present, although a snobbish insult of more limited application would not be out of place when so many of the guests, not to mention their host, are eager to forget their servile origins. Read therefore *liberti sceleratique omnia ad se fecerunt*.

40. 5 *ceterum ad scindendum aprum non ille Carpus accessit, qui altilia laceraverat, sed barbatus ingens etc.*

Earlier (36. 6 ff.) Carpus, to provide Trimalchio with a pun, had carved the current dish like a gladiator (*ita laceravit obsonium, ut putares essedarium hydraule cantante pugnare*). Apart from the trivial consideration that the *obsonium* consisted of more than *altilia*, *laceravit* had point in its initial context, unlike *laceraverat* here, and Petronius' audience is not likely to have forgotten who Carpus is after Trimalchio's carefully-staged pun. The relative clause, although linguistically and rhythmically unexceptionable, is, like several others in our text (e.g. 25. 2, 40. 8, 58. 3, 73. 5), best deleted.

73. 2, 5 *balneum intravimus, angustum scilicet et cisternae frigidariae simile, in quo Trimalchio rectus stabat . . . nos, dum illi ludos faciunt, in solium, quod Trimalchioni praeparabatur, descendimus.*

in quo Bücheler: in qua H: in aqua Fraenkel solium Bücheler: solo H: solio Scheffer
praeparabatur Heinsius: pervapatur H: vaporabatur Bücheler

The heroes have been in this *balneum* before (28. 1), when they had broken out sweating and moved to the *frigidarium*. Petronius almost certainly means by *balneum* the most distinctive feature of a Roman bath, the *calidarium*, as is clear from 72. 3: *in balneum . . . sic calet tamquam furnus*. The bath in fact is big: it was once a *pistrinum* and has a tempting echo (73. 2-4), so it is hard to see why it should be compared to a storage cistern. *angustum . . . simile* therefore is probably a gloss to explain *rectus*, and the *in qua* of H the consequence of taking it seriously. Similarly, if *solium* meant an individual tub as it does at Lucr. 6. 800 and elsewhere, it is unlikely that the timorous Encolpius would usurp Trimalchio's rights. But Petronius probably uses the word in the sense of a *piscina*, or, more accurately, the *seat* around a *piscina* of the type found in Pompeii (see Dar.-Sagl. 1. 659 and cf. 92. 6, *circa solium sedentibus*). The efforts of editors to emend a clearly defective text are wasted: *quod . . . pervapatur* is also a gloss.

112. 2: *ne ⟨in⟩ hanc quidem partem [corporis] mulier abstinuit, victorque miles utrumque persuasit.*

in add. Fraenkel corporis Jacobsio auctore del. Fraenkel

Petronius' sentence is vague, but the emendations are even more difficult. *corporis* is found in all branches of the tradition, including the florilegia, and its

authenticity may be supported by a similar sentence in Sen. *de Ira* 3. 6. 2: *quis* [sc. *ira incitatus*] *ullam partem corporis tenuit*. Petronius uses elsewhere *abstinere* with a direct object (90. 6, *me . . . abstinencebo*). Here the soldier has persuaded the widow to eat, and the maid argues, with a tag from Virgil, that she should not fight his welcome advances. Satiety often leads to sex, as Eumolpus observes (112. 1); his euphemisms therefore should leave us in no doubt as to what corporeal parts he refers to or what two things (*utrumque*) the widow was talked into.

118. 3 ceterum [neque] generosior spiritus sanitatem amat, neque concipere aut edere partum mens potest nisi ingenti flumine litterarum inundata.

neque *del.* Fraenkel

sanitatem λ: vanitatem *p*²

Müller originally accepted Fraenkel's deletion, but, perhaps less happily than Pithou in a similar case, he adopted the directly opposite interpretation of the clause in his second edition. U. Klein's lengthier defence of the MS. text (*WS* lxxviii [1965], 176 ff.) took *sanitatem* as a reference to the 'saneness' of the Attic oratorical tradition which might be naturally alien to *furor poeticus*. But this does not fit Petronius' conception of the artist's task; when he says that epic poetry should give the *impression* (*appareat*) of *futurentis animi vaticinatio* (118. 6) rather than *religiosae orationis sub testibus fides*, he is not pleading for a Christopher Smart or a John Clare, as is evident from his stress on poetic principles and extensive reading (*flumine litterarum inundata*). Petronius is objecting to cheap rhetoric (118. 2, 5: *sententiolis vibrantibus*, and, in particular, *sententiae . . . extra corpus orationis expressae*); vulgarity of language; and an unpoetic insistence on historical accuracy: *sanitas* would not be an apt description for any of these. Once again Seneca may help us: in *Ep.* 40, speaking of overfluent oratory that aims to influence the crowd, he says of it (5): *multum praeterea habet inanitatis et vani, plus sonat quam valet*. Pithou in his second edition was on the right track, but although *vanus* and *inanis* are to be found in similar Petronian contexts (cf. 1. 2, *sententiarum vanissimo strepitu*; 2. 2, *levibus atque inanibus sonis*), the slightly more probable reading here is *inanitatem*, i.e. a propensity to empty phrases and sentiments, which contrasts more pointedly with the well-filled mind (118. 6, *plenus litteris*) necessary for true poetry, and is also easier to explain palaeographically (*sinanitatem* becoming *sanitatem*).

State University of New York at Buffalo

J. P. SULLIVAN